JAN 23 1951

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 96—PART 5

APRIL 25, 1950, TO MAY 16, 1950
(PAGES 5669 TO 7134)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast entrusted this earth unto the children of men and called us unto a heavenly citizenship, grant us, we humbly beseech Thee, such shame and repentance for the disorder and injustice and cruelty that blights our world that, fleeing unto Thee for pardon and for grace, we may with full purpose of spirit set ourselves to establish that city which has justice for its foundation and love for its law.

Forgive our national sins and our social sins. Forgive our sloth and indifference to great public issues when through the indifference of the many injustice and greed and tyranny flourish. In this hour of peril raise up men of spiritual vision and decisive action. Let the flag of freedom for which so many have suffered and died fly from the castle of every heart as the bugle of Thy call wakens our souls in this crucial day and musters for service our feeble wills. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 24, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by M. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 24, 1950, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 166) to authorize the award posthumously of an appropriate decoration to members of the crew of the United States Navy Privateer who lost their lives in or over the Baltic Sea on April 8, 1950, while in the performance of duty.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi).

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1861. An act for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

H. R. 4857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley; and

H. R. 5580. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5965) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3482) granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is returning to his State for the purpose of attending hearings on a Federal judgeship for the district of Utah, be granted leave of the Senate to be absent from the sessions beginning today and through May 8, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Magnuson
Anderson	Hayden	Malone
Benton	Hendrickson	Martin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Bricker	Hoey	Millikin
Butler	Holland	Morse
Byrd	Ives	Mundt
Cain	Jenner	Myers
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Darby	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworshak	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Taylor
Ecton	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lodge	Tobey
Flanders	McCarran	Tydings
Frear	McCarthy	Wherry
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Withers
Green	McMahon	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

VISIT OF MEMBERS OF GERMAN BUNDESTAG

The VICE PRESIDENT. Assembled in the office of the Vice President are 15 members of the German Bundestag, which is the Parliament of the new government in western Germany. Their schedule is such that they are required to fill other engagements. If there is no objection, the Chair will appoint two Senators to escort the distinguished Germans into the Chamber, to be received and welcomed by the Senate. They may stay as long as they wish. It may be interesting to them to observe our procedure in the preliminary stages of the session. If there is no objection the Chair will appoint the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to accompany the distinguished members of the German Legislature into the Chamber. It will not be necessary to

take a recess. Under the rules our distinguished visitors are entitled to the floor.

The delegation from German Bundestag, consisting of Frau A. Brauksiepe, Dr. G. Bucerius, Herr J. Degener, Dr. R. Tillmanns, Prof. E. Wahl, Herr W. Fischer, Frau I. Keilhack, Herr E. Lange, Herr W. Lausen, Herr B. Leddin, Dr. W. Nomack, Dr. J. Trischler, Herr A. Ahrens, Dr. G. Seelos, and Dr. B. Reismann, were escorted into the Senate Chamber by the committee appointed by the Vice President, and took the seats assigned to them on the respective sides of the aisle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In order that our distinguished visiting friends might not be regarded exclusively as either Democrats or Republicans, the Chair has suggested that they sit on both sides of the aisle. [Laughter.]

Members of the Senate, we have with us this morning 15 distinguished Germans who are members of the Parliament of Germany, the Bundestag, and members of the Government, including two charming ladies who are members of the Bundestag. They are in this country studying our government and our institutions. They are here today to have a look-in on Congress. They desire to observe wherever possible the action of congressional committees in order that they may gather such information as may be helpful to them in the working out of the processes of their own government.

On behalf of the Senate, the Chair would like to say that we welcome these distinguished guests into the Chamber of the Senate of the United States. Under the rules of the Senate, they are entitled to sit in the Senate Chamber, so long as it pleases them and is convenient for them to do so. Therefore the Chair says to our visitors that he hopes they will remain with us as long as possible.

It so happens that we have under consideration at this time a bill providing for a continuation of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which is commonly referred to as the European aid measure.

We trust that these distinguished representatives of the German people, who sit in counsel and in legislative capacity, may find instruction, may find cooperation, may find something here they may take back with them which will be of benefit to their people, and that their presence in the United States may not only be pleasant and profitable but that also as a result of their visit they may make some contribution to a better understanding not only between the German people and the new German nation and our people and our Nation, but among all the peoples of the world and among all nations, to the end that ultimately, out of the chaos and frustration which seem now to exist in the world, there may come a better feeling of cooperation and understanding, and a just and permanent peace may bless all mankind.

The Chair assures our visitors that we are glad to have them here, and we will proceed with our ordinary legislative process in their presence. As the Chair has said, they may remain as long as they desire to do so, and we hope that they will come back to see us again in the near future. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity, before debate begins on the ECA authorization, to join with other Members of the Senate in welcoming our distinguished guests from Germany. Last fall I was privileged to pay a brief visit to Germany, and while there I went to Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Bremerhaven, Bremen, and Berlin. Other members of our party visited Munich and other places. I came away with certain very definite impressions, one of which was that Germany would need some financial aid from us after the Marshall plan ends, and I hope the Congress will provide it. In studying the rehabilitation of western Germany, I would invariably ask ministers of foreign countries, "Who was your best customer before the war?" and the answer would be "Germany." I am satisfied that the industrial rehabilitation of Germany is very essential to the industrial and economic well-being of all western Europe.

I was very happy that during my stay in Europe the Allied Governments agreed at Petersberg that there shall be no further dismantling of German industrial plants which were not primarily for war purposes.

I make these remarks, Mr. President, to indicate how much pleasure it gives me to have present in the Senate Chamber this delegation from the German Bundestag. I am looking forward with pleasure to having its members as guests of the small group over which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] presides at our breakfast meeting tomorrow morning at 8:30. I hope that on that occasion, in that small intimate group, I shall have a chance to meet and to know personally the members of this delegation. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair will recognize Senators who wish to speak with reference to our visiting guests.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Vice President and the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Virginia in welcoming these representatives of the German Government. I need not call attention to the fact that many of the people of this great land stem from the German race. Probably 30 or 35 percent of the people of my State of Wisconsin are of German extraction. They have helped build up the wealth not only of that great State, but of the great Middle West and of whatever part of the United States to which they have gone.

We are met, of course, in a fateful hour. We hope your visit here will bring about a complete understanding between these great peoples.

We have no hate in our hearts. The fact that we have contributed some $30,000,000,000, since the war, to friend and foe alike, must indicate to you that we are simply engaged in the large task of seeking to bring together men and women of great minds, to the end, as the President of this great body has said, that peace will prevail.

So I am happy to welcome you, and I hope to see you tomorrow morning at our little breakfast group.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am sure I bespeak the sentiments of every Senator on this side of the aisle and, I feel sure, of every Member of this body, when I join the Vice President in extending a most cordial welcome to our distinguished guests from Germany.

We are glad to welcome you, as we have welcomed groups from other countries. We hope you will make the most of your opportunities while you are here, not only in visiting our various cities, but in seeing our country as a whole. I hope you will be invited to visit and will visit, many of our homes, school systems, and churches, as well as the seats of government of the United States of America. Our Americanism is built upon those four cornerstones. We believe sincerely in them.

As you go back to your beloved land, if you can take something of our American ideals, which have been built upon this solid foundation, it will help us to convince all nations that we truly mean that we would like to bring peace to the world, that we would like to see each country operate as a nation of free people and, if possible, under the free-enterprise system, under which we feel all countries enjoy their greatest opportunities.

So, as the junior Senator from Nebraska, and as the minority leader, representing the minority party in the Senate, I extend to you a hearty welcome. We trust that your stay here will be not only pleasant but profitable, and will be of assistance in our mutual desire to have peace come to your country as well as to the other countries of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I speak for neither side of the aisle for I do not believe that we are or should be divided by any arbitrary line in welcoming our visitors; but in the absence of the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], in his name, and for myself, I welcome our distinguished visitors here today. I think it is particularly significant that at the time when they visit us, we have under discussion the Marshall-plan program, because I am confident that the members of Parliament from western Germany know that we in America, through the Marshall plan are doing our best to build a peaceful world and a world of human decency, by reviving the economies of the countries of western Europe.

I feel that this program which is under discussion on the floor of the Senate today has done more than anything else to save western Europe from communism. It has aided in restoring the production of western Europe to prewar levels. It has brought new hope to those who suffered so much in World War II. I am indeed delighted and happy that when our distinguished visitors are with

us today, we have under consideration this program which is so important to the peace of the world.

I am happy to welcome our distinguished visitors. I hope they will stay with us for some time, and that they will enjoy their visit here. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I wish to join in the sentiments which have so ably been expressed by the Senators who have spoken in welcoming the delegation from Germany which is attending us today.

We take it that in making their visit here they come here for the purpose of contacting the United States, its institutions, and its people. We hope the impressions our country makes upon them will contribute to their efforts to rebuild their shattered and broken country and its institutions. We take their visit here as an omen of peaceful intentions.

The war is behind us. We desire to live in peace and in harmony with the other nations of the world. We have no spirit of vengeance or retaliation. Our only desire is to live under the practices of international law and international good feeling.

We wish for you and your people rehabilitation and reintegration, as it were. We welcome you here. We have been honored by visits from representatives of other foreign countries, including Japan. We are glad that you come here. Your visit to us indicates your respect for our country, your idea that you can gain something from contact with our country. It indicates, according to our view, your desire to live in peace and in harmony with the other great nations of the earth.

In that spirit we welcome you here. We hope your stay will be beneficial. When you return to your own homeland we hope you will carry back with you, among the impressions you gain while you are here, a helpful concept of our free democracy, which for more than 150 years has grown and flourished and strengthened in this happy, free land.

We shall continue in the future, as in the past, to stand for freedom, for democracy, and for intellectual as well as physical freedom. Here in the United States we are undertaking to set before the world that concept of government, which we hope you will embrace, if you do not already possess it. We hope you will carry back to your country this message from the United States: That we welcome you into the sisterhood of states; that all of us will exert our best efforts to preserve, maintain, and strengthen the peaceful intentions of the people of the world, so that the time will come, through orderly processes, when the peace of the world will grow and be strengthened, until people like yourselves can pursue in the projects of peace the welfare of their people, and the improvement of their own country and institutions, so that all of us may reach across the waters and, joining hands, may march forward to a greater and a better day. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I personally wish to join with my colleagues in bidding our distinguished guests welcome. To our guests I may say we have in America, roughly, 33,000,000 of your blood brothers and sisters. It is unnecessary to leave Washington to find out what they did. The dome of this Capitol was designed by a man of Germanic origin. The beautiful Congressional Library nearby was likewise so designed. The finest post-office building in the the United States was also designed by a man of Germanic origin. In this very building will be found painting after painting, the work of a man of German origin. When our guests travel over this country, they will find among our most law-abiding citizens many of their blood sisters and brothers, distinguished in medicine, in the arts and sciences. Among the farmers of the Northwest they will also find their blood sisters and brothers. No matter where they may go, whether it be to Florida or to the far western State of Washington, they will find a great many of their sisters and brothers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 1 minute in German.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota may speak to us in German, and will then interpret his remarks in English.

Mr. LANGER. Herr Praesident, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren der Bundestagsdelegation.

Die ungewoehnlichen Umstaende Ihres so erfreulichen Besuches beim Senat veranlassten mich, allgemeine Zustimmung dazu nachzusuchen, dass ich kurz zu Ihnen in Ihrer eigenen Sprache rede. Der Senat gewaehrte mir dieses Ersuchen und es ist mir eine grosse Freude fuer diejenigen von Ihnen, die die vorhergehenden Reden nicht verstanden haben, hier auszusprechen, wie erfreut der Senat darueber ist, dass Sie an diesem Nachmittag bei uns sind.

Schaetzungsweise gesagt, befinden sich dreiunddreissig Millionen Amerikaner deutscher Herkunft in diesem Lande. Diese Leute haben sich einen guten Ruf erworben als patriotische Buerger, die Gott fuerchten, ehrlich sind und hart arbeiten. Sie gehoeren unter die Fuehrenden auf den Gebieten der Kunst und Wissenschaft und haben sich ausgezeichnet bewaehrt in landwirtschaftlicher Arbeit.

Es ist uns eine Freude Sie hier willkommen zu heissen als Vertreter derjenigen, denen von amerikanischen Vorfahren freudige Hilfe geleistet wurde. Kurz nachdem die aktive Kriegsfuehrung beendet wurde, begannen wir, Ihnen Buendel mit Nahrung und Kleidung zu senden. Im Oktober des Jahres 1948 sandten diese Amerikaner einundvierzig Millionen Pfund an Nahrung und Kleidung und viele, die Verwandte dort hatten, sandten jenen Verwandten und Freunden Geld.

Es ist uns eine Freude Sie unter uns zu sehen; es gewaehrt uns Genugtuung festzustellen, dass Sie an dem Wesen unserer Demokratie Interesse haben und wir hoffen, dass Sie eine lange Zeit bleiben und danach bald wiederkehren werden. Moege Gott dazu helfen, dass als Folge Ihres Besuches das Leiden und die Not derjenigen, fuer die Sie hier als Vertreter stehen, Linderung erfahren moege.

Dieser Hoffnung im Namen des Senats Ausdruck gebend, darf ich mit den Worten schliessen "auf Wiedersehen."

[Translation]

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the delegation, the unusual circumstances of your very delightful visit to the Senate prompted me to ask unanimous consent to speak to you briefly in your own language. The Senate granted me this privilege and I am happy to state to you who have not understood the prior speeches, how very happy the Senate is to have you with us this afternoon.

Roughly 33,000,000 Americans of German ancestry live in this country. They have made a good record as God-fearing, honest, hard-working, patriotic citizens. They are among the leaders in the arts and sciences and have done excellent farming work.

We are glad to welcome you here as representatives of those whom American ancestors have been glad to help. Shortly after the conclusion of active warfare we commenced to send you bundles of food and clothes. In the month of October 1948, these Americans sent over to you 41,000,000 pounds of food and clothing, and many who had relatives there sent money to those relatives and friends.

We are pleased that you are with us, happy to know you are interested in our democratic ways and we hope that you will stay a long time and then return soon. May God grant that, as a result of your visit, suffering and want among those whom you represent may be alleviated.

With that expressed in behalf of the Senate, may I say to you in closing "auf Wiedersehen."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota permit me to interpret his German address?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I understood, Mr. President, he told our German friends that North Dakota is a great State, and that we are very proud of the contributions made by the Germans especially to agriculture in the Northwest. But I may say to our distinguished visitors, if they really wish to see the finest example in the United States of German skill in farming the land, they must visit the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to congratulate the Senator from North Dakota on his accurate and meticulous German. He made but one mistake: He left a comma out after one word.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized for a moment in order that I may greet our distinguished guests from Germany.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN. To our distinguished visitors, I may say I sincerely trust that while you are in the United States you will visit the southeastern part of Pennsylvania, where German people have presided in government, in the schools, and in the churches for more than 200 years. The farms they presently occupy

have been occupied by the same families for more than 200 years. They exemplify at its best the American tradition of government. They are deeply religious. They are most law abiding, and they are most industrious. They not only preside over the farms, but they are also in the factories and in the mills, and even in our mines. In behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania and myself, I sincerely trust that you will visit that part of Pennsylvania. I may call your attention to the fact that three capitals of this Nation are embraced in that area. We are indeed most proud of the Pennsylvania Germans.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in the year 1919, a classmate of mine in school, having participated in the war in which our respective countries were engaged, remained in Germany for quite a while. He there married a very beautiful German girl. I subsequently returned to school and there met his younger brother, who kept up correspondence with him. The brother in Germany, in one of the letters to his younger brother, stated he was wondering whether his bride would enjoy the United States, whether she would feel at home and would be comfortable among our people. The younger brother—and remember that Cincinnati is in Ohio—wrote back to the older brother in Germany, saying, "When you bring your bride home, stop first in Cincinnati; then go on to your own home in Milwaukee, and she will never know she has been away from Germany." [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If no other Senators wish to comment upon the presence of our visitors, the Chair will reiterate the sincere welcome which the Senate feels toward our distinguished guests. The Chair would be excused, he is sure, if he advised our friends that, if they really want to see America, they should not fail to go to Kentucky before returning home. The Chair may say to them, they will be interested in the fact that the first Speaker of the House of Representatives of the American Congress was of German descent, a man named Frederick Augustus Conrad Muhlenberg, and that in Kentucky there is a county named after him.

We have really enjoyed, ladies and gentlemen, your presence here today. These tributes to you and these expressions of welcome have been sincere. They have come from the heart. The remarks of the Members of the Senate who have spoken represent the unanimous feeling of this legislative body, into which you have come as guests.

The Chair expresses the hope that you will remain long with us, and that you will find in the United States, outside the legislative bodies and outside the precincts of government, a cordial welcome and the same desire for cooperation that you find here.

The Chair has been reminded that Muhlenberg was from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is there not some way in which the Chair can work in the State of Nebraska?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to Nebraska very soon to make a Democratic speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. May I inquire if the distinguished Vice President will invite me to accompany him? I should like to be there to greet the German people who I know will welcome the Vice President. I should like to go along in the Vice President's plane, if possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Chair goes anywhere to make a political speech he takes a commercial plane.

Mr. WHERRY. I trust the Vice President will invite me as his guest.

May I ask the majority leader if he has arranged for an opportunity for Senators to meet our distinguished guests? I do not want in any way to dictate the program, but I think it would be a fine gesture if we can take some time, at least a 5-minute recess, in which to meet these guests before they leave the Chamber.

Mr. MYERS. It had been thought unnecessary to take a recess, but if it is the will of the Senate to take a recess I think that might well be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that it would probably be more dignified and orderly to take a recess and for the distinguished guests to stand in line and meet the Senators.

Mr. MYERS. I had discussed that question with the Vice President, and we thought at first that it might not be necessary to take a recess, but, in view of the thoughts which have been expressed, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If any of the guests would like briefly to respond to the expressions of welcome to which they have listened, the Chair would suggest that that be done at this time. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess subject to call of the Chair so that the Members of the Senate may meet our distinguished guests.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to call of the Chair.

During the recess the delegation from the German Bundestag took their places in line in front of the desk and were greeted by the Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Dr. Bucerius, one of the members of the delegation from Germany, would like the opportunity to say a few words in response to the addresses of welcome which have been delivered, and therefore the Chair is glad to recognize Dr. Bucerius.

Dr. BUCERIUS. Mr. President and distinguished Members of the Senate, I must apologize for speaking in a foreign language, and certainly for making many blunders. Of course, it does not help that I am deeply moved by what we have just gone through. We come from a country which undoubtedly has done very bad things to the world and to your country. However, I must say to you that all the Americans we have met during the course of our visit have been extremely kind to us, especially when they heard we were Germans. And now this experience in the Senate has added emphasis to the warmth of the greeting we have received.

We came here to study American institutions, because we wanted to find out how democracy, the oldest democracy in the world, the real democracy, where everybody has the same voice in the affairs of his state, really works. Our intention was to study institutions. We are here for only a week, and, of course we do not know too much yet. However, we have found out one thing, that it is not institutions which make your democracy, but the spirit of the people, the feeling which apparently every American has, that it is necessary to help other Americans and, as we learn now, to help the people of the whole world.

When the Marshall plan help was inaugurated, and when the first flood of money began to pour into our very poor and disturbed country, Germans were very doubtful about what was being done. They said, "Why are Americans doing that? Do they do it just to do it, or because they want to get rid of their surplus?" I think many Germans entertained such thoughts.

Nowadays, gentlemen, I can assure you that every German, except a few who confess to being Communists, knows very well that America does all these wonderful things in private and public to help everybody in the whole world out of a very good heart.

I do not wish to take any more of your time, but let me say that millions of Germans would no longer be alive today if it were not for the generosity of your country and of Congress. When we left Germany our Chancelor, the President of our House of Representatives, and everyone whom we asked what we were to say over here, stressed upon us the necessity of expressing thanks every time we met anyone.

Thank you, gentlemen, for everything you have done for us. [Applause.]

The distinguished visitors having been escorted from the Chamber, and the recess having expired, the Vice President (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) called the Senate to order.

TRANSACTION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent order entered earlier today, routine matters, as is customary, may be presented now.

APPRECIATION FOR WELCOME EXTENDED TO MEMBERS OF KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from Sae Sun Kim, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim, of the Korean Embassy, Washington, D. C., conveying to the Senate the text of a resolution adopted by the Korean National Assembly, thanking the Congress and Government of the United States for the cordial welcome and courtesies extended the Representatives of the National Assembly during their stay in Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

RESTORATION TO TRIBAL OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN LANDS ON FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his semiannual report, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL MOTOR WHALEBOAT TO BOSTON (MASS.) COUNCIL OF GIRL SCOUTS, INC.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Boston (Mass.) Council of Girl Scouts, Inc., had requested the Navy Department to transfer one 26-foot motor whaleboat with engine, for use in operation of an island camp; to the Committee on Armed Services.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders, together with a complete statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law and the reasons for granting such status of permanent residence (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason for ordering suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PARITY PRICE OF CORN AND WHEAT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, recommending that paragraph 2 of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, be amended so as to provide that the rate of the penalty shall be 50 percent of the parity price per bushel of the commodity as of August 1, in the case of corn, and as of May 1, in the case of wheat, of the calendar year in which such crop is produced; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CERTIFICATIONS OF COST OF REHABILITATION AND REPAIR ON CERTAIN PUBLIC AIRPORTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting pursuant to law, certification by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by Federal agencies at certain public airports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUDIT REPORT OF VETERANS CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Veterans Canteen Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF MARITIME COMMISSION UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of the Commission on its activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period January 1 through March 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine

"Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the finest standards of scientific care and the best quality of medical institutions thus far achieved by any major country in the world; and

"Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been progressive deterioration of the standards and quality of that care to the serious detriment of the sick and needy; and

"Whereas the great accomplishment of American medicine is the result of a free profession working under a free system, unhampered by government control: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the house of representatives concurring therein):

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized not to enact any proposed legislation, the effect of which is to bring the practice of medicine in this country under Federal direction and control.

"2. The Senators and Representatives from Mississippi, now in the Congress of the United States, are hereby respectfully requested to bend their efforts and utilize all facilities at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

"3. Copies of this resolution shall forthwith be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and each Senator and Congressman from Mississippi.

"Adopted by the senate March 20, 1950.

"SAM LUMPKIN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives April 10, 1950.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to carry out recommendations, concerning the relationship between Federal and State tax systems, made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government

"Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known by the name of its distinguished chairman as the Hoover Commission, recommended that our tax systems—National, State, and local—be generally revised and that, in this revision, every possible effort be made to leave to the localities and the States adequate resources from which to raise revenue to meet the duties and responsibilities of local and State governments; and

"Whereas the Commission further recommended that the grant-in-aid plan and program be clarified and systematized; and

"Whereas the Commission proposed, in order to carry out these recommendations, the establishment of a continuing agency on Federal-State relations: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to promptly adopt and carry out the recommendations concerning the relationship between Federal and State tax systems of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

"2. The secretary of state is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

"Approved April 13, 1950."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to appropriate sufficient sums of money to continue the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in California

"Whereas on February 28, 1950, the Subcommittee on the Interior Department of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives voted to delete from the appropriations bill to the Interior Departmen the sum of $2,647,871, the total necessary for operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in California for the fiscal year 1950–51; and

"Whereas this action was taken largely in reliance on testimony of individual Indians claiming to represent all of the California Mission Indians; and

"Whereas since the action of said subcommittee protest meetings have been held by Indians from at least 13 reservations in California expressing disapproval; and

"Whereas it now appears that the individual Indians who appeared before the subcommittee had no authority to represent the said Mission Indians; and

"Whereas failure of Congress to make appropriations for activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in California for the fiscal year 1950–51 will place a heavy burden on the State for education of Indian children now educated by the Federal Government, and the burden of proceeding with health and sanitation projects now conducted among the Indians by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to reconsider the action of said subcommittee and to take such action as may be necessary to effectively protect the interests of the Indian population in California by appropriating sufficient sums to carry out the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker

of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed closing of the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., and the Long Beach Naval Hospital at Long Beach, Calif., and to the use of the Corona Naval Hospital

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced its intention to move the facilities of the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., to the Long Beach Naval Hospital at Long Beach, Calif.; and

"Whereas the Long Beach Naval Hospital is due to be shut down June 30, 1950; and

"Whereas each of these hospitals is at present operating at full capacity, and it is virtually impossible to gain admission to either of them; and

"Whereas there are insufficient beds in Government hospitals for veterans in California as evidenced by waiting lists and by the large number of tubercular and mentally ill veterans now adding to the overcrowded conditions of California State and county hospitals, and many disabled veterans in other parts of the United States are requesting that they be transferred to hospitals in southern California, thus creating a need for additional hospital facilities in this area; and

"Whereas the closing of the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital and the Long Beach Naval Hospital will seriously inconvenience many veterans now being treated therein, many of whom have families who have established residences near the hospitals; and

"Whereas the closing of these hospitals will produce economic hardship among the employees of the hospitals, their families, and the business interests of the communities in which the hospitals are located; and

"Whereas the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital has a large number of tuberculosis patients requiring treatment extending over a period of 18 months to 2 years; and

"Whereas the United States Government has spent many thousands of dollars in the vicinity of the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital for the construction of special homes for paraplegia patients who need specially built homes near the hospital to enable them to return easily for frequent treatment; and

"Whereas the continuation of both of these hospitals is required for the adequate treatment of thousands of veterans in the southern California area who are in need of hospitalization and hospital treatment; and

"Whereas the closing of these hospitals is not necessitated by recent reductions in the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration inasmuch as those reductions do not affect the appropriations for hospital expenses; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced plans for a future building program for hospitals to meet this need; and

"Whereas the United States Naval Hospital at Corona, built by the Navy since 1941 at an expenditure of $19,000,000, has been abandoned by the Navy and is now idle but in every way suitable and desirable for the care of veterans by the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and other ex-service organizations have recommended the Corona Naval Hospital for transfer to the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Veterans' Administration, and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized to take such steps consistent with the national economy as may be necessary to continue the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., and the Long Beach Naval Hospital at Long Beach, Calif., in operation at their present capacity; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Veterans' Administration be, and hereby is, requested to take over at once the Corona Naval Hospital as a major veterans' facility for the care of sick and disabled veterans in California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to bring about the transfer of the Corona Naval Hospital to the Veterans' Administration and to enact any legislation which may be needed for this purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress to have the Mammoth Pass Road in California constructed as a postwar construction project

"Whereas the National Government has assisted in the construction of a national highway from the Mexican border to the Canadian line, known as United States Highway No. 395; and

"Whereas the United States Highway No. 395 connects with various other highways leading to other portions of California; and

"Whereas present direct traffic routes from the San Joaquin and Santa Clara Valleys through the Sierra Nevada Range connecting with said United States Highway No. 395, are closed for a large part of the year by heavy snows; and

"Whereas the Mammoth Pass, which is within a few miles of United States Highway No. 395, is much lower and in more open country and is not closed with snow for as long a time in the winter months as the other passes; and

"Whereas a portion of said proposed highway has been constructed by the forestry department, building from both sides of the mountain range, leaving a distance of approximately 34 miles to connect the said Highway No. 395 and State Highway No. 125 and State Highway No. 126; and

"Whereas the proposed highway will connect with United States Highway No. 99 from which several State highways lead across the Coast Range to the Santa Clara Valley on the west side of the said range, and connect with United States Highways Nos. 101 and 466; and

"Whereas the construction of the highway over the said Mammoth Pass which could be kept open during the entire year through the use of modern machinery would provide an important east-west traffic route through the Sierras and would be in every way a desirable postwar construction project;

"Whereas the construction of the proposed highway would not only be of importance from the standpoint of national defense, but would be of inestimable advantage from an economic standpoint, in that it would—

"(a) Afford an opportunity for the development of a virgin territory with extensive natural lumber resources amounting to upward of 2,800,000,000 board feet of a present commercial value and an additional 2,000,000,000 board feet of potential pulp timber and substantial deposits of iron, lead, and silver;

"(b) Attract a large number of visitors to view the priceless heritage of forests, mountains, game animals, birds, and other scenic beauties of the region which would be open to tourist and other travel;

"(c) Provide a loop trip for those persons traveling from southern California to the Owens River Valley by the eastern route;

"(d) Assist in the full power and irrigation storage development of the upper San Joaquin River in order to meet the needs of the Central Valley project; and

"Whereas the building of the proposed highway would contribute in great measure to the future, and increasing growth and prosperity of the San Joaquin Valley and of other portions of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take such steps as may be necessary to have the said Mammoth Pass Road constructed to commence at or near Casa Diablo in Mono County, on United States Highway No. 395, and continue over Mammoth Pass at the most feasible location and connect with State Highway No. 125 and Highway No. 126 in Madera County, a distance of approximately 34 miles; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the chief clerk of the assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California and from Nevada in the Congress of the United States; and the Senators and Representatives from California and Nevada are hereby respectfully urged to request such action."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coast of California

"Whereas the United States has recognized that all the States since July 4, 1776, or since their admission to the Union, have, with full recognition from the Federal Government, exercised full powers of ownership over all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries and of all natural resources within these lands and waters; and

"Whereas each State has maintained full control of its natural resources with the acquiescence and approval of the United States and in accordance with numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the executive departments of the United States that these lands and resources were vested in the respective States as an incident to State sovereignty and that the exercise of these powers of ownership and control did not and will not impair or interfere with the exercise by the Federal Government of its constitutional powers in relation to the control and regulation of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international relations; and

"Whereas substantial sums of money have been expended by the several States, their subdivisions, and persons lawfully acting pursuant to State authority in improving and reclaiming lands, and in developing the natural resources in the lands and waters relying upon the recognized rule of State ownership; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the Federal Government has certain paramount powers in respect to a portion of these lands and natural resources without reaffirming or settling the ultimate question of their ownership and control; and

"Whereas this decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the question of the ownership and control of these lands and natural resources is within the "congres-

sional area of national power" and that Congress will not execute its powers in "such way as to bring about injustices to the States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission": Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That it is in the public interest and in the furtherance of justice that title and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the States be restored to and confirmed in these States by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States recognize, confirm, and establish title to these lands in the States so concerned; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States release and relinquish to these States all right, title, and interest which the United States has in these lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to grant former owners of Camp Beale lands first right to purchase such lands if and when the lands are sold

"Whereas the United States Government is now the owner of 86,000 acres of land in Yuba and Nevada Counties, Calif., which land was acquired from individual landholders at the beginning of World War II and was used throughout the war as a training center designated as Camp Beale; and

"Whereas said use was abandoned after the war and neither the present use of 2,000 acres as a bombing range nor any contemplated use as an air force academy or air depot requires, or would be likely to require, the full 86,000 acres, thus raising the probability that a large portion of said land may be offered for sale to private interests at some future time; and

"Whereas representatives of the United States Army in negotiating the purchases of the lands now comprising Camp Beale made representations that if the Government should at any time in the future decide to dispose of such land the Government would in all probability grant to the former owners the right to repurchase their holdings; and

"Whereas legislation has been introduced in both Houses of Congress which would give such former landowners, their heirs or devises, the first right to repurchase their land, if offered for sale: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact the proposed legislation which is described above, giving the former owners of the land comprising Camp Beale the first right to repurchase their properties, if and when such properties are offered for sale, on the terms and conditions provided in the proposed legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior; to the Honorable Dennis Chavez, chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate; to the Honorable William M. Whittington, chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions adopted by the Charleston (S. C.) Life Underwriters Association; the Frances Willard Christian Temperance Union, the Woman's Republican Club of Ferndale Borough, and the Ladies Auxiliary of the Upper Yoder Volunteer Fire Company, all of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter from Local No. 808, International Longshoremen's Association, of Brooklyn, N. Y., signed by William J. Noonan, secretary-treasurer, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change the present postal system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, of Washington, D. C., signed by Mrs. Alexander Stewart, national legislative secretary, praying for the enactment of legislation to implement the President's point IV program; ordered to lie on the table.

Resolutions adopted by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Los Angeles, Calif., expressing their views on legislation concerning un-American and subversive activities, and other welfare legislation before the Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

The memorial of Harry L. Dale and sundry members of the Galt (Calif.) Townsend Club, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

Letters in the nature of memorials from Local No. 272 of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, of Monterey, Calif., signed by J. D. Warrington, recording secretary, and Phillipsville Grange, No. 690, of Weott, Calif., signed by Maxine E. Kent, secretary, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon bills, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Riverbank (Calif.) Grange, No. 719, Patrons of Husbandry, signed by Octavia Daniels, secretary, and sundry other members, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon bills, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

FEDERAL SPENDING—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL SOCIETY DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution unanimously adopted by the Fifty-ninth Continental Congress, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention at Washington on April 22, 1950, relating to Federal spending.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING

Whereas the Federal debt is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars; and

Whereas the Federal budget has been balanced only twice since 1930; and

Whereas a whole generation will have reached its majority next year under a Government financed by deficit spending; and

Whereas Federal taxes, combined with State and local taxes, are approaching confiscatory levels and even higher taxes have been recommended; and

Whereas the Federal Government through its lending programs and subsidies is already in competition with private enterprise and business; and

Whereas Federal programs already proposed would tend to federalize medicine, food and housing; and

Whereas still other proposals pending in Congress would usurp State and local prerogatives, invade individual rights and undermine constitutional processes; and

Whereas chronic deficits and increasing debt, inevitably attended by confiscatory taxes, Government competition with private enterprise and business, Federal usurpation of State and local prerogatives, Government invasion of individual rights and disregard of constitutional processes are synonymous with socialism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fifty-ninth Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution urge each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States and each Member of the Senate of the United States to advocate a balanced budget for fiscal year 1951; to vote for reduction in the appropriation bill now pending in Congress to the extent required to avoid deficit spending; and to exert positive action for reduction in the Federal debt.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 6632. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 1517).

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1950—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported favorably, without amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 246) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, submitted a report (No. 1518), including the views of the minority, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 3471. A bill for the relief of John Christsdoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3472. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ECTON (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3473. A bill to authorize the sale of a small tract of land at Great Falls, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 3474. A bill to include within any city for the purposes of the 1950 decennial census all areas annexed by such city within 15 days after the taking of such census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 3475. A bill to adjust death compensation rates under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3476. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3477. A bill for the relief of Herbert Kiilsgard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to provide for the transfer of the paintings The Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone and The Chasm of the Colorado from the United States Capitol to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE PROPAGANDA IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution calling for an investigation of subversive propaganda in educational institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a half minute statement with respect to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for a half minute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The resolution is submitted at the request of the Americanization Committee of the Sons of the American Revolution. The resolution was originally presented to the Committee on the Judiciary. However, on the advice of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. McCARRAN] it was referred to me as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I wish to say that the resolution calls for an investigation of subversive activities in the schools of our country, and I wish also to say that if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare looks kindly on the resolution, I assure the Senate that we shall undertake the investigation.

The resolution (S. Res. 264), submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of all phases of subversive propaganda in the public schools, colleges, and universities of the various States which is ultimately designed to undermine the Constitution and to overthrow the Government of the United States, including, but not limited to—

(1) the extent, if any, to which tax-exempt foundations or corporations are directly or indirectly supporting the activities of Communist-front organizations and pressure groups and promoting distribution of Socialist and Communist propaganda in the public schools, colleges, and universities;

(2) the identity of the organizations and groups, if any, engaged in the distribution of such material;

(3) the extent, if any, to which teaching materials exist, or are in preparation, for students and adult groups desiring to study the propaganda and activities of Socialist and Communist organizations;

(4) whether there is a present lack of suitable textbooks, outlines, or other teaching materials showing the economic, financial, political, and constitutional effects of Fabian socialism and the Socialist state, and if so, the reasons therefor;

(5) the extent, if any, to which research projects have been established, or are contemplated, to obtain information in relation to this matter in connection with Socialist experiments in other countries, and the reasons for any present failure to establish such research projects;

(6) the influence, if any, in the educational system of Communists, ex-Communists, and persons with a record of membership in Communist-front organizations over long periods of time; and

(7) the extent, if any, to which the indoctrination methods of progressive educators are responsible for agitations threatening the Constitution and our form of government, including attacks upon the judiciary and the Congress.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADMISSION OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3181) to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5965) to provide for the construction of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT BEFORE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the President of the United States on April 24, 1950, before members of the Federal Bar Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL BEFORE THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Attorney General, Hon. J. Howard McGrath, before the Federal Bar Association, on April 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address entitled "The Preservation of Private Enterprise," delivered by him at the annual coal convention of the American Mining Congress, in Cincinnati, Ohio, on April 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FAR EASTERN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND BEFORE CHICAGO COUNCIL OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech on United States far eastern policy, delivered by him before the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations, at Chicago, Ill., on April 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN RELATIONS AND DOMESTIC POLITICS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. LEAHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Foreign Relations and Domestic Politics, delivered by Senator GREEN at Brown University, Providence, R. I., April 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LICENSING OF MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—ARTICLE BY OSCAR DAVIS AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How Now, Senator?" written by Oscar Davis, and published in the Washington Daily News, of April 24, 1950, and a reply in the form of a letter written to Senator WILEY, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN AT DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE DINNER

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the Democratic State Committee dinner held in New York City, on April 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY OSCAR EWING

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Oscar Ewing at the forty-fifth anniversary luncheon of the League for Industrial Democracy, held in New York City on April 15, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE—ARTICLE BY ALFRED FRIENDLY

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Man Behind the Man Who Is Accusing Lattimore," written by Alfred Friendly, and published in the Washington Post on April 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADVERTISING OF LIQUOR, BEER, AND WINE—LETTER FROM MRS. R. H. SORENSEN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mrs. R. H. Sorensen, and an article enclosed, with regard to advertising of liquor, beer, and wine, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORR OIL WELL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WOOD COUNTY DEMOCRAT

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the Orr oil well, from the Wood County Democrat, of Quitman, Tex., the issue of April 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLINE IN AMERICAN SHIPPING—ARTICLE BY J. S. ARMSTRONG

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the decline in American shipping, written by J. S. Armstrong, financial editor of the Sun, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF AMERICANS AND RUSSIANS AT THE ELBE—STATEMENT OF JOSEPH P. POLOWSKY

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Oath at the Elbe," by Joseph P. Polowsky, together with an introductory statement by him which appear in the Appendix.]

THE OWEN LATTIMORE CASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE RAPID CITY JOURNAL

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not Disloyalty, Just American Tragedy," from the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial regarding Communists in Government, from the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS JEFFERSON BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Thomas Jefferson, by Harry H. Schlacht, which appears in the Appendix.]

REGULATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding an invitation to appear before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to testify, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS ARE DEMOCRACY AT GRASS ROOTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN MARCOS RECORD

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Soil Conservation Districts Are Democracy at Grass Roots," published in the April 21 issue of the San Marcos Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

REGULATORY MADNESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Regulatory Madness," published in the Boston Herald of April 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PORT AND PLAYGROUND OF THE SOUTHWEST—ARTICLE FROM THE HOUSTON CHRONICLE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Port and Playground of the Southwest," written by Don Hinga, and published in the April 12 issue of the Houston Chronicle, which appears in the Appendix.]

RENEWAL OF FRANCHISE OF WISCONSIN CENTRAL AIRLINES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board, an important matter vital to the future of my State—the renewal of the temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity of Wisconsin Central Airlines. The Badger State has always been aviation-minded, and furnished more aviators to the Army Air Forces during the war than did any other State in the Union except the much more populous State of Texas. Moreover, Wisconsin business is aviation-minded, recognizing that air freight and air travel are indispensable to the America of 1950 and of the years to come.

I have been in contact, therefore, with the Civil Aeronautics Board on behalf of the permanent renewal of the franchise because it is unthinkable that Wisconsin should be denied this crucial feeder air-line service.

During last year, 33,000 passengers were carried by the company. Twenty-two thousand ton-miles of express was carried. Wisconsin Central Airlines has, moreover, now in operation a complete network of radio and navigation aids which enable it to assure safe, unbroken service to some 26 cities through 20 airports, including 5 cities in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

The company employs 207 people, of whom 81 percent are veterans of World War II.

Folks from all the cities served by Wisconsin Central have appealed to me and to other members of the Wisconsin delegation for the franchise renewal. For example, the city of Stevens Point has invested—including Federal, State, and local funds—$245,000 in money to assure the finest possible airport service for Wisconsin Central; and that situation is paralleled by other community efforts throughout Wisconsin. All the cities on the route—Eau Claire, Wisconsin Rapids, Menomonie, Marinette, Wausau, Rhinelander, Green Bay, Clintonville, Oshkosh, Superior-Duluth, Milwaukee, Madison, and so forth—depend vitally on this service, and their eyes are on the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I have received a resolution, conveyed by George B. Burdick, assistant secretary, adopted by the Wisconsin State Aeronautics Commission, appealing for the franchise renewal. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolution relating to extension of Wisconsin Central Airlines temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity

"To the Civil Aeronautics Board:

"The Wisconsin State Aeronautics Commission respectfully requests that favorable consideration be given to the application of Wisconsin Central Airlines for renewal or extension of its Temporary Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, on a permanent basis, or on such other basis as the board may deem advisable.

"The Wisconsin State Aeronautics Commission firmly believes that Wisconsin Central Airlines has demonstrated in a very positive manner the value of interstate feeder airline service, to Wisconsin, and the obvious potential that exists for this type of service. The Wisconsin State Aeronautics Commission further believes that it would be a tragic mistake to deny the extension of Wisconsin Central Airlines' Certificate, and would do irreparable harm to air transportation in Wisconsin and the Nation.

"This company, which commenced scheduled operations hardly more than 2 years ago, has provided a remarkable and continually expanding air transportation service to the people of Wisconsin, in spite of extremely limited airport facilities, over which it has had no control.

"When Wisconsin Central Airlines began operations, the company was compelled to use a small type of aircraft adaptable to the existing airports rather than a larger aircraft which would have been more suitable for the traffic potential available.

"At the time operations were started, only five of nine airports to which the company inaugurated service in Wisconsin had paved runways; two of the nine airports had lights; and only three of the nine airports had permanent administration buildings.

"After certification of Wisconsin Central Airlines, and establishment of service by the company, the municipalities served were encouraged to proceed with airport improvements for which they had plans but did not feel warranted in making until scheduled air service was assured.

"During the past 2 years, Wisconsin cities on the airline routes have been carrying out their plans for needed improvements for better service, so that now seven of nine airports have paved runways and the remaining two will be paved by August 31, 1950. All nine airports now are lighted; five airports have permanent airline station facilities, and one facility will be constructed this year; plans have been tentatively considered at two other airports.

"By the fall of 1950 the handicaps which faced Wisconsin Central Airlines in 1948 with respect to airports will be removed, which will enable the company to utilize more suitable aircraft to develop the potential on its routes that is known to exist."

Moved by Dr. L. O. Simenstad that the foregoing resolution be adopted by the State Aeronautics Commission, and that copies thereof be sent to the Civil Aeronautics Board, Wisconsin Congressional Representatives, all cities on the routes of Wisconsin Central Airlines, and all daily newspapers in Wisconsin.

Motion seconded by Dr. Alvin G. Sell. Carried unanimously.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Aeronautics Commission, meeting in regular

session at Madison, Wis., on Friday, April 14, 1950.

GEORGIA B. BURDICK,
Assistant Secretary.

MADISON, WIS., *April 17, 1950.*

CHILDREN'S AID BILLS—EDITORIAL COMMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial printed in the April 3 edition of the Hudson Dispatch, of Jersey City, entitled "Crowley Urges United States Back UN Children's Aid Bills."

In the same connection, I call the attention of the Senate to two communications addressed to my distinguished colleague; one under date of March 31 from the Jersey City Junior Chamber of Commerce, over the signature of the President of that body, Mr. Edward P. Crowley; the other under date of April 4, over the signature of Dorothea D. Buck, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these communications, together with the editorial to which I referred, be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hudson Dispatch, Jersey City, N. J., of April 3, 1950]

CROWLEY URGES UNITED STATES BACK UN CHILDREN'S AID BILLS

Warning against a walkout by United States from United Nations' International Children's Emergency fund, Edward P. Crowley, president of Jersey City Junior Chamber of Commerce, yesterday threw full support behind two bills now before Congress bearing upon the fund's future.

These bills, S. 2920 and H. R. 7743, introduced respectively by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, and Representative ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, would make available for another year an outstanding authorization of $25,000,000 for the continuation of the fund's world-wide work for needy, sick and homeless children.

"Let it never be said of the people of the United States," said Crowley, "that they were the first to withdraw their support from this international effort that has already made an honored name for itself throughout the world. It has had very little to spend, relatively speaking, only the smallest part of the money expended by our country for foreign-aid programs, but it has made that little go a long way in getting relief to children. And, in doing the job it has built up an enormous store in the world's goodwill, in which the United States shares."

THE JERSEY CITY JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Jersey City, N. J., March 31, 1950.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: We understand that Senator TAFT has introduced a bill (S. 2920) in support of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. We trust you will lend your support to this measure for the fund which, in the opinion of many of us, has done a remarkably fine job in the international field.

It would be a pity if this work came to an end through the failure of our Congress to give support. I am afraid such a failure would be picked up and used to the discredit of the United States.

I am acquainted with many who have a close personal knowledge of the fund's organization and the work it is doing. I am impressed with the businesslike and efficient way in which this humanitarian undertaking is carried on. I doubt if our country has ever spent money to a better cause than it has done in getting milk and other aid to millions of children throughout the world.

Your help in this matter will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD P. CROWLEY,
President.

APRIL 4, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: The General Federation of Women's Clubs has been very much interested in the United Nations agency, UNICEF. We understand that this spring UNICEF will practically go out of existence, although some of its funds may be available for use for another 6 months.

We agree with those who are advocating the setting up of a permanent agency for children in the United Nations. Such a program surely must be carried out, but such things move slowly, and while the agency is being organized we fear that work for the children may suffer in the interim. Therefore, we should like to ask that appropriations for UNICEF be granted for one more year.

The work for children seems to me extremely important from every point of view, even including that of containing communism. Of course, some of the emergency for children is over but the work that will be done, if UNICEF is retained for another year, would be in such areas perhaps as southeast Asia, where the condition is chronic. Having visited these areas myself recently, I know the need of American aid in order to actually combat communism from taking over those underprivileged parts of the world.

I earnestly hope that you will use your influence in having UNICEF supported for one more year, or until such time as a permanent organization can be set up within the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,
DORTHEA D. BUCK,
Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck,
President.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared congratulating Israel on the second anniversary of her independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

In these times of internal unrest when so many long-established nations are finding it extremely difficult to rehabilitate and stabilize their economic and political economies, there would seem to be special significance to the week-long celebration now being observed throughout the United States to mark the second anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Israel. As one of the newest nations of the world, Israel has made remarkable progress during the 2 years of its formal existence. Despite the scars left by the bitter struggle to defend her borders, and under the further handicap of a constant flow of immigrants from the displaced-persons camps of Europe, and elsewhere, the leaders and the people of Israel have distinguished themselves by their progress toward national stability and a self-sufficient economy.

More so than any other nation in the world, let it be emphasized, has Israel discharged its humanitarian responsibility with regard to the unfortunate displaced persons of the Jewish race who were the object of such harsh treatment and such untold sufferings at the hands of both Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

It would be too much to expect that, in the span of 2 years and in the face of the tremendous difficulties encountered on every hand, Israel would now be free of troubles. As a matter of fact, there is grave concern among its inhabitants and its friends throughout the world over the reported feverish rearmament program of the surrounding Arab states. Following inquiries to the State Department, I am informed that there need be no concern in this respect, that both Israel and her Arab neighbors are free to import arms and munitions necessary for internal security.

Nevertheless, the feeling persists in Israel and elsewhere that the Arab states have far greater access to supplies of arms, and are importing implements of warfare in quantities which would seem far beyond any reasonable requirements of internal security. It is to be hoped that the officials of our State Department, and our representatives in the United Nations, will watch this particular phase of the Near East situation closely, to the end that the unstable and uneasy peace now prevailing there be not permitted to explode into a conflagration that might easily engulf the whole world.

On such an occasion as this it affords me the utmost satisfaction to accord to the leaders and the people of Israel sincere felicitations on the extraordinary progress that has been made, and to extend to them the utmost good wishes for increased progress and continued security.

Long live Israel.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in the editorial columns of the New York Times of Sunday, April 23, 1950, deserved tribute was paid to the signal accomplishments of the State of Israel in the 2 years of its existence.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL'S SECOND BIRTHDAY

Today Israel celebrates the second anniversary of its establishment as a free and independent state. Born in the fires of war, surrounded by enemies, attacked by neighbors, this little country has earned its place in the world through the courage, endurance, and devotion of its people. Its first 2 years have been tempestuous; and while Israel's difficulties and sacrifices are by no means over, there is no longer doubt—if there ever was any—that here is a nation founded upon rock and not upon sand.

In the last 12 months, perhaps the development of most immediate significance to Israel has been the stabilization of the military situation. The armistice agreements have held firm; and if there is no peace, at least there is no war. But of greatest long-range importance to the new state is the human tide of immigrants that has continued to sweep through its open gates. Israel now has nearly 1,300,000 people, of whom almost 400,000 have arrived since the spring of 1948.

The pressures on this infant nation—not least of which is the military threat from its Arab neighbors—have imposed an almost unbearable strain on its economy. Outside

help is still essential. That help has been freely given, both from private sources and from such public bodies as the Export-Import Bank, which has made a $100,000,000 loan to Israel. Industrial and agricultural production is increasing; but there is still a long economic row to hoe. Meanwhile, the problem of earning a living has not blinded the state to its first responsibility: its children. Education is now compulsory for all, Arab and Jewish, between the ages of 5 and 13.

While Israel has not been faultless in every aspect of its relations with the UN, it must be recognized that it has been forced to live almost from one crisis to another, and in a bitterly hostile environment. Israel is unquestionably a shining outpost of democracy in the Middle East, a proud and independent nation to which its many friends in the United States wish a happy birthday, with long years of peace and prosperity to come.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the second anniversary of the independence of the state of Israel.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the golden threads in the fabric of American history has been American aid and support for oppressed peoples who would fight for their freedom. Our own independence was won with the aid of foreign blood and treasure sacrificed in the universal cause of freedom, and we were still a young and struggling nation when Benjamin Franklin said, "Where liberty is, there is my country."

It is altogether fitting and proper, therefore, for Americans to salute one of the great anniversaries in the history of human freedom. Two years ago, another nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal was born. After an interval of 20 centuries, the Jewish people kept their rendezvous with destiny when the state of Israel declared its independence.

In all history no nation had ever assumed so heavy a burden. Yet this new struggling state was not content merely to fight for survival in war and to find bread for its immigrants. In the spirit of the great rendezvous to which it was dedicated, it undertook at the same time to build the political cornerstone of the new state. It dared to convene a constitutional assembly. It dared to write a new constitution.

One might have expected that the constitution would be some makeshift affair, some loose "Articles of Confederation" to accommodate the many shades of political opinion in Israel. One might have expected the constitution, born in time of war, to exalt military authority, to exact conformity, in the name of patriotism, to subordinate individual freedom to the security of the fledgling state. But Israel is no comfort to the expectations of the narrowly practical, the cautious, the calculating, the realistic.

That constitution is another achievement in human freedom, a beacon not only for the oppressed peoples of the Middle East, but for all the world. Blended in the constitution are the ethical values of ancient Judea, that exalt the fundamental dignity of the person made in God's image; the guarantees of freedom of speech and conscience, of modern democracy, and a recognition of state responsibility for providing opportunity for a decent livelihood in this age of world-wide economic fluctuation.

All freedom-loving Americans will join in the hope that the bond of sympathy between America and Israel will grow ever stronger with the years.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS TO THE TAX COURT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report favorably from the Committee on Finance the nominations of three of the judges of the Tax Court, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations, for the following reasons:

The three judges nominated are the Honorable John W. Kern, of Indiana, Hon. Charles R. Arundell, of Oregon, and Hon. Clarence V. Opper, of New York. Each of these judges is now in service, and has been in service for quite a length of time. They have been endorsed by the Senators from the States from which they come, and since the court has an enormous volume of work before it, and has to assign hearings in different parts of the country, it is of course proper and advisable, and almost necessary, that the nominations of these present judges be confirmed at the earliest possible time in order that they may go to the various parts of the country to which they have been assigned.

The nominations of these three judges, all of whom are now in service, as I have said, were unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Finance. No objection has been filed, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that as in executive session the nominations may be presently considered, and, if confirmed, that the President be notified at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia tell the Members of the Senate whether it is absolutely necessary that the judges be confirmed today, rather than that the nominations take the regular procedure?

Mr. GEORGE. I am able to say that it is very proper. The chief judge has advised me that assignments have already been made, but that the judges would hesitate to go to hear cases, or he would hesitate to request them to go, until their nominations were acted upon. I therefore think it is necessary that the Senate act at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there a full membership present when the unanimous reports were ordered by the committee?

Mr. GEORGE. A reasonably full membership.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the distinguished Senator would say there was no opposition?

Mr. GEORGE. There was no opposition. This is the fourth appointment on the bench of Judge Arundell; Judge Opper, of New York, I think, has received two appointments; and Judge Kern, of Indiana, has also served two terms, or is serving his second term. He is now the presiding judge of the court.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall depart from my regular course about confirmations of appointees. I still maintain that the nominations of all judges of civil courts should follow the regular procedure. I stated once on the Senate floor, and I wish to repeat, that when it comes to the appointment of Federal judges, who handle the judicial procedure in the courts, their nominations should follow the regular order. But in view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have the profoundest respect, in the emergent situation he sets forth I shall not interpose objection at this time, and therefore do not object to the immediate consideration of the nominations.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I would not make this request if the judges were not already in service, and if they had not heretofore been confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Kern, of Indiana, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles R. Arundell, of Oregon, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence V. Opper, of New York, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmations.

WINNING THE COLD WAR IV

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, today, April 25, is the fifth anniversary of two of the greatest events in the lifetime of any now living. Five years ago today the United Nations Conference held its opening session in San Francisco. Five years ago today a patrol group of the American Army and a small detachment of Russian soldiers met and clasped hands on the banks of the Elbe River in Germany. It was a strange chance, and it should turn out to be a happy chance, that these great events took place simultaneously.

There came into my office last Friday and again this morning, former Pvt. Joseph Polowsky, of Chicago. Mr. Polowsky was one of six Americans commanded by Lt. Albert L. Kotzebue who made that first unofficial but historic contact with our eastern allies.

It was a tragic meeting in view of mistakes which had led the Russians to bombard a group of refugees, crowded at the water's edge, the night before. But on the other hand, it was a happy and joyous meeting of young men full of the exhilaration of victory. Far more significant than that, however, was the expressed determination that a war like this must never happen again.

In Mr. Polowsky's words:

The greetings took place in the midst of some 200 corpses of old men, women, and children. After the preliminary greetings, the Americans and Russians looked down at the bodies, and fragments of bodies—especially the body of a child with blue eyes

and long brown hair, clutching crayons in one hand, a doll in the other.

At this historic moment of the meeting of the nations, all of the soldiers present—Americans and Russians—swore that they would do everything in their power to prevent such things from ever happening again, swore that the nations would and must live at peace.

The time has come for the nations to reaffirm that solemn oath at the Elbe.

As one of the six American infantrymen to make the boat crossing over the Elbe 5 years ago, as one of the American and Russian soldiers to take the oath at the Elbe, I believe I voice something of the thoughts and feelings of all of us on this fifth anniversary.

I therefore join in calling upon the nations for a new birth of conciliation and friendship, that the oath sworn on the blood-soaked historic ground at the Elbe River shall not have been taken in vain.

Meanwhile the delegates to the United Nations Conference were meeting in San Francisco. Addressing the delegates at that initial meeting, the chairman of the opening session said:

We approach our task humbly, but with united resolution. The prayers of the people of the world are with us. They are spoken in many tongues and in the words of many creeds. But they are as one voice, rising from the tragedy and suffering of war, in prayer for lasting peace. Thus fortified, and with the guidance of Almighty God, we must and shall fulfill the purpose for which we have come together.

In his message to the United Nations Conference, President Truman asserted that—

We hold a powerful mandate from our people who believe we will fulfill this obligation. We must prevent, if human mind, hearts, and hope can prevent it, the repetition of the disaster from which the entire world will suffer for years to come.

If we should pay merely lip service to inspiring ideals and later do violence to simple justice, we would draw down upon us the bitter wrath of generations yet unborn.

We must not continue to sacrifice the flower of our youth merely to check madmen, those who in every age plan world domination. The sacrifices of our youth today must lead, through our efforts, to the building for tomorrow of a mighty combination of nations founded upon justice and united for peace.

Mr. President, if we look at the world as it lies before us today with too myopic a vision, if we scan the omens with too materialistic an examination, both these great events take on the guise of tragic failures. Surely cynical disillusion must have come first and strongest to the disappointed youth who fought and suffered and many of whom died in that conflict which was to bring peace to the world. Yet Joseph Polowsky today has not lost his faith. Again, in his own words, let me present his earnest suggestion:

Five years ago today the soldiers of the world handed the oath of dedication and friendship, sworn in blood, on to the statesmen of the world meeting together at San Francisco. The United Nations has been entrusted with the obligation of taking the initiative in carrying forward every means of bringing us closer to a peaceful world. It must be the fervent hope of the nations of the world that the General Assembly of the United Nations, as it reconvenes in session, will approve a resolution to the effect that:

"The General Assembly recommends that each year on April 25 the United States and the Soviet Union commemorate, with appropriate ceremonies, the anniversary of April 25, 1945, when their armies at the Elbe River and their Governments at San Francisco met as friends to help open up a peaceful world; recommends that other states members of the United Nations join in the commemorative ceremonies."

Mr. President, that great organization from which we hope for so much, the United Nations, seems to be resting and rusting. In default of making precious advances toward international comity, we are watching a tremendous building arise on the shores of the East River in New York. We are reading about plans for developing the neighborhood which surrounds it. Foiled of spiritual achievement, we are trying to take refuge in a great material monument of hopes that have been well nigh abandoned.

Is it inappropriate, Mr. President, to call the attention of the Senate and of its Foreign Relations Committee again to the resolutions presented by some of its members who are not satisfied to see the United Nations lose force, lose faith, and fail of achievement? Senate Resolution 133 still rests in the files of the Foreign Relations Committee. Perhaps it is not the best way to reconstruct that great organization to do something more useful and more effective. Perhaps none of its provisions are applicable to this present period of stagnation and decay. If something better can be conceived, if something better can be done, by all means let it be presented and offered for our consideration. The inexcusable thing is that we should allow this cherished dream of peoples of the world to fade away into unsubstantial mists and leave not a wrack behind.

But something of hope, something of strength, and something of practical achievement which was present at that historic meeting on the Elbe still remains today. That was not a meeting of diplomats. That was not a meeting of rulers. That was a meeting of ordinary man. Governments did not speak to governments. People spoke to people. Let us remember that these same men who spoke to each other, and the hundreds of thousands and millions of men, women, and children who were behind them, whether in Russia, in Europe, or in North America, have still the same desires—to live in a peaceful world as brothers. Let us still remember that there are here and there, in spite of repeated discouragements, fruitful remnants of a faith that the thing can be done. On that memorable day on the Elbe those soldiers talking to soldiers swore an oath that it should be done. Mr. President, let us, as people talking to people, swear the same oath and the thing will be done.

NOMINATION OF ARCHIBALD S. ALEXANDER TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on August 8 last, in urging the Senate of the United States to confirm the nomination of my good friend and neighbor Archibald S. Alexander, for the post of Assistant Secretary of the Army, I said, among other things:

In these trying and turbulent days when our Nation is confronted with the terrific responsibility of leading the world to the ways of peace, there is no other factor more important to our own national well-being than the selection of men of competence and integrity for those offices which direct the destinies of our military establishments.

Mr. President, that utterance is as true today as it was a year ago. Thus, I again take great comfort and encouragement in the fact that in selecting a successor to the Under Secretary of the Army, Mr. Voorhees, the President of the United States has so quickly noted the competence and integrity which I predicted Mr. Alexander would bring to his present high post.

In the light of my prior unqualified recommendation of this fine American, it will not be difficult to understand why I feel a sense of genuine satisfaction over the fact that Mr. Alexander's nomination is before this body for an even higher post than the one he is now filling so ably.

I predicted a year ago that we of the Senate, who had the privilege to act affirmatively on Archie Alexander's prior nomination, would be able to take pride in the fact that we were adding new vision, strength, and courage to our Nation's leadership.

So today, Mr. President, as I urge the unanimous confirmation of the nomination of Archibald S. Alexander to be Under Secretary of the Army, I say with complete confidence that by again honoring him, we also do honor to ourselves.

For the purpose of the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the full text of my statement of last August 8.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

Mr. President, in these trying and turbulent days when our Nation is confronted with the terrific responsibility of leading the world to the ways of peace, there is no other factor more important to our own national well-being than the selection of men of competence and integrity for those offices which direct the destinies of our military establishments. Thus, Mr. President, it is not only comforting but it is most encouraging to note that the Senate now has before it for consideration, the name of Archibald S. Alexander for the post of Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Without reflection upon anyone heretofore appointed by the President to high office, I know of no nomination made during the Truman administration which is more commendable. Colonel Alexander comes from an old and distinguished New Jersey family and throughout his life, he has reflected the fine traditions of that family. As the one who was privileged to oppose Colonel Alexander as a candidate for the United States Senate in the senatorial campaign of 1948, I was not long in discovering that my opponent was a formidable foe. This was so because his strength was in his character, integrity, and his fine gentlemanly qualities. It is probably safe to say that there was never a political campaign in the history of the State of New Jersey which was waged on a higher level than the one to which I refer and for this, Colonel Alexander deserves much of the credit. By training and experience, in peace and in war, Colonel Alexander, as has been indicated, is eminently fitted for the high office to which he has been nominated.

In urging the unanimous support of his nomination by the Senate, I have every confidence that the day is not far distant

when those of us who enjoyed the privilege of acting upon this appointment, will be able to take pride in the fact that by our affirmative vote on this nomination, we added new vision, wisdom, strength, and courage to our Nation's leadership.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEM obtained the floor.

CODIFICATION OF ARTICLES OF WAR, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may submit a conference report on the Uniform Code of Military Justice, House bill 4080?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the Disciplinary Laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 9 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 7, strike out "of supervision in" and insert in lieu thereof "in supervision of".

On page 13 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 20, strike out "Nonjudicial" and insert in lieu thereof "Non-Judicial".

On page 13 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 22, strike out "nonjudicial" and insert in lieu thereof "non-judicial".

On page 13 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 23, strike out "nonjudicial" and insert in lieu thereof "non-judicial".

On page 48 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 4, strike out "president" and insert in lieu thereof "President".

On page 56 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 15, strike out "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen".

On page 57 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 6 and 7, strike out "one on March 1, 1953, one on March 1, 1955, and one on March 1, 1957" and insert in lieu thereof "one on May 1, 1956, one on May 1, 1961, and one on May 1, 1966".

On page 57 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 8, strike out "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen".

On page 57 of the Senate engrossed amendment, beginning with line 18, strike out all down to and including line 2 on page 58.

On page 58 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 3, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

On page 89 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 13, strike out "buildings" and insert in lieu thereof "building".

On page 92 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 22 and 23, strike out "National Military Establishment" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of Defense".

On page 102 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 21, after the word "executed", insert a comma.

On page 108 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 9, strike out "allowance" and insert in lieu thereof "allowances".

And the Senate agree to the same.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

OVERTON BROOKS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
CHARLES H. ELSTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will yield further, on the basis that there is, as I understand, no opposition to the conference report, and that there will not be any lengthy discussion, other than perhaps a very brief explanation, I have wondered whether the Senator would yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

Mr. KEM. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this conference report represents the culmination, so far as the Congress is concerned, of a very important piece of legislation. This bill, H. R. 4080, combines in one code the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard. It is a piece of legislation which is the result of a great deal of study by a special committee, headed by Prof. Edward Morgan, aided by his capable assistant, the executive director of the committee, Felix Larkin, and by a working committee of the various services.

The House of Representatives considered the proposal at length, and did a very masterful job in the preparation and passage of the original bill. In the Senate, special commendation should go to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who has been working on this subject for a number of years, and who, in the last Congress, presented the so-called Kem amendment, which was a step toward the final legislation which is now presented. Commendation should also go to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who have given much thought and very helpful attention to this proposed legislation. Many worth-while suggestions have been made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who joined in the conference report, although the bill does not go so far toward giving civilian control of military justice as the Senator from Oregon would like.

I think we sometimes overlook the fact that the staffs of committees render tremendously worth-while services in connection with these matters. The staff of the House committee and the staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee deserve the thanks of the House and of the Senate for what they have done. In the Senate committee, Mr. Mark H. Galusha particularly has taken the lead in preparing this legislation on behalf of the Senate committee.

By the conference report, the House of Representatives has accepted all the amendments which were made by the Senate. There was final disagreement on one item only. The bill as passed by the House provided for a Court of Military Appeals, appointments to be for life. The Senate bill provided appointments for 8-year terms. The compromise is that the first three appointments shall be made for terms of 5, 10, and 15 years, respectively, and that thereafter the appointments will be for terms of 15 years. In all other respects the House has concurred in the bill as passed by the Senate. I think as time goes on the provisions of this will give the services a system of handling military justice which will be much more satisfactory, much more uniform, and which will assure eventually civilian consideration of all important matters.

As I have previously stated, it provides for a unified code for all the services. Considering the difficulties which have confronted us in the disparity of sentences and in the impaneling of courts-martial after World War I and World War II, I believe this is a very important and worth-while step and is one of the major pieces of legislation ever passed by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a great Roman once said: "Frugality embraces all the other virtues."

Frugality is considered by some to be old-fashioned, particularly as applied to the policies of the Federal Government.

They regard frugality as a principle no more useful in our present way of life than a horse and buggy. The fact is, Mr. President, that never before in the history of the Republic has there been such pressing need for action on the part of frugal-minded Members of the Senate.

The pending measure would continue the so-called European recovery program another year. During the 2 years this program has been in operation, nearly $10,000,000,000 have been funneled overseas to 16 countries of western Europe.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will bear with me if I consider for a moment what this means to the taxpayers of a single State. The Missouri taxpayers' share of this enormous sum is more than $250,000,000. ECA Administrator Hoffman now wants another $3,000,000,000, approximately, to carry ECA through next year.

To put it another way, he asks the United States to give to western Europe next year an amount almost equal to the total assessed valuation of the entire State of Missouri, except the city of St. Louis.

The question the Senate must decide is this: Do the results of the Marshall plan justify such a lavish outpouring of dollars of the American people to western Europe, at a time when bankruptcy is not far around the corner here at home, and when we have so many needs of our own people awaiting, yes, and demanding, attention?

I. UNITED STATES IS ON THE BRINK OF BANKRUPTCY

Mr. President, this fiscal year the Federal Government is spending money faster than ever before in our peacetime history—spending at the rate of more than $43,000,000,000 a year.

The word "billion" should never have been invented. No seven-letter word can possibly express adequately how much a billion dollars really is. If a billion one-dollar bills were laid one on top of the other, the pile would be over 59 miles high. If a man worked 40 hours a week, 50 weeks a year, at $2.50 an hour, it would take him over 200,000 years to earn a billion dollars.

A billion dollars is a lot of money, and the Federal Government is spending $43,000,000,000 a year.

What is even more alarming, we are not paying our way as we go. Present taxes, high as they are, have not brought in enough to meet expenses. So the administration has turned to operating in the red to meet its bills—to printing I O U's. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation now estimates that the deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, will amount to $6,700,000,000. Furthermore, the staff estimates that the deficit next year, that is, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, will amount to $7,300,000,000. Now, if two and two still make four—and they always have—that means that during two short years our already monstrous national debt will have increased by the sum of $14,000,000,000.

This sort of thing cannot go on indefinitely. No country can drift along in the red, year after year, without the people waking up one day to find that their savings bonds, their insurance policies, and their money in the bank are not worth the paper on which they are printed.

The administration's spending orgy and the overload of taxes are threatening the continued existence of the Republic.

History indicates that socialism comes in whenever Government takes by way of taxes as much as 40 percent of the people's income. If that is the case, we are now within 9 percent of socialism—for Government is now using up 31 percent of all the earnings of the American people.

The danger is very real; the danger is very near. This is the question: What are we going to do about high taxes and extravagant Government spending?

There are three alternatives before us: First, we can continue to operate in the red, going down the primrose path which leads to national bankruptcy; second, we can increase taxes, which are much too high already; third, we can reduce Government expenses.

President Truman's budget for next year calls for continued heavy spending. It is far above what the Treasury expects to take in. The President wants to offset part of the expected deficit by an increase in taxes.

For my part, I cannot go along with this program. The only sound solution lies in cutting Government spending to the level we can afford. It lies in reducing gifts to foreign countries. Expenses should be cut deeply, so that we can balance the budget, and reduce, not increase, taxes.

II. HIGH COST OF GOVERNMENT HAS HIKED THE COST OF LIVING

The Marshall plan has contributed heavily to the high cost of our Government, and to the high cost of living of the American people.

High taxes, many of them hidden taxes which many people pay without knowing it, leave few enough dollars from the pay checks of the American people. Then the high cost of living takes what is left, and sometimes more. The high cost of living is due in large part to inflation brought on by heavy Federal spending and operating in the red.

III. GOVERNMENT SPENDING MUST BE REDUCED; MARSHALL PLAN SHOULD TAKE ITS SHARE OF THE CUT

Government spending must be reduced—right down the line—and there is no reason why the Marshall plan should not take its share of the cut.

After all, does it make sense for us to continue to furnish aid to other countries so that they can balance their budgets, and reduce their national debts, at a time when our Government is not making ends meet by far, and our national debt is zooming up and up hour by hour?

That is exactly what is taking place. Our gifts to the Government of Great Britain, for example, have made it possible for that Government to balance its budget, both internally and externally, and make substantial reductions in its national debt as well.

The debt of the United States is just under $1,700 per person. In other words, the Federal Government owes $1,700 for every man, woman, and child in the country. The per capita debt of the people of Great Britain, on the other hand, is only $1,560.

Who should be aiding whom?

IV. IT IS TIME TO DEVOTE MORE ATTENTION TO THE NEEDS OF OUR PEOPLE AT HOME

It is time to devote more attention to the needs of our own people. A lot of Americans need better housing. More than $100,000,000 in Marshall-plan funds have been used to construct housing in western Europe. In addition, we have sent—that is, we have given—American machinery to help construct new homes there, and we have furnished, without charge, building materials to carry out the program. In France more than $14,000,000 in Marshall-plan funds are being used to finance construction of workers' homes.

Italy has a new 7-year housing plan under way. Marshall-plan funds are being used to help finance it.

Marshall-plan counterpart funds are being used to build new roads in Italy, France, and in several other European countries.

I wish to say that we need new roads in this country. Recently the Joint Committee on the Economic Report issued a report stating that $40,000,000,000 will be required to bring the country's roads and highways up to present-day requirements. More than $250,000,000, according to the report, will be required to bring Missouri's highways alone up to par.

Since the war the American people have sent more than $33,000,000,000 overseas under various foreign-aid programs. Missouri taxpayers' share of this is about $850,000,000. If this money had been applied to building up Missouri's roads, we could have put our highways in first-class condition, we could have graveled every dirt road in the State, and still have had a lot of money left over. Instead, money of our taxpayers has been used to improve the highway systems of foreign countries.

Who among us will say that better roads are not needed here at home?

More than $35,300,000 in Marshall-plan counterpart funds have been allocated by ECA for reclamation of land in the Zuider Zee, in Holland. The Dutch Government has called the Zuider Zee project the "most spectacular work" it has ever embarked upon. It is a great project for the Dutch.

I am intrigued with the draining of the Zuider Zee in the Netherlands. Mr. President, I am far more interested in providing protection to the people in Missouri and other States from the ravaging floods of the Mississippi, Missouri, and other rivers.

Is it possible that drainage and reclamation, like charity, should begin at home?

I want to see Europeans prosperous and contended; but the welfare of our own people should come first, and not last.

V. THE MARSHALL PLAN HAS BECOME MERELY ANOTHER RELIEF PROGRAM

On December 19, 1947, President Truman sent a special message to the Con-

gress on the Marshall plan. This was the inception of the plan.

The President said:

In developing this program, certain basic considerations have been kept in mind.

According to Mr. Truman:

First, the program is designed to make genuine recovery possible within a definite period of time, and not merely to continue relief indefinitely.

Mr. President, let me repeat that statement:

First, the program is designed to make genuine recovery possible within a definite period of time, and not merely to continue relief indefinitely.

The period of time set for this genuine recovery was 4 years.

I am confident that we all want to get western Europe off our backs, to use Mr. Hoffman's expression, just as soon as possible. But even the Administration now admits that the Marshall plan is not bringing about genuine recovery in western Europe. On February 21 last, Secretary of State Acheson testified before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the foreign aid bill. During the course of his testimony Mr. Acheson was asked this question by Representative RIBICOFF, of Connecticut:

Mr. Secretary, do you think that aid to Europe will end in 1952?

Mr. Acheson replied:

No; I do not think that all American aid, certainly in the world and certainly to some parts of Europe, will end in 1952. (House hearings, p. 19.)

It is clear, then, that instead of being a genuine recovery program, to use Mr. Truman's language, the Marshall plan has become merely another of a long series of foreign relief programs since the war, most of which are now unhonored and unsung.

VI. MARSHALL PLAN FUNDS HAVE NOT BEEN USED WISELY OR EFFECTIVELY

Now for another of the President's objectives. Mr. Truman said:

Second, the program is designed to insure that the funds and goods which we furnish will be used most effectively for European recovery.

Instead, the Marshall plan has been used as a dumping chute for hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of things, making no contribution at all to effective European recovery.

For instance, the sum of $270,000,000 has been spent for tobacco to be sent to Europe under the Marshall plan. In other words, more than a quarter billion dollars, taken from the American taxpayers, under the taxing power, have been used to send gifts of tobacco to western Europe under a so-called recovery program.

Recently a Greek scholar visiting in the United States remarked that the Marshall plan is choking itself to death on nylon stockings, lipsticks, plastic combs, and canned tuna fish.

In his view, the insistence of the United States on shipping finished products, and things that are unnecessary to life in Greece, is stifling Greek economy and making the Greek people lazy and dependent.

VII. A MISSOURIAN TAKES A "SHOW-ME" LOOK AT THE MARSHALL PLAN IN OPERATION

Recently a number of Missouri farmers returned from an agricultural tour of several Marshall-plan countries. The tour was sponsored by radio station KCMO, of Kansas City.

J. L. Snyder, of Holden, Mo., wrote me a very interesting letter about his observations as an on-the-spot observer of the Marshall plan.

Mr. Snyder wrote:

The purpose of the trip was to study European agriculture, trade relations, and to learn the facts about the Marshall-plan money. I paid my own expenses; and therefore I am free to express my own opinions.

Mr. Snyder said that he was greatly surprised to find Europe, as a whole, in better condition than he had been led to think.

He wrote:

It was a very great disappointment to us to find that the people of the middle or lower classes knew absolutely nothing about the generous gifts of our money. Those we had hoped would be friendly because of our financial aid were antagonistic. They claimed that it had been a detriment to them. In France, the wealthy have become wealthier, and the poor have become poorer.

Mr. Snyder then said:

We had been led to think that with financial aid we have been selling democracy and helping to keep communism down. In this we have definitely been "taken for a ride."

Mr. Snyder asks how our aid can help promote democracy if the leaders of the countries and the men who administer the aid are the only people in that country who know where the money comes from.

He expressed concern over the fact that Marshall-plan dollars are being used to build up foreign competition. He said:

Belgium and Holland are exporting dairy products, and like the other countries, have become our competitors in the world market.

Mr. Snyder was not at all convinced that Marshall-plan countries would be of value to us as allies in a war with Russia. He said:

It is my opinion that in case of war with Russia, we cannot count on France or Italy as an ally. But if we build a national defense excelled by no other country on earth, they will know that by joining us they will be on the winning side.

Our only hope is to build a nation so strong both economically and militarily that no power on earth will dare attack us. Then no American boy will have to lie in the cemeteries over there because we thought of Europe first.

VIII. MARSHALL-PLAN COUNTRIES HAVE USED OUR DOLLARS TO EXPERIMENT WITH SOCIALISTIC DEVICES OF A DISTRESSING NUMBER AND VARIETY

Mr. President, during the debate in the Senate in 1948 on the original ECA authorization bill, the following statement was made:

All of the dollars in the world cannot of themselves cure the economic ills of the 16 Marshall-plan countries. Whether they solve their basic economic problems depends not on the amount of our aid but upon the actions of their own governments. These nations at the present time are carrying out vast socialistic experiments which have been unsuccessful every time and everywhere they have been tried. They show no indications of working now in Europe. Trade restrictions, unbalanced budgets, rationing, priorities, allocation of materials, and over-valuation of currencies, all are hindering recovery. These socialistic devices interfere with the natural course of production and commerce, rendering futile any help on our part. Any further aid we send will also go down the drain unless these countries discard their nationalization schemes.

The Truman-Marshall plan is conditioned on a program of self-help by the borrowing governments. But these 16 nations have given no indication that they intend to discard the socialistic practices which have nullified our aid thus far, and which will as surely continue to paralyze economic recovery in these countries. The Truman-Marshall plan would only defeat its own end by encouraging the ill-conceived policies which are at the root of western Europe's economic troubles.

Mr. President, that was said by me in the debate in 1948. The words are as appropriate today as they were then.

Certain of the Marshall-plan countries have balanced their budgets and devalued their currencies. These steps have had desirable effects.

But the so-called dollar shortage still plagues the Marshall-plan countries. The principal reason for this condition is the fact that most of the Marshall-plan countries persist in making use of a hodgepodge of trade restrictions, allocations, rationing, priorities, bilateral treaties, government planning, price fixing, profit fixing, wage fixing, import prohibitions, multiple currencies, and any number of similar socialistic devices whose net effect has been regimentation of the European economy, and extreme economic nationalism.

Mr. Hoffman has admitted several times recently that the situation is a serious one. He has stated that Europe "must bring these barriers down" and must create a free market or there will be no permanent road to prosperity after 1952.

But despite certain efforts which have been made by ECA to bring about so-called integration of the European market, the situation has become steadily worse.

As Representative LODGE, of Connecticut, stated during the House committee hearings:

Economic nationalism in Europe is rampant (House hearings, p. 607).

Henry Hazlitt, contributing editor of Newsweek magazine, and author of its business column, told the House committee:

The sad fact is that our Government foreign-aid program has had exactly the opposite effect of the one its supporters hoped for. It has slowed down the pace of economic recovery instead of increasing it. It has set back economic freedom instead of promoting it.

This, then, Mr. President, is the situation which our efforts have created. The Marshall plan participating countries have used our dollar gifts, not in accord with any over-all plan of integrated recovery, but instead, with the notable exception of Belgium, the Marshall-plan countries have used our dollars to promote, with costly results,

experiments with socialistic devices of a distressing number and variety.

Imagine the chaos that would result if each 1 of our 48 States suddenly undertook to put into effect socialistic nightmares originating in the fertile and disturbed brains of government planners from Marx to Cripps, and to regiment all trade with neighboring States in accordance with 3-, 5-, or 10-year plans. This is exactly what has happened in Europe—and its activation has been made possible by Marshall-plan dollars.

IX. THE MARSHALL PLAN IS OPERATING IN REVERSE

The original ECA authorization bill, passed early in 1948, provided that of a total of about $6,000,000,000 authorized, $1,000,000,000 should be available only in the form of loans or guaranties. Last year the amount made available for loans was reduced to $150,000,000 of a total authorization of about $4,000,000,000.

The pending authorization bill specifically limits none of the amount authorized to loans. Instead, it has left to the discretion of ECA Administrator Hoffman the amount to be allocated in the form of loans.

On Tuesday, February 21, Mr. Hoffman testified before the Senate committee. During the course of his testimony, the following colloquy occurred between the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and Mr. Hoffman:

Senator WILEY. Is there any of this loaned to any country under the terms of the act or is it given?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The present proposed bill would leave it optional, but there would be very little in the way of loans; some loans.

Senator WILEY. So it is virtually an out-and-out grant; is that right?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I think there might be $75,000,000 in loans out of the $2,950,000,000, but that would be about all that should be placed.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that this situation is antithetical to sound international economics. The Marshall plan seems to be operating exactly in reverse. If it is a genuine recovery program, as we were told by the President in 1947, if the plan has brought about a substantial increase in production in western Europe, as stated by Mr. Hoffman now, then sound economics demands that the proportion of loans to outright grants be increased, not decreased to the vanishing point.

Mr. Hoffman, in his testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 24, offered an interesting, and, I may say, a novel explanation of his position on the matter. He said:

To ask them to take loans instead of grants is to ask them to commit what I think is an immoral act. (House hearings, p. 77.)

Mr. Hoffman then said—and I ask particular attention to this language, Mr. President—

It will take 50 years for Europe to come back, in my opinion, to where she is earning enough to handle what she needs in a given year and service the debt she now has (House hearings, p. 78).

Mr. Hoffman says it will require 50 years.

In other words, Mr. President, Mr. Hoffman not only has the temerity to suggest to the American taxpayers financing his give-away plan that it is "immoral" to ask the Socialist Government of Britain to accept a loan instead of a gift; he now tells us that they cannot expect Europe to regain her economic feet for 50 years, which is exactly the reverse of all the Administration's soothing utterings about "genuine recovery" in 1952.

X. MARSHALL PLAN SHOULD BE TERMINATED IN AN ORDERLY YET SPEEDY FASHION

Nevertheless, we have embarked on this costly and, as I believe, unwise program.

The American taxpayers have a right to expect that the investment already made will not go completely for naught. They have a right to expect that the Marshall plan should be terminated in a speedy yet orderly fashion.

I do not advocate an immediate termination of our aid to western Europe. Our aid should, however, be reduced sharply this year, and terminated completely by the end of the fiscal year 1952, as originally contemplated. Furthermore, steps should be taken to insure that the remainder of the program is administered in a manner more economical to our taxpayers and in a manner designed to promote and encourage genuine recovery in western Europe.

In order that these objectives may be attained, I suggest that the pending bill be amended in certain particulars. I do not say that other amendments would not be desirable, but I have offered three amendments to the pending bill.

First. An amendment to reduce the authorization for the next fiscal year by $1,000,000,000.

Second. An amendment to terminate aid to any country participating in the program which in the future nationalizes or socializes additional basic industries.

Third. An amendment to terminate aid to any country participating in the program which continues to funnel war materials from the United States to Russia and her satellites.

I shall discuss at another and appropriate time the second and third amendments to which I have referred.

Mr. President, the pending bill would authorize the expenditure of $2,950,000,000 to continue ECA another year. The amendment to which I am now addressing myself would reduce the amount authorized by $1,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am about through with my prepared statement, which I should like to complete before yielding. I shall be very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio when I am through with my statement.

If the Senate sees fit to adopt the proposed amendment, ECA will still have available for distribution to Europe next year one thousand nine hundred and fifty million dollars, plus an estimated $149,000,000 which, it is expected, will be carried over from this year's appropriation.

When we consider the fact that a considerable portion of ECA funds have been used for purposes making no effective contribution to genuine European recovery, when we consider the fact that our own Government is tottering on the brink of bankruptcy, and when we consider the fact that the needs of our own people are being neglected to prop up Socialistic governments abroad, the reduction called for by the proposed amendment is modest, indeed.

Mr. President, the American front line is not on the Rhine or in the torrid jungles of Burma: it is in a sound American economy, and a strong national defense.

In 1879 Gladstone said:

The first thing is to foster the strength of the empire by just legislation and economy at home. * * * Here is my first principle of foreign policy: good government at home.

The greatest contribution we can make to the peace of the world is to show the people of other countries that the great experiment in self-government launched on this continent some 150 years ago can be made to work.

Are we making it work by spending billions of dollars more than we take in from taxes?

Are we making it work when we run the printing presses 24 hours a day, turning out I O U's to be paid when? By our children, or our children's children?

Mr. President, during the debate on the original Marshall plan authorization bill in 1948, I made the following statement:

The emotional interest exhibited in some quarters today in favor of distributing among the peoples of foreign lands the wealth accumulated in this country by many generations of thrifty and frugal-minded people, appears to be one of those strange emotional manias, or moral epidemics, which have excited the minds of men from time to time at various periods in the world's history.

An interesting book on this subject has been written, strangely enough, by an Englishman, L. C. Mackey. It is entitled "Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds."

The author says:

In reading the history of nations, we find that, like individuals, they have their whims and their peculiarities; their seasons of excitement and recklessness, when they care not what they do.

I should like to repeat that statement, Mr. President:

We find that (nations) like individuals, * * * have * * * their seasons of excitement and recklessness, when they care not what they do. We find that whole communities suddenly fix their minds upon one object, and go mad in its pursuit; that millions of people become simultaneously impressed with one delusion, and run after it, till their attention is caught by some new folly more captivating than the first (preface, p. xix).

Every age has its peculiar folly; some scheme, project, or fantasy into which it plunges, spurred on either by the love of gain, the necessity of excitement, or the mere force of imitation. Failing in these, it has some madness, to which it is goaded by political or religious causes, or both combined. Every one of these causes influenced the Crusades, and conspired to render them the most extraordinary instance upon record of the extent to which popular enthusiasm can be carried (p. 354).

If two or three persons can only be found to take the lead in any absurdity, however great, there is sure to be plenty of imitators. Like sheep in a field, if one clears the stile, the rest will follow (p. 613).

This book originally published in 1841, was reprinted in America in 1932. For this American edition a special preface was written by a distinguished American, the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch. Mr. Baruch wrote:

The migration of some types of birds; the incredible mass performance of the whole species of ocean eels; the prehistoric tribal human eruptions from central Asia; the Crusades; the medieval dance crazes; or, getting closer to economics, the Mississippi and South Sea Bubbles; the Tulip Craze; and (are we too close to add?) the Florida boom and the 1929 market-madness in America and its sequences in 1930 and 1931—all these are phenomena of mass action under impulsions and controls which no science has explored. They have power unexpectedly to affect any static condition or so-called normal trend. For that reason, they have place in the consideration of thoughtful students of world economic conditions.

Mr. Baruch did not do so, but he might well have included the infamous Salem witchcraft persecutions as another example of mass action under impulsions and controls, or moral epidemics.

Mr. President, on the great seal of the State of Missouri there is written: "Salus populi suprema lex esto"—Let the welfare of the people be the supreme law. The welfare of our own people—that is, the welfare of the people of the United States, and not the people of any foreign land across the sea—should be the first concern of the people of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. From the well thought out address which the distinguished Senator from Missouri has just made, I understand that he intends to offer or has offered to the ECA extension bill an amendment prohibiting the payment of money or the sending of goods to nations which are assisting Communist areas.

Mr. KEM. I have offered such an amendment, to be printed and lie on the table. I propose to discuss that amendment tomorrow.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator whether he recalls that in March 1949, I listed, in a speech I made in the Senate, 85 trade treaties which the 16 Marshall-plan countries then had made with Russia and the iron-curtain countries, under which treaties they were shipping to Russia and the iron-curtain countries all kinds of goods, such as ball bearings, tool steel, heavy farm machinery, construction equipment, farm machinery, railroad cars, locomotives, and practically everything necessary for the waging of a third world war against us and to consolidate their gains in Europe and in Asia.

I also would like to know whether the Senator recalls that on January 24, of this year, in bringing the list of such treaties up to date, I said there are 95 such treaties in good standing as of that date.

In view of the amendment the Senator has submitted, I am inquiring whether or not he has considered this feature of our relations with the nations of Europe.

Mr. KEM. I was very much interested in those treaties when the Senator from Nevada submitted them for the RECORD last year. I examined them, and I think they are an important contribution to the study of the funneling of the materials and goods produced by the American people through the countries of western Europe to Russia and the satellite countries.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator from Missouri take into consideration the fact that today France and England, 2 of the 16 Marshall-plan nations, have nonaggression treaties with Russia still in good standing, which so far as I know are still in force; at least, we have not heard anything or received any notice to the contrary. I submitted those treaties for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in March 1949. One of them was dated 1942, and was signed by Anthony Eden, for the British Empire, and by V. Molotov, for Russia. With the Senator's permission, I should like to read briefly from it:

ARTICLE VI

The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

ARTICLE VII

Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

Now let me refer to the French-Russian treaty, signed by Bidault, for France; and by Molotov, for Russia. The treaty was signed in Moscow on December 10, 1944. It was also mentioned by me in the same address in the Senate, and both these nonaggression treaties were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in March 1949. Articles V and VI of the French-Russian treaty read as follows:

ARTICLE V

The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties.

ARTICLE VI

The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war, with a view to facilitating and accelerating reconstruction of both countries, and in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether he has any knowledge of these nonaggression treaties, particularly as to whether they have been abrogated in the meantime.

Mr. KEM. I have no knowledge as to that. As I recall, the treaty between Great Britain and Russia has to do with aggression from Hitler or from some successor of the Hitlerian government. I do not recall the circumstances relative to the treaty between France and Russia.

At any rate, they are 20-year military alliances; and in case of war between Russia and the United States, it seems to me that the governments of Great Britain and France would be required to make a determination as to which of its allies it would associate itself with—whether it would join the cause of Russia or whether it would join the cause of the United States.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, let me say that I do not see in the treaties anything which limits the application of such agreements. The treaty between Great Britain and Russia, for instance, merely says, in article VII:

Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

Mr. KEM. Does not the preamble of the treaty between Great Britain and Russia say something about aggression by the Hitler government or its successor?

Mr. MALONE. Here is the opening language of the British-Russian treaty:

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the seas, Emperor of India, and the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Desiring to confirm the stipulations of the agreement between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for joint action in the war against Germany, signed at Moscow on the 12th July, 1941, and to replace them by a formal treaty.

The formal treaty takes in more territory. It came later and could well apply to any other nation attacking either of the contracting parties, as the case might be.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Nevada would know more about that than I would know. I was under the impression that the treaty had to do particularly with aggression by the government of Germany. In any event, it is clear that the treaty constitutes a military alliance between Great Britain and Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I should like to call his attention to a joint resolution which the junior Senator from Nevada introduced in the Senate on January 24, 1950. I understand that the Senator's amendment corresponds to the joint resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada. I had intended to submit an amendment to the ECA bill in line with my joint resolution of January 24, 1950, but now I intend to support the amendment which has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Missouri which I understand, will, if accepted, accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. KEM. I am glad to have the distinguished Senator from Nevada join me in that matter.

Mr. MALONE. The first paragraph of the joint resolution which I introduced on January 24, 1950, as it appears on page 818 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, reads as follows:

Joint resolution to prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point the joint resolution introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada, prohibiting assistance to such countries.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution to prohibit financial aid to any foreign country engaging in trade with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other area dominated or controlled by Russia

Whereas one of the alleged basic purposes of the Marshall plan is the restoration or maintenance in European countries of principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence through a joint program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation; and

Whereas Russia and other Communist-dominated and controlled countries and areas have refused to participate in such joint program; and

Whereas Communist actions have endangered world peace; and

Whereas certain participating nations under the Marshall plan by trading with Russia and other Communist-dominated and controlled countries and areas and through nonaggression pacts and treaties are violating the basic principles of the Marshall plan and are aiding and fostering communism in other areas of the world through furnishing the necessary equipment, machinery, and supplies to consolidate Communist gains in eastern Europe and in Asia; and

Whereas such nations are furnishing Russia and the Communist areas necessary equipment, machinery, and supplies for world war III; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Congress and the basic policy of the Marshall plan and its enabling legislation that assistance to any participating country which fails in any way to meet its obligations to sustain and strengthen the principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence, through cooperating with such Communist nations and areas, should be terminated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That on and after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, no financial aid shall be given by the United States or any agency or officer thereof (whether by loan, grant, lend-lease, or in any other manner) to any foreign country which engages in trade or commerce on or after such date with Russia, her satellite countries, or any other Communist-dominated or controlled area in any other country.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that no moneys shall hereafter be appropriated and no loans shall hereafter be made and no equipment or supplies of any kind shall be furnished to any nation engaging in such trade or commerce or permitting its nationals to do so.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a release issued by me on January 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR INTERNATIONAL STUPIDITY

This country is now arming Russia.

We censured ourselves for permitting a short-sighted administration to send scrap iron and oil to Japan before Pearl Harbor, "but today we are treating the Communists much better; we are seeing to it that they get, not scrap, but finished products. We bowed our heads in shame over our permitting scrap iron to be sent to Japan. Now is the time to bow our heads in shame again.

"Aid which we are sending to ECA countries is finding its way in finished products to the Communist countries," said MALONE, and to back up this serious charge he submitted a list of 95 recent trade agreements between ECA countries and countries behind the iron curtain.

Metal-working tools, steel, ball bearings, electrical machinery and apparatus, grain mills, heavy road machinery, farm machinery, and assembled motor vehicles are a few of the many items being sent to Russia's satellite countries from ECA nations.

It is the opinion of informed people that Russia cannot process and manufacture goods fast enough to keep her satellite countries contented, and without our help Russia will fail in her aggression. It is paradoxical that only with our help can Russia defeat us.

Is there a cold war? Let us make up our minds. If there is no cold war, let us trade with Russia openly and freely. If there is a cold war, on the other hand, if we are fighting communism, let us stop all assistance of every nature to those countries assisting Russia or in the Communist area.

It is downright silly to say there is a cold war and at the same time help our enemy in that cold war to consolidate her gains, to help our enemies fight world war III.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Missouri for his amendment and his address before the Senate today. It is high time that we made up our minds which side we are on.

In other words, now we are furnishing to the 16 Marshall-plan countries raw materials and money and industrial machinery. In truth, we are furnishing a very large amount of machinery, raw materials, and money to the 16 Marshall-plan countries; and the fact is—as shown by the 95 trade treaties made by the 16 Marshall-plan countries with Russia or with satellite countries, with which we claim we are in a cold war at this moment—that much of those materials and supplies is going from the Marshall-plan countries to Russia or the satellite countries on the first bounce. We ship the materials to the Marshall-plan countries and that machinery is installed and is used for the manufacture of the products and commodities later shipped to Russia and her satellites—it is a manufacturing in transit rate.

As a matter of fact, in the case of the treaty between Great Britain and Russia, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in March 1948 by me, the first item covered in that treaty was 1,100 locomotives, needed desperately by Russia for any war with us—either cold or hot.

We say that nothing which can be used for waging war or in any way to strengthen these nations for that purpose will be shipped by us to those areas. On the other hand, I ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether he was motivated, in offering this amendment, by the fact that not only are these treaties in existence and being fulfilled at this time, but that England, India, and other nations within the sterling bloc have recognized Communist China, and are daily increasing such shipments to Communist China, thus consolidating the Communist gains as well as preparing for war?

Mr. KEM. I think that is a very important consideration, and I thank the Senator from Nevada for the important contribution he has made to the discussion today. I expect to discuss that phase of the matter tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator offered his amendment to cut the appropriation by $1,000,000,000?

Mr. KEM. I have not asked that it be taken up. I offered it. It lies on the table, and it has been printed.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether the Senator should not offer it.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. May I ask whether any amendment is pending at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. KEM. I should be very glad to call up the amendment which I previously submitted, to reduce the authorization in the pending measure by $1,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am very much interested in cutting the appropriation. I fully agree with the Senator's warning that we are facing this year a deficit of $6,000,000,000, and next year, a deficit of six or seven billion dollars. It seems to me we must cut every phase of Government operation. Certainly there is no reason that I can see for not making a cut in the aid to foreign countries. I can see some reason perhaps for not cutting appropriations for the American armed forces, but aside from that, it seems to me that if those in charge of the Government take the position that this appropriation for a gift to many foreign nations cannot be cut, then I cannot see how we can hope to cut domestic expenditures. It seems to me the place to begin, if we are going to reduce the budget, is here—to begin whenever we come to anything on which we can begin.

So I have every sympathy with the Senator's desire to cut the budget. I have no desire to destroy the ECA program in any way. I wonder whether the Senator has given any consideration to the basis on which the amount of the program is predicated, and what the basis is for the $3,100,000,000. Does the Senator know why $3,100,000,000 was used rather than $2,100,000,000, or $2,600,000,000?

Mr. KEM. I suppose that an effort will be made to justify the amounts before the Appropriations Committee. But I cannot help recalling the justifications which were made before the committee last year. For instance, we were told that certain sums would be paid out in this country for American wheat. The amounts stated by Mr. Hoffman before the Appropriations Committee were far in excess of the purchases actually made. Apparently this is, to some extent at least, merely window dressing; the figures are picked out of the air, and the ECA Administrator feels no moral compulsion whatever to follow the figures which he so glibly re-

cites before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAFT. I have tried to analyze, from such documents as are available, the advances to the United Kingdom contained in the bill, because there are somewhat better statistics available as to the United Kingdom than as to other countries. But, taking the United Kingdom, for example, the table on country-aid programs shows that, of the total of $2,925,000,000—the balance I think is for shipping and other things—$687,000,000 is to go to the United Kingdom. I shall ask permission later to put the figures in the RECORD. Of the total, $326,000,000 is for agricultural products, and about $326,000,000—strange to say, exactly the same figure—is for industrial products. Whether that is a mere chance, or whether that figure was merely picked, or the sum merely happened to be divided up in that way, I do not know. With transportation, $34,000,000, added, the total is $687,000,000. Does the Senator know whether that total is reached by providing certain commodities which are needed, or whether it has to do with the so-called dollar balance or dollar deficit of the British Government?

Mr. KEM. I do not know how the figures were arrived at, but I can say with assurance that it is improbable there will be any relationship between those figures and the final purchases made, in the event the bill is passed and the appropriations made. We have learned that from the past.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether the Senator has read the statement made by Sir Stafford Cripps in the House of Commons, on Tuesday, April 4. I will read the essential feature of it. He said:

I should like to give to the House the figures on our gold and dollar position for the first quarter of this year. During that period the sterling area earned a net gold and dollar surplus of $40,000,000 compared with a deficit of $31,000,000 in the fourth quarter of 1949, a deficit of $539,000,000 in the third quarter of 1949, and a deficit of $330,000,000 in the corresponding—that is, the first—quarter of 1949. We received assistance under the European recovery program, largely in the form of reimbursement for expenditure already incurred by us, amounting to $229,000,000, and we also drew on the Canadian credit to the extent of $27,000,000. Thus the gold and dollar reserves rose by $296,000,000 during the quarter, so that, on the 31st of March 1950 they stood at $1,984,000,000, compared with $1,688,000,000 on the 31st of December 1949, and $2,241,000,000 on the 31st of March 1948, immediately before the European recovery program was put into operation.

The Senator will see that that means that the sterling area, during the 6 months beginning the 1st of October of last year and ending the 1st of April, this year, actually had a net surplus, without assistance from the ECA, of $9,000,000. Because of the devaluation of the pound, therefore, the British Government has balanced its international budget. The question which occurs to me is whether that fact has been taken into account. I think obviously it has not been taken into account by the ECA. I wonder why, if the British Government is able to balance its dollar budget, we should advance anything to the United Kingdom during the following year.

Mr. KEM. I think that is a very pertinent suggestion. Was the statement of Sir Stafford Cripps made in the House of Commons?

Mr. TAFT. It was.

Mr. KEM. Does the account which the Senator has before him indicate how the statement was received by the Members of the House of Commons? Did they show any marks of satisfaction?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes; they applauded. I do not have before me that particular account, but Sir Stafford was greatly applauded, particularly from the ministerial benches, as having accomplished a great feat—and it was a great feat. He points out as one of the most important reasons for the result—

The reduction in the United Kingdom's own expenditure on imports from the dollar area, bringing it now within the rate of $1,200,000,000 a year, which we have laid down in our program. * * * This major achievement is a triumph of cooperative effort by commonwealth countries of the sterling area.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator recall whether Sir Stafford Cripps made any acknowledgment of the assistance given him by his American friends in accomplishing this result?

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes. The golden-dollar balance has been built up by ECA money to more than $2,000,000,000, which is considered the safe point. They do not like to go below that point, which is, I think, a reasonable position to take. But what interests me is the justification for advancing to the British $687,000,000, if, in view of devaluation, they are able to pay their own way. The devaluation has injured us. It enabled England to sell goods in competition with American goods in all parts of the world. It has built up their exports, and it has enabled them to ship goods to this country more cheaply. Since they have that advantage over us, and have taken it, why should we go on advancing additional sums to the British in any amount?

Mr. KEM. Particularly in view of the current deficit in our finances.

Mr. TAFT. Particularly in view of the deficit in our own finances, and the fact that the British budget is balanced. It is rather interesting that in presenting the budget Sir Stafford Cripps is asking for the same tax levy, but he is reducing the income tax during the coming year as to lower incomes. That has to be made up by taxes on gasoline, for the most part.

Mr. KEM. Does the account which is before the Senator indicate whether the allocations for food subsidies to the British people are being reduced in any way?

Mr. TAFT. No. My recollection is that the subsidies are about the same. There has been a little shuffling of the subsidies.

Mr. KEM. Am I correct in my understanding that the subsidies enable British housewives to buy items of groceries for far less than their American counterparts pay in this country?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is far less, but it is less.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that on some items the prices in England are as little as one-fourth of the prices paid by American housekeepers?

Mr. TAFT. I am afraid I do not know. I had not thought so, but I have not checked it. The Senator will find in the budget estimates submitted by the ERP the same figure of $687,000,000 for Great Britain, and it is reached on the basis of the balance of payments. In that is estimated the amount of imports and payments for services, exports, and receipts for services. It seems fairly clear that the estimated balance for 1949–50 has not taken into account the change in the British balance-of-payment situation brought about by devaluation, and the amount figured for Great Britain's balance in 1949–50 is probably overstated by at least $200,000,000. How much the 1950–51 estimate is overstated is, I suppose, a matter of conjecture, but I at least wish to suggest to the Senator and to the Senate that we reexamine the situation and ask for a reestimate by ECA for the coming year in the light of the developments of the British balance of payments today.

It is quite possible they have had a balanced budget for the past 6 months, and that situation may be only temporary. Perhaps they cannot balance it for the next 6 to 9 months, but certainly it must be much closer to balance than when the estimate was made last fall by the ECA. The bill is still based in its amounts on the estimate made before the condition developed which has been shown by the statement of Sir Stafford Cripps.

I am interested in ascertaining what is the amount the authorization in the bill can be reduced. I am sure the estimate can be cut and can still accomplish the purposes of ECA, but whether it can be cut a billion dollars, a billion and a half dollars, or a half-billion dollars, I do not know. There is nothing in the hearings, so far as I have been able to ascertain, that can enlighten the Senate. I think we have a right to ask of those who advocate this tremendous expenditure that they tell us the reasons for the large amount required. Why do they have to have so many pounds of wheat and so many pounds of cotton? This is the most vague estimate that I know of among all the estimates submitted to the Senate. As to their domestic expenditures, the statement is presented in detail and we can check it. But why should we give $687,000,000 to the British instead of $300,000,000? I can find nothing in my studies to answer that question.

Mr. KEM. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the British Government has balanced its budget both internally and externally as of today?

Mr. TAFT. In the past 6 months it has balanced its external budget. So far as its internal budget is concerned, it may be balanced with some American assistance, because counterpart funds are used to some extent to help to balance the budget.

Mr. KEM. Am I correct in understanding that $500,000,000 of the counterpart funds have been used to retire the British internal debt?

Mr. TAFT. That is what I understood last year, yes.

Mr. KEM. Under those circumstances, does it not seem that the purposes of the original ECA Act have been

accomplished, so far as England is concerned, and so far as gifts from America are concerned?

Mr. TAFT. I am not quite certain. That is what I should like to know. It has been suggested in the statement of Mr. Cripps that the situation is only temporary, due to certain things which may not recur, but he said that as to the last quarter of 1949 whatever temporary conditions there were continued even more strongly in the first quarter of 1950. So I do not know. It may be that a hearing will show that there will clearly be a deficit in the balance of payments during the coming year, but I am quite certain that if so, it must be smaller than the ECA thought it would be when it made the budget 6 months ago.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator's study of the figures indicate that important discrepancies, or, shall we say, differences, exist between the estimates presented by the Administrator to the Appropriations Committee and the actual purchases made?

Mr. TAFT. So far as I can figure, the budget estimate submitted, to the extent that it is based on an estimated balance of payments for 1949–50, is at least $2,000,000,000 wrong today. We have covered three-fourths of the period. As to whether the estimates for next year are correct, I have no means of checking at the present time.

Mr. KEM. How about purchases as between different commodities in this country? Have the estimates been followed closely?

Mr. TAFT. That I do not know. That is in the hearings, on page 27, as to what they estimate for next year, but how closely the estimates have been followed I do not know.

If the Senator does not object, I should like to offer a number of matters for the RECORD.

Mr. KEM. That will be an important contribution to the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the statement by the Chancelor of the Exchequer on Britain's reserve position, which is dated April 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 4, 1950.

BRITAIN'S RESERVE POSITION

TEXT OF THE STATEMENT MADE BY SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS, CHANCELOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1950

I should like to give to the House the figures on our gold and dollar position for the first quarter of this year. During that period the sterling area earned a net gold and dollar surplus of $40,000,000, compared with a deficit of $31,000,000 in the fourth quarter of 1949, a deficit of $539,000,000 in the third quarter of 1949, and a deficit of $330,000,000 in the corresponding, that is, the first, quarter of 1949. We received assistance under the European recovery program, largely in the form of reimbursement for expenditure already incurred by us, amounting to $229,000,000, and we also drew on the Canadian credit to the extent of $27,000,000. Thus, the gold and dollar reserves rose by $296,000,000 during the quarter, so that on March 31, 1950, they stood at $1,984,000,000, compared with $1,688,000,000 at December 31, 1949, and $2,241,000,000 at March 31, 1948, immediately before the European recovery program was put into operation.

It is not possible so soon after the event to give a complete explanation of these changes in our position. In broad terms the various causes are known well enough, but their relative importance will not be able to be assessed until a good deal later. Looking at the position over the past 6 months since devaluation and comparing it with the difficult situation we faced in the second and third quarters of 1949, I think it can be said that two main types of influence have been at work in bringing about an improvement in our affairs. The first type consists of those factors which are outside our own control and which cannot be relied upon to continue; and the second is the result of policies which we have adopted to meet our difficulties and which may, we hope, have a more lasting effect. Under the first heading, factors outside our control, which reversed tendencies that had worked so strongly against us last summer, I would refer to the two most important—

1. The renewed inflow of dollars and the resumption of buying which had been held up in anticipation of a possible devaluation; and

2. The increased demand from the dollar area for many sterling area goods. This followed a further expansion in industrial activity in the United States, and the rebuilding of their stocks of commodities. Its effect has been the more marked since it has coincided with the normal seasonal increase in dollar earnings from some of the major sterling area exports such as wool and cocoa.

Under the second category which covers the results of policy decision, I mention the following as the most important:

(a) The reduction in the United Kingdom's own expenditure on imports from the dollar area, bringing it now within the rate of $1,200,000,000 a year, which we have laid down in our program, together with similar successful action by our partners in the sterling area, in accordance with the understandings reached at the Finance Ministers' meeting last July. This major achievement is a triumph of cooperative effort by Commonwealth countries of the sterling area. On its maintenance in the period immediately ahead of us depends much of our hope for the future balance of our payments with the dollar area.

(b) The improvement in our position with such hard-currency countries as Belgium, Switzerland, and Persia, which has resulted mainly from our better competitive position following devaluation.

(c) The substantial improvement of the United Kingdom's position on invisible account, due in large measure to a reduction in expenditure over a wide range of transactions.

(d) Finally, the recovery in our earnings from United Kingdom exports to the dollar area.

The explanations which I have given apply broadly to the whole period since devaluation. There have, of course, been changes within that period. In the early part, as I made clear in my statement on the results for the fourth quarter of 1949, the immediate and short-term effects of devaluation were particularly noticeable. Since then these more temporary effects have naturally declined in importance. But this decline has been offset, and indeed more than offset, in the first 3 months of this year by those other factors, which I have already mentioned, such as the increased demand for sterling-area exports and the further reduction in our imports from the dollar area. Our net payments in gold and dollars to nondollar countries and some of our payments on invisible account have recently been at a particularly low level.

The results of these last 6 months are undoubtedly gratifying. Whatever the results of a more detailed analysis, they reveal that we and the rest of the sterling area have made a further advance in our long and arduous campaign to close the dollar gap. But we must not be complacent as to these results or overestimate the progress which has been made. To the extent that the last quarters results benefited by a seasonal increase in income, we must expect that a corresponding seasonal decline will affect adversely the results of the months immediately before us. Some of the saving on dollar purchase throughout the sterling area may also have been seasonal or temporary in character. To this extent it may be balanced by higher dollar imports later in the year. We have also still been enjoying some of the temporary after effects of devaluation, although latterly to a smaller extent than previously; these effects, unlike the more permanent benefits of devaluation, will quickly pass. Nor can we be certain that the present level of demand for exports from the rest of the sterling area to the dollar area will be indefinitely continued, or that their prices will be maintained.

In looking forward we must bear in mind that the substantial gains over the last 6 months followed a period in which we lost nearly a third of our reserves of gold and dollars. Our policy is so to order our affairs that when the European recovery program ends, in the middle of 1952, we can stand on our own feet, without exceptional external aid. To that end we must maintain a rigorous economy in dollar expenditure and encourage the maximum dollar earning throughout the sterling area. We must conserve our strength and rebuild our resources until they are strong enough to withstand whatever strain the difficult and uncertain future may bring.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a break-down of the United Kingdom's allocation of $687,000,000.

There being no objection, the breakdown was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated ECA-financed program, by commodity group, in the fiscal year 1950–51

[In millions of dollars]

	United Kingdom—Requested program fiscal year 1950–51
Food and agricultural imports:	
Food	119.4
Feed and fertilizer	12.0
Natural fibers	123.0
Other agricultural products	72.0
Total food and agricultural products	326.4
Industrial imports:	
Fuels	90.0
Industrial raw materials	150.0
Capital equipment	66.4
Other manufactures and raw materials	20.0
Total industrial imports	326.4
Total commodity imports	652.8
Transportation	34.3
Total ECA-financed program	687.1
Total allotment from fiscal year appropriation	687.1

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement of the various country aid programs making up the total of $2,925,000,000, including the British estimate of $687,000,000.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Country aid programs, first 15 months, 1949–50 and 1950–51

[Millions of dollars]

	April 1948–June 1949 [1]	1949–50 [2]	1950–51 [2]
Austria	280.0	+166.4	+124.4
Belgium	261.4	+256.9	+142.8
Denmark	126.2	+87.0	+65.1
Trieste	17.9	+13.4	+10.0
France	1,313.4	+673.1	+562.8
Germany	613.5	[3] +740.3	+552.9
Greece	191.7	+156.3	+148.8
Iceland	8.3	+7.0	+5.2
Ireland	86.3	+44.9	+33.5
Italy	668.0	+364.0	+290.6
Netherlands	571.1	+295.6	+192.8
Norway	101.1	+90.0	+67.1
Portugal		+31.5	+23.5
Sweden	45.4	+48.0	+34.3
Turkey	49.0	+59.0	+44.1
United Kingdom	1,619.7	+919.8	+687.1
Total	5,953.0	[3] +3,953.2	+2,925.0

[1] Fifth report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration for the period Apr. 3-June 30, 1949.
[2] ECA appropriations justifications, 1951.
[3] Includes GARIOA assistance of $397,900,000.

See footnotes at end of table.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a copy of the Economic Cooperation Administration's budget estimate covering the United Kingdom for three periods, which appears on page II–125 of the budget estimate.

There being no objection, the estimate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Economic Cooperation Administration—Country, United Kingdom—Estimated balance of payments in gold and dollars and all currencies

[Million dollars and dollar equivalents]

Item	1948			1949–50			1950–51		
	United States	Total gold and dollars	Total all currencies (excluding own DOT)	United States	Total gold and dollars	Total all currencies (excluding own DOT)	United States	Total gold and dollars	Total all currencies (excluding own DOT)
1. Imports	−686.0	−1,644.0	−6,390.0	−628.9	−1,400.1	−6,031.8	−664.6	−1,204.5	−5,748.2
2. Payments for services	−254.0	−739.0	−1,878.9	−225.0	−338.0	−1,211.0	−224.0	−339.0	−1,148.0
3. Exports	+262.0	+691.0	+5,462.9	+240.0	+675.0	+5,300.7	+268.5	+755.5	+5,297.2
4. Receipts for services	+338.0	+504.0	+2,380.9	+239.0	+243.0	+1,613.0	+248.0	+259.0	+1,810.0
5. Current account balance	−340.0	−1,188.0	−425.1	−374.9	−820.1	−329.1	−372.1	−529.0	+211.0
6. Settlements (net)	−10.0	−323.0		−6.0	−246.0		+10.0	−165.0	
7. Capital operations (net)	+270.0	+606.0		+2.0	+110.0		−80.0	−30.0	
8. Balance of payments	−80.0	−905.0		−378.9	−956.1		−442.1	−724.0	
METHOD OF FINANCING									
9. Change in reserves		+220.0			+36.3			−13.1	
10. Change in pipe line								+50.0	
11. ERP aid		+685.0			+919.8			+687.1	

Mr. TAFT. I also ask that there be inserted table 7, on page 17, from the British Economic Survey for 1950, showing United Kingdom balance of payments on current and capital account with all areas.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 7.—*United Kingdom balance of payments on current and capital account with all areas* [1]

	Year 1947	Year 1948	First half 1949	Second half 1949, provisional	Year 1949, provisional
A. CURRENT ACCOUNT					
I. Dollar area:	£ million	£ million	£ million	£ million	£ million
Imports (f.o.b.)	561	405	204	236	440
Exports and re-exports (f.o.b.)	119	176	91	88	179
Visible balance	−442	−229	−113	−148	−261
Invisibles (net)	−113	−51	−22	+8	−14
Surplus (+) or deficit (−) on current account	−555	−280	−135	−140	−275
II. Rest of world:					
Imports (f.o.b)	967	1,365	758	772	1,530
Exports and re-exports (f.o.b.)	974	1,378	814	797	1,611
Visible balance	+7	+13	+56	+25	+81
Invisibles (net)	−52	+162	+64	+60	+124
Surplus (+) or deficit (−) on current account	−45	+175	+120	+85	+205
III. Total:					
Imports (f.o.b.)	1,528	1,770	962	1,008	1,970
Exports and re-exports (f.o.b.)	1,093	1,554	905	885	1,790
Visible balance	−435	−216	−57	−123	−180
Invisibles (net)	−165	+111	+42	+68	+110
Surplus (+) or deficit (−) on current account	−600	−105	−15	−55	−70
B. CAPITAL ACCOUNT					
(1) Gold and dollar deficit	1,024	423	239	142	381
(2) Net decrease in United Kingdom external capital assets [2]	−295	−105	−99	[3] −197	[3] −296
(3) Net change in sterling liabilities:					
(a) Nonsterling area countries		−247	−27	37	10
(b) Sterling area countries	−129	34	−98	73	−25
Net overseas disinvestment	600	105	15	55	70

[1] The figures in this table are revisions of those in Command 7793. Details will be shown in the white paper on the United Kingdom Balance of Payments, to be published shortly.
[2] This item is explained and amplified in Balance of Payments white papers (e. g. Command 7793). It includes overseas investment (mainly in the sterling area), sale of overseas assets (e. g., Argentine railways in 1948) and repayment of loans by the United Kingdom.
[3] Of which, −60 revaluation payments, matched by +60 in item B (3).

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I was very much interested in the colloquy between the senior Senator from Ohio and the junior Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend for a moment? The Chair would like to suggest that Senators observe the rules they make.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Chair outline to us just what rule to which he is referring?

Mr. CONNALLY. A Senator may not yield except for a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Missouri yielded the floor to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. KEM. I did not yield the floor. I yielded for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator the question. I was very much interested in the colloquy which ensued between the senior Senator from Ohio and the junior Senator from Missouri, and how the committee arrived at the amount of money involved in the ECA bill. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if he does not believe that the same method of arriving at the amount at this time—and it is admittedly the trade balance deficit—was arrived at in the same way the deficit admittedly was arrived at in March 1948? I have before me a table which was submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD March 4, 1948, by the junior Senator from Nevada. It shows each of the 16 Marshall-plan nations listed alphabetically. It shows their total imports in dollars, their total dollar earnings, and earnings from sources other than the

United States, and then the United States funds to be made available to them under the Marshall plan. They add up to a total of $6,860,000,000. I assume the Senator remembers the debate at that time. That amount was for a 15-month period. For the 12-month period, which was later adopted, the figure corresponding to the $6,860,000,000 was $5,360,000,000, which was the approximate amount of the funds actually appropriated. The trade-balance deficit, clearly, is added up each year, and that must have been the way the present amount was arrived at.

I will inquire of the Senator from Missouri if he agrees with the junior Senator from Nevada, that the fallacy of such an estimate is that we have no control over the purchases of the 16 European Marshall-plan countries. In other words, if the beneficiary countries have earned more than was estimated, they have simply purchased more goods. The deficit then would remain the same. Would it be a weakness in the whole system, in the judgment of the Senator from Missouri, that we have no control whatever over their purchases, and that if we could theoretically make up the existing balance they could increase them at any time at their own option by additional purchases?

Mr. KEM. I think it is a very decided weakness. We found that to be the situation in the case of purchases of American wheat. Mr. Hoffman appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and said that he was going to buy certain specific quantities of American wheat. Then Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Ernest Bevin came to the United States and had their dollar talks with the State Department. As a result, they decided to use $175,000,000 of Marshall-plan money to pay for wheat which Great Britain had previously contracted to buy in Canada. There was no mention in the authorization, and there was no mention in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of any authorization of ECA money to pay for wheat bought by Great Britain in Canada. I anticipate that if the Administrator had disclosed to the committee that he intended to use $175,000,000 of American taxpayers' money for that purpose, he would have encountered violent opposition.

I give the Administrator credit, because I do not think that at the time he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations he had the slightest idea of using $175,000,000 of his funds, or any funds, for the purpose of making payments on wheat contracted to be bought by Great Britain from Canada. Notwithstanding that, and relying on certain weasel words in the appropriations act, the Administrator, in order to assist in the dollar talks, devoted $175,000,000 for that purpose. He allocated $175,000,000 to be used in payment of an obligation of Great Britain to buy wheat from Canada. It resulted, as might have been anticipated, in purchases of wheat from the United States far below the estimates made by Mr. Hoffman before the Committee on Appropriations. In other words, we lost going and coming. We put up the money, but we did not sell the goods.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator further yield for another question?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield further.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will permit, the junior Senator from Nevada, in support of the debate on this subject, would like to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a table prepared in March 1949 showing the $5,360,000,000 trade-balance deficit of the 16 nations, corresponding to our appropriation for that year, showing that that very simple method is being used—in other words, we simply pick up the check. I ask unanimous consent to have the table included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Country	Population	Area	Allocation under Marshall plan (12-month period)	Index of industrial production (1937=100 unless otherwise noted)	Financial aid per capita
		Square miles			
Austria	7,000,000	32,369	$142,000,000	[1] 50	$20.3
Belgium and Luxemburg	8,687,000	12,774	252,000,000	[2] 84	29.0
Denmark	4,024,000	16,575	128,000,000	[3] 117	30.9
France	39,700,000	212,659	1,119,000,000	[4] 106	28.2
Greece	7,788,000	50,257	145,000,000	[5] 75	18.7
Iceland	127,800	39,709	10,000,000	[6]	78.0
Ireland	2,989,700	27,137	119,000,000	[7] 109	40.0
Italy	45,800,000	119,800	680,000,000	[8] 80	14.8
Netherlands	9,090,000	12,862	550,000,000	[9] 90	61.0
Norway	2,937,000	124,556	27,000,000	[7] 122	9.2
Portugal	8,132,900	35,466	None	[10 11]	
Sweden	6,674,000	173,347	26,000,000	[7] 107	3.9
Switzerland	4,265,700	15,737	None		
Export				[12 13] 101	
Import				[12 13] 105	
Turkey	18,971,300	294,416	None	[14 15]	
United Kingdom	47,889,000	94,279	1,378,000,000	[7] 115	29.8
Western Germany (United States, United Kingdom, French zones)	45,417,200	96,300	[16] 784,000,000	[7 17] 42	17.3
Total	259,495,600	1,348,243	5,360,000,000		

[1] State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Austria. Estimate, 1947.
[2] Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (United Nations, January 1948 issue): September 1947.
[3] International Financial Statistics, January 1948; p. 63.
[4] International Financial Statistics, September 1947.
[5] State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Greece (1939=100).
[6] No data.
[7] Hearings, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, pt. 3, p. 1222. (Figures: End of 1947.)
[8] State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Italy.
[9] State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Netherlands (second quarter, 1947).
[10] State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies. (No general industrial index available.)
[11] Full capacity.
[12] House Committee on Foreign Affairs Publication, entitled "Background Information on European Countries." (Restricted.) Aug. 21, 1947.
[13] 1938=100.
[14] State Department, European Recovery Plan, Country Studies, Turkey.
[15] Above prewar.
[16] Including Saar.
[17] United States zone, 48; United Kingdom zone, 37.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask further permission of the Senator from Missouri to have included at this point in the RECORD another table, prepared at the same time, showing the $6,860,000,000 trade-balance deficit for the 16 nations for the 15-month period, which corresponded to the 12-month period just mentioned. It also shows the total imports in dollars into those countries, the total earnings in dollars, and it shows that the amount which each one of these nations was to receive of the $6,860,000,000 for the 15-month period, which was later reduced to a 12-month period and $5,360,000,000, and corresponds almost exactly to their trade-balance deficits. I ask unanimous consent to have the table included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recapitulation of tables showing illustrative composition of imports of commodities and services from Western Hemisphere and possible sources and distribution of financing, Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949

[At July 1, 1947, prices]

	Total imports [1]	Possible sources of financing		
		Dollar earnings [2]	Sources other than new United States funds	New United States funds [3]
	Mils. of dols.	*Mils. of dols.*		*Mils. of dols.*
Austria	233	39	12	182
Belgium-Luxemburg	853	334	196	323
Denmark	237	45	28	164
France	1,931	369	128	1,434
Greece	262	67	9	186
Iceland	23	10		13
Ireland	192	40		152

Recapitulation of tables showing illustrative composition of imports of commodities and services from Western Hemisphere and possible sources and distribution of financing, Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949—Continued

[At July 1, 1947, prices]

	Total imports [1]	Possible sources of financing		
		Dollar earnings [2]	Sources other than new United States funds	New United States funds [3]
	Mils. of dols.	*Mils. of dols.*		*Mils. of dols.*
Italy	1,160	183	108	869
Netherlands	1,136	271	160	705
Norway	253	163	56	34
Portugal	144	144		
Sweden	499	423	43	33
Switzerland	535	535		
Turkey	69	69		
United Kingdom	4,311	2,133	418	1,760
Germany:				
Bizone	1,014	100		914
French zone	93	13		80
Saar	14	3		11
Total	12,959	4,941	1,158	[3] 6,860

[1] Including net dollar payments for freight and other invisibles.

[2] Including drawings of $72,000,000 by Portugal on its gold and foreign exchange resources.

[3] This column includes funds being requested by the Department of the Army for prevention of disease and unrest in Germany. A reconciliation with the $6,800,000,000 being requested for the European recovery program is to be found on p. 5.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, in support of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri I should like to introduce at this point in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch of March 2, 1950, entitled "German Sale of Rails to Red China Approved."

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN SALE OF RAILS TO RED CHINA APPROVED

West Germany has been authorized by the Allied High Commission to sell Communist China $7,000,000 worth of steel rails, authoritative sources in Frankfurt disclosed today.

The high commission approved the order 3 months after it turned down Communist China's order for 100,000 tons of rails from German mills. The new order is for 15,000 tons plus a small amount of additional parts. The Chinese will pay in dollars.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the dispatch shows that our own high commission in Germany approved the sale and shipment of goods, highly valuable for war purposes, and for consolidating gains in Communist China to Red China.

I have before me a news dispatch entitled "War Goods Smuggled to East via Germany," which was published in the New York Times of April 6, 1950. It refers to goods which are being shipped out of Germany, presumably manufactured with the aid of Marshall-plan money, but being shipped to Russia's satellite states. I ask unanimous consent to have the item included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR GOODS SMUGGLED TO EAST VIA GERMANY

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, April 5.—Western officials said today that west Germany had become a funnel for war materials smuggled into Communist satellite states.

Soviet Russia is believed master minding the war shipments through deals with private firms and international gangs, they said. The war goods are bought in some west European countries and in west Germany, the officials asserted.

Communist gangs recently were reported sniping at west Germany's economy by flooding the country with black-market goods. Officials said they buy the war materials and critical items with dollars and marks obtained through illegal cigarette and coffee sales.

Allied regulations strictly forbid shipments of war materials or strategic items to the eastern countries except under license. But authorities recently have confiscated airplane parts, bomb cases, ammunition carriers, and other war materials en route illegally to the east.

Allied officials said that only 2 percent of rail shipments and 10 percent of truck shipments from west Germany are inspected at the border. Customs controls on the German borders were turned over to the German Government last year.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri one more question. As I understand it the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri corresponds to the joint resolution which the junior Senator from Nevada introduced in January, and I understand that the purpose of the amendment is simply to make a choice of which side we are taking in the cold war. We are in the cold war with Russia and with the iron-curtain countries, or else we are not in a cold war. If the cold war is over, then we ourselves should trade with Russia. If we are in a cold war, we should not allow anyone to furnish goods from supplies provided by the United States to the Communists in order to consolidate their holdings in China and eastern Europe and to enable them to prepare for world war III. Is that the reason for the amendment?

Mr. KEM. That is the reason exactly. I have in mind that in the last World War hundreds of thousands of Americans risked their lives by being shot at with war material made out of junk and scrap iron which had been shipped from the United States to Japan. Here we have history repeating itself. We are shipping great quantities of war materials to countries in western Europe, who in turn are funneling them into Russia and its satellites.

An unkind cut—I might say the "most unkindest cut of all"—is the fact that when we sent scrap iron to Japan we are paid for it. The war materials sent to Europe to a large extent are being given gratis to the countries of western Europe to assist in their ecoonmic recovery, and perhaps the same materials, certainly similar materials, are being sold by the same countries in western Europe to Russia and the satellites. I shall have a good deal to say about that before the discussion of the pending measure is concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether, in a study of the evidence in support of the authorization which the Senate is now considering, he finds any evidence which would indicate that Great Britain is eliminating the trade barriers in her dealing with other ECA countries, as well as other countries outside of ECA; and, furthermore, whether Great Britain is attempting, in the convertibility of currency, to aid countries which are recipients of ECA funds, or whether, on the other hand, Great Britain is attempting to force to trade with her countries which formerly have been known to belong to the sterling bloc?

I have asked two questions, but I should like to have the distinguished Senator answer them. I should like to have his observations, because it seems to me that unless the purposes of the ECA can be accomplished through the elimination of the trade barriers between these countries, and the convertibility of currency, they will never get to the place where they will not need American dollars as they are requesting them under this authorization.

Mr. KEM. In reply, Mr. President, I may say that the correspondence recently appearing in the New York Times from able and experienced European newspaper men has been to the effect that the activities of Great Britain have been along the line of not facilitating the breaking down of currency restrictions or trade barriers, but along the line of insisting on their continuance.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the junior Senator from Missouri conclude that the provision in the bill establishing a fund of $600,000,000, which is to be used at the discretion of the Administrator to help the ECA countries in their convertibility of currency, so they can do business with one another, indicates that the purpose has not been accomplished, and that the Administrator himself feels that he needs legislative authority in order to bring that about?

Mr. KEM. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I think that is purely window dressing for the purpose of upholding the hands of the Administrator, and something for him to show his confreres in Europe.

I may say that my observation of the operations of the Administrator is that he is usually able to find a way under the law to do whatever he wants to do. I cite as an example—and we might refer to other examples—his purchase of Canadian wheat with ECA funds, and the use of those funds in payment on a contract previously made between Great Britain and Canada. I have examined the record. I have examined the testimony of Mr. Hoffman before the Committee on Appropriations, and there

was not the slightest indication that he had such a transaction in mind. Yet, when it came up, he evidently called in lawyers who were able to tell him how he could do it, and the nail on which his lawyers hung the transaction was the words in the ECA Act giving him the right to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as practicable.

Mr. KEM. So far as practicable. If Mr. Hoffman is given a blank check to carry out the purposes of the act, I do not see that there is much use of our spending any time on either examining his justification before the Committee on Appropriations or examining the terms of the authorization bill. I think the only substantial and important thing to do is to cut down the amount of money in his hands.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator mentioned the interpretation by the Administrator of the provision which the Congress wrote into the ECA bill relative to the purchase of surplus wheat, under which provision whenever a commodity was declared surplus, the Administrator could use ECA funds to purchase needed supplied in this country, rather than in some other country.

Mr. KEM. I also had in mind that when he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations he said he intended to buy certain definite quantities of wheat.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask the Senator if it is not true that the funds which are justified before the Committee on Appropriations are based upon the allocations which the Administrator says are needed in the particular countries. Is not that true?

Mr. KEM. Yes; but I am impressed by the fact that when the Administrator starts operating, he does not seem to be influenced in any way by statements he made or failed to make before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. So that it is the opinion of the distinguished Senator that, even though, in the appropriation bill, the allocations of wheat were justified, down to the last dollar, the Administrator discarded the intent of Congress and used the dollars he had for any other purpose Great Britain might want to use them for, so far as her portion of the funds was concerned. As I recall, Great Britain bought Canadian wheat, which reduced the surplus in Canada, but left the surplus of wheat in this country unsold.

Mr. KEM. In other words, I think there are two bits of evidence as to the intent of Congress, first, the language of the authorization bill, which said the Administrator should not purchase surplus commodities offshore when they were in surplus supply in the United States; and, second, the acceptance by the Committee on Appropriations of the justification which the Administrator presented there, in which he said he would buy certain quantities of American wheat.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether he has made any further study into the bilateral agreements Great Britain has made during the life of the ECA program.

Mr. KEM. I have made a considerable study of the agreement made between Great Britain and Canada, in which Great Britain agreed to buy a great quantity of Canadian wheat. I have also noticed, many times, statements by the able Secretary of State and others that it was the purpose of the American Government to discourage bilateral agreements. I remember very distinctly that, at the time the first British loan was proposed, Mr. Vinson, now Chief Justice of the United States, stated that the justification for the British loan was the doing away with bilateral trade agreements. Yet we made the British loan, we made princely gifts since then, and now Mr. Hoffman takes our money and finances a bilateral trade agreement without asking Congress, or without even consulting any committee of Congress, so far as I know.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that the purpose of the ECA cannot possibly be accomplished if Great Britain continues, through bilateral agreements, to do these things with other countries upon the basis of which Great Britain is now negotiating such agreements? How can trade barriers be eliminated so the various countries can get away from dollar shortages, when the countries themselves continue to come to the United States asking for money, rather than trade among themselves? How is that possible?

Mr. KEM. Obviously it is not possible.

I should like to take occasion to correct a statement I just made. I said that so far as I know the deal by which $175,000,000 worth of ECA funds was used to finance the purchase of Canadian wheat by Great Britain was not brought to the attention of the committee. It was not brought to the attenion of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I understood the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to say that it was brought to his attention informally, but it was not brought to the attention of the Agricultural Committee. I have no information as to whether or not the same thing occurred in the case of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question, please?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am also interested in a phase of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Missouri, whereby he is attempting to reduce the amount of the authorization. By reason of committee work, I have not been able to be on the floor during the entire discussion by the able Senator of the subject matter in hand. Has the Senator placed in the RECORD the financial situation of Great Britain at this time regarding her external and internal budgets, and also the gold reserve which Great Britain now has?

Mr. KEM. The distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has done that in his usual very able and exhaustive manner.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I correctly understand that the figures which have been introduced conclusively substantiate the point that Great Britain now has balanced her external budget, that her internal budget has been balanced for some time, and that her gold reserve is about $1,980,000,000, with $230,000,000 to be added, which runs her reserve above the $2,000,000,000 reserve which Mr. Cripps says is necessary? How does the Senator from Missouri feel about the aid that should be granted to Great Britain at this time by a country whose debt is now some $260,000,000,000, and whose budget has been out of balance, with the exception of two years, for 18 long years?

Mr. KEM. I think it raises the question as to who should be aiding whom.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator asked me some time during our colloquy as to the food subsidies. I have here a statement released by the British Information Services on the Cripps' budget, submitted in April, and on the question of the food subsidies it is stated that these will remain unchanged at 410,000,000 pounds a year. That would be equivalent to $1,150,000,000. If we had the same subsidy in this country it would cost us $3,500,000,000, since we have three times as large a population.

I think it might be a good thing to put into the RECORD the summary of the new budget and the changes made in the tax, showing as a matter of fact for the first time in many years in Great Britain a slight deficit of 7,000,000 pounds, almost negligible, but practically level. I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the British budget may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN'S BUDGET FOR 1950–51

Presenting his budget to the House of Commons today, the Chancellor said that a continued surplus was absolutely essential under present circumstances.

In the financial year which ended March 31, 1950, Britain's budget showed a conventional surplus of £549,000,000, and an over-all surplus (allowing for capital payments by the Government) of £62,000,000.

For the coming year the Chancellor estimated that there would be a conventional surplus of £441,000,000, and an over-all deficit of £7,000,000. The budget of almost £4,000,000,000 could thus be regarded as substantially in over-all balance.

With the increases in revenue anticipated, there could have been a conventional surplus of £550,000,000, and an over-all surplus of £65,000,000. This, however, would be a rather larger surplus than was needed this year, said the Chancellor. Taxation and other concessions would result in the figures given.

United Kingdom budget figures (in million pounds)

	1948–49, actual	1949–50		1950–51 estimates
		Estimates	Actual	
Ordinary expenditure	3,176	3,308	3,375	3,455
Ordinary revenue	4,007	3,778	3,924	3,896
Conventional surplus	831	470	549	441
Over-all surplus	352	14	62	−7

CONTINUED NEED FOR HIGH TAXATION AND FOR INCOME STABILITY

The Chancelor said that there was no scope for remission of taxation: "We cannot have the benefit of full employment and a general standard of incomes above those we now enjoy."

The Chancelor stressed particularly the need to keep personal incomes stable: "If we try, by catch-as-catch-can methods, to advance everywhere and anywhere along the wage front, we shall undoubtedly succeed in destroying full employment through inflation."

It was vital, he said, that the policy of restraint should not break down either with wages, salaries, or profits.

CHANGES IN THE BUDGET

(i) Income tax: The standard rate would remain 9s. in the pound (45 percent), but there would be an adjustment in the lower rates, so that the first £50 of taxable income would now be taxed at 2s. 6d. in the pound (12.5 percent) instead of at 3s. (15 percent), and the next £200 at 5s. (20 percent) instead of 6s. (24 percent).

Following are examples of the new rates compared with the old:

Earned income	Income tax			
	Single person		Married, 2 children	
	Old	New	Old	New
	£ s.	£ s.	£	£ s.
£250	19 ----	16 5	-----	----------
£400	55 ----	46 5	3	2 10
£500	85 10	74 5	22	18 15
£700	157 10	146 5	72	60 15
£1,000	265 10	254 10	180	168 15

Tax-free payments by corporations to high executives would be subject to surtax, and these would be retrospective to last year.

(ii) Gasoline: Tax would go up 9d. a gallon, bringing the price to 3s.; but the standard ration would be doubled to allow motorists to do about 180 miles a month.

(iii) Purchase tax: Purchase tax on highly priced automobiles would be reduced from 66.6 to 33.3 percent; but a purchase tax of 33.3 percent would be put on commercial vehicles to restrict their purchase at home and encourage their availability for export.

(iv) Beer: The beer duty would remain the same, but the gravity would be increased by 3 degrees, bringing it about halfway back to prewar strength.

(v) Health service: Contrary to the proposal made last autumn, no charge would be made at present for prescriptions. The power to charge would remain, but it was hoped to find a more easily administered method of economizing on this branch of expenditure. No increase in the cost of the health service could be allowed. Any expansion in one part of the service in future would be met by economies, or if necessary by contraction, in others.

(vi) Housing: The rate of housing had been cut to 185,000 a year last autumn. It would now be restored to 200,000 a year for the 3 years 1950–52.

(vii) Food subsidies: These would remain unchanged at £410,000,000 a year.

Mr. KEM. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if he has any figures as to what provision is made in Sir Stafford Cripps' recent budget for aid to aged needy people?

Mr. TAFT. No, I do not. I can get that for the Senator rather soon. The social-service budget is very large. But I am not certain how it is divided.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that the British Government makes a larger payment to the needy aged people of Great Britain than is paid by our Federal Government to their counterparts in the United States?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It is a much more generous provision. I am not sure that the actual amount per person is larger. The general standard of living is lower in England. I can secure those figures, but do not have them at hand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to know how the Senator from Missouri squares the position of the State Department that our Government should continue to give this amount of economic assistance to Great Britain, even though she has a gold reserve of practically $2,000,000,000, and must not allow it to drop below that figure, when the Government of the United States on January 5 of this year said to the Government of the Republic of China, "You have a gold reserve to be sure, down to about $200,000,000, but you must spend it all before you can possibly hope for any assistance from the United States"? In other words, the same policy that is followed in Europe apparently is not applied to the Far East. Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. KEM. Yes. I think it is a very interesting situation, and I would be no more able to square that with logic or reason than I would the fact that Great Britain is supposed to be fighting communism in western Europe and on the western side of Russia, whereas it has recently very promptly, I may say, recognized the Communist regime in China, and has been assisting it in numerous ways. For instance, I believe the able Senator from California pointed out on the floor of the Senate one day that some 90 airplanes belonging to the American air-line company headed by General Chennault——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Seventy-one planes.

Mr. KEM. Seventy-one planes had been turned over to the Chinese Communist Government by the British authorities in Hong Kong. I should like to ask the Senator how it is possible for the Socialist Government of Great Britain to be fighting communism in western Europe, as we are led to believe, but assisting in promoting communism in China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is one of the questions which I hope the spokesmen of the administration on the Foreign Relations Committee will answer on the floor of the Senate before we come to a vote on this bill. As the Senator may know, before the Committee on Appropriations we raised the question of the 71 planes belonging to the American company, which the British Government of Hong Kong was turning over to the Chinese Communists. We satisfied ourselves that the American Government had made representations both through the consul general at Hong Kong and through the American Embassy in London, and through the State Department in Washington.

I have no criticism at this time of our own officials because of the representations they have made. However, I have not found out as yet what if anything the British Government intends to do about it, except to mark time until the pending legislation is passed through the Congress. I think the administration spokesmen on the floor owe it to the Senate of the United States and to the country to have a report submitted to us before the pending legislation is voted on, as to what the British Government intends to do in seeing that these planes do not get into Communist hands, and are turned over to the American company who are the legal owners of the planes, and who have the planes registered in the Civil Aeronautics Authority under American ownership.

Mr. KEM. In whose hands are the planes now?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The planes have been awarded to the Chinese Communist Government, but are temporarily being held in Hong Kong. The British Government has not yet given them clearance to fly out.

Mr. KEM. When that is done is there any reason why they cannot be used in military operations against the Chinese Nationalist Government?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that it is even worse than that. While these planes are civilian planes—they are transport planes, and not military planes—the information which came to our committee was that they would be excellent planes to be used for transporting troops, not only against the island of Formosa, but that in the event of trouble in the Far East, they could be used against the Philippines, against southeast Asia, and indeed could be used against the American occupying forces under General MacArthur in Japan. They would be a notable addition to the military strength of the Communist forces in that area of the world.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator feel that that purpose is along the lines of a statement made by Mr. Clement Attlee, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, on a notable occasion, that in economic matters Great Britain looks to Russia rather than to the United States?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Missouri that many of us, I think, who have been favorably disposed in the past toward the ECA legislation—and on this matter there are honest differences of opinion as to what the best thing may be—recognize the fact that this problem is global in character, and that a wall cannot be built against communism in Europe while some of the same people who are being helped in Europe are accelerating the spread of communism in Asia, because in the event world war III should break out—and we all hope and pray that it will not—it will be global in character, and what strengthens communism in Asia is bound to strengthen it all over the world.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the able Senator from California, who was a member of this body at the time the so-called Truman doctrine was promulgated, if he understood that the encirclement of Russia by American money and American arms proposed under the Truman doctrine contemplated encirclement

on one side of Russia or entirely around the geographical limits of that country?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it was clearly indicated on the floor of the Senate by Senators who were the spokesmen of the administration and by other Senators that the menace of communism was world-wide in character, and that if it was not possible to stop the constant nibbling-off of country after country, it would be difficult to hold any place in the world. Therefore, in addition to giving aid to the countries of western Europe, we assisted Greece and Turkey, and ultimately Iran and other countries, so that the world would not be overwhelmed piecemeal by the police state which was on the march.

Mr. KEM. Has it been brought to the attention of the Senator from California that the Truman doctrine has been modified by any official statement by Mr. Truman or by the Secretary of State?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. To the contrary, in some of the more recent statements of the Secretary of State, he seems to have been emphasizing what has been called in the past the Truman doctrine, namely, that it is dangerous to the peace and security of the world to have communism spread either in Europe or in Asia.

Mr. KEM. Did he hold that view at the time of the recognition of Communist China by Great Britain?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall only say to the Senator from Missouri that I do not believe this Government made representations to the Government of Great Britain pointing out the serious nature of Great Britain's unilateral action in breaking away and in recognizing the Communist regime in China.

I may say, as I am sure the able Senator from Missouri knows, that never, I think, in the long history of the British Empire has that nation been so insulted as it has been by the Communist regime in China, because the British emissary has been cooling his heels outside the Communist foreign office in Peiping since January 6, when Britain recognized the Communist regime in China. So far as I can fathom, up to the moment the Communists in China have not yet decided whether they will recognize the Government of Great Britain.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that American soldiers, wearing the uniform of the United States, have been seized by the Chinese Communists and are now in prison in China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct; a United States Marine sergeant and a United States sailor have been held for 18 months there. There are a number of our representatives, from American consulates and from the United States Embassy at Nanking, who thus far have not been able to get out of that country; and a number of other American citizens are in the same boat.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from California know whether the facts pertaining to the recognition of Communist China by Great Britain were brought to the attention of Mr. Hoffman before that act occurred?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure Mr. Hoffman is aware of the position which has been taken on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere in the country by those who have pointed out the grave implications of the recognition of the Communist regime in China.

Mr. KEM. Has that had any effect on the release of ECA money to Great Britain by Mr. Hoffman?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it has not, to date.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to permit me to ask a further question——

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Missouri know how he can square the position taken by the administration—which the administration has rather consistently taken, I may say—in objecting rather strenuously to having any restraints or restrictions written into the ECA Act by the Congress, on the ground that to do so might impinge upon the sovereignty of such nations, with its own actions, in the case of both Greece and Korea, in laying down the law—namely, in saying that if certain things were not done by those countries, ECA funds would be withheld? Personally I find it rather difficult to follow the consistency of that line of action.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I find it extremely difficult to follow the consistency of such action. I think I read, not long ago, an interview with Mr. Hoffman, in which he was quoted as saying, in effect, that a certain country of western Europe would have to do something which he had in mind, or else he would crack down on it. Certainly it is difficult for me to understand how Mr. Hoffman can crack down on any country in western Europe except by withholding ECA funds if that country did not do what Mr. Hoffman thought it should do.

Certainly Mr. Hoffman is an agent of the United States, and any authority which he has comes from the Congress of the United States; the Congress is its source. Therefore it is extremely difficult for me to understand how Mr. Hoffman, who is empowered by the Congress, can do things which it is improper for the Congress itself to do, so we are told.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that I have not had a chance to study the Senator's amendments. It may be that I shall find that I cannot vote for any of them.

However, it seems to me that it is better legislative procedure, and it is fairer to the countries with whom we deal, for the Congress to lay down certain basic principles, just as a lending institution lays down certain principles—for instance, that the borrower must put his financial house in order, and so forth—and to make its rules applicable to all comers, rather than to pick out several nations, which at the moment appear to be weak, and use its power against them, but apparently hesitate to impose the same restrictions against other nations which, in fact, may need the object lesson a little more.

Mr. KEM. It seems so to me.

I should like to ask the Senator from California whether he believes that any restrictions placed by the Congress in the ECA extension act or in the appropriation bill to folow it are likely to prove entirely futile, if notwithstanding such restrictions, Mr. Hoffman is given authority to carry out any transactions which he believes are in the interest of the act or will promote the purposes of the act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say to the Senator from Missouri that the longer I have been here in Washington—I have been in the Senate a little more than 5 years now—the more convinced I have become that the founding fathers were correct when they wanted this Government to be a government of laws, not a government of men.

If we write out the law specifically and then require administrative officials to follow the directives of the Congress, I think we shall be much better off.

I have in mind the fact that in connection with the arms-implementation bill, the Congress of the United States appropriated $75,000,000, to be used for assistance to China. At the request of the administration, the language of that act was broadened somewhat, so as to provide that the assistance might be granted in the general area of China. However, the legislative intent was very clear, namely, that the Congress recognized that with the administration giving 98 percent of its attention to Europe and only 2 percent of its attention to the Far East, we were likely to be faced with a great debacle in that area of the world.

So even with that limited sum of money—and, as I have said, it was very clear that the legislative intent was that China was to receive some help—so far as I know, since the arms-implementation bill was passed at the last session of Congress, not a penny of that money has been expended for the assistance of the non-Communist regime in China; but to the contrary, any allocations of that money which have been made have been made to other countries in the Far East, countries outside of China.

So we see that when we leave such matters solely to the discretion of the present administration, that is the type of cooperation the Congress receives.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

I had told the Senator from Delaware that I would yield to him. However, I do not see him here on the floor at the moment.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions to be asked of me, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; if I may receive unanimous consent not to lose the floor by yielding for that purpose. I ask such unanimous consent, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well; I yield, with that understanding.

Mr. BREWSTER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on S. 3304, the foreign-assistance bill, and to express my full and wholehearted support for every one of the purposes encompassed in this measure. I hope that it passes and that the full authorizations provided in this measure are voted by the Senate.

Today I shall confine my remarks largely to that portion of this bill which provides for the so-called point 4 program. This is the program which President Truman, in his historic inaugural address 2 years ago, called a bold new program for cooperative development of the underdeveloped areas of the earth.

Later in the course of this debate I hope to speak on other aspects of the foreign-aid program and on other provisions of the legislation now before us. But, today I shall address myself largely to point 4. To my mind, point 4 proposes simply the expansion of the world's production of goods and services. By means of the point 4 program, we hope to insert the key of technical know-how into the door of the world's treasury of human and material resources.

Unfortunately, in these days there is a tendency to assess the importance of any measure in terms of its cost. In a bill authorizing expenditures of more than $3,175,000,000, it is difficult to put in proper perspective a program authorizing only $45,000,000, or less than 1½ percent of the total expenditure authorized in the bill. But as I have considered this program, I have become convinced that ultimately it can become one of the most far-reaching and significant aspects of our entire foreign policy. Like the other foreign-aid measures which we have approved, this program serves our own interest as well as the interest of other people. But unlike many other programs, this one does not involve the assumption by us of the burdens of direct support for the people needing assistance. In fact, it operates on the reverse principle. Its purpose is to provide technical means whereby other peoples may take the initiative in meeting their own needs.

Unfortunately, the troubled and uncertain state of the world today forces us to concentrate much of our thought and energies on defense and security. We are developing ever more powerful instruments of destruction. We are appropriating large sums for the maintenance of our own armed forces. We are assisting other free nations in building up their defensive armaments.

In a true sense, Mr. President, the entire foreign-aid program now before us is also a defense program. The development, with our assistance, of prosperous and sound economies among the free and democratic people of the world may well be a stronger measure of security and defense in the kind of struggle in which we are engaged than are the purely military steps which are being taken.

But the foreign-aid programs, and particularly the point 4 program, are much more than defense measures. They are constructive; they represent a concept of international relations which is dynamic and which recognizes that the economic, social, and moral interests of this country are intimately bound up with those of the other free peoples of the world.

The close relationship of our economy to the economies of other countries has become increasingly clear to us. All of the statistics show that our trade with developed countries is at a much higher level than it is with underdeveloped countries. Not only are we able to acquire from these developed areas many products which our industries and our people need and desire, but we are able to sell them more of our own products.

I find that before World War II, our exports to the developed areas averaged about $5.80 per capita, whereas our exports to the underdeveloped areas of the world averaged only 70 cents per capita. The contrast is even more startling when we look at some of our principal export items. For example, during recent years the United States has sent to the developed countries from 20 to 30 times as much tobacco per person as has been sent to the underdeveloped areas. Last year we sold 27 pounds of the rolled and finished output of steel mills to the highly developed areas but only 3 pounds per person to the underdeveloped areas. In 1948 and 1949 we sold 6.3 pounds of raw cotton for each person in the developed areas and less than 1 pound per person to the underdeveloped areas. The same pattern prevails for a long list of manufactured products. It seems clear that even though other countries may learn to produce more for themselves, they develop at the same time a greater demand along with increased means to pay for imports from us. A prosperous nation, like a prosperous man, makes the best customer.

There is one aspect of this program which especially appeals to me. The bill authorizes a part of the $45,000,000 to be made available for the technical assistance programs of the United Nations. As a nation, we have made the strengthening of the United Nations one of the cornerstones of our foreign policy. Our hope for a secure and a peaceful world rests in large measure on our hope eventually to make the United Nations an effective instrument for the achievement of world order and justice.

Although many United Nations activities have been prejudiced by obstacles raised by the current policies of the Soviet Union, and although the United Nations is not yet effective in achieving all of the high purposes for which it was created, this world organization is peculiarly equipped to render real service in the field of technical cooperation. The specialized agencies of the United Nations have already been working with a number of countries to improve conditions in those countries. Many other nations besides our own are prepared to make experts available in various fields of technical knowledge so that the exchange of technical know-how and skills can be on a truly cooperative and international basis.

It is a fact that many of the underdeveloped areas would prefer to work with and through an international organization which pools the knowledge and skill of all the world rather than directly and exclusively with the United States or with any one nation. To the extent that effective results can be accomplished through international machinery, we should be willing and anxious to give our wholehearted support to these agencies. Our object in this program is not to get credit for playing Santa Claus, but rather to reap the greater benefits which would come from helping to dispel the atmosphere of economic hopelessness in which totalitarianism and tyranny thrive. Increasing the prestige of the United Nations is almost as much to our own interest as is increasing the prestige of our own country.

I have not been able to make a detailed appraisal and analysis of the exact functions for which the $45,000,000 authorized in this bill is to be expended. However, I note that the Secretary of State, in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, indicated that the figure requested was arrived at as the result of months of careful planning by many different agencies of the United States Government. The Secretary of State said that the extensive experience which the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and other agencies gained in Latin America was heavily drawn upon in formulating the specific programs to be initiated under the proposed point 4 program.

In my opinion, the action of the House of Representatives in cutting the amount requested by the State Department was most regrettable. By its very nature, the point 4 program can never cost the large sums which are involved in programs of supply and of economic support, such as are provided under other titles of Senate bill 3304. As I have already said, the amount requested for this program is less than 1½ percent of the total proposed in the whole foreign-aid bill. The reduction made by the House results in very little savings. But this small cut would cripple or altogether prevent the launching of activities which can produce benefits of vast value—much more than can be measured in thousands or even millions of dollars. I hope that the Senate will approve the full amount recommended by the Senate Foreign Relations committee and that our conferees will stand firm on this point in negotiating with the House.

I was very much interested in Ambassador Philip Jessup's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Ambassador Jessup has just returned from a trip to the Far East. He described the interest and enthusiasm of the far-eastern countries for the point

4 program and indicated some of the specific activities in which these areas are interested. I noted that these countries, over whose future we are so deeply concerned today, want assistance of a very simple and interesting kind. They do not ask for vast steel mills or other elaborate industrial developments. They want to develop, for instance, a new variety of rice that can be grown by dry farming instead of by wet farming. What a profound difference in the economy and living conditions in the Far East such a development could bring about.

Ambassador Jessup spoke also of the control of malaria, which is one of the greatest problems in the entire Orient. He also found a great need for information about the best kinds of trees to plant under various climatic conditions. Certainly an increase in the amount of forest timber available would be of major significance in the whole economic life of these areas.

Ambassador Jessup described how the problem of finding a simple means of ascertaining the level of the underground water table was of vast importance to some of these peoples. It might lead, for instance, to finding a simple method for getting water for irrigation. These are simple problems, but once solved, new horizons would be opened to all those millions of people in the Orient.

We can help in these problems, Mr. President. Our help, if given in time and in adequate amounts, can have a great effect in bettering economic conditions and in influencing the outcome of the mighty ideological struggle which is now going on in that part of the world.

Last Saturday, Mr. President, our distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, spoke to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and described the situation which we now confront.

There are great areas of the world—

Said Secretary Acheson—

where people are living in a state of extreme poverty that is almost impossible for us to imagine. Millions of these people are not content any more to accept those conditions of poverty for themselves or their children. They are looking for a way out. That is a good thing. The will to change is half the battle. But the question is whether these people will choose a way out that leads to freedom. If we want them to move in the direction of freedom, we must help them.

That is how Secretary Acheson defined the situation. In my judgment, point 4 is one of the fundamental answers to the situation which Secretary Acheson described.

I feel, Mr. President, that we should endorse and support this program with real enthusiasm for its ultimate possibilities. Let us look at it not as a $45,000,000 aid program, but as an enlightened and dynamic movement to participate with all other free countries in sharing the knowledge and skill possessed by each of us for the benefit of all. This is a very great concept. It opens up one of the doors which can lead us out of the narrow corridor of conflict in which we are now confined. It is full of opportunities and of prospects which we cannot and dare not discard.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to the consideration of S. 3304, and in support of that very far-reaching measure.

Last January the Subcommittee on Relations with International Organizations, of which I am chairman, submitted a report on United States relations with international organizations. That report pointed out that American foreign policy is seeking to bring about conditions in the world in which democratic government and institutions can survive and flourish. It is difficult, if not impossible, however, to maintain international organizations, either within the United States or elsewhere in the world, unless conditions of peace, freedom, and economic well-being can be brought about in other parts of the world. In order to accomplish these basic objectives, this Government requires the maximum assistance and support from all other like-minded nations, since joint action is far more effective than uncoordinated attempts on the part of individual governments. I should like briefly to comment on this statement. The principal aim of American foreign policy, namely, to bring about conditions in the world in which democratic government and institutions can survive, is the aim of the American people. We do not need any polls to tell us that the goals of our forebears are our goals today. The men and women who fled repression and intolerance built a nation of freedom and tolerance. Our Nation today, in a world threatened by forces that would mold all minds to a single, godless pattern, stands as a great beacon, a beacon to which the peoples of the world look for guidance, help, and strength. Someone has remarked on the way in which one candle can pass its flame to other candles to make a dark room bright. And in the process, the first candle does not go out. The light it first carried becomes stronger.

Mr. President, so it is with the United States. As we kindle and encourage and nourish freedom and democracy in western Europe, in the Far East, in the underdeveloped areas of the world, we become stronger and our way of life more secure.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, said during his splendid presentation of this bill that he doubted whether those who oppose the Marshall plan have seriously considered whether the United States is stronger and more secure by reason of our having friends in western Europe who have retained their freedom with our help, or whether our Nation would have been more secure by keeping its aid at home and running the danger of being friendless in a world of chaos, distress, and communism.

One must agree with the senior Senator from Texas that we are far more secure today with friendly democracies in western Europe than we could ever be with Communist satellites facing us across the seas, surrounding our American troops in Germany. It is now apparent that Marshall-plan aid which has preserved and strengthened democracy in Europe is cheaper, far cheaper, for the American taxpayer, than would have been the cost of defense if western Europe were linked to the east intead of to the west. It was pointed out earlier in my statement that in order to bring about conditions in the world under which freedom can survive, the United States requires the maximum assistance and support from all other like-minded nations, since joint action is far more effective than uncoordinated attempts on the part of individual governments. That is one thing that rates approval about the Marshall plan. We are joined with like-minded nations in a cooperative venture. The same is true with respect to the Korean aid part of the bill, the title for assistance to Palestine refugees, and the technical-assistance amendment. The self-help and mutual-aid features of these programs give greater strength than if these states were seeking the same ends individually instead of collectively.

Programs of this kind will never be understood by the Communists. The programs are based on freedom and tolerance—on the give and take of ideas. The Soviet Union in its dealings with its friends never operates on what we call a give and take basis, unless those words mean give order and take whatever you can get by force or otherwise. Whoever may have first used the word "satellite" to describe the relationship of the Soviet Union to eastern Europe, it describes the relationship perfectly. I suspect the word just grew up pretty much like Topsy. It was so natural.

Mr. President, the great difficulty that we encounter as we try to build a world of freedom and tolerance is that at every turn we are confronted by a force that promises what may, at first glance, seem to be far more than we can offer. All democracy has to offer is the opportunity for a man to make his own choices, exercise his own will, create his own wealth, choose his own government. Democracy offers a man a chance to work. Communism, on the other hand, promises not freedom, not a chance to work, but it promises, rather, a surcease of any necessity to exercise one's own will, of any necessity to make the difficult political choices that confront a free people, of any necessity to worry about where the next meal is coming from. Communism tells the people that they need not worry. The state will take care of all. The state knows what is best.

Mr. President, I daresay that a man's desire to make free choices, to have freedom, bears a very direct relationship to his well-being. We know that it is in places where chaos, hunger, and depression prevail that communism thrives, partly because the people do not care; partly because the people are ripe targets for the threats and coercion that the Communists are so adept at employing. It is against this background that we should consider the President's recommendations that the Congress authorize $2,950,000,000 in new money for ECA for the coming fiscal year. Mr. Hoffman told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

We are laying before you our best carefully screened estimates as to the requirements of the fiscal year. This is the minimum we think we shall need but, if we can

save any of it without wrecking the recovery program, I again pledge you my word we shall do so.

In the light of the serious, world-wide conflict between totalitarianism and democracy, and in view of Mr. Hoffman's assurance that we shall save where saving is possible without jeopardizing the program, I for one hesitate to assume the responsibility for cuts in funds which may adversely affect our security and carefully worked-out program. Permit me to urge strongly that no cut be made in the requested and recommended authorization, and that we endorse the unanimous recommendation of the committee and vote the full amount.

I do not ask you to take this position on the record alone. The momentum of European recovery is now for the first time really being felt. The stepped up U. S. S. R. war of nerves in part grows out of the fact that Russia knows her path to conquest is daily becoming more difficult in western Europe. Dare we at such a time and in the face of the evidence submitted take the chance of meeting our responsibilities with too little and too late?

This year's requests are based on substantial estimates of probable dollar savings and earnings which will require strenuous efforts and heavy sacrifices of western Europe. Any cut in the funds might jeopardize the program. Dare we, entrusted with the well-being of our country, vote less?

Substantial gains have been made in the European battle for freedom as the committee report and the senior Senator from Texas have made clear. But let us not be lulled into inactivity by that hopeful fact. We still have some distance to go before we can call ERP a complete success, and nothing can kill it quicker than inadequacy of funds.

We should not forget that Communists have taken on renewed confidence in Europe due to Red victories in China and the anticipated end of ERP. For that reason our aid, even though in reduced amount, is just as vital now as it was in 1947. We refused to vote too little then. Let me urge that we refuse to do so now. We are more than halfway on the road to victory in Europe, and it is unthinkable that we shall fail now. The arguments which supported full appropriations in the past are still potent.

Mr. President, before concluding, let me address certain remarks to that particular portion of this subject matter which was so ably discussed by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in connection with title V of the bill under consideration, namely, technical assistance to the underdeveloped areas. A United States program of $45,000,000 is contemplated for the period ending with June 30, 1951.

This is a tremendously important undertaking. Remember, the so-called underdeveloped areas are peopled by two-thirds of the human beings on this globe. A great many of them live under conditions of great hardship. Their income is low; health conditions are bad; life is short; and most of the time is spent in getting together enough food to subsist on. This is the area marked off by communism for future exploitation; and a fruitful field it is for that purpose because communism holds out to those living in misery many false yet glowing promises of a better life, with which it tries to lure the victims to accept the Communist totalitarian enslavement and police state.

There will be found in the program recommended by the committee that the United States plans to use a substantial part of the requested funds for participation in the technical assistance work of the United Nations. This is both wise and necessary. One of the main aims of the United States foreign policy is to support and strengthen the United Nations, whose anniversary, incidentally, we observe today. By supporting the technical assistance work of the specialized agencies of the UN we shall promote the improvement and stabilization of the world in which we live and thus further our own security.

The studies which the Subcommittee on International Organizations has made of our participation in such organizations indicate that dollars contributed in that field are well spent. Assurance is given that this subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will give close attention to the way in which technical assistance funds spent through international organizations are administered. It is hoped that when this program comes up again I will be able to report to you on the administration of these programs.

The technical assistance program envisaged in title V, especially as it pertains to the United Nations and its specialized agencies is a logical companion measure for the ECA. We should in all candor recognize that it is a new venture, and many of its phases will have to be developed by experience in the field. Yet the requested amount is not excessive, and the anticipated benefits have great promise, far out of proportion to the relatively small outlay.

In closing, Mr. President, may I respectfully suggest that title V is an international measure of the greatest significance in this day when a nation's policies must concern themselves with the battle for men's minds. This is the way to win friends for the United States and to give helpful assistance to the cause of international relations in the direction of winning the cold war, attaining greater freedom, and building a better world in which to live.

Mr. President, the pending bill offers the American people positive ways in which they can combat the promises of communism with realistic, material benefits for the people who want to choose the way of democracy rather than the way of totalitarianism. If there is one thing that is clear to me it is that if we sit back and do nothing, the world will fall bit by bit under communistic control until eventually this Nation might go down. We must be affirmative. We must be positive. We must be constructive. We must look to the future. This bill points the way.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, one of the earliest lessons I learned in the sometimes rough and tumble politics of my home State of Indiana was to speak guardedly lest what I said might rise to haunt me at a later date.

That warning well could have been heeded by one of my distinguished colleagues, in view of the debate in this body yesterday relative to the current investigation into certain charges brought by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], which charges are the subject now of what purports to be an inquiry by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator from Maryland is chairman.

During the colloquy between the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] yesterday, as reported in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Senator from Maine referred to remarks made on the floor of the Senate Monday, July 19, 1947.

During the debate the senior Senator from Maine said, referring to previous remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland:

> I think it does not quite follow the pattern which the Senator from Maryland laid down in a rather historical case as to the conduct of investigations, when some 2 years ago he insisted, in a very forceful speech on the Senate floor, that future investigations should be absolutely bipartisan, by having an equal membership.

Mr. President, I happened to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration about which the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland was speaking at that time, in July 1947.

Because, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Indiana was engaged in debate with the senior Senator from Maryland on that occasion, I feel it my duty today to enlarge upon the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from Maine and repeat some of the statements made on that occasion by the senior Senator from Maryland.

I believe they are particularly apropos.

On page 9365 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1947, I find these remarks particularly applicable to the proceedings now under way by the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee in its conduct of the investigations and the charges that there are or have been Communists in the employ of certain agencies of the Federal Government.

I shall comment further after this particular quotation from the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland approximately 2 years ago:

> I respectfully suggest to the able Senator from Indiana without questioning that the motives which prompted the action which heretofore has been taken, that in my judgment the committee would be well-advised to have the recount made completely in the open and to have everything done there made known to the public, for a star-chamber proceeding, no matter how honest it may be, no

matter how fair it may be, will leave the impression in the minds of many that something has taken place which perhaps should not have taken place in the committee.

In the instant case, Mr. President, the investigating subcommittee is comprised of three Democrats and two Republicans. The Senator from Maryland, on July 19, 1947, said the investigation should not be conducted in that way; that it should be a bipartisan investigation.

Senators will recall that when the Senator from Wisconsin presented on the Senate floor this case of the individuals working for the Government which he considered dangerous because of the materials in their files, he then pointed out that the material in those files had been developed by thousands of investigators working for the Government and that it would be impossible for him to develop the case independent of the files and suggested that the committee membership examine the files and determine who the dangerous individuals were.

With this the Senate unanimously agreed and voted for a complete investigation and requested that all the files be obtained.

Subsequently, the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Connecticut rather cleverly shifted on the shoulders of the Senator from Wisconsin the burden of proving, independent of the files, the cases of those who were dangerous to our Government. The Senator from Wisconsin hired a number of former FBI men and is now doing the job which the committee should have done if the committee were to try to make a complete investigation.

Strangely, however, we discovered this morning when one of his witnesses was presented to the committee in executive session, the chairman upon his own initiative ruled that the Senator from Wisconsin could not be present and refused even to put the matter to a formal vote of the committee because, as he said, the Senator from Connecticut was absent; this despite the fact that a quorum was definitely present. If the committee wanted a bipartisan investigation, with the absence of the Senator from Connecticut the committee might have had its first chance for once.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator used the expression "when he put on a witness this morning." Is the Senator referring to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]?

Mr. JENNER. I am referring to the Senator from Wisconsin. In other words, they have thrown the burden on the Senator from Wisconsin to prove the case. He has had to hire FBI men to bring in the facts and the witnesses. It should not be his duty to do that. But the responsibility was shifted to him. Then when he brings witnesses into this star-chamber proceeding, the Senator from Maryland, who objected to what he called a star-chamber proceeding when the junior Senator from Indiana was chairman of a subcommittee conducting an investigation 2 years ago, would not even allow the Senator from Wisconsin to be present at the star-chamber proceedings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there anyone on the committee who represented the Senator from Wisconsin in any way, shape, form, or manner to question the witness or to help conduct the investigation?

Mr. JENNER. I shall go into that a little later. But I will answer the Senator by saying, "No; there was not." Even the minority counsel was excluded from the committee room. That is the kind of proceeding. That is the kind of investigation which is being conducted.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from Indiana referred to the Senator from Wisconsin as hiring FBI men. Probably the Senator meant to refer to them as former FBI men.

Mr. JENNER. Yes; the Senator from Wisconsin hired former FBI men as his investigators to make investigation of the case which the Senate has directed the subcommittee to make. That is what I am objecting to.

The action in question, Mr. President, came from the self-same Senator who 2 years ago objected so strenuously to what he termed "star-chamber proceedings" by the then Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

With further reference to alleged star-chamber proceedings, permit me to read from page 9367 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the same date, this statement by the able senior Senator from Maryland:

> I think the committee owes it to the people of the State of Maryland and to one of our colleagues who is a sworn-in Member of this body to disclose—

Note this, Mr. President. I am quoting from the senior Senator from Maryland, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations conducting an investigation of Communists in Government. He said the committee should disclose—

> from day to day, from hour to hour, and minute to minute, everything that takes place in the room.

From the same page, Mr. President, I quote the distinguished Senator from Maryland again:

> I had hoped that the investigation would be open, free, and above board, and without any tinge of partisanship.
>
> It is a terrible thing that by connivance, by the suppression of facts, or by the utterance of charges which have not been thoroughly investigated and from which the evidence on both sides has not been presented on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Indiana in the charges which he has just made, is sitting as a judge without a complete trial of the case.

I ask the membership of the Senate, Mr. President, in all candor, who is sitting as judge and jury in the matter now before the Foreign Relations subcommittee.

Again, Mr. President—and I might comment that the record is full of similar statements—the senior Senator from Maryland charged—

> Proceedings are being conducted in a closed room from which the public and representatives of the press are excluded, and the participants in that procedure are cautioned to give out no information. * * * It seemed to me the public interest was not being served by such a procedure.
>
> If there is to be any logic or any progress in government or in civilization, what we should do is to use the wrongs of yesterday to make the rights of today and in the future.
>
> What a poor and pusillanimous argument it is to say "When you gentlemen were in control you did not act right. Now we are in control and we are not going to act right."
>
> What an admission of evil doing to use as an excuse the wrongs of someone else to justify the wrongs of yourself.

Mr. President, the chickens have come home to roost. Let us look at the record.

Referring again to the debate of yesterday, I quote again from my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, chairman of the Communist-investigating subcommittee, as follows:

> I am not relying entirely upon the staff of the committee, because sometimes I can get access to things to which, perhaps, a staff investigator could not get access.

The facts, Mr. President, corroborate that statement by the able Senator from Maryland.

The record of committee proceedings of the United States Senate reveals that the senior Senator from Maryland was the original sponsor of the present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, the man really under fire in the State Department Communist cases.

The record will show that Mr. Acheson was first sponsored for a Government job in 1933 by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who sponsored him for appointment as Under Secretary of the Treasury. As corroboration of this fact, I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1933, page 3336. On the following page of the same RECORD, we find this quotation from the distinguished Senator from Maryland:

> Apart from the fact that Mr. Acheson comes from Maryland, I believe you gentlemen will find he will be a pleasant surprise in the office.

Mr. President, I think the American people will agree that Mr. Acheson has been "a surprise"; but in addition, his Damon and Pythias defense of the convicted perjurer, Alger Hiss, has certainly been a shock to the Nation.

I continue the quotation:

> He has great ability and great industry, and holds a high conception of any governmental responsibility, and it is a real pleasure for me to endorse him.
>
> I am satisfied the committee will have no regrets if they endorse him.

Mr. President, in view of the declaration by the able Senator from Maryland that he has access to things to which perhaps a staff investigator could not obtain access, let me state at this point some facts about the "interlocking directorate of Whitewash, Inc." In fact, Mr. President, about the only thing the administration has is whitewash; it has plenty of that.

A gentleman by the name of Seth Richardson was named by the President to conduct a resurvey of the McCarthy cases. He heads the Civil Service Commission's Loyalty Review Board.

Mr. Richardson is a law partner——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana is aware of the fact that on April 3 the Loyalty Review Board met, the purpose of the meeting being to determine what the President asked for in his letter, in which he requested a resurvey. After discussion, a motion was made, and was unanimously adopted, to the effect that the Board would not consider anything having to do with bad security risks. That action was taken on April 3 by the Board which was called together to investigate the so-called McCarthy charges.

Mr. JENNER. I see—in other words, some more of "Whitewash, Inc."

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

First, a motion was made, and unanimously carried, that the Board would not under any circumstances investigate anything having to do with bad security risks.

Second, there was rather lengthy discussion again; and again a motion was made, and unanimously carried, to the effect that under no circumstances would the Board delve into any cases of perversion and that despite the fact, as the Senator will recall——

Mr. JENNER. In other words, whitewash does not apply to perversion. Is that it?

Mr. McCARTHY. I guess it does not.

Then there was additional lengthy argument as to what they were asked to do in the President's letter.

I may say that this matter has never before been made public; I finally got the documents on this matter, only this morning.

Also, after very lengthy discussion, they decided that the only thing the Board would deal with would be acts of disloyalty. Does the Senator follow me?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words, when their report comes out, it will cover nothing but specific acts of disloyalty. Just what is meant by that, I do not know.

Some of the members of the Board have indicated that they do not feel that membership in a Communist Party organization is disloyalty, or that the holding of a card of membership in the Communist Party is disloyalty. I assume, then, that by "disloyalty" in that case is meant an act of espionage.

Mr. JENNER. Perhaps they mean after a man has been convicted by a jury.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know.

However, I thought the Senate should know that after the Board met, it decided unanimously that it would not investigate any bad security risks or any cases of homosexuals. I thought the Senator would be interested in knowing that.

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I am interested in knowing it. It is just some more of "Whitewash, Inc."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the Senator whether he can think of a person who could be more dangerous to the United States of America than a pervert, who is in the most vulnerable position to be blackmailed into giving information which he would not give for any reason in the world—not even for money—except for the position in which he finds himself.

Mr. JENNER. Personally, I cannot. I think the American people are utterly disgusted.

Why the Board to which the Senator from Wisconsin has just referred would refuse to go into cases of perversion or homosexuals in the Government service, I cannot understand for the life of me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. The President is hiding behind these files, under the theory that to make the files available to the Senate committee would make a gestapo of the FBI. He says publicly that he cannot reveal the evidence because to do so would violate the conditions under which the confidential information has been received.

I ask the Senator whether the rights of individual informants are any more violated if the same information is turned over to a committee of the Senate, rather than to a Presidentially appointed board of citizens—private citizens—who now are given the files by the President of the United States.

Mr. JENNER. No; but the idea is to dress up a big commission to undertake a study of the matter, and let the President appoint them. But he does not trust the elected officials of this great democracy to see the files in private. No one has asked or is asking that the files be made public. The Senator from Maryland, as I have said, objected to star-chamber proceedings in the case of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, and so this proceeding was started with all the fanfare of a movie premiere; but now, when the committee gets down to work, and it begins to pinch, the committee is going to turn it off, as one would turn a water faucet on or off. When they want to take the testimony of a witness in secret, they will take his testimony in secret, and will exclude others from the room. The Senator from Wisconsin cannot ask a question. The minority counsel cannot ask a question. Then, when they want to have another show, they will bring in the klieg lights, the press, and the cameras, and away we go with a public hearing. I think it is time that the Senate rise to its feet to demand that the resolution adopted by it unanimously be followed meticulously.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that yesterday I was called over to the subcommittee, in executive session, and asked by the Senator from Maryland to give the committee any and all information I have—which I have done as I have developed it—that he assured me, if I would give the committee the names of all the witnesses, the witnesses would not be browbeaten, but would be properly treated; and that he assured me I would be allowed to sit in, at the time the witnesses I had developed were called, which is merely the usual senatorial courtesy. I was very happy to find it was to be accorded to me. This morning Mr. Budenz was on the stand, and, as the Senator knows, Mr. Budenz is a witness the Government has used time after time. The Government has vouched for his veracity; and well it may, for he is one of the most truthful men I have ever known. Mr. Budenz was on the stand in executive session this morning. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the chairman notified me, on his own, that I would be excluded from the hearing, despite yesterday's promise; that I then asked the chairman whether he would not put that matter up to the committee, as I thought it was a matter that not he, as chairman, should decide, but that the committee as a whole decide; that he looked around the room and saw that there were two minority members and one other majority member besides himself, which gives an even balance, and then said, "I will not put this up to the committee until Senator McMAHON is here."

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I have gone into that. I am apprised of that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, does the Senator know—and here is something I am sure he does not know, and, had I been allowed to remain during the session, perhaps I might feel under an obligation not to divulge it, but it is information which I think the Senate should have and which the Nation should have now——

Mr. JENNER. I should think the Senator from Maryland would want them to have it, because the Senator from Maryland, 2 years ago, was very much opposed to star-chamber proceedings, and I am sure he would be glad if all this information were given out to the public, hour by hour, day by day, minute by minute.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then here is some information which developed today and which I should like to ask the Senator whether he is aware of. It was after I left the committee—that is, while I was not there. For instance, Mr. Budenz, who, as the Senator knows, is the former editor of the Daily Worker, and at one time a top Communist—and as I have said, his veracity has been vouched for by the Government countless times—proceeded to give the names of individuals who were Communists. Without going into the number of names given, he gave the name of one individual who is now in the State Department, receiving a very high salary in a very important position. I emphasize that he occupies a very important position. Mr. Budenz put the finger on him as a member of the Communist Party.

I especially call that to the Senator's attention, in view of Mr. Truman's statement last night that there is not a single Communist in the Government; and I

suggest that Mr. Truman today call the Senator from Maryland and ask him for a transcript of the hearings. The Senator from Maryland informed me that I could not have a transcript of the hearing, that the hearing was secret. He informed Mr. Lattimore and his lawyer, however, that they could have a transcript of the hearing.

Mr. JENNER. That is, Lattimore could have it, but the Senator from Wisconsin could not have it. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I assume that if Mr. Lattimore could have a transcript, then perhaps the President of the United States could have a transcript.

Mr. JENNER. I should think he might give the President one, particularly after the President said last night—and I quote him:

> Not a single person who has been adjudged to be a Communist or otherwise disloyal remains on the Goverment pay roll today.

So, if Mr. Budenz, in the star-chamber proceedings, has given the name of a Communist who is now in the Government service, certainly the President of the United States should have to eat those words. However, the President may be referring to the fact that it is necessary to convict a man, as Alger Hiss was convicted, before it can actually be shown that he is a Communist, and it may be then found that some other men in high places will not want to turn their backs on such persons.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to make it clear that at that time the Senator from Massachusetts was present, and as I recall—and if I am wrong he can correct me—the Senator from Massachusetts objected very strenuously to having this transcript made available to anyone. He took the position that if this was an executive session, it should be an executive session, and that the secret transcript should not be made available.

Mr. JENNER. But the chairman said that Mr. Lattimore could have a copy of the transcript, did he?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. JENNER. But that the Senator from Wisconsin could not have it?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JENNER. I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts in a moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say also, despite the fact that I was called to the subcommittee yesterday and told that when my witnesses, that is, witnesses whom I myself have found—at tremendous cost—I have four former FBI men working for me, excellent men, and I have had a great deal of difficulty finding the witnesses, for various reasons, which I intend to discuss on the Senate floor one of these days——

Mr. JENNER. The Senator should not have to develop them. That is the committee's job.

Mr. McCARTHY. But, yesterday, the Senator from Maryland said, "When those witnesses are called, you will be permitted to be present." When one of the top witnesses was called, the chairman changed his mind, and, as I have said, without even presenting the question to the committee, he said, "In view of the fact that Senator McMAHON is not here, I will not submit it to the committee. I will take it upon myself to order you, as another Senator, excluded." I trust the Senator from Massachusetts will pardon me.

Mr. JENNER. I appreciate the Senator's contribution. I think this thing must go to the American people. I think the people of the United States should be apprised of what is going on.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want to ask a question.

Mr. JENNER. I do not want to lose the floor. I desire to continue my remarks. They are not very long.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is making a statement which is incorrect.

Mr. JENNER. Which Senator is making a statement which is not correct?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I wish the Senator would correct me, then. I want to be accurate.

Mr. LODGE. Under the agreement which was finally reached in the subcommittee this morning, after a very long discussion, the record that we are making now with Mr. Budenz will not be made available to Mr. Lattimore or his lawyer.

Mr. JENNER. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Did the senior Senator from Maryland want to make the record available to Mr. Lattimore, and yet refused to make it available to the junior Senator from Wisconsin? Is that a fact, or not?

Mr. LODGE. The decision which was taken, and that was finally taken——

Mr. JENNER. I do not want to know about the final decision; I want to know whether the chairman of the subcommittee ever suggested to the subcommittee that Mr. Lattimore should have this record, but that the junior Senator from Wisconsin should not have it?

Mr. LODGE. I do not recall that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JENNER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that a good many statements have been made here, one of which I just now heard, concerning the chairman. The Senator from Maryland never suggested that a copy of the record be given to Mr. Lattimore without its being given to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to have that cleared up.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like the Senator to be more certain of his facts before he goes on——

Mr. JENNER. Wait a minute. The Senator from Indiana did not go into that. The Senator from Wisconsin brought up that subject. I had called the Senator from Maryland before I took the floor. The shoe is on the other foot now. Two years ago, the Senator from Maryland had me here, kicking me around. Today is my day in court.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. JENNER. I will yield for a question only. I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator whether he will call upon the Senator from Maryland to have the official reporter bring in the record of the proceedings this morning, not the record of the proceedings after I was ejected from the room, not the record of any final decision, but the record of the proceedings just prior to the time Mr. Lattimore and his attorney left, at which time the Senator from Maryland said that the record would be made available to Mr. Lattimore and his attorney, and that it would not be available to anyone else. I ask the Senator whether he will not ask the Senator from Maryland to bring in the official reporter and have him read exactly what was said.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I will yield for a question only. I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. In my own time, when I know what has been said, I shall address myself to the subject matter which has been discussed in my absence.

The subcommittee is now investigating; it is meeting upstairs with Mr. Budenz. His testimony is important. He has frequently complimented me on the fairness with which I have treated him. I intend to treat all witnesses fairly, whether they be pro or con, and no one is going to get me off my feet on that particular roadway. I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that yesterday it was unanimously voted in the committee that the procedure adopted this morning should be followed. The Senator from Maryland had no more to do with it than did the other Senators present. I resent this attack, singling me out as responsible for committee action, when the committee has heard both sides and has decided on a course of action.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. For a question only. I do not want any speeches.

Mr. LODGE. I shall not make a speech. Will the Senator permit me to say that the Senator from Maryland spoke the truth when he said that a certain procedure was agreed upon? I am glad to accept the responsibility for having made it clear this morning that, in my opinion, the record which we made today of the testimony of Mr. Budenz should not be made available for distribution. I reached that decision after thinking about it during the night. Evidently the members of the subcommittee agreed with me, because it was unanimously voted to adopt that policy. I do not want the Senator from Maryland to bear the whole responsibility for something as to which I bear a share of

the responsibility, and for which I do not apologize at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. For a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish the Senator from Indiana would ask the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Maryland whether yesterday they had not decided and voted unanimously, and, I will say, ridiculously, that Mr. Lattimore and his attorney could be present all during the taking of Mr. Budenz's testimony. In other words, while there was a witness developing the facts about Communists in Government service, Mr. Lattimore, who has been accused, and, I think rightly so, of being a very active Communist, was to be present with his counsel. That is what the subcommittee voted upon unanimously yesterday, and it also voted unanimously that I could be present, as the Senator from Maryland stated. The procedure was changed when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] pointed out that he was not present yesterday and he thought it was ridiculous to have Mr. Lattimore hearing all the testimony, much of which did not concern him. There was then no committee action. The chairman said, "If Mr. Lattimore must go, then Mr. McCARTHY must go."

I said to the Senator from Maryland, "Are you taking it upon yourself to eject me from the committee room? If so, good; I want to know that; but I should like to ask a favor, namely, that you submit the matter to the four Senators present and have them vote upon the very simple proposition of whether I can, as a Senator, remain and hear such witnesses as I brought, even though Mr. Lattimore has gone."

The Senator from Maryland then discussed the matter with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. The Senator from Rhode Island expressed an opinion thereon, and the Senator from Maryland said, "I shall not submit this matter to a vote until Senator McMAHON is present."

I should like to know whether the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Maryland will agree that that is exactly what happened.

Mr. JENNER. I shall be glad to yield for an answer to that question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for bringing a little bit of truth into the discussion which, up to the time he spoke, had been absent. It is somewhat difficult for Senators who do not serve on committees to come to the floor and tell what goes on in committees. If I were going to comment on what had taken place in a committee, I would rather do it not on hearsay, but on fact.

What happened yesterday was this: The committee wanted to ask Mr. Budenz a question in executive session. The chairman, therefore, called the committee together yesterday and said, "How shall we proceed?" It was unanimously agreed that the Senator from Wisconsin should be present in our executive session, and that Mr. Lattimore and his attorney should be present in executive session, because the charges against Mr. Lattimore were made in the open and, therefore, he would be entitled to reply in the open. Obviously he could not reply unless he knew what the charges were. Therefore, confronted with the proposition of how we could be in executive session and still require Mr. Lattimore to reply in open session without all the testimony, it was agreed to allow both the Senator from Wisconsin and Mr. Lattimore and his attorney to be present, and no one else.

This morning, when we met, some Members who had been absent yesterday wanted to change that procedure. At the time the question was under discussion it was agreed, tentatively, that we would exclude Mr. Lattimore and his attorney, but should give him a summary of the evidence which dealt with him, but we would give him nothing that Mr. Budenz would testify to with which Mr. Lattimore was not intimately concerned.

The purpose of giving Mr. Lattimore a summary was so that he could know what the charges were. It is pretty difficult to answer charges without knowing what the charges are. After we had discussed the matter at some length the summary idea was dropped, or at least we dropped it tentatively to take it up later if the committee wanted to take it up. We have since been proceeding without Mr. Lattimore, without his counsel, or without anyone in the room except the members of the committee, Mr. Budenz, and the counsel for the committee, and without Mr. Lattimore's having the advantage of knowing what Mr. Budenz is saying which might concern him. If the charges had been made in private, that procedure might be open to endorsement, but as the charges against Mr. Lattimore were all made in public, is it fair that the evidence against him be taken in private so that he cannot answer?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, right there——

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will permit me to conclude my statement. The committee, therefore, held in abeyance the final decision as to what it would do with reference to testimony adduced from Mr. Budenz with reference to Mr. Lattimore.

There is no mystery about it. The committee has had some minor disagreements, but it is purely a unanimous committee on the main purpose. No committee always sees as one man. We are a friendly committee, and we are running down every clue. I myself have done an enormous amount of personal investigation. I am still doing that. We have endeavored to investigate to the fullest extent, and if it will just keep out of the newspapers and keep off the Senate floor for a while, we will get to the truth of the matter.

Mr. JENNER. The distinguished Senator says, "If it will just keep out of the newspapers." It started off in the newspapers, with the kleig lights and the fanfare of a great movie premiere.

Going back to the Senator's remarks in July 1947, when the junior Senator from Indiana was conducting a similar committee, he said, "You cannot make it a star-chamber proceeding." After all is said and done, the charges against Owen Lattimore have been made in the open. Why the change of tactics in secret? We do not want star-chamber proceedings. The Senator from Maryland counseled me against it. He said, "The public is entitled to the facts, hour by hour, minute by minute, and day by day."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I promised to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator permit me to say that it is my understanding that the record we are making today is a secret record. I say to my able friend from Indiana that I do not think we can ever ferret out disloyal persons in any Government Department without having executive sessions and confidential procedure.

Mr. JENNER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say one more thing. I have consistently taken the position that it is the custom of the Senate, ever since I have been a Member of it, to allow Members of the Senate to sit in at meetings of the Senate committees. That has always been a courtesy extended to Senators. So, whenever the question of the Senator from Wisconsin being present at a meeting of the subcommittee has come up, I have always voted in favor of having him present. I want to make that point clear. That has been my position consistently, because I think the precedents and the custom of the Senate are clear on the point, and I do not think we should discriminate against any Member of the Senate, including the Senator from Wisconsin, in that respect.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask this question in order to clear up the point I have in mind: I understood the Senator from Maryland to say that my exclusion from the committee room was the result of unanimous action taken yesterday. Apparently I misunderstood the Senator from Massachusetts to say that the Senator from Maryland spoke the truth. As I understand the situation now, it is admitted that I am correct when I say that the Senator from Maryland this morning took it upon himself to refuse to put the question to the committee, and took it upon himself to exclude me, and said he would not put this question up to the committee unless and until the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] was present. I think the RECORD should be clear on that point, because the Senator from Maryland intimated that I was in error. I thought the Senator from Massachusetts had seconded the Senator from Maryland. Apparently I was mistaken.

Mr. JENNER. I do not know what goes on in the committee. I am not a member of the committee. However, I do know that every committee takes a record of its proceedings. If the record was taken accurately—and I presume the record was taken accurately—the record of the proceedings will speak for

itself. I do not think it is possible to resolve the misunderstanding which is apparent here. The Senator from Massachusetts said that he understood no Senator should be excluded, and the Senator from Wisconsin understood that he was not to be excluded, and that the reason he was excluded was that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] was not present, although a quorum of the committee was present, but that the chairman did not put the question. I do not know about that. I do know that if a record was taken, the record will speak for itself. Let us go back to the record.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me inform the Senator from Indiana that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] made the observation that he did not think it was proper to take a vote, in the absence of the Senator from Connecticut, on a matter which had been decided once before by the committee. If the Senator will bear with me, it was not the Senator from Maryland, but the Senator from Iowa who said, "Senator McMAHON is not present. I think he ought to be present, and I sustain the chairman's point of view that we should not have a vote on the question until we can have the full committee present."

The second point is that at the conclusion of our last public hearing, the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said publicly that there were some questions which he wanted to ask Mr. Budenz in executive session. I thought that other members of the committee would like to do so, and the chairman himself wanted to ask some questions. In spite of the fact that all the charges had been made in the open, I tried to accommodate Senators. My opinion, as I have expressed it at least 25 times, is that the Lattimore case ought to be considered entirely in the open, because it was begun in the open; the charges were made in the open and the Senator from Maryland does not like star chamber procedure. He accommodated his fellow members of the committee. Therefore, when the statement is made that I wanted an executive session, where Mr. Lattimore and the Senator from Wisconsin could not be present, let me say that that is not the fact. I have been for complete open hearings on the Lattimore case from beginning to end.

As to the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin about not putting the question, I have said what one eminent Member of the Senate thought about it. I refer to the Senator from Iowa, who thought that the question should not be put until after all members of the committee were present. However, when all the members of the committee were present this morning, I did put the question immediately, as I promised I would do, but there was no change in the policy of the committee.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut later.

Mr. McCARTHY. This will have to be a rather lengthy question, in order to get the Senator's answer. I think it is important that I ask it, in view of the action which I think I shall be forced to take. Does the Senator agree with me, first, that at the time I presented the material in regard to some 81 cases on the floor of the Senate, which consisted of giving the Senate a résumé of material in secret files on which at that time, as I indicated to the Senate, it would be impossible for me independently to produce all the evidence, because it took—I do not recall what figure I used as to the number of employees involved——

Mr. JENNER. I believe the Senator said thousands of Government employees.

Mr. McCARTHY. Thousands of employees over many years produced some very excellent files. Will the Senator agree with me that subsequently the administration took the position that unless the Senator from Wisconsin could prove independently from the files the guilt of the individuals named, the charges should be considered as irresponsible regardless of how right I was as to the facts in the files?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; and it was even implied that the Senator from Wisconsin would have to prove his case before a jury before they would believe it. I do not know what their attitude is.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that I went before the committee and said, "Now, you gentlemen need not worry about getting the entire 81 files to begin with. Let us take a sample case"? I said, "Let us take the case of Owen Lattimore." I said, "If I am correct in that case, if the material in his file is as dangerous as I tell you it is, then from that point onward we should have done with petty politics and proceed to have a sensible investigation." I told them if the files proved that I was wrong, that I was mistaken, or that I was lying in the case of Lattimore, they would be entitled to disbelieve any of the other 80 cases. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. JENNER. I recall it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that subsequently four members of the subcommittee went to the Justice Department and saw what has been referred to interchangeably as a 14-page summary, a 12-page summary, and an 8-page summary? At least it is a very lengthy summary to which reference has been made. I speak of the summary which was made of a summary of the raw file. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Senator from Iowa was not present? Furthermore, is the Senator aware of the fact that Mr. Lattimore appeared and testified before the committee; that he made an excellent statement—almost as good a statement as was made by Alger Hiss—that after he was through, without any semblance of cross-examination by any of the members of the majority party, all three of them merely nodding approval—and the $10,000-a-year counsel and the assistant counsel——

Mr. JENNER. Is that Mr. Morgan?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Morgan sat there and did not even ask for the right to ask a question.

Mr. JENNER. But when Mr. Budenz came before the committee Mr. Morgan was as busy as a little beaver asking questions.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator. Is the Senator aware of the fact that when Mr. Lattimore had finished, the Senator from Maryland leaned forward and very cheerfully said, "I owe it to you and to the Nation to tell you that six of us saw the files"—four Senators and J. Edgar Hoover and Howard McGrath—"and we have unanimously agreed that the files cleared you absolutely of any suspicion of being either an agent of the Communist Party or of having Communist connections"? Is the Senator aware of the fact that J. Howard McGrath later in the afternoon, said, "Mr. TYDINGS had no authority whatsoever to speak for J. Edgar Hoover and he had no authority to speak for me"? He said, further, "Both J. Edgar Hoover and myself"—I believe I am quoting him almost verbatim——

Mr. JENNER. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts said that the Senator from Maryland had no right to speak for him, either.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the Senator the question I have in mind, in order to get the whole picture before the Senate? Mr. McGrath said further, "What is more, we took every precaution to keep from indicating to the committee how we felt, because we wanted them to make their own independent decision." Furthermore, is the Senator aware of the fact that subsequently the Senator from Iowa said that the statement of the Senator from Maryland was completely unwarranted? Is the Senator also aware of the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts, who was in Massachusetts at the time the earlier statement was issued by the Senator from Maryland, subsequently said on his return, "I will speak for myself. I will make up my own mind after all the facts are known"? Furthermore, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who up until that time had agreed with the Senator from Maryland on almost everything, when asked to confirm what the Senator from Maryland had said, replied, "No comment." In that way my friend from Maryland was left away out on the limb.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that in developing these witnesses I have had tremendous difficulty, because some of them feel, either rightly or wrongly, that the committee may be prejudiced and that the committee may not want to get at the facts? They feel they might be abused if they came before the committee, and it is difficult to get the average witness, who thinks a Senator is an important individual, to come here and subject himself to what may be abuse. For that reason, I have had a great deal of difficulty. There is a long step from learning what the facts are and getting a witness to testify.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that the action of the Senator from Maryland this morning when he said, "McCARTHY, you will be asked to submit witnesses, submit them in executive session, but you will have no right to be there," will make it doubly difficult for me to present the witnesses to develop this all-important case?

Being aware of that, will the Senator agree with me that this being the situation, in view of the action on the part of the Senator from Maryland, which I think is completely inexcusable, I undoubtedly shall have no choice but to do something which is extremely distasteful to me, namely, to attempt to develop the facts on the floor of the Senate? That is, I may say, one of the reasons why I tell the Senate today something which I perhaps would feel I could not tell them had I been in the executive session, namely, that Mr. Budenz, a witness for whom the Government has vouched time and time again, and in whose veracity I have absolute confidence, testified to the committee that one of the 9 or 10 individuals whom I have named in public, one who is now working in the State Department holding a very, very important job, is a very valuable member of the Communist Party.

Mr. JENNER. That is shocking.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I say, this is the sort of thing that unfortunately I am going to have to do, if the committee is going to say to me, "McCARTHY, you produce the witnesses. There will be no cross-examination of the witnesses by the chief counsel, Mr. Morgan, unless the witness accuses someone of being a Communist." If the Senator from Maryland continues what he has done in the past, excluding the minority counsel from the room, and does not allow him to cross-examine, will the Senator agree that perhaps I shall be forced to do something which no Senator should be forced to do, namely, try to produce the facts as best I can on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. JENNER. I do agree with that. What the Senator has just said is absolutely shocking, and I hope that if nothing else comes out of this colloquy today, the committee will become a truly investigating committee, decide fairly, impartially, and for the good of the Nation. After all is said and done, this matter is bigger than party politics; it is bigger than defending some relative or some friend or some administration bureaucrat. The Senator from Wisconsin has already been put in a position in which he should not have been put. When the Senate unanimously voted for a thorough investigation of this problem, we should not throw the burden back on the Senator from Wisconsin to prove the case. He should not have to hire employees to dig out facts. That is the job of the committee. That is what the Senate authorized them to do, and it is time they were setting about their job.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator let the Senator from Wisconsin proceed——

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Maryland may make a speech, just so I do not lose the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I merely want an opportunity to reply.

Mr. JENNER. I want the Senator to have that opportunity, but I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. First of all, neither the Senator from Indiana nor the Senator from Wisconsin, nor some of the Senators on the committee, have any idea of the investigative work which the Senator from Maryland has been doing in this matter. Further than that, the staff of the committee has been called together and publicly told to take every bit of the testimony of the Senator from Wisconsin, and everything else, and pursue it to a conclusion, beyond any peradventure of a doubt, insofar as they can get the evidence.

Talking about reckless charges and reckless statements, what would the Senator from Indiana think if he picked up a newspaper, after the Senator from Wisconsin had spoken in Wheeling, W. Va., and read these words:

> While I have not the time to name all the Communists in the State Department, I have here in my hand a list of 205 names who are card-carrying members of the Communist Party, who are now in the State Department, and who are known to Acheson.

And we have had only 110 names given to us in toto.

Mr. JENNER. Did he include in that the homosexuals?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, now, do not beg the question.

Mr. JENNER. I am not begging the question. I did not read the West Virginia speech.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Indiana will have to ask the Senator from Wisconsin; but there it is, in the Wheeling Intelligencer, 205 card-carrying Communists now in the State Department, and known to Acheson. Why is it that 7 weeks after the committee is formed we got 81 names, with charges made here on the Senate floor, 8 or 9 names in addition thereto, and 25 or 20 names with no charge whatever against them? Where are the 205 card-carrying Communists? Was that a reckless statement?

Mr. JENNER. It may have been a reckless statement, but I say that if there is found one Alger Hiss in the Department, the committee will have done a wonderful job for America.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true, and if there are one more or two more or a hundred more, and evidence comes to us, believe me, they will go out on their ears. I do not take second place to any man in America in wanting to get Communists out of the Government, but it is necessary to prove a case reasonably before we can do it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that I have already gone into this matter with the Senator from Maryland in detail, and furnished to him the letter I used in the Wheeling speech, the Salt Lake speech, and the Reno, Nev., speech—the letter from the then Secretary of State Byrnes to Congressman SABATH, in which he said, in effect, "Here is the picture of the inception of the loyalty program"? I believe they called it a "security program" then. He said, "That of the first 3,000 State Department employees who were screened, screened by the President's own Board—a rather good Board, too, as he had some rather good men on that Board, but they were discharged also by Acheson. The letter from Byrnes, which I used at Wheeling, said there were 284 screened out. But 205 remained in the State Department, according to Secretary Byrnes' letter.

I called that letter to the attention of the Senator from Maryland. He knows it is there. So why this attempt at deception I do not know. I pointed out that of the 205 I did not know how many were still in the State Department. I pointed out that that represented only a small screening, but I said, "I do have the names of 57 individuals who are either members of the party or are certainly loyal thereto." Subsequent investigation has increased the list to 81, and since then I have given over 25 more.

Mr. JENNER. I understand Budenz gave the committee more today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. JENNER. But the President of the United States last night said in a speech that not a single person who has been adjudged of being a Communist or otherwise disloyal remains on the pay roll today. I wonder what he is talking about. Do we have to convict them by jury, or is the committee to investigate and find out the facts?

Mr. McCARTHY. In connection with the statement of the Senator from Maryland that he wants proof, is the Senator aware of the fact that I gave the Senator from Maryland personally, and in public, before the other four members of the committee, a complete criminal record of a man working for the State Department, getting somewhere between $10,000 and $12,000 a year? This man has now been assigned to the Central Intelligence Agency. I originally had difficulty finding out who was paying him. The best information I can get now is that he is being paid by the State Department, and therefore the Central Intelligence Agency cannot discharge this man. I was extremely curious to know why the Central Intelligence Agency had not discharged him, but the fact that he is in the State Department explains that. Is the Senator aware of the fact that I gave the complete police record of this man to the Senator from Maryland, this man who was a homosexual? The record shows—it is the police record, Senators should understand—that he spent his time hanging around the men's room in Lafayette Park. This man is still in an extremely sensitive position, being paid by the American people some ten or twelve thousand dollars, and yet, so far as I know, the Senator from Maryland has not done

one single thing to get him off the Government pay roll. I have tried to check in the State Department to see why he is there, and the only answer I got from one of my friends over there was, "Well, perhaps it is because he is a fairly nice fellow—that is, if you like the type."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me to reply?

Mr. JENNER. I certainly will. I should like to conclude, however, and will not yield any more.

Mr. TYDINGS. If I am not drawn into it I will not interrupt the Senator. I want to go over what happened. First, I want the Senator from Indiana to know that I am in favor of open hearings and not closed hearings, as he has supposed. I want that cleared up.

Mr. JENNER. Fine.

Mr. TYDINGS. The second point is that this morning when we had a vote on the question of what the role of the Senator from Wisconsin would be in our committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is now on the floor, very fairly, I thought, said that we ought to wait until the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] was present so that the full committee was there before we voted on it. So I want that cleared up.

The third thing I should like to do is this. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin, if I may, if he did not say in his speech in Salt Lake City:

> While I have not the time to name all the Communists who are in the State Department, I have here in my hand the names of 57 card-carrying Communists now in the State Department and known to Acheson.

And when the Senator gets around to answering that question——

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me to answer the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Wisconsin has asked the Senator from Maryland a question about a homosexual, and the Senator from Maryland has asked the Senator from Wisconsin about how many Communists there are in the State Department. The Senators are using my time in doing so. If Senators can work out between them in the committee the question of Communists and of "homos," that is what the American people want done.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming to that.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is taking my time, and not answering the question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming to the homo part of it. The first thing I think we ought to do is to get some of the Communists that we have been hearing so much about, out of the Government, if they are there.

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what we are doing mostly now. I am giving 7 or 8 hours a day to it now, and I am going to give 12 hours a day, if necessary, to it. I am going to get every Communist I can lay my hands on, and I am going to have all the hearings in open session. But I should like to know who the 57 card-carrying Communists known to Acheson now in the State Department are, so I can get hold of them.

Mr. JENNER. Maybe I can act as an arbiter. If the Senator from Maryland will tell the Senator from Wisconsin who the homos are, and if the Senator from Wisconsin will tell the Senator from Maryland about the 57 card-carrying Communists—maybe such a trade can be made between the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will tell the Senator about the homos. I know there is a great desire to shift from Communists to homos.

Mr. JENNER. I do not know which is the worst. Does the Senator?

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us shift to it. When I was given this information I pursued it constantly. I got our force working on it. I have documents in our office—and I am going to talk—no, I will not do that. I will not disclose what the evidence is. But when we get around to it, it will be full and complete for the committee to act on.

The Senator from Maryland has done a personal job in investigation on this all the way through. He has statements from people who are concerned. He has statements from people who know about it. He has statements from eminent people who are not involved in this. He is ready to lay the whole matter before the committee. But I cannot conduct these hearings if I am going to be called out of the hearings, and hear a lot of arguments about things that are not true, when we have important witnesses on the stand there. Senators know I am in the hearing, and know I cannot be in two places at one and the same time.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator has not answered the question, and I refuse to yield further.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say about the homos——

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me briefly?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to conclude my remarks. Then I will be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate be in order for just a minute? The Senator should not be asked to yield for anything but questions. The situation has been permitted to go a long way from questions, by speeches being made. The Senator from Indiana wishes to conclude his remarks, and will yield only for questions.

Mr. JENNER. I do not want to lose the floor. I want to be courteous. I want all Senators to have their say, because the subject is a very important one.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Indiana had agreed to yield to me for a minute, I wonder if he would not, with the consent of the Senate, make an exception.

Mr. JENNER. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That can be done by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. JENNER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MCMAHON. It will take me only 1 minute. In view of the fact that important business kept me from the meeting of the committee this morning, I think I ought to say to the Senate, so it will be in the RECORD, that I had an appointment with the President of the United States this morning at 11 o'clock. It was a few minutes after 11 when I got to see him, and I stayed with him about a half hour. It was somewhat after 12 o'clock before I got to the committee meeting.

I merely say that so the RECORD may be clear that I was engaged in official duties, and not taking French leave from the work of the committee. But I came there just as quickly as I possible could.

The only vote that was taken, so far as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned, was on whether or not the Senator from Wisconsin should be given permission, either in open or in closed hearings of the committee, to cross-examine the witnesses before the committee. That question had been decided some three times before. It was put again by the Senator from Maryland just as two of the members of the committee were on the way out of the room, and we called them back in. It was observed that that question had been settled before; that the members of the committee would do the questioning, or their counsel, with full liberty to the Senator from Wisconsin to present to the counsel or to the chairman of the committee any question that he might like to have asked. And, of course, the same consideration was given to Lattimore and his counsel in open hearings; that they could have any questions asked they wanted answers to.

I thought I had better state that for the RECORD.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to conclude. It will take me only a few minutes to do so. I was discussing the "Interlocking Directorate of Whitewash, Inc." I believe I had gotten down to the name of Mr. Seth Richardson, who is a law partner of Joe E. Davies, of "Mission to Moscow" fame. We have all read this in the press, but I thought it well to state it.

Mr. Davies, I think it is well known, is the father-in-law of the able senior Senator from Maryland who heads the subcommittee investigating the charges made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

This same Richardson, Mr. President, was chief counsel for the Pearl Harbor investigating committee which produced one of the greatest whitewashes of the entire New Deal and Fair Deal and fairy deal administrations, absolving the administration from all blame for the blunders for the blunders which plunged the United States into World War II.

Associated with Mr. Richardson on the Pearl Harbor investigating staff was Samuel H. Kaufman, who later was to be the judge whose bias for the convicted and traitorous perjurer, Alger Hiss, almost brought about acquittal of Hiss at his first trial which resulted in a hung jury.

Let's look a little deeper, Mr. President, into the "Interlocking Directorate of Whitewash, Inc." Associated with Messrs. Richardson and Kaufman was

Edward C. Morgan. Mr. Morgan now reappears in the picture as chief counsel for the committee headed by Senator TYDINGS which is investigating Senator McCARTHY's charges.

I wish, Mr. President, that I could say the story ends there, but I ask your indulgence for further revelations.

Mr. Lyon L. Tyler, Jr., another member of the Tydings committee staff, was a member of the investigating staff for the Lilienthal investigations.

The Members of this distinguished body will recall, I am sure, the charges which were made against Mr. Lilienthal when the question of his confirmation as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission was before the Senate.

The result of the investigation of Mr. Lilienthal's alleged leftist leanings was another whitewash.

But, Mr. President, Mr. Tyler was sponsored as an investigator for the present Tydings subcommittee by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], also a member of the Tydings subcommittee which allegedly is investigating the charges made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

So, Mr. President, we have involved in the current investigation men who by their past experience are well qualified in the art of swinging the whitewash brush.

In view of these facts, Mr. President, it is understandable that the distinguished Senator from Maryland would have easy access to facts—access which perhaps committee investigators would not have.

Now let us look at what the committee has done publicly, at least, so far. There seems to be some controversy about this matter, but the record will speak for itself.

One of the witnesses appearing in public was Owen Lattimore.

Owen Lattimore was allowed without interruption to speak for 2½ hours before the subcommittee, with all the appendages—press, radio, television, and movies—at hand.

During that session, the general counsel of the subcommittee, Mr. Morgan, to whom I have referred, did not make any effort to cross-examine or to discredit any of the voluntary statements of Lattimore.

That was in quite a contrast to the performance given by the same subcommittee and the same general counsel when Mr. Budenz appeared on the scene. The general counsel, Mr. Morgan, was most vigorous with Budenz, trying to discredit and to minimize the force of his testimony.

This time, you see, Mr. President, it was Budenz who exposed the Communists; and apparently that should not be done.

The able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], in marked contrast to his behavior when Lattimore was the witness, ruthlessly interrogated Budenz. This time Budenz was giving information to Congress about Communists in the Government. It would seem, Mr. President, that perhaps that should not be done.

The Senator from Rhode Island sought incessantly to label Mr. Budenz' evidence as hearsay, in spite of the fact some of the best lawyers in the country have pointed out that the nature of Mr. Budenz' testimony was such that it would be admissible in court. Also no effort was made by the majority members of the subcommittee to elicit information from Budenz or to present his testimony in the best light.

Also, Mr. President, why was Mr. Budenz being heard in secret session today? There has been some discussion of that matter; but, I say again, the record will speak for itself.

Will all these facts be brought to light?

Now, let us look at the testimony of General Thorpe, another witness whom the general counsel of the subcommittee did not cross-examine. Mr. Morgan did not cross-examine General Thorpe. Why? General Thorpe appeared as a witness for the character of Owen Lattimore. Let us look at the facts, Mr. President.

General Thorpe was not qualified as a character witness. In fact, an analysis of his testimony shows that he was testifying that Lattimore has a bad reputation, having the reputation of a Communist, and having been investigated three times by Counter Intelligence. That was the gist of General Thorpe's testimony—that Lattimore had the reputation of being a Communist, that he had a bad reputation, and that he had been investigated three times by the Counter Intelligence. Mr. President, a man who is not soft on communism in some way or at some place is not going to be investigated three times by Counter Intelligence in regard to being a Communist.

In the course of exchanges between Lattimore's counsel, Mr. Abe Fortas, and the chairman of the subcommittee, it became apparent that Mr. Fortas had consulted with the Senator from Maryland on the presentation of General Thorpe, much to the surprise of minority members of the committee.

On reading all the testimony, it became apparent to any reasonable man that General Thorpe was brought in without good reason or good excuse for being there, except only to break the force of the Budenz' testimony.

Does this act look to full disclosure or is it an act looking to whitewash?

That should be apparent to any fair-minded man. I notice that Frank Bielaski is being subpenaed. Why will his testimony be taken in secret, as I understand it will be, without having the Senator from Wisconsin present—and I hope that arrangement will be changed, and that the Senator from Wisconsin will be present—or without allowing the minority counsel to be present? I understand that the subcommittee has now changed that rule, and that now the subcommittee will allow the minority counsel to be present. I hope so. If there is to be a full, fair statement, it cannot be had by letting Owen Lattimore make voluntary statements for 2½ hours, without cross-examination or questioning, but then almost cross-examining the life out of Mr. Budenz.

Do you see what I mean, Mr. President?

Are they afraid that if Mr. Lattimore were cross-examined, he would make significant disclosures?

Are they afraid that Congress will learn what Mr. Bielaski will testify then?

This, too, is in marked contrast to the fact that Bella Dodd, a Communist who never has foresworn communism and who never has expressed a willingness to make full disclosure of her experiences in the Communist Party, is being allowed a public hearing.

This, it seems to me, is being done to confuse the whole issue and further to discredit Mr. Budenz, whose stature, by the way, seems to increase as the days go by.

Mr. President, in all seriousness, I ask, How can this investigation be termed a fair one, in view of the tactics pursued up to date by the three majority members of the subcommittee?

The majority of the subcommittee have refused, until today, to permit the minority counsel to examine witnesses. The majority of the subcommittee sent the minority counsel out of the committee meeting today and, I believe, yesterday; they would not even let him be there. The majority of the subcommittee have refused, until today, to permit subcommittee investigators to examine testimony; and the chairman of the subcommittee has refused to permit minority members of the subcommittee to issue subpenas.

This so-called investigation to date has been going down a one-way street.

The dictatorial and arbitrary attitude of the chairman of the subcommittee and his colleagues has placed handcuffs on the minority subcommittee members and the minority counsel.

The question must be asked, Mr. President, whether these tactics actually strait-jacket what should be a fair and impartial investigation into the presence of communism in high places in our Government.

Do not they lead to the conclusion that even before this inquiry began, it was determined by those in power that it was to be a whitewash, or perhaps just another "red herring"?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have no intention of discussing matters which have occurred in the subcommittee in executive session.

However, I wish to make clear one or two matters, because I fear that a wrong construction may be placed on my attitude.

In reference to certain statements which have been made in the last hour in the course of this debate, some of which I have heard in the last 15 minutes, since I have been here—having come here at that time from the subcommittee meeting; that is to say, I attended the subcommittee meeting until

about 15 minutes ago—and some of which I understand have been made, I wish to say that I fear some of them may lead to some confusion.

First, with regard to the question of the refusal to permit the Senator from Wisconsin to examine witnesses before the subcommittee, let me say that I did make the statement in the subcommittee, today, as the Senator from Maryland said a moment ago, that inasmuch as the committee had last week, by a split vote, decided that the Senator from Wisconsin could not attend the meetings, and inasmuch as the subcommittee previously had decided that neither the Senator from Wisconsin nor persons who might be regarded as being on the other side of the issue would themselves be permitted to ask questions of witnesses before the subcommittee, and inasmuch as certain other important decisions were reached by the subcommittee yesterday, while I was in the State of Iowa, and was not present at the meeting, I thought before the subcommittee considered the question of changing a position which it had taken—and of course whether I was on the side the subcommittee had taken or was on the other side of that question was beside the point—the Senator from Connecticut, who, as explained, a moment ago, was absent, should be present, so that all five members of the subcommittee could be there to make that decision—in other words, with the full subcommittee present.

I took the position originally that the Senator from Wisconsin, as one of the moving forces in the investigation, should have the right to examine witnesses—the same courtesy that has been extended time and again to other Senators who were not members of a particular committee examining into a subject. I have taken that position consistently, and I shall continue to take it both in and out of the committee, in this matter. I want that clearly understood. Any question of the exclusion of the Senator from Wisconsin, or of the refusal to let him ask questions, did not go to the point of decision, but went only to the point of getting a full committee together before the decision was made.

Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. McCARTHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is my recollection not correct that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has accorded this courtesy rather generally to Senators, in matters as to which they were particularly interested or concerned? I am referring particularly to an episode last year when I think the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee adopted that procedure.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I remember those occasions. It is not my purpose at this time to talk at any length, nor to discuss various incidents. But I recall, as we all recall, many cases in which Senators who were not official members of the committee were accorded the privilege, and at length, if you please, to interrogate witnesses in matters in which the particular Senators were interested.

It is on that basis, the basis of precedent, and on the basis that a committee hearing is often the only place where a Member of the Senate, who must eventually vote on a question, has any opportunity of questioning a witness on the subject upon which he is to pass, that I rest my opinion.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. McCARTHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator will recollect, will he not, that in the case of the original hearings on the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the joint committee, or at least the Senate section of it, which was responsible for passing on the appointment, extended that courtesy to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] who attended numerous sessions? In fact, I think at all the sessions he was in attendance and questioned the various witnesses.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; that is correct. That was done by a vote of the committee. Moreover, the Public Works Committee in the same year extended that courtesy to the Senator from Tennessee and to other Senators who were not members of the committee. There have been too many precedents to canvass here this evening. I merely make the statement that it has been done time and again, and I can see no reason for making any exception in this instance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. In order that the RECORD may be kept straight, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] said that, upon the return of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], he submitted to the committee the question of whether the Senator from Wisconsin would be allowed to be present in executive session while witnesses were being questioned. When the Senator from Connecticut returned to the floor he said—and I wish the Senator would listen to this, if he will, since I should like to have the RECORD straight on this—the only question submitted after he reached the committee was the question whether the Senator from Wisconsin should have the right to cross-examine. Those are two completely different questions.

I may say that the right to be present at executive sessions when my witnesses are being examined is very important, in that it has a very direct bearing upon my ability to get witnesses. The other question, the question of my right to cross-examine, has an entirely different importance; that is, it bears upon the importance of allowing me to assist the committee in developing the facts. I shall therefore appreciate very much having the RECORD clear now as to whether the Senator from Maryland submitted the question relating to my right to cross-examine, or merely the question of my right to be present.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to enable me to reply?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will frame it in the nature of a question, so I can yield without losing the floor, I shall be delighted.

Mr. McMAHON. The situation was rather confusing. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] were almost out of the door. I was about to turn. The Senator from Maryland said, "Just a minute." I came back. He said, as I recollect it, "The question has arisen about Senator McCARTHY's right to question witnesses—not as to Senator McCARTHY's right to be present. It was observed that that question has been settled two or three times previously," and we broke up. Of course, what went on between 10:30 and 12:30, I do not know, except it was summarized for me quickly by the chairman.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say the Senator missed a very interesting session.

Mr. McMAHON. Very regrettably. It was summarized for me very quickly. But we went ahead with the examination of Mr. Budenz, which we stopped at about 20 minutes after 1, having started at about a quarter of one. As a matter of fact, the question whether the Senator from Wisconsin should be admitted to executive hearings, to the best of the recollection of the Senator from Connecticut, has never arisen for discussion in the committee, but only the question as to whether the Senator would be permitted to examine directly instead of submitting any questions he might have to the chairman of the committee. As the Senator knows, that is the attitude taken by the committee in open hearings. I hope that clears the matter up. At least, that is my recollection of it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa, in view of the statements of the Senator from Connecticut—for which I thank him very much—whether he will not, in the interest of getting the witnesses, the valuable witnesses, to appear and testify, at the next session bring up the motion and make it very clear to the Senators present—I understand the vote was 3 to 2 this noon—that if they persist, that is, if the committee persists in the decision not to allow me even to be present——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has just said "If the committee persists" in denying the Senator the right to be present. In order to persist, it is necessary to have had a previous course of action.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. To my recollection, the only thing that has ever been de-

cided, as I told the Senator, was not the question of his right to be present. So far as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned, I have never voted on that question. The question was on whether the Senator should be permitted to examine directly, or should submit his questions, that is, any questions that occurred to him, through the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator for the correction. Let me restate it this way: In view of the fact that the Senator from Maryland this forenoon refused to present the question—that is, the question relating to my right to be present, not to cross-examine—until the Senator from Connecticut was present; in view of the fact that the Senator from Maryland apparently feels that he did present that question, while the Senator from Connecticut was present, and so stated on the floor, I now ask the Senator from Iowa, as the senior minority Member, whether he will not, before the next executive session, bring up that matter so as to make sure that every Senator present realizes he is voting, not on the question of whether I shall have the right to cross-examine—though I think it is important—but upon my right to be present?

I may say that if the committee continues to deny me that right—and that right was denied by the chairman this morning, the Senator will understand—then I shall have no choice but to take some action to attempt to develop the facts perhaps on the Senate floor, because I know what difficulty I have experienced in the past in getting witnesses. If I cannot even be present while my witnesses are on the stand, I shall have much more difficulty in getting them.

I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa to push that question, and I certainly would not be averse to knowing how the Senator from Connecticut would regard such a motion at the next session.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For a question.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Wisconsin will know tomorrow, after the Senator from Connecticut votes, how the Senator from Connecticut voted on that question. It will be no secret at all from the Senator from Wisconsin, from the Members of the Senate, or from the people of the United States. I have no desire to keep secret any action of mine in connection with the investigation. I shall try, I say to the Senator from Wisconsin, with some difficulty, it is true, to refrain from making comments on the Senator's case until the evidence is in. I shall not, except under the most severe provocation, be drawn into a discussion of the matter on the floor of the Senate until, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, it is proper to discuss it there. I shall endeavor not to be goaded into making comments on the matter. I think that is the way the investigation should be carried on. We have been given by the Senate a very disagreeable job to do, and it is our obligation, under our oaths, to do it. I want to assure the Senate, which I think needs no such assurance, that that is what I intend to do. I shall endeavor to follow that determination until the end of the investigation, so that I can at least satisfy my conscience. When I sign the report, which I hope will be a unanimous report, it must be in accordance with the conscience of the Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question. I am being diverted, Mr. President, from the real thing I wanted to say when I rose. I am a little off the track, but I shall yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for a brief question, so that I may finish what I have to say.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I correct in stating that the committee excluded the minority's counsel not only from the right to cross-examine any witnesses, but also the right to be present in executive session, but that it allowed the majority counsel to be present and to cross-examine?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am very hesitant to go into matters which have occurred in executive session, when there have been disputes as to certain things which have been satisfactorily resolved. I was not present during the first 15 minutes of the meeting this morning. I will say that before the meeting ended, however, at noon, minority counsel was accorded the right to attend the executive session.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator answer this question? I think it is very important to the Senate and to the country. Am I correct in stating that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], without any committee action, in the absence of the Senator from Iowa, in the absence of the Senator from Connecticut, and in the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts, took it upon himself to eject the minority counsel from the committee room? I think that is something which the Senate and the country should know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I feel very deeply that in areas in which the subcommittee can completely agree, such agreement should be sought and should be reached. It has not been my intention to discuss any disagreements in the committee, but I do not want to leave any mysterious clouds around the subcommittee as to what went on. I am sorry the Senator from Maryland is not present. I do not like to make statements in his absence about committee action, but in view of the fact that the matter has been bandied around, I think it is only fair.

I see the Senator from Maryland now entering the Chamber. I had just stated that I hesitated to make statements in the absence of the Senator from Maryland, and I thought that wherever areas of agreement could be reached, they should be properly reached.

The question of committee counsel, especially minority counsel, has been bandied around a little bit, and I have been asked some pointed questions about it which I at first said I would rather not answer, but I actually think for the general good I perhaps should answer them, so there will be no mystery about it.

If I am wrong, the Senator from Maryland can correct me.

I was not at the meeting during the first few minutes this morning. I met the assistant counsel, Mr. Morris, in the subway as I was coming to the committee meeting. He was getting off the car as I was getting on it. He said, "I have been excluded from the executive meeting." I said, "What is the trouble?" or something of that kind. He said, "The chairman asked me to leave." I said, 'Well, I do not like that." He said, "He asked me to leave." I said, "Well, I will see what the trouble is." So I went to the meeting. The chairman explained it in this way: He said he felt that it was not a place for the entire staff, but that only the chief counsel should be present, and he had asked the assistant counsel to leave. I felt differently about it. Mr. Lattimore was there, as was his counsel. Mr. Budenz was there. The Senator from Wisconsin was there. I personally felt, and, I think, sincerely, that the assistant counsel should have been permitted to remain. The matter was discussed at some considerable length, and the committee then officially decided that Mr. Morris could attend the committee meetings.

That is generally the story.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a Senator who is not a member of the committee and who is trying to keep an open mind until all the facts are developed, I should like to ask this question: Was Mr. Morris, the assistant counsel, duly selected by the committee at the request of the minority members? In other words, is he officially holding the position of associate counsel?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He is assistant counsel and was recommended by the minority members of the committee. He is officially assistant counsel, with Mr. Morgan as the chief counsel of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand from the Senator's statement on the floor of the Senate, the duly selected associate counsel of the committee was excluded from the session while, at the same time, the counsel for Mr. Lattimore was attending the committee meeting. Is that what I am to understand?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is a little complicated. At the time Mr. Morris was excluded, or was asked to leave the executive meeting, it was shortly after 10:30 this morning. Counsel for Mr. Lattimore, and Mr. Lattimore, were permitted to remain for a substantial period of time until it was determined that they should themselves leave the meeting.

I say that I disagreed with the action of the committee in excluding Mr. Morris, and there was pertinent discussion of the matter and it was canvassed all around. The net result was that action by the committee was taken and Mr. Morris was then authorized to attend the meetings of the subcommittee. That is the story on that question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Leaving this matter aside for a moment, I may be misinformed, because I was not present at the time, but I understand that one of the Senators this afternoon said that Mr. Budenz was viciously cross-examined.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not believe that referred to the meeting this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. To what meeting did it refer?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I came in late during the statements. I came in shortly after the Senator from Maryland arrived. It is my understanding that those references were to the open hearings.

Mr. TYDINGS. If they were, the Senator from Maryland asked Mr. Budenz only four questions. Furthermore, I should like to say that Mr. Budenz had to come back for his hat and coat just a few moments ago, while I was talking to members of the press, and Mr. Budenz, of his own volition, said to the members of the press present, "I had very courteous treatment from this committee." So I should like to get a little truth into some of the misrepresentations which have been flowing out of the committee. If the Senator will bear with me half a minute more——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, is the Senator indicating in the slightest degree that I have misrepresented anything in my statement?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I had no reference to any statement made by the Senator from Iowa. It was the Senator who was speaking, or some other Senator. I was not here. However, I should like to say that what I have recounted just now happened upstairs a few moments ago. Mr. Budenz, in the presence of representatives of the three press associations, said that he has been courteously treated by the committee. Certainly he has been courteously treated. He has been given every consideration. He has been asked to present any testimony he can, give any information he can, name any names he can, give us anything at all which will help us with the investigation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am perfectly willing to testify that Mr. Budenz, in his appearance before the subcommittee this afternoon and before lunch, was, in his treatment by the committee, accorded complete courtesy. Mr. Budenz and no one else can complain.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was present in the Senate. I do not think either of the two other Senators was present. The criticism, as I understood, of the Senator who was speaking, who was the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], was not directed to the committee. It was of the cross examination, as he termed it, by committee counsel. I was not present in the committee, so I shall not undertake to characterize it. Opinions might differ. I want the Senator from Maryland to know, however, that I believe the Senator from Indiana did not criticize the conduct of the committee or of the cross examination by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. If the Senator from Iowa will yield further, I will say that I was present when Mr. Morgan cross-examined Mr. Budenz. He asked him perhaps 20 or 25 questions. His demeanor was calm. Mr. Budenz was given ample time to answer all questions, as the record will show.

In addition to what I have just said, in response to something a reporter asked Mr. Budenz upstairs in my presence, Mr. Budenz did not complain about his cross examination, referring himself directly to that phase of the matter.

So, Mr. President, if Mr. Budenz is satisfied, it seems to me all other people who are dissatisfied are going out of their way to hamper the investigation. I may say, Mr. President, if we are to have discussions on the floor of the Senate about everything that takes place in the committee, while we are trying to run this thing down, we may very well lose some people whom we could catch. One cannot be in two places at the same time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I rose to make a 2-minute statement. I have not yet got around to making my short statement. I intended originally to yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have two questions. Am I correct in understanding that the minority counsel, while now having been granted the right to attend executive sessions, is still denied the right to examine any witnesses, or to ask any questions of any witnesses?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In answer, Mr. President, I will say that I do not care to consider Mr. Morgan, Mr. Morris, or anyone else as minority or majority counsel. I would rather consider them to be counsel who are attempting to do a vigorous job, cleaving right down the line in an investigative procedure.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me rephrase the question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The fact is that Mr. Morgan, as chief counsel, was recommended and selected by the majority members, and the minority members said, "All right. If you want him, that's all right with us." Mr. Morris was selected by the entire committee on the recommendation of the minority members of the committee. Mr. Morris was not accorded the right to ask questions at the last open hearing. No attempt was made today to have Mr. Morris ask any questions. At this hearing the issue did not come up. So I do not know what the attitude of the committee will be. I personally think, as I thought the other day, that any member of counsel should be permitted to ask questions in his turn if they occur to him in the examination.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I correct in understanding that the committee took action to deny Mr. Morris the right to ask any questions of any witnesses, and that as of now that action still stands?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The action of the committee is this: The matter did not come up in executive session. The only time it came up, I believe, was during the last open hearing when, after Mr. Morgan, chief counsel, had completed questioning Mr. Budenz, I suggested in open hearing that perhaps Mr. Morris, assistant counsel, might have some questions to ask Mr. Budenz. I do not recall at the moment—I think the record will show—whether it was put to a vote at that time. I do recall the chairman's stating that Mr. Morris would not be accorded the right to ask questions. That is the last time the specific question came up. Undoubtedly it will be raised again, but it did not come up today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that the Senator from Maryland is now on the floor——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Please do not mix me up again with the Senator from Maryland, because, if that should happen, the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Wisconsin will keep me on my feet for another half hour. I wish to sit down. I have only a few things to say.

Mr. McCARTHY. What I am about to ask the Senator is important enough for him to remain on his feet even if it means keeping the Senator on his feet for another full hour. In view of the fact that the Senator from Maryland is on the floor, in view of the fact that he had previously informed the Senate that upon the return of the Senator from Connecticut he had submitted to the committee the question of whether or not I would be allowed to be present during executive sessions when my witnesses were testifying, in view of the fact that the Senator from Maryland said that a vote had been had upon the question and that the committee had denied me the right, and in view of the fact that the Senator from Connecticut subsequently came on the floor and said it was not true, I now ask the Senator from Iowa if he does not think that before the next executive session it would be well to bring that matter before the subcommittee and get final action on it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have already clearly stated my position. I have expressed myself repeatedly as believing that the Senator from Wisconsin should have the right of cross-examination, especially with reference to witnesses which he has produced in specific cases. I do not want to make an issue of this matter, but as to whether or not the Senator from Wisconsin could remain in executive session this morning, that question was thrashed about quite a little bit, and just as we were breaking up to go to lunch, as the Senator from Connecticut said a moment ago, there were several of us out in the hall and the chairman asked us to come back. There was no formal vote taken on the question. As I recall, the chairman merely said, "Is there any change of policy on the question of Senator McCARTHY's staying in the executive meeting? Is there any change in"——

Mr. TYDINGS. Cross-examining.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot recall whether the Senator said cross-examining, but I would not dispute his word at all. Everyone was in a hurry and no one said anything. My position is well known, and the position of every

member is well known. It was not put to a formal vote. The chairman said, "I guess there is no change in sentiment." So we all went to lunch. There was no formal vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter dated July 26, 1946, addressed to "Dear Adolph," signed by James F. Byrnes, a letter about which I had told the Senator from Maryland previously. I explained to him that this letter was used in all the talks I made. I explained to him it contained a very clear indication of 205 individuals who were left in the State Department, even though the President's own board said they were bad security risks. I asked the Senator from Maryland to find out what their names were. I telegraphed the President and suggested he find out their names. The Senator from Maryland has not done that, for some reason, and I think it is not too mysterious.

The Senator from Maryland persists in toying with the figures 205 and 57. If he will take this letter and read it, and take the copy of my speech in the RECORD, he will know I do not have the names of the 205. I sent the President a telegram during the Lincoln Day tour asking him to get those names. I told him in the telegram I had the names of the 57. So that if the Senator mentions this again, there can be no doubt in his mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 26, 1946.

DEAR ADOLPH: I have yours of May 24 expressing your concern with respect to certain allegations made on the floor of the House to the effect that "hundreds if not thousands of employees have been eliminated from the State Department by the screening committee because of communistic leanings or activities or membership." Such statements are incorrect and do a grave injustice not only to the employees of the Department but to Government employees as a whole, the great majority of whom are loyal American citizens. I therefore welcome this opportunity to answer your specific questions in the order in which they are presented.

1. Pursuant to Executive order, approximately 4,000 employees have been transferred to the Department of State from various war agencies such as the OSS, FEA, OWI, OIAA, etc.; of those 4,000 employees, the case histories of approximately 3,000 have been subjected to a preliminary examination, as a result of which a recommendation against permanent employment has been made in 284 cases by the screening committee to which you refer in your letter.

2. Of the 284 individuals who have been the subject of adverse recommendation as indicated in (1), above, the services of 79 have been terminated.

3. Of the 79 actually separated from the service, 26 were aliens and therefore under "political disability" with respect to employment in the peacetime operations of the Department. I assume that factor alone could be considered the principal basis for their separation.

4. With respect to the 79 thus separated, the following break-down is submitted:

Aliens	26
Failure to comply with foreign-service regulations, such as citizenship for 15 years prior to foreign assignment and other reasons disqualifying the individual for service abroad	13
Close connections or involvement with foreign governments or their organs, past records, indicating a high degree of security risk, etc	40
Total	79

The Department is equally concerned with disclosing subversive activities or associations of all kinds, whether Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, of any employee, present or prospective.

5. Because of the security considerations involved in the mission of the screening committee, I do not feel at liberty to disclose publicly the identity of its membership. This committee, incidentally, has no power or authority to eliminate anyone from employment in the State Department. It simply makes recommendations which the Assistant Secretary for Administration may accept or reject in whole or in part in the light of all the relevant evidence.

I hope what I have said above corrects any misapprehensions which you may have entertained as to the Department's personnel policy. Like any other administrative mechanism, it is not perfect. However, I am entirely clear that it has been fair to the Department's employees in its operation. It is my firm intention to see that it remains fair.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to complete what I have to say, which will take me only a couple of minutes.

In the first place, I desire to make clear that there are many opinions pro or con on many matters in connection with this case which I should not express. I am still on the jury, as a member of the subcommittee. I do not think I should make up my mind and form any positive conclusions about many of these matters, or take positive positions on matters of evidence at this time, and I shall not do that. At the proper time and under the proper circumstances I shall not hesitate to express my opinions, whatever they may be at the moment, about the entire matter. But at the present moment I do not want to be understood as discussing the merits or the demerits of the case.

I do wish to clarify one matter, Mr. President, which has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of evidence, but I think it has much to do with the mechanics of the investigation.

I think we should stop confusing the American people. The American people are profoundly disturbed by the Alger Hiss case, for instance. They demand a fair and a thorough inquiry into whether Communists remain on the Government pay roll. Five United States Senators, making the present inquiry as the direct representatives of the people, have been denied access to the Government's loyalty files. Now an attempt is being made, in my opinion, to blame FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for that refusal.

The Senator from Maryland has told the Senate that President Truman was "ready, willing, and anxious to try to give us the files." The Senator from Maryland added that the President later said, "What am I to do? I do not want to go back on the advice of Mr. Hoover, who is unalterably opposed to furnishing the files."

The President, in a speech before the Federal Bar Association last night, similarly quoted Mr. Hoover and two others as "recommending to me in the strongest possible terms that I refuse to make the files available." He had to concede, however, that "The decision was mine, and I made it."

Mr. President, let us look at the record. What did Mr. Hoover really say? Here are his exact words before the subcommittee on March 27. He said:

> The question of opening the files of the FBI involves a grave matter of principle. In taking the position that the files of the FBI should remain inviolate, I would not, of course, presume to discuss files other than those of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In other words, Mr. Hoover referred only to his own files. He had nothing to do with suppression of other Government loyalty files. So let us keep the record straight so that the public can judge.

I call to the attention of Senators the fact that running all through the refusal to give five Members of the Senate, constituting a special subcommittee, the right to examine the loyalty files of certain people against whom suspicion has been cast and charges have been made, there is an excuse which is not justified. If Senators will read the statements of the President and of others, they will find that they say that the disclosures of these files would be bad for the investigative system. So far as I know, no human being in the Senate has ever asked that any of these files be disclosed. There is not anyone, on the committee or off the committee, who wants to make public disclosure of the files or any part of them, so far as I know. The only thing that has been asked is that five Members of the Senate of the United States, sitting as an officially appointed subcommittee under a resolution of the Senate, be permitted to examine, in secret, if you please, the investigative and the loyalty files of certain persons who are charged, or against whom strong suspicion has been cast by certain charges, of either disloyalty or of being bad security risks. Yet the publicity goes out on every refusal that somebody wants to disclose these files, to open them up to the public, but no one at any time, in the Senate or on any of its committees, that I know of, has ever suggested that they be made public or open to the public.

Mr. President, we showed the other day in an open hearing that between 700 and 800 people in the various loyalty boards throughout the United States and on the personnel staffs have full access to all the files which are necessary for them to have in their particular areas. So that there is nothing sacred about these files so far as 700 or 800 people are concerned. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President. I do not say that

these 700 or 800 people have access to all the loyalty files of the Government, but there is a group of at least seven or eight hundred people, including clerks and stenographers, who have access to the loyalty and to the investigative files in connection with the personnel in their areas and in their departments.

Yet five Members of the Senate of the United States, appointed especially to look into this matter, are refused and denied permission to examine secretly the files involving the persons who, the Senator from Wisconsin states under his responsibility as a Senator, will lay the foundation and produce the evidence to support the very serious charges which he makes.

I do not know all the evidence in these cases, but I do say that it is a very specious argument, when all manner of persons in the Government service are permitted access to loyalty and to investigative files in their particular departments and areas, to say that five Senators shall be denied the right to examine secretly those files in connection with charges the seriousness of which is well known to everybody in the United States.

Again I want to emphasize that no one has asked that these files be made public; no one has even suggested that they be made public. The Director of the FBI, Mr. Hoover, has never said anything about turning over the files of any department except his own. I do not believe the President of the United States is justified in attempting to blame his refusal to turn over the loyalty files in other departments upon Mr. Hoover, the Director of the FBI. I feel that is a matter which has been greatly confused, and I believe the record should be kept straight about it. I think a disservice is being done to public confidence when these five Senators are refused the right, secretly and in confidence, to examine the files.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] possesses as many public secrets as any man in the Senate, if not more. He is in an utterly trusted position. Few men in or out of Government are trusted with higher secrets than the Senator from Maryland. I trust him as a Member of the Senate of the United States and as a loyal public official. I have confidence that the Senator from Maryland can look into these files without anyone feeling that he will break into the newspapers and publish what is in them.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has access to loyalty files and to secrets that are much higher than personnel secrets in any loyalty or any other kind of files. The Senator from Connecticut has never gone out wearing his information on his sleeve and telling what is in the secret files of the Government, or what any secret programs may be which come to his attention, as plenty of them do.

I have served in the same capacity as the Senator from Connecticut, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I know how much work there has to be done by one in that position, how much work goes through one's hands.

I do not think anyone will charge the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] with being flannel-mouthed about public secrets.

As to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], there could be no more loyal or able citizen or Member of this body. He is one whose patriotic experience entitles him to the highest degree of trust.

Those four gentlemen, leaving out myself, can be utterly trusted with secrets that rise so much higher in importance to the people of the United States and the destiny of the United States. Yet we cannot look secretly at the loyalty files to determine whether or not the Senator from Wisconsin is right when he says many things will be found in these files that he cannot produce. I say, Mr. President, it simply is not logical. It does not hold water. I think it is a disservice to the Senate of the United States and to the public, and a disservice to the people individually who are involved. I am in thorough disagreement with the policy.

If anyone proposed to make these files public, I would defend their secrecy as much as would anyone else. But I have seen many investigative files. The Senator from Connecticut has seen many investigative files. The Senator from Maryland has seen many secret documents and secret files.

I think a mistake is being made, Mr. President. I think it is a mistake not only in the public interest but in the interest of the Government and in the interest of the individuals who are involved. It is entirely possible that all these matters could be resolved one way or the other in the public interest and in fairness to individuals in a very short time if the ill-advised policy which prevents our seeing the files in secrecy were changed and a little common sense and practicality were introduced into the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I could prolong the debate and the controversy by referring to things which have happened here this afternoon, but they are so small in proportion to the situation which confronts the country and the world that I am not going to touch on them at the moment. But for a very short period—because the subcommittee will have another meeting at 7 o'clock, and I hope I may get a chance to eat before then—I want to leave a few thoughts for the Members of the Senate who are present. The other day a ruthless and callous intrigue called a country shot down an unarmed American plane and took the lives of 10 great American uniformed men. In times gone by I suppose an incident of that kind would have more quickly evoked action on the part of our people. But I suppose there had to be the larger calculation for the moment of whether or not more harm than good might come from precipitant action. While our note of protest over this outrage was strong, it was rebuffed, in effect, by the country to which it was directed.

I have learned from the press that late in May plans are afoot by the same organization of intrigue to start and provoke a great riot in the streets of Berlin, and, if it takes place, no one can predict its final conclusion.

Across the waters, in the Pacific, things have happened which give us all pause.

Communism, inspired from without quite often but active from within, is fomenting disturbances in many countries all over the world.

I have made these few general statements to lay a foundation for an entreaty to this great body of men, the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, we have been taking our time here for a long while today debating things that, first, never occurred, as to whether an assistant counsel, of which we have four, should be in a committee room, or be out of it; as to whether this took place or that took place as a matter of procedure; as to whether or not the committee voted this way on some phase of its investigation.

Mr. President, I never saw five men—I should say four, to eliminate myself, though I take the liberty of including myself—more devoted and more anxious to sift every bit of evidence in this case, than the committee of which I happen to be chairman, and which is presently engaged in that undertaking. We are trying to do it as everyone else would do it, because any other committee would have the same problem we have. We are proceeding in good fellowship. Our disagreements are relatively minor—not more than happen in any other committee—and we are proceeding toward an objective, to wit: If there are Communists in our Government, let us get them out.

I am a little forlorn, after many hard days' work on this matter. Believe me, I have worked hard on it. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], who just left the Chamber, has no idea of the amount of time and investigation I have put on this subject. As I said a few days ago, I was up for 2 nights, one until half past one and another until a quarter of two, working on clues and procedures that might turn up something, if it was there.

Faced with this great threat from without, I ask my colleagues in the future to eliminate the petty bickering as to whether an assistant counsel sits in the subcommittee room or does not sit there. The subcommittee has four assistant counsels. Should we ask all of them to be present in the subcommittee room? They are appointed to investigate, not to sit in the hearing room to be entertained with the evidence. I have no objection to having the assistant counsel who has been referred to sit there, but we have work to do. There is no use in having the Senate instruct us to investigate these matters, and then have counsel sit in the subcommittee room and listen to evidence, rather than go out and run down the clues.

I say that, not in criticism, but by way of explanation, only to drive home this point.

If the Senate, which instructed the subcommittee to do this work, wishes it to be done, and to be done, so far as I am concerned, with all the capacity at my command, when I am giving practically all of my time, almost every day,

to pursuing the objective the Senate has directed me to pursue, certainly I cannot work on that job and do it properly if I am to be attacked on the basis of false premises, while I am working in the subcommittee room, interrogating the very witness who is thought to be so important in connection with this entire investigation. If that is going to be done, it will tend, more than anything else, to kill the hearing.

There are some matters which must be followed up with reasonable dispatch in order to reach the end that is desired. We cannot let 2 or 3 days or a week go by, after we have started on a certain phase of the matter. Evidence must be analyzed quickly, and the available force must be assigned to it, before the evidence for which we are searching is gone.

So I ask my colleagues to stop being Democrats or Republicans, if any of us are such, as regards this matter. In the face of this urgent threat, let us close ranks. I ask all Senators to give the subcommittee their support.

I am only the chairman of the subcommittee. In the subcommittee, anything that is proposed is always fairly discussed and, I believe, is rather fairly decided. Sometimes in the subcommittee I have voted with the Republican members against the Democratic members. The other day I voted in favor of having open hearings, doing so when otherwise the vote would have been equally divided, with one party member being on each side of that question.

I try to be fair and impartial.

However, if this continued haranguing and heckling continues on the floor of the Senate, it will only prevent us from finding a Communist who might be in the State Department or anywhere else in the Government.

I ask Senators to give us a free hand and to give us their cooperation. If they do, Senators can bet their bottom dollar that we will find everything that it is possible to find.

However, we cannot make real progress if we continually are advised, "The subcommittee is being criticized on the floor of the Senate, and you had better stop the hearing and go down to the floor of the Senate."

Mr. President, I do not know what next month will bring forth. Present grave problems are perplexing all the peoples of the world. We may be swept off our feet into a great adventure which cannot be finished until many months of toil, sacrifice, blood, and treasure have been spent on the battlefield of war.

I ask my colleagues to stop the continual heckling of the subcommittee about homosexuals and other matters of that kind; and let us get down, first, to the matter of investigating any possible disloyalty. Obviously, a man may have the terrible disease which has been referred to, and yet may not be a party to foreign espionage or may not be a party to deliberately being disloyal to his Government. Of course, it is a risk to have in the Government service persons who are afflicted with that disease. Nevertheless, our first job is to get out of the Government service the Communists and the Red spies. If we are sincere, we should not obscure that job by bringing in incidental matters, for we can take care of them when we have more time to do so.

Mr. President, we are pursuing the Communist phase of this matter. We have only so many hours each day which we can devote to it.

I appeal to my colleagues, to the press, and to the American people to let us alone, and let us go through with the investigation.

I no sooner came out of the subcommittee room this afternoon than I was met by several representatives of the press, who said to me, "I understand that 'the finger' has been put on a member of the subcommittee" for this, that, or the other—designating a certain incident.

I do not care to comment on whether it is true or false; I shall not do so. I do not want anyone to draw any inferences about it from what I am about to say.

However, from talking to representatives of the press, I know that sometimes there appear in the newspapers, on the following day, intimations regarding things which we in the subcommittee have barely begun to examine. Sometimes such stories appear in the press before we even can begin to look into the matter. Before we can examine into it, a big story appears in the newspapers, blocking us from obtaining or making a sound, intense, and decisive investigation.

So I ask my colleagues to have a little patience with us. We cannot please everyone.

I have served on committees ever since I have been in Congress, and frequently I have been displeased with the action or with the procedure.

However, we must move ahead. The big and the important matter is not whether it is Tuesday or Wednesday or whether there were six persons in the subcommittee room or four persons in the subcomimttee room, or whether this person or that person was in it or was out of it. The important matter and the important question is whether the subcommittee is trying to run down all the evidence. I say it is, just as quickly as it can work to it.

Mr. President, I am a little fed up with such stabbing in the back, when I am devoting almost every hour of my time and every effort I can make and every ounce of sincerity in my being and every desire of my heart to drive these infernal Reds out of our Government, if they are in it.

If this bickering in the press does not stop, Senators will not find out what they set out to find. If Senators are really sincere, there will be more silence in the newspapers, and more of a basis for determinations of fact in the deliberations of the subcommittee.

When we think of the developments which may occur by next month and all of their frightful possibilities, I say to the Senate, Mr. President, that we have worked together here through some stormy days. Let us close ranks. Let us end this smallness, this littleness. Let us dig in and get the truth, and let the truth speak for itself. Let us end this political bickering.

Mr. President, I say now what I have said before: let the chips fall where they may, but let us have the truth for our authority, rather than the authority for the truth. There is too much authority on the outside for the truth, and not enough truth for the authority, in the deliberations of the subcommittee and in connection with its ramifications and its impact on the country.

In every case we have summoned, as soon as the committee could find time to do so, any witness whose testimony before the subcommittee has been requested by anyone. There has not been a single instance of failure on the part of the subcommittee to issue orders to its staff to run down to the end of the road any piece of evidence which has been submitted by anyone. The door of the subcommittee room is wide open. If anyone knows 205 card-carrying Communists now in the State Department and known to Secretary Acheson, as has been alleged, let that person come forward with the names and facts, and we shall throw such persons out within the week. If anyone knows 57 card-carrying Communists now in the State Department and known to Secretary Acheson, as has been alleged, let that person come forward and make those charges, and we shall go into them; and if they are sustained, we shall throw out such persons.

If anyone knows 81 unsafe persons, 81 security risks, the door to the subcommittee room is open, and let that person come forward with his evidence.

But let us end this wild charging in the newspapers about something that is said to be in the files, files which not one Member of this body could possibly have seen. How could any Member of this body know what is in the files if no Member of this body has ever seen them? Yet the country is told what is in the files. Baloney! How would anyone know what is in the files? Has any Member of this body, has any witness who has come before us, ever said, "I have seen the files?" No. How can one tell what is in them if he has not seen them? And, if there are photostats, and one is sincere about it, why in the name of common sense do not the photostats come into G–23, the committee room, where we can go over them?

I have some evidence which is very pertinent to many things I have said here this afternoon, evidence which not another member of the committee knows, up to now. It will be a rather interesting bit of evidence, which I think will be supported amply; so those who are making wild charges had better watch their step.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the light of what has been said within the past few minutes, I have decided to take the floor for the first time in defense of the position I have taken relative to the investigation of subversives, not only respecting card-carrying Communists, but, in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, about those who are making statements

about homosexuals. I desire to make my position plain.

I have always admired the Senator from Maryland. I think he is a man of great ability. He has much seniority. He sits on the most important committees. He can be trusted with secrets. But he has charged this afternoon that a great many reckless statements have been made. He has brought politics into this matter with all the subtlety at his command, and that is not the kind of investigation the American people seek, in the endeavor to eliminate subversive elements from the Government.

The Senator from Maryland does not have a corner on the truth; yet I say he is a very truthful man. But others of us also are truthful. If the Senator rises on the floor and makes a wild statement that someone has only given a part of the light of truth, it is not becoming the dignity nor the respect nor the character of this great man from Maryland; not at all. So, if there have been any wild, reckless statements, believe me, Mr. President, the Senator has contributed to them this afternoon.

I did not hear any wild statements made here, or statements that were absolutely untruthful, by the Senator from Indiana or by the Senator from Wisconsin, a man who has been smeared, a man who is fighting to the last ditch for his own character. The Senator from Maryland has no corner on truth. He has no corner on patriotism. Ah, he waves the flag whenever there is a crisis. He has no corner, Mr. President, if you please, on committee investigations, either. Other committees of the Senate are doing good work, and we are not having all the difficulty with them that we are having with this one. If the Senator from Maryland and his committee want to do a job, as I have said before on the Senate floor, they must forget the Senator from Wisconsin, they must forget whether it is 57 names, 200 names, or whatever the number may be. They must carry out the provisions of the resolution and give the people of the United States of America full and complete investigation of persons in the Government who have been or who are disloyal to the United States of America. That is the mandate of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. And that is what we are doing.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I have the floor. I am not going to yield until I get through with these remarks. I have waited a long time. I have been patient. I was rather patient yesterday. I wanted to keep my mind open. But many things have been said here, Mr. President, which will have to be answered. "Reckless statements—reckless statements" we have heard. Ah, it is ringing in my ears.

Who made the most reckless statement that has ever been made, I think, by an American citizen? I have always respected the Office of the President of the United States. It is the greatest office in the world. And I have always had a wholesome respect for any man holding that office. That is true today, and no one can deny it. I think highly of the personality of the First Lady of the land, who comes from the Middle West, and I have never said one unkindly thing about the man who occupies the President's Office. I differ with him, certainly. I do not agree with his socialistic program, and I intend to fight it to the last ditch; but I intend to be honorable about it.

Let me remind Senators that the President charged that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] were agents of the Kremlin. That was the most reckless statement ever made by a President of the United States. Talk about reckless statements—how would any Senator like to have that said about himself?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would not like it, if the Senator will allow me to answer his question.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the most reckless thing I ever heard. Let the President prove it. I will put my patriotism, my honor, my character, my religion against that of other Senators, I care not who they are, who are bragging about the truth, bragging about their patriotism, and all that goes with it. I have cited one reckless statement. What is the next one?

Yesterday the President of the United States said there was neither a Communist nor a subversive in Government that he knew about, and that, if there were, he would discharge him. Very well. There is a Committee on Appropriations which has worked on this matter for about 3 years, I may say to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have got it all.

Mr. WHERRY. I know something about it. The junior Senator from Nebraska was the man who handed 27 names to Secretary Byrnes, who started out to do a good job. But those in charge of the matter in the Department have been stymied. I know, because the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has been doing a pretty good job of investigating, since the Senator has had this pantomine show in the Senate caucus room.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest that if the Senator will wait until it is over, he will find it was not a pantomine show.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to wait. It is a pantomime show, and the Senator cannot deny it. All that has been done is to try MCCARTHY, who has not even been given a chance to examine his witnesses. Witnesses have been allowed to come before the committee, and the flag has been wrapped around them while they tell how their ancestors came over on the *Mayflower*. They are then rubber-stamped and cleared, and that is all there is to it. It is not an investigation. It does not bear even the earmarks of an investigation.

I want to say now that the President was wrong, yesterday. There is a committee which has been working just as diligently as has this particular subcommittee, but not with fanfare, conducting its hearings in executive sessions, the best way they could. I am now privileged to say—and I am going to say it—that within the last 30 minutes I have been informed by the head of a Government agency that the man against whom the Senator from Wisconsin made a charge on the Senate floor this afternoon has finally resigned, and his resignation is going to be accepted within the next day or two. It is my belief that had the Senator from Wisconsin accomplished nothing more than that one thing, it would be worth the effort, the chagrin, the embarrassment, the charges, and all the smear to which he has been subjected. I am proud to be associated with a man who is doing his level best to clear this country of Communists and moral perverts in the Government.

That is not all. Mr. President, there will be other resignations. The one to whom I have referred is not the only man in high place in the Government who the President said was not there. Alger Hiss would never have been thrown out of Government had it been necessary to depend upon this administration. Alger Hiss would not be out of Government if we had had to depend upon Mr. Acheson to clean his own house.

So, Mr. President, I shall continue as an American citizen and as the junior Senator from Nebraska to do everything I can to clean out moral perverts and subversives from Government; and I am willing to be associated with any man who has the courage of his convictions in an endeavor to accomplish that objective.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gregory F. Noonan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel N. McEniry to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. HOLLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be captains, USAF

Anderson, John Richard, [redacted]
Aumer, Thurman Donald, [redacted]
Bailey, James Monroe, Jr., [redacted]
Barnett, James Willis, [redacted]
Bashor, Owen Hale, [redacted]
Beall, Max Thompson, [redacted]
Beauregard, Frank Raymond, [redacted]
Benevent, Foch Joseph, [redacted]
×Bertholf, Donald Forrest, [redacted]
Biedul, Chester Anthony, [redacted]
Blair, Will Norville, [redacted]
×Boulineau, Donald H., [redacted]
Boyles, Dixon Raymond, Jr., [redacted]
Bradley, Clyde William, Jr., [redacted]
Brake, William Jasper, [redacted]
Brose, Herbert Eric, [redacted]
×Brown, Charles Wesely, [redacted]
×Brown, Jerry Woodward, [redacted]
×Buck, Robert Earl, [redacted]
×Buersmeyer, Wilfred Charles, [redacted]
Bussells, Chatham Preston, [redacted]
Carpenter, James Robert, [redacted]
Carr, William Francis, [redacted]
Christensen, Louis Norgall, [redacted]
Colson, Carl Clayton, [redacted]
Condon, Robert William, [redacted]
Conklin, William David, [redacted]
Cox, Henry McNutt, Jr., [redacted]
Craig, Charles White, [redacted]
Culp, Charles Henry, [redacted]
Cunningham, Donal Blair, [redacted]
Dargue, Donald Salmon, [redacted]
Dauteuil, Donat Francois, [redacted]
Davis, John McArthur, [redacted]
Dent, Richard Emil, Jr., [redacted]
Deutsch, David Ernest, [redacted]
Dowell, Ralph Harrison, Jr., [redacted]
Drake, Donald Varner, [redacted]
Dugi, August Henry, [redacted]
Dunn, William Edward, [redacted]
Duval, Don Woods, [redacted]
Eastman, Phillips, Jr., [redacted]
Edwards, Paul Hartley, [redacted]
Estes, Melvin Anderson, [redacted]
Falk, David Mortimer, [redacted]
Ferguson, James Harvey, [redacted]
Fielder, Benton, Jr., [redacted]
Fisher, Alfred Kremer, [redacted]
Fitzwater, Charles Edward, [redacted]
Fletcher, Henry Merritt, Jr., [redacted]
Freeman, Elmer Clayton, [redacted]
Frisbie, Norman Horace, [redacted]
×Fry, Wallace Jiles, Jr., [redacted]
×Gaither, John Martin, [redacted]
Galas, David Emanuel, [redacted]
Garlitz, William Bryan, Jr., [redacted]
Gates, Floyd Alonzo, [redacted]
Gay, Greenwood George, [redacted]
Gifford, William Edward, [redacted]
Gorelangton, Eaton Arthur, [redacted]
Green, James Allen, [redacted]
Gullion, Allen Wyant, Jr., [redacted]
Hall, Zane Grey, [redacted]
Hambrick, George Oakie, [redacted]
Hamilton, Richard Edelen, Jr., [redacted]
×Heath, Robert Handley, [redacted]
Heintzelman, Harry Ludwick 3d, [redacted]
Hendon, Allen Hubert, [redacted]
Hill, Kenneth Douglas, [redacted]
Hinson, Joseph Arlon Wayne, [redacted]
Hojnacki, Joseph, [redacted]
Holland, Clark Othell, [redacted]
Humphrey, Lee, Jr., [redacted]
Jackson, Glen Eugene, [redacted]
Jackson, Thomas Terrell, [redacted]
Jacobs, Dan Jean, [redacted]
Jacobs, Eugene Warren, [redacted]
Jennings, William Morris, [redacted]
×Jones, Joseph Wester, Jr., [redacted]
Kammerlohr, Morton Albert, [redacted]
Kangas, John Francis, [redacted]
Keeling, David Woodrow, [redacted]
Knowles, Harold Ferguson, [redacted]
Kuertz, Robert Richard, [redacted]
Lackens, Edwin Barger, [redacted]
Laedtke, Elmer Carl, [redacted]
×Lawrence, Ralph Brown, [redacted]
Lawson, Delbert Romang, [redacted]
Leffel, Harold Samuel, [redacted]
Lemak, Frank, [redacted]
Lewis, Howard Jackson, [redacted]
Lewis, Melford Walter, [redacted]
Lindberg, Carl Albert, [redacted]
×MacCauley, Hugh Bournonville, [redacted]
MacDougall, Joseph Elbert, [redacted]
MacKenzie, Robert Francis, [redacted]
MacMullin, Robert John, [redacted]
McAdam, Richard Curry, [redacted]
McClure, Robert Dugald, [redacted]
McGregor, Jack Kenneth, [redacted]
McIntyre, Brandt, [redacted]
McIntyre, Donald Edwin, [redacted]
McKinney, Walter Allen, [redacted]
McLaren, John Paterson, [redacted]
McMullen, Frank McCoy, [redacted]
Mann, William Latimer, [redacted]
Mansfield, Cliff DeForrest, [redacted]
Marsh, Franklin Charles, [redacted]
Martin, William Wintle, [redacted]
Mayo, William Everett, [redacted]
Meline, Ralph Edwin, [redacted]
Melvin, Robert Tolar, Jr., [redacted]
Mish, Charles Clarke, [redacted]
Moffitt, Joseph Clark, [redacted]
Moore, Robert Bruce, [redacted]
Morfit, Charles Beverly, [redacted]
Morgan, Thomas Elder, Jr., [redacted]
Munro, David Duncan 3d, [redacted]
Myrick, Jesse Lee, [redacted]
Naylor, William Edward, Jr., [redacted]
Neubarth, Paul Richard, [redacted]
Nicholson, Hubert Lamar, [redacted]
× Novak, Jack Conrad, [redacted]
Nutting, Elmer Wharton, [redacted]
× O'Brien, Lawrence George, [redacted]
Ogle, Sherman Levi, [redacted]
Oldfield, Charles Sheldon, [redacted]
Oliver, Thomas Kilbury, [redacted]
Opper, LeRoy Charles, [redacted]
Osborn, Carlos Ralph, [redacted]
O'Toole, Jerome Thomas, [redacted]
Pachl, Ruel John, [redacted]
Pamperien, Roka Doyal, [redacted]
Parker, Richard Henry, [redacted]
Patterson, Edward Horace, [redacted]
Patterson, John Vance, Jr., [redacted]
Peck, Warren Kay, [redacted]
Peebles, Farley Edward, [redacted]
Pennstrom, John Howard, Jr., [redacted]
×Phillips, Maurice Francis, [redacted]
Philpott, Jammie Mendal, [redacted]
Porter, George Erskin, [redacted]
Porter, Jack Victor, [redacted]
Prahler, Robert Henry, [redacted]
Price, Ernest Collier, [redacted]
Pugh, James Rival, Jr., [redacted]
×Renth, Edward Julius, Jr., [redacted]
Riser, William Wallace, Jr., [redacted]
× Rhodes, Bernard Clair, [redacted]
Ritter, Henry William, [redacted]
Roberts, Benjamin Arthur, [redacted]
Robson, Brian Peart, [redacted]
Ruby, Vincent Miller, [redacted]
Rudat, Fred Otto, [redacted]
Russell, Thomas Pitkin 2d, [redacted]
Sarrett, Dale Thomas, [redacted]
Savuto, Joseph Anthony, [redacted]
Scarborough, Hayward Earl, [redacted]
Schramm, Ned, Jr., [redacted]
Scott, Charles Elliott, Jr., [redacted]
Scott, Ralph Meloy, [redacted]
Shaddix, Winans Cornell, [redacted]
Sherrill, Estes Bailey, [redacted]
Shively, George Knox, [redacted]
Smith, Hubert, Jr., [redacted]
Smith, James Bascom, [redacted]
Smith, Larry Wendell, [redacted]
Smith, Luther Jackson, Jr., [redacted]
Snyder, Richard Concklin, [redacted]
Sparrow, Harry Ira, [redacted]
Stanfield, Donald Neil, [redacted]
×Steele, Gordon Hall, Jr., [redacted]
Stein, Winfield Marshall, [redacted]
×Stephens, William Loyd, [redacted]
Stevens, Blythe Elmo, [redacted]
Stewart, Dana Woodfin, Jr., [redacted]
Struble, Raymond Harlan, [redacted]
Swaim, Howard Lee, [redacted]
Taylor, Franklin Woody, [redacted]
Taylor, Vernon Johnson, [redacted]
Thompson, Walter Reedy, [redacted]
Tisdale, James William, Jr., [redacted]
Trail, Reo Clinton, [redacted]
Vance, Lewis Ingram, [redacted]
Waage, Amos Ernest, [redacted]
×Walls, Le E., [redacted]
Walsh, Edward Joseph, Jr., [redacted]
Walsh, Roy Michael, [redacted]
×Ward, John Davis, [redacted]
Watson, William Glenn, [redacted]
Weil, Frank Phillip, [redacted]
Wheeler, Richard Vincent, [redacted]
White, James Henry, [redacted]
White, William Ted, [redacted]
Williamson, Thomas Wilbur, [redacted]
Wilson, Mathew Robert, [redacted]
Wilson, Stephen Cheney, [redacted]
Wilson, Theodore Allen, [redacted]
Winkel, John Leslie, [redacted]
Yockey, Donald Jay, [redacted]
Yoder, Richard Allen, [redacted]
Young, Earle Harrison, [redacted]
Ziegelgruber, Lee Roy, [redacted]
Zukerberg, Harry, [redacted]
Zuppann, Lloyd, Jr., [redacted]
Zweifel, Harold John, [redacted]

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol × are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants, USAF

Anderson, Leland George, [redacted]
Arnold, Howard Brown, Jr., [redacted]
Babbitt, Robert Paul, [redacted]
Beckelman, Robert Allan, [redacted]
Bellovin, Milton, [redacted]
Bentley, Ralph Locker, [redacted]
Biggs, Buford Bernell, [redacted]
Blanchard, Felix Anthony, Jr., [redacted]
Breedlove, James Montgomery, [redacted]
Brennan, Herbert Owen, [redacted]
Carpenter, William Spencer, Jr., [redacted]
Chamberlain, Milton Jay, [redacted]
Christensen, Leland Dale, [redacted]
×Ciamprone, William Carl, [redacted]
Coates, Arthur Emmett, Jr., [redacted]
Cofield, Egbert Haildane, Jr., [redacted]
Colburn, James Edward, [redacted]
Coolbaugh, James Smith, [redacted]
Cottongim, John Edward, [redacted]
Coyne, John Martin, Jr., [redacted]
Crowe, Forest Willard, [redacted]
×Dell, George Martin, [redacted]
Dicker, Gordon Kendrick, [redacted]
Dunham, David Michael, [redacted]

Eberle, Harold Jacob, [redacted]
Ehrlich, Robert Maxwell, [redacted]
Ellis, Angelo James, Jr., [redacted]
Enos, James Walter, [redacted]
Farrier, Kenneth Howe, Jr., [redacted]
Fernandez, Gonzalo, [redacted]
×Frost, John, [redacted]
Fuchs, Cecil Edward, [redacted]
Gainey, Homer Perry, Jr., [redacted]
Garrabrants, Edson Leonard, [redacted]
Gausche, Dean Stevens, [redacted]
Goldsborough, George Joseph, Jr., [redacted]
Gould, Alan Henry, [redacted]
Gray, William Wright, [redacted]
Gregorie, Edmund Mortimer, Jr., [redacted]
Griffith, Robert Blake, [redacted]
Griffith, Wallace Hull, [redacted]
Guice, John Thompson, [redacted]
Haas, Robert Maurice, [redacted]
Halligan, Robert Fletcher, [redacted]
Harrington, George Fred, [redacted]
Heironimus, James David, [redacted]
Helling, Donald Clement, [redacted]
Herrick, Park Brown, Jr., [redacted]
Hightower, Edwin Connery, Jr., [redacted]
Hill, Charles William, [redacted]
Hoffman, Robert Earl, [redacted]
Hudgins, Andrew Leon, [redacted]
Hudson, Frederick Gray 3d, [redacted]
Jacoby, Frederick Walter, [redacted]
Jarvis, David, [redacted]
Johnson, Walter Edward, [redacted]
Johnston, Joe Dean, [redacted]
Kaericher, Kermit Clifton, [redacted]
Kain, Harry Richard, [redacted]
Keck, Robert Edward, [redacted]
Kennedy, John Leroy, Jr., [redacted]
Kettner, Robert Eugene, [redacted]
Kinevan, Marcos Emmet, [redacted]
Kirby, John Jay, Jr., [redacted]
Knauss, Frederick John, [redacted]
Kremser, Frank Joseph, Jr., [redacted]
Kuykendall, William Thomas, [redacted]
×Lajeunesse, Conrad Norman, [redacted]
Lamattina, Frank Joseph, [redacted]
Landis, Kenneth Moore, [redacted]
Larsen, Hewitt Chemnitz, [redacted]
Learmonth, Allen Franklin, [redacted]
Leech, Charles Kennicott, [redacted]
Lerohl, John Kenneth, [redacted]
Lilley, J. Robert, [redacted]
×Litt, Donald David, [redacted]
Lowry, John Joseph, [redacted]
Lundy, Einar Glenn, [redacted]
McClure, Richard Alexis, [redacted]
McKim, James Crawford, [redacted]
Mallory, John Stevenson, Jr., [redacted]
Mock, John Edwin, [redacted]
Monahan, Thomas Vincent, [redacted]
Moore, Robert Burns, [redacted]
Munroe, Willard Noble, Jr., [redacted]
Murphy, John James, [redacted]
Murrin, Ralph Calvin, [redacted]
Newcomb, David, [redacted]
Novomesky, John, Jr., [redacted]
O'Connell, Patrick Joseph, [redacted]
Odell, David Anicker, [redacted]
Palmer, Jack Merrill, [redacted]
Pearce, Jack Vernon, [redacted]
Perry, Francis Raymond, [redacted]
Piepenbrink, John Franklin, [redacted]
Pierce, Jack Francis, [redacted]
Pinkerton, Herbert Carson, Jr., [redacted]
Reckmeyer, William John, [redacted]
Reynolds, Clyde Calvin, [redacted]
Robb, Donald Oren, [redacted]
Robertson, Edwin Wales, 2d, [redacted]
Ryan, James Edward, [redacted]
×Sapowith, Alan David, [redacted]
Sattem, Robert, [redacted]
Schlegel, Lee Geoffrey, [redacted]
Scoville, Winston Ousley, [redacted]
×Scowcroft, Brent, [redacted]
Shields, Charles Edward, [redacted]
Simon, King D., [redacted]
Staszak, Leonard Anthony, [redacted]
×Stevens, Leslie Robert, [redacted]
Stewart, Charles Carrington, [redacted]
Tucker, Young Arnold, [redacted]
Vockel, Stewart Meldred, Jr., [redacted]
Weaver, Douglas Crowther, Jr., [redacted]
White, Robert Wilson, [redacted]
×Wojciehoski, Gerald Joseph, [redacted]
Woldenberg, William James, [redacted]
Wright, Frederick Malcolm, [redacted]
Young, John Mackay, [redacted]
Zimmer, Clifford George, Jr., [redacted]

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. The officers nominated for promotion have been found professionally and physically qualified for promotion as required by law.

To be captains, Air Force nurse

Bernard, Erin Langford, [redacted]
Lott, Inez T., [redacted]
Nigro, Elaine M., [redacted]
Roche, Florence T., [redacted]

NOTE.—The officers nominated for promotion to captain and first lieutenant will complete the required 7- and 3-years' service, respectively, for promotion purposes during the month of June. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Dillon S. Myer to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1950:

Charles R. Arundell, of Oregon.
John W. Kern, of Indiana.
Clarence V. Opper, of New York.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Gregory F. Noonan to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Daniel N. McEniry to be United States marshal for the southern district of Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, may this moment of fellowship with Thee in prayer be for us a cleansing of heart and a surrender of our wills to a mind infinitely wiser than our own.

Grant that in times of darkness and discouragement, when we are challenged by problems whose solution is far beyond human wisdom, Thy truth may be our light and Thy presence our joy and strength.

May we daily walk without fear in the way of Thy wise and holy commandments. Inspire us to labor in faith and in faithfulness for the fulfillment of all high ideals, pure motives, and heroic endeavors after peace and righteousness.

In the name of the Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ELIZABETH AND LAWRENCE WONG

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1861) for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elizabeth Wong and Lawrence Wong, stepchildren of Kwai Lun Wong, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor children of Kwai Lun Wong, a citizen of the United States, and shall be deemed to be nonquota immigrants within the purview of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WALTER K. MIYAMOTO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1862) for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto—formerly Miyoko Takahashi—with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "immediately issued an immigration visa upon application hereafter filed" and insert "granted the status of a nonquota immigrant."

Page 2, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. KATSUKO NAKAHARA HUNTLEY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4857) for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after "be" down to and including "filed" in line 3 and insert "granted the status of a nonquota immigrant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. TSUNEKO SHIMOKAWA GUENTHER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5580) for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out lines 8 to 11, inclusive, and insert "be, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, deemed to be a nonquota immigrant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO IOWA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States will celebrate his birthday on May 8, and the people of Iowa are very happy over the fact that most of that day will be spent in Iowa, and from every farm, industrial plant, coal mine, business house, home, factory, in villages and cities the people will be singing Happy Birthday to You. The President will speak in Iowa three times on May 8, at Burlington, at Ottumwa, where a very large meeting will be held and probably the principal Iowa address will be given, and at Creston. The A. F. of L. bakers of Ottumwa are already planning to bake the most elaborate birthday cake that has even been seen in Iowa, and it will be presented to the President by a little girl from the orphans' home at Ottumwa. Citizens of Iowa hope that the beautiful, gracious, and charming first lady, Mrs. Truman, will accompany the President on his western tour and that their fine and talented daughter may also be in the party in Iowa. The President, being a middle westerner himself, knows of the genuine hospitality of middle western people and all good citizens of Iowa join in the greetings and best wishes for the President on his birthday May 8.

BROADCASTING OF BASEBALL GAMES

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a situation that, on Sunday, was a new one for many baseball fans of the major leagues living in Hartford, Conn. and vicinity. Local radio stations, I understand, were prevented from relaying the broadcasts of the National or American League baseball games because the Springfield, Mass., professional baseball team, a minor league, was playing one of its contests. A game being played, simultaneously, in the majors at Boston could not be heard because the original broadcasting station was not of sufficient power to allow direct tuning and good listening.

Apparently, a new rule in organized baseball dealing with the broadcasting of games within an area of 50 miles from another club's home base is prohibited without the ball club owner's consent. Other areas throughout this Nation where baseball is our national pastime may be similarly affected and I would appreciate notice to that effect. Meantime, I shall confer with the Federal Communications Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to ascertain what can be done in the matter in order that all these fans and especially war veterans confined to the Newington and Rocky Hill Hospitals may be able to listen to the games of their choice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from the Washington Post.

Mr. FUGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous material.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials and newspaper items.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a newspaper article.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the first of a series of articles to appear in the Washington Times-Herald by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to ask permission to insert each of these articles as they appear.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial, with reference to the hat situation in Danbury and Norwalk, Conn.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 140]

Barrett, Pa.	Havenner	Powell
Battle	Hébert	Quinn
Bennett, Fla.	Heffernan	Rains
Bolling	Heller	Ramsay
Boykin	Herlong	Reed, Ill.
Carlyle	Jenison	Rich
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins	Riehlman
Cavalcante	Jones, N. C.	Roosevelt
Celler	Kee	Sabath
Chatham	Kennedy	Secrest
Chudoff	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	Kunkel	Smathers
Davenport	LeFevre	Smith, Kans.
Davies, N. Y.	Lodge	Smith, Ohio
Dolliver	Lucas	Steed
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Wagner
Fisher	Michener	Wheeler
Gilmer	Miles	Whitaker
Granger	Miller, Nebr.	White, Calif.
Grant	Morgan	Wilson, Ind.
Hagen	Nixon	Wood
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton	
Harden	Pace	
Hardy	Pfeifer Joseph L.	
Hart	Plumley	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it had completed chapter IV of the bill. General debate will now be had on chapter V. Under the order of the House of April 21 general debate on this chapter is limited to 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this chapter deals with annual appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, for the fiscal year 1951.

The subcommittee in charge is composed of my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

We started hearings on the estimates of appropriations on January 9, 1950, and we sat for about a month and a half nearly every day, listening to the testimony of the various officials who appeared in support of the requests, asking questions, seeking information as to the basis of and need for the funds sought.

I do not believe that in my 10 years in Congress I have ever worked with a more conscientious or a more industrious group of Members than we have on this particular Subcommittee on Appropriations. Their attendance at the committee meetings was 100 percent. They were there at all times. We met at 10 o'clock in the morning and sat until 12:30; we resumed again at 2 o'clock and sat until 4:30 or 5:30 every day. After we had completed the hearings, we sat down and marked up the chapter now before us today. With two or three exceptions, I think we have done a good job. It was a job that took a great deal of time and a job that was not an easy one to do. I know it would have been more difficult to come to you today with the recommendations in this chapter if we had not had the services of what I personally believe is one of the best clerks in the House at the present time, that is our clerk, Mr. Paul Wilson, assigned to this subcommittee.

I think this is one of the most difficult chapters of the appropriation bill to handle. It has more public appeal, in my opinion, than any other part of the appropriation bill. I know it is one of the most difficult chapters in which to show economy, for out of total budget estimates of $2,462,072,500, $1,794,000,000, or about 72 percent, appropriation is involved in just two items. One item, $1,200,000,000 for public-assistance grants to States, we have no control over at all. The basic statute controls this appropriation.

The other large amount over which we have no control is $594,000,000, representing the net appropriation of specific railroad retirement tax collections to the retirement trust fund.

Then there are certain other grants to States in the Federal Security Agency over which we have practically no control over at all. About 93 percent of the estimates for the Federal Security Agency are for grants and benefit payments of one kind or other. So you can see by analyzing the make-up and nature of the items and then comparing the amounts with the total recommended reductions, as set out in the report, that this subcommittee was very economy-minded in reporting this chapter of the bill to the House. In fact, I must say that it was so economy-minded that the committee cut more out of the bill than I as chairman liked. I know that amendments will be offered this afternoon, or tomorrow, to increase certain items under the Public Health Service. I shall support these amendments, because in good conscience I cannot go along with the cuts that the majority of the committee made in the mark-up of the bill. When these amendments are offered to the Public Health Service it is my intention as chairman of the subcommittee to support them.

The first part of the chapter is the Labor Department. The totals for this Department show a rather large increase over a year ago, but the responsibility for that increase rests on the action of the Congress in transferring the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the Labor Department. This accounts for about $184,000,000 of this chapter.

The budget estimates for the Department of Labor for 1951 total $220,014,700. The committee has seen fit to cut this total by $11,441,600. The largest item of appropriation in this particular section of the bill deals with grants to States for the Bureau of Employment Security. The bill includes $178,500,000 for these grants, which is a reduction of $9,500,000 below the estimate of $188,000,000, but it is an increase of $10,500,000 above the present 1950 appropriations. This, however, is something over which we have practically no control. As you know, a Federal tax of three-tenths of 1 percent is levied on the pay rolls of covered employers to finance the administration of the employment security system in the States. This tax more than covers the appropriation recommended; in fact, since the program has been in existence the Federal Government had made a profit of over $800,000,000 on this tax of three-tenths of 1 percent on all pay rolls covered. I believe the figures this year will be that if we appropriate the $178,500,000 recommended, there will still be a profit of perhaps $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 or so accruing to the Federal Treasury from the tax, depending of course on the amount collected. The reason for the appropriation increase allowed is because of the steady trend of unemployment throughout the country. The covered and eligible unemployed have to be paid, and it takes personnel to pay them. In States like Rhode Island and some other New England States especially that have been hit by unemployment in the past year we are finding difficulty now in keeping our funds solvent because of the tremendous unemployment that we have in that region.

In a case like that where we have a lot of unemployment, it means at times that the Employment Service is neglected because they have to take some of the personnel from the Employment Service and use them in the unemployment insurance part of that program.

Excluding the employment security grants the bill carries only about $30,000,000 for all the other items of the Department. Several of the new proposed programs that were initially approved and presented by the budget the committee has refused to go along with. These other items are about $6,639,000 above the comparable amount appropriated in 1950. Approximately 70 percent of that increase is attributable to the 1949 amendments to the Federal wage-and-hour law and approximately 7 percent is due to increased cost arising from the last pay-raise law. The other large item of increase is $874,000 or about 13 percent of the total, for the comprehensive revision of the cost-of-living index undertaken with a special appropriation that this committee granted a year ago. I may say in that regard that the price index revision is only a 3-year program. We gave the initial appropriation a year ago. They are asking for their second year's appropriation this year to continue that revision program and we have assurances from the Secretary of Labor that the program will come to an end in the fiscal year 1952.

For the Office of Secretary we are allowing $1,382,000, or a reduction of $38,000. There were two new jobs requested for the Office of International Labor Affairs and these two new positions were refused. It seems to be the consensus of opinion of this committee that we are getting too much into international affairs. Practically all through this appropriation bill we have cut down the budget estimates for any increase that deals with international affairs.

The Office of Solicitor shows quite a large increase, but the vast majority of that increase is due to the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act passed by this Congress last year. We have cut those increases in the neighborhood of 25 percent. We have cut the over-all increase for the Wage and Hour Division that administers the Fair Labor Standards Act by that over-all amount of about 25 percent because this is the first year of operation under the new 75-cent minimum-wage law. They asked for an increase of practically 100 percent. The committee has seen fit to cut the increase by 25 percent.

The Bureau of Labor Standards remains practically the same. We cut $35,000 from their request.

There is no change in the request for the Bureau of Apprenticeship. Two million seven hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars has been allowed.

The Bureau of Employment Security, as I said before, asked for an increase

of $20,000,000 over the present appropriation for grants. The committee did not see fit to go along with all of this, as I have indicated.

As you will no doubt recall, a year ago this committee instituted something new in the Bureau of Employment Security. We set up in the bill a so-called contingency fund to deal with unforeseen salary raises in the various States and unavoidable and unforeseeable employment work loads. We set up a 5-percent contingency fund. The Bureau of the Budget this year allowed a 10-percent contingency fund, but the committees thought that, in view of the fact that they were not able to work for a full fiscal year under this new program, that we would cut the contingency fund to a basis of 5 percent of the total appropriation, so we have cut that part of the appropriation by $8,500,000.

As to the Bureau of Labor Statistics we show a reduction of $270,000 below the budget request of $5,990,700. We have cut out practically every new program or expansion that was requested for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In the Women's Bureau we have allowed an increase of seven positions, not to reestablish the various field offices that were cut out 3 years ago, but we have in effect allowed these positions here in Washington so that the various sections of the country could be serviced by these five or six representatives going out into the various regional districts in the country for the next fiscal year. That is one of the smallest units in the Department of Labor, and it only employs 65 people at the present time.

One of the largest increases, which I referred to before, is in the Wage and Hour Division and arises from the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. They asked for practically a 100-percent increase in this appropriation, and the committee has cut this increase by about 25 percent.

As to the Federal Security Agency, we have cut practically every item in it, and this is one of the agencies of Government that we do not have a unanimous report on from our own subcommittee, especially in the Public Health Service part of the bill. I think many Members who were here 4 or 5 years ago know the program that was initiated by my colleague, the ranking Republican member of this committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], because of his interest in the health of the people of our Nation, in initiating construction activities, in initiating construction of the research center out here in Bethesda which has cost the Government in the neighborhood of fifty-five to sixty million dollars, but will be completed in July of 1952, and when completed will be, without a doubt, the best and the most modern research clinical facility in the world. It will be something that every person in our country can well be proud of, and this is a program that, even though the gentleman from Wisconsin and I have differed on various other matters in this bill, we have seen eye to eye for the past 4 years on all of these appropriations dealing with the Public Health Service. This committee, under the direction of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], also 3 years ago instituted a new program for appropriating money for research facilities and building laboratories and clinical facilities in aiding medical colleges and research institutes throughout the country in trying to make progress in the fight against the two leading causes of death—heart disease and cancer. Also, the program of trying to make some progress against mental illnesses which afflict millions of our people. We have seen those programs progress for the past 3 years, and in my humble opinion this is one of the best programs that this Government has ever initiated because it affects nearly every man and woman in every walk of life in our country in one degree or another.

I do not believe there is a more popular program existing in our Government than the program which was initiated by this committee 3 or 4 years ago in these three fields—mental health, heart, and cancer. The results are tremendous. To my mind, the results are something I cannot adequately produce to you today because I do not have the words available to express my opinion on the good these programs have accomplished for all the people, not only of this country but all the world, and the tremendous strides that have been made since this committee instituted this program only three or four short years ago.

It is in view of this that an amendment will be offered to restore to the hospital construction program the $75,000,000 cut out by the committee. I will support that amendment, and I hope the House will agree to it.

I know there will be three or four other amendments to continue the program on which this committee without fail during the past 3 or 4 years has been practically unanimous in its decisions to carry on the great work, especially in the construction of facilities that deal with mental health, heart, and cancer. When those amendments are offered, I will support them. I sincerely hope the House will see fit to carry on the work this committee has been initially responsible for. I will guarantee you that it will be money not wasted, because I am sure that if you talk to any medical scientist or any medical doctor they will all agree that we cannot do anything about these killers of humanity such as heart, cancer, and mental health, unless we find the cause. In order to find the cause, we have to take the lead and appropriate money for research. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to take that lead, because in taking that lead they are interesting various private groups all over the country to get together and raise money on a private basis and to work as a team.

I honestly do not know of any other program of government that has such responsible agreement and wholehearted cooperation between the medical associations, private agencies, and the Federal Government. There are no areas of disagreement in the carrying out of this program. I sincerely hope the House will not allow this program to be stopped in its tracks as it is at the present time. I hope the House will in its wisdom and judgment see to it that we are allowed to carry on this program, and we will in that way be doing something for humanity not only in this country but in all the world.

When we were considering the mark-up of this bill there were some items in the Federal Security Agency that I personally went along with cutting, because I hoped we might work out some agreement within the committee to carry on these health programs. There are such items as the vocational-rehabilitation program. I think that is one of the best programs of the Government. They paint a beautiful picture, and I think they are right, where they maintain that, for every dollar we appropriate for vocational rehabilitation, the Federal Treasury receives back $10 because of the rehabilitation of these people into useful work. They asked for an increase of $2,500,000, which we did not allow. I went along with that cut because I know that in the over-all program, with the necessity for economy, we have to cut down here and cut down there, and we try to come out with a balanced program and at the same time show some economy. As I say, that increase for vocational rehabilitation was not allowed. If I had thought for 1 minute that we could not have reached an agreement on these other items I for one would not have gone along with that cut and with cuts all along the line. There was a budget request of $7,300,000 to establish a research institute in Alaska which is going to be our forty-ninth State. I think that is a responsibility of the Federal Government. We should do something to help that area of the country. But I went along with that cut in the name of economy in an attempt to work out an over-all agreement on the bill.

But all in all I believe we bring to you this afternoon a real showing of economy in the cuts we have made in this particular chapter. As I said in the beginning, the cuts in my estimation were too deep where they affected certain public-health programs. To repeat, I will support the amendments which are going to be offered to increase the appropriations for the public-health programs, not to increase them very much but to keep going a program which was begun and which has shown results, a program which every person who is interested in the health of the people of our Nation should support.

My feelings regarding these public-health items are supported by testimony of some of the best medical scientists and doctors not only of America but in the world who testified for the need of carrying on the research on heart, mental health, and cancer. Upon their testimony and upon their background knowledge of the subject I am willing to rest my case and go along with the increases.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I express my very deep appreciation to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island who has so courageously stated his position with respect to the great program of public health. The gentleman who is now speaking has devoted much of his active legislative career trying to advance and foster public-health programs in America. The great legislative committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has heretofore brought to the Congress the authorization legislation for all of these programs. It has been my privilege in the past to vigorously support the recommendations of that committee which would be puerile and idle if they were not implemented by sufficient funds in appropriation bills to make them effective. That goes for the great program of venereal-disease control, the great program of tuberculosis research and control, the great program of cancer research and control, the great program of heart diseases and diseases of the circulatory system, and lastly, the great program envisioned in the mental health act which was passed very recently, which is an attempt on the part of the people of the United States acting through their representatives in the Congress to do something in the interest of human welfare.

I have had the great privilege of being able to chart the course in the Appropriations Committee and in the Congress in the past that has seen to it that these great programs have been implemented with sufficient money to see that they were carried forward in the interest of protecting and preserving the health and welfare of the people of this Nation.

Let me call your attention to just one item in the pending bill where we overrode the budget estimate. That was in the item of appropriations to the National Institutes of Health, where we insisted upon providing $2,500,000 to enable the scientists of this country to ultimately synthesize and make available to the people of this country those two great drugs, ACTH and compound E. No one could sit and listen to the testimony that came before our committee from the great scientists of this Nation, and have them picture the future of medicine and the practice of medicine in the United States that envisioned when those two great drugs are fully understood and are brought to a price that will permit them to be utilized as in penicillin today, without realizing that in the discovery of those two cortisone elements, ACTH and compound E, we are going to have for the people of America and the world the most revolutionary thing in medical science that has occurred since the discovery of Pasteur. I say to you, take the testimony as it developed and read it. How anyone, in the face of that testimony, could even think for a moment that the Federal Government should not attempt to bear its part of the burden in seeing to it that those two great drugs are made available to people, is beyond my wildest imagination.

Compound E, discovered by the scientists at the Mayo Foundation, and the ACTH drug, which has been manufactured by Armour & Co., and upon which they have spent millions and millions of their own money, find themselves at a point where they could not continue to make those vast expenditures of money without some assistance. So the great public-health people of this country came to this Congress and asked for help—the same help that made penicillin and the other drugs, that have proven so efficacious in the treatment of diseases in this country, available at a cheap price.

I might say that word has come from Armour & Co., for example, and I believe the same result will come from the Merck Co., who are manufacturing the compound E, that they are going to shortly reduce the price from $240 per milligram to $100, and that the tremendous step-up in production is going to make that drug available to the people generally through this country.

As far as I am concerned, I am proud that this subcommittee has seen fit, in view of the undisputed and magnificent evidence that came before the committee, to make $2,500,000 of Federal funds available to aid in the synthesization of those products, and make them available to all the people of America.

In this great public-health work I assume there are not many Members who read those hearings. If you want to read what is going on in the field of public-health research and control of diseases, take those hearings this year and listen to the testimony of the magnificent men and women, from California to Maine, who appeared before the committee and gave their conviction and their estimates as to what the future welfare of America demands in the shape of hospital facilities, both general and special hospitals, and especially in the field of clinical hospitals that must implement any hospital program that is going to be successful. What did the committee do? The Bureau of the Budget for some reason unknown to any member of the committee, but I believe I am safe in saying in anticipation of some alleged consideration of the National Science Foundation bill, cut out every dollar of funds necessary to implement and carry out the clinical-hospital construction program. This Congress by almost unanimous vote for 3 years now has put that program into operation, and the results are simply stupendous. Not only are we promoting the actual construction of the facilities necessary to enable the researchers to work, but in that program they are training the researchers and the scientists and the technicians and the clinicians who will ultimately staff these hospitals and enable the benefits of applied medical science to get out into the hands of the medical practitioners, and through them to the people of America.

Mr. Chairman, you heard yesterday of nearly 4,000 beds in veterans' hospitals that they could not activate because of lack of proper trained personnel. How will you ever activate the 16,000 beds that you provided for when you set this program in motion yesterday for veterans without the personnel? We have but a mere handful of neurological men in this country, psychiatrists and psychologists, to handle this great volume of mental disease that is afflicting our whole Nation. By this program that was forced upon the gentleman from Rhode Island and myself and over our objections in the subcommittee we are going to have to step forward. Think of it, sixty-odd percent of all the hospital beds in America are filled with mental cases, and the number is growing. What are you doing? You are spending billions of dollars of tax money to take care of these people who are unfortunate enough to be incarcerated in these institutions: you are spending practically nothing in the field of research to try to find out why these people are there and try to get them out and become useful citizens. That is what the chairman of this subcommittee and I are trying to do; and on the basis of pure simple economy and economics the program that we have established and fought for, and which you have almost unanimously supported in the past, is showing magnificent results. Those who say that research is futile should only look for one thing, the accomplishments of the National Institutes of Health in research in the field of discovering a vaccine that permitted only three cases of typhus out of the millions of troops in our Army last year, only three cases out of the millions because they were protected by an antityphus vaccine developed out here at the National Institutes of Health. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if research had accomplished nothing else—and I could stand here for hours and tell you of the results of this great research program—but if it accomplished nothing else, on a plain system of economics, to say nothing of the broken bodies, long grief long continued, would be worth every dollar of research money that we have heretofore expended.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman will recall that I took the floor one time on legislation to admit permanently a Chinese doctor. Through the use of streptomycin, he has treated a fine young lady who had been a bed patient for 8 years. She is now cured and teaching school in my district. I have a letter on my desk that just came from her. That is what some of these programs of research are doing. I congratulate the gentleman on the effort he has made.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman. I have no personal interest in this; I have no political interest. This is not a political question. The gentleman from Rhode Island, who is a member of the Democratic Party, and I, as a member of the Republican Party have gone down the line hand in hand on this program—no politics in the committee at all—in an effort to enact a program that will be in the public interest of all the people. If you and each of you had had some of the experiences I have had in my own family, you would know why I am fighting to make available to all the people of the country the instruments of medical care, hospital care, and treatments that are available to only a few today.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I want to make a part of the record at this time my very personal and deep appreciation, as chairman of the legislative subcommittee interested in this field, for the great work that has been done by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in implementing these programs. We have kept in close touch with your subcommittee; you have kept in close touch with us over the years; and I feel at this point I should express personally as the subcommittee chairman my very deep appreciation of the gentleman and his colleagues on the subcommittee.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. As a member of the same subcommittee as the gentleman from Tennessee, I would like to concur in what he has said and to add this further thought: I think there can be no greater economy practiced than to increase the man-hour productivity of the men and women of America by maintaining their health, by improving it, by taking them out of hospitals and out of the sick rooms and keeping them producing and working for the benefit of this country and for themselves.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman. To those who talk in terms of pure economy, I may say it can be demonstrated beyond peradventure of doubt that these great programs have made an inestimable contribution to the economic welfare of the United States. Do not put it on that ground, but think of the inestimable contribution that has been made to the human welfare in the protection and preservation of human life. The baby that is born today has an expectancy of life 26 years beyond what that child would have expected were it not for these great discoveries.

We are just entering upon a new era and I say, Mr. Chairman, that merely to build hospitals out of brick and mortar, merely to put beds in those hospitals, merely to provide those things which are just the accouterments of hospitals are not enough. We must bring into those hospitals hand-in-hand with that program this great program of scientific, medical and clinical research that is going to make available to the patients in those hospitals the most advanced and modern treatment that will allow them to go out cured, and allow them to take their places as human beings in modern society. On the economic and human aspects of this thing I cannot see how anyone can say: "Oh, we are going to override the budget, we are going to spend more money than we ought to spend, we are going to have to economize."

We are going to have to economize and have people dying on all sides from tragic heart failure? We are going to have people condemned to a life of misery? We are going to have people condemned to spend their lives in darkness in a mental institution and do nothing about it in the name of economy?

Mr. Chairman, I think my record will show that I voted for economy about as often as any Member of this House. I have voted to cut wherever it was possible to do so. But I refuse to make economies in the face of known human needs that are paramount, in my opinion, to the mere acquisition or preservation of dollars.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. First I want to compliment the gentleman on the very splendid statement he is making. I would like to ask: What is the Federal Government doing in the way of research for multiple sclerosis?

Mr. KEEFE. That is one of the many programs that is involved, and it is also involved, may I say, in the research program of the National Infantile Paralysis Foundation. Multiple sclerosis is another one. I could go on and on and on and tell of these programs that are showing almost miraculous results.

Let me call your attention to just one thing. The disease of leukemia in children was ordinarily a 100-percent fatal disease. I happen to have a little niece, the daughter of my brother, who has been written up in the medical journals of this country as one in 50,000 that ever survived leukemia. Up in the great Cancer Institute in New York, under the direction of a magnificent research director, Dr. Rhodes, they are taking children into that hospital today that were doomed to die in 24 or 48 hours, with no recovery possible, and the evidence shows, under the testimony of Dr. Rhodes, that through the use of ACTH and compound E, these wonder drugs, miracles are being performed before the very eyes of the doctors, miracles that they themselves cannot explain, and children who were doomed to die within 24 hours are running around today after 6 months' treatment, practically normal, healthy children, so far as medical evidence can disclose to the contrary.

Do you think that is worth while? Well, I do, and I am going to fight for it to see to it that that program which we have set up is not going to be destroyed capriciously by those who have never read the testimony and know nothing of the progress that has been made in this great field.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Around 50 years ago there was opposition to Walter Reed putting on his demonstration to prove what was causing yellow fever. He showed what was causing yellow fever, and incidently showed what was causing malaria and typhoid fever and the hookworm, and those diseases have been swept from the face of the earth as the result of Dr. Reed's demonstration.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I happen to recall that recently the gentleman and myself had the privilege of listening to quite a distinguished person, I believe from the State of Alabama.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. His name has left me, but the impression which he left on me has not left me.

Mr. BARDEN. At that time I believe he brought to our attention the fact that virtually all of these wonder drugs and serums that have been produced have been the result of efforts of men who devoted their lives to them and produced them, and many times in dire poverty, and died in poverty, and yet they were called upon to make that sacrifice. In addition to that he brought to our attention the fact that outside of the field of cattle and hogs, and so forth, the contribution of the Federal Government in the field of research had been virtually nothing in comparison to what was needed to do the job.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is very true.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. First, I join, Mr. Chairman, with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Wisconsin for his wonderful presentation of this interesting subject. I hope that before he closes he will touch on the hospital-construction program and point out this fact that certain States are far ahead of other States in this program, and that if this cut is sustained the priorities of these States who are behind will be a long time coming up for consideration.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman that I discussed this matter on the floor of this House on April 4. I was in hopes that the Members would have the opportunity to read that statement because in it I went into great detail to give the history of this Hospital Construction Act, familiarly known as the Hill-Burton law, under which the Congress authorized $75,000,000 contract authorizations to implement these programs that have their genesis and origin in the States and local communities themselves. The program was so successful, may I say, that on the 3d day of October last the Congress here, with 43 dissenting votes, increased that authorization to $150,000,000, and thus sent the word out to the people of this country in the communities and the localities, "Congress is behind you in your efforts to establish hospital facilities throughout the land." If the Congress sustains the action of the subcommittee in reducing that amount to $75,000,000, it will be the greatest breach of trust and breach of faith the United States Government has ever perpetrated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. SCRIVNER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 1, noes 85.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan, the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. May I add my word of praise for the very fine presentation being made by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin and also with reference to the speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island. May I point out at this juncture when the vote was taken last October on the amendments to the Hospital Construction Act which increased the basic amount from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 a year 35 members of the Committee on Appropriations voted on that bill; 28 in favor and 7 voting against. I hope we will have backing for the motion that is going to come before us later.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I would like first to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Rhode Island for the able presentation they are making of this matter. I believe if every Member of the Congress had heard the presentation there would not be a dissenting vote when the amendment is offered to raise the amount from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 and the same goes for the other amendment also. I think it is worthwhile and I for one am wholeheartedly in favor of the two amendments which will be offered.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman. If the action of the subcommittee is sustained with respect to the Hill-Burton program it means that it will be stopped almost dead in its tracks. They cut it from $150,000,000 which was the action of the House last October to $75,000,000. The result of that action is to block community after community that has put on bond issues and bond drives and fundraising drives to meet the sponsor's contribution under this program. Under the program hospitals were authorized all over America and especially in the rural areas. May I say to you if this program is to go forward there must be some research to integrate the various and sundry hospitals and the little and large hospitals which are being built under the program. That is provided for in the second amendment which I shall offer. These amendments are well thought out. They are not fly-by-night amendments. These amendments have the complete and unanimous support of all of the great civic organizations of the country and the welfare organizations and public health and hospital organizations which are interested in stopping the socialization of medicine. You will get socialization of medicine if you do not go along with this program. Make no mistake about that. The people are going to demand that they be given adequate hospital facilities. This is a program that will give it to them and give it to them under the American system of medicine.

May I point out another thing. You cannot operate these hospitals satisfactorily without having the research programs going on simultaneously. In the other amendments that I am going to offer I will seek to rescind the funds for the clinical hospital construction program which was initiated nearly 4 years ago. Under the bill as we now have it that program is stopped dead. Atrocious results will follow if that happens. We have to continue this research. In order to do so we must provide the facilities. You cannot give a man a microscope and some guinea pigs without some place to use them. Under this program they will have clinical hospital facilities with beds available, with human beings getting the very best that medical science can give them, and at the same time allow the scientists to make their observations and studies, and the whole program of research will be coordinated in the fields of cancer, heart, and mental health with this great institution that you have authorized to be built and which is nearing completion out here at Bethesda. This is a great, over-all coordinating program, and it must all be adopted if we are to have a successful program.

Let me tell you this: When the chairman of the subcommittee and I sat down to see how we could work out this program without any overriding of the Budget, we decided that there would be certain items in this bill that we could cut out, $10,000,000 for grants to States, for local and State public health services. That is a new project. We will cut that out. This project for a new facility in Alaska, $7,000,000. We will cut that out. And so we went, on down the line, with the distinct understanding that of the sum of $26,000,000 that we cut out of this bill, we would be permitted to reallocate some of those funds in order to continue this clinical hospital construction program. But I am sorry to say that the subcommittee was unable, under the drive of the chairman of the full committee, to make that reallocation of funds, as the chairman and I had agreed upon before we went into the marking up of this bill.

So there we are. As the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has stated on this floor, we voted for those cuts, which I never would have voted for had it not been with the distinct understanding that those funds would have been reallocated so as to continue with this construction program for this clinical hospital and not override the budget estimates.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. With whom was that understanding had? I never heard anything of it.

Mr. KEEFE. I just stated clearly that it was the understanding between the chairman of the subcommittee and myself, as ranking minority member of the subcommittee, a practice that has been indulged in during all the years I have served on this subcommittee, and over which there was never any dispute until this year. We never raised a question about this in the full committee. There never was any discussion about it. We said, "We will leave it to the Congress to determine this issue on the floor of Congress;" and you are hearing about it for the first time today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to thank Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and his associates who appeared before our subcommittee for their outstanding statements and their willingness to cooperate in determining the needs of their departments.

I also want to thank Dr. R. E. Dyer, Director of the National Institutes of Health for his statement and cooperation in establishing the great work that his institution is doing. I understand that Dr. Dyer will retire this year. I am sure that the members of our committee regret this very much as we always looked forward to his appearance and the outstanding statements he presented to our committee.

I am pleased to report that the death rate from all causes in 1949 was the lowest ever reached in the history of our country by 9.9 percent per 1,000 population. There is a marked decrease in the maternal and infant mortality in such diseases as tuberculosis, pneumonia, and influenza. For example, the death rate from tuberculosis was 194 per 100,000 population in 1900 and in 1949 it was only 30 per 100,000 population.

The increase in births in 1949 was unusually great by more than 3,700,000 living babies born during the year. The infant death rate also reached a new low. In 1915 we lost 100 babies out of every 1,000 births before they reached the age of 1 year. In 1949 the rate was only 30 per 1,000 births. This showing may add 17 years to the span of life. A newborn baby now may be expected to reach the age of 67-plus compared to 50 years of age in 1900. This is most encouraging, but we are now faced with the problems of the middle life—which is not as good, generally speaking. In 1949, diseases of the heart, kidney, circulatory system and cancer accounted for 60 percent of all deaths in the United States. In 1900, the same group of diseases accounted for less than 23 percent of all deaths. Since 1900, the death rate for heart diseases and related ailments has increased from 333 per 100,000 population to 466 per 100,000 population. In the same time, cancer has increased from 64 in 1900 to 134 in 1949. This increase is likewise true in mental diseases, 600,000 mental patients now occupying beds in overcrowded hospitals in the United States.

The Public Health Service is one of the oldest Federal agencies. Today, it operates 25 marine hospitals and 120 outpatient clinics. It also operates hospitals for narcotic addicts and one leprosy hospital at Carville, La. The marine hospitals and clinics are the first to learn about epidemics and go into action to

protect our country against spread of disease. Two years ago, at Donora, Pa., 20 people lost their lives due to smog. At the request of the Pennsylvania health authorities and other interested people, the Public Health Service stepped in and made an investigation as to the causes and how to prevent similar occurrences in other communities. Numerous highly trained individuals participated in this investigation, endeavoring to ascertain the causes of this calamity.

During the year 1948 the National Institutes of Health isolated a virus of the common cold, and is continuing an all-out fight against all virus diseases.

Although the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was passed, which authorizes a new laboratory at Cincinnati, Ohio, for extensive research in the field of water pollution, this laboratory has not yet materialized. This is badly needed, and it is hoped that funds will be provided for completion of plans and to allow contract authorization.

While the death rate from tuberculosis, as previously stated, has been steadily declining, we still have about 50,000 deaths yearly from this dreaded disease. The States are making more than a million X-rays annually under the supervision of the Public Health, endeavoring to make an early diagnosis of the disease. It is generally known that the secret in treating tuberculosis successfully is an early recognition of the disease, and prompt and scientific treatment established at once.

In the past 12 years, the death rate from syphilis declined 45 percent. It has dropped from 21,000 in 1937 to 13,000 in 1949. There has also been a remarkable decline in congenital syphilis and central nervous system types of diseases.

In the cancer field, Congress has made it possible for the Public Health Service to expand research in the National Cancer Institute and to aid non-Federal institutions in their research. While nothing striking has been brought out in the past few years as to the cause of cancer, it is felt by the authorities that the proper approach is being made and that something is bound to materialize within the near future. We must not get discouraged in this fight. We must wage war against cancer and every effort must be made to determine the causes regardless of the cost and the time it takes to accomplish this.

Concerning the problem of cardiovascular diseases, arthritis, and rheumatism which affect the heart, we do not know the causes of many pathological conditions of the heart, but we must continue our investigations and experimentations until this problem has been solved.

The question of high blood pressure, for instance, is a question that still must be answered. Just why a young individual must have unusually high blood pressure and another individual, late in life, has a normal blood pressure or even a low type of pressure is something that we are as yet unable to answer. However, we do know considerable about rheumatic heart disease which is commonly known in the medical profession as endocarditis. This type of heart disease, which should in reality be called infection of the heart, is most always caused by focal infection. In children, infection of the middle ear, diseased tonsils, and adenoids, and in infants, pyelitis, are among the common causes of this type of heart infection. In reality, any concealed infection or pus formation within the system can readily cause endocarditis. It is vitally important before attempting to eradicate any infection of the body, especially in children, that a few doses of penicillin be given to safeguard against heart complications. This is also true in the treatment of acute inflammatory rheumatism which so frequently causes heart complications. A few years ago rheumatic heart disease was practically always fatal, or at least the patient was disabled for life. Today, with our modern methods of treatment, a considerable number of these cases recover.

In recent years there has been a marked increase in diabetes. Thousands of cases have been ascertained through annual physical examination, examinations made by insurance companies, and the armed services. A simple blood test has recently come into use to determine diabetics and potential diabetics. It is estimated that thousands upon thousands of cases of diabetes now exist that have never been diagnosed.

The dentists of this country are to be congratulated on their recent scientific studies of tooth decay and gum infection. It was only recently that sodium fluoride has become of general use in the prevention of tooth decay in children. Numerous dental-treatment units are now in certain sections of the country, endeavoring to instruct teachers and parents, as well as the local dentists, in the use of this unusual treatment. It is estimated that 40 percent of tooth infection and cavity formations can be lessened by the use of this remarkable drug. Many communities throughout the country are now making studies and investigations with the idea of using sodium fluoride in their drinking water. Great results may be obtained by such usage. It has also been determined in recent years that the eating of candy is a cause of a large percentage of dental cavities.

In mental diseases, our studies must continue, endeavoring to determine the causes which bring about or promote this ever-increasing type of disease. We need hundreds of trained individuals in this field, as well as in the field of heart and cancer diseases, to continue the scientific investigations in the effort to relieve the human race of these most dreaded afflictions.

Our subcommittee heard a number of statements from prominent scientists and physicians concerning the new wonder drugs. It was decided to appropriate $3,600,000 for the study and experimentation on the following drugs: Adrenocorticotropic hormone—acth—and cortisone—compound E. Including development of other related compounds for treatment of arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, and metabolic diseases, and including studies in the basic sciences related to such diseases.

Committee members were highly impressed by the reports received from the various witnesses concerning the marvelous results obtained by the use of these new drugs. The committee decided it was justified in the expenditure of this amount of money.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the majority of Members of the House has had numerous communications from constituents and interested parties all over the country, with regard to increasing appropriations for some of these items, especially that of mental diseases. Our committee also received hundreds of communications in this regard. We endeavored to be as liberal as possible. We well realize the importance of these subjects and millions of dollars could be spent in research which, no doubt, would be money well spent, as far as most of the taxpayers are concerned. But we felt there had to be a limit on the amount of money spent in this regard. The expense of Government is terrific, and we sought to make our appropriations justifiable.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have faith in the Members of this House, in their individual devotion to the public good and their integrity as a legislative body.

In terms of that faith I want to discuss the proposed appropriations for construction of hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act and for medical research facilities in the National Institutes of Health.

We have already heard economy praised as it should be praised. Wise economies were never more in order than at this point in our history.

I think, however, that we have not heard false economy condemned as it should be condemned. False economies have never been more dangerous than now. I join with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in supporting increased funds for hospital construction and medical research.

The economy proposed in the slashing of the annual hospital construction appropriation from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000 is false economy. The economy proposed in the elimination of requests for funds for medical research facilities of the National Institutes of Health is false economy. They represent together a unique example of the very expensive philosophy of economy at any cost.

I want to deal with these two propositions at some length. But before launching into the detailed necessity of reversing the committee decisions on these two appropriations, I want to again remind the House that both individual devotion to the public good and integrity as a body are here involved.

If we cannot find our way to spend an infinitesimal part of our national budget to improve the Nation's health, I think our devotion to the public good is open to question. And if we are to go back on the pledges of the Hill-Burton Act—the pledges of this very same Congress in its

first session—our integrity as a body is open to question by those who have been promised but will not receive.

In the first session of this Eighty-first Congress the House voted 256 to 47 to increase the appropriation for the Hill-Burton Act from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000. We did it on good evidence that such an increase was necessary to build the minimum facilities required. Of the total membership of the Appropriations Committee, 26 voted for the increase. Only 7 voted against, only 12 were absent. Eighteen Democrats and eight Republicans favored the measure. Only one Democrat and six Republicans opposed it.

I think that vote was a significant pledge—and on its basis the Public Health Service has already earmarked $108,000,000 for aid in hospital construction in 1951.

Has the real need changed? Has any new evidence been presented to show that the money is not required to make sure that people in all parts of this country get equal and adequate hospitalization when they need it? We all know the answer to both questions is no. In a real sense, I am not asking a reversal here, I am asking reaffirmation of a pledge.

As for medical-research facilities, they can hardly be separated from hospital construction. Without more research, the hospitals can never realize their greatest potentialities for good. Without more hospitals, the precious results of research will go only to the limited number of people who already can be hospitalized.

Even putting these vital arguments aside—and I believe they are decisive, there are other important reasons that the House should authorize the full $150,000,000 for hospital construction and about $1,500,000 for research facilities.

To understand the urgency of the full hospital-construction program, let us examine what has been done to date to reach the goals set by our legislation. Let us do it in terms of two typical States, Mississippi and Wisconsin.

First these States were required to survey their total requirements and plan construction on a priority basis. This is, of necessity, a slow and painstaking business.

Mississippi to date has approved applications requiring about $15,000,000 of Federal matching funds. Working on the basis of the original congressional promise of $150,000,000 annually for 5 years, Mississippi expects six million in 1951 and 1952 and has made tentative commitments in that amount. If Congress changes its mind, much of this 1951–52 program must be postponed. That, in turn, would mean that part of the $15,000,000 minimum program will never be completed.

Wisconsin would be even more badly treated. Its project approvals already exceed its combined allotments for 1948, 1949, and 1950 by $2,000,000.

There are other crippling complications. When the appropriation was raised from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000, the Federal Government was authorized to raise its contribution to any project from one-third to a maximum of two-thirds. The average has been 47 percent with the determination based on need. In Alabama, for instance, the full two-thirds has been allotted to projects. If the apropriation for 1951 is reduced to $75,000,000, the State of Alabama will either have to cut project construction in half or reduce the Federal contribution to one-third. Since the inability of such States to build hospitals without more than a one-third Federal contribution was responsible for the original increase to $150,000,000, the second alternative seems out of the question. Alabama would just have to get along without half the hospitals it needs.

Another serious aspect of this proposed turnabout is the drastic effect on the program of facilities in connection with medical centers. While rural areas needing hospitals most will properly be served first, the large centers which must train their personnel will lag behind. Unless funds are also available to expand teaching centers in urban areas in the near future, the entire program may reach an imbalance. It may make impossible the development of a well-rounded program.

We have said we needed 900,000 hospital beds. In 2 years only 50,000 beds have been approved. Our action in increasing the funds from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 was recognition that we must move faster. Our action today must be recognition that we have not yet reached the point where we can slow down. Students of hospital economics have estimated that $75,000,000 a year barely keep us ahead of replacement and repairs in hospital facilities. Are we to be content with that?

Hospitals, health centers, laboratories, nurses homes, mental, tuberculosis, and chronic hospitals are the workshops of the Nation's health. Only here can the best in modern medicine and methods help patients. Only here can the work of our scientists and researchers have its full effect. Our national health, our greatest single asset, requires that this Congress honor its pledge.

My plea is not alone for hospital construction funds, as I pointed out initially. I am anxious that all of us understand the vital work being done by the National Health Institutes. If we do so, I am sure that its value will be recognized in our action on its medical research facility appropriation, again for continuation of a valuable program which the committee has seen fit to deny funds.

The National Institutes of Health is the principal research arm of the Public Health Service. From its beginning in a small room in the Marine Hospital on Staten Island in 1887 where cholera was studied, it has grown into one of the finest research agencies in the world.

The administrative center of the National Institutes of Health, and most of the direct research of the institutes, are located in Bethesda, Md. A number of laboratories and field studies are, however, operated throughout the country. One laboratory, for example, located at Hamilton, Mont., has done outstanding work on all phases of Rocky Mountain spotted fever. Studies of the common infectious diseases of children are going forward in Norfolk, Va. An extensive and unique study of the mental health problems of an entire community is in progress at Phoenix, Ariz. A laboratory for study of cancer is located in California. A long-time investigation relating to the origins of heart disease through repeated thorough examinations of an entire population group is under way in Framingham, Mass. I consider this dispersion of research facilities and research effort a sound and productive means not only of centering attention upon regional health problems, but of bringing to the attention of people throughout the country what medical research is and how it can help them.

These basic investigations are indispensable if the levels of health of the Nation is to continue to rise in the future as it has in the past. But research alone is not sufficient. Research findings must be known, they must be applied by doctors, people must be educated to accept the measures that will keep them healthy, hospitals must be available for those who need hospital care, State and local health departments need assistance in applying the new techniques uncovered by research.

Within the National Institutes of Health are six institutes whose efforts are centered around specific groups of diseases and areas of basic medical research not related to a specific disease. These institutes are the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, the National Mental Health Institute, the National Institute of Dental Research, the Experimental Biology and Medicine Institute, and the Microbiological Institute.

The activities of the Experimental Biology and Medicine and the Microbiological Institutes are confined to basic laboratory investigations.

The other institutes not only conduct research in their own laboratories, but support research in non-Federal institutions.

Grants for basic research in medicine and related sciences under this program are made to support investigations selected by scientists in the Nation's medical schools, universities, and hospitals. The scientists and not the Public Health Service select the areas in which they wish to work. Applications for grants are reviewed by some 200 nongovernmental specialists who are leaders in their fields. They are divided into some 20 groups, each of which reviews applications in a scientific field—biochemistry and nutrition, metabolism and endocrinology, pathology, and so forth. Their recommendations are in turn reviewed by 5 national advisory councils—National Advisory Health Council, the National Advisory Heart Council, the National Advisory Cancer Council, the National Advisory Mental Health Council, and the National Advisory Dental Research Council. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service can approve no research grant that has not been approved by these groups. They advise the Surgeon General not only upon specific grants, but upon general policies that should govern the operation of the total program—the geographical distribution of grants, the period over

which research support should be provided, whether grants should be made to institutions or to specific investigators, and similar matters.

These programs, you will note, are for the most part directed toward the chronic diseases which are the major causes of death in this country. They have played a major role not only in increasing the total volume of medical research to reasonable levels, but in shifting emphasis away from communicable diseases to those that are the major cause of death, suffering and economic loss. The desirable change in emphasis has come about not only through Federal grants directly, but also through the attraction of funds from private sources into these fields as a result of Federal leadership. This, I contend, is an example of sound scientific strategy in the field of medical research.

Both the studies in the laboratories of the National Institutes of Health and the investigations supported by grants are producing results.

About one-quarter of all medical research costs of medical schools that they budget separately are carried by grants from the Public Health Service. The work supported by grants covers the full range of medical research.

Studies in the laboratories of the institutes are producing a stream of findings of direct and immediate value to protection of public health and of basic significance to the future of medicine and public health.

Some of the studies undertaken are fundamental; others have immediate and direct application. They may seek the nature and cause of specific diseases or pursue the development of drugs, serums, antibiotics, vaccines, or unknown agents that will aid in prevention, control, or cure of the scores of ailments which plague mankind. Or these research projects may be concerned with general problems of nutrition, aviation medicine, peptic ulcers, and other research to advance human welfare.

Other studies range from a search for the causes of the common cold to the causes and mysteries of cancer—from investigations of the clinical value of recently developed drugs to studies of new applications of nuclear energy and the latest advances in radiology and isotopes.

The vital work has been extended into nearly all fields of medical research by an ever-increasing complement of scientists, whose efforts have carried them to every part of the globe. The investigators are called upon to help solve perplexing medical and scientific problems from every section of the country and from many foreign lands.

Research facilities of the National Institutes of Health are to be expanded soon by a 14-story, 500-bed clinical center, now under construction. This building, scheduled for completion by July 1952, will combine within a single structure both hospital and laboratory facilities. Emphasis will be placed on the investigation and treatment of cancer, heart disease, and mental disease—now the greatest causes of illness, disability, and death.

The people of the United States can well be proud of the National Institutes of Health. This agency has played a major role in safeguarding the health of our citizens. It has pioneered into new frontiers of medical science. No attempt can ever be made to list the outstanding contributions to medical knowledge made by the distinguished scientists there. The story of their humanitarian work through the years is scattered through thousands of reports in medical and scientific journals. But let me call your attention to some notable contributions to medical science which, I am proud to point out, are typical of the high-caliber research carried on by the National Institutes of Health.

Working behind their test tubes and in laboratories, the National Institutes of Health scientists developed a vaccine for typhus fever. They developed an effective vaccine against Rocky Mountain spotted fever—the first vaccine against any rickettsial disease. They demonstrated that fluorides in drinking water are related to dental decay. They did pioneer work on bacterial content of milk and prevention of milk-borne disease, which resulted in uniform milk codes and regulations. They developed an antimalarial drug, which, taken as a tablet once a week, promises to become a potent preventive measure. They developed metapon, a powerful pain-killing drug which can be given by mouth and has few side reactions. They improved yellow fever vaccine. They discovered and described hookworm disease in this country for the first time.

Nor is that all, gentlemen. Scientists at the National Institutes of Health developed a vaccine against typhus fever that was used with outstanding success among servicemen during the last war. They also developed a shadowing technique in conjunction with the electron miscroscope that is now widely used throughout the world. This technique has made possible the visualization of many of the viruses and their body.

The list of recent accomplishments could be extended over many, many pages. New accomplishments are continually being added through the patient work of the research scientists at the National Institutes of Health. Time permits me to mention only a few.

In recent months notable advances were made in the field of tissue culture at the National Cancer Institute. A technique has been worked out for growing cells on a sheet of perforated cellophane. These techniques make possible the growth of large cultures from a single cell, and consequently the investigator can now study ample cultures of uniform cellular origin and type. Small quantities of the scarce and expensive arthritis-relieving drug ACTH have actually been extracted from pituitary tissue grown in a bottle.

The Cancer Institute has also worked out a technique for producing an essential dietary element—amino acid. For example, a quantity of a particular amino acid that would cost $1,500—and this quantity has never been available—was produced at a cost of $70 in a 2-day experiment at the Institute. Thus, for the first time, all essential amino acids can be made available for any patient with a disease in which intravenous feeding is desirable. In cancer of the stomach and digestive tract, patients sometimes starve because normal intake of food is prevented by obstruction. Intravenous feeding with proteins becomes necessary.

Health workers at the Microbiological Institute, in cooperation with the Louisiana State Board of Health, worked to prevent spread of Louisiana pneumonitis—a form of pneumonia with certain definite characteristics—to the large population centers and Army camps.

Beginning in December 1942 and continuing throughout the early part of the following year, a mysterious and deadly epidemic ran through 6 parishes in the bayou country of Louisiana at a time when hundreds of thousands of United States soldiers were being trained in the area. There were 8 deaths out of 19 recognizable civilian cases. National Institutes of Health scientists found that the disease was caused by a virus related to the viruses of the psittacosis—parrot fever—group, and developed a vaccine.

The National Institutes of Health dealt a smashing blow, in 1949, at one of the critical weaknesses in the treatment of rabies with vaccine—the possibly fatal paralysis that sometimes follows the injection of the common preventive vaccine. They were able to find the cause of this weakness—an allergic factor—and develop a method for its removal; thus rendering the antirabies vaccine safe for all patients needing it.

The National Institutes of Health has helped develop a diagnostic instrument for detecting heart disease. The instrument known as the electrokymograph, which was developed after several years' work by Public Health Service scientists working at Temple University, may eventually fill this need. Using a highly sensitive photomultiplier tube, the electrokymograph records the movements at the borders of the heart and detects variations from normal before a serious or fatal heart attack can occur.

A large number of cooperative projects are being carried on with hospitals, medical schools, and research centers to speed research in the diseases of the heart and circulation—the leading cause of death in the United States.

The National Institute of Mental Health is carrying on important research in the study of drug addicts. These findings prove that it is now possible for an addict to be withdrawn from drugs without suffering much more discomfort than is caused by a common cold. Other research is being carried on to determine whether any new drug or compound has properties which are habit-forming in man.

Another National Institutes of Health institute, the National Institute of Dental Research, has made far-reaching discoveries relating to fluorine and tooth decay. Discovery of the relationship between fluorine and tooth decay also contributed to the important demonstration program which the Public Health Service is now conducting in more than 500 communities on a Nation-wide scale to reduce tooth decay among children by

applying sodium fluoride directly to their teeth. Studies have also been made to show that there is no public health hazard involved in the addition of one part per million of fluorine to public water supplies. Other studies emphasize the importance both of diet and of individual variations in tooth decay.

These, I repeat, are high lights in a long list of notable research accomplishments. But they bespeak the quality and outstanding performance of the National Institutes of Health.

Medical research depends not only upon funds to meet current expenses, which are heavy in most areas of study, but upon a corps of trained investigators and upon adequate working space. All three factors must be available in proper proportion if medical research is to flourish.

The four institutes created by law for study of heart disease, cancer, dental problems, and mental health provide fellowships to build the professional research talent upon which the research of the future rests. About 500 students are now pursuing advanced studies with the aid of these fellowships. More than 300 of them have already received an M. D. or Ph. D. degree and are carrying on investigations at the highest scientific level. The Heart and Cancer Institutes have also helped non-Federal research institutions in dealing with the third problem in research support—provision of adequate research space. To date, Congress has provided $22,400,000 for aid in construction of facilities for heart and cancer studies.

The refusal of the House Committee on Appropriations to provide authority to continue this program in the fiscal year 1951 will, if concurred in by the House, seriously impair the development of a balanced medical research program.

In addition to the construction of research facilities for heart and cancer, the country desperately needs more laboratory space for study of mental disorders. Mental illness imposes a burden of more than a billion dollars a year on the Nation. We can cut this sharply. But the only way to reduce the load on taxpayers and on the families of those who must support mentally ill people is through more extensive research. And one major barrier to an expanded research program is the lack of facilities. A beginning should be made during fiscal year 1951 through provision of authority for research construction grants totaling about $11,000,000—$5,500,000 for heart research facilities, $3,000,000 for cancer research facilities, and $2,500,000 for mental health facilities.

For the first time in our history, we are, as a Nation, devoting a reasonable share of our national income and a reasonable share of our best brains to medical research. It is particularly significant that expanded Federal aid to research has been accompanied by increased support from private sources.

A major national enterprise of this sort cannot be successfully undertaken if the Federal part of the research support jumps about erratically from year to year. As we look ahead, we should set a base level of Federal support for medical research that will remain relatively stable from year to year at levels well above those now prevailing.

A second aspect of this problem that becomes clearer as time goes on is the relationship between research and the total activities of medical schools and hospitals. Research is now supported more adequately than is the teaching function of medical schools. This is an unhealthy situation, for research in itself, unsupported by an adequate supply of well-trained doctors, will be of restricted social value. The answer is not to cut back research, but to enact the pending measure for financial aid to medical, dental, and related teaching institutions.

Similarly, we must have a Nation-wide network of hospitals, carefully integrated to provide effective medical care at minimum cost.

What we must recognize is that the real national health program is indivisible, the whole as strong only as its parts. Congress has already given abundant evidence that it wants to meet the challenge of our national health problem. Let it now provide the funds it has promised itself and the people it represents. There is nothing economic about shortchanging the national health program—it could be catastrophically expensive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, surely there is not a Member of this House who is not convinced that the time has come for us to curtail in Federal appropriations. We simply must not institute any new obligations for the Federal Government and when and wherever possible we must drastically curtail many of the programs which have heretofore been instituted.

Having these facts in mind, however, I do not see how we can in good faith fail to provide the $150,000,000 provided for in Public Law 380 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session. It is common knowledge that there is a great shortage of hospital facilities throughout the country. It is a crime to know how our honest, hard-working people are not only embarrassed but often subjected to unnecessary inconvenience, suffering, and even death because there are no hospital beds for them. In my judgment, one of the main causes for the agitation looking toward socialized medicine is in the inaccessibility of hospitals. There simply must be an accelerated and extended program of hospital construction. This knowledge was in our minds when we wrote the provisions of Public Law 380. Relying upon the obligation of the Government, as spelled out in the law, the several communities, towns, and cities throughout the country set out to raise the portion required of them so as to become eligible for the Federal funds in the full amount stipulated. Bonds were issued, oftentimes to the maximum legal limitation. Public subscriptions were taken. The very bottom of the barrel was scraped due to the great need. In my judgment, it would be a gross breach of faith upon the part of the Federal Government to deprive these needy communities of the funds we have heretofore allocated to them. As evidence of this serious situation, I quote from the following telegrams and letters received by me. Dr. B. J. Workman, Workman Memorial Hospital, Woodruff, S. C.:

I notice in the daily papers that there is some talk of cutting down Federal appropriations for building hospitals. As you know, we have the necessary funds provided for a hospital at Woodruff, and we have been told by the State board of health in Columbia that the Government funds will be available July 1. I would appreciate it if you could find out if this reduction of Federal appropriations will affect Woodruff's getting a hospital.

Mr. J. H. Bonds, president of the Lions Club, Greer, S. C.:

Understand appropriation reduced in section for hospital construction in Public Law 725 to original amount. This appears to eliminate Greer Hospital as Greenville County allotment will be materially reduced. Working drawings are 75 percent complete and construction was planned to start in July or August. This will leave the largest city in South Carolina without a hospital and we urge all your efforts toward restoring the appropriation to the original amount in the law.

Mr. Jacque B. Norman, Greenville General Hospital, Greenville, S. C.:

Understand Appropriations Committee recommends reduction in funds for hospital construction Public Law 725, to original amount. Hospitals that I am working with and are now being planned that will be seriously hurt in your district includes Greenville General Hospital, Union, Woodruff, Greer, and Laurens. The Greenville general appropriation would be reduced from over $2,000,000 to $650,000. Urge this item be restored to the original amount in the law. Please try to help.

Mr. P. C. Gregory, Jr., chairman, board of trustees, Greenville General Hospital, Greenville, S. C.:

Greatly concerned over Appropriation Committee's recommendation to reduce funds for hospital construction Public Law 725 back to original amount. Greenville General Hospital's program has been fully committed and announcement made to the public at large based on funds available as written by law. All expansion we have committed for has been approved by State board of health and United States Public Health Service. Any reduction in funds for this project would be almost disastrous to this area. Urgently request your earnest efforts toward seeing that this item is not reduced.

Hopkins and Baker, architects, Florence, S. C.:

Amendment of appropriation bill effecting Public Law No. 725 for hospital construction in reduction of funds of $150,000,000 to $75,000,000 practically ruins proposed medical-college hospital at Charleston and other State, county, and municipal hospitals, and health centers. Urgently request the blocking of this reduction.

Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch, president of the Medical College of the State of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C.:

We are also vitally interested in restoration of the Hill-Burton appropriation for hospital construction to the $150,000,000 previously provided. This will govern whether or not the medical college shall immediately carry out its plan for hospital construction

tion to provide more doctors in South Carolina.

And—

It is of extreme importance to South Carolina that the Hill-Burton hospital-construction appropriation now before you shall be raised to previous $150,000,000. Please pardon our anxiety prompting this reminder.

Since we were able to get copies of the pending bill, I have been laboring with members of the committee for the restoration of this vital sum and as best I can judge the chances are fair for its restoration.

As badly as we need to economize, we must differentiate between economy and false economy. Let me urge upon you the importance of voting for the restoration of the cut of $75,000,000 from the hospital-construction grant.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $1,861,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 117, line 19, strike out "$1,861,000" and insert "$1,425,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas, a member of the subcommittee, may have five additional minutes in which to discuss this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, if the Members will look at the report on page 39 they will find that the committee there states that this increase granted, although it was $125,000 under that which the Office of the Solicitor asked for, was a very substantial increase over the amount allowed in 1950; and they set out there that the main reason for this was the 1940 amendments to the wage-hour law. It is a substantial increase, about 75 percent more than they had last year. The tragic part of it, however, is that I can refer you to limited printed hearings on this particular subject, because most of the hearings were held in connection with the request for a deficiency for this particular office to cover some additional employees from the time the 1949 Wages and Hours Act was passed down to the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is not the amount the gentleman has left in by his amendment more than $200,000 above what was given to them last year?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; it is a trifle more than 25 percent increase over last year.

Mr. TABER. So, really, you have been very liberal with them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is the way I felt about it. It remains to be seen how the committee feels about it.

There is no desire on the part of myself, I am sure, or the committee to hamstring or hamper the Solicitor's Office in its activities, but we were given little information and could find but little. We were told that with the passage of the 1949 Wage-Hour Act which raised the minimum from 40 cents to 75 cents that it would be necessary for the Solicitor's Office, the legal right arm of the Secretary, to revise quite a few regulations; that is true. We were told that it would be necessary to send out interpretations of the new act; that is true. But it is also true particularly as it relates to the very inception of the enforcement of the act. That act has now been in force and effect for almost 6 months, and the peak of this regulation writing and interpreting should by now be passed.

Then, of course, they pointed out that the information—and incidentally no action has yet been taken by this House or the full committee on the request for the deficiency which was requested by the Secretary of Labor—they point out that the Wage-Hour Act now applies to a million and a half more employees and working men than at the time prior to the raise to 75 cents an hour. They failed to disclose that as a result of this very same act there was somewhere in the neighborhood of a million or more persons taken out from under the coverage of the old act; so the net gain in the number covered would, according to my estimate, be only a half a million as compared to the estimated number under the old act of 22,601,000. If the increase were only a half a million, it would mean only 0.4 percent; but let us assume for the sake of this argument that there will be a million and a half more employees covered by this new act. That is a set-off to the 22,500,000 previously covered. It is a matter of less than 10 percent in the number of employees covered by the new act.

Let us turn to another column of figures which they gave us. Under the old act there were 636,000 firms covered and with the coming of the new act there will be an additional 233,000, which is an increase of one-third in the number of establishments but only a matter of a very small percent increase in the number of employees.

This being true it would seem that the work load of this office in view of the year's experience under the former Minimum Wage Act should not so sharply increase as to make it necessary to double the appropriation for this item and for Wage and Hour as well.

Let us see what happens. This relates to some figures shown by the Wage and Hour Division. However, they intend, so they say, to double the number of investigators. Of course, part of the work turned up by those investigators would be reflected in the Office of the Solicitor. They intend to double them, although the number of employees, as I pointed out, is increased less than 10 percent and the number of establishments is increased less than one-third.

I do not know much about the rest of the country but I do know pretty well the area in and around Kansas City. They have 43 investigators out there. They are asking for 100, which is an increase of nearly 60, but the number of establishments that they are going to supervise and that it will be necessary probably to inspect is less than one-half of 1 percent. The number of covered establishments, less than 50 percent which they anticipated, is increasing 25,000. They already have 56,000. In other words, it would be a third increase there instead of the double they are asking for in the number of agents. The number of employees to be covered is far less than 10 percent. They only anticipate 110,000 will be added by this new act, which is a matter of an increase of far less than 10 percent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the Fourth District of Michigan these inspectors, or whatever you might call them, go into the factories and solicit business. That is, they go from employee to employee and ask as to the work that employee has been doing. Even though the employee is satisfied, the inspector insists many times that the employee is entitled to more money. That just makes trouble and it creates a result which the Congress never intended to be created.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Every law that is written is intended to be obeyed. The record not only here but the testimony given to us indicates that by far the great majority of employers of this Nation honestly try to obey the law. Of course, there will be derelictions because of misunderstanding and other reasons, I assume. I know full well that if I were again working in a foundry and I thought my boss was not paying me what the law said, it would not take me long to get to the inspector. If they will let their presence be known, those who are being imposed upon will bring the complaints to them and then, of course, they must, as they should, take whatever action is provided in the law.

I feel that by giving the Solicitor's Office this additional 25 percent increase over last year that it will be ample to carry them through and give them all of the additional attorneys that they need and I, for one, would say that if that were not true, and if they could show early next spring when they come in for the 1952 appropriations that their work was being hampered through lack of funds, that I would be the first to admit any error in judgment and would approve sufficient deficiency money to carry on their activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it might be well if the law more specifically specified the duties of some of these employees. From my own district came a complaint from an employee, not an employer, not a Federal agent or an agent of this department, and this complaint, which she backed up by an affidavit, the employee said that the inspector had come into the factory and inquired of her as to the work she was doing and the hours she was putting in. It developed that she had worked a little overtime. So, the inspector did not ask her whether she wanted to make a complaint. He insisted that she make a complaint against the employer. And, speaking as a Federal officer, he made some impression on her. She evidently thought as I used to think when a man came around from the Federal Government that it was not my privilege to ask why he was there or to question the reasonableness of the statements he made, but just to go along with my Government. I thought that was my duty. I used to think that was the way things should be. I used to think that was the duty I owed to the Federal Government here in Washington to comply with the requests of its agents.

Well, the employee signed the papers presented to her and she was awarded a certain sum, and the company paid. My understanding from her was that she gave the money back to the employer. Then that Federal agent wanted to know where she had worked prior to the time she was employed at her present job, and he said to her, "I think I can make a claim against that company if you will give me all the facts."

What kind of business is that for an agent of the Government to be engaged in. Lawyers are not permitted to solicit business, and the ambulance chaser, the fellow who runs around after he reads of an accident, or the lawyer who runs around after he reads of an accident and solicits a case, is considered as following unethical practices and sometimes, if he goes far enough, would be disbarred. But, it seems to be common practice, an ethical procedure, for these Federal employees, charged with the enforcement of the law, to snoop around, create trouble, and bring actions against employers who are doing what they believe to be the right thing. The same procedure to a limited extent follows where employees do various classes of work. Someone from the office steps out into the factory and performs some labor, then along comes an inspector and causes trouble. That sort of conduct is not conducive to good will nor to increased production. I cannot understand why Federal employees follow that course except that they desire, like some prosecuting attorneys, to make a record of complaints made, and convictions obtained. I cannot understand it, and I think we should write into the law some rules and regulations which would limit these Federal employees to following through where complaints are made, helping the underdog, if you want to refer to employees in that way, helping them when they have a complaint to make, but staying out of a situation where their only purpose appears to be to create trouble.

The amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] has offered an amendment to reduce the appropriation for the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor from $1,861,000 to $1,425,000. The amount they had last year was $1,208,432.

It is apparent that the increase on account of the pay raise would not be over $50,000. It is apparent that if the amendment is adopted they will still have a couple of hundred thousand dollars more than they had last year, and that would hire from 35 to 40 additional people.

It seems that it is almost ridiculous that we should proceed with better than a 50-percent increase, as the committee recommends. The cut was only $125,000 below the budget, which was 60 percent above last year's figures.

We are never going to be able to meet our obligations and pay the interest on the public debt unless we show some sense of responsibility to the people in the consideration of these appropriations. Such a moderate cut as the gentleman from Kansas has proposed should receive the unanimous support of the House of Representatives.

The activities they have under this wage-hour picture cannot be increased in any substantial way because there were almost a million employees exempted, and not as many added as would counteract that.

Every employer of any account at all with any number of employees is going to do the very best he knows how to comply with the law. Instead of making it as disagreeable as possible for the employer and for the employee, and stirring up as much trouble between the employer and the employee as possible, whatever these people have to do can be done in a quiet way and quickly, and not by spending hours and hours annoying people to death.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment reducing the amount by a little over $400,000 will be adopted. I hope the Committee will have sense of responsibility enough to realize it is their duty to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment presents a question in an area where I believe the Congress can make a reduction in an appropriation estimate without interference with any substantial service to the people of the United States or to the agency of Government involved. The gentleman from New York has given you the figures. The Solicitor's Office had $1,200,000 for expenditure in the current fiscal year. The budget estimate for 1951 was $1,986,000. We recommended in the bill $1,861,000, which is $652,500 or so above the appropriation available for expenditure in the current fiscal year, and represents only a reduction of $125,000 below the budget estimate.

This entire amount of increase for all practical purposes to the Solicitor's Office is tied to the increase in the Wage-Hour Division, and the entire basis and justification for all practical purposes for this alleged increase is the alleged amount of extra work necessary in the Solicitor's Office because of the passage of the amended wage-and-hour law in the last session of Congress.

There is a deficiency before this committee for the current fiscal year which the committee has not yet passed upon, and until the committee passes upon that deficiency relating to the service for the present fiscal year I do not see how Congress can intelligently say what the needs are for the next fiscal year.

The Solicitor's Office and the Wage-Hour Division have gotten along up to this very hour without any deficiency or supplemental appropriation. Yet the estimates for 1951 are based upon the assumption that their deficiency estimate would have been granted long, long ago by the Congress. The amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is hitched irrevocably to the appropriation for the Wage-Hour Division. When that appropriation paragraph comes before the Congress I am going to offer an amendment to reduce it. The committee arbitrarily reduced the budget request 25 percent. But I will explain to you and show the tremendous increases in employees and expendable funds for fiscal year 1951 which are involved because they say Congress passed a new minimum-wage law.

Some additional duties are placed upon them as a result of the law. But when you examine the facts, the testimony, and the evidence, there is no justification in this record either for the increase requested by the Solicitor's Office beyond what is granted in the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas, and certainly no justification for the tremendous increase in the Wage-Hour Division. It contemplates a 100-percent increase in their total inspection force and doubles the appropriation practically over what it was last year. On the evidence before the committee, the number of employees covered under the new wage-hour law is about 1,500,000. Of that, they took no consideration for nearly a million employees who are left out of coverage under the amended law. So the additional employees they would have to service would be about 500,000 out of a total force that they are servicing today under their present appropriation.

I say that in line with the policy which I have always tried to follow, here is an opportunity to effect a reduction in the budget estimate without any substantial interference with the rights of any public citizen, and without interfering wih the responsibilities of the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to close debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, as was stated by the gentleman from Wis-

consin [Mr. KEEFE], we, as a committee, have allowed the Solicitor's Office an increase of $652,000 over the 1950 appropriation. But that is not all as a result of the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act that this Congress passed last year. The budget had asked for 137 new jobs, of which 125 would be for the work to be done under the wage-hour law, and 12 for the Davis-Bacon law. When we had this estimate before us, we knew that it was a new, or revised, program, and we thought when they came in with this very sizable increase that they were asking for too much, and we cut them about 25 percent. I think any cut of 25 percent in any item is a very sizable cut. If we are going to follow the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], he wants to cut an additional $436,000; that would allow an increase of only $216,000. Of this $216,000 increase, we have to allocate for Ramspeck promotions, $11,700; the Pay Act, $48,000; or a total of $59,700. That is something we cannot touch.

On the Walsh-Healey public contracts, in the wage revision program, we started this program last year, and we hope to be able to complete it this coming year. They have asked for an increase of $29,000 to carry on the program that we authorized a year ago.

The increase for 1951 in the Davis-Bacon Act is $50,000. That is something we cannot do much about. This is the responsibility of the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor, to make these wage determinations on a local area basis, for construction work done by or aided by the Federal Government. That is the reason for the huge increase from 9,000 to 18,000 wage determinations this year, because of the Hospital Construction Act, the Housing Act, and other Federal programs involving contract construction.

With this amount taken out by the amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER, it would leave an increase of only about $77,000, which would mean about a 75-percent cut in this new wage-hour program. We realize it is a new program, but we as a Congress passed this law a year ago, setting a 75-cent minimum wage. When any new program is being started there is always a lot of confusion. There are a tremendous number of interpretations that have to be made. Even if we allowed what we have, we are only going to allow them to make in the neighborhood of 50,000 inspections a year. A year ago, for the fiscal year 1949, when we had the 40-cent-minimum-wage law they were able to investigate only 30,000 establishments.

Ninety percent of those investigations were made upon complaint; they were not going around soliciting business. We found in those few inspections that were made that well over $12,000,000 was due to employees in the plants that were inspected; and out of the $12,000,000 that was found due, only $4,000,000 was given back voluntarily by the employers to the employees. But with the passage of the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act the Government sues in behalf of the employee who is not getting his just due, sues for back wages or overtime payments; and this is going to mean a tremendous amount of work for the Solicitor's Office. I honestly think that this is one Office that has been overworked. They are getting way behind in their work. It is not work that they asked for; it is work that they are compelled to do because of legislation passed by the Congress, and because of action of other governmental agencies.

I sincerely hope that this amendment will be voted down, because we have already cut the increase about 25 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired; all time on the pending amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 79, noes 76.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. SCRIVNER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 130, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will a point of order lie at this point against any phraseology under the heading of Office of the Secretary?

The CHAIRMAN. No, because that paragraph has been passed and we have already had amendments on the subsequent paragraph.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the last word with me is this: We are trying our best to vote economy here, and it seems to me that the Democratic Party does not want any economy. At least that is the way they vote for more money for this and that. They talk economy but vote more money.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not to exceed $75,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits; and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards when called by the Bureau with the written approval of the Secretary; $714,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that part of the section on line 6, page 118, beginning with the words "and expenses of attendance" down to and including the words "written approval of the Secretary" on line 9, on the ground that it involves additional duties on the part of the Secretary, and is therefore legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the previous points of order made to other sections in this bill which were sustained, I am in a position where I have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the language quoted by him, and the gentleman from Rhode Island concedes the point of order; therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 118, line 6, after the semicolon, insert "and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 64, noes 67.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. KEATING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 111, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In carrying out the provisions of said act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall apply.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 121, after line 24, add the following paragraph:

"None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment at the request of some of the Members, including the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] The same amendment has been carried in previous bills when the employment security program was under the Federal Security Agency.

The purpose of the amendment is to continue next year a provision which was applicable to the employment security

grant funds in the current fiscal year 1950 Appropriation Act.

When the appropriations for this purpose were made last year, they were included under the Social Security Administration. The bill for some years has carried language, identical with that in the amendment, under the Social Security Administration, and applicable to the various Social Security grant programs. It is continued in the pending bill as section 208 of general provisions, at page 150 of the bill. Subsequent to the passage of the 1950 bill, the Reorganization Plan transferring the Bureau of Employment Security to the Department of Labor was adopted. In making up the budget for 1951, the Bureau's estimates were, of course, placed in the Labor Department section of the budget, but the language contained in this amendment was not transferred and continued applicable to the grants for employment services and unemployment compensation agencies in the States. The provision has been carried in the bill for a number of years, and since it still applies to the other grant-in-aid programs under social security, and applies to this one during the current year, it should be inserted here in order to avoid any possible question on the matter.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee when this amendment was first introduced into the legislation by the distinguished former Member from Virginia, Mr. Harris, I fully concurred in the necessity for the inclusion of this language in the bill. It has been carried in the bill for a number of years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 38), including personal services in the District of Columbia; reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered; and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour Division when called by the Division with the written approval of the Secretary; $9,396,400.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph and against the language in lines 15 to 19, on page 123, reading "and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour Division when called by the Division with the written approval of the Secretary" on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I suppose this is the same story. The point of order will have to be sustained, but I cannot understand why these points of order are being made, because I think it was at the request of many Members of Congress that in order to keep some control of these travel allowances and attendances at meetings, if we had someone specifically to put our finger on, like the Secretary of Labor or the head of any agency, that we could have some control of the matter. But if they want to knock these things out on a point of order, I cannot prevent it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that this language on page 123 is very materially different from the language against which a point of order was made in the previous sections of this bill. I understood that the point of order with respect to some other provisions in previous sections of the bill was sustained upon two grounds; namely, that it constituted legislation on an appropriation bill, and that it imposed additional duties not prescribed by existing law upon the individual. In this case all that is provided is what has been included in previous bills as long as I can remember permitting payment of expenses of cooperating officials at conferences concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour Division when called by the Division with the written approval of the Secretary. It seems to me that there is no requirement that the Secretary make rules and regulations and other affirmative acts on his part which were the provisions objected to and against which points of order were made heretofore.

I feel that this is very important limiting language in this bill which limits the expenditure to only those instances approved by the Secretary of Labor. I believe it would be a mistake to eliminate this language from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The question, of course, is not whether the language is desirable; the question submitted to the Chair is whether the language is in order under the rules of the House.

The gentleman from Wisconsin calls attention to the fact that similar language may have been carried in previous bills. That, of course, may be true; and, perhaps, no point of order was made against such language in previous bills. But the Chair invites attention to the fact that the language here very clearly imposes duties upon the Secretary in that he is required to give written approval. If that were already provided by existing law there would, of course, be no point in having that language included in this appropriation bill.

The Chair is constrained to the view that at least part of the language against which the point of order is pressed by the gentleman from New York does constitute legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 123, line 15, after the word "rendered", insert "and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour Division."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that this is an entirely different situation. We have in the past had much difficulty trying to keep up with the travel and attendance at meetings when there was no particular person responsible. We included this language in the bill in an effort to insist that one man be made responsible. In that way we could do something to keep these agencies from running hog-wild all over the country and all over the world. That has been the reason, as I say, for carrying this language in this item.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted, because it is needed as an economy measure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in making these points of order and then opposing these amendments is to cut down on the extent to which these Federal officials are running all over the country making speeches, a large number of them political in nature.

We are now concerned with the Wage and Hour Division. It is the same old story. The Secretary of Labor and his subordinates are engaged in the same political activity as the other officials. They probably have some legitimate reasons for travel and, of course, regardless of whether the words "with the written approval of the Secretary" are retained, the responsibility devolves upon the Secretary of any Government department to watch those expenditures. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] pointed out to us the other day that there is something like $356,000,000, over one-third of a billion dollars, in these appropriation bills for travel expenses for the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government. A large part of this is not necessary.

If there were not some reason for going beyond the normal operations of the Government departments we would not find in any of these appropriation bills these provisions for expenses covering attendance at various conferences. The very inclusion of those provisions shows it is intended to give the various department and agency heads authority to do things which could not legally be done in the absence of such language.

For that reason, and in an effort to reduce the inordinately large provisions that are in all of these chapters for the various Government departments, this amendment is opposed. I hope it will be defeated like the last similar amendment was defeated. Only by vigorous and continued opposition to these unnecessary expenditures can we hope to make any headway at all in reducing the cost of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 77, noes 84.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. KEATING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 136, noes 109.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, now that we are considering this section of the bill, I think it highly pertinent that I should discuss a matter that disturbs me greatly. Each day brings an increasing number of letters protesting the international trade policy of the administration. Only yesterday I received a letter from the Libby Shoe Co. of my home town of Salem, Mass., which I quote in part:

> We have lost orders due to the fact that shoes which are being made in Czechoslovakia are being sold in this country to retail at $1.98 and $2.98. We cannot compete with these prices.
>
> This should ordinarily be our busy season on play shoes, however we are laying off workers due to this heavy competition in foreign made shoes. They are really hurting our business, as they are being sold for way below what we can make them for.

Mr. Chairman, although I recognize there may be regional differences in this country in regard to international trade, it is difficult for me to accept the proposition that we should support a satellite of Soviet Russia to the detriment of our own industries. Leaders of the shoe, hat, fish, and textile industries of my district are tremendously worried about the future. This policy by the administration is inconsistent and incongruous, with our general welfare, and should be stopped immediately before it is too late. The tragic story of Haverhill, Mass., prior to the war, with some 19 major shoe factories idled because of a flood of Czech made shoes, must not be repeated.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman has told about a situation confronting the people in his district, who are having great difficulty with the importation of shoes from Czechoslovakia. May I also remind the gentleman and the House that in Connecticut in addition to foot covering we are having a great deal of difficulty with the other end of the person, namely, the head, because a great many hats are coming in from beyond the iron curtain.

There is total unemployment and part-time employment in Danbury and Norwalk, great hat centers, caused by the influx of hats and hat bodies from beyond the iron curtain, namely, Czechoslovakia. It may be of interest to know that a trainload of persons affected by this administration policy is coming to Washington on May 9 to make a presentation before the Tariff Commission with the intent of doing something about restraining these hats and other materials from coming in from beyond the iron curtain.

I also call attention to the fact that earlier today I obtained permission to extend my remarks and include an editorial dealing with the identical problem, captioned "Absurd and intolerable." I commend it to the House.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I sincerely trust the Tariff Commission will take some action to correct this situation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from Massachusetts is to be congratulated. He has made a fine statement. The same effect that the gentleman from Massachusetts as well as the gentleman from Connecticut have described in their district is felt in practically every district in the United States with reference to some item or another. In my district we are feeling the ill effects of the importation of metals from foreign countries produced by cheap labor. As a result thousands of miners have been thrown out of employment in the great Tri-State mining district of southwest Missouri, southeastern Kansas, and northeastern Oklahoma. We simply cannot compete with that cheap labor abroad.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I appreciate very much the remarks made by the gentleman. The situation is getting to be intolerable in the little State which I undertake to represent here in the Congress of the United States, namely, Vermont.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House. This situation is reflected in the bill which is now under consideration.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Precisely.

Mr. KEEFE. The unemployment compensation reserve in States like Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Massachusetts are being threatened. The effect of it is going to spread all over the Nation. The question is if these State funds become insolvent what is the Congress of the United States going to do for the unemployed who are walking the streets in many States including the State of Massachusetts? What are we going to do to relieve that situation? It is a very critical matter which has been brought to our attention by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 123, line 19, strike out "$9,396,400" and insert "$8,000,000".

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I think this is again a situation which involves a reduction of expenditure at a point and in an area where absolutely no injury or harm can come to the Department itself and certainly no injury or harm can come to the people of the United States. Let me call your attention to the situation which is involved. In the present fiscal year in which we are operating there was made available to the Wage and Hour Division for expenditure $5,391,100. The Wage and Hour Division has done a pretty good job in making the inspections which the Congress felt were sufficient in order to see that the minimum-wage law had a reasonable policing throughout the Nation. The testimony has been for several years that they made their inspections largely upon the basis of complaint, and while of the complaint cases there is a relatively large number of violations disclosed in the over-all number of employers in the country and employees under the jurisdiction of the law, the total number of complaints is relatively very, very insignificant because their figures of percentage apply very largely to complaint cases.

We passed a new minimum-wage law, raising the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents. Under that law we covered about 1,500,000 additional people who were not previously covered, and we released from coverage about a million who were covered under the old law.

On the basis of the passage of that law, the Wage and Hour Division and the Budget recommended an appropriation of $10,587,000, almost exactly a 100-percent increase, which they asked to administer the new wage-and-hour law.

The committee discussed that situation, and I think it was unanimously agreed that there could be no justification for any such tremendous increase as that. I think any fair-minded individual will say that they made no justification for any such tremendous increase, 100 percent—increasing the inspectors from about 500 to over 1,000 to be put on the pay roll. The situation was a little unclear because at the same time we were considering this item of appropriation we were considering a deficiency or supplemental appropriation that had been submitted by the Department covering the balance of the fiscal year 1950, in which they were presently operating. The committee heard that testimony and the committee has taken no action up to date upon that supplemental request. That was a long time ago when that testimony was taken. I think the testimony clearly disclosed that they were asking for enough additional personnel to be put on the pay roll between that time and June 30 that would build their pay roll up to over a thousand in the present fiscal year, and then carry that doubling of personnel and expenditures through the entire fiscal year 1951. The Congress and the subcommittee, let alone the full committee, has not passed upon that supplemental estimate. How they are implementing their work down there now, I do not know, but if they are putting these additional men to work, as they said they

would do when they testified, they are running into a very definite and large deficiency, and, in my humble opinion, they are doing it in violation of the anti-deficiency law.

It seems to me, in view of the fact that the subcommittee has not yet determined the amount and number of employees that it will permit them to put on for the balance of the current fiscal year, it is asking too much of me as a member of the committee to say that I want you to vote to appropriate the money for the next fiscal year to carry on the roll for the entire fiscal year an indefinite and unknown and uncertain number of employees, who are to be put on the pay roll for the present fiscal year.

I do not know whether I have made myself clear or not, but I want to say to you that in my humble opinion—and I have been dealing with that Department now for 11 years, and I have great confidence in Mr. McComb, head of the Wage and Hour Division—this is the first time in my experience when we have run into anything like this. To come in and ask for a complete doubling of their force, in view of the passage of a new amended wage-and-hour law, is a complete absurdity. The committee could not stomach it, and so cut it 25 percent. Without any yardstick to measure the thing by, they cut it 25 percent. I went along with that. I moved in the committee to cut it 50 percent. That would give these people a tremendous increase over what they had for expenditure this year, would enable them to put on hundreds of new inspectors under the proposal which I made. But, no; the committee just arbitrarily cut it 25 percent and let it go at that. I say to you in all fairness, in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, that here is the chance where we can cut this and do it without disturbing any essential public service. There ought not to be political division upon this issue; there should not be. This is a matter that concerns everyone. Why because of the passage of the 75-cent minimum-wage law should there be a 100-percent increase in the inspection force of the Wage and Hour Division? They say that the child-labor provisions of the present law have simplified the situation over what they were under the old law. What they are proposing to do is to send a force of these inspectors all over the United States, not acting on a spot-check basis, not acting on a complaint basis, but they want to inspect some sixty-odd percent of all the establishments in the United States. You are going to hear from your people on this thing, believe me; you will hear from them when this thing gets into motion. I think they can do a grand job of administering this new law. All of the basic findings and regulations have been written, all of the material with respect to the education of employers and employees as to their rights has been done for years. You do not have to retrace those steps. I think this is simply a brazen attempt on the part of this Department to put on hundreds of new employees with no real basis of showing to the committee the necessity.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. While a million and a half additional persons were covered under the 75-cent minimum-wage law, a million people were uncovered by that law, so there is only an increase of about 500,000.

Mr. KEEFE. I so stated.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make an appeal to my friends over here on the right: Do not just arbitrarily when you go through tellers or stand up, vote for this thing as a political question. I have been dealing with this question for 11 years and I never considered it to be a political question. Sure; you can vote to put on 500 new employees, if you want to. Sure; you can vote to send these people all over the United States into this plant, that plant, and the other plant where it is absolutely not necessary. Sure; an appeal can be made that we are going to see to it that these employees under this law recover all their wages and overtime, and bring suits, and so on, against employers to see that they are compelled to do it. But I say, Mr. Chairman, that under the amendment which I have offered to give them $8,000,000—which is 33 percent more than they had this year—we are dealing very, very liberally with the Wage and Hour Division.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to use the 7 minutes himself?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Rhode Island proceeding for two additional minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is practically the same proposition that we voted on earlier in the day when an amendment was offered to cut the Solicitor's Office for the Department of Labor.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will cut out $1,396,400 which together with the substantial cut already made by the committee is an approximate 65 percent cut below the budget request for this item. I realize that they did ask for a tremendous increase over what they had available in the year 1950, and I also tried to make plain in my previous statement, in reference to the Solicitor's Office, that this increase of practically 100 percent was not confined to just the new amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act that we passed last year. I pointed out that some of the money was necessary to carry out other provisions administered by this division. Some of these are mandatory costs, including the pay raise, the Ramspeck promotions, and so forth, which make a total of $516,000, the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, and the wage-revision program that we allowed last year, which will be finished in the coming fiscal year, amounting to $256,000, a grand total of about $772,000. That has nothing to do with the amendments to the wage-hour law.

What is left for the wage and hour amendments? Only about $1,836,000, under the amendment offered.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] if adopted will mean a cut in this budget of about 65 percent. We knew when the budget was offered to us and when we were holding hearings that they were asking too much. We knew that this is a new program, but the program is in effect. It went into effect last January 25. Of course they had to do something about it when they were receiving requests from manufacturers all over the country to determine whether they were within the law. There is not a legitimate business concern in this country that is against the provisions of the wage-and-hour law or the Fair Labor Standards Act. The only complaints that we hear are about the illegitimate business concerns. They are the ones who are causing the complaints. Most of the inspections being made are inspections that are made on complaint from legitimate business concerns of a concern next door not paying the prevailing scale of wages or not living up to the 40-hour week. Those are the complaints that are being investigated.

As I pointed out a short while ago, even though under the 40-cent minimum-wage law and with the small number of inspections made in 1949, they only covered about 30,000 establishments out of a projected total that could be investigated under the act of 550,000 or more and they found in those few inspections that retributions to be made to the employees amounted to $12,500,000. They were willing to pay back to these employees $4,500,000 or an average of $400 per case where complaint was issued and they were found to be not living up to the law.

I think that is something that we have to realize here, and, like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I appeal to this side of the aisle to not walk up in a solid front and vote against it just because this is the Department of Labor. This is a wage and hour law that you passed last year. Many of you on that side of the aisle voted for it and most of us on this side of the aisle voted for it. If we want the law to work we have got to give those who administer the law the tools to work with. Let us not kid ourselves about that. If we do not want this law to work, let us cut out the entire appropriation and be honest about it if we do not want the law at all.

We had witnesses before our committee on the 25th of January, the week that this law took effect, who testified at that time that they had had 3,000 applications for apprentices and learners, applications to pay a wage lower than the 75-cent minimum wage. They had thousands of inquiries from management all over the country to determine whether or not they were coming under and meeting the requirements of the amended act. Of course, they had to put on some new men, and they testified back in January that they had put on 50 additional personnel to handle this load, and they

cannot keep up with it now. That is something real that we are facing. The committee took action. Our committee has not been giving everything that the budget has allowed to these departments, but I repeat again that we cut the Wage and Hour Division in the bill that we offer you this afternoon. It comes to you under a cut of about 25 percent from the budget increase. The amendment that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, offers for your consideration now is a cut of 65 percent of what the Bureau of the Budget allowed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, the purpose of the appropriation is not only to protect the employees but to protect the legitimate and honorable businessmen against unscrupulous competitors. I know I have received complaints from friends of mine who are in business, who are complying with the law, and they tell me of competitors in the same neighborhood who are not complying with the law, and it gives the unscrupulous competitor an advantage over the honorable businessman.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. And I submit to you that a 25-percent cut is a pretty deep cut. I think we would be going entirely too far in voting for a 65-percent cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. KEEFE.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 102, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 102 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, for the reasons heretofore stated with regard to similar sections.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the same provision that has been offered before, and it is the same one that was defeated just a short while ago. I will have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order and the gentleman from Rhode Island concedes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 123, after line 20, insert the following paragraph:

"SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 93, noes 64.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it has impressed me that the RECORD ought to disclose some basic facts with respect to this functional budget we now have before us which indicates the difficulty the Committee on Appropriations has in dealing with the items for travel, communications, printing, and binding. For the many years that I have been privileged to serve on the Committee on Appropriations those items with respect to each department of Government used to be considered as separate, specific items. You could put your finger on the amount of money which was being expended for travel by any one of the bureaus, for example, the Federal Security Agency or the Department of Labor or any other department of the Government. You could put your finger on the very amount that was being expended for printing and binding or for communications or for other services.

Now the situation is that the members of the Committee on Appropriations do not have any knowledge at all or any control so far as I can see over this situation because of the very provisions of law in the act. We authorize them to take any of the money that is appropriated for personal services and expend it for printing and binding or travel or communications. So you have this situation, that the total amount which is expended for travel of $355,583,000, and so on down the line cannot be broken down so that you can put your finger on any item showing just exactly which one of the agencies is spending this money and for what. It is all spent under the general authority contained in this so-called functional budget. I find that the amount that is being expended for travel is steadily going up. The Federal Security Agency travel in 1949 was $3,000,000. In 1950 it was estimated at $3,000,000, and in 1951, $4,000,000. The same rate of increase appears in the Labor Department and other agencies of the Government. If you asked me, I could not tell you how much money is actually being spent and where it is being spent and in what department of Government. If you asked me how much the Wage and Hour Division is spending for travel or for printing and binding, I could not tell you. Is that not an absurd situation? You are going to have to deal with it some of these days, and how you will deal with it, I do not know. I am taking this time to point out to the proper legislative committee somewhere that they ought to deal with this problem of transportation, travel, communications, and printing and binding. Those items are becoming so great that they will consume you before long.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TABER. For this current fiscal year the traveling expense of the Government is $356,000,000, and it is going up by leaps and bounds.

Mr. KEEFE. I just called attention to that figure. I do not know how you are going to control it when you adopt language such as is contained in this section of the bill, that all appropriations made for personal services, any part of them, may be spent for travel, any part of it may be spent for printing and binding. You have a general provision in this bill to that effect. Where you are going to have any control over it is beyond me.

Mr. TABER. And it is going up.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. The door is wide open. So what is the use of talking about the meticulous care with which we appropriate this money? We appropriate for personal services, and then we put a provision in the bill that they can spend whatever they want to for travel, for printing and binding, or what not. Then when we scan the green sheets, if we ever get them, to see what personnel is included, we think we have done a good job. But, as a matter of fact, here is $355,000,000 being spent for travel, and nobody, in my opinion, in connection with this bill has justified the expenditure of a dollar of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have walked up and down this aisle all day on this proposition of trying to stop this country from spending a third of a billion dollars. And for what? I think it is obvious to everybody. I do not object to legitimate travel for the different Secretaries. I do not know as I object to the gentleman who runs the Department of Agriculture going all through the West to sell them another story like he did last year. But I think the people, in Massachusetts at least, do not approve of spending a third of a billion dollars—$356,000,000 to be exact, which is more than a third of a billion. I think the people of the country are getting sick and tired of it.

I will be in here next week to get a million dollars to take care of some rivers and harbors that have been plugged up for the last 20. years. You know where I will get—you people who are spending a third of a billion dollars. I will get nowhere. But I will get further on the stand that we take of stopping these unnecessary appropriations. We have enough to do without paying these "biggies" for traveling all over the country trying to sell some plan that is going to cost us more money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Labor Department will be extremely glad if we stop this great avalanche of imports that is coming in from Czechoslovakia, a country that has insulted us steadily; imports of cotton and woolen textiles

coming in from Japan; imports coming in from Russia, a country that likes to snap its fingers at us deliberately. Stop those imports from coming in and there would not have to be so much traveling around by the Department of Labor to find ways of increasing employment.

We all know that in the last year unemployment has increased instead of decreased, in spite of all the efforts that have been made to improve the situation.

Stop these imports from coming in; stop the help you are giving other countries that do nothing but slap us in the face in return and you will have your employment question settled in favor of American workers and American industry instead of foreign workers and foreign industry.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. The Secretary, if he finds it necessary for the practical and efficient operation of the Department, shall have the authority to transfer funds from any appropriation made available under this title for salaries and expenses to any other such appropriation, but no appropriation shall be either increased or decreased more than 5 percent by such transfers: *Provided*, That any such transfers shall not be used for the purpose of creating new functions within the Department.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 106 on the ground that it causes additional duties to devolve upon the Secretary, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and for that reason should be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman point out the exact language to which he refers?

Mr. KEATING. I refer to the following language:

The Secretary, if he finds it necessary for the practical and efficient operation of the Department, shall have the authority to transfer funds from any appropriation made available under this title for salaries and expenses to any other such appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be recognized on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this language has been carried in previous appropriation bills and carried for one purpose, namely, to give the Secretary authority to get more efficient operation out of his Department. It allows him to transfer, within limits, funds from one agency of his Department to another with a view to efficiency of operation and economy in Government, and thus save money.

This is one way that we thought we could force the heads of the various agencies, and Cabinet members, to secure efficient operations within their own department. In view of the great economy drive that is on throughout the country we believe that this is one way—small though it is—that we could put the finger on one person to get efficient operation and not leave it to various committees of Congress to ferret out the inefficiency that may develop in some of these Government departments. If the provision is stricken I do not know where it is going to leave us. Some agency heads and some Cabinet members who have been very considerate in trying to get efficiency in their own department through use of such authority as this will probably throw up their hands and say: "If Congress does not want us to do it, let them reorganize the department themselves." Then we will find ourselves spending more money in the end by appropriating funds for various investigations for efficiency in these departments. In that way we will spend more of the taxpayers' money than if this language is allowed to remain in the bill.

Mr. KEATING. May I be heard further on the point of order and on the argument advanced by the gentleman from Rhode Island?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Rhode Island has not addressed himself as much to the point of order as to the merits of the proposal. I only want to say in reply that all of these authorizations for juggling funds within a Government department are designed for one purpose and one only. That is to assure that the money is not spent for the specific purpose stated by the Congress and there is a little something left over which could go back to Uncle Sam, the money may be used by some other division of that Government department. They do not want to take any chance that any of the appropriated funds shall be saved for the benefit of the harassed taxpayers by getting out of the hands of the particular Secretary involved.

The purpose of the provision is not one of economy. The purpose of the provision is in order to be sure to spend all of the money that is provided in this particular chapter. I call attention to the fact that clearly there are additional duties resting upon the Secretary if we adopt this provision. If that were not so, then it would not be here at all. It is subject to a point of order, in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against section 106 appearing on page 124. The Chair has examined the language and has listened attentively to the argument presented. While the Chair is of the opinion that a transfer of funds might be in order, yet it does appear that the first two lines of the section confer discretionary authority upon the Secretary and imposes additional duties upon him to the extent that the Chair is of the opinion it does constitute legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House and sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 124, line 13, insert "Sec. 106. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation in this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is legislation upon an appropriation bill in that it gives authority to somebody else to perform a budgetary act in a department. It goes beyond the pale of a direct appropriation or a limitation and it gives authority to the department to transfer funds. That authority does not exist without this language and it is clearly a delegation of additional duties to the department that do not already exist. It is neither a limitation nor an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Rhode Island has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island and has listened to the argument presented by the gentleman from New York. The Chair is of the opinion that the language contained in this amendment does not constitute legislation, and invites attention to section 1468 of Cannon's Precedents, volume 7, in which it is stated:

A proposition to transfer a sum previously appropriated from one subhead to another in the same enactment was held not to constitute legislation.

There are quite a number of decisions cited in approval of that holding. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I think what I had to say when the point of order was raised to strike out the language prevails at this time. This is one way that we can enforce the suggestions by the committees of Congress that the heads of the various agencies of Government do something themselves and provide the efficiency in Government that we are looking for. It is one way to help accomplish that, and it is a cheaper way than having some of our investigative committees of the Congress, in supporting the proposition, appropriate for these various investigations. In this way, when the various heads of the agencies appear before the Committee on Appropriations, they can be examined on the authority given them to reorganize and produce efficiency in Government, and we can hold them responsible at that time. This is one way of getting some economy and efficiency in the operation of our various agencies of Government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a way to create economy and efficiency but a way to create extravagance and to permit departments to be sure and have the opportunity to use up every dollar that is appropriated and never turn back a cent. We have tried this out and it has always worked that same way. There is no sense whatever in our allowing money to be used for something that was not justified before the committee

of Congress that has charge of going into that question. It is kind of a cover-up job rather than legislation right out in the open where the Congress can see what it is doing.

I hope that this Congress will not attempt to continue that kind of an operation any longer. It always has resulted in waste and extravagance, it always will; so let us stop it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] if my recollection is correct that this provision or a similar provision has been carried in appropriation bills of the past?

Mr. FOGARTY. It has been in this bill for the past 2 or 3 years. I remember discussing this same provision just a couple of years ago; I do not recall just what year it was that this first went in the bill, but I think it was fiscal year 1949. We agreed to put this language in the bill because we thought that would be one way of getting more efficiency out of the various heads of the agencies, putting the finger on them.

Mr. McCORMACK. My recollection is that it has been in past appropriation bills, that there was no opposition to it then on either side, and that, in fact, when it was originally put in there was a lot of comment on both sides favorable to it.

I have before me section 106 of the fiscal year 1949 appropriation bill for Labor-Federal Security. The 1949 fiscal year was when, as the result of the unfortunate nose dive of the people, they temporarily put the Republicans in control of the House. I say this pleasantly, but it is historically correct.

May I read section 106 of the appropriation bill that came out of the committee of which my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. TABER] was chairman? Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Section 106:

> The Secretary, if he finds it necessary for the practical and efficient operation of the Department, shall have the authority to transfer funds from any appropriation herein made available for salaries and expenses to any other such appropriation, but no appropriation shall be either increased or decreased more than 5 percent by such transfers: *Provided*, That any such transfers shall not be used for the purpose of creating new functions within the Department.

I will be glad to yield to my friend from New York for any purpose, and particularly to ask my friend how he can reconcile his position now as a member of the minority party with what his position was on the fiscal year 1949, Labor-Federal Security bill, when this very provision was reported by the committee of which he was then chairman.

Mr. TABER. Some folks over on this side can learn something by experience.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that it?

Mr. TABER. We have learned, and we have learned that it is bad.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very frank confession. I dislike to hear my friend from New York make such an abject confession, because I could not conceive of his thinking he was right only 2 years ago and wrong today. This little colloquy engaged in by me in the most pleasant state of mind possible with the gentleman from New York shows that he opposes today what he proposed only 2 years ago, only then he was chairman of the committee and now he is the ranking minority member. All that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is doing is offering an amendment which is substantially the same as the gentleman from New York himself proposed as chairman 2 years ago. We Democrats are willing to recognize it whenever the Republicans do something good, and this is one of the few good things that they did when they were in control of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 87, noes 53.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> For payment of obligations incurred under authority provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction of an engineering building and women's dormitory units, $412,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, in the new presentation of the budget and the rather compressed time which we have to consider the various items for which the taxpayers' money is appropriated it has not been possible to make clear to some of the Members of the House some of the items for which we are appropriating money.

I want to take this time to call attention to two institutions in the city of Washington, Freedmen's Hospital and Howard University. Lest there be any misunderstanding, the money which we appropriate here for Freedmen's Hospital is not the entire sum upon which the hospital operates. Without going into all the facts and figures, they have a great number of pay patients, so that there is considerable income coming to the hospital for the use of its operation and maintenance. However, it is not self-supporting. It is used in adjunct to Howard University for its teaching staff and its medical school. Of course, for that reason the cost of operation in this hospital is higher than some of the hospitals with which it may be compared insofar as cost of operation is concerned. They are doing a very fine job in that hospital in training Negro doctors. Those men are going out throughout the United States, and many corners of the earth, and are performing a fine service for their people and the public.

Howard University is another institution that does not pay its own way. They do have a great number of students who are paying a substantial tuition fee, and that, together with some income from property which they own, is not enough to carry on the functions of the school and the construction program which has been authorized.

If you care to read the entire story you can find it at page 119 of the hearings. This university was first chartered by the Congress back in 1867. The first appropriation for assistance to this school amounted to only $10,000. Then finally it rose in 1928 from $10,000 to $218,000. Then finally the $218,000 in the fiscal year 1950 grew to $2,335,000, and you have a figure here today which is slightly in excess of that.

This being a congressionally chartered institution, I think there should be more interest taken in it by Members of Congress. If you would take the time to do so, you would be interested in visiting the Freedmen's Hospital and the campus of Howard University, and there you will see the fine type of young people who are seeking education so that they may fit themselves for greater service among their people.

Dr. Mordecai Johnson, the president of Howard University, deserves the commendation, which he has already received from this committee, of the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States for the fine work he is doing and the fine leadership he is giving to these young people.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I think it should be pointed out to these people who are against Federal aid to education that they are now voting for Federal aid to education in this Howard University.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course, Howard University cannot be used as an example for the proposed idea of blanket aid to education.

This is an institution that was chartered by the Congress. It is a Federal school and properly the recipient of Federal funds. Other schools are local, community schools, and therefore a different status entirely exists.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination, and the development of library service throughout the country; personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; $1,900,000, of which not less than $533,700 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 131, line 4, strike out "$1,900,000" and insert "$1,882,000".

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which will demonstrate the curse of Federal aid to education beyond all question. I have in my hand a publication gotten out by the Federal Security Agency, Office of Education. Amongst the items that are set forth on the front of the cover is this: "President's Picture, Special Insert." Then, inside the magazine was this picture of the President seated at his desk. You Democrats applaud. There is not an ounce of shame in the whole crowd. You seem to be proud of the fact that they are raiding the Federal Treasury to pay campaign expenses. Here it is: "To the Teachers and Pupils of the United States. Harry S. Truman."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not far worse than trying to get the general taxpayers to pay campaign expenses? To my mind, such propaganda at the expense of our schools and the attempt to infiltrate every school in America is reprehensible.

Mr. TABER. It is absolutely reprehensible; it indicates that it is not safe to have this Office of Education operating at all.

I have not tried to punish them by striking out the whole appropriation, which I believe I should do; I have only asked to take out the $1,500 a month that it takes for this particular publication and to cut out this particular paper. The President's picture inserted going out to everybody costs an additional $559. This was in the issue for December 1949, and this issue is No. 3 of volume 32.

I wish there could be an honest approach to problems of this kind; I wish that our people and our Representatives here elected by the people would not think of such a thing as trying to condone and apologize for this performance.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Does my good friend not know that his very good friend, the Governor of New York State, has sent out pictures to the school children of the Empire State?

Mr. TABER. If he has, that is no excuse; I do not condone any such performance as that.

Mr. McGRATH. Has the gentleman raised his voice in condemnation of Governor Dewey's action?

Mr. TABER. I have strictly supported every opportunity I could get to criticize anything that I might find that was irregular or improper. I did not know that particular thing. I have criticized anything of that character; I criticize it now, and I do not care which side of the fence my criticism lands on.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman state to what extent this pamphlet is circulated?

Mr. TABER. Yes; there are 9,500 copies sent to schools all over the United States.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman repeat the date of the publication?

Mr. TABER. December 1949.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted and that the House of Representatives will show its disapproval of such performances as these by the Federal Office of Education.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Does not the gentleman know that many publications in the State of New York, as well as congressional publications, have photographs of Members of Congress as well as the President that are circulated throughout the country?

Mr. TABER. There are no publications I know of that have the photographs of Members of Congress that I have had anything to do with. I do not regard it as good tactics, I do not regard it as honest, I do not regard it as American. I think it is absolutely the reverse of an American program that such a thing as this goes on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Commissioner of Education, I think, served the people of this country well when he sent the publication containing a picture of the Chief Executive of our land. I certainly want my children to know who is the President of the United States. I want them to be proud of that man who served his country in World War I. I want them to be very proud of that man who, when everybody said defeat was imminent, fought his way to victory.

Mr. Chairman, we are being just a little bit partisan when we talk about the picture of the President of the United States being sent around the country.

What does this amendment mean when we take politics out of it? It means absolutely nothing. The distinguished gentleman from New York knows that there has been a cut of $56,000 in this item below the 1950 level. I am sure that my very distinguished friend and colleague from New York, if the election returns had been different, would have stood on this floor and would have handed out pictures of President Dewey.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Let me say to the gentleman I would not. I would not have stood for it. I would have been ashamed if such a thing had been attempted. I would have opposed it just the same as I am opposing this thing here today. I do not waiver in any position I take on that question.

Mr. McGRATH. In answer to the gentleman, then I will expect him to go back to New York State and condemn our chief executive of New York for sending out, at public cost, his picture.

Mr. TABER. Oh, certainly, I will.

Mr. McGRATH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about that.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, whose President is Harry S. Truman, anyway? I remember as a boy in southern Indiana we hung the Governor's and the President's picture on the wall of our little one-room school house and it did not make any difference whether they were Democrats or Republicans. In those days he was generally a Republican.

I recall a yearbook gotten out in my State, at State expense, in which all of the public officials of the State had their pictures printed in it and it was sent to our schools. But that is not the main point I rose here today to call to your attention.

President Truman is the President of all the people in the United States. I speak as one, who every Member of this House knows, does not hesitate to stand up and vote with the opposition when I think the opposition is right.

Another point that I want to make on this floor is that after the people have gone to the polls and voted and they have elected a Chief Executive, I think that then the election is over and it is up to us to pay due respect to that man and to accept him as the President of the United States, be he Democrat or be he Republican, rather than to engage in the vitriolic hate that is voiced by the opposition constantly to hold the President of the United States up to ridicule and to try to inspire hatred and intolerance toward him.

I would like to say here today that we in this country had best begin to think upon our own record, if you please, because the intense hatred that is generated by such conduct is the soil out of which our record, in regard to our Presidents, has grown. Since the election of Abraham Lincoln, one out of every three of our Presidents has been the target of an assassin's bullet. How many of you ever thought about that? I submit it to you for some consideration in these times when you pick up certain newspapers in this country, when you can read them 365 days out of the year, and you will never find a single issue that carries a single story or an editorial that would leave the impression that the President of the United States had ever done anything except something that was little and mean and unworthy. I wonder if the people of the United States are so utterly stupid? Is that your position that the people of the United States are so utterly stupid that they cannot select a Chief Executive that is not worthy of a commendation just once from the Bertie McCormicks, Hearsts, the Gannetts, to say nothing of a couple of newspapers in my own district that have castigated the

President of the United States in almost every issue of their publications; always condemning, always castigating, always ridiculing, always caricaturing the President, our President, in a revolting manner. It is in that soil that grows the hatred that has made this record of ours that in the last 90 years one out of every three of our Presidents has been the target of an assassin's bullet.

Yes; think it over, gentlemen. It might be worthy of your consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman who just preceded me. In substance I agree with what the gentleman has said. I think, however, it is more or less a two-edged sword.

I remember the Republican Eightieth Congress. I was a Member of that Congress. I remember all the things we did which were good for America. Then I remember, after we had been in power for almost 2 years, there were more people at work at steady pay and better pay than ever before in the history of this Nation. I also know that the farmers had the highest income of any period in the history of America. Hence, the national income in 1948 was the highest of any year in the history of America. Things were in good shape.

Every Member of that Republican Congress, Democrat or Republican, was elected by the people. They were also the people's choice, just as the President is the people's choice.

Then I remember in the campaign of 1948 how one Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States, took it upon himself to try to prove to the people of America that the Members they had elected to Congress were the worst ever in the history of the Nation. He showered ridicule on the Members of Congress that had been elected by the American people. He said things that did not square with the truth day in and day out, and you all know it.

So I wonder who started this fight? I wonder who started this abuse the gentleman talks about? Everybody knows it was high-tax Harry himself.

In this America of ours we have learned, or many of us, at least, have learned that when you tell fairy tales about somebody you are liable to be hit on the nose, or you are liable to be told right back to your teeth a few things you may not like to hear. It is the duty of the party out of power to point out the mistakes and the inefficiencies of the party in power, whether it be directed at the President of the United States or some one else, then let the people be the judge at the polls, because that is what has kept America great. That is our two-party system in action. It is not mud-slinging so long as it is the truth, it is simply pointing out to the people the things that should be known. Certainly I for one am going to continue to say what I think, and I will stick with the truth, and the facts as I see them.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I have heard the word "assassin" used here. That is one of the most despicable acts, whether it affects this Government or any other government. As the gentleman was talking, I was thinking over who the men were who were assassinated. One of them was the sainted Lincoln, one was Garfield, and one was McKinley. They were not Democratic Presidents.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] might well have not made the observations he did with the inference that his remarks may have been intended to leave or that one might draw from his remarks. What the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] said about one out of three of the Presidents being assassinated since the Civil War or attempts upon their lives, is true. However, the gentleman from New York overlooks the fact that an attempt was made on the life of Theodore Roosevelt when he was addressing a gathering at Milwaukee. If I remember correctly although wounded he made his speech. I remember on a number of occasions a friend of mine who was present at that time telling me that he saw the blood dripping down the trouser leg of Theodore Roosevelt, showing the indomitable will power of Theodore Roosevelt. We also remember the attempt made on the life of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. I do not believe the mind of the man who attempts to assassinate a President or directs a gun or fires a bullet at a President of the United States is concerned whether that President is a Republican or a Democrat. Such a thing could only be done by a man whose mind is diseased and who wants to take the life of the Chief Executive of our country. The gentleman from New York upon revision of his remarks might well include the fact that attempts have been made upon the lives of other Presidents who although elected as members of the Democratic Party after election took office as the leader not of their party but as the Chief Executive of the United States of America.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Who was it that brought up this insinuation and this criticism of the political circulation of the picture of a President at public expense to the point where we are talking about assassination of Presidents? Who brought this matter of assassination up here this afternoon? It seems to me the way it has been brought into this debate is highly reprehensible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] is entitled to credit for the remarks that he made on the floor. They are naturally the result of the remarks made by my friend the gentleman from New York. However, his remarks were of a broader nature and were made with a larger view in mind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the amendment itself, I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is not opposed to the publication of the pamphlet but he is opposed to the fact that on a particular occasion or occasions in the publication of the pamphlet a picture of President Truman was included. The gentleman overlooks the fact that the pamphlet included the picture of the President of the United States. The fact that he is a Democrat and was elected by the people as a Democrat is purely incidental.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For liquidation of contractual obligations authorized by the Congress to be incurred during the fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal year for construction grants under part C, title VI, of the act, as amended, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended. Allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of $75,000,000. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the act, subject to the amount of the allotments available to the States for such purposes, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Wisconsin has had an amendment on the desk and sought recognition for the purpose of offering this amendment. Am I not entitled to offer the amendment, as a member of the subcommittee?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a matter of discretion with the Chair. The Chair will state that the first day this bill was taken up for consideration, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] came to the Chair and said he would offer an amendment to this provision, and the Chair promised to recognize him. The Chair feels the gentleman from Wisconsin would certainly want the Chair to keep his promise.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 136, line 20, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, a lengthy statement in support of this amendment is, in my opinion, unnecessary. The program has been fully discussed in previous debate by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. FOGARTY] and the ranking minority member, the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], as well as by myself and others.

Hospital construction is the first step in providing the answer to the pressing need of adequate medical care, particularly in the rural areas. The larger cities have been able to construct hospitals fairly adequate. The rural communities have almost unanimously been unable to do so.

A hospital today is not only the workshop for advanced medical science, but it is also the situs of a technical team of doctors, nurses, technicians, with delicate equipment that is necessary for advanced diagnostics or treatment.

The average physician in the small town has neither the specialized knowledge nor the economic ability alone to buy all of the necessary equipment and employ the necessary technical personnel to make available to his patients the many modern advancements of medical science.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. For the purpose of making some time this afternoon, I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the ranking minority member [Mr. KEEFE] and I supported this full amount of $150,000,000 in the subcommittee. We have been together on this entire public-health program. I, for one, as chairman of the subcommittee, want to say that I am willing to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in offering the amendment, and also the chairman of the subcommittee in accepting the amendment. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that reported this legislation, after becoming advised of the action of the committee, unanimously agreed that we would take this matter up with the committee, and I am sure you will find the 28 members of our committee complimenting you on this job which we feel is necessary.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Arkansas. He has been very effective in his support of this program. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin seek recognition?

Mr. KEEFE. Belatedly, I would like to have recognition from the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the desk and for some time have been seeking recognition by the Chair to offer it as a member of the committee as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is delighted to exercise the Chair's prerogative and recognize the gentleman to offer his amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GORE:

Page 136, line 17, strike out "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$125,000,000."

Page 136, line 2, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I may say to my colleagues that I have no great pride of authorship, and I am perfectly willing that my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] may have the privilege of offering the amendment which I stated to him when I discussed this thing on the floor with him that I had already drawn and proposed to offer under an agreement with the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The difficulty with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is that it does not go far enough. If you will read the section of the bill to which the amendment is offered, you will see that it has two parts: One relates to the increase in the amount of the cash appropriation to $100,000,000 and under my amendment to $125,000,000. The committee bill authorized cash money to liquidate previous contractual authority and authorizations, and only $100,000,000 is for fiscal year 1951. The fact of the matter is that they need $108,000,000 to liquidate the actual obligations for the fiscal year 1950. To cut that budget estimate from $125,000,000 to $100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951 is simply to invite a deficiency and does not amount to any saving at all. The only difficulty is that by so cutting it you tie the hands of the hospital authority in the allocation of those funds; so the amendment which I have offered as a substitute increases the amount of the direct authorization from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 to conform to the action of this House last October with which you are all familiar and in which you are interested. But it goes a step further, and in the same paragraph of the bill takes care of a situation which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee does not.

I would have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee if it did the job; but I think the amendment which I have submitted and which reflects the sentiment of all the people of this country who are interested in this program should be adopted. There is no need of just saying that we are going to save $25,000,000 by cutting the actual cash appropriation from $125,000,000 to $100,000,000, for we know now that they will need the full $125,000,000 of cash in the fiscal year 1951 to liquidate the obligations created under the authorization as it presently exists. So in discussing this matter with the hospital authorities and with those in charge of this great program and with the Surgeon General and everybody else, it seemed utterly clear that if they were to make their allotments to the States based upon the availability of only $100,000,000 when they know now that it will be at least $125,000,000, they are going to slow up this hospital construction program throughout the country and cast a blanket, if you please, over the activities of States and local communities that are interested in this program.

May I say to you that I hope that the committee will see fit to adopt the substitute which I have offered and which I have been prepared to offer for a long time, of which the gentleman from Tennessee had notice, in order to carry out and do that one job, the thing that is necessary to be done.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman from Tennessee offered his amendment and it is for $100,000,000 to restore $100,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee restores the contract authorization from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000.

Mr. TACKETT. And the gentleman's?

Mr. KEEFE. Mine simply takes care of that, plus the provision in the same paragraph for actual cash to liquidate the contract authorizations that it will be necessary to liquidate in the fiscal year 1951. In other words, what the committee did in order to show a saving was to just cut this thing $25,000,000 and make $100,000,000 the base of allocation of these funds rather than the $125,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I understand the situation to be that if the amount in the second part of the gentleman's amendment is not authorized, $125,000,000, in the first place we will not be meeting obligations the Government has already incurred plus some additional millions we know are going to be incurred under the program?

Mr. KEEFE. That is substantially correct.

Mr. BIEMILLER. In effect we would be welching upon the contracts into which the Government has already actually entered or is about to enter?

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, we have got to have the cash to liquidate the contractual authority on the jobs, the hospital construction projects that have heretofore been approved and are in process of either being built or in process of having the plans drawn. We cannot welch on the proposition and simply say to these people: Well, you do not need the $125,000,000. These people know what they are doing in this hospital thing. They are very frugal. They have not asked for a dollar that is not absolutely necessary to implement and carry out the spirit of this authorization program.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I might observe that when the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association appeared before a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the whole problem of hospital construction they were very lavish in their praise of the manner in which

the program is being administered and hoped it would be continued. I hope the gentleman's substitute will be adopted.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I am sorry that my able and distinguished friend from Wisconsin is disappointed that the gentleman from Tennessee was recognized to offer the amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman and I came into this Congress at the same time. The gentleman well knows the things that transpire on this floor in connection with these bills. The gentleman knows that I am the ranking member. When the gentleman said that he had an amendment, I told him a week or 10 days ago or about 2 weeks ago when I talked on the bill that I had the amendment already prepared and was going to offer it.

Would not the gentleman feel a little bit humiliated when he is not a member of this subcommittee and the agreement was had with the chairman of the subcommittee and with all the people who are interested in it that I offer this amendment that the gentleman is recognized in my place? Would not the gentleman himself feel a little bit humiliated? I think he would.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, again I express regret that the distinguished gentleman and friend of mine from Wisconsin is disappointed. This question of giving notice regarding an intent to offer an amendment is interesting because I have in my hand the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, April 4. While the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin was then ably discussing this problem and before he had mentioned the offering of an amendment, the gentleman from Tennessee arose and asked the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin to yield. I read the following colloquy:

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the statement of the gentleman and at the proper time in the consideration of the bill I expect to offer an amendment to restore the cut back to the budget item.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. I have such a proposal already prepared.

Now, just who served notice first, if that is important?

The gentleman from Wisconsin refers to the very pleasant fact that he and I came to Congress at the same time. There are other similarities and some differences. We took the oath upon the same day. There is the difference, if one had to be technical about the question of recognition, that my name begins with the letter "G" and his with the letter "K." There is one other similarity. We are both members of the Committee on Appropriations, and as such are entitled to priority of recognition during consideration of an appropriation bill over other of our colleagues who are not members of this committee. There is one other technical difference. I sit on the Democratic side of the aisle, and, as a member of the majority party, am entitled to priority of recognition over my able colleague from Wisconsin, a member of the minority party, under the parliamentary rules and practices of the House.

Now, as to the amendment. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute. His amendment provides the same amount of funds for hospital construction, and that is the thing that fixes the level of expenditures under this program for the following fiscal year. Now he includes another item which does not fix the level or extent of this program nor is it determinative of contractual authority for construction of hospitals. On the contrary, it is only for the purpose of liquidating the obligations which have already accrued or will accrue. Now the subcommittee determined that $100,000,000, which the gentleman now proposes to increase to $125,000,000, was sufficient to meet the contractual obligations. It is the same as we have in the veterans' program. We estimate the amount of appropriation that is necessary to meet the obligation to pay compensation to veterans. It is a question of an estimate; the obligation is fixed. This $100,000,000 may be slightly too much, I do not know. It is a figure agreed upon by the subcommittee as a sufficient amount to meet the contractual obligations and has no bearing upon the level of the program next year. I emphasize that the gentleman's substitute does not provide for the construction of our hospital more than does my amendment. In that respect, they are identical.

The amendment which I offer and which both the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Wisconsin agree to support does the job I think this Congress wants to do. In order to offer a substitute amendment, the gentleman from Wisconsin must have some little difference, as an identical amendment is not in order as a substitute for that which it duplicates, so he inserts an additional item which, in my opinion and in the opinion of the committee, does not need increasing. The question is whether the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee, who has been duly recognized for the purpose of offering such an amendment, or the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be adopted. Therefore, I ask that the substitute be voted down and the amendment which has been accepted by the chairman of the subcommittee be agreed to.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. May I call attention to the fact that we have some hospitals under construction and that an uncapped wall and exposed material is certainly a waste of money and material, too. I agree with the gentleman. May I also say as a member of the Committee on Rules that we have been very deferential to a number of Republicans who have presented bills and have allowed them to come out under their names. I was not a Member of the Eightieth Congress, so I do not know whether that happened then.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Ohio. This is not a partisan matter and I do not like to refer to it in that light. The gentleman from Wisconsin is an able man and has contributed valuable service here, and I regret that he has raised the issue of recognition. But, if you will refer to the RECORD of the Eightieth Congress, an instance in which a Democrat was recognized over a Member of the Republican Party of equal committee rank to offer vital amendments will be very, very hard to find. I do not like to discuss this important matter in that light. It is not a partisan question. This amendment I have offered will do the job that needs to be done, and the amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin offers as a substitute will do no more and is unnecessary.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and, inasmuch as there was no time available to me under general debate, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I am realistic enough to know what the situation is here and what the temper of the House is. However, I do take this occasion to rise to support the report of the committee, finding myself in a very strange position, since I'll probably be the only committee member doing so.

At the outset, I want to say to any of these members who are concerned that the action of the committee absolutely protects any hospital that has already been started and is under construction. Any statement that this action of the subcommittee as proposed would stop any construction under way is absolutely wrong.

In the consideration of this section I do not want to be accused of not having any heart, for my heart is as big as anybody's. I have put in a lot of time in hospitals myself. I have had members of my family in hospitals. Some of my very dearest friends are members of the medical profession. Yet I wish the committee would bear with us who feel as we felt when the report was made, when we were taking a calm, detached, unbiased view of the entire presentation, as we explain our point of view.

You recall that originally the hospital construction bill provided for an authorization of $75,000,000 a year. Then, as has been pointed out, last year another bill was passed in which two things were done. First, in an unprecedented action which absolutely bypassed the Appropriations Committee this Congress directed that there be $75,000,000 in contract authorizations in addition to the $75,000,000 we made available in 1950 through action of the Appropriations Committee and the House. That, of course, tied the hands of the Appropriations Committee as far as contract authorization is concerned for the fiscal year 1950. That is an accomplished fact. It is done, so that in all realism and fairness we must recognize the fact that through that supplementary action the construction authorization for the fiscal year 1950 is $150,000,000. That is a bill that must be met and paid. There is no quibbling about it. It is done.

The rest of the bill provided solely this, that there is authorized to be appropriated in each of the succeeding 5 years, $150,000,000.

If merely authorizing the appropriation of $150,000,000 is an obligation and ties the hands of Congress, why have an Appropriations Committee? If that were true, then every bill passed by this body and the other body, becoming law, authorizing the appropriation would mean that the money was going to be spent regardless of any action or control through appropriations. That just is not so. That is not proper legislative procedure.

There has been some comment here about what has been done. I checked with General Scheele, the Public Health Surgeon, and a very fine gentleman he is, as to whether or not any word had gone out to any of the States authorizing them to enter into contracts for the construction of hospitals beyond the period of 1950. He assures me in a letter I have here that the Public Health Service has not made any commitments which legally bind the Federal Government to provide funds for hospital construction for the fiscal year 1951 or future fiscal years. It is just that simple.

It may be that some of these State agencies or localities, not knowing that you must have appropriation control over the funds if you are ever going to get rational control of expenditures, may have assumed that all of that would be done, but the Surgeon General and every Federal agency knows that there is no money available until it has been appropriated by Congress, and each community should know that.

Before I go on to the committee report, let me first point out that the appropriation bill for 1951 does carry $100,000,000 cash to apply on contracts already authorized for the hospitals under construction. Of course, you all know, and everybody should know, if $100,000,000 is not enough, next spring the Public Health Service has a perfect right to come in and say, "You did not give us enough money. We need more money to pay these bills." It is an obligation that we must meet. There is no quibbling about that.

When they came before us in January, this is what the testimony showed. Let it be understood clearly that in each of these years since 1943 we have authorized contracts in the sum of $75,000,000 for hospital construction. Of course, there is always a lag, so that the first year we allowed $10,000,000 to pay the bills. The next year we allowed a little more and the next a larger amount.

When they came before this committee this January they had on hand, unspent, $65,000,000 out of $95,000,000 cash already appropriated to pay contract obligations. That meant with the $100,000,000 here, from January to the end of the fiscal year, there is $165,000,000 to pay bills on contracts already entered into. I submit, with that showing, it was perfectly reasonable and proper for the committee to take that action of estimation that $100,000,000 cash was sufficient. We found that the rate of expenditure on hospital construction was about $6,000,000 a month. There is always a lag, so that we felt and the committee says on page 98:

> While we recognize the need for hospital facilities and have fully supported all requests for these programs in the past, we also felt we had another obligation to recognize that there is a limit of availability of Federal funds.

This year we are running nearly $6,000,000,000 in the red. The deficit is going to be even greater the next fiscal year. We felt, in an honest and sincere desire to fulfill our duties as Members of the House, that we were perfectly justified, in view of the financial condition of the Government, to return to our previous practice of authorizing $75,000,000 a year. You and I know that merely because Congress authorizes $150,000,000 in the substantive legislation it does not mean Congress has to appropriate that much. If that is true then you might just as well wipe out the Committee on Appropriations and save time, trouble, and expense of the Appropriations Committee. It is just that simple.

We know this year the backlog from the $75,000,000 program is going to start catching up with us. We have to appropriate at least $100,000,000 to fulfill our obligations which have already been entered into. Nobody is going to welsh on those agreements and nobody has even suggested it.

We know next year without any increase in authorization, there will have to be appropriated between $125,000,000 and $150,000,000 to pay on the current contracts and the backlog that has not yet been paid for. We are going to be faced each succeeding year, until the expiration of the supplemental act 5 years from now, with the necessity of appropriating between $100,000,000 and $125,000,000 a year for this hospital construction program. If you go ahead and fulfill the request for the entire $150,000,000 before we are through we will have engaged in a program which will cost this Nation over a billion dollars in borrowed money on which you pay interest and which 10 years from now will cost us 25 percent in interest.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understood the gentleman to say that there was $65,000,000 left on the 30th of June.

Mr. SCRIVNER. No, the $65,000,000 was on hand when this agency was before us asking for this appropriation.

Mr. TABER. That was about the first of the year?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That was in the latter part of January. I do not recall the date.

Mr. TABER. That was perhaps the first of February?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, about that time.

Mr. TABER. What did they estimate would be left on the 1st of July?

Mr. SCRIVNER. They gave us no figures on that as I recall it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Did they not testify that they would need at least $108,000,000 and that they would be in for a supplemental appropriation before the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not recall that. They might have.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course they did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. You do not figure that they need $125,000,000 to meet their obligation?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Frankly, I do not. I feel in my own heart that what is left on hand, together with the $100,000,000, would be enough, frankly recognizing that if it is not, when they come before us for the 1952 appropriation all they will have to do is to make the request for a deficiency, and, as a matter of course, it will be granted.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come when the Congress and the entire populace recognizes that Federal aid is a myth, because there is only one place that all these Federal funds come from, and that is from the taxpayers of the 48 States. I wish to place in the RECORD at this time a table, which I have personally prepared, showing the distribution of the 1950 money.

	Hospital construction (allocation 1950)	Percentage State participation in hospital program	Percentage State contribution to total Federal revenue	Ratio of participation to contribution	
				Participation	Contribution
Alabama	$2,690,543	3.6	0.6	6	1
Arizona	443,109	.59	.2	3	1
Arkansas	1,966,552	2.6	.3	17	2
California	2,121,367	2.8	7.3	3	8
Colorado	635,878	.85	.7	8	7
Connecticut	422,222	.56	1.6	1	3
Delaware	100,000	.133	.8	1	6
Florida	1,481,446	1.97	.9	2	1
Georgia	2,791,307	3.7	1.0	15	4
Idaho	300,347	.4	.2	2	1
Illinois	3,764,357	3.7	8.8	2	5
Indiana	1,754,093	2.4	2.4	1	1
Iowa	1,393,932	1.85	1.0	9	5
Kansas	972,758	1.3	1.0	6	5
Kentucky	2,560,957	3.4	2.0	8	5
Louisiana	2,099,507	2.8	.9	3	1
Maine	467,139	.62	.3	2	1
Maryland [1]	827,301	1.1	2.6	7	13
Massachusetts	1,622,561	2.16	3.0	2	3
Michigan	2,174,668	2.9	6.3	1	2
Minnesota	1,725,122	2.3	1.6	3	2
Mississippi	2,270,043	3.02	.3	10	1
Missouri	2,293,924	3.06	2.7	10	9
Montana	224,137	.3	.2	3	2
Nebraska	682,443	.91	.7	9	7
Nevada	100,000	.133	.1	6	5
New Hampshire	367,648	.49	.2	5	2
New Jersey	1,328,053	1.77	2.8	2	3
New Mexico	457,632	.61	.1	6	1
New York	3,029,743	4.0	18.4	2	9
North Carolina	3,413,486	4.4	2.9	4	3
North Dakota	287,845	.38	.2	9	5
Ohio	2,715,846	3.6	6.5	4	7
Oklahoma	1,730,437	2.3	1.0	7	3
Oregon	534,815	.71	.7	1	1
Pennsylvania	4,692,355	6.25	7.9	4	5
Rhode Island	267,856	.36	.5	5	7
South Carolina	1,923,581	2.56	.5	5	1
South Dakota	353,873	.47	.2	7	3
Tennessee	2,616,055	3.5	.8	9	2
Texas	4,865,137	6.5	3.4	13	7
Utah	354,023	.47	.2	7	3
Vermont	227,131	.3	.1	3	1
Virginia	2,114,928	2.8	1.9	3	2
Washington	553,979	.74	1.2	3	5
West Virginia	1,529,058	2.04	.6	10	3
Wisconsin	1,610,133	2.14	2.0	1	1
Wyoming	146,879	.195	.1	2	1
Alaska	100,000	.133	.1	------	------
Hawaii	261,868	.35	.2	------	------
Puerto Rico	2,327,387	3.1	------	------	------
Virgin Islands	29,271	.039	------	------	------
District of Columbia [1]	275,268	.366	------	------	------
Total	75,000,000	------	------	------	------

States contributing more than received	13
States benefiting less than 2 to 1	16
States benefiting 2 to 1 or more	19
Total	48

[1] District of Columbia revenue apparently shown as part of Maryland contribution. Ratio for Maryland takes into consideration District of Columbia participation.

You might be surprised to find how this is operating. If all of these Federal-aid grants were intended to equalize or distribute the wealth, it could not have worked any better. It is a put-and-take proposition all the way through. Many States put in a few tax dollars and take out a lot. Other States put in a lot of tax dollars and get back only a few. For instance, Alabama will get $2,690,000 under this hospital program in fiscal 1950. How much do they contribute? Their percentage of the tax contribution for all Federal taxes is six-tenths of 1 percent. So that Alabama is getting on this hospital program $6 for every dollar that they contribute to the program in taxes.

Arizona gets 3 to 1.

Arkansas gets $1,966,552, and their percentage of contribution to the Federal tax burden is three-tenths of 1 percent. They get back $17 for every $2 that they contribute in taxes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It is not a fact that that is carried out in accordance with the act that the Congress passed in 1949?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. HARRIS. Starting with 1947, and extended in 1949.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The new act is considerably different. It is one of those things that occurs, and that is why I am suggesting that there should be a joint House and Senate committee to study all of these Federal-aid programs to see where we are coming out, what their impact may be upon the Federal economy. In too many places we are simply trading dollars and getting our own dollar back, with Federal control attached to them.

The 1949 formula is described in the hearings by Mr. Cronin as follows:

> The formula is very complicated but it is allocated in such a way that in a State where each individual owned an oil well or gold mine and there were few people in the State, they would not get as much as the States where they had a large population and a relatively small per capita income.

Let us look a little further. For instance, the State of Georgia will get $15 for every $4 put in. Some of the States put in a great deal more on this program than they will ever get back. For instance, Maryland gets back $7 in the hospital building program for each $13 contributed to it in taxes.

A study of the foregoing table will show the effect in all States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on time for debate on this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, how much time will each Member be given?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it is impossible for the Chairman to know whether every Member standing desires recognition.

Mr. SUTTON. I object, since some of us have been trying to get recognition for over an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no pride of authorship on anything that I might introduce here, and I am sure my colleague from Tennessee does not either. I regret that politics has become involved in this very important issue here at this time. As for myself, this is one time that I disagree with my colleague from Tennessee; I think that the Keefe amendment goes farther than his and that it should be adopted, because the Keefe amendment takes care of contractual obligations authorized by the Congress incurred during fiscal year 1948 or any subsequent fiscal year and for grants under title VI of the act as amended.

My case is not an isolated one, because it has happened all over the United States. In my particular district in Tennessee there are three projects that are going on right today; two have been approved with no construction started, but in my home town one has been started. I know, however, that with this $100,000,000 this contractual obligation cannot be met throughout the United States. As the gentleman from Wisconsin has so ably stated, the obligations to date are $108,000,000. What is the use of our coming in here in 3 or 4 months and asking for an additional $8,000,000 or $25,000,000 to take care of obligations which we have already incurred? Why not take care of it now? I realize the fact, of course, that the Gore amendment will be adopted, because the word has been passed down by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to let the Democrats have this honor. I want my colleague from Tennessee to have the honor, but in this case I am for the Keefe amendment, yet I am a Democrat. In the second place, in case the Keefe amendment is defeated, then I shall be for the Gore amendment; but I think this is one time when politics should not be involved, because it touches all the people of the entire country, not Democrats alone or Republicans alone, but all the people of America. I say to my friends on my right, friends of my party: Do not play politics in this instance. Whether the amendment is offered by my distinguished colleague from my own home State, or by the gentleman from Wisconsin, let us forget politics. Let us think about all the people; let us forget this party line division and this center aisle when it comes to thinking about the American people. We have had too much politics in the bills that have been considered during this second session of the Eighty-first Congress. It is time that we thought about the American people and not just running for reelection this year. So I urge my good friends on the Democratic side to vote up the Keefe amendment; and I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will release the members of that committee from voting just Democratic and let them vote for the people of America; in so doing, the Keefe amendment will be adopted and the contracted obligations can be paid without a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, on the substitute, and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I supported this amendment to restore the funds for hospital construction to the full authorized sum as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget as needed to carry out the hospital-construction program provided by this Congress last year.

The committee in reporting the sum of $75,000,000 for hospital construction for the next fiscal year obviously had in mind the program as originally provided in the Hospital Construction Act of 1947. I am fully aware of the purposes and intent of the Appropriations Committee by this action.

Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, after extensive hearings and careful consideration, provided the hospital-construction program in the Eightieth Congress, 1947. It was a program of Federal contribution of one-third of the total cost of construction, authorizing $75,000,000 per year through the fiscal year 1951.

After 2 years this program advanced far beyond any expectation of our committee when it was originally adopted.

Consequently, in 1947, after hearings and consideration, we extended the hospital-construction program for 5 years, through 1954, and increased the authorization to $150,000,000 per year.

At the same time we changed the formula of Federal contribution, liberalizing it to the extent that many places that could not meet the requirements under the old act could also have their hospital-construction program. We provided a flexible amount of Federal contribution from one-third a minimum to a ceiling of two-thirds to be determined under a set formula by the local State agencies and sponsors.

The bill, as reported, had the full support of our committee and passed the Congress by an overwhelming vote. In fact, on this point, I believe there was no opposition at all.

Since then, Mr. Chairman, sponsors throughout the country have prepared plans and many hospital construction programs are underway. It was based on the action of the Congress and to reduce this contractual authorization of the amount necessary as the committee did in reporting this bill will materially affect the program.

Let us not be erroneously led here as to what this will do. It has been said that the amount reported by the committee would be sufficient to carry out any hospital program under way in the planning stages. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, this is not a fact.

I have here a number of telegrams from sponsors in my State where commitments by the sponsors have been made and the architectural plans completed, detailed specifications of the work practically completed and even scheduled for advertising bids in a few weeks. I have here information that projects already approved by State officials with only some minor details pending in regional offices. If the allocation to the State is reduced to the old formula, we are nullifying the action of Congress last year and many of these projects as are related to me here cannot proceed at all.

I think our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as well as other Members of this Congress and especially this Appropriations Subcommittee are fully aware of the importance of this program and just how it operates.

It is somewhat different to the usual program in that we provided contractual authorizations that these projects may proceed and later the appropriation when and if it is needed. In fact, this is the way our highway program is carried out, as well as other programs affecting the security of this Nation, and therefore, this is not an unusual procedure.

When the reduced amount was reported by the Appropriations Committee, our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, met and discussed the effect of this action. Being somewhat more familiar with the program and the details of it, we recognized that there must be some misunderstanding. We, therefore, agreed unanimously to go into it in greater detail with the committee in an effort to see that the amount proposed in this amendment is restored.

Our committee commends the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, in offering this amendment to restore these funds and also the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], chairman of the subcommittee, for accepting it. We appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who is always sympathetic and active in these hospital construction programs. This is a thoroughly deserving amendment and should be approved.

If not, it is our considered opinion, Mr. Chairman, there will be not only great inconvenience but much embarrassment to the Government, to the State agencies and the local sponsors of these projects. I join in urging the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed aware of the importance to our Nation of providing at the present time for ample and adequate funds to encourage and assist in the needed construction of hospitals throughout the land. As a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee handling the legislation last year to provide amendment to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, I was privileged to help make provision for the authority to increase and promote a hospital-construction program. Mr. Chairman, it should be remembered that provision was made to increase the authorization for funds from $75,000,000 annually to $150,000,000 annually. With disappointment, it was noted that provision was not made by the committee for this increased authorization in the appropriation bill now before us. Many communications have been received urging a full appropriation of $150,000,000 annually. It is my intention to and I shall vote for the pending amendment providing for an increased appropriation from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 as heretofore authorized by this Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] are entitled to highest commendation for their effective, joint sponsorship of hospital and public health programs of this bill.

It is refreshing to note the complete absence of partisanism with which these distinguished gentlemen have approached the discussion and proposed solution of these great problems.

There is a far broader significance to the settlement by the Congress of these issues than the mere individual items contained and provided for in this bill. While I fear it is not generally recognized, the real question involved here is the question of socialized medicine. The American people are wedded traditionally to freedom of action and freedom of individual effort. They are opposed to regimentation of business and the professions and workers in ordinary times. Only in real national emergencies and then very reluctantly are they willing to endure rigid arbitrary governmental controls. They realize I think that the progress of this Nation has been largely based on the freedom of the individual from oppressive restraints by the Government. History amply vindicates that realization and that belief.

Are we reaching a real emergency in national public health, hospital care, medical and nursing service? Can our present free enterprise medical and hospital system adequately serve the American people in this age of wonder drugs, scientific advance, and modern clinical techniques which require not only huge sums of money for their proper development and utilization but constant improvement in application, treatment, and research activity? Can local communities, can the States, carry this great burden of cost and large-scale cooperation and expansion and coordination required to provide modern medical care and treatment without (a) large annual subsidies by the Federal Government, (b) control and regimentation by the Government of all health and medical services?

I wish time permitted me to go more exhaustively into the background and present urgent needs of our national health program. The needs are truly colossal; the appeals from our people continuous and most impressive. That public health facilities have fallen away behind the general stream of American economic and social life is incontrovertible.

First, whether we like it or not, whether it is a good omen or not, there has been in recent years a great and

significant change in the habits, attitudes, and practices of the people. I should say, that there has been a change in their philosophy. They have become less home-minded and more community-minded, more Government-minded, more willing to assign individual family and personal problems from the home to some Government bureau—local, State, or National.

It is true also that medical schools, hospitals of every kind and purpose, nurses' training schools, private research units, and almost every activity having to do with the public health have been under heavy pressure. Government tax policies have very substantially dried up the wells of private philanthropy and charity. Many of these institutions are beset by dire financial problems. Medical schools cannot accommodate the boys and girls who aspire to careers as doctors. Hospitals do not have sufficient funds to carry the increased costs imposed upon them and have had to confine or restrict their facilities.

While our health and medical standards are the highest in the world, they still fall far short of meeting all the needs of our growing population for personal medical care and the treatment of the sick and the afflicted. Clearly our facilities and media for caring for the public health are not keeping pace with our advance in business, science, and general productivity, and the growth of the Nation.

What is the answer to this appalling situation? It is twofold. First, either the adoption of socialized medicine after the English fashion, with its bureaucracy, its overlapping, its confusion, and its drafting of the medical profession and related activities. That alternative would bring new and startling changes in the American system of individual initiative. It might well be followed by even more drastic reform.

The other alternative is to so shape our program for public health as to broaden and expand it through Federal grants-in-aid that our basic patterns would remain unimpaired, so that we would achieve the desirable ideal of adequate social and health services and yet not alter the freedom of Americans to pursue their own unfettered way of life.

It can be readily observed that these questions have widest ramifications and deepest significance. I personally believe that this Government can and should encourage, help, and save from emasculation the private agencies dealing with medicine, social services, research, and hospital care.

The Government can and should assume leadership on a broad front in this movement.

It can and should continue and expand research in new techniques and newly discovered drugs.

It can lead the fight against disease—against the scourge of cancer, against arthritis and rheumatic fever, against the great killer, heart disease, and other ailments to which the human family is heir.

It can blaze the trail in preventive medicine through education clinical centers, the promotion of better personal and group hygiene.

Congress cannot be penurious in this great war on disease. It must strike out boldly in the public interest and for human welfare.

I will support the amendments raising the grants for hospital construction and other amendments to the ends of public health.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in the Federal hospital construction program. As a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I have worked for several years in behalf of such legislation. Our committee made a careful and detailed study of the whole hospital situation throughout the entire Nation. It was appalling to learn how deficient our Nation is with respect to hospital facilities. Throughout our Nation there are vast areas that do not have hospitals available for those in need. In some areas even medical practitioners are few and far between. The opinion has been advanced by some that this deficiency in doctors is largely due to lack of hospital facilities. However, the fact remains that large numbers of our people will benefit by the provisions of the Hospital Construction Act.

The need for additional hospitals even in our cities, or more populous centers, is constantly coming to our attention. The cost of construction has risen tremendously. It has reached a point where it is difficult to raise the necessary funds for the building of additional hospitals. Demand for hospitalization increases each year as our population increases. We are not keeping up with the demand. Our failure to do so is bringing distress every day to patients who cannot get accommodations or only after great delay and at great cost.

The formula under which Federal funds are advanced to assist in hospital construction is based upon a sound basis. It contemplates that there is a willingness upon the part of voluntary contributors to do their part. The money is distributed proportionately to all of our States and Territories by taking into consideration population, income, and other varying factors. The use of the funds within the State and their disbursement is left to the judgment of State authorities. Thus the funds derived from Federal sources give assistance only to those who do their part, and the percentage of help is left to State determination. To bring the matter down to a local basis I am glad to report that local hospitals within the First Congressional District have been the recipients of Federal help after receiving approval of our State authorities. In each of the local instances to which I refer the local contributors had given generously but the amount fell short of what was necessary. It was then that Federal funds became available and made possible the completion of these new hospitals that were so necessary in their respective communities. This illustrates the good that is done elsewhere throughout the Nation.

It is regrettable that the Appropriation Committee has decreased the funds available for this worthy purpose, and, contrary to the expressed wish of Congress in fixing the amount that could be appropriated. The pending amendment to increase the amount in conformity to the authorization is entitled to the support of the House.

Economy is right and proper, but, it is not justified when it results in denying our people proper hospitalization. There are other ways of accomplishing economy than withholding hospital facilities from the sick and indigent within our midst.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to raise the appropriation for hospital construction, under the terms of the hospital construction law which we passed here last year, from the $75,000,000 carried in the appropriation bill now before us, to $150,000,000.

I worked and voted for the passage of the Hospital Construction Act last year, and at that time we wrote a provision into the bill that the Congress would appropriate $150,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951—beginning July 1, 1950. On that basis the counties and towns of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent here, made their arrangements for financing their share of the cost of these hospitals. They made detailed plans, and filed applications, based upon the assumption that the Federal Government would provide an appropriation this year of $150,000,000.

As I see it, if we fail to provide the appropriation which we led our people to believe would be forthcoming, we are not keeping faith with them.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama projects have been approved under the terms of the Hospital Construction Act of 1949 for the construction of hospitals at Hamilton, Vernon, Reform, Aliceville, and Oneonta. Projects have been approved for the construction of health centers at Red Bay, Russellville, Cullman, and other towns. Applications for other hospital and health-center projects are pending.

The program for the construction of these hospitals and health centers will proceed in an orderly way, if we vote this appropriation of $150,000,000.

The need for the hospitals and health centers is very great. For the most part they will be built in what may be termed rural areas, where the need for hospitals and better health facilities is greatest.

These hospitals and health centers will be constructed, and operated by the counties and cities that build them. In the Seventh Congressional District they will answer a long-felt need.

There is nothing socialistic about this hospital-construction program. It is an answer to the need that exists. Our Government, in recognition of that human need is contributing grants of money to aid the counties and cities in building their hospitals, under a formula prescribed by the Hospital Construction Act of 1949. That formula as it applies to the hospital and health-center projects in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, provides that the Federal Government contribute two-thirds of the cost of these projects.

This is a great Nation for many reasons, one of the foremost of which is that it recognizes insofar as it can human needs and human problems. This hospital-construction program is a further recognition on the part of our Government of the importance of the health of our people. This program will contribute to the building of a healthier Nation. A healthy people is a national asset that cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Let us work together to build a healthier country. Let us provide the appropriation of $150,000,000 which we led the people to believe last year would be forthcoming. Coming years will justify the wisdom of our action.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER] is recognized.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to restore the $75,000,000 that has been made in the appropriation for the construction of hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act.

I feel that it is essential to the welfare of our people that this program be continued in full force. The hospital construction program is needed for adequate medical care, especially in small towns and rural communities throughout the United States. Many counties in the district that I have the honor to represent, have committed themselves to building programs based on the belief that the appropriation of $150,000,000 would be continued this year. If this drastic cut of $75,000,000 is allowed to stand it will imperil, if not kill, the hospital-construction program so vitally needed in the great majority of our rural areas. The larger cities have been able to cope with the hospital situation fairly well but smaller towns and communities have been almost unanimously unable to do so. The States, counties, and cities have made definite plans on the basis of the $150,000,000 appropriation heretofore made for this program and Congress should continue the program so vitally necessary in the rural communities.

There is a tremendous need for physicians in most of our rural sections and on account of the shortage of doctors in these communities, it makes it almost impossible for citizens residing there to receive medical treatment. The construction of these hospitals would enable the citizens of those communities to receive adequate modern-day medical care. The construction of these hospitals would enable the doctors of these communities to render to their patients better care and more modern methods of treatment.

Unless you have visited the rural sections of many of our districts, it is almost impossible for you to realize how overworked most physicians are and how difficult it is for them to render adequate service to their patients. I know of no members of any profession in America who devote themselves so assiduously and so painstakingly to render service to their patients than the doctors serving the rural areas. I believe that the continuation of this hospital program will greatly facilitate their work and it should be continued. For that reason, I urge you to support the amendment restoring the cut of $75,000,000 to the hospital program as originally planned.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] is recognized.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, on previous occasions I have called to the attention of the Members of the House the significant fact that approximately 60,000,000 persons in the United States are presently carrying insurance under the Blue Cross plan, or plans of a similar make-up, all of which provide for either hospital, medical, surgical and sick benefit insurance. In my opinion, the spread of private plan insurance has tremendously augmented the need for more hospitals.

I am for the Keefe amendment which adds only $75,000,000 to the amount agreed upon in the committee. In fact, the committee cut the original amount from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000, and this amendment only restores the figures to what the original appropriation amounted to. Compared to the dire need of new and reconditioned hospitals and additional hospital space, even $150,000,000 seems inadequate, and in some respects infinitesimal.

There is a marked shortage of hospitals all over the country, in rural communities, as well as metropolitan areas. Hospitals now in use are invariably overcrowded, and in many instances, there are no facilities available at all to accommodate the requests made upon such institutions by individuals requiring medical aid and hospitalization.

Persons who are suffering from illnesses and diseases are in no frame of mind to concentrate on politics; consequently, politics should not enter into this question at any time. The question for us to determine is what is necessary and within our financial means to provide proper facilities, including hospital and bed space to care for the sick and the indigent.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], is directed along the same lines as the objectives sought by the Keefe amendment, but the amount to be appropriated is for $25,000,000, which is manifestly inadequate, and is more of a gesture to save time and expedient, rather than the basis for providing sufficient and adequate hospitals through the country.

It appears to be difficult to implement Members of the House with the idea that there is an emergency for supporting the appropriation called for in the Keefe amendment. On the other hand, only yesterday we voted more than $200,000,000 to restore the original hospital program plan for the accommodation of veterans. To stint and economize at the expense of the health and comfort of the people of the Nation does not appeal to me to be sound economy. If you defeat the amendment, that is exactly what you are doing in this instance.

The opposition's arguments presented on the floor of the House are not based on the fact that it has not been shown by indisputable facts that shortage of hospital space exists and that there is an exceptional need for expanding the hospital construction program. No one to whose remarks I have been privileged to listen, has been able to challenge this statement. On the contrary, all opposition to the appropriation has been directed to that of economizing because the present budget now before the House, in the opinion of some Members, requires considerable pruning and may call for radical reductions.

Thus far this plea for more economy has not been applied to any Governmental department in particular, as far as I have been able to take notice. Then, why make an example of a project that deals with human misery and suffering, and involves a great human equation?

There are many other specific reasons that I would like to recite in support of the Keefe amendment, but I feel that the appeal for the amendment can be made on the general principle that it is unjust and false economy to discriminate against a project such as is contemplated by the amendment.

I am supporting the amendment, and shall vote for it, and I hope that sufficient Members of the House will do likewise, in order that it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusets. Mr. Chairman, I have received the following telegram from Robert Cutler, president, Peter Bent Brigham Hospital:

> Boston hospitals are very interested in the Keefe amendment to labor security appropriations bill which will increase construction funds for United States Public Health Service National Cancer and Mental Health Institutes. This amendment will also restore Hill Burton Hospital construction funds to one hundred and fifty millions and provide three millions for cancer construction, five million three hundred fifty thousand for heart construction and two and one-half millions for mental health research and teaching construction. I hope you will support this amendment to the appropriations bill which may come up this afternoon.
>
> ROBERT CUTLER,
> *President, Peter Bent Brigham Hospital.*

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say also that the Lowell General Hospital, Lowell, Mass., is very anxious that this program go through because it has contributions for the construction of a building.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Lousiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, my State is one of those that has been woefully lacking in hospital facilities. Under the program inaugurated by the Government to allocate funds for the construction of hospitals in the various States we have started quite a few projects throughout the State. Some are under construction at this time and others have been authorized and approved.

Just recently one of the principal cities in my district, Lake Charles, La., undertook to put on a campaign to raise $600,000 for the purpose of building a hospital, that amount to be added to with funds under the hospital program of the Federal Government. They have succeeded in raising this amount, and are ready to proceed with construction on the basis of assistance under the Federal hospital program; however, unless this appropriation is increased to meet the

anticipated amounts expected by allocation from the Government the conconstruction of the hospital will have to be abandoned, and this important and necessary facility will not be made available to the community.

I am very much in favor of the amendments that have been offered to provide the anticipated Federal contribution expected by all States, and I hope they will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] is recognized.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I believe it covers the subject. I feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] does not cover it.

I have a couple of letters here which I wish to refer to regarding the law passed last October. One is from R. L. Pierce, president of the Memorial Hospital, Menomonie, Wis., and reads in part:

> In our case, construction had barely begun when the increased aid was granted, but such aid was not retroactive to projects already approved. Had we withheld our application for aid only a few weeks, the additional aid would have been paid to us. In keeping with most projects of a similar sort, we are having difficulty in meeting the requirements of the Government authorities and still stay within the amount of money locally raised, together with the grant-in-aid on the part of the Government.

Mr. Pierce is one of the prominent businessmen of Wisconsin, now chairman of the Wisconsin Republican State Committee.

I have a similar letter from Paul G. Bjerke of the Luther Hospital at Eau Claire and pharmacist member of the Advisory Hospital Council of Wisconsin. He states:

> This proposal to make a cut in the Hospital Construction Act will seriously limit the progress being made in hospital construction in the State.

With reference to economy, I am sure both of these men are very strong for economy. But they are opposed to limiting a great public-health movement. They are firm in their opinion that a healthy America makes for a strong America.

I feel this hospital program has gone so far and is so successful that unless we do pass an appropriate measure, taking care of the various projects which have been started, there will be a serious situation presented to the next Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I hope it will be adopted. If not, I hope that the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we can sink the United States by overspending. In my opinion, increasing this amount to $150,000,000 of contract authorizations and increasing the amount of cash to $125,000,000, is going to add so much money to this bill that it will present a very serious threat to our economy. I do not know how we are ever going to balance the budget or to keep the Nation right side up and prevent more terrific inflation and reduction in the purchasing power of the poor man's dollar if we go on with deficit spending and playing right into Joe Stalin's hands.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. With regard to this particular amendment before us for so-called Federal aid, which has become such a favorite phrase, the so-called Federal aid to hospital construction, figures have just been given to me showing that for us New Yorkers for every $9 that we put in we get $2 back. Is the gentleman aware of those figures, also?

Mr. TABER. That is about the way the thing goes.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, that is the way it goes very frequently in the State of New York.

Mr. TABER. Yes. We are used to carrying the burden; too used to it altogether.

I hope that this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Referring to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], if the gentleman wants to legislate like that he should be in the New York State Legislature. This is the National Congress and not the New York Legislature.

Mr. TABER. But the National Congress should treat the States somewhat fair.

Mr. KEATING. And my constituents do not expect me to send all of their money down to the gentleman's State of Tennessee. That is not what I was sent up here for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the proposition we have before us now is not a political one at all. It does not make any difference whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. When you need hosptital care you go to a hospital, and sickness does not just strike Democrats or Republicans. I do not think anyone is trying to look for any glory here on either side of the aisle. It is true that in our subcommittee I worked along with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], in all of this public health program, and we have seen eye to eye on the entire program and I, as he knows, agreed with him several weeks ago that when these amendments were to be offered on the floor, that I would support them.

I hope that we will be able to finish this chapter tonight; I do not know whether we can or not. But, I do want to make this announcement, that when this amendment and the substitute amendment have been voted on, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has at least three more amendments on mental health, heart, and cancer, and I hope we can pass them today, and that when these amendments are offered, that this committee will see fit to support them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Can the gentleman state if the $100,000,000 is sufficient to take care of the construction contract authorizations over the past year?

Mr. FOGARTY. To be perfectly frank about it, I do not know whether or not the $100,000,000 will be enough. I think they will not need the $125,000,000 they had in there, but at the same time this is money to meet contract obligations, and when they come due they have to be paid. So slicing off $25,000,000 this year is not an actual saving to the Federal Treasury, because those obligations we have to meet either this year or next year.

Mr. HARRIS. But the gentleman does feel that $100,000,000 will be sufficient to take care of the contractual obligations up to this date?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot make the definite statement that $100,000,000 will be enough, but I think $125,000,000 might be too much. It may be some figure in between that they need. When the bill was written, our judgment was that $100,000,000 might be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 103, noes 61.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GORE and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 66.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI of the act, as amended, including the purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $1,357,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 137, line 7, strike out "$1,357,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,807,000, of which $1,000,000 is for grants-in-aid pursuant to section 636 of the act, as amended."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, by the adoption of the so-called Gore amendment, the committee has indicated that it wants the hospital construction program continued at the level determined by the Congress last October when, by

an overwhelming vote, the authorization was increased from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 Federal contribution, and the States and localities, in accordance with that authorization, made their plans for hospital construction. Because of the fact that the subcommittee reduced the amount of that authorization from $150,000,000 to $75,000,000 they correspondingly reduced the budget item for the administration of the program from $2,807,000 to $1,357,000. The effect of the amendment which I am now offering is to restore the necessary funds to enable proper administration of the action which the Congress has just now taken in increasing the amount from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000.

You will observe in the amendment that $1,000,000 is for grants-in-aid to enable studies and research to be done in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in section 636 of the act authorizing this hospital construction program, so that by proper integration of the small hospitals and large hospitals, and proper studies of the necessity for the integration of all hospital services and the furnishing of hospital service under this program, we can get the most effective hospital service to the people of this country.

The facts are that a large part of the hospital construction program is in small communities and in rural areas that have not heretofore been served by hospital facilities. That was one splendid purpose of the act. This research program that is contemplated under the amendment which I have now offered is intended to make it possible for a Nationwide study in the States by the United States Health Service, to integrate these small hospitals with the larger hospitals, in order to secure proper staffing and all of the things that go with hospital management and control.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. And if it is done well, you might save what you are asking for?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, I do not think there is any question about that at all. This is a part of the over-all program which has had the overwhelming support of everybody who understands and knows what this program contemplates.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You spoke of the larger hospitals taking into consideration the smaller hospitals. Do you mean by that that the larger hospitals are supposed to conduct the nursing schools?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, no; I do not mean anything of the kind. I mean there are various areas in the country where the facilities of these small hospitals are not such as to provide the general staffs that are necessary in the large hospitals, and by a proper integration of the staffing that is possible in the large hospitals an arrangement can be made whereby the beneficial aspects of proper staff procedure in the large hospitals can be put out into the smaller hospitals, and proper hospital management will thus grow.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield further. In Pennsylvania, where I am acquainted with the hospital situation—for instance, take Pittsburgh and Philadelphia—they are making the requirements so hard for nurses that the hospitals in the country that have nursing schools are almost being compelled to close up. The educational demands and requirements are so high that it is most difficult to comply with their code. It seems to me that such a thing as that should not be possible. Nowadays, a practical nurse does not seem to have any status in the hospital field or in the field at home.

Mr. KEEFE. I think I have the point the gentleman raises. I suggest that he make his plea, if it may be termed a plea, either to his State legislature or to his local hospital authorities.

The amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin has offered is part of the over-all program that will be offered as we go through this bill to make this program effective in view of the action that has heretofore been taken. Without it you will have a hospital-construction program without any administration and without the necessary research that ought to be given to it to make it effective.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the question is very simple mathematically. The committee appropriated $224,000 for 1950. Subtract $72,000 for pay increase and you have an increase of $152,743 which increase is for new personnel in the hospital construction service.

The Department itself merely asked for $285,000. We have increased it almost $153,000, and that is for new work in this particular field. I think that the past experience from which the agency has benefited shows that an increase of $153,000 is ample with which to carry on the work which has been made necessary by the Gore amendment.

I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has not referred to that portion of the amendment which stipulates that a million dollars shall be used for the purposes of the grants in aid program under section 636 of the act. The gentleman has attempted to limit this thing solely to the hospital-construction program. Had the gentleman listened to what I said, the major portion of the increase is the $1,000,000 that is provided to implement this program by the necessary research which everybody concedes is necessary if this whole program that you have now voted is going to function properly.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows that I have always listened to him attentively. I listened to what he said on the floor because I yield to no man in my respect for his knowledge on this subject, and he knows that that is a genuine statement. The Department came in and asked for $285,000. We listened to their report, and the Committee felt that $153,000 would be ample. I maintain that having done that we took into consideration everything that the gentleman so ably pointed out on the floor.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will see fit to pass the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

As a member of the Subcommittee on Health Legislation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, along with my colleagues I listened to a great deal of testimony last summer on the need for strengthening the Hospital Construction Act. The bill that was passed on last October 3 came from that subcommittee and passed this House by an overwhelming margin. I took the trouble the other day to check, and I found that of the members of the Committee on Appropriations who were present and voting some 26 voted for the bill, 7 voted against it. One of the integral parts of that bill amending the Hospital Construction Act was the authorization for funds to conduct a very careful study and survey of the need for integrating the work of small and large hospitals, and a general survey and investigation of the problems of hospital management.

This House does stand committed by a vote of more than 6 to 1 to have such a survey made. I agree with my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that the funds that are now in the appropriation bill are funds only for administering the $75,000,000 a year increase in the authorized Federal matching funds. There is another million dollars needed if we are to conduct this survey.

I want to join the gentleman from Wisconsin in the warning that he sounded earlier on this floor, one that I concur in, that if we do not do a job of getting our hospitals integrated and do a thorough job of studying that problem, we are inviting socialization of hospitals, something I object to and will fight. In Britain one of the reasons for the socialization of hospitals was that no job was done of the sort that we have authorized the Public Health Service to do. No serious effort was made prior to the present British law, which I do not believe would be a good law for the United States, in getting integration of their hospitals and modernizing their hospital administrations.

What we are asking this Congress to do is to lay the ground work so that we can have this job done. We have already authorized under the present law about a thousand new hospitals in the United States, many of which are under construction or have been completed. We will build several thousand more under the amended Hospital Construction Act.

Is it not desirable that we take the funds and make sure that we integrate that system of hospitals, retaining the voluntary aspect of management and ownership of those hospitals by religious groups, by fraternal organizations, by municipal and State bodies, get them integrated so that we will get the maximum possible use out of the funds we are spending? Certainly we are spending the taxpayers' money. But is it not advisable that we have a little bit more money and make sure we can get the

maximum use out of it? That is the essence of the amendment which is in front of us. As a matter of good business management, it seems to me that the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Did not the Veterans' Administration refuse to accept certain types of hospitals that were constructed during the war because the administrative costs were too much and the integration was too difficult to make?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Yes, I think that is a correct statement and that is one of the things we hope to avoid at all cost and make sure that we do have the maximum utilization of our funds for hospitals. We do not as yet pretend to have complete knowledge. This study would give us that information.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Did not a gentleman on that side of the aisle a moment ago say that he listened to the committee and said the amount was sufficient to do the job as was requested and that we should allot that amount of money? Why do we not try to get a little economy in this and do the job they suggested, because that is all the money they asked for. If that is all they asked for why give them a lot of additional money?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am in favor of the Keefe amendment because I think it will result in economy. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] is mistaken. The amount to which he referred did not contemplate any funds for research into the best utilization of hospitals. I do not want to build a lot of hospitals without making sure that we do get the best utilization out of them. It is for that reason I support the Keefe amendment, and I hope the Committee will support it. It is sound economy. Economy does not mean only saving dollars; it means also making a proper utilization of the funds we appropriate.

Mr. RICH. Are not these hospitals going to be administered by the people back home where they can get aid and assistance? Does not the gentleman have faith in the people back home doing a job and just as good a job as you can get done by these bureaucrats around here?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute so I may answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, the people back home have come to us through the American Hospital Association, through the American Medical Association, through all of the other professional groups including the Nurses' Association, and have asked us to make this survey. One of the reasons it is in the bill is as a result of the request of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and the American Nurses' Association. They cannot do this job for themselves. They have testified that they have full faith in the Public Health Service to do it. No local group can do it. It is a national problem. It must be met nationally, and that is why I support the Keefe amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous censent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigin?

Mr. McGRATH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred and forty-one Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEEFE) there were—ayes 66, noes 59.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. McGRATH and Mr. KEEFE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 67, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX PROPOSAL

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the action of excise taxes already tentatively taken by the Committee on Ways and Means indicates that it will go far beyond the $655,000,000 excise-tax cut proposed by the Treasury. In fact, the cuts may reach as high as $1,500,000,000.

Even if some of the loopholes are closed, there will probably be a net revenue loss of about a billion dollars. This loss must be made up elsewhere otherwise the $5,000,000,000 deficit now facing us will be considerably increased.

My bill, H. R. 8169, introduced on yesterday, would skim just a little of the thickest cream from the profits of the most prosperous corporations. It would affect less than 25,000 of the 382,000 corporations now paying taxes. In other words, only one out of about 15 corporations would be affected, and these would be the ones making tremendous profits.

The proposal would not be nearly as drastic a levy as was imposed during wartime. It would allow or credit a profit of 140 percent of the largest profit earnings over the base years of 1936–39. In addition, it would allow a further exemption of $50,000, whereas the wartime exemption was $10,000.

New businesses would be allowed a special additional specific exemption of $50,000.

Instead of a rate of 95 percent as it was during wartime, the rate would be only 50 percent of the profit income in excess of the liberalized credits and exemptions heretofore mentioned. It is conservatively estimated that it would yield $1,000,000,000 annually. If this excess-profits tax proposal is not adopted to yield the same revenue, it would be necessary to increase the flat corporate tax 4 percent, or to drastically increase the inheritance and gift taxes.

In my opinion, excess-profits taxes would be the most practical, the least painful, and the least disruptive to a prosperous economy.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disegreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4080) entitled "An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of California and Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACY (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to

extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include in editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by James M. Mead.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain extraneous matter.)

NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the perennial question of the taxation of cooperatives is before us again. During the Eightieth Congress, I was a member of the House Small Business Committee, which looked into this question very carefully. We held extensive hearings both here in Washington and throughout the country. I had thought we had settled the question once and for all.

But it has come up again, during the recent hearings held by the House Ways and Means Committee.

One of the witnesses who appeared before that committee to favor the taxation of cooperative patronage refunds was the president of an organization well known to those of us who studied this question 2 years ago—the National Tax Equality Association. Now, in all fairness, it must be said that NTEA does not purport to represent small-business men exclusively. Its president has claimed, however, in a letter to the chairman of the Small Business Committee, that its purpose was "serving the interests of small business."

I think the House of Representatives and the public should know just who is back of the National Tax Equality Association, so that they can make up their own minds as to just where small-business men fit into this organization.

During the four quarters of 1949, NTEA filed lobby reports with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. These reports require the listing of the names of all contributors giving $500 or more. NTEA listed 138 such contributors during 1949. Of these, 43—or nearly a third—were private power utilities—no doubt interested in "serving the interests of small business."

Citizens of the Northwest will recognize the names of the Pacific Power & Light Co. in Portland, the Idaho Power Co. in Boise, the Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, and the Montana Power Co., Butte, which appeared among the 43 utilities. These are names that also appear on the list of contributors to the Pacific Northwest Development Association, which is currently waging war against a program of sensible, balanced resource development in the Northwest.

As a result of hearings held last summer, the House Small Business Committee recently issued a report on the National Tax Equality Association, which high lights a strange discrepancy in the lobby reports filed by NTEA.

The law requires that lobbyists list the names of all contributors who give $500 or more, but not the amounts they give. It also requires that they list the total of contributions of less than $500, without listing the amounts, or the names of the individual contributors. In addition, they are required to show their total receipts.

In all four quarters of 1949, the total of all contributions under $500 was identical with the sum listed as total receipts. If this is true, then NTEA could have received no contributions of over $500. Yet in each quarter, they listed the names of numerous contributors who gave over $500, including the 43 power utilities I have mentioned. I am at a loss to reconcile these two conclusions.

That is like saying, "First, we got $10,000 from contributions of under $500.

"Second, the 138 people named by us gave us at least $500 each, for a total of at least $69,000.

"Third, our total receipts, however, amounted to only $10,000."

I have asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman BUCHANAN, the chairman of the House committee investigating lobbying activities, to have his staff investigate this discrepancy. I think it is important that this be done, because NTEA, through this strange system of mathematics, has been able to thwart the Small Business Committee in the accomplishment of its very aims, that is, finding out what proportion of NTEA's funds comes from large contributors, and what proportion actually comes from the small-business men whose interests NTEA purports to serve. As it is now, the contributors whose names are listed by NTEA may each have given $500,000, for all we know.

I will be very interested to learn just how much of the NTEA money comes from large contributors.

In order that the public, as well as Members of Congress, may have a complete picture of the National Tax Equality Association, I think they ought to have a clear idea of just how NTEA goes about manufacturing support for tax equality.

For that purpose, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a chain letter sent out by the National Tax Equality Association in order to stimulate letters artificially and to flood Congressmen's offices with mail:

DEAR ———: Members of Congress must be told what the folks back home want. These two things must be done:

1. Tax the untaxed, and use this new revenue to—

2. Repeal or reduce wartime excise taxes.

It is agreed by the administration and congressional leaders that excise taxes cannot be repealed or reduced unless the income loss is replaced by other revenue. Congress can raise one billion dollars without increasing taxes by taxing the untaxed corporations.

Please write your Congressman and two United States Senators, in your own words, telling them you want action on these two specific things during the present session of Congress.

Then, keep this chain going by copying this letter and mailing it, as I have done, to 10 friends or business associates. Ask your women folk, who are vitally affected by the wartime excise taxes on cosmetics, handbags, jewelry, travel, etc., to do likewise.

If this is done, millions of letters will reach the Members of the Congress this session and definite action will result.

If you break this chain,
Please don't complain
When excise taxes give you pain
And income tax goes up again.

Sincerely yours,

———.

P. S.—Address Congressmen in care of House Office Building; Senators in care of Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

I am inserting, also, the letter of instructions sent out by NTEA with the chain letter:

NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., February 15, 1950.

DEAR MEMBERS AND FRIENDS: We have decided, after very careful consideration by our board of directors, that the enclosed chain-type letter will produce volume mail to the Members of Congress. We have been told repeatedly that the Members of Congress like to hear from the people back home. If Congressmen don't hear from their constituents, they cannot act in their behalf.

This letter will get volume results only if you participate fully in its distribution. In order to get the maximum volume, it will be necessary for you to do the following:

1. Write your Congressman and two United States Senators now, along the line suggested in the enclosed letter.

2. Copy the letter and send it, over your signature, to 10 of your friends or business associates.

3. Pass out the enclosed 10 blank copies of the letter to employees and immediate friends, asking them to:

(a) Write their Congressman and two United States Senators; and

(b) Copy the letter and send it to 10 of their friends and business associates.

We also urge that you take this matter up with the various organizations to which you belong. We will furnish unlimited copies of the letter, free and postpaid, for distribution (order blank enclosed herewith).

We particularly urge that you give this letter to your womenfolk, because they are vitally affected by wartime excise taxes on products such as cosmetics, furs, jewelry, transportation, and luggage.

It may be that you are not in sympathy with this type of approach. But in view of the need for volume mail at this time, we ask you to put aside your personal feelings in this matter and act immediately. A million letters to Congressmen will bring tax equality now.

Very truly yours,

GARNER M. LESTER,
President.

I call particular attention to the last paragraph of this letter of instructions:

It may be that you are not in sympathy with this type of approach. But, in view of the need for volume mail at this time, we ask you to put aside your personal feelings in this matter and act immediately.

So this is democracy in action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never been one to believe that you should judge the merits of a case merely by pointing out who is for it and who is against it. So let us take a look at the merits of the case in favor of taxing cooperatives.

Few people realize that those stalwart crusaders who bear the banner of tax equality are really fighting for tax inequality. It is a little-known fact that there is not one single provision of the Internal Revenue Act which mentions cooperatives by name. Those who wish to make patronage refunds of cooperatives taxable would have to write a special provision into the act to achieve their aim.

What the law says is that any business concern that legally pledges itself to pay out all of its profits to its patrons in the form of patronage refunds is entitled to have those profits exempt from taxation. The cooperatives do this in their by-laws. They choose to be nonprofit organizations. Any businessman who wishes to make this same choice is free to do so. Most of them choose to run their businesses on a profit-making basis, knowing that their profits are taxable. This is completely as it should be, in our enterprise system.

Now the tax equality crusaders believe that patronage refunds should be taxable both in the hands of the cooperative, to whom they never legally belong, as well as in the hands of the member or patron. I wonder if they would press just as vigorously for a similar double taxation scheme for the 86 percent of our businesses that pay no corporate income tax at all—namely the partnerships and individually owned businesses.

In these cases the partner or owner pays personal income tax on the earnings derived from his business. But he does not pay taxes on the same earnings once as a partner and again as an individual. Actually, all cooperatives amount to are partnerships in which all the members are partners.

There is another thing the public ought to know about the misleading literature of the tax equalitarians. Cooperatives are not tax dodgers. They pay all of the normal State and local taxes, all of the school taxes and property taxes and county taxes, along with other businessmen.

And anyone who wants to make tax dodgers out of the cooperatives should remember the thousands of good farmers who are members of farm cooperatives and who are paying their taxes, just like every other citizen, on the income they get from their patronage refunds. There are no tax dodgers among the co-op members, I can assure you.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the arguments of the tax equalitarians are just exactly as phony as their organizations are. I hope that the Buchanan committee investigating lobbying activities will have something concrete to report soon on the famous National Tax Equality Association, so that the public can know just exactly who represents whom.

CONTRIBUTORS OF $500 OR MORE TO NATIONAL TAX EQUALITY ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL.

(Source of information: Quarterly Lobby reports No. A-1954-2212-2541-2805, filed by NTEA with Clerk of House of Representatives.)

1949—FIRST QUARTER (ENDED MARCH 31, 1949)

Alabama: Alabama Power Co., Stockham Pipe Fittings Co., Birmingham.

Arkansas: Arkansas Power & Light Co., Pine Bluff.

California: Rheem Manufacturing Co., San Francisco.

Colorado: The Colorado Milling & Elevator Co., Denver.

Connecticut: Connecticut Light & Power Co., Hartford; the Stanley Works, New Britain.

Florida: Florida Power & Light Co., Miami.

Illinois: Bowman Dairy Co., the Chain Institute, Inc., International Minerals & Chemicals Corp., Chicago.

Indiana: Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc., Indianapolis.

Iowa: Maytag Co., West Newton.

Louisiana: Louisiana Power & Light Co., New Orleans Public Service, Inc., New Orleans.

Massachusetts: Samson Cordage Works, Boston.

Michigan: The Lufkin Rule Co., Saginaw.

Minnesota: Fullerton Lumber Co., Marsh & McLennan, Minneapolis; Lampert Yards, Northwestern-Hanna Fuel Co., St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co., St. Paul Live Stock Exchange, St. Paul.

Missouri: Hart-Bartlett-Sturtevant Grain Co., Kansas City; Fresh Milk Institute, St. Louis.

Montana: Montana Retail Lumbermen's Association, Missoula.

New York: New York Wire Cloth Co., Ebasco Services, Southern Agricultural Chemical Corp., New York City.

North Carolina: Carolina Power & Light Co., Raleigh.

Ohio: The Bostwick-Braun Co., Toledo.

Oregon: Pacific Power & Light Co., Portland.

Pennsylvania: Abbotts Dairies, Inc., Philadelphia.

Tennessee: Orgill Bros. & Co., Memphis.

Texas: Southwestern Public Service Co., Amarillo; Lone Star Gas Co., Texas Power & Light Co., Tex-O'Kan Flour Mills Co., Dallas; Texas Electric Service Co., Fort Worth.

Virginia: Smith-Douglass Co., Inc., Norfolk; Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond.

Wisconsin: Wisconsin Electric Power Co., Milwaukee; Wisconsin Power & Light Co., Madison.

SECOND QUARTER (ENDED JUNE 30, 1949)

California: Baker & Hamilton, California Packing Corp., Dunham, Carrigan & Hayden Co., Sloss & Brittain, San Francisco.

Colorado: The Colorado Milling & Elevator Co., Denver.

Idaho: Idaho Power Co., Boise.

Illinois: H. D. Hudson Manufacturing Co., Standard Oil Co., Uhlmann Grain Co., Chicago.

Indiana: Northern Indiana Public Service Co., Hammond.

Kansas: The Coleman Co., Wichita.

Kentucky: Belknap Hardware & Manufacturing Co., Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Louisville.

Michigan: The Detroit Edison Co., Detroit; Consumers Power Co., Jackson.

Minnesota: King Midas Flour Mills, Leamington Hotel, Northern States Power Co., Peavey Elevators, F. H. Peavey & Co., Peavey Lumber Yards, Minneapolis.

Mississippi: Mississippi Power & Light Co., Jackson.

New York: American Cyanamid Co., New York City.

North Carolina: Carolina Power & Light Co., Raleigh.

Ohio: The Bostwick-Braun Co., Toledo; Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Columbus.

Oklahoma: Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Oklahoma City.

Pennsylvania: Duquesne Light Co., Pittsburgh; Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., Allentown; Philadelphia Electric Co., Philadelphia.

Texas: Tex-O'Kan Flour Mills Co., Dallas; Lumbermen's Association of Texas, Houston; Lone Star Gas Co., Dallas.

Utah: Salt Lake Hardware Co., Salt Lake City.

Virginia: F. S. Royster Guano Co., Norfolk.

Washington: Washington Water Power Co., Spokane

Wisconsin: Stratton Grain Co., Milwaukee.

THIRD QUARTER (ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1949)

Colorado: Public Service Co. of Colorado, Denver.

Florida: Florida Power & Light Co., Miami.

Illinois: Alexander Lumber Co., Aurora; James E. Bennett Co., Norris Grain Co., Uhlmann Grain Co., Chicago.

Indiana: Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc., Indianapolis.

Iowa: Maytag Co., West Newton.

Kentucky: Kentucky Utilities Co., Inc., Lexington; Belknap Hardware & Manufacturing Co., Louisville.

Louisiana: Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport.

Michigan: Detroit Edison Co., Detroit.

Minnesota: Marshall-Wells Co., Duluth.

Missouri: Hart-Bartlett-Sturtevant Grain Co., Simonds-Shields-Theis Grain Co., Kansas City.

Montana: Montana Power Co., Butte; Montana Elevator Co., Montana Flour Mills Co., Great Falls.

Nebraska: Roberts Dairy Co., Omaha.

New Jersey: Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Newark.

New York: Consolidated Edison Co., of New York, New York City.

North Carolina: Carolina Power & Light Co., Raleigh.

Ohio: Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., Columbus.

Pennsylvania: Duquesne Light Co., Pittsburgh.

Tennessee: C. M. McClung & Co., Inc., Knoxville.

Texas: Texas Electric Service Co., Fort Worth; Moncrief-Lenoir Manufacturing Co., Peden Iron & Steel Co., Houston; San Antonio Machine & Supply Co., San Antonio.

Utah: Utah Power & Light Co., Salt Lake City.

Wisconsin: Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co., Milwaukee.

FOURTH QUARTER (ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1949)

Arkansas: Col. Robert Baker, Fones Bros. Hardware Co., Little Rock.

Indiana: E. B. Martindale, Van Camp Hardware & Iron Co., Indianapolis; M. J. Claussen, Hibbard Spencer Bartlett & Co., Evanston.

Michigan: C. H. Buhl, Buhl Sons Co., Detroit; E. B. Morley, Morley Bros., Saginaw.

Minnesota: Weaver Dobson, J. F. Anderson Lumber Co., H. K. Nilssen, George A. Clark & Son, Minneapolis; P. W. Anderson, Farwell Ozum Kirk & Co., St. Paul; Globe Elevators, division of F. H. Peavey & Co., Duluth; Ben C. McCabe, International Elevator Co., H. H. Hill, Janey-Semple Hill

& Co., Minneapolis; Leonard Lampert, Jr., Lampert Lumber Co., St. Paul; H. G. Dickey, Van Dusen Harrington Co., Minneapolis; Western Paint & Varnish Co., Duluth; W. L. Taylor, Wilcox Lumber Co., Detroit Lakes.

Missouri: A. Wessell Shapleigh, Shapleigh Hardware Co., St. Louis.

New York: Edwin R. Masback, Jr., Masback Hardware Co., New York.

North Carolina: Henry J. Allison, Allison-Erwin Co.; L. D. Nuchols, Charlotte.

Ohio: H. D. Cram, the W. Bingham Co.; A. G. Rorabeck, George Worthington Co., Cleveland.

Pennsylvania: William Steltz, Suppiee-Steltz-Biddle Co.; E. K. Tryon, Edward K. Tryon Co., Philadelphia.

Texas: Ray Grisham, Western Cottonoil Co., Abilene.

Tennessee: R. C. Dickerson, American Cotton Shippers Association; W. F. Stephenson, Stratton-Warren Hardware Co., Memphis.

Wisconsin: Edward F. Pritzlaff, John Pritzlaff Hardware Co., Milwaukee.

SUMMARY

Above reports list 138 contributors of $500 or more to NTEA in 1949, of whom 43, or 31 percent, are power companies.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 10 minutes following disposition of the legislative business of the day and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COMMUNISTS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman intimated in a speech broadcast to the Nation last night that Communists in the United States are merely a harmless though noisy minority. He said that the real danger of communism comes from without.

Only a few nights earlier Secretary of State Acheson, in an off-the-record speech to members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, called the current effort to clean out Communists and moral perverts from the State Department a dirty business. He professed great indignation and said he proposed to clear away some of the trash.

Both Truman and Acheson said, in effect, although carefully refraining from mentioning names, that the real criminal is Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, who is spearheading the campaign to return honor and decency to the State Department.

Of course, the Communists are a small minority in the United States. Nobody denies it. But as for their harmlessness: It may be pointed out to the President quite properly that this small minority proved itself just harmless enough to steal hundreds of top secret documents from various governmental departments—documents involving national security. These security secrets, of course, went to the Kremlin.

The Communist cell which stole the documents was made up largely of State Department employees in responsible positions. Other cells in the Government stole the secrets of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb, and sent them to Moscow. Did the President say these spies are harmless? Yes, and he said that his so-called security program has proved its efficiency.

Acheson said that Senator MCCARTHY's campaign to force a clean-up in the State Department is a dirty business. Of course it is. Any clean-up of the kind is bound to be dirty. But where is the dirt to be found? In the United States Senate or in the State Department? Assistant Secretary of State John E. Peurifoy admitted to the Senate investigating committee that nearly a hundred moral perverts have been fired, and nearly 200 Communists.

Acheson told the editors that now the State Department is pure as the driven snow. No Communists and no perverts in the Department of State, he said; only fine, upstanding Americans, morally and politically without fault. But the Amerasia case has been reopened. This mess involved an overt attempt by the Fair Deal administration to protect people whom the Federal Bureau of Investigation had arrested on charges of stealing hundreds of top-secret documents.

When the Amerasia mess has been cleaned up and fumigated, then we shall know whether all of the Communists were fired by the State Department. Every sensible person knows that espionage agents like Alger Hiss never are found alone. The Amerasia case is the key to the matter. The revelations bound to come when light is thrown into the dark corners of this scandalous affair undoubtedly will make it necessary for Acheson to clear away the trash now holding confidential jobs in the Department of State.

Of course, the statute of limitations has run in the Amerasia case. None of those accused can be prosecuted, unless they perjure themselves to preserve their careers, as Alger Hiss did. It makes one wonder if Truman-Acheson and company have realized the deadly parallel between the Hiss case and those now being heard by the Senate investigating committee. Perhaps they have. That may be the reason for the present frenzied campaign of denials.

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was thrilled earlier in the day to hear the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] make his maiden speech before the House. This young naval veteran chose as his subject Protection of Home Industry. His appearance and his presentation were reminiscent of his fighting father who day after day fought on the floor of this House for the best interests of our America. I predict a great future for our colleague.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I say amen to the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey regarding our colleague Mr. BATES.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow following the legislative business of the day and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GOLDEN, for Thursday, April 27, and Friday, April 28, on account of official business, dedicating Dr. Thomas Walker Park.

To Mr. FUGATE, for Thursday, April 27, and Friday, April 28, and Monday, May 1, on account of official business, dedicating Dr. Thomas Walker Park.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] to act as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3482. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3482. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico;

H. R. 6553. An act to provide uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service; and

H. R. 7846. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 26, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1404. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1405. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the designation and appointment of general officers of the United States Air Force in grades above that of major general, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1406. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from January 1 through March 31, 1950; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1407. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of John B. Underwood, Jr., TMC, United States Navy"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Resolution 539. Resolution rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WINSTEAD: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8139. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 8185. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 8186. A bill to amend pargraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 8187. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 8188. A bill to amend section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 8189. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 8190. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8191. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8192. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 8193. A bill to provide for Government guaranty-loans made to Indians for the purchase or improvement of farms and farm equipment; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8194. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 8195. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 8196. A bill to authorize adjustments of rentals paid for premises leased for use during a national emergency; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 8197. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 8198. A bill to provide for the organization of the Army and the Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 8199. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act of May 25, 1948 (Public Law 554, 80th Cong.), relating to the Flathead Indian irrigation project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 8200. A bill to amend section 508, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8201. A bill to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8202. A bill to authorize and direct the Attorney General separately to itemize the budget estimates for the salaries and expenses for the United States attorney for the District of Columbia and his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8203. A bill to provide for the hearing and adjudication of claims which would have been cognizable by the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, if they had been filed in time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 8204. A bill to maintain and increase the efficiency of the postal service with respect to the delivery of mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 8205. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8206. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of John McDonogh, international trader and educational philanthropist, October 26, 1850; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 8207. A bill to amend section 62 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 198, 32 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 4c), to include the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 8208. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8209. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 8210. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution to amend paragraph 736 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 251, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN:

H. Res. 553. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate the Curtailment of Postal Services; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 554. Resolution to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting the Congress not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, concerning the relationship between Federal and State tax systems, reported on the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 8211. A bill for the relief of Henry T. Dooley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 8212. A bill for the relief of Staff Sgt. Irvin M. Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARST:

H. R. 8213. A bill for the direct relief of individual stockholders and creditors of Laister-Kauffmann Aircraft Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8214. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Mule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8215. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg) Samuel E. McMillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 8216. A bill for the relief of Osborne E. McKay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 8217. A bill to authorize the admission of Carlo Severi to the United States as a nonquota immigrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 8218. A bill for the relief of Elmer S. Hildenbrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 8219. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Herka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8220. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of an alien possessing special skill, namely, Gerhard Zahn, and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2089. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Cambridge, Md., in opposition to compulsory health insurance legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2090. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions of Dary-Paulsen Post, No. 440, American Legion, Clinton, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2091. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles H. Tennyson, executive secretary, Texas State Teachers' Association, Fort Worth, Tex., opposing the establishing of any national agency that would offer the services previously offered by the Civilian Conservation Corps or the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as we draw near to Thee we come confessing that our own faith is often weak and frail; we are full of doubt and questioning, our minds become puzzled and confused; Thy ways with men seem past finding out; wickedness seems so rampant and strong, goodness so rare and so feeble. As we pause at this wayside shrine of devotion strengthen our confidence in the supremacy of spiritual verities, banish our doubt as the dawn banishes the shadows of the night. May we become sure of Thee as men who watch through the night become sure of the coming of the dawn. Raise us up. Forgive us. Enhearten us. Strengthen us. Send us forth as sons of the morning to bring Thy light to every shadowed area of the world and to every shadowed life which touches ours. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 25, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2895) to authorize the sale of select base material, at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing through Friday.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for an indefinite period.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Benton	Hickenlooper	Malone
Brewster	Hill	Martin
Bricker	Holland	Maybank
Bridges	Humphrey	Millikin
Butler	Hunt	Morse
Byrd	Ives	Mundt
Cain	Jenner	Myers
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Darby	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Sparkman
Downey	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Taft
Eastland	Leahy	Taylor
Ecton	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Gurney	McKellar	Withers
Hayden	McMahon	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing Congress to adopt resolution for a plebiscite in Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations

"Whereas it is essential for the United Nations to encourage a peaceful, prosperous, and united Ireland without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people; and

"Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that all Ireland, including the people of Eire as well as those of Northern Ireland should have an opportunity to express their free will for or against union; and

"Whereas there is pending in the United States House of Representatives a resolution, House Resolution 463, favoring a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the United Nations Charter, the objective being to establish terms and conditions upon which Ireland would be admitted as a member of the United Nations, and the adherence of Ireland to the Atlantic Pact: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to speedily adopt the resolution, House Resolution 463, now pending in the House of Representatives or a similar resolution to bring about a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States,

the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

"By order of the assembly:

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"Clerk.

"In senate, March 22, 1950; concurred in without amendment:

"WILLIAM S. KING,
"Secretary."

The petition of Mrs. Therese Dieth, of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the continuance of the present postal rates on relief packages to Europe; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE TAX SYSTEMS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference, Joint Resolution No. 3—Public Law 1950—of the State of New Jersey memorializing the Congress of the United States to carry out recommendations concerning the relationship between Federal and State tax systems made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government and ask unanimous consent that the text thereof be printed in full in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint Resolution 3

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to carry out recommendations, concerning the relationship between Federal and State tax systems, made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known by the name of its distinguished chairman as the Hoover Commission, recommended that our tax system—National, State, and local—be generally revised and that, in this revision, every possible effort be made to leave to the localities and the States adequate resources from which to raise revenue to meet the duties and responsibilities of local and State governments; and

Whereas the Commission further recommended that the grant-in-aid plan and program be clarified and systematized; and

Whereas the Commission proposed, in order to carry out these recommendations, the establishment of a continuing agency on Federal-State relations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to promptly adopt and carry out the recommendations concerning the relationship between Federal and State tax systems of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

2. The Secretary of State is hereby directed forthwith to transmit a copy of this joint resolution, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and to all of the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey in the Congress.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

Approved April 13, 1950.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement made by me on February 7, 1949, in respect to proposed legislation which I personally introduced at that time and which had precisely the same objectives as those sought to be attained in the resolution I have just presented, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, I desire to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a bipartisan National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in which all levels of Government are represented to study those problems in our Federal, State, and local governments which make for overlapping services, duplications of effort and sheer waste in tax dollars, and I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in reference thereto.

This bill, Mr. President, represents the views and expresses the considered judgment of many Members of this body who have served in State government. It is the result of their experience at local and State levels of government that it now comes before us for study, consideration, and appropriate action.

The distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] has already introduced a resolution to the same effect and purpose. The distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has introduced similar legislation. The distinguished Congressman-at-large from Delaware, Mr. CALEB BOGGS, is introducing a counterpart of this measure in the House today. The able Governor of my own State, Alfred E. Driscoll, keynoted the proposal at the Biannual Convention of the Council of State Governments in January 1947. The activities and the deep interest shown by the members and the experts of the Council of State Governments in this matter over the past years demonstrated clearly that there is a definite need for the study established by this bill.

In presenting a very able report on the coordination of Federal and State taxes to a Senate committee last April, our very distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Ohio, Senator BRICKER, said: "The committee was fully aware that these recommendations do not in any sense offer a comprehensive solution of the present problems of intergovernmental fiscal relations."

This bill, Mr. President, as I have indicated, provides for the establishment of a bipartisan, or better still, a nonpartisan, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which will examine all aspects and phases of National, State, and local government with special attention to the serious fiscal problems which threaten to overwhelm us today. It is true that there have been many studies in this general field in the past, but none of them have had the full participation of our National Government.

Under this bill, the commission will represent all of the parties at interest, both public and private, Federal, State, and local; legislative and executive; and, where necessary, judicial. It will be given the opportunity and the responsibility to report its findings to the people of the Nation.

It is not intended that this group shall lend itself to any criticism of the basic structure of government levels as we know them or to their general purposes, but it is our intention that we improve the services of government at each level and at the same time, stretch the value of the tax dollar in respect to the rendition of those services.

When he introduced the bill to establish the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said:

"This is not a job which Congress alone, working through congressional committees and using its own staffs, can do. We in Congress have not the time. There is no use deluding ourselves about that. We have not the time to do the job that needs to be done. We would have to leave it to our staffs; and our staffs would not have the standing which the members of this commission would have in relation to the departments. * * * All sorts of expert knowledge would be required, including the services of industrial engineers and management experts. It would take time and money."

I most heartily agree that such an undertaking requires full-time work from many experts of proven ability in the several fields we propose to study.

Since this bill envisages a full-scale investigation on all levels of government, it is necessary to include representatives of local and State governments, Members of Congress, administrative officials, and men and women from private life.

The purposes as stated in the bill itself open exciting vistas for tremendous progress in efficient and effective government. To me they spell new opportunities to employ sound and scientific business methods in public operations.

The entire world watches us day by day as we conduct our public affairs. To friends and foes we are the outstanding example of the democratic processes of government. If we are to prosper and be worthy of the hopes of those who trust and rely upon us, we must be eternally vigilant that our system does not become fatally enmeshed in coils of its own construction.

The time is ripe for such an undertaking as this—indeed, our present situation demands positive and definite action.

WOLF RIVER RESURVEY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, LANGLADE COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the Wolf River area of Wisconsin, there is a tremendous amount of concern among sportsmen and other conservation groups about the proposed ultimate erection of flood-control dams. It is felt by these conservation groups that these dams would destroy much of the scenic beauty of the river and destroy its attraction to tourists and fishermen.

The Wisconsin division of the Izaak Walton League which has always been in the forefront of the conservation movement in our State, resolved in its general meeting on April 1, to oppose the proposed survey of the Wolf and Fox Rivers. This message was reported to me by Arthur Kaftan, secretary-treasurer of the league. Charles B. Wade, chairman of the waterways committee of the

league, discussed this matter personally with me and also conveyed the very strong opposition of his particular committee on this issue. Among other officials who have kindly communicated on this matter are V. J. Muench, State president of the Izaak Walton League and W. R. Cook, of Stevens Point, an outstanding conservationist.

I have, moreover, in my hands a detailed letter received from Todd Sheldon, president of the Wolf River Conservation Club, protesting against the spending of $150,000 in taxpayers' money.

Under date of April 14, Col. W. E. Potter, of the Corps of Engineers, advised me that the division engineer of the Great Lakes Division is in the process of preparing a survey report of the Fox River and its tributaries. Interested individuals should, therefore, contact the division engineer prior to his completion of the report and prior to its referral to the board of engineers of rivers and harbors. After that, the matter will be transmitted to the Congress.

It is essential, I believe, that the views of these conservation groups be very strongly registered with and understood by the Corps of Engineers.

I have, moreover, Mr. President, in my hands, Resolution No. 9 adopted by the Langlade County Board of Supervisors, opposing the survey. This resolution was sent to me by Ronald M. Moss, county clerk at Antigo, Wis. I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolution 9

"Whereas it is called to the attention of Langlade County Board of Supervisors that Congress authorized Army engineers to resurvey Wolf River, Wis., for the purpose of locating sites for flood-control dams, to be erected at Government expense; and

"Whereas said river was surveyed for same purpose by engineers employed by Milwaukee office of Army engineers and by them an exhaustive report submitted to Congress, said report stating that only one point on the river, at Leemans in Outagamie County, was fit for a flood-control dam and that at best this dam would lower the crest of the flood at the city of New London only 1 foot; and

"Whereas construction of dams at other points would destroy much of the scenic beauty of the river and destroy its attraction to tourists and fishermen, with only nominal benefit to the water-power owners on the lower reaches of the Fox River: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Langlade County Board of Supervisors in regular meeting assembled this 18th day of April 1950, That we go on record as being opposed to such wanton waste of money at a time when the Federal Government is meeting its expenses by deficit financing, when no public benefit is to be obtained by said resurvey; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk is hereby ordered to send a copy of this resolution to the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY and Hon. JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Senators from Wisconsin, and to Hon. REID MURRAY, Member, House of Representatives for the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin.

"MARTIN STRANDBERG.
"LIONEL PALMER."

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Langlade, ss:

I, R. M. Moss, the duly elected and qualified county clerk of Langlade County, Wis., do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a true copy of resolution 9 as adopted by the Langlade County Board of Supervisors on April 18, 1950.

Dated this 21st day of April 1950.

R. M. MOSS,
County Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 2348. A bill to increase the annual authorization for the appropriation of funds for collecting, editing, and publishing of official papers relating to the Territories of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1519).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; with amendments (Rept. No. 1523).

By Mr. ANDERSON (for Mr. O'MAHONEY), from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2397. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Minnesota to Signa M. Lodoen and Nels R. Lodoen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1520); and

H. R. 5866. A bill to adjust and define the boundary between Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Cherokee-Pisgah-Nantahala National Forests, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1521).

TRANSFER OF PLASTER CAST OF STATUE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON FROM CAPITOL TO SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original joint resolution, transferring the plaster cast of the statue of George Washington from the United States Capitol to the Smithsonian Institution, and I submit a report (No. 1522) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) transferring the plaster cast of the statue of George Washington from the United States Capitol to the Smithsonian Institution, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3478. A bill for the relief of Walter Alfred Dantine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 3479. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gallagher; and

S. 3480. A bill to provide that the district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania shall become a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania alone, when the first vacancy occurs in that district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3481. A bill to provide for carrying out certain treaty commitments relating to the preservation of law and order on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3482. A bill for the relief of Emilie Syrova;

S. 3483. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Miczynski; and

S. 3484. A bill for the relief of Barbara Sugihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3485. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to subsistence allowance to be paid to veterans pursuing apprentice or other training on the job; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3486. A bill to provide unemployment benefits for employees of the postal service;

S. 3487. A bill to provide for granting 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave per year to postmasters and employees in the postal service;

S. 3488. A bill to grant an option of overtime in lieu of compensatory time to postal employees for work performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays;

S. 3489. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices;

S. 3490. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to permit the retirement of postal employees who have rendered at least 30 years of service; and

S. 3491. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. LEHMAN introduced Senate bill 3492, to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3493. A bill for the relief of Carlos Riggenbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 3494, to provide relief for farmers whose lands were inundated by recent floods, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3496. A bill to provide for the designation and appointment of general officers of the United States Air Force in grades above that of major general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 3495, to provide an emergency relief fund for repairs to Federal-aid highways and other highways damaged by floods or other disasters, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) transferring the plaster cast of the statue of George Washington from the United States Capitol to the Smithsonian Institution, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend Federal rent control which is an amended version of a bill I previously introduced, S. 3464. The changes made

are mostly for legislative clarification. I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 3464 be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from New York will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, Senate bill 3464 will be indefinitely postponed. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3492) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INVESTIGATION OF OLEOMARGARINE FIRMS, RELATING TO VIOLATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution calling upon the Federal Trade Commission to investigate monopoly in the oleomargarine industry and to make the appropriate reports to the Department of Justice and to Congress. This concurrent resolution is a revised version of Senate Concurrent Resolution 83. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 83 be indefinitely postponed.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a press statement by me explaining the new resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, Senate Concurrent Resolution 83 will be indefinitely postponed, and the press statement presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86), submitted by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. WILEY), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Federal Trade Commission should (1) in the exercise of its functions and powers, cause an investigation to be made of the principal firms in the United States engaged in the manufacture of oleomargarine with a view to determining whether any of such firms are violating the antitrust laws, (2) recommend to the Department of Justice that any such firms, which the Commission has reason to believe are violating such laws, be prosecuted to the fullest extent permitted by law, and (3) report to the Congress on its findings.

The press statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LEHMAN ON RESOLUTION CALLING FOR INVESTIGATION OF OLEOMARGARINE INDUSTRY

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, on behalf of himself and Senators FERGUSON, GILLETTE, and WILEY, today introduced a revised version of his resolution calling for an investigation of monopolistic practices in the oleomargarine industry.

The new resolution calls upon the Federal Trade Commission to make the investigation and to recommend to the Justice Department whether antitrust action should be undertaken. The resolution also calls upon the Federal Trade Commission to make a report to Congress on this situation. The original resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) called on the Justice Department to make the investigation as well as to prosecute the antitrust violations, if any are found.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for the establishment of a Joint Select Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 87) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Select Committee on the Organization of Congress, to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four members shall be members of the same political party.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. These studies shall include, but shall not be limited to, the organization and operation of each House of the Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationships between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of officers and employees of the respective Houses and officers and employees of the committees and Members of Congress; the structure of and the relationships between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress; and the rules, parliamentary procedure, and practices of each House.

SEC. 3. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to changes in the organization or operation of the Congress shall be referred to the joint committee: *Provided*, That the existing jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall remain unimpaired.

SEC. 4. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (a) referred to the joint committee or (b) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 5. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filed in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 6. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 7. The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY IN SUPPORT OF HIS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. President, I am today joining Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, in introducing for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Select Committee on the Organization of Congress. The joint committee would be authorized to continue the work so well begun by the LaFollette-Monroney committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress. The work of that former committee, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which it fathered, went far to strengthen the internal organization and operation of our National Legislature. But the experiences of the last 3 years, and especially of the past session, have led most of us, I think, on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses, to believe that much remains to be done to increase the efficiency of the legislative branch of the Government.

In the procedures of our committees, in the staffing of Congress, in the lightening of our onerous work load, in the performance of the function in controlling public expenditures, and in the regulation of lobbying, there is much room for improvement.

In these, as well as in other respects, the reorganization of Congress to keep it abreast of the requirements of the times is a continuing problem which demands continuous attention. Our resolution, therefore, provides for a select committee which would make continuing studies of the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein with a view to strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, and improving its relationships with the other branches of the Government. The executive branch of the Government is in process of reorganization after the disruptive influences of the late war. As a coordinate branch of the Government, Congress must also be organized and equipped to perform its vital functions effectively.

The joint committee would be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be chosen by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be chosen by the Speaker of the House. Not more than four members of either group could be chosen from the same political party.

The joint committee would not be barred from studying and making recommendations with regard to the rules and parliamentary procedures of either House. Such a prohibition was imposed upon the LaFollette-Monroney committee which was thus not at liberty to suggest any changes in floor procedure. The appalling delays of the past session in the Senate and the unprecedented log jam of appropriation bills, have convinced many of us that the time has come for a reconsideration of our standing rules. The rules of the Senate have not been revised since 1884—65 years ago. Is there any other mechanism in America that is powered by an 1884 motor? Where would American industry be today if it had not retooled for 65 years?

The joint committee would have jurisdiction over matters relating to the organization and operation of the Congress, but it would not be authorized to trespass upon the existing jurisdiction of the Committees on Rules and Administration of either House. Like the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it would have legislative authority to report by bill or otherwise.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS ENTITLED "HOW CONGRESS MAKES A LAW" (S. DOC. NO. 164)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a radio address delivered by me entitled "How Congress Makes a Law," which has been put into pamphlet form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Robert F. A. Studds, of Washington, D. C., to the position of Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. WITHERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

David C. Walls, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

SHOULD WE ADOPT THE FEDERAL FEPC?—DEBATE BETWEEN SENATOR HUMPHREY AND SENATOR HOLLAND

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a debate on the subject, Should We Adopt a Federal FEPC? between Senator HUMPHREY and Senator HOLLAND, on the American Forum of the Air, February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RENT CONTROL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on rent control made by him, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, on April 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE AMBASSADOR FROM IRELAND TO THE FORDHAM UNIVERSITY CLUB OF WASHINGTON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Ambassador from Ireland, Hon. John J. Hearne, to the Fordham University Club of Washington, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., April 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPLACED PERSONS—LETTER FROM SAM M. MYERS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding displaced persons in the United States, addressed to him by Sam M. Myers, of Stillwater, Okla., which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTEMPTUOUS "OFFICERS OF THE COURT"—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Contemptuous 'Officers of the Court'" published in the Washington Evening Star of today, which appears in the Appendix.]

SISTER HELEN MADELEINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON POST

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sister Helen Madeleine," from the Boston Post of April 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY EDITION OF THE ANDERSON (S. C.) DAILY MAIL—EDITORIAL FROM DIXIE BUSINESS

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in Dixie Business, commending former United States Senator Wilton E. Hall, publisher of the Anderson Independent and Daily Mail, on his recent anniversary edition of the Anderson Daily Mail, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLAND

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on the 3d of May 1791, was adopted by the people of Poland the Polish Constitution of that date. This great document was a significant development of the affection of the Polish people for the American Constitution and for the rights of man as exemplified in the American concept of free government and democracy. That splendid pronouncement expresses the aspirations of the people of Poland and of their spirit of brotherhood with the United States and the sublime principles upon which this Republic was established.

It will be remembered that in the war of the American Revolution Gens. Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski drew their swords and fought in the American Revolutionary Army in behalf of our independence. General Pulaski lost his life in the Battle of Savannah.

The people of the United States, since those historic days, have had admiration for freedom-loving Poles and their aspirations for liberty and freedom. From the third partition of Poland in 1795, that feeling continued and gained strength until new Poland was born in the peace treaty following World War I in which President Woodrow Wilson was instrumental in securing the re-creation of Poland. In this noble enterprise, he had the aid and friendship of Ignace Paderewski.

In World War II, the fury and tragedy of Hitler's war machine were directed against free Poland which was forced to defend itself against the savage attacks of Hitler's plan to conquer Europe and to enslave its people. The Poles fought with determination and courage and resisted fearlessly and with a spirit of desperation.

It is our hope that Poland may regain its liberty and its love for democratic government and that it may maintain the admiration of its people for American institutions and free government.

The oldest continuous settlement of Americans of Polish extraction lies within the borders of Texas at Panna Maria. Americans of Polish descent have been splendid citizens of our State and faithful supporters of the doctrines of the United States of America.

In recognition of these historic events, and in observance of May the 3d, 1950, the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution, I desire to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an official memorandum from the pen of Hon. Allan Shivers, Governor of Texas, and I ask that it be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 10, 1950.

Dating from the very beginnings of the American Nation, men and women of Polish lineage aided the growth of efforts on this side of the Atlantic not only to improve economic well-being but to secure and preserve our liberties. This tradition culminated the brilliant and strategic aid in our American Revolution of Gens. Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski, the latter losing his life in the Battle of Savannah.

The Polish Constitution of the 3d of May 1791 was a noble effort conceived in the spirit of the rights of man and of the American Constitution to carry out on the European scene those sacred principles of liberty which have ever since linked the people of the United States of America with freedom-loving Poles during many generations in the dreary years between the third partition of Poland in 1795 and the birth of new Poland after World War I, conceived in the friendship of Woodrow Wilson and Ignace Paderewski.

After only a few short years marked by brilliant achievements in the arts and sciences, the Government of free Poland was forced to resist in tragic single-handedness the onslaught of Hitler's mechanized millions, and has fought on underground and in Allied armies through terrible years of war, starvation, and exile.

Happily recalling that the oldest continuous settlement of Americans of Polish extraction lies within our borders at Panna Maria and that thousands of Texans have drawn inspiration from the symbol of the free Polish eagle surmounted by its majestic crown which sustained their ancestors in their defense of Christian civilization against the onslaughts of eastern dictatorships.

Now, therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, hereby designate May 3, 1950, the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution, as Polish Constitution Day in Texas, calling attention of all Texans to Poland's continuous struggle to be free of totalitarian bondage and expressing hope for its early deliverance.

ALLAN SHIVERS.

REPORT ON JAPAN

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am sure that almost everyone agrees that General MacArthur has done a superb job as supreme commander of the Allied Powers in the occupation of Japan. I have often wondered, however, what the reaction of the Japanese people is. Will the Japanese people in future years be friends of ours, or enemies, and what progress is communism making in Japan?

An article in the Reader's Digest for May 1950, by J. P. McEvoy, entitled "General MacArthur Reports on Japan" contains much food for thought.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MACARTHUR REPORTS ON JAPAN

(By J. P. McEvoy)

The legendary General MacArthur, who looks 7 feet tall and always talks like Napoleon bidding farewell to his troops, exists only in the minds of those who have never met him. He is fabulous enough without all that nonsense. At West Point he graduated with the highest scholastic record up to that time. He was the youngest general in World War I, the youngest superintendent of West Point, the youngest Chief of Staff. After a distinguished career he was called out of retirement to defend the Philippines. The rest is a colorful page of history that we all know.

But General MacArthur has his own estimate of how the schoolbooks will read. "Historians a thousand years from now may give this last war only a line, saying, 'And then the whole world was swept by a conflagration.' But I believe that there will be a page, maybe a chapter, telling how freedom and democracy were brought to the Far East by the United States—one of the greatest and perhaps the noblest single achievement of our country."

When General MacArthur discusses the problems of Japan and the Far East he exudes confidence. He is not humorless or pompous, as his critics would have you believe; he has dignity and sureness.

"What will happen after the occupation?" I asked. "Many people say the Japanese are not ready to make their new democracy work and will fall easy prey to the old dictatorship."

"If we moved out tomorrow," said MacArthur, "and any group tried to restore the old conditions they would be hanged to the lampposts. Millions of farmers who for the first time own their own little farms will fight for their land as our own farmers would fight. Seven million laborers will not give up what they have won without a desperate struggle. Many of the old crowd are dead, the others will be gone in 10 years—and all of them and their works have been thoroughly discredited.

"The Japanese not only lost the war; they also lost confidence in their former way of life. Their leaders took them to the mountaintop and showed them the world, saying, 'All this is yours if you follow us.' The Japanese people followed, blindly, passionately, and were led down the road to disastrous defeat. It is absurd to think that those leaders or their doctrines could ever rise again."

MacArthur says he was very much put out at first that the Japanese people cheered him with victory signs when he went by. Finally he realized that as the occupation progressed they looked upon him as a liberator rather than a conqueror.

"Before the war a feudalistic overlordship controlled the work of the average Japanese. He could not say what he thought. He couldn't walk down the street without fear of that dread tap on his shoulder by the thought police. He couldn't even attend his Shinto shrine without realizing that the priest was a Government official. The regimentation was complete.

"Today he doesn't have to work more than 8 hours if he doesn't want to. He can go and come as he pleases and say and write what he likes, so long as he stays within the libel laws. He can worship at any church or shrine he wishes—or not go to any. I believe that the Japanese, having once tasted this freedom, will fight and die for it just as we have in the past and will continue to do, world without end."

When I mentioned that Japanese friends of mine said the people went berserk after they got liberty and now had 2,000 political parties, MacArthur replied, "It will all shake down to three: the conservatives—and most Japanese are conservative and have been for hundreds of years—a labor party and the fringes."

"And the Communists?"

"Communists number less than a million. They consist of the underworld, a certain percentage of liberals educated beyond their understanding, some North Koreans, and the usual groups who exploit any situation that they think will bring them wealth and power. After the surrender the organization of labor unions was encouraged—the kind the workers were not permitted to have before the war. While conditions were still chaotic and the workers bewildered, the Communists moved in to get control. They were completely frustrated when the occupation authorities stopped their threatened general strike, and they have been losing steadily ever since. The Japanese will never accept communism. It spells Russia to them—and if there is one thing the Japanese know, hate, and fear, it is Russia.

"A good example of what I mean is the effect on the Japanese of the repatriated prisoners of war who were so carefully indoctrinated by the Russians before being shipped back to Japan. When these men ignored their families who had come to welcome them at the stations after years of heartbreaking absence and marched off to the nearest Communist headquarters to sing party songs and wave banners, the Japanese—to whom family life is more important than anything in the world—were first shocked beyond words, then later completely disgusted. It was a psychological boomerang and a major propaganda defeat."

MacArthur says: "A peace treaty with Japan is long, long overdue. The Japanese have fully and faithfully observed their surrender commitments. They have disarmed, demobilized, and established a peaceful democratic regime."

Should Japan be rearmed? MacArthur says: "No. Japan cannot possibly raise an army or air force large enough to protect herself. Besides, the raising of armed forces would attract rather than dissuade aggression. Japan should be the 'Switzerland of the Far East,' and neutral for the same reasons that Switzerland is neutral—no matter which side she might join she would inevitably be destroyed."

On this question, MacArthur, in his annual New Year's Day message to the Japanese people, for the first time publicly discussed the unique provision of the Japanese constitution renouncing the right of armed security. He made his viewpoint unmistakably clear in the following language:

"Some cynics deride as visionary Japan's constitutional renunciation of the concept of belligerency and armed security. Be not overly concerned by such detractors. A product of Japanese thought, this provision is based upon the highest of moral ideals, and yet no constitutional provision was ever more fundamentally sound and practical. While by no sophistry of reasoning can it be interpreted as complete negation of the inalienable right of self-defense against unprovoked attack, it is a ringing affirmation, by a people laid prostrate by the sword, of faith in the ultimate triumph of international morality and justice without resort to the sword.

"It must be understood, however, that, so long as predatory international banditry is permitted to roam the earth to crush human freedom under its avarice and violence, the high concept to which you Japanese are pledged will be slow in finding universal acceptance. But it is axiomatic that there must always be a first in all things. In this historic decision, you are the first. The opportunity, therefore, is yours to exemplify before mankind the soundness of this concept and the inestimable benefit resulting from the dedication of all energy and all resource to peaceful progress. In due course other nations will join in this dedication, but meanwhile you must not falter. Have faith in my countrymen and other peoples who share the same high ideals. Above all, have faith in yourselves."

When asked if he thought the Soviet Union would respect an unarmed Japanese neutrality, the general replied that he believed it would distinctly be to their advantage to do so for reasons of pure military expediency. An occupying power would be forced to feed the Japanese pecple—who have to import some $250,000,000 worth of food per year under favorable conditions—and would need to guard and repair an extremely vulnerable transport system. It is to the benefit of every country in the world, he believes, to have an unarmed, neutral Japan.

With little patience for detail, MacArthur has less for critics of detail. He says that too much of the reporting out of the Far East is on the police-court level. "One of the great revolutions of all time has been carried through quietly and bloodlessly in Japan, but critics are inclined to ignore this and look for perfection. Democracy is not a static thing; it is constantly changing. In our own country, nearly 200 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, we are sending out Freedom Trains to enlighten our own people on the meaning and importance of democracy. Why should we expect the Japanese to know all about it in 4 years?

"But democracy in Japan will not be the same as in our own country or in England. It will bear the marks of the Japanese people's own genius and be shaped to their own needs. When an American sees an invention he tries to invent something different and better. A Japanese will adapt it to his own requirements.

"The new Japanese Constitution is the most democratic in the world. So are Japanese laws. Their execution is something else again, but the Japanese are learning and willing to learn. They have less graft, corruption, election frauds than many democracies."

MacArthur went on to sketch the historical pattern of the Japanese genius for adaptation of techniques which they considered superior to their own. When Commodore Perry and his "black ships" forcibly opened Japan to western trade, the Japanese immediately realized that here was superior power with which they could cope only by learning how to match it. So they sent their brightest young men to America and Europe to study and bring back to their homeland the cream of western techniques. The British Navy, the German Army, the American industrial machine they copied and adapted with such incredible ingenuity and industry that they were able in less than three generations to dream of world conquest and pursue it with such fantastic success that it cost us billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of American casualties to stop them.

I asked MacArthur to explain something that puzzles many people. "Why have the Japanese, who hated us so fiercely and fought us so savagely, turned into such docile disciples of American ways?"

"The Japanese believed their own propaganda," said MacArthur. "They believed that they were divinely ordained to rule the world and that their philosophy, religion, industrial machine, and armed might made them all-powerful. America represents the power that overwhelmed them. They asked themselves: 'Who are these Americans? How did they do this? Surely they must have something we haven't. Let's learn what it is and adopt it—and maybe we, too, will become strong again.' Oversimplified, to be sure, but there is the essence of it. Critics who glibly dismiss the postwar democratic reforms in Japan's political, economic, and social life as subtle oriental deceit misread the Japanese character and misinterpret Japanese history."

I asked the general, since the old dream of outdoing the West was shattered beyond recall, what new hope could drive the Japanese to work together again like so many fanatic beavers as they did for nearly 100 years. What new dream of the future could galvanize them into picking up the pieces and starting to build again?

"The word is 'vision'—not 'dream'," said MacArthur, "and there is nothing wrong with the vision they had. The coprosperity sphere idea for this part of the world was sound. But the Japanese forgot the 'co' part of it. They wanted all the prosperity while they enslaved the rest of Asia. But it is still a fact that this part of the world holds half the population of the earth and has the lowest living standards. Remember, too, that 60 percent of the world's natural resources—rubber, oil, tin, and so on—are here.

"With the largest body of skilled and disciplined workers and the most experienced management in this part of the world, the Japanese can make goods which the rest of Asia can afford, and can develop tremendous markets in which we cannot compete because of our high prices. Japan is the natural workshop of the Far East, and for 50 years this could keep all the Japanese busy and make them prosperous and happy"—MacArthur paused—"unless the heavy hand of war is laid on them."

Did he have any reason to believe that this was inevitable?

He replied: "In the two previous World Wars there were people on one side or the other who believed they had something to gain by winning. Today the majority of the people in our own country and in Russia, and all responsible leaders, know that no one can gain by another war; the potential of destruction is so great that, win or lose, it would almost be committing suicide. If the Russians really wanted war there have been plenty of incidents in the last 2 years which would have precipitated war at any other time in history."

The Russians are no strangers to MacArthur. He has spent much of his 50 years of soldiering in the Far East and he knows his way around the devious labyrinths of oriental thinking.

When the Allied Council for Japan held its first meeting, the Russian delegation was all primed to reproduce in Tokyo the familiar Berlin pattern of Soviet propaganda and sabotage. MacArthur set them back on their heels in his welcoming speech: "As its functions will be advisory and consultative, the council will not divide the heavy administrative responsibility of the supreme commander as the sole executive authority for the Allied Powers in Japan." Then, staying only long enough to belabor the dazed Russians with some 3,000 more plangent polysyllables, the general stalked from the scene and never appeared at another meeting, sending his deputy instead.

And the Russians understand MacArthur. One day Lieutenant General Derevyanko, top Russian commander in Japan, was picked up by American MP's for reckless driving. When released, he indignantly sent a demand for an apology to General MacArthur. MacArthur asked the officer in charge, "Was he violating the law?" The officer said, "Yes, sir."

"Tell him," said MacArthur, "there will be no apology."

The message was relayed to General Derevyanko, who demanded incredulously, "Did General MacArthur say that?" When assured that he had said just that, the Russian general slapped his thigh in glee and roared, "What a man."

CONDITIONS IN JAPAN

Mr. YOUNG. Also, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a part of my remarks a letter from Mr. Erwin H. Brendel, who is presently a student at Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind., and a letter which Mr. Brendel has received from a young Japanese friend. This young friend of his in Japan worked with him all during his tour of duty there during and after the war. This letter from Mr. Matsumoto is one of the most interesting and informative that has come to my attention.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH BEND, IND., *April 18, 1950.*

Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a resident of Bismarck, N. Dak., and at present attending law school at the University of Notre Dame, therefore I am addressing this to you rather than to a member of the Indiana delegation in Congress.

I was with the Army in the Pacific during the war and spent somewhat over 2 years in the occupation of Japan, about 1½ years of which with military government as a prefectural information and education officer with additional duties as legal-government officer for over a year due to the personnel shortage. During this time I had sufficient opportunity to become well acquainted with Japan, the Japanese, and the American occupation, and I have regularly corresponded with several Japanese since leaving there in October 1947. The letter which I am enclosing was written by a man who served as interpreter-translator in my office during my whole tour of duty there. He is an automotive engineer and generally much better educated than the average run of Japanese. His letters have always been of great interest to me mainly because they have given me a bird's-eye view of the situation there which cannot be gotten from reading newspapers and magazines. The most recent letter which I received (and which I enclose) was particularly revealing, especially in the light of recent developments of world-wide interest. So it occurred to me that you might be interested in reading it also.

Undoubtedly you have available a great deal of material on the Orient which you can consult for your purposes. However, I believe that it is rarely that you can find Japan's problems so well and clearly laid out from the viewpoint of the man in the street as they are here. At any rate, I hope that the letter will be of some value, or at least of some interest to you.

Very sincerely yours,

ERWIN H. BRENDEL.

URAWA CITY, SAITAMA KEN, JAPAN,
February 23, 1950.

DEAR MR. BRENDEL: How're you getting along these days, Mr. Brendel? You must be busy with your school work. We've already passed the middle of February, and here in Japan it's getting warmer every day. A pleasant spring season seems not very far. But what is it like at your place in the States? It's still very cold, isn't it?

Well, in some respect, things in this country have greatly improved since around the time you left Japan. Today, they sell better food, clothes, and all sorts of daily necessities both in quality and quantity. So if you stand at a street corner downtown in Tokyo, you would surely be struck to see folks better clad and fed than you saw them last. Controls on commodities have been greatly lifted for some time and placed on free sale, leaving only a few scarce articles for ration. Vicious inflation cycle has also been halted by dint of Government's disinflation policies. And even some articles have dropped their prices.

Well, things are going like this. You might think everything is all right here in Japan. Yes; it is in some respects, as I said before. But there is another side of the picture. And this is a dark side.

Last year the Government carried out the readjustment of its set-up, and a great number of employees were discharged. At the same time the private enterprises followed suit. Here the unemployment has loomed as one of the major problems. Until recently a great many people engaged in black-market activities in some way or other taking advantage of the inflationary trend. But they're also going to lose their sphere of activities as the country's economy began turning toward deflation. Putting them together, I think, the number of the unemployed will make a tremendous figure. Anyway, it must be a hard task to feed and to give jobs to over 80,000,000 citizens who are elbowing one another on the small four islands of Japan.

Another thing is the pressure of Communists. While you were in Morioka you must have heard or read something about the activities of Communists in Japan. We feel the Red impact is getting ever stronger around us. It is especially so since the Communist domination of China. They spread their tentacles into every stratum of society—schools, factories, farmers, offices, and so on. Such social unrest as unemployment, economic austerity, agrarian panic which food import from abroad might produce together with the problems of foreign investment in Japan, the pending Japanese peace treaty, and even the post-treaty problem of whether or not the American Army is allowed to put her military bases on the Japanese territory have been brought forward and utilized by Communists in their propaganda efforts. The Communists contend that the introduction of foreign capital into Japanese industry is to make Japan a slave of foreign capitalists. And they stick to the demand for an immediate withdrawal of the occupation forces from this country. On the other hand they hail and try to publicize all the news that comes from Moscow or from Red China, while they keep their mouth shut tight on the matter of Japanese repatriation from the Soviet area. Anyway, Communists seem to be working hard to hold Japan by whatever means they can think of.

You Americans are giving support to the democratic nations of the world with tremendous material aids. At the same time many of your public as well as private organizations are also helping the war-sufferers, the poor, handicapped, orphans, and such people of the world with the gifts of clothes, food, candy, and toys from your truly humanitarian motives. Yes, many people ap-

preciate it and are truly thankful for your help.

But you know, the Communists' propaganda is too clever. And you are in most cases too frank and honest. In this sense, it seems to me that your country is in many cases losing the battles of pens and voices with the Russians. Especially it looks so in the theater of Asia. The Communists might say that the United States sends these gifts and aid materials to win their favor in her aim to achieve her imperialistic design. And a mass of ignorant population believe it true. Thus, isn't it probable that your vast aid materials may be wasted with no effect, or even worse still, with adverse effect. Therefore, I think it absolutely necessary for you to place more importance on dissemination activities. This kind of work needs a long-term planning and the rack of your brains. But it would surely pay you in the long run.

I was surprised some days ago at a newspaper report. The board of education of Tokyo asked some 200 Communist teachers of primary and middle schools in Tokyo area to resign. At a primary school in downtown Tokyo, the children and their parents who are apparently instigated by Communists staged a demonstration and went to the office of the board of education demanding, among others, an immediate withdrawal of discharge notice, and the improvement of their milk ration at their school lunch—everyone knows the milk is rationed to them through the good offices of UNICEF—on the pretext that the milk was unpalatable.

Well, a demonstration by primary school children is itself an unusual thing. With any stretch of imagination, I don't think the demonstration and demand were initiated by the children alone. I don't know for sure who made them do it. But a certain thing is that there are some men behind them telling them do such and such a thing.

This is only one instance, but with it I think you will see how Communists go into every corner of society ever trying to destroy the democratic society and pull the public into their side. And this kind of trick must be played anywhere and always in the world.

Now, Mr. Brendel, you might feel that these things are happening in some other world which has no direct bearing upon your daily living. But in Japan we feel their immediate pressure around us day and night. They are working on us in papers, magazines, books, speeches and overseas radio broadcasts from Russia.

I think I went a little off the track. But I feel it may give you a picture how things are ticking in Japan.

I'm still working at the same place. Yet you know, there has been much talk going around about an early peace treaty with Japan. So I don't think my present job will last very long. Anyway, these postwar years gave me a great deal of lessons invaluable. For the first time I came to understand, though not yet completely, what things in America are like. And most fortunate of all for me is that I had a chance to know such a nice American like you.

The office work also gave me good opportunities to practice my English reading and writing. I haven't much to tell you about my home life. Our daily living so far has been rather an uneventful, happy one. Today seems an exact replica of yesterday. But we see Japan and Asia as a whole is in the midst of a violent maelstrom going nowhere dragging all of us with it.

Now, here enclosed a photo, and we're so happy if you accept it. I and my wife had it taken at a photo studio a few weeks ago in this town. We wish from our heart your success in your study.

The last but not the least, we all appreciate for your Christmas card that came to us safely across the Pacific. Please drop us a line if you had a time to spare. Sayonara.

Very sincerely yours,

ATSUO MATSUMOTO.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me in recognition of the second anniversary of the sovereign State of Israel.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, on the 23d of April, the new State of Israel celebrated its second anniversary as an independent and sovereign state, and that celebration is continuing throughout the present week.

Two years ago, a dream of centuries long was fulfilled. The Jewish people, one of the oldest nations in the world, found a homeland in the State of Israel. It is indeed an historic event in our times that this state has been reborn. And it has been through the courage and determination of these people that such a rebirth has been possible. Even when it seemed almost impossible that Israel could ever become a state, the Jewish people did not give up. The sovereign State of Israel is a well-deserved fulfillment of their dream.

In the two short years of its existence, Israel has been faced with tremendous difficulties. The little country has been torn with war, its people have been faced with dislocation and misery. But through it all, the people have not once given up working for a democratic government, and their efforts to improve the well-being of the citizens of Israel have been rewarded in increased production and better living standards for all.

Israel still remains the haven for thousands of refugees—and these refugees are being welcomed into a new and vigorous state. Here they will find a home, freedom, and security.

Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to thousands of my fellow Americans in extending my best wishes to the people of the State of Israel, and my sincerest hope for their continued and ever greater prosperity in the future.

BOOSTING KANSAS

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, one of our fine newspapermen in the State of Kansas is Mr. McDill Boyd, editor of the Phillips County Review. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an excellent editorial by Mr. Boyd entitled "Boosting Kansas Is Everybody's Job."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOSTING KANSAS IS EVERYBODY'S JOB

Kansas has all the attributes of greatness but Kansans lack pride in their State, its resources and accomplishments.

Favored among all people on earth, the Kansan away from home is too often an apologist for the State. He has faith in Kansas or he wouldn't be here, but he jokes about the time-worn and usually untrue stories of grasshoppers and dust storms, when he should be proudly listing the advantages of his slum-free, healthy, and profitable surroundings.

Good health ranks high in the list of earthly blessings, and World War II selective service statistics indicate that Kansas ranks second among the 48 States in health.

And we should be a healthy folk. We have more days of sunshine than the average State; our water is clear and pure; our air is free from the taint of smog and grime. With one of the best public health organizations in the Nation providing the leadership, our cities are clean and sanitary; public and industrial practices which once menaced health have been outlawed.

Kansas is indeed a healthy place to live, and fame and fortune bring little happiness to the man with a sour stomach.

The friendly, neighborly spirit which characterizes our State is almost as well known as the Kansas cyclones which strike in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

There are no strangers in Kansas, and every man is accepted on his own mettle. There are no privileged classes in Kansas where the environment acts as a great leveling influence to bring us all together in our schools, our churches, our community work and play. Men are not numbers in an industrial machine in Kansas, where an inherited love of freedom and independence has created a hard core of resistance to the "hand-out State."

Kansans live together in their respective communities, where children of the rich and poor sit side by side in school or church; where employee and employer work together on city councils, on school boards, on boards of directors of golf clubs and recreation centers. Yes, Kansans live together, work together, play together in an atmosphere of friendliness and neighborliness that gives each man a chance to find his own level in the community.

Agriculture is the backbone of the State's economy, where farmers, by their own ingenuity, toil and resourcefulness have created a great inland empire. Kansas' production of wheat and cattle; its well-rounded farming program, have become legendary. The State's natural resources are not confined to top soil alone, however, with great reserves of oil, gas, coal, salt, lead, and zinc providing a background for the industrial development now well under way.

Western Kansas, the highly publicized dust bowl of yesteryear, in 1948 had the largest per capita earnings of any like-sized area in the world.

The proud list of Kansas' resources and accomplishments—second among all States in its educational system, its high rate of literacy among them—reaches out almost endlessly.

The time to boost Kansas is long overdue, and while a well-conceived program has been started by the Kansas Industrial Development Commission, the individual Kansan must carry the torch.

At home and away from home, Kansans should be militant boosters for their own State.

Our families have a chance to live in a happy, wholesome environment where the best in American tradition is the customary way of life. We enjoy good health, completely modern facilities, and a chance to make enough money to appreciate it all.

We have no animosity toward other States, but we do feel sorry for the folks who have to live in them—there simply isn't room enough in Kansas for everybody.

TREND TOWARD SOCIALISM

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, Mr. Richard W. Robbins, one of our leading livestock men and a leader in civic and business affairs, of Pratt, Kans., advises me of the growing concern among stockmen not only of Kansas, but of the Nation, who have assembled to voice their protest against the rising tide of Socialist trends within our Government today. I should like to call that concern to the

further attention of my colleagues and the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial taken from the New Mexico Stockman, the official publication of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association, which in bipartisan language strongly denounces this trend of our Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SIGNIFICANT STATEMENT

On the front cover of this number of the New Mexico Stockman is the text of a special resolution adopted at the opening session of the thirty-sixth annual convention of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association in Albuquerque March 27. The resolution was adopted by unanimous, rising vote.

The resolution expresses grave concern at the trend toward socialism in present Federal Government policy, and an urgent demand for a return to adherence of our Government to the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the United States, and the spirit of its Preamble.

If this action of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association had been the isolated demand of a single group for an end to socialistic trends in the Government, it might have been possible to infer that this one organization was motivated by some particular opposition of its own to current Government policy, or perhaps by some partisan political motive.

Neither of these conditions exist.

First, the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association is strictly a nonpartisan organization. Its more than 5,000 members include both Democrats and Republicans. While we do not know the party affiliations of these men and women, our guess would be that a majority, and perhaps a large majority of them are members of the Democratic Party, because very large numbers of them or their fathers or grandfathers came to New Mexico from strongly Democratic States.

Second, this declaration against socialistic trends has been voiced in equally vigorous demand by nearly every livestock organization west of the Mississippi River; by farm organizations or both sides of the great river; by numerous business groups both large and small; by women's organizations, social service clubs, and church organizations, from coast to coast.

It is the rising voice of increasing numbers of the people of the United States against a paternalistic policy which, if not arrested can lead only to the tragic conclusions stated in the resolution.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending measure. The amendment, which would reduce by $1,000,000,000 the authorization provided for in the bill, has been printed and is lying on the desk. It is lettered "D." I ask that it be made the pending question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$2,950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,950,000,000".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be regarded as the pending question.

WE MUST STOP COMMUNISM NOW

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, America stands today as the last sanctuary on earth of human dignity and freedom. Only the blind or those who dare not see can fail to admit that the struggle in which we are now caught is a matter of life or death.

I believe that our future will go by default unless we come to a complete understanding of the strategy and objective of the vicious world conspiracy that is bent on our destruction. We cannot hope to win this fight against the resources and the ruthlessness of such a deadly enemy as we now face unless we know exactly what it is we are fighting.

That is why, Mr. President, at the outset I want to warn the American people of how misleading a term the expression "cold war" really is, as it is currently being used to describe the struggle in which we are caught. There is nothing cold about the war that is raging around the world today, and we only render ourselves a disservice by our failure to take off our verbal gloves and call a spade a spade.

The truth is, Mr. President, we are now caught in the most vicious, undeclared war in human history; and this undeclared war is being waged against us on the economic, on the financial, on the social, on the political, on the religious, on the ideological, and on the military fronts with such diabolical skill and fanatical fervor that the American people simply cannot grasp the deadly seriousness of the predicament in which we now find ourselves. The only reason Russia has not formally declared a military war upon us is that she can make faster progress against us by lulling us into inactivity through the absence of such a declaration. Yet Communist literature is full of acknowledgments that Russia is at war to the finish with all the non-Communist world. Meanwhile, the capitalist world is being annihilated piecemeal.

Mr. President, time will not permit a detailed historical analysis of the causes that have led to our present dilemma, but I want to take sufficient time to draw in the starkest outline just what the central cause of our dilemma is.

The central cause to which I refer is the Communist world conspiracy which was spawned in the horrors of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and dedicated to the proposition that humankind is kin only to the brute, and entitled only to the status of inmates of a vast world concentration camp, with no other allegiance than to the fantastic, ruthless decrees of a brutal despotism. It is this ruthless, brutalizing, and inhuman perversion of every principle and ideal of cultured and Christianized humanity that lies at the root of the conspiratorial plague that now stalks across the world.

I do not intend by my remarks to pay homage to the master minds of this criminal conspiracy, for I believe their successes are naturally due, not to the justice of their cause, not to the superiority of their intelligence or to their devotion, but to the misunderstanding and weaknesses of their opponents. They fight in a manner in which we have not learned to fight.

It is a historical fact that this Communist plague has succeeded in infecting and spreading its germs and paralyzing its opponents by exploiting the weaknesses and imperfections of other peoples and by reopening and inflaming old wounds, as well as by inflicting new ones.

This Communist technique has succeeded until today every aspect of human activity and human endeavor has been turned into unhappy, political hunting grounds for Communist exploitation. They fish only in troubled waters, and have perfected the technique of roiling the waters of every realm. They defeat us by making end runs around our traditions, our mentality, and our morals.

If there is one thing, Mr. President, that the American people need to be shocked into a complete realization of, it is the fact that no area of activity in this great land of ours is immune to these vicious assaults. Our institutions, shipping, agriculture, labor, industry, mining, our branches of Government, civil service, our political parties, our culture, our science, our religion, our social and educational activities, our athletics, and even our private clubs all are grist for this Communist mill of infiltration.

This Communist world revolutionary conspiracy will stop at nothing to undermine and destroy us, twisting our noblest humanitarianism and even our patriotic impulses into whatever ugly shape will serve their vicious ends. Their genius for hypocrisy is transcendent.

However, history will recall that the Communist imperialism would not stand today where it is, both at home and abroad, without the unparalleled material aid and without a shocking ineptitude on the part of American diplomacy.

At Tehran and Yalta by the stroke of a pen, the American people lost everything they were supposed to have gained from the First World War in respect to the self-determination of European peoples. By that stroke of a pen Europe was cut in two and an iron curtain drawn across its heart. Behind that iron curtain, 110,000,000 people were transferred from the hands of one dictator into the tyrannical hands of another. The European economy was paralyzed, for Russia was left in control of a minimum of the population and a maximum of the food-producing area and the raw materials of the European Continent.

At Yalta, we lost everything we had been fighting to gain from both world wars, for by a stroke of the pen Asia was partitioned and China was betrayed and we turned over to Russian control a minimum of the population of Asia—Manchuria—and a maximum of the surplus food-producing area and the greatest industrial potential the Orient has ever seen, which Japan had built in Manchuria. Thus, we handed over to Stalin on a silver platter everything China had been fighting Japan 10 years to achieve. By these two strokes of the pen, Stalin was handed geopolitical spoils in terms of military advantages, salt water ports, navigable rivers, coal and iron mines, and surplus food-producing areas of such staggering implication that the American people completely failed to grasp what had happened; for Stalin was handed as a gift those things which the

frightening, tyrannical, imperialism of Czarist Russia had never been able to take by conquest for the past 400 years.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. To what does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi attribute this betrayal of American interests?

Mr. EASTLAND. As I stated, it was the ineptitude of our diplomacy at that time.

Mr. LANGER. Was it only that?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think it was ineptitude. I do not think the men who directed our foreign policy were Communist agents. I think Alger Hiss, the adviser, was a Communist; but I think it was purely ineptitude.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator say just what he means, according to his judgment, by "ineptitude"? As a part of it, does he mean ignorance of diplomacy?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think it was ignorance of diplomacy, ignorance of Stalin's intent, the fact that we trusted him too much, and the fact that the proper precautions were not taken to protect the interests of this country.

However, Mr. President, of even more far-reaching significance than this is the fact that the secret diplomacy of these two conferences completely destroyed the old balance of power between the great nations in Europe and in Asia, leaving a gaping power-vacuum in the Orient which communism has speedily filled.

The most tragic effect of the Tehran and Yalta conferences was the fact that they transformed what had started out as a war of limited objectives on our part into a world Communist revolution. Through our weaknesses and blunders we succeeded in playing into the hands of the master minds of this world conspiracy to such a degree that we have succeeded in destroying the only two nations in the capitalist world that were capable of withstanding Communist expansion in Europe and in Asia.

At the same time we have spread the seeds of destruction of our own private-enterprise system throughout those nations of the Western World that are now caught between the Russians and ourselves. This is exactly in accordance with the blueprints for world domination which hang in the Politburo in Moscow.

As a result of the conquest of China by the Communists and the recently signed treaty of alliance, which, in reality, makes China as much a vassal of Moscow as any other country behind the iron curtain, the Soviet Empire has become the largest empire in both area and population in the history of the world. It is larger than any empire of ancient or medieval history—larger than the empire of Alexander the Great, larger than the Roman Empire, larger than the empire of Genghis Khan. It is larger by some 200,000 square miles than the British Commonwealth of Nations, which is only a loose aggregation of nations, the largest component of which—India—may itself soon fall to the Soviets. In population the Soviet Empire's 800,000,000 souls is nearly 50 percent larger than the British Commonwealth of Nations with 550,000,000 souls. Indeed, today, Soviet Russia controls fully one-quarter of the land area of the earth and well over one-third of the world's population. Compared to the United States and its possessions, the Soviet Empire today has nearly four times our area and over five times our population.

Such, Mr. President, is the magnitude of the Frankenstein we have raised up against ourselves. The United States is not without blame for the creation of the Russian Empire. Our foreign policy has implemented the expansionist program of Soviet Russia. It appears to me that it does not matter whether our policy has been inspired by people sympathetic to Communist aims or not—as has been charged—the result, so far as America is concerned, has been the same.

I am reminded of General Patton's comment just before his tragic death, when he reviewed the results of the American policy:

> We fought the war of 1776 for independence. We fought the war of 1864 to free the slaves. We fought the war of 1917 to make the world safe for democracy. We fought this war—World War II—to lose for humanity all that we had gained from the other three.

Mr. President, we have, it is true, checkmated communism in some countries of Europe, which was a victory for America, marred though it has been to some extent by the sustenance we have given socialism, the little brother of communism. But it is in the Orient that Russia has made its greatest headway since 1945. The Berlin blockade, which we countered with the Berlin airlift—and rightly so—appears to have been merely a highly successful diversion to distract America's attention from the great headway Russia was making in China.

I need not recount here how American envoys to China after 1945 insisted that Chiang Kai-shek take the Communists into his Government and form a coalition with them. These negotiations lasted into 1946. They broke down only because of the well-known impossibility of cooperating with Communists, who insist on occupying key posts in the Government. During this period of negotiation our envoys insisted upon a truce between the Chinese Nationalists and the Chinese Communists. The truce was formally signed January 5, 1946. Under our supervision the Chinese Nationalists kept this truce. But our envoys were not present in the camp of the Communists. The Chinese Communists, therefore, used this period of negotiation to outfit themselves with the vast equipment which the Russians seized in Manchuria—described as sufficient to equip an army of 500,000 and to keep them in the field for 10 years.

In addition to equipping and training an army, the Chinese Communists expanded their holdings from 67 counties, out of a total of 2,000 counties in China, to 319 counties, during the period of supposed truce. By the time American envoys had relinquished the effort to force Chiang Kai-shek into a coalition with the Communists, the latter were ready to attack, and eventually, on April 21, 1948, they formally declared war on Chiang Kai-shek. Thus, during the period when the Chinese Nationalists had the power to defeat the Chinese Communists, our newspapers are replete with accounts of attempts of America to help the Nationalist Government withstand the Communist onslaught; but, for some reason, the desires of the American people were mysteriously thwarted, and much of this aid never reached Chiang Kai-shek.

This sort of game continued until suddenly the American people were shocked by the inevitable consequences. On May 4, 1949, William Henry Chamberlin wrote:

> The news from China represents one of the greatest diplomatic fiascos in American history. The open door to that vast country, one of the pillars of traditional American foreign policy, is slamming shut very hard. The most numerous people in the world are rapidly passing under the sway of a regime that is linked up by very close ties with Moscow, that makes no secret of its violent hostility to this country. * * * What has happened in China is tragic, from the standpoint both of the Chinese people and of United States foreign policy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether he was in the Senate during a part of the time when the policy referred to was being placed in effect in Asia, particularly in China?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think I was here all the time.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator know anything about the policy?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator ever have a chance to debate it on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it ever made known to the Senator, or to any committee on which the Senator served?

Mr. EASTLAND. It was not made known to me.

Then Walter Lippmann himself admitted that matters had so deteriorated that—

> There can be no such thing as an American policy which "unsolves" the Chinese problem. Our policy, when we are again in a position to have one, will necessarily be limited to making such contacts as we can on the best terms that can be arranged with the Chinese authorities on or near the coast of China. Whether they will also have authority in the deep interior, no man can say. It is quite conceivable that there will not be for decades, perhaps for generations, any Chinese Government which, except in name, is obeyed by all the Chinese.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he believes that the deal with Russia made at Yalta, as a result of which there were turned over to Russia the transportation system and several harbor facilities in Manchuria, had anything to do with the final loss of China?

Mr. EASTLAND. It directly contributed to it; it was largely responsible for the loss of China.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whether, in his judgment, it opened up and softened up a large part of the remaining Asiatic area, such as Indochina?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to the Senator at that point that we are witnessing at this time the greatest softening-up process in history. The next Communist conquest will be in southeast Asia. When we refused to defend Formosa, when we repudiated Chiang Kai-shek, when we let into Manchuria the greatest army of Asiatics on the continent. Without the support from this country they were foredoomed to failure. We permitted southeast Asia to be softened, and, in addition, those countries would be afraid to ally themselves with us. We have repudiated China; we have refused to help China. So what assurance could the people of southeast Asia have that we would defend them?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator believe that the policy initiated under former Secretary of State Marshall to stop the ammunition from America to Japan—and to let the Communists through the pass into Manchuria to secure the Japanese guns stored there—helped the Communists—those agrarian Communists—to capture China.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now, Mr. President, I shall not deal in personalities here in any way, shape, form, or fashion.

Mr. MALONE. I shall omit the name.

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to say this for Mr. Acheson that while I do not agree with his Asiatic policy and I think it is inadequate, yet I think Mr. Acheson is a fine gentleman who is doing the very best he can. In the light of history, however, I think he is wrong. I think his policies are totally inadequate to stop communism, but I say that our foreign policy to restore world trade is sound, and that, after all, the great bulwark to prevent Communist expansion is to make friends with people by doing business with them. I think that Mr. Acheson in that respect has shown both courage and intelligence, and I endorse that policy 1,000 percent.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. My question had no reference to foreign trade whatever. Does the Senator believe that the policy initiated in 1946 of allowing the Communists to go through the pass and arm themselves in Manchuria with the arms left there, contributed to the fall of China?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have recounted all that. The Senator was probably not in the Chamber at the time. I have gone over it, step by step.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to know that. So long as the Senator has brought up the trade question, I am wondering if he will yield for one more question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. What about the International Trade Organization?

Mr. EASTLAND. I have not studied that.

Mr. MALONE. The International Trade Organization simply transfers the regulations of our national economy from our executive department to the ITO—58 nations, each with one vote, we would have the same vote as Siam.

The ITO would have the authority to fix tariffs and import fees for its member nations, and to fix quotas of production for its members, and that would complete our economic downfall, it would accomplish the objective of one economic world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Now that the Senator has been interrupted, I should like to ask with reference to the agreement at Yalta, which was later confirmed at Potsdam and other places, whether the Senate was represented there?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. So far as the Potsdam agreement is concerned, I think if it had been carried through it would have meant the end of western civilization; and the most intelligent thing this country did was to repudiate that program in part. But we have not repudiated enough of it, as I shall show as I proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. We have repudiated a part of that policy in western Europe, but more of it needs repudiation. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. We have not gone far enough.

We now know, Mr. President, what is happening. We have lost China to the Russians. We have jeopardized our position in Japan and the threat of new Communist expansion in the Far East grows daily more imminent.

Mr. President, I find it significant that this debacle in Asia took place behind the thesis that Gen. Chiang Kai-shek was a reactionary, a corrupt politician, and a wholly unsavory character, in spite of a proven record of leadership, and also that communism was not communism at all in China, and what is more, Mr. President, this thesis blamed Chiang for every Nationalist failure and for every Communist triumph.

This disastrous line continues to cover up the fact that while we went to war in the Far East to preserve our historic policy of the open door in China, 4 years after the war was over—the most expensive and frightful war in history that has been won by forces 95 percent of which were American GI's sweating and dying in the jungles and on the beachheads of the Pacific Islands—4 years, I say, after we had won the war, the "open door" was slammed shut in our faces, while at the same time we continue this self-same disastrous propaganda line to write off all of China, and by so doing we, in effect, write off the rest of the Orient as well.

But what is even more tragic, Mr. President, is that while the American people were recovering from the shock of the collapse of China and while we have been caught in the crossfire of accusation, pro and con, an even more staggering defeat has been in the making in Europe.

Mr. President, on March 10 William Henry Chamberlin wrote:

> It is high time to stop barking up wrong trees in Germany and to consider means of implementing our professed objective of bringing as much of Germany as we can influence, on equal terms, into a closer west European federation. Measures that are indispensable to this end are the dropping of all one-sided economic restrictions and controls, the transformation of the high commissioners into ambassadors, and the metamorphosis of the obsolete occupation into some kind of protective friendly alliance.
>
> Unless solid progress along these lines is achieved quickly, we may experience a debacle of policy in Germany compared with which the Communist conquest of China may seem a very minor set-back.

On March 14, Walter Lippmann commented on the break-down of our international programs by saying:

> What we see is that Mr. Acheson has nothing new to propose to the Russians and that he has nothing new to propose to the American people and to our allies. Thus the diplomatic situation is frozen in Washington while the actual situation in Europe and Asia is deteriorating. The State Department has for the time being run out of ideas which evoke energy, offer hope, and create confidence.

On March 16, Dorothy Thompson wrote:

> Relations between west Germany and Europe are at the lowest point since the war.

On March 27, Joseph Alsop wrote:

> We are losing the cold war here in Germany. Yet this is the central fact: unless we take bold preventive measures we must prepare for the defeat in the cold war here within 2 or 3 years at most.

Mr. President, we are losing the cold war in Asia and we are losing the cold war in Europe, because we are losing it in Germany, which is the key to the Continent.

On April 1, Mr. President, Anne O'Hara McCormick wrote:

> Never again will there be as favorable a moment to draw Germany into the western community.

Mr. President, I am frank to say that I am simply astonished to find so many of my colleagues and my fellow Americans still unable to grasp the simple fact that if you pursue certain definite policies in the economic, social and political realm you will reap inevitable consequences. What has happened in the Far East was the inevitable result of the policy we

have pursued and what is now happening in Europe is the inevitable result of what we have been doing in Europe, particularly in Germany.

Again, I say, I am astonished that there are still so many who cannot see the parallel that exists between what we have done to China and what we are continuing to do to Germany at this very moment.

In China a secret deal was made which in effect amounted to the partition of the nation, rendered the Government helpless, cut its food producing areas away from the mass of the population, destroyed the industrial potential of Manchuria and poured in millions with our right hand while we are digging the grave deeper with our left. Then we covered up what was going on behind the outrageous smear and slanderous attack on the integrity and patriotism of Chiang, blaming him for everything that went wrong. This is why, Mr. President, the parallel crisis now gathering on the European Continent threatens such dire consequences. For as was the case in China we partitioned Europe through the heart of Germany; we carved Germany into five separate entities; we cut off the surplus food producing areas from the industrial centers; we poured in 12,000,000 excess population in the western zone; we took their fishing fleet out into the North Sea and sank it; we tried to impose the Morganthau plan and in many instances continue to follow the Morganthau precept, including the dismantling of German plants, and yet after these policies we continue to blame the German people for everything that happens and everything that goes wrong.

Mind you, Mr. President, this one-sided, vicious smear propaganda against taking western Germany into the community of free nations is being loosed upon the American people at a time when the whole cause of western civilization is hanging in the balance and continues so to hang.

It is little wonder then that the situation in Germany has deteriorated so rapidly without the American people's knowledge of what was taking place, until, on April 4, 1950, Mr. John J. McCloy called on western Europe to take west Germany into full partnership at once as the only means of keeping Russia from making all of Germany a satellite state. These are Mr. McCloy's own grim words: "Tomorrow may be too late."

Do the American people need any more evidence, Mr. President, of how late the hour is if we are to stop the final Communist conquest of Europe as well as Asia? Do the American people need any more proof of what is now at stake in our dealings with the German people? What more can be done to convince this administration that the time has come for a complete reorientation of our basic policies toward Germany and the restoration of some semblance of sanity and reason to our plan for their future?

The warnings of what is happening have come from our own best-informed interpreters of European affairs. From Mr. McCloy, from Mr. Churchill, from General de Gaulle, from Paul Reynaud, from the Premier of France, and from the German Government itself until, in desperation, Chancellor Adenauer, himself, has been forced to warn the western Allies:

> The tension between the east and west has increased constantly since the war. Germany lies in the middle. We don't want to see another war. We want to see an understanding between Russia and the western Allies as quickly as possible. But this understanding should not come at our expense.

Mr. President, no man ever spoke more truthful or courageous words, for it has now become perfectly obvious that any further concessions, not only to Russia, but to either Britain or France, at the expense of Germany, is another act of appeasement of Russia and brings the Communist conquest of Europe that much closer.

The question then is how are we to avoid more compromises at the expense of Germany with either our enemies or our allies. How are we going to completely change our policy to bring Germany back as an equal democratic partner into the family of western European nations and keep her there?

Today, Russia is stretched out across the Eurasian Continent from Berlin to Port Arthur; she is in possession of the raw materials; the surplus food-producing areas; the trade routes of Europe and Asia. These are the very essentials to which both Germany and Japan desperately need access to maintain even a minimum standard of living.

Russia is holding access to these essentials right under the noses of the German and Japanese Governments and their people, and only the blind can fail to see the handwriting on the wall. If we continue to do what we are doing to restrict, to destroy, to control, to sentence to substandards of living the people of these two great industrial workshops of the world, Germany and Japan, we will drive them right into the hands of Russia and that is exactly what we are doing at this very moment.

In the light of these irrefutable facts, I hope that the Secretary of State at the Foreign Ministers Conference in Europe on May 6 will stand firm to restore the opportunity of the German peoples to join with us voluntarily in stopping the steady deterioration that is eating at the roots of western civilization. If not, we can see that our own failure will encourage the steady march westward of Communist tyranny.

Mr. President, again I warn my colleagues and the American people that our failure now to stand by principles that will restore a sound foundation for democratic government to the German people will only continue to be the perfect Communist line.

I hope our State Department will make no compromise or concession to anyone that will in the least weaken Germany. To do so will constitute an act of appeasement that will play directly into the hands of Stalin.

My own personal convictions are that if this is to be prevented there are seven constructive steps we must take now:

First. We must repudiate the disastrous agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Second. We must declare an end to the state of war but with the right to retain bases and military forces in the countries now occupied.

Third. We must restore the freedom to work to the German and Japanese people and remove the outrageous restrictions on the peacetime industrial potential capacity which is desperately needed to rebuild these nations.

Fourth. We need to restore freedom of action to defend the basic interests of their own people and to provide for their basic needs.

Fifth. We need to insist that our allies accept Germany and Japan as equal partners now in the solution of all of the problems that confront the anti-Communist world.

Sixth. We need to restore the principles of the Atlantic Charter to the German and Japanese peoples, namely: equal access to the raw materials of the world for victor and vanquished alike.

Seventh. Finally, Mr. President, we must reestablish a sound foundation in our relations with the Germans and Japanese and draw a line between the tragedies of the past and new hope and promise for the future. For ironic as it now may seem, Germany and Japan have again become the last outposts of western civilization against those forces which now seek to engulf, enslave, and destroy it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I do not wish to interrupt his very able presentation, and if he does not wish to be interrupted I ask unanimous consent that my remarks follow his recommendations.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator if he has anything in mind relative to a moratorium. While a review might be made of the remaining plants, which should be converted to civilian use——

Mr. EASTLAND. There should be no moratorium. Let us stop the whole foolishness.

Mr. WHERRY. Is such a recommendation being made by the distinguished Senator?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator make it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. I thought the Senator was in the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I was being interviewed by some Senators who were inquiring about arranging time so that they might speak. However, I wish to endorse very strongly the recommendation of the Senator from Mississippi. He knows that the junior Senator from Nebraska was associated with him and 44 other Senators last year while the time was running out. We asked that a review be made of all the agreements entered into, under the theory that any plant which could be converted to civilian use should not be destroyed, because it would mean that if we were to

reestablish peace with the German people, about which the Senator is speaking, it was necessary that the people be employed and that their industries be rebuilt.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, let me cite an illustration of what was happening in Berlin during the blockade. At vast expenditure of American blood, of men who were killed taking the planes in, and of American money, we supported the people there, but at the same time we were dismantling industrial plants in Berlin during the blockade. Now 25 percent of the able workers there are unemployed, and it is costing this country millions of dollars to feed them. The Secretary of State says we must pour many millions of dollars into west Berlin to revive her industries. I agree, but we would have cut down those costs, or largely eleminated them, had it not been for the dismantling of plants at the very time when the blockade was occurring.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that when plants are dismantled in those communities the people who are thrown out of employment provide a most fertile field for the expansion of the communistic ideology?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Communists say to them, "Come with us now. That is foolish action. We will see that you are rebuilt. We are not going to interfere with your right to work. We are going to guarantee you adequate resources and jobs in order that you may be able to support your families."

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that the very purpose of the ECA bill is to rebuild and rehabilitate those countries? Is it not a nonsensical policy, certainly an expensive one, to permit the dismantling of plants in Germany at the rate they have been dismantled under the agreements, when those plants should have been converted for the benefit of the ideology we are trying to establish in those countries through the ECA itself?

Mr. EASTLAND. The trouble is that a foolish proposal, one which borders on the insane, was adopted, whereby the people were permitted to retain enough peacetime plants to maintain a standard of living equal to that of 1936, which was a depression year, but it did not take into account the fact that there are 12,000,000 refugees in western Germany, and that the population has increased. So production of supplies for the people there would be lower than it was in 1932. It would not be possible to construct a straighter highway on which to drive that country into the clutches of Moscow.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to yield for another question in reference to the recommendation made by the distinguished Senator relative to establishing bases in these particular countries, and giving them the military support that is needed.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not one of the most important countries in all western Europe, from the standpoint of military and strategic value, the country of Spain?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the Senator feel about the policy of the Secretary of State in respect to Spain, and what has been done?

Mr. EASTLAND. I think Spain should be recognized, and I think Spain should be granted credit by the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; in order to accomplish in Spain what we are attempting to accomplish in all the other countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. And to save it as a military base. Spain is a Christian country. She is a country which follows the private-enterprise system. She is the leading capitalist nation of Europe, and we should cooperate with her.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not true that nearly 90 percent of the German people voted to put into operation the free-enterprise system?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And that is the very ideology we are trying to maintain in all the countries in western Europe through the ECA, is it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Aside from America and Spain, the Germans and Japanese are the people most devoted to the free-enterprise system.

Mr. President, I fear for the future of our country. We are rapidly becoming isolated in the world. On the continent of Europe the German people hold the balance of power between the East and West. Lenin's thesis, which is still the paramount objective of world communism, is, "He who controls Germany controls Europe" and I say, Mr. President, that a Communist Germany means a Communist Europe. It means the isolation of the United States. It means that our country will be placed at grave disadvantage in the world, and that we will become inferior to the Slavic states.

Across the world, in Asia, we occupy the islands of Japan. The Japanese, Mr. President, are the only Asiatic people strong enough to prevent communism from further engulfing the great continent of Asia. The Japanese could have prevented the Communist conquest of China.

Mr. President, if there were a choice between a China controlled by Russia and a China controlled by Japan, so far as the senior Senator from Mississippi is concerned, he would a thousand times rather see Japan control that great country than to see Moscow control it.

The Japanese today, Mr. President, could prevent the Communist conquest of Indonesia and southeast Asia. Why should we not permit the countries of that area and Formosa to recruit Japanese soldiers for their armies? The Germans and Japanese are bitterly anti-Communist. Their interests lie with the West. If we make them full partners in the anti-Communist front, we will have erected an impregnable barrier which will break the waves of communism and cause its tide to recede.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of March 3, 1950, in which General Robert L. Eichelberger outlines the necessity for rearming the Japanese to oppose communism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, civilization's barriers against atheistic communism must be built upon five foundations: First, the United States; second, the British Empire; third, France; fourth, Germany; and fifth, Japan. Allied with us must be free peoples everywhere, but I say that these five nations must be the foundation of the dike.

We are in the throes of a so-called cold war now, and the Soviet Union is building up a tremendous armed striking force for the time when the cold war becomes hot. In my judgment, war between the two systems will come in time. Lenin said that war between the two systems was inevitable, and it appears that he was one of the great soothsayers of history.

Mr. President, I stated that I feared for the future of our country. I am alarmed for her security, and I am alarmed that more Americans are not alarmed for the safety of our country. We do not have the armed resources today to stop Russian aggression, and in my judgment our paramount duty is to rearm America to make her impregnable; we must permit Germany to rearm under our control; we must permit an anti-Communist army in Japan under our control; we must make ourselves invincible on the land, in the air, and on the sea, and when we have done this we have the best guaranty of peace.

I am frightened because it appears that in dealing with communism in Germany and in Asia our Government is paralyzed, and refuses to take adequate steps to prevent Communist expansion. The peoples of Europe and Asia do not want communism and it is significant that communism has been spread solely by armed force and not by the victory of ideas. Communist expansion has been by the same military means, the same pattern of conquest by armed force which was followed by Hitler in Europe and Japan in Asia, the same force which we took up arms to check for our own preservation. Yet our Government today permits Russian advance, step by step, each step of which puts our country in a weaker position.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MYERS. Would the Senator care to comment upon the recent surrender of 150,000 Nationalist troops to an invading army of apparently 15,000 troops on the island of Hainan?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the facts are in that case I do not know, but, no doubt, they will come to light. I say, however, that it is urgently necessary that we provide equipment to defend Formosa, and that we permit the Chinese Nationalists to list in their army Japanese merce-

naries, if they so desire, for the reason that if Formosa is captured without the United States raising its hands it would mean that the countries of southeast Asia would have no confidence in us. They know that Russia is giving equipment and furnishing officers to the Chinese Communist Government. They know that Russia is cooperating with the Chinese Communists. The countries of southeast Asia would be afraid to ally themselves with us unless we should stand our ground and help our friends.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment. I desire to read to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania first from an article entitled "Americans in Asia Doubt United States Policy," published under a Tokyo date line in the New York Times of April 22. I read as follows:

Discontent with the State Department has become widespread among Americans working in Asia. In a 3-month trip to Formosa and Hong Kong this correspondent found few compatriots who defended present American policies.

The virtually unanimous opinion is that the Asiatic situation has changed tremendously in the last 6 months—

Note this particularly—

and the State Department still is following policies that may have been valid a year ago but are not now. Even among foreign service officials—

Note that even among officials of the United States Government, officials of the State Department—

there is a tendency to agree to the view that trying to check communism in the small southeast Asian countries will get nowhere and the best American bet is to help and use the reborn Nationalist Chinese Government as long as possible. It is the only force in Asia with a sizable anti-Communist Army.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS IN ASIA DOUBT UNITED STATES POLICY—SAID TO FEEL STATE DEPARTMENT FOLLOWS OUTDATED PLANS—TAIPEI HELD BEST HOPE

(By Burton Crane)

TOKYO, April 21.—Discontent with the State Department has become widespread among Americans working in Asia. In a 3-month trip to Formosa and Hong Kong this correspondent found few compatriots who defended present American policies.

The virtually unanimous opinion is that the Asiatic situation has changed tremendously in the last 6 months and the State Department still is following policies that may have been valid a year ago but are not now. Even among foreign service officials there is a tendency to agree to the view that trying to check communism in the small southeast Asian countries will get nowhere and the best American bet is to help and use the reborn Nationalist Chinese Government as long as possible. It is the only force in Asia with a sizable anti-Communist Army.

In justice it must be noted that many of the State Department's loudest critics are the same men who last autumn would have gone even farther in the other direction. Then they would have rushed to recognize Communist China in the hope that by working with Mao Tse-tung's government the United States could prevent it from orienting its foreign affairs exclusively to Moscow.

But, argue the critics, the situation has changed since then and the policy also should change. Mr. Mao already has leaned toward Moscow, to use his own phrase, and there is no longer any advantage in continuing to advocate a policy designed to keep him from leaning. Besides, it is contended, Nationalist reorganization has made the Formosa regime a potentially valuable anti-Communist instrument.

Although inflation has been halted and financial affairs arranged so the Taipei Government meets its bills without printing banknotes, it is doing so at the expense of gold and supplies that won't last forever. Unless those stocks are replenished soon collapse appears inevitable. Therefore any aid must be prompt.

Even among foreign service employees this correspondent found no supporters for the view aired by Prof. Owen Lattimore in a Johns Hopkins speech last week. Professor Lattimore proposed that the United States let the Nationalists die, even hastening their fall on the theory after they had gone Mr. Mao would not be pressed so hard against Premier Stalin and the United States might be able to deal with him.

Men on the spot contend that Mr. Stalin already has taken steps to prevent any such eventuality by placing Soviet advisers in all branches of the Chinese Communist Government.

Both those who want immediate American aid for the Nationalist war effort and those who caution against going too fast agree that the Taipei Government has managed a virtually complete rebirth.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. MYERS. Since the Senator places so much credence in the article from the New York Times, from which he has just read, I should think he would likewise place credence in the other dispatches which have come to America to the effect that in Hainan 150,000 Nationalist troops surrendered to an invading army of 15,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. If it happened.

Mr. MYERS. I should think that even with their fists and without equipment the defenders could very well have thrown back the invaders into the sea if they had the will to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the great anti-Communist army, the strongest anti-Communist army in Asia, is lined up in Formosa, and we should give that army equipment.

Mr. MYERS. But does not the Senator think what has happened in Hainan is very strange, and is it not something the State Department, the Congress, the Senator from Mississippi, the advocates of the Nationalist Government, and the advocates of a strong defense of Formosa should take into consideration? To me it is fantastic.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, it is fantastic if it happened. But before arguing such a point it is important to know whether what the Senator has just said actually did happen. I do not know.

Mr. MYERS. But the Senator from Mississippi has placed great credence in the article published in the New York Times from which he has just quoted.

Mr. EASTLAND. I place great credence in that article, because the writer of it quotes officials of the American Government, officials of the great Foreign Service of the American Government.

Mr. MYERS. Does the writer of the article name those officials of the Foreign Service?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; he does not name them.

Mr. MYERS. It cannot be an exact quote unless the writer of the article names the officials. I think we should place as much credence in the other story published in the various newspapers as in the one from which the Senator quoted. The Senator is willing to have complete confidence in one article but is not willing to have complete confidence in another.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania realize that if we check off Formosa, without furnishing any help and repudiate our friends there, it would give the Communist drive in southeast Asia tremendous prestige and cause the people in that area of the world to be afraid to ally themselves with us because they would fear they would receive the same treatment. Why should we not help the army on Formosa? It is the strongest anti-Communist army in the East. Why should we not give them some equipment? It is all the more vital that we do so when we take into consideration the fact that Russia is sending equipment to the Chinese Communists. I simply say our country must support its friends.

Mr. MYERS. It was not my purpose to discuss that point. I was speaking only of the other incident and asking the Senator's opinion about it.

Mr. EASTLAND. If what the Senator said happened, it is absolutely fantastic. But that is not the army of which I am speaking.

Mr. MYERS. I understand.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Mississippi familiar with the fact that the best troops of the Chinese Republic are on the island of Formosa under the leadership of General Sun Li Jen, the commander of the ground forces there?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am going to discuss that in a moment. What the Senator says is absolutely true. Sun Li Jen is the greatest anti-Communist Chinese general.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he is familiar with the fact that as recently as from 60 to 90 days ago the Government of the Republic of China asked, in relation to Hainan Island, that they be furnished, not arms, because the Government of the United States on January 5 had declined to furnish any arms or ammunition to the Republic of China—but asked that they be sent some rice and some textiles so that they could pay some of the civilian labor on Hainan Island in order to construct roads which

would enable them to increase the defensive possibilities of Hainan Island, and that this request was refused, on the ground that indirectly it would be military help. Is the Senator familiar with that fact?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely true. Mr. President, that simply means we have no policy in southeast Asia. We have nothing in the way of a policy that will help stop the Communist drive to gain that great area of the earth. If we continue without any policy, the whole continent of Asia will be in the hands of the Communists in 2 or 3 years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Mississippi familiar with the fact that there has not been a single person of responsibility in the Military Establishment who has appeared before the Appropriations Committee who does not admit that in the unfortunate event that World War III should break out—we all hope it will not happen—but in the unfortunate event that it should happen, it could not be localized to Europe alone, and would of necessity be global in territory? Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, it would be global, Mr. President, and the Japanese are our ace in the hole. I think they ought to be armed. I think we ought to build up an anti-Communist army there. As I am going to show in a few moments, we must draw the line there. What is happening is nothing but armed conquest. The stuff about a victory of ideas is a lot of bosh. When the line is crossed and an attempt is made to take over a country we should use adequate force to prevent it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, I take it that the Senator's position is that it does not make very much sense to close the door to communism in Europe, if we are going to leave the door wide open to communism in Asia and, by so doing, greatly strengthen the capabilities of the Soviet Union to destroy a free world of free men?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course the continent of Europe is the key, and Germany is the key to Europe. We have not got proper policies to orient that country into friendship with the United States. I wish we had a customs union between the United States and Germany. There is great need for it, for the reason that we have in this country a tremendous surplus of agricultural production which Germany needs.

We must ally ourselves with anti-Communist people everywhere; and we must draw the line, and must make ourselves invincible, and must tell Russia, "One more step, another aggression, and we are going to stop you with adequate means."

That is the best guaranty of peace.

Mr. President, the United States should have taken action in 1945. We did not; and in 1950, Mr. President, we do not now have a program adequate to stop the advance of communism. Only yesterday on the Island of Hainan large numbers of Chinese who detest communism laid down their lives to prevent its spread, and yet there was no help from the Government of the United States.

On the island of Formosa there is today stationed the strongest anti-Communist army of the Asiatic peoples now in existence. The army which is there entrenched to prevent the spread of communism is under one of the most famed Chinese generals who is hostile to communism. Yet they have been repudiated by the Government of the United States; and our country, the last bastion of capitalism, has checked them off.

When they are gone, there will remain only the subjugation of southeast Asia, an area now largely undefended. In the coming struggle for southeast Asia, Mr. President, what Asiatic people would dare ally themselves with the United States? Could they be sure that we would assist them? Could they repose confidence in our claim that we oppose communism, when we have done nothing but retreat, when we have sacrificed China, when we have refused to protect our allies from armed Communist aggression? If we do not help Formosa, they will be afraid of us.

I note in the press, Mr. President, that Russian planes, Russian officers, and Russian equipment are now being used by the Red armies of China. If this is true, then the attacks on Hainan and Formosa are nothing but armed conquest by the Soviet Union; and that makes it all the more imperative that the United States protect these islands. If we will not protect them from armed Russian conquest, then what assurance have the people of southeast Asia that we will protect them from armed conquest by satellites of the Soviet Union?

Mr. President, I stated that we must rearm and must make the United States invincible. However, we must do more than that; we must draw the line. We must assure the anti-Communist people of the world that the United States will prevent, by whatever means necessary, further armed expansion by the Soviet Union. We must resist and prevent it, no matter whether it comes from the Soviet Army or whether it comes from the satellite states whose armies are equipped, trained, advised, and assisted by the Soviet Union.

In my judgment, if this assurance is given, there will be less likelihood of further conquest by Russia; but if Russia continues her expansion, we must resist and prevent it by adequate means. We cannot permit friendly peoples to be subjugated one by one. We dare not become isolated in a hostile world.

Mr. President, in addition to this American bulwark against the expansion of communism, we must assist in building prosperous economic conditions in Germany, in Japan, in Europe, and in Asia. We must assist these countries in the creation of social and economic conditions which will bring the joys and comforts of life to their people. It is conditions such as these that make young men willing to fight and die for their country. In this regard the program of the State Department is intelligent and adequate. The trade policies of the Secretary of State will do more than anything else to build up this economic bulwark which must be the foundation for the military forces to protect us.

Mr. President, if we are to prevent war, this is the way to prevent it. If we have war, this is the way to win.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I should like to ask a question. I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he is familiar with the fact that one of the principal causes of the Japanese attack upon the United States at Pearl Harbor was that the Government of the United States made it clear that in the interest of world peace and our own national security we could not and we would not permit the domination of China by Japan. Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from California expresses the historic foreign policy of this country, namely, an open door in China. We were afraid Japan would control China and would shut the door. So we went to war to prevent that; and in order to prevent it we destroyed Japan.

However, now, 4 years later, as I have said, that door has been shut in our face through Communist conquest of China, and we did not take adequate steps to prevent it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the able Senator from Mississippi familiar with the fact that from the morning of Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, until the final battles of Okinawa and Iwo Jima, almost 4 years later, in order to help prevent the domination of China by Japan, this Nation contributed heavy losses in manpower and also great material wealth to preserve a free and independent China? Is not the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California has just entered the Chamber, and, of course, he not hear the earlier part of my remarks. In them I discussed that point, namely, that 95 percent of the men who conquered Japan were American GI's who fought—and many of them died—on the beaches and in the jungles to maintain the open door in China, which historically is our sound policy, namely, that it is in our best interest to maintain the open door in China, so that no other country will have greater rights there than we will have.

Now, however, we have thrown that policy by the wayside, we have discarded it, and we have permitted Stalin to become the master of that country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, perhaps I am a little repetitious, but I think

the point is most important, although sometimes it is lost sight of.

The Senator from Mississippi is also familiar, is he not—I am sure he is—with the fact that the Soviet Union was in the war in the Pacific for less than a week? In other words, the Soviet Union went into the war on August 8, and the Japanese asked for and received an armistice on the 14th of August, a period of less than a week, as compared with the 4-year period, as the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, during which the Americans, with blood, sweat, and tears, fought their way back across the Pacific.

The question I want to ask the able Senator is this: In view of the fact that, after 1 week's participation in the Pacific war, the Soviet Union, dominating all of China with her 450,000,000 people, is today on a springboard from which she can move against southeast Asia, the Philippines, and ultimately Japan—perhaps, ultimately, even India and Pakistan—does the able Senator from Mississippi feel that we can afford a diplomacy which loses in the Pacific everything that American fighting men fought to win?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the distinguished Senator from California says is entirely true. He spoke of Soviet Russia's having been in the war for only a week. They fought a scavenger war for just a week. But they won that war. They won it from Japan and they won it from the United States. It is one of the most amazing things in all history. They entered the war in the Pacific during its last week, practically at no expense, with equipment furnished largely by this country, yet they defeated the United States in that war and they defeated Japan.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times of March 3, 1950]

EICHELBERGER BIDS UNITED STATES ARM JAPANESE—OCCUPATION COMMANDER CALLS FOR TREATY PROVISION OF DEFENSE AGAINST REDS

Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, wartime commander of the Eighth Army and its head on occupation duty in Japan, declared last night that any peace treaty with Japan must include a Japanese Army to protect the islands from the Communist menace on the mainland of Asia.

His speech was released by the Department of Defense for delivery before a dinner of the New York Patent Law Association in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and was generally construed as the first plea for a Japanese Army from an authoritative source.

On the platform with him was Brig. Gen. Frank Howley, retired, recent commander in Berlin, who has been quoted as opposing a German Army and who talked informally of his difficulties with the Russians.

Expressing the belief that the democratizing of Japan had been and would be a success, General Eichelberger said:

"As we have kept our Potsdam promises, in contrast with Russia, who has broken all hers, it is ironic to find in the recent Sino-Russian treaty provisions for mutual protection against a future imperialistic Japan and her friend, the United States.

"Red Russia and Red China, cowering behind their hundreds of divisions and pointing to a completely disarmed Japan."

WAY TO GUARANTEE SECURITY

Reviewing the work of the Eighth Army in destroying Japan's war potential and the aid from the United States toward reconstituting her economy, he doubted the wisdom of continuing to protect Japan with American forces. But he added emphatically:

"The present far-eastern situation is not a pretty picture. Japan is as necessary to us as we are to her. Since by her constitution she has renounced war and we have introduced democracy, then we have a moral obligation to guarantee her security.

"If there is a peace treaty and her security is not otherwise guaranteed, then we must at some time permit the Japanese to organize a defensive army so that Japanese and not American soldiers can defend her shores."

He described how Russia had seized every military item that came into her hands with the surrender of the Kwantung army, had kept 370,000 Japanese prisoners, refusing to discuss them, much less to account for them before the Four Power Council.

Asserting that the riches of Burma and Malaya and the East Indies lay under the menace of a southerly Red thrust, he continued:

"The Japanese are the know-how men of the East. It is easy to conceive of the Red plan to couple their abilities to build locomotives and ships and airplanes with the tungsten, the oil, the tin, and all the other raw materials to the south.

"That would signify the loss of the Pacific war to the United States, Canada, Australia, and the Philippines."

He was inclined to minimize the influence of the Japanese prisoners Russia had repatriated after indoctrinating them in Stalinism and telling them the United States was removing food from Japan.

"Papa-San and Mama-San, their Japanese fathers and mothers," he said, "quickly nailed that lie."

But he warned that there were enough Communists in Japan to constitute a fifth column should the Sino-Russian Reds decide to attack.

THE BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bipartisan foreign policy, about which we hear so much, does not exist. The Republican Party platform is diametrically opposed to that of the Acheson-Lattimore-State Department policy which the Democratic Party has adopted.

No one can be for the principles of the Republican Party and for the Democratic Party foreign policy at the same time since the fundamental principles of the two parties are opposed. "Bipartisan foreign policy," like "reciprocal trade," is a catch phrase to sell the one-economic-world philosophy to the American people.

The Executive, through the State Department, is supposed to formulate the foreign policies, through treaties and agreements, and then submit them to the Senate for consideration and debate, and approval or rejection.

The three branches of government were set up to form a system of checks and balances, and any coalition between the two, or among the three, is against the spirit of the Constitution.

As operated now, the foreign policy is handed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to accept, as is, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t."

However, when the State Department is being attacked from all sides for its miserable failure and for the questionable character of some of its officials, past and present, the President and the Secretary of State, and others made uncomfortable by the disclosures, search frantically to find a way to share the blame; it is then they like the word "bipartisan" as they plead, weakly, that those who expose the rottenness are attacking the bipartisan foreign policy.

The few Republican Senators who go along with the Acheson-Lattimore-State Department foreign policy cannot be said to represent the Republican viewpoint. As set forth in its 1950 statement of principles, the Republican Party believes that world trade, which has been made an integral part of the foreign policy through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, should be developed on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, and that products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman and the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to domestic industry. Republicans then are obviously against free trade.

On the other hand, the Democrats are committed to the three-part, free-trade program as outlined to the House Foreign Affairs Committee by the Under Secretary of State in 1949. The Democratic program includes the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the ECA, and the International Trade Organization.

Mr. President, in 1934, Congress transferred its constitutional responsibility to regulate the economy of this Nation through the regulation of imports, to the executive department; meaning, as it is now being administered, the State Department. The ECA, formerly the Marshall plan, is simply and admittedly making up the trade-balance deficits of the 16 Marshall-plan countries until such time as the State Department can divide the markets of this country with the nations of the world, through the indiscriminate lowering of tariffs and import fees.

What is the International Trade Organization which is now being debated in the House of Representatives? Mr. Acheson and Mr. Thorp, as recently as a week ago, said, "It is a part of the program, and must be passed." It will be before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which will be holding hearings before long, I suppose. The International Trade Organization is composed of 58 nations, with 58 votes, 57 of them being foreign nations. To that organization we would then make the second transfer of the right to regulate the national economy, first, from the Congress of the United States to the State Department, and now, from the State Department to this organization of foreign nations, in which we have one vote, the same as Siam. The effect of it is that we assign to those 58 nations the right to fix the tariffs and the import fees of the member nations. But that is only half of it. To that organization is assigned the matter of quotas of production of the member nations. We could get out of the Organization, after 3 years, upon 6 months' notice. By that time we would be so bloody that we would never get out.

The Democratic Party favors free trade, as Mr. Thorp outlined it before the House Foreign Affairs Committee last year. It has been adopted and is being carried out. It is for the indiscriminate lowering of tariffs and import

fees to the point that competition of low-wage foreign goods and slave-labor products is removing the floor from under wages and investments in this country, and reducing the standard of living of American workers. This is the State Department's combined policy, domestic and foreign. I submit that it cannot be bipartisan.

The two opposing positions of the major parties are clear. A Senator can be on one side or the other; he cannot be on both sides. There cannot be a bipartisan foreign policy without a major change in the accepted platform of one of the major parties. There could not possibly be a bipartisan foreign policy, first, until there is a definite foreign policy, and, second, until such foreign policy stops at the water's edge.

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, last week the Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson, issued an order that, effective around July 1, 1950, delivery service of all first-class mail in cities with a population of over 10,000 be cut from two deliveries daily to one. Prior to this, mail service in many rural areas had already been curtailed.

I have made inquiry and have been unable to find how long the two daily deliveries in cities of over 10,000 have been in effect, but I was advised that they have been in effect at least 40 years.

In making the announcement of the reduction in service, Mr. Donaldson gave economy as his reason, and called attention to the huge deficit which confronts the Post Office Department. As one who is just as much interested in seeing this deficit eliminated as is Mr. Donaldson, I have checked into the situation and developed the following facts:

The deficit of the Post Office Department for the past 12 months was over $500,000,000.

The number of employees on the pay roll of the Post Office Department as of December 31, 1949, was 535,745. This compares with 258,783 postal employees in 1935; 294,651 postal employees in 1939; and 471,787 postal employees in 1947.

In 1933 the total number of all Government employees, including the Post Office Department, was only 580,825. In other words, it is now taking almost as many employees to run the Post Office Department alone as it formerly took to run all Government services combined.

Delivery service on a twice-daily schedule, with the exception of a brief period during World War II, has been in effect at least 40 years. Beyond that, the records are not available. To maintain the above schedule for city delivery, the number of letter carriers employed by the Post Office Department during recent years has been as follows:

June 30, 1946	65,770
June 30, 1947	67,733
June 30, 1948	78,127
June 30, 1949	86,359
February 1950	90,268

I was advised by Mr. Alfer B. Strom, Commissioner of the Budget of the Post Office Department, that the 50-percent reduction of the delivery service in the cities would result in a maximum reduction of 8,000 employees, or an annual maximum saving of around $25,000,000, which would be applied on the estimated deficit for 1950 of over $500,000,000.

Assuming that the maximum savings are achieved under this order, it would still leave on the pay rolls over 82,000 letter carriers, which is 4,000 more than were on the rolls on June 30, 1948. It would be 15,000, or 20 percent, more than the Department had on the rolls on June 30, 1947. It would be 24,000 more letter carriers than the Department had on the pay rolls in 1940, during which time they were giving the twice-daily delivery service in cities of over 10,000.

I was advised by Mr. Strom that, assuming the order cutting the delivery service 50 percent were carried through and the maximum reduction of 8,000 letter carriers were achieved, it would not mean that there would be a corresponding reduction in the white-collar personnel of the Post Office Department but that they would still maintain an over-all employment in the Post Office Department of around 525,000 employees, which would mean that even after cutting the delivery service of the mails 50 percent they would still have over 60,000 employees more than were required in 1947 to give the twice-daily delivery service.

The argument is made by the Post Office Department that the increased volume of mail necessitates a heavier employment; however, we find that the revenue of the Post Office Department in June 30, 1949, was only $1,571,851,202 as compared with $1,410,971,284 in 1948, and a percentage of this $160,000,000 increase can be attributed to the increased parcel-post rates which were authorized by Congress in 1948 and which did not necessitate any additional work on the part of the postal employees to collect.

The Postmaster General has requested in the interests of economy the enactment of Senate bill 2213, the bill which proposes to repeal the law requiring confirmation of postmasters by the Senate, on the basis that this action would remove the postmasters from politics. I have already endorsed Senate bill 2213 and shall give it my enthusiastic support, because I think it is ridiculous for the Senate to insist upon the confirmation of postmasters when at the same time we allow the directors of our huge Government corporations in many instances to be appointed without Senate confirmation. However, in supporting this bill I am under no illusion that its enactment will remove the postmasters any further from the political picture than they are at present. Every Member of the Senate knows full well that all of these persons, regardless of what Government agency is involved, are appointed on the basis of the recommendations of the political organizations in the respective States, and the question of whether or not they are being confirmed by the Senate is immaterial. I can see nothing that is to be gained from the standpoint of economy by the enactment of this bill, since there is nothing under the existing law which would prevent the Postmaster General, who already has the appointive power, from selecting qualified men instead of political pets, if he so desires.

I have always agreed with the Postmaster General that Congress is wrong in allowing the subsidy payments now being made to the railroads and airlines to be charged against the Post Office budget; however, I would go even further than Mr. Donaldson in criticizing these subsidies.

It is my contention they should not only be transferred from the budget of the Post Office Department but that Congress should make a thorough study of all these subsidies with a view to their reduction and eventual elimination.

It should be noted, however, that these subsidy payments account for but a small part of the over-all deficit of the Post Office Department, and while attention should be given to this matter, it would not solve the problem nor remove the necessity of an increase in postal rates.

I also agree with Mr. Donaldson that Congress should give immediate consideration to the bill which proposes to raise postal rates sufficiently to take care of the major portion of this deficit; and toward the accomplishment of this goal I shall support the necessary legislation as soon as it can be reported by the committee. I join with Mr. Donaldson in urging that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service give top priority to solving these problems.

But while I agree substantially with the legislative program of Mr. Donaldson, and while I shall support these bills on the floor of the Senate, at the same time I do not relieve the Postmaster General of his obligations to the American taxpayers to achieve some economy in his own Department, nor do I approve of what could be interpreted as an apparent attempt on his part to force Congress both to enact his legislative program and to authorize his full appropriation under the implied threat that if we do not do so, he will cut the essential services of our constituents.

In my opinion, there is no reason whatever why a cut in the personnel of the Post Office Department could not be achieved without the reduction of a single delivery service. I see no reason why the Post Office Department should not be able to operate with at least the same number of employees as it did in 1947 and give just as good service as it did at that time.

Even assuming that the 50-percent reduction in the delivery service of mails in cities with a population of 10,000 and over is put into effect as proposed by the Postmaster General, and 8,000 carriers are removed from office, it would still mean that we would have left on the pay roll 525,000 employees in the Post Office Department.

Why should the Post Office Department today require 525,000 employees to give the American people 50 percent of the service to which they have been accustomed and to which they are entitled, when, as recently as 2 years ago, 465,000 employees were able to give us 100 percent delivery service?

What I should like to know is, why was it necessary for the Post Office Department to hire 60,000 extra employees during the past 2 years and to what kind of jobs they were assigned?

Apparently these 60,000 extra employees who are costing the taxpayers an extra $200,000,000 have slowed down the machinery in the Postal Department to such an extent that we are now going to get less service at a greater cost.

Instead of the Postmaster General's reducing the delivery service of the mails far below what the American people have become accustomed to on the basis that he can achieve a $25,000,000 savings by firing 8,000 letter carriers, I think he could achieve a greater reduction in force and an over-all savings many times more by removing nonessential employees, many of whom have been added in the executive offices in Washington.

Not only would this be more practical and enable the American people to enjoy the same service as formerly, but it would also be a step toward some real economy.

The Postmaster General's proposal to lay off 8,000 letter carriers accompanied by a 50-percent reduction in service would mean a saving of around $25,000,000 annually.

The proposal which I suggest; namely, that he retain this mail service on its former basis and instead of removing the essential letter carriers, he remove the nonessential 60,000 white-collar employees who have been added to the rolls since 1947 alone, would save over $200,000,000, which is in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which recommendations should be adopted in their entirety.

As an example of how the employment in the Post Office Department has grown during recent years, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a table which shows the number of postal employees as of June 30 for each of the past 15 years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total paid civilian employment, Post Office Department

June 30, 1934	265,070
June 30, 1935	258,783
June 30, 1936	264,614
June 30, 1937	279,443
June 30, 1938	291,613
June 30, 1939	294,651
June 30, 1940	303,654
June 30, 1941	315,181
June 30, 1942	319,763
June 30, 1943	316,357
June 30, 1944	352,773
June 30, 1945	378,849
June 30, 1946	488,623
June 30, 1947	471,787
June 30, 1948	503,607
June 30, 1949	517,743
Dec. 31, 1949	535,745

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to call attention again to the fact that the Postmaster General is suggesting that mail-delivery service be cut 50 percent but that there be retained on the pay rolls of the Department more than 525,000 employees, which number, with the exception of the recent months, represents an all-time high, or almost as many employees as were required to operate the entire Federal Government prior to the establishment of the New Deal bureaucracy.

I should also like to call attention to the fact that even after putting this reduction into effect the Post Office Department, as proposed, would still have 525,000 employees, as I have said, which represents 12,000 more than were employed 6 months ago.

PRAYERS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT—ADDRESS OF HERVÉ J. L'HEUREUX

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, many Members of this body are personally acquainted with Mr. Hervé J. L'Heureux, who is chief of the Visa Division of the Department of State. Mr. L'Heureux was a founder of the American Legion. He has been a career officer in the American Foreign Service since 1930. He is an able and devoted public servant, and an outstanding American. I mention Mr. L'Heureux because I am about to ask unanimous consent for insertion in the RECORD of the text of a short address made by Mr. L'Heureux at the annual convention of the Department of Virginia, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, at Alexandria, Va., on April 15, 1950.

This address concerned what has come to be known as the prayers-for-peace movement. Mr. L'Heureux originated the idea of the prayers-for-peace movement, and is its leading protagonist.

The idea back of this movement, like all great ideas, is exceedingly simple. The idea is that Americans should pause for 1 minute at noon each day to pray for enduring peace. The American Legion and other veterans' organizations have endorsed the movement, and I believe all Senators will be in sympathy with it. In view of the chaos which exists in the world today, this crusade of prayer becomes all the more necessary, more timely, and more obligatory upon all of us.

The one force on earth which it is impossible to overestimate is the power of sincere prayer. The people of this Nation earnestly desire an equitable and abiding peace for all the world, and it is completely logical that for the attainment of this goal, we should ask the help of Almighty God, while at the same time rededicating ourselves daily to the ideal of peace on earth, good will to men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYERS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT

(Address of Hervé J. L'Heureux at the annual convention of the Department of Virginia, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, at Alexandria, Va., April 15, 1950)

I appreciate greatly this opportunity to call your attention to the prayers-for-peace movement. I speak to you as a fellow veteran and as a layman. I am not a preacher. I advocate no new dogma. My message is simple: Prayer, a minimum of 1 minute of prayer, daily, at noon, by every man, woman, and child in the United States, each in his own way, each according to his own faith, to seek divine guidance and assistance in securing world peace.

The original prayers-for-peace resolution, adopted at Manchester, N. H., October 28, 1948, is simple and self-explanatory. Here it is:

"Having complete confidence in the ability of our fellow men, with the aid of Almighty God to establish a just and enduring peace in the world.

"We, the members of the Last Man's Club, William H. Jutras Post, No. 43, American Legion, do hereby unanimously resolve to pause for one minute in the midst of our daily task, at 12 o'clock noon each day, and raising our heart and mind toward God, ask Him to help us adjust our international differences to enable the nations of the world to secure an equitable and abiding peace; further,

"We urge that this movement be endorsed by all the spiritual, civic, and business leaders in the United States, and that a similar resolution be adopted and implemented by every organization in our country to the end that this custom may become universal in effect."

Those of us who initiated this movement were actuated by a conviction that each and every person, regardless of his station in life, or his religious belief, can assist materially, through daily prayer, in achieving the peace which all of us desire so ardently. It was thought that a pause, in the midst of our daily work, at 12 o'clock noon, is an appropriate time to marshal the spiritual force of our Nation for peace, with the hope that such a custom might become universal in effect. The establishment of this practice generally would not only be a national acknowledgment of our dependency upon God, but it might also be a source of inspiration and encouragement to the masses of unfortunate people throughout the world who look to us for moral leadership, as well as for material aid. The prayers-for-peace movement is thoroughly patriotic, consistent with our basic philosophy of life and with the fundamental precepts upon which this country was founded. It is not pacifist in character; it is not a substitute for adequate armament, but an indispensable, spiritual component of adequate preparedness—in fact, a properly balanced preparedness. And at this point I should like to emphasize, if I may, that it need not be a question of enlisting God's aid in our defense only, but in the positive prosecution of our task as a nation, according to His will, whatever that prove to be.

While our potential enemies are straining every effort in preparation for total war, and we in the United States are taking necessary precautions to meet the challenge, why not unite, simultaneously, at least in a national, if not in a world-wide, mobilization of daily prayers for divine assistance and return to good morals and true Christian principles, with the hope of dissipating the causes for another world conflict? There is hardly a person who believes in God who, whether he goes to church or not, does not turn to God for help in times of peril to himself or to a loved one. Since this be true why wait until the eleventh hour? Why not seek God's graces now, before it is too late?

Occasionally, I am told that prayer will not deter those diabolical forces that are planning war. This, to me, indicates a lack of faith in the efficacy of prayer. It is hoped by those of us who sponsor this crusade that if we can muster a sufficient force of fervent prayers throughout the world, the balance might be tilted in favor of law and order. To this end some of us at least are dedicating every possible effort. Let us ask ourselves whether we, individually, are doing everything possible with the means God has given us to help avoid the horrors of another war. There has been a definite recrudescence of spiritual thinking in the United States in the past 20 years. Religion is on the march. Each of us should do our part to accelerate its pace. We must pray increasingly, in number and in fervor, if we hope to witness

a millennium of genuine peace. However, each of us should daily and constantly endeavor to improve our individual behavior that we might be worthy of that which we seek through prayer. In the light of the moral decadence and selfishness which prevails in the world today, is it not too much to expect God to assist us in reconciling our differences and in securing world peace until through mass individual effort we shall have shown Him that we are worthy of His assistance?

As one person has recently written to me from Los Gatos, Calif., a Jesuit priest by the way, who heartily endorsed this crusade, it may be that God demands more than an occasional furtive gesture of acknowledgment on the part of some of our governmental leaders, with the implied desire that He should, so to speak, leave the needed packet of divine assistance politely at our back doorstep and slip silently away.

The prayers-for-peace movement has no organized head; it calls for no financial subscription of any kind; its spread depends entirely upon the spontaneous and voluntary efforts of those individuals, and groups of individuals, who wish to interest themselves in this crusade of prayer. The individual effort required to pause daily for a 1-minute silent prayer, and to pass on the idea to a friend or to a group, is very little indeed. Yet, through such means alone, with the limited coordination I have been able to effect, the movement has made considerable progress since it was started in 1948. It has been endorsed by religious leaders of several faiths, including Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish. Many Members of our Congress have commented upon the movement in the House of Representatives or have brought it to the attention of their constituents. One governor and several mayors have issued appropriate proclamations. Some business firms have sent out printed literature with their monthly statements. The members of at least 841 groups and organizations in the United States have formally adopted resolutions of endorsement. I have received more than 13,000 letters. The practice of a 1-minute daily prayer at noon is presently being followed by unknown hundreds of thousands of persons, perhaps millions, in this country and in foreign lands. I wish I had the time to tell you about the development and spread of this movement outside our borders. I have received a large number of letters, from 16 different countries, requesting information concerning this movement, or relating what is being accomplished outside the United States.

Most of the 841 resolutions adopted in this country have come from individual units of veterans' and auxiliary organizations—542 of them. The others have come from service clubs, fraternal societies, sororities, student bodies, church groups, business firms, groups of Federal employees, etc. The following organizations have approved the idea on a national scale at their respective annual meeting during 1949:

1. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States—convention, Cleveland, July 13, 1949.

2. Greek-American Progressive Association—convention, Milwaukee, Wis., August 5, 1949.

3. The Order of AHEPA—convention, Miami, August 9, 1949.

4. The Society of American Legion Founders—meeting, Philadelphia, August 27, 1949.

5. The Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity—convention, Detroit, Mich., August 31, 1949.

6. Jewish War Veterans of the United States—convention, Miami, October 19–23, 1949.

7. The American Legion—meeting national executive committee, Indianapolis, November 6, 1949.

Several other national groups are planning to take similar action at their respective, forthcoming, national conventions this year.

As veterans, among whom many have experienced the horrors of war and, in time of great personal danger, have called upon God for protection, I feel confident that you will endorse and personally join in this great movement. If you should find it practicable to adopt an appropriate resolution, I would urge you to take the necessary steps to bring the subject matter before your forthcoming national convention for similar action. I feel that everyone should take part in this crusade of prayer, which has won the admiration and support of so many good people. Such support seems clearly to be our duty, and we should respond with unshakable and absolute trust. We need not know what form God's answer will take. In view of some of the factors in the international situation, we cannot know. But at least we should place our trust in God, as our forefathers have done, and hope for the peace upon which civilization itself seems to depend.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JOHNSON—ARTICLE BY LLOYD NORMAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an appraisal of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, written by Lloyd Norman, of the Chicago Daily Tribune. This article shows that a fair and objective appraisal, if properly done, takes into account the honest efforts of a man and can prove to be a tribute without much effort. We all know that when Secretary Johnson took over the Department of Defense he accepted the gigantic task of unification. In his leadership of that Department he has not only saved money, but our armed services have not suffered one iota in the process.

Members of our Cabinet are always subjected to severe criticism, some of which is objective and some of which stems from political bias. No one could accuse the Chicago Tribune of being pro-administration, yet here is an article by one of its feature writers which gives Secretary Johnson his just due.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC BATTLES LEAVE JOHNSON FIT, UNRUFFLED—STARTS ON SECOND YEAR AS DEFENSE CHIEF

(By Lloyd Norman)

WASHINGTON, March 26—Defense Secretary Johnson starts his second year Tuesday as civilian head of the Nation's most powerful peace time military force.

Carrying 203 pounds on his 6 feet 2½-inch frame, Johnson is 20 pounds slimmer than a year ago and appears to be in robust health. He recently went through a navy medical check-up and was found to be in excellent condition for a 59-year-old. His blood pressure was 106 and his pulse 76.

"The only medicine they gave me," he told his associates, "was some ferrous sulfate for the blood pressure which is slightly low. I found out that was just like the molasses and sulfur we used to get in the spring when we were kids."

TOOK SUNSHINE CURE

Johnson has rid himself of a chest cold which interrupted his sleep a month ago with raspy coughing. He went to Key West, Fla., and took the sunshine cure. "Now," he says, "I sleep like a log and get to the office refreshed."

Buffeted by critical attacks from navy zealots, from Congressmen, whose districts have lost some military spending, and from newspaper columnists and certain magazines, Johnson has managed to retain his health and mental calm in a period of strain.

He has taken an inner resolve, his friends say, not to succumb to fatigue and the stresses of his job as did his predecessor, the late James F. Forrestal. He made that clear to Chicago's top executives when he spoke behind closed doors to the Commercial Club on St. Patrick's day.

Soft spoken and unhurried, Johnson displays no symptom of nervousness or anxiety after a year of budget cutting, public quarrels between the Navy and Air Force, and undercover sniping by those who were hurt by the Johnson economy wave.

CAREFULLY AVOIDS POLITICS

"Louie is going to last until the last round and he will finish that in fine shape," a close friend said. Some political observers ventured the belief that Johnson is saving himself for a contest for the Presidency.

If Johnson is secretly nursing the hope of becoming the 34th President, he carefully avoids talking about politics. He makes a point of not making political speeches and not mixing politics and defense.

FAVORITE OF TRUMAN

Many of his top aids, like Paul H. Griffith, assistant defense secretary; William T. Faricy, chairman of the civilian components policy board, and others are Republicans. As a conservative Democrat, a bank director and wealthy lawyer, Johnson is closer ideologically to the Republicans than to the Fair Deal or New Deal Democrats, his associates say.

Johnson, however, remains a stalwart pillar in the Democratic Party and a favorite of President Truman, who does not forget Johnson's steadfast loyalty in the gloomy days of the 1948 Presidential campaign. Johnson was the Democratic Party finance committee chairman who rallied an energetic fund-raising campaign for Truman.

Political wiseacres have said that Johnson does not have a chance to get into the White House because he has made too many enemies by his headlong, uncompromising drive to cut the defense budget by 1.6 billion dollars. They said Johnson has been bullheaded, tactless, and careless about stepping on toes of influential people. They said he has swung the economy meat ax too vigorously, too widely, and too often.

MIDDLE-CLASS ALLY

Some political experts analyze Johnson as a man who is confident the Nation's middle class—the vast multitude of taxpayers—will rally to him as the determined leader who insisted on getting a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent on defense.

Others are sure that Johnson has kissed good-by to any Presidential hopes and is sincerely dedicated to a self-chosen mission of making the United States strong at least cost.

When he was sworn in in the center courtyard of the Pentagon on March 28, 1949, his bald head bared to the chill winds and gray clouds, Johnson set his course.

"Our defense policy will consist in mustering the maximum of strength, within the limits of our economy and our democracy, to back up * * * foreign policy and make America secure by discouraging any potential aggressor," he asserted.

GETTING TOUGH SINEW

A year later, he has reported that the Army, Navy, and Air Force are stronger than ever in peacetime, that combat readiness is improving and that the Nation is getting tough sinew and muscle in its fighting forces instead of waste, extravagance, and duplication.

There are critics who distrust Johnson and cast suspicion on the veracity of his assertions that he is bringing efficiency and economy into the defense department. They have complained that he has cut too deep, that he has hurt the Navy by dropping naval air units and warships, that he has weakened the Marine Corps by lopping off air squadrons and ground battalions, and that he has kept

the Air Force from growing into its 70-group program.

Opposition to Johnson cropped up quickly after he took office. A man of action, spurred by a determination not to falter in indecision as did Forrestal in his later days, Johnson let the ax fall on the Navy's pet project, the 65,000-ton supercarrier. That detonated the Navy revolt.

SECRETARY QUITS IN HUFF

John L. Sullivan, then Navy Secretary, quit with an angry blast at Johnson. Johnson had threatened—in private conversations—that heads would roll if any rebels stood in the way of his economy and unification program. The first head bobbed up sooner than he expected.

Others followed Sullivan—Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, Chief of Naval Operations, who backed out of his key spot on Johnson's "team"; Capt. John G. Crommelin, the naval aviator hero, who took a martyr's role to attack what he said was "Prussianism" in the Pentagon, and Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, Navy hero, who opposed Johnson's closing of hospitals.

Those in the Pentagon who remember Forrestal and who have worked with Johnson size up the two men as follows:

Forrestal—patient, intellectual, besieged by doubt and concerned with all sides of a problem, masterful in comprehending a problem and penetrating in his insight. He liked seclusion and the companionship of a few friends, mostly Wall Streeters.

IMPATIENT AND CURT

Johnson—decisive, abrupt, brooking no interference or dilatory arguments, acute but not profound, courteous but not tactful, impatient and curt. He is gregarious, has all the social graces of a polished politician, has a wide circle of friends in the top brackets of industry and finance, and clings to his American Legion buddies.

Forrestal had the deep respect of the military, but as one top military leader said in March of 1949:

"We need a man of decision, a man who will make up his mind and tell us what to do and cut out all this quibbling and quarreling."

Johnson was the man who could make up his mind, and quickly. But a year later, this top military leader would be unwilling to say whether he wanted decisions as fast and as sweeping as Johnson made them. Forced to swallow a $13,000,000,000 budget, a cut of $1,600,000,000, the top military leaders have given grudging support to economy, but continue to talk about their need for a few more warships, a few more air groups, and an extra army division or two.

GENERAL EISENHOWER WORRIED

Even General Eisenhower, who last spring directed the planning of the defense budget for the fiscal year starting July 1 and who is author of Ike Three, the austerity $13,000,000,000 economy budget, is now worried that the Nation is being disarmed.

Johnson confided to his associates that he is not going to be panicked into spending more for defense than is necessary. He said that the $13,000,000,000 budget as now planned contains several hundred million dollars more "hardware" [weapons such as planes, tanks, guns and antisubmarine weapons] than did Ike Three.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that the pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. I desire to state that by reason of the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary must hold a hearing on a judicial nominee in Salt Lake City, it is incumbent upon the chairman of the committee to leave Washington tomorrow evening in order to assist in holding the hearing in Salt Lake City. I have asked the Senator from Missouri if he would be courteous enough to permit me to offer an amendment, which has been printed and is lying on the desk, and that his amendment be taken up after my amendment is disposed of. In that way it may be possible to proceed to a vote on my amendment today.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be made the pending question, with the understanding that immediately following its disposal the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri shall come in place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

AID TO SPAIN

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Spanish Aid Act of 1950."

NATURE OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 202. The Administrator for Economic Cooperation is hereby authorized to furnish assistance to the Spanish state in conformity with—

(a) the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, wherever such provisions are applicable and not inconsistent with the intent and purposes of this title; and

(b) the administrator is authorized to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $100,000,000 for the purpose of allocating funds during such fiscal year to the Export-Import Bank of Washington for assistance to Spain on credit terms under the provisions of paragraph 2 of section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to the extent applicable.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr President, I am glad to yield the floor to the Senator from Indiana, if that is agreeable to the Chair.

Mr. JENNER obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator from Nevada if he is trying to get a vote on his amendment at this time?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at this time. When the Senator from Indiana has concluded his address, I shall ask for a quorum call, and at that time I shall ask for 10 or 15 minutes in which to offer my thoughts on the amendment. Later this afternoon I shall try to get a vote on it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Nevada expect to get a vote this afternoon?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I was wondering whether we might not agree to vote on the Senator's amendment at a certain time tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. That would be satisfactory to me. I must leave around 4:30 tomorrow. It would be entirely satisfactory to me to vote on the amendment tomorrow. Perhaps it would be better if we could vot on it tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. I dislike to attempt to make any unanimous-consent agreement without a quorum being present or without the presence of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have requested that the minority leader come to the Chamber. He would be more conversant with the subject than I would be.

Mr. LUCAS. I am certain we can get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the amendment tomorrow, which I believe would be satisfactory to everyone.

Mr. McCARRAN. It would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that would be a better time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, as the curtain goes up on the third act of the Marshall-plan drama, the whole show becomes more incredible, more fantastic, and more frightening. Yet, the deeper the international crisis becomes, as the stage on which this drama is being played, the more determined are the stage managers of this production further to indulge their personal whims, to peddle palliatives, and perpetuate their vested interests in their own tragic mistakes.

Mr. President, March 28, 1949, a year ago, in addressing myself to the Marshall plan on the Senate floor, I said, "I am not one who adheres to the so-called bipartisan foreign policy. I do not believe in bipartisanism," and I went on to say, "I am a firm believer in and a staunch supporter of the two-party system. It is the function of a minority party to call to the people's attention the consequences and shortcomings of the majority party."

In the year that has passed, Mr. President, nothing that has happened has warranted changing my mind. Indeed, everything that has happened has only forced me to hold more strongly to my basic convictions, so that as this third act of the Marshall plan begins, I feel it my solemn duty to warn the American people that we are no longer just passive spectators sitting on the side lines, handing over our hard-earned dollars to watch this internationalist show go on. Instead, we are being drawn ever deeper into the backwash bribery and blackmail of the ancient ills of the Old World.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has just concluded an address which points that up very forcefully. We read yesterday about a report which was referred to on the floor of the Senate to the effect that England now wants the United States to pay off $9,000,000,000 of her debt.

We are no longer lifting other nations out of their suffering and degradation. We are not enlarging areas of human freedom. We are merely being sucked ever deeper into the bottomless pit of power politics and headed for bankruptcy and destruction as a sovereign people.

For a long time, Mr. President, I have felt my struggle to help stop this trend and to arouse the American people to the magnitude of the tragedy that was in the making, was a lone and losing battle. For the American people could not believe that these things that have been happening could happen to them. The American people believe in their form of government and their way of life. They believe in giving the next fellow an even break. They are not naturally suspicious of their fellow Americans. They take great pride and place complete confidence in their elected representatives, and they want to do what is right. They want to exert the full force of our moral leadership as a free and sovereign people in the struggle for a lasting peace, with justice under law.

But now, Mr. President, their confidence has been shaken at the roots. They still cannot point their finger at the source, but they have an uneasy feeling that somebody has been selling them short and they are fed up with predigested propaganda and self-appointed saviors and global do-gooders and fancy slogans. They want the facts put on the table, and they want their leadership to get out of the way and let them see what has been happening. Then they want to make up their own minds as to what shall be the best course of action.

Yet, Mr. President, as the debate on this third installment of the ECA gets under way, the President merely continues the act by saying, "the American people can look back with pride on the achievements of our foreign policy during the past 5 years."

Think of that, in the face of what has happened in the east, and in China alone. Let me remind the American people that Russia dominated only 180,000,000 people in 1945, and this is 1950, which covers the 5 years to which the President referred, and today Russia dominates 800,000,000 people. Yet the President of the United States says, "The American people can look back with pride on the achievements of our foreign policy during the past 5 years."

All I care to say, Mr. President, is that if Mr. Truman is proud of what has happened during this period, he is either suffering from criminal ignorance, he is betrayed by his advisers, or he is stooping to play politics with our future just to cover up his own tragic mistakes. Or, he has been listening to his own echo so long as a mighty miracle man, he just cannot understand that those who have been following in his Pied Piper procession are finally beginning to desert him.

Unless I am mistaken, Mr. President, the resentment of the American people at this moment is just beginning to find expression. It does not take much imagination to foresee that as the outrageous story of the past continues to unfold, all the New and Fair Deal myths and legends about how the Democratic Party is the party of peace, plenty, and progress, are going to die of the withering contempt of my fellow-Americans.

The President insults the intelligence of the American people in attempting to enlist their support for this third installment of the Marshall plan, by assuring them they can be proud of the achievements of our foreign policy, for such assurances fly in the face of the facts.

Mr. President, is President Truman proud of the fact that the terrible sacrifice and suffering of the last war, which, we were led to believe, was fought to extend the so-called four freedoms, has resulted in the imposition of slavery and degradation to more than 800,000,000, most of whom were sold out and betrayed into the hands of Stalin?

Is the President proud of the fact this terrible war that was to restore freedom from fear and want, has resulted in turning loose between 60 and 80 million refugees across the world, according to Paul Ruegger, president of the International Committee of Red Cross.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOBEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Potsdam Agreement fall within the 5-year period to which the President referred?

Mr. JENNER. I would say it does. I would say the "last 5 years" would run from 1950 to 1945, and that is the period during which these terrible mistakes have been made and this terrible diplomacy has been conducted.

Mr. KEM. Are we to understand that the President of the United States views with pride his execution of the Potsdam Agreement?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; he is proud of it, and I said there were three reasons why he was proud of it; I named them.

Is the President proud of the fact the war that was fought for the principles of the Atlantic Charter has destroyed the very foundation of international law, paralyzed the European and Asiatic Continents and plunged hundreds of millions more of our fellow-beings into the midst of a terrifying civil and guerrilla warfare all around the globe?

There is a second reason, Mr. President, why the American people are no longer following the propaganda line that the Marshall plan is cheaper than war—oh, how many times we have heard that—and that we ought to be proud to be able to continue to pay its staggering costs.

Mr. President, all of this talk of how the Marshall plan is cheaper than war is so much hypocritical drivel, for the Marshall plan is not financing a cold war, it is financing a perpetual undeclared war all over the world. This undeclared war will bankrupt us in exactly the way which Lenin foretold when he boasted, "We will force America to spend herself into bankruptcy."

It is an insult, Mr. President, to the native intelligence of the American people to tell them the Marshall plan is cheaper than war. In the first place, according to the report of the ECA Commerce Mission, October 1949, we find, and I quote:

> From July 1914 through 1948 the United States exported goods and services to a value of $270,000,000,000 and imported goods and services to a value of only $169,000,000,000. Thus we exported $101,000,000,000 more than we imported over this period.

In other words, Mr. President, we have poured out over $101,000,000,000 since 1914 down the rat holes of Europe and Asia. In addition, Mr. President, Mr. Hoffman stated during the ECA hearings, in defense of this thesis:

> You and I also know that a shooting war is definitely more costly. Secretary of the Army, Gordon Gray, recently has stated that World War II will have cost the United States $1,300,000,000,000 before it is finally paid for, and a trillion is a thousand billion.

In other words, Mr. President, we are continuing to fight the Second World War, the staggering cost of which is impossible to grasp—$1,300,000,000,000, according to Mr. Gordon Gray.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we have spent $50,000,000,000 since the so-called end of the war for national defense, and our defenses are a shambles and disgrace. Why, Mr. President, in spite of these billions, are we not in a position either to win a war or keep the peace?

Moreover, Mr. President, under the Marshall plan program we already have poured $10,000,000,000 into Europe and yet, on page 20 of the ECA hearings, we discover in the colloquy between the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and Mr. Hoffman that we will not be able to bring Europe back to the level of cooperation and integration of 1913 before the First World War, even if our Marshall-plan objectives are reached.

Then there is the matter of our $260,000,000,000 debt which is steadily rising, with an announced $7,000,000,000 deficit this year and a probable $10,000,000,000 deficit next year.

On top of this, Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, has warned us our domestic budget will rise from its present $41,000,000,000 level to $67,000,000,000, if the President's schemes for covering up the domestic consequences of this outrageous bipartisan policy is enacted into legislation.

Mr. President, a third reason why the American people no longer accept the President's glib assurances about our wonderful successes with the Marshall plan in the cold war is they are beginning to realize that the foundations on which we have built and projected every single international program during and since the war have crumbled beneath our feet.

Mr. President, on March 14, 1950, I read into the RECORD a list of the principles on which the conduct of the war and our international meddling since the war have been based, and, because I believe it to be so important that the American people realize just exactly how staggering the tragedy in the making has become, I want to read the list again into the RECORD and follow up the list of principles with a list of the international conferences which were based upon them and from which all the basic commitments that underlie our war and postwar policies were derived:

> First we were propagandized into believing that Russia was a peace-loving ally upon whom we could count for general cooperation in the just solution of all the economic,

social, political, and military problems of a postwar world.

That has not been wholly given up yet because, only in the last political campaign, the President of the United States referred to Stalin—I cannot quote him exactly, though I should be able to, but all Members of this distinguished body will recall, and I am sure the American people will recall, that the President referred to Stalin as "Good Ole Joe. He is not a bad fellow." That is one of the assumptions upon which we have proceeded. I continue to read the list:

Second, we were promised that the principles of the Atlantic Charter would provide the base for the forthcoming peace treaties. These principles we also were propagandized into believing Russia had endorsed and would continue to endorse.

Third, we were promised that the system of sovereign and independent states, and the whole system of international laws upon which that system has been based, would be preserved, and that these nations would be permitted also to join in solving the world problems as sovereign and independent states.

Fourth, we were promised that the vanquished peoples of Germany, Italy, and Japan would be reincorporated into the family of peace-loving nations on the basis of equal access to the trade and raw materials of the world.

Fifth, we were promised that there would be preserved in all the nations, stable elements of society with whom we could enter into long-term social, economic, and diplomatic contracts.

Yet, the plain fact is, every one of these principles have been repudiated by the secret diplomacy of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam which changed what set out to be a war of limited objectives in Europe and Asia, into a world revolution.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Indiana mentioned equal access to the trade of the areas in question. Does the Senator understand, as the junior Senator from Nevada believes, and has believed for a long time, that the thing which prohibits us from equal access to the trade of these areas is the perpetuation of the colonial system?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I do.

Mr. MALONE. Then, one further question.

Mr. JENNER. Of course, the colonial system is destroyed now because we sat down at Tehran, Potsdam, and Yalta and made a deal and turned over the east to the Communists. So that is all out the window.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Indiana, then, believes that perhaps all of Asia is in a fair way to be lost because of the turning over of Manchuria to the Russians in the beginning, and then the recent happenings in China as the result thereof.

Mr. JENNER. I think that is self-evident.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if a colonial system has not grown up with Russia as the center? Is not the dependency of countries such as Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Poland upon Russia, in its essence a colonial system?

Mr. JENNER. That is the new colonial system, and if Russia can make it work, there is no reason to believe she will not be a great empire for many, many years to come.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. The colonial system we are financing at this time, then, through the financing of the empire-minded nations, which are included in the 16 Marshall plan nations—and those nations are, of course, England, Belgium——

Mr. JENNER. France.

Mr. MALONE. France.

Mr. JENNER. Italy.

Mr. MALONE. We are putting Italy into the business; but it includes the Netherlands, at least. Through the ECA and through the North Atlantic Pact, and now through the great point 4 bold, new program to finance——

Mr. JENNER. It is better known as "point forever."

Mr. MALONE. In any case the Senator from Indiana agrees with the junior Senator from Nevada, does he not, that if we guarantee the investments in the colonial areas against confiscation, nationalization, and every other kind of a trick for which the colonial nations are famous, then we will help hold the colonial system together in the Far East and in Africa and in other areas where we are now and, as in the case of Africa, busy parceling out the slave areas to these nations.

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, we are helping establish a system which prevents us from having equal access to the trade. Is that correct?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It was my privilege to attend the first United Nations Conference in San Francisco. There we told the country that we would have freedom with all the other nations of the world, under the auspices of the United Nations. Many persons believed that, and all of us wanted to believe it, although many were skeptical, after noticing the treatment given there.

As a matter of fact, at that meeting I represented the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; it was under the auspices of that committee that I attended, as an observer.

In the opinion of the Senator from Indiana, have we changed that arrangement entirely; and are we now engaged in financing and holding these colonial areas, which in themselves prevent the accomplishment of what we said at San Francisco we were going to do?

Mr. JENNER. Apparently so. However, Mr. President, when mention is made of United States foreign policy, let me say that we do not have one, and we never have had one. If there is talk about the revival of our foreign policy, it is talk about reviving something that never existed in the first place. We have just been living on crises and propaganda, propaganda peddled by 30,000 propagandists of the New Deal. The sad thing about it is that the Republicans have fallen for the bipartisan booby trap, and have gone a long way down the road with it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. It is very interesting to me, and I have a further question in connection with the bipartisan foreign policy: Is it the understanding of the Senator from Indiana that under our Constitution our Government is composed of three equal divisions, namely, the judicial, the legislative, and the executive branches?

Mr. JENNER. That is my understanding; but it is not very popular any more in the United States to refer to a constitutional form of government, composed of three divisions. A person in this country is considered somewhat old-fashioned and something of a mossback if he still believes in three equal divisions of government under the constitutional system.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then any agreement made ahead of time, before a foreign policy is announced by the executive department—and of course the Constitution places upon the executive branch of Government the responsibility for fixing foreign policy.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Then does the Senator from Indiana agree and believe—as I do at the present time—that any understanding or agreement made ahead of time by the Senate, before it knew exactly what was going to be done, and before such announcement was made on the floor of the Senate, would be a technical violation or at least a violation of the spirit of the Constitution?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; and I say to the Senator from Nevada that I shall go into that matter further, a little later in my remarks; and I shall show how, by the so-called revival of the bipartisan foreign policy, a man by the name of Dulles, in New York, who represents a man who twice has been defeated for the Presidency of the United States—and Mr. Dulles himself was defeated by the people of his own State—has been selected by the present administration, and is supposed to represent the Republican Party in a bipartisan foreign policy, although he has not even been confirmed by the Senate. He has been selected by the President; the President has selected him, a lame duck, a defeated candidate; and he is going to revive the bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. President, I should like to continue with my remarks. At their conclusion I shall be glad to yield further.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more at this point?

Mr. JENNER. Yes, once more.

Mr. MALONE. For 30 or 35 years I have heard of the partisan activity of a political party in taking care of its own lame ducks; but this is the first time in the history of the United States Government, since I have been noticing it, that the party in power has taken care of the lame ducks of the opposing party.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this bipartisan foreign policy is a wonderful thing. It is many things the Senator from Nevada has never heard of.

Mr. President, I repeat a little in quoting from my speech of March 14 and the points listed in it:

Yet, the plain fact is that every one of these principles has just been repudiated by the secret diplomacy of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam which changed what set out to be a war of limited objectives in Europe and Asia, into a world revolution.

Sixth, although the pro-Russian sell-out of our vital interests and security was finally forced into the open, every single principle on which our policies have been based since then has also collapsed.

On February 6, 1950, writing in the Washington Post, Joseph and Stewart Alsop admitted: "It begins to be possible to foresee a great event here in Washington—nothing less than a sharp change in the whole tempo, scope, and plan of basic American policy. What has been happening in effect, is the rapid collapse of all the assumptions on which policy has been based since the 1943 election. There have been three of those assumptions: (1) That the Soviet Union wished to achieve its aims by the peaceful conquest of infiltration; (2) that the American monopoly on atomic weapons would continue to operate as a final safeguard against Soviet aggression; (3) that there was, therefore, all the time in the world to win the cold war."

Seventh, all of the ballyhoo about the United Nations being our only hope of peace now has been so completely exploded that the New York Times itself, admitted on February 11, 1950, "we see thorough sabotage of the diplomatic machinery of the whole world—in the UN, in the Far East, and southeast Asia, and in the European satellite countries. Diplomats are quarantined or expelled, visas are not granted, treaties and agreements are violated; in all ways the Soviet world is being cut off from the West."

Eighth, the North Atlantic Pact was based on the assumption that we alone had the atom bomb, and now the February 11 issue of the New York Times reveals that "many Frenchmen conclude, as did Gen. Pierre Bellotte, Deputy Chief of Staff, that the Atlantic Pact has not solved any defense policies, and that the Truman doctrine and the Acheson policy offer little assurance of safety to western Europe."

I am quoting further: "The comment is made that it may also have rendered western Europe permanently defenseless—unless it acquired such bombs, which do not form a part of the military aid from the United States proffered as a consequence of the Atlantic Pact."

Ninth, the basis upon which the Marshall plan was framed is now disintegrating before our eyes and, as the Washington Post of February 10, 1950, admits, the second annual report of the Organization for European Economic Recovery reveals that "attempts to eliminate dollar deficits solely by increasing exports to dollar markets are simply out of the question by 1953, and for that matter, for the indefinite future."

I interrupt to say that the Marshall plan, of course, is supposed to end by 1952—is supposed to. Continuing the quotation:

Tenth, since the success of the Marshall plan was based upon continued access by the European nations to the rich raw materials, resources, and trade monopolies of their colonial possessions in the Far East, the expansion of communism in Asia is destroying any hope whatever of restoring European economic stability.

And now, Mr. President, I quote from George Sokolsky, March 29, 1950, listing the 13 major conferences which attempted to establish the peace on the basis of the principles which I have just enumerated:

Casablanca, January 14–24, 1943; First Quebec, August 17–24, 1943; Moscow, October 19–30, 1943; First UNRRA, November 10–December 1, 1943; First Cairo, November 22–26, 1943.

What a mess that was!

Tehran, November 28-December 1, 1943.

That was a quick one, but it did a vast amount of damage, which probably will not be repaired for hundreds of years.

Second Cairo, December 4–6, 1943; Bretton Woods, July 1–22, 1944; Dumbarton Oaks, August 21-October 7, 1944; Second Quebec, September 11–14, 1944; second UNRRA, September 15–27, 1944; Yalta, February 3–11, 1945.

The damage done at Yalta can never be told.

San Francisco, April 25–June 26, 1945.

I exclude Potsdam because it was merely an affirmation of Yalta.

The realization of how far reaching a defeat we confront has so alarmed the architects, the brain-trusters, and the supporters of our bipartisan foreign policy, they have broken ranks in the press—and that has been a rather united front—in the State Department, in the labor unions, in the Republican Party, and in the Democratic Party itself.

Mr. President, I do not want to burden my colleagues with a long recitation of the frightful warnings of an impending disaster from such ardent international commentators as Marquis Childs, Dorothy Thompson, Anne O'Hara McCormick, Walter Lippmann, Joseph Alsop, William Henry Chamberlain, David Lawrence, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and others, but their warnings are a matter of record, and there can be no mistaking their protests against those things to which the American people continue to be forced to be a party. So much for the press.

But, Mr. President, what is even more startling is the fact that the State Department itself has now broken ranks. I want to read into the RECORD a special dispatch to the New York Times of April 21, from Tokyo, by Burton Crane:

Discontent with the State Department has become widespread among Americans working in Asia. In a 3-month trip to Formosa and Hong Kong this correspondent found few compatriots who defended the American policies.

The virtually unanimous opinion is that the Asiatic situation has changed tremendously in the last 6 months and the State Department still is following policies that may have been valid a year ago but are not now. Even among foreign service officials there is a tendency to agree to the view that trying to check communism in the small southeast Asian countries will get nowhere and the best American bet is to help and use the reborn Nationalist Chinese Government as long as possible. It is the only force in Asia with a sizable anti-Communist army.

In justice it must be noted that many of the State Department's loudest critics are the same men who last autumn would have gone even farther in the other direction. Then they would have rushed to recognize Communist China in the hope that by working with Mao Tze-tung's government the United States could prevent it from orienting its foreign affairs exclusively to Moscow.

But, argue the critics, the situation has changed since then and the policy also should change. * * * Even among Foreign Service employees this correspondent found no supporters for the view aired by Prof. Owen Lattimore in a Johns Hopkins speech last week. Professor Lattimore proposed that the United States let the Nationalists lie, even hastening their fall on the theory after they had gone Mr. Mao would not be pressed so hard against Premier Stalin and the United States might be able to deal with him.

That is, with a Red Communist.

The President's bipartisan supporters also have broken ranks in the labor unions. The Washington Post carried a story March 23, 1950, from which I quote:

The Administration's move to lower tariffs so as to stimulate international trade and help out the Marshall plan nations is running into the growing opposition of labor groups.

Yesterday, the newly formed National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy issued a demand for "reasonable safeguards against unfair and deflationary foreign competition."

The Council, while numerically small, nonetheless includes 15 international and national affiliates of the American Federation of Labor which has been and is a champion of the Marshall plan.

And then, Mr. President, April 21, the New York Times revealed that—

Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, appealed to congressional leaders today for prompt aid to unemployed workers.

He said that unemployment was a serious problem in the larger cities. The national total is about 4,250,000. In addition, more than 8,000,000 persons were employed less than 35 hours a week and more than 2,000,000 of these were available for full-time work. * * *

"The CIO is increasingly concerned," Mr. Murray said, "about the serious proportions unemployment has reached in many geographical areas in the United States. There are over 40 areas in the United States in which unemployment has exceeded 12 percent of the labor force. In more than 80 cities and towns unemployment has reached between 7 and 12 percent of the labor force."

In other words, Mr. President, the "do-gooders" are not doing so good by American labor, and yet these Marshall plan directors have now launched an all-out assault on the American economic and labor markets to flood this country with slave-labor imports, which cannot help but force us into a disastrous depression.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Indiana recall the testimony of Mr. Paul Hoffman before the Senate Appropriations Committee last year, in which he said to the Senator from Georgia [Mr.

GEORGE], "Sir, I cannot tell you how little concerned I am about foreign competition"?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I read that remark.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Indiana know whether Mr. Paul Hoffman is still of the same frame of mind?

Mr. JENNER. I presume he is. I have never seen any retraction of the statement. His excuse naturally is that when American men are thrown out of their jobs, we will increase the unemployment compensation and will pick up those unemployed persons and their families and transport them somewhere else. He said, "We may have to reeducate a few of them and do something for industry." But, nevertheless, he does not care anything about Americans.

Mr. KEM. Am I right in my recollection that Mr. Hoffman recently said that in the case of unemployment or paralysis of American industry as a result of the operations of the ECA abroad we should extend direct relief to American industry?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; both to employees and to industry.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator understand that he meant that American industry, driven out of business, should be subsidized?

Mr. JENNER. I would interpret it in that way; yes.

Mr. KEM. Where is the money to come from?

Mr. JENNER. Where does any Federal money come from? It comes from the people, through taxation.

Mr. KEM. So the people are being asked to pay money to build industry abroad and then to put up the money to relieve American industry which is put out of business by our operations abroad?

Mr. JENNER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. KEM. Does that impress itself on the Senator from Indiana as a sound, constructive program?

Mr. JENNER. It certainly does not, or the Senator from Indiana would not be standing here, as he has ever since he has been in this body, fighting this lonesome fight against a tragic policy which means the bankruptcy and destruction of the Nation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator from Indiana recall that one of the remedies for unemployment which Mr. Hoffman offered before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate was that there is going to be some additional unemployment, but that we will have tutors to teach them new jobs?

Mr. JENNER. To reeducate them.

Mr. MALONE. And that we will have tutors to teach industrialists how to establish new industries after they have lost their stockholders' money. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. That was Mr. Paul Hoffman's thought; was it not?

Mr. JENNER. I recall it. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Then, Mr. President, the record clearly shows the President's bipartisan supporters have broken ranks in both the Republican and Democratic parties. Such distinguished colleagues as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], together with such men as Harold Stassen and others, have become completely unconvinced of the wisdom of the policies we are continuing to pursue and are alarmed at the inevitable consequences that lie ahead if these policies are not radically altered.

Why, Mr. President, none other than my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], told W. John Kenney, ECA's Mission Chief to England, during the hearings, in commenting on the trade practices which were being financed by the Marshall-plan funds:

> This situation at present is following blindly a policy of trade without regard to human consequences. You just cannot do that in a democratic form of government.

Here, then, Mr. President, is the background against which the requests for this third installment of the Marshall plan must be projected. Yet, in spite of these facts, President Truman has been carrying on in his own arrogant, self-sufficient way. Until just a few days ago he had not even stopped at calling honest critics, who were dealing in the realm of facts, agents of the Kremlin.

Then, suddenly, overnight, President Truman's bipartisanism broke out all over, like a rash. Overnight everything became bipartisan sweetness and light. Mr. Cooper and Mr. Dulles were appointed to positions as consultants in the State Department. Both of them were defeated by the people of their respective States. The President, Mr. Acheson, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have gone far out of their way to try and resurrect a bipartisan policy which never existed, in the first place. It may have existed in some parts of the world, but it never existed in the United States.

The American people are not fooled by these antics. They know when a President of the United States, overnight, stops shouting "S O B" and starts hollering "S O S," something really is wrong. Yet, the American people still do not know how wrong things really are.

For myself, I am convinced that this sudden outburst of bipartisan piety is merely a last-ditch desperate attempt to slam the bipartisan booby-trap door behind us and lock it for good. These same architects who have gotten us into this bipartisan debacle all over the world are now playing politics with a vengeance, and this time playing for keeps.

In the first place, Mr. President, on the very day the senior Senator on the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] asked the support of his colleagues for this third installment of the Marshall plan by telling them to put peace above politics, W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador at Large for ECA, spoke at a Democratic dinner in New York City, a speech described in the New York Herald Tribune April 21 as an aggressively bipartisan speech, in which he gave President Truman and the Fair Deal all credit for successful foreign and domestic policies. He attacked Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and other Republicans for timid and vacillating leadership in national affairs, saying the party was terrified of progress.

In the second place, Mr. President, on the same day, the New York Herald Tribune revealed that after all the bipartisan folderol Mr. Acheson had gone through, and in spite of almost unanimous Republican approval of the peril-point provisions of the reciprocal-trade agreements, Secretary Acheson went before a House committee and demanded that Congress ratify the charter of the ITO, which is nothing but a complete sell-out of American interests.

In other words, after putting his bipartisan arm around the Republican Party again, his first official act is to slap the Republican Party in the face.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Did not the Republican platform contain a plank specifically saying that foreign trade shall be developed on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, and did it not oppose the importation of the products of cheap labor and slave labor produced throughout the world, which would endanger the living standards of the American workman, farmer, and American industry?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct, and the ratification of the International Trade Organization would be a complete sell-out of every interest that is American.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana if Mr. Thorp, Under Secretary of State, did not testify specifically in January 1949, and reaffirmed his stand many times since, that the three parts of the program, which he outlined at that time, were dependent upon each other and were all parts of a whole? Did he not also say at that time that those three parts were first, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act; second, the ECA, and third, the International Trade Organization, which the distinguished Senator from Indiana has so adequately described? Did he not say that those three items were all parts of the program, and that each depended on the other?

Mr. JENNER. I do not recall his saying it.

Mr. MALONE. I assure the distinguished Senator from Indiana that he did say just that. I should like to ask

the distinguished Senator one further question, if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. If he did tie the three-part free-trade program together, and if that is the Democratic platform, which makes up the bipartisan foreign policy—and if the platform of the Republican Party adopted on February 6 of this year does include the plank described by the junior Senator from Nevada; I ask the Senator from Indiana how there can possibly be a bipartisan policy.

Mr. JENNER. There cannot be if we are to preserve our system of government. In the first place, there never has been, and I hope and pray to God there never will be.

In the third place, Mr. President, the administration continues to let the outrageous propaganda that was offered in support of the third installment of the Marshall plan stand as it is without making any effort, whatever, to tell the real truth.

Mr. President, I do not want to take the time now to go into this matter in detail, but I want to give just a few illustrations to my colleagues of how we have been duped.

Let us take the testimony of France, which was given by Barry Bingham, Chief of the ECA mission to France. I understand he has in his employ some 600 bureaucrats. On page 180 of the hearings, Mr. Bingham said, "Mr. Chairman, I have great hopes that France will be able to carry its own weight after 1952."

This was February 27, 1950. Yet, April 22, 1950, Mr. Bingham told the Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington:

> These are the three alternatives for 1952. We can support the French with American tax money; or we can abandon the French, risking a Communist victory and loss of an important market for our farms and factories; or we can lower our tariff barriers to a reasonable degree and buy from France so that she in turn can buy what she wants and desperately needs from us. When I say France, I might just as well say western Europe. That is the shape and size of the problem.

What about England, Mr. President? The testimony of how Marshall plan aid has been spent in England has been shocking for it reveals we have been financing the nationalization of British industry, socialized medicine, and all of Britain's other socialistic schemes, up to the hilt. It reveals we are financing the British in their conclusion of American exports to foreign markets; that we are financing the modernization of industry to flood our domestic markets, and that we are financing the outrageous destruction of Germany's domestic market for European goods and the destruction of Germany's competitive industrial potential, thus making the recovery of Europe an absolute impossibility.

Furthermore, on April 4, 1950, Sir Stafford Cripps admitted the British gold reserve had reached $1,984,000,000 in the first quarter of 1950. In addition, Mr. Cripps admitted Britain had also succeeded in balancing her internal budget with the profits from her sterling area trade. Meanwhile, we are going deeper into the red by every tick of the clock and it certainly does not seem out of place to ask the question in the light of these developments, who should be helping whom to balance their budgets?

And yet, we are continuing to pour out more money to perpetuate the very conditions which are defeating our basic objectives in Europe.

In other words, England's external and internal budgets are balanced, and she has a gold reserve of $2,000,000,000, while our national debt is $260,000,000,000, is going up $7,000,000,000 more this year, perhaps will be $10,000,000,000 more next year, and, if Truman and his Fair Dealers and "fairy dealers" have their way, it will go up many more billions of dollars. Yet, Mr. President, England has asked us to pay off $9,000,000,000 of her debt, and has asked us for another $700,000,000 under the Marshall plan. Oh, what fools we are!

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if he has noticed the change in tactics of the representatives of ERP, as shown in an article in this morning's Times-Herald.

Mr. JENNER. I have not seen the article to which the Senator refers.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator if he understands what the switch in tactics and methods is all about. I quote from the article:

> Truman's aides claim it's ERP or a depression.

It has reference to a depression for the United States, of course.

> Administration leaders have told the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committies in a secret session that foreign-aid spending must be continued unabated or the country faces the threat of a depression.
>
> President Truman and his aides told the Congressmen that the European recovery program billions are all that is preventing an unmanageable surplus of farm products. Stop foreign aid spending, and our markets will be glutted, they maintained.

Mr. JENNER. Whose surplus products?

Mr. MALONE. Our own, of course.

Mr. JENNER. Our own?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. JENNER. Why is it that in the last 2 years we have bought almost a half billion dollars' worth of wheat from Canada under the Marshall plan?

Mr. MALONE. We are probably eating Canada wheat, while we store our own wheat as a surplus crop.

Mr. JENNER. Then, why does the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] raise question about foreign oils? Whose products are we using? We are using American dollars to finance these countries.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Without a flexible-import fee, which would make up the differential in cost due to the difference in the wage-living standards between this country and the competitive nations, we are purchasing foreign products for domestic use and paying subsidies to American producers. In the case of dried eggs from China, we pay $1.10 for dried eggs, leaving the Chinamen to starve and storing our own eggs in the Kansas cave.

Mr. JENNER. To starve people helps the Communist program. Apparently that is our objective.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Indiana has been very diligent in clearly stating the problem. At first, in 1948, it was said that our objective was to feed hungry people, stop communism, and to rehabilitate industry. In 1949 it was to lower the import fees and tariffs and promote the importation of foreign goods into the United States. In 1950 the ECA representatives say that we now must appropriate $3,250,000,000 for Europe to purchase our products to prevent a depression.

Mr. JENNER. In order to close the dollar gap.

Mr. MALONE. In 1948, the avowed position was that the Marshall plan would furnish markets in Europe for American industrialists and American workmen. In 1949 we must import the surplus goods for Europe. Our objective now is said to be to prevent a depression here. Has the Senator noticed the two switches from the initial objectives, and does he understand what it means?

Mr. JENNER. I understand it, because I understand we do not have a foreign policy. It changes as the wind changes.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator believe that the American people can be continually duped by the tons of propaganda emanating from the State Department every day?

Mr. JENNER. I am afraid they can. I hope they cannot, but I am afraid they can. I shall never stop trying to prevent it.

A third illustration, Mr. President. In February 1950, Mr. Paul Hoffman told Congress "the year-old Republic of Korea offers impressive proof that the Marshall plan is indeed a potent weapon for peace."

Yet on March 23, 1950, Mr. Hoffman wrote the Korean Premier that unless inflation was immediately controlled, "it is my real fear that the point will be reached in the not-too-distant future where our aid would make no further net contribution to the welfare of the people of Korea."

In other words, here is the head of the Marshall-plan administration in February saying that "the year-old Republic of Korea offers impressive proof that the Marshall plan is indeed a potent weapon for peace," and just a few days later saying, "It is my real fear that the point will be reached in the not-too-distant future where our aid would make no further net contribution to the welfare of the people of Korea."

Mr. President, the same kind of misleading information which covers so many other aspects of the Marshall plan convinces me this new effort to silence criticism and debate, and to reimpose once and for all the shackles of secret

diplomacy from the top down on the members of both political parties and on the American people, is political from one end to the other.

The kind of bipartisanship which our so-called statesmen are now trying to force upon us permanently is clearly revealed in the President's speech to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Culture Organizations, whose membership called on him at the White House, that—

> We have another program coming up that will be somewhat similar to that of 1948.

We have given away in foreign aid a sum slightly in excess of a hundred billion dollars since 1914, more than $35,000,000,000 of it since the end of the war. There have been the British loan, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and all the other schemes, but this is the President of the United States telling us what is to occur in the future under the bipartisan foreign policy. He said:

> We have another program coming up that will be somewhat similar to that of 1948.
>
> This time, we are trying to elect a Congress that believes in international cooperation, wholeheartedly—a Congress that believes the welfare of the United States demands a continuing foreign policy that takes into consideration the whole globe, instead of just one country or one district or one State.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. Are we to understand, from that, that Mr. Truman will support Republican Members of Congress for reelection who support his so-called bipartisan foreign policy?

Mr. JENNER. The Senator comes from Missouri, does he not, where the Pendergast gang operates? That is where the President got his training, so I will let the Senator draw his own conclusions.

And what about the attitude of our so-called Republican bipartisan representative, Mr. Dulles? Let us bring out both sides. Mr. Dulles has just published a new book called War and Peace, in which he clearly reveals what kind of bipartisanism he wants to anchor upon us. This is the same Dulles who was appointed Senator to fill an interim term. He was the man who attended one of the conferences in London under the bipartisan foreign policy, and said on the floor of the Senate that they debated whether or not they would tell the American people the truth, and he said he was glad to report that they decided to tell the American people the truth. Am I to take my bipartisan politics from a man who has to hold a discussion on whether or not the American people are entitled to be told the truth?

I now wish to read from Mr. Dulles' book, War and Peace, as to how he is going to deal with us if we are not bipartisans.

He says:

> If the leaders of the opposition party refuse at this critical time, as a matter of partisan advantage, to accept a bona fide offer to make foreign policies cooperatively, so that those policies can command unity at home and attract adherence abroad, then those who take that position ought to be repudiated at the polls. Refusal by the administration to make such a bona fide offer ought to insure a like fate.

Mr. President, there are those who continue to deride my position and to smear my efforts to bring these facts before the American people, and ofttimes I am pictured as a "lone wolf" going my own way, representing no one else's interests and ideas but own own, and I know of no better time than now to correct this illusion. All one needs to do is to visit my office and look over my correspondence to discover that I am speaking for the majority of people in my own home State of Indiana, and increasingly, as this bipartisan fund continues to be exposed, I find I also am speaking for vast numbers of my fellow Americans from such States as California, Washington, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, and many others. And what is more, Mr. President, I am proud I have the privilege to fight for those whose allegiance to America still remains their primary duty and concern. I am also willing, Mr. President, to pay whatever price is necessary to continue to represent these folks, even to the extent of being purged by Mr. Dulles.

Think of it, Mr. President, think of the utter hypocrisy of Mr. Dulles, who was repudiated at the polls, double-crossed by his so-called bipartisan partners, who has been appointed as policy maker in the State Department without any need of confirmation by the Senate and who now orders from his ivory tower a purge of the opposition.

Mr. President, is this not sufficient proof to shock the American people into a realization of the fact that this last-ditch bipartisan appeal of desperation is designed to cover up all that has happened to America and to force us into line as "goose steppers" in thought and practice, behind the procession of internationalist schemes that are leading to our suicide.

Because this is my conviction I shall consider these remarks as merely preliminary to my discussion of how ECA originated, what it has done and continues to do, and where it is leading us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly in support of the pending measure, the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950. A few days ago the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, stated the case of the ECA thoroughly and adequately. As the Senate well knows, this is the third time in 3 years this matter has been before the Senate, and the factual background and the reasons for it I think have been presented and discussed at great length. I wish to take only a few moments to make a few observations about it, and not to reiterate the facts, or accomplishments, or the major arguments supporting the program.

In certain important aspects the Economic Cooperation Act has been very successful. So far as industrial production is concerned, the results may well be characterized, as Mr. Hoffman said, as "a near miracle." The figures on agricultural production are impressive, and the internal financial stability of the participating countries has improved. In most of the countries inflation has been slowed down, if not eliminated. Exports have gone up, and the dollar earnings of the countries have risen very substantially.

I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] with regard to the present status of Great Britain. If I recall correctly, he opposed the ECA when the gold reserves of Great Britain were not so great as they are today, and when her economic condition was not nearly so prosperous as it is today. I think there is much remaining to be done to bring it back to a really prosperous state.

But I am somewhat confused over the Senator's reasoning. It seems to me the fact that Britain has made some progress in balancing her internal budget, in reestablishing a relatively small gold reserve, would be an accomplishment in which we could take great encouragement. It certainly should not now be interpreted in itself as a reason for condemning this program. I take great pride and great pleasure and some encouragement from the fact that Britain has made progress. Certainly we should not proceed on the basic assumption that whenever a country begins to make progress, therefore we ought to punish it by removing what little assistance is being offered to it through the ECA program.

While it is true that six-hundred-odd million dollars is a large sum of money from one point of view, it is not such a great sum from the point of view of a whole national economy. It does furnish certain foreign exchange—that is dollars—which is extremely important to their balance of payments.

The Senator from Indiana, of course, is very vigorous in his expression. He said he was regarded as a lone wolf. When I observe the vigor of his expression and vitality, while I agree that he is a wolf, I do not know how lonely he is. He is more wolfish than he is lonely, I think.

As a result of these developments in the foreign countries, the living standards of the western European participants have risen and have served to halt, at least temporarily, the progress of communism in that area. Mr. Hoffman has said that to stop dollar aid at this time would mean catastrophe in Europe and severe dislocations for the United States. One can agree with this conclusion, as I do, and support the extension of the ECA, and I express disappointment that this program has not been more successful toward the achievement of a proper long-term goal.

I supported this program in 1948 with genuine enthusiasm, because at that time I believed that the Europeans, with some leadership from our Government, had a unique opportunity to create a unified, strong Europe out of the chaos following the war. I believed then, as I believe now, that if we had made the federation of western European states the principal objective of our policy in Europe, we would today be on our way to its achievement.

As the Members of this body are well aware, I attempted in 1948, and again in 1949, to persuade the Senate to adopt a statement of policy in this legislation supporting the political and economic unification of Europe. This body, influenced to a great degree I believe by the attitude of the Department of State, refused to accept this declaration of policy. Today, the success of the ECA in raising the living standards of western Europe has, to a large degree, removed the compelling incentives toward European unification, although paradoxically the ECA now recognizes the necessity for unification.

The ECA, particularly Mr. Hoffman, now recognize the necessity for unification. My criticism on that point at this time is not toward Mr. Hoffman's present attitude with respect to it, but as to the timing of his conversion. While I am still strongly for federation of Europe, regretfully I must say that I think when the patients were sick, that is, 2 or 3 years ago, was the time when there was a unique opportunity to persuade them to move toward the federation of Europe. They were then receptive, and the necessity was much greater at that time than it is now. The very fact that, as Mr. Hoffman has said, this "near miracle" has occurred with regard to their economic improvement, their success, has removed the principal incentive toward the long-term solution of their problem, which I still believe permanently lies along the road of the federation of these states. I simply am more persuaded than ever that that is the true policy and the true objective the European states should seek to achieve.

This year in the committee I offered and the committee adopted an amendment providing for the utilization of as much as possible of the counterpart funds for the promotion of transferability of currencies and the economic integration of the European participants. I may again observe that last year one amendment I offered was precisely for that purpose, but it was rejected. I think at that time we could have achieved much more, because we had at that time more money to dispose of, and the pattern in the trade and political fields in Europe was not so firm as it now is.

In trying to assess this program, I doubt that it can be said that we have done more in the expenditure of approximately $10,000,000,000 than to buy time. I do not minimize, of course, the importance of the time we have bought. It may well be that it is worth the cost, and having entered upon this program we cannot afford at this time to abandon it. We cannot afford to abandon it now because we have as yet developed no effective alternative.

Members of this body, within the last day or so, have complained about the lack of attention in the debates on this bill. I feel that that indifference results from the fact that no one really believes that the limited objectives of the present legislation hold any hope for a real solution to the problems of Europe, together with the fact that existing legislation, practically the same legislation, has been discussed before at great length in the past years.

Mr. President, I should like to suggest that as one alternative the Committee on Foreign Relations give serious consideration immediately to the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 57. This resolution simply calls for a convention of the democratic countries of the Atlantic area to explore the possibilities of developing a closer association of their respective countries. I feel that such an investigation and discussion would arouse the interest and enthusiasm of these countries and help develop a much sounder basis for our continued cooperation.

I am unable to understand why our country, which has benefited so enormously from the practical application of the federal principle of government, should be so reluctant either to urge it upon the Europeans, who need it so badly, or to explore the possibility of applying the principle on a broader basis in the Atlantic area with our own participation.

A further suggestion that I feel is worthy of serious consideration by the Senate is the enlargement and strengthening of our program of information. I joined our colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] in the submission of a resolution a short time ago on this subject. I am in thorough accord with the idea that our whole information program is deficient in every respect. I have noticed, however, that, instead of increasing the appropriation for this program, the committee in the House of Representatives has recently cut the appropriation by almost 10 percent, reducing it to approximately $34,000,000. When this sum is compared to that which we spend on the armed forces or in the economic-assistance program, it seems to me obvious that it is much too small.

There is one particular activity within this program which I believe should be strengthened. I refer to the exchange-of-persons program. This program, I believe, over a long period, can contribute enormously to the understanding and better relations among the 17 participating countries. I may say that among those 17 countries are all the Marshall-plan countries, I believe, with two exceptions. Such a program would be valuable even though we had enough vision and intelligence to develop an effective United Nations or an effective Atlantic Union. But since we have made so little progress toward the development of governmental machinery in the international field, I think it is all the more important that we stress programs which may bring about better relations through the individual contacts of the citizens of the respective countries. It may well be that this approach is a necessary precedent to the development of an effective United Nations or Atlantic Union.

I wish to remind the Senate that this program was authorized in 1946; and in the last academic year, beginning in September and October of 1949, it already has resulted in over 1,800 exchanges of students. More than 800 of them were American young men and women, among them some of the finest we have—in fact, I think the cream of the crop—who visited various foreign countries. Moreover, approximately 600 foreigners have come to this country, and about 600 other foreigners are attending American schools abroad. That is merely the beginning of the program, in its first year.

In connection with that program we are utilizing foreign credits from the sale abroad of surplus United States property which cannot be converted into dollars. Assuming that such credits could be converted into dollars—although of course they cannot be—they are the equivalent of $7,000,000. However, it costs the United States Treasury, in terms of dollars, only approximately $600,000 for the payment of supplementary funds for this program for the coming year. When this program is compared with the various other programs, even the ECA program, now under consideration by the Senate, I can think of no other program of equal possibilities in this field which could be carried on at so small a cost to American taxpayers.

After all, Mr. President, the ultimate objective of the ECA is a better world and a more stable family of nations who will be better able to protect and defend themselves. So the objective of the ECA program of $3,000,000,000-plus is exactly the same as the objective of this program for the exchange of persons. I venture the statement, in accordance with my belief, that by means of this exchange-of-persons program there is more hope for improvement in international relations and in the international situation than there is in connection with or under any other program we have undertaken.

In any case, Mr. President, we do know that efforts toward international organizations have not been successful. I think it cannot be denied that a large-scale exchange of students, professors, and technical persons will contribute to the basic understanding and friendship which is all-important to a peaceful world. Mr. President, I would go so far as to say that I believe that a small part of the funds we are authorizing under the present ECA bill could well be spent, and would more effectively be spent, in increasing the flow of students, professors, and research scholars among the several nations.

Of course, in this measure we are authorizing supplemental funds under what is known as the point 4 program, which also has precisely the same objective as the program regarding the exchange of such persons.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement with regard to a suggestion which does not directly concern the authorization under the pending ECA bill, but it is an extremely important consideration for the ECA, with regard to assisting the foreign countries to improve their dollar balances. It is a discussion of the possibilities of increasing tourism through the use of counterpart funds in the various foreign countries.

In my own travels—and I also have noticed this in talking with others who have traveled—one of the principal bottlenecks in this field is the lack of

adequate accommodations for American tourists in many of the foreign countries. I speak particularly, for instance, of a great city such as Istanbul, which could be an enormous source of dollar earnings if there were adequate hotel facilities there. However, there is only one small hotel there which is considered first rate, sufficiently clean, and otherwise suitable; in all that huge city there is only one small hotel which is available to transients who visit that city, and it is extremely difficult for them to obtain reservations in that hotel. So, I think a great opportunity to use counterpart funds—that is, foreign currency or local currency funds which result from the spending of American dollars in the first place—has been overlooked. In my opinion, this field already is the largest single source of dollar earnings for foreign countries. Certainly it is the easiest one to use and the one which least depletes the resources of those countries. Altogether, and all in all, I think it is a particularly important aspect of the program which should be emphasized.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on this subject, which I believe would be very useful if the ECA would study it and take it to heart; and also it will be very informative to all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement appears in the Appendix of the RECORD, under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, Mr. President, I feel that certainly the Senate will not at this late date in any manner abandon the program authorized by the existing ECA legislation. I also hope the Senate will not adopt any amendments which will seriously reduce the amounts proposed to be authorized.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that it was necessary for me to leave the floor yesterday before I had an opportunity to comment upon a most important event which occurred just 5 years before.

April 25 is a date which I hope in time to come will be considered one of the most significant in world history. It is the anniversary of the convening at San Francisco, in 1945, of the conference to establish a United Nations Organization.

It is not necessary at this time to recount the heartfelt optimism which surrounded that occasion, or the disappointments which have been felt since that time.

There are many who will say that today the United Nations is at its lowest ebb. There is some reason for that view, for major activities of the United Nations are at a virtual standstill as the result of an obstructionist boycott by one of the major powers.

I hope the present fortunes of the United Nations will not lead any of us to discouragement which may cause us to abandon that Organization, which was conceived in hope and dedicated to man's noble aspirations for a world of peace and security.

I firmly believe the United Nations is our one best hope for peace. I believe it must be the cornerstone of our foreign policy, just as it must be built upon as the cornerstone for world peace.

Our disappointments of the past 5 years have been great, but they have been great only in proportion to the optimism we felt 5 years ago this week.

Our experiences have been bitter, but they have not been fruitless.

We have learned that the peace-living and peace-loving nations of the world are in the majority.

We have learned who our friends are, and we have learned who are our enemies. We have come to know, and I hope to deal with, the problems of the peace.

We have observed that where given a decent chance, the United Nations can succeed. From personal observations around the world—in Iran and in Pakistan, for example—I can say that where the United Nations has been given a chance to function, it has worked well.

We must now renew our dedication and our efforts to make the United Nations work, to make it the effective instrument for world peace and security that we foresaw 5 years ago at San Francisco.

It will take tireless effort, and firm and patient negotiation. I urge that patience and that effort upon the people of the world. I urge it particularly upon the people of the United States, who have been assigned by history a tremendous responsibility for leadership. The prize will be worth the price.

As a concrete program looking forward to strengthening the United Nations I have submitted a concurrent resolution, in company with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] and the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Ours is not a sensational proposal. It offers no panaceas. It is a simple spelling out of concrete steps which this Nation may take in order to strengthen the United Nations within its present framework. It is evolutionary, rather than revolutionary.

When President Roosevelt announced the United Nations Conference to the Congress and the American people in March of 1945 he predicted that the organization then gestating would not be perfect and that its Charter would be subject to revision and amendment, just as our Constitution. The delegates at San Francisco wisely made provision in the United Nations Charter for a charter revision conference after 10 years of operation. My colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, was one of the principal delegates at San Francisco. We regret that he is unable to be on the floor with us at this time, by reason of his illness. We all hope that he may return at a very early date.

We are now midway in that 10-year period. We have the opportunity to review 5 years of experience, and we have the opportunity of working faithfully toward our goal in the next 5 years, at which time such basic reforms as may be justified can be considered.

For the present, it is our responsibility to serve, as patiently and as firmly as we can, the hopes that were born 5 years ago at San Francisco.

Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has conducted hearings on the concurrent resolution of which I have spoken. I am pleased to say that in those hearings the resolution received the official endorsement of the Department of State, which speaks strongly for our hopes that the United Nations may be in reality, as it is in the wishes of millions of Americans, the shining cornerstone of our foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 72, submitted February 7 for myself, and on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United Nations is the world's best hope for the maintenance of international peace, security, and justice; and

Whereas in the 4 years of its experience the United Nations has both demonstrated strength and revealed weaknesses; and

Whereas in the light of this experience the United Nations can be made stronger by development of its powers, its procedures, its facilities, and policies of its members: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), 1. That the Congress reaffirms its faith in the United Nations as the cornerstone of the international policy of the United States, and that the President be advised that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should cooperate with other governments for the strengthening of the United Nations, by interpretation of the Charter, by action taken or usages developed under the Charter, by supplementary agreements among nations who desire thus to further the purposes of the Charter, or ultimately, if necessary, by amendment of the Charter.

2. That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should cooperate with other governments in steps for the strengthening of the United Nations, in particular—

(a) "voluntary agreement to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of international disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members," Senate Resolution 239, June 11, 1948;

(b) effort to achieve immediate membership of all states qualified for membership under article 4 of the Charter, to the end of making the United Nations universal;

(c) elimination of the reservations made by the United States to its acceptance of the optional clause of the Statute of the International Court of Justice; and acceptance by all states of the optional clause without reservations, so as to give the Court compulsory jurisdiction in legal disputes as defined in article 36 of the statute;

(d) further development of the armed guard force and field service under the Secretary General in order to assure adequate protection and assistance to missions of the United Nations in the normal course of their operations;

(e) renewed efforts, at a political level, to secure agreements for the contribution of forces and assistance under the provisions of article 43 of the Charter;

(f) utilization by all members of the United Nations of suitable measures for collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter as necessary to maintain peace and security;

(g) direct administration by the United Nations of certain disputed areas where such direct administration would contribute to the peace of the world;

(h) passage of appropriate legislation to facilitate the provision of independent sources of revenue for the United Nations in addition to the revenue provided by contributions made by members;

(i) support the principles of the United Nations Charter respecting fundamental freedoms;

(j) preparation by the International Law Commission of the United Nations of an international criminal code and of a statute for an international criminal court;

(k) carry out as far as possible, through the United Nations, the program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he is interested in presenting a unanimous-consent request to fix a time for voting on the Spanish amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is a quorum call necessary preceding a unanimous-consent order fixing the time for voting on an amendment to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that the Parliamentarian advises it is not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not advising the distinguished Senator from Nevada what to do, of course, but, so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned, I have canvassed the situation. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield, that I may make an observation?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, if I have unanimous consent that by so doing I shall not lose the floor. I do not yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may suggest to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that in view of the fact that the rules do not require a quorum call in this instance, in connection with fixing a time for voting on the amendment, if the Senator would propose a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that the Senator from North Dakota would not lose the floor, and if the unanimous-consent request were along the line suggested, I am not sure but that it would be agreed to, and might facilitate at least the obtaining of an early vote on one of the amendments to the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me, that I may make such unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LANGER. I yield, with the same understanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I propose a unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Thursday, April 27, 1950, at the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., the Senate will proceed to vote without further debate upon the amendment proposed to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, by Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER) providing for aid to Spain, and upon any amendment that may be pending or proposed thereto, including any motion in connection with the said amendment: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said amendment shall be received.

Ordered further, That the time between 12 o'clock noon and 2 p. m. on said day shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposed to the amendment and controlled, respectively, by Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. CONNALLY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, since there apparently will not be many more speeches this afternoon or tomorrow, whether it may be possible to have considered a resolution I have been interested in, namely, Senate Resolution 202.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very sorry to say to the Senator that that would be wholly impracticable. We are busily engaged in the consideration of the pending bill, and we are trying to rush it along. It is a bill of the highest importance. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee will have an opportunity to call up his resolution, when we finish with the pending bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I merely suggested it, in the case the debate ran out and time afforded.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will not run out, if I can head it off.

FLOODS IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate an unprecedented situation in the State of North Dakota. In that State, for the first time, we have unprecedented floods. For the first time we have more floods and more water than we have ever had before at any one time, in all the history of the State.

I have here the Fargo Forum, published Saturday morning, April 15, 1950, on the first page of which there is the headline: " Sheyenne threatens valley city; Red still going up in north."

For the purpose of showing exactly what the situation is, not only in North Dakota but in the neighboring State of Minnesota, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full at this point in my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the article be not clipped from the newspaper, but that the entire newspaper, together with the photographs, be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD, and will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The article is as follows:

[From the Fargo Forum of April 15, 1950]

SHEYENNE THREATENS VALLEY CITY, RED STILL GOING UP IN NORTH

The flooding Sheyenne River was causing concern at Valley City yesterday as the Red River and its tributaries continued to rise in the northern Red River Valley.

The return of warm weather yesterday hastened the run-off of recent snows. The Fargo-Moorhead temperature reached 43 and highs of 45 to 55 are predicted for the valley today, with south and southeast winds.

Col. L. G. Yoder of the St. Paul district, Corps of Engineers, yesterday inspected the Sheyenne River and Baldhill Dam area near Valley City. If the river should rise another 18 inches, the Valley City municipal power plant would be threatened. However, the river stage has been nearly stationary the last 3 days.

W. C. Lincoln of Fargo, resident engineer during construction of Baldhill Dam, will go to Valley City today to remain there until threat of flood to Valley City is ended.

Colonel Yoder conferred with Valley City officials, at the request of Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, on the possibility of partially closing the Baldhill Dam gates to hold back any sudden run-off of water which would threaten the power plant or other sections of Valley City.

It had not been planned to close the gates at all this year, because the Corps of Engineers has not taken title to all the land which would be inundated should the pool level behind the dam rise much above the present level. The level could be raised a few feet, however, without endangering any buildings.

Valley City officials were ready to aid negotiations for permission to temporarily flood affected farm land not yet owned by the Government in order to protect the city proper, should the need arise.

Gov. Luther Youngdahl of Minnesota Friday asked President Truman to allocate $25,000 for flood-control measures in the East Grand Forks, Minn., area.

Mayor Earl Enright of East Grand Forks said the money would be used to enlarge a dike to prevent present and future flooding.

(In Washington last night, Pere F. Seward of the General Services Administration indicated money from the disaster fund cannot be used for such a purpose but is restricted to relief of distress and suffering.)

The reading in Grand Forks, N. Dak., Friday evening was 34.8 feet, with a flood stage of 30 feet.

At Oslo, Minn., in Marshall County, the river was within 1 foot of the top of the dike Thursday and sandbagging cannot be done because of the flat country. Frank Forbes, disaster chairman of the Marshall County Red Cross chapter, reported warnings have been issued to all people who might be affected.

In Oslo, a community of about 500, residents who remain in their homes will have to use boats to get supplies. If the river rises two feet higher, the entire community may have to be evacuated.

Napoleon, in Logan County, where an overflowing drainage ditch caused considerable damage a week ago, was in trouble again last night as snow, melting rapidly in the warm weather, sent the ditch over its banks.

Overflowing about 8:30 p. m., in 2 hours the water had covered Highways Nos. 3 and 34, and surrounded several homes and business places.

The ditch, three to four feet deep and 10 to 25 feet wide, drains an area 10 to 15 miles wide. It empties into a lake a mile west of the town.

About 11 p. m., however, the water began to recede.

At Bismarck, Frank J. Bavendick, Federal meteorologist, said the Missouri River had risen to 16 feet there last night, but the ice cap was holding from a point near Williston to about Fort Yates in the southern portion of the State.

Flood stage, he said, was 19 feet at Bismarck and he explained we are approaching the critical point. Western North Dakota has had excessive snow, and high temperatures will bring a rapid run-off.

The ice has moved out of the Yellowstone River, 20 miles west of Williston at the confluence of the two rivers.

However, Bavendick said only shore ice was heaving on the Missouri at Bismarck and it was about 2½ feet thick. He believes channel ice is considerably thinner after having "rotted" by higher temperatures and scoured away by the rushing current.

In Fargo-Moorhead the Red went down 1.8 feet yesterday to a stage of 19.93, less than 3 feet above flood stage, and the Sheyenne was down another foot in West Fargo to 12.69 feet.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the other newspapers which I shall present be handled in the same manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. I have here, for example, a picture of the town of Mott, N. Dak. This picture shows that the water is halfway up the grain elevator.

I ask unanimous consent that the article headed "President asked to declare North Dakota flood emergency area" be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that the pictures accompanying the article be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD, and the pictures accompanying it will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The article is as follows:

[From the Bismarck Tribune of April 19, 1950]

PRESIDENT ASKED TO DECLARE NORTH DAKOTA FLOOD EMERGENCY AREA—GOVERNOR TELEGRAPHS CAPITAL

Gov. Fred G. Aandahl Wednesday requested President Truman to declare a flood emergency in North Dakota and make available all possible assistance.

Aandahl made the request in a telegram to Pere F. Seward, community facilities service, General Services Administration, Washington.

Aandahl said the floods in the Red, James, Cannonball, and Heart River Valleys apparently are more destructive than in 1943 or 1948.

He added there has been heavy damage to property. The amounts and items, however, cannot be determined until the swirling waters recede.

Critical areas Wednesday centered in the Red River Valley around Grand Forks, in the James Valley at Jamestown and in the Cannonball Valley around Breien, Solen, and Shields, south of Mandan.

Grafton, located north of Grand Forks, was 100 percent under water as the worst flood in its history struck the city, Associated Press dispatches report.

Business was at a standstill, traffic was stopped except for tractors and trucks which are being used for emergency purposes and scores of families were being moved from their homes to the schools and other public places.

An Army duck was dispatched from National Guard headquarters at Bismarck to the Grand Forks area.

A National Guard spokesman said he received one report that some people, trapped by flash floods, were being taken off housetops.

Calls for help in moving families at Grafton were coming in at the rate of one a minute.

The deluge now swamping Grafton is from overland water that has drained from fields and higher places to the west.

Observers said the north branch of the Park River north of the city was leaving its banks and that water from it would soon reach town.

Jamestown eyed the rising James River closely. The river went up a foot between 4 p. m. Tuesday and 9 a. m. Wednesday, but it was not flooding.

The swollen Pipestem, which forced about 500 families out of their homes at Jamestown, was receding slowly. If the James strikes it will flood the north and northwestern sections of the city. The Pipestem is in the southern part of the city.

Telephone communications to Breien, Solen, and Shields were out of order. Sketchy reports indicated the Cannonball, which had caused much trouble in southwestern North Dakota the past few days, was flooding the area.

The Heart, Cannonball, and Knife Rivers were receding in western North Dakota but were going up in some areas where they empty into the Missouri River.

The University of North Dakota field house at Grand Forks has been converted into a giant dormitory for refugees. The rapidly rising Red hit a stage of more than 41 feet Tuesday night, 13 feet above flood stage.

A. F. Hulteng, Grand Forks engineer, predicted a crest of about 44.5 feet for the Red this week end. That would be the greatest height since the Red hit 50 feet in 1897.

Boat crews evacuated 200 families from their homes Tuesday night and early Wednesday. An additional 100 families were taken from East Grand Forks, Minn.

Federal Weatherman F. J. Bavendick believes they have crested. The Missouri dropped 3.6 feet here Tuesday. Its stage at 10 a. m. is 14.6 feet.

The Heart was remaining about stationary at Mandan Wednesday. Its stage was 21.11 feet there at 8 a. m.

Highway travel between Bismarck and Mandan was cut off completely Wednesday night when a floodgate on a dike across U S 10 on the eastern edge of Mandan was closed.

Water poured over the highway between the dike and the Missouri River bridge. The Heart has breached a soil-conservation dike southeast of Mandan, causing the water to rush out onto the flats between here and Mandan.

The Heart is several feet below the top of the main Mandan dike system. The dikes were raised several feet last summer. United States Army engineers said Wednesday they anticipate no trouble with the Mandan dikes.

The Bismarck highway division office reported it was investigating the condition of U S 10 near McKenzie, east of Bismarck, to see whether traffic could be maintained there. Water is flowing over the road at that spot, near Steele, and at Jamestown.

Cloudy, cool weather slowed the run-off in western North Dakota Tuesday. The sun was shining Wednesday but it continued quite cool.

Though a heavy snow cover remains in the Heart River Valley, weather observers said if the rivers can get rid of much of their current high waters during the cool weather they may be able to handle additional run-off without too much trouble.

The flood situation in Bismarck itself appeared to be improving Wednesday but travel out of the city was uncertain at best and totally cut off in some directions.

The Bismarck division highway office reported that water over Highway 10 has completely cut off travel between here and Mandan and in addition about 3 miles of the highway west of the town are flooded. To the east travel is possible but difficult.

The McKenzie slough is still over the road there. Wave action is so high that cars must be towed through. A similar although less severe condition exists near Steele. Travel is possible both north and south of U S 83. Almost all other roads in this division are impassable.

Bus line officials said their service is badly curtailed. Busses from the west are still getting through to Mandan and then turning around and going back west. An attempt will be made to get through from here to Fargo sometime Wednesday and the Pierre and Minot lines are operating. Travel to the southwest is still blocked.

The Soo Line south branch train is operating and the north line train from Washburn north. All Northern Pacific branch lines are still out of operation.

Baker's Pond remained quiet Wednesday and Mrs. Ann McDonald, county Red Cross secretary said the flood refugees living in the World War memorial building were starting to move back to their homes. Of the 70 persons housed there at the peak, only about 40 remained Wednesday.

Mrs. McDonald said the Don Case and A. E. Slovap families were marooned south of McKenzie, and aid was being sent to them.

Sadie Stohl, Red Cross case worker from St. Louis, Mo., was due in Bismarck Wednesday to survey the help needed in this area.

The Washington national headquarters of the Red Cross made an emergency grant of $50,000 Tuesday for relief work in 16 North Dakota counties and five in western Minnesota, all declared disaster areas.

The 16 North Dakota counties are Cass, Traill, Grand Forks, Walsh, Pembina, Stutsman, Burleigh, Morton, Logan, Hettinger, Bowman, Adams, Oliver, Mercer, Sioux, and Grant. The five in Minnesota are Clay, Norman, Polk, Marshall, and Kittson.

At Cavalier, the flood situation was at a standstill Wednesday. Tuesday the water hit the north side, rising to 6 feet.

Bathgate and Neche, in the Cavalier area, are completely flooded. A plane piloted by Keith Gross of Cavalier took off from a highway at Grand Forks to carry supplies to Bathgate.

The National Guard at Cavalier worked Monday and Tuesday nights placing sandbags and otherwise protecting the town against water.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I might add that the town of Mott, N. Dak., is perhaps 450 miles from Grafton, N. Dak.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the Fargo Forum of April 20, 1950, carrying on the first page the headline "Floodwaters cover all of Grafton." Then follows the headline "Situation remains grave at Jamestown and Grand Forks; Aandahl calls for United States aid."

I also invite attention to the stories and the pictures on pages 10 and 13.

I ask unanimous consent that the news article may be printed in the RECORD at

this point in my remarks, and that the pictures be referred to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD, and the pictures will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The article is as follows:

[From the Fargo Forum of April 20, 1950]

FLOODWATERS COVER ALL OF GRAFTON—SITUATION REMAINS GRAVE AT JAMESTOWN AND GRAND FORKS

The northern Red River Valley, from Hillsboro to the Canadian border, had flood troubles last night.

Nearly a score of towns were flooded as the Red River and its tributaries, the Goose, Turtle, Forest, Park, Tongue, and Pembina Rivers climbed higher out of their banks. Surface waters from the spring thaw added to the flood troubles.

At Grafton, a city of 4,000 some 40 miles north of Grand Forks, water from the Park River showed signs of receding last night after covering the entire town to a greater depth than the disastrous 1948 flood. The level dropped 8 inches in 1 hour, but there was still possibility of another rise.

At Grand Forks, the flooding Red River passed the mark it set in 1948 of 41.62 feet. It hit 42.22 making the 1950 flood second only to the 1897 flood, when the river hit a 50-foot stage there.

In the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks area at least 300 families have been exacuated from their homes, and the river is slated to rise about another 2¼ feet by Saturday or Sunday. The NDU fieldhouse has been converted into a giant dormitory for refugees.

The actual flooding in Grand Forks was confined mainly to the Lincoln Drive residential area in the southeast part of town. The north end of East Grand Forks was hardest bit by the Red River, while the Red Lake River was flooding the point section of East Grand Forks. Most downtown business places on both sides of the river had to plug and put pumps into action to keep their basements dry.

The Northern States Power Co. was sandbagging its plant last night. The water was lapping at the power company's outside coal piles.

Army ducks, rowboats and moving vans were all working Wednesday to move families and their possessions from the threatened areas.

The University of North Dakota, on the west edge of Grand Forks, also had its troubles, because the campus stream, English coulee, was over its banks. Water was in the NDU steam and power tunnels, and in the basement of the Phi Delta Theta, Gamma Phi, Lambda Chi and Pi Beta Phi houses, as well as several residences bordering the coulee.

The stream overflowed the west end of University Avenue and the road was cut by bulldozers to give the water a chance to run off.

At Oslo, Minn., right on the Red River, 20 miles north of Grand Forks, the remaining residents were living on the second floor of their homes. The ground floors of practically every home and business place were under water.

An estimated 400 of the town's 500 residents have moved out to neighboring Warren and Alvarado, Minn.

At Jamestown, while the Pipestem River was slowly receding yesterday, the James River continued to rise with no sign of a crest yet.

City Engineer Erik Peterson said gages 6 miles above the city yesterday afternoon showed a 24-hour rise of 1.3 feet. The flow over the spillway at Arrowood Lake dam reached 70 inches, only an inch below the high mark of 1948's bad flood, and was still rising.

The James was over its banks at two points in the northwest part of the city last night. Water was lapping at one wall of the city water plant, where sandbags have been readied.

The Pipestem was down a few inches last night, with little effect on the extent of the flooded area.

The Red Cross last night estimated that at least 1,650 families had been driven from their homes by the North Dakota-Minnesota floods.

Several towns remained insolated from overland communications because of washed out bridges, highways, and railroads.

Grafton was totally flooded early yesterday as water poured overland from the Park River and off fields. The city, however, was well prepared to keep the water out of vital buildings with barricades of sandbags and extra pumps.

Business was at a standstill as Graftonites could travel only in hip boots, or on tractors, trucks, or in boats. The business places also were barricaded.

Through efforts of the Red Cross, 165 persons who had to evacuate their homes found living quarters in the Grafton central school. There was one large dormitory for the men, one for the women.

Mrs. Stanley Wysocki, Walsh County Red Cross chairman, who has been on the job since 7 a. m. Monday without sleep, told the Fargo Forum everybody had cots and blankets, and the children were being entertained by the school teachers.

The Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. sent an amphibious boat from Grand Forks to Grafton yesterday with four relief operators and emergency equipment.

The water was 18 inches above the first floor level of the Grafton exchange, but the building was kept dry with pumps and sandbags. The Grafton operators had prepared for the flood by putting in a supply of drinking water, food, and cots.

Pembina, on the Red River at the Canadian border, was preparing for a damaging flood. The phone company had raised its equipment with jacks as high as possible above the first floor and sandbagged the exchange building.

Yesterday an ice jam in the Pembina River, which joins the Red at Pembina, sent flood waters swirling into the Manitoba border town of Gretna. Half the town of 500 persons was under water, and the water level was still rising late yesterday. Gretna is 14 miles upstream from Pembina.

At Cavalier, in Pembina County, the flood situation was at a standstill after swamping the north section of the town and a portion of the south side, which included some business places.

A few families had been moved out and relief workers were preparing for more water which they believed was coming.

Bathgate, in the Cavalier area, is completely flooded. A plane piloted by Keith Gross, of Cavalier, took off from a highway at Grand Forks to carry supplies to Bathgate. The school for the blind was surrounded by water.

The Forest River was down 2 feet at Minto Wednesday, but National Guard ducks were evacuating eight families stranded west of town.

The town is cut off from rail or highway communication and Dan Moga, mayor of Minto, said farmers in that area were hard hit.

Water is on the first floors of many farm homes, he said, and the REA went out, leaving many without heat in Tuesday night's 20° cold.

Livestock is threatened, Moga said, with one farmer seeking help in moving a flock of sheep belly deep in water and unable to reach higher ground.

Power and water have not been cut off in Minto, he said, and the town is well situated as far as food goes. Rail travel was halted when a Great Northern railroad bridge washed out 7 miles south of town and the NP tracks west of Minto on the Grafton line were washed out, Moga said.

Farmers in the Neche area were in pretty bad shape, according to Mayor Howard Ristvedt. Floodwaters of the Pembina River surged over the banks about 2 miles west of Neche and isolated several farms.

Many farmers have moved into town and about 15 Neche families have moved to higher ground from the flooded south side of town.

Neche is isolated and supplies are brought into town by a tractor and truck shuttle along Highway No. 18 from Highway No. 55, which is not affected, Moga said.

All Missouri River tributaries were reported going down, though scores of homes and parts of several towns remained flooded.

The Solen-Breien-Shields area, located south of Mandan, near where the Cannonball empties into the Missouri, was hit hard.

The Red Cross reported 21 Indian families living in a Government settlement across the river from Shields were driven from their homes. They asked for tents, stoves, and food.

Rural areas surrounding the small towns appeared harder hit than the towns were. Two houses, however, were reported carried away from Solen.

One farmer and his wife were rescued after spending 2 nights in a truck. Their farm had been completely flooded.

Traffic over United States Highway 10 west of Mandan was restored yesterday afternoon as the Heart River went down in that vicinity.

The highway department reported, however, it probably would close U S 10 near McKenzie and Steele, east of Bismarck. Traffic was maintained east out of Bismarck during the day, but trucks had to pull motorists through flooded spots near McKenzie and Steele.

U S 10 remains blocked between Bismarck and Mandan.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Fargo Forum of April 21, 1950, bears on the first page the following headline: "North Dakota gets $100,000 in flood relief; waters still going up at crisis points."

I invite the attention of the Senate to the photograph on the front page, showing various buildings almost completely under water.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD, and that the picture may be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD, and the picture will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The article is as follows:

[From the Fargo Forum of April 21, 1950]

NORTH DAKOTA GETS $100,000 IN FLOOD RELIEF; AIR SURVEY SHOWS FLOODS "STAGGERING"

(By Gifford Herron)

The sight of water sprawled for miles over the countryside, in some places an extreme distance from any regular channel, is staggering.

It's sickening to think of what that water does in terms of human discomfort, the damage in dollars, the delay it will cause farmers in planting their crops and the effort to be expended for rehabilitation.

But such is the sight and such are the thoughts as one flies north from Grand Forks, where the Red River has spilled for miles in

places on either side of its channel, where other rivers emptying into the Red are doing the same and where water from melting snow, which fell late in the season, helps make one big lake.

Starting north Thursday morning from Hector airport in a plane piloted by E. A. Skroch, I noted a tremendous improvement in the water situation in the area between Argusville, Gardner, and the Red River from last Friday, when I last flew over the same vicinity.

Of course the ground appears somewhat freckled with water standing in low places. Immediately after passing north over where the Elm River flows into the Red just west of Hendrum, Minn., the freckles increase, as they do again north of where the Goose River flows into the Red northeast of Hillsboro.

There, too, the Red begins to widen, threatening some nearby farm buildings. And it isn't long before the freckles change complexion, in that there are high spots of land sticking up out of the water.

Approaching Grand Forks one can see to the southwest of that city what appears to be a large lake. In over Grand Forks and there you see many homes flooded in the Lincoln Drive area to the southeast of the city, in the Minnesota point area of East Grand Forks and some to the roofs in northwestern East Grand Forks.

Between those two cities, the Red Lake River joins the Red to swell the latter as it flows northward.

Looking north, northwest, and northeast from over Grand Forks one begins to see a sprawling lake, dotted with groves of trees, in which there still is considerable snow.

Those groves, for the most part, mark the locations of farms. Too, there is the winding lines of trees, which is the only way you can mark the channel of the Red River.

From 1,000- to 2,000-foot altitude, it gives the appearance of a placid lake.

But swooping down to a lower level one easily sees currents cutting across fields, over and through roads, swirling under bridges and culverts, and gnawing away at the regular entrances of those passages, foretelling more wash-outs, which will cost thousands to repair.

Soon out of Grand Forks one sees the elevators at Oslo, Minn., 20 miles to the north. Flying over the town one can see but a very few buildings that aren't touched by floodwaters.

There's a line of cars and trucks on the road as it rises to the east. But a glance to the east and you see they couldn't go very far in that direction because the road dips under water again.

The Oslo baseball park would make a better swimming pool if the water didn't have hunks of floating ice.

North from Oslo the Turtle River flows in from North Dakota to enlarge the lake still more; then there's the Snake, the Middle, and Tamarac Rivers flowing in from Minnesota, each adding more and more water.

One begins to notice ice cakes floating in the swollen water across fields. Then, as you near Drayton the flooded area narrows. There's ice holding in the channel of the Red River.

Yes, the river narrows, but the residents of Drayton have, to all appearances, a gloomy few days ahead of them, because that water following the Red is moving toward them as is more from the west and southwest from the Grafton vicinity, flowing in the Forest and Park Rivers, as well as across fields toward the Red.

From Drayton north to Pembina, the countryside is fairly dry, although there is still considerable snow and it isn't all confined to groves. Several deep cuts on side roads were visible.

From Pembina we headed southwest toward Bathgate, along the Tongue River. We weren't far from Pembina before a lake loomed ahead. The Tongue seemed to be going every direction but along its channel which was choked with ice.

Bathgate is surrounded with water and there are some buildings flooded. The North Dakota School for the Blind seems to be on high enough ground to escape serious water damage.

South along the Great Northern Railroad to Hamilton, Glaston, St. Thomas, and Auburn one can see sheets of water moving from the highlands toward the Red River.

Water is going over the railroad in many places, railroad ties have been moved and water in several places is flowing over U S 81.

One can see a layer of mud left by the flood on the streets of Grafton, which is surrounded by the dirty water. But there was traffic moving Thursday on the main street and on several of the side streets. But there are many homes and business places still surrounded.

South from Grafton along the Northern Pacific over Kellog and Voss and then approaching Forest River you see four passenger-train cars lying partially on their sides, with water going beneath the cars so fast it looks like a rapids in a river.

We cut back from Forest River to Minto, where a low part in the south end of town is flooded and water is over U S 81.

From Minto we angled southeast for Grand Forks over a continuous lake. After getting gasoline at Grand Forks we headed for Hillsboro, where we saw the Goose River flowing out of its banks, inundating some houses in the northeast part of town as well as entirely covering the city park.

Then back to Fargo, where it was a relief to set foot on dry ground.

From time to time during the trip we would see farmers feeding stock on roads or pulling farm machinery to higher ground.

At one place a farmer was driving a tractor hauling a wagon, piled high with crates full of chickens, apparently headed for market.

WATERS STILL GOING UP AT CRISIS POINT

Declaring parts of the State an "emergency disaster area," President Truman last night allocated to North Dakota $100,000 from his emergency funds set up by Congress.

The money is to be used for relieving hardship and suffering caused by floods, particularly in the valleys of the Red, James, Heart, and Cannonball Rivers.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota, wired the Fargo Forum that he understood additional funds would be made available later. He said United States Army engineers would be conferring with Gov. Fred G. Aandahl on additional needs immediately.

President Truman acted after Governor Aandahl wired him, asking the president to declare the State a flood emergency area and to make available all possible assistance.

Along with news of the allocation came reports that the over-all flood picture is no better.

The Red River is still rising at Grand Forks.

The James is going up at Jamestown, threatening that city with even higher water than it has experienced all week from the flooding Pipestem River.

Grafton, which had a respite early yesterday as water which swamped the town receded, thought it was coming all over again as the Park River began rising swiftly about 9 a. m. But by early afternoon the rise stopped and the level still appeared stationary early last night.

About a third of the city of 4,000 remained under water, including the whole west end and a few blocks in the north section.

None of the evacuated residents returned home, however, as it was not known whether the river's next move would be up or down.

About 100 persons remained quartered in the schoolhouse and others were in private homes.

The city remained cut off from rail and highway transportation. A National Guard duck yesterday took in blankets, water purifiers, and 250 pairs of hip boots.

At Grand Forks, although the rate of rise had slowed greatly, the river hit a stage of 42.88, almost 15 feet above flood point. Observers still maintained that a crest of 44½ feet will hit there Saturday or Sunday, although the rise between 3 p. m. and 7 p. m. yesterday was only 0.07.

Gen. Don D. Shingler, Army division engineer, and Col. L. G. Yoder, St. Paul district engineer, made an aerial and ground survey of the Grand Forks area yesterday as the city was hit by its worst flood in 53 years.

City Engineer A. F. Hulteng said pumps were being used in most Grand Forks business places to combat seepage although the business district is dry

He estimated that about 250 families had left their homes in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks with about 25 blocks inundated in the two cities.

The Northern States Power Co. plant was being sandbagged, Hulteng said, but there was no danger to either the city's power or water supply.

"The crest won't make things much worse than they are now," the engineer said, "although it may mean a few more families will have to move. Most people who will be affected by the 44-foot stage have moved already."

The little community of Oslo, Minn., 20 miles north of Grand Forks at the junction of State Highway 1 and the Red River, was all but isolated last night, according to Felix Mallinger, president of the community club, No. 1 was covered running board deep with water for more than half a mile to the east, but a few drivers familiar with the road were able to get through.

The whole town was covered with water last night, over the first floors of most houses. Many residents had moved to the second floors of their homes or into the homes of neighbors. A number of women and children left to stay with relatives or friends elsewhere.

Mallinger said many farmers in the area were marooned and unable to leave their farms. A few boats were available but not enough, he said. There were reports an Army duck was to be provided but it had not arrived last night.

Drinking water was being hauled from Warren, 17 miles east, Mallinger said. There appeared to be enough food available in the town.

Still further north, at Neche, N. Dak., 52 families were evacuated from their homes to escape the flooding Pembina River, Henry Schaler, Neche Red Cross disaster chairman reported. He said the west end of the town was under water, but the business section was dry.

The water had begun to recede last night, but an attempt to dynamite ice jams in the river below town may be made today to speed the run-off.

Downriver, where the Pembina and the Tongue join the Red, the town of Pembina was waiting for the floodwaters to hit. The town expects a hard blow.

Jamestown was assured a flood worse than in 1948 yesterday as the James River continued to rise at a rate of a half-inch an hour.

The spillway at Arrowwood Lake Dam showed a flow 75 inches deep, 4 inches over the level of 1948. However, the 24-hour rise

was 5 inches where it had been rising at a 9-inch rate for a few days previous.

City Engineer Erik Peterson, after a flight over the area, said the ice still appeared solid in Arrowwood Lake.

He said the crest, nearing Arrowwood Lake late yesterday, was expected in Jamestown about Sunday.

In the city, meanwhile, the water in the northwest section was about up to the level of the 1948 flood yesterday. About 10 blocks in that area were under water last night. Few residents had left their homes, however, but many were expected to leave overnight and today.

Water was flowing past the front of the sandbagged city water plant a foot and a half deep, Petersen said.

The Pipestem River, which had forced about 500 families from their homes, continued to fall. U S 10, First Street West, and the road to the State hospital were passable yesterday.

Army engineers, checking the flow of the Pipestem west of Buchanan yesterday, found the flow had decreased from 4,180 cubic feet per second at the crest to 1,500 cubic feet.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite attention to the Bismarck Tribune of April 21, 1950, carrying on the front page the following headline: "Red Cross fears at least 100 rail, road bridges out."

I also invite attention to an article headed "High on Haystack," and to a photograph on the first page entitled "30-Mile Creek Lives Up to Name."

I ask unanimous consent that the news item regarding the flood be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that the picture be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the news item will be printed in the RECORD, and the picture will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The news item is as follows:

[From the Bismarck Tribune of April 21, 1950]

RED CROSS FEARS AT LEAST 100 RAIL, ROAD BRIDGES OUT

President Harry Truman, Thursday night, allocated $100,000 emergency funds to flood-stricken North Dakota as swollen waters continued upward slowly in the northeastern part of the State.

The money is to be used in the disaster area in and around the Red, James, Heart, and Cannonball Rivers, Associated Press dispatches report.

The allocation was made after Gov. Fred G. Aandahl requested the President to declare an emergency and rush assistance to the State.

It was not immediately known specifically how the money would be used. Aandahl will confer Saturday with W. J. Tweet, St. Paul, representing the General Services Administration, and other officials on the situation.

United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, North Dakota, said he understood additional funds would be made available later.

The flooding Red River's rate of rise in northeastern North Dakota slowed to a crawl Friday. Observers, however, predicted a crest of 44.5 feet will hit Grand Forks Saturday or Sunday. It was an even 43 feet Friday, 15 feet above flood stage. About 250 people have been evacuated from their homes.

The first livestock losses were reported Friday. A farmer near Manvel said he lost eight cattle and all of his brood sows. Another in the same area lost all his pigs.

Red Cross officials estimated at least 100 highway and railroad bridges have been carried away by the flood.

Army "ducks" have been called into service to deliver milk and other supplies to flood-isolated towns. At Drayton, Assistant Postmaster Donald Holler used an amphibious vehicle to carry mail out of Drayton and from Grand Forks to Drayton.

A flood warning was issued for the Sheyenne River in West Fargo. The river is expected to crest Monday or Tuesday in that region.

The James River was still rising at Jamestown, flooding out more families in the northwestern and northeastern parts of the city.

Red Cross officials now estimate about 600 families have been flooded out by the Pipestem and James.

Engineers reported a 5-inch increase in the James in a 10-hour period ending at 7 a. m. Friday 6 miles north of Jamestown, and a 4-inch rise in the north part of the city.

The Pipestem, which had been dropping, went up slightly in the southern portion of the city as it backed up because of the James.

Water covers all floors of the crippled children's school despite about 1,000 sandbags around it.

An additional 2,000 sandbags were requested from Army engineers at Bismarck as an effort was being made to protect the city water plant.

Arrowwood Lake, north of Jamestown, was expected to get the crest of the James Friday. The crest is expected to reach Jamestown in 2 or 3 days.

Missouri River tributaries continued downward. The Missouri dropped 3.9 feet here Thursday. Its stage is now 10.5 feet.

The Heart now is below flood stage at Mandan. The Cannonball River remains several feet above flood stage in the Breien vicinity, south of Mandan, and continues to flood the lowlands.

Tents for about 40 Indian families who were flooded out of their homes across the Cannonball from Shields were brought from Camp Grafton to Bismarck.

Red Cross officials Friday were trying to figure out a way to get them to Shields. Blankets for the families, now living in a school, were flown in Thursday.

Bismarck's flood appeared virtually over Friday as transportation opened between here and Mandan and the population at the World War Memorial Building continued to drop as flood refugees returned to their homes.

City engineer E. J. Booth said the flood was all done and that all that remained was to wait until the storm sewer reservoir on the south side dropped enough to allow the water from flooded areas to be pumped into it.

Highway travel between here and Mandan was restored Friday about 10:30 a. m. and practically all bus service was reported on time with exception of Mott and Killdeer busses which have not been running for several weeks.

Travel on highway 10 was reported open both east and west out of here although motorists were cautioned to drive slowly in the McKenzie area as water was still over the road. Highway 83 was open both north and south. The flood between here and Mandan had dropped enough to permit travel and it was also possible to get to Elgin via Highway 49 and also to Flasher.

Rail travel was still curtailed as the Northern Pacific is limiting its trains to two a day through Bismarck because of wash-outs west of Mandan. Trains were arriving from the east about noon and heading back in that direction about 6 p. m. A special shuttle service is operating between here and Mandan, coming over about 10 a. m. and returning about 6 p. m. Many Bismarcker's living in Mandan and employed here are catching the early morning switch engine to get to work on time.

Mrs. Ann McDonald, county Red Cross secretary, said only 20 persons remained in the World War Memorial Building flood refugee section as dropping waters permitted return to inundated homes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the Bismarck Tribune, of April 22, 1950, bearing the headline Pembina Braces for Worst Flood. Pembina, N. Dak., is located in the northeastern corner of the State, and it is perhaps 500 miles from Mott, right across from the State of Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent that the news item dealing with the flood situation be printed at this point in my remarks, and that the picture showing many tons of ice in the wake of the flood be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD, and the picture will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The article is as follows:

[From the Bismarck Tribune of April 22, 1950]

PEMBINA BRACES FOR WORST FLOOD—RAGING RED AT 45 FEET, STILL RISING

Grand Forks and Pembina in the northeastern part of North Dakota stood poised Saturday to receive a further onslaught from the swollen Red River.

The Red Cross disaster chairman at Jamestown, R. M. Stoudt, said Saturday he believes Jamestown has had its share of the flood—the worst in the city's history.

Stoudt said a lowering Pipestem River in the south of Jamestown was compensating for the slight rise in the James and no noticeable rise in local waters was expected.

An official Red Cross report said that so far 675 families have been removed from their homes in the Jamestown vicinity since the flooding started.

Throughout the State the Red Cross estimated some 7,000 persons are homeless due to the flood situation.

Flood conditions at Grafton and in the central and southwestern districts have ceased.

All of flood-stricken North Dakota Saturday was declared a disaster area by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Robert Brumett, assistant Red Cross disaster chairman, said that more than 13,000 people have been affected to date by the flood situation in the Red River area of North Dakota and Minnesota.

"Affected" signifies people whose homes and property have been flooded and those evacuated.

North Dakota has suffered the most with 10,693 affected, of that total, Brumett said, 3,360 have been evacuated and 835 have been put up in Red Cross public shelters.

A forecast of light rain or snow in the northeast section of North Dakota is expected to add to the rising river waters.

Pembina saw the Red River at its doors Saturday overflow its banks. The flood level was 45 feet Saturday, 3 feet over the flood stage of 42 feet, Associated Press bulletins report.

City Red Cross Chairman Nathan Myrick said Pembina expects the full brunt of the rampaging Red to hit the city by midweek and crest about next Saturday.

Missouri River waters here continued to fall, dropping 1.1 feet Friday to a stage of 9.9 feet. The Heart River and other Missouri tributaries are also dropping slowly. The Heart at Mandan dropped six-tenths of a foot Friday.

At Grand Forks the Red dropped slightly Saturday. Its stage is now 42.97 feet.

Predictions are that Pembina will suffer greater flood damage this year than in 1948 when three-fourths of the city was underwater.

However, United States Highway 81 washed out near a bridge section south of Grafton necessitating supplies being flown in by plane.

Relief for the destitute in the State is coming. President Truman has allocated $100,000 from his emergency relief fund to aid the State.

Gov. Fred G. Aandahl is conferring Saturday with engineers and representatives of the General Services Administration on how and where to dispense the emergency funds.

Travel in the Bismarck area is struggling back toward normal Saturday, but it is still behind schedule or stalled in several directions.

The main line of the Northern Pacific Railway is back in operation and all four trains are expected to operate nearly on time. The Killdeer line is in operation but the Mott and Linton trains are still unable to operate.

All bus lines are moving except those to Mott and Killdeer, which have not been running for several weeks.

The Soo Line south branch train left on time but travel to the north remains blocked by a bridge washout near Washburn and the north branch turns around at Washburn and heading back north.

The Bismarck division highway office reports the main roads open. U. S. No. 10 is open both east and west out of here and the road block near Mandan will come down completely Saturday. Water is still over the road at McKenzie and Sterling but travel is possible.

On U. S. No. 83 water is over the road at Sterling but travel is possible. North Dakota No. 31 is open to Center and North Dakota No. 49 is passable to Beulah. Many of the roads in the southern part of the division are drying out, but the northern section is still bogged down in most places. No. 3 south of Dawson is blocked by a washout.

Bismarck's flood is virtually over Saturday. Only 2 families, including about 20 people, were still using temporary quarters in the World War Memorial Building and they plan to move out over the week end.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that within the past 2 days blizzards have been raging in North Dakota. In one town there is approximately 16 inches of snow, which is something previously unheard of at this season of the year. The western part of the State is covered entirely by a new blanket of snow.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the Fargo Forum of April 22, 1950, bearing the headline "Speed up evacuations in Jamestown flood," and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fargo Forum of April 22, 1950]

SPEED UP EVACUATIONS IN JAMESTOWN FLOOD

Families continued to evacuate their homes in Jamestown yesterday before the rising waters of the flooding James River.

The city experienced its second biggest evacuation day, as 50 to 75 families had to leave their homes to the ravages of the flood waters.

It is estimated at least 600 homes have been evacuated in Jamestown, with 650 to 700 families on the refugee list.

The floodwaters rose almost a foot yesterday as the James River carried more and more water into the city. The Pipestem River which had been receding, also went up 2 inches as water from the James made it impossible for the Pipestem to flow into the James.

Water stood at nearly 4 feet high on the pumphouse wall at the Jamestown water filtration plant, a rise of 11 inches Friday. But, Erik Peterson, city engineer, said sandbagging operations was keeping the floodwater out of the city system and the drinking water had not been contaminated.

The crest on the surging James River was expected to be reached Monday, Peterson said. He also expects another 8-inch rise within the city before the leveling-off point is reached.

Peter Murphy and Miss Frances Blackburn of St. Louis, Mo., disaster workers for the midwestern branch of the American Red Cross, are directing relief work and four Red Cross staff members will aid them.

Col. F. M. Albrecht of Fort Lincoln, Garrison district engineer with the Corps of Engineers, spent Friday in Jamestown with Peterson on a flood survey.

Things also were getting no better fast in the northern Red River Valley. The Red at Grand Forks topped the 43-foot stage last night, and the river was still 1½ feet below the expected crest.

The river is rising at a rate of less than 0.01 of a foot an hour. No additional evacuations were made Friday.

The Red Lake River at Crookston was reported rising at the rate of 0.10 of a foot an hour Friday night. The Red Lake empties into the Red at Grand Forks.

To the north, Grafton was beginning to clean up its homes and business buildings as its flood subsided. But at Drayton, which is in the same county as Grafton but right on the Red River, the river had reached a 39-foot stage last night. It was within a foot of the 1948 record of 40 feet and going up at the rate of 2 inches an hour.

H. R. Tisdale, Red Cross chairman at Drayton, told the Fargo Forum, "We don't expect the crest for at least a week. The water will have to rise another 4 feet before it comes into the town, but at the rate it is rising we don't know what the outcome will be."

Only one road to Drayton is still passable. Tisdale said an Army duck was helping drive 40 head of marooned cattle to high ground. He said it was necessary to swim the cattle to safety, but the water is cold and some animals are dying of exposure and overexertion.

Tisdale said an Army duck was sent from Drayton to Pembina yesterday, which is expecting a record flood. Pembina, however, was still dry last night although water from the flooding Pembina and Tongue Rivers were within 6 or 7 miles of Pembina on the west.

Floodwaters were dropping at Neche, also on the Pembina River. Henry Schaler, Neche Red Cross chairman, said he was hopeful that a crest had been reached. Water there had dropped about 6 inches yesterday.

He said an earthen dike was thrown up on the north side of town. It was 2 feet high and was all but topped, but it kept the flood out of that part of town.

Telephone communications with Oslo, Minn., which has been surrounded with floodwaters for days, were cut off yesterday, so that there was no information from that community.

Flash floods of overland waters added to farmers' troubles. Army ducks and Red Cross disaster personnel worked all night evacuating farm families and stock in the Northcote, Minn. (Kittson County), area and an area 8 miles south of Pembina.

Red Cross area disaster headquarters in East Grand Forks reported seven ducks working in the north valley with chief trouble spots in the area between Drayton and the Canadian border.

Grafton was recuperating from its worst flood Friday with the Park River stage at a standstill and overland waters that had completely covered the town rapidly receding.

Most of the ground is bare and business places have reopened, said Mrs. Stanley Wisocki, Red Cross disaster chairman.

"We have half a road (U. S. 81) from Auburn," declared Mrs. Wysocki, "and people who must come to town are using it."

Mrs. Wysocki reported that Minto was all right, although still isolated, and Park River and Auburn had no emergencies.

The Grafton duck moved out to the east Friday, she said, to call at every farm in search of possible emergencies as Grafton residents began to clean up the flood debris.

Basements were caved in by the flood and mud and damage is expected to be heavy in households. The first of the 100 persons taking temporary refuge in the Grafton school started moving back to their homes Friday, Mrs. Wysocki said.

Livestock losses were reported from near Manvel, N. Dak., about 14 miles north of Grand Forks, where Leo Kinney said eight head of cattle and all of his brood sows were drowned. Raymond Kinney lost all of his pigs in the same area and Red Cross officials said there apparently were more unreported losses.

After an aerial survey, officials estimated at least 100 highway and railroad bridges have been carried away by the floodwaters.

Missouri River tributaries continued downward, though many lands remain flooded. U S 10 between Bismarck and Mandan was reopened.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the dikes around the town of Mandan, N. Dak., saved that town from destruction.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the Fargo Forum of April 23, 1950, which carries the following headline: "Jamestown flood toll running high; town hopes worst is over."

There is another article in the same issue headed: "Thirteen thousand hit by floods; water down at Forks."

I ask unanimous consent that the pictures on the front page of the paper be referred to the Committee on Public Works, and that the news articles relating to the flood be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles will be printed in the RECORD, and the pictures will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Fargo Forum of April 23, 1950]

JAMESTOWN FLOOD TOLL RUNNING HIGH; TOWN HOPES WORST IS OVER

(By Lloyd W. Sveen)

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK.—Water-weary Jamestown caught its breath last night after a week of fighting the relentless rise of the James and Pipestem Rivers.

The James rose hardly at all yesterday, and City Engineer Erik Peterson hoped the crest was passing through the city.

But if the battle was won it was at high cost. Damage will be in the tens of thousands of dollars.

The total damage in Jamestown's 1948 flood was figured at $650,000. Today twice the area of 1948 is flooded, including several sections which are built up now but were empty lots 2 years ago.

Sixty-nine city blocks are under water, plus Jamestown's three parks and other areas within the city which have not been subdivided. The Red Cross estimates between 600 and 650 families have been driven out of their homes by floodwaters.

The city water department figures 618 residences and 23 business places, which includes neighborhood groceries, apartment houses, duplexes and the like, have been flooded. That doesn't include houses with basements filled by water from backed-up sewers.

You can't arrive at a damage figure yet—you can only try to grasp what the slow, silent rise of the James and Pipestem Rivers have done to this city of 14,000 people.

With Louis Cadieux, Jamestown photographer and special correspondent for the Fargo Forum, I toured the flood areas yesterday, covering the hard-hit northwest area in a North Dakota National Guard duck.

These powerful, ugly amphibious scows have performed heroically for Jamestown. They are water taxis grinding out errands of mercy, ranging from evacuating families to a trip to a flooded home to pick up razor blades a man had forgotten in his flight from the flood.

You start to get the impact of Jamestown's plight when you see basement after basement with windows opened. The water couldn't be kept out, so windows were opened to equalize pressure against the basement walls.

Despite this you see some foundations cracked, some smaller houses moved from their foundations.

You see houses you know at a glance are in the $15,000 price range today with water up over the doors and lapping at first-story windows.

You visualize the damage that muddy water is doing to carpets, furniture, plaster, furnaces, water heaters.

Here is a picket fence with only the sharp points of the pickets above water. Fire hydrants are out of sight but you see the tips of street markers.

You go by house after house, you lose count but you are told 350 residences in this northwest section are flooded.

Cars caught by the river's spread are abandoned. So is a child's kiddy car.

Basement belongings are piled high on porches of many homes. Boats are tied at intersections.

A man with rubber waders comes ploughing down the middle of a street with water up to his hips. Both arms are full of bags of groceries held high—he is going home. He walks slowly, steadily, against the pull of the current.

You see many ironic, many sad sights. At one house a garden hose is connected, as if the owner had been watering flower beds before the flood engulfed the lawn. At another house where the water had receded the entire lawn was covered with mud.

The water is full of debris—planks, bobbing barrels, logs, an occasional chair.

You are told of one man who had been flooded out by the James three times. He sold his home and built a $14,000 residence where he figured he'd be safe—but the water is over the door sill now.

The water from the two rivers, which converge in Klaus Park in southwest Jamestown, has damaged the northwest, southwest, northeast, and southeast sections of the city. The central business and residential area escaped damage except for a few cases where sewers were not plugged early enough.

We saw water around a row of new houses near the bridge leading to the State hospital—some haven't been completed. Along U S 10 an implement company's lot has been changed to a lake dotted with thousands of dollars of new farm machinery.

The James is cutting across U S 10 with a strong current, threatening to carry away the embankment. Sandbags have helped prevent serious damage but Highway Patrolman Donald G. McFarland has been watching it carefully.

With the help of National Guard men, he is regulating traffic to put as little strain as possible on the concrete and the roadbed. Heavy trucks are spaced far apart and are banned entirely at night when the road can't be checked. Only one lane of traffic is allowed at a time.

There is a lake in front of a drive-in along the highway. There is no business but there is an additional loss—just before the flood six loads of washed gravel were hauled in to make a parking area. Most of the gravel has been carried away by the flood.

The river engulfed other victims. Furious sandbagging failed to save the Crippled Children's Home. The Washington School was closed early in the week, and a private sanitarium was surrounded.

Damage to the streets and park areas isn't known. At McElroy Park all buildings used for the Stutsman County Fair and the State Dairy Show were in the midst of a vast lake. The racktrack is a big oval of water.

The still-to-be-completed swimming pool is filled. Klaus and Nickeus Parks are deep in water.

The duck chugs on, running on wheels until the water gets too deep. Then it is shifted, and the propeller churns it through the water.

Someone shouts and you see a man on the roof of a lean-to at the back of his house. The duck swings around, and he comes out of the front door, wearing waders and carrying a bundle of clothes.

"I'm going to stay downtown," he says. "I was going to wait until tomorrow, but there's no one to talk to."

One passenger in the duck talks to Charles Maxine, Jamestown High School football player, who is driving the duck.

Out of his excited jabbering Maxine finally understands what the man wants—he wants someone to look over the damage to his home and get razor blades he forgot in the bathroom.

This errand is performed as casually as another, delivering a housewife and her groceries to her home.

The crew of the duck—Maxine, Ronald Legler, Jim Altringer, and Ronald Johnson, all members of Battery C—are typical of the yeoman service performed by the 89 members of Company H and Battery C.

Under command of Maj. J. E. McKenna, they operated three ducks, helped with sandbags, and patroled streets.

The helmeted, booted guardsmen are a familiar sight in Jamestown now. A guardsman is on duty at every intersection which is blocked by the flood. He turns everyone back unless he has a pass showing he is authorized to enter the flooded area.

Not only is looting prevented, but the guardsmen are invaluable in trying to handle the steady stream of sightseers.

The Guard was mobilized at 7 p. m. last Sunday and has been on full duty since. Many members work all day, then take a tour of duty at night. They eat and sleep at the armory.

Working without even the slight glamor of a uniform have been 100 to 150 Jamestown college students. On call at all times, they responded immediately for everything from hauling furniture to the hard, heavy work of filling of thousands of sandbags.

And there have been scores of Jamestown citizens who have answered emergency calls—such as went out Friday when it appeared the city water works might be engulfed.

Five thousand sandbags saved the plant—along with hours of back-breaking work.

Water-plant employees James Coe and Ben Darby worked hour upon hour without sleep to direct diking and pumping which kept the plant supplying water to the city.

Although it looked like the battle was won last night they weren't relaxing yet, not until the James starts dropping.

Red Cross workers, headed by R. M. Stoudt and L. M. McElroy, cochairmen of the Stutsman County Red Cross disaster division, had a chance to take it easier yesterday. For the first time since last Sunday night there were no calls for help.

Most of the flood victims were taken into private homes, aside from the 70 children taken from the crippled children's home who are housed in the Knights of Columbus hall. The Red Cross has been taking care of about 35 people, furnishing food and lodging with help of the Salvation Army.

"The amazing thing about these flood victims is the way they are taking the flood in stride," says McElroy. "There are few complaints, their morale is high."

When the water recedes national Red Cross officials, headed by Peter Murphy, of St. Louis, Mo., a regional director, will take over the job of assessing need for assistance in rehabilitating homes. As of yesterday 59 families had registered for assistance.

While Red Cross officials are trying to assess damages, a representative of Gov. Fred G. Aandahl also is here trying to put a dollars-and-cents figure on damages. He is J. J. Walsh, of Bismarck, State engineer and secretary of the State water commission.

"It's impossible to arrive at even an estimate yet," he said, "although it is certain the damages will be far above those of 1948. That is apparent when you realize the record flow of water in the 1948 flood was 35,000 second-feet while this year it is almost doubled, 59,000 second-feet."

Meanwhile, with the river giving disaster officials a breathing spell, the Red Cross has one problem it hasn't been able to solve, according to McElroy. "We rescued a goldfish and can't find the owner."

THIRTEEN THOUSAND HIT BY FLOODS; WATER DOWN AT FORKS

Floodwaters in the north end of the Red River Valley continued their devastating sweep toward the Hudson Bay yesterday.

The Red actually showed a drop at Grand Forks yesterday, the first in a week. But the decline was only seven-hundredths of an inch. Bad news came from Crookston, Minn., 20 miles upstream on the Red Lake River which empties into the Red at Grand Forks.

Crookston looked for trouble overnight as the Red Lake River started rising suddenly. It was reported a dike in the southeast part of the city had broken.

Red Cross officials said 41 families had been evacuated before midnight and calls still were coming in.

It was expected many more families would be forced from their homes before morning.

It usually takes about 3 days for water at Crookston to reach the Grand Forks area. Unless the Red drops unexpectedly in the next 2 days, the Grand Forks flood will hit better than 44 feet despite the fact that the level was virtually stationary for the last 36 hours.

Red Cross district headquarters at Grand Forks last night estimated that more than 13,000 persons have been affected by the floodwaters in North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota.

Red Cross Director Ellis Rickey said latest reports indicated 10,693 North Dakotans and 2,310 Minnesotans were affected and that many of those had been driven from their homes by the floodwaters.

President Truman Saturday allocated $50,000 from his emergency fund for relief of hardship and suffering caused by the flood in the Red River Valley in Minnesota.

Mr. Truman notified Minnesota's Gov. Luther Youngdahl of the allocation. Earlier in the day Youngdahl had asked for $100,000, the same amount that the President had granted North Dakota earlier last week.

Handling of the $100,000 granted North Dakota was settled at a meeting in Bismarck Saturday.

The State health department will handle repairs to water and sewage systems and

public utilities. The highway department will take care of roads and bridges.

Attending the meeting were Gov. Fred G. Aandahl; W. J. Tweet, St. Paul district engineer for the General Services Administration; C. J. Daly, Kansas City, division counsel for the services administration; and Robert Brumett, assistant Red Cross disaster chairman.

The stage at Crookston before last night's rise was 21 feet, 5 feet over flood stage. Flashboards on the new Otter Tail Power Co.'s dam 7 miles upstream were washed out at 3 a. m., Saturday.

Capt. John Lang and 20 National Guard men were mobilized to evacuate families, with assistance of Bray Mercil, Red Cross disaster chairman for Crookston; Probate Judge Philip Anderson, Polk County Red Cross chairman, and Lulamay Stickney, executive secretary.

At Grand Forks yesterday there were no new evacuations. Downtown business establishments were hard pressed to keep the water pumped out of their basements. The downtown streets, though not hit by the flood proper, were nevertheless running with the dirty, smelly water ejected from the basements by the pumps.

Serious danger confronted a 100-mile downstream stretch reaching to Winnipeg, Manitoba, however. There is a heavy snow cover north of the Canadian border. Tributary streams are bursting from their banks. Rising temperatures foretell rapid melting of the snow. Jamming of ice in the break-up is another potential threat.

Aware of these possibilities and knowing that the upstream flood is the worst in half a century, communities on the lower river were bracing for the onslaught.

Pembina, N. Dak., just south of the Canadian border, was getting its first taste of the flood Saturday. The river was at the 45-foot stage, 3 feet above flood, and rising steadily. The outlying sections were inundated. The crest is not expected until late next week.

Telephone communication with flood-stricken Oslo, Minn., 20 miles north of Grand Forks, was cut off Friday but reports from nearby Warren, Minn., indicated the little community was still in bad shape yesterday.

Mayor C. E. Lundgren of Warren said the 16 miles from Warren to Oslo was practically solid water.

He said the Snake River, which flows west through Warren and parallels the Red for some distance north of Oslo, had merged with the Red until they appeared to be one river. Ninety percent of the farms between Oslo and Manvel, N. Dak., were under water.

State Highway 1 was impassable for 5 miles east of Oslo to near Alvarado, Lundgren said. A half mile of the Soo Line roadbed east of Oslo was reported out.

Earlier Oslo had been trucking in drinking water. Lundgren said he did not know if this still could be done. As far as he knew, the little community still had sufficient food.

Meanwhile, the mayor said, Warren was having flood trouble from the Snake. He said the east half of town was covered until a recession Friday night. On Saturday the river mounted still higher and last night covered part of the west half of town as well.

It then appeared to be dropping slightly again but Lundgren said more water was expected from the east.

Water last night was creeping into the west side of Drayton, N. Dak., but the town itself was reported in good shape, although with water on three sides. The Red rose from 39.81 feet yesterday morning to 40 feet last night.

Most of the trouble in the Drayton area was in the nearby farming sections where two Army ducks were on the job at 6 a. m. yesterday.

The ducks moved 24 head of cattle stranded in farm yards to higher ground. The ducks will continue moving cattle today.

Several boats equipped with outboard motors are available and it is expected a number of farm families will be moved today.

Floods were passing in other parts of North Dakota. Traffic was being restored as roads slowly emerged from the mud-laden water.

Trouble of an entirely different kind came hard on the heels of that caused by too much water. It was in the form of dust. Dust storms reminiscent of those of the 1930s were reported in a 50-mile stretch near Stanley, in the northwestern part of the State. Visibility was limited to about 35 feet.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I invite attention to telegrams which I have received from North Dakota. I hold in my hand a telegram from Cannonball, N. Dak. That town is perhaps 450 miles from Pembina. There is an Indian reservation located there. It is next to the South Dakota line. The telegram is as follows:

CANNONBALL, N. DAK., *April 25, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Emergency flood conditions this reservation leaves approximately 75 Indian families homeless and creates urgent need for immediate passage Standing Rock rehabilitation bill, S. 1541, now before Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Respectfully urge your personal intervention to secure passage this bill at early date. Understand Senate subcommittee on Appropriations holding hearing April 27 on Interior Department appropriation bill. Wish to again protest appropriations for continuance area offices particularly. Aberdeen could use funds on reservation now set up for high prices personnel which are of no practical value to Indians. Last year's expenses setting up area offices was included in administration funds of appropriations by establishment of area office not indicated in appropriation. For this reason agency offices in North and South Dakota faced with serious shortage funds to continue normal operation would appreciate telegraphic advice of action being taken in regard to above.

JOSEPHINE KELLY,
Chairman, Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Business Council.

Mr. President, they are short of money with which to maintain the agency and the schools. Yesterday, Mr. Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, advised me that money would be found somewhere with which to keep the schools and the agency operating.

I now invite the attention of the Senate to a telegram which I received on the 22d of April 1950, from Mandan, N. Dak., from the Board of County Commissioners of Grant County, Carson, N. Dak. The telegram reads as follows:

MANDAN, N. DAK., *April 22, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Most disastrous floods in the history of county have destroyed and damaged 80 percent of bridges in the county. Roads are washed out. Farmers along rivers and creeks have suffered severe losses. Estimated damage in county $1,000,000. Due to unprecedented winter county road funds exhausted. Unable to replace bridges and repair roads. Can Federal assistance be secured.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Grant County, Carson, N. Dak.

I also have, Mr. President, a telegram from the mayor of Jamestown, N. Dak., which reads as follows:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *April 21, 1950.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution passed by the City Council of Jamestown, N. Dak., in special session April 20, 1950:

"Whereas the city of Jamestown is now in great part inundated by the flood of waters coming from the James River and the crest of the flood has not yet been reached with 500 families already forced from their homes and the probability that another 300 families will be forced to move before it is over: Be it

"*Resolved,* That we earnestly request of the United States Congress and all officers in charge of the Missouri-Souris division and flood-control project move to place the proposed Jamestown Dam into the construction stage as early as possible."

Which resolution was duly adopted by the unanimous vote of all members of this council this 20th day of April 1950, and declared duly adopted by the mayor.

WM. F. SHARP,
Mayor.

I might say that upon receipt of the telegram, I introduced a bill appropriating $10,800,000 for the construction of a dam at Jamestown, N. Dak. Congress had previously appropriated $50,000 for the purpose of making a survey by proper authorities. That survey has been made, and I understand the report is favorable.

Mr. President, I also have a telegram from Grand Forks, N. Dak. Grand Forks is a town of approximately 30,000 population, and is the home of the University of North Dakota. The telegram reads as follows:

On motion by Mr. Block seconded by Mr. Cummings, the following resolution was adopted by the board:

"Whereas disastrous flash floods have engulfed and inundated hundreds of thousands of acres of rich agricultural land in Grand Forks County; and

"Whereas every stream in this county has left its banks during the past few days, causing very extensive damage to bridges, culverts, and roads, the exact amount of which damage cannot at this time be determined; and

"Whereas the net result of these disastrous circumstances is reflected in grievous human suffering plus untold loss of livestock, grain, and real estate: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this board assembled in Grand Forks, N. Dak., do hereby declare that a state of emergency exists in Grand Forks County; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That in view of the straitened financial condition existing in Grand Forks County, the assistance of the Federal Government is requested in the tremendous reconstruction and rehabilitation program which must be started at once.

"Dated at Grand Forks, N. Dak., this 20th day of April 1950."

E. O. BRY,
Chairman, Grand Forks County Board of Commisisoners.

Mr. President, I have a telegram from the Board of Commissioners of Walsh County, N. Dak., which reads as follows:

The Walsh County Board of County Commissioners urge that you continue your efforts to secure aid through legislation introduced requesting $10,000,000 or more for the relocation and reconstruction of bridges and roads. We also urge that these funds

be used on township systems as well as secondary roads.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Walsh County, N. Dak.

Mr. President, I have a telegram which I have received from Mr. Joseph Wicks, chairman of the Sioux County Commissioners, reading as follows:

What information do you have regarding Federal aid for bridges and roads washed out by this terrible flood? Pontoon bridge would do here if Army has any not in use.

Mr. President, I have a report from Mr. Rowland, of the American Red Cross, who is thoroughly familiar with this situation. He stated to me that they are sending workers into the Jamestown section today to assist in the flood area. He said 500 families had to leave their homes yesterday. He further said that they are worried about the levees at Mandan, and if they go out, it will be the worst flood in that section in the history of the town.

I might add, Mr. President, that those levees were built so well that they have not gone out. I congratulate the Corps of Army Engineers for doing such a good job.

I have a report on the Heart Butte Dam, which was also built within the past 3 years. I read this report to show the value of dams which are built by the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers all over the West in the interest of flood control. Because of the fact that this dam was built on the Heart River, it saved the city of Mandan. The town of Valley City was saved by the Baldhill Reservoir. I consider the report to be so important that I shall read it in full:

North Dakota's two new Government-built dams, both completed last year, helped to save their respective communities from being inundated by floodwaters.

Valley City was saved by the Baldhill Reservoir and Mandan by the Heart Butte Dam, 110 miles upstream. Baldhill was constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers, and Heart Butte by the Bureau of Reclamation. Mandan had the added protection of a high levee constructed by the Army engineers, without which Mandan would have been flooded by the run-off from the watershed below the Heart Butte Dam.

Reclamation Bureau hydrologists hold that the Heart Butte Dam, 15 miles south of Glen Ullin, was instrumental in saving Mandan from a flood which might have been about twice the size of the disastrous record flood of 1943.

Flood conditions began April 15, when the melted snows began pouring into the Heart River and its tributaries. River and stream levels continued to rise until the 18th, when the peak of the floodwaters passed out of the Heart River Valley into the Missouri River, which has not reached flood stage so far this year.

Floodwaters from the upper Heart River Basin were halted at the Heart Butte Dam. The dam, a unit of the Missouri Basin project, which was completed last December, formed a barrier to stop the tremendous flows.

At the peak of the flood, Heart Butte Dam reduced the passage of water by about 24,000 cubic feet per second and allowed only about 3,500 cubic feet or about 15 percent of the inflow to pass into the river channel, which has a capacity of about 10,000 cubic feet a second.

The flooding of the lowlands in the lower reaches of the river valley and near Mandan was attributed primarily to the record flows of the Muddy and Sweetbriar Creeks, which enter the Heart River downstream from the dam, and ice jamming near where the Heart River joins the Missouri.

That is the great Missouri River, Mr. President.

The heavy snow cover in North Dakota melted rapidly during the period of warm weather. The run-off roared unchecked into the Muddy and Sweetbriar Creeks and the swollen streams flooded areas on their way to the Heart River, which remained within its banks until meeting the tributary streams. The flows in the two creeks and other tributaries were considered to be of record amount. For the first time, the town of Almont on Muddy Creek was under water.

Heart River became burdened with the heavy inflows from the two creeks and began spilling over its banks in the lower areas, flooding nearby river flats in its course to the Missouri. By the time the flood had reached Mandan, the river flow was reported to be about 28,500 cubic feet a second, exceeding the 21,700 second-feet flood of 1943. The ice jam downstream from Mandan blocked the passage of water and it dumped over the river banks onto the flats south and east of Mandan.

Mr. President, every Senator from New England, the South, and all Senators who are not familiar with conditions in North Dakota should realize what took place, and what would have happened without the protection of the Heart Butte Dam.

Without the protection of the Heart Butte Dam, which held the upper flows in check it is believed that the flood flows at Mandan would have reached about 40,000 cubic feet a second, or nearly double the record flood of 1943.

K. F. Vernon, Billings, director of the Bureau of Reclamation's Region 6, said it is expected that the peak water storage in the Heart Butte Dam during the flood would not exceed 150,000 acre-feet from the flood conditions in the Heart River Valley. The maximum capacity of the reservoir, he said, is about 428,000 acre-feet, which therefore would provide for flood inflows of nearly three times the volume of the present emergency. He explained that the Heart Butte Dam operates with a "glory hole" type spillway. This tunneled spillway, which takes the water from the reservoir through a stack rising into the reservoir, begins to allow the passage of water when the reservoir has reached a capacity of 75,000 acre-feet.

Mr. President, I might say that one of the photographs which has been introduced in evidence shows the entire Heart Butte Dam and the spillways. I should like every Senator who voted for the appropriation for the construction of the Heart Butte Dam to look at that picture, because it typifies what can be done to save a community when the right kind of dam is built by the proper people.

The dam is a rolled earthfill structure 124 feet high above stream bed and has a crest length of 1,850 feet.

Further flood protection to the area, made possible by recent Reclamation Bureau construction, is a 2,800-foot dike constructed south of the dam to keep floodwaters from bypassing the dam during high water and to protect State Highway 49.

In addition to the provision of protecting from floods, Heart Butte Dam will make it possible to utilize these dangerous floodwaters for irrigation for more than 13,000 acres of land when released to the river later in the summer. It also provides for retention of silt, expansion of recreational possibilities, expansion of fish and wildlife habitat, and other features.

Mr. President, very fortunately for the people of the Northwest and all the States which were involved in the flood of 1943, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], now the distinguished majority leader, spoke upon the Senate floor on the situation in Illinois and some of the other States where conditions existed similar to those in the stricken States today. Because of the fact that I am introducing two bills, which for all practical purposes are similar to the ones which were at that time introduced by the Senator from Illinois, now the majority leader, I am going to read some of the colloquy which took place at the time he introduced a bill to take care of a similar situation in five States, particularly in Illinois, so that there may be a clear, definite understanding on the part of Senators that what I am proposing to do now simply follows the precedent laid down by the majority leader under similar circumstances for Illinois and surrounding States.

By reference to page 4919 of the RECORD, I find that on the 27th day of May 1943, the Senator from Illinois spoke as follows:

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the conference report, with a view to submitting a concurrent resolution. I do so because at the present time devastating floods throughout the Central West and the Southwest, covering some six or eight States, have flooded some 4,000,000 acres of land and made some 80,000 persons homeless.

I might say that in Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, and portions of Montana, there is now an analagous situation. We are not concerned today with Canada, which borders North Dakota and Minnesota on the north, where there is also a terrible situation.

The Senator from Illinois continued:

In my State of Illinois we have in the Illinois River the highest water known in the history of the State.

Mr. President, I refer to the articles I have already put into the RECORD from the various newspapers to show that there is a similar situation in the Northwest today.

In 1844, the records show, the highest water previous to now occurred; and yet in the floods which have just reached their crest along the Illinois River, I am advised that the water is some 3 feet higher than it was at that earlier day.

Again, Mr. President, I refer back to the articles I introduced to show that the present flood is breaking all records in the Northwest.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois continued:

Mr. President, under section 5 which is referred to in the concurrent resolution, the Army engineers in making plans and specifications for the rebuilding or the reconstruction of any walls or levees along the Illinois River can replace such walls or levees only at the same height at which they are at the present time, or at the same height at which they were immediately prior to the present floods. That is exactly what section 5 would do.

The concurrent resolution I propose to submit—

Which he did submit—

would not only give the Army engineers more money to spend in connection with the flooded areas, but also would give them the immediate right to start their planning for the future, not in connection with what the height of the walls of the present projects is or recently has been, but for any height they deem to be necessary as a result of the experience they have had in the presently flooded areas. This is probably the most important part of the resolution, but let me return to the floods in my native State.

Mr. President, I propose, in the bills I introduce, that the dikes and levees around the town of Mandan and other places be raised, if necessary, in order to prevent floods in the future, and that work may also be done from the appropriations I am endeavoring to get the Senate to make.

The Senator from Illinois continued:

Mr. President, in Illinois alone, for example, we have 1,250,000 acres totally inundated. That means that probably 750,000 crop-acres have been totally destroyed as a result of the breaking of the levees and the overflowing of the land. That does not include thousands of acres of land on the prairies east and west of the Illinois River, where the water has stood for days, and in some places weeks, on the wheat, oats, and rye, and some of the corn which has been planted thereby destroying the germ of the plant which means that no wheat, oats, or rye will be harvested upon those lands. If anything is done at all, it will be necessary to replant those wheat and oat fields in some crops which may be harvested, provided the weather is favorable through the summer and fall.

Eleven thousand farmers are affected in Illinois as a result of this flood. The Red Cross is on the job doing its duty in connection with the refugees. There are 11,500 being cared for in Red Cross shelters in my State. This represents about one-fifth of the total families affected.

Mr. President, I think I have made it clear from the newspaper articles I have inserted in the RECORD that the Red Cross is also on the job in the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, and some of the other States, and that the President has already declared county after county after county in that area eligible for disaster loans.

I wish at this time to read one of the bills I have introduced. But going back to what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said in regard to the inability of the people to raise any wheat, oats, or rye upon their land which had been flooded, I might say that of course rye cannot be replanted. Rye is seeded in the fall of the year. The result is that the rye is a total loss. But other crops, some late crops, possibly may be seeded. It is not too late to seed oats, barley, or wheat. So I have introduced the following bill:

A bill to provide relief for farmers whose lands were inundated by recent floods

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of existing law or rules or regulations promulgated by any agent or agents of the Government, the owner, lessee, tenant, or operator, of any farm land which has been inundated by flood waters during the calendar year 1950, caused by the overflow of any lake, river, stream, or canal, causing the destruction of any growing crop or crops thereon, or causing the delayed planting of any crop or crops on any such land, may, at their discretion, plant or replant any such land in any crop or crops that will mature during the growing season of 1950: *Provided,* That the provisions of this section shall also apply to any farm lands on which the growing crops have been destroyed by green bugs: *And provided further,* That the crops so grown and produced on any such farm land shall not be governed with respect to the sale thereof by any existing law or rules or regulations made or to be made by any agent or agents of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities in any area affected by floods in 1950 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed out in such area by reason of such floods.

Mr. President, that is the bill. I want to call particular attention to two lines in it—

That the provisions of this section shall also apply to any farm lands on which the growing crops have been destroyed by green bugs.

That language is put into the bill for the reason that sometimes, when the planting is very late—by this time most of the planting in the Northwestern States is done—but when the planting is late the crops are very susceptible to what are known as green bugs. They can destroy a great acreage in one single night. The green bugs can only be destroyed by another set of bugs, known as lady bugs. Sometimes when the season is late, the lady bugs do not appear, and the result is that the green bugs have not been destroyed by the lady bugs.

I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 3494) to provide relief for farmers whose lands were inundated by recent floods, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in further reference to the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as appears on page 4920 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 27, 1943, and to show the similarity between the conditions existing today in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota and the conditions then existing in the flooded areas of Illinois, I read the following, which occurred at that time:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois what caused the flood?

Mr. LUCAS. The flood which came down the Illinois Valley was caused by heavy rains. In the month of May we had the heaviest rainfall on record there. It was not caused by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Valley, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. LANGER. If it rains in the North, does not the water all come down the Mississippi River and other streams from the North?

Mr. LUCAS. One watershed is in the Illinois Valley. The waters which have come into the Illinois River and overflowed some 60 counties along that river have been entirely from the rainfall during the month of May and the latter part of April.

Mr. LANGER. But if it rained in the northern part of the country, would not the water flow south?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. If that be true, why does not the Senator amend his concurrent resolution so as to provide enough money for the Missouri River diversion, to dam some of the streams so that the water may be held back?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator that that is not what I am trying to do at the moment.

Similarly, I am asking for this money in connection with the present emergency, Mr. President.

I read further:

This is an emergency; and if the engineers of the War Department are now beginning to replace the levees, or to set the levees back, under the present law they are compelled to plan and specify in line with the present height of such levees. As I stated a few moments ago, as a result of the floods the Illinois River is 3 feet higher than it has ever been at any time before in history, at least so far as any record is concerned.

That is the primary purpose of the concurrent resolution, plus the fact that it would give the engineers the right to spend more than $1,000,000, which is now the limit under section 5 of the Flood Control Act.

What the Senator is talking about has merit; but it seems to me that it should come a little later, probably in connection with an over-all program to take care of the entire matter.

Mr. LANGER. I wished to be certain that the Senator had in mind the Missouri River diversion.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator called attention to it, because I am extremely interested in the flooded areas. I visited my home State last week. I have never seen anything like what I saw there with respect to the high water and the damage and ruin which was being wrought as a result of it. I wish to do anything that is possible so far as legislation is concerned to make certain that such a thing shall not happen again if we can control it in any way.

Mr. President, the newspaper articles I have presented and the report of the Red Cross and the reports of the various other agencies and the photographs which I have submitted, and which have been referred, by unanimous consent, to the appropriate committees, all show that the situation existing today in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota is totally without precedent. All flood records in that section of the country have been broken. When we consider the situation in towns such as Pembina, Grafton, Grand Forks, parts of Fargo, and other towns in that area, and if we then consider towns in the section around Jamestown, N. Dak., and around Mott and Cannonball, and on down into South Dakota, where thousands of persons have been made homeless, according to the various reports, we realize that, as I have said, that situation is analogous to one previously referred to by the Senator from Illinois.

In referring to the previous situation, the following then occurred:

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Under the rule, of course, a conference report cannot be amended; but I am in sympathy with the statements made and the relief suggested by the Senator from Illinois.

In other words, Mr. President, here we have a situation exactly like the one I have described.

I read further:

During the past 5 days, in company with Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, I traveled over six States in the flooded area. We flew over Indiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, and a part of Oklahoma. In some sections of those States, Mr. President, during the past 5 days the waters have been higher than they have been since 1844, or 99 years ago. During the past 5 days I have seen tens of thousands of acres of the finest lands in the Central West entirely covered with water. All that can be seen from an airplane is the tops of houses and barns.

The photographs which have been submitted, and which have been appropriately referred, show silos almost entirely covered by water, and with nothing but the tops of houses showing above the flood.

On the outskirts of the towns could be seen the fine lands adjacent to the flooded areas. From the tops of buildings which could be seen, I know the character of improvements on the land.

Yesterday there was a group meeting in St. Louis, seeking to provide some plan for the relief of stricken farmers in that area. In the past 5 days I saw towns entirely under water.

That is exactly the situation I have described in connection with the submission of various newspaper articles.

They are not large cities, but small towns, in which there is no building without water on the first floor, the second floor, or even the roof. So, of course, those towns are wholly destroyed for the time being. The residents of those towns must have some kind of relief from the Red Cross, the Public Health Service, the States, and the Federal Government. The farmers in those areas must likewise have relief.

I emphasize that, Mr. President, to show the reasons why my bill should have prompt attention, why the committee should take prompt action in reporting it. In that bill I ask specifically that there be allowed, without any regard to quota, without regard to any rules or regulations of the Department of Agriculture, the right to plant and to replant the crops. Rye, of course, cannot be replanted, but oats, barley, and wheat can be replanted, and I ask that that may be done, without regard to quotas, without regard to rules or regulations.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma continued:

Three things must be done: First, the people in those areas must have relief, and must have it now. Second, we must provide some plan for rebuilding the roads and bridges.

Mr. President, I have a bill which I wish to introduce at this time, dealing with the matter of rebuilding bridges, not only in North Dakota, but in Minnesota and in South Dakota.

Mr. President, I believe that the railroads should be included. One hundred railroad bridges were wiped out in North Dakota alone, and I do not know how many, in South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota. Certainly those railroads should have assistance. Certainly they should have the right to obtain disaster loans at the same rate of interest the farmers pay, and they should have the same time in which to repay the Government loan that the average farmer has. The railroads are taxpayers in the various States. I hope therefore that they may be included in the bill when it is reported.

The bill is to provide emergency relief funds for repairs to Federal-aid highways and other highways damaged by floods or other disasters, and reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) not to exceed $35,00,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads—

One telegram I have inserted in the RECORD shows that in one county, merely to rebuild the roads and drainage ditches would cost $1,000,000; so the sum of $35,000,000 is still too small—continuing:

in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, as an emergency relief fund, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges, whether or not on the system of Federal-aid highways, which he finds, after investigation, have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or landslides, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated any sum or sums necessary to reimburse the funds so expended from time to time under the authority of this section.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any money heretofore apportioned to any State under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or section 4 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, which is unobligated on the date of approval of this act shall be available for expenditure for the rehabilitation of roads and bridges as provided in section 3 of the act approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 993), section 4 of the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 633), section 7 of the act approved July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 561), and paragraph (a) of this section, without regard to the limitation of funds contained in such accounts.

(c) Any amounts made available to any State under the provisions of this act may be used to pay the share of such State in the cost of any project authorized by this act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference the bill I have just read.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3495) to provide an emergency relief fund for repairs to Federal-aid highways and other highways damaged by floods or other disasters, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. LANGER. I say again, Mr. President, this measure would apply to any of the States. It is not legislation for any one particular State, but for all the States affected by this unprecedented flood.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Following the Senator's remarks, I wish to bring to his attention an on-the-spot observation of the flood. I just returned from a day-and-a-half tour or trip through the flooded district in the States described by the Senator.

I wish to emphasize the importance of what the Senator from North Dakota is saying in reference to the road conditions. I have with me merely some notes I took at a meeting of about 150 municipal county, and township officials. At the conclusion of the Senator's remarks I shall use these notes as the basis of supplementing the Senator's statement in reference to conditions pertaining to his State.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted to note the Senator's return. I expect to leave tomorrow. I am going at the request of some of the county officials in various parts of the State. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. From the Senator's observation, will he not say that this flood constitutes an emergency, and that immediate relief is needed in those States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that the word "emergency" scarcely describes appropriately the disaster which has befallen the people, particularly in the Red River Valley of the North, in the counties along the eastern border of North Dakota, and over in the southwestern corner, as well as in the northwestern section of Minnesota and in certain parts of South Dakota. The disaster is beyond description. Photographs in no way properly portray its dimensions. I spent a full day traversing this area, traveling all through the countryside by amphibious equipment which the Army supplied. I viewed the destruction of farms, homes, business places, public power facilities, water plants; township roads, bridges, culverts, and drainage ditches. I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota that the amount of destruction is yet to be totalled. The floods are still at their peak. The crest of the flood is predicted to arrive about May 2. Army engineers were present with us, representatives of the Red Cross and of the Public Roads Administration, as well as representatives of the Community Facilities Bureau of the General Services Agency. The district engineer, Mr. Armour, was there. The consensus of all the men who represented the Federal Government, as well as of the men who represented the Governor of my State, Colonel Joseph Nelson, as well as the representatives of the Red Cross, headed by Carl Myers, the regional director of the Red Cross, was that this was the worst flood which had taken place in the Minnesota-North Dakota-South Dakota area since 1899.

As we know, there were floods in 1947, likewise in 1948. I think the point should be emphasized to the Senator from North Dakota that, as he well knows, because he is so familiar with the people in the area of the Northwest, and particularly in North Dakota and the northwestern section of Minnesota, that many of these

townships, counties, and villages have never been able to pay off the indebtedness occasioned by the last flood. That is particularly true in reference to the township governments.

North Dakota has a somewhat different form of county organization and township organization from what we have in Minnesota. But, be that as it may, the township roads, which are the roads made available for school busses, and the farm-to-market roads have literally been ruined in these areas. There is a maximum levy which the constitution of North Dakota, I think, permits—15 mills, I believe, is the levy for township roads. Most of that levy has been used to gravel-surface the roads to get them in shape for school purposes. All of that surface has been washed off.

I should like to point out that practically every county was represented at the meeting. The highway engineer of North Dakota was there, as was the public health officer. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], Representative HAGEN, of the Ninth District of Minnesota, and I attended the meeting in Grand Forks, N. Dak. The town of East Grand Forks, across the river, is literally inundated. The city of Crookston, Minn., has more than 500 homes damaged by water. Some of the water reached to the top of the windows of the first floors.

I traveled by train over a large section of the flooded area and found that beautiful farm land—and there is no better farm land in the world than in the Red River Valley—millions of acres, had become a lake. This area is yet to feel the full impact of the flood. So I hope the Senator's bill pertaining to Federal assistance will make it sufficiently specific that townships may receive highway aid. The present highway act provides highway assistance for primary, secondary, and urban roads.

Mr. LANGER. My bill provides for aid to Federal-aid highways and to other highways.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wanted to have the legislative history and our comments read and understood. I want to be assured that the township roads are to be taken care of. Inasmuch as the Senator from North Dakota is going there, I know he will be deeply impressed and distressed by what he sees.

Mr. Jones, the highway commissioner, representing the Governor of the State, said that the county roads are practically ruined and that township roads and bridges are wiped out. He went on to point out that the 1948 flood cost was so large that financial recovery was never made. He estimated this flood to be 50 percent worse than the flood of 1948. The flood of 1948 cost the State $340,250, but already more than $500,000 damage has been done because of the present flood. That is with reference to only one State.

Several towns in Minnesota are completely under water. Other towns, such as Red Lake Falls, are beginning to feel the impact of the flood. Crookston and many other towns in Minnesota are feeling the impact of it. The Red River of the North is overflowing its boundaries, and Snake River and Lost River are raging torrents.

There is a tremendous loss to agriculture. A representative of the Production and Marketing Administration was present at the meeting. He pointed out that that agency has 4,634 loans representing more than 5,000,000 bushels of grain in storage. The storage places are flooded. There is a tremendous loss on the crops which have been stored and on which the Federal Government has placed loans under the price-support program.

Several State legislators were present. One State legislator told of a farm of 500 acres which was completely under water. The damage was stated to be worse than the damage in 1948. Much commercial fertilizer and much seed grain have been washed away.

County engineers from several places were present. The towns they represented are not large cities, but they contain some of the finest people who ever graced this earth. They had a wonderful economy, and it has been destroyed.

Mr. President, it is time that several things were done. I have looked the situation over. The Red Cross, together with the Governor's representative, the general who is in charge of the National Guard, made emergency assistance available to feed and clothe the people. The Red Cross has not had to put up shelters for the people have taken in their neighbors, which is a real demonstration of neighborly spirit and a good-neighbor policy on a local level. But money is needed to take care of the immediate desperate needs.

Funds are also needed to rehabilitate the destroyed buildings, roads, bridges, railroads, culverts, and many public works which are necessary in the making of a community.

We have recently debated the river and harbor bill, which is called the pork-barrel bill. I would like to have the pork-barrel labelers go to North Dakota and Minnesota now. The day I arrived home one of the editors had written an editorial about the river and harbor bill. I said, "I can see that you do not read the news section of your paper. The paper contains an article about the disastrous flood. What is the reason for the flood? Why, because we have not done the job we should do. There have been three floods within 4 years. It seems to me that anyone should catch on in that length of time."

Those floods have wiped out one of the most productive areas of the Nation. I think the Senator from North Dakota will agree with that statement.

Mr. LANGER. It is the bread basket of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It surely is, in my State. The building of a few dikes or dams, a few diversion projects, a few reservoirs, holding back the water in the reservoirs which nature made, would possibly prevent such floods.

A dike constructed at East Grand Forks, increasing the elevation to 45 feet, would have prevented all three of the floods which have occurred. That has been an Army engineer project for years. The people have been before the committee asking for funds to carry on the work. The amount of funds needed runs into the thousands, not into the millions, of dollars. I do not remember the recent figures. But the project has been turned down.

A headline in the Tribune this morning says that $1,500,000 damage has been done in Grand Forks alone. We could construct a dam all around that city for that amount of money. But that would be wasting public funds. What has happened? Businessmen have been ruined, the topsoil has been washed away. Public agencies, counties, townships, cities, and villages are going to be bonded to the hilt in order to put new surface on the streets, much less properly to repair the streets. We must have these flood-control projects, or nature will take her vengeance out upon the communities, and that is exactly what is happening, Mr. President. We must have projects which will protect those great areas. We are not proposing to protect deserts; we are proposing to protect some of the most fertile land in the world.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe the Senator knows that there was a flood-control project for the valley and that the Army engineers have been working on a plan which would protect the valley against floods. If this program is completed, it will help materially, especially so far as Grand Forks is concerned. As the Senator knows, the river flows north into Winnepeg, and that land up there is still frozen, preventing an outlet for the water.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There has been some difference of opinion over the kind of public works which should be constructed for purposes of flood control. As I heard the mayor of East Grand Forks say when he was laying out his plans, it was his opinion that if a dam or dike had been constructed in this particular area which would have increased the elevation of the dam by an additional 45 feet, there would have been no flood in East Grand Forks. I am not an engineer, but a very able Army engineer expressed the same opinion. Perhaps it is a situation where the horse has already been taken out of the barn. However, we must do something to make immediate improvements to ease the situation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. We have just completed dams at Baldhill and Heart Butte, two cities which suffered very seriously in the past. They were almost completely saved this time. More than the cost of their constructing was saved because those dams were completed and prevented flood damage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The representative of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was with us on the trip, as was Representative LEMKE of North Dakota. We were informed that the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] would attend. I know that when the senior Senator from North Dakota visits the area he will come back

with the kind of observations which will cause the Senate to act on behalf of the good of these people.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether we should not increase the $35,000,000 asked for in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that it was the hope of my senior colleague, Mr. THYE—who I might say has not yet left the area because his plane was grounded, but who expects to return tonight—as well as the hope of Representative HAGEN, who attended as a Representative from Minnesota, that all of us—Senators and Representatives—could come to a common agreement as to legislation and the amount of money that should be appropriated. At the present time I would not be in a position to advise the Senator from North Dakota as to whether the funds which he has recommended are sufficient. I do not believe the fund he has asked for is extravagant. I believe that we will have to wait, as the junior Senator from North Dakota observed, until the ice goes out.

We had a blizzard in that locality. A 70-mile wind blew and 16 inches of snow fell at Minot, Duluth, Grand Forks, and throughout that area. There is zero weather, in fact it is below zero. The people in that section do not have the balmy Washington climate. The water is still coming down and snow is still piling up. So it would be difficult to estimate how much money may be needed. Mother Nature still has something to say about the proportions of the disaster.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, which appeared at page 4921 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 27, 1943, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, a point of order will be raised against the concurrent resolution because it provides for legislation upon an appropriation bill, and I cannot very well object if the point of order is made. I hope it will not be made, but I understand it will be, and obviously I shall abide by the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt, but I shall assume the responsibility of making the point of order. I think the Senator should know that.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Certainly I cannot object to it, because I am aware that the concurrent resolution is subject to a point of order. However, I wish to make a record so far as concerns what I claim to be necessary in connection with these floods, that is we need speed in enacting appropriate legislation. I present this concurrent resolution in order that I may apprise the Senate and the country of the urgency and immediate need of flood relief legislation.

Now I wish to say a word or two in connection with the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I have contacted Chester Davis, in the Department of Agriculture, who advises me that he has removed practically all the restrictions in the rules of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration which have prevented the expansion of crops. In the conference which I had with Mr. Davis he assured me that all doubtful rules and regulations which might be construed as restrictions upon the planting of crops would be looked into immediately with the view of having them removed.

Mr. President, that is very important. My only reason for mentioning it is that I should not like to have the farmers of the Nation get the notion, as a result of the bill which has been introduced by the able Senator from Oklahoma, that the Agricultural Department, through Mr. Davis, is not attempting by rules and regulations to give to the farmers in my section of the country, as well as in every other section where lands are flooded, the right to plant practically any crop which they can plant, provided the floods sufficiently recede and the lands dry up to such a point that they can plant soybeans, or 90-day corn, or any other crop which they desire to plant. In my judgment, that is one thing about which the farmers are not apprised at the present time.

I believe that sooner or later Mr. Davis will make a statement in connection with this important problem, and the statement should be made as soon as possible with respect to the removal of restrictions and regulations concerning the planting of crops.

Mr. President, there is one other thing which I should like to have the country know: The Disaster Loan Corporation, which was set up a few years ago by the Congress, is now on the job in these flooded areas, ready to take over when the floods recede to such a point that they can move in and fairly appraise the damage which has been done to the individual home owners in various towns and cities throughout the country, as well as the owners of farm homes.

The Disaster Loan Corporation was a great success in the Ohio Valley, and in every other flooded area where it operated. It now has representatives in the flooded areas contacting the people where necessary, urging them to make applications for loans if they need aid in the rehabilitation and repair of their homes.

I should also like to add that insofar as the loaning of money to the farmers for seed purposes is concerned, I was advised yesterday, in talking with officials of the Farm Credit Administration, that they are on the job in St. Louis, which is the central area of the flood, and that they have plenty of money with which to make all necessary loans in connection with any seed which may be necessary to replant any of the crops which have been inundated and destroyed as a result of this unprecedented flood. It would seem to me that this is extremely important, and I am sure that if they need more money for that purpose the Congress would not hesitate to grant it.

The Federal Housing Authority is also looking into the program with respect to sending trailers into the flooded areas. I understand they have frozen, or have on hand, some 400 or 500 trailers which are available for any of the flooded areas in the event the citizens of a community might find it necessary to use them in connection with the housing of employees or the housing of those who have been evacuated from the flooded area. At least, the trailers might be of considerable help.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the explanation of the able Senator from Illinois with regard to the Disaster Loan Corporation loaning money to farmers, because the same situation exists in the Northwest. I have not had a chance to read the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois. Does it apply to a particular area or the entire United States?

Mr. LUCAS. It covers the entire United States.

Mr. LANGER. From what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has said, am I to understand that the maintenance of roads which is to be provided for would include new bridges where the old bridges have been destroyed?

Mr. LUCAS. No; the concurrent resolution which I have in mind would have nothing to do with that problem. To meet such a proposal we would necessarily have to enact additional legislation. As the Senator from Oklahoma has said, millions of dollars of damage will result from the destruction of bridges and roads. Among the cities which have been inundated as a result of floods are municipalities which will not be able to take care of the replacement and repair of municipal equipment and property. It will be necessary for the Federal Government to step in and make grants to a number of towns and cities. It may be necessary to rehabilitate completely communities where the destruction of waterworks, streets, and similar utilities has resulted from the floods. Provision for such aid will have to come in a separate measure. It is not included in the proposal now before the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I inquire if it is the intention of the distinguished Senator to introduce such legislation to provide for the building of bridges?

Mr. LUCAS. It is. I have already taken it up with the Federal Works Administration, and it is my understanding that they will ask to appear before the Lanham committee next week when the committee will hold hearings on a bill to aid and promote the war effort. I am advised that the Federal Works Administration will ask a minimum of $25,000,000 for that particular purpose. I can wholeheartedly support that measure, and if necessary, if what is expected to be done by the House is not done, I will introduce proposed legislation here to that end.

Mr. LANGER. Would that proposed legislation cover floods all over the country?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. Everything I have done here covers the situation all over the United States. The only reason I pointed out Illinois was because it is my home State, and the floods there are so devastating and ruinous that my attention has been focused on conditions there; but I shall leave no stone unturned to give all the legislative help that is necessary to alleviate suffering and the damage throughout the Nation which has been caused by an act of God.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to assure the Senator that he will have all the help I can give him.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have in North Dakota some 15 or 17 counties that are not in shape to build bridges. Many bridges are out. One bridge is out on the main highway across the State farther west at Fallon, Mont., with the result that it is necessary to haul war materials 70 or 80 miles south in order to get them across the State. I hope that legislation on this subject will be energetically pushed, and I will do all that I can to help the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The legislation I have in mind would cover the situation disclosed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, in the interest of the proper and appropriate control of legislative procedure, and in deference to the rules of the Senate, I think our legislation should always follow a proper and appropriate line. I am in very deep sympathy with the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois; indeed, I shall support prudent legislation at the proper time to give relief to the distressed people now suffering from this great disaster; but, Mr. President, it cannot be done in this fashion.

This is an effort to amend an appropriation bill after a conference report has been acted upon by the Senate. One would have to proceed without any regard to the Senate rules if he did not make a point of order, which I now do, first, that the resolution can

only be received by unanimous consent, and to that I object.

Secondly, it is an effort to attach legislation to an appropriation bill which has passed both Houses of Congress, and is now the product of a conference committee. So I make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules of the Senate, the point of order made by the Senator from Oregon is sustained.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I recognize the validity of the point of order, and I ask at this time, out of order, to introduce a bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, which will accomplish what I proposed in the concurrent resolution. I request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as requested.

The bill (S. 1134) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT LIFE INSURANCE ACT—REGULATION OF LIFE INSURANCE BUSINESS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to take up another matter. When the calendar was called a few days ago, I objected to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4393) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, and also to the bill (H. R. 4394) to amend sections 10, 11, and 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended. At that time I did know how imperative it was that House bill 4393 be passed. Since then I have been informed that, unless the bill is passed, a large amount of accrued group insurance is either not going to be entered into at all or some of it may be entirely vitiated. Therefore, I should like to withdraw my objection to that bill. I was the only Senator who objected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in many cases when measures are called on the calendar, perhaps other Senators would raise some point if objection were not made and the bill passed over. Certainly without a quorum call, and occupying temporarily the seat of the minority leader, I would not feel that I could agree to a unanimous-consent request which would in effect pass bills which had been objected to the other day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the bills H. R. 4393 and H. R. 4394 were passed, but that motions have been entered for their reconsideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I correctly understand that the bills were passed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills were passed. Motions to reconsider are now pending.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from North Dakota had previously entered a motion to reconsider the bill to which he now refers? Is that the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to withdraw his motion to reconsider?

Mr. LANGER. I am the only Senator who objected. If the bill is not passed, many poor people will be hurt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do I correctly understand that if the Senator from North Dakota withdraws his motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, the bill goes to the House?

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw my motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota withdraws his motion to reconsider.

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw my motion to reconsider House bill 4393, Calendar 1291.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider is withdrawn as to House bill 4393, and the bill stands passed.

Mr. LANGER. My motion to reconsider will stand as to House bill 4394, Calendar 1292.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; that bill is still pending.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER'S speech,

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me so I may submit four amendments, and made a short statement in connection therewith?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] for the purpose he has stated, without losing the floor, and that his remarks may appear at the end of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it was held forth in 1948 that the Marshall plan was to aid countries of Europe by means of establishing a market for the goods produced by the American working men and the American investors. In 1949 it was said that the purpose of the ECA was to produce goods in Europe to sell on our markets to make up for the dollar balance. Mr. President, today, in 1950, the ECA representatives are saying, in secret sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, according to a dispatch appearing in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, that either we must appropriate the full amount, practically three and a quarter billion dollars, to send to Europe to buy our goods, or we will have a severe depression in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I referred published in the Times-Herald of today under the heading "Truman's Aides Claim It's ERP or a Depression," published in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S AIDES CLAIM IT'S ERP OR A DEPRESSION

(By Philip Warden)

Administration leaders have told the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees in a secret session that foreign aid spending must be continued unabated or the country faces the threat of a depression.

President Truman and his aides told the Congressmen that the European recovery program billions are all that is preventing an unmanageable surplus of farm products. Stop foreign aid spending, and our markets will be glutted, they maintained.

EMPLOYMENT PERILED

Administration leaders also declared that the Marshall plan dollars are being spent in industries where widespread unemployment would develop at once if the aid program were curtailed. They asserted unemployment would spread quickly to other industries.

The administration has decided to put all its emphasis on the depression threat at home in its campaign to sell the Marshall plan to Congress for another year, rather than on Europe's economic requirements.

The Senate is considering the administration bill to authorize three billion four hundred million for aid to Europe for another year. The bill has been passed by the House.

PRODUCTION RECOVERED

Administrator Hoffman of the Marshall plan said yesterday that Europe's industrial production is 20 percent higher than before the war, her food production is back to prewar levels, and her export trade is above prewar.

Asked if he felt that we should continue giving money under these conditions, Hoffman replied:

"The real problem in Europe today, which must be solved or both Europe and America will suffer, is to build up Europe's dollar earnings.

"Europe needs our goods, not our dollars. That is what we are giving them—the goods they can get nowhere but here. Europe could triple her production and still not have enough dollars to buy what she needs from us."

COTTON GIFTS CITED

"For example, Europe does not have enough dollars to buy the cotton she needs. We have been giving her the cotton. If we stop giving her cotton, her mills will close, unemployment will spread, and she will be right back where she was when the war ended."

The administration will rely upon the aid program to prevent the stock piles of surplus food from getting much larger, rather than revise farm supports along realistic lines.

Democrats from industrial areas are being told that they must vote for the aid program or the industries in their areas are likely to suffer and unemployment follow.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on April 10, 1950, there was published in the New York Journal of Commerce a dispatch headed "ECA sets up unit to push imports. Hoffman minimizes effect of such goods on United States economy." I ask unanimous consent that the dispatch, as marked, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA SETS UP UNIT TO PUSH IMPORTS—HOFFMAN MINIMIZES EFFECT OF SUCH GOODS ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY

WASHINGTON, April 9.—Establishment of an international trade promotion division to help Marshall-plan nations earn more dollars by exporting more to the United States, was announced over the week-end by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

In announcing the new unit, the aid agency declared Europeans must take far more vigorous steps to sell the United States market. This country, ECA continued, must refrain from blocking those efforts by means

of tariff, customs procedure, and similar barriers.

* * * * *

As a major activity in the foreign liaison field, ECA will send abroad a number of trade promotion experts to work closely with regular commercial attachés now in the field, but who will have the sole function of assisting in stimulating European exports to the United States. It will also maintain close contact with the Washington embassies and legations on all questions relating to imports and advise various United States organizations on their relations with the U. K.'s dollar export board and other similar bodies.

In the trade promotion field, the new division will concern itself with the elimination of trade barriers and with the development of plans to bring together the European seller and the American buyer.

The new ECA unit will also be concerned with international trade fairs, special exhibits of foreign merchandise, foreign trade zones, department store merchandising of imported goods, import credit facilities, and general consultation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, we create our own dangerous condition through the free-trade policy of the Administration, through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, by transferring the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate the national economy through the regulation of imports, to the executive branch of the Government, which means the State Department. Then furnishing the money and industrial equipment to the ECA nations to manufacture goods to sell to us, which we do not need, but which, according to the ECA officials, we must buy to close the so-called dollar gap.

Now they say we must continue to appropriate money and send it to the 16 European countries to buy our surplus products, so that these nations may buy our surpluses with the money we are about to appropriate to send to them, our surpluses being caused largely because of imported goods from Europe. In other words, we import the goods for which we previously furnished the money and industrial machinery for them to produce to close the dollar gap, and then we appropriate more money for them to buy our goods to prevent a depression here. It is just a little complicated and difficult to follow the ECA representatives in their changing positions.

Mr. President, this is a great method of operation. We appropriate money to give to them to buy our products. We appropriate money to set up an ECA branch to sell more of the European goods to us in this country, so we can have more surplus, so we can appropriate more money for Europe to buy our growing surplus.

Mr. President, I wish to submit four amendments at this time, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table, and also to have printed in the RECORD at this point. The first amendment is to assure the integrity of private investments in the 16 European nations on the penalty of stopping any further aid to them through the ECA or from any other source.

The amendment was received, ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One page 7, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. . Section 118 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country if the government of such country, or any agency or subdivision thereof, shall, after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950 (1) acquire or operate, in whole or in part any basic industry thereof, other than industries the acquisition of which was completed prior to such date of enactment; or (2) seize, confiscate, or destroy any private property of any citizen of the United States, or by any law, ordinance, regulation, decree, or administrative action prevent the transaction of business in connection with a business or industrial property in such country owned or controlled by a citizen of the United States'."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the second amendment provides that the Administrator shall terminate the provisions of assistance to any participating countries who have set up barriers between their own nation and other nations against trade, in the form of embargoes, quotas, specifications, and built their 100-year-old wall higher and higher, by reason of the fact that they have our money to support themselves, and have our encouragement to sell their goods to us instead of to each other.

The amendment was received, ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. —. Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country (including the zones of occupation of Germany) if such country refuses to join, within 30 days after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, in a concerted effort with the other participating countries (including the zones of occupation of Germany) to form a Federation, a United States of Europe, under a constitution which would vest in the Federation all power relating to (1) tariffs, trade, and currency within and among such countries or states and between such countries or states and countries which are not members of the Federation' and (2) the defense of the Federation."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the third amendment provides that any further aid to Europe shall be predicated on the free convertibility of the currencies of those European countries in terms of their own currencies and of the dollar. The so-called dollar shortage is the greatest hoax which ever has been perpetrated on the American people. The so-called shortage is because the manipulated prices which have been fixed on foreign currencies in terms of exchange for United States dollars have been such that no one would pay them. At first the rate of exchange was $4.03 for the pound, but no one would pay that much for a pound. Now it is $2.80 for the pound, but no one will pay that. If there were free convertibility between the currencies of those nations and United States dollars, there would be no shortage of dollars in those countries, because they could spend their own money in this country through the free convertibility.

Mr. President, I now submit and ask to have printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, my third amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment submited by Mr. MALONE is as follows:

On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. —. Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title on June 30, 1950, to any participating country unless, on or before such date, such country (1) has eliminated any currency controls imposed by it that prevent its currency from reflecting its actual purchasing power in terms of the United States dollar on the free monetary markets of the world, and (2) enters into an agreement with the United States that it will not reimpose any such currency controls prior to July 1, 1952.' "

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the fourth amendment provides that instead of giving ECA funds to the ECA countries' governments, for them to spend as they wish, to keep themselves in power, and to nationalize their industries, and to support almost every other trick of manipulation they can think of, further aid to Europe will be in the nature of loans to private industries.

In the same way that our RFC loans money to private industries in this country in times of stress, and today is lending money to industries in this country, under the amendment, the loans would be made on the basis of proper security; and the loans would be made to private industries, already in existence or to be established, which have the probability of success and liquidating the loans if the industry proves to be a mistake. That procedure is necessary; because if such an industry can be operated only by means of continual government help and aid, it cannot survive indefinitely.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit that amendment, to be printed and lie on the table, and to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MALONE is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, assistance rendered under such act to any participating country after the date of enactment of this act shall be on the basis of loans only; except that this subsection shall not apply to assistance rendered in the form of food or medicines for the relief of human suffering in a participating country if the Administrator finds, and the President approves such finding, that due to temporary conditions an emergency exists in such country which the government thereof is unable to meet.

"(b) All such loans shall be fully and adequately secured. The Administrator, under such terms and conditions as he shall prescribe, may take over or provide for the administration and liquidation of any collateral accepted by him as security for such loans. Such loans may be made directly upon promissory notes or by way of discount or rediscount of obligations tendered for the purpose, or otherwise, in such form and in such amount and at such interest or discount rates as the Administrator may approve. Each such loan may be made for a period not exceeding 3 years, and the Administrator may from time to time extend the time of payment of any such loan, through renewal, substitution of new obligations, or otherwise, but the time for such payment shall not be extended beyond 10 years from the date upon which such loan was made originally. Such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with the banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in closing let me say that I did have a fifth amendment, which corresponds with the amendment submitted yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. In January I introduced that amendment in the form of a joint resolution providing for the cessation of all payments of funds and all assistance of any kind whatever to any nation which is assisting Communist areas. At that time—on January 24, 1950—I submitted for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of 95 trade treaties which the 16 Marshall plan countries already have made since the end of the Second World War. Those trade treaties are in good standing; and by means of them those nations have shipped, and up to this day are shipping, to Russia and the iron-curtain countries almost every conceivable type of commodity—including tool steel; ball bearings; heavy construction equipment, heavy farm machinery, and heavy road-making equipment; freight cars; locomotives—and in fact practically everything those nations need to wage a world war III on us and to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and in China. It is well known that Britain, India, and several of the other sterling-bloc nations almost immediately recognized Communist China; and that the trade through Hong Kong, controlled by the British, is increasing day by day, with the result that there is being sent into Communist China practically every type of material and equipment that are needed to enable the Chinese Communists to consolidate their positions there.

Mr. President, in view of the submission of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, I shall not submit my fifth amendment in connection with this measure; but I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, in lieu of my own.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for yielding to me.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 27, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Robert F. A. Studds, of Washington, D. C., to the position of Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRIEST.

Rev. Billy Graham, president, Northwestern College, Minneapolis, Minn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we give Thee thanks today for this the greatest Nation in all the world. We thank Thee today for the Stars and Stripes that wave above the land of the free and the home of the brave. We thank Thee for this the highest standard of living in all the world.

We pray that this day, as we are faced with problems and dilemma and fear, when it seems that there are thousands and millions of the little people that are afraid at this moment, that Thou wouldst bring to us remembrance that God has been our answer in days gone by; that our forefathers placed a Bible in every courtroom in America; that Thou planted on our coins "In God we trust." Help us to remember that our Constitution was born in a prayer meeting.

We pray that on this day Thou wouldst give us divine wisdom, that Thou wouldst give us moral character, that Thou wouldst give us spiritual strength, that Thou wouldst give us courage and an enduring and indwelling faith in Jesus Christ as the answer and the solution of our problems.

We pray Thee this day that these our representatives might have wisdom as come from God to lead us and direct us at this moment.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1946)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with the following amendments:

On page 9 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 7, strike out "of supervision in" and insert in lieu thereof "in supervision of";

On page 13 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 20, strike out "Nonjudicial" and insert in lieu thereof "Non-Judicial";

On page 13 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 22, strike out "nonjudicial" and insert in lieu thereof "non-judicial";

On page 13 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 23, strike out "nonjudicial" and insert in lieu thereof "non-judicial";

On page 48 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 4, strike out "president" and insert in lieu thereof "President";

On page 56 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 15, strike out "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen";

On page 57 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 6 and 7, strike out "one on March 1, 1953, one on March 1, 1955, and one on March 1, 1957" and insert in lieu thereof "one on May 1, 1956, one on May 1, 1961, and one on May 1, 1966";

On page 57 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 8, strike out "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen";

On page 57 of the Senate engrossed amendment, beginning with line 18, strike out all down to and including line 2 on page 58;

On page 58 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 3, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)";

On page 89 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 13, strike out "buildings" and insert in lieu thereof "building";

On page 92 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 22 and 23, strike out "National Military Establishment" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of Defense";

On page 102 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 21, after the word "executed", insert a comma;

On page 108 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 9, strike out "allowance" and insert in lieu thereof "allowances";

And the Senate agree to the same.

OVERTON BROOKS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WAYNE MORSE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish the Uniform Code of

Military Justice, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

The House passed H. R. 4080, relating to the enactment and establishment of a Uniform Code of Military Justice. The Senate amended H. R. 4080 by reducing the number of days that confinement on bread and water or diminished rations could be imposed as a disciplinary punishment from 5 days to 3 days; by reducing the tenure of office of the judges of the Court of Military Appeals from life tenure to a term of 8 years, and providing a type of retirement comparable to the retirement benefits of Territorial judges; by separating the provisions governing the crime of larceny into two sections, the first of which distinguishes larceny, which involves an intent to permanently deprive or defraud another person of the use or benefit of property, from wrongful appropriation which involves an intent to temporarily deprive such person of his property; by reducing the qualifications of the Judge Advocates General; and by adopting numerous amendments for the correction of typographical errors and inadvertent use of language, which amendments were adopted for clarifying purposes only and have no substantive affect upon the provisions of the bill.

A more complete discussion of the four substantive amendments is as follows:

1. In section 1, article 15 (F), page 15, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendment, the House had provided that a commanding officer could impose, as disciplinary punishment, confinement on bread and water or diminished rations for a period not to exceed three consecutive days, if imposed upon a person attached to or embarked in a vessel. Under existing law only the Navy and the Marine Corps administer confinement on bread and water or diminished rations, and the present limitation for such disciplinary punishment is seven consecutive days. It may also be imposed upon Naval and Marine personnel ashore as well as those embarked in or attached to a vessel. The House standardized this type of disciplinary punishment for all members of the armed services by making it equally applicable to all enlisted persons who are attached to or embarked in a vessel, which provision automatically excludes this type of disciplinary punishment to shore-based personnel. The House was of the opinion that 7 days' confinement on bread and water or reduced rations was an excessive punishment for minor disciplinary infractions. The Senate was of the opinion that even 5 days was an excessive period for such type of punishment and reduced the the maximum limit to three consecutive days. The House recedes.

2. In section 1, article 67, the House had provided for the establishment of a Court of Military Appeals, consisting of three judges appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the consent and advice of the Senate, for life tenure. The House version further provided that such judges were to receive the same compensation, allowances, perquisites, and retirement benefits as judges of the United States court of appeals. The Senate amended this provision by reducing the tenure of the judges from life to a term of 8 years, providing that the first appointees should have staggered appointments with one expiring on March 1, 1953, a second on March 1, 1955, and the third on March 1, 1957, after which all successive appointments would be for a term of 8 years. While the Senate amendment left the salaries of these judges at $17,500 a year, it discarded the retirement benefits accorded judges of the United States court of appeals and substituted the same retirement benefits as those provided for judges of Territorial courts.

The conference agreement provides that the judges of the Court of Military Appeals shall be appointed for a term of 15 years, the first appointees to receive staggered terms of 5, 10, and 15 years respectively, the first of which will expire on May 1, 1956, the second on May 1, 1961, and the third one on May 1, 1966, with the terms of office of all successors to be for a full 15-year term.

The conference agreement also terminated the retirement provisions provided in the Senate amendment and substituted therefor contributory civil-service retirement. It will be noted that, as a result of the conference agreement, the bill makes no reference to retirement privileges. However, it is a well-settled principle of law that employees of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government for whom no other retirement system is provided will, as a matter of law, come within the provisions of contributory civil-service retirement. It is the intent of the conferees that this be the type of retirement for the judges of the Court of Military Appeals.

The House recedes and agrees to the Senate amendment with an amendment.

3. Section 1, article 121, of the bill contains the provisions governing the crime of larceny. Those provisions in the House bill did not distinguish between the wrongful taking with the intent of permanently depriving a person of his property and the wrongful taking with the intent to temporarily deprive a person of his property. It is recognized that there have been numerous cases of the wrongful taking of property by military personnel with only the intent of temporarily depriving them of such property. Nevertheless, under existing law and under the House provisions, there was no alternative but to prosecute under a charge of larceny. A conviction of larceny is a most serious offense in the armed services and it was concluded that there should be an alternative to a prosecution to larceny when the unlawful taking did not involve an intent to permanently deprive the owner of his property. The Senate amendment makes the appropriate distinction by specifying, within the larceny statute, a separate offense of wrongful appropriation, which is a lesser and included offense under the larceny statute.

The House recedes.

4. Section 13 of the bill, which was a House amendment to the original bill, provided more stringent qualifications for the Judge Advocates General. It provided that the Judge Advocates General must be members of the bar of the Federal court or the highest court of a State or Territory; and must have at least 8 years' cumulative experience in a Judge Advocates Corps, department or office, the last 3 years of which, prior to appointment, shall be consecutive. These provisions were not directed at the Judge Advocate General of the Army since the Army already has a separate Judge Advocates Corps from which the Judge Advocate General of the Army is appointed. The provisions were applicable to the Air Force and more particularly to the Navy. After approval of the House provisions by the House, it was determined that the provisions were so restrictive that not more than two officers in the Navy could qualify for appointment to the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. This was considered to be so restrictive that it would deny the Secretary of the Navy any choice in his selection of a Judge Advocate General. It was further concluded that it will be a number of years before any appreciable number of naval personnel could meet the House qualifications and that the enactment of the House provisions was not practical at this time. As a consequence, the Senate amended the House provisions by reducing the qualifications of the Judge Advocates General so that a person will qualify for the appointment to the office of Judge Advocate General if he were a member of the bar of a Federal court of a State or a Territory and had not less than a total of 8 years' experience in legal duties as a commissioned officer.

The House recedes.

5. The remaining amendments were clarifying only and did not alter the substantive provisions of the bill. In each instance the House recedes.

OVERTON BROOKS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
CHAS. H. ELSTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the approval by both the House and the Senate of the conference report on H. R. 4080 marks another milepost in our efforts to bring a maximum amount of justice into the military justice systems of our armed services.

I recall that a subcommittee of which I was a member began deliberations on amendments to the Articles of War on the 17th of April 1947. After extensive hearings at that time, we passed a bill which greatly improved the system of military justice in the Army. From the inception of those hearings until the studies were begun on a Uniform Code of Military Justice, I believe I am safe in saying that I was almost continuously engaged in the consideration of the subject matter.

When the late Secretary Forrestal appointed a committee to prepare legislation which would provide the Uniform code of Military Justice for all the armed services, our committee had staff representation on the Forrestal group. Through that meeting, I was able to keep abreast of the studies of that committee, and I maintained my interest until the bill was presented to the Eighty-first Congress.

It has been a great privilege to me to have been the chairman of the subcommittee which conducted lengthy hearings and studies of this legislation. The committee conducted hearings 6 days a week for almost 6 weeks, during which time a large number of witnesses testified. They included representatives of the four major veterans' organizations, four bar associations, including the American Bar Association, the Reserve Officers Association, the National Guard Bureau, and the National Guard Association, the Under Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, and numerous other well-qualified witnesses. We spared no effort in our attempt to perfect a workable and enlightened system of military justice.

I now express the hope that appropriate emphasis and proper administration by military personnel will substantiate my conviction that the new law is a great step forward for the military services.

Mr. Speaker, this act has been badly needed. It will provide for uniformity in trial and in punishment in all branches of the armed services. It will eliminate command influence and will restore confidence in the system of military justice in all of the services. It is most timely and badly needed.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report makes one change of major importance in the bill which was passed a number of months ago. The change which is made

and which is of importance is as to the tenure of the judges of the military court of appeals. The House provided originally that the tenure of these judges should be during good behavior. We wanted to place this court on a high standard comparable to the Federal court of appeals. The other body, on the other hand, provided for a shorter tenure, a tenure of 8 years. It provided the initial appointment of these judges should be as follows: The first for 2 years, the second for 4 years, and the third for 6 years, so that the terms would not expire simultaneously. Following this, the judges should enjoy an 8-year term. The amendment which we agreed to provides for tenures of all judges for 15 years, the initial tenure being for 5, 10, and 15 years respectively, so that the termination of the original terms would be staggered and they would not all expire at the same identical time.

I, personally, would have liked that all terms be during good behavior as is the term of the Federal district courts and courts of appeal. It was my idea that this court would correspond as nearly as could be made to that of the Federal courts of appeal. We have to some extent fallen short of this goal; but the tenure agreed upon—namely, 15 years—is sufficiently long to insure a stability and a permanence to the court which will serve to inspire confidence in its vitality and its integrity.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other matters, one pertaining to temporary larceny. That is a minor change so as to permit in situations where the larceny is not of a permanent nature that there might be a different definition for such type of larceny. We provided also for a change in the qualifications for the Judge Advocate General of the Navy. That was agreeable to every conferee.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are most of the changes represented by the conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume it is the intention that in all court-martial cases which have not been finally disposed of the provisions of this bill if it becomes law will govern, is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, this might make the law retroactive, but the cases that are pending will come under the prevailing law at the time of the commission of the offense.

Mr. McCORMACK. What about the cases which have not been finally disposed of?

Mr. BROOKS. They will be handled under the old law.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would suggest that the gentleman reconsider that because in criminal cases usually where a change in the substantive law is made before the final disposition of the case the later law, if more favorable to the accused, is the one which governs. If this law is more favorable to anyone in the armed services or any enlisted man in the armed services and if court-martial proceedings are pending against such a person or if the case has actually been tried and sentence has been passed except that a final review of the case has not been made as yet then the more favorable provisions of the later law would apply.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts who is the majority leader of the House and who is an eminent lawyer of great ability that there is no change in the definition of crimes contained in the conference report compared to the bill as passed by the House except with respect to one provision referring to larceny. In that particular instance we provided a definition for temporary larceny which really is what would be termed a "misappropriation" on the part of the defendant who may have the intention of returning the purloined article at some future date. In such instance the prescribed punishment may be lighter. That would be the only instance in the conference report which I can think of which would come within the sort of case that the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I believe I may be able to enlighten the distinguished majority leader to some extent by calling to his attention the fact that this new law sets up a Military Court of Appeals. That court has the authority to review all cases to determine whether or not errors of law have been committed. That court would necessarily review cases which may have occurred before the passage of this law and which are still pending. So, in the final analysis I believe no injustice will result as to the men who have committed offenses before this law was passed and whose cases have not been finally disposed of. I believe it is elemental so far as procedure is concerned, if a law is passed and there is a change of procedure, the persons whose cases are pending will get the benefit of the new procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I had in mind, and I wanted to have that in the RECORD for whatever value it might have as to the intent. If that was the intent, I thoroughly agree with my friend.

Mr. BROOKS. What I had in mind was this, that if this military code defines a new crime not heretofore in existence, nobody is going to be punished on a state of facts already in existence prior to passage of this measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes; but on the other hand, this code provides for temporary larceny. Prior to that a man would have to be charged with larceny, which we know is different from misappropriation. Larceny is intent to steal or take from another the property of another, with the intent to permanently deprive that person of his property. Misappropriation, of course, is entirely different. Sometimes the facts distinguishing them are very slight. It is a question of intent. But, you have provided here for temporary larceny, and certainly, if there are any cases that heretofore had to be charged with larceny, and they come within the purview of temporary larceny, it seems to me that the intent of Congress would be, before the final disposition of those cases, that that fact be taken into consideration by a court martial or by a reviewing authority.

Mr. BROOKS. I would think this to be true.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. I want to take this opportunity to compliment this subcommittee. In my opinion, this subject has been given more careful thought than any subject that has been brought before the Armed Services Committee or the old Military Affairs Committee, within the past 10 years. It is one of the most advanced steps, in my opinion, in regard to our military forces, of anything that we have done in the last 10 years on this floor. I wish to compliment the entire subcommittee.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina very much.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I am a little confused with reference to the words "larceny" and "temporary larceny." There is not going to be such a statement now that a man in the service who takes something is going to be charged with taking it for a short period of time? It does not make any difference how long he takes it for; if he takes it, he is committing a crime, is he not?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; and will be punished for the commission of the crime. Some States have a law defining embezzlement. You have that for instance in a great many States with reference to automobiles. This provides for that type of offense, where an accused man takes property intending to return it to the owner later.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report and the signing of the pending bill by the President will mark the culmination of a number of years of effort to draft uniform military justice legislation.

During the course of World War II approximately 11,000,000 men saw service in the United States Army, and of that number approximately 80,000 were convicted by general courts martial. Even before the cessation of hostilities it was apparent to the War Department and to the Congress that a detailed study of the Army system of justice was appropriate, if not mandatory. Accordingly, in 1944 and 1945, the War Department sent Col. Phillip McCook, former prominent New York jurist, to various theaters of operation to conduct such studies. Additional reports were submitted to the War Department from other sources.

Within a few months after the end of hostilities the matter was brought to the attention of the American Bar Association, and on March 25, 1946, the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice was appointed by order of

the Secretary of War. The committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Arthur T. Vanderbilt, and referred to as the Vanderbilt committee, consisted of nine outstanding lawyers and Federal jurists from eight States and the District of Columbia. From March 25, 1946, until December 13, 1946, a period of almost 9 months, the members of that committee engaged in studies, investigations, and hearings, and availed themselves of voluminous statistical data of the Judge Advocate General's Department and other sources.

At full committee hearings in Washington the Secretary of War and Under Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, the Commander of the Army Ground Forces, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General, numerous other officers, and the representatives of five veterans' organizations were heard. There were numerous personal interviews, supplemented by letters, and the digesting of 321 answers to questionnaires from both military and nonmilitary personnel. Additional widely advertised regional public hearings were held at New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Raleigh, Atlanta, Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle. The subsequent report of the committee was based on these extensive inquiries.

During the Seventy-ninth Congress a Military Affairs Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. CARL T. DURHAM, devoted more than 1 year to detailed study of the Army system of justice.

Additional studies have been conducted by special committees of the American Legion, VFW, AMVETS, AVC, the New York County Lawyers' Association, the War Veterans' Bar Association, the Judge Advocate Generals' Association, and the Phi Alpha Delta law fraternity. The reports and recommendations of each of these groups were made available to the Armed Services Committee and representatives of each of the organizations appeared before the committee in public hearings in support of their recommendations. Other witnesses, who had particular knowledge of the subject by virtue of their service and experience in the recent war, were heard.

In our opinion, the combined efforts of these organizations and individuals represented the most comprehensive study of military justice ever conducted in the history of our country.

During the Eightieth Congress the Legal Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, of which I had the honor to be chairman, conducted extensive hearings on the same subject. That subcommittee was in session from April 14, 1947, until July 15, 1947, and considered all of the studies to which I have referred. As a result of these hearings, our subcommittee presented to the full committee what is now known as title II, Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress. The report of the subcommittee was unanimously adopted by the full committee and passed the House on January 15, 1948. That bill, which pertained only to the Army, was included as an amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1948.

During the year 1948 Secretary of Defense Forrestal appointed a special committee to study a uniform code of military justice to be equally applicable to all of the armed forces. During the Eighty-first Congress further hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], was chairman. That committee reported a uniform code of military justice known as H. R. 4080, and it passed the House May 5, 1949. With a few exceptions the provisions of H. R. 4080 were similar to title II, Public Law 759, and the bill as passed by the House was amended only slightly by the other body.

Under the provisions of Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps was established for the Army. No such separate legal corps exists for the Navy or the Air Force. It was believed desirable to postpone the creation of a special corps for the Air Force and the Navy until further experience is available on the operation of the Corps in the Army. Later on Congress will have the benefit of the recommendations of the Court of Military Appeals on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake at this time to review the provisions of the pending bill. They were fully discussed when this legislation was debated during the past 2 years.

While I would have preferred that the tenure of the judges of the Military Court of Appeals should be for life, I consider the 15-year term agreed upon by the conferees to be reasonable, and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Every serviceman who may hereafter be accused of any military offense is assured of a fair and impartial trial free from command influence, and with the right to have his case reviewed upon the evidence as well as the law. His final review in the Court of Military Appeals will be before civilian judges possessing the qualifications of judges of the United States court of appeals. He shall hereafter be entitled to competent legal counsel at all stages of his hearing. If he is an enlisted man, he may have enlisted men on the court if he requests it. Officers may now be tried by special courts martial thus providing for greater equality in the treatment of officers and enlisted men. The system heretofore in effect could not guarantee equal and exact justice; the pending bill should accomplish it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following the legislative program and special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the second article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Catholic Transcript.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 24 entitled "Washington Dope Habit."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and to include an editorial and a news article.

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in six instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend copies of a resolution adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. There may be a slight additional cost above the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing; nevertheless I ask unanimous consent to include these resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding the additional cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include various documents with regard to the Natural Gas Act.

Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter received today from a constituent.

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. JENSEN) was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report from the projects committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend an editorial that appeared recently in the magazine Iron Age.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial from the Boston Traveler regarding the severe cut in the postal service.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three thought-provoking articles by the eminent journalist and writer Lowell Mellett appearing in the Washington Star under date of April 18, April 20, and April 22.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

SALE OF SELECT BASE MATERIAL AT FORT BENNING MILITARY RESERVATION TO MUSCOGEE COUNTY, GA.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk a bill (H. R. 2895) to authorize the sale of select base material, at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "of", where it appears the second time, insert: "not less than".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman from Louisiana explain the amendment and the purpose of the bill?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Army to sell to the county of Muscogee in the State of Georgia such amount of select base material as may be available at Fort Benning and not useful to the reservation. We stipulated in the original bill that the price should be 5 cents per cubic yard. The Senate amendment merely inserts the words "not less than" so that in the event we can get more than 5 cents per cubic yard a higher price will be available to the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 141]

Allen, Ill.	Gilmer	Nixon
Barrett, Pa.	Grant	O'Sullivan
Battle	Hagen	Pace
Bennett, Fla.	Harden	Pfeifer,
Boykin	Harvey	Joseph L.
Brehm	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Quinn
Carlyle	Hinshaw	Rains
Cavalcante	Hobbs	Riehlman
Celler	Howell	Roosevelt
Chatham	Jenkins	Sabath
Cooley	Kee	Smathers
Coudert	Kennedy	Smith, Kans.
Cox	Keogh	Smith, Ohio
Crosser	Kunkel	Steed
Davenport	Lodge	Vinson
Davies, N. Y.	Lucas	Whitaker
Dawson	Martin, Iowa	White, Calif.
Deane	Miles	Wolcott
Douglas	Morgan	Woodruff
Evins	Moulder	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and sixty-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 7, page 137, title II, chapter V, of the bill.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the twenty-sixth day of April and we have with us the first time in many weeks our distinguished colleague, MARY NORTON, of New Jersey, who has recently announced that she is not going to run again for Congress.

We welcome her back with very full hearts and we hope that she will be able to spend many hours with us before this session closes and that then for many years she will come back and be with us often and give us her wise counsel.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a woman now in this House, nor one who has been here during her long period of service to the people of the United States as well as to her district in New Jersey, who has not learned to love her, to respect her, to want the friendship with which she is so generous.

We women of the House feel a keen regret that we shall not have her with us in the coming session of the Congress. We wish her every possible and conceivable joy and satisfaction out of the many things that she has done for humanity, for her people, for other women and for so many children. We are deeply grateful for the example she has set to all women in America.

The kind of service she has rendered is quite beyond my power to put into words. We are united, we women of the House, and we know that beside us and behind us and around us the men of this body and of the other body would like to express something of their regard for the distinguished Congresswoman from New Jersey, MARY NORTON. I hope you will accept me as your spokesman on this occasion. I know that you will want to put your own words into the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, when we go back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to insert in the RECORD at this point those remarks which perhaps, if they were said now would be more than the gentlewoman from New Jersey, MARY NORTON could quite bear, with equanimity, because she is finding out how much we love her. She has been realizing that few people have as many friends as she.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, we women of the House are going to be wholly revolutionary because we want to give her a little token that is all hers just from us. As I leave this rostrum I am going to ask the Republican women who are here to go with me across the aisle that we may give to MARY on the floor of this House a tiny token that she will take with her as a continuing remembrance of our love and devotion to her as we recognize her consecration and devotion to the United States of America through her services in the House of Representatives.

MARY T. NORTON: A GREAT AMERICAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the lady from New Jersey, and I have served together in Congress for a quarter of a century, through years of peace, years of great tragedy, and years of great victory for our country. There has always been a close bond of friendship between us. All of us admire her for her great ability, her fine strength of character, and because she has always stood for the right. She has done well everything she has undertaken. Some of her philanthropies are known, but there are hundreds and hundreds of kind, thoughtful acts she has done of which the public has no cognizance. From time to time, in my own work, I run across these thoughtful acts accomplished so willingly and so unpretentiously by MARY NORTON. She has

restored to many people a confidence in human nature by her unselfishness and her willingness to help them in their hour of need. She has made an excellent Member of Congress. We will miss her greatly here in the House of Representatives. She is a great woman, a great Member of Congress, and a great American.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, 10 gold squares linked together in a bracelet with a gold disc attached as a pendant was the gift of the women in Congress to our precious colleague, MARY T. NORTON. On each gold square is the year of induction, the State initial, and the signature of each woman Member of the House of Representatives. The disc bears the signature of our lady Senator. The gift is beautiful. It is a symbol of the sincere feelings in our hearts for the dean of the women in Congress—MARY T. NORTON.

But this occasion is unique. With her seventy-fifth birthday celebrated and 25 years spent as a Member of the House of Representatives with a record second to none, Mrs. NORTON has announced her retirement at the end of this term.

I salute you, MARY, and I salute the State of New Jersey which has known the privilege of your representation. God bless you and spare you. I hope this bracelet will symbolize the unity of thought and action of women and that the round disc will symbolize the world—our cause of action—peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the paragraph appearing on page 137? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowship and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the act; the regulation and preparation of biologic products, the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; and erection of temporary structures for storage of equipment and supplies and housing of animals, $15,750,000, of which not less than $3,600,000 shall be available exclusively for grants for studies with adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH) and cortisone (compound E), including development of other related compounds for treatment of arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, and metabolic diseases, and including studies in the basic sciences related to such diseases.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 139, line 2, after the comma, immediately following the word "sclerosis", insert the word "neurological", and on page 139, line 4, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add the following: "and including not to exceed $200,000 for transfer to the Department of Agriculture for research into utilization of plant material and vegetable sources of cortisone."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that at the present moment the chief producer of cortisone happens to be Armour & Co., the second largest packer in the world. Another large packer, Wilson Co., contemplates entering the field, and I am wondering whether the gentleman, through his influence on the committee, would bear in mind a move to bring about some form of a modest subsidy to permit other packers, like Swift, John Morrell, Rath, and many other lesser ones in this country, to go into the production of this magic, this wonder substance, without which this country cannot long continue its advance against disease, man's greatest enemy. And, I want to say this, if my good friend will indulge me, that we cannot expect these people to produce and to give away this precious substance entirely at their own expense, and it may be well, with a modest subsidy, to encourage them to produce it, because for the time being at least they are giving it away free for experimental purposes.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for making that inquiry. As I tried to explain yesterday in my general statement on this bill the committee has placed $2,500,000 in the bill, which is included in the paragraph now under consideration for the specific purpose of aiding in the research and in the work in connection with the production of ACTH and compound E.

Mr. DINGELL. It would cover what I have in mind?

Mr. KEEFE. I am certain it will. There is no desire to promote monopolistic trade practices so far as the production of these two miracle drugs is concerned. The whole objective of the Public Health Service in making funds available in the form of grants for further research and to obtain synthesization of these two wonder drugs is that we may obtain the widest spread of beneficial use rather than to have, as at present, the production of these drugs limited almost entirely to research projects.

Mr. DINGELL. I have in mind that it would be possible if this sort of money is used properly that these glands, as rare as they are, as little as they produce in cortisone by immediate reduction, might even—and this is only in my lay mind, and I suggest it for whatever it is worth—that these glands be kept alive after extraction by a method similar to that employed in the Lindbergh heart, so that these glands could produce more by continued life under artificial stimulation for a long period of time, and thus produce many, many times the amount of cortisone that is extracted from them through reduction immediately following removal. That is always in the realm of possibility in experimental work.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I should like to proceed for just a moment on this subject.

As I noted yesterday, the Public Health Service and the research institutions throughout the country are fully alert and alive to the possibilities of the utilization in medicine of compound E and ACTH, the two miracle wonder drugs that are rapidly expanding in production to the point where I think it is not unsafe to say that they will be available for humanity generally in very largely increased amounts due to the aid and assistance which is contemplated in the appropriation contained in this paragraph.

The question was asked yesterday by the gentleman from Iowa as to what is being done in the matter of research in the field of multiple sclerosis. That question has been asked of me by many, many Members of the Congress. You will observe that the paragraph under consideration makes appropriations to the National Institutes of Health. Included in the research work being done presently and to be implemented by this appropriation is research into the treatment of arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, and metabolic diseases, including studies in the basic sciences related to such diseases.

When the language was drafted it was broad enough, of course, to include a specific program of research into multiple sclerosis. But it was not broad enough to authorize the National Institutes of Health to set up a program of research into neurological diseases. The matter was called to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee by the Director of the National Institutes of Health, who sought to have broad enough authority in connection with their general research program to go into some of the fields of neurological research, which is directly related to the ever-increasing mental illnesses that are afflicting the people of the country so terrifically at the present time.

So the first part of this amendment is a very simple inclusion of the word "neurological" in the description of those basic matters which the Congress is directing the National Institutes of Health to investigate, and authorizing them to make grants out of the funds provided here to extend research to those fields throughout the country.

So far as that part of the amendment is concerned, I believe it is thoroughly acceptable to the committee. Is that not true, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FOGARTY. Both parts of this amendment, I believe, are acceptable to the committee and there will be no dispute on either one of them.

Mr. KEEFE. The second part of the amendment is directly related to the subject which was discussed by my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. The Committee on Agriculture, which is dealing with the matter of plant studies, had a provision in its portion of the appropriation bill under which it was

contemplated that of the funds granted to the National Institutes of Health $200,000 would be made available to the Department of Agriculture experts to enable them to search the world for new sources of cortisone which might be found in living plant life. Thus, it is proposed by the second part of the amendment to transfer to the Department of Agriculture $200,000 of the funds appropriated to the National Institutes of Health in order that the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture may be assured in searching all parts of the world for new sources of cortisone which is the base by which ACTH and compound E are made.

I think that is a great step in the right direction. In order to carry out that purpose of the Subcommittee on Agriculture and the full Committee on Appropriations, I have offered this second part of the amendment which will enable us to carry on work which is already being carried on in Africa, Mexico, and in Central and South America by people who are earnestly trying to find the sources of cortisone that may be utilized by which we may expect to ultimately receive a vastly increased supply of this basic material for the production of ACTH and compound E.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes that I may answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's amendment does not increase the appropriation, does it?

Mr. KEEFE. It does not.

Mr. STEFAN. It merely earmarks the appropriation for that particular purpose?

Mr. KEEFE. It merely authorizes the transfer by the Public Health Service of $200,000 to the Department of Agriculture and does not constitute any increase in appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the act, $20,086,000, of which not less than $5,000,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 159, line 18, strike out the period at the end of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "; and in addition to the amount appropriated herein, the Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to approve applications for research and training grants, including grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and acquisition of land therefor, not to exceed a total of $3,000,000 for periods beyond the current fiscal year, and such grants shall, if approved during the current fiscal year, constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. I raise the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill; and, further, that the basic legislation does not authorize contract authorizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, I do desire to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to give contractual authority for cancer research construction grants. The basic authorization for construction grants is found in section 405 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, which reads as follows:

Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this title, cancer, shall be available for acquisition of land, or the erection of buildings only if so specified.

Under that language, Mr. Chairman, the Congress has, in identical language as in the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Wisconsin, accepted appropriations, and appropriations have been made with the identical language in fiscal years 1948 and 1949 appropriation bills. I think the language is certainly broad enough to authorize this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The appropriation bill passed a year ago, on page 175, included practically the same language, it seems to me, when we said at that time:

And in addition to the amount herein, the Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to approve applications for research and training grants, including grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and acquisition of land therefore, not to exceed a total of $6,000,000, for periods beyond the current fiscal year, and such grants shall, if approved during the current fiscal year, constitute a contractual obligation on the Federal Government.

It seems to me that this language and similar language having been in the bill in past years, it would be in order at this time.

I go along with the views expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that this is in order at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say further, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the basic act, under which this national cancer program was set up in the bill to which I have referred, constitutes basic authority for this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it contains legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has examined the amendment and section 405 of the Public Health Service Act referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Chair might comment on the statement made by the gentleman from Rhode Island to the extent of saying that although a provision of this nature may have been included in previous acts there may not have been any point of order made against it; so that could not be decisive in considering the question now presented.

The Chair is of the opinion that section 405 cited by the gentleman from Wisconsin does constitute legislative authority for the appropriation. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the pending amendment includes a provision for contract authorization beyond the present fiscal year, which, in the opinion of the Chair, would constitute legislation on an appropriation bill and would be in violation of the rules of the House. For that reason the Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that I may if possible have our Clerk draw an amendment to this section of the bill which will be practically the same thing and so it will not be ruled out of order. I had hoped that since we had in past years had unanimous agreement on these public-health measures dealing with heart, cancer, and mental-disease research programs, that no member of our subcommittee this year would raise a point of order on such a question on which there has been unanimous agreement in the past 3 or 4 years since this program was instituted, and because of the results achieved from the money we have appropriated over the last 3 or 4 years.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that I served on this Subcommittee on the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency for approximately 4 years. I never previously saw disagreement between the members of our subcommittee with regard to items in this bill for public health.

Mr. FOGARTY. There has never been any disagreement until this year, and

this present situation is one of my biggest disappointments since I have been a Member of Congress, to see a worthwhile program being scuttled and stopped in its tracks. If this were to be a continuing program that was going to run on for years and years and years with no estimate of how much it was going to cost in the end, there might be some reasonable argument against the appropriation of these funds. But when this program was instituted 3 or 4 years ago we had a definite time limit on construction of facilities for clinical laboratories, and so forth, to deal with this particular research in the cancer program. If we were allowed to continue, we would be out of the construction business in this particular program in another year and that would be the end of it and we would have accomplished more good by the few million dollars we spent in attempting to find the cause of this disastrous disease that no one knows much about at the present time. We can build all the hospitals in the world and fill them up with these cancer patients; it is going to cost in the end billions and billions of dollars unless we can find the cause, and the only way we are ever going to find the cause is to spend some money on research and get to the root of it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it not of utmost importance, does it not transcend all other considerations, the rules of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, that there must be an uninterrupted course of research regardless of objections or technicalities?

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively. The Federal Government today is spending about a billion dollars in research every year, yet only 10 percent of that billion dollars is going into research in the public-health system of our country. Why, we are spending at least $25,000,000 a year for research into diseases of plants and animals. I am for it. I think we should do that, and I think it should be continued. But why in the world, if we are spending that much on the diseases of plants and animals, can we not spend something to find out about the leading causes of deaths? This does not affect one segment of our economy, this does not affect one class of our people; it affects every living person in the country at the present time, regardless of from what walk of life they may come, regardless of what side of the aisle they are sitting on today. That does not make any difference. We are all susceptible to these diseases. If we have the opportunity now to do something about it, let us do it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I would like to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for the very excellent statement he has made. How much is involved in the construction program involving cancer, approximately?

Mr. KEEFE. For the initial program there is involved a contemplated expenditure of $25,000,000. Sixteen million dollars has already been appropriated by the Congress. This amendment would carry that program forward only to the extent of $3,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Wisconsin stated is correct. The program involves an expenditure of $25,000,000 spread over a period of 3 years. We have already spent $16,000,000 on the program. As I remember, the Public Health officials asked the Bureau of the Budget for $9,000,000 to complete the program this year. If we were allowed to get that $9,000,000, the program would be complete, we would be out of the construction business and we would have something that all the world would be proud of.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. And we would have maintained an unbroken fight against disease instead of carrying on a desultory attack which every time we make a break in the program proves costly in lives and in further financing it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I commend the gentlemen for the excellent work they have been doing along this line. I would like to add that one out of every seven people in the United States is affected by this disease, and the paltry sum, and this is a paltry sum, of $9,000,000 covering one out of every seven in the United States is not too much.

Mr. FOGARTY. We are not asking for $9,000,000. The amount is $3,000,000. What we want to do is continue this program so that it will not be stopped. Why stop something that is going to be a future guaranty to the people of this country and the whole world that ultimately we are going to find out the cause of cancer, the second leading cause of death.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman advise the House as to how many public cancer hospitals there are in the United States?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot give those figures.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only one I know of is in Massachusetts. I was wondering if there are any in other States, if there are any other public cancer hospitals. We have a veterans' hospital, I think, in Brooklyn, but that is for veterans.

Mr. FOGARTY. The Memorial Hospital in New York is the oldest cancer hospital in the country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I acquaint the Members of the House with the fact that in a community such as the Borough of Brooklyn, with a population of over three million, there is no cancer hospital.

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is, and this is rather interesting, that there is no public cancer hospital, and I say this with some reservation, outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. There is a veterans' hospital, they have some beds here and there. Certainly that shows the necessity for something being done. I know about the public cancer hospital in Massachusetts because I happened to be a member of the Massachusetts Senate in 1926 when a group of us got together, some in the house and some in the senate, and I led the fight in the senate for the passage of the bill that brought about the public cancer hospital that now exists in Massachusetts. If there is one field that something should be done in, it is the field of cancer.

Mr. FOGARTY. I hope the distinguished majority leader will lend his support to this proposition, because we need his help today.

Mr. McCORMACK. The majority leader certainly has been inspiring the gentleman as much as he could.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is doing a good job. Let us keep it up.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it should be borne in mind that we are going to save millions and millions of dollars if we can lick this problem, because at the present time there is no doubt that a lot of public hospitals throughout this country are faced with a costly cancer problem that they have to meet.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I also desire to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his excellent statement here this morning. I wish to state that I concur with his views.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Do I understand correctly that the National Advisory Cancer Council, composed of eminent medical, scientific, and prominent laymen, drawn from all walks of life, have endorsed this program, and are convinced, if it is continued, that we are making real progress toward solving the problem of the cure of cancer and saving the millions of dollars to which the gentleman from Michigan has referred?

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no question about that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his statement in regard to this matter and to point out that the sum involved, insofar as cancer is concerned, is a paltry one when compared to the billions of dollars that this Congress has been appropriating for Marshall-plan aid and other such aid to foreign countries.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. In answer to the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, I want to say that there are a good many branches to hospitals in the country that operate under the name of tumor clinics, that are really not identified openly as cancer institutions, but these tumor clinics are part of these hospitals. There are a great many of those in this country that carry on this work.

Mr. McCORMACK. My statement related to cancer hospitals.

Mr. JONAS. Well, there really are none. The statement that the gentleman made to the House recently about the necessity of research work is the crux of the whole thing. I have had considerable experience with hospitals, the President of a hospital board that carries on research work now. Research is absolutely necessary in order to find a cure for it, otherwise you can fill all your hospitals and not accomplish anything.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman. That is the kind of testimony that I, as a layman appreciate, hearing it from men like the gentleman who has had that experience.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Does the gentleman realize that we spend more money to store potatoes that nobody can eat than we do for this worth while program the gentleman is asking $3,000,000 for?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 139, line 18, strike out the period at the end of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and in addition to the amount appropriated herein the Surgeon General is authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to approve applications for research and training grants, including grants for drawing plans, erection of buildings, and acquisition of land therefor, not to exceed a total of $3,000,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I know of no field in which the Government could interest itself to greater advantage to the people not only of America but of the world than the field which is involved in this amendment and two subsequent amendments which I shall offer to this bill.

Let us get the history of this situation. This Congress by an almost unanimous vote adopted the recommendation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce some years ago and established the National Cancer Foundation, and provided that that organization, to be operated under the direction of the Surgeon General, should have as its advisory council a council consisting of the most outstanding medical people and laymen in America to direct its functioning.

This is not a new program, this is an old program that is a functioning program and has been in effect since 1938.

What was the thing we discovered all over America? Thousands of men and women devoting themselves as members of the National Cancer Society to going out to the people of this country to solicit millions of dollars to carry on the fight against cancer. Carry on the fight how? They have found that they are using that money and are compelled to use it principally for the care of cancer patients. The amount that is available for expenditure for research purposes is dwindling and dwindling and dwindling, just as it is in the case of poliomyelitis. The incidence of the disease is growing so rapidly and the necessities for care are so terrific that the money the people are spending in these drives is being spent for care instead of research.

The little money we provided in 1938 started a program that attacked this problem at the place where the men and women engaged in research in this country said was critical. What was it? They said, "We have been engaged in a program utilizing rats and guinea pigs and monkeys to try to find the cause and cure of cancer in human beings." I went around the country and talked to these great researchers at that time. What did they tell me? They said the bottleneck in the program, the thing that was stymieing the program, was the lack of clinical facilities. They were not available, as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts so well stated. So this Congress decided to do something about it. We decided to establish a program of assistance to the research centers of the country that would make available these clinical facilities, that not only would provide care and treatment but would afford the researchers the opportunity for finding the answer, if possible, through their observation of human beings instead of monkeys and guinea pigs or orangutans or rats.

This Congress in 1938 set that program in motion, and you authorized and furnished the money to build this great research center at Bethesda, which in turn is hooked up with all of the other research centers in the country in the field of cancer. Great progress is being made in that field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, what does the present amendment contemplate? A measly $3,000,000 with which to continue a program which has been endorsed not only by the Cancer Advisory Council but by every scientist in that field. Do they say only $3,000,000 is necessary? They say over $30,000,000 should be appropriated for this purpose if we are going to make a proper onslaught in the field of cancer.

We came into this subcommittee desiring to see to it that there would be expenditures limited to the very lowest level. We cut out of the public health part of the bill some $26,000,000 on other projects in order that we could take some of the money and apply it in the field of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. It amounted to some $11,000,000 or $12,000,000.

The gentleman from Rhode Island and I voted for these cuts with the understanding that the money thus saved or at least a portion of it would be used to implement these programs which the people of America want.

Make no mistake about it but the work of the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Society, and the Institute of Mental Hygiene working nationally over the country generally have aroused the people to the necessity for some action on the part of the Federal Government to help them in their fight against these dread diseases.

You can turn it down if you want to. I have done my part. The chairman of the subcommittee has done his part. I realize how difficult it is when people get up here and say, "Oh, you are overwriting the budget $3,000,000—you cannot do that." Well, you remember what took place here yesterday. In the very same subcommittee they voted to cut the hospital construction program in two. When the vote came on the amendment to restore those funds the very members who voted to cut it in two walked through the tellers in support of the amendment. They had heard from home? I do not know. Perhaps they heard from the American people who are demanding that something be done in this field.

Mr. Chairman, as I said originally, it does not mean anything to me personally. I am going to leave the Congress. This will be my last service. This is my last effort in behalf of public health. You take the responsibility and carry on the fight. So I am not talking because I want to get votes. I am talking because in my heart I have the conviction there is nothing the Congress can do of more interest to human welfare than the promotion of these programs involving the fight on cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. If we do not make the fight the people are going to demand it and then you will face the prospect of State medicine. Make no mistake about it.

There are those who stand up here and decry socialism and the threat of socialism day in and day out. Yet when a program is submitted which is the very antithesis of socialism and which is the one program which is going to stop socialism in this field because of the few dollars involved, they will vote to defeat the program.

I cannot see it. I am not going to be bound by that sort of attitude in the remaining days of my service in this Congress. I have been here 12 years. I hope that the membership of this House will follow the leadership of the gentleman who is chairman of this subcommittee, who heard this testimony, not once but many times, and who is familiar with the problem, as is the gentleman who is now addressing you, and not take the word of someone who has never heard a word of this testimony which was given before the committee and who has heretofore shown no interest in this program that is so vital to the interest and the welfare of the people of this Nation. Do with it as you will. I have done my part. My conscience is clear, and outside of Congress I am going to carry this fight to the people, in an effort to awaken that great consciousness that controls all of it, in doing things for the people of America that ought to be done, instead of voting billions of dollars for other people, as have some of the people who oppose this little amendment.

Think it over, my friends, before you cast your votes on this amendment. It is in the interest of the welfare of the people of America for which I am pleading.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I would like to pay tribute to him. I think I speak the views and the heartfelt feelings of I hope a great majority of the Members of this House for the Herculean effort which he has made in behalf of the health of the people of the United States, particularly in those critical fields—cancer, mental health and heart disease—which have so baffled medical science and have been so frustrating and so helpless to so many millions of Americans.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said today something that I did not know, that he is leaving congressional service. I consider that a great loss to the people of America, for this particular fight alone, if nothing else, and the gentleman has rendered distinguished service in many ways. I wish him long life and hearty years in which to wage this fight for the people's health that he has so nobly carried on on this floor.

There are really three amendments which we are considering now. The gentleman will propose them in due course. We are taking first the one for cancer. There will be another for mental health, and another for heart. This is the trilogy of frustration, frustration for medical science and frustration for human beings.

There are two thoughts that I would like to leave with you. The first is that we hear a lot from many distinguished gentlemen on the floor that we must be solicitous about the taxpayers' money. We must not waste the taxpayers' money. Of course, we understand that, and that is our duty. But what is so little said is that there are some cases in which the taxpayers want us to spend their money. They are asking us to spend their money, and to spend it wisely and well. That is one of those cases. The three appropriations for cancer, for mental health, and for heart, even when increased, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will ask us to increase them, will amount to something in the way of $55,000,000. A recent survey conducted by one of the survey organizations showed that 79 percent of all the people interviewed on heart disease research alone said they were willing to spend $200,000,000 in order to find the causes and cures for that particular disease, which, incidentally is the No. 1 killer in our country. It kills about 650,000 people a year, of whom one-third are under 65. So let us not think that these people just die of old age.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman that the only fault I find in his amendment is the infinitesimal sum that it provides. It ought to be $30,000,000 instead of $3,000,000. It is the hardest thing in the world to sell healthy people a health program. I want to commend the gentleman from New York and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for their timely stand in this tragic legislation we have here that must be sold to the people and about the necessity of which the public seems to be entirely unconscious instead of realizing its importance. Let me say, based on a little experience I have had, that it takes from $1,000,000 to $3,000,000 to build up a good clinic for cancer research.

Mr. JAVITS. I had the pleasure of initiating the program for the National Heart Disease Institute in company with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and with the help of our colleague on the Democratic side, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. Here is a situation in the case of heart-disease research, I repeat again, where the taxpayers want us to spend their money; we are not forcing it from them; we are not exacting it from them involuntarily; they want us to spend it.

And now the second point, and it is very important: It so happens that one of the greatest leaders in the cancer research program and who has figured very prominently in it, is also a friend of mine. He and I served together in the Army for 4 years, Dr. Cornelius P. Rhoads. He is head of the great cancer research organization in New York City—the Memorial Cancer Center. Dr. Rhoads is one of those great medical pioneers who has demonstrated one thing which is true in all these three fields, whether it be cancer, heart, or mental health; he has pointed out that if we are to find a cure for any one of these diseases it cannot depend upon the scientist or the doctor working alone in his backroom laboratory. Discoveries have been made in this way in times past, but not soon enough nor surely enough—in the case of cancer it just has not happened; in the case of heart disease it just has not happened, nor has it happened in the case of mental health.

Dr. Rhoads has demonstrated that if we are to make progress in these fields of medical research it must be by a mobilization of the scientific resources and with enough scientists and enough equipment where they can knock down theory after theory which may be wrong, and, with painstaking checking, build up conceptions which may be right. This can only be brought about by an adequate mobilization of scientists, researchers, and equipment. The result finally will be the saving of years and years of time because we are providing the men and facilities which otherwise could not be assembled. If we only do what the gentleman from Wisconsin asks us to do, support them, we will be taking advantage of the great advance which research science has made, that is the science of research itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. We must take advantage of these new principles in research. Nothing could be so short-sighted, as brought out by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, who has been an enthusiastic supporter of this program, as to curtail this program at this stage. Compared to the ultimate gain the cost is infinitesimal. Should we not, then, having discovered the secret of scientific research, the way in which to attack and solve a scientific problem, follow up the program with adequate support?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. How much money is appropriated in this bill for this purpose?

Mr. JAVITS. Forty-five million dollars for the three programs, in round figures.

Mr. STEFAN. Was that the amount of the budget estimate?

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the chairman of the subcommitee to answer that?

Mr. FOGARTY. On direct appropriations for the cancer part of the program we granted the exact amount that was allowed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. STEFAN. In all three programs you allowed $45,000,000. That is, the budget estimate was allowed; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. On each of the three programs we allowed what the Budget sent up to us.

Mr. STEFAN. And this is an increase of $3,000,000 over and above what the Budget allowed for that particular purpose?

Mr. FOGARTY. This in effect is trying to keep the program going which was started by this committee that the Bureau of the Budget cut out this year,

a program which we have been following up for 3 years.

Mr. STEFAN. But you gave them the budget estimate in the bill; you did not cut the budget estimate?

Mr. FOGARTY. On direct appropriations.

Mr. STEFAN. And this is a request for $3,000,000 over and above what the Budget allowed?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. What we are asked to do here, is to review the whole program including what the Budget Bureau did, and to express our view that we want the cancer, mental health, and heart disease research programs to go forward in full vigor. That is a question we must decide and, which the Budget Bureau cannot decide for us.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In view of the colloquy that has just taken place, if you consider one item in this multi-item bill and say that you are overriding the Bureau of the Budget with respect to that item, that may be true; but if you consider all of the items in relation one to the other, there is no overriding of the Budget and a very substantial cut below the budget estimate. I tried to make that clear and it was the intent of the chairman of this subcommittee that out of those cuts that were made, $10,000,000 for State and local health services alone, we would be able to take that money and apply it to these three programs to keep them functioning.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain points that ought to be made clear in this debate. As has been indicated, this is only the first of three amendments dealing with the question of construction funds for the Cancer Research Institute, the Heart Research Institute, and the Mental Health Research Institute. These are the diseases, particularly the first two, that affect older people, the so-called chronic diseases.

We have seen some rather startling advances in medical science during the last 50 years. We have seen the average life expectancy jump from 40 in 1900 to 67 today. During the Roman Empire the average age expectancy was 23. So that we have in 50 years advanced more than we did in 2,000 years in expanding the average-life span. We have done that because we have been successful with research techniques and the application of public health methods in cutting down on the diseases of children in infancy and curbing communicable diseases. We have begun to conquer those diseases. We have not done that with the chronic diseases that affect older people.

What we are endeavoring to do under the amendments now before this body is to make it possible for every human being to live longer. We think we are on the threshold of doing that through finding the cause of cancer, through finding out more about heart disease, and through the wonder drugs ACTH and compound E. We think that is a worthy objective of the Congress. We are only asking for a comparatively small amount of money to do that.

As has been pointed out before, the sum of money being requested for each of these three research institutes is simply to maintain existing programs. The funds are needed for that purpose and the funds will therefore be utilized in the most possible efficient way for the welfare of the people of all the country. I just cannot believe that anyone wants to stop this work from going forward.

Eminent scientists have pointed out one rather significant fact.

Mr. SCRIVNER. To what work is the gentleman referring?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Eminent scientists have pointed out one very important factor that seems to have been overlooked. In the animal kingdom the average life span of any given animal is six times the amount of time it takes that animal to reach maturity. Dogs take 18 months or 2 years. They live from 9 to 12 years, and so on. But a human being who reaches maturity at about 20 still has only an average life expectancy of 67. The reason for that is basically this: We have not licked these chronic diseases that affect old age. That is what we want to do and enable all humans to live longer.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. My inquiry was this: The gentleman made some statement about work being stopped. I was wondering what it was.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Expansion of the clinical facilities for cancer, for heart and for mental diseases is the work that would be stopped if these funds are not granted. I want to state again, as I did in my colloquy with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I pay great tribute to him once more and to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for the very fine work they have done, that these amendments have the backing of eminent medical scientists, eminent laymen from all walks of life who give their time and energy on the various research and advisory councils. They have, as a matter of fact, recommended a larger sum of money than is being brought before this body today. I think we can afford to accept the opinion of eminent doctors who are on the various advisory councils and of the laymen who serve unselfishly on the councils, who give of their time and energy to this work.

For the welfare of the people of America, for the health of the people of America, and for the broadening of the life span of all of the people of our country, and last, but not least, for the effect that this kind of research will have upon the good will of the peoples throughout the entire world, I think there is no greater contribution that America can make toward the peace of the world than being the discoverer of those methods that will expand the life span of all peoples—I hope, for these reasons, that we will pass all three of these amendments.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, 2,000 years ago the greatest healer of all times went about the world doing good and curing the diseases of that period. Leprosy was the great scourge of mankind in those years. Today the No. 1 killer, and equally as hateful to the human race, is cancer. Only those whose loved ones have been taken by this terrible disease can appreciate all of the agonies and pain which the victims go through before death. It is a creeping death. They die by inches. Yet, with all of our great abilities and men of science, we have been unable to exact or to discover more than a temporary halt of this dreadful disease.

I was reading an article not long ago which said that the cure is within the grasp of mankind due to the advance of science, and it may be from 2 to 5 years that we will have within our grasp the ultimate cure of this terrible malady. It behooves us then to leave no stone unturned, to take every possible step within our power to eradicate and eliminate once and for all the greatest eliminator of mankind that the world has ever known. So, with this great research which is being conducted daily—and as I understand there are various groups of scientists and medical men who are devoting themselves, their every waking hour to different phases toward the conquest of this disease—it behooves us to stop, look, and listen to the possibility of doing everything that we can within our power to aid and to help find a cure of cancer, and as to these other great diseases we are equally dedicated and devoted to their eradication and to their cure and to the successful conquest of them. But, at the moment, the real target of the medical profession and of all of the science of mankind must be geared or must confine itself to the conquest of this awful killer. As I have said, in the opinion of those closest to the wrestling for a cure of this disease, we seem to be within 2 to 5 years of a successful culmination of arriving at a cure. If we are so near and yet so far, we certainly owe it to our fellow citizens and those generations yet unborn to carry the fight to the last ditch and finally to conquer this No. 1 killer of mankind, cancer. I believe it is within our grasp and I hope that we may be able to put over that final step that will lead to successful culmination.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the comments that have been made heretofore, I am quite sure in my own mind, looking at this calmly and judicially, that the action of the committee as reported in the committee report was a proper action, and that the action of the committee as reported should be sustained. I am sure you understand that as one minority member I did not write the report.

I am quite sure the gentleman from Wisconsin did not mean to indicate that I was one of the gentlemen who might oppose this amendment because I had not heard the testimony. I have heard it. I am sure, too, that, knowing my record as he does, he did not mean to indicate to any Member here that I have been voting money for people overseas and am now trying to reduce expenditures for our own folks here at home, because that is not my record. There is not any idea, there is not any intent, there is not any purpose, there is not the result of scuttling any program by this action.

Look at the committee report. We heard the testimony, all of it. Incidentally, I had always assumed that the majority leader was to carry out the President's program here on the floor. The action of the committee was in keeping with the recommendation of the President by his right arm, the Bureau of the Budget.

If you will turn to page 100 of the report you will find that notwithstanding the urgent need for economy allowed the full budget estimate of $20,086,000. Every Member of this House and every taxpayer in the Nation knows there is need for economy. We are running $6,000,000,000 in the red this year and it will probably be $7,000,000,000 next year. Economy must start some place. We treated all these as fairly and equitably as was humanly possible to treat them.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. McGRATH and Mr. KEEFE.

The Committee divided; and tellers reported that there were—ayes 16, noes 89.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The vote discloses the presence of a quorum.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the committee realized there was need for economy. The committee says it has not imposed any reduction against the budget estimate of $20,086,000 for the work in the field of cancer. That is not scuttling a program. Further than that the report shows the Atomic Energy Commission is allocating sizable sums to this very purpose of research in cancer. Together with the work of other Government bodies and the National Cancer Society and all these other societies a considerable sum of money is being spent for this particular purpose. For the benefit of some of those who might have some questions may I say that this $3,000,000 does not build any public cancer hospitals. It is for clinical research development building solely.

As far as the Congress and this committee is concerned we have been very liberal in this program since its beginning. If you will turn to page 1357 of the hearings you will find where I have reviewed what happened. It started out in 1946 with $548,000 which is about a half million dollars. In 1947 the sum was trebled to $1,772,000. In 1948 that sum was multiplied almost 10-fold to the amount of $14,500,000. Here we now have $20,000,000, an expansion of 4,000 percent in a few short years. In view of those facts there can be no accusation justly made against this committee or the Congress that we are trying to scuttle the cancer research program.

The same is true with respect to heart disease and mental health. This committee has given these agencies every single cent which the budget approved and the budget represents the President's own financial program.

There are times when of course these programs appeal to the heart. There is no question about that. It has a tremendous heart appeal, but there are times when the cold facts of life and the condition of our own Nation, rapidly going down the road to bankruptcy, where every dollar you can possibly put off spending today until some future date—and that is all the action does—must be delayed.

There has already been somewhere in the neighborhood of sixteen or seventeen million dollars made available for these research facilities. That is no small figure in any program. While those agency officials were there, of course they were bound by the President's budget. As far as I can recall, there was not any specific statement made as to what program would be followed or where this money would be spent.

I was thoroughly in accord with making available the two and one-half million for research in cortisone and ACTH, because those have been sold to the American public as great miracle drugs. I am quite realistic, and I was not swept off my feet by all those claims, but I realize it is a great advance in science and that we should get into this program to let the public know what these remedies will eventually do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. These items, compound E and ACTH, have been represented that—and I was thoroughly convinced by the testimony given to us—they would play a great part in the cure and relief of many diseases with which the American public and people throughout the world are now suffering. The source of these drugs is very limited. You can only get it from ox bile, and in some cases from the bile of hogs. We were told that if we had all the bile available from all the cattle that it would only furnish a small part of the amount needed. Therefore we felt that if there could be developed some process by which we could get those drugs in a synthetic form, it would be a great contribution to the advance of medical science. So, while we have done that, I think it shows that the committee, in consideration of these items, was acting as fairly and impartially as it was humanly possible to do, despite the pull at our heartstrings that these claims have. I was quite happy to read that the cost will soon be cut in half, although even then it will still be high.

As you come down to these other programs, it is anticipated they will each have a similar amendment. In mental health we granted every single cent that the budget had approved; that the President's right arm had approved. The committee realized that somewhere, somehow, sometime the increase of spending must cease. The same thing is true of the National Heart Institute. This entire budget estimate was allowed. We realize that heart disease takes its toll, but, at the same time, if you will read the hearings, you will find that this is another program that has progressively increased, step by step and million by million, each year. You eventually arrive at a time when you have got to figure how much you have to spend, and try to allocate it as impartially as you can. That is exactly what the committee tried to do.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The point has been made that they have asked the budget for more than the budget gave them. Is it not a fact that every division of every department that comes before the Appropriations Committee is asked how much they asked the budget for, and invariably they asked the budget for more than the budget gave them? But in this case the committee gave these divisions every penny that the budget allowed them?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is exactly right. I am looking for the time—perhaps I am too optimistic in this—but I am looking for the time when some Government agency will come before an appropriation subcommittee of this Congress and suggest that they could get along with less than the budget allowed. We know from practical experience that these agencies always ask the budget for more than they really figure they are going to be actually allowed.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. I wonder if there is anything in the testimony to show how much the public is giving voluntarily to all these programs—the heart program, the cancer program, and the mental program.

Mr. SCRIVNER. My recollection is that Dr. Johnson was talking about that particular point. I cannot tell the gentleman the page in the hearings where that was being discussed, but he pointed out the amount of money being made available through all these programs. It was pointed out in the hearings that somewhere in the neighborhood of $25,000,000 or $35,000,000 was being raised by the National Cancer Society, the amount of money that is being raised through the Damon Runyon program that is spark-plugged by Walter Winchell—they

are all doing a fine job, and that is the way it should be; these programs should be supported by the people voluntarily, and if they want them badly enough they will voluntarily contribute their dollars. These great organizations have been doing a magnificent job in this field.

In this connection I might point out that there is another scourge that affects a lot of people, poliomyelitis, infantile paralysis. There are several civilian groups carrying on marvelous work in the infantile-paralysis program. They have not appealed to the Government making any request for Federal funds, for which they are to be highly commended. They will not appeal to the Federal Government if that program is carried on in every part of the country like it is in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., under the leadership of Joseph McDonald who makes the infantile-paralysis program his hobby. He is doing a magnificent job, putting in long and arduous hours. It is all being done with voluntary contributions. What this organization has done surely others can do.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on time for limiting debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, say 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am in no way trying to delay this bill. I was perfectly willing to sit here until 7 o'clock last night and if necessary every night to get this thing through, and I am willing to come in at 10 o'clock every day if necessary to complete it on schedule. But this is a very important subject and part of the bill. I have not objected when Members have sought an additional 5 minutes to present their arguments. I think the debate on this subject should run along for a little while and see how we get along with this particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might state that there are only four Members standing. With the limitation of 20 minutes that would mean 5 minutes for each Member.

Mr. CANNON. If only four Members desire to speak, would not 20 minutes be ample time?

Mr. FOGARTY. The reason I offer that suggestion is that we have been very liberal under the 5-minute rule in granting an extension to all those who wanted it, and on this particular amendment the two last gentlemen asked and received additional time. There are other amendments to follow this one. If this were the only amendment I could see that if only four desired to speak there would be no necessity for more than 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Would the chairman of the subcommittee be willing to agree that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end when the four who desire to speak have been recognized?

Mr. FOGARTY. I might agree, if the last 10 minutes could be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Is the gentleman for or against this amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am for the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. The committee, of course, is entitled to close, and the committee reserves the last 5 minutes against the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I object to any consent request at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. No consent request has been submitted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to have two facts in front of us and remember them very distinctly. Last year there was an appropriation of $19,000,486. This year the budget estimate was $20,086,000, an increase of $1,085,514. There was a contract authorization last year of $6,000,000 to permit the granting of allotments for construction to different institutions.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when we give an increase of $1,000,000 over last year's appropriation we are doing as much as we ought to do at this time. You cannot appropriate a lot of extra money to anyone of these agencies and have them absorb it efficiently and effectively at any given time.

I want to see this cancer proposition followed through. However, the most interesting fact about the cancer-research situation is not this appropriation, nor is it anything fostered by Federal grants. According to my understanding, it is the discovery of a small-town doctor who set up his own laboratory and did his own research. That seems to be the thing that has been most productive. In other words, it is the inspiration that comes to a man who is in this sort of thing, who feels that it is his hobby and that it is something he wants to work out.

These grants are all right, but, perhaps, they are being scattered over too big a field to be extremely effective. It seems to me that $20,086,000 is a lot of money. We are progressing. The Government is getting into this situation just as far as the funds that have been provided will permit. On the other hand, there is not in the testimony on the subject which I just finished reading a story of great advance. The great advance comes outside of the Government. I hope that great advance will continue and that the discovery that has been made will be very effective. I hope that some of these grants that are being made by the National Institutes of Health and the Cancer Institute will prove effective in finding something that may be of real service in stopping cancer.

I believe if it is used effectively that we will have accomplished something by this $20,000,000 appropriation. I do not think that it is going to add materially if we stretch ourselves too far in going beyond the budget estimate. I have never known the budget, in all of my experience with them over 20 appropriation bills I have listened to, to be niggardly in approaching any such financial problem. I believe they have offered enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. If I did not believe that they had done as much as they should do, and have given every opportunity to increase the funds, I would be willing to consider it. But, I do not believe that it can be effective in getting any more results by adding more money to this appropriation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in this total appropriation that he has referred to there is not one dollar provided for construction for research facilities?

Mr. TABER. I am; and I am also aware that what construction facilities have been provided run into a lot of money and that ordinary business judgment would require us, in approaching this problem, not to spread ourselves out, but to encourage the institutions that are already engaged in it, and see if we cannot get some results out of it.

The thing I was most impressed about in the testimony, and I read it all, was that there was no report of substantial progress on the part of these institutions. That is tremendously disturbing. I like to see these agencies of Government produce, and I believe that they would produce more by not spreading out into more construction. Now, there are an enormous number of these institutions, according to the hearings, and the table that was put in the record showed requests for grants of $12,000,000. There are an enormous number of those institutions that I believe could get the funds for any necessary construction that they want by an appeal to those people who would take an interest in that sort of thing. I believe if we concentrate our activities on the ones that are already at work, and do not do any more spreading out, that we might get more results out of this situation instead of less. Now, that is the thing that disturbs me tremendously. In other words, the poor devil off in the corner goes to work on his own hook, in his own private laboratory, and produces something, and the whole Government set-up, with $19,000,000 appropriated for grants for research and $6,000,000 for grants for construction, does not accomplish anything, and they have nothing to show for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, under House Resolutions 30 and 45, a subcommittee was set up of the House Labor

Committee to make a study of aid to the physically handicapped. I had the honor of being chairman of that subcommittee, which made an exhaustive study of the physically handicapped. Almost 500 witnesses appeared before the committee, among them doctors, scientists, and medical experts. Of the many disabling diseases studied by the committee were cancer and heart disease, with which we are dealing today.

My extreme interest in this matter stems from the information gathered by this committee. In the final report issued during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, many recommendations were made and much factual information expressed. One statement referred to these two diseases, and I wish to quote it from the report:

> Twice the number of people living in the State of Texas have heart disease; as many as live in Peoria, Ill., die every year from cancer.

This means that some 13,000,000 people have varying forms of heart disease, and 165,000 people die every year from cancer. Finally the report made this recommendation, which faces up squarely with what the Appropriations Committee is trying to do today:

> Research related to problems of health and disease should be centered in the United States Public Health Service, and the Public Health Service should continue to inform the Congress of the progress being made, and of the developing needs. The Health Service should be authorized to make use of universities, State agencies, and other mediums of research, and should be provided liberally with funds for such work.

It is of great comfort to me, as chairman of that former subcommittee, to see the vigorous efforts the Appropriations Committee has made in promoting this research, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] are to be complimented on their great interest in it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have had to do some maneuvering in the past 15 to 20 minutes. Everyone in the House knows I am for this amendment. I thought, regardless of whether I was for or against the amendment, that being chairman of the subcommittee I would receive the consideration of being the last speaker, to close debate on the amendment. I thought I would at least receive that consideration. Apparently, however, in view of the parliamentary situation, I am forced to speak at this time, and leave to the opposition to the amendment the last 5 minutes, although the chairman of the subcommittee will be on the other side of the amendment.

I concur in everything my colleague from Wisconsin has stated to the House this afternoon on these matters. In my humble opinion, there is not a Member of this House who knows more about the public health programs of this country than does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. This is not the first time I have made that statement on the floor. This is the fourth year in a row I have made that very same statement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my opinion, the words of the gentleman from Rhode Island are entirely correct. I served for 6 or 8 years with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] on that committee. I believe, as the gentleman from Rhode Island does, that he has done more for the general public health throughout the United States than perhaps any other one man.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not believe I have ever known a man who has put more time or more effort into a single subject than the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has into the problem of the health of the people of our Nation. I think he deserves a tremendous amount of credit for the work he has done for the past 10 years since he has been a member of this Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I was a member of the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee for 8½ years, and I served with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] from the time he went on until I left the committee in 1947. During all the time I have been on the committee, no abler man has ever served on the committee than the gentleman from Wisconsin, and that goes for his services on the entire Appropriations Committee. He has been particularly interested in social security and public health and has made a great contribution in those fields, which no one has equaled in my time in Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

I hope the gentleman from Michigan and the rest of his colleagues over on that side of the aisle who feel the same as he does and who have just listened to the gentleman's statement as one who knows the gentleman from Wisconsin so well and knows of the work he has done in this field will support his amendment when it comes up for a vote in a few minutes.

For the benefit of those on the other side of the aisle, may I say that I as chairman of this subcommittee am wholeheartedly supporting the amendment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has offered. I sincerely hope we will have the support of the Members on this side of the aisle for this most worth-while amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago when we had this appropriation bill before us in committee for consideration, after hearing all the testimony, after sitting for weeks, we began to mark up the bill, and we agreed unanimously that there was not enough money being appropriated in these three categories of public health, namely, cancer, heart, and mental health. So in order to bring in a presentable bill, one we could justify on the floor of this House, and at the same time show some economy, we agreed to cut other items in the public health field and elsewhere in the Federal Security Agency, where we felt that could be done, and, by so doing, we reallocated some of the funds to these three categorical programs.

We came out with a bill a year ago which had the unanimous approval of the committee. I was under the same impression this year, that we could get along as we did a year ago. I am sure if we could have worked our will in the marking up of this bill only a couple of months ago we would have had a bill on the floor of the House yesterday which would have been practically a unanimous report from our subcommittee as it was a year ago. Instead of going into our second day of debate that bill would have been read for amendment and would have been disposed of on yesterday and we would not be up here before you this afternoon unnecessarily prolonging this debate as it is being prolonged. We started to mark up the bill. I thought we were going to follow the same procedure that we did a year ago. As we went through the various items of the Public Health Service I agreed with the rest of the membership of the committee who wanted to show some economy in cutting certain phases of the public-health program to cut much more than I ordinarily would if I had thought for 1 minute that we were going to be outvoted on our own subcommittee on the reallocation of some of these cuts which were made all down the line to put back some of this money to continue these health programs. In the Public Health Service alone the committee bill reduces appropriated funds by $34,054,000. We had hoped we could reallocate within the over-all sum two or three million dollars for research in cancer and two or three million dollars for research in heart disease and two or three million dollars for research facilities in the mental-health program. But when we reached the marking up of the bill I must be frank and say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and I were outvoted and out-maneuvered on those particular programs. Let there be no mistake about that.

At that time the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] made known to the committee that he was going to offer these amendments when the bill was read for amendment. I made it known at the same time that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, would support the amendments. That is why I am in the well of the House now speaking to you in support of what I believe beyond question of doubt in anyone's mind is one of the most important phases of our economic life.

I know every Member of the Congress is conscious of the drive for economy. I do not blame you for being for economy. I do not think I know of one person in the Congress who is not in favor of economy. But I think you are making a mistake when you carry it too far and are going to economize against the millions of people who are suffering from that disease this very day as well as

Members of the House who may be afflicted by this dreadful disease this year or next year or within the next 10 years. How can we sit here this afternoon as human beings and legislate humanely and not give these great medical scientists who are spending 18 and 20 hours out of the 24 the help they need in their efforts to find the cause of this disease? If you cannot see your way clear to give these great men and women the paltry sum of $3,000,000 I think you had better think about it a second time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimons consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The fact of the matter is that with the influence of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, contributed to by the gentleman from Wisconsin, we cut appropriated items in this public-health bill for the Public Health Service nearly $35,000,000. Is that not true?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. And did so in items that were approved and submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, in order that we might have these funds available for transfer to these items of construction of facilities in the research program in cancer and in heart and in mental illnesses.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that when presentation was made to the Bureau of the Budget, the National Science Foundation bill was pending in the Congress?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. And the Bureau of the Budget took the position that if the National Science Foundation bill was passed in the form that they expected it to pass, construction funds would be appropriated to the National Science Foundation and not to any branch of the Public Health Service, and therefore they left these construction funds out of this bill on the anticipation that funds would be provided to the National Science Foundation for construction of its facilities. Now, that did not occur, and the Congress, in its wisdom, left this whole matter to the Public Health Service, and we now find ourselves in the position that no funds are available to provide construction facilities in connection with this research program.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRIEST] verify what I have said?

Mr. PRIEST. In every respect, and to state further that the conferees agreed this morning on the conference report on the Science Foundation bill. It was never intended that there would be any construction funds there. There are no construction funds in the Science Foundation bill.

Mr. KEEFE. And under that misapprehension—I talked with the Director of the Budget, and I know what I am talking about on this subject—we find ourselves completely out in the cold as a result of that transaction, and the construction of clinical facilities is going to be abated and stopped, and these research programs will be stopped, as far as providing facilities are concerned, unless these amendments are adopted. Is that not true?

Mr. FOGARTY. You are absolutely correct.

The Members of this House who vote against the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will be voting to stop this program right in its tracks. Let there be no mistake about it. We have supplied in this bill the cash to meet the contract obligations that have been incurred during the past 2 years. If that is allowed to stand, and Mr. KEEFE's amendment is not adopted, we are in effect stopping this program right here and now. That is something that I believe none of us wants to see done.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand, from what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, you had reduced the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget $35,000,000, and that if we adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which asks for $3,000,000 more, you will still be $32,000,000 below the Bureau of the Budget estimate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. And as a matter of economy, you are still doing a good job.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman spoke of the fact that this was a new attack on this problem, a mobilization of resources on a national scale; something that could not be done from a philanthropic standpoint. Is that true?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether I got the gentleman's point or not, but I do know that by the Federal Government's taking the lead in this field that people of means are willing to give a tremendous amount of money each year to these various programs. It was decided in our committee to include multiple sclerosis. When we tried to find out some information on what has been done about multiple sclerosis we were surprised to find out that there were no statistics to give any idea how many men, women, and children are afflicted with multiple sclerosis. There has been practically nothing done on research in that field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was testified before our committee only 2 months ago in that regard that there was a man living in New York City who was willing to contribute $10,000,000 to a research fund for multiple sclerosis, but there had been no fund set up, no step taken in this field. That is why the committee decided, as written in the bill, that multiple sclerosis should be included along with neurology that was included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], which was just adopted. If the Federal Government takes the lead, of course, we are not going to be spending all the money for the program but we will only be assisting in the over-all fight. Others will give vast sums of money to keep the program going.

Mr. JAVITS. And tremendous scientific resources will be available.

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively. It has been said many times that we can spend millions and millions of dollars on research and not get anywhere, but you and I both know research is a very costly thing. What would have happened with those people suffering from malaria, typhus, and similar diseases if it had not been for research? The cause of those diseases was not found overnight, but only after years and years of research. Today, as a result of that research of many years, we have those diseases under control. If we can do it in those diseases, we can do it with heart disease and cancer as well; but it is going to take time, and it is going to take money. There are many outfits in this country that spend tremendous sums of money on research. The Standard Oil Development Co. expended about $20,000,000 a year to develop better fuels, and that is only one single laboratory. All the way down the line industry has to spend money on research to keep alive, to keep competitive. What we are asking you to do is to provide this small amount of $3,000,000 to keep alive this cancer construction program that was started by this committee 3 years ago. It is not going to be a continuing program; as I stated before, there is going to be an end to it. It would have ended in this fiscal year had the Bureau of the Budget allowed the $9,000,000 asked for it, and we would have been out of the construction business as far as research, clinical facilities, and laboratories were concerned on cancer research alone. We are trying to end a program now that was started. We have spent already in the neighborhood of $16,000,000 on this program. Are you going to stop it and let some of the progress be lost, or are you going to go forward with it and finish it, and tell the people of this country that you are interested in doing something about finding out the origin of these leading causes of death?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I hope the gentleman is not carried away with the program against these particular diseases, cancer and heart disease, important and dangerous as they are. I would point out to the gentleman what has been done in

the field of tuberculosis and urge him to take comfort from the fact that the same arguments that are today being used against these great programs were then used against the program to combat tuberculosis. Through many years various programs of tuberculosis were coordinated and integrated into a program of counties, cities, State and Nation, until, as the gentleman knows, this disease has been practically wiped out. The same thing will have to be done in the case of cancer and heart disease.

Mr. FOGARTY. That, of course, is what we are trying to do; that is what we are urging, centralized programs of research; and that is what we will have if we are able to continue adequate support. They have $12,000,000 in applications from leading universities throughout the country pending at the present time for cancer construction grants.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Constant reference has been made to the voluntary funds that are being raised to fight various diseases, including cancer, heart, and so forth. Is there not ample testimony that the overwhelming percentage of the funds so raised goes for care and alleviation and very little of the funds go into research? What we are trying to get here is funds for research so that the other funds may be used for care and alleviation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. Let me make this point, and I am quoting from Dr. Rhodes of the Memorial Hospital of New York, who I think is one of the outstanding men in this particular field, as has been stated by other gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon. I know from the experience of meeting him during the past 4 years that he is not one who wants to see this country go broke but he does have a sincere desire to see money spent where it will do the most good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, he wants to see this money spent where it will do the most good and he is convinced above everything I can say to you this afternoon that this is absolutely necessary. He gave a little example in justification of such an expenditure for research. He said:

> I can give you one example of this situation. You as Members of Congress are committed to the care of veterans. Under the present circumstances something in the range of from 2 to 3 millions of veterans will be hospitalized or will be entitled to hospitalization for cancer. They will be in the hospital for an average of 1 year apiece. It will cost the taxpayers around $3,000 per case and you are already committed to the expenditure of something in the range of $3,000,000,000 for the care of these people unless advances can be made to reduce that financial burden.

What does he mean by that? The only way that we can reduce that financial burden is to find the cause of these diseases. We can appropriate millions and billions of dollars to build hospitals and staff them, but what good is it going to do if we allow these veterans, for instance, to stay in there for an average of a year at a cost of billions of dollars from now until time immemorial? Is that economy? That is what I term false economy if we attempt to vote down this amendment and ignore such examples as that given by some of our outstanding physicians, not only in our own country but in the world, who testified before our committee, man after man. They were not connected with any bureau here in Washington. They had no Government connections. They were speaking their own minds from their own experience and from the experience they had gathered through previous appropriations that this Congress had made to this end. I am willing to take their word for the need for continuance of this program. Not one man appeared before our committee, not one witness ever appeared before the committees since I have been a member of them for 4 years, who testified that this money is not needed, that this money is not essential, that this money is not necessary at this time.

O, Mr. Chairman, I know some people belittle research and talk about this or that discovery having been made by this little fellow working in a laboratory in a small town somewhere, perhaps out in the Midwest or somewhere else.

I do not say that many discoveries have not been made by individuals giving their lifetime to research out in some small country town, but I guarantee to you that if you were to go out and ask that individual that has been quoted here this afternoon who had made those discoveries if he thought it was necessary for the Federal Government to participate in a program like this, he would say, "Positively, we need more of it; there are not enough of us; we do not have the proper clinical facilities; we do not have the proper laboratory facilities. Give us something to work with and we will find the answer quicker than we will by working in the hole that I am working in at the present time." That is what we are attempting to do. We are attempting to justify this work that these individuals are putting into this cause that they are fighting for and working for by giving them the tools to work with to make these facilities more accessible to them. Is that asking too much of the taxpayers of this country? I do not believe it is. I am convinced beyond anything I may have said here today that if this issue were put up fair and square to every individual paying taxes into our Federal Treasury, that 98 percent of them would say, "Positively, I want that program continued; I think it is one of the best programs I ever heard of."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I object, unless there is an attempt made to restrict debate on this particular amendment. I have been here for an hour now, and we have had no vote, and we have been given no time. I agree with the subject matter, but I think the time has come to restrict the debate, and I object unless there is some attempt made to restrict it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. FORD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the most regrettable statements I have heard was made today that my very distinguished colleague, at whose feet I sat as a new Member here, and with whom I labored so much, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], is to leave this body. I have been asked by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK] to express to him our sincere regrets. Unfortunately, today we find ourselves on a different side of this question, but we do not differ with it fundamentally. I recognize that cancer is a dread disease. I know that it stalks along with death and reaches into many families, and I know that there are two approaches to this question: One is the emotional and one is the realistic approach. It is a popular thing to stand here and talk about cancer. It is a popular thing to say, as the distinguished majority leader said, "Something must be done about it," and the inference from that remark would be that nothing is being done, which is not the fact. I would love to agree with the very charming gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for whom I have the utmost esteem, but now let us look at this question and see what are the facts.

The budget estimate was granted in full—$20,086,000. That is what the testimony in the record substantiates, and your committee by a majority vote granted the full budget estimate. That proves that something is being done on this question.

In addition to that I call your attention to the fact that $14,000,000 has been given by the American public for cancer. Now it has been proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] that a great deal of that amount is not given for research. The fact is that five million plus out of the $14,000,000 fund is used for cancer research. In addition to that, the report, substantiated by the testimony, is that the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service and other agencies are working in this field. Heretofore the Congress of the United States has appropriated an additional $14,000,000 for contract authorizations. One of the great criticisms of the Appropriations Committee has been that it goes

into the field of legislation. I have heard Members from both sides say, "You have no right to do that," and we have no right to do it. Because of that, a point of order was raised which was sustained. In the basic legislation no provision was made for contract authorization. I say to the Members of this House, if you want to change the basic law, if you have a quarrel with it, the remedy is not to appropriate more money here, the remedy is to change the basic law. This committee has gone through this matter carefully and by a majority vote decided that $20,086,000, the full budget estimate, was the amount that was proper.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have been looking over the testimony on pages 523 and 530, and I find a very large number of institutions that have already had grants are included among those that have applications for additional grants for construction purposes. That looks like a rather unusual procedure.

Mr. McGRATH. I thank the gentleman.

Now we come to the question whether money and money alone is the answer to this question. Of course, a certain amount is necessary, and this committee tried to reach the amount that was proper. You cannot have a rule-of-thumb, but there is something that is more important than the dollar sign, and that is the human brain and the will to do things. I could cite on this floor many instances where, without one cent of Federal funds, great contributions were made to the field of science, Goodyear with the vulcanization of rubber, the monorail electric line, the sewing machine, the submarine, the reaper, the telegraph, and Coca-Cola. Listen to the story of penicillin.

The story of penicillin from the first delicate frond lifted from the growing mold by its discoverer, Sir Alexander Fleming, to the pure crystaline drug now ready for the purchaser, is more dramatic than any fiction. As related by J. D. Ratcliff in his book Yellow Magic, it is a story of headache, heartache, hard work, eased slightly by one fortuitous event.

This fortuitous event was the bit of mold that drifted through the open window of Alexander Fleming's workshop at St. Mary's Hospital in London in the fall of 1928. It settled onto a Petri dish and ruined one of the doctor's cultures. He was ready to discard the plate when he saw the green fragment. In his notebook he wrote:

> For some considerable distance around the mold growth the staphylococcal colonies were undergoing lysis [being dissolved]. What had formerly been a well-grown colony was now a faint shadow of its former self.

Fleming's chance mold was penicillium notatum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia ?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at the end of the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. So, Mr. Chairman, I close these remarks with this thought. I ask you to keep in mind that if you vote against this amendment you are doing no injustice to those who are suffering with cancer. We are giving the full amount recommended by the President's budget. This additional $3,000,000 was never talked about in our committee as far as authorization was concerned. You can go back to your people with your head high and your conscience clear, and you can say, "I voted for the necessary funds for the people of this country, and I did not go over and beyond that." If you do that, you will have discharged your duty and your obligation both to those who are ill and to your National Government, which today has a serious fiscal problem.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. We did discuss the $3,000,000 on this construction facility.

Mr. McGRATH. I repeat, I said an authorization. It was only discussed from the question of contract authorization. I said in my statement we did not discuss it in terms of authorization. The gentleman is correct when he refers, however, to contract authorization.

Mr. FOGARTY. Does not the gentleman agree that the first time we discussed this he agreed at first to go along with the continuation of this contract authority for this construction?

Mr. McGRATH. We discussed it but we did not agree definitely. From a fiscal viewpoint, we cannot prejudge any one item until we determine what the entire bill contains. Then, when you have the sum total, you must compare it with the national income. That is the only sensible way to handle appropriation matters.

Mr. FOGARTY. Will not the gentleman admit that what we are trying to do this year, as members of the committee, is the same thing we did a year ago when we came in with a unanimous report? Did we not work it out that way, the same as we tried to work it out this year?

Mr. McGRATH. That is true. I assure the gentleman that, although we find ourselves in disagreement, I am supporting the majority of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I commend the gentleman for the sound statement he has made on this amendment. As one who has had a good deal to do with cancer, both as a patient and a physician, in reputable and highly respected medical institutions, may I say that one's natural tendency is to vote more money, in the belief that just to provide more money will somehow solve the problem, which is what everyone wants. I believe that is not the right way to approach the problem. The right way is the one that the gentleman has discussed here, and that is to provide whatever amount is necessary to carry on a balanced and well-thought-out and well-managed program that is what the budget estimates and the committee have suggested. I believe the advice that the gentleman has given to the committee is the correct advice and if followed is the way to bring about the greatest progress in conquering this, one of our greatest health and human problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEEFE and Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 49, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the act with respect to mental diseases, $2,944,000, of which not less than $2,375,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer amendments to this section relating to mental health activities, and also with respect to the amount to provide facilities for research into heart and the diseases of the circulation.

It is perfectly obvious, in view of the discussion in connection with the amendment first offered, that there is no possibility of securing any favorable consideration by this House at this time for either of the increases that would be asked for in cases of mental illness research and heart disease research.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman intend to offer his amendments, nevertheless? I hope he will.

Mr. KEEFE. No. I shall not offer them.

During my membership in the House I have never tried to do what appears to be a futile thing, just merely to make a record. So I want those who have been so very kind as to join in an effort to put this bill in shape so that it will properly and truly represent the interests of those who are interested in those programs to know that I appreciate their help. I shall not offer the amendments, but I shall defer to anyone else who desires to do so. I do not want to take the time of the House in prolonging the debate, because it is perfectly obvious that the House is not in any mood to increase this bill by one single penny. If there is any other Member of the House who is interested in this program who desires to offer these amendments, I will defer

to the gentleman from Rhode Island in that regard.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, even though the gentleman from Wisconsin and I have not agreed on this amendment, and some other matters, I do want, as best I can in my humble way, to pay a tribute of respect, high regard, and great esteem to him. The gentleman from Wisconsin is not only a fine American but he is also a great legislator. He has contributed much, not only to his State and to his community but to this Nation. If it were just a matter of personal feelings for the gentleman from Wisconsin, I would gladly have gone along with any reasonable increase that he might have suggested. It has not been because there has been any lack of regard or warm friendship for him that has caused me to take a position differing from his.

I feel sad in my heart that he is leaving the Halls of Congress where he has done such a magnificent job. The gentleman from Wisconsin, in my opinion, is without a peer in debate among the men on this floor. If I could just express myself, if I could just get over to the House and to the American public my points of view with the forceful eloquence that he does, I would indeed be very happy.

So it was with deep sincere regret, Mr. KEEFE, that I learned you have found it necessary to leave this service in the House of Representatives. As you go you can always rest assured that during the remainder of your life you will have following you my very best personal wishes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that my colleague from Wisconsin would offer the other amendments, but apparently in his judgment it seems futile at this time to attempt to get this House to do something for these particular programs of public health. The next amendment that he was going to offer touches one of the most sorry predicaments we find ourselves in in the country. I wish only that all Members of Congress could have listened to the more than 20 outstanding men in the field of mental illness in this country who testified before our subcommittee. I am sure that had the entire membership of this Congress been able to listen to the testimony of other physicians and leading medical scientists throughout the country during our hearings they would have voted for the last amendment. I am amazed to think of such inattention to this matter of mental illness. It is one of the most depressing things that the people of the country are facing. About 60 percent or so of all hospital beds today are taken up with mentally ill patients. Some of these people linger there at least 10 years; they are forgotten; nobody ever goes to see many of them, and nobody seems to care about most of them; nothing much is being done for them. You will find that in practically every State of the the Union the mental hospitals are the poorest State-owned shacks there are. Once a person gets in there he seems to be forgotten.

It was not until 2 years ago that this subcommittee again attempted to take the lead in this field and provide money for traineeships, for fellowships, and for scholarships in order to get more trained personnel into this field. That is the same attempt that we have been making in the field of cancer and heart.

But in view of the tremendous number who voted against the last amendment perhaps it is useless to offer the amendments and take up the time of the House. I think, however, the facts should be brought out and drawn to your attention because, if in some future weeks you have the opportunity, you should visit the mental institutions in your own district and see how conditions are there, see how the people are being treated. Then come back here and I can guarantee that you will want the Federal Government to do something, because the States are not taking care of the situation. Make no mistake about that.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and equipment of treatment building: For construction and equipment, including administrative expenses, of a treatment building (providing separate male and female facilities), and demolition and removal of those buildings designated as Oaks and Toner Buildings with their appurtenances and attachments, within the grounds of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, $1,500,000, to remain available until expended; and, in addition, contracts may be entered into in an amount not to exceed $3,938,000 toward completion of such work at a total cost not to exceed $5,588,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, for preparation of plans and specifications for two treatment buildings, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall be available for all of the foregoing purposes, and any part of such consolidated appropriation may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to highlight a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island who called attention to the fact that in this country today over 60 percent of all hospital beds are occupied by mental cases. What are we doing about it? I see my friends who are so economy minded raising no question about the millions that are in this paragraph entitled "St. Elizabeths Hospital." They are perfectly willing to go on year in and year out to build buildings out there, vote to care for these mentally insane, but they are not willing to vote for a dollar to increase the research facilities that might ultimately empty those hospitals and reduce the tremendous expenditure that is here before you now.

Look at the expenditures to maintain St. Elizabeths Hospital, if you please, one item $1,948,000, $100,000, $406,000, $1,500,000, $3,998,000. Those are the appropriations for St. Elizabeths Hospital, year in and year out duplicated in every mental institution throughout America. The tragedy of it all is the utter futility of getting Members of the Congress to see how absurd these so-called talks of economy are in the face of that situation. Why, I can say to you that in one State today due to the utilization of new discoveries in the use of penicillin for the treatment of syphilis, congenital syphilis, if you please, they are lifting out of these institutions people who have been there consigned for life as incurable mental cases and restoring them to an active place in society. The research in that field has just started.

But, no, in face of all the medical testimony of all the great scientists of this country, we listen to some pseudo-scientists and doctors here on the floor of the Congress who discount all they say and say they have not accomplished anything, therefore we must not spend any more money.

All I have to say is that I am glad I have been able to play a small part in an effort to try to relieve that situation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman recall the account of the recent mental institution fire in Pennsylvania, a fire in which many patients perished because they were chained to concrete floors due to the fact they could not provide adequate help?

Mr. KEEFE. Why, the story is so tragic I hate to talk about it. You can repeat it in every State throughout the Union. We have been fighting year in and year out to build up a program that will do the research necessary to relieve your veterans' hospitals and your other hospitals of this ever-growing cost to the taxpayers of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. What do we find? Thumbs down. Well, I hope the other body will display more genius in its attack on this problem than has been indicated here today. I want to stand on the proposition that the Congress of the United States inspired in a nonpartisan, bipartisan manner, if you please, in the past under the leadership of the gentleman from Rhode Island, contributed to by the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has played a part in the development of this program. Those who want to see it stopped can accept that responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I just want to make one observation that this program was instituted by the gentleman speaking in the well of the House 2 years ago when he was chairman of the subcommittee, and I have just followed along with the program which was initiated and started by him. I know that he has played no small part in the building up of this program. He has played a tremendous part in it, and I do know of so many things that he has done that it is unheard of. I know there are Members of Congress that have come to him for information and help, something that they could not get from the ordinary practitioner. I know that he had an experience in his own family where the ordinary practitioner did not know anything about the case at all, but because of the gentleman's knowledge of the subject and his knowledge of these other men that he had been in contact with and had secured information from, that he was able to take care of two or three very dire situations. I think he deserves the commendation of this House for the tremendous part that he has played in building up the program that has been initiated by this committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, the gentleman is very, very kind, and I have no regrets, because you mark what I tell you. The people of America are going to demand that this program go forward, and will hold responsible those who have curtailed or hampered it. Make no mistake about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say that only this morning I was talking with an official of the Veterans' Administration when the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned the hospital in Pennsylvania where, I think he said, some 10 patients were burned to death. Five of those ten were women veteran patients. They were hospitalized there because there were no other beds. I rejoice that the House in its wisdom passed the bill for the construction of 16,000 beds just the other day.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Since I made my observation regarding the institution in Philadelphia where they had a terrible fire, I have talked with some of my colleagues of the Pennsylvania delegation who tell me that the State of Pennsylvania itself has a most forward-looking program in this regard, and I want to be recorded as reporting their comments.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad to hear that. I would also like to state that in research work it is just as important to know the cases that will not be helped by penicillin or aureomycin and the other powerful drugs. It is just as important to know that as it is to know the cases that they will cure, because sometimes, in certain instances, those powerful drugs hurt people very seriously, and that is why the research work is so terribly important. Medicine is not an exact science. We are always learning.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I would just like to say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that for the first time since he has been a Member of the House has he made a statement which was not based on the fact. I realize that that information was merely given to him. Now, I must, out of an abundance of caution, point out that by no means is the State health program and mental institution program of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania forward looking. The contrary is the fact.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman did not mean that it is not forward looking, but that the buildings were inadequate and not fireproof, and that is true with a great many places. Unfortunately, some of our Army and Navy hospitals are not the kind of construction in which to take care of mental cases. I think that probably is the point the gentleman from New Jersey is bringing out. He did not mean to say the care of mental cases is backward in Pennsylvania. But we are learning every day about the care of mental cases, of cancer cases, and the other very serious cases.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have remained here on the floor since this bill was started. I have voted for every motion to cut and I have voted against every motion to increase. I am not one of those who blames all the ills of our deficit on the Appropriations Committee. I think we are inclined to kick them around too much. There is something more far-reaching, and that is our basic opinions and convictions concerning government.

We do not pay enough attention to authorization bills. We do not determine well enough what functions of Government should be left to the States and localities and what ones can be undertaken by the Federal Government.

About 3 or 4 years ago the question of putting the Federal Government into the hospital business was before this Congress. We need hospitals in this country. I felt then and I feel now, however, that the localities, private individuals, and the States, were better able to do the job financially than the Federal Government. I voted against that authorization bill. I voted against the extension of it earlier in this Congress. It was supposed to be a $75,000,000-a-year program. That has been doubled. We are going to go on and on and on, and there is no end to it. We have to decide which ones of these things are Federal responsibilities and which ones are State responsibilities.

We are about to read that section of the bill pertaining to social security. I call your attention to an item that is noticeable by its absence. There will be paid out in benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program this year $725,000,000. It is not mentioned in the bill. I think perhaps that is the wrong procedure. It may some day be challenged in court. But I am not going to talk about that now. I want to get back to this business of authorizing.

When this social security program of ours matures, when another generation stands where we stand now in this House, making appropriations, they will have to appropriate somewhere between 12 and 20 billion dollars a year to pay for that program. It is a contractual obligation. This Congress has taken action which will require the expenditures of a minimum of 12 billions a year for social security 40 years from now. The taxpayers of that day will not have anything to say about it. The Congress of that day will not have a voice in the amount. It is in the nature of a contractual obligation. Do not misunderstand me—our old people are entitled to generous care. But the point is we have no right to legislate at this time fixing an obligation on future generations which they will have to meet. We are alarmed over the deficit this year. Authorizations have been put through which will call for a budget in the years that lie ahead many billions of dollars more than it is today. Present trends indicate the expenditures of the Federal Government will go up and not down. The Congresses to come after the present Congress will in many fields find themselves helpless because of programs that have been started.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the old-age survivors insurance program is not financially self-sustaining under the tax formula which our committee approved and which the House passed?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted that the gentleman asked that question. I hope I may have time to answer it. We have no assurance that the progressive tax rate provided for will go into effect. That is number one. Secondly, when we get that money in what shall we do with it? If we keep it in cash in the Treasury the effect on our economy is bad. That cannot be done. If we authorize the Administrator of Social Security to invest it in other than Government bonds he would soon control all the industry of the country or at least a great portion of it. That leaves but one place to put this so-called reserve of Social Security. That is in Government bonds. Let us assume that 20 or 40 years from now there are so many bonds in this reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the recipients under social security have to be paid in dollars. The old gentleman or widow or orphan who qualifies for

benefits has to be paid in dollars. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me on that. There are only three ways to get dollars to pay those benefits, just three ways. First, taxation in the particular year involved. Second, issue more bonds and borrow money from the people to pay those bonds, or, three, some form of inflation or printing-press money. It does not make any difference whether you have 1 warehouse or 20 warehouses of Government bonds in your reserve—when the benefits are due you have to pay the benefits in dollars which means either more taxation, more borrowing, or some form of inflation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The point I wanted to make to the gentleman was that this body had an opportunity to pass upon that issue. Only 12 members of the Republican Party voted against it and only 2 Democrats. I ask in that bill, H. R. 6000, whether or not it is a fact that the tax formula was set up to make this program financially self-sustaining. Is that not true?

Mr. CURTIS. I think that depends on definition. I do not think so but I respect the gentleman's opinion when he says it does.

Mr. CARROLL. Well, is it not true that insofar as the employer is concerned there is an excise tax levied upon him and upon the employee there is a gross income tax. The merging of those two taxes, assuming that future Congresses accept their responsibility by maintaining the tax formula will make this program financially sound.

Mr. CURTIS. No, I do not accept the statement of the gentleman as a sound proposition. Neither do the exponents of social security. Mr. Altmeyer has for a long time advocated one-third of the benefits being paid out of the general Treasury. At times he has increased that to one-half, I believe.

The individuals receiving these benefits now have not paid for their benefits. Take a banker in my district who this year reaches the age of 65. Under this bill, he and his wife can draw $100 a month. His life expectancy is 12 years and hers is 14 years. Do you know how much he has paid in under this Social Security Act? Three hundred and ninety dollars—less than 4 months of the benefits that he and his wife will draw for a period of 12 or 14 years. The other people are not paying for their benefits.

This program stands today where the old-time assessment insurance companies stood when they started. They were taking in a lot of members. They were young men. The death rate was low. There were few claims. The money rolled in. They had a big reserve. But the time came when they could not pay, and when the older people were frozen out. Out of every five people over 65 years today only one draws insurance benefits. So they say, "Look at the huge reserves we are building up." The day will come in this program when five out of five people over 65 will be eligible to draw benefits. That is when the program will mature, and that is when the Congress will have to secure, somewhere, somehow, $12,000,000,000 or $20,000,000,000 to pay those people.

I think it is a serious question whether or not the Government can maintain a reserve system of this volume. I think there are some obstacles to it that we should consider.

Let me say again, I do not think we should be harsh with the old people. My answer to it is this: The people today who are blessed by having good health and a job should take care of those who are unable to produce for themselves today. We should leave to other generations the same responsibility, but we should not fix now upon the generations to follow a contractual obligation, an insurance contract that they cannot carry out with solvency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to pose as an actuarial expert, but to point out some simple fundamental facts which I think the Members may have gotten a misapprehension about from the remarks made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

It has been stated for many years that the social security fund has been raided for the general expenses of the Government. That is not inherent in what the gentleman said. I rise only to correct any impression that the Members may have gotten in that regard, and to request permission to extend, as a part of my remarks, a radio broadcast I made recently, in which I quoted from the Wall Street Journal upon this subject, giving the reasons for its belief that our social-security fund is entirely sound. I believe that article appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 9 of this year.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I read that article. It is a very well-considered article. But in addition to that there was appointed a joint committee, composed of leading men of this Nation, and they submitted a report, which is a congressional document, which has presented the same theory as stated by the Wall Street Journal and all other thinking editorials on this subject, saying, of course, that the building up of this reserve and the handling of it under this trust fund was proper and followed the same procedure as that of all great insurance companies.

Mr. JACOBS. That is correct; in other words, it amounts to exactly the same thing as an insurance company; an insurance company having funds to invest invests them in Government bonds. When the time comes to pay the benefits under the insurance policy issued by this private insurance company, the private insurance company does not have the money in its vaults to pay the benefits; it has bonds, exactly like the social security fund has bonds.

The Government has not raided the social security fund. If any mistake has been made, the mistake was made when we failed to collect adequate taxes during the war to pay the expenses of the war as we fought it.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from Nebraska, I think, made a very good point, and we ought to recognize it and clear it up. After having established this tax formula under House bill 6000 and the Congress fails to go ahead by way of failing to continue a progressive tax it is true that there would be a deficit, and it is true that eventually some day out of the Treasury we shall have to appropriate huge sums of money. That is why Congresses to come must not fall into the mistake they did before when they froze that tax.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman for his fairness. I do not want to be misunderstood. I have not shared the criticism of others that these social security taxes were misappropriated when they were placed in Government bonds; I think that is the only thing that could be done with them. They could not be retained in cash. I do not want the Social Security Administrator investing them in outside securities. But I do believe that we shall have to agree that as benefits are to be paid out they are going to be paid in dollars and that it becomes a moot question how many bonds are in the reserve account, because to get those dollars they will either have to sell more bonds, or through current taxation, or else do it through some funny inflation deal. I do not believe you can come to any other conclusion.

Mr. JACOBS. Under leave to extend my remarks I ask to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast over radio station WISH, Indianapolis, for March 18, 1950:

RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. ANDREW JACOBS, OF INDIANA, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1950

One of the great public controversies of the day is the question: "Is social security a fraud?" Some say it is; others say it is not.

Of course, there are those people who claim that your Government has been a complete fraud ever since the Democrats took over. But we will disregard those folks as partisans. I am addressing myself, not to those partisans who would see nothing but evil in anything this administration does, but rather to those folks who are interested in the truth, and who reject partisanship as an evil sufficient unto itself.

In what respect do these folks claim social security is a fraud? In the first instance, they claim that it is fraudulent because the benefits are not paid to anyone who earns more than $14.99 per month in covered employment. This prohibition remained in the law under the terms of H. R. 6000, the bill to amend Social Security, in the form in which the measure passed the House, but the amount was increased to $50 per month. They claim that since the beneficiary paid for his old-age and survivors insurance, he is entitled to it regardless of how much he earns.

This assertion seems reasonable on its face. However, we must take into account the terms of the insurance. In other words, when you buy insurance from a private company, you had better read the fine print. In this case you don't have to read fine print, for the terms are all printed in the same size print.

And here it is. People who study insurance questions are known as actuaries. They know that a certain number of people will die each year; a certain number will have living husbands and wives at a certain age; that a certain number will be still able to work and occupied in trades and professions where their services will be still in demand at retirement age, etc.

We know that those persons engaged in trades and professions wherein they can still earn a substantial livelihood at age 65 will not retire for the small benefit they will derive from old-age and survivors insurance, unless they are otherwise disabled.

So this is one of the factors considered in fixing the premium charged for the insurance. The premium in this case is generally known as pay-roll deduction.

In other words, the terms of this insurance could be changed so that those who continue to work could draw it. However, in such case the premiums or pay-roll deduction would have to be more.

This is true because the premiums or pay-roll deductions must be large enough to pay the benefits.

If those who are able to, and continue to work, draw benefits, then the outgo from the fund would be greater, and the pay-roll deductions would likewise have to be more.

If the Government changed the plan and thus charged more premium, the same people who are stirring up distrust, because those continuing to work do not draw the benefit, would then attempt to stir up animosity because the premiums were raised.

However, the Government has no choice in this matter. It must do one or the other because the old-age and survivors insurance program is a sound program financially.

And this brings us to the next complaint which has served to confuse the public. Senator CAPEHART has used this assertion more frequently than any individual of whom I know. He has said that the social-security program is a fraud because the Government spends the money collected as premiums on unrelated projects. In other words, the Senator's assertion has been that the Government takes the social-security funds and spends the money on general Government activities and consequently the money is all gone—it isn't there any more for the beneficiaries—and the people will have to be taxed all over again to pay the benefits. The difficulty is that the Senator just doesn't understand the matter at all. Rather than use my own reasoning and logic to answer him, I would direct your attention to an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 9, 1950. This article blows the Senator's argument into a cocked hat. It appears on the editorial page and is written by Mr. F. A. Korameyer, who says:

"Letters to this newspaper from subscribers, among other things, show that misunderstanding of the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors insurance of the Social Security Act is still widespread. Many persons still believe what some insurance company officials asserted in the middle 1930s, that the accumulation of a pension reserve fund invested in United States bonds was purposeless, that the reserve was a fiction and that it could actually result in the cost of pensions being paid twice over. Those insurance company men have long since realized their error; a sort of vicarious recantation came in 1945 from a committee representing the 3 principal associations of life companies. The committee said, in part:

"'The first step in understanding this problem is to agree that pay roll taxes are collected so that workers may currently make a contribution to the support of the OASI system from which they hope later to benefit. The money might conceivably be held in the form of cash to be used when needed. However, the Government must currently borrow large sums, and will later need large amounts for refinancing at least some of its rapidly maturing obligations. It is reasonable for the OASI system, if it has funds available, to take advantage of this opportunity to earn interest on its money by purchasing Government bonds.

"'Furthermore, the apparent double taxation does not involve an avoidable burden if it can be assumed that the excess of income over outgo is used by the Government for some essential purpose, and does not by its existence and availability stimulate unnecessary expenditures. The purchasing of bonds by the OASI system means that, later on, when it needs money in excess of pay-roll tax receipts in order to pay benefits, the interest on the bonds (raised, of course, by general taxation) will be available to meet the additional benefit load. However, if the bonds had not been bought by the system but were in the hands of the public, then not only would the interest on the bonds have to be raised by general taxation, but additional general taxes would have to be levied to cover the deficit in OASI operations. Current pay-roll taxation to create a reserve fund, therefore, makes possible the use of interest which the Government ! as to raise by taxation anyway for a purpose which would otherwise require further general taxation on its own account.'"

Mr. Korsmeyer then comments that Brookings Institution of Washington had recently published a work incorporating an article which "unfortunately repeats the now stale errors about the alleged illusion (i. e., misbeliefs) of an old-age and survivors insurance trust fund." He points out that the Brookings Institution, by a foreword, actually disclaims responsibility for the article. That is to say, Brookings Institution published the article but obviously disagreed with it, as did Mr. Korsmeyer, who refers to it as a "weirdly untrue statement."

He further says about this article:

"The authors do not support their assertions that the Government bonds in the pension reserve have less value than fresh toilet paper."

Mr. Korsmeyer than concludes by saying:

"There is much that is open to criticism in OASI and the changes therein proposed by pending bills. But it is impossible to assert rationally that part of the national debt is rubbish and the rest is prime investment."

Then is social security a fraud? These charges must stand or fall on the facts. Senator CAPEHART says that pay-roll taxes have been collected for social security and that "the Government has used the money for other purposes." Thus he charges in effect that your Government has embezzled the social security trust fund.

Now what are the true facts? The Social Security Act provides that all taxes collected to finance the old-age and survivors' insurance program must be transferred to a trust fund and kept separate. The Secretary of the Treasury is the trustee of this fund. He is directed by law to invest the money, not currently needed, in interest-bearing Government securities.

This is exactly what the Congress of the United States directed and it is exactly what the Secretary of the Treasury has done.

The social-security program is an insurance system. Thus, by investing its reserve in Government bonds, it has done exactly what private-insurance companies and trustees have done, generally by legal direction. Of course, the Government will be required to collect taxes to redeem all of its bonds. These taxes are for the purpose of paying the Government's debt, whether it be a debt to the social-security fund, or to a private-insurance company, a bank, the administrator of an estate, or you as an individual bondholder. The obligation is exactly the same in each case.

The charges of fraud are based upon this reasoning: "The Government must now collect income taxes, etc., to redeem bonds owned by the social security trust fund. Therefore, the Government is collecting taxes to pay your social security for which you have already been taxed by the pay-roll tax." Therefore, say the opponents of this administration, the social-security fund is in debt to you and has nothing with which to pay its debt to you (its ownership of Government bonds being momentarily disregarded).

All right, let's apply this to your insurance company. You buy a policy of insurance. You pay premiums. Thousands of others do likewise in the same company. The insurance company accumulates a reserve from these premiums. It invests this reserve in Government bonds. It owes you the benefits provided in your policy, but it, like the social-security fund, doesn't have the money (also momentarily disregarding its ownership of Government bonds) to pay these benefits.

You pay income, excise, and other taxes to the Government, and the Government uses that money to redeem bonds owned by your insurance company.

Question: Are you being taxed to pay the benefits due to yourself from your insurance company?

The truth of the matter is you are being taxed to pay your Government's debt. Your Government incurred this debt by borrowing the money from your insurance company, from you, your bank, your neighbors, and your social-security fund; to pay its expenses, principally the costs of the war, including current preparation for defense. The cost of the war would have to be paid whether these bonds were held by the social security trust fund, or by some bank or insurance company. The Government's borrowing of the money through the sale of bonds is not and never was in any way dependent upon the existence of the social-security program. Had there been no social-security program, the same amounts of money would have been borrowed by the Government from other sources. The social-security fund derives additional revenue from interest on the bonds, which interest would otherwise go to private investors. Would these critics expect the social-security fund to remain uninvested?

The war cost about $350,000,000,000. The cost was higher because of inflation. Huge profits and earnings resulting from war work and scarce civilian production caused inflation.

The Government borrowed $210,000,000,000 of the three hundred and fifty billions with which to pay the costs of the war. Had the Government raised that two hundred and ten billions by taxes, inflation would have been whipped and our public debt would be $210,000,000,000 less today. Your Federal debt is $256,627,417,985 and this includes the amount of bonds held by the social security trust fund, as well as your own bonds.

No, the fraud is not with the Government, rather the fraud is found in the argument. The mistake was not made by the social-security trustee. The mistake was made by the Government in not convincing the people they should pay more taxes out of their abnormal war profits and earnings during the war so as to have paid the costs of the war rather than to have left it a burden to the returning veteran and future generations.

And the blame, to a great extent, must rest upon the people themselves for resisting higher taxes at a time when such taxes would have reduced inflation and the public debt.

Watch carefully those who charge this fraud against social security. You will observe that they will never mention the war-incurred debt, which is the other half of the truth.

The most vicious falsehood is generally a half-truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary expenses in carrying out the act of April 9, 1912, as amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instruction, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That any State plan which provides standards for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State shall be approved.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, during the past decade the birth rate in this country has risen rapidly. Inevitably we must be concerned with what the future holds for these millions of children who will become, as they grow older, the inheritors of our democracy. At a time when all the world is in chaos, we cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that the basic strength of democracy lies in the vitality and well-being of each succeeding new generation.

While the birth rate of the United States has reached unexpected heights, the appropriations of that division of government charged with working directly with the problems of children has lagged behind. This year, for example, the appropriations for the Children's Bureau recommended to the House by the Committee on Appropriations is for $1,500,000, which represents a decrease of approximately $20,000, from the sum recommended in the President's budget. While the budget recommendation itself appeared on the surface to provide an increase of approximately $40,000 over the previous year's budget, it actually represented an increase of less than $3,000, because of salary increases established by law. The end result, if the figure of $1,500,000 is approved, will be a net loss in funds available to this important agency. I, for one, do not propose to be panicked by cries of economy into failing to discriminate between trimming off the fat and cutting into bone and sinew. In my judgment, money spent for the betterment of our children's health and welfare is the best investment that this country can make. There is no substitute for strong and healthy citizens.

A small fraction of the sum spent for a single improvement on a river or in a harbor would make possible research of the highest importance. Here is one example of the kind of return we can expect from an investment in the work of the Children's Bureau; approximately 40,000 premature babies are born each year. Of this number about one-third die in their first year of life. There is good reason to believe that research into the causes of prematurity would repay the investment a hundredfold in lives saved.

It is urgently necessary that now, when the demand on our resources throughout the world and the United States is so great, we exercise our best judgment in choosing those fields in which money can be spent most profitably. In my judgment, the Children's Bureau is one of the agencies in government doing a most valuable and essential job, and I earnestly hope that its appropriations will keep pace with its increased responsibilities.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to continue for a moment the discussion participated in by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Indiana. I think the gentleman from Nebraska observed that he would not want these funds invested in so-called private securities. If there were no Federal debt at the present time, in what would our present life-insurance companies invest their reserves?

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman will have to realize that a Government insurance program, a social insurance program, covering 150,000,000 people, and that insurance company having the power to tax and the power to spend for all other things, the parallel with an insurance company is not an accurate one.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us assume now that the social security proposal absorbs all Government bonds outstanding. If we are ever going to get on a sound financial basis that might happen. Would the gentleman care to comment on a situation of that kind?

Mr. CURTIS. That is why I advocate a pay-as-you-go program and let us do as good a job as we can today for the old people of the present time and pay for it now. Let us make no promises for the future. I am sure those who follow us will do the same thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted the gentleman to get in the record. Let us go one step further. Let us assume this reserve fund reaches $45,000,000,000. That is within the concept of the proposition, is it not?

Mr. CURTIS. The social-security program goes on forever.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us take the figure that was discussed in the committee, $45,000,000,000. That is not a big figure is it?

Mr. CURTIS. No; it is one-fourth of that now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us assume we create a reserve of 45 or 60 or 87 billion dollars, which is within view we will say, what is to prevent a Congress at that time disposing of the securities then in the hands of the Social Security Administration to raise money for some other emergency of the Nation, taking those securities in that fund at that time and selling them on the open market for the people to raise funds for some other purpose? What is to prevent that?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, there is not anything in the concept to prevent it, is there?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I think so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there?

Mr. CURTIS. These bonds belong to the social security trust fund.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. How many bonds there are is a moot question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When this reserve fund gets to the point where it can absorb all Government issues outstanding. That is the point I am making.

Mr. CURTIS. There are those who believe that that was the reason this particular plan was adopted, thinking they could pay off the national debt with it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like for someone someday who believes that such a thing is possible to take the floor and demonstrate on cross-examination that any of these schemes that have ever been proposed in connection with social security is sound from an economic standpoint.

Mr. CURTIS. Lest we be in danger of making an attack on the old people, I want to point out that, under the bill the House passed, 10 years from now there will be almost as many people over 65 outside these insurance benefits as there are now. At the present time there are about 8,400,000 of our people not eligible. Ten years from now there will still be 7,200,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You have millions of people all over the United States who at no time have been permitted to participate by making contributions for their own benefit.

Mr. CURTIS. Why, it is definitely a lottery.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. Some people are getting a 40-to-1 shot.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from Nebraska said that those who are now producing should support those who are now not producing.

Mr. CURTIS. Not able to produce.

Mr. VORYS. I want to bring up the point that the only people in the country who can support those who are now not producing are those who are producing and unless that support is expressed through taking from those who are now producing part of their produce by way of taxes currently we are getting into an inflationary situation where we are trying to get something for nothing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The able gentleman from Nebraska when he was making his presentation mentioned a situation with which we would be faced when, instead of one out of five of the people drawing benefits over age 65, five out of the five would be drawing them. Now I rather think that that situation would never arise, as I understand the picture, because—and I address my question to the

gentleman from Nebraska—is it not a fact that even under the social-security program now envisioned there would never come a time when more than, let us say, two out of the five would be drawing benefits?

Mr. CURTIS. I think a more correct statement would be the time when five out of five are eligible for benefits. Now if they do not choose to retire, that is a different thing, but about 40 years from now they will be eligible, and that is when your costs will be up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the chapter be considered as read and be open to amendments at any point thereof, and subject to points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the chapter includes through page 155; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BIEMILLER. And the request does definitely preserve my right to raise a point of order against any section in the chapter?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLOOD. At this time, in view of the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island, if I have a point of order to make against any section of the chapter, am I permitted to make that point of order if the unanimous consent request is granted?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on page 154, line 8, against the language from the colon to the period on line 13 on the ground that this language constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill in that it repeals existing legislation; that it goes beyond the scope of this bill, and that it goes beyond the appropriation provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this language in the appropriation bill was put in here by the Bureau of the Budget and is a problem that we have been trying to deal with during the last 3 or 4 years in arriving at an estimate of military credits that were due to those men working on the railroads that went into the military service. As I remember 2 years ago we asked for an estimate of the total amount due, and the Bureau of the Budget refused that estimate, and we went along with the Bureau of the Budget and did not allow anything in that particular bill a year ago, but the Senate did allow the full amount. We worked out an agreement in conference with the Senate a year ago to spread this full amount over a period of 4 years, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, to pay off these military service credits. So, the committee is being consistent again this year as it was a year ago in following the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and we have gone along with this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a point of order against the language appearing in the bill on page 154, as quoted by him. The Chair has examined the language and notes that it carries a provision repealing existing law, which of course would clearly be legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order to this title of the pending chapter?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 202 on page 149 that it involves additional duties on the part of the Federal Security Administrator and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the same situation we were up against yesterday. I guess I am in the same position I was yesterday. I will have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order against the language appearing in section 202 on page 149 of the pending bill. The gentleman from Rhode Island concedes the point of order, for the reasons stated on similar points of order heretofore made.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the same grounds against the language appearing on page 150, lines 1 to 5, starting with the words "payment in advance" and ending with the words "to the general public."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think it would be a waste of time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against the language appearing on page 153, lines 17 to 20, starting with the words "payment in advance" and ending with the words "to the general public."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. I guess the same condition exists here, Mr. Chairman. I will say no more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order to the remainder of this chapter? If not, amendments are now in order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 149, line 14, insert the following language:

"SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment remedies the defect in the language which was stricken on the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. KEATING. The proposed amendment has to do with the activities of Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator. If adopted it will permit the continuation of practices in which he and others in his administration have been engaging in going about the country spreading the doctrine of socialized medicine and compulsory health insurance programs. The views of many of us as to the undesirability of a compulsory health insurance program are well known. We prefer that encouragement be extended to the promotion of voluntary health insurance plans through tax concessions or otherwise. I am not disposed to get into a debate on that subject although I am ready and willing to do so. Whatever our views may be on socialized medicine, however, there should be no difference of opinion among us about the impropriety of spending the taxpayer's dollars to propagandize for any legislation.

I simply feel it should be abundantly clear to the Members what the issue is which is involved in this amendment. If it is desired by the Members on either side to curtail the activities of the Federal Security Administrator in any respect here is the opportunity. I shall oppose the amendment not only because of my opposition to socialized medicine but because I feel neither this Administrator nor the head of any other Government department or agency should be attending meetings all over the United States at the expense of the taxpayers to promote some particular program which happens to be a favorite of his or of other leaders in the present administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 47, noes 51.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. KEATING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 65, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 148, line 7, strike out "$2,383,100" and insert "$2,145,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to cut $238,100 from the administrative expenses and salaries, Office of the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency. I have done this because the amount carried represents an increase over last year, and because I believe that a very considerable saving can be effected if the Administrator will cut out this propaganda-chasing around the country and will organize his office on a more businesslike basis. I hope we will save the $238,000 and that the Committee will vote for the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the figure that the gentleman has suggested equal to or more than was allowed last year for this activity?

Mr. TABER. No; it is not. It is below, but the amount that the committee recommended is above the figure that was allowed last year. The figure allowed last year was $2,316,000, and I am proposing $2,145,000.

There is no reason why this amendment should not be adopted. In the analysis of traveling expenses, the present picture is that the Federal Security Agency is listed for $3,000,000 of traveling expenses this year; and the budget estimates for next year carry $4,000,000, indicating an absolutely unnecessary increase. We could therefore proceed to cut down on the amounts that are provided for the Federal Security Administration and the whole of this agency where they are available for traveling expenses, and I hope that the Committee will adopt this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. And I want to call the attention of the gentleman and the rest of the committee members to the fact that under the proviso in this particular paragraph, which seems to me an unusual one, the Administrator is authorized to take out of other appropriations, funds which are to be advanced to this appropriation to finance regional office activities; in other words, money can be taken out of other activities under the Office of the Federal Security Administrator which, I understand, includes Public Health Service, and be transferred into this provision for administrative expenses which is headed "Salaries in the Office of the Administrator."

Mr. TABER. That is, he can do it for the purpose of financing the regional offices connected with the constituent organization.

Mr. KEATING. That is true, but it is a rather unusual provision.

Mr. TABER. It is very unusual.

Mr. KEATING. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think I should say for the benefit of my friend, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TABER], and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] that complete reorganization took place in the Federal Security Agency 3 years ago under the leadership of this committee and under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I fought it on the floor of the House because I did not think it would show any economy. But I had to say 2 years ago, and I did admit on this floor, that I had been wrong the previous year; that the action taken by this committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] did show better coordinated activities in the field and getting people out of Washington into these regional offices; they made a tremendous showing of economy by that so-called reorganization and I admitted it on the floor of the House.

The action which was taken 3 years ago by this committee was for that purpose. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] missed the boat, and also the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], when they talk about all this propaganda of Mr. Ewing in behalf of compulsory health insurance. You sure missed the boat when you had a chance to vote for a $3,000,000 appropriation for research into cancer, because that is one step you could have made in the direction of opposing compulsory health insurance if you sincerely do not want compulsory health insurance.

Now, we cut this particular item a total of $135,800. That is, the committee did. Every new job that was requested was refused. It is true the bill shows $66,893 more than was allowed them a year ago. We state in our report that none of the regional offices shall be cut. The bill as reported, after taking account of Ramspeck promotions, pay act costs, and other mandatory costs, will require a cut in personnel of 12 or 15. They will have to be taken out of the Washington office headquarters here. They will have a cut of perhaps 12 to 15 below what they had for the fiscal year 1950. If your cut is allowed to go into effect it is going to be here in Washington, it cannot be spread out through the regional offices because we have directed Mr. Ewing in our report that the cuts have to be made at the Washington level. If this cut is made you are going to wreck the office. You do not know how far you are going. This committee went as far as it could in cutting to the bone the Office of Administrator when we marked up this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that when we reorganized this situation 3 years ago and set up the consolidated regional offices and consolidated activities in the Office of the Administrator, we did so by combining in the Office of the Administrator many functions that formerly were appropriated for in separate items?

Mr. FOGARTY. Right.

Mr. KEEFE. And that accounts for what appears to be a large sum of money for the Office of Administrator?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct. To repeat, we cut this right down to the bone. We cut out all the additional positions they asked for—and there were several. They will have to decrease their personnel because the $66,000 increase allowed means nothing when you take into consideration the mandatory increases involved in the pay acts and other such things. They will actually have less for personnel than they had in 1950.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman point out to us where in the bill are these savings which are offset by the increased figures in this office and the parts of the bill that are reduced to make up that figure?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot show it here because that was a reorganization started 3 years ago. They reorganized 3 years ago. We were able to show it 2 years ago and again last year. They are completely reorganized. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] stated, this program started 3 years ago.

Mr. KEATING. It looks to me as if all of the provisions all through the bill are in excess of last year. There are very few that are less than last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: On page 151, line 5, after the period, add a new section:

"SEC. 209. No part of any appropriation under this title shall be paid as grants to any State or educational institution in which, because of race, color, or creed, discriminatory practices deny equality of educational opportunity or employment to anyone to pursue such educational courses or employment as are provided by such a grant."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I do not see how those conclusions can be escaped. It is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and an attempt to interfere with and direct the affairs of every State in the Union and of every Territory. The point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I refer the Chairman to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1948, page 2356. This identical amendment was offered by me on that day and a point of order was made by the gentleman from Mississippi, against the amendment. It is the same amendment, word for word, to the same section of the bill, and the point of order was over-

ruled. It is definitely a negative limitation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state in reply that because one Chairman makes a mistake does not bind the House for all time to come. There was an error on the part of the Chairman, 2 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Mississippi knows that the present occupant of the chair is bound by the decisions and precedents of the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has offered an amendment which has been reported, and the gentleman from Mississippi has made a point of order against the amendment. The Chair has examined the amendment and has compared it with the language appearing in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York on March 8, 1948, against which a point of order was made by the gentleman from Mississippi on the same grounds as stated by him on this occasion. At that time the Chair ruled that the amendment was a limitation on an appropriation bill. Of course, it is the duty of the occupant of the chair to follow the rules of the House and the precedents and decisions of the House. So, in view of this decision the Chair is compelled to and has no other recourse than to overrule the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. For the purpose of limiting debate on this amendment?

Mr. CANNON. With the gentleman's consent I would like to submit a unanimous-consent request. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an important amendment. It is not offered just for the sake of making the record. It is offered in a sincere endeavor to bring about results in a situation which is crying for results everywhere in the country. This Congress must be judged by the status of civil rights in the Nation; it must be judged by its record on civil rights. As a matter of history, the character of any period or of any institution must be judged by the status of civil rights. As long as oppression of the Negro continues, aided and abetted by government, then that government is a retrogressive and reactionary government. I am shocked and I think the American people are shocked at the neglect, the indifference, the calloused indifference with which this Congress has been dealing with this subject. The majority of this Congress was elected on the pledge of civil rights enactment. There are no more than about 110 Members who come from below the Mason and Dixon's line. They do not constitute a majority in this House. That is a mathematical fact. Yet, we have not been able to pass a single piece of civil-rights legislation. The FEPC bill? That was not FEPC at all.

Every time an amendment of this character is offered in the Committee of the Whole, what happens? Only last week I offered a similar amendment with respect to the District of Columbia. I noted what happened on the vote on that amendment. Fifty percent of the Members present remained in their seats and did not vote. The Dixie Democrats did not remain in their seats. They voted. They voted against the amendment. They voted in accordance with the manner in which they campaigned. They campaigned against civil rights and they voted against civil rights. Yet, the minority becomes the majority in this House because the majority, which campaigned on the proposition that if elected it would enact civil-rights legislation, is reneging, reneging on its campaign pledges.

I submit that this is a matter of conscience. The civil-rights issue must not be a political football. Civil rights are a challenge to the dominion of white supremacy. By virtue of what law, by virtue of what legal right, by virtue of what ethical right, by what morality do you take the money of the taxpayers, Negro taxpayers as well as white taxpayers, and with that money, with these grants that you make in this bill, grants to States and grants to institutions, place the stamp of approval on the doctrine and practice of white supremacy? You place the stamp of approval, and you do it with Federal funds, on segregation, discrimination in jobs, and discrimination and segregation in education.

How do you justify it? You cannot put up the States'-rights argument on this one. You are taking Federal funds, and when you take Federal funds you take those Federal funds subject to the conditions under which the Government gives you those funds. There is no States'-rights proposition involved here, although I have never had any respect for that kind of argument, the use of so-called States' right to defeat civil rights. You cannot advance it on this kind of proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. These are Federal funds, and the Federal Government has a right to say to the recipient States or institutions how these funds are to be spent.

This is supposed to be a civil-rights Congress. I am calling on this Congress to say to the State or to the institution, the recipient of these funds, "Look, you cannot spend this money for the purposes of segregation or discrimination in jobs or in employment."

You cannot answer this argument except by asserting the racist arrogance of white supremacy. That is the only basis upon which you can vote against this amendment. Honesty, morality, decency, and law, yes, the Constitution, requires that this House adopt this amendment.

Yes; the Eightieth Congress, the Republican Congress, did nothing on civil rights.

What is this Democratic Congress doing? Where is the leadership of this Democratic Congress on the issue of civil rights? What explanation are you going to give the 14,000,000 Negro people? Oh, you are going to say, "It was the Dixie Democrats." Yes, but they are only a minority. People can add and subtract. They are a minority. We expect them to be against us. Where is the majority? Where is the leadership of the majority? Where is the Democratic Party that said, "Elect us; let us take over, and we will give you civil rights." You have had an opportunity to answer time and time and time again. Here is another opportunity to answer. Are you going to dodge this issue by not voting? Go ahead. But the American people will judge this Congress as a Congress which will go down in history as the worst betrayer of the Negro people.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has not said anything, I do not care to take up the time of the House. His attacks on the South are not only silly but stupid. He and his communistic followers do not give a tinker's dam about the Negroes of the South and the Negroes know it. I ask for a vote on his communistic motion.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were ayes 17, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this chapter of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, in order that the RECORD may show how many Members are present, and how many voted on the amendment, I now make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-seven Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that these men rushed in from the cloak rooms were not on the floor a while ago when the vote was taken. There was no quorum present at that time, or the vote against the Marcantonio amendment would have been much greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair counted everybody who was on the floor at the time the Chair counted.

Are there any further amendments to this chapter of the bill?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have now considered about one-third of the one-package appropriation bill of $29,000,000,000. I think this bill was reported to the House early in March, and I accepted the new procedure with an open mind, but with some reservations. Now I am convinced that this arrangement is not going to prove very satisfactory, and if we proceed in the future and future sessions of Congress undertake to have a one-package appropriation bill of this size, I believe we will have to arrive at some method by which the President will be permitted to act on separate items in the appropriation bill.

This bill is only one-third approved by the House at this time. It is evident that considerably more time will be required for the House, possibly 2 weeks or more. Then the measure must go to the other body. How much time the other body may need to properly consider this measure, I have no idea. However, after that it will have to go to conference, and it occurs to me that it may be late in June before a conference report is finally approved.

I have no disposition, of course, to anticipate what the President of the United States, in his wisdom, may do—that would not be respectful. It seems to me it would be hard for any President—I do not mean President Truman, because I have no criticism of him—it seems to me that under this parliamentary procedure we are getting into a situation where any President will find it difficult to veto an appropriation bill of this kind late in June, when the new fiscal year is ready to start. I think that eventually we will have to come to some arrangement which will permit the President to scan and consider separate items, and perhaps veto separate items in a bill of this size. I am of the opinion that there ought to be some way for the Members of the House to vote on separate chapters of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think I can agree with the gentleman that we should give the President the right of appropriation. That is what the suggestion of the gentleman would be.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I have never been for the proposition of giving the President a chance to veto parts of one bill and approve other parts of the same bill, but it seems to me we are getting ourselves into a position where we are likely to come to that very thing. Of course, I would not be in favor of it with any other kind of a bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do think as we finish a chapter provision should be made to go into the House and finally decide on any amendment which might have been offered. Of course, under the present system, we are up against the peculiar situation of perhaps waiting 3 weeks after debate on a particular amendment, and consequently everybody will forget the discussion had on the amendment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the gentleman has a good point there, but we are not proceeding by that method. We are eventually going to get to the point where we will have to consider the bill in its entirety and eventually we may have to permit the President to veto one separate item of the bill.

A little later we are going to take up the chapter devoted to agriculture. I think the committee has tried to do a good job on the whole. The committee has reduced the amount of money that is available for research and experiment in connection with the European corn borer, which is a scourge and a devastating insect in the corn area of the Middle West. At the proper time I will offer an amendment that will give a little more money to meet the corn-borer threat in the Middle West, which took a hundred million bushels of corn in Iowa alone last year.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 151, line 21, strike out all of lines 21 to 25 on page 151, and lines 1, 2, and 3, inclusive, on page 152.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes in addition to his?

Mr. CANNON. No; at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment concerns itself with limitations placed on moneys appropriated for the use of the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year 1951. Let me say that I am offering this amendment as a result of testimony taken at a recent hearing of my subcommittee in regard to the Di Giorgio Farms of California. The testimony offered in that hearing indicated clearly that the Di Giorgia Farms were exempt from the provisions of the minimum wage and hour law because of the fact that they were an agricultural installation, an agricultural industry, if you please. The testimony shows that this was a $62,000,000 corporation which operates farms in California and various other sections of the country. They own a lumber mill installation at Klamath Falls, Oreg. Sixty-five percent of the production of that lumber mill goes into general commerce; only 35 percent of it goes for use by the Di Giorgio people in the packing processes of their farm products.

Here is clearly a limitation which prevents the National Labor Relations Board or their counsel from taking part in a labor dispute in an effort to settle labor trouble in this firm's operations. As a matter of fact he is forbidden even to try to hold an election if the men want to organize. One part of that Di Giorgio operation is unionized. What kind of situation will the National Labor Relations Board be in if you leave this rider in here? They could not even go out there in case there was a strike on the Di Giorgio Farms and have a bargaining election if a dispute arose—not under this rider.

I am of the opinion that we should not single out an organization of agricultural interests and farms and let them be given the special attention of this Congress. Here is a firm engaged in interstate commerce. It owns the entire outlet of fresh fruits for the city of Baltimore; it controls 59.3 percent of the outlet for the sale of fruits for the city of New York; it is engaged in interstate commerce. I insist that this House give serious consideration to the proposal to eliminate this rider in this appropriation bill. I trust it will be the pleasure of the House to eliminate it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that lines 21 to 25 on page 151 and lines 1 to 3 on page 152 be read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the matter referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks during the debate on the amendment providing $3,000,000 for the Cancer Research Institute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill now before us is disappointing in that it fails, in my opinion, to fully appreciate the importance of the research work now being done by the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., now consisting of six institutes: Experimental Biology and Medicine, Microbiological, Cancer, Heart, Dental Research, and Mental Health. The Institute of Mental Health was transferred to the National Institute of Health in April of last year. From these six institutes, important contributions have flowed into the world-wide stream of medical science.

The testimony of Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, is extremely revealing and encouraging as given before the Appropriation Committee of the House. I wish the time available would permit me to make an extended review of the same, but this I cannot do in the limited time. Hence a

mere reference to the wonderful work being done.

Expanded medical research means an increased need for trained personnel. The Public Health Service programs for the training of research scientists and of clinicians in certain special fields are already paying valuable dividends to the Nation. In the past year, 437 research fellows received help in 97 institutions in 30 States.

The Public Health Service program of financial aid to scientists in universities, medical schools, and hospitals also has produced valuable new medical knowledge. At present, more than 1,300 research projects are receiving our support. These projects are carried out in more than 200 institutions, located in 44 States and the District of Columbia. We have been gratified to find that expanded Federal support has stimulated, rather than replaced, private expenditures for medical research. There is every indication that this healthy division of effort will continue.

Mr. Chairman, I wish now to make a few remarks relative to the voluntary health agencies.

One of the outstanding contributions to the health of our Nation is being made by the voluntary health agencies in their fight against disease. Working in close collaboration with the United States Public Health Service, these agencies have established an enviable record over a long period of years.

Inspired by the energy of small groups of leaders interested in a specific disease such as cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, and polio, national organizations have come into being. They have kindled the zeal of countless thousands at the grass roots, where nourished in the soil of public opinion, the health agencies of the Government have joined with them in seeking the cause and cure of specific diseases.

The peoples of the Nation have indicated their desire to seek the cause and cure of our chronic and crippling diseases. They have set the pace for the fight in their annual drives for funds. These contributions express the voluntary giving of the public to the cause best known to them.

There has been tabulated for me an over-all summary of the general funds and research funds contributed by the people of the United States to the 18 leading voluntary health agencies. I intend at another time to enter this tabulation in the RECORD.

The Members will be interested to know that these agencies—the American Cancer Society, American Foundation for the Blind, National Council To Combat Blindness, National Society for Prevention of Blindness, American Diabetes Association, American Hearing Society, American Heart Association, American Social Hygiene Association—national, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, Maternity Center Association, National Association To Control Epilepsy, National Committee for Mental Hygiene—national, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, National Foundation for Cerebral Palsy, National Multiple Sclerosis Society—AARMS, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, National Tuberculosis Association, and the Planned Parenthood Federation received contributions totaling $55,899,184 in 1948. Of this sum, $6,306,000, or about 11 percent, was allocated for research. It is interesting to note that the American Cancer Society, which devotes one-fourth of all its contributions to research in the field of cancer, allocated $3,300,000, or over one-half of the combined total of all the 18 agencies. The encouraging research reports coming to light in the field of cancer more than justify this mass attack.

While we note the dollar magnitude of the effort these 18 agencies are putting forth, let us not lose sight of the task ahead and how much this effort means to those who die and suffer from these diseases. Mr. Chairman, 1,082,116 people died in 1948, and an additional 36,199,959 were disabled by the group of diseases. In terms of averages, this means 1.41 per death due to heart, 4.31 per death due to tuberculosis, 17.39 per death due to cancer, 4275.20 per death due to polio. We recognize that polio is a crippling and not a fatal disease.

Since the average cancer case requires about 100 days of hospitalization at an average cost of $15 per day it is evident that this $1,500 coverage cancer cost can be an economic catastrophe to most families. With cancer deaths in the United States in 1948 estimated at 188,000, it is at once evident the cause and cure must be sought out with all the speed possible in keeping with the trained manpower and research facility available.

It is interesting to note in this study that there are three national organizations in the field of blindness with little or nothing being spent on research in this problem, which disables 250,000 annually. We find no research being conducted in hearing by the American Hearing Society, yet we all face a decline in the acuteness of our hearing.

Congress has before it many bills within the broad scope of public health. Many of my fellow Members have taken part in the creation of the Institutes of Public Health at Bethesda, which now include cancer, dental, heart, mental, microbiology, experimental biology, and medicine. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has introduced a bill which would meet the multiplicity of bills now before the House for the establishment within the United States Public Health Service of various institutes for these specific diseases where these institutes do not exist. This bill would empower the Surgeon General to create an institute within the United States Public Health Service for a specific disease when the need became apparent. I hope the Members of the House will have an opportunity to act favorably on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure and good fortune to endorse the National Science Foundation bill in this and previous sessions of Congress. I am informed the conference committee is now ready to report this bill to the House. I hope it will receive the favorable action of the House tomorrow. The need is more pressing than ever. The Division of Medicine within the Foundation would undertake the broad basic studies on man which must be solved before the problem of the specific diseases can be successfully conquered.

I want to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge this praiseworthy work of these voluntary agencies and to urge the Members of Congress to support them in this effort.

But, notwithstanding the admirable work that has been done by voluntary agencies and individual contributors, there still remains a tremendous amount of work to be done. It is at this point that there arises an obligation, or duty, upon the part of Government, to supplement the work of private sources and make available funds that will assist in fundamental research.

I am convinced that the Appropriation Committee of the House has made a serious mistake in failing to provide more substantial Federal aid to these great undertakings in research. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] to increase the amount for cancer research is meritorious and should have the support of the membership. Similar amendments are in order for additional funds to other research projects, such as relate to the heart, mental, dental programs. The objective is worthy and the good already done and expected to be done entitles each to the favorable consideration of this House.

And, may I say that there is no one who has rendered more intelligent and aggressive leadership in this great cause than the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. His work in this particular will ever stand out as a monument to his zealous endeavor to advance medical science to benefit the people of this Nation.

I do hope that the Members of this House, knowing of his fine service, will follow his leadership in the effort to supply adequate funds for all of the worthwhile research programs now being conducted.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when human lives are the stake economy becomes the accomplice of murder. There is a proper place for economy in our consideration of items of Federal appropriation the same as there is in the consideration which any housewife must give to the items of household expenditures. But I have never known a mother or a father at the bedside of a gravely ill child withholding from getting every possible medical aid and attention because of fear that the household budget would not balance. I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for the historic fight which he is making in this Chamber to save us from becoming the accomplices of murder by putting economy in priority to the saving of human lives through research, expansion of hospitalization facilities and other ways. I have heard the gentleman state that he is retiring from the Congress, not being a candidate for renomination and reelection. I wish to say to him—and we have disagreed on other matters and are of different political thoughts—that in the fight he has made on this floor today, and on yesterday, for the placing of human lives high

above narrow consideration of the principles of a false economy he is closing his long congressional career in a blaze of glory which will make long remembered his name.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request heretofore agreed to, not to exceed 2 hours of general debate are in order on chapter VI.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee rises today general debate be considered as ended and that the bill may then be read under the 5-minute rule upon convening tomorrow. I may say that there is no intention of cutting off anyone. We have had no requests for time other than from members of the committee and it would be my purpose to stay here until all those who want to speak have had the opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that it is the intention of the chairman of the subcommittee that general debate will proceed as long as there is demand for it within the 2-hour limitation, and that at the conclusion of debate a paragraph probably will be read, but that no amendments will be considered tonight.

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as we are concerned on this side, I would like to announce that it will be our intention to move that the Committee rise upon the reading of the first paragraph, in the event we get that far now.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I heard the gentleman say there were no requests for time. I did not know this matter was coming up at this time and therefore I had not requested time, but I would like to have 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, it will be my purpose to recognize members of my subcommittee first. I did not mean to say there would not be any time, but I used that expression to illustrate that there was not too much demand for time, and I will be glad to recognize the gentleman from Texas later.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my remarks by paying tribute to my colleagues on this committee. The gentleman from Oklahoma, BILL STIGLER, and the gentleman from Indiana, ED KRUSE, are two of the outstanding Members of this House. They are able, sincere, and, above all, courageous and independent. The Republican members, the gentleman from Minnesota, CARL ANDERSEN, and the gentleman from Washington, WALT HORAN, are able, sincere, and are leaders of their party in the House of Representatives. We have joined to try to do a good job in handling this problem of recommending to you this chapter on agricultural appropriations. In our work we have had the services of a fine administrative secretary, Ross Pope, serving his first year but doing a fine job.

In preparing this chapter of the bill our committee was faced with the necessity of trying to strike a balance between the urgent need for many activities of the Department of Agriculture and a National Government which owes more than $256,000,000,000, and which is now operating in the red. We have tried to meet that responsibility and to provide for new programs started last year covering also the expansion of certain existing programs based on prior commitments of Congress. These mandatory allowances involve new programs, such as rural telephone, rural housing, reforestation, and fire protection, which were started during fiscal year 1950 and now must be provided for on a full-year basis in 1951. They also provide for the establishment of an estimated 150 new soil conservation districts in 1951, cover increased costs for marketing quotas and acreage allotments necessary to prevent surpluses and to return land to non-soil-depleting use, provide for the extension of the Federal crop insurance program to 240 additional counties in 1951, and cover the conservation and use of agricultural land resources program announced last year and to which the Government is committed. In addition, the pay increases pursuant to Public Laws 359 and 429 will cost the Department approximately $6,568,000.

For these programs the Bureau of the Budget recommended some 2,600 additional employees for 1951. The committee has eliminated such additional employees and has allowed increases only in sufficient amounts to permit the Department to continue positions authorized for 1950 on a full-year basis in 1951.

On a comparative basis with the present fiscal year, the amount recommended in this bill represents a decrease of $9,250,917. If pending 1950 supplementals totaling $7,085,000 are taken into consideration, the total reduction in the 1950 programs on a comparative basis is in excess of $16,300,000. To cover the new and expanded programs mentioned above in 1951, there is provided $41,955,011, which makes a total in this bill for direct appropriations of $764,032,701. This is $42,245,745 below the amount proposed in the 1951 budget estimates. In addition, the committee has reduced by $198,990,000 the revolving fund for resubscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and has approved a reduction of $125,000,000 in the revolving fund for subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal land banks.

Attention is directed to the fact that direct annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount appropriated in 1940 was $1,543,000,000, more than double the amount for 1951 carried in this bill.

Our subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations spent more than 2 months in day-long hearings on the chapter on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. These hearings began at A and went through Z so far as the operations of this Department are concerned. In approaching our job there were many conditions of which we were cognizant. We realized that the Federal Government now has a debt of approximately $256,000,000,000 and that at the present time apparently we are to lack several billion dollars of meeting expenses. At the same time we had to keep in mind that many millions of people are dependent upon agriculture as their means of livelihood and further that the entire Nation is dependent upon agriculture for the health and well-being of our people, and in addition the welfare of agriculture and those engaged in it are a key part of our economy, with the soil our chief capital asset to which we must look if we are to ever meet our national debt.

In addition to these duties, the committee has the responsibility of investigating, by its examination, the work of the Department and of recommending such changes as will eliminate waste and provide the maximum results for the money expended.

Last year the Department requested and the Bureau of the Budget approved the sum of $250,000 to construct a refrigerated building for research on the use of fuels. The committee directed that this sum be held up pending an investigation by the Department of the use of such a building that the Department of National Defense had at Eglin Field, Fla. The Department found that the Department of National Defense had such a building and further that they would be glad to arrange for this work without cost. Now it develops that there is such a building available just out of Washington.

Also last year I felt that there was too great a difference in the results obtained by some soil-conservation districts as compared with others. This question was developed fully and the facts we uncovered showed in the case of two similar districts, organized about the same time and in the same State, that one district had done twice as much work or produced twice as much results as the other. The committee directed that a standard of minimum work progress be set up by the Soil Conservation Service. That was done and the Soil Conservation Service reported this year that there has been a hundred percent increase in the progress of its work under this program.

Last year I served temporarily on the committee which then handled the requests for various control programs of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. The justification appeared to be inadequate, and when this matter was transferred to our committee for this year we had our investigators to investigate the operations of the Bureau. The results of this investigation were startling in the evidence of waste and bad management. It disclosed inadequate planning, the maintenance of a large permanent office in the field for emergency programs with those whose jobs were at stake determining whether an emergency existed. Quite naturally they have found an emergency existed

each year since 1935. Other faults were the payment of exorbitant amounts for rental or aircraft, the withholding of old automobiles and trucks from being traded in when new ones were bought, the maintenance of numerous offices in the same city handling related or similar work and actually the separation of pieces of equipment so that they would not be sought by other branches of the Department, together with the holding of huge amounts of equipment, all in violation of the directions of the Department. These facts were carried by the press, and I am sure you are familiar with them. As a result of these disclosures we have substantially reduced the funds for this work and have directed an over-all planning, and the Department is making a thorough survey of its operations to see that such practices are eliminated.

For several years the committee has tried to keep straight the operations of the Department with regard to funds for research under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. We believe in that act and the work contemplated by it. We believe in the committee system whereby it is contemplated that those in the industry shall have a say in the work selected to be done. We believe in the directive in that act that "where feasible the work shall be done with the facilities of the Department." However, the testimony this year convinced us that in many instances the Bureaus of the Department had doubled their permanent personnel to do this work. We do not believe that was intended. The facts we were able to develop also convinced us that the former practice of setting up a separate sum for research under this act was an invitation to every Bureau to get in on the work and there is much to indicate that those allocating these funds were unable to hold back and to judge a request solely on its merits but to some extent allocated funds to each bureau to keep it satisfied. The same was true of the special research fund. In this bill we have consolidated those funds that the Congress may review each project on its merits without regard to the bureau; that we may insist on certain projects being done by contract so that when the particular project is completed we will not have all this permanent personnel on the Department's hands. In taking this action it is the determination of the committee that work under the Research and Marketing Act, the use of its commodity committee system and its contract provisions shall not be reduced but actually strengthened.

Our committee has provided funds for loans for the housing program. We have provided funds for the printing and distribution of plans. We have not approved the millions requested for "research in farm housing." The Congress has provided funds for such research for years. The Department has more than 75 plans and bulletins on farm housing which it has prepared. Notwithstanding this fact and the further fact that the Farmers Home Administration has charge of this program, just about every bureau in the Department wanted to get in on this "open sesame." The Bureau of Human Nutrition wanted to take a census. The extension department, notwithstanding the fact that they have millions to do their job, which includes farm housing education, use of materials, and so forth, wanted an additional $750,000, and so on through the Department. We have denied these requests. We feel the housing program should not be delayed, while every bureau does over again what they have been getting money to do all along. They should use the plans they have.

It is the opinion of a majority of the committee that the various agricultural agencies too frequently want to be complete in themselves; that they do not properly make use of the services of other branches but too frequently try to develop their own "technical" aids. We have directed that such practices be stopped and the services of the various divisions be properly utilized. Separation of services can be worse than duplication.

We have directed that the Department, in view of the facts developed by our committee, make a thorough study of its operations to remedy these faults. However, I wish to assure the membership of the House that we are requesting a thorough investigation by our own investigatory staff. By taking this action I do not mean to indict this Department or say that it is worse than any other. In many ways I think it is far better run than most Government departments. However, its field of operations is so vast; it is bound by the civil-service regulations, whereby, if they get rid of an unsatisfactory employee, when they expand another program the same individual is sent back to them by the Civil Service; it is dependent upon annual appropriations and cannot tell until just before the beginning of the new year just what funds are available. I relate these facts that you may be assured that we, on this committee, are doing our best to get a dollar's worth for each dollar spent. And in this effort we have the help of the many fine and able people in the Department of Agriculture.

The records disclose many disturbing facts which have developed the last few years. For instance, the income of the farmers of our Nation in 1948 dropped more than 20 percent below that of 1947. In 1949 the income dropped 15 percent below that of 1948. The outlook at the present time for the current year is that the income of our farmers will be approximately two-thirds as much as in 1947. Since 1947 gross farm income has fallen more than $2,000,000,000 and during the same time cash expenses have gone up more than $1,000,000,000. The farm-family purchasing power in terms of 1947 dollars has already dropped since that date by $4,000,000,000, and it is anticipated that it will drop more than $2,000,000,000 this year.

These facts are disturbing not only as to their effect upon those engaged in agriculture, but the history of depressions in this country in years past would show that the first break has been in prices received for agricultural commodities and that the fall in such prices has pulled down the income of those engaged in other activities. These facts which I have mentioned are particularly disturbing when it is realized that 3,300,000 families or about half the families living on farms in 1949 had incomes of less than $2,000, and that a fourth of all farm families had less than $1,000 income for the whole family. I mention these facts in view of the attacks that have been made in recent months on the farm support-price program. In this connection I would like to also call attention to the fact that most of our farm-surplus problems arise from the fact that during the war the farmers of our Nation were urged to expand their production to the limit in order to supply our people and our allies. They expanded their production just as industry expanded its production and now we are faced with the necessity of cutting back to peacetime production rates for many reasons, among them the need to not needlessly exploit our soil. This need presents a terrific problem, already resulting in controls which have been approved by the farmers for many crops and in my judgment such controls will follow with regard to other crops. During this period when the farmers are faced with this necessity as has been pointed out, prices received by farmers have dropped 23 percent and yet the prices paid by farmers have come down less than 4 percent.

The Congress has tried to meet this problem through its price-support program financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation the funds for which are recommended by this committee. It is interesting to note that throughout the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation the total cost of all price-support programs for the last 10 years has been only approximately $1,000,000,000, less than one-fourth the amount spent on consumer subsidies on a few commodities during the war. Of course we have on hand many commodities in which the Government now has invested something like $3,500,000,000, a reserve of commodities that could be a blessing in case of conflict or even in the event of a disastrous farm year. Complaints appear daily in the press about this program. It should be noted that the records show that the Federal Government spent about $6,800,000,000 in enabling industry to reconvert after industrial capacity had been expanded to meet wartime needs and sold and additional $3,900,000,000 of real property to industry for $1,250,000,000. The Congress approved excess-profit-tax reductions totaling nearly $5,600,000,000. This is in addition to authority for corporations to receive certain tax credits for their operation during wartime. While these benefits apparently went to industry the prime reason for such action was to maintain employment for the millions of workers in such plants.

These facts are mentioned not to justify spending any money on agriculture which we can get by without, but to show that the total expenditure in the support of agricultural prices during this period of adjustment is much less than the money spent for adjustment in industry. The hearings before our committee disclose that as a result of the

price-support program that the drop in agricultural prices has been nothing like as drastic as the drop after the last war when we had no such price support. Certainly it would appear that such price supports have been the factor which has saved the situation, and have contributed materially to the present welfare of the United States and to the fact that we have not yet, at least, gone into a tailspin of depression. I mention these facts because a number of persons through the press are continuously making attacks on the whole price-support program for agriculture commodities. Certainly these programs are justified though of course the present method of handling potatoes and certain other commodities cannot be justified and the Congress has corrected that for next year. It is likely that corrections will have to be made in regard to other commodities where there is no control of supply or which cannot be satisfactorily stored. It appeared in the hearings that some changes would have to be made so that surplus commodities will be made more readily available to charitable institutions and others who are unable to pay the support price for many commodities. The fact that these changes may be in order, however, should not be taken as evidence of the need to strike at the whole price-support program.

It has been argued many times that the law of supply and demand should operate with regard to agriculture. It is said that people do not get all the food they could use. In this connection I point out that the law of supply and demand has been repealed insofar as labor is concerned by minimum-wage laws and by the bargaining power of labor unions all of which is reflected in higher prices for manufactured articles. It can just as readily be said that the people do not get all the refrigerators, automobiles, or other manufactured articles they could use. Yet it is not argued that industry should sell its products below the cost of production. I think almost all will agree that minimum-wage laws and labor unions, even with their excesses on occasions, have resulted in prosperity for our Nation and I know of no one that would go back to the old days when the law of supply and demand was completely operative with regard to labor. Farmers cannot organize to the same extent as labor and it will be dangerous for them to organize to the extent that they could absolutely control the food supply. But since the law of supply and demand has been repealed with regard to labor costs that go into the cost of consumer goods, it of necessity follows that unless some floor is put under the basic raw materials that the high cost of the other elements that go into consumers goods will run the price paid for raw materials down to the ground with the resulting effect of forcing this Nation into another terrible depression from which I do not know that we could recover. Many people ask why we do not export our farm surpluses. That is easier said than done. Where formerly this Nation spent millions of dollars in other countries which gave to such countries dollars to buy from us, today we are largely self-sufficient.

At one time we bought thousands of tons of cryolite from Greenland. During the war we built up a synthetic industry and now we do not need to buy.

Before World War I we got practically all our nitrate fertilizer from Chile. But today we can manufacture in the United States twice as much as we need.

In 1913, Germany produced 80 percent of the world's dyes and furnished the ingredients for the remaining 20 percent. Today we make our own dye.

In 1940 we bought 1,800,000,000 pounds of crude rubber. During the war we built up our production of synthetic rubber to more than 2,000,000,000 pounds. Vital to the production of radio, radar, electric generators and insulators is mica. Before the last war we obtained 95 percent of our supply from India. Today we manufacture a synthetic at home. From Formosa came millions of pounds of camphor, now we make camphor from turpentine, more than we can use.

Thirty-five years ago our optical glass came from England, France, and Germany. Today we produce 95 percent of all we use.

Formerly we bought $10,000,000 worth of cigarette papers annually from France. Today we produce our own. We bought eighty to ninety million pounds of silk from Japan. Today we use nylon or orlon made in the United States of America.

We then bought sugar and soybeans, figs and dates—today we produce or can produce surpluses at home.

We formerly obtained tungsten from China or Bolivia, shellac from India, hair bristles from China, now we produce synthetics and it is estimated that we in the United States are 94 percent self-sufficient. In one way that is fine, but it does mean that since we no longer buy from other countries to any great extent, we cannot sell to any great extent. It means that we must avoid production of large agricultural surpluses, for there is no substantial outlet to foreign countries, and if sold on the domestic market the price of the surplus tends to become the price for the whole supply of the commodity.

This is only another of the problems we face, for according to many economists, supported by the records of the Department, each depression has started first with a drop in farm prices. According to these records, a drop in farm prices shows up about seven times that amount of drop in national income. Through the farm-support program we have retarded such spiral. After World War I agricultural prices dropped 50 percent in 12 months. For 2 years after World War II the drop has been less than half as much for twice as long a period. In addition to that many of the charges made against the farm program have been relative to the increase in cost of various consumer goods. And yet the record shows that in the case of bread, for instance, during the period October 1947 to October 1949 the cost of the ingredients in a loaf of bread paid by the baker went down from 5.9 cents to 4.7 cents. Yet during that same time due to the high cost of labor, transportation, and other elements in producing the finished loaf of bread, the retail price to the consumer increased from 13.3 cents to 14.5 cents. Evidence before the committee showed that with regard to some foods going into New York City more than half the retail cost of some commodities were added after the commodities crossed the Hudson River.

These matters are not mentioned to strike any argument with those that come from nonagricultural areas but is to point out that there is a real need that proper attention be given to agriculture. Our Nation is extremely fortunate in the world today to be able to produce more in the way of food than we need. Most of this surplus production was built up under the wartime need. And yet we can see that if we are to enjoy peace further demands are going to be made upon agriculture and upon the soil. The records show that during the last 10 years our population has increased by 19,000,000 people. If that same rate of increase is followed for the next 50 years you can easily see that the demands on our soil will become greater and greater. We, as a nation, need to use only that which is necessary, in soil-depleting crops, and to place the balance in grass or to other uses that will save and restore this most vital natural resource.

It makes us aware of the fact that our soil, which is perhaps our greatest natural resource and on which the Nation is dependent, is the basis for the real security of our people in the years to come. Certainly a study of other nations throughout history will show that once agriculture has been permitted to take more from the soil than is put back in, so that in effect more is being extracted than is being replaced, eventually it has led to the destruction of such nations. You can look around the earth today and any country that has paid attention to the fertility of the soil and to other natural resources you will find a prosperous nation. You can look then to Greece, Palestine, China, India, and to any of the other countries where the people are having a terrible time existing and you will find that behind it all is a depleted soil structure and wasted natural resources. In other words this Nation should have foresight enough to know that we must include as a part of the cost of food, shelter, and clothing a reasonable amount to be set aside for the restoration of our production plant, our soil. No business would think of failing to set aside for maintenance and repair of its plant. The soil is the Nation's plant.

Dr. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, has testified before this committee that we have today 70,000,000 acres of lands in the United States that have been wasted and will have to be restored before they could contribute anything to the Nation's food, clothing, or shelter. A few years ago Milton S. Eisenhower, who has served as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and president of Kansas State College and who has spent a lifetime in contact with agriculture and its problems stated in an article appearing in Collier's magazine that

throughout the world there was approximately 2 acres of land which was keeping each person alive, that originally this 2 acres had an average of about 7 inches of topsoil which stood between you and starvation, but that in many places on the earth this 7 inches has been reduced by erosion and neglect to 5 or 3 or 0; that in the United States we have more than the 2 acres of land. That is where we are fortunate. But as the years pass and the population increases at the rate which it has in the last 10 years we too will reach that point unless the problem is met through the years.

In one way of looking at it we have done a wonderful job of production in this country. Through research by the Department of Agriculture and others we have learned to make two stalks of wheat grow where one grew before and so with regard to other plants. Through this means we have increased materially the production per acre in this country. It is a matter in which we all can take pride. But when we consider the matter from another viewpoint no nation in history has wasted its natural resources through the same period of time to a greater extent than has the United States. It was testified that it would take an increase of approximately 85 percent in the appropriation for the Forestry Service to adequately meet their needs in the way of reforestation and to properly supervise and protect the forests which we have remaining. Of course in view of our present financial situation that is impossible. I mention it to point out the real need that we have. We could well spend 10 times the amount of money involved in this chapter on appropriations for agriculture and the money would be well spent if we had it. We do not have it.

This depletion of our natural resources is easy to understand. When our forefathers settled this country, land was the cheapest thing available. It was good business insofar as present income was concerned, to drain the land of its fertility and then to clear more. Our forefathers followed that practice and succeeding generations grew up to believe that was the way to farm. Then in many States we became dependent on one crop, in my own area, cotton, not simply because cotton would grow well in our States, but for the further reason that we had no cash markets for much of anything else. In other areas it was tobacco, in another wheat, and so on. As all now know, this depleted the soil and in most cases financial returns were so small that the money was not to be had to protect or restore the soil. Recognizing that the Nation and future generations had an interest in this great natural resource, fertility of the soil, the soil-conservation program was set up by the National Congress. Under the program the National Government said to the farmer that if he would follow good soil practices and if he would restore his soil, the Nation would make a contribution toward the costs. This Federal contribution has averaged about one-half of the money cost with the farmer putting up his labor in addition to his half of the cash outlay. The Nation must see to it that our soil is preserved. You may say the farmer should do that on his own. He has not and there are only two ways to see that he does it, one is through our present system of leadership and aid or to make him do it by law, and that is not the American way.

There is no question but what the great natural resources of our Nation have been the real basis of our high standard of living. Therefore, all our people have an interest in our soil fertility, in its productivity. The fewer people it takes to provide shelter, food, and clothing for the rest of us, the greater the number of people left to produce radios, cars, refrigerators, and the thousand and one things for all of us, luxuries to most of the world, but taken by our people to be necessities.

The people of our towns and cities have a real interest in the fertility of the soil in the adjoining areas. The merchant has an interest, the doctor, the lawyer, yes, and the preacher. They have a real interest in the methods of farming employed by the farmers of the country though the farmer owns his land and has the legal right to farm it any way he wants, for all prosper only as the area around them prospers, the Nation prospers only as all its areas prosper. Let the farm production go down, let the land become exhausted and half the people will have to move out of our cities and the half remaining will have more of a struggle to make a living. Let that happen over the whole Nation and more and more peole will have to be employed in the production of food and clothing and fewer people will be left to provide the manufactured articles that all enjoy. That has been the situation which helped to bring about the low standard of living in much of this troubled world today.

In spite of the concrete results we have obtained through our soil programs, this program will have failed unless our people continue this change in their way of farming unless they continue to take care of the soil, rotate their crops and preserve in the land the ability to produce not only for today but for future generations. This program was started because of the tremendous need. In view of the cost it was believed that the Federal Government should institute such program, contribute toward its cost in order to awake a consciousness in the minds of our farmers of the very real danger that we would, in a few years, find all our soil gone. The Government has helped to finance practices only to bring about such practices by the farmers themselves. Whether that course was wise will be determined by what our farmers do on their own initiative in the future. We must guard against any thought that it is an obligation of the Federal Government to pay our farmers to do right by their own soil. Such a feeling would destroy our initiative and independence.

Our committee, of course, in preparing our recommendations to the Congress had to keep these problems in mind and at the same time to recognize that the Nation already owed $257,000,000,000 and was not meeting expenses now. Where to draw the line, where to stirke the balance has been our problem and we have tried to meet our obligation in this bill. We hope that we have provided reasonably adequate appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration so that at least the Nation will continue to maintain the present level of fertility and in the hope that we may restore some of the damages that have been done to our natural resources in years past.

For many years it was taken for granted that the farm people could not expect to have electricity or the same conveniences that others in our Nation have. The Congress a few years ago realizing that farmers were a part of our national economy, set out to enable the farmers to help themselves by making available electricity through the Rural Electrification Administration. We made it possible for farmers to secure loans to buy farms and made it possible for farmers to do many things for themselves with full payment to the Government for services rendered. At that time, in 1935, only 743,950 farms had electricity. Since that time, through the Rural Electrification Administration, the number has been increased to 4,850,000 farms, not on a gift basis but by the use of Government loans which are being repaid, and on which the Government actually is experiencing no loss. It may surprise you to know that less than 0.6 of 1 percent of REA cooperative borrowers are delinquent as much as 30 days on the amount due on these loans. This has actually freed these farm families from drudgery and has made the situation such that we can expect in the future a sufficient number of our people to be interested in farm life to stay on our farms and supply the food and clothing for the rest of us. As fine as that program has been, it still means little to the 16 percent of our farmers who still do not have electricity available to them. And the committee has constantly urged area coverage. During this same period many thousands of farmers have been enabled to buy and own a farm home, and here, too, we find the record of repayment to the Farmers Home Administration is excellent. In other words, we have helped the farmers to help themselves. These programs have both been considered by our committee, and there again it was our problem to determine a reasonable basis on which these programs could be carried forward and the overhead expense kept at a minimum. Already both of these programs have reached the point where more money is paid in each year than is loaned under the loan authorization carried in this bill. We have started similar programs for rural telephones and rural housing, for which the farmers will pay the entire cost.

In this chapter on the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture we deal with the research activities of the Department. Some may think that in view of the present surpluses it is well enough to drop research. Nothing could be further from the truth. The history of the world will show that as nations get old and as land is used through the centuries, in all too many cases diseases that destroy plant life become more prevalent.

In our own Nation we have seen the chestnut tree go, the victim of disease. We have the problems of the white pine blister rust and recently oak wilt. The thousand and one diseases that strike at our tree and plant life at the present time must be retarded and if possible controlled. Except for research on the part of the Department and others today we would not be growing wheat in this Nation, but would have to import it, for periodically disease has struck down the wheat which we plant and it is only by the development of resistant varieties that we have been enabled to keep up our production of this important food. The same is true of practically every product which is grown. There is a never-ending fight by the Department and those engaged in agriculture on behalf of the plants which supply us with food and fiber against the diseases which attack and will destroy.

We must ever wage the battle against diseases being brought in from other areas. We are all familiar with the Japanese beetle, brought in years ago from that country on plants imported here. We are in the midst of a fight now to prevent the fruitfly in Hawaii from coming over here and destroying our fruit which is so vital to the well-being of our citizens and which plays a great part in the financial well-being of many areas. Today we are spending millions of dollars in Mexico in an effort to eradicate the foot and mouth disease of cattle which if it ever got started in this country would wipe out the cattle industry. When such industries are wiped out it is not only the farmer in the business who is ruined, but the millions of consumers who are dependent on the farmer for food suffer just as greatly. These problems tend to become more urgent in view of the airplane and the rapid means of travel and the number of planes which move to and from foreign countries. In this bill we also are faced with providing funds to meet the problem of preventing diseases in animals within our own borders and eradicating and preventing diseases which from time to time have threatened to wipe out our food supply. Notable is hog cholera which the Department managed to wipe out years ago, but from time to time new types spring up. We have had the same experience with other animals and I am sure these bureaus could well use more money than is provided in this bill.

If, today, all the cattle we have in this country were the types which our early forefathers had, we would not have half enough meat. The same is true of corn, wheat, hogs, cotton, fruit, and of practically everything connected with agriculture. In our country we take such progress for granted, but behind it is the continual study, research, and experiment led by our splendid Department of Agriculture. Funds must be provided to continue this work. We have in this chapter the farm credit structure so vital to agriculture and the Nation. These agencies are now on a sound basis, but we must provide funds to properly supervise such activities that they will remain in a strong condition. Throughout the consideration of all these various problems which face agriculture and the Nation, our committee has had to try to balance the need against the national financial situation and to try to see not only what the need was but what it appeared that we could afford to spend in meeting these needs. I am sure we have not done a perfect job in that connection but we have made a determined effort to hold down expenditures on the part of this Department, being conscious always of the fact that the entire Nation is dependent upon agriculture for its food and for its future life and that our overall financial condition is dependent upon the well-being of such a large segment of our population.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Unfortunately some of the most bitter critics of the farm program today are among the very groups that the gentleman has mentioned which received out of the Treasury between $10,000,000,000 and $12,000,000,000 to bring about an adjustment of industry following the cessation of hostilities. And that is exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture has been trying to do over the past 2 or 3 years at a total loss in the support-price program of less than $500,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. Unfortunately the statement the gentleman has made is correct as to the sources of many of these complaints. I would like to believe these complaints are made because the people who make them are not informed. I think in most cases that is exactly the case.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very glad to hear the gentleman bring out the analogy between the minimum-wage law and what many of us have been fighting for years for on this floor, parity for agriculture. After all, if the minimum wage is fair and just to the laboring man of this Nation certainly nobody should kick about the theory that the farmer is entitled to 100-percent parity for that which he produces.

Mr. WHITTEN. Proceeding further, it has been asked: Why do you not sell your surplus in foreign markets?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I wonder if my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, would care to say anything about the fact that ECA funds have been used to build up synthetics in France, and this has depleted our cotton market over there.

Mr. WHITTEN. In this connection—and I do not want to appear local and provincial in my handling of this committee—but that is a thing that disturbs me. Last year I was one of two who started out in the Appropriations Committee to reduce our commitments made to ECA through appropriations and was taken severely to task by some of my southern friends on the basis that the ECA said we could reduce the amount of cotton you exported under the ECA. My answer to that was that they spent only about 5 cents out of a dollar for cotton, that it would be cheaper to give the cotton away than to have them spend 5 cents out of the dollar for it; further, that the record showed that in Italy with ECA aid, rayon and synthetics went up to more than 50 percent above prewar use and cotton was down to 40 percent; and that was done with ECA dollars. But I do not want to get into that. There is no reason but what we have to support the ECA, but it does mean that that is not entirely an agricultural outlet, and it can easily be shown that they have used much of that for the purpose of getting these countries started again rather than as an outlet for our commodities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall that Mr. Wells testified before our subcommittee. For the information of the House, I may say that Mr. Wells is the chief of the bureau that has to do with economic investigations such as the collection of statistics relative to agriculture. Mr. Wells testified before our subcommittee about 2 years ago, if you recall, to the effect that even in the year 1947 a laboring man paid something like 22 percent of his total earnings, whereas in 1939, prior to the war, that same laboring man with a lesser income paid only 1 percent more; that is in 1939 he paid 23 percent of his total income for food; and, going back 6 or 8 years later, in 1947, his percentage for food had dropped 1 percent.

So I do not think the laboring men can kick.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not either and I do not want to put these things into a competitive category. I am going to be frank. It is my view they are one and the same, that agriculture is depending on a high income in industry; on the other hand, I think it is a two-way proposition and that industry also has something to do with it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. May I say that no Member of the House is held in higher esteem than the gentleman from Mississippi and we all appreciate the fine work that he and his committee has done on this agricultural chapter of the general appropriations bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the fine statement of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Mississippi for his presentation which has been very interesting and informative. It shows that the gentleman has given deep study and attention to the agricultural problem, and I join with the other members of the committee in thanking him for his very interesting talk.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I would like to say to the gentleman that I think we all appreciate the fine work that this committee has done. In my experience in the House I do not recall when there has been any antagonism to amount to anything as between the city dweller, or the Members who represent people in this House from city areas, and those from country districts. I think we have had unusually fine support from the city people.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I interrupt the gentleman to say, and I am glad to point this out because my remarks may have been misunderstood, that there has not been better support for the farm program than we have had from the city Members in the Congress. My remarks were directed to the press and certain other people, but not the attitude of the Members of this House, and I appreciate the gentleman giving me an opportunity to clarify that.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I call attention to the fact that the farmers of this country are benefiting the whole world under the reciprocal trade agreements in that the farmers of America purchased $28,000,000 of supplies from other nations last year.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just want to add my remarks of commendation to the statement that the gentleman has made. As a Representative from one of the three or four greatest cities in the land, the city of Los Angeles, Calif., I want to say that I subscribe entirely to what the gentleman has said, particularly in regard to the mutuality of interest of the workers in the cities and the people on the farm, and I realize very deeply the significance of the balancing of the income of the farmer so that he can buy the products of the city worker and the balancing of the income of the city worker to get the purchasing power so that he can buy the products of the farm. I am glad that the gentleman's remarks did include a recognition of the fact that there has been on this matter of agricultural interest almost unanimous support, at least on this side of the aisle, and I am not saying that disparagingly, as well as the other side of the aisle, of those things that are of benefit to the agricultural districts of this country, and we realize that mutuality of interest.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that he is one of those that has contributed to that program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, the American farmer is again in the news. But to some he is no longer the hero he was during the war when his all-out production of food and fiber meant the difference between our Nation winning a war or suffering a defeat. Unfortunately, the farmer is now pictured by a few as the tool of the politicians, as a leech on the Federal pay roll. Yes, and I regret to say there is a growing indignation against the American farmer—and all because certain people of our Nation are interested in making political capital out of a difficult situation. In other words, the farmer is becoming the scapegoat for a condition which is not his fault.

Yet amid it all, the farmer continues his daily chores from sunup to sundown to provide our Nation of 150,000,000 people with food and fiber—products without which they could not survive.

It is unfortunate that some of our leaders cannot rise above their bickerings and concentrate with sincere interest on doing something constructive for the America farmer and his family.

A lot is happening to the American farmer today. He is in an insecure position, and he knows it. He can still remember the 1930's. He does not know from one day to the next what to expect in the way of agricultural programing. He does not know if there will be a reasonable market for his crops next fall. Besides that, as an annual worry because of the vagaries of weather, drought, and disease, he is not sure that he will have a crop by harvesting time. He figures that if things break reasonably well, he can get back his expenses with a little extra for his labor. He hopes that this little extra will be enough to give his family a reasonable standard of living for another year, at least until the next harvest comes around.

All of this does not mean that we have failed to help our farmers. Congress has done a great deal in recent years for the farm families of this country. We can be proud of the help we have given. We have gone far in providing farmers many of the same opportunities which those who live in our cities enjoy. There has been some questioning of why our State and Federal Governments have had to take the lead in providing these opportunities. I believe, however, that anyone who understands the business of farming realizes that some group—and in this case it was the State and Federal Governments—had to assume the responsibility of making these opportunities available to our farm people.

We have been able to do much in the matter of better educational facilities for our farmers. The State and Federal extension services jointly are carrying out their programs of getting the latest findings of research and other agricultural information to our farmers through their county agents and other extension employees. Without question all of us have benefited from this great program. It should be expanded and encouraged.

We have also benefited as a result of our soil- and water-conservation programs, better credit for our farmers, rural electrification, better rural roads, and our vocational agricultural programs. We have gained, too, by our crop price-support programs. Farmers have had a reasonable purchasing power to buy the products produced in our cities by labor and industry. We know well the damage which reduced farmer-purchasing power has on city employment. In addition, we have had more good food costing less of our income than ever before.

Among many fine programs, there is one which is doing and can do much in helping both our farmers and our Nation out of our present difficult agricultural situation. That is our soil conservation district program. To some, soil conservation may seem of little consequence at this time other than conserving what good land we have left. We should recognize, however, that the type of conservation work being done by soil conservation district cooperators does more than primarily save our land resources. It is a long-range program. It not only enables a farmer to diversify his production by putting his eggs into many baskets instead of one, but it also enables him to reduce the cost of production per acre, per bale, and per bushel, and so on. I believe that modern conservation farming reduces the problem of surplus crops without destroying farmer income more than any other individual program now being carried on by our farmers. It is a boon to the security of our farm families, and passes along many benefits to every family of the Nation.

A survey conducted among 618 soil conservation district cooperators in Arkansas revealed that as a result of applying their soil conservation district farm conservation plans these farmers in the last few years have reduced their acreage of corn nearly 16 percent and their acreage of cotton more than 19 percent. When these conservation farm plans help reduce acreage of crops which are in surplus, every segment of the population gains. But this type of conservation farming does even more. These farmers also increased their acreage of hay and pasture 54 percent on the average in the same period. Numbers of dairy cows increased 70 percent, beef cows 178 percent, and feeders 154 percent. As can be seen by this, modern conservation farming not only reduces the acreage of crops which are in surplus, but also enables the farmer to maintain or better his income by increasing his production of beef and timber crops which our Nation has in relatively short supply.

If every acre of farmland in this country were being cropped according to the way it could be used best economically and permanently, our surplus problems would be far less than they are now; and less than they promise to be in the next 2 years. In fact, proper land use is the No. 1 job that soil conservation districts are undertaking. This is not necessarily because of the surplus problem, but rather because proper use of every acre is also the basic job in bringing to a stop the loss of our soil and water resources.

Through our soil conservation district programs, farmers throughout the Nation are well under way in reducing their acreage of cultivated land on the average by more than 9 percent, increasing their

acreage of permanent hay nearly 150 percent, pasture or range 15 percent, and woodland crops nearly 5 percent.

But with proper use of our land, there is also the job of treating each acre with the various other soil- and water-conservation practices to aid in the fight against erosion and loss to our water resources. To do these jobs properly takes more than guesswork. It takes a careful study of such factors as the slope of the land, type of soil, precipitation, degree of erosion, and other land and water factors. Such information has now been inventoried on more than 300,000,000 acres of our Nation, and is being obtained at the rate of about 30,000,000 acres a year in our national soil conservation program.

Modern conservation farming is also helpful to farmers because it reduces operational costs. Friends of soil conservation believe that it is cheaper to farm the conservation way. There is less loss of seed, fertilizer, and productive soil that uncontrolled runoff carries away with it, they contend. Fewer crops are washed out and destroyed. Fewer gullies means less breakage of equipment. Farming on the contour takes less gas and oil for the tractors; there is less wear—all of which costs money. The end result is less expense and thus a greater net income for the farmer and his family.

These are but a few of the major reasons why our national soil conservation district program has moved ahead so rapidly. When we realize that this program enables farmers to take full responsibility and leadership in soil and water conservation, it is no wonder that the program holds such an important place in farming. More than 2,200 of these districts have been organized in the United States. They cover more than four-fifths of our farmland. I am naturally proud that Arkansas was the first of the 48 States to pass legislation enabling farmers to organize these districts as legal parts of their State government, and is now practically 92 percent covered by districts.

We hear a lot of talk and read a lot these days about the so-called threat of Federal dictation and regimentation in national farm programs—and what it will do to destroy the farm family as such. Those who fear such a development should very definitely give attention and support to the soil conservation district movement devised by the Congress for the Federal Government to help farmers with their problems and yet leave the full administration of the program completely in the hands of the farmers themselves. Our farm programs must be kept in the hands of the farmers themselves. As you know, the contribution of the Federal Government to the farmers in this conservation program is through the Soil Conservation Service which assigns conservation technicians to these districts to help farmers with their conservation problems. This is only done, however, when the soil conservation district supervisors request such assistance. These technicians are well trained in the art of soil and water conservation. But even though the Federal Government furnishes this help of the Soil Conservation Service, the district farmer-supervisors themselves actually administer all phases of their soil- and water-conservation programs with the farmers of the district. The farmers themselves are in control at the district level.

In other words, the farmers have this program under their own control—as any farm program should be. They are assuming their rightful responsibility in bringing a stop to the wasteful erosion and loss of valuable water resources of this Nation.

As a member of the Public Works Committee of the House, I have had a special opportunity to learn the importance of soil conservation districts and soil and water conservation in our national flood control operations. Flood control to many means dams, reservoirs, and other large constructions on the lower part of our rivers. Effective flood control is much more than that, however. It begins where the rains fall and runoff starts. It involves many conservation measures to get maximum absorption of rainfall, and the construction of storage basins and detention reservoirs in the upper reaches of the watershed. This is where approximately 75 percent of all flood damages occur, along the headwater tributaries where soil erosion and runoff are excessive. If left uncontrolled, this eroded soil soon becomes sediment in our river channels, thus reducing their water-carrying capacity. Reservoirs also soon become useless because of sedimentation. The storage capacity of these reservoirs is being damaged at the rate of $50,000,000 each year because of this sedimentation.

We are especially cognizant of this in Arkansas because, primarily, of various forward-thinking associations and organizations such as our conservation districts and the river valley associations in the State whose leaders and members understand our soil-conservation and flood-control problems and are getting the facts before the people. Such groups as the Keep Arkansas Green Association, Friends of the Land, and other business, civic, professional, and social organizations also have done much to support our soil conservation district work and to spread the gospel of soil and water conservation. Our flood-control results would be negligible were it not for this teamwork.

The Nation is awakening to the reasons why it is important for everyone to put his shoulder to this conservation wheel, and why we must continue to recognize and support the two most basic factors in agriculture—the farm family itself, and the conservation of our soil and water resources. More and more this modern conservation is receiving widespread support because it means the conservation of our land resources, a better income for our farmers, a better balanced agricultural production, fewer crop surpluses, and relief from heavy expenditures in our crop-price support program without it being at the entire expense of the farmer himself.

Add to this most valuable soil conservation district program the accomplishments being made in better farm credit, better rural roads, rural electrification, and the educational programs of our State colleges and our State universities and we see a better way of life and a higher standard of living for the farm families of our Nation—which is a direct objective of most of our Federal farm programing. All of them make the farm a better place to live, a better life for our youngsters who will carry on where we leave off.

It is therefore essential that we never lose sight of the real objectives of our national farm programing—and strive continuously to see that everything we do in agricultural legislation will in some way add to the accomplishment of these objectives and not to their destruction.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, no nation is stronger than its natural resources. We must never forget that simple, basic fact. If the United States is to maintain world leadership, if we are to be prepared for any emergency, we must be sure that our natural resources are constantly increasing rather than dwindling.

I wish to call your attention to our forest lands. I want to raise the question as to whether a dollar spent on these forest lands today may not be returned to us manyfold. I should like to consider whether a stringent economy in the protection, management, and use of our forests may not be very short-sighted indeed—whether it does not actually impair our national strength.

In the United States, we have approximately 624,000,000 acres of forest land. Three-fourths of this land is privately owned. The other fourth is in public ownership.

By and large, our total forest resources are on the downgrade. Each year three trees of saw timber size are being cut or destroyed for every two that are being grown. Fire, insects, and disease are taking their toll. The quality and size of our timber are deteriorating. Large areas that could grow good timber now have only low-grade hardwoods or scrub growth.

Let us look back to World War II for a moment. From 1941 to 1945 inclusive, we used an average of 36,800,000,000 board feet of timber each year. We reached a peak of 43,800,000,000 board feet in 1942. We were able to produce this much lumber by importing some of it from Canada and by drawing heavily on our lumber stock piles.

What would our lumber needs be in the event of another emergency? Possibly nobody knows exactly, but it is almost certain they would be considerably higher than they were in World War II. I think we should bear this in mind.

I am distressed to see that the appropriation bill, as it now stands, carries a cut in funds for most of the protection, management and use programs for our national forests.

On these national forests we have about 600,000,000,000 board feet of saw timber, or about 30 percent of the Nation's total volume of saw timber. Many sawmills and communities are dependent on national forests.

The yearly cut of timber from national forests, on a sustained yield basis, now

runs around 4,000,000,000 board feet. If we had more access roads to remote areas, this timber yield could be increased by at least 50 percent. Many trees in these remote areas are over mature. They should be harvested. It is a good dollars-and-cents investment.

Reforestation is needed on some 3,000,000 acres of national forest land. Most of this land was cut over or burned over before it became a part of the national forest, but it will never be very productive unless it is replanted. An additional million acres is so poorly stocked that fill-in planting is needed.

The same thing applies to grazing land in national forests. From three to four million acres need reseeding. The demand for grazing priviliges exceeds the available range, and we should do everything possible to see that our national forests produce more forage for livestock.

National forests protect the watersheds. The provide water for power and for the use of farmers and city people. More than half of the total stream flow in the 11 westernmost States, for example, comes from national forests.

Consider the matter of recreation. Last year, 5,000,000 Americans went to the national forests to hunt or fish. More than 26,000,000 Americans who wanted to enjoy the glories of nature went to the national forests to camp overnight, picnic, climb mountains, enjoy winter sports—or just to relax.

These are important values, I think, even if we cannot measure them in money terms.

Instead of cutting appropriations for national forests, we actually need to increase them. We should have more adequate fire protection. We need more access roads. We should replant range and forest land at a faster rate. For better management, we need to acquire some lands within national forests that are not now under public ownership.

I am not asking for an amendment to the appropriation bill. I do believe, however, that we should support any increases recommended by the Senate and that the House conferees should go along with the Senate increases.

Money spent now for the improvement of our national forests is a guaranty of our future strength and security.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the rural telephone program. May I say to the committee while it has not given the rural telephone program as much money as many of us think that organization might well use, I know that the United States Treasury is not inexhaustible and I recognize that the committee was torn with the problem of trying to be fair to the taxpayers and at the same time to provide adequately for these needed programs. I wish that it might have been possible to have provided at least $50,000,000 for telephone loans. I think that with less it is going to be impossible to meet much of the need for loans. I understand that REA now has applications pending which ask for more than $50,000,000. So far loans are being made to practically no one except existing companies. I fear that it is rather unfair to the local cooperatives who have, under the terms of the amendment put on the basic legislation last fall, had to wait a year to present their applications, to be told that they cannot expect to even get their applications considered.

If I had my way I would provide more money for telephone loans. I fear that without it many Members of Congress as well as rural citizens are going to unfairly blame the REA for its inability to provide the needed loans. On the other hand the committee had a hard job and I have no disposition to condemn. I know that every member has tried to do a fair job.

I am especially disturbed about administrative funds. It appears at least possible that the wording of the report might limit the Administrator of REA to the expenditure of $900,000 in administering the rural telephone program.

I am afraid that that would greatly hamper the program and if it did not hamper the program it would result in loose administration which might mean a loss to the Government of the United States. I wish the chairman would explain to us whether it is the intention of the committee that the entire $8,150,000 that is made available to REA for administrative purposes may be used for the rural telephone program if need be?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that the funds for the administration of REA and the rural telephones are carried in one figure in the bill. Insofar as the intent of the committee, it is that the employees in either agency can be used to meet the needs of the rural telephones with the understanding that if used on rural telephones that their charges would be charged up to rural telephones. And, I would like to add this, too, that in recent years there seems to be a whole lot of argument as to who is the father of REA, and so that there will be no argument in the years to come as to who is the father of rural telephones; the gentleman from Texas is the father of the rural-telephone program.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman for his generous statement. I am proud to have had a part in the rural-telephone legislation but it became law only because a majority of the Members of this House supported it. I understand the Chairman to say that if the Administrator, in carrying out the REA program, finds that he needs to use a man maybe for 2 weeks on the telephone program and maybe for 2 weeks on the electric program, that it is not the intention in this appropriation bill to say that that man must be assigned to only one job, and that it is not intended that when any specific amount, whether it be $900,000 or some other amount, is being used in telephone work, if it is still within the total appropriation, that the REA cannot do any more for telephones, but it is intended that the limit is all over for all of the work of the REA—that is, it is for electric and telephone work combined.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to say that it was brought to our attention many times that the prophecy that the gentleman made when the rural-telephone bill was on the House floor, that it would automatically extend more lines into the immediate area where they could be served, has already come about, and it is very encouraging to us.

Mr. POAGE. While it is my understanding that there have only been six loans made up to yesterday, I think there have been many thousands of rural telephones already connected that would never have been connected had it not been for the Congress making this loan program available. The more rural phones the private companies will provide the less the Government will need to loan. It is telephone service we want.

Mr. HORAN. That was our observation.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman. He has been most helpful in the fight to get this program going. I know that had he and his committee felt that it was possible they would have provided more money.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER].

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, after approximately 2 months of hearings, the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture concluded its deliberations and marked up the bill. During these hearings more than 250 witnesses were heard including representatives from the Department, Members of Congress, and the public. With few exceptions, not a single witness asked that we reduce appropriations, but practically all urged increased funds for this or that agency, depending on where their interests lay. This made our task extremely difficult and most trying.

Before discussing some of the various items which make up the Agriculture appropriation bill, I wish to state that this is my second year on this subcommittee and I continue to find it a source of rich and new experiences. It has been a genuine pleasure to work with the other members of the subcommittee.

I doubt, Mr. Chairman, if any committee could have a more capable, conscientious, fearless, and experienced chairman than we have in the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. He has a great grasp of agricultural economics. I have found his attitude quite sympathetic, yet his inquisitive and investigative mind always demands a full exploration of all subject matters which come before our committee. I want to take this occasion to salute this great friend of agriculture and publicly express my own appreciation for the privilege of serving with him on this great committee.

I, too, would pay tribute to my other colleagues on this committee: Messrs. KRUSE, of Indiana; ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; and HORAN, of Washington. My association with these gentlemen last year was extremely pleasant, but as time goes by that association becomes more delightful as one witnesses their deep understanding of the problems of

agriculture. In all our deliberations, I never heard any word of partisanship uttered by any member of our committee.

I cannot let this opportunity go by without paying well-deserved praise to our executive-committee clerk, Mr. Ross Pope. This is his first year with us, but his splendid assistance enabled us to report out such a well-balanced bill as we did.

The bill came to us with a budget-approved request of direct appropriations totaling $806,278,446, as compared with $731,328,607 for the fiscal year 1950, or a net increase of $32,704,094, but a decrease in the 1951 budget estimate of $42,245,745.

Last year Congress appropriated for the present fiscal year the sum of $731,328,607. For 1951 we recommended $722,077,690 plus the following:

Salary increases (Public Laws 359 and 429)	$6,568,000
Capital improvements (nonrecurring):	
Improvement and acquisition of property for operating purposes	690,450
Flood-control and water conservation projects	1,915,000
New programs approved last session of Congress:	
Reforestation and fire protection	1,275,000
Rural telephone	600,000
Farm housing	550,000
Expanded activities based on prior commitments:	
Conservation and use of agriculture land resources	25,456,561
Federal crop insurance	1,800,000
Other new programs:	
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	2,100,000
Soil-conservation operations	1,000,000
Total increases	41,955,011

The amount recommended in this bill represents a decrease of $9,250,917 as compared with 1950 appropriations after taking into consideration the mandatory increases as stated above. If 1950 supplements totaling $7,085,000 are taken into consideration, the total reduction in the 1950 programs on a comparative basis is in excess of $16,300,000. To cover the new and expanded programs for which Congress provided last year, there is provided $41,955,011, which makes a total in this bill for direct appropriations of $764,032,701.

As was further pointed out in our report, "direct annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for each of the 3 years preceding the last war were in excess of $1,000,000,000. The amount appropriated in 1940 was $1,543,000,000, more than double the amount for 1951 carried in this bill."

When we began marking up our bill, item by item, we were faced with the unpleasant fact that our Government has a $256,000,000,000 national debt and is now engaged in deficit spending which will exceed $5,000,000,000 by the end of this fiscal year. We were also faced with the fact that in addition to providing the necessary money to cover essentials in the regularly established agencies of the Department of Agriculture, we were confronted with various new laws which Congress previously passed authorizing expenditures of new money for new projects. For instance, last year, Congress passed the Housing Act of 1949. The budget allowed $25,000,000 for loans in 1950, which amount is to be borrowed from the Secretary of Treasury and $50,000,000 for 1951; $2,000,000 in grants and loans for 1950 and $5,000,000 for 1951; and approximately $3,000,000 for salaries and expenses and operational purposes for 1950 and approximately $5,000,000 for 1951. Our committee approved $35,000,000 for housing for 1951; $2,000,000 for grants and loans and $3,550,000 for salaries and expenses and operational purposes.

On June 25, 1949, the Forest Resources Survey Act was approved and an increase in the sum of $402,000 was allowed by the Budget for 1951 for forest resources investigations.

The reforestation and revegetation law of the Forest Service was approved October 11, 1949, and was allowed an increase of $870,000 by the budget for reforestation and $510,000 for revegetation; in addition the sum of $1,000,000 was allowed for cooperation of States in reforestation matters. Our committee allowed $350,000 for reforestation, $200,000 for revegetation, and $224,600 for cooperation with States.

Congress also amended the Federal Crop Insurance Act. It was approved August 24, 1949, and the Budget approved an increase in the sum of $2,396,000 to carry out the terms of this act. Our committee approved $1,800,000.

The sum of $25,000,000 was approved by the budget for loans in borrowing authorizations for farm ownership and water facilities on reclamation projects. We allowed $24,000,000, being a decrease of $1,000,000 below the budget estimate.

In order to carry out the proposed programs of the Department of Agriculture, we were asked to provide money for 2,600 additional employees. With the money at hand this was impossible as well as complying with some other Budget requests.

During our hearings I was convinced that practically all the projects administered by the Department of Agriculture are worthy and most desirable for our folks. But at the same time, I could not help but be appalled over the amount of money requested to carry the projects through. Therefore, in our conclusions we endeavored to put first things first and distribute the money to those departments and different projects which we considered absolutely necessary to a balanced economy. In so doing we endeavored to keep in mind a statement that has been made many, many times in the past, that as our farmers prosper so does our Nation.

The time allotted me in discussing this bill forbids a discussion of each item, all of which are important to agriculture as a whole. I shall, therefore confine the balance of my remarks to some of the testimony of Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan.

The Secretary pointed out that last year the farmer had less than four-fifths as much as in 1947 and next year he may have only two-thirds as much as in 1947. Since 1947 gross farm-cash income has fallen more than $2,000,000,000 and the cash expenses have gone up by more than $1,000,000,000.

Last year, he said, the farm operators had about $14,000,000,000 after paying production expenses. This was 15 percent less than they had in 1948 and at least 20 percent less than in 1947.

We were also told the farm-family purchasing power, in terms of 1947 dollars dropped about $2,000,000,000 in 1948 and about $2,000,000,000 more in 1949. It could drop another $2,000,000,000 in 1950 or another 15 percent if farm prices are not improved. Farm living expenses are not coming down as fast as net income. Carrying charges on debt and taxes are increasing and farm debts are going up.

This paints a very dismal picture to me, and looking behind these general trends an even more distressing picture is projected on the screen of our vision. It cannot be denied that most of our farm people have been in the Nation's low-income group. The Secretary pointed out that we were recently reminded by the subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report that in 1948, 3,300,000 families—about one-half of all the families living on farms—had money incomes of less than $2,000, and that one-fourth of all the farm families has less than $1,000, and these are not per capita figures. Instead, they represent family cash incomes, or estimates of actual dollars available for purchasing of nonfarm goods and services, for savings and for paying debts. It was further pointed out that most commodities today are bringing less than parity, and parity ratio is now less than 100; that while farm income has gone down more than 20 percent since 1947, the personal incomes of nonfarm people has gone up 10 percent. Moreover, at the same time, per capita food consumption has declined during the same period.

This picture, as I stated, is not very bright, but it would even be worse were it not for the Federal price-support program. Even with all the criticism which has been leveled at our farmers in some of the newspapers, by news commentators and others, may I say to you had it not been for the cushion which the Commodity Credit Corporation used, the shock of declining farm prices would have been greater and, in my judgment, we would have been headed for the greatest depression this country has ever witnessed.

There are many people in our land today who for good reasons of their own do not agree with Secretary Brannan's plan with reference to agriculture. But, after listening to him testify before our committee the past 2 years, one must be impressed with the fact that he has a wealth of information relative to agricultural economics and is endeavoring to place those ideas into a plan of operation. I doubt if anyone is completely satisfied with the present farm-support program. I know I am not, especially when it comes to surpluses. But, I am convinced that with the great reservoir of knowledge and information the Secretary has relative to agriculture, some satisfactory and permanent solution will be found ultimately which will be far better than the plan we have now, and will insure a fair return to the farmer for the commodities he produces.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman. I do want to make some observations that I think are timely and might be helpful. First I want to say that it has been a pleasure to serve under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. He has been very thorough and very fair. He knows the Department of Agriculture and he knows this chapter of the bill that is on the floor now. The same compliment applies to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRUSE].

I have here in my hand a pamphlet put out by the Department of Agriculture which comprises some 62 pages. It embraces the price-support programs that are now in effect. A lot of thought, a lot of debate, and a lot of good will have gone into the creation of the list of these programs, and they have all been designed for the security of our farmers here in the United States.

I would like to read from page 2 of this pamphlet. Here are price-support programs for basic commodities, for Steagall Act commodities, for wool and other commodities. Then we have the section 32 funds which are supposed to be 30 percent of import duties, and they are supposed to be spent to help and protect the commodities that are hurt by the importation of competitive agricultural commodities.

These programs actually are the result of a lot of planning on the part of farm-group leaders, agricultural educators, and economists and Members of Congress through the last 30 years. They range from outright price support based on parity to various other types of subsidy and diversification to the school-lunch program, marketing agreements and order programs and the sugar program. Consumer subsidies have figured in our price-support scheme but most of those were of an outright war nature.

The fact remains that we have had a tremendous amount of experience with various types of price-support programs. We are still learning. We know that they cost money and that they add personnel to the Federal pay roll.

Notwithstanding the fact that the record of elections and testimony show that the vast number of rural Americans prefer the programs presently in effect, there is still a feeling that modification and improvement is possible. It is not only possible but in many cases mandatory. Even in my own district at least two individuals, both associated with the Washington State Grange have been working on their own versions of a farm program, particularly aimed at the disposal of surplus commodities. And again we have as an additional evidence of the continuing trend in America toward outright government by Executive order, the spectacle of our own Secretary of Agriculture promoting his own farm program. This, of course, is contrary to the procedures that were intended for this Republic by its founders. Administrators are expected to administer laws in effect and not, as administrators, try to change them. The Brannan plan, however, in the version presently before the Congress in the form of a Senate proposal, would by virtue of the 17 pages of controls and parallel penalties, regiment the rural peoples of the United States. There can be but little question of that. And in the Brannan plan the most attractive part is not that which applies to the farmers but the suggestion of an indirect consumer subsidy. Therefore, the Brannan plan should be labeled a "consumer plan" rather than a "farm plan."

But while we and the rural peoples of America consider the past, the present, and future proposals for price-support programs affecting our agricultural producers, there is an insidious enemy right now knocking at our door. This enemy is in the shape of increasing imports of highly competitive commodities from abroad. It makes but little sense if we attempt to make our own domestic producers secure—and through this security encourage them to produce more until we have to grapple with surpluses—if we allow these same surpluses to be aggravated by imports from abroad.

This is true not only in agriculture but in many fields of production. In my own district, mining is important. In fact mining is one of the three great basic industries in this country and takes its place beside agriculture and commerce. They are all interdependent. Mining is necessary for a healthy domestic peacetime economy and for the resources of war. The greatest stock pile that this Nation can have in time of war is operating mines. A closed mine frequently becomes a liability. It is almost impossible to reopen, and yet we are confronted with the fact that 82 percent of the mines of Washington are closed, 71 percent of the mines in Idaho and Montana are closed, and 92 percent of the mines of Oregon are closed. The effect upon our local and national economy and the resulting unemployment is appalling.

The external cause of this is the gradual decline that has been taking place in the price of lead from 15.125 per pound in August 1949 to 10.5 per pound on March 15 of this year. The cause for this decline is the heavy importation of foreign lead, and the sword of Damocles that hangs over the industry is due to the enormous increase in these imports.

Devaluation of foreign currencies has probably tended to increase United States imports. When devaluation occurred, the price of lead increased in devalued currency countries. This tended to discourage consumption of lead in the producing countries and to encourage production.

This is true also in many other fields, particularly, at this time, in the shoe industry, the watch and fine instrument industry, the glass and chinaware industries and many others.

I come from the Pacific Northwest which has a wheat economy, as distinguished from the corn economy of the Middle West. Many of our agricultural industries have grown up based on our wheat economy. Our milling industry is presently running well below 50 percent of normal capacity. It is, on full shift, capable of employing tens of thousands of people directly and many others indirectly. It grew up on the basis of supplying the needs of the Pacific Northwest and adjacent communities and also the markets of the Pacific arena. Freight rates keep them out of any areas, domestically, east of the Mississippi, and rises in freight rates since the war have aggravated this situation. However, devaluations of currencies in other countries and monetary difficulties which today plague our foreign trade relations, have practically denied the markets of the Pacific arena to our wheat millers in the Pacific Northwest and freight rates continue to exercise an aggravation.

The result has been the shutting down of better than half of our milling capacity. This has had its reverberations elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest. We have a great egg and poultry industry there. And the byproducts of the mills at one time constituted the base for the feeding of our poultry flocks. Today, at increased expense, our poultry industry finds it necessary to ship in more and more corn at high freight rates from greater and greater distances. All of this has its direct relationship to anything that we may consider in the field of supporting prices and making our rural population secure in their productiveness here in America.

We cannot ignore these facts. And for the benefit of the committee, I want to put into the RECORD here a partial fiscal year basis compilation of competitive agriculture imports from abroad which are adding to our surpluses here at home and thereby making any progress toward a workable price-support program that much more difficult.

Imports food and agricultural commodities, partial fiscal-year basis, all figures covering comparable periods July 1 to February 28

	Unit	1948–49	1949–50
Butter	Pound	392,000	6,000
Cheese	do	15,511,000	29,365,000
Dried milk	do	2,132,000	6,608,000
Corn	Bushel	323,000	468,000
Barley	do	7,532,000	10,095,000
Oats	do	15,370,000	13,966,000
Dried beans	Pound	9,106,000	5,762,000
Potatoes	do	348,109,000	393,661,000
Apples	Bushel	1,732,000	1,213,000
Pears	Pound	189,000	1,949,000
Raisins	do	56,000	86,000
Pork:			
Fresh and frozen	do	214,000	506,000
Pickled	do	427,000	4,665,000
Eggs:			
Shell	Dozen	1,618,000	2,952,000
Dried yolks	Pound	294,000	2,005,000
Whole	do	28,000	99,000

I hope that the Committee will study this table for it certainly adds food for thought.

In further evidence of the difficulties which our domestic producers endure, I would like now to insert a letter into the RECORD. This letter is addressed to Mr. Hyman Leikind, United States Tariff Commission, under date of April 4, 1950, by Mr. J. Walter Hebert, chairman, import committee of the Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash.

NORTHWEST HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL,
Wenatchee, Wash., April 4, 1950.

Mr. HYMAN LEIKIND,
United States Tariff Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIKIND: When you were in Seattle recently you will recall that R. L. Shultz promised you a summary of the competitive situation that exists on the United States market as a result of importation of Canadian apples. With the assistance of Mr. Schultz,

I have attempted in this letter to summarize the more important points without going into statistical details which are already available to you in governmental statistical reports and in the briefs filed with the Committee for Reciprocity Information before the Annecy conference last year.

The United States imports of Canadian apples come almost entirely from British Columbia. Apple production in British Columbia is similar to that in the State of Washington. It has the same soil and climatic conditions and employs the same orchard practices, harvesting and packing methods as does the United States apple industry of the Pacific Northwest. They size and grade their apples and pack them in the standard northwest apple box, having adopted these practices from the United States northwest apple industry. To the casual United States consumer its apples are identical in grade and style of package to those produced in the United States northwest apple districts.

The varieties it exports to United States markets are for the most part the same as those grown on the United States side of the northwest border. The one important exception is the MacIntosh variety, which they grow in large volume. This variety is not grown in the Pacific Northwest, but is grown in our Middle Western States and New England, and is our second largest variety nationally. The British Columbia MacIntosh competes strongly with our Midwest MacIntosh. This matter of varietal competition is extremely important. For example, the 1949–50 national apple crop in the United States consisted of the following varieties in point of volume: First, Delicious; second, MacIntosh; third, Winesap; fourth, Jonathan; and thereafter followed numerous other varieties in smaller volume—Romes, Staymen, Yorks, Newtons, Baldwin, etc. The first four varieties named constituted 50 percent of the crop. The Winesap is a late keeper and is not generally shipped until after the Jonathans, Delicious, and MacIntosh are out of the way. The British Columbia exports consist primarily of Jonathan, MacIntosh, and Delicious, and compete with the heavy production in point of time as well as in usage with the major production of United States grown apples.

These so-called fall varieties move into consumption from September through February, mostly October through December, during which time the impact of additional imported quantities of these same varieties greatly aggravates the competitive situation. This is the period of the heaviest Canadian shipments, which is also the time of the heaviest United States shipments. Last season the impact was so severe as to drive prices of Jonathan and MacIntosh below the costs of packing and transportation and selling, leaving the United States grower little or nothing whatever for his apples, or even a debt in many cases.

The distribution of British Columbia grown apples to United States markets practically parallels that of apples from the Pacific Northwest. They also compete strongly with Midwest grown MacIntosh and Jonathans in Midwest markets such as Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and Chicago.

The unit cost of production in British Columbia is substantially less than in the Pacific Northwest. The transportation cost is the same to the United States markets where these apples compete. Therefore, the British Columbia grower has a distinct competitive advantage on the basis of delivered unit cost. It is the practice of the British Columbia Tree Fruits, Limited, the one-desk selling organization for British Columbia apples, to sell in United States markets on a delivered basis. This, of course, includes the freight and all delivery costs. The British Columbia shipping organization prepays the Canadian portion of the freight in Canadian currency, and the United States portion in the United States dollars. They collect from the United States buyer the entire delivered price in United States dollars. The United States duty of 12½ cents per bushel, net weight, is of course merely nominal. When computed on the net weight in the standard Northwest apple box it figures about 11.5 cents per box, compared with 37.5 cents per standard apple box, gross weight (railroad published estimated weight of 50 pounds), for the Canadian tariff.

While it is not a matter of tariff, we wish to point out that the 10 percent official discount of the Canadian dollar in terms of the United States dollar enables the Canadian grower to recover from 30 to 40 cents on the average delivered price sale of a box of British Columbia grown apples when the United States dollars are exchanged for Canadian currency. This is an important incentive, over and above the normal trading inducements, to sell larger quantities of British Columbia apples in the United States than would otherwise be the case. This recovery in exchange more than pays the United States duty and in actual practice completely nullifies the tariff.

The trend of production in British Columbia is upward because of the age of their plantings and could easily double within the next decade. According to a tree survey taken in 1945, 24.3 percent of the British Columbia trees were under 10 years of age while Washington had only 7.4 percent. Their plantings of trees since that time have been triple those of the Washington apple growers. The British Columbia plantings are mostly of the Delicious variety which is now the largest single variety produced in the United States.

The British Columbia apples (and other fruits) are sold through one selling organization established by the Natural Products Marketing Act of 1937. This act creates a complete monopoly which is empowered to fix uniform prices and control shipments. The so-called one-desk selling agent, British Columbia Tree Fruits, Limited, exercises complete control of prices and may refuse to sell any distributive agency which does not maintain wholesale or retail prices at any point in Canada. The law has been held to be constitutional in both Provincial and Dominion courts. This creates a potential competitive situation against which the United States grower is practically helpless and which is, of course, illegal in the United States. It amounts to a State-controlled cartel, which our Government has frowned upon in other British-controlled cartels, notably rubber, but seems to accept or condone in our fruit trade relations with Canada.

Prior to World War II (1939), both Canada and the United States had exportable apple surpluses, most of it going to Britain, continental Europe and Scandinavian countries. British Columbia exported between 40 and 50 percent of its production, heavily to Britain. Canada practically took over our large export business to Britain following the imposition of the Empire preference policy and the high British tariff of 4 shillings 6 pençe per hundredweight on United States apples in 1932. Canadian exports to the United States were negligible prior to 1940. The British and other trans-Atlantic markets were almost completely lost to both Canada and the United States following the 1939 crop season. Canada thereupon turned to the United States as their major export market. This situation has persisted and grown since that time. It is doubtful—in fact, practically a certainty—that exports to Britain and European markets will ever reach the same quantities they did before 1939. This is due to two major reasons: First, because of the fast-increasing production of apples in England and the European countries; and second, because of the economic effects of the war. It seems improbable that this situation will change materially for some years to come. In the meantime, as the production increases in British Columbia, the impact of its surplus, with increased United States imports, will grow and the competitive situation will be progressively aggravated. If the apple industry of the United States, and especially that large segment located in the Pacific Northwest, is not to suffer serious damage, then certainly some restrictive measures for control of imports must be instituted. At the present time there are absolutely no barriers or control measures in effect and no import regulations applicable to apples coming in from Canada other than the nominal duty. Canada on the other hand imposes a much higher duty and other import onerous regulations, and, while we do not look to Canada for any substantial apple exports, the wide discrepancy in the trading conditions offers an opportunity for a closer approach to equality of treatment in the forthcoming revision of the Canadian-United States trade agreement.

You will recall the statement made in Seattle by Mr. Shultz that in considering or attempting to evaluate the injurious effect of Canadian exports to the United States, the over-all figures such as are set forth in the tariff summary on fresh apples are misleading for the following reasons: First, approximately one-third of the total crop is processed annually. Another 10 percent is used on the farm, wasted, fed to livestock, etc. It does not get into fresh commercial channels. Exports have been limited to about 1½ to 2 percent in recent years. Fresh domestic use is therefore around 60 percent of the total crop. This 60 percent from a marketing point of view should be classified according to variety, grade, and size and by localities where grown. The most important of these perhaps is variety. Different varieties have their own peculiar qualities and uses, as well as varying length of life. Price differentials of varieties vary from year to year depending on the supply of each.

This fact is recognized both by the British Columbia sales agency and the marketing concerns in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere, wherever apples are sold from point of production. It has been customary for the British Columbia representatives at the annual conference between the Canadian and United States apple industries to give an estimate of the probable movement of British Columbia apples to the United States by varieties and by months which they intended to export to the United States. The purpose of this estimate is merely informative and not agreed to and is in no sense binding on anyone. It is a recognition of the fact that varietal impact upon like varieties grown in the United States is a vital factor in the distributive process. The 1949–50 schedule as estimated in August was as follows:

[In 1,000 bushels]

Variety	Sept. 15–Oct. 31	Nov. 1–30	Dec. 1–31	Jan. 1–31	Feb. 1 on
Wealthy	20				
MacIntosh	330	150	100		
Jonathans	300	100			
Delicious	50	200	200	150	25
Rome			25	50	25
Newtons				50	50
Miscellaneous		50		60	55
Total	700	510	325	310	155

This contemplated schedule was badly disrupted by actual marketing experience. The United States market on Jonathans and MacIntosh, due to a large crop of these varieties in our Middle-West, plus the impact of Canadian imports, sank to a point that did not return freight and packing costs. Consequently, British Columbia Tree Fruits, Ltd., largely discontinued the export of these varieties and substituted therefor heavy shipments of standard Delicious and Red Delicious, due to a much more favorable market for these varieties. In fact, British Columbia exports of Red Delicious to the United States amounted to more than 10 percent of the Northwest production of this variety. Furthermore, it should be recognized that British Columbia will probably export to the United States about 2,000,000 boxes which compete directly on the fresh fruit market with the 26,000,000 produced in the Pacific Northwest of the same varieties and sold to the same wholesale and retail buyers. This increase in supply of an identical product is approximately 8 percent and an incerase of 8 percent in years of surpluses causes a decline in prices of far more than 8 percent. The losses occasioned by a decline in price are also augmented by forcing the United States Northwest grower to hold back his Delicious and other fall varieties in cold storage at additional cost and also frequently causing loss of condition and repacking, as was the case this season. The losses occasioned by this factor alone probably equaled or even exceeded the decline in price occasioned by Canadian imports.

The Pacific Northwest apple crop this year has averaged considerably less than parity which, as of January 15, was $2.38 per bushel. And this despite the fact that the equivalent of well over a million boxes which would ordinarily be marketed were not packed and many were not harvested. Realizing there was a surplus production, growers were induced to leave certain varieties or uncolored apples on the trees or, if harvested, were sold to byproduct plants at mere salvage prices. The "preliminary" average price of Washington apples as computed by the Seattle BAE office is $2.12 f. o. b., whereas actual costs of production range around $2.55 to $2.58 f. o. b. cars, according to the best figures obtainable from large growers who keep accurate accounts.

This situation was recognized by the Department of Agriculture and the Northwest industry has been aided by PMA purchases for the school-lunch program, and by an export subsidy. The PMA purchases were at $1.70 and $1.80 f. o. b., far below costs of production or even much below parity. Similarly, some 420,000 boxes were exported to Britain through the use of CCC funds and ECA dollars. The prices, however, were also on a salvage basis and far below parity, being from $1.80 to $1.90 per box f. o. b.

The point was raised in your discussion with Mr. Shultz, that, if importations of apples were stopped, it might result in the consumer being gouged by exorbitant prices. The answer seems self-evident. We are a Nation which is geared to an historical record of apple exports. We have developed a national production which is dependent on an export market as a matter of calculated foresight and good business practice. It is only through the exigencies and disruption of normal and historical trade channels that we are not able to export an adequate portion of our production and have become an importing nation. Our imports are not necessary to fill a void or a need for more apples but are forced upon our markets by international economic pressure despite our own surpluses created by our lack of exports. The proximity of British Columbia grown apples to the United States markets, plus their loss of the British market and our normal duty, makes a combination of circumstances which prompts them to look to the United States markets as a lucrative source of revenue. When, during the thirties, there were no apple imports and our exports were at the high point, prices in the United States were at the low point of history. While there were other factors affecting price, that of imports certainly had no bearing because there were none. It should be apparent to anyone attempting to analyze the price structure of apples that all other fruits are competitive to apples, especially bananas, which come into the United States duty-free in quantities which have in the past exceeded in volume the entire fresh-apple consumption. The effect of apple imports on the United States consumer does not lie in a danger of exorbitant prices if they are discontinued but rather to the discouragement of the United States grower to the point of abandoning or being forced out of production, thereby leaving the market to a foreign monopolistic and state-controlled pricing system with which the United States grower cannot compete.

We trust this summary will give you a more realistic and down-to-earth viewpoint of the situation as we see it here in the Pacific Northwest. We shall be glad to amplify any particular point or points or furnish supporting statistical data on costs or crops by varieties, etc., should you so desire.

Very truly yours,

NORTHWEST HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL,
J. WALTER HEBERT,
Chairman, Import Committee.

I want particularly to call your attention to the sixth and seventh paragraphs of this letter which will indicate the almost impossible problems our domestic producers face when confronted with almost anything approaching competition either here in America or in foreign fields.

Because of these factors, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we will just have to have better management of our domestic affairs here at home or suffer the consequences of failure in any attempt to provide a way of salvation for our American farmers. In fact, I think it rather interesting for Secretary Brannan to espouse a plan which would virtually mean the Federal management of our entire farm production and disposal system when the facts of the matter indicate that the present Department of Agriculture has been unable to manage the situation as it is. It seems to me a rather poor recommendation, when one views the present situation, to expect our farm communities to turn over their total business management to the Federal Government.

There is another factor, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to bring to the attention of the committee and that is with regard to the use and management of section 32 funds. This year the Department of Agriculture has followed a suggestion which I made last year. What we previously referred to simply as section 32 funds now comes in the justifications marked as "removal of surplus agriculture commodities" with section 32 in parenthesis under that title. It is to the use of these funds that the producers of perishable commodities quite properly look with most hope. Perishables cannot qualify under practically any of the price support programs, with the possible exception of the school lunch program. They are not storable. Consequently, although section 32 in the original act does not designate them as the principal beneficiary of this fund, they have become the prinpal beneficiary. This is proper. I think that the producers of perishables in the United States are entitled to a full understanding and a better programing of the use of section 32 moneys. Up to now these moneys have been more or less a sort of grab bag out of which various and sundry programs could be financed. A study of the record of the use of section 32 moneys will indicate how true this is. Despite the fact that cotton is one of the first commodities to qualify for price support and commodity credit funds, we find that in this present fiscal year, better than one hundred thousands dollars of section 32 money has been used for cotton. Flaxseed is another such commodity and better than sixty thousand dollars has been used to support flaxseed. Another is peanuts and here we find better than four and one-half million dollars in the support of peanuts. Sorghum grains is another commodity for which better than twenty thousand dollars has been used to support them. And of all commodities which properly come under regular commodity credit support is wheat—nearly two and one-third million dollars of section 32 moneys has been used in the support of wheat.

I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to insert a table which outlines the way that section 32 moneys have been used in the period between July 1, 1949, and March 31, 1950. I believe that a study of this table will be most interesting.

Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec. 32)—Funds obligated by commodities fiscal year 1950

[As of Mar. 31, 1950]

Commodity	Unit	Exports		Domestic uses		Total	
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Apples, fresh	Bushel	1,835,695	$2,158,776	2,622,970	$6,970,587	4,458,665	$9,129,363
Almonds (unshelled)	Pound			6,250,000	875,000	6,250,000	875,000
Beans, snap	Bushel			32,222	46,311	32,222	46,311
Butter	Pound			16,000,000	11,459,195	16,000,000	11,459,195
Cabbage	50-pound bag			13,490	17,538	13,490	17,538
Cotton	Bale	1,000	100	7,500	101,750	8,500	101,850
Eggs	Pound	5,672,511	3,033,833	3,020,835	4,536,652	8,693,346	7,570,485
Figs, dried	Ton			1,000	60,000	1,000	60,000
Flaxseed	Bushel	3,680,719	62,716			3,680,719	62,716
Honey				(1)	180,316		180,316
Irish potatoes	Hundredweight.			2,002,000	5,000,000	2,002,000	5,000,000
Milk	Pound			12,000,000	[2] 2,691,789	12,000,000	2,691,789
Oranges, fresh	Box	352,661	567,802			352,661	567,802

[1] Transportation costs on prior year commodities.
[2] Includes $691,000 for transportation costs on prior year commodities.

Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec. 32)—Funds obligated by commodities fiscal year 1950—Continued

[As of Mar. 31, 1950]

Commodity	Unit	Exports		Domestic uses		Total	
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Orange juice, cd. SS	No. 2 case	33,627	$33,852			33,627	$33,852
Orange juice, cd. conc.	Gallon	34,587	50,104			34,587	50,104
Peanuts	Pound	62,121,891	4,709,498			62,121,891	4,709,498
Pears, fresh	Box	132,672	165,835	833,918	$2,662,763	966,590	2,828,598
Prunes:							
Dried	Ton	33,744	3,018,300	51,508	4,117,360	85,252	7,135,660
Fresh	Bushel			32,546	115,000	32,546	115,000
Raisins, dried	Ton	45,813	3,881,700	68,863	5,521,058	114,676	9,402,758
Sorghum grains	Bushel			15,990	23,987	15,990	23,987
Spinach	do			50,000	42,857	50,000	42,857
Sweetpotatoes	do			4,272	6,554	4,272	6,554
Walnuts (unshelled)	Pound			22,000,000	2,200,000	22,000,000	2,200,000
Wheat and wheat flour	Bushel	5,750,000	2,295,555			5,750,000	2,295,555
Total			19,978,071		46,628,717		66,606,788

I would also like to insert a letter from Mr. Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1950.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: The following tabulation showing the status of section 32 funds for fiscal year 1950 is furnished in response to your request of April 3:

Funds available	$125,606,932
Obligations (as of Mar. 31, 1950):	
Export programs	19,978,071
Domestic use programs	46,628,717
Total programs	66,606,788
Administrative expenses	2,722,769
Transfers to other uses	399,735
Total obligations	69,729,292
Unobligated balance	55,877,690

The above amounts represent the obligations reported on official records and not necessarily the amounts actually committed under approved obligating instruments. In some instances the amounts are necessarily less than those actually committed because of the time involved in processing a contract or other obligation instrument from the date of its approval until funds obligated by it can be officially recorded. Consequently the unobligated balance of $55,877,690 does not necessarily represent uncommitted funds which are available for additional or new programs. The total amount of funds actually committed for programs as of April 19, 1950, was $101,287,735.

The attached table shows the break-down by commodity of the funds obligated for export and domestic use programs as of March 31, 1950.

We will be glad to supply any additional information you may request.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

I believe this letter indicates the point that I wish to make—that we in the Congress should concern ourselves with a better and more explicit programing for the use of section 32 moneys.

It would appear that on March 31 we had obligated for the support of the commodities indicated in the table above a little over $66,500,000. We had spent $2,666,666 for administrative purposes out of section 32 moneys. Almost four hundred thousand had been transferred to other purposes and as of March 31, nearly fifty-six million had been unobligated.

It would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, that with the end of the fiscal year but 3 months away, we should have a better record of committing funds with regard to section 32.

I also believe that a study by the appropriate committee of this program should be had in the interests of building up and providing a real and sound program for the support of perishable agriculture production in the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRUSE].

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, and I wish to make only a few comments relative to the bill before us today and relative in particular to the work of our committee.

I believe I would be remiss in my duty here if I did not pay tribute to the chairman of our committee. It has been a privilege and a pleasure for me to have served under the direction of our able chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I also wish to commend the other members of our subcommittee.

I come from an agricultural and industrial area, so I am well familiar with the cross-currents of criticism that are being particularly leveled at the farmers of this country. I wish that all Americans who indulge in such criticism could read the speech our able chairman delivered here on the floor of the House today.

I believe that much of the present criticism of our agricultural program is unfounded, while at the same time I certainly recognize that it is not perfect. Most certainly our present agricultural policies and programs must be continually reviewed and in many respects changed or corrected. I am convinced, however, that much of the criticism today is due to a lack of understanding or knowledge as to the costs of and the manner in which our present program operates. For example, I would like to point out that the bill before us today provides less than half of the amount appropriated for this same program in prewar 1940; it is also significant to note that the price-support programs operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation have cost the American people the approximate sum of $1,000,000,000 during the past 10 years, far less than the amounts spent following the war in enabling industry to reconvert to peacetime operation. Agriculture is very much interrelated to the rest of our economy, and our investment in agriculture is justified by virtue of its contribution to the over-all economy. The continued conservation of our natural resources is vital to the continued welfare of our Nation.

One thing I have learned since serving as a member of our subcommittee is that agriculture is basic. The problem is not political. Our country would rue the day if politics became the dominant factor in our consideration of such an important and basic question. I know that at no time has politics ever entered into our discussions while our committee has been in session, either this year or last year. I think that is the greatest tribute that can be paid to the individual Members.

There is considerable talk about economy these days. Since I have been here I think I have followed as independent a course of action as any Member of the Congress. I have never hesitated to oppose the administration if I thought they were wrong. I have voted against some of the large spending programs that have brought before us in the past year and a half, and I will continue doing so in the future if I am convinced they are not in the best interests of the country, but I know that much of the criticism directed toward Government spending today is ill-timed and also is founded upon an erroneous conception of what we are doing with the money, and a notable lack of understanding of how our Government operates.

Not too many people seem to realize that about 70 to 75 percent of all our expenditures today are related directly to past wars or presently disordered world conditions. Some people criticize the relatively insignificant expenditures for our agricultural economy, when they constitute but a very, very small percentage of our over-all expenditures.

I believe one of the greatest services the average Member of Congress can perform to the people whom he represents, in addition to representing them with a sense of integrity, is to help clear up some of these misconceptions.

I wish to again say at this point that I am as concerned about mounting governmental expenditures as is any Member of this House, and I have on frequent occasions been highly critical of various proposed expenditures and also of new legislation which would inevitably entail enormous expenditures in the future. However, indiscriminate and ill-timed criticism does not contribute to a constructive solution of the problem; surely it is far better that we apply ourselves continuously in an intelligent and enlightened manner and then take that action at all times that is in the best interests of our Nation as a whole.

I think our bill this year is a good bill. It was significant that much of the in-

crease in the bill in certain specific items was due to new legislation. Therein lies one of the big problems so far as cutting down on expenditures in the future is concerned.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that had it not been for the new legislation which the Congress adopted last year we could have brought in a bill considerably under the present figure? In fact, we could have shown quite a saving under 1950.

Mr. KRUSE. That is very true.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRUSE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the sincerity of his approach and his devotion to his assignment as a member of this committee.

Mr. KRUSE. I thank the gentleman very much. Mr. Chairman, in connection with my remarks concerning the need for further economy in Government, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the following editorial from a recent issue of the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette. The editorial reads as follows:

CONGRESS MUST DO ITS DUTY

Congress is one of the three separate and distinct branches of the American Government.

Congress is elected by the people and is answerable only to the people.

Therefore, it cannot evade its responsibility for what goes on in Washington.

People say Washington is a far-flung, loose-jointed network of bureaucracies, and it is.

People say Federal taxes are too high, and they are.

People say public expenditures run rampant, and they do.

If these things are true, and they are, Congress has not done its duty to the public.

No dollar can be spent by the Government which has not been authorized by Congress.

No tax can be levied which Congress does not approve.

No bureaucrat can be paid unless Congress votes the money.

The fact is that a majority of Senators and Representatives are too responsive to the pressure of minorities which are bent on making raids on the Federal Treasury. Many Congressmen have formed the annoying and expensive habit of talking economy out of one side of their mouths, while voting for increased expenditures out of the other side of the same mouths.

The trick then is to pass the buck to the executive department which may have requested a bloated budget. The executive department must and does face its share of the blame, but that does not clear the skirts of Congress.

The President proposes. Congress disposes. The President may recommend. He cannot legislate. The power to legislate under our Constitution is invested solely in the House and the Senate.

The American people have been alarmed for years by the overgrowth of boards and commissions in the National Capital. They have talked against it. They have adopted resolutions against it. But the increase of bureaucracy has been accelerated—all because the people's duly elected Representatives in Congress have failed to stand up to their responsibility.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak briefly on the item for emergency control of insects by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

The Appropriations Committee leveled some very serious charges at this agency in connection with its operations in the grasshopper eradication campaign last year. As a result of the committee's investigations, the Commission made very sizable reductions in the amounts requested by the Bureau.

While I praise the committee in its efforts for economy, the fact remains that the sums appropriated in the recent deficiency bill and recommended for appropriation in this measure are not adequate to control a grasshopper plague of the proportions we now expect in Montana and Wyoming.

Terrific destruction of crops and ranges are in prospect if the hoppers are not controlled this spring, before they have a chance to spread over the countryside. It is a job that the local people cannot do alone. Far the larger share of the land involved is in Federal ownership. It is a Federal responsibility not only to prevent grasshopper destruction of the range it owns, but also to control grasshoppers so that they will not spread to the adjacent land in private ownership. The ranchers and farmers in the area have a right to expect that the Government will take care of its own problem, and they also wish to have Federal assistance on a 50–50 basis for the campaign against hoppers on State, county, and private lands.

The original Bureau request for $3,523,000 for this spring's work was cut by the Budget Bureau to $2,200,000 and further reduced to $1,000,000 in the urgent deficiency bill. The Bureau also requested $2,500,000 for 1951 which is cut to $850,000 in the pending bill.

These amounts I fear will not be adequate for the work ahead. I am told that a supplemental request may soon be submitted for additional funds for this spring's work, and I hope it will have the speedy attention of the Congress. I also hope that a suitable adjustment will be made for the 1951 fiscal year.

At this point I wish to include in my remarks an expression of concern from the county commissioners of six counties in northeast Montana. A similar situation is in prospect in southeast Montana and in Wyoming.

RESOLUTION REQUESTING EMERGENCY GRASSHOPPER FUNDS

Whereas a severe infestation of grasshoppers, both local and migratory, is expected; and

Whereas most of the present infestation comes from migration of hoppers from other States; and

Whereas county funds have been exhausted during the severe winter and farmers have come through a long, expensive winter; and

Whereas last year's crops were short as a result of drought and grasshopper damage. There is no money or foreseeable method of grasshopper control for the six northeast Montana counties; and

Whereas more than one-third of the land in these counties is State or Federal owned and not taxed by the various counties; and

Whereas the Bureau of Entomology program has been explained and little or no assistance can be expected from them from presently appropriated funds. Federal funds are needed because farmers do not have money for spraying crops and spraying is not effective when crops begin to ripen and/or dry out.

Whereas the State leaders of 16 Western States, at their annual meeting in November 1949 based their estimate of need at $3,523,000 for grasshopper and Mormon cricket control in 1950, upon the known facts as of that date. No new facts have been established to reduce these estimates. The State leaders reaffirm that the original estimate was based upon facts determined by sound survey methods. Therefore, to do the job properly, the full amount requested is still needed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the county commissioners of these six northeast Montana counties at a joint meeting in Wolf Point, Mont., April 17, 1950, That emergency funds in the amount of $500,000 be made available to the Bureau of Entomology to assist in fighting the severe expected infestation of grasshoppers in our area. We request an additional $350,000 to be allotted for Fort Peck Indian Agency and other Federal lands within these six counties, for the purchase and spreading of bait for control of hoppers, which we understand are Federal responsibilities.

The funds which we request for private lands will be matched on a 50–50 basis through obtaining, mixing, distributing, and spreading baits.

To be of any value in coping with the grasshopper emergency in this area funds should be available not later than May 15, 1950.

F. H. Danielson, Henry Walder, Sheridan County; Harry Bummer, Thomas Throndson, Harvey Wagar, Daniels County; George Eckhoff, Donald W. Pentre, Richland County; Floyd Davis, John Breitbach, McCone County; Stanley Nees, C. H. Peterson, Roosevelt County; Roy A. Biddle, Valley County.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman apparently there is some misinformation and misapprehension with regard to the handling of this program to which the gentleman has addressed his remarks. The action of the committee in fixing the amount of money in the next fiscal year was not intended to include the program for next year. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the problems we have had in connection with the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine in this year's report. The committee felt we ought to let them have the money this year, which came in a supplemental bill, and see what they do with it before we fix the amount for next year. So far as the committee is concerned it is the intention to bring them in next spring rather than to provide for them in this bill. I just want the gentleman to know that there was no desire to cut the heart out of the work. They are on trial. I think they invited that, but we expect to be fair with them.

Mr. D'EWART. May I state that I read the committee report carefully and I sympathize with the committee. I am sure that if the results as they appear

later in the spring show that there is a need for more funds in grasshopper control they will be forthcoming. I am sure the committee realizes that and will take care of the situation at the proper time. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks I made during general debate on April 5 beginning at page 4878 with reference to the provision in the committee bill, page 193, authorizing the Department of Agriculture to pay out of section 32 funds transportation and handling charges on surplus commodities owned by the Department or any of its instrumentalities or agencies for the purpose of distribution to public-welfare agencies. You will find that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] to whom great credit is due for sponsoring this important provision, discussed it with me and said he felt that the provision needed broadening considerably. Both he and I agreed that we could not conceive that any Member of this body would assume the terrific responsibility of objecting to such a provision which attempts to make available these gigantic quantities of surplus perishable products to the people in America who need that food.

I then placed in the RECORD two versions of amendments which could be considered. After consultation with a number of my colleagues and consideration of other comparable legislation including the conference report on the disposition of surplus potatoes, now a law, section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and the provision in the ECA Act, I have decided that the second of the two proposals is best adapted to accomplish the purposes I believe the great majority of us have in mind. For the benefit of my colleagues I want the language of this amendment which I shall propose readily available. It is as follows:

Page 193, line 18, strike out lines 18 through 24 inclusive, and insert "In order to prevent the waste of food commodities acquired through price-support operations which are found to be in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized and directed to make available such commodities as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local tax-supported institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions, and public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States; fourth, to intergovernmental or international nonprofit welfare agencies, for assistance to needy persons outside the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that such commodities are in ample supply over and above such reserves as may be required and deemed in the public interest. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Corporation shall make any such commodities available at no cost at point of use within the United States or at shipside at port of embarkation. The Secretary and the Corporation may pay as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over: *Provided*, That no transportation or handling charges shall be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation or Department of Agriculture if in so doing it would lower the total amount of agricultural commodities acquired by any institution or organization through the normal channels of trade and commerce."

Finally, I want to call attention to the tabulation which I placed in the RECORD that day of the items of food which could be immediately used, their cost, the comparable carrying charges for fiscal 1949 and the first half of fiscal 1950. This should be considered in connection with the more recent reports of heavily increased purchases as well as the announcement of the Department yesterday that all loans must be paid or the collateral, that is these surplus food commodities, would be taken over. I attempted today to get exact information from the Department as to the quantities now on hand but I was unable to get anything specific. I shall try again tomorrow morning to develop this but I have serious doubts that there is information available in any form which accurately reflects the amount of food being stored at the continuing heavy expense to the American taxpayer and at the very real risk of spoilage, if that has not been the case in large measure up to now. I can conclude in no better way than to quote from a memorandum prepared by the Friends Committee on National Legislation following a 10-day seminar from January 31 to February 10 of farmers from 18 States on the question "What could and should American agriculture do for a hungry world?" I quote:

The important thing is that food or agricultural products paid for by the American taxpayer should not be allowed to spoil, be eaten by rats, or be destroyed. It should actually get into peoples' mouths at home or abroad.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, today I take the floor to call the attention of this House to the plight of 20,000 Endicott-Johnson shoe workers in the triple cities area, if certain proposals to lower tariffs now being made by our State Department become the law of the land.

From a recent answer I had from the Secretary of State to an inquiry I made, I quote the following:

A proposal to eliminate the use of American selling price is being considered in connection with possible legislation, which it is expected will be submitted to Congress by the Treasury Department in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, during the past week, I have received the greatest mass protest in the mail from the Endicott-Johnson workers and their friends of any I have ever witnessed since I have served in Congress.

A whole table in my office is weighed down by a tremendous pile of more than 20,000 penny post cards, signed personally by each worker, and addressed to me with the following exhortation:

As a resident of the triple cities area and an Endicott-Johnson worker, I am opposed to any reduction in existing tariffs on imports of rubber-soled canvas and waterproof rubber footwear. Such reduction may come through negotiations under the reciprocal-trade program or through enactment of a proposed bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs which calls for the elimination of the American selling-price principle for assessment of duty on certain items, including canvas and waterproof rubber footwear. I regard any reduction in tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear as an economic threat to the community in which I live and therefore of a most serious threat to my own security.

I would like to have brought these cards into the well of this House to display to the membership. However, such a vast bulk as 20,000 post cards packaged together would have made it impossible to carry. Nevertheless if any would care to see this gigantic expression from patriotic American workers, I will be pleased to show them if you will come to my office.

Supported by such intense enthusiasm and demands for action, I cannot remain silent longer upon the subject of the State Department's proposal to abolish the American selling-price principle in relation to regulating duties on imported rubber-soled shoes.

According to the many statements from those who know the rubber-footwear industry in my section, to abolish the American selling price as a basis for figuring the amount of duty on rubber footwear sent from Japan or from behind the iron curtain, will flood our country with shoes of such low value, that our high standards and wages will collapse and our rubber-footwear industries will be put out of business.

As one who voted for the minimum-wage law in the first session of this Congress, I oppose any action by the State Department or by this House which will destroy that minimum wage or eliminate the jobs of any individual or group of American working men and women.

Tragic and paradoxical as it is, the State Department is in favor of this, to quote further from their answer: "require that dutiable value be based on the actual value of the imported merchandise and not on the value of domestic merchandise."

This means, for example, that a canvas oxford coming from Japan at an invoice price of 49 cents is given unfair ad-

vantage over a comparable pair made by Endicott-Johnson workers that sell for $1.80.

The American selling price therefore is $1.80 and the present tariff for the 49-cent Japanese pair is 35 percent of the $1.80 or 62 cents.

This makes the total price of the Jap pair $1.11. But if we figure on the new basis, the tariff will become 17 cents, and the same pair will be sent into this country for 66 cents.

You do not have to scratch your heads to conclude that Endicott-Johnson workers' rubber footwear or any other American firm's can never compete with a situation which practically erases American competition with Japan and iron-curtain countries right here in our own front yard.

Perhaps the State Department thinks this is a triumph in international relations. I, for one, cannot go along with them on this and I will fight as hard as I can to defeat their attempts to ruin the present arrangement which is working out satisfactorily for the workers I represent.

Let us examine this plan from another angle. The rubber-footwear industry is one in which the labor cost in proportion to the total cost of the shoe is very high, namely, 47 percent.

In Japan, the labor cost is very small, the Japanese shoe worker receiving about 67 cents a day in contrast to our American workers' hourly wage of an average of nearly $1.50 an hour.

In the Binghamton-Johnson City-Endicott-Vestal area, workers enjoy as high a standard of living as there is in America and the world. They own their homes, many drive cars, buy United States savings bonds and spend their money in the triple cities. The Endicott-Johnson workers earn living wages but they do not have money to throw away. They cannot afford to take a pay cut and they do not want interference from the State Department with the good work they now do.

Ever since I have served in Congress, I have tried to work for things which would benefit our valley of opportunity and fight things which tend to hurt it. I do not recall an incident which will prove as disastrous to the Americans in my district or to the country at large as the abolition of the American selling-price principle in the rubber-footwear industry.

Although there are nearly 1,500 workers engaged in the actual manufacture of canvas rubber-soled and rubber shoes, the whole Endicott-Johnson factory personnel of 20,000 workers will be directly or indirectly affected.

Whatever friendly international feeling the State Department might bring about by giving reduced duty to foreign made shoes and allowing Japan and other nations to engulf the American market with inferior products, I fear will be greatly outweighed by serious and widespread unemployment, and the closing of the doors of some American factories.

With the unemployment problem now No. 1 in some sections, can we afford to tolerate such ridiculous procedure?

Yet the State Department is apparently boldly accepting the certain results of American labor competing with Japanese made shoes. Note the following statement made by a prominent official working in close conjunction with them that "he is aware that many in America will lose their jobs but that the Government should take care of such jobless employees and rehabilitate them to new types of work."

In answer to that amazing statement, let me say that Endicott-Johnson workers are essentially shoe people, skilled in the technique and art of making shoes. This is their life's occupation, their chosen profession.

It seems outrageous that any scheme of power politics would contemplate abandoning large American industries to the fate of being jeopardized or closed entirely because we want to curry favor with any foreign nation. I question the wisdom and the ultimate success of such a policy.

Certainly, I am not going to stand idly by and see thousands of people engaged in the time honored pursuit of making shoes relegated to the dole or the breadline, while Japanese workers receiving about the world's lowest pay are encouraged to send in their products in unfair competition with our own people.

The United States cannot survive that kind of a program, however commendable and humanitarian it may appear to other nations. Some consideration must be given to the welfare of American labor and industry along with the rest.

In extending the high American standard of living to the entire world, we must likewise preserve it for America, else we defeat the very purposes of our well-intentioned aid and succor.

As one Member of Congress who has generally supported the foreign aid program, I have long been chagrined at the failure of those in charge to recognize that spending American dollars abroad must be carried on so as to bring home large demands for goods upon American industry so that our domestic production and employment will boom and prosperity will reach American shores while it pervades the globe.

I do hope that State Department officials, yes and the administration directing them, will reconsider their decision to ask that Congress tamper with our tariff again. In the name of the 20,000 interested Endicott Johnson workers, whose signed demands for action are now in my office, I implore Mr. Acheson and his associates to keep the American selling price principle in effect so that American-made rubber-soled shoes and rubber footwear will remain on the market.

In the name of these thousands of hardworking, earnest, patriotic Americans, I ask the Congress to protect our industry and our workers.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am glad the gentleman informed us of the fact that the wage in Japan is about 9 cents an hour. How does he expect our industries to compete with such pauper wages?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is absolutely impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

BRANNAN PLAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a lot of money for agriculture. It does not carry a dime that is not deserved. I believe that there are ways that the Government can save money on its agricultural program. At the present time the Government is engaged in the business of making loans on perishable commodities as well as those that are nonperishable, handling those commodities, transporting them, storing them, and selling them; the Government is in a big business in perishable products. There is a way that the Government can get out of that business of handling, transporting, storing, and selling perishable products. That plan has been suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan.

There are two things about that plan that I desire to especially invite your attention to: No. 1, it will get the Government out of the business that I have already stated; No. 2, it will preserve agriculture for the family-sized farm.

Today it is difficult for any person to go into private business in a line that is already dominated by large concerns. What chance has a young GI going into the grocery business, for instance, when one large concern admits that in 29 percent of the areas they sell at a loss? Naturally, it results in putting the little stores out of business; and to add to the bad effect, the Government permits them to have a tax deduction for those losses, thereby subsidizing out of the United States Treasury the concerns that destroy the independent small merchant in this country. Take the large steel concerns, they are not just in the steel business; they are in the fabricating business; they are going into all lines of business. What chance has an individual going into competition with them when the big steel companies have absolute control of the supply of materials and can cut off the supply of an individual any time they desire? He does not have any chance at all.

MONOPOLY IN FARMING?

In agriculture monopoly is beginning to rear its ugly head, although agriculture has only been real prosperous in the last few years, and only in the last few years have farmers had any degree of security; yet, after that short period of time, 1.7 percent of the farmers are producing one quarter, 25 percent, of the farm income. That is a warning to us; that is a warning we should heed. Let us not have monopoly in the farming business; let us preserve the farming business for the family-type farm.

Under the Brannan plan there is a limitation of $25,000 that can be paid to any one farmer. Under the present program one potato farmer, a Boston banker who happened to own land in Maine, received $576,000 last year. That is ridiculous; it is scandalous. It should not be

permitted; it should be stopped. The Brannan plan will stop it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman but the gentleman has reference, I presume, to the Legislative Committee. I tried to insist to my friend from Texas that this was a matter that was properly before the Legislative Committee rather than the Appropriations Subcommittee. I hope the gentleman will make that clear.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman remembers, I said "The great Committee on Agriculture." That is in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTEN. Everyone does not understand the distinction between the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations as the gentleman does. I have not made any point that this is not in order and do not wish to, but I feel I was in order in asking that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is opposition to this plan. I have been a Member of Congress for nearly 22 years and I have never known a national organization representing the big fellows and the little fellows that did not wind up representing the big fellows alone. Take the United States Chamber of Commerce, which is a very powerful organization. They are composed of the biggest businesses and industries in the country, the medium sized and the smaller ones. They often boast of the fact that most of their businesses are small. They are right. But I have never seen a time during the 22 years I have been a Member of Congress when there was a conflict of interest between the big ones and the little ones that the United States Chamber of Commerce did not take the side of the big ones.

There are quite a few Members on the floor here today. If there is any Member who ever remembers the United States Chamber of Commerce in its 38 years of experience failing to take the side of big business and against little business when there was a conflict of interest I would like to know, and I yield to anyone for that purpose.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

The same is true as to the National Association of Manufacturers. They brag about having big ones and little ones. They boast about the fact that most of their members are little fellows, but they always are on the side of the big fellows.

There is an obvious reason for that. The big fellows attend all of the meetings, they become chairmen of committees, they go anywhere in the United States and attend these meetings. They go to the top rather fast and they dominate all these groups composed of the big fellows and the little fellows. I have never seen that organization fail to take the side of the big fellows when there was a conflict of interest as between the little and big fellows.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU

Now, I may mention the American Farm Bureau, which is no exception. They have members who operate the big factory-type farms in their organization. They have the big farmers, the medium farmers, and the small farmers. But you know where the pressure comes from in the American Farm Bureau. The big fellows are right around the officers all the time, if they are not the officers themselves. They are always right around the officers. They have tremendous influence. They go to all the meetings. They are on good terms with all the officers and they dominate just exactly like they do in the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

I regret exceedingly that the great American Farm Bureau president, Mr. Kline, has taken a side in opposition to this great plan. Yet he does not offer any plan as a substitute or as an alternative. He is just opposed. Possibly there are some parts of it I do not like. But I appeal to the great Committee of Agriculture of the House, the chairman of that committe, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the Members who work with him, and it is a fine committee. I hope they will take this bill up and further consider it during this present session, because something needs to be done in 1950. It should be done right now. If there is any other plan that is better, let us adopt the other plan, but if it is not better, let us take the plan that will get the Government out of the business of perishable products, the handling, storing, and selling to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and also limit the amount that can be paid to any one farmer.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I compliment the gentleman from Texas for the courageous speech he is making and say that such a plan would be for the best interest of the farmers of America and for agriculture as a whole as a great element of our national economy.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, and the people in the cities are entitled to the lowest price that they can get consistent with the farmer's interest. I want to compliment, like the gentleman from Mississippi did, the Members from the cities. The Democratic Members from the cities of Chicago, New York, and Boston have better farm records right here in the House of Representatives than many of the Members from agricultural sections. The distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Boston, has an excellent record on farm legislation. I am talking about Members now. They almost invariably go along because they know it is in the Nation's interest, but we do not always go along with them, and sometimes we should when we do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what I wonder about the Brannan plan is, Who will ever give this House or the Congress an honest estimate of what that plan will cost the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think the gentleman can fully answer that question. I refuse to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I will give the gentleman the answer.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sorry; I do not think that he is fully qualified to answer that question because nobody has come before our subcommittee who has been able to give us that answer. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to let the farmers of America hold the sack at the end of the year because we are not able to get through Congress a huge appropriation of several billions to make good our promises if such legislation as the Brannan plan is adopted. I question sincerely that particular feature relative to the Brannan plan. How much will it cost? Also, if if does come to a show-down, will the city Members, who urge it now so as to get cheap food, vote for the huge appropriation necessary to back up the Brannan plan? Those are the questions to which I, as a farmer, have to have the answers before I discard this 90-percent price-support program I have always worked for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I did not realize that we were going to get into the Brannan plan and I did not know the Brannan plan was before the House. I do know that usually agriculture gets the short end of the legislative stick. I know we sat here today and listened to all the social-security talk, but I noticed we brought in a bill last year that prevented the agriculture people from having any social security. It seems it is the program to let the rural people help pay the social security of others but not allowed to enjoy its benefits. We passed a minimum-wage law providing a 75-cent minimum wage, and yet here every day on the floor, including a few minutes ago, we have people get up and complain because we have a farm-support program that provides for 50 to 60 cents an hour. Many years ago I came to the conclusion, and I have never changed my mind, that a large part of our people, a large number of them, were misled into believing that they liked food and they liked it cheap; they did not care so much as to where it came from. And, it does not make any difference to them if they can get it from some foreign country where they, the producers of food, are paid 5 or 10 cents an hour. That is all right, as long as it does get to them. I do not know of a better example than that shown in the Sugar Act. It was not so bad when we had a 40-cent minimum wage, but under

the Sugar Act a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of Agriculture, has the authority to fix the minimum wage. And, do you know what he has fixed the minimum wage at? It is fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture. He has the authority to do so. Do you know what the minimum wage for labor is when it comes to consideration in the Sugar Act? Twenty-five cents an hour in the Virgin Islands, 29 cents in Puerto Rico, 32 cents in Louisiana, 40-some cents in Florida, and so on.

Now, I have had considerable correspondence with our distinguished Secretary of Labor, Mr. Tobin, and I admire a man that answers his mail and answers it promptly and gives his picture, his version, of this wage business. Mr. Tobin a while ago made a ruling under the Walsh-Healey Act that the Government had to pay 95 cents an hour wage for labor in the soap factory where the Government purchases soap. That is all right, but I would just like to know why we have a Secretary of Labor looking after the interest of labor in one field and why we should not have a Secretary of Agriculture that will look after the interests in the farm labor in the farm field. Our Secretary of Commerce appears to be looking after the business field, especially big business as indicated by the stock market. So far as I am concerned, I am tired of having people try to tear down the present agricultural support program that we have. The Agriculture Department should be making an effort to strengthen agriculture rather than destroy it.

If anyone doubts my figures showing the support program provides a 50 to 60 cents per hour labor return, let him check the 20-year study made by the BAE. Then let them go out and get a farm, pay 50 to 60 cents an hour, sell their commodities at the support price, and see how much money they have left at the end of the year.

I have never made much comment on the Brannan plan, because it looked to me like a purely political plan. Until December 31, 1946, we had a nonpartisan, bipartisan, unpartisan agricultural program. Sure, it was a little bit sectional, but you would expect that. I got used to that before I had been here very long. I realize that cotton gets a little too much advantage once in a while, maybe peanuts, maybe tobacco, maybe wheat, but when all is said and done, I have a very high regard for every member of the Committee on Agriculture on both sides of the aisle and I have a high regard for this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and I know that no one person is going to have his own way about everything on any legislation. I am willing to trust the support program to the people of my district and to the type of men that are on the Committee on Agriculture and on this Appropriations Subcommittee.

The thing I resent, and I have resented it for 12 years—and if anyone can ever show anything in this record where I have mixed politics with agriculture, I would be glad to have them show it to me—but I do get tired of seeing the cheap kind of politics that has been put into this agricultural program. It never was in there until December 31, 1946, when President Truman killed the provisions of the Steagall bill by Executive Order No. 2714. We took a step backward last year. We have a bill now that is practically the same thing now as the Aiken bill. It was a step backward. There is no argument about that.

There are a lot of problems involved. The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, just mentioned that one producer recently received over $500,000 from the Government. I have had information for 2 or 3 years of one manufacturer who had been subsidized over a $1,000,000 for cotton. I got a letter saying "confidential" on it. I understand it is against the law to report one individual case, but they seem to be very free in reporting what the individual farmers get. The law does not seem to apply to them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall that he, together with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], and I joined in January 1948 for one purpose, and that was for the purpose of extending for 2 years the then price-support program. We introduced that legislation. It was considered and adopted by the Committee on Banking and Currency in May of 1948. Title II was then in that bill. Unfortunately, a dispute arose as to jurisdiction between the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Banking and Currency on this question, so it reverted to the other committee. In the shake-down we lost title II, which would have extended the then program for 2 years.

The gentleman from Wisconsin will remember the reason he and the gentleman from Iowa and I tried to extend that program for 2 years. It was simply to get our farm price-support program over the period of the presidential election, so as to remove it from any possible politics, which we know does happen in presidential years.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We have heard a great deal lately about perishable products. We heard it here today. I would just like to ask my distinguished colleague from Texas what he calls perishable products, if he knows.

Mr. PATMAN. I can give the gentleman a list of them.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want a list. I just want to know what perishable products are in his opinion.

Mr. PATMAN. Perishable products are those that cannot be stored indefinitely and which will be finally ruined and which will rot in the caves and elsewhere where they are stored. We should not be in that kind of business.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Tell me some of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, eggs and potatoes, and things like that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Those are just two.

Mr. PATMAN. I will put a list of them in the RECORD. I have it here but I cannot find it at the moment. But I am sure the gentleman is a well-informed man on farm matters and I suspect that he could tell us the names of all of them immediately and he probably has them at the tip of his tongue.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Surely I can.

Mr. PATMAN. Then tell us.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows the trap that the gentleman from Texas is trying to set for him. He has been down in the bottom of the ship long enough and now that he is back up where he can see out of the port hole, is going to try to stay there. I will explain that to the gentleman. Dairy products now have a support, not as high as the support for Texas wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice, but at least a support, and the gentleman from Wisconsin isn't going to sit idly by and see this support ruined.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we ought to get out of the hole.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, yes, we will try to keep out of the political hole that provides a mandatory support price for a part of agriculture and take what you can get for livestock and its products. I am sure no Member of Congress can blame the program because they take a lot of potatoes which are the size of a marble and send them up to the schools where the schools will not even use them and where they throw them away and buy other potatoes. They cannot charge that up to the program. Outside of the potato program this support has not cost much money. You talk about perishables and nonperishables. If you take the time to check on the matter you will find that where the Government has money invested is not in what are called perishables. The last time I checked up the Government did not have $200,000,000 invested in all the dairy products and eggs and all the other livestock products, yet they had $201,000,000 invested in a little crop like flax. If you come from a State like I do where 85 to 90 percent of the State farm income is from livestock and livestock products, I do not want to sit here on a cake of ice and let you walk off with everything. To vote for this straight across the board like the Farmers Union says is one approach, but a plan to keep mandatory supports for one group and catch-as-catch-can for the livestock industry is another question. The Farmers Union is going to have this "sell low and buy cheap" straight across the board. Under the proposed plan of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] he is going to use that nice word "perishables" and the result is going to be that the people who live in the livestock-producing States are going to have to come to Congress to try to get an appropriation and the other boys are going to sit it out with mandatory support laws, which at the present time is 90 percent of parity. This is too serious a matter to continue in politics any more. It went through one campaign and did the farm people a great deal of harm.

It has not done anybody any good. According to the way I look at it if you want the Brannan plan it is funny that out of 435 Members someone has not introduced a bill. You have a majority of 100 in this House. You should and can pass any legislation you wish. You

heard them talk about the meeting which was held the other day out in Wisconsin for explaining and selling the Brannan plan. Someone criticized that. It was evidently contrary to law. The meeting happened to be held in my district. I could not keep from thinking that these meetings of explanation were needed because I have never heard two fellows yet who could explain it the same way. They always have a different version of it. I have a great deal of confidence in the rural leaders, and in the Congressmen. I do not feel it is my responsibility to tell them whether they should have the Farm Bureau program or the Grange program or the Farmers Union program or the Brannan plan or the Lovre plan or the Beck plan or the Milk Producers plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not feel that is the responsibility of any Member of Congress. If you do not have any interest in agriculture except a political interest then go ahead. That is all right with me. I will take my chances when the time comes because at least I know some people in my own district who believe what I tell them. I have never played politics with this agricultural program. But I do not think it is my responsibility to tell them which one of these programs they want. That is their responsibility to begin with. If they want to see the price of their milk go down or the price of any other commodity go down and depend upon the Congress to make it up for them that is all well and good. Let them assume their responsibility and whatever consequences go along with it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I think any objectively minded person must agree with the gentleman in his statement that this whole program so vital to America and its economy has unfortunately run into the realm of partisan politics. I cannot see any hope of providing a solution until it is taken out of that realm of politics. The gentleman knows I have introduced a resolution which, while I do not necessarily consider it to be perfection, is patterned entirely upon the resolutions which we passed which created the so-called Hoover Commission. I feel that the joint effort of the able Members of the House and the other body and our farm leaders and leaders in business, labor, and education, will result in providing a solution which should be done soon enough to avoid a condition which we will all regret.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is another angle that I would like to speak of which was mentioned here again on the floor by the gentleman from Illinois. Talk about that trial run. I did not make any comment about it at the time it was on the floor last summer, but anyone who knows anything about these markets should realize that you cannot take one protein food like eggs and put the price down without affecting the price of beef, and pork, and cheese. I figured the Eighty-first Congress had done enough to the dairy industry without my cooperating with them to tear it down any more, because the Eighty-first Congress has many things to answer for, as far as the dairy industry is concerned. There are many things involved in connection with that particular business. I am serious about this matter, because I know what it means to the people. I never impugn anybody's motives, because I assume they think they are right when they are doing it. When the President went out in the campaign last fall and talked about the Aiken bill, is an example.

I did not sign the Aiken bill conference report myself. It was practically the same kind of a bill that we have today. I have been expecting someone to ask me how it happened I would not sign the Aiken bill when I did sign the Cooley-Anderson bill. At the time of the Aiken bill the question was, "Are you for the Aiken bill or are you for the Steagall-Hope bill? Which of those two are you for?" I am sure not going back on the Steagall-Hope bill. I will defend that any time, anywhere, any place, with anybody. They can get all the Fair Dealers and New Dealers and Republicans or anyone they want to, because I know something about it. But they came right back here with a hundred majority that you Democrats have and you passed the Anderson-Cooley bill, which is practically the same thing as the Aiken bill that you went around the country condemning. I agreed with you at the time that it was bad. But the question this year was whether we want the Anderson-Cooley bill or whether we do not want any legislation whatever. It is better than nothing. I just hope that after 25 years' work the different farm leaders of this country will not feel their labors will be in vain. I am not egotistical enough to offer a bill myself, because I know that when you go to tinkering with this agricultural situation you are disrupting the whole economy of this country. I am not going to put up my personal judgment of all these people who have been working on this for at least 25 years and have got as far as they have. So I say before we take any steps, before we get up glibly and say that we want something on perishables—canned butterfat, plus skimmed milk, is not perishable. The gentleman will find that out if he ever introduces a bill and gets before the Committee on Agriculture. Canned butterfat will keep indefinitely. Dried skimmed milk will keep indefinitely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

The Clerk read down to and including line 7 on page 156.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXPLANATION

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on the first roll call this morning the Committee on Agriculture was very busy considering important bills, but because of my attendance at the committee meeting I was not able to get here in time to answer to my name on the roll call. I was advised by our chairman that the committee had the authorization of the House to sit during the sessions of the House today. I think perhaps that is a reasonable excuse for not answering the roll call.

EXHIBIT BY LOBBYISTS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may I offer condolences to my colleagues unfortunate enough to have offices on the third floor of the Old House Office Building, which, somehow, overnight has assumed the aspects of a carnival, with some 15 satin-bedecked exhibits of the United States Steel Corp. strung along two corridors.

I have little doubt that the advertising impact is worth while—for United States Steel.

I am wondering why the corporation was provided with this bonanza. Is it in connection with monopoly hearings now being conducted on the third floor? If so, what do the exhibits have to do with that? What will the exhibits, which dramatically show off scores of products of United States Steel, contribute to the question at hand; that is, whether or not the corporation is a monopoly.

Mr. Speaker, I seriously question the propriety of such exhibits in either of the House Office Buildings; but if this sort of thing is to be permitted I trust there will be no complaint when farmers come in to testify if they fill the corridors with sacks of potatoes, crates of eggs, bales of cotton, and perhaps a few live hogs and steers.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today may be transferred to Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include two letters.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two addresses delivered be-

fore the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include printed matter.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject of cuts in the postal service.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain communications.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. HORAN) was granted permission to extend his own remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include charts and other matter.

Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND FELICITATIONS TO MRS. NORTON

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], I ask unanimous consent that any and all Members wishing to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] may do so after the remarks made in the Committee of the Whole at the opening of the session by the gentlewoman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KRUSE asked and was given permission to include a newspaper editorial in the remarks he made today in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 I attended the reception here in Washington tendered by His Excellency Eliahu Elath, the Ambassador of the State of Israel, held to honor the second anniversary of its existence as a state.

When I observed the enthusiasm and high spirits of those in attendance, my mind went back over the long struggle in Palestine which has finally resulted so happily.

I had previously met the Ambassador and Mrs. Elath at a small dinner tendered to Members of Congress who had been active in the cause, at which I also had the privilege of meeting and listening to two members of the Parliament of Israel. I am persuaded that these people will never give up the fruits of their hard-won victory, and that the State of Israel is on its way to lasting strength and stability. The Congress of the United States, and particularly those of us who worked long and earnestly on this problem, can feel a deep sense of pride at the long and unremitting efforts which eventually proved so helpful.

It was in 1922 that Congress adopted a joint resolution approving the use of Palestine as a Jewish homeland, and in 1924 an Anglo-American convention lent its endorsement, and recorded American assent to British administration, subject to the terms of that convention.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1945, the Palestine problem was presented to the world as one of the acute postwar problems which cried for solution. I spoke in the House on the subject on October 11, 1945, calling attention to the long history of this struggle, and to the long and unnecessary delay attending the solution of the problem. I called attention to the resolution of the United States Congress passed in 1922, and to what happened following 1922, and then said in part:

What happened? With limited immigration and under considerable handicaps, thousands upon thousands of members of this energetic and able race successfully commenced to build in Palestine an economy which at long last was affording them comfortable, and even prosperous living conditions, and an opportunity for real achievement, while at the same time the priceless gift of freedom and liberty seemed to be theirs. Those who would suggest that the Jewish people are not constructive builders must be confounded by the results, because by their efforts a flourishing agriculture and trade have been created and cities built, such as Tel Aviv, which in many respects equal any modern community in the world.

Such was the situation at the time of the rise of Hitler. What happened to the Jews of Europe under his monstrous dominion was and is an eternal reproach to all of us who call ourselves Christians. Millions of these people were tortured and exterminated for no fault or crime except that they were Jews, and the pitiful remnants of their race wander over the face of Europe, homeless and almost hopeless. Their families have been destroyed, their homes have been destroyed, whole communities have been destroyed, and only faith in God, and in their ultimate deliverance sustains them. They pray only for a chance to live. Shall civilized Christian people deny them this chance Shall agreements, and promises, and good faith all be repudiated? Are sacred undertakings to be regarded as mere scraps of paper?

I went on to point out the repudiation by the British Government of the solemn promises theretofore made by them, and insisted that we could no longer bear the shame of intolerance or of broken promises.

When the problem had been referred to the United Nations, I took the liberty of writing to Senator Austin, the chief United States delegate, on April 19, 1947. Among other things, I then said to the Senator:

MY DEAR SENATOR AUSTIN: I am, and have been for a long time very gravely concerned with the Palestine problem which seems to worsen rather than approach a solution.

It is needless to point out in detail the bitterly disappointing conduct of Great Britain in repudiating the solemn and official pledges made by His Majesty's Government regarding free immigration to Palestine, and the ultimate establishment of a Jewish national home. I am taking the liberty, however, of enclosing a statement I made on the subject to the Congress on July 12, 1946, which, I think, points out very clearly the wholly unjustified breach of covenant. * * *

The American people are deeply sympathetic to the appeal of the Jewish people for a place of refuge. The American Congress has formally expressed its policy in this regard. I pray that you will do what you can.

Mr. Austin replied very promptly, and I believe made effective efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House will permit me to take some pride in the part that was played in this problem by the friends of this movement in the Congress. My own individual part was a small and humble one, but at least it was performed in good faith and continuously. I can join wholeheartedly in the rejoicing which now attends the solid establishment of the State of Israel.

I should point out in conclusion that anti-Semitism is still with us even in this great country where freedom and tolerance have reached a high peak. Our treatment of minority groups leaves much to be desired. It is often inconsistent with the noble professions of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. We are by all odds the strongest country in the world, and I have no doubt of the greatness of our institutions, and the security of our future; but complete greatness can only come with a revival of spiritual grace, and a much wider extension of the Golden Rule in our governmental attitude as well as our private attitudes.

There is still much work to be done.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman has properly said he was one of that group of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle who in its early stages, even before the United Nations Resolution directed the partition of Palestine, helped this fledgling state and its harassed people to get some degree of independence; and I may say to the gentleman that that is in the great American tradition that we have on several occasions helped similar fledgling states and similar harassed people to attain sanctuary and a measure of independence and security.

Mr. HAND. I deeply appreciate the courteous remarks made by the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

TARIFFS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include as part of my remarks an article appearing in the Southern Textile News regarding Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK'S desire to protect the textile industry against cheap foreign goods, also letters from the director of the experiment station, Lowell Textile Institute, Lowell, Mass., and the Ames Worsted Co., Lowell, Mass., regarding the third reciprocal-trade agreement

negotiations to be held in England on September 28, 1950, at which meeting it is proposed to consider the tariff on wool grease and lanolin. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be beneficial to have a committee of Members of Congress attend the third reciprocal-trade agreement negotiations to be held in England and also any negotiations in this country in connection with reductions of tariffs which are going to ruin our industries.

The news item and letters are as follows:

[From the Southern Textile News]

MAYBANK WARNS AGAINST CHEAP FOREIGN GOODS—SENATOR WOULD PROTECT TEXTILE INDUSTRY

WASHINGTON.—Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina, this week warned the Senate that continuation of the present trend of declining exports and increasing imports would have a disastrous effect on the textile industry.

The Senator said that the machinery we export today could stop the wheels of our own industry.

He urged that indiscriminate imports of manufactured goods should not be allowed to infiltrate our domestic markets.

CITES FIGURES

MAYBANK told the Senate that latest figures from the Commerce Department show a decline of $199,300,000 in exports during January. He compared this with an increase of $17,600,000 in imports during the same period. "On the surface these figures simply represent a closing of the gap between exports and imports," he said.

The South Carolinian warned of the effects on the textile industry, especially in the South. He emphasized that the textile industry suffered a decline of $37,700,000 in exports in the face of an increase of $13,000,000 in imports.

MAYBANK told the Senate that he had not forgotten the disastrous effect of Japanese textiles brought into this counry immediately before the war. He served notice that this country must not allow foreign textiles, produced with cheap labor, or machinery which we have exported, to be dumped on the American market.

"We cannot again afford to weaken our own textile industry to the point it had reached at the beginning of World War II." he said.

He warned that import figures of wool fabrics are almost equally as alarming as those of cotton textiles.

SUPPORTED AIDS

"In the past I have supported foreign aids in the belief that they were essential to the continued existence of our allies and friendly foreign countries," said MAYBANK. "I supported and voted for the commodity credit amendments last year. I believe in the activation of a point 4 type program for the same reason. However, these programs must first be geared to our own domestic economy. It will gain us nothing but disaster if we carry on these aid programs in a manner that the trend indicated by the recent import and export figures show."

MAYBANK again cautioned against careless use of aid programs. "While we are saving the world with American dollars, we may well be on the verge of creating soup lines at home," he said.

He added while the present exports of our modern and efficient machinery may well be a boon to our tool and die plants, it could well cause the machinery in our own manufacturing plants to stand idle when these lower priced foreign-made products are brought back and dumped on the American market.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
LOWELL TEXTILE INSTITUTE,
Lowell, April 24, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: I have recently been informed of the reciprocal trade agreement negotiations to be held at Torquay, England, on September 28, 1950, at which it is proposed to consider the tariff on wool grease and lanolin.

This material is a valuable byproduct of the wool scouring industry and is recovered from the wool scouring liquors by equipment which entails a considerable capital investment. However, this recovery has been warranted only by virtue of a reasonable market price for the wool grease. The tariff on wool grease and lanolin has been lowered as of January 1, 1939, from the rates established by the Tariff Act of 1930. We feel that a further reduction of the tariff on wool grease is not justified and will exert a deleterious effect on the operation of the wool scouring industry.

Our immediate interest in this matter stems from an extensive research undertaking centered at Lowell Textile Institute, sponsored by a grant from the United States Public Health Commission and performed in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. This research is motivated by the urgent need to abate stream pollution resulting from the discharge of wool scouring liquor into our inland and coastal waters. Our effort to design procedures for treatment of these wastes is predicated on the premise that recovery of such byproducts as wool grease and lanolin will make the high cost of treatment economically tenable. Any reduction of the price of wool grease will seriously hinder our efforts to abate stream pollution by wool scouring liquors and, consequently, we wish to register this protest against any legislation or agreement which will lower the tariffs on wool grease and lanolin.

Public Law 845 established a Federal influence on stream pollution matters, and this law is further supported by State legislation, in all but one of our Atlantic seaboard States, which places in the hands of State regulatory bodies authority to influence regulations concerning stream-pollution control. Since the cost of industrial waste treatment must of economic necessity be mitigated whenever possible by the recovery of byproducts which will help defray these costs, it becomes evident that a reduction in tariff on wool grease and lanolin will operate diametrically in opposition to our public health interests.

Your recognition and appreciation of these facts, we hope, will dictate a policy concerning wool grease tariffs which will alleviate, in part, the urgency of our stream pollution abatement efforts.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD H. WEBBER,
Director of Experiment Station.

AMES WORSTED CO.,
Lowell, Mass., April 24, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: We understand that the United States is considering the negotaition of lower tariff rates on wool grease and lanolin. As a reasonably substantial producer of wool grease, we wish to place ourselves on record as being firmly opposed to any reduction of existing tariffs. We point out that Great Britain and Australia are large low-cost producers of wool grease with a normal exportable surplus. Prior to the war, these countries sold large quantities of grease in the American market at prices which domestic producers were often unable to meet. The resumption of such competition may reasonably be expected and a lowering of the present tariff rates would have serious adverse effects on this section of our economy.

As you may know, the capacity of the industry was sharply expanded during the war to take care of essential military needs. The resultant increase in production has already proved to be somewhat excessive in relation to demand, and the price has receded from a wartime ceiling of 20 cents for dry grease to 10 or 12 cents at the present time. Recent figures on imports of wool grease for consumption are as follows:

	Pounds
1947	139,000
1948	290,000
1949	8,427,000

It is perfectly obvious that even with the present tariff structure there is insufficient protection to domestic producers. If this present inadequate tariff were reduced still further, the effect would be demoralizing, and there might be a tendency to discontinue grease recovery. Discontinuance of grease recovery would increase stream pollution in many instances—a regretable corollary in view of the present polluted condition of many of our streams which receive waste products from industrial plants.

In view of the foregoing, we ask that you give every consideration to the foregoing before taking any action on the reduction of tariffs on wool grease.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN H. GARDINER.

DRASTIC CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from Thomas Kelley, secretary of the Massachusetts branch of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, protesting the one-delivery-a-day of mail. Mr. Speaker, it is very unwise economy, in my opinion, to curtail the delivery of mail. The amount of business that will be lost if the deliveries are cut down to one delivery a day will be enormous.

The letter follows:

UNITED NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,
MASSACHUSETTS STATE BRANCH,
Dorchester, Mass., April 22, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: The Massachusetts State branch, United National Association of Post Office Clerks have voted to protest the drastic curtailment of the postal service that has been proposed in the latest Postal Bulletin.

The postal service is a public service vitally necessary to all kinds of business, and is the heart of communication between the American people themselves.

The American people demand prompt postal service, and they are entitled to it. This association believes that this curtailment will result in the loss of revenue instead of the expected economies.

The Massachusetts State branch UNAPOC asks, that you do all within your power to have this order rescinded.

Thanking you for your kind interest in this matter, I remain.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. KELLEY,
Secretary, Massachusetts State Branch, UNAPOC.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1861. An act for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi);

H. R. 4857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley; and

H. R. 5580. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 27, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1408. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1409. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 and prior years, in the amount of $116,139.58, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 572); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, 1949, pursuant to House Resolution 5, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session (Rept. No. 1950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the American Slav Congress and associated organizations, pursuant to House Resolution 5, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session (Rept. No. 1951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on atomic espionage, pursuant to House Resolution 5, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session (Rept. No. 1952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on the Congress of American Women, pursuant to House Resolution 5, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session (Rept. No. 1953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities. Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, pursuant to House Resolution 5, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session (Rep. No. 1954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1069. An act to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee of conference. S. 247. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1958). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7363. A bill for the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 8221. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 8222. A bill to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of an interceptor sewer pipe line in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the Maritime Alameda Shipyard, Alameda, Calif.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 8223. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 8224. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 8225. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois:

H. R. 8226. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 8227. A bill to provide that members of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States shall be automatically eligible to practice before certain courts and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 8228. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8229. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Glacial Pothole National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 8230. A bill to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 8231. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration from the United States Tariff Commission to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 8232. A bill to abolish the position of mail handler in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By. Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8233. A bill to amend section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the income-tax treatment of sales of livestock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 8234. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NOLAND:

H. R. 8235. A bill to amend further the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8236. A bill to provide that on and after January 1, 1951, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8237. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 8238. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 8239. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 8240. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 8241. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 8242. A bill to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACY:

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of a Joint Committee To

Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution prohibiting discrimination by the States, their political subdivisions, and their institutions in the distribution of benefits under Federal grants-in-aid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. Res. 555. Resolution for the relief of Hazel B. Prater; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. Res. 556. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate the Curtailment of Postal Services; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 557. Resolution authorizing the printing of the committee print entitled "Congress and the Monopoly Problem—Fifty Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1950," as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8243. A bill for the relief of Giovani W. Bevilaqua and Elio Maraldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 8244. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna Ettl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 8245. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alessandro Rizzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois:

H. R. 8246. A bill for the relief of George Eldred Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 8247. A bill for the relief of John B. Underwood, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 8248. A bill for the relief of B. H. Manley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8249. A bill for the relief of William Hoyt Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8250. A bill for the relief of Hideko Ochi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8251. A bill for the relief of Kaoru Okado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8252. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emiko Ueda Fukuhara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8253. A bill for the relief of Mieko Ide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8254. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Masa Izumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8255. A bill for the relief of Kazue Kanemoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8256. A bill for the relief of Keiko Shinobu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8257. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kaneko Baba Yamamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8258. A bill for the relief of Il Nai Che; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8259. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hideko Morioka Nomura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 8260. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Crane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 8261. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lewis Loo-Yi Li; Yu-hwa Li, his wife; and Ronald Li, his son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 8262. A bill for the relief of Arthur S. Rosichan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2092. By Mr. GORSKI: Petition relative to holding a plebiscite in Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2093. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Memorial of the Legislature of Mississippi, memorializing the Congress not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2094. Also memorial of the Legislature of Mississippi memorializing Congress to authorize the State to utilize as general tax revenues the reimbursements made to counties as a result of flood-control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, through the lowly gateway of penitence we would enter the inner chamber of peace where the harsh noises of the clamorous world are hushed and in quietness of spirit we face ourselves and Thee. Take us as we are, with impulses, strivings, longings, so often frustrated and thwarted, and even with what is broken and imperfect make Thy dreams for Thy children come true. In the midst of confusions and perplexities of these days in which we are called to serve, help us to be—

"True to all truth the world denies,
Not tongue-tied by its gilded lies,
Not always right in all men's eyes;
But faithful to the light within."

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 26, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1861. An act for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi);

H. R. 2895. An act to authorize the sale of select base material, at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads;

H. R. 4080. An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice;

H. R. 4393. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley; and

H. R. 5580. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KEM was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Monday, May 1, 1950.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCMAHON (on behalf of Mr. NEELY), and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 576)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Thirtieth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, for the period ending December 31, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 27, 1950.*

(Enclosure: Thirtieth Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, since we are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] or the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] desires to have a quorum call.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not disposed to insist on a quorum call because the time consumed would necessarily come out of the time allotted for debate on the McCarran amendment between now and 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will Senators be granted opportunity to make insertions in the RECORD?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Let us postpone routine matters until after the vote at 2 o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It would be contrary to the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement to have routine business transacted at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have a quorum call.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Nevada insists on a quorum call, he will cut down his own time, because the time taken for a roll call will be taken out of the Senator's time if he has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Nevertheless, I wish to have a quorum present so that Senators may hear what we have to say on the pending amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, since the Senator from Nevada insists on a roll call, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time consumed to be taken out of the time of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Malone
Benton	Hill	Martin
Brewster	Holland	Maybank
Bricker	Humphrey	Millikin
Bridges	Hunt	Mundt
Butler	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Smith, Maine
Darby	Kilgore	Sparkman
Donnell	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Leahy	Taylor
Eastland	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Lucas	Tobey
Flanders	McCarran	Tydings
Frear	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Gurney	McKellar	Withers
Hayden	McMahon	Young
Hendrickson	Magnuson	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] for himself and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to Senate bill 3304.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under the agreement the time remaining between now and 2 o'clock is divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the amendment. The time is controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and myself. I assign 20 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the pending amendment to Senate bill 3304, offered by the Senator from Nevada and myself, provides for the insertion of a new title which may be cited as the "Spanish Aid Act of 1950." I call attention to the fact that in the pending bill, Senate bill 3304, there are supplemental titles, one of which may be cited as the "Korea Aid Act of 1950," providing for special aid to Korea; another is title III, which may be cited as the "China Area Aid Act of 1950"; and the next is title IV, which may be cited as the "United Nations Palestine Refugee Aid Act of 1950."

I mention that in order to show there are provisions of this character included in the pending legislation. Our amendment proposes to add another title to be known as the "Spanish Aid Act of 1950."

Under the first paragraph of section 202 of our amendment—

The Administrator for Economic Cooperation is hereby authorized to furnish assistance to the Spanish state in conformity with—

(a) the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, wherever such provisions are applicable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada and myself may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment offered by Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 7, after line 4, insert the following:

"AID TO SPAIN

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Spanish Aid Act of 1950.'

"NATURE OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 202. The Administrator for Economic Cooperation is hereby authorized to furnish assistance to the Spanish state in conformity with—

"(a) the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, wherever such provisions are applicable and not inconsistent with the intent and purposes of this title; and

"(b) the administrator is authorized to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $100,000,000 for the purpose of allocating funds during such fiscal year to the Export-Import Bank of Washington for assistance to Spain on credit terms under the provisions of paragraph 2 of section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to the extent applicable."

Mr. BREWSTER. Paragraph (b) of the amendment provides that—

the administrator is authorized to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 * * * in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $100,000,000 for the purpose of allocating funds during such fiscal year to the Export-Import Bank of Washington for assistance to Spain on credit terms—

I emphasize that aspect of the matter, as I think the Spanish Government and the Spanish people have one of the best records, so far as credit is concerned, of any of the existing governments of the world. Therefore, I think they are entitled to consideration when the question of credit is involved. Paragraph (b) continues—

under the provisions of paragraph 2 of section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to the extent applicable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the provisions of section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the provisions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(c) (1) The Administrator may provide assistance for any participating country, in the form and under the procedures authorized in subsections (a) and (b), respectively, of this section, through grants or upon payment in cash, or on credit terms, or on such other terms of payment as he may find appropriate, including payment by the transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the participating country) of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources. In determining whether such assistance shall be through grants or upon terms of payment, and in determining the terms of payment, he shall act in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and the determination whether or not a participating country should be required to make payment for any assistance furnished to such country in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and the terms of such payment, if required, shall depend upon the character and purpose of the assistance and upon whether there is reasonable assurance of repayment considering the capacity of such country to make such payments without jeopardizing the accomplishment of the purposes of this title.

(2) When it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms, the Administrator

shall allocate funds for the purpose to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, make and administer the credit on terms specified by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The Administrator is authorized to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $1,000,000,000 (i) for the purpose of allocating funds to the Export-Import Bank of Washington under this paragraph during the period of 1 year following the date of enactment of this act and (ii) for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section until all liabilities arising under guaranties made pursuant to such paragraph (3) have expired or have been discharged. Such notes shall be redeemable at the option of the Administrator before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such notes and shall have such maturity as may be determined by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Each such note shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the note. Payment under this paragraph of the purchase price of such notes and repayments thereof by the Administrator shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. In allocating funds to the Export-Import Bank of Washington under this paragraph, the Administrator shall first utilize such funds realized from the sale of notes authorized by this paragraph as he determines to be available for this purpose, and when such funds are exhausted, or after the end of 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, whichever is earlier, he shall utilize any funds appropriated under this title. The Administrator shall make advances to, or reimburse, the Export-Import Bank of Washington for necessary administrative expenses in connection with such credits. Credits made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington with funds so allocated to it by the Administrator shall not be considered in determining whether the Bank has outstanding at any one time loans and guaranties to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529), as amended. Amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made under this paragraph shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *Provided*, That, to the extent required for such purpose, amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made out of funds realized from the sale of notes authorized under this paragraph shall be deposited into the Treasury for the purpose of the retirement of such notes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under the provisions of section 111 (c) of the act, the Administrator is authorized to proceed in this fashion for the assistance of countries for whom it was authorized, by the issuance of notes in an amount not exceeding $1,000,000,000. Our amendment would simply provide for a portion of that allocation, in the amount of $100,000,000, which might be used for the purpose of loans by the Export-Import Bank, on proper credit terms and security, to the Spanish Government or its designated nominee. I emphasize that because it does not have an impact upon the appropriation of funds under the bill. In other words, the amount authorized by the bill for the appropriation of funds is in no way affected by the proposed authorization. It does not subtract from or add to the amount of that authorization contained in the bill, and will not affect any increases or reductions which may be made in the amount of the proposed aid, nor will the other interested countries be concerned or affected in any way. The language of the amendment was drawn in such way as to meet that problem.

It may well be asked, Why should consideration be given to Spain at this time? It is my information that our military authorities are entirely agreed upon the proposition that the Spanish peninsula—the Iberian Peninsula, as it is commonly known—is one of the more vital and critical areas of the world; and that in the event of any difficulties with any other power, such as now are freely being discussed, it might well be one of the strategic spots in the world not only because of the fact that behind the Pyrenees there is the possibility of retaining control for some time, but also because the Iberian Peninsula is obviously—even to the layman, I think—recognized as the key to the Mediterranean. All our vast interests in Greece and Turkey, which have been recognized by the Greek and Turkish loans, and the vast ramifications of those interests in relation to the Mediterranean littoral generally, obviously revolve around control of the Mediterranean, which clearly would be dominated from the Spanish territory.

I do not suggest that the pending proposal involves any aspect of an arrangement or understanding in that respect. It simply puts the Spanish people in somewhat of a posture for recognizing that we are concerned with their problems, as we are concerned with the problems of the people of many other areas of the world.

Certainly it is not only good business but good judgment, and very much involved with the vital interests of the United States of America, that we should have with Spain the cordial relationships which might well be calculated to be assisted by an action and a gesture of this character at this time.

The history of the dealings of the United States with Spain has not been happy. Without undertaking to apportion the responsibility for that situation, it is regrettable that in the initial instance the normal diplomatic relations which long had prevailed were severed because of action in the United Nations; and that when the time came, a year ago, to consider whether or not the normal relations should be resumed, the United States refrained from expressing an opinion. We had been assured that it was the idea of the United States that we would normalize relations. Yet when the fateful hour arrived in the United Nations, our representatives stood mute; they neither voted "aye" or "no." That was the action of our representatives there, those who represented the United States, the leader of world opinion, as we proudly like to call ourselves, and which, we think, in resources and in responsibility for world leadership is vitally concerned with so directing its course that it shall earn the confidence of all peoples who may be prepared not to submit to the dictatorship of Moscow. Yes, Mr. President, at that time our representatives in the United Nations stood mute. Certainly that was not exactly an heroic posture for a great nation which boasts of its responsibilities for world leadership. That action had most unfortunate implications.

Since that time, to the very great gratification of those of us who long have felt that, from every aspect, the normalization of our relations with Spain was a well-warranted course in our own interest, our State Department, through the Secretary of State, announced in January of this year that the United States was then prepared to support the normalization of diplomatic relations with Spain. The Secretary of State was frank enough in that statement to say that he recognized that the initial action of severing some portion of our diplomatic relations with Spain, by withdrawing our Ambassador, under the urging of the United Nations, was not wise, but was a mistake; that it was entered into with the idea that it might lead to a better state of things, whereas the action had had the reverse effect, and had led, rather, to consolidating a position with which at that time our State Department and our Government were not in sympathy; and that it was high time that a change was made. The Secretary of State announced very definitely that at the next meeting of the United Nations, the Government of the United States were prepared to urge, sponsor, and support a resolution for the normalization of our diplomatic relations with Spain.

Mr. President, it is a matter of very profound regret that in the very critical period in which we live, the gesture which we are now prepared to make has been so long delayed. The world is moving very rapidly. Time marches on. The entire situation in the world is deteriorating with a rapidity which certainly is a matter of vital concern to every American, as we are repeatedly assured. Here is a simple and definite step which involves as good a credit risk as any we have undertaken in the case of any of the other countries with whom we have had dealings. Certainly it does not involve any disparagement of our relations with any of our allies.

Mr. President, we are aiding other European countries to the tune of many billion dollars, in total amount; and there is indication that we may increase to $15,000,000,000 the assistance going to them from us. Furthermore, during the war we gave them between $30,000,000,000 and $40,000,000,000, and since the war we have furnished to various countries around the world from $20,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000. So it seems to me rather indelicate that the suggestion should be made that some of those beneficiaries of our aid object to having us assist Spain. I had supposed that the orientation of our policy would at least permit us to do the things which in our judgment seemed best calculated to serve our interests and, as I conceive, the interests of the entire freedom-loving world, as well.

This amendment does not involve any conclusions as to the character of any governments upon the earth. We have an ambassador in Moscow; we have ambassadors in the countries behind the iron curtain; we are carrying on relations with Tito. I am sure there is some query as to the character of the governments which prevail in many of those countries.

This amendment involves no historic determination as to whether we do or do not approve of all the acts—past, present, or prospective—of the government with whom we deal. To the contrary, we simply ask the single question, Is this action calculated to help us achieve the great objective we have in mind, namely, some measure of success in fortifying the countries against the menace of communistic atheism which is threatening to engulf the world?

The one thing upon which I think all of us can agree is that the Spanish Government has eliminated the Communist menace from its land. Without entering into a discussion of how that has been done, the fact is that it has been achieved. That is the objective of our country, in turn. I am sure the one thing of which we can be perfectly certain is that the Spanish Government is not likely to be an ally of a Soviet-dominated government unless the development of world events should make no other course possible. The Spaniards have endured many things.

At this time their interests lie entirely in this direction.

It seems to me that, as we consider the matter of foreign aid and the possible granting of $3,000,000,000, which probably never will be returned, and as we consider the granting of aid to Korea, China, and Palestine, the proposed action of the Senate in recognizing the advisability of making a credit loan—that is all this amendment involves—to the Spanish Government at this time cannot be calculated to do other than to serve the major interests of the United States of America. It is upon that basis that I hope the Senate will give consideration to this matter, and will be disposed to support this amendment, which will simply provide that up to $100,000,000 of credit by the Export-Import Bank may be extended to the Spanish Government under the direction of the Administrator of the European cooperation program.

I shall not undertake, in the limited time which we have at our disposal, to discuss all aspects of this matter. Along with other Members of the Senate and House, during the past 2 years I have twice visited Spain to observe conditions at first hand. I have seen the very great need they have of some of the raw materials which are in such abundant supply here and which are so needed there. I went through the cotton mills at Barcelona, which are crying out for assistance of this character. If an adequate amount of cotton were furnished, it would rehabilitate the entire economy of Spain, and would enable its people to establish themselves on a self-supporting and self-respecting basis. I am sure that such action cannot be calculated other than to serve the interests not only of America, but of the entire world. One-third of the cotton we might supply them would, after it had been processed, serve to pay for the supplies we should furnish. The remaining two-thirds could be used in clothing the Spanish people. Certainly when we have vast supplies of cotton in our storehouses and know not what market we shall use, this proposal is not only a matter of good business, but is calculated to advance the interests of the United States in cultivating that greater cordiality of relationship which is implicit in the statement of our Secretary of State that he is prepared now to recognize the error on our part and to support the normalizing of diplomatic relations with Spain.

Nothing could be more helpful at this time, pending the meeting of the United Nations, than to say to the Spanish people and the world that we are prepared to deal with them upon a responsible credit basis in order that their economy may become better established, in order that we may lay the foundation for other relationships which may well be calculated to serve the vital interests of this country, if we are really in earnest in believing that we are in danger of difficulty with the Soviet Republics and their associated powers.

It is upon those grounds that I hope the Senate will give favorable consideration to the proposal of the Senator from Nevada and myself. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I am in sympathy with giving some type of aid to Spain, I regret to find myself in opposition to this particular plan for aiding her. Like the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], I visited Spain last fall. While in Madrid, I made a point of discussing the needs of Spain, first with the Minister of the Interior, and then with the Prime Minister. The Minister of the Interior explained to me their need of wheat, cotton, and machinery. There is no doubt about the fact that they need those materials, of which we have a surplus.

I asked him, in the event we worked out some plan of rendering financial aid, whether the Spanish Government would be willing for us to exercise the same measure of inspection, direction, and control which was granted to us by the members of the OEEC in western Europe. He said it would. Feeling that perhaps he did not have authority to speak for his Government, the following day, in a rather large group, with two newspapermen present, I made the same proposal to the Prime Minister. He publicly said it was correct that his Government would in return for financial aid permit us to be assured that the aid would go where we intended it to go, for the industrial rehabilitation of Spain and for the relief of poverty and actual suffering among the poor people of Spain, of whom, unfortunately, there are entirely too many.

Mr. President, I feel that we were led into an error in agreeing to the resolution adopted several years ago by the United Nations, refusing official recognition to the Spanish Government. Consequently, when our last Ambassador left Madrid, we did not replace him, although we have 92 members of our chancellory in Madrid, with no operating head. Presumably, we are conducting normal trade and political relations with the Franco Government. But we do not have in our legation at Madrid a man who can discuss our viewpoint at the same level with the Spanish official who would handle it on the part of his government. That, of course, is an unsatisfactory, unnecessary arrangement.

I was very much pleased to hear our distinguished Secretary of State say, not very long ago, that he favored sending an Ambassador to Spain. While I do not know what steps have been taken in the meantime to that end, I understand that the matter is being considered by the President, who is in charge of our foreign policy, and who has a perfect right, regardless of the resolution adopted by the United Nations, to send an Ambassador. I have even heard mentioned the names of one or two men who were under consideration for that post.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Very briefly. I have but a few moments.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator understand that the Secretary of State acted at the direction of the President in making his statement about normalizing diplomatic relations with Spain and sending an Ambassador?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think that is correct. I also want to say that if our aid to western Europe is designed in part to stem the tide of communism, certainly there is no country on the map as displayed at the rear of the Senate Chamber which shows the countries we are aiding and where the main pressure of communism is felt, that is opposed any more strongly to communism than is Spain. The Spanish Government now has an army of 300,000 well-trained, well-equipped troops. I understand that, with adequate equipment, it could easily raise an army of a million troops. If we should be so unfortunate—which God forbid—as to get into an armed conflict, it is certainly my honest opinion that the Spaniards would fight to the last drop of blood in defense of their country.

I should like to say further, Mr. President, that while Spain is relatively a poor country, the Spanish people have a very ancient and proud tradition. They are a proud people. They are a friendly people. They are a people of ancient skills. I learned when in Spain that the steel at Toledo is the equal of Damascus steel, famed through the centuries as the finest in the world.

Those are preliminary observations that I wished to make.

When I returned to Washington last January, I started to make some investigations with reference to how we could

best render aid to a nation which is unusually friendly to us because of the kind treatment we extended to Spanish soldiers at the end of the Spanish-American War. The Spanish people have not forgotten that. They feel very friendly to us. I hold no brief for any dictator; I do not believe in dictatorships. I am not sponsoring the Franco regime by any stretch of the imagination. But it is quite inconsistent to send an ambassador to Moscow or to any of the satellite countries, and then take the position that we cannot send one to another dictator country. I do not like dictatorships, but, after all, it has been our foreign policy that we shall not try to dictate the politics of any other nation. We leave it to the people of the nations to choose the kind of government they prefer.

Returning to what I did during the past winter and spring, I had some conferences with representatives of the State Department, and I found them sympathetic. On the 14th of March I wrote a letter to the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Jack K. McFall, regarding some plans to aid Spain, and on March 22, 1950, I received the following letter from Mr. McFall:

MARCH 22, 1950.

The Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Thank you for your letter of March 14 setting forth your views on our Spanish policy. I was very glad to have your opinions on the subject and have passed your letter on to other interested officers of the Department.

There are two points I should like to clear up in connection with your letter, since our economic policy may not have been perfectly clear to you. First, Spain is entirely free to apply to the Export-Import Bank, the normal channel for credit from the United States Government. Spanish applications for credit for specific projects will be considered in accordance with the bank's normal procedures and on the same basis as those from any other country. Although Spaniards have talked with the bank and the procedure for project presentation has been explained to them, the Spanish Government has not yet availed itself of these facilities by presenting applications to the bank.

Secondly, our economic policy is directed toward the positive objective of developing mutually beneficial economic relations between the United States and Spain, and we believe that private business and banking arrangements and trade activities with Spain should be conducted on a free and normal basis.

I have also received and read with interest your letter of March 15 suggesting that we exchange supplies from our surplus commodity stocks for Spanish strategic materials to be placed in our military stock pile. You will be interested to know that the Spaniards have, in the past, discussed the sale of strategic commodities with the stock-pile authoritics. It has not proved possible, however, to purchase Spanish materials since they have either failed to meet the specifications of the Federal Supply Service or they have been priced above the level at which the FSS is authorized to purchase. Spanish export prices are often substantially above competitive world market prices, because the Spanish peseta is pegged above its free market value, a problem to which you will have seen reference in the closing paragraph of the Secretary's letter. A further difficulty is that the amount of strategic materials which Spain might be able to send us would probably be very small in relation to Spanish needs for wheat and cotton. I have, nevertheless, asked our technical people to make a careful study of the poscibilities of doing something along the lines you suggest.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Texas. I did not know that the letter would take so long to read.

I received another letter, which is very pertinent, I think. It is dated April 21, 1950, and reads as follows:

APRIL 21, 1950.

The Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: The Department has received a reply from the Department of Agriculture with regard to the proposal for an exchange of Spanish strategic materials and American surplus agricultural commodities, about which I wrote you most recently on April 7, 1950.

The Price Support and Foreign Supply Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, the agency responsible for negotiating such exchanges, has indicated that careful consideration will be given to any proposal directed toward such an exchange, whether it be presented by United States private entities representing foreign commercial interests or by a foreign government. It also pointed out that a list of strategic materials currently being purchased, which is subject to continual change, may be obtained from the Strategic Materials Purchase Division of the Federal Supply Service.

In the light of the foregoing, it appears that aside from business considerations such as price, specifications, and availability of materials, which presumably would have to be discussed by the entities handling the details of a specific exchange proposal, there are no obstacles to the formulation of specific plans for a commodity interchange by appropriate official agencies or private concerns.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, that correspondence shows that I have been at work both on an Export-Import Bank loan and a change in our stock-piling program for the exchange of surplus agricultural products for strategic materials which we could get from Spain and put into our stock pile.

I must say, Mr. President, that I think this proposal to amend the pending ECA bill is ill-advised. It requires taking away from western Europe $100,000,000, which has already been budgeted, because I see nothing in the amendment which provides for a supplemental fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. For 20 seconds.

Mr. McCARRAN. We have taken nothing out by giving funds to Korea. The amendment would place Spain in the same position as Korea. We take nothing from the European budget.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The practical effect would be to take it.

The second objection is that the first part of the amendment provides that we either force OEEC to accept Spain as a member of the European group of nations, or else, over their objections, and without requiring Spain to do what we are requiring the members of OEEC to do, let them have $100,000,000. Everyone knows that OEEC is not going to agree to accept Spain.

The next proposal is that the ECA Administrator turn over $100,000,000 to the Treasury Department, that the Treasury Department turn $100,000,000 over to the Export-Import Bank, and that that bank make a loan, not according to Export-Import Bank rules, but according to ECA rules. There would be a 2 percent interest rate, and the loan would be made without any of the control which we are now exercising over all loans which ECA makes to OEEC countries.

Under those considerations, as I have outlined the attitude of the State Department, they are willing to make an Export-Import Bank loan; they are willing that trade be on a normal basis; they are willing to work out any possible plan to exchange surplus farm commodities for strategic materials.

I think we have shown a friendly attitude toward Spain, but we certainly should not do violence, as I regard it, to our fundamental Marshall plan by an amendment of this kind which would certainly be very objectionable to the members of the OEEC. This action would be calculated to destroy the relations which we have. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in dealing with the subject matter embraced within the amendment, I think it may be well for us to look at the map which is on the rear wall of the Senate Chamber. If we are serious, Mr. President, about the North Atlantic Pact, if we are serious in appropriating nearly $15,000,000,000 for the military defense of the United States, if we are serious in sending arms and ammunition, airplanes, and other equipment of war to Europe, as we have been doing, if we are serious in taking Italy into the North Atlantic Pact, then we cannot, with an equal degree of seriousness, eliminate the Iberian Peninsula standing at the very gateway of the Mediterranean Sea.

The Iberian Peninsula consists of Spain, principally, and Portugal, two kindred nations, two civilized nations; Spain, with 24,000,000 civilized, Godfearing, Christian people, with a population which has always fought against dictatorship and against communism, which has expelled communism from her borders, a friendly nation which has always looked to us with a friendly eye and with an open hand. So, if we are serious about the billions of dollars we are expending for the defense of America against a common foe, if we are serious as to the military equipment we are sending abroad, we cannot overlook this strategic place which Spain occupies on the face of the map. Under the control of Spain is Gibraltar, and Gibraltar controls the Mediterranean. If another country should control the Mediterranean, it would control North Africa, and within a short time would control

the Suez Canal. Therefore, if that should happen, all the countries in the North Atlantic Pact, exclusive of Canada and the United States, would be surrounded by any enemy.

So the spirit and the morale of the people located on this great peninsula, with its strategic position, cannot be lost sight of. If Spain had no army at all, if she was not a country with a mind to fight for her own liberties and her own freedoms, if she had not always been a country democratic in nature, the territory itself, with its population and the spirit of the population, must not be overlooked, because the morale of the country, 24,000,000 strong, is indeed the outstanding item when we come to consider what is meant by the North Atlantic Pact.

No one can consider the North Atlantic Pact and not look at Spain and see what its condition is. The very top men of the Army today, those who are planning strategy for the safety of the United States, are outspoken, if you please, in saying that Spain is indispensable to the success of the North Atlantic Pact.

Spain is situated in the southwestern corner of Europe, which it links with Africa. Surrounded by the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, it encompasses the Straits of Gibraltar, key to the Mediterranean, and it is in a position to control all the east-west sea roads.

Spain can be thought of as a gigantic flat-top of 195,000 square miles. Its seacoast is extremely broken up, offering first-class natural sea bases. The Spanish Navy has modern bases at Cartagena, Cadiz, and El Ferrol, on the Spanish mainland, and at Mahon, in the Balearic Islands, thus making possible the complete control of the western Mediterranean. The Canary Islands, Spanish territory in mid-Atlantic, astride two continents, is the kingpin of the sea roads linking Europe, Africa, and America, and an ideal center for antisubmarine activities.

The Spanish borders are a guaranty of her invulnerable military position. The border with Portugal makes up for its geographic weakness by its political necessity, which facilitates communications between Spain and Portugal, joined by a treaty of friendship and enjoying most cordial relations.

The border with France is a strong military line formed by the natural barrier of the Pyrenees that, in spite of its powerful defensive characteristics, permits, at the same time, offensive actions. Her mountainous, broken-up land offers excellent sites for antiaircraft defense centers. As for aerial navigation, the Spanish climate and meteorological conditions are unexcelled because the variety of conditions is such that Spain is never as a whole under the influence of bad weather. The several plateaus are matchless for installing big-sized air bases, especially in the inner zone, where right now there are some excellent airfields. Furthermore, Spain has air bases on the Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, in the Spanish protectorate of Morocco, Ifni, and Cabo Jubi, in west Africa, over the Atlantic, all in good condition at present and susceptible of being enlarged if desired.

HOW SPAIN IS INTERNALLY PROTECTED TODAY

The Spanish Army has at present 400,000 soldiers encadred in 30 divisions, with senior and junior officers who are war tested and perfectly trained. Immediate mobilization would put in the army 1,000,000 men, and, if necessary, 3,000,000 could be drafted. Its most urgent needs are improvement of interior communications, especially railroads, modern armor and signal corps, and electronic material. As a whole, the military importance of Spain as a power factor in the over-all allied plans justifies any and all help.

HER NAVY

The naval policy of Spain has been that of stressing the importance of bases and training rather than building units that rapidly become obsolete. By American standards, the tonnage of the Spanish Navy is not great, but most of the fleet is made of small destroyers and fast units, a sizable part of which was built since the war, and very appropriate for antisubmarine warfare. The Spanish Navy has at present a roll of 22,000 training men.

AIR FORCE

In "being" the Spanish Air Force has 5 light bomber groups, 3 fighter groups, 2 assault or very close tactical cooperation groups, 4 all-purpose groups, and 2 seaplanes, with a total of 350 aircraft.

These figures are not very important if compared to the fact that Spain has at the present moment over 2,000 combat pilots and all the necessary elements for swift enlarging of the air force.

There are blueprints for 7 fighter groups with 500 aircraft; 3 assault groups with 220; special fighter group with 66; 3 light bomber groups with 150; 1 air reconnaissance group with 48 aircraft. At this very moment the Spanish air force has 36 air bases perfectly equipped, 6 of them with runways suited for the most modern and powerful prototypes. The civilian international airports of Barajas, in Madrid, San Pablo, in Sevilla, and Muntadas in Prat, Barcelona, are the largest in Europe and are used by today's air liners.

Mr. President, I mention these things because if we are serious, as I said before, with reference to the expenditure of billions of dollars to fortify and protect the North Atlantic Pact which we have entered into, if we are interested in our ally in the North Atlantic Pact in the heart of the Mediterranean, how can we ignore the morale of people who today are struggling for existence and who occupy this great peninsula which is the key to the Mediterranean?

Last fall I traveled for 9 days through Spain. I traveled by automobile all the time so that I might see its people at the grass roots, if I may so express it, and so that I might understand what they were thinking of. All they are asking for is the opportunity to get credit and to pay their debts. They are asking for no grants. They are asking for no gifts. They are asking for no aid save and except what they would pay back within the time that may be specified. Let me say that history records that Spain has always paid her debts.

What do we propose to do under this amendment? Today we have in the bulging warehouses of America, belonging to the United States, the following commodities, as indicated by an inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation dated February 28, 1950:

Cotton, upland, 3,646,272 bales	$613,353,057
Wheat, 144,853,295 bushels	358,042,121
Corn, 167,582,777 bushels	255,733,783
Linseed oil, 421,577,441 pounds	119,549,121
Eggs, dried, 79,317,979 pounds	101,361,973
Flaxseed, 12,801,153 bushels	81,278,225
Butter, 92,796,753 pounds	57,670,108
Beans, dry edible, 4,865,985 hundredweight	43,025,268
Milk, dried, 294,252,026 pounds	37,532,538
Barley, 25,079,381 bushels	36,064,035
Wool, 35,427,479 pounds	27,688,394
Rosin, 210,837,798 pounds	17,145,215
Cottonseed, 199,479 tons	10,327,809
Oats, 11,255,782 bushels	9,772,260
Cheese, 24,805,653 pounds	8,396,935
Peanuts, farmers' stock, 56,058,463 pounds	5,914,897
Peanuts, shelled, 18,679,120 pounds	2,780,289
Grain sorghum, 2,073,245 hundredweight	5,853,594
Soybeans, 2,005,507 bushels	5,055,644
Prunes, 35,326,345 pounds	3,593,150
Raisins, 9,876,690 pounds	937,061
Turkeys, 3,380,079 pounds	1,366,923
Minor items	3,923,038
Total	1,806,365,438

Mr. President, all those commodities belong to the United States, because the United States loaned money on them, and those who had them and borrowed the money on them turned them over to the Government, and today the warehouses are bulging with these commodities.

What does Spain want of us? Let us look over the record. Today Spain is asking, not for a gift, not for a grant. She wants to buy. She wants credit. She wants dollars with which to buy $10,000,000 worth of cotton, which is today bulging out of our warehouses, and is for sale, and should be sold and disposed of. She wants $10,000,000 worth of wheat, and we have wheat to sell and wheat to give away. She wants $3,000,000 worth of corn, and we have it. She wants flaxseed, peanuts, and soybeans, to the extent of $7,000,000 worth. She wants tobacco to the extent of two to three million dollars' worth. Other commodities that might be embraced within the $100,000,000 would consist of agricultural, mining and industrial-expansion implements, such as agricultural machinery.

Mr. President, I went through the textile mills of Spain. I saw a mill with 2,000 spindles, with those on one side of a great room standing idle, and on the other side of the room a thousand spindles running. The superintendent said, "If I could only buy your cotton, I would put the other thousand spindles to work."

Mr. President, all through Spain we find the inclination and desire to apply industry to the uses of peace. That is what Spain lives for. The preservation of civilization has been her goal. All the pending amendment would bring about would be to do for Spain what we are doing today for Korea, surrounded

as it is by communistic influences on every hand. All we ask by the amendment is the privilege of granting Spain credit, and Spain is indispensable, as the head of our armed services proclaimed. All we want is to grant Spain the chance to live and improve herself internally, and pay back her own debts, without the cost of a single sou marqué to this Government.

Mr. President, I care not what the internal government of Spain may be, or whether some people like Franco or do not like him, Spain has a population of 24,000,000 God-fearing, liberty-loving, law-abiding citizens. The one country in all of Europe that has stifled communism, with no excuses and no apologies, has been Spain. If we are really fighting communism, let us take into our alliance the people who have dealt with communism, and have put it out of business.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will see fit to adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has 2 minutes left. The Senator from Texas has 44 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the Senator 5 minutes, with the reservation that possibly I may yield him more later.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I believe that its adoption would seriously weaken, if not destroy, the great effort in which we are engaged, namely, to furnish assistance to the democratic nations of western Europe in their defense against the assaults of imperialistic communism. With the cooperation of the democratic nations of western Europe, we organized the great European recovery program 2 years ago. In my opinion, it has been greatly successful, and has done much to revive the economy of Europe.

Mr. President, the European recovery program is a cooperative movement. Its whole success depends on the cooperation of the 16 nations which are serving as the bulwark in freedom's fight against totalitarianism. In my opinion it would be an affront, a deep affront, and deeply resented by the members of the OEEC, the democratic nations of western Europe, if we now asked them to join with Spain—which, under the leadership of Generalissimo Franco, has not been a democratic nation—in a common effort to rehabilitate the economy of Europe for the benefit of the freedom-loving nations and peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I believe that if we enacted this amendment we would be accused, and properly so, of that moral cynicism which we condemn so bitterly and so rightly in the Soviet Union. I think it would be an affront, too, to our friends of Latin America. They have asked to be included in the ECA, but we have explained to them that we could not do that. Now it is proposed that we join to our ranks of freedom-loving nations a country whose policies have been condemned and disavowed by many of the democratic nations of Latin America.

Finally, Mr. President, we have boasted much of our desire to strengthen the United Nations. I am in full agreement with that purpose, because I still believe, in spite of disappointments, that the greatest hope of a freedom-loving world for peace and lasting security lies in the United Nations. By a vote of over two-thirds of the members of the United Nations it was determined that a recommendation be made to all the members of the United Nations to withdraw diplomatic representation from Spain, and to withhold financial assistance. Now it is proposed that by unilateral action we destroy and make futile a decision of the United Nations in which we acquiesced and even supported.

Mr. President, I distrust and dislike Franco, because he is a leader of totalitarianism which I abhor in any form. I am very willing to express my sentiments toward Franco here in public, but I want to emphasize that I admire and have the deepest affection for the common people of Spain. I know many of them. I have worked with many of them. They are a fine people. But we are not going to help them by destroying the cooperative front which we have helped to build in Europe.

As the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, if it is money that is required——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the Senator two additional minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. If it is a loan that is required by Spain, an application can be made to the Export-Import Bank here. That has been testified to by the State Department. Such a loan would be given due consideration. But to insert this amendment into the ECA bill, a mandate for a loan of $100,000,000 through the Export-Import Bank, does not make sense to me. That is contrary to what has been and is now the purpose of the European recovery program, and I hope very sincerely that the Members of the Senate will defeat the proposed amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York have any time left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York has one more minute left.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator is in error in saying that what the amendment provides is compulsory. The amendment simply authorizes the Administrator to do this. It is not compulsory.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understand that, but in moral effect it is substantially a directive. I believe the Senator from Maine will agree that there is nothing in the world to stop Spain from making an application to the Export-Import Bank and receiving consideration on its application. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. BREWSTER. Adoption of the amendment will give Spain a little more encouragement. We have not been sure that the State Department has fully recovered from its former allergy to assistance to Spain.

Mr. LEHMAN. The junior Senator from New York has more confidence in United States agencies, such as the State Department and the Export-Import Bank, than to have any doubt that they will at least give careful consideration to any application that may come before the bank.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall support the stand taken by the chairman of the committee in regard to the pending amendment. I view the question from a parliamentary standpoint. First of all there is now in existence an economic recovery program, which has been consistently worked out with many nations on a cooperative basis. I for one should like to bear testimony on the floor of the Senate to the fact that practically every provision of the economic recovery legislation, from its very inception, has been debated in committee, has been discussed time and time again, and that agreement has always been reached after certain compromises have been made.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have entered into a kind of partnership with a certain number of nations of the world, to work in harmony, it seems to me to be entirely inconsistent with the very spirit and foundation of the economic recovery program which we have consistently tried to build up, now to take action upon a unilateral basis, entirely by ourselves, and especially without action on the problem having been taken by the committee.

The word "cooperative" which is used in the European Cooperative Act, and referred to in connection with the program, is a word which signifies the sort of bipartisan cooperative spirit which the committee has shown whenever it has taken any action at all in regard to the European recovery program. The committee itself has known and continues to know that adherence to the spirit of the program will bring about its ultimate success. If we fail to act in the true spirit of the recovery program we will weaken the program. If the spirit of the European recovery program is sacrificed, the idea which it represents will be lost.

In making that statement, Mr. President, I do not criticize Members of the Senate who for one reason or another have endeavored to add provisions or take away provisions from the legislation. They have the right to do what they think is for the best, and I welcome any suggestions or proposals. But when a proposal to bring in under the program a nation which has not heretofore been a party to it, in spite of the way in which the amendment is written, it becomes impossible for the committee to harmonize such a proposal with the purposes of the economic cooperation legislation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator believe that by bringing Korea in under

its provisions we impaired the Economic Cooperation Act?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, Mr. President, I do not believe we impaired it thereby. I think it was expressed in committee——

Mr. McCARRAN. How does the action with respect to Korea differ from the proposal now made?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. With respect to Korea it was stated in committee time and time again that it was an action outside the spirit of the program. I have already said we have done such things. But I know of no time when in committee a similar provision with respect to Spain has been discussed. As I stated, I am viewing the question from a parliamentary standpoint. If I may say so in passing—I do not wish to change my statement into an argument—if anything has been done which violates the spirit of the European recovery program it is the attaching to the legislation of provisions regarding the Far East, Korea, and China. I think the spirit of the program has been violated by such actions.

I heartily agree with the position taken by the Senator from Nevada with respect to the military side of the question. The Senator has spoken about the value of the Iberian Peninsula in event of war. If war should come to us, of course Spain would be better as an ally than as an enemy. But we are not discussing the possibility of war. We are discussing the spirit of the European recovery program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Gladly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator kindly tell me why we are appropriating $15,000,000,000 for military activities if we are not looking forward to war or to the defense of our country?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I accept the last statement wholly and completely. We are spending it for the defense of our country. What we have done respecting the North Atlantic Pact, of course, has been done in harmony with the program for the defense of our country. But I do not think the entire European recovery program is based upon the idea of war. I believe it is based upon the idea of preserving peace which the American Government itself has always fostered in the development of the constitutional and economic factors which have contributed to the success of its governmental processes. I believe the European recovery program can be justified wholly and completely on a basis of peaceful development, and that we should not in any sense justify its existence as a defensive measure. I grant that some attempt has been made to justify it along that line.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why then have we been sending munitions of war to certain European countries?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have been sending munitions of war to Europe in keeping with a pact which has been entered into by several nations of the world. The answer I give illustrates completely the point I have made. What we have done has been done on a cooperative basis. No nation has been asked to cooperate unless it has wanted to do so. Spain has not been given that opportunity. The opportunity has not been given to her, primarily, because the nations of Europe have not wanted her to be given the opportunity.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator does not say, does he, that we have been sending munitions of war to Europe as ornaments?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As ornaments? No; but as defensive armaments.

Mr. President, I hope the spirit of cooperation among the nations will spread, and that someday Spain will be united with other nations in a spirit of true cooperation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has only 2 minutes left.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Nevada use the 2 minutes now?

Mr. McCARRAN. No, Mr. President. Let the Senator from Texas use whatever time he has left, and then I shall use my 2 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not going to permit the Senator from Nevada to close the debate. I will not do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has 2 minutes left.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was hoping he would use them now.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Texas use a part of the time he has remaining, and then he can close the debate? I do not care about that. Let the Senator use a part of his time now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the 5 minutes of time which the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has yielded me I should like to express my opposition to the pending amendment to Senate bill 3304, which pertains to aid to Spain in the amount of $100,000,000, in notes or loans, to be made to the Spanish Government under the rule of the dictator Franco. It appears to me that this would be a most unwise decision on the part of our Government. I think it is important that we understand the political complexities of the problem in international relations on the European Continent.

The democracies of Europe that we are aiding, and the friendly countries which we are aiding under the Marshall plan, look upon Franco and his Government as an example of dictatorship. It does not seem to me that the way to fight for freedom and peace and democracy against communism is to aid a system which has within itself the essentials and the qualities of totalitarian dictatorship.

The argument that this request for $100,000,000 loan is for the Spanish peoplt just does not face up to the facts of Spanish politics. Franco wants this money; Franco came to power as a dictator; Franco does not permit free elections. The Spanish people have no voice in the Government of Spain. The way to help the Spanish people is to help them get rid of Franco. The Spanish people want freedom. The Spanish people are a brave, God-loving, Christian people. Freedom for Spain should be our goal. Freedom is impossible under dictatorship, be that dictatorship Fascist Franco or Communist Stalin.

The Franco Government is in desperate need of this loan and credits from our Government. As a matter of fact, it has been reported in such newspapers as the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and others, that the Franco regime has repeatedly said to those in the Army, to those in business in Spain, that very shortly financial aid would be forthcoming from the United States. It is in this manner that Franco has maintained support of the Army heads and financial and business interests.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to meet with some of the representatives of the provinces of Spain, representatives who have come to the city of Washington, persons who represent the Christian democratic trade-union movements, who represent the Catholic religious faith, who are anti-Communist, who are prodemocratic. The report of every one of those representatives is that for the United States of America to give aid to Franco would be for it to give aid and comfort to communism all over Europe; that for the United States of America to give aid to Franco at this time would be merely to hold him in power at a period in history when it is possible that the Spanish people, a beloved and a great people, may be able to lift from themselves this burden and this yoke of dictatorship.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Were the persons to whom the Senator has referred associated with the so-called Spanish Government in exile?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. One of them was one of the great trade-union leaders of the Basque, a prominent layman in the Catholic Church of his country, an eminent political leader, the president, I believe, or the leader of his province. Only recently he was here at the United States Senate, and had an opportunity to dine with us.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Minnesota familiar with the activities of the Spanish Government in exile?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not tried to keep track of any of the governments in exile. I simply have a deep conviction that Franco is a dictator. Franco has denied that right of habeas corpus; Franco has denied the right of free speech, free press, and freedom of association, yes, Franco has denied the freedom of speech, freedom of political action and religious liberty.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have but 5 minutes, and I wish to use that time for the purpose for which it was allotted to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall give the Senator 2 minutes more, if he wishes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that prior to and during World War II, Franco saw fit to praise Hitler and to give his allegiance to help destroy the offensive which was being made in an effort to liberate Europe.

Franco has never been a political friend of the United States of America or of our allies in the Atlantic Pact. I wish to point out that at the time of Hitler's aggression in Europe, Franco was one of the first to send telegrams of rejoicing and congratulations. He did the same in the case of the Vichy government of France during World War II, and the Japanese puppet government of the Philippines after the fall of Manila in 1942.

But, Mr. President, even more than that—for that is the history of yesterday—the fact is that the Franco government stands as a symbol of the Fascist reactionary and the antidemocratic elements in Europe.

To aid Franco would merely be to say to the French Social Democrats, to the French Christian Democrats, to the people of Belgium, to the people of the Netherlands, to the Scandinavian people, to the people of England—people who are our friends—that we have forgotten our commitments to the principles of political liberty and democracy for which we are supposed to be working and fighting in the cold war.

Mr. President, I have heard many arguments to the effect that we will need Spain as an ally. I wish to make it very clear that if we need Spain as an ally, believe me, Mr. President, Spain will need us. If Franco is as violently anti-Communist as he says he is, it will not require a loan from the United States of America to bolster his convictions. We cannot buy convictions. I assume that his convictions of anticommunism are sincere. However, in this day and age it is not enough simply to be anti-Communist; it is just as important to be prodemocratic, profreedom.

There are people who are anti-Communist; but in the process of being anti-Communist, they are not for the emancipation of their own people and the liberties of their own people. Hitler was anti-Communist. Does that, or should it, therefore, mean that Hitler was a desirable ally—a friend worthy of help? Of course not.

So, Mr. President, without making any further remarks, I simply say that inasmuch as the Government of the United States is in a cold war which has great psychological effects—and its psychological effects are almost as important as the financial, political, and economic aspects—it would be a singular tragedy for the Government of the United States, which is talking in terms of peace and freedom and liberty, and is saying that it is fighting the cold war not just against communism, but for democracy to give financial aid and assistance to a dictatorial regime which in past years has seen fit to ridicule democracy, has seen fit to praise Hitler, has denied freedom and liberty to his own people, and has seen fit to rebuke democratic standards, wherever that regime or its leader found an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day, when discussing the McCarran-Brewster amendment, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have a statement printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I now send it to the desk and ask that it be incorporated at that point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because of this Nation's leadership of the democratic world in this mid-century period, the problem of our relations with Spain assumes an especial significance.

We share the faith and conviction that our world is not yet condemned to the fatal choice between fascism and communism. This is the clear and deeply felt faith and conviction of millions of men and women throughout the world without whose adherence to our democratic cause the defense of free institutions cannot be won.

It is therefore imperative that the issues involved in our relations with Spain be clearly understood by Americans. For those who believe that our policies must be based on careful analysis and concrete facts, we recommend this question-and-answer memorandum which has been prepared by Americans for Democratic Action.

ELMER DAVIS.
QUINCY HOWE.
EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER.
IRVING PFLAUM.
LELAND STOWE.

Americans are up against the Spanish question again. Who brought it up? Francisco Franco brought it up. He and his government in Spain want help from the United States. To provide thinking Americans with the background necessary to judge the Franco government's request for American assistance, here are the outstanding questions involved:

What does Franco want from Americans?

He wants the United States Government to send an ambassador to Spain, with or without United Nations approval. He wants the United States Government to sponsor his dictatorship as a member of the Atlantic Pact and of western union. Most of all, he wants American dollars, the dollars we pay in taxes, to keep his regime going in Spain.

Is Franco in trouble?

Yes, he is in serious trouble. His government is nearly broke. It has only about $85,000,000 in gold. Franco's government wants to borrow at least $400,000,000 from the United States and, to keep going, will need at least $1,450,000,000 over the next 4 years, according to the figures published by the Urquijo Bank, a Madrid bank which has supported Franco. Needless to say, Franco will be glad to get any American loan, however small, to convince people in Spain and elsewhere that the United States is supporting his government.

Does friendship with Franco fit into our foreign policy?

No; it does not. The United States is spending billions in western Europe to build up the resistance of democratic countries to the spread of communism. American assistance to Franco Spain would, on the contrary, be of great assistance to Moscow propagandists who are trying to convince the rest of the world that Americans are supporting dictatorships like Franco Spain and care nothing about democracy in Europe or elsewhere.

Is aid to Franco likely to become American policy?

It is very possible unless the issues are made clear and are understood. Secretary Acheson's latest statement on Spain, while condemning the lack of democratic freedom in Spain under Franco, is not clear on this point.

Is Franco anti-Communist?

Yes.

Then why not accept Franco as our ally?

The American Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, answered that question on May 11, 1949. He said that the Franco government in Spain denies four basic rights to the Spanish people—the right of individual liberty and the writ of habeas corpus, the right of trial by jury, the right of religious liberty, and the right of free association in political, trade union, and benevolent activities. He said: "These certain fundamental basic rights of the individual which make the difference between what we will call free Europe and the iron-curtain countries—these rights do not exist in Spain and the Spanish people are prevented from enjoying them by action of the Spanish Government." In his latest statement on Spain, Secretary Acheson explained why Spain under Franco was not an acceptable ally for the western alliance. He said the alliance "is not merely a negative reaction to communism. It is, rather, a positive program to support and to strengthen democratic freedoms, politically, economically and militarily. In that context, the participation of the present Spanish Government, unless and until there has been some indication of evolution toward more democratic government in Spain, would weaken rather than strengthen the collective effort to safeguard and strengthen democracy."

We are lending money to Tito's dictatorship in Yugoslavia—why not money to Franco Spain?

By helping Tito we are hurting Russia. Tito is showing Communists that they do not need to obey Moscow. If we helped Franco Spain, we would hurt nobody but ourselves and the Spanish people. We would lose friends and influence throughout the democratic world. We would, therefore, help Russia.

We recognize Russia, why not recognize Franco Spain?

We do recognize Franco Spain. We have an Embassy and consulates in Spain. We do not have an Ambassador in Spain because, in 1946, the United Nations Assembly passed a resolution asking its members to withdraw their chiefs of mission from Spain until the Franco government is changed. That resolution is still on the books of the UN and, as long as we are members of the UN, we are bound by it until it is removed from the record.

What happens if the UN ban is lifted?

First, the United States will be free to send an Ambassador to Franco. This, in itself, might not be so important if it were not for the fact that Franco thereby gains prestige. In addition, another part of the UN resolution bans Franco from membership in the specialized agencies of the UN. If this ban is removed, Franco will be in a position to seek membership in, and assistance from, such organizations as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Food and Agriculture Organization. Franco wants United States support to get dollar loans and other assistance; that is his real objective.

Is the United Nations resolution the only reason we should not help Franco?

No, indeed. There are lots of other reasons—economic, military, and political.

What are the economic objections?

For one thing, apart from all other considerations, Franco is a bad risk. His government is riddled with corruption which has sapped the country's economic strength. Farm production in Spain for the years from 1940 through 1948 has averaged only 65 per-

cent of farm production averages from 1930 through 1935. Industrial activity in Spain, according to the Foreign Policy Association, is below the levels of the years 1922–26. National income has declined steadily under Franco. According to the Franco government's own figures, based on official prices, the cost of living in Spain is about six times as high as in 1936, but the workers' take-home pay has only doubled. The government's budget takes about 26 percent of income, and, in addition, estimates of the amount of national income absorbed by official graft and corruption range from 10 to 15 percent. Thus, the government's total drain on national income comes close to 40 percent. Franco Spain is a poor risk for a loan.

Is Franco getting dollar loans from private bankers?

Yes; he obtained one private loan last year. The Chase National Bank loaned him $25,000,000, but only after the Franco Government had deposited more than $25,000,000 worth of gold in London as collateral to cover not only the principal but also the interest. Franco could have sold the gold, of course, but he preferred to make a loan with an American bank, hoping that the terms would remain secret and that it would improve his chances of getting other loans. But no bankers so far have been willing to lend him dollars without 100 percent collateral.

Is there a ban on private loans to Franco?

No; but he can't find a banker willing to take the risk. That is why he wants a United States Government loan.

Isn't Franco Spain making any money in trade?

No. Under Franco, Spain has a growing trade deficit with the rest of the world. In 1948 the deficit was $68,000,000; final figures for 1949 will probably show a larger deficit.

Is the United States losing its trade with Spain to other countries?

On the contrary, the United States is buying a greater portion of Spain's total exports than usual. The total volume, of course, is smaller. In 1934, the United States bought less than 9 percent of Spain's exports; Britain bought 23 percent; France bought 11 percent; and 4 percent of Spain's exports went to her colonies. In 1948, the United States share of Spanish exports was up to 9.5 percent, while Britain bought only 14 percent of the total, and the French share of Spanish exports was down to 3½ percent. And Spain now is forced to sell 26 percent of her exports to her colonies.

What about United States sales to Spain?

Spanish purchases in the United States have been limited to what she can finance from current earnings. This means that United States sales to Spain are about half what they were in 1947, but the same drop has occurred in British and French sales to Spain.

What raw materials or goods do we need from Spain that we cannot get from friendly countries?

None. Cork, olives, mercury, in fact all the things which Spain sells to the United States, now can be bought at about the same price or cheaper elsewhere.

Have other countries given Spain loans or credits?

Yes. Franco has been friendly in the past with President Juan Peron of Argentina. Not long ago Argentina gave Spain the biggest loan and credit in Argentine history, but recently Argentina has refused to make deliveries to Spain until the Spanish Government catches up on deliveries to Argentina, now hundreds of millions of dollars in arrears. Some other countries, notably Britain, have granted trade credits to Franco Spain, but all these are tied to the delivery of Spanish goods on trade account, year by year. Franco has not been able to get the kind of loans he needs to keep h's government going.

Is he counting on a United States loan?

He certainly is. Spanish businessmen and bankers who once supported Franco because he enabled them to make big profits now are anxious to get him out of office. A lot of them feel that Spain will not be able to borrow the money it needs as long as Franco is in power. But Franco tells them to wait—he says he can get American aid in time to shore up his government.

Won't United States help to Franco feed hungry Spaniards?

Very little American aid would reach poor Spaniards if handed over to the Franco government. Franco Spain made a lot of money during the World War and Franco's friends made big fortunes, but the standard of living of the Spanish worker became progressively worse, not better. The Associated Press reported from Madrid on February 21, 1949, that economic conditions for the working man in Madrid were "the toughest in Europe, not excepting the countries behind the iron curtain." Under Franco, Spain is a rich man's country. If we want to get American food to hungry Spaniards it can be done only by having an American organization—like CARE or the American Friends Service Committee (Quaker)—distribute the food directly to the Spaniards who need it, not to the Falange Party.

What about the military considerations—doesn't Franco have a big army?

Yes; but it's the kind of army designed to run a police state, not an army that could fight abroad. There are about 300,000 men in the Spanish Army, with an ill-assorted collection of Nazi German and Fascist Italian arms sent to Franco by his allies during the Spanish Civil War. The Spanish Air Force has 4,400 officers and 35,000 enlisted men, but only 350, aircraft of German and Italian origin, most of them obsolete. In the Spanish Navy there are 5 cruisers and about 70 other craft. All the warships lack radar and fire-control equipment. Franco hasn't much to show for the $5,400,000,000 he has spent on the armed forces since 1939—much of the money went down the rat hole of military graft.

Wouldn't Spaniards be useful in a war between the west and Russia?

Perhaps, if the United States spent about $1,000,000,000 in Spain rebuilding the country's roads and railroads and arming Spanish soldiers. But it must be remembered that most of the Spanish people fought against Franco, not for him, in the civil war. That civil war ended 10 years ago, but it still isn't safe to travel through the mountain regions of Spain at night.

Is the Spanish underground opposing Franco really strong?

In numbers, yes; in military strength, no. Ten years of a police-state dictatorship with thousands of executions and hundreds of thousands kept in prisons for a good part of that time have discouraged active opposition to Franco. But if there were war between the west and Russia, and if the United States tried to use Spain and Franco as an ally, hundreds of thousands of Spaniards would prefer to fight against Franco than for him. Don't forget the German experience in Yugoslavia during the Second World War—they tried to use an unpopular dictatorship as an ally and they spent a lot of their strength in Yugoslavia fighting off guerrillas. In a war under Franco there would be plenty of guerrillas in Spain.

Wouldn't Spain provide useful air bases against a Russian invasion of western Europe?

Air bases in friendly countries like Norway, the British Isles, north Africa, and Turkey are closer to the targets our aviation would want to reach. If the Russians smashed through the western Europe defenses from the Rhine and the Po to the Pyrenees they wouldn't be likely to stop there. What is more, the people at both ends of he Pyrenees, the strongly anti-Communist Basques and Catalans, fought Franco in the civil war.

If we didn't help Franco, would he join the Russians?

No. Don't forget that Franco did everything he could short of war to help Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy beat the United Nations, including Russia. If he couldn't stay neutral in a war he would want to be on our side because he has no place else to go.

Won't the Communists take over in Spain if Franco goes?

No. The Spanish Communist Party is very weak in Spain and has always been weak save during the civil war when Russia alone sent help to the Spanish Republic after Germany and Italy helped Franco. There is little or no Communist influence in the Spanish underground today, although Franco, of course, calls all his enemies in Spain Communists. The only chance the Communists have in Spain is that the United States will make an alliance with Franco, thus showing Spaniards that they can get rid of Franco only by joining the Communists.

Is the opposition to Franco in Spain anti-Catholic?

Not at all. Almost all Spaniards are Catholics, including Franco's opponents inside Spain—among them the Basques, many of whose priests were jailed by Franco after the civil war. The strongest alliance against Franco, an alliance of Monarchists and democratic parties, is composed predominantly of Catholics.

What about the Catholics outside Spain, how do they feel about Franco?

Almost all the Catholic political parties which support the anti-Communist governments of western Europe have condemned the Franco government. For example, Gaston Tessier, president both of the International Confederation of Christian Unions and the French Confederation, its largest affiliate, said recently: "Since its foundation in 1919, the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions has always opposed all forms of dictatorship, whether those of Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, or Franco." A Catholic priest, Father Cary-Elwes, said in the London Spectator, October 7, 1949: "If we help Franco we support a dictator and so increase the chance of communism after him."

How does labor as a whole feel about Franco?

The best answer to that is to quote from a resolution of the recent Congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions—the anti-Communist unions of the world, including the CIO and AFL. This congress unanimously passed a resolution urging that Franco Spain not be included as a partner of the democracies of the world, and added: "This Congress goes on record as opposing the granting of any assistance to Spain until such time as democracy and full trade-union rights have been restored and the workers are once more able to make their contribution to the country's recovery."

Are the Russians trying to keep us from making friends with Franco?

No. On the contrary, the Russians are doing everything they can to make the rest of the world think we already are allied with Franco. Radio Moscow talks about this almost every day in radio broadcasts to western Europe in every language. For example, on September 28, 1949, Radio Moscow said: "In exchange for the complete handing over of Spain, Franco is granted the help of United States imperialism so as to avoid the complete collapse of his tyranny. This is nothing new. It is the direction taken by United States postwar policy, directed to protecting the fascist and antidemocratic regimes throughout the world." That's the

Moscow line. In the UN, the Russians and their satellites frequently make the most extreme proposals on Spain with the sole purpose of forcing the United States and other democracies to vote against them—thus appearing to be for Franco. You can see how pleased these propagandists would be if we really did line up with Franco.

Why do the Russians want to show we are friendly with Franco?

In order to break up the alliance between the United States and the democratic forces of western Europe.

Why do western Europeans dislike Franco?

Again, Secretary Acheson gave the best answer to that question when he said recently: "The Franco Government was one which was established with the active support, and only with the active support, of Hitler and Mussolini. A government was established in Spain which was patterned on the regimes in Italy and in Germany and was, and is, a Fascist Government and a dictatorship." Western Europeans who live next door to Spain feel very strongly about Franco; their governments even asked that Franco be specifically banned from membership in the United Nations as long as the Franco Government remains in power.

Do the Latin Americans like Franco?

Some of them, yes; notably the Latin American dictators. If these totalitarian "strong men" are able to claim that the United States, by helping Franco, has gone over to their side, the democratic forces in Latin America would suffer a devastating blow and the prestige of American democracy would sink to its lowest level. An example of the anti-Franco feeling in Latin America was the strong resolution unanimously adopted last September at the Havana convention of the Inter-American Confederation of Workers representing strong pro-democratic and anti-Communist labor in all Latin-American countries.

Is there really a chance that Franco will be forced out soon?

Yes; there is. He is running out of money and his own allies are deserting him. Both big business and the army in Spain want to halt the steady deterioration of the Spanish economy and they see no chance of doing it as long as Franco remains in power. Without such support, Franco can't last much longer—unless, of course, he is kept going by United States loans. That is why he is so anxious to get United States help now.

Who will succeed Franco if he goes?

In Spain all parties to the alliance of the major political groups opposing Franco want a plebiscite to determine what kind of regime will follow. It may be a republican government; it may be a constitutional monarchy. Alternatives to a police state are not easy to see while the dictatorship is in power; the present democratic leaders of Germany and Italy were unknown when Hitler and Mussolini ruled. Like the Spanish monarchy in 1931, the Franco regime may end without bloodshed, provided, of course, that it is not kept in power indefinitely through American aid.

So Franco's only hope of staying in power is help from the United States?

Yes; that's about it. His representatives are in Washington now, looking for a loan or any other help they can get from Congress or any United States Government agency.

Who is Franco's chief lobbyist for American aid?

Jose Felix de Lequerica, technically known as Inspector of Embassies. He spends much time in Washington, where only a few people know that he once gave the Japanese diplomats at Vichy, France, a banquet to celebrate the Japanese capture of Manila from United States forces in 1942.

Speaking of Manila, what did Franco think of the Japanese puppet government there?

On the establishment of the quisling government there in October 1943, Franco's Foreign Minister, Count Jordana, sent "most sincere sentiments * * * from the Spanish people" to the puppet president, Jose Laurel.

LEST WE FORGET

Said Franco to Hitler—

On Hitler's fourth anniversary in power, January 30, 1937: "Fervent wishes that the great German people advance under the glorious emblem of the swastika. Heil Hitler!"

On the occasion of Hitler's annexation of Austria, March 23, 1938: "Greetings from the Spanish Nation in this solemn hour."

On the occasion of Hitler's conquest of Czechoslovakia, October 2, 1938: "Cordial congratulations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, following the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, let me say that I now hold in my hand what purports to be a true and correct copy of a letter signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, under date of November 4, 1942, on the letterhead of the White House. The letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 4, 1942.

DEAR GENERAL FRANCO: It is because your nation and mine are friends in the best sense of the word and because you and I are sincerely desirous of the continuation of that friendship for our mutual good that I want very simply to tell you of the compelling reasons that have forced me to send a powerful American military force to the assistance of the French possessions in north Africa.

We have accurate information to the effect that Germany and Italy intend at an early date to occupy with military force French north Africa.

With your wide military experience you will understand clearly that in the interests of the defense of both North America and South America it is essential that action be taken to prevent an Axis occupation of French Africa without delay.

To provide for America's defense I am sending a powerful army to French possessions and protectorates in north Africa with the sole purpose of preventing occupation by Germany and Italy and with the hope that these areas will not be devastated by the horror of war.

I hope you will accept my full assurance that these moves are in no shape, manner, or form directed against the Government or people of Spain or Spanish Morocco or Spanish territories—metropolitan or overseas. I believe the Spanish Government and the Spanish people wish to maintain neutrality and to remain outside the war. Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations.

I am, my dear general, your sincere friend,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

(NOTE.—This letter was written on the eve of the north African invasion, November 7, 1942.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator from Texas; that is very kind of him.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is hands across the sea.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let us go to lunch together. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, in the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine and myself there is nothing which interferes in any sense of the word with the activities of the Marshall plan. In the amendment there is nothing which at all curtails the success of the Marshall plan. If it were true that the amendment would interfere with the activities or curtail the success of the Marshall plan, then indeed the application of the very principle which we seek to apply to Korea would limit or interfere with the Marshall plan. However, it does not.

More than that, Mr. President, having seen to it that Korea is taken care of, and realizing that we are spending billions of dollars for the military defense of our own country, we cannot stand idly by and not help a nation of liberty-loving, God-fearing people who want only to be assisted, who will pay us back for the assistance we shall give them, who wish to join with us if war or trouble arises—the only country in Europe, I say without fear of successful contradiction, which has succeeded in conquering and driving out communism.

Senators may talk about Franco all they wish, but I am not going to bring Franco's name into this argument, because there are 24,000,000 human beings in Spain, and Franco is only one of them. If they wanted to oust Franco, they would have him out tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry I cannot yield, the time is too limited. I am going to yield a little time to the Senator from Maine.

If it were a question of giving something to Spain, if it were a question of breaking up the administration of the ECA, if it were a question of impairing the efficiency of the Marshall plan, there might then be some argument against the pending amendment. But there is nothing in the amendment which would interfere with anything in the Marshall plan. Last December, Spain wanted to buy $50,000,000 worth of grain in this country. She wanted to get the credit from the Export-Import Bank. She was stopped in her effort, because the Export-Import Bank refused the credit, for the reason that the State Department had put its thumb down on it. Today the Government's warehouses are bulging with grain which we cannot dispose of, and with cotton, which we cannot dispose of, and which Spain wants to buy and put to a beneficial use. Under such circumstances, how can it be said that we should stand by and refuse to assist a potential ally? I yield the remainder of my time, if I have any, to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BREWSTER. Could I have 2 minutes?

Mr. CONNALLY. Make it 3 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Texas very much. I appreciate his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to read a statement made by one

who served for a time as Ambassador to Spain, during the late unpleasantness. It seems to me it has a most pertinent application. He states:

Under Senor Lequerica, as under his predecessor Count Jordana, the Spanish Foreign Office, with the obvious approval of General Franco himself, granted us more favors than did any other neutral government, whether Sweden, Turkey, Switzerland, or Portugal. Not only did the Spanish Government pledge itself not to interfere in any way with our fateful landings and campaign in north Africa, not only did it assure us as early as February 1943 that it would join us in war if the Axis should attempt an invasion of Spain, not only did it permit us to use Spain as the base for invaluable espionage of Axis activities in France and the Mediterranean, it also accorded us important positive favors. It allowed us to get over 1,200 American airmen safely across the peninsula, without any internments. It permitted the transit and exit of over 25,000 members of the French resistance movement as reinforcements for Allied armies in north Africa. It choked off export of strategic war materials to Germany before any other neutral had done so. Spain, too, was the first country to conclude a permannet air agreement with us, and one whereby we were enabled to obtain landing rights for military as well as civilian planes.

In the light of all such facts, it is simply hypocritical to countenance the notion that Spain has been hostile to us and should therefore be treated as a pariah among the nations. It certainly belies the solemn assurances which President Roosevelt gave to General Franco in writing in November 1942.

That has refence to the letter which the Senator from Nevada has just read. I submit that the idea that we should discriminate against Spain because of its record is not warranted by this plain statement of facts.

The further question of whether we approve or do not approve of things that have gone on in Spain seems to me utterly irrelevant, when the safety and security of our own country is vitally involved. As I understand, there is no question now except as to whether we should authorize the ECA Administrator to do what is proposed. We are told that the Export-Import Bank can do it today. We are assured that it will give sympathetic consideration, and that the Senate of the United States by adopting this amendment would simply encourage the Export-Import Bank and the ECA Administrator to do a thing which apparently everyone recognizes is now in the interest of the safety and security of the United States of America.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much regret that during the debate on this particular amendment the attendance of the Senate has been, I may say, so indifferent. I think Senators should be present in order to understand the issue.

Mr. President, allow me to say that in opposing this amendment I am not fighting Spain. I have a very warm feeling for Spain, and I have conferred with the Spanish representatives who have been here from time to time with reference to a loan to Spain. In the United Nations General Assembly, when this question was voted on, I personally was opposed to the resolution which was adopted. However, my delegation outvoted me. The Secretary of State and others insisted that we vote not to return a diplomatic representative to Spain. I expressed myself to the other members of the delegation to the effect that I thought we ought to have representation in Spain, not, to be sure, as a sop to Spain, not to please Spain or to court its favor, but that, in the interest of the United States, we should not discriminate against Spain, and should send an ambassador to Madrid.

I approached the consideration of the pending amendment with no spirit of hostility or ill will toward Spain, but believing that it would be a serious interference with the principal purpose of the ECA in Europe and with the obligations we have assumed under ECA.

Turning to the amendment, it begins, not as a real amendment to the pending bill, but as follows:

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Spanish Aid Act of 1950."

Mr. President, what has that to do with it? What has Spanish aid got to do with the principal purpose of the pending bill? Its principal purpose is to carry forward the ECA program and to make its benefits available. This would be a unilateral act. It would not require the consent or cooperation of any of the European countries who are members of OEEC.

Let me suggest, Mr. President, that OEEC is not a one-way street, it is not a unilateral arrangement. Each of the OEEC members is required to sign a bilateral contract with the United States, assuming certain obligations and promising the performance of certain things. That is the purpose of OEEC. It is a part of the OEEC plan. But Spain will not have signed any bilateral agreement. Spain will have assumed no obligation except to repay the loan. This amendment, if agreed to, would inject an alien proposition into ECA and the European organization which would not be helpful. The ECA was organized with a definite and certain number of European countries within its compass. Those countries, as one of the conditions precedent to the creation of ECA, were required in turn to form an arrangement among themselves, which would be the OEEC, and the OEEC would undertake to carry out the policies of ECA. The members of OEEC, not merely by stump speeches, but formally and actually, would obligate themselves to the United States to do certain things.

To bring Spain in on a unilateral basis, as here proposed, would be very offensive to a large number at least of the countries which are now within the ECA program and which have assumed certain obligations and made certain promises. It would be tantamount to admitting a partner without the desire and consent of all the present partners. It would be admitting one to whose admittance many of the countries object. France, for example, would be displeased. The United Kingdom would be displeased. Certain of the Scandinavian countries would be displeased. Why should we do it, simply to satisfy certain elements at home and abroad who are insisting upon this proposition?

Mr. President, we have established machinery for that very purpose. We have the Export-Import Bank. It was stated a while ago that Spain had applied to that bank for a loan, but without success. I deny that statement. I have in my hand a letter from the Department of State which says that the Department believes that is the normal channel of which the Spaniards have not yet availed themselves.

It is true that certain of their representatives conferred with the Export-Import Bank, but my information is that the Spaniards have never made a formal application to the Export-Import Bank, seeking to bring themselves within the terms of the law. So they cannot say they have been refused. They were welcomed here. The bank is open to them at this time.

This morning, Mr. President, I attended a conference with the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, and as a result of that conference—I shall not quote the words because I do not quote the President under such circumstances—but after that conference it is my firm conviction that there would be no opposition on the part of either of those sources to a loan to Spain by the Export-Import Bank if Spain complies with the normal requirements of that bank.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am happy to hear the very able and distinguished Senator from Texas make the statement which he has just made, because a number of us have been led to believe that Spain had been denied a loan from the Export-Import Bank. I know that I, as one Senator, shared the feeling that Spain should be granted a loan if it could put up the proper security. I definitely believe that Spain should be granted a loan through the proper channels, as any other nation may be granted a loan.

So I am very happy that the very able Senator from Texas assures us that the President and the State Department would look in a friendly manner upon such an application on the part of Spain to the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I am personally entirely agreeable to a Spanish loan if it complies with the regulations governing the Export-Import Bank, just as every other borrower must comply with such rules and regulations. I have no prejudice against Spain. When the resolution came before the United Nations Council I opposed it until I was overruled in my position by the other members of the delegation and had to vote contrariwise. The Secretary of State and the other members of the delegation insisted that I vote the other way. I was a servant of the delegation, and I finally voted for the resolution as it was adopted. But it did not represent my own views and convictions. I could not see why we should not have an ambassador in Spain. We are cutting off our noses to spite someone's face when we refuse to send an

ambassador to a nation when, as a matter of fact, we should have an ambassador there.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I can yield only briefly, for I have only 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator does not mean to infer, does he, that Spain has not been given an indication, certainly, by the Export-Import Bank that loans would not be made to her? The Senator stated that Spain had never been denied a loan only because it had not made formal application. Was Spain not told that there would be no object in making an application?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I cannot say that. The Senator must have sources of information which are not available to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know. That is my understanding. Apparently, I know as much about it as does the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas has not pretended to know. The Senator from New Hampshire rose and propounded an inquiry to the Senator from Texas, but he did not know, and I did not think he knew when he rose. I do not claim to know anything about it. I know that representatives of Spain—not official Government representatives, but financiers—were in America. I saw them. There was a luncheon at which we conferred about the matter, and I expressed the hope that they would see the Export-Import Bank and would comply with the rules of that bank and receive a loan. The Secretary of State says that they have not availed themselves of the requirements of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator understand that the amendment would be mandatory, or would it leave them in the same position in which they are today?

Mr. CONNALLY. It would not be mandatory, except that it says that they must do it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall have to decline to yield further.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator made a statement——

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from New Hampshire will bear with me a moment, I will explain it. If the Senate should adopt this amendment, would not the Export-Import Bank have sense enough to know that we meant for them to make the loan? They would know we meant for them to make the loan, whether it were a sound loan or not. They would take the recorded speech of the Senator from New Hampshire, read it over, and say, "This man from New Hampshire is after us. We have got to make this loan."

I discussed the question this morning with the President and with Mr. Acheson, and as a result of the conference I believe that if Spain makes application to the Export-Import Bank and complies with its regulations, there will be no objection to a loan.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have only a few seconds remaining, but I yield if the Senator will be quick.

Mr. WHERRY. What the Senator has stated is exactly in contradiction of the position which the Secretary of State took before the Appropriations Committee when he was asked the same question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know what happened at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I am telling the Senator from Texas what happened there.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am telling the Senator from Nebraska what I heard this morning.

Mr. President, the question of Korea has been raised. That is a wholly different question, involving a different area of the world. We have no contracts with Korea, but we have contracts with every nation in the ECA. They are bilateral contracts providing that they are to do certain things in compliance with our gifts and contributions to them. Those requirements are for our benefit as well as for theirs. I do not want to introduce into the plan and into the system something which is offensive to them, something they will not like, something which may lessen the enthusiasm and interest of those countries in carrying out the OEEC obligations and promises to us.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not see fit to adopt this amendment. It is legislation. It starts out by saying, "This title may be cited as the Spanish Aid Act of 1950." This bill is for the ECA, and carries it forward for another year. The amendment is not in accordance with the purpose of the bill; it introduces a new responsibility, putting on the ECA obligations and duties which do not belong to it under the law. If we adopt this amendment, some Senator may have an amendment similar to it, providing that "This may be cited as the aid act for Central and South America."

Why should we not aid them? They are at our very doorstep. They are our brothers. They received their inspiration for independence, freedom, and liberty from the American revolution. Yet we have not embraced them within the ECA; we have not embraced them within the OEEC, although we have had calls from those areas that they be included. But why should we include this new element?

I hope Senators will vote against this amendment, because it is not in the interest of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD, at the close of the remarks I made on the amendment which has just been voted on, a letter from the Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 25, 1950.

The Honorable TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: I am writing to you to express the views of the Department with respect to the proposed amendment to S. 3304, introduced by Senator MCCARRAN on behalf of himself and Senator BREWSTER, which provides for ECA assistance to Spain.

Our basic objective with regard to Spain is its inclusion in the western European community, but it seems unlikely that Spain will be accepted by a majority of its neighbors unless and until there is a perceptible evolution toward democracy within Spain. As I said in my letter to you of January 18, 1950, Spain's entry into cooperative western European projects is a matter that cannot be solved by us unilaterally but requires the cooperation of all parties, including Spain.

In this connection, we believe that the western European countries should have the decisive voice as to whether Spain is to participate in projects such as the OEEC. A similar position was agreed upon on April 1, 1948, by the conference committee of the two Houses of Congress on the Foreign Assistance Act. In the statement of the managers on the part of the House, it was reported that "this enterprise is open to Spain whenever the participating countries desire to have Spain enter the partnership. Under the theory upon which the partnership has been launched and organized, the United States leaves to the participating governments the initial decision on the admission of a new partner." This principle was incorporated in the convention establishing the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, signed by the participating countries in Paris on April 16, 1948. Article 25 of the convention provides that "any nonsignatory European country may accede to it by notification addressed to the Government of the French Republic, and with the assent of the council of the organization."

I believe, therefore, that a congressional appropriation for Spain in the ERP framework, without the concurrence of the ERP countries, would jeopardize the program. It would not only violate the principle of joint responsibility but also would undermine the concept that the ERP is a positive program to strengthen the forces of democracy in western Europe. Without exaggerating the danger to our over-all policy, I think that such unilateral action would have seriously unfavorable repercussions in the OEEC countries as was the case with the O'Konski amendment in 1948. I believe this would be true regardless of whether the action was intended to bring Spain into the OEEC framework or merely to have the ECA handle the funds as it does in the case of Korea. It was in accordance with this principle that the Department opposed the amendment to the 1950 appropriation bill for the ECA offered by the Senate Appropriations Committee, which proposed that $50,000,000 be earmarked for use only for loan assistance to Spain.

While we do not contemplate any special government-to-government loan arrangement to provide economic assistance to Spain, the normal channel for credit from the United States Government, namely the Export-Import Bank, is open to Spain on the same basis as any other country. The Spaniards have talked with the Bank concerning the procedure for applying for credit and are free at all times to apply for loans for specific projects in accordance with the Bank's normal procedures. They have been informed of the Bank's requirements with respect to the types of projects it considers

and the extent of justification of each project which is required. The Department believes that this normal channel, of which the Spaniards have not yet availed themselves, should be utilized for projects in Spain requiring financial assistance from the United States Government.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired on the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Malone
Benton	Hill	Martin
Brewster	Holland	Maybank
Bricker	Humphrey	Millikin
Bridges	Hunt	Mundt
Butler	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Darby	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Leahy	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Taylor
Eastland	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Lucas	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Tobey
Flanders	McCarthy	Tydings
George	McClellan	Wherry
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] for himself and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000,000."

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

The question is now on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was, on page 7, after line 4, to insert the following:

AID TO SPAIN

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Spanish Aid Act of 1950."

NATURE OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 202. The Administrator for Economic Cooperation is hereby authorized to furnish assistance to the Spanish state in conformity with—

(a) the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, wherever such provisions are applicable and not inconsistent with the intent and purposes of this title; and

(b) the administrator is authorized to issue notes from time to time during the fiscal year 1951 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate $50,000,000 for the purpose of allocating funds during such fiscal year to the Export-Import Bank of Washington for assistance to Spain on credit terms under the provisions of paragraph 2 of section 111 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, to the extent applicable.

Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCARRAN, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CAIN. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and his pair has been announced previously.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—35

Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Langer	Schoeppel
Capehart	Lodge	Stennis
Chapman	Long	Taft
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McCarthy	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Withers
Gurney	Millikin	Young
Hendrickson	Mundt	

NAYS—42

Anderson	Holland	McFarland
Benton	Humphrey	McMahon
Bricker	Hunt	Magnuson
Connally	Ives	Maybank
Cordon	Jenner	Neely
Darby	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Flanders	Knowland	Taylor
George	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Green	Lehman	Thye
Hayden	Lucas	Tobey
Hill	McClellan	Williams

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Graham	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hoey	Pepper
Cain	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Kerr	Vandenberg
Frear	Morse	Watkins
Fulbright	Murray	
Gillette	Myers	

So Mr. MCCARRAN's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITION

Mr. HUMPHREY presented a petition from the Chamber of Commerce and Resort Group, of Ely, Minn., signed by Stan Pechaver, secretary, and sundry other citizens of Ely, relating to damage to lake shore and river-front property as a result of the fluctuation in water levels, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PLEBISCITE IN IRELAND—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and inclusion in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the New York State Legislature calling for a plebescite in Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations. I take pleasure in presenting this action by the New York Legislature since it proposes action very similar to that called for under a resolution I have already submitted to the Senate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing Congress to adopt resolution for a plebiscite in Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations

Whereas it is essential for the United Nations to encourage a peaceful, prosperous, and united Ireland without imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland and that all Ireland, including the people of Eire as well as those of Northern Ireland should have an opportunity to express their free will for or against union; and

Whereas there is pending in the United States House of Representative a resolution, House Resolution 463, favoring a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland under the auspices of a United Nations Commission for Ireland, to be designated by the General Assembly pursuant to articles 11 and 35 of the United Nations Charter, the objective being to establish terms and conditions upon which Ireland would be admitted as a member of the United Nations, and the adherence of Ireland to the Atlantic Pact: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to speedily adopt the resolution, H. Res. 463, now pending in the House of Representatives or a similar resolution to bring about a plebiscite of all the people of Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations, and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate March 22, 1950; concurred in without amendment.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by the Duluth-Superior Advisory Board on April 20, 1950, at Hibbing, Minn., favoring the continuation of rent control.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At an adjourned meeting of the Duluth-Superior Rent Advisory Board No. 2, held at the Androy Hotel, Hibbing, Minn., on the 20th day of April 1950, at 7:30 p. m., the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas it is the opinion of this board that the shortage of rental housing and of all residential housing is extremely acute in the towns along the Mesaba Range in upper St. Louis County, such as the village of Hibbing, the cities of Chisholm, Virginia, Eveleth, and Ely on the Vermilion Range, that great suffering and hardship will result particularly to families of moderate and small incomes unless rent control is maintained in such communities beyond June 30, 1950, and that rentals demanded for dwelling accommodations will rise to exorbitant levels unless rent controls are maintained: Be it

"*Resolved*, That this board recommends the continuation of rent controls in and for such municipalities until such time as adequate additional supply of housing accommodations shall become available; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Tighe E. Woods, Housing Expediter; to the Honorable John A. Blatnik, Representative in Congress; to the Honorable United States Senator Edward J. Thye; and to the Honorable United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey."

MARTIN HUGHES,
Chairman of the Board.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Virginia, Minn., on April 11, 1950, opposing the discontinuance of rent control.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 5462 OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA, MINN., APRIL 11, 1950, OPPOSING DECONTROL OF RENT CONTROL IN THE CITY OF VIRGINIA

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Virginia, That—

Whereas there is still a housing shortage in the city of Virginia; and

Whereas same will cause hardship upon the citizens:

Resolved, That we protest same and request State and municipal local option, and that copies of this resolution be sent to Tighe E. Woods and the Honorable Representative John Blatnik and the Honorable Senators Edward Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

Moved by Alderman Fredrickson, supported by Alderman Oklobzija, that the above resolution be adopted.

Ayes: Aldermen Hedican, Glatz, Maryland, Virshek, Luodo, Vukelich, Oklobzija, Fredrickson, President Stock—9.

Nays: None.

Adopted April 11, 1950.

ARTHUR J. STOCK,
President of the City Council.

Attest:

J. G. MILROY, Jr.,
City Clerk.

Presented to the mayor, April 12, 1950.

Approved April 17, 1950.

Returned by the mayor, April 17, 1950.

W. S. ANDERSON,
Mayor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 7057. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) with respect to the computation of estimated costs of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction in the case of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts and other nonprofit educational institutions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1524).

By Mr. BENTON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to provide for the transfer of the paintings, the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone, and the Chasm of the Colorado, from the United States Capitol to the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 3497. A bill to authorize credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood-protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River in Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

S. 3498. A bill to provide for advancement of certain retired officers of the armed forces on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. PEPPER):

S. 3499. A bill to grant persons entitled to vocational rehabilitation under part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, a minimum of 4 years' training; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate bill 3500, to authorize deductions from the wages of seamen for payment into employee welfare funds, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate bill 3501, to establish a Chiropractic Service in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration and to authorize the use of chiropractic care in all cases where persons are eligible for medical care by or through the Veterans' Administration; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 3502. A bill for the relief of Ayako Chika; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3503. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Karl-August Wagner, Magdalena Wagner, Klaus Peter Wagner, and Kathrin Margarete Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 3504. A bill to promote the development of improved transport aircraft by providing for the operation, testing, and modification thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY) introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appear under a separate heading):

S. 3505. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; and

S. 3506. A bill to provide for the modification of certain recommendations relating to flood control on the Red River of the North and its tributaries, to include the construction of additional flood-control improvements.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 3507. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for transport aircraft adaptable for both commercial and military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 3508. A bill to authorize the modification of the Mispillion River project; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. TAFT) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 172, designating April 28 as Tax Freedom Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

DEDUCTIONS FROM WAGES OF SEAMEN FOR PAYMENT INTO EMPLOYEE WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing deductions from the wages of seamen for payment into employee welfare funds, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3500) to authorize deductions from the wages of seamen for payment into employee welfare funds, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and encourage the American foreign carrying trade, and for other purposes," approved June 26, 1884 (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 599), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection, as follows:

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply to, or render unlawful, deductions made by an employer from the wages of a seaman, pursuant to the written consent of the seaman, if (1) such deductions are paid into a trust fund established for the sole and exclusive benefit of seamen employed by such employer, and their families and dependents (or of such seamen, families, and dependents jointly with seamen employed by other employers and their families and dependents); and (2) such payments are held in trust for the purpose of providing, either from principal or income or both, for the benefit of such seamen, their families, and dependents, medical and/or hospital care, pensions on retirement or death of the seamen, life insurance, unemployment benefits, compensation for illness or injuries resulting from occupational activity, sickness, accident, and disability compensation, or any one or more of the foregoing benefits, or for the purpose of purchasing insurance to provide any one or more of such benefits."

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SEAMEN'S ALLOTMENT STATUTE

Public Law 99 of the Seventy-sixth Congress states in part as follows:

"(b) That it shall be lawful for any seaman to stipulate in his shipping agreement for an allotment of any portion of the wages he may earn to his grandparents, parents, wife, sister, or children, or for deposits to be made in an account opened by him and maintained in his name either at a savings bank or a United States postal savings depository subject to the governing regulations thereof."

No allotment except as provided in this section is legal.

The recently established welfare plan between the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards and the Pacific Maritime Association provides that each employee shall contribute 1 percent of his wages into the MCS-PMA welfare fund.

The parties do not believe that the above-quoted statute was intended to or necessarily does have application to deductions from seamen's wages of the types and for the purposes outlined in the welfare plan. Nevertheless, because of the possibility of confusion on this point, an amendment has been prepared, and agreed to by both the MCS and the PMA, which would clarify the seamen's allotment statute.

The amendment simply makes clear that the restrictions upon allotments from seamen's salaries do not extend to voluntary deductions for a welfare plan such as this one.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CHIROPRACTIC SERVICE IN DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Chiropractic Service in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3501) to establish a Chiropractic Service in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration and to authorize the use of chiropractic care in all cases where persons are eligible for medical care by or through the Veterans' Administration, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946 (59 Stat. 675; 38 U. S. C. 15) is amended as follows:

(a) In section 2 insert "Chiropractic Service," after "Dental Service,".

(b) In section 3 (a) strike out "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "nine".

(c) Before the period at the end of the first sentence of section 3 (d) insert a comma and the following: "and one assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of chiropractic who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operations of the Chiropractic Service."

(d) In section 4 (a) insert "chiropractors," after "dentists,".

(e) In section 5 insert after subsection (c) a new subsection as follows:

"(d) In the Chiropractic Service—hold the degree of doctor of Chiropractic from a college or school approved by the Administrator, and be licensed to practice chiropractic in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia." and redesignate the succeeding subsections accordingly.

(f) In section 6 (a) insert "chiropractors," after "dentists,".

(g) In section 6 (b) insert "Chiropractic," after "Dental,".

(h) In section 6 (c) insert "chiropractors," after "dentists,".

(i) In section 7 (a) after the listing of grades and pay ranges for the Dental Service and before the listing of grades and pay ranges for the Nursing Service, insert the following:

"CHIROPRACTIC SERVICE

"Chief grade, $10,000 minimum to $11,000 maximum.

"Senior grade, $8,980 minimum to $9,800 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $7,600 minimum to $8,600 maximum.

"Full grade, $6,400 minimum to $7,400 maximum.

"Associate grade, $5,400 minimum to $6,400 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,000 minimum to $5,750 maximum."

(j) In section 7 (b) insert "chiropractors," after "dentists,".

(k) In section 14 (a) insert "chiropractors," after "dentists,".

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever any person is entitled by law or regulation to receive medical care by or through the facilities of the Veterans' Administration, he shall, if he so elects and if chiropractic care in his case is approved by the Chiropractic Service, have the right to receive chiropractic care to the extent deemed necessary by the Chiropractic Service.

(b) "Chiropractic care" as used in this section shall consist of either the determination and adjustment of subluxations of the spinal column for the purpose of releasing pressure upon nerves, or such means as is allowed by statute in States where the practice of chiropractic is regulated by statute.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON BILL TO ESTABLISH CHIROPRACTIC SERVICE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced proposes the establishment of chiropractic service in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. If this bill is enacted, chiropractic health care would become available for disabled veterans who desire it on the same basis as they may now receive medical and other services.

At present, a veteran who is entitled to institutional or outpatient care through the VA finds the service of a chiropractor unavailable to him, even though he may prefer and request that form of health care. There are numerous cases on record where veterans desiring them were unable to obtain the services of chiropractors, even though eligible and, in many cases, receiving medical or other care at Government expense. Some of these veterans have had to pay for chiropractic care out of their own funds.

The bill I have introduced embraces what I believe to be the objectives implied in a resolution recently passed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. At their 1947 convention in Cleveland, Ohio, through resolution No. 480 and at their 1950 convention through resolution No. 436, the Veterans of Foreign Wars went on record on this subject. The pertinent part of these resolutions reads as follows:

"Resolved, That we advocate that all disabled veterans be offered chiropractic health service, by and through the Veterans' Administration; and further, that the National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be instructed by this national encampment to take any and all legislative action necessary, proper and needed to have an adequate bill introduced and passed by the Congress of the United States to authorize, direct and empower the Veterans' Administration to offer chiropractic health service to all disabled veterans, and to establish a department of chiropractic in the Veterans' Administration."

A number of American Legion posts have taken action along similar lines.

Early in the present session companion bills—S. 2025 and H. R. 1512—were introduced, dealing with chiropractic services in the Veterans' Administration. In my judgment, these bills are a step in the right direction. It is my personal opinion, however, that they do not conform fully to the course of action implied in the resolution above quoted.

On a number of occasions I have discussed the objectives and general provisions of the bill I am introducing today with Mr. George Sheridan, national director of legislative affairs of the International Chiropractors Association. I believe this organization will endorse and support this bill.

FLOOD CONDITIONS IN MINNESOTA

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, last Monday noon, in company with Representative HAGEN, from the Ninth District of Minnesota, where the flood is possibly the worst in any area in Minnesota, I proceeded to that section. We were joined by my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], in Minneapolis, and went to Crookston, Minn., by train, due to snow storm, then to Grand Forks by car, in a biting northwest wind, with driving snow and almost blinding conditions.

When we arrived in the area of Crookston, East Grand Forks, and towns north of there, we found the area just one lake of water. I noticed in Crookston, as we proceeded to go through the flooded area in the National Guard duck boat, as they call it, a vehicle and boat combined, as we passed through the various street or blocks, by looking through the windows of the houses we could see beds, furniture, equipment, and utensils floating in the rooms. The homes were submerged in some instances almost to the roofs, and yesterday, when the storm lessened so that it was possible to take a plane into the area, we flew north along the Red River, up through and over the flooded area. We could see farmsteads where the buildings were standing in lakes of water. The town of Oslo, and other small villages, were right in the midst of a lake.

My colleagues can imagine what those fields and those farm buildings will be like as the waters recede. The township roads, the culverts, the bridges will be washed out. It is a situation almost impossible to describe.

There was a blinding, driving snow, which started Monday evening and lasted all through Tuesday and part of Tuesday night. The local people, the National Guard, and the National Red Cross were attempting to aid the families in the flooded area.

In view of all this, the junior Senator from Minnesota and I are introducing a bill to deal with the flood conditions through a direct appropriation, as well as a bill for the purpose of having the engineers review the entire flooded area in northern and northwest Minnesota, which includes not only the Red River Valley area, but the Red Lake River, as well as the Mississippi River areas in the vicinity of the town of Aitkin and in Aitkin County, and elsewhere, as the flood has taken its toll not only on public properties, but private property.

Mr. President, the language of the bill we are jointly introducing specifically sets forth provision for aid to townships in the repairing of roads, bridges, and culverts, and also the repair of municipality streets. Heretofore in legislation townships have not been specifically benefited. Yet a township can levy taxes only on its own property within the township, and if a township is located entirely in a flooded area, and many of the townships in the northwest section are ininundated with water, a farmer may not be able to produce a crop—at least he will not be able to produce a normal crop on his land—but at the same time he is compelled to repair his buildings damaged by the devastation which has been brought on by the flooding waters. While he is put to the expense of repairing his own personal property, and sustaining a loss because he cannot produce a normal crop, he must be assessed to the maximum possible, in order that the township may raise sufficient funds to repair the roads in the township, the bridges, and the culverts. The farmers are placed at a disadvantage, whether they are in a township or live in a local village, far beyond their ability to cope with.

In behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3505) to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself, I also introduce for appropriate reference a bill requesting the engineers to review this entire area, and to make recommendations as to what should be done to avoid a recurrence of such a devastating flood as that with which the northwest section is now confronted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3506) to provide for the modification of certain recommendations relating to flood control on the Red River of the North and its tributaries to include the construction of additional flood-control improvements, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

TAX FREEDOM DAY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, tomorrow, April 28, will be a day of liberation for the American taxpayers. In commemoration of this event, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I introduce a joint resolution designating April 28 as Tax Freedom Day, which reads as follows:

Whereas postwar spending is continuing at an unprecedented rate so that the national debt now stands at $255,500,000,000; and

Whereas the Federal spending budget for 1951 has been set at an additional $42,439,000,000; and

Whereas this represents a direct obligation on the average American wage earner whether he or she pays in direct or indirect taxes; and

Whereas it requires one-third or 32 cents out of every dollar a man or woman earns to support present profligate expenditures; and

Whereas this means every salary and wage earner actually works for the tax collector for the first 117 days of each year before he or she can call his or her money their own: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 28 be observed and is hereby designated as Tax Freedom Day marking this date from January 1 when a man can call a dollar his own; and

SEC. 2. That April 28, now designated as Tax Freedom Day be symbolized as a day of relief throughout the land with such demonstrations as may seem appropriate including a prayer for deliverance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 172) designating April 28 as Tax Freedom Day, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 21 OF 1950

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 265), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

GREETINGS TO STATE OF ISRAEL ON SECOND ANNIVERSARY AS INDEPENDENT STATE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, for myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 266) was read, as follows:

Whereas the establishment of Israel as an independent state on May 14, 1948, represented a triumph not only for the Jewish world but also for all men who believe in human freedom, justice, and dignity; and

Whereas during the 2 years of its existence as a sovereign nation, Israel has successfully defended its independence against invading armies; and

Whereas during such period, Israel has admitted approximately 400,000 homeless and destitute Jews from displaced-persons camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy, from

countries in North Africa and the Middle East, and from other countries throughout the world; and

Whereas by its achievements during the period of its existence as an independent state, Israel has demonstrated that it possesses all the necessary qualifications of a successful, useful, and permanent member of the family of nations; and

Whereas the 23d day of April was the second anniversary, according to the Hebrew calendar, of the establishment of Israel as an independent state: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the greetings of the Senate of the United States are hereby cordially extended to the State of Israel upon the occasion of the second anniversary of its establishment as an independent nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of these resolutions, through the Department of State, to the President of Israel.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

PRINTING OF SUMMARY OF HOUSING ACT OF 1950 (S. DOC. NO. 165)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a summary of the Housing Act of 1950 (S. 2246), Public Law 475, approved April 20, 1950, which was prepared by the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Austin L. Staley, of Pennsylvania, to be a United States circuit judge, third circuit, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Thomas Washington, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and

Sidney Sugarman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address discussing happenings in Washington, being program No. 23 in the series of addresses by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEAWAY PROJECT A THREAT TO PHILADELPHIA AND UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway Project a Threat to Philadelphia and United States," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the St. Lawrence seaway and power development project made by the Secretary of State before the House Committee on Public Works on April 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. BULLITT AT THE YALE LAW SCHOOL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by William C. Bullitt at the Yale Law School on April 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

McCARTHY VERSUS REDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE LAWRENCEBURG (IND.) PRESS

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Some Views on McCARTHY Versus Reds," published in the Lawrenceburg Press of April 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR CONFUSED PRESENT AND UNCERTAIN FUTURE—EDITORIAL FROM THE AVE MARIA

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Ave Maria of April 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PMA IN FARM POLITICS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "PMA in Farm Politics," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORKINGS OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of the workings of governmental agencies, published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. ALVAN C. GILLEM, JR., BY HUBERT LEE

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in Dixie Business, of East Point, Ga., paying tribute to Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., Commanding General of the Third Army, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning it was my privilege to testify before the House Public Works Committee on behalf of St. Lawrence seaway legislation.

A companion bill is, of course, pending in the Senate, where, unfortunately, it has been gathering dust since its introduction.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my statement before the House committee printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY BEFORE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1950

WHY THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY LEGISLATION SHOULD BE ENACTED NOW

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of testifying before this distinguished committee today. I will keep my remarks to a brief minimum, because I know that you have heard and will hear testimony from outstanding experts of Government and private industry on behalf of this project. Moreover, it is a strong conviction of seaway proponents, including myself, that there has been such a mountain of conclusive investigations, hearings, surveys, and reports on this issue for the last 30 years that repetition of all of the points in the seaway's favor is hardly necessary. The warehouses are full of millions of words printed in congressional hearings and debates why this seaway is essential, and I frankly do not propose to honor the opposition to the seaway by reviewing facts which have been well stated before.

May I respectfully refer this committee to the testimony which was given to myself and my colleagues when I was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee which held hearings on this issue in May and June of 1947. Among the individuals who testified before us was the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of Commerce Harriman, the legislative representative of the National Grange, the then president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and so outstanding a galaxy of other American leaders as not to require detailed description.

The case for the seaway boils down to the following points:

1. For the Congress to continue to reject the seaway is an affront to all the Presidents of the United States who unanimously endorsed this project and to the outstanding leaders of both major political parties who have fought for the seaway valiantly for all of these years. I respect the convictions of opponents, but I must respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that the opponents, in my frank opinion, are, generally speaking, as unfortunately blind as the individuals who opposed the Panama Canal, because they thought it would be a waste of money, an unused artery, and a danger to the Nation's railroads or the Nation's ports.

IRON ORE MUST BE BROUGHT FROM LABRADOR

2. Continued refusal to act on the St. Lawrence seaway is a disgraceful commentary on our lack of defense preparations. The iron-ore shortage facing this Nation is one of the most serious problems confronting America. The imminent exhaustion of the Mesabi Iron Range makes it essential that seaway navigation works be completed in order to bring in necessary Labrador ore. Unless this is done, the entire basis of midwestern industry will be shattered and whole industries will have to move to the east coast in order to receive ocean-borne iron ore from Latin America—ocean-borne ore tremendously vulnerable to submarine attack in the event of war. The whole life and death of the Midwest and its industry depends on a continuation of present plants in their present position. The staggering economic costs of transferring these plants to the overconcentrated, overcongested industrial East are too terrible to contemplate.

FARMERS HURT BY CONGRESS' INACTION

3. Continued rejection of the seaway is a grave blow to the interests of American agriculture. The farmers of the Midwest could

profit tremendously from shipping their grain and other farm commodities inexpensively through the seaway. The Midwest has recently received many serious blows as a result of declining dairy income and other factors. The refusal of the Congress to enact the seaway is one more such blow.

CANADA HAS BEEN DOING HER PART

4. The continued rejection of the self-liquidating St. Lawrence seaway is an affront to our Canadian good neighbor, with whom we long ago concluded the necessary agreement for the joint development of this project. It seems a crying shame that the one nation in the world which has always maintained the friendliest of relations with us, which has always given us a tremendous amount of trade and good will, should be the nation that we kick in the pants, so to speak, by refusing to build our share of the project. Canada, with its limited financial resources has already spent far more on her portion of the uncompleted project than we have.

WE SHOULD LOOK AFTER OUR OWN FIRST AND FOREMOST

5. Continued rejection of the St. Lawrance seaway in the face of the fact that we are spending tens of billions of dollars in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, is a ridiculous commentary on our short-sightedness in protecting our interests here at home. Right now, there is pending before the Senate a $3,000,000,000 foreign-aid bill. Why should we lavish $3,000,000,000 in aid abroad and fail to provide the funds—every cent of which will be repaid to the Federal Treasury—for this great project. I say that as a friend—not a foe—of foreign aid.

SEAWAY COSTS

When I was chairman of the Seaway Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, we received testimony from the Corps of Engineers that the total cost of the combined seaway-power project would be $884,000,000. The Canadian cost is $361,000,000 and the United States cost is $523,000,000. However, a considerable amount of the works have already been completed, and only $720,000,000 remain to be spent. The Canadian cost, therefore is now $230,000,000. The United States cost is $490,000,000. Every dime of that $490,000,000 will be repaid through ship tolls and power charges. The best experts of the United States Government have proved that time and again by elaborate statistical preparations.

DUAL-PURPOSE WORKS ESSENTIAL

I emphasize dual-purpose seaway and power project because it is unthinkable that the Ontario government and the New York State government should attempt to go ahead and complete the power works, leaving the 27-foot navigation works for the nebulous future. It is essential that both jobs be done now. There is a terrible power shortage in New England, but there is also a terrible shortage of this great transportation artery.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that you will understand my reasons for not attempting to go into further detail. I have fought for this issue so long, as have the other proponents, that it seems as unthinkable to me that the Congress should spend a long time debating this issue any more than we would attempt to spend a long time evaluating whether the Ten Commandments were sound propositions.

CONCLUSION

I respectfully urge this committee to promptly report this bill to the full House of Representatives. I know, very frankly speaking, that sectional interests and other blind economic interests will attempt to sabotage this effort, just as they will do so on the Senate side, in pigeonholing the bill in subcommittee, but I submit that we should rise above narrow interests. I am not fighting for this project because I am a midwestern Senator but because I am a United States Senator. If I thought that this project would only benefit the Midwest (to the detriment of the other sections) rather than the country as a whole, I would certainly think twice before supporting it so strongly. But it will prove of life-and-death importance to the Midwest. And, I respectfully submit, of life-and-death significance to our Nation as a whole.

Thank you for the privilege of being with you today.

KANSAS

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in the May issue of Pageant magazine entitled "Everybody Comes From Kansas," written by Mr. Murdock Pemberton, of New York, a native Kansan. The grand and glorious heritage of our State is eloquently pictured in Mr. Pemberton's reflections, past and present, upon many of our famous Kansas citizens who have distinguished themselves and Kansas by their worthy achievements in public and private life.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYBODY COMES FROM KANSAS

(By Murdock Pemberton)

THIS KIND OF THING COULD GIVE A TEXAN AN INFERIORITY COMPLEX

What's the matter with Kansas? As a native Kansan, living in New York, I read and hear a great deal about the climate of California and Florida, the citrus fruits of the same, the wide open spaces of Texas and the tallness of the buildings, or lowness of the reservoirs, of my adopted town. Is Kansas suffering from an overdose of modesty? Is there anything the matter with Kansas that couldn't be cured by a good press agent? I believe not, and until a good one comes along, I'll take the pitch.

Along in the end of the last century, William Allen White gathered himself a lot of fame, and his State a black eye, by asking the above question. He gave credit to the State's great productivity in matters of corn, wheat, pigs, and cows; its low rate of illiteracy and its unfilled nuthatches, but he ended on a note of woe saying, in effect, that Kansas, with all her virtues, had never produced a great painter, a great writer, or a great poet. When the sage of Emporia wrote that he was either in one of his spanking, this-hurts-me-worse-than-it-hurts-you moods, or else he slipped as a mere reporter. For at that time he was certainly aware of John J. Ingalls, whose speeches in the Senate had to be learned by every schoolboy. And if he had ever seen a painting he must have come across some by the great Frederick Remington. And as for poets, give me a greater name in contemporary American verse than the name of Edgar Lee Masters.

Next to the Bible, the best seller in the book list is an old number called In His Steps, written by Charles M. Sheldon, a Congregationalist minister. Not literature, perhaps, but what best seller is? Dr. James Naismith, of the University of Kansas, invented a game called basketball, and see what happened. Gen. Fred Funston captured Aguinaldo almost single-handed, and ended the Philippine campaign.

So, not wishing to Peglerize a departed great, we will drop the subject of those that White forgot, or omitted, in his chastisement. Perhaps he had his tongue in his cheek. Anyway, Kansas is too well remembered for such types as Sockless Jerry Simpson, who refused to wear hose in the Senate, or Carrie Nation, who tried to dry up man's drinking habits with a hatchet. Or Buffalo Bill or the James brothers, who crossed over from Missouri where the pickings were not so good.

Consider, then, the Kansas great of today. Who is the bright young man that all Republicans, and some Democrats, look wishfully to for 1952? None other than Dwight, of the Eisenhower clan of Kansas. In fact, it is difficult to pick up a periodical these days without the name of some Kansan passing before the eye. Paul Culbertson, of Emporia, recently was writing to the State Department hinting about a loan for Spain, where he is stationed in lieu of what would be an Ambassador, if we weren't frowning at the Spaniards. And his older brother William can wear the Grand Cross from Chile, Peru, Rumania, and Ecuador, where he was Ambassador at various times before he became a technical adviser for the Government. Leona Baumgartner Elias is the director of child and maternal health activities in the world's greatest city—New York. Arthur Remington Kellogg is mammalogist and director of the United States National Museum. E. V. McCollum is food director of Johns Hopkins of Baltimore. Edward R. Weidlein is the director of the Mellon Institute, Pittsburgh. Harold D. Smith is the United States Budget Director, and if you have any little green bills, you may see on them the fair name of Georgia Neese Clark, Treasurer of the United States.

Kansas probably would never lay claim to being the home of belles lettres in the United States. Not that it wouldn't know the meaning of the word, but Kansas would look upon it as a little too flossy a word; Kansas favors the rugged. It was E. Haldeman-Julius who took the literature of all time and sent it throughout the world from Girard at 5 cents a book. That's making belles lettres work. Joseph Stanley Pennell took a little polishing at Oxford, fell under the spell of James Joyce, and came back to Junction City to write one of the most gifted and amazing books on the Civil War, the History of Rome Hanks and Kindred Matters. I predict it will be long remembered in the history of American literature. Even the great slogan makers and the glib copy writers were caught napping when a Kansan brought out his portrait of their weird inner life, the Hucksters, by Fred Wakeman, of Scranton. Then there is Dorothy Canfield Fisher; William Lindsay White, son of William A.; Carleton Beals, of Medicine Lodge, who has written many volumes about our South American neighbors; Rex Stout, creator of Nero Wolfe; Osa Johnson, who hunts tigers and then writes about them; and the late Damon Runyon. The list could be stretched for pages.

It is no accident that this great surge has welled up from the endless prairies, this inner impulse to tell the world the way of the truth and the light. An Irish wit once said to me: "God pity the Irishman that isn't a priest or a policeman—he has no aim in life." And that might well be paraphrased to fit the Kansan: God pity the Kansan that doesn't write, preach, or teach—he has nothing to do except raise corn and wheat.

Most of the Kansans of today are descendants of the same stock that I sprang from—pioneers who rushed out to join old John Brown, of Osawatomie, to keep the State one for freemen. Their best weapon was the written word. A printing press was set up in Leavenworth under a tree before a house was built. My grandfather's three sons, Marsh, Bent, and Roland, bought a shirttail full of type and set up papers at El Dorado, Burlingame, and Wichita. Every hamlet had its Clarion or its Bugle.

Unfortunately, for Kansas' pride, its great training newspaper of later years was across the muddy river, in Missouri—the Kansas City Star. But it was a Kansas paper, in cir-

culation, in viewpoint and staff. A few were trained on White's Gazette and a few on the Wichita papers, but the reporter's goal was the Star. The year before I came to New York, a great hegira took place, led by Jerome Beatty, who had been a brilliant reporter and later went into the fiction and magazine field, and George Bye, first reporter to cross an ocean in flying machine (by easy stages). Bye later deserted the World to become a literary agent and guide such notables as Sinclair Lewis, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Amelia Earhart, another Kansan, before she attempted her last tragic flight. George Matthew Adams, writer and later syndicator of writers, came along about then as did my brother, Brock, who became a drama editor and later theatrical producer and president of the League of New York Theaters. Roy Roberts, of Muscotah, remained behind eventually to inherit the managership of the Star when the owner died. The late Ralph Barton, a brilliant artist of his day, was in that group, as was Lionel Moise, long-time editor of Hearst publications, and Frederick Tisdale, now settled down to editing a country weekly at New Milford, Conn.

Since then the Kansas newspapers have ground out their grist to feed the world. You run across them wherever you travel: Marvin Creagar, of the Milwaukee Journal; Bert Lewis, on the Philadelphia Bulletin; and Ben Hibbs, who took over Ben Franklin's place on the Saturday Evening Post. Charles Driscoll, of Wichita, writes a column about New York for the country press and turns out a book every 2 years.

There was also Sherwood Eddy, long-time secretary for the YMCA in Asia; Tom Craven, of Salina, author of many definitive books on art who spends most of his time carrying culture to women's clubs throughout the land; Jane Grant, of Girard, once a correspondent on the New York Times, a leader in the keep-your-own-name movement among women, and cofounder of the New Yorker; and Doris Fleeson, columnist. Eugene Pulliam, who used to cover the police stations with me on the Star, is now publisher of the News and the Star in Indianapolis. If you are a gourmet, or mere housewife, you know of Clementine Paddleford, writer on food for the New York Herald Tribune and various other publications. Clementine is a Manhattan, Kans., girl. Lloyd Stratton, another Star man, is assistant manager of the Associated Press.

The Kansas State Historical Society boasts of 800 names of men and women in Who's Who. Being of a self-effacing and modest breed, their names are seldom seen in print. Exceptions of course are Za-Su Pitts, of Parsons, and Glenn L. Martin, who is known wherever men take to the skies. The bulk of them, however, are astronomers, statisticians, engineers, explorers, educators, such as Clyde Tombaugh, of Burdette, discoverer of the ninth planet, and Thomas Jerrell Carter, who has a list of medical accomplishments longer than your doctor's bill and is now commanding officer of the United States Naval Medical unit at Cairo, Egypt. Karl Murdock Bowman, who has written a long list of psychological treatises, now head of the medical center, San Francisco, is a Topeka boy.

There is no way of proving that White's scolding about the dearth of Kansas artists led to the immediate taking of the palette and pencil. Like the rest of America, Kansas fell under the general art renaissance that struck the country about two decades ago. Henry Varnum Poor, of Chapman, is now recognized as one of America's truly fine artists. He left the first of the year for Rome where he will be resident head of the American Academy. John Noble, now dead, is the subject of a recent popular book about his life. John Steuart Curry is among the Nation's great.

Then there is C. D. Batchelor, the cartoonist who helps the New York Daily News editorialist put across his point with a blunt instrument, and Jeff Machamer, cartoonist for the slick magazines.

Is culture in Kansas a passing phenomenon? I personally doubt it. An aunt (I was the favored, and expectant, nephew) died, leaving me a silver dessert spoon and three million to found an art gallery in Wichita. She was wise, as the art gallery produced more than my trying to raise myself with the spoon in my mouth. It's symbolic of the place. The youth grow up to look out upon the waving seas of wheat, the rows of corn that march down to the edge of the dusty towns. Or if they travel farther they can see where the endless prairies meet with the copper sky. Nothing there but fables to feed upon—no drama, no beauty except the awesomeness of space. So the young grow up with starved eyes and most of them turn to painting imagined trees and streams or sing of the far-away hills.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] on page 4, line 2, to strike out "$2,950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,950,000,000."

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of all Members of the Senate the fact that we have now been debating the pending bill for approximately a week, and it seems to me that we should be in a position to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill and all amendments thereto. I intend to make a unanimous-consent proposal, therefore, to see whether it will meet with the approval of all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Monday, May 1, 1950, the Senate proceed to vote upon the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and all amendments or motions, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., and that beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock noon the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the bill, controlled respectively by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]; that no amendment or motion may be offered that is not germane; that after said hour of 4 o'clock each side shall have 10 minutes of debate on each amendment as it is called up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinios?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, of course I want to cooperate in getting a unanimous-consent agreement. It is unfortunate that the majority leader did not consult the minority leader about the time for a vote, because I have been trying to work out an agreement on a day next week which would be agreeable to all Senators. While I am not at all criticizing the efforts of the majority leader, yet I am quite satisfied that there are Senators on both sides to whom Monday is not acceptable as a day for a vote. If the distinguished majority leader desires to get a unanimous-consent agreement, I should like to ask him if he would insert, for example, next Thursday as the time for taking the vote.

The reason for my suggestion is that Senators on this side of the aisle who have made the suggestion as to time for a vote have said that next Thursday would be the most suitable day. That is why I have made this suggestion. If it is acceptable, I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request. If it is not acceptable, we will have to have time to work out a date.

Secondly, I should not like to be given control of the time of the opposition, because there are Senators in opposition to the bill who have amendments to offer who I think should be named. I therefore ask the distinguished majority leader to leave out the name of the one to control the time on the part of the opposition, until it can be settled by those who have more of an idea of what the division of time should be, and all that goes with that. But I would be agreeable to fixing Thursday as the day for the vote, if that is agreeable to the other Members of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Nebraska that I had no desire to offend him in any way by taking up the unanimous-consent agreement without his knowledge. It was my understanding that while I was away unanimous-consent agreements were discussed from time to time by those who have been acting in my place while I was slightly under the weather.

It seems to me that fixing a week from today as the time for a vote would mean a long, long time for us to debate the bill and amendments to it, in view of the fact that the bill has been under debate for a number of days. Obviously I cannot control the unanimous-consent agreement if one Senator desires to object, but fixing a day such a long time ahead would only prolong the session, and the longer we prolong under unanimous-consent agreements, the time for voting, the longer the session will last. As I have said, there is a certain amount of work the Congress has to do at this session, and so far as I am concerned, we are going to remain here until we finish our work. It seems to me that by Tuesday next—and I should be willing to compromise on that date—all the Members of the Senate should be convinced

whether they should vote for one amendment or another, and all those Senators who desire to make speeches, and get their addresses into the RECORD and into the press, would have plenty of time to do it.

I appeal to the minority leader and Members of the Senate to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement providing for the vote to be taken on Tuesday next. I am willing to withhold the request for a while, but in view of the fact that practically every Member of the Senate is present on the floor I hope Tuesday may be an agreeable date for the vote to be taken.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that it is perfectly satisfactory to me if the Senate agrees on next Tuesday. I should like to have half or three-quarters of an hour to express some of my views on the pending legislation, and I imagine I will have time to do so within that period of days. But I do not think it is a good practice to agree to vote at a certain time on the bill and all amendments, without having established an hour previous to that after which amendments may not be offered, because whenever we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement of that type we find ourselves in the situation where an amendment is stated, of which we had previously never heard, and then we have no chance to study it before a vote is taken on it. So I ask the Senator from Illinois if he will not modify his request so that, let us say, after 2 o'clock on Tuesday next no more amendments will be in order, and that then we will vote at 4 o'clock. That will give an opportunity to Senators to familiarize themselves with all amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I modify my request to the end that the voting begin at 2 o'clock, and that, thereafter, each side have 20 minutes on each amendment until action is concluded on the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I think that would be an improvement.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad so to modify my request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request, as modified?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York wants it understood that he has no objection to the present request of the Senator from Illinois, but that he will object to making the day Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. How about Wednesday?

Mr. IVES. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska will object to a unanimous-consent request for a vote to be taken before Thursday of next week. But I shall ask the distinguished majority leader to withhold his request, because already two Senators have come to me and told me they do not want the vote to be had even on Thursday. I am not sure that we can obtain consent for a vote to be taken on Thursday. However, I shall do my level best to iron out objections and see if an agreement can be entered into. I cannot do so at this time, however. I shall be forced to object if the request is made at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, while I am on my feet let me make a suggestion. Every time an endeavor is made to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement we encounter the same difficulty. So far as I am concerned, it is my hope the Senate will reach the point where we will never enter into unanimous-consent agreements, but that we take up a bill and act on one amendment after the other until we conclude action on the bill. Coming down to hard facts, that is really the way to legislate. Every time a unanimous-consent request is made on this side of the aisle, in practically every instance the consent of all Democratic Members can be obtained. Usually no one on this side of the aisle objects, whether we endeavor to set the date for a vote on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. Yet some Member on the other side of the aisle is quite sure to object when a unanimous-consent request is made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. TAFT. I yielded to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Ohio was entitled to the floor, and he yielded to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Ohio has the floor, and the Chair has recognized him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has yielded to the Senator from Nebraska, has he not?

Mr. TAFT. I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I again thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, is it not a wonderful thing that at long last we have something on which Democrats can finally be unanimous, and that is on a request for a unanimous-consent agreement? This is the first time during the present year that I have seen the Democrats unanimous on anything. That is point number one. I wish they could be as unanimous in taking up FEPC legislation. Then we would get somewhere with the legislative program of which the majority leader has just spoken.

Mr. President, unanimous-consent agreements are all right if they can be entered into without too much discussion upon the floor. I submit that the way to iron out such a situation as the present one is to contact the Members on both sides of the aisle and see what they agree upon as being the best date on which to vote. It so happens that there are some Senators who have made other arrangements for next week. Certain Senators who have made such arrangements are absent today. I should like to discuss the matter with them before I enter into an agreement.

I suggest to the distinguished majority leader that the best way is to discuss the matter with the individual Senators before the request is presented upon the floor of the Senate. In that way agreement can often be reached before the request is actually made on the floor.

All I ask of the distinguished majority leader—whether he agrees with me or not is immaterial—is that he withhold the request for the moment, or else endeavor to ascertain whether Members of the Senate are willing to agree that a vote he had on Thursday of next week. However, I have already been informed by one Member of the Senate that he is not agreeable to that particular day. If the majority leader will withhold his request for a while perhaps we can iron the matter out.

Will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Considerable debate will be had on this particular piece of legislation. Three or four amendments have been presented, the purpose of which is to cut the authorization. They have not yet been fully debated. I happen to know that there is a list of at least 12 Senators who desire to speak on the ECA bill and amendments thereto. There is an amendment proposing to modify the so-called point 4 program. There is going to be considerable debate upon that amendment. There are several amendments which might take more time than either the majority leader or the minority leader feel should be allotted to them. Therefore, I believe ample time should be given to debate. We should endeavor to find out how much time will be required. Then on the basis of that information a unanimous-consent request can be submitted. With that kind of an approach I assure the distinguished majority leader that I shall do everything I can to have a unanimous-consent agreement entered into for a vote to be taken some day next week, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for one more observation?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank my distinguished friend from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I did not take up the matter of the unanimous-consent request with my friend from Nebraska, and I apologize to him for not having done so. I know how sensitive my friend is with respect to unanimous-consent requests. I want to apologize to him a second time.

Mr. President, I now withdraw my unanimous-consent request, and I will amiably, amicably, and humbly go over to my friend the Senator from Nebraska and consult with him, and I am sure the two of us will be able to iron out the matter. Senators who desire to ob-

ject to action being taken on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday will probably be able to work out an agreement so that perhaps we may have a vote sometime on Monday or Tuesday.

So, Mr. President, I withdraw the request, because I do not want to offend my friend the Senator from Nebraska.

RESOLUTIONS DISAPPROVING REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while the Senator from Illinois is on the floor I should like to bring up for consideration another matter of procedure. The resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 is now on the calendar. Consideration of that matter is a highly privileged matter. Time for action expires on May 23. It is my desire, after I shall have consulted with the majority leader and others, to make a motion on Wednesday, May 10, for consideration of the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12. I make that statement now so Senators may know in advance what I propose to do. The resolution is one which requires an affirmative vote of 49 Senators. Therefore, it is important that the Senate have notice, so Senators may make their plans to be present.

It is my hope that the majority leader may at some time present a unanimous-consent request that the time of 10 hours for debate established by the Reorganization Act may be cut to perhaps 4 hours, or so, in order that the resolution disapproving the reorganization plan may be acted upon in 1 day. I am very anxious that we dispose of it, if possible, in 1 day. It is my intention at the present moment, subject to persuasion by the majority leader, on Wednesday, May 10, to move to take up the resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 relates to the Comptroller of the Currency. I do not think there will be much debate on it. Forty-nine votes are required to adopt the resolution, as well as the resolution relating to Reorganization Plan No. 12. It is my hope that we may act upon and dispose of both resolutions on the same day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is possible that the debate on both of them might be limited, so that both of them could be disposed of on the same day. As the Senator from Virginia knows, the act provides for 10 hours' debate on each one, but also provides that by motion or by unanimous consent that time may be reduced. Certainly I do not expect that we shall need to have 10 hours of debate on each of those resolutions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that resolutions of disapproval of Plan No. 12 and Plan No. 1 have been reported by the committee, and I am not so optimistic as to believe that there will not be considerable debate on both of them.

However, I think the time on each one can be reduced from 10 hours—I see no objection to doing so—to 4 or 5 hours.

As to the two which already have been reported—and 6 other resolutions of disapproval are pending, making a total of 8 resolutions of disapproval, among the 21 reorganization plans; and whether any more resolutions of disapproval will be filed, I cannot say—the committee is holding hearings mornings and afternoons. In fact, I am due at the committee meeting now, inasmuch as the committee took a recess until 2:30 this afternoon. The committee is making every effort to expedite the work and to get the plans before the Senate.

However, if we reach an agreement in regard to fixing the time for the 10th of May in respect to Plan No. 12, I should like to have the Senate agree upon May 11 for Plan No. 1, so that we can try to dispose of one plan on one day and the other plan on the following day.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe it would be possible to dispose of two of them on one day, for judging from various observations which have been made, I think there is likely to be considerable debate on them. I think it might be wise to provide 4 or 5 hours' time for debate on each one, and have one voted upon on one day, and the other voted upon on the following day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I bring up this matter only so that Senators will have notice that the proposal is to agree upon May 10 as the date when the Senate will consider the resolution to which I have referred.

I understand that the majority leader would like to take up this matter later on, and that will be agreeable to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say that the Senator from Ohio is correct, in that I should like to take up this matter next Tuesday at the Democratic policy committee's weekly meeting. I can assure the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Arkansas that thereafter we shall give them a definite decision on the matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it was my thought to have the decision made, because we wish to have a maximum attendance of Senators at the time when those measures are under consideration by the Senate, for the requirement is that if a reorganization plan is to be disapproved, at least 49 Senators must vote in favor of the resolution of disapproval.

My thought is that if we had 49 Senators present on one day, we probably could get the same number of Senators present on the following day, and in that way could have as great an attendance of Senators as possible.

Incidentally, let me say that I cannot be here on May 12 or May 13; personally, that is my own situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think perhaps I should say that following the disposition of the ECA bill, it is the plan to have the Senate take up the FEPC bill, which now is on the calendar. Of course, the consideration of that bill probably will cause some little debate on the floor of the Senate. It might be that on the 11th and 12th of May we would be right in the midst of that debate. However, if that were the case, I assume that, by unanimous agreement, we could set aside that measure temporarily.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand the rule, a motion to set a measure aside is a highly privileged question, and is not subject to debate.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that; but a majority vote is required to set a measure aside, even though the question of setting it aside may be a privileged question. Once the FEPC bill is taken up, it can be set aside or taken from the floor only under such circumstances, by majority vote, even though the question of setting it aside would be a privileged question.

I merely make that suggestion in connection with the attempt to work out an arrangement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I hope a satisfactory arrangement can be worked out. However, of course, if nothing is worked out, 21 resolutions of disapproval could be filed, and subsequently could be called up as privileged matters, one at a time, and we could continue on them indefinitely.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas is making a threat——

Mr. McCLELLAN. No, I am not making a threat. I simply thought the Senator from Illinois was suggesting that we should have considerable debate.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Let me say that it is my desire to speak on the ECA bill in behalf of an amendment to cut the total amount. However, in the meantime, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Ohio, I should like to make a request of the Senator from Illinois. When he confers with the minority leader in regard to an agreement relative to the legislative program, will he please commence negotiations looking to a 10-day recess just before the elections in November, because I have some important business in those 10 days. [Laughter.]

CANADIAN RIVER LAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the near future I hope the Senate will have opportunity to approve H. R. 2733, a bill which will give a large segment of Texas and the Southwest an opportunity to conserve the precious waters of the Canadian River.

H. R. 2733 passed the House of Representatives last year by unanimous vote. That vote, I believe, represents a tribute to the unique self-reliance of the people of the Texas Panhandle who need and want to dam the Canadian River and use its waters. The people of that section are not asking for hand-outs. They are not sponsoring a give-away program. Under the plan proposed in H. R. 2733,

the Texans who use the water will repay 95 cents of every dollar they are asking the Federal Government to invest in the region.

For each $1 the Federal Government invests in conserving the waters of the Canadian River, it is estimated that the Nation will receive at least $1.70 in benefits.

The Panhandle and South Plains of Texas have contributed much to the welfare of the Nation. Geology was unkind to the region, and now the people find their water supply running low. They are asking the Federal Government to help them help themselves in utilizing to the fullest the waters of the only major river in the region.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a statement which I made on April 18 to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee which now is considering this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON BEFORE SENATE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE, APRIL 18, 1950, IN SUPPORT OF CANADIAN RIVER DAM

Mr. Chairman, we are here today to present to your committee the story of a vast region which is living on borrowed time.

We are here to tell you of the need for water in northwest Texas—a region better known as the Panhandle and the South Plains.

This region is rich in history, rich in cattle, rich in grain and cotton, rich in oil and natural gas, especally rich in level-headed, forward-looking leadership.

Although the region's riches are great and varied, all these riches combined cannot offset the poverty of northwest Texas' water supply.

That is why we are here today.

We believe this region is too rich in resources our Nation needs—too rich in potential benefits for our national economy—for it to be permitted to wither and die now before it reaches full bloom, all for a lack of economy in saving its scarce rainfall.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an instance in which the Federal Government is being asked to subsidize speculation.

We are not here seeking funds to open up new and unused lands.

We are here seeking to establish a working partnership with our Government to keep alive a region of enormous value to the Nation.

These men who are here in the committee room today from the Panhandle and the South Plains represent one of the most fiercely independent regions in the world.

I emphasize this, Mr. Chairman, because, to my mind, the proposal presented to the Senate in H. R. 2733 is characteristic of the people who now urge its enactment. These people of the Panhandle-High Plains region are not shouting "Economy" out of one side of their mouths, and whispering "Gimme" from the other side.

Under the plan presented to you in H. R. 2733, the Nation will receive at least $1.70 in benefits for every dollar that the Federal Government spends.

As members of the committee are aware, such a favorable ratio of benefits to cost is certainly better than average.

Moreover, the municipal and industrial water users would repay 95 cents out of every dollar advanced for construction of the project.

The people who will benefit directly from this project—the people of 11 major cities in the Panhandle-High Plains area—do not want to impose upon taxpayers in other States any burden which they themselves should rightfully shoulder.

All of the cost of the Canadian River Dam and other works will either be paid for by the actual water users or allocated to flood control and fish and wildlife conservation. The flood-control benefits will not accrue to the municipal water users but will primarily benefit areas farther along the Canadian River below the dam—mostly in Oklahoma.

The Federal Government can look forward to this promise:

Within 50 years, all of the costs of this project will be paid for by the people who are asking for this project—except for flood control and conservation costs of 5 cents out of each dollar.

That in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, is a good, sound business proposition.

I have emphasized this first, Mr. Chairman, because I know that Senators are interested in economy. I know that you do not want to authorize construction costs of $85,000,000 without a full knowledge of what the Nation as a whole can expect in return.

As a Senator from Texas, I am especially proud that these people from this vast area are willing to undertake this obligation—willing to pay back the Nation nearly its total investment.

That, I am sure, will be of interest to Senators on the subcommittee and to the Nation.

Why is this program necessary?

Why is it urgent?

In the presence of such a considerable array of expert talent, I shall not attempt to detail for you the full story of the "what's" and "why's" of this region's water supply. I do want to picture it for you in a layman's terms.

This Panhandle-South Plains region of northwest Texas was handicapped by erosion of surrounding areas which left it as a sort of a gigantic plateau several hundred feet above the surrounding terrain, with its ground-water beds isolated from recharge except from rain falling on the surface.

Because of the flat topography, the rainfall, such as it is, collects in surface depressions and most of it evaporates there. The Panhandle-South Plains area has few creeks and no rivers, except the Canadian River.

Cities on this plateau have found their water supplies through wells, drilled deep into the earth to reach a huge pool of water which underlies much of the region.

For many years this underground supply of water was treated rather casually—without much knowledge of where it came from or why it was there.

Then wells began to run dry. Not many wells—yet. But out in the land of the West, where summer temperatures are regularly 105° or more and winter temperatures are 5° below sometimes, water can no longer be taken for granted.

Now, geologists tell us that this underground water is not the water of an underground stream fed by a constant supply. It more nearly resembles a washtub full of water. Each time a pail of water is dipped out of the tub the water level drops—and it is replenished so slowly, if at all, that it must be considered a disappearing source.

At present, this underground water is a primary source of life for both the people and their crops. It is not sufficient for both indefinitely—and you cannot have the crops without the people or the people without the crops.

The only potential source of water to supply the people's needs is the Canadian River, a river that skirts along the northern edge of this plateau.

We believe that by the proper use of the waters of this river—limited though those waters are—the Panhandle-South Plains area can be kept alive, kept vigorous, kept useful to the Nation.

Exhaustive studies have been made of the river by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The program before you in H. R. 2733 is, we believe, the best and most practical program. It is the program which the people of the area believe will serve their purposes.

It is—I may add—a program for which they are willing to pay more than $80,000,000.

They believe—and I share that belief with them—that the water to meet the needs of this great region is worth that price to them and worth that much to the Nation.

I hope that the Senators of the subcommittee will view with favor the presentation which the people of the region will make to you this morning. When you have heard them, I believe you will share my conviction of the need for this program—and I believe you will share my own great admiration for the people of this region.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Senate an amendment to the ECA bill to reduce the total authorization by $1,000,000,000. That amendment has been offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

There is at the desk an amendment to cut the authorization by $600,000,000. That amendment is by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I wish to say a few words in behalf of the general principle of cutting the ECA authorization and the subsequent appropriation.

Two years ago I supported ECA, and last year I supported it. In both cases it seemed to me that the total amount requested was excessive. It seemed to me that there was no actual proof that any particular amount was needed. In both cases I supported a resolution or amendment to reduce the amount.

Last year that proposal was defeated, but my recollection is that some part of that cut was made at a later time by the Appropriations Committee.

I supported ECA when it was originally proposed for the reason that it seemed to me that we were in a position to check the growth of communism in Europe. It seemed to me that the only real justification for ECA was the fact that the various countries of Europe were so disturbed by the war conditions, by the complete turn-over of the entire economic system of the world, that probably it would have taken them some 10 years to get back to normal if they had had to rely only on their own efforts; and so I thought the conditions which existed there were very ripe for the growth of communism, and that probably in 2 or 3 years we could furnish those countries with sufficient assistance so that they could resume their normal economic activities. I never felt there was economic justification for one nation making vast subsidies and gifts to other nations on the theory simply that in some way it was going to increase their standard of living. I think in the

long run it would be ineffective, for a nation can succeed only through its own efforts, not through the gifts of others.

But here was an emergency situation created by the war. Here was a situation which apparently could not be dealt with promptly or handled without outside aid, and it seemed to me we should render aid. In my opinion, what we did was done effectively. My own belief is that the growth of communism, particularly in France and Italy, was substantially checked by American aid. My belief is that the manner in which the ECA has been handled has been excellent and that Mr. Hoffman has done a good job. I have been notified from time to time of various projects which it seemed to me were unnecessary. I always thought he could get on with less money and accomplish very much the same purposes. Nevertheless, I think the job has been well done and that the program has effectively checked the growth of communism, so that communism today, from an internal standpoint of operation, is very much weaker in France and Italy and throughout all Europe than it was.

However, today those countries have returned to normal, and the question whether we should continue the ECA certainly is one which should be considered on the basis of its own merits. Generally speaking, I am in favor of continuing the ECA in accordance with the original plan for 4 years, tapering it off in the third year and in the fourth year more than Mr. Hoffman is proposing. Mr. Hoffman himself says it must end in 1952. As a matter of fact, the conditions in Europe today are such that I doubt whether we would be justified in starting a new program today. But I feel that, having started the program and having outlined certain general assistance upon which the participating nations have made their plans, it would be most unfortunate if we were to cut the program to such an extent as to hamper seriously its operation or to modify substantially the general understanding which we have given to the other countries. So I feel that we should continue the program, but that it should be continued with a substantial cut.

The whole program is vague. It is almost impossible to guess at any figures. There is no list of projects contained in it. The figure is taken out of the air. Mr. Hoffman might have said $3,500,000,000, or he might have said $2,500,000,000. He has said $3,100,000,000. It is difficult to say how much it should be cut, but I have finally come to the conclusion that a 20-percent cut of $600,000,000, the same amount suggested by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in the Foreign Relations Committee, would be reasonable, and would not hamper seriously the operation of the program.

In the first place, I believe we ought to recognize that this is a perfectly extraordinary program, something which no nation in the world has ever done before, and which probably no nation in the world will ever do again. In 1949, as well as in the year 1947, the Federal Government has given in grants and credits $5,700,000,000, almost entirely in grants. We have made a free gift of $5,700,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to various nations throughout the world for the general purpose of promoting the cause of anti-communism and promoting the recovery of those nations from the war. Anyone who says we should continue that program indefinitely certainly has the burden of proof upon himself. The burden ought not to be on those who propose a cut; the burden ought to be on those who ask that the American people continue such a lavish outpouring of gifts and subsidies as we have given.

The total proposed cut for this year is small. A Federal Reserve bulletin shows that in 1949 the United States Government financed $5,700,000,000. The total budget for next year, including ECA, contemplates $4,700,000,000, a very small reduction considering the amount involved. We are therefore practically asking our people to continue in 1950 the program which was proposed in 1947, 1948, and 1949. In fact, $4,700,000,000 is the same as the amount in 1948. Unless we begin to cut, we are not going to get any reduction in these tremendous foreign payments.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Would the Senator rather not be interrupted?

Mr. TAFT. No; I am glad to be interrupted.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Economic Cooperation Administrator, Mr. Hoffman, has, of course, given the committee every assurance that as soon as there is any opportunity to make savings he will do so, and that for the fiscal year which is about to end he has $149,000,000 that he has not spent? I think that is a record so far as administrators in the executive branch of the Government are concerned.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is a record. If anyone is given $4,000,000,000 to spend, and he can spend it in 12 months, that would be extraordinary, for inevitably anyone with $4,000,000,000 would fail to find things on which he could profitably spend that entire amount. It merely happens that there is $150,000,000 left, which is only, after all, 3 or 4 percent of the total money given to Mr. Hoffman. That is true of practically every appropriation we make. There is always a 4-percent lag, except in a few instances. In general, there is always that lag in the ability to spend all the money which is appropriated. So I do not think there is any tremendous credit there. I see no reason whatever for thinking that if we give Mr. Hoffman $3,100,000,000, he will not probably spend it by the first of July 1951, except for some slight saving; because it cannot be absolutely budgeted. Some things on which it had been planned to spend money may fall by the wayside.

The condition I want to emphasize is this: When we started the ECA 2 years ago, we had at that time a surplus in the Treasury of $8,400,000,000, for the year then ending. Now, 2 years later, we find a deficit of $6,000,000,000 for the fiscal year. That alone would be a justification for a complete reversal of the entire program. Had we had a deficit of $6,000,000,000 2 years ago, we never would have started the ECA; and yet, in 2 years, our situation has deteriorated. Even a year ago when we were discussing this matter, we looked forward to a deficit of only $800,000,000, practically a balanced budget, allowing for the expenditures. Today we know that by the first of July we are going to have a deficit of $6,000,000,000, and we know that in the next fiscal year, for which this appropriation is requested, the President contemplates another budget deficit of $5,000,000,000. The probability is that additional recommendations for expenditures will be made and that the budget deficit will actually be more than $5,000,000,000; in fact, the estimate of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation today is that there will be a deficit of $7,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year. Under those circumstances, it seems to me that we must economize in every field of activity; and certainly among those fields of activity is that of foreign spending.

There is before us no proposal for additional taxes. The administration's proposal is apparently indefinite deficit financing, or indefinite spending of money vastly in excess of the moneys which accrue from taxation. The President himself, in his reports, in effect expresses the hope that in the future, some day, the budget may be balanced; but he says we cannot levy any more taxes, because if we try to do that, we will deter the very business development which is necessary in order to produce taxes, and to provide the jobs which must be available if we are going to have anything like full employment.

The President has recommended, and I agree with him, that taxes be not increased. On the other hand, the deficit-spending policy seems to me to be inconceivable. That policy inevitably means inflation. We already see it in the price of some agricultural products, in the speculative market today in soybeans, and in various other products. There is a recurrence of the inflationary cycle which existed approximately a year ago and which was only then checked. Inevitably, if we spend $6,000,000,000 more than we take in, we shall start inflation again.

The depreciation of the dollar ultimately means a repudiation by the Government of its debts, because its own policy is actually so decreasing the value of the dollar that it is only able to pay for the money it borrows in poorer dollars than those which it actually borrowed.

The deficit-spending policy is demoralizing. If Congress ever decides that it will not have to raise the money to pay for the expenditures requested, there is no limit to what the expenditures will be. There are before us projects which will cost $20,000,000,000. If we once admit the principle that we can indefinitely pursue a deficit-spending policy, there is no possible restraint on expenditures. It is demoralizing to the people, because they believe they can receive something for nothing, whereas, of course, in the long run, they cannot. It is impossible. They pay for the increased expenditures

in the general depreciation of their savings, their insurance policies, and in an unstable economy, which, in the end, must bring perhaps a boom and then a depression. So it seems to me that such a policy is impossible.

The only alternative must be the reduction of expenses. I do not know that we can cut $6,000,000,000 off in 1 year; I doubt it. The only reasonable, sensible, and possible policy which Congress can pursue is to try to save at least $3,000,000,000 this year and to reduce expenditures another $3,000,000,000 next year. If Congress is not willing to cut expenditures for foreign nations, then certainly there is very little hope that we are ever going to make any reductions in domestic expenditures.

It is said that this bill is only an authorization and that the appropriations will have to be considered by the Appropriations Committee. That argument is always advanced, but once the authorization is made, there is a presumptive argument to present to the Appropriations Committee.

The way to cut expenditures is to take advantage of the first opportunity. Cut them whenever it is possible; vote against any nonessential expenditures or authorizations which are proposed. I think we should determine now that we intend to economize all down the line. There is no reason at all why any appropriation, any proposal, or any authorization should be considered sacred in the amount which is demanded by the administration.

There are many other factors which I believe justify the cutting of expenditures for the ECA by a substantial amount. In the first place, the position of the participating nations is very much better than it was 2 years ago. It is said that the ECA has been successful in bringing about that situation. I believe it has substantially helped. Perhaps the actual operation of the ECA is best expressed by Sir Stafford Cripps when he stated that in 1948–49 Britain's national product totaled £10,800,000,000, and that Marshall aid, expressed in sterling as £328,000,000, was equivalent to only 3 percent of Britain's total national product in that year. In 1949–50, the proportion was still less. He said that this is by no means the real measure of Marshall aid's usefulness to British recovery today.

I believe we exaggerate the importance of Marshall-plan aid. Yet, to the extent that we can give it, the value of the aid which England gets from us is probably doubled in the value of the products which England can produce from the raw materials we actually give her. As a result of this plan, and as a result of other causes, the fact is that the ultimate goal of the Marshall plan has been accomplished. England, according to Sir Stafford Cripps, has reached an industrial production 30 percent over that of prewar, and her population is only 5 percent over that of prewar. He says that in 1946 Britain's total industrial production had been brought back to the level of 1938. By the end of 1949 it was about 30 percent above the prewar level. By 1946 Britain's exports had climbed back to 7 percent below the volume of 1938. By 1949 exports had increased to 60 percent above the 1938 volume.

So, to a large extent we have gone far in actually increasing British production—if we are responsible for it—far beyond anything they had before the war. Yet we are asked to make an outright gift to England of $687,000,000 and to all European countries of more than $3,000,000,000 this year. Other countries of Europe, if we omit Germany, have also increased their production nearly 30 percent.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Would not the Senator be even more critical of the Marshall plan if those nations had not increased their production? Would he not think the outlook would be even more grim?

Mr. TAFT. I am not critical of the Marshall plan. I say that it has apparently accomplished its purpose, and it requires a great deal of justification to continue it. The only justification for continuing it is that we have practically agreed to do a certain thing and plans have been made on that basis. I am prepared to go through with most of the plan, but we are entitled to scrutinize it with the greatest care and discrimination.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think it would be wise to make such an important decision as that of terminating aid simply on the basis of a seasonal fluctuation, which I am sure is what has happened in the United Kingdom?

Mr. TAFT. I think that would be a justification for the discontinuance of aid, but I am not advocating that. All the ECA estimates have been based on the balance-of-payments theory. They have been based on the theory that there was a certain shortage of dollars and Britain could not export as much as she had to import; she could not ship to dollar countries as much as she had to buy from dollar countries. On that basis, the tables which I placed in the RECORD a few days ago show that on the balance-of-payment theory the ECA reached the estimate of $687,000,000 which we are asked to give the British in the next fiscal year. It is based entirely on a balance-of-payments theory, how much they are going to export and how much they are going to import. As a matter of fact, Sir Stafford Cripps has made it clear that in the past 6 months they have balanced their dollar budget; they do not have any dollar deficit. The sterling areas, from the first of October to the first of April, have come to slightly better than even.

In his statement to the House of Commons on April 5, Sir Stafford Cripps stated that during the first quarter of this year the sterling area earned a net gold and dollar surplus of $40,000,000, as compared with $31,000,000 in the fourth quarter of 1949. That amounts to a net gold and dollar surplus of $9,000,000 in a period of 6 months.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Is that not merely a seasonal fluctuation, and not a figure which is sufficiently firm or sufficiently strong on which to base a decision?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct, but it is much better than the ECA figures. The ECA figures on which are based this particular demand for England are out of date, and they are two or three hundred million dollars wrong, on the basis of any present estimate. I do not think the fact that the British have balanced their gold and dollar budget proves that they will do so in the next fiscal year, but it does cast doubt on the entire basis of the appropriation requested by ECA today. Certainly it makes it necessary for ECA to present new tables based on present conditions, instead of on conditions which are 6 months old. Some have talked with ECA. They say, "No, we won't submit any new estimates." I venture to say that the estimates for 1949–50 are at least $200,000,000 away from the facts. It is much more difficult for me to estimate next year. I do not know what the estimate may show. I can only see that the actual results during the last 6 months are very different from the basis on which the ECA demands have been based. The ECA should come before us with a new table based on the new condition that has come to exist.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Is not the Senator from Ohio aware of the fact that the ECA Administrator is on record in most specific terms as promising that whenever an occasion arises in which actual conditions make possible a saving of money he will effectuate such savings?

Mr. TAFT. I suppose every administrative officer has said that. I do not believe it varies by one iota the obligation of Congress to limit an appropriation to what it thinks the appropriation ought to be, and not give an executive officer something on his promise of "You give it to me, but I won't spend it." My experience certainly has not been encouraging as to the carrying out of promises of that kind.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. If participating countries had not made great improvement in production, and if their condition were not much better this year than before the Marshall plan, would not the Senator from Ohio be calling for a drastic cutting of the Marshall plan because it had been so ineffective as an aid to Europe?

Mr. TAFT. No; the main cause for my asking for a cut is the American deficit. I believe that is the principal reason. To ask the United States to give foreign nations a great deal of money when we have a deficit of $6,000,000,000 is quite different from asking us to give it to them when we have a surplus of $3,000,000,000. That is the main reason. I do not think that failure to make the expected headway

would have been a good argument for cutting expenditures.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I agree with him wholeheartedly as to the seriousness of the American deficit, and I feel that, as one Senator, I have done everything I possibly could to bring about economy in government and a saving of public funds. However, I hope the Senator from Ohio does not contend that the only way in which public funds can be saved is at the expense of the security of the United States in this present very dangerous world situation.

Mr. TAFT. I wholly deny that a reduction of ECA has any relation, or, at best, a most remote relation, this coming year to the security of the United States. I do not think that if we cut $600,000,000 from the appropriation we would set back in any way the security of the United States. To the extent that we can help nations, we should help them. However, we have already shown that they are 30 percent better off than before the war. How our failure to advance them still further is going to affect our security, is hard to say. A justification for this program as a security measure was that we were interested in preventing the spread of communism in these countries because of their disturbed conditions. Now the disturbed condition has gone. Now we have restored prosperity to these countries. I do not mean that we alone have done it, but the conditions, with our assistance, have improved in those countries. They are now 30 percent better off than even before the war. We have done the job of eliminating the danger of infiltration of communism simply because of bad economic conditions, and from now on those nations can defeat communism only if they are against communism. They can defeat communism only by their own efforts and within their own countries.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Ohio in permitting me to ask these questions. I am sorry that I shall not be able to stay on the floor much longer, because I shall have to leave very shortly to attend a hearing of the subcommittee investigating disloyalty charges. However, before I leave the floor, I should like to point out one thing to the Senator from Ohio and ask his comment on it. It seems to me unanswerable that the world menace of communism affects the security of the United States. It seems to me that we can agree on that.

Mr. TAFT. I agree fully on that with the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. And that communism operates in many forms—political, economic, and military. In a country like France, for example, the Communist movement, with all that it implies economically, politically, and militarily, has been stopped absolutely dead in its tracks, as evidenced by votes which have been taken recently, in the electoral results in the voting for Members of the Chamber of Deputies, and in the circulation figures of Communist newspapers. By common consent that condition is attributed to the help which France has received under the Marshall plan. Therefore, it seems to me that a continuation of the Marshall plan and carrying out of the pledged word which we have given is inextricably and intimately bound up with the security of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. I would say that it did not make any difference to the security of the United States whether we give France $500,000,000 or $400,000,000. That is the question I am raising, the cutting-off of 20 percent from these amounts. So that I cannot see how the cutting of this appropriation could in any way affect the security of the United States. In fact, the French are doing so well that perhaps they could get along with much less, but I do not want to run the risk of upsetting programs which they may have set up for a year or 2 years ahead.

Mr. President, I shall finish reading the Cripps' statement so that I may make the point I wanted to make:

> Sir Stafford Cripps said: During the first quarter of this year the sterling area earned a net gold and dollar surplus of $40,000,000, compared with a deficit of $31,000,000 in the fourth quarter of 1949, of $539,000,000 in the corresponding first quarter of 1949. [Ministerial cheers.]
>
> We received assistance under the European recovery program, largely in the form of reimbursement for expenditure already incurred by us, amounting to $229,000,000. We also drew on the Canadian credit to the extent of $27,000,000. Thus the gold and dollar reserves rose by $296,000,000—[Ministerial cheers]—during the quarter, so that on March 31, 1950, they stood at $1,984,000,000 compared with $1,688,000,000 at December 31, 1949, and $2,241,000,000 at March 31, 1948, immediately before the European recovery program was put into operation.

The result is that the British have balanced their budget in 6 months, balanced their gold and dollar balance, and balanced their balance of payments. The ECA gave them about $500,000,000 in 6 months. So they simply took our money and add $500,000,000 to their gold and dollar reserves, until they got them back to $2,000,000,000, which is approximately the figure which they think is necessary to be safe. If it continues for another 3 months they will still have more reserves. I do not know whether it will, but I do want to point out that the whole budget of the ECA was presented on the basis of estimated balances of payments. For instance, in 1949–50, the adverse balance payments were $956,000,000. According to the present figures that balance for the current fiscal year will be probably two or three hundred million dollars more favorable to Britain than the ECA basis of payments, and if those figures are as wrong as those in 1949–50, and if this 6 months' experience is to be carried out, the very basis for the appropriation is completely eliminated.

I have been told that the ECA, when that was brought up to them, said, "After all, the balance of payments is not the real test." They have been claiming for the last 3 years it was the real test, that the balance of payments is what we have to pay. Yet today, when that balance of payments will probably no longer justify an appropriation of $687,000,000, they are shifting off to other bases, and abandoning the balance-of-payments theory, which I personally have questioned for these 2 years, but which they have strenuously defended. They are now seeking for other grounds to support this appropriation of $687,000,000.

The French and Italian position is somewhat different. I remember that when I was in France the ECA Administrator said, "France has no economic problem. After all, the French feed themselves. They raise enough food to feed their people. They can get on without our assistance." Their problems were political problems, and to a large extent our money assisted the French Government that was in power. It assisted them particularly to balance their budget, so that they would not have to levy more taxes. To a large extent the counterpart funds were used to help balance the French budget.

It does seem to me rather ridiculous for a country whose budget is $6,000,000,000 out of balance to attempt to justify a gift to foreign nations on the ground that we are going to help them balance their budgets. If that is the only justification for the appropriation, it seems to me we had better keep the money at home and balance our own budget with it.

The Italian situation is also a more or less hopeless one, one which may require American aid for many years to come. But, certainly, the difference between giving them $290,000,000 and $232,000,000 is not going to make any substantial difference to the Italian people. That is about the scope of their particular share of this new appropriation.

It seems to me perfectly clear that a 20 percent cut is not going to injure any nation, and that to a large extent it is completely justified. It is much more difficult to justify the 80 percent that remains than it is to justify the 20 percent cut.

The fact that these countries could get on with 20 percent less is shown by Mr. Hoffman's own proposal for a European payments union. After allotting the figure he fixed, which appeared day before yesterday in the RECORD at page 5689, a total of $2,925,000,000, divided among countries according to the figures given in the RECORD, Mr. Hoffman proposed to take away 20 percent from all of those countries, and set up a European payments fund of $600,000,000, which he is going to use as a kind of inducement to nations to reduce their tariffs, and for other actions. But presumably if they do not do what he says they should do, they will not get the 20 percent.

Certainly that shows that he does not think that cutting off 20 percent is going to wreck any of them, or affect the security of the United States. It seems to me that his taking $600,000,000 out shows it is not necessary for the national programs which are in existence.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Inasmuch as I intend to propose an amendment providing for a cut of approximately 20 percent, which the Senator has been discussing, I am glad the Senator brought up the currency equalization fund of $650,000,000. I should like to have the Senator specifically discuss his views as to whether or not this new program of $650,000,000 for currency equalization is compatible with, or in furtherance of, the original idea of the Marshall plan, which was construction relief, that is, physical development relief. Up until now, we have aided the countries in Europe in projects such as the construction of factories, and like matters, and now it is proposed that we take $650,000,000 out of the physical development field and put it into an exchange equalization fund, which I believe goes further than the original intent and the original proposal of ECA. I wish the Senator would develop that thought.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator. Undoubtedly it is a departure from the original purpose of ECA, and that it is set out in this new authorization bill. I suppose it is in general furtherance of the purpose of ECA, if we have the money to pay nations to reduce their tariffs, and then try to settle their balances at the end of the year, instead of giving them the money in advance. It does not greatly offend me, except that it seems to me to go into a field where we have already spent a great deal of money.

The International Monetary Fund was set up almost exactly for that purpose, namely, for the settlement of balances. If one nation owed, at the end of the year, $70,000,000, and some other nation had a gold surplus of $70,000,000, the nation lacking would go to the fund and draw from the fund the money it needed to pay its debts. That was the purpose of the International Monetary Fund.

I notice that in the House of Representatives Mr. JESSE WOLCOTT, who was a member of the Bretton Woods Commission, opposed the whole fund theory on the ground that he thought it was duplicating the International Monetary Fund. We put $2,750,000,000 worth of gold or its equivalent into the International Monetary Fund, and according to the last figures I have been able to get, the International Monetary Fund a year ago had still $1,436,000,000 in gold and a very considerable amount of demand obligations, which are equal to gold, against the United States and other nations who would make good the obligations. So that today they have two or three billion dollars available for settling balances. It does seem to me very dubious that we need this European payments fund.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator says that money is available for settling balances through the International Monetary Fund. Is it not true that that money is available for settling balances at different currency values, or at rates of values of currency set by other countries, which are out of line today? Is this not actually the fact today in the European countries?

Mr. TAFT. Then it is up to the International Monetary Fund to change the situation. The very purpose of that fund is to regulate the business of currency exchange, to see that it is realistic, and to authorize nations to change their exchange rates when the International Monetary Fund thinks they should. I think they have done it without the consent of the International Monetary Fund, to a large extent. But there is this agency, and whether the agency is not being used properly I have no means of saying at the moment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not a fact that they are disregarding the actual values of currency in these countries? Is not that one of the problems?

Mr. TAFT. So long as there is over a billion dollars of our money still around, it seems to me that might be used for the settlement of balances in some way, rather than to use another $600,000,000.

If the result of cutting $600,000,000 from the appropriation is to eliminate the international payments fund, I do not think it is going to do any great damage to the security of the United States, as seems to be feared by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that there is great wisdom in the remark of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts. The international fund has been a complete failure. It has not served its purpose at all. It is tied up with rigidities arising out of the overvaluation of currencies when it was set up, which it has not been able to overcome, and in my opinion, this step is a subterfuge for violating the International Monetary Fund. Perhaps it is a necessary step. In 5 years' time, with all the changes that have taken place in the world, and with all the different fluctuations in the real value of money, the last time I looked up the matter I found the Fund had made changes in the value of currencies of two countries, and they were very small countries. They put the currencies of the world in a strait-jacket from which they have not been able to extricate themselves. So I think the senior Senator from Massachusetts has probably put his finger on the real reason for this new device. It is another circumvention of fine, but impracticable, purposes to which we committed ourselves under bad foresight.

Mr. TAFT. In any event there seems to be quite a great deal of difference of opinion about the European payment fund. Everyone thinks it is a nice thing. Well, $600,000,000 is a nice amount for us to keep, too. I do not see any tremendous justification for setting up this new international fund, that is, I do not think it is something which affects the national security to an extent which justifies our increasing the deficit of the United States by $600,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me that the ECA—and I am going to support the program, I hope under reduced appropriations, because I think the balance is more to the good than to the bad at this time—it seems to me that they have gotten into the evil habit of taking unto ourselves every unaccomplished objective that was originally set up for ECA. The ECA countries do not lower their tariff barriers. They do not render their currencies convertible. They do not set up a western European trade area. So, instead of insisting that they do that, we say, "Oh, well, the boys did not do it, so we will absorb it, we will absorb it by imports, we will absorb it by putting in money" of the type which the Senator is talking about. I think that thing can progress to the point where in the end we will find ourselves having aggravated the very situations which we intended to cure.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. At the time we voted on the proposal for a 10-percent cut for the ECA last year we were told that this was a situation similar to trying to get a man out of a 100-foot well with a 90-foot rope. Does the Senator from Ohio find such a comparison applicable today?

Mr. TAFT. I never felt that the ECA was going to solve all the problems of Europe, nor have I ever thought that any special or particular sum was necessary. It always seemed to me that we could help, we could appropriate money which would no doubt be helpful, to the extent it could wisely be used. But there is no sacredness about any particular figure, and never has been, in my opinion, and if we get a bigger and bigger deficit in the United States, it seems to me we have more and more justification in scaling down the amount requested.

Mr. LONG. It boils down to this, then, does it not, that the larger figure we appropriate, the bigger deficit we have here in the United States and the smaller deficit some other country has? Is that not true?

Mr. TAFT. That is entirely true. We balance some other country's budget at our expense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There was much use of that 90-foot-rope illustration in the early days. It used to be said that if a man was 100 feet out from shore and drowning, what good was it to throw him a 90-foot rope? Well, if a man is 100 feet out in the water, and a 90-foot rope is thrown to him, if he cannot swim 10 feet he is dead already. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is one other reason why I think we ought to cut the appropriation, and that is I think we ought to serve notice on the world that we are getting toward the end of the possibility of free dispensation of gifts and subsidies to the entire world, because we have facing us many other proposals for such gifts and subsidies.

We have now become involved in a tremendous military program. I was interested in an article written by Joseph Alsop, dispatched from Rome, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, regarding the military program. In it he says the European nations have discussed this military program. Representatives of those nations went to The Hague to meet with our Army representatives and others. I believe the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] went to that meeting, together with the Secretary of Defense. Mr. Alsop in his article says:

The heavy list of requirements agreed upon at The Hague came as a rude shock to almost every European leader outside the charmed circle of the Chiefs of Staff and Defense Ministers. Here in Italy, Prime Minister de Gasperi and Finance Minister Pella were plainly appalled by costs they could not meet. Since Italy, however, is after all a lesser partner, the Italian Government waited to see what would be the reaction of the key western union powers and Benelux countries.

Some days ago, a full and representative group of Cabinet Ministers from Britain, France, and the Benelux countries met at Brussels. After the shortest examination, they concluded they could not foot the bill for The Hague program. Ambassador Lewis Douglas was hastily summoned from London, confronted with this unanimous decision, and requested to inform Washington that the defense of the west could not be organized without much larger American contributions.

This, of course, had been obvious from the first. As has been often stated in this space, an increase in the American effort of from three to six billion dollars annually is clearly necessary until a solid western defense has been built up. As matters stand, however, we face the grave danger of the whole problem being deferred.

Mr. President, I have been opposed to the program from the beginning, so the grave danger from deferring it does not greatly concern me. But it is a serious proposition. Later this year we will undoubtedly be asked for an increase in the proposed program of military aid to Europe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully say to the Senator from Ohio that I, together with other Senators, listened to the testimony of the military leaders, Secretary Johnson and others, yesterday. While I believe that what the Senator says happened at The Hague is true, and while I cannot say definitely what the military leaders would say, they certainly gave us no indication that they were going to be too much influenced by what was said at The Hague in connection with the request that will be made for this year.

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder if the Senator from Massachusetts can answer the question, though, as to why the figures have not been given to the committee respecting military requirements, in addition to the requirements for the regular program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question except to say that I gained the impression—and I state it only as an impression—that those figures are not yet ready.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article written by Mr. Alsop be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIDDEN CRISIS

(By Joseph Alsop)

ROME.—In the last year and a half, this old city has been, as it were, gilded with a splendid appearance of prosperity. The Italian recovery, which is now as complete as any recovery can be, wholly fails to solve all the really basic social and economic problems. There are vast gaps, but the surface, always exquisitely beautiful in Rome, in any case now positively glitters.

But immediately below the surface, moreover, there is a hidden crisis of the utmost significance to the United States as well as to western Europe. The whole effort to organize the defense of the western world against Soviet aggression is in fact now in danger of breaking down.

In order to understand what is happening, one must go back to the beginning of the planning of the defense of the West under the Atlantic Pact. The spadework was done, for reasons which must be examined later, in the closed circle of the so-called Atlantic Pact standing group. This body, headed by Gen. Omar Bradley, and comprising representatives of the staffs of the more important Atlantic Pact nations, labored for many months to produce two fundamental papers.

The first paper was a seclusive plan for the defense of the West. The second was a list of requirements—of weapons, of bases, and of manpower—to make this strategic plan a real thing.

With almost no strength in Europe and with America disarming as a result of Secretary of Defense Johnson's economies, the program was necessarily ambitious. Powerful European ground forces had to be built up and ground defenses had to be designed. Western Europe had to be defended securely in the air, naval forces provided to protect the ocean, supply lines provided. Strategic air bases had to be prepared to assure immediate retaliatory air attacks in the event of Soviet aggression.

Furthermore, the time allowed was very short. The year 1953 is the moment when Russian war preparations will reach their first climax. It was necessary to provide at least a skeleton defense by 1953, with 36 fully armed divisions in being in Europe by that date. In the final phase, in 1955, European ground forces were to be considerably more than 50 divisions, with all other arms in balance.

This was the program that was presented some weeks ago to the assembled Atlantic Pact defense ministers at The Hague. Significantly, it was considered adequate by all those at the meeting. France alone entered reservations about the future German participation in the western defense efforts. With this exception, the program was approved in toto and unanimously.

Especially at this point, however, it began to be clear that a heavy price would have to be paid for Secretary Johnson's decision to dissolve the State Department-Defense Department partnership, which had been so close before he took office. Because the planning of this had been isolated in Washington, it had also been isolated in Europe. Until The Hague conference of defense ministers and chiefs of staff was so triumphantly concluded, none of the really important problems of western defense, political or social, economic or fiscal, had ever been explored on the highest governmental level.

The list of requirements to carry out the program approved at The Hague demanded a very great effort by every European partner in the Atlantic Pact. With almost no exception, all these nations are already strained to the limits of their strength and resources by the task of postwar reconstruction. If Secretary Johnson and Secretary of State Acheson had been continuously working together, with their opposite numbers in Europe, all the leaders of all the European governments might by now have been educated in the dimensions of the problem. The ways might also have been found by now to balance the American contributions against the special kind of European contributions, which would not have threatened the precarious recovery that Europe has achieved.

Instead, the heavy list of requirements agreed upon at The Hague came as a rude shock to almost every European leader outside the charmed circle of the chiefs of staff and defense ministers. Here in Italy, Prime Minister de Gasperi and Finance Minister Pella were plainly appalled by costs they could not meet. Since Italy, however, is after all a lesser partner, the Italian Government waited to see what would be the reaction of the key western union powers and Benelux countries.

Some days ago, a full and representative group of Cabinet ministers from Britain, France, and the Benelux countries met at Brussels. After the shortest examination, they concluded they could not foot the bill for The Hague program. Ambassador Lewis Douglas was hastily summoned from London, confronted with this unanimous decision, and requested to inform Washington that the defense of the west could not be organized without much larger American contributions.

This, of course, had been obvious from the first. As has been often stated in this space, an increase in the American effort of from $3,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 annually is clearly necessary until a solid western defense has been built up. As matters stand, however, we face the grave danger of the whole problem being deferred. The Europeans cannot and, therefore, will not make the necessary extra effort at this time. Because of the way the problem has been handled by the Defense Department, it is really almost inconceivable that the needed additional resources will be provided at this late date by the American Congress.

All this may seem unimportant and academic. But the grim central fact which cannot be escaped is that the year 1953, when Russian war preparations will be completed, will be a year of utmost danger. If the west now throws away the 12 months of the short time that is still allowed for organizing a solid defense, the consequences can be disastrous. This is a heavy price to pay for American officials who do not know their business and are more interested in furthering their own ambitions than in performing their great tasks. Because so much time has been wasted, it is now more than ever necessary for the leaders of the west to tackle urgently, seriously, and practically the vital defense problems.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One statement the Senator from Ohio made disturbed me very greatly, because the basis on which I voted for ECA aid as well as for MAP aid and other aids of this character is the security of our country. If I heard the Senator from Ohio correctly he felt that the security of our country was not still the background on which

we must make these appropriations for ECA. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. TAFT. Undoubtedly it is the background. It is the reason why I voted for the whole program. Having gone half way through the program, with certain commitments having been made to various nations, I think we should continue and finish the program in 4 years, but with, I believe, at least a 20-percent reduction. I would say that if we were planning to begin such a program at this moment with the present economic condition as it exists in Europe, we would have a hard time to prove today that there was any national security involved in giving 1 cent of aid.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will agree that the only justification for our making these payments is the security of our country.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. That is the reason I voted for the program. Having committed ourselves to the program, and these nations having made certain general plans based on it, I do not want to kill the program. I do not think a 20-percent cut will do that. If a 20-percent cut is made, I think the remaining 80 percent will cover all the important things to which they may possibly have become committed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not part of the improvement, both in England and on the continent, due to a feeling of confidence that we will continue this program in a substantial amount—perhaps not in the full amount, but at least in the full amount which would remain after the reduction made in accordance with the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think so at all. I think the British figure that they are going to come through anyway, and I do not think they are dependent upon this program any more. I think an arbitrary action in cutting it off overnight would have a bad effect, yes. I agree with the Senator as to that. That is why I do not favor doing it.

On the other hand, we cut the appropriation $400,000,000 last year, and I did not see that that resulted in doing any harm.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, in regard to the last observation the Senator has made, let me say that when we adopted the program it was the intention to cut the amount every year. In fact, thus far, we have exceeded our hopes in that respect, for it rather looks as if, instead of having $17,000,000,000 over-all, when we finish we shall get out with about $15,000,000,000.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that last year the amount was $4,200,000,000, and the total of new funds requested was $2,950,000,000. In other words, we are down about $1,300,000,000 from the amount for last year; and, as the Senator knows, the amount for last year was less than the amount for the year before.

Mr. TAFT. It was very little less than the amount for the year before. When we consider the total amount of United States aid, we find that in 1946 it was $5,100,000,000; in 1947, $5,700,000,000; in 1948, $4,700,000,000; in 1949, $5,700,000,000. In fact, in 1949 the Government actually put up a billion dollars more than it did in 1948, for foreign aid. Of course, the ECA is only part of that.

The actual cut proposed by Mr. Hoffman is from $4,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000.

Inasmuch as eventually we are going to end the program, and are going to taper it off in the meantime, I would taper it off to about $1,000,000,000 or $1,250,000,000 the fourth year, rather than make a reduction to 75 percent of the former amount. Of course, if in the third year we made a reduction to 75 percent of the funds for the previous year, and if in the fourth year we made a reduction of a similar percentage, the figure for the fourth year would be approximately $2,200,000,000, which, it seems to me, would be high.

Mr. McMAHON. How much of a cut is the Senator from Ohio proposing?

Mr. TAFT. I said I would support a cut of $600,000,000, under the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. McMAHON. I see.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has offered an amendment proposing a cut of $1,000,000,000. I do not think I would favor that amendment, because I do not wish to be accused of really wrecking the program, and I am afraid that might at least be claimed if a reduction of $1,000,000,000 were made. However, I am confident that a reduction of 20 percent will not really injure anyone.

Mr. McMAHON. I am a little curious to know, if the Senator from Ohio can tell me, why he has selected $600,000,000 as the amount of reduction he favors, instead of $500,000,000 or $700,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. For the same reason that Mr. Hoffman chose $3,100,000,000 instead of $3,500,000,000. He took a figure out of the air; he did not have any justification for it. He simply hit it in the middle with a shotgun, so far as I can see. There was no justification; no figures were presented in regard to what the projects will be or the purposes for which the funds will be spent. In fact, in the past a part of the funds has been spent for things entirely different from those suggested in the testimony.

We have a proposal to have so many bushels of wheat go to these foreign countries, but there is no assurance that that proposal will be carried out. Last year the actual figure was at least 200,000,000 bushels of wheat off, and the ECA turned over $175,000,000 to Britain to permit Britain to purchase Canadian wheat, although, under the estimates which were presented to us, the money was to be spent for American wheat.

There is nothing firm about any of these proposals. As I have said, so far as I can see, Mr. Hoffman might just as well have said $2,500,000,000, instead of $3,100,000,000, to begin with.

I quite agree that I might just as well have suggested $2,500,000,000 or $1,500,000,000; but some figure must be decided upon, and most persons seem to believe that a 20-percent cut is justified, and that we can be fairly certain that the funds remaining after a 20-percent cut is made will be sufficient.

For instance, consider the actual figure of $500,000,000 to France. I cannot see that it will make any great difference to France if she receives $400,000,000, instead of $500,000,000.

It seems to me the same is true as regards Britain. I believe that a 20-percent cut in the fund now proposed for Britain is required by the circumstances.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator from Ohio underestimates the amount of care and scrutiny which have gone into making Mr. Hoffman's estimates. At first they were submitted to the respective countries involved, and from then they went to the OEEC, and from the OEEC to the ECA; and in the conferences they have had with the Foreign Relations Committee, I say to the Senator, it seemed to me they demonstrated that they had given the matter very careful consideration.

So I think it is a mistake to believe that Paul Hoffman wants to throw away or to disperse the taxpayers' money.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that I have never known an administrator who did not think his job was more important than that of any other branch of the Government, and I never saw one who in perfectly good faith did not want 50 percent more funds than Congress would give him.

Of course, I am not questioning for a moment Mr. Hoffman's belief that this money should be spent or his good faith in asking for it.

Mr. McMAHON. No; but I think we should ascribe to him more than that. I think we should ascribe to him an intelligent appraisal of conditions as he has seen them and a desire on his part to have the amounts authorized and appropriated reflect the existing conditions, which demand that either we do this job in a satisfactory way or that we do not do it at all.

Certainly there are Government administrators who have demonstrated a desire to reduce expenditures. For instance, I refer now to the Secretary of Defense. I see that he has retreated a little in the last few days, but certainly he has evidenced a determination to make reductions.

I offer that observation in view of the all-inclusive statement of the Senator from Ohio that anyone who works in an executive department has no other ambition than to obtain for his agency, by means of attempts on his part to justify allegations of the necessity for his agency to have larger and larger sum total amounts, any amount of money which he thinks is necessary.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in reply, let me refer to the requested program for the United Kingdom in the fiscal year 1950 and 1951, and in that connection let me show the arbitrary nature of the request.

The total of the ECA-financed program requested for the United Kingdom in the fiscal year 1950 and 1951 is $687,100,000, of which $34,300,000 is proposed

or requested for transportation, leaving an amount of $652,800,000 requested for commodity imports. That figure of $652,800,000 is broken down, in turn, into two subdivisions, one being an amount requested for food and agricultural product imports, and the other an amount requested for industrial imports. It just happens—I suppose, by chance—that the total amount requested for the United Kingdom for food and agricultural product imports is $326,400,000, and the total amount requested for the United Kingdom for industrial imports is $326,400,000; those amounts are equal to the dollar.

Of course it is obvious that what the ECA did was to say, "Here is the total you can have. How do you want to divide it?"

The response was, "Well, we will take half of it for industrial imports, and half of it for food- and agricultural-product imports."

In other words, these figures have come from the top; an amount has been fixed at the top, and then they have divided it between the various things for which they would like to receive funds. The program has not built up on the basis of actual needs totaling a certain amount of money.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. When Mr. Hoffman comes before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, does he bring to the committee the same kind of showing that must be brought to the appropriate committees of Congress when there is a request for a reclamation project or for a flood-control project? Are showings of that kind made before the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that I have seen innumerable charts, statistics, and statements justifying the various projects which are listed in the request.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; but has the Senate Foreign Relations Committee taken these billions of dollars and broken the whole thing down and considered it item by item, as is done, for example, in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when it is considering the feasibility of an irrigation project, or as is done in the Committee on Public Works when it is considering a flood-control project? I respectfully suggest to the Senator there is no parallel or analogy.

Mr. McMAHON. As for the Senator from Connecticut, I may say this: Unfortunately, though I am a member of the committee, I have not engaged in an item-by-item estimation. However, the statistics are available. I have made what may be called a sampling of the justifications. As the Senator knows, it is impossible to examine each particular item.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest it is perfectly evident that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not given the type of consideration, to which I have been referring, to these various programs, else it would not have authorized and put its imprimatur on these unbalanced industrial developments which are going on in western Europe, where each nation is in a scramble with our money to build up complete self-sufficiency, where each nation, with our money, is trying to build up a complete, rounded military machine. These are things that are being complained about. These are things which, if we had any control over them, would not be happening.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to finish, if I may. I was making the point only that I think the time has come to say we are going to taper off these programs. I have been in Ohio and different parts of the country, and what I get, even from people who are most friendly to the idea, is always this: "Well, we had to do it. We have to help against the Communists. But, for heaven's sake, when can we stop sending money to Europe? How can we go on, with a deficit of $6,000,000,000?"

In addition to this program, which we would encourage by merely putting a rubber stamp on the administration's request, we have the military program, which Alsop says ought to be $3,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 a year. Then, we have the latest proposal of a discussion, in which the British are proposing apparently to discuss with our Treasury and our people the problem of our indirectly, at least, assuming the debts that the British have in India and Pakistan and other countries throughout the Far East, to take the form of some kind of general far eastern recovery administration or far eastern recovery program, with more money for all parts of the world, and then we have this point 4, which is just beginning to show in the pending bill, $45,000,000 more to add to the American deficit, to give technical assistance to all undeveloped countries throughout the world. It seems to me we have reached a point where, if we are not prepared to cut out everything at home and balance our budget, we are going to have to put a veto on further extension of existing programs. The present one can be justified because we committed ourselves to it, and in substance, I think, we ought to carry it out. But as far as the amount is concerned, we are not committed to any amount. I believe we ought to exercise every possible economy in determining what that amount shall be. So I propose to vote for the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the proposal of the Senator from Colorado to eliminate the proposed amendment setting up this technical aid and establishing instead a commission to study the whole problem of whether the United States, after ECA is through, can afford further assistance to foreign nations, and, if so, how much, if anything, can be done. There are always some projects that I think probably would be worth while, in the nature of the program which should be substituted. Certainly, as far as these other programs are concerned, let us finish ECA first. In the case of the ECA, I believe very strongly that a 20-percent cut is a definite notice to the world that we are rapidly eliminating and proposing to eliminate foreign aid, and that that is the view of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio and the chairman of the Republican policy committee whether, in connection with this so-called point 4, the Republican leaders, or any Republican Senators, were consulted as to whether it should be included in this bill?

Mr. TAFT. No. The Senator is referring, I suppose, to the general idea that there is to be a bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is quite correct, so far as I know, in supposing that no Republicans were consulted before this new point 4 program was adopted or before the amendment was sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations. At least not to my knowledge was any Republican advised or consulted or his advice asked or any attempt made whatever to make it in any sense a part of a bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. President, I have only to say that in my opinion we in this country face a serious crisis in our financial development, that when we talk about national security, if we are going to have another war, we cannot afford to go into it with a public debt constantly increased by deficits amounting to $6,000,000,000 a year; that we are going to find it impossible to finance that war if we are going to continue peacetime expenditures on the basis of $6,000,000,000 above what a very burdensome tax system is able to produce.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. In connection with the question of the Senator from Colorado, is the Senator aware of the fact that Mr. Haldore Hanson, who has been selected as the head of the technical staff for the planning of point 4, was named by Mr. Budenz day before yesterday in executive session as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAFT. No, I did not know that. I have not followed the secret testimony.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think Senators should know that when they are considering point 4.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I therefore appeal to Senators to indicate clearly now by their vote that they feel there should be a legislative declaration that foreign aid should be reduced as rapidly as possible.

Finally, I should like to request the ECA to examine the justification for the $687,000,000, found on page 5799 of the RECORD, which was taken from their

budget request, and to tell us why that should not be completely revised. I think they owe it to the Senate to come in with a revised estimate for the year 1949–50, in the light of Mr. Cripps' latest statements about the balancing of the British budget, and in the light of that, also to make another estimate for the year 1950–51.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. In order to keep the record straight, and with regard to the observations made by the Senator from Colorado about the fact that there was no bipartisan consultation, it is my information—and I think it is correct—that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Republican whip, and Representative HERTER, of Massachusetts, had many consultations with Members of the House in trying to work out the point 4 program. I would also advise the Senator that the matter was very thoroughly discussed in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I believe that the vote was unanimous, Democrats and Republicans alike, voting to include point 4 in the pending bill. The Senator can make his own interpretation as to what that means, but I merely thought those facts ought to be in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It certainly does no harm, I would suggest, to have the Republican members of the committee in favor of a program, but it does not in and of itself make a bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. TAFT. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he knows of any consultation with any Republican before the recent revival and development of support for the so-called International Trade Organization? That is another substantial and tremendous change in foreign policy. So far as I know, Secretary Acheson, in spite of his desire for a bipartisan foreign policy which he has expressed, came to Congress and insisted upon ITO being adopted without consulting any Republican in either the House or the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Was that on the House side?

Mr. TAFT. I think it was in testifying before a House committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. They have been holding hearings on it.

Mr. McMAHON. It takes all I can do, and more, to keep up with what is going on in the Senate. I do not know whether he appeared before a House committee. I will take the Senator's word for it. I do say that when he comes here he will talk to all Senators who are on the pertinent committee.

Mr. TAFT. But the point is that he has already committed himself and has made an agreement without consulting any Republicans, and it is far too late to make it a bipartisan policy at this time, when he has already committed the United States Government to that policy.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, the Senator from Ohio could now march to its support.

I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado how long ago it was that the treaty was signed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It was in 1948, and in all these years the State Department has not had the intestinal fortitude really to urge it on the Congress. For some reason or other, it decided to reactivate it right at the very time when some of us were looking around to see whether there were any areas in which we could work up a bipartisan foreign policy.

I do not want to press too many of these things on the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, but I remind him, also, that every vote on this side of the aisle, and several on the other side, are opposed to the present tariff policies of the Department of State. Despite that fact, we are going to have another run of tariff reductions in September, and I respectfully suggest that that does not aid the cause of bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I am more optimistic than is the Senator from Colorado. I think we can adjust our differences before we get through. I should not want the impression to be created that the Foreign Relations Committee had not really tried to do a conscientious job in evaluating the requests. The Senator will see from the volume of the hearings that many hours were spent in listening to the best testimony the executive branch of the Government could produce. The Senator may feel that that is not very good, but, after all, Mr. Hoffman, I believe, has no particular political allegiance. I do not care about that. I think he has done, on the whole, an excellent job. We have tried to evaluate the over-all program based upon results which have undoubtedly been achieved up to this time.

I may say, if the Senator will permit another observation in his time, that if it were not for this program and what it has been able to accomplish, the second greatest producing economy in the world would now be behind the iron curtain. Two hundred and seventy million persons would, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, be slaves of a slave state, and participants, unwilling though they might be, in the great drive to extinguish the light of liberty everywhere in the world.

I think it has been cheap, so far, Mr. President, and I think it is a great bargain.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not want to depreciate the value of ECA, but I differ wholly with the Senator from Connecticut. I do not think the ECA can claim that it is the only responsible agent which has kept Europe non-Communist. I feel that even without it, those countries would have come through, with the possible exception of Italy. That is the only place in which we used ECA money for political purposes, and used it successfully. With the exception of Italy, I do not think for a moment that the absence of ECA would have resulted in communism overrunning Europe. I think ECA was a great aid, and I am prepared to say that it has accomplished a substantial part of what was intended when the program was started.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think we can concede everything which the distinguished Senator has said as to the past value of the organization. I intend to vote for the bill, with, I hope, some substantial cuts. I think we can accept the good purposes of the ECA, but that does not go to the point of whether we should vote for all these proposed expenditures.

Mr. YOUNG obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me for 3 minutes? I want to put something into the RECORD which I have already released to the press. It is pertinent to the discussion we have had this afternoon.

Mr. YOUNG. I am sorry. I have received six similar requests from other Senators. My speech is only about 10 minutes long.

Mr. President, I voted for the ECA program in past years, and I have no regrets. I think it has accomplished a great deal of good. It has probably saved Europe from communism and has probably helped our own agriculture and other industries. Whether I vote for its continuance will depend almost entirely on amendments which will be approved on the Senate floor. It is like most Government alphabetical programs. They are good to start with and oftentimes they are necessary, but they are usually carried too far and kept too long. Most of the countries of Europe which are benefiting under the program have a smaller per capita than we have in the United States, and a smaller per capita income tax. That is true of our good neighbor to the north, Canada. It has a smaller per capita debt and a smaller per capita income tax. A few days ago Canada's Agricultural Minister told the people of Canada that they were in excellent shape agriculturally, that there was no surplus wheat or rye. And he encouraged Canadian farmers to plant more this year, while here in the United States we are required to reduce our wheat production approximately 20 percent. Canada was relieved of its surplus by more than $400,000,000 of ECA funds. I think that is carrying the program much too far. I think the Administrator did not follow the provisions of the act, and it is for that reason that the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and myself are offering amendments to put teeth into the bill and require that the Administrator follow the letter of the law and buy grain in the United States where we have surplus, rather than in foreign countries.

The amendment to the pending measure known as ECA, offered by the senior Senator from Oklahoma and myself on April 24, is designed to correct what I feel have been misinterpretations of congressional intent by the Economic Cooperation Administration with respect to the offshore procurement of surplus agricultural commodities, particularly wheat.

Although section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act directs the administrator to procure surplus farm commodities within the United States, this mandate has been rendered ineffective by an escape clause which says he must purchase such surpluses in the domestic market only. "Insofar as practicable and where in furtherance of the purposes of this subchapter."

Wheat has been a surplus commodity in the United States since the inception of ECA. Yet from April 3, 1948, through December 31, 1949, ECA financed the purchase of $424,600,000 worth of wheat and wheat flour from Canada. The total will be in excess of half a billion dollars when ECA closes its books on the deal made last September whereby it agreed to finance $175,000,000 worth of wheat purchases in Canada for the United Kingdom during the 1949–50 crop year.

From the inception of the ECA program through December 31, 1949, only 61.2 percent of all wheat purchases were made in the United States. During the same period, 69.2 percent of all wheat flour financed by ECA was purchased within the United States.

On other major farm commodities, I am happy to say, the record has been better. ECA has purchased 97.8 percent of its coarse grains here, 90.7 percent of its dairy products, 99.9 percent of its cotton, and 98.2 of its tobacco. Total purchases of United States farm commodities in first 2 years amounted to $2,667,000,000. It has been of great help to agriculture in the United States.

When it first came to the attention of the Senate Agriculture Committee that ECA was financing huge purchases of wheat in Canada—even though the grain was surplus in the United States—top officials were called upon for an explanation. This was early in 1949. Their first defense was that Canadian wheat was slightly cheaper. When it was pointed out that the Foreign Assistance Act gave them no latitude in offshore procurement solely for reason of price, they offered another explanation. They said that while wheat was in surplus in the United States it was not available. They contended that United States shipping and loading facilities were overtaxed and that it would have been impossible to move the quantity of wheat needed abroad solely through American ports. Both Secretary Brannan and Dr. Fitzgerald of ECA told the committee, however, that no effort had been made to determine whether additional United States wheat might not have been loaded through Canadian port facilities.

I do not believe that all members of the committee were satisfied with their explanation. I know that I was not. I did feel, however, that there would be no further ECA purchases of wheat in Canada. With far less wheat scheduled for export from the United States during the 1949–50 crop year, I was certain that there could be no question of overloaded loading and shipping facilities.

This belief was confirmed when Administrator Hoffman and Dr. FitzGerald appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in June 1949. Testifying on H. R. 4830, Dr. FitzGerald flatly asserted:

> ECA will not be financing any wheat from Australia and Canada.

Mr. Hoffman said:

> We think it is extremely important, and Dr. FitzGerald can testify more accurately on that than I can. We think it is important that the European countries buy their wheat from the United States.

On that basis, I supported the ECA appropriation, and for other reasons. In view of the assurances of both Administrator Hoffman and Dr. FitzGerald, I felt that no further restrictive language was necessary insofar as offshore procurement of surplus agricultural commodities was concerned.

Just 3 months later, however, Mr. Hoffman announced that ECA had agreed to finance the purchase of $175,000,000 worth of wheat, or about 88 million bushels, in Canada for shipment to the United Kingdom. This was justified on the grounds that Great Britain had a commitment to buy $175,000,000 worth of wheat from Canada, using her own free dollars. Administrator Hoffman found that if this transaction were carried out it would create an undue drain on Britain's free dollar resources. This, in turn, would not be in "furtherance of the purposes" of the ECA Act. So again Mr. Hoffman decided he could procure wheat offshore, even though it was in surplus in the United States.

Under a resolution offered by the junior Senator from Missouri, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed to investigate this transaction. A detailed report was filed with the subcommittee recently by Mr. W. F. Howe, counsel, and Mr. R. S. Nelson, investigator. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YOUNG. This report makes it clear that Mr. Hoffman was acting within the letter of the law, as Congress wrote it, in approving the British-Canadian wheat deal. In my opinion, however, his action did violence to the spirit of the law and certainly it was a repudiation of the assurance he gave the appropriations committee only 3 months earlier.

This report also makes it clear that producers of other major farm commodities, notably cotton, lost a huge export market as a result of the wheat transaction. I hope that Senators from the Cotton States will study carefully appendix D of the report.

It reveals, in brief, that when ECA came before the Senate Appropriations Committee in June 1949 it submitted a budget estimate that $433,500,000 worth of food and agricultural commodities would be financed for Great Britain with ECA funds. Of this amount, $325,000,000 was earmarked for purchases within the United States and $172,000,000 of that sum was to be spent for American cotton. Only $73,500,000 was to be spent in Canada, all of it for meats and dairy products. Note that not one dollar was earmarked for Canadian wheat.

ECA got its requested appropriation. Now we come to the revised budget estimate of ECA expenditures for food and agricultural commodities for Great Britain. This was prepared by ECA in March of 1950, well toward the end of the program and at a time when actual expenditures could be estimated much more closely. The total is up only slightly, from $433,500,000 to $438,200,000. The amount to be spent for United States commodities is down sharply, however, from $325,000,000 to $205,100,000. The amount to be spent in Canada jumps from $73,500,000 to $205,100,000, including the $175,000,000 item for wheat. The amount to be spent for United States cotton is down almost $100,000,000, from a projected $172,000,000 to $75,500,000. Proposed coarse-grain purchases within the United States, totaling $58,500,000 were eliminated entirely. So was an item for $15,600,000 worth of American dairy products. That is what the ECA-financed British-Canadian wheat deal did to producers of other American commodities.

In the light of this record, I think it is absolutely essential that Congress write into the ECA Act, in language so plain that any bureaucrat can understand it, a clear stipulation that ECA shall not finance offshore procurement of any agricultural commodity in surplus in the United States. No if's, no and's, no but's, no insofar as practicable. Just a plain directive: If it is surplus, buy it here.

On April 5, 1949, the Senate defeated by a vote of 48 to 32 an amendment by the junior Senator from Indiana which would have tightened up section 112 (d). The debate at that time indicated many Senators believed the amendment was unnecessary. They felt that ECA had learned a lesson as a result of its chastisement by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in connection with earlier purchases of Canadian wheat.

The statement made on the floor at that time by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who opposed the amendment, probably convinced many Senators that it was unnecessary. I should like to read that brief statement, which appears on page 3856, volume 95, part 3, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 5, 1949:

> Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to make this general statement: Agricultural commodities have been given special consideration by the law and by the ECA, in that they are the only kind of commodities which the ECA itself undertakes to purchase. All other commodities are purchased by the participating countries through their agents here, or through their purchasing commissions.
>
> It is the earnest desire of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as I take it also to be the desire of Senators who have spoken on this matter, to see to it that agricultural products receive the highest and best consideration.
>
> I say to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that if in the course of events it comes to the attention of our committee,

by the action of a Senator not on the committee or by the action of a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the law is not being carried out in its spirit, as well as in its letter, the Committee on Foreign Relations will not hesitate to bring the matter to the attention of the Administrator and the proper authorities. to see to it that such action is corrected, and that the act is administered in the way in which the Congress determined it should be administered, at the time when the act was enacted.

In view of what has transpired, I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will join me in supporting this amendment to section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

I think it should be pointed out that the funds which finance the ECA program and the funds which are appropriated by Congress for farm price supports come from the same source, the pockets of American taxpayers. It should be clearly understood that every dollar which ECA spends offshore for farm commodities which are available in the United States increases the eventual loss which Commodity Credit Corporation must some day take on its price-support operations.

We are facing the prospect of a 450,000,000-bushel wheat carry-over July 1, 1950. That will be the largest peacetime carry-over of wheat in our history. Half of that amount would be a reasonable carry-over and had ECA procured all of its wheat within the United States we would not today be encumbered with this burdensome surplus, and we would not be faced with the need of curtailing production of grains in the United States by as much as 21 percent at a time when Canada is encouraging her farmers to increase their production.

Adverse weather conditions throughout the winter wheat belt this spring may bail CCC out of its predicament, but if that happens it will not be the result of thoughtful planning.

The amendment introduced by the able chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and myself would eliminate the "insofar as practicable and where in furtherance of the purposes of this subchapter" language which now qualifies the directive to the ECA Administrator to procure commodities which are in surplus within the United States only within the United States.

It would also further define what constitutes a surplus agricultural commodity. The present law defines it merely as "any agricultural commodity, or product thereof, produced in the United States which is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of domestic requirements." That language would be retained under the proposed amendment. We would, however, add the stipulation that any agricultural commodity, or product thereof, which is selling below the support price would automatically be defined as a surplus commodity. It is quite conceivable that a commodity might be selling above the support price and still be in surplus. Wheat and cotton are in fact today bringing prices higher than the support level. At the same time, however, I think it is inconceivable that any commodity should be selling below the support price and still not be in surplus. I am certain that Congress would not want to permit ECA to procure offshore any farm commodity which is selling below the support price. To do so would be to increase greatly the cost of any price-support program.

In my opinion, the proposed amendment places no undue restrictions upon the ECA Administrator. It will prevent him from doing nothing which it would be in the public interest for him to do anyway. I am genuinely sorry that an amendment of this nature is necessary. But at the same time I believe the record proves abundantly that it is.

I wish to make it clear that this amendment would in no way require ECA to purchase any specific amount of any agricultural commodity. It is in no sense a plan to dump unwanted surpluses in the lap of the Administrator. Its sole objective is to require ECA, whenever it is in the market for any agricultural commodity, to buy that commodity only within the United States, if that commodity is in surplus here.

I might add, Mr. President, that a good motto would be: "Buy American."

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT ON THE $175,000,000 BRITISH-CANADIAN WHEAT TRANSACTION

On September 15, 1949, ECA announced an arrangement allowing the United Kingdom to use $175,000,000 of ECA-grant funds to purchase Canadian wheat during 1949–50. As part of the arrangement, ECA declared, the United Kingdom agreed to buy $30,000,000 of United States wheat and eight to ten million dollars worth of perishable United States fruits and vegetables during the year. Canada, it was stated, would review its embargo on the importation of fresh fruits and vegetables from the United States.[1]

OPERATION OF THE ARRANGEMENT

The United Kingdom will employ the $175,000,000 grant to buy wheat under the 1946 United Kingdom-Canadian wheat agreement.[2] By its terms that contract calls for the purchase of 140,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, at a price fixed thereunder of $2 per bushel, Canadian currency, in store Fort William.

The free-along-ship cost of wheat taken under the agreement is about $2.1875 per bushel Canadian, and at prevalent exchange rates the ECA grant, which amounts to approximately 193,500,000 Canadian dollars, will purchase approximately 88,000,000 bushels of wheat.

We are informed that during 1949–50 the United Kingdom will take about 128,000,000 bushels under the 1946 contract, instead of the specified 140,000,000 bushels, which means that the ECA grant will finance about 69 percent of the 1949–50 United Kingdom purchases of wheat from Canada.

The $30,000,000 worth of United States wheat, and wheat equivalent in flour, also will be purchased with ECA-grant funds, and will be bought against the United States quota under the International Wheat Agreement. Against that allocation ECA has issued authorizations for $26,594,000 of wheat and $3,406,000 of wheat flour.

Available data indicates that a substantial part of the eight to ten million dollars worth of perishables the United Kingdom has agreed to take from the United States will be bought with ECA-grant funds under section 112 (e) of the Economic Cooperation Act. Accordingly, in connection with such purchases the USDA will make available equal amounts of its section 32 funds, doubling the quantities purchasable by the United Kingdom.

Lastly, it may be noted in this connection that as of October 1, 1949, Canada lifted the embargo on the importation of fresh fruits and vegetables from the United States.

BACKGROUND OF THE ARRANGEMENT

The $175,000,000 ECA grant was arranged at the Anglo-American-Canadian monetary conference, during the summer of 1949, apparently as part of the general agreement there reached to permit a broader use of ECA funds to help alleviate the United Kingdom dollar-deficit situation.[3]

It is noteworthy that the grant represents a substantial deviation from the estimated 1949–50 ECA program presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations in June 1949. At that time ECA estimated that it would finance $11,500,000 worth of United Kingdom wheat purchases during the year, all to be bought from the United States.[4]

Dr. FitzGerald then testified that "ECA will not be financing any wheat from Australia and Canada,"[5] and Administrator Hoffman stated, "We think it is extremely important, and Dr. FitzGerald can testify more accurately on that than I can, we think it is important that the European countries buy their wheat from the United States."[6]

Apparently at that time ECA contemplated that the United Kingdom would be able to finance its 1949–50 wheat purchases under the 1946 contract with Canada outside the ECA program.

It is pertinent to note therefore that in June 1949 the gold and official dollar assets of the United Kingdom amounted to approximately $1,650,000,000, compared to $1,910,000,000 in March 1949,[7] and the potential commitment under the 1946 contract with Canada (then $309,000,000) was about 18.1 percent of such holdings.

By the end of September 1949 the United Kingdom gold and dollar holdings declined to $1,430,000,000,[7] and the potential commitment under the 1946 contract, in terms of United States dollars,[8] then was about 15.9 percent of such holdings.

ALLEVIATION OF UNITED KINGDOM DOLLAR DEFICITS

As indicated the basic argument in support of the $175,000,000 ECA grant is that it was necessary to alleviate the drain on United Kingdom dollar resources.

Thus Administrator Hoffman has stated:

"The United Kingdom is the traditional and normal outlet for the major portion of wheat exported by Canada. Three years ago these countries entered into an agreement under which the United Kingdom was to purchase 140,000,000 to 160,000,000 bushels of wheat annually from Canada. The quantity of wheat involved for 1949–50, the final year covered by the agreement, is 140,000,000 bushels at an agreed price of $2 a bushel, in store Fort William. The total dollar f. a. s.

[1] ECA Release No. 859, copy of which is attached as Appendix A.

[2] Copy is attached as Appendix B.

[3] Text of the communique issued at the close of the conference appears in the Department of State Bulletin, volume XXI, No. 534, p. 474.

[4] Hearings on H. R. 4830, p. 385. Because Congress appropriated less than ECA then asked, and in August 1949 the United Kingdom reduced its schedule of dollar imports, the $11,500,000 for wheat subsequently was eliminated from the ECA program.

[5] Hearings on H. R. 4830, p. 338.

[6] Hearings on H. R. 4830, p. 366.

[7] ECA, Country Data Book, United Kingdom, 1950, Table XI–1.

[8] The pound and Canadian dollar were devalued in September 1949. During August and September 1949 the United Kingdom purchased about 24,000,000 bushels of wheat under the 1946 contract.

cost of the wheat involved for 1949–50 amounts to $309,000,000.

"You have on several occasions advised us that wheat is a surplus agricultural commodity under the provisions of section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, and it is my understanding that this condition still prevails. Effective with deliveries after the first calendar quarter of 1949, the ECA discontinued authorizing the use of its funds for the purchase of Canadian wheat, and as a consequence, the United Kingdom has been using its free dollar reserves to meet the deficit in its Canadian accounts, a substantial element of which consists of Canadian wheat.

"Recently, there has been a very severe drain on United Kingdom gold and dollar reserves. This drain, if not halted, would quite certainly vitiate the progress toward economic rehabilitation and recovery which the United Kingdom has made and remove all prospects of achieving the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act, not only in the United Kingdom but in all probability in the other countries participating in the European recovery program. It is, therefore, a vital necessity to take all steps possible to end the drain on British gold and dollar reserves.

"In an effort to avoid this grave contingency and to extend such help as is within our power, we propose, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act, to agree in part to the British proposal and authorize the use of $175,000,000 of ECA grant funds to finance a portion of this year's purchases of Canadian wheat by the United Kingdom." [9]

The extent to which the grant has eased, or will ease, the United Kingdom dollar situation is not measurable with any degree of mathematical precision.

It did not increase the amount of dollars available to the United Kingdom for 1949–50. In effect, the grant released free dollars potentially committed under the 1946 wheat agreement with Canada, and reduced the amount of ECA funds available to the United Kingdom for the purchase of commodities other than wheat by an equal amount.

However, ECA estimates that 1949–50 dollar imports of the United Kingdom will amount to about $1.4 billion, [10] compared to scheduled dollar imports prior to the August 1949 cut-back amounting to approximately $1,625,000,000—a reduction of some $225,000,000.

Starting with the proposition that the United Kingdom could not curtail its 1949–50 wheat buying, so as to eliminate the quantity purchasable with the $175,000,000 ECA grant, and is obliged by its 1946 contract to buy the wheat in Canada, there is sound basis for concluding that the grant has been of material assistance in the United Kingdom curtailment of dollar imports.

Insofar as the grant operates to enable the United Kingdom to reduce dollar imports it should be an influential factor in alleviating the drain on United Kingdom dollar resources.[11]

In this connection, however, it should be noted that at the time the grant was announced Secretary Brannan stated that the United Kingdom agreement to purchase $30,000,000 of United States wheat was "made possible" by the relief to the United Kingdom dollar position resulting from the grant.[12]

Since the $30,000,000 purchase will be made with ECA funds, which otherwise would have been available for the purchase of other commodities, that statement implies that such other goods will be bought with free dollars released by the grant. If such other items are not purchased, then there can be no cause-and-effect relationship between the grant and the diversion of $30,000,000 of ECA grant funds for wheat.

And to the extent that the $175,000,000 free dollars released by the ECA grant are used to purchase goods which otherwise would have been bought with ECA money, the relief to the United Kingdom dollar situation would not be substantial.

BENEFITS TO UNITED STATES AGRICULTURE

The extent to which the export of United States agricultural exports has been, or will be enhanced by the arrangement is problematical.

The degree to which the lifting of the Canadian embargo on the importation of fresh fruits and vegetables will increase the export of such commodities cannot be accurately measured. Mr. Gustave Burmeister, of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, USDA, points out in a letter that available data is not conclusive largely because of the short periods involved and because of the shifting dates of application and relaxation of the embargo on these commities. [13]

In addition, it must be noted that Canadian tariffs ranging from 10 percent during the Canadian offseasons to prohibitive heights during the Canadian fruit and vegetable seasons remain effective.

However, the following tabulations compare exports of fresh fruits and vegetables from the United States to Canada during October and November of the respective years:

Fresh fruits:	
1946	$6,761,000
1947	5,118,000
1948	3,961,000
1949	5,039,000
Fresh vegetables:	
1946	$1,287,000
1947	1,569,000
1948	701,000
1949	1,916,000

Compared to the estimated ECA program of June 1949, which called for the United Kingdom to purchase $11,500,000 of wheat in the United States, the agreement to take $30,000,000 worth, or about 15,800,000 bushels (wheat and wheat equivalent in flour), represents a gain of some 9,500,000 bushels for export. However, it is not possible to determine the extent to which that purchase will enhance total United States wheat exports.

If Canada, for example, should move the 12,000,000 bushels cut-back from the 1946 contract with the United Kingdom into markets otherwise available to the United States, in order to meet Canadian export goals for 1949–50, the extent of the gain would be largely nullified.

Relative over-all wheat situations of the United States and Canada are indicated by the tabulation following: [14]

	1948–49		1949–50	
	United States	Canada	United States	Canada
1. Stocks start of year	186	78	307	101
2. New crop	1,314	393	1,146	367
3. Total supply	1,512	471	1,454	468
4. Carry-over end of year	307	101	[1] 414	[1] 84–94
5. Exports	503	232	[1] 350	[1] 226–236

[1] Estimated. Later unofficial estimates by U. S. Department of Agriculture indicate a United States carry-over of 450 million bushels on July 1, 1950.

It is noteworthy that while estimates indicate that United States exports for 1949–50 will decline at least one-third from the preceding year, Canadian exports for 1949–50 probably will approximate those of 1948–49. In addition, the estimated Canadian carry-over on August 1, 1950 will probably be less than the preceding one by several million bushels, while the corresponding United States carry-over will be one of the largest in history.

In this connection it is pertinent to note that wheat producers in this country are being subjected to wheat acreage restrictions, with reductions averaging about 14 percent. Canadian farmers, on the other hand, will continue to operate without crop controls, and are expected to seed a near maximum wheat acreage in 1950.

United Kingdom wheat purchases from Canada pursuant to the 1945 contract constitute a large portion of estimated Canadian exports, with the 88,000,000 bushels financed with ECA money accounting for approximately 37 to 39 percent of the estimated exports.

And it also is noteworthy that such purchase constitutes a significant factor in the relative 1945–50 positions of the United States and Canada under the International Wheat Agreement; which, as of the latter part of February 1950, are indicated by the following tabulation:

	United States	Canada
1. Quota (bushels)	168,069,635	203,069,635
2. Total sales (bushels)	[1] 69,015,877	[2] 153,881,722
3. Sales to United Kingdom (bushels)	[1] 9,834,321	[2] 120,539,869

[1] Confirmed by CCC through Feb. 28, 1950.
[2] Recorded by Wheat Council through Feb. 24, 1950.

At the time of the $175,000,000 ECA grant Secretary Brannan expressed the view that if the United Kingdom had been compelled to buy such wheat in the United States the only net result would have been "a compensating shift of Canadian exports to markets which the United States would otherwise supply." [15]

Conceding that some disruption of normal markets may have been the result, it is pertinent to note that USDA estimates are that the United States quota under the International Wheat Agreement, for 1945–50, will not be filled.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT

In pertinent part section 112 (d) of the Economic Cooperation Act, as amended, provides that where a surplus agricultural commodity is available in the United States in quantities sufficient to meet the requirements of the participating countries the Ad-

[9] Letter to Secretary Brannan; for full text see appendix A.

[10] ECA, Country Data Book, United Kingdom, 1950, table II–1.

[11] It may be noted, although the improvement cannot be attributed entirely to the reduction of dollar imports, that by December 1949 United Kingdom gold and official dollar units had increased to about $1,690,000,000—an increase of approximately $200,000,000 over September 1949.

[12] Appendix A.

[13] Text of the letter, with attached tables, is attached hereto as appendix C.

[14] Source: USDA. All figures in millions of bushels.

[15] Letter of Administrator Hoffman; for full text see appendix A.

ministrator, "insofar as practicable and where in furtherance of the purposes of" the statute, shall require that ECA grant fund purchases of such commodity be made in the United States.[16]

In addition, section 102[17] provides that no assistance contemplated by the act "shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States."

Adopting the premise that the United Kingdom could not eliminate the purchase of the quantity of wheat procurable with the $175,000,000 ECA grant and that by reason of the 1946 contract was obliged to buy the wheat from Canada, the ECA grant can be justified as permissible under the law.

One of the declared purposes of the statute is to give assistance to further "the restoration or maintenance of the soundness of European currencies, budgets, and finances."[18]

From the premise stated, and available data supports the premise, it can be argued that the $175,000,000 grant properly was designed to alleviate the United Kingdom dollar situation by enabling it to reduce free dollar imports. Furthermore, it can be urged that because of the United Kingdom 1946 contract obligations it would not have been practicable to condition the grant upon the purchase of United States wheat—the alternative to the grant being to force the purchase of Canadian wheat with free dollars—and that no potential market for United States exports was destroyed.

However, it must be noted that domestic wheat surpluses constitute a major economic problem, and that the Canadian 1949–50 wheat situation is relatively more favorable than that of the United States.

Section 112 (d) is intended to foster the maximum use of domestic surpluses compatible with the basic purposes of the law. Accordingly, we have inquired to determine whether at the time the $175,000,000 grant was arranged the possibility of effectuating a reduction in the United Kingdom's obligation under the 1946 contract with Canada, to permit purchases of United States wheat, was explored.

We are informed that the matter was discussed, but to date we have been unable to determine the extent of the discussion. Therefore, we cannot state what efforts ECA made to effectuate such a program.

There is attached as appendix D hereto a tabulation comparing the estimated ECA food and agriculture program for the United Kingdom, presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee in June 1949, with a current estimate of that program made in March 1950. Wheat purchases from the United States now show an increase of $18,500,000 from the April 1949 estimates. However, it now appears that during 1949–50 the United Kingdom will take $119,900,000 less of United States foodstuffs and agricultural commodities than was contemplated in April 1949, and by reason of the wheat grant will take with ECA funds $113,600,000 more of Canadian commodities than was contemplated at that time.

In the reshuffle of the United Kingdom's ECA-financed purchases of food and agricultural products, cotton bore the brunt of the reduction necessitated by the Canadian wheat transaction. As is shown in appendix D, the proposed expenditure of $175,000,000 for United States cotton has been cut back to $75,500,000 in the latest ECA estimate, a reduction of $96,500,000. At the same time planned purchases of $58,500,000 worth of coarse grains such as corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghums were eliminated completely from the United Kingdom's ECA-financed budget.

Appendix E, attached hereto, shows ECA authorizations for various agricultural commodities from the inception of the ECA program through December 31, 1949. Among the commodities tested, which include basic domestic surpluses, wheat and wheat flour are the only ones for which substantial offshore authorizations have been issued.

APPENDIX A

WASHINGTON, September 15.—The Economic Cooperation Administration agreed today to permit Great Britain to use ECA funds to purchase $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat in an effort to alleviate the critical drain on British gold and dollar holdings.

The agreement came after consultations between ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman and Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan on the British dollar crisis and the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of the United States.

The Secretary said he believed Mr. Hoffman's proposed action was "fully warranted." He has issued the following statement:

"The effect of ECA's decision will be beneficial to United States farmers as a whole, including wheat producers, because it will increase our foreign markets for a number of agricultural products and help to maintain a traditional pattern of international trade with England, Canada, and other countries which has been beneficial and can continue to be beneficial to farmers of this country.

"To wheat farmers it should mean as large, if not larger market, for exportable wheat this year. What ECA has done is help England pay for wheat which they had contracted to take from Canada during the last year of the 4-year British-Canadian wheat pact. However, England has agreed to buy $30,000,000 of wheat (about 15,000,000 bushels) from the United States which had not been previously planned. This has been made possible by the relief to British dollar resources resulting from Administrator Hoffman's action.

"Under the International Wheat Agreement, Canada has an export quota of about 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. Any sales under the British-Canadian contract count on that quota. If the British were to shift purchases from Canada to the United States this would entitle Canada to claim other outlets under the wheat agreement which we expect and prefer to fulfill.

"Due to the relief being granted by ECA, the U. K. will also buy $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of United States perishable surplus agricultural commodities that had not been planned. These purchases will help relieve our growing surplus of these commodities.

"Finally, Canada will reexamine restrictions on import of fruits and vegetables with the view of giving relief where possible from restrictions that are especially burdensome to United States producers.

"In the final analysis, the action taken by Administrator Hoffman, which I believe was fully warranted under the circumstances, will enhance our export marketing not only for the American wheat farmer but for the entire agricultural economy."

Since March 1949 ECA has not financed the purchase of wheat from any source other than the United States. As a result, Great Britain has been spending its free dollar reserves to meet the deficit in its Canadian accounts, a substantial element of which consists of Canadian wheat.

The ECA action permits Marshall plan financing for a little more than half of the $309,000,000 worth of wheat which Great Britain will purchase from Canada during the current fiscal year under British-Canadian wheat-buying programs.

Greater flexibility in the use of Marshall plan dollars by Great Britain was one of seven measures adopted during the Anglo-American-Canadian monetary conference to relieve the British dollar crisis.

In addition to authorizing the use of ECA funds to pay for part of the United Kingdom's Canadian wheat purchases, ECA also agreed to finance certain "vessel disbursements" by the United Kingdom which were heretofore ineligible for ECA payment. The vessel disbursements are for bunker fuel purchases which require payment in dollars and port and harbor expenses which can be documented. They amount to about $30,000,000.

ECA said it is exploring the possibility of making other nonagricultural commodities and services, which are causing a drain on Britain's dollar reserves, eligible for ECA financing. ECA emphasized that while the agreements broaden the use of Marshall plan dollars they do not increase the amount of dollar aid for the United Kingdom.

Administrator Hoffman and Secretary Brannan, in an exchange of letters concerning the proposal to finance a portion of the British purchases of Canadian wheat, agreed on the importance of checking the drain on British dollar holdings.

"Recently, there has been a very severe drain on United Kingdom gold and dollar reserves," Mr. Hoffmna said, "This drain, if not halted, would quite certainly vitiate the progress toward economic rehabilitation and recovery which the United Kingdom has made and remove all prospects of achieving the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act, not only in the United Kingdom but in all probability in the other countries participating in the European recovery program."

Secretary Brannan, in reply to Hoffman, said the interest of his Department centers about the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of the United States.

"We believe, as stated in your letter, that the financing by ECA of a portion of the wheat moving under the United Kingdom-Canada agreement will not diminish the over-all exports of United States wheat but may even result in a slight increase, and, in view of the other measures which you point out will be taken, the proposed action will facilitate an increase of United States exports of other agricultural commodities to Canada and the United Kingdom," Mr. Brannan said. "The Department's statutory responsibility in this matter is to determine whether our supply of wheat is in excess of domestic requirements. The determination that such a surplus exists presents a situation for the consideration by you of your discretionary authority under the Foreign Assistance Act. The combination of the circumstances recited in your letter and in this response, we believe, fully warrants the action which you propose to take in facilitating the purchase by the United Kingdom of Canadian wheat."

Mr. Hoffman said that as a part of the general arrangements the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States about $30,000,000 worth of United States wheat. In addition, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase eight to ten million dollars' worth of perishable surplus agricultural commodities in the United States.

During the discussions leading to the decision to finance with ECA funds a portion of the United Kingdom purchases of Canadian wheat, the Canadian Government reaffirmed its policy to keep under constant review its restrictions on the import into

[16] 22 U. S. C., sec. 1510 (d).
[17] 22 U. S. C., sec. 1501.
[18] Sec. 102; 22 U. S. Code, sec. 1501.

Canada of United States fruits and vegetables. It is understood that in the process special consideration will be given to those instances where such restrictions are especially burdensome to United States producers.

Copies of the Hoffman and Brannan letters are attached.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 13, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, one of the measures proposed by the United Kingdom during the three-power financial conferences was the financing with Economic Cooperation Administration grant funds of the British requirements for wheat from Canada.

The facts, with which you are familiar, are these:

The United Kingdom is the traditional and normal outlet for the major portion of wheat exported by Canada. Three years ago these countries entered into an agreement under which the United Kingdom was to purchase 140 to 160 million bushels of wheat annually from Canada. The quantity of wheat involved for 1949–50, the final year covered by the agreement, is 140,000,000 bushels at an agreed price of $2 a bushel, in store at Fort William. The total dollar f. a. s. cost of the wheat involved for 1949–50 amounts to $309,000,000.

You have on several occasions advised us that wheat is a surplus agricultural commodity under the provisions of section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, and it is my understanding that this condition still prevails. Effective with deliveries after the first calendar quarter of 1949, the ECA discontinued authorizing the use of its funds for the purchase of Canadian wheat, and, as a consequence, the United Kingdom has been using its free dollar reserves to meet the deficit in its Canadian accounts, a substantial element of which consists of Canadian wheat.

Recently, there has been a very severe drain on United Kingdom gold and dollar reserves. This drain, if not halted, would quite certainly vitiate the progress toward economic rehabilitation and recovery which the United Kingdom has made and remove all prospects of achieving the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act, not only in the United Kingdom but in all probability in the other countries participating in the European Recovery program. It is, therefore, a vital necessity to take all steps possible to end the drain on British gold and dollar reserves.

In an effort to avoid this grave contingency and to extend such help as is within our power, we propose, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act, to agree in part to the British proposal and authorize the use of $175,000,000 of ECA grant funds to finance a portion of this year's purchases of Canadian wheat by the United Kingdom. Aside from the vital importance of such action to European recovery, we believe that the proposed action is also in the interests of agricultural producers in this country in that it will not result in any over-all decrease in United States wheat exports and will facilitate additional exports of other agricultural commodities, both to Canada and the United Kingdom.

As part of the general arrangements under which it is proposed that ECA funds be used to finance part of the U. K. purchases of Canadian wheat, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States some $30,000,000 worth of United States wheat. Consequently, net exports of United States wheat may be slightly larger as a result of the proposed action. Furthermore, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of perishable surplus agricultural commodities in the United States. Without the contribution which the financing of $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat will make to the British dollar position, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the United Kingdom to purchase these commodities.

The Canadian Government reaffirmed its policy to keep under constant review its restrictions on the import into Canada of fruits and vegetables from the United States. It is my understanding that in reviewing these restrictions the Canadian Government will give special consideration to those instances where the import restrictions are especially burdensome to United States producers.

In view of the above considerations, it will be appreciated if you would advise us whether you have any objection to the proposed ECA financing of the purchase by the United Kingdom of $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat during the current fiscal year.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 14, 1949.

Hon. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: This is in reference to your letter of September 13, 1949, in which you discuss the proposal that the Economic Cooperation Administration authorize the use of $175,000,000 of grant funds to finance purchases of approximately 80,000,000 bushels of wheat by the United Kingdom from Canada during the year 1949–50.

You are correct in your understanding that wheat at this time is surplus to our domestic requirements and, therefore, is a surplus agricultural commodity under the provisions of section 112 (d) of the Foreign Assistance Act. Your letter, however, sets forth the disruptive effect upon the economic recovery of the participating nations that would flow from a failure to adopt the proposal. You propose, therefore, to exercise your authority under the act to arrange for the financing referred to above, and you request our comments on the proposed action.

We are, of course, familiar with the importance of the proposal to the furtherance of European recovery; however, the interest of this Department naturally centers about the effect of the proposed action on the agricultural economy of this country.

As you state, Great Britain is a traditional outlet for much of Canada's wheat and is under agreement with Canada covering purchases of one hundred and forty to one hundred and sixty million bushels annually. The failure by the United Kingdom to take the 80,000,000 bushels from Canada would result in a very large Canadian excess. Canada would, of necessity, be forced to use every means at its command, including price reductions, to dispose of these stocks in other markets, which would be largely those now supplied in whole or in part by the United States. Moreover, as an exporting country under the International Wheat Agreement, Canada, like the United States, is assured of a market for its guaranteed sales of wheat. These purchases by the United Kingdom would be chargeable to the guaranteed sales of the exporting country. If the United States were to sell any part of this quantity of wheat under question to the United Kingdom, Canada would, therefore, have the right to sell a similar quantity to other importing countries under the International Wheat Agreement. Many of these other countries are our traditional markets which we desire to retain.

Thus, the only net result of a switch from Canada to the United States of any sizable portion of the United Kingdom requirements for wheat would be a compensating shift of Canadian exports to markets which the United States would otherwise supply. There would, in consequence, be no net advantage to American wheat producers.

We believe, as stated in your letter, that the financing by ECA of a portion of the wheat moving under the United Kingdom-Canada agreement will not diminish the over-all exports of United States wheat but may even result in a slight increase, and, in view of the other measures which you point out will be taken, the proposed action will facilitate an increase of United States exports of other agricultural commodities to Canada and the United Kingdom. It is observed also that, as part of the general arrangements, the United Kingdom has agreed to purchase directly from the United States some $30,000,000 worth of our wheat and also to purchase from the United States from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 worth of perishable agricultural commodities.

The Department's statutory responsibility in this matter is to determine whether our supply of wheat is in excess of domestic requirements. The determination that such a surplus exists presents a situation for the consideration by you of your discretionary authority under the Foreign Assistance Act. The combination of the circumstances recited in your letter and in this response we believe fully warrants the action which you propose to take in facilitating the purchase by the United Kingdom of Canadian wheat.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

APPENDIX B

The Government of Canada and the Government of the United Kingdom, recognizing that their mutual interest in the maintenance of reasonable prices and adequate supplies of wheat for consumers and of steady and remunerative prices for producers can best be met by international cooperation in the expansion of world trade and employment, have entered into the following arrangements designed to insure a measure of security in the supply of stability in the price of wheat supplied by Canada to the United Kingdom:

1. (a) The United Kingdom Government undertakes to purchase and the Canadian Government undertakes to sell the following quantities of Canadian wheat, which quantities include wheat to be processed into flour for sale to the United Kingdom Government—

(i) within the crop year 1946–47, 160,000,000 bushels;

(ii) within the crop year 1947–48, 160,000,000 bushels;

(iii) within the crop year 1948–49, 140,000,000 bushels; and

(iv) within the crop year 1949–50, 140,000,000 bushels.

A bushel shall be of the weight of 60 pounds avoirdupois.

(b) In the event of the United Kingdom requiring from Canada any additional quantities of wheat that the Canadian Government is prepared to make available, such additional quantities which the Canadian Government offers and the United Kingdom Government accepts shall in all respects be subject to the provisions of this agreement.

(c) Of the total quantity of wheat specified above for each crop year, the United Kingdom Government agrees to take the following quantity in long tons in the form of flour:

1946–47: 500,000 tons as a minimum, with an additional quantity not exceeding 140,000 tons to be determined by negotiations in the light of the out-turn of the crop.

1947–48: 400,000 tons as a minimum, with an additional quantity not exceeding 140,000 tons to be determined by negotiations in the light of the out-turn of the crop.

1948–49: 300,000 tons as a minimum, the actual tonnage to be negotiated by July 1, 1947.

1949–50: 300,000 tons as a minimum, the actual tonnage to be negotiated by July 1, 1948.

(d) The rate and place of deliveries of wheat and flour shall be determined from time to time by mutual agreement.

2. (a) The price per bushel to be paid by the United Kingdom Government to the Canadian Government, on the basis No. 1 Manitoba Northern, in store Fort William, Port Arthur, Vancouver, or Churchill, shall be as follows:

(i) In respect of wheat bought and sold in the crop year 1946–47, $1.55.

(ii) In respect of wheat bought and sold in the crop year 1947–48, $1.55.

(iii) In respect of wheat bought and sold in the crop year 1948–49, not less that $1.25.

(iv) In respect of wheat bought and sold in the crop year 1949–50, not less than $1.00.

(b) The actual prices to be paid for wheat to be bought and sold within the crop year 1948–49 shall be negotiated and settled between the United Kingdom Government and the Canadian Government not later than December 31, 1947, and prices for wheat to be bought and sold within the crop year 1949–50 shall be negotiated and settled not later than December 31, 1948. In determining the prices for these two crop years, 1948–49 and 1949–50, the United Kingdom Government will have regard to any difference between the prices paid under this Agreement in the 1946–47 and 1947–48 crop years and the world prices for wheat in the 1946–47 and 1947–48 crop years.

(c) The prices to be paid for grades other than No. 1 Manitoba Northern to be delivered under this agreement shall be determined yearly in consultation between the United Kingdom Government and the Canadian Government.

(d) In addition to the prices detailed in section (a) of this article, the United Kingdom Government undertakes to pay such carrying and forwarding charges as may be mutually arranged.

(e) Payment shall be made in full in Canadian funds at par Winnipeg by the United Kingdom Payments Office against presentation of completed statements of claim or otherwise as may be mutually agreed.

3. It is agreed that the United Kingdom Government may sell or dispose of the wheat and flour purchased under this agreement in whatsoever manner the United Kingdom Government may deem expedient both in regard to destination and price.

4. (a) The Canadian Government will use its best endeavors to arrange that the quantities of wheat set out in article 1 (a) shall at all times be available and at the disposal of the United Kingdom Government within the stipulated dates and in accordance with the rates and places of delivery determined under section (d) of article 1 of this agreement.

(b) The United Kingdom Government will use its best endeavors to arrange for the provision of the required ocean tonnage within the stipulated dates and in accordance with the rates and places of delivery determined under section (d) of article 1 of this agreement.

5. It is agreed that the detailed terms and conditions relating to such matters as carrying and forwarding charges, grades, routing of shipments and all other matters incidental to the fulfillment of this agreement shall be discussed and settled from time to time and incorporated in documents to form annexures to this agreement.

6. It is mutually understood that matters arising from, or incidental to, the operation of this agreement may at the instance of either party become subjects of discussion between the parties to this agreement.

7. Having in mind the general purposes which this agreement is designed to serve, the two governments have agreed that its terms and conditions shall be subject to any modification or amendment which may be necessary to bring it into conformity with any international agreements or arrangements hereafter entered into to which both governments are parties.

Done in duplicate, in Ottawa, on the 24th day of July 1946.

For the Government of Canada:

JAS. A. MACKINNON.

For the Government of the United Kingdom:

P. A. CLUTTERBUCK.

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS
Washington, D. C.

Mr. R. S. NELSON,
Senate Agriculture Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. NELSON: Reference is made to your telephone request concerning the quantity and value of fresh fruit and vegetable imports into Canada during the last quarter of 1949 as compared with previous corresponding periods.

As I told you on the telephone, the December figures are not available at this time so we have included only data for October and November of each year—1946–49. These data are not too suitable for the purpose for which they are intended largely because of the short periods involved and because of the shifting dates of application and relaxation of the embargo on these commodities. For instance, the embargo on many of these fruits and vegetables first became effective on November 18, 1947; it was relaxed on certain items in November and December 1948, and on all of them in October 1949. Also apples, citrus fruits, onions, and potatoes were put under a quota provision with the quotas changing from time to time. Nevertheless the data show an improvement somewhat in 1949 over that of the two previous comparable periods but in the case of fruits was less than in 1946.

For your information, I am including another set of tables including information on trade in general with Canada and some details on fruits and vegetables on an annual basis.

Very truly yours,

GUSTAVE BURMEISTER,
Head, Division of Fruits, Vegetables, and Sugar.

Canada: Imports of fresh fruit from the United States, quantity and value, October and November, specified year

Commodity	1946	1947	1948	1949
QUANTITY	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*	*Thous.*
Apples.....Pounds	1	6	-------	332
Apricots.....do	8	11	-------	13
Cherries.....do	0	-------	-------	-------
Grapefruit.....do	18,790	15,186	18,518	10,105
Grapes.....do	25,227	26,040	25,102	40,236
Lemons.....Boxes	65	71	32	25
Muskmelons....Pounds	291	328	-------	1,218
Melons.....Number	2	1	-------	25
Oranges.....Boxes	646	670	630	522
Peaches.....Pounds	0	8,077	-------	49
Pears.....do	3,277	5,281	-------	1,832
Pineapple.....Crate	(1)	(1)	-------	1
Plums.....Pounds	45	717	-------	260
Cranberries.....do	1,827	1,702	1	2,731
Raspberries.....do	-------	-------	-------	-------
Strawberries.....do	-------	-------	-------	5
VALUE	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*
Apples	(1)	(1)	-------	12
Apricots	(1)	1	-------	1
Cherries	0	-------	-------	-------
Grapefruit	676	472	413	498
Grapes	2,124	1,321	1,426	1,963
Lemons	402	398	.190	204
Muskmelons	13	16	-------	62
Melons	1	(1)	-------	7
Oranges	2,863	1,941	1,932	1,820
Peaches	-------	300	-------	3
Pears	187	235	-------	96
Pineapple	(1)	1	-------	4
Plums	3	36	-------	16
Cranberries	492	397	(1)	353
Raspberries	-------	-------	-------	-------
Strawberries	-------	-------	-------	1
Total	6,761	5,118	3,961	5,039

Canada: Imports of fresh vegetables from the United States, quantity and value, October and November, specified years

Commodity	1946	1947	1948	1949
QUANTITY	*Thous. of lbs.*	*Thous. of lbs.*	*Thous. of lbs.*	*Thous. of lbs.*
Asparagus	(1)	-------	-------	5
Beans, green	852	491	-------	883
Beets, except sugar	0	-------	-------	136
Cabbage	45	5	-------	7
Carrots	207	80	-------	1,927
Cauliflower	736	501	-------	787
Celery	12	351	-------	454
Cucumbers	360	158	-------	887
Lettuce	9,625	10,783	7,579	8,945
Mushrooms	3	(1)	-------	(1)
Onions	969	208	311	2,593
Peas	33	96	-------	43
Potatoes:				
Sweet	3,219	2,985	123	4,964
White	358	184	-------	451
Spinach	176	278	3	287
Tomatoes	8,432	11,112	6,116	8,682
Others	815	856	1	1,289
VALUE	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*
Asparagus	(1)	-------	-------	1
Beans green	84	54	-------	72
Beets, except sugar	0	-------	-------	2
Cabbage	1	(1)	-------	(1)
Carrots	4	4	-------	32
Cauliflower	25	19	-------	30
Celery	1	21	-------	18
Cucumbers	28	19	-------	53
Lettuce	360	431	256	497
Mushrooms	6	1	-------	(1)
Onions	28	13	8	114
Peas	5	11	-------	5
Potatoes:				
Sweet	159	143	5	270
White	4	6	-------	11
Spinach	7	22	(1)	19
Tomatoes	512	769	432	675
Others	63	56	(1)	117
Total	1,287	1,569	701	1,916

[1] Less than 500.

Compiled from Trade of Canada.

APPENDIX D

ECA program for United Kingdom—Food and agriculture: 1949–50

[Millions of dollars]

Commodity	Estimated, April 1949 [1]				Estimated, March 1950			
	Total	United States [2]	Canada [2]	Latin America and Philippines [2]	Total	United States [2]	Canada [2]	Latin America and Philippines [2]
Food, total	147.0	38.5	73.5	35.0	265.3	33.8	187.1	44.4
Bread grain	11.5	11.5			205.0	30.0	175.0	
Fats and oils								
Sugar	35.0			35.0	44.4			44.4
Meats	57.6		57.6		12.1		12.1	
Dairy products	31.5	15.6	15.9					
Other foods	11.4	11.4			3.8	3.8		
Feed and fertilizer, total	59.6	59.6			.6	0.6		
Coarse grains	58.5	58.5						
Protein feeds								
Fertilizer	1.1	1.1			.6	.6		
Natural fibers, total	172.0	172.0			81.0	79.4		1.6
Cotton	172.0	172.0			75.5	75.5		
Wool								
Other					5.5	3.9		1.6
Tobacco	45.9	45.9			85.7	85.7		
Other agricultural commodities	9.0	9.0			5.6	5.6		
Total	433.5	325.0	73.5	35.0	438.2	205.1	187.1	46.0
Changes from April estimate					+4.7	−119.9	+113.6	+11.0

[1] Estimate presented to Senate Appropriations Committee, June 1949.
[2] Countries of origin.

Source: Economic Cooperation Administration.

APPENDIX E

ECA procurement authorizations

[Millions of dollars]

Commodity	1948		1949							
	Apr. 3 to Dec. 31		Jan. 1 to Apr. 2		Apr. 3 to June 30		July 1 to Sept. 30		Oct. 1 to Dec. 31	
	Total	United States	Total	United States	Total	United States	Total	United States	Total	United States
Coarse grains	89.2	81.8	43.8	43.7	19.3	19.3	43.8	43.8	57.8	57.8
Corn	58.2	58.2	34.0	34.0	12.8	12.8	27.8	27.8	45.3	45.3
Other	31.0	23.5	9.8	9.7	6.5	6.5	16.0	16.1	12.5	12.5
Dairy products	70.3	60.0	11.6	11.6	39.9	39.9	−13.6	−13.6	3.0	3.0
Cheese	41.4	31.2	9.4	9.4	38.5	38.5	−15.8	−15.8	.4	.4
Other	28.9	28.8	2.2	2.2	1.4	1.4	2.2	2.2	2.6	2.6
Cotton	285.4	285.1	106.9	106.9	150.1	150.1	134.6	134.6	184.3	184.3
Tobacco	106.4	102.3	18.3	17.7	16.9	16.9	107.4	107.4	20.6	20.6
Wheat	548.1	343.5	112.6	61.4	79.6	79.6	85.3	45.3	89.0	30.3
Wheat flour	169.6	120.4	25.4	15.7	12.1	12.1	12.6	2.5	8.1	7.0

Totals—Apr. 3, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949

[Millions of dollars]

Commodity	Total	United States	Column 3 as percent of column 2
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Coarse grains	254.0	246.5	97.8
Dairy products	111.2	100.9	90.7
Cotton	861.3	861.0	99.9
Tobacco	269.6	264.9	98.2
Wheat	914.6	560.1	61.2
Wheat flour	227.8	157.7	69.2

Source: ECA reports to Congress and ECA Procurement Authorizations, Dec. 31, 1949.

COMMUNIST OUTRAGES IN GUATEMALA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this afternoon when some remarks were made in relation to the possibility of a bipartisan foreign policy, I was reminded of the fact that distant pastures always look greener. Paraphrasing that expression, I might say that possibly redder pastures appear in the distance in Europe and in China. I want to call attention to the fact that right on this continent we have a red pasture.

Mr. President, throughout my period in the United States Senate, I have emphasized my firm belief in our closely adhering to the American system of separation of powers and checks and balances. I believe, for example, that in the field of foreign policy, the direction and execution of that policy is the jurisdiction of the executive branch through our President and his Secretary of State. I have never attempted to interfere within that jurisdiction. I have, however, sought to fulfill the constitutional mandate for Congress to advise and consent in the formulation of foreign policy.

I mention this matter now because I think that it is particularly important in view of the present melee over this issue of bipartisan foreign policy. With charges and countercharges filling the air, it is essential, I believe, that those of us who are deeply concerned with obtaining an effective, strong, foreign policy should take action leading to a meeting of the minds on this question. I believe that for a bipartisan foreign policy to be truly bipartisan, the suggestions of the members of the minority should earnestly be considered and evaluated. It is with these thoughts in the background that I should like to submit the following statement in relation to

a situation nearby that calls for consultation. Perhaps this might provide an open sesame for this consultation process.

Mr. President, I refer to a series of disgraceful actions prompted by Communists in Guatemala—actions which I believe constitute a grave affront to the American Government and a critical threat to pan-American unity. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I protest, therefore, with all the vigor at my command against the following:

RED REQUEST FOR UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR'S RECALL OUTRAGEOUS

First. The outrageous request of the Guatemalan Government to the United States for the removal of American Ambassador Richard C. Patterson, Jr., on the completely phony and trumped-up ground of interference in the domestic affairs of that country. This charge is, of course, completely groundless and is simply a part of the over-all Red smear campaign against North American, Wall Street imperialism carried on by the Reds of Guatemala and other Latin American countries. If we dare to so much as sneeze in their direction, the Reds scream "imperialism."

Second. I protest, second, against the threats against the life of America's Guatemalan envoy—Mr. Patterson—and the information that was given to him that in the event he did not leave, the government supposedly would not be responsible for his life, because of what it said was danger from irresponsible elements. Since when do we allow a United States envoy to be subject to threats of assassination? Would Great Britain tolerate such an affront?

Third. The miserable action which occurred at the Central American Olympics in Guatemala City several weeks ago when the Star-Spangled Banner was initially not played, although the anthems of other nations were played in honor of the athletes of those countries. This anthem incident is merely a symbol, of course, of the hate and the nefarious actions of the Guatemalan Reds.

Fourth. The whole series of vicious actions taken against American business interests in Guatemala—actions which threaten to grow far worse.

Fifth. The Red-inspired smear campaign carried on in elements of the Guatemalan press against the United States of America.

RED HOTBED IS NOT ISOLATED PROBLEM

Mr. President, this Guatemalan Red hotbed is not simply an isolated problem—nor merely a case of innocuous leftism. It is a definite Red pattern transplanted to the Western Hemisphere from the lands beyond the iron curtain. While our eyes have been diverted to the Communist threat in Europe and the Communist advances in Asia, we have become blind to the Politburo's plotters in our own backyard who have been making Red hay in our own hemisphere, within a few flying miles of the vital Panama Canal. Senor Toledano of Mexico—head of the pro-Communist labor federation—affiliated with the pro-Red World Federation of Trade Unions, has been intensely busy in his continental network of conspiracy as evidenced by this crisis.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that unless the sternest and most vigorous action is taken by the United States Government in this Guatemalan situation, then the following will result:

DANGERS IF UNITED STATES DOES NOT ACT FAST

First. Pan American union and solidarity will become a farce and a travesty.

Second. The Reds throughout the South American countries will receive tremendous encouragement and will step up their anti-American tempo.

Third. The United States will suffer a grave loss of prestige throughout this hemisphere and the world. If a relatively small nation the size of Guatemala can get away with the sort of actions she has indulged in—a nation less than three and a half million people in population—if the Reds there can poke their thumbs in Uncle Sam's eyes, step on Uncle Sam's feet, hurl insults at Uncle Sam, threaten his envoy, in effect, practically throw out his envoy on completely unwarranted grounds, then the United States, which pretends to be a leader of the world, can just as well take a back seat in international affairs and can classify herself as a fourth-class power.

It is ridiculous that we should be spending $3,000,000,000 in foreign aid in Europe, that we should be contemplating a huge four-point program, when here in our own hemisphere a relatively small country is using Uncle Sam as a punching bag. We, Mr. President, do not, of course, evaluate any people merely on their numbers or their resources. Small-sized nations can be great as can their larger cousins. But the Reds will not lose sight of the propaganda value of this small nation pulling Uncle Sam's whiskers.

I AM NO DEFENDER OF IMPERIALISM

Mr. President, I for one, despise jingoism and chauvinism. I am no defender of imperialism, no defender of exploitation. I have never asked my Government and my people to take any action designed to humiliate any people or push any people around or design for selfish, self-aggrandizement. But I realize, just as the Communists realize, that we are battling for the minds of men throughout the world and the people of the world will have nothing but contempt for the America giant unless we take stern action.

WILL STATE DEPARTMENT SIMPLY EXCHANGE NOTES?

I congratulate our State Department for having rejected categorically the outrageous charges filed against American Ambassador Patterson. However, I do not believe that the State Department contemplates anything more than the meaningless exchange of notes between our own Government and the Guatemalan Government. And I say that far more than literary lullabies are necessary in this situation, or else it will lead to a gigantic flop in foreign policy which will go far beyond the disgraceful Chinese debacle wherein we have practically turned over all of Asia to the Reds.

GUATEMALAN PEOPLE RESPECT UNITED STATES

Mr. President, nothing that I am saying now should be construed in the slightest way as an affront to those freedom-loving elements in the Guatemalan Government and to the freedom-loving Guatemalan people. I am satisfied that propably 99 percent of the Guatemalan population loves liberty, loves independence, and has a deep affection for the freedom-loving people of the United States.

However, the Guatemalan Government has shown that apparently it feels the pressure of Communist-led labor unions, as has occurred with other governments elsewhere throughout the world. I am aware that elections are approaching in Guatemala and that this anti-Americanism is being used to whip up sentiment not only against freedom, but against the capitalist system in general and in support of pro-Red candidates. I do believe, however, that it is up to responsible elements in Guatemala to take vigorous action against their own Red minority.

THREE ACTIONS SUGGESTED

I suggest three actions as follows:

First. The Pan American Union should consider stern action to set this situation right. The Pan American Union, after all, was created and is maintained by the 21 American Republics in order to promote peace, commerce, and friendship by fostering economic, social, and cultural relations. If the Pan American Union is to have continued validity, it cannot ignore this situation, anymore than the United States could ignore Red-inspired assaults on a member state.

Second. I suggest that the State Department give serious consideration to a request for immediate withdrawal of the Guatemalan Ambassador from the United States. I call attention to the fact that the United States has, on occasion, thrown out Communist satellite diplomats from America when premeditated action was taken against our representatives in those satellite states abroad.

Third. I respectfully suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. TOM CONNALLY, that he ask Ambassador Richard C. Patterson, Jr., to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in executive session on the Guatemalan crisis.

AMBASSADOR PATTERSON HAS FINE BACKGROUND

In selecting Mr. Patterson as a target for their action, the Reds could hardly have chosen a more able representative of the American way of life and the American Government. I say that on the basis of my study of the Ambassador's record. I have never had the pleasure of meeting him personally or even corresponding with him. Mr. Patterson, a native of Omaha, Nebr., had a long and distinguished business career prior to his Government service. He has served longer as an American diplomat behind iron-curtain countries than any other United States representative abroad. He served in Yugoslavia from 1944 to 1947, and, upon his resignation

it was recorded in the newspapers that one of the warmest letters of regret to a retiring diplomat that has ever been sent was conveyed by President Truman to him.

Ambassador Patterson, a colonel in our Reserve forces, also served as an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and was first appointed Chief of the United States Mission in Guatemala way back in September 1948. To my knowledge, he has conducted American affairs in Guatemala with distinction and complete propriety, and there is no basis whatsoever for the Guatemalan Red charges again him. The only thing they do have against him is that he is an effective, able diplomat—the kind the Reds cannot stomach, the kind they would like to replace by United States milquetoasts.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, Guatemala is the most populous of the Central American Republics. We have nothing but good will for her, and we ask only that she display good will in return. I appeal to the Guatemalan Government, to all responsible elements in the Guatemalan Government, including the Chief Executive, to cooperate with the Pan American Union and with the United States, her good-neighbor friend, to take immediate steps to correct this appalling situation. Guatemala's own prosperity, its own freedom, hang in the balance.

NEW YORK EDITORIALS

I congratulate the American press for clarifying this situation and for its support of the State Department's efforts. I send to the desk two important editorials from the New York Times and the New York Herald-Tribune which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

I ask, finally: Is Uncle Joe Stalin moving his iron curtain to this hemisphere? Let us prevent it before it is too late.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Guatemalan Incident," published in the New York Times of April 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GUATEMALAN INCIDENT

We believe the State Department has acted properly in its prompt and definite response to the oral charges that Ambassador Patterson has interfered in Guatemalan internal affairs. One Department official summarized the case when he said that he was just doing his duty. For this Mr. Patterson was insulted and threatened, although we cannot believe that the majority of the Guatemalan people approved of these actions.

Anti-American feeling has seldom been unknown in most countries south of us. A generation ago there was often good reason for it. That it should still exist in spite of our good-neighbor policy is baffling. It goes particularly vocal in Guatemala when a presidential election impends, and pulling the eagle's feathers is as popular a sport as is the twisting of the lion's tail in which we frequently indulge.

Anti-American feelings sometimes take childish forms. This happened, for example, last February at the Central American Olympic Games in Guatemala City. The national anthem of each participating country was played as the national standard was carried into the arena. When the Puerto Rican athletes entered with the Stars and Stripes, a popular dance melody—of Puerto Rican origin, it is true—was the only recognition. To this Ambassador Patterson made a strong protest. Two days later the Guatemalans unofficially apologized by raising two American flags and playing the Star-Spangled Banner. Less dramatic but more serious has been studied discrimination against American business and businessmen. Ambassador Patterson has undoubtedly spoken forcibly and frequently in these cases. From these protests has developed the current news.

Guatemala is a volcanic country in more ways than one. Its history has been exceptionally unhappy in a region where strife and misery were the rule. Centuries of repression under the Spaniards and generations of the worst type of dictatorship lie behind today's provocative political extremism. The present Guatemalan Government arose out of a revolt against a particularly unsavory dictator. This revolt had at first some promising features. Now it seems fairly obvious that the present leaders of the Guatemalan Government are permitting themselves to be manipulated by Communist revolutionaries. They fail to realize—or for political purposes refuse to admit—that the United States is not trying to block social and economic progress but is interested rather in seeing that Guatemala becomes a liberal democracy and not a totalitarian slave state. We want to be friends with the Guatemalan people, but we do not believe the road to friendship lies through the uncomplaining acceptance of insults and discriminations. We applaud the State Department for its categorical rejection of such a policy.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Guatemala Problem," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GUATEMALA PROBLEM

Guatemala, one of the three problem children of the Caribbean who are already under formal reproof by the Council of the Organization of American States, has chosen to call attention to its backward political affairs in a curiously (and one would suppose unnecessarily) dramatic way. The American Ambassador, Mr. Richard C. Patterson, Jr., arrived in Washington at the end of March for a medical examination. It then appeared that some days before Guatemala had asked for his recall; the request had been an oral one, delivered through the Guatemalan Ambassador in Washington, without bill of particulars, and in what has been described as a friendly manner. But it was surrounded with rumor and allegation—that Ambassador Patterson's life was in danger, that he was interfering in domestic politics, that he was conducting a defamatory campaign against Guatemalan institutions, and so on—all seemingly generated out of the hot politics of Guatemala's current presidential maneuverings.

The State Department has properly and gravely rejected these unsustained oral representations; the Embassy at Guatemala City remains in the hands of a competent chargé and Ambassador Patterson remains, ostensibly at least, in the hands of the doctors. But American opinion, meanwhile, may well have been stirred to take a look at the Guatemalan institutions which the Ambassador is said to have attacked. It may, for example, look up the recent series of articles in which Mr. Fitzhugh Turner, a correspondent for this newspaper, described what is actually going on there. It was a reasonably complete and convincing picture of a small and potentially enormously wealthy country in the hands of a group of leftist politicians, who have allowed their ranks to be heavily infiltrated by Communist sloganeers if not actually Moscow Communists, working up a fine little dictatorship of the officeholders on the well-tried basic recipe of battling Yanqui imperialism.

Along with this there goes an amount of assassination, filibustering, and armed revolution which one once associated only with "banana republics" and which would seem to return Guatemala to that invidious and elsewhere forgotten classification. The United States could, of course, react against the insults which President Arevalo's regime, adopting the manners and the vocabulary of the Kremlin, has been flinging in this direction. We could dismiss the Guatemalan Ambassador, close our Embassy in Guatemala City, remove the numerous missions which are trying to bring economic and educational progress to the little country, and so on. It is doubtful whether the situation either calls for or would be served by such a course. The Guatemalan regime is convicting itself sufficiently of backwardness and rudeness; and it is hardly necessary for the United States to provide its politicians with the electoral issues for which they seem so eager. The Organization of American States is certainly competent to deal with any practical issues that may arise. If the Guatemalan politicians meanwhile want to conduct themselves like a "banana republic" then a "banana republic" is what their country will become.

SUGGESTED EXCHANGE OF SURPLUS AMERICAN COTTON FOR MANCHURIAN SOYBEANS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, Wayne Darrow's Washington Farm Letter of April 22, 1950, reports that the United States Government is about to make a deal with Communist China to exchange a quantity of surplus American cotton for 2,000,000 bushels of Manchurian soybeans.

The Japanese Government would be used as the agent in the swap, with Japan getting the soybeans for domestic use.

I understand that Mr. Darrow is a former employee of the Department of Agriculture and maintains close contacts in that agency. My own inquiries convince me that Mr. Darrow knows whereof he speaks on this matter and that we may expect official announcement of the deal within a few days.

Presumably such a trade will prove beneficial to Red China or its Communist masters would never have consented even to discuss it.

Although we are told that the people of China are starving, their Government is quite willing to rob their bellies further by trading highly nutritious soybeans for cotton which may well be used to clothe its commissars.

Mass starvation is an old Communist tactic. It has been used to break the backs of the Russian people and certainly the present Chinese Government would have no compunctions in employing it.

That the Japanese must import soybeans to augment their own meager supplies of fats and oils goes without saying.

I understand, too, that ECA has allocated substantial amounts for the purchase of soybeans for Germany, Austria and other European nations.

For some reason, however, the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was charged with the job of buying these soybeans for ECA and for Army feeding in Japan, failed to fulfill the orders when they were first placed and when soybeans were available in the domestic market at below parity. Many people wonder why soybeans have gone up in price so much. Let us look at the picture. The present parity price on soybeans is $2.49 per bushel. Actually soybeans today are commanding a price of about $2.95 per bushel in the domestic market. Last winter, however, soybeans were available at $2.25 per bushel and export orders for Army and ECA easily could have been fulfilled then. It would also have helped the market. It would have helped the American farmers who had no storage facilities.

CCC chose to wait until prices moved up considerably. Then they went into the market on a small scale and shot prices even higher.

Now they say American soybean prices are too high and that consequently we must deal with Red China to obtain the quantities necessary to fulfill our export requirements.

Mr. President, I say that at any price whatever, American soybeans are not so high that they should drive our Government to bargain with the Communist Government of China.

Senators must remember that we are supposed to be fighting a cold war against Communists. Senators have heard debate on the floor of the Senate today in which it was stated that the purpose of the Marshall plan was to stop communism.

The April 1, 1950, report of grain stocks on farms, issued by the Department of Agriculture, reveals that there were 44,014,000 bushels of soybeans in the hands of American farmers on that date. This compares with the 1939–48 average of only 34,952,000 bushels of soybeans on the farms as of April 1.

From this it would seem to me that our export commitments could well be filled from American stocks even though its does mean paying the farmer a price somewhat above the official parity.

Farmers are being forced to market so many of their commodities at below parity prices today that it would not be out of place to pay them a little more than parity for one crop. My own State of Indiana is the second largest producer of soybeans. Indiana and Illinois together produce roughly one-half of all the soybeans grown commercially in the United States.

I am moved to wonder what nimblebrain in the State Department hatched this Manchurian soybean deal.

Who conceived this newest method of "stopping communism" by doing business with the Reds themselves?

Is this the first step down the road toward full resumption of trade relations with Red China and eventual recognition of the Red regime? Or are we undertaking a policy of strengthening the Communist government in China by underwriting trade deals designed to starve the people into submission?

Perhaps these are questions which might well be investigated by the Foreign Relations Subcommittee which is now studying Communist influence in the State Department.

I cannot bring myself to believe that this Manchurian soybean deal was conceived by anyone who has the real interests of the United States Government or the welfare of the American farmer at heart.

I believe it should be disavowed at once by responsible officials of the State and Agriculture Departments.

ATTITUDE OF EXECUTIVES OF MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last night, on their invitation, I conferred with the executives of the leading corporations in the motion picture industry. They convinced me that my deep convictions respecting the harm to the American people involved in the exploitation of the immorality of motion-picture performers are shared by them. Those executives, individually and collectively, emphatically assured me of their grave concern and of their well-considered plans to deal with this problem through the adoption of a stringent amendment to their advertising code—an amendment which, they contend, would effectively prevent exploitation in motion picture advertising of misconduct of performers. I readily concede the positive need for additional time, since that problem is greatly involved. To permit that to be done voluntarily and effectively, I am announcing the postponement of the hearings scheduled for May 15 before our committee. I am also requesting the return to Washington of Judge Stephen S. Jackson, special consultant for the committee, who presently is in Hollywood.

Since in recent weeks I have not hesitated to state bluntly that the industry had failed in an important respect, I hope I may soon have the pleasure of commending it heartily for taking an important and far-reaching forward step in the public interest.

Those who were present at last night's meeting, and upon whose integrity and assurances I am relying in good faith, included Messrs. Barney Balaban, president, Paramount Pictures; Theodore Black, vice president, Republic Pictures; Nate Blumberg, president, Universal Pictures; Jack Cohn, vice president, Columbia Pictures; Ned Depinet, president, RKO-Radio Pictures; Joseph H. Hazen, president, Wallace-Hazen Productions; Nicholas M. Schenck, president, Loew's Inc.; Spyros P. Skouras, president, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp.; Maj. Albert Warner, vice president, Warner Bros. Pictures; J. Robert Rubin, vice president, Loew's, Inc.; Eric Johnston, president, Motion Pictures Association; Joseph I. Breen and Francis Harmon, vice presidents, Motion Picture Association; and Joyce O'Hara, of the Motion Picture Association. Mr. Edward Cooper, of the committee staff, accompanied me to the meeting.

I should like to commend Eric Johnston, of the association, for his sincere and enthusiastic efforts in this entire matter. In fairness to Mr. Johnston, I now believe that I did him an injustice some weeks ago, when—in castigating the industry for its laxity in the matter of exploitation of immorality—I suggested that he had the power to prevent such evils. As the president of the Association, he has been and is a wholesome influence for common sense and decency. Yet he does not have the authority usually vested in a czar. I wish he had that power. I hope it may be imposed upon him soon.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may have unanimous consent to yield and not to lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the course we follow in respect to the pending business before the Senate—I refer, of course, to ECA and the several amendments which have been offered thereto—concededly is of great importance to the world, but it is of vital importance to American labor and industry.

Today I received from my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey, a brief statement which includes two exchanges of correspondence; one between Mr. Julius G. Forstmann, president of the Fortsmann Woolen Co., of Passaic, N. J., and Mr. Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator; the second between Charles F. H. Johnson, president of Botany Mills, Inc., of Passaic, N. J., and Mr. William C. Foster, Deputy Administrator of ECA, all of which treats with the problems which confront American manufacturers in exporting dollar goods to Europe in the face of European dollar shortages.

Although time has permitted me only a cursory examination of this correspondence, I am convinced that its careful study by the Members of this body before the debates on ECA are concluded will prove to be extremely helpful and will make a distinct contribution to the discussions on those phases of the matter which relate to the domestic impacts of this program.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the statement of the senior Senator from New Jersey, and all of the correspondence referred to therein, be inserted in the body of the record at this point in my remarks.

In my own behalf, I would like specifically to state that contrary to the views

of my distinguished colleague, I am inclined to concur with the arguments set forth in Mr. Forstmann's letter of April 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement and the correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. President during the consideration of the pending bill to extend the ECA program through the fiscal year 1951 it seems to me important that we should have as complete a record as possible of the problems involved in this important undertaking.

In this connection I should like to make available to the Senate two exchanges of letters which I have had. The first was with Mr. Julius G. Forstmann, president of the Forstmann Woolen Co., of Passaic, N. J., and with Mr. Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the ECA. This correspondence deals with the effect of the ECA operations on our foreign trade, and especially with the question of increasing imports of European goods into the United States as one approach to the problem of reducing the so-called dollar gap.

The second exchange of letters was with Col. Charles F. H. Johnson, president of the Botany Mills, Inc., of Passaic, N. J., and with Mr. William Foster, Deputy Administrator of the ECA. This correspondence deals with what may be called the other face of the coin—namely, the difficulty which American manufacturers find in exporting dollar goods to Europe in the face of the European dollar shortage.

This correspondence is so illuminating and so important that I ask unanimous consent that the letters in question be printed in full in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The first letter is dated February 28, 1950, and is addressed to me by Mr. Forstmann:

FORSTMANN WOOLEN CO.,
Passaic, N. J., February 28, 1950.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I have been very much disturbed, as I am sure you must be, to read in recent newspaper articles about the comments made by Mr. Paul Hoffman of the ECA in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Hoffman, who presumably spoke not only for himself, but for the Administration, stated in essence that in order to bolster the economic stability of various European nations, we would have to accept a vastly increased volume of imports in this country. If in this process any domestic industry suffered such competition from low labor cost countries as to be unable to survive, the employees of such stricken industries should go temporarily on Government relief, while everyone in the industry, from top management to unskilled labor, should undergo an integrated course of instruction to fit them for taking up some entire new line of business.

While Mr. Hoffman was making these far-reaching remarks, Secretary of State Acheson indicated in the public press that if domestic industries were injured by greatly increased foreign competition, such local industries should be in effect subsidized by the Government at the taxpayer's expense. This, of course, would inevitably impose Government control on the recipients of Government bounty.

I need hardly tell you how disturbing such a philosophy of economics is to American management, who are doing their very best to keep up the volume of production and the fullest degree of employment possible. Those responsible for company policy are hardly encouraged to move ahead with plant modernization programs and other forward looking steps if the Administration announces in so many words that entire industries may be sacrificed for the sake of gaining increased imports.

I believe, as I know you do, that our country and our people have certain international obligations, but I also firmly believe that the only way in which we can properly assume the responsibilities of world leadership that have been thrust upon us is for us to make sure that we are secure at home both economically and in every other sense. This can only be done if industry is encouraged to keep up production and employment.

I am troubling you with this letter because I feel that all of us who have the well-being and security of our country at heart must watch with increasing care the trend of the Administration's thinking to which I have referred.

At your convenience, I would be happy to learn of your own personal reaction along these lines, especialy since this problem is of such importance to a highly industrialized State such as New Jersey.

Thanking you for your kind consideration, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
JULIUS G. FORSTMANN,
President.

I immediately forwarded this letter to Mr. Hoffman, and under date of March 21, Mr. Hoffman replied to me as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1950.

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Thank you for sending me a copy of Mr. Julius Forstmann's letter of February 28. The questions which he raises are important and I welcome the opportunity to clarify further the position of the ECA with respect to imports from Europe.

We recognize that expanding imports from Europe will affect certain groups in the United States favorably, other groups unfavorably. However, before discussing the effect of imports on special groups, I should like to call attention to the extent to which the interests of all the citizens of the United States are involved in achieving a balanced trade between the United States and Europe at a reasonably high level.

There has been a lack of balance in trade between the United States and western Europe for a long time. As might be expected, that lack of balance was aggravated by World War II. Trade was still badly out of balance in 1948, the first year of ECA's operation, with exports of goods and services from the United States to western Europe amounting to $5,600,000,000, imports into the United States to $1,700,000,000. It is out of balance in the current fiscal year, with exports at $4,500,000,000, and imports at $1,600,000,000. In addition, western Europe has to import more goods from Canada and Latin America than it exports to them. One other element in the situation is the trade between the dependencies of the European countries and the Western Hemisphere but this trade is approximately in balance. The deficit between the imports of goods and services for dollars into western Europe and the exports of goods and services from western Europe to the dollar area is the familiar dollar gap. The Congress has assigned to ECA among other responsibilities bringing that gap down to manageable proportions prior to the termination of ECA activities in 1952.

There are only two sound ways of closing Europe's dollar gap. They are by reducing requirements for dollar imports through building up economical sources of supply in Europe itself and in other nondollar areas; and by increasing Europe's dollar earnings through direct and triangular trade. This means, of course, that we must sell less to and buy more from Europe. There is little appeal in such a program, but if we do not sell less and buy more, we must either continue our aid or see the European economy placed in grave danger, which, in turn, would seriously endanger our own prosperity and security.

The dollar gap could, of course, be closed tomorrow if exports from the dollar area to Europe were reduced to what Europe can now pay for with her present earnings. That would call for a reduction in exports of more than $3,000,000,000. Such a quick and drastic reduction would obviously mean catastrophe for Europe because her very life depends on maintaining a huge flow of food and raw-material imports, as well as certain tools and equipment which can be obtained only in the United States. Such a reduction would also result in a severe dislocation of our own economy.

If the dollar gap is to be closed without disastrous results, Europe must, between now and 1953, effect further dollar savings of something more than $1,000,000,000 and concurrently increase her earnings by something less than $1,000,000,000. If these goals are met and if we assume that there will be a reasonable amount of American investment of dollars abroad, trade between the United States and western Europe can be brought in balance at a figure between $3,000,000,000 and $3,500,000,000. That figure represents, in our opinion, the minimum number of dollars that Europe must have to buy these goods and services obtainable only in the United States.

A considerable part of the billion dollars of increased earnings needed by Europe can come through tourism and expansion in the sale of noncompetitive goods. However, approximately $400,000,000 of the billion dollars would be in competitive goods. Even taking into account this $400,000,000, the total imports of competitive goods from western Europe would still be substantially less than $1,250,000,000.

In light of the fact that the wholesale value of goods reduced in the United States in 1949 is approximately $140,000,000,000, I don't believe that anyone could argue that increased imports amounting to one-third of 1 percent of our total output could have any appreciable effect on the total economy; nor, of course, is there anything to the argument that when we import goods we are importing unemployment. If we do not import, we cannot export; and if we do not export, we create unemployment in the export field. The sole question is whether by increasing imports and hence maintaining exports the shifts in trade and employment will occasion serious hardships where these shifts pinpoint.

In order to determine whether, as a result of increased imports, undue hardship might accrue to any industry, I suggest that it would be well to examine the program ECA is proposing to encourage imports. We have suggested (a) that the Europeans make a more intensive effort to sell goods in this market; (b) that there be legislation to simplify customs procedures, and (c) that continued reciprocal tariff reductions be made as provided for in existing legislation. Of these three proposals, the one about which Mr. Forstmann seems most concerned is that of further tariff concessions.

May I point out that these concessions can be granted only within the framework of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. They can and have been granted only after the most careful review. I know of no instance in which tariff concessions have jeopardized the life of any American industry. May I add that the only industry for which I have advocated the complete abolition of tariffs is the automobile industry, of which I speak out of long experience.

Our experience with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act indicates that it is possible to reduce duties in many industries without doing serious harm to American businesses. Actually, in the event of serious injury to American business because of a concession in reciprocal tariff negotiotions, the Tariff Commission is required to increase rates. Only the following industries have applied for relief under the escape clause: spring clothes pins, candied marrons, wool knit berets, whiskey, crude petroleum, hops, rattan reeds, sponges, narcissus bulbs, knit gloves and mittens, woven silk fabric, stencil silk and women's fur-felt hat bodies. A formal investigation was ordered in the case of clothes pins, but the case was later dismissed. The next eight cases were dismissed for lack of evidence of serious injury. In two cases only a single firm was involved and in several cases the only injury was that part of the prewar market had been recaptured by foreign suppliers. The whiskey case arose because, at the time, the production of American distillers was limited by the shortage of grain—a condition that has passed. The knit-glove situation continues under study to insure that serious injury does not occur in the future from reviving Japanese competition, though it had not occurred at the time the industry sought relief. The last three cases are still pending. This record certainly seems to indicate that American business has not been seriously hurt by tariff concessions.

And now I should like to turn to a statement made by Mr. Forstmann that "the only way in which we can properly assume the responsibility of world leadership * * * is to make sure that we are secure at home both economically and in every other sense. This can be done only if industry is encouraged to keep up production and employment." If I might rephrase this idea of Mr. Forstmann's, I would like to substitute the word "strong" for the word "secure." In my experience, there is really no such thing as security for a business, because no business can stand still. The only security for a business derives from a vigorous, imaginative and aggressive management. I am a firm believer in competition. I believe that competition is in a large way responsible for the dynamic character of the American economy. All my experience confirms my belief that businesses which are being pushed by competitors are likely to keep themselves in better trim than those which are protected from competition.

Mr. Forstmann has completely misunderstood my remarks when he attributes to me a desire to have the Government subsidize stricken industries. I stated in my testimony before a joint session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee on February 21, 1950: "True, this new competition would create problems in a few localities—competition always does; but if there must be some relief in this situation, I suggest that it be given directly." Please note I said "if there must be." As I have already indicated, I do not think the apprehensions as to the effects of a slight increase in imports are well founded. However, if this new competition, slight though it might be, should result in a loss of employment, I suggest it might be a good thing as a matter of public policy to develop programs for the retraining and relocation of workers, such as we had during the war. This is the kind of relief, if needed, that I had in mind. I repeat that it is my belief that failures due to increased imports would be so utterly insignificant that I consider this question of relocation and retraining of workers academic rather than factual.

Attached to this letter is a table with explanatory notes showing the imports received into the United States by category in 1948 and 1949, with an estimate of those which will be received in 1950. This table should, I believe, allay the fears of anyone as to whether increased imports will upset the United States economy. To businessmen who are concerned about competition, I suggest that it is domestic, not foreign competition, to which they should address themselves.

In conclusion, may I state that there are reasons other than economic why every effort should be made to bring the trade between the United States and Europe into balance at a reasonably high level. The relationships between Europe and the United States can be sound only if there is no element of charity in that relationship. Europe wants to pay her own way and we should help her to do so. We in ECA in administering this program have constantly kept in mind that the only charity of enduring value is that charity which lifts people above the need of charity.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

ENCLOSURE TO LETTER FROM MR. HOFFMAN TO SENATOR H. ALEXANDER SMITH, MARCH 21, 1950

The record of United States imports in 1948 and 1949 from ERP metropolitan countries receiving ECA aid is shown in the following table. Imports fell to an especially low level in the second and third quarters of 1949. For planning purposes ECA has developed a projection of probable imports in the fiscal year 1951, as indicated, though as a matter of policy more rapid growth would be regarded as desirable. Since United States prices are about 10 percent lower than they were in 1948, the volume of exports represented by the total of $876,000,000 in 1950–51 is about 15 percent larger than the volume in 1948:

[Millions of dollars]

Census group		1948	1949	1950–51
00–2	Animal and vegetable products	239.1	214.1	262.8
3	Textiles and products	150.1	121.7	164.3
4	Wood and paper products	103.9	58.3	65.7
5	Nonmetallic minerals	69.3	55.5	75.4
6	Metals and manufactures	140.2	168.9	124.0
7	Machinery and vehicles	63.7	37.9	58.3
8	Chemicals	25.8	21.4	31.1
9	Miscellaneous (excluding lend-lease vessels and household effects)	54.4	57.0	95.0
	Total	846.5	734.8	[1] 876.6

[1] The total exports of the PC's to the United States shown in the balance-of-payments tables is $870,000,000. This includes $13,000,000 of Danish exports to United States personnel in Germany, but it excludes $19,600,000 shown in the table for the raw-material value of tin and nickel processed on toll in Norway and the United Kingdom.

When these imports are analyzed in detail, it becomes clear that imports from western Europe normally constitute a small proportion of total United States consumption. The latest Summaries of Tariff Information in 15 volumes compare United States imports and production, wherever possible, for each classification of the tariff act. They are too detailed to be quoted here and the data generally relate to 1947. The following paragraphs deal with the relationship of imports to United States production or consumption in 1948, since imports in that year were larger than in 1949.

Out of the projected total of $262,800,000 of imports of animal and vegetable products shown above, $120,000,000 consists of Greek and Turkish tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and cheese. Tobacco imports, used largely for blending to conform to the tastes of American cigarette smokers, amounted to 2.3 percent of domestic production in 1948. Cheese imports amounted to 1.4 percent of United States production. Imported wines accounted for 2.5 percent of United States consumption; distilled spirits (primarily Scotch whisky) for 9 percent; and malt liquors for 0.1 percent.

In the textile field, cotton textile and woolen and worsted imports both amount to about 1 percent of United States production. (Differences in the classification of United States manufacturing statistics and import statistics make an exact comparison difficult.) Imports of rayon filament yarn totaled 1.1 percent of United States consumption, while rayon staple fiber imports amounted to 16 percent of United States consumption. The increases in imports of all products except rayon staple fiber will amount to only a fraction of 1 percent of our production. Demand for staple fiber has been increasing so rapidly that we have witnessed a marked growth of both imports and domestic production.

The most important imports of wood and paper products consist of woodpulp and newsprint. The United States depends upon imports of these two products for normal supplies. However, we also imported from the ERP countries about $4,900,000 of other paper, equal to about 0.3 percent of domestic production.

More than half our imports of nonmetallic minerals consist of diamonds. However, clay products, including household chinaware and earthenware, are also included in this general classification. Differences in the classification of United States production and import statistics make comparisons difficult but it would appear that pottery imports may have amounted to 8 to 10 percent of United States production (exclusive of hotel ware, vitreous plumbing fixtures and porcelain electrical supplies).

As for metal products, machinery, automobiles, and chemicals, it is safe to say that in all these categories imports amount to less than 1 percent of production. In some specialties the proportion is of course higher, but for some broad categories like machinery imports would appear to be less than one-quarter of 1 percent of domestic production.

PAUL HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

Upon receipt of Mr. Hoffman's reply, I immediately sent it to Mr. Forstmann and he in turn replied to me under date of April 12, as follows:

FORSTMANN WOOLEN CO.,
Passaic, N. J., April 12, 1950.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Because of the admitted importance of the issues involved, I would like to take this opportunity of replying in some detail to the letter which you received under date of March 21, 1950, from Mr. Paul Hoffman, pertaining to my original letter of February 28.

Mr. Hoffman agrees "that expanding imports from Europe will affect certain groups in the United States favorably, other groups unfavorably." The difference of opinion is a question of degree, and whether the unfavorable factors outweight the favorable for our country as a whole.

Much is being currently written and said, especially by Administration spokesmen in Washington, about closing the so-called European dollar gap. Mr. Hoffman states: "There are only two sound ways of closing Europe's dollar gap. They are by reducing the requirements for dollar imports through building up economical sources of supply in Europe itself, and by increasing Europe's dollar earnings through direct and triangular trade. This means, of course, we must sell less and buy more from Europe. There is little appeal in such a program, but if we do not sell less and buy more, we must either continue our aid or see the European

economy placed in grave danger, which, in turn, would seriously endanger our own prosperity and security."

I consider this quotation of great significance, not only because Mr. Hoffman admits that his program has little appeal, but because he, too, is concerned about our Nation's prosperity and security, despite his rather pointed objection to my use of the argument that we must "make sure that we are secure at home both economically and in every other sense."

Let us consider the dollar gap further. Mr. Hoffman asserts that Europe wants no charity; she wants to earn her dollar balances. May I point out that the wool textile industry of the United States in the year 1949, imported 262,276,000 pounds of raw apparel wool in the grease, valued at approximately $161,113,000, largely from the sterling areas against a corresponding exchange in dollars. These dollars were earned by selling a natural raw product in the ordinary channels of international trade.

In converting this raw wool into finished cloth, we added labor, American labor, providing employment for our people who look to this industry for their livelihood. We added labor at the highest rates of pay that this industry has ever seen at any time or any place, helping to maintain the highest standard of living that the world has ever witnessed.

If this imported raw wool had been converted in Europe, rather than here, our friends across the Atlantic would have lost the dollars that we spent in their raw commodity market, against the possibility of their manufacturing cloth at labor rates but a fraction of ours and selling the finished article to American customers. Our wool textile mills, on the other hand, would have manufactured one less yard for every yard imported and an industry which, according to the 1939 census, was the seventh largest employer of industrial labor in the country would have been sacrificed as a source of employment.

I am confident that our workers are as anxious to stay on their jobs as people abroad are to come by dollar exchange, by work rather than relief rolls or government subsidy.

Further, in his letter, Mr. Hoffman states: "Nor, of course, is there anything to the argument that when we import goods, we are importing unemployment. If we do not import, we cannot export; and if we do not export, we create unemployment in the export field. The sole question is whether by increasing imports and hence maintaining exports the shifts in trade and employment will occasion serious hardships where these shifts pinpoint."

The basic fallacy in this argument is the unwarranted assumption that a job lost in one industry is necessarily gained in another.

This can be illustrated very graphically by actual figures. In 1939, we find that 397,537 workers in the automobile industry produced finished products valued at $4,039,930,733, or in other words, one worker produced $10,162.40 worth of automobiles. In the same year, 140,022 workers in the wool textile industry manufactured cloth valued at $685,311,713, or $4,894.31 worth of cloth per worker. Because of a basic difference in the crafts involved, the machine has replaced the man to a greater extent in the automobile industry than in the textile industry, and hence one auto worker produced a value more than twice as great as the outturn of a worker in our industry. Therefore, if automobiles are exported from Detroit to foreign markets, and are counterbalanced by importations of wool textiles in equal value, two jobs will be destroyed in America for every one created. This is hardly the way to keep America strong. Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, in his press interview of April 10, expressed his concern about the effect of foreign imports on domestic employment, on this very point.

Mr. Hoffman further states: "The only security for a business derives from a vigorous, imaginative, and aggressive management. I am a firm believer in competition." So, too, am I. But it is interesting to note that in the wool-textile industry, by and large, one-third the cost of manufacturing a yard of cloth is the price we pay for raw wool, and one-third is labor cost. A large percentage of the wool our industry uses must be bought at foreign auctions against worldwide competitive bidding. Over this our management has no effective control. The labor rates we pay are set by union bargaining. Both the unions and the Government favor the highest possible rates and management itself desires to pay the best rates that our ultimate market can absorb. "Imaginative and aggressive management" must therefore be largely confined to items that represent only the remaining one-third of the manufacturing cost. We do not fear competition providing that the cards are not stacked against us.

According to studies of the United States Tariff Commission, the efficiency of the American textile worker as compared with the British is 1.3 to 1 in our favor. To show what this means by an actual example, an American mill would pay a $3 labor cost to produce 1.3 units of cloth, while the English mill would pay a $1 labor cost to produce 1 unit of cloth. Therefore, our labor cost per unit would be $2.31 against a British labor cost per unit of $1, or expressed in terms of percentage, our labor cost per unit is 231 percent greater than the English labor cost per unit, even after giving full credit to our greater labor efficiency. Despite this greater labor efficiency of the American workmen, no amount of management ingenuity can compete against labor rates which in England are about one-third of ours, in Italy about one-fifth of ours, and in Japan about one-twentieth of ours; Secretary of Commerce Sawyer also commented on this.

Mr. Hoffman makes much of the point that our current imports of competitive goods, and the increases in such imports which the ECA envisions and hopes for, are a very small percentage of our internal production. I do not argue that there should be no such imports. In fact, a reasonable quantity of such imports, based on a sensible and historical relationship to our production and consumption, provides just the stimulating competition that Mr. Hoffman favors. What our industry has good reason to fear, on the other hand, is the fact that if the tariff rates on manufactured wool products, which are already considerably lower than the rates last set by Congress, are lowered still further, we may be faced with a ruinous flood of imports from countries whose labor rates and standards of living are far lower than ours. The ECA would open the barn door, but can they then close it before the horse is stolen? This is not a mere academic speculation; the evidence is already apparent in our domestic watch industry, for example. According to a press release dated April 7, 1950, 80 percent of the jeweled-watch movements used in this country are now imported from Switzerland, and 50 percent of the imported movements are already cased, and yet Mr. Hoffman states: "I know of no instance in which tariff concessions have jeopardized the life of any American industry."

In these worrisome days of a cold war, with the possibility of shooting war the subject of daily concern in government, the security of our country, in both an economic and a military sense, is of the very utmost importance. For this very reason alone, our domestic wool textile industry should be kept vigorously active. An adequate supply of wool fabrics must be available at all times no matter what channels of ocean commerce may be forcibly interrupted. Guns, tanks, and planes are no more essential than clothing. Our own Government is considering the emergency stock piling of wool and wool fabrics. By the same token, the growing of domestic raw wool, now at a dangerously low level, should be encouraged so that we are not lacking supplies of a vital raw commodity which must be transported across the seas.

In the light of these facts, I earnestly question the wisdom of placing an industry so strategically basic as the manufacture of wool textiles in further jeopardy by competition from low-labor-cost countries by way of another round of tariff cuts. From the standpoint of maintaining employment, providing national security and sustaining one of the best dollar customers of foreign raw materials, our industry must be kept flourishing and strong. We do not seek unreasonable nor prohibitive tariffs; we do seek adequate means of counterbalancing or controlling the form of competition offered by countries with lower standards of living, completely managed economies and currencies, and outright subsidies.

Very sincerely yours,

JULIUS G. FORSTMANN,
President.

While I do not fully agree with Mr. Forstmann's arguments in the foregoing letter, I do think his letter makes a distinct contribution to the discussion of this very involved but extremely important problem of American imports from Europe.

The correspondence with Mr. Johnson of Botany Mills, Inc., and Mr. Foster of the ECA, clearly high lights the other side of the same problem of the European dollar gap—the difficulties of American exporters to Europe.

Under date of January 23, 1950, Mr. Johnson wrote briefly to me enclosing a photostatic copy of a letter he had received from a potential customer in Germany. His letter and enclosure are as follows:

BOTANY MILLS, INC.,
Passaic, N. J., January 23, 1950.

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Attached photostat will undoubtedly interest you. Our taxes are used to finance our competition. They close their markets to us. We open our markets to them by reducing entry costs. So-called barriers are a myth so far as we are concerned, but are definitely in operation against us.

The principal offenders are Great Britain and her present or former colonies.

Sincerely,

CHAS. F. A. JOHNSON,
President.

KÖLN-RODENKIRCHEN,
Auenweg 31, November 5, 1949.

Messrs. BOTANY MILLS, INC.,
Passaic, N. J., USA.

DEAR SIRS: I thank you for your letter of September 22.

The last weeks I tried every thing to get an import license for your goods, but I always was told that there is no possibility to import American woolen piece goods. I have seen everybody in the JEIA on the American and German side and spend a lot of time and money but without any result. There is no chance for your goods.

I was very much surprised to learn that because we get imports of woolen piece goods from England, France, Belgium and nearly all parts of Europe but not from America. I can't understand that you aren't allowed to export to Germany and do a good business instead of sending only the money for our trade.

Perhaps you can find out the reason for this stop or a way to get goods over to Germany. From this side I tried every chance without any result.

There is a great need of woolen cloths and it was stated only a week ago at a meeting of the German woolen manufacturers and woolen merchants that the German production can supply within the next 3 years only 2 or 3 meters of woolen cloth for every German citizen. You can imagine the business we could do if we could get an import license.

I'm very sorry to confess my failure but I don't feel responsible for it as the imports are handled only by Americans. I'm sure to be able to sell hundreds of pieces for you within a very short time.

Perhaps there will be imports on a later date or a free trade between our countries and I leave the decision about our collaboration to you. As soon as there is a chance for imports of American piece goods I will let you know.

Yours very truly,

E. VENTEN.

In the temporary absence of Mr. Hoffman, I referred this letter to Mr. William Foster, ECA Deputy Administrator, and received the following reply dated February 17:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1950.
Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: At first glance the situation described in the letter from Germany which you sent me looks unreasonable. It would seem that all the necessary conditions required for doing business in textiles with the potential buyer in Germany exist. Botany Mills has textiles for sale and the German wishes to buy them. Under normal circumstances there should be no trouble about transacting business satisfactorily and profitably.

Unfortunately, however, these are not normal circumstances and an additional element in the picture constitutes a serious obstacle to trade between sellers in the United States and buyers in Germany—or for that matter between sellers in the United States and buyers in most of the rest of the world. This additional obstacle is simple to define—it is the fact that German marks and most other currencies are not freely convertible into American dollars—but the reasons for this situation are complex and extremely difficult to overcome.

There is no question that the demand from private importers and consumers in western Europe for dollar goods is very real. There are many desirable consumer goods, of which textiles are an example, which Europeans are eager to purchase and genuinely need. The trouble is that the sum of these demands both in Germany and elsewhere, far exceeds the amount of dollars available for such purchases. Even with the dollars supplied through ECA, which are added to the dollar earnings of these countries themselves, dollar resources of the European countries fall far short of the amount that could and would be used to buy American goods if this dollar shortage did not exist. It is conservatively estimated that genuine orders could be obtained for billions of dollars worth of American goods over and above shipments which are currently being made if it were not for the dollar shortage.

Under these circumstances one of the main problems which the participating countries of the Marshall plan and Mr. Hoffman and the ECA organization face is that of selecting wisely the items for which dollars are to be spent by the European countries so that the dollars made available by the American taxpayer to promote European recovery shall be spent only for those goods which will make the greatest contribution of that recovery.

The procedure to accomplish this result, which has been worked out, operates as follows: Each participating country develops its own request for imports to be paid for with ECA dollars, choosing those items which in its judgment are most essential to its recovery. Application is then made by the participating country to the ECA for approval of the items it has chosen. ECA will then carefully scrutinize and screen the proposals of the participating country and may eliminate certain items which, in its judgment, are not absolutely essential for recovery. In this process, both in the case of the participating country and in the case of ECA, the question is asked first as to whether the item is an absolutely essential import. Following this a careful study is made to determine whether the country could not obtain the item from the proceeds of its own exports to the other participating countries or from nondollar countries anywhere in the world. If this procedure were not followed the result would be an increase in the cost of the recovery program to the American taxpayer which would be directly contrary to the congressional mandate to ECA to promote recovery in western Europe at the lowest possible cost to the United States.

It is clear of course that under these procedures Germany, for example, if she needed to import textiles, would first determine whether the necessary items could be obtained in England or France or in any of the other countries where purchases can be made with pounds or francs which Germany earns in sufficient quantities through her own exports to these countries. That will account for the fact, pointed out by the German who wishes to buy textiles, that Germany gets "imports of woolen piece goods from England, France, and Belgium and nearly all parts of Europe but not from America."

If dollars were to be made available for all the American goods which buyers in Germany would like to have and could in fact use, the appropriation for the Marshall plan would have to be very greatly increased over what is currently being provided. If, on the other hand, the appropriation were not increased and the careful screening process were eliminated, the limited amount of dollars provided would be spent, in part at least, for items not vitally needed for recovery in Europe. This would mean that the participating countries would have to do without certain more essential items. The result of this course would be to jeopardize the success of the whole recovery program. The hard fact is that Germany, much as she could use substantial quantities of American textiles, can get along without them without endangering the continuation of her recovery. Since she does not have enough dollars to buy everything she could use and would like to have from the dollar area, she must therefore forego the importation of any substantial amounts of American textiles.

It is, of course, obvious that the provision of the Marshall plan appropriation does make it possible for American producers of a wide variety of goods to ship large quantities of their products to western Europe, which they would otherwise not be able to ship because dollars for the purpose would not be available. There shipments, however, for the reasons given above, must be confined to items which are absolutely essential to German recovery and cannot be obtained elsewhere for soft currencies.

This is the background of a situation which worries me as it does you. It seems clear to me that the only really satisfactory and permanent solution for this problem is a genuine recovery of Europe so that European countries will be able to pay their own way in the world. They can do this only if they take the steps necessary to increase their efficiency and lower their costs so that they can compete effectively in world markets. If they succeed this will inevitably involve competition for our producers. This, however, seems to me a necessary and essentially a healthy thing. The strength and adaptability of our own economic system as compared with that of western Europe is attributable to the fact that we have had the stimulus of competition in our own large home market to drive our producers to strive constantly for greater and greater efficiency. It is a significant and sobering fact that the start of the decline of western Europe, the beginning of the period during which she has progressively fallen further and further behind the United States in economic strength, coincided with the adoption by the nations of western Europe of the practice of trade restrictions and various other devices designed to minimize the effect of competition upon their producers. With this object lesson in mind I would hope that the United States, as the largest creditor and the most powerful nation in the world, would follow the course of welcoming fair and free competition and would not attempt to kill off such competition, whether domestic or foreign.

Finally, I should like to say that I see no satisfactory solution for the threats to our security and prosperity inherent in the dynamic cold-war attack of Russian imperialism on the free world unless we can successfully help to build a strong, prosperous, and self-supporting western Europe. Without such an ally the threat to our own freedom and prosperity would be very seriously increased. There is no chance, however, that western Europe will be able to achieve and maintain this position unless we continue to press forward with the recovery program and, after recovery has been accomplished, we make it possible for western Europe to earn its own way by giving its producers access on the basis of fair and free competition to our own markets. Certainly, if we raise our tariffs and other obstacles to trade against western Europe, there is no hope that she can earn enough dollars to continue to be a substantial paying customer for our goods.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Deputy Administrator.

Mr. President, this correspondence brings out some of the problems involved in our efforts to reduce the dollar gap of the European nations and to bring our trade with them into balance at a reasonably high level. These are important issues in our postwar foreign-trade policy, which will presently be before the Congress for fuller consideration.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Ferguson	Kem
Benton	Flanders	Kilgore
Brewster	Frear	Knowland
Bricker	George	Langer
Bridges	Green	Leahy
Butler	Gurney	Lehman
Cain	Hayden	Lodge
Capehart	Hendrickson	Long
Chapman	Hickenlooper	Lucas
Chavez	Hill	McCarran
Connally	Holland	McCarthy
Cordon	Humphrey	McClellan
Darby	Hunt	McFarland
Donnell	Ives	McKellar
Douglas	Jenner	McMahon
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Magnuson
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Malone
Ecton	Johnston, S. C.	Martin
Ellender	Kefauver	Maybank

Millikin	Smith, Maine	Tobey
Mundt	Sparkman	Tydings
Neely	Stennis	Wherry
O'Conor	Taft	Wiley
Robertson	Taylor	Williams
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Withers
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Young
Schoeppel	Thye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on yesterday the President of the United States called in for advice a man from my State, by the name of William T. Evjue. I have prepared some rather lengthy remarks in regard to this individual for the benefit of the Senate. However, I have much more important matters to discuss, so I ask unanimous consent to insert the remarks in the RECORD as part of my statement.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH MCCARTHY

Yesterday the President called in a man from my State for advice—a Mr. William T. Evjue, editor of the Capital Times at Madison, Wis.

I think it might be well to give the Senate a picture of this new Presidential adviser.

It will be recalled that among other things yesterday, Mr. Evjue condemned the use of congressional immunity to make what he referred to as reckless charges. I intend to give the Senate some information about Mr. Evjue and his organization today, which, if true, would be most definitely libelous. However, as you know, truth is a defense in any libel action.

While this is being made on the Senate floor and immunity would attach thereto, I want to assure Mr. Evjue and his attorneys that I will waive congressional immunity if they desire to sue and will assure me that suit will be started within such reasonable period of time as they shall name.

I want to notify Mr. Evjue, however, that he and his city editor, Cedric Parker, will be immediately called for an adverse examination and put under oath at that time. In fact, I would welcome such a suit from Mr. Evjue and his city editor, Mr. Parker, so that I shall have the opportunity to question them in detail under oath.

Last fall I made some statements in regard to the Communistic connections of Mr. Evjue's city editor, Mr. Parker, and the extent to which the Capital Times was being used as the mouthpiece of the Communist Party.

Mr. Evjue, at that time, claimed I was using congressional immunity, and threatened to sue if I would make the statements where I was not immune to suit. I call his attention to the fact at that time that congressional immunity did not apply, in view of the fact that the statements were not made in the Senate nor before any legislative committee.

Moreover, I assured him that if he felt immunity attached, such immunity would be waived and challenged him to commence suit.

He then challenged me to debate the question of the extent to which the Capital Times was used by the Communist Party. I accepted that challenge and told him to name the time and the place, and that he could even select the crowd and that I would pay his cab fare over to the appointed place.

That was the last I heard of this debate challenge.

I would not take the time of the Senate to discuss Mr. Evjue, Mr. Parker, and the Capital Times except for two reasons: (1) that the President has seen fit to call Mr. Evjue in as an adviser, and (2) that the Communist Party is exerting every effort to get its members and stooges located in important positions on newspapers, radio, magazines, in the motion-picture business, and in every other channel of public information.

The party considers it especially important to get control of newspapers in college towns so that the young people will be getting daily doses of perfumed Communist Party line propaganda sewage under the mistaken impression that they are absorbing liberal ideas from a progressive American newspaper.

Mr. Budenz is now preparing a list of all those whom he—as one of the top members of the Communist Party—knew were being used by the party in the above-mentioned channels of information. This will be a very valuable list when completed.

I frankly had not planned on discussing the Capital Times until such time as that list was completed and until I had gotten beyond the crest of the work involved in exposing Communists in our State Department. But as stated above, the fact that the President has called Mr. Evjue in to advise him has caused me to decide to touch the subject briefly at this time. I shall go into it in more detail at a later time.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the speech which I made in Madison, Wis., in regard to Mr. Evjue and his publication.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert a letter dated December 3, 1949, to Mr. John Nestingen, chairman of the University of Wisconsin chapter of the AVC, and a letter dated December 3, 1949, to Mr. William Evjue.

So there can be no doubt in the minds of any of the Senators in regard to Mr. Evjue, I again want to call your attention to the fact that I will waive any senatorial immunity so that Mr. Evjue or Mr. Parker can sue if they so desire.

Mr. Evjue's paper, the Capital Times, in my opinion acts as a disguised poisoned water hole—a poisoned water hole of dangerous Communist propaganda—in a most dangerous spot, a university town where thousands of young people are attending a university which is attempting to prepare them for their place in a very hectic world.

In this connection I want to call your attention to the fact that the city editor of the Capital Times is a Mr. Cedric Parker; that the editor of that paper is the President's new adviser, Mr. William T. Evjue.

I want to call your attention to the fact that long before I discussed the communistic connections of Mr. Parker, Mr. Evjue on March 14, 1941—that is at a time when communism was less unpopular—in an editorial signed by himself, proclaimed that Cedric Parker was, and I quote, "the Communist leader in Madison."

This statement by Mr. Evjue was never later denied or retracted by him. It still stands.

He subsequently, however, promoted this man Parker, whom he referred to as the Communist leader in Madison, to the job of city editor of the Capital Times, which position he now holds today. Not only does he hold that position, but he also does much of the speech writing for Mr. Evjue.

However, as I have stated before, I think it would be entirely improper to convict anyone of such an odious charge on the word of Mr. Evjue.

Therefore, I call attention to the fact that on June 22, 1939, Farrell Schnering, a former member of the Communist Party, testified under oath before a legislative committee, as follows:

"Over in Dane County they had been able to set up a county council controlled by the Communist Party. The president of the Dane County Council is Cedric Parker, a reporter of the Capital Times, who has been a sympathizer with the party and a fellow traveler since early in 1935. He joined the party toward the end of 1935."

On April 9, 1947, Kenneth Goff, of Delevan, Wis., testified before a congressional committee, under oath, that he was a member of the Communist Party, and that among the Communists he met during this time was Cedric Parker of the Capital Times.

In April of 1934, Eugene Dennis, who as you recall was recently convicted with 10 other top Communists, and who as you recall was a member of the Communist politburo—and Cedric Parker organized and sponsored respectively the State-Wide Conference on Farm and Labor Legislation. This organization was listed by the House Un-American Activities Committee of the Seventy-sixth Congress as being Communist-controlled.

In the document which I have inserted, and which was publicly read, you will note that I list some of the other Communist-front or Communist-controlled organizations with which Mr. Parker was affiliated.

One of these, incidentally, was the Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder. This organization, to which Mr. Parker belonged, has been listed by the Attorney General as a Communist organization. The official report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, had the following to say about this organization: "Both the personnel and the objective of the Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder showed clearly that it was a Communist organization. No one who affiliated himself with it could make any claim to ignorance of this evident fact."

Cedric Parker of the Capital Times was listed in the official report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as being affiliated with the Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder.

You will note also that in the speech, which I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and which, I repeat, was publicly read without any congressional immunity about which Mr. Evjue talks—I discussed the parallel between the Daily Worker and the Capital Times.

As I stated, I intend to go into this matter at a later date. Suffice to say at this time that, in my opinion, outside of the Daily Worker, there is no other paper in the United States which renders a greater service to the Communist cause.

I have previously stated—and again state—that Cedric Parker, according to all of the available evidence, has been a member of the Communist Party. By his actions he gives no indication of having repudiated that membership.

On January 31, 1948, the Capital Times carried the following article. This article, you understand, refers to Parker, the city editor of the President's new adviser, and will give you some idea of how well the President may be able to rely upon the truthfulness of his new adviser.

"Cedric Parker, reporter-photographer for the Capital Times and President of the Newspaper Guild of Madison, has signed an affidavit that he is not a member of the Communist Party.

"The affidavit was signed in conformity with the Taft-Hartley Act which requires that officers of labor unions seeking the services of the National Labor Relations Board must submit sworn statements that they are not members of the Communist Party, that they are not affiliated with the party, and that they are not members of any organization which advocates overthrow of the United States Government by force or by illegal means.

"A photographic copy of Parker's affidavit was attached to copies of the Madison Guildsman issued today. The Guildsman is a bulletin published by the local guild which is a union of newspaper employees.

"In connection with the affidavit, Parker made the following statement in the Guildsman:

" 'Attached to this issue of the Madison Guildsman you will find a photostatic copy of a legal document.

" 'This document is the non-Communist affidavit which must be filed by all unions desiring recognition by the New National Labor Relations Board, under the Taft-Hartley Act. All of the officers of the Madison Guild are filing this affidavit with the Board.

" 'I am making the copy of the affidavit which I signed available to the entire Guild membership, because I am the only present officer of this Guild who has been called a Communist. This affidavit is my answer to those, both inside and outside of the Guild, who have made that charge.

" 'I believe the affidavit is a better answer than any mere verbal denial, which anyone could make. But anyone, and most especially a Communist, could not sign this affidavit—or would do so at great risk.

" 'This affidavit is a legal document, sworn to before a notary public. This means that if it is a false statement, the signer can be fined $10,000 or sent to Federal prison for 10 years, or can be given both penalties.

" 'I have signed the affidavit with no fear of any such consequences.

" 'Actions speak louder than words. This is my answer to the old Red charge.' "

I received the following letter, however, on November 10, 1949, from the National Labor Relations Board:

"DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Since receipt of your letter dated November 8, 1949, I have caused the files in this office to be searched for the American Newspaper Guild, CIO. This search included the international union as well as each local including those located in Madison and Milwaukee. This office has no record of an 'affidavit of non-Communist union officer' having been filed by Mr. Cedric Milford Parker.

"In accordance with the request contained in your letter, there is enclosed blank forms 'affidavit of non-Communist union officer.'

"Very truly yours,
"CLAUDE B. CALKIN,
"Affidavit Compliance Officer,
National Labor Relations Board."

When newspapermen asked Mr. Parker whether or not he had been a member of the Communist Party, he used the same answer which many of you have heard used time and again before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, namely, "I refuse to answer upon the advice of my lawyer."

Perhaps it might be well for Mr. Evjue to explain to the President why he has promoted to the important job of city editor a man who he himself publicly proclaimed as Madison's leading Communist—a man who refused to tell whether or not he was a Communist on advice of counsel.

Let me make my position on Mr. Evjue completely clear. I do not have any documentary evidence to show that he is a member of the Communist Party. We do have documentary evidence consisting of sworn statements of former Communist members that Cedric Parker, his city editor, was a member of the party. We have Evjue's public statement that Parker was the leading Communist in Madison. We have Parker's refusal, on advice of counsel, to tell whether he was a Communist. We also have Parker's public proclamation that he was filing a non-Communist affidavit, and the proof that, in true Communist fashion, he was lying when he so stated.

The fact that Evjue himself may never have joined the party is in my opinion much less important than the fact that he (1) hires and promotes a man who he declares to be the leading Communist of Madison, and (2) that he allows his paper to serve the cause of the Communist Party.

Such is the adviser Mr. Truman calls down.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement with reference to the Capital Times, a letter to Mr. John Nestingen, and a letter to Mr. William T. Evjue, with reference to the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS FOR THE PEOPLE OF DANE COUNTY

1. HAS THE COMMUNIST PARTY WITH THE COOPERATION OF THE CAPITAL TIMES CORP. WON A MAJOR VICTORY IN WISCONSIN?

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, and members of the Central Intelligence Agency have stated that one of the major aims of the Communist Party is to get its members located in important positions on newspapers—especially in college towns so that the young people who will take over control of the Nation someday, will be getting daily doses of the Communist Party line propaganda under the mistaken impression that they are absorbing liberal and progressive ideas from an American newspaper.

As one Communist said, "Give us control of the press in all of the college towns for 10 years, and we shall have no trouble destroying democracy."

2. IS CEDRIC PARKER, CITY EDITOR OF THE CAPITAL TIMES, A COMMUNIST?

(a) On March 14, 1941, at a time when communism was less unpopular, William Evjue, the editor of the Capital Times, proclaimed that Cedric Parker was the Communist leader in Madison.

It would, of course, be improper to convict anyone of such an odious charge merely upon the evidence of Mr. Evjue. The following documentation, therefore, is given.

(b) On June 22, 1939, Farrell Schnering, a former member of the Communist Party in Wisconsin testified under oath as follows:

"Over in Dane County they had been able to set up a county council controlled by the Communist Party. The president of the Dane County Council is Cedric Parker, a reporter of the Capital Times, who has been a sympathizer with the party and a fellow traveler since early in 1935. He joined the party toward the end of 1935."

(c) On April 9, 1947, Kenneth Goff, of Delevan, Wis., testified under oath that he was a member of the Communist Party from May 2, 1936, to October 9, 1939, and that among the Communists he met during this time was Cedric Parker, of the Capital Times.

(d) The American League for Peace and Democracy has been listed by the Attorney General as a Communist organization. In early June of 1938 this Communist organization held a mass meeting. Listed among the sponsors was Cedric Parker, of the Capital Times. The House Committee on Un-American Activities of the Seventy-eighth Congress (Democratic-controlled) referred to this organization as "nothing more nor less than a bold advocate of treason."

(e) On October 14, 1949, Eugene Dennis was convicted, along with 10 other Communists, in New York, of conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence. Twelve Americans, upon being presented with all the facts that both the prosecution and the defense were able to bring before them, came to the unanimous conclusion that beyond a reasonable doubt, Dennis was one of a group which exists in the United States "in the setting of a huge and well-disciplined organization spreading to practically every State of the Union and all the principal cities and industries" which uses methods of secrecy and fraud and lies to bring about at the earliest opportunity the forcible overthrow of the Government of the United States and has "sought to mask their purposes by pretending that they were fighting always and solely for democracy and the interests and welfare of the workers." In April of 1934 Eugene Dennis and Cedric Parker, now city editor of the Capital Times, organized and sponsored respectively the State-wide Conference on Farm and Labor Legislation. This organization was listed by the House Un-American activities Committee of the Seventy-sixth Congress as being Communist-controlled.

(f) The Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation is listed by the Attorney General as a Communist organization. In April of 1940 Cedric Parker, of the Capital Times, attended a conference of the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation.

(g) The Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder has been listed by the Attorney General as a Communist organization. The official report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, had the following to say about this organization: "Both the personnel and the objective of the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder showed clearly that it was a Communist organization. No one who affiliated himself with it could make any claim to ignorance of this evident fact." Cedric Parker, of the Capital Times, was listed in the official report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as being affiliated with the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder.

The above would indicate that Parker was at one time a member of the party and was closely affiliated with a number of Communist-front organizations, and there is nothing in his writings which has been brought to our attention which would indicate he has in any way changed his attitude toward the Communist Party.

I have included in the above no information from any secret files. It is all available to the public. If anyone desires more complete and detailed documentation of the above, I shall be glad to supply it upon request.

3. IS THE CAPITAL TIMES CORP. THE RED MOUTHPIECE FOR THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN WISCONSIN?

The simplest and most infallible way to answer this question is to examine the method of handling news by the Capital Times Corp. to see whether it follows the Communist Party lines * * * for, as someone has said, if a fowl looks like a duck, walks like a duck, swims like a duck, and quacks like a duck, then we can safely assume that it is a duck.

The Capital Times has repeatedly condemned our democratic system in practically the identical language used by the official Communist paper, the Daily Worker, referring to it as a system of monopoly capitalism.

(a) For example, on April 11, 1949, the Capital Times had the following to say:

"Our entrenched economic order is looking toward the future in fear. The beneficiaries of our system of monopoly capitalism view with alarm the fact that the rest of the world is embracing a socialized economy. If Russia were the only country where this had happened, the fear would not be so pronounced."

It then goes on to condemn our entrenched economic order for implanting in the people a fear of communism. The Communist Daily Worker likewise rails at those who implant in the people a fear of communism.

(b) September 12, 1946, Henry Wallace made his notorious Madison Square Garden speech which led to his resignation as the Secretary of the Department of Commerce.

September 13, the Communist Daily Worker denounced Henry Wallace.

September 16, there was a radio broadcast from Moscow praising Wallace unconditionally.

Immediately, the Daily Worker reversed itself and went all out in its praise for Wallace, stating, "The entire issue raised by Wallace is an integral part of the electoral battle. It cannot be separated from the campaign to defeat the reactionaries and elect those who will respond to the desire of our people."

The Capital Times withheld comment until the day after Radio Moscow praised Wallace, at which time it followed the same line editorially, saying: "The reactionary crowd wants to destroy Wallace, fearful of his emergence as the country's leader which will mean an opportunity to free the American people from the claws in which it is held by a few powerful monopolistic corporations. * * * it knows that its power will face real danger if a fearless man of the type of Wallace, with his high social ideals and determination to carry them through, ever comes to power."

(c) On May 19, 1948, the Communist Daily Worker condemned the bankers and generals for opposing the Wallace-Stalin proposal.

On the following day, May 20, 1947, the Capital Times also approved the Wallace-Russian proposal and condemned the United States position as untenable and most unreasonable.

(d) The Capital Times, like the Communist Daily Worker, viciously attacks the American Legion, which the Communist Party considers one of its greatest enemies. The following language is taken from a radio address by William Evjue, reprinted in the Capital Times on March 21, 1949:

"The top hierarchy of the American Legion has been alined with the entrenched economic order. Go back over the years and note how in nearly every year the American Legion elects some corporation lawyer, utility executive, banker, or spokesman for corporate wealth as its national commander. Note how uniformly over the years the national commander has used his position as a springboard for launching the propaganda of big corporate interests."

This is the typical Communist Party line attack upon the successful middle class, which the Communists have liquidated in every country they have taken over—but, first, they must create class hatred through a Communist-controlled press.

(e) On the 11th of June 1948, William Evjue, editor of the Capital Times, in a radio address which was later reprinted in the Capital Times, in attacking the judicial system in a democracy, said: "The commencement orators can talk all they want about equality before the law, but the fact is that we have a double standard of justice—one for the rich and another for the poor, one set of laws that is quickly invoked against those who dare to challenge the entrenched economic order and another set that remains inactive against those who make peace with the status quo." This is the type of charge repeatedly made by the Daily Worker.

(f) On August 9, 1948, William Evjue, in a radio address, later reprinted in the Capital Times, condemned the Congress for investigating Communists who have infiltrated into our Government and ridiculed newspapers and radio commentators who publicized the activities of Communists in high Government positions.

(g) During the worst phase of the housing shortage the Communist official party line was to appeal to the veteran on the ground that our present democratic system did not work or the veteran would have a decent house in which to live. At the same time, however, they did an all-out character assassination job on anyone who was spending his time attempting to intelligently solve the housing problem. In this connection it might be well to quote Lenin, who said: "Take advantage of the difficulties of the Government * * * with the aim of overthrowing it."

At that time, as vice chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Housing, I was making an intensive study and getting suggestions from all interested persons and organizations as to what could be done to solve the housing problem. During this investigation I found evidence of gray marketeers who were guilty of viciously gouging veterans—unprincipled men who were growing fat because of the misery of those living in tarpaper shacks. One of the worst was a New York pinko called Isidore Ginsberg. While I was publicly exposing and furnishing to the district attorney of Queens County, N. Y., evidence of Ginsberg's gouging and cheating of veterans, I was viciously condemned by the Capital Times.

The Capital Times had this to say about Mr. Ginsberg's activities:

"Mr. Ginsberg has done nothing but be a smart businessman exemplifying the traditions of our free-enterprise system. Mr. Ginsberg did only what a free enterpriser is expected to do in the free-enterprise system. Things have come to a pretty kettle of fish when we find 'such as McCARTHY' objecting to that."

However, in honestly presenting the facts the Capital Times ignored Mr. Ginsberg's subsequent trial and sentence to 5 years, based upon evidence which our committee supplied.

(h) While the Communists were basing their appeal for new members on the housing shortage—and with a disturbing amount of success—the Capital Times singled me out of 96 Senators for vicious, unrestrained attacks in connection with my efforts to solve the housing problem. In the typically "honest" fashion of the Communist Daily Worker, it repeatedly referred to me as public housing enemy No. 1. This despite the fact that all veterans housing legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress was legislation drafted by me. (Public Law No. 702, providing Government-built homes for certain classes of permanently crippled veterans, which was drafted with the aid of the Paralyzed Veterans Association and introduced by me on May 15, 1949, in the Senate, the companion bill in the House being introduced by Congressman Vail on July 17, 1947; and Public Law No. 901 providing for liberal, guaranteed loans, etc., for low-cost housing and Government research on low-cost housing, introduced by me as a substitute for the House bill, on p. 9935, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and passed on August 6, 1948.)

While praising the public-housing legislation passed by the Eighty-first Congress, the Capital Times in typical fashion "overlooked" telling its readers that its slum clearance section is identical, word for word, comma for comma, with the slum clearance bill which I drafted after months of investigation and work, and introduced on the floor of the Senate on April 15, 1948, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4500. They also failed to mention that the public-housing section passed by this Congress is not from the old Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, but contains the about-face on the admittance of tenants in accordance with the amendments which I introduced and argued for on page 4604, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, April 20, 1948.

To keep the record absolutely clear, it should be noted that the Democratic-controlled Eighty-first Congress did not repeal or change a single line or word of either of my housing bills, but merely extended the provisions of my over-all housing legislation, Public Law No. 901.

(i) Another example of honest reporting by the Capital Times was in connection with what they referred to as "McCARTHY's tax difficulties."

In this case there can be no defense by the Capital Times of its being an honest mistake, for the reason that all matters pertaining to Wisconsin income taxes are public knowledge, and every income-tax return as well as every letter written the tax department is available to the public. The Capital Times made a detailed study of all my correspondence with the tax department and therefore cannot claim ignorance of the facts.

This is a field, however, in which distortion and twisting of the truth can be successfully employed because the average newspaper reader does not go to the tax collector's office to verify the truth or falsity of a newspaper's report.

While the Capital Times was editorializing on "* * * Taxes Dodged by McCARTHY," and "Income Tax Secrecy," etc., it deliberately failed to tell its readers all of the following facts: (1) That the public records in the collector's office show that McCARTHY, who, in March 1944 (the legal date for filing the 1943 return) was in the Marine Air Corps, wrote the tax department, giving them all the facts, and stated that under the circumstances, while he did not feel that there was any necessity for filing, he would be glad to abide by whatever decision the legal staff of the tax collector's office made; (2) that the decision was not made until over 2 years later—1946—at which time McCARTHY promptly filed, but that the delay of the tax department of over 2 years in making this decision was no fault whatsoever of McCARTHY's; (3) that every piece of correspondence which McCARTHY had with the tax department on this subject indicated that he would abide fully and completely by the decision made by the tax department's legal staff; (4) that the facts which he gave the tax department in 1944 (the legal time for filing the 1943 return) were accurate down to the last period. Certainly, honest, decent reporting would have required that the readers be so informed.

The other phase of "McCARTHY's tax difficulties" repeatedly dwelt upon by the Capital Times involved a 5-year field investigation made by the tax department. The Capital Times claimed credit for obtaining this investigation, which was made at considerable cost in auditors, etc., to the State. While it was being conducted the Capital Times repeatedly headlined and editorialized on the subject, but not a word as to the results when the survey ended.

Honest, decent newspapering would have required that the paper which claimed to have succeeded in obtaining this 5-year audit would have told its readers the outcome thereof. This was not done, however, for the very obvious reason that the audit not only gave McCARTHY a clean bill of health, but showed a balance of $1,100 in his favor. In other words, the deductions which the Department's auditors found he could have taken, but did not take, amounted to approximately $2,200. The deductions which he took, but which were disallowed, amounted to approximately $1,100, leaving a balance in his favor of $1,100.

Moreover, the Capital Times on a number of occasions reprinted copies of letters which I had written to the Department, but completely destroyed and changed the meaning by leaving out words and sentences. This is the type of honesty advocated by Lenin when he urged Communists to "overlook or conceal the truth" to accomplish their ends.

The Communist Party line is to ridicule and criticize all the institutions upon which our democratic form of government is based. The party line is that (1) our police departments are all dishonest; (2) our legislators are all degenerate; (3) our governors are incompetent; (4) our judges are crooked; (5) our courts apply a different standard of

justice to the rich and to the poor; and (6) that men in professions—doctors, lawyers, dentists, all professional people, as well as the great middle class who have been called the backbone of America—are dishonest because they live better than those in the lower-income group.

Quoting from Judge Medina, who recently tried the 11 Communists in New York, "The process of indoctrination at these various schools and classes was sought to be accomplished by the defendants by: (1) A persistent and unremitting playing upon the grievances of various minority groups, such as young people, veterans, Negroes, housewives, Jews, and those suffering from economic handicaps of one sort or another—rubbing salt into these wounds and doing their best to arouse and inflame antagonisms between various segments of the population; by picturing the Government of the United States as imperialistic and tending toward fascism and the Soviet Union as the protector of the rights of minorities."

The Communist Party program is to put over these ideas so thoroughly by constant day after day, week after week, month after month repetition, that if economic conditions become bad, the seed will have been planted and the time will be ripe to accomplish the Communist aim—the violent, forceable overthrow of our form of government and the liquidation (i. e., murder) of all those who have been successful under our system.

Every man in public life expects criticism—the kind that stems from honest differences of opinion. There is often a vast difference between what a public official thinks is right and what his critic thinks is right. Constant watchfulness on the part of newspapers and radio commentators is a healthy thing. It is essential to a healthy democracy. This type of constructive criticism is to be expected by anyone who enters politics. It is a far cry, however, from the Communist smear technique and character assassination of anyone who believes in and works for the preservation and improvement of our way of life under a system which guarantees the individual the maximum amount of freedom.

4. WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT THIS SITUATION?

There is no law which prevents the Capital Times from hiring Communists as it sees fit. There is no law which prevents the Capital Times from following the Communist line right down to the last period, if it so desires. It is for the people of Madison and vicinity to decide whether they will continue by advertisements and subscriptions to support this paper in view of the above facts—especially in view of the fact that the man who is editor publicly proclaimed that the man hired as city editor was an active and leading member of the Communist Party.

JOE MCCARTHY,
United States Senator.

DECEMBER 3, 1949.

Mr. JOHN NESTINGEN,
Chairman, University of Wisconsin Chapter, American Veterans Committee, Madison, Wis.

DEAR MR. NESTINGEN: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your kind offer to sponsor a debate between an employee of the Capital Times and me.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I have today mailed Mr. Evjue, the editor of the Capital Times. After reading this letter I am sure you will understand why I cannot consent to have a minor employee of the paper substituted for Mr. Evjue in this debate. For example, following are a few of the many questions which only the editor can answer: (1) Why did Mr. Evjue hire as his city editor a man whom he had publicly proclaimed to be the county's leading Communist; (2) Why have the Capital Times' editorials so often paralleled the Communist Daily Worker; (3) Why did Mr. Evjue falsely proclaim in a headline on page 1 of the Capital Times, "Parker Files Non-Red Oath"; (4) Why did Mr. Evjue fail to admit this falsehood until almost 2 years later when I exposed the fact that the affidavit never was filed.

If this debate is to be of any value, the man responsible for the situation on the Capital Times—not one of his employees—must give the answers. If you care to sponsor this debate between Mr. Evjue and myself, I shall most certainly be available at any time.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

DECEMBER 3, 1949.

Mr. WILLIAM T. EVJUE,
Care of the Capital Times,
Madison, Wis.

DEAR SIR: Today I received a letter from Mr. John Nestingen of the University of Wisconsin Chapter of the AVC, telling me that he had made arrangements with one of your employees for a debate with me and asking my approval thereof.

Recently when I exposed in a detailed, factual document the Communistic background of your city editor and the extent to which the Capital Times was being used as the mouthpiece of the Communist Party in Wisconsin, you dared me to discuss this with you in an open forum. I accepted your challenge to a debate and asked you to name the time and place. It is interesting to note that you now plan to send one of your minor employees to do this job for you. Why are you attempting to avoid a debate which you requested? Can it be that the self-styled roaring lion becomes a lamb when his bluff is called? Or is it perhaps because you agree with me that such a debate would prove to the people of Wisconsin that you hired known Communists in important positions on your paper with the result that the Capital Times has been used to aid the vast Communistic propaganda network in this country?

If this debate ever does take place—this debate for which you so loudly asked but so meekly dismissed from your mind once I accepted your challenge—there are certain questions which I intend to make you answer.

1. For example, you will be called upon to tell the people who support your paper whether you are satisfied with Parker's refusal to tell whether he was a Communist on advice of counsel. To date practically every Communist who has appeared before our courts or before congressional committees has also refused on advice of counsel to answer the simple question, "Are you a Communist?"

2. You will be asked to explain, Mr. Evjue, why in fairness to your readers and to the parents of the thousands of university students, you have not simply called Parker into your office and demanded his answer.

It would be very simple indeed for you to say to him, "Now, Cedric, as your boss I want to know whether you claim I was lying when I stated in my paper that you were the leading Communist in Dane County. I also must know whether you claim that the former Communist members who testified under oath that you were a Communist were committing perjury at that time."

If he refuses to answer you, his boss, and says that he is going to continue to keep this a secret because his lawyer tells him to, what do you intend to do then? Or if Cedric Parker admits that he was a Communist but claims that he has reformed, don't you think that your readers should know what brought about this reform and when it occurred?

3. You will be asked to explain whether you considered it honest journalism to have falsely proclaimed on the front page of your paper on January 31, 1948, Parker Files Non-Red Oath, and then to have waited until I exposed your falsehood before admitting that the affidavit never was filed?

4. You will also be asked whether you are today satisfied with Parker's proof that he was not a Communist? Let's here examine that proof.

(a) First, Parker's facts: Parker's lengthy statement which appeared in the Madison Guildsman and in the Capital Times, January 31, 1948, boils down to this:

"Here is a copy of the non-Communist oath which I am signing and filing with the National Labor Relations Board."

(b) Next, Parker's clinching argument: His argument, in the same article, briefly stated was:

"If a Communist were to file this affidavit, he could be fined $10,000 and sent to a Federal prison for 10 years. Therefore, my signing and filing of this proves that I am not a Communist."

(c) And now, the truth: The National Labor Relations Board, in a letter to Senator MCCARTHY, November 10, 1949, stated:

"We have made a complete search of our files and find that Cedric Milford Parker did not file a non-Communist affidavit."

(d) Finally, Parker's admission: After I exposed the above false claim of filing, Cedric Parker and the Capital Times for the first time admitted that Parker never did file the affidavit.

5. You will also be asked to explain why it is that time after time your editorials and your broadcasts have so closely paralleled the material which appears in the official newspaper of the Communist Party, the Daily Worker. You will be asked whether or not you think your city editor might not have had something to do with this.

6. And finally, Mr. Evjue, you will be asked whether or not you think it aided the Communist cause in this country on the numerous occasions on which the Communist Daily Worker has quoted with approval what you have said in defense of Communists and in attacking our democratic institutions. They have praised you as "one of Wisconsin's leading editors," and have accepted you as a man who takes exactly the same position they have taken. They gloat over the fact that your words will reach thousands of ears that are deaf to the Daily Worker.

In my original fact-sheet, I did not discuss whether you personally subscribe to the principles of or belong to any particular "ism" or cult. Nor do I intend to do so in this debate which you suggested, because I think that question is relatively unimportant for the purpose of this debate. In my opinion what makes you dangerous, Mr. Evjue, is not the fact that you as an individual subscribe to the principles of any particular ism, but rather the fact that your high regard for the almighty dollar outweighs any concern for the consequences of your actions. The Capital Times in my opinion is following the Communist Party line of sensationally attacking our democratic institutions, not because you are a loyal member of the Communist Party, but rather because you find it profitable to do so. In my opinion you would be willing to hire an anti-Communist as city editor if you felt that he were sufficiently proficient in the type of character-assassination, name calling and sensationalism which would sell more papers.

For this reason I feel that you are of infinitely more value to the Communist Party than thousands of loyal card-holding party members who do not have the means of reaching the public which you have. The Communists, as you know, would not be dangerous if they did not have a network of newspapers, etc., through which to spread their propaganda in this country.

I have often wondered why men who have prospered so well under our system are willing to see it destroyed, why a man who

has fared as well financially as you have would hire as one of his top men an individual whom he publicly labeled as the county's leading Communist, and why he would allow his paper to spew forth almost verbatim material from the Daily Worker. Perhaps you can supply the answer in this debate.

Sincerely,

JOE MCCARTHY.

Mr. McCARTHY. I discussed in detail the extent to which this new Presidential adviser's newspaper is used as a mouthpiece for the Communist Party. I also discussed the communistic background of his city editor. These remarks, if not true, would be very definitely libelous.

Yesterday Mr. Evjue made some comments about my making statements behind the cloak of senatorial immunity, so today I am assuring him that if he feels he wants to sue, or if his city editor, Mr. Parker, whom I have named as at least a former member of the Communist Party, wants to sue, based upon this statement, I shall be glad to waive any senatorial immunity on condition that they will put up a bond sufficient to take care of the cost of the lawsuit if they lose it.

I might say, in that connection, that I feel perfectly confident in doing this, because truth is a defense to any libel suit.

Mr. President, a few days ago I discussed the very unusual activity on the part of the Loyalty Review Board. I think I should at this time read into the RECORD the names of the members of the Board who were present at the time of the meeting which I discussed on April 3. They are as follows:

Members who were present: George W. Alger, John H. Amen, Harry W. Blair, John Kirkland Clark, Clem W. Collins, Meta Glass, Paul M. Hebert, Garrett S. Hoan, Wilbur La Roe, Jr., Brunson MacChesney, Arthur W. Macmahon, Henry L. Shattuck, Andrew Steers, Eliot Wadsworth, Leonard D. White.

The absent members were: Harry W. Colmery, Edwin A. Cottrell, Burton L. French, Laurence F. Lee, Henry Reining, Jr., Murray Seasongood, James F. Twohy.

Members in Territory of Hawaii: Mrs. Catherine Pratt Field, Marshall B. Henshaw, Gregg W. Sinclair, Frank E. Midkiff.

For the benefit of Senators who were not present at that time, I pointed out that at a secret session, a very lengthy one, on April 3, the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board met to consider what the function of the Board was after the Presidential directive which we have, of course, all heard. It will be recalled that the President, at the time of his refusal of the files to the Senate committee, said:

> My Loyalty Review Board can do this job better, anyway. I am referring the matter to them and asking them to make a complete and thorough check.

Their report, of course, was to put at rest once and for all any claims of disloyalty in the State Department. The Board met and considered the President's letter.

I do not care to have my remarks referring to what occurred at the meeting as a criticism of the Board. They are not meant as such, because the Board had received written instructions from the President, and when there was doubt in their minds as how to interpret the instructions, they received verbal instructions from the President and the Attorney General.

The first thing the Board considered was whether or not it should consider whether any of the individuals named were bad security risks. They went into it in some detail.

Here is a most interesting piece of information: This is some of the material which is supposed to be secret—why, I do not know, unless it is to protect the administration. One of the men present stated he had been very much impressed with the fact that approximately 286 cases of State Department employees had been recommended for full field investigation. The Board said:

He goes on to say that in not one of these cases had an individual been declared ineligible for Federal employment, either on grounds of disloyalty or of being a poor security risk. He wondered whether the Board might not be subject to some criticism—which is really an understatement—if such a situation were allowed to continue, without at least calling it to the attention of the President. He further wondered, in view of the situation, whether the Board's report to the President should not include information to the effect that a review of the record tended to prove that the individual is either homosexual, a habitual drunkard, and so forth.

I should like first to say that another member spoke up later and said it was his opinion that since both the President and the Attorney General had been asked whether they desired the Board to consider security matters as well as loyalty matters, and since the President's letter requests so definitely a report on loyalty, that the Board should confine its consideration to that aspect of the case. Do Senators follow me? There was some doubt as to whether or not they could go into the question of bad security risks and homosexuality, according to the minutes of the meeting—minutes which I am not supposed to have, of course—that they contacted the Attorney General and they contacted the President. They were instructed that this board under no circumstances should make a report or delve into the question of either bad security risk or homosexuality.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator telling the Senate that the loyalty review boards have specific instructions to deal only with the loyalty or disloyalty of an employee or an official, and that in no way do they discuss or look into or investigate what we call generally a bad security risk, which to my mind is the crux of the whole situation? By security risk I mean whether he is a Communist, a fellow traveler, a pinko, a homosexual, incompetent, stupid, or a drunkard?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and the Senator can go a step further on that. Individuals on this Board have a great deal of difficulty in determining just what is meant by a report on a man's disloyalty. The consensus seems to be that it was expressed clearly by Mr. Peurifoy in one of the cases which I read to the Senate on February 20. In effect it is: "Unless you can find an overt act of disloyalty, you should not report the man as disloyal." In other words, it means belonging to an organization, or keeping company with Communists or espionage agents. In their opinion, that is not an overt act of disloyalty. Then what is meant by an overt act, unless it means lighting a fuse on an A-bomb or H-bomb, or placing a bomb in the White House? Therefore, this board of review, this great review board which the President has talked about, said, "This will be the coupe de grace." Therefore, when the report comes in showing that there are no disloyal individuals in the Government—and which of course I would not be able to make public, except for the fear of some individuals on that board—that report will concern itself only with whether or not an individual is guilty of an overt act of disloyalty, so that this wholesale clearing which will come about will be completely meaningless, and that is why I think it is important that the Senate be aware of these facts.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as the statement made the other day by a high Government official is concerned, to the effect that there were no known Communists in the State Department or in Government service—I cannot remember the exact wording——

Mr. McCARTHY. He said that there were no individuals in Government service who had been formally adjudged to be Communists.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe it is the unknown Communists that we are after, and it is the unknown factor which must be investigated and looked into by the committee. On the known cases, of course, action will be taken, or I assume that action will be taken. However, it is the great unknown powers, from whose sources are shaped the opinions and the strings are pulled, and who are not doing it in the open or who are performing an overt act who are the dangerous ones we have in Government, and for whom we should be seeking.

Mr. McCARTHY. I call the Senator's attention to what Mr. Budenz testified the other day, after the President had said that there were no persons in government service who had been adjudged to be Communists. I stated that if the President would get the testimony of Mr. Budenz given at the executive session, which testimony, incidentally Mr. TYDINGS said in the morning would not be made available to me but would be made available to Mr. Lattimore—and I assume that if Mr. Lattimore is

entitled to it, the President would be also—he would find individuals who were named as Communists by Mr. Budenz. Incidentally, Mr. Budenz has been used as a Government witness and his veracity has been vouched for by the Government perhaps more times than any other man in this country. Today, when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was discussing the point 4 program, I felt that I was obliged to inform the Senate that the man named by Mr. Budenz the other day was a member of the Communist Party is a man who heads, as of today, the technical staff of the point 4 program. That man is Haldore Hanson. His case is one which I developed before the committee some time ago, but there has been no action since that time on the part of the committee. I do not know whether the Senate is aware of that case. Mr. Hanson, as I said, is a very intelligent young man. He was coeditor of a Communist magazine in Peking when the Japanese-Chinese war started. He was penniless at that time. Today he has a very high job in the State Department. I gave his record in some detail. Mr. Budenz has confirmed some angles of it, and there will be additional testimony in the case. If the President is looking for Communists, and if he has the high opinion of Mr. Budenz which the Justice Department and the FBI have, it would be at least well if he were to suspend Mr. Hanson until he is able to convince himself about his Communist connections.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator state what is claimed Mr. Budenz testified about Mr. Hanson yesterday?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator state whether or not Mr. Budenz named Mr. Hanson—was it at the hearing the day before yesterday? The Senator was there.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask the Senator if he will please state for the RECORD as to what he claims was testified. I might say that I have sent for the transcript of testimony. I assume that the Senator stated Mr. Budenz' statement was that Mr. Hanson was a member of the Communist Party. If I am mistaken, I would appreciate the Senator's correcting me. Did not the Senator say that to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCARTHY. I said that Mr. Budenz testified that Mr. Haldore Hanson, who is presently head of the technical staff of the point 4 program, is in effect a member of the Communist Party. I ask the Senator to stay on his feet, and I ask the Senator if he will please tell the Senate whether or not Mr. Budenz did so state before his committee. I think the Senate is entitled to that information, especially in view of the fact that we find the Senator's committee has been calling men like Mr. Browder, or anyone at all who will deny the existence of Communists in the Government, in public sessions of the committee. The men who expose Communists in Government are called in private. In view of the fact that we are presently considering legislation and authorization for appropriations in support of the point 4 program, I feel that the Senator from Connecticut has a very serious duty to tell the Senate today—and I will be glad to give him the time to do it—exactly what Mr. Budenz said about Mr. Haldore Hanson. I believe he should read into the RECORD what Mr. Budenz said. It is something which the Senate should know. It should not be kept secret, especially when his committee has called in open session Mr. Browder, the top Communist in America, who has been convicted of fraud, perjury, and so forth. I believe we should hear the testimony Mr. Budenz gave. If the Senator merely reads excerpts from the testimony, I shall insist that the entire testimony go into the RECORD, because one or two sentences will not be clear. There is nothing so secret—and I know what it is—that the Senate should not have it.

I will not permit the Senator in my time to read out of context particular sentences which will in any way deceive the Senate or the country. If the Senator wants to read anything from that record, I will insist that he put the entire record in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield for the purpose of a question, and also if the Senator wants to read anything into the RECORD I will yield, but only on the condition that he insert the entire testimony in the RECORD.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has no intention of reading any part of the record taken by the committee in executive session yesterday. The matter was discussed in a meeting we have just finished, and it was unanimously determined, all five members being present, that that was not the thing to do. I stated yesterday that I would try to see that——

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not yield for a speech at this time.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator refuse to yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I refuse to yield unless the Senator will answer my question, namely, whether he will tell the Senate now whether or not Mr. Budenz discussed Mr. Hanson, and pointed out his communistic connections. I am not going to yield for any other speech at this time. The Senator can make his speech in his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator yield to me while I quote the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin to the Senator from Ohio earlier in the day?

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the Senator a transcript of the executive testimony?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin cannot ask the Senator from Connecticut a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator from Connecticut a question without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator now whether he has the transcript of Mr. Budenz' testimony taken in executive session.

Mr. McMAHON. The testimony taken in yesterday afternoon's session has not yet been transcribed, and therefore I do not have it before me. For the Senator's information, I have the statement he made to the Senator from Ohio earlier in the day. I was about to quote it, and make a statement to the Senate that all five members, including myself, authorized me to make for the committee. However, if the Senator does not wish to have me do that, of course, I shall not persist.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not yield for a statement unless the Senator will inform the Senate, will give them information to which I think they are entitled, namely, whether or not Mr. Budenz yesterday, or the day before, I believe it was, did discuss in detail the case of Haldore Hanson, and if he will give the Senate that information. That is information which should not be kept secret, especially when we are considering, at this time, appropriating huge sums of money for the point 4 program. If the Senator does not want to do that, I will not yield for a speech on some other point.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator yield to me so that I can answer his question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield for the Senator to answer that question, but not to make a speech on any other point. To make it clear, I shall yield, with the consent of the Senate that I shall not lose the floor, solely for the purpose of having the Senator tell us whether or not he will inform the Senate at this time what Mr. Budenz testified to the other day in regard to Haldore Hanson, and so that there may be no question of identification, I mean the Haldore Hanson who is presently the head of the technical staff of the point 4 program. For no other purpose will I yield at this time to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the committee unanimously authorized me to state that the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin was not accurate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not yield to the Senator for any speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment? The Presiding Officer is having a bit of difficulty finding out what any Senator is yielding for. The Chair would suggest that the Senator having the floor follow the rules of the Senate, and yield only for questions, and ask of any other Senator only by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think that the members of the subcommittee should inform the Senate immediately exactly what the testimony of Mr. Budenz was in regard to Mr. Haldore Hanson. That might not be too urgent, except that we are now considering the point 4 program. I do not believe any technical answer, to the effect that he may not have used the identical words which the Senator from Wisconsin used, is adequate. This is something too serious for that. I think there is no reason whatsoever why the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], or one of the other Senators, should not come on the

floor and say here exactly what was said in the meeting. Mr. Budenz was called by me, or, rather, I asked that he be called. I thought I should be allowed to sit in. I knew the substance of his testimony, which is as I stated it. It may be that the words may not be exactly as I stated them. But I do not think we can rely upon any technicalities. I think we should know what the testimony was.

The import of the testimony was that Mr. Haldore Hanson is doing the work of the Communist Party, at least has been a member. Mr. Budenz has not been a member for a few years, so I do not suppose he could state that Mr. Hanson is a member as of today, but I do not think we should resort to any subterfuge, and I assume that what the Senator was about to say was that the committee authorized him to say that Mr. Budenz did not testify that Mr. Hanson is a member of the party. The purport of the testimony was that he was a member of the party at a time when Mr. Budenz was a top member of the party. If that is not true, it can be easily proven by making the record public, and there could be nothing very wrong about making the record public. There was Mr.—what is his name—this morning, who testified in public.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to have the Senator know—I will see if I can put this in the form of a question—I should like to have the Senator know, or does he know, that the subcommittee unanimously voted, all five members being present, that at this time the record of our proceedings of yesterday would not be divulged?

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

The other day I pointed out on the Senate floor that while originally I had stated that it would be impossible for me to develop complete cases against various individuals named independent of their files, I further pointed out that in view of the fact that the files were not obtained, I felt it necessary to attempt to present at least enough documented evidence so that the Senate and the public would know how dangerous the situation is, with the hope that the limited information which I might be able to produce myself outside of the files might force the production of the files so that a thorough job could be done.

I repeat, those files are the result of the work of thousands of trained investigators over years and years, and it will be completely impossible for me to remotely attempt to duplicate the information in those files.

I might also say that those files, the top-secret information, is now completely open and available to individuals being named by competent witnesses as members of the Communist Party.

I further pointed out some of the obstacles placed in my way by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the committee. I pointed out that the Senator from Maryland had called me on Monday and assured me that I now at long last would get the cooperation of the committee, and requested that I give the committee the names of all witnesses I desired to have appear, and that I would be able to at least sit in during their testimony. I pointed out the necessity of my being able to attend, in view of the reluctance of many witnesses to appear because of their fear, either justified or otherwise, that the majority members of the committee would be completely hostile to any witneses who would expose communists in government.

For that reason I pointed out that it was very important for the sake of getting at the truth that I be able at least to attend the executive sessions at which my witnesses appeared.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], however, after having assured me that I could attend, ordered that I leave the committee room, giving no reason therefor except that if Mr. Lattimore could not attend that I could not. I informed the Senate that if this attitude on the part of the Senator from Maryland and upon the part of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] also were to continue I would have no choice but to attempt to develop the facts in some of the more important cases on the Senate floor. I consider this method entirely unsatisfactory and entirely undesirable. However, as the attitude of the Tydings-McMahon committee becomes more and more clear, I feel that I shall have no other alternative, unless there is an abrupt about-face.

I have been extremely disturbed by the fact that the committee has apparently now decided to hold executive sessions whenever a witness appears who will give evidence which will expose Communists in government and hold public sessions whenever a witness is going to testify that there are no Communists in government, or who will defend those who have been named.

As the Senate knows, the committee decided to hold an executive session to hear Mr. Bielaski, whom I named as one of the important witnesses in the Amerasia case.

I may say that when I refer to the Amerasia case, I am not referring merely to the theft of the documents back in 1945. I am referring to the entire espionage network. Understand, I am not referring to all of the espionage networks. There are a number operating independently. I am referring to the entire espionage network when I refer to the Amerasia case. Mr. Bielaski has been called as a witness in that case.

At the same time it held a public session this morning to hear Mr. Earl Browder, one of this Nation's leading Communists. However, luckily—I think very luckily—the spectacle presented this morning was so sorry that it may have accomplished a purpose opposite from that intended. While Mr. Browder bragged—and listen to this—that he was using the committee as his transmission belt—that was his language used this morning, "I am using this committee as my transmission belt to get my story across to the American people"—while he bragged that he was using the committee as his transmission belt, I am inclined to think that the American people are too intelligent to believe a man who has been convicted of a conspiracy to block the draft during World War I, of passport fraud, and vagrancy, and who subscribes to the maxims of Lenin when he said, "We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding, and concealing the truth." We find there a language which sows among the masses hate, revolt, scorn, and the like toward those who disagree with them. I doubt very much whether the American people are going to be fooled too much by this individual who testified this morning.

It is almost beyond belief to me that the majority members of this committee would call at a public hearing Earl Browder, and then ask him very carefully prepared questions so that he could deny everything that Mr. Budenz said, and allow him to refuse at will—I repeat, allow him to refuse at will—to answer such questions as he did not care to answer, and then to call in secret those reliable witnesses who have evidence which the people should know.

I might say also that if any benefit is to be derived from calling Jack Stachel, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Browder, or any other of such type members of the Communist Party, we can get no benefit by calling them, and then have no cross-examination, except the very limited cross-examination which the members of the committee can think up on the spur of the moment. This is no reflection on the ability of the committee to cross-examine. I am sure any lawyer will agree with me that if Browder, Stachel, Field, and such well-known and very active Communists are to be given the searching cross-examination which must be given if one is to develop the facts, it can only be done after weeks of preparation. One must go into everything they have said in the past, all the hearings at which they have testified, and then there must be a chairman of the committee who will not say, "Well, I can understand your position in refusing to answer." There must be a chairman of the committee who has some guts, some willingness and desire to develop the facts, so when the Communist comes before the committee and says, "I will not answer," he will promptly cite the witness for contempt.

We know it is practically impossible ever to convict men like Browder because of the type of conspiracy they indulge in, but they can be convicted of perjury and contempt of committees if they are handled without kid gloves.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota was engaged in another committee this morning so did not hear much of the Browder testimony. I was in the room perhaps 20 or 30 minutes. Does the Senator from Wisconsin recall whether the committee, in interrogating Mr. Browder, brought out the fact that he had served a Federal penitentiary term for falsifying a Federal passport, thereby amply qualifying himself for the title of professional perjurer which he

attempted to place on Mr. Budenz? Was that brought out this morning?

Mr. McCARTHY. I know that is the situation, but whether it was brought out this morning, frankly I do not know. I did not stay for the entire hearing. I stayed and watched that procedure for about an hour, and it frankly made me sick way down deep inside, and I could not stomach it and left.

Mr. MUNDT. During the time the junior Senator from South Dakota was there certainly there was a most revolting type of interrogation being conducted by Mr. Morgan. Would the Senator from Wisconsin agree with me that Mr. Morgan apparently was treating Mr. Browder with such deference and such kindly consideration that it would certainly look as though he were trying to encourage him to take that opportunity to expound upon communism for the information of the country, rather than to try to find out any facts in connection with the Budenz testimony?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me recall it this way. I have hesitated discussing Mr. Morgan. I have felt that he was a young man, with a great deal of promise. He had an excellent reputation. Some Senators may disagree. I know some Senators discussed his connection with the Pearl Harbor Committee. I frankly do not think he was responsible for the whitewash by that committee. When Mr. Morgan took over this job I said to him that he had a golden opportunity; that if he wanted really to dig in he could make this a real committee and perform a great service for the Nation. I advised him that if he did not want to do that to give the job to another. I think he should do either one now. I hesitate to discuss Mr. Morgan. I do not think, however, this is a case in which we can afford to be delicate when facts start becoming more and more crystal clear.

I may say Mr. Morgan is on salary now of ten, eleven, or twelve thousand dollars a year, and has been working for the committee for some 10 or 11 weeks—I do not know how many. He sat through all the hearings, and when Mr. Lattimore and various witnesses appeared, to disprove my claim of Communists in government they were not cross-examined. As the Senator will recall, since he was on the committee which exposed and was active in convicting Mr. Hiss, some of the statements we heard before this committee were about as good as those of Mr. Hiss, and sounded about the same. Mr. Morgan sat there all this time and never raised his voice, that is, he never asked for the right to cross-examine.

However, when Mr. Budenz appeared to testify, then Mr. Morgan was very active. He made a very serious attempt, a very excellent attempt, to try and discredit Mr. Budenz. Do not get me wrong. I think the type of cross-examination Mr. Morgan gave Mr. Budenz is the type that should be given every witness. I do not object to any witness that I have produced being thoroughly cross-examined. But I am just giving this as a part of the entire situation. There is no cross-examination of anyone who says "There are no Communists in government," but Budenz was given a very rigorous cross-examination when he tried to expose Communists in government.

However, when Mr. Browder comes on the stand, instead of giving him the type of vigorous examination which I think Mr. Morgan would be able to give a witness, he framed his questions just as well as Mr. Browder's own attorney—or what is the other lawyer who sits in the back of the room, who is representing Mr. Lattimore—Mr. Fortas could have framed them. He gave him an excellent opportunity to do what Mr. Browder said he was doing, namely, using the committee as his transmission belt. I think Mr. Morgan now, for his own sake, for his own good name, should do one of two things. I do not condemn Mr. Morgan too much. I know he is a very good friend of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and he was hired by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. Mr. Morgan may find that it is impossible for him to do a good job when he is under the orders of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Maryland, and inasmuch as Mr. Morgan is a close friend of the Senator from Illinois. If Mr. Morgan finds that that is the situation, then for his own sake and for the sake of the Nation he should resign today, and he—a young man of such great promise—should not take a major part in what is becoming a very sorry spectacle.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not wish to be put in the position of criticizing Mr. Morgan. I have never met him. I do not want to prejudge his ability or astuteness. I heard him interrogating only a few of the witnesses before the subcommittee. However, I cannot refrain from saying that I was literally appalled by the spectacle I saw in the committee room this morning. Has the Senator from Wisconsin ever known of any other time in our history when a great committee of the Senate—in this instance, a part of its Foreign Relations Committee—has called before it a Communist, for the purpose of permitting him to expound on the purposes and philosophy of communism, and has permitted him to do so without even attempting to challenge his statements or to show the falsity and fictitiousness of such propaganda?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, I never have known of a similar instance.

I may say, further, that when counsel for the subcommittee asked Mr. Browder questions which apparently the subcommittee and its counsel, Mr. Morgan, thought competent questions, Mr. Browder often would say, "I will not answer that question. I do not think it is competent." How many times he did so, I do not recall; and at that time we found the subcommittee members closely watching the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who was smiling and nodding and apparently indicating, "Here is a fellow who is doing a good job."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I was not at the meeting of the subcommittee today during its entire proceedings, so I should like to inquire—because I think we should distribute or assign the responsibility or credit exactly in accordance with the way it belongs—whether the minority counsel of the committee, Mr. Morris, was given an opportunity to question the witnesses, and whether he asked Mr. Browder questions in an attempt to disparage the falsehoods which Mr. Browder so recklessly put in the record?

Mr. McCARTHY. The minority counsel, Mr. Morris, was not given an opportunity to ask any questions up to the time when I left the subcommittee today.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin say that Mr. Morris was not permitted to ask any questions?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Not only that, but Mr. Morris was excluded from the subcommittee room the day Mr. Budenz testified. Mr. Morris was not allowed to stay in the room, even though Mr. Lattimore and his attorney, Mr. Porter, were allowed in the room.

Mr. MUNDT. That sounds incredible. I really think the Senator from Wisconsin should yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], to permit him to correct the RECORD, if there is any error in the statement the Senator from Wisconsin has made. Surely the committee has not barred its second highest ranking counsel from interrogating witnesses.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be more than happy to do so, so as to let the Senator from Connecticut correct me if I am wrong either in that statement or in the statement I now make, namely, that the morning Mr. Budenz appeared in the subcommittee room, Mr. Lattimore and his attorney, Mr. Porter, also appeared in the committee room. Mr. Morgan, the counsel for the subcommittee, was also in the room. Mr. Morris, the assistant counsel for the subcommittee, was first ejected; I met him as I came toward the committee room. He was ejected by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

At that particular time the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was not present; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was not present. Whether the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] was there at that time, I do not know.

Later on, after the Senator from Iowa arrived, he pointed out how very ridiculous it was that although the committee is studying the subject of communism and is attempting to investigate and obtain information and facts regarding Communists in the State Department, it would allow to sit on the other side of the table in the committee room the man I have named as one of the top Communists, and also his attorney.

The Senator from Iowa then got up to leave; he said he would not stay in the subcommittee room, in view of the fact that Mr. Morris was excluded and with Lattimore and his attorney present.

Then the Senator from Maryland asked the Senator from Iowa to stay, and the Senator from Maryland decided that

Mr. Lattimore and his attorney would leave, but said to them, "We will give you a copy of the testimony taken in executive session."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] very strenuously objected to that procedure. He said he thought an executive session should be an executive session, and nothing else; and that although interested Senators should be allowed to be there, there should be no outsiders, either attorneys or other persons.

After expelling Mr. Lattimore and his attorney, the Senator from Maryland then informed me that I would have to leave; and he gave as his reason the fact that if Lattimore could not be there, I could not be there to hear Mr. Budenz's testimony.

I pointed out to him that it had long been the practice, so far as I knew, for Senators who were interested in the subject-matter of a committee inquiry, even though they did not belong on the committee, to be allowed to remain in executive sessions of the committee. That has been the practice, so far as I know, throughout the history of the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. It is an established senatorial precedent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, it is an established rule.

However, the Senator from Maryland said he would order me out.

I said, "Mr. TYDINGS, will you at least present this to the committee, so that whatever action is taken will be the action of the committee, and not the action of Mr. TYDINGS?"

The Senator from Maryland discussed the matter with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The Senator from Maryland then said that he would not do it unless the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] were present.

Then I said, "Do you mean you are going to eject me today, without any action of the committee?"

The Senator from Maryland hesitated and stalled on that.

So I said, "Is it your order that I leave the room?"

He said, "Yes, it is."

Mr. President, that is the complete picture, I think. If there has been any inaccuracy in the slightest detail of my presentation of it, I think the Senator from Connecticut should make any possible corrections, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to do so.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that what the Senator from Wisconsin has just said is certainly an astounding and revealing recital, but it does not quite answer what I had asked about.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sorry if I have not done so.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator will further yield, let me pursue the matter a little further: Do I correctly understand him to say that at the Hollywood spectacle we witnessed in the committee room this morning, when the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee permitted Earl Browder to come into that klieg-light atmosphere and recite falsehood after falsehood and place falsehood after falsehood in the record, without any challenge being made by Mr. Morgan while I was there, and without any challenge being made by any member of the committee, at least not while I was there, then Mr. Morris was denied the right to ask questions? Is it possible that that happened? It sounds perfectly incredible. If it is true, the country should know it. If it is not true, certainly the Senator from Connecticut or some other Senator should make the necessary correction of the statement. We are all hoping this is not to become a partisan whitewash. However, if minority counsel is denied by the Democratic majority committee members the right even to question witnesses, there can, of course, be no other conclusion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Morris has been denied the right to ask questions, at least up until the time I left the room today.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the Senator tell me what in the name of high heaven the country is paying the salary of Mr. Morris for, if it is not to interrogate witnesses? What is he there for? Who is stopping him? Is this a partisan approach, or are we trying to get down to the facts in government? The Senate is entitled to know whether we are sponsoring an investigation or a whitewash.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator it is incredible to me that the committee would not allow the minority counsel to ask questions. I cannot conceive why any committee would want to protect a man like Mr. Browder from cross-examination. I may say I have asked, and I have even begged the committee to give me the right to cross-examine witnesses such as Stachel, Browder, and Field. I have assured the committee that if they will give me that right, I will make those gentlemen either indict themselves or perjure themselves. That is not because I think I am a more brilliant cross-examiner than anyone else on the committee. It is because I have been living with this thing for months and months, and I know the background of these individuals, and it is inconceivable to me that this committee should try to protect a man like Earl Browder from my cross-examination. After all, the only man who should worry about cross-examination is a man who is lying. Any man who tells the truth should not worry about cross-examination.

Mr. MUNDT. Earl Browder, of course, was in the Federal penitentiary until President Roosevelt pardoned him. Browder was sentenced for procuring fictitious passports, on evidence secured, incidentally, in part by the House Committee on un-American Activities, of which I was a member. But let me get this point completely clear: Mr. Morris, the assistant counsel, has been denied, by action of the committee, the right to ask questions. If so, by what vote, and how did each committee member vote, and what is their purpose? What is their reason? I think the country wants, not a partisan approach to this, either by the Democratic majority of the committee, or by the Republican minority, but it wants the committee to get down to the facts. No reasonable American is going to believe remotely that this is anything but whitewash if the minority counsel is denied the right to interrogate witnesses. It stands self-condemnatory What is the reason? Why do they do it? It is all very incredible to me; I think the country is entitled to specific information on this significant and completely unprecedented procedure.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator, I do not know, in answer to his question, by what action of the committee, by what vote. This is what I have gotten from one of the minority members of the committee. It is that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] made the decision. Well, I believe both the majority and the minority members were present, including the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and, as I recall, he stated there was no formal vote taken, because it was a 3-to-2 proposition.

Mr. MUNDT. I suggest then it might be well to have a roll-call vote on that, before they have any more Hollywood scenarios with Earl Browder as the hero, and the members of the committee as the applauding auditors. The first thing they might do, certainly, is to give the minority counsel the right to sit in and ask questions. If he is not worthy of asking questions, he should be fired, because it is a fraud upon the American taxpayers to be paying a salary to an assistant counsel whom the majority implies is so inefficient they will not let him ask the witness any questions.

Mr. McCARTHY. I very heartily agree with the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. May I suggest, or add to that statement, that the junior Senator from South Dakota is not altogether without some experience in holding investigations of this type, having served for more than 8 years on a very similar committee. Throughout those years, we never once denied the assistant counsel the full right to interrogate witnesses. It was our theory that our job was to find out where the truth was, not to protect anyone, not to condemn anyone. We needed to bring into focus consequently the minds and talents of the best people available. Never once in our career did we pay a salary to a man and say to him, "Sit there, mute; ask no questions; do no work—you might embarrass the majority of the committee."

Now, if I may ask another question, I ask unanimous consent to read some statements from the Associated Press tear sheet out in the press lobby, without jeopardizing the right of the Senator from Wisconsin to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. It is reported here, in a running account of what apparently transpired in that strange and unprecedented spectacle which occurred in the Senate committee room this morning. Mr. Browder was the center of attraction. It apparently occurred after I left. I quote now from the green sheets which we all see every day in the press lobby:

Browder admitted receiving letters during the war from Chinese Communist leader Mao Tse-tung. He said he had passed the information they contained about the war

along to President Roosevelt and had been informed that the information was confirmed by the American high command.

Then, as shown in quotation marks, Mr. Browder said:

"I assume this information played a decisive role in re-forming the American position in China," he said.

Let me repeat the testimony given to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by their star witness, Mr. Browder, as it appears within quotations in the Associated Press story. Mr. Browder said:

"I assume this information played a decisive role in re-forming the American position in China," he said.

I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] can shed any light as to whether any one on that committee today tried to explore that highly important clue any further by legitimate questioning.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say I left. I do not know what happened after I left the committee room.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator was not there when that thing took place?

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. MUNDT. A little bit later, the Associated Press story says:

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, asked Browder if in 1942 he transmitted a message to Mme. Sun Yat-sen in China from then Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles.

To me, it is an astounding thing that we find this jailbird and perjurer, who was pardoned by President Roosevelt from the Federal penitentiary, being used by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles as a State Department messenger carrying a message to this particular person. I wonder whether anyone, during the hearing, thought to ask any questions about how that strange anomaly occurred. Was the Senator from Wisconsin present at that time?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not know.

Mr. MUNDT. I continue reading:

Browder said he did—

He delivered the message to Garcia. An Elbert Hubbard ought to write a new speech about him. But here is the point I was leading to:

Browder defied the investigators—

The star witness finally turned around and slapped the faces of those who had so graciously accepted his testimony up to that point without challenge.

Browder defied the investigators to force him to reveal the details of a meeting he had with a Chinese Red leader before the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco.

He told the subcommittee that nothing would force him to tell who was present at the meeting other than himself and the Chinese Communist Tung Pi Wu.

He said:

"You can't force me by indirection to answer any question which I have refused to answer directly."

Browder's flat refusal came while he was under questioning by HICKENLOOPER.

I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin, in view of the fact that that is a clear-cut case of contempt of Congress, whether the committee then summarily cited Browder for contempt, or what then occurred to this star witness.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that what happened then is largely a matter of rumor. I understand, and the Senator from Connecticut—I see he has left the Senate Chamber. All I have on that point is merely what I have gotten by rumor, and I may be far off on this. I doubt very much whether I should discuss it.

Mr. MUNDT. No; if the Senator does not know, of course, I do not want him to make any conjecture.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand.

Mr. MUNDT. But does the Senator agree with me that that is a clear-cut case of contempt of Congress? Can one become much more contemptuous of a committee, in other words, than Mr. Browder did this morning in the contempt he manifested?

Mr. McCARTHY. I could not think of anything more contemptuous, and I could not think of any information which the committee might want more than that particular information. I can see no excuse whatever for the committee's not immediately citing Browder for contempt and taking action against him—no reason whatever.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Connecticut has returned to the Senate Chamber, and he can answer. Possibly the committee has cited Browder for contempt?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to advise the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from South Dakota that the witness Browder is still under subpena by the committee, that he has not been released from the subpena. The committee has not finished questioning him. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], one of the minority members, questioned Mr. Browder for upward of an hour this morning. It got to be 5 minutes after 1. The Senators had other engagements. I believe two of the Senators announced they had further questions to ask the witness. That is the reason why he is still under subpena. These matters were discussed in a meeting of the committee this afternoon. I am not at liberty to state what action the committee took, except that I am pleased to inform Senators regarding the action of the committee on the matter that, while no formal record was taken probably of any portion of it, we were unanimous in our viewpoint.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield on condition that I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] care to comment on whether he concurs in the reflections of the junior Senator from South Dakota, that the actions of Mr. Browder before the committee this morning were not only contemptuous but also contemptible?

Mr. McMAHON. I would say, of course, that as a citizen of the United States and as a Senator, I know Mr. Browder's record; I know what he is, what he has been, and what he would do in this country if he had his way. I do not think the Senator needs any protestations from me as to what I think of Mr. Browder.

Mr. MUNDT. I am referring to his actions before the committee this morning.

Mr. McMAHON. So far as his testimony today is concerned, I think it can be best described by saying that he was insolent. I think that is a sufficient description to indicate how I feel about his testimony.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is a good indication of the direction in which the Senator is leaning, and I think, in fairness to the Members of the Senate, that summarily and soon the members of the committee should either cite Mr. Browder for contempt or appoint him as another assistant counsel, saying nothing, knowing nothing, but being bound by the rules of the committee not to interrogate the witnesses. In that way he could do less harm than serving as an unchallenged witness propagandizing the Communist line.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that when Mr. Browder refused to answer certain questions as to whether he knew certain individuals, the chairman said:

I can understand your position and see your reasons for not wanting to answer these questions.

Is that substantially correct?

Mr. McMAHON. The record will speak for itself. I would not attempt to say, in the two and a half hours of hearing, exactly what is said, except that any implication that is sought to be left with the country, with the Senate, or with the press as to the attitude of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] will be well answered, if I am any judge, in press reports of what took place this morning. Therefore the Senator from Connecticut will not comment. I have enough faith in the fairness of the gentlemen who were there this morning and who will report to the American people to think that they will give a clear and objective report of what took place. I shall not comment upon any characterization by the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from South Dakota.

I say that because, as I said yesterday, despite efforts to goad me, I shall not take part—and I would advise the other members of the committee, either of the majority or the minority, not to take part—in a running debate about this matter when we are supposed to be doing our duty under a resolution of the Senate. I think that would be a mistake. What the Nation expects from us, Mr. President, is careful, honest, judicial work done according to our best ability. I believe each member of the majority and each member of the minority is trying to fulfill that obligation. When the report is finally made to the country we shall have to answer to the Senate and to the people of the country fully so far as this business goes on day by day.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. First, let me say that the Senator was asking about whether Mr. Morris was denied the right to cross-examine. I should first like to

point out that Mr. Morris, in my opinion, is one of the most able young men for this type of work that can be secured. He is very, very well equipped for this task. During the war he was in Navy Intelligence. At that time he was on the Communist desk.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. In view of the fact that the Senate subcommittee, in its good judgment, has elected to continue Mr. Browder under subpena rather than to cite him for contempt by virtue of the fact that he thumbed his nose so arrogantly at the members of the committee, individually and collectively this morning, and in view of the fact that I think the Senator from Connecticut is quite correct in his statement indicating the subcommittee would like to have advice on about what the country would like to have examined, may I suggest, speaking as a country boy from South Dakota, that since they are going to keep Mr. Browder under subpena and are going to ask him some more questions before they decide whether to cite him for contempt, I should like to have them ask questions to find out what happened when he said he believed he played a decisive role in reforming our American position in China. I think it would be very fruitful for the country to find out, by interrogating this Communist, what he had in mind, what he did, how he reformed the American position in China, how much influence he had with or without Lattimore in pushing our policy in the direction in which the Soviets wanted to have it go. I should also then like to have the committee elaborate in its direct questions to Browder so as to find out how it happened that he was used by Sumner Welles as a State Department emissary—a sort of forerunner to Hiss—conveying messages from the State Department to the wife of Sun Yat-sen in China. So long as the committee does not intend to cite him for contempt at the time he is contemptuous, and is going to converse with him further, those are points, speaking for one section of the country, in direct reply to the statement of the Senator from Connecticut, that I think would be very important to bring out in the additional testimony.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to say that while he obviously had no preparation for examining the witness, I think the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] did a very commendable job in exposing the things he exposed this morning. If he had had sufficient preparation, I am sure it would have been infinitely better. I think that in the limited time in which he had to prepare, he did a very fine job of cross-examining while I was present.

Mr. President, as I stated, if the committee continues to place obstacles in my way when I ask to produce material of value to the committee, I feel that I shall have no alternative ultimately but to take the Senate floor and again attempt to develop these cases. I think that is entirely unsatisfactory. I sincerely hope that it will not be necessary. I firmly feel that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are doing a tremendous disservice to what was once certainly a great party and which still has in its membership some of the outstanding men whom we see on the other side of the aisle.

I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] did a tremendous disservice to his country and to his party when he picked the Senator from Maryland to head the subcommittee when there were so many men in his party who could have done a better job with greater credit to the Nation.

The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] urged that the Senate appropriate much more money for the Voice of America. With that I would heartily agree if we first had a thorough house cleaning of the staff of the Voice of America and had the project operated by good, intelligent Americans, of whom there is no shortage.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to what I am about to say.

I have given to the committee today the names of two individuals who are, according to all the evidence, extremely dangerous to this Nation and who are perverting the purpose for which the Voice of America was originally established. I have called the staff's attention to the fact that in the case of one of these individuals they will not need the loyalty files, but will merely need to look over the personnel files of the State Department. The other individual has been previously publicly named as a member of the party. His actions indicate that he is a member. I have informed the Chief of Staff, Mr. Morgan, that unless the State Department within a reasonable period of time informs me that either these two men have been discharged or tells me what circumstances exist which justify their being kept on despite the dangerous picture of them in the files, I shall be forced to discuss both cases in detail on the Senate floor. One of the cases I shall very much dislike discussing, in view of the fact that it involves not only Communist activities but complete and utter degeneracy insofar as sex perversion is concerned.

I have given those two names to the committee and I have given them sufficient information. I have asked that they take this matter up with the State Department, and I have asked the State Department within a reasonable length of time to either let me know that these two men have been discharged or, in the absence of that, I think I am entitled to know what justification there could conceivably be for their being kept on. In the absence of that, I intend to develop those two cases on the Senate floor.

Now I should like at this time to give the Senate some further information on the John Service case which I have not heretofore given the Senate. I had the information but I did not have the exact dates.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, providing he does not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos the question raised by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on the testimony today to most of which I listened, as did the Senator from South Dakota. I was rather startled at the testimony of Mr. Browder, to the effect that he had transmitted through some channels to the Government of the United States messages he had received from Mao Tse-tung, the Communist leader in China, which influenced this government in changing its policy. As I understood the testimony this morning, that policy was changed on or about October 1942, and from that time to 1945 it was so satisfactory to the Communist Party of the United States that they did not feel it was necessary to carry on their agitation. While he said that he felt it would not be proper to claim sole credit for doing it, it did so happen that the policy which we pursued after October 1942, was certainly reasonably satisfactory to the Communist Party in this country.

I have not had a chance to completely reanalyze the American white paper, which was issued on August 5, 1949, relative to our dealings with China, except in a somewhat cursory manner. I have checked through it, and I cannot find any such document in the American white paper on or about the date of October 1942. I have had my office contact the State Department to ask them to furnish me with a copy of this document, which Mr. Browder says Sumner Welles gave him with the understanding that he would transmit it to Mme. Sun Yat-sen, who was one of the leading figures in the Communist Party in China, and who, I believe, is now one of the vice chairmen of the Communist regime in China. I have also asked that they supply me with the documents leading up to the issuance of that paper, which apparently was turned over to Mr. Browder for transmittal to Mme. Sun Yat-sen.

Reserving my judgment until the State Department clearly can indicate whether or not this memorandum appears in the white paper, I should say that it would seem to me to be rather unusual for a document of such importance, which marks the turning point of American policy in China, should have been excluded from the white paper. I am saying now that it has been excluded. I cannot find it. Certainly I feel that there should be a full explanation to the Senate and to the country as to why these documents, which now appear to be of considerable historic interest in this whole problem, were not amply outlined in the white paper with reference to China.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

As I said, I should like to give the Senate some more detailed information in the case of Mr. Service. The Senate will recall that Mr. Service is a man who has taken such an active part in shaping our China policy. During the entire year of 1949 Mr. Service was under intensive investigation by the FBI. Reports were forwarded to the Loyalty Review Board which reflected adversely upon his desirability as a State Department employee. On December 28, 1948, the Loyalty Review Board received a copy of such report, and again on February 18, 1949, March 10, 1949, April 4,

1949, May 11, 1949, August 9, 1949, September 7, 1949, and September 21, 1949, the Loyalty Board received reports from the FBI containing information which would strongly indicate—to put it mildly—the wisdom of terminating his employment immediately. Those reports have been subsequently picked up by the Justice Department. Incidentally, three copies of each report were forwarded to the State Department. Service's file was requested by the Loyalty Review Board from the State Department repeatedly until the year 1949, but was not received by it until February 24, 1950. On March 3, 1950, as I have previously stated, the Review Board referred his file back to the State Department, with the request that further hearing be held and that a new board be appointed. On March 6, 1950, the Justice Department picked up Service's entire file.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing through Tuesday of next week.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and continuing for the next 2 weeks. These Senators are members of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which is holding hearings on a judgeship nomination in the State of Utah and will conduct hearings during that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave of absence is granted.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the Senate consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar of David C. Walls, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the Senator whether the nomination has been reported in the regular way by the committee?

Mr. MCFARLAND. It has been.

Mr. MARTIN. Do I correctly understand that no objection was raised to it by the two Senators from Kentucky, to the Senator's knowledge?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Not to my knowledge. I do not know as a fact.

Mr. MARTIN. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 28, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Austin L. Staley, of Pennsylvania, to be a United States circuit judge, third circuit, vice John J. O'Connell, deceased.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 27 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

David C. Walls to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our father, we are again fervently seeking Thee in the fellowship of prayer, beseeching Thee that we may find Thee continually a presence to purify and strengthen, a light to guide and encourage, and a loveliness to transform and transfigure our lives.

May our minds and hearts be more receptive and responsive to the Master's ways of living and may we find our joy in striving to emulate His character and walking in His paths of justice and righteousness, of peace and good will, of kindness and love.

Grant that the day may be hastened when all men everywhere shall give themselves in a glad and willing obedience to the mind of Christ. In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 24, 1950:

H. J. Res. 454. Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the pay rolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners;

H. R. 4342. An act for the relief of J. R. Holden, R. C. Biggadike, and John Hoffman; and

H. R. 5839. An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

On April 26, 1950:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg;

H. R. 1699. An act for the relief of the estate of William Kraus;

H. R. 3306. An act for the relief of Antonio Rejas Velez;

H. R. 3309. An act for the relief of the estate of Ovidio Vazquez;

H. R. 3315. An act for the relief of Alejo Padilla;

H. R. 5361. An act for the relief of Charles G. McCormack, captain, Medical Corps, United States Navy;

H. R. 3205. An act to provide an extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay;

H. R. 3319. An act for the relief of Juana Pagán;

H. R. 4411. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Mary C. Mangle;

H. R. 4229. An act to amend section 17 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act;

H. R. 5341. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Greer;

H. R. 5503. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release and quitclaim a portion of a right-of-way easement to Langley Air Force Base, Va.; and

H. R. 5951. An act to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4393. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

STEEL EXHIBITS

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a number of interesting and highly informative exhibits which are currently on display in the Judiciary Committee room and in the caucus room on the third floor of the Old House Office Building.

In these days we hear a great deal of talk about monopoly in the steel industry. We are told, for example, that it is a mature industry which has waxed fat and lazy, wallowing contentedly in the same old rut, while younger and more enterprising industries have brought fabulous new miracles from their laboratories and their factories. I know of nothing that will dispel that notion and disprove that charge more completely and more graphically than a brief examination of the exhibits I have mentioned.

I wonder how many of us realize that the greatest single resemblance between steel as it is produced today and the steel our fathers knew before World War I is to be found in the name alone. The product itself is so vastly improved that it might properly be entitled to an entirely different name. I wonder, too, how many of us are aware of the fact

that modern research in the steel industry has been a fundamental prerequisite which has made possible many of the present-day miracles that most of us do not associate with steel at all.

We marvel, of course, as we see the momentary flash of a jet plane streaking across the sky, but how many of us know that supersonic flight was made possible, in part, by the development of what is known technically as stainless W—a specialty steel which was created by United States Steel Corp. before the recent war and produced under the cloak of military secrecy during the hostilities?

We look to television as one of the great new industries which will grow and blossom during the second half of this twentieth century, but how many of us have heard about the combination stainless steel and glass picture tube which makes possible larger pictures and smaller cabinets, and which costs much less than the original all-glass tube? We could not have these better, cheaper television sets today had not the research laboratories of United States Steel produced an entirely new steel which could be bonded to glass without cracking apart as the tube heats and cools.

We look with jaded contempt upon the automobiles of 20 or 30 years ago, but how many of us understand that the streamlined, luxury cars of today are possible only because of the amazing new steels which have been developed and perfected in the past few decades? In 1910, 11 standard kinds of steel were all that were used in the manufacture of automobiles. Today that industry uses 162 entirely separate and distinct types of steel in more than 1,000 different combinations of form, analysis, size, and quality.

It is the improvement in steel that has made possible the one-piece, all-steel top which adds so much to our safety as we ride in today's automobiles. New deep drawing carbon steel sheets are basically responsible for new oil pan design which permits shorter over-all length in today's cars without loss of interior room, at the same time reducing engine weight and providing over-all cost savings and a better product.

New alloy steels have permitted manufacturers to reduce the weight of an automobile ring gear by 45 percent, and at the same time put 26 percent more power through that gear. In 1936 the sleek, streamlined fender of a Cadillac cost a great deal of money because it had to be made of three pieces welded together, and had to be finished by an expensive, hand grinding operation covering the greater part of the surface. Today, thanks to new and more versatile steels, the 1950 Chevrolet carries a better fender, made at much lower cost from a single piece of steel and needing almost no hand grinding to finish it. So the fact is that, unbeknown to most of us, the steels which make possible the smart new lines of today's low-priced cars were born unsung in the laboratories of one of the world's most progressive enterprises, the American steel industry.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to spoil these exhibits for my colleagues by trying to describe here all of the amazing new developments they depict or the infinite variety of products which exist today only because of the technological strides which have marked the progress of this industry over the years, but I do believe that all of us will profit by at least a reasonable knowledge of what the steel industry has done, what it is doing, and how it affects almost every other major industry in America. I know of no better way to obtain that background of knowledge than to spend a few minutes studying the exhibits which United States Steel is displaying here this week.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1958)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'National Science Foundation Act of 1950'.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Foundation'). The Foundation shall consist of a National Science Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') and a Director.

"FUNCTIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

"(1) to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

"(2) to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare;

"(3) at the request of the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support specific scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

"(4) to award, as provided in section 10, scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

"(5) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

"(6) to evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government, and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups;

"(7) to establish such special commissions as the Board may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act; and

"(8) to maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States, including its Territories and possessions.

"(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

"(c) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include (1) minority views and recommendations if any, of members of the Board, and (2) information as to the acquisition and disposition by the Foundation of any patents and patent rights.

"NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

"SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio, and shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, exercise the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, agriculture, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

"(b) The term of office of each voting member of the Board shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, and eight at the end of six years, after the date of enactment of this Act. Any person who has been a member of the Board for twelve

consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the expiration of such twelfth year.

"(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Board, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a chairman and a vice chairman.

"(d) The Board shall meet annually on the first Monday in December and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing. A majority of the voting members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

"(e) The first Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall be elected by the Board to serve until the first Monday in December next succeeding the date of election at which time a Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of two years. Thereafter such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

"DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 5. (a) There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board may make recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment of the Director, and the Director shall not be appointed until the Board has had an opportunity to make such recommendations. He shall serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of the Board. In addition thereto he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum and shall serve for a term of six years unless sooner removed by the President.

"(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this Act, the Director shall, in accordance with the policies established by the Board, exercise the powers granted by sections 10 and 11 of this Act, together with such other powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board; but no final action shall be taken by the Director in the exercise of any power granted by section 10 or 11 (c) unless in each instance the Board has reviewed and approved the action proposed to be taken.

"POWER TO RECREATE COMMITTEES

"SEC. 6. (a) The Board is authorized to appoint from among its members an Executive Committee, and to assign to the Executive Committee such of the powers and functions granted to the Board by this Act as it deems appropriate; except that the Board may not assign to the Executive Committee the function of establishing policies, or the function of review and approval (except review and approval of minor modifications of contracts or other arrangements previously approved by the Board), to be exercised by the Board in accordance with section 5 (b).

"(b) If an Executive Committee is established by the Board—

"(1) Such Committee shall consist of the Director, as a nonvoting ex officio member, and nine other members elected by the Board from among their number.

"(2) The term of office of each voting member of such Committee shall be two years, except that (A) any member elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (B) the term of office of four of the members first elected after the date of enactment of this Act shall be one year.

"(3) Any person who has been a member of such Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for election during the two-year period following the expiration of such sixth year.

"(4) The membership of such Committee shall, so far as practicable, be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation.

"(5) Such Committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing its activities and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee shall be included in such reports.

"(c) The Board is authorized to appoint from among its members or otherwise such committees as it deems necessary, and to assign to committees so appointed such survey and advisory functions as the Board deems appropriate for the purposes of this Act.

"DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

"SEC. 7. (a) Until otherwise provided by the Board there shall be within the Foundation the following divisions:

"(1) A Division of Medical Research;

"(2) A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

"(3) A Division of Biological Sciences; and

"(4) A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

"(b) There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Board may, from time to time, deem necessary.

"DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 8. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

"(b) Each divisional committee shall be appointed by the Board and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Board.

"(c) The terms of members of each divisional committee shall be two years. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members and shall prescribed its own rules of procedure subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Board.

"(d) Each divisional committee shall make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the Board and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division.

"SPECIAL COMMISSIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) Each special commission established pursuant to section 3 (a) (7) shall consist of eleven members appointed by the Board, six of whom shall be eminent scientists and five of whom shall be persons other than scientists. Each special commission shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman.

"(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation at the earliest practicable date an over-all research program in its field.

"SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

"SEC. 10. The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available specifically for such purpose pursuant to section 16, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of substantially equal ability, and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships shall be awarded to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"GENERAL AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

"SEC. 11. The Foundation shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, but without being limited thereto, the authority—

"(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

"(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this Act;

"(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and, at the request of the Secretary of Defense, specific scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense, and, when deemed appropriate by the Foundation, such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

"(d) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific research without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 529);

"(e) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

"(f) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

"(g) to publish or arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest, without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U. S. C., sec. 111);

"(h) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons serving without compensation; and

"(i) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for scientific research shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without re-

gard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

"PATENT RIGHTS

"SEC. 12. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed pursuant to this Act which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation to enter into any contractual or other arrangement inconsistent with any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

"(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Director may establish.

"INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY

"SEC. 13. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized to cooperate in any international scientific research activities consistent with the purposes of this Act and to expend for such international scientific research activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable. The Director, with the approval of the Board, may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of individual scientists to accredited international scientific congresses and meetings whenever he deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this Act.

"(b) (1) The authority to enter into contracts or other arrangements with organizations or individuals in foreign countries and with agencies of foreign countries, as provided in section 11 (c), and the authority to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in subsection (a) of this section, shall be exercised only with the approval of the Secretary of State, to the end that such authority shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

"(2) If, in the exercise of the authority referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection negotiation with foreign countries or agencies thereof becomes necessary, such negotiation shall be carried on by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided,* That the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this Act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees and special commisisons, shall be appointed without regard to civil-service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Board, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

"(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Board, a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Board, may prescribe and shall be Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director.

"(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

"(d) The members of the Board, and the members of each divisional Committee, or special commission, shall receive compensation at the rate of $25 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2).

"(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees and special commissions, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

"(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board, of a divisional committee, or of a special commission shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. sec. 99), unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

"(g) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals in the United States or foreign countries, including Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance basic research, and (4) encouraging independent basic research by individuals.

"(h) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and, until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation, for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds.

"(i) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the United States Employment Service to the Foundation, together with such records and property as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

"SECURITY PROVISIONS

"SEC. 15. (a) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of nuclear energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 11 (e) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. To the extent that such activity involves restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 the provisions of that Act regarding the control of the dissemination of restricted data and the security clearance of those individuals to be given access to restricted data shall be applicable. Nothing in this Act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

"(b) (1) In the case of scientific or technical research activities under this Act in connection with matters relating to the national defense, with respect to which funds have been transferred to the Foundation from the Department of Defense in accordance with the provisions of section 14 (h) of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, as he deems necessary.

"(2) In the case of scientific research activities under this Act in connection with matters relating to the national defense other than research activities referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Foundation shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, as it deems necessary.

"(3) Any agency of the Government exercising investigatory functions is hereby authorized to make such investigations and reports as may be requested by the Foundation in connection with the enforcement of security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, established under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection.

"(c) No employee of the Foundation shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions have been established under subsection (b) (1) or (2) until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation into the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual and shall have reported the findings of said investigation to the Foundation, and the Foundation shall have determined that permitting such individual to have access to such information or property will not endanger the common defense and security.

"(d) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure by the Foundation under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments under any scholarship or fellowship to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Foundation an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign

and domestic.'. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 16. (a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and not to exceed $15,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

"(b) Appropriations made pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in the Acts making such appropriations."

And the House agree to the same.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
GEO. HOWARD WILSON,
CARL HINSHAW,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment was passed in lieu of all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The accompanying conference report recommends the adoption of a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The substitute agreed to in conference follows in general the pattern of the House amendment, including the organizational structure providing for a Foundation consisting of a Board and a Director.

The differences between the House amendment and the conference substitute are explained below, except for minor clerical, clarifying, and conforming changes.

FOUNDATION'S REPORT TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

By section 3 (c) of the conference substitute the Foundation is required to make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. This subsection is the same as it appeared in the House amendment, except that there is included a requirement that the Foundation's report shall contain the minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Board.

DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

Section 5 of the House amendment contained the following sentence: "There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving recommendations from the Board." In this sentence, the words "after receiving recommendations from the Board" replaced the words "after the members of the Foundation have been appointed and qualified" which were contained in the same sentence in the Senate bill. In lieu of this sentence the conference substitute contains the following two sentences: "There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board may make recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment of the Director, and the Director shall not be appointed until the Board has had an opportunity to make such recommendations."

Section 5 (b) of the conference substitute, relating to the powers and duties of the Director, is the same provision contained in the House amendment except that it has been modified to make it clear that in each instance where the Director takes any final action under section 10 or 11 (c) the Board must review and specifically approve the action proposed to be taken. It is the view of the conference committee that this requirement makes more certain than otherwise might be the case that, in conformity with section 3 (b), contracts or other arrangements made under section 11 (c) for carrying on basic scientific research activities will not be unduly concentrated in a few organizations or institutions or in a limited area of the Nation.

POWERS TO CREATE AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND OTHER COMMITTEES

The Senate bill, in section 4 (e), authorized the Foundation to appoint an Executive Committee from among its members, and to appoint from among its members or otherwise such other committees as it deemed necessary, and to assign to such Executive Committee or other committees such powers and functions as it deemed appropriate for the purposes of the act.

The House amendment, in section 6, created an Executive Committee and provided that, in addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in it by the act, the Executive Committee "shall exercise such powers and duties as may be delegated to it by the Board." The House amendment granted no authority, similar to that granted by the Senate bill, for the creation of other committees. Section 6 of the House amendment also contained specific provisions as to the membership of the Executive Committee, the terms of office of members, a requirement that members should be representative of diverse interests and be chosen so as to provide representation so far as practicable for all areas of the Nation, and contained a provision as to the making by the Executive Committee of an annual report by the Board.

Section 6 of the conference substitute combines the Senate and House provisions above referred to as follows:

(1) It grants to the Board the authority to create an Executive Committee and to assign to the Executive Committee such powers and functions as may be deemed appropriate, except that it is provided that the Board may not assign to the Executive Committee the function of establishing policies, or the function of review and approval (except review and approval of minor modifications of contracts or other arrangements previously approved by the Board), to be exercised by the Board in accordance with section 5 (b).

(2) The section further provides that if an Executive Committee is established by the Board it shall consist of nine members of the Board elected by the Board, and of the Director as a nonvoting ex officio member; and it contains provisions, similar in general to those contained in the House amendment, as to terms of office, representation of diverse interests, and the making of an annual report to the Board.

(3) It authorizes the Board to appoint from among its members or otherwise such committees as the Board deems necessary, and authorizes the Board to assign to such committees such survey and advisory functions as the Board deems appropriate.

CONTRACTS OR ARRANGEMENTS FOR RESEARCH RELATING TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

In both the Senate bill and the House amendment (sec. 4 (a) (3) of the Senate bill and sec. 3 (a) (3) of the House amendment) the Foundation was authorized and directed, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research. Section 10 (c) of the Senate bill authorized the Foundation to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities as the Foundation deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. In this section no reference was made to contracts or arrangements for scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense. Section 11 (c) of the House amendment contained an authorization similar to that contained in section 10 (c) of the Senate bill, but also authorized the Foundation to enter into contracts or other arrangements, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, for the carrying on of scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense.

Both section 10 (c) of the Senate bill and section 11 (c) of the House amendment authorized the Foundation to enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof, without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

In the conference substitute section 3 (a) (3) is a modification of section 4 (a) (3) of the Senate bill and section 3 (a) (3) of the House amendment, and reads as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

* * * * *

"(3) at the request of the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support specific scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;"

Section 11 (c) of the conference substitute is a modification of section 10 (c) of the Senate bill and section 11 (c) of the House amendment, and reads as follows:

"SEC. 11. The Foundation shall have the * * * authority"—

* * * * *

"(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and, at the request of the Secretary of Defense, specific scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense, and, when deemed appropriate by the Foundation, such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes;"

The fact that under the conference substitute the Foundation is authorized, at the request of the Secretary of Defense, to engage in specific scientific research activities relating to the national defense (research

which may be basic or applied in character) does not place a limitation on the authority of the Foundation to engage in basic scientific research.

SECURITY PROVISIONS

In the conference substitute the provisions with respect to security safeguards have been brought together in section 15.

This section has been given very full and careful consideration, in consultation with representatives of the Department of Justice, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of Defense.

The objective of the conferees has been to provide for full and adequate security safeguards, while at the same time meeting certain points raised by the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Defense with respect to two provisions contained in the House amendment. It is believed that this objective has been successfully accomplished.

The following explanation of section 15 points out how it differs from the security provisions contained in the Senate bill and the House amendment.

Subsection (a): This subsection, relating to research in the field of nuclear energy, is identical with subsection 14 (k) of the Senate bill and subsection 14 (j) of the House amendment, except that a new sentence, shown in italic type in the subsection as reproduced below, has been added:

"(a) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of nuclear energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 11 (e) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. *To the extent that such activity involves restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 the provisions of that Act regarding the control of the dissemination of restricted data and the security clearance of those individuals to be given access to restricted data shall be applicable.* Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

The committee of conference is satisfied that this subsection is entirely adequate to give full security protection in connection with any activity of the Foundation in the field of nuclear energy involving restricted data. The provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (including penalties) will be fully applicable with respect to any such activity and to those individuals who are engaged in it. With respect to this subsection, Acting Chairman Sumner T. Pike, of the Atomic Energy Commission, in a letter dated April 12, 1950, addressed to the chairman of the committee of conference, made the following statement with particular reference to the new sentence which has been included in this subsection:

"It is the purpose of this language to make explicit that which is implicit in section 14 (j) as presently drafted with particular emphasis placed on those security provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 which would be applicable to certain activities of the Foundation in the field of nuclear energy. The effect of this section together with the suggested additional language is to make it clear that all those who receive restricted data (as defined in the Atomic Energy Act) through work with the Science Foundation shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to character, associations, and loyalty and shall be cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission."

Subsections (b), (c), and (d): These subsections are included in section 15 of the conference substitute in lieu of subsection 10 (b) of the House amendment; subsection 14 (l) of the Senate bill and subsection 14 (k) of the House amendment; and subsections 14 (l) and (m) of the House amendment.

Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 15 of the conference substitute are as follows:

"(b) (1) In the case of scientific or technical research activities under this Act in connection with matters relating to the national defense, with respect to which funds have been transferred to the Foundation from the Department of Defense in accordance with the provisions of section 14 (h) of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, as he deems necessary.

"(2) In the case of scientific research activities under this Act in connection with matters relating to the national defense other than research activities referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Foundation shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, as it deems necessary.

"(3) Any agency of the Government exercising investigatory functions is hereby authorized to make such investigations and reports as may be requested by the Foundation in connection with the enforcement of security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, established under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection.

"(c) No employee of the Foundation shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions have been established under subsection (b) (1) or (2) until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation into the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual and shall have reported the findings of said investigation to the Foundation, and the Foundation shall have determined that permitting such individual to have access to such information or property will not endanger the common defense and security.

"(d) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure by the Foundation under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments under any scholarship or fellowship to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Foundation an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits."

Subsection (d) is the same as section 10 (b) of the House amendment, except that it contains an additional requirement that before funds may be paid to an individual under a scholarship or fellowship such individual must subscribe to the following oath or affirmation:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

Section 1001 of title 18, the penalties of which are by subsection (d) made applicable with respect to false affidavits executed under that subsection, applies only in the case of violations knowingly and willfully committed.

Subsection (b) is a modification of subsection 14 (l) of the Senate bill and subsection 14 (k) of the House amendment and requires the establishment of such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, as may be deemed necessary in connection with research activities under the act in connection with matters relating to the national defense. Such requirements and safeguards will be established by the Secretary of Defense in the case of research carried on with funds transferred from the Department of Defense, and by the Foundation in the case of research carried on with other funds.

Subsections 14 (l) and (m) of the House amendment (quoted in full below at the beginning of the letter from the Department of Justice) required a specified investigation and report to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with regard to any individual before he could be employed by the Foundation or awarded a scholarship, or, in the case of a national of a foreign country, before he could become associated with the Foundation in any capacity.

Serious objections have been made to these provisions of the House amendment by the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Defense. These objections are based on reasons which may be summarized as follows:

(1) If enacted, section 14 (l) would require the Federal Bureau of Investigation not only to investigate employees of the Foundation and applicants for scholarships but to evaluate the information collected through its investigation. This requirement would seriously impair the efficiency and reputation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as an investigating agency.

(2) Section 14 (l) would preclude employment of, or awarding of scholarships to, persons who at any time have been members of so-called "front organizations" regardless of whether such persons withdrew from such organizations when they first suspected their subversive character. To deny to such persons an opportunity to prove that their membership was innocent would unjustly penalize many completely loyal Americans who innocently joined such organizations, and the denial of such opportunity would be inconsistent with American concepts of justice and fairness.

(3) Section 14 (m) would require investigations to be carried on by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of foreign nationals in foreign countries. This requirement would be impractical since the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not have facilities for conducting investigations abroad.

The objections of the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Defense were set forth in identical letters to Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public welfare and chairman of the committee of conference, and to Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the letter to Mr. CROSSER being as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT TO
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, March 6, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The legislation to establish the National Science Foundation (S. 247 and H. R. 4846) has been amended within the past few days in a manner which has caused me deep concern. I refer to two amendments added by the House of Representatives to S. 247. The first of these amendments reads as follows:

"(1) No person shall be employed by the Foundation and no scholarship awarded to

any person by the Foundation unless and until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have investigated the loyalty of such person and reported to the Foundation such person is loyal to the United States, believes in our system of government, and is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization declared subversive by the Attorney General or any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

The second amendment provides:

"(m) No person a national of a foreign country shall be associated with the Foundation in any capacity whatsoever unless and until the Federal Bureau of Investigation, independent of any investigation made by the government of such person, shall have investigated such person and reported to the Foundation that such person is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence."

I, of course, am firmly of the belief that disloyal persons should not be in the employ of the National Science Foundation. The amendments, however, go beyond this. Should they be enacted into law they would not only effect an extremely radical and undesirable change in the basic responsibilities and functions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation but also, in my opinion, they would bring about a departure from American concepts of justice and democratic government.

The Bureau is at the present time solely an investigative and fact-gathering agency; it does not evaluate or make recommendations with reference to the information it collects through its investigations. In loyalty investigations, as in others, the Bureau submits the information it has obtained through investigation for the consideration of the employing agency and for such determinations by that agency as may be required. The fine reputation which I believe the Bureau enjoys today as an impartial investigative agency results in large part because it has carefully restricted its activities to the making of investigations. Indeed, while the Bureau's expertness and high qualifications in this field would be challenged by no one, it is not equipped to go beyond the field of investigation and into that of making the determinations called for by the amendments. If the Bureau were called upon to perform the functions required by the amendments, its efficiency and good reputation as an investigative agency would be seriously impaired.

The enactment of either of the amendments mentioned above would remove the Bureau from its position as an impartial fact-gathering organization and impose upon it the responsibility for making decisions concerning the loyalty of individuals under consideration by the National Science Foundation for employment or for a fellowship under the act. To place the Bureau in the position of an evaluating agency regarding the loyalty of persons affected by this legislation is fraught with peril, not only to the Bureau itself, but also to the country at large. In the opinion of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with which I agree, such legislation would constitute a clear departure from accepted fundamental theories of American government and lay a foundation for criticism of the Bureau as a state police organization.

It is also to be noted that the amendments, in precluding the employment of, or the awarding of a scholarship to, any person who has "at any time been a member of" any subversive organization seeks to deny to the Foundation the services of many Americans of unquestionable loyalty to the United States and its form of government who innocently joined a so-called "front" organization with the highest motives and who withdrew their membership from such organization upon their first suspicion of its subversive character.

It is characteristic of many "front" organizations that their purported purposes and programs are designed to appeal to loyal Americans and frequently it is behind a screen of respectability, loyalty, and even patriotism that subversive activities are carried on, often by only a few disloyal persons. In other instances a small minority subvert an organization of previously good purposes and having many members of unquestionable loyalty to the United States. This amendment would unjustly penalize many completely loyal Americans who innocently joined such organizations and would, in some measure, tend to defeat the carrying out of the purposes of the act.

The amendments also overlooked the fact that under the employee loyalty program, membership in an organization on the Attorney General's list is regarded as merely one piece of evidence pointing to possible disloyalty. The loyalty program enables an employee who is a member of a listed organization to respond to charges against him and to show that his membership is innocent and does not reflect upon his loyalty. This opportunity to defend oneself in a manner consistent with American concepts of justice and fairness is lacking from the amendments.

It is also to be noted, with regard to the second amendment above quoted, that a very practical difficulty exists with respect to the proposed investigation of foreign nationals by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in that the Bureau does not have facilities for conducting investigations abroad.

For the reasons above stated, I request and hope that you will make every effort to eliminate the amendments in question before final enactment of the National Science Foundation Act of 1949, thus leaving investigations of the personnel of this agency to be conducted on the same basis as investigations of personnel of other nonsensitive agencies.

I am authorized to state that this letter also reflects the views of the Secretary of Defense.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

In reaching agreement on the provisions of section 15 the committee of conference has retained the purposes of subsections 14 (l) and (m) of the House amendment so far as it has been practicable to do so, but great weight has necessarily been given to the strongly expressed views of the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Defense.

The text of section 15 has been examined by representatives of the Department of Justice, and on April 25, 1950, the Honorable Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, sent a joint letter to the chairman and vice chairman of the committee of conference in which he stated:

"The Department of Justice would have no objection to the proposed new section 15."

The committee of conference is convinced that the provisions of section 15 are adequate with regard to the loyalty investigation of individuals who will become employees of the Foundation or holders of scholarships or fellowships, or who will be associated with the Foundation in any way.

A draft of the proposed section 15 was submitted to the Department of Defense, and a letter regarding it was addressed to the chairman of the committee of conference on April 24, 1950, by Mr. William Webster, Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the Department. The letter states in part as follows:

"This draft has been examined with care, for the Department of Defense has long been strongly in favor of the establishment of a National Science Foundation. The proposed security provision seems to strike a proper balance between two objectives. It recognizes, one, the need to protect research and development related to the national defense according to the possible damage which could result from the disclosure to a potential enemy of information concerning it and, two, the need that scientific research, particularly basic research, be open in order to achieve maximum progress.

"It is our understanding that the National Science Foundation would deal principally with basic research and other matters of a nonclassified nature and that the authorization for it to engage in applied research in connection with matters relating to the national defense is designed primarily to enable the Foundation to assist the military effort in a small number of cases or in the event of an emergency. It does not appear that the volume of such work relating to the national defense will be significant, particularly classified work of that type. In view of the limitation on appropriations authorized for the Foundation, it may be expected that the bulk of such work would be carried on by funds transferred from the Department of Defense. In cases of this type, authority is provided to the Department by the proposed subsection (b) (1) to ensure that adequate security precautions are taken wherever necessary. It is assumed that the subsection would authorize controls relating to any person who might have access to classified information including fellows and employees of the Foundation and its contractors. The caliber of men who will constitute the Foundation—appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate—should provide assurance that the Foundation would take adequate precautions with respect to research supported by it and related to the national defense, if there be any. Furthermore, it is noted that all employees of the Foundation must be fully investigated and cleared before being given access to any classified information.

"I understand that subsection (a) of the proposed security provisions has been approved by the Atomic Energy Commission. It appears that the principles involved in the proposed provisions and the provisions themselves will be satisfactory, particularly in view of the assurance above-mentioned that the Department of Defense would establish requirements covering the security of all research work supported with its funds. This letter has been coordinated among the departments and agencies of the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Defense. Shortness of time, however, has prevented submission of it to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance."

It has already been pointed out in the explanation of subsection (a) that full investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation will be required, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, before individuals are permitted to have access to restricted data as defined in that act.

Subsection (c) provides that no employee of the Foundation shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions are established under subsection (b) (1) or (2), with respect to research related to the national defense, until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation into the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual and shall have reported its findings to the Foundation, and the Foundation shall have determined that permitting such individual to have access to such information or property will not en-

danger the common defense and security. The investigation thus required is the same as that required under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Since the members of the Board and the Director will not be employees of the Foundation, but officers appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, subsection (c) will not apply to them.

Under subsection (b) the security safeguards to be established by the Secretary of Defense and the Foundation in connection with research activities of the Foundation related to the national defense may provide for such investigations of scholarship and fellowship holders, employees of contractors, and others, as may be deemed necessary.

In order that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, and any other appropriate agency of the Government will have authority to make the investigations provided for pursuant to subsection (b), a paragraph (3) has been included specifically authorizing any agency of the Government exercising investigatory functions to make such investigations and reports as may be requested by the Foundation. Nothing in section 15 of the conference substitute is intended in any way to alter the present authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in matters dealing with internal security.

The provisions of subsection (b) are consistent with the method of imposing and enforcing security safeguards which is presently in effect with respect to the Department of Defense. In the case of that Department, it is left to its judgment to determine the instances in which to require investigations of individuals before they are permitted to have access to classified matters and, depending on the degree of secrecy involved, the nature and extent of the investigation to be made of particular individuals.

As indicated in the letter from the Chairman of the Research and Development Board, the Foundation's activities will be almost exclusively in basic research. Basic research generally does not involve security problems. It is confidently anticipated that only a very small part of its activities will be concerned with research on matters related to restricted data in the field of nuclear energy or related to the national defense—the two fields in which problems of security may be involved. It is the considered judgment of the committee of conference that to the very limited extent that activities of the Foundation will involve security problems, section 15 of the conference substitute provides a sound and satisfactory method of dealing with those problems.

It is unnecessary to include in this legislation special penal provisions with respect to violations of the security requirements and safeguards which will be in effect thereunder. As already pointed out, the penalties provided by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (in sec. 10 thereof) will apply with respect to any activity involving restricted data in the field of research related to nuclear energy. These penalties are wholly adequate. In the field of research related to the national defense, the same penalties which now apply to security matters concerning the Department of Defense will be applicable. These penalties are contained in title 18 of the United States Code, principally in chapter 37 thereof. Sections 793 and 794 of that chapter are as follows:

"§ 793. Gathering, transmitting or losing defense information.

"Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States, or to the advantage of any foreign nation, goes upon, enters, flies over, or otherwise obtains information concerning any vessel, aircraft, work of defense, navy yard, naval station, submarine base, fueling station, fort, battery, torpedo station, dockyard, canal, railroad, arsenal, camp, factory, mine, telegraph, telephone, wireless, or signal station, building, office, or other place connected with the national defense, owned or constructed, or in progress of construction by the United States or under the control of the United States, or of any of its officers, departments or agencies, or within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, or any place in which any vessel, aircraft, arms, munitions, or other materials or instruments for use in time of war are being made, prepared, repaired, or stored, under any contract or agreement with the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or with any person on behalf of the United States, or otherwise on behalf of the United States, or any other prohibited place so designated by the President by proclamation in time of war or in case of national emergency in which anything for the use of the Army or Navy is being prepared or constructed or stored, information as to which the President has determined would be prejudicial to the national defense; or

"Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, and with like intent or reason to believe, copies, takes, makes, or obtains, or attempts to copy, take, make, or obtain, any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, document, writing, or note of anything connected with the national defense; or

"Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, receives or obtains or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain from any person, or from any source whatever, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note, of anything connected with the national defense, knowing or having reason to believe, at the time he receives or obtains, or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain it, that it has been or will be obtained, taken, made or disposed of by any person contrary to the provisions of this chapter; or

"Whoever, lawfully or unlawfully having possession of, access to, control over, or being intrusted with any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note relating to the national defense, willfully communicates or transmits or attempts to communicate or transmit the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it on demand to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"Whoever, being intrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, or information, relating to the national defense, through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"§ 794. Gathering or delivering defense information to aid foreign government.

"(a) whoever, with intent or reason to believe that it is to be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of a foreign nation, communicates, delivers, or transmits, or attempts to communicate, deliver, or transmit, to any foreign government, or to any faction or party or military or naval force within a foreign country, whether recognized or unrecognized by the United States, or to any representative, officer, agent, employee, subject, or citizen thereof, either directly or indirectly, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, instrument, appliance, or information relating to the national defense, shall be imprisoned not more than twenty years.

"(b) Whoever violates subsection (a) in time of war shall be punished by death or by imprisonment for not more than thirty years.

"(c) Whoever, in time of war, with intent that the same shall be communicated to the enemy, collects, records, publishes, or communicates, or attempts to elicit any information with respect to the movement, numbers, description, condition, or disposition of any of the armed forces, ships, aircraft, or war materials of the United States, or with respect to the plans or conduct, or supposed plans or conduct of any naval or military operations, or with respect to any works or measures undertaken for or connected with, or intended for the fortification or defense of any place, or any other information relating to the public defense, which might be useful to the enemy, shall be punished by death or by imprisonment for not more than thirty years.

"(d) If two or more persons conspire to violate this section, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be subject to the punishment provided for the offense which is the object of such conspiracy."

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Section 14 of the Senate bill contained the following subsection not contained in the House amendment:

"(h) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development."

This provision has not been included in the conference substitute. No such provision seems needed to insure continuance of research which is or may be carried on by other Government agencies under specific statutory authority and the provision seemed so broad and inflexible in its terms that its inclusion might unduly interfere with the administrative coordination through the National Science Foundation of activities in the basic sciences being carried on by various Government agencies.

Moreover, debate in the House over the striking out of a similar provision in the House bill as introduced made it clear that omission of the provision in no way implies that the Foundation is authorized to take over the research functions which have been granted other agencies by law or that the exercise of those functions is to be curtailed. It was made especially clear in the debate that its omission would not result in any limitation or curtailment of the programs of research in the fields of medicine and related activities being carried on by the National Institutes of Health or other units of the United States Public Health Service. After discussion of the nature of the research being carried on by the Institutes or supported by them, the committee of conference agreed with this interpretation.

TRANSFER OF NATIONAL ROSTER OF SCIENTIFIC AND SPECIALIZED PERSONNEL

Section 14 (i) of the conference substitute relates to the transfer to the Foundation of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, which is now in the United States Employment Service. The provision is the same as in the House amendment, except that the President, rather than the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, will have the authority to determine the records and

property to be transferred with the roster and the time when the transfer shall take effect. This modification has been taken from the corresponding provision in the Senate bill.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
GEO. HOWARD WILSON,
CARL HINSHAW,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PRIEST (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give us a complete explanation of just the differences between this bill as it is now and when it left the House.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman will attempt to do so to the best of his ability.

Mr. RICH. Just so we know what it is.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my intention. It is a rather long statement. I intend to explain the conference report.

Mr. RICH. We may have some questions about it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman not agree that it might be wise to allow the Clerk to read the paragraph he has just begun, which has to do with security?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes. I will withdraw the request until the Clerk has finished that paragraph.

(The Clerk concluded reading the paragraph.)

Mr. PRIEST (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report that is brought in this morning on the National Science Foundation bill is a unanimous report. It is a report agreed to unanimously after a number of meetings of the committee on conference and following several conferences with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Military Establishment, and the Department of Justice.

We believe that the bill we bring to you in the conference report is the best Science Foundation bill that has been produced after 4 years of effort along this line. The conference report substantially is the bill as it passed the House. Before going into an explanation of some of the changes that might be important let me say that in practically all instances the Senate conferees accepted the House version of the bill.

There was one rather important difference on which there was an agreement in the form of a compromise. That was with reference to the executive committee provided for the Foundation by the Senate bill and the House bill. In the Senate bill the executive committee was permissive. It simply made provision that the Board might appoint an executive committee and assign to it certain powers and functions.

The House committee reported a bill, and the House passed a bill, providing that the executive committee be mandatory, and then spelled out a pattern for the executive committee with reference to the number of members, their terms of office, how they should be selected, and all other matters that usually apply in such a case.

In the conference it was agreed that the executive committee would be permissive but that if the executive committee should be appointed by the Board, then it should follow the pattern previously set out in the House bill. That was about the only point in which the House bill did not prevail all the way with the exception of the security provisions, which constitute an entirely new section. You may recall that when the bill was before the House it had in it one security provision which was the requirement that all applicants for fellowships and scholarships shall execute an affidavit and place it on file. The Senate bill had no security provision whatsoever.

When we went into conference the first agreement was that we must have some security provision in the bill. In consideration of the bill on the floor of the House a number of amendments along that line had been offered, including the one offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], one by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and others. The conferees agreed immediately that we would have to have adequate security provisions when we brought the bill back to the respective Houses.

Having made that agreement we then met for several conferences with our own staff and agreed in principle as to just what those provisions should be. Some of us engaged also in conferences with the Atomic Energy Commission, with the Military Establishment and the Department of Justice. We had as one of the conferees, of course, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], who is also a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and I want to express here my very deep appreciation for the great help he gave us in that respect. So in the conference we have written a new security provision, as section 15. Just briefly I will explain in substance what the security provisions in the conference report are as we bring it to you today.

We provide that the Foundation shall support no research in the field of atomic energy without the approval of the Atomic Energy Commission. If it does support such research, then all of the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, including all of the penalties in that act, shall apply in every respect just as they do in the Atomic Energy Act. That takes care of that situation very well, and as you will note by the letter from Mr. Sumner Pike set out in the report, the Atomic Energy Commission is very well satisfied with that provision.

The same situation applies with any research which the Foundation may support with reference to the Military Establishment. All of the laws apply as they apply now to any research that might be undertaken by any research agency for the national defense.

Before going further with the security provisions, I want to point to one particular change at this time. When the bill was on the floor a number of questions were asked as to why the Foundation should support any research involving the national defense. That question came up a number of times. The provisions in the bill at that time were that after a consultation with the Secretary of Defense the Foundation may support certain specific research projects for the national defense. The more we studied this provision in conference the more we came to the conclusion that the emphasis in the National Science Foundation should be on basic research. It was not intended to take over applied or technical research of the Military Establishment. However, we wanted authority in the law in case of an emergency, for the Secretary of Defense to call on the Foundation for any specific research that might be necessary.

The change that has been made in two places in the bill with reference to the participation of the Foundation in supporting research for the Military Establishment is that it may do so at the request of the Secretary of Defense.

That, I think, is better language, and all of the conferees thought that it was better than to leave it as we had it "after consultation with."

Now, at the request of the Secretary of Defense the Foundation may support research projects relating to the National Defense. To proceed a bit further with the security provisions, we also provide that the Foundation may call upon any investigating agency of the Government, and that may be the FBI, it may be Central Intelligence, it may be any other agency that does investigating, for a report on individuals if those individuals in any way have access or may have access to the classified information in any field of research. We provide in the bill the requirement that all applicants for fellowships and scholarships shall file with the Foundation a loyalty affidavit. We added to that also the requirement that applicants take the oath of allegiance, which is substantially the same oath that Members of the House of Representatives take when they are sworn in, the oath of allegiance to the United States.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a careful study of the security provisions now in the conference report will satisfy everyone that the conferees, even as the House was originally, were greatly interested in seeing that adequate, workable security provisions were included in the bill. We bring it here in a form that we believe contains adequate provisions all along the line from the standpoint of security, with adequate penalties, where a penalty may be necessary.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The executive committee that was set up is composed of members of the board of directors who will look after this organization, is that correct?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. The members of the board of directors, as it was set up, were each to be paid a pretty good salary. Will the executive committee receive additional compensation?

Mr. PRIEST. May I state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the members of the Board are not paid any salary, nor are the members of the executive committee paid any salary. They would be allowed per diem expenses when engaged on work for the Foundation. The Director, the Assistant Director, and what clerical staff may be necessary, are the only salaried employees.

Mr. RICH. That is different from the House bill then.

Mr. PRIEST. No. I believe the gentleman is perhaps a little confused there. Neither bill ever contained any provision for salaries for the executive committee, or the board.

Mr. RICH. Well, then, will this Board, as set up, cooperate and work with the various boards that are trying to make discoveries in colleges and other foundations? Are they going to work with them or are they going to work alone?

Mr. PRIEST. It is still permissive in the bill, but assuming that an executive committee is established within the Board, it simply will be a group of nine members of the Board who may be able to transact business a little more expeditiously than would be the case if the entire Board had to act on all matters. The executive committee simply will carry out the program of the Foundation. The Board cannot delegate to the executive committee, however, the function of making policies, nor can it delegate to the committee the authority to sign contracts and agreements until the Board has approved them, that is, the entire Board. The bill does provide that minor modifications of contracts may be approved by the executive committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this conference report on the National Science Foundation bill which we bring here makes it a much better bill than either the House or the Senate version, because we have been able to utilize the suggestions made when the bill was on the floor of the House, with certain amendments offered, as a basis for genuine improvement.

I should like to speak briefly in reference to the security provisions, because when the bill left the House the security provisions were spread hither and yon throughout the bill. They now have been concentrated in one place, section 15, where they are easily seen and understood. There is no conflict in the bill at the present time in this respect as there was when the bill left the House.

I have no intention of discussing this matter at great length, so will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the conference report contain the provision which was inserted by the House with respect to the $15,000,000 limitation?

Mr. HINSHAW. The conference report contains the limitations as they left the House, yes, $15,000,000 as a ceiling for direct appropriations and $500,000 for the first year, fiscal 1951.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman from Tennessee and also the gentleman from California will remember I opposed this bill on the floor of the House for certain reasons which I regarded as fundamental and which I still believe are fundamental. I will say, however, that one of the things that disturbed me most in the House bill was that provision which would permit this foundation to engage in applied science and technical developments. If left in the law, that provision would actually give this foundation the right to go into every kind of research the Nation over, because any scientific research affecting the national defense goes right down to the farm. They could engage in research in the production of food or clothing or shoes, or almost anything. You have cured that, at least, by saying that they shall not do that unless the Secretary of Defense asks them to do it. I hope the Secretary of Defense will make just as few requests as possible in that field so that this foundation, which apparently is going to be established, will be confined largely to basic research.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I reply to my distinguished friend from New York by saying that the conferees on the part of the House had particularly and very clearly in mind the ideas which were expressed by the gentleman from New York when this bill was on the floor of the House, and we did our very best to bring in a conference report which would be pleasing to the gentleman from New York from the standpoint which he has just now expressed. We hope the gentleman can now support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, when it becomes law, should go far toward eliminating that lag in education and basic research which occurred by reason of so many of our most brilliant young students having been called into the armed services during the war. It should do much toward assisting in breaking through the present limits of knowledge by advancing the learning of new knowledge of the basic facts in nature.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was on the floor I opposed it very largely on the same grounds so ably expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in the debate. I offered the amendment which was adopted unanimously by the House on the security provisions, having been disturbed by the lack of such provisions in the bill. I merely want to say that I think the conferees have given very careful, thorough, and adequate consideration to the language necessary to accomplish the desires of the House on that occasion, because, if you recall, my amendment was adopted unanimously by the House. It was hastily drawn. It was subject to the objection that it required the FBI to evaluate as well as sesure the information. I am glad to be corrected in that respect. I think the language now adequately covers what I had in mind, and I am very happy that the conferees should have worked the matter out as carefully as they have.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I share with the gentleman his concern over the national security provision. The gentleman will recall that in the interim between the time the bill was reported out and before it reached the floor of the House the Fuchs case developed which caused everyone a great deal of concern. May I say to the gentleman I believe we spent more time on the security angle of this and I believe we did as fine a job as could be done in trying to draw up the strongest provisions possible dealing with our security. I might even go so far as to say that I believe the provisions as now carried in the bill exceed even the original amendment offered by the gentleman. I assure the gentleman we have the strongest possible security provisions that we could possibly draw up.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the House is now in a position to complete legislation on the National Science Foundation bill. This bill I consider one of the greatest achievements of the present session of Congress. It means far more to the future welfare and security of our people than the average person realizes.

The conference report should have the unanimous approval of this House. The bill represents five long years of effort. It should have been an accomplished fact years ago. The intervening years should have been utilized in effecting its purposes. However, it is now our duty to immediately pass the bill and after Presidential approval which I am sure it will receive, see that it is put into operation at the earliest possible moment. There

is no excuse for further delay. It is time for action. We cannot afford to put off this important matter any longer.

It is plain to see that the present is a scientific age, and, whether the subject is considered from a military, health, or industrial standpoint, science will undoubtedly play an important part in the future. The purpose of this bill is to develop fundamental or basic science. Its terms are broad enough to pursue research in every kind of scientific endeavor. We need the knowledge that such study can be expected to develop. I am confident that the results will prove not only highly beneficial to our own people but also to the people of the world.

I am proud of the opportunity I have had to participate in the drawing of this important legislation. I am anxious to see the administration of the law conducted in a manner that will bring the beneficent results expected. No law no matter how good its purpose may be, can ever accomplish its fullest expectations unless there is a good administration of it. I am certain that the President realizes the importance of the law, and recognizes the necessity of naming a director and members of the board of the highest quality to provide the wise and effectual administration of the powers and authority granted under its terms.

Great credit should go to Dr. Bush and the other eminent scientists and educators who have toiled so zealously through the years to bring into being this worthwhile legislation. Their interest has been unselfish and with no thought other than to promote the welfare of our Nation and its people.

It is our duty as Members of the House to give our approval now to the conference report and thereby make possible the enactment of the bill without further delay.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on the conference committee in expressing my appreciation and pleasure for the opportunity of serving with them. It is one of the finest conferences that I have ever served on in my years of experience in the Congress. The conferees worked earnestly to solve the differences between the House and Senate version of the bill and to strengthen the provisions of the bill. I believe the conference has been successful. An excellent job was done by our legislative counsel and the staffs, particularly Mr. Perley, of our legislative counsel, who was of great assistance in drafting changes in the report. Personally, I feel that the bill as it is now before us is far less objectionable and, as a matter of fact, should meet with the approval of many of those who originally may have been opposed to the bill. The purposes of the bill have been clarified, and in some cases generalities have been cleared up.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have done the best possible job under the circumstances, and the bill should meet with the approval of all.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add my words to what has previously been said about the conference report. The bill as it has come out of conference meets most of the objections which were raised on the floor of the House. I think the security provisions in particular as worked out in conference will leave no doubt in anyone's minds as to their value and soundness. I do not think they discriminate against anyone. I think they do offer protection which is needed for the welfare of our country. The AEC will have jurisdiction as has been explained by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] over any matter affecting nuclear energy. The Department of Defense will have jurisdiction as far as its rules and penalties will prevail over any matter affecting national defense on projects initiated or requested by the Department of Defense. Otherwise we have the same kind of provisions that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce originally asked for in the bill. Furthermore, on the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] we have written a very intelligent provision in the bill to the effect that the Foundation shall not support any research of an applied scientific nature in the field of national defense unless requested specifically by the Secretary of Defense to take such action so that clause will keep the Foundation from supporting research in a great variety of applied fields as some Members feared. It is the intent of the conferees as is carefully explained in the report to limit the National Science Foundation insofar as practicable to basic research. That is the intent and that is the field that all of us felt there was a lack in at the present time. We want to penetrate the walls of darkness that now exist in certain fields of science. I think we will succeed in so doing through the establishment of the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, it was a great privilege to serve on the conference committee which has reported this very important piece of legislation. The inspiring leadership of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] was most helpful to all of us on the conference committee and the fine bill that is now before the House is in large part his creation. He has made a great contribution to the future of our beloved country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with my colleagues who were members of the conference committee in congratulating our chairman [Mr. PRIEST] for the magnificent way in which he handled this matter, both at the time of the conference and presently on the floor.

I want to point to one thing in the report particularly that may have been forgotten, that these security provisions have been carefully gone into.

In section 15, which is the compilation of security provisions, in subsection (c) there is this language:

(c) No employee of the Foundation shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions have been established under subsection (b) (1) or (2) until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation into the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual and shall have reported the findings of said investigation to the Foundation, and the Foundation shall have determined that permitting such individual to have access to such information or property will not endanger the common defense and security.

Then in the report it is specifically stated:

Nothing in section 15 of the conference substitute is intended in any way to alter the present authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in matters dealing with internal security.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all firmly of the belief that no disloyal person should be in the employ of the National Science Foundation. We are of the firm opinion that the security provisions as now written will do just that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I was not on the conference committeee. But as a member of the general committee, I can express my opinion and conviction that the conference committee has done an excellent and constructive piece of work on this legislation. It should remove any doubts held by any Member as to its wisdom. We can all now look forward with confidence, and I believe a very real measure of relief, to the establishment of the Foundation in the very near future. Properly organized and initiated, it can and will make an invaluable contribution both to our national security and to the future development of this country. I know that those who have worked so diligently and effectively to bring this Foundation into being will have reason to look upon their contributions as among the most significant of their legislative careers.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A SINCERE HEARTFELT WISH

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the second anniversary of Israel's rebirth is an occasion of happiness and rejoicing not confined exclusively to the people of Israel, world Jewry, or the Near East. Being the fulfillment of God's word and the satisfaction of the centuries' old yearning and hunger suffered by the Jews, it now in reality becomes a celebration of Christian as well as Jew and all liberty-loving peoples throughout the world.

Israel is the keystone in the arch of peace in the Near East because its people through blood, sweat, and tears fulfilled more than was expected of them in so short a span of time under tragic circumstances and war, through their sacrifice they made it so.

The determination and advancement shown thus far by Israel is an assurance of stability and peace which points to prosperity and leadership among the family of nations.

America hails a sister Republic with expression of sentiment which flows from the heart. Congratulations and an old familiar "Mazeltov" to the reborn Israel as a free and sovereign state.

NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just sent to the Clerk a bill which would repeal the inequitable section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

This is the subsection in which Congress for the first time departed from the principle of indivisibility of citizenship by providing for the automatic expatriation of naturalized citizens who reside anywhere abroad for 5 years or more.

It is my belief that this section flagrantly violates the spirit of the Constitution and the language of the Constitution.

It creates a caste of second-class citizens with rights and privileges inferior to the rights and privileges of native-born citizens.

This is repugnant to the whole theory of American citizenship and to the noble traditions which have raised the United States, in less than 200 years, from the status of foreign colony to the paramount power of the world.

The section has been held applicable even though such absence is involuntary and in spite of strenuous efforts on the part of the individuals involved to return to this country before the expiration of the 5-year period.

No penalty whatever attaches to similar residence abroad by native-born citizens.

The reason for this overt discrimination against naturalized citizens is obscure.

In the light of our naturalization proceedings the discrimination is wholly illogical.

Both native-born and naturalized citizens are in all respects citizens and equal in rights and duties. Their allegiance runs to the Government of the United States and to no other.

There is only one distinction, in fact, between a native-born citizen and a naturalized citizen: One of them never owed fealty anywhere else; the other at the time of his naturalization solemnly abjured forever all allegiance to a foreign state.

As one of our former attorneys general cogently remarked: "If this does not work a dissolution of every political tie which bound him to his native country, then our naturalization laws are a bitter mockery and the oath we administer to foreigners is a delusion and a snare."

We believe, and we must believe, that the oath of allegiance is a ritual of deep substance and meaning.

Therefore, there can be no conceivable justification for legislation which deprives naturalized citizens of their rights of nationality solely because of residence abroad.

It is an especially brutal and illogical perversion when, as in section 404 (c), the expatriating residence is in a country with which the citizen never before had connection.

There can be no demonstrable difference between the natural citizen and the naturalized citizen under such circumstances. The attempt to manufacture distinctions must be branded as arbitrary and improper.

It is sometimes contended that the provision I object to, and the nationality lawyers object to, is an indispensable adjunct of American foreign policy.

It is argued that the State Department regards it as vital if we are to protect this Government from embarrassment in its foreign relations.

Neither contention has merit and is disproved by the statements of State Department officials.

As long ago as July 15, 1947, the then Assistant Secretary of State wrote to Senator MYERS, who has introduced a similar bill in the other body, and I quote from the letter:

> The experience of the Department has strongly inclined it to the opinion that subsection (c) of section 404 of the Nationality Act does not serve the interests of the United States—

And that in his opinion—

> it ought to be repealed.

As recently as March 25, 1950, Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley, the present Chief of the Visa Division of the State Department, in a public address, sharply condemned 404 (c) as inequitable and declared that its presence on the statute books adversely affects operations in her department.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that even in the brief time remaining in this session we can act on this repealer. As you are aware, I have another bill pending which proposes to repeal other subsections of section 404, including (c); but I have separated this one section in the belief that it is the least controversial of the proposals and on its face the most inequitable.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Government Group Seeks Ruin by Big Business."

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include statistics and excerpts from various publications.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the Detroit Jewish News.

Mr. THOMPSON (at the request of Mr. FORAND) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Guy C. Jackson, Jr., president of the Water Association of Texas.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Mr. BONNER.

Mr. HARRISON (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Secretary of Defense Johnson at the University of Virginia.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. KEARNS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address entitled "The Meaning of the New Wage-Hour Rules," which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $307.50.

Mr. WOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one to include an address recently delivered by Mr. WHEELER over radio station WSB at Atlanta and in the other a resolution adopted by Post No. 1540 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Honolulu, Hawaii, concerning the action of the Committee on Un-American Activities in holding hearings in the Islands recently.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the magazine Coronet.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD and include a certain resolution.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled, "Fifty Years of Philippine-American Trade," by the distinguished Filipino journalist, Vincente Villimen, which appeared in the anniversary issue of the Manila Bulletin, March 27, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the prescribed minimum under the rule in the amount of $410.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 142]

Battle	Harden	Pfeiffer,
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison	William L.
Boykin	Harvey	Plumley
Breen	Heller	Poulson
Brehm	Hobbs	Powell
Brooks	Javits	Quinn
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenison	Rains
Cavalcante	Jenkins	Redden
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Rhodes
Crosser	Kelly, N. Y.	Riehlman
Davenport	Kennedy	Roosevelt
Davies, N. Y.	Keough	Sabath
Deane	Kunkel	Sadlak
Donohue	Lodge	Scott, Hardie
Douglas	Lucas	Shelley
Durham	McSweeney	Smathers
Engle, Calif.	Macy	Smith, Ohio
Fallon	Martin, Iowa	Steed
Feighan	Miles	Vursell
Fugate	Miller, Nebr.	Whitaker
Gilmer	Morgan	White, Calif.
Golden	Morrison	Wolverton
Gore	Murdock	Woodruff
Granger	Nixon	
Grant	Pfeifer,	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Joseph L.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that—

The chapter on agricultural appropriations be considered as read and open to points of order and amendment; that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] have consent to offer a blanket amendment relating to administrative expenses;

That when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet on Monday next;

That no debate be in order on Friday, Monday, and Tuesday except general debate;

That general debate on the civil functions appropriations bill be confined to Tuesday;

That when the House adjourns on Tuesday next all general debate be concluded on the entire bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PACE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman's request include the waiving of points of order under the agricultural title?

Mr. CANNON. No points of order are waived under the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this restrict the offering of amendments in any way?

Mr. CANNON. No restrictions of the right to offer amendments are contemplated.

Mr. PATMAN. Or debate?

Mr. CANNON. Debate is to be confined to general debate. There is no provision for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill will not be read for amendment until Wednesday morning.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the general debate is confined to the bill and is not available for anything else except the chapters involved.

Mr. CANNON. Of course that is a part of the original agreement. All debate is confined to the bill and to the chapter under consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the general debate on the other chapters of the bill, not mentioned in the request, follow in sequence?

Mr. CANNON. In regular sequence, with the exception of the civil-functions chapter, which will be confined to Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. But all general debate closes on Tuesday?

Mr. CANNON. All general debate on the bill and all chapters of the bill closes on Tuesday, and we begin to read the bill under the 5-minute rule Wednesday morning.

Mr. TABER. That does not prevent people offering amendments and receiving recognition to speak under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have a genuine amendment. I want to ask the gentleman, if you are limiting the debate to 1 day and the time is all taken up, if there will be a chance to offer my amendment and to speak on it for 5 minutes?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman will have every opportunity to offer his amendment when the chapter to which it applies is under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this unanimous-consent request provides for waiving no points of order, and has nothing to do with the restricting of time for amendments.

Mr. PACE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the request contains consent for the gentleman from Minnesota to offer an amendment. Does that request carry with it a waiver of a point of order against that amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Under the pending request no points of order are to be waived on any portion of the bill or any amendment thereto.

Mr. TABER. Except that it will cover more than one paragraph and it will be a blanket amendment.

Mr. CANNON. But no points of order are waived.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the chairman has said that the debate will follow in sequence on the chapters in the bill. Then there is a special mention made of the civil-functions chapter. Is it to be understood that on Wednesday we will start considering the chapters of the bill in sequence, for amendment, without respect to civil functions?

Mr. CANNON. In their regular and orderly sequence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this mean that general debate on Interior and the military portion of the bill would have to be disposed of on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. CANNON. On Friday, Monday, or Tuesday.

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Interior Department, is there anything in the motion that precludes the submission of an amendment under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. CANNON. Every opportunity will be afforded under the rules of the House for the consideration of amendments offered by any Member of the House.

Mr. TABER. I understand that with reference to the pending agricultural chapter there will be no attempt to close debate on that until after all legitimate amendments have been discussed?

Mr. CANNON. The pending chapter will be considered under the regular rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement when the Committee rose yesterday, chapter VI, relating to the Department of Agriculture, is considered as read. It is now subject to points of order to any part of the chapter.

Is there any point of order to be made to chapter VI?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in lines 15 to 17 on page 157,

reading "Except that a poultry breeding house may be constructed at Purdue University," on the ground that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that under the Research and Marketing Act, section 7–A, 7 United States Code 427 (h), the Department of Agriculture is authorized to construct agricultural buildings without limitation on the amounts. This committee has put restrictions heretofore on these amounts, fixing the individual amount at $15,000 per unit. We carry that provision with the exception that in this instance we let them go above it.

It traces back to the legislative authorization in the Research and Marketing Act under which they have authority to build such houses without any limitation.

In effect this is a limitation.

The authorization reads as follows:

The money appropriated in pursuance of this title shall also be available for the purchase or rental of land and the construction and acquisition of buildings necessary for conducting research provided for in this title.

In effect this is a limitation fixing the amount they may spend for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the language appearing in the pending bill on page 157, lines 15 to 17, on the ground it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has examined the provisions of existing law cited by the gentleman from Mississippi and invites attention to the fact that the first part of this paragraph appears clearly to be a limitation and the latter part of the paragraph appears to be an exception to the limitation for a purpose authorized by law.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in lines 6 to 7, page 204, "travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field."

Mr. Chairman, I ask to be briefly heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be very pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in previous chapters we have had before us a similar provision but in each instance the wording has contained the phrase in substance "as approved" or "as authorized by the Secretary." In those instances the particular section has been held to be subject to a point of order because it involved additional duties on the part of the Secretary. In this case those words are absent. There is nothing in existing law to my knowledge—I will be glad to be referred to it if I am uninformed—to authorize such expenditures. Indeed, if there had been, there would seem to have been very little reason for the inclusion of previous sections which we have adopted conferring such authority. Therefore, it seems to me that these travel expenses for the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture are subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that as to whether this language is surplusage or essential in this bill is beside the point. To properly discharge the duties of the Secretary of Agriculture under the basic law setting up the Department and the duties of the Secretary, this is absolutely essential to carry out those duties and it is authorized in that way. As to whether it may be necessary to carry this language might be something else. I would like to point out to the gentleman that it is under this language that inspections in the field are made by the Congress. I know that from time to time we have to undergo criticism for our efforts in trying to cut these appropriations, but last year, I would like to point out to the gentleman, as the result of our investigation we turned down a quarter of a million dollars for the building of a refrigeration unit for research, because they had one in Florida. On a check it was found that the Army did have one, and we saved that amount of money. As the result of our investigation of the foot-and-mouth disease, I think I can point out that we have saved untold amounts of money, and I think if you go further you will find that this committee, by reason of its investigation, has brought about 100 percent increase in productivity as the result of the soil-conservation policies, and I certainly offer no apologies for the efforts that this committee has put into those projects. I think the point of order should not be sustained, because it is essential to properly discharge the duties of the office under the legislation setting up the Department of Agriculture, and the duties of the Secretary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the force of what the gentleman from Mississippi said. I have no reason in any respect to question the good faith or the value of the work of his committee in the field. My point of order is made against that provision, and I think if we are going to enter into the type of activity which he describes—and if it should be done, as to that I have no views at the moment—then we should do it in an appropriate way by authorizing legislation. I still think that this is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has made a point of order against the language appearing on page 204 of the chapter beginning in line 6, which has been quoted by him, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The Chair has examined the language and has listened attentively to the arguments presented and has also made an examination of the precedents and decisions of the House. It appears that in 1938 a point of order was made against language similar to this, and the Chairman, Mr. Jones, of Texas, overruled the point of order. The decision is found on page 2656 of the RECORD of March 1, 1938. On the basis of that precedent and decision the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order. I make the point of order against the language in lines 16 to 20:

For necessary expenses, including dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293.

It involves additional duties on the part of the Secretary, and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to call the attention of the Chair to 5 United States Code, section 83, which seems to cover this matter.

Mr. Chairman, a further review of this matter raises a question in my own mind as to whether the language "when authorized by the Secretary" does not make the point of order in order; in other words, it should be sustained. Therefore, I offer no objection to the point of order that has been raised, and I shall offer an amendment, because I think that in the absence of the language "when authorized by the Secretary" the amendment would not be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appreciates the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi. However, amendments will be in order after all points of order that may be made against the chapter have been considered and disposed of.

The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] makes a point of order against the language appearing on page 208 of the pending bill in lines 16 to 20, inclusive, on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order in that the language includes the words "when authorized by the Secretary." Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order to this chapter?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 193, lines 18 through 24, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore is contrary to the rules of the House, in that it seeks to add an additional purpose for which section 32 funds may be expended.

Section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, is the section which sets aside 30 percent of the gross customs receipts to be expended for certain purposes; namely, to increase the export and the consumption

of agricultural commodities. The purposes for which the funds may be expended are set out. They may be used by paying indemnities to exporters, and by making payments to producers. The further authority proposed to be set forth in this bill is to pay the transportation and handling charges on certain agricultural commodities.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would, but I should like to yield first to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, needless to say I regret very much that the gentleman from Georgia feels it necessary to press this point of order.

Mr. PACE. If the committee in its wisdom should put some limitation of, say, $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 on the expenditure of these funds for this purpose, there would be no objection on my part, but I understand there is no estimate of how much will be expended. It could be that the entire sum could be expended in paying transportation charges. I feel very deeply that it would be unwise to impose this burden on section 32 funds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to accept an amendment such as the gentleman has in mind. Will the gentleman from Mississippi prepare such an amendment, because after all, the gentleman from Georgia knows this particular language is aimed at saving the taxpayers of the Nation millions of dollars by preventing the spoilage of these tremendous quantities of perishables that we have on hand? Certainly if you gentlemen can aid me right now in putting some limitation in the bill so that we can achieve that purpose I will be deeply grateful to you.

Mr. WHITTEN. While there is much merit to the intent of our friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, I am rather of the same opinion as my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, so far as the use of section 32 funds is concerned. Further, it has been my purpose and the purpose of our committee to cooperate with the legislative committee and in no case to usurp or try to usurp their prerogatives. The provision put in here is a stop-gap and it was done only on the basis that the legislative committee was now considering this matter. I think the committee is so considering it. I wonder if it would not be better to let the whole thing go out and let the legislative committee handle it by substantive law. I think that is the way it properly should be handled. I did yield to the desires of our colleagues of the committee to try to meet this situation by putting it in here. But if there is any objection on the part of the legislative committee, certainly it is their business. We are trying to help out rather than try to usurp their prerogatives. That is the position I take.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, may I call to the attention of the committee that the intent of section 32 of the act of 1938 is to dispose of surplus commodities. Obviously that might entail their transportation to places where they might be consumed. I do not believe any ruling or interpretation of that act has been had in that regard. I just want to call it to the attention of the Committee before the Chairman rules on the point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If this point of order should be overruled or withdrawn is it not entirely possible that this section might be amended so that section 32 funds might even be used in connection with our foreign-aid program which contemplates the exportation of vast surpluses of agricultural commodities?

Mr. HORAN. I am sure that is possible and I am sure the Congress will take some action.

Mr. COOLEY. If that is true, then as suggested by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia the burden on section 32 funds will be even greater and more intensified and section 32 funds as a result may be entirely used up and not available for the purposes for which they were originally intended.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, since the chairman of the legislative Committee on Agriculture has raised the point of the burden on section 32 funds I trust that if the ruling on the point of order should include the kicking out of this paragraph, I trust there will also be an investigation made, if the gentleman's committee works on this, of the use of almost $3,000,000 of section 32 funds for administrative purposes. I do not believe that was the intent either.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further on the point of order in connection with the point raised by the chairman of the legislative committee on agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I want to say I am just as disturbed as he is about this foreign situation and the use of section 32 funds in connection with ECA and the occupied countries, and so on. On April 4 I had them give me a statement as to what part of section 32 funds were being used to reduce costs paid for agricultural commodities below what we have invested in them to ECA.

In other words, the Department of Agriculture has had to sell its commodities $36,000,000 below what we had in it, and section 32 funds were used. So $36,000,000 of section 32 funds have gone into the ECA program into these occupied areas. That money would have been put up by the Federal Government either way, whether by appropriation through ECA or whether by the means that they used. But by doing it this way it is charged up to Agriculture, which I insist is not right. I want to agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who raises that question, that it is serious.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, some time ago the question arose on the floor as to whether existing law permitted section 32 funds to be used for the payment of transportation of surplus commodities. It was my impression at the time that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] called the Department of Agriculture and talked to someone there, and was advised that the present law was broad enough to permit the use of section 32 funds for that purpose. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] some time ago, in referring to section 32, used the word "consumption." I do not have the law before me. Perhaps the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has. Perhaps he feels there is an absolute bar there against this purpose, but the impression has prevailed among many Members that the original section 32 law was broad enough to cover this matter. I was wondering if we might not perhaps arrive at a unanimous-consent request that the right to consider the point of order on this particular paragraph be deferred until we reach that in the orderly consideration of the bill for amendment, and then the issue be resolved as to the point of order and also as to the possible modifications or limitations on this paragraph, as proposed by the Andersen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request entered into, the whole chapter is open to points of order at any point, if offered; and also to amendments that are offered. The Chair said that points of order would have to be disposed of first.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, would it not be possible for the point of order to be reserved, by unanimous consent, as to this paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. It is rather unusual. It might make it more difficult to keep up with the situation.

Mr. TABER. But it could be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair prefers to dispose of it here and now.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I understand that numerous amendments will be offered. Section 32 does specify that one of its purposes is to increase the consumption of agricultural commodities, and it says exactly how the money shall be expended. It says, "To encourage exportation by payment of benefits, by payment of indemnities for losses, by payments to producers." Then, to increase consumption, "by payment of benefits, indemnities, and donations," and so forth. Certainly, it is evident if the Department of Agriculture was satisfied that it had authority to spend section 32 money for transportation of any or all agricultural commodities that are in surplus, it would not be here today asking the committee to give it the authority.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia has amply made the point I was seeking to bring out, that by donations to encourage consumption, the authority does exist. The Department is not here asking for this authority. The language was put in here on the suggestion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Under the language which the gentleman from Georgia has read and under the example cited by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] as to the use of this fund for the payment of certain costs in connection with ECA, it would seem that this might come within the broad powers already given by section 32, and conse-

quently not be a broadening of the existing law.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if there could be understanding with the chairman of the subcommittee and other members of the subcommittee that there be a limitation in the nature of an amendment to this, limiting the over-all expenditure for this particular purpose to $5,000,000.

Mr. PACE. That would be entirely acceptable to me.

Mr. TABER. Would you be willing to waive the point of order, if that understanding may be had?

Mr. PACE. I would.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the chairman of the subcommittee handling this chapter cares to say anything about it.

Mr. WHITTEN. If such an amendment were sent to the floor I would like to ask the Chair's advice in connection with it. I understand certain other amendments will be offered to this section if it remains in the bill, which are quite definitely legislative. This is far reaching in its provisions. Notwithstanding the fact that the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is trying to reach an objective which is worthy and has done much work on it, I would be constrained to make a point of order against such amendments.

I want to know at this time if this point of order is withdrawn against this section, whether an amendment greatly enlarging it would still be subject to a point of order? If not, I would rather make the point of order to this section myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously, the Chair cannot undertake to pass on a point of order of that nature until the amendment is presented.

Mr. WHITTEN. If points of order to the bill are now waived and this section is held to be in order I wish to know whether legislation which would necessarily follow would be considered on the pending basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not be passing on the question at all if the point of order were withdrawn.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Whatever may be done now certainly does not prejudice the right of the gentleman from Mississippi to raise the point of order against any amendment that may be offered and, certainly, whatever may be done now would not make in order an amendment which would not otherwise be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel I did not make myself clear. It is whether if a legislative section is in the bill as it is now written and it remains in the bill, would substitute legislation for the legislation be subject to a point of order if we take it for granted that the amendment is legislation? The fact that we have permitted such legislation to be in the bill would preclude the offering of a substitute legislative provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to answer the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry and will state that such an amendment could be offered provided it were germane, and also provided that it did not extend the legislative provisions now appearing in the bill.

Mr. TABER. A further parliamentary inquiry on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The waiving of a point of order at this point would not permit a germane amendment to this paragraph which would expand its legislative activity, and such an expansion would be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. That is what the Chair just endeavored to state.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. This is the regular order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who has the floor; may I inquire?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the floor right now considering a point of order.

Mr. PACE. In the light of the situation, I am constrained to insist on the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this particular point of order in connection with this section be laid aside temporarily reserving all rights to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], later on, anywhere through the bill, at any part he sees fit, to again bring the matter up. We do not want to act hastily here. This is too important a matter.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the point of order is sustained, later on if the parties get together after other amendments are offered, assuming points of order are advanced against them and are sustained, if the parties get together there is nothing to stop them from offering an amendment if no one advances a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. An amendment could be offered and if no point of order is made against the amendment, of course, the question is not raised.

The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has made a point of order against the language appearing in the pending bill on page 293, beginning in line 18 and including line 24, on the ground it contains legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill under consideration, for all practical purposes concedes the point of order.

The Chair has examined the language referred to and is definitely of the opinion that it does include legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair is very favorably impressed with the last statement made by the gentleman from Georgia in reply to the observation made by the gentleman from South Dakota to the effect that if existing law provided for this there would be no useful purpose to be served by having this provision in the bill. It does appear very clearly to the Chair that the inclusion of this language would result in a diversion of certain funds from the purpose provided by existing law for the use of those funds. It therefore appearing to the Chair that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 205, beginning with line 8:

> together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $207,000, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

I make a point of order against all of the remainder of the provision relating to the Office of Solicitor on the ground that the provision therein contained is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair understand the gentleman. He refers to page 205 of the pending bill, beginning in what line?

Mr. KEATING. Beginning with line 8, the words "together with such amounts" to the end of that paragraph. I make the point of order on the ground that the provisions call for additional duties on the part of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget and constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I can only say that this is the usual and customary way of carrying these funds. In fairness to the Chair, I think it does appear to be legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the language appearing on page 205 beginning with the words "together with such amounts" in line 8 and through the remainder of that paragraph, on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill and in violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order; therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the language appearing on page 207, line 8, beginning with the words "*Provided*, That."

The CHAIRMAN. And going how far?

Mr. KEATING. To page 208, line 3, ending with the words "objects specified herein." I make the point of order that these provisions require additional duties upon the part of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget and constitute legislation on an appropriation bill and are, therefore, subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no desire on the part of the committee to legislate except in line with the usual and customary practices that have been carried on in this bill. I think the first part of the language to which the point of order is made could be classified as legislation on an appropriation bill. I do have doubts as to whether a point of order should lie against the part beginning with line 19, and that that part is good. The point of order, as I understand, is not divided but is to the entirety, and in view of that I am of the opinion that the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] makes the point of order against the language appearing on page 207 of the bill, which has been pointed out by him, on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order. On page 200, line 16, beginning with the words—

Provided further, That for the purpose of making loans pursuant to the foregoing authority, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such loans to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury on such loans shall be treated as a public-debt transaction.

I make the point of order that that language involves legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I do this in order to protect the record at this point and would be very glad to reserve the point of order and ask for an explanation of what is attempted to be accomplished by this proviso. My point is that it may be something highly desirable to which I would not want to make a point of order. Offhand it looks to me clearly like legislation on an appropriation bill, but perhaps it may be desirable legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. This language was included to facilitate the handling of the program which is set out above in the bill. It is merely technical, as is apparent, and is just in order to facilitate the handling of the matter by the Treasury Department and, as I understand, was originally included at the insistence of the Treasury Department to so facilitate it. I am not prepared to say whether it is or is not legislation on an appropriation bill. I do say that it is economy to keep it in rather than strike it out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the justification for this language is that this would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to use the proceeds of bond sales for making loans which he is directed to make in the foregoing proviso, and that otherwise he would be required to make these loans out of tax revenues rather than from bond sales?

Mr. KEATING. If these loans are going to be made, it just strikes me offhand that they should be made out of tax revenues rather than involving the Government in additional deficit spending. If that is the effect of it, I certainly press my point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The foregoing proviso authorizes the Secretary to utilize the proceeds from payment of principal and interest under certain acts referred to to repay the Secretary of the Treasury for the amounts borrowed. The proviso ahead of that, beginning with line 9, reads that the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to loan such sums to the Secretary. It is my recollection that the language to which the gentleman has directed his point of order is language which appears in the RFC Act, and in the Housing Act, and in other acts which make either discretionary or mandatory loans from the Secretary available to various agencies, that is, loans from the Secretary of the Treasury. Here it would make them available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some question whether the gentleman wants to press the point of order. If it is pressed, there is nothing for me to say except that I think the point of order should be sustained. I seriously doubt whether the gentleman really wants to do it in this instance. I do not think he gains anything. I think he contributes somewhat to the problem of handling the very things that go before it. But that is a decision for him to make, and I could be wrong. If the point of order is insisted upon, I shall have to concede it.

Mr. KEATING. My impression is that it is desirable to have the RECORD show the cost in each year of these various programs. They should be handled on a current basis rather than by having one arm of the Government loan to another arm, thereby deferring the day of reckoning. This looks to me like a possible manner of covering up the present cost of the program for the Farmers' Home Administration. I think at this point, at least, I will press the point of order, with the suggestion to the gentleman from Mississippi that if an amendment is offered to the bill later to restore this language, and we can be convinced that it is desirable, it is possible that at that time no point of order will be raised. At this juncture I do press the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] makes a point of order against the language appearing in the pending bill on page 200, beginning with the word "*Provided*" in line 16 and continuing through the remainder of that paragraph, on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized under the rules of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi concedes the point of order.

The Chair would invite attention to the fact that the language appearing in this provision, "the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act," and so forth, would appear to be clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the following language beginning in line 17 on page 191—

Provided further, That the county agricultural conservation committee in any county with the approval of the State committee may allot not to exceed 5 percent of its allocation for the agricultural conservation program to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for technical and other assistance in such county—

That it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The language contained in these lines has to do with the administration of the programs in two separate agencies of the Department of Agriculture, which ought to come before a proper legislative committee to have legal determination made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statement by the gentleman from Minnesota, I point out that this provision was written in the bill last year after conference with and with the approval of the members of the legislative Committee on Agriculture. It is an effort on the part of our committee to more properly utilize the various specialists of the two agricultural programs.

Under the present law, these two agricultural agencies are authorized to utilize the services of other agencies. In effect, by fixing it at 5 percent, I think we are on sound ground in insisting on the limitation. It is a limitation in the amount which can be used for a particular purpose, whereas, in the absence of the 5-percent figure, each agency could use the services of the other, and under the general law would have a right to compensate the other for services rendered. I think under the general provisions of the law that is true. The 5-percent provision is a limitation rather than legislation or an authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it the contention of the gentleman from Mississippi that, under existing law, without this limitation an allotment might be made in excess of 5 percent?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know as to the use of the word "allotment," but under the Economy Act of 1932, section 601, any agency is entitled to use and is authorized to use the services of another agency and to pay for such services.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the basic act, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, is it not true that these technical and other services could be provided?

Mr. WHITTEN. They could be. The point that we are trying to get at here is that the Production and Marketing Administration is entitled to this type of service, and in many cases has to go out and hire and train additional specialists while the Federal Government is paying such specialists, who are doing the same kind of work.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. They would be authorized to use the services of the Soil Conservation Service beyond this 5 percent. May I point out that the citation of the act is 31 United States Code, section 686. The 5-percent provision here is not compulsory. By its insertion we hope to be able to get these two agencies to use the services of the other, instead of going out in two directions. I think we are on sound ground in our objective and in our approach to reach that objective. They already have authority to use these services, but by putting this provision in we stress our intention that they make use of the services. I think it will result in economy, if they do make use of the services. I may say that the Department has just begun to make use of them, and, from the reports that I am now getting, it is doing a great deal of good.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I understand the gentleman correctly, this service could be carried on by the Production and Marketing Administration itself?

Mr. WHITTEN. And in most cases it is, with absolute disregard of the fact that technical people are already drawing pay from the Federal Government who could do the work.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has cited the act and also pointed out that existing law authorizes the agency to utilize the services of another agency to carry out its authorized functions.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I regard this as a matter of importance or I would not inject myself into the discussion. We are now faced with a situation where we have the Soil Conservation Service, and I think $50,000,000 is provided for that service under this bill. Then we have the Production and Marketing Administration, which is given authority to pay out benefits to the farmers for the practices in which they are engaged. We all fear that there is about to come about the setting up of two sets of technicians. The Soil Conservation Service now has those technicians. They are paid by the Government and they are in the counties and they are available, but there seems to be a tendency for PMA to set up its own technicians, with others standing by. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that under the general authority which one department has to call upon the services of another, and for which they must pay, that it is authorized by law for this transfer of funds to be made, and that in the transfer of funds, in using the technicians available in the Soil Conservation Service, there would be enormous savings to the Government; and, second, in a small way, would eliminate the duplication which we find in the Department.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Of course we are committed to the organization of the entire Nation into soil conservation districts. We are moving in that direction. I asked Mr. Dykes, of the Soil Conservation Service, when he was before our subcommittee, if we were to organize the entire Nation into soil conservation districts, what, in his opinion, would be the amount of personnel required to carry on the work in those districts, and he answered: "Better than 16,000 men." They now have 11,700 in the Soil Conservation Service. Obviously, we will have greater commitments in the form of larger appropriations before the Congress when we have organized all the districts in the United States. We now have nearly 2,400. So, obviously, this language does serve a very useful purpose and should exist.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege last fall to sit in on a meeting with the Soil Conservation Service in my district. It was also my privilege to sit in with some county PMA committees. I do desire to bring this statement to the Committee, in thinking in terms of economy, that that little provision which was placed in the Appropriation Act last year has created in my district more confusion than any similar number of words could possibly do.

Those agencies were cooperating fairly well until this language was put into the appropriation bill, which nobody seemed to clearly understand, bringing about a feeling that the Congress of the United States was attempting in some way or other to put one under the other, or the other under the other. It has interfered very greatly with their program of planning work. The Soil Conservation Service cannot possibly set up their schedule of dates and follow it through when the PMA committees request that they do something for them on such and such a date. The same thing is true as far as the PMA committee is concerned. I agree with the preceding gentlemen who have spoken in terms of economy and in terms of the necessity of something being spelled out so that there is no duplication in these agencies. That is heartily in accord with my views. However, I think that is an entirely separate matter. I think it is something that ought to be taken up and given consideration by the legislative committee of the House, which has control over these agencies, and that part should be left by the Appropriations Committee to them.

Mr. Chairman, I desire that my point of order be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] has made a point of order against the language appearing in that section of the bill on page 191 beginning with the word *"Provided"* in line 17, and continuing through the remainder of that paragraph down to and including the word "county" in line 25, on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has examined the language here in question and is of the opinion that it could be drawn so as to constitute a limitation, but as the language appears now in the bill it does appear to the Chair that it contains legislation. The Chair, of course, has to pass on the question as it is here presented and invites attention to the fact that among other things it includes the words "with the approval." It appears to the Chair that the language quoted does include legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The point of order is sustained.

Are there further points of order to this chapter? The Chair will not entertain points of order after we begin the consideration of amendments.

Is there any other point of order to this chapter of the pending bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and will consider amendments at this time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

On page 158, line 8, strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$2,548,000."

On page 159, line 1, strike out "$2,725,000" and insert "$2,671,000."

On page 165, line 3, strike out "$2,250,000" and insert $2,205,000."

On page 166, line 14, strike out "$12,800,000" and insert "$12,544,000."

On page 170, line 3, strike out "$3,400,000" and insert "$3,332,000."

On page 170, line 7, strike out "$2,950,000" and insert "$2,891,000."

On page 170, line 10, strike out "$450,000" and insert "$441,000."

On page 170, line 22, strike out "$2,680,000" and insert "$2,627,000."

On page 172, line 25, strike out "$4,100,000" and insert "$4,018,000."

On page 174, line 8, strike out "$4,185,900" and insert "$4,101,900."

On page 176, line 14, strike out "$539,500" and insert "$528,500."

On page 176, line 17, strike out "$900,000" and insert "$882,000."

On page 176, line 20, strike out "$3,280,000" and insert "$3,215,000."

On page 179, line 3, strike out "$665,000" and insert "$652,000."
On page 180, line 15, strike out "$26,890,000" and insert "$26,790,000."
On page 181, line 14, strike out "$2,995,000" and insert "$2,893,000."
On page 181, line 17, strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$1,274,000."
On page 181, line 20, strike out "$880,000" and insert "$863,000."
On page 182, line 3, strike out "$10,348,000" and insert "$10,248,000."
On page 184, line 10, strike out "$9,500,000" and insert "$9,400,000."
On page 185, line 2, strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$1,274,000."
On page 185, line 11, strike out "$10,750,000" and insert "$10,535,000."
On page 188, line 11, strike out "$1,490,000" and insert "$1,460,000."
On page 188, line 19, strike out "$400,000" and insert "$392,000."
On page 194, line 18, strike out "$2,050,000" and insert "$2,010,000."
On page 195, line 6, strike out "$780,000" and insert "$765,000."
On page 196, line 1, strike out "$1,260,000" and insert "$1,235,000."
On page 196, line 18, strike out "$1,660,500" and insert "$1,627,500."
On page 197, line 4, strike out "$1,675,000" and insert "$1,642,000."
On page 197, line 21, strike out "$3,550,000" and insert "$3,479,000."
On page 197, line 25, strike out "$650,000" and insert "$637,000."
On page 198, line 2, strike out "$6,854,000" and insert "$6,717,000."
On page 198, line 9, strike out "$8,150,000" and insert "$7,987,000."
On page 201, line 12, strike out "$27,700,000" and insert "$27,423,000."
On page 204, line 2, strike out "$900,000" and insert "$882,000."
On page 204, line 13, strike out "$2,143,300" and insert "$2,140,000."
On page 205, line 8, strike out "$2,450,000" and insert "$2,401,000."
On page 206, line 5, strike out "$600,000" and insert "$588,000."
On page 206, line 12, strike out "$1,265,800" and insert "$1,239,800."
On page 208, line 20, strike out "$713,293" and insert "$699,293."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact there are 40 small items embraced in this particular amendment, and it will be thoroughly discussed, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do so regretfully, but I think even with the reading now we still will have trouble knowing what is in the amendment; so I shall have to object.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

(The Clerk concluded reading the amendment.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to 40 specific items in the bill calls for a reduction of a total of only $2,562,300 and I wish you would keep that figure in mind. All I am asking here is to tighten up just a little bit in the various bureaus of the department. In not a single case have I asked for over a 2 percent cut and in a good many cases only 1 percent. In some not at all.

Mr. Chairman, I have a little son age 11. He gets a certain allowance each week, but I notice if I give him a little too much that he is inclined to spend the allowance perhaps for things that do not do him much good; for instance, he may buy too many Coca-Colas. So as much as I think of that boy I have to hold him down in his expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, the same proposition holds true here with the Department of Agriculture. We have a splendid group of bureaus in this great division of our Government.

It seems to me it is my duty as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and the duty of all of us, Mr. Chairman, to scan every appropriation bill we have before us and see if we can tighten up here and there a little.

This is not meat ax economy. Referring to the remarks of one of my friends, he stated, "Well, Carl, this is just peanuts; why bother trying to get this $2,500,000 reduction through?" My answer to that is, gentlemen, if we get enough of these peanuts cut off of these various bills, perhaps it will amount to something toward stabilizing the financial security of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was difficult for me and perhaps for other Members to keep track of all of the amendments which the gentleman included in his general amendment. May I ask him if a reduction is proposed by him in the appropriation made for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics on page 164?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; there is no reduction proposed there, because, frankly, I think that our subcommittee was hard enough on that particular group. In other words, may I say to the gentleman, I have very carefully gone over these items and I am not attempting to reduce all of them. I am just trying to squeeze a little where it will not hurt and where we, on the subcommittee, in my opinion, were a trifle lenient.

Now may I say something about the work of our subcommittee? I think it has done a good job in this bill which we have brought to the floor. It is my personal opinion that with some of these items we have been a little liberal and, frankly had it not been for the assertion made officially the other day that our deficit is apt to go up to $7,300,000,000 for next year, I doubt whether I would have tried to take this amount off the Department's budget, because I do think that our subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has done a good, conscientious job. But, let me call your attention to the fact that this very day, just this one day, our Nation is going into the red to the extent of $20,000,000, $800,000 an hour, and all I am asking for in this reduction is to take care of 3 hours of that deficit; just 3 hours. All I am asking is to take about 600 employees off of the over 64,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture. Certainly that cannot be said to be a meat ax economy. It is just as I stated about that small boy of mine; you have to tighten up occasionally.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Involved in the gentleman's amendment, was there included a reduction in moneys for agricultural research?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There are no reductions in that particular item. Let me say to the gentleman, you must remember that the Secretary has the right all through the bill, if he so sees fit, to shift 7 percent of any of these appropriation items in his discretion over to another department. If he feels, for example, that the Bureau of Human Nutrition has been unfairly treated by the Congress, he can take 7 percent from another item and put it over into that particular bureau and increase its appropriation. So, I cannot possibly see, gentlemen, where a little tightening up, just a mere 1 percent or 2 percent, in these 40 items will do any damage whatsoever to our great Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOLMES. The reason I asked that question of the gentleman from Minnesota is that I believe the Research Division of the Department of Agriculture is one of the most important divisions that we have.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOLMES. And I do not want to see those funds unduly reduced, because I think they are making a great contribution to the whole problem.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You will see that the first item having to do with research has not been touched at all.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I should like to ask a question similar to those asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]. I am interested in the gentleman's amendment. I wonder whether he would tell the House exactly where, in what bureaus, his reductions will take place. As the Clerk read the amendment, I was unable to follow it. I think perhaps it would be wise if the House knew exactly where the gentleman proposes that the reduction be made.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if we should not give the gentleman time enough so that he can start at the beginning and go right through and tell us what each item does and why.

Mr. YATES. I think that would be a very good idea.

Mr. TABER. With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 10 additional minutes, and I suggest that we let him

have a little more if necessary in order to let him finish.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is agreeable. Of course, I hope the gentleman will be fair enough to give us the same time in reply. I am sure he will.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As far as I am concerned, the gentleman from Mississippi can have until 6 o'clock tonight.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wonder if we could have an agreement as to time on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 15 minutes to be controlled by the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is out of order until the first speaker has finished speaking, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may yield if he so desires.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wanted to give the gentleman his time, but I wanted to be sure the same time was given the other side.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surely, but it is a little bit early to make that request. I should like all the gentlemen interested to have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that whatever time the gentleman has, the committee have an equal amount of time preceding the close of the debate.

Mr. TABER. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understand from that there is no limitation on other gentlemen who may care to speak, because after all this may be the only opportunity a lot of Members who are interested in agriculture will have to say what they think.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have no desire to close them off at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Minnesota be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is really a little easier, Mr. Chairman, to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois by simply pointing out, as I have, that these cuts are not directed in the main at any one item.

Mr. Chairman, these are all very small reductions. But you will see they total up to a considerable sum. All it means in reference to any of these particular items is that in the case of a few people who happen to retire, just do not replace them and shortly these bureaus will be down to this particular figure. I know how it is on my farm in Minnesota. Prices have gone down. I do not get what I used to get for my produce. Consequently I had to lay off a man in the last 2 years. It seems to me we get the work done anyhow to a certain degree. Times are getting hard. The average man in the Government does not realize that. My amendment is simply an effort, as I have said, to do a little tightening up.

Two or three years ago I mentioned to CLINTON ANDERSON, then Secretary of Agriculture, "Why do you not come to Congress and ask the Congress a little additional pay for the top men under your jurisdiction? I do not like to see men having the responsibility of a great bureau receiving the same pay, $10,330, as three or four or five of his subordinates receive." I said, "If that man is any good, he is entitled to $13,000 or $14,000 a year." So I say that perhaps we have too many eight- and nine-thousand-dollar-a-year men in Government, and I certainly feel on the other hand that our topnotchers, who have proved themselves, are entitled to consideration, which was given them just this last week by affording a little break on that ten-thousand-dollar limit, a place where these good men in Government could expect to pass on upward if they really showed they had the goods.

I think that gives you my opinion relative to these good men in Government. Let us pay them what they are worth, but let us not have too many of them.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. REES. I think it is extremely important, however, in giving consideration to the increase in salaries to these top-flight men in Government, that we do secure men who are qualified and entitled to those increases in salaries, and not simply increase somebody's salary because we can get it done. I am very earnest when I say it is extremely important that we get men of ability to hold these jobs, and not select them just because they may be political appointees, appointed because of their political affiliations, or something they have done for the party, and things like that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman's record in Congress has always shown that he has been sincere in these things. He is trying to accomplish much for the good of our Nation. But I want to tell the gentleman this: I have been closely associated with this great Department of Agriculture for at least 6 years, while serving on this subcommittee. I know there are many, many very good men connected with that department. I am sure the gentleman does not dispute me in that regard.

Mr. REES. Oh, I am in accord with that statement. I am speaking generally with respect to this question of paying top-flight salaries. I supported the legislation, but along with it we want to get men who are entitled to that salary.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say that the Forest Service is one of the services of this country more near to the hearts of the average Member of Congress than any other service, but, at the same time, let me come back to this old thesis of mine, that if we are to cut we also have to cut on those things that are dear to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Now, as to REA, it is very important to many of us; in fact, in 1948, I fought through an amendment on the floor adding $100,000,000 in loans for that particular project, and since that time our subcommittee has seen fit—and I may say that that was in the awful Republican Eightieth Congress when first REA received the great impetus toward construction—but since the Republican Congress took that step, the step which gave to them whatever money they could use without waste—because, after all, it was nothing but loans, and the repayment record was splendid—the Eighty-first Congress has, I am glad to say, followed the same policy. Since the Republican Congress started that policy we have continued the same policy in this subcommittee, and, as a consequence, that great boon to the farmers has spread all over the Nation. I want you to remember that point when you refer to the awful Eightieth Congress. I might elaborate by saying that in that particular Eightieth Congress we gave $800,000,000 in loan authorization to the REA where the previous five Congresses had given them only $240,000,000 more than that amount. The total is $1,042,000,000, I believe. I am just pointing that out, as an indication that REA is a very dear project to me personally; it lights my own farm. But at the same time I am asking that REA take here a small administrative cut. It is 2 percent, I believe, to be exact. We cannot expect, Mr. Chairman, to cut the projects dear to other people unless we are willing to take part of that cut on our own projects, on those, so to speak, very close to us personally.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. By this rather lengthy and comprehensive amendment which we agreed the gentleman might offer all together, he does not mean to indicate that we have not already cut out financing of these programs, does he?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows that I have said that the subcommittee has done a very splendid job. I also made the statement that had it not been for that shocking statement made the other day that we were going into the red during fiscal year 1951 by $7,300,000,000, I would not have offered this amendment. But I feel it my duty to do so, because I added $1,000,000 to the bill for more Soil Conservation Service districts, as the gentleman knows; so I feel it my duty to take off a little to make this bill balance out.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, after the gentleman adds to this whatever he is specially interested in he wants to cut down on the rest of it; is that it?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No. I might say that I did not do it; I am not powerful enough on that subcommittee to add an additional million. I did it together with my good friends the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KRUSE]; they aided and abetted me in that addition on the theory if we were to have new soil-conservation districts throughout America formed by people interested in keeping up the soil, that certainly those soil-conservation districts should be activiated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if you will look on pages 180, 181 and 182 in connection with the Forest Service you will see there that I propose very small cuts on tremendously big items. They are little 1 and 2 percent cuts. Here we have, for example, a cut of $100,000 on a great big item of $9,500,000; only $26,000 on forest fire cooperation out of $1,300,000; flood control, a reduction of 2 percent on an item totalling $10,750,000; soil conservation, two particular items, a reduction of $38,000, which has nothing to do with the operation of the Soil Conservation Service. Then there is P&MAIN we have six different items on which we have asked very minor reductions totaling about $300,000 which is very little when you figure that we have given that great organization approximately $10,000,000 or $11,000,000 in this part of the bill. And so on through. I may add that there is a 2 percent cut there also for REA of $163,000 out of $8,850,000, which leaves them $8,000,000. I remember not so long ago they were very pleased to get an appropriation of $5,200,000. I do know the telephone bill passed last year and for which I was glad to vote, further work has been necessary; but at the same time if we are going to cut government expenditures we must also cut these things that are dear to us. This brings us up to the Office of the Secretary. I propose there only a 2-percent reduction, an amount of $43,000, reducing an appropriation of $2,143,000 to an even $2,100,000. That is a considerable sum of money. The same applies to the Office of Solicitor, Foreign Agricultural Relations and Information.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. On page 180 did the gentleman reduce the item for national-forest protection and management of $26,890,000? If that was reduced I did not hear it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. By only one-third of 1 percent, $100,000, on that large item of $26,800,000. That is because of the splendid record that the Forest Service has made in bringing back into the Treasury an almost equal amount in receipts.

Mr. STAGGERS. Page 182, the item of $10,348,000 for roads and trails, was that reduced?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. By 1 percent, a little less than 1 percent, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by making this statement. Remember that we as a nation are going into the hole $800,000 every hour of the day. This amendment simply takes care of the deficit for 3 hours. I cannot help but remember that back in my county a 2 days' deficit on the part of this great Government of ours would buy all of the splendid farms in my home county and you could throw in a good many of the business districts in that particular area to boot for that money.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. During the debate on the District of Columbia appropriation the gentleman stated that in the name of economy and in order to cut the District of Columbia appropriation he was willing on behalf of the farmers of Minnesota to accept a 10-percent reduction on AAA payments.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes.

Mr. YATES. Is that provided for in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Had your people on your side done what I challenged them to do, and that is to cut everything along the line 10 percent, I would be willing that agriculture also share in its contribution to our national solvency. But, no, you know what little amendments have been accepted in the last 8 days on this floor. The majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], knows what has been done. It does not amount to anything; practically nothing, and I am hoping that this amendment now will be considered so moderate and so reasonable that you Democrats will help to save $2,500,000 and get 600 people off of the pay rolls of our great Government, people who are not necessary. Yes, I repeat, had similar cuts been made throughout the bill, certainly I would have voted and would support an amendment to cut out 10 percent of the triple A payments. My farmers would want me to do so.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my interest in the proposed appropriations for the national forests. I have a personal as well as a national interest in them. The Allegheny National Forest is located in my district in Pennsylvania—the Nineteenth Pennsylvania District. I know, therefore, from observation what is being done to rehabilitate that forest land there on the headwaters of one of the important watersheds in this country. I am seriously concerned, therefore, that this bill not only does not provide for strengthening our work with these natural resources but, instead, proposes the equivalent of heavy cuts in this type of work.

I realize that the report—page 154—shows an increase of $590,000 for "national-forest protection and management." However, when Pay Act costs are included, that increase is converted into a decrease of $250,000.

In other words, instead of there being an increase for the national forests, the bill actually calls for the equivalent of a cut of more than $1,000,000 in most national-forest activities.

The bill also calls for cuts in other national-forest projects. For minor forest roads and trails—our western friends call them access roads—a cut of almost $200,000 below the amount available this year. And a cut of 75 percent below the appropriation this year for acquisition of lands inside the national forests—as within the Allegheny National Forest.

Many of us here—and many of our fellow Americans throughout the country—are inclined to believe that our forest resources are really in pretty good shape, not a thing to worry about. That is perfectly natural, I think, and is in large measure induced by the fact that—as you travel or drive along in your car—you will see many trees growing, most everywhere. Unfortunately, too few of the doubting Thomases among us take time to stop, get out, and see what kind and manner of trees these are. Granted that they are pretty to look at, serve some purposes of shade, and soil and watershed protection, we must still think, practically, along the lines of our Nation's need for timber today and tomorrow. And that is really something to think about, gentlemen. The close view will disclose the alarming fact, even to a layman, that our second-growth stands of timber generally cannot begin to compare with the original. Most of the trees growing, apparently so prolifically, are but poor substitutes for those they replace, both in species and quality. A large part of this timber will never make the grade as sawlogs, our essential source of wood.

There is little doubt that everyone of us is concerned with bringing about economy in government, whenever and wherever it is feasible and just. I realize fully what a difficult job it was for the committee to weigh all the factors, coordinate all the demands, and come up with the fine bill which it finally prepared. If I have any criticism of this bill it deals mainly with what I think is a rather natural failure to consider—from a sufficiently long-range point of view—a very definite, very valuable, portion of all the trees growing in this country. I am speaking, of course, of the timber in our national forests. In establishing the appropriation for the protec-

tion, management, and utilization of these national forests of ours, I firmly believe that our committee should have taken more into account the future values inherent in these public forests. What the bill proposes is the equivalent of a heavy cut in the appropriation, seriously affecting future timber yields, future financial returns.

It is estimated that more than 600,000,000,000 board feet of saw timber is presently growing in our national forests. Now, these are multiple-purpose forests, with trees good to look at and enjoy, good for watershed purposes, and—if our foresters are only given the wherewithal—capable of management for the greatest possible yield of lumber and other forest products. The timber harvest on the national forests is running about 4,000,000,000 feet a year, a very vital contribution to total production in the country. Cash returned to the Treasury from this harvest exceeded $27,000,000 last year. This is not as much timber as could be harvested right now, actually only about two-thirds of the current, possible timber yield. And with proper consideration from an appropriation standpoint the yield could well be doubled in a not-too-distant future. But it takes a small increase, not a cut, in protection and management of the national forests; a small increase, not a cut, in the building of access roads to open up the stands of big trees that are ready, right now, to be logged; a small actual increase, not a diversion by earmarking from other needed national-forest funds, for the program of planting small trees to replace those gone; in the acquisition of key sites within the national forests to make the handling of them more efficient and effective. Aside from the timber resource, more money, not less, is needed to build up and maintain the other national-forest services our citizens deserve to have and to use; the range resource, the fish and wildlife resources, the recreational resource, the water resource. Well, the bill as it now stands does not provide the necessary increases; instead, it cuts in several instances well below budget figures.

Gentlemen, as you know, you cannot grow a crop of trees overnight or in a single season, as you do a crop of corn. Our appropriations for the national forests should be made with that in mind. We should not hamstring necessary current efforts; nor place a restrictive ceiling on future values and returns. We just cannot afford to hold back the clock in the matter of national-forest management, protection, and utilization. Our national welfare, during peacetime, and our national strength, at any time, demand that we overlook no bets in keeping our natural resources well and strong.

I do not now propose an amendment to the appropriations bill in connection with the national-forest items. I do, however, urge our House conferees to favorably consider any proposal by the Senate to increase these appropriations.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LECOMPTE to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] Where the words "on page 172, line 25," appear in the Andersen amendment strike out the figure "$4,018,000" and insert "$4,118,000" and add the words *"Provided,* That $100,000 shall be made available for European corn borer research."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Minnesota has offered a comprehensive amendment to change almost all of the figures in this entire section, I am offering an amendment at this time to his amendment, which provides simply for adding $100,000 for European corn borer research and making that amount available exclusively for this important task. We have spent over $100,000,000 to fight the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico to keep it out of our great herds, and this is money well spent if we win the battle, for the livestock industry is worth billions of dollars. Can we not spend a little to fight the corn borer?

Mr. Chairman, the Middle West is the bread basket of the United States. At the present time the great Midwest corn area is invaded by the European corn borer which was discovered 25 or 50 years ago along the Atlantic seaboard. It gradually traveled west until it has invaded the commercial corn area to such an extent that it is believed that the corn borer in the crop season of 1949 cost the producers of this country from 100,000,000 to 200,000,000 bushels of corn. Corn is worth over a dollar a bushel. I offer this amendment which simply raises the total amount in this bill by $100,000, an increase of $100,000 in a $29,000,000,000 bill. As an actual matter of fact, I think this is the best economy that we can practice. I imagine that it will occur to many persons that at the present time there is a surplus of grain, particularly a surplus of wheat and corn. But, that may not always prevail. The gentlemen from the city districts should be interested in this amendment because 90 percent of the corn crop is fed to meat animals and poultry. It is commonly said that corn is marketed on the hoof.

The whole purpose of this amendment—and I have been at the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine day after day—is to get a little bit more money for experimentation and research into methods by which we can control the European corn borer and perhaps discover a parasite that will live on the European corn borer and help to destroy it without becoming a pest itself. There was a cut of $166,000 below the President's budget estimate for insect investigation and control. My request is only for an additional $100,000, $66,000 less than the President's request. In the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota there is a proposal for an additional cut. The corn borers have invaded practically every corn field in the commercial corn area. Some progress has been made in treating young corn with DDT and other insecticides. Efforts are being made to develop a variety of corn that will be corn-borer resistant.

My amendment, although it provides for research, will permit some of the money that is to be used for research to be released for control. At the present time the Bureau is cooperating with the several States. A corn-borer experiment station has been located in Iowa. The fieldmen of the Department go through the counties and advise the farmers of the proper time and the proper method of applying the dust or spray to control the corn borers.

I believe this amendment might save the country vastly more than the $100,000 involved. It might save millions of dollars in the years to come. Now is the time to accomplish results. I have been in favor of the economy proposals down through the consideration of this bill. In most of the cases I have supported the proposals to cut the appropriations in this bill. However, I think it is real economy to give the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine a little more money with which to go into research on the European corn borer and undertake to discover some kind of parasite that will prey on the corn borer and to that extent help in the production of one of the greatest of all basic crops.

Remember when you vote on this amendment that every person is interested in the production of food. A little money invested now in research will bring in untold returns.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of this House operate farms, as I do. However, it is not necessary to be a farmer, though it helps, to be fully aware of the decline in farm income. The prices received for farm commodities have declined much more rapidly than the operating costs. That is what hurts, and the small farmers have suffered most, for their margin of profit is less. This situation prevails in your district as well as mine.

We are all familiar with the findings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. It was released some months ago. It showed that about one-half of the farm families, in this great, rich country of ours had insufficient income to maintain a decent standard of living and meet current, essential, farm-operating costs. The report was for the year 1948, when the farm income was considered satisfactory. Now the income is considerably less, yet the operating costs remain relatively high.

We used to talk about the lower third. Now, due to economic changes, it appears that we should be concerned about the lower half of the American families who gain the major portion of their livelihood from farm operations. Where can they turn to for needed credit, advice, and guidance? Credit through the regular channels is not now readily available. For the majority of these farm families, their only source of help is the Farmers Home Administration.

Many Members of this body believe that, due to the economic trend, the only salvation for many farm families is to make changes in their farming operations. To do this they, too, need credit, advice, and guidance in making this transition. Again, the only source of credit and help available to them is through the Farmers Home Administration. Feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, and good operating equipment are essential for successful farming operations. It is

immaterial whether one lives in the East, South, West, or North.

Thousands of veterans turned to this agency for financial aid and assistance. It was the only avenue open to many of them who desired to get reestablished on farms. The latest report I have shows that over 150,000 loans have been made to ex-servicemen, who also received helpful guidance through this agency of the Department of Agriculture. What would these young men be doing now if it had not been for the Farmers Home Administration?

The Administrator, Mr. Dillard B. Lasseter, in accordance with the wishes of the Congress has given preference to veteran needs. But, the demand from veterans for operating loans to properly stock and equip a farm have been so great that, after their needs have been taken care of, what is left cannot even partly meet the needs of the nonveterans. They, too, are good Americans and made valuable contributions to the war effort, even though they were never in uniform. If eligible and worthy, families of these nonveterans, if they too wish to farm, should be given encouragement. Funds should be made available to both groups. Who are we to say that they are not entitled to an opportunity?

In the Ninth Wisconsin District operating loan funds have been exhausted for some time. The same situation prevails throughout the entire State. It happens every year. I get numerous complaints—several this week—from young folks in my district advising that the county committee has approved their applications but no help is available, for the money has run out. I made it my business to find out just how much Wisconsin was allocated out of funds appropriated by the Congress for the 1950 fiscal year. The amount was $2,350,000. This two-million-odd dollars did not meet the demand. We could use advantageously twice that much in Wisconsin. There is no reason to think that the situation is any different in my State than yours. Members of this body, especially those representing agricultural districts, are equally aware of the inadequacy of operating loan funds. In all probability the demand will be still greater in 1951.

I know what the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessors have accomplished. I have followed their activities closely for a number of years. I have been on their farms and observed the progress made by farm families through the assistance of this agency. It has a most commendable record; no agency of the Department has a better one. Not only has it rendered valuable assistance to millions of worthy farm families, unable to get credit elsewhere; it has a remarkable collection record. Of the obligations to the Government which have matured, the Farmers Home Administration has collected $9 out of every $10. The interest collected has gone far in defraying cost of administration.

I believe, as many of you do, that the budget estimate of $85,000,000 for operating loan funds is too low to meet the demand for the 1951 fiscal year. I believe the future has been underestimated. Mr. Lasseter is conscientiously endeavoring to carry out the mandate of the Congress. We expect him to render a service to a community and give financial aid and assistance to all worthy farm families. At the same time we cripple him with lack of funds. He is unable to perform the duties expected of him. We give billions to foreign countries in an effort to rehabilitate the needy and underprivileged, much of which we know will never be repaid. But here at home we hesitate to make funds available for loans to our own countrymen, the major portion of which we know will be repaid to the Treasury, with interest. Is that fair?

I am recommending an increase in the operating loan authorization for the Farmers Home Administration. I think this is seriously needed if this agency is to function properly and as the Congress expects. I repeat, I believe that the Budget Bureau's request for $85,000,000 is too low. If my home State of Wisconsin is a criterion, the amount should be far greater—at least $125,000,000.

Again, let me remind you that this is not to be a dole or a gift. The funds appropriated will be paid back into the Treasury, with interest, by good, substantial, hard-working, worthy families. I believe they are entitled to an opportunity to get a start in life through our help. They do not want subsidies—all they ask for is a loan.

I also want to call attention to another program included in a part of the bill now under consideration. It is the soil-conservation program carried out through soil-conservation districts. Farmers are proud of the success they have made in tying down their topsoil by applying conservation practices and measures through this program. They find it increases their efficiency and that it is profitable to them. It is making them more independent and more secure in the feeling that they can weather whatever economic situations they are likely to encounter in the future. To me this soil-conservation program is the very kind which the Federal Government should foster because it is building up not only the land resources upon which the future well-being of this country depends but it is helping to make farmers stronger and better able to carry their share of the responsibility for keeping America great.

The Federal Government contributes to this program by supplying the needed technical assistance to farmers through the Soil Conservation Service. It is important that sufficient funds be made available to give farmers the technical help they are asking. In the 57 soil-conservation districts in Wisconsin where technical assistance is being provided, and I presume everywhere else in the United States in the 2,152 soil-conservation districts, there is a waiting list of farmers who are anxious to get help in applying a soil-conservation program to their farms. We must not fail to provide sufficient funds to see that these farmer requests are met as quickly as possible.

Farmers themselves operate these soil-conservation districts. They take the responsibility of organizing their own program and obtaining assistance from all available sources. The Federal Government supplies the technical assistance largely but the State and local government agencies also assist these districts in getting their job done. The big point is that farmers themselves put their own money, time and effort into applying the conservation measures and that amounts to from 3 to 10 times more than they receive from governmental sources.

There were more than 125,000 farm conservation plans made in soil-conservation districts, with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, during the last calendar year. These plans covered nearly 35,000,000 acres and the application of conservation practices and measures was completed on nearly 25,000,000 acres. Although these totals are considerably greater than the accomplishments of the 1948 calendar year, still they are lower than could have been accomplished providing more Federal assistance were available since I understand there were more than 350,000 farmer applications in the districts than it was possible to get around to with the assistance available.

My own district in Wisconsin is completely organized into soil-conservation districts and they are moving ahead very rapidly. I want to encourage them in this most important job and urge that the Congress make sufficient funds available so that the farmer needs will be met. Conserving our resources is equally important with that of national defense and the maintenance of a wholesome economy in keeping our country prepared to withstand any crisis in which it may be forced. The appropriation to the Soil Conservation Service contributes directly and most efficiently to conserving our land resources so I urge that its appropriation be made sufficient to carry out all the farmers' needs.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is a change in the figure appearing in the bill at page 208, line 20. Under previous rulings of the Chair lines 16 to 20 have been eliminated from the bill. My question is: One, is it too late to make a point of order against that portion of the gentleman's amendment, and if it is too late what is the effect of amending a figure which is not now in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late now to make a point of order and, of course, it will be a nullity to amend something if it is not in the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the last 20 minutes to be reserved to myself.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it necessary if one wishes to reduce further the figures included in the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota to offer such reductions as amendments to his amendment, or would they be in order at a later time?

The CHAIRMAN. They would be in order at a later time if the H. Carl Andersen amendment were voted down.

Mr. KEATING. But if the H. Carl Andersen amendment is carried then they would not be in order at a later time, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with all the newspaper articles and all the stuff we hear on the air during the last few months about agricultural-support programs, it is always refreshing to me to be able to report that we have one agricultural program, at least, that is doing a very good job.

During the Easter vacation I took occasion to visit and study over one of these guaranteed loans as provided by the Cooley bill. The Cooley bill is one of the most constructive pieces of agricultural legislation that the Congress has passed in the last 10 years. Together with the Steagall bill, they were probably the two most constructive pieces of legislation that this Congress has passed. These guaranteed loans are an example of the cooperation that can take place between the bankers of a State and the local people. Young farmers are provided farms before they get so old they cannot work on them.

There have been 2,400 of these guaranteed loans in the United States, and over 260 of them are in the State of Wisconsin. It was refreshing to go on this kind of a field day. We visited one of those farms on which they were going to make a guaranteed loan, and we met the people. It was encouraging to see the things that could be done here in Washington and see it in action out in the field. Here was a young couple, in their late twenties, going out there and acquiring a home, owning a piece of America. I do not imagine any of us will live long enough to see the time when it will mean much in this country because we have too much undeveloped land, but it is an indication of a program that should be followed, because there is nothing that brings unrest, there is nothing that feeds communism as a program that does not allow people to own something and become a part of America themselves.

Under the Cooley Act, since its organization some 4 years ago, an organization has developed that is going ahead carefully. The returns to the United States Treasury have been very satisfactory. I repeat, it is one of the outstanding projects in legislation that has been passed. I wish to add that it has had bipartisan support all the way through. I repeat what I said before, in these days when so many things are said about agriculture, some true and others not, with everyone seeming to know all about it, it was surely a refreshing day to me to see legislation in operation right out in the field.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, as I understood the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota he referred to his amendment as a "peanuts" amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I stated that some other gentlemen had called it a "peanuts" amendment. To my mind it is anything but peanuts.

Mr. STAGGERS. I stand corrected.

As I understood the gentleman from Minnesota in his talk he proposes a small cut all along the line, but when he referred to the school-lunch program he praised that and said he was not going to make any reduction there.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will note that I made no reduction whatsoever in any of these great worth-while programs, loans, or anything of that nature; the cuts were aimed simply at administrative expenses throughout the bill in certain items.

Mr. STAGGERS. I stand corrected.

Mr. Chairman, we are living in a highly turbulent world today. Everyone recognizes this fact. We have recently passed through one of the greatest depressions of history and have taken part and successfully waged the greatest war of all times. We are standing today almost alone as the one nation which is trying to uphold the rights of freemen throughout the world.

We recognize, too, that all the material things which go into making this a great and independent nation directly come from the soil. Therefore the fundamental truth is we rely upon the farmer and his products, so the strength of this Nation is directly interwoven with the strength and prosperity of our farmers.

Anything that affects this group of people affects everyone in the Nation whatever his walk in life. His well-being is our responsibility as well as any other phase of our national life. There is no question but what the great natural resources of our Nation have been the real basis of our high standard of living.

The committee is to be congratulated on the work it has done.

I well recognize the problems which it faced in its consideration of this bill. However, I believe that in recommending the equivalent of a reduction in the appropriations for our national forests, the committee failed to give sufficient consideration to the long-time implications of this reduction. In examining the budget requests for the national forests it is evident that they are based upon the financial needs to make these national assets contribute more adequately to the Nation's future security. We are all agreed that the United States must be kept strong to retain its place of world leadership. Our natural resources—soil, forests, and water—are the basis of that strength. We must not allow them to deteriorate. They should be strengthened.

It is true that there is a budget deficit this year. It is also true that 75 percent or more of the total budget is concerned with past and future wars, the national debt, and with miltary and economic assistance abroad. Only a little of it has to do with the conservation of the natural resources of which the national forests are such a vital part.

There certainly is no economy and, in fact, little sense in neglecting the protection and management of forest, range, and watershed resources belonging to the Federal Government; in failing to make these resources contribute their utmost to our welfare and to our own strength and security. Such investments as these pay very good financial returns as well as nonmonetary returns indispensable to a prosperous people.

It is my understanding that we tried to recognize some of these needs by saying that they should be taken care of but that this should be done by diverting funds from one national forest activity to another. It does not make much sense to say you should put more money on reseeding ranges or replanting forests but drop the protection and administration of these resources while doing it. The more timber and forage we can grow on these national forests, the greater will be the dividends—the returns—from them. We know there will always be a demand for this timber, for the forage, and for the recreational and wildlife resources. So it seems only common sense to step up the production of these national properties; to protect and develop them so they will contribute more of the goods and services we need.

Such action necessitates providing each year suitable funds under a long-term program to protect and improve these forest properties. Continued productive condition of these properties will contribute greatly to the Nation's tax base and long-time security. It is urged that the conferees of this body when considering the several key items of the Forest Service, appropriations for which are now very inadequate, concur in the increased recommendations which we hope and expect will result from Senate consideration. The conferees who really study and investigate the amounts recommended by the two Houses will, in my opinion, find the higher recommendation of the Senate none too high due to the urgently needed work to prevent our national-forest properties and other forest lands from being threatened with inadequate protection—a "paper" economy usually resulting in heavy losses and damages to the public's interest concerned.

National forest protection and management

Appropriation, fiscal year 1950	[1] $26,300,000
Budget Bureau recommendation, fiscal year 1951	30,270,500
House committee recommendation, fiscal year 1951	[1] 26,890,000
Difference	3,380,500

[1] Comparison misleading. Present national forest work will have to be cut $250,000 to provide salary increases. Present work on the vitally important 9 subitems of timber, range, wildlife, watershed and recreation management, land-use survey (Alaska), maintenance of improvements, fire control, and unit management will have to be cut a further $775,000. This amount is to be added to 3 subitems, namely, construction improvement ($150,000 to correct inducive interference from REA lines and $75,000 for sanitation improvements), reforestation ($350,000), and range revegetation ($200,000). The last 2 subitems were given only a portion of the appropriation authorization of $3,000,000 and $1,500,000, respectively (Public Law 348, approved Oct. 11, 1949).

Forest-development roads and trails

Appropriation fiscal year 1950	$10,348,000
Budget Bureau recommendation, fiscal year 1951	12,465,000
House committee recommendation, fiscal year 1951	10,348,000
Difference	2,117,000

Many of our development roads have been so long without adequate maintenance work they are injuring adjacent national-forest resources by accelerating erosion. Log bridges constructed by the CCC on some of these roads are becoming hazardous and need immediate replacement. In addition, many access roads are urgently needed and expenditures on these would be completely self-liquidating. These roads would make overmature virgin timber accessible for immediate cutting. Delay in such cutting encourages disease or insect epidemics, the control of any one of which may cost many times the amount by the Bureau of the Budget. That amount, $12,465,000, is still $5,000,000 less than the appropriation authorized for this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the next fiscal year amounts to $764,000,000 plus. This is an increase of approximately $32,000,000 over the appropriations for the last fiscal year. The omnibus amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota seeks to make some reductions in the administration of this Department. As I understand the amendment, it refers entirely to administration and is an attempt to eliminate small items in various parts of the chapter in the sake of economy without affecting actual benefits to the farmers. It should not affect REA or Soil Conservation.

My purpose in rising at this time is to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the committee whether or not their assurances to me of last year to eliminate duplications have been carried out in this year's bill? I cannot find it in the report. I refer specifically to the duplication of investigation of farms by the AAA and the Soil Conservation people, both of which agree with me that duplication should be eliminated.

The AAA examines farms, the owners of which are to comply with the soil conservation program. They make the payments. The Soil Conservation people furnish the technical advice. They also make full examination of the same farm. One examination should be sufficient. On certain occasions I have had opportunity to investigate the complaints of the AAA agency, also the complaints of representatives from the Soil Conservation Service that there is definite duplication in the examination of the farms and the projects under the soil conservation program.

Now, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not that duplication has been eliminated in order that one examination of farms may be made to comply with the program?

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman that this has caused us a great deal of concern. All of us on this committee have tried to avoid this type of duplication. The 5-percent provision which went out on a point of order was our effort to take care of that. In other words, the technical engineers of the Soil Conservation Service will lay out plans for a drainage ditch and so forth, then you have a layman with no experience going out there and O. K.'ing the project.

Mr. STEFAN. The complaint of the farmer is he would like to go to the county seat or town and get all his information at one place. Then, too, his complaint is he has two sets of people who come to the farm and make examinations, one for technical advice and the other for payment. The officials of the AAA and soil conservation people tell me they are worried about this duplication and that the duplication exists. A year ago I took it up with this committee and I was assured they were going to do something about it. I am sure the two agencies would like to have this matter straightened out one way or another.

Mr. WHITTEN. We tried to put this provision in there. It was a starter, but we were tied down by limitations as to what we can do in an appropriation bill, and that provision went out on a point of order. We will follow it up by offering amendments to carry out the same purpose, but we are very limited in what we can do.

Mr. STEFAN. In view of the fact that the farmers, the officials of the AAA and officials of the soil conservation all agree that duplication is there, I hope that an effort will be made to eliminate such duplication. I want to do everything to make the soil-conservation program successful. Let us cooperate for that success.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Members of the House feel as I do about this bill. I think the committee has done a very excellent job. I think, however, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has just stated, that we could very well cut down a little on the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture and it would hurt no one.

Agriculture is, of course, the basic industry in America. About 80 percent of all of the raw products are grown on our farms. The other 20 percent of raw products come from underneath the ground and from the sea. That is the new wealth that is created each year and is consumed the year it is grown or mined, or the year after, and because of that it becomes the basic industry of our land. The things that are manufactured and processed from raw products do not wear out and need replacement for years and years. So, first of all, we have to get the things that are grown on the farm to start this great economic system of ours to operate. Mother earth is our economic generating plant. Seventy percent of all the labor in America is employed in the transportation, the processing, the distribution, and the sale of farm products, and when we have a deficiency of farm products, naturally employment suffers, but when we have depressed price for farm products, we have a depression in America. We have always had a depression in America with poor farm prices, and we have always had prosperity in America with good farm prices. Let us not forget that our wage earners collect over $4 for every $1 of farm income; also the businessmen of America sell over $4 worth of goods for each $1 of farm income. And I want to say that it is not just we folk that come from the farm districts that understand the problem and the value of a good farm program and of good farm prices, because most of the Members from the city districts on both sides of the aisle in this House have been very cooperative with the Members from the farm States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been called by some a peanuts amendment because it takes a little bit out of a great many appropriations. Let me say to you that the over-all figure is, as I understand, $2,585,000. I may have that last figure wrong, but it is $2,500,000 anyhow.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I give the gentleman the correct figure?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Two million five hundred and twenty-two thousand three hundred dollars. Of course, that includes the cut made on the estimate which was stricken on a point of order, I believe.

Mr. TABER. Well, that, of course, would not be affected at all.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. These cuts vary from amounts as low as $10,000 up to amounts as high as nearly $300,000. It would be absolutely impossible to take up the time of the House to have these small cuts running about $10,000 considered, for there would be too many amendments to consider them individually. This blan-

ket amendment proposition is the only way we can get any consideration of a reduction in the bill on so many items, where the proposed cuts are comparatively small. Under those circumstances I think the gentleman from Minnesota has performed a real service.

I am not going into detail on these items except to say that we all know there is not a department or agency of the Government of the United States that cannot take at least a 10-percent cut without being hurt a bit. When a Member proposed only a 2-percent cut we ought to adopt it and adopt it quickly and without any division on the floor of the House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Remember that on many of these items only a 1-percent cut is asked for.

Mr. TABER. I understand that is so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Further in reference to what the gentleman just had to say, if anybody would take the time to go through any of our departments he would find plenty of people in the departments that would make him wonder just what they are doing for the money the Government is paying them.

Mr. TABER. Yes. The committee has made a great many cuts. It has tried hard to make some savings in this bill. We have so many burdens being thrust upon us in the nature of defense that we cannot consider cutting in any substantial amount that our situation today is such that every place we can cut where it will do no harm we ought to cut.

I think the committee should accept this effort to cut and should allow the Congress to adopt this cut unanimously. I know of no possible way except by cutting down the expenses of government that this bill or any other bill relating to the disbursement of funds can be brought down within the limits of our ability to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota which I understand is not in order while the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is pending. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa at this time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I must object to that, of course, since we have not had a chance to speak on the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read at this time and I will speak to it and the amendment be disposed of later.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and Mr. WHITTEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 10, noes 47.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 198, line 2, strike out "$6,717,000" and insert "$5,054,000."

On page 198, line 9, strike out "$9,987,000" and insert "$6,963,000."

On page 201, line 12, strike out "$27,423,000" and insert "$26,149,000."

On page 205, line 8, strike out "$2,401,000" and insert "$2,364,000."

On page 206, line 5, strike out "$588,000" and insert "$576,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment at least has the merit that it will produce a substantial saving, and is simple. I hope it has sufficient merit that it will appeal to the Members of the House.

There are five instances in the perhaps 30 or 40 included within the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], where his proposed cut does not go as far as reducing to the figure for that particular expenditure to the amount provided last year. I commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] for the study and the care that he has given to this matter. He has certainly performed a distinct service. I shall of course support his amendment.

I do feel, however, that we should go further in those places where we are appropriating this year more money than we appropriated last year. This is no time to increase. On the contrary, we must decrease at every possible point if we are to achieve financial stability. My amendment, I emphasize, is conservative in that it only restores last year's appropriations at the designated points. There are only five such places but they do involve substantial expenditures. I would like to point out those five places in detail, without discussion of the figures.

On page 198 the provision for Federal Crop Insurance Corporation would be reduced by this amendment $1,700,000 more than the gentleman from Minnesota has reduced it, but it would give to this Corporation the same amount which it had last year.

The next figure is in the Rural Electrification Administration, which I realize is a touchy subject, but it seems to me that here again we would be acting with all the generosity which our Federal purse permits, and then some, if we were to allot to this Administration the amount which it had last year, which is provided in my amendment, rather than the increased amount.

Then, on page 201, in line 12, is a provision for administrative salaries and expenses for the Farmers Home Administration, which again is reduced to the amount they had last year.

At page 205, line 8, the same reduction to last year's appropriation is provided for the expenses of the Office of the Solicitor for the Department and at page 206, line 5 for the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. I hope the Members will agree that retrenchment at least to the extent of returning to last year's figures on these items is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized in opposition to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired except the time reserved by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I may have the attention of the membership when I try to address myself to the pending amendments.

I do not yield to anyone in this Congress in my sincere effort to reach governmental economy. I think my record here will bear that out, and I think my actions on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations will bear that out. Certainly I hope that it will, and my sincere effort has been to see that it would.

This thing of providing appropriations for a governmental department which affects approximately 6,000,000 farm families and goes into every county and into every home in the United States is an important undertaking. To try to determine how much money a great department should have is a terrific problem. As I tried to tell you yesterday, one has to give attention not only to one bureau's need but to every part of it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman mentioned 6,000,000 people. Do I understand that the money in this appropriation is paid to 6,000,000 different people?

Mr. WHITTEN. I meant to say that the effects of the operations of the Department of Agriculture directly goes into the home of approximately 6,000,000 farm families. It is not a case of any particular person, or anything like that.

Mr. VORYS. How many direct recipients would there be?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would be hard to say; it would be just as if the gentleman asked how many direct recipients there are of ECA aid. It is something one cannot state with exactness. But I may say that the residual beneficiaries of the action of the department are every man, woman, and child in the United States; and now, through ECA, in many of the foreign countries.

In considering our activities on this bill and trying to meet our responsibilities we have worked as a committee. I am proud to say that in our considerations on the Appropriations Committee we have tried to start at A and go through to Z, to ferret out and dig into each item and say how much it took to actually operate this department. As we went ahead and advised with people

to try to fix the program that we have brought to you we found that this 70,000,000 acres of land is eroded and needs to be restored. It was testified in the hearings that there would have to be an 85-percent increase in forestry appropriations if we were to properly take care of our forests. We do not have the money. We did not make any such provision, but it does call attention to the actual need that exists. When we got in there we tried to act as a committee for the whole United States; we try to be nonpartisan; we try to look over these situations. We realize that in particular areas there are particular problems, but we try to do this on a national scale and act from a national viewpoint. I think we have done a good job.

I know that it is popular to cut, and my good friend from Minnesota is taking the popular side of this matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows full well, and all of the members of the committee and our executive clerk know full well that I stated in the subcommittee that I did not consider myself bound, but felt free to offer any amendment I cared to either in the full committee or on the floor of the House. Surely, the gentleman does not want to leave the impression that I am going back on my word in any way, does he?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; I do not mean to indicate that; the gentleman has not gone back on his word. He stayed in the committee, and we worked out these amounts, and we worked them out to a general concensus of opinion of the five members. I believe that is a sound operation.

There is nothing wrong in offering these amendments as the gentleman does here; it is something that appeals to people; they like to think of cutting bureaucrats; they like to think of cutting public office holders. But the thing to remember is that last year this Congress raised the salary of many people in these departments. That was apparently popular with many Members here. It passed, anyway, and there is $6,000,000 in this bill that had to be inserted to pay for these salary raises that this Congress passed last year. One bureau head testified that they had about twice as much money this year as they had in 1939, but fewer people, and that this was due because Congress had raised salaries. That is something we are up against when we try to provide for these programs.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Before the week is over I shall offer an amendment to reduce salaries. Will the gentleman go along with it?

Mr. WHITTEN. When the gentleman introduces a bill here, I will go along with it, but how can I vote on it if he does not have a bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman could make a talk for it; that would help some.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would be glad to do that.

Now, in connection with this bill the Congress last year authorized the rural-telephone program. Are you going to destroy the rural-telephone program by voting for the language offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] which strikes out all of the money with which you set up the program? If you do not, and you are going ahead and have the program, are you going to strike out the expenses of the lawyers and those who have to go out and see whether you are going to get good security and whether you are setting it up on a sound basis, whether it is economically feasible, and for determining whether the Federal Government will be repaid?

Then there is the Rural Electrification Administration which has loans outstanding of approximately $2,000,000,000. Are you going to strike out the supervision of those loans and not see to it that the borrowers repay their money, that the rates are reasonable, and that these benefits go to the rural people? Are you going to do that?

In that connection, we set up the rural housing program. Are you going to strike that out, too? Are you going to let it go out to the rural people of this country that we set up for them a rural housing program, then proceed to strike it out?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not assuming that it was me personally who offered that particular amendment. He, I believe, is referring to the Keating amendment, is he not?

Mr. WHITTEN. I mean no such inference. I know the gentleman is for both these programs.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. We both know that certain bureaus have considerable additional work as a result of last year's legislation, and I therefore cannot agree with Mr. KEATING's proposals.

Mr. WHITTEN. But I am trying to point out to you that when you cut down supervision you are cutting down your chances of collecting the money that is outstanding. You have to give attention to implementing these programs that you go to the country and say you have passed to provide for the rural people of the country.

When I say that, I do not mean that we should not conserve in every way we can. I do say that the bill this committee brought out does do that. The President's budget was reduced more than $42,000,000 by this bill. The bill that we present to the Congress this year is less than half the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in 1940. Can you show me any record in any department that compares favorably with that?

Mr. Chairman, I do not advocate spending a dime that we can get by without spending, but in our effort to try to take advantage politically, and this is a political year, in our effort to get a reputation and headlines back home that we have set out to cut these bureaucrats, let us not lose sight of the fact that the American people and the American taxpayers have a whole lot of interest in these outstanding loans. We have a great interest in the proper operation of the Rural Electrification Administration, we have a great interest in the operation of the Farmers Home Administration and I say to my friends on the left who come and talk to me and say: Some of you say we have cut the Forest Service too much, this one too much and that one too much, that we have tried to do this thing on a fair and impartial basis. And may I say that my friend from Minnesota carried his due share of weight in the committee. This bill is the general consensus of opinion.

Just to show you how this thing works out, the corn borer is a very important item in Iowa. Our friend from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] wants to increase that item because it affects his area, and it is a serious problem. We are all aware of our local problems. We know what our local problems are.

It is popular today to offer an amendment to cut the bill away off here, there, and yonder or somewhere, and I am ready right now to cut from A to Z throughout this Department if it becomes necessary, and I tell you that it is rapidly reaching that point. And, if you make an over-all cut here and then at the conclusion of this omnibus bill you make another cut, where are you going to leave agriculture? I think we have cut in this bill beyond the point that other subcommittee has gone. I think when I tell you that we have reduced this appropriation to where it is less than half the amount that was appropriated in 1940, that that of itself would show to you that we are doing a sincere job, and I believe that in the long run you will come out better if you will follow the advice and the consensus of opinion of the five members of this committee who worked long and painstakingly two and a half months on it than you would when some man gets up and says, "Let us cut it by this amount." Listen, in some places he takes out $3,000, and in some places $200,000, and, as I pointed out, in some cases there is no reduction. Now, that is not the way to do business here, and I say to my friends on the left I do not believe that you want to do that kind of business. Now, the gentleman has offered his amendment. Now, come on, let us run this Department like it should be run, and if there is any reason that we should cut further, I am willing to cut further.

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. KRUSE. I want to commend the able chairman of the subcommittee on the statement he has just made and to join with him in his desire to see this amendment defeated.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the statement of my friend from Indiana.

Now, looking to the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] I want to say that this problem which he raises here is a serious problem. This European corn borer is very, very destructive, but I would like

to point out that in this bill there is close to $200,000 for work in connection with the European corn borer. So, we are not ignoring that subject.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We are spending $112,000,000 trying to stop the foot-and-mouth disease down in Mexico, and it is money well spent. My amendment just asks for $100,000 for research with respect to the European corn borer, and we have not got near enough money in the bill on that subject.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. The gentleman from Iowa knows that, the fellow from the forest areas knows about that, and the fellow from the cotton area knows about that, and if we total them all up this bill will be five times the amount that we have in it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Are we not all interested in that program?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, and I make no criticism of that. I have the same thing in my area and I am just saying that you have to cut your pattern to the cloth, and I am pointing out, and you are proving it, that this committee held back just as far as it could and still meet the problems that exist in this country.

In regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], under the basic law the crop insurance program is to be extended to 240 new counties. If his amendment prevails, you are not carrying out the law. You are giving aid to two-thirds of those entitled to it, but you are saying to the other one-third, "Well, we will not do it." If his amendment prevails you are cutting out the money for the rural-housing program. You see, we authorized the loans. Well, what good is a loan if there is nobody to process them, if there is nobody to supervise them, or if there is nobody to see that that money is repaid, as provided by law. What good is it if you are not going to protect your investment by not setting up supervision. What good is farm housing, what good is the rural-telephone program if you want to do that?

When I make this type of appeal, and I hope it has appealed to you, I am in no way trying to get away from the fact that we have to reduce governmental expenditures drastically. As chairman of this subcommittee, I say to you that we went into the subcommittee room and we spent 2½ months working on this bill. I have had complaint after complaint, just as from my good friend from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], that the cuts are too drastic. I have had plenty of them like that.

Then after we did that and found that we had reduced the appropriation by many millions of dollars below the President's budget, when we resurveyed the situation and saw that we were running in the red, I asked the members of my committee to go back, and we went back and cut out more than $6,000,000 more. I mention that to show you that I have tried to cooperate in every way that I know.

If we are going to have to start from A in Government down to Z in Government, I will be ready just as quickly as any of you are ready to take that action in the light of necessity, but I say to you that you make a mistake in cutting Agriculture, in this manner, now that we are right in the process of trying to get readjusted to a peacetime basis, further than we have already cut it, at the same time that you are voting authorizations for Marshall plan aid and for these many other things that most of you have voted for.

I say to the Members on my left who have been before my committee urging and beseeching that we take care of problems in connection with their own areas, with which they are familiar, and on which they should come before our committee, you think long before you come in here and vote to cut down still further the amounts we have put in this bill. I do not believe there is a one of you but that knows our subcommittee has made a firm and a conscientious effort to reduce these appropriations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the force of what the gentleman is saying. I of course admire him and his sincerity, as he knows. But the fact remains that regardless of the sincere effort which the gentleman says he and his committee made, the appropriation under this chapter is still $32,000,000 more than it was last year. My amendment is designed to reduce that by some $4,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. In reply to that, may I say to the gentleman that that is true, because the Congress provided for salary raises, the Congress provided for all these forest programs, the Congress provided for additional fire protection, the Congress provided for the rural telephone program, and the Congress provided for the rural housing program. If you want to cut those out, vote for these amendments, but if you want to keep faith with the American people and protect the position you have taken, you implement them as we have tried to provide that they be implemented here.

Just to give you some idea of what we have had to do in connection with this Department, you know it is popular to say, "Put them in the field, cut them out in Washington," but we are looking to this Department in Washington to supervise properly a $750,000,000 operation.

Last year I tried to pare down every division in the Department. If you will read the hearings you will see that that is so. This year the Republican members of my committee were protecting the Department from the questions I was asking the witnesses on one or two occasions. I tried to go into those things.

It developed that the Soil Conservation Service was not making the progress in some areas I felt it should be. We got them to bring up two different districts organized in the same State at about the same time. One of them had done twice as much work as the other. I asked that they set up minimum work standards, and gave them $25,000 more with which to make this study. That was last year. They made it. This year their statement was that the results from that program have increased 100 percent.

Mr. Chairman, do not vote for this false economy by striking out the supervision of a billion-dollar operation. I am going to hold them responsible. I ask you to let us give them enough funds so we can hold their feet to the fire and keep them responsible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 198, line 2, strike out "$6,717,000" and insert "$5,054,000."

On page 198, line 9, strike out "$7,987,000" and insert "$6,963,000."

On page 201, line 12, strike out "$27,423,000" and insert "$26,149,000."

On page 205, line 8, strike out "$2,401,000" and insert "$2,364,000."

On page 206, line 5, strike out "$588,000" and insert "$576,400."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 53, noes 82.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 77, noes 91.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 111.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not have proceeded very far before it will become apparent to the Members here present that my remarks will not sway any votes. I am tempted, however, to impose upon you for a very few moments in order that I may draw a picture in which may be

contrasted the conditions of 30 or 40 years ago with the conditions that exist today. My recollection in this regard is probably not important at all; in fact it may not be too interesting, but, nevertheless, I venture to recite it.

Back in 1905 my father was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, a position which he held for 10 years. In those days the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as did the chairmen of the other standing committees of the House at that time, handled the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture on the floor of the House.

I was serving in the New York Legislature at that time. Upon adjournment of that body I came down here for a little 3- or 4-day vacation and found my father in his residence here in Washington. He was very much disturbed, pacing the floor, a worried look in his eye. I said to him, "What is the trouble?" He said, "Boy, do you realize that no matter how hard I work I cannot keep this Agricultural Department appropriation bill below $15,000,000?"

The bill now before us carries $769,000,000. If there is any such thing as turning over in graves, my revered father is doing that today. He made another observation to me which may have some bearing upon the present situation.

He asked me, "Do you know what an expert in the Department of Agriculture is?" I told him I was not sure. He said, "I will tell you. An expert in the Department of Agriculture is a man who can make two dollars grow in an appropriations bill where one grew before."

Mr. Chairman, apropos of that remark may I call your attention to the output of our present-day experts. I hold in my hand a document gotten out by the Department of Agriculture entitled "Family Fare—Food and Management Receipts." It is gotten out by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics. It might well be called "The Federal Cook Book." I understand that every Member of the House is to have 3,000 of these for distribution as he sees fit. How many copies will be given to each Senator I do not know. If every Member of the House gets 3,000, there being 435 Members of the House, there will be 1,305,000 copies at the disposal of the Members of the House of Representatives in the aggregate. Probably that figure will be raised to over 2,000,000 when the Senate's quota is added.

This pamphlet covers 95 pages devoted to telling the housewives of America how to cook, starting out chapter by chapter, how to cook beef in various ways, how to cook mutton, how to cook fish, how to fry eggs, how to boil potatoes. Is it not sweet that Uncle Sam should be so nice to our people by teaching them to cook?

I wonder what Jefferson and those who helped to write the Constitution and found our Government would think when they realize the powers of the Federal Government have now been extended to the point where it is regarded as a duty of the Federal Government to teach our women how to cook in their own homes?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any appropriation for more cookbooks in this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know. This pamphlet has been paid for under appropriations made for the current fiscal year.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentleman know that there are 30 tons of books going out of the storeroom down here under the House Office Building, that have never had the wrapper broken on them, sold for old waste paper twice a year? And, they are baling it up every day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It may be that some tonnage will be added to the amount referred to by the gentleman from Idaho, and that it will be contributed out of this publication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. If the gentleman does not want his 3,000 copies, I would like to have them, because my people want them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say to the gentleman that I am not going to burden the Post Office Department with added loads. Everyone of these things is carried to the people at a loss to the taxpayers. I am not going to encourage its distribution. I do not know why I should pile such burdens on the people of this country. If other Members want to send out 6,000 instead of 3,000 or 9,000 instead of 3,000, they can go ahead and do it, but when you do so, remember the Post Office Department. It is going to cost thousands and thousands of dollars in addition to the cost of printing. I understand these things are going to be for sale at 25 cents apiece. It seems to me that bureaucracy has gone just about far enough. There is no public demand that the United States teach people how to cook. They can be taught in their local schools; they can be taught by State educational institutions. Why should they come to Washington? Is this a paternal government to that extent? Perhaps I ought to say it is a maternal government.

Already it has been proposed that the next move of this kind will be to design working clothing for women. Ouch! Where are we going?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we all dearly love to hear our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] speak. I do not know of any man on the Republican side or the other side here that is listened to more closely than is JIM WADSWORTH. In this connection, though, I think there are some facts that perhaps should be called to your attention. This book succeeds Aunt Sammy's cookbook, printed in 1927, under the Coolidge administration, and for many years thereafter, and it was continued on that basis until a few years ago. I would like to point out that in this pamphlet on Human Nutrition and Care it goes into the various foods, the calciums and the vitamins in general, and how to use foods and retain various elements. That is included in this book. Just yesterday this Congress voted millions and millions of dollars for public health, but to spend a little money here in trying to get the people themselves to study something about human nutrition, of course, it is good politics to laugh about that. I would like to point out to you the fact—and you supported it, and I am not condemning it—that this Congress provided the funds, and the public has demanded these volumes regarding the care and keeping of livestock healthy. In the last 2 or 3 years you have spent five times as much money on keeping livestock healthy, but you say it is ridiculous to give a little attention to human health. Do you know that in the last war about 36 percent of the draftees were turned down because of physical defects—mostly from faulty nutrition? Did you know that in this bill—and if you want to cut it down, you can do so—there is $83,500,000 for the school-lunch program? And, the testimony shows that the children from well-to-do families in about 50 percent of the cases need nutritious meals just as badly as those of poor people, and which they do not get because of the inadequate supervision and preparation in the home. And that is borne out by the record. Now, that is the book that is before you. Then there is criticism that the Congress distributes 3,000 copies of this book per Member, to whom? To the American people. Do you know any way in which to create more interest so that other people will buy them and get general distribution?

No, there is one other way to create more interest in it, and that is to have a few Members get up in Congress and makes speeches concerning its publication. They create interest, and those speeches are helpful, because it has created interest in this pamphlet. The interest is such that people all over the country are asking for them.

Of course, our friend, the gentleman from New York, JIM WADSWORTH like me was raised on his mother's cooking, and I like to eat like she cooked, but in many cases it perhaps was not always the most nutritious way. It was the way we learned, and the way we like.

If you want to give a little attention to human health, you had better think of the money you spent on 71 previous pamphlets to keep livestock and other animals healthy. You spent millions of dollars yesterday on public health. Let us pay a little bit of attention to preventive medicine, and not wait until the opportunity is gone.

We had it so well pointed out to us in the last war when 36 percent of our youth at the very prime of their lives were physically defective, in most cases because of inadequate diet or bad nutrition.

I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] pointed out this Department used to be run for $15,000,000. I am proud of my record of holding down appropriations for this Department. It believe you will agree privately that I was right in what I was trying to do. This is the only Department of Government that is below what it was 10 years ago. Did you know that this appropriation is less than one-half the appropriation for the same Department in 1940? I am proud of that record, because it is a fight to hold administration costs down. But we are making that fight. You will strengthen our hand a little bit if you will recognize value when you see it, and pay a little attention to keeping people healthy instead of putting all your attention on horses and cows and mules, just as you have done. I believe you are going to do it.

This committee tried to keep the faith. We did not appropriate new money to provide this pamphlet. We substituted this for another book on keeping livestock healthy. We believe in putting people first. If that be bad business, make the most of it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 208, after line 20, insert "Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for travel expenses. Amounts available from appropriations contained in this title are hereby reduced by the total sum of $645,496, such amount to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this chapter."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. I think the gentleman from Washington and I are interested in the same thing. Certainly we do not want needless travel.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if a point of order is going to be raised, I think it should be determined now. I do not believe the amendment is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi may reserve the point of order if he so desires.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But that does not leave the presumption Mr. Chairman, that the point of order will stand, does it?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KEATING. Does the reservation of a point of order by the gentleman from Mississippi give any Member the right to make a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It limits the amount of money which may be spent for travel. It provides for the covering back into the Treasury of the United States of money which has been budgeted this year above the fixed amount.

There have been ugly rumors going over the land that the Department of Agriculture has been engaged in what is certainly not legal tactics and that travel expenses have been involved in such activities. I believe until we have made some dispositon of these rumors it will be a protection to the good men and women in the Department of Agriculture to restrict these travel funds.

The founders of this great Republic of ours, believing as they did in a division of responsibility, provided for a legislative branch who were to express the will of the people of the United States. They were expected to meet once a year and put that will into law. Then the executive branch was to administer those laws as they appeared on the statute books. If we want to preserve the Republic, then when we hear of such infractions of the law of the land and infringements of one department of Government over the rights and duties of another department of Government, it is our duty to correct the situation. Certainly the executive branch should not become a propaganda machine to work its will when to do so would be contrary to what has been done by the Congress, the people's Congress, in this Nation's Capital. It should help stop the dangerous trend toward executive government. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I presume my appearance here would be taken as in opposition to the amendment. But this is what I want to discuss with you. There is no difference between me and the gentleman from Washington so far as holding down travel is concerned not only in this department but in all the activities of Government. Travel should be restricted to the work of the department. It should be restricted to the necessities for carrying on the operations of the department. We have constantly stressed that fact. On occasion we do hear certain charges and frequently when we investigate them we find that the situation is not as it appears in the press but quite different instead. I question the wisdom of this amendment. Travel is not set up here as a separate item in this bill. The budget estimate came to us setting up tentative amounts which it was indicated would be used for travel. We reduced the budget. I personally state now so far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for the other members of the committee, the department will be expected to reduce travel in proportion to the reduction in these programs. Further we expect to see to it that they stick to the programs as they have been set out. If that is done they will come down to the figures in the gentleman's amendment. The only thing that I see about the amendment, and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman who has offered it in the hope that he will at least give thought to withdrawing the amendment, is if you set up a certain amount then when the end of the year comes around and there is still money available the temptation to take a few trips because they have the money is pretty big.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a better chance by having a committee understanding, as shown by the records in the debate, that they shall reduce their travel allowance to this amount or in proportion to the reductions we have made. I believe it would be better operation to reach our objective. We want them to have the right to do those things that they should do in connection with the operation of their department. I believe we can do it better without this amendment than with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 1 minute of the 5 minutes to which I am entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, with the dog-eat-dog parking situation that exists in the vicinity of the House Office Buildings for Congressmen, their families, visitors, and employees, Members of the House might be interested to know that Capitol Police have carried out orders from somewhere to reserve on Delaware Avenue, usually a nonrestricted area, space for about 10 cars, most of them reportedly Packards used by the United States Steel officials who are testifying on the third floor of the Old House Office Building in connection with the monopoly investigation.

I am wondering if the same parking facilities are furnished to other citizens called to testify in other hearings. If not, why this special privilege to United States Steel?

Is this in line with another privilege that I called attention to on the floor of the House yesterday, that of United States Steel being allowed to clutter up the third floor of the Old Building with satin-bedecked exhibits, advertising scores of products of the corporation?

Incidentally, although I understand the exhibits were scheduled to remain in place for a week, they disappeared in the tubercular hours of the early morning today.

I again ask Members of the House, why all this special privilege?

Now, with respect to this bill, Mr. Chairman, it will take more than dollars alone to pull the farmers out of a tailspin which gives every indication of ending in a crash of the entire national economy.

Let us remember that every depression or period of prosperity has begun on the

farms, because agriculture is our basic economy; because every dollar of farm income generates 7 dollars of national income, due to the fact that the farmer supports himself and six other people.

This is not like the chicken and the egg. We know by studying years of Government figures where depression and prosperity begin: on the farms. Never in the history of this country have unemployment lines lengthened until farm income has dropped.

And now, with the administration spending billions of dollars on inconsistent farm policies that fluctuate hour by hour, we know that farm income, according to the Department of Agriculture, has dropped about 30 percent in the past 2 years on a national average, with still another 3 percent drop forecast by the Department for 1950. And farmers of the Third District of Iowa, with whom I talked during the Easter recess, displayed produce and livestock receipts which demonstrated that their income has fallen not 30 percent but closer to 50 percent in the past 2 years.

Lawyers who helped farmers make out income tax statements tell the same story: farm income is down. Farmers therefore are paying much less income tax this year, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue will find this out when it completes final tabulations.

Although farm income has nose dived an admitted 30 percent, average prices that farmers have to pay to live and stay in business have fallen only imperceptibly. Prices of some farm equipment have actually increased as much as 26 percent while farm income has been dropping.

What has this situation already done to the Nation's economy? You surely know the answer: National income dropped about $5,000,000,000 from 1948 to 1949 and unemployment has now reached well above four million.

Thus we have chaos in the making, with population and unemployment increasing, but national income decreasing, ample evidence that the farm policies of the administration, although costing billions, have miserably failed not only farmers but the country as a whole.

As though this were not disastrous enough, the administration is sabotaging the farmer with his own tax dollars, by allowing the importation of almost every conceivable kind of farm product produced by slave or underpaid labor, financed in all too many instances by ECA.

I have repeatedly called attention to these imports, including hams from Poland, wheat and fresh eggs from Canada, and dried egg albumen from China and Argentina.

In the first 10 months of 1949 the administration imported 18,000,000 eggs from Canada, on top of an egg surplus in the United States, and I am informed that the Department of Agriculture will import not 18,000,000 eggs from Canada in 1950, but 360,000,000, or three-fifths of the total Canadian output, because Britain, Canada's traditional egg market, prefers not to buy eggs for cash from Canada when she can use our give-away dollars, or buy our dried-egg surplus for practically nothing—a cent a pound.

And if you read last night's Washington Star, you perhaps noticed this ad by a supermarket. Here it is, in big type: Canned South American corned beef and canned South American roast beef at 43 cents per 12-ounce can. No doubt this is a tremendous aid to Dictator Peron, but it is no less than the act of a traitor to American beef producers; a further lever to pry the bottom out from under American farm prices.

Those of you from metropolitan districts might wonder what has happened, or not happened, to food prices that your constituents are forced to pay now that prices received by farmers are down about 30 to 50 percent.

Dun & Bradstreet reported yesterday that the wholesale food index, based on the total cost of a pound of each of 31 foods in general use, is up 2.8 percent over the same week last year.

Your metropolitan consumers are still tied up in the same noose they were last winter when they paid up to 70 cents a dozen for eggs for which Iowa farmers collected as little as 18 cents.

And how about so-called surplus onions? Iowa farmers have been plowing them under, rather than accept 3 cents per 50-pound bag, while metropolitan consumers pay 2 pounds for 15 cents, or at the rate of $3.75 per 50-pound bag.

So, I say again, we must look further than appropriations. This Congress should smoke out and order the prosecution of those responsible for the unconscionable spread of prices between farmer and consumer. Here's a job that my colleagues from metropolitan centers ought to enjoy getting their teeth into.

And we should enact a sound farm program, based on cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the farmer—a farm program such as the one introduced last session by the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], or the bill that I introduced March 24, House bill 7852.

These bills are not based on so-called parity, figures of the past, but on cost of production, the same as the products the farmer buys. Nor are they based on subsidies to be picked from the taxpayers' pockets; instead, support prices would be paid at the market place.

Mr. Chairman, such a farm program would go far toward stabilizing the economy of this Nation and avert the depression now in the making.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 1

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and take this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he is in a position to tell us about the program for tomorrow and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be pleased to.

Tomorrow, as heretofore announced, there will be general debate on one of the chapters of the general appropriation bill.

Monday: The Consent Calendar will be called and there will be three suspensions: One on H. R. 4942 relating to the Seneca Indians;

H. R. 6354, daylight saving time for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7185, relating to a civil-service examination or list for veterans in one of the agencies.

General debate will continue on the appropriation bill.

Tuesday: The Private Calendar will be called and general debate on the appropriation bill will continue.

Conference reports, of course, may be brought up at any time.

The general appropriation bill will be the continuing order of business next week, but should it be disposed of in time for the consideration of other legislation I will confer with the leadership on the other side and announce to the House as soon as possible what the program will be so that the membership may be advised.

Mr. ARENDS. Is there a possibility there may be some roll calls under the suspensions on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I should think so.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say there would be nothing but general debate on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Following the Consent Calendar and suspensions on Monday and following the Private Calendar on Tuesday.

There has been an understanding that all general debate on the appropriation bill will end Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. Is not that crowding general debate on some of these chapters?

Mr. McCORMACK. Earlier today there was a consent agreement that general debate would close on next Tuesday.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the majority leader whether the hour of meeting tomorrow and on Monday and Tuesday of next week will be at 12 o'clock rather than 11?

Mr. McCORMACK. The House will meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow and at 12 o'clock on Monday. I should like to leave the hour of meeting open for Tuesday.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to bring out the fact that on Monday and Tuesday there will be a lot of Members absent because of primary contests. There are a lot of Members, I am sure, who will be absent but would like to hear the debate on the Interior bill. I wonder if we can have an understanding that we will not bring up anything pertaining to the Interior appropriation bill until Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is beyond my control, I may advise the gentleman, because there is already a unanimous-consent agreement entered into that all general debate on the bill will close on Tuesday next and that the general debate on Tuesday will be on the civil-functions chapter. That was the unanimous-consent agreement made in the House before we went into the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not hear that request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is binding, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, with further reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] I wonder actually how many Members of the House have made a study of some of the publications, some of the hundreds and probably thousands of publications that are being issued from the very many plants devoted to the printing of Federal booklets, pamphlets, and publications? I have made a very cursory study and have come up with some very interesting facts.

For instance, the Interior Department has an interesting little brochure called The Early Life of the Atlantic Mackerel. I do not know how many people are interested in the early life of the Atlantic mackerel, but I should think it would be only a relative few.

If anyone is interested in the Mist Netting of Birds in Japan they can get full information on the subject from the Military Establishment. I am sure that in my district and throughout the Nation generally there are very few people indeed who have any interest in the mist netting of birds in Japan. I question that most of them could even afford the excise tax on a ticket to Japan.

Another little number is entitled "The Mortality of Soft Clams at Essex, Massachusetts." That probably is extremely interesting to the people of Essex, but it has no general utility so far as 160,000,000 people in the United States are concerned.

Now, we have something in the way of a Kinsey report on the sex life of the watermelon, for which the taxpayers of this country are being assessed. This may be biologically interesting to a few people as illuminating the facts of life about what transpires in a watermelon patch.

There is a humorous side to this but, on the other hand, hundreds and thousands, probably millions of dollars are being spent to turn out a lot of, to be charitable, we will say trash.

What this country needs today is not a good 5-cent cigar. It needs some booklets issued by the Federal Government on the following subjects: First, How To Balance the Federal Budget; second, How To Put an End to Deficit Financing; and third, How To Take a Saddle Off a Taxpayer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In listing these documents that are of limited interest, I think the gentleman and the Members may also be interested in some of the research projects that are undertaken and envisioned in this particular bill. I am happy at this moment to pay a compliment to the gentleman from Mississippi for bringing this out in the testimony.

The Bureau of Home Economics, it seems, went into the subject of functional clothing for women, and came up with the surprising result that the best way that a woman could carry more groceries home with her was to have pockets built in her apron.

Then on page 804 of the hearings they went into the question of how high a work table should be for the housewife in the kitchen. The gentleman from Mississippi with his usual adroitness brought out the fact, which seemed to be of some surprise to the research experts, that the height of a table would depend on the height of the housewife.

I congratulate the gentleman on his efforts in that direction.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Unless the Federal Government stops beating down the taxpayer they can build the tables considerably lower.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Since we are discussing the agricultural appropriation bill, it might be of interest to the committee to know that quite recently the Department of Agriculture issued a very profound statement to the effect that eggs stored in cold storage will keep better than those in warm places, and that eggs in motion are more likely to be broken than if they are kept lying still.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I can only add that the Department of Agriculture missed one salient fact, to wit, that eggs are generally oval in shape, and except during the Easter season, are usually brown or white in color.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Horan amendment. May I call the attention of the House to the fact that the amount of money available to the Department for travel during this fiscal year is estimated at $12,126,201. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] in reality only drives that down $126,000. I think it is a very modest amendment. I do not see that there should be any objection to it. This is simply telling the good folks in the Department of Agriculture that they must hold their travel down to a total of $12,000,000. And, remember this, that the Secretary does have the right to shift from one fund to another in case of need in a certain bureau up to a limited extent, should the need arise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to point out, as was earlier stated, that I am in thorough accord with what we are trying to do in this amendment, and that is to hold down the amount of money that is spent for travel. But, I have made some investigation of the matter, and administratively this effort to fix a limit in the bill will make it awfully difficult to handle. I believe that we should defeat this amendment, and in saying that I want the record to show that I do not believe they should exceed the amount provided for, and, furthermore, if possible, they should keep it below that. But, the bill does not now carry a separate provision for travel. The estimate of travel is listed in the budget; it was just on the budget submission to us for the operation of the Department. We have reduced the budget by $42,500,000, and the travel should be reduced accordingly, and further, if possible. So far as I am concerned, I want the record to show that that is where we stand, but I do question the wisdom of doing it in this way.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Why not put a little bit of restriction upon them, so that they will have to toe the line a little bit? If we turn them loose, they are apt to run wild.

Mr. WHITTEN. To make this Department alert, they have to come back before this committee next year—or at least, I trust that some members of this committee will be here next year—and I think that the arguments that we are making here on the floor at this time will be sufficient notice to them that they better have their house in order, and I believe that is the better way to handle it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am a little bit dubious about this, though. If we defeat this amendment, would it not be serving notice on the Department that they could go sky high?

Mr. WHITTEN. I asked the gentleman earlier to give consideration to withdrawing it for that very reason, but I reiterate that if it is defeated it does not in any way change the attitude of the majority Members that they should hold their travel expense to this figure or below. I hope we will defeat the amendment, because I believe we can meet the problem better without this being written into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 65, noes 68.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. HORAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 75.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, under the Agricultural Research and Marketing Act with regard to the utilization of research under section 10 (a), and cooperative research with State agencies under section 10 (b), the subcommittee in its wisdom has consolidated the appropriations under those sections with the regular appropriations of the various research bureaus and agencies of the Department which have been doing work by allotment from this appropriation in the past. Of course, we will all watch with interest what I might call this experimental effort on the part of the subcommittee. In the report of the committee at page 128 the committee states, "It is expected that the Department will continue to utilize the commodity committees provided for under title III of the act to an even larger extent than has been done in the past. The committee feels that the use of these committees is of extreme importance to the future effectiveness of the research work of the Department." I am in full accord. I think the House Committee on Agriculture fully agrees with that recommendation by the Appropriations Subcommittee. But reports have already reached me that inasmuch as the bill provides for the consolidation of the appropriations under sections 10 (a) and 10 (b) with the regular funds that the Bureau chiefs plan to eliminate from reports to and consideration by the commodity advisory committees of utilization research and in all cooperative research with State agencies.

I am further advised that similar action is contemplated in connection with research projects involving more than one commodity. I think this is of great importance, because I think the future of agriculture is in the research laboratory, and therefore I would like to ask whether or not it is the intent of the subcommittee that the research agencies in the Department shall, in every instance, continue to use the advisory committees, authorized under the act of 1946, or whether you intended, by consolidating the 10-A and 10-B funds with the regular funds, that those agencies were authorized to disregard and not make reports to and not use the services of the advisory committees.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly it would be the intent of the committee to see that the committees were used, as heretofore, to the fullest extent that they had been used, and in addition to that beyond the way they have been used before.

Mr. PACE. Notwithstanding this consolidation of the 10-A and 10-B funds?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true. This research has been consolidated under one research administrator, and I personally conferred with him and suggested that he hold to himself the same rights to supervise the operations of research as heretofore, under the research administration, and not surrender it to the bureaus, as you indicate they have done. Instead of trying to enable the bureaus to get out from under the committee system, we have been trying to bring before the committee some of the regular operations of the Department, because we think that would be wholesome.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Now, is that the understanding of the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Washington, that they not only intended to use the advisory committee but to make greater use, notwithstanding the consolidation of funds?

Mr. HORAN. Very definitely, and to the fullest extent possible. I think the success of research depends entirely upon that. I am somewhat at a loss to have the gentleman from Georgia get any inference from our operation that we intended otherwise.

Mr. PACE. The rumor seemed to have some significance, and I hope the bureau chiefs will pay attention to what has been said here in the last 5 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree entirely with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] in what they have had to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk. I wonder if they could be disposed of. I offer the first amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 191, line 17, after the colon insert: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allocated to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program, and the funds so allocated shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we all appreciate what a tough situation the committee was facing in preparing this bill. Two volumes of testimony, most of it calling for increased appropriations, had to be weighed against the urgently pressing need to get this Nation on a better basis, financially. What I wish to propose is consistent with the committee's viewpoint in that respect—as considered from a long-range point of view.

Instead of a cut in the appropriations for protection and management of the national forests, an increase as provided in the budget would, without doubt, result in the long run, in strengthening the financial condition of this country Anyone who has tried to buy a single board within the past few years will appreciate the tremendous values we have in our national forests. More than 600,000,000,000 board feet of saw timber is growing within these Federal forests. Some 4,000,000,000 feet is now being cut annually from that stand. But billions of board feet more could and should be harvested every year by taking out the old trees and making room for the young ones. All of you farmers know that a crop should be harvested when it is ripe, and that provision should be made for the new crop. Appropriations for that sort of work are not expenditures of the ordinary type. They are investments which in the long run will be returned with good interest to the Treasury.

Funds are badly needed for access roads, fire protection, reforestation, and related work which will make our national forest timber available in great quantities, and forever, for peacetime and wartime needs, whatever they may be.

The situation is much the same with regard to other valuable national forest resources. Some 10,000,000 head of livestock are utilizing national forest ranges. The returns to the Treasury from grazing fees last year were more than 3¼ million dollars. In addition, those 10,000,000 animals contributed no small amount to the meat supply for this Nation. Surely we should do whatever is necessary to reseed depleted ranges and otherwise keep this great resource at a high level of productivity.

I realize that the House committee report, page 154, shows a small increase for national forest protection and management. However, instead of an increase there is actually a cut of more than $1,000,000 in most national forest activities. That is due to Pay Act cost disallowances of $250,000 and earmarking increases—page 134 of the committee report—of $775,000 for some projects, without providing any additional funds for them. Hence, those earmarked increases can only be made by corresponding reductions in other work, such as timber sales, fire protection, range management, camp-ground operation, maintenance of lookout towers, and other improvements, and so forth. As shown on page 154 of the House report, the bill makes a cut below the budget of $3,380,500 for national forest protection and management.

The same page in the House report shows a reduction of $2,117,000 below the budget for forest-development roads—access roads. Due to Pay Act costs, this appropriation is cut almost $200,000 below the amount available this year. The total proposed is more than $7,000,000 below the authorization.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I raise the same objection to this amendment as I heretofore raised, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to make that point of order?

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would just like to say that we made an effort to modify the amendment to strike out the language which we believe caused the Chair to hold earlier that it was subject to a point of order. We have tried to bring it within the limits of a limitation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this amendment offered in an effort to eliminate duplication?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is an effort to try to coordinate these activities. I believe it holds high promise to give us a start on the point which the gentleman raised previously.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Mississippi has offered an amendment which the Clerk has reported. The gentleman from Minnesota has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it contains legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has examined the amendment and is of the opinion that it constitutes a limitation on an appropriation bill and is in conformity with the rules of the House.

The point of order, therefore, is overruled.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to state to the House that there has been considerable confusion about this item. It was carried in the bill last year and despite the confusion has brought about beneficial results.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. We understand there has been confusion, but we do not know who created the confusion. It is a permissive provision and is one that could be used to great advantage.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. I think it will prove workable and I hope the House will adopt it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is not this about the only opportunity we have of getting any technical assistance in those areas where new soil-conservation districts are organized and established but without staffs at the present time?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think it will be a real help in that type of situation.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE PROGRAMS IN WISCONSIN

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, on May 11, 1950, the Rural Electrification Administration will be 15 years old. During this period the percentage of farm electrification in the United States has increased from 10.9 percent of all farms to over 83 percent.

In Wisconsin, at the time REA was established, only 39,206 farms, or 19.6 percent of the total, were receiving central station electric service. According to REA estimates, on June 30, 1949, 162,802 farms, or 91.6 percent of the total, were receiving service, leaving approximately 14,943 farms unserved.

Through February 28, 1950, REA had approved $81,207,614 in loans in the State to 31 borrowers, 30 of them cooperatives. These loans will enable the borrowers to construct 27,926 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 80,690 rural consumers. Most of these facilities already are in operation, and additional lines are being built as rapidly as possible.

REA had advanced $58,405,125 as loans by February 28, 1950, and borrowers in Wisconsin were operating 26,185 miles of line serving 72,932 farms and other rural consumers.

The average monthly farm consumption on REA-financed lines in Wisconsin increased from 84 kilowatt hours in December 1941 to 210 kilowatt hours in December 1949. This increase reflects greater use of electrical equipment to save time and labor in performing farm and household tasks to help bring about a more comfortable way of rural living. In the same period the national average went from 61 kilowatt-hours to 141 kilowatt-hours per farm.

As of December 31, 1949, Wisconsin borrowers have paid $8,592,528 in principal and interest on their Government loans. This includes $305,398 paid on principal in advance of date due. Fourteen borrowers were ahead on their payments. Three were behind, only $38,159 being more than 30 days overdue on loans in the State.

The Rural Electrification Act was amended on October 28, 1949—Public Law 423, Eighty-first Congress, first session—to empower REA to make loans for the improvement and expansion of rural telephone service. These loans may be made to commercial telephone companies, cooperatives, or mutual nonprofit organizations. Like the electrification loans, these loans bear 2 percent interest and are repaid over a maximum period of 35 years.

Nearly 2,500,000 farms had telephone service in this country in 1920. That was 38.7 percent of all farms in the United States. Farm service declined substantially during the late twenties and early thirties.

Beginning in 1936, farm telephone service was again expanded and by 1945 the census indicated that 31.8 percent of the farms in the United States had telephones, although much of the farm service was mediocre or poor.

In Wisconsin, 111,800 farms had telephone service in 1920. Paralleling the national trend, farm service declined substantially during the late twenties and early thirties. In 1940, only 72,440 Wisconsin farms had telephone service. By 1945 some increase was noted and the number of farms with telephone service had risen to a little more than 86,100, or 48.4 percent of the total number of farms. This left 91,640 or 51.6 percent without any kind of telephone service.

Although the telephone loan program is barely 6 months old, the REA has received 415 formally executed loan applications from borrowers all over the country. This includes 22 applications received from potential borrowers in Wisconsin, through April 25, 1950. These 22 applications represent requests for loans totaling $1,948,050 which would be used to extend telephone service to 3,836 new subscribers and improve service for 6,927 subscribers presently receiving substandard telephone service.

The 1951 budget request for the Rural Electrification Administration asked for a total of $450,000,000 in loan funds, of which $400,000,000 is to be used for electrification loans and $50,000,000 for telephone loans. A total of $9,525,000 in administrative funds was requested to administer these two programs—$7,425,000 for the electrification program; $2,100,000 for the telephone program. As recommended by the committee, this bill contains loan authorizations for the rural-electrification program amounting to $350,000,000, in addition to which a total of $150,000,000 additional may be made available upon certification by the Secretary of Agriculture as to the need for additional sums. For the rural-telephone program, the committee recommended $25,000,000 in loan funds. A total of $8,150,000 for administrative expenses was included in the bill. This represents a decrease of $1,375,000 from the budget estimates for 1951. It appears that unless this amount is reinstated, REA will be unable to add personnel to its present skeleton staff of less than 100 people assigned to rural-telephone work.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with the intent in the least that has been expressed by a number of Members of the House in trying to do away with existing duplication; my point is simply that based upon observation I know what has taken place in my district. I know from first-hand observation what has taken place, and this defeats the very purpose that the gentleman from Mississippi has in mind, for it drives a wedge between two agencies of the Government; you are driving a wedge which defeats the purpose of the cooperative effort we should have.

It is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture has ample provisions within their regulations to provide for one agency's assisting the other. There is not the least doubt about that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. For a question.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will ask it this way: The gentleman understands, I am sure, that this provision is permissive only; it is not compulsory. It was put in here in order to effect a saving, to allow them to use these technical people where they can be used to advantage and where we know they should use them. We believe it will help the situation.

Mr. MARSHALL. Soil conservation does not bring any dividends to the taxpayers of this country until it is actually

put into effect on the farms. This particular provision does create in the minds of the people administering the program a feeling of distrust of one another. The farmers themselves are anxious, of course, to carry on good soil-conservation methods. It means that when this has been put into effect and each organization sets up their plans to carry on the best type of soil conservation possible, that, due to the wording of the bill, it complicates administration to the extent that the intent of Congress is not put into effect.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It happens that I personally did not last year agree with this action of the subcommittee. I believe from all I have learned that the action of the subcommittee did no good whatsoever to the soil-conservation program of America. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] said, it has created a sort of distrust between the two bodies, between which, on the other hand, there should be 100-percent cooperation. I certainly agree with him this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman. May I say that the wording in this amendment costs more in administrative determination than the value received by the taxpayers in trying to do something to get these agencies together.

I have another point and I think this is a very important point. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Agriculture of this Congress to do something to bring about a solution of this problem. I believe legislative action is absolutely necessary. This legislative action should be based upon a complete understanding. I do not think that can be determined on the floor of this House. A legislative committee of this House will have to make a thorough investigation, not from the top in these agencies but out here on the farms to determine on the farm end exactly what this means.

The farmers do not like duplication and I do not like duplication, but that should be determined by a legislative committee based upon a full determination and understanding of what it means in the back 40, 80, or 160 acres, not what some person in Washington might determine it should be. I want to inform the committee that from my understanding of things in my neighborhood and among my neighbors they do not like this duplication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to point out, if the gentleman will permit, that the provision here is at the county level, that this may be done at the county level, which is at the local level in county communities. I would like to point out further, and I am sure he is interested in the same thing I am, that the Appropriations Committee felt like he did; that is, this is a matter that should have some legislation. We have had to wait 8 or 9 years for such legislation and it is not here yet. In consultation with the legislative committee we worked out this effort to try to bring this about. We have evidence before our committee that in many cases they would get a graduate engineer to lay out these ditches and other things according to good engineering practice, then before any payment could be received by the farmer he would have to go to a different agency and get the approval of some farmer or some layman with no technical experience or background to approve it before he would get the Federal payment.

It is that kind of thing that we are trying to cure, and I point out again that the legislative committee has not acted in 9 or 10 years. We worked this out with the legislative committee, that committee approved it, we put it in, and it works at the local level. Nothing can be done except at the instance of the local committee.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am in accord with what the distinguished gentlemen from Mississippi is attempting to do, but I do maintain this is not doing the thing he thinks it is doing. I am basing my opinion upon first-hand information. It is confusing, it is adding salt to a sore, it is creating more problems instead of simplifying them and I believe that the thing is of such extreme importance that a legislative committee ought to take action on this matter once and for all and settle it. I do not think it is proper to bring this in in connection with an appropriation bill and complicate that end of the procedure.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will join with the gentleman in striking it out, but we have waited for 10 years and I doubt the wisdom of waiting 10 years more. We may lose the whole program.

Mr. MARSHALL. You have set the program back 2 years by the provisions that were put in last year in an effort to bring these agencies together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize this is a serious situation in many places, although in my particular home county it is working out very satisfactorily the way it is.

I want to ask a little indulgence on the part of the membership so far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned. We have spent so much of our time defending the things we have already accomplished and in keeping everyone from tearing them apart that we have not spent the time on constructive measures that we should have.

The Hoover Commission is of the opinion, and I think most everyone else agrees, that we must have a consolidation of some of these agencies. There must be some consolidation on the basis of the educational viewpoint and the noneducational viewpoint. But, as I say, I do not like to see this part go out of this legislation, because certainly in many places it is working out satisfactorily, and I have much confidence in the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and if the committee will just give us time now, I think it can be worked out. This problem has not been up for 8 or 9 years, I believe, because the picture has changed during this time. You want to remember that there are many things we have today that we did not have 8 or 9 years ago, because the triple A did not spend the time in connection with soil conservation that they have in the last 2 or 3 years. I think that if you just give us 1 more year of grace, let us work it out the best we can this year, we will come in a year from now and we will be able to take care of this situation. I hope this amendment is passed.

HARD FACTS FOR FARMERS

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, let us get the facts straight. The farmer is again being made the political football. The shock absorber for the mistakes of the Secretaries of Agriculture from Wallace on down to Brannan. He is blamed by the unthinking for the high cost of living. Intelligent people know that the high cost of living is the result of high taxes, high wages, high distribution charges, and the depreciated 32-cent dollar. Depreciated by increasing the money in circulation from less than six billion to over twenty-seven and one-half billion.

The farmer, too, is effected by the high cost of living. He is also confronted with the high cost of production. This by the tripled prices of farm implements, repairs, and maintenance, by the tripled farm wages by the tripled and quadrupled real estate, income and 100 hidden taxes. This situation was brought about largely because of our Government's foreign flirtations and the international WPA. The farmer has the same problems as the rest of us. Let us not blame him for that for which he was no more responsible than we are.

It costs three times as much to operate your farm in 1942 as it did in 1932. From 1935 to 1942, the average annual cost of operating the farms of this Nation was $16,303,000,000. This on an average was 45½ percent more than the average total gross annual farm income of $11,204,000,000. By 1948, this had increased to $38,016,000,000. These higher costs are the direct result of increased taxes; higher farm wages; and higher prices for farm implements, equipment, and maintenance.

Now the farmer is blamed for the disastrous results of Brannan's potato fiasco and Brannan's scrambled eggs and putrid butter program. He is now pestered with more regimentation and more allotments.

The public has suddenly become aware that the Secretary of Agriculture has been in the habit for years of dumping and destroying millions of bushels of potatoes, millions of dozens of eggs, and thousands of pounds of butter. An aroused, enlightened, and outraged public opinion now in no uncertain terms condemns such vandalism. So does the farmer. That vandalism was not necessary under the present farm program.

The Government could have disposed of these surpluses through charitable institutions at home, and through the ECA abroad. There was no need of dumping or permitting these surpluses to spoil. Unfortunately Secretary Brannan and Paul Hoffman, of the ECA, were more interested in shipping high-priced farm machinery and other manufactured articles to Europe than agricultural products.

However, Secretary Brannan is not wholly to blame. He was not the father of the disease known as the abundant life by scarcity; he inherited it from one of his predecessors, Wallace. It was Secretary Wallace that wantonly destroyed millions of pigs, calves, cattle, and sheep. It was Wallace that plowed under every third row of corn and cotton, and burned stacks of hay, wheat, and other grain. This at a time when millions were hungry and in rags.

It was Wallace that had his picture taken in Texas, with a mule hitched to a one-handle plow, plowing under cotton. It is said that the mule refused to step on the cotton while his master, who planted it, was still barefoot and in rags. We will leave it to future generations to decide who was the greater economist, the mule or Wallace.

The wanton destruction of property—especially agricultural products—is legally criminal, economically unsound, and religiously sinful. Brannan, however, blindly followed the Wallace program of waste and destruction. But now an aroused public opinion and a guilty conscience has overtaken him.

The Secretary now has a new program. He is not at all modest about it. He calls it the Brannan plan. He is still for price support on nonperishables in accordance with the present farm program. But he wants to add 27 other perishable farm products to potatoes, eggs, and butter. He wants these perishable products sold in the open market in competition with world prices. Sold in competition with farm products produced in other countries by slave and semislave labor.

In this way, he thinks he can fool both the farmer and the consumer. He tells the consumer that this will enable him to buy agricultural products cheaper. Then he tells the farmer that he will pay him the difference between the market price and 100 percent parity. The Secretary apparently believes that he can pull himself up by his own bootstraps. He forgets that his plan would give him only 27 additional headaches.

The Brannan program if carried to its logical conclusion would require an appropriation each year of at least $10,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000. This amount is so staggering that any one with common sense knows that Congress would never appropriate it. The Secretary cannot fool either the farmer or the consumer. They both are taxpayers. Both know that for every dollar they receive in subsidies or save in lower cost of living, they or their children would have to pay $2 in increased taxes. The extra dollar would be for the collectors and distributors of the tax and for interest and overhead expenses.

The President shocked by the Secretary's potato, egg, and butter dumping program, attempts to escape his administration's responsibility by advocating the Brannan plan. You can always drop a hot potato by advocating something else. But that something else must have a semblance of success. A known failure is not even an experiment. No one expects the President to run the Department of Agriculture. Just now he is knee-deep in international politics. He has troubles enough with his international point 4 program.

Under this program we send farm machinery and equipment, and agricultural experts to backward nations. The American taxpayer, and that includes both the consumer and the farmer, are paying for this lunacy—paying to build up competition for themselves. If we wish to maintain our standard of living, then we must all realize that the American farmer and laborer cannot compete with slavery.

The President and his lawyer Secretary of Agriculture are out of step with the Committee on Agriculture. That committee turned thumbs down on the Brannan plan. This because they feel the plan would wreck agriculture—would destroy what little progress has been made.

Chairman COOLEY, of the House Agriculture Committee, disagrees with the President. He said:

> I regret that the President made his mesage a vehicle for general condemnation of the present farm program * * * most disturbing of all to me in the President's statement is what appears to be a lack of appreciation of the soundness, importance and effectiveness of the present farm program * * *.
>
> The present farm program is now operating in the interest of the general welfare, except for potatoes it has not proven unduly expensive or costly and assures consumers of an ample supply of food and fiber at fair prices. The only alternative which Congress is offered is one which apparently contemplates the junking of the principles of the whole present program, and the acceptance of an entirely new program based primarily on principles of a consumer subsidy. Only with a sound workable program can we hope to maintain a balanced national economy.

The farmer cannot be blamed because the Secretary was caught with millions of bushels of potatoes, several million dozen of eggs, and thousands of pounds of butter while we imported these same products from other nations under the reciprocal trade agreements. Such a procedure seems inconsistent, if not idiotic. Here are some of the imports while Brannan was accumulating surpluses of domestic potatoes, eggs, and butter.

During the fiscal year ending July 1, 1949, we imported in round numbers 552,600,000 pounds of potatoes, 3,500,000 dozen of eggs, 25,200,000 pounds of cheese, 542,000 head of cattle, and in addition 116,200,000 pounds of canned beef.

We imported 150,000,000 pounds of hides and skins of all kinds; 974,000,000 pounds of wool, all grades; 10,400,000 bushels of barley; 19,400,000 bushels of oats; 7,000,000 bushels of rye; 4,500,000 bushels of wheat and in addition 82,000 100-pound bags of wheat flour; 70,000,000 pounds of nuts; 9,000,000 pounds of honey; 4,600,000 pounds of rice and rice products.

We imported 1,952,000 bushels of apples, 637,000 bushels of corn, 618,000 bushels of flax, 2,242,000 pounds of linseed oil, 19,291,000 pounds of onions, 239,050,000 pounds of tomatoes, 14,415,000 pounds of sausage casings, 15,475,000 pounds of pears, 57,395,000 pounds of barley malt, and 139,858 tons of bran and shorts. While statistics are not yet available, the imports since last July 1 have increased by leaps and bounds.

During 1948 and 1949 we imported free of duty some $267,000,000 worth of furs, to compete with our fur farmers and trappers.

These are just a few agricultural products we imported under the reciprocal trade agreements. On some of these we maintained a support price not only for the American farmer but for the foreign farmer and the importer as well. Take the potato scandal. The importers bought these potatoes for 60 cents below the support price and then sold them on the New York market at the support price.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Act, the President can enter into agreements with other nations and reduce the existing tariff as much as 75 percent.

Not satisfied with this betrayal of agriculture, further tariff slashes on agricultural imports are in store when our Government meets with 17 other nations in England next September. The Brannan plan is just a forerunner of a complete sell-out of agriculture. Get the farmer to sell his products for little or nothing in competition with foreign imports and then have him come on bended knees and beg Congress for an appropriation—a hand-out from an empty United States Treasury.

These trade agreements were first put over in 1934 on an unsuspecting and unalert Congress, by a group of international bankers and manufacturers who spent thousands of dollars in high-pressure propaganda. Nearly every agreement that has been entered into under this legislation has favored the international manufacturers, bankers, and importers against the best interests of agriculture and labor—against the best interest of our Nation.

Because of this performance, a support price on one hand and a reciprocal-trade agreement on the other, we have piled up surpluses at the expense of the American farmer and taxpayer.

While the present farm program has been of help it is not a permanent remedy. The whole agricultural problem has been fumbled by Congress. While both parties were chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of subsidies and price support, crop reduction allotments, and regimentation,

there was pending a bill, H. R. 1686, that would have solved the problem permanently.

This, by giving the farmer cost of production for the principal agricultural products. This cost to include interest on farm indebtedness, soil depletion, depreciation of building improvements and farm implements and equipment, and wages for the farmer and his family equivalent to those received by industrial workers.

H. R. 1686 is a two-price-system bill. It would give the farmer the average cost of production on agricultural products domestically consumed. It would protect the family sized farm by giving the domestic market to all farmers up to $1,000, on any one product. After that, those who produce more would get their percentage of the remainder of the domestic market.

Under the provisions of this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would ascertain the average cost of production to the farmers of each such agricultural product. Such average cost of production would be determined after public hearings participated in by the representatives of farmers' organizations and by other interested parties.

The bill provides for the disposition of surpluses. These must be disposed of in foreign markets. It protects domestic industry and labor. It permits the processing or manufacturing of surpluses into finished products. These, however, must also be disposed of in foreign markets.

The purpose of the bill is accomplished by the licensing of dealers in such agricultural products in interstate and foreign commerce.

It provides that when the price of any product falls below the average cost of production, that then there be an embargo prohibiting importations of such product or substitute. It gives the domestic market to our own people who are entitled to it. It gives to the farmer cost of production on farm products as a floor below which the price on that part domestically consumed will not fall. It protects the producer and consumer alike. This without appropriations, regimentation, subsidies, or increased taxes.

Under the provision of this bill the farmer would today receive in round numbers $29 per hundred pounds for hogs, $21 for beef cattle, $25.42 for veal, $20.23 for lambs, $15 for mutton, and $6.70 per hundred pounds for milk.

He would receive $2.35 per bushel for corn, $2.88 for wheat, $1.60 for oats, $1.70 for barley, $1.78 for rye, $6.58 for flax, $2.55 for potatoes, $2.94 for sweetpotatoes, $5.51 for cowpeas, $3.58 for soybeans, and $7.66 per bushel for dry beans. He would receive 46 cents per pound for cotton and 95 cents for wool.

He would receive comparable prices for his other farm products. This would put him on a par with the industrial worker.

When this bill is passed, then there need be no further appropriation for agriculture—no more subsidies. It will abolish regimentation of the farmers, who will again produce wealth in place of figuring out rules, regulations, and allotments. It will save the Treasury millions of dollars and give the Nation a permanent food supply. It will put the American farmer on a par with industrial enterprises.

No other segment of society works as hard or as long hours as the farmer and his family. No segment of society receives so little for their work per hour as the farmer and his family, who feed the Nation. It is time for the industrialist, the laborer and the city dwellers to wake up and to realize that their prosperity and future success is inseparably linked and intermingled with that of the farmer.

If the farmer is reduced to poverty he will not be able to buy the things that industry and labor produces. When the income of the farmer goes down so will wages, and so will the industrial and the national income at a ratio of 7 to 1.

Let us keep the record straight. The farmer, on an average, receives less than 30 cents out of the dollar that the consumer pays for his products. The balance goes for transportation, processing and marketing.

To make it plain, if wheat sold for $3 a bushel, then the farmer would get only 2½ cents out of the 14 cents the consumer pays for a pound loaf of bread. Out of this 2½ cents, he pays for labor, seed, cultivation and preparation of the land, harvesting and thrashing. He also pays for necessary fences, buildings, and farm equipment, as well as for replacements and repairs. He pays for real estate, income and hidden taxes on the implements and other farm improvements, as well as on the wheat he produces. He pays overhead expenses and replaces soil depletion with fertilizer.

Again, the producer of apples in the State of Washington gets only 26 cents out of the consumer's dollar in Chicago. The balance goes for packing, transportation and wholesale and retail distribution.

In conclusion, we must never forget that the farmer produces the food that produces the energy for the industrial workers. Without food there could be no industries. The men and women that work in the factories live on that which the farmer produces.

The farmer is not responsible for the high income tax of 20 to 85½ percent, and the more than 100 hidden taxes that are added to consumable goods. He is not responsible for the waste and wanton destruction of food products.

The farmer knows that because of our large indebtedness, appropriations will be hard to get even though they come out of his and the consumer's tax dollar. He knows that the farm population has decreased from 33,000,000 in 1932 to 24,000,000 in 1950, while the general population has increased 26,000,000. He knows that as a result his strength in Congress has been reduced from one-third to one-seventh. He knows that he must get permanent legislation—100 percent real parity, or better still, 100 percent cost of production.

I have consistently supported all temporary farm legislation and shall continue to do so but that is not a solution. There is only one solution and that is cost of production for that part of agricultural products domestically consumed. The farmer will have to get that eventually, why not now? The farmer is the only person who, when he sells, asks "how much," and again when he buys, "how much"?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORDS.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the able and distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the other members of the subcommittee for bringing in an excellent bill.

I believe that the committee has carefully considered the needs of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out its programs and functions. I further believe that the committee has made a conscientious and careful effort to cut down the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture to the lowest possible point consistent with good service. If I were on the committee I perhaps would not come up with exactly the same figures on the various items, and no doubt every Member of the House would, if it were within his power, like to change some of the items in this bill.

I personally have a feeling that perhaps the appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration may not be sufficient to enable that agency to carry out the rural telephone program. I know, however, that the members of the subcommittee are all vitally interested in the rural telephone program and I have so much confidence in their good judgment that I am satisfied to accept the amounts which have been inserted in this bill. I say this, feeling sure that if it should be demonstrated as time goes on that this appropriation is inadequate the members of the subcommittee will cooperate in securing whatever additional appropriations may be necessary.

The rural telephone program has evoked a tremendous amount of interest among the farmers of this country and while it has taken some time to get the program started, and while the number of loans made up to date is small, I anticipate that during the fiscal year 1951 the demands upon the Rural Electrification Administration under the rural telephone program will be very substantial.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that has brought this matter about which we now have under discussion is the simple fact that the Soil Conservation Service has never had sufficient funds with which to do this important job of conserving our top soil, with the exception of our people the most priceless and precious thing we have in America. The gentleman from Mississippi and his committee placed this 5 percent provision in the bill last year, which the PMA now is permitted to use in conjunction and in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service, and will do good wherever there are friendly relations between the Soil Conservation Service and the PMA. There are places however where they do not get along so

good. We might be better off in the long run to keep the PMA and the Soil Conservation Service responsibilities separate. As most of you already know the PMA takes care of the payments for doing certain things such as fertilizing, contouring and terracing, taking land out of soil-depleting crops and putting in soil-conserving crops. The Soil Conservation Service provides the farmers with technical engineering service in cooperation with the Extension Service in planning a farm program, in showing farmers how to contour, how to build terraces, how to heal over gullies and how to build ponds, and proper crop rotations. But, as I said before, this Congress has never seen fit to appropriate the money that is justly needed by the Soil Conservation Service to get this job done in time for conserving our soil, which is the reason I introduced a bill during the last session which provides a speed-up program. So, I am not going to condemn the committee for putting in this 5 percent provision last year. I know the intent of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], was of the highest order, and I believe it can work, if the folks have the right kind of spirit and politics do not get mixed into it. First of all they must have soil conservation in their blood, in order to do a real job of conserving their soil under any circumstances.

Just how we can get sufficient funds to carry on the Soil Conservation Service and the great job we have to do all over America in conserving the soil is quite a problem so long as we spend millions for a lot of useless things as we are doing in this very bill.

The committee has recommended $1,000,000 over and above what the budget asked for the Soil Conservation Service, because the future of America depends on how well we preserve and conserve this priceless topsoil of ours. The farmers in my district are busy in the conservation of soil, as they are in the whole State of Iowa and in most every other State of the Union. They are going to see to it that at least this Nation does not commit national suicide through the starvation route, as have many other nations of the world who have been and are now at our doors crying for bread, because they forgot to take care of their priceless soil.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would not attempt to speak for the entire Committee on Agriculture, but as one member of the legislative Committee on Agriculture I commend the Committee on Appropriations on bringing in a practical method whereby we can secure some needed cooperation between the Soil Conservation Service and the PMA payment program. If you want the PMA payment program to be a real instrumentality of soil conservation, you must make some provision for technical supervision, you must have something more than mere farmer committees to be able to pass upon the technical qualities of the work that is done under the program.

As long as you expect to pay out more than one-quarter of a billion dollars a year in soil-conservation payments through the PMA, it seems to me it is but sound that we have some kind of well trained technical supervision of those practices and a determination that the practices have been well handled from a technical standpoint before we put out the money to make the payments.

You may say, "Why does not the Soil Conservation Service do that?" The Soil Conservation Service has been getting something less than $50,000,000 a year. I believe $52,000,000 is provided in this bill. The number of districts has been rapidly increasing in the United States, and many of those districts do not have any technical staff at all today. There is no way under the limited funds that are provided in this appropriation bill or the bills in the past few years whereby the Soil Conservation Service can staff even the existing soil-conservation districts. Without that added staff, there is no way we can expect them to pass reasonable judgment upon the work of the farmers who may come in and say, "We are entitled to payment under the Soil Conservation Practices Act."

The way we get payments is this. I am a farmer, and one of the practices in my territory is to establish a stock pond. For that the Government will contribute not to exceed 10 cents a yard for the moving of dirt up to a limit normally of about $250. I go out to build a tank, and I spend $1,000 on it. On it I cannot receive more than a definite sum, say $250, and that will depend on whether or not I have built it in keeping with good engineering practices. Unless there is some engineer to look at it the PMA man knows no more about it than I do and probably less. He does not know whether the tank has been properly built or not. He probably does not even know how much dirt has been moved. But could he go and look at the tank and say either it has been properly built or it has not been properly built. As a matter of fact he does not go but he employes somebody else. He employs some farmer and pays him out of the very funds which we propose to use for a soil conservation expert. He can pay out of these funds, out of the $285,000,000, that we have in this bill. A portion of it can be spent to pay for supervision anyhow. This proposal of the gentleman from Mississippi says that instead of being required to go out and employ somebody who never saw a slide rule and who does not know one engineering principal from another, the PMA may employ the Soil Conservation Service technicians.

We have never provided enough money to provide for all of this work by the soil conservation technicians. We might just as well use 5 percent of this money which we are appropriating for supervision purposes to provide some soil conservation technicians to do the job as to get somebody who never saw that kind of job and knows nothing about it. It just comes down to the question of what kind of supervision do you want. Do you want a trained technician to pass on an engineering problem or do you want to spend a quarter of a billion without any trained supervision?

This is not a problem of creating friction between anybody. Friction is created when somebody for political purposes tries to create ill feeling between these services. I say to you in my home county we have all the agricultural agencies in one building. They are on one floor of our post-office building. We have the county agent and the county home demonstration agent, the FHA, the PMA, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Bureau of Entomology all around one hall. When a farmer comes in it makes no difference whether he goes into one office or the other, if he gets in the wrong office he is directed to another office right down the hall.

If he says he does not have the time to look all over town he is told that he need only go right across the hall, or right next door. The representatives of all these agencies get along together fine. Just put these agencies together physically. Most of them are represented by good men and they will get together and work together when they know each other. That is what is needed. To get the agencies together; then they will work together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Texas states that the American farmer will go out and spend his money to carry on practices which are not feasible from an engineering standpoint. I would like to say to the gentleman from Texas that from my knowledge of American farmers based upon my knowledge of Minnesota it does not appear to me that the gentleman from Texas has too high a regard for the intelligence of the American farmer to carry on these engineering and technical practices and carry on good sound conservation practices. If that is the case we are going to be faced with a most difficult problem in carrying on national conservation of our soil which is absolutely necessary if we are to safeguard the most vital element in our natural resources.

Mr. POAGE. Unfortunately it is true that the average farmer is no engineer. Unfortunately the average American farmer, and I do not speak of Minnesota, because I do not know anything about that, maybe they all are college graduates in Minnesota, but unfortunately the average American farmer whose income is less than a thousand dollars a year—and that is the average income of the average American farmer, has not had an opportunity to go to engineering school. Unfortunately the average American farmer does not know anything about engineering practices and cannot tell whether a terrace is running up or down hill until it rains. The average American farmer knows no more about engineering than I know about medicine. It would be just as reasonable to say that the farmer's family's physical

health should be intrusted to his judgment because he has a deep interest in his family as to trust the health of the soil to an untrained farmer when it involves engineering principles simply because the farmer has a deep interest in the soil. Generally speaking, the farmer has not had an opportunity to obtain needed training. If every American farmer were an engineer we would have little need for the Soil Conservation Service. If we could have every American farmer a graduate of the Texas A. & M. College we would not need many of these programs. But unfortunately the income of American farmers is not great enough to enable many of them to have that background. Therefore the best thing we can do is to get some people who have had that opportunity and use those people with that kind of training rather than waste the taxpayers' money. This amendment simply gives us an opportunity to have some real and effective supervision of these soil conservation payments. I look upon this as a real soil conservation program. I want to keep it that way. I know that that can only be done through trained supervision.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a most splendid argument in behalf of the defeat of this amendment. This matter should be gone over carefully by the legislative committee of the House. It has no business in this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 71, noes 14.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 208, line 16, insert: "For necessary expenses, including dues, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; $713,293."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I may say that this amendment has had stricken out the part of the original provision which was subject to a point of order. This simply makes provision for the library service in the Department of Agriculture in the usual manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: On page 193, line 18, insert "In order to prevent the waste of food commodities acquired through price-support operations which are found to be in danger of loss through deterioration or spoilage before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are authorized and directed to make available such commodities as follows in the order of priority set forth: First, to school-lunch programs, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Federal, State, and local tax-supported institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, schools, penal and mental institutions, and public-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and other needy persons; second, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within the United States; third, to private-welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States; fourth, to intergovernmental or international nonprofit welfare agencies, for assistance to needy persons outside the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that such commodities are in ample supply over and above such reserves as may be required and deemed in the public interest. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Corporation shall make any such commodities available at no cost at point of use within the United States or at shipside at port of embarkation. The Secretary and the Corporation may pay as against handling and transportation costs in making delivery up to the equivalent of 6 months' storage costs on any such commodities turned over: *Provided*, That no transportation or handling charges shall be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation or Department of Agriculture if in so doing it would lower the total amount of agricultural commodities acquired by any institution or organization through the normal channels of trade and commerce."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, but will not press it at the moment in order that the gentleman from Massachusetts may present his argument in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the gentleman from Mississippi in reserving his point of order rather than pressing it. I realize that the point of order can be well taken, but I hope that the gentleman, after listening to my presentation, may be prevailed upon not to make the point, under all the circumstances. The amendment is rather long. For that reason I placed it in the RECORD of yesterday. It will be found at page 5834, if anyone cares to restudy its contents.

Basically, the amendment is simple. We have a gigantic amount of edible foods in storage; we paid tremendous amounts of money for them; we are paying into the millions to keep them in storage. They are in danger of spoiling. The only sensible, the only sound, the only decent thing to do with these foods, it seems to me, is to get them out where they can and will be used for food, and stop this indefensible waste of public funds. Here we can economize if our Members here are given an opportunity to vote.

I call as witnesses to this contention the Friends Committee on National Legislation, which called together here farmers from 18 States for a 10-day seminar in January on the question: What Could and Should American Agriculture Do for a Hungry World? I quote two sentences to prove the case:

The important thing is that food or agricultural products paid for by American taxpayers should not be allowed to spoil, be eaten by rats, or be destroyed. They should actually get into people's mouths at home or abroad.

We have, as a matter of fact, in butter, dried milk, prunes, raisins, beans, dried eggs, and turkeys, something like $8,490,000 of carrying charges just to February 28. We have reports of increasing quantities of butter to be purchased. It already has reached the staggering total of 98,500,000 pounds. It has been publicly stated that this program, if carried out in this manner, bringing in 15,000,000 more pounds since the first of the year, can well leave in our storage warehouses better than two or three hundred million pounds of that wholesome food which could and would feed the American people. In the local press it was estimated that we now have on hand butter enough for 10,000,000 persons based on last year's consumption of less than 10 pounds per capita. That is more than twice the number of people in my State of Massachusetts. It would feed every man, woman, and child in Massachusetts for 2 years on this basis.

Any normal, objective person would wish that we could do something and do it before it is too late. I know the Committee on Agriculture is considering the problem; I know that they have assured us that they will hold further hearings and try to report some legislation, but I wish the chairman and the members of this subcommitte would take at least this initial step and let it go to conference so that we could insure against letting this thing be carried through beyond the period when we adjourn and then being faced with the charge that we were not responsible and not willing to measure up to our responsibility.

Some have said to me, "What do you expect when the President refuses to do anything?" His refusal is his responsibility, not ours. He will have to answer to an outraged public when the record becomes clear to him. But we will, too, if we refuse to act. And our responsibility will be the greater the longer we delay action. Others have said, "Do you really expect any legislation in view of what has happened here today already?" Members of the press have asked me if I did not think this whole story was now a runaround. I do expect legislation. Honorable men on the other side who control the matter have assured me that there will be. I respect and believe them. I do not think this is a runaround. I do not want that to happen because I know that most of the Members of this body are sickened and disgusted with those conditions and want an opportunity to stop it. But, my friends, we must act or it will be too late. I do hope the chairman will not press his point of order. Nothing compels him to do so. He can waive it and let all of us decide the matter on its merits. He did not make any point against the committee provision. The American public would construe a waiver now as consistent, logical, and in their interest.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. One final thought, and then I will yield.

According to an item in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of Commerce of Saturday, April 22, and this condition has been repeatedly reported on this floor, of other agencies of the Government going into the market and purchasing food products when we have already paid for them and are keeping them in storage. The Federal Supply Service there announced that it would receive bids on February 25 to furnish f. o. b. Seattle, 1,650 dozen eggs, grade AA, large eggs in cartons. When in heaven's name are we going to recognize that the American people will eventually learn what is going on and will charge clear irresponsibility and flagrant dereliction of duty against not only the Department of Agriculture, but against those here who have known what was going on and who refused to take any action that might bring about a solution?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, and I commend him again for authorship of the committee provision. I regret his fine work has been wrecked by a technicality. I know the American people will regret it too.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall that for several years this Congress permitted the school lunch program, for example, to stay in the appropriation bill, regardless of the fact it was not authorized. Now, the matter rests with you gentlemen, but you should consider right here that we have a problem, a very grave problem. Why should any of you take the responsibility upon yourselves to refuse to allow an amendment of this nature to stay in the bill when it means what it does to all the people of America? I frankly cannot understand it. In other years we permitted the school lunch program to remain in. We did not make any fight against it in the Rules Committee. We were glad to waive the point of order on it. I think the responsibility belongs to you people if you want to strike this out on a point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly I am not opposed to what you are trying to do but unfortunately the rules of the House govern.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The rules of the House do not require that you bring up a point of order. You need not say anything. You can permit this amendment to be considered.

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee provided a provision in the bill to meet the problem and we did not put it in this lengthy language of a legislative nature, but it was stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yet the gentleman is here trying to strike it out.

Mr. WHITTEN. We had a chance to study that provision, but it went out. Now we are asked to substitute legislation. What the gentleman is trying to reach is a very worthy objective, certainly, I am not opposed to it, but I do insist on the point of order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi insists on his point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order—not the merits.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. On the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, does not an amendment of this nature come under the Holman rule? I do think a broad interpretation of it would apply to this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has offered an amendment which has been reported, and the gentleman from Mississippi has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground it proposes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The Chair has examined the amendment very carefully and is unable to see how it could be held in order as a limitation because it provides for the disposition of commodities and does not even attempt to be a limitation on money appropriated in the bill. The amendment itself on its face contains quite a number of provisions that are very clearly legislation, which is in violation of the rules of the House, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Mississippi with reference to his intent to proceed further this afternoon? We have two or three very controversial amendments and if we are to proceed with those amendments I personally shall insist on a quorum being present.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, that is within the gentleman's right. I hope to go along as far as we can. I wonder if he will let us proceed for a moment so that we may have some little time to check?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What is the great hurry, may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi? Why can we not let this go over until Wednesday for final determination? It will only take 2 or 3 hours at that time. It will give Members who want to talk on the bill an opportunity to do so. We have an amendment which will try to reduce the amount of money that may be paid to one farmer under the AAA Act. Quite a few Members want to talk on that. We also have an amendment relative to the grasshopper situation in the West.

Mr. WHITTEN. Here is the situation. Earlier today we had this unanimous-consent agreement which I finally entered into largely to accommodate the gentleman from Minnesota, I may say, and under that agreement I felt that we would go ahead and try to work as long as we could so as to complete this chapter. I do not want to be insistent, but if we are going to carry out that unanimous-consent agreement, we are going to have to work toward its completion tonight.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say when I make an agreement, express or implied, that I carry it out, and I consider that we have an implied agreement. I will agree that it was no express agreement, but I assumed it was implied. There was plenty of work done in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into today, time that I wish I could have devoted in other directions. But I want to be frank in saying that I personally assumed that it was an implied agreement that this chapter would be disposed of today.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman assumed that, it is all right with me to continue. I really did not have that assumption in mind.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend. I want to frankly state that I considered there was an implied agreement.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to compliment the subcommittee for its splendid work on this section of the appropriation bill. I think, on the whole, it has done a pretty good job.

However, I want to call attention to the drastic cut that was made on the item for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant disease. I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

As the committee well knows, we had a bad situation with respect to grasshoppers in Wyoming and in several other Rocky Mountain States last year. The situation is much worse this year than it was a year ago. If we can control and eradicate these grasshoppers at their source, when they are hatching, we will prevent infestation in other States. The people of my State appreciate the gravity of the situation. Our people were led to believe that if a special session of the legislature had been called early this year and if it appropriated $750,000, that a like amount of Federal funds would be available to fight this grasshopper infestation. The infestation has reached epidemic proportions and certainly the Federal Government should bear the burden equally with our State. In the first instance, the United States owns outright more than 52 percent of all the land in the State of Wyoming. The United States owns 70 percent of the minerals underlying the entire State of Wyoming. The Federal Government is paid $10,000,000 in royalties from the minerals under the Federal lands in Wyoming each year. True, 37½ percent is returned to the State. Our legislature met and appropriated $750,000 to match an equal amount of Federal funds. It did that on the assumption that we could make an all-out attack on the grasshoppers and wipe them out as we were told by the Bureau people that it would take $1,500,000 to do a complete

job. Now we find that the Bureau is able to match just about two-thirds of our money. This committee cut the budget request for this item by two-thirds as is shown on page 175 of the bill. When we had the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill before the House I indicated to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that the amount allowed was insufficient and I asked him if a second deficiency bill would be brought before the House this spring, and he assured us then that a second deficiency bill would be brought in after the Easter recess. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if it is the intention of the committee to bring in a second deficiency bill before the middle of May so that we may have an opportunity to get enough money to match the funds appropriated by the State of Wyoming to fight grasshoppers.

Mr. CANNON. We expect to report another deficiency bill before the end of the session. Hearings have already begun in some of the committees on items which are being considered for that bill. If the gentleman has a budget estimate for his item, I am certain the proper subcommittee will be glad to give it consideration.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. We have a budget estimate in this bill of $2,500,000. The appropriation was cut to $850,000. A larger cut was made on this item than was made on any other item in this bill. In January the Bureau of the Budget sent up a request for $2,200,000 for supplemental funds for the current fiscal year. Only $1,000,000 of that request has been allowed.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands the last budget estimate which came to the committee was disposed of when we reported this bill. If the gentleman desires consideration of such an item in the next bill it will be necessary for the Bureau of the Budget to send up another estimate.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: On page 175, line 22, strike out "$850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,010,000".

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, it is very doubtful if we can get action early enough on the second deficiency to provide the funds to match the Wyoming funds. Most certainly I will urge that such a request be sent up again.

Just as a matter of good faith, the United States should match Wyoming funds. Here is a situation where the United States owns half of the land. It owns the minerals in a great deal of the lands where the people own only the surface. The State of Wyoming appropriated $750,000, and all we are asking is that the United States appropriate a like amount so that we can take care of the property of the United States as well as the private property that is involved in this infestation.

I call your attention to the fact that the committee made some pretty drastic cuts here, but at the same time, during the war the Department of Agriculture spent considerable money to pay technicians to fight locust infestations in the Middle East, and we are spending large sums of money through the United Nations at the present time for research in controlling that infestation in Iraq, Syria, and Egypt.

It may well be that it will be impossible to bring out a second deficiency bill until the latter part of this session, but it seems to me that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], should bring out a second bill in the near future so we can take care of this emergency.

If we are going to fight grasshoppers in Wyoming effectively we must have the money by the middle or the end of next month.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will approve my amendment adding $160,000 at this time. While I know it will not take care of the situation in all of the States affected, yet it will take care of the situation in our State. Wyoming is the one State that called its legislature into special session and put up its share of the money to carry on this fight. So I hope the committee can go along with this amendment and increase this amount by $160,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to minimize in the least the seriousness of the problem the gentleman has nor the need of meeting that problem. The statement was made here that we have cut the appropriation for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine 66⅔ percent on this particular appropriation. I suspect technically that statement is correct. I did tell the gentleman this morning it was not because we were trying to cut the operation to that extent, however. Last year I served on another committee, when this Department came in for money for the grasshoppers. This program was set up in 1935 as an emergency program. Since 1935 they have had an emergency every year. They have had 80 employees in a permanent office whose job it was to get out each year to decide whether another emergency existed. Naturally they found another emergency.

I was not quite satisfied with their justifications. So I asked the investigators for our committee to investigate the operations of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine in this regard.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Certainly the people of Wyoming consider that it is an emergency when they call their legislature into special session and appropriate $750,000 to fight grasshoppers. So it cannot be said that it is not an emergency.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not questioning that but the gentleman intimated that our committee had not taken sound action in this particular bill. I think it is very sound. I do not differ with the gentleman about the existence of his problem or the seriousness of it, but I think there are other things involved here. The testimony showed that they paid $27,000 for the rental of an airplane which cost $6,000. It showed that they paid $1.87½ an hour for schoolboys who were working out there. Many times they had altogether more people than they needed there. They had a world of supplies on hand for years which they made no use of. They moved equipment part to one place and part to another so that some other department of the Government would not get it. The testimony showed many, many other things. So what we did in this bill was to place supplies in the hands of the farmers and we held up next year's program until we could see how their program this year will be handled. The program that the gentleman wishes to amend was handled in a deficiency bill for this year's program. The money in this bill will be too late according to the testimony before our committee to meet the need of the gentleman from Wyoming. Now he tells me that he can get the money in Wyoming if he can assure the folks that the money will be forthcoming here.

As to that I am sure he would know more than I. I have suggested to him that since the record before the House shows that this money will not be available until July 1, there is no record in our hearings to support it, and I suggest that he take his case to the other body and present his case there, and if there is sound justification for it in the hearings, we will be sympathetic with it when we come to conference. That is the best I can do.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The management of the program this year is going to be mainly under the control of the State officials. They will use State money. We do have State money available, and this little item of $160,000 that I have asked for here will be available the first of July, and we can use that, because the program is going to be going on until about the middle of July.

Mr. WHITTEN. Here is the statement before our committee, and this is the position on which they justified it: They wanted to go in early in the spring and kill these grasshoppers before they laid their eggs; that if you waited until late spring or early summer, that would be too late. That is what they said before the committee.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. We do not intend to wait until then. We propose out of the Wyoming money to start the program and carry it on until the middle of July and then this money will be available in July.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will make his case in the Senate, we will be sympathetic with him when it comes to conference, if we can be shown that it is necessary. If your amendment is voted on here and it is not agreed to, it will not help the cause when we come to conference.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee tells me now that he will have the second deficiency bill sometime toward the end of the session. If we could get action on this item today, we could go ahead with the program. If we have to wait until the deficiency bill

is passed or wait until the Senate acts, it will be too late to do anything with the program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have just stated that the money in this appropriation bill will not be available until the 1st of July. That is all I can tell the gentleman. I am glad to help him in any way I can.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how many amendments there are to consider this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. There are three on the Clerk's desk now.

Mr. TABER. And I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Several other Members apparently have amendments to offer.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 191, line 7, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$750".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we do not know yet what the amendment is. If the gentleman would reserve his request until we find out what it is about, there might not be any objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, this is a big bill. It involves the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. This item alone amounts to $285,000,000. Here we are in late afternoon. It is almost 6 o'clock. Yet we are told by the leadership we must complete the chapter of the bill relating to agricultural appropriations before we adjourn today. I am informed there are several amendments to be considered following this one. I think it is unfair to crowd such important legislation without giving it the consideration to which it is entitled. After all, the funds that are appropriated in this measure are funds of the people who pay the taxes, including the farmers of this country. I feel we should have more Members present to hear this discussion.

As I have stated, this bill appropriates $285,000,000 for what is generally known as triple-A payments, together with cost of administration, and is administered by the Production and Marketing Administration. Incidentally $25,500,000 is for salaries and expenses.

The funds, as you know, are paid to farmers provided they follow requirements with respect to soil practices and soil conservation. The practices differ in different localities. Generally they are paid to the participant for means of preventing soil erosion, soil depletion, floods, and so forth. It includes building contours by the farmer. Also dams and reservoirs on the owner's farm. Also fertilizer and other relative items. They come under what is described as soil-building practices and must be done under specifications laid down by the Production and Marketing Administration and its representatives, except the representatives in each State may arrange a program suitable for that particular area. The participant is paid for approximately one-third of the estimate of the cost of the work performed, in some cases more, and is also paid a share of the cost of the fertilizer used on his farm. There are a number of things the owner of the land may do in order to participate in soil practices. Except on a small farm the chances to earn the payments are very much limited.

When this program was first put into effect there was no limitation in the amount any one person could be paid, provided he had enough land and complied with the program. The result was that payments as high as $100,000 and more were paid to individuals for following soil practices on their own land. It was observed that out of the hundreds of millions appropriated under the act, most of the funds—in fact about 90 percent—was distributed to less than 10 percent of those under the program. So Congress limited the amount anyone could receive was $10,000. Again it was observed the thing was lopsided and that many payments of $10,000 were being paid to landowners. Later it was reduced to a lower figure, I believe $2,500 to one individual. Either last year, or the year before, the limit was fixed at $750. This was the limit last year. This present bill increases the limitation to $2,500 that may be paid to any landowner who will follow what is described as a soil-conservation program.

My amendment would limit the amount paid to the landowner or the tenant, as the case may be, to not more than $750. I think the limitation is fair. Certainly no one would be unduly injured thereby. I really think a farm owner with an operation that would permit him to participate for a larger amount, would not want to ask his Government to pay more. The limit of $750 was satisfactory last year. It should be satisfactory next year.

Now, I want it understood that I am in favor of a real soil-conservation program. Certainly, as one who has always been associated with agriculture, I want to do everything to encourage the conservation of the soil in this country. But let us take a look at the manner in which these funds are distributed after they are appropriated. During the last 10 years, or I may say 5 years, the average payment to almost half of those under the program was less than an average of $60. Listen to this. Seventy-five percent of the participants got an average of less than $100. In fact more than half of the money went to less than 15 percent of those who participated. Who were they? They were the large land owners, of course, who could well take care of the program, without, at least, asking the Government for more than the amount limited in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my contention, if you want to do a real service, spend a little more on these small farms that really need most conservation practices. What are you paying the small farmer under this program? A good many of them get from $25 to $35.

Much is said these days about the family-sized farm. Here is a chance to help the small operator, the man of the famly-sized farm, if you want to do so. You can increase payments to those who receive the smaller amounts. Then adopt this amendment and still have at least $35,000,00 or $40,000,000 for the taxpayers of this country. The people of this country, including the farmers, will applaud you if you will do it.

I am not unmindful of the good that has been accomplished under soil-conservation programs in this country. I want to remind you also of the big soil-conservation program that is carried on under another agency, the Soil Conservation Service. I wish I had the time to discuss the work that is being accomplished in the conservation of soil by this Service. Incidentally, you have an appropriation of $56,000,000 for this Service in this bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, a very active and effective member of this great committee.

Mr. HORAN. Does the gentleman remember the discussion we had about the growth of the soil-conservation districts? If we assume that commitment, we are going to have to divide a smaller melon into a greater number of slices. Unless we greatly increase our budget, irrespective of the national income, or dip into this fund to help man additional districts.

Mr. REES. The gentleman refers to the great Soil Conservation Service, which is separate and apart from the one presently being considered, and for which this bill provides an appropriation of $56,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What will be the cost to the Government of the program allowing $2,500 as the maximum payment?

Mr. REES. It is difficult to answer that question accurately. I tried to get the figure. The $2,500 program will cost several million dollars more than if my amendment is adopted. On the basis of that argument why limit the payments to $2,500. If that is your reasoning, why limit to $5,000 or $10,000. I challenge anyone to answer that, especially those of you who say this amendment will injure the program. I just do not believe anyone will answer it.

Most of the plea will be for the big operator and the plantation owner.

The gentleman from Georgia is on the floor. His state, of course, participates greatly in this thing, I understand. But let us give a little more to his smaller farmers down there, these peanut growers in whom he is greatly interested

and for whom he has rendered great service. The cotton growers, I mean the individuals, the big operators, the plantation owners, would still get as much as $750.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In a moment. Let me make this one statement and I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia who is a very important member of the House Committee on Agriculture. This House saw fit to reduce the payment to $750 at one time. Why in the world at this time should you want to raise it to $2,500? Who of you, opposed to this amendment will answer that? I want to hear you explain that.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I did not understand the gentleman's remark. He said if there were larger returns to the Soil Conservation Service for their money. The Soil Conservation has no money.

Mr. REES. I had in mind payments under this program. I meant the AAA payments. AAA payments, I should have said. The Soil Conservation Service does not pay money to farmers. It renders service to farmers in assisting them in soil conservation and soil practices.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, also a very important member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I favor the gentleman's amendment. If his amendment were adopted it means that the man who operates a small family-sized farm will get more money as a result of the savings from these larger sums that are paid to the big operators.

Mr. REES. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct. If you approve this amendment, you can give the small operator a better break. You will conserve soil where most needed. And at the same time you can still save several millions of dollars for the taxpayers of this country. No one was injured when the limit was $750. You heard no complaint except from the few big operators who thought they should have more money. I don't think very many of them really complained. Most of them, I think, have insisted we cut the cost of Government. Here is a place to do a little good in that respect. I understand the gentleman from Mississippi, the able chairman of this subcommittee, is interested in this proposal. He has a few big operators in his State. I have a few in mine. I hope he will go along with me on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas would have you believe that this Congress is just giving away several millon dollars here under this PMA soil-conservation program. He feels we would be giving it away, and he thinks the little farmer ought to get the major share of it because we are going to give it away.

Does the gentleman realize that out of every dollar the farmer realizes out of this program he puts up a $1 or $2 in order to realize that $1 benefit out of the United States Government? Does the gentleman realize that fact? You are not giving him one red-copper cent. As a matter of fact, we are protecting for years to come the land, the most precious possession we own in this country.

There will be 175,000,000 people in America to feed in the year 1970, at least that many to feed and in addition the Nation's soil will be called upon to feed peoples in other lands. We must protect our soil. If you are going to let the share cropper and the tenant share in this program you must let the man who has acquired 200 or 300 acres of land come in too.

The family-sized farm has been mentioned. Let me tell you something about the man who has two, three, or five tenants. Those tenants are family-sized farmers. They would be deprived of participation, they could not come in at all, if the man who owned the land did not come in.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I am not talking about giving anything away.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. REES. If you are going to share this money, if you are going to help the farmer, let us take care of the individual farmer.

Mr. GATHINGS. What does the gentleman mean, limit the size of a man's holdings? Does he advocate the philosophy the Communists are promulgating to cut down a man's acreage and not let a farmer who has saved his money and acquired 200 or 300 acres operate? Is the gentleman going to cut him out of the program completely and not conserve the soil on those farms?

Mr. REES. I am referring to the conservation program now.

Mr. GATHINGS. You would not save one penny at all.

Mr. REES. You could use the soil-conservation program to advantage.

Mr. GATHINGS. There was a $10,000 limitation up until the Republicans took over in the Eightieth Congress. They cut it down to $750 and the program would not work. So this committee saw fit to bring it back up to $2,500. Now this gentleman wants to cut it back down. Every year he has come in here with this amendment.

Mr. REES. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. Which has been contrary to what the sharecroppers and the tenants wanted.

Mr. REES. Oh, no; the sharecropper wants it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. What is the nature of this program? Is it a soil-conservation program?

Mr. GATHINGS. If you are going to have a soil-conservation program you ought to conserve the soil and not limit it to a small plot of ground.

Mr. POAGE. This is a soil-conservation program rather than a give-away program?

Mr. GATHINGS. It is not a give-away program.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman from Kansas looks upon it as a soil-conservation program, then he should pay for the conservation of the soil, should he not? If you are going to look upon it merely as a subsidy or classify it merely as a subsidy, then there may be some justification for saying "Just give it to everybody who comes up and holds out his hand." I think we have got a good soil-conservation program. I hope we will not brand it as a subsidy.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes; and it ought not to be wrecked by such an amendment as is offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. I trust that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; if it does not come out of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is an old story. When the triple A was set up some of the big farm operators in this country received as high as $110,000 a year out of the United States Treasury. Millions and millions of dollars have been spent in the name of soil conservation, and yet the facts are that today the soils of America are not as good as they were 10 years ago, and 10 years ago they were not as good as they were 20 years ago, and a lot of this talk about soil conservation has really not been soil conservation. In fact, we have been subsidizing and promoting the production of soil-depleting crops and have not really devoted the time or the energy or the money to really conserve the soil of the United States. Livestock farming has been discouraged in many instances.

Now, before the Eightieth Congress, there was a reduction of these funds from $110,000 down to the $10,000 limit. But, in the Eightieth Congress it was reduced to $750. As passed by the House

it was $500 and $1,000 by the Senate, and they agreed to $750.

The philosophy of agriculture comes in here. We hear it every day. We hear a lot of talk about the family-sized farm. If you are interested in the family-sized farm, I say that we should do something to support the family-sized farm instead of just talking about it. One of the weaknesses of our whole agricultural program has been that we have had a landowners' program and a land-speculators' program. One of the troubles we have in connection with the price-support program, if you please, because it is not the average farmer that is causing the trouble. There were a few producers that caused the trouble. So, I hope that we can pass this amendment because I refuse to believe in the philosophy that says that the United States Treasury will provide a $2,500 Christmas present to somebody that owns a large acreage of land and fails to maintain the fertility of his own soil.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. It is made to appear here that if you do not pass this legislation you are taking something away from the farmer. Is it not true that the farmer himself, the owner of the land, would be expected to protect and conserve his land? Generally speaking, is not that true?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The facts of the case are that we have some two-hundred-million-plus dollars and over 6,000,000 farmers. We are talking about forty-some dollars per farm for the United States. I know my good colleague from Missouri tells me he gets $1,000 out of it. That is all well and good, but he took it away from 19 other fellows when he got it.

This is just a matter of whether you want to distribute it to the big landowners or want the average farmer to have the $40 or $50 that is provided under this legislation. That is all there is to this question, whether you want to confine this to family-size farms or whether you want to dissipate these funds to the big landowners. If any man owns a thousand acres of land, I would think he ought to be able to tend to his own fertility and not ask the general taxpayers, the rest of the people of the United States, to pay for his fertilizer. He ought to be able to do it himself, or let somebody else own the land. That is my own personal opinion.

Mr. REES. We do have a soil-conservation program separate and apart from this?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, the Soil Conservation Service. We have this one that provides for forty-some dollars a year. If a farmer follows certain practices he can get a bigger share than the $40. It make a nice Christmas present of $2,500 for him. That is the issue here today.

Mr. REES. But it is separate and apart from the big soil-conservation program on which we spend some $56,000,000?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is purely technical service. This is where the money goes out. It has been improved during the years. A vote for this amendment is a vote for the family-sized farm and a vote against this amendment is a vote for the large landowner.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 143]

Abbitt	Golden	Nixon
Addonizio	Gordon	Noland
Allen, La.	Gore	Norblad
Auchincloss	Gorski	Norton
Bailey	Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.
Barden	Granger	O'Neill
Barrett, Pa.	Grant	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Green	Pfeifer,
Battle	Gwinn	Joseph L.
Beckworth	Hall,	Pfeiffer,
Bennett, Fla.	Edwin Arthur	William L.
Bentsen	Hall,	Plumley
Blemiller	Leonard W.	Potter
Blackney	Hand	Powell
Bolling	Harden	Quinn
Bolton, Md.	Harrison	Rains
Bolton, Ohio	Hart	Ramsay
Boykin	Harvey	Redden
Breen	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Hedrick	Rhodes
Buchanan	Heffernan	Rich
Buckley, N. Y.	Heller	Riehlman
Bulwinkle	Herter	Rodino
Burke	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoffman, Mich.	Roosevelt
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	Sabath
Canfield	Howell	Sadlak
Cavalcante	Jacobs	Sadowski
Chatham	James	Sasscer
Chudoff	Javits	Saylor
Clemente	Jenkins	Scott, Hardie
Cole, Kans.	Johnson	Scott,
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.	Hugh D., Jr.
Coudert	Kearns	Shelley
Crawford	Kee	Short
Crook	Keefe	Simpson, Pa.
Crosser	Kelly, N. Y.	Smathers
Davenport	Keogh	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y.	Klein	Smith, Wis.
Dawson	Kruse	Spence
Deane	Kunkel	Staggers
DeGraffenried	Latham	Steed
Delaney	Lesinski	Tauriello
Denton	Lichtenwalter	Taylor
Dingell	Lodge	Thomas
Dollinger	McGrath	Thompson
Donohue	McMillen, Ill.	Thornberry
Douglas	McSweeney	Towe
Durham	Macy	Vinson
Eaton	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	Martin, Iowa	Walsh
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Mass.	Whitaker
Evins	Mason	White, Calif.
Fallon	Miles	White, Idaho
Feighan	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Fogarty	Monroney	Wilson, Tex.
Fugate	Morgan	Withrow
Gamble	Morrison	Wolcott
Garmatz	Moulder	Wolverton
Gavin	Murphy	Woodhouse
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
Gilmer	Nelson	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, and finding himself without a quorum, he caused the roll to be called, when 250 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the other 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that always has appeal. I have seen it offered every year since I have been a Member of this House. But if the theory behind the proponents of this amendment be correct, you should strike out the soil-conservation program tomorrow.

If the soil-conservation program is no more than a grant of money to farmers, it should be eliminated. I do not so concede it to be, and as I said yesterday in opening the general debate on this bill, the whole Nation has an interest in our soil. Check every country in the world that is having trouble making a living today and you will find that it results from inadequate attention to the welfare and fertility of their soil.

Mr. Eisenhower, who used to be head of the University of Kansas, and for years was active in agricultural matters, has estimated that there are only 2 acres of land for each individual in the world, to supply food, clothing, and shelter—only 2 acres for each person in the world. It has been shown by records in our own country that 70,000,000 acres of land have been eroded to the point that they are no longer productive and must be restored if we are to have the high rate of production in future years that we have enjoyed heretofore.

We have made the worst record in history in destroying the natural resources of our country in the length of time we have occupied it. You may say that the farmers themselves should take care of the fertility of the soil. I agree that they should, but they have not. I think we all have an interest in the soil.

Now this production payment business, the PMA business, let us get this straight, and I hope you are listening to me and will bear with me. It does not say that we will pay you $750, Mr. Farmer, if you adopt the gentleman's amendment; nor does it say that we will pay the farmer $2,500. Under this provision you let the people in the States select the things that are needed to restore the fertility of the soil in the State; you tell them to select those things that are needed, and you tell the farmer that if he does those things, build the terraces, drain the land, or whatever it may be, that for every $2 worth of material and money that he spends in that effort we will pay one-third of it.

I regret only that you did not hear the testimony before our committee. If you would just read a little of it, you would

realize that this Nation with a nineteen million increase in population in 10 years cannot afford further waste of our natural resources.

You say: Let the farmer do it. That is all right, but he does not do it. The proper way to get him to do it is to lead and to assist, and that is what we are doing in this program. The only other way would be to force him to do it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is not the entire question here whether or not this is a soil-conservation program? If it is, should it not apply to every farm? And if it is not, should we not abandon it now?

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his statement and appreciate his comment. He has rendered long and fine service in this House. I know of no man who is held in higher esteem on both sides of the aisle than the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFF HOPE.

If this is a soil-conservation program, if you were to set out to save the soil of this country you should build terraces where terraces are needed whether the land belongs to BEN JENSEN or myself. It is not enough to tell the farmer to do it or to say that he ought to do it by himself; you have got to induce them to do it by leadership, education, and assistance. All we have to do is to look at China, India, and other countries throughout the world to see what neglect of the land brings to a country. You will find they are countries where they have taken more out of the soil than they have put back into it. Look elsewhere and you will see countries which in many instances do not have too much soil, but they have learned how to take care of it satisfactorily. In the northern part of Europe you will find prosperous countries where soil conservation is practiced.

You should realize that what happens under this program is not just another assistance program, but one wherein they say they will pay one-third of the cost per foot of terrace, per yard of ditch, or per unit of other practice.

It is not entirely a question of the size of the farm; it is based on work on the land. If the land happens to be in the ownership of one individual he has got to spend twice as much on 200 acres as he would on 100 acres in doing these things for the land. The amount of work he does on the land sets the amount of the contribution from the Federal Government.

By all means this amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. They tell me that practically every day a good-sized farm is washed down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Is that true or not?

Mr. WHITTEN. That statement has been made before our committee and if you will go down and look at the rivers you can see a great deal of soil is washed away and has gone away.

Mr. CHELF. If we do not protect the soil it is not going to protect us?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, and our farmers, as fine as their production is, have the worst record in the history of the world in the amount of soil fertility we have wasted. The farmers have not protected the land as they should, and in the interest of the national economy we are going to have to protect it. You either do it through leadership, cooperation and assistance or you do it by order of law. That is the Stalin and Hitler method. We do not want to reach that point.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out one other thing. This payment is for work on land. It is not a payment to the man to do it. He has got to spend this money on the land plus $2 of his own for each dollar the Government gives him. He cannot pocket this money. He has got to spend this money and $2 of his own for improvements on the land. He has got to spend the money first. Then this contribution is made. If your large units of land are excluded, you exclude every tenant and small farmer on that land. You are defeating the very purpose that you seek to serve.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman explain how much was spent in this fashion last year by the Government?

Mr. WHITTEN. Approximately $250,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL. Has the gentleman some idea of how many farmers received benefits under this program?

Mr. WHITTEN. My guess would be very rough. There are mighty few farmers who have not contributed to this program, who have not participated in it in one way or another. The rate of improvement in saving our soil and in restoring our soil has increased from 200 to 300 percent since this program was started.

Mr. CARROLL. How many farmers were actively engaged in soil conservation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is estimated that we probably have about 6,000,000 farmers and it is reasonable to presume 5,000,000 of them are participating in this program.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas

Mr. REES. I want to take issue with the gentleman that we might as well throw this legislation out of the window. I am as much for soil conservation as is the gentleman from Mississippi and I want to say to him, as I said a while ago, that 80 percent of those participating received less than $100 apiece. I am in favor of a soil-conservation program, but I say you should be more liberal with the little fellow and not give away millions of dollars to the big fellows.

Mr. WHITTEN. If my friend were right I would be with him. If the facts were as he says, I would be for him; but this is not a payment to a farmer. They say to the farmer: "If you will build so many feet of terraces we will pay a third of the cost."

It is not a payment at all. They tell him that if he will do so much of the work he will be paid one-third of the cost. If it were a payment, as the gentleman insists, I would agree with him, that we ought to divide it equally and give the little fellows the big end of it. It is not that.

SOIL CONSERVATION FOR SOUTH CAROLINA'S PIEDMONT AND THE NATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I received a letter the other day from a longstanding friend and neighbor of mine, suggesting that I make a speech here in the House on soil conservation. This man, Mr. S. B. Huff, of route 2, Piedmont, S. C., is just a plain, practical farmer. But he has a great passion for conserving our soil and water resources, and restoring the productiveness of some of our farming lands which have suffered much through years and generations of neglect or abuse.

Mr. Huff is chairman of the board of supervisors of the Greenville County Soil Conservation District. He knows what he is talking about when he says that an adequate soil-conservation program must constitute the basis of any long-range agricultural program. My personal observations likewise confirm his statement that this is a matter of great interest and importance, not only to his neighbors and himself in the South Carolina Piedmont country, but also to farmers and other people everywhere. A permanently healthy agriculture is a matter of direct concern in every State and in every congressional district in the country. We, whose business it is to pass upon a great variety of legislation affecting the welfare of agriculture, certainly should take the time occasionally to discuss the progress and needs of such basic undertakings as those for conserving our production farm lands, our forests, our wildlife, and our other natural riches.

William Jennings Bryan said one time:

> Burn down our cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

Although I am a city man, I agree with Bryan's reasoning in this regard. No one needs to remind me, for example, that it was South Carolina land that actually provided my own education and has helped to support me in my law practice since. For it was cotton produced on the land around that kept the spindles turning in the Greenville mills where I worked for 15 years while going through school. And it is cotton, livestock, peaches and other products of this same land that today still provides the wealth upon which I and my fellow townsmen depend for our living. It is most certainly true that if agriculture succeeds, industry thrives; and if agriculture languishes, industry and all our business in town suffers accordingly.

Grass has not grown in the streets of Greenville, Laurens, Union, or Spartanburg, but we undeniably have paid a price through the years for agricultural setbacks in our part of the country. Not all of these can be charged against the cot-

ton inset infestations of years past or to economic upsets. Thinking people know, even without the experts telling us, that wasteful use of our land and of the water which enables it to produce has reduced crops yields and lowered farm income and purchasing power. We know, too, that generations of preponderantly row-crop farming—cotton and corn—took heavy toll in damage to our farms, our mills and our public facilities such as highways, railroads, and industrial and city water supplies.

Sloping fields gashed with ugly, unproductive gullies; roads relocated one to several times because the old wheel tracks grew into impassible ditches where runoff water sluiced down them from bordering cropland; and muddy streams and silt-clogged ponds and reservoirs—these are our constant reminders that we have not always used our land and managed our rainwater too well in the past. I can show you more than one reservoir that has silted full or nearly so behind dams built in my day, filled with soil washed off the fields upon which we depend for growing our food, feed, and fiber crops. This process of man-made soil and water waste started long before my time, of course; but it is important to keep in mind that when our forefathers took over from Nature the job of managing the land and the waters of our Piedmont country, the land was covered with timber and our streams were, in the words of early-day writers, "of surpassing transparency." It has been a long, long time since anything like that could be said of our streams such as the Saluda, Enoree, Reedy, Tiger Rivers and others.

Today, in fact, siltation of our reservoirs, streams, and harbors and flood damage along most of the country's rivers are of major concern to all of us. We spend a great deal of time here in Congress, as you know, considering flood-control survey reports and appropriations. I think we are all pleased that since the Flood Control Act of 1936 was enacted proper weight now is being given to the important watershed phases of flood control, up on our farmlands and timber lands, with soil and water conservation playing a major part in such planning and operations by the United States Department of Argiculture through the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service.

In South Carolina, for example, preliminary examinations have been completed by the Soil Conservation Service and flood-control surveys are scheduled to start during the 1951 fiscal year in the Santee-Cooper watershed in which my counties lie, as well as on the lower Pee Dee and the Tar-Neuse watersheds and in the coastal drainage from the Savannah River to the Albemarle Sound. That is most of the State, except for the part included in the Savannah River watershed, on which a survey already is well under way. I certainly hope to see this important work carried on through.

My part of the country, of course, does not have any monopoly on our unenviable history of land and water use. It came about, not deliberately or maliciously, but through the course of conventional settlement and development of the land in the best accepted American tradition. I feel sure that the land story follows a similar pattern in most of your States and districts.

We can profit in looking back, though, only to the extent that we employ the lessons of the past in shaping our course for the present and the future. We lawyers find past court decisions indispensable in building up our cases day by day. Nature has rendered some sharp decisions on man's occupancy and use of the land; we who hold title to or rent the land today will do well to study those decisions and weigh the penalties and awards which have resulted. Frankly, I believe we have been doing a pretty honest job in this respect in recent years; and the good results are much in evidence.

Great strides have been made, as you know, in the last 17 years in many phases of our economy. We can think of an imposing list, ranging from the guaranteeing of bank deposits to social security and housing aid. The advancements in the field of agriculture have been especially noteworthy. Some of those we now accept as a matter of course as permanent, everlasting, stable improvements include: rural electrification, now expanded to extend rural telephones; Federal crop insurance; Farmers Home Administration lending for farm ownership or production and subsistence needs, with 28 percent of the ownership loans already paid up in full 30 or more years in advance, and the remainder paid an average of 2 years in advance; and the varied Production and Marketing Administration functions, from its marketing service and the school-lunch program to the agricultural conservation programs.

But I have no time to talk about these various worth-while activities today, even though some of them contribute materially to furthering of the country's soil- and water-conservation accomplishments. The agricultural conservation payments, for example, have helped the farmers to do more conservation work. Progress of soil conservation likewise has been hastened because of the educational program of the Extension Service; the cooperative research work of the experiment stations and the State colleges with the Soil Conservation Service; and the United States Forest Service's conservation and research on national forest lands. I shall confine my remarks principally to the work of our Greenville County Soil Conservation District and the approximately 2,200 other districts organized and run by local farmers of the 48 States and 4 Territories and insular possessions.

Generally speaking, I think that soil conservation as it is being carried on through these democratic, locally voted and managed districts is perhaps the greatest program in agriculture that has been hit upon in recent years, if not in all time. The purpose of soil conservation is to help all agriculture. Any number of our scientific agricultural achievements are of incalculable value or indispensable, such as crop, livestock, and poultry improvements, insect- and disease-control methods, and so on. But none of these alone can produce a bale of cotton, a pound of beef or pork, or a board foot of lumber unless there is productive land on which to grow our food, feed, fiber, oil, and timber crops.

Our Greenville County soil-conservation district is 9 years old. It is one of the 33 such districts which blanket the entire State of South Carolina—one of 8 States which are 100 percent covered by these districts. The other soil-conservation districts in my congressional district are the Laurens County district, of which Mr. Ryan F. Lawson, of Clinton, is chairman; the Spartanburg district, Mr. J. A. Bridwell, of Moore, chairman; and the Broad River district in Union County, Mr. W. C. Camp, of route 2, Gaffney, chairman. Each of them has its own report of splendid conservation accomplishment; but I have time to discuss in any detail only the work of the Greenville County district, with which I naturally am most familiar.

I can say with certainty that the conservation work they report is actually out there on the land. I have been out and have seen the results of this soil- and water-conservation planning and land treatment. I have observed the systems of terracing, the conservation drainage improvements, the conservation farm wildlife developments that are providing us with better hunting and fishing, the cover cropping, the farm ponds, and other practices and measures. Thus I have had the opportunity of observing at first-hand the great contribution these farmer districts have made toward restoring the permanent productiveness of the farm lands in our part of the country where cotton has placed a heavy drain on the land.

In the Greenville County district's 1949 annual report which Chairman Huff sent me, I was impressed by such indicators of healthy progress in district accomplishment as the growth in the number of conservation farm plans. That has been from 75 plans covering 7,599 acres at the close of 1940 to 865 plans covering 900,000 acres at the end of 1949. Some of the individual accomplishments reported included about 4,000 acres of pasture established, more than 6,000 tons of lime, and a thousand tons of superphosphate used, 100,000 trees planted, and 162,000 pounds of summer legume seed and 34,000 pounds of winter legume seed planted.

The Soil Conservation Service, as the technical agency which helps the Greenville County and the other districts in conservation surveying, planning, and initial application of these measures, at the request of the district supervisors, has supplied me with some additional figures. They show, among other accomplishments, that our Greenville County district farmers to the first of this year have done 17,000 acres of contour farming and developed 3,700 acres of new cover crops, done nearly 13,000 acres of strip cropping, built 1,428 miles of terraces, and put conservation woodland management into effect on 18,000 acres.

Those figures, you understand, represent only a few of the conservation measures actually put on the land in the one soil-conservation district in one county. I could give you comparable facts about the others in my congressional district, elsewhere in South Carolina, and for the country as a whole. I think it is enough to point out at this time, though, some more general State and national figures. For example, I find that to January 1 approximately 29,000 complete conservation farm plans had been worked up by district farmers and assisting Soil Conservation Service technicians in South Carolina. These plans called for the treatment of 4⅓ million acres, and the land treatment reported as already applied totaled more than 3,000,000 acres in our South Carolina soil-conservation districts.

Also, I was interested in knowing that 11¼ million acres in my State alone already have had the benefit of detailed conservation surveys, which the Soil Conservation Service assists the districts to make to find out what conservation treatments the land needs on each farm, and how each acre may be used most profitably and safety. If any of you are not acquainted with this basic land inventory on which the districts' conservation planning and land treatment are based, I am sure you would find it worth while to post yourselves on it.

These land capability surveys, as I understand them, develop for every acre on every farm such pertinent information as to the type of soil, the slope of the land, the amount of erosion it has had in the past, and its susceptibility to further erosion under prevailing climatic conditions with different kinds of use cultivation, pasture, and so forth. With such facts available it is then possible for the farmer to separate the best land from the less productive and more hazardous lands, and plan his farming accordingly. It seems to me this ought to be good information for us to have for the entire country, and that such a national land inventory could have many important uses in the planning and carrying out of almost all the different agricultural programs, whether they be strictly soil conservation, farm credit, production, allotments, or whatever.

Dr. H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, tells me that by the first of this year, January 1, 1950, detailed soil conservation surveys adequate for farm planning had been made on 321,000,000 acres in the country as a whole. He pointed out, though, that the demands from the districts for help in planning and applying conservation measures had been so heavy that the survey work had not been able to go forward as rapidly as it should of late.

I also asked Dr. Bennett for other Nation-wide soil conservation accomplishment figures. They showed that up to January 1, 1950, about 807,000 complete soil conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone, covering nearly 222,000,000 acres. More than 112,000,000 acres of that had been treated with needed conservation measures by the first of this year, just in the soil conservation districts and not including past work done in the erosion control demonstration projects, CCC camp areas, and through other programs in which the Soil Conservation Service has participated. Nor do they include the important soil and water conservation research activities which this agency is carrying on all the time in cooperation with the State experiment stations.

But enough for figures. Meantime, let us go back to Mr. Huff's report from the Greenville County Soil Conservation District and consider a couple of points brought out which I think are most important in connection with the successful undertaking of our whole conservation program. One is the local community-group approach which our Greenville County farmers are using to help speed up their programs. I find that just about everybody agrees on the need for going ahead as fast as possible with this soil- and water-conservation work; and I understand that this group-action procedure is getting splendid results, both in our local district and in other districts all over the country.

As it is worked out in the Greenville County district, this method consists of organizing communities into groups for the purpose of getting a pattern of soil conservation over entire neighborhoods, without regard to farm boundary lines. The district has five of these neighborhood groups, with two Negro groups. These organized farmers select a leader for each group within the soil-conservation district; and, as Chairman Huff points out, these farmer-leaders have in many instances "become true conservationists and are rendering a real service to the cause of soil conservation." I think you will agree with me that this is the basic, democratic way of going about a job of this kind. It is no wonder that our Greenville County conservation groups have attracted the attention of agricultural leaders from different parts of the United States and from foreign countries.

Closely related to this successful farmer-group approach to the conservation problem is the emphasis which our Greenville County district is giving to community-wide support of its program. As Mr. Huff wrote:

> As we soil conservation district supervisors understood our duties better, we came to believe that people, other than farmers, have a responsibility to the land. As we saw the success of groups of farmers working together, we realized that the help of these other people would give impetus to the soil-conservation program and that it would be well to seek this outside help and give them the opportunity to have a part in the soil-conservation movement. In considering the fact that every citizen has a stake in the land, district supervisors have called upon all types of business, banking, manufacturing, commerce, and industry to help with the job. We have sought the help of teachers, preachers, newspapers, radio, civic clubs, and private citizens.

I personally can vouch for the success which has attended their efforts in this common-sense attitude toward the conservation program. For example, I had the pleasure of attending the Greenville County district meeting in Mauldin at the close of the district's 1949 pasture contest, which the supervisors have sponsored each year since 1947. Business firms of Greenville furnish prizes in the contest and put on a dinner at the close of each year's event. The supervisors report that these pasture contests have resulted in the planting of 4,000 acres of fescue and Ladino clover. I wish I had time to tell you of some of the outstanding results which our individual district farmers have had with their pasture-livestock programs.

The Greenville County district supervisors call attention in their report to what I agree is a particularly significant phase of this whole matter of conserving our soil and water resources. That is, "the tremendous influence for good among young folk of the community—influence that will keep these boys and girls on the farm, continuing the type of farming their fathers advocate." During the past year, the Greenville County district also sponsored a soil-conservation contest among 4–H Club boys, with prizes provided by the Greenville Kiwanis Club through its agricultural committee.

The district supervisors also are cooperating with veterans' classes, by getting motion pictures for the classes and cooperating with the instructors in observational tours. Over the country generally, I understand that a most constructive soil conservation training program for veterans has been under way. Also, that many veterans are among the approximately 16,000 private contractors who have found most profitable opportunities in terracing, drainage, pond building, and other conservation-construction work for soil conservation district farmers.

I want to mention another outstanding conservation contest activity in my county. That is the 2-year Piedmont communities soil-conservation contest. Originally sponsored by the Spartanburg Herald-Journal, the second contest now under way is being sponsored by supervisors of the Spartanburg, Laurens County, and Broad River, Union County, soil-conservation districts in my own congressional district and the districts in Cherokee, Polk, and Rutherford Counties. I am told that 370 farmers and 28 groups are participating in Spartanburg County, with $10,000 in prizes offered by business firms; 145 farmers in 10 groups in Union County, with $3,000 in prizes; and 269 farmers in 14 groups in Laurens County, with $2,800 in prizes. Every cotton mill in Laurens County is offering a prize in the contest. This will give you a further idea of the way all of us down in my part of the country believe in getting behind this important work of soil conservation.

Nor is this just another do-good movement that all these varied interests enter into because it seems to be a genteel and proper thing to do. Our mill owners and business and professional people of all kinds appreciate all too well the fact that we people in town are not going to prosper unless the farmers of Greenville County and the rest of the country can keep up their income and maintain their purchasing power. Soil-conservation farming, it has been demonstrated over and over, is the most efficient and hence the most economical and profitable. It enables the farmer to adjust his produc-

tion best to meet changing market and other conditions.

As I have pointed out to this body before, my home is the center of the South's thriving and growing cotton textile industry. None of us, naturally, want to see cotton driven from the South; but neither do we want to see our good land needlessly exhausted in growing quantities of cotton which may not be needed at a given time, or our already depleted and low-producing lands needlessly pushed to produce surplus cotton. Instead, we want to grow the cotton which is needed on our good land, economically and profitably, and produce other, needed commodities like feed and livestock, fruit, timber, and so on on the lands best suited to produce them safely and profitably. I should say that the same general goal would hold for the Wheat Belt and other cash-crop areas.

The agricultural pattern in our Southland already is changing definitely in that very direction, to the everlasting benefit and well-being of us all. While our industries thrive, many of our people are living better than they ever did before. Soil-conservation farming unquestionably has played an important part in this. And new agricultural developments are bringing new prosperity to many localities. In my home district, for example, peach growing has become an important part of our agriculture in recent years. In fact, Spartanburg County has become one of the Nation's peach centers, now that South Carolina has forged ahead of even Georgia in peach production in some recent years.

Mr. Huff in his letter reminded me that the farmers of Greenville County and the Nation are concerned over the type of agricultural legislation that may be considered and passed by Congress this year. We now are working under the greatest pressure to economize and are trying to slash off every unnecessary expenditure possible. But for us to curtail or hinder this sound soil-conservation program which is so successfully under way would be false economy, and the resultant loss to the country would be too terrible to contemplate.

As you know, busy farmers like Mr. Huff do not sit down and write letters to their Congressman just to be doing something. He and his fellow farmers are sincere in their efforts to help improve our agriculture and our whole economy with it. They are standing on their own feet, and giving liberally of their own time and sometimes cash money to get the job done. All they ask is that we make available to them such facilities which they need as the technical assistance provided by the Soil Conservation Service, along with the continued educational help of the Extension Service and PMA conservation incentive payments.

Dr. Bennett tells me that the demands from soil-conservation districts for Soil Conservation Service technical aid continues to be far in excess of the personnel available for giving such assistance. In my own State, for example, the backlog of farmer applications for conservation surveying, planning, and application help through their districts totaled about 2,850 on January 1. I know that this agency is just about as efficient as it could be in assigning all but a very small percentage of its employees to work directly with the farmers or to duties involved specifically in getting conservation onto the land. I have visited the Service's southeastern regional office in Spartanburg, and am personally acquainted with Dr. T. S. Buie, the regional director, and different members of his staff in Spartanburg and in the field offices in my counties. I also have had the pleasure of attending a meeting of the local chapter of the Soil Conservation Society of America, composed of members from different agencies and groups and individuals whose work has to do with soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation.

It is good to see all these people working together toward the common objective of conserving and making more satisfying use of our land and other resources—the farmers, agricultural and other scientists, business and professional people, and just about everybody else. This teamwork is going to continue to pay us big dividends. And, as Mr. Huff wrote:

Until—

The soil-conservation district—

supervisors can add all our State and national lawmakers to the enlisted group of Americans who are helping farmers to save the soil, then we will be minus an assistance that can do much to encourage good land use.

I hope it may be said of all of us here that we are going to meet this challenge squarely and wholeheartedly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES) there were—ayes 63, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFER) there were—ayes 67, noes 93.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 189, line 10, strike out the figure "$282,500,000" and insert "$400,000,000".

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I have had that amendment on the Clerk's desk all afternoon, and I have been seeking recognition.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, prior to the ruling, I wonder if I could have the attention of the gentleman from Missouri, the author of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to state this, that the gentleman's amendment is directed to the payment for the soil conservation program. This program was announced last year. The orders and all the regulations and all the commitments were made last year, and this is in payment of the program in this amount. I am not trying to say what the gentleman intended, but apparently the gentleman has directed his efforts along the line of the announcement of the next year's program, rather than increasing the payment this year beyond the obligation we have. I mention that to clarify the situation, I hope.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, last year the amount that is now carried was authorized, and that is the only authorization there is for it. The amendment is entirely without authority in law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Missouri has offered an amendment, which has been reported. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order against the amendment. However, the Chair invites attention to the fact that all the amendment does is seek to increase the amount of the appropriation carried in the bill.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, but the amount that is authorized to be carried is limited to the authorization that was in the bill last year, and that was the amount that now stands in the bill. That is the only authority there is. The $400,000,000 that is now being offered by way of amendment is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. No; I do not desire to be heard on the point of order, but I know that the soil of the United States needs $400,000,000 for its conservation during the coming year. If the law is so written that we cannot have it, then I will turn my attention to changing the law, if possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The point presented here is whether the amount provided in the bill is the amount authorized by law, and whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri would exceed the amount authorized by law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The burden would be on the gentleman to show that the amount provided in his amendment did not exceed the amount authorized by law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered my amendment. If it is more than is authorized by law, the burden of proof is on the objector and not on me. If he can prove it, okay.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules and precedents of the House, the burden of proof is always on the proponent of the amendment.

In view of the information given the Chair, which is assumed to be correct, that the amount proposed by the amendment exceeds the amount authorized by law, the Chair would be forced to sustain the point of order.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a minute or two to discuss how payments are set up on the farm for soil conservation. First, waste land is excluded from the farm acreage. Then the lands that

the buildings and the lots are on are excluded. Then a payment is set up on the crop acreage. That is the plowable acres or the tillable acres. Out in my neighborhood in Missouri, it is about 68 cents an acre. That is only paid to the farmer if he does about $2 or $2.50 worth of soil conservation work for each dollar that is paid to him. I am not quarreling about that. He should do this soil conservation work and he does do it if he gets his payments. But the man who does soil-conservation work over 300 acres of land is entitled to three times as much payment as the man who does the same amount of work per acre over 100 acres of land. That should be evident to anybody. This PMA program is not a hand-out and it is not a gift. It is the only soil-conservation program that has got anything done and is getting anything done. Let us see just what is needed in the United States. We need 8,000,000 acres of land terraced and the PMA has gotten terraces built on 738,000 acres. That is less than one-eighth of the job. On pasture and range improvements we need 129,000,000 acres reseeded. The PMA has succeeded in getting 37,000,000 acres reseeded. On green manure crops the PMA has 109,000,000 acres of green manure crops most of which was used and plowed under in a 12-year period. That should happen every year in the United States. We need 30,000,000 acres for tree planting and the PMA has succeeded in replanting 627,000 acres. On phosphates we need 17,000,000 tons a year spread on the farms of the United States and slightly more than 10 percent of that, or a million and a half tons, are being spread each year. For earthen dams for livestock water and erosion control, we need 2,000,000 dams and we have 730,000. On lime we need 65,000,000 tons a year and we are spreading 25,000,000 tons. There are 5,858,000 farms in the United States and the allotment for soil conservation this year figures $48.25 a farm. It costs $150 to build a mile of terrace and it costs a $10 bill to lime an acre of sour land. How much do you expect the farmer in our low-income groups to do, the farmer whose income is less than $1,500 a year per family? How do you expect them to do effective soil-conservation work unless the Government will match the dollars that they pay to the extent of at least $68.25 a farm?

Those are things I would like to know. I want you to get these figures because they are correct. Our soil conservation appropriation for 1939 was $500,000,000. In 1940 it was $532,500,000 approximately. In 1941 it was $465,500,000. In 1942 it was four hundred ninety-nine and one-third million dollars. In 1943 it was $450,000,000. In 1944 it was $400,000,000. That is the amount to which I am trying to raise it today. In 1945 it was $302,500,000. In 1946 it was $355,000,000. In 1949 it was $159,734,500, and certain people bragged that they would take that off next year but they did not have the courage to do it. In 1950 it was set at $257,043,439. I am trying by this amendment today to raise the appropriation to the place it occupied in 1944, $400,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 215, line 4, insert a new subsection 411 to read as follows:

"(a) No part of any funds appropriated or made available to the Department of Agriculture under this chapter shall be used for paying any of the expenses (including per diem, transportation or other expense) of the Secretary of Agriculture, or of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture (including State, county, or community production and marketing administration committeemen or their successors) in connection with their attendance or participation in any meeting, conference or gathering outside the Department of Agriculture (except before, or at the request of, the committees of Congress having jurisdiction of the legislation) if such meetings, conferences, or gatherings are utilized for the purpose or with the effect of promoting, fostering, discussing, analyzing or explaining, or effecting the adoption or nonadoption, of any plan, bill, proposal, measure, or other proposed legislation which has been submitted, in whole or in part, to the Congress of the United States or any authorized committee thereof but which has not been enacted into law."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. I do not wish to preclude discussion of the amendment, but I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment, which is clearly a limitation and clearly in order, for the purpose of preventing the use of the people's money to propagandize, in calling conventions, drawing in committeemen, and other employees of the Department of Agriculture, so that they might be organized for political propaganda in behalf of legislation.

Such a meeting as this was held in Minnesota a little while back. Other meetings have been held from time to time. Millions of dollars, over all, have been wasted by departments, spending travel money for such purposes and drawing people in for the purpose of conference, to promote particular legislation. I hope that this Committee will vote for this amendment, and that we can begin to stop that sort of thing. It is a disgrace to the United States that that situation could exist.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, this amendment simply provides that the Department or the Secretary of Agriculture cannot call in their committeemen for the purpose of promoting legislation that has not been presented to the Congress.

Mr. TABER. Or that has been; either way. Anything that has not been enacted into law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. So, if it has been presented to the Congress, then they cannot call in those people; or if it has been enacted into law, then they can call them in to interpret the law and to administer it?

Mr. TABER. To administer it, but not for the purpose of creating the law.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. As a matter of fact, if the present law, generally speaking, were enforced, such an amendment would not be necessary, because the employees at the present time, under the Hatch Act and other acts, are not permitted to carry on these activities. So this becomes a very necessary amendment to declare the policy of the Congress.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr TABER. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I also believe that the members of the Department of Agriculture have been guilty of criticizing existing law and the way it is administered. Strangely enough, out in my area they have been doing that—tearing down the confidence of the people in laws that exist.

Mr. TABER. That is true, with the idea of promoting a change, in their own interest.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand the amendment, it would make it impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture or any employee of the Department to use funds to pay the traveling expenses or per diem expenses of anybody to arrange a meeting or to attend a meeting to explain or promote the Brannan plan.

Mr. TABER. It would.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. I agree with the gentleman's idea that we do not want to have any politics in this. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, if a thousand farmers, for example, wanted to have the Brannan plan explained to them by the Secretary so they could determine whether they wanted it or not, the gentleman's amendment would prevent that; would it not?

Mr. TABER. No; it would not. It would not prevent anybody's going to any meeting that he wanted to voluntarily and at his own expense.

Mr. FURCOLO. Would not the gentleman's amendment prevent payment to the Secretary of Agriculture to go to this meeting that had been called for him to explain his plan?

Mr. TABER. No; it would not prevent his going, but he would have to go at his own expense or at the expense of those who wanted him to go and explain it.

Mr. FURCOLO. Does not the gentleman feel that the farmers, or any other segment of the people of the country, are

entitled to have explained to them a plan suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe that the taxpayers of the United States should pay the traveling expenses of anybody to go out and promote particular types of legislation; I think it is absolutely contrary to a republican form of government.

Mr. FURCOLO. But not to a democratic form.

Mr. TABER. If a democratic form of government means a Stalin form of government that could be so.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will permit, I think the answer is found right in the amendment. The amendment states that if the committee authorizes or requests him to go he can get his expenses—any committee in the Congress; and I am sure the Chairman will agree that it would be tickled to death to pay Mr. Brannan's expenses or the expenses of anyone who could explain the Brannan plan to the farmers of the country.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FURCOLO. As I understand the amendment, it states that if legislation has been presented to the Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, or anyone else cannot travel and have his expenses paid to go and explain that to the farmers or anyone who wants it explained to them.

Mr. TABER. He cannot have his expenses paid to promote any particular type or piece of legislation.

Mr. FURCOLO. This goes farther than to promote; it states "analyze, explain," and so on. Under it, if a thousand farmers wanted him to come out and explain the plan to them, he could not have his expenses paid by the Government for going there.

Mr. TABER. But he can by a committee of Congress, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to this request, I wonder if we cannot find some way of limiting debate. We want to get through this evening, otherwise the whole chapter goes over until next Wednesday.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to inquire if the gentleman withdraws his point of order or desires to press it?

Mr. WHITTEN. After further consideration—I had not had the privilege of seeing the gentleman's amendment at the time I made the point of order—we seem to be agreed that the point of order was not well taken. For that reason, I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to submit a consent request?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last five to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would not the gentleman amend his request to make it 20 minutes so that each of us may have at least 2 minutes?

Mr. WHITTEN. If there is 20 minutes on this amendment, the next amendment, and the other amendments, we do not know how long we would be here. That is the only point.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will withdraw my request if you will honestly quit here; but if you are going to continue on and on, then I want this gentleman to be heard.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, too.

Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 12 minutes, the last 4 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, much as I dislike to disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who has performed a most valuable service to the country in holding down expenditures, I fear that his amendment goes too far. I have observed for years the workings of our AAA and county and community committeemen, and I cannot agree to any limitations on their rights to attend meetings for the purpose of studying and analyzing whatever programs might be proposed. Let us remember that our township committeemen are elected by their fellow farmers in their township. The county committeemen are in turn selected by the township committee from among their number. What can be fairer or more democratic? Let us remember, also, that generally these men are among the best and most respected farmers of their communities. They give much more of their time than they are ever paid for.

May I point out to the House that last year the average county committeemen, of whom there are three in each county, received only an average of $525 a year for the 77 days they were officially paid for on an average. Ask any county committeeman and he will tell of the many additional hours he puts in at his home without compensation, listening to the problems of his neighboring farmers who depend upon him as a source of information on matters relating to the farm programs. I well remember the hours I have personally taken of the time of a good friend, Mr. Frank Brandt, of Tyler, Minn., and the willingness he has always shown in helping me with matters pertaining to my grain-sealing operations.

May I also point out that the approximate 4,200 township or community committeemen in Minnesota, together with the others in our Nation, only averaged $75 last year for the 11 official days of work for which they were paid. Do you not think that these men are worth that small sum of less than $100 a year to pay them in part for the time they spend making our farm programs work? I certainly do and will not begrudge them a trip once a year to some central point in our State to hear any farm program discussed.

It has been extremely unfortunate that politics were injected into the April 4 meeting at St. Paul, but please do not lay the blame for this upon this 4,400 county and township committeemen who may have attended that gathering. Please also keep in mind that during that 2 days conclave, at least six speakers made addresses relative to certain phases of our farm program.

Knowing these men as I do, and having the confidence in their desire for as good a farm program as we can devise, I ask the House to defeat the Taber amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not the custom when a chamber of commerce or a medical association or any other group invites a Government official to come to a convention or other meeting to give an address or discuss any proposal, that the organization usually provides the traveling expenses of that Government official?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. Why should that not be true when farmers have a meeting and have an official of the Department of Agriculture come out to explain a program to them?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Explain some new proposal?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, or explain a program that has been adopted that would help them in their operation of it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This permits payment of expenses to explain programs that have been enacted into law.

Mr. JUDD. Personally, I do not think the Government should pay their traveling expenses when farmers invite them to any meeting and certainly not if it is in regard to something that is being proposed or propagandized, which is all that is prohibited in this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the 2 minutes allotted to me may be given the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather long amendment, but, as nearly as I can read it, all it does is to say that no part of the funds appropriated or made available to the Department of Agriculture under this chapter shall be used for paying any of the expenses for somebody to go out and lobby for a new law. That is, it says in effect that you cannot lobby or put on

the heat at the expense of the Government.

May I ask the gentleman from New York if that is a fair interpretation of his amendment?

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman from Minnesota was mistaken if he thought this would prohibit the explanation of existing programs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. The last clause is "but which has not been enacted into law." It permits the explanation of law, but it prevents lobbying or putting on the heat at the expense of the Government for bills which are not yet law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I hope you know what you are doing. I doubt it. You might go all the way and say that neither can the President of the United States visit parts of this country and explain the proposals he has made to the Congress. It may be that there are faults in the Brannan plan, but I think what you seek to do by this amendment will contribute toward a revolt among the farmers of this Nation and the people of this Nation. They desire to know, need to know and are entitled to know the full terms and effect of the so-called Brannan plan and every other proposal which the Secretary makes, which I make and which you make. I have great respect for, I have great confidence in, Secretary Brannan. I think he is an honest man. I think he is sincere, and I think he is concerned about the expenditure of public funds. For my part I shall not subscribe to this amendment or any comparable amendment which strikes directly at the Secretary of Agriculture, which strikes by such indirection at a proposal which he has submitted to the Congress. If it is true as the gentleman from Minnesota says, that the more the Secretary explains his proposal the less popular it becomes, then why are you here trying to strangle, yes, trying to prevent, yes, trying to prohibit an important member of the administration from submitting to the farmers of this Nation for their judgment, not for the judgment of any group in the Congress or elsewhere, whether or not his proposal is one under which they desire to operate? I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be directed along the line of my colleague from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. I believe you will recall that I made the closing argument against the Brannan plan in this House last fall when this trial run was up in the House of Representatives. I made that because, based on my experience on this committee, I did not believe that it would work, and I believe I am sound in that reasoning. But, as I said this year when the Secretary of Agriculture was before our committee, that this problem is sufficiently big and it has got sufficient problems connected with it, such as your potato surplus and a number of other things, that not only did I think that all of us were entitled to our views as to how to correct these ills, but I thought that we all should be giving some attention to it, and while I differed with him, not only did I think he had a right to his thinking in the matter, but I thought that he had a duty to consider these problems and to arrive at the conclusion that he believed was best to handle these ills.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why pick out one Secretary; why not all?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, that is the point.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think that the taxpayers of the United States ought to pay the Secretary to run around and do it rather than have him pay his own way, just like you and I would have to?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. I want to say this. I do not think the Federal Government should pay the expenses of anybody to run around and promote anything. On the other hand, I think whoever the Secretary of the Department is, if he cannot discuss the programs of his Department, past, present, and future, we are trying to dictate to the executive departments of the Government.

The thing you are trying to drive at in this amendment I think has more dangers than the thing you are trying to cure. If Mr. Brannan goes down into my district and talks to the farmers there, with all due deference to him, and I think he is a high-class gentleman, I think the more he talks about the Brannan plan the fewer people there will be for it. I am willing to let the plan stand on its own merits. I think the plan would defeat itself. But I do say that the head of any department certainly should have the right to have and discuss his own views, and to express them wherever he wants to.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FURCOLO. It is not so much a question of consideration for the Secretary or what he wants, it is a question of consideration for the American people. They have a right to information from the top servants of the Government.

Mr. WHITTEN. I was speaking of the Secretary as a position rather than the individual who now occupies that position. The American people are entitled to a full discussion on the part of its top employees as to what their programs are.

The thing that is supposed to have happened in this instance, as the facts have been related to me, is this. The administrative people in the PMA committees were called in to a State committee, which happens each and every year in each and every State. On this occasion the Secretary of Agriculture was asked there to talk. I do not think that is anything unusual. The unusual thing, and it is unfortunate in this case, is that the State head of that committee wrote all these fellows and said that if they attended this meeting the Secretary would be there, and they would be paid for it. They would have been paid for this meeting if he had not gone there. They would have been paid if the letter had not been written.

I am advised they are having a meeting in the State of Vermont next month, and Senator AIKEN is invited up there. Those fellows will be paid their expenses, because their primary purpose in being there will be to attend to the business of the PMA, and to take occasion there to hear these departmental representatives is not out of order.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Will the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York prevent a county agricultural agent from attending a 4-H Club meeting?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this chapter and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 16 minutes with the last 4 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LECOMPTE: On page 172, line 25, strike out "$4,100,000: *Provided*" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$4,200,000: *Provided*, That $100,000 shall be available for European corn borer research: *Provided further.*"

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour all I want to say is that this is the same amendment which I offered a while ago as an amendment to an amendment. We are spending fabulous sums all over the world. The infestations of the corn borer are a very serious threat to the food supply of the country and of the world. We are spending over $100,000,000 to stop the spread of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and I heartily approve of this for our livestock industry is worth billions, and we are sending a great deal of money abroad. This calls for only $100,000—not $100,000,000, but $100,000. There is a conservation angle in this also. At this late hour I do not desire to take the time of the House, but let me say this is very important, and it is later than you think. We can well afford to spend $100,000 to stop the spread of the corn borer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LECOMPTE) there were—ayes 31, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHRISTOPHER: On page 190, line 24, strike out "$285,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that this is language that is not authorized by law.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I am informed by rather reliable sources that the authorization is for a $500,000,000 program.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair would invite attention to the fact that this is for the future. Unless there is some limitation of law to which the attention of the Chair has not been called, this amendment is in order.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be given to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER]. I am supporting his position, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may follow his in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will require 6 minutes.

It was 1948 before the appropriation for soil conservation sunk to as low a figure as $285,000,000. In 1940 the appropriation was for $532,538,497. We need soil conservation in the United States, and this is the one program in the United States that is getting terraces built, getting lime spread, getting sweetclover plowed under. Drive across the country and look. The plow has followed the ax up the mountainside just as far as it can reach. I heard a man in Arkansas say that a fellow fell out of his potato patch three times in 1 day. The last time he fell he landed in Missouri. There are some places in the mountains out in the West, which I drive through on the way home, where men have little corn patches up on the mountainside where these men are in danger of falling out of the cornfield. How they take anything up there more than a hoe is more than I can understand.

We have got enough money to take care of Europe and Asia, but we do not have any money to conserve the soil of the United States. I would like to do something for somebody at home. I know what we need, whether we can get it or not. I have only asked that the appropriation be set up to $400,000,000. It ought to be $500,000,000. If we have got billions for Europe, we can undoubtedly save our own land, because agriculture is the foundation under our house.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman whether or not, in the past, we provided twice as much for soil conservation as the gentleman is asking today.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. We provided a much greater appropriation than we do now, as the following will show. I have the figures all the way from 1948 clear back to 1939. In 1939 it was $500,000,000; in 1940 it was $532,500,000; and I gave the figures a while ago for the other years. For the year 1948 it got down to $228,000,000, and in 1949, $159,000,000, and for 1950 it came back up to $257,000,000.

I ask you to vote for my amendment and let us put soil conservation back up to $68.25 per farm. That payment of $68.25 per farm reminds me of the old farmer who had a wife and 11 children; he bought six bananas, peeled them, cut them in the middle, gave each one half a banana and said "Now, eat until you bust." The present program is like that; that is a case in point.

Here is a chance to see whether the Members want to practice soil conservation with their lips or whether they believe in it with their hearts.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I take it the gentleman's experience as a farmer and observation of soil conservation shows him that it is much cheaper for the taxpayers to maintain the farm than it is to dig it out of the river, does it not?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is true.

My son came back from 4 years in the southwest Pacific. He said: "Dad, let's take care of this soil." He said: "I saw women carrying mud in buckets on their heads up mountainsides to pour into rice paddies in order that they might raise enough rice to live."

I hope we do not come to that in this country but unless we all bend every effort to save the soil we still have we will soon find that with our population going up a million per year and our soil resources going down we will leave to our children and grandchildren a land that will not feed and clothe the population.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], has informed the House of the need for $400,000,000 for soil conservation and I wish to concur in what he has said.

This Nation must conserve its soil. All informed people know that. The future of this country rests upon our ability to maintain and conserve our natural resources. I doubt if the history of man can show another instance of the waste of natural resources that has taken place in this country in the past 100 years. Land has been denuded of its forests. Mineral resources have been dissipated. Our fields have become gullied. The results of wind erosion in the Dust Bowl will never be forgotten by us. This must stop. It is of benefit to all the people of this great Nation that remedial steps be taken now.

We talk of crop surpluses. Is not that the time when we should retire some of our soil from the strain of unwise production and by carrying out good soil-conservation practices restore it to a state of greater fertility? Every dollar spent in building up our soil adds to the future national income.

This program is one of cooperative effort. Every farmer who complies with the program pays out his own money and contributes the labor necessary to put sound conservation practices into effect. In return his Government repays him a portion of the cost incurred by him. That is the democratic way of doing what is required. No farmer is forced to engage in this program. If he does, he is reimbursed for a portion of the costs. What are the alternatives? We cannot continue to ruin our soil. All intelligent people agree with that. If the farmer does not voluntarily participate in this worthwhile effort, might it not then be possible that the people of this country will demand the putting into effect of mandatory controls over the care a farmer has for his fields? That certainly would be statism in a disliked form. Nations of Europe would not condone farmers ruining their fields as we do. Farmers would not be allowed to farm that way. Some would end up in the salt mines of Siberia. Some nations show a contempt for democracies saying that we cannot put into effect things necessary for the public welfare. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], who preceded me, gave us the answers. We are doing it in a cooperative way and we are doing it successfully. Farmer community and county committeemen are elected by their neighbors. Then, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, they, the committeemen, talk soil conservation with their neighbors. They put into effect the necessary practices. They decide what needs to be done on the farm and proceed to do it. They see that the practices agreed on are carried out before payments are made by the Government. Is there anything more democratic than that?

The place to stop erosion and waste of fertile land is on the fields. We have through AAA and now PMA made remarkable strides in spite of a war which placed a terrific strain on our farms. We are succeeding; the records prove that. These records are available to every Congressman. Those of you who can, should visit the countuy PMA offices. You ought to spend some time with a few committeemen and have them take you out and show you the work that is being done. They are proud of it and I am proud of them and what they have done. The farmer committeemen are outstanding men in their communities. They are doing a good job, and they will do a better one if we give them the funds to work with. The solution of the problem rests with us. They have proven their ability.

We can do no less than to assure them the necessary funds to do their work.

Remember we spend millions for silt control. Let us put into effect soil conservation practices that will cut down the necessity for spending so much for this purpose. I repeat PMA farmer committeemen have the know-how and the proven ability to accomplish the task.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no better friend of agriculture in the Congress than the gentleman from Missouri who has just addressed you. In my own period of service in the Congress I expect I have spent greater time and effort trying to provide and take care of the soil-conservation program than on anything else. I remember several years ago when this program was cut to $150,000,000. Then it was that those of us who had been trying to carry the fight for the soil-conservation program concluded that it was best to have a consistent program rather than an up-one-year-and-down-another sort of program if you were going to reap the most benefits. And in that connection the gentleman from Minnesota, myself, and others on this subcommittee decided that we would stand shoulder to shoulder for $285,000,000, believing that by so doing we would have a better program of soil conservation than to have it up one year and down another. I call the attention of the membership to that, for I believe it is a sound principle.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has stated the facts. We are working for a consistent and sustained soil-conservation program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I wish to verify everything our chairman has said regarding the fight for soil conservation in the committee.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. But does not the gentleman agree that under the control program, with thirty or forty million acres of land being taken out of production next year and the years to follow, that this makes more necessary a greater expenditure for soil conservation than we made in the last 2 years?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is probably true. In this connection we have outlined the committee's conservation program recognizing that such a thing would probably occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHRISTOPHER) there were—ayes 35, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNAHAN: On page 194, line 4, strike out "$83,500,000" and insert "$85,000,000."

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the school-lunch program and will raise the appropriation from $83,500,000 to $85,000,000. I offer it in an attempt to be of some help to the schools in their effort to provide adequate lunches for our school children.

The appropriation carried in this bill is the same as was appropriated last year; however, each year there are many new schools entering the program and, of course, the contribution per child then must necessarily go down each year from what it was the year before.

I regret that I do not have more time to argue the amendment but I do wish to invite your attention to this very worthy program. It should be extended and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. Chairman, it is mighty hard to talk against an increased school-lunch program. The only basis on which you can do so is the present financial condition of the Federal Treasury. We do have in addition to the $83,500,000 appearing in this bill approximately $30,000,000 of commodities made available under section 32 purchases from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The sky is the limit as to what many people would like to do for this program and we have to fit the pattern to the cloth. For this reason I believe it is better for us to stand by the figures that we have in this bill. Increases have been badly needed for many years but I believe that the States and local municipalities are in just as sound financial condition to take care of these increases as is the Federal Government which has a debt of $257,000,000,000 at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CARNAHAN) there were—ayes 37, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to this chapter of the pending bill? [After a pause.] If not, general debate is now in order to chapter VII.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, in a short time, certain momentous events of vital interest to all Americans will take place. I refer to the impending statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. The manifest destiny, which pushed our borders logically westward to the Pacific, has now moved us closer to Asia. To the Americans who have pioneered in Alaska and Hawaii, and to the peoples of those Territories, we are about to offer full and equal citizenship, with all the duties and responsibilities as well as privileges of our present 48 States.

The House has already acted to include Alaska and Hawaii in the roster of American States and expected action by the Senate will bring the total of States to 50.

One of the problems occasioned by the inclusion of these two fine Territories as States deals with our flag. Our flag, which is a symbol of democracy and peace to peoples most everywhere, must undergo a change when Alaska and Hawaii become States.

In fact, I should like to point out that our flag has undergone a change every time a new State has joined the Union. We who are of the present generation think of the flag as a permanent display of 48 white stars on a blue union with 13 alternate red and white stripes. Yes, this was the flag hoisted so proudly over that barren hill at Iwo Jima. This was the flag carried by our brave troops in World War I.

But the flag viewed by Francis Scott Key at Fort McHenry, when he wrote his immortal words, "gave proof through the night that our flag was still there," had 15 stars and 15 stripes. The flag at George Washington's inauguration in New York in the spring of 1789 had 13 stars and stripes. The standard carried by Union troops into Richmond during the Civil War had 36 stars. And the flag we carried in the Spanish-American War of 1898 had 45 stars.

Today, when we give thought to the impending statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, we must also give thought to our flag. We are the only major nation whose flag changes every time an integral addition is made to its total authority. We are one of the few nations on this earth which does not have an official custodian of the flag.

Nowhere in our Constitution or in our body of statutory law is detailed provision made for changing our flag—as we have had to do so many times in our history. All we have to go by is the vague law of April 4, 1818, which said merely that when a new State comes into the Union, an additional star must be added to the flag the following Fourth of July.

Nowhere is provision made for determining who should alter the flag or how it should be done. The result has been a chaotic state of affairs. Shortly before the Civil War, an observer in New York harbor counted various totals of

stars on the harbor and ship flags. In addition, he noted 9 different arrangements of the stars.

The present arrangement of the stars we owe to an executive order by President William Howard Taft in 1912, when Arizona and New Mexico joined the Union. If we accept this as a precedent we can expect another executive order by the President when Alaska and Hawaii enter the Union.

However, I do not believe that this is the most satisfactory method to solve the problem of our ever-changing flag. I believe the time has come for Congress to determine once and for all who should alter the flag and how it should be done. This is clearly a job for Congress and not for the President.

For this reason, I have introduced today a resolution which would establish a five-man committee to inquire into the entire problem of our flag. This committee will hold hearings to which all interested Americans will be invited to state their views on the coming flag. We will also want the advice of heraldists, both professional and amateurs, who have made flags their vocation and avocation. And at the conclusion of such hearings and investigations, the committee would make its recommendations to the House.

It is with deep nostalgia that most Americans will say farewell to the flag of 48 stars. For this has been the flag which they have known through wars, depressions, peace and prosperity. Let us pray that our next flag will fly over a world at peace; a world with a high standard of living; a world with an understanding and a compassion of man for man.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARRIS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, to say that I was sorely disappointed by the action of the President in vetoing H. R. 1758, as amended by the Kerr amendment to the Natural Gas Act, is putting it very mildly indeed.

The consumers of this country who are pleading and begging for natural gas in their homes have been sold down the river.

The consumers of this country who have been hoping they could have natural gas as a fuel in their homes have by the most malicious and willful propaganda had the wool pulled over their eyes.

It is a strange and sad commentary that certain interests, including some business interests, selfish interests, would join in vilification and baseless untruth at the expense of the consumer and the destruction of a basic and fundamental principle known only in America.

In my opinion time will reveal that the action of the President on this fundamental issue was a grave mistake.

Through the most willful and vile propaganda campaign, the people of this country who are so anxious for this fuel believe they will not get more gas at less cost.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, will in due time be brought to a stark realization that these interests have, through such false propaganda, in fact, preyed on them as a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Truth will be brought to light and when the consumers find that they will get less and less gas for fuel in their homes at higher cost, there will assuredly be some very red faces.

I wonder if there are those so naive as not to remember what happened in the OPA days of 1946. Ah, Mr. Speaker, how we remember those who came to the well of this House, who issued statements and how the press throughout the country, yea, the column writers, changed their attitude overnight publicly proclaiming that such unwarranted controls be abandoned. I remind my party, Mr. Speaker, what happened in that cold November.

Let me remind you that in the Eightieth Congress, when the so-called Rizley bill was before the Congress, no such baseless and false propaganda campaign was undertaken and that bill, as every Member here knows, would have gone so far as to destroy certain provisions of the Natural Gas Act and the intention of the Congress when that act was passed.

The veto message mentioned monopoly because of the relatively few companies owning the gas reserves.

Obviously, the President is grossly misinformed when there are thousands of people throughout this Nation, who have explored, discovered, and own the reserves, even those with the Leland Olds' philosophy admit that a large percentage of the gas reserves is owned by more than 70 companies.

Yet, the big natural-gas companies where the monopoly really prevails are limited to a very, very few. In this challege to a great industry in this country, I charge, Mr. Speaker, that some of these selfish interests gigantic interstate natural-gas companies entered into a conspiracy in helping to bring about this unfortunate action.

Even one company appeared before the committee in opposition and another of the great gigantic utilities lurched in the dark and used its cryptic and deceitful means in preventing the consumers to have the truth as well as to have more gas at less cost for the fuel necessary to the homes of this country.

No, when the far-reaching Rizley bill was before the Congress, neither did you hear from these five gigantic importing companies who have increased their imports in this country during this time by more than 300 percent.

Oh, how the hearts of some have bled for the consumer but yet by this action and the continued increase of imports being made necessary the consumer pays two and one-half times as much for the fuel as being forced to continue its use without the competitive fuel that the gas would bring in the normal and established way in this country.

Likewise did the great coal industry use its influence to defeat the efforts to clarify the issue, but to their credit, Mr. Speaker, they are consistent, they took the same position with the Rizley bill in the last Congress.

But they have based their position this time, giving complement to all of this publicity in the interest of the consumer. Everyone knows the cost of coal to the consumer has gone up 276 percent. The cost of gas has gradually gone down in the same 10 year average 1938–48 by 12 percent. Interested in the consumer?

I ask you, who have had such great fears and concern for the consumer. I ask you, right here in this House to go and compare the monthly bill of your consumer on what he pays for coal to heat his home and what he pays for this imported fuel oil to heat his home as against what he pays for gas when he can get it to heat his home.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is not the end of this important issue. These interests know that by far and large that those who discover and make available to this country natural gas are not going to be arrayed by a Federal regulatory agency. They cannot afford it.

These interests know if they can suppress the activity that they will make available more and more gas to the people of the country they can prevent the real competitive spirit to prevail in the field, that this product will not be made available in increased quantities and that they can continue their monopolistic strangle hold over higher and higher cost of fuel.

Such groups, Mr. Speaker, teaming up with other elements in this country, who would destroy our system of enterprise, those who would nationalize and federalize the oil and gas and other industries of this Nation, makes this a most serious problem.

There are two fundamental issues involved here, and I wish our beloved President would take note. In the first place there is the fundamental issue of Federal control and regulation of the oil and gas industry, leading to nationalization and a desperate attempt by some for the Federal Government to control and own the mineral resources of this country.

Would not those who would be so naive to follow this course know that the next step would be to take over completely the coal industry, nationalizing it too?

In the next place, we have the issue of the Congress legislating and determining policies of this country instead of it being done by bureaucratic and executive fiat.

The Congress said in 1938 the activities of the independent producers and gatherers of natural gas should be exempted from the control and regulation of the Natural Gas Act. The Congress

said specifically in that act and the committee report said that when these sales are at arm's length to the interstate natural-gas company they are competitive and are exempted.

The Congress said the act also provided for the regulation and control of interstate natural-gas utilities who transport gas interstate for resale at wholesale prices.

The FPC for 12 years recognized and heeded that directive and policy of your Congress.

The FPC even by affirmative action enunciated this directive of Congress by its order 139 in August 1947.

The Supreme Court in the Interstate case in June of 1947 merely overstepped through a technical provision the intent of Congress and only by implication places a different interpretation on what the Congress said when the act was passed.

The FPC, further carrying out what it knew to be the intent of Congress, recognized some confusion because of the implication of the Supreme Court and presented its own bill, the Priest bill, H. R. 4099, in the last Congress and urged its adoption.

It was the program of the President as the record clearly shows.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what brought about a change in the attitude of the President?

Yet, in the early part of 1949, a different philosophy was announced by the FPC. The same members who had urged this action only a few months before announced that if the Congress did not do it by affirmative action, it would as a Federal agency move in and exert its authority over this field which the Congress had so clearly said was exempted.

The Congress, I say, in the interest of the people and in the preservation of our constitutional Government should legislate these policies.

I do not know what the final outcome of this fundamental question will be. There are several steps that can be pursued.

The FPC could very well and should continue to administer this act as the Congress intended.

In view of the history this is not, in my opinion, too hopeful.

The Supreme Court of the United States may very well have to pass on this particular issue.

Both the Commission and the Supreme Court have indicated the Congress should clarify this problem and restate its intention.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has done just exactly that. If the expression of Congress means anything to the Commission and the Executive, it should be followed. If the expression of Congress is considered by the Supreme Court, that great judicial body will, when the issue is clearly presented to it, say that this is the law of the land as provided by the Congress of the United States and will continue to be until changed by the Congress.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this issue is far from being settled and again when the consumers realize the facts, you are going to see a different attitude in many places.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in protest against the order of the Postmaster General which will curtail delivery and other essential postal services to take effect on July 1, 1950.

If this order becomes effective on a Nation-wide scale it will completely demoralize the whole postal service and cause the American people in general much concern. I am, however, especially interested in the postal service as it affects the State of Montana because there we have one of the most efficient postal organizations in the country, and because of the distances to be covered and the hazards to be met one of the most difficult, there is a very high esprit de corps on the part of the postal employees in my State which, at the present time, has suffered a severe shock because of the order issued by the Postmaster General.

As a matter of fact in the city of Butte, Mont., one delivery postal service was inaugurated on April 25, which is indeed jumping the deadline, many weeks ahead of the time when the supposed cut was suppose to go into effect. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks a telegram I have just received from my friend, Dan McGonigle, president, Branch 621, NALC, of Butte, Mont.:

BUTTE, MONT., *April 26, 1950.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

One delivery postal service inaugurated today despite vigorous protest. Letter carriers instructed to eat lunch on curb or impose on hospitality of some patron. Climate precludes former as you well know. The latter alternative is objectionable. Pretty picture—lunch pail on one shoulder, mail satchel on the other. Understand Postmaster General Donaldson scheduled again before Senate Post Office Committee Thursday, April 27. Respectfully request your attendance that meeting and interrogation of Donaldson regarding uncivilized treatment of Butte letter carriers. Respectfully request also you demand in writing from Donaldson instructions Nation-wide that letter carriers will be afforded humane consideration and their dignity as a human being will be respected.

DAN MCGONIGLE,
President, Branch 621, NALC.

We have always looked upon our postal service with pride. It has rendered excellent service throughout the years and it is the one governmental agency which has served all the people in such a way that they have come to rely upon it in their everyday lives. If the Postmaster General's order is not rescinded, it will reduce the efficiency of the postal service considerably; delivery of mail will be restricted; business will suffer; magazines and newspapers upon which our people rely and look forward to receiving, would be delayed. Parcel post deliveries would also be cut and most important of all, many men would be forced out of work and their families forced into a difficult economic position. In my opinion, there is no justification for this destruction of the fine postal system we have. Instead of threatening the livelihoods of our postal employees and their families they are entitled to security. The proposed action of the Postmaster General is indeed a sorry way to show our regard and esteem for the fine and loyal group of men and women who man our post offices and who do so much for the welfare of America.

I am calling upon the Postmaster General to rescind his action ordering a reduction in force and in doing so I am appealing to my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me in opposing this reduction in the interest of of service in Government and security to the postal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a number of communications I have received about this very important matter and which I want to call to the attention of the House so that all the Members will realize the seriousness of this situation. Most of these communications are from personal friends of mine—people whom I respect highly and whose judgment I value:

ELECTRIC & MUSIC MART,
Butte, Mont., April 20, 1950.

DEAR MIKE: Here is one businessman that does not think that the postal service should be cut to one delivery a day. Lord knows the service is lousy enough and cut it to one a day and it can be nothing else but worse. There is plenty places to cut Government spending, which you well know, but it would not be in the postal service, which is the one service that most business organizations in America make a living. Let's improve the postal service not clip it. Best regards.

ED REEDER.

BUTTE, MONT., *April 20, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD:

Kindly do all in your power to keep the United States mail service at the level it was intended to be on.

Respectfully,

INA J. MCGEE.

BUTTE, MONT., *April 23, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: Yesterday, I read in the paper that 9 employees will be laid off in the local post office because of the proposed curtailment. Also, I read where a survey was conducted to find new homes for the men being brought here to work in the mines. From the survey all available space is occupied. Does this fact warrant a cut in postal service?

I asked a few carriers what the cut would mean to them. I found that first, the routes will be one-half again as long as the existing ones. Because of the many new homes the routes are already quite long. It will mean secondly, that nine war veterans will be laid off. The men remaining on the job will have to report 45 minutes earlier in the mornings, and possibly eat their lunch at the curb when it's raining or below zero weather. Does that sound like a forward step?

What will it mean to the public? All mail that comes to Butte on the Short Line and Northern Pacific No. 1, which is now delivered in the afternoon, will lay over about 20 hours before delivery. Even mail on the Northern Pacific train 3, which usually comes in on time to be delivered in the forenoon and always in the afternoon, will lay over until the next day.

To me all this seems to be a step backward. It is wrong to lay off these men who a few short years ago were promised so much. To the old-timers in the Department who served short-handed during the

war, and made an all-out effort since, to keep pace with postwar expansion, it's a very shabby reward to increase the distance they must cover each day.

Your record for fairness, justice, and equitable treatment for all justifies the confidence that I have in you to do something to stop this action which I feel is false economy.

I feel that the Government should not use further speed-up methods on the postal employees and should treat veterans, above all, with fairness and justice.

Sincerely yours,

M. J. KEANE.

BUTTE, MONT., *April 21, 1950.*

Subject: Curtailment of postal service.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE MANSFIELD: I wish to register a strong protest against the Postmaster General's recent order. If we must economize, this it not the way to do it. Is the American way of life to include only one delivery of mail a day from 1950 on?

Hoping you can help us.

DANIEL R. BERSONTI.

BUTTE, *April 20, 1950.*

SIR: This refers to the slash in postal service which has been ordered by Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson.

Inasmuch as I am a postal employee myself, I am very much interested in the outcome of this situation.

If this curtailment is put into effect, it will cause considerable hardship among those employees who will be discharged, most of whom are veterans.

I take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your previous consideration shown postal employees, and also for whatever you may be able to do in the way of having the Postmaster General rescind his order on this postal-service cut.

Sincerely yours,

VERNON E. MAKI.

BUTTE, MONT., *April 21, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representaives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I am writing this letter to you to ask your aid in opposing the recent measure taken by Postmaster General Donaldson in cutting postal service throughout this country.

This action, against one of the most efficient arms of the Government, to cut their service at a time when the volume of mail is the greatest in history is not only a terrible blow to the postal worker, but also a great disservice to the American people as well.

I am a disabled veteran and a postal worker, and all the men in this office who will be laid off, due to this crippling measure, are veterans or disabled veterans. We don't ask for charity. All we want is our work, and the work is there. Why then this cut-back? You can readily see our bewilderment. Men who fought all over this world, and came home and worked hard to make a place for themselves and their families are thrown out on the streets without even an explanation. And this at a time when the mail load is unprecedented and steadily increasing.

Our only hope lies with our friends in Congress to combat this measure. We know that you have always been a friend of the postal worker, and the veteran. That you have voted in our behalf on previous occasions. We appeal to you now to take a stand against this measure, not only for us but for all the American people who deserve a prompt and efficient mail service.

Thanking you as a true friend.

Yours truly,

THOMAS M. SHEEHAN.

BUTTE, MONT., *April 28, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representaitves,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the favors that you have shown me personally and my fellow postal workers in the past.

It seems we again have a problem—the proposed cut-back in postal service—and again we come to you to aid us in its solution.

The postal department has a proud history in pioneering new methods to expedite the delivery of mail. Its record of efficiency has never been challenged and its personnels' record for honesty, integrity, and high devotion to duty is one that is hard to match.

Do the people of America wish to exchange the efficiency and dependability of the Department at this time for a very nebulous saving? Do they want to go back 100 years in the handling of mail? Do they want to lay off faithful postal workers most of whom are veterans? I do not think so. Judging from my contacts with them I think they want the best service possible. They feel rightly, I think, that their postal service should be the very best.

A policy of saving a few pennies which will make people spend dollars for telephone and telegraph service is one of the best illustrations of the axiom—being pennies wise and pounds foolish.

In view of the record-breaking volume of mail handled in the past 12 months a cutback seems ill advised. Expansion seems more in order.

I know that you will do your level best, as you always have, to solve this problem and I wish to thank you again for past favors.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD O'NEILL.

BUTTE, MONT.

DEAR MIKE: Cutting of the postal service is causing a great deal of comment. Why can't they cut other departments or raise the rates?

JOHN PASKO.

BUTTE, MONT.

DEAR SIR: Would like very much if possible for you to do all you can in regard to the postal cut.

As ever,

JAMES FERRERO.

BUTTE, MONT., *April 23, 1950.*

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a taxpayer and citizen it is my privilege to send you this letter in protest to the curtailment of postal service. Not only does this measure put a hardship on the general public but also lays off many workers—mainly veterans of World War II.

Anything you can do to help correct this situation would be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

GLADYS ROWE.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,
April 26, 1950.

Congressman MICHAEL MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Branch No. 650, National Association of Letter Carriers, protests order curtailing service and resultant unemployment of members. Urge you to use your influence toward easement of this order. Service, morale at all-time low here.

Respectfully,

DAN F. HENDERSON,
Correspondence Secretary.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,
April 22, 1950.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Organized labor of Cascade County strongly opposes any curtailment of post office service. We ask General Donaldson's order be rescinded.

JOHN EVANKO, Jr.,
Secretary Cascade County Trade and Labor Assembly.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain telegrams and letters.)

THIRTIETH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 576)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the thirtieth report to Congress on lend-lease operations, for the period ending December 31, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 27, 1950.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the chapter under discussion this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. TAURIELLO (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. CHESNEY (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HARRIS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address on the subject of rivers and harbors.

Mr. BROOKS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. LANE) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Where the Menace to Freedom Lies."

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. VAN ZANDT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rubber footwear imports.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an item on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mrs. ST. GEORGE) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include the third article by Mr. Frank Waldrop on the subject: Growth of Communism in Our Country.

Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee today and include tabulations.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2895. An act to authorize the sale of select base material, at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads;

H. R. 4080. An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the Disciplinary Laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice; and

H. R. 4393. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1861. An act for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi);

H. R. 2895. An act to authorize the sale of select base material, at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads;

H. R. 4080. An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice;

H. R. 4393. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Nakahara Huntley; and

H. R. 5580. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 28, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1410. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950, involving an increase of $700,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 573); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1411. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of R. W. Harris, authorized certifying officer, Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1412. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for financing the operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1413. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1414. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the request of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for authority to undertake certain projects for the development of class IV and larger airports which, in his opinion, should be undertaken during the fiscal year 1951, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Airport Act (Public Law 377, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1415. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1416. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the financial statements and operations of the banks and corporations supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, except those exempted by law, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 574); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1417. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $50,000,000 and additional contract authorizations in the amount of $300,000,000 for the Department of Defense, in the form of amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1951 (H. Doc. No. 575); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 8083. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (59 Stat. 526, 666; 61 Stat. 130), to vest in the Export-Import Bank of Washington the power to guarantee United States investments abroad; with amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE:

H. R. 8263. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8264. A bill to provide for the modification of certain recommendations relating to flood control on the Red River of the North and its tributaries, to include the construction of additional flood-control improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8265. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Buffalo River, Minn., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8266. A bill to provide for the construction of a flood-control and hydroelectric dam on the Red Lake River, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 8267. A bill to amend chapter VI of the omnibus appropriation bill with reference to removal of surplus agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8268. A bill to repeal section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 and to provide that no person shall have lost his nationality thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 8269. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 8270. A bill relating to the renewal of contracts for the carrying of mail on star routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8271. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 8272. A bill to authorize construction in Baltimore or vicinity of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8273. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the finality of determinations relating to the assessment of duties or charges on certain imported merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 8274. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 8275. A bill to increase the area of the Cumberland National Forest by the acquisition of lands in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 8276. A bill to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes· to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 8277. A bill to provide for the designation and appointment of general officers of the United States Air Force in grades above that of major general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8278. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8279. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 8280. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution to designate Tax Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. Res. 558. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to investigate the seizure of five fishing vessels of the United States by the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. Res. 559. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to investigate the seizure of five fishing vessels of the United States by the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. Res. 560. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to investigate the seizure of five fishing vessels of the United States by the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. Res. 561. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to investigate the seizure of five fishing vessels of the United States by the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. Res. 562. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study to determine an appropriate design for the flag of the United States should the Territory of Alaska or the Territory of Hawaii, or both, be admitted to the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 563. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 562; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to holding a plebiscite in Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 8281. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eng Yoke Mee Wong, Chee-on Wong, Chee-leong Wong, Qew-yuen Wong, and Mee-yuen Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 8282. A bill to provide for the renewal of patent No. 1,596,994, issued August 14, 1926, relating to shoe button-snaps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 8283. A bill for the relief of R. F. Moss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8284. A bill for the relief of Nicolae G. Caranfil and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 8285. A bill for the relief of Taeko Inoue Bouchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 8286. A bill for the relief of Raymond B. Jeffrey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 8287. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate No. 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 8288. A bill for the relief of Wong Toy Won, Woo Shack Quon, Woo Shack Yee, Woo Shack Wai, and Woo Shack Chai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 8289. A bill for the relief of Yee Balche Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 8290. A bill for the relief of Jeffrey Bracken Spruill and Susan Spruill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2095. Mr. MILLER of Maryland presented a resolution of the Federalsburg Chamber of Commerce, Federalsburg, Md., in opposition to legislation providing for compulsory health insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

For the beauty of the earth, robed in the blooming garb of spring; for the tint of the tiniest flower, we raise our morning hymn of praise.

In our deep concern for the Nation and for mankind everywhere and in our grim resolve at any cost to balk the forces of darkness which threaten our heritage of freedom, we ask that our strength may be as the strength of 10 because our hearts are pure. Give us the insight, the faith, the courage, in these days of destiny, to escape the futile repetition of old error and the restoration of ancient evils. Let not ignorant nor mean partisanship, nor selfish greed block the way to a new order with hope of lasting peace, enlarging brotherhood and universal justice, a world with all things made new in which the young lives offered on the altar of freedom and of righteousness shall not have died in vain. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 27, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday and Tuesday of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS, because of official business, was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Monday, May 1, 1950.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPARKMAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during next week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Darby	Kefauver	Sparkman
Donnell	Kerr	Stennis
Douglas	Kilgore	Taft
Eastland	Knowland	Taylor
Ecton	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	Magnuson	Williams
Hayden	Malone	Young

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in the family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. Does the Senator from Texas seek recognition?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. I was going to suggest that the Senator from Utah has a conference report to present, which he assures me will take only a very short time. I am agreeable to his bringing it up at this point.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the Senator from Texas would ask for unanimous consent to permit Senators to present routine business for the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will take the liberty of suggesting that, without objection and without speeches or debate, the Chair will recognize Senators who wish to present matters for the RECORD or introduce bills or resolutions. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930 RELATING TO EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF CERTAIN SOUND RECORDINGS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCING OF OPERATIONS OF BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for financing the operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

DEVELOPMENT OF CLASS IV AND LARGER AIRPORTS, 1951

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the request of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for authority to undertake certain projects for the development of class IV and larger airports which should be undertaken during the fiscal year 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

R. W. HARRIS

A letter from the Administrator of General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of R. W. Harris, authorized certifying officer, Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF CORPORATIONS OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of corporations of the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

A letter from the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington, D. C., reporting, for the information of the Senate, that the bank had given financial assistance to India for the third time, in making a loan of $18,500,000 to that country on April 18, for the Bokaro-Konar project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to restore the recent appropriation taken away from the United States Post Office so that postal service will not be curtailed and the general welfare and commercial progress of the Nation impaired

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States recently voted a reduction in the appropriation for the United States Postal Service; and

"Whereas the reduction will necessitate a drastic curtailment in the postal service heretofore rendered to the American people, and the dismissal of many postal-service employees who have rendered long and faithful service; and

"Whereas it is clearly evident that the reduction in the appropriation will impair the efficiency of the postal service because of a shortage of qualified personnel; and

"Whereas it is deemed a matter of common knowledge that there are many departments and agencies of the Federal Government where economy measures could be effected without such injury to the American people as will be felt by the forced curtailment of postal service brought about by the reduced appropriation; and

"Whereas it is deemed appropriate and wise to memorialize Congress to reconsider its action in order to prevent injury to the American people and to American business interests because of the curtailment in postal service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, That the Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is memorialized and respectfully requested to rescind its recent action in reducing the appropriation for the United States Postal Service in the interest of the general welfare of the American people and their business enterprises, and that the appropriation be restored so that the vital and efficient service of the United States postal service may continue to be available to the Nation."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House resolution to memorialize the Government of the United States to lend financial assistance to the peach growers of the State of South Carolina on account of their serious financial condition due to heavy losses from frost to the peach crop for the past 3 years

"Whereas the peach growers of the State of South Carolina have suffered severe losses to the fruit crop for the past 3 years due to the unseasonable cold weather with accompanying frost; and

"Whereas many farmers of the State have come to depend almost entirely on the peach crop for a livelihood; and

"Whereas from the losses sustained many farmers are now in serious straits and are greatly in need of financial assistance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Government of the United States be memorialized to extend all possible financial assistance allowed by law to the peach growers of the State of South Carolina, in order to tide over this most important industry which is facing a financial crisis; and that the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in Washington."

A resolution adopted by the Missouri State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for a world government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Honolulu (T. H.) Post, No. 1540, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, relating to the inclusion in the proposed constitution for the new State of Hawaii a provision outlawing the Communist Party; to the Committtee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the International Executive Board, of the United Automobile Workers of America, A. F. of L., of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to charges of communism in legislative bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Johnstown Catholic Sorority, of Johnstown, and the Insurance Agents and Brokers Association, of Philadelphia, both in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

VETO OF NATURAL GAS BILL—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of St. Paul, Minn., on April 19, 1950, expressing to the President sincere thanks for his veto of the natural gas bill.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States, in the interest of all the people, has vetoed the so-called Kerr-Thomas bill, relating to the regulation by the Federal Power Commission of independent producers of natural gas; and

Whereas by such action the President has rendered conspicuous service to the city of

St. Paul and other communities similarly situated:

Resolved, That the City Council of the city of St. Paul, on behalf of the people of the city, hereby expresses to the President of the United States sincere thanks for a veto of this legislation;

Resolved, further, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and copies thereof be sent to Senators EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and to Representative EUGENE J. MCCARTHY.

Adopted by the council, April 19, 1950.

Approved, April 19, 1950.

FRED M. TRUAX,
Acting Mayor.

RESOLUTIONS OF DELEGATES OF MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by delegates at the twenty-fourth annual stockholders' meeting of Midland Cooperative Wholesale held in Minneapolis, Minn., on March 27, 28, and 29, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway and funds by REA for generation and transmission construction wherever cooperatives have entered into sales contracts or lease agreements with nonrural consumers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution No. 1—St. Lawrence waterway

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress a bill providing for action on the long-awaited St. Lawrence waterway project; and

"Whereas the general welfare of hundreds of communities in the upper Midwest will be improved by the completion of the project; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to the whole Nation that the economic prosperity and progress of this section of the country be stimulated and improved: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the delegates here assembled at the twenty-fourth annual meeting of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, representing 240,000 families residing in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and northern Iowa, That the Congress of the United States be urged to take favorable action on pending legislation immediately; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Members of the Congress from the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa."

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution No. 4—REA generating loans

"Whereas there is pending before Congress a bill called the Thomas-Tackett bill, which would halt the advance of funds by REA for generation and transmission construction wherever cooperatives have entered into sales contracts or lease agreements with nonrural consumers; and

"Whereas the enactment of this bill would seriously cripple the operation of existing REA generating and transmission plants and would curtail and in many cases completely stop construction now going on; and

"Whereas this bill is part of the general campaign to harm and cripple cooperatives of all kinds: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we as delegates to this twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Midland Cooperative Wholesale, representing 600 local cooperatives with 240,000 members in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, do hereby register our protest against the Thomas-Tackett bill, and urge our members to send their protests to their Representatives in the Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives from the States of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin."

ISSUANCE OF FARM LOAN BONDS AS OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF FOND DU LAC, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution adopted by the city commissioners of Fond du Lac, Wis., urging the passage of Senate bill 2166, for the reimbursement of purchasers of joint stock land bank bonds issued under the authority of the Federal Farm Loan Act, for their loss in premises. Many folks in my State are affected by the default on these bonds, and I have accordingly received many similar expressions from individuals and groups in Wisconsin. This bill is now pending before the Senate Agriculture Committee where I am hoping that early action may be taken on it.

I appreciate, of course, the tremendous work load faced by the committee, but I do hope that it will find it possible to schedule action on this issue.

I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution as conveyed to me by G. J. Ondrasek, city clerk of Fond du Lac, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States:

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Fond du Lac, Wis.:

The city of Fond du Lac by its council does herewith petition your honorable bodies and respectfully submits that—

Whereas the Federal Farm Loan Act was passed in 1919 to obtain funds for a national agricultural program, and the act provided for the sale to the public of millions of dollars in farm-mortgage bonds to refinance farm mortgages; and

Whereas such farm-loan bonds sold to the investing public for the purpose of aiding the national agricultural program were expressly declared by Congress to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the Treasury printed the joint-stock-land-bank bonds and on the face of each bond were these words: "Farm-loan bonds issued under the provisions of this act shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States"; and

Whereas the investing public was thus led to believe that the Government would permit no loss on such bonds; and

Whereas the Firemen's Pension Fund Board of Trustees of the City of Fond du Lac invested funds in the bonds of Fond du Lac Joint Stock Land Bank in the justified and sincere belief that they were Government obligations and eligible for trust-fund investment; and

Whereas many thousands of investors in Fond du Lac and Wisconsin and other States bought these joint-stock-land-bank bonds from the Fond du Lac and other joint-stock land banks as instrumentalities of our Government; and

Whereas the Farm Loan Board as a Government agency controlled each issue of joint-stock-land-bank bonds and the liquidation of each joint-stock land bank and should be held responsible for the unpaid balances on such bonds; and

Whereas the Farm Credit Administration has succeeded the Farm Loan Board with all its powers; and in 1949 it transferred to the general fund of our Government $189,000,000 without making any allowance for payment of the unpaid balance on joint-stock-land-bank bonds; and

Whereas purchasers of joint-stock-land-bank bonds who have an unpaid balance thereon will have reason to lose faith in the integrity of the Government of the United States if said bonds are not paid in full: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Fond du Lac, That we most strongly urge upon your honorable bodies the propriety and justice of passing Senate bill No. 2166, Eighty-first Congress, or such other curative and remedial legislation as will provide for reimbursement to all purchasers of joint-stock-land-bank bonds issued under authority of the Federal Farm Loan Act for their loss in the premises; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk transmit a copy of this resolution to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to the Secretary of the United States Senate for the information and guidance of the Members of both Houses and to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to which said bill has been referred for hearing.

G. J. ONDRASEK,
City Clerk.

APRIL 25, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the City Council of Fond du Lac, Wis., identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 3459. A bill for the relief of Carmencita von Plettenberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1526).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3509. A bill for the relief of Hedvig Collin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3510. A bill to amend Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, relating to the rate of penalty on the farm marketing excess of corn and wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3511. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Preston Watters, the estate of Mrs. Jessie Nivens Watters, and the estate of J. W. Gillum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3512. A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense

Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3513. A bill for the relief of James Shellenberger, Jr.; and

S. 3514. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Sugimoto and minor child, Brenda Arlene Sugimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE IN BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. CAIN) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6567) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Harold K. Hill, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice William B. Crawley, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED REGULATION OF MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him congratulating the motion-picture industry on the suspension of hearings on the licensing bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DOUGLAS BY WALTER LOCKE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article paying tribute to Senator DOUGLAS, by Walter Locke, editor of the Dayton Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTRICITY AND THE VALLEY'S FUTURE—ADDRESS BY GORDON R. CLAPP

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Electricity and the Valley's Future," delivered by Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, at the fourth annual meeting of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Nashville, Tenn., on April 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT ON PROGRAM FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND RELATED WORK BY MAJ. GEN. LEWIS A. PICK

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report on the program for flood control and related work of the Federal Government, delivered by Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, at the annual meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on March 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE McCARTHY INVESTIGATION—ARTICLE BY DORIS FLEESON

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Battle for Soul of GOP in Making With Growing Influence of McCARTHY," by Doris Fleeson, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETO OF NATURAL-GAS BILL—EDITORIAL IN THE TRAINMAN NEWS

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thanks, Mr. President," from the Trainman News of April 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

GERMANY: TIME BOMB OF EUROPE—ARTICLE BY HENRY C. WOLFE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Germany: Time Bomb of Europe," by Henry W. Wolfe, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHITEWASH INCORPORATED?—EDITORIAL FROM INDIANAPOLIS (IND.) STAR

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Whitewash Incorporated?" published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of Thursday, April 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPIRITUAL ASPECTS OF OUR DEMOCRATIC FAITH—EASTER MESSAGE BY CHARLES COLLINGWOOD

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Easter message on the spiritual aspects of our democratic faith, by Charles Collingwood, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, on Sunday, April 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHARLES HAMILTON HOUSTON—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial eulogizing Charles H. Houston, published in the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVOCATION AT JACKSON-JEFFERSON DAY BANQUET

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the invocation delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor John R. Mulroy, at the Jackson-Jefferson Day banquet held in Denver, Colo., on April 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK DESIGNATING APRIL 29 AS LOYALTY DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD following these brief remarks the text of the proclamation issued by the Governor of the State of New York proclaiming tomorrow, April 29, as Loyalty Day in the State of New York.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For several decades the 1st day of May in each year has been preempted by subversive groups dedicated to the destruction of freedom. They have used this day for demonstrations and for the promulgation of propaganda contemptuous of American ideals, American aspirations, American institutions. So far as these groups are concerned, May Day has been virtually Disloyalty Day.

The New York Legislature has become justly and reasonably resentful of these persistent and insolent exhibitions of treason. A joint resolution of the assembly and senate endorses and supports the action of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the State of New York in setting aside April 29, 1950, as a day upon which the people of the State may show publicly that an overwhelming majority of them reject and despise the ideas and aims of the subversive groups. The resolution asks me, as Governor, to issue a proclamation to this end. I am happy to comply, especially in view of the present state of international affairs which renders a public rededication to our country's ideals most appropriate and desirable.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim April 29, 1950, as Loyalty Day in New York, and I urge the people of the State to join in appropriate ceremonies and exercises at public assemblies to commemorate the occasion.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 20th day of April in the year of our Lord, 1950.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

HISTORY AS A GUIDEPOST—ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a delivered address by former President Herbert Hoover last night before the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor to address the editors and publishers of the United States. You are the most powerful of all influences in our country.

My subject on this occasion arises from my suspicion that the world in its tumults has abandoned most acceptance of history as a guide post.

There are plenty of voices about but the voice of experience seems to have become stilled.

I have had to do with the boiling economic, social, and poltical forces during two world wars and their aftermaths. I propose for a few moments to add some of the voices of world experience into the present clamor. I shall explore four samples, one each from the economic, social, political, and international field.

In the economic field there are many shrill voices proclaiming that our American economic system is outmoded. They say it was born of undesirable parents, such as American individualism and a French lady named Laissez-Faire. They accuse the ghost of Adam Smith as having had something to do with the matter. They conclude our system is of the jungle or dog-eat-dog variety.

It might be observed that the alternative offered us is a drink mixed by three different ghosts. That is, the shade of Karl Marx with his socialism. The shade of Mussolini with his dictated and planned economy. The spook of Lord John Maynard Keynes with his "operation Cuttlefish" comprising managed currency, peacetime inflation by deficit spending and perpetual endowment for bureaucrats.

THE AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS

And we have contributed an American ideology of give-away programs. It might be called the New Generosity. It is not yet a ghost. However, the handiwork of the ghosts and their auxiliaries furnish you most of your page 1.

I am not going to repeat the old and valid defenses of the American economic system; I may mention that in recent years we have taken strong drinks from the three "hants" I have mentioned, and from the New Generosity, all mixed with varying amounts of pure water from the American system.

Be all that as it may, my purpose here is to call your attention to a less obvious world experience.

Sixty years ago our American system was divorced from the laissez-faire lady. We started proceedings in 1887 when we created the Interstate Commerce Commission, thereby initiating the control of natural monopolies. But far more revolutionary was the Antitrust Act of 1890.

Western Europe has never had effective antitrust laws. To the contrary, there grew up in those countries a maze of State-favored private trade restraints, combinations, trusts and cartels. This form of economic organization sought profits by fixing prices and by control of production and distribution.

Under our revolutionized American system, competition remained the restless pillow of progress. It had to seeks profits from improved technology and lowered costs of production.

In time, western Europe, without the full pressure of competition, lost much of the impulse to improve methods and equipment. Plants became obsolete; standards of living stagnated.

In contrast, our technology with one hundred times as many inventing laboratories and a thousand times more trained technicians has steadily improved its tools. Our standards of living increased with cheaper costs and more goods. Our system was dynamic; theirs was static.

Finally, western Europe, with its obsolescent plants, its inability to compete in world trade, except at the expense of labor, was desperate. It took to hard drinking of the potions from the shades of Marx, Mussolini, and Keynes—plus the New Generosity.

Our American system continues to produce despite periodic indulgence in these drinks. It does it despite two world wars, innumerable interferences with incentives, and a Government take of 60 to 70 percent of its savings. It still retains the dynamic power to provide the greatest and widest spread of comfort to our people that the world has ever known. That is, if we would join Alcoholics Anonymous and quit mixed drinks.

CRADLE-TO-GRAVE SECURITY

Lest any dangerous thought flash through your minds, I am recalling this experience exclusively to you as publishers and editors.

Now lest someone think all this is economics without humanism, I offer an experience on the social side. It is punctuated today by the siren voices calling for security from the cradle to the grave.

Security from the cradle to about 18 or 20 years of age, and from about 65 to the grave, has always been sacred to the American people.

The training of our children, the care of our aged and the unfortunate have been a part of our system since the founding of the Republic. It is part of our civilization. The governmental part, however, needs some repairs.

But the voice of experience which I wish to recall relates to the idea of security for the middle group—say, from 20 to 65 years of age. We have less than 70,000,000 providers in this group, and they must provide for 80,000,000 children, aged, sick, nonproductive Government employees and their wives. It is solely from the energies of this middle group, their inventions and their productivity that can come the support of the young, the old, and the sick—and the Government employees.

Unless there is the constant pressure of competition on this group between 20 and 65 plus the beckoning of fairies and rewards, to stimulate incentives and work, the children and the aged will be the victims. This middle group can find its own security only in a free but tough system of risk and self-reliance. It can be destroyed by taxes and the four mixed drinks.

Experience calls sorrowful confirmation of all this. My recollection is that the Lord remarked to Adam something about sweat.

Be that as it may, there is convincing evidence from the British experience of trying to include the middle group in blessed security. Their incentives to sweat have diminished under that illusion. The needed leadership of the middle group in production and distribution is being destroyed. Otherwise they would not need lean on the New Generosity.

There are also some lessons of experience to be had from Russia where the grave is close to the cradle. And 15,000,000 people are compelled to work in slave camps under the whip.

The voice of experience also calls loudly as to organization of the political field. In 1938, I spent some months on the continent inquiring "how come" 15 new democracies created after the First World War had failed.

The downfall of these representative governments was due in part to the drinks compounded by the three ghosts. But there was another step in their arrival at chaos, which contains a potent experience for America.

THE SPLINTER PARTIES

There had grown up in their legislatures a multitude of splinter parties. There were all the way from 5 to 15 of them. In consequence, there was no responsible majority. Governments were driven to improvised legislative coalitions, which could only agree upon negative policies and give-away programs. In each coalition small foreign-controlled tricky groups played a part. In confusion and despair, their peoples welcomed the man on horseback.

Even though old-time religion, it is worth repeating that the preservation of representative government requires two major political parties.

I am not going to deliver a history of the rifts between major parties in the United States. So you may relax. I might mention that once upon a time, say for about 60 years, the members of both our major political parties were, in large majority, liberals in the ninteenth century sense. They quarreled mostly over the tariff but not over ideologies.

However, since Lenin's implication that the hermit crab, by seizing the shell of another animal knew his business, the term "liberal" has lost its soul. Its cheerful spirit of less power in government and more freedom of men has passed to the world beyond.

Nor am I going to try your after-dinner souls with ideological definitions—not even of statism. That definition has already been made instinctively by the common tongue of all nations where free speech still has a part in their proceedings. That effective but perhaps unrefined definition is "right wing" and "left wing."

The point I am concerned with here is that from the ideological tumults stirred by the three shades and their helpers, our major American political parties have been in large degree reoriented into these new compartments of right and left.

I do not charge the real Communists to the American left wing. They are agents of a foreign government.

If a man from the moon, who knew the essentials of representative government, came as a total stranger to the United States, he would say some obvious things within the first week or two.

He would say to the Republican Party: "There is no room for you on the left. You must be the party of the right, or you will split into ineffective factions."

And with equal emphasis he would say to the Democrats: "Your die is cast. You are the party of the left, or you will likewise split into futile factions."

He would say to some members of both parties: "You are not in your proper spiritual homes."

He would say that in all this ideological tumult, if there cannot be a reasonably cohesive body of opinion in each major party, you are on a blind road where there is no authority in the ballot box or in government.

He would say that if you want confirmation look at 15 European countries where representative government was torn to shreds.

EXPERIENCE WITH RUSSIA

I need not remind you that our page 1 international issue is Communist Russia. There are seven phases of this experience which I must recall before I come to a proposal of action.

The first phase of experience with Russia began under the czars. Since Peter the Great they steadily have expanded their reach of empire over the largest land mass in the world. Their method was that of a burglar going down a hall. If there was no one in the first room, he took everything, including the doorknob. If he found someone in the second room who protested, he weighed the strength of the protestor and might leave part of the furniture. If he found an armed man in the third room, he closed the door and waited.

Lenin and Stalin added a new apparatus for the robber. They now make the man in the second room a party member and rob him later, and by degrees. They now put the armed man in the third room asleep with a nonaggression pact or a promise of peace. Thus he neglects his weapons. In any event they steal his secrets.

The second phase of this experience with Russia was a period of 16 years during which four Presidents and seven Secretaries of State opposed our having any relations with this malignant government. Their attitude was that when our neighbors are living a life of spiritual and other disrepute, we do not attack them. But we can hold up standards in the world a little better if we do not invite them into our homes by so-called recognition.

The third historical phase arrived when our left wingers had their way in our relations with Communist Russia. They produced the recognition of the Soviet in 1933. They produced the alliance with Russia in 1941. They produced the appeasement of Russia in western Europe until its reversal by President Truman and Secretary Byrnes in 1945. I will not join in the explanations about China. Up to now there is agreement on only one point. We lost the game—400,000,000 to nothing.

Many of our left wingers were not consciously doing all this. They were just trigger happy to anything new in ideological life.

Lest anyone think I am a recent convert in these views, I may cite that just 9 years and 63 days ago I warned the American people that collaboration with Stalin to bring freedom to mankind was a gargantuan jest. I used the wrong adjective. I should have said tragic. For as a result, instead of the expansion of liberty, we witness a dozen nations and 600,000,000 human beings enslaved.

The fourth phase of this experience was that Soviet Russia has in the last 12 years violated more than 35 solemnly signed agreements.

The fifth phase of this experience has been with the Communists in the United Nations. That Charter for which we hoped so much contains lengthy pledges to the independence of nations, to human liberty, and to nonaggression. About a dozen provisions of that Charter have been violated either in spirit or in letter by Soviet Russia. The Kremlin has reduced the United Nations to a propaganda forum for the smearing of free peoples. It has been defeated as a preservative of peace and good will.

NOW THE COLD WAR

The sixth phase of this experience is that we now find ourselves in an expensive and dangerous cold war. We conduct the battle

with subsidies to beguile peoples to rectitude from internal communism. A year ago we made the Atlantic Military Pact. The expressed hope was that, although there was no commitment to go to war, these nations would build up their own arms to adequately defend their own rooms. In persistence to an old habit, we are taking up the check.

In the meantime, we learn that our first defense—the atomic bomb—has been stolen from us.

The final phase of our experience with Russia is the belated realization that this is not one world but two worlds. The one-world idea seems to be lost in the secret files.

One world is militaristic, imperialistic, atheistic, and without compassion. The other world still holds to belief in God, free nations, human dignity, and peace.

Now to come to the point of all this. The American people ought to take a cold and objective look at this experience before we go any further.

This look should be directed to the fact that more and more the burdens of defending free men and nations are being thrust upon the American people, who are only one-sixth the population of the globe. We are becoming more and more isolated as the sole contender in this cold war. We are steadily losing ground because the non-Communist states are being picked off one by one or are compromising with the Communists. Our countrymen are in a fog as to what, where, and when all this leads to.

What the world needs today is a definite, concrete mobilization of the nations who believe in God against this tide of Red agnosticism. It needs a moral mobilization against the hideous ideas of the police state and human slavery. The world needs mobilization against this creeping Red imperialism. The United States needs to know who are with us in the cold war against these practices and whom we can depend on.

Therefore, I have a proposal to make.

I suggest that the United Nations should be reorganized without the Communist nations in it. If that is impractical, then a definite New United Front should be organized of those peoples who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love freedom.

This is specifically not a proposed extension of a military alliance or any color of it. It is a proposal based solely upon moral, spiritual, and defense foundations. It is a proposal to redeem the concept of the United Nations to the high purpose for which it was created. It is a proposal for moral and spiritual cooperation of God-fearing free nations.

If the free nations join together, they have many potent moral, spiritual, and even economic weapons at their disposal. They would unlikely ever need such weapons. Such a phalanx of free nations could come far nearer to making a workable relation with the other half of the two worlds than the United States can ever do alone.

By collective action we could much more effectively keep their conspiring agents and bribers out of all our borders and out of our laboratories.

It may be the non-Communist world is not willing to take such a vital stand. At least it would clarify what we have to do.

The test I propose is the logical and practical method of total diplomacy. It would make diplomacy dynamic and lessen the dangers of the American people. All this may give pain to some people. But by their cries ye shall know them.

My friends, I am not disheartened by all this recall of disturbing experience. We must retain our faith in western civilization. In support of that faith we are perhaps a slow but a resolute and intelligent people. We have the greatest organ of education known to man—a free press. You can dissolve much of our confusions and frustrations.

And in rejecting an atheistic other world, I am confident that the Almighty is with us.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DENTAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Veterans' Administration regarding dental activities of that Administration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Your letter of April 4 concerning the costs of certain Veterans' Administration dental activities is very much appreciated. It is regretted that this reply has been delayed until a decision could be reached as to the number of dentists it would be necessary to release.

As you perhaps have been informed, the proposed reduction in force of dentists has been temporarily extended, and we have hopes that it will not be necessary to reschedule it. However, should a similar occasion arise, the information you requested is contained in subsequent paragraphs.

As of February 28, 1950, there were 1,070 full-time employees in the dental units of the Medical Division of regional offices in the following categories:

Dentists	520
Dental assistants	314
Dental hygienists	8
Dental mechanics	109
X-ray technicians	1
Clerical	118
Total	1,070

During the month of February these employees completed 26,205 examination cases, 7,178 treatment cases, along with the professional work involved in the authorization of examination and treatment cases to participating dentists.

The proposed cut of approximately 175 employees represented a 16-percent reduction in staff personnel. By applying this percentage to the monthly production in examination and treatment cases, it can be determined that approximately 4,193 examination cases and 1,148 treatment cases would have had to be referred to participating dentists if the 175 employees had not been available. At $13.38 per examination case and $83.81 per treatment case, the bill for these services would have exceeded $150,000 for the month of February, and at the February rate, would amount to approximately $1,800,000 during a complete fiscal year.

It would be difficult to compute the exact amount of savings to the Veterans' Administration which would accrue by retaining these employees on a staff basis, but it is believed that the figure would be substantial. The average annual salary of employees in the medical division of regional offices was approximately $4,100 at the January rate. This division performs medical and dental out-patient activities. Assuming that the 175 dental employees previously scheduled for reduction in force were of the average salary group, their monthly salary would amount to approximately $60,000 and their annual salary to approximately $720,000. In order to compare these costs with the $1,800,000 cost of performing this work with participating dentists, it would be necessary to add to the staff salaries the costs of facilities, equipment, and supplies. However, in this instance, the facilities are already in operation, the equipment has already been installed, and the cost of supplies would be considerably less than the cost of salaries as computed at $720,000 per year at the January rate. Thus, it appears that it is to the advantage of the Veterans' Administration to avoid a reduction in force of employees in this category.

Your interest in this matter is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL B. MAGNUSON,
Chief Medical Director.

COMMUNISTS IN HAWAII—EDITORIAL FROM THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very short editorial entitled "Communists' Numbers Unimportant," from the Honolulu Advertiser of April 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISTS' NUMBERS UNIMPORTANT

Harping on the small number of Communists witnesses at the recent Un-American Activities Committee hearing were able to say reside in Hawaii is misleading. The Communist cell system prevents one group of party members from knowing the number or the identity of their comrades in sedition. What is important is that the Communists and their fellow travelers here had sufficient strength to seize and hold the Democratic Party machinery.

Whether there are 130 Communists in Hawaii or 1,300 has little significance. Some estimates place the total number of Communist card holders in the whole United States at only 200,000. Post-war investigations have shown that Hitler controlled Germany with a handful of Nazis. Mussolini dominated Italy with a small group of Fascists.

In subversive treachery it is what is done, not how many persons do it, that tells the story. Even one Communist in Hawaii who can deceive innocent Americans into disloyalty is one too many.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further routine matters to be presented, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 247, to promote the progress of science, and so forth, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 5899–5906 of House proceedings of April 26, 1950.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senate, of course, is very familiar with the Science Foundation bill. Such a bill has been passed three times by the Senate. The subject has been before us for consideration for almost 10 years. The bill is in reality the outgrowth of our experience in the war, when we were brought to realize that there had not been assembled into one group those persons who were thought-

ful about scientific development. During the war the Government set up various boards, and of course scientific contributions to the war were immense.

Mr. President, under the Science Foundation Act of 1950, the Foundation will come into being as an independent agency. A board of 24 members will be established. These members will be appointed by the President of the United States after recommendations or suggestions have been made to him by the great scientific groups of the country respecting such membership. After the board has been appointed the powers and functions of the Foundation will rest in the board. The board itself will make recommendations, or, rather, suggestions, respecting the appointment of the director. The President, of course, is free to act in that respect, however, under his constitutional powers. So after the board has been organized the President will name and the Senate will confirm a director. Thereafter the powers and functions of the Foundation will rest in a board of 24 members and a director.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate by going over the details of the bill, unless there is some question; but I wish to say that after many days of meeting in conference, the conferees have worked out what I consider to be a stronger bill on this subject than has ever been presented before, a better bill than even the House version of the bill or the Senate version of the bill was. There is unanimous agreement on the part of all the conferees, both the conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate. All the conferees have signed the report.

The House acted upon the conference report yesterday, at that time unanimously agreeing to accept it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I was on the conference committee on this bill. I wish to review briefly the history of the bill, as a matter of information for the Senate, and to make it perfectly clear that this is an example of bipartisan policy probably not equaled in the history of the last two or three Congresses.

This bill arose in the first place out of a recommendation by Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, during the war, whose work I think received almost unanimous approval as the very best form of scientific organization to give the services of science to the Government during the war. His report in July 1945, recommended the creation of a permanent national science research foundation.

A bill on that subject was introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator fram West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I believe, in the Seventy-ninth Congress. That bill passed the Senate in that Congress.

However, I have before me an editorial from the Washington Post at the time when the Seventy-ninth Congress expired. The editorial states, in part, that—

Failure to establish a National Science Foundation must be ranked high among the grievous sins of omission of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Guilt rests, in this case, exclusively with the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, as soon as the Eightieth Congress met, bills to establish a National Science Foundation were introduced.

Senate bill 526 was introduced on February 7, 1947, by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has taken an active interest in this bill throughout, although he is unable to be here today by reason of illness. The bill was introduced at that time by the Senator from New Jersey for himself, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Cordon; the then Senator Revercomb, of West Virginia; the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Saltonstall; the Senator from Utah, Mr. Thomas; the Senator from Washington, Mr. Magnuson; and the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright. That bill passed the Senate in 1947. It passed the House in 1947, and went to the President at the end of that session. The President pocket-vetoed the bill. He vetoed it in connection with a veto message, which I now submit and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the veto message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1947.

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval of S. 526, the National Science Foundation bill.

I take this action with deep regret. On several occasions I have urged the Congress to enact legislation to establish a National Science Foundation. Our national security and welfare require that we give direct support to basic scientific research and take steps to increase the number of trained scientists. I had hoped earnestly that the Congress would enact a bill to establish a suitable agency to stimulate and correlate the activities of the Government directed toward these ends.

However, this bill contains provisions which represent such a marked departure from sound principles for the administration of public affairs that I cannot give it my approval. It would, in effect, vest the determination of vital national policies, the expenditure of large public funds, and the administration of important governmental functions in a group of individuals who would be essentially private citizens. The proposed National Science Foundation would be divorced from control by the people to an extent that implies a distinct lack of faith in democratic processes.

Moreover, the organization prescribed in the bill is so complex and unwieldy that there is grave danger that it would impede rather than promote the Government's efforts to encourage scientific research. The Government's expenditures for scientific research and development activities currently amount to hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Under present world conditions, this work is vital to our national welfare and security. We cannot afford to jeopardize it by imposing upon it an organization so likely to prove unworkable.

Under S. 526 the powers of the proposed Foundation would be vested in 24 members, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. These members would be part-time officials, required to meet only once each year. This group would, in turn, select biennially from among its 24 members an executive committee of 9 members and would exercise its powers through the executive committee. This nine-member executive committee would also be a part-time body required to meet only six times a year.

The Foundation would have a chief executive officer, known at the Director. He would be appointed by the 9-member executive committee unless the 24-member body itself chose to appoint him. The power and duties of the Director would be prescribed by the executive committee and exercised under its supervision.

There would be within the Foundation a number of divisions, each exercising such duties and performing such functions as the Foundation prescribed. There would be no limit upon the number of divisions which the Foundation could establish. For each division there would be a divisional committee. In the case of the Committee for the Division of National Defense, there would be a limit of 36 members, half of whom would be appointed by the Foundation and half of whom would be representatives of the armed services. In other cases, there would be no limit upon the number of members of each divisional committee and all of the members would be appointed by the Foundation. Not only would these part-time committees furnish advice and make recommendations concerning the Government's scientific research program, but each divisional committee would also exercise and perform the powers and duties of its division.

The Foundation would also be empowered to appoint commissions in various fields of research. Three such commissions are specified in the bill, and the Foundation could appoint as many additional special commissions as it saw fit. Each such commission would consist of six eminent scientists and five members from the general public. After making a survey of public and private research already being carried on, each of these commissions would recommend a research program within its field and constantly review the manner in which such program was being carried out.

Apart from the conflicts and confusion which would result from this complex organization, the bill would violate basic principles which make for responsible government.

The Constitution places upon the President the responsibility for seeing that the laws are faithfully executed. In the administration of this law, however, he would be deprived of effective means for discharging his constitutional responsibility.

Full governmental authority and responsibility would be placed in 24 part-time officers, whom the President could not effectively hold responsible for proper administration. Neither could the Director be held responsible by the President, for he would be the appointee of the Foundation and would be insulated from the President by two layers of part-time boards. In the case of the divisions and special commissions, the lack of accountability would be even more aggravated.

The members of the Foundation would also be authorized to appoint the full-time administrative head of an important agency in the executive branch of the Government, as well as more than 70 additional part-time officials in whom important governmental powers would be vested. This represents a substantial denial of the President's appointing power, as well as an impairment of his ability to see that the laws are faithfully executed.

The ability of the President to meet his constitutional responsibility would be further impaired by the provisions of the bill which would establish an Interdepartmental Committee on Science. The members of this committee would be representatives of departments and agencies who are responsible to the President, but its chairman would be the Director of the Foundation. It would be the duty of this committee to correlate data on all Federal scientific research activities

and to make recommendations to the President, to the Foundation, and to the other departments and agencies of the Government concerning the performance of their functions in this field. Thus, an officer who is not appointed by the President, and not responsible to him, would be the man primarily charged with the performance of functions which are peculiarly within the scope of the President's duties—that is, the coordination of the work of executive agencies. This is especially unwise when the activities concerned are so intimately related to the national welfare and security.

There are other compelling reasons why control over the administration of this law should not be vested in the part-time members of the Foundation. The Foundation would make grants of Federal funds to support scientific research. The recipients of these grants would be determined in the discretion of the Foundation. The qualifications prescribed in the bill for members of the Foundation would insure that most of them would be individuals employed by institutions or organizations eligible for the grade. Thus, there is created a conflict of interests which would inevitably give rise to suspicions of favoritism, regardless of the complete integrity of the members of the Foundation.

It is unfair to individuals asked to accept public office that they should be put in such a vulnerable position. Moreover, colleges and universities and other organizations seeking aid for scientific research deserve the assurance that the manner and extent of their participation in a national program will be determined on a completely impartial and objective basis.

Adherence to the principle that responsibility for the administration of the law should be vested in full-time officers who can be held accountable will not prevent the Government from utilizing with great advantage the services of eminent scientists who are available only for part-time duty. We have ample evidence of the patriotic and unselfish contributions which such citizens can make to the success of governmental programs. The role to be played by such part-time participation, however, is more appropriately one of an advisory nature rather than of full responsibility. In other governmental programs of vast national importance, this method is used to obtain advice and recommendations from impartial experts as well as from parties in interest. There is no reason why such a system cannot be incorporated in legislation establishing a National Science Foundation.

For the reasons I have indicated, I believe that this bill raises basic issues of public policy. There would be no means for insuring responsible administration of the law. If the principles of this bill were extended throughout the Government, the result would be utter chaos. There is no justification in this case for not using sound principles for normal governmental operations. I cannot agree that our traditional, democratic form of government is incapable of properly administering a program for encouraging scientific research and education.

It is unfortunate that this legislation cannot be approved in its present form. The withholding of my signature at this time, however, will not prevent the Government from engaging in the support of scientific research. Research activities are carried on extensively by various executive agencies under existing laws, and would continue to be carried on whether or not this bill became law. The only funds made available by the Congress for expenditure by the Foundation are funds which might be transferred from other agencies, thereby reducing the amounts which those other agencies could spend for similar purposes. No funds were made available for the scholarships and fellowships authorized in the bill. Thus, there would be no immediate gains which would justify accepting the risks involved in the approval of this legislation.

I am convinced that the long-range interests of scientific research and education will be best served by continuing our efforts to obtain a Science Foundation free from the vital defects of this bill. These defects in the structure of the proposed Foundation are so fundamental that it would not be practicable to permit its establishment in this form with the hope that the defects might be corrected at a later date. We must start with a law which is basically sound.

I hope that the Congress will reconsider this question and enact such a law early in its next session.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 6, 1947.*

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the President of the United States vetoed the bill largely because of the fact that in the bill the board of 24, to be set up, was given power to appoint the director of the Foundation, and because the board had power to distribute the grants among the various colleges and other foundations which were to conduct the actual scientific work. No effort was made at the time to pass the bill over the veto of the President, although efforts were made to compromise with him on his objections to the bill and to find out exactly what might be satisfactory.

The pending bill was introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I think, in behalf of himself and other Senators, on January 6, 1949. It passed the Senate on March 18, 1949. It passed the House of Representatives on March 1, 1950. The matters objected to by the President were compromised. The director is to be appointed by the President, but he is to be subject to the direction of the board. I, myself, felt very strongly that it was a great mistake for the President to veto the bill or to give power to a director to distribute millions of dollars between different private institutions. I felt confident that a director subject to appointment by the President would be subject to all kinds of political pressure from various Senators and Representatives, and that the distribution would be made on a political basis.

This bill, as I have said, permits the President to appoint the director; but all distribution of money—contrary to the principles set forth in the President's veto message—is under the control of the board of 24 members. They cannot even delegate the final action on that question to the executive committee of nine. So the 24 scientists finally will pass on all grants to colleges, other institutions of all kinds, and research organizations throughout the entire United States.

I trust very much that the President will sign the bill.

However, I wish to make it clear that the bill originated in Congress. It is literally a product of bipartisan work. Both Democrats and Republicans have worked on it in three Congresses, and I think the result which has come out should be satisfactory to everyone.

I think it is highly to the credit of the Senate of the United States, because the Senate originated the bill in all cases—the Senate of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Senate of the Eightieth Congress, and now the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has been very much interested in this bill over the past 4 years, I wish to ask whether the authorization made by the bill is $15,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. I think there is no limit.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if I may reply, let me say that the Senate version of the bill had no authorization limit. However, the House version of the bill provided an authorization of half a million dollars for the first year and $15,000,000 for the years thereafter. The Senate conferees have accepted the House provision.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the authorization for the Science Foundation is to be $15,000,000, unless it is amended by future legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; after the first year.

Mr. TAFT. It is $15,000,000, but of course the $15,000,000 is the limit on direct appropriations to the National Science Foundation. However, we are now appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for research. In the armed forces bill, I think, provision is made for——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For $5,000,000 or $6,000,000, I believe.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Massachusetts says he understands that research funds of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 are provided in that bill. It is suggested that in connection with the distribution of that fund for actual research by others it will to a considerable extent be turned over by the Department of Defense to the National Scientific Foundation. So, actually, the funds at its disposal may be much greater than $15,000,000, without any amendment to this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. Let me very briefly add my congratulations to the conference committee. I am not a member of that committee; but, as the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Ohio know, I worked many hours on this bill, and I am very pleased to see it go through.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to say a further word or two. First, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. President, I have moved that the Senate temporarily lay aside the pending business and proceed immediately to the consideration of the conference report on S. 247, the National Science Foundation bill.

Mr. President, as is well known by the Members of this body, this problem has been continually before the Congress for a period of 10 years. During the Eightieth Congress both Houses approved a National Science Foundation bill which was vetoed by the President. After a series of conferences between the executive branch and representatives of the Congress, a revised bill was passed in the last session of the Eightieth

Congress but the Congress adjourned before final action was taken by the House of Representatives.

During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress the Senate approved a National Science Foundation bill by unanimous consent. This bill, with some modifications, was approved by the House of Representatives on March 1, 1950. The Senate disagreed to the House amendments and requested a conference.

Mr. President, the report which I submit has the unanimous approval of the conferees of the two Houses and represents, in my opinion at least, a bill which is superior to both the House and Senate versions. Your conferees have given careful study to this matter and the result of their efforts is worthy of the approval of the full Congress. The House of Representatives adopted this conference report yesterday and I now present it to the Senate for final approval.

FOUNDATION AND BOARD

The conference report embodies the language designating the Foundation as the institution created by this act and designating as the Board the 24 members who are primarily responsible for the administration of the act. This change was made in order to differentiate clearly between the Foundation in the institutional sense and the individuals responsibility for carrying out the purposes for which the Foundation is created.

DIRECTOR

The bill as agreed upon by the conferees provides that the Director shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate after the Board has had an opportunity to make recommendations to the President. The Senate bill required that the Director could not be appointed until the Board had been appointed and qualified. It was pointed out in conference that in view of the fact that the Board members are required to be confirmed by the Senate, unnecessary and serious delay might result if only 1 or 2 of the 24 nominations to the Board were held up, for any reason, by the Senate. The provisions agreed upon in conference make it clear that the Board shall be given every opportunity to present recommendations on the appointment of the Director to the President.

Another provision agreed upon by the conferees provides that the Director shall carry out the policies established by the Board, but that he may not take any final action with respect to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships or the entering into of contracts or other arrangements for the conducting of basic research until the Board shall have reviewed and approved the proposed action in each instance. This provision is designed to assure the final responsibility of the Board in these two important areas of the Foundation's activities.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The bill as passed by the Senate permitted, but did not require, the establishment of an executive committee. The bill as passed by the House required the establishment of an executive committee and set forth in some detail the procedure to be followed in the establishment of such a committee.

The bill agreed upon by the conferees retains the permissive provisions of the Senate bill, but further provides that in the event such an executive committee is created, it shall be created only in accordance with the standards provided in the bill. These standards are set forth in order to make sure that the primary purposes of the act, particularly those concerned with the widest possible distribution of research, shall not be subverted.

Since the Board is required to meet only once a year, it is quite likely that some such committee will, of necessity, be established. Since that is so, the conferees agreed that that committee should be surrounded with proper safeguards.

In the event that an executive committee is created the Board may not assign to that committee the function of establishing policies or the function of review and approval to be exercised by the Board in accordance with section 5 (b). The Board may, however, assign to the executive committee the review and approval of minor modifications of contracts or other arrangements previously approved by the Board.

OTHER COMMITTEES

The bill agreed upon by the conferees empowers the Foundation to create other committees composed either of members or nonmembers of the Foundation. These committees, however, are limited to performing only such survey and advisory functions as the Board shall designate.

DEFENSE RESEARCH

The bill as agreed upon by the conferees provides that the Secretary of Defense may call upon the Foundation to conduct specific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense. The conferees agreed that such a provision was desirable in order that whenever the need presented itself, maximum effort could be centered on any scientific research necessary to the national defense.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN ESTABLISHED RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The bill as passed by the Senate provided that the activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing but not curtailing or limiting any of the functions or activities presently being carried on by Government agencies. This provision was stricken from the House bill.

The conferees were agreed that the Senate language was so restrictive that it might result in depriving the Foundation of effecting any coordination of research presently being conducted. The conferees were likewise agreed that certain of the established research activities, particularly those being carried on by the National Institutes of Health in the United States Public Health Service, should not be interfered with. The position of the conferees on this point is made clear on the last page of the conference report.

PATENT RIGHTS

The bill as agreed upon by the conferees follows completely the theory of the Senate bill. Two clarifying changes have been made in the text in order to more clearly set forth the intent of the Congress in this regard. The Senate bill provided that nothing in the act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation to alter or modify any provision of law affecting the issuance and use of patents. Since it is obvious that no agency other than Congress has the authority to alter or modify existing law, the language has been amended to read that the Foundation may not enter into any contract or other arrangement inconsistent with existing law.

APPROPRIATIONS

The bill as agreed to by the conferees provides that not more than $500,000 may be appropriated to the Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and that not more than $15,000,000 may be appropriated to the Foundation for any fiscal year thereafter. The Senate bill contained no such limitations.

The conferees were agreed that at least in the early years the Foundation could not effectively expend great sums of money and that most of its efforts must be concentrated toward establishing a solid and effective basis upon which to carry forth its activities. It is highly unlikely that the Foundation will be in a position to effectively spend more than the amounts stipulated in the bill, when it is remembered that other agencies of the Government may transfer funds to the Foundation to permit that agency to carry on certain research activities.

SECURITY PROVISIONS

The bill as passed by the Senate provided that the Foundation must obtain the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission in conducting any research in the field of atomic energy. The Senate bill also provided that regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property having military significance should be established in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense in order to properly safeguard the national security.

The House bill, in addition to the above provisions, contained extensive amendments dealing with the investigation of individuals employed by the Foundation or awarded scholarships by the Foundation and relating to foreign nationals who might become associated with the Foundation.

The provisions contained in the House bill were rather severely criticized by educators and other groups, as well as by the agencies who would be charged with conducting the investigations required by the House bill.

The conferees rewrote the security provisions of the bill in a manner which the conferees feel properly safeguard the national security, without impeding the untrammeled development of basic research. The provisions approved by the conference have been endorsed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of Defense.

The security provisions approved by the conferees can be summarized as follows:

1. Where any activity involves restricted data as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the provision of that act regarding the control of the departmentation of restricted data and the security clearance of those individuals to be given access to restricted data shall be applicable.

2. In the case of scientific research activities relating to national defense, security requirements and safeguards shall be established by the Secretary of Defense.

3. No employee of the Foundation shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which restrictions have been established until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation of the character, association, and loyalty of such individual and reported its findings to the Foundation, and the Foundation shall have determined that permitting such individual to have access to such information or property will not endanger the national security.

4. Before any funds can be paid by the Foundation under a scholarship or fellowship, the individual must subscribe to the following oath or affirmation:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

It is believed by the conferees that the provisions contained in the bill finally agreed upon effectively protect the national security, without departing from established security procedures, without burdening the investigating agencies of the Government with additional responsibilities of questionable merit. The provisions also avoid subjecting those actively engaged in scientific pursuits to needless investigations and controls.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Next, Mr. President, let me say that before the conference report is agreed to a statement should be made regarding the security provisions of the measure. We have worked out what I think is a most sensible provision, which will provide security in every way in which such matters

are secure now under regulations and under the laws of the United States, so far as all persons who may be working on a defense project or on an atomic-energy project, or something of that kind, are concerned. The country's welfare is well taken care of. But the average scientist, who is a scholar and works in all sorts of fields, will not be bound except by this one single provision, and we thought anyone who took employment in the United States, even as a scientific scholar or as a fellow, should be held by the same sort of oath or affirmation which we all take and which all persons who serve the country take, so that in the beginning of his work he will swear allegiance to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to say that we agreed with the House upon a conference report as well as upon the statement as submitted by the House managers. That is true; is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We agreed to accept the statement made by the House managers to the House of Representatives, and it is incorporated in our report.

Mr. TAFT. Will it be printed in the RECORD, without a special request?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement to which the Senator refers will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement of the managers on the part of the House is as follows:

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment was passed in lieu of all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The accompanying conference report recommends the adoption of a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The substitute agreed to in conference follows in general the pattern of the House amendment, including the organizational structure providing for a Foundation consisting of a Board and a Director.

The differences between the House amendment and the conference substitute are explained below, except for minor clerical, clarifying, and conforming changes.

FOUNDATION'S REPORT TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

By section 3 (c) of the conference substitute the Foundation is required to make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. This subsection is the same as it appeared in the House amendment, except that there is included a requirement that the Foundation's report shall contain the minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Board.

DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

Section 5 of the House amendment contained the following sentence: "There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving recommendations from the Board." In this sentence, the words "after receiving recommendations from the Board" replaced the words "after the members of the Foundation have been appointed and qualified" which were contained in the same sentence in the Senate bill. In lieu of this sentence the conference substitute contains the following two sentences: "There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board may make recommendations to the President with respect to the appointment of the Director, and the Director shall not be appointed until the Board has had an opportunity to make such recommendations."

Section 5 (b) of the conference substitute, relating to the powers and duties of the Director, is the same provision contained in the House amendment except that it has been modified to make it clear that in each instance where the Director takes any final action under section 10 or 11 (c) the Board must review and specifically approve the action proposed to be taken. It is the view of the conference committee that this requirement makes more certain than otherwise might be the case that, in conformity with section 3 (b), contracts or other arrangements made under section 11 (c) for carrying on basic scientific research activities will not be unduly concentrated in a few organizations or institutions or in a limited area of the Nation.

POWERS TO CREATE AN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND OTHER COMMITTEES

The Senate bill, in section 4 (e), authorized the Foundation to appoint an Executive Committee from among its members, and to appoint from among its members or otherwise such other committees as it deemed necessary, and to assign to such Executive Committee or other committees such powers and functions as it deemed appropriate for the purposes of the act.

The House amendment, in section 6, created an Executive Committee and provided that, in addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in it by the act, the Executive Committee "shall exercise such powers and duties as may be delegated to it by the Board." The House amendment granted no authority, similar to that granted by the Senate bill, for the creation of other committees. Section 6 of the House amendment also contained specific provisions as to the membership of the Executive Committee, the term of office of members, a requirement that members should be representative of diverse interests and should be chosen so as to provide representation so far as practicable for all areas of the Nation, and contained a provision as to the making by the Executive Committee of an annual report by the Board.

Section 6 of the conference substitute combines the Senate and House provisions above referred to as follows:

(1) It grants to the Board the authority to create an Executive Committee and to assign to the Executive Committee such powers and functions as may be deemed appropriate, except that it is provided that the Board may not assign to the Executive Committee the function of establishing policies, or the function of review and approval (except review and approval of minor modifications of contracts or other arrangements previously approved by the Board), to be exercised by the Board in accordance with section 5 (b).

(2) The section further provides that if an Executive Committee is established by the Board it shall consist of nine members of the Board elected by the Board, and of the Director as a nonvoting ex officio member, and it contains provisions, similar in general to those contained in the House amendment, as in terms of office, representation of diverse interests, and the making of an annual report to the Board.

(3) It authorizes the Board to appoint from among its members or otherwise such committees as the Board deems necessary, and authorizes the Board to assign to such committees such survey and advisory functions as the Board deems appropriate.

CONTRACTS OR ARRANGEMENTS FOR RESEARCH RELATING TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

In both the Senate bill and the House amendment (sec. 4 (a) (3) of the Senate bill and sec. 3 (a) (3) of the House amendment) the Foundation was authorized and directed, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research. Section 10 (c) of the Senate bill authorized the Foundation to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientic research activities as the Foundation deemed necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. In this section no reference was made to contracts or arrangements for scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense. Section 11 (c) of the House amendment contained an authorization similar to that contained in section 10 (c) of the Senate bill, but also authorized the Foundation to enter into contracts or other arrangements, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, for the carrying on of scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense.

Both sections 10 (c) of the Senate bill and section 11 (c) of the House amendment authorized the Foundation to enter into contracts or other arrangements or modifications thereof, without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

In the conference substitute section 3 (a) (3) is a modification of section 4 (a) (3) of the Senate bill and section 3 (a) (3) of the House amendment, and reads as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

* * * * *

"(3) at the request of the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support specific scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;"

Section 11 (c) of the conference substitute is a modification of section 10 (c) of the Senate bill and section 11 (c) of the House amendment, and reads as follows:

"SEC. 11. The Foundation shall have the * * * authority"—

* * * * *

"(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and, at the request of the Secretary of Defense, specific scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense and, when deemed appropriate by the Foundation, such contracts or other arrange-

ments, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes;"

The fact that under the conference substitute the Foundation is authorized, at the request of the Secretary of Defense, to engage in specific scientific research activities relating to the national defense (research which may be basic or applied in character) does not place a limitation on the authority of the Foundation to engage in basic scientific research.

SECURITY PROVISIONS

In the conference substitute the provisions with respect to security safeguards have been brought together in section 15.

This section has been given very full and careful consideration, in consultation with representatives of the Department of Justice, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Department of Defense.

The objective of the conferees has been to provide for full and adequate security safeguards, while at the same time meeting certain points raised by the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Defense with respect to two provisions contained in the House amendment. It is believed that this objective has been successfully accomplished.

The following explanation of section 15 points out how it differs from the security provisions contained in the Senate bill and the House amendment.

Subsection (a): This subsection, relating to research in the field of nuclear energy, is identical with subsection 14 (k) of the Senate bill and subsection 14 (j) of the House amendment, except that a new sentence, shown in italic type in the subsection as reproduced below, has been added:

"(a) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of nuclear energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 11 (e) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. *To the extent that such activity involves restricted data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 the provisions of that Act regarding the control of the dissemination of restricted data and the security clearance of those individuals to be given access to restricted data shall be applicable.* Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946."

The committee of conference is satisfied that this subsection is entirely adequate to give full security protection in connection with any activity of the Foundation in the field of nuclear energy involving restricted data. The provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (including penalties) will be fully applicable with respect to any such activity and to those individuals who are engaged in it. With respect to this subsection, Acting Chairman Sumner T. Pike, of the Atomic Energy Commission, in a letter dated April 12, 1950, addressed to the chairman of the committee of conference, made the following statement with particular reference to the new sentence which has been included in this subsection:

"It is the purpose of this language to make explicit that which is implicit in section 14 (j) as presently drafted with particular emphasis placed on those security provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 which would be applicable to certain activities of the Foundation in the field of nuclear energy. The effect of this section together with the suggested additional language is to make it clear that all those who receive restricted data (as defined in the Atomic Energy Act) through work with the Science Foundation shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to character, associations, and loyalty and shall be cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission."

Subsections (b), (c), and (d): These subsections are included in section 15 of the conference substitute in lieu of subsection 10 (b) of the House amendment; subsection 14 (l) of the Senate bill and subsection 14 (k) of the House amendment; and subsections 14 (l) and (m) of the House amendment.

Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 15 of the conference substitute are as follows:

"(b) (1) In the case of scientific or technical research activities under this act in connection with matters relating to the national defense, with respect to which funds have been transferred to the Foundation from the Department of Defense in accordance with the provisions of section 14 (h) of this act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, as he deems necessary.

"(2) In the case of scientific research activities under this act in connection with matters relating to the national defense other than research activities referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Foundation shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, as it deems necesary.

"(3) Any agency of the Government exercising investigatory functions is hereby authorized to make such investigations and reports as may be requested by the Foundation in connection with the enforcement of security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, established under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection.

"(c) No employee of the Foundation shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions have been establised under subsection (b) (1) or (2) until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation into the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual and shall have reported the findings of said investigation to the Foundation, and the Foundation shall have determined that permiting such individual to have access to such information or property will not endanger the common defense and security.

"(d) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure by the Foundation under authority of this act shall be used to make payments under any scholarship or fellowship to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Foundation an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits."

Subsection (d) is the same as section 10 (b) of the House amendment, except that it contains an additional requirement that before funds may be paid to an individual under a scholarship or fellowship such individual must subscribe to the following oath or affirmation:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

Section 1001 of title 18, the penalties of which are by subsection (d) made applicable with respect to false affidavits executed under that subsection, applies only in the case of violations knowingly and willfully committed.

Subsection (b) is a modification of subsection 14 (l) of the Senate bill and subsection 14 (k) of the House amendment and requires the establishment of such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property, as may be deemed necessary in connection with research activities under the act in connection with matters relating to the national defense. Such requirements and safeguards will be established by the Secretary of Defense in the case of research carried on with funds transferred from the Department of Defense, and by the Foundation in the case of research carried on with other funds.

Subsections 14 (l) and (m) of the House amendment (quoted in full below at the beginning of the letter from the Department of Justice) required a specified investigation and report to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with regard to any individual before he could be employed by the Foundation or awarded a scholarship, or, in the case of a national of a foreign country, before he could become associated with the Foundation in any capacity.

Serious objections have been made to these provisions of the House amendment by the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Defense. These objections are based on reasons which may be summarized as follows:

(1) If enacted, section 14 (l) would require the Federal Bureau of Investigation not only to investigate employees of the Foundation and applicants for scholarships but to evaluate the information collected through its investigation. This requirement would seriously impair the efficiency and reputation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as an investigating agency.

(2) Section 14 (l) would preclude employment of, or awarding of scholarships to, persons who at any time have been members of so-called front organizations regardless of whether such persons withdrew from such organizations when they first suspected their subversive character. To deny to such persons an opportunity to prove that their membership was innocent would unjustly penalize many completely loyal Americans who innocently joined such organizations, and the denial of such opportunity would be inconsistent with American concepts of justice and fairness.

(3) Section 14 (m) would require investigations to be carried on by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of foreign nationals in foreign countries. This requirement would be impractical since the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not have facilities for conducting investigations abroad.

The objections of the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Defense were set forth in identical letters to Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and chairman of the committee of conference, and to Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the letter to Mr. CROSSER being as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT TO
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, March 6, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The legislation to establish the National Science Foundation (S. 247 and H. R. 4846) has been amended within the past few days in a manner which

has caused me deep concern. I refer to two amendments added by the House of Representatives to S. 247. The first of these amendments reads as follows:

"(1) No person shall be employed by the Foundation and no scholarship awarded to any person by the Foundation unless and until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have investigated the loyalty of such person and reported to the Foundation such person is loyal to the United States, believes in our system of government, and is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization declared subversive by the Attorney General or any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of our Government by force and violence."

The second amendment provides:

"(m) No person a national of a foreign country shall be associated with the Foundation in any capacity whatsoever unless and until the Federal Bureau of Investigation, independent of any investigation made by the government of such person, shall have investigated such person and reported to the Foundation that such person is not and has not at any time been a member of any organization that teaches or advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence."

I, of course, am firmly of the belief that disloyal persons should not be in the employ of the National Science Foundation. The amendments, however, go beyond this. Should they be enacted into law they would not only effect an extremely radical and undesirable change in the basic responsibilities and functions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation but also, in my opinion, they would bring about a departure from American concepts of justice and democratic government.

The Bureau is at the present time solely an investigative and fact-gathering agency; it does not evaluate or make recommendations with reference to the information it collects through its investigations. In loyalty investigations, as in others, the Bureau submits the information it has obtained through investigation for the consideration of the employing agency and for such determinations by that agency as may be required. The fine reputation which I believe the Bureau enjoys today as an impartial investigative agency results in large part because it has carefully restricted its activities to the making of investigations. Indeed, while the Bureau's expertness and high qualifications in this field would be challenged by no one, it is not equipped to go beyond the field of investigation and into that of making the determinations called for by the amendments. If the Bureau were called upon to perform the functions required by the amendments, its efficiency and good reputation as an investigative agency would be seriously impaired.

The enactment of either of the amendments mentioned above would remove the Bureau from its position as an impartial fact-gathering organization and impose upon it the responsibility for making decisions concerning the loyalty of individuals under consideration by the National Science Foundation for employment or for a fellowship under the act. To place the Bureau in the position of an evaluating agency regarding the loyalty of persons affected by this legislation is fraught with peril, not only to the Bureau itself, but also to the country at large. In the opinion of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with which I agree, such legislation would constitute a clear departure from accepted fundamental theories of American government and lay a foundation for criticism of the Bureau as a state police organization.

It is also to be noted that the amendments, in precluding the employment of, or the awarding of a scholarship to, any person who has "at any time been a member of" any subversive organization seeks to deny to the Foundation the services of many Americans of unquestionable loyalty to the United States and its form of government who innocently joined a so-called front organization with the highest motives and who withdrew their membership from such organization upon their first suspicion of its subversive character.

It is characteristic of many front organizations that their purported purposes and programs are designed to appeal to loyal Americans and frequently it is behind a screen of respectability, loyalty, and even patriotism that subversive activities are carried on, often by only a few disloyal persons. In other instances a small minority subvert an organization of previously good purposes and having many members of unquestionable loyalty to the United States. This amendment would unjustly penalize many completely loyal Americans who innocently joined such organizations and would, in some measure, tend to defeat the carrying out of the purposes of the act.

The amendments also overlooked the fact that under the employee loyalty program, membership in an organization on the Attorney General's list is regarded as merely one piece of evidence pointing to possible disloyalty. The loyalty program enables an employee who is a member of a listed organization to respond to charges against him and to show that his membership is innocent and does not reflect upon his loyalty. This opportunity to defend oneself in a manner consistent with American concepts of justice and fairness is lacking from the amendments.

It is also to be noted, with regard to the second amendment, above quoted, that a very practical difficulty exists with respect to the proposed investigation of foreign nationals by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in that the Bureau does not have facilities for conducting investigations abroad.

For the reasons above stated, I request and hope that you will make every effort to eliminate the amendments in question before final enactment of the National Science Foundation Act of 1949, thus leaving investigations of the personnel of this agency to be conducted on the same basis as investigations of personnel of other nonsensitive agencies.

I am authorized to state that this letter also reflects the views of the Secretary of Defense.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

In reaching agreement on the provisions of section 15 the committee of conference has retained the purposes of subsections 14 (l) and (m) of the House amendment so far as it has been practicable to do so, but great weight has necessarily been given to the strongly expressed views of the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Defense.

The text of section 15 has been examined by representatives of the Department of Justice, and on April 25, 1950, the Honorable Peyton Ford, Assistant to the Attorney General, sent a joint letter to the chairman and vice chairman of the committee of conference in which he stated:

"The Department of Justice would have no objection to the proposed new section 15."

The committee of conference is convinced that the provisions of section 15 are adequate with regard to the loyalty investigation of individuals who will become employees of the Foundation or holders of scholarships or fellowships, or who will be associated with the Foundation in any way.

A draft of the proposed section 15 was submitted to the Department of Defense, and a letter regarding it was addressed to the chairman of the committee of conference on April 24, 1950, by Mr. William Webster, Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the Department. The letter states in part as follows:

"This draft has been examined with care, for the Department of Defense has long been strongly in favor of the establishment of a National Science Foundation. The proposed security provision seems to strike a proper balance between two objectives. It recognizes, first, the need to protect research and development related to the national defense according to the possible damage which could result from the disclosure to a potential enemy of information concerning it and, second, the need that scientific research, particularly basic research, be open in order to achieve maximum progress.

"It is our understanding that the National Science Foundation would deal principally with basic research and other matters of a nonclassified nature and that the authorization for it to engage in applied research in connection with matters relating to the national defense is designed primarily to enable the Foundation to assist the military effort in a small number of cases or in the event of an emergency. It does not appear that the volume of such work relating to the national defense will be significant, particularly classified work of that type. In view of the limitation on appropriations authorized for the Foundation, it may be expected that the bulk of such work would be carried on by funds transferred from the Department of Defense. In cases of this type, authority is provided to the Department by the proposed subsection (b) (1) to insure that adequate security precautions are taken wherever necessary. It is assumed that the subsection would authorize controls relating to any person who might have access to classified information including fellows and employees of the Foundation and its contractors. The caliber of men who will constitute the Foundation—appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate—should provide assurance that the Foundation would take adequate precautions with respect to research supported by it and related to the national defense, if there be any. Furthermore, it is noted that all employees of the Foundation must be fully investigated and cleared before being given access to any classified information.

"I understand that subsection (a) of the proposed security provisions has been approved by the Atomic Energy Commission. It appears that the principles involved in the proposed provisions and the provisions themselves will be satisfactory, particularly in view of the assurance above-mentioned that the Department of Defense would establish requirements covering the security of all research work supported with its funds. This letter has been coordinated among the departments and agencies of the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Defense. Shortness of time, however, has prevented submission of it to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance."

It has already been pointed out in the explanation of subsection (a) that full investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation will be required, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, before individuals are permitted to have access to restricted data as defined in that act.

Subsection (c) provides that no employee of the Foundation shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions are established under subsection (b) (1) or (2), with respect to research related to the national defense, until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation into the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual and shall have reported its findings to the Foundation, and the Foundation shall have determined that

permitting such individual to have access to such information or property will not endanger the common defense and security. The investigation thus required is the same as that required under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Since the members of the Board and the Director will not be employees of the Foundation, but officers appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, subsection (c) will not apply to them.

Under subsection (b) the security safeguards to be established by the Secretary of Defense and the Foundation in connection with research activities of the Foundation related to the national defense may provide for such investigations of scholarship and fellowship holders, employees of contractors, and others, as may be deemed necessary.

In order that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, and any other appropriate agency of the Government will have authority to make the investigations provided for pursuant to subsection (b), a paragraph (3) has been included specifically authorizing any agency of the Government exercising investigatory functions to make such investigations and reports as may be requested by the Foundation. Nothing in section 15 of the conference substitute is intended in any way to alter the present authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in matters dealing with internal security.

The provisions of subsection (b) are consistent with the method of imposing and enforcing security safeguards which is presently in effect with respect to the Department of Defense. In the case of that Department, it is left to its judgment to determine the instances in which to require investigations of individuals before they are permitted to have access to classified matters and, depending on the degree of secrecy involved, the nature and extent of the investigation to be made of particular individuals.

As indicated in the letter from the Chairman of the Research and Development Board, the Foundation's activities will be almost exclusively in basic research. Basic research generally does not involve security problems. It is confidently anticipated that only a very small part of its activities will be concerned with research on matters related to restricted data in the field of nuclear energy or related to the national defense—the two fields in which problems of security may be involved. It is the considered judgment of the committee of conference that to the very limited extent that activities of the Foundation will involve security problems, section 15 of the conference substitute provides a sound and satisfactory method of dealing with those problems.

It is unnecessary to include in this legislation special penal provisions with respect to violations of the security requirements and safeguards which will be in effect, thereunder. As already pointed out, the penalties provided by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (in sec. 10 thereof) will apply with respect to any activity involving restricted data in the field of research related to nuclear energy. These penalties are wholly adequate. In the field of research related to the national defense, the same penalties which now apply to security matters concerning the Department of Defense will be applicable. These penalties are contained in title 18 of the United States Code, principally in chapter 37 thereof. Sections 793 and 794 of that chapter are as follows:

"§ 793. Gathering, transmitting, or losing defense information.

"Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States, or to the advantage of any foreign nation, goes upon, enters, flies over, or otherwise obtains information concerning any vessel, aircraft, work of defense, navy yard, naval station, submarine base, fueling station, fort, battery, torpedo station, dockyard, canal, railroad, arsenal, camp, factory, mine, telegraph, telephone, wireless, or signal station, building, office, or other place connected with the national defense, owned or constructed, or in progress of construction by the United States or under the control of the United States, or of any of its officers, departments or agencies, or within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, or any place in which any vessel, aircraft, arms, munitions, or other materials or instruments for use in time of war are being made, prepared, repaired, or stored, under any contract or agreement with the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or with any person on behalf of the United States, or otherwise on behalf of the United States, or any other prohibited place so designated by the President by proclamation in time of war or in case of national emergency in which anything for the use of the Army or Navy is being prepared or constructed or stored, information as to which the President has determined would be prejudicial to the national defense; or

"Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, and with like intent or reason to believe, copies, takes, makes, or obtains, or attempts to copy, take, make, or obtain, any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, document, writing, or note of anything connected with the national defense; or

"Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, receives or obtains or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain from any person, or from any source whatever, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note, of anything connected with the national defense, knowing or having reason to believe, at the time he receives or obtains, or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain it, that it has been or will be obtained, taken, made or disposed of by any person contrary to the provisions of this chapter; or

"Whoever, lawfully or unlawfully having possession of, access to, control over, or being intrusted with any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note relating to the national defense, willfully communicates or transmits or attempts to communicate or transmit the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it on demand to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"Whoever, being intrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, or information, relating to the national defense, through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"§ 794. Gathering or delivering defense information to aid foreign government.

"(a) Whoever, with intent or reason to believe that it is to be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of a foreign nation, communicates, delivers, or transmits, or attempts to communicate, deliver, or transmit, to any foreign government, or to any faction or party or military or naval force within a foreign country, whether recognized or unrecognized by the United States, or to any representative, officer, agent, employee, subject, or citizen thereof, either directly or indirectly, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, instrument, appliance, or information relating to the national defense, shall be imprisoned not more than twenty years.

"(b) Whoever violates subsection (a) in time of war shall be punished by death or by imprisonment for not more than thirty years.

"(c) Whoever, in time of war, with intent that the same shall be communicated to the enemy, collects, records, publishes, or communicates, or attempts to elicit any information with respect to the movement, numbers, description, condition, or disposition of any of the armed forces, ships, aircraft, or war materials of the United States, or with respect to the plans or conduct, or supposed plans or conduct of any naval or military operations, or with respect to any works or measures undertaken for or connected with, or intended for the fortification or defense of any place, or any other information relating to the public defense, which might be useful to the enemy, shall be punished by death or by imprisonment for not more than thirty years.

"(d) If two or more persons conspire to violate this section, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be subject to the punishment provided for the offense which is the object of such conspiracy."

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Section 14 of the Senate bill contained the following subsection not contained in the House amendment:

"(h) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development."

This provision has not been included in the conference substitute. No such provision seems needed to insure continuance of research which is or may be carried on by other Government agencies under specific statutory authority and the provision seemed so broad and inflexible in its terms that its inclusion might unduly interfere with the administrative coordination through the National Science Foundation of activities in the basic sciences being carried on by various Government agencies.

Moreover, debate in the House over the striking out of a similar provision in the House bill as introduced made it clear that omission of the provision in no way implies that the Foundation is authorized to take over the research functions which have been granted other agencies by law or that the exercise of those functions is to be curtailed. It was made especially clear in the debate that its omission would not result in any limitation or curtailment of the programs of research in the fields of medicine and related activities being carried on by the National Institutes of Health or other units of the United States Public Health Service. After discussion of the nature of the research being carried on by the Institutes or supported by them, the committee of conference agreed with this interpretation.

TRANSFER OF NATIONAL ROSTER OF SCIENTIFIC AND SPECIALIZED PERSONNEL

Section 14 (i) of the conference substitute relates to the transfer to the Foundation of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, which is now in the United States Employment Service. The provision is the same as in the House amendment, except that the President, rather than the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, will have the authority to determine the records and property to be transferred with the roster and

the time when the transfer shall take effect. This modification has been taken from the corresponding provision in the Senate bill.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
GEO. HOWARD WILSON,
CARL HINSHAW,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate on this bill, I simply wish to say that I feel the proposed legislation is now in a satisfactory condition, and that the establishment of the National Science Foundation represents a great and a constructive step forward. I very much hope that the conference report will be agreed to by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM.]

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly in favor of an adequate authorization for the Economic Cooperation Administration and at more length in favor of the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and myself, calling for a bipartisan study of technical assistance and private investment overseas.

Three years ago, on June 5, 1947, former Secretary of State Marshall spoke at a Harvard commencement. This was the origin of the so-called Marshall plan. In outlining what is now the Economic Cooperation Administration, he stated:

> I need not tell you gentlemen that the world situation is very serious.

He concluded his remarks by saying:

> An essential part of any successful action on the part of the United States is an understanding on the part of the people of America of the character of the problem and remedies to be applied. Political preference and prejudice should have no part. With foresight and a willingness on the part of our people to face up to the vast responsibility which history has clearly placed upon our country, the difficulties I have outlined can and will be overcome.

The plan General Marshall outlined at that time has twice been authorized by Congress and funds have been appropriated to carry it out. It has been well administered by businessmen—Paul Hoffman and his assistants.

We now have before us a bill which includes a third authorization. I intend to vote for an adequate authorization, as I have for the two previous ones.

I do so because I believe that the ECA expenditures are in the best interests of our own security and of world peace. But these expenditures are in the best interests of our own security only if we make it clear that ECA, in its original concept, will be completed in 1952.

Nothing in the history of mankind has been more important than is peace to the present generation. Peace—and the security that goes with peace—means more to more people now than ever before in the history of the world. Of course there are great differences of opinion as to the best way to gain peace, but we all agree upon the final objective—peace with security.

Today the world is still in a turbulent condition. The uncertainties we face from day to day are brought home to us by new incidents. Only last week 10 of our citizens in an unarmed plane were shot down and killed or drowned. More incidents are bound to come. We can expect them. Apparently Soviet Russia does not begin to understand the moral fiber of the American people. The more incidents, the tougher we are going to get, and the more we will understand how to deal with a ruthless opponent. This does not mean war, but it does mean that we cannot predict just what is in store for us in the years ahead. I optimistically and sincerely believe we are gaining in our over-all effort to bring about greater security and peace, but we cannot for one moment relax that effort. Certainly, an adequate authorization and appropriation for ECA in the fiscal year 1951 is one more such necessary effort on our part.

We are all familiar to a greater or less degree with the problems represented by the ECA. We have become so by listening to the debates on the floor and in committee over the past 2 years. So, I should like for a few moments to discuss briefly one subject which is not strictly a part of the responsibility of the ECA, but which has become a part of the pending bill by reason of the action of the House in joining to the ECA authorization for 1951 a new title: "Title III—An Act for International Development." This title seeks to create in other countries an atmosphere or climate favorable to private investment and provides for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The provisions of the Senate bill are not those contained in the House bill. The Senate bill is not centered around the idea of encouragement of foreign investments. It is confined to purely technical and other assistance. I wanted to bring that to the Senator's attention.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Texas I realize that, and I shall discuss it more fully as I proceed. I realize the distinction.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wanted the Senator to bear that in mind. The Senate committee did not feel that this was a program to export our funds to foreign countries for foreign investment. I know there is much support for the idea in this country, but we were confining it purely to technical and other assistance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in reporting the ECA authorization, omitted title III of the House bill, but the chairman of the committee [Mr. CONNALLY] has filed on behalf of the committee an amendment creating a new title, title V, which covers in part title III of the House bill. It provides for technical assistance, but does nothing toward creating a favorable atmosphere for private investment.

The House authorized $25,000,000 for its title III. The Connally amendment authorizes an appropriation of $45,000,000 for his title V, $20,000,000 more than the House authorized for the same general purposes: namely, the providing of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. But, the provision for technical assistance is only a part of the problem as I see it. The other part is the responsibility of our Government to create an atmosphere which will encourage private investment in other areas of the world, such an atmosphere as may also result in furnishing the technical assistance which under the Connally amendment Government alone must provide.

Mr. President, I favor title III of the House bill. I had hoped that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee might see fit to recommend it in its entirety, but in their wisdom they have not. They have merely seen fit to recommend the technical assistance part without the investment "atmosphere" part. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have recently heard a great deal about technical assistance and am beginning to learn of its many ramifications that already exist within our governmental departments. At first I thought that I would offer title III of the House bill as an amendment to this bill, but after careful consideration. I decided that it could not be adopted, and therefore I thought of ways and means to which the Senate might agree and which, in the long run, would preserve a program similar to that contemplated in the President's point 4 program and implemented by title III of the House bill.

I believe that the amendment filed by the Senator from Colorado for a bipartisan study is a proper approach. This amendment, if adopted, as I hope it will be, will solidify in its report the thinking of various groups of people. It will point up to the Congress where we are headed and point it up to the American people in more concrete terms than it has been possible to do to date because of the newness of the whole proposal and the total problem.

While I realize there has been broad discussion of point 4 and that in its objectives it is backed by a great many organizations and people, I do not believe the average individual has had an opportunity to think through this question and where it may lead us in all of its various ramifications. It is the duty of the Congress to appropriate, and I feel that the Congress wants to understand what the program is, and where it will head before too large appropriations are made.

On September 15, 1949, I introduced Senate bill 2561, entitled, "A Bill To Establish a Program of Foreign Economic Development." This was exactly

the same bill as was introduced in the House by Representative HERTER of Massachusetts. On January 24, 1950, Representative HERTER introduced in the House an improved version, and I introduced in the Senate the same version, which is now Senate bill 2197. The bill introduced by Mr. HERTER became the basis of title III of House bill 7797, a bill to provide foreign economic assistance, which was passed by the House. Now, in the interest of seeing the overall problem in point 4 get off to a proper start, and to see that its potentialities are properly recognized and developed, with emphasis on private investment, I have joined with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] in filing an amendment to Senate bill 3304, which is now pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it the major purpose of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Colorado to encourage foreign investments?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot speak for the Senator from Colorado on that point. I speak for myself alone. I listened very intently to the President's explanation of point 4. I believe we should, to the best of our ability, provide an atmosphere to encourage American businessmen to take an interest in other countries, to help develop those countries in the way we have always gone ahead in this country and in our undertakings throughout the world, from the early clipper-ship days on. I would say to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that there are many problems involved which I shall discuss at length. I believe in the purpose, in the ideal, and in the principle involved in creating an atmosphere for private citizens to invest their money abroad.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the creation of this atmosphere to be followed later on by Government guaranties?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not in every instance, by any means.

Mr. CONNALLY. But in some instances?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would depend on the discretion of the Export-Import Bank as it is now constituted. It would depend on the purposes for which the Export-Import Bank guaranteed investments. As I understand, the provision in the bill which is now before the Senate and in the bill agreed to by the House committee is for expropriation and for currency purposes alone. It does not guarantee profits, and I think it should not guarantee profits.

The amendment to which I have referred calls for a study by a bipartisan commission set up on the same basis as the Hoover Commission, except that it is proposed to have 24 members instead of 12 members. The purpose is to study the whole program of international development and technical assistance, with, as I say, emphasis on private investment, with a directive to report within 60 days after Congress meets in 1951.

I have joined in this amendment because I believe there are many problems connected with these undertakings which have not been sufficiently clearly brought before the Congress and certainly not clearly understood by it. I have joined in the amendment because I believe Congress should include in its authorization the creation by our Government of the necessary atmosphere or climate to encourage private investment in the underdeveloped and other areas of the world. The House version provides for this, but the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] does not.

Mr. President, I should like to insert as a part of my remarks at this point, and I ask unanimous consent to do so, excerpts from Secretary Acheson's testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee. The Secretary said in his statement, in part:

> Its purpose is to encourage the exchange of technical skills and promote the flow of private-investment capital where these skills and capital can help to raise standards of living, create new wealth, increase productivity, and expand purchasing power.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BILL ESTABLISHES NEW NATIONAL POLICY

The bill now before you establishes economic development of underdeveloped areas for the first time as a national policy. Its purpose is to encourage the exchange of technical skills and promote the flow of private-investment capital where these skills and capital can help to raise standards of living, create new wealth, increase productivity, and expand purchasing power. There are other conditions. American aid will be furnished only where it contributes to the development of a balanced economy. It may go only where it is actually needed, and where the country receiving it cannot provide skills and capital for itself.

CAPITAL TO COME FROM UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Most of the capital needed for economic development must come from the underdeveloped areas themselves. However, foreign capital will be needed from three main sources: from private investors, from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and from the Export-Import Bank. The latter two should supplement, not compete with, private capital. They should finance projects, such as transportation and irrigation, which are foundations for economic development and which are not ordinarily attractive to private investment. We put primary emphasis, however, on the need for stimulating an expansion of private investment not only to provide capital but also to provide the technical and managerial skills that come with capital. On the subject of capital investment, the bill makes some important findings. It recognizes that, if investment is to do its job, the people of those underdeveloped areas must have confidence that foreign investors will not squander their natural resources, will pay taxes, will obey the local laws, and will provide decent wages and working conditions.

At the same time, it recognizes the fact that investors must have confidence that their property will not be confiscated without fair compensation; that they can take their legitimate profits and their capital out of the country, and that they can have reasonable freedom to manage their own business, subject to local laws that apply to everybody equally.

We have examples of these treaties, Senator, which are now before your committee. One of them is a treaty which we have recently negotiated with Uruguay, which is now before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. A treaty in a somewhat similar vein is the treaty with Italy, which you have before you, and we are negotiating with a number of other countries to provide these treaties which do guarantee protection along the lines which I have indicated for investment capital, for the right to do business, for the right to have managerial personnel come to the country and operate the business, equality of application of local laws such as taxes, et cetera, et cetera. Some of these treaties have been negotiated. Some are before your committee; others are being negotiated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Thorp, along the same line, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSSIBILITY OF USING SMITH-MUNDT ACT

I think that a considerable part of this program could be done under the authority of that act. There are some elements, such as cooperation with the United Nations, for example, which were not envisaged at the time that that act was passed. I think the other element is that the general framework of that act is not focused on economic development. While that certainly is an element in the total picture, the diffusion of effort in covering all cultural informational relations in many areas makes it harder to focus on economic development, and therefore it seemed better to have a bill which was specifically directed to the economic development program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the colloquy between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], appearing at page 39 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I raised the question of the Secretary of State whether it (the technical assistance program) could not be incorporated in our existing legislation. I am still troubled by having a new over-all approach to this, because I think we have to feel our way. I think if we try to cover the whole scope of it in this thing now, and especially if we try to add it on to the ECA bill, we are going to have real resistance.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are right, and I thought that we were just simply going to utilize the ECA bill for this year and appropriate money for this year, and let this thing come up on an independent basis.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I would rather see it as separate legislation. I think it is a very worthy project, but it needs a lot of study.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; because this ECA is just an annual appropriation, and if we are going to bring this in and tie on to it a lot of permanent legislation we are going to be in difficulties. I think we ought to handle this on the basis of this year in the ECA bill and then take it up as an independent measure. That is the way I feel about it. However, I will be governed by the committee's action, of course.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cite the colloquy and statements, Mr. President, to

show that the committee itself believed that study and careful consideration should be given to the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is the Senator yielding for a question at this time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to ask the Senator if he does not think that in the past some of the projects in connection with our foreign policy have been failures, or partial failures, because we had not given them sufficient study as independent projects?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is no question about that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that here we have a project which is very important not only to America, but to the world, and which needs special attention as an independent project, so that we may ascertain what the roadblocks or pitfalls may be, in order that we may do a good job and do it through the independent, free enterprise system, rather than have the Government start in now on a temporary program and be unable, perhaps, to vary it in the future?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. I think we ought to get the point of view of the private interests who are now interested in foreign countries, as well as of the private interests in the United States who perhaps would have to compete with the businesses abroad, and who may have a completely different point of view. We want to get all points of view. We want to get the point of view of the Government. As I say a little later in my address, if some cash appropriations are to be made we can consider it as a separate proposal, and not ascribe to it the purpose which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ascribed to it when they said that its purpose is to help and encourage foreign trade. Those are not the exact words of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the Senator has indicated, does not the danger exist that if we are not careful in laying out the road, even on a temporary basis, we may not be able to vary that course in the future? In other words, there should be a complete study of the project.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We may get ourselves into a position of giving false ideas to other countries as to what we intend to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I mean, that it would be expected we would follow it out along the same road as that set forth in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am eager to hear the remainder of the distinguished Senator's address on the subject, because I am greatly interested in the program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I know he is interested. Later in my address I shall cite some of the work he has done in connection with it.

Mr. President, this country has reached its maturity and its strength through the initiative, the imagination and the willingness of private persons to risk their savings and even their lives in new undertakings. If the underdeveloped areas of the world are to become greater markets for our products and for the industry of our workers, more must be done than simply to help improve their health, or to give them more education, or to encourage know-how in agriculture and industry. These aids, it is true, will provide a first step by creating better conditions in these areas, by creating a better understanding of our country and of theirs, but they are only a first step. There is much more to be done. We must encourage our private citizens to undertake activities abroad and provide an outlet for greater investment by them in other parts of the world. Our taxpayers cannot continue indefinitely to carry the entire burden.

I listened intently to President Truman in his inaugural address describe his so-called point 4 program, and I came away with the feeling that this program had great possibilities when properly implemented, but that the implementation must be carefully worked out and cover a really adequate program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The point 4 program will go beyond the countries that are now a part of the ECA program, will it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. In the event the point 4 program were incorporated into the ECA plan, we would go beyond the countries with which we are now engaged in the European recovery plan?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] were adopted, it would apply to countries which are not now included in ECA.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator agree that point 4 is not a necessity insofar as the countries which are now under and in the ECA program are concerned?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That statement is a little too inclusive. Korea is included in the ECA bill. It includes Korea and some other parts of the world.

Mr. BREWSTER. Palestine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; Palestine, and some other parts of the world which were not in the original ECA bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. China.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Also China.

Mr. THYE. ECA administrators may proceed in any manner they desire to assist, whether in the field of agriculture or industry, or in the monetary field. In other words, ECA is not in any sense restricted as to the manner in which it may assist in European recovery.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the way I understand it. I understand they have very broad discretionary powers.

Mr. THYE. I have found them engaged in introducing the use of hybrid plants and seeds to advance and promote greater production of agriculture, and I have found them engaged in consolidating parcels of land into one unit in order to bring about a more efficient program of operating the farm unit. Therefore it was my observation and understanding that ECA could enter any field they desired in order to bring about a speedy recovery in the European countries where ECA is now in operation. So, point 4 would not mean anything so far as advancing recovery of the countries now under the ECA program are concerned. It would be only in the areas where ECA does not reach at the present time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator that I do not think that is quite correct. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would provide additional funds, presumably to go into ECA areas and into areas all over the world which are not now included. As I conceive it, point 4, with private investment, might include European countries, because they create the atmosphere, as well as any other place.

Mr. THYE. ECA is creating an atmosphere which has encouraged private capital's adventure. ECA has given hope and courage to the foreigner to invest his money, as well as to the American investor. My observation last fall was that ECA was not only bringing about a recovery by the use of the American dollars, but that it was giving hope and courage to the people, not only industrially but politically. It has encouraged them to enter into political campaigns in order to elect sounder types of government.

So, from the standpoint of point 4 as the President outlined it before the joint session of Congress, I could see that ECA was doing much of what was set forth in the Presidential message on point 4. But that is only in the countries that come under the European recovery program. From the standpoint of point 4 in other countries, where ECA does not reach, because we are not operating in those countries, I could see an opportunity for an administrative function under the proposed plan of point 4.

However, as I have followed the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in his statement, I believe he is entirely correct when he says that we might find ourselves out in a millstream without any way of getting back to shore. Evidently the Senator proposes a plan of study and research on how we may get back to shore after we get out into the millstream. I think the Senator is entirely sound in his approach to the question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not correct that the ECA is a temporary program, intended to expire 2 years from now?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Point 4 necessarily would be a permanent program, perhaps running over generations, involving billions upon billions of dollars.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of private investment, and some Government funds.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator may consider it either way he wishes, but in either event, whether by private investment or by Government investment, or by both, by its very nature it is a permanent program. So is not a basic defect of the Connally amendment the fact that it in-

jects into a dying temporary plan a long-range program plan, with implications possibly as great as the plan which is now on its way out?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree. We now provide technical assistance in the pan-American countries through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and by other activities. We now provide for all the ECA countries through ECA. We have 47 different international tie-ups which I shall set forth a little later. The Connally amendment would permit in any section of the world the same work that is being done in South America and the ECA countries.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not correct that the program covered by the Connally amendment is the entry program into point 4?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is the entry to point 4 so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is what I am talking about. Therefore, it is the entry program into a permanent program, injected into the middle of a program which is temporary and which will expire in a couple of years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. The chairman of the committee said that himself in the colloquy in the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LODGE. First of all, I express my regret that because of my attendance on the meeting of the Subcommittee on Disloyalty Charges I have not been able to be on the floor in connection with the proposal now under consideration, which interests me very much.

I should like to say further, so far as the comment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is concerned, that he is entirely right that this is not an ideal place to put such legislation, and I made the same comment when the matter was before us in the committee, and was given the classic answer which we so often receive, that this is the way the House wants us to do it because in the House they must take up one big bill and cannot take up separate small bills. Whether that is accurate or not, or desirable or not, if accurate, I cannot say, but I think it is not ideal to tie a long-range program into a short-range program.

So far as my colleague is concerned, he and Representative HERTER, of Massachusetts, have made a very profound study of this whole matter, and I think have done valuable pioneer work in connection with it. The proposed legislation as it came over from the House not only covered the question of technical assistance, which we now have before us, but also contained language which was agreed upon after long conferences between representatives of the State Department and representatives of American industry, which, without underwriting anything or guaranteeing anything or pledging anything, would nevertheless have tended to create an atmosphere abroad that was favorable and encouraging to private investment.

Of course, for most of the undeveloped countries, that is by far the best hope. The work which a foundation, like the Rockefeller Foundation, does is very good and is to be commended, the work of Government agencies is very good, and is also to be commended; but, by and large, the best hope of those undeveloped countries is the work of private enterprise.

This language which my colleague had a great part in developing, and which Representative HERTER defended in the House, came over to us in the House bill, and very much to my regret, was taken out of the bill in committee. I argued as best I could in the committee, but for reasons which did not seem to me good then, and do not seem to me good now, it was taken out.

I believe what is left is all right. I do not share the fears entertained by the Senator from Colorado that the provisions for technical assistance are dangerous, but I believe it would have been very much better if we had stayed with the over-all, well-balanced contemplation which my colleague advocates, and of which he is such a distinguished sponsor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Massachusetts yield again?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank my colleague for his contribution. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My present purpose is not to attack the technical assistance. My present purpose is merely to say that this is the indirect entry to a long-range program, and that it requires preliminary study, rather than the hasty consideration which has been given to it.

Since the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts was good enough to state his own position in the hearing, I would remind him that the distinguished chairman of the committee, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], voiced similar alarm over the inappropriateness of putting this matter into the ECA legislation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall now proceed with my prepared remarks.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas and offered by him with, I understand, the unanimous support of his committee, does not, in my opinion, adequately implement the President's program. It covers only part of the ground. I believe, therefore, that the time has come to have a thorough study of this whole subject made by a bipartisan commission composed of members of the executive department, Members of Congress, and citizens from private life, over the period of the next 8 months so that the Congress and the public may have a factual report at hand to help them with their studies, with their deliberations, and with their actions.

I quote from the first paragraph of the proposed amendment:

> There are presently before Congress problems for stimulating an atmosphere for capital investment in and providing technical assistance for underdeveloped areas of the world such as Africa, the Near and Far East, and Central and South America.

And again, section 9–B of the amendment states:

> Within 60 days after the Eighty-second Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress with attention to the relationship between the Commission's recommendations and the peace, security, and solvency of the United States.

Spread out through our various departments of Government, but concentrated to a large extent in the Department of State, are a greater number of activities in this field of technical assistance than most of us have any idea exist. In addition, there are spread through the United Nations and its various commissions more of these undertakings to which we contribute in great part.

Let me quote from a recent pamphlet issued by the Public Affairs Institute called Ground Work for Action—Bold New Program, Series No. 3, page 14:

> To implement the President's point-4 proposal of January 1949, a program was prepared and submitted to Congress. This would provide for furnishing assistance to underdeveloped areas both through multilateral programs such as the United Nations program, and bilateral programs conducted in accordance with arrangements made directly with foreign governments. The program as submitted covered technical assistance and proposals for fostering foreign investment by United States capital. The proposals for technical-assistance programs were based largely on the assumption of expanding existing United States bilateral programs and increased participation in the expanded program of the United Nations and specialized agencies.

Please note the statement that both the bilateral and multilateral programs were expanding.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the State Department, let me call the Senate's attention to requests for contributions to the following international organizations:

World Health Organization	$1,920,000
UNESCO	2,814,381
International Labor Organization	1,091,739
Food and Agriculture Organization	1,250,000

They total $7,076,120.

In addition to these requests for contributions, there are requests for funds for American missions to these and other international organizations with salaries and expenses of approximately $1,500,000. In addition, there are employees in the State Department whose job it is to correlate the work of these missions and of these organizations in the State Department, as well as in the Department of Agriculture and other departments of our Government.

In addition, under the Smith-Mundt Act, there is a request of approximately $2,925,000. It does not include the estimated amount of foreign credits under the Fulbright program nor the educational activities under the Voice of America program. Please note in subchapter 4 of the Smith-Mundt Act, entitled "Participation by Government Agents," section 1458, a policy governing rendition of services, that the Secretary

of State shall encourage through any appropriate Government agency the performance of services to foreign governments by qualified private American individuals and agencies and "shall not enter into the performance of such services to any foreign government where such services may be performed adequately by qualified private American individuals and agencies, and such qualified individuals and agencies are available for the performance of such services."

I mention this to show that the Smith-Mundt Act clearly recognizes the need for encouragement of private investment. The Connally amendment recognizes the need for participation of private agencies but does not create the necessary implementation to attract these agencies.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am very much in favor of the amendment the Senator from Massachusetts is discussing which provides for a study to be made of the subject of technical assistance, and so forth. Should not the study include the nature of the government of the country to which we propose to supply aid, in order that we may determine whether the aid will stimulate free and individual enterprise rather than to give aid which will be under Government control? Is it not necessary that the aid we furnish shall create a climate favorable to individual enterprise rather than that in giving such aid we become a partner with a socialistic nation? If we give the aid without making a thorough study of the purposes for which it is to be used is there not danger that what our country really will do will be to become a partner with a foreign government on a socialistic basis?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator says might very well happen.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore it is essential that we make a study not only with respect to what we might very well do to aid a certain country, but whether or not there exists there a climate favorable to the aid developing through free enterprise?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that the more I have studied the question, particularly in connection with this amendment, the more I am convinced that there should be made a thoroughgoing study as absolutely far removed from politics as possible. I believe such a study will be of benefit to the Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The report to be made next March may be merely a temporary one, merely a report of progress. We should have such a report. That report, however, may show that it is necessary that further study be made, and the report may furnish the ground work for further study.

Further, there is the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, which has been engaged over a number of years in very successful technical-assistance programs covering the fields of education, health, and agriculture in particular. That Institute is this year requesting a cash appropriation of $6,500,000 and contract authority of $14,000,000, or a total of $20,500,000. The House Committee on Appropriations cut the cash appropriation by a million dollars and the contract authority in half. The House itself threw out, on a point of order, the contract authority, but the amount will undoubtedly be requested of the Senate Appropriations Committee in due course.

In addition to the Institute, there are other inter-American organizations, for eight of which requests for appropriations amounting to $3,032,919 have been made.

I also call attention to the report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Report No. 1274, filed by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] on February 14, 1950. The appendixes to this report commencing on page 50 give a list of the permanent and emergency international organizations in which the United States participates. This list totals 47 in number.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the list in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERMANENT AND EMERGENCY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATES

I. United Nations and specialized agencies: United Nations (including International Court of Justice); Food and Agriculture Organization; International Civil Aviation Organization; International Labor Organization; International Telecommunication Union; United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; Universal Postal Union; World Health Organization; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; International Monetary Fund; International Refugee Organization;[1] United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.[1]

II. Inter-American organizations: American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, Inter-American Indian Institute, Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Inter-American Radio Office, Inter-American Statistical Institute, International Office of Postal Union of Americas and Spain, Pan American Institute of Geography and History, Pan American Railway Congress, Pan American Sanitary Bureau, Pan American Union (including Inter-American Defense Board).

III. Other international organizations: Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration, Cape Spartel and Tangier Lighthouse, Caribbean Commission, Central Bureau of the International Map of the Millionth Scale, International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property, International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs, International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, International Bureau of Weights and Measures, International Council of Scientific Unions and Seven Associated Unions, International Criminal Police Commission, International Hydrographic Bureau, International Meteorological Organization, International Penal and Penitentiary Commission, International Statistical Bureau at The Hague, International Sugar Council, Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses, South Pacific Commission.

TEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATES

Central Rhine Commission, Inter-Allied Reparation Agency, International Authority for the Ruhr, International Cotton Advisory Committee, International Seed Testing Association, International Tin Study Group, International Union of Official Travel Organizations, Rubber Study Group.

[1] These organizations are not permanent but were created to meet emergency situations arising out of World War II. The IRO, which is scheduled to terminate its operations on March 31, 1951, is a specialized agency and is therefore included here as such. The UNICEF has no termination date and is an agency of the United Nations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I call attention to a few organizations. Under the United Nations and specialized agencies there are the Food and Agricultural Organization; the International Civil Aviation Organization; the International Labor Organization; the International Telecommunication Union; and many others. Under the inter-American organizations there are the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood; the Inter-American Indian Institute; the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences; the Inter-American Radio Office; the Inter-American Statistical Institute, and others. Under the heading "Other international organizations" there are the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration; the Caribbean Commission; the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs, and others.

Then under the heading of "Temporary international organizations in which the United States participates," there are the International Cotton Advisory Committee, the International Seed Testing Association, the International Tin Study Group, and several others.

The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] had the foresight last August to ask the Director of the Budget to secure information for him concerning United States technical assistance and exchange programs for certain other foreign expenditures. I call attention at this time to the fact that it took the Director of the Budget more than 5 months to gather the material and to reply to the Senator from Michigan on February 8. This, I think, might well be traced to the fact that many different agencies of the Federal Government are involved in one way or another. I have been endeavoring to reconcile the figures the Senator from Michigan received and which he was good enough a few days ago to read into the record of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for State, Commerce, and Judiciary with other figures which have been furnished me. It is extremely difficult. The figures which I now quote are figures which were prepared by the State Department on March 27 and are for the fiscal year 1951:

First. Technical assistance in Connally amendment to S. 3304: $45,000,000. This includes $2,900,000 Smith-Mundt Act money and a cash appropriation for the Institute of American Affairs of

$6,500,000 but does not take into account contract authority requested in the amount of $14,000,000 for the Institute.

Second. In addition to this, there is $15,000,000 included in the ECA authorization for technical assistance and $2,779,000 in the Korea authorization.

Third. Other statutes authorize $501,489, or a total of $63,280,482.

Fourth. In addition to the total I have just given, we pay about $29,000,000 to the regular budgets of the international organizations, exclusive of contributions to IRO. Of this, about $2,000,000 goes for technical assistance.

Fifth. It also costs $1,600,000 to staff our missions to international organizations. This is not directly for technical assistance. There should further be considered the amount of money that is paid to the various people who supervise all of our international organizations in the State Department; that is, the people who stay in this country and back up the overseas force.

If we add these figures together, we get about $65,000,000 for technical assistance, $27,000,000 to regular budgets of international organizations, exclusive of technical assistance, and $1,600,000 for missions to international organizations, or approximately $94,000,000.

Then, Mr. President, I would call attention at this point to a memorandum from the State Department showing the service rendered by the Department of Commerce to business. I shall ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I point out that the fifth paragraph of the memorandum states:

> The estimate of this Department of Commerce service to business program for fiscal year 1951 is $398,000.

So, Mr. President, if that amount is appropriated, it will be in addition to the totals I have given.

I now ask unanimous consent that the memorandum to which I have just referred be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICE OF COMMERCE DEPARTMENT TO BUSINESS

The service outlined here is to provide detailed information on investment opportunities and business problems in underdeveloped areas to the American business community, and to collaborate directly with business in stimulating foreign investment undertakings. Lack of this information constitutes one of the impediments to American foreign investment.

This general program is composed of the following elements:

(a) Census of United States private investments abroad: This will provide up-to-date information on the character of existing investment, annual earnings and the manner of payment. The latest census of American investment abroad covered holdings as of May 31, 1943 but used 1942 and 1943 values.

(b) Country industrial development: A thorough collection and analysis in Washington is needed of economic, financial, and industrial information on each country, in order to provide business with a more complete background for their investment activities. This work will involve interdepartmental cooperation and some field surveys. The Department of Commerce proposes to set up an industry advisory committee to insure the most practical approach to the whole problem of investment in connection with country industrial development, and will also expand its contacts with all segments of business and industry on more specialized foreign business problems related to underdeveloped areas.

The estimate of this Department of Commerce service to business program for fiscal year 1951 is $398,000.

Preparation of field data: Not included here is a proposal for strengthening the economic staff of the Foreign Service in some underdeveloped areas with investment analysts, in order to provide on a continuing basis from the field the additional current data and analyses relating to investment opportunities and business problems called for under this program of service to business. This permanent addition to the reporting requirements is presented elsewhere in connection with other expanded responsibilities of the Foreign Service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, inasmuch as I think it would be of interest to the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum covering technical assistance. The memorandum has been handed to me by the State Department. It is a three-page memorandum, and substantiates the figures I have just tried to read under the five points. I shall not take the time of the Senate to repeat those statements, but I now ask to have the memorandum printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Your request is as follows:

How much "technical assistance" is included in ECA and other agencies excepted from section 417 (a) of aid bill (title III, H. R. 7797)?

Should this amount be added to the $45,000,000 in aid or is it part of it?

2. Technical assistance activities authorized by law and excluded from Aid Act are those carried on under:

(a) Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress, "not primarily related to economic development."

(b) International Aviation Facilities Act.

(c) Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

(d) Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, as amended.

(e) Korean Aid Act (not a part of ECA estimates).

3. Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1951 under these statutes are as follows:

(a) Public Law 402 (not in aid)	$358,101
(b) International Aviation Facilities Act	None
(c) Philippine Rehabilitation Act	143,381
(d) Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, as amended	15,000,000
(e) Korean Aid Act	2,779,000
Total	18,280,482

4. These amounts are being requested in appropriations other than the aid appropriation. They are not a part of the $45,000,000 for aid.

5. The total estimated expenditures for all technical assistance activities are as follows:

(a) Under aid	$45,000,000
(b) Not under aid	18,280,482
Total	63,280,482

6. The total estimated expenditures for all technical-assistance activities are shown in terms of H. R. 7797, as follows:

(a) Technical assistance authorization in H. R. 7797	$62,779,000
Aid (title III)	45,000,000
ECA (included in total ECA authorization of $2,100,000,000)	15,000,000
Korea (included in total Korea authorization of $100,000,000)	2,779,000
Total	62,779,000
(b) Technical assistance authorized in other statutes	501,482
Total	62,280,482

7. The details on technical assistance activities and expenditures outside aid are as follows:

(a) Educational exchange activities under Public Law 402 outside the Aid Act:

The 1951 State Department appropriation request includes the following items for technical cooperation—advice to foreign governments and training of their nationals—in cultural fields:

Archival science	$21,352
Historical resources	55,691
Library sciences	84,438
Social anthropology	105,840
Wildlife resources	90,780
Total	358,101

(b) Technical assistance under International Aviation Facilities Act:

No funds are being requested for 1951.

(c) Technical-assistance activities under Philippine Rehabilitation Act:

Most Philippine rehabilitation activities are ending in 1950; $3,013,062 was made available for fiscal 1950 activities in the following fields:

Public-road maintenance	$16,184
River and harbor engineering	200
Public-health facilities	1,122,841
Seamanship	246,201
Civil aviation	175,315
Meteorology	124,268
Fisheries	976,385
Geodetic and hydrographic work	351,663
Total	3,013,062

The only item being requested for 1951 is for seamanship, a sum of $143,381.

(d) ECA technical assistance. In fiscal year 1950, ECA set aside $15,000,000 for technical-assistance activities. Of this amount, $2,589,300 has actually been spent as of December 31, 1949. The amount estimated to be spent from January 1 to June 30, 1950, is $6,250,900, making a total for the year of $8,840,200. The remainder—$6,159,800—has been transferred to country-aid funds.

For fiscal year 1951, ECA estimates its project needs for technical assistance in the amount of $16,359,900. However, since there may be lapses in the program and some programs that will run over the fiscal-year period, ECA has reduced its request to the round figure of $15,000,000. It intends to use the full amount in fiscal 1951 if the funds are made available.

The fields of activity represented in the ECA technical-assistance program are:

Industrial productivity	$3,120,500
Overseas territories	2,495,700
Agricultural productivity	2,344,000
Marketing	1,447,300
Manpower utilization	1,421,800
Public administration	1,204,300
Communications and transportation	864,400
Tourism	162,000
Miscellaneous and program costs	300,000
Total	16,359,900

(e) Korean Aid Act:

Activities under this act are in the same fields as point 4, but the funds are part of the request of $100,000,000 for Korean aid. The amounts requested for 1951 are as follows:

Management and training	$1,650,000
Technical training institute in Korea	430,000
Training Koreans in United States	129,000
Special training and assistance projects	170,000
Training supplies and equipment	400,000
Total	2,779,000

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I cite these figures to give some indication of the growing expense to our Government that is involved in technical assistance and participation in international organizations. In considering this expense I want to make it clear that I am not criticizing it nor am I criticizing any international organization at the present time. By and large, I am for international organizations to which we now belong, because I believe that when they are properly administered they can be a tremendous force toward achieving a closer understanding among the peace-loving nations of the world. It is my hope that this understanding will help lead us to a true peace among all nations.

With these figures in mind, let me repeat: The House authorization for its title III calls for only $25,000,000 for technical assistance. The amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] provides for $45,000,000, but the true questions are: Where does it lead us? How far should we go? What percent should be private investment? How many of the taxpayer's dollars should we send out of the country in order to try to realize our objective of developing underdeveloped areas in order to give our citizens more business and to give us greater security and to provide more peace in the world? Certainly, our objective cannot be fully realized merely by the spending of dollars. It must be carefully planned on a basis that is recognized by our citizens and by our Government officials, both in the executive and legislative branches, as being in the best interests of our country, our security, and world peace.

I have tried in this brief manner to give some indication of the scope of our technical assistance organizations already under way and of the need for a careful study before we are committed, perhaps too far, along the lines of technical assistance before we have consolidated what we are now doing. Although the appropriation now requested is, in terms of present-day figures, not very substantial, even if it is made what we want to know is where we are heading, how much the cost is, and how much can be done through private agencies if the Government is willing to work to create a proper atmosphere to encourage these private agencies and private investment. As I see it, this is a long-term pull, except where such assistance may be needed to bolster our immediate policy against the spread of communism. Certainly I have always tried by my votes to stop the spread of communism, and I shall continue to do so, and to vote for assistance in that connection, be it military, economic or technical assistance.

To encourage and help private investment, we already have in existence the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank. The first-mentioned intergovernmental agency has met with general approval. This International Bank is designed to encourage and guarantee international government loans. It may be expected to play a fuller role as the years go by; but this institution, like the Export-Import Bank, is designed to supplement, not to supplant, normal investment channels.

Mr. President, this morning I saw a letter, addressed to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], in which the head of the Export-Import Bank stated that that bank had $2,000,000,000 in loans in 40 different countries.

One of the difficulties of normal investment channels which we must overcome is the question of exchange convertibility. The international monetary fund was set up to overcome this difficulty; but, as all of us well know, in many cases it faces almost insoluble difficulties at the present time. In the end, these difficulties must be resolved if we are to have trade between nations. Today we know that the old-fashioned barter method of trade is being more widely used than before.

The more I have studied the question of technical missions and the question of creating a satisfactory investment climate, the more difficult I find the whole problem which is involved. It is one which I believe has tremendous potentialities, but it is also one which leads to tremendous responsibilities. The Senate has before it now for ratification a Treaty of Friendship and Commerce with the Republic of Uruguay. I call attention to this treaty because I think it might have been very beneficial if we had been able to debate its terms and its ratification prior to the discussion now under way. It is, as I understand it, an over-all attempt to secure an understanding between Uruguay and our country in the interest of better trade relations, better friendship, and encouragement of the movement of capital. I do not say it is a completely model treaty, because, frankly, I am not sufficiently familiar with its terms; but I do say it is the type of treaty that I have in mind when I think of the implementation of point 4—not by the taxpayers, but by the movement of private capital.

A proper investment atmosphere, if it can be obtained, is, in my opinion, a slow and difficult process, but it is something that we must seek to obtain in the interest of peace and in the interest of friendship among nations as well as in the interest of the United States in having trade for its citizens, so as to have more jobs.

Let me cite a few of the questions involved: What does a favorable atmosphere for an investor mean? It may mean many things. Of course, the chief one is confidence that the country in which the investment is made will have a stable government that will live up to its obligations. No one can guarantee this, but a willingness on the part of the country to help attract American investment and a willingness on our part to work with that country and to assure it that we want to help and welcome its friendship will go a long way. There may be some need for some kind of government guaranty; but if a Government guaranty is used, it should be used carefully and sparingly, because in the long run it will only lead to confusion and to an endless list of Government guaranties in business. The clearest guaranty by our Government is that of convertibility and against expropriation. These are powers which the Export-Import Bank now has, but they are more clearly set forth in a bill now pending before the Senate. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the Export-Import Bank now has those powers, even though we have before us a bill which will clarify them. However, one of the great questions involved is, from a practical point of view, to write out such guaranties of convertibility and against expropriation on a contract basis and to carry them out.

Here are a few more thoughts in regard to creating such an atmosphere: The individual should, through treaty agreements, be sure that his American employees are not interfered with as to their persons, their personal belongings, their ability to enter and leave the country, their ability to receive food from home, and their own clothes and furniture for their own use, and that they are not discriminated against in regard to taxation or otherwise. There should be a definite understanding as to conversion of currencies. Very few nations today do not have exchange control. It must be understood just what priority American investment capital and the service of capital will have. All phases of capital should be covered—interest, amortization on loans, dividends on stocks, profits from branch establishments, fees for industrial techniques, royalties, copyrights, and many others. This, of course, should be tied in with the International Fund and should be consistent with its practices. There also must be some kind of agreement that the foreign country will not expropriate the American investors' property. There must be proper guaranty as regards taxation, a proper method of arbitration of disputes between the company and the government, what court will have jurisdiction, and whether the matter can be taken to an international court. These are some of the questions which readily come to everyone's mind, but there are many more that cannot be worked out overnight.

I have already pointed out that we have before us for ratification a Treaty of Friendship and Economic Development with the Republic of Uruguay. We also have before us a treaty for a convention with Ireland to avoid double taxation, and a claims convention with the Republic of Panama. An Italian treaty of friendship was ratified in June 1948, and a treaty with Ireland was submitted to the Senate on February 28, 1950. That is another treaty which is pending before the Senate. It takes

time to draft those treaties. We also must consider various kinds of political considerations in the country with which we are dealing. I mention these matters briefly, as they are just some of the problems involved in creating an atmosphere to encourage our citizens to invest in other countries of the world. They point to the complexities of the whole problem, and lead to the necessity, in my opinion, for a further bipartisan study.

I have already discussed the expense to our Government of the technical assistance through the United Nations organizations and bilateral understandings that we are now conducting. The more I go into the problem, the more I believe that a bipartisan commission to study it and to make a report to the next session of Congress will be of very great value and will not delay to any degree the technical assistance in which we are now participating. I cite the fact that such a commission will not in any way stop the work on our inter-American activities, nor will it stop the assistance that we may be rendering of a technical and educational nature in southeast Asia, for the President has remaining, I understand, from a $75,000,000 appropriation for this purpose, around $45,000,000. The authorization act is sufficiently broad in scope, in my opinion, to permit the President to furnish in that area what we have been discussing, in the form of technical assistance. In addition, there may be other unallocated balances from previous appropriations. This makes a very substantial amount of money available for this purpose in southeast Asia. Let me make it clear that appointment of such a bipartisan commission for careful study of this problem in no way weakens or runs contrary to the objectives of the proposed point 4 program. Rather, it will go far toward assuring a sound, sensible, and productive implementation of point 4 in all its aspects, especially at that critical time when ECA comes to an end.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that we may adopt the amendment that will permit a bipartisan commission, a joint cooperative effort joined in by the President, the Congress, and the public, to study this problem and make a report to us next March. We can then be guided by circumstances as to how to proceed, with a much better background than we now have, which will lead to greater security for ourselves and a more secure peace in the world.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure that those Members of the Senate who have been privileged to listen to the Senator from Massachusetts will realize the importance of the problem which he has discussed, and which deals with the whole future of our relationships with the other countries of the world. I believe that the careful study which he proposes is well warranted in the interest of being sure that we shall make no false step. I particularly approve his emphasis upon the development of an atmosphere congenial to private enterprise.

We realize, I think, that whether the system of private enterprise under which America has made its amazing development is to continue to flourish in the world or is to be followed by a more and more completely socialized state, is one of the great issues in the world mind at the present time. The government-to-government dealings, which have perhaps necessarily been an aspect of relationships during the war and immediately thereafter, must not continue indefinitely, because they are so nicely calculated to force all private enterprise into the control of the Government, whether or not that be the intent. That is why I think we should be profoundly grateful for the careful documentation which the Senator from Massachusetts has given to his amendment and the reasons he has set forth why its adoption should at least be considered seriously.

The discussion in which I now desire to engage leads, or at any rate relates very closely, to the same problem, the problem of our trade relationships. Some 10 days ago the President invited to the White House the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to discuss the reimplementation—if the word is correct—of the so-called bipartisan policy. The word "bipartisan" seems to be in some aspects a red rag to some bulls; so I should prefer to say "the matter of cooperation," in order that we may avoid any implications of language which is provocative. But certainly in the Republican platform and in the Republican statement of aims and policies issued recently there was a very clear indication that the members of the Republican Party associated in the drafting of those declarations recognized the very great responsibility upon every party to do everything in its power to arrive, so far as humanly feasible, at some common concert of action in our relationships with the other countries of the world.

In the progress which we have made in recent years in that direction—and the United Nations stands as one of the great monuments to that achievement—beginning back during the bitter years of the war, under the leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, an entirely bipartisan committee was constituted for the first time, so far as I know, in the history of movements of this character, with equal representation accorded to each side of this political aisle, four members of one party, and four of the other, in order that they might work with the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, in undertaking to lay broad and deep the foundations of a world structure which should be, it was hoped, equal to the great task of implementing peace throughout the world. That committee went forward in cooperation with the Secretary of State and achieved the success which was crowned at San Francisco. There was, so far as I know, no recognition of party lines in the considerations of that committee. We were equally represented on each side, and apparently the conclusions of the committee, if not always unanimous, at any rate had no trace, so far as the record shows, of partisan division.

Following that, we moved forward in order to carry on this world understanding. The Republican Party took over control for 2 years, and the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations passed to this side of the aisle, to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The same policy was continued in an attempt to eliminate, so far as humanly possible, all primarily partisan considerations in the conduct of our relations with the other countries of the world.

The control has now passed back across the aisle. We again have the Senator from Texas, with his long experience, in the position of Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. When the suggestion was made that we should seek once again so far as practicable to arrive at an accommodation of viewpoints between the two sides of the aisle in the evolution of our foreign policy in these very critical days, I think all the country was interested and hopeful that this might perhaps be brought to pass; not that it would ever be completely realized, but that in substantial measure there might be accord.

I shall not look back to the controversies of recent years to determine the responsibility for any change in policy which has ensued, but shall look forward simply into the future, as one who, 30 years ago, first associated himself as a young man out of World War I with the so-called League to Enforce Peace, which was organized under entirely bipartisan auspices to achieve if possible a union of peoples of the world at that time. It was to me a matter of profound regret that the atmosphere in this country at that time did not seem to be congenial to its achievement. Whether the cause of world understanding would have been advanced, had we entered the League of Nations at that time, may always be a matter of debate. Unless the American people, by a very substantial majority, were in favor of that course, it would, in any event, have been abortive. However, the recent suggestion from the President brought the hope to all those who have realized the significance of current events that, so far as practicable, we would seek that course.

So to me it was a matter of profound regret that on the day following the appeal by the President there should have been urged upon the Congress by the Secretary of State one of the controversial aspects of our foreign relations, a subject upon which there have been always, historically, the sharpest divisions between the two sides of the aisle.

As late as last year there was an issue presented in that very connection on which there was an absolutely partisan division, the only one I know of in the whole session of the last Congress, except for various minor matters.

It was to me a matter of profound regret that the administration felt impelled to urge upon the consideration of the Congress, in the closing months of the session, when there was an enormous amount of work ahead, the implementation of the so-called International Trade Organization. This subject has been under discussion for a long time. Two years ago, in fact, when this body was under Republican control, the matter was referred, I believe, by the Committee

on Foreign Relations, to whom it was sent, to the Committee on Finance. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] held hearings upon the then draft of the charter of the International Trade Organization for, I think, a period of at least 20 weeks, going with meticulous detail into the question. The Senator from Colorado, I think it is safe to say, is probably more completely informed regarding this matter than is any other Member of the Congress, as a result of the application of his very great talent to a study of the situation. The Senator from Colorado feels it would be most unwise to proceed with this matter at this time, considering all the controversial problems involved.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether the International Trade Organization would be the subject of a treaty, and that if this country should become involved in that organization it would do so by means of the ratification of a treaty?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is a very interesting question and one which has been under debate for a very long time. As the Senator from Missouri knows, the question of what is a treaty and what is an agreement is still a difficult one. There is a twilight zone involved. I have seen it in the various questions we have considered, and I think I am correct in saying that the State Department itself has considered this question a very long time, and—the Senator from Texas will correct me if I misstate it—I think it finally concluded it would submit ITO to the Congress as an executive agreement, so that the House and the Senate could concur in implementing legislation, rather than submitting it as a treaty, although it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate and to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who was at that time, 2 years ago, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, asked the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] as chairman of the Committee on Finance to hold hearings on the matter, saying they would like to have it considered by the Committee on Finance because probably 80 percent of the provisions were concerned with trade and tariff regulations.

So I am unable to answer the Senator from Missouri categorically, yes or no, except to say that the State Department at present treats it as an agreement, while I think the Senator from Colorado believes it should have the dignity of a treaty, because I recently heard him say it imposes far greater restrictions upon our sovereignty and freedom of action than do many matters which we have considered as treaties.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his response.

Mr. BREWSTER. So it is my very earnest hope that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and those associated with him in that committee, in considering the questions which should appropriately receive our attention at this time, will give very careful consideration as to whether in the interest of the accord which we desire in many fundamental matters, it would be well to postpone until next year, at least, a study of the charter of the International Trade Organization, with all the matters which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has urged, which are most pertinent. It should also be realized that only 2 countries up to the present time, out of 30 or 40, have acted in the matter, and that the reciprocal-trade agreements are still in full force and effect, with the power of the Administration to move further in that direction.

It is my hope that the Senator from Texas will at least give his usual careful consideration to a possible delay in this matter, with the idea that other very much more pressing questions, which, perhaps, are of greater immediate importance, may be considered, and it may be possible to find an accommodation of viewpoints rather than to precipitate an issue which will inevitably involve a very heated discussion for a very considerable period, with the danger of a rather sharp partisan division upon the question, which might do very great injury to the attempt to bring about some understanding in other matters.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether it has been his observation that in recent years there has been a strong tendency on the part of the State Department to treat a subject matter which previously would have been considered as a treaty, because of its nature, as an executive agreement, rather than as a treaty?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is unquestionably of considerable concern.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. It seems to me there are factors which differentiate the ITO matter from the ordinary treaty. It deals principally with tariffs and international trade, of which the House of Representatives has primary jurisdiction because of its originating revenue bills. So some of the trend which the Senator suggests is caused by pressure of Members of the House and other persons who feel the Senate is taking over, instead of giving the House an opportunity. We remember the old Jay treaty in which a similar question was vigorously raised. So I do not regard it as any effort to evade the issue as to a treaty, because the House of Representatives is at this time holding hearings.

Mr. BREWSTER. The only answer to the Senator from Texas is that it was referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee considered a resolution asking for its transfer to that committee for the very reason which the Senator from Texas so properly points out. But the Committee on Ways and Means, for some mysterious reason, was not prepared this morning to support it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not familiar with the details, but I know the House is giving attention to this very question, which we have not yet considered. I think the reason I have suggested is the primary one in this particular instance, and it is not the result of a desire to evade the constitutional provisions whereby the Senate alone ratifies treaties.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator from Maine will permit me, I want to thank the Senator from Texas for his statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not know whether the Senator from Texas has considered the matter of agreement, in the light of what he says. Has there been any conclusion reached on that matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would say there has not been. Of course, agreements are ratified, in a sense, by both bodies, by a joint resolution of the Congress, so that both bodies are having a voice in the matter as we now look forward to it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask either the Senator from Maine or the Senator from Texas whether there is any provision in the Constitution of the United States for ratification of a trade agreement? The point I have in mind is this: If a particular document is a treaty, it must be ratified by the Senate. If it is a trade agreement, is there any provision which requires any action by Congress, or does not the Executive have authority, under the law, to make such trade agreement? Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator has gone a little too far in the last part of his statement. A trade agreement may be made effective without any action by Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what the Senator from Missouri said, I believe. In other words, if it is an executive agreement, by its very terms it means that the Executive can make it. Of course, he may have to come to Congress to get an appropriation to implement it. I think I used the word "implement" before. It may be that the agreement can be implemented only by action of Congress. However, so far as an agreement itself is concerned, it is binding by action of the Executive.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. That is precisely the thought I had in mind. Perhaps I did not state it clearly. It would appear to me that if a particular document is in fact a treaty, the proper body to ratify it is the Senate. If, on the other hand, it is an executive agreement, there is no provision of law which requires ratification by Congress of such agreement.

Am I correct in saying that an executive agreement can be made by the executive department? On the other hand, a document which is a treaty cannot be made by the executive department, save only subject to ratification by the Senate. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator is correct in his understanding. I see not only the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] but the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in the Chamber. Certainly they would be a better authority on that point than I would presume to be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. An executive agreement, in order to be valid without ratification, must be on some subject on which the President has authority to act. He cannot merely make any sort of agreement and call it an executive agreement. For instance, the matter of international mail has for many years been regarded as one on which the President can make agreements with other nations. I refer to arrangements with respect to foreign postal matters, and things of that nature. However, we are not in a field where the signposts are very clearly marked.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say so, the Senate has the power to ratify or reject a treaty. The practical question is whether it be a treaty or an executive agreement. There are many matters that lie within the jurisdiction of the Chief Executive. With reference to matters which clearly fall within the Executive power, agreements may be made by the Executive, and they do not require ratification by the Senate. If the matter rises to the dignity of a treaty, whatever may be the subject matter of the agreement, under the Constitution, it must of course be ratified by the Senate alone, because while the House might act with respect to a treaty insofar as appropriating money for the purpose of carrying it out or implementing it is concerned, nevertheless the validity of a treaty itself is a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the Senate.

It often has been a question of debate whether an agreement was a treaty or merely an executive agreement. That question arose—and not for the first time—in 1934 when Congress passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It was contended by very eminent members of this body, among them the then Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Hon. Key Pittman, from the State of Nevada, that a trade agreement negotiated by the executive department could not become effective until ratified by the Senate, because, it was his contention, any such agreement was in fact a treaty. The contrary view prevailed. There was a very sharp division in this body on the question at that time. I may say that there is always a dispute as to whether an agreement assumes the proportions or dignity of a treaty or remains an executive matter, which the Executive himself may dispose of.

I was not in the Chamber to hear the first part of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maine, but I presume he has been directing his remarks to the International Trade Organization. My examination of that instrument convinces me that it does partake of the nature and dignity of a treaty. I think it is a treaty which must be finally ratified by the Senate. That would be my view. There is a contrary view which is held by eminent men in the executive branch of the Government, and, no doubt, in the legislative branch as well. Since first I have had an opportunity to study it, I have regarded it as a treaty. It will be recalled that the Committee on Finance several months ago gave very careful consideration to the ITO before it was drawn up in its present form. Indeed, for many weeks while it was being considered at Havana, or about to be considered, we launched into a study and detailed analysis of the instrument itself. We were not then concerned with whether it was a treaty. It dealt with many things, but it dealt primarily with trade, and the Senate Committee on Finance is interested in trade and tariffs, particularly as trade is affected by our tariff policies, and for that reason we were trying to make an analysis of it. In my opinion, as I said, in its present form it is a treaty.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator about the nature of the action which the executive department is asking of Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know what is being asked. I understood in a general way that a resolution or an enabling act had been introduced in both Houses of Congress. If so, it would be a matter over which the House, concurrently with the Senate, would have jurisdiction under this instrument, whether it be a treaty or an agreement. However, in my own view it is a treaty and should be regarded as a treaty.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is my understanding from one who has been advising me in the matter that the executive deparent apparently has recognized that it is beyond the scope of authority contained in the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and therefore some further authorization is necessary. To what extent Congress may authorize the Executive to enter into an agreement which would be beyond the scope of the executive power, without congressional action, opens another field, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it is true also that the International Trade Organization does contain one section which is strongly suggestive of the so-called point-4 program which the Senator from Massachusetts has discussed, and it does go to considerable length into rights, obligations, hopes, and aspirations of countries in developing their international trade relations.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that is referred to as the investment section of ITO.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that is what is referred to, although I am not quite sure about it. It has been several months since I studied it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia whether or not there has been submitted to the Senate at any time the Habana Charter for the International Trade Organization as a treaty for ratification by the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations may be able to advise the Senator on that point.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the Senate has not taken any action. No bill has been introduced. We have in our files in the committee a proposed bill which was forwarded to us, but it has not been introduced. It is a bill treating the instrument as a joint resolution, and not as a treaty.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator from Maine object if, for the purpose of ready reference, I should offer for the RECORD, at this point, the numbers of certain joint resolutions which have been handed me within the last few minutes, coming from the House, which pertain to this matter?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the information would be very helpful.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to call attention to House Joint Resolution 14, introduced in the House of Representatives on January 3, 1949. I also call attention to House Joint Resolution 71, introduced on January 6, 1949, in the House of Representatives, and, finally, House Joint Resolution 236, introduced in the House on May 3, 1949.

I cite these measures not with a view of establishing whether or not the instrument is in fact a treaty or a trade agreement, but for the purpose of ready reference, so that we may have these numbers before us during the address of the Senator from Maine, and in reading the address subsequently.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, I should like to say just one more word.

What the Senator from Texas had in mind a while ago, when he said what the prevailing route should be where there were no clearly marked signposts, was that there always arises the question whether one of these instruments is in fact a treaty or an executive agreement, and the distinction is not clear. There is a field there which is not clear, and each case has to depend upon its own circumstances and the particular facts.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that the joint resolution bearing on this point, which is apparently what the House is considering, authorizes the President to accept membership for the United States in the International Trade Organization, I assume under the theory that he does not have the authority at the present time. That is evidently the form in which the question is approached, and I apprehend that subsequently there will be due consideration of whether or not

the instrument should be considered as a treaty, in which event it would require a two-thirds majority of the Senate for ratification.

Bearing on this question, it seems to me it is most desirable that we should not proceed with the consideration of the International Trade Organization at this session, because the trade situation at this time is of a very transitory character, with the rapid changes which are occurring as a result of devaluation abroad, and as a consequence of the recovery which is going on in other countries, with the result that a very radical change is taking place at the present time. Accordingly, it seems to me most unfortunate to precipitate not only this highly controversial matter into what we hope will be a very calm and collected atmosphere in the next few months, because it will be impossible to consider wisely the course we should take until we shall see a little more clearly the implications of the current trend.

The changes which have occurred in the past 5 months are so radical, following devaluation last September, that it is impossible for anyone at this time to forecast what the situation may be a few months from today. Before we freeze the situation, as we would in large measure do by the ratification of the International Trade Organization, it seems to me it would be well to stop, look, and listen, to pause and consider and see a little more clearly the developing patterns of world trade, before we freeze arbitrarily the condition as it now exists.

ECA AND THE DOLLAR GAP

So I desire to address myself—and it has a very definite relationship to the pending legislation—to the ECA and the dollar gap.

Mr. President, for some years now the air has been filled with talk of the terrible dollar gap, and with agonized pleas for doing something about it.

We are told that ECA must continue indefinitely unless we take steps to supply a good many foreign nations with other means of support. I think Mr. Hoffman said some time ago that he thought it would be necessary for us to appropriate one billion or two billion dollars a year following the ECA in order to stabilize world trade.

Without in the least underestimating the desirability of bringing into reasonable relationship our outgo of dollars and our income, I must take serious issue with the desperate measures advocated by some of the administration's free-trade economists.

Try as I will, I cannot visualize the cataclysm that we are told will soon come if our exports of goods and our imports are not equalized.

The constant use of enormous figures, hundreds of millions, billions, even trillions of dollars, has so numbed and inured some who hold positions of importance in our Government that a simple and not unusual gap in our foreign trade seemingly frightens them.

Like the horse that has inadvertently eaten of the loco weed, the twig becomes magnified into a tree and the meandering brook becomes a mighty torrent.

As the drug addict must continually increase his shot, so administration leaders seem to needle the public with larger and larger doses of the dire results of buying at home rather than abroad.

We are told that we must import to the tune of $15,000,000,000 or more annually—or continue ECA indefinitely—if we are to keep the "bear" from the European door, or our own economy from complete collapse.

It seems an appropriate time to clear the air, so far as practicable, of certain widely held misconceptions of our foreign-trade situation and its relation to our domestic economy and the peace of the world.

In this connection, two important questions may appropriately be asked.

Is the dollar gap as serious as administration leaders have painted it? And are more trade agreements the answer? Is ITO necessary in order to insure our future progress and our trade relations with the world?

The pending proposal to appropriate three billion more dollars for European recovery seems to require careful consideration of these questions and of our foreign trade situation in general.

This discussion will include a short analysis of our over-all trade and will show that a greater volume of exports than imports is normal and desirable for the United States.

It will show that we are, in the first months of 1950, very near to the long-term average ratio of our exports and imports.

That, to me, is a most astounding and dramatic fact, and certainly one very far removed from that suggested by the current agitation that we must immediately go much further in the reduction of our domestic tariffs in the interest of world trade.

The discussion will show that the situation is being deliberately overemphasized and will question the use of the term "reciprocal" in our trade agreements.

It will show that our trade with Europe, which includes most of the ECA countries, has not approached a balance for many years and will explain that this is natural and normal and not the extreme crisis some would have us believe.

It will offer evidence that agriculture is taking a literal beating at the hands of our trade-agreement negotiators—and will serve as a warning to the agriculturalists and fishermen of the entire country.

It will show that 60 percent of our imports come in free of any duty and that hundreds of other rates are so ridiculously low that they have no protective value whatsoever; on the contrary, some rates are so low that the cost of collection often exceeds the amount collected in duty.

It will show that truly reciprocal agreements cannot possibly be the means of closing the trade gap.

THE DOLLAR GAP

The economists tell us that every dollar sent abroad eventually returns to us and therefore we cannot, over a long period, sell more than we buy. If a nation has dollars, but does not want United States goods, that nation will trade the dollars to some other country which does have a need for our products.

For many, many years the United States has exported much more in the form of commodities than it has imported. The figures given on this score are amazing.

Under the free-enterprise system and the doctrine of fair protection to American agriculture and industry, a large number of our citizens are financially able to travel abroad. These tourists spend many millions of dollars in foreign countries. Furthermore, millions are sent home by the Chinese laundryman, the Danish dairyman, the Italian delicatessen owner, and the hundreds of thousands of others who have come to this fabulous land to make their living. Also, many millions are sent to needy foreign areas each year by charitable individuals and churches and other institutions. I have spoken of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Transportation between the United States and foreign countries has greatly improved since the First World War and the amounts being spent abroad by tourists are increasing month by month. In the year 1949, according to the Department of Commerce, American tourists spent about $700,000,000 in foreign countries, individuals sent money home or to relatives in the amount of almost $350,000,000, and various foundations and institutions expended about $250,000,000 in foreign countries.

This totals well over a billion and a quarter dollars that went to foreign countries last year, and for which there was no direct return. Those dollars, in other words, were in the hands of foreign countries to spend for anything they desired in this country. They did not involve any reciprocal trade. This does not include any ECA or other free dollars from the United States Government.

The average monthly exportation of the above-mentioned dollars is approximately $108,000,000. Subtract that from the total excess of exports over imports in the month of January of this year—$113,000,000—and we find the dollar gap narrowed to the insignificant amount of $5,000,000—believe it or not. In other words, in January of this year, on the basis of these figures, the foreign trade gap was approximately $5,000,000, not the billions of dollars of which we have heard so much.

The trade gap in February jumped to $162,000,000, and the dollar gap would then be $54,000,000. Averaging the 2 months we can forecast, taking that as a basis, a total dollar gap in 1950 of something less than $400,000,000—not the billions of dollars of which we have heard—and this does not take into consideration any private capital invested in any foreign country. The Senator from Massachusetts has just shown to us how large those figures are. If the flow of dollars abroad in the form of investments in factories, machines, or similar productive equipment even approaches the hopes of the planners, the dollar gap will dwindle to insignificance.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator have any information as to how much in dollars is annually coming into this country from investments owned abroad by United States corporations or individuals?

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator refers to the question of investments by foreign interests in this country——

Mr. DONNELL. No, it was the converse of that to which I referred. May I amplify my question slightly?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the correct answer to the Senator's question is $1,200,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. One billion two hundred million dollars?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. That is to say there is income in dollars coming into this country of $1,200,000,000 a year, by reason of investments which this country has made in foreign countries?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. That is income coming in from those investments? Is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. What would be the effect of our making further foreign investments? Would not the effect be to increase the number of dollars which would come into this country, thereby increasing the dollar gap instead of decreasing it? It not that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is unquestionably one of the factors to which the Senator from Massachusetts alludes in connection with this whole matter of private investment abroad, because the ultimate effect must be, if we are ever going to get any earnings into this country or get the principal repaid, that we will to that extent have to call on foreign American dollars to be paid to this country.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that the view which the Senator takes is that if the United States does make extensive investments abroad, and does derive income from those investments, that will bring more dollars into this country, thereby increasing the gap between the dollars coming into this country and the dollars which we send out annually to the other countries? Am I correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is correct, although I must say that I am in rather cordial sympathy with the idea that we should look forward to the increasing investment of American dollars abroad even though that is the consequence. In other words, I am in general sympathy with the so-called point 4 to the extent that it is related to private investment in productive enterprises under free enterprise in foreign countries with a congenial atmosphere.

Mr. DONNELL. I am not disagreeing with the Senator's view along that line, at least for the present, but I wanted to bring out clearly in my own mind just what the Senator's view is as to the effect on the dollar gap which, absent other factors, would result from increased investment of our money abroad.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I have stated it correctly, have I?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. It is my hope that in the long-range view we shall gradually be able to absorb the differences that would result. That is my hope as the other countries build up their economies. But this again is the point the Senator from Massachusetts makes, that we must take a long-range view, and not get into terms of billions of which we now speak so glibly, but, rather, in far more modest terms. A little later I shall point out another curious item, which is an investment of apparently some $700,000,000 by foreigners in this country in recent years. That is the reverse, and that is a very curious and very interesting item to which I shall come shortly.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine further yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. If I am disturbing the continuity of the Senator's address please do not hesitate to say so. Has the State Department given out any information, so far as the Senator knows, in recent months as to how much foreign money is invested in the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is a very interesting question, and it is one which the State Department for some years now has declined to answer, partly on the ground, as they state, that they do not have complete information. That is, to my mind, something the American people are entitled to know. Certainly, when we discuss the question of how poverty stricken other countries of the world are, if it is true that billions of dollars are invested in this country by foreign citizens I think it is a fact that may well be taken into account in the development of our plans.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not true that in order to know what is the dollar gap to which the Senator is addressing himself, we must not merely know how many dollars are coming into this country but we must know how much is going out by way of income derived by foreigners from investments within the boundaries of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is quite correct.

Mr. DONNELL. So, in order to have the complete picture we must know not only what is coming into the United States by way of dollars, but we must know what is going out from income on investments of foreigners within our borders. Is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Missouri almost takes my words out of my mouth. My next paragraph is this:

In fact, if we consider all the factors, it has already dwindled to that point—that is, the point of insignificance.

I call attention, Mr. President, to some additional statistics which may surprise a great many of my colleagues and point up this whole problem. It is not so much the gap between imports and exports that is worrying our country's financial experts, as the gap—and I call this to the attention of the Senator from Missouri—between the dollars going out of the country and the dollars coming in—the very words the Senator from Missouri used.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Has the State Department given any further reason as to its declination to give us information as to the amount of foreign investments in this country?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I think they have simply said that they did not have adequate information. I am sure they must have a great deal of information, but they have declined to disclose it.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the State Department have a Foreign Trade Division which we could question in connection with the International Trade Organization, and do they not have adequate facilities to discover how much foreign money is invested in this country?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is my hope that we are going to learn that in the course of time as America becomes conscious of the importance and significance of these figures, and I hope that we shall continue to press for them.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think we should have that information before we go ahead with the International Trade Organization.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me for one further question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. If it be correct that the International Trade Organization agreement or charter is a treaty, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is inclined to think, and as he has expressed himself today, it would be one of those documents, would it not, which are referred to in article VI of the Constitution, as follows:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

I am correct in that statement, am I not?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. So does it not become of very great importance for us to ascertain whether the International Trade Organization Charter is a treaty which has the dignity and effect cited in that article of the Constiution?

Mr. BREWSTER. It does; that is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the question of whether the proposed International Trade Organization Charter is a treaty, I should simply like to say that it surrenders many times over more sovereignty than the United Nations Charter did. Yet, we found it necessary to consider the United Nations Charter as a treaty. If the United Nations Charter is a treaty—and it is—then, by the same reasoning, compounded by the seriousness of what would be done under the International Trade Organization, should not the International Trade Organization Charter be considered as a treaty?

I wish to say that in my opinion it undoubtedly should be considered as a treaty.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Colorado will be interested to know that the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Finance Committee, a little earlier today stated that that is his considered conclusion as well.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may add that, from the standpoint of the proponents of the International Trade Organization, a permanent trade relation system which is set up on the basis of the International Trade Organization cannot be founded or established by means of ephemeral legislation which may be changed every 2 years. From their standpoint—if they are serious—in order to have a new and revolutionary trade relationship with the rest of the world, such a measure should be considered as a treaty. Therefore, as a treaty, it will have precisely the effect of which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, doubtless the Senator from Colorado is familiar with the words used by the President of the United States in submitting this matter to the Congress on April 28, 1949, almost a year ago at this time, since when the proposal has safely reposed in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I read the two opening paragraphs of the President's message:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, the charter for an International Trade Organization, prepared by a conference of the United Nations which met in Habana in 1948, together with a memorandum from the Secretary of State.

Please note the next paragraph, Mr. President:

The charter is designed to do two things: to establish a code of international conduct to guide nations in dealing with the fundamental problems of world trade—

There could scarcely be any more conclusive demonstration that, as the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, it is supposed to govern us, not for a year or two, as an ephemeral document which could be changed at any time, but as a very fundamental agreement affecting the life and the livelihood of every citizen of the United States, in some respects doing so far more fundamentally than will the United Nations. Although the long-range impact of the United Nations may be of greater import or more valuable, yet the effect of the proposed International Trade Organization program upon our agriculture and industry will be most profound. Now I read the next portion of the President's message to Congress on this subject—

and to create an agency, within the framework of the United Nations, to help implement this code.

In other words, in that connection we intend to enter into a code which will bind us, but also to enter into a means of binding ourselves to it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Charter of the United Nations was a treaty, was it not, and was so considered by the Senate?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator from Maine familiar with the fact that on Monday of this week there was rendered by a California court a decision—which I shall later this afternoon submit for the record, with some comments, if I am able to obtain an opportunity to do so—to the effect that the Charter of the United Nations invalidates the California alien land law. In that decision the court, in referring to the Charter of the United Nations, made the following statement:

Clearly such a discrimination against a people of one race is contrary both to the letter and to the spirit of the Charter, which—

I call especial attention to this portion of the decision—

as a treaty, is paramount to every law of every State in conflict with it.

Does not the Senator from Maine regard that language as very significant and as making it of the highest importance that we ascertain whether the International Trade Organization charter is a treaty, and that we bear in mind the fine words of wisdom stated this afternoon, with respect to that instrument, by the distinguished Senator from Colorado and by the distinguished Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is my earnest hope that in the development of the coordination of policy, for which the President has appealed, he will at least ask his agencies—in this case, particularly the State Department—to consult with Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle as to the nature of the agreement and as to whether it seems wise and practicable to undertake to implement it at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say that at the time when the United Nations Charter was being considered, I asked quite a few questions in regard to the impact of its provisions upon our domestic procedures and laws. The members of the committee at that time stated rather positively that in the Charter of the United Nations there is a saving provision expressly stating that nothing contained in the Charter shall interfere with the domestic business of a country.

If that is true, the decision the Senator from Missouri has mentioned may be off base.

If that is not true, it illustrates the point I was emphasizing a while ago, namely, that when we went into the United Nations Charter, we went into it as a treaty. However, the International Trade Organization charter contains numerous serious interferences with our domestic procedures and wtih many of our domestic laws. If the United Nations Charter had to be considered as a treaty—and it was so considered—surely the ITO instrument will have to be considered as a treaty.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maine whether he understands that the International Trade Organization charter, as now written—and it comprises approximately 125 pages of written material in respect to conditions, and also presents a good many ambiguities—in the main means that we transfer from the executive branch of our Government to an International Trade Organization, which presumably would have in it at least as many nations as the United Nations itself has—let us say 58—and in which we would have only one vote, the right to suggest the tariffs and import fees and quotas of production for its member nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Oh, yes; that is a part of the whole idea of the International Trade Organization. I assume that we are not bound beyond our present commitments as to that proposal; but if we were to act in accordance with the spirit of that instrument we would have to proceed very much further than we might well be advised to go.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a further question. If that be true, then let us recall that by means of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act the Congress transferred its constitutional authority to regulate the national economy, through the regulation of imports, to the executive branch of the Government—in that case meaning, of course, the Secretary of State.

This ITO proposal would be the second move toward the control of the national economy. Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, control passed from the Congress, to the Executive, including the State Department; and then, by the adoption of the International Trade Organization, that authority would be transferred to an international trade organization, made up, as I have previously stated, of at least 58 nations, and perhaps more, each with one vote. Then that organization would suggest regulations aimed toward one economic world.

Mr. BREWSTER. I read from the memorandum of the Secretary of State which was transmitted with the President's message. Under the heading, "Structure and functions of the organization," the memorandum, in part, says:

The Organization will be empowered to make studies in various fields, for example,

standardization, uniformity, and simplification of customs regulations. It can be a means of the collection and dissemination of technological information.

I think with our experience we know what that means. In other words, we shall be told increasingly that this is a wise thing, and that if we do not do it we shall be obstructing. We are creating a very considerable power and authority.

Mr. MALONE. Then what we are doing, in the judgment of the senior Senator from Maine, is to establish an organization, and, when we do not follow its suggestions about dividing the markets of our country through this free-trade set-up, which they call reciprocal trade, we would then be accused of bad faith. Is that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. The question is not simple. There will be undoubtedly much argument, but I think the statement of the Senator from Colorado, who I think everyone will agree knows more about the details of this thing than any other Member of the Congress, because of the exhaustive study he has given to it, is that it does involve more restrictions of our sovereignty than any other action we have considered. While there are all kinds of escape clauses, it was my impression, from the time I sat in while it was being considered, that the escape clauses were chiefly for the benefit of the other countries, that practically all the other countries had escape clauses by which they could get out, but we were a sort of rich uncle who would have to be the final goat. That is the way it looked in the original drafting.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield, unless the Senator from Colorado desires to comment at this point.

Mr. MALONE. I have just one more question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Since we are the ones who have the rich markets of the world because of our higher standard of living, which during the past 70 years has been due, in the judgment of most of us, at least, to our protective tariff and import fees, making up that differential, if it is the purpose to divide the markets of this country with the nations of the world, with the direct objective of raising the standards of other countries and lowering ours, thus averaging the standards, would we not, if we failed to go along with this great one-economic-world idea, be accused of bad faith from the beginning?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think we would be very much embarrassed. Undoubtedly it would be said that we entered into this thing and were not playing ball.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I believe we should emphasize what has just been said by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, that since we originated the plan, since we are its chief promoters, if we decided to get out from under it, we certainly would be accused of bad faith and of breaking the heart of the world. On these various escapes which we might take, the other fellow is entitled to take retaliatory measures and many of the escapes, I bring to the mind of the distinguished Senator from Maine, can only be taken when authorized to be taken by the whole group of nations, in which we have one vote.

Mr. BREWSTER. Another statement in the analysis by the Department of State was:

This charter establishes a code of principles to be accepted in the conduct of international trade and an organization to help make them work.

That is certainly a clear and simple statement that this is supposed to settle things for some time to come. The figures I am about to give will answer in part a question the Senator from Missouri asked awhile ago. I am advised that the ECA countries whom we are assisting, according to a report by Mr. Hoffman, have a long-term investment in this country of their assets, by participants from those countries, of approximately $5,000,000,000—$4,800,000,000, to be exact. That is one figure which we have.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator have any information from Mr. Hoffman or from any other source as to the amount in dollars of yearly earnings on the $4,800,000,000?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think that is shown. It would vary each year, I presume.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I had been saying that what we were interested in was the gap between the dollars going out of the country and the dollars coming in.

In 1948 this country sent $1,900,000,000 to foreign countries as the net amount—that is excess of outgo to income—of new investments. Of this amount $900,000,000 were Government and $1,000,000,000 were private. In 1949 the net amount of investment added was $1,200,000,000; $700,000,000 Government and $500,000,000 private. These additions brought up to thirty-one and one-half billion dollars of United States money invested in foreign countries—a sum that should be remembered when we take drastic Government action to promote and insure new foreign investments. That is, we must realize the investment we already have.

So, we must add another category of dollar outflow as we try to estimate the 1950 picture. There was a decline in foreign investment dollars going abroad in 1949 from 1948, but, with all the encouragement being offered we can expect an increase in 1950. The average of the last 2 years was $1,500,000,000—probably as good an estimate as can be made for 1950.

Again, according to a very recent newspaper article, which is verified by official Federal Reserve Board figures, in 1948, foreigners obtained $1,200,000,000 that we, somehow, are unable to account for, and in 1949, $700,000,000 went abroad for which there is no definite or detailed record.

Because of the timeliness and startling nature of this article, I think I shall read it, because it seems to have such a bearing on this problem. It reads as follows:

"LEAK" OF $700,000,000 FOUND IN UNITED STATES OUTGO ABROAD LAST YEAR—FOREIGNERS' SCRAMBLE TO INVEST IN THIS COUNTRY COST UNCLE SAM A FOREIGN-AID SAVING

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam could have saved several hundreds of millions of foreign-aid dollars last year, but for a secret scramble on the part of foreigners to get good United States investments.

The Federal Reserve Board yesterday as much as acknowledged that foreigners had $700,000,000 more United States dollars last year than policy-makers here realized. That was at a time when the United States was pouring out billions to help "needy" governments in Europe and Asia.

The elusive $700,000,000 was mentioned in the Board's latest monthly bulletin in an article called The Balance of Payments Position of the United States.

Government figures indicate United States income from abroad last year was $15,900,000,000. Since outgo was $9,800,000,000, net income was $6,100,000,000. If nothing else had happened, the foreigners would have drawn down their holdings by $6,100,000,000.

But Uncle Sam loaned and gave away $5,700,000,000, private United States citizens made investments and donations of $1,000,000,000 abroad, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Monetary Fund had net outlays of $100,000,000. That meant foreigners got $6,800,000,000 to cover a $6,100,000,000 deficit. They should have been $700,000,000 to the good, and this $700,000,000 should have shown up in their private or government assets. But it didn't.

This isn't the first time this has happened. Back in 1948, the Board noted, foreigners apparently had $1,200,000,000 that somehow went uncounted in statistics here.

What happens to these "lost" dollars? The Board—

That is, the Federal Reserve Board—

figures a lot of this money is salted away in "unrecorded" investments foreigners made in the United States. Sometimes these deals are "unrecorded" simply because there are gaps in the statistics Uncle Sam collects—some of those bothersome questionnaires the bankers and securities dealer get from Federal agencies aren't quite complete enough.

Sometimes the investments are just plain evasions of rules laid down by other governments. Foreigners decide United States securities, commodities, real estate, or bank accounts are sounder than similar holdings at home. But regulations—in Britain, for instance—say they can't use their dollars this way—

That is, a citizen of England is not supposed to invest in the United States—

so they invest under cover. They get a friend or business associate who is a United States citizen to make and hold the investment or bank account for them.

With all this added, what is the true dollar picture? Will the year 1950 find us putting out more dollars than we are taking in or will we be near the greatly hoped for balance that we hear so much about?

THE DOLLAR GAP IN 1950

If the January and February average of imports and exports is indicative of the full year's foreign trade, we will export goods valued at about $9,000,000,000 and we will import goods valued at about $7,300,000,000. That will leave an excess of exports over imports of $1,700,000,000.

Not the $7,000,000,000 about which we have been hearing so much, but it is less than $2,000,000,000.

Tourist trade is increasing, but if we estimate 1950 to approximate 1949 and if individuals and institutions send the same amount abroad as in 1949, there will go out of this country to foreign nations about $1,300,000,000. That will leave a dollar gap of $400,000,000.

If foreign investments are made in 1950 to the amount of $1,500,000,000 as estimated above, we will then be $1,100,000,000 on the wrong side of the ledger, and if as many dollars go abroad in 1950 for which we cannot account as there were in 1949, another $700,000,000 can be added, and we will be $1,800,000,000 on the wrong side of the ledger.

Those figures are extremely interesting and, in the light of much of the current propaganda, somewhat astounding.

Our ECA commitments for 1950 have not been considered here. Neither has the amount of dollars presumably paid our experts who have gone abroad to aid other countries to increase production, help build roads, dams, and such services. A large number of foreign industrial and laboring men have come to this country to learn our ways, and that has, to a considerable extent, offset the dollars that might have been paid our own experts who went abroad.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has indicated the amount we may pay for those technical assistants in the coming year.

I have discussed this matter of the dollar gap for the chief purpose of showing that the hue and cry about greater imports, greater foreign investments, greater amounts for ECA, for this, that, and the other foreign-aid program, is mostly in the nature of propaganda, free-trade propaganda, among other things.

The principal worry now should not be how to accelerate the closing of the trade gap, but how to control it so that injury to domestic industries may be minimized and our exports maintained sufficiently to balance our imports.

The following table compares imports and exports since 1920 and shows the excess of exports and the percentage of imports. It will be noted that the percentage figures for January and February of this year, 1950, approximate those of the peak 10-year period, 1926–36.

I shall read excepts from it and then ask that the complete table be inserted in my remarks.

It is a very interesting table, showing the relation of our exports to imports over a period of years. The first period is 1921 to 1925. Our exports were a little more than $4,000,000,000; our imports a little more than $3,000,000,000, a difference of approximately $1,000,000,000. Our imports were 78 percent of our exports.

In 1920 to 1930 we were close to $5,000,000,000 in our exports, $4,000,000,000 in our imports, and the balance, the excess, was $750,000,000. Our imports were 84 percent of our exports. Note how close the figures are.

Coming on down, we find that in 1938 the imports were 63 percent; in 1939, 73 percent.

We now come to the current situation. In 1949 we were down to what was almost the lowest figure. The lowest figure was in 1947.

On the projected average, if, during the coming year, we continue at the same ratio between exports and imports which prevailed in the first 2 months of this year, January and February, then for the current calendar year we will have exports of approximately $9,000,000,000, imports of $7,326,000,000, and an excess of exports over imports of $1,650,000,000. Our imports would be 82 percent of our exports.

In other words, the only trade gap we have to absorb is less than $2,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of United States exports and imports for specified years and periods

[In millions of dollars]

Year or average of period	Exports	Imports	Balance, excess of exports	Percent imports are of exports
1921–25	4,397	3,450	947	78
1926–30	4,777	4,033	744	84
1931–35	2,025	1,713	312	84
1938	3,094	1,960	1,134	63
1939	3,123	2,276	847	73
1940	3,934	2,541	1,393	65
1941	5,020	3,222	1,798	64
War period.				
1946	9,503	4,792	4,711	50
1947	14,252	5,643	8,609	40
1948	12,532	7,092	5,440	57
1949	11,885	6,598	5,287	56
1950 [1]	8,976	7,326	1,650	*82*
January	735	622	113	*85*
February	761	599	162	*79*

[1] Projected average of January and February for 12 months of 1950.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think it is high time that the American people should be treated to a little taste of the realities of our existing trade relations and realize that instead of five, six, or seven billion dollars, about which we hear so much, our trade gap is down to less than $2,000,000,000. If the trend of the past 5 months since devaluation continues, it is impossible to predict how much further it may decline. That is one reason why it seems to me tragic that we should be asked, in the closing months of this session, to take action of so comprehensive a character, freezing to a considerable degree our existing trade relationships, when one cannot possibly forecast what the situation may be 9 months from today. It is on that basis that I continue to hope and to urge that the Committee on Foreign Relations may go very slowly in the consideration of the international trade organization charter at this time.

A brief bit of tariff history seems in order at this point.

The tariff rates on dutiable goods under the Tariff Act of 1930 and prior to any modifications under important trade agreements, averaged about 45 percent.

Under the Fordney-McCumber Act, in effect from 1922 to 1930, tariff rates averaged approximately 38.5 percent.

While the Underwood Act, generally considered as a Free Trade Act, was in effect, from 1913 to 1922, tariff rates averaged about 27 percent.

I point out that 3 years after the First World War, as indicated by the action of the Congress, it was necessary very greatly to revise the Underwood Act in order to preserve the economy of the United States. Today tariff rates, under the existing so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, approximate 13 percent, which is less than a third of the rates under the Fordney-McCumber Act, which was considered a protective tariff, and further important reductions are in immediate prospect as a result of discussions planned this fall at Torquay, England.

I call attention again to the fact that these rates refer only to dutiable goods and not to the very important 60 percent of our total imports which come into the country free of any duty.

The average rate of duty on United States imports, applied to dutiable products only, has declined as follows:

	Percent
1944	32.7
1945	29.0
1946	26.3
1947	20.1
1948	14.3
1949	13.8

The average rate of duty on all imports, free and dutiable, was only 7.6 percent in 1947 and 5.7 percent in 1949.

Therefore, the suggestion that we must go forward with further import cuts in our tariff duties seems fantastic, in the light of the almost utter lack of protection which the American workingman and American farmer enjoy at the present time, and when we realize that European production is now from 35 to 40 percent greater than it was before the war, that these countries are recovering with assistance we have rendered to them, and that already many of their products are beginning to penetrate our own markets at home. They are not being used for the benefit of the so-called poverty-stricken lands, but are penetrating the markets of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is not the fantastic quality of the tariff cuts accentuated by the devaluation of the pound which has occurred, and the devaluation of other moneys which are inevitable?

Mr. BREWSTER. If I understand international trade relations, it was equivalent to a cut of 40 percent in our tariff.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is some difference of opinion as to the amount. In some cases it would be 35 or 40 percent, and in some cases it would be nothing. However, on a conservative basis it is estimated that the average would be between 10 and 15 percent.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Scandinavian countries made a devaluation of almost 50 percent, I believe. That certainly went to great length.

Mr. MILLIKIN. When a foreign country had a product which it sold without competition with the products of this country, it did not give any reduction at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. No.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think Scotch whisky and a few other things might be cited as examples of cases in which no reduction or very small reductions were

made. In some cases I think the reductions were in an amount equivalent to the full value of the reduction of the pound. In other cases they adjusted themselves to competition and other factors. Therefore I have heard it said that probably reduction runs on an average of 10 to 15 percent, which is an enormous cut.

Mr. BREWSTER. It enables them to go as far as they need to meet competition in this country with our high-cost production. I think that the more profound impact of it has been on our foreign trade, because of the effect it has had on our export market. I know that in my own State of Maine the paper industry, which developed quite a business in South America and South Africa, suddenly found itself completely pushed out of those markets by Scandinavian and other countries of the world who were able completely to undersell them as a result of that type of devaluation. While we had thought chiefly of imports into our country, I believe the tragic collapse has been in our exports. That explains much of the decline in the trade gap. I believe, too, that the consequences of the administration's proposal looking to $15,000,000,000 in imports are being little appraised. I believe that is the approximate figure the administration has used. We cannot very well increase our free imports, because they are copper, rubber, tin, and other commodities which are not susceptible of very great expansion. Therefore, an increase from the current $7,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 of imports to the projected $15,000,000,000 would have to be made almost entirely in dutiable goods, which are competitive with American agriculture and industry. It would mean that from the current two to three billion dollars we would go up to around eight to ten billion dollars of dutiable, competitive imports. In other words, we would multiply our dutiable imports by four or five times, not merely doubling them, as one might at first infer, unless we look at items which are free of duty. So the impact on industry and agriculture, which are competitive, would be profound.

We have reciprocal trade agreements with most countries which are important in world trade. We have not fared too well in the reciprocity. Mexico canceled all her concessions to us 2 years ago, but we still give that country and the rest of the world the full benefit of all the concessions we originally granted to that country.

The former foreign markets of the United States are now encircled with greater restrictions than ever before. On the other hand, the tariffs of our own country are lower than for a hundred years. The continual plea for greater and greater imports will carry us directly into free trade unless checked. The closing-of-the-gap obsession is resulting in the irreparable injury of some of our oldest and most independent small enterprises. However, the real impact of competitive foreign goods is just beginning to be felt, and 1950 and 1951 will be crucial years for millions of workers and many industries. To what extent it is related to the four or more million unemployed is a subject for very careful scrutiny.

It should be noted here that whenever this country makes a concession in a trade agreement, that tariff reduction is applied to every similar article imported from any country which is the beneficiary of the most-favored-nation clause, including, for instance, Germany and Japan at the present time.

All the world benefits when we make a concession, regardless of which country is negotiating with us. It would almost seem to be a Christmas tree, decorated for every trading nation of the world.

Almost every country with which we have made agreements has taken subsequent steps to render ineffective a large proportion of the concessions they have granted to the United States. In not one instance has our State Department "reciprocated." It should not be interpreted that these nations have been dishonest. Each one felt it necessary to their national interest to raise barriers to American goods. The dishonesty is found in the continual use of the term "reciprocal" by the free-trade group, which continually harps on that word as the basis of all our agreements.

In that connection, Canada found it necessary to rigidly restrict, and in many cases to completely prohibit imports of various items grown and produced in the United States, particularly potatoes. Included were many kinds of fruits, vegetables, and other products normally shipped to Canada in large quantities. The effect of these restrictions, even while mutual trade agreements were in force, was very severe on the farmers and fruit growers of California and other areas, yet our concessions to Canada remained unchanged and "unreciprocal." As a matter of fact, we imported millions of dollars' worth of potatoes and other farm items that were in great surplus in the United States at reduced rates of duty, and under support programs.

Again, criticism should not be directed to the countries which found it necessary to negate their concessions to us. We should look askance, however, at any attempt to classify existing or future agreements as "reciprocal."

Administrator Hoffman of the ECA, with the blessing of the Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, recently granted the United Kingdom permission to use an extra $175,000,000 of ECA funds to purchase Canadian wheat. The United States has an enormous surplus of wheat, and under the agreement could have required it to be purchased here. Canada which also had a surplus appeared grateful for this windfall, for the following paragraph is taken from a statement by Secretary Brannan made last September 15:

> Finally (in return for the wheat deal), Canada will reexamine restrictions on imports of fruits and vegetables with the view of giving relief, where possible, from restrictions that are especially burdensome to the United States producers.

This "keeping in review" is typical of the kind of reciprocity our State Department apparently believes in. A release by the Department of Commerce, dated April 10, 1950, reports that exports from the United States to Latin American countries decreased by 14 percent in 1949. The export decline, according to the Department release, reflected the "tightening of trade and currency controls in nearly every South American country." As a result, our trade was restricted. Likewise, Canada shipped into our country 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes at a time when the State of Maine already had a surplus of 15,000,000 bushels. This means that it will cost the Government from fifteen or twenty million dollars to absorb the resulting surplus. Under the trade agreement, those commodities could perfectly well have been excluded, exactly as Canada excluded many of our fruits and vegetables when it served the purpose of their own agricultural program.

Most Latin American countries have made solemn agreements with us about these trade and currency controls. How long will the people of the United States be fooled by the glib use of the term "reciprocal" as used in these one-sided agreements? The general level of world trade barriers is far higher than ever before and makes the so-called "retaliatory" barriers of the period following the Smoot-Hawley tariff act of 1930 seem insignificant.

The public pronouncements and claims of glorious success broadcast by our diplomats after each trade agreement has been negotiated, are entirely misleading and will not stand up under even a cursory examination. Not one of our agreements can justify the use of the term "reciprocal."

Secretary Acheson and Administrator Hoffman are doing their best to put over the Administration's free trade theories. Bamboozling the public seems to be a part of the scheme.

A campaign, almost a door-to-door proposition, is being conducted at no little expense to the taxpayer, to convince everyone that we should purchase goods made in Europe in preference to those produced at home. They even seem to question the patriotism of those who prefer home-made articles.

The propaganda is that the recovery of Europe depends on our purchases of more of their goods, and continualy hints that we must increase purchases from Europe by $3,000,000,000. The irresponsible use of such exaggerated figures only serves to alarm the American worker and owner of small enterprises.

HISTORY OF EUROPEAN TRADE

Now I should like to give a brief history of European trade in order that we may understand the situation with ECA countries. Let us see what the history is.

Imports from central and northwestern Europe, mostly ECA countries, seldom exceed one-half of the amount we export to that area. Furthermore, up to 1949 we had not yet reached the normal status of trade with Europe and some further adjustments were advisable. Those adjustments are rapidly taking place in the form of greatly increased imports and decreased exports in the first 2 months of 1950.

The temporary appointment of a stout whipping boy to take the pressure off the Secretary of State and the ECA Administrator is an evidence of the tightening up of the whole situation. The position of an international trade balancer is not likely to be an enviable one during the current year. Business declines, a rise in unemployment, and a general increase in apathy toward the whole free-trade program, make Mr. Gordon Gray's recent appointment a delicate one.

Mr. President, I wish to give certain figures appearing in a table I have had prepared, and I ask that the complete table be inserted at this point in the RECORD. The table is headed "United States trade with northwestern and central Europe." There are some 15 countries included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States trade with northwestern and central Europe, 1910–40

[In millions of dollars]

Yearly average	Exports	Imports	Percent imports of exports
1910–14	$1,222.9	$725.8	60
1915–19	2,900.0	427.0	15
1921–25	1,960.6	885.0	45
1926–30	1,878.2	1,005.4	53
1931–35	795.4	412.5	52
1936–40	1,130.7	468.8	43
1947	4,025.1	581.5	14
1948	3,370.5	795.5	23
1949	3,264.0	708.9	21½

Countries included: Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, United Kingdom, Ireland, Belgium and Luxemburg, France, Netherlands, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Germany, and Switzerland.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the period 1921 to 1925 the exports amounted to $1,960,600,000, approximately $2,000,000,000, while the imports amounted to $885,000,000. So the imports amounted to 45 percent of the exports.

In the period 1936 to 1940 the exports were $1,130,700,000, the imports to $468,800,000, or 43 percent.

Coming down to the current year, the imports are at a low of 21½ percent of the exports.

Now let us see where this will lead us if we go on. According to this table, from 1910 to 1925, the ratio of imports to exports was substantially under 50 percent. According to the table normal imports were about 50 percent of exports from 1926 to 1936.

Imports from that area of Europe averaged 45 percent of exports in the 1921–25 period and increased to 53 percent in the 1926–30 period. However, in most years since 1915, the ratio of imports to exports has been substantially under 50 percent.

According to the above table normal imports from Europe seem to be just above 50 percent of our exports to that area. After the war that percentage was not reached until recent months, and it is obvious that some further rearrangements in trade will take place. However, it is not the impossible and frightening problem presented by propagandists who seek completely to break down the tariff structure of the United States before easing up in their campaign. There is concrete evidence that even before the end of 1950 a very large part of the larger-than-normal dollar gap will be closed.

If American capital continues to flow abroad and imports and exports become more similar in volume, we will be shipping out more dollars than we are getting back long before the end of ECA. That is a statement which may be interesting to those who are so vitally concerned in the problem we are to face at the end of ECA.

Furthermore, if we should purchase as much in the form of raw materials and finished goods as we ship to Europe, the total trade of the United States would show a large surplus of imports as compared with exports. This can be explained by an illustration.

This country imports upwards of $300,000,000 worth of rubber per year. The normal sources are British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. It is common knowledge that most of the rubber plantations are owned by firms, individuals, or corporations located in England, Holland or other European countries. It is also known that comparatively small percentages of the dollars spent for rubber go to the producing area. The laborers in that area get 10 cents a day. Similarly diamonds, tin, spices, and various other items contribute large sums to Europe rather than to areas in which they are produced.

This accounts for the normal wide discrepancy between imports from Europe into the United States and our exports to European countries. If we actually balanced our trade with the ECA countries, and continued to import the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of raw materials from other sources, our exports would be far below our total imports.

So we can take with a very large grain of salt the pleas to import from Europe as much as we export to that area.

Speaking, now, strictly of ERP countries—those receiving billions of dollars from the United States for rehabilitation and aid—and those from whom our diplomats say we must import billions more in order to balance our trade—may I present some very interesting figures?

In 1948 the so-called ERP countries sent goods to the United States valued at $977,000,000; in 1949, although United States tariffs had dropped from an average ad valorem equivalent of 7.6 percent in 1947 to 5.7 percent in 1949—I repeat, despite that drop, 1949 imports from ERP countries decreased to $846,000,000, a decline of $131,000,000. At least we cannot blame our tariffs for that.

They had lower tariffs in the later years, but sent a smaller quantity of goods. It would be interesting to see where their goods did go, since England had balanced its foreign trade in that year.

On the other hand, receipts by ERP countries of United States dollars from travel expenditures of tourists and businessmen visiting those countries increased from $186,500,000 in 1948 to $272,000,000 in 1949. This means that 19 percent of all the dollars received by ERP countries, other than outright gifts, grants, or loans, were supplied by Americans traveling abroad in 1948. In 1949 the percentage of such dollars sent abroad had increased to 24.5 percent of all the dollars earned.

In other words, one-quarter of all the United States dollars received by ERP countries came from American tourists. I shall at another time undertake to show that those are the dollars susceptible of the greatest increase because air travel has now made it possible for a very much greater number of Americans to go abroad, and they are interested to go. Eighty percent of Americans have 2 weeks' vacation, but formerly they could not go abroad in that period. Now they can. The result is going to be a constantly increasing host of Americans from our vast population who will visit Europe. They include those with interests abroad, those concerned with the traditions of the war and war memories, and those who in recent decades have come to this country and have relatives abroad. In my judgment, the increase of travel by Americans in foreign countries may well be calculated to close the narrow dollar gap, which is now so rapidly narrowing. If we should spend in travel abroad the same percentage of our national income that we spent in the decade of 1920–30, we would close the dollar gap today. That is a development not at all impossible to contemplate under current conditions. That is why I am not so seriously concerned about the closing of the trade gap.

If we further implement the point 4 program by practical proposals in the coming year, such as made by the Senator from Massachusetts, I believe those two factors alone, the point 4 program as finally implemented and the increased travel, will more than close any gap that can be reasonably anticipated.

These figures, supplied me by the Department of Commerce, graphically refute the claim of a few frenzied agitators for greater imports of pottery and chinaware, fish products, lumber and wood pulp, perfumes, liquors, toys, shoes, cotton textiles, petroleum, and oil products, which is a matter of interest to my good friend from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, watches—remember Waltham—and other highly competitive items in order to buy as much as we sell. Actually, 1949 tourist travel was considerably greater than in 1948, and 1950 will, on account of Holy Year and other factors, far exceed 1949, when one-fourth of all the earned dollars that went to ERP countries were taken and left there by travelers from the United States.

It simply means that, leaving out the hundreds of millions that flow to ERP countries in the form of private, public, and institutional dollars for which there is no recompense, we can still ship to those areas 25 percent more goods than we buy from them. If the millions sent to those areas as private returns and gifts are counted, we could probably send to ERP countries twice as much as we

buy from them—and they would still have the necessary dollars to pay for them.

There is additional proof of this in the fact that since 1915 the average imports from ERP countries have been only about one-third of our exports to those areas. In the most normal years, if we can identify any such years since 1915, imports have been 50 to 55 percent of exports, and the point I wish to establish here is that an approximate 50 percent ratio is safe, sane, and economically sound.

I hope the thousands of worried employers and the millions of workers who fear that unregulated imports will further seriously upset our economy will take cognizance of the true situation.

A really cooperative, bipartisan approach to our foreign trade problems and to our international policy would demand that full recognition be taken of all these facts. If one may presume to make a suggestion to those who are preaching free trade at any cost, the American citizen and taxpayer, the employee and the employer are all entitled to a full and complete statement of our trade situation. The constant cry that "our imports must be as large as our exports" if Europe is to be kept from communism is not likely much longer to fool the public.

It may be recalled that several weeks ago I made a public suggestion that the diplomats who manipulate our foreign trade "come down out of the clouds and get practical about our imports and exports." The answer seems to have been a redoubling of the efforts to get European goods into our home markets and a reiteration of the "industry subsidy and unemployment dole" plan to take care of those driven to the wall by artificially increased imports of competitive products.

It will interest and make very dramatic reading for the 4,000,000 of our unemployed today—the figure may soon be five or six million—to spend their time reading the brochure published by our own Department of Commerce at a considerable expense in research and printing, to show foreigners how to penetrate our markets at the expense of domestic producers on our farms and in our factories.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator from Maine refer to a recent publication with regard to 2,500 items which, it is suggested, should be permitted to come into this country?

Mr. BREWSTER. No. I refer to a publication last summer by the Department of Commerce giving very constructive suggestions to European producers as to how they can market their products in the United States, showing them what are the tariff limitations, and so on, and distributed very generally among them. The item of which the Senator from Missouri speaks is in preparation for the agreement at Torquay in England, to which I shall refer in a moment. That book deals with the question of how foreign producers can meet domestic competition.

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

The farm situation is becoming more and more alarming. Price supports and other agricultural programs are literally threatened with destruction because of a combination of circumstances.

During and after the war it was the patriotic thing to expand production and raise every bushel of wheat, potatoes, apples, and other farm products possible. The world was starving, and the American farmer came through in noble style.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to refer for a moment to the manufacturing industry. The question, of course, is very elemental, and I almost ask the Senator's pardon for asking it, but it is perfectly obvious, is it not, that not only are management and capital interested in the dangerous competition which may result, but labor has a vital interest in not being put out of work by undue introduction of competitive industrial products into this country?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will be interested in knowing that the Wage Earners Conference, formulated first under labor auspices, has brought to Washington, within recent weeks, 17 national labor unions vitally concerned with the problem, along with many others in industry who are interested, and that they are going forward to see that the people of the United States, and particularly the laboring people, understand the impact of this program and what it is going to mean to them. That is one of the most significant developments in connection with this entire program that I have seen, and one of the most encouraging developments.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. So it is not merely capital and management that are vitally concerned in this prospective importation of goods, but it is labor, which may find itself displaced and out on the streets, adding to the already considerable number of unemployed. Am I not correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. In my judgment, that is one of the most serious problems confronting our economy at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. I am correct in my statement, am I not?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is absotlutely correct. I think labor is most vitally interested. A manufacturer interested in this matter said to me that he was not so much concerned over the fact that it was not possible to produce cheaply in this country, for he could import from abroad, but he said, "In recent months large manufacturers have told me that they were compelled to go abroad to examine the possibility of production there, because it was impossible for them to meet the competition here at home."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. It is a fact, is it not, that there are already large interests of American capital in Paris and Cherbourg. For illustration, the Singer Sewing Machine Co. has established a very large plant in France.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. And if capital should find itself injured by importations, it might very well be that capital, instead of remaining in the United States, might go abroad, and there be invested, whereas labor could not leave the United States, pick up its families, sell its homes, and go abroad in the search for further work. Am I not correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is entirely correct. I have seen such situations all over the world. Some American industry may go abroad to develop in other countries—I have seen that happen in several European countries this year—to supply the local requirements. That has been done by many of our largest industries. However, when they go beyond that, I begin to be concerned.

For instance, traveling through the State of Maine I have seen hundreds and thousands of agricultural implements which have been manufactured in foreign countries by an American concern, but manufactured abroad by that concern under cheap labor conditions. That concern has produced those implements abroad because under such circumstances the implements it produces may come into this country free of duty. Therefore I begin to be greatly concerned. I think at that point the United States and its working men, above all others, are gravely injured.

Of course the manufacturer is not particularly injured, for under those conditions in many cases he makes more money by manufacturing commodities abroad and shipping them into this country than he does by manufacturing them in this country. That is why certain of our manufacturers operate in that way. Under such circumstances, they get along all right. However, as I have pointed out, the American working men are the ones who are hurt. That problem is one about which I believe American labor will think more and more seriously in coming weeks and months.

To the extent that our ECA grants abroad have rehabilitated foreign industry, that is very good. In most cases those foreign countries are now producing from 38 to 40 percent more than they produced before the war, as a result of the use of the labor-saving machinery we have provided. However, when they turn around and begin to inundate our own markets, at the expense of American working men, that is something else again.

That is why I favor the proposal of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] that we very carefully consider the implementation of the so-called point 4. Along with our consideration of the ITO Charter, I hope we may defer the consideration of point 4 until a more careful study can be made of the situation under the rapidly changing conditions of the present time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. In addition to what the Senator from Maine has stated and to what has also been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, does not another factor enter into the situation? Not only is a deplorable unemployment situation brought about, but we lose a great many skills by reason of the closing of such plants? For example, let me refer to the closing of the Waltham Watch plant in Massachusetts. The precision instruments which we must use in wartime are largely produced by the skilled craftsmen of the watch industry. The closing of such plants will be very disabling to our national defense, will it not?

Mr. BREWSTER. Of course, I think it is estimated that during the last war approximately 80 percent of our watch industry was converted to the production of precision instruments which were vital to the prosecution of the war. We then had a great watch industry which was able to do that work. However, when we destroy that industry—and its destruction is exemplified by the case of the Waltham Co., and I have heard of others which are approaching that situation—what will we do? Then we shall find ourselves lacking in precision instruments, and confronted by an enemy equipped with ample precision instruments of a quality equal to or even better than the quality of the smaller number of precision instruments we then are able to produce.

Mr. MARTIN. We are now engaged in a cold war with Russia. If that war should be converted into a hot war, certainly it would not be expected that the workmen in the Swiss watch factories would be available to the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. It would be most unlikely that they would be available to us. Certainly that possibility is not to be depended upon.

Mr. MARTIN. Then we would not have anyone to fall back upon for the production of precision instruments; and in that event it would be almost impossible for us to wage war under modern circumstances, which require the precision instruments not only for airplanes, but for so many other purposes and uses, vital in wartime.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; as our armed forces become more and more highly mechanized, and as we move into the realm of guided missiles and similar instruments, the production of precision instruments becomes absolutely indispenable.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Does not the Senator from Maine agree that before we entered into the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, approximately 15 years ago, more than 80 percent of the jeweled watches used in the United States were produced by American craftsmen and mechanics, whereas today they produce only about 15 percent?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; we now produce only about 15 percent, whereas formerly we produced more than 75 percent.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the difference.

Mr. MARTIN. To my mind, that is an appalling situation, and it is something about which the American people should be informed, because, as I understand the matter—and I am sure the Senator from Maine has more information on the subject that I have—in connection with the meeting next fall of 17 countries, at which meeting it is proposed to begin to reduce American tariffs, it is anticipated that the tariffs on 2,500 items produced in the United States will be affected.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. As the Senator from Maine stated so well a moment ago, of course the owner of a factory can very well conduct his operations in a foreign country, and by doing so perhaps will make more money than if he produced the articles he manufactures in a factory in the United States. However, our workingmen are the ones who are injured by such a development.

If the Senator from Maine will permit an observation at this point, let me refer to the glass and china and pottery industries of western Pennsylvania, northern West Virginia, and eastern Ohio. Today goods similar to those made by those industries are being imported from countries in which the wage scale is from 10 cents to 30 cents an hour, whereas the wage scale in those industries in the United States is more than $1.40 an hour. That development produces a situation with which we cannot compete very long.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, there is no question about it. The Senator from Pennsylvania will be interested to know, I am sure, that a few years ago we had 20 watch manufacturers in this country, whereas today we have only two.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. One of them is in the Senator's State, I think, and the other is in Illinois.

Mr. MARTIN. As to the one which is located in my State, if it were not for the fact that it has built up an enormous surplus and has developed a great sales organization, I do not know whether it could remain open today.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. While the Senator is discussing the effect on labor which is involved in the situation in those industries and on management and capital, and also the effect as regards the loss of skills, a situation to which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has alluded, let me inquire whether it is appropriate that we also mention that the effects of the closing of industries as a result of undue competition from imports will be felt throughout society, in every section of the country where that situation develops.

By way of illustration, let me refer to a town in which a certain manufacturing plant is located. Suppose it closes. In that event not only is the plant closed, and not only are those who have been employed in it then out of work; but in that community the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, the farmer who has been producing the food that has been consumed by those who have been working in that manufacturing plant, and the clothing merchant who has been selling clothes to the workers in that plant, are also disastrously affected. All of them, every portion of society in that area, feels the impact of the excessive competition, in the manner indicated. Is not that correct?

Mr. BREWSTER. I can agree with the Senator from Missouri in a peculiarly personal way, inasmuch as I grew up and still live in a small town of about 4,000 inhabitants, a town which for more than 100 years has had four small woolen mills, each employing between 200 and 300 persons. Despite all vicissitudes those mills have carried on for more than 100 years under local ownership and local enterprise. However, this winter—for the first time—under the operation of the theories we have been discussing today, one of those mills was liquidated, closed; and 250 persons, having altogether probably 750 persons dependent upon them, in their families, were thrown out of work. Consider the consequences of that situation to that small town; and then consider the consequences to the entire country, if that development is applied in many other localities! Such a consideration brings us to a realization of the direction in which we are moving.

In that connection, let me say that the other mills in that town are just hanging on by their eyelids.

Recently I talked with one of the larger manufacturers in New England. He is greatly concerned with that situation. He said that, as a matter of fact, the small mills are doing better than the large ones, because the small mills are able to produce more economically; but he pointed out that the small mills are being forced to the wall, and many of the big ones, as well.

As the Senator from Missouri has stated, that impact reverberates through our entire economic structure, in a multitude of ways.

Mr. President, I have spoken of our industries, and now I am about to discuss our agriculture. I referred to the fact that our farmers were urged, during the war, to produce more agricultural commodities; and I said that at that time the world was starving. I pointed out that in response to those appeals, the American farmer came through in noble style. Now he must pay for his response to the pleas of ECA Administrators. He expanded his acreage and increased his yield per acre; he outproduced all prior agriculturists. Suddenly he found no market for his goods—except to the United States Government, and that only by the grace of the laws adopted by Congress.

Surpluses have been piled up until their volume staggers the imagination. Storing some of them may be insurance against famine or leanness within the next 2 or 3 years, but many products cannot be stored for any length of time. The taxpayer is being taught by an insidious form of propaganda that the farmer is robbing him, and all the time the very individuals and groups which prepare this propaganda are maneuvering and negotiating for greater and greater imports of the same farm products that are in such huge surplus.

We are actually importing millions of dollars worth of eggs, both dried and fresh. The same is true of potatoes and a large number of other price-support products. The old promises of President Roosevelt and others promulgating the trade-agreement program that agricultural and fishery products would not be affected by agreements with foreign nations have given way to a tariff-reduction project which affects those products more than any others. President Truman has assured us repeatedly that no tariff reduction would be permitted to injure any domestic producer or industry, yet we now see the impact of these increased imports upon the industries and the agriculture of our country.

I have included here certain statistics as to the import of many kinds of agricultural products, many of them on the price-support and surplus list.

We imported over 3,500,000 dozen of fresh eggs—valued at over $2,000,000.

We imported dried eggs—about 2,000,000 pounds valued at nearly a $1,500,000.

We imported $16,000,000 worth of wheat for grinding and reexport.

We imported over $3,000,000 worth for our own consumption.

We imported 17,000,000 bushels of oats valued at about $13,500,000.

We imported nearly 13,000,000 bushels of barley valued at $19,000,000.

We imported $1,500,000 worth of corn.

We imported well over one-half billion pounds of potatoes valued at $13,000,000. It is common knowledge that the whole support program has been attacked, with potatoes as the whipping boy.

These are only a few of the huge imports of surplus products. More careful regulation of such imports would not cure the surplus problem, but it would make a great contribution both to the relief of the American taxpayer and to the protection of the American farmer.

Here is an interesting item: Potatoes, which of course is a subject rather near to my heart, are actually on the list of items released by the State Department for possible further tariff reductions this year. In view of the fact that we are utterly unable to absorb our own production, in view of the fact that we have imported 15,000,000 bushels from abroad and the Government has had to buy that many more, still it is proposed to reduce the tariffs further.

Dozens of other agricultural products and a number of fish classifications are also included.

What kind of economics is this? To what ridiculous limits can this program be carried, in the light of what has now occurred?

It was thought that the climax of this attack on domestic farmers and fishermen came in the last batch of agreements negotiated at Annecy, France, in 1949. A study of the concessions made by the United States in those negotiations reveals the startling information that over 83 percent of the tariff cuts made by this country were on products of direct interest to the farmer and the fisherman. The percentage would be slightly less if fish products were eliminated, but those were included because of their close relationship. So far as Maine is concerned, as well as all New England, the subject of fish means a great deal.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In saying that 83 percent of the tariff cuts made by this country were on products of direct interest to the farmer and the fisherman, what does the Senator mean?

Mr. BREWSTER. I mean that by the volume of the imports, 83 percent of the tariff cuts affected the fisherman and the farmer.

Mr. DONNELL. That is to say, it affected them injuriously, or does the Senator mean beneficially?

Mr. BREWSTER. The assumption is that the domestic producer is normally injured by imports.

Mr. DONNELL. I may tell the Senator the thought I had in mind. Someone merely reading these few sentences by themselves might understand that the Senator was saying that the imports were of things that the persons affected were using, and therefore it was to their benefit. But I understand the Senator to mean—and I ask him whether I am correct—that the percentage to which he refers, estimated to be in excess of 83 percent, is injurious to the fisherman and to the agricultural interests.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. Had I said, instead of "direct interest," "of direct and vital concern to the farmer and the fisherman," it would have conveyed my meaning better. In other words, they were matters that very seriously affected their own markets.

Mr. DONNELL. They seriously affected them to their injury, that is?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

This means that the farmer absorbed about four-fifths of the tariff cuts made at Annecy. This is something the farmers do not always realize, because we think of the tariff so much in terms of industry. It should be noted here that the largest volume of our imports of agricultural products consists of items that have long been on the free list—such things as coffee and bananas are free of duty—so the brunt of tariff reductions falls upon competitive goods and not upon those which do not compete directly with our own products.

The farmer in the dell will be on the dole before very long if Secretary Brannan keeps planning and the free-trade trend continues. Our own market is opened wider and wider to competitive goods grown in foreign countries, while our own foreign markets are being closed tighter and tighter against our exports.

Secretary of State Acheson and ECA Administrator Hoffman are advocating greater and greater imports, even though it results in injury to independent farms and industries in the United States. They have actually recommended doles and subsidies to salve the wounds of those that must be hurt in the forcing of imports. Here, again, agriculture takes it on the chin.

In the 2 months of January and February of 1949—just a year ago—our exports of agricultural products amounted to $662,000,000, and our imports were only $490,000,000—a balance of $172,000,000 in favor of exports. That was our agricultural export balance.

In the same 2 months of 1950 our exports had dropped to $471,000,000, a loss of $191,000,000 in 1 year, and our imports had increased to $587,000,000. In only 2 months of this present year we imported $116,000,000 worth of farm products more than we exported, and conservative estimates indicate the 1950 excess of imports over exports of agricultural products may reach $1,000,000,000.

I think that is a figure which will be of interest to every farmer in the United States, if we are going to have an import surplus of $1,000,000,000 of farm products this current year, under the current-trade program of this administration.

The full weight of the tariff cuts under trade argreements has fallen on agriculture and small, independent, free-enterprise industries, and the end is not yet. The 17 unions that have met here, many of them being engaged in the smaller industries, tell of the alarm of labor over this thing. Many more agricultural items are on the new list for the big tariff negotiations scheduled to begin next September in Torquay, England. The free traders will not be satisfied until they have cut every rate the full 75 percent allowed by existing law.

The list of items to be considered at the Torquay negotiations, released on April 14, contains some surprising information. Only 11 of all the 34 nations now belonging to the general agreement have consented to negotiate, although six new countries, Austria, Germany, Guatemala, Korea, Peru, and Turkey, contemplate joining the meeting.

The complete list of items to be considered is available at the State Department of the Superintendent of Public Documents. The list includes 345 paragraphs and about 2,500 items which are dutiable and which are slated for consideration of cuts, plus about 50 paragraphs of free items which may be bound against any future imposition of duty by the Congress.

As stated earlier our tariff rates are the lowest in modern history. Furthermore—and this is interesting, I think, to those who attack us for our trade policies—the United States has lower tariffs and fewer import restrictions than any other nation of economic importance. The average rate of duty on all imported products is now between 5 and 6 percent and the average on dutiable products is in the neighborhood of 13 percent. Dozens of rates of duty are so low, ranging from 1 and 2 percent to as low as one-fourth of 1 percent, that they have no protective value whatsoever. In a number of instances the cost of collecting the duty exceeds the amount collected.

I might say in reference to the agricultural problem that cotton, for instance, while it is theoretically subject to import, is prohibited from import by the quota restrictions imposed by the President. I believe the figure this year is 90,000 bales of long-staple cotton. I speak of that because it indicates the power the President possesses to impose restrictions which could be absolutely

protective of an American industry or of an item of production. I certainly commend the President for this measure of care, but I wish that our southern friends, who are concerned with cotton, would appreciate the problems of other sections. I wish they would think a little bit about my potatoes and about some of the other items which also need a little protection. I wish the President could be persuaded to use his power to give the same consideration to us as he does with reference to some other items in the schedule.

In the month of January, imports of dutiable items amounted to $256,000,000 while those free of duty amounted to $366,000,000. This means that in January almost 60 percent of the imports paid no duty whatsoever. That is the usual average. Over two-thirds of the imports of agricultural products were free of any duty. The ratio was approximately the same in the month of February.

State Department releases constantly refer to rigid trade restrictions, such as quotas and import licenses, as the most obnoxious of all forms of regulations, and freely admit that tariffs are the mildest of all of them. They, however, by ill-advised tariff cuts, have forced the use of quotas and licenses to keep segments of domestic agriculture and industry from being completely wiped out.

When the duty was reduced on butter, New Zealand, Denmark, and other dairy countries immediately prepared to invade the American market on a large scale. The huge surplus of butter in the United States made the tariff cut a foolish gesture, for the Department of Agriculture, despite pressure from the free traders, refused to grant licenses to those who would import the butter. Such working at cross-purposes has done much to antagonize friendly nations and it has not made life any easier or more certain for our own farmers.

The peril-point procedure adopted by the Eightieth Congress and repealed by the Eighty-first Congress would have prevented such fiascoes. The President found the peril-point procedure extremely obnoxious because it would have called upon him to explain why he made such unwise concessions as the one on butter, although, only if and when he exceeded those peril points.

The trade gap is rapidly closing and the dollar gap is almost at a balance. There is nothing to stop the continuation of the trend. Severe injury to domestic agricultural programs, to the farmers themselves, and to hundreds of thousands of workers in small, independent industries is increasing by leaps and bounds.

The need for peril-point studies before agreements are made is acute. The so-called escape clause is no substitute at all and its administration and interpretation become more ludicrous with each attempt at application.

We tried that out in connection with the glove industry. Japanese gloves were coming into the State of my colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. It was stated that the fact that the industry had no orders had nothing to do with it; the fact that they had made their orders for millions of dozens of gloves in Japan had nothing to do with it. We had to wait until the gloves actually arrived in this country. In the meanwhile, the employees in the glove factories were starving to death. If the danger was anticipated when the cut was made in the tariff, then it is not within the scope of the escape clause. That is very small comfort to the fellow who lost his job. In other words, if it were anticipated that Japan or some other country would send in a lot of gloves, there was no redress whatever under the escape clause. We are going to get educated in the next few years or the next few months. I am sure it will be a matter of very great concern to many of my colleagues.

A truly reciprocal trade agreement will open the door of the two negotiators to the goods of each other in approximately the same degree.

I am sure we all agree with that. It is a matter of give and take. We give up on some items, and they give up on other items, and the reciprocal trade should be approximately the same.

Many factors enter into such negotiations, it is true, and State Department leaders have testified before congressional committees that when this country enters into an agreement, calculated risks are taken. In other words, the safety and life of domestic industries and producers are risked in order to obtain questionable concessions from the other country. This has been openly admitted.

In general, however, if an agreement is reciprocal, the subsequent increase in trade between the two nations should be fairly evenly divided. Now, although administration economists have apparently not figured this out, no matter how many truly reciprocal agreements we enter into, we do absolutely nothing toward closing the trade gap. Pointing to trade agreements as essential because they will help balance our trade is just as misleading as is much of the prior propaganda that has been fed the public about the trade program.

If an agreement is negotiated, and it is truly reciprocal, both participating nations benefit in about the same degree. That means each country's imports and exports would be affected similarly, for if an agreement greatly increases imports and does not increase exports, where is the reciprocal benefit?

In other words, if the agreements are really reciprocal, they do nothing to close the trade gap. You get something and I get something, and we end up with the trade gap exactly where it was before. I think these gentlemen are intelligent enough to know that it is a very different situation. They have simply used the word "reciprocal" as a means of eliminating protection for American producers, knowing it will close the trade gap by closing out American producers.

When the public is finally informed of the facts about our trade agreements, they will no longer tolerate the use of the term "reciprocal." Proponents of free trade still glibly pin the label of reciprocity on past and proposed future agreements, but no one has yet been able to pin down what we have received in return for what we have given in any agreements so far. This is true of some of our treaties which apparently can be ignored or observed without any objection by our State Department.

In this connection, the able Senator from South Carolina recently told us about a shrinkage of our textile export trade in 1949; a $33,000,000 drop was referred to.

Recently I visited one of the largest producers of suits in New York. He had no American cloth whatsoever. It was entirely foreign cloth. That was one of the great producers who serves thousands of our citizens.

I have been very much concerned about this and about competition of foreign textiles here at home, because both contribute greatly to our unemployment problem. I have studied the statements of the ECA Administrator in his correspondence with the Senator from New Jersey.

Apparently the Administrator claims that our textiles have no part in his plans for our export trade and quantities of foreign textiles are to be expected in our home markets. That was made plain in the correspondence I had with him last year.

I wrote him then about an embargo of our cotton goods from Morocco, formerly an outlet for substantial quantities of American cotton goods. The embargo was pointed up by the fact that cotton goods were welcomed from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and other countries. The loss of this market, caused by the embargo imposed in Morocco, accounted for 10 percent of our 1949 loss of export volume.

Now, Mr. President, I find that Morocco is participating in some new trade agreements which provide for the purchase of cotton textiles from a number of countries, including Switzerland and Portugal, whose currencies are readily converted into dollars. Here we apparently find specific trade advantages being given to other countries in the very face of a solemn treaty between the United States and Morroco that American goods and American citizens shall have the same trading rights as are granted to any other nation. Yet our diplomats do absolutely nothing about the embargo of American cotton goods.

Furthermore, radios, cigars, and some other items purchased with dollars enter Morocco in unrestricted quantities, although necessities such as cotton sheetings are prohibited if purchased with dollars.

I have information that indicates our ECA operators support the Moroccan embargo of American cotton goods, even though private operators who have the dollars are willing to use their own money and in no way depend on ECA. Such goods are classed as luxuries, and therefore are prohibited. The incongruity is that radios and cigars are permitted, and, furthermore, the same ECA operators are shipping cotton goods into Moroccan markets from foreign producing areas and are even using the American taxpayers' money for that purpose.

The December 1949 issue of the ECA monthly report which was circulated in Paris shows cotton thread and piece goods are being shipped to Algeria,

Guadeloupe, French Guinea, and Martinique. The relationship of these areas to France is about the same as that with Morocco to France, and I cannot help but feel that the Moroccan restrictions are designed to favor certain foreign interests.

It seems to be quite all right to send our textiles, bought with taxpayers' money, to French colonies in which only foreign interests can profit thereby. In Morocco, and perhaps in other areas where our citizens could and would like to compete, cotton goods have been ruled nonessential, and our diplomats apparently support those rulings.

I have pointed this out, Mr. President, to further show that our treaties as well as our trade agreements often completely lack reciprocity, and the final analysis shows that the United States is the one country which always provides the concessions in the end.

Most opposition to the whole trade agreement program has been a result of the shroud of secrecy, the calculated risks taken, and the overbearing treatment of domestic agriculture and industry in the negotiations. The misleading use of the term "reciprocal" and the complete abandonment of that principle has greatly damaged the theory of true, businesslike agreements between nations.

Trade agreements and the doctrine of true reciprocity were first espoused by Republicans. Prior to 1932 the other major party fought vigorously against the principle, saying it lodged too much power in the executive branch. The present law, without even peril points, is much more autocratic than was ever advocated by the Republican Party and the refusal of the President to divulge even the bases upon which he makes tariff cuts and his willingness to allow injury to domestic agriculture and enterprise may well destroy the whole trade-agreement program, and seriously damage the ECA program in the process.

Workers on the farm, or in the mine or factory, will probably have something to say about it when they have an opportunity to speak next November.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield the floor?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I desire to take the floor in my own right. May I inquire how long the Senator from New York will take with his address.

Mr. LEHMAN. About 20 minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to wait.

SOCIAL-SECURITY COVERAGE FOR HOUSEHOLD WORKERS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in my own behalf and in behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I am submitting an amendment to H. R. 6000, which would extend the Social Security Act to cover an additional 900,000 domestic workers under the old-age and survivors' insurance program.

Household workers are one of the forgotten groups in this country so far as social security is concerned. They are not covered under our Federal Social Security Act. In general they are not protected under our State programs of unemployment insurance, sickness insurance, and workmen's compensation. Almost no governmental action has been taken to provide for the security of these employees.

Furthermore, there is no other organized method of social security available for household workers. Industrial workers, through collective bargaining, can obtain very good protection under union-management pension and welfare plans, but household workers by the very nature of their occupation are precluded from making organized efforts along this line. Even where industrial and commercial employees are not organized, many responsible employers have provided pension plans on their own initiative.

In the past, employers of domestic help sometimes made provision for the security of their employees in their old age, but with the disappearance of the old "family retainer" type of servant this custom, too, has largely disappeared. The average household employer today is simply not in a position to assure the future security of her employees, no matter how sincere her interest and sense of responsibility.

If the household worker is to stay off the relief or assistance rolls in her old age, and to provide for her family in the event of her death, she must do so through her own individual efforts, out of her current income. Yet earnings figures show that it is utterly unrealistic to expect the average household worker, save in relatively few cases, to do this. Employees in domestic work are even less able to provide for their own security than are the groups now covered by social security and industrial pension plans. The best available estimates indicate that in 1948 over three-fourths of all domestic workers earned cash wages of less than $1,000, and fewer than 5 percent earned more than $2,000. It is obviously impossible to save enough out of such earnings to make one's old age secure against want. The typical household worker has no recourse in time of need but to apply for public assistance, with its means test and personal investigations, despite a lifetime of hard work.

It is true that few household workers are men with families. In 1948 only 7 or 8 percent of all workers in household employment were men. However, most women who engage in household employment do so because they have the economic responsibility, in whole or in part, for their families. According to the 1940 census, about 34 percent of the women in household work, as compared with only 20 percent of all women workers, were separated, widowed, or divorced. Moreover, single women in household work are generally older than single women in industry, indicating that they, too, are more likely to have family responsibilities.

Fortunately, it cannot be said that household workers have been entirely ignored. I am proud to be able to say that in my own State of New York, during my administration as Governor, I was instrumental in covering household workers under our State unemployment insurance law. That law now covers domestic workers whose employers hire 4 or more workers on at least 15 days in a calendar quarter. Subsequently our State workmen's compensation law was amended to include domestic workers in cities of 40,000 or more. Our State cash sickness insurance law applies to household workers whose employers hire 4 or more workers on at least 30 days in a quarter.

On the national scene, as long ago as 1940 my predecessor, the distinguished Senator Robert F. Wagner, introduced a bill which would have amended the Social Security Act to provide old-age and survivors insurance coverage for domestic workers; and in subsequent Congresses he and the distinguished Senator from Montana repeatedly sponsored similar measures. I am happy to carry on the tradition established by Senators Wagner and MURRAY. I am proud that Senator MURRAY is a cosponsor of this bill I am introducing today.

I am proud, too, to be able to say that during the present Democratic administration the first real progress has been made toward providing for domestic workers under the Federal social security program. H. R. 6000, the social security bill which was passed by the House last year and which I hope will soon be reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Finance, will extend the old-age and survivors insurance program to cover 950,000 of the 2,500,000 persons who work in domestic employment during the course of a year. H. R. 6000 would do this by including under the program any "regularly employed" domestic worker who earns as much as $25 from one employer in a calendar quarter. The worker would be considered regularly employed if he works for that employer on at least 26 days in the calendar quarter. This is a step in the right direction, a real forward step toward providing the protection that these workers so sorely need, and I am glad our colleagues on the House side have taken this action.

In my opinion, however, H. R. 6000 does not go far enough in this respect. It would cover household workers who are hired on a weekly or monthly basis, but it would not cover the typical household worker who is hired to work by the day—in other words, the great number of people who work for the same employer on the same day each week, but on each day of the week for a different employer. These people are just as regularly employed as those covered by H. R. 6000. They are just as much in need of social security—perhaps even more so—and they could be covered with little administrative difficulty and almost no trouble or inconvenience to their employers. There is no sound reason for leaving them out.

The chief argument against covering these people is the alleged administrative difficulty and the allegation that making the necessary reports would be an

impossible burden on housewives and other household employers. In my opinion this argument is not sound. I am advised that the Social Security Administration has worked out some very simple procedures for administering the coverage of domestic workers.

Two alternative methods have been developed for securing wage reports for these domestic workers. Under the first, the simplified pay-roll reporting plan, the housewife would fill out a simple form showing the name of her employee, the social-security account number of the employee, the total wages paid, and the amount of the tax contributions payable. Moreover, the housewife would be required to do this only once in every calendar quarter—only four times a year. Under the second alternative, the stamp plan, the housewife would simply buy stamps at the post office and paste one in the domestic's book weekly. The worker would obtain the book and turn it in to the Government at the end of each reporting period. I am especially impressed with this latter plan, the stamp plan, which has been widely used in Europe, and makes record keeping an almost automatic process.

Surely this kind of record keeping is not too much to expect of the American housewife as the price of providing security for her employees. I do not believe it is too much to ask of anyone, and I do not believe that those housewives who are in a position to employ household help will object to carrying out these simple tasks. In confirmation of this opinion, I may cite the fact that many women's organizations have supported social-security coverage for domestic workers. Among the organizations advocating such coverage are the YWCA, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the National Women's Trade Union League, the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Council of Negro Women, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Home Economics Association, the American Public Welfare Association, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and the department of social education and action of the Presbyterian Church.

I earnestly hope that favorable action will be taken on this amendment to H. R. 6000.

I am including as part of my statement some questions and answers on the problem of social security for domestic workers, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR DOMESTIC WORKERS—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. What is the present social-security situation with respect to domestic workers?

At present domestic workers are excluded from the contributory Federal old-age and survivors insurance program. This is the part of social security under which most industrial and commercial workers are now assured cash retirement benefits after 65 or survivors' benefits to their dependents if they die. These payments are made to insured persons as a matter of equity right from an insurance fund built up by contributions from covered workers and their employers in contrast to assistance which is paid on an individual means test basis from general tax funds.

2. Is there any general recognition that domestic workers need the protection of the insurance program, or any likelihood that they will get such protection in the near future?

Coverage of domestic workers has been recommended by most authorities who have studied the problem. In particular, the advisory council on social security appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance, in its report to that committee in 1948, recommended that "the 2,500,000 persons who work in household employment during the course of a year should be covered under old-age and survivors insurance."

H. R. 6000, the social-security bill which passed the House of Representatives this year and is now scheduled for early consideration by the Senate Finance Committee, would cover regularly employed domestic workers. In order to be covered the worker would have to receive cash wages of at least $25 from his employer in a calendar quarter and would have to work for that employer on at least 26 days in a calendar quarter. Thus, most household workers who are hired on a weekly or monthly basis would be covered while most day workers would remain excluded. H. R. 6297, a bill introduced by Representative KEAN which embodied the views of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, would substitute for the 26-day requirement a requirement of 6 days' work for an employer in a calendar quarter. There is every reason to believe that similar proposals for a broader coverage of domestic workers will be pressed in the Senate.

3. Why should domestic workers be covered under this insurance program?

The fact that domestic workers are not now covered by the program does not mean that they have no need for its protection. They are just as likely as any other group to grow old, to become disabled, or to die and leave their families with no earning power. Because their earnings are generally lower than those of other groups, they are even less able to provide individually for their own security. The best available estimates indicate that in 1948 over three-fourths of all domestic workers earned cash wages of less than $1,000, and fewer than 5 percent earned more than $2,000.

Moreover, domestic workers have no means of providing security for themselves as a group. The employer and union pension plans which are now developing so rapidly for the industrial worker do not, of course, apply to those in domestic service. In the past, employers of domestic help sometimes made provision for the security of their loyal employees in old age, but with the increasing mobility of the population and the disappearance of the old family-retainer type of servant this custom, too, has disappeared. The typical domestic worker nowadays has no recourse in time of need but to seek assistance, which is less satisfactory to him and more costly to the general taxpayer.

4. What are the advantages to the employer of bringing domestic workers under the insurance system?

The average household employer is not in a position to assure the security of an employee no matter how sincere her interest or sense of responsibility. Moreover, now that pension and retirement plans are increasingly recognized as a factor in industrial and commercial employment she is in a disadvantageous situation to compete with such employers even at an equivalent wage rate. Inclusion of domestic workers in the governmental insurance system would not only relieve the employer of a natural concern for the welfare of those who help her but would also make it easier to secure such assistance in a competitive labor market.

5. How would social insurance for the day workers among domestic employees be administered?

The Social Security Administration has indicated that such workers, as well as the more regularly employed domestic servants, could be covered without any difficulty. One of the ways this could be done is through the use of a stamp plan. Under this plan the domestic worker would be provided with a stamp book in which the employer would place special social-security stamps indicating the amount of wages paid to the worker. The employer would buy the stamps from the post office and would deduct half the cost of the stamps from the worker's earnings as his share of the contributions. The money value of noncash wages, such as meals and lodging, would be included in the wages reported. The stamp book would be sent to the Social Security Administration, which would credit the worker with the amount of the wages reported.

6. In view of the low wages which household workers receive, could they afford to pay for this insurance protection?

They cannot afford not to. Contributions are related to earnings, so that ability to pay is taken into account. In addition, while benefits are also related to earnings, they are so computed that the lower-paid workers receive greater benefits in proportion to their contributions than do higher-paid workers. It must be remembered, too, that there is no other effective way for household workers to provide security for themselves.

7. How much would they pay for this insurance protection?

Under H. R. 6000, those domestic workers covered would pay 2 percent of their annual net earnings during the years 1951 through 1959; employers of domestic help would pay a like amount. Thus, a household worker earning, say, $1,200 a year would pay $24—or $2 a month—for the next 10 years, for a total of $240 over the 10-year period. After that the rates projected in H. R. 6000 are scheduled to increase gradually to a maximum of 3¼ percent in 1970. However, the Senate Advisory Council has recommended that when the contribution rate reaches 2 percent each on employer and employee a governmental contribution be considered as in other countries.

8. What protection would the domestic worker get for these contributions?

If he lived to age 65, he would receive a retirement benefit each month; the wife of a domestic worker would also receive a monthly benefit at that age; and if there were children under 18 they, too, would get benefits. If the worker died prematurely, a lump sum would be paid to his spouse or to the person who paid the funeral expenses, and the widow and young children, or aged dependent parents, would get monthly benefits. Monthly benefits would not be paid to the widower of a female worker, but her children would get benefits if she had worked recently and for a substantial length of time in covered employment, or if they had relied chiefly on her for support. H. R. 6000 would also provide for the payment of monthly insurance benefits to permanently and totally disabled workers, so that the household worker would receive benefits before age 65 if permanently unable to work. Benefits would not be paid for any month in which the beneficiary received as much as $50 for covered work.

9. How large would these insurance benefits be?

Under H. R. 6000, if the worker had been covered for 10 years at $1,200 a year he would be eligible at age 65 for benefits of $52 a month. When his wife became 65 the family would get $79 a month. If the worker died after 10 years of coverage at $1,200

and left a widow and one child under 18, the family would get $79 a month. If there were a child but no widow (including, of course, cases where the deceased worker was a woman), the monthly benefit amount would be $39; if there were two children, $65. Benefits would stop when the youngest child attained age 18, but the widow would again be entitled to benefits at $39 a month when she reached 65. In addition, a lump sum amounting to $156 would be paid.

10. How long would the domestic employee have to contribute to the insurance program in order to get benefits?

Under the provisions of H. R. 6000 he would be insured for survivor benefits after he had been covered for a year and a half. In most instances under this bill he would have to be covered for at least 5 years before he could get retirement or disability benefits. He would have to continue working in covered employment for about half of his time to remain insured, but after he had been covered for 10 years he would be insured permanently for retirement and survivor benefits.

However, under the so-called new start recommendation of the Senate Advisory Council newcomers to the insurance program would be fully covered for retirement after 1 year and a half (or six quarters) of covered employment. If the Senate considers extending coverage as recommended by the Advisory Council it will undoubtedly consider this corollary recommendation.

Many people now in domestic work have already spent sometime in covered employment, particularly during the war; this employment already credited to them will shorten the time they need to work in the future to become eligible for benefits.

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 1949.*

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 6000) to extend and improve the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to amend the public-assistance and child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

THE PRESENT SPY HUNT AND EARLY WITCH HUNTS IN SALEM VILLAGE—ARTICLE BY EDWARD A. HARRIS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the able Pulitzer prize-winning reporter, Mr. Edward A. Harris, of the St. Louis Post——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did not the Senator omit one portion of the name of the paper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch?

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly did, and I appreciate the reminder. I should have said the able Pulitzer prize-winning reporter, Mr. Edward A. Harris, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Is that correct?

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have to be very correct in what I am saying here now, because I have a particularly critical audience. My youngest granddaughter, 3 years of age, is sitting in the gallery on her first visit to the Congress, and I must be careful not to make any slip.

I repeat, Mr. President, the able Pulitzer prize-winning reporter, Mr. Edward A. Harris, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has written a very arresting article contrasting the present spy hunt with the hysterical witch hunts which took place in Salem Village, Mass., three centuries ago. This article shows the almost incredible parallel between the events of that day and events of today. I commend it to the reading of the Members of the Senate and to all the people of our country. I hope that more and more of our public leaders and publicists will have the vision and the courage to speak out boldly on this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Harris, which was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 28, be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEVIL IN WASHINGTON

(By Edward A. Harris)

WASHINGTON.—Pathological fear gripped the townsmen of Salem Village late in the seventeenth century when a little group of neurotic teen-age girls fell into hysterical fits as if possessed of the devil. Breaking the bonds of strict Puritan discipline, the girls talked blasphemously during their fits and cried out against those in league with the devil who were afflicting them.

Few escaped the spiteful vengeance of the girls, who suddenly found all the attention they had ever craved. A pious pure-hearted old grandmother, Rebecca Nurse, was cried out against by the girls as a witch, and carried from her sickbed to be hanged. An old man, sound in body and mind despite his age, was pressed to death because he remained mute, refusing to confess his witchery. The constables righteously piled rocks upon his chest as he lay prostrate until the mounting weight crushed him. Children as young as 5 years of age were carted to dank and foul prisons as bedeviled.

The madness and panic were contagious. As soon as one villager was named as a witch, corroborating witnesses marched to court to detail acts of witchery of the accused. These witnesses were not malicious liars; they fervently believed their own tales, as embellished by sick imaginations, and their hearsay gossip was accepted as evidence in the sick atmosphere of the day.

The Salem court, however, convicted the witches mostly on spectral evidence. What good was it for accused witches to swear to their innocence when even at that moment the teen-age girls rolled on the courtroom floor and shrieked wildly that the spectral shapes of the defendants were then afflicting them?

To some observers there appears a striking parallel between the Salem pathology and the current spy hysteria in Washington. A new book, the Devil in Massachusetts, by Marion L. Starkey, comes as a fresh shock in its vivid portrayal of the depths of cruelty and irresponsibility to which human beings can sink in the spell of fear and ignorance.

Then, as now, the accusers were the exalted, including exwitches who recanted and pointed their cleansed fingers at former conspirators. It was safe, even noble, to be an accuser; there was no risk to it, but there was fame and glory. Spectral evidence was accepted then, even as hearsay evidence is today spread across the Nation's press.

Those who dared criticize the teen-age neurotic girls were promptly—within seconds—themselves branded by the girls as witches, and hanged. Anyone who dared to defend the good name of the accused was at once cried out against by this little feminine band of life-and-death givers.

There is no gallows as yet in the Washington manhunt, but character assassination serves as effectively. Here, too, it is safe to be an accuser, and perilous to back the good name of the accused. As to the accused himself, how can he ever prove he is not a witch? How can Prof. Owen J. Lattimore, of Johns Hopkins University, or Secretary of State Dean Acheson, for that matter, prove beyond a shadow of doubt that they are not Communists? It cannot be done.

The accusers must be well aware of this. But lest the trap be not tight enough, ex-Communist Louis Budenz has conveniently made it escape-proof. The truly dangerous Communists, he avers, do not carry party cards and may never join he party. They even remain aloof from the fringes of the party and in order to conceal their true identity may pose as anti-Communists or supporters of the Marshall plan.

If Lattimore's writings show a party line, he stands condemned; if they show anti-Communist sentiment, the clever scoundrel is doubly damned. The trap is sufficiently elastic to apply to anyone.

In 5 years of constant communion with the FBI Budenz would have the public believe that he did not "have time" to mention the name of Lattimore. Only after Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY charged that Lattimore was the "top Red espionage agent" did Budenz find his memory refreshed and his time ample for long public dissertations on Lattimore.

The "corroborating witnesses" may continue to parade to MCCARTHY's side as he continues to cry out his accusations. But more and more observers are wondering why the word of admitted ex-Communists is sanctified over the word of other citizens. Would not the same character markings that first led them into communism carry over to an intemperate opposite extreme? Here is the admission of one noted ex-Communist, Author Koestler, in this respect:

"Those who were caught by the great illusion of our time, and have lived through its moral and intellectual debauch, either give themselves up to a new addiction of the opposite type or are condemned to pay with a lifelong hang-over."

Secretary Acheson, in a stirring speech before editors and publishers in Washington, described MCCARTHY's crusade as "mad" and "vicious." In Salem Village many long years ago the madness was ended only when intelligent men with cool heads emerged from their neutral retreats to speak their minds, aware at last that no one was safe from such pathology. Until such an awakening takes place on a large scale, the Washington bedlam will go unchecked. Acheson has shown the way, but many more as courageous as he must speak up if common sense is to prevail over the devil in Washington.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propose a unanimous-consent request for a vote on the ECA bill?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose if I can do so without losing the floor. I assume the Senator will suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will have to do that.

Mr. DONNELL. I will consent to the interruption on the understanding and agreement that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask agreement to the following unanimous-consent request——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as a quorum call is necessary in connection with such a request, can we not save time by having the unanimous-consent request presented after the quorum call?

Mr. CONNALLY. In order to come within the rule, a quorum call must be had after request is made for unanimous consent to the proposed agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement by the Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit the following proposed unanimous consent agreement:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 5, 1950, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, except as hereinafter provided, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending or that may be proposed to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and upon the final passage of the said bill: *Provided,* (1) That after said hour of 1 o'clock debate upon any amendment or motion, when proposed, shall be limited to not exceeding 20 minutes, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposed thereto; (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be in order; and (3) that said bill shall not in the meantime be laid aside except by unanimous consent.

Ordered further, That on said day of Friday, May 5, the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 1 o'clock p. m. shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of said bill and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and—

Such Senator as may be designated by the opponents.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Texas will insert the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] I think it will be satisfactory. I have not gotten in touch with him, however.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will insert the name of the Senator from Missouri:

and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]; and

Ordered further, That in the event of the passage of said bill S. 3304, the Senate shall, without debate, immediately proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7797)—

That is the House bill upon the same subject—

to provide foreign economic assistance; that it be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of S. 3304 as amended; that the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of said bill be deemed to be ordered, and a vote taken on the final passage of the House bill as amended; and that, if passed, the proceedings on the passage of S. 3304 be vacated and said bill be postponed indefinitely.

Pending action on that request, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Darby	Kefauver	Sparkman
Donnell	Kerr	Stennis
Douglas	Kilgore	Taft
Eastland	Knowland	Taylor
Ecton	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	Magnuson	Williams
Hayden	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the proposed agreement be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed agreement.

The Chief Clerk read the requested unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 5, 1950, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, except as hereinafter provided, upon any amendment or motion that may be pending or that may be proposed to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and upon the final passage of the said bill: *Provided,* (1) That after said hour of 1 o'clock debate upon any amendment or motion, when proposed, shall be limited to not exceeding 20 minutes, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposed thereto; (2) That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be in order; and (3) that said bill shall not in the meantime be laid aside except by unanimous consent.

Ordered further, That on said day of Friday, May 5, the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 1 o'clock p. m. shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of said bill and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]; and

Ordered further, That in the event of the passage of said bill (S. 3304), the Senate shall, without debate, immediately proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7797) to provide foreign economic assistance; that it be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of S. 3304 as amended; that the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of said bill be deemed to be ordered, and a vote taken on the final passage of the House bill as amended; and that, if passed, the proceedings on the passage of S. 3304 be vacated and said bill be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If unanimous consent is given to the proposal of the Senator from Texas, does that mean that a privileged matter, such as a conference report, cannot temporarily displace the consideration of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request, as worded would exclude everything except a privileged matter. It contains the provision—

This bill shall not in the meantime be laid aside except by unanimous consent.

That provision would exclude the consideration of any other matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Unless privileged matters are excepted, I shall be constrained to object.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, would the Senator agree if we insert "except conference reports"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Privileged matters, including conference reports. I would not object if that modification is made.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I agree to the modification.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may the Clerk read the provision as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will read the modification.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That said bill shall not in the meantime be laid aside except for privileged matters.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Including conference reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request as amended or modified by the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, should there not be something said about the Senate meeting at 11 o'clock on Friday?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection to the unanimous-consent request, and I am satisfied that the acting majority leader will assure us that when the Senate takes a recess on Wednesday or Thursday it will be to convene at 11 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the event it is sought to take up the conference report on the basing-point bill, what vote would be required in order to bring up that matter for determination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A majority vote would be required.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement, as modified, is entered into.

The Senator from Missouri had the floor and yielded for the discussion of the unanimous-consent agreement. The floor will now be returned to him in good order.

CALIFORNIA ALIEN LAND ACT HELD INVALID UNDER UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, this afternoon we have had the very rare treat of a discussion, most interesting and learned, and at the same time practical, with respect to the interests of our Nation, labor and management, and the general public as well. The Members of the Senate should be congratulated upon being the beneficiaries of the research and the work of the distinguished members of this body who have presented these various facts to us.

Among the very interesting questions which have been laid before us this afternoon is the question of whether or not the charter of the International Trade Organization, into which this country is asked to enter, and entrance into which is being considered, would constitute a treaty or an executive agreement. I recall to the attention of the Senate the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]—I think I quote him substantially correctly—expressed at least tentatively, and possibly even somewhat more than tentatively, the view that the International Trade Organization Charter, which is referred to in resolutions the numbers of which were mentioned in the course of the discussion, is a treaty; and to similar effect there was an expression, quite vigorous, clear, and, to my mind convincing, by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], that the charter of the International Trade Organization is a treaty.

Mr. President, this is not a mere abstract or academic question. It is one which has at least two important bases.

Under the provisions of the United States Constitution, the Senate is the body which must ratify a treaty, two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present being required to ratify. The question therefore arises as to whether or not the International Trade Organization charter comes within that provision, or whether by simple majority of both Houses of Congress that agreement and charter may be put into effect.

Mr. President, there is a far more fundamental question involved with respect to the International Trade Organization than merely the question as to whether both Houses of the Congress shall participate in the determination of whether or not ratification and joinder shall occur. I do not mean by saying that there is a more important question in any sense to minimize the importance of the question as to whether it is the Senate or the Congress as a whole which is to pass upon this question. But the fundamental question which is involved, and which I have in mind at the moment, is as to whether or not this agreement to be entered into, if it shall be entered into by our Nation, is one which rises to the dignity of a treaty, and therefore comes under that provision of the Constitution of the United States which reads:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and, the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is not my purpose this afternoon to discuss the International Trade Organization charter, but mention of it in the course of a previous address on the floor emphasizes to my mind the grave importance of knowing what we are taking up when we undertake to consider that instrument. We should know whether it is merely an executive agreement or a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct to say that it is planned to have the ITO charter approved by both Houses of Congress and not by a two-thirds vote of the Senate?

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator that earlier this afternoon I offered the numbers of three resolutions. They indicate precisely what the Senator from Michigan has just stated. I refer to House Joint Resolution 14, House Joint Resolution 71, and House Joint Resolution 236.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let us take for granted that under the Constitution this instrument is a treaty, but it is submitted as an executive agreement, to be acted on by a majority of both Houses, and signed by the President, as in the case of an ordinary bill. Thereupon the question of appropriation to implement the so-called executive agreement arises. I have pointed out on the floor that there is no constitutional method by which the right of Congress to appropriate money for the implementation of an executive agreement can be questioned. If that is correct, by indirection we take away from the people of the United States the right to have an instrument, which is in law, effect, and substance, a treaty, which should be ratified by the Senate by a two-thirds vote, as the Constitution requires, by merely passing legislation to implement an executive agreement.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator has raised a very interesting question and a highly important one. In the first place, I would say that obviously the use of a plan to obtain approval by a simple majority of either of the two Houses does take away from the Senate, prima facie at any rate and for the moment at any rate, the power to pass upon the validity by ratification or nonratification of a document which is before it. I defer to the Senator's opinion, at which I assume he has arrived, as to the difficulty, and perhaps impossibility, of attacking successfully an appropriation in aid of an instrument thus entered into. However, I am not prepared to admit, and do not admit, that there may not be some appropriate means by which we may still be able to determine in the courts of the land whether the proper or an improper course was followed. I may say that it is an interesting question, to which, however, I have not given attention or study. However, as a lawyer if there were brought to my office a question involving a document which had been passed upon by the two Houses of Congress by a simple majority of each, and the interests of my clients were involved in a determination of whether or not the instrument was or was not a treaty, I should certainly not advise the client to go his way without making a very careful search in an endeavor to find means by which I might safeguard his interests by establishing through the courts that the document was a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to preface the question by a brief statement. As a lawyer, the Senator from Michigan does not know of anyone to whom he would rather take a case involving a method of litigating it in the courts for a determination than to the distinguished Senator from Missouri. In fact, the Senator from Michigan would like to work upon that problem with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for the compliment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Even though the Senator from Michigan has his own opinion on questions of this kind, he has always hoped that a way would be found of testing them in courts of law, because they are vital to the Nation.

Mr. DONNELL. If I may interrupt the Senator at this point, let me say that at the time of the early decisions of our Supreme Court, notably by Chief Justice Marshall, notwithstanding the fact that there is not one word in the Constitution of the United States to the effect that the Supreme Court may pass upon the constitutionality of a statute, the Supreme Court itself, on the theory that it was its duty to follow the law, found it necessary to ascertain what the law was, and therefore considered it necessary to determine whether or not a statute fell within the provisions of the Constitution, which the Court considered to be the fundamental law. I may say that there is quite an analogous situation presented here.

I am not certain of the validity of my position, because I have not looked into it or studied it, but, as the Senator presents it to me this afternoon, if we should have before us an instrument which obviously on its face was a treaty or, as obviously as the distinguished Senator from Colorado has indicated he believes the ITO charter to be a treaty, and it was not acted upon as such, it would appear to me that it would be well worth the effort and time of counsel to take the matter to the Supreme Court of the United States in order to determine whether or not Congress had taken the wrong course, and whether or not a document which had been approved by the two Houses of Congress was in fact a

treaty. I think it would be well worth while to take the matter to the Supreme Court. It seems to me that the Supreme Court could find that the document which the two Houses of Congress had passed was not valid, just as the Supreme Court has found in various cases that statutes which had been enacted by the two Houses of Congress were not valid but were violative of the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the Senator from Michigan reads the decisions of the Supreme Court, there is no party who in this case could bring the litigation before the Court. It does not say, however, that some way could not be found to bring it before the Supreme Court. I should like to raise another question.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him again, I recall that it has been indicated in substance by the Supreme Court that the interest of any one taxpayer is so infinitesimal that he cannot be considered a real party in interest. But I would still say that if a case were brought to a law office of which I was a member, and I believe if one were brought to a law office of which the distinguished Senator from Michigan were a member, we would not turn down the case without full investigation, and doubtless without testing the matter in court.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is a fact, but, be that as it may, is it not the duty of the United States Senate, when any instrument is presented to ascertain whether in its opinion it is a treaty or something which can be properly handled by enacting a law?

Mr. DONNELL. My answer is, "Yes," unqualifiedly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Therefore, we have an obligation to the people of the United States, in passing upon this question, to determine, in effect, whether the ITO charter is a treaty within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. I thoroughly concur with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to ask a further question. How are we going to raise that question but by the Senate of the United States voting down any bill on the subject, not upon its merits, but upon the fact that it covers a matter which is not subject to enactment into a law, but a matter solely within the jurisdiction of the Senate as a treaty?

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator has precisely stated the remedy, and the course which should be followed by the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I might suggest that the distinguished Foreign Relations Committee could set the whole matter at rest by its own finding that it is a treaty, and that if it comes before the Senate at all, it should come as a treaty.

Mr. DONNELL. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Colorado for his statement. Did I understand him correctly to state that the Committee on Foreign Relations has already determined the matter?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, no.

Mr. DONNELL. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is my understanding that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has done nothing about the matter.

Mr. DONNELL. What was the Senator's statement? I obviously did not catch it correctly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I said that in the first instance the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations could set the matter at rest by deciding that the agreement should be submitted as a treaty, and would not come out of the committee as anything else.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is an appropriate subject for the committee to determine, and that it should not allow the agreement to reach the floor for a vote, because it is a treaty rather than a bill which would become a law.

Mr. DONNELL. I agree thoroughly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Be that as it may, the responsibility is upon every Member of the Senate to determine that question in his own mind.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, Mr. President, I take it that the Senator and I agree that even though the Committee on Foreign Relations should permit the instrument to come upon the floor of the Senate in the form of a bill, with all due deference and all respect to the committee, the duty still would lie upon the shoulders of every Member of the Senate to vote in accordance with whether or not he thought the instrument was a treaty or was not a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest, further, that if the instrument is not before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as a treaty, then definitely primary jurisdiction should be in the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and it might be that the Senate Committee on Finance would also decide that this is a proper subject for a treaty, and therefore should not be considered as ordinary revenue legislation.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his comment.

DECISION IN CASE OF SEI FUJII AGAINST STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. President, as previously stated, it had not been my intention even to mention the International Trade Organization Charter this afternoon, but I could not refrain from doing so in view of the great appropriateness, as I saw it, of the illustration of the importance of the determination of whether a given document is or is not a treaty.

Mr. President, my purpose this afternoon is to call to the attention of the Senate a decision of a court. It is the decision in the case of Sei Fujii against the State of California, rendered on April 24, 1950, 4 days before this day, by the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, Second Appellate District, Division 2.

The court consists of three judges, Justice Wilson, who wrote the opinion of the court, Presiding Justice Moore, and Justice McComb, each of whom concurred in the opinion written by Justice Wilson.

The April 25, 1950, issue of the Los Angeles Daily Journal, and the Los Angeles News, which I take it is a joint title of the publication, which publication is denominated upon its face "Official Paper for City and County of Los Angeles," contains comments I shall read with respect to the decision rendered on the day preceding. But before reading them, I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks the entire article set forth in this issue, including the comments and the text and addenda to the text of the decision, be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the comments to which I refer consist, first, of a headline the importance of which I think is indicated by the large type in which it is printed. It reads:

Charter of United Nations held to invalidate California Alien Land Act.

Then the comment of the writer in this official paper is as follows:

Believed to be the first decision in which the Charter of the United Nations has been invoked to invalidate a law of a State, the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division 2, yesterday held the alien land law of California to be no longer enforceable because it is in conflict with the Charter.

In its opinion, written by Justice Emmet H. Wilson, concurred in by Presiding Justice Minor Moore and Justice Marshall F. McComb, the court declared that the Charter is a treaty between the United States and other nations, and that the Federal Constitution provides that all treaties take precedence over state laws. The Charter, says the court, guarantees universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without regard for race, color, or religion, and because the alien land law discriminates against Japanese concerning the ownership of land, its restrictions are untenable and indefensible.

It is shown in the opinion that when the statute was adopted in 1920 it was applicable to the nationals of several countries by reason of their ineligibility to citizenship but that by amendments to the Federal naturalization laws only Japanese and an insignificant number of other Asiatics are now prohibited from owning land.

The opinion points out that the land law has been repeatedly held to be constitutional by the United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of California and that none of such decisions has ever been overruled. The court therefore states that it is not declaring the statute to be in violation of the Constitution but the decision is limited to the conflict between the statute and the United Nations Charter.

For the moment, Mr. President, I shall read no more from the article in the

official paper, but I shall return later in my remarks to the opinion itself, in order to read certain portions of it.

On July 18, 1949, there was in progress the debate in the United States Senate on the question as to whether or not the North Atlantic Treaty should be ratified by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have to leave the Chamber, or I would wait until a more appropriate time to offer a comment I desire to make.

I have glimpsed the decision to which the Senator has referred. I have not made a careful study of it. But there might be a viewpoint available that there is nothing mandatory in the Charter, so far as that kind of a question is concerned; that the United Nations Organization exhausts its jurisdiction when it makes a recommendation to a nation along that particular line which the nation may be free to accept or reject. That viewpoint might find some support in the record of the hearings on the charter, and also in the exact words of the Charter dealing with the question of the interference of United Nations' activities with domestic jurisdictions. I simply suggest that as a possible offset viewpoint to the opinion to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Colorado in this respect. I may say that he has very courteously this afternoon called to my attention some of the colloquy which I do not have at hand but which the Senator from Colorado showed me in the course of the discussion between us this afternoon. I appreciate the point which he has made. I shall give attention to it. I am very sorry that the Senator from Colorado cannot be in the Chamber the remaining portion of the afternoon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I must leave. I simply wish to say that I have no final opinion on the subject at all, but I knew the distinguished Senator from Missouri would desire to have called to his attention that particular provision of the Charter and the interpretative questioning and answering that went on in the hearings on the Charter before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the Senator's comments, and I shall give attention to the matter. I trust I may have the Senator's permission, without violation of any propriety, to discuss this matter in his absence this afternoon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall read with great interest what the Senator from Missouri has to say.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. While the Senator from Colorado is present I should like to make the observation that ipso facto, the Charter, by the use of this language, does not repeal State law; that the language at its best would only permit Congress to pass laws rather than to repeal State law.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will say "Yes" to the Senator. In other words, I got the impression, I will say to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, that a considerable part of the court opinion was based on language of purpose rather than mandatory provisions which would compel action by the States. I went over the opinion very hurriedly, and I may be wrong about that. It was my distinct impression, because I directed a number of inquiries to the very point we are considering, that all the United Nations could do in this particular field—and I feel that would cover the particular exclusionary law we are talking about—was to make a recommendation. It would then be up to the United States to accept or reject the recommendation. In other words, we were at that time—I among others—wondering what the compulsory impact of the Charter might be on our domestic affairs. It was clear that we had the power to veto so far as the Security Council end of the organization was concerned. It seemed clear to me—at least, my present impression is—that in the whole field that is involved in the particular question raised in that case, the most the United Nations could do would be to make a recommendation, and it would then be up to us whether we wanted to accept it.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator can take a moment before he leaves the floor, I should like to inquire of him, first, whether or not the language in the United Nations Charter which might be the basis for the viewpoint which he has tentatively suggested here this afternoon is that contained in article 2, chapter I, as follows:

> Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am under the impression that that is the language in the Charter which I had in mind. I also recall that the hearings developed that there were some expressions of interpretation by the drafting committees of the United Nations which might have bearing on the same question.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit me, before he leaves, to call his attention to the fact that, in the course of the decision of the court in this Fujii case to which I have referred, the court among other things has this to say, referring to the United Nations:

> In article 2 it is affirmed that the organization and its members "shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter."

And that furthermore the court calls attention to this, and again I quote:

> It is agreed in chapter 9, article 55, that "the United Nations shall promote * * * universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

And then the court further says:

> By article 56 it is declared that "all members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that from what he has read I think the question is still open as to who is to be the judge of the performance of the purposes. I had the impression that the individual nations were to be the judge of their performance. That is the question obviously. As I said, I have not had the time to study that decision as closely as I would like to study it. I shall read with great interest the comments of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply repeat that I was driving at the same thing at the time, and the impression which has lingered with me is that it at least was cleared up in my mind that the kind of statements which the Senator has read were statements of purpose, were not mandates, and that in the last analysis the member states were themselves the judge of whether they were acting in good faith.

Mr. DONNELL. May I also ask the Senator whether he agrees with the view which I hold that such, if any, obligation as exists under a treaty does, under article VI of the Constitution become a part of the supreme law of the land?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes, I agree fully to that. I think there is a twilight zone where a treaty might go too far under our Constitution. I read a very interesting paper on that question at one time. But, generally speaking, I agree completely with what the Senator has said.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator that I may have used some such illustration along the line the Senator speaks. Suppose a treaty were made which provided that every child with blue eyes should be killed before 6 o'clock tomorrow morning. I doubt exceedingly whether that would be sustained by anybody.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Suppose a treaty changed the structure of our Government, changed our Constitution.

Mr. DONNELL. I am not prepared to express an opinion on that. I think there would be a debatable purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I mentioned that to show that the scholars have always considered that there were certain twilight zones which might go beyond the jurisdiction of a treaty, but generally speaking, of course, the Senator is completely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that, notwithstanding the point which has been raised by the distinguished and able Senator from Colorado, the California court at least held, without discussion of the point, that the particular State law

was repealed by the Charter of the United Nations?

Mr. DONNELL. It was made invalid by the Charter of the United Nations, according to this decision of the court. The Senator from Michigan is precisely correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The State law was made invalid; and, in effect, that constitutes a repeal of that law on the statute books of the State of California.

Mr. DONNELL. I am not certain whether technically it would amount to a repeal, but certainly it means that the statute falls because it is in conflict with the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. So far as the distinguished Senator knows and can determine from the opinion, in it the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Colorado is not raised. Is that correct?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think it is raised in the opinion. I have not seen the briefs in the case, and I do not know whether the point was raised by the counsel.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well.

In other words, as I understand the point made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, it is that the provision cited as nullifying the State law is more or less in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations, and therefore it is not binding as law, but is only advisory, and that the Government of the United States has a right to make it effective by enacting further legislation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am reluctant to make a statement on this matter in the absence of the Senator from Colorado, because I know of his utmost good faith. Let me say that it is not a fact that the points upon which the court relies are merely those contained in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have that matter made clear.

Mr. DONNELL. I quoted from chapter IX, article 55, of the Charter of the United Nations, which obviously is not the preamble, but is far down in the body of the Charter. With the permission of the Senator, I shall read that portion of the Charter. Article 55 is not in the preamble; but in the publication which I have before me, it appears on page 945, and in this publication the Charter begins on page 934, so, in this publication, article 55 is 11 pages down in the body of the Charter:

CHAPTER IX. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COOPERATION

ARTICLE 55

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

That is not an expression of a mere purpose—

a. higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

b. solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

c. —

This portion is quoted by the Court itself, as I read the opinion a few moments ago—

universal respect for, observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Immediately thereafter comes article 56, which the court also sets out in its opinion. Article 56 reads as follows:

ARTICLE 56

All Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

Let me say further to the Senator, so that the RECORD may be complete, that there is also a statement of the determinations of the peoples of the United Nations and certain things to be done for those ends. That is set forth in the preamble of the Charter, in addition to what I have read from the body of the Charter.

Mr. FERGUSON. But if we follow the opinion of the Supreme Court of California——

Mr. DONNELL. It is not an opinion of the Supreme Court of California; it is an opinion of the California District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division No. 2. The opinion is that of an appellate court.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. If we follow the opinion of that appellate court, namely, that the United Nations Charter automatically nullifies a law of California, then we may find, if that is the law of the land, that various statutes of the States have been nullified by the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. DONNELL. Precisely; and, furthermore, we may find that many other laws of the States may have been nullified by the North Atlantic Treaty, which goes much further than the United Nations Charter goes in respect to the obligations imposed upon the signers of that treaty, of whom the United States of America is one.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the distinguished Senator read from the text of the United Nations Charter, I noticed that its effect may be to nullify or make void all statutes in any State in relation to distinctions made between the sexes; and, in addition, we may find that by that means equal rights have already been established in the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. It is entirely possible that a court might so hold, in my opinion.

Mr. FERGUSON. I mean to say that if the decision of that California court is determined to be the law of the land, then what I have just stated could follow.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes. I may say to the Senate, for purposes of the RECORD, that I think the importance of this decision, or at least the feeling of those who issue this official publication in Los Angeles, Calif., in regard to its importance, is at least in part indicated by the fact that a photograph of each of the judges is published along with the opinion, and the opinion is printed in full, together with the footnotes. I think it is perfectly clear that the editors of that newspaper considered this opinion as certainly extremely important, if not very monumental, in American jurisprudence.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me state to the Senator that I shall be very happy to yield to him at any time he may desire to ask further questions.

Mr. President, as I was about to state a few moments ago, on July 18, 1949, the Senate was debating the question of whether or not the United States should ratify the North Atlantic Treaty. At the expense of possibly being considered as stating something in the nature of "I told you so," I desire to read a portion of the remarks I made in the Senate on that date. I now call attention to page 9631 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 18, 1949. I hope the Senate will not consider that I give evidence of egotism or of an improper attitude, when I call attention to my own remarks on that date. They express at least as clearly as I could express now my views in respect to the possible consequences of our entering into the North Atlantic Treaty.

From that page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I read the following:

The instant before the treaty is ratified, each of the 48 separate States of the United States of America is entitled to whatever rights the domestic constitutional law of our own Nation today preserves to such State, and those rights are free from usurpation by the Federal Government.

I see now in the Chamber a distinguished Senator from one of the Southern States, who doubtless is interested in problems of this kind, as indeed are all of us. I say that the instant before the treaty is ratified, his State and my State and every other State of the Union is entitled to whatever rights, free from contractual obligations, free from treaty obligations entered into by this country with other countries, as the domestic constitutional law of our own Nation preserves to each such State, and those rights are free from usurpation by the Federal Government. Those rights of the State may relate to many important matters. I mention among them suffrage, schools, segregation, poll tax, freedom from seizure, and many other fields which likewise might be mentioned.

However, the instant the treaty is ratified, what do we find as to that situation? We find that at that very instant there is created the basis for the forceful and persuasive contention, both in legislative halls and in courts, that the treaty has become a part of the supreme law of the land and has vested in the Federal Government the duty, and by virtue thereof places within the domain of the authority of the Federal Congress a correlative power, to deal with such free institutions, thereby superseding the power previously vested in the several States over the protection of such institutions.

Mr. President, in a few moments I shall read from the decision of the California court in regard to the point to which I have referred.

At this time let me refer to another statement I made in the Senate on July 18, 1949, as it appears at pages 9632 and 9633 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. President, this is a very serious implication, because of the fact that today the 48 States of the Union are free from obligations entered into by this country with other

countries, of the nature set forth in the treaty. But the minute, yes, the second ratification occurs, there is immediately presented opportunity for serious contention, serious assertion, that every one of the States and the Federal Government likewise must take notice of the fact that the treaty has become a part of the supreme law of the land, and that inasmuch as a Federal obligation has been created under the treaty, Federal power to perform that obligation has likewise been created.

Mr. President, I am not so sure but that those who make the contention would be sound in what they say. I am not making any concession on the floor of the Senate that would preclude me from presenting views to the contrary, if I should think such views were sound, but I am convinced of the truth of what I am about to say, and the Senate will observe my comment.

The Senator from Michigan—

I may say I was referring to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—

will recall that recently, in a colloquy with his distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan—

Referring to Mr. FERGUSON—

reference was made to the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416). What is the effect of article 2 of the treaty in light of the decision in Missouri against Holland? In considering that question, the attention of the Senate is called to the fact that under holdings rendered previous to that case, Congress, prior to the exercise of the treaty-making power, with respect to the subject of migratory birds, had no power to pass laws concerning that subject; the reason for the lack of such power in Congress being that the Constitution does not grant Congress power to pass laws on that subject, but the subject of migratory birds is, according to Missouri against Holland, a part of the field in which treaty-making powers may be exercised. Furthermore, according to that case, after the making of a treaty on the subject of migratory birds Congress can—

I emphasize the words "after the making of a treaty on the subject of migratory birds"—

Congress can, by virtue of the provisions of article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, validly pass laws to put into effect the provisions of the treaty.

The section to which I refer is the one which provides that Congress shall have power—

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or office thereof."

That, of course, should be read in connection with that portion of article 6 of the Constitution, which reads:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. President, Missouri against Holland does not hold that a treaty can repeal the Constitution of the United States. Under the doctrine of that case, the adoption of a treaty on a given subject matter which is within the treaty power and as to which subject matter there had been no previous grant to Congress of legislative power causes Congress, because of the terms of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to be possessed of power to legislate to carry into effect such treaty.

Missouri against Holland establishes that if the agreements made by said article II are within the treaty-making power of the United States Government, Congress has the power to enact legislation to carry out those agreements.

These were the remarks made on July 18, 1949.

I refer now to the decision of the court rendered in California, April 24, 1950. In the first place, as pointed out earlier, this is a unanimous decision of the three judges of the court. I quote certain excerpts from that decision, the first of which is the following:

Save for the matters to be hereinafter discussed, which are based upon an authority more potent than the constitution of this State, an authority which for want of opportunity has not previously been made the basis of a judicial determination of the question before us, this opinion might well be terminated under the doctrine of stare decisis with a reaffirmation of the former decisions, since upon constitutional questions we deem ourselves obliged to follow the decisions of the Supreme Courts of the United States and of this State until one of those courts should announce the overruling of its own decisions.

Mr. President, later in the decision occurs this significant language:

The Charter—

I interpolate to say that the court is referring to the Charter of the United Nations, mentioned in the preceding paragraph, in sentences reading as follows:

The efforts of our Government in this regard—

That is, in regard to espousing rights of man, championing the cause of the smaller and less privileged nations, and so forth.

The efforts of our Government in this regard reached fruition in the convention of representatives of the nations of the earth at which the Charter of the United Nations was adopted. It was promptly ratified by the Senate of the United States, thereby proclaiming allegiance to its principles and providing precedent and example for other countries. The United States has consistently regarded its treaties with other nations as inviolate.

And then, Mr. President, comes the language which I was about to quote before going back into the preceding paragraph. The court says, referring to the United Nations Charter:

The Charter has become "the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. (U. S. Constitution, art. VI, sec. 2.)

Continuing, the court says:

The position of this country in the family of nations forbids trafficking in innocuous generalities but demands that every State in the Union accept and act upon the Charter according to its plain language and its unmistakable purpose and intent.

Since the Charter is now the supreme law of the land it becomes necessary to examine its provisions and guaranties and to interpret it in the light in which it was adopted by the participating nations. The Organization determined in the preamble "To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, * * * to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." Among the purposes and principles found in article 1 of chapter 1 are "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights; * * *. To achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." In article 2 it is affirmed that the Organization and its members "shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter."

It is agreed in chapter IX, article 55, that "the United Nations shall promote * * * universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." By article 56 it is declared that "All Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55.

In the address of the President of the United States to the Senate on July 2, 1945, urging the prompt ratification of the Charter by that body, he said:

"It seeks to promote world-wide progress and better standards of living.

"It seeks to achieve universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all men and women without distinction as to race, language, or religion.

"It seeks to remove the economic and social causes of international conflict and unrest.

"It is the product of many hands and many influences. It comes from the reality of experience in a world where one generation has failed twice to keep the peace. The lessons of that experience have been written into the document." (U. S. Code Cong. Service, supra, pp. 961–2.)

On December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed and proclaimed—

Mr. President, I call especial attention to this mention made by the court, not of the provisions of the Charter, but of an instrument subsequently passed and proclaimed. The court says:

On December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed and proclaimed and called upon all member countries to publicize, disseminate and expound in schools and elsewhere, a "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" affirming among other things that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They * * * should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood (art. 1.). Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political, or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status (art. 2.). * * * Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others" (art. 17). This Declaration implements and emphasizes the purposes and aims of the United Nations and its Charter.

Democracy provides a way of life that is helpful; however, its promises of human betterment are but vain expressions of hope unless ideals of justice and equity are put into practice among governments, and as well between government and citizen, and are held to be paramount.

The integrity and vitality of the Charter and the confidence which it inspires would wane and eventually be brought to naught

by failure to act according to its announced purposes. Its survival is contingent upon the degree of reverence shown for it by the contracting nations, their governmental subdivisions and their citizens as well. This Nation can be true to its pledge to the other signatories to the Charter only by cooperating in the purposes that are so plainly expressed in it and by removing every obstacle to the fulfillment of such purposes.

A perusal of the Charter renders it manifest that restrictions contained in the alien land law are in direct conflict with the plain terms of the Charter above quoted and with the purposes announced therein by its framers. It is incompatible with article 17 of the Declaration of Human Rights which proclaims the right of everyone to own property.

I pause, Mr. President, to point out that the Declaration of Human Rights is the subsequent document not contained in the treaty itself.

Returning to the opinion:

We have shown that the expansion by the Congress of the classes of nationals eligible to citizenship has correspondingly shrunk the group ineligible under the provisions of the alien land law to own or lease land in California until the latter now consists in reality of a very small number of Japanese. The other Asiatics who still remain on the proscribed list are so few that they need not be considered.

Clearly such a discrimination against a people of one race is contrary both to the letter and to the spirit of the Charter which, as a treaty, is paramount to every law of every State in conflict with it.

The alien land law must therefore yield to the treaty as the superior authority. The restrictions of the statute based on eligibility to citizenship, but which ultimately and actually are referable to race or color, must be and are therefore declared untenable and unenforceable.

Judgment reversed with directions to enter a decree in favor of plaintiff in accord with the prayer of his complaint.

Mr. President, the opinion from which I have just read holds, as I understand, that a valid treaty, which is, by the Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of the land, invalidates the law of a state which is in conflict with said treaty, even if the law is not otherwise in conflict with the Constitution of the United States or the laws of the United States. The opinion indicates that the United Nations Charter is an authority more potent than is the constitution of a state.

It is not my understanding that this case holds that a treaty supersedes the Constitution of the United States. It is my understanding, however, that the case does hold that a valid treaty, in that case the United Nations Charter, supersedes the laws of a state and the constitution of a state.

Mr. President, the treaty-making power is a power vested in the Government of the United States. Congress, under Article I, section 8, of the Constitution has power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

It would seem to follow, logically, that the Congress would have the power to pass laws to enforce the rights agreed to by either the United Nations Charter or the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. President, I again quote from a statement made by me on July 18, 1949, with reference to the North Atlantic Treaty, as follows:

However, the instant the treaty is ratified, what do we find as to that situation? We find that at that very instant there is created the basis for the forceful and persuasive contention, both in legislative halls and in courts, that the treaty has become a part of the supreme law of the land and has vested in the Federal Government the duty, and by virtue thereof places within the domain of the authority of the Federal Congress a correlative power, to deal with such free institutions, thereby superseding the power previously vested in the several states over the protection of such institutions.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me that during the debate on the North Atlantic Pact in 1949 the distinguished Senator from Missouri asked the junior Senator from Nevada several questions in relation to the North Atlantic Pact, while he was engaged in making a statement in connection with that pact. Among them was the very question which the Senator now raises.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. I seem to remember, without reference to the debate, that we agreed at that time, the Senator from Missouri and the junior Senator from Nevada, that we were entering into a pact which would or could, in effect, not only change the basic law of the states or of the Nation, but might even become paramount to the Constitution of the United States. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Missouri explain a little more in detail, after 6 months under the North Atlantic Pact, what effect it is having.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the Senator's asking me the question. I recall very distinctly the interchange of questions and answers as between him and myself on the occasion of the debate referred to. I may say that I have, subsequent to my making that statement, examined into the question whether a treaty can repeal any provision of the Constitution of the United States, and have reached the conclusion that it cannot do so. It is, however, true that, although Congress is unable to exercise power to legislate upon a subject matter which is within the field of the treaty-making power but as to which subject matter Congress, in the absence of a treaty on that subject matter, is not by the Constitution granted power to make laws, nevertheless the ratification of a treaty on that subject matter will enable Congress to exercise power to legislate on that subject matter. The fact that Congress becomes, in that case, able to exercise power to legislate on that subject matter arises from (a) that part of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States which provides that the Congress shall have power—

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

And (b) that part of article VI of the Constitution of the United States which reads:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Thus, in the case of Missouri against Holland, Congress, in the absence of a treaty on migratory birds, could not exercise power to pass laws concerning migratory birds, but after the ratification of a treaty on migratory birds, Congress could, by virtue of those two quoted excerpts from the Constitution, validly enact legislation to carry into effect the treaty provisions on migratory birds.

I will say to the Senator that, to my mind, it is perfectly clear that while the North Atlantic Treaty does not, nor do I think any treaty can, repeal the Constitution of the United States, inasmuch as the treaty is a vehicle which is authorized by the Constitution of the United States, it may bring about an extension of terms and may bring about powers in Congress which never existed prior to the time the treaty was ratified.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, if the Senator will yield for another question——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If I correctly understand the Senator's interpretation of the liberties which such a treaty might give Congress—and I want to say at this point that I have a high regard for the Senator from Missouri in his interpretation of the effect of State laws—it does open the door to Congress to legislate on subjects which were never given by the States through the Constitution of the United States to the Congress in the first place.

Mr. DONNELL. That is precisely correct.

Mr. MALONE. To that extent, it is dangerous.

Mr. DONNELL. To my mind, it is highly dangerous.

I pointed out in the course of the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty the fact that, by virtue of the provisions in the North Atlantic Treaty which I quoted, as, for illustration, the provision that the parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being, the parties to that treaty were contracting to do things which it might be very plausibly and possibly correctly claimed would give Congress vast powers of legislation which, prior to the ratification of the treaty, had never been vested in Congress at all by any provision of the Constitution.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not think a treaty could supersede the Constitution. It would simply be in line with the power of the Constitution. However, the effect of a treaty may possibly be to vest in the Congress of the United States a vast reservoir of power to legislate on matters which perhaps previously had been confined to the States entirely or in large part. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. MALONE. It does. However, I should like to ask one further question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator is a distinguished lawyer, well known and recognized as such throughout the country, and therefore I wish to bring out this point in debate with him: As I understand, through the Constitution of the United States certain powers are delegated to the States and certain powers are delegated to the National Government. Always prior to approximately the last 15 years it had been taken for granted that any powers not specifically delegated to the National Government were reserved to the States.

Mr. DONNELL. Or to the people thereof.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; or to the people thereof. If I am correct in the assumption, which I should like the distinguished Senator from Missouri to affirm if it is correct, this is a back-door method—and I may be saying it very poorly—of changing or enlarging the powers of Congress which the Constitution of the United States never intended should be done.

Mr. DONNELL. I would say that the Constitution of the United States did contemplate the possibility of treaties being made. Therefore it may be very properly argued that the framers of the Constitution realized the power which could be exercised to increase and add to the powers specifically granted in the Constitution. However, to answer the Senator's question, when we search the Constitution to find out what it says are the powers of Congress it is entirely possible that a treaty may go far beyond the enumerated powers in the Constitution and give to Congress powers which are not enumerated.

Mr. MALONE. And perhaps were never contemplated at all.

Mr. DONNELL. And perhaps were never contemplated at all. I may say, in tribute to the clear memory of the Senator who interrogated me as to the provision of the tenth amendment of the Constitution, the amendment reads as follows:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Have our courts ever passed on a treaty and declared it to be unconstitutional?

Mr. DONNELL. I cannot answer the question categorically, but I know of no such decision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It seems to me that it would be an important observation.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator that the courts have upheld numerous treaties. I recall no instance in which the courts have declared a treaty invalid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Because of its unconstitutionality?

Mr. DONNELL. Because of its unconstitutionality. I think the Senator is precisely correct. I think as a matter of chance, in the course of reading from time to time it would appear that knowledge to such effect would have come to my attention, and I know of no instance in which the courts have held a treaty to be unconstitutional.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] very appropriately suggested that there may be a point of view opposite to that which was taken by the court in California. I can well appreciate the point which the Senator from Colorado made, and I can appreciate it doubly because of the very profound and evident attempt on the part of the Senator during the hearings some 5 years ago to see that the internal interests of the United States were protected. I regret that I do not have before me this afternoon the volume which the Senator from Colorado very kindly showed me earlier in the afternoon, in which occurs the colloquy which I am sure the Senator from Colorado at least considers to fortify his tentative position—perhaps I am understating his view, and it may fortify him finally—that the United Nations Charter does not permit any interference by anybody with the laws of the States of the Union on the ground of violation of the Charter of the United Nations. As the Chair will doubtless recall, I asked the Senator from Colorado, before he left the Chamber this afternoon, which he was unavoidably required to leave, whether what he had in mind as a safeguard against any such result is that which reads as follows. I quote from article 2, chapter I of the Charter of the United Nations:

> Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII.

The Chair will doubtless recall that the distinguished Senator from Colorado was inclined to think that that was the language which he had in mind. I hope I am not misquoting him. I think I am accurately stating what occurred. It may be, Mr. President, that there are other provisions of the Charter which he may have had in mind. Then he referred to some interpretations which he thought might have a bearing on it.

I am not here this afternoon primarily for the purpose of justifying or certifying to the infallibility of the decision of the California court. However, I wish to say several things about it. In the first place, it was a unanimous decision of three judges. In the second place, it is a decision of an appellate court. In the third place, I think anyone who looks at the decision and reads those portions of it to which I have referred this afternoon must be convinced of the fact that earnest thought was given by the court to the case. In the fourth place, I submit that the court obviously made a very careful study of the Charter of the United Nations, pointing out, as it did, various portions of the Charter which it deemed necessary to make the decision which it rendered.

I may say, Mr. President, that regardless of whether the court was right or wrong in its final decision, as I see it, it could have been wrong only on the point that the United Nations Charter contained a safeguard. I think the reasoning of the court to the effect that a treaty is a part of the supreme law of the land cannot be successfully controverted by anyone. I do not think any Member of the Senate would undertake to controvert it. It is possible that an appellate court of higher jurisdiction may hold that there is an adequate safeguard in the United Nations Charter to prevent the Charter from interfering with the validity of any statute. However, this appellate court did not conclude that any such provision of a prohibitive or security nature was found within the terms of the Charter. It failed to mention any such thing, and failed even to mention the point to which the distinguished Senator from Colorado alluded. If a higher appellate jurisdiction should so hold, that would not in the slightest interfere with the soundness of the position taken by this appellate court, namely, that a treaty is the supreme law of the land, or embraced within that supreme law, and consequently would supersede the statutes of any State upon the subject matter of the treaty.

Indeed, Mr. President, it would be difficult to see how any court could hold otherwise on that fundamental proposition, when the Constitution says that "the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding," and when the Constitution further says that "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

Mr. President, it is not particularly essential here this afternoon to determine whether or not this court was right or wrong in failing to find that there was a safeguard within the United Nations Charter. The major point, the fundamental point, is that that treaty superseded the law of every State of the Union, that any treaty would supersede it unless there were within the treaty itself something which negatived such supersession of the treaty over and above the State statute.

Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that the language which I have read here this afternoon, and which I read to the Senator from Colorado before he left the floor of the Senate, to my mind is more susceptible to the view that

the California court was correct in its decision in not giving the State law any force in the instant case, than it is to the contrary.

Let me call attention briefly to the analysis of the language I have read.

Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

Mr. President, as I see it, that means that nothing contained in the Charter shall authorize the body which meets at Lake Success to intervene, as the language says, "in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State."

So far as I know, no one claims, except perhaps from the inference which, in its opinion, the court itself mentions as to the universal declaration of human rights, that the United Nations as an entity can step up and say that the law of Texas, or of California, of Alabama, or any other State, is invalid. That is what it says in that portion of the language I have read:

Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

Mr. President, do not overlook the fact that in addition to what the United Nations is or is not authorized to do, the states which are parties to the United Nations charter entered into solemn and binding agreements among themselves, and that is what is embraced within the portion of the quoted language which the California court sets out, namely, that—

All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55.

One of those purposes is, universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Mr. President, I submit that the portion of the language which I read to the Senator from Colorado upon the floor of the Senate, which I have just now read, certainly does not, by the mere fact that it prohibits the United Nations from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, relieve a signer of the United Nations Charter from the solemn obligations into which such signer has entered by its signature.

The language I read to the Senator from Colorado proceeds further, after the language, "Nothing contained in the present Charter," and so forth, and states, "shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter."

Of course, Mr. President, there is provided for in the Charter the International Court of Justice. That is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. True, there is nothing in the Charter which says that the United States of America must go into the Court of International Justice and lay before it a submission of the question as to whether the California alien land law is or is not valid; certainly there is nothing to that effect, and that is all this language says, as I see it.

Mr. President, it would appear to me that by all odds this unanimous opinion of the appellate court of California is borne out by reason, and that the point that the United Nations Charter has prevented the applicability of that Charter to the alien land law of California is without merit.

As I have said, I do not regard the question as to whether it is or is not of merit to be at all of ultimate importance in this decision. The importance of the decision lies in the fact that every time this Nation enters into a treaty, that treaty becomes a part of the supreme law of the land, and if there are either additional powers or additional duties cast by the treaty upon the Congress of the United States, those powers and those duties become a part of the law of the land.

If in the course of the treaty there is anything which makes it illegal for a State or the Federal Government to pass a particular act, as, for instance, the Alien Land Act, or some other act of the type the Senator from Michigan referred to this afternoon, any party may rise in any court of justice in the United States and say that the provision of the Constitution has made that portion of the treaty a part of the supreme law of the land, and, as the California court indicated, that treaty takes precedence over the State statute which is involved.

Mr. President, I close with this very brief statement: As we are confronted by not only the North Atlantic Treaty, into which we have entered, but by the possibility of another document which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] thinks, tentatively, at any rate, is a treaty, and which the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is perfectly clear is a treaty, we are distinctly reminded that we should be sure of our ground before entering into such obligations, which may go far beyond either the powers or duties previously contemplated to be placed in the hands of Congress, and far beyond those specified in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, this afternoon, with that in mind, it seems to me that it is highly appropriate that we should give consideration to the decision of this Appellate Court of the State of California. I appreciate the privilege of placing it and my remarks with respect to it in the RECORD.

EXHIBIT 1

CHARTER OF UNITED NATIONS HELD TO INVALIDATE CALIFORNIA ALIEN LAND ACT

Believed to be the first decision in which the Charter of the United Nations has been invoked to invalidate a law of a State, the district court of appeal, second appellate district, division 2, yesterday held the alien land law of California to be no longer enforceable because it is in conflict with the Charter.

In its opinion, written by Justice Emmet H. Wilson, concurred in by Presiding Justice Minor Moore and Justice Marshall F. McComb, the court declared that the Charter is a treaty between the United States and other nations, and that the Federal Constitution provides that all treaties take precedence over State laws. The Charter, says the court, guarantees universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without regard for race, color, or religion, and because the alien land law discriminates against Japanese concerning the ownership of land, its restrictions are untenable and indefensible.

It is shown in the opinion that when the statute was adopted in 1920 it was applicable to the nationals of several countries by reason of their ineligibility to citizenship but that by amendments to the Federal naturalization laws only Japanese and an insignificant number of other Asiatics are now prohibited from owning land.

The opinion points out that the land law has been repeatedly held to be constitutional by the United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of California and that none of such decisions has ever been overruled. The Court therefore states that it is not declaring the statute to be in violation of the Constitution but the decision is limited to the conflict between the statute and the United Nations Charter.

OPINION—CIVIL No. 17309

In the District Court of Appeals of the State of California, Second Appellate District, Division Two.

Sei Fujii, plaintiff and appellant, versus the State of California, defendant and respondent.

Appeal from judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Wilbur C. Curtis, judge. Reversed with directions.

J. Marion Wright, Owen E. Kupfer, for appellant.

Fred N. Howser, attorney general of the State of California, Everett W. Mattoon, assistant attorney general, for respondent, John F. Hassler, deputy attorney general.

The sole question on this appeal is the validity and enforceability of the alien land law, sometimes referred to as the Alien Property Initiative Act of 1920. (Stats. 1921, p. lxxxiii; 1 Dearing's General Laws, 1944 ed., p. 129, Act 261.)

Pursuant to permission to sue the State of California granted by section 738.5[1] of the Code of Civil Procedure plaintiff brought this action for the purpose of obtaining a determination whether or not an escheat has occurred under the provisions of the alien land law as to real property which he acquired by grant deed in July 1948. An answer was filed by the State alleging as a defense that plaintiff was born in Japan; that he is ineligible to become a citizen of the United States by reason of the naturalization laws, and that by virtue of the provisions of the alien land law he "is not qualified or permitted to acquire, possess, enjoy, use, cultivate, occupy, or transfer real property or any interest therein in the State of California, or to have in whole or in part the beneficial use thereof."

[1] Section 738.5 authorizes the bringing of an action against the State of California by any person claiming an interest in real property to determine whether or not an escheat has occurred as to such property under the provisions of the alien land law of 1920. It is provided that no matter may be adjudicated in such action except the issue of the occurrence of an escheat and no issue shall be raised or claim made by the plaintiff based upon estoppel or failure of the State to have commenced an escheat proceeding.

When the cause came on for trial it was submitted on a statement of facts which it was stipulated should be considered as evidence, to wit: that plaintiff was born in Japan in 1882; he came to the United States in July 1903, where he resided until June 1911; in the latter month he departed for Japan and remained there until he returned to the United States in July 1913; he has resided and made his domicile in the United States continuously since his last arrival; plaintiff is and at all times throughout his lifetime has been an alien, a citizen and subject of Japan and a person ineligible to become a citizen of the United States by reason of the naturalization laws; that there is no treaty now existing between the United States and Japan nor has there been at any time a treaty giving to plaintiff, a citizen and subject of Japan, or to any alien Japanese not eligible to citizenship in the United States, any right to acquire, possess, enjoy, use, cultivate, occupy, or transfer real property in the State of California, or any interest therein; that plaintiff purchased and acquired the property which is the subject of this action by grant deed dated July 29, 1918.

The court made findings of fact in accord with the stipulated evidence, whereupon judgment was entered declaring and adjudging that the property described in the deed to plaintiff escheated to the State of California on July 29, 1948, the date of the deed, by reason of the provisions of the Alien Property Initiative Act of 1920, and that plaintiff has no right, title, or interest in or to such property or in or to any beneficial use thereof. From that judgment plaintiff has appealed.

The alien land law was adopted by the electorate at a general election held in 1920 pursuant to the initiative provisions of the Constitution (art. IV, sec. 1). Conformable to the permission to amend the Initiative Act granted to the legislature by section 13 thereof several sections have been amended. Sections 1 and 2 (as amended, Stats. 1923, ch. 441, p. 1021) reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. All aliens eligible to citizenship under the laws of the United States may acquire, possess, enjoy, use, cultivate, occupy, transfer, transmit, and inherit real property, or any interest therein, in this State, and have in whole or in part the beneficial use thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as citizens of the United States, except as otherwise provided by the laws of this State.

"SEC. 2. All aliens other than those mentioned in section 1 of this act may acquire, possess, enjoy, use, cultivate, occupy, and transfer real property, or any interest therein, in this State, and have in whole or in part the beneficial use thereof, in the manner and to the extent, and for the purposes prescribed by any treaty now existing between the Government of the United States and the nation or country of which such alien is a citizen or subject, and not otherwise."

That portion of section 7 of the statute applicable to this action reads as amended (Stat. 1943, ch. 1129, p. 2164):

"Any real property hereafter acquired in fee in violation of the provisions of this act by any alien mentioned in section 2 of this act, or by any company, association, or corporation mentioned in section 3 of this act, shall escheat as of the date of such acquiring, to, and become and remain the property of the State of California."

Plaintiff contends that the statute is in violation of the Constitution of the United States in that it denies to him the equal protection of the law; that it arbitrarily discriminates against him solely because of his race; that classification on the sole basis of race is arbitrary and irrational; that the test of eligibility to citizenship, to wit, the so-called primary standard in the acts of Congress relating to naturalization and citizenship, does not afford a sound basis for discriminatory State classification; that no undesirable traits can properly be attributed to that class of aliens identified as those ineligible to citizenship; that no clear or present danger or other exceptional circumstances exist sufficient to justify arbitrary discrimination against Japanese; that the alien land law is not a valid police regulation; that it is invalid, special legislation prohibited by sections 11 and 21 of article 1 and section 25 of article IV (subd. 33) of the constitution[2] of this State; that it unlawfully delegates State legislative power to Congress, and, finally, that the statute is inconsistent with the declared principles and spirit of the United Nations Charter.

The constitutionality of alien land laws has been the subject of attack for nearly 30 years and, except for a few provisions not relating to the right of an alien to own land, the attacks have failed. The Supreme Court of the United States sustained the provision of the Constitution of Washington prohibiting the ownership of lands by aliens other than those who in good faith have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States (*Terrace* v. *Thompson* (263 U. S. 197, 68 L. ed. 255)) and the Alien Land Law of California. (*Porterfield* v. *Webb* (263 U. S. 225, 68 L. ed. 278); *Webb* v. *O'Brien* (263 U. S. 313, 68 L. ed. 318); *Frick* v. *Webb* (263 U. S. 326, 68 L. ed. 323); *Cockrill* v. *California* (268 U. S. 258, 69 L. ed. 944).) The statute has been sustained also by the appellate courts of this State. (In re Akado, 188 Cal. 739); *Porterfield* v. *Webb* (195 Cal. 71); *Mott* v. *Cline* (200 Cal. 434); *People* v. *Osaki* (209 Cal. 169); *People* v. *Cockrill* (62 Cal. App. 22, affirmed sub nom.); *Cockrill* v. *California*, supra; *People* v. *Nakamura* (125 Cal. App. 268).)

The validity of the statute was again sustained in *People* v. *Oyama* (29 Cal. 2d 164). That decision was reversed (*Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633, 93 L. ed. 249)) on one ground only, to wit, the unconstitutionality of section 9 which (1) declares a prima facie presumption that a conveyance is made with intent to evade or avoid the statute if title of real property is taken in the name of a person eligible to citizenship and the consideration is paid by a noneligible alien, and (2) places the burden on the grantee to show the conveyance was not made with the intent to prevent, evade or avoid escheat. The court (pp. 646–647) expressly declined to reexamine the constitutionality of any provision of the statute other than section 9.

In plaintiff's brief he has quoted from concurring and dissenting opinions in many of the cases in which some of the justices have expressed the opinion that the statute is void, but he has not referred us to a case in which either court has overruled its former decision upholding the act. The cases cited by plaintiff to sustain his theory are *Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633, 92 L.ed. 249, supra) *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U. S. 1, 92 L.ed. 1161) and *Takahashi* v. *Fish and Game Comm.* (334 U. S. 410, 92 L.ed. 1478). In none of these cases does a majority of the court indicate a disagreement with its former decisions sustaining the validity of the statute.

We have noted that in *Oyama* v. *California*, the latest expression of the court on the subject, only one provision of the act was discussed and that did not relate to the right of an ineligible alien to own land. The prior decisions of the court hereinbefore cited remained unchallenged by the majority opinion. No question relating to the alien land law was involved in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*, or in the Takahashi case. In the Shelley case it was held that restrictive covenants as to ownership of property based on race or color are not in themselves a violation of the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment, but that clause inhibits judicial enforcement of such covenants by State courts. The Takahashi case held that the California statute forbidding the issuance of commercial fishing licenses to aliens ineligible to citizenship violates the equal protection clause. None of the three decisions of the United States Supreme Court relied on by plaintiff can be considered as modifying in any particular the previous opinions relating to the alien land law. The only case cited directly sustaining plaintiff's position is *Namba* v. *McCourt* (Oreg.) 204 P. 2d 569) in which the Oregon Supreme Court invalidated a statute of that State similar in terms to the California act. The opinion in that case, after quoting extensively from majority and minority opinions of the United States Supreme Court in the cases last above cited, concludes that that court has now overruled its former decisions. We do not so construe the decisions in the Shelley and Takahashi cases, since no question relating to the alien land law was there involved, and, as we have stated, the court refused in the Oyama case to consider the main questions as to constitutionality of the statute although such questions were squarely placed before the court and extensively argued in the briefs.

Save for the matters to be hereinafter discussed, which are based upon an authority more potent than the Constitution of this State, an authority which for want of opportunity has not previously been made the basis of a judicial determination of the question before us, this opinion might well be terminated under the doctrine of stare decisis with a reaffirmation of the former decisions, since upon constitutional questions we deem ourselves obliged to follow the decisions of the Supreme Courts of the United States and of this State until one of those courts should announce the overruling of its own decisions.

While the alien land law, as will hereinafter appear, is applicable at the present time to only a few aliens other than Japanese, historically it has not always been so. By the provisions of section 1 of the act, "All aliens eligible to citizenship" may own or lease real property, and under section 2, "All aliens other than those mentioned in section 1" may own or lease real property in the manner, to the extent, and for the purposes prescribed by treaty "now existing" between the United States and the nation or county of which such alien is a citizen or subject. It is conceded that the treaty of commerce and navigation in effect between the United States and Japan in 1920 did not entitle Japanese nationals to own real property in California.

At the time of the adoption of the statute natives of Japan, China, India, and many other nations were ineligible to become citizens of the United States and by reason of the nonexistence of treaties with such countries entitling their nationals to own real

[2] Art. I, sec. 11: "All laws of a general nature shall have a uniform operation."

Art. I, sec. 21: "No special privileges or immunities shall ever be granted which may not be altered, revoked, or repealed by the legislature; nor shall any citizen, or class of citizens, be granted privileges or immunities which, upon the same terms, shall not be granted to all citizens."

Art. IV, sec. 25: "The legislature shall not pass local or special laws in any of the following enumerated cases, that is to say: * * * (subd. 331). In all other cases where a general law can be made applicable."

property in this State they were inhibited from that privilege. Thus the right of aliens to own real property in California was made by the alien land law to depend upon the Federal statute as it then existed designating the aliens who were "eligible to citizenship" and upon such amendments as the Congress might thereafter enact.

In 1920 only aliens who were free white persons, aliens of African nativity, persons of African descent and native-born Filipinos having 3 years' honorable service in the United States Coast Guard, Navy, Marine Corps, or Navy Auxiliary Service were eligible to become naturalized citizens. (8 U. S. C. A., sec. 359; 40 Stat. 542, ch. 69.) By the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1140, ch. 876, as amended 57 Stat. 601, ch. 344, 60 Stat. 416, ch. 534, the subject matter now being in 8 U. S. C. A., sec. 703) persons eligible for naturalization now include white persons, persons of African natvity or descent, persons who are descendants of races indigenous to the Continents of North or South America or adjacent islands, Filipino persons or persons of Filipino descent, Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent, and persons of races indigenous to India.

The list of persons eligible to citizenship has been further extended (8 U. S. C. A., sec. 1001) permitting the naturalization of persons who served honorably in the military or naval services of the United States during World War II and who but for such service would be ineligible.

The census report of 1940 (Sixteenth Census, 1940, Characteristics of Nonwhite Population by Race, p. 2) shows that the number of aliens residing in the continental United States who were ineligible to naturalization under the law then in effect by reason of racial origin were: Japanese, 47,305; Chinese, 37,242; Hindu, 1,495; Korean, 749; Filipino, 431; Polynesian, 9; other Asian, 95. The number of foreign born of each race then residing in California were: Japanese, 33,569; Chinese, 16,676. Other foreign born in California are not shown by the census report.

Using the figures shown by the 1940 census and applying the naturalization law now in effect only a total of 48,158, composed of Japanese, Korean, Polynesian, and a small number of other Asiatics, residing in the United States would be at present ineligible to citizenship. The census report shows a decline in the foreign-born Japanese population residing in the United States from 70,477 in 1930 to 47,305 in 1940. Since there has been no Japanese immigration since 1940 it is reasonable to assume that there has been a further substantial decrease in such population since the last census was taken, that the number of Japanese in the United States ineligible to naturalization is now far below the total in 1940, and that the number in California has correspondingly declined. Since the number of resident Asiatics ineligible to citizenship other than Japanese is negligible it follows that the latter are practically the only persons affected by the statute under consideration.

The successive amendments to the naturalization law expanding the class of persons entitled to citizenship and therefore entitled to own land in California, have, by the process of congressional erosion, left only the natives of Japan and an insignificant number of nationals of other countries who remain ineligible to citizenship and hence ineligible under the terms of the statute to own real property.

In the period of 30 years since the alien land law was adopted we have revised our opinions concerning the rights of other peoples. Out of the travail of World War II came the concept of respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion as expressed in the Charter of the United Nations.[3] (59 Stat. 1035 ff.; United States Code, Congressional Service, 79th Cong., 1945, p. 964).

The Government of the United States has traditionally been the leader in espousing the rights of man and has championed the cause of the smaller and less privileged nations. The war of 1898 was fought in support of an oppressed country. The efforts of our Government in this regard reached fruition in the convention of representatives of the nations of the earth at which the Charter of the United Nations was adopted. It was promptly ratified by the Senate of the United States, thereby proclaiming allegiance to its principles and providing precedent and example for other countries. The United States has consistently regarded its treaties with other nations as inviolate.

The Charter has become "the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." (United States Constitution, art. VI, sec. 2.) The position of this country in the family of nations forbids trafficking in innocuous generalities, but demands that every State in the Union accept and act upon the Charter according to its plain language and its unmistakable purpose and intent.

Since the Charter is now the supreme law of the land it becomes necessary to examine

---

[3] The preamble to the Charter, chapter I and a portion of chapter IX reads as follows:

"We, the people of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

"to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and

"to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

"to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors; and

"to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security; and

"to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and

"to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples; have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

"Accordingly, our respective governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

"CHAPTER I. PURPOSES AND PRINCIPLES

"ARTICLE 1

"The purposes of the United Nations are:

"1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

"2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

"3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

"4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

"ARTICLE 2

"The Organization and its members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in article 1, shall act in accordance with the following principles:

"1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.

"2. All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

"3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.

"4. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

"5. All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

"6. The Organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"7. Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII.

* * * * * *

"CHAPTER IX. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COOPERATION

"ARTICLE 55

"With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

"(a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

"(b) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

"(c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

"ARTICLE 56

"All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

its provisions and guarantees and to interpret it in the light in which it was adopted by the participating nations. The Organization determined in the preamble "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom[.]" Among the purposes and principles found in article 1 of chapter I are "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights; to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion[.]" In article 2 it is affirmed that the Organization and its members "shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter."

It is agreed in chapter IX, article 55, that "the United Nations shall promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights, and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." By article 56 it is declared that "All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

In the address of the President of the United States to the Senate on July 2, 1945, urging the prompt ratification of the Charter by that body he said: "It seeks to promote world-wide progress and better standards of living.

"It seeks to achieve universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all men and women without distinction as to race, language, or religion.

"It seeks to remove the economic and social causes of international conflict and unrest.

"It is the product of many hands and many influences. It comes from the reality of experience in a world where one generation has failed twice to keep the peace. The lessons of that experience have been written into the document." (United States Code, Congressional Service, supra, pp. 961–2.)

On December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed and proclaimed and called upon all member countries to publicize, disseminate, and expound in schools and elsewhere, a Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirming among other things that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They * * * should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood. (Art. 1.) Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status. (Art 2.) * * * Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others." (Art 17.) This declaration implements and emphasizes the purposes and aims of the United Nations and its Charter.

Democracy provides a way of life that is helpful; however its promises of human betterment are but vain expressions of hope unless ideals of justice and equity are put into practice among governments, and as well between government and citizen, and are held to be paramount. The integrity and vitality of the Charter and the confidence which it inspires would wane and eventually be brought to naught by failure to act according to its announced purposes. Its survival is contingent upon the degree of reverence shown for it by the contracting nations, their governmental subdivisions and their citizens as well. This Nation can be true to its pledge to the other signatories to the Charter only by cooperating in the purposes that are so plainly expressed in it and by removing every obstacle to the fulfillment of such purposes.

A perusal of the Charter renders it manifest that restrictions contained in the alien land law are in direct conflict with the plain terms of the Charter above-quoted and with the purposes announced therein by its framers. It is incompatible with article 17 of the Declaration of Human Rights which proclaims the right of everyone to own property. We have shown that the expansion by the Congress of the classes of nationals eligible to citizenship has correspondingly shrunk the group ineligible under the provisions of the alien land law to own or lease land in California until the latter now consists in reality of a very small number of Japanese. The other Asiatics who still remain on the proscribed list are so few that they need not be considered.

Clearly such a discrimination against a people of one race is contrary both to the letter and to the spirit of the Charter which, as a treaty, is paramount to every law of every State in conflict with it. The alien land law must therefore yield to the treaty as the superior authority. The restrictions of the statute based on eligibility to citizenship, but which ultimately and actually are referable to race or color, must be and are therefore declared untenable and unenforceable.

Judgment reversed with directions to enter a decree in favor of plaintiff in accord with the prayer of his complaint.

WILSON, J.

We concur: MOORE, P. J., MCCOMB, J.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Reports of committees are in order. If there are no reports to be submitted, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Thomas Washington to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sidney Sugarman to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the two confirmations.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 1, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Harold K. Hill, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice William B. Crawley, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. George Thomas Washington, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Sidney Sugarman, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that the words of our mouth and the meditations of our heart may always be acceptable in Thy sight.

May there be nothing in this day's work of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

Fill our souls with lofty aspirations, and may each day find us eager and ready to do Thy will, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

May we have the courage to believe that none of the Christlike hopes and longings which Thou hast planted within us are too high and too difficult to be fulfilled by Thy wisdom and power.

In Christ's name we bring our needs and desires. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. H. Morris, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight

Monday to file a report on Reorganization Plan No. 7, and the request will also include the right of any member to file minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight on Tuesday next to file a report on Reorganization Plan No. 5, and also to include the minority views of any member if any such minority views are expressed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE MURRAY HULBERT

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme regret that I announce to the membership of the House this morning the death of one of our former colleagues, Hon. George Murray Hulbert, of New York.

Judge Hulbert served in this House, having been elected to the House of Representatives in 1914 and again in 1916, from the Twenty-first District in New York, a part of which was contained in the county in which I lived at the time, and which now is included in the district I have represented in Congress since 1940.

As a Member of the House, Judge Hulbert served with great distinction on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and was primarily responsible for the great harbor development of New York. In 1918 he was appointed commissioner of docks of New York, and during his term of office was responsible for the enlargement of the docks of that great city.

In 1921 he was elected president of the board of aldermen and served with distinction as the second leading political figure in our city at that time.

Subsequently he retired from active politics and finally, after resuming the practice of law, was appointed by the late President Roosevelt as a member of the bench of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, where he served with outstanding distinction until his death on yesterday.

During his lifetime he was active in the fraternal and athletic activities of our city. He was outstanding as an athlete, and was responsible for the promotion of many of the great athletic events of our community. For years he was president of the Amateur Athletic Union, and also director of the International Athletic Union.

In fraternal life he was most active in the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and reached the high position of Grand Exalted Ruler of that great fraternal organization.

When he passed, the city of New York and the Nation lost a great citizen, the bench of the Federal court, a great jurist; and today I desire to express my own deep sympathy to his widow and his child on the death of a great American citizen and a wonderful husband and father.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest sorrow that we learned of the recent passing of Judge Murray Hulbert. With his death the American bar suffered the loss of a forceful and courageous leader. And we from the New York area will particularly miss his vigorous personality now withdrawn from the community which he has served so well for almost 50 years.

Judge Hulbert was admitted to the bar in 1902 on the completion of his study at the New York Law School. He then opened an office and practiced in that city until his appointment as judge in 1934. Taking an early interest in the political affairs of New York, he became an active member of the Democratic Party soon after receiving his law degree.

In 1914 he was elected to Congress from the Twenty-first Congressional District of New York and was reelected in 1916. Those interested in the welfare and growth of New York City will not soon forget his active interest in the port facilities at the time, nor his success in securing Federal aid in the creation of much of the great terminal facilities which exist today.

In 1918 he resigned his seat in Congress to become commissioner of docks and to preside over the board of aldermen in the two Hylan administrations. Resigning from these offices in 1924, he returned to private practice in the city. Ten years later President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him a Federal judge in the southern district of New York where he served with distinction for 16 years. During these years on the bench, Judge Hulbert presided over many of the important cases of his day. He sat during the Albert N. Chapereau smuggling trial, and that of the officers from the tragic *Morro Castle* fire.

He was the first jurist to participate in the recent conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, his refusal of a motion to quash the indictment against them setting in motion the now historic proceedings.

In recent years, Judge Hulbert was increasingly disturbed at the lawless tendencies he noted in the American people today.

Only a week before his death he had spoken to the press deploring the increase of crime and moral disintegration which he felt growing around him on every side. As a result of his reserving decision on a plea by the convicted Communists to tour the Nation on a money-raising campaign, he was deluged with a flood of abusive letters. On the occasion of this incident he again declared his deep concern over the growing disrespect in this country for the legal process and our historic rights.

In this day of doubt, fear, and indecision we have need of men of Judge Hulbert's stature, and it is with a mixed emotion of gratitude for his contributions and loss of his fearless personality that we face his passing from us at this time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Judge Murray Hulbert was born and raised in my district. He always came back there in the summertime. He and I, his family and mine, were personal friends. I think he was the most popular of the native-born sons among the folks in my district. He was a fine character; he was a fine legislator, a judge of courage and integrity, one of those who hated everything of a disloyal nature. He leaves a reputation of the best. He will be greatly mourned by the people of the place he came from as well as in the great city of New York, the place he went to carve out a name for himself.

I wish to join with the gentleman from New York in expressing to his family, his dear ones and his friends, my sincere and deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to know Murray Hulbert for over a quarter of a century. I know it is extremely difficult for the average Member of this House who has never resided in New York to realize that this city is home to more than 8,000,000 people. It is just the same as the smaller town or community. We have back yards, we have lights in the windows, we have the neighborhood rivalries and factions; we have men who become part and parcel of our city, men who make history, men who are venerated and loved. Murray Hulbert was one of those men. He stood alongside of Jimmy Walker, Al Smith, and Fiorello LaGuardia, men who gave New York its character and who made it New York.

Murray gave himself unselfishly to anything that affected the city of New York or its people. He was extremely interested in working for youth and their progress. He developed many of the athletic activities in organizations; he gave boys in the slum parts of the city a better opportunity in life; he taught them the principles of sportsmanship and good fellowship, showed them that there was more to the world than the little neighborhood in which they were brought up, taught them to get away from provincialism. He gave of himself freely and fully in this legislative hall. Later when he occupied the position of president of the board of aldermen, as my colleague said, the second highest political position in the city of New York, he gave fully there of his experience and of his knowledge.

His years of service on the Federal bench are known to almost every man in

this House. He served there with pride and distinction. We who later came into this House are doubly proud of him because he was such a fine upstanding judge. We of the New York delegation today extend from the depths of our hearts our deepest sympathies to his wife and to his family.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD on Murray Hulbert at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sadness that we learn of the death of former Congressman Murray Hulbert. Murray Hulbert served in this House with distinction and later served admirably as a United States judge of the southern district of New York.

I have personally known him for three decades and during that period developed an affectionate regard for him as well as the highest respect for his ability as a legislator and as a judge. It is not given to many to excel in both capacities.

Our condolences go to his dear ones. The void created by his passing will never be filled. The memory of his kindness and goodness, of his fine character and wisdom will remain with us long.

RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1950 AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H. R. 5472, the River and Harbor Act of 1950 and the Flood Control Act of 1950.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FLOWERS, NOT BRICKBATS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how people, and even Members of Congress, scream for economy and then scream again when they get it. Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson should be commended, not criticized, for his order reducing mail deliveries to one a day in the residential areas of our cities.

The postmasters of my district approve of this action, and a good many intelligent citizens have written me to applaud the same. In this morning's mail I have received a letter from a good citizen, a good businessman, and a good friend, who writes:

> Nationally there seems to be a wail going to the heavens about curtailed post office service because some help has been laid off. This economy should be nurtured, not condemned. Either continue this or charge us enough postage to pay the bill. It is not right to let us (corporations) mail things and then turn around and tax our employees because we did not pay enough for the service.
>
> The Post Office has a time-honored deficit but that does not forgive its existence. The level-headed people I talk to say "cut expenses or raise postage."

Mr. Speaker, our Postmaster General is an able, conscientious public servant. No one works harder than he in an effort to do his full duty. In the opinion of most of us he is doing an excellent job. He is deserving of our support.

SEIZURE BY THE REPUBLIC OF MEXICO OF FIVE FISHING VESSELS

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Resolution 558 requesting the Secretary of State to investigate immediately the seizure of five fishing vessels by the Republic of Mexico. I believe the House should be informed of some of the far-reaching implications of the strange procedure by which our neighboring Republic on the south has come into international waters and seized vessels of the United States, flying our flag and manned by our citizens.

We are extremely sensitive to such high-handed treatment under any circumstances. We are particularly concerned over this act coming as it did so soon after the shooting down of our Navy plane by the Russians. Assuming, however, that all of these angles will be amicably adjusted, there is another phase which is of the greatest importance to the fishing industry.

All over the world fishing vessels acting under international law fish wherever they please in international waters. These waters are accepted as being all which lie more than 3 miles off the coast of any nation. The great fishing industry of our northeast follows the practice. They fish off the Canadian coast, and the Canadians fish off ours. The same thing happens on our northwest coast, and it is practiced to a tremendous extent by the tuna fishermen of southern California.

The Republic of Mexico may have taken the present step in order to establish 9 miles as the limit of territorial waters, rather than 3 miles. If they succeed, they are seriously affecting the fishing industry not only of the United States but of all the world. It behooves the Congress to watch carefully the developments of the next few weeks. The Subcommittee on Fisheries, of which I am chairman, expects to hold hearings at the earliest possible moment in order to develop all of the facts in this far-reaching case.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF BARRATT O'HARA, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE SECOND DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCGUIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I include the following biographical sketch of the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA. Today is Mr. O'HARA's birthday and, I think, an appropriate occasion to call your attention to the distinguished career of our colleague from the Second District of Illinois.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF BARRATT O'HARA, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE SECOND DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

BARRATT O'HARA, Representative from the Second District of Illinois, was born at St. Joseph, Mich., on April 28, 1882, a son of the late Thomas O'Hara, judge of the second judicial circuit of Michigan.

At 14, he went to Nicaragua with his father, personal representative of President Grover Cleveland, in the controversy of that period with Great Britain over the Mosquito coast. After 2 years in Central America, he returned to Benton Harbor, Mich., and at 16, enlisted in Company I, Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry, participating in the assault of July 1 and 2, 1898, on the city of Santiago, Cuba.

He then returned to his studies at the Benton Harbor, Mich., high school, from which he was graduated.

He attended the University of Missouri and later, pursued his law studies at Northwestern University, and at Chicago-Kent College of Law, taking his degree from the latter institution.

At 21, he was sporting editor of the Chicago American. Later he was cable editor of the Chicago Chronicle and Sunday editor of the Chicago Examiner.

At 30, he was elected Lieutenant Governor of the State of Illinois, and as chairman of the Illinois senate vice and wage committee conducted an inquiry into the wages paid woman workers in department stores and factories which aroused national interest.

President Woodrow Wilson summoned the committee to a conference with him in his executive office in Washington. As a result of the interest aroused on the subject matter of the inquiry, some six or seven State minimum wage laws were enacted in the year 1913.

In 1915, while Acting Governor of Illinois, during the absence from the State of Governor Dunne, the steamship *Eastland* tragedy occurred in the harbor of Chicago. He served as a member of Mr. Secretary of Commerce Redfield's board of inquiry into the causes of the disaster, and suggested certain recommendations resulting in legislation by the Congress which has operated to prevent similar disasters on the Great Lakes since that period.

In 1917, he again joined the Armed Forces, serving throughout World War I with the Eightieth and Twelfth Divisions. He is a past judge advocate general of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and was the chairman of the first executive board of the Department of Illinois, American Legion.

At the close of World War I, and until 1939, he practiced law in the city of Chicago. In 1939, he became associated with William H. Sexton as special attorney for the city of Chicago in traction reorganization and in the construction of the comprehensive system of subways and superhighways. He remained in this work until assuming his duties as Member of the Eighty-first Congress.

He is the author of a number of books, including annual volumes digesting the new legislation of all State legislatures, and (co-author) of a history of the Constitution of the United States.

NATURAL GAS FOR NEW ENGLAND

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, a great number of my constituents have been much encouraged to know that the Federal Power Commission was holding hearings on applications for a certificate to extend natural-gas pipe lines into New England. This relatively new source of lower-cost fuel is very much needed in Massachusetts and all New England and we had been hopeful that we might have natural gas during the current year. It is therefore distressful to note that the hearings conducted by the Federal Power Commission have been subject to postponement and delays. If this slowdown in the processes of the Commission is allowed to continue, then I am very much afraid that the hopes of our people for natural gas this year are doomed to disappointment. I have today written the following letter to the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission urging upon him the necessity of continuing and concluding these hearings without further interruption:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1950.

Hon. NELSON LEE SMITH,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I am disturbed because there has not been a greater acceleration in the hearings before the Federal Power Commission on applications for a certificate to construct a natural-gas pipe line into New England. My constituents are exceedingly interested in getting natural gas at the earliest possible time. We need natural gas in Massachusetts and we need it now. Householders and others whom I represent are demanding of me appropriate and immediate action, and I therefore urge that the hearings heretofore started on the applications for the benefit of New Englanders, both market hearings and otherwise, be held and continued without interruption until a decision can be reached.

I realize that the supply of natural gas is limited and I understand that other localities are claiming a prior right to this limited supply. However, I am satisfied that the hearings will disclose that the needs of New England are so compelling that we in our section ought not to be relegated to any secondary priority. I should be disappointed if it should develop that there was any disposition within the Federal Power Commission to fence New England out in this problem of making natural gas available to those who need it. A slowdown in these hearings almost forces us to the belief that natural gas for Massachusetts in 1950 is a forlorn hope. This would be a grievous disappointment.

Sincerely yours,

ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
Member of Congress.

THIRD RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a House resolution into the House today asking that the Speaker appoint a committee of five Members of the House to attend the Third Reciprocal Trade Agreement Negotiations to be held at Torquay, England, beginning September 28, 1950. The negotiations will be of tremendous importance to our United States industries and Congress should be represented. The committee of House Members should be most helpful in the Interdepartmental Trade Agreement Organization consisting of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Economic Cooperation Administration. The Interdepartmental Trade Agreement Organization has approximately 50 members. The negotiations will last several months. The first negotiations were held at Geneva from April to October 1947; the second negotiations were held at Annecy, France, from April through August 1949. At the first negotiations 24 countries participated, at the second 34 countries, and at the third approximately 50 countries are expected. Czechoslovakia is the only country from behind the Russian iron curtain to participate. Officially, the negotiations are called the third round of tariff negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The resolution I am introducing today reads as follows:

Resolution creating a select committee to attend the third round of tariff negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the manner provided for original appointment.

The select committee is authorized and directed to (1) attend the third round of tariff negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which will be held at Torquay, England, beginning September 28, 1950, and (2) report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) before the end of the present Congress with respect to the activities and accomplishments of such negotiations, together with such recommendations as the select committee may deem appropriate.

For the purposes of this resolution the select committee is authorized to sit during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary.

THE BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the House has been engaged in a great battle between the economizers and the spenders in Congress. Three weeks have now been devoted to the administration's omnibus appropriations bill, which provides funds for the various operations of the Federal Government for the coming fiscal year beginning July 1.

The bill itself is an inch thick and has 425 printed pages. The committee report accompanying it is a 335 page volume filled with astronomical figures and innumerable tables. The volume has a "mystery" feature. The "mystery" is why all this spending is necessary in a year of peace and relatively high prosperity. An even greater "mystery"—which the House Appropriations Committee has referred to the House Ways and Means Committee—is where and how are we going to get the money?

The physical size of the bill and the committee report is certainly in keeping with the enormous size of the proposed Government expenditures of almost forty-two and a half billion dollars. The proposed spending program for next year will add another $7,300,000,000 to the already huge national debt.

With another year of deficit spending facing us, the future of the American taxpayers is indeed bleak. Many of us hoped that we could make some substantial cuts. We believed this could be done without impairing a single essential function of Government. Senator BYRD has been saying for 10 years that we could save between three and four billion dollars a year on the Federal pay roll. The Hoover Commission has said the same thing. However, the spenders have finally prevailed over the economizers in the Battle of the Budget.

MEXICO'S SEIZURE OF UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 23 an unfortunate incident occurred off the coast of Mexico which most urgently necessitates the attention of the State Department. On that day five trawlers owned and operated by United States citizens were seized by a Mexican gunboat and ordered to proceed to Tampico, Mexico. There fines were imposed upon the owners and their catch of shrimp was confiscated.

The boats had been engaged in catching shrimp off the coast of Mexico. The distance offshore of their operations is perhaps the subject of some dispute. The Mexican authorities assert that the

vessels were within 9 miles of the low-tide watermark. The operators claim they were beyond the 10-mile limit.

Be that as it may, no one disputes the fact that they were beyond the 3-mile limit. It is true that Mexico claims jurisdiction of its coastal waters within the 9-mile limit. But the unfortunate part of the circumstances is that each of the boats involved was carrying a copy of a letter from our Department of State stating that the United States has not recognized Mexican territorial waters jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit. The letter further states that United States fishing vessels have the right to carry on their operations beyond the distance of 3 miles from the coast of Mexico. Notwithstanding this fact, the vessels were seized and the men detained.

Mr. Speaker, the incident points up a situation and a problem which should be settled and determined without undue delay in order that further such incidents will not occur between our neighbors to the south, and that our fishing people may have some assurance as to where they may or may not fish. Other nations to the south have asserted jurisdiction over their territorial waters beyond the 3-mile limit. For instance, off the west coast of South America, Peru has claimed jurisdiction of coastal waters up to the 200-mile limit and has forbidden our vessels to fish within those waters except upon permission.

Incidents like the one of April 23 could lead to more serious disputes. They have done so in the past. Most certainly they do not make for harmonious relationships between those nations which consider each other friendly neighbors.

I am sure our State Department is cognizant of this fact and make these remarks only to emphasize the need for quick action and an early solution to the problem.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, for 2 weeks we have been considering a $29,000,000,000 appropriation bill. We all know that it must be reduced if we are to attain a balanced budget, yet the sum total of our efforts has been a net increase of more than a half billion dollars.

On this side of the aisle we have set a goal of a billion-dollar reduction in the appropriations bill as it came from committee. Surely that is not much of a reduction in a $29,000,000,000 budget—less than 5 percent. The record will show that we have not only talked for economy and a balanced budget; we have voted for it.

As we considered each section the minority party has pointed out where savings could be made, and we have proposed amendments to make those savings. Almost without exception the Democratic majority has voted as a bloc against any reduction in appropriations. Like a battered prize fighter, we have been knocked to the canvas time and again. We may lose this battle on the floor of the House, but the final decision rests with the voters next November. We have no doubt whatever what their decision will be.

While we have been whittling away at this appropriation bill here (and achieving a net increase of over $500,000,000) our Ways and Means Committee has been slashing some of the wartime excise taxes. I am strongly in favor of that. Most of those excise taxes should be repealed or reduced, but we will have a deficit in excess of $7,000,000,000 unless we perform some major operations on this appropriations bill now before us.

Every day I receive letters from constituents demanding an end to deficit spending, the elimination of waste and duplication in Government, the adoption of the Hoover report recommendations. The thinking people are genuinely alarmed to see this Government go further and further in debt when we should be balancing the budget and retiring our huge national debt. If we cannot do it now in good times, they ask, when is it going to be accomplished?

It may be the majority party believes it can hoodwink the voters. We are meeting as a Committee of the Whole and there are no roll-call votes. I doubt if many Members on the other side of the aisle would have the temerity to consistently vote against every economy amendment we have proposed in the past 2 weeks if their votes were recorded.

But the people are not fooled that easily. They know that the minority Members of the House have been voting solidly for economy while the majority Members have just as consistently resisted every effort to cut appropriations. The record speaks for itself even though the individual names are not listed in roll-call votes.

Let me cite just one example. Last week in considering an appropriation of $675,000 for the State Department to buy food and drink to entertain foreigners abroad, we offered an amendment to trim this to $500,000. A half million dollars will buy a lot of champagne and caviar, and a saving of $175,000 in one item certainly would not handicap the social life of our envoys abroad too much.

As a matter of fact, we only appropriated $150,000 for this item in 1941. In 1943 it was raised to $200,000, in 1945 it was $300,000, and in 1947 it had grown to $500,000. Some people may say that you must wine and dine those foreign diplomats to make deals with them. I maintain that our diplomacy has fallen to a pretty low state when we have to spend $675,000 on entertainment in order to carry on important business with foreign nations.

At any rate, the majority members voted down this amendment to cut $175,000 from the appropriation, just as they voted down a score of other amendments before and since.

We have been beating our heads against a stone wall for the last 2 weeks in trying to trim some fat from this appropriation bill, but the experience has not been without its compensations. When constituents write me now asking who is to blame for high taxes and deficit spending, I can tell them. The record speaks for itself.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 143, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ISRAEL

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as the new State of Israel commemorates its second anniversary as the newest member in the community of nations, I should like to add my word of felicitations and congratulations. The State of Israel is the realization of a great dream and a goal which the Jewish peoples have pursued diligently and faithfully for many centuries. It is difficult for one who has not lived through a succession of events such as outlined by Noach Levinson in his famous archives of the Warsaw ghetto to realize and appreciate the true significance of the new state to the Jewish people. In spite of persecution, tyranny and blood purges on a monstrous scale, the Jews have pursued their dream with unfailing confidence in God and in the ultimate justice of their claims. Israel stands today as a monument to that faith and perseverance. Though the new country is small in a geographical sense, it is vast in tradition and in human resources. Its foundations are constructed of hope and human courage. It, like our own great Nation, stands as a beacon light in defiance of oppression and tyranny. It is truly said in Isaiah, "A little one shall become a thousand and a small one a strong nation."

May Israel and its people prosper in their age-old wisdom and in their devotion to their traditions and to the word of God who led them out of the darkness of oppression into the promising light of the new Israel.

TAXES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I picked out of the Times-Herald yesterday an editorial entitled "Tomorrow's the Day." That means today. It reads as follows:

Since January 1, the average salary and wage earner in this country has worked 117 days and every cent he's earned must be paid

the tax collector. So, tomorrow for the first time this year he can call his salary his own.

We think such an occasion should be marked for a special observance in the hope of stopping the flood of Government spending which might increase the number of days we'll have to work for taxes next year to 120 or 140 days.

TAXPAYERS NEED HELP

The national debt today has reached $255,583,544,106.81. The administration plans to spend $42,439,000,000 in 1951. Such a budget will increase the debt by another 4 or 5 billions.

In order to meet this huge expense you must pay direct and indirect taxes such as 8 cents on a quart of milk, 18 cents on a can of baby powder, $2 on your telephone, $3,000 on a new house, 70 cents on a shovel and $3 on a pair of shoes.

Congress could make it a real celebration tomorrow. For a starter it could cut down the 1951 budget until it balanced and then wipe out the excise taxes put on the American public as wartime emergencies. How about it?

GENERAL MOTORS BONUS AWARDS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], here is another example of our country going to rack and ruin.

General Motors, in April 1950, voted bonus awards of $6,000,000, plus 24,000 shares of stock to officers and directors. This was for services for 1949. Charles E. Wilson, president, received $586,000 salary and bonus awards. Three executive vice presidents received the following salary and bonus awards: Albert Bradley, $511,000; Harlow H. Curtice, $496,000; Marvin Coyle, $496,000.

In addition, the bonus is payable in five annual installments so the income tax is thereby reduced.

In addition to the salaries and bonuses, General Motors directors voted Charles E. Wilson and the three executive vice presidents $25,000 each per year retirement pensions effective when they decide to retire.

If American industry—big business—can afford to pay pensions to retired officials who do not need them, is it state socialism when the people's Representatives impose a tax on industry and on employees to pay retirement pensions, or social-security payments, to those who do need them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. GOSSETT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one a letter from the Philippine War Veterans and in the other a radio address by Admiral Swanson, Surgeon General of the Navy.

Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a prize-winning American Legion essay written by Mr. Bursick.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Richard S. Kaplan, historian and service officer of the Gary Memorial Post 17, American Legion, on the subject The Most Dangerous Ism in the World Today.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. KEARNEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include the fourth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951—CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday, it was agreed that general debate on the remaining chapters of the bill be had today, Monday and Tuesday; that general debate on the civil functions appropriations chapter be confined to Tuesday next; that when the House adjourns on Tuesday next all general debate be concluded on the entire bill. Debate on chapter VII and subsequent chapters will follow in sequence, except on chapter IX, the civil functions chapter.

Chapter VII, Interior Department Appropriations, will now be considered under general debate for not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us the chapter making appropriations for the Department of the Interior. The subcommittee met and worked for 2½ months. At the end of 2½ months the members of the subcommittee were on speaking terms. This has often been a disputed bill, and that is an indication of how friendly our relations were in that room while we were working on this bill. I want to say that it is a pleasure to work with the members of this subcommittee. I do not want the Members to think that I am in the well of the House to talk politics. I am not. I am going to try to speak on the problems of the Interior Department, as I see them, after 54 years of labor; and I mean 54 years of labor in the fields covered by this bill.

Free enterprise started in this country long before my time with the mining industry in Pennsylvania. Men with large families would clear off a tract of land, take away the debris, and then be prepared to mine coal. When they petitioned the railroad to put in a siding, that was done. After they got the car full of coal they charged those men 20 cents per ton-mile to ship that coal. But the railroads charged the large shippers only 2 cents per ton-mile. Case after case was taken to many courts in Pennsylvania, and even to the Supreme Court of the United States. There, by a vote of nine to nothing, the United States Supreme Court held that the big shippers and the railroads were correct. That situation prevailed down through the years until most of the small operators were made to get out of the coal mines.

The large operators have not put back the proceeds of their operations so as to keep the worked-out shafts from decaying and falling in. So now many towns above old mines are in danger from cave-ins. Many millions of dollars will have to be spent in Pennsylvania when towns like Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and Pottsville, and others start to fall into the mines, simply because we had no Government supervision.

The next great industry of that day was oil, as I said here on the floor a year ago. They first discovered oil at Oil City, Pa. Again there was no supervision, and the railroads shipped what oil they wanted to favored friends. The rest of it ran back into the Allegheny River by the millions of barrels. They used to set the river on fire every couple of weeks. It did not take too long to get rid of that oil in Pennsylvania.

I remember as a young man working for $2 an hour filling sacks with sand. At that time the largest oil gusher ever struck in the world came in. Twenty-five thousand barrels of oil went into the air every day for 3 weeks. Back when such wages were rare they were paying anyone who could work there $2 an hour

for loading sand into sacks. Again, we wasted those reserves.

We come next to the lumber interests. What they did not do to the forests of Pennsylvania is not worth talking about. I remember just as though it was yesterday, when the Prince of Wales came to this country and the reporters asked him, "What impressed you most in this country?" He said, "The burning of your forests. You will live to see the day that you will wish to God you never had done it." We were at that time burning up trees that it took God 200 years to grow. But we are paying the penalty today. There was no supervision in those days. And there is not enough now.

And then there is the steel industry—United States Steel, for example. That was one of the next feathers in the cap of free enterprise. I remember that at the turn of the century a group of men gave Andy Carnegie $300,000,000 for his holdings and organized the United States Steel. I remember then that they put the stock on the market for $14 a share, and most of the employees had a bite at it. Of course the employees were pressured into buying the stock with their life's savings. They sold $600,000,000 worth of stock, largely to steelworkers. The great leaders of industry got back $300,000,000 more than they gave Carnegie for his interests. Then these captains of industry drove that stock down to $7 a share, and the employees became panicky and tossed it overboard. It did not cost the United States Steel Co. one dime for all of Carnegie's holdings.

I remember when Judge Gary, almost on his death bed, said they could never work 8 hours a day in the steel industry; that it was not feasible. But they are doing it.

As for our lumber industry, I can remember about La Crosse, Pa., where they laid the foundation for the national leagues. They had ball teams in Oil City and Franklin and Lancaster and Williamsport, and they paid the players high salaries. It cost 15 cents a game to see those games. We thought the lumber barons were great people in that day, but it was after they destroyed our forests and ruined our soil by erosion, when we realized what they had done to us. That was after the trees were gone. Yes, that is a part of it.

They tell me in the district I represent that in Ashtabula County they used to fertilize the farms there with sturgeon out of Lake Erie. There is probably not one sturgeon in Lake Erie today. Not one. No one tried to save some of those fish for the future.

But in those days, like today, we had to balance the budget or stop spending.

After we had killed all the buffalo and wild game in this country, then we put the Indians on reservations, and the figures presented by the Indian Bureau to the Congress show what it cost. We took the good land, and killed off the wild game. Then we put the Indians into the desert where they could never make a living. Since the turn of the century we have spent $1,000,000,000 on the Indians on Indian reservations. A man just came down from Alaska to my office not long ago. He had been up there 35 years and had become wealthy. He said: "It is only going to be a couple of years until you have the Indians and Eskimos up there in Alaska on reservations." I asked him why he said that. Before the war, in the caribou herd alone there were 2,500,000 head that together with the fish furnished food to Eskimo and Indian. Today, from the illegal shooting during the war, the herd has been cut down to 500,000; so it will be only a short time until we have the Indian and the Eskimo on relief on reservations up there. There will be no food for them, no work for them. Then it will cost us $50,000,000, as it costs us now to take care of the other Indians on reservations in this country. Why? Because that territory up there is as vast and huge as all the country east of the Mississippi. In my State of Ohio we have 100 game wardens protecting the fish and wildlife in that small State, but in this huge Territory of Alaska there are only a few men protecting the whole business. So you know how long it is going to last, and you know what is going to happen in a few years. I repeat, the Indians and the Eskimos will be on reservations in Alaska before long.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. I know my chairman is very much interested in the fish and wildlife phases of this bill, and I am very greatly interested in the remarks that he is making about Pennsylvania and the conservation of the fish industry. I wonder if he would mind stating, for the benefit of the committee, his impression of the diminution of the shad industry in Pennsylvania, particularly on the Susquehanna River?

Mr. KIRWAN. The pollution of the stream?

Mr. FENTON. Yes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. That was the fault, as I say, of the Pittsburgh coalmining industry. Seventy-five years ago they had steamboat service between Harrisburg and Wilkes-Barre on the Susquehanna River, but today you could not paddle a canoe between those cities with the channel of the river filled up with debris from the coal mines which was dumped in the river. Not only did that make the river too shallow for navigation; it killed off the fish, also.

Mr. FENTON. If the gentleman will yield further; that, I think, is only one of the factors entering into the depletion of shad. Another factor is the great hydroelectric plants and dams on the river which prevent the fish from getting up the river.

Mr. KIRWAN. But a greater cause is the pollution of the streams. Throughout the country today there are relatively a few streams in which fish can live, mostly in the mountains. Many of the rest of the streams have been polluted and most of our woods and our forests have been cut down and destroyed. We are doing it at a fast pace.

Today all we can talk about is balance the budget. I made the statement when, as chairman of the subcommittee, I reported this bill to the full Appropriations Committee, that Eugene Grace, chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Co., said to the stockholders of his company scattered throughout the Nation: "Unless you put quite a bit of the earnings of Bethlehem Steel back into the company it is not going to survive." And rightly so. Our Nation is the biggest corporation in the world, a corporation that produced $225,000,000,000 gross income last year. This is not a question of politics; I am not blaming anybody on either side of the aisle; I am merely stating facts. Back in 1932 we had a total national income less than what we are spending today to run the Government. The national gross income of the country in 1932 was only $37,000,000,000. Today we are spending $42,000,000,000 to run the Government. In 1939 the gross national income was $87,000,000,000. Last year it was $225,000,000,000. Certainly it takes money to operate a government for a nation like that, which can be compared to an industry that produces $225,000,000,000. We are told all over the country and all over the Nation that we have got to balance the budget. But while we are attempting to balance it we must not lose sight of the kind of job we are doing in the greatest country on earth, America. No one wants an unbalanced budget. But no one wants a country that has wasted away all its natural resources, either. This has been called a war budget, and it is a war budget in many ways. But we cannot afford to use up all our timber, our underground fuels, our soils, our wild game, and our fish just because world affairs require us to spend a lot of money. We have to spend money to save what is left of our natural wealth. We had better save it while we have some left, because once it is gone mere money can never bring back our God-given natural wealth.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What is happening to our Stream Pollution Act?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know.

Mr. STEFAN. For 16 years I have been working here to get a Stream Pollution Act through. We finally got one enacted. How are we operating under it?

Mr. KIRWAN. We are probably trying to balance the budget and will not give them any men to operate.

Mr. STEFAN. We passed a Stream Pollution Act. Why pass it?

Mr. KIRWAN. We probably do not want to give them any men to enforce its provisions. We enact laws here but we often do not give them anyone to enforce the laws. That does not come under the Interior Department, and I am not too familiar with it.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. As far as the State of Pennsylvania is concerned, we have a Stream Pollution Act in that State. The Schuylkill River is now being rapidly

cleaned up and we hope that the pollution caused by the mining industry as far as the Susquehanna River is concerned will be cleaned up under the present program in Pennsylvania.

Mr. STEFAN. Some of that industry opposed us so far as the Stream Pollution Act was concerned. Do they still oppose the enforcement of it?

Mr. FENTON. No.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia and I were traveling in Europe last fall and, among other countries, we visited France, Germany, and Belgium. While we were there it rained for 3 days. We tried to find some evidences of erosion in driving through those three countries. You can drink the water right out of the ditch at the side of the road over there. It is good clear water. That was true in all those three countries we visited. Yet here in America, the greatest country on earth, there is hardly a farm in the country today that does not suffer from erosion. As you drive along the roads you will see ridges which the water has caused. You will see erosion in ditches along the roads. We have many automobiles in this country. When you have automobiles you must have good roads, and to have good roads you must have adequate drainage. In 5 or 10 minutes after God lets the rain come out of the heavens, the water is on its way to the ocean. In Ohio today we are drilling 80 feet deeper for water than did our grandfathers. We have a million acres of the finest land in the world in the State of Ohio, but too often now, no water. The pumps are running dry. Yet every time we come to this Congress and ask for a couple of million dollars to erect a dam and reservoir—a trap for the water so as to protect the soil that produces our wealth—what do we find? Opposition. We are told the budget cannot stand it.

Just stop and think of what the walls of this great Hall would say if they could only divulge their secrets. Theodore Roosevelt, a great President, at the turn of the century tried to have a law enacted under which the cattle that went into the packing plants in Chicago would be stamped. It was to be a Government supervision stamp to let the people know whether the cattle, hogs, or cows, were fit for human consumption. Roosevelt, being a great man and a great President, knew what he was doing. Yet it took 4 years to get through Congress a law to provide for the stamping of meat to show whether it was fit for human consumption. That took 4 years. That holds true for every law or every effort we make to try to preserve American land and resources.

You will find out about that a couple of days from now when we move forward in connection with this bill.

Just stop and think that in 1929 when the collapse came in this country we belonged in the Dark Ages, though we thought we were a great Nation and a great people.. Yet only 29 out of 100 people in these United States had electricity in their home. Today only 64 out of every 100 famliies have electricity in their homes in America.

The private electric companies have had more than 50 years to put electricity in our homes. But it is not there yet. When the Government tries to furnish power to the people from our great dams the private utilities cry "socialism."

We destroyed three nations—Japan, Italy, and Germany—that were 90 percent electrified. But this country is not well electrified. You can hire a moving van and tell them that you want to go to an isolated spot in the Rockies. You start out on a four-lane highway and then you go to a three- and a two- and a one-lane road. They deliver your furniture, and when you get there, there will be no electric lights. But you will find all along the way in this bill and in every bill in this Congress that many people are fighting every effort where someone tries to do something to develop this country. President Truman is right. In 1929 our national income was only $87,000,000,000, but after we put electricity into another third of our American homes, look where the income is today; and when we put more electricity into their houses they will be able to purchase washing machines, mangles, and other appliances, and cut out much of the hard labor in the house and on the farm. Then we will have an income of $300,000,000,000. Then, and only then, can you pay off this national debt. But we have to start all of these resources working, and working the right way.

Look at this country and look at what mankind has suffered to put it where it is today. You hear a lot of talk about free enterprise and free industry, but I want you to look back and see how free it was. I remember starting to work in a mine when I was 9 years of age, and I remember the conditions that existed in the mines at that time. I was just reading about this a short time ago. I saw a picture of a coal breaker where a lot of children were working some years ago. I thought maybe I could identify myself in the picture. Then it dawned on me that I was too old when I started to work, because the kids were not more than 7 years of age in that picture. I was 9, and I had quite a bit of schooling compared to what they had. Those children worked long, hard hours—they were driven by an overseer until they cried. That was the condition that existed in those days, and after nearly 60 years of mining—58 that I can remember—we have not improved very much. We have cut out child labor, which was really slave labor. And we have made other progress. But in the midnineties they were only working 2 days a week. I can still remember the straw boss marking up on a piece of metal a notice telling you that this colliery will work only on Tuesdays and Fridays, 2 days a week. What are they getting ready to do now? Work 3 days a week.

Have we done much toward conserving our minerals in the past 50 years, or our mines? Oh, no; we are still letting them dig the coal out of the mines and destroy everything that they can destroy all over this Nation.

This country is still being robbed and looted. Look at the railroads. During the war $1,500,000 was charged to move a trainload of shells from the Ravenna Arsenal in my district to Camp Stanley in Texas, while the kids were laying down their lives in the fox holes. I worked on the railroad 20 years. I remember once that when the yardmaster put a way bill in my hand I noticed that one car cost $5,280. Now, multiply that by the number of cars in a train. Some years later it cost you $1,500,000. That is why the Attorney General is suing the railroads for the recovery of $3,500,000,000 that they took during the war, and I repeat, while the kids were laying down their lives overseas. As to the land-grant railroads, when Congress gave them the land they said that in an emergency they would move any of the Army matériel and men for 50 percent. But did they keep their promise? No; they came into the Congress and asked for an increase. They charged 100 percent rates to move the guns and the men.

Yes; these things happen, but they tell you about free enterprise and what it has done. In many ways it has done very little, I am telling you. As to the money that has been invested in big corporations, very little of it is their own funds. We heard the names of men mentioned down here today who are getting half a million dollar bonus. Very little of their own money did they put into General Motors. It is the small stockholder back on the farm that put the funds into General Motors. But, look at the salaries handed out to their officials. And, I again say, it has been that way all down through the years.

These are the reasons why I am saying to every Member of the Congress that every dime in this bill is going to be spent on America and its possessions. There is not a quarter of a dollar appropriated in this Interior bill which is going abroad. If any nation needs to spend money on its country, we need to spend it on ourselves.

The only regret I have in mind in presenting this chapter of the bill to the Congress is that it has too little in it. It should include $2,000,000,000, not merely $621,000,000, because if ever a Nation could stand to have billions and billions spent upon it, this is the country.

I hope that after next Tuesday Members will be on the floor of this House to see that the money that has been put into this bill by the committee, money to be spent on America to help make it a better place to live in—I hope that money will stay in the bill. If we do that, then I know there will be happiness, and there should be.

I saw in the paper just last week that the Medical Association said that in America there is a doctor for every 750 people. The figures are not correct so far as the Indians are concerned. There is only one dentist for every 19,000 Indians, and most of the few Indian kids that go to high school have lost at least some of their teeth. Fifteen thousand of the Indians have never put foot in a school room, although we have binding treaties with these real Americans—some treaties requiring us to educate them. How can the rest of the world respect us when we will not keep faith with the Indians, the real Americans?

There are 300 Navajo Indians out of every 100,000 dying with TB, but this compares with only 33 whites per 100,000 of population. Of the greatest people of them all, some of the American Indians, 300 out of 100,000 are dying of TB. There are hospitals in this country, but on some Indian reservations one doctor is looking after 100 beds, and then he has to look after 5,000 Indians and travel 90 miles. If it were not for his good wife, who is working shoulder to shoulder with him 24 hours a day, where would the Indian be? Yet we want to balance the budget. I am asking and pleading with you—make every effort to protect every dime the committee has recommended in this bill. Like you all, I would like to see the budget balanced, but a promise is a promise. We cannot let these Indians down.

We have a lot to be thankful for. When I got off the boat in Genoa last year I asked the American Consul, "What is a gallon of gas selling for?" He said, "90 cents." Suppose you told the American people tonight, "We are not going to charge you 90 cents for gas but we are going to charge you 35 cents." There would be a howl reaching from Maine to California, saying, "Don't you attempt to do that."

Suppose you walked into a night club here or into a cigar store and said, "Give me a pack of a popular brand of cigarettes," and they charged you 75 cents for them, as they do in London. If you charged the Americans only 30 cents for cigarettes, look at the howl they would put up.

Are we taxed like other Nations No. Just look at the difference between the tax situation in England and here that appeared in the United States News last week. Some say, "Oh, we are following England on the road to socialism." I say that we do not think much of our country when we make that statement, because England is a nation just about as big, and half again, as Pennsylvania. You might say her only asset is fog. If they can ever find out what they can do with fog, England will be the wealthiest nation in the world. But up to now they do not know much about how they can use fog.

But if you took Pennsylvania with all its minerals, its State forests and streams, and dumped 38,000,000 people in there, the number of people they have in England, it would not be socialism, it would be cannibalism. They would eat one another. Yet, we are howling about what a bum job England is doing. She is doing a great job on comparatively nothing just keeping body and soul together over there. But to compare America with England—that little bit of an island which is only one and a half times as big as Pennsylvania—when we have 48 States with everything; and to say that we are going down the same road to socialism—why then we do not think much of our country.

Again I am asking and pleading with every one of you that when the bill is read for amendment I hope to see every dime stay in this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I commend the gentleman for the very fine statement he has made. The gentleman referred to the figures $89,000,000,000 and $300,000,000,000. He mentioned the word "budget" He meant "income," did he not?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. I thank the gentleman for calling it to my attention.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that everyone who heard the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio were rather intrigued with his very interesting statement. I must take issue with the gentleman on some of his statements. I have a high regard for our chairman the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], but I feel I should remind the Members that regardless of all the faults of this great American free-enterprise system which has been in operation since the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and Bill of Rights, we have had in this Nation the happiest people, the best-fed people, the best clad, the best-housed people, the most religious, and the most blessed people in the whole world. There is hardly a person in this wide world today who, if he knows anything about this great free America of ours, who does not want to come here. So with all the mistakes we have made we have a mighty lot for which to be thankful. Mr. Chairman, our fine American youth have fought all over the world and on the seven seas. Yes, my friends, many, many thousands of them sacrificed all, that this Nation, under God, might be preserved for future generations to enjoy. I am proud to be a citizen of America and I am going to do everything in my power so long as I have the breath of life in me to preserve our great republican form of government with all its faults. I think every American regardless of what station of life he finds himself in owes that obligation to the people of America and the people of the world because the people of the whole world are now looking to us for guidance in this dark hour. We can talk about how much the people of other nations must pay in taxes compared to us, but most of those people have lost their liberties; they have lost their opportunities; they have lost everything worth living for. Certainly I am not going to be a party to destroying America by committing national suicide in America through the bankruptcy route, which, after all, is the quickest way to destroy a nation. Yes, a dictator can take over and we can starve to death after the soil has been depleted and ruined, but that takes time. However, it does not take long to destroy a nation through the bankruptcy route. If you do not believe so, just read the history of every nation in the world that has gone the full length of the reckless spending road on which we are traveling today at breakneck speed. Now, let us not be swept off our feet by these folks who seem to have no conception and are careless about wasteful spending and burdensome taxes. We spend so much money for a lot of useless things here at home and a lot of useless things all over the world, to build great irrigating projects, great hydroelectric dams, and public works in many sections of Europe to the end that we dare not spend what we should for the development of our own country, for soil conservation, and the preservation of our own natural resources.

We are not only carrying on a great program here, keeping 2,000,000 people on the pay roll, costing $7,000,000,000, but we are running a WPA all over the world. God knows I have just as soft a heart for suffering humanity as most folks have, but when our ship goes down, when this great free enterprise ship of ours goes down, there are a lot of folks in this world who are going right down with us. So we had best keep our torch of freedom burning, we had best keep ourselves in some kind of a solvent condition or many people of the world, let alone ourselves, will suffer the consequences that is a certainty.

I have here the report of the full Appropriations Committee. I shall turn to the section dealing with the Department of the Interior. The budget request was made for the sum of $669,251,505.

The committee reduced that amount to $621,634,130, making a reduction of $47,672,375.

We have revenues coming into the Treasury from the Interior Department functions from a number of different sources as will be seen from page 27 of the hearings: Admission fees and concessions; hunting stamps, fees, and licenses; grazing fees; revenues, Oregon and California and Coos Bay Wagon Road lands; sale of seal skins and other products; oil, gas, and mining royalties and rentals; interest on and repayment to Colorado River Dam fund and other funds; revenue from Colorado River Dam fund projects; collections, reclamation fund; sale of helium and of gas from helium plants; sale of Bonneville power; sale of Norfolk and Dennison power; sale of Fort Peck power; miscellaneous rentals, fees, and permits; collections for services to Indians; Alaska Railroad receipts; and unclassified receipts. In the fiscal year 1949 the revenues amounted to $149,437,659. That was net revenues. The estimate for the fiscal year 1950 is $153,402,995; and for the fiscal year 1951 it is $165,001,288.

The revenues have been increasing year by year for almost every year since we have records of revenues of the Department. So we do have some income from the activities under the Interior Department.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my good colleague from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. What is the total of the revenue items in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. JENSEN. I just read them.

Mr. HORAN. What was the total?

Mr. JENSEN. For 1949 the actual total was $149,437,659. For 1950 the estimate is $153,402,995. For 1951 the estimate is $165,001,288.

Mr. HORAN. What is the biggest item in the receipts?

Mr. JENSEN. The largest source of funds is collection of reclamation funds for fiscal year 1949, $32,388,255. The estimate for 1950 is $59,487,000; and the estimate for 1951 is $62,168,570.

The next largest item is the sale of Bonneville power. Last year it was $26,000,000 plus; for the fiscal year 1950 it is estimated to be $29,000,000 plus and for the fiscal year 1951 it is estimated to be $31,000,000 plus.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to say when the gentleman interrupted me, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution, that our hearings were on a short, tight schedule this year as they were last year. There were many times I felt, as did other members of the committee, that we were not allowed enough time to question department heads and officials and other folks who came in to testify. In fact, our hearings this year were about one-third the number of hours that were spent in the hearings for the fiscal year 1949. If you want rather complete information about the Department of the Interior, and every phase of that Department, you can get it in the 1949 hearings composed of 4,707 pages. There were 424 witnesses who appeared before the committee that year. Most every project is very fully explained in those hearings. So if you want to know something about the Department of the Interior, any branch of it, you can find it in the hearings for the fiscal year 1949.

The report is justifiably critical of several of the branches of the Department. For example, I note on the first page it is stated:

> The committee last year also urged improvement of the material submitted by the Department in justification of its estimates. Some improvement in the material submitted by certain of the bureaus was noted but on the whole the committee request of last year that the justification notes be clear, concise, and insofar as practicable, uniform in treatment was not honored. There were extenuating circumstances, but next year tangible and extensive improvement will be expected without fail.

There are a number of criticisms in this report. I may say however that I had nothing to do with writing the report because I was not consulted when the report was written and neither was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]. The report was completed and printed without either of us having a chance to look at it until it was made public, which is quite out of the ordinary, although I am not too critical of that because there have been many other things that were much more distasteful in the handling of this one package bill, which I will speak about at a later time.

There are a number of things in this bill that I felt could and should be reduced, in fact amendments were offered to reduce some of the items in this bill in the subcommittee, also in the full Committee of Appropriations, but they were all rejected. At the proper time I shall offer a few amendments to this bill which I know are justified and I hope they will be adopted.

There are many departments and branches of the Department of the Interior. Generally speaking, the officers and employees of these different branches and departments are interested in their work, but a few of the top officials do very little other than to run all over the country making political speeches on the taxpayers' time. You will notice in going through the report that the chairman has seen fit to criticize, and I think justly so. I hope there will be some improvements made.

The Bureau of Land Management is a very important branch of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How many employees are there in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. JENSEN. Around 60,000, as I remember.

Mr. STEFAN. Did you go into the question with the security officer whether or not the employees have been checked for loyalty?

Mr. JENSEN. We did that 2 years ago, but very little has been done about it this year or last year. We were rushed every minute. We were on a strict schedule. Our chairman was ordered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to follow that schedule, and if you were not through asking questions, of course, that was just too bad.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that the saboteurs captured on Long Island had a list of strategic places in the United States that they planned to bomb, and I thought perhaps you went into the question of loyalty like we do in other departments of Government.

Mr. JENSEN. I might tell the gentleman that we have got our eyes on a few of the boys in the Department. I am happy to say that a few of them chose to get out before they were investigated or brought before the bar of justice.

I want to talk about a few items in the bill. We have 180,000,000 acres of public land in America, and we spend annually the large sum of one-fifth of a cent an acre for soil and moisture conservation on that 180,000,000 acres. My friends, that is nothing less than criminal.

When the Director of Indian Affairs, Mr. Nichols, who was Director just a few short months and all at once found himself out in the cold, testified before the committee, he said he had traveled all over the world and he thought the first thing that we should do to help the Indians was to give them a good education and good health. Now, Mr. Nichols is a very able man. I think he would have done a wonderful job if he had been permitted to stay as Director of the Indian Bureau, but you see he had a mind of his own. He was honest, straightforward, and said what he thought. I asked him this question: "You say you traveled all over the world. Now, did you ever in all your travels find healthy, happy, well educated people where the soil was poor?" He said, "No, I must admit I never have."

"Well," I said, "then do you not think the first thing we have to do for the Indians, especially the Navajos and the Hopis, is to build up their soil so that they can become healthy and happy?" Then we can also bring education to those people because then they will have income from the production of farm products to carry on their educational program. He then admitted that soil conservation, the building of our soil, good land did come first, because he admitted he had never seen a happy, healthy, well-educated people where they had poor, run-down, badly eroded soil.

So here we are spending the large sum of one-fifth of 1 cent an acre on public lands for soil and moisture conservation, while we are wasting billions of dollars for other things that are not necessary, as is good soil for our own welfare and for the welfare of those who come after us.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to the soil conditions as pertaining to the land occupied by the Indians, what has been the practice in recent years in the way of the Federal Government's encouraging them to keep sheep, goats, and other livestock on these lands? Have they encouraged that as a soil-building measure, or has the sheep population gone down? Has the gentleman's committee gone into that?

Mr. JENSEN. The Grazing Service limits the number of cattle and sheep that can be grazed.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that.

Mr. JENSEN. But we are not seeding enough; grasses build up this soil. It is going down. The soil on our public lands is being depleted every day at a rapid rate, much of it is already beyond redemption.

Mr. CURTIS. Perhaps I can make my question a little more plain. Referring only to the Indian reservations, I have heard reports that the Bureau of Indian Affairs in some instances has discouraged the Indians from owning goats and sheep and everything else that not only produce food but improve the soil.

Mr. JENSEN. That is quite a long story. There was a former Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Collier by name, who about 15 years ago decided the Indians should get rid of most of their goats and buy sheep. That was on the Navajo and Hopi Reservations. So they did. Then they did not have the milk they and their children should have. Then, along came the Grazing Service and said, "You have too many sheep, you have to sell half of them." So they made the Indians sell half of their sheep. From that day to this, and I will leave it to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] if it is not a fact, from the day the Indians were forced to dispose of a lot of their goats the standard of living of the Indians has gone down, down, down.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to compliment the gentleman not only on his remarks with reference to soil conserva-

tion on public lands but also because he has always been an outstanding and intelligent advocate of soil conservation and flood control. I have heard him before our Committee on Agriculture. I think one of the crying needs of our time is to have more attention and more money spent on the conservation of the soil. The gentleman from Iowa is certainly one of the outstanding exponents of this great program.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I can say as much for him. I appreciate working with him in the important job we have to do in conserving our soil.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the next Governor of the great State of Michigan, an able, honest legislator and patriot.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It might interest the gentleman to learn that Soil Conservation District No. 1 was organized some 10 years ago in my district, at Grand Haven, Ottawa County, Mich. Ottawa County is on Lake Michigan, with the great sand dunes. They have planted 1,400,000 pine trees on the sand dunes and other lands. Today you can see the pine trees growing 4, 5, 6, and 7 feet tall on what is nothing but white sand.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. It is surprising what can be done in a very few years in building up our soil and stopping erosion if the people are determined to do it and it costs so little compared to the profits derived. I am proud of the farmers and the people of my district, the Seventh District of Iowa, for the great job they are doing in conserving the soil. I think the record will show we have more miles of terraces and more acres of contoured land in my district than any district of the United States.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman asked me a question with respect to the Indian livestock program. Former Indian Affairs Commissioner Collier not only reduced the number of goats but reduced the number of sheep and other stock to the extent that he set a trend which we have been unable to stop. In 1939 the Navajo Indians had 29,000 head of cattle. Today they have only 9,000. It is not because Collier reduced them to that extent, but because there is a trend which we have not been able to stop and they are in that situation because of the trend which was established.

Mr. JENSEN. That program has set the Navajo and Hopi Indians back at least 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that is very disturbing too at this very minute and which is giving the folks all over the Missouri Valley a great deal of concern is the terrible floods now raging in that valley. Even though the Missouri Valley covers one-sixth of the area of the United States the leadership saw fit to take about $10,000,000 out of this appropriation for the Missouri Valley which amounted to almost one-fifth of the amount of reduction in the entire bill while barely touching any other item in the bill for reclamation. In addition to that the democratic leadership saw fit to reduce the flood-control items in the civil-functions bill by more than 25 percent. On August 3, 1947, the day after Congress adjourned and all we Members of Congress were safely out of town. President Truman froze 50 percent of all the flood-control funds that Congress had appropriated. What happened, floods occurred all over the country. Then he accused the Eightieth Congress of being at fault for that job. Right this minute terrible floods are raging, in North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa. I have a clipping in my hand from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil which I am going to read to show you just what is happening in western Iowa, eastern Nebraska. Listen to it and then you will know just why I am so concerned:

MISSOURI CREST HIGHEST SINCE 1943—FLOODWATERS ROLL INTO LOWLANDS; SEE 22-FOOT RIVER STAGE

The highest crest of flood waters in the Missouri River since 1943 is moving down or southwestern Iowa.

Northward, it has overflowed thousands of acres of lowland, started taking toll of livestock.

A stage of 22 feet is forecast for Council Bluffs Friday. This is an increase of one-half a foot from the high forecast made last week end.

This means water above official flood marks for at least 5 days. It will be a severe test for many levees, drainage officials indicated.

The long crest of the river is apparently in the Yankton, S. Dak., area where a rise of only four-tenths of a foot was reported in the last 24 hours, the weather bureau said.

The river reached 19.2 feet here Monday. This is two-tenths of a foot over the official flood mark.

* * * * *

TWO LEVEE BREAKS

Two levee breaks were reported just north of Council Bluffs.

The Paxton levee west of Crescent broke Sunday night or Monday morning. Water was flooding the Findley Frost farm through a levee hole 100 to 150 feet wide.

A break in the Pigeon Creek levee overflowed the old Hanthorn lake bed. Waters were backing through the old Boyer River bed and over farmland of M. A. Smith.

Flood waters from the two breaks were expected to join and begin flooding land to the east.

Bottom-land farmers between Crescent and Honey Creek were moving livestock and furniture Monday morning. Levees were being built up on Honey Creek ditch and near Hoffman's saw mill, west of Honey Creek.

Just north of Council Bluffs, the river was flowing over the road near the Tyson farm, said Peace Justice Frank Larsen. It was covering adjoining wheat fields. This land is outside of the levee area.

Army engineers reported two additional breaks near the Blair bridge. About 320 acres were overflowed by a break in the Mencke levee on the Nebraska side, 2 miles above the bridge. Still another 320-acre area was inundated by a break in the Rand levee on the Iowa side just below the bridge.

BLENCOE THREATENED

Blencoe was threatened with floodwaters in its city streets Monday. Mayor Wayne Gotschall said the water had swept around the upper ends of the levee there and was within half a mile of the city limits. He plans to ask Gov. William Beardsley for National Guard "shovel battalions" if the situation becomes worse.

West of Whiting, the Sedig dike along the Missouri River broke and water rushed over 1,600 acres of land. Back waters coming through the Adams and Gard Lakes backed across Highway 366 at Onawa.

PMA officials were attempting to release all sealed corn in the flood's path and around Blencoe shellers were delivering free corn which is not under seal.

Farm facilities evacuated themselves and their livestock in the area southwest of Blencoe around Pickle City. Army engineers are advising all farmers west of Highway 75 from Blencoe to the Harrison County line to be prepared to move before Wednesday.

The Sioux City Board Club's Elmwood golf course, across the river in South Dakota, was "pretty well covered," an official reported.

Seventy-five volunteers, headed by Marion Lockwood, chairman of the Dakota County flood-control committee, patrolled the 4-mile dike protecting South Sioux City.

The volunteers, many of whom, Lockwood said, have not "closed their eyes in three nights," dumped 1,000 sandbags along the river Sunday night, working under the powerful lights of a portable electric plant.

Nearly 5,000 acres of farm land were reported flooded in Dakota County, Nebr., across the river from Sioux City. About 10 families have evacuated the area and others are preparing to move.

A crest of 18 feet is expected at Sioux City Tuesday morning.

* * * * *

After a high of 90° Sunday, highs in the low 50's were predicted for Tuesday, which will be partly cloudy, windy and cool.

Monday was a gray day, mostly cloudy with light showers and mercury reading in the mid 50's. Northwesterly winds blew between 25 and 35 miles an hour here.

Some hail and a half inch of rain were unofficially reported Monday morning at Hamburg.

We tried to get a valley-wide soil conservation and flood prevention adopted in the last session of the Eightieth Congress. That Congress authorized a survey to be made of the Missouri Valley in its entirety to determine what we could do to prevent floods and to build up our soil. But the head office of the Department of Agriculture saw fit to carry on a greater research program which would cost $3,500,000,000 over a period of 30 years instead of the $1,000,000,000 program which we authorized. To this very day we have not been able even to get a bill before a committee of Congress to consider either report. That report which was submitted by the Soil Conservation and Forest Services was to cover the whole Missouri Valley and would have done a grand job. Had it been put in operation last year it would have lowered the flood crest considerably. So what have we been getting? We have been getting a good run-around and a good smack in the face—we folks who need flood control so badly in the Missouri Valley. I refer you to my speech of April 5, page 4871 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My people are getting pretty sick and tired of it, and all the folks in the Missouri Valley area see the handwriting on the wall and know the purpose behind the whole thing. The whole purpose is to force, by hook or crook, a Missouri Valley Authority on the people of that great Missouri Valley, so that a few boys appointed by the President can run the

people of that valley to suit themselves. Most of the people in the Missouri Valley can see through this Socialist trick and will fight it to the last ditch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. I yield myself one additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am grateful for the gentleman's interest in the Missouri Valley. He has done a lot of work on it. I want to point out that the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri Valley is also flood control.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. It is in that area where the arid and semiarid lands meet, and the same structure is both flood control and irrigation, and there is flood control in this chapter. I also want to commend the gentleman's fine work in soil conservation, because the more conservation we have of our soil the more service we will get out of these dams that the Government is building, and the longer they will last.

Mr. JENSEN. Soil conservation is also flood prevention.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my friend who is having plenty of flood worries just as myself right now.

Mr. LEMKE. I want to suggest that about one-quarter of my State has been under water all the way from 2 to 10 feet, and more, and that a great deal of feed and seed has been destroyed. Also roads and bridges, and therefore we will need an appropriation, because these people cannot take care of it now. It has been a real disaster, and I hope that some of the millions taken out of this bill may be put back somewhere so as to help out in this disaster.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has again expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who has done an outstanding job as chairman of this committee. He has taken a real interest in the development of our great natural resources. I wish to say the same about my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON.

It also should be pointed out that our clerk, Claude Hobbs, has been of invaluable assistance in providing the kind of technical aid that is so necessary in perfecting a bill of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I know that many Members of this House are businessmen or have had business experience. I am sure that many of them have had the experience of deciding just how much they are going to lay aside for the wear and tear of their plant and equipment, and just how much they were going to invest in the development of new equipment, in order to prepare for the growth of their business.

In a sense, when we in the House of Representatives consider the budget for the Department of the Interior, we are making just that sort of decision for the greatest producer in the world—Enterprise U. S. A. This tremendous productive enterprise has 150,000,000 stockholders. We are acting on their behalf, as a sort of board of directors. We are deciding for them how much we should invest in the capital equipment of our Nation—that is, its natural resources.

Now, as directors of Enterprise U. S. A., there are a couple of considerations we simply cannot avoid. One of them is that we simply must plan for a growing enterprise—there is no alternative. No sensible businessman turns his head away from the facts. It is a plain fact that the population of our country grows by about two and a half million persons every year.

It is a plain fact that about 800,000 more people are looking for jobs every year.

It is a plain fact that unless we plan to have this enterprise called the United States produce more every year and employ more people every year, then we must plan to see the produce and dividends for each of its stockholders dwindle every year, and the rolls of the unemployed grow.

Now any businessman realizes that plant and equipment do not spring up in a day. If he wants to expand his business, he plans as far ahead as he can, and he begins building months before he wants to increase his production.

The Department of the Interior, in preparing its budget, and your committee, in considering that budget, have looked ahead to America's future needs, knowing that some of our resources, such as hydro-electric power, that remain to be—and that need to be more fully developed—take years of planning and construction before they can be put to work for Enterprise U. S. A. Much of our farm and range land is worn out and ought to be retired. To replace this land, and to meet the demands of growing population, will require the reclamation of great areas of land that will be fertile if we can bring water to it. This, too, takes years to accomplish. Some of our resources—such as our soil and our timber—are being wasted because we are not taking care of them properly. If we fail to undertake programs to care for these resources, then we are guilty of waste—and the waste is probably much greater than the cost of, say, an erosion control or a sustained-yield forest program.

Now as businessmen, and directors of Enterprise U. S. A. we ought to take a careful look at the financial strength of our business—to see just how much we can afford to invest in the development of our plant and equipment. But we have also got to answer the question—"Can we afford not to invest in a growing America?" "Can we afford to let any of our resources go to waste?"

Enterprise U. S. A. is a little different from most businesses—it's got a bigger borrowing power than most businesses—because it can borrow just as long as its stockholders—the American people—have confidence in it as a growing enterprise. A deficit in dollars is bad—but we have learned that we can survive it.

But a deficit in resources is something a great deal more serious. Sometimes it can never be overcome—if the resources run out completely. Sometimes it can be remedied—but it might take years—and billions of dollars to do it.

We might think, just for a moment, what a deficit in resources might have meant to our war-production effort, not many years ago. Half of our aluminum production during the war came out of the Pacific Northwest. The greatest atomic reactor in the country was located in the Northwest—solely because of the great sources of electric power available from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams and the abundance of water from the Columbia River. What if we had not undertaken the construction of these mighty dams years before the war? What if they had not been waiting—ready to pour out millions of kilowatts of energy? Could we have sat around for 3 years or 5 years—in the middle of the war—while we built a Grand Coulee and a Bonneville?

I think it is clear that we directors, in considering whether or not we can afford resource-development programs, we have got to realize just what a "deficit in resources" really means to this enterprise, and we have got to ask ourselves, "Can we afford to even leave open the possibility of a resource deficit?"

Now your committee, in recommending this Interior budget to you, has taken into consideration the financial strength of Enterprise U. S. A. We have realized that this "budget for resources" had to be fitted in with a "budget for defense," and "a budget for veterans," and many others, and that all of these budgets have to fit as closely as possible the ability of our stockholders to invest in our enterprise. We have made an over-all cut in the budget of about 7 percent. We have made every cut only after the most careful consideration, asking ourselves, "Can we afford not to make this investment in our future?" as well as "Can we afford to make the expenditure?"

We have realized that, in a program as large as Interior's, there is bound to be some waste. And where we have found waste we have tried to cut it out. But I firmly believe that you do not get rid of fat and waste by across-the-board percentage cuts. The fat on the bureaucratic body does not lie in an even layer near the skin. It collects in pockets that lie beneath the surface. You have got to put the bureaucratic body through a careful examination to see where the pockets of fat are located. If you do not, you are liable to cut a tendon or some much-needed muscle by wielding a "flat-bladed percentage kitchen knife" when what you really need is a surgeon's scalpel.

You will note that we have made the largest cuts in the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Park Service.

Now there is one thing that is quite clear and explicit about this Enterprise U. S. A.—speaking of it in terms of the Federal Government. It is not in business for its own profit. It is in business solely because of the profits and benefits it—and it alone—can give to its stockholders, the American people. The business of the Interior Department is to care for the Nation's capital resources, so that they will be available for use by the stockholders. Under our economic system the major portion of the profits can—and should—accrue to stockholders who are themselves engaged in competitive enterprise. I will show, in just a moment, in the case of Federal investments in power development, how these investments bring returns many times their own size—in terms of the Nation's wealth.

But since we are spending the stockholder's money, I think that we directors should be aware that much of the money we are spending is due to be returned to the Central Treasury. Every year, part of the investments we have made in the past are flowing back to the Treasury. As directors of this enterprise, we ought to look at the precise figures.

Out of an expenditure for fiscal year 1951 of $621,000,000, which your committee is recommending, $462,000,000, or 75 percent, is wholly or largely recoverable; that is, 50 percent or more of the outlay made by the Government will, over a period of time, be returned to the Federal Treasury. So three-quarters of the Interior budget should not be considered a one-time outlay, but merely as an investment which will bring returns to the Treasury as well as adding wealth to private businesses.

During the current fiscal year, 61 percent of the Interior budget is largely or wholly recoverable.

Now, when a businessman wants to make an investment, one of the things he looks at is the record of past earnings. What is this record for the Interior Department?

In the current fiscal year, the receipts attributable to the Interior Department are estimated at about $153,000,000. For fiscal 1951, they are estimated at over $165,000,000. Both of these represent a return to the Treasury of about one-quarter of the outlay for the year.

In our subcommittee, we have tried to be hard-headed businessmen about this budget, and we have tried to place the emphasis on the expenditures which will be largely or wholly recoverable, in time, to the Federal Treasury, and on those which are now bringing in large receipts to the Treasury. The largest item in the budget, for example, is the Bureau of Reclamation, almost exactly half of the entire Interior budget. One-hundred percent of this is largely or wholly recoverable, and will return to the Treasury in time. In addition, the Reclamation funds are expected to have total receipts for this year of over $62,000,000.

Another large item is the Bonneville Power Administration, $46,500,000 in cash, plus $22,000,000 in contract authorization. All of this appropriation is recoverable. Total receipts for BPA are estimated at $33,000,000 for fiscal 1951, although a substantial part of this will go to the Reclamation fund. This does not include huge benefits to private industry, which I will describe in a moment.

Mr. Chairman, the report of the Appropriations Committee, which is available to all of the Members, sets forth in detail our findings on specific items in this budget. It would be repetitious for me to cover them again, and time does not permit it. I would, however, like to touch briefly on one item with which I am particularly familiar—and that is our investment in the development of power.

It seems to me there is a good deal of confusion about who benefits from our investment in power development. There is a good deal of talk about socialism, and a fairly widespread impression that it is only the Government that benefits. We in the Northwest have found that hydroelectric power has been the backbone of the development of private industry. I do not think I need to tell my good friends from the Tennessee Valley what power can mean to industrial development. They have seen money rolling into everybody's pockets down there since the Tennessee Valley Authority started in developing their valley.

We have seen the same sort of thing in the Northwest. Because of the great amounts of low-cost power available from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, we have atracted to our area great manufacturing plants who depend on power—particularly plants which use electricity to process metals.

The story is simply and graphically told in the history of 11 plants which located in Washington or Oregon primarily because of the power available. Five of these plants produce aluminum ingots—half of the Nation's supply, in fact. The other plants make chemicals, fertilizers, and other metals. Together, the 11 plants represent an investment of $200,000,000. Since 1939, their products reach a total value of $925,000,000. Their total pay rolls in that period amount to $137,000,000. In 1949 alone, they produced $155,000,000 in goods, employed about 7,500 workers, and paid out $27,000,000 in pay rolls. That is what they have meant to the Northwest alone.

But their production has meant employment, profits, and pay rolls in other parts of the country as well. In Iowa, Alcoa has a $20,000,000 aluminum rolling mill which employs 2,000 men, and which depends for part of its raw material on the Alcoa Vancouver aluminum plant. The Reynolds Metal Co. was able to open a rolling mill in Chicago and put 2,500 people to work by virtue of its aluminum reduction plants in Troutdale and Longview in Oregon and Washington.

These 11 plants have helped to support the local tax burdens—and in some cases, have succeeded in lowering the taxes paid by the citizens around the plants. Taxes in 1942 and 1943 on a 64-acre farm near the Troutdale aluminum plant in Oregon were $275. That was before Troutdale was built. Two years later, with Troutdale in operation, the assessed value of the farm had gone up, but its taxes were only $179.

That is the kind of industrial development that follows the development of large, low-cost sources of hydroelectric power. It adds to pay rolls, profits, and employment. Its success and popularity can best be measured by the fact that in the Northwest the demand for power still outstrips the supplies. Great quantities of resources are being wasted because the power is not available to exploit them. Many of our lumber companies in southern Oregon could be making hardboard and pulp out of "wood waste," but because they cannot get the power they are burning a lot of their waste or leaving wood material in the woods. We are beginning to find out that electric-furnace methods can refine a good deal of low-grade ores so that they will be commercially usable. But until we can get the power to develop them these ores will have to remain idle.

The investments required to develop large quantities of electric power are immense. Many of them can only be made by the Federal Government. But these are investments in the wealth of the Nation; they are not outright expenditures. The actual dollar outlay is returned to the Treasury, but the real wealth does not accrue to the Government. The real wealth is to be found in the hundreds of millions of dollars I described before, that appears as the produce of private enterprise, the additional hundreds of millions of dollars that have been paid by private concerns in pay rolls to private citizens.

In short, we in the Northwest have found that these Federal investments in power development have not hampered our private enterprise; they have been the firm backbone of our industrial development.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me impress three major points upon the members of this committee:

First. Because the Interior budget is essentially an investment in the capital plant and equipment of an expanding Enterprise U. S. A., we must ask ourselves whether we can afford not to make these investments.

Second. While a dollar deficit is serious today, a resource deficit will certainly be calamitous tomorrow.

Third. Without a fund of natural resources continually at its command in increasing quantities, how can our private-enterprise system—this great Enterprise U. S. A.—expect to prosper and grow in the future?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I have been tremendously impressed by the very thoughtful statement made by the gentleman. I was particularly impressed by his statement with reference to the effect of the development of hydroelectric power on an expanding enterprise.

Recently I have been again over most of the area in the Tennessee Valley. I doubt very much, as the gentleman emphasized, if there is any spot on the American continent or anywhere else in the world today where free enterprise is better entrenched and is in better financial position, with greater possibilities of expansion, than in that Tennessee Valley area.

I think the gentleman has brought to our attention some very significant points in connection with the total effect of these developments such as he has mentioned in his own area and in the Tennessee Valley, with reference to the assistance and the strengthening they give our free enterprise system.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Coming from the West, much of the interest I have in the legislation here is bound up in the Interior appropriations. I want to express my gratitude to the members of this committee for the job they have done. Like everyone else, I suppose, I feel that they could have retrenched in places other than the places they did retrench. However, looking over the committee, which is a cross section of this country and represents fairly, I think, the thought of the Congress, I feel very grateful to Mr. KIRWAN, who comes from the great State of Ohio, and who is not necessarily interested in reclamation and the problems which concern us in the West. I feel that he has been a great friend of the West, as have the other members of this great committee.

I am wondering if the gentleman has any figures there on repayments for reclamation projects. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us in cases where the projects are actually completed. As I understand it, you have them in all stages of construction and completion but where they are actually completed are they being repaid as we claim they are and the money being put back in the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In reply to my good friend, the gentleman from Utah, I will say these projects are being repaid. The total receipts for this fiscal year I believe aggregate some $153,000,000. The Bureau of Reclamation is the largest contributor. To my knowledge, to answer the gentleman's question specifically, all of these projects are paying back. Some of them are paying out in a shorter period of time than the others.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I compliment the gentleman for the excellent presentation he is making and also commend him for the work he has done while he has been a Member of the Congress to preserve the great natural resources of the Northwest from which section of the country both of us come. Is it not a fact that in the Bonneville project which the gentleman has mentioned in his discussion the payout schedule is some 10 years ahead of schedule? That is, that they are paying back the funds to the Federal Government 10 years faster thus far under the repayment schedule for amortization than was originally decided upon and that eventually every dollar with interest which the Federal Government has invested in that great project will have been repaid?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It is my understanding that the power feature of the Bonneville investment will be paid back with interest and that they are ahead on their pay-out schedule. Just how many years I do not know.

Mr. ANGELL. My understanding is that it is some 10 years.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement as well as the other members of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and others who have spoken. I would like to pose this question for the gentleman. Can we afford to remain static in this program or must we continually and progressively go forward? I have in mind the fact that some of the funds for surveys and investigations are curtailed somewhat in this bill whereas I also know the plans that we made for the great Central Valley which we felt were adequate some years ago now have proven to be inadequate due to the great increases in population in the West. I wonder what the gentleman thinks on that score.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. We have tried to strike a balance as the chairman of our committee pointed out. We really should be spending $2,000,000,000 on the resources of America in this bill. But unfortunately considerations with which we are all familiar make it impossible. We have, however, I believe, gone forward on the assumption that the very basis of our economy is an expanding one and that we cannot stand still if we hope to survive. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I think that it is admitted by all of us that an effective approach to a sound and efficient management program in Government is one of the major accomplishments of this administration. In making this statement I do not wish to minimize any of the accomplishments that have been made heretofore. Neither do I desire to leave the impression that it is my thought that there is no further need in such respect. However, the fact remains that more has been done in this particular recently, than in a long, long time.

The President's budget took into full account the need for economy while at the same time recognizing the dangers of cutting too deeply into Federal expenditures necessary for continued development of our country.

In a day when the people of the Nation are deeply concerned over the financial situation in our Government, and are demanding economies whenever and wherever it is possible to bring them about, there is a likelihood that Congress and its committees may unintentionally promote a program which is penny-wise and pound-foolish. I am deeply concerned regarding some of the cuts that have been made by the Committee on Appropriations wherein such cuts appear to have resulted in amounts far below those prepared by the budget. In my opinion there are many specific items which should be reconsidered and restudied. Some of these are to be found among the proposed appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management for the Department of the Interior. One is an item of $1,651,530 for the grazing administration; and another is an amount of $844,220 for land classification. Still others have to do with appropriations necessary to carry forward the entire Bureau program of disposal and management of the public domain.

It is not my intention at this time to offer any amendments to the bill before us. However, I do wish to call to the attention of the members of this committee that by following the proposals as now set forth in the bill, we are more than likely precipitating a program which in the end will cost our Government more money and will permit of less efficiency in this particular agency of Government.

My own State of Colorado contains 25,000,000 acres of public-domain lands that through careful management and selective disposal can reap large revenues for the State and Federal Governments.

We are especially aware in Colorado of the importance of safeguarding the watershed areas of public-domain lands. Our irrigated farmlands will suffer seriously if lack of management on watershed areas fills irrigation reservoirs with silt. We have spent millions of dollars for soil-conservation work, construction of dams, and flood-control work. However, many of the benefits of this work are lost if we do not furnish sufficient money to manage properly the vast areas of public-domain land that are an important segment of the watersheds in the West.

I mention also the item of land classification for this is closely connected with any of the management programs of the Bureau. There are millions of acres of public-domain lands that have not been classified for use. What are they good for? We don't know. The Government cannot manage them until they know what treatment is required or to what use they should be put. Money for land classification should be restored in full to this appropriation. Without money to classify them, these public lands cannot be turned into productive acres for the people's use.

The people are seeking opportunity to develop the public lands. This is evident in the greater number of applica-

tions received for oil and gas development. In my own State of Colorado we are especially concerned with the need for adequate help in the land office to handle the expected volume of oil-shale cases. Failure to provide sufficient land-office personnel will slow down this development. I seriously ask your reconsideration of the Bureau of Land Management appropriation.

This agency needs increased personnel to properly manage and protect the public domain and to carry increasing loads of land-use applications.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the Bonneville project, as you know, is situated on the Columbia River and lies within my district on the Oregon side and I am deeply interested in the Bonneville Power Administration and the excellent record it has made under the direction of Administrator Paul J. Raver.

The item in this appropriation bill, H. R. 7786 for construction, operation, and maintenance for the Bonneville Power Administration appears on page 219 of the bill as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction: For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $41,500,000, of which not to exceed $17,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $21,750,000: *Provided*, That unexpended balances of prior year appropriations, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, $5,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed 17 of which 12 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed 2) of aircraft; and printing and binding. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

In the committee report, page 162, this appropriation is discussed, as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Construction: The 1950 appropriation for construction by Bonneville Power Administration amounted to $26,284,500 and $16,239,500 of contractual authority. The 1951 estimate is $42,000,000, of which $17,000,000 is for liquidation of previously authorized contractual obligations, and additional contractual authority of $21,750,000. The committee recommends approval of a direct appropriation of $41,500,000 and contractual authority in the amount of $21,750,000. This would provide a net increase of approximately $14,000,000 in obligational authority for the fiscal year 1951. This increase is to continue the transmission construction program already approved and to provide additional transmission facilities needed to market power from new generating facilities presently under construction and approaching completion in the near future.

Operation and maintenance: The 1950 appropriation for operation, maintenance, power marketing, and general administrative expenses was $4,000,000. The 1951 estimate for these activities is $5,250,000. The committee recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000. The requested increase of $571,975 for maintenance of transmission system and $295,150 for operation of transmission system is approved, owing to the fact that the Administration will be operating a larger system in 1951. Also, there are certain items of deferred maintenance which need to be corrected. The reduction of $250,000 in the 1951 estimate should be applied against the total increase requested for power marketing and general administrative activities, since the estimates for the latter do not appear to be adequately justified.

Mr. Chairman, the hydroelectric-power projects on the Columbia River under the operation of the Bonneville Power Administration have proven themselves to be excellent investments for the United States Government. They are self-sustaining and are returning revenues to the Federal Government sufficient to repay all costs, together with interest, maintenance, and expenses.

As regards the financial side of the picture, Bonneville has continued to show an excellent record of financial pay-out of all power facilities in accordance with law. Not only have they met pay-out requirements, but they have exceeded these requirements. For instance, at the moment Bonneville Dam financial requirements are 10 years ahead of schedule, reducing the pay-out period, if further payments are made on schedule, from 50 years to 40 years. Pay-out requirements of Grand Coulee Dam and of the Bonneville transmission system have likewise been exceeded by substantial percentages. During the fiscal year 1949 the total operating revenue of the Bonneville Power Administration was $27,821,029, representing an increase over 1948 of 13.5 percent. Surplus net revenues for the same year, after deduction of all expenses of operation and maintenance, provision for depreciation, interest, and other deductions, was $10,665,769. Total gross operating revenues from the beginning of operations to June 30, 1949, were $157,687,195, and, after all required expenses have been met, this has left a surplus net revenue of $42,735,034. This is a clear demonstration that all moneys expended in the Pacific Northwest for power facilities represent only a loan that will be paid back with interest. It also represents an increase in wealth of the whole Nation, and, as such, the Federal Government will be repaid many times over its investments in my area.

I would like to say a word about some of the things that have been done by Bonneville in order to insure efficient operation and a financial picture such as I have described at power rates that are the lowest in the country. Many things have been done to achieve this goal, and one of these is advances in engineering developments that have resulted in decreases in construction costs, as well as operation and maintenance costs. For instance, by keeping constantly abreast of engineering developments and by moving into fields previously unexplored, it has been determined that insulation requirements of certain electrical equipment could be reduced, resulting in net over-all savings. In 1940, the average costs of large transformers were $7.25 per kilowatt of installed capacity. In 1949 these same costs were $3.81 per kilovolt-ampere of installed capacity. This, despite the fact that over-all costs of equipment nearly doubled over that period. The costs of steel towers have been reduced by the use of a tower design made by Bonneville engineers and which upon test proved to be entirely satisfactory for high-voltage transmission lines. These are only examples of many such things that have been done in order to insure that the Federal Government gets the utmost in value for every dollar invested.

Yes, the people entrusted with this job in my area have done an excellent job of using the facilities that were given them. We need additional facilities, and it is my hope that the power resources will be provided us as now scheduled, to prevent deterioration of our economic prospects by virtue of a lack of the most essential ingredient—power.

Mr. Chairman, I represent in the House the Third Congressional District in which the Bonneville Dam project is situated. My parents, as ox-team pioneers, traversed that great northwestern country almost within the sound of the Columbia River and having spent my life in the Pacific Northwest, I have developed a deep and abiding interest in the abundant natural resources of that area. During my service here I have deemed it a privilege and an honor to devote much of my time to the conservation, development and full utilization of these great natural resources in the Columbia River basin which are the key to the economic welfare of that great region.

During my service I have seen the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects through the development stage. Bonneville, as you know, is completed and the Grand Coulee Dam is near completion. We have in addition now under construction the McNary Dam on the Columbia and in the early stages the Chief Joseph Dam on the same river. The Columbia River and its tributaries has the greatest potential storehouse of electric power of any waterway in the Nation, some 20,000,000 kilowatts, of which less than 10 percent having been developed. The remainder of this great source of energy and power is flowing to the sea without let or hindrance with a resulting loss of untold millions of revenues which could come into the coffers of the United States.

The Bonneville plant during the war turned out 570,000 continuous kilowatts, which is equivalent to 8,800,000 barrels of oil. The 15-unit completed Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to 28,000,000 barrels annually. When McNary Dam is completed the oil saving will be about

15,500,000 barrels annually. The existing usable steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions, 5,000,000 barrels will be consumed. If this displacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be, in round numbers, 290,000,000 barrels annually, or about 95 percent of the total European consumption, or a quarter of our own prewar consumption. I cite these facts to show the importance of undeveloped hydro power in our future economy.

Unfortunately, we have no large deposits of coal or of oil in the Pacific Northwest, but the enormous pool of hydroelectric power stored in the Columbia and other rivers compensates for this loss. The McNary Dam project alone will provide the necessary energy for industries which have aggregated a total investment of $100,000,000 and supply employment to 100,000 residents of the Northwest. It is estimated that benefits to navigation from this great dam will reach a million dollars a year and it will reduce pumping costs for lands adjacent to the pool approximately $300,000 a year. The power alone generated at this huge project will return to the Government $17,500,000 a year to produce which 3,000,000 tons of coal or 11,000,000 barrels of oil would be required. It is significant to recall that hydroelectric power is not expendable like oil, gas, or coal, and that as long as the sun shines and water falls this great source of energy will work round the clock in the interests of the great industries of the Pacific Northwest.

I am proud to say that I have been a vigorous advocate of the development of these great resources of the Northwest not alone because they spell prosperity for the area but because they are wise investments for the Nation as a whole. The power developments are returning every dollar invested together with interest and maintenance and other costs properly allocated to the projects. This Nation in the exercise of wisdom, instead of curtailing the development of these great revenue-producing projects, should make available the necessary funds for full development as rapidly as the demand for electric energy requires.

On a number of occasions in the past I have addressed the House on the matter of the power-supply situation in the Pacific Northwest. These reports were given in support of appropriations to be made for hydroelectric generating plants and for transmission facilities critically needed if that region were to make reasonable approach to a solution of this very serious problem. My purpose now is to give a further report as regards this situation at the present time.

Before proceeding further, I must acknowledge the work of the many Members of the House and commend them for what they have done toward the solution of the power-shortage problem in the Pacific Northwest. I wish to thank those Members very sincerely for what they have done in this regard.

For the past 2 years this region has been increasingly short of power. A few months ago I would have said that the last winter had been the most crucial period to date. I must now say that so far, this winter has been the most crucial to date. The situations are very similar in that there has been inadequate capacity to carry the maximum loads and, although over-all water supplies turned out to be better than minimum, there has still been insufficient power available to carry the loads that have developed. This has been very detrimental to the region not only by reason of the necessity for voluntary load curtailment but also by reason of the fact that certain new industries which desired to commence operations could not do so because the required power is not available. By mutual agreement among the power operators, no new loads above 500 kilowatts are being accepted in the Pacific Northwest because there is not power available to serve them. Many existing businesses and industrial plants have had to rearrange their operations to reduce power consumption during peak hours and, in some cases, it was actually necessary to cut back production to conserve power.

This last requirement has been very definitely true this winter with regard to the aluminum industry. For a period of about 6 weeks, between October and December, so-called interruptible power supplies to the aluminum plants were cut off because of the threat that occurred at that time that a low-water period was in the offing. Fortunately, early in December the water situation improved, and these supplies of power were restored. It should be pointed out, however, that curtailment of aluminum operations by virtue of this interrupted power supply was responsible for increased unemployment, but for that matter the whole power situation tends in that direction, because curtailment in any degree must necessarily be reflected in employment figures.

This restoration of interruptible power to the aluminum industry, made early in December, was not the complete picture, however. This winter has been most severe throughout the Pacific Northwest area, and this has resulted in peak loads beyond those estimated. During January it became necessary to cut off interruptible power deliveries during the evening peak loads for a good part of the month, and sometimes it was necessary during the morning peak loads. On January 31 it was necessary to cut off interruptible power for most of the day. The highest peak load on the Bonneville Power Administration's system occurred on January 4 and was 2,106,000 kilowatts. The peak load for the previous year occurred on January 4 and amounted to 1,698,000 kilowatts. It is significant that in January 1950 at the highest peak period, the Bonneville Power Administration was delivering 408,000 kilowatts more than in the corresponding period for the previous year, whereas only 324,000 kilowatts of generating capacity were added during the year. This has been possible by the simple expedient of overloading the machinery as far as it was reasonably possible to do so, but operating conditions were certainly not of the best. In 1949, during the high-peak period, frequency sagged to 59 cycles. In 1950 frequency sag was 59.4 cycles at this peak period. I should further point out that a decrease in frequency occurred a number of times over the peak periods in January 1950. What this means is simply that the load was greater than the ability of the generators to supply it, causing them to slow down, and this further results in unsatisfactory operating conditions throughout the area. May I again emphasize that this was the result of the load on the system at that time. It does not take into account the load that could have been served had there been facilities for generating and transmitting the power. I should further point out that during these heavy-load periods, every available resource in my region, either steam or hydro, was operating at its utmost capacity, leaving absolutely no reserve. This is not only an intolerable operating situation but is an exceedingly dangerous one. It leaves nothing to take care of load fluctuations that constantly occur and, if trouble developed with any of the generating equipment in the area, it is difficult to predict what the result would be, except that whatever it was it would not be good.

As I indicated previously, three new generators were installed at the Grand Coulee plant during 1949, and it is planned to install three additional units in 1950. It is further planned to install the last three units in this plant during 1951, but even with these additional installations the power-shortage situation will still prevail. A dependable power supply will become available only if construction of hydroelectric projects is maintained in accordance with the so-called schedule S that has been worked out between the Bonneville Power Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation. Even assuming the most rapid construction of new plants physically possible under normal procedures, the region's total requirements for power cannot be met in full on a dependable basis until the winter period of 1957–58. Until that time, cumulative load growth will exceed additions to firm generating capacity. In the interim period, if poor water conditions should occur, it will make it impossible to serve the potential loads in the area. I might further point out that in calculating potential capacity to serve expected loads, there is included imports from Canada, as well as all of the available steam capacity in the region. If construction proceeds on schedule, it is expected that by the 1957–58 period there will be available capacity to serve all potential loads, with a small margin of reserve. This is the forecast at this time of people who are experts in these matters, and represents their conservative judgment as of now. However, it is entirely possible that the shortage period may extend beyond that on the basis of later forecasts, because the present expectations do not extend this shortage period beyond that forecast several years ago.

There are a number of projects now under construction that will come into operation within the next few years. The Hungry Horse project is scheduled to go into operation in December of

1952. McNary Dam and Detroit Dam will come into operation in 1953, and, as I mentioned previously, additional generation will be installed to complete the Grand Coulee powerhouse. These facilities will add 1,200,000 kilowatts of new capacity to the area by 1953, which to many must seem to be a tremendous amount of power to take care of all foreseeable needs. This is not the case, however. This new generation will be absorbed as rapidly as it comes into operation, and will still leave a situation much the same as we are facing now due to the rapid increase in loads that has taken place and will take place between now and that time. Appropriations have been requested by the Corps of Engineers this year to start construction of Chief Joseph Dam that is scheduled to come into operation in 1956, with final installations being made in 1961, and this project will add another million kilowatts to available supplies by 1961. It is imperative that construction of this project be maintained on schedule, along with others included in schedule S.

The growth in power requirements are the result of an extremely rapid growth in population, coupled with expansion and electrification of farms, businesses, and industries in the area. In population growth, the Pacific Northwest has far outstripped the United States as a whole. In the period between 1940 and 1949, which is the major development period of the Bonneville Power Administration, the population of my State of Oregon has increased 59.3 percent. The population of our neighbor State of Washington has increased 48.7 percent. The Pacific Northwest average increase in population is 44 percent, compared with the United States average of 13 percent. We confidently expect a continued upward swing in population, and it is predicted that the increase for the next 10 years will equal that of the last 10 in number of people. Population increase, however, is only a part of the reason for growth in the region's nonindustrial power requirements. More electricity than ever before is being used by all classes of customers. Farms and businesses are rapidly finding new uses for power, and home consumption is steadily increasing.

Increases in industrial uses of power have likewise been rapid. The number of Northwest production workers has increased over 50 percent between 1939 and 1947, and value added by manufacture in the region increased from $454,000,000 in 1939 to $1,655,000,000 in 1947. It is expected that this trend will continue and that industrial use will more than double within the next 10 years, assuming that generating capacity is added as scheduled.

Along with the need for more generating capacity, an equivalent increase in transmission capacity will also be needed. The Bonneville Power Administration has included in their 1951 budget, requests for authorization of nine additional circuits that will be needed to transmit the additional 1,200,000 kilowatts of power that will come into operation between now and 1953. As new capacity is added, additional transmission lines will be needed. The major part, in fact approximately 80 percent of Bonneville's 1951 requests, are for major grid lines that are needed to carry the power to load centers to integrate projects and to relieve presently overloaded facilities.

The situation as regards generating capacity is closely paralleled by that of transmission capacity. There is no reserve at all. This is demonstrated by the fact that during the past year, five major power interruptions were experienced in the area, during which all major components of the Northwest Power Pool separated. The immediate cause of these were such things as lightning striking a transmission line, but their seriousness is a direct result of a badly overloaded transmission system that is constantly on the brink of instability. In one such instance, two lines that were originally designed to carry approximately 110,000 kilowatts, each were carrying 300,000 kilowatts when lightning struck one of the lines. The net result was a complete pool break-up because, when such overloaded line was interrupted by reason of the lightning stroke, this load was thrown on other lines already overloaded and they in turn were interrupted by automatic devices necessary for line protection. It is extremely important that these necessary transmission lines be provided in order to spare my region these costly service interruptions.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that these appropriations in this bill for construction, maintenance, and operation of the Bonneville Power Administration will not be disturbed. In fact, if any changes should be made in the allocation it should be by increasing the amounts rather than decreasing them. These projects are among the few operations of the Federal Government that are carried on with a profit to the Government and which pay their own way. As I have pointed out approximately 50 percent of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States is locked up in the Columbia River and its tributaries and only about 10 percent of this great pool of energy is now developed and put to useful purposes. The program for additional construction of hydroelectric projects should be carried on at an increasing speed in order to make available hydroelectric energy so vital to the economy of this great region in the Pacific Northwest and to fill the industrial, agricultural and domestic needs which are not being met by the generating capacity now available. This accelerated program can be carried out by the Federal Government without loss on a pay-as-you-go basis with full reimbursement to the Federal Government.

I want to thank my colleagues for their support of my efforts in the past to secure the needed appropriations for carrying forward this program of resources development in the Columbia River area.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, about 3 weeks ago I spoke at some length on this particular chapter of the appropriation bill. I am not going to take up very much time today. Rather, I would yield my time to some of the Members who have not had an opportunity to speak on the bill.

However, I do want to make a few observations.

I listened to my very dear and charming chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and while I can agree substantially with most of his remarks, I must confess that I do not think the great United States is such a bad place to live in.

I enjoyed the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], as I did the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. While we do not agree on policy, there are a great many things on which we are in accord.

I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] regarding the aluminum production. I am glad that he has an aluminum plant out there which, through cheap power, I might say, is able to take on 2,500 employees in his district. I am glad that he said the object of this great hydroelectric plant and the reclamation policy is for cheap power. Up until this time all we have heard is that they were afraid of brown-outs there, but today he has admitted on the floor that it is the cheap power they are interested in.

I have an aluminum plant in my district. It is capable of employing 3,500 men, but at the present time the anthracite region is in a very distressed condition. It is one of the topmost distressed areas in the United States. Yet that aluminum plant, which happens not to be in the good graces of the United States Government, the Aluminum Co. of America, is held down to about a thousand men, when they could readily employ 3,600. So this story has two sides to it.

I do come from the East, and I may say to my good friend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], that I have not for 1 minute tried to thwart the progress of the West. I believe my membership on this subcommittee has been such as to prove that I have tried to develop this great America of ours.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly agree with what the gentleman has said. The gentleman has certainly been fair in everything he has done for the development of the West, and everything else that pertains to this subcommittee. I want to say this: that the gentleman is a physician by profession, and he has been a most valuable member of that committee in looking after the health problems of the Indians; not only the Indians but the Eskimos in Alaska. He has done wonderful work. He was also chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of our committee during the Eightieth Congress. He traveled over 12,000 miles looking into the laboratories and mines and other problems, and he learned a great deal about them, and he has been very valuable because of that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I, as a colleague of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], want the membership to know how much we appreciate his work, and what he has done on this great committee. It has been stated that he is a doctor by profession. He comes from one of the blighted areas of America, the anthracite-coal region. Ours is a great industrial State. The district in which I live is the fourth industrial district in Pennsylvania, and the seventh in the world. We contribute nearly 12 percent to the national income. This man who stands before you modestly, quietly, yet efficiently, has done more, in our judgment, than any man we have ever had in this committee in recent years. I am glad to pay this tribute to him.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I will have to yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I hope the distinguished gentleman did not misinterpret any clumsy language I might have used. Certainly, it was my intention to pay the gentleman a very well-deserved compliment, and it was not criticism at all.

Mr. FENTON. Not at all. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, on April 6—3 weeks ago—I addressed the membership of the House in the general debate on this one-package bill. I outlined to you the routine and the mechanics of this one-package bill and the treatment afforded most of the members of the Appropriations Committee.

But I will not take up too much time today in the debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill. I shall gladly yield the most of my time to others who would like to talk on it. However, I would like to make a few observations which I have gathered in listening to the debate for the past few weeks.

You may recall that in my remarks on April 6, I dwelt at considerable length on the hospital situation in regards to our armed forces and the Veterans' Administration. Well, after 3 weeks or more there is still indecision as far as the Army hospitals are concerned and a defiant refusal of the VA to take over the Army hospital at Valley Forge. In the meantime, our veterans are still "hanging on the limb" waiting their turn for hospital admission.

One arm of our Government wants to get rid of hospitals. Another arm of our Government does not want to take them over and so the veteran is being kicked around. And let me say right here and now that this is not a political statement. It comes from one who, as a battalion surgeon of infantry in World War I, saw scores and scores killed in action and who treated hundreds on the field of battle. It sickens me to think that there are 2,785 veterans in Pennsylvania alone on the waiting list for hospitalization out of a total of 22,993 for the country as a whole.

In Pennsylvania our veterans hospitals are filled to capacity—that is 4,900 out of 5,138 beds occupied continuously—including the beds allowed for VA patients at Valley Forge which was discontinued as of February 15, 1950—and almost 2,800 men relegated to a waiting list. The Lord pity them while two bureaus of this great Government argue and quibble.

A little ray of hope, however, has just come to our attention. I bring it to you today so that you might know that the people of Pennsylvania are solidly behind the proposition that our veterans must be taken care of. Gov. James Duff has asked the Secretary of Defense to sell to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania the Valley Forge Hospital if the VA refuses to take it over. I am sure sufficient beds would be turned over to the VA in the event of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania securing the hospital. It would help out immensely until the new general medical hospitals at Altoona, Erie, and Wilkes-Barre are opened sometime this year, and the NP section of the hospital at Lebanon becomes available later this year.

Yes; here is an opportunity for this administration to act and not do so much talking about helping our veterans who need hospitalization—whether they be World War I or World War II veterans or Spanish War veterans; whether they be service connected or nonservice connected—they are veterans who fought to preserve this country.

Now this brings me to a portion of this chapter that has to do with this Government's mishandling of medical matters. If the handling of the medical service of the Indian Bureau and the present stupid work of the VA and our Defense Department is any criteria of the way socialized medicine or Government medicine would be to our people, then "Heaven help us."

I listened with a great deal of interest to the debate for several days on the chapter of labor and social security, and I want to congratulate the members of that subcommittee for the presentation of certain items in that chapter. But let me say to you that all the money in this world will not produce cures in heart conditions, arthritis, cancer, multiple sclerosis, insanity, or any of the well-known killers over night or perhaps many years to come. The medical profession has not been standing still. They have, down through the years, been working night and day studying all those problems. Scientists all over the country and philanthropists have been continually at work. The United States Public Health Service has done a fine job. The people of this country have given voluntarily for many years.

Certainly we are all in favor of the Government assisting financially in all those problems and it certainly helps and I hope quickens the day that cures for all those diseases will come. But I also hope and pray that those in government, having charge of the programs, will never conclude that they have all the brains and get as arbitrary as some people in this country who think that they can solve all those problems—with money. That goes for Members of Congress and even the Social Security Administration—yes, even the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am gravely concerned with the need for judging our Federal expenditures in relation to financial returns and to the industrial and economic life of our Nation. This administration is doing a real management job. The President's budget this year represented a most businesslike weighing of costs and benefits, especially in the conservation field.

The committee's report on the budget, however, in some instances has eliminated funds which are seriously needed for good Government management and maximum net return to the Treasury. I refer specifically to the amounts for the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior.

A total of $6,756,800 was allowed for this agency—that amount represents a reduction of $1,893,200 below the estimate in the President's budget. At this time I will not attempt to analyze each item, but I do want to call your attention to certain aspects of this agency's program which warrent additional funds, namely, its cadastral surveying program, and second, the range management and improvement program on the public domain.

In review I want to mention that the Bureau of Land Management exercises jurisdiction over the largest area of Federal land of any agency—180,000,000 acres in the continental United States and 290,000,000 acres in Alaska. In addition, it is responsible for the leasing of minerals on most Federally owned lands, totalling 700,000,000 acres, and on about 50,000,000 acres of privately owned lands in which the United States Government has mineral rights.

Careful management of these lands has resulted in increased revenues to the Government and the public-land States, of which Utah is but one. No Federal agency or business firm can continue to carry an increasing work load as this agency is doing without sufficient funds to employ adequate personnel. The Bureau of Land Management has made a record for itself in speeding up the processing of applications for public-land use, but there is still a backlog of veterans' applications to be processed. Applications for land use have more than doubled in the last 3 years, during which time personnel has decreased. This agency needs funds to increase its personnel to handle this greater volume of business. In my own State of Utah, the land office is swamped with oil, gas, and homestead applications. Delay in processing these gas and oil applications impedes development of much needed oil supplies and consequently affects employment opportunities in private enterprises all over the country. Furthermore, the Government loses money with every month's delay in awarding these leases.

I want to make special mention of the need for Bureau of Land Management funds to make cadastral surveys, and I want to point out that the Budget

approved $1,024,410 whereas the committee allowed only $743,000. This cut is of major concern to me because many Western States, such as my own, are losing revenue every day these surveys are delayed. Until the land is surveyed, the State cannot receive title and cannot obtain full revenue from its school lands.

I also want to call your attention to the range-reseedings and range-management projects. It will be impossible for the Bureau of Land Management to practice range conservation as it should be practiced with the sums allotted in the committee report. There are not sufficient range men in the area to protect the grazing resources from misuse and deterioration. One-half of the public-domain lands are in a serious to critical state of erosion. This land cancer we call erosion spreads from Government lands to private lands. We have talked much and thought much of conservation; but when we are denying funds for range-conservation programs, we are neglecting to take remedial measures to protect our natural land and water resources.

The grazing capacity of the range has been increased many times in areas where conservation programs have been followed. Besides adding to the forage supply, and consequently to the revenues collected, the heavier plant cover cuts down the movement of water over the ground surface and reduces erosion. The Bureau's reseeding work on the range in my State has been successful to the degree that the State has joined hands with the Federal Government under cooperative agreements, using available State and Federal funds in a combined program. In many areas, private funds have been contributed in substantial amounts so that more acres can be planted.

In conclusion, I just want to say that the Bureau of Land Management's conservation program is one which is needed to develop oil and gas leasing by private enterprise, to carry out important survey programs which are essential to State rights, to protect the natural resources, and to increase the grazing capacity on public domain lands. I am hoping that we may consider these items carefully and recommend that when final action is taken the appropriations be raised above their present level.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

(Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain quotations from hearings before the Public Lands Committee.)

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for this opportunity to address a few remarks to this committee concerning this bill. During my service in Congress I have been on the Public Lands Committee. I am, therefore, intensely interested in every phase of this legislation, and I hope when the bill is read for amendment under the 5-minute rule to address my remarks to several points. This afternoon I wish to speak very briefly on one matter of national policy, that of dealing with concessions in the national parks.

Since the end of the war the Committee on Appropriations has time and again brought up the matter of the lack of legislative policy in regard to concessions in national parks. They have requested, I believe first in 1947 that the Committee on Public Lands write a policy regarding concessions. Also, the Interior Department has time and again indicated the need for more legislation in regard to this matter. Law is almost nonexistent as regards policy for park concessions; present legislation simply gives the Department of the Interior the right to regulate and maintain the parks; it does not go much beyond that. Our committee has, over the last 5 years, held extensive hearings on park concessions. We have held them here in Washington. We have had Mr. Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Drury, Director of the National Park Service, and at hearings out in the national parks we have had concessionaires and people who visit the parks, appear before us.

I may say at this point that there is a wide difference of opinion among not only those who visit the parks but those in the Department of the Interior as to the proper policy that should be followed in connection with park concessions. I think Mr. Davidson perhaps represents one point of view. He believes all concession facilities, and I think I am indicating his thought correctly, the hotels, the bath houses, and the lunch counters, and so forth, should be owned by the Federal Government. On the other hand, there are many in the Department of the Interior and many in the Park Service and on the Public Lands Committee who do not go along with that policy.

We believe that those facilities should be built and operated by private enterprise, wherever possible.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that these concessionaires or many of them have spent millions upon millions of dollars to build hotels, cabins, recreational facilities and so forth for the visitors. They only have about 4 months of the year in which to collect any revenue.

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Generally speaking, the concessionaires have done a most wonderful job in taking care of the people who visit these parks at a rate that most people can pay.

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct. Our committee recognizes that. Last year, 1949, some 31,864,180 people visited the national parks and monuments of this country. There are at the present time facilities to accommodate only half that number of people or about 15,000,000.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the subject the gentleman is discussing about the concessionaires in our national parks. I am interested in it from this viewpoint and I want the gentleman's opinion on it: In some of our national parks, particularly where there are mountains, and rather high mountains, there are concessions on top of the mountain for shelter and food. People sometimes climb the mountain, spend the night and come back the next day.

The question is this: I have thought for some time we should require of a concessionaire on the top of a mountain that he provide, or that we provide on behalf of the Government, some sort of shelter facilities where a fire could be built for persons who may get wet and cold climbing the mountain and who reach the top without any place to go unless they go into some of the facilities of the concessionaire. Most of the time these are filled. I have one or two experiences along the line of where a large group of people became very cold in a drizzling rain going up the mountain, then were unable to find facilities on top to warm themselves and dry their clothes because all of the concessionaire's facilities were filled.

Mr. D'EWART. I think our committee recognizes in its study that we must have three classes of facilities in our national parks; one for the deluxe trade who are willing and able to pay a large price for accommodations; second, for the ordinary person of medium income, and, third, for those who walk in or go in by bicycle or in an old car, who are not able to pay more than a minimum but certainly have a right to visit these parks. We recognize those three groups and we recognize that facilities for the last group must be provided.

Our investigation has shown that the concessionaires are willing and able at this time to spend some $29,000,000 or more, if it is necessary, to provide large additional facilities which are needed in the national parks to accommodate the thirty-odd million people who will visit them this year. In studying the question we have found there are only two courses to follow: Either the Federal Government must write a policy of building all of these facilities, deluxe and all the others, or we must write a policy that will encourage private enterprise to provide the facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point to include in the RECORD a number of references, taken from our committee files showing the need of legislation that would establish a national park concession policy:

REFERENCES BY DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR TO LEGISLATIVE DETERMINATION OF NATIONAL PARK CONCESSION POLICY

I have already explained these policies to the House Public Lands Committee, as you know. I explained to the House Public Lands Committee that the Department recognizes that franchise and entrance fees are basically matters of congressional policy. I explained further that the Department, of course, will be guided by any decisions of the Congress affecting the administration of the parks but that, in the meantime, the Department feels obliged to pursue the policies described in order to fulfill its obligation under existing law to provide the public with needed facilities. (Letter of November 1, 1948, from

Assistant Secretary Davidson to Secretary Krug.)

Some of the recommendations (of the Concession's Advisory Group) are adopted herein as the policy of the Department; others, however, involve considerations on which it is believed that guidance from Congress should first be sought. (Concessions Policies of the National Park System, November 1, 1948, Approved by J. A. Krug. Secretary of the Interior, pp. 1–2.)

We feel that it is necessary for the Congress to pass on matters of that kind (franchise fees and entrance fees) because there is obviously a difference in what this advisory committee has recommended and what the Appropriations Committee seems to want.

Now that is an impossible situation for a department, trying to carry out the laws of Congress, to be in. It was for that reason that we wanted to present it and have a full discussion of the matters of this kind with the committee. It was those general principles we did want to discuss, and we want to discuss them with this committee, which is our legislative committee, before we conclude these long-term contracts.

However, I would assume that since the law now charges us with the responsibility of negotiating and executing contracts, and we will set forth the policy we think should be incorporated in those contracts—that it is then our duty to go on and execute contracts after having presented these matters to this committee of the Congress.

Of course, if there are some laws which you start through, we will see if matters cannot be delayed. (Assistant Secretary Davidson testifying before House Public Lands Subcommittee, Hearings on H. R. 2312, May 21 to June 16, 1948, p. 126.)

In connection with Mr. Barrett's statement, I would like to make it clear that we do intend and want to submit the general principles to this committee. (Ibid. p. 128.)

The majority of the recommendations in the advisory group's report are adopted as the policy of this Department, as indicated in this policy statement. Others, however, involve considerations on which it is believed that guidance from the Congress is necessary. (Ibid., pp. 130–131.)

Whether the viewpoint that visitors to the parks should be required to pay something more toward the cost of their administration and protection than those persons who do not visit the parks, or whether the viewpoint expressed by the concessions advisory group should be adopted, is essentially for the Congress to determine. (Ibid., p. 131.)

Through the waiver of franchise fees, funds should be made available, if necessary, for improvements, rehabilitation, and additions, and for the amortization of new facilities. This is one of the problems which we feel that the Congress should give us some advice on. (Ibid., p. 136.)

NOTE.—It is clear from his subsequent testimony that the only "advice" that Assistant Secretary Davidson would heed would consist of a change in the law. This is evidenced by the following colloquy on the resolution passed by the subcommittee directing the Secretary not to disturb existing concessioners' operations under extensions of expired contracts pending further study by the subcommittee and recommendations by it of policy-fixing legislation.

"Mr. MILLER. I would like to ask the Secretary a question here. It is the intent of the Secretary to follow the spirit of the resolution which we have just passed, not to disturb the contracts for 1949, or will you disregard the desires of the committee?

"Mr. DAVIDSON. I think I made my position clear in my original statement.

"Mr. MILLER. You can answer 'Yes' or 'No' without any trouble.

"Mr. DAVIDSON. I specified in my original statement that the Congress has enacted certain laws directing us to provide facilities in the national parks for the accommodation of the people. If the Congress passes laws changing that, or saying that we should not do that, we will, or course, respect the laws of Congress.

"Mr. MILLER. Then unless we pass this through both Houses you have no intent of respecting the wishes of this body?

"Mr. DAVIDSON. I am afraid if we in any way disregard the laws of the Congress——

"Mr. MILLER. You have answered it." (Ibid., pp. 232–233.)

"The CHAIRMAN. Are you making any recommendations for legislation, Mr. Drury?

"Mr. DRURY. Yes; we have quite a list of matters, Senator, upon which we expect to make recommendations, some of them relating to management of the national park areas. There will be, undoubtedly, as a result of this report and policy statement, a proposal on this matter of the ultimate public ownership of concessions facilities. That undoubtedly will be embodied in legislation." (Director Newton B. Drury, National Park Service, testifying before Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, January 31 to February 7, 1949, pp. 281–289.)

Davidson, August 4, 1949:

Page 530: "This is a matter that the committee should properly consider."

Page 535: "Problem of financing these facilities is one which must be met by Congress."

(c) (Unprofitable operations should be abandoned): "It is up to the committee to decide whether this suggestion should be adopted."

Page 563 (financing): "I have pointed out that I think this committee should consider whether our policy is too liberal."

Page 574 (What is proposed by Department?): "That is the question we are presenting to you as the Congress, to tell us what you think should be done."

Page 575: "We hope that this committee will prepare and produce such legislation that it feels is desirable to provide the necessary facilities to take care of the traveling public in the parks."

Bottom of page: "If the committee comes to the conclusion that private capital cannot be raised to provide these facilities then we may be able to present such recommendations as the committee would ask us to on that subject."

Page 620 (on offering value to old and new concessioners): "Whether it is right or wrong I think is a matter for the committee certainly to decide and to tell us what they want us to do in the future."

Page 630 (appreciate hearing): "So we can see where we are heading, etc."

Page 653: Mrs. Bosone: "Mr. Davidson, has said 'whatever the committee wants is agreeable to him.'"

Davidson: "Thank you."

Chairman: "Yes, if the Congress will fix a policy, then the Secretary will follow that policy."

Davidson, August 11 (renewal of contracts): "That is a particular kind of policy on which I want a determination, on which we want a determination from this committee and the Congress as to how we should handle that everywhere."

In making this study, I think the members of the Public Lands Committee, and a good many people in the Department of the Interior, are agreed, that six principles must be recognized if we are to have the necessary funds provided by private enterprise to give necessary park facilities for the accommodation of the public:

First. A certain security of investment. A person will not invest money without some assurance of return of capital.

Second. An opportunity to realize a fair and reasonable profit.

Third. In fixing rates and charges, they shall be judged by comparison with similar enterprises outside the park, giving thought to the length of the season and other limitations.

Fourth. Franchise fees should be based on probable value to the private investor of the privilege that is granted in operating the facility.

Fifth. A right to renewal when the service has been satisfactory to the public and to the Federal Government. When that service has been satisfactory to the Government and to the concessionaire, certainly there should be right of renewal.

Sixth. A recognition of possessor interest, that is, a right to operate that facility as long as they have a balance of equity in the investment in which they have placed their money.

So, our committee has made this study. They are directing their staff to draft a bill in cooperation with the National Park Service that will encourage private enterprise to provide these facilities that are needed in the national parks to accommodate these millions of people who have a right to expect that they will find a place to eat, a place to sleep, and shelter such as is necessary within our national parks.

It is not all national parks and monuments that need these facilities within their borders. Wherever it is possible these facilities should be provided outside of the national parks, but many of them are so large, so extensive in their areas, that hotels and camping grounds and other facilities must be maintained inside the parks for visitors.

As I have said, we must reach a decision. Will the Federal Government take over and nationalize these concessions, or will we encourage private enterprise to go in and do this job? I think that the Congress, and I believe our committee, and I believe most of those within the Park Service, would like to see private enterprise do this job under adequate regulations; accommodations that are necessary for health, pleasure, and recreation when they visit the area.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the statement of Don Hummell, president and general manager, Lassen National Park Co., as showing the difficulties under which park concessioners labor at this time in trying to negotiate a contract with the National Park Service, a satisfactory contract which will encourage private enterprise to build the facilities necessary for the accommodation of park visitors. I can assure you this is not an isolated example.

[Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives, on June 12, 1948]

STATEMENT OF DON HUMMELL, PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, LASSEN NATIONAL PARK CO.

Mr. HUMMELL. I am Don Hummell, president and general manager of the Lassen National Park Co., a concessionaire in Lassen Volcanic National Park. My statement today will attempt to show the position that some of the concessionaires find themselves in as a result of the change of policy. I will make this as succinct and brief as I can.

In 1933 the United States Government through the National Park Service gave our company a temporary permit to build facili-

ties in Lassen Volcanic National Park for the accommodation of visitors. That was a very small operation, as most of the visitors to the park were fishermen or campers. The road has just recently been completed and there was no real index as to what the travel in the park would be. After operating for approximately 2 years and having one remaining year to go, and as the travel exceeded expectations there was additional investment required in the park.

I proceeded to Washington and contacted the Branch of Concessions of the National Park Service, a Mr. Charles Gable, since deceased. When I was shown the contract that I was to sign, and being just fresh out of law school, I was considerably apprehensive because it seemed to be all on one side. I called attention to the fact of the number of instances where the Secretary's decision was final and the Secretary had complete discretion. At that time I was told by Mr. Gable that that was the language that had been used for some 30 or 40 years and that nothing that I could do or say, or nothing that he could recommend, would change that language, and in his words I had to rely on the good faith of the United States Government. He said that all the other contracts had similar language, and that they had operated under those contracts for some 30 years, and the policy of the Government was that if you performed satisfactory service your contract would be renewed.

On the basis of those assurances, I signed the contract for 10 years. That was to expire in May of 1946.

Pursuant to the contract that I signed in 1935, we put in additional facilities and reinvested all of our earnings, as there has never been a stock dividend to the stockholders in our company since the day it was organized. Every cent of earnings plus everything that we could borrow went into the construction of facilities in the park. The members of the company were on the pay roll only for short periods of 3 months and then sought other jobs during the winter so as not to burden the company with too much overhead. Our services, I believe, were satisfactory to the parks. We have never had any indication to the contrary.

Then the war came along and as the members of the company were of military age we found ourselves in a difficult position of not being able to comply with our contract in that we had no management, so with the good offices of the National Park Service we talked with the National Parks Concessions, Inc.

Mr. BARRETT. Were you in the service?

Mr. HUMMELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARRETT. For how long?

Mr. HUMMELL. Four years.

Mr. BARRETT. What branch of the service were you in and where did you serve?

Mr. HUMMELL. Army Air Forces. I served in north Africa, India, China, and the Philippines.

Mr. BARRETT. Were your partners also in the service?

Mr. HUMMELL. My partner was deferred for his work in the State Department, but he was of military age. We made a contract with National Parks Concessions, Inc., to get us out of our dilemma that we were in, in that we were not able to provide management for our firm. This contract was made, according to my understanding, not with the idea that any profit would result, because we did not expect profit, but to aid us in that we were engaged in the more important duties connected with the war. There was the further necessity of attempting to provide public service during the war years in Lassen Volcanic National Park.

I was quite disturbed the following year to hear that the company would not continue its operation and was exercising its right to get out of the contract at the end of that year. However, they were curtailing their activities in one of the other parks and allowed us to hire directly the manager which they had furnished under the contract, and we continued his services on a salary basis without real or apparent direction from us.

At the end of 1944 this company called their manager back to their service and we were left without a manager. I received that word when I was in China, and immediately asked the Army for relief. I was granted a 30-day leave to return to the United States, and did return.

Upon my arrival in the United States I contacted a man who was a school teacher and the principal of a school in Piedmont, Calif., and who had worked one season with the National Park Concessions, Inc. I had a short discussion with him and gave him the authority to write checks on our bank account, and gave him the keys to the place and sent him up, and I returned to China.

In 1946, toward the end of January, I returned from overseas and was released from the Army. As our contract was expiring in May of that year I immediately proceeded to Washington, D. C., to negotiate a new contract. I was met with a very friendly attitude in the National Park Service and sat down with the members of that organization and negotiated a contract. We wrote it, I signed it, and we sent it in for approval, which in the past had always been a mere formality. All the problems had been worked out with the National Park Service. I returned then to the park to get things ready as the facilities had been seriously depleted during the war. There was no maintenance and there was a totally inadequate staff. Much of our equipment had been taken during the war years when people could not buy blankets and could not buy sheets and could not buy pots and pans, and most of those things had disappeared with our previous guests.

It was about 2 months later that I received a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior which was directed to Mr. Drury, the Director of the National Park Service. This letter said in substance that regardless of the obstacles that appeared insurmountable, every effort had to be made to extend facilities in the national parks to take care of the increased travel which was expected through the cessation of rationing. On the basis of that information, and on the fact that I had negotiated a contract with the National Park Service and we seemed to be in complete accord, I went to the bank and advised them of the position that I was in and that we needed additional capital. They looked at my operating statement and asked me what the terms of the new contract were, and I told them they were in substance what we had always operated under, and I borrowed additional sums.

Then through the War Assets Administration, and by the fact that I was a veteran, I was able to get adequate equipment which I otherwise would not have had an opportunity to purchase. I spent altogether that year about 8 months visiting one War Assets camp after another, buying houses and tearing them down to get the lumber to build additional tent platforms and using every facility which I had available through my veterans preference to get equipment to continue the operation. Those operations were established and as far as I knew everything was satisfactory until the Chapman memorandum came out in June.

Then I was informed that it was the policy of the Secretary of the Interior to hold up all contracts until such time as these basic policies were worked out. I now find myself in the position of having incurred obligations, made representations to the bank, used all my veteran's preference, after having in good faith sat down with the National Park Service, and they certainly were in good faith, and had been the agency that we had always dealt with.

Now, I am told that my company's assets are supposed to be broadcast to the public to see if somebody else would rather come in and operate them. I am in a position where I cannot even meet that competition on equal terms, for although we have invested some $137,000 in the park I have a book value of around $45,000. I am entitled to earn 6 percent on my net worth, or $2,700, and any man who comes in there is going to have to take it over on an appraised value, and he will be able to earn 6 percent on whatever the appraised value of the assets is.

Those assets, in my opinion, will not be appraised under $200,000 because of the increased cost of construction.

That, in brief, is the situation I now find myself in, along with the other members of my company.

Mr. BARRETT. The situation then resolves itself down to a point, Mr. Hummell, that after 4 years' service in the Army you find yourself confronted with the proposition whereby the Government that you served during the war years is willing to say to some third person, "We will allow you 6 percent on approximately $200,000," or somewhere in the neighborhood of $12,000 a year, whereas they say to you, "Mr. Hummell, you have to be satisfied with an income of $2,700." Is that about it?

Mr. HUMMELL. In substance, that is the position I find myself in; yes, sir.

Mr. BARRETT. It is kind of tough.

Mr. HUMMELL. It is not pleasant.

Mr. BARRETT. It does not seem fair, equitable, right, or in the interest of justice, or in the best interests of the Government.

Mr. D'EWART, do you have any questions?

Mr. D'EWART. No contract has been offered to you at the present time?

Mr. HUMMELL. No, sir; it has not.

Mr. D'EWART. Short nor long?

Mr. HUMMELL. Well, I am operating under an extension which expires the 31st day of December of this year.

Mr. D'EWART. And you have invested $137,000?

Mr. HUMMELL. With my associates; yes, sir.

Mr. D'EWART. How much have you had to borrow?

Mr. HUMMELL. Well, we have borrowed practically from the day we started at one phase or another. We put in an original investment and then borrowed and reinvested all our depreciation and earnings. I owe in excess of $53,000 now.

Mr. D'EWART. If you sign the proposed contract you would be allowed 6 percent on $137,000; is that right?

Mr. HUMMELL. No, sir; I would be allowed 6 percent on my net worth, which is $45,000.

Mr. D'EWART. On $137,000, minus depreciation?

Mr. HUMMELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. D'EWART. You would be allowed no income on what you borrowed?

Mr. HUMMELL. None other than what interest I pay, which is an expense of operation.

Mr. D'EWART. That is an expense of operation, but you are not allowed to earn anything on the money you borrow?

Mr. HUMMELL. No, sir.

Mr. D'EWART. Why do you borrow if you cannot earn any money on which you borrow?

Mr. HUMMELL. I am sure I could not answer that, Congressman. I cannot see any rhyme nor reason, if the plant is there and serves the public, why you should not be able to earn money. I thought that was the basic philosophy of building a company, was that you attempted to build up your business, and you borrowed money when you did not have sufficient capital of your

own, but you expected to earn on that borrowing or otherwise you would have no way of ever paying the principal back.

Mr. D'EWART. I do not see any encouragement to anybody to enlarge their facilities by borrowing when you cannot earn on that borrowed money. It certainly is a way to discourage enlarging these facilities.

Mr. HUMMELL. I am also in a very awkward position with my bank. I made statements to the bank, on the assurance of having dealt with the National Park Service and having always had a very friendly relationship with the National Park Service, and they having lived up to their statements. All of a sudden I find myself in the position of going back to the bank, particularly if the Government now releases in fact a request for bids. I am going to have some tall explaining to do to the banker. There is one thing sure—I will never get another loan.

Mr. D'EWART. I believe that is true of others who have tried to open up concessions, unless they are a Government-owned corporation.

Mr. HUMMELL. Mine is in no different position than any of the others.

Mr. BARRETT. That is only half of it. You are not going to get another loan, and if this thing goes through you are not even going to pay off the loan you do have.

Mr. HUMMELL. That is right, sir; I am not in a position to pay it off if this goes through.

Mr. D'EWART. Out of the 6 percent that you are going to get, what do you have to pay?

Mr. HUMMELL. Well, I have to set up any reserve for depreciation, any reinvestment in the park, any return to stockholders, any interest on obligations. All of that must come out of the 6 percent or the $2,700 a year.

Mr. D'EWART. Just where is the money coming from to repay this loan?

Mr. HUMMELL. I think your guess is as good as mine on that. I do not see where it can come from. Under this theory, I do not see where it would come from.

Mr. D'EWART. And if you should sign one of these proposed contracts where would the money come from to pay the loan?

Mr. HUMMELL. It would be impossible to repay it, and I might say here that I do not see where I could in good conscience sign one of these contracts because I can work the next 20 years and come out with less than what I have now.

Mr. D'EWART. In other words, you are not only not going to be able to pay this old loan, but you will be precluded from ever borrowing again and paying off any new loans?

Mr. HUMMELL. That is correct.

Mr. D'EWART. Even if you did sign the new contract.

Mr. HUMMELL. That is correct.

Mr. D'EWART. How does that encourage you to enlarge your facilities?

Mr. HUMMELL. It is not very encouraging.

Mr. D'EWART. That is true of all who attempt to take on a concession in a park. You are not giving us an individual example. You are giving us an illustration of the thing that has developed and faces the organization in all the parks.

Mr. HUMMELL. In view of the statement of policy that we have been given in the proposed contract, I think we would all be in exactly the same position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of the House, and a member of the Committee on Public Lands, I should like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Montana who just preceded me. Mr. D'EWART is an untiring worker. I do not know of any member of our committee who more regularly attends committee meetings than does the gentleman from Montana. He and I quite often disagree. However, I want to say to him that he is a real statesman, a hard worker, and an excellent gentleman. He is considerate. He has a thorough analysis of every problem that comes before our committee. It is my hope that at some time I can be at least partly as good a legislator as the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that though an appropriation of $17,758,000 is recommended for the conservation and development of mineral resources, little work is being done to develop the vast peat resources of the United States.

In items for the Bureau of Mines an increase of $90,000 is provided for lignite research and an increase of $80,000 is recommended for the anthracite research laboratory. An increase of $200,000 is recommended for research and demonstration work in synthetic liquid fuels.

I think that every effort should be made to develop all of our natural resources. It is therefore necessary to undertake research in the effective utilization of peat. Legislation to authorize this work is now pending before the Committee on Public Lands where hearings have begun. I hope my bill is favorably reported to the House and that the United States will begin to seriously investigate the potential value of our 15,000,000,000 tons of peat, about half of which is found in Minnesota.

I would also like to point out that imports of peat continued to rise in 1949, totaling 94,747 short tons, an increase of about 21 percent over the 1939 prewar figures. These imports of peat for last year were valued at $3,184,409. At the same time the already limited American production decreased slightly.

From this we can see that further research and demonstration is imperative if we are to reap the benefits of this great untapped resource. I hope that next year will find an appropriation for this work, just as we are now considering funds for lignite, anthracite, and liquid fuel research. These resources are enough alike so that research could be done at the same time, thus saving taxpayers money.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on the work of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the funds recommended in the bill now before us for carrying out the Bureau's functions. Those of you who do not represent areas embracing Indian reservations, or having a large Indian population, may not be familiar with those Federal activities administered through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As compared with other bureaus of the Federal Government, the Bureau of Indian Affairs may be described as a government within a government because of its extensive and varied activities. Through these activities the Indian is afforded similar services provided his non-Indian neighbor through the many activities of other Federal agencies, either by direct assistance or through State and local governments.

Because of historical relations existing between the United States and the various Indian tribes, the Federal Government, as trustee, administers the affairs of Indians by numerous treaties and laws through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As a result of this trusteeship, large segments of our Indian population would be denied benefits accorded non-Indian citizens were it not for the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The bill now before us recommends appropriations totaling $76,293,000 for the work of this Bureau. This represents a reduction of $9,703,375 below the budget estimates of which approximately $2,500,000 pertains to health, education, and welfare services, $1,500,000 to the development and management of resources, $4,600,000 to capital improvements, including the construction of schools, hospitals, road, and irrigation systems, and $1,000,000 for administering these programs.

The House Committee on Appropriations is to be commended for its action in approving substantial amounts for health, education, and welfare services. Except for the elimination of funds to be used in the State of California, which I am informed would result in the discharge of Indians with active tuberculosis from hospitals, close Sherman Institute, a nonreservation boarding school enrolling overage non-English-speaking Navajo and Papago Indians and deny Federal assistance to local school districts in the education of Indian children who live on nontaxable Indian-owned land, the House committee recommended the full amount of the budget estimate for health and education activities. While recognizing the need for these services, other than in the State of California, the committee at the same time eliminated funds from the estimates for the operation of vessels which serve hospitals and schools in Alaska by transporting supplies and materials to isolated stations in the Territory of Alaska, where commercial shipping is either not available or is too expensive.

Also eliminated from this bill are funds for an apprentice-training program proposed for the Navajo and Hopi Indians in conjunction with the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program authorized by recent law. This phase of the rehabilitation program is to acquaint untrained Indians with certain fundamentals in the trades and crafts before and while they are engaged on work projects. This type of education and training appears to me to be an essential factor in the success of the off-reservation resettlement program to reestablish Navajo and Hopi Indians permanently and satisfactorily at off-reservation locations where permanent employment opportunities exist. The Congress last year provided funds for placing Indians in off-reservation jobs and the Bureau of Indian Affairs has rightly recognized the need for appren-

tice training to insure the success of this program.

It is not difficult to visualize the situations that exist on Indian reservations where no law enforcement program is carried on or where enforcement is attempted with insufficient law enforcement officers. Reports from several sources indicate that the budget estimate for this purpose would not provide adequate protection against disorder and crime on Indian reservations. I am informed that the Bureau has been requested by the Senate Appropriations Committee to submit revised estimates for this work.

Although the items in the field of community services which I have discussed are of utmost importance to isolated segments of our Indian population, the development and management of resources in these areas are equally important to the economy and well-being of the individual and the Nation. Groups populating these areas are primarily dependent upon forest and range lands, irrigation and road systems, agricultural and industrial enterprises, and soil and moisture conservation practices for a livelihood. The development and utilization of these resource facilities cannot be ignored if a stable economy is to prevail among the people in these areas.

In addition to the reduction of $4,680,400 for the construction of buildings and utilities, road and irrigation system, the House committee denied contract authority for construction work in the amount of $6,500,000, of which $5,275,000 was for construction work proposed in connection with the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program and $1,000,000 for the construction of a hospital authorized by Public Law 438, Eighty-first Congress. Restoration of the contract authority should be made it seems to me in order that construction can go forward on the hospital authorized by Public Law 438 and to avoid the elimination of projects proposed in the rehabilitation program which would disrupt and delay this program twice approved by the Congress.

I am informed that the position of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is, and I quote:

1. Another serious reduction in the budget estimates is the reduction of $1,035,000 for general administrative expenses. Increasing program activities, resulting in increased administrative requirements from the headquarters office level to the smallest field office, have overloaded the administrative staff to such an extent that the effectiveness of the Bureau's program activities is endangered. Of the $15,181,564 increase provided in this bill for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, only $109,831 is for administrative management purposes. This will throw the Bureau's functions so far out of balance as to make it virtually impossible to control and administer activities efficiently and economically. Operating under such adverse conditions the Bureau could not be expected to meet present budgetary, accounting, and other administrative requirements much less give attention to the modernization and improvement of work methods and procedures.

2. As compared with 1950 appropriations, adjusted to include the proposed supplemental appropriations to meet pay increases authorized by Public Law 429, and the supplemental appropriation for welfare of Indians contained in the recent Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, the House committee allowance provided increases totaling $15,181,564. It may appear that this substantial increase would provide adequately for the Bureau's regular activities. However after providing $11,353,470 of this increase for the long-range program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and $1,737,500 for the liquidation of prior year contract authorizations, a comparatively small increase of $2,090,594 is available for allocation to the many regular activities of the Bureau. An analysis of the Bureau's many functions and the far-reaching effects of its work in relation to the present and future development of isolated and backward areas of the Nation appear to fully justify the approval of the Budget estimates for the Bureau as submitted to this Congress by the President.

I hope that the membership of the House will give careful and earnest consideration to this whole matter before final determination is made on this chapter of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time so that I may point out what I believe to be an oversight on the part of the committee in regard to funds for Indians in California. There was deleted from the recommendations of the Bureau $2,647,871, which was all of the money that was recommended for Indian affairs in California. On the testimony of four or five Indians and an attorney, I believe from here in Washington, that money was deleted.

I have prepared amendments to reinstate those funds. However, I do not intend to offer them when the proper time arrives because of the fact that the evidence which should have been before the committee, but which was not of record during the recent hearings, could not be presented in a matter of 5 minutes, as stipulated under the 5-minute rule. I have conferred with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and also personally appeared and testified in behalf of the restoration of these funds before the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations. The subject is being fully covered in the Senate and I have every reason to believe that there would be no objection raised in that body to the reinstatement of these funds in the bill as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

I merely want to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the deletion of the funds has totally deprived California and its contract for the education of Indians of $800,000 for the construction of a school building on the Indian reservation that has not a single acre of ground accessible for school purposes.

It deletes $322,000 for the education of 2,300 Indian children. It destroys all supervision over Indian contracts, such as logging contracts, and so forth, that total well into the millions of dollars. The supervision is needed.

Again, I am calling the attention of the Committee to these facts so that in conference it will be understood that there is something more in the Senate record than was before the House committee. The situation is very disturbing to the Department of Education of California, to all the county superintendents of schools who have Indian reservations, and to the tribes themselves and their advisers.

As set out in a pamphlet entitled "Program for Termination of Indian Bureau Activities in the State of California," which was submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in June of 1948, we have a plan for the granting of complete rights to Indians in that State. It should be done uniformly, and the supervision of these contracts should be carried out in an orderly manner.

I appreciate the intention and the desires of many of the members of the committee when they took their action, but I believe it was ill-advised because all of the facts were not before the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement relative to the Bureau of Reclamation's program for the Colorado-Big Thompson project contained in the General Appropriation bill, 1951, under chapter 7, Department of the Interior.

It pleases me deeply that the House Appropriations Committee saw fit to provide the full amount of the estimate for the irrigation production facilities on the Colorado-Big Thompson project. This project is essential to assure an adequate supply of supplemental water to irrigate 615,000 acres of land in the northeastern part of the State. In addition to supplying water for the lands, the project is designed to produce electrical energy for use on the project for pumping purposes and to provide more adequate supplies for rural and municipal use on both the eastern and western slopes of the Continental Divide. The project's power system is now interconnected with the Wyoming system to the north and with the Missouri Basin system in the far northeastern corner of the State. Many municipalities and rural cooperatives are receiving benefits of Federal power from this interconnected system, with the present source being power plants in Wyoming. Supplies are inadequate, and the completion of the generating and transmission facilities on the eastern slope of the project are essential to assure more adequate supplies.

I was indeed disappointed at the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee in deleting funds for the contruction of the Estes-Leyner-Plains 115-kilovolt line and the Leyner substation, and also, the elimination of the extension of the Flatiron-Brighton line eastward toward Hoyt and Brush, Colo. These lines are an essential component of the Colorado-Big Thompson project and do not represent new starts, but an extension of the existing system to provide the necessary outlet for power which will be soon available at the eastern slope power plants. The Estes-Leyner-Plains line and Leyner substation will provide an

interconnection with the facilities of the Colorado Public Service Co. in order to make available to the company surplus power from the project and to permit the interchange of energy with the company in order to firm up the project's power supply during times when hydroelectric generation is not sufficient. It will also provide a secondary source of power to the Brighton-Hoyt-Brush transmission line.

The extension of the Flatiron-Brighton line from Brighton to Hoyt and Brush, Colo., in no way duplicates present facilities. It is not a new feature but an extension proposed to deliver the additional power to be generated on the eastern slope to the Hoyt and Brush area. An existing line now runs from Estes to Flatiron and eastward to Brush. The capacity of this line, however, is not adequate to carry the additional power, which will soon be available, to the large rural area in the northeastern part of the State. I have been advised that the construction of the extension from Brighton to Brush will provide the necessary capacity at the most economical cost to the project. It will also provide a secondary source of power to existing customers and make service available to an REA by construction of a substation at Kiowa, Colo.

I sincerely believe that the elimination of these transmission lines from the program for the fiscal year 1951 will serve no other purpose than to delay essential service to rural customers who have been anxiously waiting for the completion of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. Additional generating capacity will be available, but service will be limited to those customers now being served within the limited capacity of the present transmission lines.

I submit for the consideration of the Members of the House that the reductions made in the estimate for the Colorado-Big Thompson project are serious and should be restored to permit the construction of these essential extensions of the transmission system.

At this point in my remarks on this important rural electrification and water conservancy project for Colorado and the Nation, I am including the statement I made before the Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 25, 1950.

I urgently requested the committee to reconsider and restore the funds for the Colorado-Big Thompson project which were eliminated by the House Appropriations Committee.

It is my contention that the House committee was unjustified in eliminating these funds from the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation. The committee maintained that the funds were for "certain new power facilities," basing its decision on the declared policy of the President's budget message for 1950–51, that appropriations should be limited to continuation of work on projects started in prior years.

An investigation will reveal that these funds were to be used on projects already under construction.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM S. HILL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SECOND DISTRICT, COLORADO, BEFORE THE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, APRIL 25, 1950

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call your attention to an injustice which has developed with respect to the construction of needed and planned rural electrification facilities in my district, the Second District of Colorado.

In his statement in the budget message for 1950–51, the President said, in part: "The activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers, involving the construction of dams, power facilities, canals, channels, and levees, will be limited in 1951 to continuation of work on projects started in prior years."

In view of this policy laid down by the President, the House Appropriations Committee cut $928,000 from the Colorado-Big Thompson project in my district. The committee denied authorization of funds for the Estes-Leyner-Plains 115-kilovolt line and substation totaling $160,000; the Leyner substation, $264,000; and the Brighton-Hoyt-Brush portion of the Flatiron-Leyner-Brighton-Brush 115-kilovolt line and substation, $504,000. In explaining its elimination of these funds, the House committee maintained they were for certain new power facilities.

Because of this unjustified interpretation of the President's statement with reference to the Colorado-Big Thompson, I urge your reconsideration of this reduction in funds. Upon further investigation, I am confident that you will discover that the funds requested by the Bureau of Reclamation in this instance are for the continuation of existing projects and are not new starts. Interruption of the outlined construction program will curtail the plans for providing rural power for thousands of ranchers and farmers who have no other source of power available. If the funds are not provided, it means the Government is failing to meet an obligation to these rural people.

As a consistent proponent of a sound, progressive rural-electrification program wherever needed in the Nation, I have been greatly disturbed by the President's budget statement. It is similar to the one he made in 1948–49. If further misconstrued, like in the Colorado-Big Thompson case, it could result in the complete disruption of the rural-electrification program. This program has been beneficial to the people and has been no burden to the taxpayers, since it is self-liquidating.

Therefore, I urge this committee to restore these funds and permit the continuation of the Colorado-Big Thompson project as planned and under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

CHAPTER VIII—EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, chapter VIII is now subject to general debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this chapter be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and 30 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up too much of the committee's time, and I will briefly summarize the bill. It includes about $8,000,000,000 of appropriations, and $510,000,000 in contract authorizations.

Before I discuss the bill I would like to say something about the membership of this subcommittee that I have the honor and privilege and pleasure of serving with. On the Democratic side we have the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is also a very hard worker, an able parliamentarian, and a man of great human understanding with a wealth of good old common horse sense that can be called good judgment.

There is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], who is always present at the hearings. His contribution in committee work is outstanding. Of course, when we come down to the difficult task of trying to allocate and prorate the funds to the various governmental agencies, his good judgment is always of monumental strength to the remainder of his colleagues on the subcommittee.

I might say that this subcommittee has as little partisanship in it as it is humanly possible to have in the consideration of estimates for 33 governmental agencies which are independent in character. Most of these agencies operate as commissions, made up of both Democrats and Republicans, and we also conduct our committee hearings along nonpartisan lines.

The ranking minority member of our subcommittee is the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I might add that the House is in imminent danger of losing his services. In fact, I understand that we will lose his services at the next election, because he is going over to another body. Of course, the other body will be the winner, because they are getting one of the outstanding men, not only of this House, but one of the outstanding men in public life in this country. Of course, their gain will be our loss. The service that he has rendered in this House to his great State of South Dakota has been nothing short of phenomenal. He has really carried wood and water for those fine people, and I know that they appreciate his outstanding ability and his tireless efforts in service, just as the membership of this House appreciates it. I know that you all join me in wishing him the best of success in all of his many undertakings.

The other Member on the Republican side is our distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is unquestionably one of the outstanding men of this House. He is a man of fine judgment and boundless energy. Sometimes I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] does not mind working 15 or 16 hours a day. Even though he puts in those hours, he seems to enjoy it. He, too, has rendered great service, not only to his district in California but, being the only

minority representative on this committee from California, naturally he has had to carry the whole weight for his great State, and he has certainly done an outstanding job.

Let me say again, it is worth repeating, there is absolutely no partisanship on this committee. We have done a fine job, we believe, and certainly, if we have done a good job for you gentlemen, it must be partly attributed to our staff too, Mr. Duvall and Mr. Skarin. I do not know of two finer gentlemen in our entire staff. They are hard workers. They know what the answers are. They have made our work much easier. The budget estimate for 1951 for these 33 independent agencies was approximately $8,500,000,000. After some 2 or 3 months work we effected cuts in appropriations and contract authorizations totaling $501,000,000. We have not crippled any essential service of Government, and I believe most of the agencies will agree to that even though dollar-wise—this subcommittee has made cuts more than 100 percent greater than any other subcommittee.

I think it is worth while to mention here briefly that there are two agencies as now provided for in the bill that are going to have to be revised provided certain legislation is enacted; one is the selective service, which at the time we considered their budget estimate, was in the process of liquidation, but which if Congress continues selective service for another year will require more funds and necessitate reconsideration by our committee of the item now in the bill. They are no more than a liquidating agency for fiscal 1951. The other agency I have in mind is the Displaced Persons Commission. It is our understanding that the House and the other body are now in conference on that legislation and a conference report will be brought back in due time. Assuming that is true, we will then have to reconsider what we have done for the DP Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. It so happens I am one of the conferees on that bill. I may say that we expect to have our report ready in about 2 weeks.

Mr. THOMAS. If we are through with this bill at that time, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the matter can be taken care of on the Senate side and in conference. We will have ample opportunity to do it that way.

I am not going to take up the time of the House in going through all these agencies now; we will do that when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule. The big money in this bill goes to three agencies: The Veterans' Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the General Services Administration.

For 1951 the Veterans' Administration funds in the bill total about $5,800,000,000 as against appropriations totaling $6,330,000,000 for 1950. The primary reason the 1950 figure is in excess of the 1951 appropriation is that we have recently given the Veterans' Administration a deficiency appropriation for 1950 of $720,000,000 for use in connection with the item for readjustment benefits, recent increases in enrollment for trade and vocational training and other training below the college level being the primary reason for this increase.

Another agency requesting a large appropriation is the Atomic Energy Commission. This year they requested about $1,043,000,000. That is divided between cash and contract authority. The agency is doing a tremendously important job, and every Member here knows how valuable their work is. It will not serve any useful purpose to go into its plans. I want to point out, however, that the Committee has urged, is urging, and will continue to urge upon the Commission in spite of the very important work, to be as economical as possible. We reserve to ourselves as your representatives the right to carefully scrutinize their expenditures. We have placed some limitations on them in here. Sometimes we felt they have spent too much money in spots where they should not have spent it in connection with their town operations. For instance, there is the little city of Oak Ridge, a town of between 32 and 35 thousand people in the great State of Tennessee, a Government-owned and operated town. The Government repairs the houses, it owns the houses, it paints the houses, it maintains the security of the town, it gathers the garbage, it paves the streets, and it runs the transportation system. But for the life of us we have not been able to understand why they had to pay a town manager $180,000 a year when the duties are in most respects comparable to a city manager's job which would not pay more than from $25,000 to $35,000.

In addition to the Government running the transportation system at Oak Ridge it owns all of the trucks, busses, and automobiles, and pays the salaries of all the drivers, all of the mechanics, it buys all of the tires, the gasoline and oil and pays a fee of $90,000 for doing perhaps a $15,000 job. Bear in mind that the taxpayers of the United States pay the salaries of the policemen, the firemen, the school teachers and of all the maintenance and operating people in the town.

The third agency to which I have referred is the General Services Administration. This is a new activity established by the Federal Property Act of 1949. Actually it represents the consolidation of a number of old agencies, consisting primarily of the former Bureau of Federal Supply, the Federal Works Agency, the National Archives, and the liquidation of the affairs of the War Assets Administration. The committee considered total estimates of $861,883,000 and has included in the bill $836,126,000 for the several activities making up this agency. In effect, we have made a saving of $25,756,000. We feel that the General Services Administrator is in a position to effect real economies and increase efficiency in these activities and we have confidence that he will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur wholeheartedly in the nice things that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] said with reference to our colleague the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE, who has been away part of the time recently and has not been with us as much as we would like. We understand he is leaving us and we shall miss him from this body.

I have been associated with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in committee for a number of years and I want to make the statement that there is a no more industrious Member of this House than is the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE. His judgment is good, he is as sound as a lawyer, he is one of the first Members of this Congress. We shall miss him, of course, when he leaves us, but I wish for him always the things that he wants most in life and the things that will make him happy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure of serving in committee for 3 years with our distinguished friend from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I am thoroughly familiar with his work. I know of no harder-working Member in the Congress of the United States than is the gentleman from South Dakota, FRANCIS CASE. I too shall miss him when he leaves, but I certainly wish him the best of luck.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, the first time I had the opportunity of meeting the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota was when we were in the Marine Corps on Mare Island. I have always had a great interest in the gentleman and have watched him on the floor. As a very proud ex-marine I want to pay my compliments to one of the hardest workers that we have ever had in the Congress of the United States. His interests have been largely my interests, and many of us from the West have relied on his good judgment to be the spokesman, and in many ways our leader, in getting the things that were beneficial especially to the West. Certainly, as a westerner, I regret that he is leaving this body, and I wish him every success in the world in any other aspirations he might have.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I realize, knowing the extreme modesty of the gentleman, that

these are perhaps embarrassing moments to him. But, I simply want to concur in what has been said here by these gentlemen. There is no clearer thinker in the House of Representatives than FRANCIS CASE, and he certainly shall be missed in this body. Whatever his fortunes may be, and we hope they will be good in the future, we shall all be pulling for him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I certainly am thrown off balance by having these requests to yield made. No one can hear such remarks about himself without having some sense of embarrassment. Perhaps it is accentuated by the fact that no one knows, at least I do not have any firm knowledge, what is going to happen to me in the direction to which some of these remarks have alluded. But, I do assure each and every one of you that I deeply appreciate the kind remarks you have made. It happened that I was coming through the door when the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee was making his remarks, and they were so glowing and so far beyond my deserts that I hesitated to come on in. I thought perhaps I should stay outside in the lobby. But, I do appreciate them, and I can assure each and every one of you that my thoughts and my feelings are going to be with the Members of the House of Representatives, and particularly with those of you with whom I have labored in the Committee on Appropriations and in these other matters of interest to the West.

Mr. Chairman, in reporting the chapter of the appropriation bill that deals with independent offices, it has been my privilege to work with as fine a subcommittee, and as able a subcommittee, myself excluded, as there is among the subcommittees of the great Committee on Appropriations. And we have had the benefit of a very able and experienced staff in William Duvall and Homer Skarin. Their services have been invaluable.

It is no accident, Mr. Chairman, that this Appropriation Subcommittee has made the heaviest percentage reductions of any of the chapters in the bill reported. It is due, I believe, to the intelligent and persistent attitude of my colleagues on the committee. Our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and my Republican colleague, the very able and experienced legislator from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], have been diligent in their attendance at the hearings of the committee, have been intelligent in their questions, and have not simply sought to fill the printed record. They knew what they wanted to get, and they went after it. So, with a bill which is very difficult to make economies on, we have been able to recommend substantial savings.

This morning there was in my office a man from my home State, a banker, who said, "I do not understand, when you come to these appropriations, why you just cannot make a 10 percent cut and really cut these appropriations?" "Well", I said, "I am glad you brought up that question because," I said, "I recognize that that is the feeling of the average person throughout the country." He said, "Why do you not make a 10 percent cut or a 25 percent cut and balance the budget?" I said, "The bill I happen to work with illustrates just why you cannot do it that way." We have in the independent offices bill a section, for instance, which deals with the Veterans' Administration. Over $4,500,000,000 of the amount of money that goes to Veterans' Administration goes to pay for adjusted compensation or pensions which are obligations of the Government by existing law.

A veteran is determined to have a certain percentage disability, service-connected. Under the law he is entitled to receive a compensation of a certain amount. When you have the facts as to how many of them there are with a certain entitlement under the law, all you can do then is use the multiplication table and provide the money to discharge those obligations.

Then we have the salaries that are involved in the 30-odd agencies that get their money out of the independent offices bill. Those salaries are established on a pay schedule that is law by previous acts of the Congress. Within the past couple of days the subcommittee has been hearing some supplemental estimates where we have been asked for about $20,000,000 to make up the pay increases for the current year on salaries that have been increased by acts passed by the Congress. Some 17 bills were passed by Congress last year that increased the pay obligation of the Government.

The Supreme Court has held that when an employee is working for the Government at a fixed rate of pay determined by the Classification Act and by his rating, it is an obligation of the Government to pay him so much money. The only way you can reduce that obligation is either not to employ him or to discharge him. It is beyond the power of the Appropriations Committee to discharge him. That is up to the agency involved. So the Appropriations Committee has its hands tied when it comes to personnel. The only thing we can do is say we will not appropriate over so much for personnel; in many instances we have done that. That is partly responsible for the reductions which are proposed in this chapter of the bill. It will mean some vacancies cannot be filled.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The committee could cut some of those appropriations at Oak Ridge, could they not? If I heard correctly, you are paying a city manager $70,000 a year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was a management fee, not an individual's salary. But the committee did make cuts in that direction. On that manager proposition, the money that is requested in the bill this year is less than it was a year ago. That is largely due to the investigation the committee instituted a year ago into the management of these cities that are operated by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I have just returned from spending some time in my State. As I have talked with the rank and file of the people there, I have found there is nothing that concerns them more today than their alarm over the increase in Government spending. They are anxious that the Congress do something about it. I have been saying to them, "If you want the Congress to do something about it you must ask that Members of Congress stand up when these authorization bills are passed and oppose them, so that we do not create these additional obligations."

Probably the bill will be gone into in greater detail when we take it up for amendment under the 5-minute rule, but there are two or three features of the bill I do want to mention now. One is that this bill for the first time deals with the General Services Administration. Various activities such as Procurement of Supplies and Strategic Materials, the Bureau of Community Facilities, the Public Buildings Administration, the Surplus Property Administration, Archives, and so forth have been consolidated into what is now called the General Services Administration.

There are two possibilities for this new agency of the Government. One is that it shall become a great empire, because it does deal with some large activities of the Government. The other is that it shall become a coordinating agency of the Government which will bring together property management for the Government and prevent overpurchases and overlapping in procurement.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. I was very much interested in the statement by the distinguished colleague from South Dakota that we should be very careful in the authorizations that we make for the spending of money. There is a project before our Committee on Public Lands. Unfortunately it passed in the other body. That project would cost over a billion dollars. That is one of the mistakes. That is one of the things we should avoid. We should be careful about these projects and about any authorizations because then it becomes an obligation of the Congress to go along and authorize for the project. Is that not true?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly we need to be careful about such authorizations. If we are ever to have economy we have to stop passing some of these vast authorizations of questionable feasibility.

There are, of course, two classes of authorizations. One of them is permissive and the other is mandatory. With reference to the salary pay schedules which are mandatory we have our hands tied. The authorizations of the other kind are always persuasive. Once the authorization is passed, of course, the Congress is expected to make some appropriation for it.

Mr. Chairman, as I said the General Services Administration offers us the

possibility of doing something to eliminate overlapping in procurement. I was very much interested in the statement by Jess Larson, the head of that agency, that in their investigation of the supplies of the various agencies they had found a great deal of overprocurement. For example, Mr. Larson spoke of an examination into the personal property field where the warehouse of one agency contained a supply of fluorescent light tubes which would last the agency for 93 years at the rate they had been used the previous 6 months. He also stated they had ruled filler paper which would last them 168 years at the current rate of use and they had enough loose-leaf binders to go with this filler paper for 247 years. That was only one agency. That merely illustrates the importance of the work that can be done by the General Services Administration in determining whether or not there is overprocurement.

There is another agency with which we deal in this bill which should be called to the attention of the committee. That is the Maritime Commission. I dislike to say this but in the 12 years that I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have never heard a hearing which did as little credit to an agency as that presented by the Maritime Commission this year. Members of the House know that the head of the General Accounting Office, the Comptroller General, is Mr. Lindsay Warren, who was for many years a distinguished Member of this House and a man in whom we have a great deal of confidence. His comment on operations of the Maritime Commission was the most scathing that I have ever heard come from his office. For instance, in dealing with the payment of operating subsidy differentials the Comptroller General called attention to the fact that the law requires whenever the subsidies are in excess of 33⅓ percent the Commission shall possess convincing evidence that the difference between the foreign and domestic cost is in excess of 33⅓ percent. Then the Comptroller said in his report:

> Actually not only was no such evidence presented to the Commission as a body in the cases discussed in this report but it was not even in the possession of the staff of the Commission making the recommendations.

That is just a sample of what he said repeatedly with respect to the operations of the Maritime Commission.

When we discussed this with the Maritime Commission we found ourselves baffled by the fact that a new Chairman of the Commission had to say in most cases that he had been Chairman for only a few months and consequently did not know of these transactions. We were baffled by the fact that there was a difference of opinion between the members of the Commission and the general counsel. The general counsel apparently had taken one position at one time and another position at another time. No one seemed able to defend the actions of the Commission. It was evasion from start to finish.

Finally we asked the Commission to make direct comment upon some points that the Comptroller General had brought out, and in reply we got a letter which was properly characterized by one member of the committee as "insulting." In effect, the letter said, "So what?"

The only thing I can see Congress can do about these matters is to limit the appropriations, as we have proposed in some instances, and to bring the situation to the attention of the executive branch of the Government and say, "Here is one place you want to clean house if you want to avoid some scandals that will harass the administration for a long time to come."

The chairman of the committee has made reference to the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and the great part they have in this bill. I will not at this time go into the discussion we had with them about the developments in the field of nuclear energy and their responsibility in the production of the hydrogen bomb; but, necessarily, when we were dealing with an agency which deals with as sensitive a subject as that, and mostly behind closed doors, the committee found itself handicapped in trying to assess the dollar value of the projects that were proposed. When an agency is doing new things, it is very difficult for it or for the appropriations committee to determine whether or not it needs this dollar or that dollar, or what final costs will be.

We discussed this problem with the Atomic Energy Commission a year ago. At that time I expressed the hope that they would find some device by which the committee and the Congress could get some assurance that the money they asked for and the money they paid out on different projects was required. We had no measuring stick, no yardstick by which we could determine what it would cost to build a factory or a plant that would be described by a letter and a number. If you tried to get a more revealing description, we ran into very technical and scientific matters. The Commission itself said that it had no past experience in building many of its projects. I suggested that even so, the Congress ought not be at the mercy of a round-figure estimate for some of these things, that they should be based on something firmer than guesses.

This year they told us that last September, following the discussion we had with them a year ago, they had created a finance division, and they had placed that under a comptroller general, and that this was the device intended to assure that the money requested would have real meaning. Even so, when we came to questioning about the basis-cost estimates we found ourselves getting unsatisfactory answers.

The general policy of the Atomic Energy Commission is to let its work by contract; a contract with a private firm to operate a city or to build a plant, with a university to carry on a research project, or with some big scientific firm to carry on a production project. Most of those projects are let on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. The contractor places his estimate on the job; naturally it is a safe estimate from the contractor's point of view. It is reported to his opposite number on the staff of the Atomic Energy Commission. He in turn relays it to the new finance division, the comptroller. But we found that this controller has little or no authority except to see that disbursements are charged against the proper accounts. He has no real authority to curtail or control charges. He is a glorified accountant, keeping books on a disbursement of three-quarters of a billion dollars without any real authority to curb waste or extravagant expenditures.

In my opinion, the Atomic Energy Commission has a great job to do in its research and development and production. I think it is doing a good job, in the main, but I do think it is operating with as little regard for sound business management as any agency could. It needs tightening up; it needs a little more hard-headed management; it needs more practical construction engineers in its set-up with real authority to step on excessive costs and charges by its contractors.

I realize that my time is exhausted. In closing, I want to express the hope that the Atomic Energy Commission will apply to its fiscal responsibilities some of the intelligence and earnest endeavor which I have seen it apply to its scientific problems. It can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, we are informed by the members of the Appropriations Committee that the $29,000,000,000 included in this bill for the various departments, represents a cut of close to one and one-half billion dollars below the amount requested in the President's budget. Many of us believe this bill could and should be reduced by at least another one and one-half billion dollars. In fact, it is my belief that with the cooperation of the President the budget could be reduced by a total of approximately $5,000,000,000.

For instance, we have been informed that Federal pay rolls provided for in the budget will run close to $7,000,000,000. It is my belief that we could reduce the amount of money for Federal pay rolls in this bill by $2,000,000,000, and probably bring greater efficiency in government by such reduction.

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out last week in the debates, there is provided in expense alone for various Federal employees, and the total telephone and telegraph expense for employees provided in this bill reaches the colossal sum of $65,000,000. These amounts should be cut for a saving of $40,000,000.

In addition, I believe that close to a billion dollars could be trimmed out of this bill by freezing Federal employment and revamping the provisions for shorter annual and sick leave. We could also save a lot of money by reducing annual and sick leave of the thousands of Federal employees serving overseas who get over a hundred days leave with pay a year. There are many, many instances

throughout this bill where we could reduce spending on many fronts.

If we could reduce the President's budget request by $5,000,000,000 it would save the citizens of the State of Illinois alone approximately $387,000,000. That is a lot of money.

Mr. Chairman, a $5,000,000,000 reduction would save the taxpayers of the 15 counties I represent in Illinois $8,739,000. For instance, it would save the taxpayers of Jefferson County $1,184,000; Hardin $116,000; Hamilton $213,000; Gallatin $213,000; Edwards $186,000; Clinton $523,000; Clay $538,000; Wayne $484,000; Saline $1,126,000; Pope $101,000; Marion $2,036,000; White $1,198,000; Washington $341,000; Johnson $186,000; Massac $294,000.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of whether or not we can reduce this budget $5,000,000,000, the greatest responsibility resting upon this Congress is that we resolve here and now that we shall make a tremendous effort to reduce it to the lowest possible amount.

We must stop spending more than we take in or it will wreck the financial solvency of this Government in the near future. If we allow this to happen we cannot defend ourselves against a foreign foe and all will be lost.

I urge the Members on the Democrat side to join with and help us to reduce this budget and, thereby, the cost of government, in an effort to stop deficit spending and to maintain the financial solvency of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Reader's Digest in December 1949 published an article on Government spending under the following head, "Is this the time to spend billions more?"

The following figures printed by the Digest should astound the Members of Congress and the American people.

These figures show that President Truman, in 5 years, has spent many billions more than all of the Presidents have spent from Washington up to and including 8 years of the Roosevelt administration.

Here are the figures:

Washington	$34,088,486
Adams	34,262,668
Jefferson	72,424,289
Madison	176,473,964
Monroe	147,237,899
Adams	65,427,017
Jackson	152,969,968
Van Buren	122,325,242
Harrison and Tyler	108,904,678
Polk	173,477,220
Taylor and Fillmore	$179,631,529
Pierce	255,154,244
Buchanan	272,933,490
Lincoln	3,252,380,410
Johnson	1,578,557,645
Grant	2,253,386,743
Hayes	1,032,268,037
Garfield and Arthur	1,027,742,757
Cleveland	1,077,629,089
Harrison	1,412,315,899
Cleveland	1,441,674,174
McKinley	2,093,918,514
Theodore Roosevelt	4,655,450,505
Taft	2,799,211,854
Wilson	46,938,260,143
Harding	6,667,235,429
Coolidge	18,585,549,115
Hoover	15,490,476,636
Roosevelt (8 years)	67,518,746,001
Total	179,620,113,645

Think this over:

32 Presidents in 156 years spent	$179,620,113,645
1 President (Truman) in less than 5 years has spent	191,081,394,191

(The extraordinary expenditures of the war years from 1941 to 1945 have been excluded.)

Mr. Chairman, there is only one way to reduce the Federal pay rolls, reduce wasteful spending in every department of Government that now exists and that is to reduce the appropriations. This is the only way we can reduce taxes. The people of my district and yours are crying out to the Members of Congress to reduce Government spending and reduce their tax load. I want to give them this relief they are entitled to, and I want to prevent this Nation from being spent into financial bankruptcy. The time is getting short in which we must act.

This bill before us gives us the opportunity to carry out our responsibility to the people and reduce the cost of Government. I hope a majority of the Members of Congress will face up to their obligation and join with us who are making an effort to protect the financial solvency of this Government.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the committee states that the budget estimate for 1951 was $8,458,000,000, but that it recommends to the House an appropriation as shown on page 199 of chapter VIII of only $8,024,000,000. That brings to mind a little event that is happening at this very moment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe Members of the House will be interested to know that Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan made a gala flight to Paris today in the President's personal plane, the *Independence*.

The White House jester and 5-percent greeter apparently is in need of a bit of Paris in the spring and the glamour of night life, so to speak, especially after the conviction this week of his old friend John Maragon.

The White House plane has an assignment to pick up the Premier of Pakistan and his wife in London Sunday, and bring them to Washington for an official visit. That is all right as far as it goes.

But why should the taxpayers have to pay the cost of carting Harry Vaughan to Paris? This is another brazen example of White House disregard for spending the people's money.

But maybe Harry wants to look over the French style of deep freezers or do some perfume business for his pal Maragon, who has been more or less restricted by a Federal jury—and the big boss said, "Yes, Harry, take my plane and have a good time on the banks of the Seine."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take the floor at this time for the purpose of saying something that I have too seldom had an opportunity to say in connection with these appropriation bills: I have been pleased with the way this Subcommittee on Appropriations approached the solution of its problems, and the efforts that it made for economy. I believe that of all the subcommittees that have reported on general operations of the Government, this subcommittee has done the most conscientious job of cutting.

I especially want to commend the members of the Committee, ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas; GEORGE ANDREWS, of Alabama; ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee; FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota; and JOHN PHILLIPS, of California; and I should not forget Bill Duvall, the clerk.

The thing about this situation that bothers me is that FRANCIS CASE, on the Republican side of the committee, is going to leave the House of Representatives this year, I hope and believe to become a Senator from the great State of South Dakota. It bothers me because FRANCIS CASE is one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives—keen, sharp, intelligent, probably as good a parliamentarian as there is on the floor of the House, always active in the interest of economy in government, and yet one who has always believed in being absolutely fair to the interests of the people that he represents. The loss by the House due to his leaving will be the gain of the Senate of the United States. He will be, in my opinion, an outstanding Member of that body.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee brings its recommendations to the floor, covering as much territory as does the appropriation for independent offices, with a feeling of satisfaction, and I think also of regret that the associations of the year and of the committee are about to be ended, especially as is the fact in this case. There will be changes in the personnel of the Congress which will affect several of the subcommittees, and particularly and seriously the subcommittee now before you.

I would express my regards and my appreciation to the majority side and to our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] who has one of the most able minds in the Congress. He has the ability to take pages of figures a day or so before the hearing when these have been delivered to the subcommittee, and almost to memorize them, so that during the hearing he can question an agency without reference to the tables and justifications; to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] with whom I have now served for 4 years; to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and, then, the Member from South Dakota concerning whom so much has been said this afternoon.

It is a fact that in a body like ours we get accustomed to working with people, we get accustomed to depending on people, and it is only when those people for some reason or other leave or even suggest they are about to leave that we suddenly realize the gap that will be left by their absence. I do not need to repeat what has been said about the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], but

I do wish to say that I have worked intimately with him on this committee for the last several years, and I know from personal experience that while we will miss him here, our loss will be a gain to the other body. There comes a time when every man in public life must make the hard decision whether to continue in the established routine of his present work, or whether to offer his experience, his knowledge, and his ability in that body in which he can be of the greatest and most lasting service to his own people. The necessity for that decision came this year to my California colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], and it has come to my subcommittee colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Our good wishes go with him to the other body.

The bill we bring before you is a difficult one because of the number of agencies involved. Our chairman in his few remarks spoke about the 30 or more agencies for which we appropriate, yet he could not demonstrate the differences that exist between the budget items or the fields which the operations of the agencies cover.

Take the Atomic Energy Commission with its highly confidential information; its budget is submitted under circumstances which compel us almost to write a blank check; yet, there is the necessity of checking them in routine operations to make a comparison of those operations with the ones we do not want to place in the record. Take the Veterans' Administration with its billions of dollars spent in all fields of work supervising the benefits that the Congress has given to veterans. Take the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, one of which you rarely hear, mentioned by both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] this afternoon. Here is an agency started in 1941 with an authorization of $2,800,000 and which, year after year, without further authorization, has come before the committee, for more and more money until this year it asked for $62,000,000 and was given by our committee $56,390,000.

We have housing, we have the Securities and Exchange Commission, we have Civil Service, we have the Federal Communications Commission, we have the Tariff Commission, the Power Commission, the ICC, the new General Services Administration, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the expenses for the President, the Executive Mansion, the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library, the Smithsonian Institution, and we go down in a list of agencies, large and small, to some 30 or more.

I would speak of the Veterans' Administration and its present attitude toward the hospitalization of veterans. This is primarily in the hands of the Congress, and yet it has seemed to many of us that with the increasing cost of construction, and the increasing cost of the administration of the hospitals, it behooves the Veterans' Administration to use every hospital that is presently built in the Nation and which can be used. In my particular section of the country there is a hospital—the Corona Hospital—that has been used by the Navy, and I am quite sure the same situation exists in other areas, where the Veterans' Administration will not use the hospital. Why? Because they say it is not satisfactory for a general hospital. In that I concur, but there are domiciliary patients, there are tuberculosis patients, and there is great need today that the Veterans' Administration immediately do two things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

First. The VA must explore again the whole program of hospitalization so that it may use every available institution in the United States and not propose to spend $18,000,000 to build a complete new hospital while within a short distance there is an adequate hospital which has already cost the taxpayers $17,000,000, which requires only the adjustment of patients between hospitals to be one of the most satisfactory in the United States.

Second. There is a very great need of the Veterans' Administration for a reexploration of the veterans' census. The figures that the Veterans' Administration is using by States is the census several years old, while the veteran population has moved not only westward, but internally in the United States, and has made all those figures out of date.

I will speak briefly on two other subjects. The one is to supplement what the gentleman from South Dakota said regarding the problem of employment, of civil service, and of rating. What the gentleman said was true, but there is also involved the fact that we need in the Federal Government a reexamination of the ratings given people in the Government service as well as the numerical personnel of the Federal Government.

It has been brought out by our subcommittee, as the other members of the subcommittee will recognize, that by giving a title to someone which is a little higher-sounding, and by taking into consideration the number of employees under some minor executive, it has been possible little by little to raise the salaries in Government out of comparison here and there with the salaries paid for the same work in private industry. Those things come with a Government which has grown as fast as ours. No criticism need be directed on the broad scale, but it is time in this Government that we apply ourselves to an examination of such details, for the benefit of the taxpayer. It will be impossible for us to continue spending at the present scale and on a deficit basis.

Second, I think I may take a little credit for the subcommittee when I say that for 4 years we have worked with a little problem in the District of Columbia known as the Marshall Heights residential area under the supervision of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. We have consistently said to them that we would not appropriate money so that a minority group, a group of Negro residents of the District of Columbia, should be forced out of their privately owned homes and prohibited from making improvements to their homes because that area is desired by other people to build more expensive properties. We have consistently refused to concur with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Commissioners of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

I saw this morning a matter which the subcommittee may take a little credit for, that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have finally decided to leave these home owners, who bought their homes, who built their homes, and who desire under the American tradition to live were they own their property and not be put off and have some Government housing project substituted—the Commissioners have finally agreed to remove the restrictions, and I think the freeze order will soon also be removed.

Mr. Chairman, I express again my personal appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee for the many courtesies and the very great pleasure of working with a committee which brings to the floor a chapter of a bill which has in it so little controversy after it is out of our hands. I express my personal regret that we will not have the gentleman from South Dakota with us carrying a very large share of the minority load of the subcommittee next year.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for the information of the Members and so that their attention may be called to it, if it is not true that the general debate on the chapter on Civil Functions will take place on Tuesday as soon as the House goes into the Committee of the Whole for that purpose?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct. It is the only place in the program where there has been an inversion of the order. Civil Functions is listed as No. 9 in the report accompanying the general appropriation bill for 1951, but it is really going to take tenth place as far as the general debate which will take place on Tuesday is concerned.

Mr. TABER. I think the Members ought to know about that so that those who are interested will be sure to be here. All general debate on the bill itself has to be closed by Tuesday night?

Mr. RABAUT. All general debate closes by Tuesday night on all of the chapters.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman will yield, is it still part of the program that we are to have the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar and also the District Calendar on Monday and Tuesday, in addition to general debate on the remaining chapters?

Mr. RABAUT. May I refer the gentleman to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. The District Calendar will not be called. There is one suspension from the Committee on the District of Columbia which is on daylight saving

for Monday. But the regular calendar will not be called.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There was some confusion about that. I was not sure. It is a fact, however, that the Consent Calendar will be called on Monday and the Private Calendar on Tuesday?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement general debate on chapter IX will be postponed until Tuesday next.

CHAPTER X—DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

General debate on chapter X is now in order not to exceed 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and 1 hour by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have two legislative days to extend their remarks on chapter VIII of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 247) entitled "An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes."

SUPPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 565, Report No. 1964) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7941) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER ON CHAPTER VIII OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 566, Report No. 1965) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, all points of order against chapter VIII of said bill or any provision contained in said chapter are hereby waived.

BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. SABATH (on behalf of Mr. MADDEN), from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 567, Rept. No. 1966), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution its shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5990) to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENDING RUBBER ACT OF 1948.

Mr. SABATH (on behalf of Mr. LYLE) from the Committee on Rules reported the folowing privileged resolution (H. Res. 568, Rept. No. 1967), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7579), to extend the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER ON CHAPTER VIII OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 566.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 566

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, all points of order against chapter VIII of said bill or any provisions contained in said chapter are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain statistics on power rates and rural electrification.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement on certain phases of the Marshall plan notwithstanding the fact the extension is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205.

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 247. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1418. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill

entitled "A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1963. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 565. Resolution for consideration of and waiving points of order against H. R. 7941, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 566. Resolution for the waiving of points of order against chapter VIII of H. R. 7786, a bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 567. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5990, a bill to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 568. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7579, a bill to extend the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 5472. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1968). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TOWE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7708. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 8291. A bill to abolish the position of mail handler in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 8292. A bill to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Percy Jones General Hospital at Battle Creek, Mich., by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 8293. A bill to abolish the position of mail handler in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8294. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 8295. A bill to provide for the disposition of internal-revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8296. A bill to provide an additional amount for the emergency fund for the President for the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 8297. A bill for the safety of life and property by making all commercial fishing vessels subject to the rules and regulations of the United States Coast Guard marine inspection; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 8298. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 564. Resolution creating a select committee to attend the third round of tariff negotiations under the general agreement on tariffs and trade; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 569. Resolution creating a select committee on international economic relationships; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 570. Resolution to amend rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 571. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 8299. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 8300. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. LaPorta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 8301. A bill for the relief of Midshipman Willis Howard Dukelow, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 8302. A bill for the relief of Jai Young Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2096. By the SPEAKER: Petition of G. J. Ondrasek, city clerk, Fond du Lac, Wis., requesting passage of Senate bill 2166, which would bring about payment of defaulted bonds of the joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2097. Also, petition of James E. Collins, city clerk, Niagara Falls, N. Y., requesting extension of time to January 1, 1952, for the completion of demolition of Hyde Park Village; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the hunger of heart which leads us to this pavilion of prayer where we are united in a common fellowship of yearning and aspiration. We turn to Thee as the true home of our spirits. Our littleness needs Thy greatness, our weakness needs Thy strength. We have found that apart from Thee we fail to do our best and reach our highest, and that unlest we find our rest in Thee and our peace in Thy will we lack poise and tranquillity. In this quiet moment, lead us past all shams and subterfuges to Thyself.

Grant this dear land of ours, in days that are heavy with crisis, the strength of purpose to do justly and to love mercy. Save us from self-interest and self-righteousness. From yielding to melancholy moods that depress others, from the sullenness of temper that drives the sunshine from other faces, from the defeatism that shrinks from the summons to do battle with gloom and with falsehood wherever it is entrenched, good Lord, deliver us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 28, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to

to meet today during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Millikin
Anderson	Holland	Morse
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Ives	Myers
Butler	Jenner	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Kefauver	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Darby	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Leahy	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Lodge	Taylor
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McClellan	Thye
Frear	McFarland	Tobey
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
George	McMahon	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Gurney	Malone	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KEM obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches, and without the Senator from Missouri losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS OF THREE AFFILIATED TRIBES OF FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION, N. DAK.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a resolution of certification of official vote of the members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to vest title to certain lands of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., in the United States, and to provide compensation therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF LOW-RENT HOUSING AND SLUM CLEARANCE PROGRAMS TO ALASKA, HAWAII, PUERTO RICO, AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enable the governments of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands to authorize public bodies or agencies to undertake slum clearance, urban redevelopment, and low-rent housing activities including the issuance of bonds and other obligations, to amend the low-rent housing enabling statutes for Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS AND HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Federal Home Loan Banks and the Home Loan Bank Board, for the year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Mary Leila Forrest nee Jackson from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Hawaii Small Ranchers Association, Honokaa, T. H., favoring the reappointment of Ingram M. Stainback as Governor of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by Hillyard Post No. 1474, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Spokane, Wash., relating to the tour of the United States by 11 convicted Communists, to raise funds for an appeal from the decision by a Federal court jury in New York City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the General Council of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., signed by William R. Johnston, moderator, and H. B. Clawson, stated clerk, relating to the separation of church and state; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Maryland State Junior Chamber of Commerce, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation to effectuate the recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation to remove or reduce the excise tax on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Federalsburg Chamber of Commerce, the Cambridge Woman's Club, the Cambridge Rotary Club, the Allegany-Garrett County Medical Society, and the Calvert County Medical Society, all of the State of Maryland, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition signed by Mrs. Marion Loyd, and sundry other citizens of Washington, D. C., Maryland, and Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of House concurrent resolution 64, to seek development of the United Nations into a world federation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Memorials signed by sundry employees of the Baltimore Photoengravers Union, Local No. 2, the Art Photo Engraving Co., Inc., the Alpha Photo-Engraving Co., the News-Post Engraving Department, and sundry citizens of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1103, to readjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing socialized medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROTEST AGAINST REDUCTION OF POSTAL SERVICE FUNDS—MEMORIAL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a memorial signed by Leon Gary, mayor of the city of Houma, and sundry other officials and citizens of Terrebonne Parish, all in the State of Louisiana, remonstrating against a reduction of postal service funds, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

APRIL 25, 1950.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the citizens and officials of Terrebonne Parish, La., wish to register our protest to the action which has resulted in a reduction of postal-service funds. The lessening of funds will result in poor mail service when the reduction in daily delivery is put into effect. We protest that such a move should be undertaken which seriously affects the much needed service of regular mail delivery.

We urge that you exercise your usual diligence in investigating the apparent lack of wisdom on the part of the Post Office Department.

Leon Gary, mayor of the city of Houma, and sundry other officials and citizens of Terrebonne Parish, La.

PROTEST AGAINST WEAKENING OF ANTITRUST LAWS—RESOLUTION OF PIERCE COUNTY (WIS.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution adopted by the Pierce County Farmers Union relative to protection of the Nation's antitrust statutes. Naturally, I agree with this resolution 100 percent, because I feel that it is essential that we curb monopolistic trends in our land in order to protect small business as well as to protect consumers—both in the cities and on the farms—from high prices which monopolies inevitably cause. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution as sent to me by Leo H. Schroeder, president of the Pierce County Farmers Union be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESCOTT, WIS., *April 24, 1950.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Following is resolution adopted by Pierce County Farmers Union:

"Whereas there have been numerous attempts made to weaken existing antitrust legislation; and

"Whereas we, as farmers and consumers, are vitally interested in the retention and strengthening of all antitrust laws, including enforcement of such laws: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That we the delegates to the quarterly convention of the Pierce County Farmers Union, meeting at Ellsworth, Wis., this 24th day of March 1950, do hereby go on record as opposed to any efforts to weaken antitrust laws."

Adopted unanimously.

LEO H. SCHROEDER,
President.

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE GAMBLING—RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE (WIS.) PRESBYTERY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 2, I commented on the Senate floor on the importance of an all-out campaign to curb interstate gambling and affiliated racketeering activities. I stated the convictions of America's decent citizens for strong congressional action along this line.

In this connection, on April 25, 45 Presbyterian churches in the Milwaukee, Wis., area met through their representatives and unanimously adopted a resolution on behalf of action such as I have suggested. The resolution was sent to me by Rev. Carl R. Simon, stated clerk of the Milwaukee Presbytery. Naturally, I endorse the resolution as conveyed by this distinguished spiritual leader who is incidentally chairman of the social education and action committee of the Milwaukee Presbytery.

As Reverend Simon stated in a letter to me:

It is our fervent hope that you and all other high-minded persons in the United States Senate will do everything possible to eliminate this evil which yearly reaps its pitiful harvest of ruined lives and wasted resources.

Two days after the meeting of the Milwaukee Presbytery, the Milwaukee Journal published an editorial on the need to pass the anticrime legislation now pending. The Journal editorial mentioned that there are "an estimated 150,000 horse-race bookies now operating in the United States, and Congress is studying ways and means of adding them to the unemployment rolls." The Journal editorial also pointed out that in what were known as the "John Doe" investigations, held more than a year ago in Wisconsin's largest city, it was proven that wire services were indispensable to Milwaukee horse-race gambling.

The Milwaukee (Wis.) Presbytery resolution is brief, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Milwaukee Presbytery hereby goes on record as favoring legislation prohibiting gambling on an interstate basis, and directs its committee on social education and action to represent Presbytery in writing to Federal Representatives, asking that they take action to prevent gambling, and the spreading of gambling information across State lines.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1777. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; with amendments (Rept. No. 1527);

H. R. 4892. A bill to provide for the admission of pay patients to the Home for the Aged and Infirm; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528); and

H. R. 6104. A bill to authorize the establishment of an educational agency for surplus property within the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1529).

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 257, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $10,000, in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator state how much money is involved and for what purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. Ten thousand dollars. Under the law the committee is allowed $10,000. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has used its first $10,000, and now is asking for a second $10,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 257) submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado on April 13, 1950, was considered and agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM—PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT NO. 1515

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 262, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I wish to say that the total cost involved is $1,018. It relates to the printing of 1,100 copies of Senate Report No. 1515, dealing with a very important subject which has been under investigation for a couple of years, the investigation of the immigration system.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 262) submitted by Mr. MCCARRAN, on April 20, 1950, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to have printed for its use 1,100 copies of Senate Report No. 1515, a report pursuant to Senate Resolution 137, Eightieth Congress, first session, as amended, relative to an investigation of the immigration system.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 1, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for Mr. PEPPER):

S. 3515. A bill to bring employees of county agricultural conservation committees and cooperative agents of the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture within the purview of the civil-service laws and regulations, the Classification Act of 1949, the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the laws relating to sick and annual leave for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. O'CONOR introduced Senate bill 3516, to authorize acquisition of a suitable building for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in or near Baltimore, Md., which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 3517. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3518. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ellsworth Schroeder; and

S. 3519. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Chester Stevens; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3520. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing for continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abaca by the United States; and

S. 3521. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3522. A bill to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 3523. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Alberto Pizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3524. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act of May 25, 1948 (Public Law 554, 80th Cong.), relating to the Flathead Indian irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 3525. A bill to amend section 28 of the Enabling Act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. DONNELL) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 174, granting the consent of Congress to the entry, by the State of Missouri and by the State of Illinois, into a compact or agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

ACQUISITION OF BUILDING FOR BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize requisition of a suitable building for the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance in or near Baltimore, Md., and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Maryland will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3516) to authorize acquisition of a suitable building for the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance in or near Baltimore, Md., introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. O'CONOR is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR O'CONOR

The people of Maryland are greatly concerned at the moment over two matters that directly affect them, their pocketbooks and their local interests.

They want to see the huge total of Federal spending scaled down to the point where a balanced budget will be made possible and hopes generated thereby for reduction in the burden of individual and corporate taxes.

They also are most anxious to retain in their midst the activities of the old-age and survivors insurance section of the Social Security Division, with its 5,000 or more employees.

Complaints have been expressed by officials of the Bureau regarding the present quarters available in Baltimore in the Candler Building and a proposal now is before the Congress for a new building in or near the District of Columbia to cost approximately $11,500,000.

In an effort to keep the activities of this Bureau in Baltimore, and to avoid further spending, responsible banking and business interests there have developed a plan under which the desired building can be erected, in or near Baltimore, without the $11,500,000 outlay by the Government which is now proposed.

Under the contemplated arrangement the Baltimore interests would build the building to Government specifications, and lease it to the Federal Government at the current space rate, under an arrangement that would apply the rental to the retirement of the cost of the building. The result would be that in a matter of 25 years the building would be fully paid for, the title would revert to the United States Government without any $11,500,000 expenditure, and at very little if any greater yearly cost than the Government has been paying up to now for its quarters in Baltimore.

I sincerely believe that this program, if adopted, would save the taxpayers of the country a great deal of money and I am sending to the desk a bill which would authorize the acceptance of this very attractive proposal. It is offered, of course, on the basis of my conviction that a thorough study by the General Services Administration officials will disclose the plan to be most advantageous to the Government and to the taxpayers who now are being asked to supply the additional $11,500,000.

ADDITIONAL TRANS-ATLANTIC PASSENGER SERVICE AT LOWER COST

Mr. BREWSTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 267), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas travel by United States residents contributes to the creation of vitally needed dollar exchange in European countries; and

Whereas lack of adequate trans-Atlantic passenger service during the summer season at rates within the reach of the middle-income market is limiting the extent of such travel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Civil Aeronautics Board and the United States Maritime Commission are requested (1), to explore every available means of providing additional trans-Atlantic passenger service at lower cost, including maximum utilization of existing service under special low-fare arrangements, charters, and group contracts; and (2), if they find their existing authority inadequate to facilitate and encourage such low-cost transportation, to recommend to the Senate such legislation as may be necessary to enable them to accomplish such objective.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AMERICAN SECURITY AT MIDCENTURY—ADDRESS BY PAUL G. HOFFMAN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject American Security at Midcentury, delivered by Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator of the ECA, before the American Society of International Law, Washington, D. C., April 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATIVE FOR AMERICAN REMITTANCES TO EUROPE—STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York, regarding the observance of Care Week, May 1 to May 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HON. HERBERT HOOVER'S SUGGESTION ABOUT RECONSTITUTION OF UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE BY JOHN W. OWENS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding Mr. Hoover's suggestion about the reorganization of the United Nations without Russia and her satellites, written by John W. Owens, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF CAPITAL TO AMERICAN STANDARDS OF LIVING—EDITORIAL FROM THE MAGAZINE PARTNERS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Capital Punishment," from the April issue of the magazine Partners, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPLY OF THE BROOKLYN TABLET TO MR. FRIENDLY'S ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Patrick J. Scanlon, managing editor of the Tablet, of Brooklyn, N. Y., regarding the activities of Mr. Alfred Kohlberg in connection with United States China policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF FEDERAL RENT CONTROL—LETTERS TO SENATOR CAIN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters addressed to him by Earl J. Glade, mayor of Salt Lake City, Utah, Lt. (jg) C. L. Edwards, United States Naval Reserve (retired), New Orleans, La., and Richard W. Lenington, of Seattle, Wash., relating to the proposed extension of Federal rent control, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRENGTHENING THE SPIRITUAL VALUES OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum received by him from C. E. B. Ward, of the League for the American Home, Inc., relating to cooperation between the American home and the American church in strengthening the spiritual values of democracy, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the promulgation of Poland's

constitution, containing her famous bill of rights. I have prepared a statement commemorating this anniversary, which is a day to be noted by all liberty- and freedom-loving people. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to have my statement printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Americans of Polish descent and Poles in all the free countries observe today one of the greatest Polish national holidays—the anniversary of the signing of Poland's bill of rights—the Third of May Constitution.

One hundred and fifty-nine years ago, in 1791, the Polish leaders, encouraged and inspired in part by the American Constitution, proclaimed a new constitution for the Polish nation.

The Polish Third of May Constitution was the most liberal and the most democratic of its day. The constitution's recognition of equality for all men, the proclamation of religious liberty, and all the new freedoms were more than Catherine the Great of Russia could bear. This Russian monarch had perceived that the Polish constitution presented a great danger to the tyrannical form of government in Russia. With the connivance of the rulers of Prussia and Austria, Poland was attacked, partitioned, and enslaved.

All during the century and a quarter of Poland's enslavement, the Polish Third of May Constitution served the Poles as a guiding light in their struggle for freedom, independence, and democracy.

It seems that the tragic part of Poland's history repeats itself. In the eighteenth century the tyrannical ruler of Russia, the infamous Catherine, destroyed Polish freedom, Polish institutions, Polish culture, and Polish national life. Today the Kremlin is again carrying out Catherine's work. Catherine's and Stalin's methods are basically the same, only Stalin's are more insidious and deadly.

The people of Poland are, of course, opposing Soviet designs upon them in every way they can under the existing conditions of oppression and terror. The Polish people look to us for encouragement in their struggles.

What can we say to them?

We can say that their cause is our cause and that we will never sacrifice them to permanent slavery behind the iron curtain.

Let every true American stand with Poland in her hour of sorrow and oppression and let us do everything we can as a people and a nation to secure Poland's early liberation.

On this day we may also note the fact that the United States Senate recently recognized the contribution of Polish men-at-arms in the recent conflict. I refer to the inclusion in the displaced-persons bill of a special provision for admittance into this country of 18,000 members of the Polish armed forces who fought under Allied banners in the recent war. These men who a few years ago were fighting for the liberty of all mankind will now be able to apply for immigration into this country, together with members of their immediate families. Here in this free land of ours they may find a home. I am proud and glad of the opportunity I had to fight for and support this legislation. I hope it will be included in the final version of this bill when it becomes law.

OWEN LATTIMORE—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR TYDINGS AND FORMER SECRETARIES OF STATE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the matter of correspondence between four former Secretaries of State and myself having occasioned some discussion on the floor of the Senate, I think it most appropriate that the Senate and the country be advised that on April 17 I wrote similar letters to the four living Secretaries of State who have held office since 1932, inquiring into certain phases of charges made on the Senate floor and elsewhere. I ask that my letter, together with the reply of each of the Secretaries, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF LETTERS ON LATTIMORE

WASHINGTON, April 29.—Following is the exchange of correspondence regarding Owen Lattimore between Senator Tydings (Democrat, Maryland) on the one hand; Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; and Gen. George C. Marshall, James F. Byrnes, and Cordell Hull, all former Secretaries of State:

APRIL 17, 1950.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: It has been stated by Senator MCCARTHY during the course of the hearings now being held by the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Senate Resolution 231, that Mr. Owen Lattimore is "the principal architect of our far-eastern policy."

It is important for our committee to determine the truth of this contention for whatever bearing it may have on other evidence adduced in the Lattimore matter. For that reason, I would appreciate it greatly if you would inform me at your earliest possible convenience of the extent to which, in your opinion, Dr. Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far-eastern policy" or the extent that Dr. Lattimore influenced our far-eastern policy during the period in which you were Secretary of State.

I am addressing a similar letter to Secretary Acheson, Mr. Hull, and Mr. Byrnes.

Thanking you for your kindness in giving the committee this information, I am

Very respectfully,

MILLARD E. TYDINGS.

[TYDINGS sent similar letters to Secretary Acheson, former Secretary Hull, and former Secretary Byrnes.]

GENERAL MARSHALL'S REPLY

APRIL 22, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I have received your letter of April 17 in which you refer to a recent statement in connection with the hearings of the subcommittee on foreign relations under Senate Resolution 231, that "Owen Lattimore is the principal architect of our far-eastern policy." Your letter then asks the extent to which, in my opinion, "Lattimore was the principal architect of our far-eastern policy" during the period in which I served as Secretary of State.

The statement referred to above is completely without basis in fact.

So far as I and my associates can recall I never even met Mr. Lattimore.

I take the liberty of commenting on the harmful effect on our foreign relations of such statements, charges, or insinuations broadcast with so little regard for the truth. They undoubtedly confuse our friends abroad, undermine and weaken our position before the world and actually lend assistance to the powers that would destroy us.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

TEXT OF BYRNES' LETTER

APRIL 24, 1950.

DEAR MILLARD: I have your letter of the 17th asking the extent to which, in my opinion, Mr. Owen Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far-eastern policy" or the extent he influenced our far-eastern policy during the period I was Secretary of State.

I do not know Mr. Lattimore. If he ever wrote me about the far-eastern policy the letter was not called to my attention. If, while I was Secretary of State, he discussed our far-eastern policy with any officials of the Department concerned with that policy, in their discussions with me, they did not quote him.

Early in December 1945, Gen. George C. Marshall went to China and thereafter his reports to the President and me influenced our policies in China and the Far East.

I do not think General Marshall was influenced by Mr. Lattimore.

To my former colleagues, I take the liberty of adding, that regardless of the merits of complaints as to what has heretofore occurred, the President and Secretary of State have given proof of their desire to restore the bipartisan policy in our foreign affairs, and I earnestly hope the Members of the Senate will cooperate in that effort.

While I was Secretary of State I found I could talk to Senator VANDENBERG with the same freedom with which I talked to Senator CONNALLY and to my assistants, and I profited by his advice. I am sure that in his absence other Republican Senators will cooperate just as did Senator VANDENBERG.

It is extremely important at this time, in view of the tenseness of the situation in world affairs, that we do not give to either our friends or enemies abroad, the false impression of a serious division among us in our policies as to the Soviet Government. Seldom in history have our people been so united on any issue.

I hope that, regardless of our difference on domestic issues, our political leaders can present a united front in our foreign relations.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

CORDELL HULL'S ANSWER

APRIL 20, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: A have your letter of April 17 in which you inquire concerning the extent to which, in my opinion, Dr. Owen Lattimore was "the principal architect of our far-eastern policy" or the extent he influenced our far-eastern policy which I was Secretary of State.

In my opinion he was in no sense the principal architect of our far-eastern policy during the period I served as Secretary of State.

Although his position in academic circles as a student of and writer on some aspects of Chinese life and history was of course known to us, I am not aware that during this period he had any appreciable influence on our far-eastern policy. I do not remember having consulted with him on that subject or on any subject at any time.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

SECRETARY ACHESON'S LETTER

APRIL 27, 1950.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: In a letter dated April 17, 1950, you asked that I inform you of the extent to which, in my opinion, Mr. Owen Lattimore was the "principal architect of our far-eastern policy," or the extent to which he influenced our far eastern policy during the period in which I have been Secretary of State.

On April 17, Mr. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, wrote you in full detail concerning Mr. Lattimore's connections with this Department in the past.

The far-eastern policy of this Government, like all other foreign policy, is the responsibility of the Secretary of State and has been made by me in my administration subject, of course, to the direction of the President.

I welcome this opportunity to state personally and categorically that during this period in which I have been Secretary, Mr. Lattimore, so far as I am concerned or am aware, has had no influence in the determination of our far-eastern policy.

There is clearly no basis in fact for describing Mr. Lattimore as the principal architect of our far-eastern policy. I might add

that, so far as I am aware, I have never met Mr. Lattimore.

The far-eastern policy of the United States has at all times been determined after careful study by the responsible officers of the Department and an objective evaluation by me of all the facts available to this Government.

The Department of State has explored all avenues to arrive at the relevant facts. The measure of the participation of Mr. Lattimore, so far as this Department and I are concerned, is fully and fairly indicated in the letter of April 17 from Mr. Peurifoy.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

DEVASTATION WROUGHT BY CORN BORERS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is absent because of illness, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a letter he received from Dr. Harold Gunderson, of the Iowa State College of Agriculture, Ames, Iowa, concerning the appropriation for research work on the control of the corn borer.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a reply, prepared in behalf of the Senator from Iowa and myself, to the letter from Dr. Gunderson.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOWA STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Ames, Iowa, April 24, 1950.

Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: I must apologize for my delay in answering your letter of April 14 and April 18 in regard to the European corn borer.

We feel, and justifiably I think, that the corn borer is the most important crop pest in the United States. During the past 10 years the borer has struck at the major corn-growing area of the country, Iowa, Illinois, Nebraska, and Minnesota, where more than half of all the corn in the United States is produced. In Iowa alone, losses have been tremendous. In 1948 our loss was $93,000,000 and in 1949 it was either $171,000,000 or $212,000,000, depending on which corn-price figure was used. The pattern shown in these two years merely followed that set earlier, since the annual loss from borers has doubled or more than doubled each year since the borer entered Iowa in 1942.

If this pattern continues in 1950, our loss in Iowa alone could approach $300,000,000. Winter survival of borers has been high, according to surveys now in progress in Iowa. These surveys, like the other corn-borer work, are cooperative between Iowa State College and the United States Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.

I'm sure that anything you can do to restore or increase research funds for corn-borer work will greatly benefit everyone in the Corn Belt States.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD GUNDERSON,
Extension Entomologist.

MAY 1, 1950.

DR. HAROLD GUNDERSON,
Extension Entomologist,
Iowa State College of Agriculture,
Ames, Iowa.

DEAR DR. GUNDERSON: Your letter concerning the increased destruction of corn by corn borers was brought to our attention.

One of the most important farm problems facing the entire Midwest is the destruction of corn crops by this pest. It is not merely the annual destruction which causes concern, but it is primarily the trend of increasing destruction. The annual loss from borers has more than doubled each year since its introduction into the Midwest.

Your letter clearly shows the destruction caused by corn borers in Iowa. Taking the Nation as a whole, this pest destroyed approximately 85,000,000 bushels of corn in 1948, and about 313,000,000 bushels in 1949. In Illinois 58,000,000 bushels were destroyed last year, representing a money value of about $69,000,000.

The cost of research into the control of the corn borer is an investment in our future. If methods of controlling this pest are not discovered, the great resources of farm production will be dried up and we will be faced, not with problems of abundance, but with problems of scarcity of basic food commodities.

With every best wish,

Sincerely yours,

GUY M. GILLETTE.
SCOTT W. LUCAS.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have proposed to the pending measure an amendment reading as follows:

Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country whenever he determines that such country exports or permits the exportation, to Russia or any of its satellite countries, after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, of any article or commodity which, in the opinion of the Administrator, could be used to maintain or expand, directly or indirectly, the military forces of any such country."

Mr. President, there are strong indications that the Marshall plan is operating in reverse. All too much evidence is coming to light that the real beneficiaries of the program may be the Communists.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should prefer to make a short statement first, and then to yield to my able friend, the Senator from Indiana. In due course I shall gladly invite his inquiries.

I wish to call the Senate's attention to certain rather startling facts, some of which have not received the public attention which they deserve.

The Marshall plan was designed to create a bulwark in western Europe against communism with a wall of dollars taken under the taxing power from the American people. But, it soon became apparent that dollars alone could not do the job. The administration then asked the Congress to approve a program of military aid—to send weapons of war to prop up our toppling dollar wall. Congress acceded to the request of the administration.

Only quite recently Washington echoed with the roar of B–29 bombers on their way to Great Britain under the military-aid program. Almost daily, shipments of heavy artillery and other arms leave American ports, bound for Europe.

Unfortunately, there is no certainty—no certainty at all—that European governments now receiving our gifts of arms and dollars would be effective allies in a war against Russia. Would they indeed be allies—that is, our allies—at all?

Britain and France are principal beneficiaries under both the Marshall plan and the military-aid program.

The British Government that was our loyal ally in World War I and World War II has passed into other hands. It is now entirely different.

In Great Britain, the ruling government is a Socialist government. It follows closely the doctrines of Karl Marx. The Government of the U. S. S. R.—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—also adheres to the teachings of Karl Marx. In event of a war with Russia—and God forbid it—the Marxist government of Britain would decide with whom Britain would cast her lot—with the U. S. S. R. or with the United States.

It is true, of course, that Britain's Socialist government has a 20-year military alliance with the United States and 10 other Atlantic Pact countries. That is what we call the North Atlantic Pact.

But it is also true, as pointed out a few days ago by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], that Britain has a 20-year military and economic alliance with Russia.

The miners' union of Britain is dominated by its secretary, Arthur Horner, who is a Communist. He has announced publicly that if England goes to war with Russia, no coal will be mined in England.

British Prime Minister Attlee has said that in economic matters the British look to Russia, rather than to the United States.

Mr. President, I have none but feelings of friendship and affection for the British people. We Americans have both admiration and gratitude for the England of Shakespeare, Milton, Kipling, Disraeli, and, of course, Churchill. But I oppose the use of American aid by the present British Marxist government to coddle communism.

After the British election last February, Prime Minister Attlee appointed John Strachey to head the vital British Ministry of War. It so happens that Mr. Strachey has quite a record as a Communist writer and Communist worker. He has written numerous books on the virtues of Soviet socialism, as he calls it. He once wrote, "the coming of communism can alone render our problems soluble."

Think of that. The man who now heads the British Ministry of War has said, "The coming of communism can alone render our problems soluble."

As late as 1945 Mr. Strachey welcomed the prospect that two Socialist powers, Great Britain and Russia, as he said, would shortly join in an effort to rid the world of capitalism.

In 1935 Mr. Strachey made a lecture tour of the United States. While on this tour he was accused of declaring that he was a Communist, and was arrested by United States immigration agents. The immigration authorities dropped deportation proceedings when Mr. Strachey departed voluntarily for Europe.

Again in 1938 Mr. Strachey sailed for the United States, only to have his visa canceled while in mid-Atlantic by the

American Consul General in London, who declared he was "convinced that he is a member of the executive committee of the British Communist Party." Accordingly, Mr. Strachey again faced deportation proceedings in this country, which were dropped when he decided to return voluntarily to Britain.

As Minister of War, Mr. Strachey also is in charge of Britain's intelligence system, which has the job of tracking down Communist spies. This is the same agency which cleared the notorious spy-scientist Klaus Fuchs for work on the atomic bomb in the United States. Mr. Fuchs kept himself quite busy. As fast as we learned something new about the atom, Mr. Fuchs slipped the information on to Stalin. As a result, or at least as a coincidence, the Russians now have the atom bomb—at least a year ahead of the time we expected them to have it.

The Washington Post, in a recent editorial, referred to the appointment of Mr. Strachey as "plain stupidity." But the British are not a stupid people. They have earned the reputation through the years of being brilliant and shrewd, particularly in the conduct of their foreign affairs. Certainly Mr. Attlee, the Prime Minister, could not have been unfamiliar with the reputation and activities of Mr. Strachey. I do not agree, I cannot agree, that the appointment of Mr. Strachey can be properly laid to stupidity. I believe it is a key move in a carefully calculated plan of Communist forces to dominate the world.

The Socialist Government in Britain has recognized communism in China. I am glad to say we have not done so—yet—and I hope we shall not do so. The bitter experiences endured by our State Department in recent months should afford sufficient proof to convince us of the folly of trying to appease Russia and her satellites.

I frequently receive letters, as I am sure other Members of this body do, saying, in effect, "There must be no compromise with communism."

But the British Socialist Government has compromised with communism. It not only chose to recognize the Red government in China; it also recently turned over to the Chinese Communists about 90 airplanes claimed by Gen. Claire Chennault's air line.

It is utter folly for us to supply arms and money to Britain, supposedly to check communism in Europe, while, at the same time, her Socialist government is encouraging and actually aiding Communists in the Far East. So much for Britain.

Let us look for a moment at the situation in France. The largest single group of delegates in the French national assembly is made up of Communists.

France, like England, has a 20-year military and economic alliance with Russia.

Dr. Frederick Joliot-Curie, until last week the head of the French Government's atomic-energy program, is a notorious Communist. He served in that position for quite some time, and during that period, had he been so disposed, could have supplied to the Russians all the information he obtained. Changes in the French Government occur almost as frequently as changes of the moon. The next government may reinstate him. Quite recently, in an address before the national congress of the French Communist Party, Dr. Joliot-Curie vigorously attacked the atomic-energy policies of the United States, though he stoutly defended those of Russia.

As Life magazine recently said in an editorial:

> An active Communist has no business being at the head of the French Government's atomic program. A Marxist of John Strachey's stripe has no business being the British Minister of War. It just won't do.

I agree, Mr. President, it just will not do.

It is argued that we should take a calculated risk. It is said that Socialist governments in western Europe might side with us in case of a war with Russia. But the hour is late to be gambling, speculating, with the security of our country. If the people of Europe want our assistance, let them clean house. If they do not, we should halt our aid. That is the philosophy behind the amendment to which I am now addressing myself.

We should concentrate our energies and our money on building our defenses here at home.

A few days ago there came to me startling evidence that Marshall-plan countries are making substantial shipments of war material, including arms, to Russia and her satellites, material which we ourselves have refused to ship to those countries.

Let us take a look at the picture. It will not be a complete look, because I was able to obtain information about only three of the Marshall-plan countries—Great Britain, France, and Belgium. But the information I have will give a pretty good idea of what is going on.

First, here are just a few of the things that Belgium shipped to Russia and her satellites last year: Firearms, to Czechoslovakia, iron, cast iron, steel, copper, lead, tin, and zinc. Belgium also sent substantial quantities of electrical machinery, articles for electrotechnical use, and measuring and precision instruments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a partial list of exports during 1949 from Belgium and Luxemburg to Russia and satellite nations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Partial list of exports from Belgium-Luxemburg during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations [1]

Item	Amount in dollars [2]	Amount in thousands of francs	Metric tons [3]
Arms (to Czechoslovakia)	6,040	302	-------
Iron, cast iron, and steel	19,782,840	989,142	151,749
Copper	11,028,820	551,441	23,523
Lead	1,583,160	79,158	4,836
Zinc	3,003,780	150,189	10,413
Tin	941,060	47,053	485
Other base metals and alloys	1,387,360	69,368	623
Boilers, machinery, mechanical apparatus and appliances, and parts	7,937,880	396,894	6,273
Electrical machinery and apparatus, and articles for electrotechnical use, and parts	5,840,660	292,033	-------
Railway and tramway rolling stock and material	430,600	21,530	872
Optical, measuring, precision, and other instruments and apparatus	2,480	124	-------
Chemical products	1,709,540	85,477	8,573
Explosives, fireworks, matches and other inflammable materials	1,447,960	72,398	2,014
Rubber and manufactures	942,600	47,130	1,355

[1] Complete list available in my office, including a break-down of exports by importing country.
[2] Computation based on current exchange rate of 50 francs to the dollar.
[3] 1 metric ton is equal to 2,204.6 pounds.

Mr. KEM. Now for Great Britain. Last year the British Socialist Government permitted more than $45,000,000 worth of machinery, including electric generators and machine tools, to be sent behind the iron curtain. Substantial shipments of ball and roller bearings also went into Communist hands. The British Government also let the Reds have sizable shipments of barbed wire and railway construction material.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a partial list of exports during 1949 from the United Kingdom to Russia and satellite nations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Partial list of exports from United Kingdom during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations

Item	Amount in dollars [1]	Amount in thousands of pounds sterling	Quantity
Ball and roller bearings and parts	243,600	87	[2] 2,000
Iron, steel, and manufactures (total)	12,140,800	4,336	[3] 88,000
Steel bars and rods, not alloy	1,736,000	620	[3] 20,000
Bars and rods of alloy steel	504,000	180	[3] 1,000
Hoop and strip	422,800	151	[3] 3,000
Railway and tramway construction material	708,400	253	[3] 10,000
Barbed wire	420,000	150	[3] 3,000
Cable and rope (except insulated telegraph and telephone cable)	425,600	152	[3] 1,000
Nonferrous metals and manufactures (total)	4,062,800	1,451	-------
Aluminum and alloys	618,800	221	[2] 21,000
Brass and other alloys of copper, other than nickel alloys	1,142,400	408	[2] 63,000
Copper	694,400	248	[3] 1,000
Electrical goods and apparatus	6,806,800	2,431	-------
Machinery (total, excluding ball and roller bearings and parts)	45,172,400	16,133	[2] 867,000
Electric generators	11,986,800	4,281	[2] 181,000
Electrical machinery, other than motors and generators	2,864,400	1,023	[2] 46,000
Machine tools (metal-working) other than portable power tools	5,138,000	1,835	[2] 129,000
Vehicles (total, including locomotives, ships, and aircraft)	13,361,600	4,772	-------
Rubber tires for motor vehicles, other than motorcycles and tricars	229,600	82	9,000
Chassis for motor vehicles, with engines	1,660,400	593	1,000

[1] Computation based on present exchange rate of $2.80 to the pound sterling.
[2] Hundredweight (112 pounds).
[3] Long tons.

Mr. KEM. France permitted all sorts of war material to go to Russia, and other countries behind the iron curtain, such as lead, aluminum, transportation equipment, chemicals, scientific instruments and apparatus, and so on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a partial list of exports during 1949 from France to Russia and satellite nations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Partial list of exports from France during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations

Item	Amount in dollars [1]	Amount in thousands of francs	Metric tons
Chemicals:			
Inorganic	1,546,759	533,365	23,425
Organic	983,283	339,063	610
Rubber and rubber products	1,678,616	578,833	1,426
Steel-mill products, hot-rolled, sheets and plates	4,198,881	1,447,890	41,696
Steel-mill products, cold-rolled, tubular products and wire	3,087,703	1,064,725	19,283
Aluminum, crude and semi-manufactures	369,245	127,326	815
Aluminum alloys	408,688	140,927	833
Lead and lead alloys	316,349	109,086	1,115
Metal manufactures	2,046,376	705,647	3,985
Machinery and apparatus	10,272,238	3,542,151	6,771
Machinery, electrical and apparatus	2,015,239	694,910	525
Transportation equipment	8,281,011	2,855,521	7,913
Optical, surgical, scientific, and photographic instruments and apparatus	1,113,145	383,843	115

[1] Computation based on current exchange rate of 350 francs to the dollar.

Mr. KEM. This information is official; it was furnished to me by the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce.

Many of the same materials which are being sent to Russia and her satellites by Marshall-plan countries are being supplied these same countries by the United States under the Marshall plan and the military-aid program. In other words, Mr. President, we are giving these materials, or their equivalent, to the Marshall-plan countries which, in turn, sell them to Russia and the satellite nations.

For example, we are supplying arms to Belgium. Belgium last year sent a shipment of firearms to Czechoslovakia. We are sending iron and steel to Belgium under the Marshall plan—$12,000,000 worth since the program began. Last year Belgium sent $19,782,840 worth of iron, cast iron, and steel to Russia and her satellites, $5,744,520 of which went directly to the U. S. S. R.

J. Mishell George, assistant to the Director of the United States Office of International Trade, writing in the March 27, 1950, issue of Foreign Commerce Weekly, an official Department of Commerce publication, had this to say:

> While United States exports of security items to Soviet bloc destinations were being severely restricted, such shipments continued to move as freely from other source countries as supplies permitted. * * * Examples of such shipments were quick to arise, indicating that the United States export market, for security items, was to some extent shifting to western Europe.

In other words, Mr. George said that when we cut off these shipments to the Russian satellites, the Marshall-plan countries in western Europe took our place and engaged in a profitable trade in the vacuum which was caused by our refusal to make the shipments. We are declining to permit manufacturers and merchants in the United States to go into the market, but our friends, the so-called participating countries in the Marshall plan, are invading the market with great success. Mr. President, does that make sense?

I continue to quote from Mr. George:

> This trade both created the undesirable discrimination and threatened to undermine the effectiveness of the United States security effort to restrict the growth of the Soviet war potential.

Mr. President, I interpolate to say that is a triumph of understatement.

I continue to quote from Mr. George:

> Many of these governments have export control over weapons and certain other strategic goods. For the most part, however, their controls have not been as extensive as our positive list.
>
> Both the trade community and the Office of International Trade have been deeply concerned about the trade inequities implicit in the possibility of United States exports of security items to friendly countries being diverted from use there and transshipped to destinations in the Soviet bloc, as well as about the effect of such action on the attainment of our security objective. * * * Examples of such transshipments have been numerous in western Europe.

A partial list of such transshipments, as Mr. George calls them, are incorporated in the three tables which I have inserted in the RECORD. I invite the earnest consideration of Senators to those tables.

I should like to remind the Senate that the information I have obtained pertains to only three of the 16 Marshall-plan areas: Belgium-Luxemburg, France, and Great Britain. I have endeavored to obtain similar information for other countries, including Sweden, which, there is some reason to believe, is perhaps the worst offender of all. However, the administration has not been able, or perhaps not willing, to make this further information available to me.

The Office of International Trade has advised me that domestic merchandise exported to Russia during the year 1949 amounted to $6,434,000, the lowest annual figure since 1923, and approximately one-fourth of 1948 exports. In other words, we are cutting down the exports of so-called positive-list materials to the Russian satellites, and enforcing our regulations. Apparently it is these potential war materials which Russia is interested in buying in the United States.

As I have said, our export trade with Russia has fallen in 1949 to about one-fourth of what it was in 1948. The low level of exports to the U. S. S. R. during the past year, following the trend of the last 8 months of 1948, came about in consequence of United States restrictions on the export to eastern Europe of commodities regarded as having direct or indirect military significance in effect since March 1, 1948.

It may be asked by someone looking at the tables, "Why do you refer to these materials as war materials?" Mr. President, we have called them war materials and we have prevented their sale directly to Russian satellites. I pose this question: If they are not war materials when the Marshall-plan countries sell them to Russia and its satellites, why are they war materials when our own manufacturers and merchants want to ship them there? It seems to me that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander.

This policy, says the Office of International Trade, practically brought to a halt the exportation of such industrial equipment as machine tools, electrical machinery, and construction, mining, refining, and conveying machinery, which formerly comprised the bulk of Soviet procurement in the United States.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that it is essential to the national security that we continue to ban shipments of war materials to the Soviet Union. I do not wish to be misunderstood as suggesting otherwise. However, it does seem to me that it is tragically absurd for us to pour into western Europe vast quantities of war materials under the Marshall plan and the arms-aid program, only to have our friends export the same materials to Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain.

The amendment which I have proposed would shut off further aid to any Marshall-plan country which continues to funnel war materials behind the iron curtain.

In view of the tense international situation, it is shocking that Marshall-plan countries are still permitting—right at this moment—substantial shipments of war materials to the Reds. While this is going on, the Russians cold-bloodedly shoot down an American plane and its crew in the Baltic. I understand that some Senators will assign that as a reason for voting for ECA. I make no such charge, but it could be that this plane was shot down with materials provided by us. During World War II our ships and planes were blasted with ammunition which had been made out of scrap iron furnished to the Japanese by us. Millions of American men risked their lives facing it. Tens of thousands were killed or maimed for life.

And yet, here we are again supplying, indirectly, materials of war to an unfriendly nation. Surely we should not permit this to go on much longer.

I hope the Senate will see fit to adopt this amendment.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield now to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

Mr. JENNER. How would the adoption of the Senator's amendment affect the 96 trade pacts which the Marshall-plan countries now have with Soviet Russia?

Mr. KEM. That would be a problem for the Marshall-plan countries to work out. Under my amendment, they could continue to ship war materials to Russia and the satellite countries if they considered it to be to their advantage to do so, but the amendment would say to them, "If you are going into that kind of business, you cannot at the same time get war materials and supplies from the United States."

Mr. JENNER. Last year, under the 26 trade pact agreements, Marshall-plan countries had a trade exchange with Communist Russia of $3,000,000,000. If the Senator's amendment is adopted and the $3,000,000,000 trade which western European countries have been engaged in with Communist Russia is stopped, does not the Senator believe that some Senators will say that the American taxpayer must make up to these European countries the $3,000,000,000 which they have lost in trade with Russia?

Mr. KEM. That might be said. I have been very much surprised at some things which have been said in this discussion of ECA. Surely no father or mother of a son who fought against the Japanese would take such a view.

Mr. JENNER. Is not the Senator afraid that argument might be made; and if so, could our economy stand it when we cannot pay our debts now? We are running $7,000,000,000 in the red this year; and if we have superimposed another $7,000,0000,000 gift to Europe, we will have that much more of a deficit, resulting in printing-press money and an inevitable inflation. Or, does the Senator think Congress would advocate making up the $3,000,000,000 by increasing taxes in order to put American taxpayers' money in Europe, as has been done during the past several years under UNRRA, the North Atlantic Pact, and the like?

Mr. KEM. President Truman suggested some time ago that taxes be raised, but evidently the reaction to that suggestion was such that he has not seen fit to renew it. It seems to me that it is impractical for us to shore up the entire economies of the countries of western Europe. The further we get along with this ECA program the more foolhardy the project is shown to be.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JENNER. In the Senator's remarks he referred to the fact that the air over Washington was filled with the noise of B-29's, American B-29's on their way to England. I presume the Senator was referring to the fact that we are sending the B-29's, the heavy bombers, to England, as a part of our treaty obligations under the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. KEM. Yes; but is is the unkindest cut of all for the British to sell war materials to the Russian satellites, at the very time of, and coincident with, our gifts of these same materials.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator know that Great Britain cut her own military budget last year almost $700,000,000?

Mr. KEM. I did not, but I have in mind that the Minister of War of Great Britain is Mr. John Strachey, who until recently was an avowed Communist.

Mr. JENNER. Our Government has been able to get along pretty well with Communists. We can get along with them in our Government. Alger Hiss had no trouble in the State Department for years. But there is a fact I desire to bring out. Does the Senator know that Great Britain itself does not have one single heavy bomber, and that she is completely relying upon America and the American taxpayers to furnish her defense?

Mr. KEM. That is a very alarming situation.

Mr. JENNER. I was in England last fall, and I went to the head of our military mission there. I asked him how many heavy bombers England had, and he said, "None." I said, "Who is furnishing the heavy bombers at this time?" This was in October. He said, "The American taxpayers are. We have three fields here, all equipped with American heavy bombers." England, after she entered into the North Atlantic Pact, further cut her military expenditures, while we are increasing ours every day. But I ask the Senator, what good is it going to do us to increase our military expenditures if we are to take the equipment and send it all over the world?

Mr. KEM. Particularly if it is to be funneled into Russia and the satellite countries.

Mr. JENNER. And England with a Communist Minister of War.

Mr. KEM. It does not make sense to me. I was about to ask the Senator whether he could have confidence in military operations conducted by Great Britain, as the ally of the United States, against Russia under the leadership of a man with the views held by John Strachey?

Mr. JENNER. The Senator has asked me a question. I would answer by saying that certainly I could not. But that is a question which General Bradley should be asked, and Mr. Johnson, the head of our Defense Department. They have been over in Europe in conference. I presume there cannot be a conference on defense with the North Atlantic countries unless we can consider the Minister of War of England being one of the conferees. Those are the gentlemen who should answer the Senator's question for the American people.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks the Members of the Senate shou'd vote for a program like that, or whether he thinks General Bradley should decide that question.

Mr. JENNER. He was over there in conference.

Mr. KEM. If we authorize the program and vote appropriations for the program, can we of the Senate escape responsibility for it?

Mr. JENNER. Primarily, the responsibility is ours.

Mr. KEM. And does not the responsibility rest on the shoulders of every Senator who votes for a program of that kind?

Mr. JENNER. I should think so.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the able Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri in relation to the statement—and I hope I am quoting him correctly—to the effect that some of the war materials being sent to England have been resold or have found their way from that nation into Russia. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. KEM. Materials of the same kind have gone to Russia. I have introduced into the RECORD a table showing the items, the kind of supplies which were shipped during the year 1949 by Great Britain to Russia and the satellite countries.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The question I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri is this: In view of the recent conference on the part of this country's high military command with the military officials of western Europe—and I assume the British Empire was represented at the conference—I am wondering if the military representatives of the United States knew of the situation the Senator mentioned; or does the Senator have any information along that line?

Mr. KEM. I do not know. The information came to me from the Department of Commerce. Mr. Botner, a member of my staff, secured the information for me from the Department of Commerce. I quoted from Mr. J. Mishell George, in the March number of an official publication of the Department of Commerce, in which Mr. George said that this was going on, and protested against it in as diplomatic language as the situation permitted.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In view of that situation, I am wondering if the Senator has any information to the effect that that condition has been brought to the attention of our Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEM. I am bringing it to the attention of the Senate and the public today. The table will go into the RECORD. I think it is fair to say that every Member will be charged with notice of the facts from this point on.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] raised a question about England's large bombers, and the fact that the British were depending upon us to supply such bombers. He referred to a trip he made abroad.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact, and ask him if he is aware of it, that in the latter part of 1947, when, with a group of Senators, I went to Germany where we were told about two great airfields where American planes had been junked. Some members of the party visited the airfields, which were in remote places, and as far as our eyes could reach we could see American planes, the same type of planes that won the war in 1945, wing to wing, mile after mile of them. A charge of dynamite had been put in the noses of the planes and they had been blown up. But that is not the end of the story about which I desire to ask the Senator.

When we went to Greece, we found we were helping Greece and Turkey. I voted for and supported that movement, and I am glad I did. But I was surprised to find that one of the things we were supplying Greece at that time was planes. Where did those planes come from?

Did they come from the United States; were they new planes supplied from here? Were they some of the used planes of the type we had destroyed in such great numbers in Germany? No. Our money was taken, and used to buy second-hand planes from the British to supply the Greeks who were at war. To my mind that is something beyond comprehension. I cannot understand it at all. But it illustrates in reverse what the Senator from Indiana was speaking about.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if it is not the same sort of transaction that was cooked up during the dollar talks held here in Washington whereby $175,000,000 of ECA funds were allocated to buy Canadian wheat for shipment to Great Britain? Is not that the same sort of transaction?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I think so. I believe in the theory of the so-called Marshall plan and the ERP. I have supported that program and intend to support it now. But I believe that the Senator from Missouri is rendering a great service in approaching the whole problem on a realistic and sound basis. I was a member of this body before the days of World War II, when scrap iron and steel were being shipped to Japan. I then introduced a resolution to prohibit the shipping of scrap iron and steel to Japan, because war might come between us and Japan. It was lost in committee.

My proposal was opposed by the administration, because it said we must not take an unfriendly attitude toward the great power Japan. I see the same thing happening now. If what is now happening is total diplomacy, if it is an all-out effort to stop communism, then there is no object in putting a bottom in the barrel if we are leaving the top off.

Mr. KEM. It seems so to me. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether he has any confidence in socialism as an antidote to communism? Does he believe that by building up socialistic countries in western Europe we are erecting an effective barrier to communism?

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to quote from a gentleman whom the distinguished Senator from Missouri has just quoted, Mr. Strachey, the Minister of War for Great Britain. I cannot give the exact words he used, because I do not have them at hand at the moment. They are in my office. He said in effect, "We do not move to communism directly. We do not go from capitalism to communism. But there is an in-between space which is called socialism to which we must move first. That is the transitory stage between capitalism and communism."

I think that statement should satisfy the Senator that I do not condone socialism at all.

Mr. KEM. It does. The Senator from New Hampshire has in mind that Mr. John Strachey is the author of books on the virtues of British Socialism and Soviet socialism, is he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am.

Mr. KEM. And has he not welcomed the prospect that two Socialist powers, as he calls them, Great Britain and Russia, would shortly join in an effort to rid the world of capitalism?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from New Hampshire has had wide experience in this body, and has had unusual opportunity for observing during two great world wars, the war efforts in which we have engaged. Can the Senator have any confidence in military operations of an ally conducted under the leadership of a man like John Strachey, who is committed to the same ideology as our potential enemy?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. To me it is a very questionable thing. I think the Senator from Missouri is rendering a fine service in bringing out the point he has. I believe we must face the situation in a realistic way. We cannot talk about a total diplomacy and an all-out war against communism, and then put on blinders or close our eyes to the supplying of war materials and war potential to Russia and her allies behind the iron curtain.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator another question. Are we not compromising with communism when we permit our money and our materials to be used in the way I have described?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I agree absolutely.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has just referred to another one of the booby-trap expressions which have been sprung upon us by our great and illustrious Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, the expression being "total diplomacy." Does the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from New Hampshire, either one, know what Dean Acheson means when he uses the expression "total diplomacy?"

Mr. KEM. On that question I shall defer to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. JENNER. I should like the two Senators and other Senators to hear from the author of that expression, as to what he, Dean Acheson, means. Following is his definition. In his April 22 speech Dean Acheson defined what he meant by the expression "total diplomacy." I quote from his speech, as follows:

> I mean by "total diplomacy" that there is no longer any difference between foreign questions and domestic questions.

So the expression "total diplomacy" is another trap to put us all as goose-steppers behind the line, so that not only can we not raise the question, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri has done here today, about our foreign policy, but we will not even dare open our mouths about anything respecting our domestic policy. There we have Mr. Acheson's total diplomacy.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator from Indiana consider it total diplomacy, within Mr. Acheson's definition, for us to shut off shipments of war materials from the United States to Russia and her satellites, but at the same time permit the participants in the Marshall plan to carry on a profitable trade of the kind to which I have referred? Would Mr. Acheson call that total diplomacy?

Mr. JENNER. I would call it almost anything. I would even call it destroying our domestic economy, throwing American laborers out of work in order to give jobs to Europeans. I would call that a part of total diplomacy, because Dean Acheson says there is no difference between foreign questions and domestic questions.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Missouri to say that he placed in the RECORD and offered as evidence during the course of his speech figures and facts to show that some of the ECA material which we, the United States, have been giving to certain countries has in turn been sold or has passed into the possession of the Russians?

Mr. KEM. I said that war material was being given by the United States to Marshall-plan countries and identical material was being sold to Russia and her satellites. I gave as an instance Belgium, which has received from us a large quantity of iron, cast iron, and steel, and in turn sold in the year 1949, a large quantity of iron, cast iron, and steel to Russia and the satellite countries.

Mr. BRIDGES. That would mean, then, that Belgium, if she had that material to sell to Russia, certainly did not need it from us. Is that not correct? And that we should reappraise the Belgian application for aid under the ERP?

Mr. KEM. I would think Belgium did not need such materials from us. I gave the following instance. We have sent $12,000,000 worth of iron and steel to Belgium under the Marshall plan, since the program began. Last year Belgium sent $19,782,840 worth of iron, cast iron, and steel, to Russia and her satellites, $5,744,520 of which went to the U. S. S. R. I gave another instance, namely, our giving of firearms to Belgium, under the Marshall plan, and last year Belgium sold a shipment of firearms to Czechoslovakia.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Missouri has offered fairly good evidence of what has been taking place. I want him to know that, as one Senator who has supported the Marshall plan, I am shocked at the information he has given on this point. I knew something of the trade between the Marshall-plan countries and the iron-curtain countries and Russia, but this is the first evidence which has come to my attention of the transfer of identical material.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that he may be interested in the fact that it is said by apologists for this business that the firearms sent by Belgium to Czechoslovakia were hunting rifles. I should

like to ask the Senator if it is not true that hunting rifles were about what his ancestors, the embattled farmers at Concord Bridge, had when they "fired the shot heard round the world."

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. In fact, the hunting rifles to which the Senator has just referred, as being shipped to Czechoslovakia by Belgium, undoubtedly are more effective than the rifles which were used at Concord Bridge.

Mr. KEM. Similarly, are not hunting rifles the arms which Gen. Andrew Jackson's troops had when they crouched behind the cotton bales outside New Orleans and stopped what was said to be the finest troops in Europe?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. So hunting rifles are not to be sneezed at, as munitions of war.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is quite correct.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Did the Senator from Missouri say that the shipments went from Belgium to Russia in 1929?

Mr. KEM. No; it was in 1949.

Mr. FREAR. I am sorry that I misunderstood.

Mr. KEM. I said that since the Marshall plan had begun, we had sent to Belgium $12,000,000 worth of iron and steel, and that during the year 1949 Belgium had sent to Russia and the satellite countries more than $19,000,000 worth of iron and steel, $5,000,000 of which went to Russia alone.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator for correcting my impression. I thought the Senator said that was in 1929.

Mr. KEM. No; it was in 1949.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to ask another question, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire said that during his visit to Greece he found that United States dollars which had been loaned to Greece were used by Greece to purchase second-hand war planes from Great Britain. Did the Senator from Missouri understand the Senator from New Hampshire to say that?

Mr. KEM. I understood him to say that at the same time we were sending money to Greece, Greece was buying second-hand war planes from Great Britain.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator know whether Greece used the money we sent to her to buy those planes, and whether Britain ultimately got that money from Greece?

Mr. KEM. I suppose the national treasury of Greece was swollen to the extent that we contributed to it, and that the credits which were used for the purchase of the war materials from Great Britain were the same as the credits coming from us.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; but did Greece actually use dollars to buy those planes, or did she use Greek currency or some international exchange?

Mr. KEM. I apprehend that she used international exchange. I do not know whether the drafts were drawn on New York or London or Paris or Amsterdam.

Mr. FREAR. So, in effect, England got the dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. Yes; she got the credits.

Mr. FREAR. Would the Senator care to say whether those dollars came back to the United States, in return for the purchase of new planes by Britain from the United States?

Mr. KEM. Suppose they did. I am not at all intrigued by the suggestion that we give away dollars and then get orders for planes. The same argument was made when $175,000,000 of ECA money was used for the purchase of Canadian wheat for shipment to Great Britain. It was said that Great Britain would also use some of the ECA money to buy wheat in the United States. But what of it? Can we build a sound economy by such transactions?

Mr. FREAR. I did not want to intrigue the Senator with any question. I am seeking information.

Mr. KEM. Perhaps my use of the word "intrigue" was unfortunate. I meant that such transactions do not arouse my interest favorably. I am glad to cooperate with the able Senator from Delaware in developing the facts.

Mr. FREAR. What I am trying to learn from the Senator is this: If United States dollars go to Greece, and if Greece uses those dollars to buy second-hand British planes, and if Britain buys new United States planes with the same dollars, is that undesirable from our viewpoint?

What I would really like to have the Senator comment upon is this: Does he think it better that Great Britain have new planes, rather than for Greece to have new planes? Does the Senator think it would be better for us to send the dollars to Greece originally, to permit Greece to buy new planes from the United States? Or if Greece bought used planes from Great Britain, and Great Britain bought new planes from the United States, would our dollars be used to the best advantage? In other words, would our dollars be used to the best advantage if they were used to permit Greece to buy new planes or if they were used to permit Britain to buy new planes?

Mr. KEM. I have indicated that I would not have great confidence in war operations conducted by Great Britain under her present Minister of War against Russia or against any of the countries behind the iron curtain. As I am presently advised, I think I would as soon have the new planes go to Greece. However, comparisons are odious.

Mr. FREAR. I agree with the Senator. I merely wondered whether he thought the exchange we have been discussing would be beneficial to the United States.

Mr. KEM. I think we cannot lift ourselves by our own bootstraps. To the contrary, I think we would do much better to strengthen our own economy. I cannot believe that our frontier is either in Greece or in Great Britain. I think our real frontier is in a sound American economy.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I believe the greatest contribution we can make to the peace of the world is to build a sound economy here at home.

Mr. FREAR. I would not disagree with the Senator that we need a sound economy here in the United States.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me and for replying to my questions.

Mr. KEM. It has been a pleasure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If I may, I would like to say a further word in relation to the inquiry made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware regarding this matter. What I am about to relate occurred 2½ years ago. At that time, when we were struggling to pay our bills and balance our budget, and when we had appropriated $400,000,000 for Greek-Turkish aid—an appropriation which I supported and for which I voted—it was shocking to go to Germany and see in the airfields and air bases or former airfields and air bases, hundreds and hundreds of planes, the most modern we had, decomposing or being destroyed by demolitions, and then go to Greece and find that instead of our providing Greece with new planes, the purchase of which from the United States might bolster, for instance, the manufacturing industry in this country, or instead of our providing the Greeks with some of our surplus used planes, which at that time we were destroying, in effect we were using our money to permit the Greeks to buy second-hand planes from the British. That did not make sense to me then, nor does it now.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I believe the Senator will admit that I was agreeing with the Senator's remarks about the necessity for the maintenance of a sound economy, and I was trying to determine whether the exchange which had been referred to was the one which would have been of assistance to our economy.

Mr. KEM. Yes; but are we developing a sound economy when we give away the money, and then expect to recoup by means of orders for goods placed with us by countries abroad?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know but what that may be sound thinking. It is somewhat difficult to frame a question to ask the Senator from New Hampshire which, perhaps, would strengthen the point I am trying to bring out, but might it not have been better to give to Greece the used planes which we had in Germany, rather than the dollars we were sending to Greece? The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said he voted for the loan to Greece. I do not think I had the opportunity of doing so, at that time, but I believe he was very serious when he voted for it, thinking it would do something for Greece and would not injure our economic standing or situation in this country.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to indicate to the Senator from Missouri, if I may be permitted to do so, the nature of

my approach to this question. I realize many people differ with me. There are people who want to go blindly into a Marshall plan or an ERP, or something of the kind. On the other hand, there are people who are opposed fundamentally to the whole thing. But I believe that, properly administered, properly worked out, the plan could be a real force for stopping communism in Europe. Yet, if there are to be allowed as many leaks in it as there are holes in a sieve, certainly much of it represents wasted effort and wasted money. Therefore, what I should like to do, through various amendments, is to plug as many of the loopholes in the bill as possible. That is my fundamental approach.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether it is not more than waste if our money is being used to arm our potential enemies?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would say that it is not only wasteful, but it is a very sinister and dangerous thing we are doing. I was shocked at the Senator's revelations.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Missouri another question?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. In the exchange which Belgium made in connection with the steel, to which the Senator referred, to the Senator's knowledge, did Belgium make any economic gain on the exchange?

Mr. KEM. Belgium made a distinct gain, because we gave the iron and steel to Belgium, who in turn sold it to Russian satellites. It is decidedly a gain if one country is given free material which it in turn sells to some other country. That is a clean-cut gain, I should say.

Mr. FREAR. I am glad to hear the Senator make that plain. I wanted it to be clear in my own mind. I may say to the Senator I certainly would not approve of our giving dollars to those countries, to enable them to make money on them ultimately in any financial transaction through which the dollars would go to Soviet Russia or to one of her satellites.

Mr. KEM. I invite the attention of the able and distinguished Senator from Delaware to the tables I have inserted in the RECORD today.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I agree that this is a very important subject, but I do not feel that we are justified in saying that anything sinister is being done. It is a field in which honest men may differ. It is a field which involves an exercise of judgment. If we thought there was to be a war within 6 months or a year, there are many of these things we would not do; but if we thought and if we hoped there was some chance of peace within the next 5 or 6 years, then the things would be justifiable. It is all a question of judgment and estimate as to the future, and it is very difficult for me to see how anyone can be absolutely dogmatic and say "This is right, and this is wrong."

Take the question of a British automobile, for example, a British passenger car. We all know that in the Army in time of war a passenger car has military value. There can be no question about that. It does not have as much military value as a rifle or a cannon or a tank, but it has some military value. But if we take that principle and follow it through to its logical conclusion, then it means that we would eliminate all exportation of goods having the slightest possible military use, and we would be increasing the dollar gap by about $3,000,000,000. I do not think anyone seriously advocates doing that.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. KEM. My question is whether the Senator agrees with the so-called positive list, in other words, the list of items which citizens of the United States are restricted from selling to Russia and satellite countries? Is the Senator in accord with that policy?

Mr. LODGE. I think the items on the list, whatever it may be called—the 1-A list—are not being sent from this country.

Mr. KEM. No; that is my understanding. But is not the Senator in accord in believing that it is sound and in the public interest to have such a list in effect?

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that, while the Senator from Massachusetts has spent a good deal of time in the military, he is not a military expert and does not pretend to be one. All I say about the list, from the military standpoint, is that it is my understanding that every item on it is either cleared by the military or else the military know about it and have made no complaint.

Mr. KEM. I assume that is correct.

Mr. LODGE. And that "cuts some ice" with me as I am sure it does also with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Exactly. Would not the Senator agree that it is not in the public interest for any materials to be funneled through Marshall-plan countries, the shipment of which directly from the United States is not permitted?

Mr. LODGE. I do not quite follow. Why would that be a bad idea?

Mr. KEM. It would not be a bad idea; I think it is an excellent idea to forbid such shipments. In other words, it seems to me the positive list which we apply to ourselves, to restrict shipments from the United States to Russian satellites, should be equally applicable to other Marshall-plan countries. In other words, it does not make sense for us to forbid shipments by our own people to Russia and her satellites, and then permit the shipment of identical materials from the Marshall-plan countries to Russia and her satellites.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator give me an illustration of what he has in mind?

Mr. KEM. I just read——

Mr. LODGE. Let me say I regret I have not been able to be present during all the debate, and I shall not be able to be in the Chamber most of the day, because I am on a subcommittee that is making an investigation, which takes most of my time.

Mr. KEM. Take a shipment of firearms. Let us say hunting rifles, from Belgium to Czechoslovakia. No firearms can be cleared from any American port for Czechoslovakia or any of the countries behind the iron curtain. Does it make sense for us to continue to give firearms to Belgium, with Belgium selling rifles to Czechoslovakia?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know about that particular case. I would say if they were rifles which had a military value, the Senator's argument would be very sound.

Mr. KEM. Let us say they were hunting rifles. The Senator has had a fine record in World War II. Would he not say that hunting rifles are munitions of war?

Mr. LODGE. They are, of course, and so is an automobile. I understood there were some shotguns from Belgium in the list which the Senator put into the RECORD. I did not realize there were any rifles, but it may be there were. There is this consideration, that if we are trying to get the nations of Europe off our backs and onto their own feet, then obviously we want them to export as much as possible without endangering the security of anyone, and we would encourage them to export items which we can produce, but which it is better for us not to export, because it is cheaper for us in the long run to have those countries more or less independent.

Mr. KEM. Exactly. I may ask the Senator, would it not be a sound rule for us not to send aid to any Marshall plan country which is sending to Russia or her satellites war materials which we forbid our own people to send to Russia or the satellites? Is not that a matter of sauce for the goose being sauce for the gander?

Mr. LODGE. I should rather leave it the way it is, and let the military approve of these items.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator want to continue this vast trade in war materials between the Marshall-plan countries and Russia and the satellite countries at the same time we are taking money from the American people, under the taxing power, and making gifts of arms and military equipment to the same Marshall-plan countries?

Mr. LODGE. No; that is not what the Senator from Massachusetts wants to do.

Mr. KEM. What does the Senator want to do?

Mr. LODGE. He does not want to do anything which will be of positive benefit to the military preparations going on behind the iron curtain. That he definitely does not want to do. The Senator from Massachusetts does want to build up the nations of western Europe so they will be able to stand by themselves. I think we can send steel and iron, noncritical items, automobiles, and things of that sort, which have

some military value, a slight and indirect military value, but which help to build up the industries of those nations.

Mr. KEM. What would the Senator from Massachusetts say with reference to scrap iron?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a question which depends upon the estimate of the imminent possibility of war. I was very much opposed to sending scrap iron to Japan before the war.

Mr. KEM. Is the Senator opposed to sending scrap iron from the United States to Russia and her satellites?

Mr. LODGE. I have not studied that question.

Mr. KEM. Is the Senator opposed to sending scrap iron from the Marshall plan countries to Russia and the satellite countries now?

Mr. LODGE. It depends upon what the quid pro quo is, in other words, what we get back from it. As I have stated, I am not an expert in that line at all. I was trying to indicate the general issues involved. It depends entirely on judgment as to the imminence of a crisis. If we think the crisis is imminent, we probably want to shut down on the whole business.

Mr. KEM. I am glad the Senator has raised that point, because I should like to say, Mr. President, that I think the Senator from Massachusetts is in a better position to pass on this subject than are most of the other Members of the Senate, because of his military experience, his intimate acquaintance with the nations of western Europe, and his service on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I should like to ask the Senator if he knows how imminent war may be.

Mr. LODGE. I wish I did.

Mr. KEM. The Senator's opinion is certainly as good as that of any other Member of the Senate. Is he willing that items like these shall be shipped from the United States to Russia and the satellite nations: arms, scrap iron, steel, copper, lead, zinc, tin, and other base metals and alloys; boilers, machinery, chemical apparatus, appliances, and parts; electrical machinery and apparatus, articles for electro-technical use, and parts; railway and tramway rolling stock and material; optical and measuring instruments; chemical products, matches, inflammable materials, rubber, and so forth? Those are articles which are included in the partial list of exports from Belgium and Luxemburg to Russia and the satellite nations which I have placed in the RECORD.

My question is whether the Senator from Massachusetts is willing that exports of those items be made from the United States to Russia and satellite countries?

Mr. LODGE. As I have previously stated, I am not an expert. I do not know what harm there would be in sending some rubber hose to the Soviet Union. It might be a beneficial thing to do.

I simply want to say two things to the Senator from Missouri. First, I think he has put his finger on a very important subject. I do not go along with persons who flatly disagree with the Senator from Missouri and who say there is nothing to it and that we should forget it. I think this is a subject into which there enters the exercise of judgment. Our guess as to the future also enters into it. It is a subject concerning which it is almost impossible to be dogmatic. I think its details involve so much expert knowledge that I should like to leave the clearance of these special items, whether rubber goods, cast iron, or whatever they may be, subject to the approval of the military authorities. I do not think either the Senator from Missouri, or I, or the Senator from Delaware, or the Senator from Colorado, or any of us have qualifications to decide as between cast iron and rubber goods and the other materials which have been mentioned. That, in general, is my position.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Massachusetts would agree, would he not, that the question of whether war materials from the United States should be shipped to Russia is a proper subject for debate?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is a proper subject for debate; and the Senator from Missouri, who is a very good lawyer, which I am not—I am not even a bad lawyer; I am not a lawyer at all—knows that the term "war materials" is a very comprehensive one and subject to a great deal of definition. So when we have said we want to control war materials, we have not really said very much.

Mr. KEM. I believe that the items which appear on the so-called positive list, shipments of which from the United States directly to Russia and her satellites are severely restricted, should likewise be restricted in case of shipment from Marshall-plan countries to Russia and her satellites, so long as those nations are receiving shipments of war materials as a gift from the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I would accept that, subject to one qualification, namely, the approval of the military authorities.

Mr. KEM. Next Friday this bill will be voted on. Looking around the Senate, I notice that the Senator from Massachusetts is the only member of the Foreign Relations Committee present on the floor while the subject is being discussed. Would it be proper for me to suggest that sometime before the bill is voted on, some member of the Foreign Relations Committee come to the floor, and after having informed himself as to what is going on, discuss the matter in detail?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to repeat what I said before, that if it were not for my membership on the subcommittee which is investigating disloyalty charges in the State Department, I would be on the floor all day, because I think it is my duty, and it would also be a privilege to debate with the Senator from Missouri. But that subcommittee is meeting in the morning, in the afternoon, and last week it met at night. We are instructed by unanimous vote of the Senate to investigate the subject assigned, and that is why I have not been present. I am here for only a moment at this time, because I have not yet discovered how to be in two places at the same time.

I think the Senator from Missouri is entitled to have some member of the Foreign Relations Committees here. I think the Senator is entitled to a connected, reasoned statement of the subject, and I shall prepare one and try, at some time later on in the week, to make a statement regarding the whole matter and will subject myself to interrogation. I wish I could remain here this afternoon, but I have to go now.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator permit me to say that I do not suggest that anything is owed to me in the matter. I have in mind the fathers and mothers of the boys who may have to go out and be met by these munitions if they are shot back at us.

Mr. LODGE. I would be definitely opposed to that. I am a father, myself, and I am very much interested in the fathers, mothers, and boys of the Nation. I would not vote one nickel for ECA, I would not authorize one paragraph or one comma in the bill, unless I thought it was directly in the interest of the young men of this country and of their fathers and mothers. Let us not have any misunderstanding about that.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the Senator does not rely on any instinctive judgment on that matter. The only way to arrive at a sound conclusion is by logical processes. Is not that correct?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. And the Senator will agree, will he not, that his judgment is no better than his information?

Mr. LODGE. I say we have to form judgments sometimes without knowing all the facts.

Mr. KEM. Are they apt to be sound judgments?

Mr. LODGE. Sometimes they are not.

Mr. KEM. Are they not unfortunate, when the very security of the United States is at stake?

Mr. LODGE. We are getting into generalities now. I believe we should not send anything that is of military value behind the iron curtain unless it has the approval of our military authorities.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Massachusetts join me in an effort to incorporate in the pending measure a provision which would prevent that from being done?

Mr. LODGE. I would if I thought it would be effective. I am inclined to think that the full list has the approval of the military.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator advise me whether the so-called positive list, which applies to shipments from the United States directly to Russia and its satellites, has the approval of the military?

Mr. LODGE. My understanding is that everything either has to go out with their approval or they know about it and have a chance to complain, and they have not made a complaint.

Mr. KEM. Do I understand that the military authorities differentiate between items which are properly shipped by the United States to Russia and her satellite countries and items which are properly shipped by Marshall-plan countries?

Mr. LODGE. I think so.

Mr. KEM. What is the ground for that distinction?

Mr. LODGE. I think the ground for the distinction is that they have definite statutory power insofar as shipments from this country are concerned, which they do not have to the same extent and to the same degree with respect to foreign countries.

Mr. KEM. I think the Senator misunderstood me. I meant to ask the Senator whether the military authorities, from a military standpoint, have any less concern about shipments of military material from Marshall-plan countries to Russian satellites than they have with shipments directly from the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I should not think so. It would not be any different, it seems to me.

Mr. KEM. Is it not our duty, therefore, to see that there is incorporated in the pending bill an amendment which will prevent money and military materials from being funneled from the United States through Marshall-plan countries into Russia and its satellites?

Mr. LODGE. If it can be done without creating other problems and getting into worse situations. However, I should first want to see the language of any such proposed amendment. I am inclined to think that perhaps it would do more harm than good if we were to undertake to do that. However, the Senator from Missouri is an able lawyer and he may be able to draft a provision which will accomplish the good things without creating some new problems. I shall be very glad to study such an amendment.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator permit me to invite his attention to the amendment which I have prepared? I have no pride of authorship. In all probability, it could be improved upon. The amendment reads:

On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following new section:

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 107. Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country whenever he determines that such country exports or permits the exportation, to Russia or any of its satellite countries, after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, of any article or commodity which, in the opinion of the Administrator, could be used to maintain or expand, directly or indirectly, the military forces of any such country.'"

Mr. LODGE. That would keep British passenger cars out of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. KEM. It would keep out of Czechoslovakia, in my judgment, if the act were properly administered by the Administrator, any articles which the United States could not directly ship to Czechoslovakia.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator does not wish to answer my question?

Mr. KEM. I should like to apply the maxim: Facit per alium, facit per se. What he does through another, he does himself. If it is unsound for us to sell items of military equipment directly to Russia and the satellite countries, then it is not sound for any Marshall-plan country to sell such materials to Russia and its satellites.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that the Senator does not desire to answer my question.

Mr. KEM. I wish very much to answer the Senator. I say that would be a matter for the sound discretion of the Administrator.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator uses the word "indirectly." That could include passenger cars, radio sets, bathtubs, and practically anything. Why not be frank about it and cut off the whole business?

Mr. KEM. No. We have some trade with Russia. We have not cut that trade off entirely under the present regulations.

Mr. LODGE. But under the Senator's proposed amendment we would have to do so, because the word "indirectly" would cover everything.

Mr. KEM. I do not think so. The Administrator might decide to cut off shipments of such items as appear on the so-called positive list. I would regard this as the exercise of a sound discretion.

Mr. LODGE. That is not the way the Senator's amendment reads. The Senator's amendment uses the word "indirectly."

Mr. KEM. "In the opinion of the Administrator."

Mr. LODGE. It would even include soap.

Mr. KEM. All the Administrator would have to do would be to take the positive list and invite the attention of Marshall-plan participants to that list and say, "Our merchants and our manufacturers are not selling this kind of material to Russia and its satellites, and we do not want you to sell it to them, either."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I must leave to go to a hearing, as I said before.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Missouri yield so that I may ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to take any more time than is absolutely necessary. If the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Missouri are so close together, why could we not modify the Senator's amendment? Would the Senator from Massachusetts be agreeable to modifying the amendment by taking the positive list of shipments from the United States to Marshall-plan countries and limiting that positive list to ECA countries?

Mr. LODGE. I was merely asking the question about the word "indirectly." I believe the amendment would go further than I think the Senator from Missouri wishes it to go. All I can say is that I shall be very glad to study the amendment, and I shall be glad to study it very carefully and sympathetically, and then I shall be prepared to take a position on it when I get the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the Senator another question, with the same understanding?

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very much interested in a statement in the report of the committee because of the general feeling with respect to the establishment of east-west trade, which has been very clearly presented by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Massachusetts. The only part of the report which has any bearing on the subject appears at page 22, as follows:

In executive session the committee received a full report from ECA officials on this subject and is satisfied that proper action has been and is being taken to safeguard the security interests of the United States and western Europe.

I note that the report speaks of an executive session. No doubt the able Senator from Massachusetts thoroughly discussed it at that time. Was there anything said about the positive list?

Mr. LODGE. All I can say to the Senator about the confidential report is that it gives ground for great optimism about this whole matter. I shall be very glad to discuss the question with the Senator in private. If we do so, I know he will see why it cannot be discussed in public. However, it is of an encouraging nature and one which should tend to dispel any great feeling of alarm.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Missouri will yield further, I should like to ask another question of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the offer just made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to discuss the matter with me in private, and I shall be very happy to do so. However, it seems to me that, in order to vote intelligently upon this amendment, Members of the Senate should have all facts before them and should have information as to whether or not the materials on the positive list, which United States merchants are not now permitted to send to satellite countries are the same materials which ECA countries are permitted to ship into satellite countries. If there is a difference, why should a difference exist? If it is for security reasons, that is one thing. If there is another reason, that is another thing. That is what I was going to ask the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LODGE. I must leave now.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether there is another reason why this bar exists. Before the Senator from Massachusetts leaves, I should like to ask him another question. Is there anything in the report, confidential or otherwise, which would foreclose or prohibit or not meet with the approval of the Senator from Massachusetts in narrowing this amendment to the identical language suggested, namely, that the basis of exports from the United States to satellite countries be identical with that of ECA countries to satellite countries.

Mr. LODGE. That is not what the Senator's amendment as now framed proposes to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator from Massachusetts be in accord with an amendment which would modify the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to include an identical list of materials? In other words, would he be in

accord with an amendment providing that ECA countries can ship into satellite countries only those materials which the United States can now ship into those countries? What would be wrong with that? What would be wrong with narrowing the amendment to that extent?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be very glad to look into it, and I shall be glad to report on it later.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems to me that this is very pertinent. I am not suggesting that the distinguished Senator from Missouri narrow his amendment. That is up to him. I understand the general intent of the Senator's amendment, and I think it is one which certainly deserves very careful consideration on the part of the Members of the Senate, because it seems to me that American manufacturers should be permitted to ship the same kind of merchandise into satellite countries which ECA countries are permitted to ship into satellite countries. That seems sensible to me. Does the Senator know whether or not the positive list, to which the Senator has referred, is in the interest of national security? Is that the reason for the restriction, or is there some other reason which the Secretary of Commerce gives for saying that these items cannot be shipped to satellite countries? I cannot find any statement on that subject in the RECORD, and I do not know whether the distinguished Senator has searched it out.

Mr. KEM. They are regulations promulgated by the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce, in the interest of national security.

Mr. WHERRY. So that, generally speaking, one could assume that the reason for this positive list is that American manufacturers are barred from making these shipments in the interest of national security. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. Exactly.

Mr. WHERRY. With that statement, I do not see how any Member of the Senate could help looking with favor on narrowing the amendment at least to that point, so that only those materials or finished products could be shipped from ECA countries into the satellite countries which are permitted to be shipped by American industry. Does not the Senator agree with me in that?

Mr. KEM. It seems to me so. It further seems to me that we should not be lulled into a sense of security with the idea that all we have to do is merely to give a blank check to the Administrator and everything will be all right, we cannot evade our responsibility by saying that he is a man of sound judgment, and if we simply give him this money everything will turn out all right in the end.

In view of some of the experiences we have had in the past 2 years, particularly in view of the shipments being made, of our own materials through the Marshall-plan countries to the satellites, it is up to the Senate, before we authorize this program for another year, to look into it and discharge its responsibility. I do not think that our people are going to be satisfied to have their elected representatives turn all of these matters over to Mr. Hoffman, and get a clearance in that way. I think we have to grapple with the problems ourselves.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to belabor the point, because I think it has been amply covered, but I desire to ask once again whether the Senator knows, from his research, or from any other source of information, whether or not American manufacturers today can send the same items into the satellite countries which now may be exported by the ECA nations into those countries.

Mr. KEM. They cannot under existing regulations. I invite the attention of the able Senator from Nebraska to the tables which I have incorporated in the RECORD, which show shipments made in 1949 of materials from Great Britain, Belgium, Luxemburg, and France. Most of these items could not be shipped during that period by American merchants and manufacturers directly to Russia and the satellites.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the suggestion made by the junior Senator from Nebraska that if the amendment of the junior Senator from Missouri were limited to these specific items it would cure the situation, or does the Senator feel that it should be left up to the Administrator as to what items are war materials?

Mr. KEM. When the amendment was drafted I felt, as did members of my staff, that the sound approach is to make clear the intention of the Congress, and then to give the Administrator certain latitude in carrying it out.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that, ordinarily speaking, that is the soundest course, but we had difficulty with the administrational provision already written into the authorization for ECA, and I suggest to the Senator to make it a clean-cut issue, if he can possibly see his way clear to do so, and limit the amendment to the specific items he has already brought to the attention of the Senate. If that can be done, offhand, without studying the record further, or having had the benefit of research of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it seems to me that is a constructive way to handle the matter, and there would be no chance about the administration of the act, so that it would be a mandate of the Congress, and at least we could depend upon that much in the authorization of the proposed ECA act.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect;

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled, "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2919. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse;

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H. R. 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps; and

H. R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7302) to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 184) authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the presentation of a statue of the late Brigham Young.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 186) authorizing a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. JENNER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. For what purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum, or would the Senator prefer to proceed?

Mr. JENNER. I should not care to yield for that purpose. Senators are all busy.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, with every day that passes, this Marshall plan, European recovery program, Economic

Cooperation Act, becomes more of a fraud and swindle. The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has clearly pointed out enough facts and given enough evidence to sustain that statement. It is no wonder, Mr. President, that the name of this international hand-out scheme has been changed often, and that now before it is half over, the President has appointed Mr. Gordon Gray to devise a new scheme to put this give-away program on a permanent basis after 1952, and Secretary Acheson has appointed a new policy committee in the State Department to help chart the course Mr. Gray will pursue.

I wonder where the bipartisanism is in the appointment of Acheson's committee? Did he consult any of the Republican Members of the Congress in regard to this policy committee which was to help Mr. Gordon Gray figure out what the new international give-away program would be at the end of 1952, when the Marshall plan will end? Of course not.

Meanwhile, the political sleight-of-handers who are juggling these programs about, continue deliberately to make it impossible for the American people, or the Members of Congress, themselves, to keep up with the actual facts of what is happening.

No one knows any better than I how grave the international crisis is that now confronts us. No one more passionately hates every foreign ism or more completely loathes communism and all its works. I know that America today along with western civilization hangs on the edge of the abyss of disaster.

Yet, I still believe what we need today, if our way of life is to be made secure, is an aroused and informed American public opinion.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for example, who said he had voted for and supported the Marshall plan from its beginning, was astounded at the facts disclosed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, which clearly indicates that it is not possible to keep up with what is actually happening. Without a knowledge of the facts, there is not a chance of avoiding disaster.

This is why I believe the continuing propaganda and misrepresentation of facts which is poured out by this administration and its jingoistic gigolos, is the most criminal disservice that could be rendered the American people in this hour of crisis.

We cannot win this cold war by resorting to the techniques of our enemies. We cannot continue to feed the American people a daily diet of lies, deceit, subterfuge, smear, and hypocrisy and expect the strength of their convictions of mind and heart to grow in defense of the understanding and the justice of our cause.

Can there longer be any doubt that such has been the diet of the American people for long years now? This diet has become so nauseating that April 24, 1950, none other than General Eisenhower, himself, urged leaders of the Nation's press to an increasing effort "to get the facts, because only an informed public opinion can win the peace."

Then General Eisenhower went on to make the startling charge that—

> The shattering of our dream of permanent peace has brought a confusion that is almost a bewilderment to our minds. The danger of our confusion * * * is that the world will make a mistake about our courage and confidence.
>
> To my mind it means that we have not yet got sufficient facts. We just do not have * * * information and we must get it in order to have moral strength. * * *
>
> Our confusion is compounded by the fact that some of our leaders—at least we have the right to look on them as leaders—are "shooting from the hip." They give us didactic, arbitrary answers on things which need facts and interpretation and not merely someone's prejudiced view.

Mr. President, where did the Marshall plan originate? We were told in the development of its background that it was a humanitarian effort to relieve temporarily the terrible suffering following in the wake of the war.

We were told also that it was supposed to be an honest, intelligent, patriotic approach to the tragic postwar situation that had developed on the European continent, as the only means of preserving the basic, economic foundation of western civilization, against the growing threat of the spread of communism, which could thrive only on want, misery, and disunity in the Western World.

However, in order to understand how gigantic a swindle these assurances continue to be we have to pause for just a moment to reflect on the actual consequences of the war which the Marshall plan was supposed to be designed to help alleviate, correct, and cure. What were these actual consequences?

As a result of America's sell-out at the secret conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, the economic basis of the Western World was cut in half, and that was done in three different ways. First, western Europe's vast industrial potential was cut off from eastern Europe's storehouse of raw materials and food; second, eastern Asia, with its vast population, was cut off not only from the raw materials and surplus-food producing areas, but also from the vast industrial potential of Manchuria and western Asia; third, the prewar pattern of relationship between the industrialized nations of Europe and the raw materials and markets of the colonial possessions in southeast Asia, had the foundations knocked completely from under it. It was perfectly obvious that these were the basic, economic consequences of these secret sell-outs of the war.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with the Senator's discussion, I wonder if he has had occasion to see the recently published book written by Admiral Leahy, entitled "I Was There"?

Mr. JENNER. No; I have not.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator, then, perhaps is not familiar with the fact that Admiral Leahy, apropos of the conference at Cairo, states in the summary of the whole book, at the very start:

> The Allies made an agreement with Chiang Kai-shek which they did not keep.

In those few words he characterizes the situation correctly, and he is even supported by President Truman, who says in his introduction to the book:

> This is an authoritative exposition of what went on.

In the second chapter of the book Admiral Leahy says that he accompanied the President to the conference at which the entrance of Russia into the war with Japan was discussed, and his very terse comment with respect to that is:

> We entered into discussions regarding the entry of Russia into the war with Japan which, in my opinion, were not necessary.

In the two sentences to which I have just referred I think Admiral Leahy, from the point of vantage of Chief of Staff both to President Roosevelt and to President Truman, has made a contribution which may well be contemplated by those who may be disposed to question the loyalty of anyone who does not worship at the shrine of the infallibility of those who were carrying out our plans.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator for his quotations from Admiral Leahy's book. I am sure that is what General Eisenhower had in mind when he made the statement from which I quoted. That is what he meant when he said that if we are to preserve our form of government and to retain America as we know and love her, people must be given the facts instead of lies, deceit, and hypocrisy.

It was also obvious that Germany and Japan, whose greatest access to raw materials and markets had been cut off from them by the iron curtain, would have to be incorporated into any realistic plans by restoring a realistic ecomonic basis to the anti-Communist world.

In other words, the stopping of the spread of communism demands our welcoming of Germany and Japan as equal partners into an intelligent and honest cooperative effort to reintegrate the industrial potential of the Western World with the raw materials of southeast Asia, South America, and Africa.

Yet, Mr. President, what do we find? Was the Marshall plan such an intelligent and honest effort to undertake this kind of a program? No, Mr. President. In the Atlantic Monthly of January 1950, under the title of "Our Worst Blunders in the War," Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, one of our ablest interpreters of military and international affairs, wrote:

> The major American wartime errors were all part and parcel of our political immaturity. We fought to win, period. We did not remember that wars are merely an extension of politics, by other means; that wars have objectives; that wars without objectives represent particularly senseless slaughters; * * * that the general objective of war is a more stable peace. We forgot that the unity of outlook between allies in war never extends to the subsequent discussion of peace terms. We forgot that while the attainment of military objectives brings victory in war it is the attainment of political objectives which wins the subsequent peace. The United States, in other words, had no peace aims; we had only the vaguest kind of an idea * * * of the

kind of postwar world we wanted. * * * We were idealists, not pragmatists. We embarked upon total war with all the zeal and energy and courage for which Americans are famous, but we fought to win; in the broader sense of an objective, we did not know what we were fighting for.

On the basis of testimony of the Marshall planners themselves, we still have no plan within or outside the so-called European recovery program to build either genuine economic recovery or to win the cold war.

Why, Mr. President, Mr. Acheson, himself, admitted in answer to consistent prodding by my colleague the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] during the recent hearings on ECA, and I quote from page 97:

I think it is not the purpose on the part of the administration to recommend the same sort of organization or program which was devised for these highly industrialized countries of western Europe with the particular economic problems that they had. It is not the idea to apply that to the very different situations which exist in the far eastern area that you spoke of. The problems there are quite different. Also, there is not the same interrelation of economic factors in that part of the world as there is in Europe.

The very inception of the Marshall plan proves it was designed, not to stop Russia, but to try to bribe her, for no one knew of this program until on June 5, 1947, when speaking—oddly enough—at Harvard University, General Marshall pulled the Marshall plan right out of the blue, and offered it equally to Russia and her satellites, along with western Europe.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. Are we to understand from what the Senator from Indiana has said that the idea of using the Marshall plan as a wall of dollars against communism was an afterthought?

Mr. JENNER. It was purely an afterthought, because when General Marshall proposed the plan, it was offered to Russia in the same way that it was offered to the western European allies.

Since that time, this Marshall plan has not only been a plan; it has been nothing but a catch-all for "calculated riskers," "dollar gappers," and "do gooders," leading us from one crisis ever deeper into another. This Marshall-plan project reeks of politics both domestic and foreign.

For illustration, let us recall that before the Marshall plan began, the nations of western Europe were asked to submit to our big-hearted State Department estimated deficits in their trade balances for the years 1948 and 1952. Their first estimate amounted to $29,000,000,000. But our State Department officials immediately went to Europe, on the "QT," and told our friends that $29,000,000,000 was too much. A revised estimate of twenty-two billion came back; but our State Department replied it still was too risky to try on Congress. The final estimate of $17,500,000,000 was accepted and the plan got under way. Senators will remember that it was said, "We want the whole 4-year program authorized," and President Truman said, "All or nothing." That is how the Marshall plan started.

Mr. President, the second year's estimates of ECA were just as much of a farce. For illustration, I refer to page 499 of the hearings on ECA, in February 1949:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Senator, I think I can add a little light on this. In July, when I first met Mr. Stafford Cripps, we were talking about the second year's program. I told him I thought it should be understood that the Americans were very insistent that the second year's program be less than the first year's program, and he asked what amount of cut I had in mind. Well, I said, I think that as it is to be a 4-year program, it would be a good thing to aim at a 25-percent cut. What figure he had in mind up to that time I do not know. He came out with a 24-percent cut.

Senator TYDINGS. What did he say in response to your suggestion?

Mr. HOFFMAN. He said, "That is a very drastic downward revision." I said, "Nothing less than a marked revision will convince the Americans that the Europeans are really serious."

Senator TYDINGS. The original picture encompassed 100 percent and the final figures encompassed a 25-percent cutting. He had approached you with the idea that he was going to get a lot more than you finally agreed upon.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot be sure what was in his mind, but the British must be credited with attacking the problem and coming out with this.

Senator VANDENBERG. How do you get your 24-percent figure if you have no original figure to get your percentage from?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Twenty-four percent less than for 1948–49 the first year.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question at this point?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether the Senate was told by the Marshall planners, when the original bill was introduced, that there was no commitment, moral or otherwise, extending beyond the first year.

Mr. JENNER. No; originally, as I remember, the President of the United States said, "I want all of it or nothing." However, the Marshall planners knew they could not cram that down the throat of Congress; even that was too much for the bipartisan "do-gooders." So finally they decided to approach the matter a year at a time. Their first step was to approach it on an authorization basis; they told the Senate, "This is merely a little authorization. These figures are not sacred. After all, the appropriation has to be made. If it is a little high this year, we will take care of it next year," and so forth. That is the history of the Marshall plan.

Mr. KEM. Was not the Senate told, before the vote was taken on the original authorization bill, that there was no commitment, moral or otherwise, extending beyond the first year?

Mr. JENNER. Oh, yes; before the vote was taken the Senate was given that information, because those who were sponsoring the program knew they had to take it a bite at a time, and that they could not cram a 4-year program down our throats.

But, Mr. President, as I have previously stated, now the President has appointed Gordon Gray to devise a new scheme by means of which to put this give-away program on a permanent basis after 1952, and Secretary Acheson has appointed a new policy committee in the State Department to help chart the course Mr. Gray will pursue. So Gordon Gray is to determine what the program in 1952 will be, under point 4. In other words, Mr. President, the plan is not to be terminated at any time, but is to continue. Point 4 should be called "Point forever."

Third, Mr. President, I want to read, from the official record, proof of just how political these techniques have been from the start, to show my colleagues that the Marshall plan is merely underwriting the total deficit of the Marshall-plan countries, which is obtained by lumping together the estimates of the deficits of the individual countries.

In spite of the fact that Mr. Acheson said no plan that related the requirements for European recovery to the problems of the Far East existed, on page 7 of the February 1949 hearings on ECA, Mr. Hoffman admitted:

I want to begin by explaining how we divided the aid provided by Congress among the participating countries, and how we arrived at the estimate of money needed for the coming fiscal year.

To make intelligent judgments on these matters, we have had to have (1) a thorough knowledge of the domestic economy and use of resources within each ERP country; (2) of the economy of Europe as a whole; (3) of the economic relationships among the ERP countries; and (4) of their economic relationships with the rest of the world.

In other words, Mr. Hoffman assured us he was doing the very thing which Mr. Acheson said was not being done.

Yet Mr. Hoffman also admitted that so far as the second year requests were concerned, even up to the time of the hearings on ECA, and I quote from page 9 of these 1949 hearings:

The Organization of European Economic Cooperation has not yet had time for a thorough review of individual county programs for the fiscal year 1949–50.

Yet, Mr. Hoffman said we had to have that information before we could make an intelligent decision.

Then we discover, on page 72 of the House Appropriations Committee ECA report, that the following testimony was given in response to Representative WIGGLESWORTH'S question:

If the ECA is to accomplish the results which we all have at heart * * * why has the OEEC failed to screen the 1950 requests?

Mr. BISSELL. I think, sir, because the kind of judgments that they had time to form in the month or 6 weeks that the organization had for the study of the national programs were judgments about the total volume of commodity imports that would be required and the potentialities for exports in the whole group of the European communities, and it requires a much fuller and more detailed analysis to go into them individually.

Mr. President, these facts are alarming enough in themselves. Yet they can be substantiated time and again by countless facts to prove not only that there is

no plan underwriting this hand-out scheme, but that we have actually been financing the deficits of individual countries, which have gone madly on their own way, sticking knives in each others' back, and setting in motion the most vicious economic, financial, and trade war in European history.

On page 29 of the Senate hearings of 1950, we find that even our colleague the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was so shocked to discover what ECA has been financing in Europe during the past 2 years under the guise of the so-called intra-European payments plan, that he exclaimed, "I am astounded."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator referred to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether the Senator saw the chairman's statement of last fall.

Mr. JENNER. I saw it in the RECORD. He said, "I am astounded."

Mr. TAFT. No; what I am referring to is a dispatch which I have here from the New York Herald Tribune, bearing the date line Washington, October 26, in which the chairman is quoted as saying:

> Congress will cut next year's funds for the European recovery program at least a billion dollars.

Mr. JENNER. I think I recall reading that somewhere. I thank the distinguished Senator.

In other words, all this ballyhoo about the great success of the Marshall plan merely covers up the political manipulations the American taxpayer has been financing during the past 2 years, manipulations which are not merely a waste of money nor merely WPA hand-outs, but which have now become explosive boomerangs. For in financing recovery in England and France at the expense of Europe, we have played directly into the hands of Russia.

The Marshall planners may continue to try to fool the American people, but they are not fooling Mr. Stalin, they are not fooling the Communists, for they are playing directly into the hands of communistic strategy which is based upon encouraging the private-enterprise system to destroy itself.

To show the Communist plan which we are financing under ECA, I quote from a speech that was delivered in the Bolshoi Theater in Moscow, January 21, 1950, in celebration of Lenin's anniversary:

> The whole progress of historic development has confirmed the wise and scientific foresight of the great strategists of the proletariat, Lenin and Stalin, on the inevitability of the further development and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, that a number of countries will fall (away) on a revolutionary road from the capitalist system.
>
> The world historic victory of the country of socialism over Fascist Germany and imperialist Japan in the Second World War, the formation on the basis of this victory of the states of people's democracy in a number of countries of Europe and Asia, the fact that these countries have fallen away from the capitalist system—all this testifies to a further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism which more and more loses its former stability, and to the fact that the rule of capitalism in the colonial and semicolonial countries is being shaken.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that Lenin himself said, shortly before his death, "We must cause the Americans to spend themselves to their destruction"?

Mr. JENNER. As I recall, he said, "Do not worry about the capitalistic nations. They will destroy themselves by spending themselves into bankruptcy." And we are certainly playing into their hands. We are being bled white all over the world, in connection with the cold war. Stalin will get exactly what he wants, and he will not fire a gun or spend a ruble.

Mr. KEM. Did not Lenin indicate that that was a part of the grand strategy of the Soviets?

Mr. JENNER. He did, of course.

Mr. KEM. Are we not, therefore, playing into the hands of the Russians when we spend something like $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 more than the people of America have made available for appropriation?

Mr. JENNER. I do not know a shorter road to bankruptcy than to keep going into debt to the extent of $7,000,000,000 a year, when we supposedly have prosperity all around us.

Mr. President, is it not time that we recognize the suicidal course we are pursuing? Is it not time the American people realize that the Marshall plan is being used to destroy what remains of the private-enterprise system in the anti-Communist world? Has not the time come to force a show-down on these issues and to call a halt on this homicidal, suicidal mania called "international cooperation" which the American people are continuing to be compelled to finance under the Marshall plan?

Why, General Marshall, himself, admits that to make this fantastic plan a success, "We must work for and expect another miracle." And Paul Hoffman admitted that "the OEEC countries will need to accomplish within the next 25 months—between now and the termination of the ECA—what would normally take 25 years." Also, the top economist of Europe, Dr. Roepke of Zurich, gave an analysis of what the ECA was doing to Europe, when he said:

> It is a bit of irony that the Marshall plan, which should have pulled western Europe out of the muck of collectivistic nationalistic economic policy, has threatened to create a new collectivism on a superstate level. The way things are today, everything seems to indicate that the Marshall plan will achieve the exact opposite to what most of its American creators and clear-seeing Europeans had originally expected.

The truth is, the so-called successes of the Marshall plan may be going to the heads of our ECA officials, but they are digging the ground from under the feet of the American people, for the Marshall plan is merely continuing to carry out the functions described in the New York Times commentary of October 20, 1947, on the original Krug report, that "the United States is really being called upon to make up the deficit created in European economy by the regime imposed on Germany."

We have been spending a billion dollars a year to destroy the industrial peacetime potential of Germany under the so-called level-of-industry agreement, which is supposed to be designed to keep Germany from rearming.

Yet behind this propaganda, ECA has been financing, for the past 2 years, the shipment into Europe of almost every kind of equipment, machinery, and raw materials which Germany could have provided, had we not spent our billions destroying her capacity to produce. What Germany would have been able to contribute would have changed the whole basic pattern for the financial and economic structure of the European continent, and the world.

The same thing is true of Japan. I want to bring home to the American people again the economic lunacy that is involved, and the crimes against the peace that are being committed with the financial support of the Marshall-plan money.

What is going on in Germany? The Marshall plan has financed construction of steel plants in England, Belgium, France, and Italy—I saw one of them, a $156,000,000 beauty—to the point where outside Germany, not including Germany, there is today a 6,000,000-ton surplus of steel-producing capacity in western Europe. Belgium steel is being bought 10 to 15 times more cheaply than our own manufacturers can produce it. Are we not a smart people? Yet, at this very moment, we are continuing to destroy the most modern steel producing plant and rolling mills in Europe which are located in Salzgitter on the Russian-British frontier, 100 miles from Berlin. This plant is being destroyed, according to Mr. McCloy, because it is an economic monstrosity.

Yet, the same American firm of Brassert & Co. which built this plant, built an identical plant in Corby, England, and is negotiating with France to build an identical plant in Alsace-Lorraine.

In the August Thyssen plant in Dusseldorf, which is permitted to process 800,000 tons of raw iron, the British have imposed restrictions that ruin the economic possibilities of the production processes by limiting the production of finished steel to 117,000 tons. Yet, in the ECA hearings, Mr. Harriman admitted that since 1948, through 1949, the ECA financed machinery and vehicle importations into Europe to the tune of $1,174,000,000. Yet at this moment the British are destroying the steel foundry and machine-tool plant in Remscheid, which was never listed as a war industry and which has been in business for 97 years.

Next, ECA is requesting $432,000,000 to provide food and agriculture products

just for western Germany in the coming year.

While I speak, the French are destroying fertilizer plants in the French zone. Yet we are going to spend $432,000,000 to provide food and agricultural products. The American farmers will be made to believe that those nations will spend the money here, but they will take American dollars and buy Canadian wheat, as they have been doing.

What about the watch industry?

An outstanding example of Anglo-French business cooperation in eliminating German competition is afforded by the watch industry which used to employ thousands of skilled artisans in the Black Forest area. Thanks to certain English liberals, anxious to expose the abuses practiced under the pretense of destroying Germany's watch-making capacity, the following excerpt from the British trade journal, British Jeweler and Metalworker, was widely publicized in England, in 1948, to show the real motive behind dismantlement:

> Lengthy negotiations and discussions have been conducted by Mr. Barrett (chairman of the British export group) over the past 3 years with a view to fixing the future level of the German horological industry below the 72 percent of the 1948 level which had been agreed by the Allied Control Commission. It is pleasing to be able to record that the final result has been to reach agreement that the German industry is to be reduced to 50 percent of the 1938 level.

The same sort of outrageous destruction and restrictions continue in coal-mining equipment, in the cement industry, synthetic oils, synthetic rubber, to such an extent that Germany is daily being forced into the arms of Russia. I sometimes wonder, Mr. President, if it is not a part of our great plan to do just that.

Today, Mr. President, we are tearing down an aluminum plant in the American zone at Töging, near Munich. We are doing it. We cannot lay the blame on the French or the British. Think of it. Today the American Government, in our zone in Germany, is tearing down an aluminum plant, and at the same time ECA is spending millions of dollars to enlarge aluminum facilities in France.

Meanwhile, Mr. McCloy's testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, March 10, 1950, is kept secret to cover up the crimes against the peace which the American people are financing with Marshall-plan funds.

At the same time, as a direct result, the most pro-western German chancelor in history has to stand by and watch the West cut the ground out from under his Government.

Meanwhile we are continuing to do to Germany just exactly what we did to Berlin. The order to stop destruction of industrial peacetime potential in the western zones of Berlin did not come until November 22, 1949. In other words, this senseless program continued throughout the Berlin airlift and has left Berlin with 300,000 unemployed, its peacetime industrial potential destroyed by war or by dismantling, with one-half the population living on $49 or less a month, and with Mr. Acheson announcing he is now ready to make an initial down payment of $25,000,000 to start to build what we have helped to destroy in the past 5 years. So much for Europe.

When we turn to the Far East we find what has been happening in Japan. It is true that because of General MacArthur Japan has not been subjected to this reckless, brutal treatment being accorded Germany, to the same extent. However, this is not because Britain is not determined to keep Japan from becoming a competitor. On March 8, 1950, the New York Times revealed that the British, in a secret memo, urged the strictest kind of controls for Japan for years to come. These controls included a close check on the country's trade and industrial production and rigid cut on Japanese merchant shipping, and plans to limit and prohibit production of ferrous aluminum of steel alloys, together with synthetic oils.

On April 7, 1950, the New York Times also revealed that British economists are anxious about the dollar gap because they "fear the consequences of the revival of German and Japanese competition in the world markets," when the Marshall plan ends.

Last year Germany was able to pay only one-tenth of the cost of her foreign trade from exports, and in the same period Japan's deficit cost the United States taxpayers about the same amount, or $400,000,000 each, making almost a billion dollars. Meanwhile, in the Far East we are forcing conditions on Japan which have resulted in a $50,000,000 Japanese-Philippine trade-barter agreement. Thus, we have governments trading together, which is the end of free enterprise.

Because of this continued basic exploitation, not only of Germany and Japan, but also of undeveloped areas outside the Russian iron curtain, we find that even the Filipinos themselves, according to Walter Simmons in the Times-Herald of March 18, 1950, are in the position where "the island economy is in disastrous condition despite frantic attempts in recent months to balance income and outgo."

Mr. President, could any program be better designed to play directly into the hands of Russia?

Second, the ECA is not only destroying competition at its source in these nations we are trying to keep within the remains of the Western World, it is financing the further destruction of our way of life by underwriting the socialistic regimes of Britain and France, whose socialism cannot stop at national boundaries, cannot stand the faintest breath of honest, free enterprise competition, yet whose socialistic schemes we are subsidizing to the hilt with American dollars.

Third, ECA, through 96 separate trade pacts, is siphoning American goods and dollars through Marshall-plan countries into—of all places—Russia, indirectly, to the tune of $3,000,000,000 a year. Mr. Hoffman says this is a major objective of the Marshall plan, namely, to restore east-west trade.

That is a silly cold war. We are fighting a lone hand. We will not trade with Russia, but we send billions of the American taxpayers' dollars to the 16 western European nations, and they enter into 96 bilateral trade agreements with Russia. Last year that trade amounted to $3,000,000,000.

Mr. Hoffman, the ECA administrator, says that this is a major objective of the Marshall plan, namely, to restore east-west trade. What do Senators think of that?

Yet, April 19, 1950, my colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the shocking list of war materials that were shipped to Russia and her satellites during 1949 and which will continue to be shipped in 1950, unless the amendment introduced by the distinguished Senator from Missouri is adopted.

And yet, on April 8, 1950, the New York Herald Tribune revealed:

> "European countries will try next month to get the United States to relax its restriction on trade with Russia and the Soviet satellites," authoritative sources said today.

Fourth. By this form of economic insanity, we are directly financing the rearmament and expansion of Russian communism. Russia now has taken control over the state-controlled trade monopolies in the satellite countries, which force those nations to sell their export surpluses to Russia for soft currency and then exports them to hard-currency areas and pockets the profits.

Fifth. We are being frozen out of foreign markets not only behind the iron curtain, but throughout the anti-Communist world, including South America. We are financing our own exclusion from these markets.

Why, Mr. President, last year we gave Britain $600,000,000 just for oil, so that British production could be sold to the rest of the world and our gifts used to meet her domestic requirements.

No wonder the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], representing an oil-producing State, said he was astonished. Mr. President, the American people paid $600,000,000 in taxes and gave $600,000,000 worth of oil to England. England took her great oil production of the Middle East and sold it to the world in trade and for her domestic use lived off our bounty and gifts.

By these uses of ECA funds we are also undermining any hope of erecting military defenses in Europe or anywhere else which can stop the expansion of communism. For instance, Mr. John Strachey, who is a fellow-traveler if ever there was one, is Britain's Minister for Defense, and it seems the significance of this fact has been completely overlooked. Mr. Attlee put Mr. Strachey in this position in order to reassure Russia that Britain was not a pawn in our hands, but was free to make any kind of deal she wanted with the Soviet Union.

In France, Dr. Joliot-Curie was, until April 28, only a few days ago, the High Commissioner for Atomic Energy. He was kicked out of his job on that date, but who knows when he will be back because government in France changes with every change of the moon. One of out of every four Frenchmen today is a

Communist. I think the Communist Party in France holds the largest representation in the Chamber of Deputies. It has the largest single body of elected representatives in the Chamber of Deputies. Their party is the largest party in France.

What cynicism there is on the part of those who assure us France is a "tried and true" ally. The New York Times of April 6, reveals that Dr. Curie, who is a member of the Communist Party, told the National Congress of French Communist Party, "that a true progressive scientist would never give a scrap of his knowledge for war against the Soviet Union."

But what is even more despicable, Mr. President, is the way in which ECA officials continue to deceive the American people.

April 12, 1950, Deputy ECA Administrator, William C. Foster, told the American Society of Mechanical Engineers:

> The security produced by the Marshall plan in the last 2 years has enabled us already to reduce military expenditures, and I believe, save more than the cost of the Marshall plan to date.

What do Senators think of that? That is the Deputy Administrator speaking, Mr. President. That is the Deputy Administrator telling a d—— lie.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did Mr. Foster undertake to work out in detail in his speech how we had acquired security under the Marshall plan?

Mr. JENNER. If so, I did not see it.

Just 1 week later, the Washington Post revealed that the North Atlantic Pact nations have protested the roles assigned to them under General Bradley's conception of European defense. The same day the Washington Star in a dispatch from Brussels, revealed that—

> Key Atlantic Pact nations have told the United States they don't have the money to supply some of the military equipment required by present defense plans.

If they do not have the money under the required plan, which is merely in its inception, and which contemplates at this time, I think, only 12 divisions of men in western Europe to stand up against 100 divisions in Communist Russia, what will be their share and what will they do when the program is stepped up and they must meet the situation on a truly military basis, if there is to be anything at all to the North Atlantic Pact?

As the Senator said today, we have been reading of B–29's on their way to England. We will not be able to sleep in America for the B–29's and the other materials we are sending to Europe, as as long as we have a dollar left with which to do it.

The extent of this deception of Messrs. Foster, Hoffman, Harriman, McCloy, Acheson, General Bradley, and President Truman, is outrageously shocking, for the western European nations are not only unable to balance their economies and pay for the initial cost of defense under the North Atlantic Pact, in Europe, they now have formed a line beginning at the left to take us over completely.

March 28, 1950, according to the New York Times, Turkey's Foreign Minister—here come some more—said the North Atlantic Pact is not enough. It must be completed with another regional pact in the Mediterranean.

April 10, 1950, Gen. J. Lawton Collins in discussing mid-East defenses admitted "the highly strategic area could offer no sustained resistance should Russia move in that direction."

April 13, 1950, the New York Herald Tribune revealed that "French officials assert that one of the most pressing needs is a general recognition that the cold war in Europe and the hot war in southeast Asia are the same and must be regarded as a joint Western responsibility." Americans had better look out, or they will be having their boys in Indochina pretty soon.

Now, France is asking us for $500,000,000, for an army of American GI's, and for a revival of lend-lease, to carry on her losing struggle in Indochina.

April 22, the New York Times revealed, in a dispatch from The Hague in the Netherlands that—

> To continue military expenditures under future North Atlantic Defense Pact arrangements at their present rate would mean that all hope of economic viability for the Netherlands was "going right out the window," Finance Minister Pieter Lieftinck said here today.

If the Netherlands does her share in the North Atlantic Pact, Finance Minister Lieftinck says the Netherlands economic viability is going right out the window; in other words, that she cannot do it. Who is going to do it? The whole world is look to "Uncle Sugar" to do it, and can "Uncle Sugar" keep on doing it for everybody all over the world, and at the same time still keep his standards of living and his form of government here at home?

On the same day the New York Times revealed that the Italian Government is under severe attack on its foreign policy and that even ex-Premier Orlando charged Italy's friends were abandoning her.

April 25, 1950, the New York Herald Tribune stated:

> The British Government has proposed that the United States take over a big share of Great Britain's economic burden in India, Pakistan, and southeast Asia.
>
> Officials disclosed today the British Embassy has put forward this idea in an "exploratory" proposal now under consideration by high administration officials.

I wonder where the bipartisan policy is there? Have the Republicans been consulted about it?

> The British plan would call for the United States to pay off in dollars to such countries as India and Pakistan part of Britain's nine billion wartime debt to sterling-bloc nations.
>
> The main idea behind the suggested program is to help non-Communist countries in Asia fight off communism while at the same time easing the huge debt which is jeopardizing Britain's economic come-back.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is anything said there about the anti-Socialist countries? Is it the idea that we are to finance Socialist countries in order to fight Communist countries?

Mr. JENNER. Apparently that seems to be the idea, but, so far as I am concerned, I see very little distinction between socialism and communism. The ultimate end of both is exactly the same—totalitarianism, a loss of freedom, a loss of liberty. Their methods are a little different. Communism sticks a gun into a man's back and says, "Go along," but in England the Government just keeps bribing the people and subsidizing them, and buying their votes, and saying, "We are all going to the same place, and will get there anyway."

Mr. KEM. What the Senator says is that we will put up $9,000,000,000 for the Socialist Government of Great Britain in order to fight the Communist government of Russia?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. They are both Marxist governments, are they not?

Mr. JENNER. There has not been a true Marxist since Trotsky. In the cold war we are fighting one in order to get rid of the other, and, as I said before, we are going to get ulcers before we ever accomplish the task.

And now, Mr. President, we discover that a secret agreement for transferring this British debt from Britain to the backs of the American taxpayer was reached in a Washington conference of last September and that Dean Acheson now has the impudence to ask us to rubber stamp it. Why, even Senator CONNALLY repudiated the idea as "astounding." Walter Lippmann wrote about that in his recent article of April 27.

As tragic as these facts are, they still do not picture the extent of the tragedy that awaits us if we continue down this road. These facts reveal that neither the Marshall plan nor the President's point 4 program can restore the economies of the anti-Communist world, insure political stability, or enable these nations to defend themselves in western Europe or eastern Asia. We find ourselves in the position where we are spending billions of dollars abroad to subsidize surplus industrial export potential the products of which cannot balance the budgets of the nations we are helping, to say nothing of supporting necessary defense requirements.

By pouring out these billions we are guaranteeing permanent deficits unless we continue the subsidizing. Meanwhile, we are spending billions of dollars to destroy or restrict the German and Japanese markets. In addition, we are spending billions of dollars in subsidies to maintain our domestic production, with a fixed cost of production as a floor and confiscatory taxes as a ceiling.

Now we are going to be asked to permit foreign exports, subsidized by the American taxpayer, to flood this country, undercut our fixed cost of production, put the American laborer out of work, close American farms and factories, destroy our price level, and reduce our national income.

Yet, we are expected to make sense of the administration's schemes to put on a permanent basis this insane, criminal

squandering of the American taxpayer's dollar. We shall be asked to finance permanently not only the deficits of foreign competition, which we shall continue to subsidize, but also to finance the disastrous consequences of deficits in our domestic economy resulting from the importation of these foreign goods. Then we shall be compelled, as Mr. Hoffman suggests, through increased unemployment benefits, or a domestic point 4 program, to finance the resulting unemployment, and to assume the staggering costs that continue to mount all over the world. And all of this, Mr. President, is to be financed out of a decreasing national income.

Is there any longer any doubt but that dangerous as the Communists are in our agencies of Government, they are no more dangerous than the internationalist madmen in control of our State Department?

To cover up these facts, those in control of our foreign affairs are now determined to force us into an international semi-super-state, to surrender our sovereign control over our resources, our security and our own destiny and to subject us to the dictates of international power politicians, pirates, and parasites, and use the next 2 years' ECA funds to finance these schemes, such as the ITO. They will destroy what we have known and loved as Americans, once and for all, if they succeed, without our ever firing a shot.

Mr. President, we have seen how President Truman and John Foster Dulles have ordered a purge of the Members of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, who refuse to go along any longer with this outrageous bipartisan foreign policy that is destroying America both from without and from within.

I have charged before and again I charge that this latest revival of the bipartisan foreign policy fraud is designed to force us into line and to silence all honest criticism, in a last desperate attempt to cover up the criminal blunders and betrayals that have taken place and to slam the booby-trap door shut once and for all.

Now, Mr. President, the final proof of this fact lies in Dean Acheson's speech of April 22, 1950, in which he admits that there can no longer be any distinction between our foreign and domestic policies and that from now on the bipartisan approach will be used to stifle and purge all opposition, not only to our foreign policies, but to our democratic policies as well.

This connection of foreign and domestic policies is hidden in Dean Acheson's new invention called total diplomacy.

What does this term really mean? In his April 22 speech he defined it as follows:

> I mean by "total diplomacy" * * * that there is no longer any difference between foreign questions and domestic questions.

Thus, Mr. President, anyone who now criticizes either the foreign or domestic policies of this administration is to be branded as a traitorous reactionary and isolationist who refuses to resist Russian totalitarianism.

Thus, through the trick of a definition, Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman, and Mr. Dulles want to use Russian totalitarianism as a weapon to silence all criticism, debate and opposition to their domestic and foreign policies, once and for all.

In conclusion, Mr. President, there are those who always come up with the $64 question, "What would you do?" How many times, Mr. President, have we not heard that question, "What would you do?"

Mr. President, I would stop what is going on, put the cards on the table, open the files, expose the sordid secret agreements that have been made and are in the making, and give the American people a chance to decide what we shall do from now on, because no sense can be made out of the mess into which we have been driven.

Mr. President, if the American people finally get these facts, what will the American people find? They will discover not only that they have been lied to, used, and betrayed by conspirators who have been following Stalin's blueprints for destroying the Western World, they will also discover that our self-righteous internationalists have been playing hand and glove with the Communists and master-minding policies that lead to the same end, namely our own destruction.

The American people also will find that these internationalists have had neither the decency, the integrity nor the courage to tell us that they are deliberately scheming to destroy our sovereignty as a free people, to destroy our constitutional form of government, to destroy our private enterprise system and our personal liberties.

This is why, Mr. President, we must not heed the counsel of hysteria that would have us jump on the horse of bipartisan policy and ride off rapidly in all directions on a wild goose chase against the bogey of communism. Neither should we heed the counsel of despair that we should now break up the United Nations as it exists and turn it into a semisuperstate by joining an Anglo-American financial, economic, military, and political alliance with a halo around its head.

Mr. President, Herbert Hoover did not propose such an extension of military alliances, the giving away of our sovereignty, or permitting the ITO to take over our sovereignty. Mr. Hoover's proposal was that if we cannot get along with those nations who want to be communistic, let us have a new try.

We must heed only the counsel of those Americans who now are determined once more to salvage what remains of our form of government and way of life and who will set about the business of restoring our constitutional Government, financial solvency, economic freedom, personal liberties, and an impregnable national and western hemispheric defense. This necessitates, of course, the most gigantic political house cleaning in our history, and this is a job which only the American people can do.

Then we must repudiate all secret agreements and devise additional constitutional safeguards against the abuse of executive power in this field in the future, and at the same time we must take immediate steps to protect our standard of living, American farmers and laborers, and our national income against the disastrous consequences of slave labor and cheap labor of foreign competition.

Then, Mr. President, we can assume the role, not of political, but of moral leadership in the world. We can say what we mean and mean what we say; and we can offer the nations of Europe and Asia a chance voluntarily to embrace federations of states, outside of the Russian iron curtain, which are willing to work, to fight, and to die to preserve their integrity and their liberty.

We can work with these nations on a voluntary cooperative basis only by restoring our economic relations to the bedrock of economic reality and by setting up American relief missions to administer our surpluses for relief of disaster and starvation areas.

Mr. President, if we are to survive as a free people, this is the direction in which we must now prepare to move, and these are the steps we must prepare to take in that direction.

For 150 years America managed to survive in the world family of nations on the basis of this kind of international relations. As sure as I am standing here, if we should finally forsake these lessons of history, we shall underwrite our death warrant as a free people.

Certainly we are still entitled to believe that when two American Presidents have boasted to the world that we are the champions of those who are struggling to preserve their liberties, or to regain them, those two American Presidents were also speaking for the American people. But we cannot preserve our liberties and our freedoms by continuing longer down the road we are traveling.

This is why I still believe the American people may yet find that two terrible World Wars in one generation is not too big a price to have paid to learn once and for all that we can forsake our magnificent traditions only at our peril.

In other words, Mr. President, there is no half-way house between a sovereign, independent, free America and a world slave state. These sacrifices may yet prove not to have been wasted if, before it is too late, the American people realize that we can remain what Lincoln called, "The last best hope of earth," only so long as our foreign relations are designed first, last, and always to keep America sound, strong, and free. This is why the course before us and the alternatives are so clear.

On the one hand, we can continue blindly down the road to a semisuper-slave state; or we can take the control of our own destiny back into our own hands and, on the basis of voluntary and cooperative efforts with other peoples, work to restore, to strengthen, and to preserve a system of sovereign and independent states outside of Russia's iron curtain. For myself, this is the direction in which I shall continue to move; these are the steps I shall continue to urge my

fellow Americans to take; because I still have only one client, and his name is Uncle Sam.

ILLINOIS-MISSOURI DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the entry, by the State of Missouri and by the State of Illinois, into a compact or agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District.

I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief explanation in connection with the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. The last session of the Illinois Legislature authorized a compact, entered into by Missouri and Illinois, setting up the Bi-State Development Agency. This compact and the joint resolution are endorsed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and myself.

This agency, composed of representatives of the two States, has the power to plan, develop, and maintain improvements for the metropolitan district, composed of the city of St. Louis and counties of St. Louis, St. Charles, and Jefferson, in Missouri; and the counties of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe, in Illinois. These improvements would include bridges, tunnels, airports, terminal facilities, and similar works. The agency would also coordinate similar intercommunity improvements in which joint action would be generally beneficial.

The compact permits the agency to charge and collect fees for the use of its facilities, to issue bonds upon the security of the revenues derived from its facilities, and to receive contributions appropriated by the two States or other governmental units.

This compact is quite similar to the agreement between New York and New Jersey, setting up the Port of New York Authority. The New Jersey-New York arrangement has been highly successful in improving traffic conditions in and out of the island of Manhattan. The Holland Tunnel is one of the projects operated by the New York Port Authority.

Mr. Charles P. Casey, director of the department of public works and buildings, in a letter to Governor Stevenson has stated that there is a definite need for this agency. A letter has also been written by Mr. Day, administrative assistant to Governor Stevenson, setting forth the Governor's views on this matter. Governor Stevenson has consistently supported the idea of the development agency, and has approved $50,000 for its expenses.

Under article I, section 10, of the United States Constitution, every compact or agreement between States must receive the consent of Congress. The joint resolution is intended to provide this consent. This resolution has been thoroughly checked by the Senate legislative counsel, and is in proper form for introduction, according to his view.

Mr. President, this joint resolution is important. I assume it will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Before taking my seat, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the letter in regard to this matter, to which I have previously referred, from Mr. Charles P. Casey, Director of the Department of Public Works and Buildings, of Springfield, Ill., addressed to Governor Stevenson.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS,
Springfield, April 25, 1949.

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
Governor, State of Illinois, State Capitol Building, Springfield, Ill.

DEAR GOVERNOR STEVENSON: On March 2, 1949, Senators Thomas, Crisenberry, and Mueller introduced Senate bill 179. This bill would provide for the participation of the State of Illinois in a compact with the State of Missouri for the establishment of a Bi-State Development District and the creation of a Bi-State Development Agency. The bill states in full the terms of the compact.

In Brief, the Bi-State Development Agency, composed of representatives of the States of Illinois and Missouri, would have the power to plan, develop, and maintain improvements for the metropolitan district, composed of the city of St. Louis and counties of St. Louis, St. Charles, and Jefferson in Missouri, and the counties of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe in Illinois. These improvements would include bridges, tunnels, airports, terminal facilities, and similar works. The agency would also coordinate similar intercommunity improvements in which joint action would be generally beneficial.

The language of the compact as proposed closely parallels that of the pact between the States of New York and New Jersey, upon which was formed the Port of New York Authority. The port authority, originally designed to reorganize and unify rail transportation in the metropolitan area, has been much more successful in improving vehicular and air traffic into and out of the island of Manhattan. At present four bridges and two tunnels are operated by the authority.

It is believed that there is a definite need for an agency with the powers and duties as proposed for the Bi-State Development Agency. Similar agencies in other States have proved workable and successful. However, it is suggested that the power of eminent domain be specifically granted to the proposed Bi-State Development Agency in order that such developments as are thought desirable may be expeditiously made.

This department interposes no objection to the passage of Senate bill 179, but recommends that consideration be given to the inclusion of an adequate eminent domain clause in the provisions of the bill.

Yours very truly,
CHAS. P. CASEY,
Director.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I also desire to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter, to which I have previously referred, from Mr. J. Edward Day, administrative assistant, in which he advises me that the joint resolution is satisfactory to the Governor of Illinois.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Springfield, April 17, 1950.

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Jim Mulroy has passed on to me your inquiry about the Governor's attitude on the Bi-State Development Agency, in connection with the request to you to sponsor a joint resolution relating to this agency.

The agency was created by a compact between Missouri and Illinois which was authorized at the last session of the legislature. I am enclosing a copy of the bill which sets forth the terms of the compact. The governor approved a $50,000 appropriation for the expenses of this agency and appointed five commissioners. He has consistently supported the idea of the development agency. It is highly probable that the agency, as a result of its present surveys and studies, will recommend large appropriations from the State treasuries of Illinois and Missouri and it is, of course, very doubtful whether such appropriations could be fitted into the badly cramped Illinois budget. The agency will also probably recommend certain developments to be financed by private sources or by revenue bonds. As you probably know, this is a pet project of the Post-Dispatch and seems to have almost unanimous support in the St. Louis metropolitan area on both sides of the river.

I am sending this very brief outline since Jim Mulroy said you wanted something right away. If you want more details, please wire me and I will send them at once.

Very truly yours,
J. EDWARD DAY,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. LUCAS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a copy of the bill passed at the last session of the Illinois Legislature authorizing the compact.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 1949—
SENATE BILL NO. 179

A bill for an act providing for the State of Illinois to enter into a compact with the State of Missouri for the establishment of a Bi-State Development District and the creation of a Bi-State Development Agency and setting forth in full the terms of such compact

Be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly:

SECTION 1. Within 60 days after this act becomes effective, the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the senate shall appoint three commissioners to enter into a compact on behalf of the State of Illinois with the State of Missouri. One commissioner shall be designated as chairman of the Illinois delegation. If the senate is not in session at the time for making any appointment, the Governor shall make a temporary appointment as in case of a vacancy. Any two of the commissioners so appointed together with the attorney general of the State of Illinois may act to enter into the following compact:

"COMPACT BETWEEN MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS CREATING THE BI-STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND THE BI-STATE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

"The States of Missouri and Illinois enter into the following agreement:

"ARTICLE I

"They agree to and pledge each to the other faithful cooperation in the future planning

and development of the Bi-State Metropolitan District, holding in high trust for the benefit of its people and of the Nation the special blessings and natural advantages thereof.

"ARTICLE II

"To that end the two States create a district to be known as the 'Bi-State Metropolitan Development District' (hereinafter referred to as 'the district') which shall embrace the following territory: The city of St. Louis and the counties of St. Louis and St. Charles and Jefferson in Missouri, and the counties of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe in Illinois.

"ARTICLE III

"There is created the Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District (hereinafter referred to as the Bi-State Agency) which shall be a body corporate and politic. The Bi-State Agency shall have the following powers:

"1. To plan, construct, maintain, own, and operate bridges, tunnels, airports, terminal facilities, and to plan and establish policies for sewage and drainage facilities;

"2. To make plans for submission to the communities involved for coordination of streets, highways, parkways, parking areas, terminals, water supply, and sewage and disposal works, recreational and conservation facilities and projects, land-use pattern, and other matters in which joint or coordinated action of the communities within the areas will be generally beneficial;

"3. To charge and collect fees for use of the facilities owned and operated by it;

"4. To issue bonds upon the security of the revenues to be derived from such facilities; and/or upon any property held or to be held by it;

"5. To receive for its lawful activities any contributions or moneys appropriated by municipalities, counties, State or other political subdivisions or agencies; or by the Federal Government or any agency or officer thereof;

"6. To disburse funds for its lawful activities, and fix salaries and wages of its officers and employees;

"7. To perform all other necessary and incidental functions; and

"8. To exercise such additional powers as shall be conferred on it by the legislature of either State concurred in by the legislature of the other or by act of Congress.

"No property now or hereafter vested in or held by either State, or by any county, city, borough, village, township, or other political subdivision, shall be taken by the bi-State agency without the authority or consent of such State, county, city, borough, village, township, or other political subdivision, nor shall anything herein impair or invalidate in any way any bonded indebtedness of such State county, city, borough, village, township, or other political subdivision, nor impair the provisions of law regulating the payment into sinking funds of revenues derived from municipal property, or dedicating the revenues derived from any municipal property to a specific purpose.

"Unless and until otherwise provided, it shall make an annual report to the governor of each State, setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this agreement and any legislation thereunder.

"Nothing contained in this compact shall impair the powers of any municipality to develop or improve terminal or other facilities.

"The Bi-State Agency shall from time to time make plans for the development of the district; and when such plans are duly approved by the legislatures of the two States, they shall be binding upon both States with the same force and effect as if incorporated in this compact.

"The Bi-State Agency may from time to time make recommendations to the legislatures of the two States or to the Congress of the United States, based upon study and analysis, for the improvement of transportation, terminal, and other facilities in the district.

"The Bi-State Agency may petition any interstate commerce commission (or like body), public service commission, public utilities commission (or like body), or any other Federal, municipal, State, or local authority, administrative, judicial or legislative, having jurisdiction in the premises, for the adoption and execution of any physical improvements, change in method, rate of transportation, system of handling freight, warehousing, docking, lightering or transfer of freight, which, in the opinion of the Bi-State Agency, may be designed to improve or better the handling of commerce in and through the district, or improve terminal and transportation facilities therein. It may intervene in any proceeding affecting the commerce of the district.

"ARTICLE IV

"The Bi-State Agency shall consist of 10 commissioners, 5 of whom shall be resident voters of the State of Missouri and 5 of whom shall be resident voters of the State of Illinois. All commissioners shall reside within the Bi-State District, the Missouri members to be chosen by the State of Missouri and the Illinois members by the State of Illinois in the manner and for the terms fixed by the legislature of each State except as herein provided.

"ARTICLE V

"The Bi-State Agency shall elect from its number a chairman, a vice chairman, and may appoint such officers and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties, and shall fix and determine their qualifications and duties.

"Until otherwise determined by the legislatures of the two States no action of the Bi-State Agency shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which at least three members from each State are present, and unless a majority of the members from each State present at such meeting shall vote in favor thereof. Each State reserves the right hereafter to provide by law for the exercise of the veto power by the governor thereof over any action of any commissioner appointed therefrom.

"Until otherwise determined by the action of the legislature of the two States, the Bi-State Agency shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office, or other administrative expenses, prior to the making of appropriations adequate to meet the same.

"The Bi-State Agency is hereby authorized to make suitable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the Constitution or laws of the United States or of either State, or of any political subdivision thereof, and subject to the exercise of the power of Congress, for the improvement of the district, which when concurred in or authorized by the legislatures of both States, shall be binding and effective upon all persons and corporations affected thereby.

"The two States shall provide penalties for violations of any order, rule, or regulation of the Bi-State Agency, and for the manner of enforcing same.

"ARTICLE VI

"The Bi-State Agency is authorized and directed to proceed with the development of the district in accordance with the articles of this compact as rapidly as may be economically practicable and is vested with all necessary and appropriate powers not inconsistent with the Constitution or the laws of the United States or of either State, to effectuate the same, except the power to levy taxes or assessments.

"It shall render such advice, suggestion, and assistance to all municipal officials as will permit all local and municipal improvements, so far as practicable, to fit in with the plan.

"ARTICLE VII

"In witness thereof, we have hereunto set our hands and seals under authority vested in us by law."

SEC. 2. The compact when signed by the signatories of each State as herein provided shall become binding upon the State of Illinois and shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of State of Illinois.

SEC. 3. Vacancies occurring in the office of any appointed commissioner shall be filled by appointment by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate. In any case of vacancy, while the senate is not in session, the governor shall make a temporary appointment until the next meeting of the senate, when he shall nominate some person to fill such office.

SEC. 4. The Bi-State Agency shall have power to apply to the Congress of the United States for its consent and approval of the compact; but in the absence of such consent of Congress and until the same shall have been secured, the compact shall be binding upon the State of Illinois in all respects permitted by law for the two States of Missouri and Illinois without the consent of Congress to cooperate, for the purposes enumerated in the compact, and in the manner provided therein.

SEC. 5. Since there is immediate need for the coordinated action of the States of Missouri and Illinois to solve the critical bi-State problems present in this area, therefore, an emergency exists and this act shall take effect upon its becoming a law.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 174) granting the consent of Congress to the entry, by the State of Missouri and by the State of Illinois, into a compact or agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District, introduced by Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. DONNELL), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. DONNELL subsequently said: Mr. President, there was introduced earlier today a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 174, by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], for himself and for the senior Senator from Missouri. The joint resolution has been the subject of some consideration by both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Illinois made a very excellent statement about it, and I should like very much to have the privilege of making a short statement with regard to it. The joint resolution is one that proposes to grant the consent of Congress to the entry by the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois into a compact of agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District.

The high purpose of the compact appears from the fact that in article 1 the States of Missouri and Illinois agree to and pledge each to the other faithful cooperation in the future planning and development of the Bi-State Metropolitan District, holding in high trust for the benefit of its people and of the Nation the special blessings and natural advantages thereof.

By the compact the two States create a district to be known as the Bi-State Metropolitan Development District,

which shall embrace the following territory: The city of St. Louis and the counties of St. Louis, St. Charles, and Jefferson in Missouri, and the counties of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe in Illinois.

By the compact there is created the Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District, which shall be a body corporate and politic.

In order that all Members of the Senate may have before them in convenient location the contents of the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent that there be set forth in the RECORD, at this point, a copy of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 174) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, pursuant to Senate bill No. 99, Senate bill No. 100, and section 10.420 of House bill No. 433, each of which three bills is included in the laws of Missouri, 1949; and Senate bill No. 179, Senate bill No. 180, and House bill No. 299, each of which three last-mentioned bills is included in the laws of Illinois, 1949, the States of Missouri and Illinois entered into a compact or agreement which is as follows:

"COMPACT BETWEEN MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS CREATING THE BI-STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND THE BI-STATE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

"The States of Missouri and Illinois enter into the following agreement:

"ARTICLE I

"They agree to and pledge each to the other faithful cooperation in the future planning and development of the Bi-State Metropolitan District, holding in high trust for the benefit of its people and of the Nation the special blessings and natural advantages thereof.

"ARTICLE II

"To that end the two States create a district to be known as the 'Bi-State Metropolitan Development District' (hereinafter referred to as 'The District') which shall embrace the following territory: The city of St. Louis and the counties of St. Louis and St. Charles and Jefferson in Missouri, and the counties of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe in Illinois.

"ARTICLE III

"There is created the Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District (hereinafter referred to as the Bi-State Agency) which shall be a body corporate and politic. The Bi-State Agency shall have the following powers:

"1. To plan, construct, maintain, own and operate bridges, tunnels, airports and terminal facilities and to plan and establish policies for sewage and drainage facilities;

"2. To make plans for submission to the communities involved for coordination of streets, highways, parkways, parking areas, terminals, water supply and sewage and disposal works, recreational and conservation facilities and projects, land use pattern and other matters in which joint or coordinated action of the communities within the areas will be generally beneficial;

"3. To charge and collect fees for use of the facilities owned and operated by it;

"4. To issue bonds upon the security of the revenues to be derived from such facilities; and, or upon any property held or to be held by it;

"5. To receive for its lawful activities any contributions or moneys appropriated by municipalities, counties, State or other political subdivisions or agencies; or by the Federal Government or any agency or officer thereof;

"6. To disburse funds for its lawful activies, and fix salaries and wages of its officers and employees;

"7. To perform all other necessary and incidental functions; and

"8. To exercise such additional powers as shall be conferred on it by the legislature of either State concurred in by the legislature of the other or by act of Congress.

"No property now or hereafter vested in or held by either State, or by any county, city, borough, village, township or other political subdivision, shall be taken by the Bi-State Agency without the authority or consent of such State, county, city, borough, village, township or other political subdivision, nor shall anything herein impair or invalidate in any way any bonded indebtedness of such State, county, city, borough, village, township or other political subdivision, nor impair the provisions of law regulating the payment into sinking funds of revenues derived from municipal property, or dedicating the revenues derived from any municipal property to a specific purpose.

"Unless and until otherwise provided, it shall make an annual report to the Governor of each State, setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this agreement and any legislation thereunder.

"Nothing contained in this compact shall impair the powers of any municipality to develop or improve terminal or other facilities.

"The Bi-State Agency shall from time to time make plans for the development of the district; and when such plans are duly approved by the legislatures of the two States they shall be binding upon both States with the same force and effect as if incorporated in th's compact.

"The Bi-State Agency may from time to time make recommendations to the legislatures of the two States or to the Congress of the United States, based upon study and analysis, for the improvement of transportation, terminal, and other facilities in the district.

"The Bi-State Agency may petition any interstate commerce commission (or like body), public service commission, public utilities commission (or like body), or any other Federal, municipal, State or local authority, administrative, judicial or legislative, having jurisdiction in the premises, for the adoption and execution of any physical improvements, change in method, rate of transportation, system of handling freight, warehousing, docking, lightering or transfer of freight, which, in the opinion of the Bi-State Agency, may be designed to improve or better the handling of commerce in and through the district, or improve terminal and transportation facilities therein. It may intervene in any proceeding affecting the commerce of the district.

"ARTICLE IV

"The Bi-State Agency shall consist of 10 commissioners, 5 of whom shall be resident voters of the State of Missouri and 5 of whom shall be resident voters of the State of Illinois. All commissioners shall reside within the bi-State district, the Missouri members to be chosen by the State of Missouri and the Illinois members by the State of Illinois in the manner and for the terms fixed by the legislature of each State except as herein provided.

"ARTICLE V

"The Bi-State Agency shall elect from its number a chairman, a vice chairman, and may appoint such officers and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties, and shall fix and determine their qualifications and duties.

"Until otherwise determined by the legislatures of the two States no action of the Bi-State Agency shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which at least three members from each State are present, and unless a majority of the members from each State present at such meeting shall vote in favor thereof. Each State reserves the right hereafter to provide by law for the exercise of the veto power by the governor thereof over any action of any commissioner appointed therefrom.

"Until otherwise determined by the action of the legislatures of the two States, the Bi-State Agency shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office, or other administrative expenses, prior to the making of appropriations adequate to meet the same.

'The Bi-State Agency is hereby authorized to make suitable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the Constitution or laws of the United States or of either State, or of any political subdivision thereof, and subject to the exercise of the power of Congress, for the improvement of the district, which when concurred in or authorized by the legislatures of both States, shall be binding and effective upon all persons and corporations affected thereby.

"The two States shall provide penalties for violations of any order, rule, or regulation of the Bi-State Agency, and for the manner of enforcing same.

"ARTICLE VI

"The Bi-State Agency is authorized and directed to proceed with the development of the district in accordance with the articles of this compact as rapidly as may be economically practicable and is vested with all necessary and appropriate powers not inconsistent with the Constitution or the laws of the United States or of either State, to effectuate the same, except the power to levy taxes or assessments.

"It shall render such advice, suggestion, and assistance to all municipal officials as will permit all local and municipal improvements, so far as practicable, to fit in with the plan.

"ARTICLE VII

"In witness thereof, we have hereunto set our hands and seals under authority vested in us by law.

"(Signed).

"In the presence of:

"(Signed)."

Whereas said compact or agreement has been signed by each Commissioner of the State of Missouri and by the Attorney General of the State of Missouri and has been signed and sealed by each Commissioner of the State of Illinois and has been signed by the Attorney General of the State of Illinois; and

Whereas said compact or agreement has been filed in the Office of the Secretary of State of each said State: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the entry, by the State of Missouri and by the State of Illinois, into the compact or agreement set forth above, and to said compact or agreement and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided*, That any obligations issued and outstanding, including the income derived therefrom, under the terms of the compact or agreement, and any amendments thereto, shall be subject to the tax laws of the United States; and provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, in, over, or in regard to the territory which is embraced in the district created by the aforesaid compact or agreement or any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the

aforesaid compact or agreement; or otherwise affected by the terms thereof; and provided further, That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there shall be set forth in the RECORD the contents of Senate bill No. 99, Senate bill No. 100, and section 10.420 of House bill No. 433, each of which three bills is included in the laws of Missouri, 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate bill No. 99

An act providing for the State of Missouri to enter into a compact with the State of Illinois for the establishment of a Bi-State Development District and the creation of a Bi-State Development Agency; and setting forth in full the terms of such compact, with an emergency clause

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, as follows:

SECTION 1. Within 60 days after this act becomes effective, the governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint three commissioners to enter into a compact on behalf of the State of Missouri with the State of Illinois. If the Senate is not in session at the time for making any appointment, the governor shall make a temporary appointment as in case of a vacancy. Any two of the commissioners so appointed together with the attorney general of the State of Missouri may act to enter into the following compact:

"COMPACT BETWEEN MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS CREATING THE BI-STATE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND THE BI-STATE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

"The States of Missouri and Illinois enter into the following agreement:

"ARTICLE I

"They agree to and pledge each to the other faithful cooperation in the future planning the development of the Bi-State Metropolitan District, holding in high trust for the benefit of its people and of the Nation the special blessings and natural advantages thereof.

"ARTICLE II

"To that end the two States create a district to be known as the 'Bi-State Metropolitan Development District' (hereinafter referred to as 'the district'), which shall embrace the following territory: The city of St. Louis and the counties of St. Louis and St. Charles and Jefferson in Missouri, and the counties of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe in Illinois.

"ARTICLE III

"There is created the bi-State development agency of the Missouri-Illinois metropolitan district (hereinafter referred to as the bi-State agency) which shall be a body corporate and politic. The Bi-State Agency shall have the following powers:

"1. To plan, construct, maintain, own, and operate bridges, tunnels, airports, and terminal facilities and to plan and establish policies for sewage and drainage facilities;

"2. To make plans for submission to the communities involved for coordination of streets, highways, parkways, parking areas, terminals, water supply, and sewage and disposal works, recreational and conservation facilities and projects, land-use pattern and other matters in which joint or coordinated action of the communities within the areas will be generally beneficial;

"3. To charge and collect fees for use of the facilities owned and operated by it;

"4. To issue bonds upon the security of the revenues to be derived from such facilities; and, or upon any property held or to be held by it;

"5. To receive for its lawful activities any contributions or moneys appropriated by municipalities, counties, State or other political subdivisions or agencies or by the Federal Government or any agency or officer thereof;

"6. To disburse funds for its lawful activities, and fix salaries and wages of its officers and employees;

"7. To perform all other necessary and incidental functions; and

"8. To exercise such additional powers as shall be conferred on it by the legislature of either State concurred in by the legislature of the other or by act of Congress.

"No property now or hereafter vested in or held by either State, or by any county, city, borough, village, township or other political subdivision, shall be taken by the bi-State agency without the authority or consent of such State, county, city, borough, village, township or other political subdivision, nor shall anything herein impair or invalidate in any way any bonded indebtedness of such State, county, city, borough, village, township or other political subdivision, nor impair the provisions of law regulating the payment into sinking funds of revenues derived from municipal property, or dedicating the revenues derived from any municipal property to a specific purpose.

"Unless and until otherwise provided, it shall make an annual report to the governor of each State, setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this agreement and any legislation thereunder.

"Nothing contained in this compact shall impair the powers of any municipality to develop or improve terminal or other facilities.

"The Bi-State Agency shall from time to time make plans for the development of the district; and when such plans are duly approved by the legislatures of the two States, they shall be binding upon both States with the same force and effect as if incorporated in this compact.

"The Bi-State Agency may from time to time make recommendations to the legislatures of the two States or to the Congress of the United States, based upon study and analysis, for the improvement of transportation, terminal, and other facilities in the district.

"The Bi-State Agency may petition any interstate commerce commission (or like body), public-service commission, public utilities commission (or like body), or any other Federal, municipal, State or local authority, administrative, judicial or legislative, having jurisdiction in the premises, for the adoption and execution of any physical improvements, change in method, rate of transportation, system of handling freight, warehousing, docking, lightering or transfer of freight, which, in the opinion of the Bi-State Agency, may be designed to improve or better the handling of commerce in and through the district, or improve terminal and transportation facilities therein. It may intervene in any proceeding affecting the commerce of the district.

"ARTICLE IV

"The Bi-State Agency shall consist of ten commissioners, five of whom shall be resident voters of the State of Missouri and five of whom shall be resident voters of the State of Illinois. All commissioners shall reside within the bi-State district, the Missouri members to be chosen by the State of Missouri and the Illinois members by the State of Illinois in the manner and for the terms fixed by the legislature of each State except as herein provided.

"ARTICLE V

"The Bi-State Agency shall elect from its number a chairman, a vice chairman, and may appoint such officers and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties, and shall fix and determine their qualifications and duties.

"Until otherwise determined by the legislatures of the two States no action of the Bi-State Agency shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which at least three members from each State are present, and unless a majority of the members from each State present at such meeting shall vote in favor thereof. Each State reserves the right hereafter to provide by law for the exercise of the veto power by the governor thereof over any action of any commissioner appointed therefrom.

"Until otherwise determined by the action of the legislature of the two States, the Bi-State Agency shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office or other administrative expenses, prior to the making of appropriations adequate to meet the same.

"The Bi-State Agency is hereby authorized to make suitable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the Constitution or laws of the United States or of either State, or of any political subdivisions thereof, and subject to the exercise of the power of Congress, for the improvement of the district, which when concurred in or authorized by the legislatures of both States, shall be binding and effective upon all persons and corporations affected thereby.

"The two States shall provide penalties for violations of any order, rule or regulation of the Bi-State Agency, and for the manner of enforcing same.

"ARTICLE VI

"The Bi-State Agency is authorized and directed to proceed with the development of the district in accordance with the articles of this compact as rapidly as may be economically practicable and is vested with all necessary and appropriate powers not inconsistent with the Constitution or the laws of the United States or either State, to effectuate the same, except the power to levy taxes or assessments.

"It shall render such advice, suggestion and assistance to all municipal officials as will permit all local and municipal improvements, so far as practicable, to fit in with the plan.

"ARTICLE VII

"In witness thereof, we have hereunto set our hands and seals under authority vested in us by law.

"(Signed).

"In the presence of:

"(Signed)."

SEC. 2. The compact when signed by the signatories of each State as herein provided shall become binding upon the State of Missouri and shall be filed in the office of the secretary of state of Missouri.

SEC. 3. Vacancies occurring in the office of any appointed commissioner shall be filed by appointment by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, for the unexpired term. In any case of vacancy, while the Senate is not in session, the governor shall make a temporary appointment until the next meeting of the senate, when he shall nominate some person to fill such office.

SEC. 4. The Bi-State Agency shall have power to apply to the Congress of the United States for its consent and approval of the compact; but in the absence of such consent of Congress and until the same shall have been secured, the compact shall be binding upon the State of Missouri in all respects permitted by law for the two States of Missouri and Illinois without the consent of Congress to cooperate, for the purposes enumerated in the compact, and in the manner

provided therein. Provided, that no appropriation of moneys from State funds in support of the Bi-State Agency herein created or in support of the project provided for in the compact herein set out shall ever be made by the State of Missouri after December 31, 1951.

SEC. 5. Since there is immediate need for the coordinated action of the States of Missouri and Illinois to solve the critical by-State problems present in this area, therefore the general assembly declares this act necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, safety, and general welfare, and an emergency exists within the meaning of the Constitution and this act shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and approval.

Senate bill No. 100

An act authorizing the appointment of commissioners of the Bi-State Development Agency created by compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois, providing for their terms of office, qualifications, and expenses, defining their powers and duties, and providing for the transfer to them of all maps, plans, and other properties now in the possession of the commission appointed pursuant to an act of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Missouri, Laws of Missouri, 1947, volume II, page 354

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Missouri as follows:

SECTION 1. Within 90 days after this act becomes effective the governor shall, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, appoint five commissioners of the Bi-State Development Agency created by compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois. If the senate is not in session at the time for making any appointment, the governor shall make a temporary appointment as in case of a vacancy. All commissioners so appointed shall be qualified voters of the State of Missouri and shall reside within the Bi-State Development District established by the compact.

SEC. 2. Of the commissioners first appointed one shall be appointed to serve for a term of 1 year, one for 2 years, one for 3 years, one for 4 years, and one for 5 years. At the expiration of the term of each commissioner and of each succeeding commissioner, the governor shall, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, appoint a successor who shall hold office for a term of 5 years. Each commissioner shall hold office until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

SEC. 3. Vacancies occurring in the office of any commissioner shall be filled by appointment by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, for the unexpired term. In any case of vacancy, while the senate in not in session, the governor shall make a temporary appointment until the next meeting of the senate, when he shall nominate some person to fill such office.

SEC. 4. The commissioners shall serve without compensation but shall be entitled to be reimbursed for the necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 5. The commissioners shall have the powers and duties and be subject to the limitations provided for in the compact entered into between the two States, and together with five commissioners from the State of Illinois shall form the Bi-State Development Agency.

SEC. 6. The commissioners of the Bi-State Development Agency shall receive and take over the furniture, fixtures, books, maps, plans, records, reports, pictures, sketches, films, and other papers and property of what kind soever pertaining or belonging to or in the custody of the members of the commission appointed pursuant to an act of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly, Laws of Missouri, 1947, volume II, page 354, or in their possession or under their control as such commissioners, or held by them, or for which they are responsible in their official capacity.

SEC. 7. The commissioners of the Bi-State Development Agency shall take up, study, and consider the recommendations of the Bi-State Commission, appointed pursuant to an act of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly, Laws of Missouri, 1947, volume II, page 354, shall hold public hearings thereon, shall confer with the Federal, State, and municipal governing bodies within the district, and any other bodies having to do with bi-State district facilities, and shall, for the purpose of securing advice and information, create an advisory council of representatives of business, labor, and other civic bodies within the district, whose objectives include consideration of the matters embraced in the compact.

SEC. 8. The commissioners of the Bi-State Development Agency shall report to the legislatures of the two States during January 1951 the results of such study, investigation, hearings, and conference, and shall submit a comprehensive plan for the development of the district, based upon the results of such study, investigation, hearings, and conferences, together with their recommendations for such legislation as they deem appropriate for the effectuation and consummation of such plan.

SECTION 10.240 OF HOUSE BILL NO. 433

SECTION 10.240. There is hereby appropriated out of the State treasury, chargeable to the general revenue fund, the sum of $50,000 to the Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District for the payment of salaries, wages, and per diem of its employees and for all other necessary expenses incident to carrying out the compact between the States of Missouri and Illinois as provided by law; for the period beginning July 1, 1949, and ending June 30, 1951.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, from the copy of Senate Joint Resolution 174 will be noted the power of the Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District, and the safeguards to the interests of the United States of America which are set forth in said joint resolution.

From the joint resolution it will be observed that the compact or agreement has been signed by each commissioner of the State of Missouri and by the Attorney General of the State of Missouri, and has been signed and sealed by each commissioner of the State of Illinois, and has been signed by the Attorney General of the State of Illinois; also that said compact of agreement has been filed in the office of the secretary of state of each said State.

Mr. President, article I of the Constitution of the United States provides that—

No State shall, without the consent of the Congress * * * enter into any agreement or compact with another State.

It is in order to obtain this consent that said joint resolution has been today introduced.

Mr. President, as bearing on public recognition in the city of St. Louis of the importance of the tasks of the Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be incorporated in full an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 5, 1950, above the headline, "Much planning, many millions needed to keep city great—Bi-State commission reports on what St. Louis must do to prevent decay."

The article was written by Con Kelliher, Globe-Democrat staff writer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUCH PLANNING, MANY MILLIONS NEEDED TO KEEP CITY GREAT—BI-STATE COMMISSION REPORTS ON WHAT ST. LOUIS MUST DO TO PREVENT DECAY

(By Con Kelliher)

St. Louis is a city about to come to grips with its own destiny, a survey showed yesterday. Leaders in all fields are beginning to realize that the problem put off too long and aggravated by the war years must be met now.

All are agreed that careful planning and decisive action will determine whether the year 1975 will find St. Louis one of the world's great metropolises by any other gage than population.

More than face-lifting and face-saving through elimination of slums and ending the housing problem are required, say the practical and farsighted men.

CITY BURSTING AT SEAMS

And private capital, supplemented by Government aid, must carry the burden of the multi-million-dollar projects that are necessary if the city is to be saved from decay.

It is common knowledge that St. Louis is a city bursting at its seams. Population is spilling across the Mississippi River and spreading into St. Louis County and adjacent areas. Much of this is St. Louis' excess population, excess either because of inadequate accommodations or because of individuals' desire for suburban life.

The debate over the city's current population will soon be settled by the new census, but right now there are a lot of different figures offered. The mayor's office believes there are 901,000 St. Louis inhabitants today.

ESTIMATE OF 1,648,000

The Metropolitan Plan Association, which fostered the Bi-State Development Agency, estimated in 1948 that the metropolitan area's population totaled 1,648,000. Other estimates have run as high as 1,750,000. Figuring that half of this number would be concentrated within the city limits, that would have given St. Louis slightly more than 800,000 residents 2 years ago. The association then anticipated a 1980 population in the area of 1,820,000, which would make the figure for the city proper about 910,000.

The city plan commission, in 1947, declared St. Louis can anticipate a population of 900,000 persons by 1970. The widespread belief is that the current population has exceeded the more conservative estimates for the future.

STATIC BOUNDARIES

While thousands of suburbanites overflowing the St. Louis boundaries would identify themselves on visits to far points as being from St. Louis, there is little likelihood of the city's boundaries being pushed substantially outward to make their statement precise.

Practical politicians point out that perhaps it would be nice to have one mayor, fire department, and police department for St. Louis and its contiguous areas, but it will never become a reality.

Political organizations in each community are not going to join any move to kill off hundreds of public offices that are choice prizes to politicians, as well as to subject everybody to a higher tax rate.

Moreover, dwellers in many suburbs are positive their respective city governments are more efficiently operated and are closer

to the community problems than the St. Louis city hall can ever hope to be.

NO FALSE ILLUSIONS

The long-range planners have no illusions about any such consolidations anywhere, but they know their work concerns really one big city. Chief among the planners is the Bi-State Development Agency, established by Missouri and Illinois to coordinate development and the metropolitan area.

The territorial scope of the agency pretty well defines the mythical city limits of a greater St. Louis. Bi-State will plan for over-all development in St. Charles, St. Louis, and Jefferson Counties—and the city of St-Louis—in Missouri, and Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe Counties in Illinois.

Within this area totaling 3,000 square miles, there are more than 100 municipalities and 600 taxing agencies, annually spending millions of dollars on public improvements.

CITY'S SLUMBER OVER

While St. Louis proper is beginning to arouse itself from too long a slumber to solve its own problems, the city planners are apparently agreed that many of its ills will be eliminated effectively with the solution of the area-wide development problems.

If this is true, the Bi-State Development Agency is the chief assurance that St. Louis and its environs will successfully meet the challenge.

The bi-State organization is more than a planning group. Patterned after the Port Authority of New York, but broader in concept, it has the power to construct airports, terminal facilities, bridges, and tunnels, and to plan and establish policies for sewage and drainage facilities.

It cannot levy taxes, but it can float bonds to be retired by revenues earned by its projects. It also can accept grants from other governmental agencies.

BUSINESS PROPOSITION

The bi-State group also will submit to the communities to be affected, plans for recreational and conservation projects, zoning and other matters in which joint or coordinated action of the communities within the areas will be generally beneficial."

"This agency is governmental in structure, but in operation it will be a business proposition that must earn its own way," declared W. Phillip Shatts, secretary of bi-State. He also is president of the Metropolitan Plan Association.

To influence the legislatures of the two states to create the Bi-State Development Agency a few months ago, the proponents had to submit a guide plan, based on a study of conditions and including recommendations as to what must be done.

BEST BLUEPRINT YET

Many St. Louisans regard this guide plan, with the more detailed studies of its component parts that are to follow, as the best blueprint for a greater and economically sound St. Louis.

The bi-State commission submitted reports to the two legislatures, to show the need for the agency. These reports concisely reflect what is needed, and the agency is now busy with the supplementary planning.

Lief Sverdrup, consulting engineer, was the chairman of the committee that summarized the airport situation, and found that while there are 19 airports in the area, Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport, is the only field suitable for major transport operations.

PLANNING IMPERATIVE

"The Metropolitan St. Louis area is in a very critical stage in its aviation development," the committee reported. "It must go forward or it will go backward. There are ample opportunities to make the area advance into a major part of the air transport network of the Nation. Competition, however, is keen, and other areas are fully aware of the potentialities of air transportation.

"Adequate and aggressive planning and action are imperative now if this metropolitan area is to take full advantage of its strategic location and latent possibilities."

The city plan commission has reported that 35 airfields have been proposed, including 3 major airports, 1 field for feeder transport, 15 minor fields for nonscheduled traffic, commercial uses and training, 13 local personal fields for private planes, and 3 congested area airports, for service to congested business centers.

TRANSPORTATION HUB

St. Louis is the hub of the inland waterways system of the midcontinent area, and a record total of 6,198,998 cargo tons of shipping passed through the Alton Dam in 1949. The city also is the second largest railroad center, the hub of a great transcontinental rail network and of a transcontinental highway network.

If the municipality is to achieve its potentialities, it must develop the metropolitan area interchange facilities between rail, highway, and river transportation. That was the conclusion of the bi-State commission's first report from the committee on union freight terminals, headed by Lachlan Macleay, president of the Mississippi Valley Association.

This will be one of the first problems tackled by the Bi-State Agency, with a study to be made of the possibilities of combined barge-rail-truck terminals in the area.

LACK OF PLANNING

The piece-meal construction of sewerage facilities, resulting from the lack of over-all planning and zoning with proper subdivision controls, concerned the committee headed by Orville Hodge of Granite City, Ill.

The Bi-State Agency will make the necessary studies, surveys, and help bring about a unified system of sewers and surface water drainage. The problem is acute in some St. Louis County communities, which have discovered cumbersome State laws on bond issues will hamstring efforts to expand existing facilities.

Streets, trafficways, and bridges are important phases in the city's development. More than 100,000 vehicles now enter and leave the St. Louis business district on an average 24-hour day, it was reported by the bi-State committee headed by H. F. Thomson, consulting engineer.

BIG TRAFFIC INCREASE

The city plan commission has estimated that the annual city traffic will increase to 2,403,000,000 vehicle miles by 1960, as compared to 1,531,000,000 in 1946. It cannot be accommodated on our present street system, the commission stated.

While the Bi-State Agency will work on a comprehensive highway plan and river crossings, based on a sound pattern of population distribution and land uses, the city is studying the problem within its boundaries.

The city plan commission has reported the desirability of grade separations at intersections such as Grand Boulevard and Market Street, and Lindell Boulevard and Kings Highway.

MAJOR STREET PLAN

It has prepared a major street plan, including such major trafficways as the Third Street interregion highway, that must be put into action if the city is to grow.

Mass transportation ranks as one of the greatest problems, the planners believe. Although more and more people are pushing out into the suburbs, both the St. Louis County Transit Co. and the St. Louis Public Service Co. have found it necessary to ask fare increases.

Both have sought discontinuance of competing lines. Whenever transit service is reduced, more residents switch to motor travel. That results in further reduction of transit service, and the cycle apparently is repeated many times. The Bi-State Agency's efforts to induce an orderly growth pattern in the metropolitan area undoubtedly will help solve this dilemma.

HOUSING BIG PROBLEM

Housing and slum clearance is particularly the cross of the city of St. Louis. The remedy, say the planners, again rests primarily with private capital and not sole reliance on the Government for financial hand-outs.

St. Louisans winced in 1947 when the city plan commission gave the score on blighted areas. It found that 33,000 dwellings still have outdoor toilet facilities. In another 25,000 dwellings, toilets are shared by several families. A total of 82,000 dwellings are more than 50 years old.

The St. Louis Housing Authority has inventoried approximately 48,000 units that could be classified as slums, and has calculated that it ought to build replacements of 12,000 units, with private capital taking the rest of the burden.

FIVE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED UNITS PLANNED

But that is long-range planning. The housing authority has provided 1,357 units, and its immediate planning is for 5,800 units.

Meanwhile, the city is cheered by the growing interest of private builders, such as is demonstrated by the new apartment project of Horace Deal at Fourteenth and Pine Streets. They hail this as the type of planning that will convert unsightly areas into downtown residential districts.

The city plan commission, with Harland Bartholomew as its engineer, readied a comprehensive plan many months ago, providing for the future in the above fields, as well as land use, zoning, recreation facilities and improvements in the central business district.

The Bi-State Agency has begun its tremendous task for the sprawling metropolitan area that actually is St. Louis. Private capital and private initiative are beginning to show interest in what must be done to insure St. Louis against growing decay. The next few years will disclose whether the city seized its golden opportunity.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it is my information that the resolution (S. J. Res. 174) has been today referred to the Committee on Public Works. In view of the fact that Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, provides that to the Committee on the Judiciary shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subject of interstate compacts generally, the senior Senator from Missouri had assumed that the joint resolution would be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. President, although the senior Senator from Missouri is not certain that he shall present a motion that the reference to the Committee on Public Works be set aside, and that the Senate direct the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 174), to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Missouri does, however, reserve the right to make that motion.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Cain	Jenner	Malone
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ecton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Lucas	Wherry
George	McClellan	
Hendrickson	McKellar	

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from New Jersey whether he concurs in the general policy of quorum calls which are abandoned in the midst of the call, thus resulting in some Members coming to the floor and others not doing so?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No, I do not concur in that general policy.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DARBY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEM, Mr. KERR, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THYE, and Mr. TYDINGS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to speak in behalf of the amendment which I submitted on the 26th of April 1950, lettered "C," which, briefly, provides that any further foreign aid to European nations shall be conditioned on the free convertibility of their currencies in terms of each of the nations and in terms of the dollar. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. . Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title on June 30, 1950, to any participating country unless, on or before such date, such country (1) has eliminated any currency controls imposed by it that prevent its currency from reflecting its actual purchasing power in terms of the United States dollar on the free monetary markets of the world, and (2) enters into an agreement with the United States that it will not reimpose any such currency controls prior to July 1, 1952."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the field of international trade many factors are involved, factors of money manipulation, among others. In the field of international trade, involving the manipulation of the money systems and currencies of the foreign nations for trade advantage, our representatives have about as much chance of winning in the trades, or breaking even, as a neophyte might have in a professional poker game.

The Constitution of the United States divides the Federal Government into three separate branches, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. I wish to make a statement regarding the suggestions being made in favor of collusion between branches of the Government. The debates at the time the Constitution was drawn up and the opinions expressed by those who drew it up indicate that the three branches were created as a system of checks and balances, providing that each be independent of the other. Any collusion between the branches of Government which would limit debate or the dissemination of public information was not contemplated by the framers of the Constitution of the United States.

It is the opinion of many informed persons that it would be a violation of the spirit of the Constitution if an agreement should be made between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches for the submission of legislation to the legislative branch by the executive, for its ratification without adequate debate, and, finally, for its being held constitutional by the judicial branch without adequate argument. Any elected or appointed official participating in such collusion should, in the opinion of the junior Senator from the State of Nevada, be impeached. I have in mind, particularly, those who take part in any prearranged bipartisan foreign policy arrangement which would preclude full and open debate.

Mr. President, from certain quarters comes the suggestion that, in the interest of bipartisan foreign policy, the International Trade Organization Charter be withdrawn at this session of Congress. The International Trade Organization is the third part of the three-part free-trade system started by the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. That act placed in the hands of the State Department, inexperienced in industrial affairs, the fate of industry and the fate of the working men in the United States. The Constitution rested the responsibility for such matters in the hands of the legislative branch, but the executive branch tried for a hundred years prior to 1934 to get it into its hands, and the act of 1934 accomplished that aim.

Then, Mr. President, we have the ECA, the purpose of which is to make up the trade-balance deficits of the foreign nations of Europe, until such time as the markets of the United States can be divided with those nations to the point where theoretically there will be no deficits in their trade balances.

The ITO is the third part of this three-part free-trade system and would make permanent what the first two have temporarily established.

Mr. President, as I previously stated, the suggestion has recently been made in certain quarters that in the interest of bipartisan foreign policy, the International Trade Organization charter be withdrawn during the present session. The inference has been drawn that as the Republican Party is opposed to the ITO, in the interest of harmony this controversial subject should be deferred until the Republicans can take "a more enlightened view." I repeat the last phrase—until the Republicans can take "a more enlightened view." What is meant is: until they can look at this instrument through the eyes of the one-economic worlders, which would average the standard of living of the United States of America with that of the foreign nations of the world—and perhaps through the so-called bipartisan policy secure an agreement that the legislation will pass the Senate.

The ITO is but one more device affecting private trade which has been placed under the umbrella of that great protective phrase "bipartisan foreign policy."

When the ITO charter was sent to Congress some weeks ago we were told that our liberties were at stake, that its adoption was necessary for the preservation of peace and prosperity. Let us take this propaganda at its face value and bring the charter to the Senate floor. If adoption of the charter is as urgent as officially stated, then it should be considered now. Mr. President, I defy the administration to have the ITO charter brought to the Senate floor.

During the past 18 years the Congress of the United States has set up an "executive-order government" which has made political cowards out of the businessmen of the United States. The businessmen of America operate under the executive bureau directives, not under law.

Mr. President, it is necessary as a basis for my address to define the specific difference between the two major political parties. During the past 18 years the expression has become common that there is no real difference between the

two major political parties. That simply is not true.

The Republican Party strayed for a while. It lost its bearings and fell into the hands of its enemies. It fell into the hands of the camp followers and the "me-tooers," because it had temporarily lost its positiveness, a quality which can come only from knowing where it is going. I am glad to say that now the Republican Party has quit following false prophets. It took a look into the future and as a result is now definitely for maintaining the American standard of living while assisting the foreign nations to raise their own standards. The Republican Party is definitely opposed to the Democratic program of tying the regulation of the national economy to the Nation's foreign policy.

The Republican Party is definitely opposed to the often reaffirmed policy of the Democratic Party of promoting unlimited imports of the products of the low-living-standard and slave-labor foreign nations of the world.

The Republican Party favors a floor under wages and investments, through tariffs and import fees, so as to preserve the standard of living of the working men and women of American, which has been built up over a century of time.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY POLICY

The pronounced foreign-policy program of the Democratic Party was set down in detail by Assistant Secretary of State Willard H. Thorp in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in January of last year, when he said:

> The European recovery program—

He put it first; and, of course, the European recovery program is the same as the Marshall plan or the ECA—

> extends immediate assistance on a short-term basis to put the European countries back on their feet.

Mr. President, the ECA makes up in cash and goods the trade-balance deficits of the 16 Marshall-plan countries each year. Under that program our chief export is cash.

Mr. Thorp further said:

> The Trade Agreements Act program is an integral part of our over-all program for world economic recovery.

In short, the program is to divide the markets of this Nation with the countries of the world, to the point where, theoretically, there are no further trade-balance deficits.

That is to be done through an indiscriminate lowering of tariffs and import fees, after perfunctory hearings.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended, removed the floor under wages and investments and stopped the flow of venture capital into the business stream of the Nation.

Mr. Thorp further said:

> The International Trade Organization, upon which Congress will soon be asked to take favorable action, provides a long-term mechanism—each part of this program is important. Each contributes to an effective and consistent whole.

Mr. President, when Mr. Thorp said that "Each part of this program is important—each contributes to an effective and consistent whole," he was pronouncing the basic combination domestic and foreign policy of the Democratic Party.

The International Trade Organization Charter simply transfers the regulation of our national economy to the ITO, a foreign-controlled organization. Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the control of our national economy was transferred from the Congress to the executive branch of the Government; and now it is proposed, by means of the ITO, to have the control transferred from the executive branch of our Government to the ITO, an international organization.

The Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, has said:

> It is hardly possible any longer to draw a sharp dividing line between the economic affairs and political affairs * * * each complements and supplements the other. They must be combined in a single unified and rounded policy.

Through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the control of the national economy was transferred to the State Department. Under the proposed International Trade Organization, which Mr. Thorp, the Assistant Secretary of State, says is a part of the whole program, the control of our national economy is to be transferred from the executive branch of our Government, from the State Department, where it actually is administered, to the 58 foreign nations making up the International Trade Organization, in which we shall have but one vote. In that connection, our national economy will be controlled by the ITO through the importation into this Nation of the products of other nations.

They—the ITO—will fix the tariffs and import fees of the member nations—and also fix quotas of production.

Both Secretary of State Acheson and his assistant, Mr. Thorp, recently appeared before a House committee and urgently requested that the International Trade Organization be approved at an early date. They made that request within the last week.

This pronouncement marked the final abandonment of the workingmen and investors of this Nation, in favor of the one economic world theory of averaging the living standards of the nations of the world. Under this policy, no further venture capital for business development or stabilization could possibly be available.

Mr. President, those who have already invested their money in manufacturing plants, processing plants, mines, lumbering, and other industries in this country must take the consequences. If the program cannot be changed. Under the circumstances, they are stuck. Such persons have come to Washington in droves, and have appeared before the Tariff Commission, in an attempt to ascertain whether or not they can get relief from the free-trade program; also if they can keep from being hurt further in the tariff reduction scheduled for September of this year, at Torquay, England, where additional reductions are threatened on 2,400 products. Those persons are receiving very little attention. They are frightened. They cannot get their money out of such industries as long as they are threatened, and of course under the circumstances no new venture capital will go into such industries.

The last 15 years the people of the United States, through the propaganda of the State Department, have been sold a bill of goods that if business cannot provide full employment, then the Government must do so. Then we in Congress have proceeded to make it impossible for venture capital to go into business and to keep pace with the increase in our population. When that becomes impossible, of course the Government must step in. That is the plan.

That means, in short, the enactment of the Spence bill or a similar measure. The Spence bill calls for $15,000,000,000, and allows the President of the United States to build steel mills, sawmills, or to engage in other construction or business in order to increase employment. So, first, by means of what is done right here on the floor of the Senate, we make the achievement of that objective impossible through private business. Thus we make it necessary for the Government to provide employment, because we say that business has failed to do so.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. ECTON. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Nevada, but I should like to ask a question. In the face of a program such as the Senator is outlining in connection with the ITO, how is it possible to have a long-term, long-purpose farm program in this country?

Mr. MALONE. It is utterly impossible, simply because we not only have practically free trade at the present time, in respect to the importation of farm products coming from Canada and other foreign nations; but under the stabilization program and the provision of 90 percent of parity, or whatever it amounts to, we are actually stabilizing the prices of the farm products of other nations.

By entering the ITO, we shall make that particular condition permanent. It is true that the ITO charter provides that we can withdraw after 6 months' notice; but once we have entered it, we shall not have the stamina to withdraw, because the ITO charter provides that we shall assign to that international organization—according to the 125-page ambiguous pamphlet issued by the State Department—the right to fix tariffs and import fees and quotas of production for its member nations. In other words, if we produce too much wheat, they can allocate some of it to Canada or to Australia. If we produce too many shoes, we can allocate some of them to Czechoslovakia or to some other nation.

So I say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that he has put his finger right on the sore spot, under the proposed ITO it would be impossible for us to have a long-term farm program.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ECTON. Then does the Senator from Nevada believe that perhaps that is what the Secretary of State had in mind the other day when he said that our international policies were one and the same with our national policies?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Montana has brought up that point. That is exactly what we have done. In 1934 the Congress transferred to the executive branch of Government—in this case to the State Department—its constitutional responsibility to regulate the national economy, through the regulation of imports. The State Department, then, is administering the national economy in connection with its administration of the foreign policy, because the Constitution of the United States puts the responsibility of fixing the foreign policy in the executive branch. Under these circumstances, the executive branch of our Government now fixes both the domestic and foreign policy; it ties the regulation of the national economy to the foreign policy.

So the Senator from Montana is entirely correct, in that today the executive branch of our Government is doing both. That makes a bipartisan policy impossible in any case.

Mr. ECTON. Then is it not a fact that in order to make the reciprocal trade agreements operate and in order to make even a stab at establishing a floor of fair prices under our farm products and other commodities of this country, the only way by which we can proceed to make such policies work is by continuing and extending the so-called Marshall-plan aid to foreign countries?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that the junior Senator from Nevada believes that the only way to make the farm program successful is to initiate a flexible import fee tariff policy, meaning that the import fee, being flexible, would be administered by a nonpartisan committee.

As the Interstate Commerce Commission administers and fixes freight rates on the basis of reasonable return on investment, so this nonpartisan body contemplated by the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada in 1948 and again in 1949, and submitted as a substitute last September, for the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, would turn the long-experienced Tariff Commission into a foreign-trade authority.

That authority would have the same latitude in fixing import fees and tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. In other words, it would have authority to make up the differential at all times between the standards of living in nations competitive with our Nation. Therefore, foreign products would come into our country on our basis of costs. Unless we have such an import fee, then, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, the farm program is bound to fall, because we shall be buying goods from foreign nations, just as the merchants in this country bought dried eggs from China for $1.10 a pound to be fed to our people, while we bought the dried eggs produced in America at $1.25 a pound, to be stored in a cave in Kansas.

Mr. ECTON. Does that not build up our own surplus?

Mr. MALONE. That builds up our own surplus. The Senator from Montana is entirely correct.

Mr. ECTON. And does it not complicate any and all the programs we might devise?

Mr. MALONE. It makes them entirely unworkable, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, because it would be necessary to raise the $6,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 to pay the subsidies. We could go only so far, when it would become impossible to obtain the money with which to maintain the program.

Mr. President, the program I have just described is the three-part free trade program tying the national economy to the foreign policy, to which, as I have said to the distinguished Senator from Montana, the Democratic Party is irrevocably committed, and upon which they have staked their entire combined domestic and foreign policy. It is a combined policy. That is the reason it is impossible for a Republican Senator to make any kind of a deal with the executive department, even if it were not against the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. This is the so-called bipartisan foreign policy that wrecked the Republican Party and is moving toward merging this Nation with a foreign-controlled one economic world.

Spokesmen for the administration say that they have adopted this three-part free-trade program to average our standard of living with the foreign nations of the world, on the theory best expressed in one of their slogans: "You cannot be prosperous in a starving world." They say we must divide our markets, the basis of our own income, with the nations of the world, and average the living standard of nations of the world, to avoid world war III.

It is that party's method of establishing world peace.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ECTON. When this country encourages the importation of food products, such as eggs, from China, are we not doing a great disservice to the people of China? Should not that food remain for the use of those people, who are starving to death, instead of being imported into our country in order to rectify certain dollar balances?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Montana has mentioned that particular feature. Of course such products should be retained for the use of the people of China. It has already been hinted that within a very short time we shall be asked to feed Communist China. Perhaps they need additional food, anyway. But we have now imported from China a large amount of what food they had in the form of dried eggs. The dried eggs from China will be eaten here while the Chinese people starve, so we may appropriate more money in order to help the people of China.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. ECTON. Did the Senator from Nevada notice recently a news item to the effect that butter made from whale oil in foreign countries had been shipped into New York City and sold at a lower cost per pound than the price at which we can sell our own butter in this country, and notwithstanding the fact that the Government has in storage 100,000,000 pounds of butter?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Montana, I should like to say that I covered that particular feature in a debate in March 1949, when I read from an article written by Paul Hoffman for the April issue of the American Magazine. I read exactly what the distinguished Senator has just stated, or, to be more accurate, perhaps, what Mr. Hoffman really said was that, but for the "inordinate" tariff of 14 cents a pound, or whatever it was at the moment, Norway or certain of the Low Countries would furnish their surplus butter to the United States of America. I said then that I supposed the farmers producing butter for sale in this country would be very happy to know that Paul Hoffman favored the reduction of the tariff on butter, which was but one of approximately 3,000 items on which a reduction of tariffs was favored. I interpreted Mr. Hoffman's meaning to be that such products could come into this country without proper safeguards in the interests of the American producer, the American workingman, and the American investor. Mr. Hoffman denies that. But there was no denying that he was in favor of the reduction in the tariff on butter and other things. Since then Mr. Hoffman has created—I suppose with the help and advice of Mr. Acheson—an organization within ECA for the very purpose of promoting the importation of European products into the United States, to assist in determining what products can best be sold here, and to give foreign producers advice as to how to package the products, how to get them here, and how to sell them in competition with our own producers, with the advantage of as nearly a free-trade basis as possible.

So, Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Montana that that is the objective of the Democratic Party. I would be happy to prove in debate with anyone, anywhere, that the Democratic Party is irrevocably committed to the three-part free-trade program outlined. It is committed to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transfers constitutional responsibility of Congress to the executive department, giving it full authority to lower the tariffs and import fees by 75 percent of what they were in 1934, after perfunctory hearings, with no check whatever.

The Democratic Party is also in favor of the ECA's making up the trade balance deficits of the 16 Marshall-plan countries until such time as the division of the markets of the United States can be brought about, so that theoretically

the trade-balance deficits will be overcome.

The Democratic Party is likewise for the International Trade Organization, which makes permanent what the Trade Agreements Act and ECA temporarily do. Within the past week or 10 days the Secretary of State and Mr. Thorp, the Under Secretary, testified to that fact.

To those three things the Democratic Party is irrevocably committed.

Mr. President, what does the Republican platform say in this regard?

The Republican Party, on the other hand, believes in protecting American workers and investors against the unfair competition of low-wage foreign goods. In other words, the Republican Party believes in maintaining our standard of living while we assist the foreign nations to raise their own standards—not to average the living standards of all the nations of the world.

Mr. President, I said once on the Senate floor, and I repeat that with two and one-fourth billion persons in the world and perhaps only 160,000,000 persons in the United States, and our area being such a small part of the world's area, it would be like taking a glass of water and averaging the level of the water in that glass with that in the city reservoir. We pour the water out of the glass and nothing perceptible happens to the reservoir.

The Republican Party believes in maintaining the American standard of living while we are helping other nations.

It believes that the best safeguard of the peace of the world is a strong American economy.

The Republican Party believes that the regulation of the foreign policy should stop at the water's edge.

It believes that the domestic policy and the foreign policy should remain separated just as the framers of the Constitution of the United States intended.

Let the President of the United States consult the Secretary of State and the National Defense Secretary and determine what the foreign policy is to be, and send it to the Senate floor in the form of a treaty, if it is a matter for a treaty, and then, as the framers of the Constitution intended, let the Senators debate it until everyone understands it. Let the House, likewise, debate it, if it is presented in the form of a bill.

Mr. President, quite a clever arrangement has been in vogue. Rightfully, these questions would come as treaties requiring a two-thirds majority of the Senate for ratification, but they are being presented as bills, which require only a simple majority, which is much easier to secure.

The Republican Party does not believe that imports from the low-cost and slave-labor foreign nations should be allowed to endanger American industry, nor the standard of living of the working men and women of America.

It does not believe in exporting American jobs to foreign soil.

The 1952 Republican platform specifically establishes that party's definite and unmistakable position in the development of foreign trade. The statement of principles says:

> We favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of "fair and reasonable" competition and we assert that this can be done within the Republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security.

Mr. President, it is impossible for any Senator or anyone else to be in favor of both those policies. Any Republican who supports the so-called bi-partisan foreign policy does not represent the Republican Party.

Under the Republican Party platform, Mr. President, a flexible import fee principle must be substituted for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended. With a flexible import fee principle, there would be no high or low tariff or import fee, but an import fee which would at all times correctly represent the differential in labor standards between this country and countries abroad.

I desire to emphasize that statement. Whenever someone protests the free-trade principle, it is said that he favors a higher tariff, a higher import fee. That is not true. Under a flexible import fee plan, properly administered by a nonpartisan Tariff Commission functioning as a foreign-trade authority, there would be no question of a high or low tariff, but products from foreign nations would come in on a basis of fair and reasonable competition. In other words, any foreign nation would have equal access to our markets, but would not be favored over the American producer.

It would establish a floor under wages and investment, and again encourage the investments of venture capital, the life blood of continued industrial growth and employment.

Such flexible import fees would be lowered in accordance with any improvements of the foreign nations' living standards, and, when their living standards and working conditions approximate our own, then the common objective of free trade between this country and the foreign nations of the world would be almost automatic and immediate.

POLICIES OF TWO PARTIES DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED

No one can possibly support the principles of the Republican Party and approve the Democratic Party's combination domestic and foreign policy at the same time, since the fundamental principles of the two parties are diametrically opposed. They have been opposed for 70 years, except within the past 18 years, when the Republican Party temporarily got off the track. It is back now, Mr. President, on the long-standing policy which has built up the standard of living of the United States of America higher than that of any other nation in the world.

I said that loud enough for the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to hear it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not hear the Senator say that he would yield.

Mr. MALONE. I will be very glad to yield for anything the Senator from Texas desires to ask.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Bipartisan foreign policy, like reciprocal trade, is a catch phrase to sell the one-economic-world philosophy to the American people and to again destroy the effectiveness of the Republican Party.

THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Congress transferred its constitutional responsibility to regulate the national economy to the executive branch of the Government through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, by that action placed into the hands of an industrially inexperienced State Department the fate of the workingmen and investors of this Nation, and by that act effectively destroyed the flow of venture investment capital into the business and industrial life of this Nation.

The Constitution places the responsibility of fixing foreign policy in the executive branch. Therefore, Congress by its act tied the regulation of the national economy to the foreign policy.

As a result of the administration's 3-part free-trade program, the textile, mining, lumber and wood products, precision instruments, watch, crockery, petroleum, coal, and many other industries, have been forced to curtail production which can only result in severe unemployment, a reduced standard of living, and continued losses to the investors of this Nation.

Not content with the damage already done, our State Department is now preparing to still further sell out America with another tariff-reduction parley in Torquay, England, on September 28 next where they threaten to reduce tariffs on 2,400 items. Although our mills and mines and factories are already being forced to reduce production because of heavy imports, our administration is actually attempting to increase imports.

As I said, Mr. Paul Hoffman has created a special division within the ECA to assist foreign nations to find in their localities additional products, produced by slave labor, which they could ship into this country in competition with our standard of living. We have created that particular condition.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Congress of the United States had seen fit to adopt the so-called peril point in the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, at least we would have had a reasonable approach to this problem in the protection of American industry, would we not?

Mr. MALONE. I say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that we would at least have put the President in such a position that if, in the reduction of tariffs and import fees, he went beyond the point where the Tariff Commission considered it dangerous to

American industry, he could at least have written a letter to the Senate. I do not consider the peril point an adequate substitute for the flexible import fee—in fact the peril point might be dangerous if in proposing it—it might be understood that we also accepted the principle of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is very interesting to me to see that some people in the United States who were not for the peril-point proposition when we acted upon it, and which lost by a very few votes, now have reversed their position and are for the peril point and are expressing a hope that it may be adopted, or at least regret that it was not adopted. Has the Senator noticed that change of feeling?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the effect of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was not understood by the workingmen and the investors of this Nation, but its effect can only be increased unemployment and loss of investments. The petroleum industry, the crockery industry, the watch industry, the wood and lumber industry, and the mining industry are all in trouble, and the effect is just beginning to be felt. It also includes producers of farm commodities. They are very nervous that the purchasing of foreign agricultural products through "free trade" while we store our own will finally cost so much money that they will destroy the farm program.

I would say to the very distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that the peril point would provide a danger signal, but would be entirely inadequate to change the present situation. I would say further to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that, as he will remember, in September 1949 the junior Senator from Nevada offered a flexible import-fee principle as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. That substitution would have cut the jugular vein of the administration's "free trade" policy. There is no proposal of a high tariff or a low tariff in the flexible import-fee principle, but Congress would regain its authority transferred to the State Department through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

The bill which I introduced provided that there be a foreign-trade authority, a nonpartisan commission, and that they be given the same latitude in the field of fixing tariffs and import fees on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—no high tariff, no low tariff, merely a differential of cost due mostly to the difference in the living standards here and in the competitive nations. It would operate in the same manner as the Interstate Commerce Commission in the field of fixing freight rates for the carriers. Originally every railroad had a separate freight rate for almost every shipper. That system did not work very well. So Congress created the Interstate Commerce Commission and put into its hands the power to regulate freight rates on the basis of a reasonable return on investment.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator referred to industrialists. Has the Senator also noticed the growing concern on the part of American labor because of what is happening?

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire brought up that subject. Most of the labor organizations in Nevada have passed resolutions against the International Trade Organization, and have asked that it be not adopted. They also ask that the flexible import-fee principle be adopted in place of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. In the humble opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, labor is now learning for the first time what effect "free trade" has on their jobs. I think they were promised certain things, and in return they were to support the administration's program. They did not know that the three-part foreign-policy program of the administration, namely the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the ECA, and the ITO, added up to free trade. Mr. Hull, a distinguished former Secretary of State for whom everyone has the very highest regard, calls it "free trade" and they would not take it. But when it was called reciprocal trade, it sounded reasonable, not thinking that the two words "reciprocal trade" do not occur in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is not a reciprocal trade act, and it was never intended to be reciprocal trade. I predict to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that by October that will be the great political issue. It will be the question upon which the elections will hinge. The question will be free trade on the one hand, or, on the other, maintaining our high standard of living while we assist other nations to raise their own. Labor will go along with that idea.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has the Senator noticed, as I have noticed, the concern with which farm groups are viewing this subject for the first time?

Mr. MALONE. The Farm Bureau of the State of Nevada passed a resolution against the ITO and to substitute the flexible import fee for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Labor passed a similar resolution. The Republican Party in Nevada passed a strong resolution. The three were together on principle.

In my opinion, farm groups will become increasingly worried about the farm program, which most of us voted for, because it seemed to be the best thing that we could get. However, we find wheat, shoes, and many other commodities coming into the United States without check, while we store our own surpluses and pay out billions of dollars by way of subsidies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to remind the senior Senator from New Hampshire of a provision of the rules of the Senate, which was pointed out some weeks ago to the present occupant of the chair by the senior Senator from Missouri, namely, that a Senator who wishes to interrogate another Member of the Senate should face the Presiding Officer and address him.

The Chair now recognizes the senior Senator from New Hampshire to ask a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer for his correction. I should have followed that procedure, but it slipped my mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not be so pleasing to view the Presiding Officer, but the Chair is sure that the senior Senator from New Hampshire would prefer to face the Chair and address him, and then address his question to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Presiding Officer is correct, and through the Presiding Officer I shall ask if the Senator from Nevada will yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. I have received recently numerous complaints from New Hampshire, which is one of the leading shoe manufacturing States, from those who manufacture shoes, and from members of the shoe workers' unions, the labor groups who are employees in the shoe factories. They are much concerned over the importation of shoes, and particularly do they feel strongly about the importations of shoes from Czechoslovakia, which have been reaching a peak recently. They point out particularly that Czechoslovakia is a Russian satellite country, Communist-controlled, behind the Iron Curtain, against which we are in an all-out fight, supposedly. These correspondents of mine cannot for the life of them see why we should be extending to a country with which we are fighting a total diplomatic war, a cold war, the privilege of exporting shoes to this country and taking bread out of the mouths of the American workers. I wonder if the Senator will comment on that?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has brought up that particular subject, because I should like to state at this point that I am not particularly concerned with the manufacturing industries, but I am particularly concerned with the workingmen and the investors of the Nation. The workingmen and investors are absolutely on common ground in opposition to the "free trade" program. There can be no disagreement. Anything that threatens one threatens the other. Whenever Czechoslovakian shoes, manufactured by their cheap labor, by people who live under cheap living conditions, are imported into this country and undersell the products of our manufacturers, it does not mean that it is absolutely necessary to quit producing shoes here, but the American industries and workingmen have a choice—and this applies to every industry affected, and all industries will be affected.

They can either reduce their wages and write off the investment down to the point where they can compete with the standards of living abroad, or they can become unemployed.

Mr. Hoffman suggested that tutors be employed who would teach the workers new skills, and teach the industrialists, after they had lost the stockholders' money, how to create new industries to take the place of the old. Neither Mr. Hoffman nor Mr. Acheson suggested the industries which would not be affected. The workers who would be getting eight or nine or ten dollars a day, as in the case of the miners in this country, would not have to quit. When free trade came

along in copper the copper miners did not need to quit. All the employers had to do was to reduce their labor costs from $11.17 a day, which was the rate of pay in most camps to $2.50, $2.60, or $2.40, the rate paid in Chile, write the investment down to meet that particular emergency, and still mine copper. Shoes, crockery, watches, and all kinds of materials in this country could still be produced, but the workers would have their choice either of lowering wages and writing off the investment to meet competition, or becoming unemployed and going on unemployment insurance, if they could get on it, so long as the Government of the United States or the States would support them. Does that answer the question of the Senator?

Mr. BRIDGES. It does.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this effort to increase imports is a direct attack on the American standard of living, as I have just explained, since an increase in the imports of slave-wage products cuts production here. The curtailment of production in this country and the resulting increase in unemployment will increase in proportion to the cuts made at the Torquay Conference in England, in September. This is a one-way street. There is nothing reciprocal about it.

I would suggest at this point, Mr. President, that we have never made a trade agreement; we have made agreements to lower tariffs. The foreign nations agree to lower tariffs, but immediately resort to quotas, embargoes, specifications, and various other subterfuges, and, in addition, manipulate the price of their currencies. As a matter of fact, they have several different exchange values for most of the individual countries. I have not checked recently, but at one time England had 20 or 30 different exchange values for her pound, and Argentina had at least six different values for the peso. Colombia has three or four.

There are many ways in which they get around allowing us to trade with them, all enumerated by me last year in the debate. Colombia, for instance, might even give a permit for the importation of products, but it would give the importer an exchange different from what it gave his competitor. We will assume that in their particular unit of money they give one a rate of three and one-half to the dollar, and the other four and one-half to the dollar, so that it would be impossible to meet competition.

That is what I meant in my opening statement when I said that there are dozens of ways of defeating us in the objectives we try to carry out with our representatives meeting in conferences with the representatives of foreign nations that have made their living in foreign trade for from 100 to 300 years.

We are just like neophytes in a professional poker game, and have just about as much chance of coming out even. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his contribution.

Approximately 85 percent of the agricultural population of this Nation would not need a subsidy if the flexible-import-fee principle should be substituted for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

By that act, the Congress placed in the hands of the State Department the right to say what industries would be preserved and what industries in this Nation would be sacrified upon the altar of "one economic world."

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

I now come to the International Trade Organization, on the President's "must" list. Senators will recall the first address on the State of the Union the President of the United States made to the Congress at the beginning of the session these things were in his "must" list: First, the International Trade Organization, that final part of the three-part free-trade system. Then there was point 4, the bold new program which would guarantee the investments which are made in countries where the investment is gone the moment it is made. There, too, was the well-defined nationalization, socialization, and appriation-of-private-capital pattern, and of course increased appropriations to carry those things out. That is what the President's program boiled down to in the first message he delivered to this Congress on January 4 of this year.

The International Trade Organization, which was on his "must" list, to be passed at this session of Congress, not at the next session, would transfer the regulation of our national economy directly into the complete control of foreign nations, the same foreign nations which were to sell their products, produced at lower living standards and by slave labor, in this country.

The ITO is set up to include, to start with, 58 nations, with 58 votes at present. The United States would have one vote, just as would Siam, that little nation, many of whose people live on canals, using the canals for sewage disposal, for cooking, for bathing, for fishing. One battalion of United States Marines could take over the whole nation in 3 or 4 days, and half its people would not know it. That nation has one vote in the International Trade Organization just the same as has the United States of America.

It is proposed to transfer to the ITO the power to regulate our national economy through fixing the tariffs and import fees of its member nations.

Mr. President, that is only half the story. It would also set quotas of production, if you please, for the countries signing its charter.

According to the terms of the proposed International Trade Organization charter, we can theoretically withdraw from the ITO after 3 years and 6 months' notice, but by then we would be so bloody that it is unlikely that any withdrawal could be effected.

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ECA

The ECA—formerly the Marshall plan—is a stop-gap arrangement to make up the trade-balance deficits of the 16 ECA European countries in cash and goods until such time as the markets of this Nation can be divided with the foreign nations of the world so that theoretically there would be no trade-balance deficit.

The weakness in that theory is that we would have no control over foreign purchases and they could increase their purchases as their credit increased.

The taxpayers of America furnish the money to install the necessary industrial machinery in foreign countries to manufacture products that must be sold in competition with our own workingmen and investors. This fact alone discourages future venture capital.

The administration's three-part free-trade program, then, includes the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended, the ECA—formerly the Marshall plan, and the International Trade Organization.

IMPORTING PRODUCTS OF CHEAP LABOR

There is no practical difference in importing the products of cheap labor and in importing the cheap labor itself. It would be inconsistent to support one and not the other.

POINT 4—THE BOLD NEW PROGRAM

Now the point 4—the bold new program—is designed to carry on where the ECA eventually leaves off—and will prove to be just one more siphon out of the United States Treasury, since investments in the areas subject to socialization and nationalization of capital and industries can be written off when they are made—unless the countries where the investments are to be made completely change their attitude toward such private investments.

Guaranteeing the integrity of private investments by the country in which they are made should be a firm condition of any future aid of any kind from this Nation.

It is definitely the responsibility of a recipient country to establish a business climate which encourages private investments, and our State Department should make such a condition a part of our foreign policy.

Much of the private investments to be guaranteed under the point 4, or the bold new program, are to be expanded in the colonial areas, which include the Far East and Africa. It would further perpetuate the colonial system, which has been exploited by the empire-minded nations for from 100 to 300 years. What areas in Asia and Africa are governed by the colonial-minded, empire-minded nations? I have visited those areas. They are the areas which produce tin, nickel, chrome, manganese, hemp, copra, and practically everything we do not produce here. The colonial nations, the empire-minded nations of England, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and now Italy, found out over the past 300 years that the countries which are now their colonies produced things which we eventually would buy. The empire-minded nations control the colonies through the use of slave labor, paying them 50 or 60 cents a day. In some of those colonies wages as low as 25 cents a day are paid.

The empire-minded nations are to be encouraged under a free-trade program to hold labor down, sell the copra, tin, nickel and so on for what the market will pay in this country, and keep the difference. That is the way the colonial nations, the empire-minded nations, have made a living for from 100 to 300 years.

Mr. President, I should like at this point to have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a dispatch which I will designate presently. It is dated May 1, and was written by Paul Catz, of the New York Times. The dispatch is well written. The writer puts his finger on the sensitive spot. He says:

Considerable astonishment was caused here by the annual report of Dr. Marius W. Holtrop * * * published this week.

It is difficult to see, the report said, what acute problem can be solved by forming one large European market.

That is the United States of Europe, which many of us advocate. It is difficult to see what one such market would do, he said.

Doubtless by such a large market Europe in the long run would share in the advantages of natural international labor distribution. But one must fear that this would be preceded by a period of great confusion and great investment needs on one side and heavy capital losses on the other.

Moreover, this one great European market would yield no wheat, corn, cotton oil, and nonferrous metals. What European countries need more than a larger market within themselves is a larger market in the United States.

Mr. President, I hope the implications of that statement are not lost on the Senate of the United States. What they need is a larger market, not within themselves, but a larger market in the United States for their goods.

Only in this way could Europe earn more dollars without having to hold up her hands for gifts which in the long run are bound to undermine European good will in America or to accept loans which she cannot repay.

Mr. President, the amendment I have submitted, which was read at the beginning of my address, would, as a condition to further help to Europe, require a free convertibility of the currencies of the nations of Europe in terms of each other and in terms of the dollar.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred a few moments ago to the International Trade Organization, did he not?

Mr. MALONE. I did.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether or not he has given attention to whether the International Trade Organization's charter, into which the United States is asked to enter, is a treaty or an executive agreement.

Mr. MALONE. I am not a lawyer, and the distinguished Senator from Missouri is a very fine lawyer, but I would say to him that in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada it has been transformed into an agreement, so that it can come before both Houses of Congress as a piece of legislation to be passed by a majority of both Houses instead of coming before the Senate as a treaty and requiring a two-thirds majority.

That is a condition which has been brought about by the smart persons in the executive branch of the Government, who have done so in an attempt to avoid the ratification of such a proposal by the Senate as a treaty, in view of the fact that ratification by the Senate would require a two-thirds vote, which it seldom is possible to obtain for anything which does not make considerable sense.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Chair would remind the Senator from Missouri that, in line with the rule, Senators who wish to ask questions of other Senators should address the Chair when asking whether the Senator who has the floor will yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri most respectfully advises the Chair that he did address the Chair when he asked whether the Senator who has the floor would yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For his first question, the Senator from Missouri did address the Chair; but for his second question, the Senator from Missouri did not address the Chair.

Mr. DONNELL. In both cases I addressed the Chair, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair begs the Senator's pardon if the Chair is in error.

Mr. DONNELL. Of course, the Chair is quite correct in his observation that a Senator who wishes to ask another Senator to yield, to permit a question, should address the Chair. In both cases I did address the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is glad the Senator from Missouri did address the Chair, and he hopes all Senators will do so.

Mr. DONNELL. It is entirely possible that the fact that the Senator from Missouri was facing the Senator from Nevada is the reason why the Presiding Officer did not hear the Senator from Missouri address the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hopes that in the future the Senator from Missouri and all other Senators will face the Chair and then address the question.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no rule which requires that that be done, but I shall do so at least in this instance.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, to permit a further inquiry?

Mr. MALONE. Now that we have been properly reprimanded, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Nevada has noted, has he not, the procedure which thus far has been followed in regard to the International Trade Organization, as he has indicated, namely, in bringing it before the Congress by means of a bill or joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives, from which, if it is passed by the House, it will come before the Senate? However, I ask the Senator whether in his judgment he is of the opinion that the subject matter of the International Trade Organization properly should be considered an executive agreement or whether it properly should be considered a treaty.

Mr. MALONE. There is no question in my mind that, if treated properly, it would be a treaty, and would come before the Senate for proper discussion, with no suggestion of collusion between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, at this point I wish to emphasize again, because I do not believe the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri was on the floor when I began my address, that I believe that any attempt at collusion between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch of the Government is entirely improper. Of course, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government were established by the Constitution as entirely separate branches, and were meant to operate separately.

Therefore, I take the position that any collusion to bring about an advance agreement to the effect that any measure instituted or drawn up by the executive branch of the Government and sent by it to the Congress shall be accepted by the Congress without proper debate before either of the two Houses of Congress, would be entirely improper and would be a violation of the spirit of the Constitution.

At this time I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri what his ideas are in that connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator from Nevada that he must obtain unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, now facing the Chair—at least at this time—and addressing the Chair most respectfully, I ask whether I have leave to answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has.

Mr. DONNELL. I would state that in my opinion, without determining whether the action the Senator has recited would constitute collusion, I think it devolves upon the Senate, when the measure comes before it, if it does, to use its own best judgment in determining whether the document presented to the Senate is in fact a treaty or is in fact an executive agreement. If the Senate concludes that the document is a treaty, not a mere executive agreement, the Senate—on the theory that it is its duty to abide by the Constitution—should decline to approve the document, and should do so on the ground, if for no other reason, that the document is a treaty, rather than a mere executive agreement.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if I may have unanimous consent to ask a further question of the distinguished Senator from Missouri——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. MALONE. If such collusion occurs by means of conferences between Members of the Senate and members of the executive branch of the Government, by which they agree in advance that such a measure shall be approved by

the Senate without necessary debate, would that be a violation of the spirit of the Constitution?

Mr. DONNELL. I certainly think it would be. As I stated, there are three distinct branches of our Government, namely, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. No one of those three branches has any right to dictate to the others or to agree that proper consideration shall not be given by the others with respect to any measure.

To my mind—answering the Senator's question further—it is appropriate that the executive confine itself to the executive functions, that the legislative branch confine itself to the legislative functions; that in the matter of treaties, the executive present the treaty to the Senate, and that the Senate thereupon determine, after full, complete, deliberate study, whether the document should or should not be ratified by it, and do so without yielding to dictation on the part of the executive branch, should the executive branch undertake to evidence such dictation.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if I may have unanimous consent to ask a further question of the Senator from Missouri——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. MALONE. Then I ask the opinion of the Senator from Missouri about what I said earlier in my remarks, as follows: If it were possible, through collusion, bipartisan agreement, or other methods, to have a meeting between the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Senators constituting a minority in the Senate—or, for that matter, all Members of the Senate, and representatives of the executive branch of the Government, by which they would bind the executive and the legislative branches of the Government in regard to a bill or other measure which, it would be agreed, would be passed by Congress without necessary debate; and if it were further agreed that, without proper hearings or arguments before the Supreme Court, such a measure would be held by the Supreme Court to be constitutional, what would the Senator from Missouri think about that?

Mr. DONNELL. I think every Government official who was a party to such proceedings should be impeached. That is what I think about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nevada talks about collusion, and asks what the situation would be if certain persons engaged in collusion and if they were able to obtain the passage of a measure by Congress without debate. Of course the Senator knows that that cannot happen.

Mr. MALONE. We know it cannot happen, but it has been tried and is being suggested by the Executive at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nevada knows, does he not, that it is not true that there has been collusion to bring about agreement by the Senate without debate?

Mr. MALONE. I know it has been prevented so far, but right now it has been tried again.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nevada should answer the question.

Mr. MALONE. I did answer it, but the distinguished Senator from Texas forgets that an attempt is being made at this time to establish such an agreement.

What I said—I wish to make it plain to the distinguished Senator from Texas—was that if such persons make an agreement for the Senate of the United States and the executive branch of the Government—call it collusion or call it something else—then it violates the spirit of the Constitution and I fully agree with the senior Senator from Missouri that it is an impeachment offense.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nevada called it collusion.

Mr. MALONE. I did; the dictionary defines collusion as an agreement between two or more persons to attain an object forbidden by law. The Senator from Texas can call it anything he wishes to, but any such an agreement will still be against the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, call it bipartisan policy or what you will.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, the Senator from Nevada is turning to another subject now.

Mr. MALONE. That is the subject matter of the debate, and is a serious matter to me, regardless of how it appears to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to get the point of so-called collusion settled. According to the Senator from Nevada, it would be collusion if Members of the Senate discussed with the President something about a treaty. The Senator from Nevada says that would be collusion and, being collusion, the Supreme Court should declare it unconstitutional.

The Senator from Nevada does not believe that; he does not seriously advance that, I am sure.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that the junior Senator from Nevada at no time even indicated that a simple discussion had anything to do with it.

Mr. CONNALLY. What did the Senator from Nevada say?

Mr. MALONE. I shall review exactly what I said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I heard the Senator's previous remarks, but I should like to know what he means by stating that such action will be taken by means of "collusion."

Mr. MALONE. Has the Senator from Texas completed his remarks?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have for the moment.

Mr. MALONE. I will yield further if the Senator wishes to ask another question.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will answer that question, then we shall discuss it.

Mr. MALONE. Just what question does the Senator from Texas want answered?

Mr. CONNALLY. My question is this: What does the Senator mean by "collusion"?

Mr. MALONE. What the Senator from Nevada means is that it is a violation of the spirit of the Constitution, in his humble opinion, for the Senate, through its representatives, to make a bipartisan agreement with the executive department, agreeing in advance that a certain treaty, agreement, or other legislation will receive favorable action.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know of such a thing ever having happened in the Senate. I have never heard of it.

Mr. MALONE. It has been claimed that it happened, but is not happening at this time. The press is continually quoting the executive department that the policy—bipartisan foreign policy—is being revived.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anyone may claim anything, as we have known now for several weeks. Many claim things which are not true.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have the highest regard for the Senator from Texas, but he is the one who is denying that such an attempt is being made, and press reports indicate that he is trying to bring about such a condition.

Mr. CONNALLY. Trying to bring what about?

Mr. MALONE. Bipartisan control.

Mr. CONNALLY There cannot be bipartisan control except through a majority of the votes.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. That is where the junior Senator from Nevada wants to keep the control—in the majority of votes on the Senate floor after full debate.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nevada favors control by the minority. I favor control by the majority. However, the Senator from Nevada talks about collusion. How can the majority collude against the minority? They do not need to collude. If the majority has the votes, it can go ahead and do what it pleases, and it does not require any collusion. But I resent the charge of collusion. It implies something morally wrong. Collusion implies something that may be illegal. When the Senator from Nevada says there is a purpose to get together, to collude, to bind the Senate so that the Senate cannot even debate a bill or a treaty, it is ridiculous on its face.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I agree with the senior Senator from Texas, that the whole attempt to commit the Senate of the United States in advance, is ridiculous on the face of it, and a violation of the spirit of the Constitution. I also agree with the senior Senator from Missouri that any man who is a party to such an agreement should be impeached.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nevada is not definite. He knows much that is not so, though he does know some things that are so. Does he know of any case of collusion of that kind? If so, let him state what it was.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the news dispatches are filled with discussions of such bipartisan agreements now. The bipartisan policy is being revived they say. I notice that the distinguished Senator from Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has appointed eight committees. I do not know why he has appointed those committees,

but special writers and others point out that it is a move, in the right direction, toward bipartisan control. If the distinguished Senator from Texas means what he says, that all they have to do is to bring a matter to the Congress and have it decided by a majority vote, I am with him all the way. The junior Senator from Nevada will support that theory, because he believes that that is what is intended by the Constitution of the United States under which three branches of the Government are provided. The three branches should be kept completely independent. I fully agree with and emphasize what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has said in that regard. But, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, any attempts to make such bipartisan agreement ahead of time, an agreement that a certain piece of legislation or a certain treaty shall be accepted when it reaches the Senate, is wrong in principle; any such agreement is a violation of the spirit of the Constitution; and I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri as to what the penalty should be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not know of any agreement the Senator may have happened to see. Perhaps it is dark rumors circulating in the bushes, of which the Senator is afraid. I know of no collusion.

The Senator has referred to the fact that, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I appointed eight committees. Those eight committees were appointed not for any sinister purpose. They had nothing to do with the bipartisan foreign policy. Those eight committees were appointed so that each of them would specialize on certain policies in certain areas, and to let them specialize more or less on those particular things, without giving up their right to vote on matters generally. We did that in behalf of efficiency. There had been some complaints. They were without foundation, but there had been some complaints by distinguished members of the Senator's party that they were not being advised in advance. If there is any collusion, that kind of collusion is not collusion about the foreign policy. The subcommittees, with specialists to assist them, were appointed so that any Senator, the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Missouri, or any other Senator could contact them at any time, before or after or during the consideration of any matter of foreign policy.

One other thing, and I am through.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada is not afraid of the rumors of collusion in the bushes or any place else—he simply believes that there should be no agreements between the legislative and executive branches of the government before reaching the Senate floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator wants to object——

Mr. MALONE. I do not object to questions by the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then let me alone.

Mr. MALONE. I merely want the Senator to make his question clear.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator is not going to object, I suggest he let me proceed.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to let the Senator proceed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada talks about the three branches of the Government. Of course the Constitution created three coordinate branches, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. But that does not mean that they cannot speak to each other. It does not mean that they cannot have any contact. It does not mean that when members of either branch of the Government meet on the street they must look the other way in order not to see the judges, in order not to see the legislators, or in order not to see the President, as the case may be. Each branch of the Government has its responsibilities, but the representatives of the several branches are not supposed to be enclosed in an airtight or a waterproof compartment so that they may not concern themselves with the affairs of the Government, regardless of where the primary jurisdiction may lie. That is another ridiculous statement about the Government of the United States.

Of course, we are all citizens of the Republic. In the Senate our primary responsibility is to deal with legislative matters. That does not prevent our considering matters which possibly may lie primarily within other jurisdictions. It is not that we exercise the power, but we have a part in forming public opinion; and public opinion, after all, in this country is the ruling power. It decides questions. It makes the policy that the Government advances and pursues.

I thank the Senator. He is most generous. I have been listening to him a great deal, and I thank him for listening to me for a very few moments.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the explanation made by the distinguished Senator from Texas, chairman of the important Foreign Relations Committee, when he says there is no attempt on a bipartisan basis to agree on anything in advance through the eight committees he has set up. I know now that the newspapers have not given the full story, and I am very grateful to the Senator for his explanation that it has nothing whatever to do with the bipartisan foreign policy.

Further, I should like to sum up, at this moment, so we may know exactly the point in question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. What I meant was that it had nothing to do with this dark, dangerous, and slimy charge of collusion. There is no collusion in the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee is composed of five Republicans and eight Democrats. So far as I know, political questions have never been raised in the committee. I have been chairman of it for some years, and I challenge any member of the Foreign Relations Committee to point out wherein I have ever, at any time, raised any political or partisan question in the committee.

I have attended many international conferences with distinguished Republicans, and there is not one of them who will say that I have injected any kind of partisanship or partisan politics into their deliberations. I have a letter—I shall not quote from it—from a very high and very distinguished Republican, congratulating me upon the appointment of the eight subcommittees of the Foreign Relations Committee, applauding me and saying that it confirms the policy I have advocated for years of handling foreign relations above and beyond low political, bar-room, back-stage, domino-room politics. That has never been my purpose, and it has never been a habit of the Senator from Texas.

I have undertaken, in the consideration of foreign affairs, to represent the American view, the American interest, the interest of the United States and of its people. I have never on any occasion injected partisan considerations. I have never charged that the minority had colluded; I have never charged that Republican members of the committee had colluded because they had spoken to some of the other members. Because the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] do not agree with me, I have never charged that they colluded or had acted in the dark. No, Mr. President; my record is an open book. It is within the knowledge of all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have never injected politics or partisan considerations into that committee.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. I am very thankful to the senior Senator from Texas for his very clear explanation of his long-time stewardship of a very important committee and to know that he will under no conditions be a party to the proposed collusion between the legislative and the executive branches of Government.

To sum up in connection with that particular point, Mr. President, I did not say that the Senator from Texas appointed eight subcommittees for the bipartisan purpose indicated by the newspapers. I have pointed out that if the Senator from Texas appointed the subcommittees for the purpose of promoting a bipartisan policy which would amount to an advance agreement on a proposed treaty or agreement between the Senate of the United States and the executive and would amount to collusion to defeat proper and necessary debate and would violate the spirit of the Constitution and as such should be punishable, as the senior Senator from Missouri indicated by impeachment. I say, Mr. President, that I am not accusing the senior Senator from Texas of entering into a collusion. Some Members on the other side of the aisle seem unduly agitated because the distinguished Senator from Missouri mentioned the fact that if there were collusion, which I take to mean an understanding in advance to violate the spirit of the Constitution; it would create a very danger-

ous situation and should be punishable by impeachment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article by Mr. Paul Catz, of the New York Times, appearing in that newspaper today, May 1, 1950, entitled "One Big Market in Europe Opposed," with a subheading reading as follows:

Netherlands Bank Head Says What Is Needed Is Larger Outlet for Goods in United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE BIG MARKET IN EUROPE OPPOSED—NETHERLANDS BANK HEAD SAYS WHAT IS NEEDED IS LARGER OUTLET FOR GOODS IN UNITED STATES

(By Paul Catz)

AMSTERDAM, April 30.—Considerable astonishment was caused here by the annual report of Dr. Marius W. Holtrop, president of the Netherlands Bank, published this week.

"It is difficult to see," the report said "what acute problem can be solved by forming one large European market. Doubtless by such a large market Europe in the long run would share in the advantages of natural international labor distribution. But one must fear that this would be preceded by a period of great confusion and great investment needs on one side and heavy capital losses on the other.

"Moreover this one great European market would yield no wheat, corn, cotton, oil, and nonferrous metals. What European countries need more than a larger market within themselves is a larger market in the United States. Only in this way could Europe earn more dollars without having to hold up her hand for gifts which in the long run are bound to undermine European good will in America or to accept loans which she cannot repay.

"It is improbable that the problem of the dollar scarcity can be solved unless the United States helps to promote a much larger American market by reducing existing import hindrances."

Dr. Holtrop maintained that the economic financial situation in the Netherlands last year has materially improved; that inflationary tendencies almost have disappeared and monetary equilibrium shortly will be reached. He pointed out that the deficit on current items on the balance of payments have fallen from 947,000,000 to 239,000,000 guilders, but warned any further raising of Government expenditures would threaten the value of the guilder.

Dr. Holtrop said the Netherlands bank of the United States and Canadian dollar reserves at the end of last year were $295,000,000, against $243,000,000 a year ago.

The recovery bank has voluntarily reduced the amount of the World Bank loan granted last year from $15,000,000 to $8,800,000.

This was because some industries with allocations of these special purpose dollars have been able to buy their equipment elsewhere, especially in Belgium and Germany. In addition, some projects planned under the loan have become too expensive because of devaluation.

Dutch financial circles think this renouncement reflects a more favorable trend in Dutch payments and dollar balance and that it shows the Dutch desire not to increase Holland's liabilities abroad above what is strictly necessary.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in that connection I should like to quote from an article by Mr. Constantine Brown, who is, in my judgment, one of the outstanding columnists in Washington, D. C. The dispatch appears in the Washington Star. He says:

As things stand today the Republican Party is being called upon to support policies, the background of which they do not know, in the consultation on which they do not participate, and in the decision of which they have no voice.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nevada, in quoting that article, is complaining that there is no consultation. A little while ago he was complaining that there was consultation—too much consultation; in fact, collusion. I do not know, in my experience, of anything such as the Senator imagines ever having happened. I do not know of any case in which Republican Representatives, Democratic Representatives, and the White House ever got together, talked things over, and agreed that a certain thing would be done. We debate questions and discuss them and act as American Senators should act.

I again thank the Senator for permitting me to trespass. I apologize for trespassing so much upon his time.

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to have the distinguished senior Senator from Texas interrupt at any time, on any subject. I am doubly happy that the Senator from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has made it abundantly clear that he does not intend to use the eight subcommittees, through collusion or any other method, to undertake to bring about any understanding ahead of time as to what action the United States Senate will take on any piece of proposed legislation, or treaty sent to the United States Senate. I am doubly grateful that the Senator has made that point entirely clear, and, therefore, as I have said before, the remarks of the junior Senator from Nevada, and, I take the responsibility of saying, the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, do not apply to the distinguished Senator from Texas if there be no such collusion to bring about an understanding in advance.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator now complain—I understand he does—because of Republicans being consulted before final action on these questions has taken place? We hear wild and raucous cries from members of his party that they are not being consulted. Now the Senator from Nevada complains that they have been consulted. Which horn of the dilemma does the Senator take? Does he think they should be consulted, or does he think they should not be consulted?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada was quoting from a special writer. It was not the junior Senator from Nevada who was speaking—he is simply making it plain that any such advance agreements between two or more persons in this case would be collusion, because it violates the spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator rises and reads an article on the floor of the Senate, he is approving it; he is adopting it. The words are no longer the words of the writer; they are the words of the Senator who is quoting them with approval.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I dislike to differ with the distinguished Senator from Texas, who has served so many years longer than I in this distinguished body, but the junior Senator from Nevada often places articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which clarify points, not always agreeing in every particular with the position taken by him. Reading portions of such an article in no way commits the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, the Senator places articles in the RECORD which do not represent his views but which clarify his views. If the article clarifies his views, he is agreeing to the clarification, is he not?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Texas would like to be fair. I did not say it was clarifying the views of the junior Senator from Nevada; I said it was clarifying a point.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, a point. If it clarifies a point, it helps the Senator from Nevada, does it not?

Mr. MALONE. I am sure it will help him. I was quoting from a distinguished writer and I had not as yet finished the quotation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator referred to his habit of placing matters in the RECORD. He said it was his habit.

Mr. MALONE. No; I did not say it was a habit, I simply stated that when a point in question can be clarified in that manner the Junior Senator from Nevada availed himself of that method.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what the Senator meant.

Mr. MALONE. I hope the distinguished Senator from Texas will remain in his own bailiwick and not discuss my habits.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator does not wish to be interrupted, I shall not trespass further.

Mr. MALONE. I am always happy to be interrupted by the distinguished Senator from Texas, but I wish he would speak of his own habits, not of my habits.

Mr. CONNALLY. My habits are above reproach, of course. However, the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Texas addressing a question to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask leave to address a question to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad to yield any reasonable time.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nevada put items into the RECORD and says they clarify a point. In putting them in the RECORD he says he does not necessarily agree with them. He said they clarify a point. I say that if they make a point clearer to him—and evidently they must—then he is at least to that extent approving an article, and approving of what the writer says. If that is not the case, he ought not to sanction with his approval, his blessing, and his acolade of perfection, an article or the word of someone else which he does not believe in, or does not have any basis for agreeing with. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to have the ideas of the distinguished Senator from Texas. However, it does not move the Senator from Nevada from his earlier position, namely, that he does not necessarily have to agree with every paragraph of an article which is put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I continue with the reading of the article:

As things stand today the Republican Party is being called upon to support policies the background of which they do not know, in the consultation on which they do not participate, and in the decision of which they have no voice.

The big question is just whom Mr. Dulles is supposed to represent. He does not represent the Republic National Committee. He does not represent the Republican minority in both branches of Congress. Nor does he represent any segment of the American people. It is noted in the last connection that he was defeated in his one and only attempt to win public office.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Texas will not think I am condemning Mr. Dulles for his ideas. They are Mr. Dulles' ideas. They are not the ideas of the junior Senator from Nevada.

I quote further:

If the Democrats were far-seeing they would understand how a sincere effort to win Republican cooperation now would work to their advantage in case of a change of administration in 1952, 1956, or any other time.

I suppose that means that the State Department could get such an agreement of their policy—which I call a stupid foreign policy, if it can be called anything—if already agreed upon by the minority side.

It is presumed that we would go right on with their stupid policy with no change in 1952 even if the Republicans won the Presidency and had a majority in Congress. It would be a case of one big happy family. We go off the deep end together in a bipartisan foreign policy which has proved the most colossal failure in modern times. It is understandable that the executive branch would want to share the blame with the Republicans.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator goes to another point, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad to yield to the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask permission to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Was not the Senator speaking of proposed legislation which might have been referred to a legislative committee, or even might not have been referred to a legislative committee, or which, in the formulative stage, bipartisan support was asked, either by agreement or in some such fashion? Is not that what the distinguished Senator has been speaking of?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in answer to the question propounded by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska, I will say that the junior Senator from Nevada merely wanted to show that the 1950 Republican Party platform states in words of one syllable that we believe in the development of foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and that we are opposed to the importation of goods from cheap slave labor areas which might lower the standard of living of our workers and farmers, and injure industry. We state in our platform that we are opposed to any such proposal.

The three points laid down by the State Department, to which the Democratic Pary has subscribed time after time, included the three-part free-trade program consisting of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the ECA, and the International Trade Organization.

I wish to point out definitely once and for all that a Republican cannot be in favor of the Democratic foreign policy; that he cannot approve a bipartisan policy, even if it were not against the spirit of the Constitution, unless he changes his policy and disagrees with the foreign trade plank of the Republican platform for 1952.

Mr. WHERRY. In the formulative stage there cannot be a pledge, as I understand the Senator, without a violation of one or the other function of the three branches of the Government. Is that the position of the Senator?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; if there is collusion through a bipartisan policy or any other subterfuge.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in another phase, which I believe goes beyond the proposed legislation in the formulative stage which has been brought to the Members of Congress. I am interested in executive agreements which have been entered into, and as to which the Congress of the United States had no information at all. I ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if the Congress of the United States knew anything about the Yalta agreement? I ask him if it was ever proposed to a legislative committee or proposed to either party? Was anybody else ever consulted about it? I ask the same thing about the agreement reached at Potsdam. I ask about the Chinese policy which has been formulated.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska has brought up that point. It is to prevent a repetition of the Yaltas, the Potsdams, and the Tehrans that I am speaking today. It is to prevent a repetition of such things, whereby the executive department can make an agreement through its leaders, and have it go into effect without any action on the Senate floor, such as the Yalta agreement, about which we do not know very much even now. We only know that it gave a foothold to Russia in China and Asia, and gave the bread basket of China to Russia by giving Russia full control of the transportation system of Manchuria and of its harbors. Likewise, Berlin was given to Russia by not providing any means of egress and ingress for us.

Any 10-year-old boy in a real estate office would know better than to do a thing like that. It cost us millions of dollars to maintain the Berlin airlift. It cost us hundreds of dollars to transport each ton of coal into Berlin. It cost us much equipment and many lives. Yet it is built up in this country as a great heroic effort.

It was a heroic effort by the boys who did the work. It was not a very heroic effort on the part of our great State Department which made the agreement with Russia that made it necessary to do such a thing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator from Nevada have an opportunity to debate the Yalta agreement on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that since the junior Senator from Nevada has been a Member of the Senate, beginning in 1947, any questions about the inquiry as to the details of that and other similar agreements have been rebuffed.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The only time the question of bipartisanship in our foreign policy is brought in is after the administration has met with a failure. Then it asks for bipartisanship. Then it wants another party to assume responsibility for a failure. I wish the Senator from Texas were here to hear this. An outstanding example of the lack of any bipartisan policy is the case of Yalta. Another example is China. We had no opportunity to debate an executive agreement under which we have already yielded nearly one-fourth of the land surface of the earth and brought it into the orbit of Soviet Russia.

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad that the Senator from Nebraska has interjected that question into the debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is the Senator complaining about a bipartisan policy or the lack of a bipartisan policy? One minute he says that the minority party was not consulted, and the next minute he says that they are consulted. What is the Senator complaining about?

Mr. MALONE. I want the distinguished Senator from Arizona to be entirely clear on the matter. The junior

Senator from Nevada has said that there never was a bipartisan foreign policy, and any collusion to gain any such advance agreements would be contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. It is not possible for the Congress of the United States and the executive branch to have a bipartisan policy, because any collusion necessary to bring about an understanding between two or more independent branches of the Government, whether it be the judicial and the legislative, the executive and the legislative, or the judicial and the executive and legislative, would be a violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. It is wrong in principle and there has been no indication by the junior Senator from Nevada that he ever, at any time, approved of such a foreign policy.

It is to prevent such collusion that the junior Senator from Nevada is speaking today. I do not know how the distinguished Senator from Arizona can misunderstand it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Constitution says that the President shall have the power, by and with the consent of the Senate, to make treaties. Does the Senator object if the President wants the advice of the Senate before he negotiates a treaty? Does he think that is improper?

Mr. MALONE. I would say that any agreement made by the executive department of the Government and the legislative department of the Government ahead of time, which was to be accepted on the Senate floor without proper debate is wrong in principle, and is a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Arizona that in asking a question of another Member of the Senate he must first address the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for one more question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. According to the understanding of the Senator from Arizona, the President has a duty to ask the advice of the Senate, and that is what is provided for by the Constitution. It seems to me that the Senator is complaining that the President is not asking for the advice of the minority party. I think he should ask the advice of both parties before treaties are negotiated in order that he may have some idea of what the Senators of the United States want.

By and with the advice and consent of the Senate is generally accepted to mean that the Senate considers any treaty or nomination presented to it independently—and accepts or rejects such proposal after full debate.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada is very glad the junior Senator from Arizona has raised the point. He is not complaining if the President asks the Senator or any group of Senators anything he desires to ask them. The Executive is not supposed to introduce legislation in the Senate or in the House. It has unfortunately become a habit, during the last 18 years of Democratic rule, for the President of the United States to send proposed legislation to the Congress for the Congress to pass, and in most cases has insisted that it not be changed.

What the junior Senator from Nevada is objecting to at the moment is any agreement, any collusion, between the Senate of the United States, or the legislative branch, and the executive branch, which would preclude adequate debate on the Senate floor, and a full understanding not only of Senators during such debate, but the public understanding throughout the United States, before any legislation is passed or any treaty is ratified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a Times-Herald dispatch dated Saturday, December 31, 1949, in regard to the bipartisan policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALONE SCORES VANDENBERG ON BIPARTISAN POLICY

Bipartisan handling of America's foreign policy, "a misnomer intended to sugar-coat internationalists in selling out our workers," was sharply criticized yesterday by Senator MALONE (Republican), of Nevada.

MALONE took issue with one of his own Republican Party chieftains, Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, a determined advocate of bipartisan treatment of tariffs and foreign affairs.

MALONE said:

"Many measures enacted with the aid of the so-called bipartisan policy supported by Senator VANDENBERG and just affirmed by him, have removed the floor under wages and investments, and is rapidly transferring American jobs to foreign soil."

STATE DEPARTMENT BLAMED

"This has been accomplished through the 1934 Trade Agreement Act as extended, giving the State Department authority to lower the floor under wages and investments 75 percent by arbitrarily lowering tariffs after perfunctory hearings, and includes making up the trade-balance deficits of the European countries in cash each year through the Marshall plan.

"The bipartisan policy also includes the International Trade Organization from the President's 'must' legislation list for early in 1950. It includes 58 nations, each with one vote (we would have the same vote as Siam), and we would transfer to the ITO all of our rights to fix tariffs and import fees to maintain the floor under our own standard of living wages and investments. In addition, this organization is to have full authority to fix production quotas of agricultural, mining, and industrial products for each of the member countries, including the United States, with no appeal from decisions."

TWO COURSES OPEN

"This Nation does not have a foreign policy. It has a series of financial programs, furnishing cash and goods to foreign nations without requiring the usual courtesy of integrity of private investments, free convertibility of their currency in terms of the dollar, and equal access to the markets of the world.

"There can be only two courses of action that this Nation can logically pursue as a foreign policy: First, an understanding with Russia that she withdraw within her own borders, both in Europe and Asia."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the acting majority leader that it is about 6:15 o'clock, and I am quite sure the distinguished Senator from Nevada has not anywhere near concluded his address. I am wondering if the distinguished acting majority leader would feel that it is about time to take a recess, and permit the distinguished Senator from Nevada to take the floor tomorrow to conclude his address?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, with the understanding that the junior Senator from Nevada may resume the floor when the session of the Senate convenes tomorrow, I shall be very glad to yield at this time. Is that the understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so understood.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 1 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Edwin F. Stanton, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Thailand, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for terms expiring January 27, 1953, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified (reappointments):

Harold W. Dodds, of New Jersey.
Edwin B. Fred, of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Benjamin J. Chester

To be assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Preston Holden

To be nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Virginia Arnold

To be senior assistant dietitian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Susanne L. Cihunka

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

John B. Vander
Albert L. Chapman
Henry I. Kohn
Edward K. Reid
John D. Porterfield

Dental surgeon to be senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Joseph E. Unsworth

Scientists to be senior scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Charles G. Dobrovolny
Malcolm J. Williams
Willard T. Haskins
Clarence M. Tarzwell

Senior nurse officers to be nurse directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Lucille Petry
Pearl McIver

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Mildred E. Barnett
Ruth E. Anderson

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels

Clark Norace Bailey, [redacted]
William Clyde Baker, Jr., [redacted]
Wallace Hayden Barnes, [redacted]
Elliott Jeff Barnette, [redacted]
Keith Richard Barney, [redacted]
William Livingston Bayer, [redacted]
Hugh Belden, [redacted]
John Henry Fritz Bittner, [redacted]
Jacob Haberle Bloss, [redacted]
Oliver Blanchfield Brown, [redacted]
Harold Anthony Brusher, [redacted]
Raymond Thayer Bunker, [redacted]
James Vincent Carroll, [redacted]
Samuel Pickens Collins, [redacted]
La Vell Irvin Cooley, [redacted]
William Preston Corderman, [redacted]
William Murlin Creasy, [redacted]
Robert Eugene Mousseau Des Islets, [redacted]
William Jesse Deyo, Jr., [redacted]
Russell George Duff, [redacted]
William Peirce Ennis, Jr., [redacted]
Wendell Welby Fertig, [redacted]
Halbert Ernest Fillinger, [redacted]
Maurice John Fitzgerald, [redacted]
Harold McClure Forde, [redacted]
Donald Martin Forney, [redacted]
James William Fraser, [redacted]
Andrew Suter Gamble, [redacted]
Lewis Sherrill Griffing, [redacted]
Leslie Ellis Griffith, [redacted]
Aaron Steele Guthrie, [redacted]
Elmer Peter Hardenbergh, [redacted]
George Albert Harvey, [redacted]
Benjamin Peter Heiser, [redacted]
Edward Herendeen, [redacted]
William Edward House, [redacted]
Gordon Douglas Ingraham, [redacted]
Montgomery Chamberlayne Jackson, Jr., [redacted]
Harry Warren Johnson, [redacted]
Malcolm Dudley Jones, Jr., [redacted]
Werner Eugene Jones, [redacted]
Malcolm Raymond Kammerer, [redacted]
×Maurice Stewart Kerr, [redacted]
Arthur August Gerhart Kirchhoff, [redacted]
Robert Herman Krueger, [redacted]
Waldo Eugene Laidlaw, [redacted]
Paul Hudson Lawrence, [redacted]
Rutledge Maurice Lawson, [redacted]
Frederick Stevens Lee, [redacted]
Alfred Russell Marcy, [redacted]
Harwood Leon Marshall, [redacted]
Norman Arthur Matthias, [redacted]
Richard Walden Mayo, [redacted]
Preston Brooks Mayson, [redacted]
Robert Kinzie McDonough, [redacted]
James Joseph Menagh, [redacted]
Carl William Meyer, [redacted]
William Michener, [redacted]
Earl Lewis Mickelson, [redacted]
John Vincent Mills, [redacted]
William Hunt Mills, [redacted]
Benjamin Franklin Modisett, [redacted]
Roy Philip Moss, [redacted]
James Alva Murphey, [redacted]
Earl Jerome Murphy, [redacted]
Clarence James Nelson, [redacted]
George Patrick O'Neill, [redacted]
Harold George Osborne, [redacted]
Harrold Franklyn Osborne, [redacted]
Ralph Morris Osborne, [redacted]
Guy Lionel Pace, [redacted]
Richard Wyman Pearson, [redacted]
John Ensor Perman, [redacted]
Gerald Peterson, [redacted]
James Nicholas Purcell, [redacted]
Rene Odilon Quenneville, [redacted]
Parker Montrose Reeve, [redacted]
Earl Lewis Ringler, [redacted]
Joseph Honore Rousseau, Jr., [redacted]
John Matthew Ruddy, [redacted]
Henry Mathew Rund, [redacted]
Louis Bernard Rutte, [redacted]
John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., [redacted]
James Forbes Seals, [redacted]
Gustav Leonard Seligmann, [redacted]
Paul Andrew Shields, [redacted]
Clerin Rodney Smith, [redacted]
Wilbert August Speir, [redacted]
Fiorre John Stagliano, [redacted]
Walter Clement Stanton, [redacted]
John Cline Strickler, [redacted]
Perry Dillon Swindler, [redacted]
Myron Benjamin Tauer, [redacted]
Egon Rowland Tausch, [redacted]
Benjamin Easton Thurston, [redacted]
George Frederick Titus, [redacted]
Holger Nelson Toftoy, [redacted]
John Wayne Trone, [redacted]
Sumner Pinkham Tufts, [redacted]
Edwin Van Keuren, [redacted]
David Louis Van Syckle, [redacted]
William Alexander Walker, [redacted]
Henry Walsh, [redacted]
Glen Arthur Webster, [redacted]
Theodore Charles Wenzlaff, [redacted]
Edward Thomas Whiting, [redacted]
Willard Allen Whittet, [redacted]
Arthur Nathaniel Willis, [redacted]
Richard Tyler Wilson, [redacted]
George G. Wolfe, [redacted]
William Burbridge Yancey, [redacted]
Edward Richter Young, [redacted]

To be colonels, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Allan Roland Browne, [redacted]
William Price Connally, Jr., [redacted]
John Henry Derrick, [redacted]
Albert Neil Hickey, [redacted]
Cyril Dean Hill, [redacted]
Stanley Walker Jones, [redacted]
Doane Fred Kiechel, [redacted]
Ellwood Webb Sargent, [redacted]
Richard Ferdner Scarborough, [redacted]
Carlton Gustav Schenken, [redacted]

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Norman Wilhalm Anderson, [redacted]
×Kenneth Arthur Brewer, [redacted]
John Frederick Blatt, [redacted]
Otto Leonard Churney, [redacted]
×Albert Russel Dreisbach, [redacted]
Kenneth Fredrick Ernst, [redacted]
Paul Strimple Fancher, [redacted]
Kermit Hoyt Gates, [redacted]
Franklin Hayward Grauer, [redacted]
Frank Eric Hagman, [redacted]
Augustus Alonzo Hall, [redacted]
Thomas James Hartford, [redacted]
Vinnie Hale Jeffress, [redacted]
Richard Paul Johnson, [redacted]
Merrill Hubert Judd, [redacted]
Paul Edmund Keller, [redacted]
Francis Patrick Kintz, [redacted]
Charles Lee Kirkpatrick, [redacted]
William Clarence Knott, [redacted]
Frank Yearsley Leaver, [redacted]
Karl Rosenius Lundeberg, [redacted]
Joseph Hamilton McNinch, [redacted]
William Weaver Nichol, [redacted]
Ralph Vernon Plew, [redacted]
Allan Brodie Ramsay, [redacted]
Albert Henry Robinson, [redacted]
Robert Barrett Skinner, [redacted]
Cleveland Rex Steward, [redacted]
Leonard Neil Swanson, [redacted]
Milton Strong Thompson, [redacted]
Achilles Lacy Tynes, [redacted]
Frederic Ballard Westervelt, [redacted]
William A. Dains Woolgar, [redacted]

To be colonels, Dental Corps

Samuel Rush Haven, [redacted]
Leland Grant Meder, [redacted]
Wallace Jacob Morlock, [redacted]
Henry Richard Sydenham, [redacted]

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

Charles Frank Cruse, [redacted]
Frederick Harrell Gibbs, [redacted]
Douglas Hall, [redacted]
John Edgar Haughey, [redacted]
James Stuart Morgan, [redacted]
Bernard Norton Riordan, [redacted]

To be colonels, Chaplains

Edward Joseph DeMars, [redacted]
William Belt Estes, [redacted]
John Thomas Kilcoyne, [redacted]
Charles Patrick Malumphy, [redacted]
Frank Alden Tobey, [redacted]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels

Irvin Louis Allen, [redacted]
Edwin Lee Andrick, [redacted]
Herbert Rolfe Archibald, [redacted]
David Armitage, [redacted]
Charles Frederick Arny, Jr., [redacted]
Charles Askins, Jr., [redacted]
Arthur LeRoy Baker, [redacted]
×Orval James Baldwin, [redacted]
Ray King Bannister, [redacted]
George Emery Baya, [redacted]
Raymond Wortendycke Beggs, [redacted]
×Thore Fritjof Bengtson, [redacted]
John Greaves Bennett, [redacted]
Joseph Grant Bent, Jr., [redacted]
Holmes Hoffman Bevington, [redacted]
Arthur Lewis Bivens, [redacted]
Howard Frank Bogner, [redacted]
Marion Monroe Brown, [redacted]
Robert Louis Brunzell, [redacted]
×Paul Burns, [redacted]
Ernest Linwood Bush, [redacted]
Louis Buttner, [redacted]
Arthur Paul Carter, [redacted]
Lydon Briggs Cole, [redacted]
Robert H. Cole, [redacted]
Paul Andrew Conlin, [redacted]
Richard John Conran, [redacted]
Frederick James Cooke, [redacted]
Gerard Charles Cowan, [redacted]
James Richard Crank, [redacted]
George Clifton Creighton, Jr., [redacted]
Wiley Burton Davis, [redacted]
Francis Deisher, [redacted]
Fred LeRoy Eaker, [redacted]
Frank Theodore Edson, [redacted]
Eugene Munson Elliott, Jr., [redacted]
Stanley Knapp Franks, [redacted]
William Franklin Gaffney, [redacted]
Theodore Patrick Gahan, [redacted]
Loren Elmer Gaither, [redacted]
Walter William Gerken, [redacted]

Donald Francis Gibbons, [redacted].
Gilbert Patrick Gibbons, [redacted].
Roland Dale Graves, [redacted].
William Hill Greene, [redacted].
Edgar Lee Grider, [redacted].
×Gardner Baker Gross, [redacted].
George Virgil Guisleman, [redacted].
Lauren Elmer Hannah, [redacted].
Karl Clifford Hansen, [redacted].
Richard Vernon Hart, [redacted].
Glenn Amos Hawes, [redacted].
Robert Thomas Hazlett, [redacted].
Loveaire Ackley Hedges, [redacted].
Hans Wilhelm Helm, [redacted].
Frank William Herberth, Jr., [redacted].
×Dean Ambrose Herman, [redacted].
Carl Richard Hill, [redacted].
Robert Hays Holmes, Jr., [redacted].
Milton Joseph Ingeman, [redacted].
Roy Oliver Irvin, [redacted].
Clinton William Janes, [redacted].
Robert Ewing Johnson, [redacted].
Kenneth Charles Jones, [redacted].
Robert Raymond Judson, [redacted].
Lester W. Kale, [redacted].
Stephen Allen Kallis, [redacted].
Harry Fredrick Kirkpatrick, Jr., [redacted].
Pierre Augustine Kleff, [redacted].
Howard Arthur Klinetop, [redacted].
Alfred Maria Koster, [redacted].
Charles Alford Laforge, [redacted].
Vincent Francis La Piana, [redacted].
Alwyn Vincent Larkin, [redacted].
×Vasco Laub, [redacted].
Ray Joseph Laux, [redacted].
Henry Grant Learnard, Jr., [redacted].
Elmer Louis Littell, [redacted].
Andrew Ralph Lolli, [redacted].
Lorraine Lynnhaven Manly, [redacted].
John Danhouse Martz, Jr., [redacted].
Nathan Sanborn Mathewson, [redacted].
Henry Herrward Mauz, [redacted].
John William Maxwell, [redacted].
George Francis McAneny, [redacted].
William Taylor McAninch, [redacted].
Floy William McGinn, [redacted].
Clyde Wesley McKnight, [redacted].
Fred Herman Meinert, [redacted].
Martin Michael Mendell, [redacted].
Wilfred Felix Menegus, [redacted].
Eugene Ernest Moyers, [redacted].
John William Murray, [redacted].
Ralph Ernest Newcomb, [redacted].
Jack Voorhies Nicholas, [redacted].
Harold Charles Parsons, [redacted].
Benjamin Lindley Pickett, [redacted].
George Eugene Pickett, [redacted].
Miguel Joseph Pomar, [redacted].
Speers Gordon Ponder, [redacted].
Joseph George Porter, [redacted].
Malcolm Townsend Powell, [redacted].
Lowell Hugh Powers, [redacted].
Kenan McLendon Rand, [redacted].
×Herbert Herman Rasche, [redacted].
John William Mackay Read, [redacted].
Herbert Nelson Reed, [redacted].
Alva Lawrence Ritchie, [redacted].
Robert Raymond Robertson, [redacted].
×Henry Irvine Sanders, [redacted].
Harold Rennie Sanderson, [redacted].
Clement Van Beuren Sawin, [redacted].
Clifford Lyman Sawyer, [redacted].
×Robert Ludwig Schulz, [redacted].
Harry Leo Sievers, [redacted].
Ralph Thomas Simpson, [redacted].
Weldon Lester Slisher, [redacted].
Robert Greenlief Smith, Jr., [redacted].
Robert Nicholas Smith, [redacted].
William David Smith, Jr., [redacted].
Paul Truman Snowden, [redacted].
Charles Sumner Standley, Jr., [redacted].
Robert Ellsworth Stoever, [redacted].
Wilburn Lesca Strickland, [redacted].
×George Wellford Taylor, [redacted].
William Mackentyre Thames, Jr., [redacted].
Charles John Timmes, [redacted].
William Preston Tuggle, Jr., [redacted].
×Abel Acacio Valente, [redacted].
Thomas Francis Victory, [redacted].
Frederick Grant Waite, [redacted].
James Thomas Walker, Jr., [redacted].
Charles Marion Westrup, [redacted].
Winslow Randall Willis, [redacted].
Arnold Vinson Wyss, [redacted].

To be majors

Thomas William Ackert, [redacted].
William Leon Adams, Jr., [redacted].
×Jack Frank Albert, [redacted].
Ben Elmer Allen, [redacted].
Ollie James Allen, [redacted].
John Adams Alley, Jr., [redacted].
Franklin Noble Allwine, [redacted].
Leland Earle Anderson, [redacted].
×Robert Charles Angster, [redacted].
Norman Randolph Archer, [redacted].
Bryan Coffield Arnold, [redacted].
Thomas St. John Arnold, [redacted].
Elmer Joseph Attaway, [redacted].
Alvin Berthold Auerbach, [redacted].
Laurence Thomason Ayres, Jr., [redacted].
Donald Moseley Bachelor, [redacted].
Harle Grady Bailey, Jr., [redacted].
Arthur Cecil Ball, [redacted].
William Edward Barkman, [redacted].
Richard Barrell, [redacted].
Elmer Henry Bauer, [redacted].
John Wilbur Baumgartner, [redacted].
Ford Murray Beardsley, [redacted].
Ernest Herbert Bearss, [redacted].
John Justice Beeson 3d, [redacted].
Roy Frederick Benjamin, [redacted].
James Audemard Beplat, [redacted].
George Arnold Bieri, [redacted].
Jack Snead Blocker, [redacted].
Daniel Luther Blue, [redacted].
Frank Adrian Bogart, [redacted].
William Sailor Bowers, [redacted].
×Harold Melville Bowman, Jr., [redacted].
Jack Wesley Boyer, [redacted].
Joseph Edward Boyle, [redacted].
Samuel Julian Boyles, [redacted].
×John Murray Brannon, [redacted].
Merritt William Briggs, [redacted].
William Albert Brinkerhoff, [redacted].
John Patrick Brown, [redacted].
Paul Jordan Brown, [redacted].
Ray Kenneth Bruch, [redacted].
Paul Allen Bucha, [redacted].
×Walter Joseph Burk, [redacted].
Wesley Herbert Burr, [redacted].
Charles Wood Calvert, [redacted].
Charles Hill Campbell, [redacted].
Charles Spencer Campbell, [redacted].
John Campbell, Jr., [redacted].
Thomas Stacy Capers, Jr., [redacted].
Gerald Carlisle, [redacted].
Hughes Alfred Carnes, [redacted].
Sam Carter, [redacted].
James Irvin Casterline, [redacted].
×Carl Samuel Casto, [redacted].
Bruce Benjamin Caulder, [redacted].
Oren Dean Chapman, [redacted].
Sam Joe Clark, [redacted].
Charles Boyd Claypool, [redacted].
George Russell Cole, [redacted].
Leon Commerford, Jr., [redacted].
Thomas Charles Compton, [redacted].
Charles Duncan Conley, [redacted].
William Joseph Convery, Jr., [redacted].
James Sion Cook, Jr., [redacted].
George Moses Cookson, [redacted].
Harold Wilson Corder, [redacted].
×Francis Hugh Corgan, [redacted].
×Kay Kipling Cowan, [redacted].
William Earl Crump, Jr., [redacted].
×Don Osvold Currier, [redacted].
Roy Edwin Daniel, Jr., [redacted].
Freeland Allyn Daubin, Jr., [redacted].
Francis Daugherty, [redacted].
Walter Ward Davis, [redacted].
James Henry Davitt, [redacted].
Ramon Francis D'Elosua, [redacted].
George Ellis Deshon, [redacted].
Jewett Agusta Dix, [redacted].
Jobie Julian Dixon, [redacted].
×Roy Tinsley Dodge, [redacted].
Sam Frank Doering, [redacted].
×Herbert Preston Donald, [redacted].
×James Damian Donlon, Jr., [redacted].
Thomas Dooley, [redacted].
William Daniel Drake, [redacted].
Eugene Gordon Drouillard, [redacted].
Fred Edward Dueker, [redacted].
Nicholas Dunlap, [redacted].
Paul Anthony Eckstein, [redacted].
Edward G. Edwards, [redacted].
Irwin Allen Edwards, [redacted].
Clarence Paul Ehrhardt, [redacted].
John Thomas Evans, [redacted].
Felder Lavett Fair, [redacted].
Leon J. Fishkin, [redacted].
Charles Walter Flint, [redacted].
Harrison Sam Francis, [redacted].
Paul Shepherd Fromer, [redacted].
Carl Willard Fuller, [redacted].
×Linwood Eugene Funchess, [redacted].
Freeman Francis Gage, Jr., [redacted].
Fred Edward Gerber, [redacted].
John Stephen Gerety, [redacted].
Tommy Herbert Giles, Jr., [redacted].
John Jackson Gillespie, [redacted].
×Kenneth Glade, [redacted].
John Benjamin Murphy Goetz, [redacted].
Andrew Gordon Gorski, [redacted].
Laverne Woods Graff, [redacted].
×Robert Orr Graham, Jr., [redacted].
Millard Glen Gray, [redacted].
Francis Herbert Gregg, [redacted].
Herbert Louis Haberstroh, [redacted].
Stanley Lauriston Harding, [redacted].
Warren Morehead Hargrave, [redacted].
Daniel Dean Harris, [redacted].
George Daniel Haskins, [redacted].
Frederick West Hawksworth, [redacted].
Charley Walker Haynes, [redacted].
×Philip Charles Hess, [redacted].
Paul Shirley Hicks, [redacted].
×Nathan Hanks Hixson, [redacted].
Maurice Aaron Hoard, Jr., [redacted].
Eugene John Hollerbach, [redacted].
×Howard Calhoun Hooker, [redacted].
Keith Herbert Houlson, [redacted].
Harold Harvey Houser, [redacted].
Charles Luke Hustead, Jr., [redacted].
John Haig Jackson, [redacted].
Stanley Evers Jacobs, [redacted].
Roy Abram Jameson, Jr., [redacted].
Milton Jarrold, [redacted].
John Palmer Johnson, [redacted].
×Warren Raymond Johnson, [redacted].
David Willard Jones, Jr., [redacted].
William John Judson, [redacted].
James Hugh Keefe, [redacted].
Donald Thomas Kellett, [redacted].
John Ellsworth Keough, [redacted].
Edward Peter Ketcham, Jr., [redacted].
John Joseph Kiely, Jr., [redacted].
Dan Christie Kingman, [redacted].
Oliver Gordon Kinney, [redacted].
Phillip Ignatius Klein, [redacted].
×Elwood Franklin Knoche, [redacted].
Otto Rudolph Koch, Jr., [redacted].
×Rudolph Charlemagne Koerner, Jr., [redacted].
Willis Everett Kooken, [redacted].
×Edward Henry Koreman, [redacted].
Dalton Walker Lain, [redacted].
Gordon Everett Larson, [redacted].
Robert Grant Lavell, [redacted].
×Leon Frederick Lavoie, [redacted].
William Law, [redacted].
Jackson Stuart Lawrance, Jr., [redacted].
William Edward Leckie, [redacted].
Ralph Elman Leighton, Jr., [redacted].
Stanley Victor Lesneski, [redacted].
Edwin Levin, [redacted].
Lester Henry Levine, [redacted].
Robert Runyan Linvill, [redacted].
Herbert Steele Long, Jr., [redacted].
James Philip Lyke, [redacted].
×Clayton Bane Lyle, Jr., [redacted].
John Joseph Macken, [redacted].
Henry Howard Marsden, Jr., [redacted].
David Neil Marshall, [redacted].
Lawrence Alfred Martin, [redacted].
Edward Joseph McCool, [redacted].
Dan Scott McMillin, [redacted].
×Charles Edward Michaels, [redacted].
William Raymond Milburn, [redacted].
Melvin Oscar Miller, [redacted].
Ellis Harry Mist, [redacted].
×Leonard Donald Mitchell, [redacted].
Brian Odell Montgomery, [redacted].

Joseph Beeman Mullinix,
Gordon Elliott Murch,
Arthur Philip Murphy,
William Davis Murphy,
Arnold Peter Murr,
William May Myers,
Jack Priestley Napier,
William Howard Nelson, Jr.,
Marion Burns Noland,
Ralph Lawrence Norling,
Donald Anthony Oberst,
Roy Iver Olson,
William Lloyd Osborne,
×Herbert Nelson Ostrom,
Fredrick Bert Outlaw,
Henry Morrison Owen, Jr.,
Owen Waite Owens,
John Pachomski,
Ted Joseph Palik,
John Palsrok,
Howard Clarence Parker,
John Curtis Payne,
Edwin Augustus Perry,
Kenneth J. Peterson,
Louis William Pflanz, Jr.,
Royal Ector Phillips,
Claude Leonard Pridgen, Jr.,
Alexander Johnston Rankin,
John Allen Rankin,
James Luther Regan, Jr.,
Norman Gradon Reynolds,
John Andrew Rice,
Jack Bernard Richmond,
Robert James Robideaux,
Charles Carroll Roder,
Theodore Wesley Roe,
Herbert Fletcher Rolph,
Ralph Edward Rose,
×Joseph Francis Ryneska,
Eugene Saffold,
Bertil Bernhard Sandell,
John David Sapp,
Howard Francis Schiltz,
Lionel Edward Scott,
Robert Sheldon Scott,
×Raymond August Seifert,
Hobert Wayne Sharp,
Harold Herring Sharpe,
Victor Edward Sinclair,
Jack Bryant Slimp,
Robert Henry Slover,
×Arthur Cloake Small,
David Custer Smith, Jr.,
James Wilbur Smith,
Woods Burton Smith,
Carl Gerlach Sory,
Robert Cornelius Spiedel, Jr.,
Mortimer Robert Staley,
Robert LeRoy Staver,
Oscar Stegall, Jr.,
Ayres William Stoddard,
William Gustavus Stotlar,
Alexander Garrett Sutton, Jr.,
×Robert Rives Taylor, Jr.,
Chase Rawson Teaboldt,
Aaron Underwood Trimble,
Robert Lee Trout,
Lawrence Arver Twomey,
John Stanley Tyler,
Lloyd Peter VanCourt,
Joseph Ernest Veale,
John Emery Veatch,
Frank Milton Vinson, Jr.,
John Edgar Wales 3d,
Lee Wallace,
Milton Irving Wallace,
Marvin Elza Waller,
Wallace Creel Wardner,
×Maynard Byron Weaver,
Harold William Wheeler,
×John Lewis Whipple,
Howard Sigman White,
Arthur Kendal Whitehead,
Karl Josef Wicker,
×Herman Bennett Wild,
Wilford Lloyd Willey,
Frank von Phul Williams,
Gardner Alston Williams,
George Wright Williams,
Walter Harvey Williams,
Lloyd Earl Wills,
Paul Francis Wilson,
Weldon Winston Wilson,
Jack David Wolfson,
×Benjamin Foreman Wood,
Charles Eugene Woodrow,
Frederick Starr Wright, Jr.,
Frederick Zitzer,
Robert Whitman Young,

To be captains

Kenneth George Althaus, Jr.,
Aaron George Amacher,
×Arnold Vendelberg Anderson,
Albert Eugene Andrews,
×Kermet Hurd Applewhite,
John Francis Aschoff, Jr.,
James Edward Aud,
James Lewis Aylor,
Alfred Edgar Barbour,
Lee Roy Hyatt Beaumont, Jr.,
Jack Findlay Belford,
Harold Black,
Victor Paul Blair,
Rex Royden Blewett,
Charles Jay Bliss,
Frederick Griffith Bohannon,
Joseph Anthony Bohnak,
James Olin Bolick,
Eugene John Braun,
Charles Harold Brown,
Robert Middleton Buttler,
William Traipe Call, Jr.,
×Richard Thompson Cann 4th,
Guy Gerard Cannity,
Edward Robert Carmody,
William Benton Carne,
John Anthony Chiment,
Francis Green Coachman,
Samuel Morgan Coggins,
Rodney Jewett Colins,
George Golden Cook,
Howard Harrison Cooksey,
William Perry Craddock, Jr.,
Donald A. Crawford,
×James Joseph Crawley,
Jack Arthur Curry,
Robert Nevin Dallam,
Charles Henry Dalton 3d,
William Edward Davis,
Dallas Orion Dawson,
Jack Taylor Dempsey,
James Robert Dew,
Werner Leird Dickinson,
Oliver Raymond Dinsmore, Jr.,
Walter James Dixon,
Fred Washington Dollar,
John Jay Douglass,
Ferris John Drackett,
×John Perry Dring,
Duncan Elihu Duvall,
Robert Lewis Eaton 3d,
Edwin Waldo Emerson,
Keith Howard English,
Theme Troy Everton,
Charles Gerard FitzGerald,
Spillman New Fitzpatrick, Jr.,
Willard Flint,
Max Ramage Floyd,
Joseph John Franaszek,
John Edward Franey,
John Harvey Fye 3d,
Frank Joseph Gabrhel, Jr.,
Martin Mahlon Georges,
×John Frank Gerstner,
James Burnham Gilbert,
Hampton Jervis Godfrey,
Robert Glemons Goforth,
Morris Winfield Goodwin,
Charles Van Doran Graft, Jr.,
Lester Willis Grandia,
Charles Wesley Green,
×Frank Alexander Gregg,
George Edward Grimes,
Mortimer George Guinn,
×Rene Jean-Andre Guiraud,
×Thomas Hagler,
×Paul John Halin,
Jack Iden Hamlin,
Richard Howard Hansen,
×Wilford LeRoy Harrelson, Jr.,
John Pannill Hastings,
John Robert Hauser,
George Frank Heidt, Jr.,
×William Grauley Henderson,
William Reice Henry,
Leslie Hesketh, Jr.,
Grady Lee Hicks, Jr.,
Warren Joseph Higgins,
Robert Charles Hixon,
×William Campbell Hoge,
John Harvey Holt,
Peter Leighton Horne, Jr.,
×James Brittain Humphrey,
Paul Eugene Hunt,
Milo Igersheimer,
Frederick Lucius Ingham,
×Gordon Lyle Jacks,
Harry Homer Jackson,
Alfred Paul Jelley,
Joseph Edgar Jenkins,
John Page Jervey,
Daniel Burr Jones, Jr.,
William Kenneth Jordan,
Clifford Joseph Kalista,
George William Kane,
Eugene Harvey Kipp, Jr.,
Hale Hampton Knight,
Charles William Koburger, Jr.,
Cortland Tilden Krams,
Albert John Kuehn,
Jonathan Frederic Ladd,
William Clyde Lafield, Jr.,
John Erwin Lance, Jr.,
James Carl Larson,
George Washington Lewis,
Robert Ben Lewis,
Jack Paul Libby,
Ben Hugh Lowry,
Walter Clyde Lowry, Jr.,
Eugene Roman Lukosky,
Francis A. MacDonald, Jr.,
John Powell MacDonald,
Nelson Alexander Mahone, Jr.,
Richard Edward Maloy,
×Stanley Richard Mathews, Jr.,
William Henry Mathis,
Albert Victor Mathwin,
James Huston McClurkin,
Chester Bailey McCoid,
Guy Grant McConnell,
Daniel Wade McElwee,
Bob Alexander McIlwain,
John Vester McLain,
×Samuel Finley McNeil, Jr.,
×John Russell McRae,
×George Francis McSoley,
Oliver Levi Mercer,
×Charles Henry Meyers, Jr.,
Adelbert Ellsworth Miller,
John Harold Miller,
×Robert Garner Miller,
×Robert Campbell Mize, Jr.,
John Lee Nohl,
Clayton Arrington Morgan, Jr.,
Charles Aubrey Morris,
Lawrence Louis Mowery,
Norman Ferdinand Arthur Muser,
Paul Titus Naugle,
×Robert Eugene Neiman, Jr.,
Bernard Edward Neubert,
×James William Newman,
Robert Evoy Odom,
James Donald O'Neal,
Daniel Overton,
×Albert Jean Parker,
×Russell Edgar Parker,
×Harvill Hamilton Patterson,
Lucius Kennedy Patterson, Jr.,
Dewey Thomas Pfeiffer,
William Gene Phelps,
×Robert Ferguson Phillips,
John Austin Pierce, Jr.,
James Glenn Piper,
Ray Edison Porter, Jr.,
×Charles Eben Preble, Jr.,
Roy Wallace Preston,
×Arthur Preston Price,
×Richard Charles Rantz,
Louie Townes Rawls,
Boyd Foster Reeder,
×Raymond Theodore Reid,
Woodrow Anthony Reitmeier,

Wylie Scott Reynolds, Jr., [redacted].
George Horace Ried, [redacted].
Richard Mahlon Ripley, [redacted].
Edward Alfred Robinson, [redacted].
William Adolph Roemer, [redacted].
×George Sibley Royal, [redacted].
Clyde McLain Russell, [redacted].
Earl Lester Russell, Jr., [redacted].
Richard Theodore St. Sauver, [redacted].
James Howard Scheer, [redacted].
Robert James Schmidt, [redacted].
Richard Harry Schoning, [redacted].
Jack Emerson Schroeder, [redacted].
Richard Louis Seidel, [redacted].
Stanley Waldermar Selander, [redacted].
John Marior Shaw, [redacted].
Byron Eliot Sheppard, [redacted].
Charles Frederick Sieber, Jr., [redacted].
Irvin Dennis Smith, Jr., [redacted].
Robert McKain Smith, [redacted].
George Murrell Snead, Jr., [redacted].
×Quentin Cletus Soprano, [redacted].
Donald Norrish Sproul, [redacted].
Rudolph William Staffa, [redacted].
Arthur Jefferson Steele, [redacted].
Horace Griffin Stephenson, [redacted].
John Allen Stewart, Jr., [redacted].
Whitney Douglas Stuart, [redacted].
James Allen Suddeth, [redacted].
Peter Cornelius Sweers, Jr., [redacted].
Charles Carroll Thebaud, [redacted].
Milton Roy Thompson, [redacted].
×Richard Ferdinand Thomure, [redacted].
John Edward Truog, [redacted].
Walter Morrow Turner, [redacted].
James Joseph Ursano, [redacted].
Stanley Carl Waldner, [redacted].
Joseph Walker, Jr., [redacted].
Robert Benjamin Walker, [redacted].
Gene Allison Walters, [redacted].
Ralph Charles Wardlow, [redacted].
Virgil Lee Warner, Jr., [redacted].
Francis Marion Watson, Jr., [redacted].
Robert Alden Webster, Jr., [redacted].
Othon Emmett Wedbush, [redacted].
Frederick Alven Wells, [redacted].
×Wayne Henry Wernimont, [redacted].
Jesse Leonard Wheeler, Jr., [redacted].
Fred Renner White, [redacted].
Lawrence Joseph White, [redacted].
David Harrison Williams, Jr., [redacted].
Robert James Williams, [redacted].
×William Rosser Williams, Jr., [redacted].
Warren William Witt, [redacted].
×Carroll Hamilton Wood, [redacted].
Wilbert Tucker Woodson, Jr., [redacted].
Myron DeWayne Yantis, [redacted].
×Robert Miles Young, [redacted].

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Toxey Hannon Sewell, [redacted].

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

Floyd Jackson Blasingame, [redacted].
Alfred Richard Cannon, [redacted].
Frank Randle Day, [redacted].
Maurice John Fletcher, [redacted].
Monroe Edward Freeman, [redacted].
James Daniel Galvin, Jr., [redacted].
John Mark Gracie 2d, [redacted].
John Gordon Morris, Jr., [redacted].
Russel Murray, Jr., [redacted].
×Arthur James Orange, [redacted].
Russell Obed Pennepacker, [redacted].
Kenneth Hill Reed, [redacted].
Earl Alonzo Richhart, [redacted].
Melvin Villiger Schlaak, [redacted].
Ray Elmer Stoltz, [redacted].
Joseph Alexander Walkowski, [redacted].
Joseph Elijah Webb, Jr., [redacted].

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Harry Jean Adams, [redacted].
Denver Irving Allen, [redacted].
Oren Calvin Atchley, [redacted].
Vernon Ellsworth Blythe, [redacted].
John Edmond Burns, [redacted].
John James Clary, [redacted].
Walter Douglas Correll, [redacted].
William Thurman Covey, [redacted].
Harold Lloyd Cummings, [redacted].
William Joseph Deragisch, [redacted].
Floyd Colvin Egger, [redacted].
John Dietrich Flintjer, [redacted].
Frank Fortunato, [redacted].
Ivan Magill Foster, [redacted].
Richard Robert Freeman, [redacted].
×Lee Allen Grove, [redacted].
Vincent Isherwood Hack, [redacted].
Wade Fredwick Hampton, [redacted].
Donald Leslie Hitchings, [redacted].
James Lowry Ingram, [redacted].
Glenn Clarence Irving, [redacted].
George Wilson Johnston, [redacted].
×Gordon Andrew Jones, [redacted].
Converse Rising Lewis, Jr., [redacted].
Arthur Richard McAlpine, [redacted].
Kermit James McCaslin, [redacted].
Edward Joseph McIntyre, [redacted].
Harold George Molyneaux, [redacted].
×Ernest Kimball Montague, [redacted].
Arlice Jackson Moore, [redacted].
×Earl Lee Moore, [redacted].
Carl William Nicolary, [redacted].
Ben F. Peake, [redacted].
Emmett Lenard Peterson, [redacted].
John Paul Ransom, [redacted].
Richard Newton Roerig, [redacted].
James Wesley Rowe, [redacted].
Percy Rudolph Shealey, [redacted].
Andrew Joseph Stack, [redacted].
×Oliver Harold Steed, [redacted].
Alfred Chanslor Strode, [redacted].
Alfred Leo Taro, [redacted].
David Tatch, [redacted].
Robert Eli Watson, [redacted].
Irving Barton Wiley, [redacted].
Wendell Reed Wilkin, [redacted].
Elwood Wright, [redacted].
Virgil Templeman Yates, [redacted].

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Kilie Elvira Bridger, [redacted].
Ruby Ficklin Bryant, [redacted].
Hazel Irene Burford, [redacted].
Sylvia Mae Evans, [redacted].
Marie Stella Galloway, [redacted].
Inez Haynes, [redacted].
×Edna Dora Hess, [redacted].
Naomi Jane Jensen, [redacted].
Katharine Virginia Jolliffee, [redacted].
×Helen Johanna Jurash, [redacted].
Agnes Alice Maley, [redacted].
Ruth Payne, [redacted].
Alice Junice Robbe, [redacted].
Mabel Geraldine Stott, [redacted].
Marian York, [redacted].

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Mary Catherine Bateman, [redacted].
Ruby Grace Bradley, [redacted].
Eileen Winifred Brady, [redacted].
Margaret Norman Brannon, [redacted].
Mary Belle Clark, [redacted].
×Catherine Mary Flatley, [redacted].
Alice Edith Greenawalt, [redacted].
Edith Shacklette Grimes, [redacted].
Francis Cecil Gunn, [redacted].
×Kathleen Harris, [redacted].
Mabel Eugenia Hause, [redacted].
Clara Marie Kiely, [redacted].
×Irene Johanna Klemp, [redacted].
Blenda Mae Laverick, [redacted].
Agatha Mary Martin, [redacted].
Hortense Eleanor McKay, [redacted].
×Eileen Kathryn Murphy, [redacted].
Frances Louise Nash, [redacted].
Isa Gladys Pifer, [redacted].
Rowena Georgia Roach, [redacted].
Ruth Mary Schwing, [redacted].
Edith Lorena Shutt, [redacted].
Mary Matilda Steppan, [redacted].
Madeline Marie Ullom, [redacted].
Lena Vanderwood, [redacted].

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Catherine Elizabeth Francis, [redacted].

To be majors, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Helena Dolores Quinn, [redacted].
Ruby Zillah Winslow, [redacted].

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose blessings far outnumber our many needs, we rejoice that Thou art willing and able to do for us exceeding abundantly above all we can ask or think.

Grant that in this moment of prayer there may come to us a new nativity of the cardinal virtues of faith, hope, and love.

Inspire us with a more daring venture of faith as we labor together for the peace of the world.

Illumine our minds with a radiant hope as we walk reverently and humbly in the ways of our blessed Lord who alone is our light in times of darkness and despair.

Enlarge our hearts with a love that casts out fear, a love that seeketh not her own, a love that is ready to make any sacrifice for the eternal glory of God and the good of humanity.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 28, 1950, was read and approved.

REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining my colleagues in congratulating the Republic of Israel on the celebration of its second anniversary. Born and nurtured during times of greatest adversity, this Republic has demonstrated to a world torn between two systems of government that democracy is made of stern stuff; that its citizens are—without any compulsion or force—capable of the greatest self-discipline and generosity. Although there remains the threat of a fresh outbreak of the very war through which Israel won independence, this staunch new nation has continued to open its doors to those who have sought refuge from their oppression in Europe. In my opinion, there is little doubt that the first 2 years in the life of the Republic of Israel will be brightly illuminated in the pages of the history of man's struggle for a better, more humane life.

CENTENNIAL YEAR OF UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, the first group of Utah pioneers saw the valley of the Great Salt Lake on July 24, 1847. Just three short years later—in 1850—these pioneers established their first university.

I take deep pride, in this centennial year of the University of Utah, in paying homage to all of the leaders, both past and present, who have made the school what it is today. The University of Utah of 1950 represents the sum total of the efforts of the pioneers who had the foresight to establish it, the educators who built it into a strong, liberal institution, the citizens who supported it, and the students who went forth from its doors to make their name and fame throughout the world.

Today, the University of Utah is the oldest State-supported university west of the Mississippi. Its enrollment is between 9,000 and 10,000 students—twice as many students for each 1,000 people as the average State in this country. In fact, it can be said that in Utah more people get more years of schooling than in any other State in the Union.

It therefore is with great pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the outstanding address which was made at the centennial celebration of the University of Utah by its president, Dr. A. Ray Olpin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

A LEADER HAS FALLEN

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the untimely death, at the age of 59, of a man who has personified, in his own lifetime, the opportunities and the trials of the democratic way of life.

Generoso Pope, publisher, leader, political figure, public servant, businessman, who in a short life rose from the role of penniless immigrant boy to a man of vast power and influence and great wealth, died suddenly in New York early Friday morning.

This country has suffered a great loss by his passing in the prime of his manhood and at the zenith of his influence; it is, perhaps, no exaggeration to say that the world, in its anxiety to maintain peace with honor, has suffered a grievous loss.

Mr. Speaker, a leader of stature has fallen whose place in the American community and in the Democratic Party will not be easy to fill.

A HORATIO ALGER STORY

The story of Generoso Pope is a true story which puts to shame the Horatio Alger romances.

A little less than half a century ago Generoso Pope, a boy of 10 without a word of English, without a friend, and practically without funds, landed in New York City and immediately went to work as a water boy for a piano manufacturer.

Less than 3 years ago Gene Pope, no longer a boy, no longer friendless, no longer penniless, but still filled with that unending drive of energy which sent him from rags to riches in a generation, was credited with saving Italy from communism.

With his unexpected death as a relatively young man, still in the full course of a rich career and multitudinous activities, his friends will be many years trying to arrive at a true estimate of his contributions to his adopted and to his native countries, to his people of Italian descent in America, to his church, and to his party. Certainly I do not feel competent to essay any definitive tribute at this time of grief, although I knew him well.

It is sufficient to say and to recognize that a vital force has been taken away from us at a time when it is greatly needed.

BOUNDLESS ENERGY AND AMBITION

Gene Pope was a man of boundless energy and ambition.

While still a very young man, he took over the doubtful assets of a bankrupt company, and turned the Colonial Sand & Stone Co. into the largest firm of its kind in the State of New York, and possibly in the country.

His company once firmly anchored to prosperity and his personal economic security established, he turned his energies to his church, the Democratic Party, and the welfare of his people. In 1928, he bought Il Progresso Italo-Americano and made it the most widely circulated daily newspaper printed in Italian in the United States, and perhaps in the world. Eighteen years later he bought radio station WHOM and gave it the same preeminence among foreign-language radio stations.

He was a friend of the great, the near-great, and of the obscure. In the late thirties his relations with President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the party leadership became strained over the foreign situation, and for a time democratic Generoso Pope was seduced by the undemocratic Benito Mussolini.

With the outbreak of war, Gene Pope, with an emotional and intellectual generosity which lived up to his given name, forswore this brief infatuation with totalitarianism and threw his whole furious energy into loyal support of the United States and its elected leaders.

The struggle with total government of the extreme right having been won safely by the forces of democracy, Generoso Pope saw with horror the rise of a new totalitarianism of the extreme left, and threw all his resources into the battle against Communist domination of Italy. His vast prestige and his mastery of press and radio appeals were counted decisive in that victory for the Western World in 1948. He instigated and made effective the famous letter-writing campaign from Americans of Italian descent to their friends and relatives in Italy, urging them to vote for freedom and democracy.

He leaves a widow and three fine sons, to whom our sympathies go out. I know that they will carry on the father's crusading tradition.

Mr. Speaker, in paying this tribute to the late Generoso Pope, I know I speak for the mayor of the city of New York, the Honorable William O'Dwyer; for the leader of the New York County Democratic organization, the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio; and for those of my colleagues not able to be here today in person, and for the untold thousands whose hearts are torn with sorrow at his passing.

It may be pertinent to mention that the funeral was held this morning at 10 o'clock from St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York; the body lay in state through the week end where thousands of his friends visited the bier.

Under leave, I am including at this point as a part of my remarks the official obituary prepared by and published in Il Progresso Italo-Americano:

BIOGRAPHY OF GENEROSO POPE

Generoso Pope came to the United States from Arpaise, Province of Benevento, Italy, at the age of 10, with no knowledge of English and no friends.

His assets consisted of a few dollars. Shortly after arriving here he secured a position as a water boy in a piano factory, and thereafter a similar one in the Pennsylvania tunnel. Then he became a horse and cart driver for a sand company, and before long he was foreman and superintendent of the Manhattan Sand Co.

In 1914 he secured a job as superintendent of the Colonial Sand & Stone Co., Inc. In 1916 this company went bankrupt and Generoso Pope decided to assume the responsibility and obligation of paying the company's indebtedness. Grit and determination enabled Mr. Pope to pay off the debts in a short time and thus became the owner of Colonial Sand & Stone Co., Inc.

In 1924 he started buying other companies engaged in the sand and gravel business.

Colonial Sand & Stone Co., Inc., is presently located on the forty-ninth floor of Radio City. Generoso Pope is the president and chief stockholder.

The company is New York's largest supplier of sand, gravel, concrete, ready-mixed cement, stone, and cinders. It operates numerous plants in the metropolitan area and several hundred big red, white, and green trucks which carry the makings of Radio City, LaGuardia Airport, Parkchester, Idlewild Airport, Floyd Bennett Field, and many other important construction works in the area.

In 1928, Generoso Pope purchased the Il Progresso Italo-Americano, the oldest and largest Italian newspaper in the United States.

Through its pages, Mr. Pope has conducted several campaigns to make the readers better acquainted with the history of America, with the duties of citizenship and with the concepts of our democracy.

He also started a column giving English lessons to the readers of Il Progresso as he

felt that knowledge of English was essential for good citizenship. He published many articles explaining the rights and responsibilities of American citizens, expounded the principles of democracy and also made clear the many privileges to which American citizens are entitled. Mr. Pope has made Il Progresso a true and effective voice of the people and a servant of their interests. In this spirit, Il Progresso has constantly and vigorously dealt with domestic and foreign affairs, making proposals for action by our Government, questioning or approving its policies.

He has vigorously supported a campaign to combat juvenile delinquency and for years has striven to bring into the homes of his readers, ways and means to combat the peril among the youth of our communities.

Mr. Pope has also directed several campaigns for the teaching of the Italian language in high schools and colleges.

Many young men and women have secured degrees in college and universities through Mr. Pope's interest in raising funds to furnish scholarships for them in order that they might continue their studies and thus realize the ambition of their life. For several years, prior to World War II, Mr. Pope donated scholarships to Fordham College and Columbia University.

As president of the Columbus Citizens Committee, Mr. Pope is responsible for many scholarships being awarded each year to young people regardless of race, color, or creed.

Mr. Pope also directed a campaign for humanizing immigration and naturalization laws so that the sacredness of the home and family life may be preserved.

In 1946 Mr. Pope became the owner of radio station WHOM, popularly known as the Il Progresso Station.

Mr. Pope, through Il Progresso, waged a vigorous campaign for a just peace for Italy, and called on President Truman with a memorandum espousing the cause of the restitution of the Italian colonies to Italy.

Mr. Pope, through the media of Il Progresso and radio station WHOM, effectively urged the readers and listeners and their friends and relatives to write to their friends and relatives in Italy, the truth about America. He began the letter-writing campaign on January 19, 1948, and as a result, millions of letters praising the opportunities and freedom of America, poured into Italy. Today, Mr. Pope shares the distinction of having done the most to help defeat the Communists in the April elections in Italy.

Mr. Pope organized Il Progresso Campaign for Italian Relief, and as president of that organization, raised hundreds of thousands of dollars to help alleviate the distress among the war stricken people of Italy.

Mr. Pope has successfully concluded a vigorous campaign against the use of names of foreign-born Americans for gangster roles, in the movies and theaters.

Through Il Progresso, Mr. Pope raised funds to erect a monument to immortalize the memory of the great genius, Guglielmo Marconi. Mr. Pope is also responsible for the raising of funds to erect a memorial to Sgt. John Basilone, an American of Italian origin, who was decorated with the Congressional Medal of Honor by the United States Government. Sergeant Basilone was the first enlisted United States Marine to win the Congressional Medal of Honor.

For his great contribution to the rehabilitation of Italy, Mr. Pope was recently decorated with the Star of Solidarity by the new Republic of Italy.

Through Il Progresso, Mr. Pope has worked tirelessly to make democracy a living actuality. He has consistently pointed out a fatal weakness in our national life. In this connection, Il Progresso was singled out in a Nation-wide editorial contest, sponsored by the Community Council for American Unity. More than 1,000 foreign-language newspapers competed, and a distinguished board of judges awarded Il Progresso's editorial against racial intolerance and bigotry the first prize.

Always mindful of the other person's plight, Mr. Pope is recognized for his philanthropy.

He has contributed generously to the social service organizations of the Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic faiths. He has served as chairman of the Committee of Americans of Italian Origin for the American Red Cross, for the cancer and infantile paralysis funds during several of their campaigns, and helped raise thousands of dollars for them.

During World War II, Mr. Pope was chairman of the Committee for Americans of Italian Origin of the State of New York, which raised more than $400,000,000 for the war bond drive.

Some of the awards conferred upon Mr. Pope are as follows:

United States Treasury award, medal for exceptional service in sale of United States war bonds; the service certificate and medal from the United States Government under the Selective Service and Training Act, Appeal Board No. 6; meritorious civilian service award from the United States Navy; Duquesne University doctor of letters; Honorary Deputy Police Commissioner of the City of New York; Star of Solidarity from the Republic of Italy; Magistral Cross of the Military Court of Malta.

Mr. Pope was also permanent arbitrator for the Broadway Master Barbers Association, Inc., and Barber and Beauty Culturists of America, Locals 1 and 3; member of the Commission of Displaced Persons; member of the Board of Directors of American Relief for Italy, Inc.; member of the Archbishop's Committee of the Laity; and many other organizations; president of the Columbus Citizens Committee, Inc., and one of the founders of the J. Edgar Hoover School.

Mr. Pope was born April 1, 1891, in Arpaise, Province of Benevento, Italy. He leaves behind his wife, Catherine Richichi Pope, three sons, Fortune, Anthony, and Generoso Pope, Jr., and four grandchildren; also four sisters, Giovannini, Beatrice, Rose, Fortuna, and Maria, and two brothers, Carlos and Antonio.

STATUE OF THE LATE BRIGHAM YOUNG

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 184) authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the presentation of a statue of the late Brigham Young, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, after "therefor", insert "; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That said statue shall be permanently located in Statuary Hall."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIGHAM YOUNG STATUE

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 186) authorizing a statue of the late Brigham Young, of Utah, to be placed in Statuary Hall, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert "That the statue of Brigham Young, presented by the State of Utah, to be permanently placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States; and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for his leadership as a colonizer; and be it further

"*Resolvea*, That a copy of these resolutions suitably engrossed and duly authenticated be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Utah and to the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints."

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Brigham Young for Statuary Hall in the name of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHIGAN NAVY BEANS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, usually when people think of the State of Michigan they think of the great automobile industry that is first in the industries of our country. However, I am in receipt of a letter today from the Governor of Michigan, G. Mennen Williams, advising that the State is setting apart a 2-week period from April 27 to May 10 to bring to the attention of the Nation the fact that our pioneer forefathers relied on the navy bean, and that the navy bean which is used in the United States is produced to the extent of about 92 percent in the State of Michigan. So, we make a lot of noise about things other than automobiles in Michigan, and we want to talk today about our navy beans.

The Governor's letter to which I refer is as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, April 26, 1950.

The Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RABAUT: Among the fine old traditions of American life is the navy bean. Our pioneer forefathers relied on them because they packed a lot of nutritious goodness in a small space; and today it makes you hungry just to think about them in navy bean soup or delicious baked navy beans.

Michigan is celebrating National Bean Weeks from April 27 to May 10.

So that you may be sure to again enjoy the mouth-watering goodness of navy beans on this occasion, I am sending under separate cover a sample from the 92 percent of the Nation's navy-bean crop which Michigan regularly produces, as one of our major agricultural achievements.

Sincerely,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor,

MEXICAN SHRIMP BOAT SEIZURE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objections to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my two colleagues from Texas who were kind enough to bring to our attention on Friday last a very unfortunate occurrence that took place a week ago Sunday off the coast of Mexico when five of our fishing vessels were seized by that Government for the reason that they were fishing for shrimp within the 9-mile limit, a limit laid down by decree of the Mexican Government. It has always been a hard and fast rule that the fishing industry has the right and the privilege of fishing outside of the 3-mile limit, under international law. I join with others in the fear that this may interfere with the fishing industry of New England and the fishing industry of Massachusetts if our resentment is not lodged at once with the State Department. I think that all of us should protest strenuously to the State Department the seizure of these five American fishing vessels by the Republic of Mexico and further we should support House Resolution 558 which has for its purpose an immediate investigation by the Secretary of State.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MEXICAN SHRIMP BOAT SEIZURE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentlemen from Texas with regard to the very unfortunate incident of the seizure by the Mexican authorities of our fishing vessels off the coast of Mexico. I am taking it up with the State Department. Such incident with the resulting loss to our fishing industry and injustice to the United States cannot be tolerated. We have the friendliest relations with Mexico and I am confident Mexico will right the wrong.

BOSTON'S FIFTIETH JUBILEE

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has spoken of the fine Michigan beans.

Mr. Speaker, at Boston, Mass., on the 20th of May we are celebrating a fiftieth jubilee. We shall have a mammoth baked-bean supper and I hope all the Members will come to sample the real Boston baked beans, and I am suggesting that they have also Massachusetts codfish cakes served with the beans.

MEXICAN SHRIMP BOAT SEIZURE

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. I think the State Department should look out for these men who risk their lives every day to provide food for the people of the United States. I think it is up to the State Department to protect them as well as the rest of the citizens of this country.

CHINA

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday several distinguished citizens of this country, men who have been identified with the State Department, rose in unison to say to the people of this country that so far as the Lattimore doctrine is concerned the State Department at no time followed that doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, surely historians will record that the debacle in China has been our greatest diplomatic defeat. If Lattimore and Service did not write that policy, then the people of this country are entitled to know who did. The results are identical with those advocated by Lattimore. The people have lost faith in the State Department in view of the results in China. All the facts should be exposed by the Department, that is the only way public confidence will be restored.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am always interested in thrifty people and economy in Government. In talking to some of the lady Members of Congress I found that the women who belong to the Women's Congressional Club tell me that several years ago the club had quite a debt on their building, but they kept pounding and pounding on that debt until they wiped it out. They want to be thrifty and sound. It was the right thing to do.

I do not know why the lady Members of Congress do not get after everybody that belongs to this Congress and say, "Now, Members, now husbands, you have to cut down on the spending of Government. If you don't, you are going to wreck this country. We have a $256,000,000,000 debt and going in deeper each day. You are leaving to our children and our children's children the burden of paying the debt you are not big enough to assume." A debt you are not wise enough to handle, an unnecessary squandering of your children's heritage.

Why do not we as Members of Congress realize that we have to balance this budget, and that we have to pay our way? I hope the wife of every Member of Congress gets after him and tells him that we have the appropriation bill coming up now and we have to vote for economy. If we do not, this country is going to ruin. This administration is running rampant into debt more and more each day as the days go by at the rate of $20,000,000 a day, or $900,000 an hour. It is terrible, it is wrong, it is unjust. Let us correct it at once. Stop spending.

Be wise and economize.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow on the subject of Americanism versus Communism, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MEXICO SEIZES AMERICAN VESSELS ON THE HIGH SEAS

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that the House is called upon to give its attention to the problems of the fisheries of the Nation. The seizure by Mexico of five American-flag fishing vessels and their American crews calls attention to the denial of rights which we claim for our citizens and to the similar problem which involves several other nations.

Waters within the 3-mile limit are recognized to be territorial waters of the nation which they border. The waters beyond are customarily considered to be international waters open to the vessels of all nations. Mexico has recently asserted a claim to jurisdiction over fishing in all waters within a 9-mile limit and has seized our vessels and men fishing 9 miles from the Mexican shore. Should the action go unprotested, our rights will be prejudiced. Other nations which have evidenced similar intentions to ex-

clude our fishing vessels from waters distant from their shores are observing our actions. We should not encourage them to attempt to carry out any such intentions.

Our industry is an important one to us. In a typical prewar year, 124,800 fishermen caught 4,400,000,000 pounds of fish. In 1943, the value of the product was about $600,000,000. The capitalized value of our fishery resources is about $5,800,000,000. We cannot stand idly by while other nations attempt to appropriate to themselves the raw material upon which our industry has every right to depend.

California is especially concerned. It produces about one-fourth of the fish of the Nation. Management and men alike request action.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our State Department will take prompt and effective action to protect American rights and interests against the announced claims of Mexico and will set precedents which will deter other nations from violation of our rights in the fisheries in international waters, and that the House will adopt House Resolution 558 calling upon the Secretary of State to investigate immediately the seizures which have been involved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REORGANIZATION OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, with approval of each body, to appoint a joint committee to study the United Nations organization for the purpose of making recommendations to each member nation to implement or reorganize that body to assist in the achievement of world peace and to prevent aggression against any nation by any member of the United Nations; and further to revise the existing Charter to permit other nations, presently excluded, membership in the organization.

Three years ago this July, in an address, I made almost the identical suggestion and recommendation. It fell on deaf ears, and as a result we now face a condition in the world that threatens our very existence. I believe that if such a suggestion had been adopted in 1947 much of the aggression of the Soviet Union could have been stopped and a strong unit of nations could have been formed to help in the achievement of world peace. It appeared clear to me then that Russia had no intention of cooperating through the United Nations to settle our differences, but rather intended to use it as a propaganda forum to disrupt our efforts to settle the differences of the world.

I compliment former President Herbert Hoover on his outstanding address last Thursday night. I agree with Mr. Hoover that if Russia will not agree to changes in the United Nations which will make it an effective organization for world peace that we must insist on reorganization without Russia. We must recognize that we cannot adopt their atheistic philosophy, and we must organize Christian nations to save the world. I do not believe there is any other way.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

BEANS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] should not think she has a monopoly on this bean business. It is my purpose now to announce my deep appreciation, and I assume the Michigan Members will all join with me, of the receipt this morning of 2 pounds of beans. And from whom do you suppose I got them? From Soapy Williams, our Democratic, share-the-wealth New Dealer Governor who is campaigning for reelection. It cost the State 23 cents to get those beans down to me. I hope they are good beans.

VERMEJO RECLAMATION PROJECT, NEW MEXICO

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MILES] and I have today reintroduced a bill authorizing construction of the Vermejo reclamation project in New Mexico. This project was approved by both the House and Senate at the last session, but disapproved by the President because at that time there were some items in the bill which did not have the full approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill as rewritten has met the requirements of the Bureau of the Budget, and now has the full approval of the Bureau.

We sincerely hope that the repassage of this bill may be expedited not only for the reasons advanced at the last session of Congress but for the additional reason that this construction and development will provide work and water for a large number of families in that area who will be without home and without work by this summer. Because of conversion from coal to fuel oil by the railroads, the Dawson coal mines in Colfax County have been forced to permanently suspend work on the 28th of April this year. Families comprising 2,100 people have been given notice to vacate their homes, which are owned by the coal company, by this coming June. These miners and their families who have depended on coal production at this mine for half a century will find themselves in a serious predicament. This project will have to be reconstructed sooner or later, and prompt action on the part of the Congress at this time will relieve the hardships attendant upon the losing of their jobs by these miners. I hope that the Public Lands Committee will take action immediately, and that the Congress will reenact this bill, which has already had the approval of both the House and the Senate.

AMENDING THE ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Forces, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7635) to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to provide graduation leave upon appointment as commissioned officers in the regular components of the armed forces of graduates of the United States Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I wish the gentleman would kindly explain what the bill provides.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the present law, and for a great many years, there has been a striking disparity between the graduation leave given to graduates of West Point and the graduates of Annapolis. The present practice is that West Pointers receive 60 days' graduation leave. The graduates of Annapolis are given 30 days' leave, which they must later earn. So that the net difference between the two is that the Annapolis graduates are given no graduation leave and the West Point graduates are given 60 days' leave. This bill is to put the graduates of the two institutions on the same basis with respect to graduation leave.

The reason for the urgency is so that it may be applied to the graduating classes this year.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Would it be the wise thing to extend the time to 60 days, or to cut the time down to 30 days? In reference to sick leave in Government the various departments have a discrepancy in time. We in Government certainly give greater leave than we do in business all over the country, at great cost to taxpayers. I just ask that question not so much to bring attention to the West Point and Annapolis discrepancy, but to bring to the attention of the Congress the discrepancy in the time that we give to Government employees.

I think we give them too much time, or at least to some of them. We should adjust it and do it now. I hope this bill will give 45 days' leave to both Academies.

Mr. COLE of New York. I appreciate the gentleman's position that every time we undertake to remove any discrimination between services or agencies of Government, the standard is always fixed at the maximum or most favorable or generous terms. However, when this matter was brought to my attention, I passed it along to the Department of Defense for their recommendation, and it was recommended by them that rather than equalize it by giving 30 days each to the two Academies, because of military consideration with respect to the graduates of West Point which requires the 60 days, the Department of Defense recommended that the two institutions be placed on a 60-day basis.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. As a matter of fact, the students at the Academy lead a very secluded life during the 4 years they are in school. I do not think it is asking too much to give them 60 days in which to visit with their folks back home before they start on a life career in the service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I wonder if the committee gave any consideration to the possibility of making it a 30-day-leave proposition and giving them the other 30 as a reasonable compromise.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is one possible compromise that might have been made to establish a common practice for the two institutions; but, as I have indicated before, the Department of Defense considered these various proposals and recommended this one as being the fairest to the two institutions, having in mind the military responsibilities of the two institutions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not a fact that these men would be on the Government pay roll in either event? So the passage of this proposal would not entail any additional cost.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, but in answer to the gentleman from Iowa, it seems to me that although we may spend no more money the Military Establishment will not be getting any service or work out of these people who are on the 60-day leave, and as a result there will be a material loss to the Federal Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. That is really on the same basis as the Foreign Service; they have 60 days leave. I think there should be equalization between the two Academies.

Mr. FORD. I think there is a material difference between the Foreign Service situation and that of young men who have just graduated from either of the service academies. The people in the Foreign Service have been overseas for at least a year and possibly longer, while the men in the Academies have simply been going to service schools.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following new subsection to section 3:

"(c) Graduates of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy who, upon graduation therefrom, are commissioned in a regular component of the armed forces may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be granted graduation leave not in excess of 60 days, which leave shall not be deducted from nor charged against other leave authorized by the provisions of this act but shall be in addition thereto. Graduation leave granted pursuant to this subsection must be completed within 3 months of the date of graduation and no such leave shall be carried forward as credit beyond the date of reporting to the first permanent duty station or to a port of embarkation for permanent duty outside the continental limits of the United States."

SEC. 2. The act of December 20, 1886 (24 Stat. 351; 10 U. S. C. 1150), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the phrase "and during his graduation leave,".

SEC. 3. The paragraph entitled "Graduates of the Military Academy may serve as instructors," of chapter XVIII of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 892; 10 U. S. C. 445), is hereby amended by substituting a period for the comma appearing after the words "training camps" and deleting the words "and their graduation leave may be taken at the termination of their services as instructors at these camps."

With the following committee amendment:

Immediately following section 3 add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. This act shall take effect as of June 1, 1950."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POINT OF NO QUORUM

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count, but the Chair must state that we rearranged the program for Monday and Tuesday of this week so that Members could go away to attend their primaries, both Democrats and Republicans. The Chair has no control over the gentleman from Minnesota, however.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an oration.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two addresses.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include newspaper editorials.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Herbert Hoover.

Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in three instances and to include the fifth, sixth, and seventh articles by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on communism in this country.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an essay.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two articles.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a poem by Hon. Jed Johnson.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the program of the Army Chemical Corps, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $218.68.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4295) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Re-

tirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I take this time for the purpose of making this statement: If it were intended that there be no quorum calls or roll calls today, then important legislation should not be listed for consideration today.

The SPEAKER. It is the gentleman's privilege to ask for a quorum any time he pleases.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons as stated at the time this calendar was called previously, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN PARTS OF ALASKA BY WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4424) to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EDUCATION OR TRAINING OF VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been granted on this bill; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4499) to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill is entirely too controversial and too important to be on the Consent Calendar at all; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 175) to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to reduce the residence qualification in divorce proceedings from 2 years to 1 year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill was called up before I objected because it reduces the residence requirement in Hawaii from the present 2 years to 1 year in divorce proceedings. It seems to me that is a step in the wrong direction. For that reason, I object.

Messrs. KARSTEN, COX, and LANE also objected.

PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS DUE MENTALLY INCOMPETENT PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5920) to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I recognize the desirable objectives of this bill, but when we permit a department to designate a person who will occupy the position of conservator or guardian of a person incapable of handling his or her funds, in this case money received from the Federal Government, and it is without limitation, it seems to me there should be very careful safeguards because assuming the person appointed violates the law there appears to be nothing in the bill making it a crime; there is nothing in here compelling accountability. When a person is appointed guardian by a probate court or any court having jurisdiction, of course they are an officer of the court, they are acting for the court and there are local laws which govern their responsibility. They have to make an accounting once a year in most States and there is opportunity for anyone who feels that the guardian or conservator is not performing his trust properly to bring a petition in court for their removal, or if they delay making an accounting as required by law to call upon them to make an accounting. There is plenty of legal machinery.

I recognize the objectives of the bill are what the committee may consider desirable, but there are many other factors involved in guardianships than this bill seems to contemplate. While it came out of the Committee on Armed Services, and properly so, there are many legal questions involved in guardianships where one is appointed a conservator over an individual. If the amount were limited to a certain small sum, I can see where from the practical angle it might not require a person to go into a local court or go to the expense of having a guardian appointed.

But, as I read this bill, it is without limitation, and I am fearful about the right of the agency to get reports of any person designated, or to proceed against him in case he violates his trust. I was anxious to find out what assurance there is in this bill, to protect the beneficiary. If anyone can explain these matters to my satisfaction, I would be glad to withdraw my reservation of objection. But, I am disturbed, recognizing the objective sought, with the fact that unless there are more provisions inserted in this bill to protect the beneficiary that, as the result of a bill that is intended for a good objective, out of it might grow many abuses and many evils.

In the light of the statement that I have made, and desirous of additional information, unless there is some one who can satisfy me, I shall have to ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, so that 2 weeks hence, having the observations that I have made, and knowing that it comes from one who is friendly to the objective but skeptical about the results that might flow therefrom, some member of the committee may be in a position then to make a satisfactory explanation in relation thereto.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I appreciate what the gentleman has said. As I interpret this measure, it would be possible, if this bill became law, for a representative or member of the incompetent family to, over a period of years, receive a very large amount of money and not have to put up any bond or indemnity to guarantee supervision over the mentally incompetent at a later date.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill would permit that, exactly, and if it was limited to a certain amount, I could understand that. It is true that they might call for a bond, but there is something about a bond in the case of a guardian appointed by the court, that the court has power then, and there could be contempt proceedings if they do not obey the order of the court. And, our probate courts in all the States, throughout decades of experience and development of local laws, are all for the protection of the beneficiaries of an estate or where a guardian is appointed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I read the bill, a man could also be declared incompetent by a medical officer of the armed services or any branch of the Government without his having been declared mentally incompetent by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true; the bill would permit that to be done. I recognize the desirable objective, but those of us who have had experience in the field of law recognize that guardianships are not a development over night; it is the result of decades of experience, and that there is plenty of opportunity for a court, where a guardian is appointed, to protect the interest of the beneficiary or, in the case of an estate, to protect the estate.

I am not opposing this bill, but I want to get information and I want to be cautious about it, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMITTING ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN DECORATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6820) to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2853, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any member of the armed forces of the United States participating in the Berlin airlift, for the period during which a medal for participation therein is authorized to be awarded to such person by this Nation, and for a 2-year period thereafter, may accept and thereafter wear, subject to the approval of the head of the department of which he was a member at the time of his participation in the Berlin airlift, any decoration, order, medal, or emblem tendered him in recognition of such humane service by any foreign government which was a cobelligerent with the United States in World War II and was a coparticipant in such airlift.

SEC. 2. The express consent of the Congress, as required by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution, is hereby granted to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6820) was laid on the table.

PROCEDURE FOR CRIMINAL, CIVIL, AND ADMIRALTY CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6390) to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2874, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at or after the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the first day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported. All laws in conflict with such rules shall be of no further force or effect after such rules have taken effect."

SEC. 2. The third paragraph of section 2072 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at or after the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the first day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported."

SEC. 3. The third paragraph of section 2073 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at or after the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the first day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6390) was laid on the table.

SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 277) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever shall knowingly and willfully communicate, furnish, transmit, or otherwise make available to an unauthorized person, or publish, or use in any manner prejudicial to the safety or interest of the United States or for the benefit of any foreign government to the detriment of the United States any classified information (1) concerning the nature, preparation, or use of any code, cipher, or cryptographic system of the United States or any foreign government; or (2) concerning the design, construction, use, maintenance, or repair of any device, apparatus, or appliance used or prepared or planned for use by the United States or any foreign government for cryptographic or communication intelligence purposes; or (3) concerning the communication intelligence activities of the United States or any foreign government; or (4) obtained by the processes of communication intelligence from the communications of any foreign government knowing the same to have been obtained by such processes, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

SEC. 2. (a) The term "classified information" as used herein shall be construed to mean information which, at the time of a violation under this act, is, for reasons of national security, specifically designated by a United States Government agency for limited or restricted dissemination or distribution.

(b) The terms "code," "cipher," and "cryptographic system" as used herein shall be construed to include in their meanings, in addition to their usual meanings, any method of secret writing and any mechanical or electrical device or method used for the purpose of disguising or concealing the contents, significance, or meanings of communications.

(c) The term "foreign government" as used herein shall be construed to include in its meaning any person or persons acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of any faction, party, department, agency, bureau, or military force of or within a foreign country, or for or on behalf of any government or any person or persons purporting to act as a government within a foreign country, whether or not such government is recognized by the United States.

(d) The term "communication intelligence" as used herein shall be construed to mean all procedures and methods used in the interception of communications and the obtaining of information from such communications by other than the intended recipients.

(e) The term "unauthorized person" as used herein shall be construed to mean any person who, or agency which, is not authorized to receive information of the categories set forth in section 1 of this act, by the President, or by the head of a department or agency of the United States Government which is expressly designated by the President to engage in communication intelligence activities for the United States.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall prohibit the furnishing upon lawful demand of information to any regularly constituted committee of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States of America, or joint committee thereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILES CITY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7984) to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey by patent to the city of Miles City, a municipal corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Montana, upon payment of a just and reasonable consideration to be determined by the Secretary, and subject to existing permits, rights-of-way for gas, telephone, electric, and other utility lines, the following tracts of public land in Custer County, Mont., formerly a part of the Fort Keogh Military Reservation and now a part of the United States range livestock experiment station, to wit:

Tract numbered 1. Beginning at a point on the north right-of-way line of the Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad opposite Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad station 3243 plus 46.07, said point being south forty-five degrees fourteen minutes east a distance of seven hundred eighty-six and five one-hundredths feet from the rock marking the corner sections 31 and 32, township 8 north, range 47 east, Montana principal meridian, and sections 5 and 6, township 7 north, range 47 east, Montana principal meridian; thence north forty-five degrees fourteen minutes west a distance of fifty feet; thence north forty degrees east a distance of six hundred feet; thence north twenty-one degrees fourteen minutes east a distance of seven hundred thirty-eight and seven-tenths feet; thence north forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes east a distance of two thousand seven hundred and eighty feet, more or less, to the west line of the Miles City water plant tract; thence south fifty-two degrees thirty-one minutes east a distance of four hundred fifty-six and sixty-four one-hundredths feet, more or less, to the north right-of-way line of the Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad right-of-way; thence south forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes west along said right-of-way a distance of one hundred sixty-eight and three-tenths feet, more or less to the Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad station 3204 plus 00; thence south forty-two degrees forty-four minutes east a distance of fifty feet; thence south forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes west along the north right-of-way line a distance of three thousand eight hundred feet, more or less to the Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad station 3242 plus 00; thence north forty-two degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of fifty feet; thence south forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes west a distance of one hundred forty-six and seven one-hundredths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning and containing thirty-nine and seven one-hundredths acres, more or less.

Tract numbered 2. Beginning at a point on the south right-of-way line of the Northern Pacific Railway, said point being south forty-five degrees six minutes thirty-eight

seconds east a distance of twelve and eighty-one one-hundredths feet from the quarter corner of section 5 and section 8, township 7 north, range 47 east Montana principal meridian; thence north forty-one degrees thirty minutes east along the south right-of-way line of the Northern Pacific, a distance of five thousand one hundred eighteen and sixty-seven one-hundredths feet; thence south forty-eight degrees thirty minutes east a distance of six hundred feet; thence south forty-one degrees thirty minutes west a distance of five thousand one hundred fifty-four and two-tenths feet; thence north forty-five degrees six minutes thirty-eight seconds west a distance of six hundred one and four one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning and containing seventy and seventy-five one-hundredths acres more or less.

Tract numbered 3. Lot 15 (seven and sixty-seven one-hundredths acres) in section 33, lot 4 (five and sixty-eight one hundredths acres) in section 34, township 8 north, range 47 east and lot 10 (thirty-eight and thirty-one one-hundredths acres) in section 3, lot 9 (seventy-one and thirty-two one-hundredths acres) in section 4 in township 7 north, range 47 east, of the Montana principal meridian in Custer County, Mont., containing one hundred twenty-two and ninety-eight one-hundredths acres more or less.

Tract numbered 4. Lot 16 (two and one one-hundredth acres) in section 28; lot 14 (seven and six-tenths acres) and lot 15 (seven one-hundredths acre) in section 32; lot 12 (twenty-two and sixty-three one-hundredths acres) and lot 13 (six and thirteen one-hundredths acres) in section 33, all in township 8 north, range 47 east, of the Montana principal meridian in Custer County, Mont., containing thirty-eight and forty-four one-hundredths acres more or less.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to convey by patent or patents to the city of Miles City, upon the payment of a just and reasonable consideration determined by the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of use for industrial purposes, such of the following tract or tracts or parts thereof within the said experiment station as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be more suitable for the use of the city:

Tract numbered 5. Beginning at a point on south boundary of tract C and the north right-of-way line of the Northern Pacific Railway said point being south sixty-six degrees twenty-one and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand one hundred seventy and forty-eight one-hundredths feet from the monument marking the corner of sections 32 and 33, township 8 north, range 47 east, Montana principal meridian, and sections 4 and 5, township 7 north, range 47 east, Montana principal meridian, thence south forty-one degrees thirty minutes west along the north right-of-way line of the Northern Pacific Railway a distance of six thousand two hundred sixty and sixty-five one-hundredths feet, more or less to the intersection of the south right-of-way line of United States Highways Nos. 10 and 12 with the north right-of-way line of the Northern Pacific Railway; thence northeasterly along the arc of a circular curve radius nine hundred and five feet through an angle of thirty-four degrees forty-two minutes to the end of curve highway station 145 plus 43.1; thence north twenty-four degrees fifty minutes east a distance of six thousand two hundred and twenty feet more or less T. P. C. of curve highway station 207 plus 73.2; thence along the south right-of-way line of United States Highways 10 and 12 along the arc of a circular curve through an angle of eight degrees twenty minutes and a radius of one thousand eight hundred and sixty feet (or chord length two hundred seventy and four-tenths feet north twenty-nine degrees east, to the intersection of said south highway right-of-way line with tract C; thence south sixteen degrees fifty minutes west along the west boundary of tract C, a distance of one thousand two hundred sixty-seven and twenty-nine one-hundredths feet, more or less, to monument numbered 3 of tract C; thence south seventy-three degrees ten minutes east a distance of one thousand seven hundred seventy-eight and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet, more or less to the north right-of-way line of the Northern Pacific Railway the point of beginning and containing one hundred forty-two and fifteen one-hundredths acres more or less.

Tract numbered 6. Beginning at a point on the south right-of-way line of the Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad opposite Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad station 3233 plus 49 said point being south eighty-four degrees fifty-nine minutes east a distance of one thousand five hundred thirty-three and seventy-five one hundredths feet from the rock marking the corner of sections 31 and 32, township 8 north, range 47 east, Montana principal meridian, and sections 5 and 6, township 7 north, range 47 east, Montana principal meridian; thence north forty-seven degrees sixteen minutes east along the south right-of-way line of the Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul and Pacific Railroad a distance of two thousand three hundred sixty and five-tenths feet more or less, to boundary of tract granted to the city of Miles City for recreational and industrial purposes; thence south sixty degrees fifteen minutes east along the boundary of said tract a distance of one thousand five hundred sixty-six and twelve one-hundredths feet, more or less to the southeast boundary of said tract, which point is also the north right-of-way line of United States Highways Nos. 10 and 12; thence south twenty-four degrees fifty minutes west along said north right-of-way line a distance of three thousand sixty-three and seventy-four one-hundredths feet; thence north forty-two degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of two thousand six hundred sixty-two and sixty-four one-hundredths feet more or less to the point of beginning and containing one hundred twenty-seven and one one-hundredth acres more or less of which twenty-seven and one one-hundredth acres is a designated stock trail.

In the event of conveyance to the city of any part of the stock trail described as part of tract 6, the city shall not close any part of said trail unless another trail is provided in lieu thereof over the portion of tract conveyed to the city. Land conveyed pursuant to this section shall be conveyed on condition that it shall be used exclusively for commercial and industrial purposes or in furnishing essential municipal services. If any tract so conveyed shall not be so used or shall be used for purposes other than those specified, title to such land and all rights of possession or enjoyment thereof as is not used as provided by this section for a period of 3 years, shall revert to the United States without any act of reentry. Successors or assignees of the city of Miles City shall be bound by the provisions of this section.

SEC. 3. Said patents shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits as may be found in such lands and the right to the use of the lands for extracting and removing same.

SEC. 4. The city of Miles City shall, within a reasonable period after the patenting of all or any part of the land hereunder, and in any event, prior to actual use thereof, provide suitable fences upon the lines thus newly established. The cost of such fencing may be credited to the consideration determined to be paid for the land patented hereunder.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to grant to the city of Miles City such easements for rights-of-way as may be necessary.

SEC. 6. The authority herein contained shall expire 5 years from the effective date of this act unless, prior to such expiration date, the city of Miles City shall have made proper tender of consideration and other necessary arrangements as set forth in this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW MEXICO STATE FAIR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6247) authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey, without the payment of any funds, to New Mexico State Fair, a body corporate of the State of New Mexico, the land with improvements thereon which New Mexico State Fair conveyed to United States for use as an Indian exhibit building within the New Mexico State Fair grounds by deed dated July 14, 1938: *Provided, however*, That in any conveyance made by the Secretary of the Interior he may incorporate therein such terms and conditions with respect to continued use of said premises or any part thereof by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary or desirable.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LAND WITH ARMY ENGINEERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4969) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Army to transfer and convey certain lands and thereby facilitate administration and give proper cognizance to the highest use of United States lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to convey to the Secretary of the Army without consideration a tract of land situated in the county of Perry, State of Arkansas, being parts of sections 31 and 32 of township 4 north, range 20 west, of the fifth principal meridian, bounded as follows: Beginning at the southwest corner of said section 31; thence with the west line thereof north thirteen and sixty-five one-hundredths chains to a point; thence with a line of tract formerly owned by Carson Flewellen, north sixty-eight degrees thirty-nine minutes east approximately seventy-five chains to a point on the right bank of the Fourche La Fave River, which at this point is submerged in the Nimrod Reservoir; thence down and with said right bank as it meanders, passing through the Nimrod Dam structure to a point on the east line of the fractional southwest quarter southwest quarter of said section 32; thence with said line south approximately eighteen chains to the south line of township 4 north, range 20 west, and with the same, west one hundred sixteen and twenty one-hundredths chains to the beginning, it being the intention to include all of the fractional southwest quarter southwest quarter, section 32, and all that part of section 31 lying south

of Fourche La Fave River, except a tract of thirty-seven and ninety-seven one-hundredths acres formerly owned by Carson Flewellen, containing three hundred twenty and forty-nine one-hundredths acres, more or less, the same being part of the land conveyed to the United States by deed of the Fort Smith Lumber Co., dated November 28, 1928, and recorded in Perry County, Ark., December 12, 1928; and by decree of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas entered October 29, 1928, covering land in Perry and Yell Counties, Ark., Fort Smith Lumber Co., et al., for the purpose of facilitating maintenance and operation of the dam and preservation and control of the reservoir area in the vicinity of the dam and to permit development of a portion of the area for its highest and best public use consistent with the primary purposes of the Nimrod Reservoir project, Arkansas, under the administration of the Chief, Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby directed to convey to the Secretary of Agriculture without consideration all those parts of the following-described subdivisions of land situated on the south side of Nimrod Reservoir in Perry and Yell Counties, Ark., whose surface is above the contour at elevation three hundred and forty-eight feet (mean sea level), which is the clearing line for the Nimrod Reservoir: East half southeast quarter southwest quarter, north half southwest quarter southeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter, and east half northeast quarter southwest quarter of section 36, township 4 north, range 21 west; northwest quarter northwest quarter, north half north half northeast quarter northwest quarter, north half northwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter, east half northeast quarter northeast quarter, and northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter of section 2, township 3 north, range 21 west, all in Perry County, Ark.; northwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter northeast quarter, and north half northeast quarter northeast quarter, of section 3; southwest quarter northwest quarter, north half north half southeast quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter of section 4; north half southwest quarter northeast quarter, north half south half southwest quarter northeast quarter, and north half southeast quarter northeast quarter of section 5; township 3 north, range 21 west, fifth principal meridian, all in Yell County, Ark.

All of the above-described land contains in the aggregate three hundred six and thirty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less, for the purpose of national forest development as part of the Ouachita National Forest, Ark., to be administered under the terms of the Weeks Law Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 16, after "Arkansas" insert "subject to the right of the Department of the Army to overflow the lands as necessary for the operation of the Nimrod Reservoir."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LAND IN ROSS COUNTY, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5913) to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ross County, Ohio, for lands within Symmes Creek Purchase Unit in Lawrence County, Ohio, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to approval by the National Forest Reservation Commission as established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to exchange a parcel of land located in parts of sections 26 and 31 in township 8 north, range 21 west, Ohio River Survey, Ross County, Ohio, consisting of eighty-four one-hundredths acre of land, together with improvements located thereon, for lands of at least equal value situated within the exterior boundaries of the Symmes Creek Purchase Unit, within Lawrence County, State of Ohio: *Provided*, That any lands conveyed to the United States under the provisions of this act shall be subject to all of the laws and rules and regulations applicable to lands acquired under the afore-mentioned act of March 1, 1911, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCE FOR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT POSTAL CLERKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5103) to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever deemed necessary in serving military and naval camps, posts, or stations, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to detail any postal employee from main post offices to postal units at such camps, posts, or stations, without changing the official station of such postal employee, and to authorize allowances, not exceeding $4 per day in lieu of actual expenses, while so detailed, without regard for the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, such allowances to be paid from the appropriation, "Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class offices".

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make payment for actual expenses so incurred, not exceeding the allowances herein provided, to employees so detailed for the period from January 25, 1948, to date of approval of this act, or for any portion thereof. The Comptroller General is directed to allow credit for any payments so made commencing with January 25, 1948.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) whenever the Postmaster General deems it necessary in serving the military and naval camps, posts, or stations, he is authorized to (1) detail postal employees from main post offices to postal units at such camps, posts, or stations without changing the official station of any such postal employee, and (2) without regard to the Travel Expense Act of 1949, pay each such postal employee an allowance, in lieu of actual expenses, of not more than $4 for each day while so detailed.

"(b) The Postmaster General is authorized to pay each postal employee who was so detailed after January 24, 1948, and prior to the date of enactment of this act an allowance, in lieu of actual expenses, of not more than $4 for each day while so detailed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CHARGES ON UNDELIVERED C. O. D. PARCELS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3117) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, any collect-on-delivery parcel which the addressee fails to remove from the post office within 15 days from the first attempt to deliver or the first notice of arrival at the office of address may be returned to the sender charged with the return postage, whether or not such parcel bears any specified time limit for delivery; and a demurrage charge of not exceeding 5 cents per day may be collected when delivery has not been made to either the addressee or the sender until after the expiration of the prescribed period. No demurrage shall be charged on collect-on-delivery parcels exchanged between post offices in the continental United States and post offices in the Territories and island possessions of the United States."

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General may direct the immediate return to the sender, charged with return postage of any collect-on-delivery parcel which is found to be undeliverable.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCLUDING POSTAL EMPLOYEES IN CANAL ZONE FROM CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7888) to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to make it inapplicable to postal employees of the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, through an oversight or inadvertence when the classification bill of 1949 was drawn up, the postal employees in the Canal Zone were not excluded as they should have been.

Section 81 of title II of the Canal Zone Code provides that the compensation of postal employees of the Panama Canal shall be fixed with reference to the compensation of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department in the United States. In view of the fact that

the field service of the Post Office Department in the United States is excluded from the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 under section 202, the committee believes that the additional exclusion of postal employees of the Canal Zone should be provided. The effect of this legislation will be to continue the pay schedule for postal employees in the Canal Zone which has been in operation since the completion of the construction of the Canal in 1914.

The postal workers there are paid on the same scale as postal employees in the United States. Their salaries are fixed by the Government of Panama. They are appointed by the Department of the Army in the Canal Zone. The metal trades council of the American Federation of Labor, representing the postal employees of the Canal Zone, are in favor of this legislation. The Civil Service Commission is in favor of it. This bill was sent to the Speaker by the Secretary of the Army and has the endorsement of the Bureau of the Budget. There is no objection whatever to the legislation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a chance to study this situation, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

POSTPONING APPLICATION OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949 TO SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7889) to postpone the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain employees of the Selective Service System.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (b) of section 1105 of title XI of the Classification Act of 1949, Public Law 429, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 28, 1949, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That with respect to employees of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System this act shall not take effect before the first day of the first pay period which begins 1 year following the date of enactment of this act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5628) to direct the Federal Works Administrator to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the State of Rhode Island, without consideration, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two-tenths acres of land, more or less, in the town of Narragansett, county of Washington, State of Rhode Island, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the easterly boundary line of a State highway, said point being on the boundary line between land of the United States of America and land of Amasa and Viola Saint Onge; thence along said boundary line between land of the United States of America and land of Amasa and Viola Saint Onge by the following courses and distances: South seventy-four degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty seconds east fourteen and sixty-seven one-hundredths feet, more or less, southeasterly by a curve deflecting to the left, having a radius of two hundred and sixty feet a distance of three hundred seventy-four and ninety-four one-hundredths feet, more or less; south sixty-seven degrees sixteen minutes east four hundred fifty-one and fourteen one-hundredths feet, more or less; southeasterly by a curve deflecting to the right, having a radius of four hundred and forty feet a distance of one hundred nine and five one-hundredths feet, more or less; south fifty-three degrees four minutes east four hundred twenty-six and seventy one-hundredths feet, more or less, southeasterly by a curve deflecting to the right, having a radius of four hundred and seventy-five feet a distance of one hundred forty-seven and thirty one-hundredths feet, more or less; south thirty-five degrees eighteen minutes east one hundred forty-one and eighty-one one-hundredths feet, more or less to the northerly side line of the said State highway; thence north seventy-nine degrees fifty-four minutes forty seconds west along said side line eighty-five and forty-four one-hundredths feet, more or less, to a point; thence through land of the United States of America by the following courses and distances: North thirty-five degrees eighteen minutes west eighty and eighty-nine one-hundredths feet, more or less, northwesterly by a curve deflecting to the left, having a radius of four hundred and fifteen feet a distance of one hundred twenty-eight and seventy-one one-hundredths feet, more or less; north fifty-three degrees four minutes west four hundred twenty-six and seventy one-hundredths feet, more or less, northwesterly by a curve deflecting to the left, having a radius of three hundred and eighty feet a distance of ninety-four and eighteen one-hundredths feet, more or less; north sixty-seven degrees sixteen minutes west four hundred fifty-one and four-tenths feet, more or less, northwesterly by a curve deflecting to the right, having a radius of three hundred and twenty feet a distance of two hundred eighty-one and seventy-five one-hundredths feet, more or less, to said easterly line of the said State highway; thence north fifteen degrees twenty-one minutes east along said side line one hundred seventy-three and ninety-five one-hundredths feet more or less, to the point or place of beginning.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all language after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a replacement road containing approximately 2.2 acres of land substantially as shown on a map, Headquarters of Narragansett Bay Highway Relocation, Point Judith, Narragansett, R. I., United States Engineer Office, Providence, R. I., June 1942.

"The conveyance is to be in full and complete settlement of all damages to the State of Rhode Island for the taking of approximately 2 acres of State-owned highway in the condemnation proceeding filed in the United States District Court in and for the District of Rhode Island, entitled '*United States* v. *2 Acres of Land in Washington County, Rhode Island, the State of Rhode Island et al., Civil Action No 232*,' to be evidenced by the filing in said proceeding of an adequate stipulation between the parties thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW JERSEY STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6971) to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas the New Jersey State Highway Department, pursuant to act of the legislature of said State approved April 3, 1945 (ch. 83, Laws of New Jersey, 1945), which makes provision for the establishment, construction, and maintenance of freeways and parkways, has embarked upon the construction of its first freeway project located upon State Route No. 100, a new route which is partially graded but on which no road now exists; and

Whereas certain amounts of State and Federal-aid road funds have been allocated and partially expended for the acquisition of portions of the right-of-way required for and for initial construction on said project; and

Whereas by act approved October 27, 1948 (ch. 454, Laws of New Jersey, 1948), the legislature of said State established the New Jersey Turnpike Authority and empowered said authority to construct, maintain, repair, and operate turnpike projects to facilitate vehicular traffic and remove the handicaps and hazards due to the congestion of such traffic on the highways of the State, such projects to be financed by the issue of turnpike revenue bonds payable solely from tolls and revenues derived therefrom and to become free roads on the State highway system upon amortization of such bonds; and

Whereas engineering studies have disclosed that from the standpoint of urgent need, topography, industrial activity, and economy of construction, the most suitable location for a turnpike project that reasonably may be expected to amortize the cost of its construction by tolls and revenues derived therefrom is that selected for State Route No. 100, in view of which the New Jersey Turnpike Authority has decided to adopt said route for such a project and to proceed with the construction thereof pursuant to the act creating said authority; and

Whereas the New Jersey State Highway Department, pursuant to said act of April 3, 1945, has also begun construction, with the aid of Federal funds, of a parkway, designated as Route 4 Parkway, which will run practically the full length of the State and which the State desires to complete as a Federal-aid project:

Be it enacted, etc., That all Federal-aid road funds heretofore programed for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Route No. 100 are hereby authorized to be transferred for programing and expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department in expediting the construction of Route 4 Parkway of said State.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS THEREON IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7219) to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, for the construction, enlargement, remodeling, or extension of public buildings in the District of Columbia, at such times and upon such terms and conditions as he deems to be in the best interest of the United States, all privately owned lands or interests in lands, together with the improvements thereon, located within square 167 of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "buildings", strike out "in the District of Columbia, at such times and upon such terms and conditions as he deems to be in the best interest of the United States, all privately owned lands or interests in lands," and insert ", the lands".

Page 1, line 10, after "thereon", strike out "located within" and insert "described as lots numbered 48, 813, 814, 815, and 819 in".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 415 OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3255) to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 415 of the Career Compensation Act be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 415. Any member who, on October 1, 1949, was a hospital patient and who, prior to January 1, 1951, is retired as a result of a physical disability growing out of the injury or disease for which he was hospitalized, may elect to receive retirement benefits computed under the laws in effect on September 30, 1949."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT ANNUAL REUNION OF UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8139) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans at Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of defraying expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such reunion there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leader and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $8 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowance to be in addition to pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7700) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, it seems to me that this bill is of sufficient importance that the membership should be advised of its contents and just what it does, before it is passed by unanimous. Therefore, I ask the chairman of the committe, or someone who has the information, to explain the bill.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 years since we have had marketing quotas on rice. Due to increased production during the war, there was naturally an increase in acreage, and now we are just getting back to normal. In such adjustments it is natural that you run into many inequities. Many producers have gone to an enormous expenditure in preparing for the production of rice. Some of them, under the general terms of the Marketing Quota Act for rice, were cut in their acreage as much as 64 percent. This bill provides that for this year one-half of 1 percent of the national quota, which would be 7,965 acres, would be added to the national quota; one-half of 1 percent of the national allotment. And hereafter, for all cases of this kind, to avoid adding on acreage, the bill provides that 1 percent of the national allotment shall be set aside to meet inequities and hardship cases.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Would this bill in any way establish a precedent for other agricultural products than rice?

Mr. PACE. It does not, except I may say the precedent has already been set, both in the case of wheat and cotton, because the gentleman will recall that last year, in order to take care of a similar development in the wheat area, particularly in Colorado and that section of the country, we did add some additional acreage.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Was this a unanimous report from the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. PACE. It is my understanding that there were no dissenting votes against it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The national acreage allotment of rice for each calendar year, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent thereof for apportionment by the Secretary as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States in which rice is produced in proportion to the average number of acres of rice in each State during the 5-year period immediately preceding the calendar year for which such national acreage allotment of rice is determined (plus, in applicable years, the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs) with adjustments for trends in acreage during the applicable period. The Secretary shall provide for the apportionment of the reserve acreage set aside pursuant to this subsection to farms receiving allotments which are inadequate because of an insufficient State or county acrage allotment or because rice was not planted on the farm during all of the preceding 5 years. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the reserve acreage set aside for the 1950 crop pursuant to this subsection shall be in addition to the 1950 national acreage allotment as heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary and apportioned by him among the several rice-producing States and shall be available for apportionment to new farms without regard to the limitation contained in subsection (b) of this section."

SEC. 2. Section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) The provisions of this part shall not apply to rice produced on any farm on which the acreage planted to nonirrigated rice does not exceed 3 acres or to rice produced outside the continental United States."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 14, after the word "subsection", insert "shall not exceed one-half of 1 percent and."

On page 3, line 2, insert the word "nonirrigated."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COVERING INTO THE TREASURY MONEYS ARISING FROM CHARGES AND DEDUCTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1069) to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3552 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 369) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3552. The money arising from all charges and deductions on and from gold and silver bullion and from all other sources, except the money derived from the manufacture and sale of medals and proof coins and as otherwise provided by and pursuant to this title, shall from time to time be covered into the Treasury, and no part of such deductions, or profit on silver or minor coinage, shall be expended in salaries and wages. The money arising from the manufacture and sale of medals and proof coins shall be reimbursed to the appropriation then current and chargeable for the cost of manufacture and sale of medals and proof coins. All expenditures of the mints and assay offices, not herein otherwise provided for, shall be paid from appropriations made by law on estimates furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to correct a clerical error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: On page 2, line 2, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COINAGE OF SUBSIDIARY SILVER COINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2590) to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3526 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 31, sec. 335), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3526. In order to procure bullion for the silver coinage authorized by this title, other than the silver dollar, the superintendents, with the approval of the Director of the Mint, as to price, terms, and quantity, shall purchase such bullion with the bullion fund. The gain arising from the coinage of such silver bullion into coin of a nominal value exceeding the cost thereof shall be credited to a special fund denominated the silver-profit fund. This fund shall be charged with the wastage incurred in such coinage, with the recoinage loss on silver coins recoined pursuant to section 9 of the act approved March 14, 1900, chapter 41 (31 Stat. 48), as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 31, sec. 320), and with the cost of distributing silver coins. The balance remaining to the credit of this fund shall be from time to time, and at least twice a year, covered into the Treasury of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7302) to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

PAUL HIGH HORSE AND ANNA HIGH HORSE

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2919) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out all after "acres" over to and including "purchase" in line 5 on page 2.

Page 2, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of Indians of the Rosebud Reservation of South Dakota or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the said Rosebud Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the register of deeds of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so merely for the purpose of having the gentleman from Oklahoma make an explanation of the effect of the amendments.

Mr. MORRIS. I shall be glad to explain the matter.

This is merely an effort to perfect record title where preference to members of an Indian tribe or to the tribe itself to purchase land is given where a patent in fee is granted and an Indian is permitted to sell his land. We have all agreed that the tribe involved, or its members, should have first preference in buying the land, if they so desire.

We in the Public Lands Committee of the House first put in all these bills a somewhat similar provision reading as follows, in this particular bill:

Provided, That when the land herein described is offered for sale the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of Indians or Rosebud Reservation of South Dakota, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase.

Objection was made when the bill went to the other body that there would be nothing on the record to show a title examiner whether or not that preference had been exercised, and especially whether or not some person who was not a member of the tribe, or the tribe itself, had exercised the right to purchase. So this amendment is designed to show on the face of the record who purchased the land and whether or not this preferential right or a legal exception to it has been complied with.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand several bills of a similar nature will be called up by the gentleman from Oklahoma and I may state for the information of the membership that the same provision is found in all of them and the same situation applies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

B. M. (BUD) PHELPS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5609) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "quarter" where it appears the second time insert "and the."

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after "acres" down to and including "purchase" in line 6.

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMMA PHELPS GLENN

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5610) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out all after "less" down to and including "purchase" in line 8.

Page 2, after line 8, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES M. PHELPS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5611) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out all after "acres" down to and including "purchase" in line 13.

Page 2, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if this is the same situation as in the first bill?

Mr. MORRIS. Exactly the same; these all deal with the same proposition.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK PHELPS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5860) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "authorized", insert "and directed."

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "to a Crow Indian, or to the Crow Tribe."

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out ", the status of such land with respect to taxability to remain unchanged."

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

"(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The Superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was on objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT OF MONEYS OF SENECA INDIANS (NEW YORK)

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4942) to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys realized from leases made by the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all moneys of the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York realized from existing leases, or leases that may hereafter be made, of lands within the Cattaraugus, Allegany, and Oil Springs Reservations shall be paid to and recoverable by the treasurer of the Seneca Nation of Indians for and in the name of the Seneca Nation of Indians: *Provided*, That the city of Salamanca may, if authorized by the laws of the State of New York, pay to the treasurer of the Seneca Nation all moneys payable on leases within the city of Salamanca on behalf of the owners of such leases.

SEC. 2. From the money so received, the treasurer of the Seneca Nation shall, annually on the first Monday in June, deduct and set aside .. sum not to exceed $5,000 for disposal of the council of the Seneca Nation, and distribute the balance among the enrolled members of the Seneca Nation on a per capita basis.

SEC. 3. The treasurer of the Seneca Nation shall give bond to the Seneca Nation, conditioned upon his faithful performance of the duties herein imposed, in such sum as may be approved by the Comptroller of the State of New York, and he shall, annually on the first Monday in July, make a report to the comptroller showing the receipts and disbursements of all moneys received by him under authority of this act.

SEC. 4. In addition to the authority now conferred by law on the Seneca Nation of Indans to lease lands within the Cattaraugus, Allegany, and Oil Springs Reservations to railroads and to lease lands within the limits of the villages established under authority of the act of February 19, 1875 (18 Stat. 330), the Seneca Nation of Indians, through its council, is authorized to lease lands within

the Cattaraugus, Allegany, and Oil Springs Reservations, outside the limits of such villages, for such purposes and such periods as may be permitted by the laws of the State of New York.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion to transfer to the State of New York, or any agency thereof, or to the proper officials of the several tribes any of the official records affecting the Indians of New York State.

SEC. 6. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I shall read a very short excerpt from the report of the Committee on Public Lands in regard to this bill which will probably make it clearer than any statement I might make at this time. The excerpt to which I wish to call attention is as follows:

The over-all purpose of H. R. 4942 is to permit the Seneca Nation to take over the functions now being carried on by the United States and to make it possible for the United States to withdraw from certain operations which it is now carrying on. The Indian Bureau has been maintaining an agency primarily for the collection and distribution of cash funds. This legislation would make the closing of the agency possible at an early date. The agency cannot be closed until these responsibilities can be taken over by the Seneca Nation, State of New York, and the city of Salamanca. The ground on which the city of Salamanca (a town of about 10,000) is built is on the property belonging to the Seneca Nation and leaseholders have been paying rent to said nation.

In other words, this takes the Bureau of Indian Affairs out of the picture, and the expense entailed by reason of its being there, and permits these rental payments to be made directly to the Indian nation or tribe. I cannot see any reason in the world why this bill should not pass because it is an economy move and in addition to being for economy it is a move in the general direction in which we all want to move, and that is in the direction of eventually assimilating all of the good Indian people in our country into our society so that they will no longer be wards of the Government. In other words, it is a move in the general direction that I think this Congress wants to move. I cannot see how the Indians will be injured in any way. Certainly it gives them more autonomy and self-government and it prevents the funds from being paid into the United States Treasury with a lot of red tape ensuing. It provides that the funds be paid directly to their treasurer, and then of course to them on a per capita basis.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Does this tribe of Indians presently have control over its tribal funds?

Mr. MORRIS. No, not entirely; they do not. They now, of course, are subject to the rules and regulations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This money is now paid into the United States Treasury and has to go in a roundabout way to get back to them. Under this bill the money would go directly to them.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. In fact, under this legislation, the Indians will have much better protection than they have now because they are assured of getting all their rent, because the city guarantees that payment.

Mr. MORRIS. It seems to me that that is true. I might make this final statement, that there has been some objection raised, but why some object I cannot understand, and I certainly believe it will be to the best interest of our society, to the best interest of the people of the city of Salamanca, and I believe it certainly will be to the best interest of the Indians, and I surely can see no reason in the world why this bill should not become law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can find the words to express how earnestly I feel about what has thus far taken place on the floor of this House during the reading of this omnibus appropriations bill.

Maybe I am too much an idealist, and maybe I take this job of representing the people much too seriously. But I confess great disappointment and utter discouragement over the apparent unconcern for the welfare of the country as a whole in the action taken on this very important measure.

For 3 weeks we have been considering this bill. In a bill appropriating around $29,000,000,000 and embodying hundreds of items, surely there are many places where reductions can be made without impairing a single essential function of government. I firmly believe this. But instead of effecting any economies the proposed expenditures have been increased by around $70,000,000.

This is May Day, and we are certainly giving the Communists reason to celebrate. They confidently expect to take over when our economy collapses from the weight of debt and taxes through continued reckless spending. They cheer as they watch us weaken our first line of defense by undermining our financial stability.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are deeply distressed. They have reason to be. They want to know—and I think the people should know—who is responsible for this shameful performance we have witnessed these past weeks in dealing with our country's financial stability.

I have been constant in attendance since this bill has been brought before us. As accurately as circumstances would permit, I have kept a running record of pencil notes of each and every amendment, and each and every vote. To say that I am keenly disappointed over the lack of assistance we have received from our Democrat friends on the other side of the aisle in our efforts to effect some economies is to put it mildly. I am really amazed and astounded.

Thus far in the reading of the bill not a single amendment—no, not one—has been offered from the Democrat side to reduce any of the hundreds of items embodied in the bill.

Not including amendments ruled out of points of order or where no dollar estimate could be made of the savings, the Republican side of the aisle has offered 18 amendments to reduce the spending items. Only three have been adopted, but the savings they will effectuate amount to little more than two and one-half million dollars. Approximately $80,000,000 would be saved by the 15 other amendments that were rejected.

I have carefully observed the teller votes. Some of our friends on the Democrat side of the aisle will themselves be amazed and astounded when I tell you there has been an average of only five Democrats who voted for these reduction amendments we have offered. It is thus understandable why after 3 weeks work we have increased rather than decreased the amount to be appropriated.

I do not know what I might say to prevail upon this House to stop this steady march into national bankruptcy. I do not know what appeal I might make to cause our Democrat friends in the majority to join with us in making every possible economy. Nonetheless, as futile as it may presently seem, I do make this appeal, and I make it as earnestly and sincerely as I know how.

Surely the leaders on the other side of the aisle recognize the gravity of the situation. The existing uncertainties internationally make it apparent that we may be called upon to make some extraordinary expenditures not presently forseeable. Since this bill has been reported the Appropriations Committee has already voted to add $350,000,000 for national defense purposes.

Our first line of defense is our own economic stability. I ask our friends on the other side of the aisle with 90 majority to join with us on this side of the aisle in making the necessary sacrifices to make that defense impregnable.

I sincerely hope that as we continue with this bill we will have more than an average of five Democrat votes on amendments to reduce items of expenditure that are unnecessary or at least can be postponed.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am against the passage of H. R. 4942, because

it is a bill to gouge further and not to help the Seneca Indians residing on reservations in New York State. I say this in spite of the claims to the contrary of any persons great or small.

I have not taken my past verbal stance in this matter or my present position of opposition against this bill, because of the doings or sayings of any lobbyist, but because this legislation is just dead wrong as far as the real welfare of the Seneca Indians is concerned.

This is a truly bad bill dressed up for Little Red Riding Hood Congressmen in supergrandma style, by experienced old legislative property-room technicians, in all of the alluring and appealing habiliments of economy so as the better to hide its true money-grabbing appearance and its most unworthy purposes. At the last session of Congress, on October 17, 1949, H. R. 4942 was stricken from the consent calendar by the objection of a number of House Members, including myself, after it had been placed on the Consent Calendar by the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

The impression was current then, as it now is, that the bill had unanimous approval of the Seneca Indians when that was not the fact.

At that time I pointed out to the Members of the House that this bill, contrary to having the approval of the Seneca Indians, always had their unanimous disapproval. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] knows of the disapproval of the Seneca Indians to this bill since their reservations lie within his congressional district.

Today I received the following telegram from the people's committee of the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York State:

The people's committee of the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York wishes to go on record as being opposed to the passage of H. R. 4942. Documents filed with your committee show that 98 percent of the members of the Nation voting to express their opinion on the bill are opposed to it. The people's committee voice the expressions of the members of the Nation in opposition to H. R. 4942. (Each member of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs has been sent a similar telegram.)

I received also today a copy of the following letter sent to the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs by Mrs. Genevieve R. Plummer, general chairman of the people's committee, Seneca Nation of Indians of New York:

On many occasions, both directly and through counsel, the people of the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, through the peoples committee and otherwise, have expressed their wholehearted disapproval of H. R. 4942. The records of your committee will disclose that 98 percent of the members voting on a referendum signified disapproval specifically of that bill.

H. R. 4942 comes up for consideration by the Members on Monday, May 1. Once again the people of the Seneca Nation desire to go on record with your committee in opposition to this bill which is so inimical to their best interests. The record is replete with reasons for our objections, not the least of them being the further stripping of the Indians of their property rights intended to be secured by treaties and supported by judicial decisions and acts of Congress with which you are familiar.

To ignore the Indians' interests by attempting to force H. R. 4942 upon the Seneca, which bill deals solely with their property rights, is in direct violation of existing treaties and contrary to the spirit of existing congressional legislation which was intended to secure approbation of and participation in legislative acts dealing with property rights of Indians.

The peoples committee of the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, speaking for 98 percent of the Indians on this matter, forcibly call to the attention of your committee their disavowal of participation in H. R. 4942 and signify their repudiation of this bill.

The peoples committee respectfully request, in all fairness to the Seneca Indians, that when this bill is brought before the Members of Congress on May 1, 1950, the committee publicly proclaim to the Members of Congress the objection of the Seneca Indians to this measure.

The most unfortunate part about the whole matter is that these Indians, the owners of the lands, cannot vote, and the people of Salamanca, N. Y., the tenants renting the lands, can and do vote.

The advantages of this bill accrue solely to the city of Salamanca, N. Y., and not to the Seneca Indians who own the land.

In the interest of justice I again desire to point out to the Members of Congress that the Committee on Public Lands and the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs have in their files the most strenuous objections to this legislation by 98 percent of the members of the Seneca Nation who voted at a referendum to signify their approval or disapproval of this legislation. Bear in mind, that 98 percent of the people whose property rights are affected by this bill are opposed to it. It has been claimed that the only Indians against this bill are a few disturbers, but the contrary is true really, as the only Indians for this bill are a few grasping disturbers who have been catered to by the city of Salamanca, N. Y., and some of its scheming citizenry.

I think we should pause, gentlemen, to consider this matter fully before rushing it through as law under suspension of the rules where it will be practically unnoticed and unconsidered.

Consider for the moment, gentlemen, that the city of Salamanca, N. Y., is completely within the confines of the Seneca Reservation. The land is owned by the Indians and their complete and absolute rights to it have been assured by treaties with the United States.

From a historical standpoint it might be well to know that by an act of Congress passed on September 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 558) the Congress of the United States recognized the validity of the previous leases on Seneca lands for terms not to exceed 99 years. This was done in order to secure the validity of leases to white men who had settled previously upon the leased lands. Subsequently, many of the white settlers refused to pay their lease money to the Indians and the Congress of the United States then recognizing the equities involved, passed the Ryan Act in 1901 (31 Stat. 819). This act created an Indian agent whose responsibility it was to collect the rental moneys on behalf of the Indians, because of the inability of the Indians, through the courts and otherwise, to collect the moneys which were due and owing to them, and yet, all of these white settlers were in possession of the Indian lands under what was purported to be a valid lease by virtue of the previous act of Congress passed in 1890.

A few years ago, in 1942, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, in the case of *U. S.* v. *Forness* (125 Fed. 2d 928) reaffirmed the rights of the Seneca Indians to collect rentals to and renegotiate leases on properties belonging to them solely by virtue of the old treaties existing between the United States of America and themselves.

This decision is very embarrassing, however, to those white settlers and others who desire to strip from the Seneca Indians all proper exercise of their property rights, so that they might profit from a use of the leased lands without payment of rentals or adequate rentals to the Indians. That is why we now have H. R. 4942, which under the guise of giving a benefit to the Indian, in fact completely strips the Seneca Indians of all real treaty authority over their properties which include the city of Salamanca, N. Y. How does it do this, you might ask? It does this by telling the city of Salamanca, N. Y., that it shall have control of the collection of the lease moneys owing to the lessors. Did you ever previously hear of a sort of a superlessee collecting the rentals from the leaseholders for the lessors? This action can have but one effect and that is the complete bypassing of the Seneca Indians' equity in the properties involved. It goes without saying that promise after promise to the Indians have been violated by the white man and now the Seneca Indians have very little confidence in the polite phrases and stated intentions of the people of Salamanca, N. Y., and the State of New York.

When the United States Government validated these leases with the Indians in order to protect the white settlers thereunder, it incurred the responsibility at the same time of seeing that the Indians were protected also in their property rights with respect to these same leases. We cannot, gentlemen, disencumber ourselves of this responsibility without making sure that the Indians have the same protection under any new set-up which they are to operate under.

But, an examination of H. R. 4942 discloses that there is nothing in that bill which guarantees to the Indian that the city of Salamanca, N. Y., must protect the rights of the Seneca Indians to their property. Rather the bill does strip the Indians of their treaty rights, giving the power to exercise control over their properties to certain civil authorities of the city of Salamanaca, N. Y., and then it tells the Indians that if they suffer any wrong thereunder they must go to those same civil authorities and seek redress. Is this honest? Is this fair? Of course, it is not. This is the type of an

abuse of the American Indians which has caused the Government of the United States to be severely criticized as being unfair. It follows the time-honored pattern of our treatment of the American Indians: First, make a firm and solemn treaty before God to carry out the honorable intentions and purposes of the agreement; second, take over the administration of the property of the Indians under the guise of helpfulness; and, third, take over the property and liberate the Indians. These same tactics have a particularly bad odor today when we view their application elsewhere.

It was said previously by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] that turning over the control and management of the properties to the city of Salamanca, N. Y., would relieve the United States Government of the responsibility for maintaining its Indian agent at Buffalo, N. Y. Yes, it would do that. It would relieve the United States Government also from any responsibility with respect to the satisfactory maintenance of its obligations under its treaty with the Seneca Indians to see that they were not abused in their property rights. I ask you, gentlemen, what is wrong with the maintenance of an Indian agent in Buffalo, N. Y., to see that the responsibilities of the United States are carried out satisfactorily? I repeat that when the United States in 1890 made secure the white man and the people of the city of Salamanca in their property rights under leases which the United States Government negotiated with the Seneca Indians they, at the same time, assured to these Indians equal protection of their property rights under the existing treaties.

My worthy colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], says that it would save the United States of America $15,000 or more a year. That is no valid excuse for ignoring treaty and other rights. It would save the United States also many millions of dollars not to further employ its other help including Congressmen, but that is not the over-all controlling thing. It would also save the United States Government millions of dollars to call off its law-enforcement programs but that economy measure would also be ill-advised.

To attempt to abrogate these treaties with the Seneca Nation, by this type of "back-door" legislation, over the strenuous objection of the Seneca Indians, would be a real discredit to the honesty and integrity of the United States and its peoples.

Let me say in conclusion that no good will ever come to the Seneca Indians out of the passage of this legislation and 98 percent of them are well aware of that fact.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 144]

Abbitt	Goodwin	Nixon
Addonizio	Grant	Noland
Andrews	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Gwinn	O'Neill
Battle	Hall, Leonard W.	Patterson
Beall	Halleck	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bennett, Fla.	Hand	Phillips, Tenn.
Biemiller	Harden	Plumley
Boggs, La.	Hart	Powell
Bolling	Harvey	Price
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Quinn
Breen	Hinshaw	Rains
Buchanan	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes
Buckley, N. Y.	Holifield	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Rodino
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Rogers, Fla.
Canfield	James	Roosevelt
Cannon	Javits	Sadlak
Carlyle	Jenkins	Sadowski
Carroll	Jones, Ala.	Scott, Hardie
Cavalcante	Jones, N. C.	Smathers
Chatham	Kearns	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield	Kelley, Pa.	Staggers
Chudoff	Keogh	Stanley
Cooley	Kilburn	Steed
Corbett	King	Taylor
Coudert	Kirwan	Teague
Crook	Kruse	Towe
Crosser	Kunkel	Velde
Davenport	Lichtenwalter	Wadsworth
Davies, N. Y.	Lyle	Walsh
Davis, Tenn.	McCarthy	Weichel
Dawson	McCulloch	Wheeler
Deane	McGrath	Whitaker
DeGraffenried	McGregor	White, Calif.
Denton	McMillen, Ill.	White, Idaho
Dingell	McSweeney	Widnall
Doughton	Madden	Wigglesworth
Douglas	Mahon	Willis
Elliott	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Miles	Woodhouse
Fenton	Miller, Md.	Woodruff
Gamble	Miller, Nebr.	Young
Gary	Morgan	
Gilmer		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 298 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT OF MONEYS OF SENECA INDIANS (NEW YORK)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply want to say that my purpose in calling the quorum did not indicate any opposition to the bill; in fact, I favor the gentleman's bill. My purpose in calling this quorum is to delay the bringing up of a bill which is discriminatory to the Negro people in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious that you should give me close attention, because there has been one speech made here in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor of representing 2,740 Seneca Indians for a period of 32 years, and I flatter myself that I have represented them well, and I think that the Seneca Nation believes that I have done so. Of course, there are always disturbers in every group of people. But, the constituted authorities are for this bill, H. R. 4942.

Now, this is a unique situation. The city of Salamanca, a city of 10,000 people, stands on Indian land, and it had its beginning in this way: When the railroads were proceeding westward they passed over this part of the Indian land, and it then became a terminus, for the time being, in which the men who worked for the railroads had to live somewhere, and they built their huts and houses and squatted on the Indian land. A little later they paid on short leases. Later on they paid on longer leases under acts of Congress, and finally in 1890 an act was passed which authorized them to enter into 99-year leases.

A beautiful city has grown up there with its schools, its hospitals, its stores, and everything that goes to make a fine, well-rounded, beautiful city. Now then, for years New York State has really supported the Indians. The Indians would have starved to death had they had to depend on what they received from the Federal Government. During the period of the last 39 years all that the Federal Government has contributed has been a little over $300,000. The State of New York during that same period has contributed to the welfare of the Indians to the extent of over $15,000,000. They have contributed during that time over $8,000,000 to the cause of education. The Seneca Indians, through the generosity of the State of New York and the generosity of the citizens of Salamanca and elsewhere, have the finest schools that you can imagine. The Thomas Indian School on the Seneca reservation is a better school than my children ever attended, until they went to college. Perfect harmony exists between the Seneca Indians, the constituted authorities, and the citizens of Salamanca.

I am the author of this bill. The purpose of it is to save money and do justice to the Indians. At the present time the Federal Government keeps an Indian Agency there to collect the 99-year-lease rents, totaling annually $12,000 or $13,000. This costs the Federal Government for three employees and has cost over a period of years that amount of money plus the bookkeeping of the Treasury and the distribution of the funds per capita to the Indians themselves. That has made the cost run over $20,000 for the purpose of collecting $12,000 or $13,000 in rents.

The Indian Bureau is in favor of this bill. The Committee on Public Lands has been unanimously in favor of the bill. What does it do? It provides that the government of the city of Salamanca, when it sends out its tax bills, will include the amount of money due as rental. The city government will collect it, but in the meantime they will pay that full amount to the Indians in a lump sum, taking all the chances in collecting the rents. This sum is turned over to the treasurer of the Seneca Nation, who gives them a bond that he will

faithfully discharge his duties of his office and distribute this money to the regular members of the Seneca Nation per capita.

This is a just bill. I presume many of you fail to realize that the Seneca Nation is an incorporated nation. They have their own government, their own president, their own legislative group. They have every phase of our Government. They have their marshal and their peacemakers' courts. They, the president and the council, are in favor of this bill.

Why is there opposition to the bill? There has been a very active lobbyist working around here for some time. What has he done? There are some Indians that have been eating out of the public crib here, and some other malcontents who have always tried to upset the constituted authorities of the Seneca Nation. I could read to you what the president of the nation has to say about that. This lobbyist has worked on individuals, has misled them as to the facts, and has poisoned their minds. I say to you again, this is a just bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The effect of this bill will be to save the taxpayers of the United States $20,000, and pay this $12,000 to $13,000 over to the Indians?

Mr. REED of New York. The collection of it is guaranteed by the city itself, so that in every respect it is a just bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the gentleman say the United States Government had contributed to the welfare and education of the Indians on that reservation approximately $70,000,000?

Mr. REED of New York. No; I did not. It never has contributed that amount.

Mr. STEFAN. How much has it contributed?

Mr. REED of New York. I said it has contributed a little over $300,000 over a period of 39 years.

Mr. STEFAN. How much will this bill amount to?

Mr. REED of New York. This does not amount to anything.

Mr. STEFAN. I mean, as to the payment to these Indians.

Mr. REED of New York. It is $12,000 in rentals; that is all.

Mr. STEFAN. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that when you start settling this up the Government will charge offsets to anything you are trying to give the Indians.

Mr. REED of New York. I cannot help what the Government does.

Mr. STEFAN. We have approximately a billion dollars worth of Indian claims in the Court of Claims. When the offsets are figured in very little will be left for the Indians. I think the gentleman's bill is meritorious.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. As a member of the Committee on Public Lands, may I say that I sat with other members of the committee in a joint meeting with the Senate. We heard all sides of that discussion and came to the conclusion, at least some of us did, that the opposition was largely instigated by overzealous lawyers who wanted to collect a fee to which they were not entitled.

Mr. REED of New York. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I understand the bill correctly, it simply does two things. First, it takes off the backs of the Seneca Nation a pay roll of $20,000 for Federal employees and permits the State of New York and the city of Salamanca to do the distributing; and secondly, it provides that the comptroller of the State of New York shall audit all the accounts in order to be certain that they are kept in the proper order.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is perfectly correct. The salaries of these three employees to collect these rentals is $12,500. But they told me over the telephone at the Indian Bureau, after all the bookkeeping expenses and going through the accounts and so forth, it amounts to double that amount.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It amounts to $20,000.

Mr. REED of New York. He used the words "double the amount."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. It occurs to me that this bill is an advantage to the Indians, in that it requires the city of Salamanca to be the payor to the Indians of the leasehold interests or rents rather than for the Indians to look to the individual property users.

Mr. REED of New York. There is no question about that. The city guarantees in a lump sum the total amount of rentals from the leases in that city. There is no question about that at all.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Has any amendment been made to the original bill in regard to putting the collectors under bond?

Mr. REED of New York. Oh, yes. Everything is under bond. The treasurer is under bond approved by the comptroller of the State of New York.

Mr. BURDICK. That was the objection that I received from the Indians, that they were afraid to trust the audit.

Mr. REED of New York. May I say that they ought to trust the State of New York which, during the last 24 years, has appropriated and spent for Indian welfare each year more than the total contribution of the Federal Government during the entire 39 years.

Expenditures by the State of New York for Indian welfare for fiscal years ending 1911 to 1930

Fiscal years ending June 30—	Indian agents and attorneys	Thomas Indian School	Educational		Social welfare		Highways and bridges		Annual total
			Reservation schools	Agricultural extension work	Medical and nursing	Maintenance of Indian poor	Maintenance and repair	New construction	
1911	$1,095.90	$41,022.37	$12,031.00		$300	$3,877.83	$87,750.00	$68,705.90	$146,077.10
1912	1,095.90	44,674.42	10,046.29		300	2,184.57	59,182.00		186,189.08
1913	1,095.90	55,082.86	15,557.13		300	1,711.07	76,655.00		150,401.96
1914	1,095.90	46,001.47	16,000.00		300	6,854.55	40,000.00	134,394.28	244,646.20
1915	1,095.90	47,896.95	29,000.00		1,200	5,509.31	40,495.66	53,765.34	178,693.16
1916	1,095.90	45,969.28	17,795.74		1,200	5,664.23	40,814.56	72,637.02	185,176.73
1917	1,095.90	66,641.69	18,000.00		1,200	8,862.50	51,388.35		147,188.44
1918	1,095.90	70,318.45	22,900.00		1,200	8,348.39	62,364.53		166,227.27
1919	1,095.90	74,879.06	21,945.00		1,200	7,823.92	82,164.74		189,108.62
1920	1,095.90	107,386.08	23,465.00		1,200	6,192.36	62,341.36		201,680.70
1921	1,095.90	110,514.63	27,625.00	$10,000	6,100	8,028.35	63,626.71	140,028.04	367,018.63
1922	1,095.90	103,030.20	28,625.00	6,000	6,100	6,543.21	66,671.26	468,253.77	685,719.34
1923	1,095.90	95,868.44	40,875.00	6,000	6,300	10,723.82	119,483.95		280,347.11
1924	1,095.90	103,571.16	41,700.00	6,000	6,300	12,461.35	65,340.49		239,468.90
1925	1,095.90	116,059.05	39,500.00	6,000	6,300	15,835.77	104,735.93		289,526.66
1926	1,095.90	122,666.30	42,000.00	6,000	6,300	19,210.94	81,337.39		278,610.53
1927	1,095.90	137,188.00	49,400.00	6,000	6,300	22,239.86	109,825.03		332,048.06
1928	1,095.90	126,863.00	51,400.00	6,000	6,500	27,043.64	71,932.04	322,563.48	613,398.06
1929	1,095.90	130,170.30	58,875.00	6,000	6,500	31,282.70	79,168.97	120,128.50	433,221.37
1930	1,095.90	201,176.00	59,875.00	8,000	6,500	43,000.00	80,000.00		399,646.90
Total	21,918.00	1,849,979.72	626,615.16	66,000	71,000	253,398.37	1,444,677.97	1,380,476.33	5,714,665.55

Expenditures by the State of New York for Indian welfare for fiscal years ending 1931–50

Fiscal years ending—	Thomas Indian School	Educational purposes	Attorneys, agents, etc.	Maintenance of Indian poor [1]	Capital improvements, repairs, etc.	Annual total
June 30, 1931	$195,220.00	$55,941.47	$6,042.72	$72,705.28	$39,138.94	$369,048.41
June 30, 1932	172,674.67	65,523.59	35,198.20	94,806.81	8,902.26	377,105.53
June 30, 1933	178,354.94	74,151.88	13,450.75	112,495.93	17,807.18	396,260.68
June 30, 1934	141,246.30	77,720.73	27,724.15	92,951.08	10,549.08	350,191.34
June 30, 1935	151,710.28	78,298.59	21,732.91	100,828.00	2,100.25	354,670.03
June 30, 1936	146,039.99	82,724.65	19,419.25	113,728.00	64,805.34	426,717.23
June 30, 1937	153,807.91	80,068.05	28,956.98	107,909.00	69,514.51	440,256.45
June 30, 1938	170,379.43	86,359.15	15,885.72	91,292.00	65,218.03	429,134.33
June 30, 1939	198,413.59	88,559.23	20,409.37	90,577.00	40,076.01	438,035.20
June 30, 1940	170,320.13	88,321.37	29,160.79	139,962.00	61,804.05	489,568.34
June 30, 1941	169,183.41	98,038.58	23,062.88	112,238.00	25,242.90	427,765.77
June 30, 1942	177,111.00	103,719.47	24,009.90	105,150.00	6,458.06	416,448.52
June 30, 1943 [2]	133,787.60	79,239.67	15,356.67	[3] 81,184.00	139.83	309,707.77
June 30, 1944	174,524.68	74,643.59	21,392.00	90,371.00	79.01	361,010.28
June 30, 1945	223,666.63	122,282.51	20,434.57	89,344.00	----------	455,727.71
June 30, 1946	231,186.81	147,372.44	21,087.79	88,314.00	7,449.05	495,410.09
June 30, 1947	259,387.89	171,196.90	20,804.56	111,104.00	18,897.61	581,390.96
June 30, 1948	322,367.11	211,481.06	20,482.10	137,642.00	3,419.50	695,391.77
June 30, 1949	368,697.94	269,222.27	20,262.31	181,694.00	3,635.82	843,512.34
June 30, 1950	369,623.04	349,961.07	19,850.73	[3] 235,603.00	22,157.75	997,195.59
Total	4,107,703.44	2,404,826.27	424,724.35	2,249,899.10	467,395.18	9,654,548.34

[1] Figures furnished by department of social welfare.
[2] Covers 9 months only due to change in fiscal year.
[3] Received from department of social welfare and includes estimated expenditures for March 1950.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 145]

Addonizio	Gwinn	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Hall,	O'Neill
Andrews	Leonard W.	Pace
Battle	Halleck	Patterson
Beall	Hand	Pfeifer,
Bennett, Fla.	Harden	Joseph L.
Biemiller	Hart	Pfeiffer,
Boggs, La.	Harvey	William L.
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Phillips, Tenn.
Boykin	Hinshaw	Powell
Buchanan	Hoffman, Ill.	Price
Buckley, N. Y.	Holifield	Quinn
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Rains
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	James	Rhodes
Cannon	Javits	Richards
Carlyle	Jenkins	Rodino
Carroll	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Cavalcante	Jones, N. C.	Roosevelt
Chatham	Kearns	Sadlak
Chiperfield	Kelley, Pa.	Sadowski
Cooley	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Corbett	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kilburn	Smathers
Crook	King	Smith, Ohio
Crosser	Kirwan	Staggers
Davenport	Kruse	Stanley
Davies, N. Y.	Kunkel	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	Latham	Taylor
Dawson	Lichtenwalter	Teague
Deane	McCarthy	Towe
DeGraffenried	McCulloch	Velde
Denton	McGrath	Wadsworth
Dingell	McGregor	Walsh
Doughton	McMillen, Ill.	Weichel
Douglas	McSweeney	Wheeler
Elliott	Madden	Whitaker
Feighan	Mahon	White, Calif.
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Wickersham
Fulton	Miles	Widnall
Gamble	Miller, Md.	Wigglesworth
Gary	Miller, Nebr.	Willis
Gilmer	Morgan	Wilson, Ind.
Goodwin	Morton	Woodhouse
Gossett	Nixon	Woodruff
Grant	Noland	Young
Green	Norrell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 293 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on dispensing with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 191, noes 0.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

So further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COLLECTION AND DISBURSEMENT OF MONEYS OF SENECA INDIANS (NEW YORK)

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just counted, and 227 Members were present.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7185) to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (Public Law 359, 78th Cong.), is amended (1) by inserting after "messengers," the word "apprentices" and a comma, and (2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other law, the examinations for apprentice positions shall be open competitive examinations conducted by the Civil Service Commission, and the Commission shall determine, on the basis of good administration, whether such examinations shall be conducted on a regional or Nation-wide basis."

SEC. 2. The amendments made to section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, by the first section of this act shall take effect as of March 1, 1950, and no appointment to any apprentice position shall be made on or after such date as the result of any examination held on or after such date, except an examination conducted in accordance with such section 3 as amended by this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was just about to interrogate the gentleman about that.

Is the gentleman from Kansas opposed to the bill?

Mr. REES. No, I am not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY].

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are about to consider was introduced to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

On March 10, the committee conducted a public hearing, where witnesses were almost unanimously in favor of the bill. On March 13, the bill was reported from the committee with amendments.

This bill was introduced to prevent discrimination in the hiring of a certain group of Government employees, and to enforce the civil-service laws in the procurement of such workers. It was not intended to destroy any fair-employment-practices law. It was designed to provide a means of fair and impartial procurement of Government employees.

The bill was introduced to prevent the Treasury Department from ignoring Civil Service customary practice of holding an examination for the selection of 35 apprentices as engravers and plate printers. It was proposed that the examination be open only to persons already employed by the Treasury Department. This would eliminate from competition all other citizens desiring employment.

It was to prevent this gross partiality and unfairness to all other citizens of the United States that I introduced this bill. Under the terms of the bill, the group which the Treasury Department wanted to favor, is still permitted to compete.

I cannot make myself believe that it is either right or fair to limit employment in any Government department to only those who are now enrolled in that department—even if such practice is now or ever was approved.

As a Congressman, I reserve the right to oppose the action of any executive board, whenever I believe it wrong. And in the case in question, the ruling is so patently unfair, that it requires only ability to read to discern.

The bill itself clearly shows its purpose on its face. The amended matter reads as follows:

> Provided that the examinations for apprentice shall be open to all veterans in the United States and its possessions.

I do not believe this bill needs any further argument to disclose its fairness and honesty. It is fair to every employee of every department of Government, and to every citizen of the United States. It needs no defense. It is based upon our old-age tradition of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

The gentleman from New York, commenting on this bill in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 15 said:

> This legislation is the most discriminatory legislation this House has seen—

And—

> It is an insult to every Negro veteran and believer in democracy.

Why any Negro veteran—or any other veteran or citizen, regardless of color—should believe that giving all veterans and all citizens, without regard to race, creed or color, an opportunity to compete for employment on a merit basis is discriminatory, we are not told.

Why only a small, select group of men, who by a fortuitous set of circumstances are already employed in a specific department, has a sacred and legal right to be the sole participants in such a test, we are not told. And we will not be told, because it is so patently and apparently wrong, that such practice cannot be defended.

If I wanted to be a demagogue, I could claim that the present procedure of the Treasury Department is discriminatory against Negroes. I have a constituent who has experience as an apprentice. He is a Negro. He wants to be employed by the Government. I should like to be in a position to advise him to compete for these jobs. Under present procedure, he is discriminated against, because he cannot compete for these jobs.

The bill does not discriminate against this small, select group, because this bill does not shut them out. They can still take the examination, and I wish them the best of luck. I hope that because of their qualifications, they will be high on the list of eligibles. If they are not qualified, then we should find out. That is sound, fair employment practice.

This bill was introduced not only to protect the rights of our citizens to compete for these and any other positions which might become available, but to prevent this department of Government—and all other departments of Government—from setting up a practice that would make it impossible for a non-Federal employee to compete for employment except for these jobs which present employees decline to seek.

If each department is to establish its own rules and regulations governing employment, we might as well dissolve the Civil Service Commission and save its expense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, recognition to call up and pass a bill in this Democratic Party Congress depends on whether the bill is pro- or anti-FEPC. If the bill is of a pro-FEPC character, you do not get recognition. If your bill is anti-FEPC, then not only do you readily obtain recognition, but everything is greased for your anti-FEPC bill to have easy sailing, and you can count on the support of the House leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very involved situation here. What appears on the surface is something that conceals a very ugly situation. The real ugly facts concealed by the wording of this bill are very revealing of its anti-Negro objective. The situation is a rather intricate one, and, therefore, I ask the indulgence of the House to please follow me closely in this matter.

What is involved here is the employment in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving of apprentice plate engravers. Throughout the history of this particular branch of this Bureau there has not been a single apprentice or plate engraver of the Negro people. Not one. Prior to 1938 selections of apprentices were made from private industry, and because of the exclusion of Negroes from this type of work, there was no recruitment from private industry of Negro apprentices. Hence this particular branch of the Bureau remained completely a lily-white branch.

Subsequent to that time selections have been made from lists of eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission from assembled written examinations throughout the United States. From 1938 to 1950, 75 apprentice plate printers have been recruited, and not one a Negro. As a result, on July 16, 1948, a promotional examination was ordered in order to in some measure remove discrimination in the employment of Negroes as apprentice plate printers. Let me give you the terms of the promotional examination as described in the decision of the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission:

> Admittance to the promotion examination was limited to seven classifications of Bureau employees having permanent civil-service status, and within these classifications veterans of World War II under 41 years of age.

From 100 entrance applications originally accepted, 94 applicants remained. Of those, 47 were Negroes. After this examination was announced, there was an indefinite postponement of the examination announced on November 5, 1948. The Negro applicants who applied to take this promotional examination charged that the indefinite postponement was aimed at them, appealed from the decision of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury to the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission which found that there existed discrimination against Negroes in the employment of apprentice plate engravers and that the reinstatement of the examination to take place on March 15, 1950, was an encouraging step in the right direction. The examination had been ordered reinstated while the appeal was pending. The examination took place on March 15, 1950, and now this bill would vitiate the results of that examination.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does this situation apply to any other Government agency or department, or is it directed primarily and solely to certain employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is directed at this particular office. The effective date provided in the bill is March 1, 1950. This is a dead give-away, when you consider that the examination took place on March 15.

Mr. ROONEY. And the particular group of forty-some Negro war veterans?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Exactly. Even though the language is general, when

you reduce it to application, to the date when the bill goes in effect March 1, when the date the examination was held was March 15, you must agree it applies to this particular examination and to nothing else.

Now, let me repeat what happened because these events completely expose this bill for what it is; a bill to deprive Negroes of employment as apprentice plate engravers after they have won such employment by promotional examination on March 15 of this year. The men involved charged that the examination was being postponed for discriminatory reasons. They brought these charges before what is known as the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission. This Fair Employment Board was set up by the President. Its purpose was to go into situations of this character. The Fair Employment Board in effect decided that the examination should be held and that not to hold the examination constituted a discrimination in Government employment.

The Board sustained these Negro veterans who had made application to take the examination. Remember, the examination did take place. It took place on March 15 of this year; it took place despite the attempts of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], who tried to prevail upon the Civil Service Commission not to hold the examination. What is more, another group which has been interested in perpetuating this particular Bureau as a lily-white branch of the Government went into Federal court and applied for an injunction. Judge Keech denied the application, so now we have this bill.

Despite the language of the bill, which is general, it applies to this situation and to nothing else. I do not see how any member of the committee can deny, and I challenge them to deny, that this bill was drafted for the sole purpose of undoing the decision of the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission and of depriving these Negro veterans of their rights. It was introduced for that purpose; it is here for that purpose.

So what are we asked to do? We are asked here today to pass this bill and do away with the fair-employment-practice decision of the Civil Service Commission and to continue the vile discriminatory practices against Negroes who seek employment as apprentice plate engravers. That is the proposition before us. If the gentleman from Tennessee as chairman of this committee, or any other member of the committee advances any other reason for this bill he will be violating the facts and the record. This decision of the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission has been sustained all the way down the line; it has been sustained in the Federal Court and sustained by the President. The Congress is asked to do the dirty work here today of undoing it and of perpetuating a lily-white branch of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who is opposing this bill. This bill is opposed by every group that has been fighting against discrimination in employment and Government employment. The National Association for the Advance of Colored People is opposed to this bill, so are the United Public Workers. Some of you this morning, I understand—although I did not—received a communication, letter or telegram, supposed to have been sent by Mr. Green of the American Federation of Labor asking you to vote for this bill. Personally, I believe Mr. Green has been misled about the matter. I am sure that if Mr. Green sat down with representatives of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and heard their side of this question he certainly would not ask you to support this bill. I am sure that if Mr. Green read this decision which I have before me he certainly would not ask you to support this bill.

The aim of this bill is to perpetuate an un-American condition that has existed in this Bureau. I wish that you Members would read this decision. I am convinced that any Member of this House who does not believe in the racist theory of white supremacy, who believes in equality of employment, will recognize this bill for what it is and will support the decision of the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. Is it not a fact that in order to be consistent any Member of this House who voted for the FEPC legislation must vote against this particular bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This is the reverse of FEPC legislation. It is anti-FEPC legislation.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. I do not think this is the reverse of everything connected with FEPC legislation. This morning I, too, received a telegram from Mr. Green endorsing the bill. I have also received this notice: The American Federation of Labor has endorsed the bill. Certainly that has been in favor of FEPC. The Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., is in favor of the bill, and other organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The Veterans of the Spanish War are supposed to be in favor of the bill; they certainly have been in favor of FEPC. The Disabled American Veterans are supposed to be in favor of the bill; the Catholic War Veterans of the United States certainly have been in favor of FEPC and they are supposed to be in favor of the bill, as well as the AMVETS. According to my information, the only ones who are opposed to it are the United Public Workers Union and some other people.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is not true.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, that is not true. The National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People is strongly opposed to this bill, very strongly opposed to it. As far as the other organizations that the gentleman has mentioned are concerned, I venture to say, and I submit this to the gentleman in all fairness, that I extremely doubt whether any of these organizations that he has mentioned know of the decision, the opinion, and the finding of facts rendered by the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission in this case. If they knew, I refuse to believe that any of those organizations would come out on record in favor of this bill.

The gentleman has been here long enough to know that people are imposed on, that matters are misrepresented. Look at the stated purposes of the bill. It says that the purpose of it is to provide employment opportunities for veterans. Well, of course, if anybody came to the gentleman and asked for an offhand opinion he would be for it. I think that is the way they got some of these organizations to go on record. Let me say that any person who believes in the principles of FEPC cannot support this bill in the light of this decision of the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission. Has the gentleman read that decision?

Mr. LYNCH. No; I have not read the decision. Let me ask the gentleman, Has it not been his experience that the organizations which I have enumerated have in the past always given fair consideration to the questions that they have endorsed?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman raises an issue of fairness. I am not here challenging the fairness of these organizations. I say they have been imposed on and I say that any representative of any organization, no matter what organization it may be, who reads this decision and then says he is for this bill, that person does not believe in the principles of FEPC. There are no two ways about that.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOLLINGER. May I say that the gentleman is correct in his statement that this is an anti-FEPC bill and for that reason I am going to vote against it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I know that the gentleman has studied this matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Quite apart from the implications whether this is FEPC or anti-FEPC, I would like to have him or someone else explain why in section 2 of this bill it is made retroactive to March 1 and why this Congress should make it impossible for persons who have already taken civil-service examinations to qualify for appointment if this bill becomes law?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman has put his finger on the situation. The examination took place on March 15. Despite all efforts that were made to prevent the examination from taking place the promotional examination did take

place on the 15th of March. That is why they want to put the effective date of this legislation back to March 1 so as to vitiate the promotional examination which was ordered by the Secretary of the Department and ratified by the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MULTER. One other question I would like to have the gentleman answer if he can. This bill apparently makes the promotional examination for apprentice a Nation-wide examination, if the Department so desires. Does he know of any other Department in Government that has promotional examinations open to other persons who are not within the department?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not know of any. Let us not forget that by the selection system employed prior to this March 15, 1950, examination no Negro has ever been selected. As to the few Negro people who were certified as eligibles under the old system, they were passed over and the people who had lower ratings were appointed. The Negro who was qualified and eligible was not appointed. That is the finding of this Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission.

I submit that with the passage of this bill we do another dirty job in the interest of white supremacy and this is done in a Congress the majority of which was elected on civil-rights promises. Not only has this Congress done nothing for civil rights, but in this instance Congress pushes the clock backward again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that as part of my remarks I may include the decision of the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission to which I have been referring.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT BOARD,
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

Name of appellants: Earl E. Ashton, Raymond F. Cooke, Paul F. Cooper, John E. Harris, Francis E. Janifer, Thomas M. Keys, Edward L. Mitchell, Edgar Sims, Frederick Wiggins.

Department: Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

BASIS OF APPEAL

The above-named persons appealed individually to the Fair Employment Board under Executive Order 9980 from the decision of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, dated December 29, 1949, that there was no racial discrimination in connection with the postponement of a promotional examination for apprentice plate printer in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. All of the appellants had applied for, and were eligible to take the examination. The appeals were consolidated for hearing.

The appellants alleged, in substance, that in the recruitment of apprentice plate printers and plate printers by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing discrimination against Negroes has long prevailed; that the promotional examination for apprentice plate printers announced July 16, 1948, was a practical and very welcome step toward removing this discrimination; and that the indefinite postponement of the promotional examination on November 5, 1948, reerected a barrier which effectively deprives all Negroes of any opportunity to qualify for, or attain employment as, plate printers in that Bureau.

Admittance to the promotion examination was limited to seven classifications of Bureau employees having permanent civil-service status and, within these classifications, to veterans of World War II under 41 years of age. From 100 entrance applications originally accepted, 94 applicants remain. Of these, 47 are Negroes.

The announced reasons for the postponement were: (1) that 20 power plate printing presses of considerably greater potential output than the presses then in use had unexpectedly become available and had been purchased for immediate installation; (2) that a program for modernization of the presses then in use had been developed and adopted; and (3) that if those steps proved successful the plate printers requirements of the Bureau could easily be met with existing personnel, therefore making it unnecessary to appoint apprentice plate printers for an indefinite period of time.

The bulletin postponing the examination held out for the applicants only the prospect that, "If the program fails, obviously it will be necessary to revive consideration of the apprentice program."

HEARING AND INVESTIGATION

The Board held a hearing on January 30, 31, and February 1, 1950, at which the appellants, their representatives, and a representative of the Treasury Department were present. Testimony was adduced from witnesses presented by the appellants or called by the Board itself. In addition to the information secured at this hearing and from a review of the file of the Treasury Department, the Board has obtained supplemental data from the Treasury Department, the Civil Service Commission, and other sources, with particular reference to possible racial discrimination in the recruitment and employment of plate printers and apprentice plate printers in the Government service.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The position of plate printer has been clearly identifiable in the pattern of Federal employment for many decades. It is unqualifiedly subject to civil-service laws and regulations. All citizens, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin, are, therefore, entitled to an open channel toward employment as plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

2. The promotion policy of the Treasury Department, which is the only agency of the Federal Government employing plate printers, provides, in its departmental order No. 114, dated June 1, 1949, that—

"It is the policy of the Treasury Department normally to fill vacant positions above the customary recruiting levels in each bureau, office, and division by the promotion from within of qualified employees whose abilities have been demonstrated and who have the capacity to undertake more advanced work. Promotions will be based solely on merit. There will be no discrimination because of race, color, creed, or for any other reason. Preference will be given to seniority only when other qualifications are equal."

3. The number of plate printers employed throughout the country is relatively small, and the Bureau is by far the largest employer. On January 1, 1950, it had on its employment rolls 492 plate printers, a number which is more than 50 percent of the total number of this craft now in employment. Over the past 20 years the Bureau force, with some fluctuations, has grown from about 400 to nearly 500, despite improvements in equipment and technology which have increased individual-production capacity. No Negro is or ever has been employed by the Bureau as a plate printer.

4. Journeymen plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing must have had 4 years of apprenticeship, or its equivalent in practical experience. At present there are no apprentice plate printers employed in the Bureau, as the last apprentice became a journeyman this year. No Negro has ever been recruited or employed as an apprentice plate printer in the Bureau.

5. For at least 20 years prior to 1938 the Bureau met its plate printer personnel recruitment needs through appointment, on certification by the Civil Service Commission, of journeymen who had served an apprenticeship in private industry. The Civil Service Commission requires the full apprenticeship experience of 4 years, or, since 1942, its equivalent of practical experience, as a prerequisite to such certification, but the Commission in no way restricts the operating Bureau to this single channel for meeting its need for plate printers. The recruitment of journeyman plate printers solely from private industry had the effect of erecting a barrier against Negroes who might aspire to become plate printers in the Bureau, because in private industry up to this time, Negroes have not had equal opportunity to secure the requisite training.

6. Since 1938 the number of plate printers appointed in the Bureau has averaged 49, and the number of separations 46 per year. As of January 1, 1950, there were 492 plate printers on duty in the Bureau and 20 vacancies to be filled. The Director of the Bureau expects that, subject to possible fluctuation in demand for currency and stamps, the plate printer force will be stabilized at approximately 500 journeymen after the installation of new presses and the modernization of old presses have been completed.

7. For several years there has been a shortage of qualified journeyman plate printers. This shortage is reflected in the amount of overtime worked by the plate printers on duty in the Bureau. On November 29, 1949, the Civil Service Commission announced an open continuous examination for plate printer. To date, as a result of this examination, the Commission has not secured a sufficient number of eligibles to fill existing vacancies in the Bureau and to provide for the normal annual turn-over in plate printer personnel. According to the Bureau's own estimate, separations are anticipated as follows: 1950, 36; 1951, 36; 1952, 30; 1953, 34.

8. Over the 13 fiscal years, 1938 to 1950, inclusive, the Bureau has recruited 75 apprentice plate printers, and it has carried on its rolls an average of 21 such apprentices for each of those years. None has been recruited since April 15, 1946.

Of these 75 apprentices, 61 were chosen from lists of eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission from assembled written examinations, advertised and held throughout the United States, and 14 were recruited by such noncompetitive action as transfer, promotion, or reassignment. Negroes competed in these examinations and were certified as eligibles, and at the same time qualified Negroes were available for noncompetitive assignment within the Bureau as apprentice plate printers. But none of the 75 apprentices were Negroes. In at least one case a Negro eligible failed of appointment while white eligibles of lower rating on the same certificate were appointed. This Negro eligible was subsequently certified to another Government agency where he served his apprenticeship, and is now employed as a journeyman in another craft.

9. The cessation of apprentice recruiting in 1946 recreated the recruitment situation which existed prior to 1938. Negroes in considerable numbers, presently employed in the Bureau, and veterans of World War II, aspire to become plate printers. The announcement of the promotional examination in July of 1948 opened the channel for a spec-

ified group of Negroes in the Bureau, including the appellants. Continued postponement of the examination restores the exact situation which existed prior to the announcement and closes the only channel by which the Negro applicants can become plate printers in the Bureau.

DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The method of recruiting plate printers is clearly the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government and, particularly, of the officers charged with general management of the employing bureau. Generally speaking, these officers must be allowed to determine whether such recruitment shall be accomplished exclusively by recruiting journeymen or in whole or in part through an apprentice program. Such discretionary authority should, however, be exercised within the framework and in the light of the spirit and intent, as well as the letter of civil-service law and regulations and of Executive and departmental orders. If the exclusive recruitment of journeymen operates, for any reason, to deprive any group of American citizens by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, of opportunity to qualify for the civil-service position of plate printer, the recruitment policy and program should be changed.

The Fair Employment Board recognizes that the postponement of the apprentice plate-printer examination in 1948 was, at the time, an exercise of reasonable business judgment. But it concludes that any continuation of past recruitment methods and procedures as applied to plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing will inevitably involve an element of racial discrimination against Negroes, in that it will perpetuate a system which has operated effectively to bar Negro citizens from the civil-service position of plate printer in the Bureau.

The Board is gratified to learn that the Department of the Treasury has now rescheduled for March 15, 1950, the promotional examination, the indefinite postponement of which precipitated the appeal in this case. This is an encouraging step in the right direction, but is of itself insufficient treatment of the basic problem. The civil-service laws and regulations, the financial resources of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the numerical strength of the plate-printer force, and the pattern of work organization around the plate-printing press provide ample management flexibility to permit the operation of a recruiting system free from any taint of racial discrimination.

It is the recommendation of this Board that the best corrective of the existing situation will be found in the early initiation and continuous operation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of an in-service training program with respect to the plate-printing craft, related numerically to the normal turn-over in that employee classification and to the total Government and private employment in this craft. This program should be open to all qualified employees of the Bureau within these numerical limits, thus effectuating the intent of Executive Order 9980 as implemented by the Department's promotional policy announced in Departmental Order No. 114 of June 1, 1949.

By direction of the Board.

JAMES L. HOUGHTELING,
Chairman, Fair Employment Board.
FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, if this bill does not become law you might as well throw the civil-service law and rules and regulations in the ash can. What will happen if you do not pass this bill?

Every particular agency of the Government may go ahead and hold so-called closed examinations within the agency and eliminate all veterans or persons of any creed, color, or race throughout the whole country and limit the examination to employees of their own departments. How could any veteran or any colored person or anyone else get into an agency until many years too late? In other words, you are just throwing overboard the whole civil-service rules and regulations that we have passed both in this Congress and other Congresses for many years past. As a matter of fact it will also lower the quality of the people going into these jobs. For instance, you take 25 or 50 or 100 of the agency employees now taking this examination, compared to the larger number if the examination was open to the whole country, so any veteran and persons of all creeds and color could be eligible. The latter case will result in more eligibles for the jobs.

Of the 25 or so who were hired just before the war, every one of them got 100 percent in the country-wide civil-service examination. Do you think you are going to get such high grades for 25 or 50 in a little bureau taking the examination, many of them 30 to 40 years of age? Your quality will be lowered and your standard will be lowered if you adopt the policy of having a closed examination within any bureau.

Anyone who voted for FEPC should support this bill, because if you do not, you will throw open the door for discrimination and unfairness in selecting candidates for these various jobs, and you will set up a patronage king maker in any agency, and you are going to have discrimination in all Government agencies. I shall vote for this measure and ask you to do so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it the contention of the gentleman that if this bill is passed it will be fair to every creed and every race and every religion of the country?

Mr. HAGEN. Yes. The present policy throws it open to every veteran, every person, regardless of race, color, or creed, and if he qualifies and has a high enough mark he will be accepted for these jobs. Do not let the bureaucrats disturb the present situation. You must vote for this bill to give veterans and others over the whole country an opportunity to take examinations for these apprentice jobs.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misunderstanding with respect to this legislation. I regret I do not have sufficient time to explain the legislation as I see it. Discrimination has been mentioned. Without the approval of this bill there is likelihood, in my judgment, that you will have more discrimination than without the approval of this bill. It is unfortunate that the bill comes to the floor of the House because of a situation in a bureau in one of our agencies. The Civil Service Commission gave its approval to a policy of conducting an examination, not upon a Nation-wide basis, or a regional basis, or even an agency basis, but only within the Bureau itself.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I will, if the gentleman will give me more time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that before a promotional examination or any examination of any kind, before any such examination can be held by the Department it must have the approval of the Civil Service Commission; is that not correct?

Mr. REES. I will explain that in a moment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is that not so?

Mr. REES. If an agency wanted to promote these employees they could do so without an examination at all. All they would have to do is to secure the approval of the Civil Service Commission. Does that answer the question?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. REES. That takes care of the question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My question is this: This examination or any other examination has to have the approval of the Civil Service Commission; is that not correct?

Mr. REES. That is correct. All in the world the agency needed to do was to secure the approval of the Civil Service Commission. If the Commission saw fit to approve the promotions, then it could be done without examination, but I insist that if examinations are to be given that they should not be narrowed down to one bureau in an agency. Such would not be fair to other people who might qualify, including veterans. In fact, it would be a violation of the intent and spirit of the Veterans' Preference Act.

You can see that with this kind of legislation colored people, whether veterans or not, could easily be discriminated against in other agencies. I regret, as you do, that this particular legislation may affect one group of people, but you must remember they would still have the same right as anyone else to compete in examinations for these jobs, and if qualified they would certainly be entitled to have the jobs. If there are people in authority in such agencies who refuse to let them have the jobs for which they qualify, then such action would be violation of the intent of civil-service law, and persons who caused such violation should be dealt with by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I find in the report that the Commission had no authority to deny the Treasury Department such prerogatives.

Mr. REES. That is what the Commission claims. It is just in reverse from what the gentleman from New York has said, that is, if the Bureau requested that this examination be held, then, if they did hold it, they would have to have the approval of the Civil Service Commission. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

All in the world we are doing here is to take care of and correct a situation that has been brought to our attention by reason of the action of the Bureau of Printing and Engraving which is only a part of one agency. I am not saying that there might not be discrimination against individuals in this department, but it is not right, as a matter of principle to narrow the opportunity to take the examination down to one comparatively small bureau of Government. If there is discrimination as alleged by the gentleman from New York then the fault is with the Agency or the Commission.

H. R. 7185 proposes to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to add the position of "apprentice" to those positions now restricted to veterans for appointment in the Federal service.

Section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act provides that the positions of guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians shall be reserved for veterans. This bill merely adds the position of "apprentice."

Under the provisions of the bill, the Civil Service Commission may determine whether an examination for the position of apprentice in the Government shall be conducted on a regional or Nation-wide basis, whichever is in the interest of good administration.

The problem to which the bill addresses itself is the fact that on March 15, 1950, the Treasury Department held a so-called promotional examination for the position of apprentice plate printer and restricted applicants for such examination to certain employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, thus excluding all other veterans. During the hearings on H. R. 7185, it was developed that the annual salary of an apprentice plate printer is $2,059.20. All of the 97 employees who took the examination are now receiving in excess of $2,433.60. Over 25 percent are receiving between $3,000 and $4,000 annually, 10 percent are receiving salaries above $4,000 a year and over 50 percent are receiving $2,745.60. Under the circumstances, the committee could not understand how the examination could be construed as a promotional examination.

For some time I have been concerned about the delegation of authority from the Civil Service Commission to departments and agencies to conduct all phases of personnel administration, particularly the conduct of examinations for appointment to Federal positions. I am in accord with the views of the committee that this procedure of the Treasury Department establishes a dangerous precedent because it would lead the way to administrative practices in other departments and agencies designed to by-pass open competitive examinations for the selection of Federal employees.

I believe that the executive departments and agencies should adopt a progressive promotional policy within their respective departments and agencies, but not at the expense of well-qualified applicants who are outside the Federal service and who desire consideration for Federal positions.

I have received a telegram from the president of the American Federation of Labor, the Honorable William Green, who states his unqualified endorsement of this legislation as well as that of the American Federation of Labor. All of the veterans organizations unanimously endorsed this bill, as well as the Government Employees' Council of the American Federation of Labor, representing the Federal employee organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

I believe this legislation is fair and equitable. I see no cause for objection that examinations for the position of apprentice be open competitive examinations restricted to veterans. The Government has encouraged an apprentice training program for veterans all over the United States and this is one way in which the Federal Government can give encouragement to the employment of veterans qualified for the position of apprentice.

My colleague who has preceded me indicates that the purpose of this legislation is solely to prevent certain employees at the Bureau of Engraving from receiving a promotion. In the first place, of the 97 employees involved, practically all of them are receiving more than the entrance salary for apprentices, and most of them have received promotions in their own field within the Bureau of Engraving.

The gentleman has implied that it is the purpose of this bill to prevent colored people from receiving appointments as apprentices. As a matter of fact, in the long run more colored people will have an opportunity for appointment as apprentices by virtue of this legislation than they would have such opportunities under the system proposed by the Bureau of Engraving. May I emphasize that if the Bureau of Engraving desired to promote a colored person, or all of them for that matter, they could do so provided the individuals concerned qualified. It is assumed they would qualify if they can pass the apprentice examination.

There are only 34 vacancies for the position of apprentice plate printer and 97 have taken the examination. For the 63 who would not be given such assignments, they would have been in much better position for a regional or Nation-wide examination so they could have competed not only for the vacancies at the Bureau of Engraving but for those in the Government Printing Office and other Government printing establishments.

Those who today set themselves up as championing a cause for a few employees in the Bureau of Engraving were strangely silent on exactly the same proposal when they were written into the Veterans' Preference Act for the positions of railway mail clerks, guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians. I voted for the Veterans' Preference Act. I approve of the section setting aside certain positions for veterans only, and I would have been for the addition of the position of apprentice at the time the veterans' preference was enacted. I do not believe it has occurred to Members in Congress that the whole history of filling our apprentice positions by open competitive examination would be reversed and our Government would be filling these openings into a specialized craft in the Federal Government to only those who were presently on the rolls and occupying dissimilar jobs.

The gentleman from New York who preceded me has quoted extensively from the Fair Employment Board decision. He has inferred that officials of the A. F. of L. and the veterans' organizations are not familiar with this order. Frankly, I do not see some of the things in this order to which my colleague refers and wonder to what extent he has made a study of it. For example, he has stated that the Fair Employment Board has directed the Bureau of Engraving of the Treasury Department to hold this promotional examination. The Fair Employment Board gave no directive to the Bureau of Engraving, but merely stated:

> It is the recommendation of this Board that the best corrective of the existing situation will be found in the early initiation and continuous operation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of an in-service training program with respect to the plate-printing craft, related numerically to the normal turn-over in that employee classification, and to the total Government and private employment in this craft. This program should be open to all qualified employees of the Bureau within these numerical limits, thus effectuating the intent of Executive Order 9980 as implemented by the Department's promotional policy announced in Departmental Order No. 114 of June 1, 1949.

It is submitted that this is merely a recommendation with respect to an in-service training program. In view of all that has been said here today, I submit that the decision is strangely silent as to any examination of any nature.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this legislation appears to be misunderstood by Members of this House. I understand there has been complaint on the part of a group of employees, being colored people, who are not given a chance to be promoted to certain jobs for which they feel they are qualified. If they were qualified for such jobs, then they were entitled to consideration for promotion in their regular order. Furthermore, if they can qualify under an examination, they should be given a chance to do so.

It is my contention that if any bureau within an agency is permitted to follow a practice of excluding anyone except those within the narrow confines of a small bureau to take a competitive ex-

amination, then there is discrimination on a large scale, and to such an extent that these same people who complain today would not have a chance to compete with people in another agency or even in another bureau when vacancies in such agency are to be filled.

As a matter of fact, these are matters that should have been handled by the Civil Service Commission and should not have necessarily been brought to the attention of Congress. It has always been my view that opportunity for appointment in civil service should be on as wide area as possible, so that any persons who feel they are qualified for jobs might have a chance to compete for them, and they are entitled to these opportunities, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

This bill not only has the approval of the following organizations, but they have requested and urged that this legislation be approved. They are: The American Federation of Labor; the Government Employees' Council, AFL, and other organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Disabled American Veterans; Catholic War Veterans of the United States; AMVETS.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise to speak against this measure. I would offer an amendment to cut out the retroactive phase of it if I could, but because of the manner in which it has been presented such an amendment is impossible.

For a long time members of my group have been employed in the Bureau. They were never given an opportunity to raise themselves within that Bureau by promotion until this promotion examination was held.

Now, a small group of veterans, men who fought for this country will have taken from them by this bill, which is made retroactive in its effect, the only opportunity they have ever had in the history of their employment in the Bureau to promote themselves. If this bill were so necessary, why did they wait until this occasion arose when for the first time, as I have said, a group of American citizens who have been fighting for their country came back, had an opportunity to take a promotional examination, and now a small handful of them are in line to get their promotion? Why is the Congress being called upon to pass a bill to take from them that which they have won both by virtue of their service to their country and their service to this Department of the Government.

This is not a fair thing. If you wish to pass such a bill as this, so that in the future such a situation will never exist, and they want to have promotional examinations, then let us pass such a bill; but what man in this House would take from veterans a promotion which they have won as a result of serving both their country and their department?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. REES. I agree with the distinguished gentleman that promotions should have been granted these employees, but these promotions could have been granted and could have been approved and should have been approved by the Civil Service Commission for all of those who could qualify. That is the present law. If those men were qualified, and probably they were, I am sure—some of them were—then the thing to have done was to promote them without holding these so-called promotional examinations. It is the principle of holding these examinations within the agencies and not giving more people, especially veterans, a chance to compete for these jobs, with which I disagree. The area should be widened and not narrowed where competitive examinations are given.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you: Is it not passing strange that promotional examinations have been held all these years and we did not need to come to the Congress to pass such a law as this? Is it not passing strange that when a group which has never had an opportunity to have a chance to promote themselves, went through a promotional examination which was legally held, they have gained that right, and mind you, gentlemen, that it is not claimed that this promotional examination was illegal, they had the legal right to hold this examination, why will you ask the Congress to make this law retroactive and take from this group of veterans that to which they are entitled? The promotional examination was legal, and I submit to you it was something that they had a right to do. They did it. A few veterans are now in a position to get a promotion and yet Congress is being asked to pass a law retroactive in effect to take from them something that they have won. I am a veteran. I know what it is to fight for this country.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman will make it plain that this bill came out of committee without a dissenting vote.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman in the course of his remarks explain why this bill is brought up under suspension of the rules?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Very well, sir.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide that the position of apprentice in the Federal Government shall be filled by competitive examination open to all veterans throughout the United States. The bill adds the position of apprentice to the position of guard, elevator operator, messenger and custodian, which positions are reserved for veterans under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. Such examinations are to be conducted on an open competitive basis which the committee believes is desirable. This bill has the unanimous support of the entire committee, both on the majority and minority sides.

The necessity for considering this bill comes about because the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the first time in its history is now attempting to appoint to the positions of apprentice plate printers from a so-called promotional examination list. This alleged promotional examination does violence to the traditions of our civil-service system and the civil-service laws and regulations.

In the first place, this examination, called by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, is not a promotional examination, even though it is called that. Ninety-seven have taken that examination and 28 are now receiving from $3,000 to $4,000 per year. Over 58 of them are receiving over $2,700 a year. Their salaries are considerably higher than that of an apprentice plate printer and they certainly would not be receiving a promotion from the standpoint of an increase in salary. Many who stood the examination are not now working in related positions to plate printers as persons in the Bureau who are employed as guards, messengers, and elevator operators, stood the promotional examination on March 15, 1950, yet the salary of a plate-printer apprentice is only $2,473 per year. This racial question has not one solitary thing to do with this bill, which is not my bill. It was introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY]. I, as chairman of the committee, am advocating the bill because it is meritorious and it is just. This so-called promotional examination is nothing in the world but a closed-family examination held by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing because of the objection to an open competitive examination by this left-wing radical group, the United Public Workers of America, an organization which was recently expelled from the CIO for its communistic tendencies and leadership. Who testified for this bill? Mr. Frank Coleman, president of the International Plate Printers and Dye Stampers of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Charles E. Foster, assistant national legislative director, Disabled American Veterans; John C. Williamson, assistant director of legislation, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Thomas G. Walters, operations director, Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor; Col. Charles I. Stengle, legislative representative of the American Federation of Government Employees; and George D. Riley, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor.

I have here a telegram from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, saying:

On March 31 I sent you a letter with a statement in regard to H. R. 7185. I would appreciate your reading the statement in your files which I sent with my letter and be at the session on Monday, May 1, when H. R. 7185 will be called up for consideration under suspension of the rules. This is the bill which provides for open competitive examinations for apprentices in the Federal

service and which gives all veterans throughout the country an opportunity to take the examination instead of confining it to an individual Government agency.

If this promotional examination becomes effective and if new apprentice plate printers are appointed from this so-called examination, it will be a precedent which will be dangerous in the future. Hereafter all agencies will hold their own little family, or closed, restricted, examinations and keep outsiders from an opportunity to compete for these positions. This FEPC has nothing in the world to do with this legislation. Fifty-two and one-half percent of the employees today in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing are members of the colored race. In 1940 only 25 percent were members of the colored race. So you can see the members of the colored race are receiving fair treatment in that agency.

I also wish to include in my statement letters from the American Legion in favor of this legislation; from the AMVETS; from the Catholic War Veterans; also from Omar B. Ketchum, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Thomas G. Walters, of the American Federation of Labor; and William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in support of this measure.

I trust the Members will not be misled by this extraneous discussion about the FEPC. I stand here asking you to preserve the integrity and the right of our civil-service system and to give all veterans a chance to stand these examinations. As soon as this examination was called a number of World War veterans, who are not employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, filed suit in court to try to stop the promotional examination, but they were not successful. Unless this legislation is passed, you will prevent World War veterans everywhere from taking this examination. It has always been the custom to hold open, competitive examinations for these appointments. Why should we now permit the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to hold so-called promotional examinations just for the benefit of a few veterans down at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing? This does not prevent these veterans down there from taking the open, competitive examination when it is called. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing has agreed to hold up any appointments from this promotional examination until this legislation is acted upon by Congress.

I have here a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury which reads in part as follows:

It is my earnest belief that the Department has cooperated with the committee to the fullest possible extent by agreeing that no promotions would be made as a result of the examination while the Congress is giving active consideration to the legislation approved by the committee.

It has been stated——

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I refuse to yield to anyone; several are clamoring for me to yield, but I have not the time.

I hope Members will resolve their decisions on this bill purely on its merits and not be influenced by any racial issue which has not a solitary thing to do with this bill. If you believe in civil service, if you believe in giving all veterans, both white and colored, an equal chance to stand competitive examination for these jobs, then you will support the bill. The so-called promotional examination discriminates against both white and colored veterans throughout the United States who are not now employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing as they will have no opportunity or chance to compete for the appointments of apprentice plate printer.

This bill was introduced before the alleged promotional examination was called as the bill was introduced on February 7, 1950, and notice of the examination was issued on February 21, 1950. At the hearings prior to the date of the examination on March 15, 1950, I, as chairman of the committee, requested Mr. E. H. Foley, Under Secretary of the Department of the Treasury, and who was acting secretary when he appeared before our committee, to hold up the examination until the present legislation could be considered. Then later, before the date of the examination, our committee sent two written requests to the Department of the Treasury which has charge of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing urging that the examination be postponed. The Acting Secretary of the Treasury refused to accede to this reasonable request and went along and held the examination. In view of the attitude and position of the Treasury Department, I advised Acting Secretary of the Treasury E. H. Foley, Jr., that our committee would seek to make the legislation retroactive to March 1, 1950, since he would not agree to defer the examination. Only the radical left wing United Public Workers of America, which was thrown out of the CIO, appeared at the hearings against the bill. A number of their members who are employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing have taken the alleged and so-called promotional examinations.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I have referred to correspondence from various individuals and organizations. For the benefit of the membership I set them forth in full at this point in the RECORD:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1950.

Re H. R. 7185.
Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Referring to the above-numbered bill which was introduced February 7, 1950, by Congressman RAMSAY, I understand that when it came up on the Consent Calendar it was objected to by Congressmen MARCANTONIO, KLEIN, and POWELL and that it is now your intention to call it up under suspension of the rules on April 3, 1950.

While we have no direct mandate on the provisions of this bill, please be advised that the national organization of the American Legion has no objections to its provisions and its passage as we feel it would be of material benefit to our veterans.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

AMVETS,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1950.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: AMVETS would like to bring to your attention their support of H. R. 7185, a bill now before your committee for consideration which would amend the Veterans' Preference Act to include apprentices in those protected positions.

It is AMVETS' contention that the inclusion of apprentices in this list of jobs would greatly widen job opportunities to veterans with particular attention, of course, being given to disabled veterans enabling them to acquire a more equal job opportunity in Federal employment.

It is AMVETS' further contention that the enactment of this bill would eliminate an evil situation by making this examination for apprentice jobs in the Government Printing Office and Bureau of Engraving open to all veterans and not confining it to those men now employed by those agencies as is presently contemplated. It would not deprive those men, many of whom are veterans, from an equal opportunity to take these tests and to qualify for these jobs, but would at the same time give all veterans an equal opportunity to show the necessary ability to hold the job.

AMVETS wish to thank you for your many kindnesses and courtesies in allowing us to bring this matter to your attention.

Very truly yours,
MARVIN L. GOLDBERGER,
National Legislative Director, AMVETS.

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1950.

Congressman THOMAS MURRAY,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Representing the Catholic War Veterans' National Department, the undersigned wishes to go on record as unqualifiedly recommending the passage of H. R. 7185 and regrets his inability to be in Washington for the hearing on this bill, Friday, March 10, 1950.

However, as a national officer of the Catholic War Veterans, I stand in readiness to participate in all future meetings in this regard and to offer my full support in this case.

Sincerely,
JOHN J. MCGINTY,
Adjutant General.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1950.

Re H. R. 7185.
Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is my understanding that on Monday, April 3, 1950, the House of Representatives will take up for consideration the bill, H. R. 7185, which amends the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

The bill would provide that for a limited period the job of apprentice in the public service would be limited to veterans and that open competitive examinations for such would be conducted on a Nation-wide or regional basis.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, pledged to the strengthening of the principle of veterans' preference in Government service, believes that the legislation is most desirable and worthy of your favorable consideration. The introduction and consideration of the bill by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was prompted by the recent action of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, for the first time in over 60 years, in announcing a closed examination for the job of apprentice, plate printer, limited to certain employees of the Bureau who were then employed as messenger, guard, or elevator operator. This legislation, if enacted, would not operate to defeat the opportunity of these individuals to compete for these appointments. On the other hand, the bill, if enacted, would provide hundreds of other veterans an opportunity to compete for these positions.

The action of the Bureau in insisting on a closed examination strikes at a fundamental root in our whole civil-service system as well as veteran preference in Government service. The policy of the Bureau, if left unchallenged and carried to its ultimate conclusion, would result in few if any open competitive examinations for appointment. Veterans, desiring to enter the public service as apprentice, etc., would first be required to serve as a messenger or guard. Surely, this was never the intention of the Congress in enacting the basic Civil Service Act, or the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

Efforts have been made to becloud the principle underlying this legislation by introducing the issue of racial discrimination. This is a great injustice which serves naught but to mislead the Congress. Actually approval of this legislation would provide hundreds of veterans of all races an opportunity to compete for positions in the civil service. The racial issue has been inspired by a small group of employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing who claim a privilege to compete for these jobs, yet would deny to others of their own race equality of opportunity.

In behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I hope that you will vote in favor of passage of the bill H. R. 7185.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COUNCIL
OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington D. C., February 10, 1950.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Post Office and
Civil Service Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: On February 7, Congressman RAMSAY introduced H. R. 7185 to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

This legislation was drafted to eliminate a condition which now exists in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. At the present time, only those who were able to receive war-service or temporary appointments in the Bureau are eligible to take examinations. H. R. 7185 when enacted into law would make all veterans eligible to take examinations.

We feel that this bill is fair and just and will be a very popular piece of legislation and will have the active support of the Government Employes' Council, the majority of the veterans' organizations, and the American Federation of Labor. I am of the opinion that the Civil Service Commission will endorse the intent of this legislation.

Frank Coleman and I would appreciate an opportunity to discuss with you the merits of this legislation.

Most sincerely,

THOMAS G. WALTERS,
Operations Director.

H. R. 7185

A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 as amended, Public Law 359, Seventy-eighth Congress

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 1, 1950.*

To All Members, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: H. R. 7185, a bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, Public Law 359, Seventy-eighth Congress, will be called up for a vote by Chairman MURRAY of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on Monday, May 1, 1950.

This bill was reported by a unanimous vote after due consideration by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Friday, March 10, 1950.

This bill has the endorsement of the American Federation of Labor; the Government Employees' Council, AFL; and other organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Veterans of Foreign Wars; Disabled American Veterans; Catholic War Veterans of United States; AMVETS.

This bill is opposed by the United Public Workers Union, recently expelled from the CIO; prominent Communists in this country, and their allies.

The defeat of this bill on May 1, would be a real May Day celebration for the Communists of this country.

Senate bill 3050, a companion bill to H. R. 7185, has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and is now on the Senate Calendar.

We respectfully request and urge you to be present and vote for H. R. 7185, on Monday, May 1, 1950.

Respectfully.

Government Employees' Council of the American Federation of Labor: Leo E. George, chairman; William C. Doherty, vice chairman; Orrin A. Burrows, secretary-treasurer; Thomas G. Walters, operations director; John B. Haggerty; William C. O'Neill; Louis A. Lopez; James G. Yaden; Stanley W. Oliver; W. M. Thomas; trustees.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1950.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On April 3, H. R. 7185 will be up for discussion in the House. It will be appreciated if you will take time to read the attached supporting discussions of this bill offered to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
March 31, 1950.

REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 7185

This bill provides for open competitive examinations for apprentices in the Federal service. It would amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to include apprentice jobs of all types in the group for which veterans only are to be eligible for competition for a period of 5 years following a declaration of peace, either by the President or the Congress.

The bill is intended to counteract a condition which has been created administratively in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. In the Bureau, the Treasury Department and the Director of the Bureau have determined, with the sanction of the Civil Service Commission, that only a handful of persons now employed in the Bureau may compete for apprenticeship appointments.

This is a departure from policy and practice generally throughout the Federal service. It differs substantially from the method used in the Government Printing Office where beginners are recruited for skilled trades jobs. No objection has been raised to the orderly method used in the Government Printing Office in selecting apprenticeship candidates. It was not until recently that objection was raised in the Bureau to the tried-and-true system of opening apprentice jobs to national competition.

It has become universally a practice in the Government service where apprentices are wanted to hire on an open competition basis. In this manner, the Government has had the opportunity to select the best available from among the greatest possible number. Because this is what is known as a general purpose examination, it lends itself readily to use by a large number of agencies seeking mechanical aptitudes adaptable to the particular kinds of jobs in the skilled trades later to be filled.

It should be noted, however, in the present instances, that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is seeking to fill apprentice jobs without resorting first to the list of available journeymen waiting to be considered. This number is approximately forty.

There have been times when certain dissident groups employed in the Bureau have, under the leadership of well-known fellow travelers who have paraded before the Bureau entrance with their usual "demands" and chants on how some classes of our countrymen are being "discriminated" against. This is but a part of the party line often demonstrated by the well-classified troublemakers who have worked hard to divide Government employees into conflicting classes.

Unless this bill is passed, veterans, except a small number in the Bureau, will be completely discriminated against and the spirit of the Veterans' Preference Act will have been violated once more. A number of persons of the small group to which the examination has been limited are receiving twice as much or more now than they would receive as apprentices should they finally be appointed. This raises a question of good faith which remains unanswered as to why much lower pay is welcomed in order to prevent the examination from being open to all competitors.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have decided that I am going to vote against suspending the rules and passing this bill H. R. 7185. I am in favor of legislation adding the positions of apprentices to those positions reserved for veterans under the Veterans' Preference Act. I would vote for this bill were it not for the retroactive date March 1, 1950, contained in section 2 on page 2 thereof. The inclusion of this date can only mean that it is directed against the few dozen Negro veterans here in the District of Columbia in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. I will not vote for a bill which is directed primarily and solely against this small group of war veterans.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 113, noes 62.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twelve Members are present, not a quorum.

The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 209, nays 94, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—209

Abbitt	Hardy	Patten
Abernethy	Hare	Perkins
Albert	Harris	Peterson
Allen, Calif.	Harrison	Pickett
Allen, Ill.	Hays, Ark.	Plumley
Allen, La.	Hébert	Poage
Andersen, H. Carl	Hedrick	Potter
Anderson, Calif.	Herlong	Poulson
Andresen, August H.	Hill	Preston
Angell	Hobbs	Priest
Arends	Hoeven	Ramsay
Auchincloss	Hoffman, Mich.	Rankin
Bailey	Holmes	Redden
Barden	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Barrett, Wyo.	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Hull	Rees
Beckworth	Jackson, Calif.	Regan
Bennett, Mich.	Jenison	Rich
Bentsen	Jennings	Riehlman
Blackney	Jensen	Rivers
Boggs, Del.	Johnson	St. George
Bolton, Md.	Jones, Mo.	Sanborn
Bonner	Judd	Sasscer
Bramblett	Karst	Saylor
Breen	Kearney	Scrivner
Brooks	Kee	Scudder
Brown, Ga.	Keefe	Secrest
Bryson	Kerr	Shafer
Buckley, Ill.	Kilday	Short
Bulwinkle	Lanham	Sikes
Burleson	Larcade	Sims
Burnside	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Burton	LeFevre	Smith, Va.
Camp	Lemke	Smith, Wis.
Chelf	Lind	Spence
Chiperfield	Lovre	Staggers
Christopher	Lyle	Steed
Clevenger	Lucas	Stefan
Cole, Kans.	McConnell	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	McCormack	Stockman
Colmer	McDonough	Sutton
Combs	McMillan, S. C.	Taber
Cooper	Mack, Wash.	Tackett
Cox	Macy	Talle
Cunningham	Magee	Teague
Curtis	Marshall	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Iowa	Thompson
Davis, Wis.	Mason	Thornberry
D'Ewart	Merrow	Tollefson
Dolliver	Meyer	Towe
Dondero	Michener	Trimble
Durham	Mills	Underwood
Eaton	Monroney	Van Zandt
Evins	Morris	Vinson
Fallon	Morrison	Vursell
Fellows	Morton	Walter
Fisher	Moulder	Welch
Flood	Murdock	Werdel
Ford	Murphy	White, Idaho
Frazier	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Fugate	Murray, Wis.	Whittington
Garmatz	Nelson	Williams
Gathings	Nicholson	Wilson, Okla.
Golden	Norblad	Wilson, Tex.
Gore	Norrell	Winstead
Gossett	O'Hara, Minn.	Withrow
Gregory	O'Konski	Wolcott
Gross	O'Neill	Wolverton
Hagen	Pace	Wood
	Passman	
	Patman	

NAYS—94

Aspinall	Doyle	Howell
Baring	Eberharter	Huber
Barrett, Pa.	Ellsworth	Jonas
Bates, Mass.	Elston	Jackson, Wash.
Bishop	Engel, Mich.	Karsten
Blatnik	Fernandez	Kean
Bolton, Ohio	Fogarty	Keating
Bosone	Forand	Kelly, N. Y.
Brehm	Fulton	Kennedy
Brown, Ohio	Gavin	King
Burdick	Gillette	Klein
Burke	Gordon	Lane
Carnahan	Gorski	Linehan
Carroll	Graham	Lynch
Case, N. J.	Granahan	McGuire
Celler	Granger	McKinnon
Chesney	Hale	Mack, Ill.
Clemente	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mansfield
Cotton	Havenner	Marcantonio
Crawford	Heffernan	Marsalis
Dague	Heller	Mitchell
Dawson	Herter	Multer
Delaney	Heselton	Norton
Dollinger	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Donohue	Howard	O'Hara, Ill.
O'Sullivan	Rogers, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
O'Toole	Rooney	Sullivan
Philbin	Sabath	Tauriello
Phillips, Calif.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Vorys
Polk	Shelley	Wagner
Rabaut	Sheppard	Yates
Ribicoff		Zablocki

NOT VOTING—127

Addonizio	Green	Nixon
Andrews	Gwinn	Noland
Battle	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.
Beall	Halleck	Patterson
Bennett, Fla.	Hand	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Biemiller	Harden	Pfeiffer, William L.
Boggs, La.	Hart	Phillips, Tenn.
Bolling	Harvey	Powell
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Price
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Quinn
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Irving	Rhodes
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Richards
Canfield	James	Rodino
Cannon	Javits	Rogers, Fla.
Carlyle	Jenkins	Roosevelt
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, Ala.	Sadlak
Cavalcante	Jones, N. C.	Sadowski
Chatham	Kearns	Scott, Hardie
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Keogh	Smathers
Corbett	Kilburn	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Kirwan	Stanley
Crook	Kruse	Taylor
Crosser	Kunkel	Velde
Davenport	Latham	Wadsworth
Davies, N. Y.	Lesinski	Walsh
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Weichel
Deane	Lodge	Wheeler
DeGraffenried	McCarthy	Whitaker
Denton	McCulloch	White, Calif.
Dingell	McGrath	Wickersham
Doughton	McGregor	Widnall
Douglas	McMillen, Ill.	Wier
Elliott	McSweeney	Wigglesworth
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Willis
Feighan	Mahon	Wilson, Ind.
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Woodhouse
Furcolo	Miles	Woodruff
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Young
Gary	Miller, Md.	
Gilmer	Miller, Nebr.	
Goodwin	Morgan	
Grant		

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Madden and Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. McSweeney against.

Mr. Davies of New York and Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Byrne of New York and Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Biemiller against.

Mr. Stanley and Mr. Gilmer for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Cavalcante and Mr. Jacobs for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana and Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Fenton and Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Rains and Mr. Wheeler for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Battle and Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina and Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Grant and Mr. Andrews for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Mr. Bennett of Florida and Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Jones of Alabama and Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Buckley of New York against.

Mr. Rogers of Florida and Mr. Richards for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Price against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. Green with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Bolling with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Quinn with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Kruse with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Crook with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Miller of Maryland.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Walsh with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. White of California with Mr. Weichel.

Mr. Miles with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Carlyle with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Noland with Mr. Kilburn.

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Young with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Wier with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. James.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Mahon with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. MAGEE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MCCONNELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. KEARNEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the Consent Calendar for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7888) to amend the Classification Act of 1949, to make it inapplicable to postal employees of the Panama Canal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 of the Classification Act of 1949, approved October 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 954), is amended by changing the period at the end of clause (31) to a semicolon and adding the following new clause, numbered (32):

"(32) postal employees of the Panama Canal whose rates of compensation are fixed by the Governor of the Panama Canal with reference to the rates of compensation for similar positions in the field service of the Post Office Department of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6354) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for the period commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April 1950 and ending not later than the last Sunday of September 1950. Any such time established by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker I demand a second.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to grant the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to declare daylight saving time from the last Sunday of April to the last Sunday of September, or for any period within the above-named dates.

Mr. Speaker, immediately after the termination of active hostilities the House repealed national daylight saving time. Each year since that event the Congress has granted the District of Columbia permission to declare daylight saving time for the summer months.

Personally, I have consistently voted against daylight saving time because I felt that it was a useless piece of legislation. However, I have been in the minority. It seems to me that the departments in the District of Columbia and the District Government could arrange to set back their working time 1 hour without tampering with the standard time of the United States.

This year we find ourselves accused of confusing time throughout the country by failing to comply with the request of a majority of the large cities in the United States for daylight saving time. I agree that there has been some confusion, but I believe it was not caused by the Congress of the United States; we have done nothing to change the time, which has caused all the confusion. Since they have already changed their time in the majority of the large cities I expect to vote for this bill, but against my best judgment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from South Carolina has indicated, this brings up what has been a rather controversial subject as far as the District of Columbia is concerned. I may say that this bill was reported by a vote of 10 to 9 in the committee itself. It is unfortunate that some of the opponents of daylight-saving time were not at the committee meeting.

I have personally opposed daylight-saving time. I did during the war and I intend to do it while I am living in the District of Columbia because I feel it is a complete delusion and a myth to begin with. There have been certain interests, some newspapers, some radio stations, and a small group of the Board of Trade who have demanded daylight-saving time.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that during the war when we had daylight-saving time there was so much feeling throughout the country against it that it was the first act which was immediately repealed after the end of the fighting part of the war. It is one of the few wartime acts which has been repealed up to date, showing the lack of popularity of daylight-saving time throughout the country. It is true we have a few of the larger cities in the country that are on daylight-saving time. Part of the promotion and the force behind this bill originates in New York City where the radio people put on their programs and it comes out through the country; so they would like to have as many parts of the country on daylight-saving time in the larger cities as possible.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to remind the gentleman of Stevenson's Child's Garden of Verses:

> In winter I get up at night
> And dress by yellow candlelight.
> In summer, quite the other way,
> I have to go to bed by day.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman has stated in classic language his opposition to daylight-saving time.

There are some serious aspects to this. The gentleman from New York has quoted a poem which illustrates the objection which comes to me from the mothers of the District of Columbia who want to put their children to bed but who cannot get them to go to bed or get them to go to sleep. They cannot get the rest that they should have. Some members of the medical profession have commented upon the serious effect of this situation upon the children of this country. It might also apply to some of those who are more mature in the District of Columbia, who are kept up through daylight-saving time and who do not get the sleep they should have.

Getting back to the propaganda which has been going on in the District of Columbia by the newspapers and by the radio stations, the Commissioners recently submitted this matter to a vote to the people of the District of Columbia. They scattered 200,000 ballots by policemen taking them out. I do not know how fairly it was conducted in the sense of those who voted. I do not infer there was anything wrong about the manner of distribution, but how many persons voted for a lot of people I do not know. I have received communications, for instance, advising me that whole families were opposed to daylight saving but never had the slightest opportunity to record their opposition to it. And, in reference to this ballot that was taken, the radio announcers were quite frequently, at least, urging the people to vote for daylight saving time. The newspapers carried on front page publicity about the need of voting for daylight saving time, but notwithstanding that, of the 200,000 votes only 92,000 voted for it, 37,000 against it, and 17,000 said that they did not care, and the balance of all those people who got the ballot who did not care did not vote. So, the majority of the people of the District of Columbia do not want daylight saving time. That is the obvious situation that a majority of the people, notwithstanding all the effort, the clap that was heard to try to put it over, did not agree that we should have daylight saving time.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Would the gentleman and I want to apply that same formula in our own campaigns and lectures?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Well, we could.

Mr. PACE. That the people who did not vote were all against us?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Well, they did not have much interest or they would have voted for or against us, one of the two, especially in a hot, heated campaign. However, that is my viewpoint, and the gentleman does not have to take my argument if he does not want to. Here we have 92,000 people telling 150,000,000 people that they should have daylight-saving time in the Nation's Capital which, again, I protest, is an example of a vociferous few in the District of Columbia who feel that this is not the Nation's Capital, that it belongs just to the people of the District of Columbia, and anything that they want or anything that they particularly feel they should have, regardless of its impact on the rest of the country, they must have, regardless of what it does.

Now, what does this do? This makes confusion all over the United States, in every city, and every part of the country that does not have daylight-saving time. Your constituents come into this city; they come in and go out on eastern standard time regardless of this bill, and if this bill became a law, they would still have that condition, because the Federal statute insists that transportation be run upon the basis of standard time. And, it is for the safety of this country as well. Furthermore, after they come in here they suddenly find out that they are an hour later than they should be, so when they adjust their watches to the wishes of the District of Clumbia and they decide then to go back on the train, to go back to the station or the airport, they arrive an hour before they need to. So, they are very unhappy about that. When your constituents want to call you from back home in the Midwest, instead of there being an hour's difference in time, there are 2 hours' difference in time. So it is all through the departments of Government. There are some 190,000 Government employees here, and regardless of the wishes of the rest of the employees in the United States, here they are being sent down to the departments and regulated in their homes on the basis of what a few people in Washington want. I confess that I do not like daylight-saving time. Some people like it.

There is the argument for playing golf and then the argument that it gives them more opportunity for gardening and recreation and that they get out in the sun more. Well, I wish some of you would get the official timetable of when the sun rises and sets in the city of Washington, and look at the time of day that the sun gets up on standard time. You will find on the 1st day of May that the sun rises at 5:11 and sets at 7 o'clock in the evening. On the 20th of June the sun rises at 4:51, standard time, and sets at 7:18. On the first of September it rises at 5:36 and sets at 6:39. Therefore, the average person living in the District of Columbia has every opportunity in the world under the working hours and the working conditions we have here, generally speaking, in the Government offices, to adjust himself so that he can get all the sunlight and daylight he wants. Most of the offices close early in the summertime.

I think all you are doing is making this confusion apply to all the United States. You are not giving the people who are supposed to be benefited by daylight-saving time anything but the delusion that they have more time in the sun, if you shove the watch an hour ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill is defeated, and that we get rid of daylight-saving time.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. The gentleman is worrying a great deal about the people being an hour late. Does he not believe that when they arrive in Washington they are just too late, they have already lost everything?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That might be political. I do not want to make any comment on that.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. During the war when we had daylight-saving time we had it all over the United States.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It was a completely different situation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It caused no confusion then, but this bill causes confusion everywhere.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. There is enough confusion here now.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well to start this debate with some phrase such as "Here we go again," or "This is where we came in." We have this same debate every year. I have prepared some figures as to the cost to the taxpayers of this country of bringing up this question, which in spite of what the gentleman from Minnesota says, and I have the highest regard for him, is strictly a local problem to be decided by residents of the District of Columbia and by the Congress really sitting as a city council for the District of Columbia.

Unfortunately the parliamentary situation is such that we cannot amend this bill. If we could, I was prepared to offer an amendment to substitute the Senate bill, which instead of letting this question come up every year, would give us a permanent daylight-saving bill.

You all understand this is purely permissive. This permits the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to call daylight-saving time into being whenever they feel it is necessary, and to do away with it in the same fashion.

It costs the taxpayers of this country almost $100,000 for the debate which goes on here year after year. Finally, after much travail and blood, sweat, and tears, we pass the bill. We usually pass it after daylight-saving time has gone into effect in other parts of the country. If there is any confusion, I think the confusion arises because we do not have daylight-saving time here, whereas the other large cities of the country do have it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I am going to vote for this bill. Does the gentleman think the Congress ought to have anything to do with the District of Columbia?

Mr. KLEIN. I do not think they should. I think this debate that comes up here year after year is the best argument you could possibly have for home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. RIVERS. Wait a minute. I want to get it plain for the record. The gentleman does not think the Congress ought to have anything to do with the District of Columbia? Turn it over to these people and let them have it on a one-way ticket to hades and forget about it.

Mr. KLEIN. I do not agree with the gentleman. I do not think we ought to have anything to do with legislation for the benefit of the District solely. If they had home rule here, it would not be necessary for us to spend all this time, valuable as it is for this kind of local legislation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman considered the fact that under the present set-up as of today his train gets here in 3 hours instead of 4?

Mr. KLEIN. Better than that, my plane left New York City at 9:30 a. m. this morning and it got me here at 9:25 a. m. So that I got here even before I left New York.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. As a matter of fact, actually the schedules of train times, both in New York City and here remain on standard time regardless of daylight saving time. Is that not true?

Mr. KLEIN. That is true as to trains that travel throughout the States. Local trains, of course, are all on daylight saving time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman really concerned about how quickly he can get from New York to Washington, or about how quickly he can go from Washington back to New York?

Mr. KLEIN. Well, it takes me an hour longer to get back to New York.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe that is what is really worrying the gentleman.

Mr. KLEIN. Of course, that is bad. But might I remind the gentleman from Ohio of a little colloquy that he and I had last year when this bill was being debated where we brought out, or at any rate, I believe I brought out that the people of the District of Columbia want this law. We are sitting here today as a city council for the people of the District. It is not fair to bring into the debate the prejudices of our constituents back home when we are considering District legislation. There are no farmers that I know of in the District of Columbia, who are usually opposed to daylight saving. There are no farmers in the large cities of the country. Large cities have daylight saving time and it has worked out very well.

This will give Government employees, many of whom have small gardens outside their homes, an opportunity to tend to their gardens after they have dinner, and it will give them an extra hour of sunlight for all types of recreation.

I would like to sum the whole thing up by saying that we should consider the interests of the people that we are legislating for, and not the interests of our own constituents wherever they may be. We should not consider whether this is good for the farmers or good for anybody else. The question is, is it beneficial to the people of the District of Columbia, and do those people want this legislation. I think that is the only point that should be taken into consideration.

The gentleman from Minnesota mentioned the fact that this poll taken by the newspapers does not indicate that the majority of the people want it. I would question that reasoning. At any rate I am certain, from the letters that I have received, and the way in which this law has worked out in past years, that the people, by and large, in the District of Columbia want it. All the people in the cities of the country have benefited by it, and are satisfied with the way that daylight saving time is operating. That is the only thing which should be taken into consideration in voting on this bill.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House except for a few moments. Personally I have been opposed to what we did have as daylight saving time during the war and what resulted after the war. I am of the opinion, however, Mr. Speaker, that the matter should be cleared up Nation-wide. Whether or not the District of Columbia has daylight saving time is not going to clear it up. As the situation now is, many of the metropolitan areas—as a matter of fact, probably most of them have daylight saving time, so-

called. The radio networks all go on daylight saving time. Transportation facilities all remain on standard time. The situation is confused throughout the Nation.

Sometime I believe that the Congress of the United States should clear it up one way or the other on a Nation-wide basis.

But the thing we are to determine here today is again whether or not the people of the District of Columbia will go on daylight saving time, and perhaps the metropolitan area of the District, because I understand they are waiting for the Congress to take action one way or the other, and if the District goes on daylight saving time, then Arlington and adjoining sections of Maryland will follow.

Personally I am going to support this bill. I do that, Mr. Speaker, because so many people locally have told me they prefer it because they want the District to be in step with other metropolitan areas throughout the entire Atlantic coast area. I do not give much credence, frankly, to the poll which was taken. I am not familiar with how it was conducted. I know the police department, who was charged with the responsibility, did the best it could under the circumstances. However, in my opinion, the poll was generally taken by those who were somewhat prejudiced and naturally, when they would see a person and ask them if they wanted to be put down for daylight saving, they were approached in such a way that they would say "Yes." I personally know of some who have responded to those requests. So, consequently, I do not join my colleague from New York [Mr. KLEIN] in saying that was a consideration. However, I do call attention to the fact that the District of Columbia, in my opinion, does want to keep in step with the other metropolitan areas of the East.

I want to say that this is the prerogative of the Congress of the United States. It is in accordance with the Constitution. When those who shout so loudly that Congress should not have anything to do with legislation of this kind, I only refer you to the Constitution of the United States, which has been in effect throughout the history of this country.

I do not know what is the answer to this daylight-saving problem. You are not going to solve it by saying whether it should be in the District of Columbia or not, because the radio networks and the transportation facilities and many other businesses are going to continue in a confused status, and the people of the country are going to continue to have to put up with that confused status until the Congress settles it for the entire United States. Personally, I would oppose it. But I do call attention to the fact that this comes before us every year, and I do not think the Congress should take up its time in this way every year. We should act, as it is our responsibility, to settle it, once and for all. Then, if it is determined that it is needed or it should be changed, the Congress is here, and the Congress should act in the interest of the people of the country.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. It has been stated that there is a great deal of confusion by having daylight saving time. Since the rest of the eastern seaboard has gone on daylight-saving time, would it not be double confusion and double trouble if we do not go on daylight saving here?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, whatever the action of the Congress is today, I do not think it is going to clear it up, because you have these facilities and services in the country and some are on one schedule and some on the other. It is not going to clear it up because the people throughout the country are affected by it. I disagree with those who say that this applying to the District of Columbia is only for the people of the District of Columbia. I think it does have a vital effect on the rest of the country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman says it should be cleared up once and for all. Do you have any proposals to offer by which it can be determined for all time?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I cannot, because I have stated that the Congress is here continuously.

Mr. GAVIN. Do you have any idea how it could be done?

Mr. HARRIS. The committee failed to report a bill which would give the Commissioners authority to declare daylight-saving time each year.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If we pass this bill it does not change the railroad or airport or bus time. They go on standard time, but the confusion is then created in the minds of the public who do the traveling.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. I just tried to explain that.

One other thing. That is the reason this came up under suspension of the rules. Some of us questioned this procedure, but it is well known that on yesterday, in other metropolitan areas throughout the country, they went on daylight-saving time. If we did not bring this up now and act on it under suspension of the rule—I do not know whether this Congress will adopt it by a two-thirds vote or not—but I think the Congress should determine it today or not at all, and not go along here for 3 or 4 weeks, as we have in the past, and then say we should go on daylight-saving time. That is the reason we brought this to you today under suspension of the rules.

Mr. CHELF. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. Since I have been here I have constantly been against daylight-saving time, but since the people here seem to want it, and since the eastern seaboard has already adopted it, I am constrained to go along with it.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman from Arkansas has stated the question pretty clearly. Every argument that has been made by people who say they favor daylight saving time has been an argument against it.

In my opinion, what the Congress should do but what we do not have the opportunity to do today is to say that the District of Columbia shall never go on daylight saving time. Then I believe we would eliminate this confusion in the country. This bill was reported out of the committee by the small margin of 1 vote; the vote was 10 to 9. Every argument agrees that confusion results from this. There is nothing to prevent any industry or any group of people from changing their hours of work to take advantage of this recreational period that is spoken of. In that connection it has been my observation that all of the people favor daylight saving time make up the group that is always looking for shorter hours, more pay, and less work; they want more time in which to engage in activities other than productive ones. I think that if we at this time defeated this bill, it would be notice to the rest of the country which looks to the Congress for leadership that we are not in favor of the continuation of this time change. I believe that, if you vote the bill down today, it will not come up again.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently been opposed to daylight-saving time.

I am sorry to say to my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] that I cannot go along with him this time because I believe that we are faced with a practical situation. The best evidence we have shows that the people of the District of Columbia are in favor of daylight time. I think it would be a mistake at this time to keep the District on slow time while the major cities of the country are on fast time. As confused as the situation is now, to keep the District on slow time would only further add to the confusion.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. The two gentlemen who preceded me said that heretofore they have been consistently against daylight-saving time, but this time were going to be for it. I wish to advise the gentlemen that heretofore I have been consistently against it and am still against it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. CAMP. I merely want to state that in the place where I live they asked me how I stood on daylight-saving time, and when I said I was against it they did not offer me a ballot or a chance to vote. I think that was true of those living at our place. There were enough ballots

for everybody who live there, but only those who were for daylight time were allowed to vote.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I think that unfortunately in some of these polls which are taken and which seem to have some effect on some of our colleagues they are giving too much credit to the type of poll which is conducted.

I had the legislative drafting service, through the clerk of our committee, prepare an amendment which I intended to offer before knowing that this bill was going to come up under a suspension of the rules, an amendment which would have eliminated the Government and transportation facilities so that there would be absolutely no question about their not being involved in this daylight-saving time; but I cannot offer the amendment because the bill comes up under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I would have no objection to the local people working the hours and time they want to work; but when it comes to the Government I think the Government should be on such time that makes for the best interest, not of the people of the District of Columbia, but the people of the United States as a whole.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. BROOKS. And if changing time causes more confusion throughout the entire country than keeping standard time, then I say we should keep standard time.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will be defeated. I have worked as earnestly and as zealously on behalf of the people of the District of Columbia as any member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and I am taking the position I do on this bill that this is not good policy for the District of Columbia by the Congress. I do not think it is proper to impose upon the people daylight-saving time when they do not want it. It merely causes confusion because after all this is the seat of the Government.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is it not true that if this bill is not passed by a two-thirds majority today, it will come up on the calendar next week?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I suppose it will. If it does not pass today then it will come up next week.

Mr. TEAGUE. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. It will come up on the next District day.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 194, nays 87, not voting 149, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—194

Abbitt	Graham	Mitchell
Albert	Granahan	Monroney
Allen, Calif.	Granger	Morton
Anderson, Calif.	Hagen	Moulder
Arends	Hale	Multer
Aspinall	Hardy	Murdock
Auchincloss	Harris	Murphy
Bailey	Havenner	Nelson
Barrett, Pa.	Hays, Ark.	Nicholson
Bates, Mass.	Hébert	Norblad
Beckworth	Hedrick	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Heffernan	Pace
Bentsen	Heller	Patman
Blackney	Herlong	Patten
Blatnik	Herter	Perkins
Boggs, Del.	Heselton	Peterson
Bolton, Md.	Hobbs	Philbin
Bolton, Ohio	Holifield	Plumley
Bonner	Holmes	Poage
Bramblett	Hope	Polk
Breen	Horan	Potter
Brown, Ga.	Howell	Poulson
Bryson	Huber	Priest
Burke	Irving	Rabaut
Burleson	Jackson, Calif.	Ramsay
Burnside	Jackson, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Burton	Jenison	Regan
Carnahan	Jonas	Ribicoff
Carroll	Judd	Rich
Case, N. J.	Karst	Riehlman
Celler	Karsten	Rivers
Chelf	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Chesney	Kearney	Rooney
Clemente	Keating	St. George
Cole, Kans.	Kee	Sasscer
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Saylor
Combs	Kerr	Scott,
Cotton	King	Hugh D., Jr.
Crawford	Klein	Scudder
Dague	Lane	Secrest
Dollinger	Lanham	Shelley
Dondero	LeFevre	Spence
Donohue	Lesinski	Staggers
Doyle	Lind	Stigler
Durham	Linehan	Stockman
Eberharter	Lovre	Sullivan
Ellsworth	Lucas	Taber
Elston	Lyle	Tauriello
Engel, Mich.	Lynch	Teague
Engle, Calif.	McConnell	Thornberry
Evins	McCormack	Tollefson
Fallon	McDonough	Towe
Fisher	McGuire	Underwood
Flood	McKinnon	Van Zandt
Fogarty	McMillan, S. C.	Walter
Forand	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Ford	Mack, Wash.	Werdel
Fugate	Macy	Whittington
Furcolo	Mansfield	Wier
Garmatz	Marcantonio	Wilson, Tex.
Gavin	Marsalis	Withrow
Gillette	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Gordon	Merrow	Wolverton
Gorski	Michener	Yates
Gossett	Mills	Zablocki

NAYS—87

Abernethy	D'Ewart	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Dolliver	Meyer
Allen, La.	Fellows	Morris
Andersen, H. Carl	Frazier	Murray, Tenn.
	Gathings	Murray, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Golden	Norrell
	Gore	O'Hara, Ill.
Angell	Gregory	O'Hara, Minn.
Barden	Gross	O'Konski
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall,	O'Sullivan
Bates, Ky.	Edwin Arthur	O'Toole
Bishop	Hare	Passman
Brehm	Harrison	Phillips, Calif.
Brooks	Hill	Pickett
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Preston
Camp	Hoffman, Mich.	Rankin
Chiperfield	Hull	Redden
Christopher	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Jones, Mo.	Rees
Cooper	Keefe	Sabath
Cox	Larcade	Sanborn
Cunningham	LeCompte	Scrivner
Curtis	Lemke	Shafer
Davis, Ga.	Marshall	Sheppard
Short	Stefan	Vorys
Sikes	Sutton	Vursell
Simpson, Ill.	Tackett	Wagner
Smith, Kans.	Talle	Williams
Smith, Va.	Thomas	Winstead
Smith, Wis.	Trimble	Wood

NOT VOTING—149

Addonizio	Gilmer	Nixon
Andrews	Goodwin	Noland
Baring	Grant	Norton
Battle	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Beall	Gwinn	O'Neill
Bennett, Fla.	Hall,	Patterson
Biemiller	Leonard W.	Pfeifer,
Boggs, La.	Halleck	Joseph L.
Bolling	Hand	Pfeiffer,
Bosone	Harden	William L.
Boykin	Hart	Phillips, Tenn.
Buchanan	Harvey	Powell
Buckley, Ill.	Hays, Ohio	Price
Buckley, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Hoffman, Ill.	Rains
Burdick	Jacobs	Rhodes
Byrne, N. Y.	James	Richards
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Rodino
Canfield	Jenkins	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon	Jennings	Roosevelt
Carlyle	Johnson	Sadlak
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, Ala.	Sadowski
Cavalcante	Jones, N. C.	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Sims
Colmer	Kelly, N. Y.	Smathers
Cooley	Keogh	Smith, Ohio
Corbett	Kilburn	Stanley
Coudert	Kilday	Steed
Crook	Kirwan	Taylor
Crosser	Kruse	Thompson
Davenport	Kunkel	Velde
Davies, N. Y.	Latham	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Wadsworth
Davis, Wis.	Lodge	Walsh
Dawson	McCarthy	Weichel
Deane	McCulloch	Wheeler
DeGraffenried	McGrath	Whitaker
Delaney	McGregor	White, Calif.
Denton	McMillen, Ill.	White, Idaho
Dingell	McSweeney	Whitten
Doughton	Madden	Wickersham
Douglas	Magee	Widnall
Eaton	Mahon	Wigglesworth
Elliott	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Feighan	Miles	Wilson, Ind.
Fenton	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Okla.
Fernandez	Miller, Md.	Woodhouse
Fulton	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff
Gamble	Morgan	Young
Gary	Morrison	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hand and Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Stanley against.

Mr. Wigglesworth and Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Miller of Maryland against.

Mr. James and Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Weichel against.

Mr. Crook and Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Gary against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Battle with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. Price with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Quinn with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Corbett.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McGregor.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Kruse with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Green with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Madden with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. REED of New York changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today may be transferred to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STUDIES OF PROBLEMS RELATED TO PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under the Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was given jurisdiction over the allied problems of petroleum and natural gas and related products. I have the privilege and honor of being chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has been for some time—in fact, over a year—making an over-all study of petroleum problems and how they affect activities of domestic industry. Included in this I think we are making also a very thorough study of the effect on the domestic industry and economy of the country of the importation of foreign crude.

It would certainly not be my intention to cast any reflection whatsoever, but we do have overlapping jurisdiction to some extent and overlapping investigations on matters affecting certain phases of legislation and problems of the country. I make this announcement so that the Members of Congress may know that our committee has been making a very thorough study of this problem. I understand the Committee on Education and Labor, and I am not entering into a feud or fight with the Committee on Education and Labor, although I think that we should adhere to some extent to the functions and responsibilities of committees—is making the same type study on the effect of the importation of foreign fuels. I think that perhaps there should be some approach or procedure to these problems because the agencies of the Government that are responsible for certain functions are called up before these committees. We have had all of the agencies thus far, the Departments of State, Interior, Commerce, and so forth, in this over-all study. We have been giving it our attention and it is our plan to file a very thorough report within the next few days.

I make this announcement and call this to your attention and invite every Member of the House to come before the committee and give us any information they may have as to any problems that might affect their particular areas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very unfortunate when two committees appoint subcommittees that in a sense duplicate one another. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce appointed a subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas is chairman, some time ago, and as a result of this his committee had original jurisdiction. The matter comes before the gentleman's Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its broad aspects. When the officials of the executive branch have to come before two or more committees they are justified in complaining against that. We should as far as possible avoid it. The gentleman from Arkansas in his very fine, not critical in any way but justifiable statement is to be commended and I thoroughly agree with him. We should obviate as much as possible duplication of surveys, investigations or inquiries of any kind.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his statement. I do want to make the further statement that we are giving special emphasis to this problem because we recognize it is a very great problem. It affects every phase of our economy, particularly the domestic industry, and the foreign aspects enter into it also. We have been giving special attention to the over-all picture, not only from the standpoint of the industry itself but the consumers of the country, in order that the Members may know the extent to which we are going into all phases of this as we promised in connection with the gas bill last year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part thereof the outline that our committee has announced in connection with this study.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee include liquid fuels generally? I had in mind inquiring if the gentleman's subcommittee has examined into or does intend to examine into the reduction of coal to a state of liquid fuel?

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman that liquid fuels or synthetic fuels is a part of the jurisdiction of our committee, and we have been giving a great deal of study to this in connection with the over-all study.

Mr. FLOOD. Including the reduction of anthracite to a state of liquid fuel?

Mr. HARRIS. We recognize there are various products from which synthetic or liquid fuels may be made. We are giving that attention in connection with the Bureau of the Mines and the industry.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not true also that the subcommittee, of which the gentleman is chairman, is a standing committee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and not a special committee and that under the Reorganization Act of this Congress the general committee was given specific jurisdiction over this particular problem?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct, and we are trying to carry out that responsibility.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman tell me whether or not the investigation of his committee proposes to go into increases such as occurred in the case of the price of gasoline last week in New England and which is gradually being taken up by one company after another?

Mr. HARRIS. We are having the Federal Trade Commission before the committee again. They have been before us one time. They are coming back in the next few days. That is a part of the over-all study. We are endeavoring, Mr. Speaker, to go into all of these problems that our committee has jurisdiction over and which affect this particular subject.

HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATION BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM, HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

A. H. R. 6047, to establish a Petroleum Policy Council, for the purpose of developing, clarifying, and coordinating national policies relating to petroleum, and for other purposes.

B. Over-all study of petroleum situation and problems to include:

1. Exploration and development in the United States.

(a) Technological advancement in exploration.

(b) Progress being made and to what extent.

(1) Historical.

(2) Current.

(c) Future plans and programs.

2. Supply of Petroleum in the United States.

(a) Rate of production.

(1) Historical.

(2) Current.

(3) Trends or estimates of future crude reserves.

(4) Estimated reserves, other sources.

a. Natural gas.

b. Natural gasoline.

c. Liquefied petroleum gases.

d. Oil shale.

3. Production of petroleum in the United States.

(a) Technological advancements.
(b) Methods of production.
(c) Secondary recovery.
(d) Avilability of materials.
4. Refining and processing in the United States.
(a) Design and technological process developments.
(b) Current runs by products.
(c) Refinery location in relation to markets and source of crude supply.
(d) New construction.
(e) Result in the shift from a processing to a chemical manufacturing industry.
5. Volumes of United States imports of crude and refined products.
(a) From outside sources—that is what country and amounts.
(b) Importing companies, source and amount.
6. Needs for supplying demands.
(a) National security, United States military and naval.
(b) United States consumers.
(c) Estimated future demands.
7. Economic problems of petroleum industry, United States.
(a) Price, general trends.
(b) Taxes, including depletion allowances.
(c) Competitive and monopolistic practices.
8. Transportation, storage, and marketing.
(a) Pipe lines.
(b) Tank vessels.
(c) Tank cars.
(d) Highway tank trucks.
9. Conservation and control.
(a) Progress by voluntary cooperation.
(b) Unitization of production.
(c) Employment of proration by cooperative action with State authorities.
(d) Extension of Federal ownership of oil resources.
(e) Methods by which Federal control of industry extended and to what extent.
10. Foreign situation.
(a) Economic recovery program.
(1) Extent of developments.
(2) Future proposed program.
(b) Availability of crude supply and in what countries.
(c) Trade practices by various countries.
(1) Extent and effect of proposed British Embargo on World Situation.
(d) Refining capacities abroad and location.
(e) New construction abroad.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

MEXICAN SHRIMP BOAT SEIZURE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have talked with the State Department regarding the seizure by the Mexican Government of the five American fishing vessels off the coast of Mexico. They tell me that today is a holiday in Mexico, but that on Wednesday those five fishing vessels will be released on the payment of a fine, if a fine be insisted upon. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the fine will not be insisted upon. We have had the most friendly relations with Mexico. The Mexican Ambassador and his wife are very fine people. I attended the Inter-American Conference held in Mexico City, and I know the worth of the Mexican people. I should be very sorry to see any incident occur over this unjust seizure of American fishing vessels. I hope the whole matter will be adjusted satisfactorily.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

COMMUNISM

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain textual material taken from the Department of State appropriation bill hearings for 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, in order that my remarks may not be misconstrued, I want, initially, to observe that I detest communism as the most sinister, Godless concept ever conceived to enslave mankind; and that I will fight communism in any form whenever and wherever it may manifest itself. I hate the deceit, the fraud, and the intellectual dishonesty that are the inveterate handmaidens of communism.

But for these very same reasons, I would have complete contempt for anyone who, through deceit or fraud would seek to inflame and hoodwink the American people with the assertion that the State Department of their Government has harbored or is saturated with Communists.

I have no brief for the State Department but I cannot in good conscience sit idly by and see the American people confused with distrust of their own Government at a time when our Nation needs the greatest unity of purpose in its history to meet the world menace of Soviet Russia and the slavery and degradation it would impose upon all mankind.

I have some information which I believe is of vital importance to the security and integrity of our State Department and our Government. I am working under rather severe limitations here for I try at all times to conform to the rules of the House. I shall do so this afternoon.

During the Eightieth Congress, investigators of the House Appropriations Committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] conducted a general inspection of State Department functions. Incident to this inspection, they examined the loyalty files in the State Department, this being done prior to the President's directive of March 13, 1948, limiting access to these files. As a result of this examination, memoranda were prepared concerning some 108 individuals whose files were reviewed. These persons were employed or mere applicants for employment in the State Department.

In a public record of the proceedings with respect to the appropriation for the State Department, for the 1949 fiscal year, there is set forth textual information relative to 13 of the individuals included in the list of 108. I have carefully studied the information concerning individuals appearing in the public record and call particular attention to the textual material, exact date, places, and occupation.

Under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks an analysis of the information set forth concerning 9 of the 13 individuals in the public record, the report of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

108 LIST CASES

Case No. 3, page 177:

1. The applicant came to the United States from Hungary in 1938 and was naturalized in New York City in August 1944. She has been employed since October 1944 as a translator and script writer with OWI and the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

2. A report of January 3, 1947, stated the subject was an active member of the International Workers Order, a Communist-front organization. One former employer said he discharged the subject for being argumentative, and inclined toward Communism. Another former employer said she is a radical and boasted of being a Communist. A third informant said the subject had told him that communism is a very good thing. A fourth informant said the subject always argues over politics and stated communism was right for this country. A fifth informant said she is oversympathetic to communism. Two references on her application for citizenship were members of the IWO and contributors to Communist periodicals.

Case No. 5, page 177:

1. This is an example of the failure of the evaluation section to take action on considerable derogatory information available relative to security, and expenditure of many weeks of additional investigation with no conclusion reached.

2. The subject was born in New York City in 1900. He was employed by the Foreign Economic Administration from August 1942 to August 1945 and has been employed by the State Department since that time in research and intelligence.

3. An investigative report dated May 4, 1946, reflected the opinions of eight persons, including six professors at Harvard and the University of California, a naval officer, and a fellow student, that he has strong Communist sympathies. They stated he frequently expounded these sympathies and is either a party member or a fellow traveler.

Case No. 1, page 176:

1. He was born in New York City in 1918. He was employed as an economist and analyst with OSS and the State Department since June 1945. Previous to that he had worked for the Treasury Department and the War Production Board. He is now in research and intelligence.

Case No. 9, page 180:

1. The subject is also an applicant for a position as Foreign Service career officer, and is presently a Foreign Service reserve officer under the informational and cultural program. He was appointed to this position in September 1947 and was assigned to Milan, Italy, where he is engaged in the educational program. He was a major and, subsequently, lieutenant colonel, in the United States Army from May 1943 to August 1946, after which he was assigned to the educational program in Italy.

2. Member of trade-union delegations to Soviet Russia in 1927. (This delegation was repudiated by William Green, president of the A. F. of L.)

Case No. 44, page 182:

1. He was appointed on January 2, 1947, for a position as economic analyst in research and intelligence.

2. He was employed by the Soviet Purchasing Commission and its subsidiary autostroy from 1932 to July 1945.

Case No. 61, page 183:

1. The subject agreed that she was responsible for the State Department having employed No. 12, but stated that it was because of his ability only that she had recommended him.

Case No. 99, page 173:

1. Several references state he is a liberal, but anti-Communist. One informant states he is a friend of C–36, of FCC, a reported Communist. He is a member of the National Lawyers Guild and Washington Book Shop. His wife belongs to the League of Women Shoppers. The applicant is a subscriber to New Masses, and has closely associated with members of the American Peoples Mobilization and Washington Committee for Democratic Action. A relative of his has a financial interest in the Daily Worker.

Case No. 100, page 173:

1. He is an applicant for a P–8 position with the State Department. He has been employed by the Treasury Department from April 1940 to the present time, except for military leave from July 1942 to December 1942.

2. He is highly recommended by E–3, and is an apparent prodigy of E–2. Both of these individuals are allegedly engaged in Soviet espionage activities.

3. CSA has received information from another Government agency to the effect that the subject was one of many contacts of E–19, subject of a Soviet espionage case.

4. One of the subject's references refused recommendation of him because of his association with two pro-Communists.

Case No. 78, page 184:

1. Inasmuch as most of the information in this report was given in the strictest confidence by loyal employees of OIE, it is strongly recommended that it not be made a matter of public record. However, there is set out below from a CSA memorandum of June 18, 1947, a summary of the information developed by investigation. It is suggested the committee may wish to use it rather than the appendix in recorded hearings.

2. However, the special agent was able to locate and interrogate numerous witnesses who stated in substance that the subject has (gathered together in this office) a mixture of fellow travelers, pseudo-liberals, and outright Communists. These witnesses stated that this group is a closely knit sect, the members of which protect each other and continuously assail anyone who dares to disagree with their way of thinking.

It is very important to observe from the record that on January 28 and 29, 1948, during the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, the Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee considered the report of the House investigators concerning the 108 individuals. Testimony was received in the executive session; the matter was considered; and no further action was taken.

It is apparent that the memorandums prepared by the House investigators in 1947 were selective and did not presume to set forth information from the State Department files which would disprove charges of disloyalty with respect to each individual. As a matter of fact, the House investigators' report, being not for the primary purpose of challenging the State Department's conclusion as to disloyalty or security risk, did not in most instances concern itself with the merits of each case. The House material merely dealt with the necessity or the inadequacy of the investigation.

Over 2 years ago I served as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments consisting of former Representative J. Edgar Chenoweth, chairman, former Representative Fred Busbey and the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative Walter Judd, Republicans, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative McCormack, and myself, Democrats, that investigated the list of 108 names. Our investigation of these cases resulted from the information obtained by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the State Department as shown in the printed hearings of the appropriation bill for 1949. The public hearings on March 10 and 12, 1948, before the subcommittee of which I was a member clearly show that the 108 cases are the same as those considered by the Subcommittee on Appropriations. The results of the investigation made by the Subcommittee on Expenditures were such that not even a report was made. It was considered that the investigation did not warrant the making of any report. The hearings indicate that a majority of the subcommittee felt that the State Department was doing a good job. This, too, was in the Republican-controlled Congress.

At that time the office of controls which had charge of security matters within the Department was under Mr. Hamilton Robinson, who was investigated at the hearing. As I said, the Subcommittee on Expenditures made no official report to the House of the hearings but there was some rather descriptive editorial comment about the matter particularly when the committee found that the only card Mr. Robinson carried was the card of the New York Republican Party. At this point I should like to quote a few paragraphs from an editorial of the Washington Evening Star for March 11, 1948:

The session was called as a result of a letter Mr. Busbey wrote last February to Chairman Chenoweth, of the subcommittee, having to do with State Department expenditures. In that letter, released at the time to the press, Mr. Busbey flatly asserted that Mr. Robinson was not qualified for his job. The Busbey letter said, moreover, that "in view of certain facts known to his superiors, he should have been removed from office many months ago." Mr. Busbey was quoted as saying he intended to prove his charges.

But the only conceivably derogatory fact that Mr. Busbey proved at the hearing was that Mr. Robinson has a second cousin who, Mr. Busbey said, resigned from the State Department in 1946 while under investigation. The questioning of Mr. Robinson revealed that he has had "absolutely nothing to do" with the second cousin since taking over the Office of Controls, and that he disagreed with the liberal views of the cousin. And Assistant Secretary of State Peurifoy, the only one of Mr. Robinson's superiors to testify, made it plain that, aside from the second-cousin angle, everything the State Department knows about Mr. Robinson is complimentary. He was recommended for appointment by Assistant Secretary of State Norman Armour, was praised by William L. Clayton, when he was Under Secretary of State, and is highly regarded by John Foster Dulles and other prominent and reliable citizens. Mr. Peurifoy told the subcommittee that the FBI report was favorable to Mr. Robinson, except for the reference to the second cousin.

To pillory a responsible official of the State Department on such flimsy evidence as Mr. Busbey produced at the hearing is unfair in the extreme. Such exhibitions can do grave harm to the serious business of trying to safeguard the Government against subversive individuals.

Of the 108 cases considered by the Subcommittee on Expenditures the hearings developed that 57 of the individuals were employed in March 1948 and 51 were not employed. Of the 51 not employed 23 had never worked for the State Department but were applicants for positions. Resigned or terminated, 28.

Of the 57 who were employed, the hearings show that all of these cases were submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At that time, the Assistant Secretary of State testified that about half of the 57 had already been investigated by the FBI and approved by the State Department. He said that 22 of the cases were then pending before the FBI and they were awaiting reports of investigations of them.

This is all that I can say from the hearing, which is a public record on file in the Clerk's office, and I must confine myself to that but I want to point out to the House that these 108 cases are more than 2½ years old. The hearings to which I have referred show that they were under study and investigation by the Eightieth Congress as well as the FBI at the time the Department of State was in charge of one of the greatest Americans I know, Gen. George Marshall. Do you think that a man of his honesty and patriotism would have permitted any of the 108 or the 57 I have mentioned, who might be questionable security risks, to remain with the Department as a threat to the country for which he fought? I do not. I have great respect for him and I believe that is shared by the majority of the people of America.

It is important to the interest of our country that the matter I have presented be looked into and the facts obtained and further disclosed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, who was a member of the Subcommittee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. I remember well the investigation which was made. It started out with this gentleman Robinson, to whom you have referred. The subcommittee was properly constituted. I see our former chairman of the Committee on Expenditures, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] on the floor. Mr. Chenoweth was chairman,

and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] was a member of it, as was former Congressman Busbey, Republicans, and the gentleman from Missouri and I were on the minority side. Mr. Busbey sent a letter to Mr. Chenoweth making charges against a man by the name of Robinson. I thought it was strange that he should be a member of the subcommittee, because he not only charged the man, but in his letter to the former chairman, Mr. Chenoweth, he convicted him. There he sat on the jury, so to speak. But I did not raise any question. None of us did at that time. In any event, the committee went into that, and I may say that the chairman appeared to be very much disgusted.

Mr. KARSTEN. At several points during the hearing the chairman took charge of the meeting himself and said, "This part of the investigation is closed." Apparently he had enough of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and Mr. Busbey wanted to keep right on. Mr. Chenoweth just cut him off short and said, "This part of the investigation is over, as far as Robinson is concerned." I remember Robinson's saying that the only card-bearing association that he was a member of during that time was the Republican Club of New York City, and he had been a member for 10 years.

Mr. KARSTEN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, as a Democrat, I felt rather sorry that there was not some Democrat in the position, but that is another story.

Mr. KARSTEN. I wondered about that, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but that is another story. Then we went into the 108. There is no question but that the 108 cases were the 108 cases that the Subcommittee on Appropriations in the State Department had looked into, and properly so. Mr. Peurifoy particularly testified that his Subcommittee on Appropriations had looked into these cases. They were gone into very thoroughly. I remember Mr. O'Donnell, attorney for our subcommittee, inquired into them quite thoroughly. Three of the cases, as I remember, were persons who were employees of the State Department who were supposed to have signed a Communist petition, and upon inquiry they found that it was three persons of the same names who had signed it, but not the same persons in the State Department. They were other persons entirely, and it was a case of mistaken identity. In any event, the subcommittee went into it very thoroughly and at the end we did not even make a report.

Mr. KARSTEN. If there ever was a hearing that blew up on the committee table, that was it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, it blew up on Mr. Busbey. The other members were Mr. Chenoweth and Mr. Judd, whom we all know and highly respect, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] and myself. But it certainly blew up because nobody wanted to make a report. We tried to get a report.

Mr. KARSTEN. We tried our very best.

Mr. McCORMACK. But we could not get our Republican colleagues on the committee together to even make a report.

Mr. KARSTEN. And it is important to observe from the hearings at that point that it was the concensus of the majority of the committee that the State Department was doing a good job under the direction of General Marshall.

Mr. McCORMACK. And you can rest content that if they thought otherwise they would have made a report.

Mr. KARSTEN. In a Republican Congress I have no doubt of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was a Republican-controlled committee. There were three Republican members and two Democrat members. The result of it was that it just simply folded up. Nobody wanted to think about it again. Everybody recognized that the State Department was handling whatever situation existed there under Secretary Marshall and former Secretary Byrnes—I think General Marshall was then Secretary.

Mr. KARSTEN. He was then the Secretary.

Mr. McCORMACK. The situation that existed under former Secretary Byrnes and General Marshall had been handled by them. We knew they had taken over several thousand employees of temporary agencies. They had been transferred over into the State Department. The State Department was going through the investigations that involved security risks which are entirely different from loyalty or disloyalty cases. A person could be a security risk if being in a position to know something he should not divulge, drank too much or was inclined to talk too much. He might be just as good an American as anyone else and still not be a good security risk. Some people just cannot keep their mouth shut when they know something and yet may be just as good a person as anybody else, just as good an American as anybody else but not a good security risk so far as a particular position or job is concerned.

I think the gentleman from Missouri has made a marked contribution to our country in the statement he released to the press and in making the speech he has made.

If ever an investigation blew up, and if ever silence indicated a desire to avoid any reference to it, that has been achieved by the subcommittee on which the gentleman from Missouri and I served, the subcommittee that looked into the case of a man by the name of Robinson whose second cousin, mark you, whose second cousin was supposed to be pro-Communist. Or, make him out a Communist; go the full distance and say he was a Communist. Certainly I am not going to convict any man of being a Communist because his second cousin might be a Communist. That was the whole theory at the time our investigation started, and then it stretched into the 108 cases. It is very apparent to me that there is a master list in the Committee on Appropriations. I see here a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. We picked up what the investigators of the Appropriations Committee found. Out of 20,000 employees in the State Department in the Foreign Service they brought up 108 cases of which 23 were never employed by the State Department at any time, and 14 were not even going to be considered. Under the law once they pass the examination for the Foreign Service they have to be given an oral examination, so Mr. Peurifoy testified before the committee; and the decision was made that 14 were not even to be considered, and the other 9 who were going to be considered were among the 108 cases.

Our records are public but they were not even printed; we did not even want to put the Government to the expense of having them printed.

Mr. KARSTEN. I may say to the Majority Leader that copies of the hearings are available and are in the possession of the Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are public records and the transcript of the evidence is available, I assume, in the Clerk's office. But the subcommittee did not think it important enough even to have the hearings printed. Am I right?

Mr. KARSTEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. In any event the subcommittee, I want to say in that respect, properly entered into it, my friend from Missouri agrees. The chairman was very fair, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] was very fair because we were there as minority members and we are always presumed to be fair, we Democrats. Mr. Busby was insistent on interrogating Mr. Robinson. He did not even want to stop when the chairman of the committee, Mr. Chenoweth, was so disgusted with it that he said in substance, "That phase is all over; we are not going to look into that any more."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened rather attentively to the discussion of the gentleman from Missouri and the contribution made by the distinguished majority leader. Am I correct in the assumption that the conclusion which I am to draw as a result of this colloquy is that this subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures of the Eightieth Congress under the chairmanship of Mr. Chenoweth did a remarkably good job and that the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Massachusetts approved of it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman I must admit that Mr. Chenoweth conducted a very fair hearing.

Mr. KEEFE. So the action of the committee as I understand it—and I can come to no other conclusion from the discussion which has taken place—was that, so far as Mr. Chenoweth was concerned, so far as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] was concerned, so far as the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Missouri were concerned, they were in accord as to what the final action of the committee

would be with respect to this subject matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, except that the 108 cases were never new.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that.

Mr. McCORMACK. When you talk about 80 cases and read in the newspapers of 80 cases, most of them supposed to be of recent origin, they were among those 108.

Mr. KEEFE. I take it the gentleman's criticism of the action of this committee, if any, is directed at former Representative Busbey.

Mr. KARSTEN. I have not criticized him. The gentleman led the discussion in the hearings, and that was his right.

Mr. KEEFE. The whole purport of the colloquy which has been placed in the RECORD is that this subcommittee did take the report or a report from the Appropriations Subcommittee, and a report based upon this investigation by the investigators of the Appropriations Committee in the Eightieth Congress, and conducted this hearing?

Mr. KARSTEN. We did not conduct a hearing on your report. The gentleman's committee considered the matter and our committee thereafter considered the subject after the gentleman's committee had done so. It is very interesting to know, I may say to the gentleman, that we had a hearing and an executive session after which the matter was closed without any other action. The same action as was taken by the committee of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Then I cannot see anything to criticize or find fault with in the statement of either gentleman. I am glad to know that at least one action of the Eightieth Congress seems to be approved.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman would not be able to see it. The gentleman from Wisconsin fails to grasp the point that of the 108 names which were investigated by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and later by a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the greater part of 80 other names recently disclosed and supposed to be something of recent origin, were among those 108 names. So the gentleman should wake up.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that I have no reputation of being so naive as to not appreciate what the purpose of this discussion is, but under the rules of the House neither the majority leader nor my good friend from Missouri would attempt to get into a discussion that would violate those rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. But I am clearly able to understand the gentleman from Massachusetts, confined and limited as he is by the rules of the House, and confined and limited as my friend from Missouri is.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman gets the point?

Mr. KEEFE. I thoroughly understand the gentleman's point and may I say to my friends, both of whom I have great admiration for, that the people of America are not naive either. They will understand when this whole matter is washed out, wherever it may be washed out, the facts and the situation.

Mr. KARSTEN. I may say to the gentleman that the people of America are fair. They have a good sense of judgment.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, they are.

Mr. KARSTEN. I think in a matter of this kind we should refer that to their judgment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Particularly when two committees of the House have looked into it over 2 years ago, both controlled by the Republicans.

Mr. KARSTEN. It does look convincing.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very interesting to the American people.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I am not a member of either of these committees, but I have followed the proposition in reference to the charges made by my colleague from Illinois, Mr. Busbey, and I presume the statement on the part of the gentleman from Missouri is to call attention to the unfairness of the charges and the lack of justification for making them and giving them to the press against the State Department. In view of an investigation on the part of the then Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress and later by another committee which found nothing to substantiate the charges that have been made from day to day on the part of my former colleague, Mr. Busbey. I presume you want to make it clear that even now the charges that were made in such a reckless manner by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Busbey, in the Eightieth Congress there is nothing to justify these charges and there is nothing to the charges that are being made against the State Department today. I presume that is what the gentleman is trying to bring out; is it not?

Mr. KARSTEN. The point I am trying to make is that there is nothing new in the 108 cases nor in the 57 cases I spoke of.

Mr. McCORMACK. I see the gentleman from New York here. I ask him if he has any knowledge about the 108 cases.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in affirmatively answering the gentleman I can say that in the summer of 1947 the House Committee on Appropriations initiated an investigation of the administrative operations of the Department of State and sent members of its investigative staff to study various areas of the Department. On the 8th of August 1947 the Department announced to all employees that the investigative staff of the House Committee on Appropriations, under its then chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], consisting of Robert E. Lee, Harris Huston, James Nugent, and Wilfred Sigerson, were making a study of the Department, and that they would be interviewing members of the Department's staff during the next few weeks. Departmental officers were requested to cooperate in making available the information which the investigators would require. Subsequently, and during the period from the 18th of September 1947 until November 3, 1947, committee investigators, including Mr. Huston and his assistant, Eugene Rinta, were down in the State Department. They interviewed employees but spent most of their time reviewing the personnel security files. They were given desk space in the file room of the Division of Security and Investigations and had unlimited access to all files and to all material in the files. This was prior to the President's directive of March 15, 1948, covering the confidential treatment of loyalty files. Subsequently a report was made in mimeographed form to the House Committee on Appropriations and to members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary. In the month of January 1948 the subcommittee had a copy of a 69-page mimeographed list of 108 cases which had been selected by the investigators from the files of the Department without regard to inserting any of the information in the files which was to the credit of any one of the 108 persons, but which portrayed the worst picture as to each one of the 108.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not want to object, I want to ask a question and perhaps the distinguished gentleman from New York who is now addressing us can answer, and that is as to whether or not in these 108 names the names of Alger Hiss or Julian Wadleigh appeared.

Mr. KARSTEN. Let me answer the gentleman that our committee had no names.

Mr. KEEFE. You had no names?

Mr. KARSTEN. We had no names.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. All we had was simply factual cases by number. But, I would like to recommend to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he study the dates, the occupations, and places because I believe that is very important.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman wish me to continue?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Out of the 108 cases contained in the list I have referred to, copies of which were given to the subcommittee in January 1948, and at the time another copy of which was given to Assistant Secretary of State Peurifoy, someone extracted 81 of the 81 cases contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1950. In other words, every case mentioned in the other body on

that date is contained in the list of 108. We find that of the 1947, 1948, and 1950, 108 names 68 are not employed in the State Department. There were 40 of the 108 to whom security clearance was given and who are still employed. Of the 68, 17 had never been employed at any time in the Department of State, 37 resigned either by request or voluntarily, 7 were laid off on reduction in force, 6 completed their assignment and their services were terminated, and 1 died. The security files of the 40 cases still employed have been reviewed by the Division of Security of the State Department, and I understand that in each case security clearance has been given for the individual's employment. At one time all these individuals were favorably processed under the provisions of the President's Loyalty Order. In those cases where the FBI found it necessary to conduct full field investigations under the loyalty program, favorable determinations have been made by the Department's Loyalty Security Board. Cases on which no unfavorable information was uncovered do not go through the loyalty program. Clearance is given by the Department alone. I am assured that all these favorable determinations, except one, have been post-audited by the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission. In four other cases, where the FBI had previously informed the Department that its files contained no disloyal data with regard to the individuals concerned, full field investigations have since been conducted or initiated by the FBI. At the present time, one of these cases is pending adjudication by a regional loyalty board of the Civil Service Commission, and a second case is pending adjudication by the Department's Loyalty Security Board. In a third case, I am told the investigative reports were received very recently for reference to the Department's Loyalty Board for adjudication. In the fourth case, the department was recently advised by the Civil Service Commission that the FBI has initiated the investigation of this individual under the provisions of the President's loyalty program. In all four of these cases the Department had available the results of its own investigations at the time when security clearance was given for the continued employment of these individuals. It should also be noted that as I have indicated, these four individuals were also previously processed in a favorable manner under the President's loyalty program.

As to the 81 persons referred to in a subpena list given to a subcommittee of the other body, compared with the list of 108, they are identical except in a certain few instances. For example, case No. 15 was left blank on the floor of the other body. There was a skip in the presentation from case No. 14 to case No. 16. In the subpena list, "15" is a new name later inserted.

As to case No. 19, it was presented on the floor of the other body in such a way that it contained no information which would permit identification. In the subpena list case No. 19 is a new name later inserted by somebody and believed to be a Commerce Department employee involved in a highly publicized congressional loyalty investigation and later cleared by the Loyalty Review Board.

As a further example cases Nos. 21 to 26 on the February 20, 1950, list of 81 were lumped together on the floor of the other body as typical of many of the employees in the New York office of OIE, but insufficient information was given to permit precise identification in the comparable 108 list. In the subpena list to which I referred, the names are given. None of these names are on the 108 list. Will they be found in certain appendices prepared by the House investigators to case No. 78 of the 108 list?

There may be at the bottom of this whole situation an employee of the House named Robert E. Lee, who is now on the pay roll of the minority in the House Appropriations Committee. I suggest that some further information might be obtained from Mr. Lee as to exactly what went on in bringing to life as brand new a list of 81 cases from a list of 108 prepared by him 3 years ago. Let us get any Communists out pronto—but let us see if there is any politics being played.

Mr. KARSTEN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. What is the difference between the 108 and the 81? I cannot quite understand it. Is it that 81 now are being charged and picked out of the 108, and new charges being made, notwithstanding that they are the same people that were included in the 108 that were investigated by the different House committees in the Republican Eightieth Congress?

Mr. ROONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. SABATH. That is the way I take it, that it really is a sham and a publicity stunt and nothing else.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman is referring to a proceeding in the other body as a sham and a disgrace.

Mr. SABATH. I did not know that the 81 came from the other body.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman just referred to the proceeding. No one can draw any other conclusion than that.

Mr. SABATH. I want to know where that comes from, where the 81 have been taken from, by whom and where. I do not know whether it was in the other body or not. But I will eliminate the word "sham" and say it was perhaps done for political reasons.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not care to prolong this discussion at all. It is just that I want to see the rules of the House followed. The gentleman from Missouri in the discussion has scrupulously tried to do just that.

Mr. KARSTEN. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I have always made it a policy to obey the rules of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. I attempted to ask the question as to whether or not the gentleman knows from the research that he has given to this matter whether or not the names of Alger Hiss or Julian Wadleigh were included in this list of 108 names to which he has referred.

Mr. KARSTEN. No names were given. They were known by case numbers and no names were mentioned.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the gentleman cannot tell us whether or not the name of Dr. Philip Jessup was in this list of 108 names?

Mr. KARSTEN. I cannot say because, as I told the gentleman, no names were mentioned. They were investigators' reports known only by case numbers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have no master list of names, but it is very apparent from the printed hearings of the Committee on Appropriations, because they say there were 108 in the hearings, and there seems to be an inference that there was a list of names.

Mr. KEEFE. I think there is a master list and I think ultimately it ought to be exposed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and that is what we hope.

Mr. SABATH. It should be.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to inquire if anyone on the Committee on Appropriations knows that there was a master list of names.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say there was a key list containing the names and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had a copy of it. I am sure the gentleman from New York can disclose to the gentleman from Wisconsin whether or not the names to which he refers were contained in that list prepared by Mr. Lee, who worked for the majority party of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. KARSTEN. Could the gentleman say how many copies of that list there were?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from New York, the then chairman of the full House Committee on Appropriations, should best be able to answer that question.

Mr. KARSTEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. These lists were in the files of the committee and were turned over when we left. I do not know just exactly how many master lists there were or to what members of the subcommittee they were given. I have seen such a list. I do not have such a list at the moment.

Mr. KARSTEN. The gentleman could not say how many copies were made at the time the list was given to the committee?

Mr. TABER. I could not say. It is customary when those reports are made out that each member of the subcommittee have a copy of the report, and that would include both the majority and the minority.

Mr. KARSTEN. I thank the gentleman. It is my hope that the information I have presented will be looked into

and the facts obtained and further disclosed.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] a question: My colleague, do you not believe it is—I will use the word "reprehensible," though that is too strong a word—to charge anyone with an "offense by association"?

Mr. KARSTEN. I will say to the gentleman I think it certainly is.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Or to charge anyone with an offense by innuendo or insinuation?

Mr. KARSTEN. Certainly. And may I say to the gentleman, and I have tried to obey all the rules of the House in my presentation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have the highest respect for the gentleman from Missouri. I have served with him a long time. I make no criticism of anything he said.

Mr. KARSTEN. I thank the gentleman. I wonder if the gentleman also agrees with me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That you have obeyed the rules of the House?

Mr. KARSTEN. Oh, I think the gentleman understands.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think you have most scrupulously followed the rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, I also assume you agree with the gentleman from Missouri that you should not find a person guilty by association.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. I have had some experience with that, when the Washington Post several years ago had their reporter, this Dillard Stokes, a man using two aliases, by fraud and deception and the use of the mail which enabled the Post to use the Federal courts, prefer charges here in the District of Columbia, and bring from the utmost limits of the country, from the Pacific coast and other far-off places, some of the 30 people it caused to be indicted in these so-called sedition cases; falsely charged those poor, helpless people with sedition, and through the use of the District courts kept them here for something over 2 or 3 years; and finally, in an editorial, the Washington Post was forced by its own shame to apologize for that disgraceful persecution. That most reprehensible action—cowardly and un-American. Persecution by the strong and influential of the poor and helpless—that was the Washington Post which then and ever since has rushed to the defense of those charged with communism.

Now, I am not quite as bright and alert as some of the Members of the House, and I did not just sense the purpose of the talk by my colleague from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN]. My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] seemed to get it, but I did not get it. I did not get what the gentleman from Missouri was driving at.

Mr. KARSTEN. I suggest that you will read the RECORD tomorrow. Read it carefully and pay particular attention to dates and places and occupations. That is as far as I can go.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Aside from the possible conclusion that our former colleague, Mr. Bushey, who is no longer with us, but who I hope will soon be back as a member had poor judgment and acted inadvisably, just what point did you want to put over? Aside from that the other point, that Mr. Chenoweth and the other Republican on that committee—the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]—acted very fairly and with good judgment, what other point did you want to put over?

Mr. KARSTEN. I think I made myself perfectly clear, and I believe the gentleman from Michigan understands it. That is far as I can go. I have made my statement, and I hope the gentleman will read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, I shall; but I listened very carefully, and I say, aside from those two points—I will concede my dullness—just what were you driving at? What point were you trying to establish?

Mr. KARSTEN. Let me say I will not elaborate on the statement I have made. If the gentleman does not understand it, I am sorry. It may be that the people of the country will understand it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, I will have to accept the interpretation that I gather was put on it by my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], which was that in some indirect way, by some insinuation or innuendo, you were referring to charges, irresponsible charges, in your opinion as you might describe them, made by someone else, and you were using this horrible example of Mr. Busbey who in your opinion was once mistaken to make your point.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Busbey is only an incident.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, that is right. The reference to Mr. Busbey was only incidental, to establish the point that it was wrong to recklessly make charges which one could not substantiate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that the gentleman's inference?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My inference?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the only conclusion I can get from the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. McCORMACK. I certainly would not challenge that conclusion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. Now we have it. You see what they have done? They have used—the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] have used 35 minutes, trying by insinuation and innuendo and by citing what they consider a horrible example of misjudgment, to put across the point that recently someone, whom they did not dare mention because of certain rules of the House, has made false and reckless charges. What does it come to? Are the gentlemen using the same methods which they charge someone else used and which they take 35 minutes to condemn?

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; not just now. Let me go ahead.. We come down to this: All that the gentlemen did, aside from citing facts which showed that in their judgment a former Member of the House was mistaken in charging that an employee of the State Department was guilty of improper conduct, was to show that a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, controlled by Republicans, gave the accused a prompt, fair and impartial hearing and failed to find that there was foundation for the charges made.

The gentlemen used 35 minutes to prove that charges made against a State Department employee were not substantiated when submitted to a subcommittee controlled by Republicans.

That illustration has nothing whatever to do with charges made against other employees of the State Department or of the Justice Department, two of whom, Hiss and Coplon, have since been convicted by a jury.

Certainly the gentlemen are not so naive as to argue that, because the innocence of one employee of the State Department was established, all other employees are innocent.

So far as I know, no one has ever contended that a majority or even a substantial number of the State Department employees were guilty either of improper conduct or disloyalty. What those presently making charges against the State Department are trying to do is, I assume, to find the one rotten apple in the barrel which taints the whole barrel.

Now, there is one pertinent question that I think if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] were here, he might answer. Is it not true that Mr. Peurifoy testified that there were more than 50 homosexuals in the State Department?

Mr. KARSTEN. I would say to the gentleman from Michigan that, as I remember, that question never came up before the subcommittee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman said that was a recent development that did not come up before our subcommittee. I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] to tell us about that.

Mr. KARSTEN. And on the subject of reckless charges——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; let me proceed, now please.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

I just want to make one short statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am always glad to have a statement from the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated that the subject matter that he has most recently referred to was not considered by the subcommittee because the information given to the American people on that subject was of very recent origin. May it not be, by the same token, that some of the other information that has recently been given to the American people was never considered by this subcommittee or by any subcommittee on appropriations, information that is of recent origin? For example, the disclosures in the Hiss case; for example, the confessions of Julian Wadleigh; for example, the conviction of Judy Coplon in the Justice Department; for example, many others that are now coming to the attention of the American people. The attempt to make it appear that the failure of the subcommittee for lack of information to go into those subjects here discussed this thing and to find that they have gone over this whole situation as a result of the hearings which they had 2 or 3 or 4 years ago, it seems to me does not at all reach the issue that is now before the American people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, of course, it does not reach the present issue. The facts to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has just referred were in existence—they were hidden—they existed at the time the congressional subcommittee made its investigations. They were covered up by the administration. All that the statement of the gentleman from Missouri proves is that the committee did not uncover Communists who were in Federal jobs and the further fact that the administration, concealing the facts by closing its files, was successful in covering up for Communists.

Subsequent events showed that the Communists were there, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said. Alger Hiss was there, and Judy was there, and the other people who have been named were there; but our committee of the Eightieth Congress, in the opinion of the great self-satisfied Mr. Truman, the worst Congress until the coming of his Eighty-first Congress that the country ever had, just failed to dig them up. They were buried so deed by the Executive order that we could not get at them.

Now, why were they not dug up and exposed before?

That is a little ancient history, but let us have some of it. Yes, at the risk of having the mud slingers and the smear artists, including even the great and powerful Washington Post, which usually rushes to the defense not only of those charged with left-wing activities but of those who subsequently are shown to be Communists, smearing those of us who would like to see the State Department given a clean bill of health by the expulsion not only of the Communists but of others who are subject to pressure, let us have the facts—let us get the files—hear the evidence.

Members of this House remember when the Dies committee was created; Members of this House remember, some of them do, anyway, that Mr. Browder, an admitted Communist, had access to the White House; that the administration at that time did not object when his wife went to Canada and then with the administration's aid reentered the country; Members of this House know that Browder was convicted of perjury because he denied that he was a Communist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just the first 10 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct; the gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I remember being in this House when Mr. Dies tried to uncover the Communists and their activities. He was most shamefully abused and vilified by the Washington Post, by those who opposed the attempt which he was making to expose and drive out the Communists who were in the administration. I remember how certain gentlemen—I see one sitting before me now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who opposed the creation of that committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. No; I was responsible for passing the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; I will apologize and withdraw that and say now the gentleman from Illinois, if he says so, supported the creation of the committee. Did you not oppose the appropriation of any money for the committee? I will leave that for the RECORD to answer.

Mr. SABATH. When I learned that they did not investigate the Nazis as was contemplated, then I said that they should start to investigate those whom the resolution was aimed at, namely——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Fascists?

Mr. SABATH. The Nazis as well as the Communists.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, yes!

Mr. SABATH. Which the Dies committee did not do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; I cannot yield further; and go a little slower on the Communists.

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will accept the gentleman's statement and add that the resolution creating the committee was adopted on the 26th day of May 1938 by a vote of 191 to 41 and without a roll call.

However, if recollection serves me correctly, when, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] offered a resolution that the rules of the Seventy-eighth Congress be adopted and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] offered an amendment creating the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee of the House, the gentleman from Illinois on that roll call voted against the Rankin amendment.

Well do I remember that, for some time after the creation of the Dies committee, there was on the Democratic side a group of 50 or 75 Members who time and again voted against appropriations for the Dies committee.

Well do I recall the opposition to the Dies committee. Permit typical quotations from just two Congressmen and one columnist:

Mr. CELLER. * * * This committee, the Wood-Rankin committee, and its predecessor committee have caused no end of trouble, no end of embarrassment to this very Congress, because those committees have caused trepidation in the hearts and minds of the people of the Nation, and fear to express their own opinions; and you know, as well as I, that only on the anvil of free discussion and free opinion can we forge the truth. Maybe some of the members of this committee do not want the truth to be told.

I believe this $75,000 that will undoubtedly be appropriated today will be just a waste of money as valueless as putting that money down a drain, as valueless as dropping a bucket into an empty well. We have spent—I asked this question but got no adequate answer—we have spent well-nigh a million dollars through the Dies committee and this current committee. What have we got from that?

* * * * *

This committee has resulted in dangerously splitting and splintering our people into hostile groups. In addition to the fact that no one bill has been passed, the activities of this committee have created festering sores of prejudice and intolerance in many parts of this country, and for that reason I hope this resolution will be voted down.

Instead of judicial fairness and decorum prevailing in the committee hearings we have noted browbeating of witnesses, badgering of witnesses, and unjustifiable tirades against witnesses.

* * * * *

If some of the committee members had their way they would put plugs into the ears of the Nation, gags in mouths, and blinders on eyes, because they want the Nation to see, hear, and speak only what they desire.

* * * * *

Anyone who disagrees with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is a Communist or un-American. The red herring is constantly drawn across the trail.

* * * * *

Thomas L. Stokes, able and skillful columnist of the Scripps-Howard papers, questions:

"Can it be healthy for our democracy to have the gentleman from Mississippi using a committee, with the whole Nation for its sphere of operations, to exploit his own fears and prejudices?"

Mr. MARCANTONIO. * * * We must judge it by its trend, and we must judge it by its actions. The record will show that the trend of this committee has at all times been to attack pro-Democratic organizations in the country and anti-Fascist organizations in this country. The record will also show that the test of what is subversive and what is not subversive has been the political standards of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. No one can deny that. His viewpoint has been a most aggressive one and it has been impressed thoroughly on the committee.

Perhaps some of those who are now condemning others who are trying to un-

cover Communists may later discover that they, too, have been mistaken.

I remember how the administration attempted to cover up. If you want me to go further, I can tell you how a member of the family of the then President came to a House committee hearing investigating Communists with a group of known Communists. There is no dispute about that.

There is no getting away from the facts which have been here for the last 10 years that the preceding and the present administration have hampered and hindered the Congress every time it wanted information on Communist convicts who were paroled and in other cases where a cover-up seemed expedient.

I even introduced a bill which if passed would have required executive departments to give the Congress information and it called for a penalty to be imposed upon any Congressman who disclosed that information. The information given was to be regarded as secret and confidential. No; Congressmen and Senators are not to be given information, are not to be trusted, but dozens, perhaps hundreds, of Federal employees are to have access to these files.

Mr. KARSTEN. And was it not the Eightieth Congress that would not act on the gentleman's resolution?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. True enough, the Eightieth Congress did not. Why? There are altogether too many Members of Congress who have not, I will try to be charitable, the inclination or the courage to go ahead and assert and exercise the power that the Congress rightfully has when it comes in conflict with those in the executive departments who can distribute favors or flattery—many of us have been too trusting, too amiable, too disinclined to fight, too fearful of the smear articles and mud-slinger.

I recall when the Civil Service Commissioners came before our subcommittee, and the gentleman from Missouri was, I think though I am not sure, a member of that subcommittee, and admitted that they had no knowledge of 750,000 cards that were compiled in part by a firm of New York attorneys and in part by civil-service employees, cards which reflected upon many Members of the Senate, many Members of the Congress; and when we asked for the cards they said: "We did not know they were there." The cards were there all right. The Commissioners admitted it was unlawful to have them. "We should not have them, we will destroy them, but we will not let you see them." So in substance they testified.

Think of it, the employees of the Civil Service Commission had them, but, no, when the Congress wanted information which the taxpayers' dollars had been misused to gather, the executive department said, "No." And it stuck in spite of my efforts. All I got was the Commission's promise to destroy the cards which reflected on the Members of Congress.

If a gentleman on that side said to me: "HOFFMAN, you stole my pen and you have it in that little pocket, this little inside pocket, you have it there." What would I say? I would say, "My friend," if he was my friend, "you are mistaken. Here is the pocket. See if you can find it." That would settle that issue. And settle it for keeps.

When we say to the administration or when individuals say to the administration: "You have had Communists there over the years," the administration has said, "No. The charge is nothing but a political red herring." "Not a word of truth in it." "You are the Kremlin's best asset." But when a court comes along and convicts a man because he lied when he said he was not a Communist, when that woman is convicted, there is no longer room for argument.

And Secretary of State Acheson—has he yet apologized to the American people for saying, after Hiss' conviction, that he would not turn his back on Hiss? As an individual, that was his right. As a Secretary of State, did he not, when he made that statement, weaken our position before the world?

The important question now is: Are there still Communists in the State Department?

With the third world war threatening us, does not our national security demand that others than those who were, to be most charitable, so lacking in knowledge and foresight as to permit the Communists to take over so much of China, be from here on out in charge of our national defense, our operation against the Communists?

If the administration desired the truth, would it not go before the Senate committee and say, "Here are our files. We will trust your loyalty, we will trust your discretion just as we trust the loyalty and the discretion of our employees. Now, look at the files and see whether there are friends of Russia—enemies of our Republic—in the executive departments."

An administration which wanted the Communists taken from public power, wanted the Communists taken from positions where they can influence the policy of this country, would say: "Sure. We do not believe any are there, but we are going along with you. If they are there we are going to find them and we are going to root them out and we are going to discharge them."

That is what an honest, patriotic, truth-seeking administration would do.

When heretofore it has been so mistaken and abusive about those who now seek to learn the truth, it should be more charitable. It would not cover up, it would not make charges. When the loyalty of its employees was questioned, it would not say the motive was all a political one.

The motives of those who charge that there are disloyal or unfit persons in the executive departments is not the issue before the people. What the people want to know is this: Are the charges true? Is there foundation for those charges? If there is, what does the administration propose to do about it?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Is it not a fact that at least George Washington and William Howard Taft and Theodore Roosevelt——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, I know what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Refused——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will not yield any further because I know what the gentleman is asking.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. O. K. Answer me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, it is a fact that George Washington was the first President that refused to give the Congress information. Now, why? Because under the Constitution the President is charged with conducting foreign affairs and the information which Washington refused to give was the kind of information which he obtained and needed to exercise the power vested in him by the Constitution. He was absolutely right in making that decision.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. How about Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft and on down? Let us have some history. The gentleman knows it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My time will not permit. But the issue is all set forth and discussed in two pamphlets, one which our committee made as a report and one which the Senate committee made as a report, and if the gentleman cares to be enlightened on the subject—because of my lack of ability I would not venture to try the job—but the gentleman may read those two reports, one of which I wrote and which I will print as an extension of my remarks and I am sure he will get at least my views.

This is the point. We have no business asking the President for information on matters where, under the Constitution, he has exclusive authority to act, but where we create a department and provide for the support of that department, as the Supreme Court said in the Dougherty case, it is within the province of Congress to ask, and to require, and to obtain information to enable us to carry out the duty imposed upon us by the very first sentence in the Constitution which is that the legislative power is vested in the Congress.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. Does the gentleman feel that J. Edgar Hoover is wrong when he recommends that the Congress be not given access to these files?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think J. Edgar Hoover is right thus far, and no farther, that the Congress should not ask and should not have laid before it the sources of the information obtained by the FBI. The FBI accepts rumors, they accept the statements of stool pigeons, and if Hoover gave us the names of the people who gave him that information, I think the opportunity for his services and the services of his agents would be destroyed. He would be prevented from doing a good job, but as to the information in those files I can see no reason why we should not have it.

Mr. HUBER. The gentleman is a lawyer, and I am not. Would that not be hearsay? That would not be evidence if you did not have the source, would it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If you did not have the names?

Mr. HUBER. No, the source.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I do not think it would be hearsay if you had the original statement. If an affidavit was produced that would be proof of what was in the affidavit but it would not be proof of the truth of the statements therein unless it was shown the affiant had actual knowledge. But even hearsay while not admissible in court may give a lead to direct and positive evidence. For instance, a man says that another man is a Communist. I do not think you can prove that by a card or certificate, but you may prove it for all practical purposes by what he says and does. I would say to the gentleman from Ohio I can illustrate it this way. You say I am a Congressman. That is hearsay. You do not know. You see me here. You notice me getting my pay downstairs; maybe you have seen my certificate of election. But, it is hearsay, strictly speaking. Why? Unless some law makes the certificate of the Secretary of State evidence, it would be hearsay. You see the signature on my certificate of election. You do not even know that he who signs it is Secretary of State. Do you not see how absurd we can get in asking for direct positive testimony or proof? For all practical purposes, I am a Congressman, but for actual positive proof, such as some defenders of the Communists are asking you have to go to the books, learn first how one becomes a Congressman.

Perhaps you would not be required to go back of the certificate of the Secretary of State, but, if the law did not raise a presumption that the signature of one claiming to be Secretary of State, under the seal of the State, was sufficient, it would be necessary that the Speaker take the certificate, look up the Secretary of State, get the doctor who was present at the Secretary's birth, then individuals who had known him from that time on until he was elected and qualified as Secretary of State, and, even then, some perfectionist might require proof that the Secretary signed his name to the certificate showing the individual's election as Congressman.

Yes, and to listen to some of these commentators, I might be required to prove that I was the individual to whom the certificate was issued.

All the law requires, even when one is charged with high treason, is that the charge be proven by evidence which convinces beyond a reasonable—not a capricious—doubt.

So it may be said that, if one subscribes to the Communist doctrine, talks and writes and acts like a Communist, he may, for practical purposes, be regarded as a Communist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman's view on the legislation he has referred to, and I thoroughly respect his views. The gentleman knows that I disagree with him, and I think he respects my reasons for it. Will the gentleman admit that there is a fundamental question involved there that has existed in one form or another, but basically the same, from the time of the first President, George Washington?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There is a fundamental question; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. People may honestly disagree about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask my friend one more question. Forget you are a Congressman, but assume you were President of the United States; what would you do? Would you release it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I would make this distinction. If I had the authority—and that is such a violent assumption I find difficulty in entertaining it—I would release the facts. I would not ask J. Edgar Hoover to disclose the source of his information, but I would say this to my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]: "Listen, now, these charge have been made." I would just lay aside my vacationing, my contemplated nonpolitical trip throughout the country on the taxpayers' dollar. I would just take time off and stick my nose right into those files and learn whether or not in my administration there were Communists, enemies of my country. If I found any out they would go.

I would go one step further, and I would say, "Listen, now, you fellows who are not decent and respectable," these unmentionables, I would say, "Listen, get to heck out of here."

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman realizes that as a Congressman he might do things from one angle and as President from another angle.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not assume to be President. There is no difference between the principles which should guide a President or a Congressman. The gentleman just asked me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I said "assuming." And if he were a Republican President, the gentleman would represent his party with strength and vigor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I interrupt? Yes; when I thought it right. Not otherwise. I would put good Republicans in office. I would not go outside and pick up these unmentionables. I would not pick up this riff-raff. You have hundreds of thousands of good Democrats who ought to be in public office, instead of these odds and ends that have wormed their way into office, these associates of pinks, of left wingers, of gangsters; these associates of questionable characters. My friend, the supply of capable, loyal Democrats is unlimited. Why not use them? Oh, well, every man to his taste.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman were President he would frankly say, "No Democrats need apply."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will say very frankly that I believe in what they so slightingly refer to as—well, I will not say—the spoils system. I will say that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Democrats? Yes, on nonpartisan boards and commissions and as judges in our courts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman and I are not very far apart on the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The thing that amazes me, astounds me, and distresses me, is the fact that with these hundreds of thousands, as I said a moment ago, of good, loyal, sound, sensible Democrats, you have to get so many nuts in the Departments.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; if the gentleman will promise me he will read those two reports I referred to.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I will do it. Can the gentleman furnish me the reports?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As the request is that of a typical New Dealer, I will make an effort to get them for you. That is, you know, New Deal philosophy "from those that have to those that have not" or "if you can get someone to do it for you don't do it yourself."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire any further time?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If failure to ask him is going to keep the gentleman awake nights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Does the gentleman believe that J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, if they had enough evidence on a man to convict him of being a Communist, would suppress that evidence and not turn it over to the Department of Justice, and have that man prosecuted?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The rule is that the FBI does not formulate any opinion at all. Nor does it institute prosecutions. It just gathers the facts and turns them over to the Department of Justice.

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Am I wrong? I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to tell the gentleman the answer if he has a better one.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that in the case of investigations under the loyalty order that is true, but where the evidence discloses a crime, I think then they would take it up through the Department of Justice through the regular channels.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the way I understand it, the FBI does not prosecute; it gives the information to the Department of Justice, but it is up to the Department whether they prosecute. In connection with the Dock Street investigation down here in Philadelphia, we called before the committee two of the experts from the Department of Justice, and in the case of Christoffel, who was later convicted of perjury, we called up two from the Department and those people were then prosecuted and convicted, but it took committee action to do it.

One of the reports which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] requested reads as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 342) directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the joint resolution, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Government", strike out the comma and add the words "created by the Congress,".

Page 3, line 1, strike out figure "2" and insert figure "3"; line 3, strike out figure "3" and insert figure "4."

Insert new section 2, as follows:

"SEC. 2. When, by virtue of section 1, any committee of the Congress shall have received information, books, records, or memoranda from any of the departments, agencies, Secretaries, or individuals in pursuance of a request made under the authority of said section, it shall forthwith, by majority vote of the membership of said committee, determine what, if any, part of such information shall be made public and what part shall be deemed to be confidential, and it shall thereafter be unlawful for any member of said committee or any employee thereof or any other invidual obtaining knowledge of such information because of the disclosure of such information to said committee, to divulge or to make known in any manner whatever not provided by law to any person any part of the information so disclosed to said committee and which has by said committee been declared to be confidential; and any offense against the foregoing provision shall be a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court; and, if the offender be an employee of the United States, he shall be dismissed from office or discharged from employment."

March 17, 1948, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had before it for consideration House Joint Resolution 342, directing all executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government to make available to any and all standing, special, or select committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, information which may be deemed necessary to enable them to properly perform the duties delegated to them by the Congress.

After full consideration of the joint resolution and the amendments proposed thereto, the committee approved and ordered reported to the House of Representatives the resolution, as amended, and the chairman of said committee was directed to transmit a copy of the report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

Partial background

To enable it to legislate effectively and in the interests of the public welfare, the Congress, through its committees, has sought information from the executive branch of the Government, its departments, officers, and employees.

Speaking generally, the right to such information has not been challenged either by the executive branch of the Government or by the courts. In fact, the various departments of the Government, when favoring legislation proposed by the administration in power, have been quick to assert the right to have their representatives appear and testify before congressional committees.

Occasionally, opposing some action thought to be contemplated by the Congress, the President or his subordinates have challenged the right of Congress to certain specific information either on the ground that the activity challenged was one exclusively within the authority of the Executive or that the information sought was confidential, and that to reveal it might result in giving it publicity which would injuriously affect the public welfare.

Action on the part of the Executive or the head of some department, challenging the right of the Congress to specified information has never been confined to the representative or representatives of either political party. It has been a policy followed by the Executive who at the moment was in power.

Nor is the proposed legislation aimed at the acts of the present Executive and his subordinates, for he and they are but following in a greater or a lesser degree a position taken by the Executive of all parties. It is aimed at a practice or policy.

The issue is one between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, regardless of political affiliations.

The practice of the Executive in denying to congressional committees information sought by those committees has gradually widened in scope. Today, committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives find their efforts to ascertain how money appropriated by Congress is being spent, how the laws are being interpreted and administered, whether certain legislation is effective or ineffective, are being hindered or delayed by the refusal of various officials and departments of the executive branch to make available information sought by congressional committees.

Recently a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, charged with ascertaining the propriety of paroles granted to four members of the underworld, convicted of a conspiracy to extort a million dollars from the motion-picture industry, was by the Department of Justice denied information deemed relevant and material to its inquiry and collected by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, even though the subcommittee expressly stated that the source of the information was not requested.

To another subcommittee of the same committee, the Civil Service Commission admitted that certain derogatory information reflecting upon Senators and Congressmen had been collected and was retained without authority and without the knowledge of the members of the Commission. The CSC promised to destroy the cards carrying such information but refused to permit an agent of the Congress to ascertain whether such cards had actually been destroyed. Later and after further consideration the Commission changed its position and wrote the committee it would permit members of the committee to inspect the files.

It should be noted that in this case the members of the CSC each testified that such information had been collected or was being preserved in the CSC files. The subcommittee in this instance thought that, inasmuch as the CSC did not know the information had been collected, it might not know whether it had been destroyed.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, charged with making an inquiry into the manner in which the Taft-Hartley law was being administered, whether the Taft-Hartley Act was aiding and correcting the conditions which it was enacted to improve, caused subpenas to be served upon John R. Steelman, directing him to appear before the subcommittee on two separate occasions.

Mr. Steelman failed to appear on either occasion, though personally served; returned the subpenas to the chairman of the subcommittee with a letter stating, among other things, that "in each instance the President directed me, in view of my duties as his assistant, not to appear before your subcommittee."

Last October, the Civil Service Commission advised a subcommittee of this committee that it had been directed by the President not to submit a so-called key loyalty list which had been requested by the subcommittee.

March 13, last, the President issued a directive to all officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government, which is as follows:

"The efficient and just administration of the employee loyalty program, under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, requires that reports, records, and files relative to the program be preserved in strict confidence. This is necessary in the interest of our national security and welfare, to preserve the confidential character and sources of information furnished, and to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations. It is necessary also in order to insure the fair and just disposition of loyalty cases.

"For these reasons, and in accordance with the long-established policy that reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch are to be regarded as confidential, all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies) shall be maintained in confidence and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business.

"Any subpena or demand or request for information, reports, or files of the nature described, received from sources other than those persons in the executive branch of the Government who are entitled thereto by reason of their official duties, shall be respectfully declined, on the basis of this directive, and the subpena or demand or other request shall be referred to the Office of the President for such response as the President may determine to be in the public interest in the particular case. There shall be no relaxation of the provisions of this directive except with my express authority.

"This directive shall be published in the Federal Register.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN.

"THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 13, 1948.*"

To a congressional committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Secretary of Commerce has recently refused to

give certain information requested by that committee.

The issue

The issue raised by this resolution is clear and basic. No claim is made that the Congress has the right to challenge the actions of the executive or of the judiciary while acting within the scope of the authority given by the Constitution. Those departments of the Government are created by the Constitution, and congressional power over them is limited to removal from office through constitutional procedure.

It is the claim of the proponents of this resolution that, inasmuch as the Congress is charged with the authority to create—and it has created—various executive departments and agencies, and as it is charged with the duty of appropriating funds and enacting legislation for the proper and effective activities of those agencies, it not only has the right but the duty to seek and obtain from every agency created by it and which, for its existence, depends upon appropriations by Congress, all relevant, needed information necessary to the enactment of proper legislation.

The issue then is: Shall the Congress insist that departments created by it, dependent upon its will for existence, give to its committees the information necessary to enable it to act intelligently and wisely, or shall it permit its creatures to arbitrarily determine what information the Congress shall or shall not have?

The remedy

Inasmuch as both Senate and House committees find their legitimate activities sometimes impeded and occasionally thwarted by the action of the executive departments, the proper remedy would seem to be not special legislation enacted to meet a particular situation but over-all legislation by the Congress which, subject to court decision will settle the question as to the authority of the Congress to demand information from the executive departments.

It is recognized that there may, on occasion, be information in the possession of the executive departments, publicity of which would injuriously affect the national welfare. This so-called confidential information is, in the first instance, in the hands of an executive branch of the Government. There have in the past been, not one but several, occasions when, for example, the State Department or some of the departments, employees have given publicity to information which should have remained confidential.

There is, moreover, no foundation for the premise upon which the denial of information has been based, i. e., that the Members of Congress are any less descreet or loyal than either the heads of, or the subordinates in, the executive departments.

Information which should remain confidential will so remain

Nevertheless, to throw the greatest possible safeguards around the information which may by the executive branch of the Government be deemed to be confidential—information which should be kept secret—the proposed resolution expressly states that, before a congressional committee may successfully demand information from an executive department, a majority of the committee requesting such information must find and declare that the information sought is "necessary to enable it to carry on the investigations, perform the duties, falling within its jurisdiction."

The resolution goes further and provides another safeguard, which is that, after such finding and declaration, before it becomes effective, the request of the committee must be approved by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Nor is that all. The resolution contains a section which makes it the duty of the committee by majority vote, forthwith upon receiving the information, to declare how much of it shall be deemed to be confidential, how much shall be made available to the public.

Nor is that all. The resolution also provides that if any member of the committee, or any individual who derives his information through that given to the committee, makes that information public, he shall, upon conviction, incur a penalty of a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

The precedent for this section will be found in subdivision (f) of section 55 of title 26 of the United States Code, Annotated, which has to do with information furnished by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to certain Senate and House committees.

The committee was unanimously of the opinion that, if legislation of this type was to be enacted, the proposed resolution, as amended, was the fairest type of a bill that could be enacted into law. Upon roll call, 17 Members voted to report out the resolution as amended. Four, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. WILSON, who voted in the affirmative, reserved the right to offer amendments or to oppose the legislation upon the floor if, upon further consideration, they deemed that course advisable. Six voted against reporting the legislation. Two members were not recorded.

If the Members of Congress desire to go further into the previous history of the conflict between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government on this issue, valuable information will be found in the Senate committee print, Eightieth Congress, second session, January 6, 1947, Memorandum on Proceedings Involving Contempt of Congress and Its Committee, printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and available to Members of Congress.

There is also a subsequent memorandum compiled for the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on December 30, 1947, by the Federal Law Section of the Library of Congress—Frank B. Horne and Robert S. Oglebay. A still later compilation from the same source is dated March 10, 1948. Both are printed herewith as an appendix to this report.

No hearings were held, for the reason that all Members of Congress are familiar with the history of the policy challenged and with current events which have made a final, clear-cut determination of policy necessary to the efficient and expeditious transaction of congressional business.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN, *Chairman.*
GEORGE H. BENDER.
WALTER H. JUDD.
ROBERT F. RICH.
HENRY J. LATHAM.
JAMES W. WADSWORTH.
FOREST A. HARNESS.
CLARENCE J. BROWN.
ROSS RIZLEY.
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH.
FRED E. BUSBEY.
MELVIN C. SNYDER.
J. CALEB BOGGS.
R. WALTER RIEHLMAN.
RALPH HARVEY.
HENDERSON LANHAM.
PORTER HARDY, Jr.
J. FRANK WILSON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution of protest against the lowering of the tariff on rubber goods by the American Tariff Commission.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made on H. R. 4942 and to include a table.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Mr. H. G. Ritchie, of New Orleans.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made on the bill H. R. 7185 and include certain letters therein referred to.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by John L. Thurston, assistant administrator of the program of the Federal Security Agency on the subject of investments in human resources, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $225.50.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four separate instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Father Connor.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. BREHM) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. NOLAND (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for Monday, May 1, on account of official business.

To Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. TAURIELLO), for Monday, May 1, on account of official business.

To Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. TAURIELLO), for Monday, May 1, on account of official business.

To Mrs. WOODHOUSE (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for Monday, May 1, on account of official business.

To Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), indefinitely, on account of serious illness in the family.

To Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1419. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1420. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill

entitled "A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing for continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abacá by the United States"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1421. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 7, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Johnson Creek, a branch of the Wicomico River, in Somerset County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7635. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to provide graduation leave upon appointment as commissioned officers in the regular components of the armed forces of graduates of the United States Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies, with amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Education and Labor. S. 2227. An act to amend the act approved July 18, 1940 (54 Stat. 766; 24 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 196b) entitled "An act relating to the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of persons resident or domiciled in the Virgin Islands of the United States," by enlarging the classes of persons admissible into St. Elizabeths Hospital and in other respects; with amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Resolution 545. Resolution declaring that the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 7 transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 13, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 8303. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake the North Fork Kings River development, California, as an integral part of the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOUGHTON (by request):

H. R. 8304. A bill to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and related laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 8305. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 8306. A bill to abolish the position of mail handler in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8307. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 8308. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 8309. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8310. A bill to abolish free transmission of official Government mail matter under the penalty privilege; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8311. A bill to create the position of mail handler in charge in the postal transportation service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 8312. A bill to provide for an adjustment of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act according to the needs of the fishing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a joint committee to study the United Nations Organization; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to restoring the recent appropriation taken away from the United States Post Office so that postal service will not be curtailed and the general welfare and commercial progress of the Nation impaired; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, requesting a loan of financial assistance to the peach growers of the State of South Carolina on account of their serious financial condition due to heavy losses from frost to the peach crop for the past 3 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8313. A bill for the relief of Rita Keskula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 8314. A bill for the relief of R. W. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 8315. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gallagher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 8316. A bill for the relief of Nicholasde Lorence Pigulewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 8317. A bill for the relief of William McGraw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2098. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk, Chicago, Ill., requesting that additional television stations be licensed for the city of Chicago; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2099. Also, petition of M. H. Westerman, secretary, city of Houston, Tex., requesting passage of House bill 7258; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we thank Thee that Thou hast implanted within us the breath of a divine life, that there is an infinite in us which, with all our cunning, we cannot quite conceal beneath the finite; that by our very natures we hunger and thirst after Thee. Forgive us that, knowing this, we so often seek to satisfy the deepest cravings of our spirits with the things of time and sense.

We pray that in our tasks we may be preserved from impatience and depression. Increase our faith, mellow our judgments, deepen our affections. Grant us some part in the fulfillment of Thy mighty purpose for the world. Amid all the distraction of this complicated modern life of ours, keep our hearts childlike and trustful, that the gates of the kingdom, closed to the merely clever and conceited, may be opened unto us as we come in the simplicity as it is in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 1, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1069) to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4942. An act to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys realized from leases made by the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4969. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Army to transfer and convey certain lands and thereby facilitate administration and give proper cognizance to the highest use of United States lands;

H. R. 5103. An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5628. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island;

H. R. 5913. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States

situated in Ross County, Ohio, for lands within Symmes Creek purchase unit in Lawrence County, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6247. An act authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair;

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District;

H. R. 6971. An act to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4;

H. R. 7185. An act to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session;

H. R. 7219. An act to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7635. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to provide graduation leave upon appointment as commissioned officers in the Regular components of the armed forces of graduates of the United States Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies;

H. R. 7700. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 7888. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to make it inapplicable to postal employees of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 7889. An act to postpone the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain employees of the Selective Service System;

H. R. 7984. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3139. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LONG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 1 week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from the close of business today until after his primary campaign.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida the reason for the request which he is now presenting?

Mr. HOLLAND. The reason for it is that the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] had not concluded his address yesterday afternoon, and it was agreed that he should have the floor to continue with his address this morning. I do not believe there is any question about a quorum being available. Committee hearings are still going on. I previously asked the consent of the Senate for a committee to continue with its work during the session of the Senate, and I do not like to interfere with its meeting.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will permit, and if I may do so by unanimous consent, as I have indicated on the floor of the Senate, once expressly and another time at least by implication, I believe that the procedure of starting a quorum call and bringing Senators in to respond to it, only to find that other Senators have not been required and will not be required to respond, causing those who respond perhaps to cease consideration of important matters in which they are engaged, is a very unwise procedure. Therefore, with all due deference to my very close friend, who is the acting majority leader, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The Secretary will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Graham	McKellar
Anderson	Gurney	Malone
Benton	Hayden	Maybank
Brewster	Hendrickson	Neely
Bricker	Holland	Saltonstall
Connally	Hunt	Stennis
Cordon	Ives	Taylor
Darby	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Douglas	Lehman	Thye
Eastland	Lodge	Wherry
Ellender	Lucas	Wiley
Ferguson	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ILLINOIS - MISSOURI DEVELOPMENT AGENCY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the majority leader, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that he may yield to the Senator from Illinois without losing the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Illinois, for himself and for the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], introduced a joint resolution dealing with a compact between the States of Illinois and Missouri. As I understand, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works. It is my understanding that a similar joint resolution in the House of Representatives was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 174, granting the consent of Congress to the entry, by the State of Missouri and by the State of Illinois, into a compact or agreement between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois creating the Bi-State Development Agency and the Bi-State Metropolitan District, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield that I may make a very brief observation?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada will be happy to yield, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a very brief observation in regard to the request made by the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. I am very much pleased that the Senator from Illinois has made this request, and I think it is quite appropriate that it should have been made. It was pointed out on the floor of the Senate yesterday that Public Law 601, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, provides that to the Committee on the Judiciary shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relative to the subject of interstate compacts generally. I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois, and join with him in the hope that his request may be acceded to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference is made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless there is objection, the Chair will recognize Senators to permit them to submit routine matters ordinarily covered in the morning business, but without speeches or debate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred, as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 166)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, in the amount of $936,000, for the fiscal year 1951, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS

A letter from the Secretary of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, of New York, N. Y., reporting, pursuant to law, on its activities during the year ended December 31, 1949; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF PETROLEUM MARKETING PRACTICES—RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE, SUPERIOR, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter received from the director of the educational division of one of the great cooperative organizations of my State of Wisconsin and indeed of the Midwest and the Nation, the Central Cooperative Wholesale of Superior. The resolution vigorously supports a proposed investigation of petroleum marketing practices. I believe that the resolution will be of interest to my colleagues and so I ask unanimous consent that the text of E. A. Whitney's letter to me as well as the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE,
Superior, Wis., April 27, 1950.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution was adopted at our annual meeting on April 12–13, with 350 delegates present from northern Minnesota, northern and central Wisconsin, and upper Michigan, representing a total of 90,000 member families. These are folks who are shareholders in petroleum distributing cooperatives, and therefore vitally interested in the future of independent petroleum organizations, and concerned greatly about the monopoly marketing practices of the majors. Everything you can do to help get the facts will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. WHITNEY,
Director, Educational Division.

RESOLUTION ON INVESTIGATION OF PETROLEUM MARKETING PRACTICES

Whereas monopoly business has during the past year put the squeeze on cooperatives and independent producers by holding the price of crude oil at an unnatural level in proportion to prices of finished products; be it

Resolved, That this annual meeting of Central Cooperative Wholesale call upon Congressmen and Senators of our respective States to actively work for passage of the Cannon resolution introduced in the House of Representatives and authorizing an investigation of petroleum marketing practices.

TRANSFER OF WATSON LABORATORY AT RED BANK AND EATON TOWER, N. J., TO GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE AT ROME, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Oneida County committee of the American Legion in New York, urging transfer of the Watson laboratory at Red Bank, N. J., to the Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y. The Senate has already approved this transfer, which is now pending before the House of Representatives in the military public-works bill.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Oneida County committee of the American Legion in regular meeting convened on this April 17, in the year of 1950, at Clark Mills, N. Y., and after much discussion on this project, deems it necessary to ask your consideration and support when this matter comes up for action or a vote: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oneida County committee of the American Legion goes on record as strongly recommending the transfer of the Watson laboratory at Red Bank and Eaton Tower, N. J., to Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y., in accordance to the Air Force's announced plans to concentrate electronic units at Griffiss Base.

Primarily that the defense of our country be given priority over politics or any other factors incident to the proposed transfer, that the Air Force be given a free hand in executing their responsibilities.

In addition, Griffiss Air Base now employs 956 veterans, most of whom would be adversely affected were the laboratories not moved to Rome, N. Y., inasmuch as they have purchased homes and have families in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oneida County committee, American Legion, representing 27 posts, express their desires to our representatives in Washington, and a copy of this resolution be sent to our Representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and a copy to the daily papers of this county.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2604. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1530); and

S. 2605. A bill to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1531).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3526. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate No. 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 3527, to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3527) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

Under existing law the Federal Reserve banks have authority to buy directly from the Treasury, rather than in the open market,

direct obligations of the United States or obligations fully guaranteed by the United States, up to an aggregate holding at one time of $5,000,000,000. The Federal Reserve banks had this authority without any limitation on holdings from 1913 to 1935. The present authority, which was provided by the Second War Powers Act of 1942, will expire on June 30, 1950. This bill would make the authority permanent.

The direct purchase authority is a useful mechanism whereby the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System can coordinate financing requirements of the Treasury with the requirements of the Federal Reserve System in regulating bank reserves and the money market. The mechanism is important at periods when the Treasury has to meet large payments, such as the redemption of maturing debt, at a time when withdrawals from the banking system are unusually heavy, as in the case of withdrawals to meet the quarterly tax payments. The authority thus provides an aid in stabilizing the securities and money markets without which the Treasury would feel obliged to carry larger cash balances to accomplish the same purpose, a procedure which would increase interest costs to the Government.

The purpose for which the direct purchase authority has always been used in the past and would always be used in the future is simply to meet temporary needs which if not met would cause unnecessary fluctuations in the securities and money markets for brief periods, and which if met in other ways would entail unnecessary additional costs in managing the public debt. As used to date, this line of credit has been secured by special 1-day obligations on which the Government pays interest of only one-quarter of 1 percent per annum. Since it was granted in 1942, the direct purchase authority has been used on only 63 days, all of them just prior to times when large tax receipts were deposited.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TAX BILL

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to H. R. —, a tax bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 3424) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, together with an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the amendments and the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from New Hampshire will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The amendments submitted by Mr. TOBEY are as follows:

On page 21, line 24, before the period, insert a comma and the following: "and the term 'county or parish' shall include town, township, or other political subdivision of a State, exercising powers or functions in respect of 'county' road construction".

On page 22, line 22, strike out "a county" and insert "an".

On page 22, line 23, strike out "a county" and insert "an".

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

Mr. President, I am submitting today amendments to S. 3424, a bill which was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ, to amend the Federal-Aid Road Act. Among other things, Senator CHAVEZ' bill would authorize the appropriation of a sum of money to be used in the improvement of county roads.

Under date of April 25, 1950, I received a letter from the Honorable Sherman Adams, Governor of the State of New Hampshire, which reads in part as follows:

"In S. 3424 there is a provision authorizing the appropriation of a sum of money to be used in a county road improvement program. Inasmuch as we have no county roads, as such, this bill should be amended to provide that where no county roads exist the funds should be available for town road construction or any roads outside the secondary system, supervision as to which is in governmental units other than counties."

In examining S. 3424 to carry out the request of Governor Adams, it seemed to me that an oversight in language had omitted the rural nonsecondary roads in New Hampshire and other New England States from consideration.

Section 12 (a) of the bill defines "county" roads as including "parish roads or any other road used as a rural local road which is not presently on the secondary road system in a State." Since the State of New Hampshire and many other States no longer have a county supervised road system, nor do they fall within the bill's definition of parish, my amendment seeks to make clear that the term "county," is broad enough to include the town roads of New Hampshire and other New England States. The amendment seeks to make it clear that county or parish shall include any political subdivision of a State which exercises powers or functions in respect to the construction of county roads, as defined.

The amendments also include a minor change in page 22 of S. 3424 which would strike out a "county" engineer and insert "an" engineer. It does not seem to me to be necessary to specify a county engineer since the section defines and delineates his qualifications. Since the term "county" as used in this section would be broadened by my amendment, it seems desirable to eliminate any ambiguity which might arise by specifying that the engineer must be a county engineer.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that when the Public Works Committee considers S. 3424, as an amendment to the Federal-Aid Road Act, that it will give careful consideration to my section of the country, which would not benefit in an equal manner with other sections of the Nation under the presently defined terms of the bill.

I shall ask Senator CHAVEZ and his colleagues to incorporate the amendments in the bill when it is considered in committee session.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar:

H. R. 4942. An act to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys realized from leases made by the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6247. An act authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair; and

H. R. 7984. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4969. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Army to transfer and convey certain lands and thereby facilitate administration and give proper cognizance to the highest use of United States lands;

H. R. 5913. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ross County, Ohio, for lands within Symmes Creek Purchase Unit in Lawrence County, Ohio, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7700. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 5103. An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7889. An act to postpone the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain employees of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5628. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island;

H. R. 6971. An act to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4; and

H. R. 7219. An act to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7635. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to provide graduation leave upon appointment as commissioned officers in the regular components of the armed forces of graduates of the United States Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies; and

H. R. 8139. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7185. An act to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; and

H. R. 7888. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to make it inapplicable to postal employees of the Panama Canal; ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT OF MAIL DELIVERIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release by him on April 28, 1950, regarding proposed curtailment of mail deliveries, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED RENT-CONTROL EXTENSION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on April 26, 1950, in support of rent-control extension, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDUCATION ON RADIO—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him at the television dinner sponsored by the Association for Education on Radio, University of Pennsylvania Museum, April 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEWS LETTER BY SENATOR MYERS TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a news letter by him dated April 20, 1950, being a personal report to the people of Pennsylvania, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR MYERS' REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA—NO. 23, NO. 24, AND NO. 25

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three radio addresses delivered by him to the people of Pennsylvania, the twenty-third, twenty-fourth, and twenty-fifth in the biweekly series, April 3, April 17, and April 30, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM AND THE WELFARE STATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN—CITATION FROM LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Freedom and the Welfare State," delivered by Senator LEHMAN on the occasion of the forty-fifth anniversary of the League for Industrial Democracy, at the Hotel Commodore, New York, N. Y., on April 15, 1950, together with a citation by the League for Industrial Democracy to Senator LEHMAN, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHALL WE GIVE FREE REIN TO THE ENEMY IN OUR MIDST?—EDITORIAL SUPPORTING THE MUNDT-FERGUSON-JOHNSTON BILL

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper editorial supporting the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill to curtail Communist activities in America, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITICAL CONDITION OF THE MARITIME INDUSTRY AND ITS EFFECT ON THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST—MEMORANDUM BY HOMER T. SHAVER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum entitled "The Critical Condition of the Maritime Industry and its Effect on the Pacific Northwest," submitted to him by Mr. Homer T. Shaver, of Portland, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

AIR WARFARE AND MORALITY—ARTICLE BY MAJ. GEN. ORVIL A. ANDERSON

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Air Warfare and Morality," written by Maj. Gen. Orvil A. Anderson, and published in the Air University Quarterly Review, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR WILEY BY WISCONSIN WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "WILEY Alert for Wisconsin," published in two weekly newspapers of Wisconsin, the Waupaca County Post and the Clintonville Tribune Gazette, which appears in the Appendix.]

A REPORT ON PROGRESS OF CONNECTICUT'S PROJECT FOR STATE GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report on progress to date in Connecticut's project for State government reorganization, entitled, "All the Functions of State Government," by Ralph P. Solloti, staff director, Connecticut commission on State government organization, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLL OF MINNESOTA FARMERS ON CONTINUANCE OF EGG SUPPORTS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Minnesota poll of April 23, 1950, entitled "State's Farmers Strongly Favor Continued Federal Egg Supports," which appears in the Appendix.]

RENT CONTROL

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a number of letters addressed to him on the subject of rent control, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONFUSION AS TO SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES INVESTIGATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE MAYNARD NEWS

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Confused Press," from the Maynard News, of Maynard, Minn., which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTACKS ON SENATOR McCARTHY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MAYNARD NEWS

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Red Defenders Smear Senator McCARTHY," from the Maynard News of April 7, 1950, of Maynard, Minn., which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES—EDITORIAL FROM CAPPER'S WEEKLY

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Charges of 'Asset of the Kremlin' Boomerang," from Capper's Weekly of April 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF THE POLISH NATIONAL CONSTITUTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the signing of the Polish National Constitution, which appears in the Appendix.]

GALLUP POLL ON DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ABOUT AMERICA

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of April 28, 1950, containing a Gallup poll on sentiment about spreading information concerning America, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News for Tuesday, April 25, there appeared an editorial entitled "What's There To Hide?" which contains some unusually helpful observations on the many difficulties which we are confronting in connection with the investigation of disloyalty in the State Department.

In particular, the editorial urges that the subcommittee "conduct a full examination of the present loyalty program so that there can be an independent review of its inadequacies."

It seems to me that this is the very heart of the matter and I am glad that the subcommittee has already taken steps which I believe will prove to be most significant toward achieving this objective.

I believe more strongly than ever that a trained bipartisan commission operating under a strict rule of secrecy is the right way to solve this problem. Until such time as such a commission is established, however, our subcommittee must do its full duty and an independent examination of the operations of the loyalty program is certainly a most vital point in the discharge of that duty.

The editorial contains one reference to a poor job of cross-examination in the case of Mr. Budenz with which I do not agree and which, I believe, stems from a misunderstanding of the fact that the major part of the Budenz testimony was cross-examined in executive session. But this is a minor point compared to what seems to me to be the editorial's major merits. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the body of the RECORD where all Members of the Senate can read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S THERE TO HIDE?

President Truman's spirited defense of his loyalty program before the Federal Bar Association would have been more convincing had he answered some of Senator McCARTHY's specific critcisms of that program instead of dealing in sweeping generalities almost—but not quite—as broad as those Senator McCARTHY usually uses himself.

"Not a single person who has been adjudged to be a Communist or otherwise disloyal remains on the Government pay roll today," Mr. Truman said.

We do not question the sincerity of that statement. But we wish we could be sure that the President's information is complete and exact. Senator McCARTHY specifically charges, for example, that George Wheeler was cleared for important State Department work in Europe after he had been unanimously rejected by the loyalty board. How could that happen if we have an airtight security program?

It also has been pointed out that the loyalty board has no jurisdiction over such security risks as perverts, habitual drunkards, and others whose personal habits or afflictions might make them dangerous. That seems a serious loophole in the President's program.

These flaws in the loyalty program were pointed out at the time it was proposed.

This newspaper commented on it, for one, pointing out that loyalty, in the final analysis, was not the real criterion. We said at the time that what the Government should be interested in was security. We pointed out that a person could be loyal and still a bad security risk.

We criticized the very name of the program, saying that what it should be called was a security program, and that's what it should be.

Why doesn't the President invite—indeed, urge—the Senate subcommittee now investigating Communist influences in the Government to conduct a full examination of the present program so there can be an independent review of its adequacy? It has seemed to us that the administration did not want a real investigation of this subject.

One newspaper editor who attended a session of this committee when Louis Budenz was on the witness stand left the hearing with the opinion that a slipshod job was being done.

Mr. Budenz, he said, made an opening statement indicating what he expected to prove. That called logically for detailed development by a series of questions and answers.

"But," the editor added, "I waited in vain for such questioning. The questions came neither from those on the committee who wanted to establish Budenz's testimony as true or those who wished to destroy it. There were questions, yes, but not the kind of questions which develop or destroy the story of a witness. I have never seen such a poor job of cross-examination."

For ourselves, we still like the proposal of Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., which calls for the creation of a trained commission of 12 members, 4 to be appointed by the President, 4 by the Senate, 4 by the House, and the whole membership to be equally divided between the two parties.

As Senator LODGE said when he introduced his bill: "The present method of making public charges against individuals before a congressional committee has proved in itself a very defective method of promoting loyalty, since it often besmirches the character of innocent persons, weakens the position of the United States before the world, fails to find the really dangerous individuals, and can actually increase the security of the real Communist leaders."

On the other side, President Truman's blanket defense of everyone on the Federal pay roll accomplishes nothing.

Meantime, if the administration and its supporters in the Senate have nothing to fear from a free, bipartisan investigation, they should open it to full minority participation.

The effort to keep the Senate investigation under wraps detracts from anything the President can say in defense of his loyalty program. He should let down the bars and allow the facts to speak for themselves.

STRATEGY OF DEFENSE—LETTER FROM FACULTY MEMBERS OF HARVARD AND MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on the editorial page of the New York Times of Sunday, April 30, there appeared a letter signed by members of the faculties of Harvard University and of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This letter discusses the reliance which so many Americans in the executive branch, in Congress, and in private life attach to the defense of America largely by means of the atomic bomb and strategic bombardment. The letter exposes the danger of an exaggerated reliance on the atomic bomb and strategic bombardment and challenges the widely held concept that this method of defense is the most economic either in terms of money or in terms of manpower. It points out that reliance on this method of defense may tend to put us in a position in which we must either give in to what any potential enemy may want us to do or else open up full-scale war with its inevitable accompaniment of attacks on the civilian populations of the world, including our own. According to these men an exaggerated reliance on the atomic bomb and strategic bombardment makes any military middle ground impossible, however vitally necessary such a military middle ground might some day be. They argue strongly that a western Europe made impregnable by means of ground defenses strongly supported by tactical aviation which contained armies strong enough to resist aggression might make possible the avoidance of war or at the very least the containment of war and the prevention of wholesale destruction of the great population centers of our country. It is such an interesting, well-thought-out letter I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGY OF DEFENSE—CONSEQUENCES OF PRESENT PLANS AND POLICIES ASSESSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

This statement is the product of a deep apprehension over the present strategic position of the United States. It is addressed to questions of military strategy and to these alone. We emphasize that we do not regard military defense as the only or even the first source of security of the United States. That security we regard, first of all, as depending on the economic strength and political cooperation of the free world. These latter are the first tasks of American policy.

We are concerned here with military policy, not as a means of preparing for war, but as a means of gaining time during which economic and political efforts may help create the situations out of which lasting peace may emerge.

We believe that our present strategic position is founded on a misplaced faith in atomic weapons and strategic bombing. This system of defense seems to us, for reasons we shall set forth below, to impair the moral and political strength of the United States in the present period and to evade the true requirements of national security. We believe that the United States must move beyond its present central reliance on atomic warfare and must accept the costs in money and inconvenience involved in such a shift in policy. These costs are to be measured against the loss of the American moral position in the free world, the invitation to limited aggression inherent in the present strategy, and the possibly catastrophic dangers to ourselves and civilization in an atomic war.

CONCERN OF ALL

We believe that the civilian may properly speak on questions of national defense. While the plans for defense cannot be the property of all citizens, an important distinction is to be drawn between essentials and details. It is the details that must remain secret. The fundamental problems are the proper concern of all; and it is to such fundamentals that this statement is applied.

The power which forces the United States to adopt a posture of defense is the Soviet Union. We make no estimate as to the immediacy of the Soviet threat to the security of the United States and western Europe. For present purposes we assume the danger, and the corresponding need for western military strength sufficient to deter Soviet aggression. The difference between a deterrent force and one that accords absolute security in the event of actual aggression must be emphasized. In case of actual war, the Nation can have only the single objective of overwhelming superiority; but the prevention of a war is a different undertaking, and there is room for argument as to the size and nature of the effort required.

The present defensive position of the United States depends heavily on its possession of atomic weapons coupled with faith in strategic bombardment. This has been made evident in the recent controversies over the roles of the several services and in the allocation of defense appropriations. It is implicit in the size and distribution of our ground forces—the fact that at present the United States has about 10 divisions, few of which are fully manned and equipped—and in the subordinate role assigned to tactical air power.

This defense plan, with its emphasis on atomic weapons and strategic air power, has been misleadingly attractive to the American people and Congress.

It has promised us all great economies in financial outlay, in manpower, and in political inconvenience. We believe that this plan has been shaped less by a dispassionate view of the United States in the world than by political factors, including the ebb and flow of interservice rivalry.

WORLD POSITION

However, it is less important to allocate responsibility for present strategy than to assess its consequences. These, we believe, raise questions which go to the roots of the position of the United States in the world.

1. United States strategy today is not well equipped to deal with problems of limited aggression. We accept the view that the essential deterrent to all-out Soviet attack is the conviction that such attack would provoke a general war with the United States. But there are degrees of Soviet pressure short of open military aggression; and to this form of limited aggression—such as sponsorship of revolution or of guerrilla operations in independent countries—the United States may have no effective response except an atomic war. This condition may invite the extension of techniques of guerrilla warfare and internal revolt in marginal areas in the confidence that such local activity would incur only local risks.

2. The predominant reliance by the United States on atomic warfare may weaken the morale and confidence of our European allies. Unless we have substantial ground, naval, and tactical air forces available to supply immediate help in the event of Soviet aggression, our allies may be the less disposed to make the necessary efforts and sacrifices to prepare for such an ordeal. Yet their present strength and their will to resist are important elements among the factors which can deter Russian aggression and avert war. Anything that weakens the will to resist of our allies therefore jeopardizes the peace we are striving to maintain.

3. The present reliance by the United States on the threat of the bomb is continuing indication to the world that American military strategy accepts the principle of mass destruction of human life. This can only lead to a damaging misconstruction of American motives and character and to resentment of American power. It has already contributed to the conviction that the United States is a dangerous ally and has strengthened the search for neutrality or some other form of immunity as between the United States and Russia.

4. To the extent that the United States has placed extensive reliance on the bomb, it has become more difficult for the United

States to accept agreement restricting the use of atomic weapons. Such an agreement today would, in effect, constitute unilateral disarmament. To the degree that it has liberated its own defense strategy from its present central commitment to atomic weapons, the United States will be the more free to press for international control of atomic energy as part of a general system of disarmament. In the meantime, if control of atomic energy, with genuine inspection and safeguards, is impossible, the United States has no alternative but to continue to build up its atomic strength for the certainty of retaliation is probably the major deterrent to atomic warfare.

CHIEF WAR WEAPONS

5. The peacetime defects of our present strategy are matched by equally serious defects in time of war. There may be the hope, however faint, that in case of war both sides may hesitate to initiate the use of atomic weapons, through fear of the inevitable retaliation. But there is not the slightest ground for hope that mutual fear may thus spare the world if either side is dependent on atomic weapons as its main instrument of war.

Atomic war has made no clear limits. If the battle should be joined in western Europe, the Red army could be subjected to direct atomic attack only at the expense of blotting out the people and the cultural heritage which the North Atlantic Pact has committed us to defend.

The employment of the bomb on Russian soil, whatever its immediate military advantages, would complicate vastly any postwar rehabilitation of the Russian Nation. And now that the bomb is no longer a United States monopoly, Americans must recognize their own exceptional vulnerability to this weapon.

Our population and our industry are highly concentrated; our main cities are easily accessible by air and water. We are dependent on intricate and fragile systems of communication and transport. As a people we are not accustomed to the shock of military catastrophe. Moreover, where our vulnerability is relatively great, that of Britain is virtually total. An atomic war would almost certainly result in the obliteration of our closest ally. It is one of the tragic contradictions of our time that American strategy has organized the science and technology of the Nation around weapons which, when imitated abroad, are potentially most dangerous to itself and its friends.

WARFARE PROSPECTS

From the standpoint of its desire to achieve moral leadership in world affairs, the United States can ill afford a strategy which commits it in advance to warfare of mass slaughter on both sides—which might doom it to the fearful choice between worldwide mass destruction, on the one hand, and outright military defeat, on the other.

The emphasis on the weakness of the present strategy is justified if only to stimulate the search for alternatives. We assume that responsible members of our military establishment have this problem constantly in mind; but, inasmuch as military decisions must be circumscribed by political considerations, we believe that the problem will benefit from public discussion.

It seems clear that important alternatives have so far been set aside, not on their merits but because of the strategic commitment to and the popular faith in atomic weapons. The danger of exclusive or even predominant reliance on the atomic alternative must now be clear.

The question of the kind of conventional military force which would supplement the bomb as a deterrent is one the American people must now face. The development of an adequate ground army, the strengthening of our tactical air wing, the supply and logistic components, including the provision for air transport, the development of antisubmarine and other specialized naval forces, the use of the draft—all these problems pose questions not easily answered.

But these questions, we believe, must be answered if the United States policy is to be liberated from its present overwhelming dependence on atomic warfare. We call upon our political and military leaders to explore these issues with the American people.

Duncan S. Ballantine, McGeorge Bundy, Saville R. Davis, Martin Deutsch, J. K. Galbraith, William R. Hawthorne, John E. Sawyer, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Charles H. Taylor, Jerome B. Wiesner, Jerrold R. Zacharias.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 26, 1950.*

(The signers of the above letter are members of the faculties of Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.)

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Sunday, April 23, marked the second birthday of the new State of Israel.

I am glad to take this occasion to offer my congratulations to its founders and directors and to the many people whose combined heroic efforts have brought this new nation on its way, surmounting the immense difficulties and dangers which have threatened its very life.

My best wishes go out to the infant state for continuing strength and vitality and a working out of a peaceful and prosperous existence which will contribute to the well-being and happiness of all.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to hold hearings on the postal-rate bill today while the Senate is in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, no unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not understand the Senator.

Mr. MALONE. I say this thing is getting away from us. No unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent was already given for the presentation of routine matters.

Mr. MALONE. Then that is the last one.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And the Chair will recognize Senators who want to place routine matters in the RECORD. Objection will not lie, inasmuch as the Senate has already given its consent for the transaction of routine business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the President of the Senate mean that if unanimous consent is requested now, such as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has made, that objection will not lie?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not hold that a request that a committee be permitted to meet is a routine matter. Such a request can be made at any time during the day. Objection lies to it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was on my feet, and I should like to reserve the right to object in order to make one observation. I think this is the third time today, if not the fourth, that request has been made for unanimous consent to authorize a committee to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate. Such requests are agreeable to me, because I realize that committees must meet during the session of the Senate, in order to perform their necessary work. But it is very difficult to secure a quorum of the Senate during the afternoon, so Senators may hear debate on important questions, such as the pending ECA bill, when so many committees are meeting and holding hearings while the Senate itself is in session in the Senate Chamber. I shall not object to the request made by the Senator from South Carolina, but I call attention to the fact that when request is made that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, due to failure of a sufficient number of Senators to respond, and objection is made to such request, or when statements are made concerning the seeming lack of interest of Senators in the subject under discussion by reason of their failure to appear on the floor, the reason for such failure or delay in appearance of Senators is because most of them are working in committees while the Senate is in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada object to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MALONE. Since the Senator from Nevada has been granted the courtesy of having the opportunity to object, he will not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the consent requested is granted.

FOREIGN-MADE SHOES—LETTER FROM BOOT AND SHOE WORKERS' UNION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary for the Senator from Nevada to yield, for the Chair has obtained unanimous consent for Senators to submit routine matters.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield to me for 2 minutes, in order that I may present a letter which has been received by me from the boot and shoe makers of Milwaukee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, it is not necessary for the Senator to request the Senator from Nevada to yield.

The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 2 minutes on the matter to which he has referred. Without objection, he may do so.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, throughout my career in the Senate, I have emphasized two points in conjunction with the problem of foreign trade:

First. Our basic obligation is to afford reasonable and legitimate protection for

American jobs and American producers, as against unfair competition from floods of cheap foreign imports.

Second. To the greatest extent possible, consistent with that point, it has been my aim to try to increase trade with other countries, particularly in commodities that are not produced here at home, and where there is an unfulfilled need.

I have received many messages from Wisconsin businesses which are deeply concerned with recent policies adopted by the administration for the reckless slashing of trade barriers. These folks—both businessmen and unions, as well as individual workers—are concerned lest in our zeal to promote world commerce we lose sight of the fact that—

(a) America has the highest standard of living in the world.

(b) American wages are, generally speaking, the highest in the world.

(c) The largest element in the cost of any commodity is, generally speaking, the cost of labor.

(d) If foreign countries using inexpensive labor, at what amounts to serf prices, can have tariffs lowered appreciably, they can literally flood many American items off the market.

Mr. President, I am not an alarmist, and I do not want to overestimate this situation. Neither do I want us to underestimate it. I have supported foreign aid programs; I have supported the goal of helping foreign countries to get back on their own feet by means of increased trade with America; but I can never and will never lose sight of the fact that many jobs have already been wiped out in our country by a reckless tariff slash policy. I have protested many times to the United States Tariff Commission against particular tariff slashes, but usually my protests have fallen on deaf ears, and the same holds true in the case of appeals to the White House.

As an indication of the sort of problem with which I am deeply concerned, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the text of a letter which has come to me from Local 705 of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union of the United States. This letter symbolizes many other messages which come to me from organized labor, from individual employees, and from management.

The letter states, in substance, that shoes are being dumped on the American market at prices much lower than the prices at which comparable shoes can be manufactured in this country. The letter further states that women's shoes which are imported into the United States from one particular foreign country are being sold here at $1.20 wholesale, to retail at $2 a pair, whereas the same type of shoe made in this country would cost at least $2.15 a pair wholesale.

I think the letter speaks for itself, and that is why I have requested unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL UNION NO. 705,
BOOT AND SHOE WORKERS' UNION,
South Milwaukee, Wis., April 27, 1950.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At a meeting of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, Local No. 705 of South Milwaukee, Wis., at South Milwaukee on April 19, 1950, the question of foreign-made shoes was one of the main topics for discussion, and the members of this local voted to inform you of the seriousness of the situation and its effect on the shoe industry.

There has been a steady flow of shoes into this country at prices far below our domestic retail prices, and unless you, as our representative enter a protest, the situation will become worse and will force us shoe workers to seek employment in other industries.

Shoes are being dumped here at prices much lower than comparable shoes can be manufactured. Women's shoes from one country are being sold at $1.20 to retail at $2 per pair. The same type shoe made in this country would cost at least $2.15 per pair wholesale, and at that figure would require the lowest possible labor costs. Other shoes made for women retailing for $3 to $4 which, if made here under American standards, would have to retail at $5 to $6.

The same conditions apply to men's shoes, and if not stopped may eventually force American shoe manufacturers out of business and American shoe workers become displaced persons.

Therefore, we, as American citizens and American shoe workers, enter a protest to you, as our representative, to do something to correct this gross injustice to us American shoe workers.

Fraternally yours,
RAY M. STROZYK,
Secretary-Treasurer, Local No. 705.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 6354) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District was read twice by its title.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 6354, and express the hope that the Senate will promptly pass it. About 10 days ago the Senate passed a bill which is identical with this House bill with the exception that the Senate bill provided that the law should be permanent. This bill provides that the operation of the law shall be limited to the present year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished Senator from West Virginia how long he estimates consideration of the bill will require?

Mr. NEELY. If it requires more than 2 minutes, I shall withdraw my request.

Mr. MALONE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6354) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I desire to applaud the efforts of the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] who has been so vigilant in advancing the interests of the District of Columbia; but I should like to make one observation. It seems perfectly ridiculous that the Congress should be occupied each spring with a question which should be left to the determination of the authorized representatives of the people of the District of Columbia. I certainly hope, through the very valuable efforts of the Senator from West Virginia, that that situation may be corrected before next spring, so that we shall not have a repetition each year of this very sorry spectacle, because the people of the District of Columbia ought to have daylight saving, if they wish it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I heard the distinguished Senator from West Virginia correctly, I understand the only difference between the House bill and the Senate bill is that the Senate bill which was passed provided for permanent daylight saving time, and the House bill is a temporary measure, effective for 1 year only. Is that correct?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONE. Does the junior Senator from Nevada have the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's occupation of the floor has been temporarily suspended for routine matters. Does the Senator from Illinois have a routine matter?

Mr. LUCAS. It is not so routine, and yet it is. Will the Senator yield for one brief observation?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, since I have been consulted in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada yields to the Senator from Illinois, without losing the floor himself.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely want to observe that I share the views so ably expressed by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. Certainly the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives when they return here next year should give the people of the District of Columbia the right to say whether they want daylight-saving time. If a city in Illinois were interested in daylight-saving time, or in not having it, certainly the Senator from Illinois would not intervene in the local matters; but Senators do intervene here, because the people of the District of Columbia have

no votes. That is why it is done. I certainly hope the viewpoint of the Senator from Maryland will prevail next year.

OPTOMETRY'S FIFTIETH YEAR

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me 2 minutes for the purpose of making a brief statement?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, optometry, the science and art of visual care, is just entering its fiftieth year. It was in Minnesota, in April 1901, that the first Optometry Practice Act was passed. For that reason I desire to present very briefly an expression of appreciation to the 17,000 licensed optometrists who are engaged in the practice of their profession in every State of the Union.

The American Optometric Association, which represents this profession on a national plane, has its secretarial headquarters in Minneapolis, and in June of this year will observe the fiftieth year of professional optometry at its annual congress in Minneapolis.

It seems to me proper that we should give recognition here to the anniversary of optometry, particularly because legislation pertaining to health and visual care is constantly before us. It is important for us, especially, to seek to understand and appreciate all health professions.

In a strict sense, optometry is concerned with the measurement of the range of vision and the scientific examination of the eyes for the purpose of prescribing glasses and other corrective methods to cure defects. Our optometrists have sought to improve the scope of their work in two ways, which are characteristic of any profession; namely, broader understanding of the common needs of those to be served and higher standards of scientific training and ethical conduct among those directly engaged in the practice of the profession.

It is gratifying to note the emphasis that is being placed on visual care and correction in our schools, among drivers on our highways, in jobs where proper provision for visual requirements increases production and safety, and in sports and leisure-time activities as well. While making a contribution to these desirable ends, modern optometry has also pioneered in development of new methods of diagnosis and correction of visual problems.

As we observe the half century of development since adoption of the first legislative enactment relating to optometry, we note the increased emphasis on thorough education of the practitioner, the improved regulation of the practice by State laws, and the discipline of the profession itself by its national, State, and local optometric associations.

It is a privilege, therefore, to congratulate those engaged in this professional activity for the admirable accomplishments of the past and to bespeak for them continued progress and recognition as they seek to ably serve the American people.

TREATY WITH CANADA RELATING TO USES OF WATERS OF NIAGARA RIVER—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting Executive N, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a treaty with Canada relating to the uses of the waters of the Niagara River, which, with the accompanying treaty, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask with what subject the treaty deals?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It relates to the uses of the waters of the Niagara River between the United States and Canada.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in that connection I ask that the ban of secrecy be removed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty between the United States of America and Canada concerning uses of the waters of the Niagara River, signed at Washington February 27, 1950, together with a report of the Secretary of State.

This treaty is necessary in order to make definite and permanent allocations of Niagara River water for domestic, scenic, navigation, and power purposes. At present these allocations are governed by an obsolete and inadequate set of international agreements.

The new treaty is designed to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and to prescribe how much water, consistent with this purpose, may be diverted for power purposes in the two countries.

Today the beauty of the Falls—particularly of the Horseshoe Falls on the Canadian side—is impaired by uneven distribution of the waters over the crest, and concentrated flows are accelerating erosion. The treaty makes positive provision to correct this situation by providing for the construction of works designed to spread the waters over the Falls in an unbroken crestline and reduce the concentrated flows over parts of the crest.

The treaty reserves the necessary amounts of water for the scenic beauty of the Falls, as well as for domestic and sanitary purposes and for navigation, and provides that the remaining water shall be available for power and shall be divided equally between the United States and Canada.

The flow of water between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario is the greatest potential source of hydroelectric power at one location on this continent. For many years, some of this water has been used to produce hydroelectric power. The International Boundary Waters Treaty, signed January 11, 1909, authorized some diversion for power purposes, and exchange of notes between the United States and Canada in 1941 and 1948 provided for additional temporary diversions to meet emergency needs. In all, some 82,000 cubic feet of water per second has been authorized to be diverted for power purposes, of which 56,000 cubic feet is on a permanent basis, and some 1,290,000 kilowatts of power capacity have been installed on both sides of the border.

For some time, it has been evident that much more hydroelectric power can be produced from the Niagara River without detriment to navigation or to the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls. In September 1949, the staff of the Federal Power Commission reported that by using the water which can properly be made available for power, through modern, efficient generating facilities, some 1,250,000 kilowatts of net additional power capacity can be developed in the United States. The Federal Power Commission staff report did not, of course, cover in detail the additional capacity which might be added on the Canadian side, where more water is already being used than in the United States. It is evident, however, that several hundred thousand kilowatts of additional power can also be made available in Canada.

Thus, the new treaty will permit the development of substantial amounts of low-cost power, in an area of urgent need, without detriment to the scenic beauty of the Falls. I believe it is a fair and wise treaty, which protects all legitimate interests, and I recommend its approval by the Senate.

It is clear that the additional power to be produced from the Niagara River should be considered in relation to other sources of hydroelectric power in the northeastern United States, particularly the St. Lawrence seaway and power project which is in the same watershed.

The St. Lawrence project is urgently needed, of course, not only as a source of additional power, but equally as an additional avenue of transportation. Considered from the power point of view alone, however, both the Niagara and St. Lawrence sources are badly needed. The national security and the economic growth of this part of the country require that additional sources of low-cost power should be rapidly developed. The staff of the Federal Power Commission found that the need for power in the northeastern part of the country is so great that the additional power from the Niagara River, together with that to be made available from the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, can all be used in New York and adjacent States as soon as the necessary works can be constructed.

When the Niagara treaty has been ratified, the question will naturally arise as to how additional facilities shall be developed to achieve the best use of water to be diverted for power purposes. My own views on this question are a matter of public record; I believe that the additional power facilities should be publicly constructed, in order that the benefits of the hydroelectric power produced there can be passed on to the people at the lowest possible cost to them.

This is a question, however, which is not determined by the treaty itself. It

is a question which we in the United States must settle under our own procedures and laws. It would not be appropriate either for this country or for Canada to require that an international agreement between them contain the solution of what is entirely a domestic problem. All this treaty does is to make additional water legally available for power purposes in each of the two countries. This is a step which must be taken in the interest of the United States. It is one which should be left separate from the steps which must be taken in this country in order to convert this water into additional power.

Accordingly, I urge the Senate to consider this treaty promptly, in order that this hydroelectric power, badly needed in the United States and Canada, can be made available at the earliest possible time.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 2, 1950.*

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read a statement with reference to the treaty. It will not take more than 40 seconds.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think it is time that I proceeded with my remarks. The junior Senator from Nevada has yielded to nearly every Senator on the floor, and it seems to me it is time to proceed with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator object?

Mr. MALONE. I do.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is not this a communication from the President with reference to a treaty, and is not that a privileged communication?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Laying the President's message before the Senate is a privileged matter. What the Senator from Nevada is objecting to is to the Senator from New York reading a statement in connection with the treaty.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for an observation?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that five committees have been granted unanimous consent to sit and hold hearings during today's session of the Senate. I know how important the distinguished Senator from Nevada feels the question of trade relations between this Nation, the ECA countries, and other countries of the world is. Does the Senator wish the junior Senator from Nebraska to suggest the absence of a quorum, or does the Senator feel that he should proceed? I have just been handed the figures, and I find that 73 Senators have been permitted to leave the floor today (later found to be 78). If the Senator feels that he would like to have a quorum call, I should be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MALONE. No, Mr. President. It has been rather amusing to the junior Senator from Nevada that so many Senators consider their minds so closed on this subject that they no longer need to listen to any debate whatsoever on the question. The junior Senator from Nevada predicts that by October of this year—1950—that many Members of Congress will be reexamining the three-part "free trade" program so enthusiastically followed by many converts of this body.

RECAPITULATION

Mr. President, at the close of the session yesterday the junior Senator from Nevada had outlined the position of both major parties on foreign trade and pointed to the diametrically opposed policy of two parties in that respect. In order to sum up I want to say that one of the reasons why it may not be necessary for anyone on the majority side to listen to this debate is because the Democratic Party is committed to the three-part free-trade program, as determined by the State Department and which Under Secretary of State Mr. Thorp so ably outlined. He said that the ECA and the Marshall plan—he implied it was a trade-balance deficit program, and it has been proved to be such on the floor of the Senate—would make up the trade-balance deficit of every nation in Europe, in cash each year. Mr. President, cash is our chief export. Furthermore, the ECA was supposed to be a stopgap arrangement. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, to which the Democratic Party is irrevocably committed, simply transferred the constitutional responsibility of regulating the national economy of the United States of America through the regulation of imports from Congress to the executive department. That was the first time such a thing was done since the Constitution of the United States was adopted. Congress gave permission to the executive department with perfunctory hearings to lower tariffs and import fees as much as 75 percent of those imposed under the Tariff Act of 1930, thus effectively stopping the venture capital flowing into the business streams of the Nation. If tariffs are lowered only 10 percent, Mr. President, and they correctly represented that differential of the cost of production—then you virtually have free trade unless the wages are lowered and the investment is written off to meet the competition—it is simply a choice of a lower standard of living or unemployment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator state whether or not the provision in the Democratic national platform for 1948 to which he refers is the one which reads:

> We pledge ourselves to restore the reciprocal trade agreements program formulated in 1934 by Secretary of State Cordell Hull and operated successfully for 14 years until crippled by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Further, we strongly endorse our country's adherence to the International Trade Organization.

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I do have reference to that particular plank in the platform of the Democratic Party. I also have reference to the statements which the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State have reiterated, not in reference to the Democratic platform. Those gentlemen said that the ECA, the ITO, and the 1934 Trade Agreements Act are connected, each dependent upon the other.

THE PERIL POINT

In further answer to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, in the Eightieth Congress the peril point was proposed in connection with the renewal of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. All that the peril point provision would have amounted to is a notice to the President of the United States that, if he lowered tariffs and import fees below the point which the Tariff Commission considered the danger point to American industry and American workingmen, he must write a letter to the Congress of the United States explaining why he had done it.

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that the peril-point procedure would not have changed the Democratic administration's headlong course toward free trade. However, it would have required him to write a letter, probably addressed generally to the world, saying what a great job he was doing in developing markets here to ease the trade balances of the nations of the world, and he would have had to send us a copy of the letter. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that acceptance of the peril-point amendment to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act would have meant that the Republicans would have been stuck with the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that was sold to the American people under the catch phrase of "reciprocal trade." It never gave and never will give reciprocal benefits. And the Republicans would have been stuck with the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and the principle of "free trade"—meaning the last difference between the parties would have disappeared. We would then have joined the Democratic Party in wrecking the floor under American wages and investments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There was considerable confusion during the introduction of matters into the Appendix of the RECORD, but did the distinguished Senator from Nevada hear the senior Senior from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] offer a resolution adopted by a trade union in Wisconsin complaining about the dislocation of jobs and people having been thrown out of work because of the unfair competition in the shoe business, which is resulting from the factors the distinguished Senator is now mentioning on the floor?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has reminded the junior Senator from Nevada of that particular point. I did take note of that letter, and I intended to mention it. The Wisconsin shoe industry is only one more industry which has fallen into the trap and the deceptive "free trade" come-on designed by that

misleading phrase "reciprocal trade." The workingmen of America are more interested in having a floor under their wages and under investments than are any other individuals in the whole United States of America. Workingmen are the first ones to suffer. The owners of the business, the investors, and the managers of the business may consist of entirely different personnel. Management may own only a small percentage of the business, and if the business fails the manager of the business is identified. He is known and can get another job, and they also may have a little money laid aside. No doubt investors, too, have some money laid by, and their investments in a particular business may be only one part of their entire investments, whether in the shoe business, the mining business, or the crockery business.

However, the workingmen of America, in a mining camp, in a town with shoe factories, or a town with crockery manufacturing, with their homes half paid for and with their children in school, have no other job for which they are trained. What are they to do? The workingmen of America are beginning to realize their position. Furthermore, my earnest opinion is that 3 or 4 months from now there will be no other issue in the United States of America so important as that issue—the floor under wages and investments.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. MALONE. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the distinguished Senator from Nevada read the recommendations made by the Administrator, Paul Hoffman, and also the advice given by the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, to the effect that they knew that dislocations would occur in the United States of America; that we should anticipate such dislocations, and that in the case of industry and management provision should be made so that those who had to close their doors because of being undersold could get into new businesses, so that labor could be taken care of by extending unemployment insurance to those thrown out of employment by extending the Unemployment Insurance Act and requiring the taxpayer to take care of the unemployed? Does the Senator remember reading those recommendations by the Administrator and the Secretary of State?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, I should like to turn back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1 and read briefly an excerpt from my address under the heading "The economic Yalta." I read an excerpt from that address, as follows:

> Both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman agreed that the old "Buy American" slogan should be dropped in the face of increased unemployment and that the new slogan of "Buy European" should be adopted and a real drive begun, assisted by Government appropriations to make it effective.

Mr. President, since that time Mr. Hoffman, I suppose, with the active assistance and cooperation of Mr. Acheson, has created a division within the ECA, the sole objective of which is to search for things in Europe to import into this country, showing the producers in Europe how to package them for sale in this market, finding markets in this country, and promoting fairs and other means of selling more European goods to this country. Mr. Hoffman mentioned in 1949, in an article in the April issue of the American magazine, a copy of which the junior Senator from Nevada secured in March and used excerpts during the debate, that he favored a fair train traveling throughout the United States advertising the goods of Europe, to help Europe obtain a part of the United States market.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada, in connection with what he is now saying, apropos of the question whether or not American workingmen were becoming awakened to what is going on, if he has seen a report in the New York Times of this morning, from Boston, of an address by Emil Rieve, general president of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, dealing with this matter, in which, according to this report, Mr. Rieve suggested today that it would be better for the United States to give away our surplus goods abroad than to buy imports at the cost of unemployment at home.

I read from the article:

> In a keynote speech he said to the 1,748 delegates—

Delegates, mind you—

> opening the union's sixth biennial convention, Mr. Rieve warned that private enterprise was having its final test and that, unless it could provide full employment and a decent standard of living for all the people, it would disappear.

This is very interesting, coming from Mr. Rieve.

> He asserted that he was sick and tired of statements from Washington, "by our friends as well as our enemies"—

That is very interesting. I wonder whom he meant by "friends"—

> that the country was in fine shape the way it is.

The only one I have heard say those words recently was the distinguished President of the United States, who asserted it was in fine shape. Mr. Rieve is sick and tired of hearing those statements.

> Mr. Rieve said that this was not so "when workers in Lawrence, Mass., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., New Bedford, Mass., and Cumberland, Md., and a hundred other towns from coast to coast can't find honest work at decent wages."
>
> If these people were jobless now, said the textile union leader, "where will we be when we stop pumping billions of dollars a year into our economy through our armament program and our foreign-aid program?"

I wonder whether the Senator from Nevada had that called to his attention before.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Maine has read this reference into the RECORD, because it had not been called to my attention. But the newspapers of the United States are full of the subject now. Workingmen all over America are meeting daily and are slowly becoming conscious of the danger to their jobs, because, as the junior Senator from Nevada has just said, the workingmen are the first to suffer, they are the first to be laid off. Investors may have other means of livelihood. Management can get other positions, but the workingmen, who know only one type of work, have no other place to go.

Mr. President, I have been in about 25 States in the last 60 days, and I wish to say that 60 percent of our own people in the United States of America are not getting along very well. They are having a tough time paying their taxes, and keeping their children in school. Make no mistake about that. There will be an accounting when they finally realize what is pulling the economic rug out from under their feet, with Members of the United States Senate and the Congress and administration officials rushing to Europe, participating in industrial committees and agricultural committees, trying to save some of their constituents from being ruined by these policies and to preserve some semblance of common sense in some of the things that come out of these committees. Senators are so busy meeting in committees, as we saw here this morning, that 78 of the 96 Senators were attending meetings of committees. They will be busy all day. They will rush here a little later in the afternoon, and then rush to their offices to sign their mail. They are so busy they do not see the economic rug slipping out from under their feet through this three-part free-trade program. That is exactly what is happening, and the workingmen of America are beginning to find out that they have been duped.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

WHY THE DELAY ON THE ITO?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, at the Democratic National Convention held July 12 to 14, 1948, at Philadelphia, the convention there said:

> Further, we strongly endorse our country's adherence to the International Trade Organization.

I ask the Senator whether or not, following that declaration, there was elected to both Houses of Congress a sufficient number of Democrats to be in control of each of the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it true that ever since the January convening of Congress in 1949, until and including the present moment, there has been a Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress?

Mr. MALONE. There has been.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator if he knows, therefore, why it is that, notwithstanding this strong declaration in

the Democratic national platform in July 1948, and notwithstanding the fact that the Democrats have been continuously in control of the Congress from the early part of 1949 to and including the present time, no action has been taken up to this date, so far as the House Calendar of May 2, 1950, advises, on either House Joint Resolution 14, introduced in the House on January 3, 1949, House Joint Resolution 71, introduced in the House on January 6, 1949, or House Joint Resolution 236, introduced in the House on May 3, 1949, each of them over a year ago, and two of them a year and 4 or 5 months ago, and each of them providing for membership of the United States in the International Trade Organization, and authorizing an appropriation therefor? When the Democrats claim that the International Trade Organization is so desirable that they strongly endorse our country's adherence to it, and ever since early in January 1949 they have been in control of both Houses of Congress, why is it, if the Senator knows, that nothing has been done on any one of these three joint resolutions providing for membership of the United States in the International Trade Organization?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Missouri has brought this matter again to the floor of the Senate. In yesterday's debate the junior Senator from Nevada defined what the International Trade Organization would do. In other words, after the Congress of the United States had transferred its constitutional authority to regulate the national economy to the Executive, the International Trade Organization would, if approved, transfer that authority to 58 nations, or 56, whatever number would become members, perhaps 60, with the United States having one vote. It would transfer the control of the economy of the United States of America, because after 125 pages of ambiguous statements in the charter of the ITO, there is only one conclusion that can be reached, namely, that to that organization would be assigned the authority to fix the tariffs of its member nations. That also means to fix the tariffs and import fees of the United States of America. And further the ITO would be authorized to fix quotas of production of such commodities as shoes, wheat, or any other commodities, and 58 or 60 of the representatives around the table, knowing the historical consumption of the world of each product each year, could transfer production from this country to another country to balance production and level our standard of living with the nations of the world. If we decided to withdraw we would be accused of bad faith, and anyway we would be so bloody after the 3 years we are bound that it would be impossible for us to withdraw.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator think that it is passing strange that if the Democratic Party believes it should have strongly endorsed our country's adherence to the International Trade Organization, and had it within its power to do so during all the intervening months, from the early part of January 1949 until May 2, 1950, it has not taken steps to pass any one of the three measures which have been lying dormant in the House of Representatives, so far as the House Calendar of today shows, but has allowed them to lie dormant all that time? Is it not strange that, if the Democrats think the International Trade Organization is so essential and have so strongly endorsed it in their national platform, they have done nothing toward causing that document, the platform, to be approved by adopting one of the three joint resolutions?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is rather strange. But yesterday on the Senate floor I read a dispatch which stated that it had been concluded, or at least was being considered, that any consideration of the ITO on the Senate floor be withdrawn until—and I may be in error in quoting the exact language—until the "Republicans had taken a more enlightened view." Yesterday I said:

> The ITO is but one more device affecting private trade which has been placed under the umbrella of that great protective phrase "bipartisan foreign policy."

The distinguished Senator from Missouri said yesterday, in answer to a direct question from the junior Senator from Nevada, that if we entered into the bipartisan policy, through the collusion necessary to have such a bipartisan policy, it should be an impeachable offense. To that the junior Senator from Nevada subscribed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I assume that what the Senator from Nevada is referring to is the question and the answer appearing in column 1 on page 6067, the question reading as follows:

> Mr. MALONE. Then I ask the opinion of the Senator from Missouri about what I said earlier in my remarks, as follows: If it were possible, through collusion, bipartisan agreement, or other methods, to have a meeting between the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Senators constituting a minority in the Senate—or, for that matter, all Members of the Senate, and representatives of the executive branch of the Government, by which they would bind the executive and the legislative branches of the Government in regard to a bill or other measure which, it would be agreed, would be passed by Congress without necessary debate; and if it were further agreed that, without proper hearings or arguments before the Supreme Court, such a measure would be held by the Supreme Court to be constitutional, what would the Senator from Missouri think about that?

And the answer being as follows:

> Mr. DONNELL. I think every Government official who was a party to such proceedings should be impeached. That is what I think about it.

Is that the question, and is that the answer?

Mr. MALONE. That is the question and the answer.

Mr. President, I say that the Senate of the United States should have the same dignity as members of the Supreme Court. If anyone approached members of the Supreme Court and asked them to give their decision before the arguments had been made, or to give out the decision prior to the official release, it would be deeply resented. It seems to me the Senate of the United States should be at least on a par with the Supreme Court, as one of the three coordinate branches of Government.

Mr. President, that does not preclude at all any discussion between the President of the United States and any Member of the Senate relative to an agreement or a treaty, before it has come to the Senate and before proper debate is had. It does not mean that such discussion should be subject to impeachment proceedings at all—but an agreement for a bipartisan foreign policy that may limit discussion on the Senate floor certainly should be subject to such proceedings.

Mr. President, in further answer to the distinguished Senator from Missouri as to why this important matter, this vital matter—the third part of this free-trade program—has not come before the Senate, yesterday on the Senate floor the junior Senator from Nevada said:

> When the ITO charter was sent to Congress some weeks ago we were told that our liberties were at stake, that its adoption was necessary for the preservation of peace and prosperity. Let us take that propaganda at its face value and bring the charter to the Senate floor. If adoption of the charter is as urgent as officially stated, then it should be considered now. Mr. President, I defy the administration to have the ITO charter brought to the Senate floor.

I do not think the ITO can be passed and I think they know they cannot pass it in the Senate, because the workingmen of America are awakened now. They know what might happen if this treaty becomes the permanent law of our country, thus enabling foreign nations to control the economy of our Nation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator desire to express any judgment as to why it is that the International Trade Organization proposal has not been presented to the Senate by way of a treaty, particularly in view of the expression made here on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] the other day that in his opinion the subject matter is a treaty, also particularly in view of the fact that the very strong statement was made by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKEN] that he thinks it is a treaty? Why is it, in the judgment of the Senator from Nevada, that three measures have been introduced in the House of Representatives, none of which has made any visible progress, that is, visible to the naked eye, so far as I can find, although each is a measure requiring only simple majority in each of the two Houses, whereas a treaty would require a two-thirds majority in the Senate? Does the Senator desire to express any judgment as to why that course of procedure has been followed?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has propounded a very

pertinent question. The junior Senator from Nevada has watched the progress that has been made during a period of years in carrying out platform promises and measures which have been initiated by the Democratic Party in Congress.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri was in the Senate, of course, before the junior Senator from Nevada and should have much greater knowledge as to the actual reasons. But the reaction of the junior Senator from Nevada is simply that it was found early in the present administration that a way must be found to have treaties with other nations adopted by a simple majority of both Houses, since two-thirds of the Senate could never be found to approve such stupid and dangerous treaties as were continually coming before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, the Secretary of State several months ago made a statement, quoted literally and accurately yesterday for the RECORD, that it was almost impossible now to distinguish and separate the national economy from the foreign policy. What the Under Secretary has said on many occasions was that the three parts of the free-trade system to which I have referred are each dependent upon the other—the ECA, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and the International Trade Organization.

The junior Senator from Nevada will say that the first two established free trade, and the International Trade Organization would simply make the policy permanent. The ECA is simply a stopgap to make up the trade-balance deficits of the nations of Europe until such time as the markets of this country can be divided under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act so that theoretically there are no more trade-balance deficits.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act, established free trade, and then the International Trade Organization does nothing except make that situation permanent.

Mr. President, Mr. Acheson spoke further in that connection when he appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in testifying relative to House Joint Resolution 236, on April 19, 1950, only about 2 weeks ago. At that time he said:

> Many of the commitments of the charter—

In other words, the International Trade Organization charter—

> even under today's economic conditions, can be immediately put into full effect. These commitments include those dealing with negotiations for the reduction of tariffs and elimination of preferences.

In other words, Mr. Acheson still maintains that the present state of our domestic economy allows many of these provisions to go into effect, including the elimination of tariffs or the further reduction of tariffs, with no consideration given as to what is involved in the cost differential between the competitive nations and the United States, due to the differences in the wage standards and living.

Mr. President, I have not quite finished responding to the question of the junior Senator from Nebraska, who asked about the attitude of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman.

It was Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hoffman who said that we must buy European now, instead of buy American. The words "buy European" are Mr. Acheson's and Mr. Hoffman's words.

Mr. President, as I said in my speech in the Senate on March 1, 1950:

> "Buy European" with approximately 6,000,000 unemployed in this country today and probably 12,000,000 partially unemployed at the present time, and with the number increasing each day in the textile, crockery, precision instruments, lumber and wood products, mining, agriculture, petroleum, and other vital industries, Mr. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and Mr. Paul Hoffman, Director of ECA, had the effrontery to tell the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the State Department's free-trade program should be continued.
>
> DIRECT RELIEF TO DISPLACED WORKERS
>
> I shall quote from the New York Journal of Commerce of February 23 relative to a suggestion made by Mr. Hoffman. During his initial testimony on Tuesday, Mr. Hoffman had merely stated that, "if there must be some relief in this situation, I suggest that it be given directly."
>
> They had disagreed slightly on how to support the unemployed in this country, and to reimburse industrialists with their stockholders whose investments have gone bad as a result of the imports, fostered by ECA.
>
> THE HOFFMAN THREE-PART UNEMPLOYMENT SOLUTION
>
> Taking the highly problematical case of the one-industry town, with a plant which could not shift its products to some other line, the ECA Chief said he saw three possible types of relief:
>
> First. Unemployment compensation insurance.

Since the junior Senator from Nevada said that a statement has been made by the President of the United States that Congress should increase the amount of money available for unemployment compensation, and perhaps should help the States in regard to their unemployment insurance.

I further said in my speech on March 1:

> Second. A program of job training; and
>
> Third. Possibly management training, to try and bring new industry into the area.
>
> ALICE IN WONDERLAND SOLUTION
>
> Mr. President, this, to my mind, reached the *n*th degree of some kind of Alice in Wonderland theories. In other words, here is a man, a supposed industrialist, drawn into this great job of directing the expenditure of from $5,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 each year, who apparently has never found until now that for a hundred years the nations of the earth have been competing for markets. So, after financing industries in ECA countries to the extent that they cannot, through their own quotas, embargoes, and the manipulation of their foreign currencies and other stoppages of trade among themselves, sell what they produce, he suddenly finds out there is a great solution on their doorstep. What is it? It is to allow them to take the market we have protected and built up the hard way for 75 years in the United States.
>
> Mr. President, it is a great solution. In my opinion, it is comparable to two great armies facing each other, such as you and I and many other Senators on this floor have seen twice within the last 30 years. The armies face each other. So, one of the generals suddenly determines how to stop the war—he surrenders to the other. A wonderful solution, Mr. President.

Mr. President, what a fantastic proposal that is—namely, that all we have to do is divide the markets of the United States with the other nations of the world, and then everyone will be happy. In that event, of course, everyone will be happy except the workingmen and the investors of the United States whose jobs and investments have been exported to foreign soil.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the Chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the argument in favor of that course is that although there will be dislocations in this country, yet on the over-all basis, with the international trade, the United States still will benefit. For that reason, apparently, those who are in favor of the program base the proposal for the United States to make contributions to it, doing so, apparently, on the theory that it will close the dollar gap, and that as soon as the dollar gap is closed there will be the mutuality of opportunity which they advocate. At least, I assume that is their theory. It is very difficult to understand exactly what their theory is, but apparently that is it.

I say to the Senator from Nevada that I cannot find anywhere in the record or the report a statement of how much of the British, French, Dutch, and Belgian dollar earnings come from their colonial possessions, if the question is one of closing the dollar gap.

The Senator from Nevada has visited practically all the countries of the world, and I should like to know from him whether in the course of his visits to various foreign countries he has ascertained what that situation is. If he knows, I should like to ask him. If he does not know, I should like to ask any member of the Foreign Relations Committee whether he knows what the dollar earnings of those countries are from their colonial possessions, and whether the budgets of Britain, France, and the other countries which have colonial possessions and are participants in the Marshall plan and are requesting more dollars from the United States, show that that gap is more nearly closed than is shown by the figures contained in the report.

For illustration, as I recall, during the war we bought some of our items directly from the colonies, and paid for them in dollars. Immediately after the war, that direct source of supply was shut off to us, and we had to buy those items from the mother countries, who, in turn, did business with their colonies in obtaining the materials. If the colonies are paid in dollars, certainly their earnings in dollars would figure in with the over-all dollar earnings of the mother countries, and should be considered in connection with the calculation of the number of

dollars which the mother countries tell us it is necessary for them to have in order to be able to close the dollar gap. So I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether he knows about that matter. If he does not know, then I should like to ask if any other Senator knows whether there are available in the record figures from which we can determine what are the dollar earnings of those colonial possessions, so that we can consider them in connection with the attempts of the mother countries to justify the asserted need for dollars from the United States under the Marshall plan.

When that question is answered I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada another question, a separate one. The ECA money is contributed for definite purposes, and, of course, eventually it goes on to the colonies, at least in part. I should like to know whether there is available anywhere in the report—or, if not, whether any Member of the Senate knows the facts—information as to whether an audit is made of the ECA funds, beyond the grants which go to the ECA countries, so as to make it possible for us to know for what purposes the ECA dollars we contribute are actually spent—whether for the purposes outlined in the ECA Act or for other purposes. If that information is made available, it seems to me it will have a great bearing on the dollar-gap question we are discussing and on the question of whether on an over-all basis the United States of America is receiving any benefit from this so-called trade.

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has brought up this point. It might be interesting to reflect, however, on the wording of the ECA Act, first known as the Marshall plan. It is very loosely worded. As in the case of the authorization acts for many of the other bureaus for which we appropriate large amounts of money, in the ECA Act there are many provisions by which the agency itself is allowed to set up the rules and regulations under which it will operate, and by which it is allowed to determine how it will spend the money which is appropriated to it.

Let me say that, as all of us realize, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska has something of a habit of considering, in connection with matters of current debate, events which occurred some time ago. I think it is most appropriate for that to be done. If the Senator will recall the debate in March 1948, he will remember that at that time the Senators who were advocates of ECA aid told us, on the floor of the Senate, "We must feed hungry people. We must rehabilitate the industries of these European countries. We must stop communism. Therefore we must authorize $17,000,000,000, by means of the ECA bill. We must provide between $5,500,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 a year. We must permit one man to handle it, and must allow him to rush over to those European countries, and use it at once in almost any manner he may decide—those were actually the provisions of the bill. Very little detail was given. At that time the junior Senator from Nevada felt impelled to go into some detail, after visiting practically all the nations of Europe and going into the coal mines and steel mills in the Ruhr Valley, where the English were in charge of the coal mines, trying to increase coal production. Of course, they could not produce enough coal in their own country to keep warm, although England had been one of the greatest coal-producing countries in the world. So we put the English in charge of the Ruhr coal production. The first indication the junior Senator from Nevada saw that there might be something that did not meet the eye was in the Ruhr. That is what we saw after going through some of the mines, for instance crawling on our hands and knees for an eighth of a mile to inspect the face of a coal vein. The veins of the coal there are not so thick as they are in this country, therefore it is impossible for a man to stand upright where the coal is mined. Half a mile underground, perhaps three-quarters of a mile back from the face, we saw a new coal cutter in action. We were lying there in about 2 inches of water, talking to the "shifter," who spoke a little English, and I had already seen the automatic loaders and the lifts taking the coal to the surface. This coal cutter was dropping the coal into a steel shaker conveyor, going down to a web conveyor, thence up to the next level, and on to the automatic loaders, with 35 3½-ton cars moving up automatically, no one touching the coal. I said to the shifter, "In Nevada we merely open up more faces when we want to break more ore down. You have plenty of opportunity here if you want more coal to do just that." He said, "We would like to do that, but, the only factory in Germany that makes coal cutters is on the reparations list—which means no more coal cutters." So we went from there to something else, always finding the same thing. Some deliberate action to prevent reaching the announced objective.

Then I was invited to dinner with Mr. Collins, who was in charge of the coal mining in the Ruhr, and living in the great Krupp residence, a magnificent building. So, after three or four rounds of the lemonade we had dinner and they started again on the lemonade. I was winning the argument, I think, because it looked to me as if all that would be necessary was to use a little horse sense, and the coal production, steel production, and everything else, could be increased without a large expenditure of money. So finally Collins stopped dead and grinned at me. He said, "You know, you are going to give us that money in order to support your own economy." Madam President, I then stopped dead myself. But I heard that same statement several times in Europe to my extreme embarrassment. The first time I heard it around the capital was in the latest argument being made that "if you do not appropriate this $3,333,000,000, we will have a great depression in this country." That was not the first time I heard it, but it was the first time I heard it advanced here in the Capitol.

Madam President, I do not know the exact amount of dollar income of these nations from the colonial possessions alone. I visited practically all the colonial nations in Africa and also in Asia. Of course, as the Senator from Nebraska knows, the Far East Asiatic nations, and the nations in Africa include most of the colonial nations.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Referring for example to rubber, the Senator knows where Britain gets her rubber supply, and he knows how we pay for it. That is one item I had in mind. I hope that if the distinguished Senator does not know where he can find the figures in the report—and I could not find them—I hope he will ask some member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to furnish the figures for the Senate. I think they are very interesting figures. Perhaps the Senator knows where to obtain them. If so, I should like to have that information.

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, so far as I know, the figures are not contained in any report. For example, in Singapore, as in Bangkok, Siam, I met Mr. Malcolm McDonald, a son of the old-time MacDonald who was the head of the English Government for many years. Malcolm MacDonald and I talked at considerable length about the tin situation and the rubber situation. He was very adamant, saying to me that if we continued to manufacture synthetic rubber, the price of natural rubber would be pressed down in the Malayan States and other areas over which they had control, and that they would not be able to earn the amount of dollars necessary to continue to hold those areas by the sale of rubber to the United States of America.

I pointed out to the distinguished Malcolm MacDonald that we remembered when we had no synthetic rubber, that rubber went to $1 a pound here in the Malayan States. So I told him that I thought it very unwise for us to go out of the synthetic rubber business. However, I could sympathize with his point of view.

Again, we got together in Singapore at the British headquarters, where substantially the same conversation ensued. In all these areas such as Indonesia, the Malayan States, Indochina, and the African nations, the colonial possessions, this is the principle on which they proceed. The junior Senator from Nevada accumulated quite a fund of information on just how it was being done. Through our free-trade methods, they are encouraged to hold their own labor and this slave labor down. They hold it just as low as possible—25 cents a day, 50 cents a day, or whatever they are finally forced to pay for native labor. They then sell the product, tin, rubber, hemp, copra, and the other products which we require but which we do not produce, for all the traffic will bear. It has been done for 100 years. But, through our production of synthetic rubber, we have some control of the price of natural rubber. That is the way those

nations have made a living, some of them for 300 years, some of them for 100 years. We are encouraging the holding down of the labor by the very free-trade methods which we say will raise their standard of living. In the humble judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, this is the way it operates. When we have free trade, or virtual free trade, it encourages them to hold the labor down as much as possible. I refer to the slave labor in the imperial or colonial areas, and their own labor in their own countries, as witness the freezing of the wages of labor in England. They then sell the products of the low cost and slave labor for what the traffic will bear.

It will be remembered that even when the British devalued their currency they did not change the sale price in dollars on products that were not competitive in this country. So long as we permit the free trade, it encourages them to freeze their labor wages, to keep it as low as they can.

But if we had a flexible import fee principle which would make up the differential of cost between the slave labor and the low-cost labor employed to produce the products coming in here, and the difference were paid into the United States Treasury, about the second or third time the Englishmen, the Frenchmen, or the Dutchmen, and the others paid the flexible import fee, they might go home and say, "Well, boys, we may as well give you a little higher wage and create a market here in Europe, in England, France, and the other European nations." In other words, by using the flexible import fee system we would encourage them to pay more to labor and raise the standards of living in those countries, and would create additional markets in Europe. The difference between slave-labor costs and what the traffic will bear here, is kept in their pockets, and represents the amount the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is asking about. I am sorry I have been unable to obtain recent figures on it, therefore I cannot give the current answer.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. To me, that is one of the very important features about having free and open debate on this subject. This morning, when unanimous-consent requests were made for committee meetings, I finally did not object, because it seemed to be the program to go ahead and let the committees meet, but I said then that there were 76 Senators granted leave of absence. I was in error: It was 78.

Mr. MALONE. That leaves 18 Senators, and I see most of them are here.

Mr. WHERRY. That figure does not include the six Senators who were given personal leave of absence by the Senate. To me, the debate concerns some of the important aspects of authorizations, and the time to talk about appropriations is when they are being authorized, not after the Congress has authorized them. Not until after the money has been authorized is it so much a question of appropriation.

Yesterday a question was asked by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] which has not yet been answered. It was also restated in different form by the junior Senator from Nebraska. The question was this: Why is it that American industry is foreclosed from shipping into the satellite countries, in the interest of national security, materials which are apparently being shipped on wholesale basis by the ECA countries?

There is a $64 question which has not yet been answered. The speech which the Senator from Nevada has made and is making has for its purpose an endeavor to provide some basis on which our labor can compete with foreign labor. When it comes to dislocations and unemployment, something has to be done about it in this country. I should like to know, and I do not know why the information is not yet available, something with reference to the closing of the dollar gap, and what the colonial possessions earn in dollars. I think we should have on the desk information as to what the colonial countries are earning, and whether the gap is as wide as some persons say it is. I think that is highly important, because if we are going on the basis that we must close the dollar gap in order to have trade on a free-trade basis, we have got to ascertain what has already happened. We do not have a complete picture unless we have evidence as to what the colonial possessions will earn in dollars this year, and what they expect to earn next year. In making appropriations to close the dollar gap, we should know whether those countries will have the dollars to go around.

I think another very important question is the question which the Senator has already stated he could not answer, because it is a question of administration.

I think every United States Senator has the right to know whether the Administrator makes any kind of a report as to what becomes of the funds. How do we know whether the money goes for the purpose for which the act was passed or whether it goes for an entirely different purpose? I think our experience with UNRRA is convincing evidence that we need a watchdog committee.

The Senator from Nevada has given a very intelligent answer to the first question with reference to shipping. Senators who are responsible for authorizations and appropriations should know whether the money is being spent for the purpose for which the act was passed, and certainly there is a great question as to whether portions of the appropriations are being used for the proper purpose.

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, I believe the ECA funds are being used for the purpose for which Congress appropriated the money, but Congress did not understand what kind of bill it was voting for. We voted for a blanket appropriation. Was anything said on the Senate floor in 1948, when the great Marshall plan, or the Bevin plan, or whatever it should be called, came before the Senate? I call it the Bevin plan, because he caught it on the first bounce after Marshall made a paragraph reference to it at Harvard, and in 30 days he told us how much it would cost us. I think he had it in mind before that; I think there had been a few telephone calls, and perhaps a little collusion practiced in that connection.

The first evidence before the Senate was the statement that we were going to create more markets in Europe for our workingmen and investors. Was anything explained on the Senate floor at that time as to a special office being set up under the ECA to promote imports into this country and to stop exports from this country to ECA countries? I do not think so.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the answer is that the act can be so administered, along general lines, that there will not be any accounting made. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONE. I should say, in answer to that question, that 90 percent of the legislation which has been passed in the past 18 years is so worded that anything can be done with the money appropriated, so that the Government bureaus and the great multitude of organizations established to spend the money can to a large extent make their own rules and regulations in the expenditure of such funds. Congress has been very careless.

Mr. KEM. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if the use of $175,000,000 of ECA funds for the purpose of purchasing Canadian wheat to go to Great Britain is not a shining example of what the Senator from Nevada has just been talking about?

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad that the distinguished Senator has brought up that question, because the junior Senator from Nevada was invited to go to Toronto to address a national mining convention there. Knowing the kind of audience he had, and liking all of them—they are very fine people, our kind of people—he spent a little time joking with them, but his remarks were really serious. One of the things he said was, "You are now waiting"—this was in February 1948—"for us to furnish the money to England for them to buy your wheat and pay cash for it."

That is what I said in my address, and it was subsequently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That is exactly what happened. In other words, Canada could not afford to give away wheat and needed hard money for it. So we appropriated the dollars and sent it to England. Theoretically it made the "round robin" and came back to Canada to pay for Canadian wheat.

It did not make much sense to the Senator from Nevada. I believe my statement will be found in the debate which occurred on the 4th and 5th of March 1949, at which time the Senator from Nevada tried to make a little sense out of something for which he was expected to vote.

Mr. KEM. At the time the ECA appropriation bill was passed did the Senator from Nevada have the slightest intimation that the Administrator intended to pay $175,000,000 of the money for the purchase of Canadian wheat?

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that the junior Senator from Nevada knew what they were going to do with it, because of the sources of information open to him between the United States and Canada. Canada was then waiting for the money to be appropriated by us.

Mr. KEM. Did Mr. Hoffman let the cat out of the bag before the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. MALONE. He is a very good and cagy witness. We wound up with the kind of a bill the administration sent down to the Foreign Relations Committee, with practically every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed.

Mr. KEM. I understand he had a good deal to say about agricultural products which he proposed to buy in the United States.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will recall, we used to converse about it. We knew on the floor of the Senate that the influence of the need for purchasing tobacco, canned tomatoes, and other surplus products in this country had a great deal to do with the passage of the ECA bill in the beginning, or Marshall plan in 1948, and again in 1949.

Mr. KEM. For my part, I shall have to disclaim any knowledge of the slightest intimation that the administrator intended to buy $175,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat with ECA money. I was present when Mr. Hoffman testified before the Appropriations Committee. He had a great deal to say about agricultural products which he proposed to buy in this country. But, so far as I remember—and I have refreshed my recollection from an examination of the record—there was not the slightest intimation of any kind that any part of the money would be used to buy Canadian wheat to be shipped to Great Britain.

Mr. MALONE. That is easily accounted for, because without some other knowledge in addition to the testimony of the witnesses from the State Department, certainly we would have practically no information as to what is really the intention of ECA. Certainly I do not believe that in 1948 or in 1949 anyone testified that they intended to set up an office—a cell—within the ECA, financed with several millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money whose function would be to go to Europe to show those nations how to package goods, or to tell them what kind of products they could sell in this country, then help get the tariffs scaled down, and then come into this country to act as salesmen for the goods. I venture to suggest that the distinguished Senator from Missouri did not hear that story either during the first 2 years.

Yesterday the junior Senator from Nevada began to discuss, and had read the amendment proposed by him providing that further assistance to Europe would be conditioned upon free convertibility of the currencies of European nations with each other and with the dollar. The reason for that amendment—and the text of the amendment will be found at page 6060 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—is the very dollar shortage which many people in the administration are saying must be made up.

The dollar shortage simply comes about through the fact that European nations have put a price on their currencies which is higher than anyone will pay. When the pound was worth $4.03 none of my acquaintances who dealt in foreign markets in foreign trade was paying more than $2.60. All anyone had to do was to buy the pounds through Hong Kong or a money center in Europe. In Hong Kong $1 of American money would get $6.10 of Hong Kong money. I was there in the latter part of 1948. With the $6.10, or the $16 of Hong Kong money one could buy British pounds and spend them anywhere in the world. Therefore, a pound would cost $2.60. Who would pay more? The British pound is officially down to $2.80 today, due to the great gesture of devaluing of currency which threw out of gear every trade agreement which had been made with the United States since 1934. Today the pound is worth between $2.25 and $2.40 on the international exchanges. Few pay any more than that amount.

Madam President, I wish now to review the basic analysis of this entire question. First, I ask that my amendment lettered "E," introduced by me on April 26, 1950, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. . Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country (including the zones of occupation of Germany) if such country refuses to join, within 30 days after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, in a concerted effort with the other participating countries (including the zones of occupation of Germany) to form a Federation of a United States of Europe, under a constitution which would vest in the Federation all power relating to (1) tariffs, trade, and currency within and among such countries or states and between such countries or states and countries which are not members of the Federation; and (2) the defense of the Federation."

Mr. MALONE. Madam President, referring further to the free convertibility of currency amendment, let me say that the so-called dollar shortage is the greatest hoax that has ever been perpetrated on a trusting people. It is a matter of overvaluing currencies from 10 percent to 80 and 90 percent of what they are worth on the exchanges of the world. Anyone would just as soon have a British pound in his pocket or a French franc, or a Dutch guilder, as the same amount of money in dollars, that he could get on the exchange for it. No one wants to own a British pound, however, at $2.80, because one cannot get his money from it. It is as if a housewife were to go down to the corner grocery store and ask for sugar. She would say to the grocer, "I want 40 pounds of sugar for a dollar." The grocer would think that she had always been a good customer and a law-abiding citizen, but nevertheless she would soon find herself out in the street without any sugar. Thereupon she would go around the neighborhood shouting about the shortage of sugar. That is exactly the kind of dollar shortage we have. In other words, one can spend a pound in this country, or spend a franc in this country, or spend any of the other currencies in this country if the currency is allowed to reach its real value on the exchanges of the world.

Many think that we are getting fair treatment in the European nations and in South American nations; but I wish to say at this point that the way traders in this country are discriminated against is simply by placing a different value on the exchanges than with traders from other nations. To illustrate, England had at one time—I have not checked it in the last few months—something like 28 or 30 different exchanges for the British pound, depending on which area they were trading in and on the type of trade, and whether they wanted certain imports or exports. To take a specific example, let us consider Colombia. Let us suppose that some people wanted to trade with Colombia. What they had to do was this. The official rate was 1.96 pesos to the dollar. That was the official rate at that moment, which was only about a month and a half or so ago. However, the rate which the people in Colombia have to pay in order to bring goods into Colombia from this Nation was 3.3 pesos to the dollar. In other words, when they had to pay 3.3 pesos to the dollar, even if the official rate is 1.96 pesos to the dollar, there is little export going from this country to Colombia. Exactly the same thing is true with reference to Britain. Britain has a sterling area set up, with about 65 possessions, islands, and countries in it. In several countries sterling is convertible. In others sterling is partially convertible, and for countries outside the area, sterling is nonconvertible. Even Russia is in a convertible area. We are not. We pay the full amount which is listed on the board, $2.80. It is not convertible on the exchanges. In other words, one cannot buy a pound on the exchanges for its real value because their controls are too tight. Even if one got an import license, by this very method of manipulating the exchange values the actual trade can be prevented.

In considering a United States of Europe, we have a terrific problem now with Germany. John J. McCloy, the United States High Commissioner in Germany, a fine citizen and a very capable man, is

doing his best in Germany to pull Germany out of the spiral she is in—largely of our own making and do something about the situation. But it will be remembered that we first adopted what we called the Morgenthau plan, and we are still carrying it out, as a matter of fact, wrecking the industry of Germany, unless it has been stopped very recently. We were going to make Germany an agrarian state. How she was going to buy half of the food her people required, which she had never been able to raise, no one has explained, but Germany was to be an agrarian state, with little industry.

It was found very soon that in order to do that it would cost us about a billion dollars a year, to supervise the German activities, to feed the Germans, and do all the things which were necessary. So we were putting up the billion dollars a year and still carrying out the agrarian plan of Mr. Morgenthau encouraged by England and other European nations.

I do not blame Morgenthau altogether for this, because England and France and other nations are bitterly afraid of Germany in business competition, and are actually physically afraid, and they are the ones, perhaps, who put as much pressure on the United States of America to make an agrarian state out of Germany as any other pressure group.

If we have a United States of Europe, with Germany one of its states, then we might solve the problem. There would be little Switzerland, and Germany, Germany being the most powerful State in Europe, as has been demonstrated many times through two world wars, with Switzerland perhaps the smallest. It is comparable to the State of Nevada, my State, and the State of California. Naturally there is a great difference between those States. If they were allowed to compete with each other, as the states in Europe are, with all the embargoes, quotas, and money manipulations against each other, and our furnishing the money to build barriers higher and higher, Nevada would stand little chance. But in the United States of America, because it is one among 48 States, Nevada has the same chance as California and New York have. That is why the junior Senator from Nevada is suggesting that further aid to Europe shall be contingent on their showing themselves willing to enter a United States of Europe, of which Germany would be one state, and then, with no barriers among themselves, with all the embargoes and the quotas and the money manipulations gone, Europe could reach her peak in economic development and military strength. No one would say that with Germany as one State, and cooperating with the other 15 or 16 or 17 nations of Europe, each as a state, they would not be strong in a military way, because we have had two experiences with Germany, when it took practically the whole world to bring her to terms.

Mr. President [Mr. DARBY in the chair], it is well known that England and some of the other countries are preventing such an arrangement because of this economic fear, because of this military fear. Once Germany were a state along with the 16 or 17 other states, she would take her proper place in the economic firmament, and England could not control the great sterling bloc. So I say that a united states of Europe, including Germany, should be a condition to further aid.

Commissioner McCloy said recently:

> That no permanent solution of German problems seems possible without an effective European union.

With a United States of Europe, Germany would no longer be the problem she now is.

We are now torn between allowing Germany to become strong industrially, with the danger that she may join Russia and through that union seek to dominate the world, or to turn her into a harmless agrarian state, with our endless financial support, and with the always present danger that a frustrated Germany would ultimately join Communist Russia anyway, since Russia is offering her industrial independence.

Russia has just made a trade treaty with Germany to furnish Russia with a large order of manufactured goods to that country, and Russia is holding out the opportunity to Germany of furnishing the necessary manufactured and processed goods to Communist China.

Where we used to have the opportunity to furnish goods to China, her markets are being opened to Germany, through Russia. Russia is controlling a large part of Germany, including Berlin, and is in a fair way of controlling most of Asia. That is the problem of Germany at the moment, a great problem, which presents itself to the United States of America, and would be solved by a United States of Europe.

OTHER CONDITIONS FOR FURTHER AID TO EUROPE

As a condition of further aid to Europe we should also insist upon the integrity of private investments within the 16 ECA nations, free convertibility of the currencies of the European nations, and in terms of the dollar, and then loan such ECA money to private industry within the area through the World Bank on the same terms—no more lenient and no more stringent—as the RFC loans money to private industry and individuals in this country in times of stress.

In other words, as we are proceeding now, to ship a blanket amount of goods and money to the government of one of these little states of Europe to do with as they will. That, Mr. President, was the complaint of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, that we did not know what became of the money and what became of the goods.

I can suggest what might become of the goods and the money. Much of the money is used to keep the current government in power, and through the 95 trade agreements which, it is well known now I hope, the 16 Marshall plan countries have made with Russia and with the iron curtain countries, they send for everything they need to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe or China. We know now where most of the goods, or a good part of them, have gone.

In no case should we lend money or assistance of any kind whatsoever to the 16 European ECA or any other nations which are trading with or assisting Russia or the iron curtain countries to prepare for world war III or to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe or in Communist China.

LITTLE INTEGRITY AMONG NATIONS

There is little governmental integrity outside of the United States of America—especially among the ECA European nations. The proof of this fact is that they persistently repudiate their debts and manipulate their currencies for trade advantage—and generally follow the line of socialization and nationalization of private investments.

It is impossible to make effective trade agreements or agreements making tariffs or import fees with a nation that manipulates its currency for trade advantage, since any such trade agreement can be immediately nullified through a change in the price of their currency—in terms of the dollar, or as the junior Senator from Nevada has already outlined, a different price on the exchanges, that is, favoring one nation over another nation in regard to the amount of money with which to buy the unit of currency of that nation for their imports.

Mr. President, England, one of the 58 or more nations and entities of the sterling bloc area, is notorious for such manipulations, as are France, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Such manipulations are a form of piracy, automatically making all prior agreements ineffective.

Yesterday, Mr. President, on the Senate floor the junior Senator from Nevada quoted a dispatch from the New York Times, reportedly an interview with Dr. Marius W. Holtrop, who said:

> It is difficult to see, the report said, what acute problem can be solved by forming one large European market.
>
> Doubtless by such a large market Europe in the long run would share in the advantages of natural international labor distribution. But one must fear that this would be preceded by a period of great confusion and great investment needs on one side and heavy capital losses on the other.
>
> Moreover, this one great European market would yield no wheat, corn, cotton, oil, and nonferrous metals. What European countries need more than a larger market within themselves is a larger market in the United States.

Mr. President, what does that mean? It means that they do not care to build up a market within themselves. They do not think it is important to build up a market in their own nations. It is much easier for them, Mr. President, to continue the hundred-year-old feuds which have existed among themselves, and then have the United States of America divide its own markets with them, markets we have built up over a hundred years of time. That, Mr. President, would result in destroying the standard of living which it has taken us a century to build. That is what division of the markets of America with the nations of the world will mean.

PRESENT POLICIES AND THE REVOLUTION

The kind of government they are now trying to foist upon us—and I state that the European nations have a considerable amount of influence upon our State Department—in relation to England and other foreign nations, was the basic cause for the Revolutionary War in 1776. When the original colonies rebelled against England, it was a rebellion against the supreme state where the individual had no rights.

During the rebellion, the people of the American colonies said:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

UNALIENABLE RIGHTS

The Old World philosophy was, and generally speaking is to this day, that the individual derives any right he may have from the state—his right to freedom, his right not to be molested, or mutilated—and that he has no such unalienable rights as the American colonies laid down in their declaration in 1776 and for which they fought and won in a bitter struggle for independence—and which, in fact, laid the foundation for this great Nation.

The philosophy of Americans, from the firing of the first gun in the Revolutionary War in 1776, was that the individual had unalienable rights that he did not derive from the state in the first place, and that the state could not interfere with such rights. They believed that such right included the dignity of man—his right of worship—and his liberty.

The three parts of government—the legislative, the judicial and the executive—were set up as checks and balances for each other.

The Republican Party believes in maintaining the three separate independent governmental departments to safeguard the unalienable rights of the individual—as established by the Constitution of the United States—and that any change shall be made by the consent of the States and not by subterfuges.

Any bipartisan foreign policy which includes collusion between the executive and legislative branches of the Government is a direct violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, but is directly in line with the trend of the present administration's program.

"DOLLAR SHORTAGE"—A CATCH PHRASE

"Dollar shortage" is a slogan or catch phrase to sell a bill of goods to the American people that they should buy goods from foreign nations, a program which can only lead to the displacement of the workingmen of this country and the putting of them on relief rolls and unemployment insurance.

That, of course, has been admitted by the Secretary of State and by Mr. Paul Hoffman, the head of the ECA, but they do not consider that to be dangerous to the welfare of the United States of America.

This is part of the three-part free-trade program which has effectively stopped the investment of venture capital, without which private business dries up, causing unemployment and loss of taxable property. This leads inevitably to the Government stepping in and gradually taking over the business life of the Nation. We are following the pattern.

Mr. President, as we divide the markets of the United States with the peoples of the world, thus lowering the standard of living of our own people—and the State Department can lower tariffs 75 percent without consulting anyone, after holding merely perfunctory hearings—we have slowed down and will eventually stop the venture capital that is necessary for the growth of this Nation to keep pace with its population growth. Already we have read in the newspapers that business growth has not kept pace with population growth. Why? Because of much of the legislation we have passed on the Senate floor. That is the reason for it.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

However, we are met with the old slogan which was sold to this country 10 or 12 years ago, and which has been almost continuously kept in front of us, that if private business does not provide full employment, Government must furnish the necessary employment. Government ownership will be the logical conclusion if we ourselves stifle the venture capital—through free trade—necessary to keep business going.

Karl Marx said 102 years ago, that he was for free trade because it would hasten the revolution.

CONGRESS CREATES ITS OWN PROBLEMS

The President has just recommended that the appropriations for relief and unemployment insurance be increased. Congress creates unemployment through appropriations and free-trade policies—and then appropriates more money to cure the problem that it deliberately creates.

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

The next step, if we do not stop this crazy spiral, will be increased governmental propaganda for the passage of the bill calling for the appropriation of $15,000,000,000, in order to permit the President to build industrial plants throughout the United States to relieve unemployment—in other words, the Spence bill—unemployment caused in the first instance by our almost fanatic insistence, through ECA—1934 Trade Agreements Act—and other channels, that we import the products of the foreign countries which have low standards of living, in other words, import the products of slave labor, and let those products displace in our United States markets the goods produced by our own workingmen.

We stop the investment of venture capital through our own actions—they furnish taxpayers' money through appropriations to compete with the same taxpayers.

Mr. President, sometimes I wonder if we read the bills which come to the Senate and the House. Committees make reports on bills, and say that this bill or the other bill is an emergency measure, so Congress passes such measures in a very short time on the Senate floor. We pass bills involved on difficult and important subjects. No Member of Congress could read all of them in the time available. After the bills are passed, then, as the Senator from Nebraska said, we wonder where the money goes—how it was spent. We wonder where authority was granted to Government officials to do the things they do with the money.

If we read some of these bills we pass we may find that at least one, or perhaps a half a dozen paragraphs are devoted to providing that the bureau under which the money appropriated is to be administered may adopt or fix rules and regulations. The bill itself is vague in its provisions, so the bureau takes over.

CATCHWORDS AND PHRASES

Mr. President, the problem of the so-called dollar shortage is the greatest hoax ever sold to a trusting public, and it will soon go down in the limbo of such catch words, slogans, and phrases as the "war to end wars," "save the world for democracy," "the four freedoms," "reciprocal trade," "the forgotten man," "economic royalists," "we owe it to ourselves," "we cannot be prosperous in a starving world," and dozens of other expressions designed to inflame the minds of men in a time of extreme stress and strain.

Mr. President, I have visited most of the nations of the world, and I have observed their governments. They are building up their 100-year-old feuds higher than ever before, and they have continued along the same lines for centuries.

NATIONAL PRIDE—TREATIES WITH RUSSIA

Just a few weeks ago Russia shot down one of our planes, and several years ago there was a similar incident in Yugoslavia. We are getting ready to vote the appropriation of more billions of dollars to the 16 Marshall plan-ECA nations of Europe, which at this very moment have 95 trade treaties with Russia and the iron-curtain countries, trade treaties entered into since the end of World War II. By means of those trade treaties the 16 Marshall-plan countries are sending to Russia and the iron-curtain countries almost every type of material needed for a third world war and to permit Russia to consolidate her gains in eastern Europe and in China.

There is little real respect for the American flag anywhere in the world today. Our planes are shot down. Our people are imprisoned. Instead of taking a firm stand against such treatment we continue to finance the whole business, without providing any safeguards whatever.

Mr. President, the materials being sent to Russia and to the iron-curtain countries and to Communist China through the medium of such trade treaties with the 16 ECA countries include almost every type of material—for instance, ball bearings, tool steel, electrical equipment, heavy farm machinery, heavy road machinery, locomotives, freight cars, airplane parts, all manufactured and processed and ready to be used against us; and all that is done with the money and the aid we have furnished

Europe through UNRRA, through the $3,750,000,000 we gave Britain in 1946, and by means of the $9,000,000,000 we have already furnished the 16 western European nations coming under the ECA plan.

WORLD STANDARDS OF LIVING

Mr. President, many of these world areas have not improved their standards of living preceptively during recorded history, and most of them have had more raw materials available to them throughout that period than the United States has access to at the present time.

That fact alone should be food for thought when we say to the world that we are going to raise their standards of living almost overnight. In other words, we divide our markets in order to make up their trade-balance deficits, meaning that by means of this proposed free trade we shall raise their standards of living up to the level of our standard of living. However, Mr. President, most of us believe that we shall simply bring down our standard of living to the level of theirs, and then have to start over again raising our own standard of living.

FOREIGN POLICY

Let us examine for a moment the foreign policy of the United States as such, the colossal failure, in regard to which the administration is now so anxious to get some Republicans to join with it in sharing the blame.

Mr. President, at the Yalta Conference we gave Manchuria, the bread basket of China, to Russia without China's consent, thus giving Russia a foothold in Asia.

At the same conference, we gave Berlin to the Russians, without any means of ingress and egress, which resulted in hauling coal into the area at a cost of several hundred dollars a ton, with the resulting loss of lives and property, all because our own State Department was asleep at the switch. Ironically, the resulting airlift was built up in this country, through the great propaganda machine, as an heroic accomplishment. It was an heroic accomplishment, Mr. President, on the part of the individuals engaged in it, but there was nothing heroic in making such a thing inescapable by signing an incomplete agreement.

This horrible exhibition resulted from the fact that our diplomats forgot, or did not have the nerve, to place a condition on the Russian occupation that we could use the rights-of-way—the railroads, the highways, and the waterways—to reach our own areas.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who now occupies the chair, was in those areas. I believe he will remember that we stopped our soldiers on the banks of the Elbe and kept them there from 30 to 35 days while Russia was given time to bring material from Russia, and the time to occupy Berlin, while this great agreement was being made between others and our ambassadors and our representatives to that area. It has never been satisfactorily explained why all this was done. Nevertheless, like what was done at Yalta, it was done, and we lost Asia by giving away Manchuria. We may lose Germany by having given away Berlin.

Another illustration of our defunct diplomacy is, that as is well known, we stopped our own armies on the banks of the Elbe River, as I previously stated, while the Russian forces took over Berlin. We even gave them time to bring up reinforcements and material from Russia to do the job.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not dispute what he has said regarding Berlin. But is it not true that Mr. McCloy and the other authorities in Berlin have stated definitely, within the past 10 days, that we shall stay in Berlin at the present time? Is that not true?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should dislike to have to review all the things that have been stated positively by the present administration during the past 18 years. Yes, it is true, and it is very dangerous way of stating it. We have said that we will use guns and bayonets on marching school boys if we have to do so to remain in Berlin. Of course, I think the chief of police of Reno, Nev., would handle the school-boy situation differently. I think he would handle the school boys with a little more judgment.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. President, in January of this year I listed the 95 trade treaties which have been made with Russia and the "iron-curtain" countries by the 16 ECA nations. At that time I introduced a joint resolution providing for ending the assistance by the United States to any nation assisting Russia or the "iron-curtain" countries, including Communist China, or other Communist areas. This joint resolution still remains in a Democratic-controlled committee. The joint resolution parallels an amendment to the ECA Act recently submitted, during the course of the debate on the pending measure, by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I am supporting that amendment.

TRADE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to an article published in the New York Herald Tribune on April 27, 1950:

UN AIDE URGES TRADE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST—MYRDAL SAYS ALL EUROPE WILL SUFFER IF WALLS ARE NOT BROKEN DOWN

PARIS, April 26.—Western Europe will have great trouble in balancing its economy without foreign aid if present stagnation in east-west trade continues, Gunnar Myrdal, executive secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, predicted today.

Eastern European countries also would suffer, Mr. Myrdal said in an interview published in Le Monde, since their industrial development plans would be held up.

Mr. Myrdal, the Swedish head of the only economic organization embracing both western and iron-curtain countries, is here on a trip around Europe with the purpose of breaking down the artificial wall which has very largely blocked the traditional exchange of goods between eastern and western Europe.

He will visit Moscow, where he hopes to get the Soviet reaction to his suggested new approach to the east-west trade problem, involving long-term purchase agreements for eastern cereals, lists of industrial goods the west would be willing to sell to the east, and a more flexible payments scheme to replace the present bilateral arrangements.

A negative response has already come from Poland, possible foreshadowing the Moscow reaction.

A French Foreign Ministry spokesman said today that while an increase in trade with the east is very desirable, it is not the only way of bridging the dollar gap. He mentioned increased productivity, an intensified export effort and lower American tariffs as other ways.

The official said that the low level of France's trade with the east, which is regulated by bilateral agreements, could not be attributed to the eastern countries' inability to buy strategic materials (because of the American-sponsored export-licensing policy). Russia has charged that this discrimination is the main cause of the present low level of east-west trade.

A Czechoslovak trade mission has been in Paris for 3 months, and its negotiations with French officials for a new trade agreement have been deadlocked over the issue of compensation for French concerns nationalized by the Czech Government. Trade talks with Poland have not been resumed since they were broken off.

Mr. President, the article which I have just read into the RECORD states that western Europe should trade with eastern Europe, just as I have stated is being done. However, according to this dispatch, that is not a secret notion, nor is it their idea. It is the idea of the United Nations that the United States of America furnish the money needed for the purchase of materials and the production of the goods Russia needs in preparing for a third world war, and to consolidate Russian gains in Europe and in Communist China, while at the same time telling the American people, "Oh, no, we would not send to Russia anything which Russia could use in a war against the United States."

Mr. President, the materials being sent to Russia are simply building Russia up to a point where, if Russia ever can make trouble for us in a third world war, she certainly would not fail to utilize the opportunity to arm herself. In other words, although we say we are against Russia, although we say we are against the iron-curtain countries, yet our actions belie our words.

At this time England is making with Poland a further trade agreement. This one involves more than $1,000,000,000 worth of manufactured products and materials, much of which will then be shipped to Russia.

EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES FOR WORLD WAR III

Mr. President, we find ourselves in the same relative position that we were in when we were furnishing scrap iron and petroleum to Japan before the second world war. However, at that time the Japanese paid for those raw materials. On the other hand, today we are furnishing raw materials free to the European nations, which then turn the raw materials into processed and manufactured goods and sell them directly to Russia and her satellites. Russia and her Communist allies would not have the

manufacturing capacity to prepare for war without that help from the United States.

The jet planes which Russia is supposed to be turning out by mass-production methods are copies of such planes sold to Russia by England.

We are arming Russia faster than we armed Japan prior to World War II, because through the ECA nations Russia is receiving materials which already are manufactured and processed, whereas before World War II we forced Japan to manufacture in her own plants the raw materials which were shipped to her from the United States.

Mr. President, it will be remembered by the Members of the Senate that the scrap iron and petroleum which went to Japan before World War II went from San Francisco through the Golden Gate over a period of 6 or 7 years. The patriotic organizations of this country continually objected to that procedure, but almost no one else paid any attention to their protests. Those shipments occurred following the recognition of Russia, without the provisions of any safeguards whatever, in 1933 or 1934. After we had shipped the scrap iron and petroleum to Japan, affording plenty of material with which to arm themselves, we then sent American boys in World War II out in the Pacific area to catch that scrap iron in their bare hands, scrap iron which had been turned into bullets for Japanese guns. I was in the Pacific area with them for a while. It was not pretty, and we are heading for the same kind of goal.

ANNUAL EXPENDITURE IN EUROPE

It should be remembered that we are sending more money each year to Europe through the ECA than it took to finance the entire governmental activities just a few years ago.

It is time that we recovered some semblance of common sense and American ways in the executive departments and begin to follow a definite plan of our own, instead of those suggested by the European experts.

TIME TO REVIEW THE WHOLE STUPID PROGRAM

Mr. President, it is time that we got our feet back on the ground. Let us review the whole stupid program. Let the administration quit looking for Republicans to take part of the blame for the colossal failure of both the domestic and foreign policies—and in each case establish the common-sense principle, backed by American principles—and regain the respect for our country and our flag which they deserve.

A COMMON-SENSE PROGRAM

In March of 1948 I suggested on the Senate floor that the President, who is charged by the Constitution of the United States with fixing foreign policy, first determine the areas and nations in Europe, Asia, and Africa whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety, and then:

First. Feed emergency-hungry people within those areas to the extent of our ability without endangering our economic stability. It is no use trying to feed all the people in Asia and Africa, because most of those people have been hungry for 2,000 years, living up to the food supply and dying off to it. But do not ask for the return of the money, when we feed emergency areas.

Second. Loan money within such areas to private industries for rehabilitation of industries—through the World Bank—under the rules and regulations used by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in helping private industry in this country in an emergency.

The third thing is to stop communism. Extend the 125-year-old Monroe Doctrine to include the areas whose integrity is determined to be important to our ultimate safety, the nations to be named by the President of the United States through his authority derived from the Constitution of the United States to fix foreign policy, and simply repeat President Monroe's words, spoken in 1823, omitting the reference to the Western Hemisphere, and say, in the exact words of President Monroe, 125 years ago:

> We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Mr. President, what does that mean? It meant, in the old days, and I hope it means now—though I am beginning to doubt it—that we had integrity, that we meant what we said, and therefore, when any other nation sought to extend its system of government into an area named by President Monroe, it knew exactly what it would meet. So, Mr. President, for many years we maintained the peace through the Monroe Doctrine and prevented any infiltration of the Western Hemisphere by other nations having different forms of government.

Fourth. After that is done, after these areas have been determined by the President of the United States to be areas whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety, after he has named those nations and made that pronouncement, then we should build a national-defense organization, spearheaded by an air corps, that bears silent evidence that we are ready and willing to enforce the pronouncement. It is sometimes necessary to risk a fight to avoid one.

This still can be done. We can stop this senseless pouring of the taxpayers' money into the bottomless maw of Europe, simply giving the money into the hands of governments to enable them to reelect themselves and to perpetuate themselves, and to manufacture industrial goods and war matériel to be sent to Russia and the iron-curtain countries. Let us stop that senseless program; let us make some sense out of it by loaning money to private industry within those areas which are named, as I have said before, on the basis of the same rules and regulations as those used by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in loaning money to private industry in this country.

The claim is made that we are stopping communism, when as a matter of fact we are supporting the Socialist governments of Europe, which are furnishing processed and manufactured products to Communist Russia.

Will they be on our side when the showdown comes?

Furthermore, England has said through its leaders, Mr. Bevin and Mr. Wilson, that they want to be neutral—they want to trade with Russia—they want to be the bridgehead between Communist Russia and capitalist America.

Later Mr. Nehru said that India would remain neutral.

Mr. President, do we not believe what they say to us, what they say for the press, through official pronouncements?

Following soon after those prophetic pronouncements, both England and India and other sterling-bloc countries recognized Communist China—and England has stepped up her trade with Communist China. All this, while we are telling the American people that we will not furnish Russia and the Communist areas material that can be utilized to consolidate their gains, or to fight a war with us.

Who can tell who our allies will be in the next war—when and if it comes—and who will remain neutral? Certainly they are not proving to be our friends in the deadly trade wars which often precede shooting wars.

OBJECTIVES—COMMUNIST AND SOCIALIST GOVERNMENTS SAME

There is no practical difference in the ultimate objective of Socialist and Communist governments. Their common objective is the perfect state, with the individual owning nothing. The difference is that a Communist will shoot you to get into power, and a Socialist will spend you into it. That is what we are doing in Washington, spending the country into socialism. A Communist then is just an impatient Socialist.

In summation, let us inaugurate a new approach to the domestic and foreign problems.

DOMESTIC POLICY

First. Substitute the flexible import fee principle for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended and separate the domestic from the foreign policy.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States, through that method would again assume its constitutional responsibility to regulate the national economy of this country through the regulation of imports. If we could substitute the flexible-import-fee principle for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and establish the principle of promoting foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, that one thing alone would cut the jugular vein of the administration's one economic world. That would be the end of it.

Second. Then, stop the senseless International Trade Organization, by which, instead of taking back the regulation of the national economy to the Congress, where the Constitution placed it in the beginning, we would transfer it, through the International Trade Organization, from the executive department to foreign nations, to the full control of foreign nations, 58 of them, 57 nations and the United States, we having the same vote as Siam, assigning to those

nations the right to fix the quotas of production for this country and to fix the tariffs for its member nations.

Mr. President, with reference to further aid to Europe, there is involved, first, the integrity of private investments. We are not the ones to guarantee the integrity of investments made in London or in Paris, in the Far East on in Africa. That is like going to a bank and saying, "I want to borrow a thousand dollars," and expecting the bank to guarantee the integrity of the investment. Try that out on a banker some time. It is the duty of the foreign countries to create a climate favorable to private investment, and certainly to guarantee the investment against nationalism, socialism, or confiscation. The Senate floor is not the place in which to do it.

Third. A united states of Europe, including Germany, which the junior Senator from Nevada has already described.

Fourth. The free convertibility of the currencies of the nations of Europe within themselves and in terms of the dollar. Such free convertibility would end the so-called dollar shortage.

Fifth. Equal access to the trade of the nations of the world, subject only to the action of the individual nation in each case. This condition would end the colonial slavery system carried on by the empire-minded nations for profit for from 100 to 300 years.

The administration's free-trade policy endangers every workingman's job and every investment in America. It discourages the further investment of venture capital, which has furnished the equipment for increasing employment and taxable property for a century of growth in this country.

The free-trade policy can lead only to Government ownership and further control of the business and the private lives of the people of this Nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 621) for the relief of Horace J. Fenton.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Alcide Raymond.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson; and

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Avner.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2919. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse;

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H. R. 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps;

H. R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations; and

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

RELATIONS BETWEEN STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE PUBLIC PRESS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on April 24 I discussed the situation involving relations between the State Department and the public press. The discussion begins on page 5569 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, running on to page 5574. I made certain specific charges concerning certain activities of the State Department to which I took rather serious exception, and I want at this time to present the State Department's view of the matter for the information of the Senate and of the press and for their judgment as to the correctness of the explanation of the State Department.

The case involves some irritation which had been occasioned through a member of the State Department holding an important position, by publication in Newsweek magazine of certain statements regarding certain activities which that magazine indicated were very improper concerning the leak of some confidential document.

Following that there was a report dealing with recent discussions in the Senate, before the Tydings committee, throughout the country, and in the press as a whole. As reported in Newsweek magazine, it did not meet with the confidence of the State Department, and that Department took occasion to express its feeling in letters to the editor of Newsweek magazine.

Following that, there developed an investigation by the State Department of the previous writings of this individual.

All this added up, as I felt very strongly, to suggestions of improper pressure on the press, showing the power of the Government to intimidate the press, and, as I stated on page 5571 of the RECORD, in characterizing the situation, "What follows is either the most stupid act in history, or one of the boldest attempts to intimidate one of the editors of this country that I have ever known."

Naturally, that is language which invites a response.

Following that, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, indicated on the floor that he would ask the State Department to give an explanation of these curious incidents. Thereafter, he wrote to the State Department asking some very pointed questions regarding the episode. Following that, the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Barrett, and the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. John E. Peurifoy, came to see me regarding the matter. We have discussed the matter in the past week, and I now have the correspondence in the situation which I should like to have included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I make that request in order that the statements by these individuals may be in the RECORD at one place, although I shall read from the correspondence and interpolate my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall now read from the letters which I have received and shall interpolate my comments in order to make a consecutive account of the episode.

The first letter dealing with the matter is from Mr. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State. There is no date on the letter, but I think it followed the publication of my remarks. The letter begins as follows:

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: When friends tried to dissuade me from coming into Government service, they warned that, whatever I did, I would be attacked publicly within 2 months. They were wrong; it took 2 months and 1 week. I was none the less surprised by your remarks about me on the Senate floor on April 24. Since you do not know me personally, I can only conclude that you have been grossly misinformed by someone—

The RECORD will indicate the extent of my misinformation, which I think was rather insignificant—

Confident that you will want to set the record straight, I am setting down the rather undramatic and mundane facts:

1. I have never sought to "intimidate" in any way my old friend, Kenneth Crawford, the capable national-affairs editor of Newsweek. (I suppose I should be flattered, since I couldn't even intimidate him when he worked for me.) I did write him two perfectly proper personal notes indicating that I thought Newsweek, though known for its objectivity, had been unfair to the Department of State in certain articles. I urged him to come to Washington and take a first-hand look at the Department's loyalty-checking machinery, with which I have been greatly impressed during my short term in office. I attach copies of these letters. Mr. Crawford subsequently did come to Washington, took such a look at the machinery, and talked to the key people in charge of that machinery. Since then I have had no occasion to voice even personal criticism of anything in Newsweek on this subject.

That, I may comment, is a very gratifying indication that he had evidently written the statement with considerable persuasiveness.

At this point I want to read the two letters which he enclosed, bearing on the question of whether they were calculated

to have any influence upon the expression of opinion by Newsweek.

The first letter is under date of March 9, 1950, and is addressed to Mr. Kenneth Crawford, Newsweek. It reads:

DEAR KEN: Oh, what fun to write a letter of complaint to a Newsweek editor.

Re attached: Ain't you ashamed?

All goes pretty well—though it's a real workout. All the best to you and your swell Nation team.

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. BARRETT.

(Attachment: Newsweek article titled "McCarthy Bombshell," March 6 issue, National Affairs, with words "Acheson's Defense of Hiss" circled.)

This is underlined in pen, and I assume it was done by Mr. Barrett. I refer to the quotation "with Acheson's Defense of Hiss circled."

I hold in my hand an article from Newsweek which appeared in the issue of March 6, entitled, as he says, "McCarthy Bombshell" under the heading "Communists." The item which was encircled and enclosed to Mr. Crawford, reads:

More than a week after McCARTHY's speech, a reporter quizzed Senate Majority Leader SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, about the McCarthy-Peurifoy exchange. LUCAS, who has been getting a heavy mail denouncing Acheson's defense of Hiss, told the reporter he wouldn't defend Acheson's emotionalism but added that McCARTHY was the greatest headline hunter in the world.

That was the item, covering 2 pages in Newsweek and going somewhat into a routine account of the McCarthy episode to that date, which was encircled and marked for the attention of Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Barrett, as Assistant Secretary of State and formerly a member of the staff of Newsweek—and I believe he still has some connections with Newsweek, either himself or through his family, although concerning that I cannot speak completely or in more detail—writes Mr. Crawford, who was presumably responsible for this account, since it was under "National Affairs," which is in his jurisdiction, and asks him, "Ain't you ashamed?" I presume the "ain't" was a colloquialism used by him in deference to their long association. I gather that it means to Mr. Crawford that he should consider whether he should be more careful in what he prints. I think it should appear also that Newsweek was being subsidized by one of the divisions of our foreign activities, I believe through the ECA, to the tune of $40,000 a year, to assist in their foreign circulation. I think that has a bearing when the one who administers the program writes in to say, in effect, "Are you not ashamed of what you published about the State Department, in view of the fact that we are now assisting you very materially in your circulation?" They did not say that, but I should say that it was perhaps in the minds of all concerned. That was the first letter.

I notified both the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] that I would discuss this matter today. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] formerly occupied the position which is now occupied by Mr. Barrett. I notified the Senator from Connecticut because he had indicated some interest in the subject.

The second letter was written on March 14, 1950, and was written by Mr. Barrett to Mr. Crawford. I may say, Mr. President, that these letters have been furnished to me by Mr. Barrett, as I did not have copies of them. I simply had reports that such letters had been written. Mr. Barrett furnished me with copies of them, with the understanding that they would be inserted in the RECORD. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR KEN: This is strictly a personal note. I feel sure you will appreciate the spirit in which it is written.

I believe I am looking at this just as much from the standpoint of Newsweek as from the standpoint of my present job—since I still feel proud whenever I read something that is well done in Newsweek (like your recent Defense Roundup) and still squirm when I read something that is not too well done.

Without wanting to butt into your field at all, I suspect that if you stand off with the well-known Crawford detachment and look at some of the recent coverage on the McCARTHY subject, you may find it falling a little short of your own standards of objectivity.

More important, from my present standpoint, I think the tone of the Newsweek pieces is really an injustice to the Department.

Remember, Mr. President, that this is from an officer of the State Department who had made arrangements, or at least must have been familiar with the arrangements, by which $40,000 was paid to Newsweek to assist in their foreign circulation. That was done because it was calculated to serve the interests of our country, and it was also a matter absolutely within the discretion and the judgment of the State Department and the ECA authorities, who were supporting the program. I say that when a letter of that character is written to a publisher in a situation of this kind it is very difficult to conceive that it is not calculated to affect his future approach to the subject of the news.

I continue reading from the letter of March 14:

I may be wrong, or I may be naive, but I I would like to make this suggestion: That you personally come down here for a day or two and take a thorough look-see at the Department's loyalty set-up, the procedures followed and the way individual cases are handled. I think it sound and effective. If it isn't, we would like to have someone with your well-grounded skepticism take a look and make suggestions.

I think this is a matter of vital concern to all of us and that it would be worth while for you to do this. The sooner you do it, the better—

Mr. President, that speaks to me a little in terms of insistence: You better do it—

and I will guarantee to have the right people who know all the ins and outs of the security deal to talk to you. What say?

All the best.

Cordially,

EDWARD W. BARRETT.

That is the second of the letters written in connection with this affair which Mr. Barrett in his letter me, which I have read, says he does not conceive that they were anything more than personal letters and that they were not calculated in any way to intimidate or influence the activities of Newsweek.

Mr. Barrett goes on in his letter of March 14:

2. Soon after my last letter, there appeared in Newsweek a brief item about alleged leaks in the State Department. A Department press officer strongly denied the item. Subsequently, Mr. Crawford, and other friends on Newsweek, asked my advice as to what they should do. I said that, as a State Department official, I would not object to their publishing any details they had. But I added that, as an old Newsweek colleague, I doubted that this would do much good, since it developed that the alleged leaks had taken place not recently, but some years ago.

Mr. Crawford and I had two or three friendly talks on the telephone about this subject. I did not go to New York at any time to see Mr. Crawford, though on one occasion when I was in New York he telephoned me and said he had decided not to pursue the matter further. I feel sure that he will confirm that I at no time sought to put pressure on him in any way. In fact, I note that he has issued a statement to the press to this effect.

Now I should like to read the letter from Mr. Crawford about this matter, which I have also asked to have printed in the RECORD. Mr. Crawford, in his letter to me of April 29, writes:

DEAR SENATOR: I am grateful for your interest in my controversy with the State Department and for your invitation to comment on the speech you recently delivered touching upon it.

I may say that before I made this speech I had no communication of any character with the Mr. Crawford.

Your statement of the facts was essentially correct.

I should like to underline that statement, "Your statement of the facts was essentially correct."

After printing the Periscope item you quoted, Newsweek was accused of unfairness to the State Department by a press officer and the investigation of my past writings followed. I assumed, as you did, that the investigation represented an effort, however clumsy, to bring pressure on me to present the news in a light more favorable to the Department.

This is Mr. Crawford's letter to me. So that I think it shows rather conclusively that Mr. Crawford considered at that time that this was an attempt to bring pressure. I continue:

When I protested, I was told that the investigation must have been ordered by an overzealous employee of the Department—that policy-level officials knew nothing about it. Later the explanation was offered that my articles of the past were being reviewed in connection with a study of "press attitudes."

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to that, because I have other statements from the Department which indicate a different explanation. I read this, however:

With one part of your conclusions I must take issue, however. I never regarded the letters I received from Edward Barrett, a friend and former colleague on Newsweek, as anything but friendly and personal. In the

whole affair Mr. Barrett's attitude was helpful and eminently correct.

I am happy to read that, in justice both to Mr. Barrett and to Mr. Crawford. He distinguishes very sharply between what other members of the State Department did and what Mr. Barrett did.

I have read the letters. It is possible for everyone to conclude for himself, and particularly for the press, which is concerned in these matters to conclude, in view of the circumstances of the subsidy to Newsweek from the State Department and of the relations which must necessarily exist between the one who is handling the office of information in the State Department, so far as international affairs are concerned, and the press, whether correspondence of that character, in view of the circumstances, would embarrass anybody concerned. Mr. Crawford states it did not embarrass him and that as far as the correspondence with Barrett is concerned, he did not consider it as anything but friendly and personal, and eminently correct.

He proceeds:

I regret that his role has been misinterpreted, understandable as the misinterpretation is. He recently reentered the public service at considerable personal sacrifice and with extraordinary qualifications for the exacting assignment he received.

I should like to add, in fairness, that Edwin Lennerts, the security officer who called at my home, was most courteous and obviously acting on orders from his superior.

Yours truly,

KENNETH G. CRAWFORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand correctly from the letter written by Mr. Crawford to the Senator from Maine that Mr. Crawford is not angry at anyone in the State Department as a result of what Mr. Barrett did or what some subordinate did?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator is proceeding a little hastily, as Mr. Crawford is very careful to exculpate Mr. Barrett, the Assistant Secretary of State, from any improper pressure or undue activity.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the other part of the letter dealt with some subordinate.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was Mr. Lennerts, who was the investigating officer who called on Mr. Crawford. The other party in this proceeding is the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. Peurifoy, from whom I also have a letter. He is the one to whom Mr. Crawford does not refer.

Mr. LUCAS. Does Mr. Crawford in the letter complain in any way about Mr. Peurifoy?

Mr. BREWSTER. No, nor does he exculpate him. He apparently leaves it open.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe that, as a result of this correspondence, the Senator from Maine went just a little too far the other day in condemning Mr. Barrett of the State Department?

Mr. BREWSTER. I would say that the conclusions which the Senator from Maine drew were entirely warranted by the facts. The responsibility as between Mr. Barrett and Mr. Peurifoy was a matter of which I had no knowledge. The only charge I made was that the Lennerts call, which resulted from Mr. Peurifoy's direction of investigation, was either a very stupid act or was a deliberate attempt to bring pressure. But when I read Mr. Peurifoy's letter, the Senator will find that he agrees with my conclusion.

Mr. LUCAS. I may be mistaken, and I am speaking only from memory of what I read in the press, but I was under the impression that the Senator from Maine castigated the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Barrett, in rather unusual terms because he had attempted to put pressure upon Mr. Crawford. I may be wrong about it, but that was the impression I gained. As I understand now, Mr. Crawford has not resented anything Mr. Barrett did, or anything even one of his subordinates did.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Crawford in his letter entirely acquits Mr. Barrett of any impropriety or undue pressure upon him, which makes the matter very clear. In my discussion, which the Senator will find in the RECORD of April 24, at pages 5569 and 5571, if he is interested in the details, he will find it was not possible for me to define where the responsibility lay. I knew simply what had transpired, and I thought it was most extraordinary and unwarranted, and I think that when I conclude, the Senator from Illinois may share with Mr. Barrett the conclusion that it was utterly inept.

Mr. President, I go on to the next item in this episode, paragraph 3:

A few days later, Mr. Crawford telephoned me and said he was being "investigated by the State Department." I did not feign disbelief. I expressed genuine disbelief and said I would look into the matter. I understand another letter is going to you to clarify this matter.

That is the letter to which I have referred, the letter from Mr. John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State. This is the letter which I have from Mr. Peurifoy under date of May 1, 1950. This deals with the curious succession of coincidences by which Mr. Crawford, who had made reports which were displeasing to Mr. Peurifoy, and were considered unfair by Mr. Barrett, became the subject of an investigation. These are the circumstances under which that investigation developed. I now read from Mr. Peurifoy's letter:

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: On April 24, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, the question was raised as to why Mr. Edwin D. Lennerts was investigating Mr. Kenneth Crawford of Newsweek magazine.

I am pleased to give you the following facts pertaining to that incident. I requested an officer of the Department to obtain for me a copy of an article which was supposed to have been written by Mr. Kenneth Crawford and to have appeared in PM several years ago. I naturally expected that a copy of this article could be picked up in the Library of Congress.

There has never yet been any suggestion that that would not have been possible.

However, the request was referred to New York where presumably the old files of PM were still in existence. After careful review of all files Mr. Lennerts was not able to locate the article. He then went openly to see Mr. Crawford at his home, since he knew Mr. Crawford formerly worked on PM, and inquired whether he had a copy of this article entitled "Let's Abolish Congress."

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Lennerts went to Mr. Crawford's home.

I do not know what the experience of the other Members of the Senate is, but in my own long experience in public life I have not taken into my home, to my family, to my wife, all the matters with which we are concerned. If a secret service agent making an investigation came into my home and asked my wife, as happened in this case, whether I had files of an article I had written 7 years ago dealing with Congress, at a time when highly controversial subjects were in process, I do not think she would be other than rather seriously disturbed. I am still at a loss to understand why Mr. Lennerts, who was directed to get this article, and why the officials in the Department who were directed to get it, did not go to the Library of Congress, which certainly possesses everything that was sought, or why they did not go to the New York Public Library, and failing both of those, why they did not call Mr. Crawford on the telephone at his home or in his place of business. The fact that Mr. Lennerts went to Mr. Crawford's home on the assumption that Mr. Crawford would keep files of PM in his home—I presume that was his New York apartment—7 years after the event, I think is sufficient to excite concern as to his stupidity, or some more sinister construction. That was the conclusion which I drew, and I said it was one thing or the other.

Let us now see what happened. Mr. Peurifoy wrote:

Upon being informed that he did not have a copy, Mr. Lennerts reported back to Washington. The matter was closed.

This is Mr. Peurifoy's story.

Mr. Lennerts' inquiry was conducted only for the purpose of locating the article and not for the purpose of investigating Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Peurifoy in his letter continues—and I hope the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] when he returns to the floor will read this passage from Mr. Peurifoy's letter, in view of his comments, because I think it does credit to Mr. Peurifoy's frankness:

I must in all frankness state that I think this was handled in a very inept fashion and that I can assure you, as a personal friend, I would not countenance for one moment the investigation by any agent of this Department of a private citizen unless, of course, he were applying for a job or for some other official reason, such as a passport or visa investigation.

I trust that this will answer satisfactorily your inquiry, and that we can consider this incident closed.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY.

So much for Mr. Peurifoy's report on the episode. Mr. Peurifoy rightly concludes that the matter was handled in a very inept fashion, and I think that is a very mild and masterly understatement, when we think that the investigating procedures of the State Department were loosed upon Mr. Crawford to secure an article which he had written 7 years before.

What this had to do with the question of whether or not Mr. Crawford had correctly reported a story regarding a leak in the State Department is beyond my comprehension and understanding. If that procedure were to be followed, there is not a Senator on this floor, there is not a Member of the other House, there is not a private citizen of this country upon whom, if he were to say something unkind or unpleasant about the State Department or any other governmental agency, the full force of the Government investigative agencies might not be loosed to find out whether there was some skeleton in the closet that might be shaken in order to embarrass and close up the mouth of that man.

That is to me the inevitable conclusion, and I am very happy that Mr. Peurifoy states that he recognizes the utter impropriety of investigating private citizens unless it in in connection with their application for official positions, or for official action of some character. In other words, Mr. Peurifoy recognizes in that statement that the idea of loosing investigative agencies upon persons connected with the press, or persons in private life, or persons in public life, is utterly outside the proper scope of their activity.

Mr. President, I see the senior Senator from Illinois now on the floor. I shall venture to read to him the closing paragraph of Mr. Peurifoy's statement, since he had inquired about it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret to say that my absence during the time the Senator read from Mr. Peurifoy's letter, was due to the fact that I was called out of the Chamber to answer a telephone call.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Peurifoy explained the episode by which Mr. Lennerts made his call, and said he very much regretted it. In his final paragraph Mr. Peurifoy says:

I must in all frankness state that I think this was handled in a very inept fashion.

In that connection I call attention to what I said in the Senate, as appears on page 5571, first column.

What follows is either the most stupid act in history or one of the boldest attempts to intimidate one of the editors of this country that I have ever known.

I characterized it either as stupid or malicious. Mr. Peurifoy said "This was handled in a very inept fashion." I think that is at least a proper characterization, and I am grateful to Mr. Peurifoy for recognizing it. Mr. Peurifoy continues:

I can assure you, as a personal friend, I would not countenance for one moment the investigation by any agent of this Department of a private citizen unless, of course, he were applying for a job or for some other official reason, such as a passport or visa investigation.

I feel that is very important, particularly in this period when so many things are going on, that it be clearly determined that Government investigative agencies shall not take on the aspect of a gestapo. I thought it was most unfortunate when, under the authority of the Senate, some of the investigators went to West Virginia to find out what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] had said. There may have been warrant for that, but it was a little remote, it seemed to me. I think that the less suggestion there is of that character in the conduct of our investigative agencies, the more readily they will command the confidence of the Congress and of the country.

When the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] was called out of the Chamber I was commenting on the facts of the call at Mr. Crawford's home, and I expressed the idea of how much simpler it would have been if Mr. Lennerts had simply taken the telephone and called Mr. Crawford at his office and asked him if he had a copy of PM. That would have settled the whole matter. The call at his home was a rather curious and unfortunate aspect of the matter, in my judgment.

The remainder of Mr. Barrett's letter does not bear directly upon this matter.

4. As for my politics and origins—

That does not enter into the matter—

I came from Alabama originally, spent many summers in your own State of Maine—

Showing his good judgment—

and most recently have had my home in Connecticut. I am proud of all three States. Politically, I have always considered myself an independent, for the simple reason that my profession is that of news editing. I feel deeply that a news editor should not be either technically or morally tied up with any partisan group.

5. I was in charge of the Overseas Branch of OWI during the last part of the war, and I am proud of what I did toward helping to make that agency an effective psychological warfare arm of the Government. Owen Lattimore worked under me for a brief time during the war, but he left OWI a few weeks after I became his superior. I have not seen him since. In fairness I should add that, in the period I knew him, I had no reason to doubt his loyalty to this country.

6. I have not organized any campaign or brought any pressure on anyone. I have been convinced, in my two short months in the State Department, that it is staffed by intelligent, capable, and loyal people. I am also satisfied that every responsible and practicable step has been taken and is being taken to make sure that the Department is staffed only by loyal individuals. I have said this publicly and privately, and I will say it at every opportunity.

7. If you have any doubts about my deep devotion to the principles of a completely free press and of objective reporting, I suggest that you check with my former employers and associates at Newsweek.

Feeling sure that you believe in the spirit of fair play, I want to make these facts available to you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

P. S.—The two letters to Mr. Crawford are attached.

That I think sufficiently covers the situation. I simply make this statement in conclusion:

The fact that a news medium was printing material which a Government department did not like is a tribute to the American press, especially when the publication was being paid $40,000 by the same Government to assist its circulation abroad.

Whether or not under those circumstances the letters of the Assistant Secretary of State to Mr. Crawford were likely to influence his journalistic judgment I shall be quite willing to leave to the Press Gallery to determine.

The coincidence of the call of the investigator at the home of Mr. Crawford, instead of his office is similarly unfortunate and well justifies its characterization by Mr. Peurifoy as "inept."

I am sure everyone will heartily applaud Mr. Peurifoy's declaration that he "would not countenance for one moment the investigation by any agent of the Department of a private citizen unless, of course, he were applying for a job or for some other official reason, such as a passport or visa investigation."

I trust that this episode will serve as a salutary warning to all Government departments as to the care with which their very considerable power should be exercised, particularly in their dealings with the press. I believe it is most fortunate that the circumstances surrounding this matter have been brought out in this open and complete way, in order that it may serve as a warning to all who are connected with the Government and who realize the enormous powers the Government departments and agencies now exercise to prevent such incidents as this which, as Mr. Peurifoy explains, simply because of his action in calling for this article, unleashed their whole resources of investigation, resulting in this call at Mr. Crawford's home, when, as the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, the resources of the State Department and of all other Government departments are very seriously strained at the present time to take care of very much more important matters than the question of whether Mr. Crawford 7 years ago wrote an article about Congress.

I am sure that the use of the Government time which was involved to hunt up this article by Mr. Crawford in the fashion in which it was pursued is a glorious example not only of ineptness but of inefficiency, inasmuch as the Library of Congress could have been called at any time and could have provided the article, without more ado, for in my opinion any capable secretary could have obtained the article from the Library of Congress, in view of the very complete documentation which such articles receive in the Library. However, if that effort had failed, one need only have picked up the telephone and called Mr. Crawford in order to have obtained it. Either course would have resulted in solving the problem.

Mr. President, if that is an example of the way the Government investigative agencies are being used, I think the Appropriations Committee may well consider whether or not some economies may well be effected.

EXHIBIT 1

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

The Honorable OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: When friends tried to dissuade me from coming into Government service, they warned that, whatever I did, I would be attacked publicly within 2 months. They were wrong; it took 2 months and 1 week. I was nonetheless surprised by your remarks about me on the Senate floor on April 24. Since you do not know me personally, I can only conclude that you have been grossly misinformed by someone.

Confident that you will want to set the record straight, I am setting down the rather undramatic and mundane facts:

1. I have never sought to intimidate in any way my old friend, Kenneth Crawford, the capable national affairs editor of Newsweek. (I suppose I should be flattered, since I couldn't even intimidate him when he worked for me.) I did write him two perfectly proper personal notes indicating that I thought Newsweek, though known for its objectivity, had been unfair to the Department of State in certain articles. I urged him to come to Washington and take a first-hand look at the Department's loyalty-checking machinery, with which I have been greatly impressed during my short term in office. I attach copies of these letters. Mr. Crawford subsequently did come to Washington, took such a look at the machinery, and talked to the key people in charge of that machinery. Since then I have had no occasion to voice even personal criticism of anything in Newsweek on this subject.

2. Soon after my last letter, there appeared in Newsweek a brief item about alleged leaks in the State Department. A Department press officer strongly denied the item. Subsequently, Mr. Crawford and other old friends on Newsweek asked my advice as to what they should do. I said that, as a State Department official, I would not object to their publishing any details they had. But I added that, as an old Newsweek colleague, I doubted that this would do much good, since it developed that the alleged leaks had taken place not recently but some years ago. Mr. Crawford and I had two or three friendly talks on the telephone about this subject. I did not go to New York at any time to see Mr. Crawford, though on one occasion when I was in New York he telephoned me and said he had decided not to pursue the matter further. I feel sure that he will confirm that I at no time sought to put pressure on him in any way. In fact, I note that he has issued a statement to the press to this effect.

3. A few days later, Mr. Crawford telephoned me and said he was being "investigated by the State Department." I did not "feign disbelief." I expressed genuine disbelief and said I would look into the matter. I understand another letter is going to you clarifying this matter.

4. As for my politics and origins: I came from Alabama originally, spent many summers in your own State of Maine, and most recently have had my home in Connecticut. I am proud of all three States. Politically, I have always considered myself an independent, for the simple reason that my profession is that of news editing. I feel deeply that a news editor should not be either technically or morally tied up with any partisan group.

5. I was in charge of the Overseas Branch of OWI during the last part of the war, and I am proud of what I did toward helping to make that agency an effective psychological warfare arm of the Government. Owen Lattimore worked under me for a brief time during the war, but he left OWI a few weeks after I became his superior. I have not seen him since. In fairness I should add that, in the period I knew him, I had no reason to doubt his loyalty to this country.

6. I have not organized any campaign or brought any pressure on anyone. I have been convinced, in my two short months in the State Department, that it is staffed by intelligent, capable, and loyal people. I am also satisfied that every responsible and practicable step has been taken and is being taken to make sure that the Department is staffed only by loyal individuals. I have said this publicly and privately, and I will say it at every opportunity.

7. If you have any doubts about my deep devotion to the principles of a completely free press and of objective reporting, I suggest that you check with my former employers and associates at Newsweek.

Feeling sure that you believe in the spirit of fair play, I want to make these facts available to you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

P. S.—The two letters to Mr. Crawford are attached.

MARCH 9, 1950.

Mr. KENNETH CRAWFORD,
Newsweek, New York, N. Y.

DEAR KEN: Oh, what fun to write a letter of complaint to a Newsweek editor.

Re attached: Ain't you ashamed?

All goes pretty well, though it's a real workout.

All the best to you and your swell Nation team.

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. BARRETT.

(Attachment: Newsweek article titled "McCarthy Bombshell," March 6 issue, National Affairs, with words "Acheson's defense of Hiss" circled.)

MARCH 14, 1950.

Mr. KENNETH CRAWFORD,
Newsweek, New York, N. Y.

DEAR KEN: This is strictly a personal note. I feel sure you will appreciate the spirit in which it is written.

I believe I am looking at this just as much from the standpoint of Newsweek as from the standpoint of my present job, since I still feel proud whenever I read something that is well done in Newsweek (like your recent defense round-up) and still squirm when I read something that is not too well done.

Without wanting to butt into your field at all, I suspect that if you stand off with the well-known Crawford detachment and look at some of the recent coverage on the McCarthy subject, you may find it falling a little short of your own standards of objectivity.

More important, from my present standpoint, I think the tone of the Newsweek pieces is really an injustice to the Department.

I may be wrong, or I may be naive, but I would like to make this suggestion: That you personally come down here for a day or two and take a thorough look-see at the Department's loyalty set-up, the procedures followed, and the way individual cases are handled. I think it is sound and effective. If it isn't, we would like to have someone with your well-grounded skepticism take a look and make suggestions.

I think this is a matter of vital concern to all of us and that it would be worthwhile for you to do this. The sooner you can do it, the better, and I'll guarantee to have the right people who know all the ins and outs of the security deal to talk to you. What say?

All the best.

Cordially,

EDWARD W. BARRETT.

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 1, 1950.

The Honorable OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: On April 24, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, the question was raised as to why Mr. Edwin D. Lennerts was investigating Mr. Kenneth Crawford of Newsweek magazine.

I am pleased to give you the following facts pertaining to that incident. I requested an officer of the Department to obtain for me a copy of an article which was supposed to have been written by Mr. Kenneth Crawford and to have appeared in PM several years ago. I naturally expected that a copy of this article could be picked up in the Library of Congress. However, the request was referred to New York where presumably the old files of PM were still in existence. After careful review of all files Mr. Lennerts was not able to locate the article. He then went openly to see Mr. Crawford at his home, since he knew Mr. Crawford formerly worked on PM, and inquired whether he had a copy of this article entitled, "Let's Abolish Congress." Upon being informed that he did not have a copy, Mr. Lennerts reported back to Washington. The matter was closed. Mr. Lennerts' inquiry was conducted only for the purpose of locating the article and not for the purpose of investigating Mr. Crawford.

I must in all frankness state that I think this was handled in a very inept fashion and that I can assure you, as a personal friend, I would not countenance for one moment the investigation by any agent of this Department of a private citizen unless, of course, he were applying for a job or for some other official reason, such as a passport or visa investigation.

I trust that this will answer satisfactorily your inquiry and that we can consider this incident closed.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY.

(On request of Mr. BREWSTER, and by unanimous consent, the following was ordered transposed from the daily RECORD of May 5 to this point in the permanent RECORD.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State, dealing with the State Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 4, 1950.

The Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: I want to thank you for putting my statement and the attached documents in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, even though I disagree with some of your interpretations. I do not think there is any need for prolonging the discussion but, for your information, I should like to clear up the following points:

I am not now connected with Newsweek in any way, and my family has never had any connection with it. I resigned from my post as editorial director when I became Assistant Secretary of State.

To date I have had no connection whatever with the ECA expenditures to further the circulation abroad of representative American magazines, including Newsweek. No doubt I shall be called upon for advice on this matter. I can only say that I shall take the position at that time that all publications in the category of Newsweek should be treated alike, without any favoritism one way or the other.

Regarding the last few paragraphs of my previous letter, I note that you said that these "do not enter into the matter." I am sure you realize that I included these only because of the remarks you had made regarding my origins, politics and reputed connections with Mr. Owen Lattimore.

I trust everything is now cleared up, and I thank you again for putting my statement in the RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

TERMINATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a man whom many of us enjoy counting as being among our warmest and most delightful friends is troubled in mind at the moment; and the junior Senator from Washington wishes to lessen the suffering from which that noted wit, raconteur, and pundit, George Dixon, presently suffers.

In his syndicated column of April 25, George Dixon worries over what will happen to six Members of the United States Senate and to others whom he refers to as being big-shot occupants if the Westchester becomes a cooperative. I mention that Mr. Dixon's column is syndicated because I know that his observations are read with great and deserving relish throughout the land. George Dixon has a large following in my State of Washington, and I personally never overlook an opportunity to draw Mr. Dixon's virtues to the attention of the uninitiated. George Dixon has the unusual faculty for being able to make his readers laugh or cry, and sometimes to do both simultaneously. I do not mind their tears, but I do not wish them to weep too much over what may happen to the tenants of the Westchester, in our Nation's Capital. I want to encourage those tenants to be of good cheer, for the future ought to be fairly rosy, so far as they are concerned.

Perhaps some Senators did not see the Dixon column in which our friend bled so profusely for his fellow men. I chortled with glee when George Dixon's sympathy for those who do not need sympathy came to my attention. The men and women who live in the Westchester ought to be grateful to a good fellow for recognizing a possible plight which might cause them some inconvenience and anoyance, but no injury in the future. Because it will take but a minute or two, I want to read the Dixon gem for the benefit of those who read the RECORD.

CO-OP DEAL PERILS SIX SENATORS' HOMES

(By George Dixon)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—Our biggest and most elegant apartment house, the Westchester, known to the irreverent as Queen Wilhelmina's old Dutch retreat, is seething with apprehensive big brass.

The inhabitants, including six Senators, two Cabinet members, five generals, three admirals, six judges, and the country's top housing official, Housing Administrator Raymond M. Foley, himself, are afraid they're going to be tossed out, with no place to lay their heads.

The present owners, a New York syndicate, which bought the 553-unit colossus from Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, are talking about turning the place into a cooperative.

The majority of the big shot occupants crave to buy an apartment about as eagerly as they crave to purchase an embalmed whale. They never know how long they will be in Washington.

But they are afraid that if they don't buy, their apartments will be sold from under them and they'll be given 30 days' notice to pack up their certificates of high office and get out.

The senatorial tenants—all Republicans, oddly—are HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan; HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana; IRVING IVES, of New York; WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin; and HARRY CAIN, of Washington.

The cabineteers are Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman and Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan. Also dwelling there in splendor are former Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard, now head of the Rural Electrification Administration, and Secretary of the Senate, Leslie Biffle.

The whole deal of turning the place into a co-op depends, however, on whether the present District of Columbia Rent Control Act is permitted to lapse when it expires June 30.

Under rent control an apartment house cannot be turned into a cooperative unless 65 percent of the tenants agree to it.

IN TIGHT SPOT

But if the law is not extended or reenacted, the owners can do just about what they wish. And the Westchester owners have made it pretty clear that what they wish is to unload.

I may say I am looking forward with considerable interest to see how the six Senators vote on rent control; particularly Senator CAIN, who has been widely accused of favoring the real-estate lobby.

Maybe they will rise above personal consideration and vote themselves out of hearth and home—maybe.

That is the end of Mr. Dixon's very charming and illuminating column.

Mr. President, as George Dixon has pointed out the Westchester is quite a place, and among its tenants are found many leading citizens of Washington, D. C., and of the Nation. All of its tenants, in fact—at least, to my mind—are very fine people. I have lived in the Westchester for about 3 years with considerable satisfaction. The Westchester has adequate play areas for children and provides all of the many services which help to make life pleasant and comfortable. The Westchester has everything but a city council, for it is a small city in itself. There are, as Mr. Dixon has related, some 553 units; and if we estimate that on the average there are four persons in each unit, we find that approximately several thousand Americans, and also some foreigners, are living there. Those who live within its confines consider themselves to be most fortunate. As one of those tenants I think they are, for certainly I and my family have been.

About a month ago, Mr. President, I attended a reception for somebody's guest in the Westchester Apartments, and everybody there was talking about a prevailing rumor that the management of the Westchester was taking steps to sell the establishment to its occupants. A suggestion was made that a committee of tenants be organized to visit with the management and protest vehemently any such intended move. I was encouraged to become a member of this intended committee, but I declined with alacrity. I had no desire to recognize the rumor until it became a fact, and I went further to suggest that it was none of my business what the management did with its property—property which that management owned, and property in which I had no interest, other than that of being a very happy tenant.

After reading George Dixon's column my curiosity overcame me. I inquired of the City Investing Co., a New York corporation which is headed by Mr. Robert W. Dowling and a very fine gentleman he is, to my mind—what their intentions were. The story I got from them differs completely from the story which has been running promiscuously around Washington for some weeks past. The management told me that a number of responsible tenants in the Westchester—I was not told how many, for in fact the management did not know—had approached them through an agent to determine whether the management would consider permitting tenants to buy the apartment units in which they now live. The management suggested that if the agent represented 25 percent of the tenants, the management would seriously consider the definite proposals which might be offered. It is my understanding that the agent did not represent 25 percent of the tenants, but that he is presently endeavoring to get the required percentage to give him the green light to go ahead.

This story makes sense to me, because I should not think that the management of the Westchester would endeavor to convert their facility into a cooperative until the management ascertains the action to be taken by the Congress with reference to the proposed extension of the District of Columbia rent law from July of this year through June of 1951. There would be no point in the Westchester management going about trying to solve the cooperative problem in the hard way. Why should they ask for trouble when there would be no trouble if the present rent law is not continued? As all Senators know, the present law provides that the units within an apartment house can be sold to the tenants if 65 percent of the tenants agree to purchase their units. If the present law is not continued, there would be no such restriction on any management, and it could sell or rent apartment units as it saw fit.

I think this story as related to me by the City Investment Co., or the City Investing Co., will promptly create a furor of considerable dimensions within the Westchester Apartment House in the city of Washington, D. C. The tenants who do not view the prospect of a cooperative with any favor will try to search out the tenants who presumably approached the management with such a hope in view. The truth, however, never hurts anybody, and I have just given the Westchester tenants a lead which they can follow to its source where the facts in the case, whatever they actually may be, will be uncovered.

My chief wish at this moment, Mr. President, is to satisfy George Dixon's curiosity. He wants to know how each

of the six Senators who presently live in the Westchester are going to vote on the question of continuing rent control for another year in the District of Columbia. He would not expect me, a friend of his, by the way, to answer for any other Senator, but I can let him know where I stand. Regardless of what happens in the Westchester, I shall vote at the first opportunity against extending rent controls for a longer period in Washington, D. C. I really mean that. As one who believes in a competitive society and as one who seriously believes that a decontrol of rents will be of substantial benefit to an overwhelming majority of the fine citizens who live in our Nation's Capital, I must vote "no" to any further extension of rent control. I am no more inclined to tell the owner of real property how he must use it and what he can get for it than I am inclined to tell any citizen how he can dispose of and use what properly belongs to him. If I thought, though I think otherwise, that rent decontrol would result in my being requested to pay more than I thought I could afford to live in the Westchester, I would promptly move out. Under these unlikely circumstances, no one ought to ask me where I would move to, because that would be my problem, and I would today, in Washington, D. C., have no trouble in solving it. I might not immediately get what I most wanted at a price I was able to afford, but it would be silly for anyone to maintain that I could not secure adequate accommodations for myself and my family. I expect to vote "no" to any proposal to extend rent controls any longer in the District of Columbia, and the foundation for my vote will continue to be a firm belief and faith in the elasticity and the workability of competition.

From this foundation I shall offer a good many obvious and economic reasons why the citizens in our Nation's Capital will be better off in the future without rent control. I shall attempt to prove, and think I can, that there is a very great difference between a strong demand for rental housing, which obviously prevails now in Washington, D. C., and a housing shortage, which, to my mind, no longer prevails in this city in which so many of us live so very happily. If my basic premise can be established, it is likely that many will agree with me that the decontrol of rents will solve the existing strong demand for housing, while the continuance of rent controls will lead inevitably to a housing shortage.

Now that George Dixon no longer needs to worry himself or his readers about where the junior Senator from Washington stands on this interesting and important public question of the control of private property by governmental regulation and edict, I want only to read the lead editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of last Saturday. It bears the title "Kill It."

I shall read this editorial because I believe it deserves to be brought to the attention of my colleagues and because it offers strong evidence that those of us who seek only to protect the rights which belong to citizens shall not be required to fight alone. If those who wrote the editorial mean what they say—and I take for granted that they do—it stands to reason that the columns of the Times-Herald will permit those of us who expect to resist any effort to continue rent controls in the District of Columbia to be fully and objectively and accurately heard. We could ask for nothing more. We desire only to provide the citizens of the Nation's Capital with the truth as we see it and as we believe it to be.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I shall read to the Senate the editorial to which I have referred for whatever worth other Members of the Senate may think it possesses:

KILL IT

Here's a classic example of how Government agencies try to keep going long after the cause for their existence has disappeared. Congress has just received another request, the sixth, to continue rent control in Washington for one more year.

The District rent-control law was enacted December 1, 1941. It was a temporary wartime measure. It was specifically provided that it should end in 1945.

In 1942 it was discovered the law didn't exactly suit and it was amended. Then before it expired in 1945 it was extended for another year. In 1946 it was extended until 1947. In 1947 another year of life was added. In 1948 it was revived twice, once for 30 days and again until 1949. Last year Congress reluctantly continued it until June 30 of this year.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, it should be stated, because every Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives will remember the very deep and sincere reluctance with which Congress agreed to an extension of the Federal rent-control law and to a continuation of the District rent-control law, that the gentlemen and ladies of the Congress thought they meant what they said a year ago, that that was the last time Congress expected to renew either of the two rent-control laws, one for the Nation, the other for the city of Washington, which became a part of our living in this country because of the war, but which, as temporary wartime measures, should be done away with as soon as possible after the war had been concluded.

The war finished its fighting phases in Europe in the early part of May 1945, and several months later than that, in Japan. The day on which I speak is May 2, 1950. I resume reading from the editorial:

COGSWELL WANTS IN

Now the District Commissioners have recommended that the law be extended again for another 12-month period. Their recommendation is based upon a request from—guess who?—Rent Control Administrator Robert F. Cogswell.

Of course Cogswell doesn't say that working for the Government has gotten to be such a habit that he hates to tear himself away. He says housing accommodations are still scarce and:

"If, therefore, control is lifted from all housing accommodations in the District of Columbia prior to June 30, 1951, it is a foregone conclusion that present controlled rental ceilings will be advanced to a point where most wage earners will find it impossible to pay the rent demanded."

Washington is in the midst of the biggest building boom in its history. It's so big it has run far past the most optimistic forecast.

From 1941 until the first of this year approximately 135,000 housing units were built. And more are going up.

Rent control already has been taken off the new buildings. Congress should relieve Washington of the burden on the rest of the city as promised. Rent control is not needed. The emergency is over. Kill it.

INVESTIGATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the hour is still comparatively early. In conversation earlier this afternoon with the majority leader, he indicated that if the Senate ran out of speakers on the ECA bill, it might be possible this afternoon to bring up for consideration Senate Resolution 202, to investigate gambling and racketeering activities, which I have been anxious to have considered. I hesitate to ask unanimous consent, in the absence of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the minority leader, and the majority leader, but it seems to me that if no other Senators wish to speak this afternoon on the ECA bill, we might finish the consideration to Senate Resolution 202 if it can be brought up at this time.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the minority leader has authorized me to say that there is no objection on this side of the aisle to bringing up the resolution to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred, but the minority leader has suggested that because of a positive interest in the resolution by several Members on this side of the aisle, he would wish only that they be notified—certainly I would take care of that responsibility—and that the Senator from Tennessee would agree to the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are operating, no other business can be transacted. The unfinished business cannot be laid aside for any other business except privileged matters. Therefore it would require unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and to take up Senate Resolution 202 or any other resolution unless it be privileged.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the majority leader said to the acting majority leader a few moments ago that he would have no objection to the Senator from Tennessee asking unanimous consent to bring up the measure to which he has referred. He requested me, in the event such a request was made, to be sure to suggest the absence of a quorum. He also stated that the Senator had agreed personally to give notice to two or three Senators who are particularly interested in this subject.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Darby
Anderson	Cain	Donnell
Benton	Chapman	Douglas
Brewster	Chavez	Eastland
Bricker	Connally	Ecton
Bridges	Gordon	Ellender

Ferguson	Kerr	O'Conor
Flanders	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Frear	Knowland	Robertson
Fulbright	Leahy	Russell
George	Lehman	Saltonstall
Graham	Lodge	Schoeppel
Green	Lucas	Smith, Maine
Gurney	McCarthy	Stennis
Hayden	McClellan	Taft
Hendrickson	McFarland	Taylor
Hickenlooper	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Holland	Magnuson	Thye
Humphrey	Malone	Tobey
Hunt	Martin	Tydings
Ives	Maybank	Wherry
Jenner	Millikin	Wiley
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Williams
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Young
Kefauver	Myers	
Kem	Neely	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 202.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, there is nothing in the Senator's request which would permit the Senate to continue consideration of the Senate resolution for any extended period of time. He simply requests that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside so Senate Resolution 202 may be temporarily considered. Is that the request?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if I may make a parliamentary inquiry, I should like to make the request that the resolution be considered until action on it is concluded. I do not know, however, how that might fit in with the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into for a vote on Friday on the ECA legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because I favor the resolution, and would like to see it adopted, at the same time I feel that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] should be consulted as to the exact provisions of the unanimous-consent request before it is propounded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair might suggest that if consent is granted without certain restrictions, any Senator can demand the regular order at any time, and that will automatically bring the Senate back to the consideration of the ECA bill. If the request is broad enough to continue consideration of the Senate resolution until it is disposed of, then, if it is not disposed of until Friday, under the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into, the Senate would return, on Friday, to the ECA legislation, to vote on the ECA bill and amendments, according to the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator have any idea how much time will be required to dispose of his resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Texas I will say that my part will be very brief. I understand the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] wishes to make a speech, as does also the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I should think about 4 or 5 hours would be required.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Am I correct in my understanding that any Senator at any time can make a point of order to revert to the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any Senator can demand the regular order, unless the unanimous-consent agreement includes the provision that consideration of Senate Resolution 202 be continued until disposed of. In that case consideration of the resolution would be continued, if it took that long, until Friday, when the Senate would automatically vote on the pending bill. But the mere request to take it up, even though it is taken up by unanimous consent, without any further request, means that any Senator can demand the regular order at any time, which would automatically bring the Senate back to consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. CONNALLY. The request does not include the provision "until action on the resolution is concluded" then?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has indicated that he might include such a provision.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would object if that provision were included.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in view of that situation, and I appreciate the position of the distinguished Senator from Texas——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I regret we on this side cannot hear what the Senator from Tennessee is saying.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I said in view of that situation, and I appreciate the position of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee who wishes to allow other Members of the Senate to make speeches on the ECA legislation, I simply make the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 202.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the junior Senator from Missouri reserving the right to object?

Mr. KEM. I am reserving the right to object, Mr. President. I had planned to address the Senate tomorrow on an amendment to the pending bill. I should like to inquire whether anything connected with the plans of the Senator from Tennessee would interfere with my address?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri may address himself to his amendment to the pending bill while Senate Resolution 202 is pending, or he may demand the regular order, in which case the Senate would return to the pending bill, on which the Senator may speak on the subject of his amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have no disposition to object to the request of the Senator from Tennessee if it will not interfere with my addressing the Senate tomorrow in regard to an amendment to the ECA bill. If it would interfere I would be disposed to object to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would ask the Senator if his amendment has been offered?

Mr. KEM. The amendment has been offered and is lying on the table. It has not been made the pending question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been technically offered?

Mr. KEM. It has not been made the pending question. It has been printed and is lying on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator could debate the amendment during the pendency of the resolution. There is no requirement of germaneness of debate, although there is the requirement of unanimous consent as to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. KEM. I should like to have the junior Senator from Tennessee understand that I propose to address the Senate tomorrow on the subject of my amendment. I might consent to his request now if it would not interfere with my doing so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I understand that.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the senior Senator from Missouri wish to reserve the right to object?

Mr. DONNELL. No, I do not wish to reserve the right to object, but I should like to ask unanimous consent to make a statement which will take but a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am very heartily in favor of the Senate taking up for consideration Senate Resolution 202 at the very earliest possible moment, and I trust unanimous consent will be given that it may be taken up for consideration forthwith. In regard to the time which will be consumed, it is my best judgment that about 2 hours would be required for me to present the argument which I desire to address to the Senate. I do not want to be bound to the exact instant or minute, but that is my present best judgment.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'CONOR. If the request of the Senator from Tennessee shall be agreed to, will that preclude the possibility of consideration of privileged matters, including a conference report which I have in mind, on Senate bill 1008, the basing-point legislation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such matters are privileged at any time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the request just made by the Senator from Tennessee is granted, then, as I understand, at any

time any Senator can demand the regular order, which means that the Senate would revert to consideration of the ECA bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that that is probably what will occur, in view of the announcements which have been made respecting speeches proposed to be delivered on the floor, because I am anxious to get along with the ECA bill. I shall make now the reservation that at any moment I may rise and demand the regular order.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes to make an observation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator may do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to know that each and every time he has made this request, it has met with my approval, with the single exception of the time when the Senator from Missouri was called home on account of the death of his uncle. At that time, in his behalf, I stated that if consideration of the resolution could be put over until his return, that action would be appreciated.

Certainly I want the RECORD to show, so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska or the minority leader—in whichever role Senators may wish to consider me—is concerned, I have no objection to having the Senate take up the resolution. In fact, I think the sooner it is disposed of, the better.

In view of the fact that the Senate was in session until approximately 6:30 last night, it seems to me that we should continue until approximately that hour this evening in an attempt to dispose of the resolution, doing so either this evening or tomorrow morning.

I should like to suggest to the Senator that it should be clearly understood that several more speeches will be made on the ECA bill, and that thereafter—on Thursday—there will be speeches on the so-called point 4 program. So there will be considerable debate. However, if the unanimous-consent proposal is agreed to, I see no reason why action on the resolution cannot be concluded either tonight or tomorrow morning; and then the Senate could proceed, without further interruption, with the further consideration of the ECA bill.

However, of course, the chairman of the committee can use his own best judgment as to the time to be allotted for debate on the ECA bil.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that, as I understand, it is understood that I shall have the floor the first thing tomorrow during the session of the Senate. In that case, the resolution referred to by the Senator from Tennessee should be disposed of tonight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So far as the Chair is concerned, there is no such understanding, because the unanimous-consent request does not include a provision for the recognition of any Senator.

Mr. KEM. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee whether it will be agreeable to him to modify his unanimous-consent request so as to have it provide that if the resolution if not disposed of this evening, it will not be taken up when the Senate convenes tomorrow. Otherwise, I shall be disposed to object, because I have made my plans to present tomorrow the amendment to which I have referred, which is pertinent to the unfinished business, the ECA bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I would be very happy to propound a unanimous-consent request that the resolution be disposed of this evening, but I am afraid that would mean that objection would be made by the other Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like agreement to be had either that the resolution will be disposed of this evening or that the Senate will not proceed with its consideration tomorrow until after I have finished my speech on the amendment to which I have referred.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure other Senators will cooperate in trying to see that the Senator from Missouri obtains the floor fairly early tomorrow. Certainly I shall cooperate in regard to fulfilling that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the parliamentary situation is not very complicated. The Senator from Missouri could, upon reconvening of the Senate tomorrow, call for the regular order, and that automatically would bring the ECA bill before the Senate again, and then the Senator from Missouri could submit his amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall do so if the resolution is not finally acted upon within a day, I shall not object to the proposed agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit an inquiry of the acting majority leader?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Vermont reserving the right to object to the request which is pending?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the acting majority leader or of any other Senator who can answer the question. I wish to know when it is expected that the bill providing $2,000,000,000 of additional credit for the Commodity Credit Corporation will be brought before the Senate for consideration.

As I understand, a week ago the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation was practically exhausted; and it was expected that a considerable amount of corn might be put under loan by the end of June; and it was doubtful whether a sufficient amount of money or borrowing power remains for that purpose.

So I wonder when that bill is likely to be considered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, to permit me to answer the question which has been asked by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that, according to my understanding, we are precluded from taking up that measure until after the vote is taken on the ECA bill on Friday, unless before that time, unanimous consent is obtained to temporarily displace the ECA bill with another measure. It is also my understanding that such unanimous-consent request would not meet with a favorable reception, because I understand that a Senator on the other side of the aisle has served notice that he will not agree to such a request, and that he wishes to be heard at some length on that measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, does the Senator understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be taken by following the taking of the vote on the ECA bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no knowledge as to that.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know whether the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is likely to be taken up before the FEPC bill is taken up?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say that it would meet with my complete approval to have the Commodity Credit Corporation bill taken up prior to the taking up of the FEPC bill—[laughter]—but my understanding of the announcement made several days ago on the floor of the Senate by the majority leader is that it is his intention to move to have the Senate take up the FEPC bill upon the conclusion of action on the ECA bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Under those circumstances I assume that it is unlikely that unanimous consent would be obtained for some time to take up the bill relating to the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is certainly in accord with my understanding of the situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether he has read the press dispatch which just came over the ticker, reading as follows:

> Senate Democratic Leader LUCAS announced that he expects to bring the administration's fair employment practices bill before the Senate late Friday.
>
> After the weekly Senate Democratic policy committee meeting, LUCAS told reporters he will offer a motion to take up the bill after the final vote Friday on the pending foreign aid bill.

I suppose that announcement will resolve any doubt on the part of the acting majority leader as to the bill which will be the subject of a motion to have the Senate take up on Friday, following the vote on the ECA bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Ohio, but I did not have any doubt in regard to that matter, because my understanding was exactly in accord with that which has been suggested by the Senator from Ohio in connection with his reading of the dispatch on the ticker. I understand that is the definite expectation of the majority leader, following the vote on the ECA bill.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that the proposal of the majority leader poses a serious problem for the Senate, because I should think the FEPC bill probably will take several weeks, in connection with the taking of the necessary cloture votes and the debate on the bill. That raises a serious question regarding a number of reorganization plans which must be vetoed, if they are vetoed at all, by May 23, and inasmuch as each reorganization plan probably will require about a day's debate.

It seems to me that it will be almost essential for those who are interested in the vetoing of any reorganization plan—regardless of what bill is brought before the Senate, whether it be the FEPC bill or any other bill, and regardless of how strongly they may favor such a bill—to move to have the Senate take up the reorganization plans; because if we wait until May 17, it is not at all clear that there will then be sufficient time for us to take up various reorganization plans. If there were not sufficient time, the effect would be to make it impossible for the Senate to veto any of the reorganization plans proposed by the President.

In that dilemma, I do not know what procedure it will be necessary for us to take.

However, regardless of what bill is taken up by the Senate or regardless of how strongly I may favor such a bill or how much I may be in favor of bringing it to a vote, my inclination is to vote in favor of a motion—as I suggested recently—to have the Senate take up on May 10 the resolution, now on the calendar, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12.

I shall consult further with the majority leader before making a definite announcement to that effect.

Of course, such a motion would be privileged. I shall certainly appeal to those who are in favor of the resolution to agree to have the Senate take it up, regardless of what measure may then be pending before the Senate.

If the majority leader does not himself plan to move to have the Senate take up the resolutions affecting the reorganization plans, that will place upon those who are interested in the reorganization resolutions the burden of doing so, regardless of what measure then is before the Senate.

I think it should be understood, in connection with the taking up of any other measure on Friday, that no choice then is given to any Member of the Senate who is interested in such a plan to do anything but object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would observe for the information of the Senate that in regard to the Reorganization Plans, under the Reorganization Act and the rules of the Senate, they are highly privileged, and any Senator may move to consider any one of them at any time, no matter what else is pending; and that motion is voted on without debate, and the Senate can limit debate on the resolution itself, as it may see fit.

Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that about 10 days ago I asked the majority leader when he expected that there would be an opportunity to consider the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which is ready for action by the Senate. It was then called to the attention of the Senate that on this side of the aisle there were objections, or that at least there were those who would like to speak on the bill. It was my understanding that those desiring to speak on the bill would take possibly only 2, 3, or not to exceed 4 minutes, unless there were prolonged debate by those on this side of the aisle.

In view of the fact that there is so much farm legislation dependent upon the borrowing authority of the Department of Agriculture or upon the additional borrowing authority provided for in the amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, I think it very important that this bill be given consideration. If there are to be additional applications for corn loans, and if, in the event the Commodity Credit Corporation must assume additional obligations, it finds itself without sufficient money, the effect will be very serious upon the entire farm program.

I am sure the debate on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will not continue for many hours and that we can take it up immediately after action on the ECA bill on Friday. There is no certainty when the Commodity Credit Corporation bill can be considered if FEPC or other important legislation gets under way.

There should also be legislation on the potato question. The potato growers in the northern area of the United States will be planting potatoes in the very near future, and there is no legislation giving them assurance of price supports. It seems to me to be necessary to consider the important measures to which I have referred before the season becomes so far advanced that the legislation, if passed, could not become applicable to the farm program in any sense.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and asking unanimous consent to answer the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, I say to him that, so far as I know, there is no disposition whatever on this side of the aisle to delay the consideration of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. The Senator from Florida was advised by one of the acting minority leaders some time during the day that, in the event, there was an effort made to take up that measure, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] wished to be heard. The Senator from Delaware has just entered the Chamber, and the Senator from Florida will not attempt to say what the position of the Senator from Delaware is. But at least that was stated to him to be the position of the Senator from Delaware.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business, and to proceed to consider Senate Resolution 202?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with additional amendments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during a very few moments this afternoon I wish to tell the Members of the Senate how I happen to be interested in this problem, and also the legislative situation with respect to the various resolutions which are now pending in connection with the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator presented his substitute for the resolution which is now before the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment which is in the nature of a substitute, which I shall offer at the proper time, and I ask that it be printed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator have copies of the proposed amendment which are available for examination by the Members of the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the distinguished Senator, I think I have furnished copies to everyone interested, or to a good many of those interested. But I have here a number of mimeographed copies, which I ask to have distributed to Senators.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure the Senator meant no discourtesy at all. I think the Senator realized that I was somewhat interested in this resolution. I have not seen a copy of the Senator's amendment. I should like very much to have one.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I apologize to the Senator. I thought I had given him a copy.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure the Senator intended to do so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I gave the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a copy, and I thought I had given one to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator whether this is identically the same as the copy which was handed to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I believe, about the time that the Democratic Policy

Committee took up the matter? If so, I may say I saw that for a little while. The Senator from Ohio was kind enough to let me see it. Is this an identical copy?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is identically the same, except that in the copy which was given to the Senator from Ohio, the date of the report of the committee was given as January 31, and the date for winding up and discharging of the committee, February 28. Inasmuch as the matter has been delayed about 3 weeks since the substitute was drawn, the Senator will find an amendment on the last page, advancing the dates 1 month. Those are the only changes.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. DONNELL. I was about to ask, Mr. President, whether we might have the amendment read with reasonable deliberation, if the clerk would be so kind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has so ordered.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That a special committee composed of five members to be appointed by the President of the Senate from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations by which such utilization is being made, what facilities are being used, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of law of the United States or of the laws of any State: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained herein shall (1) authorize the recommendation of any change in the laws of the several States relative to gambling, (2) effect any change in the laws of any State relative to gambling, or (3) effect any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 2. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. A majority of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949 for comparable duties. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the heads of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than February 28, 1951, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable. All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on March 31, 1951.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether the amendment which has been read by the Clerk and which I tried to follow, as best I could, along with the printed copy and it was reported by the Judiciary Committee, and, later, by the Committee on Rules and Administration, insofar as it relates to the duty of the proposed committee, is identical with the printed copy so reported from the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say to the Senator that section 1, down to the proviso, is identical with the provision in the original resolution as reported by the Judiciary Committee. In the exceptions we found one clause in the resolution of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which we thought was a little superior to the language contained in the resolution from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. What is the different clause which has been added to the amendment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator will observe that on page 2 of Senate Resolution 202, beginning in line 8, there are the words "That nothing contained herein shall authorize (1) the recommendation of any change in the laws of the several States relative to gambling."

That is the same as the language in the substitute.

No. (2) in the original resolution is as follows:

Any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders.

No. (2) in the substitute uses the words—

Effect any change in the laws of any State relative to gambling, or (3) effect any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders.

Clauses 2 and 3 are taken from the resolution of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and in our discussion we thought the language was clearer. Outside of that, there are no differences.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that the Senator from Tennessee met with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the four Senators agreed on the language which is now contained in the proposed substitute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. The substance of it was agreed to by us.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not understand the names of the Senators who were mentioned by the majority leader.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. MCCARRAN], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], who is chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. President, I wish to send to the desk and have read for the information of the Senate, and to have printed in the RECORD, a joint resolution which the Senator from Tennessee will offer in the event of the adoption of Senate Resolution 202.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the projected resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of any person as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the special Senate committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, agreed to———, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

SEC. 2. Such special Senate committee is authorized to employ a chief counsel at a salary not to exceed $17,500 per annum and

an associate counsel at a salary not to exceed $12,500, to be paid out of any funds available for the payment of the expenses of the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the need for the passage of the joint resolution which was just read, in the event of the adoption of Senate Resolution 202, is obvious. In the selection of counsel and associate counsel for the committee we should have exceptionally good lawyers who have had experience in criminal investigations, criminal trials, and tax work. The field is very limited unless we have the power to select persons who may be members of law firms. Practically all law firms have tax cases or other matters pending before the Federal Government. Under the statute, it would be unlawful for anyone selected from a firm to receive any money from the Federal Government if he were receiving any part of the fees which might already have accrued as a result of his work for his firm.

There seems to be some dispute as to which is applicable in this connection, the Pay Act or the Classification Act. I understand the financial clerk of the Senate, Mr. Oco Thompson, contends that the Pay Act limits the salary of any staff employee to $9,800 or $10,800, whereas the Classification Act, it is contended by Mr. Rice, of the Legislative Counsel's office, permits a salary up to $14,000. I do not know that it will be necessary to pay the chief counsel and the associate counsel the salaries indicated in the joint resolution which has been read, but some time ago the majority leader indicated, and I think he is correct, that we should secure the very best men available for this work. It will require a counsel and an associate counsel of unusual ability and experience, and we might not be able to get this type of counsel on a long-time basis under the salary limitations now applicable.

Mr. President, referring to the interest of the junior Senator from Tennessee in the resolution, in the summer of 1945, at which time I had the pleasure of serving as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, the chairman of that committee, Representative Sumners, a great statesman from the State of Texas and one of the finest men, I think, who ever served in Congress, appointed a subcommittee consisting of six members, three Democrats and three Republicans, of which I had the privilege of being chairman, to investigate alleged judicial corruption in the middle district of Pennsylvania, involving Judge Albert Johnson.

The committee, composed of six members, devoted most of the summer and fall of 1945 to this inquiry. There had been a great many complaints about corruption and mismanagement and barter of justice in the middle district of Pennsylvania. Many investigations had been made by local bar associations, grand juries, and other agencies. There was a great deal of smoke about it, most of the lawyers and bar associations felt that justice had reached a very low ebb, and that there was no respect for the judiciary and little respect for the enforcement of laws in the middle district of Pennsylvania. However, they had been unable to find out anything definite about Judge Johnson. The 6 members of the committee were Mr. Reed, of Illinois, Mr. Gwynne, of Iowa, Mr. Talbot, of Connecticut, Mr. Cravens, of Arkansas, Mr. Russell, of Texas, and myself as chairman. Mr. Russell was unable to attend many of the meetings.

After making some investigations in the middle district of Pennsylvania—and we had very fine cooperation from the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other governmental agencies—we found that Mr. Max Goldschein, who was in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice—I did not know it at the time, but I found out later that he had originally come from Nashville, Tenn.—had been conducting a grand jury investigation in Scranton, Pa., for some short time in connection with this matter. We engaged him as counsel for the committee. After quite a lengthy inquiry we finally uncovered—and without the cooperation we received it would have been impossible—one of the most notorious and disgraceful judicial rackets which had ever been heard of in the history of the American judiciary. One judge was receiving money for the dispensation of justice, and he had sons located in strategic sections throughout the district. It involved referees in bankruptcy, auditors, and attorneys for referees. The whole judicial system was in a terrible state of corruption. Respect for the law was almost absent.

During that time we had an opportunity of seeing how this corruption fitted in with other kinds of rackets and betting in which these people were engaged. We had occasion also to see how some of the money which was criminally taken had been used in efforts to bribe local officials, both Democrats and Republicans, to keep out of the hands of the law. During this time members of the committee had an opportunity of meeting and talking with such young men as Boris Kostelanetz, who, at that time, was with the Department of Justice and was doing some special work there. He is now in the private practice of law. He had successfully prosecuted Bioff and Brown, some of the Capone group, and others, and was a very successful prosecutor and a certified public accountant. He had a great record with the Department of Justice. We also conferred with FBI agents concerning rackets and interstate crime in general.

From that time on I took a special interest in the reports of various crime commissions throughout the country. I think, Mr. President, a word of praise and tribute should be said about the voluntary associations which have been formed in various sections of the United States, whose expenses are paid by interested citizens who have no motive except that they want good law enforcement and to rid their communities of the influence of gamblers and racketeers. I have had an opportunity of reading reports of the Greater Miami Crime Commission, of which Colonel Springer is chairman and Daniel Sullivan is the operating director, and of talking with these men about conditions in that section of Florida. I have read the various reports of the California Crime Commission. There have been three of them. This commission has been operating under the direction of former Admiral William H. Standley. Their deputy director is Frank E. Crane, and they have with them an investigator by the name of Robinson, who used to be with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and is one of the top investigators of crime in the United States. Then there is the great Massachusetts Citizens Committee, of which Mr. Godfrey L. Cabot is honorary president and the Reverend Dana Greeley is president. Dwight S. Strong is the secretary.

Further, there is the Chicago Crime Commission, with Mr. Guy L. Reed as president and Virgil W. Peterson as operating director. He also was a former FBI agent and has done very excellent work in investigations which have been made and the reports which have been filed. All the investigations by these commissions have been made, Mr. President, without the power of subpena. The amount of information which they have set forth in their various reports is an eye opener for anyone who is interested in good law enforcement in the United States and the riddance from society of the influence of the criminal element.

I should also mention that crime commissions have done great and fine work in Baltimore, Md., Cleveland, Ohio, New Orleans, La., and in many other cities.

For the information of the Senate I should like to read one or two sentences from some of the reports issued by these crime commissions. For instance, I have the second report of the crime commission in the State of California, one paragraph of which reads:

> The problem of organized crime in California cannot be considered separately from the national problem. The central feature is the spread of national criminal organizations and syndicates into California. Unless the general outlines of the picture of nationally organized crime are understood, it is impossible to detect the presence, activities and methods of the most menacing criminal organizations in our State.

Let it be said to the credit of the American Municipal Association and organizations of mayors and other officials that in their various meetings during the past few years they have recognized the presence of criminal syndicates operating across State lines, and have asked the Federal Government to carry on an investigation to see if there is some way by which the Federal Government can help them in an effort to enforce the laws of their respective States.

For instance, in Newsweek of November 21, 1949, an article about Mayor deLesseps S. Morrison, president of the American Municipal Association, says:

> Mayor deLesseps S. Morrison of New Orleans, president of the American Municipal Association, which represents the governments of 9,500 cities and towns in the United States, has called on the Federal Government for help in fighting what he describes as a tightly knit Nation-wide network of crime. This crime syndicate has extended its activities throughout the Nation, Mayor Morrison declares. It has become so powerful that it threatens to take over the governments of several of the Nation's key cities.

Mr. President, the Citizens Committee of Massachusetts report estimates that big time gambling takes from $11,800,000,000 to $21,500,000,000 out of the pockets of American taxpayers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I was speaking a moment ago to the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to attempting to get a unanimous consent agreement for a vote on the resolution and all amendments thereto, and to dispose of the matter without some Senator calling for the regular order. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is present, and of course is very anxious, as is every other Senator, to get along as fast as possible with the ECA bill.

I was wondering whether when we conclude tonight we could not recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow, and agree to vote on the resolution at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, whether that would not be satisfactory to most Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator from Illinois to be proposing a unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. LUCAS. I had not proposed it; I was merely suggesting one, to see whether or not we could reach an agreement whereby we might vote upon the substitute amendment or any amendment thereto, at 1 o'clock tomorrow, let us say, after meeting at 11 o'clock. That would give a couple of hours to debate this evening, and 2 hours tomorrow. I was wondering whether the Senator from Missouri would have any objection to that.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I thought it was rather definitely understood that I would have the floor when the Senate convened tomorrow, for the purpose of addressing myself to an amendment to the unfinished business, and I consented to the request of the Senator from Tennessee with the distinct understanding that I expected to do that. It does not seem to me that I should be asked to agree further to another understanding which will deprive me of that opportunity. The amendment is an important one, and I have prepared myself to discuss it. It is a little hard for me to understand why the unfinished business should be again set aside to take up a wholly extraneous matter.

Mr. LUCAS. The unfinished business would not be set aside. All we are trying to do is to get a vote on the resolution now pending.

Mr. KEM. I have no disposition to block a vote. I would like to have an understanding with the Senator from Illinois that I may have the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow and that I may be permitted to address myself to my amendment to the unfinished business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should say that 99 times out of a hundred I could agree with the Senator from Missouri that he should have the floor, and I would agree to a unanimous-consent request to that effect. However, there have been very few speeches made on this side of the aisle on the unfinished business, and this afternoon I agreed with one Senator on this side to attempt to get the floor for him when the Senate meets tomorrow. That is why I cannot agree to the Senator's request. I know the Senator from Missouri is very much interested in the question involved in his amendment, and I know he has made one or two excellent speeches, from his viewpoint, on the ECA program. Very few speeches have been made on this side of the aisle. I had hoped that perhaps the distinguished Senator from Missouri might agree to my request, because I am sure there will be plenty of time for him to make his speech sometime tomorrow afternoon, or perhaps the next day.

Mr. KEM. The majority leader was not present when the discussion occurred with reference to my having the floor, but his deputy was present, and I think it was the general understanding that the request of the Senator from Tennessee would include a provision to the effect that I would have the floor when the Senate convened tomorrow. I believe the Senator from Florida, who was the acting majority leader, will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if we agreed to vote at 1 o'clock, would not the Senator be satisfied to proceed at 1 o'clock, that is, if the Senate meets at 11 and votes at 1?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for an extraneous party to inject himself into the discussion?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am always delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I understand the point of view of the Senator from Missouri, and I have discussed the matter with the majority leader. I wonder if we could get together on this basis: Assume that the Senate assembles at 11 o'clock tomorrow, and that we agree to vote on the substitute resolution of the Senator from Tennessee at 1 o'clock; then would it be possible, I ask the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Illinois, for the Senator from Illinois to say to the Senator from Missouri that by 2 o'clock, let us say, he could have the floor, in other words, that whoever on the Democratic side is to speak would not speak longer than an hour, or some such time?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield, I do not believe I could enter into such an agreement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is correct, as stated by the Senator from Missouri, that there was discussion of his desire to be heard tomorrow when the Senate convened. The Senator from Florida did not understand that it was included in the unanimous-consent agreement that he was to speak, but it was stated by the President of the Senate, presiding at the time, that the Senator from Missouri or any other Senator would have the right, when the Senate convened in the morning, under the unanimous-consent agreement which was then pending, if it were agreed to, to call for the regular order, and then to proceed to make a speech upon the unfinished business. I will have to say to the Senator from Missouri that I did not understand that it was included in the agreement that he was to speak.

Mr. KEM. I think that is correct; I do not think there was any definite incorporation of any such understanding.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the unanimous-consent agreement on the pending matter, Resolution 202, prohibit speeches being made on the Senate floor on other subjects than the one now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been the understanding of the present occupant of the chair that there was no rule of germaneness in the proceedings of the United States Senate, and that if a Senator gets the attention of the Presiding Officer and is recognized, he may speak on any subject, from the North Pole to the South Pole.

Mr. FERGUSON. Another parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not be necessary for the junior Senator from Missouri, if he can be recognized, to have the pending resolution set aside, in order to make a speech upon his own amendment to the ECA program, would it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator is correct. While the present occupant of the chair was not presiding when the discussion about this matter occurred some time ago, he is informed that the then Presiding Officer ruled substantially to that effect.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I have unanimous consent to make a statement rather than ask a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may do so.

Mr. DONNELL. The suggestion was made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois that 1 o'clock tomorrow be fixed as the hour for the vote. I want it very clearly understood that I have no desire in the world to delay the proper consideration of the resolution, but it is now almost 20 minutes past 5—5:18 in the afternoon, to be exact. The Senator from Tennessee has entered upon his address; I do not know how long he will consume. It is obvious that there are a

comparatively small number of Senators on the floor. I counted them a little while ago, and I think there were then some 17, including the occupant of the chair, a number in that neighborhood, at any rate.

It is obvious that when the Senator from Tennessee shall conclude his remarks, if some Senator in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee—for illustration, the present speaker—should obtain the floor, he would be speaking, in all probability, to a very small number of Senators. To agree to a vote at 1 o'clock tomorrow would mean virtually having delivered an address this evening, and then either saying the same things tomorrow, or not having any chance at all to present the arguments tomorrow.

Mr. President, I therefore do not see how it would be possible for proper consideration to be given to this very important matter if the hour of 1 o'clock were fixed as the hour for a vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Could we agree to vote at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, meeting at 11, and letting the distinguished Senator from Missouri and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee control the time, which would give practically an hour and 15 minutes on each side, assuming some time was taken for a quorum call?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say, for the information of the Senator from Missouri, that I shall conclude my presentation in 15 minutes. That is all the time I desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent has been granted to the senior Senator from Missouri to make reply to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, that would bring it up to 25 minutes to 6 o'clock this evening, when the floor would be surrendered by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, with the comparatively small number of Senators here present. To my mind, Mr. President, it would not be advisable tonight, under those circumstances, to make an agreement as to an hour for voting tomorrow. I think we all want to join in the effort to have this matter heard adequately and properly, without the vote being rushed and at the same time without it being impeded. I am sure that is the intention of at least myself, and I believe it is the intention of every other Senator. I believe it would be better for us to proceed this evening for a reasonable length of time. I am somewhat nonplussed by the consideration that if I should enter upon my discussion, which, as I indicated earlier this afternoon, would take approximately 2 hours, and deliver my remarks in largest part tonight to empty benches, I should certainly feel under the obligation to say practically the same thing over tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. To the same empty benches.

Mr. DONNELL. I should hope not. I should hope more Senators would be present tomorrow. So, Mr. President, I respectfully submit that it would not be advisable to attempt to fix an hour for voting at the session this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. We have, of course, as everyone knows, an extremely important measure pending before the Senate, which affects not only the United States of America but practically every nation in the world. In the event the resolution is taken up, obviously some Senator is going to call for the regular order, and the Senate then will automatically return to consideration of the ECA bill. It seems to me that if we take some time tonight in discussing the resolution, and if we devote, let us say, 3 hours tomorrow to a discussion of the resolution, which is so vital to the Nation, we ought to be able to secure a vote on it at the end of that time.

Mr. President, I am going to disavow any further responsibility for trying to secure a vote on the resolution. The Senator from Tennessee has been trying to secure a vote on it for some time. I have been trying to cooperate with the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators who are interested in trying to ferret out the crime syndicates operating in interstate commerce. I want to go all the way with him. I suggested that, so far as I am concerned, he can have all the money he wants, and have the best counsel in the country to carry on this work. I am satisfied the Vice President will select from among the two committees that are involved in this resolution, assuming such a committee is established, will be an excellent one.

The responsibility is not going to be on the majority leader's shoulders any longer for delaying the resolution. I have been criticized by the press, and there have been intimations and innuendoes that I am trying to do something to prevent the adoption of the resolution. I want the country to understand that I for one want to see it adopted. If we use a couple of hours tonight and 3 hours tomorrow there is no reason why we cannot act upon the resolution. Every Senator knows how he is going to vote on it. Whoever delays the resolution will have to accept the responsibility for doing so.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield briefly to the senior Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee yields to the Senator from Missouri to make a statement.

Mr. DONNELL. I want to state that I feel, as I have previously indicated, that this is an important matter, as the Senator from Illinois has emphasized, and I think it is a matter that should be determined promptly. But I do not believe that we should argue this matter under the force of compulsion of finishing our arguments within any certain particular number of minutes. To my mind it would be decidedly a mistake to agree tonight upon any hour for voting. I would personally not be willing to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if under all the circumstances he would not be willing that the Senate convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock, and then let us be guided by circumstances at that time as to how to proceed further? I ask that question in order that, if the suggestion is agreeable to the Senate, I may notify Senators on this side of the aisle. I ask the Senator if he believes there is wisdom in my proposal, as it appears in the form of a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have no objection to doing that. But it seems to me that we ought to be able to vote upon the resolution at a certain hour. We ought to be able to secure a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect.

I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that I dislike very much to debate this subject tonight, debate it for an hour tomorrow, and then have the Senator from Texas or some other Senator rise and demand the regular order. If that should occur, everything we shall have theretofore done in connection with the resolution will have been wasted effort. If the regular order is demanded, after some hours of discussion of the resolution, we will come back to it within a week or 2 weeks, or perhaps several days, and at whatever time we resume consideration of the resolution we will have to go over the same ground again. What I am trying to do is to expedite the procedure and save a little time. The Senate will remain in session long enough to discuss the resolution, along with all the other important measures we have before us.

I am fearful that if the Senate should meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow and should resume debate on the resolution, and it should not be disposed of by 1 o'clock, or by 1:30, then some Senator would demand the regular order and thus we would lose all the ground we have gained, so to speak. We will have marched up the hill and marched down again.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I asked the Senator from Illinois the question I did because it seems to me that perhaps by tomorrow morning after convening at 11 o'clock, and being fresh, we will be able to reach an agreement respecting an hour that would be suitable for voting at some time tomorrow afternoon, at which time we could conclude action on the resolution. and then return to the regular order of business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will have no objection to trying anything. I wish to say to my friend from Massachusetts, and I hope it will work. I hope the Senator will persuade the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who is very much interested in the subject, of course, but who is also a very reasonable man. The Senator from Massachusetts has great persuasive

power. I think he can work upon the Senator from Missouri, perhaps on both Senators from Missouri, so we may reach an agreement for a vote on the resolution at 1 o'clock or 2 o'clock in the afternoon tomorrow.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator for a question or a very brief observation.

Mr. KEM. The Senator yields for what purpose?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not want to yield the floor. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I wish to make a short statement. I thought it was clearly understood when the question was before the Senate previously, that the junior Senator from Missouri would have the floor when the Senate convened tomorrow. I asked the Senator from Tennessee if he would be willing to incorporate in his unanimous-consent request a statement to that effect, and I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say he would.

It is true that I did not pursue the matter further and secure the exact language to be incorporated in the unanimous consent request. I thought that was unnecessary. I thought it was fully understood by the Senators present that I was agreeing to the unanimous consent request on the express condition that I would have the floor when the Senate convened tomorrow. Now it seems that that is not understood. That means that I failed to make myself clear. I shall make myself clear now. I shall not agree to any unanimous consent agreement until I have had an opportunity to address myself to the amendment I have proposed to the unfinished business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the majority leader a question. Is it the idea of the majority leader that when the distinguished Senator from Tennessee finishes his discussion the Senate shall recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. I would not object to recessing until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning providing we are going to discuss the issue of the Senate resolution. But the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] just now served notice that he is not going to agree to any unanimous consent request for tomorrow unless he is recognized immediately following the convening of the session tomorrow. There is no point in coming in at 11 o'clock tomorrow under those circumstances. As I see it, there is no point in debating the resolution unless we can finish it. So there is no point in meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning under those circumstances. If we meet at 11 o'clock, some Senator may call for the regular order, and the Senator from Missouri may be recognized and proceed with his remarks on his amendment. I do not say the Senator from Missouri will get the floor. That will depend upon what Senator the Chair recognizes at that time. However, I assume the Chair probably will look in this direction; at least, I hope the Chair will do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to the query of the Senator from Illinois, I would say that following the hint the Senator from Illinois has just given, I assume that the Vice President will look in that direction.

Mr. LUCAS. It is usually done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And I would not be surprised if the Vice President should do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, that is an old Democratic custom. [Laughter.]

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask this question: Under all the circumstances, would it not be possible for the majority leader, with the full cooperation of Senators on this side of the aisle, so far as we can do so tonight, to state that when the Senator from Tennessee finishes his discussion this evening, he will move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and at that time perhaps see whether we can make progress in cooperating with the junior Senator from Missouri and the senior Senator from Missouri in reaching a vote on the resolution, on which all of us wish to vote, and then proceed with the regular order?

Mr. LUCAS. I would have no objection to having the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. I would hope my good friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] could be persuaded to relinquish his previous position, because he will have plenty of time to make his ECA speech. After all, the Senator from Missouri already has made two or three speeches on the ECA bill. I did not hear all of them, but I read all of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all of them are interesting speeches from his viewpoint. So I am sure he will be able to make another good speech on that subject. Whether he makes it tomorrow or whether he makes it the next day, I would not think would make much difference.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Missouri is so much interested in cleaning out crime, I should think he would agree to this proposal, because I have heard him speak on this matter, and I know he is very much interested in having investigators start to work.

I do not wish to take any further responsibility for causing delay in the taking of action by the Senate on the resolution on which the Senator from Tennessee has been doing heroic work for several weeks, in trying to have it considered by the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would suggest to the Senator that the Senate, as we in New England say, would make more hay if we made haste a little slowly at this particular time, and if we resume our session at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and if we do not have any agreement tonight from the Senator from Missouri, but perhaps secure agreement tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield further, let me say that, so far as I am concerned, I shall agree to that—in other words, to have the Senate resume its session at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and let every Senator take his chances then on getting the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; and not ask the Senator from Missouri at this time to agree to do anything.

Mr. LUCAS. No; but I hope he will agree between now and then.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, lest there be any possible misunderstanding of the colloquy which occurred a few minutes ago between the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Florida, I wish to make it completely clear that at that time the Senator from Missouri made it abundantly clear to all Senators who were present when the unanimous-consent agreement was pending that he expected to request recognition in order to make a presentation of his amendment tomorrow, and he was assured by the Vice President, who then was presiding over the Senate, that he would have a right to do so.

I wish to repeat what I have already said, namely, that such an understanding was not embraced within the unanimous-consent agreement.

Let me add that, recognizing the right of the Senator from Missouri, and recognizing the fact that he declared himself in that way—which certainly is incontrovertible—I would still like to associate myself with the request of the Senator from Tennessee and the request of the Senator from Illinois and the request of the Senator from Massachusetts that, if possible, there be some slight delay on the part of the junior Senator from Missouri in presenting his amendment tomorrow morning. I take that position in the hope that by that means it will be possible for us to take action on this crime-investigation resolution, which, after all, is only a starter of a formal investigation which will have to run a long time. Certainly the resolution itself should not take an undue amount of time for debate. I hope that, in his wisdom, the Senator from Missouri will decide that it will not prejudice the presentation of his amendment if he waits until 1 or 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon to do so, so that in the meantime the resolution can be disposed of.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether he understood that my acceding to the request of the Senator from Tennessee was conditioned upon the expectation that I would have the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow?

Mr. HOLLAND. Whether it was upon that condition or not, I certainly understood, with complete clarity, that the Senator from Missouri had been assured by the Vice President that he would have the right to ask for the floor tomorrow morning and to call for the regular

order, and then to address himself to his amendment to the ECA bill .

However, I repeat that I do not think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that any agreement to that effect was made.

Mr. KEM. I agree. As I recall, I asked the Senator from Tennessee whether he would incorporate such an understanding in his unanimous-consent request. The Senator from Tennessee, as I understood, said he would do so. However, I did not pursue the matter further, and I did not ask him expressly to do so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Senator from Missouri must have misunderstood what I said. I said I would be glad to cooperate in any way I could to help the Senator from Missouri get the floor. However, I do not think I said I would incorporate that suggestion in the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEM. Perhaps not. I cannot always hear the Senator from Tennessee from my seat on this side of the aisle. I understood that he was indicating acquiescence in what I was saying at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not think there is the slightest misunderstanding between Senators as to what occurred.

The only thing which would remain to be done in order to allow the resolution to be disposed of would be for the junior Senator from Missouri graciously to permit—if he saw fit to do so; of course, the decision would be his to make—the debate on the crime investigation resolution to continue until, let us say, 1 or 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, or until whatever other time, early tomorrow afternoon, the Senate is able to reach a decision upon the resolution.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am always glad to agree to any reasonable request of the majority leader. I recognize the necessity for having leadership in the Senate.

However, I also feel that when the majority leader is absent from the Senate and when an acting majority leader is here in his place and certain discussions take place, they are just as binding on the majority leader as if he were here in person at the time.

As the acting majority leader has said, it was clearly understood that I agreed to the request of the Senator from Tennessee upon one condition, namely, that I would be permitted to address the Senate tomorrow morning.

I hesitate to impose myself upon the Senate under any circumstances; but when the fact is that the unfinished business is the ECA bill, and when my purpose is to submit what I regard as an important amendment to that bill, I certainly think it is entirely proper that I insist upon my right to submit the amendment at that time.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I am not disposed to agree to any further unanimous-consent requests, unless they have incorporated within them an express provision to the effect that the junior Senator from Missouri will have the floor when the crime-investigation resolution is disposed of.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, rather than read all the excerpts from the crime commission reports to which I have referred, I now ask unanimous consent that a few of them be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Second Progress Report of the Special Crime Study Commission on Organized Crime of the State of California, on page 8, states as follows:

"It seems necessary, even in a progress report, to include at least a brief explanation of what the commission considers is embraced within the term 'organized crime.' Without such a starting point the whole direction of the commission's investigations and activities, and the reasons and basis for the commission's findings and recommendations remain obscure.

"Simply stated, organized crime is what the term implies. It is the activity of a group of persons working together for the express purpose of more effectively accomplishing criminal acts against society. By organizing, criminals are able to secure greater immunity from the law, a wider field for operations, monopolistic control over specific types of criminal activity, and of course greater profits. The emergence and development during the past 20 years of criminal syndicates extending throughout our entire country is recognized by criminologists as the most prominent, the most threatening, and the least understood feature of our national crime problem.

"The great and dangerous criminals of today are not the publicized desperadoes of the newspapers, magazines and radio, such as John Dillinger, 'Baby Face' Nelson and 'Machine Gun' Kelley. The great and truly dangerous criminals of the present are the directing heads of the syndicates in control of bookmaking, slot machines, organized gambling, prostitution, narcotics, the loan shark racket, swindling schemes, organized murder, and the host of extortionate rackets playing upon legitimate business and labor in many different fields—men who are almost unknown to the public and whose names never appear currently on any police blotters. Criminals of this latter type are always difficult to identify. An inevitable effect of organization is to clothe the activities and participation of the leaders in secrecy. The directors and master-minds of organized crime are seldom apprehended or arrested. They live peacefully and luxuriously, enjoying a full sense of security, and with complete confidence that they will not be disturbed in their criminal activities. Their only real fear is concerned with the ambitions and competition of rival mobsters."

The same report, in its recommendations, recommends that there be passed by the California State Legislature a joint resolution petitioning the Federal Communications Commission to adopt an order requiring all communication companies to refuse the use of interstate communication facilities when such companies have reasonable grounds for believing such facilities are being used for purposes which violate the laws of the States.

An article from the Washington Post, dated January 27, 1950, states as follows:

"AND THAT'S NOT ALL—BIG-TIME ANNUAL GAMING TOLL IS $21,500,000,000, GROUP SAYS

"Big time gambling takes up to $21,500,000,000 a year out of American pockets, a group of Bostonians reported today after a Nation-wide investigation.

"The Citizens' Committee of Massachusetts, Inc., whose letterhead bears some of Boston's best names, said in a 46-page report that figure does not even include the proceeds of such forms of gambling as lotteries, raffles and carnival games.

"It charged that big-time gambling is controlled and operated in businesslike fashion by organized syndicates which ultimately have 'a corrupting influence on good government and the welfare of the community in general.'

"The committee said its investigators estimated that from $11,800,000,000 to $21,500,000,000 is spent each year on horse and dog race betting, sports pools, numbers pools and slot machines.

"The gambling estimates were broken down this way:

"Parimutuel betting—$1,500,000,000.

"Off-the-track betting—$3,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000.

"Sports pools—$5,000,000,000.

"Numbers pools—$300,000,000 to $2,000,000,000.

"Slot machines—$2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000.

"The committee, organized some 10 years ago, is headed by Reverend Dana McLean Greeley, minister of Boston's Arlington Street Unitarian Church.

"Its vice chairmen are Financier Charles Francis Adams, Industrialist Godfrey Lowell Cabot and the Reverend Frank Jennings, secretary of the Massachusetts Council of Churches.

" 'Organized syndicated gambling is in the ranks of "big business" ', the report said. Illegal gambling activities are controlled by antisocial groups, so organized as to have an apparent immunity from the law and an ever-widening field of operations. * * *

" 'In its Nation-wide implications, large-scale illegal gambling activities are carried on by dangerous criminal elements who have adapted recognized systems of business organization and efficiency to syndicates which control, among other activities, bookmaking, slot machines, and organized gambling activities in their other forms.

" 'A notorious criminal syndicate, through its headquarters in Chicago and agencies in various metropolitan areas, is a dominant factor in off-the-track horse-race betting and has been credited with interest in sports pools activities on a Nation-wide basis.

" 'A widely known New York City rackets' head is the reputed head of the slot-machine racket.'

"The committee said the public has refused to face the fact that gambling diverts large amounts of money that might be spent to better advantage and that most wagering enriches and entrenches antisocial and criminal groups.

" 'The corruption of police officials is a fundamental in the promotion of illicit gambling operations,' the report noted. It said slot-machine interests commonly allot 10 to 20 percent of their gross profits for graft and protection."

From an article in the Washington Post, dated Saturday, December 3, 1949, the following is quoted relating to the subject:

"Carl H. Chatters, executive director of the American Municipal Association, wrote to Attorney General J. Howard McGrath on September 19 to enlist his 'active assistance.'

" 'From the experience of several mayors of our member cities,' Chatters wrote, 'there has recently emerged the necessity of dealing with organized crime on a national scale. The matter is important because it appears that crime syndicates are making an effort to control local politics in those municipalities where the public officials are most opposed to organized crime in all of its aspects.'

" 'In some cases the mayors are threatened with recall, and in other cases it appears there is active political pressure prior to election.'

" 'In any case the matter is too great to be handled by local officials alone, since the organized criminal element operates on a national scale across State boundaries.' "

A memorandum from the operating director of the Crime Commission of Greater Miami, Miami, Fla., dated January 20, 1950, which was received by the committee, states on page 3 thereof, as follows in quoting the results of a grand jury investigation dated November 13, 1944:

"The 'wire service' and the telephones are the lifeblood of the horse-booking racket. The 'wire service,' national in scope, is a network of leased circuits from the many horse-track locations to centers of population where the politicians permit bookmaking."

The same memorandum on page 5 thereof states as follows in regard to gambling:

"Large gambling syndicates made up of nationally known criminals have been organized in recent years. A large number of these criminals in former years engaged in burglaries, robberies, murders, and in those violations over which the Federal Government took investigative and prosecutive jurisdiction, namely, white slavery, narcotics, auto thefts, bootlegging and rum running, and other violations. Undoubtedly, these nationally known criminals have gone into the gambling racket because no local investigative agency can follow their interstate gambling transactions."

The same memorandum on page 6 quotes the grand jury's report filed on November 7, 1949, relative to the criminal element located in south Florida, as follows:

"We feel that the Federal Government would find it a very profitable field to investigate these people regarding the sources of their income and the origins of their wealth by which they can live in such ostentation among us and purchase valuable and expensive properties and businesses. We feel that proper investigation of these individuals would reveal violations of Federal laws just as investigations in the past have done with other criminals who rose to wealth and notoriety. We recommend that a coordinated investigative body from the various Justice and Treasury Department units be established here to look into these persons' activities."

The memorandum of the Crime Commission of Greater Miami, dated January 20, 1950, further states as follows:

"The difficulty of any local law-enforcement agency regardless of how large it may be to cope with national gambling syndicates should be manifest. Through services provided by the Nation-wide bookie wire services, and in some instances by radio, these gambling syndicates can obtain one of the only two essentials for successful gambling operations, namely, up-to-the-minute information on entries, scratches, and final odds. After the race is run the bookie wire services provide almost instantaneous information on the names of the winners and the mutuel prices paid. This information is one essential requirement in the successful operation of any large bookmaking syndicate. The second essential is, of course, the necessary corruption of public officials that will insure uninterrupted continuance of the syndicate's illegal operations. The promotion of gambling by the bookie wire services poses another problem to local law-enforcement agencies in view of the recognized opinion that the wire services are now controlled by the old Capone syndicate."

The memorandum of the Crime Commission of Greater Miami, dated January 23, 1950, on page 2 thereof, states as follows:

"Another practical difficulty in suppressing large-scale gambling rackets comes about through the operations of the bookie wire services, which is a Nation-wide service primarily designed only for providing necessary information to organized gamblers and bookmakers. The wire services, operating within the present laws, continuously are striving to increase their net income. This can only be done by increasing the total number of customers, that is, increasing the number of bookmakers, gambling houses, and gamblers they service. Endeavors on the part of local authorities to suppress local gambling are resisted as much by the bookie wire services as they are resisted by gamblers themselves. Experience in the past 3 years has shown that even the power and authority of an entire State is scarcely sufficient to restrict the flow of this bookie wire service to gamblers and gambling syndicates. Even the States are restricted in what actions they can take by the fact that these services are operating in interstate commerce with facilities over which the Federal Communications Commission has jurisdiction."

The Federal Government through the Office of the Attorney General of the United States has also interested itself in the subject, as is indicated in an article from the San Francisco Chronicle, dated January 11, 1950, which in part states as follows:

"McGrath announced that the annual United States attorneys' conference on February 16 will be attended by four groups representing local authorities active in the drive against bookies, numbers operators, slot-machine kings, and other law violators who operate across State lines."

In addition to the foregoing, there are in the file of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, among the data therein contained, which the committee deems to be related to the subject matter on which Senate Resolution 202 is based, the following:

1. Criminal Justice, the Journal of the Chicago Crime Commission.
2. Gambling, Should It be Legalized? by Virgil W. Peterson, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission.
3. The Cities and Crime, by Virgil W. Peterson.
4. Memorandum from the New Jersey State Senate Judiciary Committee, by John J. Winberry, of Rutherford, N. J.

The committee believe that there is need for the investigation and report as proposed, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be reported favorably.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think I need not go into the matter of the public interest and demand for an inquiry of this kind. The press of the Nation has served a very great purpose in calling to the attention of the public, through newspaper articles and editorials, the efforts and the activities of certain alleged criminals and law violators to try to corrupt local officials in some cases. The radio commentators have performed a great public service in explaining the extent of the operations of some of the persons who are alleged to operate illegally in interstate commerce. Many articles have appeared in most of the great magazines of the Nation.

It should also be pointed out that the Attorney General of the United States, the Intelligence Service of the Treasury Department, the enforcement division of the Treasury Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation all have taken steps in the effort to expose these alleged criminals and to protect the public from their operations. It should be pointed out, however, that most of their operations, according to newspaper reports, are not in violation of the present Federal laws, but they are operating in interstate commerce in violation of the laws of many States.

In November of last year I drafted a bill designed to prohibit the interstate shipment, of certain gambling devices, which are in violation of the law of the State to which the shipment is to be made. I also began the preparation, with the assistance of the legislative counsel, of a bill imposing penalties upon the users for illegal purposes of information coming over the wires in interstate commerce. After working on the bills and after talking with a number of experts who know a great deal about the operations in interstate commerce of gamblers and of criminals, I came to the conclusion, that, as stated by the experts, before any laws could be very intelligently considered by the Congress, or before the reaction of public opinion could be secured on them, there should be a development at least to the extent it was possible to get it of the over-all picture of interstate syndicates, if there are such, who operates them, how they operate, what the source of their power is, what communications they use, and what corrupting influence if any they may have or attempt to have on governing bodies and officials.

So, Mr. President, on January 5, I filed a resolution for the purpose of investigating generally the subjects I have stated, in order to develop if possible the over-all picture of interstate gambling and crime. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee appointed——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. For the purpose of clarity, may I ask the Senator to be kind enough to state for the record that the resolution which he offered on January 5, 1950, was Senate Resolution 202?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; that is correct. It was Senate Resolution 202. The legislative history since that time, as I remember, has been about this: The Chairman of the Judiciary Committee appointed a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], to consider the resolution. After the resolution was amended in several respects, upon suggestions, which I think were very good, from the Senator from Missouri and from the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Nevada, and after some delay occasioned by the preparation of the report of the subcommittee, the resolution was finally reported by unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary on February 27.

In the meantime, following up an announcement in December, that he would do so, the Attorney General of the United States called a crime conference to meet in Washington. The conference met here about the middle of February. It consisted of mayors, district attorneys, law enforcement officers of all kinds, and State's attorneys. There was a very worth-while discussion and a hearing participated in by all these representatives as to what crime conditions were in their respective States, and as to whether there was a field into which the Federal Government might enter for

the purpose of assisting the local law enforcement officers in the enforcement of laws of the States and of the local communities. I may say that a great many excellent public officials attended the conference. They all seemed to feel that there should be an over-all investigation in order to complete the picture.

As a result of the conference, a legislative committee was appointed. This legislative committee, with the assistance of the Attorney General, prepared two bills: one, a bill to prevent the interstate shipment of gambling devices; the other, a bill to prohibit the communication companies from sending over the wires certain types of information or communications, which might result in betting or gambling, and placing the responsibility for enforcement largely upon the companies, as a regulatory measure.

Those bills were transmitted to the President by the Attorney General, with a letter, and to the Vice President, as President of the Senate, with letters from the President and the Attorney General, I believe. I had an opportunity of talking with the Vice President and also with the Parliamentarian about the bills, and of examining them before they were submitted, thinking that perhaps they should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. But, following the precedents, which I could not dispute, the Parliamentarian and the President of the Senate felt that they should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I may say in that connection, however, that had the bills been written as penal measures, or as amendments to the criminal code, they would have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. But the communications field is of course peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A few days prior to the submission of these bills, I, together with other members of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration to request funds with which to carry out the purposes of the resolution. At that time the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] appeared, saying he understood these bills were coming up and would be referred to his committee, that he thought the matter should be held up, and that if the bills went to his committee, his committee should get the money for the investigation rather than the Committee on the Judiciary. But in any event the Committee on Rules and Administration reported, with two amendments, the resolution which had been acted on by the Committee on the Judiciary. One was that the Judiciary Committee should make its report not later than July 31, 1950; the other was, that the committee would have $50,000 for the investigation instead of $100,000, as contained in the resolution as reported. The bills to which I have referred were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield. I was going to make a statement about the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Then I withhold my question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The report of the Committee on Rules and Administration was handled by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and as chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. They, I understand were responsible for the inclusion of these two amendments. I want to say that these distinguished Senators told me at the time—I thought, somewhat in confidence, but they have later stated it publicly, so I have no hesitation in telling what they said—that if this committee got under way and made good progress, they would join in recommending that the committee be given the full $100,000 which had been requested, and also that the committee be given more time in which to make its report; that they thought the shorter time and the smaller amount of money would be useful for the purpose of letting the Senate and its committees see by that time what kind of progress we were making. I think that is substantially the attitude of the members of the subcommittee. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I think the minutes of the meetings held by the committee, if minutes were kept, will indicate that the original request, as it came to the Committee on Rules and Administration, was for $50,000. It was raised to $100,000, and the subcommittee, of which the Senator from Kansas was a member, together with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], reported to the Committee on Rules and Administration that the report of July 30 or 31 was a preliminary report. I think the records of the committee will so indicate. The Senator from Tennessee just said that a statement was made to the effect that the subcommittee would join in further recommendations. In the absence of the distinguished Senators whom I have mentioned, I want the RECORD to show that it was the members of the subcommittee who clearly understood, and so reported to the full Committee on Rules and Administration, that it was a preliminary report, that additional funds would be needed, that if the investigation would be thorough and complete and would not be a whitewash investigation in any sense of the word, that we would go before the appropriate committee and ask for sufficient money to continue to conduct such an investigation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I want to join, Mr. President, in saying that the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the full Committee on Rules and Administation, have shown the very heartiest cooperation and have given assurance that they would endorse the investigation to the fullest extent. I have no complaint as to the cooperation I have received from the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator from Tennessee any concrete ideas as to what, if any, new Federal legislation will be required after the investigation is completed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that I have some ideas as to what types of legislation may be required, but as to whether the facts would justify them or as to whether the kind of legislation I have thought of would be the kind that should be passed, I am unable to say until we can secure more facts.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will not the Senator have difficulty in drawing the line between interstate crime and State crime? Where is the boundary line located?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer to the Senator from Texas, there are many things that are possible in interstate commerce which are in violation of the laws of the respective States, I think, in the field of transportation of gambling devices, and communications which are used illegally in various States, perhaps in connection with some phases of the narcotic laws, perhaps the strengthening of the Fugitive Felon Act, and other items which I might mention. It is time for the Congress to consider whether it cannot throw some blocks in the way of the alleged big-time gamblers and criminal operators about whom the public is complaining so much.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not indicating any interest in the gambling fraternity. But gambling is not the only crime. With reference to prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices from one State to another, that would result in each State making its own gambling devices. Someone would establish a plant in each State to make such devices.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator for his observation, but the general consensus of opinion is that if the vehicle of interstate commerce were denied to a great many of these transactions, the operators would have much difficulty in conducting their operations, because there are clearances of money and clearances of information across State lines vital to the gambling syndicates, according to the reports of crime commissions.

Mr. President, the situation regarding the amount of money required is that originally the resolution referred only to gambling and racketeering. The resolution provided $50,000, but the chairman of the full committee suggested that it should be much more. The scope of the committee was enlarged, so that the Judiciary Committee wrote in $100,000. It

was the Committee on Rules and Administration which reduced the amount from $100,000 to $50,000. But I think there is no doubt that if the investigation had been proceeding and making reasonable progress, members of the Committee on Rules and Administration would have been the first to authorize additional money.

Mr. President, in that situation, with two resolutions for investigations almost identical in their terms, one by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the other investigation to be conducted by the Judiciary Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce announced that it was beginning hearings on the two specific bills it had before it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator spoke of two resolutions which were almost identical. Was he referring to Senate Resolution 202 as reported from the Committee on the Judiciary and later from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and Senate Resolution 249 as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. May I inquire of the Senator from Tennessee if under Senate Resolution 202 an investigation was not only to be made of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the laws of the United States, but, in addition, the inquiry was to include the question whether the utilization of such facilities was in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the laws of the State in which the transactions occur? Is not that provided for in Senate Resolution 202?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Is there in the opening sentence of Senate Resolution 249 any reference to the laws of the States in which the transactions occur?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is not, in the opening sentence, but I shall invite the Senator's attention——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, perhaps I should have stated it all in one question, because I do not want to mislead in any sense. There is nothing in the opening sentence of Senate Resolution 249 which refers to the utilization of the facilities of interstate commerce in furtherance of violations of law in the State in which the transaction occurs, but there is in a subsequent sentence, namely, the sentence in Senate Resolution 249 which says that such investigation shall include but shall not be limited to a determination of certain things. There are, in fact, two references to violations of the laws of the States or the hampering or corruption of officers of the law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. The coverage which could be made under each of these resolutions would be substantially the same. In that situation the junior Senator from Tennessee tried several times to secure consideration, by unanimous consent, for Senate Resolution 202. It was objected to from time to time. Some Senators said they would object because certain Members of the Senate were out of town. That was shortly before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee started its hearings.

The hearings commenced, and still the junior Senator from Tennessee was unable to get either resolution off the calendar. The hearings started before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. At that time it seemed to the junior Senator from Tennessee that the only way the investigation he had in mind could be made was to have a resolution considered which would consolidate the investigations. It was proposed by the majority leader and the Democratic Policy Committee, and agreed to by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], that both committees call off their separate investigations, that they be not competing investigations, that the committee's membership be taken from the membership of the two committees, that the amount authorized for the investigation be increased to $150,000, and that the July 31 dead line be stricken out. I joined in that recommendation and agreed to present for the consideration of the Senate a proposed substitute in order to carry it out.

The compelling reasons for which I have offered a substitute were, first, I felt it would be very difficult to get Senate Resolution 202 up for consideration if two committees were to make the same investigation. Second, it would look bad for Congress to authorize such a duplication of effort. It certainly would not impress the public very favorably to have two senatorial committees covering substantially the same ground separately calling witnesses from distant cities to give testimony on the same subject.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator speaks of two investigations going on side by side. Neither Senate Resolution 202 nor Senate Resolution 249 has been adopted by the Senate. Am I not correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

However, I say frankly to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, if one were adopted, both would be adopted. Furthermore, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, conducting hearings on separate bills, would probably go ahead with this same kind of inquiry.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like the Senator to be kind enough to tell the Senate the reason why he thinks or thought that if one of the two resolutions, Senate Resolution 202 or Senate Resolution 249, should be adopted, that the other, which would provide, as the Senator puts it, for practically a duplicatory investigation, would also be adopted. Would not the Senate differentiate and determine which of the two it wanted and not be confronted with the alternative of having two investigations going on at the same time? Why does the Senator think and why did he think that the Senate would adopt two resolutions providing for duplicatory investigation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the Senator that I thought so originally, but that later I decided the Senate probably would not adopt either resolution. The reason I thought so was—and the Senator was present—that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce said, "When one of these bills comes to us we will have to insist on its passage." They drew up a resolution, and, except for the fact that an agreement had been worked out, the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Arizona would be insisting that their resolution be agreed to. The only reason they dropped the matter, in my opinion, was because an agreement was worked out.

Frankness compels me to say to the Senator from Missouri that on the record so far, aside from the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary thought of the matter first and started action on it first, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce probably has a little superior claim to making the investigation over the Committee on the Judiciary. That has reference to the bills which have been introduced. However, as I said before, the bills could have been so written that they would have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. There might also have been many other things to supplement the picture. Bills could have been introduced which would have gone to the Committee on the Judiciary. I can even imagine some bills which might have gone to the Committee on Finance. Bills dealing with counterfeiting, for example, would have gone to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator spoke in substance of his view that perhaps the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has gotten a little further along with the subject matter than the Committee on the Judiciary. I take it that the Senator will agree with me, will he not, that it is not with respect to Senate Resolution 249, which, as the Senator indicated, duplicates Senate Resolution 202, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has made that further progress, because both resolutions are still before the Senate and neither has been acted on? Is it not true that the only progress the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has made ahead of the Committee on the Judiciary is on two entirely different bills, namely, Senate bill 3357, which the Senate passed on April 19, 1950, relating to the transportation of gambling devices, and Senate bill 3358, on which extensive hearings have been held by the Committee

on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and which relates to the prohibition of transmission of certain gambling information? In other words, the point to which I desire to invite the Senator's attention is that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary are in precisely the same situation at this very moment with respect to Senate Resolution 249 and Senate Resolution 202, namely, that neither of them has been adopted by the Senate. Therefore there is no reason in the world to think that the Senate in its good judgment would authorize duplicating investigations by adopting both resolutions? Am I not correct in my conclusion?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am afraid I do not agree that the Senator is correct in his conclusion. In the first place, since there is a good deal of legislation in this field which is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I must say I think they have as good a right to present a resolution providing for an investigating committee, or to have their committee make the investigation, as has the Committee on the Judiciary. As I said before, on the basis of where the bills dealing with the matter have so far come to rest, that committee probably has a little superior claim. However, it is true that neither Senate Resolution 249 or Senate Resolution 202 have been adopted and both committees are in the same condition as to those resolutions. However, this point has always been in my mind; I think the Senator from Missouri will agree that the two bills covering the transportation of gambling devices and gambling in connection with communications, represent, so far as the gambling and the criminal features are concerned, a large part of the subject matter. Already the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has gone into many aspects of the criminal situation in the country, and plans to go into more. That has been done notwithstanding the efforts of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] to try to limit it to communications. However, the two are inextricably interwoven when it comes to what happens in connection with bookmaking and numbers rackets, telephone information and Western Union information. So it is hardly possible to investigate one part of it without investigating the other.

It was intended at the time the agreement was made that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would call off their investigation, and that the whole matter would be handled by members from both committees, so that whether the legislation went to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee or to the Committee on the Judiciary, there would be members on the so-called joint or special committee who probably would stand in the position of a subcommittee for their respective committees, and the subject was to be considered by the whole committees.

It was also discussed a time or two, I may say to the Senator from Missouri, that in the event the Committee on the Judiciary made the investigation, and found that there were some very important things which should be done, or legislation which should be passed, in connection with the wire services or communications, and the public became concerned about it and demanded the passage of legislation, the members of the other committee might resent though, perhaps not outwardly, having given much consideration to the problem, that the Judiciary Committee had stirred it all up and then passed it on to the other committee. That was mentioned in private conversations a few times.

So that in the effort to have a real investigation by the two committees which were most interested, and in order to try to get immediate consideration of the legislation, I did endeavor to bring the matter up the day following the agreement, but was unable to do so. I suggested tht we try to vote on the following day, but the Senator from Missouri thought more time would be needed for debate; and I am not criticizing him for that. I tried to bring it up on other occasions before the investigation by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee had gone so far.

There is another point to be considered in that connection. For instance, an editorial from the Miami Daily News says:

> The Senate joint committee investigation approved by Democratic policy leaders into nationally-organized crime is not to be confused—though the public be understandably of that opinion—with the Senate commerce subcommittee probe already begun. The latter has made the headlines the last few days with a parade of witnesses whose prominent names have been matched by equally prominent denials of useful information.

The press and the people of the country are deriving the impression that the demand in the Senate to investigate organized crime in interstate commerce, and to investigate the efforts to corrupt local public officials, is actually resulting in an investigation being carried on. Of course, that is going to diminish, to a considerable extent, the demand for such an investigation.

I think it would have been very much in the public interest if both committees could have started work on the matter together, as was originally intended.

I also think it is fair to say, and I believe the Senator from Missouri will agree, that whether the committee had been the Judiciary Committee, or whatever investigation had been carried on, at least as to about half the witnesses who have been called before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, any committee making a similar investigation would have called those witnesses. The first one would have been the Attorney General of the United States, of course, and perhaps Mr. Hoover, then Mr. Wayne Coy, of the Federal Communications Commission, and representatives of the mayors, the State attorneys general, and the Attorney General's legislative committee, which drafted the bill. All these would have been called.

Of course, as to others who have been called, the chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee said that they were not interested in crime, so there was not very much investigational and staff work to be done before some of the other witnesses would have been called. I think under the investigation we have envisioned, there would have been a great deal of information obtained about certain other witnesses before they were actually put on the stand.

I think we would be able to have a better investigation, a more satisfactory one, and would be in a better position to have some legislation passed, if legislation is found necessary, in addition to the bills which are now proposed, if the investigation could be carried on in the way I have suggested.

For my own part, I know there have been numerous charges about politics. I have stated frankly and fairly the motivating influences which cause me to go along with the chairmen of the two committees in this connection.

Mr. President, very briefly, I wish to indicate what I would do if I should have any connection with the committee. Of course, I am a novice in the United States Senate and have not had as much experience with congressional committees as many of the other Members of the Senate have, but as chairman of the committee which investigated Judge Johnson, who impeached himself by resigning, by relinquishing his office, or by saying he would not run for office, and signing a statement to that effect, I had some experience along investigational lines. A majority of the committee voted against impeachment proceedings because of Judge Johnson's action in signing the statement, but I voted for them. We operated that committee without any politics being brought into the matter whatsoever, although local pressures were brought on both sides of the aisle, because both Democrats and Republicans were involved.

It would be my purpose, if I had anything to do with the direction of the committee, in the first place to have it understood with the committee that the object was not to smear anybody or to whitewash anybody, that what we wanted to get were the facts, and if anybody got hurt with the facts, he would just get hurt; that on the other hand we did not want to harm the names of good, innocent people, and we would try to work with people, either in executive meetings of the committee or in private meetings, or through staff consultations, and go over the facts and circumstances, before they were actually brought out in the public hearings, so that we would be sure we had something to go on when charges were made in public hearings.

I think the practice of allowing charges to be made in committees which do damage to the names of good people is not reflecting too much credit on Congress. There are proper ways of conducting congressional committees. I have always had the feeling that the way the Truman committee went about its business was most commendable and that the Truman committee was the greatest congressional committee I have ever known anything about. I have talked with many persons about the

methods of the Truman committee, and in the committee which investigated Judge Johnson, we followed almost identically the same methods, in the first place finding out what we had in the way of facts, what sort of case we could make, and whether it would stand up. We would determine by staff investigation where we were going before we had a public hearing and any charges were made. I understand that there was a kind of a pretrial practice in the Truman committee of any case to see whether they did have facts and circumstances which could be made public.

Mr. President, another consideration is that this is going to be a committee's committee, at least I hope so. I trust the work can be done on the basis of nonpartisanship, that no one on the committee will feel that there is anyone to be prosecuted or smeared, and also that there is nobody to be protected, that we can go at our investigation on the basis of the facts, and develop them.

I know that some men think we are not getting after some people hard enough, and others may feel we are pushing some too hard.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Permit me to finish my statement. I know also that there will be some disappointment respecting the amount of work we may be able to perform in various local communities. I now have in my files requests from law-enforcement officers or officials of 19 important cities in the country setting forth that conditions involving interstate crime exist in their communities, which they would like to have investigated. But I think the public should understand in the first place that, as has been stated so often, the crimes committed in various communities are largely of local concern. While some local officials perhaps would like to transfer their burdens to the FBI to enforce their laws where they have been unable to do so yet, it is almost always primarily a matter for local enforcement if we are really to have law enforcement. The Federal Government is not interested in getting into everyone's back yard and trying to enforce laws which the local communities should themselves enforce. So I am quite sure we are not going to be able to go into as much detail in the investigation as we would like to. Many persons may be disappointed.

For instance, this afternoon I received copies of two stories from the Providence Journal-Bulletin, written by John Strohmeyer, one dated May 1, the other dated May 2. If half the allegations made in these two stories can be proved, it would take a senatorial committee 6 months, I am sure, to investigate all the matters involving Boston, Providence, and other cities in New England. So there may be some disappointment as to the number of cities and the number of towns in which we can make investigations and as to the time that can be granted. I think, however, that the committee can obtain a notion of what the picture is; that we can present cases and do our work with courage, so as to enable the Federal Government to consider whether legislation should be passed, and if so, what legislation.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I have received several inquiries as to the scope of the resolution, and whether it would be the intention and the purpose of the committee to investigate the very unfortunate conditions which exist in Kansas City, Mo., my home, and the home of my family for many years.

I should now like to ask the Senator a specific question about a specific crime. Many residents of Kansas City believe that the present crime wave in that city dates back to May 27, 1947. On that date, as the Senator from Tennessee may recall, a safe in the office of the board of election commissioners was blown open and ballots that constituted evidence in 72 cases of vote fraud then pending in the circuit court of Jackson County, Mo., were carted away. This crime occurred in the courthouse, where the office of the sheriff is located, ostensibly a deputy being in attendance at all times. Across the street was the city police department. It so happened—it was a mere coincidence—that the President of the United States was sleeping some five blocks away. But it is important that the whole downtown district, ostensibly, at least was covered by Secret Service men at the time. After the crime occurred it was announced that a full and complete investigation would be made by the FBI. But from that day to this no arrests have been made, no indictments have been returned.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether under the language of the proposed resolution his committee, in his opinion, would be authorized to make a full and complete investigation of that crime?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Missouri I will say I am sure the Senator would not want me at this time to try to outline a course of action for a Senate committee which has not been formed, and of which I may not be a member, and with the direction of which I may not have anything to do. Furthermore, I am sure the Senator would not want me to make a statement prior to having had an opportunity of discussing with the committee which might be named, and with the staff of the committee, the relative importance of the concentration of gambling transactions, and what the operations have been. I am sure the Senator will agree that it would be very hard to outline the exact program that any committee should follow. I am sure the Senator does not want me to do so. But I do want to say that I think the committee, when created, should give Kansas City the exact importance to which it is entitled in relation to the committee's over-all job, and to the over-all problem with which it is trying to deal.

As I said a long time ago, so far as I am concerned there is not going to be any shying away from Kansas City. We intend to go there. If that is what the committee decides to do, we will give it the same treatment we will give Miami, Chicago, or any other city that might be involved. If the statements are true which were released by the special grand jury, which I read in the newspaper a few days ago, as to the interstate nature of gambling in the Kansas City area, statements containing allegations about the involvement of two men who have passed on, certainly that phase of the situation would be brought under the terms of the resolution, and then it would be the duty of the committee to see what effect, if any, it had on local government or an effort to corrupt local government.

As to what is involved in the vote fraud matter, I want to say frankly to the Senator I do not know. There is a very good man connected with the Department of Justice, whom I mentioned a while ago, who is with the grand jury in Kansas City, and there may be some developments in connection with that matter. But I can assure the Senator that the committee would want to obtain all the information possible from the Senators from Missouri, receive their suggestions as to how the matter could be investigated, the sources of information, and to go into the matter just as straightforwardly and as impartially as would be possible, and that Kansas City would receive the same treatment as any other section of the United States. It would receive the treatment to which it was entitled.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I seem to have been rather unfortunate today in not making myself clear. I have failed again to express the exact idea I had in mind. I meant to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether in his opinion under the resolution the committee would have jurisdiction to investigate the crime occurring under the circumstances I have outlined.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I do not know exactly what interstate aspects of the so-called ballot stealing are involved. I frankly do not know. But I say that if we find that communications across State lines are being used, and that such communications have been any source of operations of gamblers, that subject certainly is within the purview of the investigation. We should investigate how such gamblers attempt to corrupt politicians or local governments.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I understood the Federal jurisdiction would be based on a conspiracy to deprive citizens of the right to vote, the right to have their votes counted as cast. Assuming that such is the case, would the Senator believe that his committee would have jurisdiction to investigate such a crime committed under such circumstances?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution provides:

To make a full and complete study and investigation of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate

commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur.

In order to make that germane for the purpose of the investigation, I think there would have to be some connection with organized crime operating across State lines in violation of the law of the State in which the crime occurs. Whether that fits the present situation, I cannot say.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I wish to say that the crime to which I have referred strikes at the very roots and basis of law and order. When we cannot have a clean election and cannot have ballots counted as they are cast, then the very foundations of our institutions are on very uncertain ground.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree fully with the Senator about that.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator from Tennessee be willing to accept an amendment, drawn in appropriate language, to give his committee authority to investigate a crime committed under the circumstances which I have outlined to the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say to the Senator from Missouri that I am going to support the resolution as written, because I think the scope of the responsibility with which the committee will be charged under this resolution is so vast and so tremendous that, of course, the committee could spend years and years without doing much more than scratch the surface.

The purpose of the resolution is to finish by February 28 whatever is required to be done. The report is to be made by that time, under the language of the substitute.

If we come to a vote on the question of increasing or enlarging the authority of the committee under the resolution as it now is written, I must say that I am opposed to enlarging it at this time. I agree that the ballot is sacred and that the preservation of the sanctity of the ballot is essential to a democracy.

The particular question now before us is whether an organized syndicate is acting to mulct the savings of many persons and to corrupt officials in certain localities and local communities, and whether that matter is one about which the Government should take some action.

I have an idea that if we successfully do what the committee will be charged with under the resolution as now written, that certainly will have a wholesome influence upon the exercise of the franchise throughout the United States.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator spoke of a report of a Federal grand jury, just released in Kansas City. Did the Senator see in the report the slightest indication that any determination had been made as to those who were responsible for the theft of the ballots in Kansas City of 1947?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did not see the full report. I only saw the newspaper account. I have written for the full report.

Mr. KEM. The Senator spoke of the skill and ability of lawyers sent to Kansas City for the purpose of investigating crime there, did he not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I referred to the skill and ability of a lawyer of the Department of Justice by the name of Max Goldschein.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Tennessee agree that nothing can be accomplished in regard to the investigation of this major crime if representatives of the Department of Justice are told to hang their clothes on a hickory limb but not to go near the water?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Senator from Missouri is trying to get into a field about which I hope we may have an understanding in connection with this entire matter. In other words, I hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will agree upon the scope of the resolution and the matters which can be investigated in connection with it, and will agree that the investigation will be made impartially, without regard either to an attempt to hurt anyone or an attempt to protect anyone.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I hope that in the entire discussion the Senator from Missouri will at least give the junior Senator from Tennessee credit for sincerity, and not at the very outset try to drag into this matter any political questions.

Mr. KEM. Oh, no.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We want to do the best we can.

Mr. KEM. I agree.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri will not be satisfied with what we do, but at least we will do our very best.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Tennessee agreed, the other day, that the question of the sanctity of the ballot was not a political question, and that there was no difference between Democrats and Republicans on that ground.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Tennessee certainly has the reputation of being a very sincere man, a reputation which I know he wishes to defend and to continue.

It seems to me that the Senator from Tennessee should make clear to the Senate and to the public whether, if the resolution is adopted, in his judgment a complete investigation will be made in Kansas City, including an investigation of this major crime which strikes at the very basis of our free institutions, or whether there will be just another superficial examination of gamblers and such persons who have been encouraged to engage in what they have done by the fact that they have seen this major assault on the rights of the people go entirely unpunished.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Missouri a question. I believe the grand jury has been operating in Kansas City for 9 or 10 months. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I assume that it has been investigating the crime committed in connection with the alleged vote fraud, and everything else about it. I do not know how long the Senator might think it would take the Senate committee to investigate the vote fraud. If we were also called upon to make a detailed investigation of alleged frauds in many other States where frauds have been alleged, does not the Senator from Missouri think the resolution should be reworded, and should be cast in such a manner as to permit the investigation to move in another direction?

I understand that in the Eightieth Congress a Subcomittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration made many investigations in many parts of the United States—in West Virginia, in Maryland, in Kansas City, as I recall, and in various other places. It seems to me that if that is to be the only thing this committee is to do, the other job should be the work of the other committee.

Mr. KEM. I have not suggested to the Senator that his committee investigate any vote frauds. If he thinks I have suggested that, he has misunderstood me.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought that was what the Senator meant.

Mr. KEM. The statute of limitations has run on the vote frauds committed in the election in Kansas City in 1946. It is beyond the power of the President, the Department of Justice, or the district attorney to punish at this time those responsible for those frauds.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then I misunderstood the Senator from Missouri, for I thought he was talking about the vote frauds.

Mr. KEM. But on May 27 of this year the statute of limitations will run on the theft of the ballots. I am interested in knowing whether the Senator from Tennessee is interested in investigating the theft of the ballots which occurred on May 27, 1947.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say to the Senator that I would certainly be interested in investigating that, if it is within the purview of this resolution. However, if we are going to investigate ballot frauds and ballot thefts and what not, which have occurred in various parts of the United States—at least, it has been alleged that there have been similar situations in other localities—I certainly think that we shall at least have to find some tie-in with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and we shall have to have a great deal more money than the amount of money provided in any of the resolutions.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee know of any theft of ballots which is at all comparable to the one which occurred on May 27, 1947, in Kansas City?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly I agree with the Senator that they have received more notoriety and public attention than any others I have heard of.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator agree it is deservedly so?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly think so. I am sure no Member of the Senate would agree that any ballot theft should be condoned.

Mr. KEM. If I may ask the Senator a final question, in the event the Senator determines on further consideration that his resolution would not permit the committee to investigate the theft of ballots which occurred in Kansas City, Mo., on May 27, 1947, will the Senator accept an amendment drawn in appropriate language which will give the committee that power and authority?

The junior Senator from Tennessee is going to defend the resolution as here presented.

Then there is no reason for the public to be given the impression that the Senator from Tennessee has in mind making such an investigation. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know what impression the public is going to gain. I have not said whether the committee would make the investigation or not, because I do not know whether there is an interstate tie-up. If it is a crime involving interstate commerce, it would be the duty of the committee to make the investigation; if it is not, it would not be its duty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee, because I am particularly interested in the objective of his resolution and the purposes for which it is prepared and to which it is directed. I want to make a comment, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is this: There seems to be some concern as to what the public might think regarding the purpose and objective of the resolution. I think one thing ought to be crystal clear, namely, that the resolution itself will not save America from sin or from crime.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. I should be glad if the Senator would expand on that idea. I think it needs enlargement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purposes of the resolution are to aid the municipal, county, and State officials, and to extend the helping hand of the Federal Government insofar as the interstate commerce aspects of organized crime may be concerned. I surely want to commend the Senator particularly on the proposals which he has suggested as possibly being within the purview of the committee, legislative suggestions for proposals such as the banning of shipment of gambling devices between the States, and also the matter of sending communication materials or information. But I think it is important, as this resolution is discussed and as the body of the RECORD is developed about the nature of the resolution, to realize that law enforcement cannot take place out of the Congress, that what the Congress can do under the terms of the resolution is to redefine certain laws, to prepare some new laws. But, basically, law enforcement is a local governmental responsibility.

I desire to make a further observation, because I have had a little bit of experience along this line. All too often one of the real reasons for the lack of good law enforcement in a community is the failure of the citizen population to take any interest in their local governmental affairs. I hope that as this committee goes into the interstate aspects of crime and as it makes investigations of the respective municipalities or areas, questions will be asked as to how many people voted in the last municipal election. Another question: How much money do you appropriate for your police department? Another question: How many police officers do you have in your city per square mile? Another question: To what extent have you mechanized or modernized your police department? Do you have a crime laboratory? Do you have motor-vehicle equipment? Are you up-to-date in your police-training methods?

I may take a look at my own State. The Governor of my State is not a member of my political party, but there are no slot machines in my State. They are not there because the Governor of the State drove them out. Interstate crime or no interstate crime, there simply are no slot machines. I may say with equal candor there are none left in the city of Minneapolis. We have plenty of interstate crime. If we get Federal, State, and county officials who have the will and the intestinal fortitude to enforce the law, they will do a great deal of law enforcing, particularly if the people will support them.

One of the worst things that could happen would be to have the Federal Government take over the responsibility of local law enforcement. I know that the purpose of this resolution is to have the Federal Government only aid in it, and I think it is a wonderful and, let me say, a very important aspect, of a law-enforcement program.

I mention this, because I am of opinion that somehow or other some persons are going to get the idea that if we investigate crime, crime will, in a way, disappear, and that we shall have a nice moral utopia. That simply is not going to be the case, because, even though we pass a new Federal law, there will still be violators, and those violators will not all be apprehended by an FBI. They will have to be apprehended by local police officers as well as by Federal officers.

I hope this resolution will be agreed to. As the committee develops its case and prepares its legislative suggestions, I hope that the chairman and the other members of the committee will interrogate those who come before it from municipalities, from counties, and from State governments, as to just what they are doing back home really to enforce the law.

I shall make no further comment, except as we possibly discuss the resolution more fully in the debate, but I want to assure the Senator from Tennessee of my support. I know that he has given great study to this proposal. I know that the municipal and State officials are strongly in support of his resolution, and I know that he will want to keep this committee within the bounds of the terms of the resolution, and to place the major responsibility for law enforcement where it really belongs, back in the local community, where the local people develop their own standards of conduct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the observation of the Senator from Minnesota, and I hope that in the discussion and, if the resolution is adopted in the public estimation of it, no city, municipality or State will get the idea that this committee is for the purpose of undertaking to solve their difficulties and to ferret out criminals in their section. As stated by the Senator from Minnesota, that could only do harm; it could do no good.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will yield in a moment. The impetus for law enforcement must always be local. The only purpose this committee can serve is to get a sufficiently comprehensive over-all picture of the various ways in which crime may be operating in interstate commerce, to see what, if any, legislation may be passed to assist the local communities, but not to take over their primary responsibility.

I should like to say, and then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri, that in my references to the inquiry which has been held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I can do nothing but pay high commendation and compliment to the chairman and other members of that subcommittee upon the hearing they have had. Bills were presented to them, which it was, of course, their duty to consider. It was their duty to hear witnesses. I understand they have not as yet finished their hearings. So, undoubtedly, the testimony secured at the hearing will be of great benefit to this committee, if and when it gets started.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if it is a fact that the substitute which he has announced he will support and in advocacy of which he speaks provides for a special committee composed of five members. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Are they to be appointed by the President of the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. The resolution, as the Senator originally presented it on January 5, 1950, provided that the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make the study and investigation. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Under the provisions of the resolution as it was initially presented by the Senator from Tennessee, there was no number prescribed as to the membership of the subcommittee, was there?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator this question: I note his earnest interest, which I know of from my conversation with him in the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I notice his having sent to Kansas City for a copy of the grand-jury report. Am I to understand, however, that the Senator does not know who is to be the chairman of the five-member special committee should his substitute be adopted?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and also the majority leader, have expressed a desire that the junior Senator from Tennessee be named as chairman; but I cannot say that the committee will elect me chairman.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I notice in the Washington Evening Star of April 11 the statement:

> Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who proposed the Judiciary Committee inquiry, probably will be chairman, according to Senator LUCAS.

In the Washington Post of April 12 there is this statement:

> Senator KEFAUVER, the Tennessee Democrat, who has proposed a Senate investigation of the "tygoons," the big-time racketeers, will "in all probability," be the chairman, LUCAS said.

Does the Senator know whether any assurance has been given in advance as to who is to be the chairman of the committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly no assurance has been given to me. As I stated, all three Senators whom I mentioned expressed the hope that I might be chairman. I do not see how any assurance could be given, of course, because, in the first place, I might not be named on the committee, and, in the second place, the committee might very well decide to name another chairman. As I contemplate the job the committee is going to have, I wish they would name another chairman, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I desire to invite the Senator's attention to an article appearing in Newsweek on April 24, 1950, which refers to the initial resolution, Senate Resolution 202. I do not think it refers to it by number, but it speaks of it in this language:

> Because no man is more against sin than a United States Senator, the bill seemed slated for quick passage. It was unanimously reported out by the Judiciary Committee on February 27 and placed on the Senate Calendar less than a month later by the Rules Committee, which first chopped its $100,000 appropriation in half and placed a July 31 limit on the investigation.

I take it that the Senator has no doubt that it is Senate Resolution 202 to which the article refers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to read to the Senator from the article from Newsweek. I shall read it with the quotation marks which are contained in it, and then I shall ask the Senator for his comments:

> What worried the Democrats was the possibility that FERGUSON'S experience would make him the strongest man on the subcommittee.

I might say that the reference is to the junior Senator from Michigan, as appears earlier in the article.

> What worried the Democrats was the possibility that FERGUSON'S experience would make him the strongest man on the subcommittee. Since most big city political machines are controlled by Democrats, the fear grew that the subcommittee's findings could well be used against the administration in the coming crucial election.
>
> When, 2 weeks ago, Senator ED JOHNSON, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, introduced the two anti-gambling bills the worried Democrats found a way out of their dilemma. Ostensibly to reconcile the clashing jurisdictions of the two committees, the Democratic policy group last week decided on a five-man special committee—three Democrats and two Republicans—to be appointed by Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY. In this way, less able Republican investigators could be named. "We just don't want to have any part of Ferguson," said one top Democrat. "He'd move the thing into Kansas City and New York and we'd never get him out of there." With Ferguson out of the way, the Democratic Party could continue to be against sin—with considerably less risk.

I should like to ask the Senator to be kind enough, if he will, to make what comment he desires. I ask him, also, if he knows who the person described as "one top Democrat" is, who is quoted in this article as saying, "We just don't want to have any part of FERGUSON. He'd move the thing into Kansas City and New York and we'd never get him out of there."

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator for reading that comment from Newsweek.

I do not know who wrote the statement, and, to my knowledge, I do not think I ever talked with any reporter of Newsweek about this matter. At least, I did not know it if I did. I certainly do not know what top Democrat they were quoting. I can say they were not quoting the junior Senator from Tennessee.

So far as the original subcommittee consisting of five members is concerned, the motivating circumstances and reasons why I felt this was a good substitute I have already stated. I want to say, with perfect candor, to the Senator from Missouri, that I have not considered personalities in the matter. I have not made any recommendations or suggestions about who should be named, either before the compromise or substitute was agreed upon, or since that time.

I have a feeling, Mr. President, that the public is very much interested in the matter and that they are not going to look very kindly upon political considerations, either for smearing or for whitewashing anyone, and that there should not be any political conflict. This person drew his own conclusion. Whom he may have talked with, I do not know, but I have seen similar things in other articles in the press.

Mr. President, that completes the general presentation of the measure.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Tennessee that there should be no politics in the hearings, and also, that the investigation should be thorough and directed to matters in which the public is interested.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he does not feel that the public has an intense and abiding interest in the theft of the ballots on May 27, 1947, in Kansas City, and does the Senator feel that the public is interested in seeing the persons responsible for that crime brought to justice?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The public has a great interest in it, and certainly the public wants to see whoever perpetrated that crime brought to justice.

Mr. KEM. Under those circumstances, why does the Senator from Tennessee oppose the incorporation in this resolution of language which would permit the committee to make such an investigation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think, as the committee now stands, it has a humanly impossible task already, with all the requests and the number of persons who have already been to my office and talked with me and the members of my staff. I think my personal staff has spent half its time in the past 3 months doing nothing but talking with people, answering, letters, and acknowledging mail complaints and charges which have been coming in. The committee, if it is authorized, will devote the better part of 6 months to an inquiry which is very important.

I am not saying whether or not we could go into the matter of the vote fraud or theft. Certainly it should be investigated and whoever is guilty should be brought to justice, and I hope the guilty will be brought to justice. However, if we were to investigate everything that ought to be investigated and tried to do things which people in local communities are not able to do, we would have an impossible job on our hands, as the Senator well knows. I think if all these things are to be gone into we had better have other committees appointed in order to divide up the work.

Mr. President, I hope, in view of the very precarious and tenuous parliamentary situation, with any Senator having the right to demand the regular order, that we may be able to finish consideration of the resolution before some Senator demands the regular order. I do not know whether we can go any further tonight. I have already consumed too much time. However, I know that several of us would be willing to

stay later if any Senators should wish to speak further tonight. By meeting at 11 o'clock in the morning I hope we can conclude consideration of the resolution in the early afternoon tomorrow. I yield the floor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] be granted leave of the Senate for the remainder of this week. They will be necessarily absent on official business as members of the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leaves of absence are granted.

RECESS

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 2 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John G. Erhardt, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Austria, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for appointment to the grade of rear admiral as indicated:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE LINE

Kenmore M. McManes
Frank T. Ward, Jr.

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT IN THE CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Algert D. Alexis

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 2, 1950, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Peter Anthony Abbruzzese
Paul Smith Ache, Jr.
Dwight Lyman Adams
Walter Edwin Adams
Abraham Noble Allan
John Wesley Allen, Jr.
Arthur Martens Apmann, Jr.
Luther Bachman Aull III
Thomas Adam Austin III
Charles Francis Baish, Jr.
George Lawson Ball
Thomas Henry Ball
Grady Huger Banister, Jr.
Phillip George Bardos
Cyrus Phillip Barger
Arthur Carlton Barker, Jr.
James Cross Barnes, Jr.
John Anton Barnet, Jr.
Courtenay Leonard Barrett, Jr.
Raymond Ney Barry
Thomas Martin Barry, Jr.
Boyd Truman Bashore
Richard George Bastar, Jr.
John Olin Bates, Jr.
William Joshua Baxley, Jr.
John Leo Begley
Charles Edward Bell, Jr.
Charles Hoey Bell
Aubrey Lee Benson
Elbert Devore H. Berry
Elmer Lawrence Birk
Arthur Hadfield Blair
Howard Byron Blanchard, Jr.
Harold Louis Blank
William Herbert Bloss, Jr.
Donald Lee Bohn
Lucien Eugene Bolduc, Jr.
Philip Lawrence Bolte
Warner Turner Bonfoey, Jr.
Thomas Wesley Boydston
James Franklin Boylan
Egbert Leo Brady, Jr.
William Frederick Brandes
Thomas Oliver Brandon II
Albert Gustav Breitwieser III
David Cullen Briggs
John Richmond Brinkerhoff
Howard Gallaway Brown
Vance Saunders Brown, Jr.
Joseph Peter Buccolo
Garrett Davis Buckner, Jr.
Charles Lewis Butler
Andy Joe Byers
David Herdman Cameron
Stephen Francis Cameron, Jr.
David Kay Carlisle
Robert Middleton Chambers
Malcolm Wright Chandler, Jr.
Herschel Eugene Chapman
Robert Arnold Cheney
Frank Peter Christensen, Jr.
Willard Holbrook Coates
Florian Octave Cornay
Rudolph Vincent Cosentino
Malcolm Robert Cox, Jr.
Harry Michael Coyle
John Marshall Cragin
Albert Benjamin Crawford, Jr.
Donald Phillip Creuziger
William Earl Crist, Jr.
Dale Jackson Crittenberger
Edward Painter Crockett
Victor Nicholas Cuneo, Jr.
Charles Carroll Cunningham
James Alvin Curtis
Lloyd Eugene Darland
William Lester Daugherty
Reed Ellsworth Davis, Jr.
William Daniel Davis
William Bradford DeGraf
Ralph Hoyt Detherow
Charles Frederick Dickerson, Jr.
August John Dielens, Jr.
John Emilio DiGrazia, Jr.
Louis Frederick Dixon
Harry Eugene Dodge
Phillip Henry Donahue
James Clayburn Donovan
Claude Holt Doughtie, Jr.
Robert Wilkins Douglass III
Ray Michael Dowe, Jr.
Thomas Francis Dreisonstok
James Curtis Drewry, Jr.
Frank Hall Duggins, Jr.
James Frank Dunn
Jay Bernard Durst
Roy Woodson Easley, Jr.
Robert Wayne Eastman
Kenneth Rohn Ebner
Robert Charles Edwards
Lauris Martin Eek, Jr.
Ira Robert Ehrlich
William Newsome Eichorn II
Charles William Elliot
Joe Flint Elliott
Charles Ozro Eshelman
Richard Cooper Ewan, Jr.
Donal Aloysius Fahey
John Leonard Fahs, Jr.
John William Fahy
Charles Kohl Farabaugh
Peter Buck Farrell
Salvatore Edward Fastuca
Robert Bruce Ferguson
Albert John Fern, Jr.
James Hoover Fette
Thomas Wilfred Fife, Jr.
George Clark Fifield
Philip Dudley Fischer
William Thrower Fitts III
Robert Francis Flinn
Allan Sarsfield Flynn
John Charles Fogarty
James Frank Fooshe III
George Everett Foster
Edward Jay Fox
John Edmond Fox
John Aaron Fray, Jr.
Edward Paul Freedman
Charles Douglas Friedlander
George Rae Fullerton
Richard Stanley Fye
John Robert Gaffney
Franklin Gaillard
Arnold Anthony Galiffa
Joseph Anthony Gappa, Jr.
Robert Gibbins Gard, Jr.
Leonard Joseph Garrett
Vernon Rowe Gatley, Jr.
William Keaveny Gearan
Louis Vincent Genuario
Henry Alfred Gilbert
Russell Alger Glenn
John Walsh Goldsmith
Paul Francis Gorman
Edward John Gradoville
Charles Passmore Graham
John Henry Green
Robert William Green
Thomas Patrick Greene
Thomas Upton Greer
Alfred Lee Griebling
Joseph Trundle Griffin, Jr.
Robert Marshall Grow
James Louis Guion, Jr.
Paul Lawrence Gurnee
Fredric William Haberman
Carter Burdell Hagler
John Richard Hall, Jr.
Kenneth Walter Hall
John Samuel Hamel
Frederick Joseph Hamlin, Jr.
Lyman Hutchinson Hammond, Jr.
Mark James Hanna
George Ervine Hannan
Ray Samuel Hansen
Jack Richard Hanson
Louis Bernard Hansotte
Philip Harlan Harper
Norris Eugene Harrell
John Sherman Harrold
Charles Winthrop Hayward
Falkner Heard, Jr.
LeRoy Walter Henderson
John Raymond Hendry
William Ritter Henn
Frank Andrew Henning III
Morris Joseph Herbert, Jr.
Louis George Hergert, Jr.
Robert Andrew Hetz, Jr.
James Edward Higgins
Sidney Rae Hinds
William Mullock Hinds, III
Irvin Stafford Hirsch
Richard Gurney Hoffman
Frederick Dixon Hoham, III
Robert Henry Hoisington
Leslie Page Holcomb, Jr.
Hugh Carter Holt
Francis Elliot Howard, Jr.
John Darby Howard
William Smith Howe, Jr.
James Grant Howell
George Hale Hubbard, II
Norman Failor Hubbard
James Raymond Hufnagel
David Ralph Hughes
Robert Burnett Hughes
Thomas Watkins L. Hughes, Jr.
Richard Lee Hunt
John Emory Hurst, Jr.
Philo Allan Hutcheson, Jr.
James Virgil Irons

John Francis Irwin
Lawrence Winfield Jackley
Gerhard Leonard Jacobson
Allen Burke Jennings
John Rex Jennings
Howard Oliver Johns
Malcolm Dayton Johnson
Richard Lee Johnson
Melvin Henry Johnsrud
Briggs Howard Jones
Clarence Quentin Jones, Jr.
John Griffin Jones
Mark Ellis Jones
William Robert Daniel Jones
David Duncan Joy
Gerald Patrick Kelley
William Harold Kellum
James Laflin Kelly
Edwin Lyle Kennedy
Howard Everett Kessinger, Jr.
Ira Lafayette Kimes, Jr.
Neal Bert Kindig
David Bryant King II
Francis King
George Denys Klie
William Leonard Knapp
Glenn Warren Knauer
John Jacob Koehler, Jr.
Robert Stanley Kubby
Karl Otto Kuckhahn
William Ridgely Lamdin
Philo Brendel Lange, Jr.
Donald Richard Langren
George Emory Lear
Robert Paul Leary
Burke Whitehurst Lee
Emmett Chambers Lee, Jr.
James Madison Lee
Bruce Jean Leiser
Richard Henry Lewandowski
Bennett Leonard Lewis
Harold Libert
Edmund Jones Lilly III
Roger Charles Lind
Paul Costanzo Listro
Warren Carr Littlefield
Thomas James Lobe
Kilbert Emile Lockwood
Lawrence Sherman Lodewick
Reginald Thomas Lombard, Jr.
Thomas Cameron Loper
Keith Wilson Loucks
Melville John Lougheed
Roy Elton Lounsbury
Joseph Bland Love
Frank Riley Loyd, Jr.
Lonnie Harrison Lumsden III
Raymond Richard Lunger
Robert Joseph Lunn
James Edward Lynch
Jack Vincent Mackmull
Raymond Maladowitz
Peter Mallett
Cloyce Leland Mangas
Wiley Mark Mangum, Jr.
Clark Charles Martin
Edward Francis James Mastaglio
William Mastoris, Jr.
Linwood Bertram Mather
John Snyder Matthews
Bernard Paul Matthey, Jr.
Clarence James Matthiessen
John Christopher Maxwell, Jr.
Ross Freeman Mayfield, Jr.
Robert Dana McBride
Thomas Elliott McBride, Jr.
Robert Hays McCandlish
John Edward McCleary
Offa Shivers McCollum, Jr.
Joseph Matthew McCrane, Jr.
Dan Robert McDaniel
Paul Blaine McDaniel
William Robert McDowell
Andrew Jackson Briggs McFarland, Jr.
Mark McGuire
John Tierney McKinney
Walter Clinton McSherry
Charles Franklin Means
David Sutton Meredith III
David Warren Mernan
James Drexler Michel
George Ralston Middleton, Jr.
William Henry Miehe, Jr.
Lloyd Ernst Mielenz, Jr.
Carmelo Placido Milia
John Elbridge Miller
Robert Lee Miller, Jr.
Wilfred Donald Miller
James Reagan Mitcham, Jr.
Howard Savage Mitchell
Peter Howland Monfore
David Maxwell Monihan
George Thomas Morris, Jr.
Robert Charles Morrison
Paul John Mueller, Jr.
John Michael Murphy
Kenneth Erwin Murphy
Harold George Nabhan
Pasquale Navarro
William Frederick Nelson
Charles William Newcomb
Fred Emmord Nickerson
Phillip Elmer Nicolay
James Miller Nold
Wallace Hall Nutting
John Edward O'Brien
Robert Kevin O'Connell
George Sanders Oliver
William George O'Quinn
Stanley David Osborne
Charles Junior Osterndorf
William Edwards Otis, Jr.
William White Palmer
John Victor Parish, Jr.
Howard Nixon Parks
Oliver Wolcott Parmly
Tarlton Fleming Parsons II
Hunter William Passmore
Albert McLees Paulger
Duane Melvin Pederson
Robert Benjamin Peltz
Philip Julian Pennington
Bruce Edward Petree
David Page Pettit
Wendell Edward Phillips
Lewis Andrew Pick, Jr.
Edward Martin Pierce
James Robinson Pierce, Jr.
William Franklin Pierce
Frank Augustus Pierson, Jr.
John Herbert Pigman
Ralph Donald Pinto
Douglas West Poage, Jr.
William Alexander Pogue
Arthur Gignilliat Porcher
Louis Watkins Prentiss, Jr.
Russell Bates Preuit, Jr.
George Lynwood Price, Jr.
Walter Edwin Price
Clifton Augustine Pritchett, Jr.
Stanley Marshall Prouty, Jr.
Vernon Alfred Quarstein
Edward Barney Quinn
Morton Ray
William Edgar Read
Robert Duncan Reed
George Cornelius Rees
Marvin Wade Rees
Richard Arthur Rein
Stanley Eric Reinhart, Jr.
Louis Arthur Reinken, Jr.
Philip Curtis Reybold
Mark Charles Rhoads
Lucien Edward Rising
Nelson Fred Ritter
Paul Adams Roach, Jr.
Lilbern Beryl Roberts
Robert Webb Robinson
John Francis Roehm, Jr.
Manley Eaton Rogers
Albert Leo Romaneski
Blair Arthur Ross, Jr.
James Allan Ross, Jr.
John James Ross
Roswell Emory Round, Jr.
Maurice Denman Roush
Ronald Rovenger
Milo David Rowell
Lindsay Craig Rupple
Andrew Madison Rutherford
John Jacob Saalberg
Henry Steele Sachers
Francis Alois Sailer
Donald Earl Sampson
Philip Bruce Samsey
Alfred Lang Sanderson
John David Scandling
Pedro Ivan Schira
Dean Frederick Schnoor
Allan Peter Scholl
Jared Bruce Schopper
George Harry Scithers
Theodore Anderson Seely, Jr.
Robert Jordan Seitz
Robert Ambrose Shade
George Bernard Shaffer
John Robert Shaffer
William Edward Shambora, Jr.
Joseph Fay Shankle
Stanley Paul Shankman
Jere Worth Sharp
Thomas Carter Sharp, Jr.
John Richard Shelley
Arthur Luther Shemwell, Jr.
Don Franklin Shreve
Graham McLeod Sibbles
Raymond Philip Singer
Millard Henry Singleton
Winfred George Skelton, Jr.
James Rush Skove
William Edgar Slavins
Martin Joseph Small
Clark Smith
John Harvey Smith
Samuel Waynne Smithers, Jr.
Myron Dow Snoke
Clyde Wadsworth Spence, Jr.
Henry Donald Spielman
Walter Clement Stanton, Jr.
Samuel Leroy Stapleton
Sidney Robert Steele
Edward Peter Stefanik
Irwin Ira Steinberg
William Andrew Steinberg
Richard George Steuart
Henry Ewell Strickland, Jr.
Thomas Prall Strider
Richard Maynard Strohm
Kenneth Arnold Tackus
Marshall Dillon Talbott, Jr.
Will Hill Tankersley
Grayson Dee Tate, Jr.
Francois Xavier Therrien, Jr.
Grace Gay Thomas, Jr.
James Mason Thompson
Nelson Loren Thompson
George Purefoy Tilson
Patrick David Tisdale
Charles Frederick Tonningsen
James Henderson Tormey
James Leo Trayers, Jr.
Richard Greenleaf Trefry
John Charles Trent
Paul Donald Triem
John Hunt Truesdale
Thomas Hogshead Tullidge
William Henry Tuttle, Jr.
John Ufner
Herbert Patton Underwood
Howard John Vandersluis, Jr.
Walter Monroe Vannoy, Jr.
John Horace Vanston, Jr.
Paul Schuyler Vanture
Austin Kinzey Veatch, Jr.
Ralph Hadley Viskochil
William Cooper Waddell
John Edward Wagner
John Stanley Wagoner
Ira John Ward
William Francis Ward, Jr.
Volney Frank Warner
Wilbur Moore Warren II
John Fabian Wassenberg
John William Watson, Jr.
Clarence Murphy Watters
John Lonergan Weaver
Karl Boromaeus Weber III
Warren Webster III
Leonard William Wegner, Jr.
Robert Rehm Werner
Edward Charles West
Jack Robert Wheatley
James Russell Wheaton, Jr.
Warde Franklin Wheaton

Francis Wilford White, Jr.
Robert Richard White
John Adams Wickham, Jr.
Chester Morse Willingham, Jr.
Durward Saunders Wilson, Jr.
Gail Francis Wilson
Patrick Wayne Wilson
Robert Maris Wilson
Rene Arthur Wolf
Francis Rudolph Wondolowski
Stuart Wood, Jr.
Walter Alexander Wood III
James Frederick Workman
Richard Lee Worley
Sidney Thomas Wright
Richard Robert Wyrough
William Frank Yeoman
Patrick Henry Zabel
Paul Ray Zavitz

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are coming unto Thee with many needs and desires. May this be a day of unclouded vision and joyous service.

Inspire us with a clearer understanding and a more wonderful appreciation of the greatness and glory of democracy. May we earnestly proclaim its ideals and principles. May we feel its compelling constraints and believe in the certainty of its ultimate triumph.

Grant that we may be one in spirit with all who are striving courageously and faithfully for the higher good of humanity.

May that day soon dawn when men and nations everywhere shall be members of the kingdom of peace and brotherhood.

Humbly we offer our prayer in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE AMERASIA MATTER

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been doing a little investigating on my own accord of the so-called Amerasia matter, and I am glad and pleased that I have been joined in this by the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Here were the most sensational and astounding conspiracy charges and arrests of the last war. The facts were that deep-secret American military documents had been taken illegally from Government files, much more vital documents than were involved in the recent Hiss-Chambers affair. It is a strange case, and an aroused public is curious. Six people were arrested. Three were indicted. Two paid small fines. The policy advocated by the defendants in these cases became the official American policy in China, and China, for a century friendly to America, became a satellite of Soviet Russia. I am today asking the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives to start an investigation of this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

J. T. MELSON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 597) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "liability", insert "if any."

Page 1, line 7, after "recovery", insert "if any."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB BROWN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1024) for the relief of Jacob Brown, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "and interest."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSIE LEE SPENCER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1026) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$7,500".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLEEN L. SHERWOOD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Alleen L. Sherwood, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,087.50" and insert "$587.50".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

I. D. COSSON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2719) for the relief of I. D. Cosson, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$15,000".

Page 2, line 3, after "*Provided*", insert "That such payment to such guardian shall not be made unless such guardian has been authorized by a court of competent jurisdiction to enter into a final settlement, and give a final release in full, of all claims of said minor against the United States by reason of such accident: *Provided further.*"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. NORA JOHNSON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3536) for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$504" and insert "$388.80".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELMER PIPPIN ET AL.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4164) for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$5,183" and insert "$15,183".

Page 2, line 3, after *"Provided"*, insert "That such payment to such guardian shall not be made unless such guardian has been authorized by a court of competent jurisdiction to enter into a final settlement, and give a final release in full, of all claims of said minor against the United States by reason of such accident: *And provided further."*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STELLA AVNER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4720) for the relief of Stella Avner, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "October 16, 1946" and insert "October 13, 1946".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALCIDE RAYMOND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6051, for the relief of Alcide Raymond, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,965.67 to Maud E. Raymond, widow of Alcide Raymond, Army serials No. R-203028, formerly sergeant, Battery A, Thirteenth Coast Artillery, which amount is equivalent to full retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of active-duty pay of a sergeant from November 14, 1936, to and including January 31, 1948, the date of the death of Alcide Raymond: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULE PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 5074, DEALING WITH AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 572, Rept. No. 1972), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5074) to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HIGH PRICE OF BEEF?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I protest as vicious propaganda and defamation of beef producers in Iowa and elsewhere the following article which appeared in the Washington, D. C., Daily News on April 28 and from which I quote the following:

CHICAGO.—Housewives across the Nation were reported today to be resisting higher and higher prices tagged on beef by butchers.

Analysts blamed the spiraling prices on farmers who held cattle on pasture to force prices up. Choice cuts of beef sold at about 20 cents higher than they did a month ago.

This article collapses at the first sign of a fact.

Practically the same number of cattle were on feed and slaughtered in the comparable period last year.

While beef prices to consumers went up 20 cents a pound, farmers were being paid at Chicago stockyards only about a cent and a half more per pound.

Last Thursday, on the floor of the House, I urged Members of this Congress to smoke out and order the prosecution of those responsible for unconscionable price spreads between farmers and consumers. I said then and I repeat that here is a job that my metropolitan colleagues, whose constituents are being bilked, ought to enjoy sinking their teeth into.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON POST—BROWDER?

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in the proceedings an editorial from the Washington Post of April 28, entitled "Browder's Contempt," which is probably the most incredible editorial in the history of American journalism. It should be reproduced in the form of badges to be worn by Mr. Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board, Mr. Philip L. Graham, president and publisher, and Mr. Herbert Elliston, editor, as a passport which would gain them prompt entrance into any iron-curtain country in the world. Considering the Post's performance on Browder, together with its shameless defense of Alger Hiss, it is a wonder that the Post has any American subscribers left.

MR. BROWDER'S CONTEMPT

If Mr. Earl Browder were a malicious man, he could have paid off a number of old scores in his appearance yesterday before the Tydings subcommittee. Senator HICKENLOOPER asked him to put the finger on a great many persons, some of whom very probably had shared responsibility for ousting him as general secretary of the Communist Party. But, as Mr. Browder put it, he did not intend to allow himself to be degraded to the level of Louis Budenz. And he did not propose to participate in any further extension of guilt by association.

In refusing to identify and stigmatize certain of the persons whose names were presented to him by Senator HICKENLOOPER, Mr. Browder was patently in contempt of the committee's authority. But this contempt was pretty well earned by the drift and character of Senator HICKENLOOPER's questions; and it was by no means discreditable to Mr. Browder. It did not reflect any unwillingness to assist the subcommittee in the discharge of its investigative function; Mr. Browder was as responsive as anyone could have wished to those questions relating directly to the McCarthy charges and to "disloyalty" within the State Department. But, like Mrs. Bella Dodd, who appeared before the subcommittee Tuesday evening, he firmly refused to engage in what might be called for want of a better term the onomatophilia to which Senator HICKENLOOPER appeared to be addicted.

Senators MCMAHON and TYDINGS deserve a great deal of credit for bringing the proceedings back into focus and winnowing out of Senator HICKENLOOPER's chaff the questions that Mr. Browder could answer in good conscience and with self-respect. No doubt they saved the witness from a contempt citation. They also saved the subcommittee from engaging in a kind of persecution that might have resulted in its punishing Mr. Browder for adherence to fundamental Amer-

ican decencies. Not everyone in America tests a man's loyalty to his country by his willingness to betray his former friends. The apotheosis of the informer is not yet altogether accomplished in the United States.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MIDWESTERN TOUR

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that our good President is making a little nonpolitical tour through the Midwest, and I wish, when he stops in my district, that he will tell my farmers just why, first of all, he gave the rabbit punch to the dairy farmers by signing the oleomargarine bill and, secondly, why the State Department follows that up with a knock-out blow. According to a news release today the United States will cut tariffs on butter within a month and consider tariff concessions on several hundred other items, and this in spite of the fact that our Commodity Credit Corporation today has nearly 100,000,000 pounds of good butter in storage. I think the proposal to encourage competing imports at this time is ridiculous, and I wish our President would tell my good farmers a little about that when going through my district, the Seventh of Minnesota.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to the fact that if you want all these things in this country, how far can you go in giving all the people all over the world everything they want? I say it must stop. Do you not think this is pretty near the time when you are going to wreck the American people with spending? We must stop spending and balance our outgo and income. If we want to help the American people, we better begin to help them here at home, and the only way to start is just like the gentleman from Minnesota said a minute ago; stop this administration from taking off the tariff on 2,500 articles and letting the merchandise come in from foreign countries and putting our people out of work, shutting down our industries. You have to do that first. That is one thing. The second thing is, you have to stop going into the red to the tune of $7,000,000,000 a year, or you are going to wreck our Nation. So, you are on the road to ruin. Now, let us stop that road to ruin and let us get down and get some common sense, and let the American people know pretty soon that they have a Congress that will cut down on our spending. You are laying up a great debt and expecting your children and children's children to pay the bills that you are leaving unpaid.

I say it is a sin, a sin against your children.

Yes, it is a crime to wreck our Government and that is what debt does, it wrecks anybody, it will wreck any nation if it is carried too far.

A word to the wise is sufficient. Be wise and economize. It is sensible, it is wise, it is sound.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th day of March the President sent down 21 reorganization plans. The House had a 10-day recess, but all of those plans will become effective unless rejected by either the House or Senate. If any of them are to be rejected, a vote must be taken before the 23d day of May. There are several resolutions which ask for the rejection of some of those plans, perhaps five or six, maybe more. Unless the House begins to consider some of those resolutions soon, the legislation proposed by those plans will become effective by default. It is my purpose, I think beginning tomorrow, to ask that some of those plans be given consideration under the reorganization law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has conferred with me. He knows what the situation is. I told the gentleman that after the appropriation bill was over I would get into a huddle with him and the chairman of the committee and we would make arrangements about bringing them up. Only yesterday we had a chat about the subject. Am I correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the unanimous-consent order of the House the appropriation bill pending has preference, so we cannot consider anything until after its consideration is completed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me tell the gentleman the answer. The answer is that I discovered this morning that the appropriation bill, in the opinion of one qualified to speak, is going to take all of this week and all of next week. It is physically impossible to take up those resolutions asking for the rejection of those plans and give each one consideration in the remaining time; that is, the time that will remain after the debate on this bill is finished and the 23d of May.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know; but there is nothing that can be done. The appropriation bill has the right-of-way. I assured the gentleman that when we got to where it was apparent that the consideration of this appropriation bill would be concluded in the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman and I and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] would get together and discuss the matter; that the gentleman from Michigan could take it up with his Republican colleagues on the committee and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] with his Democratic colleagues and arrange for bringing up these various resolutions of disapproval that have been introduced and reported out adversely; so there is nothing more anyone can do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That would be fine and agreeable were it not for the fact that there will not be time enough left to consider them before the 23d of May.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman cannot criticize anybody for the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not criticizing anybody. I am just seeking relief, asking that the House be permitted to act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a series of editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial that appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald; also a statement by O. R. Strackbein, chairman, National Labor-Management Council, on foreign trade policy, before the Steed subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, and in two to include newspaper editorials.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Pittsburgh Press.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a magazine article.

Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter appearing in the Washington Post from the former Undersecretary of State, Mr. Will Clayton.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two articles.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by Frank C. Waldrop on communism.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. MARIE Y. MUELLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 866) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. ASPINALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAROLINE M. NEWMARK AND MELVILLE MORITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1814) for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

GLADYS J. SENYOHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Gladys J. Senyohl.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES APPRAISERS BUILDING, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 794) for the relief of certain contractors employed in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named firms the sums herein specified, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for losses arising out of the performance of contracts or subcontracts in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.: Carthage Marble Co., $2,902.23; Herman Lawson Co., $105,286.51; James A. Nelson Co., $40,892.56; George F. Brayer Co., $23,910.04; and American Terrazzo Co., $9,283: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any such claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Carthage Marble Company, $2,902.23."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$105,286.51", and insert "$36,127.93".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "$40,892.56", and insert "$27,221.01".

Page 2, line 3, strike out "$23,910.04", and insert "$15,044.93".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "$9,283.00", and insert "$5,366.40".

Page 2, line 4, strike out the colon, and insert "Plant Rubber & Abestos Works, $8,502.17; Emil Solve, $2,483.34; Dohrmann Hotel Supply Company, $97.30; Mundet Cork & Company, $7,253.95; S. H. Pomeroy, $8,128.18; Fire Protection Products Company, $895.49; Lamson Corporation, $267.84; Texas Quarries, $790.84; Frank B. Smith, $1,509.00; Turner Resilient Floors, Inc., $4,068.02; D. N. & E. Walter & Company, $573.93; Phoenix Simpton Company, $362.13; and Acme Floors, $115.92."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JUAN ANTONIO RIVERA AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Col. Juan Antonio Rivera, the sum of $10,000; to Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Raul Valle Antelo, the sum of $10,000; to Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Jorge Diaz Romero, the sum of $10,000; to Mrs. Otto Resse, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Otto Resse, the sum of $10,000; and to Mrs. Hugo Soria, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Hugo Soria, the sum of $10,000. Such sums are in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the deaths of Col. Juan Antonio Rivera, Maj. Raul Valle Antelo, Maj. Jorge Diaz Romero, Maj. Otto Resse, and Maj. Hugo Soria, who were killed as the result of an accident in which a C–54 transport plane of the United States Air Force crashed in the Pacific Ocean approximately 1 mile off the Peruvian coast near the town of San Juan, Peru, on September 19, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the payments authorized by this act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOURDINE LIVERMORE ESTATE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5151) for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the estate of Lourdine Livermore, of Long Beach, Calif., and to pay the sum of $10,000 to the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas, of Long Beach, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said Lourdine Livermore and Dorothy E. Douglas sustained as a result of being shot by Lt. Beauford G. Swancutt of the United States Army, on March 4, 1944, at Camp Anza, Riverside, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,701.62".

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,499".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. L. SMELCER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5250) for the relief of J. L. Smelcer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. L. Smelcer, doing business as the Warrensburg Foundry, Midway, Tenn., the sum of $49,875.42. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said J. L. Smelcer against the United States arising by reason of losses sustained by him when, at the insistence of contract representatives of the Government and officials of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and upon their assurance that he would be reimbursed for any losses occasioned thereby, he entered into the production of base-closing plugs for fragmentation bombs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVAR G. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5972) for the relief of Ivar G. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ivar G. Johnson, of Jamestown, N. Y., the sum of $275. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ivar G. Johnson against the United States on account of property damage sustained by him when his automobile was destroyed in a collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck which took place on April 19, 1941, on State Highway No. 18 about 2 miles south of Cattaraugus, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK, RICHMOND, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6198) for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif., the sum of $27,039.46, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of a proportionate part of the loss sustained by said bank on a Government-guaranteed loan to R. J. Minton, doing business as R. J. Minton Construction Co.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. L. M. COX AND MRS. M. R. NICKLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6449) for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. L. M. Cox of Pocahontas, Ark., the sum of $2,000 and to Mrs. M. R. Nickle of Pocahontas, Ark., the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. L. M. Cox and the said Mrs. M. R. Nickle (widow and daughter, respectively, of the late F. W. Cox) against the United States arising out of damage done to certain real property owned by the late F. W. Cox and situated near Biggers, Randolph County, Ark., which property was damaged as a result of the construction, in 1942, of Biggers Auxiliary Field: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH E. BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6969) for the relief of Ralph E. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500 to Ralph E. Brown, former private, serial 15086200, United States Air Force, of Adrian, Mich., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the erroneous arrest in Detroit, Mich., on June 3, 1949, and confinement incommunicado at Selfridge Field Air Force Base, Michigan, until June 13, 1949; and payment for the loss of wages as a result of such arrest and confinement: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "incommunicado".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLARA M. FORTNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7278) for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Clara M. Fortner, of 220 West Magnolia Street, Auburn, Ala., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Frasier Fortner, who was killed by the collision of a United States Army plane with an Eastern Air Lines plane copiloted by him at the Thirty-sixth Street Airport, at Miami, Fla., on September 22, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HORACE J. FENTON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 621) for the relief of Horace J. Fenton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Horace J. Fenton, formerly an associate professor at the United States Naval Academy, the sum of $100 per month for the remainder of his life, beginning with the month in which this act is approved, chargeable to such appropriations as may be made for the payment of retirement annuities to civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy and postgraduate schools.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAVROS MATHEOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4011) for the relief of Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos and Matheou).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to withhold and suspend further proceedings in the case of Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos or Matheou), who, by an order of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, under date of February 21, 1949, is required to depart from the United States without expense to the United States Government, to any country of his choice on or before June 30, 1949, or suffer deportation; and further that the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos or Matheou) as of October 5, 1926, the date on which he entered the United States, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the country properly chargeable therewith.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 5, page 1, strike out the words "withhold and suspend further" and insert in lieu thereof "cancel".

On page 2, line 9, strike out the words "other than those relating to quotas." and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FERDINANDO SCHIAPPA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4188) for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ferdinando Schiappa, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on March 14, 1948. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Italian quota of the first year that the same Italian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FRANCESCO DRAGO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4806) for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Francesco Drago, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 19, 1948. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Italian quota of the first year that the same Italian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DAVID MUNSON OSBORNE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6505) to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand, shall be considered to have entered the United States for permanent residence on May 17, 1946, at New York.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall deduct one number from the British quota in the current quota year or the first year in which the quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "British", and on line 10, after the word "quota" insert "for New Zealand".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BERNARD SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7254) for the relief of Mrs. Bernard Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Bernard Smith, a native of Burma, who is the wife of Bernard Smith, of Philadelphia, Pa., a citizen of the United States, presently employed by the Isthmian Steamship Co. If otherwise admissible under the immigration laws the said Mrs. Bernard Smith shall be granted the status of a nonquota immigrant.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Co.", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 11 and 12.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JACK B. MEYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7283) for the relief of Mrs. Jack B. Meyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Jack B. Meyer, Japanese wife of Sgt. Jack B. Meyer, and that the said Mrs. Jack B. Meyer may be permitted to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all of lines 9 and 10 and the words "permanent residence" in line 11, and insert "a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIA MARGARITE NOE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7485) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe (nee Wiegmann), German wife of Jesse L. Noe, Jr., master sergeant, United States Army, of Louisville, Ky., a citizen of the United States, insofar as concerns any conviction or admission of the commission of a crime by her of which the Department of Justice and the Department of State have knowledge on the date of enactment hereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID GEORGE CALLAWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7656) for the relief of David George Callaway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien David George Callaway, who is the adopted child of George Denton Callaway and Margaret Katharine Callaway, husband and wife, and who are native-born American citizens, shall be deemed to be the natural-born child of said George Denton Callaway and Margaret Katharine Callaway.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, David George Callaway shall be considered the alien natural-born child of his adoptive parents, Major and Mrs. George Denton Callaway, United States citizens."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIE GAM YEAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7050) for the relief of Louie Gam Yean.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause an immigration visa to be issued to Louie Gam Yean, born on July 13, 1948, the son of Louie Do Jum, who is a resident of Butte, Mont., if he is found by the United States Consul to whom application for visa is made, to be admissible under all the provisions of the immigration laws other than the annual quota limitations.

SEC. 2. Upon the admission of Louie Gam Yean to the United States the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Chinese persons for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, pertaining to unmarried children under 21 years of age of a citizen of the United States, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Louie Gam Yean, minor child of Louie Do Jum, a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGUSTIN CORTES MARTINEZ ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3169) for the relief of Agustin Cortes Martinez, his wife, Guillermina Diaz de Cortes, his

children, Santiago Cortes Diaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortes Diaz, and Guillermo Agustin Cortes Diaz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Agustin Cortes Martinez, his wife, Guillermina Diaz de Cortes, his children, Santiago Cortes Diaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortes Diaz, and Guillermo Agustin Cortes Diaz, of San Juan, P. R., shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on September 4, 1946, the date of their actual entry into the island of Puerto Rico, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct five numbers from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain Spanish physicians and their immediate families, to wit, Agustin Cortes Martinez, his wife, Guillermina Diaz de Cortes, and his children Santiago Cortes Diaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortes Diaz, and Guillermo Agustin Cortes Diaz; Victor Cuquerella; Rafael Troyano de los Rios; Jose A. Garcia Galarza, and his wife, Maria Sobrino Perez de Garcia Galarza; Ruperto Varela Canosa, his wife, Maria del Carmen Menendez de Varela Canosa, and his sons, Ivan Ruperto Varela Menendez, and Igor Felix Varela Menendez; Jose Vasquez San Martin, and his wife, Maria de los Angeles Crespo de Vazquez San Martin; and Francisco Colchero Arrubarrena; as of the respective dates of their lawful temporary entry into the United States, if they are found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was a quota immigrant at the time of entry, instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each such alien named herein from the quota of the appropriate country of the first year that such quotas are available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY MITSUYE NISHIHAMA YABE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6169) for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of law which make ineligible for permanent residence persons who are racially ineligible to citizenship, the Attorney General shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama, now Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe, who is the legal wife of Donald T. Yabe, a United States citizen, as of June 26, 1949, at which time she was temporarily admitted into the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, an insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission into the United States persons who are racially ineligible to citizenship, the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe, the wife of Donald Takeichi, first lieutenant, United States Army, and a citizen of the United States, as of June 26, 1949, the date on which she entered the United States temporarily."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FUJIKO CHICHIE IMBERT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6652) for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of the law excluding from admission to the United States persons of a race ineligible to citizenship Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, Japanese wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., Japanese son by birth, of Robert Imbert, a citizen of the United States and a soldier in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, if they are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the admission of the said Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert and child, respectively, to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That in the administration of the immigration laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert and Robert Imbert, Jr., the wife and child, respectively, of Sergeant Robert Raymond Imbert, a citizen of the United States, presently serving with the United States Armed Forces."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KAZUKO MIYAMA AKANA AND CHANG KING AKANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7065) for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana, wife and son of Tai Honk Akana, a citizen of the United States and presently serving in Japan as a civilian employee with the United States Army, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Army", change the comma to a period and strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETSUKO AMANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7066) for the relief of Setsuko Amano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Setsuko Amano, native of Japan, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, she shall be granted admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race, shall not hereafter apply to Setsuko Amano, the Japanese fiancée of Thomas A. Takasue, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that the said Setsuko Amano may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ETHEL N. PLUNKETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 702) for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum

of $35,000, to Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett, of Hartsville, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of an operation at the station hospital, Huntsville Arsenal, Alabama, on February 18, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLIE SYLVESTER CORRELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2464) for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie Sylvester Correll, the sum of $22,106.10, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for time lost from work, medical, and other expenses incident thereto, sustained on or about the 14th of February 1943, as a result of a collision on Highway 466 approximately 23 miles northwest of Barstow, Calif., between the automobile in which he was riding and an Army transport truck owned by the United States Government, said truck was transporting an airplane: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$22,106.10" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,107".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSÉ SALGADO SANTOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3305) for the relief of the estate of José Salgado Santos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to the administrator of the estate of the late José Salgado Santos, who was killed on August 17, 1943, when struck in Guaynabo, Puerto Rico, by a Government truck operated by a project employee on the work-relief program in Puerto Rico under the Federal Works Agency. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIK H. LINDMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3675) for the relief of Erik H. Lindman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Erik H. Lindman, warrant officer, retired, United States Coast Guard, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any of the compensation paid to him as a civilian employee of the War Department during the period beginning on March 23, 1942, and ending on May 1, 1945, both dates inclusive. The Comptroller General has ruled that $14,069.89 so paid Warrant Officer Lindman was paid in contravention of section 2 of the Appropriation Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 62), although Warrant Officer Lindman was advised by a Coast Guard officer before accepting such employment that his receipt of such compensation would not be in contravention of such section, and the Comptroller General has recognized "that such employment was due solely to the erroneous construction placed upon the controlling statutes by the administrative office."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Erik H. Lindman, the sum of $4,447.01. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Erik H. Lindman against the United States for retired pay for the period beginning on August 1, 1942, and ending on January 31, 1945, both dates inclusive. Although such sum is due and unpaid, the Comptroller General has ruled that such sum should be applied in partial liquidation of the indebtedness asserted under the act referred to in the first section: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED TRANSFORMER CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6489) for the relief of the United Transformer Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the United Transformer Corp., of New York, N. Y., the sum of $136,135.72, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation from the Horni Signal Manufacturing Co., of New York, N. Y., for war material shipped to the Horni Signal Manufacturing Co. at the direction and request of the Signal Corps, Department of War, the Signal Corps having failed to notify the United Transformer Corp. of the cessation of advance payments to the Horni Signal Manufacturing Co. prior to the shipment of war material for which claim is made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $10,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "136,135.72", and insert "54,458".

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Corp.", and insert "Co. (formerly United Transformer Corp.)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of United Transformer Co. (formerly United Transformer Corp.)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINENTAL INSURANCE CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6053) for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $12,000 to the Continental Insurance Co., to pay the sum of $18,000 to Federal Insurance Co., and to pay the sum of $12,500 to National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained to the residence of Mrs. Ruth T. Weeks, of New Canaan, Conn., as a result of an accident involving a United States Army airplane of the Connecticut Intercepter Command which struck the dwelling on October 12, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVAN E. TOWNSEND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5639) for the relief of Ivan E. Townsend.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ivan E. Townsend, Muscoda, Wis., the sum of $1,500. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ivan E. Townsend against the United States arising out of his improper arrest and detention by Army authorities in 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRA D. DOYAL AND CLYDE DOYAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5150) for the relief of Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal, both of Long Beach, Calif., the sum of $5,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ira D. Doyal and the said Clyde Doyal against the United States on account of the loss on February 24, 1942, of their fishing vessel *Tennessee*, when such vessel, while in a disabled condition, was cut adrift in a rising storm by United States Coast Guard vessel No. 411: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN G. ESSENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4628) for the relief of John G. Essenberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to John G. Essenberg, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army truck bearing New York license No. 422991 owned by Camp Shanks at Miller Highway and Fifty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., on March 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000".

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Essenberg" insert "of 453 Sixty-eighth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIRO TAKEMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4371) for the relief of Shiro Takemura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Shiro Takemura, of the county of Los Angeles, city of Los Angeles, State of California, the sum of $5,000, in settlement of all claims against the United States on the part of all heirs at law, payable to the said Shiro Takemura, as the head of the family, on account of the death on April 23, 1943, and funeral expenses of Paul Toshio Takemura, a minor, as a result of the failure of the officials in charge of the Granada Relocation Center, Amache, Colo., to provide necessary safeguards for danger zones, in said center: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not to exceed $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. C. S. WALKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4163) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker, Ogilby, Imperial County, Calif., the sum of $11,322.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker against the United States for destruction of personal and real property during a period of more than 18 months beginning February 1943, caused by operations of several units of the United States Army while those forces were stationed between El Centro, Calif., and Yuma, Ariz.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$11,322.50" and insert "$2,252.50".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN D. LANGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3994) for the relief of John D. Lange.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John D. Lange, the sum of $153, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States as a result of an erroneous payment by the Alien Property Bureau out of trust account No. 29066.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the name "Lange", insert ", of 492 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KOTO KOGAMI KITSU AND JEANNETTE AKEMI KITSU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7073) for the relief of Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu, natives of Japan, the wife and daughter of Stanley Y. Kitsu, a citizen of the United States and presently serving in the armed forces of the United States, and that,

if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the words "United States", change the comma to a period and strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOBUKO MAEDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7199) for the relief of Nobuko Maeda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Nobuko Maeda, of Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan, the Japanese fiancée of First Lieutenant George N. Asai, a citizen of the United States on active duty with the United States armed forces, and that Nobuko Maeda may be eligible for a visa as a nonquota immigrant provided the marriage between the above-named parties occurs within six months after the effective date of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Nobuko Maeda, the Japanese fiancée of First Lieutenant George N. Asai, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Nobuko Maeda may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within three months immediately succeeding the enactment date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIO LOUIS TOMITA AND FUMIKO TOMITA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7292) for the relief of Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita, natives of Japan, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLARD THULIN (FORMERLY JUTTA MAINKE)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7362) for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Mainke).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Mainke), the wife of Willard Thulin, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Mainke" and insert "Kono".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Kono)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUZUKO TAKANASHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7416) for the relief of Suzuko Takanashi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Suzuko Takanashi, the Japanese fiancée of Sergeant Paul J. Kiefer, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Suzuko Takanashi may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment date of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Sergeant".

Page 1, line 7, after "United States" insert the following: "presently serving with the United States armed forces".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELLEN KNAUFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7614) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings, and to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, if any, issued in the case of Mrs. Ellen Knauff. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Mrs. Ellen Knauff shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mrs. Ellen Knauff shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States on payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the word "deportation" and insert in lieu thereof the word "exclusion"; and in the same line after the word "proceedings" insert "under 22 U. S. C. 223 and 8 C. F. R. 175,53, 175.57".

On page 1, line 5, strike out the words "and warrant" and substitute the word "exclusion" for the word "deportation".

On page 1, line 8, after the words "subject to", insert the words "exclusion or".

On page 1, line 10, strike out the word "deportation"; substitute the word "warrant" for the word "warrants".

On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "as of the date of her last entry into" and insert in lieu thereof the word "in".

On page 2, line 5, after the word "States", insert "as of August 14, 1948".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AKIKO OSADA GUSTAFSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7682) for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson, Japanese wife of William Albert Gustafson, a natural-born United States citizen and an honorably discharged World War II veterans who is serving in Japan in a civilian status with the armed forces of the United States. The said Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson shall, upon application hereafter filed, be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out line 11, and page 2, strike out lines 1 to 3 inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MITSUKO ITO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7658) for the relief of Mitsuko Ito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Mitsuko Ito, the Japanese fiancée of Corp. Thomas Stafford Radtke, a citizen of the United States and a member of the United States armed services, and that Mitsuko Ito may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visi-

tor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Mitsuko Ito is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Corp. Thomas Stafford Radtke, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Mitsuko Ito, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Mitsuko Ito, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Mitsuko Ito as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUZUKO YAGI AND ANNE YAGI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7363) for the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi, natives of Japan, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONMOUTH CONSOLIDATED WATER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7708) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, for and on behalf of the United States, to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co., Long Branch, N. J., its successors and assigns, on such terms and conditions as he determines to be in the public interest, easements, and rights-of-way for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a water tower, together with necessary pipe lines and other appurtenant facilities, at such place or places within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J., as may be approved by the Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLINE M. NEWMARK AND MELVILLE MORITZ

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 744, the bill (H. R. 1814) for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their father, Commander Albert Moritz, United States Navy, retired, who died as the result of injuries sustained in a fall at the Brooklyn naval hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y., on January 15, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER 10. DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on chapter 10 is now in order, not to exceed 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary inquiry that I desire to submit is, When will it be in order to make points of order on chapter 10? Can that be done now, under the agreement that was reached in the committee the other day, or can it be done when the chapter is being read for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. When the chapter is read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity of conveying to the House, as vice chairman of this committee, that it is my privilege to carry the bill for the balance of the afternoon because our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is away taking care of official business. He will be back in Washington late this evening, and will take over the responsibilities of the committee chairmanship tomorrow.

As you undoubtedly know from previous statements that have been made by members of the committee, we held rather extensive hearings on this measure, starting on January 9 and ending on April 27, which was some 3 months plus.

May I express my personal appreciation to my colleagues on the committee. We have worked together very harmoniously over a long period of years. It certainly is a very pleasant feature for one to enjoy when dealing with problems of the magnitude presented in a bill of this character.

I also want to thank our executive committee secretary, Mr. Lambert, and Larry Miller, his assistant. They have done a remarkable job in cooperation with the members of the committee. We are all most appreciative of the fine efforts they have always extended.

We have gone into the various and sundry aspects of this bill most exhaustively, and have submitted to the whole committee and to the House the results of our efforts.

May I call attention to some parallels that prevail and that are indicated in the final totals of the respective bills of a year ago and as of the present. For example, the appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 were $13,000,000,000 plus. At that time there was a reduction on the part of the committee of $230,221,000. The budget for the fiscal year 1951 was $13,028,675,000, and the reduction made by the committee was $203,332,700. In other words, the totals here give evidence of the consistent manner in which the committee has surveyed the presentations that were made to it and of the carefully considered reductions because of the general international picture that you all know prevails.

I think, in general, if I have any adverse comments to make about the bill, it is because I am concerned over the international aspects as they presently prevail. I am sometimes confronted with the thought, Are we doing as much as we ought to do in providing our military forces with adequate and advanced matériel of all types and characters in order that we may preserve the integrity of our form of government and our way of living?

Today our national security is in constant danger. If we act intelligently, as

I believe we will, we will approach the problems of our national defense with a great deal of concern and sympathetic understanding. I realize, as we all do, there is a limit to the capacity of the economy of our Nation to provide funds for any operation in the governmental departments. But, at the same time, it does seem to me, in the search for economy we would do well to scrutinize expenditures, for example subsidies, and various and sundry other governmental operations and make our reductions there so that we may preserve an adequate military establishment for the defense of our Nation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely right in his last statement. I think above all the Congress should seriously consider cutting down on those other items wherever we can cut, always with a view to having ample funds for our military establishment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman has always been a very able representative in this body and is always greatly concerned in matters having to do with the welfare of the country and the safety of the country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not get the total amount for the armed services. Was it $13,500,000,000?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The request from the budget was $13,028,675,000. The report of the subcommittee which was submitted to the entire Committee on Appropriations was $12,825,342,300, which reflected a reduction of $203,332,700.

Mr. STEFAN. Does it include the additional $350,000,000 voted by the full committee a few days ago?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It does not. I am coming to that later in my statement.

Mr. STEFAN. Does it also include contract authorizations?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It does not. I am coming to that later in my statement.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman going to come to the full amount?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. My figures are approximately $15,000,000,000, including contract authorization for armed services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; I will come to that in the final part of my statement.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will permit, in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, with a $15,000,000,000 budget for the armed services, with $1,000,000,000 for atomic energy and stock piling, and $6,000,000,000 for the Veteran's Administration and $6,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt, with $3,000,000,000 for the Marshall plan, if those are to be fixed items, you do not have very much to work on and it would only leave about ten or eleven billion dollars left to carry on the remaining functions of the Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, it depends upon the point of view one takes as to what is first and what must come first. I think we have reached the stage, may I say to the gentleman very frankly, where we will have to draw very sharp lines of demarcation in our expenditures. In other words, if we have a dollar, to wit, 100 cents, and naturally we have to subdivide that into certain categories of expenditure, we have to draw the line some place as to what should have priority.

Mr. STEFAN. The expenditures are going to be around $42,000,000,000 and the receipts are going to be between thirty-seven and thirty-eight billion dollars. If $31,000,000,000 are for fixed items, how much will you have left to run the rest of the Government with? Cannot we make some real reductions without hurting necessary functions?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will admit the proportions are not too generous.

Mr. STEFAN. No.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But perhaps in those places where we are not bound by the mandate of law we can make further reductions than we have been making.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will agree with me that with this disparity between receipts and expenditures, with the deficit, and with only about $11,000,000,000 left to cover the expenditures of the other functions of the Government, there is no possibility of balancing the budget or paying on the public debt, is there?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It depends on the attitude.

Mr. STEFAN. There have been further suggestions that the national defense items can be cut where that can be done with safety. I understand the Secretary is asking the other body to restore that $203,000,000 which your committee has cut already. I am for all needed for defense, but I am worried about national bankruptcy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that is what the Secretary of Defense is going to do.

Mr. STEFAN. That will amount to a half-billion-dollar increase in the bill for the armed services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman is premising his remarks on whether we are going to balance the budget this year, my answer is emphatically and automatically "No"—not at the present rate that we are appropriating funds. That is the point I am trying to make and that is what I am expressing my opinion on.

It comes down to the question: If we are going to balance the budget, where are we going to make the cuts? Personally, I feel that I have supported reductions in our military functions as far as it is reasonably safe to do so. I even questioned this figure. The reductions have to be made some place else. Recently the Post Office Department curtailed some of its service. I do not know what your mail indicated, but I am getting more complaints about not having five deliveries a day than anything else. Furthermore, it might be advisable for a lot of the people back home who are recommending a balanced budget to quit asking Uncle Sam to function as a Christmas tree and to be a little self-sufficient themselves. It all depends on whose ox is gored. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too. That policy or procedure, economically or otherwise, just cannot prevail.

So that the discussion we have in mind today, as far as I am concerned, at the moment is whether or not your committee is presenting to you a bill in respect to its application to the defense program of this country that should be acceptable to the Members of the House of Representatives and to the other branch of Government as well. I sincerely trust it will be acceptable, because, frankly, I think the external hazards are far greater today than they have been before. If for some reason we were to have to go through another war, and the good Lord forbid that possibility, I do not think we will ever have the time again to prepare ourselves that we have had in the past, and I do not think we will experience any kindly considerations or preknowledge. It all depends on what you and I, as representatives of the people, and the people themselves want to do about writing a life-insurance premium to protect the continuity of our form of government. The determination has to be made by the public and by its representatives in Congress. I feel that the bill we are presenting today is a just one. I question whether it is enough or not, but nevertheless I am happy to go along with the judgment of the committee, both in the subcommittee aspect and in the committee as a whole.

On April 26 the Secretary of Defense reappeared before our subcommittee and requested additional funds. He made a considerable statement on the record and a considerable statement off the record relative to the reasons for the request. But I can say to you Members of the House that he presented to our committee what, in our opinion, were justifications for the added request up to a point. Resulting from his request, the Navy originally had $475,000,000 in its contract authority aspect. Under the request of the Secretary of Defense, the subcommittee presented to the whole committee, and, in turn, we are going to present it later, in the form of amendments to the bill, to this committee, of an additional $100,000,000, which will make the total in that respect $575,000,000. For contract authority for the Air Force there was originally $610,000,000. The Secretary of Defense asked for $2,000,000 more. That will be presented in the form of an amendment when we reach that portion of the bill. That makes a total of contract authority of $1,385,000,000.

He also asked for $50,000,000 in cash, of which the major portion was to go for submarine activities.

When the bill is in total, if the amendments are accepted by the membership that will be presented by the committee, it will resolve itself into a total of

$14,255,000,000, cash and contract authority.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that now the Secretary of the Navy is asking for most of the program that Admiral Denfeld asked for before he was removed as Chief of Naval Operations? In reading the press and in asking questions, I have discovered that many of the things he asked for but were refused—I do not mean by Congress but by the Department of Defense—are now being asked for. So his removal really resulted in securing some of the things he tried to get when he was Chief of Naval Operations?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In answer to the gentlewoman's question, of course I do not feel that I am qualified to enter into the minds of certain personalities or military positions of authority. I will say, however, that the concepts as expressed by Admiral Denfeld during his tenure in office, and as is presently being considered by the commander who occupies the same position Admiral Denfeld did, are so close that it would be very difficult to draw a line of demarcation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So the sacrifice was not in vain, although it was unfortunate.

I wish to state the very high regard I have for the gentleman from California and my appreciation of the fight he has made for naval appropriations. Had it not been for him we would have had a very different picture in our naval defense. The gentleman from California is a magnificent fighter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentlewoman for her complimentary remarks.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. From my many years' contact with the gentleman from California I consider him one of the ablest Members of the House.

I believe the gentleman from Nebraska was laboring under the assumption that it was impossible to cut our $42,000,000,000 budget below the point specified. My line of approach would be to take $1,000,000,000 at least from ECA appropriations and perhaps liquidate what is left of $1,450,000,000 appropriation for the rearming of western Europe. We can do without those things but we cannot gamble with our own personal defense. That is my personal position.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for expressing his personal views. The gentleman is very gracious in his remarks about me. It has been a pleasure to work with him.

I feel very strongly about this issue, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota. Very candidly, I have told the people in my congressional district, and in my State of California, that I realize that our national economy is capable of withstanding only a certain amount of expenditure of funds, that somewhere we have got to tighten up our belt if we are going to have adequate military protection to preserve our form of government. I have admonished them, requested them, and told them, insofar as I was concerned, that much as we need flood control, much as we need reclamation and sundry other things in the West, these matters can be put in a stage of gestation, if I may use the term, for 5 or 10 years, if need be, in order to maintain and preserve our form of government. I am making very strenuous recommendations. I hope my fears and concern may ultimately prove erroneous; I would be very happy if that should result. In the meantime, however, the international situation is so clearly indicated as being hazardous that we cannot afford to jeopardize our defenses or the security of our people.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, during the hearings held before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Armed Services I said:

> The effectiveness of the economies proposed by the Secretary of Defense Johnson are comparable to those accomplished by the man who cut his wife's throat to stop her nosebleed.

I have not changed my mind, and subsequent events have corroborated my statements.

Despite the changes made in the bill as it is now proposed to be amended, I have preferred to make the speech for the RECORD which I prepared as of the date the Committee on Appropriations approved the report of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, since in substance it is all apropos.

When the committee said that the country could not "safely make further reductions in the military program" and that, on the contrary, it felt that "there is ample warrant for a number of increases in the budget to more adequately prepare this country for an emergency—undoubtedly we are taking certain very grave risks in not being better prepared," it spoke whereof it knew.

I have not changed my mind. The truth is that the proposals of the Secretary of Defense, made, I am afraid, for publicity purposes, in an undertaking to make an alleged saving of $25,000,000 by abandoning several hospitals, thereby involving an irretrievable loss in money, in readiness of the armed forces, and in services to be rendered to the veterans and dependents of servicemen, have had all the hot air let out of them and have been proven in fact to be no savings at all.

I am sorry to say that this is the rule of thumb—that is, "hog-wash"—to be applied to very many of the alleged savings propositions announced by the Secretary of Defense.

For instance, his dictatorial impounding of $357,000,000 in funds specifically appropriated by Congress, duly authorized with practical unanimity of purpose and intended to be used in the construction of Navy and Air Force airplanes, evidences no savings. Neither does the $736,000,000 more, impounded unconstitutionally by the President on Johnson's recommendation, which funds were to raise the Air Force from 48 to 58 groups. These events make it evident that in his zeal for an economy record, Johnson is impairing the national defense. Of course, it is an open secret that he has high political aspirations. The time loss in our readiness program sustained by reason of such action by Johnson has immeasurably weakened our national security. He has deprived us of strength increases which should be in being as of now—increases which are more obviously needed today than ever before in time of peace. The loss of opportunity to construct these planes which were properly authorized and money properly appropriated therefor by the Congress is a measure of the shortsightedness of Johnson's highly publicized program of alleged savings, most of which in the end are in fact no savings but reductions that may ultimately cost us in lives and treasure, unmeasurable.

THE "BIG CARRIER"

There is, moreover, no doubt that eventually we absolutely must have the Navy's big carrier—the 65,000-ton U. S. S. *United States*—as a movable base in Alaskan waters and elsewhere if ever war comes. And I charge the Secretary of Defense with gross negligence, with unwarranted assumption of dictatorial authority, with contempt of Congress, for having so arbitrarily stopped its construction. This action, militarily and economically unsound, was in my opinion unjustified and unwarranted and unauthorized, and it will cost us heavily in the future.

Can it be that we have forgotten the Constitution of the United States because it has so often of late been disregarded? It imposes upon the Congress the obligation of providing for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States. Have we forgotten that any act of Congress which undertakes to grant to the Executive Branch of the Government any of the nondelegable powers or authorities of the Congress is unconstitutional?

Have we forgotten that any action taken by any person, from the President down, in contravention of the Constitution, despite any legislation which Congress may have enacted, per se, is void and of no effect?

ILLEGAL USURPATION

I defy anybody to dispute the logical conclusion which must be drawn from these premises which are fundamental despite the intentional usurpation by the executive branch of legislative authority. There must be a reassertion of authority by the Congress. The Congress must preserve its rights. It must protect its prerogatives. They must not be so easily and insultingly disregarded. If legislation be necessary to insure compliance with the will of Congress, and I believe it is, in view of the actions of the Secretary of Defense, it should be promptly enacted to that end.

If we are not to live under a dictatorship in disregard of the Constitution and the prerogatives of Congress, it is high

time Congress realized what has happened recently in the Department of Defense, as evidenced by the usurpation by the Secretary of Defense of the nondelegable functions of Congress.

At the first appearance of the Secretary of Defense before the Subcommittee for the Armed Service, I said, as appears on page 52 of the hearings:

Mr. PLUMLEY. I want the Secretary of National Defense to undertake to justify the usurpation of the prerogative and responsibilities of Congres as reduced to appropriations definitely stating the purpose for which the money is to be used.

On page 61 of the hearings the following colloquy appears of record:

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate and renew the statement that I previously made.

I want the Secretary of Defense to undertake to justify the usurpation by the executive department of the prerogatives and responsibilities of Congress as reduced to appropriations definitively made, stating and limiting the purposes for which the moneys appropriated by Congress are to be used. I want an answer. I do not want an avoidance and evasion; I want a justification of the action taken by the executive department in violation of the rights and prerogatives of Congress. I want to know how to justify it. I am going to know before I get through.

Secretary JOHNSON. I can only repeat what I said before.

The following information was supplied after the hearing:

I think his powers are inherently constitutional, both as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief. The Budget and Accounting Act, or the Apportionment Act, which Colonel Moore mentioned, may be pertinent. Similarly, the war powers may have some bearing, but I am not sure of this at the moment. But whatever is provided in any statute, in my opinion, the source of the President's power is in the Constitution.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not want you to repeat what you said before, with all due deference.. I want you to answer my question, which you have not done.

Secretary JOHNSON. I think I have.

Mr. PLUMLEY. All right. We differ very diametrically.

Secretary JOHNSON. I realize that we differ, but I think that I have answered it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Not to the satisfaction of this committee, if you want to know.

Secretary JOHNSON. So I understand, but I am sorry about that. I have given you my honest belief, and I can only repeat that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Do you want to tell me that when the President signs a bill which becomes a law, which he had an opportunity to veto but did not, he can look over a record of the votes of the several Congresses and say, "Well, I just guess they did not mean what they said, and I will do so and so against the expressed will of the representatives of the people of the United States." Do you wish to stand on that?

Secretary JOHNSON. I did not say that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. You substantially said that.

Secretary JOHNSON. But the difference between my saying that and substantially saying it is a keen difference. I stand on what I said.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I think you should not try to equivocate and avoid.

Secretary JOHNSON. We are not equivocating or avoiding and quibbling. We are being frank about what we believe.

The questions were never answered to my satisfaction. Neither did the attempted, evasive answers satisfy many other Members of Congress, though the questions are of such basic importance that they should be answered flatly and without equivocation.

A CLEAR WARNING

In reporting out the bill now under consideration, the Appropriations Committee sounded a clear warning which, in my opinion, the House—and the Nation—cannot ignore. The committee stated that the country "cannot safely make further reductions in the military program;" and that, on the contrary, "the committee feels that there is ample warrant for a number of increases in the budget to more adequately prepare this country for an emergency—undoubtedly we are taking certain very grave risks in not being better prepared."

These risks are being taken, the committee informs us, because the necessity for economy and financial stability. No one feels more strongly than I do that economy and financial stability are essential if this country is to survive, and I want to say right now that I am delighted to see this idea beginning to take root in the minds of the Democratic Members of the House. It is high time it took root and grew, and high time that positive action in this direction was taken.

But it is an artificial economy that cuts at the basic strength and security of the United States. That kind of false economy will prove very expensive in the long run. The period of time in which we live is one of titanic conflicts and titanic decisions. The fact that these decisions are now going against us shows that we are not measuring up well to the needs of the time. Since last year we have seen the hundreds of millions of good people of China succumb to the leaders of the Communist slave state. Those millions, who should have been won to the ways of free pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness, are now lost—temporarily, I hope—as allies to those forces fighting with us for freedom and self-government for peoples and nations throughout the world. Since World War II, Russia's dictatorship has expanded to include influence over 790,000,000 persons—a third of the population of the globe—from previous authority over 193,000,000 persons.

DANGEROUS ASIA

Since last year, the Communist danger to south Asia has increased. Since last year, the world situation has deteriorated very seriously. There are still no treaties on Germany and Austria in sight. Central Europe remains a critical trouble spot in this cold war, the outcome of which is uncertain in many parts of the world. Russia has built an army of 150,000 in eastern Germany. Her military machine has grown enormously. She has just become so confident as to shoot down one of our naval planes. Her people have just seized Hainan, the strategic key to the important island of Formosa. Why then, are we now cutting our military strength? Why then, are we the leaders of the free portions of the world, measuring up like Caspar Milquetoasts to the titanic decisions the times call for? Where is the courage and vision of our great statesmen of the past who measured up well against the needs of their times? It was the great Theodore Roosevelt who said:

The voice of the weakling or the craven counts for nothing when he clamors for peace; the voice of the just man armed is potent. We need to keep in a condition of preparedness * * * not because we want war, but because we desire to stand with those whose plea for peace is listened to with respectful attention.

PEACE THROUGH POWER OF PREPAREDNESS

If we want peace in our times, we must have the military strength to command the respect of the peoples and nations of the world. This military strength will assure that our diplomacy is listened to, that the great American story of our free institutions and their splendid fruits are heard, and they should be. Our people enjoy a standard of living second to none, because the productivity of our people and their industry is the greatest in the history of the world, because of what our Government and social institutions are.

That our political freedoms, our material aid to people of other nations, our consistent fight over the years for peaceful international relations are no mere gesture, must be made known to the peoples of the world. These facts will not command the respect or attention of the people of the world unless and until we have the military strength to back up our demands for the free flow of the information and exchange of ideas between peoples, to demand the right of nations to self-government, and to compel recognition of the right of all men to be free.

It is a law of physics that nature abhors a vacuum. This law is just as valid when applied to world politics as to physical forces. The Communists, like a boxer looking for weak spots in his opponent's defense, press first in Germany, next in China, then in Korea and south China—wherever they find a military vacuum they move in.

We live in an age when great scientific advances have made close neighbors of nations formerly great time-distances apart. If war comes, it may and almost certainly will come suddenly. The weapons of this scientific age are terrible in their speed and in capacity to inflict stupendous destruction. Planes that travel faster than the speed of sound; atomic bombs that level whole cities in a matter of seconds; listening posts that warn of danger with the speed of light, all have become part of the armaments of nations.

Until such time as we achieve peace in international relations, we must keep our military organization strong enough to meet any eventuality. We must not leave any military vacuum to tempt aggression by the Communist dictators. World War II cost us over $300,000,000,000. If we keep our military strength adequate until we achieve the peaceful world we all yearn for, we may forestall that great expenditure of manpower and blood and tears and money that military weakness will ultimately cost us.

RELIEF OF AUSTERITY

The armed services submitted an austerity budget to the Congress this year. They requested a cash appropriation of $13,028,657,000. This budget, which gets

down to the very bone and sinew of your Defense Establishment, represents the minimum requirements—they are, in fact, below minimum—for a nation already accepting grave risks in its security program, as pointed out by the committee report. The Defense Establishment has accomplished more than any agency in reorganizing itself to achieve economy and lower cost of operations, as recommended by the Hoover Commission, even though it has gone so far as to injure our fighting strength. This is well known to you esteemed gentlemen, and to the country at large. The money originally requested was stripped of all fat. It represents the below-minimum amount necessary to provide the combat and operating forces, as well as the back-up support, determined as necessary under this austerity budget. The committee cut this already well-pared budget by $203,332,700, and in my opinion the committee, in doing that, made a mistake. However, we are now trying to rectify it. What we now have to do is to make that $200,000,000 available for the Air Force to keep it from going to 42 groups. We should maintain at least the 48 groups the President has called for. And, in addition, some $380,000,000 should be provided to maintain our declining air power in the Navy. So, in total, this means an increase of $330,000,000 over the President's budget. Let us not pinch pennies on the cost of security, when the freedom of man throughout the world hangs in the balance.

During the war we set as our goal prosperous economic conditions and employment for 60,000,000 people. We achieved that goal, and our production is at the highest levels in our history. Surely we value our way of life, our freedoms, our high standard of living, our political institutions dearly enough to achieve the minimum goals the Joint Chiefs of Staff say must be met to provide security to those institutions, with a certain degree of calculated risk. Let us not increase the risks further or any more by squeezing the well-pressed security dollars and by failing to keep up our naval and Air Force air strength.

A WONDERFUL TEAM

We have a wonderful team in the United States that will assure us victory in the cold war, and in a shooting war, too, if necessary, If we in Congress treat that team as it should be treated and if—I say "if"—we forbid in the future unconstitutional usurpation of congressional defense authority.

The members of that team, Air Force, Army, Navy, our industrial facilities, and production workers on farm and in factory, represent a winning combination. That combination can meet any future threat of war and crush an enemy if necessary. Let us preserve all the components in that combination in the condition necessary for victory. Right now, it means providing the armed services with the funds necessary to maintain our air power in this air power age.

In conclusion, I quote Stewart Alsop's column entitled "Grandmother's Footsteps":

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

GRANDMOTHER'S FOOTSTEPS

In the child's game, called grandmother's footsteps in some infantile circles (and Red light or I spy in others), the "it" stands with his back to a second player while the second player tries to sneak up on him. When the "it" turns his head, the second player freezes in position, looking as innocent as possible. If the second player can tag the "it," he wins. But if the "it" sees him moving, he loses.

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson is now playing the part of the second player in grandmother's footsteps, while the unwary American public plays the "it." Secretary Johnson is now reversing his position, but so quietly and carefully that he evidently hopes the "it" will not catch him at it.

The latest move in the game was Johnson's request to Congress last week for an increase in aircraft procurement of $300,000,000, with $50,000,000 more for antisubmarine work. This move was covered, rather inadequately, to a reasonably sharp-eyed "it," by Johnson's assertion that certain events had forced a reappraisal, notably the Soviet atomic explosion, the fall of China, the serious situation in southeast Asia.

The meaning of these events has presumably burst with sudden force upon Johnson's consciousness. At least since Johnson assumed office, it has been fairly obvious to anyone capable of reading the newspapers that China was finished and southeast Asia in grave danger. As for the Soviet bomb, the decision drastically to reduce American defenses was confirmed well after it was exploded last September. Only now, 7 months after the event, has it suddenly occurred to Johnson, according to his statement, that the Russian bomb might affect American military planning.

Yet in fact, Johnson began playing "grandmother's footsteps" some time before last week's request to Congress. Here it is necessary to examine the original Johnsonian economy program. It had two phases. In the first phase, Johnson was to save $1,000,000,000 out of appropriations for the fiscal year ending next June 30. This sum was to be actually returned to the Treasury, presumably with suitably grandiloquent Johnsonian gestures.

The second phase was to have seen the 1951 defense budget held to a $13,000,000,000 maximum, with twelve billion envisaged as the limit thereafter. Well into this year, months after the Soviet atomic explosion, Johnson was still loudly talking this kind of economy. Then (is it possible to suspect that reports appearing in this space had a little to do with it?) the game of "grandmother's footsteps" began. Various increases in American armed strength (which were not really increases at all, but reductions in strength somewhat less drastic than originally planned) were announced with a flourish.

Economies, it was announced, had made these increases possible, Some perfectly authentic economies have undoubtedly been made. Chairman CARL VINSON, in a recent brilliant, too little noticed speech, credited Johnson with $600,000,000 in real savings, against $1,500,000,000 "cut into the sinew and muscle of the armed services." But what really happened was that Johnson quietly abandoned the idea of handing the unfortunate taxpayer a poisoned plum, and spent the money instead, on what the Pentagon calls hardware—arms.

This was the first quick, silent dash in Johnson's game of "grandmother's footsteps." Last week's request was the second. Future dashes are clearly in prospect. The events which have so suddenly and belatedly forced themselves on Johnson's attention, says Johnson, "make it entirely possible that appropriations in excess of those which have been requested for the current fiscal year will be required in succeeding years, not only for our own military forces but also for the military-aid program."

In short, with the 1951 defense ceiling already breached, the Johnsonian economy program is to be relegated to the ash can as inconspicuously as possible, while Johnson continues to shout economy, at the top of his lungs. Unfortunately, this almost certainly does not mean that the great effort required by the world situation will be made.

In his remarkable speech, Chairman VINSON documented all that has been said in this space, and more, of the extraordinary damage inflicted by Johnson on the military posture of the United States. This damage cannot possibly be repaired without a total reversal, as public as a strip tease, of Johnson's position. And if Johnson made so public a confession of previous error, the "it"—the American public—would then catch him out in his little game.

"I will leave it to others," said Chairman VINSON, "to sell this idea that we rise by falling, that we advance by retreating, that we can achieve strength through weakness." One question remains to be asked. Is the man who has consistently attempted to sell this idea—an idea which bears within it the seed of our destruction—fit to hold the position he now holds?

Let me say, please, as a valedictory, that we may dream of the day when wars shall cease; it does no harm; on the contrary, every effort to bring about the realization of such dreams is commendable and deserves our support so long as it does not strip us of our defenses, develop a condition of unpreparedness, or lay us open to or invite attack. We must shake ourselves out of the trance and face facts, for, while we are dreaming, the grim reality stares us in the face that if we are to have universal peace, we will have to be prepared to do our part to obtain it, and, if necessary, to fight for and to maintain it.

Yes, we dream of the day when swords shall be sheathed forever, and our weapons turned into plowshares and pruning hooks; and those days of which Longfellow sang, when he said:

Peace! and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of war's great organ shakes the skies!
But beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise.

But the road to universal peace is a tortuous path which leads down the dark future through long generations, involving the Christianization of the world—an end devoutly to be sought, eventually to be obtained—but obviously ages hence.

The sober realization of a people who do not allow their idealism to divorce them from stark reality and their clear conception of the foibles and idiosyncracies of human nature impresses the fact upon them that just so long as racial hatred and discrimination, economic rivalry between nations for world markets, and arrogant nationalism remain, and communism persists in its atrocious attempts, disarmament and a pacific world cannot be.

The fate of civilization has always hung in the balance, but there are certain ideals of civilization which cannot

be destroyed. The progress of humanity throughout the centuries is marked by the bloody battlefields which have made possible our achievements. The arts of peace will not always prevail. Nations, no more than individuals, will always keep their word. Why will we not realize that civilization in itself comprehends the struggle for advancement, and that the opposition it meets must be overcome? When principle or honor is at stake, no man or nation is entitled to live who is not willing to fight to maintain it.

I should like to believe that human nature had changed, but the hard cold facts are that no plan has been promulgated in our day or generation that will change human nature or bring about the millenium by contract. No covenant which has ever been made or will be entered into in this day of grace between and among nations will prove a perfect panacea for or perfect preventive of war. The truth is that neither you nor I, our children or great-grandchildren, will live long enough to see the day when it will be unnecessary to maintain a sufficient force to guarantee safety and to keep the peace.

The fight between good and evil has just begun. Old as the beginning of things, yet young as tomorrow when it is born, the struggle between these two opposing forces must go on forever through all history to the end. Those who believe in the eventual triumph of the right must still march and fight and fall, recruited from the flower of mankind, cheered only by their own hope of and for humanity, strong only in their confidence in their cause.

It pays to be prepared.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to break into the thoughts so ably presented by my colleague from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. His speech was such an excellent one that I wish it could have continued much longer.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I want to state to the gentleman from Florida and to the Committee that it has been my privilege to listen to a great many speeches during the years I have served in this House, but the speech just made by the distinguished gentleman from Vermont I consider one of the best I have heard in years and years.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege for me to serve on the Committee on Armed Services of the great Committee on Appropriations, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas, GEORGE MAHON, whose work is so widely recognized. It has been a great privilege to serve with the other members of the subcommittee, men of sterling quality and great ability. One of them in particular I want to single out, because he is leaving the committee and leaving the Congress. Mr. Chairman, we shall miss the gentleman from Michigan, ALBERT ENGEL. It has been a signal honor for me to work with him and to see the uniformly high standard of his work, his complete unselfishness, his devotion to duty, and the fine character of the public service that he has rendered here through the many years.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation to the clerical staff of our subcommittee. I do not think any committee in Congress is more fortunate than we in the men who have worked with us.

My colleague from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has ably presented a general outline of the budget on armed services, as presented to our subcommittee. He has told you of the over-all amount, the funds allocated for each of the services; the fact that the committee, seeking to find economy, has cut $203,000,000 from the over-all total, and, upon the urgent request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, agreed to by the President, that we have agreed to the restoration of a small part of this money. We have further agreed to an appropriation of additional funds for aircraft procurement and for antisubmarine activities.

Our recommendations are based largely on budgetary estimates. World conditions have not permitted major changes in budget recommendations. Changes that have been made are small ones where the committee felt savings could be made. This year's budget is substantially the same as last year's. Pay increases brought about by action of the Congress in the last session are responsible for an increased cost of $500,000,000. This includes military and civilian personnel. Thus, for the same money we are buying a half billion dollars less in defense.

Actually, we are weaker than we think. I say this despite the fact that the Chiefs of Services testified without exception, that qualitatively our defenses are stronger than at any time since the war actually ended. Qualitatively we are stronger. Quantitatively there is a big gap in what we have and what we need for mobilization in case of a global war.

The committee's problem has been first to decide how much defense the country can afford, and next how to allocate the defense dollars between the services. If we knew what to anticipate trouble, the problem would be very simple. Since we do not know, we have no choice but to try to maintain a first-class defense qualitatively, and deliberately to sacrifice quantity.

We must place emphasis on development, for it is in superiority of weapons and equipment that our greatest strength lies. For a time we could rely principally upon atomic monopoly plus strategic air power. That monopoly no longer exists and we must give closer attention to the development of technical air power, ground defenses, guided missiles, jam-proof communications, and antisubmarine measures.

The cost of defense in the United States is terribly high compared, for instance, to that in the Soviet Union. Their pay scale is about one-tenth as high as ours. Food and care provided for their military personnel are correspondingly lower. In the occupied areas and their allied countries, the Russian troops live on the country. This makes a vast difference in the amount of defenses for a given sum.

We have emphasized hardware—not men—on the ground that, in the main, men can be speedily called in and given the necessary training in event of trouble. Modern machines of war are highly complicated, exceedingly technical, and in some instances they take years to develop or build. Always the hardware for modern defenses is costly. For instance, the electronics equipment in an average modern plane costs more than the entire plane would have cost during World War II. An infantry division now has 20,000 weapons, 2,000 radios, 4,000 vehicles. There is in this budget a $600,000,000 item for Army ordnance and yet this is a small part of Army ordnance needs. Primarily it is to buy antiaircraft guns or aiming devices. Our antiaircraft equipment must be as good as the planes we may have to fight, and planes fly so fast and so high that human calculations are no longer adequate to aim and fire the guns we use against them. Tank procurement, largely neglected since the war, is again forcibly thrust into our consideration for the Russians are known to possess many thousands of heavy tanks. Those who encountered the German tiger tanks have a most wholesome respect for them. The Russian tanks are patterned on these heavy German tanks. This too is a costly field.

Adding to the committee's problems is the fact that now that we have no monopoly on atomic warfare, we must accept a realization that there is no sure defense against atomic bombs. The Russians possess many B–29-type planes. These planes are adequate for a one-way trip from territory now held by the Soviets to any point in the United States. A one-way trip to deliver atomic bombs would hold no fears for Russian fliers who would expect to find friends in the underground here, or at the least, to be comfortably housed and fed as prisoners of war for the duration of hostilities.

The committee members cannot call themselves experts in war. They must take the advice and counsel of men who are experts in war. These men have placed emphasis primarily on planes. However, such an authority as Vannevar Bush has indicated that guided missiles may soon render the big bomber obsolete. I have felt and have repeatedly stated that guided-missiles development has not sufficiently been emphasized. Historically, many Americans in positions of high military authority fight their wars in the past. They continue to emphasize the weapons with which their medals and their glory were won. For that reason, in particular, we have almost invariably started our wars with the weapons of the last war. There is less of that spirit now. There is emphasis on the development of new weapons, including guided missiles. Yet I do not think there is enough emphasis. In addition, there have been delays in the guided-missiles program which testi-

mony showed were not due to lack of funds. It is entirely possible that within the next 5 to 10 years, the huge and highly technical planes, costing up to $5,000,000 each, may be rendered utterly useless by radar-guided rockets.

That condition is not true now. At the moment, we do have to depend largely upon planes for our primary war objective in the early days of war; that of powerful attack and secure defense. The need for additional aircraft procurement, in order that our air force and naval aviation may stay modern is not news to the committee. During the long weeks of hearings, we asked questions time and again, whose answers showed that aircraft procurement would have to be stepped up if the air services are to be kept modern.

Nor is the increasing gravity of world conditions news to Congress. The atomic bomb in Russia was exploded months ago. The loss of China and the gravity of Asiatic conditions was conceded months ago. The step-up in cold war by Russia was obvious months ago. Our committee asked many questions about the effect of these activities upon the request of funds by defense chiefs. Only when emphasis was added by General Eisenhower and Chairman Vinson did the defense chiefs publicly take cognizance of changed world conditions. I confess I am puzzled by the reasoning which has produced the conclusions submitted to us at this late date.

Be that as it may, the committee endorses the recommendations of the people upon whose advice we must depend. We recommend $350,000,000 additional to the funds formerly agreed on. That amount sounds big—actually, it does not buy much because it is chiefly directed at high-priced planes.

Two hundred millions additional will be provided for the Air Force. This will buy 77 new planes. It will modernize 228 primary trainers. It will convert 71 medium bombers of the B–29 type to tankers principally for refueling in air.

For the additional $100,000,000 for naval aviation, we will be able to procure 95 new planes.

Fifty millions of dollars is also provided for antisubmarine work, probably our greatest immediate need. Snorkel equipment and high submerged speeds of present-day submarines make our antisubmarine equipment largely obsolete. Hitler nearly choked off our life lines with a much smaller submarine fleet and a much less potent submarine fleet than the Russians now have.

We will also get four Marine air squadrons—not groups—which would have been deactivated, but no additional funds are requested for this. It is made possible by transfers.

I said a moment ago that the committee had long realized that additional plane procurement would be necessary if our Air Force and naval aviation are to stay modern. Testimony revealed that within a very few years both services will have to depend increasingly upon second-line planes because there will not be sufficient new, modern planes coming off the assembly lines to replace planes that are dropping out and to keep abreast of world conditions. One billion three hundred and fifty millions originally recommended for Air Force plane procurement in 1951 would have purchased 1,383 planes. In order to maintain a 48-group modern Air Force plus 11 modern National Guard groups, 2,000 new planes yearly are required at a cost of $2,000,000,000. Thus, originally we were short 617 needed new planes. Under the adjusted program we will get 77 additional planes. That means we are still short 540 planes.

The naval aviation picture is substantially similar. The original request for Navy planes was six hundred and thirty-three millions for 1951 with which to purchase 817 planes. To maintain present levels and to keep naval aviation modern, we will need 1,347 new planes yearly. To the 817 originally planned, 95 are now added for a total of 922 planes. The Navy is still short 435 planes, or one-third of its needs. But there is more to the Navy picture than appears on the surface. Navy plans are now based on approximately 60 percent of the 1949 strength. Nineteen hundred and forty-nine is the postwar year which probably is the most nearly comparable in gravity to this one. Yet naval strength is held to 60 percent of the estimated needs for that year and we are providing only two-thirds of the planes which would be required to maintain that 60-percent level. This is a most disturbing situation.

Naval and Marine Air Reserves train with modern jet planes, but there are no jet planes available for them to man if they should be mobilized for service. For this purpose 819 planes would be needed at a cost of $650,000,000. The Navy needs an additional four hundred and fifty million annually to keep its naval aviation fully modern. Perhaps I should add at this place that the weakness is not in the Navy. The Navy in particular deserves a pat on the back for the efficiency of its operation and the way in which it has kept down administrative costs.

I have repeatedly mentioned the high cost of defense today. One chapter which will illustrate this is the additional cost of overhauling and operating jet engines, to which we are turning more and more. The cost of overhauling a jet engine runs from $6,000 up. It is twice as costly as the overhauling of a conventional-type engine. Yet jet planes have to be overhauled four times as frequently as conventional engines. Then, in addition, the cost of operation of the jet in flight is two to four times as great. The old P–51, which was a very good plane, used 64 gallons of fuel per hour at a cost of $13.41. The P–80, which is probably the most nearly standard of the jets, requires 348 gallons of fuel per hour at a cost of $50.48—all this just to go twice as fast. This should give ominous warning of the cost of defense—and of war—in future years.

Yet as much as we depend upon the air services and as much as we recognize the necessity of first-line equipment and training, we know this is an air age only in part. It costs too much and requires too many planes to move troops and cargo by air alone. In World War II, only 5 years ended, we moved by ship 720,000 tons of cargo daily. We moved several million soldiers across the ocean each way. During this time we brought in countless thousands of tons of strategic and essential war materials without which we could not have built weapons. And we supplied our allies with those weapons and with food. We still cannot put all our eggs in one basket. We have presented a bill which provides a balanced force at the lowest possible safe cost.

I want to point to several interesting chapters, some of them small in application, some of them important in the long pull. The services are doing a magnificent job in research and development and they are enjoying an unusually fine degree of cooperation from industrial and educational institutions. This work, I believe, has reached the highest plane ever achieved in this country.

One interesting point is the development of titanium. If for no other reason it would be interesting because of the depletion of iron ores. But that is not all. Titanium alloys are 40 percent lighter than steel. It is stronger than steel. It is the fourth most abundant structural metal in the earth's crust. Its resistance to corrosion is as great as platinum—better than nickel. Heretofore it has been too costly for general use. New methods are now taking care of that limitation. It may be the metal of tomorrow.

Not all of the work of the services is of this high caliber. There is, for instance, the build and repair program All the services testified that World War II surplus materials are rotting and rusting rapidly. Much of this material will very soon be beyond recovery. Roughly, it costs only one-fourth as much to repair and rebuild a piece of machinery or a weapon as it cost to buy it new. Much of the surplus material is standard equipment of a type still in use and is as valuable as new equipment to the services when rebuilt or repaired. Yet only the Navy seems to have done a top-flight job in this field. For $30,000,000 the Navy is in the process of reclassifying or rehabilitating 2,000,000 tons of this material worth approximately $2,000,000,000. Already they have reincorporated into the service $155,000,000 worth of weapons and equipment as good as new. They will have completed the job by the end of fiscal 1951. Among the reasons given by the other services for not completing this work is the Johnson economy order which which laid off many civilians who were engaged in this important work.

The committee found that bonuses are still being paid for service in combat areas for ship crews. This is because of mine dangers. The last known incident occurred about 2 years ago. Nobody got hurt. Yet we are continuing to pay $2,500,000 annually for service in danger areas which apparently have largely ceased to be danger areas.

The committee found that moving from office to office is very popular in the

Pentagon. Apparently it takes up a lot of time. More important, it costs about $1,000,000 a year. There seems to be no rhyme or reason for the continuous shifting of people within the building.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the gentleman's committee gone into the matter of two branches of the service under unification really carrying out unification so as to save money, or is the duplication still going on?

Mr. SIKES. The committee has gone very thoroughly into that field. Sometimes we have felt that instead of unification we were securing triplication.

As a matter of fact, however, I think there is an effort on the part of the Office of the Secretary of Defense to achieve unification. I think the services are achieving unification. It is taking time. They are not achieving it as fast as they should and could and therefore they are not saving as much as we hoped for.

Mr. CURTIS. I am certainly not an expert in these things. I believe I have evidence of a case where one branch of the service at a cost of millions of dollars is enlarging and rebuilding and expanding a facility to do something which another branch of the service has an idle plant to do within 35 miles.

Mr. SIKES. In a number of cases the committee explored reports of that kind. The committee never was able to substantiate charges that that sort of thing was being done. In each case which was called to our attention it was found the new work was something necessitated by modern warfare which was not being done or could not be done at existing plants.

I do not say that duplication has not been the case. If the gentleman has evidence, I am sure the committee would like to have that evidence in order that we may further pursue the matter. But the committee has not found instances where upon investigation it was found that those practices of duplication were being indulged in.

Mr. CURTIS. The matter whereof I speak, I have laid before Secretary Johnson.

Mr. SIKES. I believe the gentleman has done the proper thing.

Mr. CURTIS. We are at this disadvantage, however. If the ordinary layman makes such a contention and those high in military circles say that is not so, that is the end of the case.

Mr. SIKES. I know exactly what the gentleman is talking about. The services can wrap up answers in high-sounding technical language which is incomprehensible to the layman. Unless you can get the responsible people across the committee table where you can ferret out the cold facts, you may not really learn what is being done. But the committee has tried to ferret out the cold facts. If the gentleman is not satisfied with the information he gets, I am sure the committee will be glad to explore the matter further.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In some instances is it not true there is a merger rather than unification of some of the services?

Mr. SIKES. That appears to be the case in some instances. But in the main I think there is an effort to achieve unification and to save money by doing so. It is taking a long time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been listening with intense interest to the statement of the gentleman from Florida. I think he is making a brilliant speech. The gentleman served with me on the old Committee on Military Affairs and now the Committee on Armed Services. We feel his loss on that committee. In these dark days through which we are passing, I believe every Member of the House ought to read the address which the gentleman is now making, with great care and thought because I know what effect the experience and knowledge set forth in the gentleman's address will have upon the Congress.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is very kind. I have had no finer experience than that of serving with the distinguished and able gentleman from Louisiana on the old Committee on Military Affairs, later the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, to get back to some of the little weaknesses in the services that came out during the testimony. We found that the services expect to buy new desks and office equipment each 10 years and they base their requisitions accordingly. I do not know what kind of desks they buy in government offices, but I know that my desk which was not new when I inherited it, has been used 10 years by me. It looks about as good as it did when I got it. The services testify that they base their requirements for new office equipment each 10 years on the experience of business firms. I am sure that they are not the kind of businesses that I have been associated with in Florida.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I suggest that perhaps one of the reasons the gentleman's desk is so well preserved is that it is not moved around as often as some of the desks are moved in the Pentagon Building.

Mr. SIKES. That is entirely possible.

Mr. Chairman, we found the Air Force proposes to build an academy similar to that at West Point and the academy at Annapolis at a cost of 160 to 200 millions of dollars.

It has sent out teams and examined some 250 sites, all of this without authorization from Congress. Even if the matter does not proceed beyond the point of examining 250 sites, a lot of expense will have been incurred, possibly for nothing.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has many times pointed to the folly of spending $2,800 on battle equipped jeeps for station use here at home. Yet, only this year would the services reluctantly agree to start using standard jeeps for routine station use.

Last summer we passed a housing measure known as the Wherry Act. It was passed primarily at the request of defense chiefs who insisted, and we know it to be true, that housing needs at military installations are possibly the most aggravated local problem we have. Until this date, practically no use has been made of the Wherry Act. This is inexcusable for the need for housing still exists and the Wherry Act would utilize private initiative. The initiative is there. Builders are clamoring for a chance to provide housing under the Wherry Act. The services are bogged down in red tape and regulations of their own making.

I have one quarrel with the training programs of the service academies. Students at West Point and Annapolis get general training for 4 years. Then, after graduating, they have to start specializing in whatever department of the service, Army, Navy, or Air Force, they are going to devote their life work to. This usually means additional college training. The old practice was all right in the days when a man could be familiar with all the weapons in all the departments of the Defense Establishment. It is behind the times now. When students go to college they, in most instances, get 2 years of general training; then they begin to specialize. If the services adopted the policies which have been found most practical for most students outside the military academies, they could save valuable time plus the cost of additional training later for their graduates.

The greatest quarrel the committee has had with the services has been the use of funds for other than the purposes for which they were appropriated. The legality or the constitutionality of this practice is questioned. It appears to be an effort to circumvent the clear responsibility of the Congress to appropriate funds for the services, and to determine the use to which those funds shall be put.

Compared to the over-all scope of our military preparedness picture, these are relatively minor items. I do not want to leave the impression that I have a lack of confidence in the military chiefs or the military establishments. I do have great confidence in them. I feel that we have some of the ablest leadership the services have ever enjoyed and I subscribe to the statement that qualitatively our defenses are at their highest peacetime peak. There are relatively few changes that I think could advantageously be made at this time in the present picture, or in this bill as written.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. ENGEL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, personally I think that it is unfortunate there has not been a larger attendance on the floor this afternoon

to hear the speeches that have been made on the subject of national defense. They have been outstanding, and I commend them to the reading of the entire membership.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in listening to the discussion which has been had, it has been brought forcibly to my attention that the House is probably about to lose the services of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. It was my privilege to sit at his elbow for 9 years on this particular subcommittee, or the subcommittee which dealt with the appropriations for the Army and the Air Force, and for the civil functions of the Army, from the first of 1940 through 1948. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] really needs no praise from me. His record has been written across the country, a record of vigilant economy, a record of vigilance for the soundness of the national defense of the United States.

I hope that the people of Michigan appreciate the opportunity they have of continuing in public life a gentleman with the capacity, the integrity, and the ability of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order that I may bring to the attention of the membership a letter which I received from Lt. Gen. E. W. Rawlings, Deputy Chief of Staff, of the United States Air Force, and comptroller of the Air Force funds. The letter was received in response to a letter which I wrote to him under date of April 6, 1950, in which I requested specific information in regard to the proportion of Air Force, fiscal 1950 funds, that were frozen by the President. The date of the reply is April 19, 1950.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read the letter at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1950.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: This is in reply to your letter of April 6, 1950, in which you requested information regarding Department of the Air Force fiscal year 1950 funds which were frozen by the President.

Following the enactment of the fiscal year 1950 appropriations bill, the President directed the Secretary of Defense to reserve the additional funds added by the Congress to the President's 48-group budget for the purpose of building up toward a 58-group Air Force. As a result, the following funds were placed in reserve.

Appropriation:	*Amount*
Construction of aircraft and related procurement	$577,755,000
Special procurement	8,338,000
Maintenance and operation	130,928,000
Research and development	18,000,000
Contingencies	733,000
Total	735,754,000

Next is a point to which I wish to call particular attention:

Had the Air Force been authorized to obligate the entire appropriations enacted by the Congress for fiscal year 1950, the aircraft-procurement program for that fiscal year—

That is, for the current year—

would have been expanded from 1,250 to 1,832 aircraft and the Air Force would have continued its build-up toward a 58-group level.

I want to interpolate again to say that I want the record to be clear as to why we have not built up to the 58-group air force. Congress last year appropriated the funds. They were frozen, and the effect of that freezing was to hold us below the 58-group level; and instead of a procurement of 1,832 aircraft, the freeze held us down to 1,250.

Now, proceeding with the letter:

In the case of research and development, the reservation of funds in this appropriation resulted in the slowing down of the rate of development, and, in some instances, the elimination of certain projects.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has called attention to the tendency of this country and perhaps other countries to try to fight a future war with weapons of the past. That is historically true, but it is also historically true that we usually in the course of a war do not get any weapons which were not on the drawing boards prior to the start of that war. To get new weapons they have to be worked out and they have to be on the drawing boards and in a state of development.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is also a very pertinent part of the consideration to take into consideration the interim time that is involved from the time they are in the drawing board stage until they are literally in production.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That certainly is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Particularly in making up the interim time there is a lag in production. The lapse of time from the drawing board stage to front line use is about 2½ years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I remember, and I believe Members who were serving on this committee 3 or 4 years ago also will remember the time, when General LeMay appeared before our committee when we were discussing certain research and development funds which had been transferred to pay purposes. General LeMay told us that at least 18 months had been lost in progress through that transfer of funds. That is why this freezing of the funds we appropriated last year could be serious. For this reason the public and the country should know that it was not done by action of the Congress but was done by the President after Congress had provided the funds.

Continuing now with General Rawlings' letter—and bear in mind this letter was not a voluntary offering on his part, but is entirely in response to my inquiry to him—General Rawlings states:

The placing of these funds in reserve had no effect on the radar screen, and this program is being prosecuted as originally planned. However, it should be pointed out that the fiscal year 1950 appropriations bill did not provide funds specifically for this activity. Provision was made in the bill, however, for the transfer to the "Acquisition and construction of real property" appropriation of the funds required to finance this program. Such action necessitated the reprogramming of activities in the "Aircraft and related procurement" and "Maintenance and operations" appropriations to the extent necessary to finance the fiscal year 1950 increment of the radar screen.

The total amount which the conferees of the House and the Senate added to the appropriation estimates of the Department of the Air Force for fiscal year 1950, as passed by the Congress, was $735,754,000. The amount set aside in reserve by direction of the President also totaled $735,754,000.

Sincerely yours,
E. W. RAWLINGS,
Lieutenant General,
United States Air Force,
Deputy Chief of Staff, Comptroller.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to remember the fact that the amount frozen by the President, $735,754,000, is exactly the amount which the Congress on its own motion and initiative last year appropriated and said: "Here are the funds for the Air Force. We, the Congress, have provided them. We want you to build up a 58-group air force. We want you to proceed with research and development, we want you to proceed with the aircraft procurement program."

That amount, $735,000,000, which the Congress on its own motion provided, was the exact amount later frozen and set aside by direction of the President.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as remains on this side to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

VALUE OF CIVIL WORKS TO THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, today's way of global war, with its ever-increasing emphasis on logistics—has given rise to the expression that war today is an engineer's war. That statement—while appropriate—is, of course, a generalization. War belongs primarily to the man who wields the individual weapon. In the ground force, that man is the infantryman. In the Air Force, it is the man who drops the bomb or mans the machine gun. All efforts made by all other branches and services of the military establishment are only to assist him.

Yet, with the vast distances, variety of climates, and multiplicity of technical problems involved in war today, one would be amiss if he should under-estimate the ever-increasing importance of logistics—of engineering. For the success of the man who wields the gun depends increasingly on production, transport and supply. On having his combat power ever-increased by both construction and destruction. On having his movements facilitated, while those of the enemy are impeded.

It was the ability of the American military engineers in World War II to build a road, construct an airfield, rehabilitate a port, lay a pipeline, tear away a jungle, and throw a bridge across a river faster and more efficiently than ever had been done before that collapsed every strategic timetable of the Axis high command.

In the final analysis, it is the engineer who, today, in large measure, must marshall a Nation's work-power at its greatest and speediest efficiency, and place this

combination of natural and industrial resources at the disposal of the military command.

In World War II, this marshalling of American work power—the providing of design, material, and equipment—the construction of war plants, posts, camps, stations, airfields, utilities, pipe lines, storage facilities, roads, docks, and bridges—both at home and wherever over the world the Army needed them—constituted the greatest challenge ever hurled at the military engineer.

But the challenge was met. Proof of that fact is recorded in two great days—VE-day and VJ-day.

The following excerpts are taken from the wartime dispatches of famous American newspapermen and war correspondents. The dispatches were written on scene and carry the person right to the front.

By Walter McCallum, war correspondent from the Washington Star:

Fanatical German Lieutenant General Ramcke, commandant of the Brest fortress, which held out for weeks in an isolated pocket before surrender, stood up in an airplane flying high over the harbor of Cherbourg and said in guttural German, "My God, how can this be?" Below him were the funnels and stacks of a literal forest of ships, Allied ships of all kinds and sizes bringing the material of war to France. "They told us Cherbourg could not be used as a port," he muttered. "The general staff told us that."

The port engineers did one of those typical American will-to-win jobs at Cherbourg. Soon after its capture on June 27 they were hard at work clearing away the sunken ships, the toppled freight cars and the other obstacles which blocked use of the port. The engineers never stop. They work on at night under bright lights along the quay sides. They work in relays of 12 hours on and off. One of the real problems is rest. They never get any.

By William L. Shirer, war correspondent:

In the strange world of the airplane swooping down on bases humming with activity in weird places, which never heard the hum of a motor 3 years ago, one sees whatever constructive side there is to the war. At these bases American engineers, American labor, and American ingenuity have wrought miracles, and when the firing ceases these places will have value as a foundation for world-wide air transport which will make the world seem small indeed. The eyes of the French officer with me pop in amazement as he sees these things for the first time. "Ah," he exclaims, "you Americans know the secret of combining imagination and hard work, and the result is miraculous. In Europe our imagination was dulled and the people had forgotten the rewards of labor and therefore worked as little as possible. No people of Europe could construct these things. The future belongs to you, if you realize it.

By Kenneth L. Dixon, war correspondent for the Associated Press:

The engineers have frosty ears and they don't fool around with trifles. That is about all that is printable of the new version of that ancient ballad of the Army's battling bridge builders whose trifles in this First Army offensive consist chiefly of snow, ice, fog, and zero weather. Of course they have had a few incidental trifles in the form of enemy mines, shells, and bullets, but those are the standard occupational hazards for combat engineers. Only by working day and night through blizzards and cruel, cutting cold have the engineers been able to keep the roads comparatively clear in this offensive. They have improvised freak snowplows, ice-breakers, and nonskid materials. They have gone without sleep, without food often and kept every available piece of equipment in operation. The Germans originally held this territory. When the Yanks first drove through here the enemy blew all the bridges and mined the terrain. So American engineers rebuilt the bridges and cleared the minefields. Then came the German counterattack and the Yanks blew the bridges behind them and spread mines. Now the Americans are on the offensive again and the retreating Germans again are blowing the bridges and sowing mines in the same fields.

This achievement by the American Army engineers has since been referred to as "the American miracle." But, actually, it was no miracle at all. It was the results—the rich dividends—of accumulated experience, knowledge, and skills acquired by the Corps of Engineers during almost two centuries of continuous active service. It was the pay-off of this Nation's traditional—and unique—peacetime policy of giving the Army engineers jobs that are both civil and military. The nucleus of the engineers' wartime forces has always been an established organization of officers and civilians kept ever-ready with the practical skills of modern engineering.

Without diminishing even slightly the gigantic stature of such a task, it can be said that the construction phase of the war was a natural for the engineers. For 176 years, the Army Corps of Engineers had been a principle instrument in the hands of a democratic people building a nation. As an organization, it was accustomed to taking on the major construction projects of each era in the country's history.

For years, the Army engineers had supervised construction of large flood-control projects, and river and harbor improvements. They had worked closely with the Nation's construction industry from its early beginning to its growth into one of the wonders of the world. They had the basic organization, the experienced personnel, the technical information, the methods. Consequently, with equipment of this kind, in the hands of experienced men who had inherited the knowledge and methods used on thousands of peacetime construction jobs, they had a decided edge on the enemy.

The value of this type of engineering organization is incalculable.

The value of the Corps of Engineers' civil-works program in times of peace is extensively understood and appreciated by the American people. Only a relatively few people, however, know of the program's military value. Yet, this military value can hardly be overestimated. For the civil-works program, as assigned to the Corps of Engineers by the Congress, provides the proper training ground and Nation-wide engineering organization that, in time of war, establishes the United States Army engineers as the most efficient among modern nations.

At the outset of World War II, the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers was of a size previously unknown. The enormous construction task, and the additional responsibility of engineer procurement, were successfully accomplished through the agency of the corps' civil-works organization. Without that organization, already functioning in the field, the problem would have been impossible of solution within acceptable time limits.

It is virtually certain that in any future war the demand will be even heavier, and that it will develop with incredible rapidity. If an organization for this work does not exist at the outset of the emergency, it will be an almost hopeless task to organize one after the emergency arises.

The cost of maintaining such an essential engineering organization as the Corps of Engineers maintains, solely as a military stand-by to meet an emergency, would be prohibitive. But, as an organization responsible for the civil-works functions it has long performed, it is always ready—decentralized and flexible, capable of immediate expansion and contraction to meet varying work loads—in peace or in war.

The following extract is from a letter written last year to the Chief of Engineers by the British engineer in chief, after his official visit to this country:

During my visit to the United States last June, I was privileged to see many of the very large works now being carried out under the responsible charge of officers of the Corps of Engineers. While viewing these great undertakings I was very greatly impressed by all I saw and I certainly learned many lessons. One point which struck me most forcibly wherever I went was the very great opportunity which this work affords for providing technical education and practical engineer training for your officers—both junior and senior. We, in England, fully realize the importance of practical experience in the carrying out of engineering projects in peace, in order to fit our engineer officers for the heavy responsibilities which fall upon many of them in war, but for many reasons we fail to provide this experience on anything but a very modest scale. It was, therefore, with feelings of considerable envy that I saw what you actually achieve.

I have always been firmly of the opinion that this type of training is not only desirable but essential, and my experiences in two large theaters during World War II most fully confirmed that view. There was no type of civil-works project that did not have its counterpart in war, and often on a huge scale. Furthermore, I am convinced that in every successive war we military engineers will be called upon to carry out larger and more difficult tasks. As the power and mobility of armies is increased by science and mechanization, so do their demands upon their engineers grow in proportion.

To the great value of the civil works field organization, and its potential wartime operating capacity, must be added the opportunity which civil functions provide for the engineer officer to obtain wide professional experience.

Approximately 200 engineer officers are assigned to the civil-works program at all times. And though much has been said of this relatively small number in recent months, hardly any reference has been made to the fact that the offi-

cers are rotated. The policy is not a static affair, but one in which change is continuous. So much so that during his full career, an engineer officer has ample opportunity to receive the well-rounded, practical experience that throughout its history has made the American Army engineer a successful leader in military operations.

For example, Gen. Lucius Clay was completing the world's largest earth dam on the Red River in Texas when the late war began. Gen. Brehon Somervell, wartime Chief of Supply for the Army, was reassigned numerous times during his career to the civil-works program. Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Casey, who was chief engineer of General MacArthur's command from Bataan to the occupation of Japan, returned this past August after 8 years in the Pacific, and was reassigned as division engineer of the Ohio River division, until his retirement from active duty. Brig. Gen. John F. Conklin had years of practical experience on various civil-works projects prior to establishing his military reputation as chief engineer of General Patton's fast-moving, hard-hitting Third Army. Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler received invaluable practical experience on numerous civil-works assignments prior to establishing history's greatest supply line, and subsequently becoming wartime Deputy Chief of Allied Forces in the India-Burma theater, and the first postwar Chief of Engineers.

To be successful in a position of great technical responsibility in war, an engineer officer must possess a wide knowledge of engineering and construction methods, he must be versatile, and he must be self-confident. These attributes can be attained only by diversified experience.

The purely military engineering, which is done in time of peace, is neither sufficiently large in volume nor complex in character to afford him that necessary experience. But in the civil-works organization he has this opportunity. In addition, the civilians of the organization provide a valuable reservoir from which to draw emergency officers for military construction and other technical duties in theaters of operations.

In brief, the value of the civil-works organization to the national defense lies both in its capacity as a Nation-wide, territorially operating agency in war, and in the professional opportunities it affords individual engineer officers. Should this organization be lost to the Corps of Engineers, the damage would be irreparable.

In time of war, a nation's strength—and potential success—is measured by its outstanding possession of three great powers, or forces—combat, production, and construction. This Nation has proved itself without a peer in each of these fields. Under the United States Department of Defense, the Corps of Engineers is unique among the services and branches in that its mission includes assignment in each major field. And its wartime construction power—which dovetails directly with production and combat power—is definitely tied in with its peacetime civil-works program.

The development of atomic energy was not an engineer job. It was a result of scientific endeavor. However, the atom bomb was definitely an engineer project. The bomb was a product of the Manhattan District, which was headed and staffed by officers of the Corps of Engineers.

Such are a few commentaries which I have obtained, from time to time, and have preserved with reference to the magnificent work of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. This record speaks in such glowing terms of outstanding and patriotic contribution to the growth of this Nation that I had reached the point of believing that no one would seriously attack the integrity of, or the work of the Army engineers. Much to my surprise, within the last year and a half a real campaign has been developing to take from the Corps of Engineers the civil function of the flood control, rivers and harbors, work which it has been carrying on for 148 years. Opponents of the engineers have found to accomplish this result they have had to tear down the Corps of Engineers in the minds of the American people, and at the same time to extol the virtues of the Interior Department. This campaign has been going on throughout the country, in the official life in Washington, and even in Congress itself. The Hoover Commission report to which frequent reference has been made, the bill before the Armed Services Committee of the House to which I have made reference, the report of the Appropriations Committee of the House, together with other recent developments, are indicative of the terrific onslaught that is now being made against one of the departments of our national defense.

I do not believe this campaign will be successful. I do not share sympathy with any of those who assail the patriotic part which the engineers have played in the development of our country. I think we will win, but we will not win without a terrific effort on our part. We will modify and change the bill before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives; we will oppose the Hoover Report to the extent necessary to save the civil function work of the Corps of Engineers and we will, on the floor of the House, refute the vicious attacks which the Appropriations Committee report makes upon this organization.

The training which the Corps of Engineers receives in time of peace from this work on the rivers and harbors and in the flood control throughout the country is worth hundreds of millions of dollars to this Nation. It gives this country the finest Engineer Corps in any country in the world. It maintains the efficiency of the national defense, and by doing so helps to maintain the independence of our country against the encroachment of the Soviet and its satellites who would crush and engulf democratic government throughout the world.

In conclusion I wish to say that during the course of the war I had occasion to land on the Normandy beachhead some time after the tide of the invasion swept inland from the North Sea. When I landed with a group from the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives the first object which I saw was a stone shaft raising itself above the sands of the Utah Beach of Normandy. I was startled to find such a monument existing at a point which a few weeks previously had felt the full tide of the allied invasion of Europe with the host led by General Eisenhower. I approached this stone shaft some 15 or 20 feet high and read the proud inscription which combat troops had placed upon it long before the echoing sound of the cannon had fully died away. The tablet placed there reads as follows:

In proud memory of our dead—First Engineers Special Brigade—H-hour, 0630; D-day, 6 June 1944.

In other words, this tablet indicates an engineer battalion had actually landed on the Utah Beach 6 hours before date set for the invasion and had prepared the way for those tens of thousands who followed quickly.

I say my friends, I challenge those statements which attack the efficiency of the engineers. They come with poor grace at this time, leveled as they are against an organization which performed such efficient and proud a part in the records of the history of our country. We certainly should not tolerate any change which reduces the authority of the engineers or is harmful to this organization.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues who have so eloquently spoken on this part of the appropriation bill, which affects our armed services. None of us want to see our armed services and our defenses curtailed in any way. But I think that very fact points out the necessity of seeing to it that intelligent economies are effected in other directions. Certainly we know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has long been a zealous advocate of economy even in the armed services. I should like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him and also to deplore the fact that we here in the House of Representatives may lose his services.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing which has recently come to my attention which I would like to call to the attention of the House. Like a great many other Members of Congress, I practically only know what I read in the newspapers. Lately I have read this in the newspapers, that there is a move afoot, which may or may not be denied, to shift part of Great Britain's debt, amounting to $9,000,000,000, which she owes to India, Pakistan, and southeastern Asia, to the United States. Undoubtedly we will soon have that brought to us as an accomplished fact. I believe it is a fine thing to pay the debts of our friends. I wish someone would pay mine. But I

submit to you it is a mistake to pay the debts of one's friend when that friend has a balanced budget and money in the bank when we, ourselves, are borrowing the money to finance ourselves as well as our friend.

Here is the story:

For the fiscal year ending March 31 in England they showed a balanced budget, with a surplus of $1,537,000,000. For the next year, which began on April 1, Sir Stafford Cripps announced that he expected to end fiscal 1951 with a balanced budget and a surplus of $1,240,000,000.

Now, it seems a little absurd, to say the least, when we are running at a deficit of, conservatively, $6,000,000,000 a year, when we have been told by a very distinguished Member of the other body that we might expect to end fiscal 1951 with a deficit of $14,000,000,000, that on top of all this we should assume the debts of a neighbor who is apparently solvent and apparently has some money in the bank. Surely this is not the way to economize. Surely this is not the way to go to the people of the United States and explain the necessity for more and heavier taxes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I congratulate the gentlewoman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House. It seems to me that she has performed a real service in doing that. It is certainly my hope, as I feel sure it is the hope of the gentlewoman, that under the bipartisan arrangement which we have recently been told about, whereby members of our party will be called in at the outset to help plan some of the methods in the foreign countries, rather than having matters handed to them on a silver platter as accomplished facts, that great thought and study will be given and many deliberations entered into before any legislation is brought to us which requires us to assume a part of the debt of a country which is today balancing its own budget. I feel sure that the gentlewoman shares those views.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for the contribution. May I also hope that his statement will prove to be more than a pious hope and that this foreign policy will be conducted on patriotic and American lines throughout.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to say something about an old friend of mine of long standing, who has served upon this subcommittee for a great many years and who has done a wonderful job in promoting efficiency and economy in the armed services, the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. ALBERT ENGEL. I am sorry to say that he is retiring from the Congress. He is a candidate for nomination and election as Governor of Michigan. I think he knows more about the armed services situation and matters that used to be tied up with the armed services in the appropriation work, the civil functions of the Army engineers, and other activities of that kind, than any other Member of the House. He has never hesitated to go out on long trips. We have reaped a great deal of benefit from his services. He found out many things that his fine business sense allowed him to correct.

I have asked for this time, this opportunity to speak, that I may pay my respects to him and wish him Godspeed and success in his ambitions and his every undertaking.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I join the gentleman in tribute to our colleague. I recall, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], on the Appropriations Committee making one of his famous one-man tours of the country for the sake of economy and efficiency was nearly killed as a result of an accident when a train struck his automobile. His courage in war and peace is well known to those of us who served with him. It has been said that as a result of his investigations and recommendations made by him to the Army saved the taxpayers of the United States more than a billion dollars, and that national defense was made more effective because his personal work and investigations were not only adopted, but they resulted in the elimination of obsolescence and brought about more effective national defense in all categories. His service to the country and the taxpayer can never be repaid. Is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I, too, had the pleasure of serving with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] not only on appropriations for the War Department, but was also delighted to have him join me as a joint member in a dual capacity on the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee.

I know of no man who has had a greater zeal, or more energy; or more profound knowledge of the armed forces. He has brought about a great deal of economy. I join the gentleman from New York in his good wishes and further say: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to join my good friend from New York in this tribute to one whom I regret very much is retiring from Congress.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has won the admiration and affection of us all by his conscientious and splendid work. He has worked tirelessly to save the taxpayers' money and to bring about a greater efficiency in Government. I know of no one who has made a more careful or praiseworthy investigation than Mr. ENGEL did several years ago when he uncovered graft, corruption, and mismanagement in some phases of our war work. It made for him a national reputation. I know from my own personal knowledge of no one in the country who has a better knowledge of the value of the development of our waterway system and flood controls than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. He has made a personal and careful investigation of every project. I wish to express my keen personal sorrow that he is retiring from Congress. He has served the country well. Our best wishes follow him.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As the gentleman from New York knows, he and I have served shoulder to shoulder with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] over the years.

He has served as a member of the Subcommittee for Deficiency Appropriations. He has served as a member of the Subcommittee on the Armed Forces, as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs, as a member of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor and Social Security.

He has been indefatigable in his work and has demonstrated great over-all capacity.

In my opinion, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has made a tremendous contribution in the fight to preserve the solvency of this Nation.

I deeply regret his present inclination to sever his connection with this body. I wish him every success and future happiness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join the gentleman from New York and the others who have referred to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. Perhaps it would be more statesmanlike if I would refer to him as the Honorable ALBERT ENGEL, of Michigan.

We who have worked with you, AL, are going to miss your genial appearance and attitude very much. Wherever you go and whatever you do, we on this side of the aisle wish you all of the happiness and success possible.

May I also say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], we are also going to miss you gentlemen and we sincerely trust that whatever endeavors you take on in the future will result in prosperity and great happiness.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would be ungrateful indeed if I did not express my appreciation for the tributes that have been paid me by my beloved colleagues with whom I have worked during the past 16 years. Take away from me the friendship of the friends I have made on both sides of the aisle during the 16 years I served in Congress and you take from me the greatest remuneration I have received for that

service. Men serving in Congress and in public life are not paid with dollars, they are not always paid with public appreciation, but they must take their pay in the satisfaction of a job well done.

I thank each and every one of you from the bottom of my heart. God bless you all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, there are two aspects of this appropriation bill which I should like to discuss at this time—one of them has to do with the military appropriation and the other with the general method of dealing with the responsibility of Congress in appropriation of public funds. For the first time, the House has consolidated all of its appropriations into a single bill in the belief, entirely mistaken in my opinion, that by this method we can more effectively discharge our responsibilities in handling the public purse. We have been working on the measure for over 2 weeks now and find ourselves in a pathetic situation. Here we have a bill appropriating over $29,000,000,000 dollars, a fantastic sum, certainly the largest single appropriation ever attempted by our Government or any other government in peacetime in all the history of the world. We are perplexed, bewildered, befuddled, and bemused; many of us completely despondent and discouraged in our efforts to deal with our responsibilities intelligently, effectively, and with the degree of economy so essential to national financial stability. This feeling of frustration is caused, in my opinion, entirely by the effort to wrap all the Government appropriation bills into one neat and pretty little package, in a package which consists of nearly 500 pages and weighs over a pound. Even the report accompanying the bill is a sizable tome which would run a close race with Gone With the Wind in number of words. The hearings upon which the bill is based consist of several volumes of testimony. It is impossible for any of us to act and vote intelligently. It is doubtful if even the members of the Appropriations Committee themselves are advised with respect to all provisions of this bill; in fact, I dare say that not a single member, even including the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member, knows in detail what this bill contains or the justification for the various items.

This novel idea has resulted in utter chaos and confusion; a complete lack of comprehension by the House generally as the bill is being jet-propelled along the legislative highway. The result has been a sort of lethargy, a complete defeatist-type of acceptance on practically everything the Committee on Appropriations has reported—in a supine acceptance of the fact that by the very nature of this process, the Appropriations Committee is given practically a dictatorial control over the deliberations of the House and the appropriation of public funds. What is even worse, this process fixes the situation so that the House, being completely confused, is not in a position to estimate the result of this dictation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my hope that this stupendous bill, this incomprehensible process, this befuddlement in matters of appropriations will not be repeated in the future, and so far as I am able, I shall as one Member of the House do whatever lies in my power to return our future budget deliberations to some degree of sanity and coherence. In fact, I am strongly of the opinion that the rules of the House should provide that appropriations for each department or agency of the Government be considered in a separate bill and that on each appropriation measure a record vote is required. It is my hope that the other members of the House who are so deeply concerned over the financial condition of our Government and who have made serious efforts, not only to understand the Federal budget and expenditures, but who have made serious efforts to pare expenditures to the bone, will join with me in that undertaking.

We have a strange situation on our hands. Already the budget is about $6,000,000,000 out of balance and it is estimated that before the fiscal year is finished, there will be a deficit of over seven billion. There is not a single Member who thinks that this is desirable or healthy or conducive to the financial stability of Government except those few who subscribe to the fallacy voiced by some responsible officials of Government that deficit financing is wholesome to the national welfare. Unquestionably, the great majority of us would vote enthusiastically to balance the budget this minute, but why has this not been done. In my opinion, it is caused by a combination of factors—not the least of these is the propensity of this administration to gush dollars wildly and widely about as if they were water and about as plentiful. There is not the slightest doubt but that if solid conservatism got a firm hold of this budget process for even a brief period of time, hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars of waste could be found and eliminated. This has not been done and apparently will not be done despite the fact of general business prosperity.

Another reason why the budget is out of balance is the predilection of the administration to dash aimlessly and whimsically over the world exuding dollars by the millions to any and all nations that appear to be having a tough time balancing their own budgets—as is we were not. Not only is it the idea that our own unbalance is unimportant, but we follow the practice of providing the funds to others and then walking blithely away and expressing the pious hope that the millions thus granted will be expended by the foreign nations precisely as we had planned when we gave it to them.

The fact that that has not worked out time and time again, in practice, has been considered to be of no consequence. We are still doing it. And until reasonable conservatism, until reasonable people, until reasonable prudence and business sense, are returned to control of the Federal Treasury, this aimless program is bound to continue.

And that is another reason why the budget not only is out of balance now—but is sure to remain that way in the future so long as a spendthrift administration stays in power.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what about the military phase of this appropriation bill? Here is another reason why the budget is in serious jeopardy. It is the perilous condition of the world today.

No matter how you approach the world situation, you end up at the hard core of the problem—the Soviet Union has dedicated herself to the destruction of our political and social system, and she is moving in all fields, with considerable success, toward the accomplishment of her goal.

The hard fact confronting us today is that, for an indefinite time in the future, we will find it necessary to maintain standing armed forces far in excess of any ever before even dreamed of by the American people in time of peace.

The fact is, that we have no alternative, if we prize our freedoms, if we wish our ideals and aspirations to take hold throughout the world, but to keep up American armed strength. For, if we fail to do so, our dividend will not be a balanced budget. Our dividend will be a destroyed America—an America destroyed by a war invited by American military weakness—and a war lost, after having been incited by that weakness, because of that weakness.

So, now I am referring directly and exclusively to the military budget itself. It amounts to almost $13,000,000,000, a fantastically large sum of money. The question before the House is whether or not it provides adequate armed forces to meet conditions in today's world.

In my opinion, it does not. And here is why it does not.

Last year we appropriated money to support over 70,000 more men in the Navy than this bill authorizes. Last year we appropriated money to support almost 50,000 more men in the Army than is permitted by this bill. Last year we appropriated money to support 1,500 more active airplanes in the Navy and more fighting ships. And those appropriations, let me remind the Members of the House, were attuned to the international conditions existing at that time. But since last year we have had a whole succession of reverses—serious reverses throughout the world.

China is now in Russian hands. An army of 150,000 has been built up in eastern Germany. We have been warned that within a month, hostile demonstrations in Berlin will occur and we have announced to the world that these demonstrators will be resisted with our bullets. The strategic island of Hainan, which holds the key to the extremely important island of Formosa, has fallen to Russian minions.

Indochina is about to fall like a rotten apple to fanatics favorable to Russia and bitterly hostile to us. Next the effort will no doubt be Burma, perhaps India, perhaps the Dutch East Indies.

Russia has just killed 10 Americans by an unprovoked attack on an American Naval plane and we have been told that she would do it again. Russia has just demanded, in an insulting message, our removal from Trieste. Russia has built up the mightiest military force in the world—in submarines, in aircraft, in

armed manpower. That force is steadily growing.

Russia has exploded the atom bomb, although all of our leaders have predicted all the way along that she could not possibly master the atom until 1952 at the earliest. This event of incalculable military importance is now being laughed off by the very people who so earnestly have counseled the Congress for the last 4 years that we must peg all of our armed force planning on 1952 because of their expectation that Russia would have the atom bomb by then.

All this has come about since last year's military budget. But what, in the meantime, have we done in this so-called mightiest country in the world—I say, "so-called" because of what we have done in the past.

We have seen the President withhold $736,000,000 in aircraft procurement funds which the Congress had provided to increase the Air Force from 48 to 58 air groups. We have seen the Secretary of Defense withhold $234,000,000 more in aircraft procurement funds of the Air Force. We have seen the Secretary of Defense withhold $123,000,000 in aircraft procurement funds for the Navy.

As Chairman VINSON said last April 4, we have seen over $1,500,000,000 withheld from the fighting forces—all of which have been steadily declining since a year ago January so as to reach a predetermined low level of strength which the Appropriations Committee has simply accepted in this budget.

None of this program of inflicting injury on the effectiveness of our fighting forces received the approbation of the Congress.

We in the Congress are in a most peculiar position. We are daily warned by the Secretary of State that we must embark on what he calls "total diplomacy"—the complete resistance by the United States, including the maintenance of our military strength, to Soviet advance throughout the world. We are daily admonished by the President and Secretary of Defense that we must remain well prepared if we are to maintain peace in the world. We are daily warned by the military leaders of the Nation that failure to remain adequately prepared will not only bring on war, but will lose the war if it begins.

And, all the while, day in, day out, for months on end, we have been steadily reducing our military strength.

To my way of thinking, this situation is deplorable. It is playing fast and loose with the security of our Nation. It is intentionally misleading our people. It is confusion gone rampant in the highest councils of our Government.

So, what does this budget provide? It provides for the sharply reduced military strength Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and the President have graciously decided to let the Congress provide. It is a budget that will, in effect, put the Congress in the position of kneeling to the "superior judgment" of those downtown who have ignored the previous decisions of the Congress in respect to the national defense. But, what else does it do? It asks the Congress to approve a program which will, as surely as day follows night, compel a continuing reduction in naval and Air Force air strength in the future. So the idea is that we will reduce our military strength in the face of tremendous increases in Russian strength and despite great advances the Russian have made in strategic positions throughout the world. In addition, we will not make enough new airplanes available to our Navy and our Air Force to keep them from becoming obsolete in the next very few years.

Mr. Chairman, I draw the line there. I cannot let my eagerness for economy, my anxiety over the Nation's financial situation, my enthusiasm for a balanced budget, lead me to the decision that we can dispense with our future military power—especially in the air.

I cannot conceive of our approving a program here, as this bill provides, that will run the Air Force down to 42 groups—as the Appropriations Committee blandly admits. That is worse than false economy. This is saving today at the expense of tomorrow; it is a refusal to face the facts of today's world.

Neither can I conceive of our approving a program, as this bill would have us do, which strikes a mortal blow at our naval air arm which is the cutting edge of our modern fleet.

Here we are being asked by all our leaders to maintain our armed strength. So this bill comes along and says we need to have 48 groups in the Air Force. But we are told that the bill does not carry enough new planes to keep up 48 groups. Then we are again counseled, however, to maintain our armed strength in the future. Now just what sense does that make?

Next, we are told that the Navy must have 6,233 active aircraft. So the bill provides only enough new airplanes to maintain about 3,500 airplanes. The result is that, in the future, the naval air arm will be cut about in half in terms of modern aircraft. Meanwhile, the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense are shouting all over the United States that we must maintain our armed strength in the face of Russian intransigence.

Now, just what sense does that make?

I agree wholeheartedly, as I know this House does, that we must not economize at the expense of an adequate national defense. And this budget proposes the absolute minimum defense I can conceive under existing international conditions. If anything, it is too low, as recent events amply demonstrate.

That being true, I feel that there is the obligation on every Member of this House to support the increase necessary in the defense budget to maintain the limited air strength authorized by this bill.

I listened with extreme interest to the debate on this point of last April 4, between Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, and Chairman MAHON, of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services. In my opinion, the facts speak for themselves. The truth is that our air strength is certain to decline if we do not increase this budget—the required increase amounting to $200,000,000 for the Air Force and $383,000,000 for the Navy. Since the committee has reduced the President's budget by over $200,000,000, this amounts to an increase over the President's budget of the balance, or $383,000,000. Since this argument occurred a month ago the Secretary of Defense has asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reapprise their military requirements in the light of present world conditions, and it has been announced that this measure is to be increased by $350,000,000; $200,000,000 for Air Force procurement, $100,000,000 for Navy Air procurement, and $50,000,000 for submarine construction and reconversion. To the extent that this amendment will correct the deficiency in our military requirements to which I have just made reference, we can all take added comfort.

However, the situation presents aspects which are still disturbing in that it apparently is essential for the people, through their Representatives in Congress, to insist upon a more adequate military machine than the administrators of the executive department whose judgment is dominated by economic considerations would allow us. Historically, until the past year or so, the military has asked for funds far in excess of the amount the public would give, and the Congress was required to pare military requests by varying degrees of reductions throughout the years. In the last year or so, including the appropriation for this year, the reverse is true, and the people, through Congress, have appropriated more than was sought for the military budget.

The proposed agreement to increase the appropriation by $350,000,000 certainly should be supported by the House, for it does correct in a substantial measure a deficiency which might well have placed our national security in jeopardy. It is trite to say that we all hope war can be averted; that is the consuming passion of each one of us. We, as a nation, cannot place our national safety in jeopardy in a universal desire for peace. International brigandry is on the march today fully as much, if not more, than a decade ago. We were not prepared to meet that war then, much less to avert it. These experiences with two wars within our generation should provide some valuable lessons in international relations. Certainly, to my mind, they have established that the responsibility for world peace rests initially and largely upon America; that this responsibility cannot be met except through a strong Military Establishment.

It is, of course, deplorable that such vast sums should be diverted from creative purposes for the benefit of the general welfare and used for the wholly sterile purpose of national defense; however, we have no choice.

For my part, I prefer to retrench in public expenditures in every other way than, in the name of economy, to whittle down gradually our military forces until we become fully incapable of protecting our national interests.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this chapter of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, this concludes general debate on chapter X. General debate on chapter IX is now in order, not to exceed 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] and 1 hour by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take this opportunity to review the history of the early waterway improvements and flood protection in this Nation.

To those who came adventuring to a new world, harbors were of the first importance and safe anchorage for their ships determined the location of their settlements. The natural channels were deep enough for their small vessels, so little or nothing in the way of improvement was attempted before the Revolutionary War; and, for a good many years thereafter, it was the established practice for States to improve their harbors from funds raised by tonnage dues, and so forth.

For more than two hundred years after the first settlers landed on our shores, the rivers were the principal highways, just as they had been for unknown thousands of years on the other continents of the earth. These first settlers found the country covered with a vast unbroken forest. It was inevitable, therefore, when the westward movement of population began, that the line of march should go first up the rivers flowing into the Atlantic and then down those flowing to the Lakes and the Mississippi. Washington made repeated journeys from the Potomac to the Ohio, which, of all the westward-flowing streams, was the one most largely used.

In the early days of the Government it was seriously doubted that the power to regulate comprehended the right to improve; in other words, was the improvement of rivers and harbors a matter of national concern and therefore subject to appropriation under the Constitution? However, as early as the first Congress an act was passed providing for the future support and maintenance at Federal expense of lighthouses, buoys, beacons, and public piers; and for rendering the navigation of bays, harbors, and ports easy and safe. Thereafter, appropriations were made from time to time for the construction and placing of these facilities.

During the early decades of the nineteenth century, civilization spread swiftly along the natural waterways and from them into the wilderness through a spreading network of canals. By this time Congress had extended its jurisdiction to the granting of Federal aid in the building of canals. The first major canal was the Erie Canal, which was opened to through navigation from Buffalo to the Hudson in 1825. Its success was so great that canal projects sprang up on every hand.

In 1809 Congress appropriated $25,000 for extending the Carondelet Canal from Lake Pontchartrain to the Mississippi River and for making it "sufficiently deep throughout to admit an easy and safe passage of gunboats." This was not only the first direct appropriation for canal construction but was the only one made by the Government before the Civil War. However, between 1825 and 1830, Congress subscribed the following amounts to the stock of private canal companies: Louisville and Portland, $100,000; Chesapeake and Delaware, $200,000; Dismal Swamp, $283,500; Chesapeake and Ohio, $1,000,000.

Congress also aided in other ways besides subscription to the stock of private companies. In 1824 grants of land to aid in canal construction and river improvements were made to a number of States —including Alabama, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin—and, under this and other acts, nearly 4,500,000 acres of land were granted specifically for the construction of canals. One of the most important grants to the States was through an act passed in 1836, providing for the "deposit" with the States of surplus funds then in the Treasury. A high tariff and the rapid increase in the sale of public lands had created the surplus; and $37,000,000 was so distributed before the panic of 1837 caused the surplus to disappear.

Rapid settlement of the United States and the destruction of forests primeval and the intense cultivation of our soils brought about the necessity for flood control and the protection of our many fertile soils as well as the creation of electric power to implement the progress and welfare of mankind.

Congress initiated improvements for the benefit of navigation by the act approved May 24, 1824, which provided for improvements in the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

The act of June 28, 1879, created the Mississippi River Commission and directed the Commission to mature plans for navigation, bank protection, and to protect against destructive floods. Appropriations were made regularly for the work recommended by the Commission, and improvements were made in the river between the mouth of the Ohio River and the Head of the Passes.

The Flood Control Act of March 1, 1917, adopted a project for flood-control improvement on the Sacramento River, Calif. This act authorized appropriations in the sum of $45,000,000 for controlling floods in the Mississippi River and $5,600,000 for similar improvements in the Sacramento River.

The River and Harbor Act of January 21, 1927, and the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, authorized surveys to be made of the principal river valleys of the country with a view to improvement for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation. The reports submitted in response to these provisions form the basis for many of the projects for flood control that either have been completed or are under construction.

The Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, authorized appropriations in the sum of $325,000,000 for the Mississippi River and $17,600,000 for the Sacramento River.

The Flood Control Act of May 22, 1936, adopted the general policy now in effect—that the Federal Government should improve navigable waters or their tributaries for flood-control purposes if the benefits that may accrue are in excess of the costs.

The Flood Control Act of May 22, 1936, as amended and modified by the act of June 28, 1938, provided "that penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission."

The benefits to be derived from river-and-harbor improvements and flood-control programs have been carefully and fully explained to the Congress and the country as authorizing legislation has been considered and enacted. A great amount of such work was authorized and completed prior to 1938 when the above-quoted provision of law was enacted. The justification for the legislation at the time of its enactment was and is well understood by Members of the Congress.

Since the above basic principles became law, events of world-wide importance have disclosed the tremendous value of the programs inaugurated and completed prior to our entrance into World War II. Industrial capacity, increased largely through hydroelectric power generated under these programs, made victory possible. Since World War II the Congress, being apprised of shortages, enacted the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act under which it is the policy of the Government to acquire and retain stocks of critical materials and to conserve and develop the sources of these materials within the United States.

In the light of experience and current events what could be more important to the welfare of the Nation than the stockpiling of hydroelectric energy? What can be more critical than the need for power in times of emergency? Of what value are many of the critical raw materials acquired under the Stock Piling Act without the power to process them?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that one of the most critical items at any time, and especially in time of emergency, is power. The millions of acre-feet of water withheld from flood crests and stored behind Government-built dams is power. The harnessing of this natural resource within the streams of the Nation is, to me, one of the most important programs of stock piling of resources it is possible for this Nation to pursue. It provides the additional energy so necessary in our industrial age for needs during normal times and so essential in times of emergency. It augments the industrial capacity of this Nation, which is the most feared of our resources in times of emergency. It is one item that can be stockpiled during normal times that will repay its cost to the economy of the Nation, and without which the Nation, if deprived of its benefits, may not survive in an emergency. Let us not overlook

this essential item as we plan for this and future generations.

Now, with reference to the bill before us, the action of the committee on civil functions is summarized clearly in the last line of the tabulation appearing on page 263 of the committee report. The chapter on civil functions contains a total of $632,620,000, representing a decrease of $31,634,190 under the appropriations for the current year, and a reduction of $202,247,500 in the budget estimates.

The largest item is for work of the Corps of Engineers in connection with flood control and rivers and harbors activities for which the chapter includes $600,945,000. This represents a decrease of $34,559,190 under the current year's appropriation and a reduction of $197,537,000 in the budget estimates.

The chapter contains no new projects either budgeted or unbudgeted. While the reductions in the budget estimates submitted for the individual projects are, in most instances, substantial, I wish to state that, in the judgment of the committee, the amounts recommended are considered adequate to keep the projects current. The fiscal year 1950 bill for this activity did not become law until October 13, 1949. As a result of this delay in the enactment of legislation, the engineers in the majority of cases lost what might be considered as one construction season. This is borne out by the reported large unobligated balances for nearly all of the projects appropriated for in fiscal year 1950. The committee took cognizance of these balances in recommending appropriations for the fiscal year 1951. There seemed to be no advantage, either to the Federal Government or to the individual project, in appropriating funds which could not be used perhaps until the summer of 1951. In some instances none of the fiscal year 1950 funds were reported obligated as of the time of the hearings. In a great number of instances only small portions of the funds were obligated. The committee did not make a percentage reduction, but considered each project on the basis of the stage of construction and the amount of money presently available for each project.

A small number of projects have been eliminated from the bill because either they should be completed with funds heretofore appropriated, as agreed to in conference last year, or because the total estimated Federal cost was increased over that given the committee when construction was initiated.

With respect to this matter of increasing total Federal cost, I wish to say that the committee could find no justification for increased Federal cost because of increases in unit costs during the past year. The Engineers, in a majority of instances, have submitted increased Federal cost estimates because of subsequent changes in engineering and structural design. While some such changes are generally accepted as inevitable, the committee is of the opinion that the variations in the estimates of the engineers have been too great. It is hoped that these changes could be greatly reduced by more careful planning before beginning construction.

For the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, the chapter includes $65,000,000, which is only $2,000,000 less than is available for the current year. The majority of the committee did not feel that a further reduction in this item was in order.

The committee has eliminated all funds requested for planning. The impression gathered by the committee is that the engineers have over the past few years concentrated too heavily on individual projects with the resultant submerging of the over-all plans for both flood control and rivers and harbors. The action of the committee will give both the Congress and the engineers an opportunity to take stock of the present program and speed this program to completion before proceeding with the construction of new projects.

The remaining items in the chapter are more or less routine.

I do not subscribe to the serious criticism of our Army engineers who, under the law, are required to pass upon the projects involving flood control and rivers and harbors improvements—they are human beings and make some mistakes as all other humans do. For a number of years I have contacted these Army officers and I am convinced that no organization could be perfected which could do this important work better than those officers educated and trained by this Government for such purposes. If you will turn to the list of these fine officials within the last 10 years, this important duty has been placed upon Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, and Col. William E. Potter, Acting Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works. In my opinion, no ulterior motives were ever involved by these gentlemen or the others who were designated for this work. They have attempted to do a good job and this Nation owes them a debt of gratitude inestimable.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We all appreciate the splendid speech that the gentleman from North Carolina made on this chapter of the appropriation bill. I want to congratulate him on the fine and excellent service that he has rendered his district, his State, and his Nation throughout his long tenure of service.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate deeply the gentleman's expression.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman pointed out that there were no funds available in this bill for new construction. Does that apply also to planning funds and to engineering and surveying funds?

Mr. KERR. Both; to any and all new construction.

Mr. PRIEST. No funds for either planning or construction? I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some excerpts from a statement I made before the Senate committee yesterday, and also from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I arise to appeal to the Congress, first, from a standpoint of national defense and, second, from a standpoint of our internal water transportation system, to support the amendments that will be offered for funds to speed-up the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway—the missing link in our national defense program—as well as the missing link in our internal waterway system.

We cannot afford to wait until our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb, as was done in the case of Pearl Harbor. The very safety of our Nation may depend upon the speedy construction of this short slack-water route. It will cut the water distance between the Gulf of Mexico and our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., by more than 800 miles, cut the cost of transportation between the Gulf and Oak Ridge from 50 to 75 percent, and provide an additional outlet to the sea from that great project in case of emergency.

The enemies of this vital construction, led by the railroad lobbyists, who are opposed to all water transportation, continue to tell you they do not want to start any new projects.

This is not a new project.

It is an extension of our present national defense program. It is an extension of our facilities of access to our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., the greatest defense project the world has ever known and the one on which America must rely for her security and protection in case of another conflict.

In other words, it is a part of our defense program that must be constructed sooner or later, and should be constructed now with all possible haste.

Remember that, as General Wheeler pointed out, this project was not feasible until Pickwick Dam was built in 1938, raising the water level on the Tennessee by 54 feet, which made it possible to cut through the sand ridge that separates the two streams and put the summit of the project in the Tennessee River.

It is absolute nonsense to be sending billions of dollars of the American taxpayer's money abroad under the pretense of strengthening our national defense, and at the same time refusing this small appropriation to build this channel of ingress and egress to and from our atomic-bomb plant, which in case of another conflict will be worth more to us than all the billions of dollars this country could possibly send abroad.

Pouring those billions of the taxpayers' money into foreign countries and then refusing the small amount necessary to

complete this short, necessary passage to and from our atomic-bomb plant is like straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

We cannot afford to dilly-dally along until it is too late.

General Wheeler told us, when he was Chief of Army Engineers, that the construction of this project providing this short slack-water route from the Gulf to our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge was absolutely necessary to our national defense. If any of you doubt the wisdom of that statement, look at this map, which I am going to place out in the hall for the Members to examine at any time they desire to do so.

This is not a new project, so far as our internal waterway system is concerned, for it is an extension or a completion, of developments which have been going on for years and years and years.

It is an extension of that transportation system on the Ohio River, as well as on the Monongahela and the Allegheny, where we have constructed 68 locks and dams; 47 on the Ohio, 13 on the Monongahela, and 8 on the Allegheny. The traffic on those streams is now bottled up, so far as its connection with the Gulf of Mexico is concerned, for the want of this slack water route for the returning traffic, which this project will provide, and still save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream shipments.

Again, I say it is not a new project, for the reason that it is an extension of our transportation system on the Great Lakes and the upper Mississippi, where we have constructed 7 locks and dams on the Illinois River, to provide transportation to and from the Great Lakes, and where we have constructed 26 locks and dams on the upper Mississippi, to provide transportation to and from cities along that great stream, such as La Crosse, Minneapolis, and St. Paul, and all other points along the Mississippi from Minneapolis and St. Paul to New Orleans, La., and on to the mouth of the stream.

Again, I say it is not a new project, for the reason that it is an extension of those developments on the Missouri River, the Arkansas, and along the Intracoastal Waterway from the west coast of Florida to Brownsville, Tex., on the Mexican border.

Again, I say it is not a "new" project, for the reason that it is an extension of that development which has been going on along the Tombigbee, the Tennessee, and the Warrior Rivers for the last 30 years.

This project is already authorized by law. It has been approved by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. We have spent $858,000 on the planning, which is, as the Chief of Army Engineers expressed it, "substantially complete." They are ready now to move forward with its construction, and rush it to a speedy conclusion.

The Demopolis Dam, which the Chief of Army Engineers said the other day is the "connecting link" between this project and the Gulf, is already under construction, and should be completed as quickly as possible.

In addition to its benefits to the Nation as a whole from a standpoint of national defense, as well as from a standpoint of transportation, let me show you the water frontages of the various States which this project will directly serve.

ILLINOIS

In order to show what this project will mean to the people of Illinois, let me call your attention to the fact that the State of Illinois will have 1,097 miles of water frontage which this project will serve—581 miles along the Mississippi River, 133 miles along the Ohio, 326 miles along the Illinois, and 57 miles along the shore of Lake Michigan.

This project will be worth untold millions, yes, hundreds of millions of dollars to the people of Illinois; and, remember, they will not be merely temporary benefits, but benefits that will last throughout the centuries to come.

OHIO

Now let us see what it will mean to the State of Ohio.

That State will have 451 miles along the Ohio River, 27 miles along the Wabash, and 182 miles along Lake Erie, which this project will serve. It is impossible to estimate the great benefits which a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Ohio River and the Great Lakes, of which this project will be the completing link—it is impossible to estimate what it will mean to the people of Ohio in the years to come.

INDIANA

Take the State of Indiana, with 350 miles along the Ohio River, 40 miles of shore line along Lake Michigan, and more than 200 miles along the Wabash, all to be served by the slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, of which this project will be the completing link.

Who can estimate the benefits which the people of that State will derive from this development, which, as I said, will provide a slack-water route for their returning traffic, and, at the same time, save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream shipments.

PENNSYLVANIA

It is utterly impossible to overestimate the benefits which the great State of Pennsylvania will derive from the construction of this project. Pennsylvania not only has a large stretch of frontage on the Ohio, as well as on the Monongahela and the Allegheny, but she has a frontage of 44 miles on Lake Erie, all of which would be served by this project.

One of those vast 14,000-ton barges, or tows of barges, that are now going down the Ohio and the Mississippi, carrying the finished products from the Pittsburgh area, would save more than $22,000 on its fuel bill alone by returning through this slack water route, of which this project will be the completing link.

KENTUCKY

It is useless to dwell on the benefits which this great project would bring to the State of Kentucky. As everyone knows, the Tennessee River joins the Ohio at Paducah, and the Ohio touches the boundary of the State of Kentucky for 664 miles.

This development would provide what would virtually amount to a slack water route all the way from the Gulf at Mobile to Paducah, as well as to all points on the Ohio River, which, as I said, touches the boundary of Kentucky for 664 miles.

WEST VIRGINIA

The people of West Virginia would greatly benefit by this project. The Ohio touches the boundary of that State by 277 miles, and the Monongahela, which joins the Allegheny at Pittsburgh, flows through the State of West Virginia.

Every barge, and every vessel, that goes down the Ohio, or the Monongahela, from West Virginia to the Gulf would enjoy the benefits of this slack water route for its return.

It may be of interest to the Members of the House to know that in 1948 the traffic on the Monongahela River exceeded that of the Panama Canal by more than 6,000,000 tons. This project would stimulate that traffic, as well as the traffic on the Ohio River, which exceeded that of the Panama Canal in 1948 by more than 16,000,000 tons—this project, as I said, would stimulate that traffic by providing a slack-water route for returning vessels that carry the products of that area to the Southern States or to the Gulf of Mexico to be shipped to foreign countries.

MICHIGAN

Michigan is one of the States that is shipping a large portion of her finished products down the Ohio and the Mississippi by barges. She would have a total of 1,564 miles of water frontage to be served by this project.

When these barges return they want to bring back raw materials, such as oil, lumber, cottonseed meal and hulls, salt, sulfur, bauxite, iron ore, sea food, and other materials needed by the people of that State to carry on the great industrial enterprises which they have developed. This project would do more to aid in that respect than anything else that has ever been proposed.

MISSOURI

This project would be worth more to the State of Missouri than any other development of its kind that has ever been suggested. Missouri has 495 miles frontage on the Mississippi River and 570 miles frontage on the Missouri River, or a total of 1,065 miles of frontage that this project will serve. Yet the people of Missouri have their traffic bottled up, because returning vessels must fight that swift current of the Mississippi River. And besides they are paying a one-way freight rate that is literally bleeding them white.

I do not hesitate to say that if this proposition were left to a vote of the people of Missouri, and they were given to understand just what it means to them, there would not be enough votes against it to count. It would carry virtually unanimously.

If the enemies of this project succeed in blocking it, they will have done the State of Missouri, as well as all the other

States in that great basin from Pennsylvania to Montana, the greatest possible injury.

IOWA

Take the State of Iowa, which is one of the richest agricultural States in the Union. We find her traffic bottled up and her people punished with a one-way freight rate that is literally draining the resources and retarding the prosperity of that great Commonwealth.

Iowa has 312 miles frontage on the Mississippi River and 190 miles frontage on the Missouri River, or a total of 502 miles which this project would serve. The Mississippi is already navigable, and we are moving forward with developments on the Missouri River to make that stream navigable as rapidly as we can and as far up as possible.

This project would be a godsend to the people of Iowa in enabling them to bring back the materials they need, and to use the swift current of the Mississippi and Missouri for the downstream shipment of their products to the markets of the world.

MINNESOTA—WISCONSIN

Here are two States that will benefit immeasurably by this project. Minnesota has 150 miles of frontage on Lake Superior and 180 miles on the Mississippi River. Wisconsin has 350 miles frontage on Lakes Michigan and Superior, and 230 miles frontage on the Mississippi River.

As I have pointed out before, we have built 26 locks and dams on the upper Mississippi River, in order to provide a navigable channel all the way up to Minneapolis and St. Paul. Those people can ship their products down the Mississippi River with all ease, and at a minimum of expense. But when they start back and have to fight the swift current of the Mississippi River all the way up to Cairo, Ill., it eats up their profits and makes it impossible for them to enjoy the great benefits which the easy, rapid, downstream course of the Mississippi provides. But if they had this slack-water route for their returning traffic, it would be worth untold millions—yes; hundreds of millions of dollars—to the people of those two States in the years to come.

KANSAS—NEBRASKA

The same thing may be said of both Kansas and Nebraska. Kansas has 128 miles frontage on the Missouri River, and Nebraska has 415 miles frontage on that stream. Both States are being penalized by a one-way freight rate, and as a result are unable to get their products to market without the burden of unnecessary expense. This project will enrich every individual in those States—not only now but for centuries to come.

SOUTH DAKOTA—NORTH DAKOTA—MONTANA

This project will be of great benefit also to the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana as we develop the Missouri River which flows through them.

South Dakota alone has 547 miles of frontage on the Missouri. North Dakota and Montana each have a similar frontage on the upper stretches of that stream.

It is impossible to estimate the benefits which the people of those States will derive from the completion of this missing link in this great inland waterway system.

It is useless to further enumerate the States which this project will benefit. Even the State of New York has 280 miles of shore line along Lakes Erie and Ontario that this project would serve, since it would be available to all traffic on the Great Lakes; and if and when the connection is finally made between the Ohio River and the Great Lakes, either through the Beaver-Mahoning or the Allegheny route, this project will be of double importance to the people of western New York, as well as to the people along the Erie Canal.

I might point out also, that it will be of benefit to every State along the Atlantic seaboard that is now being reached by the Intracoastal Waterway, which we hope to connect with the Gulf intracoastal waterway, and thereby facilitate transportation of traffic from one section of the country to the other.

All the States on those streams, and the ones on the Intracoastal Waterway, from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Brownsville, Tex., from Knoxville, Tenn., to Sioux City, Iowa, and beyond, from Minneapolis and St. Paul to New Orleans and Mobile, will benefit directly from this development, as well as all the other States whose tributaries flow into those streams and into the Gulf of Mexico.

A barge or a tow of barges can go from Pittsburgh, Pa., or from Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, or any other point along the Great Lakes, or along the streams I have mentioned, all the way down to the Gulf and along the Intracoastal Waterway to the west coast of Florida, or to Brownsville, Tex., on the Mexican border, but when they start back they are penalized because of the lack of this connection which would provide a slack-water route for their returning traffic.

Here is a table showing what those 14,000-ton barges, or tow of barges, would save by returning through this slack-water route instead of fighting the swift current of the Mississippi:

Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 14,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	$28,280	$18,480	$9,800
	Paducah	29,400	17,640	11,760
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	33,880	13,860	20,020
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	33,460	13,300	20,160
	Paducah	34,580	12,460	22,120
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	39,060	8,680	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	41,440	13,300	28,140
	Paducah	42,560	12,460	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	47,040	8,680	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	37,520	9,380	28,140
	Paducah	38,640	8,540	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	43,120	4,760	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	39,620	7,140	32,480
	Paducah	40,740	6,300	34,440
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,220	2,380	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	40,320	6,440	33,880
	Paducah	41,440	5,600	35,840
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,920	1,820	44,100
Amory, Miss.	Cairo	40,740	6,160	34,580
	Paducah	41,860	5,320	36,540
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,340	1,540	44,800
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	41,020	5,740	35,280
	Paducah	42,140	4,900	37,240
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,620	1,120	45,500

Remember that the savings up to Cairo, Ill., apply to every load of traffic going to any point above Cairo on the Mississippi, Illinois, the Great Lakes, and the Missouri, and that the savings back to Paducah apply to all the traffic going up the Ohio and its tributaries.

I have gone into this proposition somewhat at length, in order to try to impress the Congress with the dire necessity of speeding up the construction of this short, missing link in our national defense program which, as I said, is also the missing link in our internal waterway system.

We cannot afford to delay it any longer.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am bothered somewhat by this entire chapter. I have tried to find justification for many of the items, but have been unsuccessful. Rivers and harbors traditionally is the repository of the so-called pork barrel in our Government expenditures. I think all of us realize, too, that pork barrel is a symbol of waste and congressional extravagance. Pork barrel means cynicism and indifference toward economy.

Too much lip service is given to economy and not enough action. There is no person today who does not recognize that our national resources and the amount the Government can spend are limited. Pork barrel benefits only a few and not the Nation as a whole.

We are faced today with a dangerous cold war which has taken large amounts of money from every person in the United States. We are also faced with a budget that is sadly out of balance and our national deficit is increasing every day. There is no prospect for a tax decrease.

This Nation cannot continue to survive in health and strength by financing everything we want through borrowings. Deficit financing can lead only to a weakening of our economic system and ultimately to a loss of our democratic leadership.

People of this country want to have confidence in their Congress. They want to know that Congress understands that there is not enough money for everything. The people certainly understand it.

The pork-barrel politics is impossible to defend. The items listed for these millions of important dollars can be done without and we know it. The waters in these rivers and harbors can flow many more years without these improvements. At best, such expenditures should wait upon a better budget picture and a more healthy tax structure.

The people of this country cannot be asked to have faith and confidence in us if we are not prepared to discriminate among the possible ways of spending their money.

Let us strike "pork" from the appropriation. Let us have the moral courage to be economical. Let us give birth to a new confidence and sanity in our judgment. The country will approve this contribution to a strong and stable economy.

I have heard the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee talk about the part the rivers have played in America. Historically, I suppose that is true. I suppose, too, that all over America there are thousands upon thousands of rivers that are crying for a dam, and many harbors, probably, crying to be deepened, but we do have the railroads and we do have the roads.

I should like to address a few questions to the gentlemen of the subcommittee, be it on this side of the aisle or the other. These questions come about because of being unable to find within the hearings or the report the justification for some of these expenditures.

On page 249 of the report there is listed a figure of $2,780,284,270 as the estimated total cost of all Government projects excluding flood-control projects now under construction. How firm is this figure? Has there been any increase over the original estimates of these projects? Will somebody please enlighten me?

Mr. KERR. Those were the estimates of the Corps of Engineers, and they were thoroughly gone over.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I called the Corps of Engineers a few times to try to get answers to these questions. I was told I could not get the justifications because there were four copies of the justifications, and those justifications were in the hands of the subcommittee and were not available to me.

I thereupon called the assistant clerk of the committee and he told me that he could not give me the justifications.

We here in this Congress are asked to vote for these projects. These projects are in 33 States. There is great doubt all over America concerning the wisdom of these projects. The least that can be expected if we are going to vote intelligently upon these measures is to have the justifications for these projects. Certainly it is no answer to say that we can get them from the Army engineers, because I tried.

Mr. TABER. May I suggest to the gentleman that on page 379 of the hearings is a table that runs two or three pages, which shows the original estimated cost of the projects considered. The gentleman will note that in some cases the original estimated cost is 20 percent of the current estimated cost.

I call attention at the moment to one project picked at random. The original estimated cost was $3,350,000. That is the Whitney Reservoir, listed on page 382. The present estimated cost is $41,794,000.

We have had estimates of the cost jumped as high as 100 percent from the bill that was put through here in 1949 to the bill that is presently being considered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Under those circumstances, does not the gentleman believe we are being led down a very dangerous blind alley when we approve a project that is represented to cost approximately $8,000,000, and we get started on the project and find when we get through that the project will cost $41,000,000? That is not good business, it is not good government, and it certainly is not sound practice or economy.

Mr. TABER. It is not keeping faith with the Congress by the Corps of Engineers, either.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is exactly the point I want to make. If the Corps of Engineers is coming in here to justify their point of view and estimate $8,000,000, and then have a cost of $41,000,000, I think instead of hearing praise for the Corps of Engineers, the Corps of Engineers should explain why they are so far off in their estimates.

Mr. TABER. That is what we have tried to find out. We have been unable to find good reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee for five additional minutes?

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Will the gentleman on the other side of the aisle yield me five additional minutes?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have some pertinent questions to which I think it is important to have the answers.

Are there any projects under construction not included in this figure on page 249 of approximately $2,750,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean the projects on page 379 that I referred to?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No. I am looking at the projects listed on page 250. On page 249 of the report there is this statement:

> The total estimated Federal cost of the rivers and harbors projects presently under construction is reported at $2,780,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Those, of course, are rivers and harbors projects. They are separate from the flood-control projects.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I understand. I am only asking concerning the rivers and harbors projects.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, those figures cover the total of the presently authorized rivers and harbors projects on which appropriations have been made to start construction. I do not have the page marked where the comparative table appears to which I referred the gentleman on flood control, but there is a table and I will give the page number to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does this figure represent the average yearly value of projects under construction year in and year out, from the experience of the gentleman in the House? Does this figure of approximately $2,750,000,000 represent the average yearly value of projects under construction?

Mr. TABER. No. We have rather increased the value of the projects under construction from year to year. Some of these tremendous increases have come in the projects on the Missouri River. That is, some big increases have come in the projects on the Missouri River and some in the State of Washington. I am being somewhat general and am referring to projects on rivers and harbors and flood control.

Mr. RIBICOFF. On page 250 of the report is listed a number of projects to which have been allocated the total sum of $187,678,000. One hundred five million eight hundred and thirty-eight thousand dollars is for the purpose of continuing projects under way. Do I understand that is the entire construction allotment necessary to have these projects proceed during the coming fiscal year? Is that all the money which will be used on these projects during the coming fiscal year for construction purposes?

Mr. TABER. Not necessarily. All of this money which is appropriated is made available to the engineers until expended. That has been the practice for generations. During the last couple of years, and I might state frankly to the gentleman that my service and the service of the other members of the subcommittee, with the exception of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], on this subcommittee only dates back to last year, but we have tried in the last year to find out what the unexpended and unobligated balances were before we made our appropriations and we considered the projects on that basis. This year we made the discovery for the first time that they were boosting the costs of these projects, and so we have gone into the thing much more thoroughly than we ever have before, and we have had to discriminate against projects where the estimate of costs has been boosted out of sight.

Mr. RIBICOFF. This sounds very close to dishonesty in figures. How much money does the Army Engineer Corps now have where funds have been appropriated and unexpended?

Mr. TABER. I do not have that figure at hand. We had it by individual projects. I do not have that at hand.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does the gentleman mean unobligated funds with respect to rivers and harbors and flood control?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; with respect to rivers and harbors and flood control.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As of December 31, it was approximately $220,000,000.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it sound, when the Army engineers have on hand $220,000,000 unexpended, that at the same time we vote them another $187,000,000 that

probably will be unexpended? Certainly, with the deficit that we are running at the present time, could we not find better use for the current funds?

Mr. TABER. That is one reason why these appropriation figures in this bill are cut as much as they are. It was because there were such enormous unexpended balances. I have a table before me now which relates to rivers and harbors. On pages 190 and 191 is the detailed break-down of the original estimated cost and the present estimated cost of rivers and harbors projects. One of them I will refer to. The Chief Joseph Dam was estimated at $104,000,000 in 1945, and at the present time the estimated cost is $206,000,000. It has only gone up approximately 100 percent. I might be exaggerating a little.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I say this with a feeling of humility. This is my first term and perhaps I should not be asking these questions, but certainly it is shocking to find out——

Mr. TABER. If it shocks you, you can be sure it shocked me tremendously, because I had always been brought up to have a great deal of faith in what the Army engineers might do. I have been terribly disappointed, I will say to the gentleman, in what I have found in the 2 years I have served on this subcommittee.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I think probably it would be well for the country if there were perhaps more of us in this Congress that might be shocked by such financial shenanigans.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I will give the totals of those figures on page 191. The original estimates of cost were $1,747,000,000. The present estimates are $2,780,000,000. For those same projects the estimates last year were $1,974,000,000—more than 50 percent up in the last year.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Which of the projects listed on page 250 of the report could be stopped this year without economic loss to the project?

Mr. TABER. Well, there are not very many that could be stopped without loss. I would say that there were not very many projects that could be stopped without serious loss. In this approach it has not been a partisan approach in the slightest degree. I will say that the Members on the majority side and the Members on the minority side have pretty well agreed.

There is one item that I think is larger than justified, but outside of that I would say that we were pretty well set on what this bill should carry; it represents very substantial cuts.

Mr. RIBICOFF. This year Congress has authorized $1,453,414,300 for new projects.

Mr. TABER. No, no.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Authorized but not appropriated.

Mr. TABER. We have done neither. The bill has passed both houses and a conference report lies on the table. I understand it will be brought up tomorrow. Frankly, I cannot support it.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I will join the gentleman in that.

May I say to the gentleman from New York that if this conference report were adopted how eventually would these items be brought into the swollen sum being spent under the so-called rivers and harbors bill here?

Mr. TABER. They would come in on budget estimates from the President; then the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate would hold hearings, and they would recommend action on those budget estimates, either approving them, disapproving them, or modifying the projects after they had held their hearings.

Mr. RIBICOFF. But this year, as I understand, the Committee on Appropriations has not appropriated any funds whatsoever for additional new projects.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I ask whether this is a policy of the Appropriations Committee to continue to cut back appropriations for new projects until we have a better budget picture?

Mr. TABER. That is my personal position. I think it would hardly do for a minority member to speak for the full committee. I would say that from all I can gather it is the attitude of the majority of the subcommittee that has been involved in this.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Would that be a fair question to put to the majority members of the committee? Whether it is the intent and policy of the committee to discontinue any appropriations for new projects until we have a better budget picture?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. RABAUT. It has certainly been the views of the committee, as is evidenced by the report that comes up to the House from which the gentleman is quoting.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I think the committee should be commended for the action it is taking, because that is what the public expects of this Congress, good faith.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will study the report of this subcommittee he will find, I believe, that it tops the list for respect for the purse of Uncle Sam.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In that respect it should be commended. I think it is unfortunate that the report did not contain justification of these projects and some of the answers to the questions that I raised.

(Mr. RIBICOFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut did not have time to yield for a couple of questions.

Let me state at the outset that I do not profess to know anything about the pork barrel contained in these various projects, but it seems to me that the gentleman's general statement criticizing the Army engineers for their varying estimates on the total cost of these projects is altogether without any basis. The projects should be judged individually from the standpoint of value. As I understand, the money the engineers have on hand, which was referred to in colloquy between the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is all earmarked for certain projects and must be used to complete those specific projects. It may be that there are some projects in this bill that should not have been commenced, but the question presented here is obtaining money to complete projects where the Government in many instances has made a huge investment. Of course the engineers' estimates on many of these projects varied from time to time on account of increased cost in construction. In many instances there were unforeseen circumstances that made the project cost more than originally estimated.

Now, if the gentleman from Connecticut will turn to page 253 of the report, he will find a statement of the committee that says:

> In view of the fact that unit costs on construction have remained more or less stable since that period—
>
> Talking about the previous year—
>
> the committee feels that these projects should be completed on the basis of the fiscal year 1950 estimates.

Let us analyze this one statement that appears in the committee report for the purpose of seeing how it affects the Dewey Reservoir, a recreation and flood-control project located in my congressional district in eastern Kentucky, and for the purpose of seeing whether or not this is a sound statement in the committee report. The Army engineers in their 1950 estimate estimated the total cost of the Dewey Reservoir to be $6,246,800. Congress has appropriated approximately $6,000,000 for this project. This year the engineers appeared before the committee and stated that they needed more than a million dollars to complete the project.

At the time the engineers gave their testimony before the Appropriations Committee they were laboring under the impression that the acquisition of lands for this reservoir would cost more than $1,000,000 over their previous estimate for the budget year 1950. About August 1948, when the estimate was made for the 1950 budget, very few, if any, condemnation suits pending in the Federal court had been tried. Thirty to thirty-five percent of the entire acreage in this reservoir area had to be obtained through condemnation proceedings. If I recall correctly, the first few condemnation cases tried exceeded by far the original estimates allowed for the value of the land in the 1950 budget, on account of the fluctuation in land values. On the basis of these awards the engineers in the fall of 1949 increased their

estimates on the total cost of this project to more than a million dollars. That amount was provided for in the budget.

No one can say that the engineers were not justified in increasing their total estimate in this instance. A few weeks ago the engineers arrived at the conclusion that it would take only $600,000 to complete this project. Since August, 1949 agreements have been reached in several condemnation suits and the engineers have been in a better position to appraise all the individual tracts of land necessary to acquire than they were 6 months ago. There has been less fluctuation and variation in real estate values.

All of the construction on this particular project has been completed for some time but this additional money is to acquire land in order to hold the floodwaters before the project can be fully utilized. Yet the Appropriations Committee has denied the amount of money that it will take to complete the project, and are holding the engineers to the estimate of total cost they made for the 1950 budget.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not know about the particular project to which the gentleman refers, but when the original estimates were made, was it not known by the Army engineers you would have to have additional work in order to properly complete that dam?

Mr. PERKINS. I will answer the gentleman in this way: The original estimate in 1950 was made for $6,246,800 as the total cost. At that time they were unable to tell or to judge what the cost of the land would be. They had traded with a few parties and on that basis they made the estimate for acquisition of the total amount of land. But it turned out that they had to condemn thousands and thousands of acres of this land and the estimates went much higher. For that reason the Army engineers could not make an accurate estimate, it was impossible, and that is the reason I say that in many instances they are justified in requesting more money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Any time the Army engineers approve a project, if that is the system under which they operate, then this Congress in effect gives them a blank check. If the estimates are wrong, if they are negligent, then under those circumstances, once a project is started, from then on they can come to the House and expect the House to pull them out of the hole that they themselves have dug because of their own ignorance.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no evidence and the gentleman from Connecticut has not presented evidence to show that the Army engineers have failed to exercise ordinary care in connection with the estimates in these cases. They certainly were not negligent by reason of their varying total estimates on this particular project.

Mr. RIBICOFF. When the gentleman talks about evidence, the case he cites and the cases cited by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] indicating the terrific increase in the actual expenditures and the estimates would certainly indicate gross negligence on the part of the Army engineers.

Mr. PERKINS. I disagree with the gentleman from Connecticut by reason of the fact these estimates were first made in previous years and construction costs have gone up by more than 100 percent in many instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to an error in the Appropriations Committee report with reference to certain Arkansas River projects. I do not understand how the inaccuracy got into the report, but it is too important to the people who live in the valley of the Arkansas River to go unchallenged.

The following statement appears at page 249 of the report:

> Furthermore, the committee wishes it understood that in appropriating this sum ($500,000 for work below Little Rock) it is not committing itself to the amount of $765,460,000 estimated by the Corps of Engineers as the total Federal cost for the comprehensive plan on the Arkansas River and tributaries. There is no question in the mind of the committee but that no funds would have been recommended last year for the three projects had it been realized that they merely represented segments of an over-all plan of this magnitude.

Now, the record is clear to the effect that items referred to for the three projects were included in the conference report on the civil functions bill only after the Corps of Engineers representatives stated, in support of requests for these improvements, that the projects were segments of the authorized comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River. This is set forth at pages 565 and 1470 of the Senate hearings on the civil-functions bill for 1950.

The elimination of a budget request for other bank stabilization projects on the ground that the stabilization work was to be completed in the current year, is answered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in his address to the House on April 5, in the general debate on the pending bill, as follows:

> The report of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions criticizes the Chief of Engineers for including a project on the Arkansas River on the ground that bank stabilization would be completed for the current year and that the committee of conference so provided. My understanding was that there was nothing in the conference report to notify the engineers that the previous appropriation had been made with that provision.

In the Senate hearings upon the 1950 civil-functions appropriations, Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, asked the representative of the Corps of Engineers if the sums in question for the Arkansas River were applicable to the comprehensive plan, and the reply was in the affirmative.

Three items are involved, as follows: Bank stabilization, Little Rock to the mouth of the river; bank stabilization below Dardanelle; and the Morrillton cutoff. The Dardanelle and Morrilton items were eliminated altogether and the request in the amount of $700,000 was reduced to $500,000, with the notation previously quoted. It is difficult to see any justification for the committee's deletion of the Dardanelle and Morrilton items on the basis that their inclusion previously was due to misinformation, particularly since the bank stabilization below Little Rock has exactly the same status as the other items in relationship to the comprehensive river program.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee's reference to the Arkansas River comprehensive plan, particularly the allusion to estimated total costs, is highly inappropriate and a reflection upon the work of other committees of the House. The Arkansas River plan as a whole was approved by the Seventy-ninth Congress, Public Law 525, and while that law contained a limitation of $55,000,000, a bill approved by both Houses of the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 5472, raises the authorization to $70,000,000. The conference report on this bill was filed on April 28, 1950, and an additional sum of $10,000,000 is recommended by the conference committee, thus providing a total for the comprehensive plan of $135,000,000. The Public Works Committee wisely limited the authorization to less than the contemplated total, thus reserving for the Legislative Committee the opportunity of having a periodic check on the progress of this highly important improvement.

The Arkansas River is the last of the Nation's great rivers to receive congressional approval for a comprehensive plan of improvement. It serves a great area in the Southwest, and is the most important stream between the Missouri River and the Gulf. For 118 years there has been Federal activity along this stream, but not until the action of the Seventy-ninth Congress was a legislative mandate for multiple-purpose improvements secured. The Congress has been generous with the people of our section, but it is fair to say that the generosity was not always accompanied by foresight. This was the substance of General Pick's statement in hearings before the Public Works Committee last year, when, in reply to Chairman WHITTINGTON'S question regarding the comprehensive plan, he stated that the time had come for tying the improvements together for the purpose of giving maximum service to the area at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. Chairman, I was born within 2 miles of the Arkansas River, and all of my life, except the time I have spent in Washington, I have lived within 3 miles of that great stream.

I remember the days before it became a serious national obligation to build levees and to stabilize banks when local

farmers were bankrupted by the excessive cost of constructing levees without help from the Government. It is now a national problem, no longer a local problem. The waters that descend upon us in flood proportions are not the waters that fall upon our State, but upon other States to the west and to the north of us. And if our Nation does not view sympathetically the plight of the farmers who own lands that are destroyed by these waters, and the people dependent upon them, then, of course, there is no hope for relief for us.

Even since I came to Congress in 1943, a single flood destroyed one-tenth of all the cultivable land in the valley between Fort Smith and Little Rock. Twenty-three lives were lost in that flood. The Members will recall the emergency appropriation we made to meet the conditions of distress that grew out of it.

In spite of the tremendous natural resources of the region, the counties between Little Rock and Fort Smith, in the very heart of the Arkansas Valley, suffered losses in population between 1910 and 1940. The development of our land and water resources, including the production of hydroelectric power, offers the only hope of strengthening our economy and adding to the national wealth.

Two great national forests are in this area. One, the Ozark National Forest, is north of the river, and to the south is the Ouachita National Forest. There are vast reserves of timber offering opportunities for wood-product industries that would enter into the calculations. Of course, there are oil and coal in abundance. There is bauxite and almost every kind of material that justifies planning for navigation.

General Feringa once said that the Arkansas River is the most treacherous and the most unpredictable large stream in the United States. All the way from Colorado to the Mississippi River, it winds through an area that has vast potentialities. The people of four States look hopefully to the Congress to proceed with this program in accordance with previous actions of the Congress.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I am glad to join with my colleague in his insistence on this program being completed. Congress authorized the whole comprehensive plan, in 1946, but I think unwisely put a peg in at $55,000,000 which precluded the engineers from starting the project. I think after a project has been authorized, that it should go to the Committee on Appropriations and not have to continue to go to these other committees seeking increased authorizations. I want to say at this time that the people in the Arkansas Valley owe a great debt of gratitude to my colleague, the gentleman who has the floor. As a member of the authorization committee of this House, I know he has continually been insistent that Arkansas be cared for. I hope he is successful in securing an appropriation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to my friend. I am glad to have his comment with reference to the ceilings on the authorization. I would be inclined to defer to his judgment. It seems to me, however, that there is some value in a periodic check-up by the legislative committee. For that reason I made the statement.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I endorse and give emphasis to every word the gentleman has said about the Arkansas River. It is one of the great major streams of this Nation. It has been neglected as no other major stream has.

While I am a member of the committee that has presented this bill, may I say that as a member I do not subscribe to the wording of the report of this committee.

In this connection, may I say that many of the Corps of Army Engineers are graduates of that great academy at West Point, skilled in engineering and other military tactics as they must be. In peacetime they manage our river-and-harbor, flood-control, and other civil works. They have done the world's outstanding engineering job. I challenge any corps anywhere to equal it, much less exceed it.

In time of war, the training they get here, first at West Point, then in actual experience, equips them as members of the armed services to go out in no man's land between our troops and the enemy troops to supply bridges and other engineering works in order to conserve human life.

I am shocked that anybody would have the nerve and audacity to get up here and criticize the Corps of Army Engineers for making estimates 10 or 12 or 14 years ago, or even a year ago, that are lower now than the prices are.

May I say in conclusion that I endorse everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. I endorse every statement that has been made by my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], who now has the floor, and by my colleagues from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. NORRELL]. I could add additional words about the tremendous need for the improvement of the Arkansas River Valley, a portion of which is also within my district, but because time is limited I merely wish to say that I endorse the words that have been said, and wish to add any assistance I may to bringing about the completion of this comprehensive program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, with other Members of the Congress I fully appreciate the most difficult task of the Committee on Appropriations in bringing to the House this general appropriation bill for the several departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year 1951.

In this history-making, record-breaking omnibus appropriation bill of approximately $29,000,000,000 for these several agencies of the Government we are forcefully reminded how difficult it is in providing the fiscal affairs of this country. The security of our Nation, our own national defense, and the services to our people are all revealed in one compact presentation.

Whether this is the best way to consider appropriations for these services and our national security remains yet to be seen. Whether or not this approach will lend itself toward balancing the budget, that is, living within our revenues, also remains to be seen. I am fully aware, however, of the good intentions and splendid efforts of this great committee in endeavoring to assume its tremendous responsibility which it has toward the people of our country. I appreciate the efforts they have made and join with other Members of this House in commendation for their hard and faithful work throughout this session as they have endeavored to present a record justifying or not requests and demands upon the Treasury of the United States.

Throughout the debate and consideration of these various chapters I have not undertaken thus far to enter into the debate, but I feel, Mr. Chairman, that in the consideration of this chapter on civil functions that reference again should be made to some of the points of consideration and the result of the work of the committee as it is presented to the House.

I do not wish my remarks to be in the nature of criticism of the subcommittee headed by our good colleague, Judge KERR. In fact, this subcommittee, as the other subcommittee, have labored hard and endeavored to do the very best they could in providing for rivers and harbors and flood control for the next fiscal year.

I have appeared before the committee and appreciated very much the courtesy extended to me and deep concern for the problems present and the careful consideration given to what I endeavored to say.

Frankly, I think the items reported for rivers and harbors and flood control have not only been reduced to an almost irreducible minimum for the best interest of our future, but have in fact been reduced entirely too much. I would not feel this way if in my opinion reductions in the other agencies and departments on the same percentage basis had been made.

Perhaps it might be much better to reduce the appropriations of the other agencies to the same extent in an effort to balance our budget and bring our expenditures in line with the revenue, but as a practical situation it has not been done. As I understand and from reading the report and making comparisons, civil-functions appropriations have been reduced by something like 25 percent from that requested by the Budget. No other item has, as I view the report, been so reduced.

I think it is well recognized that there is no better way of strengthening the economy of this country and making us

stronger than by developing these resources. Economically speaking, there is a return of the dollar spent for these purposes in many, many ways.

If this bill is going to stand as reported, that is, other agencies are not going to be reduced accordingly, then I feel, Mr. Chairman, these items should be restored.

I had hoped the committee could be more successful in bringing about a general reduction, because we cannot afford to continue indefinitely deficit spending without ultimately destroying our economy.

If an effort is made to bring this appropriation, providing the funds for these other agencies, in line with the reduction made for civil functions, I will support such a move.

Furthermore, there are recommendations in the report which I consider to be criticisms of the Corps of Engineers, some of which I do not feel are valid criticisms, but realize at the same time that the committee was acting in accordance with what it believed to be the facts.

Something has already been said by others in connection with the report, and at the risk of being repetitious, I should like to refer to some of these criticisms in an effort merely to keep the record straight. In fact some of these things could well be said over and over in order to emphasize what the record shows and what the Corps of Engineers has endeavored to do in carrying out its responsibility, as directed by the Congress, in behalf of the Nation.

EXPENDITURES BY LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES

In the first place, the committee recommends that the Corps of Engineers discourage expenditures by local communities on the basis of surveys and recommendations made by the Corps of Engineers and states that "it has come to the attention of the committee that, in some instances, local funds have been uneconomically employed because anticipated Federal appropriations were subsequently not made."

There have undoubtedly been cases where local communities have undertaken work which would conform with Federal improvements anticipated in the future. As a general rule this merely represents logical planning on the part of local communities; and merely reflects the close liaison which the Corps of Engineers as a Federal construction agency maintains with affected local agencies. The Corps of Engineers, however, does not encourage local expenditures in anticipation of appropriations of Federal funds.

HOUSING OF CONTRACTORS' EMPLOYEES

In its report, the Appropriations Committee calls attention to what it terms as the "practice of providing housing for contractors' employees" which is followed by the Corps of Engineers; and states that savings could be effected by contractors housing their own employees even if the cost of such housing was included in contractors' bids.

The general practices of the Corps of Engineers is that contractors will provide for housing of their own employees; and instructions of the Chief of Engineers to that effect have been in force since September 1947. There are some isolated cases where it may be more economical to the Government to provide housing, but such procedure is approved by the Chief of Engineers only as specific exceptions. When the Chief of Engineers approves housing of contractors' employees it is because of isolated location of projects and the necessity for attracting large numbers of competent contractors. Also in some cases provision of housing of contractors' employees is necessary and more economical to permit successive use of the housing on subsequent construction contracts by other contractors. At present there are less than 10 projects out of more than 200 projects under construction where the Government is providing housing for any sizable number of contractors' employees.

INCREASE IN COSTS OF THE CIVIL-WORKS PROGRAM

The committee presents an analysis of cost estimates furnished by the Corps of Engineers and draws the conclusions and makes the serious charges that—

(a) The Chief of Engineers has committed the Government and is continuing to commit the Government to the expenditure of funds far in excess of amounts contemplated by the Congress either at the time of the original authorization of the projects or at the time funds were appropriated for initiation of construction; and

(b) Continued modifications in design and structure made by the Corps of Engineers on projects, once construction has been initiated, are expensive to say the least and border on profligacy.

These charges made against a Federal agency which has heretofore enjoyed the confidence of Congress and the public should be examined carefully.

INCREASES OVER ORIGINAL ESTIMATES

In order to show that the Chief of Engineers has committed the Federal Government to expenditures in excess of those contemplated by Congress when projects were authorized, the committee report makes the following comparison of total costs of civil-works projects in the approved budget estimates for fiscal year 1951:

Total of original estimated costs when authorized by Congress	$4,364,000,000
Total present (1949) estimated cost	$7,034,000,000
Increase	$2,270,000,000
Percentage of increase in cost	52

The committee does not point out, although it is clearly published in the hearings, that the original estimated costs of the projects in question were made over a period of years to present requests for appropriations. Construction costs have risen greatly since original estimates were made.

For example, about 80 percent of the current civil-works program was authorized by Congress during the past 25 years. In this period, Engineering News Record construction-cost index, which is representative of the type of work included in the civil-works program, has risen by 130 percent. In other words, construction costs have more than doubled in this period, although there have been intermediate fluctuations in prices such as the temporary downward trend during the depression years. Furthermore, most of the projects in the 1951 budget estimates were originally estimated and authorized prior to World War II. The ENR construction index has risen from the pre-World War level of 242 in 1940 to 477 in 1949, an increase of 97 percent.

It seems obvious, therefore, that an over-all increase of 52 percent of present costs above original estimates, is well within the general rise in construction costs applicable to these projects. It indicates that the estimates presented by the Chief of Engineers as a basis for authorizations by Congress were carefully and conservatively prepared, and have afforded a sound and reliable basis for authorization of civil-works projects.

INCREASES OVER ESTIMATES WHEN FUNDS WERE APPROPRIATED

In order to show that estimated costs of projects have increased excessively over costs presented by the Corps of Engineers when funds were appropriated for initiation of construction, the Committee report presents the following figures on total estimated costs for projects in 1951 budget estimates:

Estimate for fiscal year 1949	$6,073,765,000
Estimate for fiscal year 1951	$7,034,408,000
Increase in dollars	$960,643,000
Percentage increase	16

The figures presented by the Appropriations Committee include one large project, that for the Arkansas River, in such a way as to magnify the true difference between 1949 and 1951 estimates for the program as a whole. If this one project is removed from the list to make the estimates comparable, the comparison would show an actual over-all cost increase of only 10 percent between estimates presented by the Corps of Engineers in support of fiscal year 1949 appropriations and those presented in support of the 1951 appropriations now being considered.

In this connection it should be noted that the cost estimates for fiscal year 1949 presented by the Chief of Engineers were based on September 1947 price levels, while estimates presented in support of estimates for the fiscal year 1951 are based on July 1949 price levels. The Engineering News Record construction-cost index has increased from 426.4 in September 1947 to 477.4 in July 1949, showing a general rise in construction costs applicable to civil-works projects of about 12 percent. Thus, the over-all increase of 10 percent in cost estimates presented by the Chief of Engineers is actually less than might have been expected due to the general rise in construction costs.

In presenting its figures and in severely criticizing the increases in estimated costs, the committee refers to the Department of Commerce composite construction-cost index increase of 14 percent between November 1947 and November 1949. The composite index used by the committee covers all types of construction and is not as applicable to the

civil-works program as is the Engineering News Record index referred to by the Chief of Engineers in hearings before the Appropriations Committee. However, use by the committee of a 14-percent increase appears to confirm the validity of estimates presented by the Corps of Engineers rather than detract from them.

It appears therefore that the Appropriations Committee has presented figures proving that in general the costs of civil-works projects have increased less than the general Nation-wide rise in construction costs. It is difficult to see how the difference between 1945 and 1951 estimates supports the "conclusion that the Chief of Engineers is continuing to commit the Government to the expenditure of funds far in excess of amounts contemplated by Congress at the time funds were appropriated for initiation of construction."

THE MAJOR INCREASES IN COST OF PROJECTS ARE DUE TO ENGINEERING AND STRUCTURAL MODIFICATIONS MADE BY THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

The committee states that—

The major portion of the increases is due to engineering and structural modifications permitted under authorizing legislation to be made by the Chief of Engineers.

In support of this point the committee makes an analysis of information on cost increases between 1947 and 1949 on 63 selected projects, which was furnished the Corps of Engineers. As a result of this analysis the committee arrives at the following figures:

(a) Engineering and construction modifications authorized by the Chief of Engineers seem to amount to 58 percent or a major portion of the increased total Federal costs; and

(b) For some reason, not quite clear to the committee, over 33 percent of the increase is placed on higher construction costs; and that no construction-cost index known to the committee substantiates the 33-percent figure.

These figures used by the committee were based on information specifically requested from the Corps of Engineers, and are mathematically correct, but the analysis and conclusions drawn by the committee do not reflect the facts in the case.

The totals of the cost figures furnished the committee at its request by the Corps of Engineers are as follows for the specified 63 projects:

Fiscal year 1949 estimates (1947 price level)	$2,000,225,000
Fiscal year 1951 estimates (1949 price level)	$2,503,341,000
Increase in dollars	$503,116,000
Percentage of increase	25

The break-down of the reasons for the increase in cost requested by the committee and used by it was as follows:

	Amount	Percent
(1) Rise in construction costs	$171,306,000	34
(2) Engineering and construction modifications	292,502,000	58
(3) Additional authorizations	39,308,000	8
Total	503,116,000	100

In the first place it should be stated that an analysis of the increase in cost of these estimates should be a comparison of the $503,116,000 increase with the estimated cost of work remaining to be done in 1947, when the 1949 estimate was made, as the rise is, of course, not applicable to work already completed. This estimated cost of remaining work was $1,475,000,000, and the increase to 1951 estimate was therefore about 34 percent. This increase is naturally higher than the normal rise of 12 percent in cost index between 1947 and 1949 estimates because the 63 projects were selected by the committee to show cases where there had been an abnormal increase. An even greater number of projects could have been selected from the budget estimates which would either show no increase in estimated cost or increases well within the rise in the cost index.

A more detailed break-down of the increase in cost between 1949 and 1951 estimates for the 63 selected projects shows that the engineering-and-construction-modification category specified by the committee includes large amounts which should not be included in this category. The correct break-down of this increase in cost, together with percentages of the increase, is as follows:

	Amount	Percent
(1) Rise in construction costs	$171,306,000	34
(2) Enlargements and extensions of projects authorized by specific and general legislation	125,784,000	25
(3) Changes in conditions and physical difficulties which could not have been foreseen when estimates were made	41,834,000	8
(4) Increases in costs of lands, rights-of-way, and relocations	51,117,000	11
(5) Engineering and construction modifications	113,075,000	22
Total	503,116,000	100

It is thus apparent that only 22 percent of the cost increase for the 63 projects may be charged accurately to engineering and construction modifications in the sense in which this term is used by the committee in its report. And the $113,075,000 increase resulting from these changes is only 7.7 percent of the estimate of cost of work remaining to be done when the 1949 estimates were made. The 58 percent figure used by the committee without further analysis is very misleading as to the magnitude of these changes.

The second point made by the committee in its analysis of the estimated costs of the 63 projects is that over 33 percent of the increase in costs is placed on higher construction costs and that no construction-cost index known to the committee substantiates the 33-percent figure.

It is true, as indicated by the break-down of the cost increase given previously, that the rise in construction costs accounts for about 34 percent of the total cost increase—or for an increase amounting to $171,306,000. The committee compares this figure—using 33 percent—with the 14-percent rise in the Department of Commerce composite construction-cost index, apparently to show that costs under the Corps of Engineers have increased at a rate far beyond that warranted by the general rise of construction costs. The figure of 33 percent used by the committee however merely shows the part of a total greater increase attributable to a rise in the cost index; but is not comparable with any index. Actually the $171,306,000 increase is only 11.6 percent of the $1,745,000,000 estimate of work remaining to be done when 1949 estimates were prepared; and is less than the 12-percent rise in the Engineering News Record index between 1947 and 1949 and less than the 14-percent rise in the Commerce Department index used by the committee.

AVAILABILITY OF COST AND ENGINEERING DATA

The committee states that it "has reason to believe that very little cost and engineering data with respect to individual projects is on file with the Chief of Engineers, most records being maintained at offices of the various district engineers."

The Chief of Engineers and his representatives have appeared before the Bureau of the Budget, including its engineering staff, with detailed cost and engineering data on every project being considered for 1951 appropriations; and budget estimates were approved on the basis of that data. This same data was presented to the Appropriations Committee. Furthermore at the request of a member of the Appropriations Committee, made through the Bureau of the Budget, the Office, Chief of Engineers, prepared and made available original estimated costs, present estimated costs and other cost data on almost 2,000 separate projects comprising the entire authorized civil-works program.

It is quite true that the basic engineering data and cost computations on which the Chief of Engineers bases his cost estimates is prepared and kept in district offices. It would be entirely unreasonable to keep such detailed data in the Office, Chief of Engineers, as this would require a greatly increased staff in that office, duplication of effort, and much greater overhead costs.

APPROVAL OF COSTS

The committee concludes that as a result of lack of cost and engineering data in the Office, Chief of Engineers, "these excessive obligations of Federal funds are being incurred by the district engineers and are, it would seem, approved by the Chief of Engineers as a matter of form."

One of the primary and most important functions performed by the Office, Chief of Engineers, is review of plans, specifications, and estimates presented by district engineers. Expensive changes in projects and increases in cost are never approved as a "matter of form" but only after careful analysis and through engineering and economic presentations by district engineers. This is the reason why in spite of necessary changes in some instances, and authorized modifications in the scope of some projects, the over-all increases in costs of the civil-works program under the Corps of Engineers have been less than the normal increases in construction costs throughout the country.

The committee, in a spirit of helpfulness, I am sure, says in the report the

Chief of Engineers has committed the Government and is continuing to commit the Government to the expenditure of funds far in excess of the amount contemplated by the Congress, either at the time of the original authorization of the contract or at the time the funds were appropriated for initiating construction, continued modification, and so forth. I do not agree with the committee and respectfully submit the record does not sustain such contention. Now it is well known what the facts are. For 25 years these authorizations were made; during the time when cotton was selling at 10 cents or less; when wheat was selling at 35 cents; when wages were at such tremendously low figures, and now you indicate you would expect the engineers to use cheap labor as has been discussed so much on the floor of this House, and to use cheap materials that you had 15 or 20 years ago, to use the same low economy which was at that time so much below what it is now.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose you get the price of cotton up to 40 or 50 cents a pound and the price of wheat up to $1.50 or $2 a bushel, and the price of oats up to a dollar a bushel, you go into the red $7,000,000,000 a year, and you go so far and so long that you are going to wreck the economy of the country. What makes the difference? As long as you are trying to wreck everything, there ought to be a time when you ought to economize in the operation of Government and get down to solid facts and stop doing a lot of things you are doing now.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not yield any further.

The gentleman is not a member of the Appropriations Committee——

Mr. RICH. If I were I would be cutting this down to the core.

Mr. HARRIS. The engineers are not responsible for high cost. They have nothing to do with high prices, high wages, or high index in our economy. They only construct these projects as directed by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has again expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. I had a lot of things I would like to say; I think I have the facts, and I wish I had the time to present those facts. I think it is a sad situation that we come here with a 29-billion-dollar appropriation bill, with almost 700 million dollars involved here, and limit this debate to 2 hours, when there are important matters to be discussed like this. I am not saying it to my good friends, the members of this committee, in any spirit of criticism, but because I think the record should be clear.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to say to the gentleman that the things he complains about, the advances in costs, and so on, were all taken into consideration in arriving at these figures, and these cuts according to the cost estimates of the Department of Engineers.

Mr. HARRIS. I recognize that the committee has made every possible attempt to get at the facts and to find out just what the situation is, but the indication here is that the engineers, because costs have gone up, are responsible, though many of these projects were authorized over a period of 20 to 25 years ago. They are not the ones who increased these costs.

Mr. RABAUT. There were cost increases allowed to them a year ago. Then the index, in relation to costs, was taken into consideration in arriving at the action taken this year by the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure the Engineering News Record cost index was taken into consideration, too.

The other point I wish to make is, recognizing the tremendous difficulty that this committee has had, and appreciating the fact that you have done the best you can, I still think, if we are going to economize, let us economize all along the way, and provide a budget as it should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], has largely made my speech for me this afternoon. I agree with his appraisal of the variation in the estimated over-all costs by the Corps of Engineers for the projects under consideration in this bill.

To have a 52-percent increase in the present over-all estimates of costs for these projects as compared with initial estimates; to have an increase of a billion dollars or more in the estimates for these projects in the past 2 years, just seems to me entirely out of line with the standards which we have a right to expect from the Corps of Engineers.

As the report points out, an analysis of the increase in respect to 63 major projects shows that 33 percent of the increase is due to alleged higher construction costs, which cannot be justified in the light of any price index that the committee has been able to find. It shows also that 58 percent of the increase appears to be attributable to engineering and construction changes which have been authorized by the Chief of Engineers.

The fact is, as the report states, that the Chief of Engineers has been committing this Government to the expenditure of sums far in excess of the amounts contemplated at the time that individual projects were authorized or at the time the initial work on those projects was covered by appropriation; and it is entirely conceivable that the projects might not have been authorized or might not have been started had the later estimates been presented.

It is very difficult indeed to understand the variation in the estimates which have been presented to the Congress. It indicates that those estimates in the first instance were of very little value or were based on entirely inadequate data.

Mr. Chairman, the total in this bill, as has been pointed out, is about $632,000,000; that is about $31,000,000 less than was made available in the fiscal year 1950.

There are several smaller items which call for no particular discussion.

For "cemeterial expense, Department of the Army, $5,500,000" is provided a million dollars or so less than the budget estimate and about a million dollars more than was available for fiscal 1950.

I may point out in passing, as indicating the costs we are called upon to pay by the agencies of the Government, that among the items for expenditure requested under this heading, are flagpoles at a cost of over $4,600 per pole. Think of it.

For the Alaska communications service $3,000,000 is provided, which is about $100,000 less than the Budget Bureau recommended and is the same amount that was allowed for the current fiscal year.

The committee recommends the appropriation of a million dollars for the more urgent construction work for necessary facilities.

I may point out however as indicating further the prices that we are called upon to pay nowadays, that the request included funds for 28 family houses for NCO's at an estimated cost from $28,000 to $42,000 per family unit, plus $5,000 for site development.

Those houses would be of ordinary frame construction, with asbestos shingles, concrete basement, and according to the testimony of one member of the committee who has had some exeprience in this field, should be built in this country for about $4,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman mentioned Alaskan construction. I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Services which handled the authorization for construction and handled the communications bill. At the time the estimates were made for construction up there we thought perhaps the engineers were high. For instance, they came in with figures showing a house would cost $35,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Per family unit?

Mr. BROOKS. We refused the authorization. We had our own investigators go out and they got people from Alaska and made an independent check. They found the engineers were within the right figure on that. As a result, we took the ceiling off the cost of construction in Alaska in that particular bill because the costs were so high there was no alternative if we wanted the work done and if we wanted to defend this country.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that $47,000 per family unit exceeds any costs for similar construction, I ever heard of.

Mr. BROOKS. It sounds terrific and I will tell the gentleman that we did not think the figures were fair. So we sent out our own investigators, we made our own independent investigation with contractors and people who knew the situation up in Alaska and they said it could not be done for any less.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Than what figure?

Mr. BROOKS. As I recall the figure for Alaska construction in the bill that we handled, it was $35,000 per unit.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This estimate is as high as $47,000 per unit if everything is included.

Mr. BROOKS. That is in line with the terrific cost of construction in Okinawa and in Alaska, where the costs are terrifically out of line with any other place in the whole world, I believe.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. It is very difficult for people who have had any sort of business experience to try to reconcile themselves to the fact that anybody going to Alaska to live is going to need $40,000 or $50,000 to build an ordinary little house.

These figures might be justified in a special instance. They might be justified for some Government agencies. But if we are going to spend $40,000 or $50,000 to house civilians who are going to Alaska, and we are talking about statehood for Alaska, we are getting into an awfully high-priced proposition.

Now, we had another experience here lately, if the gentleman will bear with me for a minute, of a project that was taken down in Alaska and moved to Seatttle, then purchased by another Government agency and taken back to Alaska. That is some of the cooperation which exists between Government agencies. It is no criticism of the gentleman, who is really telling the same things that were told us about the cost of building in Alaska. The prices are simply out of this world. Something has to be done if we are going to have in Alaska a respectable figure for building.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman that if we are going to have protection and national defense in Alaska, we have to pay the bill. When the materials are brought from the United States and labor is brought from the United States and everything else is at a terrifically high cost, we will have to pay the bill. It does seem to me to be out of the world, I agree with the gentleman. But our committee made an investigation of this thing and we were convinced that the engineers were in line.

Mr. RABAUT. With the investigations that have been made of people who are interested in housing and building in Alaska, a terrible error was made when we permitted a whole project to be torn down, taken out of Alaska and sent to Seattle, then bought by another Government agency and taken back up to Alaska.

Mr. BROOKS. I am not defending that.

Mr. RABAUT. I know that and I am not laying it at the gentleman's doorstep. I do not make that inference. But I am talking about the agencies of Government and how indifferent they are to the things that cost the taxpayers money, things which this committee is taking special cognizance of.

Mr. BROOKS. Perhaps they should be more diligent in checking on it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think it is necessary to mention the item for the United States Soldiers' Home of $2,395,000; or for the Panama Canal, of $21,825,000; or for the Panama Railroad Company, of $820,000, which reflect either the budget estimate or slight reductions.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Since we are talking about this Alaska building situation, I think I can throw a little light on the matter which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] just talked about.

In 1946 a number of us members of the Committee on the Interior visited Alaska, and we made quite an investigation of many things that were going on up there.

The buildings which the gentleman just mentioned were the Navy installations at Excursion Inlet that were torn down and shipped to Seattle. It was frame construction. There was all kinds of fine lumber in those buildings. I saw them as did the other members of the committee. There were doors, there was flooring, there were windows, there was everything with which to build houses.

Across the bay about 15 miles was the town of Hoonah, an Indian village, and every one of those homes in that village had burned down. There were 86 homes. They were built out over the water, most of them, and they had stored gasoline under these houses, and this gasoline caught fire and the whole town went up in smoke.

They shipped this lumber from the buildings at Excursion Inlet to Seattle. Now, I know they did not take the same lumber and send it back, because we saw the homes go up. They were building homes for those Indians at a cost of $8,600, and they were putting the finest lumber that I ever saw in those homes, with fine oak floors and fine doors and fine windows and asphalt roofs and everything that goes to make a very fine home.

Well, the Indians were not appreciating that kind of a home very much, because the fellow in charge said that it would not be long until they would have the doors off and they would have a bearskin hanging up for the doors, and the panes in the windows would be out and they would put something over the windows. So it was not an encouraging picture, when they could have taken that lumber from Excursion Inlet and taken it right across the bay and built those homes for possibly $1,000 apiece, and the Indians would have been tickled to death with that kind of lumber and with a more simple home. These homes were modern in every respect, and everything was charged to Uncle Sam. Now, that was a despicable thing to do.

We have things going on that are worse even than that.

The Army and the Navy and every department of Government, instead of using standard doors, standard windows, standard millwork when they build buildings, have special designs, specially designed doors, specially designed entrances and specially designed windows that cost from five to ten to fifty times more than the standard stock does, and we are paying the bill, and that is why it runs up so terribly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I should like the RECORD to show that this is not chargeable to the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. JENSEN. No, indeed. I was not criticizing the Army engineers.

Mr. NORRELL. If the gentleman will indulge us just a moment, I have seen the houses being built in Okinawa and Guam. I have not seen them in Alaska. However, on Okinawa and Guam they have to build the houses of concrete and steel, mostly shipped from the United States. I have been in those houses, and I would not live in one myself, although I see they cost $47,500.

Either we have to pay that price or we do not have to build the house, but let us not charge that to the Army engineers. If we do not want to build it, let us not build it. I know the gentleman well enough to know that he is fair and square and does not mean to be unfair.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is entirely correct when he says that this is not an Army engineer item. I cited it merely as evidence of the costs we are called upon to meet by the agencies of Government nowadays.

I may say, however, that the record indicates in this instance that the houses under consideration would not be houses such as the gentleman has described. They would be of frame construction, with asbestos shingles, and a concrete basement.

Mr. NORRELL. I want the RECORD to show I have implicit confidence in the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know he is fair in all things.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much time. I do want to make one further observation, however.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has indicated that in his opinion this chapter of the bill has been dealt with more or less as the whipping boy, if I understood him correctly.

May I point out that the over-all request of the Corps of Army Engineers, which, of course, is the largest request in this chapter of the bill, despite the over-all fiscal situation by which we are confronted at this time, amounted to something like 25 percent in excess of the funds which were made available in respect to the current fiscal year.

The effect of the committee's recommendation is merely to take that 25 per-

cent out of the picture and to bring the over-all appropriation down just a little bit below what it has been for the current fiscal year.

That reduction, as pointed out in the report, has been based not only on an item-by-item consideration but on certain over-all considerations. These considerations include the desirability of spreading construction activity over a period of time, with a view to unemployment in the future; the desirability of concentrating on fewer existing projects with a view to expediting their completion; and above all, the fact that delay in respect to the 1950 appropriation bill lost one construction season in many instances, and resulted in the very large unobligated balances that have already been referred to. These unobligated balances amounted to something like $220,000,000 as of December 31 last.

I think the subcommittee has done a good job in view of the circumstances by which it has been confronted.

I shall reserve any further discussion, Mr. Chairman, until later when individual projects may be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, certain questions have been raised during the course of this debate which have brought out a good many facts which are very interesting. I am not going to repeat what has been said but I am just going to call attention to one or two things. The over-all cut in this bill was not more than it ought to be. There are some projects, the major projects which have not been cut as much in proportion as were the others. Frankly, I have always felt these projects could take a little more of a cut, and if the opportunity presents itself where that can be done I hope I may be able to offer amendments which will save a dollar or two. We were confronted with quite a proposition. There are projects involving present estimates of cost on rivers and harbors which are under construction in which the over-all estimated cost is $2,700,000,000 for rivers and harbors. There are projects representing more than that in estimated cost at the present time for flood control. I would figure the projects under construction would cost six and one-half to seven billion dollars to complete. Frankly, I do not know where we would get the money if we should attempt to appropriate it. Our people are taxed beyond all endurance. I am one of those real peculiar fellows who votes to cut these foreign-aid projects down to the point where the people can afford to meet the situation and I reserve the right to vote for only the amount which these people can justify and which they can legitimately and honestly use. I have never believed in voting money for any agency, foreign or domestic, just because they ask for the money. I believe we have to cut our cloth down to what we can afford to pay. I do not believe we should embark upon flood-control projects or rivers and harbors projects where we do not have the money to pay for them. My efforts at economy are no more active on one line than another. They will always be just that same proportion all the way through, as long as I happen to be here.

Just to illustrate the kind of job the engineers have come to do, I think I will call attention again to the figures that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] said the engineers used on the cost of a flagpole, something like $1,800 for engineering on a $6,200 flagpole. Six thousand two hundred dollars is almost enough to pay for the flagpole alone, but that is within my comprehension. I can realize how outlandish the engineers' estimates are when they ask for $1,800 for engineering for that kind of a job. It is just so ridiculous that it cannot mean they are screening the situation the way it should be screened.

I have been hopeful that when the Congress made those people realize that they do not intend to accept estimates based on that kind of engineering, which just an ordinary fellow who has had a little business experience where engineering has been a factor, cannot be deluded into following, that they will revise their estimates. It is a situation that we must realize. Our cuts have not been deep, considering the situation. The increase in the budget estimates for this year over last year was larger than it was anywhere else. That meant that in order to get the bill down to any size, as compared with last year's bill or what we could afford to put up with, we had to make a very substantial cut; and the committee has done that. The committee worked hard. We held hearings which continued over a month, all day long. I think the committee very generally has done a first-class job on this.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am very appreciative of the gentleman's efforts to promote economy, not only during the current session but in all of his career. However, I respectfully suggest to him that, while I speak from memory I think I speak correctly, that when he said the river and harbor projects aggregated $2,700,000,000 authorized, the figure was really $2,070,000,000.

Mr. TABER. It is $2,780,264,270.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I was giving my recollection.

Mr. TABER. That is found on page 191 of the hearings.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I appreciate that, but my recollection of the budget is that the figure is $2,070,000,000. If I might suggest to the gentleman, that covers projects that had been authorized through the years, some of them for 50 or 75 years, that will never be constructed.

Now, with respect to the flood-control projects, permit me to say that while there is general approval of projects, which, if all of them were constructed, might amount to several billion dollars, the fact remains that there are no authorizations for any such amount, because the authorizations for flood control cover partial accomplishment of the project. And the further fact is that for general flood control including the lower Mississippi River, after we have considered the bill that you have reported this year, only $640,000,000 remains authorized.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman. The thing that I have been looking at all the way through has been the estimated cost. I appreciate that these people have not a great big authorization; on the other hand, I do not know what the rule is here, but I think it is just the same as it is on a building job, that where you start a project you are allowed to go on and appropriate to continue it and finish it in a great many cases.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, and with all due deference to him, the rule as I recall has been not to go beyond the authorization for flood control.

Mr. TABER. I am glad to hear that; it will enable us to follow this thing out a little closer in time to come.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman will find that that has been the policy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to commend the subcommittee handling this chapter of the appropriations bill on a very effective job and one which has objectively sought economy. I find, however, that there are certain discrepancies in that in other chapters of the bill similar projects have received more generous treatment. Perhaps in working our will on this bill we can equalize matters in the Committee of the Whole.

I wish to call the attention of the Committee to one matter. I notice that on many projects that will be completed by the appropriations recommended by the committee, no cuts were made in the requests of the Bureau of the Budget. This, to me, makes very good sense. The cut was divided, for the most part, among those projects that are continuing and have 3 or 4 years to go before completion. I have such a project in my district, a flood wall at Louisville, Ky. Some $11,000,000 has been appropriated with $14,000,000 still necessary. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $4,500,000 for fiscal 1951; the committee has cut it to $3,500,000. I may say, however, that all continuing projects such as the one located in my district took a proportionate cut, so I have no quarrel there whatsoever. It so happens that because of the topography involved that had the $4,500,000 been allowed, pumping stations would have been provided in the west end of the city of Louisville, which suffers the most. That would have completed for the west end of the city flood protection to the extent of the flood that we had in 1913 and 1945, two of the three most severe floods in the twentieth century. The flood of 1937, our greatest flood, it would not have helped; in other words, there is high ground in the center of the city which, if the pumping station had been put in would give us a relatively completed project for that section which suffers the most. A gigantic flood such as that of 1937 would still have inundated the entire city. These problems must be studied in the future. If a reasonable amount of protection

can be given to even a section of the city by following the recommendations of the Budget Bureau, we should give consideration to that. I am sure that the committee has done all it could in the interest of economy; and, as one who has spoken for it and voted for it I recognize that the treatment I have received is the same as all others.

I do want to point out that a partial flood wall is no protection in general. Yet, in this case if the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget is followed thousands of homes and factories and retail establishments will have a reasonable degree of flood protection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from New York who has given me 5 minutes. I could take a half hour to talk on the subject of dredging the harbors in southeastern Massachusetts. I intend, although I hesitate to do so, to offer an amendment when we come to consider this bill under the 5-minute rule to see if I cannot get the approval of Members of the Congress to do something that is long overdue. Of course, I appreciate the sympathetic hearing that was given me by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. It was very sympathetic but I did not go there to get sympathy. I went before them to see if I could get funds to have the harbors dredged, but, lo and behold, when I get the report of the committee, there is nothing appropriated for this purpose, not a single cent. I would not complain about that at all, but I have found in sitting around here for 2 or 3 years that we are ever ready to spend millions, yes billions of dollars, for foreign countries, but when it comes to old Cape Cod, the place where this country started and where there are a great many descendants of those hearty people, that dredged out their own harbors and rivers, built ships and defended this country, the Government has helped out towns and cities along the great Mississippi, the Arkansas, the Missouri, and every other river in the United States, but they forget the Pilgrim Fathers, or apparently they did, because, to my knowledge, there has not been anything done in 15 years.

All that we are asking is that the Government pay half of the cost of these projects. We will pay the other half, in addition to paying all the other taxes that are imposed on us by the Congress of the United States.

It is significant that 3 or 4 months ago the President instructed Mr. Steelman, his economic adviser, to pick out the areas that needed help due to lack of employment. New Bedford, a city I represent, was the first one on the list. There were other towns on Cape Cod and Nantucket and the upper part of Plymouth County in the same position as New Bedford.

There is no other thing that would be of more help to us than to have these harbors dredged out so that the fishermen can get in with their catch instead of having to wait 4 or 5 hours for high tide. They have been waiting long enough and I think they are entitled to it. I want the Congress to give it the consideration it deserves. It is only a small amount, but it means a great deal to the people I represent because the only industry we have is summer visitors and fishermen. If you take the harbors away from the fishermen they cannot get in and unload their fish, then you destroy half of our income. We are a people who are not asking anybody for anything we do not deserve. We do not have too many people trying to get something for nothing so far as the Government is concerned. We never have and we do not intend to start. All we are asking is that you help us out. I realize as well as anybody why we should practice economy, but this is economy, because it gives us the opportunity to pay our taxes against all the levies that the Federal Government puts on us. The people in Provincetown have built walls and piers and all of these other necessary works for protection, but everytime we get a severe northeaster or southeaster, the wind and the water pound these defenses to pieces so that they are ruined, and when the fishermen and the yachtsmen and everybody else coming into Provincetown Harbor put down their anchors, they do not hold, because there is nothing to stop the terrible winds and waves from washing the boats up on the shore and onto the docks, and they are broken up. For a small amount, Mr. Chairman, a jetty would save them and it would save the fishermen. They have a difficult enough job the way it is. Only 2 or 3 weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, 18 fishermen lost their lives on the Nantucket shoals, so I think it is important to have these harbors fixed up, in order that the fishermen and yachtsmen can be protected and also prevent the terrible catastrophes that have happened in the past.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for giving me this time. I certainly appreciate it.

Mr. KERR. I have no more requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Neither have I, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on May 3, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, FIRST REPORT—RECORD AND FORECAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the Eighty-first Congress is now at midpoint. In this important election year Congress normally heads for an adjournment early in July. By now the extent to which a legislative program may be enacted becomes evident. So far in this session accomplishments have been meager in domestic affairs most important to the people. And in foreign affairs the Congress indicates it will but carry on already established programs. Pending legislation will continue the European recovery program and the mutual defense assistance program, revise the displaced persons bill and inaugurate a point 4 program.

No legislation has been finally enacted regarding Federal aid to education or health. Social security reform, including increase of benefits and coverage for old age and survivors insurance, passed the House of Representatives, but is awaiting action in the Senate and even the pending bill does not yet increase benefits to realistic levels considering costs of living or adequately amend other disadvantageous provisions. Adequate housing legislation for middle-income families failed of passage in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Neither has adequate civil-rights legislation, like the FEPC, been passed—an FEPC bill with investigatory powers only passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate. The vexatious excise taxes bearing directly on the cost of living have not yet been reduced or repealed but tentative action by the House Ways and Means Committee makes for a favorable outlook. Not a single major new measure has yet become law in this session.

I have worked hard here to endeavor to realize for our people the objectives of decent housing, stable employment, reasonable security, the maintenance of international peace, and the preservation of our freedoms. Within the limits of the labors of one among 435 Representatives I have endeavored to reflect the needs, the ideas, and the aspirations of my district.

RENT CONTROL

The Federal rent-control law expires, by its terms, on June 30, 1950. In the State of New York we are passing from Federal to State rent control. Whether or not Federal rent control will be renewed continues as an urgent question for the general well-being of the country,

but no longer becomes of primary interest to the people of my district for their own dwellings.

The Federal rent-control law, though it resulted in some drastic and uncalled-for increases due to the fair-net-operating-income provision, on the whole held the rent line within reason. It was found that the amendment which I wrote into the law requiring landlords to certify to the maintenance of all services before being entitled to apply for a rent adjustment was one of the most important phases of the law to protect the rights of tenants. This same amendment is now contained in the New York State rent-control law, and I will use all my efforts to see that in that law it also continues to be the useful means for protecting tenants' rights that it has been in the Federal law.

The State rent-control law rolls back rents to the amount actually paid on March 1, 1950, or March 1, 1949, whichever is lower. Increases ordered by the Federal Housing Expediter unless agreed to by the tenant or ordered paid by the City Rent Commission are not included. No retroactive increases are permitted under the new State law. It does not contain the fair-net-operating-income provision of the Federal law. It allows increases only after December 1, 1950, for a hardship amounting to actual loss in operations only. This is the original OPA basis in effect during the war years. The New York State rent-control law gives tenants a right of hearing in regard to increases in rent. It has safeguards against evictions, and strict penalties against landlords violating its provisions.

The State law permits increases, after December 1, 1950, due to severe hardship on grounds of comparability. Its administration under a distinguished public servant like the Honorable Joseph P. McGoldrick, former comptroller of the city of New York, assures tenants against abuses of this provision.

In addition the facilities of my congressional rent clinics are being further expanded and additional staff added to the branches now operating throughout the district. The corps of lawyers working in these clinics on a voluntary basis has had considerable additional experience: They are now in a position to render outstanding service to the people of my district. The congressional rent clinics continue to function under the chairmanship of Hyman W. Sobell, Esq. A schedule is available upon application to my office showing the location of these clinics, the hours of operation and the lawyers in charge. A similar service is now being inaugurated by the New York County Republican Party throughout the county under the supervision of a committee of which I am cochairman with Oren Root of New York.

In view of the importance of rent control to the people of the country I shall work for and support Federal rent control here. Even with New York out of the Federal rent-control system there are still some 8,000,000 dwelling units under Federal control. This is a critically important front in the national fight against inflation and must continue to be protected in the interest of all of our people.

HOUSING

I cannot report any real victory for housing in this session nearly comparable to the authorization of 810,000 new Federal low-rent public housing units and a $1,500,000,000 slum-clearance program by the Federal Housing Act of 1949. It is true that the authority of the FHA to insure mortgages has been increased by about $2,250,000,000, and that this will help materially private construction in industry and those who are out to buy homes of their own. But in the rental field, particularly for the family in the $2,000 to $4,000 per annum income bracket—which includes most unhoused veterans' families—there is still no real relief.

I fought very hard for approval this year of a Federal program to assist the construction of rental housing for families in this middle-income bracket. I sought $3,000,000,000 in direct loans from the Federal Government to housing cooperatives for that purpose. This was finally whittled down to $1,000,000,000 in the form of a National Bank for Housing Cooperatives which would have enabled the Federal Government to make mortgage money available to 3¼ percent for 60 years, in this way reducing rentals for the normal city apartment from $85 per month to about $63 per month and bringing it within reach of the middle-income family. Even this title was defeated in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Together with many other Representatives here I have not given up this fight. We may have to wait until the next Congress to win but I am confident that win we shall. These middle-income families can neither qualify for public housing nor afford private rental housing. Their problem remains almost as acute as it did just after the war in 1945. They must indeed have help. And it is up to us here to see that they get it.

EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR

Grave concern exists with respect to the size of unemployment the country may have to face this summer and fall. The present unemployment recorded in the United States Employment Service Offices is 4,123,000. Fears are expressed that this will go up to 5,000,000 in a few months. That figure used to be a danger signal before the war. However, at that time we had approximately 45,000,000 Americans gainfully employed; today we have almost 60,000,000 gainfully employed. Hence unemployment of 5,000,000 should not be as alarming as it used to be. It is certainly a bleak prospect, however, for the individuals concerned, and we must give them adequate aid.

The unemployment insurance systems will help but these must be very much strengthened as the benefits differ widely between States and many give far less than the optimum 26 weeks of coverage. We must see that these systems are strengthened so that they can do their job in an emergency.

Also, we must consider other means for making our economic system more stable. Increasingly, I believe, legislation to provide stable employment and a stable economy will come up for consideration. I have proposed such legislation myself through the establishment of a Federal Economic Commission and of goals for our economy which business and Government can act together to effectuate. I am convinced that planless acceptance of the inevitability of widespread unemployment as a chronic ailment of our economic system is undesirable and unnecessary, and I shall use my efforts to see that no such suffering is inflicted on our people because of unwillingness to take remedial measures.

We faced a crisis in the last few months in the coal strike which threatened to paralyze the whole country. We may soon face a similar problem in railroads and telephones. These situations bear out what I have been strongly advocating—that Congress should give the President power to seize mines or facilities where essential to the public health and safety, but with the right to operate them only to the minimum extent required for such health and safety. I have introduced legislation expressly for this purpose and have pointed this out as a necessary element in labor legislation. It now becomes apparent that this is an essential power of Government in the interest of all the people and I shall continue to work to see that this deficiency in our law is corrected.

FEPC

The House of Representatives finally had its opportunity to debate a Fair Employment Practice Commission bill providing for equality of job opportunity without discrimination on account of race, color, creed, or national origin. Such a law has been operating in the State of New York very successfully for a considerable time and is also in effect in nine other States, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Indiana, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Oregon, and Washington. The mere problem of bringing this legislation up for debate was monumental, but by cooperative effort on the part of all of us who were fighting for this bill it was finally accomplished. Debate opened at the usual hour of noon on Wednesday, February 22, and continued until 3 a. m. the following morning. At that time, in spite of all of our efforts to the contrary, the House of Representatives by a vote substituted for the FEPC bill with enforcement powers an FEPC bill with investigatory powers only.

It is true that this was the first time in history that such a bill has passed the House at all, but the absence of the power to enforce the orders of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission was a great disappointment to those of us who fought so hard for this bill. We were then faced with the dire alternative of voting down what the House of Representatives had passed and having no FEPC bill of any kind or voting to send even this inadequate bill to the Senate. I chose the latter course as did most of the liberal Members of the House in both parties. I am convinced this was the right course; otherwise, any hope for FEPC legislation would have been killed

for this session. Now at the very least the issue is forced upon the Senate and it must consider the FEPC bill which came from the House. At the same time our ability to fight for an FEPC bill with full enforcement powers is not at all impaired.

The battle has shifted to the Senate, but my interest in it is so great that I am continuing my work here with Senators, on the public platform and over the radio to attain an FEPC bill with full enforcement powers.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

The Congress continues to overlook urgently needed legislation in this field. A national health program is almost exactly where it was before, except that a material increase in the annual sums available for hospital construction, doubling these, from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000, has passed the House. No action, however, has been taken on a national program for health either along the lines of the plan which I have offered, providing for Federal-State aid to cooperative plans, organized on a community and local level, or on the administration's own health plan financed by a compulsory pay-roll tax. The national responsibility for health must be accepted and work to get this done must continue unabated.

No action has been taken either on Federal aid to education. I continue unequivocally in favor of such legislation and do not consider help to school construction or health services—desirable as these are—to be a substitute. The terms of the Barden bill, which prevents States from using any of the proposed Federal aid for any services, even health services, except for public schools, is still an issue delaying the bill. The Senate has passed bills aiding school-building construction and school-health services, but the House has not acted. I have expressed myself as being opposed to restrictions imposed by the Barden bill. There should be no little argument about health services for all children, regardless of the schools they attend, and the Supreme Court has ruled that there should be equality in respect of bus service to all schools. With the overwhelmingly complex problems which our young people will face when they become adults, fundamental improvement in our educational system particularly in States which are below par in this respect is vital. I shall continue to fight for these principles to gain Federal aid to education.

In the course of this session I have offered a bill, H. R. 7336, to set up a Federal Board of Education as recommended by the Hoover Commission and also to abolish segregation and discrimination in educational institutions receiving Federal aid. Right now this applies to institutions of higher learning, which received over $3,500,000,000 a year from the Federal Government in 1949. It is high time that this essential reform was made nationally, just as we have already made it in New York.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social-security improvements which have already passed the House are tied up in the Senate. The gains effected by H. R. 6000 in extending old-age and survivors insurance to millions of self-employed, to employees of State and local governments and nonprofit organizations on a voluntary basis, to domestic servants, to agricultural-processing workers, and to certain other employees should pass at this session. Increasing benefits from 50 percent for the highest pension groups to 150 percent for the lowest pension groups, and increasing the minimum monthly benefits from $10 to $25, and the maximum monthly benefits from $85 to $150 is a step in the right direction, although with present living costs far from adequate.

There has been some criticism of H. R. 6000 as it could by a referendum of those affected supersede some State and city retirement plans, but both Senators from New York are trying to strike this out in the Senate.

Social-security improvement is good legislation which the people want and I shall do all I can to see that it becomes law before this Congress ends, but we must go much further. Our population is aging, job opportunities for older people are becoming less plentiful, living costs are advancing, and it is becoming harder to pile up private resources against advancing age. A strengthened social-security system upon which retired people can really live is a must for our society.

EXCISE AND INCOME TAXES

This session has been characterized by a great drive to relieve the people of the wartime luxury taxes on items entering into the ordinary cost of living which are not luxuries at all. These include, among others, moving-picture admissions, inexpensive cosmetics, baby oil, popular-priced handbags and moderate-priced fur coats costing no more than cloth coats in the same price range. The fight to repeal the moving-picture admissions tax has especially brought out the support of the people of my district.

The President has made certain recommendations regarding reductions of excise taxes but the items he covered are far more limited than the need of the moderate-income families indicates.

I testified before the Ways and Means Committee in favor of repeal of these excise taxes and have been supporting and fighting for the consideration of measures which would effect this result. The committee has now tentatively acted in reducing excise taxes in some cases and repealing them in others. Such favorable tentative action has been taken repealing excise taxes on electric-light bulbs, purses and handbags, and baby oil and powder; and by reducing them on motion-picture admissions, communications, transportation, jewelry, and furs.

It will be said that excise-tax reduction must be coupled with means for raising additional revenue through taxes. Aside from economies in the administration of government, many of which can be effected by utilizing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Federal Government, it is also possible to save large sums of money on programs like the farm price-support program, which I will discuss a little later in this speech.

Consideration should be given to a graduated income tax on corporate profits instead of the present flat tax, and to closing up the tax loopholes in present laws. All of these steps should be taken first before reconsidering the personal income tax. Suggestions have also been made for charges to be made by the Federal Government for certain services now rendered free but from which the recipients get monetary benefits.

I have been seeking action on my bill exempting from Federal income taxes the pensions of Federal, State and city employees up to $2,000 a year and also disability pensions. Recently, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7443, allowing a deduction from income subject to income tax to the extent of $600 per year, for those with serious physical handicaps—the same allowance made for the blind. It will interest the people of my district to know that I got the idea for such a bill from a letter from one of my constituents and that the bill has received widespread notice.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

A storm of protest broke out over the drastic curtailment of mail deliveries to homes and offices announced by the Postmaster General as attributable to budget limitations on April 18, 1950; effective in New York, June 1. It subsequently became clear that the Post Office Department had not asked Congress for the necessary money but had just gone ahead with this drastic move. With much support from my district I have vigorously protested this action, both in the House of Representatives and to the Postmaster General. So much opposition has been aroused that I believe corrective action will not be long delayed.

The principal effort during this session to help postal employees has been to pass in the House of Representatives H. R. 87, the military-credits bill. This bill affords to postal employees a starting salary grade commensurate with their status after giving them credit for their war service. It appears to be an eminently fair application of the principle that no employee should be penalized for the time when he was serving his country. It is likely that this principle will be extended to benefit all Federal employees.

Salary increases and other problems had to give way to the military-credits bill in which there was the principal interest right now. Other developments under this heading will follow as the session goes on.

SMALL BUSINESS

The fight to retain the vitality and position of small business while giving all business relief from a decision of the Supreme Court raising doubt as to the lawfulness of sales at delivered prices—not just f. o. b. prices—has been going on continuously. The effort to limit the effect of remedial legislation so that it would not jeopardize small business has resulted in a considerable struggle. Those of us who are deeply concerned about the small-business position, though we have been fighting as the opposition a rear-guard action, have nevertheless had considerable influence in

bringing about changes to protect small business. We are not satisfied with it, but it is certainly better than what was presented to us to begin with, and we shall work hard to see that, if it does become law, its administration does not violate the spirit of small-business protection.

VETERANS

The House of Representatives has approved by an overwhelming vote and sent to the Senate for action the addition of 16,000 beds for veterans' hospitals, 1,000 of these in New York. These include many urgently needed psychiatric facilities.

One of the principal problems of veterans so far in this session has related to VA cuts in hospitals and medical and auxiliary staffs. I have protested these cuts and urged the Veterans' Administration to seek a deficiency appropriation to avoid them. This is now being done with resultant withdrawal of reductions in medical and hospital staffs.

Veterans who have suffered wounds in the protection of their country are entitled to the best we can offer, certainly in medical care and equipment. Many veterans are concerned about the recommendation of the Hoover Commission which would eliminate a separate veterans' hospital and medical service for veterans. I share this concern and assure the veterans of my district that I will consider not only the economies involved in such a move, but would have to be shown affirmatively that the veteran will get medical service equal to what he is getting now plus particular consideration for his care as a veteran. In other words, on this proposal the burden of proof is distinctly on those who propose a merger of Government hospital and medical facilities.

Veterans have also been concerned with VA regulations seriously curtailing their educational benefits under the GI bill of rights. Bills are pending to lift these limitations and give veterans their full opportunity for educational benefits, permitting them to take the courses and attend the schools which will do them the most good. There may be some help afforded with this in the pending appropriations bill. I have introduced legislation similar to the Taft-Teague bill for this purpose and I am working here to get it enacted and will guard against any effort to emasculate this remedial legislation by amendments.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We are all deeply concerned and exercised about exposing and routing out subversives—Communists and Fascists alike—who may be in our midst. We are also concerned about victory for the forces of freedom in the cold war. In order to effectuate both these aims, it is neither necessary nor wise to weaken or impair our constitutional guaranties and freedoms which protect the innocent individual here.

It is interesting at this point to quote the words of J. Edgar Hoover, the great director of the FBI, who said as recently as March 27, 1950:

I would not want to be a party to any action which would smear innocent individuals for the rest of their lives. We cannot disregard the fundamental principles of common decency and the application of basic American rights of fair play.

This question has come forward very strongly in connection with the recent investigations of subversive activities in the Senate and the House of Representatives. It is essential that we hold the balance between the investigatory powers of the Congress which in the national interest we must protest, and the capability of destroying the reputations and the means of livelihood of innocent people. Such activities have inflicted mounting damage on the position of the United States abroad and upon the respect here at home for the justice and efficacy of our institutions.

I recognized this situation a long time ago, saw how it was of great concern to all fair-minded Americans and might particularly concern large minorities like Catholics, Jews, and Negroes. For this reason I have been waging an almost lone battle in the House with the idea of getting the House Un-American Activities Committee to adopt adequate rules of procedure. I started this in the last Congress and continued it in this Congress by introducing on opening day, House Joint Resolution 20, which calls for a joint Senate-House investigating committee and which incorporates the rules of procedure to protect the livelihoods and reputations of innocent people as recommended by the bar association of the city of New York.

Recently the Senator from Massachusetts, Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, has come to substantially the same conclusions to which I had come and recommended almost the same remedy. The very successful Canadian spy investigation by a Royal Commission a few years ago following exactly this procedure certainly bears this out. In order to keep my position intact, with respect to this question of reform of procedure and of protection of individual rights, I have had to withhold my support from the appropriation for the existing House committee. I believe that with the increased emphasis on reform of such procedure, the necessity for withholding such support on my part will soon be ended.

It is absolutely essential that the people have the facts which have been brought out in the current investigation on subversives in the State Department and elsewhere, and that every inquiry be pursued to the end so that a final result may be arrived at and all the facts developed for the American people. This can be done consistent with our freedoms.

I have reported above on the progress of the FEPC bill and on legislation against discrimination and segregation in education. Antilynching and anti-poll-tax legislation have been relatively overlooked by the Congress in view of the FEPC fight. However, we cannot rest until all of our citizens without exception and without segregation enjoy their full rights and freedoms as Americans of the same class.

FOOD PRICES

The work which I started last year of opposition to the inflexible 90-percent parity farm prices, which is helping to keep food prices up, is beginning to show progress. The shocking experience of the potato price-support program resulting in an expenditure estimated at over several hundred million dollars to date, and the piling up and wasting of 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes this year, has sunk into the consciousness of most Americans.

Opposition to these programs beginning from the time when I was one of only 25 who voted against the high farm price parity bill last year has been mounting. On a recent vote on the bill to expand cotton and peanut acreage, likely to pile up more surpluses, this opposition rose to 155 negative votes in the House.

An effort to write into the European recovery program recently provisions which would further increase farm prices was stricken out by the House of Representatives without even a record vote. These are signs of the times.

High Government supports for farm prices bear unfairly on the living costs of city consumers; they are also unwise for the farmer who does not want a reaction to set in which may swing the pendulum too far the other way.

It is very much in the interest of city dwellers that agriculture should be prosperous and Government should help with that, but not that farmers should be a favored class.

There is a farm program which can be fair to both, but it is not the one which is law today. The glittering promises made by the administration of low food prices to consumers and high food prices to farmers just cannot stand up, and both city dwellers and farmers are becoming disillusioned. It will interest my constituents to know that the investment in the farm-price-support program on the part of the Federal Government aggregates in direct investment over $4,000,000,000 and that the cost is running at about $1,000,000,000 a year. I shall stay in this fight which is so important to the well-being of the country and I believe that we shall make progress at long last and bring food prices within reasonable relation to city incomes while dealing fairly with our farmers.

FOREIGN POLICY

The issue of peace or war continues to dominate the minds and hearts of man in our own as well as in every other country. American foreign policy is founded firmly on the rock of freedom and constitutional government by law—not men. We are determined to win the struggle against the totalitarian ideology of communism whose aim is to enslave all men. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, our district, through me, has had an excellent opportunity to participate in this cold war struggle in an effective way. I spent some time in November and December last in Western Germany, Berlin, Italy, Israel, France and Great Britain with a mission from this committee working on foreign-affairs problems.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC STABILITY

Americans recognize by now that we cannot be prosperous in a bankrupt

world. We recognize also that we cannot be safe in such a world, for peoples who have no hope will flock to communism out of sheer despair, and we may then find that we are isolated rather than isolationist, and face a whole hostile world with the choice either of giving in, or destroying ourselves in a war or in unbelievably large military expenditures. Hence, the billions we invest in international economic stability are primarily invested in the interest of our own security and well-being.

We are continuing the 4-year European recovery program—Marshall plan—this year into its third year with an expenditure which is likely to be about $2,850,000,000. The first 2 years of ERP were spent in helping our allies in western Europe to recover from the direct ravages of war. The next 2 years of ERP will be spent in building up markets where our allies may sell what they make, and in integrating them economically with each other so that, instead of being 16 nations at economic war, they are 16 nations working together cooperatively much like our own 48 States in economic peace.

It is by now clear that even after 1952, when the European recovery program is due to end, western Europe will still face a serious dollar shortage with which to feed and clothe itself even austerely, and get raw materials for its factories. This can be made up by slicing drastically our exports, or it can be made up for by increasing imports from western Europe, and improving western Europe's opportunities to get raw materials in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. If we slice our exports drastically, we are heading for a depression of our own making, because we would have to lay off a few million workers engaged in the export industries, and deprive ourselves of an outlet for billions of dollars in surplus manufactured and agricultural products. If we increase imports and build up underdeveloped acres to supply raw materials, we can save ourselves and the world.

Two necessary ingredients at this point are the acceptance by the United States of membership in the International Trade Organization—ITO—which will facilitate trade for all the participating countries, including ourselves; and a vigorous development of the point 4 program to make available American technical skill to develop underdeveloped countries, concentrated in the first instance on agriculture, health, and education.

I fought hard for this point 4 program in the recent legislation for the European recovery program, and it passed the House of Representatives after a very difficult battle. Export of our technical skills is the most economical thing we can do. It will save us hundreds of millions of dollars in expenditure for direct assistance to recovery, while adding to those who benefit from it billions of dollars through their own efforts and their own resources. I intend to continue to work for this program constantly. It is one of the best answers we have to communism and one of the best ways we have to attain a stable and prosperous world.

THE FAR EAST

Our policy in this area has been bankrupt of vigor and original ideas. The forces of freedom on the whole have suffered losses in this area, the gravest of which is the loss of the mainland of China to the Communists. In the absence of a policy by the Administration the Congress has itself stated a policy, which I have had the honor to have a part in drafting. This policy calls on the peoples who remain free in Asia, southeast Asia and the western Pacific, and this includes as well such areas of China as are still free, Japan, South Korea and the Philippines, to organize themselves in a new program of self-help and mutual cooperation and assures them of our aid if they do.

I fought hard here for assistance to South Korea, one of the sturdy outposts of freedom in Asia which we are honor bound to maintain. A far-eastern policy is in the making. It must be compounded of self-help by the free peoples of the Far East themselves with our aid, and by making it clear that the United States intends to protect and to continue to assist vigorously and effectively all those peoples of the Far East who maintain the desire to be free. I place great reliance in this respect on the people of the great subcontinent of India.

There need be no haste about recognizing Communist China, such as was shown by other nations. It is much too early to judge whether it is anything but a tool of the Soviet Union—another satellite. We must be prepared for great and bold policy in the Far East which need not include speculative military adventures. Our reverses in China have taught us how much the Far East really means to our own security, to the fight against communism and to world peace.

GREEK CHILDREN

The whole world was outraged by news of the abduction of 28,000 children of Greece by the Communist guerrillas for training and indoctrination in countries behind the iron curtain. It is gratifying to be able to report that in cooperation with the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, I was able to get favorable action on a resolution which I introduced and which unanimously passed the House of Representatives condemning in unmeasured terms the brutality of this abduction. This resolution demanding the restoration of these children to their homes strengthened the hands of the President in seeking help on this subject from Yugoslavia and other nations.

NEAR EAST ARMS RACE

A new problem with respect to the establishment of peace and security in the Near East following the Arab-Israeli conflict came to my attention directly as a result of my visit to Israel in December last. It was clear to me that a renewal of this conflict was threatened by the development of an arms race in the Near East brought about by continued and large scale shipments of jet fighter aircraft, tanks, and gunboats, and other arms capable of use for aggression by Great Britain to Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan and perhaps through them to other Near East states.

When I returned to the United States I vigorously protested this British policy to the Secretary of State. His answer to me impliedly admitting the arms shipments started in train a current of protest from Members of Congress—including the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives—labor unions including the AFL and CIO, and citizens' organizations of all kinds, which is still going on unabated.

I have been constantly pursuing the demands that the United States must use all its influence to make the British stop their help to this arms race and I shall continue to do so; no problem is greater as it affects the future of the new State of Israel. Our own national security which would be involved with any renewal of war in the Near East, is also affected. This British policy jeopardizes, too, the situation of Jerusalem where peace is so essential to the whole Western World concerned as it is with the protection of the holy places.

ARMED SERVICES

Our national security continues to require between $13,000,000,000 and $14,000,000,000 annually for its protection. General Eisenhower has pointed out certain defects in our military preparations and has especially emphasized antisubmarine defense. Fortunately the additional amounts required to tighten up these deficiencies is not excessive. Though our military establishment is only one element in our foreign policy of which economic and cultural policy are the other parts, yet our Military Establishment must be effective and adequate to our needs. It must be dominated by modern concepts of security in the atomic age and also follow the traditional American pattern of civilian control.

In an exchange of correspondence with the Secretary of Defense I have emphasized the urgency of securing our own freedoms and our position in the world by eliminating segregation on grounds of race or color in armed forces. I introduced House Resolution 328, seeking an investigation of such practices of segregation which persist, and urged an amendment to any renewal of the draft law to that effect in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee.

IRELAND

In an effort to focus attention on the problems of Irish partition, I introduced House Resolution 456, seeking a plebiscite under United Nations auspices of all Ireland so that the will of its people to end partition could be manifested and Ireland could join the Atlantic pact nations and be admitted to the United Nations. In the course of the debate on the European recovery program and the amendment on this subject offered by the Honorable JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, I was able to bring about assurance that hearings would be promptly held on the resolutions which would put the House of Representatives on record as favoring the unification of all Ireland. Such hearings have now been held, and I am hope-

ful of favorable action on such a resolution.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

The last few months have seen the United States decision to manufacture the H-bomb. The seriousness of this decision cannot be overemphasized. It puts the greatest pressure upon all nations to bring about an agreement which will give the United Nations the power to keep the peace and as the first step adopt the plan, as requested by the United States and the great majority of UN members, for control and inspection of A-bomb materials and manufacture.

The Soviet walk-out from the Security Council over the failure to seat Communist China has greatly complicated the UN problems. We must remain serene and yet determined in the face of this threat and go about the business of the United Nations anyhow. The United Nations' Secretary General has spoken of a 20-year peace plan. It may be 20 years and we must have the courage and patience to see it through—it will still be infinitely better than war. The ultimate goal which promises peace in this dangerous world is the development of the United Nations itself into a world federation with necessary powers and with adequate forces to keep the peace.

GERMANY

I have long recognized this as the principal area in the struggle in the cold war. It is now becoming clear that the Communists in the eastern zone of Germany will use the ex-Nazis of the western zone which we and the French and British occupy, and hold out the bait of the unification of the eastern and western zones and the return of Germany's eastern provinces, in order to make of a united Germany a new Soviet satellite.

As a member of the European Study Mission of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I spent several weeks studying the situation in western Germany in November and December last. I came away convinced that if we do not plan for a long-term occupation of western Germany, if we do not, with determination, fight against the recurrence of ex-Nazis and ultra-nationalists in high places in government, business, and society there, and if we do not reform the educational system and insist on democratic procedures in all levels of government and society, we will be encouraging a new Germany as aggressive a menace to humanity as before and this time in a league with the Soviet Union which may well be successful in overpowering the civilized world. I have called unceasing attention to these dangers and will continue to do so. I have helped to organize the introduction in the House of Representatives of the same resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, Senator IVES, of New York, and others seeking a Presidential commission to investigate the whole German situation and our occupation policy there.

I have vigorously opposed and will continue to oppose the remilitarization of Western Germany. The hope for Germany and the hope for peace in Europe is a federation of western Europe, of which Western Germany can be a part, and in this way to make of all the other Europeans, guarantors of a new Germany's peaceful intentions.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The new displaced-persons legislation now passed by the Senate and House, liberalizes the definition of those eligible and eliminates many of the discriminatory provisions found in the previous law. As soon as a few conflicting Senate and House provisions are ironed out in conference it will undoubtedly be signed by the President. Provisions are made for the admittance of 344,000 displaced persons in 3 years instead of the present 205,000 in 2 years, 20,000 may be orphans admitted for purposes of adoption—legislation which, with Senator IVES, of New York, I pioneered in 1947—4,000 may be anti-Communist refugees stranded in China—a provision which I initiated together with Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York; 18,000 may be veterans who fought under the flag of the Polish Republic and cannot return to their Communist-dominated homeland; 10,000 may be natives of Greece made homeless by the military operations of first the Nazis and later the Communist guerrillas; 5,000 may be from Trieste; and 5,000 may be eligible displaced orphans. The measure gives preference to skilled workers in trades still badly needed to strengthen American industry. The passage by the Senate of so liberal a displaced-persons bill is very gratifying to me, as it is a measure for which I have been fighting since I first came to Congress in 1947. It will be recalled that I was a member of the first congressional committee to investigate the displaced-persons situation in Europe in 1947.

CONCLUSION

From the above it can be seen that our problems are vastly expanded in magnitude and complexity and that the world leadership which our power and resources have forced on us has enormously increased our responsibilities. The American people continue as always to want only peace, freedom, and the practice of the golden rule for themselves and others. This continues to be our greatest strength. Attention has been focused too on the part which our political system must play in these great endeavors, and I have necessarily been concerned in view of the critical importance in our national life of the two-party system with strengthening the hands of progressivism in domestic and especially in foreign affairs in the Republican Party. I have valued, too, the fact that I am elected also by the Liberal Party and this has given me the opportunity for that political independence which is of such great importance to the people of my district. Just as the minds and abilities of Americans are expanding to meet our new challenges, so I believe too that we will find our political institutions doing the same thing.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HOW MUCH IDLE POWER IN THE MERRIMACK AND CONNECTICUT RIVERS?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the managers on the part of the House of the committee on conference of the Committee on Public Works have agreed to the Senate amendment of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill to provide for a power survey of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries in New England.

Under H. R. 5472, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to make an engineering study of these industrial rivers and tell us how much of its energy is unemployed.

And I say: "It's about time."

American industry was born in New England. This region has had its periods of expansion followed by leveling-off intervals before the advance was resumed.

Today, as always, we look ahead. Following the advice of that good merchant, Lincoln Filene, of Boston, we are determined to build a balanced economy that will make for steady growth.

New England must concentrate on greater diversification. We must attract a variety of new, small industries. To do this we must be able to offer an abundance of low-cost hydroelectric power.

H. R. 5472 gives us hope that the Congress will help us to reach this objective.

Over the years, hundreds of millions of dollars in tax money have been taken from New England to develop public projects in other sections of the Nation. We have been willing to make this contribution to the over-all progress of the United States. Now that those undeveloped areas are thriving, we ask that they have some consideration for the problems of their benefactor—New England.

The President has focused attention on the need for the utilization of water-power resources in the Northeast. Members of both parties from Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut are living up in support of it.

Here is the central problem. We have been suffering from a serious power shortage since 1946. The high cost of available power ties up farmers and industrial users alike. It is preventing them from making full use of electric service in this postwar era of expansion, and puts them under a competitive handicap.

New England labors under the burden of the highest power rates in the Nation. The reports of the Federal Power Commission back up this statement with documentary proof.

We have the water-power resources. But not the full and effective employment of them.

The limited and inefficient techniques which were sufficient in the past, do not measure up to the needs of the present.

The six States cannot do the job alone. Neither can private industry because the whole question of a river basin and its coordinated development is one in which the public interest is paramount. Only the Federal Government has the means

and the authority to initiate a complete program that will not bog down in contradictions.

I do not hear the communities or the States within the Tennessee Valley basin complaining that their sovereign rights have been usurped by the TVA. Because that progressive and successful project has proved its worth beyond criticism.

What has stimulated the growth of economic enterprise in the valley of the Tennessee, can do the same for other regions.

Change is the law of life. It must be guided, not obstructed.

Our own form of Government is not committed to the maintenance of a rigid status quo. Its success is rooted in its flexibility, its ability to evolve with the times and effectively serve new needs.

When the motorcar was invented, we did not forbid its manufacture for fear that it would endanger the established manufacturers of whips, harness, and buggies. To do so would thwart progress.

Likewise, we of the present do not close our eyes to the fact that private producers of power just cannot do the job of integrating the development of a river basin, which is beyond their scope in the first place.

The only alternative they suggest is that we stay as we are.

This negative attitude has been overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States which has decided that the Federal Government has full power and authority over all navigable streams and that Federal control of navigable streams extends to the entire basin.

The elimination of pollution, the control of floods, the development of hydroelectric power and incidental benefits cannot be handled by individual States, or on an isolated basis, with each phase of the problem separated from the others.

In H. R. 5472 we find the first realistic step toward searching out the facts on the hydroelectric potential of the Merrimack River which courses through New Hampshire and northeastern Massachusetts.

I am confident that the findings will be implemented by further positive action to boost the economy of New England.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] on his very effective speech. His address is most appropriate. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has been a leader in the fight for the development of the resources of New England which are now wasted and which have been wasted for a long time. Unfortunately in the past, due to the opposition of States in New England, the advancement and progress which this survey represents has been held back. We are very thankful to President Truman for the recommendation he made in connection with the New England situation and the development of our national resources which are going to waste and which could be utilized in the interest of business generally and of the people of New England. Throughout the years that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has been a Member of this body he has been advocating the very thing that President Truman so effectively recommended to the Congress and which has brought about the inclusion of that recommendation in the conference report on the Rivers and Harbors bill which will come before us tomorrow.

Mr. LANE. I thank our distinguished majority leader, Hon. JOHN McCORMACK, of Boston, for his contribution with respect to this matter and for the remarks that he has just made. I know over the years the majority leader has been one of the outspoken advocates of this policy. He has been joined by the Governor of our Commonwealth on many occasions and he has spoken not only here on the floor of the House but publicly in the State of Massachusetts to further the interests of the Government of the United States in taking over these rivers to see if we cannot develop them to obtain further power projects for New England to help our business and industries in that section of the country.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS BUTTER

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I received this afternoon advice that the Production and Marketing Administration has been providing surplus butter in rather substantial quantities to 29 States. This led to an inquiry addressed to the Distribution Division, and I am now advised that since April 14, as of this morning, there has been distribution under section 416 of a total of 3,426,800 pounds. This is further clear recognition of the basic soundness of the proposal I have repeatedly made that these food commodities should be distributed to needy people to avoid spoilage and to eliminate the wholly unjustifiable waste of Federal funds in their storage. I only hope that the program can be stepped up and that this evidence of a belated recognition of the soundness of the proposals I have made will become the official policy of the executive department.

However, I am puzzled by the facts which have been reported to me. I am including here a breakdown of the distribution of this butter in 29 States. I think all Members will be interested to note that 43 percent, or 1,473,760 pounds, have been distributed in Illinois, against the total of 1,953,040 in the other 28 States. I think my colleagues from Illinois may also be interested in this development.

Distribution of butter since April 14 under section 416 as of May 2, 1950:

	Pounds
Alabama	1,216
Arkansas	26,432
California	54,400
Colorado	24,000
Florida	20,032
Georgia	50,816
Idaho	128
Illinois	1,473,760
Iowa	13,056
Kansas	64,128
Kentucky	55,296
Louisiana	72,000
Maryland	32,640
Massachusetts	147,840
Michigan	183,232
Minnesota	119,040
Missouri	72,960
Nevada	1,920
New Hampshire	35,200
New Jersey	132,800
New York	376,768
Oregon	512
Pennsylvania	205,824
Rhode Island	21,120
Tennessee	40,464
Utah	21,120
Virginia	21,120
Washington	74,496
West Virginia	84,480
Total	3,426,800

According to the best information I can get, this butter is going to relief agencies.

The more I think about it the more I question that 43 percent of all the needy people are located in one State with 57 percent in 28 other States, and no one in need of butter in 19 States. Quite probably there is an explanation, and I would be interested in having it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE (at the request of Mr. TABER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, on April 29 I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $273, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on the late Generoso Pope.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. IRVING (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a poem.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Evening Sentinel of Shenandoah, Iowa, by Mr. David Archie entitled "Off the Cuff," and a copy of a letter he wrote to a friend.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution and statement introduced today by a bipartisan group of Members seeking the appointment of a

Presidential commission for the investigation of a situation in Germany, as was recently done in the other body.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2919. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse;

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H. R. 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps;

H. R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations; and

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2919. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse;

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H. R. 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps;

H. R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations; and

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1422. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $2,191,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1423. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal home-loan banks and the Home Loan Bank Board for the year ended June 30, 1949, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 857) (H. Doc. No. 578); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1424. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 8, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Quillayute River, Wash., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 579); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1425. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the tribal business council of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1426. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to enable the governments of Alaska, of Hawaii, of Puerto Rico, and of the Virgin Islands to authorize public bodies or agencies to undertake slum clearance, urban redevelopment, and low-rent housing activities, including the issuance of bonds and other obligations, to amend the low-rent housing enabling statutes for Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1427. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Mary Leila Forrest, nee Jackson, No. [redacted] CR 27429, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 572. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5074, a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7764. A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Resolution 546. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5; without amendment (Rept. No. 1976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 187. Concurrent resolution favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Alexander Stewart, with amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8318. A bill to prohibit the transportation or importation of any goods, wares, or merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by any person, firm, or corporation who has refused to bargain collectively, fairly, and in good faith with employees or who indulges in any unfair labor practices; prohibition against same; penalty for violating the act; and exceptions to the scope of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHESNEY:

H. R. 8319. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8320. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agriculture commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 8321. A bill to incorporate the National Sheriffs' Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 8322. A bill to provide for the construction of a suitable building or buildings in or near the city of Baltimore, Md., for the use and accommodation of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8323. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 8324. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retirement pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8325. A bill authorizing the Shilshole Bay breakwater project, Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8326. A bill to remove certain restrictions with respect to clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8327. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Concurrent Resolution 199; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 573. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of flood conditions in the Red River of the North drainage basin; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 574. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 573; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GROSS:
H. Res. 575. Resolution for the improvement of rural delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
By Mr. SHELLEY:
H. Res. 576. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to investigate the seizure of five fishing vessels of the United States by the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
By Mr. VINSON:
H. Res. 577. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7764, a bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.
By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:
H. Res. 578. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. CELLER:
H. Res. 579. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. BLATNIK:
H. Res. 580. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. EBERHARTER:
H. Res. 581. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission to study and report on American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. JAVITS:
H. Res. 582. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission on American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. MITCHELL:
H. Res. 583. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H. Res. 584. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. Res. 585. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:
H. Res. 586. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, requesting the enactment of legislation for a national and comprehensive pension program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:
H. R. 8328. A bill for the relief of John Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:
H. R. 8329. A bill for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, Sor Elisa Perez Tejeiro, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 8330. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, his wife Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and his child Jose Maria Thomasa Duran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JUDD:
H. R. 8331. A bill for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCARTHY:
H. R. 8332. A bill for the relief of Elena Bohdanecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McGUIRE:
H. R. 8333. A bill for the relief of S. Francis Liu and Victor Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MORTON:
H. R. 8334. A bill for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. PETERSON:
H. R. 8335. A bill for the relief of Dr. L. W. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SABATH:
H. R. 8336. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Marchetti Belluomini, Mirena Belluomini, and Salvatore Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SASSCER:
H. R. 8337. A bill for the relief of William A. Hogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2100. Mr. FORAND presented a resolution of the City Council of Providence, R. I., petitioning the Congress and the President of the United States to enact without delay such legislation as may be needed to continue Federal control of rents until such time as the current housing shortage may be eased, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, high over all, blessed forever, whose dwelling is the light of setting suns, the round ocean, the living air, the blue sky, and in the mind of man, we lift our hearts to Thee. Thou makest Thyself known in the stillness. May we become aware of Thy healing presence in this hallowed moment. Grant us to rise on stepping stones of our dead selves to finer and better things. Nourish within us a divine discontent, that we may be restless among the things that spoil the music of our common humanity. Plant a cross in our hearts and let it burn out all vanity and pride. Set us apart to be builders of a better world, architects of nobler international relationships.

Thou hast shown us, O Lord, what is good. Enable us to perform what Thou dost require, to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 2, 1950, was dispensed with.

NOTICE OF VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, tomorrow the Prime Minister of Pakistan and a party of 10 will arrive at the Capitol around noon. They will be escorted to the Vice President's office, and later the Prime Minister will appear before the Senate to address the Members thereof. I make the announcement now in the hope that all Senators will be present at the time the Prime Minister appears, which, I repeat, will be 12 o'clock.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing for 1 week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCLELLAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to conduct a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING DISLOYALTY CHARGES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the subcommittee investigating disloyalty charges in the State Department is now accumulating quite a number of witnesses. I have been tied up in the mornings, the afternoons, and some evenings in the hearings. The witnesses are becoming restive because we cannot place them on the stand promptly, and in many cases they have to be here a week at a time before we can call them.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that we are going into some phases of the matter which have not been currently heard by the committee, I shall have to ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be allowed to sit at such times as necessary during the sessions of the Senate in order to dispose of these witnesses. We have accumulated such a backlog of work that unless we are given this right, we could not possibly hear and determine the issues which are involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Benton	Humphrey	Mundt
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tobey
Fulbright	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Young
Hendrickson	Malone	
Hickenlooper	Martin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 794) for the relief of certain contractors employed in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett;

H. R. 1814. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz;

H. R. 2464. An act for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll;

H. R. 3169. An act granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3305. An act for the relief of the estate of Jose Salgado Santos;

H. R. 3675. An act for the relief of Erik H. Lindman;

H. R. 3994. An act for the relief of John D. Lange;

H. R. 4011. An act for the relief of Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos or Matheou);

H. R. 4163. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa;

H. R. 4371. An act for the relief of Shiro Takemura;

H. R. 4628. An act for the relief of John G. Essenberg;

H. R. 4806. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago;

H. R. 5051. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria;

H. R. 5150. An act for the relief of Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal;

H. R. 5151. An act for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate or Dorothy E. Douglas;

H. R. 5250. An act for the relief of J. L. Smelcer;

H. R. 5639. An act for the relief of Ivan E. Townsend;

H. R. 5972. An act for the relief of Ivar G. Johnson;

H. R. 6053. An act for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 6169. An act for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe;

H. R. 6198. An act for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 6449. An act for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle;

H. R. 6489. An act for the relief of United Transformer Co. (formerly United Transformer Corp.);

H. R. 6505. An act to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand;

H. R. 6652. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Brown;

H. R. 7050. An act for the relief of Louie Gam Yean;

H. R. 7065. An act for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana;

H. R. 7066. An act for the relief of Setsuko Amano;

H. R. 7073. An act for the relief of Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu;

H. R. 7199. An act for the relief of Nobuko Maeda;

H. R. 7254. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bernard [illegible]nith;

H. R. 7278. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner;

H. R. 7283. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jack B. Meyer;

H. R. 7292. An act for the relief of Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita;

H. R. 7362. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Kono);

H. R. 7363. An act for the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi;

H. R. 7416. An act for the relief of Suzuko Takanashi;

H. R. 7485. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe;

H. R. 7614. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff;

H. R. 7656. An act for the relief of David George Callaway;

H. R. 7658. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Ito;

H. R. 7682. An act for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson; and

H. R. 7708. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will take the liberty of suggesting that, without objection and without speeches or debate, he will recognize Senators who wish to present routine matters for the RECORD or introduce bills or submit resolutions. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COVERING INTO TREASURY OF MONEYS ARISING FROM CHARGES AND DEDUCTIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1069) to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions, which was, on page 2, line 2, to strike out "and" and insert "or."

Mr. MAYBANK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (S. DOC. NO. 167)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions for the fiscal year 1951, Department of Defense, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

Mr. GREEN presented a resolution of the legislature of the State of Rhode

Island, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolution memorializing Congress in the plea to revive the Civilian Conservation Corps for unemployed youths between the ages of 17 and 23

Whereas United States Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, has introduced into Congress a bill to revive the Civilian Conservation Corps which functioned during the 1930's; and

Whereas the Senator says "this is to be regarded as an investment in human and natural resources that will repay big dividends in increased national wealth, lowered raw material costs, and trained and adjusted young manpower, the most precious of all our resources"; and

Whereas the Civilian Conservation Corps would be for youths between 17 and 23 who are unemployed, not going to school and are on the towns, who would work under purely civilian management in national parks and forests, on flood control and in restoring grazing and farm lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, which has already created a special committee to make a study of the desirability of the adoption of a yield tax on woodlands in this State, now endorses the restoration of the Civilian Conservation Corps, as indicated in the proposed congressional bill, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their best efforts to have this legislation enacted into law; directing the Secretary of State to transmit to said Senators and Representatives duly certified copies of this resolution.

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES—RESOLUTION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution adopted by the Twenty-eighth Annual Conference of the Izaak Walton League of America, which met at Des Moines, Iowa, during the latter part of March this year. This resolution endorses the International Treaty on Great Lakes Fisheries.

Included in the resolution is a reference to the critical problem of sea lamprey, the vampire eels which have destroyed so much of the commercial fishing on the Great Lakes. I have taken up this issue on many occasions with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and I mention this matter at the time because I am delighted to see that the Izaak Walton League is continuing its own deep interest in the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution of this distinguished organization be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TREATY ON GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

Whereas the commercial fisheries of the Great Lakes represent one of the vital food resources of this country supporting an industry involving millions of dollars in capital and thousands of families; and

Whereas said industry has in the past been regulated by piecemeal laws and regulations adopted by the respective States bordering upon the Great Lakes but without any uniformity or long-range programs or understanding, with the result that the industry has been deteriorating, the supply of the better species of fish has been decreasing and in some instances has disappeared entirely; and

Whereas the industry is today faced to a greater degree than ever before by pollution and silting of fishing grounds, by invasion of predator species such as the sea lamprey, by overfishing and lack of adequate control measures, and

Whereas a treaty between the United States and Canada providing the ground work for proper management and husbandry of this resource on both sides of the border was prepared after years of thought, study, and cooperation between various states, the Federal Government, and the Government of Canada, which treaty was signed by the contracting parties in 1946 but has not to date been ratified by the Senate of the United States, largely because of localized political opposition: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That the Izaak Walton League of America renew and reiterate its urgent request to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate that immediate steps be taken looking to ratification of said treaty and the prompt enactment by the Congress of such legislation as may be necessary to implement it.

RADIO CLEAR CHANNELS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the National Grange at its national convention held in Sacramento, Calif., last November, a copy of which has just been sent to me, which urges that there be no further breakdown in the number of clear-channel broadcasting stations in the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY DELEGATES OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE AT THEIR EIGHTY-THIRD ANNUAL SESSION IN SACRAMENTO, CALIF., NOVEMBER 1949; PORTLAND, MAINE, NOVEMBER 1948

RADIO CLEAR CHANNELS

We reiterate our stand as taken at the national convention held at Portland, Maine, in 1948 and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the National Grange delegates realizing the necessity of insuring reliable and satisfactory radio service to the farm population of the United States, reiterate our previous recommendations that there be no further breakdown in the number of clear-channel broadcasting stations in our country; and we further urge that the Federal Communications Commission grant permission to clear-channel stations to operate at sufficient power to provide adequate service to all rural areas; and we emphasize that the United States Department of State should resist any attempt by other North American countries to establish stations on frequencies at present assigned to clear-channel stations in the United States."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2155. A bill to authorize the cancellation or settlement of claims of the District of Columbia against the estates of recipients of old-age assistance; without amendment (Rept. No. 1532).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LEHMAN introduced Senate bill 3528, to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 3529. A bill for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3530. A bill to abolish the position of mail handler in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3531. A bill for the relief of Doctor Chao-Jen Chen, Dr. Janet Wang Chen, and Eleanor Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. DOWNEY):

S. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the California World Progress Exposition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Mr. KEFAUVER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 176, to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by S. Res. 202, 81st Cong., which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Niagara Development Act of 1950." It is a bill to carry out the purposes expressed in President Truman's message to the Senate yesterday. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement I have prepared on this bill to be printed in the body of the RECORD together with an analysis of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and analysis presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3528) to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement and analysis presented by Mr. LEHMAN are as follows:

MAY 3, 1950.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN INTRODUCING NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT ACT

For more than a century, the Niagara Falls, one of the scenic wonders of North America, has attracted visitors both from America and from abroad. And for almost a century men have dreamed of harnessing the mighty power of that cataract to serve man's needs. Some of that power has indeed been harnessed during the past 50 years. But a really complete mobilization of that tremendous resource has waited until this very day.

Yesterday, the President sent to the Senate for its advice and consent a treaty with the Dominion of Canada providing for the preservation of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and for the utilization of the power potential of the Niagara in such a manner as to preserve and enhance the scenic wonders of that river and at the same time to make some of those waters available for the benefit and welfare of the peoples of the United States and Canada.

I want to emphasize that the whole object of the treaty is to protect and develop both resources—the resource of beauty and the resource of power. I have always been committed, as a private citizen, as Governor of New York, and now as United States Senator to the preservation of Niagara Falls as a scenic wonder on one hand and the development of power in the public interest, on the other. I was pleased to note that the President in his message to the Congress yesterday took a similar stand on behalf of the administration.

I am today introducing a comprehensive bill, the Niagara Development Act of 1950, for the utilization of the power possibilities of the Niagara as well as for the preservation of the scenic beauties of the Niagara. This same bill is being introduced simultaneously in the House of Representatives by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

This bill represents the studies and the work of many months and, in fact, of many years. It utilizes the successful findings of conservationists, power experts, and engineering surveyors for over two generations.

Our bill proposes a power development in accordance with plans recently completed by the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission for a staged development which would install new United States capacity of 1,330,000 kilowatts and would provide an increase in the average annual energy available in the United States of 7,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The total installation at Niagara Falls would then be 1,695,000 kilowatts, including the privately owned plant (Schoellkopf) now in operation there. The available annual energy would be 11,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours as compared to the present availability of 3,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

New York alone would be able to absorb this energy and more by the time these facilities can be put into operation, which is estimated to be about 3½ years after the start of construction. In recognition of the fact, however, that States adjacent to western New York, namely, Pennsylvania and Ohio, have a legitimate interest in the power from this great waterway, I make provision in my bill for means whereby they can secure some of this power.

Our bill provides for the Federal construction of these works by the Chief of Army Engineers, whose experts have done much of the surveying, boring, and testing of this area over the past years. The project works, under the terms of our bill, would be sold to the State of New York for the operation and maintenance of those works in the public interest.

We propose to protect the interests of the people of the United States and of the people of New York State by providing that the transfer of facilities to New York State should occur under the terms of an agreement to be negotiated between the State of New York and the Federal Government. This agreement would be subject to approval by the State Legislature of the State of New York and by the Congress.

This agreement would include all the provisions necessary for the protection of the Federal interests, of the national defense interests, and of the interests of the eventual consumers of the power. The whole object of our bill is to provide power to the people at low cost. I think this is an essential disposition of this great natural resource, which is one of the resources of the American people, and must not be subject to exploitation for the benefit of a small group of any kind.

I believe New York to be the proper operator and guardian of this power development. It is, of course, necessary that the State of New York enact the necessary legislation authorizing the New York Power Authority, for instance, to operate this project. The present authorization for the New York Power Authority extends only to the St. Lawrence. It would also be necessary for New York State to agree to the provisions necessary to protect the Federal interest and the interest of the people of New York as well as of the adjacent States. I have no doubt that the people of New York will indicate their complete acceptance of this opportunity to acquire ownership of a great power facility whose eventual potentiality will be greater than that of Grand Coulee Dam.

In line with President Truman's proposal to the Congress of a month ago for a study of a possible northeastern power pool—a proposal which I endorsed—our bill makes provision for the coordinated operation of the Niagara project with the other power projects which may be involved in the pool, but only in the event that such a pool is established either by Congress or by compact among the several States.

Our bill is in the pattern of the arrangements originally envisioned for the development of the St. Lawrence project. Indeed, the way is left open for the operation of these projects in tandem, as soon as the St. Lawrence project is authorized and constructed.

Our bill conforms to the principles of the Federal Power Act of 1920 by providing that the Federal Power Commission shall issue a license for the operation of this project. This, however, is not a matter for discretion by the Federal Power Commission. The Federal Power Commission is directed to issue the license, provided that the agreement between New York State and the Federal Government is consummated and all the conditions provided in this act are fulfilled.

New York State is at the present time in the process of applying for a license from the Federal Power Commission for the development of the power potentialities in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence. In this application, the Federal Power Commission has full discretion whether to grant or reject this application. Under my bill no such discretion would be granted the Federal Power Commission. The Federal Power Commission would be directed to issue the license if all the conditions are met. Where there is inconsistency between the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act and the provisions of the proposed Niagara Development Act, the provisions of the latter will pertain.

In the event that New York State does not choose to take advantage of its opportunity to acquire these facilities, my bill would leave the way open for an agency later to be created by Congress to operate these facilities in the interests of the people of the State of New York and of the adjacent States.

In the event that no such agency is established by the time the project is ready to deliver power, and if New York State is not then prepared to assume control, the provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944 would pertain, and the project would continue to be operated by the Chief of Engineers and the power would be disposed of by the Interior Department. I have sought in every way to protect the interests of the people of New York State and the interests of the duly constituted authorities of New York State.

It is my earnest hope and desire that this will be a New York project for the primary benefit of the people of New York. Necessarily the interests of the adjacent States must be recognized and the interests of the Federal Government must be protected. The Niagara River, after all, is the outlet for four of the Great Lakes, discharging the waters from this great system of lakes of the Middle West into Lake Ontario on its way to the St. Lawrence and to the Atlantic. This great system of waterways is the lifeblood of the Middle West and of the Northeast. The great drainage system which it represents is one of the priceless heritages of the American people.

On their way from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario, the Great Lakes waters drop a total of 326 feet, the magnificent descent off the Niagara escarpment providing the beauty of the Niagara Falls and the power potentialities that we now propose to develop.

Ours is a complex bill, but its objectives are very simple and its means are equally so. I ask that this bill be given the earliest possible consideration by the Senate, so that the authorization may be on the statute books and a request for suitable appropriations may speedily be made.

The cost of this project under present plans will be either $350,300,000 or $308,700,000, depending upon the kind of construction decided upon. This is but a small investment compared to the benefits which the people will derive. The annual value of the additional power developed on the United States side will be $61,339,000 or one-fifth of the capital cost. This is, of course, a very simplified cost comparison, but it represents in a true sense the value of the project to the public.

ANALYSIS OF NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1950—BILL INTRODUCED BY SENATOR LEHMAN IN THE SENATE AND IN THE HOUSE BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

PURPOSE

To provide for a public development of water power made available to the United States under the terms of the Canadian-United States Niagara Treaty and to insure at the same time the preservation of the scenic beauties of the Niagara Falls.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

1. Authorizes the United States Corps of Engineers to plan and construct the necessary project works.

2. Authorizes and directs the President of the United States to turn over the project works to whatever agency the State of New York may designate by law for this purpose, provided that certain conditions protecting the interests of the people of the State of New York and the interests of the people of the adjacent States and of the Federal Government are met.

3. Provides for the repayment by the State of New York to the Federal Government of such construction costs as are properly allocable to the power development. Costs for works designed solely to preserve the scenic beauty of the Falls are to be borne by the United States Government.

4. Provides that amount and terms of repayment as well as other pertinent conditions shall be covered in an agreement to be negotiated between the United States Government and the State of New York, subject to approval by the Legislature of New York and the Congress.

5. Provides that if the State of New York does not choose to acquire and operate the project or if no agreement is reached by the time the project is ready to deliver power, the power is to be distributed by the United States Government either through an agency authorized by Congress for the purpose or by the Federal agencies authorized to develop and distribute power under the terms of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

ANALYSIS OF BILL BY SECTIONS

Section 1

Statement of national policy and of purpose of the act.

Section 2

A. Authorizes construction of the works in accordance with project plans outlined in report of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission (September 28, 1949) subject to modification not inconsistent with the act and found advisable by the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission after consultation with the Governors of New York and of other interested States and with other interested Federal agencies.

B. Provides for start of construction as soon as funds are appropriated.

Section 3

A. Authorizes and directs the President to transfer the project facilities to an agency of New York State, when such an agency shall have been authorized to accept and operate these works by the State of New York and when three major conditions will have been met:

1. An agreement shall be negotiated between the United States Government and the government of the State of New York and such agreement shall have been approved both by the Legislature of New York and the United States Congress.

2. (a) The agreement shall include provisions for—

(1) Repayment of costs allocable to power; and

(2) For the maintenance and operation of the project in the public interest—including especially the interests of the State of New York and of other States within economic transmission distance.

(b) Agreement shall prohibit the alienation of any of the waters to any private person or company other than waters over which private persons or corporations already have existing rights.

(c) Agreement shall give full recognition to the interests of national security.

(d) The agreement shall provide for the granting of preference to local government units or their instrumentalities and to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations.

(e) The agreement shall provide for the construction or acquisition of necessary transmission lines in order to make power available in wholesale quantities to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

(f) Agreement shall provide that project power shall be sold primarily for the benefit of the consumers of electric power at the lowest possible rates (and in such a manner as to encourage the widest possible use.)

(g) Agreement shall provide that contracts for resale of project power shall include provision for establishing resale rates to be fixed by the seller (State of New York) so as to pass on the savings to the consumers.

(h) Agreement shall provide that if and when a northeastern power pool or some other agency for the coordinated operation of power facilities in the Northeast shall be created, either by future Federal legislation or by compacts between the States, arrangements shall be made by the State of New York for the coordinated operation of the Niagara power facilities with those of the pool.

(i) Agreement shall provide that other States within economic transmission distance may obtain needed power from Niagara by contract with New York State; if any State is denied what it believes to be its fair share, the Federal Power Commission, after full and open hearings, shall have the power to determine the arrangements whereby the power shall be sold to these States within economic transmission distance.

3. (a) New York State will apply to the Federal Power Commission for a license for operation of the project; Federal Power Commission is thereupon directed to issue the license, provided that all the conditions referred to above have been satisfied.

(b) In case of any conflict between the licensing provision of the Federal Power Act and the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall pertain.

B. Eighteen months after the beginning of construction the President is directed to send a report to Congress on the state of negotiations with the State of New York.

C. If transfer of the power facility to the State of New York has not been completely accomplished in accordance with the above provisions by the time power is available from any generating unit of the project, the project shall be maintained and power disposed of by any agency which Congress may have meanwhile created for the purpose; if no such agency has been created, the project shall be maintained and operated by the Chief of Engineers and the power shall be disposed of in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1944 (by the Secretary of the Interior).

NOTE.—In this analysis—

Section 2, A and B correspond to section 2 in the bill.

Section 3, A corresponds to section 3 (a) in the bill.

Section 3 (A) (1) corresponds to section 3 (a) (i) in the bill, etc.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. HENDRICKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett;

H. R. 1814. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz;

H. R. 2464. An act for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll;

H. R. 3169. An act granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3305. An act for the relief of the estate of Jose Salgado Santos;

H. R. 3994. An act for the relief of John D. Lange;

H. R. 4011. An act for the relief of Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos or Matheou);

H. R. 4163. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa;

H. R. 4371. An act for the relief of Shiro Takemura;

H. R. 4628. An act for the relief of John G. Essenberg;

H. R. 4806. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago;

H. R. 5051. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria;

H. R. 5150. An act for the relief of Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal;

H. R. 5151. An act for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas;

H. R. 5250. An act for the relief of J. L. Smelcer;

H. R. 5639. An act for the relief of Ivan E. Townsend;

H. R. 5972. An act for the relief of Ivar G. Johnson;

H. R. 6053. An act for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 6169. An act for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe;

H. R. 6198. An act for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 6449. An act for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle;

H. R. 6489. An act for the relief of United Transformer Co. (formerly United Transformer Corp.);

H. R. 6505. An act to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand;

H. R. 6652. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Brown;

H. R. 7050. An act for the relief of Louie Gam Yean;

H. R. 7065. An act for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana;

H. R. 7066. An act for the relief of Setsuko Amano;

H. R. 7073. An act for the relief of Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu;

H. R. 7199. An act for the relief of Nobuko Maeda;

H. R. 7254. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bernard Smith;

H. R. 7278. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner;

H. R. 7283. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jack B. Meyer;

H. R. 7292. An act for the relief of Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita;

H. R. 7362. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Kono);

H. R. 7363. An act for the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi;

H. R. 7416. An act for the relief of Suzuko Takanashi;

H. R. 7485. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe;

H. R. 7614. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff;

H. R. 7656. An act for the relief of David George Callaway;

H. R. 7658. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Ito; and

H. R. 7682. An act for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7708. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3675. An act for the relief of Erik H. Lindman; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONVENTION ON ROAD TRAFFIC—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting Executive O, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a convention on road traffic which was open for signature from September 19, 1949, until December 31, 1949, and during that period was signed on

behalf of the United States of America and 20 other states, which, with the accompanying convention, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the ban of secrecy be removed from the convention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a convention on road traffic which was open for signature from September 19, 1949, until December 31, 1949, and during that period was signed on behalf of the United States of America and 20 other states. There is also transmitted, for the purpose of receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification thereof, a certified copy of a related protocol concerning occupied countries or territories which was open for signature at the same time as the convention.

The purposes of the convention are explained in the report of the Secretary of State which is transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1950.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of convention on road traffic; (3) certified copy of related protocol; (4) excerpt from report of United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport.)

THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM—ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Road to Socialism," delivered by Hon. J. Lindsay Almond, attorney general of Virginia, at Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va., on April 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL THOMAS C. KINKAID—EDITORIAL BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, Naval Warrior of the Pacific," written by Harry H. Schlacht and published in the Hearst newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHITHER THE RAILROADS?—ADDRESS BY M. W. CLEMENT

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Whither the Railroads?" delivered by M. W. Clement, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad, before the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED SALE OF UNITS IN WESTCHESTER APARTMENTS—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of April 19, 1950, regarding the proposed sale of units in the Westchester Apartments in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE TULSA TRIBUNE

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of April 22, 1950, regarding the Kerr natural-gas bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

PASSAGE OF RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL—ARTICLE BY C. F. BYRNS

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of the recent passage by the Senate of the bill authorizing rivers and harbors and flood-control projects, written by C. F. Byrns, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMEMORATION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, 159 years ago today the Republic of Poland adopted its famous constitution of May the 3d. In commemoration of this historical event I have prepared a brief statement and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement by Mr. IVES was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES IN COMMEMORATION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, MAY 3, 1950

Today, May 3, freedom-loving peoples all over the world will commemorate the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. Barely 2 years after the acceptance of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, the brave Polish people produced the Magna Carta of Polish parliamentary history—a document instantly recognized and hailed by the leading thinkers of the day as a major milestone in man's progress toward democracy.

Those familiar with Polish history have no difficulty in understanding why it was that the Poles, a Slavonic people of eastern central Europe, should be the authors and promulgators of the first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a nation of the Old World. For the Poles are the possessors of an ancient and enviable history of devotion to the parliamentary system of government.

Among the Slavonic peoples of Europe, only the Poles can point with justifiable pride to a record of constant and deep-rooted faith in the parliamentary tradition throughout their independent existence as a nation. And nowhere else on the Continent of Europe among all the states which have survived down to 1950, is the unbroken continuity of the existence of a legislative body a feature of national life.

Thus, it was only natural that during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when the enlightened ideas of such western philosophers as Locke and Rousseau were being greeted with enthusiasm by the great intellectuals of the age, the Polish people should produce a document immediately acclaimed as an outstanding political achievement rivaling in scope of concept and boldness of language the American Declaration of Independence.

A brief examination of the high lights of the constitution of May the 3d, will reveal instantly the reasons why it is ranked among the foremost documents in the evolution of parliamentary democracy.

This constitution, adopted May 3, 1791, by the Congress of the Republic of Poland, proclaimed as a primary postulate the sovereignty of the people in the state. This important principle was stated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation."

Like the Constitution of the United States, the May the 3d constitution provided for three separate and equal branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. Also guaranteed were the important principles of rule by majority, the secrecy of the ballot at public elections, and—an unprecedented feature of political life in eastern or central Europe at the time—the extension of full protection of the law to the peasant. This part of the constitution was given even greater significance when it was supplemented in 1795 by Kosciusko's famous proclamation granting full civil rights to the peasant.

The constitution of May the 3d also contained a ringing proclamation of the principle of freedom of religion:

"We * * * owe to all people of whatever persuasion, peace in matters of faith, and the protection of government; consequently we assure, to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country, and in all dominions of the republic."

Other equally enlightened and courageous provisions of the constitution of May the 3d—all expressed in language as noble and as inspiring as that of the passages I have quoted—aimed at the correction of parliamentary weaknesses and the achievement of various social reforms. The result was an inevitable immortality for this historic document.

So high was the torch of human liberty raised by the May the 3d constitution, however, that the tyrannical monarchs of Poland's neighbors, alarmed at this latest menace to the perpetuation of their own despotic rule, dismembered Poland in the partitions of 1793 and 1795. Poland fell, not because she could not live, but because, inspired and strengthened by her democratic ideals, she chose to live only as a free nation.

Today Poland again finds herself enslaved. But the basic elements in the hearts of the people which produced the constitution of May the 3d still live with a vitality which will, I am certain, win their freedom for the Poles again. And as we here salute the Polish people on Polish Constitution Day, let us renew and refresh our determination to hasten the dawn of that day of freedom for Poland. No nation has shown itself more deserving of liberty and independence.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in commemoration of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish 3d of May Constitution.

There being no objection, Mr. BENTON's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENTON

Americans of Polish descent and Poles in free countries throughout the world observe today a date which is very close to their hearts.

This date marks the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the signing of Poland's bill of rights—the 3d of May constitution. It was on May 3, 1791, just 2 years after the United States adopted its Constitution, that signatures were affixed to a document giving to the common man in Poland the freedoms known only in a democracy. Its purpose was to perform true democratic reforms and to improve an existing form of government by peaceful methods. It granted liberty to all citizens, without discrimination.

The Polish 3d of May constitution was among the most liberal and most democratic of its day. It stated: "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and objective being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

But the liberation of the Polish people came too late, for in 1795 the Republic, with a history dating back to 966 and a history as a great power as far back as the fourteenth century, suffered its third partition.

Poland today is a tragic nation. After having fought gallantly on the field of battle, side by side with our own soldiers, it is at present under the domination of Soviet Russia. It is, therefore, a serious obligation for all of us to strive for the restoration of a free Poland. For until these brave people and other subjugated nations are free the peace of the whole world can never be secure.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it Senate Resolution 202.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have the attention of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. If those who are supporting Senate Resolution 202 and those opposed to it will enter into an agreement to vote on the resolution at 1 o'clock today, and then let the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] follow after 1 o'clock, I shall be agreeable. Otherwise, at the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri I shall have to request that the Senate return to the regular order.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. It will not be possible for me to enter into such a unanimous-consent agreement as the Senator from Texas proposes. As I stated on the floor yesterday, it was then my estimate that my remarks in connection with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would require approximately 2 hours for delivery. I am not able to give positive assurance as to the exact length of time. It might run something over that time. I should like to have it run something less, but I am not at all sure that it would run less than 2 hours.

Mr. President, it is now 25 minutes to 12. It is only 1 hour and 25 minutes to 1 o'clock. I realize, of course, that in addition to the time necessary for the speaker to deliver his address, that Members of the Senate may desire to interrogate the speaker. I should certainly not want to confine myself to any specific time.

I want to make it perfectly clear, though, Mr. President, that it is my desire to proceed with the resolution. I think it is entirely proper that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] should be recognized at this time for his remarks, which I understand are to be with respect to the unfinished business, the economic cooperation bill. The bill which is subject to being set aside temporarily is the unfinished business. But, Mr. President, I do not think it is at all appropriate that in connection with a resolution of this great importance I should be restricted to the time which has been mentioned by the Senator from Texas.

I may say that I would not be willing to enter into any unanimous-consent agreement at this moment with respect to the time at which the Senate should vote on the resolution.

I shall not trespass further upon the time of the Senate, except to say that I am strongly in favor of the adoption of Senate Resolution 202 as it came from the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration, with two changes only: One, a change to remove the time limitation for the report; the other, a change with respect to the amount of money to be appropriated. I think the amount is too small, and I favor an amendment to increase it.

I am opposed to the substitute which would create a special committee. The substitute was argued yesterday afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

It is with no desire whatsoever to delay the consideration of the resolution that at this time I refuse to enter into any agreement with respect to the time for voting. I assure the Senate, as I did yesterday, that I shall make every effort to have the Senate proceed expeditiously with the resolution. I think it is a most important matter which should be acted upon promptly, and I trust that it can be voted upon during the present day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has not yet been recognized; but the Chair would state that in view of the conversation which occurred yesterday at the time when the Senator from Tennessee requested unanimous consent that the resolution be taken up, at which time the Chair assured the Senator from Missouri that he could be recognized to speak on the resolution or to speak on his amendment to the ECA bill, or that he could call for the regular order, in which event he might speak on his amendment to the ECA bill, the Chair feels that it is his duty to recognize the Senator from Missouri at this time. Therefore, the Chair now recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in answer to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], as well as the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], I wish to say that we have only today and tomorrow to conclude the debate on the ECA bill, because under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate must vote on the bill on Friday. Under such circumstances, in view of the interests of Senators who wish to discuss the ECA bill and possibly some other matters relative thereto, I cannot imperil the situation by agreeing to have the Senate continue with consideration of the resolution following the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri. I wish to serve notice that I shall be on the floor seeking recognition at the end of the address of the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, whether he will withhold his unanimous-consent request, or at least modify it, so that the time for the further consideration of the resolution may be extended to the extent the distinguished Senator from Missouri and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee may feel necessary, and beyond the time when the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] concludes his remarks.

It does not seem to me—if the Senator from Missouri will yield further to me—that it makes any difference, inasmuch as the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri are to be on the ECA bill, whether the Senator from Missouri speaks first for 2 hours—he has agreed not to exceed that time—on his amendment to the ECA bill, and the Senate then proceeds to consider further the resolution, or whether the Senate proceeds now with the further consideration of the resolution, and then the Senator from Missouri is recognized.

If we were considering the advisability of proceeding to the consideration of an extraneous matter, I would agree that the Senate would be losing time by considering such a matter at this time. However, the junior Senator from Missouri proposes to speak on the unfinished business, the ECA bill; and the senior Senator from Missouri wishes to speak on the resolution which has temporarily displaced the unfinished business, the ECA bill, prior to the vote upon it.

I am satisfied that if the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will withhold his unanimous-consent request until after the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, no time will be lost, and an agreement can be reached to have the Senate vote upon the resolution sometime this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has not submitted a unanimous-consent request; he simply notified the Senate that at the end of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri, he would call for the regular order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, Mr. President; that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was answering the telephone when the distinguished Senator from Texas was speaking. I understood that probably a unanimous-consent request would be made.

So I have said that I trust that the Senator from Texas will not ask for the regular order at the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri, but will withhold such a request until some arrangement can be made whereby the Senator from Texas can be assured that a vote will be had today on the resolution, and that no

time will be lost so far as the ECA bill is concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Texas will reconsider his idea of calling for the regular order at the time he has indicated. I am very anxious that Senate Resolution 202 be agreed to. As suggested by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, I agree that the time devoted to consideration of the resolution will not be lost.

The distinguished junior Senator from Missouri is going to speak upon the ECA bill. Following the conclusion of his remarks, we would be able to proceed with the further consideration of the resolution and dispose of it in a short time. Although I wish to make a few remarks, they will be briefer than I originally had intended them to be, so that, so far as I am concerned, a vote can be had in a short time upon the resolution.

It is an important matter. I do not feel that Senators can agree upon a definite hour for voting on the resolution, because questions may be asked of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, as well as of the Senator from Tennessee and of myself.

So I hope the Senator from Texas will reconsider the matter and will wait as long as he can before he exercises his right to call for the regular order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the junior Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to Senators who have been insisting on continuing with the resolution that the resolution was brought up last evening with the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, thinking it could be promptly disposed of. As usually happens, when the door is opened an inch for someone, he sticks his foot in, and when an hour and a half has been consumed more time is desired. So I shall have to adhere to my announced intention that, at the end of the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], I shall insist on returning to the regular order. We have a great many other matters of high importance awaiting consideration.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield before he begins his speech?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely want to make the observation that this is exactly what I anticipated last night would happen. Here we have a resolution pending, which deals with a very important question. The Senator from Texas was good enough to permit the unfinished business to be temporarily laid aside in order that the resolution might be debated. The Senate met this morning at 11 o'clock upon the theory that we might be able to conclude consideration of the resolution which is now before the Senate and that probably we could get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the resolution. But, instead of working on the resolution which the distinguished Senator from Texas permitted to displace temporarily the consideration of ECA, we are now back on the ECA bill.

Mr. President, we ought to be considering the Kefauver resolution. It is the pending business before the Senate at the present time. Instead of that, we are now going off on a 2-hour or 3-hour journey on ECA.

Obviously, after the junior Senator from Missouri finishes his speech on ECA, the senior Senator from Missouri will come along with another 2-hour speech on the Kefauver resolution. That will bring on another 2 hours' debate from other Senators who are also vitally interested in the Kefauver resolution, especially so, in view of the statement of the senior Senator from Missouri that he is unalterably opposed to the substitute offered by the able Senator from Tennessee. So it would be impossible to get through with the Kefauver resolution in a matter of 2 hours, unless it is possible to reach some kind of unanimous-consent agreement, and, if something is not done similar to what the Senator from Texas suggests, before we get through we shall be on the Kefauver resolution probably 2 days.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say in reply to the Senator from Illinois that since I have been a Member of this body I have recognized the necessity of leadership on the floor, and although I felt that last night I had staked out a claim to the floor this morning, I called the minority leader and told him I should be glad if he would consult with the majority leader, saying to the minority leader that any arrangement which was made by them would be agreeable to me. I understood that the two leaders had conferred, and that it was agreed I should have the floor. It is for that reason that I am prepared to speak at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri is absolutely incorrect insofar as my having agreed that he should have the floor. I protested last night all along with respect to that. I consented only after I talked with the Vice President, who said he felt morally obligated to recognize the Senator from Missouri. The Senate convened at 11 o'clock this morning on the theory that the Kefauver resolution would be debated, not the matter which the junior Senator from Missouri is now proposing to debate. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. KEM. I do not know where the Senator from Illinois got that theory, since the RECORD is very clear on the subject. It clearly appears from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday that my agreement to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee was conditioned on my obtaining the floor when the Senate convened today. I reiterated that position on several occasions, and stated it while the Senator from Illinois was present on the Senate floor; so, if the Senator got any other idea, it was either because he did not hear the Senator from Missouri or because he did not understand the very clear statement which was made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Here is what the Senator from Illinois said:

> I would not object to recessing until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning providing we are going to discuss the issue of the Senate resolution. But the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] just now served notice that he is not going to agree to any unanimous-consent request for tomorrow unless he is recognized immediately following the convening of the session tomorrow. There is no point in coming in at 11 o'clock tomorrow under those circumstances. As I see it, there is no point in debating the resolution unless we can finish it. So there is no point in meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning under those circumstances.

Mr. KEM. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that at no time did I accede to the idea of the majority leader, when he made that statement on the floor; but I also invite his attention to the fact that I communicated with him this morning, through the minority leader, and, through the minority leader, told him I would be glad to accede to any plans the leadership of the Senate adopted. I am still willing to do that, notwithstanding the fact that I have an address which I am ready to begin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have proposed an amendment to the pending measure. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

> TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE
>
> SEC. 107. Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provisions of assistance under this title to any participating country if the government of such country, or any agency or subdivision thereof, shall, after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, acquire or operate, in whole or in part, any basic industry thereof, other than industries the acquisition of which was completed prior to the date of enactment of such act."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is read for the information of the Senate. It is not technically offered, because another amendment is pending.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed amendment is to prevent the dollars of the American taxpayers being used by socialistic governments of Marshall-plan countries to nationalize or socialize additional basic industries. Let me make this clear. The amendment is not an attempt to undo what has already been done. But if adopted it would prevent further use of American dollars in new socialistic schemes.

Members of the Senate will recall that a similar amendment was proposed last session. The Senate did not see fit to give its approval at that time. However, subsequent developments have made the need for such an amendment all the more urgent. Regardless of what may occur in future months, the American taxpayers are entitled to the protection its adoption would give to the use of their money.

I. IT IS ILLOGICAL FOR THE UNITED STATES TO FINANCE MARXIST SOCIALISM IN AN EFFORT TO BLOCK OFF MARXIST COMMUNISM

Mr. President, socialism has been described as a "river highway down which Communists find their journey much easier because a channel has been made and obstacles have been swept aside."

Webster's New International Dictionary describes communism as "any theory or system of social organization involving common ownership of the agents of production, and some approach to equal distribution of the products of industry."

Webster describes socialism as "a political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods."

According to Webster's dictionary, then, socialism and communism are practically one and the same.

Both socialism and communism are inspired by the doctrines of Karl Marx. The late Prof. H. J. Laski, writing on behalf of the British Socialist Party headquarters in a foreword to a May 1948 reprint of the Communist Manifesto, had this to say:

> In presenting this centenary volume of the Communist Manifesto the Labour Party acknowledges its indebtedness to Marx and Engels as the two men who have been the inspiration of the whole working-class movement * * * who, remembering that these were the demands of the Manifesto, can doubt our common inspiration (Communist Manifesto—Socialist Landmark, by Prof. H. J. Laski, Allen & Unwin, May 1948).

John Strachey, the newly appointed British Minister of War, has said:

> It is impossible to establish communism as the immediate successor to capitalism. It is accordingly proposed to establish socialism which can be put in the place of our present decaying capitalism. Hence, Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a necessary transition stage on the road to communism.

Socialism and communism, then, have the same objective, namely, the nationalization of the means of production and distribution. They differ only in the method they utilize to attain their objectives. The Socialist prefers to use peaceful methods of infiltration. The Communist is willing to resort to force and violence to accomplish the results which both he and the Socialist desire.

In the U. S. S. R., the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Communists control the government. In Great Britain and other countries of western Europe, followers of the other branch of Marxism—socialism—control the governments.

So we have this strange, illogical, contradictory situation. The United States, under the Marshall plan, is furnishing billions of dollars to finance Marxist socialism, in an effort to block off Marxist communism. Does it make sense for us to furnish dollars to such Socialist leaders as British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, who has said, referring to the association between the present Socialist government of Great Britain and the government of Russia: "Left can speak to left in comradeship and confidence," and John Strachey, who brazenly admits that Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a stepping stone to communism?

II. THE CASE OF THE BRITISH SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, I shall emphasize the case of Great Britain, because her Socialist government receives the "lion's share" of Marshall-plan aid. Nearly two and one-half billion dollars has been made available to that government under the Marshall plan. Next year the British Marxists are scheduled to receive $687,000,000 out of the $3,000,000,000 proposed to be sent to the nations of western Europe.

A. AMERICAN DOLLARS HAVE FINANCED THE BRITISH HAND-OUT STATE

On February 23, last, the British Socialist government bought, with American dollars, a new lease on life. Only a vast array of postwar gifts from America enabled that government to stagger through one costly dose of Marxism after another. Already one-fifth of her total economy is nationalized, and the noose of nationalization draws ever tighter about what remains of the British free-enterprise system.

It is not at all surprising that the Socialists emerged victorious last February. Indeed, what is surprising is that the Conservatives made the showing they did.

American dollars have served to cushion the British people from the severe privations which inevitably accompany the handout state.

Socialist subsidies on food, made possible by Marshall Plan dollars, enable British housewives to buy groceries for as little as one-fourth the price American housewives pay for the same items.

The British pay 4 cents for a loaf of bread. They pay 21 cents for a pound of butter, 12 cents for a quart of milk. Compare that with the prices American housewives pay for these items. These cheaper British prices are possible only because the British Socialist Government makes up the difference with subsidies, and it has been able to do this only because of the munificent gifts of dollars from the American taxpayers.

The British program of socialized medicine, which Oscar Ewing so fervidly admires, could not have been carried out without American aid.

Last fall, during the famous dollar talks in Washington, Mr. Eugene Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, made some hard-hitting, if-the-shoe-fits remarks. Mr. Black said in part:

> It has been pretty well demonstrated, I think, that productive efficiency cannot be brought about merely through Government edict or exhortation. * * * Since World War II many governments have committed themselves to extensive programs of social welfare. No one can dispute their right to follow this course, if they have the means to undertake it. Unfortunately, however, it has become apparent that many countries cannot now afford ambitious programs of social services.

The London Economist on April 1, 1950, made some pertinent observations about spending in Great Britain. It said:

> A wrong conception has grown up that the central budget is today so much larger than before the war mainly because of the increased expenditure arising out of wars, past and prospective. This is not so.
>
> This category of expenditure, in which war pensions and interest on the national debt are included, is today just about the same proportion of the national income as before the war. It is the social expenditure which has enlarged so much that it is now 17.5 percent of the national income compared with about 10 percent in the 1930's. It is, therefore, social rather than defense spending which dominates the budget.

The British Socialist Government has nationalized 10 important basic industries. Without American aid, this socialization process would have bankrupted the British economy. More than $500,000,000 worth of Marshall plan counterpart funds have been used to reduce the British national debt, swollen by the purchase, with Government bonds, of nationalized industries.

Most of the industries which the Socialist Government have taken over are operating in the red—deep in the red.

According to Winston Churchill:

> Every major industry which the Socialists have nationalized, without exception, has passed from the profitable or self-supporting side of our national balance-sheet to the loss-making debit side. * * * All nationalized industries, I assert, have ceased to be services and assets to the public and become instead burdens upon it.

The collective total of the losses to date of nationalized industries amounts to some 75,000,000 pounds sterling, or $210,000,000, based on the current exchange rate.

During the last 3 years the Government-owned civil airways lost nearly $90,000,000.

The Government-owned transport system has been steadily losing money at the rate of $1,500,000 every week. Part of the losses of these socialized industries have been covered by short-term borrowing, which, of course, also increases the British national debt.

On May 18, 1949, Sir Stafford Cripps, British Chancelor of the Exchequer, told the House of Commons:

> The honorable member talks about nationalization at a loss. It is quite a false conception to consider that it is necessary to make a profit out of any industry, except under a capitalist system.

We may remind you, Sir Stafford, that none of your socialized industries need operate at a profit as long as the American free-enterprise system underwrites your heavy losses.

Vast quantities of Marshall-plan raw materials and machinery have been given to the British Socialist Government for distribution to nationalized industries as it has seen fit. During the

period April 3, 1948, through February 28, 1950, more than $25,000,000 worth of ECA construction, mining, and conveying equipment was made available to the British Government, and much of this went to the nationalized coal industry. Large quantities of transportation equipment was also given to the Socialist government for distribution to the socialized transport system.

Last fall, Representative BOLTON of Ohio, a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, made an on-the-spot inspection of conditions in Britain and other countries of western Europe.

Upon completion of her trip, Mrs. BOLTON reported her findings to the House. She said, among other things:

To a statement that I made to one group telling that the American people were not particularly enthusiastic about further bolstering England's socialistic government with American taxpayers' dollars, came the argument that the American dollars were not bolstering their Socialist government; that the American dollars which we are sending them are not being used to pay for the welfare services rendered by the government. "For that purpose we are using British pounds," they said. Whereupon, I retorted, "But if you did not have the American dollars to spend for your indispensables, could your pounds be put to use in developing or perfecting your social-welfare and nationalization programs?"

Mrs. BOLTON said:

That question still remained unanswered when I crossed the Channel to France.

Representative BOLTON also reported:

From an intelligent, earnest young Socialist, leader of his party, I indeed received a severe shock. Our discussion was apropos the British economic problems. He declared boldly that American money must continue to come to England. Whereupon I said to him, "Do you realize what you have said? That you, a Socialist citizen of a Socialist country, expect to receive continuing support from us, a capitalist country?" Continuing, I told him, "If you expect that financial action from us in America, certainly we Americans are going to expect something in return of your people and of your government."

B. BRITISH EDITOR: "STOP THE FLOW OF MONEY"

Mr. President, free-enterprise, Marshall-plan dollars made possible the British Socialist binge, and they will continue to be so used unless the Congress decides otherwise. Or, I may say, until Congress decides otherwise.

On February 26, last, 3 days after the British election, an interesting editorial appeared in a leading British newspaper, the Scottish Sunday Express. The editor, John Gordon, wrote:

It was the people of the United States who were really responsible for the very large vote given to socialism, little as they desire it.

For they provided the money that enabled the Socialists to hide the full extent of their incompetence. It was the loans and the Marshall aid they poured out that sustained the Socialists in office.

That pouring out of money was perhaps the most moving gesture by one people to another in all the history of man.

For the impulse that moved the Americans to do it, for the scale of generosity on which it was done, we can never thank them adequately.

But it was a terribly wrong decision from our point of view. * * *

In fact, all they (the Socialists) did was to use America's money for the building up of socialism, instead of for the building up of Britain, for which it was given.

So, to socialism-fearing Americans, who wonder why it is that Britain has been duped into socialism, I would make this reply: "Don't blame us, blame yourselves. For you did it.

"You did it after full and grave warning of what the consequence would be. For 70 members of Parliament and a strong force of peers foretold in debate the inevitable future, and cautioned you to hold your generous hand.

"What they said then should be reprinted now and spread across your Continent in order that greater knowledge and wise guidance should be available to your generous Nation on that soon-to-come day when the decision to continue or stop the flow of dollars must again be taken.

"When that day comes, if you wish to make amends and save Britain and the world as well, my advice to you is: 'Stop the flow of money. Give Britain a chance to stand on her own feet.'"

Now that our dollars have enabled the Socialist Government to continue in power, we must assume that the Socialists will carry out their plans to liquidate what remains of the British free enterprise system. The all-important iron and steel industry will be nationalized on January 1, 1951, pursuant to a law enacted last year. And as one of the Socialist members of Parliament said:

Once we have nationalized steel we shall have broken the back of capitalist control of industry in Great Britain and its domination forever. If that happens, whatever party is in power, we shall be a Socialist state.

Prime Minister Attlee on March 6, last, dispelled any doubts that his government planned to proceed with the socialization of the iron and steel industry. In response to a question from a member of Parliament as to his government's position on the Iron and Steel Act, Mr. Attlee declared:

That statute is on the statute book and our purpose is to give effect to acts passed by Parliament.

The Socialists also plan to seize the sugar industry, the cement industry, water works, wholesale meat, fruit, and vegetable markets, slaughter houses, all suitable mineral deposits, and industrial insurance.

C. SOCIALISTS ARE NOT SOFT-PEDALING SOCIALIZATION PROGRAM

There has been some speculation that because of the reduced majority of the Socialists in the House of Commons, the Socialist Government might soft-pedal its socialization program. Here is what Mr. Attlee had to say about that on March 6:

We shall, therefore, continue to administer the affairs of the country in the same spirit and on the same principles as we have done during the last 4½ years.

In other words, Mr. President, the present Government of Great Britain does not intend to change a bit.

The Socialist government also has made it clear that it will not hesitate to submit proposals for additional seizure of industries if it decides they are "necessary" for the "national well-being," "even though they may seem likely to prove contentious."

There can be no doubt then that the Socialists plan to proceed with their nationalization program. And it will be made possible by the dollars of the American taxpayers unless and until the Congress decides otherwise.

The Marxist leaders of Russia have made no secret of the fact that they hope to force the United States to spend itself into destruction. Could it be that the Marxist leaders of Britain have no objection to this? Could they be trying to pump our Treasury dry?

The British Socialist Government has spent nearly $50,000 on advertising in the financially hard-pressed London Daily Worker, the Communist Party-line newspaper. This has been paid out while the British Treasury was being supplied with Marshall plan dollars from America.

Since the end of World War II the British Socialist Government has received more than $7,000,000,000 in gifts from the American taxpayers. As fast as dollars were shoveled across the Atlantic Britain's Socialists called for more.

But it seems these generous gifts only serve to whet the appetite of the Socialists for more of our dollars. Like "the man who came to dinner," the British Socialists seem more and more reluctant to wean themselves away from American subsidies.

Now we learn of a new give-away scheme being planned by the British Socialists and American bureaucrats. The British Socialist Government now wants the United States to pay off about $5,000,000,000 of British debts owed by Britain to other foreign countries, principally India, Pakistan, and Egypt.

It is a slick plan. It does not call for the United States to turn over the dollars directly to Britain for payment of her debts. The British Socialists and Washington bureaucrats are afraid that might not be popular with the American people or the Congress. Instead, the United States would hand out large gifts of money to Britain's creditors in Asia. Then in an "entirely separate transaction," so they say, the countries receiving the hand-outs would wipe out the British debt. So we see there are more ways than one to skin a cat. The British know by experience there are more ways than one to skin Uncle Sam.

If Britain would put her affairs in order—if she would call a halt to her experiments in socialism—she would not need such large grants of aid from America.

III. ECA HAS FINANCED FRENCH EXPERIMENTS IN SOCIALISM

There is another of the Marshall-plan countries far down the highway toward a Marxist state. I refer to France.

Twenty-three of her industries have been nationalized, approximately 40 percent of her total economy.

Most of the nationalized industries in France like those in Britain, are operating at a considerable loss. These losses have served to swell the French national debt. And, here again, as in the case of

Britain, the ECA came to the rescue, permitting the French Government to apply 45,000,000,000 francs of Marshall plan counterpart funds—$130,500,000 worth—to reducing the French national debt.

In addition, ECA has permitted 320,000,000,000 francs of Marshall plan counterpart funds—$608,000,000 worth—to be applied to promoting production. Much of this assistance went to the French socialized industries, including the mining, gas, and electricity industries, and the railroads.

Furthermore, large quantities of ECA machinery and equipment of all types was given to the French Government for distribution to its socialized industries. For example, $32,800,000 worth of electrical apparatus, including generators and motors, was made available to the nationalized electricity industry.

IV. AMENDMENT WOULD NOT INTERFERE IN INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF MARSHALL-PLAN COUNTRIES

Mr. President, it has been said that the adoption of this amendment would constitute an unusual or unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of another country. This argument is as full of holes as Mr. Hoffman has bureaucrats on his pay roll.

In the first place, the amendment is not a directive to any country to do anything. Britain or France or any other Marshall-plan country would still be free to socialize just as many industries as they desired. But the amendment would prevent their using American dollars to do it.

Furthermore, the ECA Act authorizes the Administrator to place all sorts of conditions on the aid he distributes. Mr. Hoffman himself has testified that he has not hesitated to establish those conditions which would permit recovery.

A. UNITED STATES HAS INTERFERED DIRECTLY IN INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF GREECE AND KOREA

Two glaring examples of United States interference in the internal affairs of other countries occurred only quite recently. I refer to the cases of Greece and Korea.

On March 31, last, United States Ambassador to Greece, Henry F. Grady, sent a letter to the Premier of Greece relative to American assistance. Mr. Grady laid down stringent, detailed, and exacting conditions which the Greek Government must either fulfill—or American aid will be shut off.

Mr. Grady wrote:

> The American people * * * are entitled to expect, and do expect, that any Greek Government which hopes to continue to receive the aid which they have generously offered, will utilize this assistance to the fullest degree.
>
> In my opinion, only a stable and efficient government supported by the people and by Parliament will be able to act with the courage and the firmness of long-term policy which are essential to the wise use of the aid offered by the American people. Irresponsible talk of adjourning Parliament or of new elections before the new Parliament has had an opportunity to rise to its responsibility, can only create a climate of political and economic uncertainty which may do grave damage to the country's future. * * *
>
> The chief of the ECA mission to Greece and I are in complete accord that, pursuant to the obligations imposed upon us by the Congress of the United States, we cannot conscientiously approve the commitment of American funds for contemplated new projects until the Greek Government has made basic and binding decisions which will assure the success of the purposes for which the funds are intended.
>
> Foremost among these projects are those which contemplate the construction of four new electric power plants which would more than double the present generation of electricity in Greece and which would bring cheap electric power to many areas of Greece for the first time. The desirability of these new plants is beyond question. They are the keystone to the further industrial and agricultural development of Greece.

Mr. Grady then called upon the Greek Premier to adopt an "adequate financial plan."

> An adequate financial plan should include measures which will sharply curtail Government spending on current account, including the armed forces, in order to provide funds for capital investment.
>
> The financial plan should establish a ceiling on the debt which the Government may incur by borrowing from the Bank of Greece or by other means. No change in this debt ceiling should be possible without express authority of Parliament. Subsidies should be curtailed. Government enterprises, such as the state-owned railways, which are a drain on the budget, and the Agricultural Bank, which incurs a deficit in spite of excessive charges to farmers for fertilizer and for loans, should be put on a self-supporting basis, while, at the same time, reducing costs to the users of their services.
>
> The tax system should be simplified and rationalized, and taxes due should be fully collected, to the end that Government revenues will be increased, the investment of private capital will be encouraged, and social justice will result from each citizen paying his fair share of taxes.

Mr. Grady then told the Greek Premier:

> A major improvement in Government efficiency is essential to a proper administration of the aid which is offered. The improvement should include the establishment of a Cabinet with a minimum of Government ministries, a greater decentralization of responsibility to nomarchs, and the enactment of a civil-service code to replace the one recently declared invalid because it had not received parliamentary approval.
>
> In order to foster self-help and local initiative, it is advisable that elections of local officials, which have not taken place for 14 years, should be considered for the very near future. To administer whatever electric-power program that may be undertaken, a special agency should be established, independent of politics and with a tenure for its officials long enough to cover the period of construction and initial operation.
>
> The foregoing measures, which we regard as essential to the successful fulfillment of a major capital investment program, should, it seems to me, be proposed by the Greek Government to the Parliament at the earliest possible date. * * *
>
> It is in the hands of the Greek Government and the Greek Parliament to decide whether or not they wish to continue to receive American aid, and hence to accept the responsibilities which will attain its purpose. It is the obligation and intention of the American Government with regard to all Marshall-aid countries to decide whether or not the performance of the recipient Government, whether Greek or any other, justifies a continuance of the aid on the scale heretofore contemplated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Grady's letter be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

TEXT OF UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR HENRY F. GRADY'S LETTER TO THE PREMIER OF GREECE ON AMERICAN ASSISTANCE

> EXCELLENCY: I feel obliged to bring to the attention of yourself, the new Parliament, and the Greek people the fact that a critical period has been reached in the recovery of Greece.
>
> American aid was designed not only to help establish peace, but to meet the basic needs of the people for food and clothing. It was intended also to create new productive enterprises which, by employing more fully the willing labor of the people and the natural resources of the country, would improve the lot of the people and would render Greece independent of foreign aid in the future.
>
> The first two objectives, those of military security and relief from distress, have been attained. The physical reconstruction stage of Greek recovery has proceeded well. But the effort to make Greece self-sustaining and independent of foreign aid, to develop a power program to establish new industries and to improve agriculture, has hardly begun.
>
> This results partly from the tragic guerrilla war. But it should also be frankly recognized that an important reason for the delay has been a less than satisfactory performance by the Greek Government in its conduct of economic affairs. Only 27 months remain in which the Greek Government may take advantage of the American aid made available through the Marshall plan. This short time permits no further delay.
>
> It seems to me self-evident that the Greek people are most anxious to improve their economic position, but that this can be accomplished only by increasing the productive capacity of the country.
>
> THE FREE ELECTION
>
> I believe that this desire for economic betterment was a paramount consideration of the Greek people when on March 5 they chose a new Parliament in free elections that won the respect of the entire democratic world.
>
> The American representatives in Greece have scrupulously refrained from any attempt to influence either the outcome of the election or the formation of a new Government based on this fresh mandate of the people. The American people, however, are entitled to expect, and do expect, that any Greek Government which hopes to continue to receive the aid which they have generously offered, will utilize this assistance to the fullest degree.
>
> In my opinion, only a stable and efficient government supported by the people and by Parliament will be able to act with the courage and the firmness of long-term policy which are essential to the wise use of the aid offered by the American people. Irresponsible talk of adjourning Parliament or of new elections before the new Parliament has had an opportunity to rise to its responsibility, can only create a climate of political and economic uncertainty which may do grave damage to the country's future.
>
> The undertaking of a program of large-scale investment, which must necessarily be compressed into a short period of time, will present many problems which can be solved only by a Government which has a consistent policy and which is prepared to act with great courage.
>
> Temporary sacrifices must be made for the sake of future benefits. Many of these sacrifices will be unpopular with local minorities, especially if the people are not convinced that the sacrifices are being equally shared.

If funds are to be available for financing an ambitious program of new electric power plants, new industries to provide employment, and the irrigation and improvement of the land, then rigorous economy in other Government expenditures will be essential.

It will be necessary to continue the planned reduction of the armed forces, to curtail subsidies, and to make many other savings. I am confident that if the issues are properly presented to the people, they will readily choose new opportunities for employment in preference to special privileges which can only result in continuing budget deficits. Nevertheless, these will not be easy decisions, and only a Government which can secure and maintain public confidence by its boldness and by its devotion to the public interest can be expected to execute the reconstruction stage of Greek recovery. We earnestly hope the Greek Government will meet this challenge.

BASIC ACTIONS NEEDED

The chief of the ECA mission to Greece and I are in complete accord that, pursuant to the obligations imposed upon by the Congress of the United States, we cannot conscientiously approve the commitment of American funds for contemplated new projects until the Greek Government has made basic and binding decisions which will assure the success of the purposes for which the funds are intended.

Foremost among these projects are those which contemplate the construction of four new electric power plants which would more than double the present generation of electricity in Greece and which would bring cheap electric power to many areas of Greece for the first time. The desirability of these new plants is beyond question. They are the keystone to the further industrial and agricultural development of Greece.

When Mr. Potter was recently in Washington, he received the approval of ECA headquarters for the allotment of American aid necessary to their construction, subject to the judgment of the American mission here as to the financial capacity of the Greek Government to embark on a program of this magnitude. The hard truth, however, is that while the dollars and other foreign exchange needed for the electric power program are available, the Greek Government at the present time does not have the drachmae to pay the local costs of construction. The drachmae which should be available for this purpose are presently required to meet the deficit in the Government budget which results from excessive spending.

Whether or not all or some of the contemplated power plants can be begun in time to take advantage of American aid is a matter that depends solely upon decisions to be made by the Greek Government and the Greek Parliament within the next few weeks. The decisions which need to be made are of two kinds. The first are those which relate to the adoption of an adequate financial plan which the Government will follow. The second are those which should result in a wide and far-reaching improvement in Government efficiency.

FINANCIAL PLAN URGED

An adequate financial plan should include measures which will sharply curtail Government spending on current account, including the armed forces, in order to provide funds for capital investment.

The financial plan should establish a ceiling on the debt which the Government may incur by borrowing from the Bank of Greece or by other means. No change in this debt ceiling should be possible without express authority of Parliament. Subsides should be curtailed. Government enterprises, such as the state-owned railways which are a drain on the budget, and the Agricultural Bank which incurs a deficit in spite of excessive charges to farmers for fertilizer and for loans, should be put on a self-supporting basis, while at the same time reducing costs to the users of their services.

The tax system should be simplified and rationalized, and taxes due should be fully collected, to the end that Government revenues will be increased, the investment of private capital will be encouraged and social justice will result from each citizen paying his fair share of taxes.

A major improvement in Government efficiency is essential to a proper administration of the aid which is offered. The improvement should include the establishment of a cabinet with a minimum of Government ministries, a greater decentralization of responsibility to nomarchs and the enactment of a civil-service code to replace the one recently declared invalid because it had not received parliamentary approval.

In order to foster self-help and local initiative, it is advisable that elections of local officials, which have not taken place for 14 years, should be considered for the very near future. To administer whatever electric power program that may be undertaken, a special agency should be established, independent of politics and with a tenure for its officials long enough to cover the period of construction and initial operation.

FOR PARLIAMENTARY APPROVAL

The foregoing measures, which we regard as essential to the successful fulfillment of a major capital investment program, should, it seems to me, be proposed by the Greek Government to the Parliament at the earliest possible date.

The Parliament, of course, may modify, enact, or reject all measures proposed to it, in accordance with what the deputies believe to be the will of the people. But we in the American missions regard parliamentary approval of major recovery measures to be essential, not only as a validation of the democratic process of government but as an assurance that the hard tasks of reconstruction have the willing support of the sovereign Greek people.

It is in the hands of the Greek Government and the Greek Parliament to decide whether or not they wish to continue to receive American aid and hence to accept the responsibilities which will attain its purpose. It is the obligation and intention of the American Government with regard to all Marshall-aid countries to decide whether or not the performance of the recipient Government, whether Greek or any other, justifies a continuance of the aid on the scale heretofore contemplated.

I trust that this clear statement of the American concern in the Greek recovery will receive the earnest consideration of the Greek people and their representatives and that decisions to proceed boldly with an ambitious reconstruction effort will be taken quickly by the new Parliament.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

GRADY.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on April 7, last, Secretary of State Acheson sent a strong note to the Korean Ambassador demanding action to halt inflation in Korea.

Mr. Acheson said in part:

The Secretary of State must inform His Excellency that unless the Korean Government is able to take satisfactory and effective measures to counter these inflationary forces, it will be necessary to reexamine, and perhaps to make adjustments in, the Economic Cooperation Administration's assistance program in Korea. * * *

Of equal concern to this Government are the reported intentions of the Korean Government, as proposed by the President of the Republic of Korea in a message to the National Assembly on March 31, to postpone the general elections from the coming May until sometime in November. The Secretary of State wishes to draw to His Excellency's attention the fact that United States aid, both military and economic, to the Republic of Korea has been predicated upon the existence and growth of democratic institutions within the republic. Free, popular elections, in accordance with the constitution and other basic laws of the republic, are the foundation of those democratic institutions.

The holding of the elections as scheduled and provided for by the basic laws of the Republic appears to this Government as equally urgent with the taking of necessary measures for the countering of the inflationary forces already discussed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary of State Acheson's note be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the note was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON'S NOTE TO THE KOREAN AMBASSADOR REQUESTING ACTION TO HALT INFLATION IN KOREA

The Secretary of State wishes to take this opportunity to express to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea, prior to the latter's return to Seoul, the deep concern of this Government over the mounting inflation in Korea. The Secretary of State wishes His Excellency to convey to the President of the Republic of Korea the view of this Government that the communication of March 4, 1950, from the Korean Prime Minister to the chief of the economic cooperation mission in Korea, in which the view was expressed that there is no serious problem of inflation in Korea, but rather a threat of deflation, indicates a lack of comprehension on the part of the Korean Government of the seriousness of the problem and an unwillingness to take the drastic measures required to curb the growing inflation.

It is the judgment of this Government that the financial situation in Korea has already reached critical proportions, and that unless this progressive inflation is curbed in the none too distant future, it cannot but seriously impair Korea's ability to utilize effectively the economic assistance provided by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

BUDGET LIMITS IGNORED

Government expenditures have been vastly expanded by bank overdrafts without reference to limits set by an approved budget. Tax collections have not been increased, aid goods have been underpriced, and governmental subsidies have been expanded. The dangerous practice of voluntary contributions has been used as an inefficient substitute for a sound taxation system. These uneconomic practices have, in turn, served to expand the currency in circulation, unbalance the Korean national budget, and cause a sharp rise in wholesale and retail prices, thereby strengthening the growing forces of inflation.

The Secretary of State must inform His Excellency that unless the Korean Government is able to take satisfactory and effective measures to counter these inflationary forces, it will be necessary to reexamine, and perhaps to make adjustments in, the Economic Cooperation Administration's assistance program in Korea.

The Secretary of State wishes to inform His Excellency in this connection that the American Ambassador in Seoul is being recalled for consultation within the next few days regarding the critical problems arising out of the growing inflation in Korea.

ELECTION MOVE NOTED

Of equal concern to this Government are the reported intentions of the Korean Government, as proposed by the President of the Republic of Korea in a message to the National Assembly on March 31, to postpone the general elections from the coming May until sometime in November. The Secretary of State wishes to draw to His Excellency's attention the fact that United States aid, both military and economic, to the Republic of Korea has been predicated upon the existence and growth of democratic institutions within the Republic. Free popular elections, in accordance with the constitution and other basic laws of the Republic, are the foundation of those democratic institutions.

The holding of the elections as scheduled and provided for by the basic laws of the Republic appears to this Government as equally urgent with the taking of necessary measures for the countering of the inflationary forces already discussed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I now wish to set forth what the American people are entitled to expect and do expect.

B. AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO EXPECT—AND DO EXPECT—THAT MARSHALL-PLAN GOVERNMENTS WILL UTILIZE ASSISTANCE TO THE FULLEST DEGREE

Mr. President, I do not condemn the actions of our Department of State in either the case of Greece or Korea. But, as the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] said the other day, it is difficult to square the position taken by the administration in objecting strenuously to having any restraints or restrictions written into the ECA Act by the Congress, on the ground that to do so might impinge upon the sovereignty of such nations, with its own actions in Greece and Korea in laying down the law—namely, that if certain things are not done by the countries, including the holding of elections, ECA funds will be withheld.

I agree with Ambassador Grady that—

The American people * * * are entitled to expect, and do expect, that any Greek government which hopes to continue to receive the aid which they have so generously offered will utilize this assistance to the fullest degree.

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to expect, and do expect, that the governments of any and all Marshall-plan countries which hope to continue to receive the aid they have offered will utilize this assistance to the fullest degree.

C. AMENDMENT WOULD PROTECT AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FROM FURTHER MISUSE OF THEIR GIFTS BY SOCIALISTIC GOVERNMENTS

Mr. Hoffman has admitted that Europe's experiments with socialism are slowing down recovery there. He has said, "Socialism will slow down the [production] process."

He has also expressed the belief that private enterprise will produce more for less and will serve the people better.

This is borne out by what has happened in Britain under Sir Stafford Cripps' democratic planning. As Winston Churchill put it:

Socialism, with its vast network of regulations and restrictions and its incompetent planning and purchasing by Whitehall officials, is proving itself every day to be a dangerous and costly fallacy.

Even the Socialists are beginning to wonder why it is that free-enterprise America should be able to produce so much while British workers have to depend upon American aid to maintain their standard of living nearly 5 years after the end of the war.

The answer is not difficult. Another member of Parliament has summed it up as follows:

Working for a great central machine has never appealed to people, and it is unlikely to do so. State monopoly brings into being a machine so cumbersome that it cannot be controlled. The machine becomes the master. When industrial organizations are taken off the rails of private enterprise and bereft of their motivating forces of competition and profit, all sense of purpose and direction appears to be lost.

The whole conception of state ownership and control is a feeble attempt to meet a twentieth-century problem with an outmoded nineteenth-century remedy.

As a Socialist government nationalizes more and more industries, the ratio of government bureaucrats to productive workers steadily increases. These administrative parasites only serve to add to the general frustration and disillusionment among the workers in the industries.

The nationalized coal industry of Great Britain is a good example. Since it was socialized in 1947, 6,000 workers have been added to the administrative, nonproductive staff, an increase of 27 percent. Output per miner has decreased 6.2 percent. Absenteeism has doubled, and strikes have tripled, as compared with prewar.

The deficit for 1947 and 1948 of the nationalized coal industry amounted to $86,800,000 as compared with a prewar—1938—profit of $54,000,000 under private ownership and operation.

Mr. Hoffman has stated that he has a clear duty to protest any Government action that in any way slows down recovery.

The amendment now being considered would protect the American taxpayer from the use of American dollars by Socialist governments in a way that is "slowing down recovery" in Europe.

V. CAN EUROPE AFFORD ANYTHING BUT FREE ENTERPRISE?

Mr. President, recently William Henry Chamberlin, noted writer and editor, returned from a 3 months' visit to Europe, where he went to study conditions on the spot.

Mr. Chamberlin, in an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post, reported:

It is a pet idea of leftist advanced thinkers on both sides of the Atlantic that Europe, being poor, cannot "afford" free enterprise. That sort of thing, the argument runs, is a luxury possible for rich America. Poor countries can make both ends meet only by employing hordes of bureaucrats to think out new ways of putting production into straitjackets.

There is one contradiction in this theory which these advanced thinkers never explain. How does it happen that free, or capitalist, America with its supposedly wasteful system not only maintains the world's highest standard of living for its own people but contrives to subsidize the scientific collectivist economies of Europe?

Is it just possible that freedom offers some of the decisive answers in economics as well as in politics?

Mr. Chamberlin then said:

I found visible prosperity in proportion to the degree of freedom from state control.

Belgium is exhibit A for this proposition. Of all the nations involved in the war, Belgium has given the freest rein to the profit motive. Rationing is a distant unhappy memory; taxes are moderate; there is a minimum of planning.

The missing dynamo in the British industrial machine is the absence of incentives to work hard and efficiently. Everyone is assured an extremely low, sub-WPA standard of living through full, or overfull, employment, cradle-to-grave "security," and subsidies to keep down the prices of rationed foodstuffs. But because of the back-breaking taxes and the thousand restrictions on private initiative, no one has much inducement to rise above this low average.

Moreover, the ECA effort to promote closer economic union is foundering on the rock of Socialist planned economy.

That closer union in which farsighted Europeans of all nationalities see the salvation of the old continent can only be a union of free economies. The question is not whether Europe can afford free enterprise. The question is whether it can afford anything else.

VI. IT IS UNWISE TO ENCOURAGE UNIFICATION OF EUROPE'S SOCIALISTIC, PLANNED ECONOMIES

Mr. President, we are told that one of the objectives of the Marshall plan is to encourage the economic unification of Europe. If this is one of the objectives, very little progress has been made thus far. To date Mr. Hoffman has made very little progress on this score. However, he has made it known that he intends to take vigorous steps to further economic integration in the months ahead.

The question arises, will it be to the best interests of European recovery, will it be to the best interests of our American economy, to encourage the integration of the socialistic, planned economies which exist in so many of the Marshall-plan countries? Is it wise to encourage the unification of the cartels and monopolies which now exist in individual countries into giant European cartels and monopolies? I, myself, cannot help but have grave doubts in regard to the wisdom of such a course. In that event, instead of having one great government cartel engaged in the iron and steel industry in Great Britain, would it not be possible that a giant cartel would cover all of western Europe, and that the American producers of iron and steel and the American workers engaged in those industries would be in competition with such a cartel and with workers employed under such conditions?

One of Europe's foremost economists, Dr. Wilhelm Roepke, now associated with the Graduate Institute of International Studies at the University of Geneva, Switzerland, has said:

It is a bit of irony that the Marshall plan, which should have pulled western Europe out of the muck of collectivistic nationalistic economic policy, has threatened to create a new collectivism on a superstate level. The way things are today, everything seems to indicate that the Marshall plan will achieve the exact opposite to what most of its American creators and clear-seeing Europeans had originally expected.

That is not the loose talk of an idle thinker. Those are the words of one of the greatest economists of Europe, a man with a world-wide reputation, who must weigh his words before he speaks.

VII. UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION CREATED BY MARSHALL PLAN HAS NOW RETURNED TO PLAGUE US

When the proposal to adopt the Marshall plan first came before the Senate early in 1948, this question was raised during the course of the debate:

Assuming that the 16 recipient countries are able to increase production sufficiently to meet the requirements of the plan, will there be world markets for the contemplated exports?

It was stated further at that time:

In order for her exports to balance her imports by 1952, it is necessary for western Europe to expand her export volume far above prewar levels, due to reduced foreign investments, higher prices of imports, and increased population.

There seems little possibility that western Europe can find markets for the industrial products she will have to offer.

Mr. President, we are told that industrial production in western Europe is now well above the prewar level. According to ECA Administrator Hoffman, "industrial production has not merely been lifted to the prewar level, but stands 20 percent above it."

But in spite of this increase in production the so-called dollar-gap problem is still with us. Our American taxpayers are told they must contribute approximately $3,000,000,000 to bridge this gap between western Europe's imports and her exports.

One factor contributing heavily to the continuation of the dollar gap, in spite of nearly $10,000,000,000 of Marshall-plan aid already extended, is the lack of markets for the products being turned out by western Europe's factories. So now western Europe, with the blessing of the Administration, has begun dumping her products on the American market.

A. UNDER THE HOFFMAN PLAN, THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL PAY TILL IT HURTS—AND THEN KEEP ON PAYING

ECA Administrator Hoffman, in his statement on February 21, 1950, before a joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, said: "We must sell less to and buy more from Europe." He wants American producers to give up part of their overseas business and forfeit part of their markets here at home to foreign producers.

Mr. Hoffman admitted that this new competition would create problems. Some American industries would be driven out of business, a large number of American workers would be thrown out of work. And how does Mr. Hoffman propose to meet this situation? He said: "If there must be some relief in this situation, I suggest that it be given directly." He apparently wants our taxpayers to subsidize American industries paralyzed by foreign competition—competition which has been brought into being and built up by the dollars that the same American taxpayers sent abroad in the form of foreign aid.

Under the Hoffman plan the American people will pay until it hurts—and will then keep on paying after it hurts.

B. COMPETITION WITH SOCIALISTIC CARTELS AND MONOPOLIES IS UNFAIR COMPETITION

The most distressing aspect of this situation is the fact that much of the competition which is being built up by American dollars is unfair competition. American businessmen and workingmen pride themselves on being able to meet fair competition, anywhere, any time. They have been able to do so in the past, and they can do it now. All they ask is an even break.

But competition with the vast socialistic monopolies and cartels being built up with Marshall-plan dollars is not fair competition. These government-owned and operated industries have definite advantages when competing with private industry. They do not have to pay taxes. Their government owner stands ready to subsidize their losses, and they have a monopoly of their home markets. These advantages enable them to carry on dumping operations in other countries, including the United States.

This unfair foreign competition, built up by dollars taken from the American taxpayers, has already caused a great many American workers to lose their jobs.

According to the Bureau of the Census, there are now more than 3,500,000 American workers unemployed. The Department of Labor of the State of Missouri told me recently that during the 5-month period ending March 1, last, more than 160,000 workers in Missouri filed unemployment insurance claims for the first time.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake to review any great number of American industries with the idea of examining the effect of what is going on upon their prosperity, but I shall refer to two or three of them.

C. THE WATCH-AND-CLOCK INDUSTRY

The American watch-and-clock-making industry has been hit particularly hard by unfair foreign competition. The distressing case of Waltham Watch, now closed down, is all too familiar. Waltham Watch "went under" despite a loan of some $6,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As a result of the closing of the Waltham plant, some 1,200 skilled workers were thrown out of employment.

While this is happening in this country, ECA is helping to develop Britain's watch-and-clock industry.

I wonder whether the workers of the Waltham Watch Co. who have been thrown out of employment happen to have seen the January 1950 issue of the British magazine Soundings, which contains this statement:

MARSHALL AID IS PROVIDING NEW JOBS FOR BRITISH WORKERS

The ECA has granted to the General Time Instruments Corp., of New York City, a $1,000,000 currency convertibility guaranty to cover the operations of its British subsidiary, Westclox, Ltd.

Westclox has set up a new plant in the Strathleven Industrial Estates, near Glasgow. The Marshall plan is developing the United Kingdom's watch-and-clock industry and creating jobs in one of Scotland's economic problem areas. Strathleven has been converted from a country estate into a government-sponsored development scheme to draw light industries into an area dominated by the heavy engineering, coal mining, and shipbuilding industries centers on the Clyde River. These have created periodic unemployment problems in the past and do not give opportunities for workers with special light-industry skill.

Westclox now employs some 250 persons, who can make 400,000 clocks a year. Plans are being made for watch production, and by 1951 the plant will have 350 workers running out an estimated 500,000 "alarum" clocks and 50,000 pocket watches annually.

Westclox is helping to break new economic ground in Britain. Before the war the U. K. imported most of its watches and clocks, many of them from the American and Canadian plants of General Time Corp.

Mr. President, I emphasize the sentence:

Before the war the United Kingdom imported most of its watches and clocks, many of them from the American and Canadian plants of General Time Corp.

The quotation continues:

But the new Scottish plant is already producing more than the parent company used to send to Britain.

Here we have a specific example of watch-making companies going bankrupt here at home while American people are furnishing aid to build up similar industries in Britain, whose products are rapidly taking over the market which our producers formerly enjoyed.

Furthermore, the British Socialist Government is giving direct subsidies to its watch-and-clock industry. According to the January 16, 1950, issue of Foreign Commerce Weekly, an official Department of Commerce publication, subsidies paid by the British Socialist Government to the watch-and-clock industry during the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, were as follows: $310,000 in 1946–47, $730,000 in 1947–48, and $590,000 in 1948–49.

The British Socialist Government, it so happens, is placing great emphasis on increasing exports of timepieces. According to our Department of Commerce, each British manufacturer is assigned an individual export quota, and is allocated scarce materials in ratio to his success in meeting his quota. To meet foreign competition and achieve export goals, some manufacturers have reduced export prices below cost.

The Department of Commerce admits that this competition is likely to be felt by the United States clock industry.

Here is additional enlightening information:

An agreement was signed March 12, 1946, under which the Swiss * * * agreed to make available, on a rental basis and under certain conditions, the special machines which the British needed. * * * The Swiss also agreed to furnish to the British jewel bearings and certain watch parts. The British established acceptable import quotas for Swiss watches and movements at increased maximum prices.

Wages paid workers in the British watch industry average 30 cents an hour. A considerable number of youths are employed at a starting wage of 22 cents an hour. These rates are less than half

those paid to American workers. Of course, British workers are able to make a living on these lower wages because costs of food are lower in Britain than in America, due to the food subsidies made possible by Marshall-plan aid.

Here, then, is what American watch and clock producers are up against:

First. Under the Marshall plan, aid is being extended to rehabilitate and expand the watch-and-clock industry in Britain.

Second. The British Socialist Government is making generous, direct subsidies to the watch industry there, so that manufacturers are able to reduce export prices below cost. These subsidies are made possible by Marshall-plan aid.

Third. The British have a discriminatory bilateral agreement with Switzerland relative to production and imports of watches and parts.

Fourth. The British workers receive less than half the wages paid American workers, which greatly aids the British manufacturer to turn out a low-cost instrument. The British Socialist Government, in turn, subsidizes food costs. These subsidies, too, are made possible by Marshall-plan aid.

Is it any wonder, then, that the British are so rapidly taking over markets formerly belonging to American producers?

D. THE BICYCLE INDUSTRY

Recently a representative of our bicycle industry told me that unfair foreign competition—largely from Great Britain—threatened to drive his industry out of business.

The American bicycle industry is particularly vulnerable to British competition. The British Socialist Government, I am informed, grants special benefits and subsidies to the bicycle industry there, all to the end that they may ship British bicycles into our markets at prices which are below the actual cost of production of American bicycles.

Foreign manufacturers, with far greater production, lower labor rates, and various types of subsidies have practically preempted all foreign markets. Now they are moving in on the American domestic market.

On January 16, 1949, F. E. Ahern, attaché at the American Embassy in London, submitted a report to the Department of State on British bicycle production. This report quotes Mr. George Wilson, managing director of Raleigh Industries, Ltd., one of the largest British manufacturers of bicycles as saying:

> Reduction in our prices in the United States resulted in a substantial increase in orders to our Boston plant. This means doubling our business in America during the coming year.

American bicycle manufacturers have no desire to exclude foreign bicycles from the United States market. They are demanding that they be permitted to compete for this business on a fair basis and not with products subsidized by foreign governments and further supported by grants of money from our own Treasury.

E. THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

Dant & Russell, Inc., an important lumber firm operating in Washington and Oregon, recently wrote me saying:

> The way ECA is operating means that we are financing the business of every country in the world except the United States. Every year more of our people are becoming unemployed while the countries we are helping have full employment.

F. THE AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Let us refer briefly to the aircraft industry for another example of how American dollars are being used to build up unfair competition abroad.

The ECA program authorization for aircraft engines and parts for the period April 3, 1948, through February 28, 1950, is shown on a table which I have here. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA procurement authorization for aircraft, engines, and parts for the period April 3, 1948, through February 28, 1950, reads as follows:

France	$37,600,000
Italy	4,500,000
Netherlands	28,700,000
Belgium-Luxemburg	2,900,000
Greece	900,000
Denmark	800,000
Norway	900,000
Sweden	500,000
Total	76,800,000

Mr. KEM. Each of the countries receiving these gifts of aircraft, many of them of the latest type, in addition to engines and other parts, has a government-owned air-line monopoly.

These air lines are all nationalized, and are competing directly with American industry.

I have previously called to the Senate's attention the fact that American Airlines, Inc., decided to dispose of its interest in an American overseas operation because of difficulty in securing risk capital on reasonable terms. While this is going on, its direct competitor, the British Government, is being financed by the ECA.

G. THE JOB OF EVERY AMERICAN WORKER IS JEOPARDIZED BY GROWTH OF DOLLAR-BUILT SOCIALIST CARTELS ABROAD

Mr. President, these are only a few of many similar examples that could be cited. They are conclusive evidence that unfair competition from abroad gravely threatens our American economy. Unfortunately, the worst is yet to come, unless the Congress acts.

As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, the Socialist Government of Britain is scheduled to take over the iron and steel industry only 8 months from now. Nearly half of Britain's exports are largely based on steel. If the steel industry is turned into a vast Government-owned monopoly, it will be a giant sword of Damocles over the American economy. The British Socialist Government will be in a position to dump products on American foreign and domestic markets on an unprecedented scale, drive more of our industries out of business, and throw more millions of American workers out of employment. Unless the Congress decides otherwise, all this will be done at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The use of American dollars to finance experiments in socialism abroad affects the well-being of both the people of America and the people of the countries we are trying to aid.

The job of every American worker is jeopardized by Socialist cartels abroad. I cannot justify paying heavily for the privilege.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect;

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 3, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect;

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

Mr. DONNELL rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from Missouri rise?

Mr. DONNELL. To ask recognition to speak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state by title the pending business.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, had not the senior Senator from Missouri been recognized before the Senator from Texas rose?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas gave notice that at the close of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri he would ask for the regular order.

The senior Senator from Missouri is now recognized.

INVESTIGATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I rise at this point in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute presented by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to Senate Resolution 202. I understand, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Texas has called for the regular order, but I also understand that it is within my rights for me to speak upon such subject as I shall choose, and I choose to speak, as I have indicated, in opposition to the amendment presented by the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I have just asked that the Senator from Tennessee be informed of the fact that I am speaking.

As I stated earlier today, I am in favor of the adoption of Senate resolution 202 as it was reported by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and as supplemented by report of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with two amendments to be incorporated therein.

The amendments to which I refer are the deletion, on line 18, on page 2, of the comma and the words and figures "but not later than July 31, 1950," and on line 2, page 3, to strike out the figure "$50,000" and incorporate in lieu thereof the figure "$100,000."

Mr. President, in order that we may intelligently consider the resolution which I favor and the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, which I oppose, it will be necessary to consider something of the respective contents of each of the two resolutions, namely, Senate Resolution 202, and the substitute which constitutes the amendment presented by the junior Senator from Tennessee, whom I am pleased to see now upon the floor.

Senate Resolution 202 provides at its outset that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make full and complete study and investigation of the subject matter which is thereafter set forth in the resolution. It will be observed, Mr. President, that under Senate Resolution 202 it is either the entire Committee on the Judiciary, which consists of 13 Members of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof which is authorized and directed to make the study and investigation to which reference has been made. There is no restriction as to the number of persons who shall constitute the subcommittee in the event that it shall be a subcommittee, rather than the entire committee, which shall make the study and investigation authorized by the resolution. It is entirely possible that the subcommittee could consist of 3, 5, 7, 9, or any other number of members, equal to or less than the entire membership of 13 of the Committee on the Judiciary. The substitute presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee, in place of authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make the study and investigation, provides for the appointment of a special committee composed of five members, to be appointed by the President of the Senate from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary. It is to be noted, Mr. President, that there is in the substitute a limitation on the number of members of the special committee, the limitation being five, no more and no less.

Although the substitute provides that the special committee shall be appointed from two of the committees of the Senate, namely, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary, there is no provision in the substitute which designates how many of the members shall be from either of those committees. It is entirely possible, at least theoretically, for four of the members to be from one committee and one member to be from the other committee, although I assume that in all reasonable probability the membership would be taken, three from one committee and two from the other committee. Obviously, members from one of the two committees would predominate on the special committee, and would therefore constitute a majority. At the time the Senate votes in favor of the substitute, if it shall so vote, no Member of the Senate, unless he were given special information which is not now available generally, would have the slightest knowledge as to which of the two standing committees would contribute the majority of the special committee. Thus it is that if Members of the Senate should sustain by their votes the amendment submitted by the junior Senator from Tennessee, we would have to wait until after our decision is made to ascertain from the lips of the Vice President who shall be chosen and which committee of the two standing committees shall contribute a majority of the members of the special committee.

Mr. President, it is to be observed also, as an essential difference between the two resolutions, namely, Senate Resolution 202 on the one hand, and the substitute submitted by the junior Senator from Tennessee on the other hand, that, in the first instance, under the resolution reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules and Administration, it is a standing committee of the Senate, or a subcommittee of such standing committee, to which is delegated the duty reposed by the terms of Senate Resolution 202. On the other hand, the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the junior Senator from Tennessee provides not for a standing committee of the Senate, neither the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce nor the Committee on the Judiciary, to be the body by which the study and investigation shall be made, but, instead, provides for a special committee. That is the language of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Yesterday afternoon a brief statement was made by the Senator from Tennessee as to the history of Senate Resolution 202. I should like very briefly to recapitulate the legislative history to this point both of that resolution and of Senate Resolution 249, to which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee also referred yesterday afternoon. Those are the two resolutions which were considered by the Senator from Tennessee as being substantially to the same effect as to the scope of the investigation and the study which should be made. Therefore, I think it is of some importance to consider the legislative history to this point of each of the two resolutions and also to consider whether there is any reason for the fear expressed by the Senator from Tennessee that if one of these resolutions should be adopted there will necessarily or reasonably likely follow a duplication, with two investigations of substantially the same scope in operation at the same time. I may say, as I indicated last evening, that I do not believe it follows at all that if Senate Resolution 202 shall be adopted by the Senate there is any danger whatsoever of a rival or duplicatory investigation being carried out under the terms of Senate Resolution 249. My reasons were briefly indicated yesterday, and I shall in a few moments have something further to say with respect to those reasons.

Senate Resolution 202, which I shall for the purpose of brevity from time to time refer to as the "Judiciary Committee resolution," was submitted to the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee on January 5, 1950, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on the same day.

As the Senator from Tennessee said yesterday, a subcommittee, consisting, as I recall, of five members of the Committee on the Judiciary, was selected for the purpose of giving attention to the Judiciary Committee resolution and reporting back to the full committee with respect thereto. It was the privilege of the Senator who now addresses the Senate to be one of the members of that subcommittee, and to have observed with much interest and cordial appreciation the fine spirit of public service evidenced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who served as the chairman of the subcommittee. I think it is fair to say that conscientious and, I trust, at least reasonably capable efforts were bestowed by the subcommittee on the consideration of the Judiciary Committee resolution.

We were assisted also by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary himself, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I observe with interest and pleasure that the junior Senator from

Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is now occupying the chair, I judge by the expression on his face, concurs in my statement that the distinguished Senator from Nevada did render very substantial assistance in the preparation of the final form of the Judiciary Committee resolution.

On February 27, 1950, the Judiciary Committee resolution was reported by the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and was then referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The reason for the reference to the latter committee was the fact that it was provided in the Judiciary Committee resolution that for the purpose of the resolution the committee was authorized to employ certain assistance, and that the expenses of the committee under the resolution, which it declared should not exceed $100,000, should be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee. Thus, it was that on February 27, 1950, the Committee on Rules and Administration was charged with the responsibility of giving consideration to the terms of the Judiciary Committee resolution.

As the Senator from Tennessee recalled to the attention of the Senate yesterday afternoon, the Committee on Rules and Administration held a hearing, on which occasion there were present several members of the Committee on the Judiciary, notably the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], besides one or two other Senators whom I do not recall, and the chairman of the committee. It was also the privilege of the present speaker to be present at that meeting. That was the meeting at which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] set forth the views which he had with respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over the subject matter which was embraced within the Judiciary Committee resolution.

Following the hearing before the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Judiciary Committee resolution was, on March 23, 1950, reported by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, with the additional amendments to which reference has been made by the Senator from Tennessee, namely, the incorporation at line 18, on page 2, of the words, the punctuation and the figures, "but not later than July 31, 1950," which, as the context will disclose, is the date fixed by the resolution as so amended by the Committee on Rules and Administration not later than which it should be the duty of the Committee on the Judiciary to report to the Senate its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation.

The second of the amendments inserted by the Committee on Rules and Administration was a reduction from the $100,000 figure for expenses to the figure of $50,000, which had been the initial figure carried in the Judiciary Committee resolution at the time of its submission by the Senator from Tennessee.

We were favored yesterday by a statement by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] as to the circumstances surrounding the change in the figure and the circumstances with reference to the attitude, the very kindly attitude, the very courteous attitude, of the Committee on Rules and Administration with respect to the resolution.

Therefore, on March 23, the Committee on Rules and Administration having thus completed its duties, the Judiciary Committee resolution came to the table of the Senate, if I may term it such, for further consideration by the Senate, and became a part of the calendar of the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the legislative history of Senate Resolution 249, which was submitted on April 4, 1950, by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is, and was then, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It will be observed that it was not until approximately 11 days after the Judiciary Committee resolution had been reported to the Senate that Senate Resolution 249 was submitted to the Senate and came before it in any manner, shape, or form. On the very next day, April 5, 1950, Senate Resolution 249 was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which it had been referred on the preceding day, and was reported without amendment, and thereupon was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, it will be observed that the report by the Senator from Colorado and the reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration of Senate Resolution 249 was 3 months, less 1 day, after the Judiciary Committee resolution had been submitted to the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Yet we find Senate Resolution 249 immediately referred, on April 5, to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, there are two other measures to which brief reference should be made, and at least to one of which, and possibly to both, reference was made yesterday by the Senator from Tennessee. I refer to Senate bill 3357, which is a bill to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. This bill, S. 3357, was itself not introduced until April 4, 1950.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for 5 minutes?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may yield to me for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I had just referred to S. 3357, which was introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] by request on April 4, 1950, which was some 12 days after the Committee on the Judiciary resolution had been reported to the Senate by a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Thus it was that S. 3357 did not come into the Senate until approximately 3 months, I think lacking possibly 1 day, after the submission of Senate Resolution 202. We find, however, that on April 12, 1950, S. 3357 was reported by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Senate, and placed upon the calendar of this body, and that 1 week later, April 19, 1950, upon the call of the Consent Calendar, the bill (S. 3357) was passed by the Senate.

The second bill to which reference is made, in addition to the resolutions to which reference has already been had, is S. 3358, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Colorado by request, and referred on the same day, April 4, 1950, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Although, Mr. President, no action has ever been taken by the Senate itself as to S. 3358, other than to refer the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on April 11, 1950, 7 days after the introduction of S. 3357, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce decided to begin hearings on April 17 on said bill S. 3358. The first witness who was heard at the hearings to which reference has been made was the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, our former colleague, Attorney General McGrath, and he was to be, and I presume was, followed by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Crime Division, as well as by other witnesses, and from day to day thereafter, at least a portion of the time, hearings proceeded with respect to S. 3358, although until this present moment no action—I think I am correct in stating this—has been taken by the Senate itself as to S. 3358 other than the reference to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. President, there was presented to the Democratic policy committee of the Senate what was considered to be the problem caused by the pendency of Senate Resolution 202, the Committee on the Judiciary resolution, and Senate Resolution 249, the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Colorado. The Democratic policy committee gave consideration to the question and to the general subject, I assume, of the proper phraseology of a resolution designed to solve the problem which was so presented.

It is my understanding from the press that there was considered by the Democratic policy committee of the Senate an amendment in the nature of a substitute to solve this problem, and, as I understood yesterday from the Senator from Tennessee in his address to the Senate, the problem which confronted the Democratic policy committee of the Senate was the alleged likelihood of two parallel hearings, practically duplicates one of the other, proceeding unless some such solution were arrived at, namely, a proceeding under Senate Resolution 202, the Committee on the Judiciary resolution, and a proceeding under Senate Resolution 249, which I may term the Johnson resolution, which had been

pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as previously indicated.

From the Washington Post of April 13 I understand that the substitute which has been proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee was a compromise offered by the majority leader and accepted on April 11 by the Democratic policy committee. I have in my hand the Evening Star of April 11 of this year, which also contains an item in the course of one of its articles reading as follows:

> The Senate Democratic policy committee decided this afternoon to set up a special five-man committee for a thorough investigation of interstate crime syndicates, Chairman LUCAS announced. This would avoid the duplication of two separate inquiries, one by the Judiciary Committee and the other by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. President, what does the substitute proposed by the junior Senator from Tennessee do? In the first place it substitutes, as has previously been noted, in place of a standing committee of the United States Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, a special committee of five members to be appointed by the President of the Senate from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

I have previously noted the fact that there is no requirement as to how many members shall be from each of those standing committees, and that an appointment of four from one of them and one from the other would meet the requirements of the substitute. I have stated, however, my assumption that the President of the Senate would probably select from one of those standing committees three, and from the other two, of the members of the special committee.

I want to emphasize, Mr. President, two facts to which I have already made reference, but which I think will bear repetition and which should be emphasized. First, that the membership of the special committee, cannot, by virtue of the odd number, the number of five, be equal from each of the two standing committees. Therefore, a majority of the members of the special committee will come from either the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Committee on the Judiciary, and therefore the members from one or the other of the two said standing committees will be in the minority on the special committee.

Second, that if the Senate creates a special committee, not a single Member of the Senate, unless possessed of some information not known to the entire Senate, will, when the vote creating the special committee is announced, know which of the two committees, namely, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Committee on the Judiciary, will be the one which shall furnish the majority of members of the special committee. It is entirely conceivable, Mr. President, that some Members of the Senate might desire to have such knowledge. They might feel that the subject matter is peculiarly one as to which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for illustration, should have the majority, or, conversely, that the subject matter is such that the Committee on the Judiciary should have the majority. But in voting upon the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee all of us are in the dark as to which of the two standing committees will furnish the majority of the members of the special committee.

I am opposed, Mr. President, to the creation of a special committee. The first of my reasons for being opposed to the creation of a special committee is that there is no need to bypass the standing committees of the Senate by authorizing the employment of a special committee.

Press reports indicate that it has been asserted that adoption of the Kefauver substitute is needed in order that there may not me a duplication resulting from the making of two separate investigations, one by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the other by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

A few moments ago I read from the Washington Evening Star, in which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is stated to have announced that the setting up of a special five-man committee would avoid the duplication caused by having two separate inquiries, one by the Judiciary Committee and the other by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That newspaper account illustrates very clearly the reports which have appeared in the press in regard to the reason for the proposal to create a special committee.

Mr. President, the argument that adoption of the Kefauver substitute is needed in order that there may not be a duplication resulting from having two separate investigations made, one by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the other by the Committee on the Judiciary, is not well founded. The reason why it is not well founded is that Senate Resolution 249, the Johnson resolution, which provides for an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has not been adopted by the Senate, and no hearings under that resolution have been authorized by the Senate. There is no compulsion upon the Senate to permit two separate investigations to occur, if the Kefauver substitute is not adopted. The Senate is not obligated to permit the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an investigation. The Senate has a right to authorize its Judiciary Committee to be the only committee to conduct the investigation. Likewise the Senate has a right to authorize its Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to be the only committee to conduct the investigation. Certainly the ability of the members of either of those standing committees is such that either one of them could conduct the investigation and study.

Of course, Mr. President, my association has been somewhat closer with the members of the Judiciary Committee than with some of the members, at any rate, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Therefore it is with no derogation to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that I assert that, without any question, the Committee on the Judiciary, headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, is able to conduct the investigation. I assert with equal certainty that it is true that until the Senate authorizes the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an investigation under Senate Resolution 249, there will not be two duplicate or separate investigations in process, one under Senate Resolution 202 by the Judiciary Committee and the other under Senate Resolution 249.

Mr. President, the Senate need not be apprehensive that unless the Kefauver substitute, providing for the appointment of a special committee is adopted, two duplicate investigations—one under Senate Resolution 202 and the other under Senate Resolution 249—will be in process. The Senate has this matter entirely within its control. Until such time as the Senate approves Senate Resolution 249, no investigation can be entered upon by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under that resolution.

However, Mr. President, it is curious and interesting to note, on the other hand, that even if the Kefauver substitute, providing for the appointment of a special committee is adopted, it still will be entirely possible that its investigations will be paralleled by hearings conducted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under Senate bill 3358, which pertains to the transmission of certain gambling information, on which resolution, as has been previously stated. Although the resolution has not been adopted by the Senate, hearings began on April 17, with the Attorney General of the United States being the first witness.

Thus it is, first, that the adoption of the Kefauver substitute, providing for the appointment of a special committee, is not necessary in order to prevent the making of separate, duplicate investigations under Senate Resolution 202 and Senate Resolution 249; and, second, even if the Kefauver substitute is adopted and even though the special committee to be appointed thereunder makes an investigation, there is nothing to prevent an additional investigation, namely, an investigation under Senate bill 3358, from also being carried on simultaneously with the investigation which the special committee constituted under the Kefauver substitute would be carrying on.

Mr. President, in connection with the consideration by the Senate of the first point of opposition which I make to the proposal to appoint a special committee, namely, the reason that there is no need—and by my voice I emphasize the word "need"—to bypass a standing committee through the authorization of the appointment of a special committee, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the appropriate standing committee, whichever it may be, whether the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is by the terms of the Legislative

Reorganization Act of 1946 fully empowered and eminently able to do all that is needed to be done in the premises.

I need not remind the Senator from Tennessee, who occupies the chair in this body at this moment, of the great care which was devoted to the preparation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I personally can remember, as do all other Members of the Senate, I am sure, who were in the Senate at that time, the fine work which was done by former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, whose name is one of the two names by which the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is currently known—the La Follette-Monroney Act of that year.

I have stated that the appropriate standing committee, whichever it may be, is by the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 fully empowered and eminently able to do all that is needed to be done in the premises with respect to the investigation and study which are proposed to be made of the crime situation.

At this point let me quote from the remarks of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], when speaking in the Senate on January 15, 1947. Let me add that at that time he was quoting the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], my esteemed seat mate in the Senate; and the remarks of the Senator from Oregon were also quoted in this very body on the 20th of February of this year by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I read now from page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1947, volume 93, part 1:

> The jurisdiction of the standing committees has been so comprehensively described in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation.

I have at hand a copy of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and, as bearing upon the powers of standing committees, created I should say by that instrument, and as to the type of membership of the staffs of such standing committees, I call attention to section 202, at page 26 of the printed copy of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, in which section each standing committee is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs, and I quote the words "on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

So, Mr. President, a standing committee, either the Judiciary Committee or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is provided presumably with staff members, of qualifications, appointed on a permanent basis and without regard to political affiliations and "solely," to quote the Legislative Reorganization Act, "on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

As bearing further on the question whether there is any need to bypass the standing committees of the Senate through the appointment of a special committee, I also call to the attention of the Senate the provision at page 23 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, namely, the Legislative Reorganization Act, section 134 (a), which sets forth the powers of each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee. The importance of the reference to "subcommittee" is that, should Senate Resolution 202, the Judiciary Committee resolution, be adopted, it might be that, instead of the entire Committee on the Judiciary, a duly authorized subcommittee thereof might function.

What are the powers of the standing committees and of the subcommittees of any such committee, under section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946? I read:

> Each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions—

Yes; but I pause there. Someone might say, up to that point, such committee could not act in recess; but the framers of the Legislative Reorganization Act thought of that. I continue to read after the word "sessions": "recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate."

In other words, they have power—

> to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of $10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable.

I pause at that point to indicate, as I have done previously, that under the terms of Senate Resolution 202, the Judiciary Committee resolution, the $10,000 figure, of course, will be superseded by the figure which the Senate in its wisdom may cause to be finally placed in the resolution, $50,000, $100,000, $150,000, or whatever it may be.

Then there is a very interesting direct statement in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which bears directly on the question of making investigations; and what is that provision? It reads:

> Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words.

The concluding sentence of the subsection reads:

> The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. President, obviously there is no reason to bypass either of the two standing committees. I want to make it clear, if I may, at this point, that I am not advocating that both of the standing committees should be empowered to make this investigation. I see no reason for both of them to do it, and, as the members of the Judiciary Committee who appeared before the Rules and Administration Committee argued, it was entirely proper that the Judiciary Committee should make the investigation. But, aside from that, obviously there is no need to bypass either of these two standing committees of the Senate, because of any lack of adequate power on the part of such standing committee or committees to handle the investigation.

In this connection, attention is invited to the following observation, on January 15, 1947, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, at page 343, by the very distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whom I do not see in the Senate this afternoon, but who was here earlier today. Reading:

> Therefore the argument that it is necessary to have special committees in order that authority to subpena witnesses may be conferred is not sound, since such authority has now been given to the standing committees.

I call attention to this strong, vigorous sentence from our able and distinguished friend, who is so keen and alert, as he always is in the performance of his duties in the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Maryland. Said he:

> That is an additional reason why no special committee should be created by the Congress.

Mr. President, remember the fact that the Kefauver substitute abandons this theory of the senior Senator from Maryland and undertakes to, and if adopted will, create a special committee, according to the exact words of the Kefauver substitute. But the Senator from Maryland, as I say, after indicating the fact that it is unnecessary to have special committees in order that authority to subpena witnesses may be conferred, says, "That is an additional reason why no special committee should be created by the Congress."

The distinguished Senator from Maryland, however, did not stop with the observation to which I have referred and which I have quoted. Speaking further on January 15, 1947, at page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, he said:

> But the question again comes down to this—and I shall not now argue it—that there is absolutely nothing, and in fact almost minus nothing, if that is possible, which a special committee purports to do that the standing committees are not authorized to do, equipped to do, and can do—

And I emphasize this, Mr. President—

> and can do a great deal better than the special committee.

Mr. President, I have already referred to the fact that there is an express provision in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, reading as follows:

> Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction.

Attention is invited to another provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act, namely, section 136, appearing at pages 23 and 24 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, which reads as follows:

> Legislative oversight—

That is the heading—

> Legislative oversight by standing committees.

Then the section reads as follows:

> To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as

it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee, and for that purpose shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, I quote again from the senior Senator from Utah, speaking on January 15, 1947, and doing honor, as he did, to the junior Senator from Oregon by quoting from remarks previously made by the latter Senator on January 13, 1947, at page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, as follows:

Second, the standing committees of the Senate have been authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act to exercise continuous oversight of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions. They are being equipped with professional staffs and expert investigators to assist them in performing their oversight function and have been armed with the subpena power for this purpose. Hereafter the investigatory function of Congress should be performed—

I emphasize the words from here on—

should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose, instead of relying upon special investigating committees which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.

So, Mr. President, for the reasons and by virtue of the facts set forth in what I have presented, I submit that my objection to the Kefauver substitute resolution, namely, that there is no need to bypass standing committees, is sound.

This is not the only reason, Mr. President, which the Senator now speaking has for opposing the creation of the special committee which is contemplated by and provided for in the Kefauver substitute for Senate Resolution 202.

The second of my reasons for opposing the creation of the special committee is that it is not only unnecessary to bypass standing committees, but that the creation of the special committee violates the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It will be recalled that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 apportions among the standing committees the various subjects of legislation, and, to quote from the junior Senator from Oregon—I shall indicate to the reporter in a moment where the quotation starts—to create a special committee, quoting from the Senator from Oregon, "is to trespass on the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee."

Senators who may be interested in finding this quotation will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93 part 1, at page 344.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Utah on January 15, 1947, quoting further from the junior Senator from Oregon, said:

First, the jurisdiction of the standing committees has been so comprehensively described in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. Thus, to create a special committee is to trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee.

It may be suggested to the Senate that the Legislative Reorganization Act, as it passed the Senate originally, before it went to the House of Representatives for concurrence, contained a section which was not in the bill as it came back from the House and, consequently, not in the Act as it was finally passed by the Senate. The section to which I refer is section 126, which reads as follows:

No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

It may be argued, Mr. President, that the fact that the Senate had adopted section 126 but subsequently accepted the LaFollette-Monroney bill, the Legislative Reorganization Act, without this section in it, indicates a departure by the Senate from its previous position in opposition to the establishment or continuance of special or select committees; but, this point was ably considered by the senior Senator from Utah in his remarks of January 15, 1947. I again quote from his remarks at page 343 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1. Said he:

During the Senate debate on the bill a few Senators, including Senator Mead and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], questioned the desirability of section 126 which imposed a ban on the future establishment of special or select committees, but their doubts on this score appeared to be set at rest by Senator LaFollette's assurance, first, that the jurisdiction of the reorganized standing committees had been so comprehensively described in the bill as to cover every conceivable subject of legislative concern, and, second, the possible reminder that the Senate can always expand the jurisdiction of a standing committee to embrace some unanticipated problem, or suspend its rules by a two-thirds vote and establish a special committee to deal with a normal subject. With this assurance, opposition to this provision evaporated, and the Senate approved the entire measure by a 3-to-1 vote.

Mr. President, on the same date, January 15, 1947, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], now the honored minority leader in the Senate, speaking at page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, said this:

There is no dispute over what the Senate did, but the law which was passed did not contain the provision outlawing special committees. It is my opinion, as I think the distinguished Senator from Utah will agree as he reviews the history of what happened in the joint committee, that the main reason the House did not go along with that provision was the mechanical reason I have given relative to the procedure of standing committees. The practice which is still in vogue in the House is to create special committees, cutting across the standing committees to give such special committees the subpena power, and not to give it to the standing committees. It is not now given by the House to standing committees.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the power of subpena, so far as I have observed in the Legislative Reorganization Act, is not today given to the standing committees of the House of Representatives under the provisions of the act, but is, as I have previously indicated, by reading section 134 (a), distinctly and unequivocally given to the standing committees of the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Utah, speaking on January 15, 1947, said this:

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The fact that the subpena power is given to the Senate standing committees merely proves that in our minds we were thinking of making the standing committees powerful and enabling them to go into any field that might be desirable. One of the sections that was eliminated from the reorganization bill while it lay on the Speaker's table in the other House was section 126, which banned special committees. What the motives of the House leaders were in thus emasculating or denuding the Senate-approved bill in such a fashion I have no idea, but the effect of their action was to deny the membership of the entire House of Representatives an opportunity to express their will with respect to the proposed ban, as well as with respect to other stricken sections.

Therefore it was not the House of Representatives but a few leaders thereof who are responsible for the amputation of the reform bill and for the deletion of the ban on special investigating committees.

Thus amended, the reorganization measure came back to the Senate on July 26 for our consideration. The Senate sponsors of the bill were anxious to restore, as affecting the Senate at least, the provisions which had been stricken on the House side, including the ban on special committees, but it was too late in the session to risk sending the bill to conference. Members of the House were leaving town in large numbers, and there was grave danger that the conference report would fail of acceptance in the other body because of the absence of a quorum.

In order to salvage what was left of the original bill, former Senator La Follette moved that the Senate concur in the House amendments, and the Senate so concurred, but in so moving and acting neither former Senator La Follette nor the other Senate members of the joint committee, nor the Senate itself, yielded their original conviction as to the desirability of prohibiting the establishment of special committees in the future.

It is an erroneous interpretation of what happened on that occasion to say that in the Legislative Reorganization Act Congress expressly refused to abolish special committees. We yielded to a parliamentary situation. We have not changed our minds.

Mr. President, as previously indicated, section 134 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1946 contains the power of subpena for the Senate standing committees. There is no such power for the House standing committees. This fact indicates that, notwithstanding the noninclusion of section 126, the Senate gives the subpena powers to the standing committees, thus obviating the necessity of creating such committees with such subpena powers.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to certain observations made in past years by distinguished Members of the Senate which bear upon the question of special committees and the attitude of the Senate with respect thereto. I quote first from the distinguished former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, speaking on June 6, 1946, during the debate preceding the passage of the Reorganization Act, which, incidentally, was approved finally on August 2, 1946. I quote the following from what he said at

pages 6365 and 6366 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5:

Nevertheless I am sure that all Senators appreciate that, if this work is done by the standing committees, it is a much more efficient way of transacting business, because no matter how well the select or special committee may do its work, whatever legislative recommendations flow from the studies or investigations made by select or special committees must in the end be referred to the standing committees of the Senate. Often, because there is no cross-reference between the standing committee in a particular province of legislation and a select committee created for a special purpose, it becomes necessary for the standing committee, to some extent at least, to replow the ground which has been gone over by the select committee or the special committee.

Furthermore the work of select or special committees is of necessity sporadic. They are created for a special purpose, with a special objective in mind, for a certain field of investigation or study. When that need has passed they tend ultimately to be abandoned, and for that reason their effectiveness is sporadic in character; whereas, if it now becomes the responsibility, as we propose, of the standing committees of the Senate to carry on this very important oversight function, we feel that it will result in a much more continuous surveillance of the executive agencies and departments of government.

Mr. President, I quote from the observations made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], speaking on June 6, 1946, at page 6366 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5:

Mr. HILL. Anent what the Senator from Maine has said, I think there are many very wise, constructive, and fine features in this reorganization bill; but I doubt if there is any feature that commends itself more than this very feature involving the abolition of special committees. As the Senator from Maine knows and has stated, the creation of special committees has meant a great deal of dispersion of effort, and much duplication and waste of time and effort on the part of Senators. The regular legislative committees alone can report proposed legislation to cure ills or defects which may exist; and yet we find numerous special committees taking numberless hours of the time of Members of this body to investigate, investigate, investigate, though they have no power to report remedial or other measures.

The Senator and his committee certainly have pointed out a most important and needed reform, in my opinion, in connection with the work and procedure of this body, namely, to do away with the special committees, and to impose responsibility and the authority directly on the regular legislative committees.

Again, Mr. President, I quote from the distinguished former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, at page 6394 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5:

The committee came to the conclusion that if we could reorganize the committees, and staff them adequately, it would be in the interest of orderly and efficient legislative procedure to have the standing committees or subcommittees thereof conduct studies and investigations, because, after all, if legislation is to flow from these activities, normally the select or joint committees do not have legislative power, and it is often necessary for the standing committee to thrash over much of the straw and the wheat that has been thrashed over by a special or select joint committee, as the case may be.

I pause at this point to mention the fact that although it is provided in the Kefauver substitute that "the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable," I assume that no one would question the statement that after the recommendations have been embodied in the requisite bills, they would still have to be referred back to the appropriate standing committee or committees of the Senate for further consideration, thus involving not only the consideration by the special committee created by the Kefauver substitute, but also by the standing committee or committees to which reference of such measures had occurred.

Finally, Mr. President, with respect to the former Senator from Wisconsin, let me point out that on June 6, 1946, at page 6371 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5, referring to the power of the suspension of rules to cover extraordinary situations, he said:

However, if in the future some very extraordinary matter arises, such as the control of atomic energy, as to which it might be felt that there was a need for the creation of such a committee, or if we were, unfortunately, to be engaged in a war, I have no doubt that a matter of such transcendent importance would cause a sufficient number of Senators to vote to suspend the rule.

The distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], has himself given much thought and consideration to this very important question as to whether special committees should or should not be created. The senior Senator from Illinois gave such consideration even before the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed.

I refer to his remarks on April 1, 1946, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 3, page 2876, reading as follows:

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Nebraska has said, I should like to make one further comment on what occurred before our committee this morning dealing with the termination of all special committees.

It was agreed by members of the Mead committee that they were of the opinion that they could finish their work by January 1 of next year. It was also agreed by the Kilgore committee, for which a resolution is now on the calendar, that they could finish their work and terminate the committee by January 1 next. It was also agreed that the committee set up under the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would also be terminated at that time.

In other words, there is a feeling among members of these special committees—and I am very happy to report it—that sooner or later, and the sooner the better, so far as our committee is concerned, the special committees will terminate and finally find their way back into standing committees, where a subcommittee, or the full standing committee, can take care of the kind of work formerly handled by a special committee.

Then, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois concluded this particular portion of his utterance by saying—and I call special attention to this language:

Mr. President, I merely wished to mention that fact, because I am satisfied that it is the feeling of the Senate as a whole that standing committees should perform the work of these special committees in 90 percent of the cases, and the sooner we return to the fundamentals which have existed in the Senate so far as standing committees are concerned, the better it will be for the United States Senate.

The observations, the very sound, very well-considered, and, to my mind, very wise observations, on the part of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois thus indicated clearly his view in opposition to the advisability of the creation of special committees, and indicated it even before the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois did not cease to give thought to this important question after the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that almost 6 months after the approval of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which, as previously indicated, occurred on August 2, 1946, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois addressed the Senate on January 20, 1947, his remarks being set forth at page 451 of the RECORD, volume 93, part 1, in a debate on the continuation of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, Senate Resolution 46.

Before quoting the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I am sure we would all agree that a special committee on the investigation of the national defense program certainly would be one of the outstandingly important committees, and that the observations of the Senator from Illinois with respect to a committee having such important functions are of especial consequence and moment. The Senator from Illinois said on January 20, 1947:

Every Senator knows—

"Every Senator knows"—

that if we follow the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act there is no place for this particular special committee to continue its investigation.

Speaking on the same day, as reported on page 453, volume 93, part 1, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Senator from Illinois made these observations:

Mr. President, the reduction of the number of committees and limitation of membership on committees is an absolute necessity if the committee system is to work efficiently. The crux of the La Follette-Monroney Act—

I pause, Mr. President, so the record may be made clear that that is the Legislative Reorganization Act—

The crux of the La Follette-Monroney Act is in those provisions limiting the number of committees and defining the jurisdiction of all the committees created under the Reorganization Act. Here is something that has never been tried before. It is the keystone—

Listen to the language, Members of the Senate, of the Senator from Illinois—

It is the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. It is also the complete answer to those who seek—

I want every Senator here—and I am sorry there are not more here—to re-

member this strong statement by our distinguished friend the majority leader—

It is also the complete answer to those who seek to undermine the foundation stones of this legislative act by insisting that special committees be appointed. The very reason we spelled out in the Reorganization Act the jurisdiction of each and every committee was that special committees were being eliminated. Therefore, when an investigation was called for, we specified by which committee it should be conducted.

Mr. President, obviously the Senator from Illinois considered not only that the provisions limiting the number of committees, defining the jurisdiction of the committees, were the keystone, as he said, in the arch of congressional reform, but that those who insist that special committees be appointed "seek"—to quote his picturesque language—"to undermine the foundation stones of this legislative act." This is the Senator from Illinois speaking on January 20, 1947.

Mr. President, I call attention also to this significant language by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois on the same day, January 20, 1947, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, at page 453:

Anyone who says that by creating the special committee now proposed we shall not be violating the letter of the law, as well as its spirit, simply does not know what he is talking about, because in connection with each and every one of the standing committees established under the Reorganization Act the jurisdiction of each committee is clearly spelled out, word for word, and as a result of designating clearly the jurisdiction of the 15 standing committees, anything under God's high heaven can be investigated. In my opinion, if new committees are created, both the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act will be violated.

I think the language of the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois, that as a result of designating clearly the jurisdiction of the 15 standing committees "anything under God's high heaven can be investigated," is certainly sufficiently broad to cover the investigation proposed in the Kefauver resolution or in the resolution of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, again on December 31, 1948, almost 2 years later than the observations thus quoted from the senior Senator from Illinois, he had this to say to the Senate, as it appears on page 10257, volume 94, part 8 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I shall not object to the resolution which has been submitted for continuation of the committee for a period of 30 days, in order that the committee may make its report during that time. However, Members of the Senate well know the position of the great majority—

I wish there were some way I could emphasize that statement, Mr. President, by my voice. The Senator from Illinois said:

The Members of the Senate well know the position of the great majority of Democratic Members with respect to special committees under the Reorganization Act. No Senator is more interested in the continued success of small business than is the Senator from Illinois. However, a vital principle dealing with special committees is involved under the Reorganization Act, and it seems to me that at the proper time either the Banking and Currency Committee or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should take over the duties of the Small Business Committee. One of the regular standing committees should continue to operate in behalf of the small business of this Nation. As everyone knows, I feel very keenly about the matter, as was apparent from the spirited debates we had on this subject 2 years ago when the matter was before us at that time. I shall reserve further remarks upon the question until some more appropriate time.

Mr. President, in this year, 1950, to wit on February 20 of this year, the Senate was the recipient of a most interesting address by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], whom I have known for many years. I knew him when he was the distinguished chief executive of his State, as was the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] of his State. The junior Senator from Florida, speaking in the present Congress on February 20, 1950, had these significant observations to make:

Mr. President, I do not care to go over the same ground that I covered Friday afternoon in my argument on this subject. However, there are two points which I think need to be accentuated at this stage of the argument, the first of which is to remind Senators—and I wish more Senators were present in the Senate Chamber at this time—

I pause to say that this subject matter must contain some strange allergy to keep the Senators away, because the Senator from Florida seems not to have had a very large attendance at the time of the delivery of his address. He continued:

that this matter was very fully and ably argued to a conclusion, at least for the time being, in 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, and that the splendid arguments against the setting up of any special committee on small business, as then suggested by Senate Resolution 20, are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that time, and it seems to me they still very clearly express a conviction on the part of the Democratic majority of this Congress, then the minority of the Eightieth Congress, against the creation of any special committee on small business or any other special committee, as being in contravention of the spirit of the Reorganization Act, and also as not being in accord with the best interests of sound, economical, efficient, and democratic government, here in the Halls of Congress.

Continuing, the distinguished Senator from Florida said:

I have been impressed today while rereading the arguments presented in the 1947 debate, and I wish time permitted me to read a larger portion of them into the RECORD at this point.

I wish to comment that able Senators who are still Members of the Senate took very strong positions against the adoption of the then pending measure, Senate Resolution 20, which was intended to reestablish a special committee on small business. The argument of the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was very compelling on this point. The argument of the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was one of the best I have ever heard him make. The two arguments made by the able senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are full of good meat, and they lead one to the very definite conclusion that it was against the interests of sound and well-organized legislative government to trespass against the spirit of the Reorganization Act by the adoption of a measure to set up a special committee on small business.

The able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] argued the matter with great ability and distinction.

The able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], although he now takes a different position, at that time—as shown by his participation in the argument on several occasions—was strongly of the feeling that the special committee should not be reconstituted or set up again.

The then serving minority leader, Mr. BARKLEY, now the President of the Senate—

I pause to call attention to the fact that he is also the Vice President of the United States—

likewise argued this question exhaustively at that time, and I shall quote briefly from his argument before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, in the course of the remarks so made by the Senator from Florida, he referred to the two arguments made by the senior Senator from Maryland. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that that is the same Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who made the observations which have previously been referred to, namely—

Therefore the argument that it is necessary to have special committees in order that authority to subpena withnesses may be conferred is not sound, since such authority has now been given to the standing committees. That is an additional reason why no special committee should be created by the Congress.

Again, he said:

But the question again comes down to this—and I shall not now argue it—that there is absolutely nothing, and in fact almost minus nothing, if that is possible which a special committee purports to do that the standing committees are not authorized to do, equipped to do, and can do a great deal better than the special committee.

On January 15, 1947, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] said this, in quoting the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as appears on page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1:

Hereafter the investigatory function of Congress should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose, instead of relying upon special investigating committees which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.

Mr. President, referring again to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], let me say that he was quoted as follows by the Senator from Florida on February 20, 1950, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1933.

Then we shall eliminate the duplication of effort, waste of time, and waste of manpower which was unavoidable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

Further, Mr. President, let me say that the following colloquy appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 20, 1950, at page 1940.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend, I have only a few minutes. After the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed, the Senator

from Illinois tried to live up to the letter and spirit of the act, by voting against special committees. The Reorganization Act is plain on that score; it outlaws special committees. But the Reorganization Act has been violated many times since then.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not disagree with what the Senator has said up to this point. But the Legislative Reorganization Act does not outlaw special committees.

Mr. LUCAS. I was under the impression it did. I still think it did. I took that position at the time. But, anyway—

The junior Senator from Florida made this further statement, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 20, 1950, at page 1933.

Mr. President, not only was this the position taken by the distinguished leaders on this side of the aisle, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the votes were taken on this measure, it appeared that all but three Members among the Democrats in the Senate at that time voted to stand by their then leader, the then distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky; and also by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, the whip at that time; and that with three exceptions, on both yea-and-nay votes taken on that legislation, first upon the so-called Tobey amendment, and, second, on the adoption of the resolution, there were only three Democrats then sitting in the Senate who did not go with the leadership and with the other leading Democrats, who had voiced their extreme disapproval of the custom and practice of setting up special committees, and of the efficiency of such a system. I may say those three include the senior Senator from Montana, who is consistent in his continued opposition on the floor of the Senate. He is the only one who has been consistent, I may say, and I think, in passing, we should all compliment him upon his consistency. The other two brethren among the Democrats who joined him in 1947 are no longer on the floor of the Senate. They were the then Senator from Texas, Mr. O'Daniel, and the then Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Stewart. So that the only Senator now serving as a Democrat who then took that position is the distinguished Senator from Montana, who quite consistently maintains his position; which, however, flew in the face of the party's position taken by his leadership, and followed by nearly all members of the Democratic minority.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, on January 24, 1947, even voted against Senate Resolution 20, the small business special committee resolution.

So, Mr. President, I submit that not only is there no need to bypass the standing committees of the Senate—and that is the first point of my opposition—but, in addition, there are profound reasons—as we may determine by studying the history of the La Follette-Monroney Legislative Reorganization Act and the provisions of that act, and in view of the qualifications of the standing committees and their staffs—for the superiority of the views so vigorously asserted on those previous occasions by the Senator from Illinois, as compared to the view which now apparently is asserted by him in connection with the Kefauver resolution, which was reported as a result of the action of the Democratic policy committee.

Mr. President, a third reason which I have for opposing the proposed creation of a special committee is that the special committee will not be subject to the discipline under which a standing committee would operate or to the oversight and superintendence to which a subcommittee of a standing committee would be subject. Obviously, if a special committee is appointed consisting of five Members of the Senate, it is not a part of any other committee. It is true that some of its members are drawn from one committee, and one or more of its members are drawn from another committee, but there is no committee which has any jurisdiction by way of discipline or oversight or supervision with respect to the action which shall be taken by the special committee. The special committee would be sailing a sea in a ship of its own, without any supervision whatever or control from any of the regular committees.

Contrast that, Mr. President, with the situation in one of the standing committees. I know that in the Judiciary Committee we hold hearings ordinarily once a week, or sometimes not quite so frequently, sometimes every 2 or 3 weeks; at other times, several times in 1 week. The distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee sits upon the floor this afternoon in the absence of the chairman—who is in the West on an important mission of that committee, I may say—and he can testify, I am sure, as can also my distinguished friend from Tennessee, the author of the Kefauver resolution, who is a very capable and distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee himself, as to the fact that, week after week and month after month, the subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee are subject to its jurisdiction, to its oversight, to frequent questioning as to progress which is being made, and sometimes even to what might amount to censure, sometimes to compliment, but certainly at all times, to the independent oversight not only by the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who has rendered great service to the committee, but by the committee as a whole; and this very fine quality, this very fine fact with respect to subcommittees of a standing committee would not exist in the case of a special committee.

Mr. President, I shall group three other objections which I have to the creation of the special committee, and I want to say in fairness that they are taken verbatim from the language already used by my distinguished friend and seat mate, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If I am not mistaken, they were adopted likewise by the Senator from Utah in quoting from my friend from Oregon. I quote these fourth, fifth, and sixth of my reasons for opposing the creation of the special committee, taken from the statement made on January 13, 1947, by the Senator from Oregon, as follows:

The reformed Senate rules limit Senators to service on two standing committees each so that they can meet their legislative responsibilities more effectively. If, in addition, Senators are appointed to serve on special committees, the burdens of committee work will be correspondingly multiplied and the old evils of poor attendance and scattered attention will return.

Creation of one or two special committees now will pave the way for the establishment of a rash of special committees with inevitable duplication of the work of the standing committees and unnecessary large-scale expenditures. It might also lead to a revival of the use of staff personnel borrowed from downtown departments with all the disadvantages of that practice.

Creation of special committees to deal with subjects already assigned to standing committees will also be a burden to, and impair the efficiency of, the executive agencies of the Government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think I am correct in the statement I am about to make. If I am not, I hope some Senator will be kind enough to correct me. It is my understanding that the only select or special committees the Senate now has are two; one, the Special Committee on the Reconstruction of the Senate Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of the Senate Chamber—and I am pleased to note that my esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri, is one of the Senators who has served upon that special committee—second, the Special Senate Committee on Small Business, under the terms of Senate Resolution 58, members of which committee were appointed on April 10, 1950. Someone may say, "Well, there are committees on atomic energy and on printing." But I call attention to the fact that while there is a committee on printing and a committee on atomic energy, each of the two last committees are joint committees, whose membership consists of Members of both Houses of the Congress. So, Mr. President, at this time, unless I am mistaken, the Senate has been very scrupulous in following the rule of not creating special committees, and only for some special, outstanding reason are they created.

We have had references here in some of the quoted observations of the Senator from Illinois as to the number of times the Senate has violated the Legislative Reorganization Act. In the first place, one violation of it, so far as I can see, does not afford any basis for future violations of it, and, in the second place, my memory fails to recall a great abundance of violations of the Legislative Reorganization Act. But the fact remains that, regardless of whether there have or have not been violations, there are, today so far as I know, only the two special existing committees of the Senate, which I have mentioned.

Mr. President, someone may raise the question—and it would be a very appropriate one—whether the Senator who is now addressing the Senate himself voted for the creation of the Special Committee on Small Business. I want to say that he did so vote. I think it was proper that he should, and I am quite sure that if the situation were to arise again he would do so again.

Mr. President, in the first place, it will be recalled, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 1943, of February

20, 1950, that under the terms of the so-called Wherry resolution (S. Res. 58) a select committee was created with the following provision as to its duty:

> It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises.

A resolution was offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], in 1947, to the effect that "the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey, by means of research, all the problems of American small-business enterprises." The Senator who is now speaking voted against the resolution so presented by the Senator from New Hampshire, and for Senate Resolution 20, the so-called Wherry resolution. which authorized a special committee of 12 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, to study, and so forth, all the problems of American small business enterprises.

Obviously, there are sound reasons for voting to create a committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business. The very content of its duty, namely, "to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises," indicates the vastness of the scope of the committee which should consider that subject. Obviously, there is no one committee of the Senate which has, and there are no two committees which have, legislative jurisdiction of all the problems of American small-business enterprises. For illustration, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has jurisdiction over the inspection of livestock and meat products, and over the dairy industry. The Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction over financial aid to commerce and industry, with one specific exception; it has jurisdiction over the control of prices of commodities and services. The Committee on Finance has jurisdiction over revenue measures, tariffs, and national social security. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction over interstate commerce, and communications by telegraph, telephone, and radio. The Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction over the protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has jurisdiction, among other things, over wages and hours of labor.

Obviously, all these subjects to which I have referred, over which these half a dozen committees of the Senate have jurisdiction, are included within the term "all the problems of American small-business enterprises."

Mr. President, it is entirely appropriate, to my mind, that a committee to study all—and I emphasize the word "all"—the problems of American small-business enterprises be not one of the standing committees, but shall be a special committee.

In the case of the Kefauver resolution, however, there is no such diversity of subject matter as exists in the case of all the problems of small business. The subject matter of the Kefauver resolution is the single one of the utilization of facilities or their operation in interstate commerce, in furtherance of illegal transactions and the results thereof, including the development of corrupting influences in violation of law. Therefore, Mr. President, there is no such argument in favor of the creation of a special committee in the case of the subject matter of the Kefauver resolution as there is in the case of the study of all the problems of American small-business enterprises, which problems go into subject matters over which at least half a dozen of the committees of the Senate, which I have mentioned, have jurisdiction.

Mr. President, there is a further reason for just opposition to which such a committee, selected as provided in the Kefauver resolution, is subject, and that further reason is the conflict of tendencies between the members who are selected, at least in part, because of their membership on two committees with diverse jurisdiction. There are Senators from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee who have given years of service in the Senate to the particular and peculiar problems of that committee, and there are Senators, on the other hand, from the Judiciary Committee who have given years of service to the problems of that committee, with obviously entirely different tendencies. Members selected from each such respective standing committee are obviously apt to be inclined to direct the investigation primarily along lines to which the committee from which they emanate customarily devotes its attention. For example, if the members selected from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should be in the majority, there would be a strong tendency for the special committee to emphasize primarily the phases of commerce, communication by telegraph, telephone, or radio, rather than to emphasize primarily the study of crime.

I take it that no one among us can have the slightest question that although there are some matters relevant to interstate commerce involved in this study, the primary thing which is involved in the proposed study is crime. The very substitute resolution of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee states that the special committee is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the laws of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and so forth, and so forth, including the question, Mr. President, whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the laws of the United States or of the laws of any State.

There can be no question that the predominant thought in the Kefauver resolution is the subject of the investigation of the activities of organized crime. It is true that the mention of interstate commerce exists in the resolution, and it is perfectly clear to every Member of the Senate why it is placed in the resolution. It is because of the fact that the Senate and the House of Representatives have no jurisdiction over crime as such in the State of West Virginia or in the State of Michigan or in the State of Missouri. Those are local matters, unless there is some basis of Federal jurisdiction, Federal interference in Federal matters. The transmission of information and the transmission of machines which are capable of illegal use are matters which are within the interstate commerce powers of the Federal Government. But to say that this resolution can have anything as its primary object other than the study of the activities of organized crime is to overlook the entire basis on which the resolution proceeds.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has himself done a most excellent job, assisted by one of the members of the staff of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Green, to whom I pay tribute at this moment—I think I see him in the Chamber at this time—for placing in the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary illustrations which emphasize the importance of the investigation of crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy, first, of the report of the Judiciary Committee to the Senate with respect to Senate Resolution 202; and second, a copy of the report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration with respect to Senate Resolution 202.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the plan here proposed by the Senator from Tennessee is not his initial thought, because in his initial thought he had in mind the Judiciary Committee. He submitted a resolution in that form to the Senate and it was referred to the Judiciary Committee. He served as the chairman of a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and he approved and advocated the resolution which gives this function to the Judiciary Committee or a subcommittee thereof. But influenced, undoubtedly, by good motives—I have no question of his entire integrity of motive—influenced by the fact that the Democratic policy committee, for some reason best known to itself, has undertaken to bring forward a resolution to combine in this hybrid type of treatment members from two committees, for the committee is to be composed, if the resolution be adopted, of members not only of the Judiciary Committee, but of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, I fear, repetitiously, this afternoon, there is no assurance at all as to which of the two committees, the Committee on the

Judiciary, or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, will furnish the greater number of members of the special committee if it shall be authorized. Suppose it shall develop that three of the members of the special committee shall be derived from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Is there any question of doubt that there will be a strong tendency for the special committee to emphasize primarily the phases of commerce, communication by telegraph, telephone, and radio, rather than to emphasize primarily the study of crime?

Mr. President, there sits in the Senate this afternoon a Senator who is peculiarly qualified to serve upon a committee of this type. I hope he will take no offense at my having something to say with respect to his peculiar qualifications, his outstanding qualifications.

I should like to read at this point the contents of an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of April 13, 1950, which was just 2 days after the action of the Democratic policy committee, after a lengthy meeting, recommended this combination special 5-man committee, to which the Senator from Illinois referred. I quote from the editorial entitled, "Crime Probe," published in the Washington Post on April 13, 1950:

CRIME PROBE

It is now apparent that the Senate made a serious mistake in assigning the administration's two crime bills to the Interstate Commerce Committee. To be sure, they involve control of the instrumentalities of interstate commerce for the suppression of crime. But general legislation dealing with crime usually goes to the Judiciary Committee, and the present situation is clearly one demanding a thorough investigation into criminal activity of Nation-wide concern. In other words, the conflict of jurisdiction between the committees ought to have been resolved, in our opinion, in favor of the Judiciary Committee, which proposes to do a thorough and comprehensive job.

The compromise offered by Majority Leader LUCAS and accepted on Tuesday by the Democratic policy committee is unfortunate for a number of reasons.

This is not the Senator from Missouri speaking. This is a quotation from the Washington Post. I continue reading:

It would set up a special committee with members drawn from both Judiciary and Interstate Commerce. The effect would be a division of responsibility, loss of discipline over the committee, and creation of a new precedent for special investigatory units contrary to the sound policy followed in recent years of keeping investigations within the standing committees. The ease with which this reform appears to have been abandoned by the senatorial leadership is certain to be disillusioning to those who are seeking further improvement of congressional machinery.

Vice President BARKLEY has been given a free hand in selection of the proposed five-man special committee. Presumably this means that the committee will be headed by Senator KEFAUVER, who has sponsored an investigation of the comprehensive type. That is all to the good. Senator KEFAUVER is as able as he is fearless and, in addition, the country has reason to be confident of his sincerity in seeking a thorough investigation.

I ask Senators to listen to what follows in this editorial, which was published in the Washington Post 2 days after the action taken by the Democratic policy committee:

But it is also assumed that this turn of events will keep Senator FERGUSON off the committee, and this seems to us a grave mistake. We have often disagreed with Senator FERGUSON, but we recognize that he is one of the most persistent, thorough, and relentless investigators in the Senate. His special training in this field entitles him to a place on the committee; and if he should be excluded, the committee would begin its work under a suspicion that the Senate is afraid to expose a complete picture of interstate criminal operations.

If this task is worth doing, it is worth doing well. Even a suspicion of whitewash in drawing up the resolution or in selecting the personnel would be a serious disservice to the cause of exposing and suppressing criminal gangs.

That is the observation made by the editorial in the Washington Post, and it refers to the possibility of the Senator from Michigan being left off the committee. Of course there can be no assurance, if the Committee on the Judiciary has charge of the investigation, that the Senator from Michigan will be on the committee. That would be a matter for the determination, I presume, in the first place, of the chairman of the committee, but certainly subject, I assume, to the approval of the entire Committee on the Judiciary. Nor is it at all certain that the distinguished Vice President would fail to appoint the Senator from Michigan on the committee. Obviously, however, what pervades the public mind generally is along the line indicated in this editorial: "This turn of events will keep Senator FERGUSON off the committee." I think the public would agree with the editorial writer in saying: "This seems to us a grave mistake."

I had the pleasure of reading Mr. David Lawrence's column published in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, April 12, 1950, and I should like to quote a portion of it at this point. The article was published the day after the action taken by the Democratic Policy Committee. Mr. Lawrence points out what is apt to be felt, whether truthfully or untruthfully, whether correctly or incorrectly, by the people of the Nation if the so-called Kefauver substitute should be adopted. I read from his column, as follows:

BEHIND-SCENE MOVES COULD CAUSE POLITICAL CRIME PROBE SCANDAL—BIG CITY MACHINES SEEN TRYING TO DELAY INQUIRY ON INTERSTATE RACKETS

(By David Lawrence)

Strange things are happening behind the scenes in the Democratic Party in Congress which may have a bearing on what could prove to be the worst political scandal in a generation.

Who is trying to squelch the congressional investigation of gambling and interstate rackets? What are the Democratic machines in the big cities trying to do to limit the inquiry, to delay it, and possibly to frustrate a thorough investigation of the tie-up between party politics in America and the worst vice rings that this country has encountered since the black days of the prohibition era?

The maneuvering in Congress as to what kind of investigating committee should be appointed, who shall sit on it and what its scope shall be looks very suspicious.

Why, for instance, has the Democratic Party, in a formal conference of its policy members, decided to violate the precedent which was established when the La Follette-Monroney law was passed specifying that, when investigations are voted, they must be conducted not by special committees but by the regular committees charged with drafting legislation developed by an inquiry?

POSITION REVERSED

For many months now the Democratic leaders in Congress have fought against special committees and argued that the regular committees must do the investigating. Now this position has been reversed. Ignoring the demands of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which logically should conduct the investigation of crime—

Note that, Mr. President—

Ignoring the demands of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which logically should conduct the investigation of crime, a resolution has been decided on by the administraton leaders which would limit the committee to only five members. Three of these would be Democrats. They would not necessarily be selected from the Judiciary Committee but would be appointed by Vice President BARKLEY, which means that the appointments are bound to be political.

The test will be what Republicans will be permitted to sit on the special committee if it is ever appointed—for it looks as if there is a concerted movement afoot to delay the inquiry's start so that it cannot gather much information prior to the congressional elections this autumn.

Mr. President, let me read one more sentence from this article:

Why is it that, in a matter of crime and law violation, anybody in the Senate should try to fix so early a date as July 31 as the day on which the investigation must be concluded?

Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] gave us the answer to that yesterday when he pointed out that this report is intended to be only a partial report of the committee.

What are the Democratic leaders afraid of? Do they fear that the investigation will probe too deeply into the big rackets in New York, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and the major centers of crime in America today?—

And so forth and so on, from Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. President, these indicate something of what the public feeling is apt to be if in the instant case we shall violate the well-established rule, established not only by the La Follette-Monroney law, the Legislative Reorganization Act, but established by sound reason, proclaimed by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois himself before the La Follette-Monroney Act was passed, as I quoted him this afternoon, that the regular standing committees of the Senate should handle matters of this type.

Mr. President, I read yesterday afternoon this observation from Newsweek, which is a well-known publication, referring, as it does, to Senate Resolution 202. It says:

STRATEGY

What worried the Democrats was the possibility that FERGUSON'S experience would make him the strongest man on the subcommittee. Since most big city political machines are controlled by Democrats, the fear grew that the subcommittee's findings could well be used against the administration in the coming crucial election.

When 2 weeks ago, Senator ED JOHNSON, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, introduced two antigambling bills, the worried Democrats found a way out of their dilemma. Ostensibly to reconcile the clashing jurisdictions of the two committees, the Democratic policy group last week decided on a five-man special committee—three Democrats and two Republicans—to be appointed by Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY. In this way, less able Republican investigators could be named. "We just don't want to have any part of FERGUSON," said one top Democrat. "He'd move the thing into Kansas City and New York and we'd never get him out of there." With FERGUSON out of the way, the Democratic Party could continue to be against sin—with considerably less risk.

Certainly, this body, and Congress as a whole, do not want to embark on an investigation of the type and importance of the one now proposed, which may have ramifications in every great city, yes, and in some of the smaller places, perhaps not in cities exclusively at all with suspicions of this kind, and I can multiply them with numerous others, as Senators all realize, from publications which we have all seen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the other exhibits which have already been introduced by me may be set forth at the conclusion of my remarks the rules of committee procedure for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The importance of the exhibit, I think, is indicated by the fact that the rules indicate something of the supervision, something of the efficiency, which may reasonably be expected from the action taken by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was referring a few minutes ago to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], whom I do not see on the floor at the moment. I have no basis for knowing what the intention of the distinguished Vice President is. I should certainly not ask him what his intentions may be in the event the resolution shall be passed. I have the greatest confidence in the Vice President. I esteem his friendship, and we are greatly honored, in my opinion, by having a man of his type and integrity among us, and presiding over us.

I desire to submit most respectfully, if I may, either to him or to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, or to whomever may be the appointive power or whatever committee shall be appointed, regardless of which one of the resolutions shall be adopted, that it would be a very decided mistake to leave off of the committee the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan. He is a graduate of the University of Michigan, a graduate of the Law School in 1913. He served as a practicing attorney in Detroit, Mich., until 1929, when he was appointed to the Wayne County Circuit Court bench.

As a member of the bench, he also served as a professor of law at the Detroit College of Law, teaching courses in common law and procedure. The Senate is presided over at the moment by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], a distinguished member of the teaching profession, an author, a gentleman, a statesman, who I have no doubt would highly regard the professional work of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan as a professor in the Detroit College of Law.

In August, 1939, the junior Senator from Michigan was selected by his circuit court colleagues to undertake a so-called one-man grand jury investigation of gambling, of graft and corruption in Detroit and Wayne County, Mich. The Michigan law provides, rather uniquely, so far as I know, for a circuit court judge to act as grand jury, with full power. I understand he names his own investigative and legal staff, and acts in accordance with the proceedures of a grand jury.

The Ferguson grand jury in Detroit operated for more than two years. Its activities included taking 20,000,000 words of testimony, from 6,000 witnesses, resulting in a series of more than 360 indictments and convictions of such prominent individuals as a former Mayor of Detroit, a Wayne County prosecuting attorney, a sheriff, a Detroit superintendent of police, three city councilmen, innumerable police officials, county officers, and lesser political figures.

The record of that campaign against civic corruption and the alliance of crime and politics in Michigan, brought Judge Ferguson into national prominence, and in my judgment was in no small measure responsible for the nomination and election of this great statesman, as he is, to the United States Senate, as a fearless and incorruptible public official.

On his election to the Senate, Mr. FERGUSON was immediately assigned to the War Investigating Committee, under the chairmanship of the then distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Honorable Harry Truman, now President of the United States. Senator FERGUSON has been publicly praised on many occasions for his contributions to the work of the War Investigating Committee.

He was selected as a member of the Joint Committee To Investigate the Attack on Pearl Harbor, and in that investigation, I am sure all Senators will agree, he proved to be a relentless prober after the full record of facts.

When the War Investigating Committee expired, under the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act, under which we are now operating, an investigating subcommittee was established in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the Senator from Michigan was made chairman of that subcommittee.

Under the rules which prevent a member of the minority party from serving on more than two standing committees, the junior Senator from Michigan was forced to resign from the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and its investigating subcommittee, with the opening of the Eighty-first Congress.

The Senator from Michigan now serves on the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, which certainly has a wide range of duties, and is not only a fine educational institution, so to speak, for its members, but gives them the opportunity for wide, detailed, and profound knowledge of the Government and its various activities.

The Senator from Michigan served also, as I have indicated, I believe, on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I can testify, and do testify, from my own personal observation of his work, that he is an invaluable member of that committee. He is tireless, he is diligent, he has a high intelligence, he is willing to speak his mind, and he is a fine lawyer.

My understanding is that altogether during his term in the Senate the junior Senator from Michigan has been either responsible for or a prime mover in more than 60 major investigations, most of them under the old War Investigating Committee.

My understanding is that some of the recent congressional investigations in which he played an important part are the following:

First. The Erie Basin Metals investigation, which revealed the corrupt practices of the Garsson brothers and of Representative Andrew J. May, and resulted in jail sentences for some or possibly all of them.

Second. The North American Aviation, of Dallas, Tex., investigation, which revealed a waste in manpower, and which resulted in freeing 10,000 workers for other employment in the aircraft industry.

Third. The Pacific shipping situation. It appears that approximately 190 merchant ships, usable in world commerce or for the return of service personnel to the United States and costing the Government $380,000 a day to maintain, were found idle in the Pacific immediately after VJ-day. Action initiated by this investigation resulted in the return of more than half the ships within 90 days.

I digress to say, Mr. President, that I am not claiming that the distinguished Senator from Michigan did all this alone. Of course, he acted in cooperation with his brethren on the committees. But from my knowledge of him, as I have seen him operate in the Committee on the Judiciary and upon the floor of the Senate, I believe we will find it fair to assume that he was carrying his full share of the load in these various matters.

The fourth investigation to which I refer in which he had a part was that of the strategic war reserve, in connection with which the investigation revealed the unnecessary stock piling by the military of $850,000,000 of civilian-type goods which were immediately declared surplus and for sale, thus to enter the civilian economy and return millions of dollars to the Treasury.

The fifth item to which attention is called is the matter of renegotiation of contracts. Numerous investigations resulted in recommendations of policy and legislation whose dollar value to the Government is incalculable.

The relations of former Senator Theodore G. Bilbo, now deceased, to war contractors is the sixth item. No Senator who was a Member of the Senate at the time of the conclusion of Senator Bilbo's membership will fail to recall in general the circumstances with respect to Senator Bilbo. I do not mean the specific situation, because I myself am not familiar with the matter of the war contractors, but we know something of the general situation into which the Senator from Michigan undoubtedly was placed.

The seventh item to which I call attention is the irregular relations with war contractors of a certain Representative from the State of Washington, the revelations concerning which resulted in his defeat.

The eighth matter to which I call attention, in which the junior Senator from Michigan, as I understand had a part in investigating, was the Canol project, which revealed the $146,000,000 cost of the project, and also the inadvisability of the pipe line to Canadian oil fields. The investigation resulted in suspending $7,000,000 actually allocated for further prospecting and exploration.

The ninth item is the matter of the Inter-American Highway. I understand that an investigation revealed the ill-advised project for not merely one highway, but parallel highway systems through Central America, to be constructed at enormous expense, and in the midst of the war effort. Further expenditures on the project were blocked, except upon assurances of closest supervision of the construction and maximum efficiency in maintenance.

The tenth item is the investigation of Hughes Aircraft and Gen. Bennett E. Meyers, concerning which our memories are yet fresh. The investigation revealed irregularities and weaknesses in the aircraft procurement inspection program and the improper wartime activities of General Meyers. As a result of the investigation, the Air Force has revamped its inspection program in procurement; General Meyers was sentenced to prison for subornation of perjury; and the disclosure of the nature of General Meyers' retirement on a disability pension resulted in an overhauling of the Army and Navy retirement systems.

The next item, No. 11, relates to the Arabian-American Oil Co. The investigation revealed overcharges on sales of oil to the Navy in excess of $30,000,000.

Item No. 12: I have referred already, Mr. President, to the investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster. By reason of the vigorous efforts and questioning by the junior Senator from Michigan, the inquiry brought out the most complete record available to the public for an appraisal of responsibility for the disaster; pointed out the paramount need for a candid foreign policy; and pointed out the need for a revised Intelligence Service, which resulted in establishment of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Item No. 13: I come now to a further item in which the junior Senator from Michigan has rendered distinguished service. I refer to a matter with which my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is thoroughly familiar, and as to which he has addressed the Senate on more than one occasion, including the remarks made by him yesterday, on the subject of the Kansas City vote fraud. The preliminary investigation was made by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, in connection with which the junior Senator from Michigan rendered outstanding service.

The fourteenth item to which I call attention relates to export licenses. A preliminary inquiry resulted in freezing licenses for shipping certain heavy machine goods to Russia. Later inquiries revealed frauds and costly inefficiency, which had permitted large-scale exports of such items as nails and soil pipe while they were in critical short supply at home.

Item No. 15: Finally, I call attention to the loyalty program. This investigation centered about the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley, a confessed Russian spy, that there had been a Communist espionage ring in Government circles. The question of whether the Government's loyalty program was working to rid Government of subversive elements was tested by the case of William W. Remington. He had held a series of important governmental positions while under surveillance by the FBI and a Federal grand jury for subversive activities. The inquiry into the Remington case was blocked by a presidential directive which withheld key Government files, but the Ferguson committee was able to make a report recommending certain invaluable improvements in the loyalty program.

Therefore, Mr. President, I very respectfully call the attention of the Vice President and of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the outstanding nature of the qualifications of this one member of the Committee on the Judiciary, namely, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I trust it will not be considered inappropriate or in any sense offensive that this comment has come from the floor of the Senate with respect to our distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, in conclusion I take the position, first, that I am strongly in favor of the Committee on the Judiciary resolution, Senate Resolution 202, submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on January 5, 1950, now on the calendar of the Senate. I am in favor of it with the two amendments indicated, namely, to strike out the limitation of time within which the report of the committee shall be filed, and also to increase the amount of the expense allowance to $100,000. I am in favor of it. I hope we can secure action on it. I realize that at the moment we are talking under the head of the ECA program. But to my mind it is of highest importance that at a very early moment there be action taken affirmatively upon Senate Resolution 202, the resolution of the Committee on the Judiciary, which provides that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of activities of organized crime, the effects thereof, and so forth, of questions as to whether or not organized crime is utilizing interstate facilities, or otherwise operating in interstate commerce, for the development of corrupt influences, in violation of the laws of the United States or the laws of any State.

Mr. President, I am equally opposed to the Kefauver substitute—not to the original document—submitted by the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Tennessee did not propose, independently of the action of the Democratic Policy Committee, any such proposition as is now before us in the substitute.

I am opposed to the program which the Democratic Policy Committee has brought forth as a compromise to meet a situation which does not exist, namely, the danger of two duplicating investigations under the two resolutions, Senate Resolution 202 and Senate Resolution 249. Mr. President, the danger does not exist. We have not adopted Senate Resolution 249, and there is no obligation on us requiring us to do so.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the special committee on the general proposition, first, that there is no need to bypass standing committees; that the standing committees, with their power of subpena, their investigatory power, their ability to exercise a high degree of watchfulness, and with all the facilities of a staff, members of which are chosen solely on the ground of merit, and without regard to political considerations, are amply able to conduct such an investigation as is proposed. The standing committees are able to do all that it is sought here to have the special committee do. Therefore, Mr. President, there is no need to bypass the standing committees.

In the second place, I oppose the Kefauver substitute because the special committee would violate the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act. To substantiate that contention, I have produced before the Senate this afternoon witness after witness of undeniable ability and undeniable knowledge, headed up, I may say, by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as to his views respecting the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act; in the case of the senior Senator from Illinois not only as to the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but as to the sound reason which existed even before the Reorganization Act was passed.

Then, Mr. President, I have pointed out that a special committee would not be subject to the discipline to which a standing committee would be subject.

I have pointed out the lack of efficiency of a special committee.

I have pointed out the precedent which the appointment of such a special committee would constitute; and in that connection I have referred to the fact, as was so picturesquely stated by the Senator from Oregon, that it might very well result in a rash of other special investigating committees.

Mr. President, with all these reasons opposed to the appointment of the proposed special committee—the fact that the Senate itself has found it inadvisable to have special committees, and has only two special committees at this time, so far as I know, namely, one to be in charge of the reconstruction of the roof of this Chamber, and the other the Special Committee on Small Business, a subject comprising such vast and comprehensive problems that obviously they cannot be handled by even two committees—it is of the highest importance, from the standpoint of principle and precedent in the Senate, that we should not appoint the proposed special committee.

Mr. President, I shall close my discussion of the proposed special committee by referring to a further fact which exists in this specific, instant case; namely, that if the proposal for the appointment of the special committee is adopted, the general public obviously will be inclined to feel that the writer of the article in Newsweek is correct, that David Lawrence is correct, that the Washington Post is correct, that the numerous other newspaper writers are correct, when they say that the appointment of the proposed special committee will create on the part of the public a suspicion with respect to the sincerity of the inquiry.

I realize the integrity of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. He is a valued friend of mine. We belong to an organization in which both of us take great pride; I refer to the Kappa Sigma fraternity. I think I may say with reasonable accuracy that we are close friends. I have great confidence in him.

On the other hand, we do not want to handicap him, if he is to be the chairman of the special committee—and I think it is safe to say that he will be, if it is appointed—by creating in the mind of the public the belief that the special committee is created in order to whitewash the investigation and in order to keep off the committee making the investigation a Senator who has demonstrated conspicuous investigative ability; namely, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

So, Mr. President, with the request that the President of the Senate and my colleagues in the Senate will pardon me for the length of time I have consumed, I strongly advocate, first, the adoption of Senate Resolution 202 with the amendments I have advocated; and with equal strength I oppose the adoption of the Kefauver amendment in the nature of a substitute.

EXHIBIT 1

[S. Rept. No. 1317]

INTERSTATE GAMBLING

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 202) authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities and of the manner in which the facilities of interstate commerce are made a vehicle of organized crime, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, with amendments, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

AMENDMENTS

1. On page 1, beginning with line 4, strike out all down to and including the period on line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations by which such utilization is being made, what facilities are being used, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of law of the United States or of the laws of any State: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained herein shall authorize (1) the recommendation of any change in the laws of the several States relative to gambling, or (2) any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders. For the purpose of this resolution, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States."

2. On page 2, line 3, strike out the figures "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$100,000."

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

The purpose of amendment No. 1 is twofold. First, it is intended to define more clearly the intent of the resolution and to make it clear that the investigation authorized hereunder may go into fields other than gambling. Second, it is the view of the committee that the investigation herein authorized should not be conducted for the purpose of passing on the merits or lack of merits of gambling and should not be used for the purpose of interfering with the rights of the several States to prohibit or legalize gambling within the borders of such States.

Amendment No. 2 is designed to provide for an amount which the committee believe is the minimum necessary to conduct the proposed legislation in a suitable and proper manner.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed resolution, as amended, is to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and investigation of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations by which such utilization is being made, what facilities are being used, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of law of the United States or of the laws of any State, subject to the proviso that "nothing contained herein shall authorize (1) the recommendation of any change in the laws of the several States relative to gambling, or (2) any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders."

For the purpose of the resolution, the term "State" is to include the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States. The resolution would instruct the committee to report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, and would authorize the employment, upon a temporary basis, of such technical, clerical, and other assistants as the committee deems advisable.

The expenses of the committee under the resolution, as amended, would be limited to $100,000.

STATEMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 202, as amended) is based largely on averments contained in various newspaper articles, editorials, magazine articles, and material from crime commissions. Such averments indicate to the committee that it is desirable that the authority and direction specified in Senate Resolution 202, as amended, be respectively granted and issued.

It is to be noted that the subsequent material herein set forth deals primarily with organized gambling of an interstate character, but, there is also mentioned prostitution, narcotics, loan-shark rackets, swindling schemes, organized murder, and extortion rackets, plying upon legitimate business and labor in many different fields. The committee is of the opinion that although, as stated before, the subsequent articles deal primarily with gambling of an interstate character, there is reason to believe that interstate commerce may be used in furtherance of other organized criminal activities, and for that reason the committee believe that the resolution, as amended, should include not only gambling of an illegal nature, but any other criminal activity participated in through the use of interstate commerce.

The second progress report of the Special Crime Study Commission on Organized Crime of the State of California, on page 8, states as follows:

"It seems necessary, even in a progress report, to include at least a brief explanation of what the commission considers is embraced within the term 'organized crime.' Without such a startling point the whole direction of the commission's investigations and activities, and the reasons and basis for the commission's findings and recommendations remain obscure.

"Simply stated, organized crime is what the term implies. It is the activity of a group of persons working together for the express purpose of more effectively accomplishing criminal acts against society. By organizing, criminals are able to secure greater immunity from the law, a wider field for operations, monopolistic control over specific types of criminal activity, and of course, greater profits. The emergence and development during the past 20 years of criminal syndicates extending throughout our entire country is recognized by criminologists as the most prominent, the most threatening, and the least understood feature of our national crime problem.

"The problem of organized crime in California cannot be considered separately from the national problem. The central feature is the spread of national criminal organizations and syndicates into California. Unless the general outlines of the picture of nationally organized crime are understood, it is impossible to detect the presence, activities, and methods of the most menacing criminal organizations in our State.

"The great and dangerous criminals of today are not the publicized desperadoes of the newspapers, magazines, and radio, such as John Dillinger. 'Baby Face' Nelson, and 'Machine Gun' Kelley. The great and truly dangerous criminals of the present are the directing heads of the syndicates in control of bookmaking, slot machines, organized gambling, prostitution, narcotics, the loan-shark racket, swindling schemes, organized murder, and the host of extortionate rackets plying upon legitimate business and labor in many different fields—men who are almost unknown to the public and whose names never appear currently on any police blotters. Criminals of this latter type are

always difficult to identify. An inevitable effect of organization is to clothe the activities and participation of the leaders in secrecy. The directors and master minds of organized crime are seldom apprehended or arrested. They live peacefully and luxuriantly, enjoying a full sense of security, and with complete confidence that they will not be disturbed in their criminal activities. Their only real fear is concerned with the ambitions and competition of rival mobsters."

The Federal Government through the Office of the Attorney General of the United States has also interested itself in the subject, as is indicated in an article from the San Francisco Chronicle, dated January 11, 1950, which in part states as follows:

"McGrath announced that the annual United States Attorneys' Conference on February 16 will be attended by four groups representing local authorities active in the drive against bookies, numbers operators, slot-machine kings, and other law violators who operate across State lines."

The committee believe that there is need for the investigation and report as proposed, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be reported favorably.

EXHIBIT 2

[S. Rept. No. 1367]

INVESTIGATING INTERSTATE GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities, having considered the same, report it favorably to the Senate with additional amendments and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be adopted.

Two changes have been ordered in the resolution by this committee. The first cuts back the amount to be spent on the investigation to the original sum of $50,000. The second requires that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, shall report back to the Senate on its findings, together with such legislation as it feels advisable to recommend, on or before July 31, 1950. The scope of the investigation remains unchanged.

The proposals of the inquiry, as outlined by the Committee on the Judiciary, will seek to establish the following:

1. The adequacy and effectiveness of present Federal statutes relative to crimes involving interstate commerce.

2. The extensiveness of the use of interstate commerce which result in the violation of the laws of the several States.

3. The extent to which organized crime may corrupt the governing bodies in the Nation.

4. The extent to which, if any, syndicates engaged in organized crime may control the facilities of interstate commerce.

5. The extent to which the use of the facilities of interstate commerce by organized crime may tend to obstruct local authorities in the enforcement of local criminal statutes.

A proposed budget submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary in the amount of $100,000 is included here for the information of the Senate:

Travel expenses (committee members and staff)	$6,000.00
Salaries:	
1 staff director at $10,346.83	10,346.83
6 staff members at average salary of $7,581.75	45,490.54
3 stenographers at $3,980.59	11,941.77
Consultants on per diem basis	4,000.00
Reporters (cost of transcript)	8,500.00
Per diem and other expenses	7,968.96
Fees and expenses of witnesses	1,000.00
General expenses	4,751.90

An explanation of the items of its budget by the Committee on the Judiciary follows:

Item 1 for travel expenses is intended to cover the expenses of committee members and the travel expenses of the staff. It would seem reasonable that in an investigation of this nature the investigators should conduct their work in teams of two together with an official reporter. The figure contemplates three such teams to be in the field for approximately 6 months.

As to item 2, staff, six staff members are grouped at an average salary of $7,581.75. The six staff members should include one lawyer at $8,024.17, one accountant or statistician at the same figure, and four field investigators at $7,360.55. The foregoing presents a minimum for it is anticipated that the committee will need for its staff a variety of skills and professions: lawyers, statisticians, investigators, and experts in the criminal fields. In order to accomplish the intent of the resolution, it is believed that careful selection of staff members will make it possible to secure in one person two or more of the qualifications needed. Three stenographers at a figure of $3,980.59 will be required.

Item 3, consultants on per diem basis, is included with the intention to permit the employment of specialists for short periods of time as the needs of the committee may require and will also cover part-time service of consultants who could not be employed on a full-time basis, should such consultation be advisable or necessary.

Item 4, reporters' cost of transcript, is intended to cover both anticipated hearings in Washington and in the field and also various needed conferences between the investigating teams on the one hand and State and local officials and members of the staff on the other.

Item 5, per diem and other expenses, is intended to include per diem in lieu of subsistence for four investigators and two reporters who will constitute two investigating teams expected to be in the field for the 6 months' period. This makes a total of $7,968.96. This item would also include the sum of $500 for shipment of baggage and records. Nothing in this item shall be taken to indicate that there will be a deficiency since the primary work of the investigating teams should be accomplished within the 6 months' period and the balance of their time occupied in Washington for the purpose of assembling and evaluating the results of the field work.

Item 6, fees and expenses of witnesses, is a minimum and probably would not cover all of the expenses for witnesses should the witnesses called before the committee demand fees and transportation expenses. For the reason that past investigations have indicated many witnesses prefer not to make this demand, it is hoped that the expenditures under this allowance can be kept within the budget figures.

Item 7, general expenses, is intended to include costs of telephone, telegraph, newspaper, clipping service, photostating, and all other expenses not otherwise itemized.

EXHIBIT 3

RULES OF COMMITTEE PROCEDURE FOR THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Rule 1. Five members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of such business as may be considered at any regular or special meeting of the committee,[1] subject, however, to the provisions of section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.[4] No member of the committee shall for the purpose of determining the existence of a quorum of the committee be deemed to be present unless he be personally present.

Rule 2. Unless otherwise ordered and notice is given, the committee shall meet regularly for the transaction of its business on Monday of each week while the Senate is in session at 10 a. m., and additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary.[2]

Rule 3. The committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.[3]

Rule 4. No vote cast in the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, by proxy shall be counted.[4]

Rule 5. It shall be the duty of the chairman to report or cause to be reported promptly to the Senate any measure or recommendation approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.[5]

Rule 6. The committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 24 hours before hearing, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument. The committee staff shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.[6]

Rule 7. All hearings conducted by the committee, or its subcommittees, shall be open to the public, except (1) executive sessions for marking up bills, or (2) for voting, or (3) where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.[7]

Rule 8. Whenever a nomination for an appointment to the office of judge of any Federal Court is referred to the committee, the nomination shall be referred to a subcommittee to be composed of at least three members to be selected by the chairman of the committee within 3 days after such reference to the committee.

It shall be the duty of the subcommittee to which the nomination is referred to fix a date, which shall not be less than 7 days after the date of such nomination is referred to such subcommittee, on which all interested parties shall have an opportunity to be heard with respect to the nomination, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a notice to that effect as soon as such date has been determined by the subcommittee, and to notify both Senators of the State of which the nominee is a resident.

No such subcommittee shall make its report to the full committee with respect to any such nomination until the date so fixed has expired.[8]

---

[1] In Senate rule XXV, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (hereinafter referred to as "the act"), paragraph 3 thereof (last paragraph so designated) provides that each standing committee may "fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum."

[2] Section 133 (a) of the act requires each standing committee to "fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business before the committee," and provides that "additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary."

[3] This is essentially the text of section 13 (b) of the act.

[4] Section 133 (d) of the act provides: "No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such (standing) committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present."

[5] This is, essentially, the text of section 133 (c) of the act.

[6] This is, essentially, the text of section 133 (e).

[7] This is, essentially, the text of section 133 (f).

[8] Rule 8 is, essentially, the text of the predecessor committee's rule No. 1, adopted February 17, 1941.

Rule 9. Whenever a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall be reported to the whole committee by a subcommittee, there shall be placed before the whole committee a print of the statute to be amended or the part thereof to be repealed (together with the citation thereof), showing by stricken-through type the portion or parts to be omitted, and in italics the matter proposed to be added.[9]

Rule 10. The chairman shall name subcommittees to which a bill, resolution, or nomination may be referred, and so far as is practicable, a subcommittee shall consist of not less than three members, one of which shall be of the minority, and if the subcommittee consists of five members, two shall be of the minority.

Rule 11. Whenever a subcommittee delays in reporting more than 30 days (except when time is extended by committee), the matter may be withdrawn by the chairman and submitted to another subcommittee.

Rule 12. The chairman of the committee shall be ex officio a member of all subcommittees with full right to participate in all proceedings thereof, but shall not vote as a member of any subcommittee unless duly appointed a member thereof.

Rule 13. Any member of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall have the right to have included in any report of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, a statement of how he would have voted on the matter or matters involved if he had been present.

Rule 14. Subject to statutory requirements imposed on the committee with respect to its procedure, the rules of the committee may be changed or suspended at any time: *Provided, however,* That not less than two-thirds of the entire membership so determine, at a regular meeting with notice of the nature of the change proposed, or meeting called for that purpose.

Rule 15. Whenever there shall be referred to the committee a bill providing for the payment of a claim against the United States based on either tort or contract, the committee may report to the Senate an original resolution referring such claim to the Court of Claims pursuant to the provision of 28 U. S. C. 257: *Provided,* That two or more such claims may be made the subject of a single resolution.[10]

RESOLUTION

Resolved by the Committee on the Judiciary, That, pursuant to subsection (3) of rule XXV, as amended, of the Standing Rules of the Senate (S. Res. 180, 81st Cong., 2d sess., agreed to February 1, 1950) a quorum of the committee for the purpose of taking sworn testimony shall consist of one Senator of said committee. (Adopted February 27, 1950.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin, and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor;

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Avner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is Senate bill 3304, to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; and the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I propose to offer to the pending ECA authorization bill an amendment which will reduce its over-all total in the amount of $500,000,000. This will be the first time that I shall have voted to cut an ECA authorization. I wish to explain briefly why I intend to do so.

First of all, in this action I am impelled by the urgent need for economy. I do not need to enlarge upon that subject. We face a budgetary deficit, this year, which various authorities have estimated will be between $5,500,000,000 and $8,000,000,000, and an even larger budgetary deficit next year.

Of course in this instance we cannot afford to make a cut which will endanger foreign policy vital to the security of the United States. But I believe that the foreign policy presented by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 will be promoted rather than impaired if the Congress indicates by something more than words our dissatisfaction with the lack of progress in the effectuation of that policy as it is set out in the act.

In its first phase, the European recovery program was essentially a relief operation. That phase has now been passed. Productivity in most of the ECA countries equals or exceeds that of the prewar period. This accomplishment represents a gigantic and praiseworthy effort by the peoples concerned.

But this accomplishment is not good enough, for the ECA countries must do something to compensate for the prewar trade now cut off by the Iron Curtain and for the loss of former colonies. Section 102 (a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 sets up as the goal among the ECA countries the establishment of "a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers." This section further declares it to be the policy of the United States that "continuity of assistance provided by the United States should, at all times, be dependent upon continuity of cooperation among countries participating in the program." Furthermore, last year the Congress added to this 1948 policy the further declaration that it is "the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification of Europe."

Despite the vigorous efforts of the able Administrator, Paul Hoffman, little progress has been made in effectuating this declared policy of the act. There is danger that we shall subsidize a continuance of the conditions which spell continuing weakness and necessitate continuing relief that we can ill afford, in the light of domestic needs, civil and military, and in the light of the compelling need of organizing a far-eastern policy.

If we reduce the present authorization as proposed, the European countries concerned can more than make up the difference in economic health by arrangements among themselves, so that the surpluses of each, industrial and agricultural, which today are accumulating, can be exchanged among themselves for mutual benefit, instead of being dumped in the United States or causing local unemployment.

If further assistance during the coming fiscal year should prove absolutely necessary, a further authorization and appropriation can always be made.

In conclusion, let me make perfectly clear that I wholly approve of the European recovery program. I believe that, despite shortcomings, it has been worth all and more than the effort and sacrifice it has cost us to date. But I believe that both we and the free peoples of Europe can get out of it more permanent and lasting results if the Congress shows its concern to assure that this program will have the permanent benefits that were anticipated in the congressional declaration of policy.

I trust that if the Congress in its wisdom should decide thus to curtail this particular ECA authorization, the Secretary of State will effectively carry this viewpoint to the forthcoming meetings of the foreign ministers at London.

Mr. President, in closing, and at this point in my remarks, I submit the amendment to which I have previously referred, which strikes out the authorization figure of $2,950,000,000, and substitute in lieu thereof $2,450,000,000. I submit the amendment on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Ellender
Anderson	Cordon	Ferguson
Benton	Darby	Flanders
Brewster	Donnell	Frear
Bricker	Douglas	Fulbright
Butler	Eastland	George
Byrd	Ecton	Green

[9] This is the verbatim text of rule No. 3 of the predecessor committee, adopted November 3, 1941.

[10] Adopted April 12, 1948.

Gurney	Leahy	O'Conor
Hayden	Lehman	Robertson
Hendrickson	Lodge	Russell
Hickenlooper	Lucas	Saltonstall
Hoey	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Holland	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Humphrey	McFarland	Stennis
Hunt	McKellar	Taft
Ives	McMahon	Taylor
Jenner	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	Malone	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Martin	Tobey
Kefauver	Maybank	Tydings
Kem	Millikin	Wherry
Kerr	Mundt	Wiley
Kilgore	Myers	Williams
Knowland	Neely	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Congress has created a Frankenstein's monster called ECA, which, unless restrained and controlled, threatens to destroy us. Money taken away from the American taxpayers has been sent to Europe by the billions of dollars. It is now proposed that we send over more billions—money which we have not yet taken away from our taxpayers. It is also suggested that untold billions are to be collected from our taxpayers over years to come to finance extentions of ECA. This can crush us. To safeguard the United States of America—and that is what the junior Senator from Nevada is interested in—I have introduced four amendments to the ECA appropriations bill which would set up conditions for further aid to any Marshall-plan country. These amendments would require each participating country to agree—

First. That any further aid from the United States would be loaned to private business through the World Bank, in line with RFC loans to private business in this country; it is estimated that if loans were made to private industry, the amount needed would be less than 30 percent of the amount we are asked to appropriate.

Second. That it will guarantee the integrity of private investments within its borders against socialization, nationalization, or confiscation, as we protect private investments in this country;

Third. That it will join in a concerted effort with the participating countries to form a United States of Europe, including Germany, similar to the United States of America;

Fourth. To eliminate any currency manipulation which prevents its currency from reflecting its actual purchasing power in terms of the United States dollar on the free monetary markets of the world.

In addition to my four amendments, I am supporting the amendment introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri which would stop our present policy of supplying many kinds of machinery and equipment and parts together with funds to process and manufacture products to countries which ship such materials on to Russia. This provision was originally made in Senate Joint Resolution 151, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada on January 24, 1950.

The ECA is part of the defunct foreign policy of the Democratic administration. The United Nations Secretariat recently reported that notwithstanding the billions of dollars poured into Europe by us, Europe's economic problem is not solved and the solution is not in sight. Our taxpayers' money has accomplished one result: The renewal of hundred-year-old feuds among the countries of Europe.

Now we are handed an ECA appropriation bill and told: "This is it. This is what the experts demand." On another occasion I am going to discuss the background of these so-called experts. Most of them could not hold comparable jobs outside Government service.

Are we going to fall for the administration's false propaganda again?

Do you remember that when the ECA was first being foisted upon our unsuspecting taxpayers, we were told that by helping Europe recover we would establish European markets for American products? That is conveniently forgotten now, and we are told that "buy European" is the new slogan, that when unemployment hits us, as a result, they will teach our workers new jobs and put them on relief.

The current propaganda is to the effect that, if Congress does not provide continuous ECA appropriations for the European nations to buy our goods, we face a depression in this country. There is nothing economically sound in such reasoning. If it is offered by well-meaning persons, the best that can be said is that it is childish. One wonders what childish reasoning they will offer us next. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that there is design back of such a statement. Congress should be on guard against scare-headings designed to force us into unwise legislation. It is much nearer the truth to say that if we do not stop this give-away show we face a depression from which we can never recover. If we do not destroy this Frankenstein's monster it will destroy us.

INVESTIGATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have talked to Members of the Senate who are very much interested in Senate Resolution 202, the resolution to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities. I do not see the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] present, but I am sure he will not object to a unanimous-consent agreement to lay aside for a moment or two the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and to proceed to the consideration of the resolution, Senate Resolution 202.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 202, and amendments thereto, at 4:15 this afternoon, the time until then to be equally divided between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois that, at 4:15, a vote be had upon the pending resolution (S. Res. 202) and amendments thereto, and that the time from now until then be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the situation, before the resolution which came from the Judiciary Committee is voted on, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Tennessee has already offered his substitute, has he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been offered technically. It has been read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. An amendment then, to the Kefauver amendment in the nature of a substitute would be in order, when it is before the Senate. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be subject to amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, since we have arrived at a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Senate Resolution 202 at 4:15 p. m., the opposition to the substitute has approximately 12½ minutes. I shall take but a little of that time.

There are two questions confronting us: First, should such an investigation as is here proposed be made? The Senator from Tennessee has very ably set forth the need for an investigation into the question of whether organized crime has spread itself across State lines and into interstate channels. On that question, there seems to be no dispute. I think the American public is alarmed by reports of the growth of criminal syndicates, and I think there is ample reason to ask whether there should be Federal law to cope with a situation which those reports would indicate does exist. I think we can take for granted, Mr. President, the fact that the investigation should be made, and that there is no issue on that question.

The next question is: Who should make the investigation?

It was the opinion of the Judiciary Committee that, under the Reorganization Act, it had jurisdiction of all judicial proceedings, civil and criminal gen-

erally. The Reorganization Act states that the committee shall consist of 13 members, "to which committee shall be referred all proposals, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to judicial questions." Certainly "other matters" would include investigations relating to judicial proceedings, civil and criminal generally, including the adequacy of present law.

The subject matter of this resolution very clearly falls within that category. It is true that the Federal Government, generally speaking, has jurisdiction in criminal matters only when the crime involves a crossing of State lines or the use of interstate facilities. That fact, however, does not remove the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee over such criminal proceedings. Nor should it bestow jurisdiction upon the committee which is concerned with facilities of interstate communication and commerce in such a general investigation, nor should it diminish in any degree the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

But what has happened since the Judiciary Committee, with the endorsement of the Committee on Rules and Administration, made its report according to the rule, calling for this investigation?

Mr. President, instead of acting on the resolution which is now before the Senate, the requirement of the Senate majority, dictated by its policy committee, is that we now substitute a new resolution which creates a separate and distinct special committee.

The effect is not only to bypass the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, established by the Reorganization Act. The substitute resolution has not, under the rule, been sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration to determine the amount of money necessary. The entire result, Mr. President, is very irregular.

Let me invite attention to the wording of the substitute resolution, as contained in the last section:

> SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than February 28, 1951, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable. All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on March 31, 1951.

This is more than a special committee, of the sort that was to be banned by the Reorganization Act. It is a committee which can recommend legislation. It is given not only the investigative authority of the Judiciary Committee, but its legislative powers as well.

Yet we are to place in the executive branch of the Government—the Vice President of the United States—the right to select a standing committee, to all intents and purposes. The substitute resolution does not even require that the Vice President follow the suggestion of the minority in the selection of personnel. I say, Mr. President, to all the Members of the Senate, that if we are going to have a two-party system, if we are ever going to have government which is bipartisan, we had better have it in relation to an investigation as to what kind of criminal laws we need in the United States of America.

What is partisan about an investigation as to what criminal laws should be passed by the United States Senate? Yet we have the policy committee of the majority party saying that they shall name five members of a special committee to investigate the situation as to what criminal laws are needed and should be passed.

Mr. President, this would not be an easy investigation to undertake. It will demand experience. We have had an example of what happens when we call before a committee those who operate criminal syndicates in the United States without first thoroughly preparing what may be required to be done and what may be asked of them, in order, if they do not tell the truth, that foundation may be laid for a charge of perjury. We have had an example of what these men might do to public opinion and what they might do to the opinion of the Senate of the United States if a case were not properly investigated. That is why I hope the Senate will not take from the Committee on the Judiciary, a committee which has had an honorable history in the Senate, which has jurisdiction in all judicial procedure, the criminal code and the criminal law, which is composed of lawyers, many of whom are former judges, the right to investigate the question of passing criminal laws.

Mr. President, I could argue on this subject for a long time, there are elements of high principle involved. I earnestly believe the problem is one which the Committee on the Judiciary should investigate. It is a matter which should not be placed in the hands of the executive branch of the Government through the Vice President. We should not place in the hands of the executive branch the right to determine membership on legislative committees in the Senate. We should not violate the spirit of the Reorganization Act by taking jurisdiction away from a qualified standing committee.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the substitute and ask unanimous consent that it be read by the clerk. I understand that it is not in order to offer it at this time, but I wish to make a few remarks on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, at the end of line 17, of the so-called Kefauver substitute, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Two members of such special committee shall be appointed from among the minority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary on the nomination of the minority floor leader of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in case the substitute should be adopted, I have submitted the amendment for two reasons. The first reason is that while two Republicans should be on a committee consisting of five members, perhaps not one Republican would be appointed. The appointment of Republican members of the committee is left entirely in the discretion of the Presiding Officer. In fact, so far as I can see, there is no requirement that he appoint any Republicans. Recently we had a proposal to appoint members of a Special Committee on Small Business. At that time the Presiding Officer determined that there should be eight Democrats and five Republicans on the committee. It seems to me that if the proposed committee is to be a committee of only five members, there should be at least two Republicans on it.

In the second place, my amendment proposes that the Republican members of the committee be appointed on the nomination of the minority leader.

I realize that there were certain special circumstances involved in the appointment of the members of the Special Committee on Small Business. I do not know about the majority members of the committee, but the fact is that so far as the minority members were concerned the Presiding Officer undertook to appoint them and did appoint them without any consultation whatsoever with the minority floor leader or the minority policy committee. The appointment of minority members of regular standing committees has always been upon the nomination of the minority floor leader. There has never been any question that the majority has always permitted the minority to choose its own members on committees. That was the practice ever since I have been a Member of the Senate until the appointment of the members of the Special Committee on Small Business, when that practice was ignored. I have said that I thought probably there were special circumstances which might have justified such procedure at that time. However, I think it would be exceedingly unfortunate to proceed to make it the permanent policy of the Senate. Therefore, I have submitted an amendment which would provide, first, that there shall be two minority members of the committee, consisting of five members, and, second, that the minority members shall be appointed upon the nomination of the minority floor leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I think that an examination of Senate precedents will show that similar resolutions have been adopted which gave the presiding officer power to appoint members of a special committee.

I do not have any particular objection to one phase of the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio, and that is with respect to the suggestion that two Republicans be appointed on the committee. However, I do object to the other part of the suggestion. In other words, it is the theory of the minority that the Vice President will not be fair in the appointment of a committee of five. There is no man in public life in the United States today who enjoys greater respect and who has a higher reputation for integrity and honor than the Vice President of the United States. A suggestion that the Vice President would not be fair and just in the appointment of

a committee of this kind does not square with the background of the distinguished Vice President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not have the time to yield.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is a strange thing that it is the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who should seek to defeat the so-called Kefauver substitute. Why is that? The Senator from Michigan has been talking about the Committee on the Judiciary. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. MCCARRAN] has definitely agreed to the proposed arrangement. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the author of the resolution in the first instance, has agreed to the arrangement. Therefore the two members of the Committee on the Judiciary who are most interested in the resolution, along with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the chairman of the subcommittee which has been handling matters of this kind for that committee, have agreed that this is the proper procedure to be followed.

Why is it, Mr. President, that certain Senators on the Republican side of the aisle are practically demanding to be appointed to this committee? I know the reason, and the Senate knows. It is the first time in my experience that Senators almost demand they be put on a committee charged with conducting an investigation. I do not know what the Vice President of the United States would do with respect to the appointment of the committee. However, whomever he appoints—and I know he will appoint two Republicans and three Democrats, because that is the way it should be—will be men who enjoy the respect of the people of the country and the people of their respective States, and who will do a thorough and convincing job so far as investigating crime syndicates is concerned.

Mr. President, other Senators are capable of conducting investigations, and certain Senators do not have a monopoly on ability to make investigations simply because they came to the Senate with reputations of having been successful investigators.

The Vice President may decide to appoint the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. TOBEY], or other Senators who are members of the two committees concerned. Whomever the Vice President appoints certainly will be satisfactory to the majority, and they should be satisfactory to the minority. However, Mr. President, the minority wants to place its special Senators on the committee. They want that power. In the Eightieth Congress, I remember whenever there was a time the minority wanted something, they got nothing. In the Eightieth Congress, so far as any suggestions were concerned as to what the majority should do, the minority received no consideration at all. The provision for the appointment of the committee as it now stands in the resolution is in line with precedents, it is in line with what was done in the case of the Pearl Harbor investigation, when the then Vice President appointed a special committee.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be voted down. I rely upon the Vice President of the United States to appoint to the committee Senators who will make the kind of investigation which the resolution demands. I want the Senate to understand that the Senator from Illinois is in favor of the Kefauver substitute. I want the committee to have the money that is necessary to make the proper kind of an investigation. I want it to have the kind of investigators who are necessary, and I want it to be surrounded by the kind of personnel who will do a job which will add dignity and prestige to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not want a fishing expedition. I want an honest-to-God investigation, without any politics involved, and let the chips fall where they may—not the kind of an investigation we have seen around here in the Senate at different times in the past.

Mr. President, that is all the Senator from Illinois desires to say. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, in the brief time the Senator has yielded to me, I do not intend to comment on the personnel of the proposed committee. I am moved to speak only to express the hope that we may have a full and complete investigation of any interstate facilities which may be used for criminal enterprises.

I have a rather vivid recollection of committees in the early 1930's, when investigations by the Congress brought to the attention of the country the need for legislation, which was enacted into law, and which undoubtedly did tremendous good in preventing and stopping kidnapings, bank robberies, the transportation of stolen automobiles, and other criminal activities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me another half minute?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who is yielding to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MCMAHON. Did not the Senator from Illinois yield me time?

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair announced that the time had expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois, in my time, whether he knows of any instance in the Eightieth Congress when the Presiding Officer, who was then a Republican, did not give the minority the opportunity to appoint their own members on every committee.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Ohio is talking about standing committees, yes.

Mr. TAFT. Or special committees.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as special committees are concerned, I do not know; I cannot answer the question at all. But I know what the precedent has been in the past, and I know what the leadership in the Eightieth Congress did to the minority many times with respect to courtesies of this kind. We got the little end of nothing whittled down to a fine point.

Mr. TAFT. I appeal to the majority for the protection of the minority. I say the minority should have the right to appoint their own members, not only to standing committees, but also special committees. In my experience in the Senate for 12 years, until the time of the appointment of the Small Business Committee recently, the minority had always been consulted, and their recommendations as to the minority members of the committees had been accepted by the appointing officer. I know of no instance in which that practice was not followed, until the case of the Small Business Committee recently, and the action in that case was the only reason why I offered the amendment. In that case the Presiding Officer undertook to appoint the committee, including the minority members of the committee, without consulting the leader of the minority.

What is involved is not a question of personalities. I do not know whom the minority will recommend. They may not recommend either the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Missouri, but I say we have the right, and should have the right, to nominate our members of the committee, that that is a basic principle of two-party Government in the Senate. So I appeal to Senators to see that that right is reaffirmed at this time, and that we do not now establish a precedent by which, when such committees are established, the majority will undertake to select the minority members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the parliamentary situation, the committee amendments to the original resolution must be acted upon before the substitute can be offered.

Mr. DONNELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Will amendments other than the committee amendments to the original resolution be in order immediately after the amendments of the committee are acted on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any amendment to the original resolution would have to be voted upon before the substitute was voted upon, so long as it was not embraced within any committee amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Immediately following action on the committee amendments, will it be in order to send for-

ward an amendment to the original resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks so. Even if the substitute be offered, it would seem to be in order to amend the original resolution, and such amendments would have to be acted upon.

The Chair would ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment, in view of the statement of the Senator from Ohio about the appointment of the Small Business Committee.

The resolution under which that committee was appointed authorized the Chair to make the appointments. As soon as the resolution was adopted, the Chair stated to the majority leader and to the minority leader that he accepted full responsibility for that committee, that it was a duty imposed upon him by the Senate, that he did not seek it, but that he would do the best he could to select a good committee, that either of the gentlemen might submit a list, if he desired, but that the Chair would not obligate himself to appoint any of them or all of them.

The majority leader did not submit any list at all. The minority leader did submit a list, and two of the five minority members were chosen from that list. The Chair made the committee eight Democrats and five Republicans, because that is the ratio of all the committees of the Senate at this time.

The Chair accepted full responsibility for that committee. The Chair thinks the Senate intended that he should do so, he did appoint the committee, and he is satisfied with what he did in that regard.

The question now is upon the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the statement the distinguished President has made about the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief observation in reply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Of 1 minute?

Mr. WHERRY. I will make the statement just as fast as I can.

Mr. TYDINGS. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. WHERRY. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. May we have the amendment stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the committee amendment ought to be stated, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 4, it is proposed to strike out "of interstate gambling and racketeering activities and of the manner in which the facilities of interstate commerce are made a vehicle of organized crime" and to insert "of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations by which such utilization is being made, what facilities are being used, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of law of the United States or of the laws of any State: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained herein shall authorize (1) the recommendation of any change in the laws of the several States relative to gambling, or (2) any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders. For the purpose of this resolution, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As many as favor the amendment will rise and stand until counted. [After a pause.] Those who oppose the amendment will rise and stand until counted. [After a pause.] The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think there is a misunderstanding about what amendment was voted on. Is it the one about the date of making the report, on page 2, line 18?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, the Chair is advised that is not the amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I voted against the way I desired to vote, because I thought we were voting on the date, on page 2, line 18. I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote, because I think the first committee amendment should be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment of the committee to the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Was that the announcement of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced that it was agreed to. The question now is on the second amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the word "date", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "but not later than July 31, 1950."

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$50,000" "$100,000" and insert "$50,000".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that, for the information of the Senate, he should state that when the resolution was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary it provided for $100,000. It was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and as reported from that committee the $100,000 was cut to $50,000, which is the amount contained in the original resolution. So that in order to vote intelligently on the amendment, which represents the difference between $50,000 and $100,000, the Chair is of the opinion that the vote would come on the amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary, which substituted $100,000 for the original $50,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the vote is "no" on the amendment, then the $100,000 is restored, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The Chair does not think so. There are two amendments here, one by the Committee on the Judiciary and one by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. If it is not an increase of $50,000, why vote on it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in the resolution. That is the only reason.

Mr. WHERRY. That is why I asked the question. It seems to me that a vote "no" on the amendment would mean a vote to return to the $100,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair would be permitted to put the question as to whether it should be $50,000 or $100,000, that would simplify the matter. Without objection, the Chair will put the question in that way. As many as favor the amount of $100,000 will say "Aye." Opposed "No." The "ayes" have it, and the $100,000 is agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which has been printed and is on the desks of Members of the Senate for their information. By agreement with the majority leader the substitute has been modified on page 1, line 1, after the words "five members," to insert "two of whom shall be members of the minority party."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee desire the substitute to be read again?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the substitute was read on yesterday, and I do not think it is necessary that it be read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Tennessee, as modified by him, which he has the right to do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which is somewhat repetitive, but I think it can be offered as it is. It will not contradict the other language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, at the end of line 17, it is proposed to insert:

> Two members of such special committee shall be appointed from among the minority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary on the nomination of the minority floor leader of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As many as favor the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business, and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business and is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Ives	Schoeppel
Bricker	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler	Kem	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Thye
Darby	Lodge	Tobey
Donnell	McCarthy	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Mundt	
Hendrickson	Saltonstall	

NAYS—39

Anderson	Holland	McKellar
Benton	Humphrey	McMahon
Byrd	Hunt	Magnuson
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Eastland	Kefauver	Myers
Ellender	Kerr	Neely
Frear	Kilgore	Robertson
Fulbright	Leahy	Russell
George	Lehman	Stennis
Green	Lucas	Taylor
Hayden	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	McFarland	Tydings

NOT VOTING—26

Brewster	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Cain	Hill	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Chapman	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	McCarran	Watkins
Dworshak	Morse	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment to the Kefauver amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. This vote is on the Kefauver amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Okla-

homa [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business and is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—35

Anderson	Humphrey	McMahon
Benton	Hunt	Magnuson
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Ellender	Kefauver	Myers
Frear	Kerr	Neely
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
George	Leahy	Stennis
Green	Lehman	Taylor
Hayden	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	McFarland	Tydings
Holland	McKellar	

NAYS—35

Aiken	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bricker	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Jenner	Schoeppel
Byrd	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Taft
Darby	Lodge	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	McClellan	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—26

Brewster	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Cain	Hill	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Chapman	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	McCarran	Watkins
Dworshak	Morse	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the Constitution, the Vice President, having the right to vote in case of a tie, casts his vote in the affirmative.

So Mr. KEFAUVER's amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Holland	Martin
Anderson	Humphrey	Maybank
Benton	Hunt	Millikin
Bricker	Ives	Mundt
Butler	Jenner	Murray
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Cordon	Kefauver	Robertson
Darby	Kem	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ecton	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Leahy	Stennis
Ferguson	Lehman	Taft
Flanders	Lodge	Taylor
Frear	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Tobey
Green	McFarland	Tydings
Gurney	McKellar	Wherry
Hayden	McMahon	Wiley
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Williams
Hoey	Malone	Young

NAYS—1

Donnell

NOT VOTING—26

Brewster	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Cain	Hill	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Chapman	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	McCarran	Watkins
Dworshak	Morse	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	

So the resolution (S. 202), as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to state that he will defer for a day or two the naming of the committee, but he wishes to announce that when the committee is named it will be in the ratio of three Democrats to two Republicans.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate now reverts to the consideration of the ECA bill, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Under Secretary of State, John E. Peurifoy, released a statement for the press yesterday, which I desire to read into the RECORD at this time, making certain comments as I go along. I read:

MAY 2, 1950.

The State Department has been asked to comment upon Representative FRANK M. KARSTEN'S statement suggesting the possibility that, through deceit and fraud, the American people have been hoodwinked with the assertion that the State Department is saturated with Communists. That is a question which the Senate subcommittee must determine.

However, speaking for the Department of State as the officer in charge of loyalty matters, I can relate the facts:

This whole business started on February 9 when Senator MCCARTHY was making a speech before a Women's Republican Club at Wheeling, W. Va. While he was making that speech, he said:

"I have here in my hand a list of 205 * * * a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department."

When I heard what Senator MCCARTHY had said, I was amazed. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has the authority for investigating to see that only loyal people work in the Department of State. We have our own security organization, headed by Don Nicholson, a former FBI agent, to work with them. Neither the FBI nor our Security Division had told us about one Communist working in the State Department, much less 205. But in this business, we are very careful. On the outside chance that Senator MCCARTHY may have had some information that neither the FBI nor our Security Division had found out, the State Department telegraphed Senator MCCARTHY and asked him to send us the information which he had about these 205 people which he said he had listed as known Communists. We felt that if Senator MCCARTHY was interested in the safety of his country, he would give the FBI and our Security Division their names and any information he had on them. We have waited a long time for him to give us this information. We are still waiting.

On the night of February 20, Senator MCCARTHY made a speech in which he claimed he would back up the charges which he had made against the State Department. He hasn't done so. His 205 had shrunk to 81. They were not all "still working and shaping policy in the State Department" either. Some of the people he mentioned work in the State Department; some of them used to work in the State Department; some of them had never worked in the State Department at all. What's more, the nature of the charges had changed. They weren't "known Communists" any more. From reading Senator MCCARTHY'S speech, we don't yet know just what he thinks they were.

Senator MCCARTHY hasn't backed up even the highly general charges he made on February 20. Over 2 months have passed. A special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been appointed. It is a matter of public record that this committee has asked Senator MCCARTHY many times to supply proof to back up his charges. But as far as the Department can ascertain, the Senator has not yet presented any evidence that even one employee of the State Department is a Communist. The single individual on whom Senator MCCARTHY has concentrated his recent fire is not connected with the Department. As Secretaries Hull, Byrnes, Marshall, and Acheson have publicly attested, he is not and has not been what Senator MCCARTHY called "the chief architect of our far-eastern policy." Finally, there is no shred of truth to the Senator's flat statement——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. My point or order is that under rule 19 of the Senate the Senator from Illinois is out of order.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I can make that point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the right to call the attention of the Senate to any violation of the rules.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois is calling the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] a liar. I think the Senator should take his seat.

Mr. LUCAS. I am reading the press release.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is using it in debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any Senator has the right to call attention to any violation of the rules. If any Senator impugns the motives of a Senator, under the rules, the Senator speaking must take his seat.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have not even finished reading the press release.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not have to finish it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must enforce the rule. No matter whether it is justified or not, when a Senator raises the point of order that the Senator speaking is violating the rules, the Senator speaking must take his seat.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to proceed in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JENNER. I object.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Illinois may be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. TAFT. I make the point of order, and I ask that the exceptionable words be taken down in writing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Official Reporter is instructed to read the words to the point at which the Senator from Illinois was stopped.

The Official Reporter (J. Chester Wilfong) read as follows:

The single individual on whom Senator MCCARTHY has concentrated his recent fire is not connected with the Department. As Secretaries Hull, Byrnes, Marshall, and Acheson have publicly attested, he is not and has not been what Senator MCCARTHY called "the chief architect of our far-eastern policy." Finally, there is no shred of truth to the Senator's flat statement——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the vote determine whether the Senator from Illinois is in order, or whether he should proceed in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Whether he should proceed in order. The motion is not debatable. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seems to have it, the "ayes" have it. The Senator from Illinois may proceed in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to read this statement and then let some Senator again make a point of order.

This does not have reference to what I previously read; it is another matter. I think this is a truthful statement, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] will admit it:

Finally, there is no shred of truth to the Senator's flat statement that this man "has, or until recently had, a desk in the State Department."

That refers to Lattimore, I presume.

That has no relation to the previous statement I have made.

I do not think anyone will contend under oath that this man Lattimore had a desk in the State Department, Mr. President. That is all that is said.

In his speech on February 20, Senator McCARTHY said that he had obtained his information from loyal State Department employees. He said that he had digests of the file he was talking about, apparently given him by his loyal friends in the State Department; and he hinted he had photostats of some of them.

Actually, all Senator McCARTHY had done was to shake 2 years' dust off of some old reports and produce them as his "newly discovered evidence." The old reports which he was using were reports made up in the fall of 1947 and the winter of 1948 by the staff of the House Appropriations Committee. In the fall of 1947, before the issuance of the President's directive concerning loyalty files, the House Appropriations Committee asked to look over the security program in the State Department. The committee investigators compiled a list of 108 cases concerning which they wanted to ask the State Department questions. Not all of these 108 worked in the State Department. Only 40 work there now, and after investigation and reinvestigation, those 40 have been found to be absolutely loyal. They compiled summaries of the "derogatory information" in these cases and used these summaries as the basis for questioning. During the Eightieth Congress, this list of 108 cases was gone into by the House Appropriations Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Yet none of these committees suggested that there are any Communists in the State Department. In fact, on one of the last days of the Eightieth Congress, Representative Jonkman, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee, made this statement on the floor of the House:

"But before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, I want the Members to know that there is one department in which the known or reasonably suspected subversives, Communists, fellow travelers, sympathizers, and persons whose services are not for the best interests of the United States, have been swept out. That is the Department of State."

When Senator McCARTHY was making his charges on the floor of the Senate on February 20, he was simply reciting, somewhat inaccurately, items from this shop-worn list of 108 cases. In all of this hit-and-run campaign of accusation, villification, and character assassination, the main burden of the so-called proof rested on that threadbare list.

Those are the facts.

I don't think it is appropriate for me to state whether the American people have been subjected to "deceit and fraud." When a Senator charges that there are 205 known Communists in the Department and when, instead of proving there is even one, he releases a succession of loose accusations against persons inside and outside of the Department, I am sure the Senate subcommittee is fully capable of making its own decisions.

Mr. President, why was this investigation started? I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, when the Senator from Wisconsin made his speech. I asked the Senator from Wisconsin a few questions about the speech he had made in Wheeling, W. Va., before the Republican Women's League. The speech the Senator from Wisconsin made before the Republican Women's League of Wheeling, W. Va., is the reason for all of this investigation. As everyone knows, the headlines, not only in the Wheeling newspaper, but in every newspaper in the United States of America, through the press services, carried what the Senator from Wisconsin had said with respect to there being 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department, that the Secretary of State knew it, and that these Communists were helping to shape the policy of the Government of the United States in foreign affairs at the present time. Those who were in the Senate that night heard me time after time press the Senator from Wisconsin to state whether or not he had made that statement before the group before whom he had made his speech or whether he had made it to a group of newspaper men on the outside. The only answer the Senator from Illinois ever received was the speech itself. When I objected to the Senator placing the speech in the RECORD, he read the speech. There was nothing in that speech, Mr. President, which tallied with or paralleled what was said by the newspapers at that particular time—not a word. So far as I am concerned, the statement of Mr. Peurifoy, as Under Secretary of State, with respect to the 205 card-carrying Communists, which he makes at this time after weeks of investigation, carries a considerable amount of weight on the question of truth and veracity.

Today, at this very hour, thousands upon thousands of loyal employees in the State Department are still hovering under the shadow that was cast upon them by the Senator from Wisconsin in the speech he made in West Virginia, and the one he made in Utah. In Utah he had shifted from 205 to 57, apparently losing that many Communists as he traveled through the air from West Virginia to Salt Lake City, or Nevada, or wherever it was.

Mr. President, the time has come to call a spade a spade. The time has come to ferret out and let the country understand what is back of these charges which have been made against loyal employees in the State Department. The time has come when we in the Senate, including the Senator from Wisconsin, must remove the cloud of suspicion of disloyalty which exists with respect to thousands of Americans who are now working in the State Department. Mr. President, if I were an official or employee of the State Department; if I were working in that branch of our Government, and I were to walk down the street today and someone looked at me in a rather strange manner, I would be wondering whether or not he thought I was one of the 205 or 257 whom the Senator from Wisconsin had named in his speeches. Yet, today, not a shred of evidence has been presented—not a shred.

Mr. President, this is what the Senator from Wisconsin said, what he read into the RECORD, what he claimed he said in his speech in West Virginia:

This, ladies and gentlemen, gives you somewhat of a picture of the type of individuals who have been helping to shape our foreign policy. In my opinion the State Department, which is one of the most important Government Departments, is thoroughly infested with Communists.

I have in my hand 57 cases of individuals who would appear to be either card-carrying members or certainly loyal to the Communist Party, but who nevertheless are still helping to shape our foreign policy.

Mr. President, the point I make is that that statement is in total variance—total variance, Mr. President—with every newspaper article which was published at that particular time as to what the Senator from Wisconsin had said upon that particular occasion.

Mr. President, I do not care to go further into this subject at the present time. The statement which was made with respect to 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department is far-reaching in its implications and effects. It is a statement about which the Senator from Wisconsin should have known something before he made it. I am willing to take what the press said at that time with respect to the situation, rather than the statement as it was read into the RECORD that night by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator desire to have me yield?

Mr. KILGORE. No; if I could get the floor, I should like to make a statement for the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I was in West Virginia on Lincoln's Birthday, strange as it may seem, addressing a Lincoln Birthday dinner before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I found voters very much perturbed and upset by reason of the statement which the majority leader just quoted. This had been printed in the Wheeling Intelligencer, a very reputable newspaper in Wheeling, W. Va.:

While I cannot take the time to name all the men in the State Department who have

been named as members of the Communist Party and members of the spy ring, I have here in my hand a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary of State as being Members of the Communist Party, and who, nevertheless, are still working and shaping the policy of the State Department.

Mr. President, the speech to which the majority leader referred was broadcast twice over the most powerful radio station in West Virginia; in fact, the station practically blankets the State. Ever since the making of that speech I have been queried every time I met a West Virginian as to what there is in this commotion. For instance, many persons cannot see why we should be voting funds to be expended in Europe, to strengthen the nations of Europe against communism, and at the same time have the policy laid down by Communists and spy-ring members.

I have become tired of it. When something worries the people of my State—and they do not like Communists—it worries me. It finally came to a climax with me on the 25th of April, when my former colleague, Dr. Joseph Rosier, wrote me a letter in which he said he thinks a book entitled "The Devil in Massachusetts," should be required reading for all Members of the United States Senate. That book, Mr. President, is a rather modern history of the witchcraft trials in Massachusetts. He goes on further in his letter and says that it looks as if we are engaged in a witch hunt, and that the people of the State are disturbed by it.

The next day, on the 26th, I wrote to Mr. Peurifoy, of the State Department, and asked him if the Department had any way of verifying whether or not the statement which had been published was actually made. I did not think all the persons in the Department would make any mistake. He sent to my office a transcript of the speech, two copies of it, one copy certified to by Paul A. Myers, an official of the radio station, who checked the filed speech against the delivery, and by another man who did the same thing, Mr. James K. Whitaker.

Mr. Myers, in his affidavit, says:

State of Virginia, County of Ohio, to wit——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, who is Mr. Myers?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Myers is program manager of Station WWVA, and Mr. Whitaker is the station manager of Station WWVA, which is the largest station in Wheeling; in fact, the most powerful station in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. LUCAS. The station broadcast this address, did it?

Mr. KILGORE. It broadcast the address, and these two men checked the script against the address as delivered, to make sure whether it was delivered as filed.

Mr. Myers' affidavit reads:

This day Paul A. Myers personally appeared before me, Lucille M. Bock, a notary public of said county, being by me first duly sworn, says: As program director of radio station WWVA, I read the attached 13-page speech script before it was delivered by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY on February 9, 1950. I reviewed our tape recording of the delivered speech before WWVA broadcast it on that same evening, and again reviewed it, against the script on the following day. I certify that the tape recording was the same as the attached script with the exception of interpolations and connective words such as "a's"; and "and's" and "the's"; which to my way of thinking did not materially change the meaning of the text.

I have initialed each page of the attached photostatic copy of Senator MCCARTHY'S speech.

PAUL A. MYERS.

Taken, subscribed and sworn to before me this 25th day of April 1950.

LUCILLE M. BOCK,
Notary Public.

My commission expires February 3, 1952.

On page 7 of the transcript is the exact wording referred to. I quote:

And ladies and gentlemen, while I cannot take the time to name all the men in the State Department who have been named as active members of the Communist Party and members of a spy ring, I have here in my hand a list of 205 * * * a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department.

That speech was made on the 9th day of February and, as I said before, that part was reported by the Wheeling Intelligencer.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to read into the RECORD what the Senator from Wisconsin said, as he read the speech on the night of February 20, on that very point. This is what he said he said:

I have in my hand 57 cases of individuals who would appear to be either card-carrying members or certainly loyal to the Communist Party, but who, nevertheless, are still helping to shape our foreign policy.

Mr. KILGORE. Also, Mr. President, Mr. James K. Whitaker made an affidavit:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
County of Ohio, to wit:

This day James K. Whitaker personally appeared before me, Lucille M. Bock, notary public of said county, and being by me first duly sworn says: As news editor of radio station WWVA I was in charge of the tape recording of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY'S speech at the Hotel McLure, Wheeling, W. Va., on February 9, 1950. At the hotel I followed the prepared script as I listened to the speech. I certify that the delivered speech, as recorded by me, and on that evening broadcast by Station WWVA was in the same form as the attached photostat of the prepared script—with the exception of the usual added connective phrases and the addition or deletion of such words as "a's"; "and's" and "the's," which to my thinking did not materially change the meaning of the text.

I have initialed each page of the attached photostatic copy of Senator MCCARTHY'S speech.

JAMES K. WHITAKER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of April 1950.

LUCILLE M. BOCK,
Notary Public.

On page 7 will be found a paragraph identical with the paragraph previously read.

Mr. President, as I have stated, a statement such as I have referred to upsets the people. It creates disunity. When a statement criticizing one of the Government departments, and persons employed in it, comes from a Member of the United States Senate the people of my State feel, since he is an official of the Government that he knows what he is talking about. It is disturbing to them, particularly to the type of people we have in the Wheeling section, a large steel producing area, and in the big coal fields. We have, thank goodness, but few Communists in West Virginia. But such a statement as that to which I have referred is disturbing, and I feel that something should be done to reassure and perhaps to correct the attitude of our people.

Mr. President, I see that the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is present. I am not a member of the subcommittee. Paraphrasing what Will Rogers once said "What goes on in the subcommittee I know about only from reading the papers." I have not seen any statement like the one I read produced before the committee. I ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland whether anyone has testified before the subcommittee about the alleged 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I gladly yield so the Senator may answer the question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, all I care to say now is, as I told the Senate the other day, that I have been working very, very hard on this case. I promised the Senate when I stood here a little while ago that I would make a complete and far-reaching investigation into all phases of it. Therefore, all I can say to the Senator from West Virginia at this time is that I do not care to comment on the matter he has brought before the Senate at this particular time. In due course, and when it is appropriate, I shall come before the Senate, and it will take me a considerable while to lay this matter in all its ramifications before this august body.

Mr. KILGORE. Would the Senator care to have the copies from which I have read, for the benefit of the subcommittee?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be very glad to have them. I assume they are pertinent matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield so I may ask the able Senator from Maryland one question?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If it is a fair question, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether the Senator from Wisconsin produced any proof with respect to the 205 persons who, as the affidavits just read show, he said were card-carrying Communists employed in the State Department and helping to establish its policy?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that all the testimony of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] dealing with Communists or disloyal persons has been taken in open hearings, and therefore the Senator from Illinois can draw the same conclusion from that testimony that I can draw. I do not care to comment at this particular time on that matter, although I am always glad to accommodate the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the Senator correctly, then, with respect to the 205 card-carrying Communists, so-called, anything that has been testified about them has been testified in the open?

Mr. TYDINGS. By the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LUCAS. Which has been nothing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me so that I may address a question to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if the Senator from Wisconsin has at any time been asked by any member of the subcommittee whether or not he made the statement in West Virginia that there were 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not press that question, because it would not be proper for the Senator to answer it at the moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield so I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KILGORE. I have already yielded to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I ask if the chairman of the subcommittee will at a later date in the hearings of the subcommittee try to reach a decision as to whether or not there were 205 card-carrying Communists, or whether there were 57 card-carrying Communists, or whether there was 1 card-carrying Communist? I think the American people would like to know from the findings of the committee just how many card-carrying Communists there are supposed to be in or out of the Department That is something I should like to have investigated. As one Member of the Senate, I should like to know that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Without desiring to evade the Senator's question I will say that all matters pertinent to this inquiry will in due time be laid before the Senate. I prefer not to make any comment at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Although the Senator from Maryland has been very busy in connection with his duties as chairman of the subcommittee, I am sure he is familiar with the series of articles which began 2 days ago in the Washington News, relative to the Amerasia case. I wonder if the able Senator from Maryland could give any assurance to the Senate that this matter will be diligently pursued since it does involve the theft of papers from various agencies of the Federal Government, including the State Department, so that once and for all we can have cleared up this aspect of the case, which has been of vital concern to the American people, Democrats and Republicans alike? I think, as the News said in its editorial today, that the able Senator from Maryland could perform a great service to the country if he were to go into the Amerasia case entirely and develop the facts to which I think the American people are entitled. Can the Senator give us any assurances on that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. To repeat what I have said to Senators who have been interrogating me previously, all matters pertinent to this investigation will be thoroughly investigated, and in due time the Senator from Maryland will lay a very, very complete report before his colleagues for their consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for one more question?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; I yield for one more question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like, if the Senator will permit me, to ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the articles dealing with the Amerasia case which have appeared in the last 3 days in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should say to the Senator from California that, so far as I am concerned, I shall not object, but I believe the Senator would be well advised if all matters of that character were not printed until the subcommittee comes in with its report, at which point, if the Senator thinks it pertinent, he can put the matter in the RECORD. I do not think we should load up the RECORD with articles pro or con, because if Senators begin doing so other Senators will present similar matter for the RECORD, and the Senator himself knows that such procedure would be endless. Since there are two good Republican colleagues on the subcommittee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—and our relations, in spite of some minor differences, have been very harmonious—I hope the Senator from California will give us a chance to go into whatever matters we think pertinent, and lay the facts before the Senate, without inserting anything in the RECORD at this time. But it is the Senator's privilege to do so, if he wants to do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, as a part of my remarks——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield, if I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent the Senator from West Virginia may yield for such a purpose. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer and ask to have printed as a part of my remarks, Mr. President, the series of articles which began on Monday, May 1, in the Washington News, and continued on Tuesday, May 2, and Wednesday, May 3, dealing with the Amerasia case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 1, 1950]

THE AMERASIA CASE

Time and again over the last 5 years the phrase "Amerasia case" has bobbed up in the newspapers and magazines.

Well, just what is the Amerasia case?

Why was it important?

What was involved?

And who?

And what happened?

The story has been told piecemeal as it unfolded. But never before has it been woven together as a whole, against the background that spells out its significance.

Many believe the Amerasia case is the key to America's postwar diplomatic debacle in Asia.

Many, including the Scripps-Howard newspapers, believe that if the case had been pursued honestly and vigorously:

Pro-Communists in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department would have been cleaned out.

General Marshall probably would never have been sent to China with instructions to force the Nationalist Government to take in the Chinese Communists.

Probably China would not have been handed to the Soviet on a silver platter.

Most important of all, the United States would not today be looking down the gun barrel in the frightful prospect of another war.

Once again an effort is being made in Congress to bring full public disclosure of the political shenanigans, cover-ups and whitewashes of the Amerasia case.

That effort will succeed only if the public demands all the facts, no matter who is affected.

On page 3, Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Frederick Woltman begins to tell in chronological order, the bold outline of the Amerasia story. His stories will tell how it started by mere chance, the climax of the arrests and the anticlimaxes of the strange suppressions that followed the arrests. These suppressions prevented the public from learning the full story of the theft of hundreds of secret Government documents during the war.

In today's article Mr. Woltman exposes the bare bones of the Amerasia skeleton. In his subsequent articles he will add flesh to those bones.

But Mr. Woltman can't tell the whole story.

Only a committee of Congress with the power to subpena evidence and compel testimony can do that.

Senator TYDINGS' committee can find the answers—if it will.

And maybe it will, if public opinion insists.

You are part of the public. You should have an opinion about this matter. We believe this full account of it will help you to reach an opinion. Besides, you will find

the story, which starts today on page 3, an exciting and interesting one to read.

CHANCE GLANCE SET OFF FAMOUS AMERASIA CASE

(By Frederick Woltman)

Early in March 1945, an official in the Office of Strategic Services here happened to be glancing through an obscure magazine published in New York City, called Amerasia.

What he read sent Archbold van Beuren, security chief of America's wartime espionage agency, flying to New York.

It was an article criticizing the British occupation of Thailand. And it was, in substance, virtually identical with a secret report the OSS had sent to the State Department 2 months earlier. Some of the phraseology was the same.

In the Manhattan office of Frank Bielaski, director of undercover investigation for OSS, an immediate plan of action was mapped out.

For the war, then, was nearing a climax in both the East and the West. The American First Army was smashing across the Rhine, ready to pierce the heart of Germany. Our troops were chasing the Japs out of the Philippines. The Air Force was preparing a devastating raid on Tokyo.

The atom bomb was still a secret. Five months later it would destroy Hiroshima.

Investigator Bielaski put a round-the-clock surveillance on Amerasia's headquarters at 225 Fifth Avenue. Ten days later, at midnight March 11, he raided the office—without a search warrant.

The raiders didn't need to stay long.

In an envelope on a desk they found copies of six documents from the Office of Naval Intelligence, marked "top secret." Then they turned up not only copies of the original OSS report on Thailand but five original OSS documents which nobody knew were missing.

FOUND SUITCASE FULL OF SECRET DOCUMENTS

Finally, in the office of Philip J. Jaffe, Amerasia's editor, one of the OSS men found a suitcase, bearing the initials "PJJ." It contained scores of documents or copies of documents, classified "restricted" to "top secret." They came from Naval Intelligence, Military Intelligence, the Office of Censorship, the State Department and OSS. Nearly all of them dealt with the Far East, especially China.

Pocketing 15 of the documents, Mr. Bielaski headed for La Guardia Airport.

The next morning OSS headquarters here was thrown into a turmoil. Brig. Gen. William J. Donovan visited a high Navy Department official. Together they called on Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius. Mr. Stettinius immediately sent for Assistant Secretary Julius C. Holmes.

At the request of the State Department and the Navy, the FBI was put on the Amerasia case. President Roosevelt, himself, who had less than a month to live, is reported to have ordered the inquiry.

J. EDGAR HOOVER LED TOP-DRAWER MANHUNT

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, had a complete go-ahead.

Since it involved thefts of documents from the Nation's most important wartime departments, it was to be a top-drawer investigation.

For 3 months the FBI conducted one of the most intensive jobs in its history. FBI agents watched everybody connected with Amerasia and its editor and owner, Mr. Jaffe.

Mr. Jaffe, a greeting-card manufacturer with a yearly income averaging $30,000 to $40,000, turned out to have Communist ties. He was a friend, they learned, of Earl Browder, for many years boss of the Communist Party. Mr. Jaffe had led or served on various Communist fronts, particularly ones that promoted Soviet foreign policies, including Stalin's aspirations in Asia.

AMERASIA WAS BIBLE OF STATE DEPARTMENT BLOC

Amerasia, supposed to be an authoritative journal on the Far East, had a circulation of only 1,700. But Amerasia was a favorite—some said "the bible"—of the influential bloc in the State Department which saw in the Chinese Reds, rather than the Nationalist Government, the true destiny of China.

From issue to issue Ameriasia strictly followed the Communist Party line on Asia.

A member of its editorial board from 1937 to 1941 was Owen Lattimore, professor of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University.

While Mr. Jaffe was under 24-hour surveillance by the FBI he met a State Department official. He was John Stewart Service, a Foreign Service officer and member of the anti-Nationalist bloc.

Mr. Jaffe met Mr. Service in New York City.

ROTH WAS JAFFE AIDE BEFORE ENTERING NAVY

Another Jaffe contact was Lt. Andrew Roth, who was liaison officer between the Office of Naval Intelligence and the State Department. Lieutenant Roth, the FBI discovered, had been Mr. Jaffe's research assistant on Amerasia.

While under consideration for the Navy assignment, Lieutenant Roth had been investigated by the counter-intelligence division of the Third Naval District in New York. The counter-intelligence report termed him a Communist fellow-traveler and recommended that he be not assigned to Naval Intelligence. But nevertheless he was.

Meanwhile, on several occasions the FBI tailed Mr. Jaffe to the Soviet Consulate in New York. Three times he visited the home of Earl Browder in Yonkers, N. Y.

Then, on April 22, 1945, the Communist Party chief returned the visits. Mr. Browder brought along a third person and all three conferred for 5 hours in Mr. Jaffe's Greenwich Village apartment.

The third person was Tung-Piwu, formerly a resident of Russia and one of the three top Chinese Communists who, through the years, had masterminded the Red opposition to Chiang Kai-shek. Thereafter, Tung flew to the United Nations Organization Conference in San Francisco as a delegate of the Chinese Communists.

FOUND COMPLETE DETAILS OF NATIONALIST ARMIES

This seemed significant because one of the secret documents Mr. Bielaski saw in the Jaffe suitcase was a detailed report on the complete disposition of the Chinese Nationalist armies. That report would have been invaluable to the Communist forces which were later to take over China. The report listed the locations, commanding officers, and names of all of Chiang's fighting units, including their military strength.

The FBI never was able to trace the transmission of any of the Government documents to known Communist agents.

Finally, its case in shape, the FBI turned all the evidence over to the Justice Department. The Department's legal experts appraised it carefully. Then, the Attorney General's office ordered six arrests. The order for the arrests was personally authorized by President Truman shortly before he left for his Potsdam conference with Premier Stalin.

On the night of June 6, 1945, the Department of Justice issued an official release.

HOW JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCED SIX ARRESTS

"The Department of Justice announces the arrest by special agents of the FBI of six persons, including a Naval Reserve lieutenant, until recently on active duty, and two State Department employees in Washington, and the editor of Amerasia magazine in New York City, on charges of conspiracy to violate the Federal Espionage Statutes through theft of highly confidential documents."

The statute invoked, concluded the release, "covers the unauthorized possession or transmittal of national defense data. The maximum penalty upon conviction is 2 years' imprisonment and $10,000 fine."

Data "removed from the Government's confidential files," said the Justice Department release, "usually was turned over to Jaffe at meetings in Washington and New York."

While arresting Mr. Jaffee on a warrant, the FBI found four file drawers crammed full of the documents.

PUMPKIN WAS PIKER COMPARED TO THIS

There were 267 prepared by the State Department, including 2 top secret and 34 secret; 50 prepared by OSS; 19 prepared by Naval Intelligence; 34 prepared by Military Intelligence, and 58 prepared by the Office of War Information.

Their number many times over exceeded the State Department documents in the famous Whittaker Chambers "pumpkin papers" case which earlier this year resulted in the conviction of Alger Hiss.

The Amerasia documents, moreover, were far more important.

Among them was an order of battle report showing the disposition of the Japanese fleet before the Battle of Leyte and a description of the prevailing winds and the length of runways at the landing fields of Korea.

THIRD DOCUMENT WAS CRITICISM OF CHIANG

A third, marked Document No. 58, was entitled "Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—Decline of His Prestige and Criticism of and Opposition to His Leadership."

The six arrested were:

Philip J. Jaffe, born in 1897 in Mogilev, Ukraine, Russia, and naturalized as a United States citizen in New York in 1933.

Lt. Andrew Roth, born in 1919 in the Bronx. He received degrees from the College of the City of New York and Columbia University; joined the Navy in 1941 after working as a research associate for Amerasia.

John Stewart Service, born in Czechwan, China, in 1909; a graduate of Oberlin College, Ohio, State Department Foreign Service officer since 1933.

Kate Louise Mitchell, born in 1908 in Buffalo, where she was listed in the Social Register, a graduate of Bryn Mawr and a co-editor of Amerasia.

Mark Gayn, born in 1908 at Barim, Manchuria, naturalized in 1943, a free-lance writer who, at the time of his arrest, was planning to go to Russia, India, and China as a newspaper correspondent.

Emanuel Sigurd Larsen, born at San Rafael, Calif., in 1897, educated in China and Denmark, a specialist in the Chinese Division of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, State Department. For a time he had been employed by Naval Intelligence as a civilian senior analyst on affairs in China, Indochina, Thailand, and India.

Bail for each was set at $10,000.

RED PRESS SET OFF HOWLS OF ANGUISH

At once a howl of anguish went up from the Communist press. The Communist Party began a counteroffensive which spread to the leftist press and even to more conservative newspapers. Friends of the six went to work on prominent radio commentators.

The Daily Worker promptly arrived at a verdict of innocent. It called on "the American people" to flood President Truman with a barrage of protests for this "attack on democracy."

Lieutenant Roth, then on bail, wrote a series of articles for a New York newspaper lambasting the State Department.

Columnists accused Acting Secretary Joseph C. Grew, a leader of the anti-Soviet

bloc in the State Department, of attempting to "terrorize" and "intimidate" the critics of his Far Eastern policy.

GOVERNMENT AVOIDED COMMUNIST ANGLE

Actually, Mr. Grew was an innocent bystander. The Amerasia case itself had been sparked by Mr. Stettinius. But, so fast had the counteroffensive mushroomed that 9 days later the Acting Secretary took the unprecedented step of issuing a defense:

"There isn't any mystery about this at all. We heard somebody in the chicken coop and went to see who was there, and what we found has been announced publicly. * * *

"The investigation was requested to determine the facts about a substantial traffic in secret document affecting the national defense. * * * Ample grounds were found to cause the arrests and to bring about charges."

Throughout the Amerasia case, the Government carefully avoided introducing the Communist angle. That was to come out at the trial.

In the meantime, a special effort was made to have the charges dropped against Miss Mitchell and Mr. Service. Miss Mitchell, who was wealthy, retained Joseph M. Hartfield, a politically influential New York attorney. Mr. Jaffe was represented by a law partner of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York.

DEFENSE ATTORNEYS CONSULTED CLARK

Defense attorneys made repeated trips here to consult Department of Justice officials. On at least one occasion they spoke with Attorney General Tom C. Clark, now a Supreme Court Justice.

Finally, in July 1945, the Justice Department presented the case to the spring term of the District of Columbia Federal grand jury.

All the evidence was in, including testimony of FBI agents, and indictments were expected the last day of the term.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT PRESENTED CASE AGAIN

Instead, the grand judy was dismissed. The Attorney General, it was explained, had agreed to permit Miss Mitchell and Messrs. Gayn and Service to testify in their own behalf.

Not infrequently in Washington Federal grand juries are extended over the regular terms for uncompleted business.

Nevertheless, the Justice Department presented the Amerasia case all over again to the summer grand jury. All witnesses had to return and tell their stories a second time. The new grand jury heard the three defendants and returned no true bills. This cleared Kate Mitchell, Mark Gayn, and John Stewart Service of all charges against them.

At the same time, it indicated Messrs. Jaffe, Larsen, and Roth on a reduced charge of "conspiracy to embezzle, steal, and purloin property, records, and valuable things of the record and property of the United States."

BROADCASTER MADE PROPHETIC TALK

A few days later, on August 13, a radio commentator, J. Raymond Walsh, made a prophetic talk over the air. A backer of many Communist fronts, he had been stoutly defending the Amerasia group. Concerning Miss Mitchell, Mr. Walsh said:

"People who knew her were dumfounded when she was arrested. They quickly came to her defense, for they knew she could not possibly have been guilty. It so happens that she had some very powerful connections, which probably led the State Department people to wish they had never heard of her * * *."

Of Mr. Service, he stated:

"His arrest brought some exceedingly powerful people within the Government to his defense. Again one can easily infer that those who began this affair wish they hadn't."

And, of the three indicted, Messrs. Jaffe, Larsen, and Roth, the broadcaster declared:

"And one even hears rumors of settlement of their case without trial."

SHAKE-UP PREDICTED FOR STATE DEPARTMENT

A shake-up, meanwhile, was predicted for the State Department. James F. Byrnes had now become Secretary. Mr. Grew was on his way out.

Within a week after the grand jury acted, Mr. Grew and Assistant Secretary Holmes resigned. Dean Acheson, who had previously resigned from the Department, was named Under Secretary to succeed Mr. Grew.

Within 2 weeks, Mr. Service was reinstated "for important work in connection with Far Eastern Affairs" and congratulated by Secretary Byrnes "on this happy termination of your ordeal." Mr. Grew also wrote expressing pleasure at Mr. Service's "complete vindication."

There were still three under indictment in the Amerasia case.

On September 29, a Saturday morning, when Federal court is rarely in session, Mr. Jaffe was permited to plead guilty. Whether any reporters were present could not be ascertained at this late date. The press services sent out a few paragraphs. And the story of the Amerasia case practically evaporated.

It was a peculiar court session.

Robert M. Hitchcock, Special Assistant Attorney General, permitted Mr. Jaffe's lawyer to make the "statement of facts." Ordinarily, that's the duty of the prosecutor, since it guides the court in fixing the penalty.

When Albert Arent, defense attorney, asked permission to make a statement "setting forth the situation," Judge James M. Proctor, a respected member of the Federal bench, replied:

"Please make it brief because I do not expect to hold any extended session here this morning."

Prosecutor Hitchcock concurred in the defense statement.

And, when the judge asked him how long it would take to explain where the Government stood, Mr. Hitchcock replied:

"Less than 5 minutes."

TRIAL WOULD LAST ABOUT 4 MONTHS

Whatever use Mr. Jaffe made of the Government documents, Mr. Hitchcock told the court, "was largely to the purpose of lending credence or variety" to his magazine Amerasia. A trial, he went on, would be difficult and probably last 4 months.

He agreed with the defense claim that the Government "does not contend that any of this material was used for any disloyal purpose."

Judge Proctor suggested a probation report to guide him. Both the Government and the defense quickly talked that down, urging that a fine be imposed that very morning. (A probation officer, in District Court here, has access to the "jackets" of each case. These would include the complete FBI investigative report, including Mr. Jaffe's Communist background for cross-examination purposes.)

No evidence was introduced into the record. None of the documents were shown to the judge. If anyone from the FBI was present, he did not participate.

UNITED STATES ASKS DISMISSAL OF CHARGE AGAINST ROTH

The judge imposed a $2,500 fine which Jaffe paid at once.

Subsequently, Mr. Hitchcock left the Justice Department. He joined the Buffalo law firm of Kenefick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth. A partner of that firm was James Mitchell, Kate Mitchell's uncle who had worked on the case in her behalf.

The charge against Lieutenant Roth was later dismissed on motion of the Government. Mr. Larsen, the last of the defendants, pleaded nolo contendere and was fined $500.

Mr. Jaffe paid Larsen's fine and kicked in an extra $2,500 to reimburse his codefendant for legal costs.

REPUBLICANS FILED DISSENTING REPORTS

The case did not die here.

In 1946 the Hobbs House Judiciary subcommittee took a look at it again. The Democratic majority found "an astonishing lack of security in some departments or agencies of our Government." At the same time, the administration majority reported it found no evidence to justify adverse criticism of anyone connected with the Amerasia case. The two Republican members filed dissenting reports.

The Hobbs committee had held only one public hearing; and it toook 5 months to submit a report. The report gained little public attention. In that postwar period, public opinion was in a confused state over the Communist issue. Most people familiar with the Amerasia background were dissatisfied with the Hobbs subcommittee's haphazard review. So again the case did not die.

CASE COMES TO LIFE AS BUDENZ TESTIFIES

Since the Communist conquest of China, there has been a rising public suspicion that the Amerasia case might be the key to what happened in Asia.

Mr. Larsen has declared he was an innocent victim of Mr. Jaffe's machinations and charged there was a mysterious whitewash of the chief actors in the case.

American policy did switch.

The Amerasia case has come to life once more. Louis F. Budenz, former Communist and editor of the Daily Worker, swore that Mr. Jaffe was a Soviet espionage agent.

And the Tydings subcommittee, investigating Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S charges of Communists in the State Department, has promised to investigate. But it hasn't scratched the surface yet.

[From Washington Daily News of May 2, 1950]

HOW P. J. JAFFE, OF AMERASIA, LED DRIVE TO WEAKEN UNITED STATES RESISTANCE TO RED EXPANSION

(NOTE.—Hundreds of secret documents, stolen during wartime from the State Department, Naval Intelligence, Military Intelligence, and the Office of Strategic Services, were found during a raid on the New York offices of the obscure magazine, Amerasia. That was the start of the notorious Amerasia case. Now, 5 years later, there still is much about the Amerasia case that the public has not been told. There were mysterious moves and cover-ups, intrigue, and whitewashes as the case progressed and finally came to a deadend. Here for the first time the Amerasia case is being told as a whole against the background that shows its significance. Yesterday Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Frederick Woltman sketched the outline of the case. Today he exposes the background of its central figure, Philip J. Jaffe.)

(By Frederick Woltman)

Philip J. Jaffe is the central figure in the Amerasia case. He edited and financed the magazine, Amerasia. And in the magazine's offices the FBI found hundreds of secret Government documents.

Jaffe also was the man Earl Browder picked to head the Communist Party's front for swinging American public opinion in favor of a Red China.

On this mission Jaffe used several aliases. First as John Phillips, then as J. W. Phillips, he set up a so-called Friends of the Chinese People and became its executive secretary. And he published its magazine, China Today.

Later, as his identity became known, the name Philip J. Jaffe appeared on China Today's masthead instead of J. W. Phillips.

Through the ensuing years, Jaffe continued in the forefront of the Communists' drive to weaken this Government's resistance to Soviet expansion in Asia.

FINDS A WAY TO GET CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

Then along about 1944–45, at the height of the war, Jaffe struck oil.

He worked out a system of getting confidential reports on the Far East prepared by the State Department, Naval Intelligence, Military Intelligence, and other Government wartime agencies.

But, from the moment the Amerasia case broke in June 1945, the Government never disclosed his Communist activities which had so vital a bearing on the Amerasia thefts. Instead, the Justice Department allowed the prosperous New York businessman to plead guilty to illegal possession of secret Government documents. It gave him a slap on the wrist in the form of a $2,500 fine.

Here are some facts the Government neglected to tell the public—or the judge in the Amerasia case.

Jaffe, who manufactures greeting cards for a living, had for years been contributing upwards of $5,000 annually to Communist causes.

Originally a Socialist, he switched to the Communists in the early thirties. He began to write for Labor Defender, official organ of the International Labor Defense. Then the legal defense arm of the Communist Party, the organization has since been put on the Attorney General's subversives list.

"THE NEWEST AND LATEST DEMAGOG, ROOSEVELT"

The August 1933 issue published a full-page article headed: "Uncle Sam Exploits the Chinese People * * * by Philip Jaffe." It began:

"American capitalism is giving the workers of this country a new deal. The only thing new about this deal is that it is handed out by the newst and latest demagog, Roosevelt."

Around this time Jaffe got the assignment from his friend, Browder, boss of the Communist Party. In 1934 he started to edit China Today from his Greenwich Village apartment, handling all copy, correcting proofs, and doing the general editorial work.

The first issues, mimeographed, carried no masthead. Hence, its editor remained anonymous. But the May 1934 issue did run a back-cover ad: Lectures on China for May by friends of the Chinese people—Strike struggles in Koumintang China, by John Phillips.

Under that was an ad for the Communist Party's Workers' Book Shop.

The first, full-scale printed edition of Jaffe's China Today came out October 1934. J. W. Phillips was listed as an editor. Inside the front cover Jaffe published a letter to the editor which set the future tone of China Today.

"YOURS FOR A SOVIET CHINA"

The letter called for an end of American help to the established Government of China. It concluded: "Yours for a Soviet China, Malcolm Cowley."

Over the cover itself was spread a map of China. The Soviet districts were inked in red; the Red Partisan areas dotted red.

This map showing the progress of the Soviet conquest of China, became a regular feature of Jaffe's China Today. The Red leaders of that conquest are the men who now have taken over most of China's 400,000,000 population.

From there on China Today went all out for the Chinese Reds, even selling portraits of Mao Tse-tung, their Soviet-trained leader, at 25 cents a copy.

The November 1934, issue carried a piece signed J. W. Phillips. Jaffe, who later had an income reported to be more than $30,000 a year, wrote:

"Fascism in the western countries is a product of the decadent period of capitalism. Capitalism has outlived its historic role as the organizer and builder of modern life."

In his December 1934 issue, Jaffe published this comment:

"If the people of the United States know what is happening in China, if they knew the glorious history of the Chinese Communists * * * there will be a storm of protest against American and European aid for Chiang Kai-shek. * * *

"Thus, in telling the story of China to our people, your magazine is helping to protect the future of the Soviet Union."

SWITCH TO CHIANG IN FEBRUARY 1939

Five years afterward, Russia's position on Chiang switched. World communism decided to work with him in "a united front against Fascist aggression." China Today and the American Friends of the Chinese People, as it was then named, went right along.

The February 1939 China Today ran an article favorable to the Generalissimo, comparing him with George Washington. It was titled: "Two Fathers of Their Countries."

Earlier, in June 1930, the magazine published a photograph of the Communist Party's May Day parade. Jaffe was in the picture with a delegation from the American Friends of the Chinese People.

His magazine frequently advertised monster mass meetings on China, featuring Earl Browder as principal speaker. One such, in October 1935, listed J. W. Phillips as chairman.

After Pearl Harbor, China Today mysteriously disbanded. The Communists were concentrating on opening a second front for Russia, rather than helping China. By now, the name of Philip J. Jaffe had appeared on its masthead.

CONSPIRING AND TEACHING AT THE SAME TIME

At the very time Jaffe was conspiring to steal Government documents on the Far East he was teaching at the Jefferson School in New York. That's the Communist Party's official training school for pounding Stalinism-Marxism into future Red leaders. His subject was: The Far East in World Affairs.

He helped organize and was a national director of the American Council on Soviet Relations and its successor, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Both, listed as subversive by the Attorney General, have served as the leading pro-Soviet propaganda outfits in America.

He was active in the American Writers Congress and the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy, both on the Attorney General's list.

Today Jaffe is consultant for the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, the Communist Party's newest front for a Soviet China. It's also listed as Communist by the Government.

None of these facts were made public by the Government in the Amerasia stolen-documents case.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1950]

AMERASIA JUDGE WASN'T TOLD OF JAFFE'S RED TIES

(NOTE.—Almost 5 years ago the Amerasia case came to an obscure end in a rare Saturday session of District Court here, remarkable for the fact that the judge learned as little about the case as the public has before or since. Today Scripps-Howard Writer Frederick Woltman, who has investigated the bewildering facets of the case which produced more stolen Government documents than Whittaker Chambers, tells of this strange legal climax in the third of a series of stories.)

(By Frederick Woltman)

Philip J. Jaffe's Communist record was not mentioned by the Government in the court hearing that wound up the Amerasia case of the stolen State Department documents.

Not a single reference to it appeared in the 15-page transcript of the court record.

Nor was the judge told that Amerasia magazine, which used confidential data from rifled State Department files on the Far East, was dedicated to the promotion of the Communist Party line on China.

This would have been of the utmost importance to the court. For, the punishment to be meted out depended on Mr. Jaffe's motives and the use he made of the hundreds of secret State Department and military and naval intelligence records found in his office as editor of the magazine.

The Government recommended against a jail sentence. Consequently the key figure in the Amerasia case escaped with a $2,500 fine after pleading guilty. And the sensational evidence painstakingly dug up by the FBI was kept from the public.

Mr. Jaffe pleaded guilty here in Washington on September 29, 1945, before Justice James M. Proctor, a respected member of the Federal bench who now sits on the United States Court of Appeals.

The charge was "violation of section title XV888, United States Code, which is conspiracy to embezzle, steal, and purloin property, records, and valuable things of record and property of the United States."

CONDUCT OF CASE WAS UNUSUAL FROM OUTSET

The hearing took place on a Saturday morning, when the District Court rarely sits. It got little attention.

Robert M. Hitchcock, Special Assistant Attorney General, permitted Mr. Jaffe's lawyer to make the statement of facts. Ordinarily, in a guilty plea, that's the job of the prosecutor, since it guides the court in fixing the penalty.

When Albert Arent, defense attorney, asked permission to make a statement, Judge Proctor replied:

"Please make it brief because I do not expect to hold any extended session here this morning."

Later, when the judge suggested the Government explain where it stood and asked how long that would take, Mr. Hitchcock replied: "Less than 5 minutes."

NOT "DISLOYAL PURPOSE" BUT "JOURNALISTIC ZEAL"

Mr. Arent described his client as "for many years a student of far-eastern affairs"; a graduate of Columbia with A. B. and M. A. degrees; a lecturer at Harvard, Vassar, Yale, Dartmouth, and other schools.

Among co-founders of his magazine Amerasia, the defense counsel said, "were distinguished academic people, scholars, political scientists like Owen Lattimore, head of the Walter Hines Page School of Diplomacy and International Relations at Johns Hopkins * * *."

For 8 years, he went on, Mr. Jaffe edited Amerasia "without compensation and at considerable sacrifice."

It circulated "amongst scholars and specialists in far eastern affairs and has found a place in the leading libraries and educational institutions of the country.

"The Government does not contend that any of this material was used for any disloyal purpose," said Mr. Arent.

"If Mr. Jaffe has transgressed the law, it seems he has done so from an excess of journalistic zeal * * *."

Judge Proctor, interposing, remarked: "There is no doubt but what he has."

The indictment, declared Mr. Jaffe's attorneys, "charges a relatively minor violation

which arose out of his anxiety to be accurately informed in the field of his scholarly and journalistic interest."

He urged that Mr. Jaffe's case be disposed of that morning because of "the very grave illness of his wife."

Asked by the court if that was "a correct statement," the special Assistant Attorney General answered:

"In substance, yes, Your Honor."

NO PROBATION OFFICER SAW JAFFE JACKET

Then Judge Proctor proposed that the probation officer investigate and report so that the case "take the usual course of such cases with a view to possible probation * * *."

Had that been done, the probation officer would have access to the Jaffe "jacket" in the United States attorney's office. This includes the FBI "prosecutive summary report" as well as Mr. Jaffe's vast Communist background and that of Amerasia.

Here Mr. Hitchcock told the court: "I assume that prior to the imposition of sentence, which I think counsel hoped to be disposed of today inasmuch as we have the facts pertinent to the subject, that perhaps even a probation officer would get not only from this district but would have to go to New York for, Your Honor may wish to hear what the Government has to say."

Mr. Jaffe, he went on, was charged with conspiracy in taking and removing from Government files, primarily the State Department, Office of Naval Intelligence, Strategic Services and War Information, certain documents that belong to these various agencies.

"The use to which they were put was, as I understand it, largely background material that Mr. Jaffe in the conduct of his Amerasia magazine used to assist him in publishing articles and preparing arguments that would lend to its weight and, perhaps, its circulation. The magazine, we know as a matter of fact, was a losing proposition financially."

Asked if the documents were used in such a way as to embarrass the Army or Navy in the conduct of the war, Mr. Hitchcock said there was no such evidence.

"To us," he went on, "it was largely to the purpose of lending credence or variety to the publication itself, and perhaps increase its circulation and prestige." The documents, the prosecutor added, "were undoubtedly used by him—else, why take them?"

RECOMMENDED FINE, NO JAIL SENTENCE

Asked for a recommendation, the Government attorney proposed "the imposition of no jail sentence but that a substantial fine be imposed." Mr. Jaffe, he added, "is a well-to-do man—the sole owner, we understand, of a prosperous greeting-card business."

"Well," said the judge, "I regret, Mr. Jaffe, that you in your zeal to carry on your work, which was evidently for a trustworthy purpose, that you were misled to do these things which, of course, did tend to break down the fidelity of Government employees and officials in the performance of their work."

He set the fine at $2,500 which Mr. Jaffe paid immediately.

Nowhere does the record show that Mr. Jaffe had been recruited by Earl Browder, Communist boss, to head the party's front for a Red China: that Amerasia was started by Mr. Jaffe, Frederick V. Field, wealthy Communist Party member, and Ch'ao-ting Chi, a leading Chinese Communist; or that Amerasia, which used the documents, was dedicated to influencing American public opinion and the State Department in behalf of Russia's aspirations in the Far East.

Not one of the stolen documents was introduced. Nor was the word communism mentioned.

If any FBI agents were present, they took no part.

HITCHCOCK JOINED FIRM OF DEFENDANT'S UNCLE

Fifteen months later Mr. Hitchcock resigned from the Justice Department. He joined the Buffalo law firm of Kenefick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth.

James Mitchell, a partner of the firm, was an uncle of Kate Louise Mitchell, Mr. Jaffe's coeditor of Ameracia, who was arrested in the Amerasia case but later cleared by the grand jury. Mr. Mitchell had been active in behalf of his niece.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like simply to make the observation that I have accumulated a great deal of data about which even the committee knows nothing. That is not due to the fact that I have gotten it from our staff, because I have not. I have accumulated it myself by hard and diligent work into the late hours of the night. I believe I know a great deal more at this moment about the whole case and its ramifications than does any other man in America. I say that with no thought of immodesty. If the Senate and the country will just wait until we come in with the report I am sure it will be very instructive.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. For what purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to ask the Senator from Maryland a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question is this: Does the Senator from Maryland agree that the enabling resolution permits the subcommitee, of which he is the distinguished chairman, to investigate the Amerasia case? The language in the resolution not only covers those in the employment of the State Department now, but those who heretofore have been in its employment, who might be disloyal.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland is fully aware of all the privileges and responsibilities and duties encompassed in the terminology of the resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator answered the question of whether or not it will permit an investigation of the case referred to?

Mr. TYDINGS. If it is within the purview of the resolution, the Senator from Michigan would know that as well as I would. I am not going to be drawn out into a discussion of this case. I have taken a good deal of vilification and abuse on the floor of the Senate; but a long time ago I learned an old proverb that "The spoken word is your master. The unspoken word is your slave."

I think perhaps that will be an appropriate proverb for all of us to bear in mind when I lay the facts before the Senate at the conclusion of the investigation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I previously agreed to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield now to me——

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be very brief. I simply wish to ask the Senator two or three questions.

I think the question of the 205 cases arises in large part from a letter written by the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, on July 26, 1946. That letter is reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, 1950. In view of that letter, I should like to have clarification made of two or three points.

Has the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Maryland is chairman been cognizant of the fact that there seems to be a misunderstanding as to who made the investigation of the 205 cases? I ask that question because the letter was inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin, and it refers to 284 cases. Action was taken on 79 of them, and that leaves 205. That is the basis of the matter; and those of us who are familiar with the activities at that time know that Secretary Byrnes dealt with 205 cases.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to interrupt the Senator, if I may, long enough to say that if there was an investigation during the Eightieth Congress, the Congress preceding this one, by the House Appropriations Committee, by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and by the Senate Appropriations Committee, public documents will show whether or not that is so.

The Senator from Maryland has not been idle while a great deal of oratory has been indulged in on the floor of the Senate. In due time the Senator from Maryland will respond to the question of whether or not the affidavits and the paper issued by the State Department and the other matters referred to here are to be taken at face value.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point I should like to reach is this: The letter from Secretary Byrnes says the investigation was made by the screening committee of the Department. On the other hand, the Senator from Wisconsin said it was done by the Security Board appointed by the President. Could not the committee ascertain the correct situation in that connection?

Mr. TYDINGS. We can.

Mr. ANDERSON. Seventy-nine cases were acted upon. The Senator from Wisconsin is under the impression, I am sure, that they had been labeled bad security risks.

The report from the Secretary of State is that at least the first 26 were aliens who could not be employed in peacetime, but could have been employed in time of war. Could not the committee make a finding as to the facts regarding the 79 thus involved?

Mr. TYDINGS. We could.

Mr. ANDERSON. There remain 205. The impression the Senator from Wisconsin has is that the President's Loyalty Board labeled them bad-security risks. My understanding was that it did just

the reverse, namely, that it screened them.

Since the 205 cases started this whole matter, regardless of whether those names were brought in by the Senator from Wisconsin or by anyone else, could not the committee take those 205 cases and give the Senate a report on them?

Mr. TYDINGS. We could.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the date of the letter of Secretary Byrnes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The date of the letter of Secretary Byrnes was July 26, 1946.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I now yield to my colleague from West Virginia, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I desire the floor in my own right as soon as my distinguished colleague concludes his remarks.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well. Then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for a question which I wish to ask of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In this afternoon's Evening Star there appears an article by Miss Doris Fleeson, in which the following is stated, among other things:

> The Tydings subcommittee of the Senate will momentarily disclose the whole story in detail. It will show that—
>
> Every name on the list of 81 supposed Communist sympathizers handed to Senator TYDINGS by Senator MCCARTHY appears on the old House list.
>
> The descriptions given by Senator MCCARTHY of the 81 tally in substance in every instance with the descriptions given in the House record, as to ages, dates, type of work, background, etc. In some instances Senator MCCARTHY scarcely bothered to change the wording.

Can the Senator from Maryland tell me whether that statement is true and correct or whether that statement will be investigated with respect to the 81 cases?

Mr. TYDINGS. As I said a moment ago, the Senator from Maryland is not hearing anything much this afternoon that is new. In the subcommittee we have been so busy conducting hearings that there is much data which I have assembled which I have not as yet had an opportunity to lay before the subcommittee.

What the Senator from Illinois asks is a very pertinent question. If he will forgive me, I prefer at this time not to make an answer.

Mr. LUCAS. So long as the question is pertinent, I forgive the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is pertinent, and I think the Senator from Maryland is well advised about the ramifications of this whole case.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, unhappily, this communistic warfare was started at Wheeling, W. Va., in a congressional district which honored me with five elections to the House of Representatives.

The people of West Virginia have been intensely interested in this extraordinary matter ever since the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] made his sensational speech in Wheeling on the ninth day of last February.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from West Virgina will yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield for a question.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I wished to ask the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] this question, but he refused to yield to me. So I could not ask the question then.

Therefore, I should like to ask it of the junior Senator from West Virginia.

In view of the fact that we are playing this numbers game today, I should like to ask the Senator whether he is aware of the fact that during the Lincoln Day speaking tour I made, I sent to the President of the United States a telegram in which I called attention to the 57 names I had, and also said, "Mr. President, you can have those names if you desire them." At that time I also called attention to the letter of Secretary Byrnes in which he points out that his own security board or loyalty board—and there were some fine men on that board also—labeled approximately 300 as improper for State Department employment. The actual number is 284 or 285. I called attention in that wire to the President the fact that only about 80 of those men were discharged——

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield for a question—not for a speech.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am asking the Senator from West Virginia whether he is aware of the fact that on that speaking tour I sent the President such a telegram, which I assume he still has, so that there will be recorded in his mind and in the mind of everyone, the fact that in that telegram I referred to the 57 names which I said I had, and the 205 names which I said were named by the President's own security board, and which persons were not discharged.

So I think we should be done with this silly numbers game.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am familiar with all that has appeared in the papers concerning the matters mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin. Let me assure him that it is not my intention to discuss anything as unimportant as a numbers game or racket.

My very limited relations with the Secretary of State have been uniformly friendly. My intimate associations with the able Senator from Wisconsin, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I am the chairman, have been harmonious and pleasant in the highest degree. There is not a single reason—personal or political—that would induce me to help or hurt either of these high officials at the expense of the other. Whatever I may say or do relative to the bitter controversy raging between the Senator and the Secretary of State will be prompted solely by a desire to discharge fully and fairly my official duty to all concerned.

Soon after the Senator from Wisconsin delivered his West Virginia speech, which appeared in the Wheeling Intelligencer, and from which I shall later quote, I ventured to tell him that, in my opinion, if he, by legal evidence, conclusively proved that with the knowledge and consent of Secretary Acheson there were 205 Communists in the Department of State, he would thereby render his country one of the greatest services that has been performed since the days of the immortal Washington; but that if those charges failed, and the people became convinced that they were without justification, he would be not only discredited but retired from public office and disgraced forever.

If Secretary Acheson has knowingly harbored 205 Communists, or even one Communist in the Department of State, he should be scourged from office and, by unanimous consent, degraded to the level of Benedict Arnold for being a traitor to the United States. But if it becomes apparent that the Secretary is completely guiltless of these charges, he should be handsomely vindicated, and his innocence should be officially proclaimed to the world.

If the Secretary's vindication becomes a generally accepted conclusion, the usefulness of the Senator from Wisconsin to the Senate and the country will, in my opinion, be totally and eternally destroyed.

We do not know whether the Senator's charges are true or false. So far, my judgment has been wholly suspended. But it is high time that some reliable relevant evidence be made a matter of record.

I listened, with the keenest interest and the deepest anxiety to the Senator's first speech in the Senate on the charge of Communism in the Department of State. I even objected to what seemed to me to be an excess of inquiries and interruptions to which the Senator was subjected, because I was impatient to hear every word of his amazing narration. I fully intended to vote with him if he established his case, and support him to the limit of my capacity. It was my fervent hope that, regardless of politics or friendship, punishment—swift and severe—would be inflicted upon any government official who had knowingly kept 205, or any other number of Communists in the Government's service, in which opportunities for traitorous actions are always available.

There has never been any doubt in my mind that communism is the greatest menace to Christianity, democratic government and human freedom that has ever cursed the world. An American official—high or low—who would, for a moment, knowingly retain a Communist in a place of responsibility from which he could betray to a hostile nation all that is dear to the hearts of the American people, ought to be, not in public life, but in the penitentiary or on a gallows as high as Haman built for Mordecai.

Mr. President, it is important to a proper understanding of the merits of

the Senator's charges to know just what he said in his West Virginia speech. For that information let me invoke the assistance of the Wheeling Intelligencer in which the speech appeared on the 10th day of February.

This paper is one of the oldest and most celebrated journals of West Virginia. As long as I can remember, it has been the political bible of the Republicans of my State. Its founder was the late H. C. Ogden, one of the country's most distinguished newspapermen. He died a few years ago, and the Intelligencer, with a dozen other important papers known as the Ogden Chain, descended to his daughters, Mrs. Frances Stubblefield of Charleston, West Virginia, and Mrs. Nutting of Washington, both of whom are outstanding from every desirable point of view. The former is, and long has been, the Republican National Committeewoman for West Virginia.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. Under the will of the late H. C. Ogden, a distinguished lawyer and prominent Republican, Col. Austin Wood, of Wheeling, is the general supervisor of all the Ogden papers—including the Intelligencer. Colonel Wood uniformly insists upon pitiless accuracy and never-failing propriety in the Ogden papers. In these circumstances, it is difficult for me to doubt that the Senator, in his Wheeling speech, used the identical language attributed to him by the Intelligencer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. NEELY. Not at the moment. Later I will yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield for the present.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President this outstanding Republican paper contains the following concerning the Senator's speech. But he declared:

> While I cannot take the time to name all the men in the State Department who have been named as members of the Communist Party and members of a spy ring, I have here in my hand a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary as being members of the Communist Party, and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department.

Let me ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whether in the course of the hearings which have been conducted on this matter there has been adduced any proof that there were 205 Communists in the State Department at any time on, before, or after the 9th day of February, 1950.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from West Virginia that I have written the Senator from Wisconsin three letters, one by the counsel, I think, and two by myself, and I have sent the counsel to his office three times to get any evidence he might care to offer, for the committee to consider. I have publicly, on the Senate floor on several occasions told the Senate, and I hope the country, that if anybody in America has any evidence which will sustain these charges, they are welcome to come and present it to the committee. I have said to the committee in public that any evidence tending to sustain the charges which caused the subcommittee to be brought into being would be welcome.

Now, since the Senator from Wisconsin testified in public hearings, I leave it to others to say whether he has offered proof to sustain the newspaper story of 205 Communists now in the State Department and known to the Secretary.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator from Maryland please answer this question yes or no? Has the Senator from Wisconsin given to the committee the names of 205 Communists who are employed in the State Department or who are shaping State Department policy?

Mr. TYDINGS. With some reluctance, I think the question is so far outside committee procedure that I may answer, and say the answer is "No."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin whether he said in his Wheeling speech that he had the names of 205 Communists who, with the knowledge of the Secretary of State, are now employed in the State Department or who are shaping its policy?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say, first, that I have produced evidence only with reference to about 81, but before I am through, if it will make the Senator happy, I may be able to give evidence on more than 205. There is no doubt in the mind of the Senator from Maryland as to what was said. The President received a telegram from me——

Mr. NEELY. That is not my question. I now ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether I correctly understood him on the floor of the Senate, on one occasion, to say that he had not said at any time, at Wheeling or at any other place, that he had the names in his hands, or before him, of 205 Communists who were employed in the Department of State or who were shaping State Department policy.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said I had in my hand a letter from former Secretary Byrnes in which he pointed out that there were 205 men who his loyalty board said should be discharged because they were dangerous to the Government, and that none of them had been discharged. I then called on the President, by telegram, the next day, to find out the names of those 205 persons from the Secretary of State. I told the President I had the names of 57 other dangerous individuals and that he could have those names.

So let us be done with this silly "numbers game." There is no doubt as to the figures. The President received that telegram the next day. His attention was called to Secretary Byrnes' letter. I said I had 57 names which were available to him for the asking. Since that time the names have increased, and I have given the committee the names of and information on the files of over 100. All the committee needs to do now is to get the files. If what I have said is not the truth, we can be sure the President would make those files available.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator answer yes or no, and then explain? Did the Senator say, in his speech reported in the Wheeling Intelligencer, that:

> I have here in my hand a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who, nevertheless, are still working and shaping the policy in the State Department.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to read to the Senator what I said.

Mr. NEELY. No; I want the Senator's simple yes or no answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator want an answer?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I certainly do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will he be quiet long enough for me to answer him?

I said I had in my hand 57 names of individuals who would appear to be members of or loyal to the Communist Party, but who, nevertheless, were helping to shape our foreign policy.

That is what was said at Wheeling and in other places in the country, and that was called to the Senator's attention——

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator please stop evading and candidly state whether he wrote and said in his Wheeling speech what I have read from the Intelligencer?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not going to talk about the rough uncorrected draft of any speech which someone may have gotten. I did not say I had the names of 205. I said that Mr. Byrnes said, "Here are 205." I said, "Mr. President, get their names." I am not going to discuss any rough draft of any speech. I have told the Senator what was said in that speech. I offered the Senator from Illinois, 2 days later, a transcript of that speech, which he refused.

Mr. NEELY. I insist that the question be answered "Yes" or "No."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to answer further.

Mr. NEELY. I should like to know whether the Senator gave to the Wheeling radio station a speech which contained the language I have read relative to the alleged employment of 205 Communists by the Department of State. Did the Senator say that?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator asks me a question he will have to wait until I can answer it; otherwise, he will not get an answer.

Mr. NEELY. If the Senator will not answer "Yes" or "No," I must assume that he purposes to persist in evading my question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it seems perfectly obvious that the Senator from Wisconsin must have known the story which was carried in this and other newspapers. It is perfectly obvious that he must have known what went on over the air.

Did the Senator from Wisconsin ever try to clear this up, either through channels in West Virginia or over the broadcasting station?

Mr. NEELY. To my regret, I do not know.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the able Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wanted to ask the Senator this question: Did the distinguished Senator from West Virginia read the letter which the distinguished former Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, wrote to the committee?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I have read it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the eminent Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think, in fairness to the former Secretary of State, that his exact words should again be placed in the RECORD. I do not think the Secretary of State said more than this—and I am reading now from his reply:

> Of these 4,000 employees the case histories show approximately 3,000 have been subjected to a preliminary examination as a result of which a recommendation against permanent employment has been made in 284 cases by the screening committee to which you refer in your letter.

I do not think the Secretary of State ever said these persons were Communists or were card-carrying Communists or bad security risks. I mention that because in many of the cases the only objection to permanent employment was that peace having arrived, wartime employees, aliens to this country, could no longer be retained in the State Department.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I know that Jim Byrnes would never tolerate a Communist around him in any capacity. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico recalls the date of the letter.

Mr. ANDERSON. June 26, 1946. The reason I wanted to insert the statement in the RECORD is that former Secretary of State Byrnes presented it to the Cabinet. At that time I was a member of the Cabinet and I heard his statement. I know it was not that they were card-carrying Communists.

Mr. MAYBANK. Since then the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has read the letter?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. MYERS and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. NEELY. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Does it not seem strange to the Senator from West Virginia that the Senator from Wisconsin has just admitted that he was reading from a statement made by former Secretary of State Byrnes dated in 1946 to the effect that these people are still on the pay roll of the State Department, and today seems to base his case upon a letter which is 3½ years old?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; strange beyond comprehension. According to the Wheeling Intelligencer, the Senator made a statement which was entirely different from anything said by Secretary Byrnes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not desire to get involved in this debate. I would appreciate it if a question could be properly propounded to the Senator from Wisconsin and have him answer it either yes or no, because it is not a trick question and can be answered either in one way or another by an honest man.

Mr. McCARTHY. More questions? I thought that if the Senator from Maryland had desired to ask me questions, he had the opportunity to do so. He has had hours, during which he has been cross-examining me in detail.

Mr. TYDINGS. I never cross-examined the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without unanimous consent the Senator from West Virginia cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me for a question.

Mr. NEELY. I shall be glad to yield if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that not long ago I asked the distinguished Vice President a parliamentary inquiry, and I wanted recognition for 2 minutes, but the distinguished Senator from Maryland denied me that right.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I said, "Reserving the right to object," and then asked the Senator whether he was going to speak at length. He never gave me a chance to find out.

Mr. NEELY. I hope that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska will not hold me responsible for anything the Senator from Maryland may have done or failed to do.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I hold nothing against the Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the able Senator from Maryland, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. The question that has been raised is susceptible of a "yes" or "no" answer. I would ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin this question: Did the Senator from Wisconsin give to the newspaperman who wrote the article for the paper a manuscript containing the paragraph which he has read, and did he give to the radio people a manuscript containing the paragraph from which he has read? Certainly he did or did not. I am certainly very glad that the Senate has had the opportunity today to see what the situation is, because I want the Senate to know how difficult it is under some circumstances to extract information from witnesses.

Mr. NEELY. I cannot answer the question of the Senator from Maryland because of my utter inability to obtain the necessary information from the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator know that the only money which the Senator from Maryland has spent upon investigations was for an investigator whom he sent down to Wheeling, W. Va., to investigate me? The Senator from Maryland has the figures 205 and 57 clearly in mind. I have gone over them with him in detail at least five times, and he has told me at least twice "Now I understand."

Mr. NEELY. My answer to the Senator's question is an emphatic "No."

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator think——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator think that the important issue before the committee today is to take all the evidence which has been presented, regardless of whether it was 10 individuals or 100 or 50, and investigate them?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator agree that the important thing is to take the evidence on Communists and to get rid of those individuals, whether there are 50 or 100? Will the Senator agree that this bickering over whether there were typographical errors in the rough draft given the radio station should stop, and that the important question is to get those Communists out?

Mr. NEELY. Of course, I want to get rid of any known Communist, if such there be, in any branch of the Government without the delay of a single moment or a single heartbeat. But I also want a "yes" or "no" answer to the questions I have asked the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the eminent Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia whether or not, in listening to the debate on the floor this afternoon, he understood that the Senator from Wisconsin had said that the charges as to Communists in the State Department to which he had referred at Wheeling, W. Va., came from the context of a letter written by former Secretary of State Byrnes.

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I heard what the Senator said on that point.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has asked a question of the Senator from West Virginia, and he is now in the process of answering it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator so understand?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from West Virginia understood the Senator from Wisconsin to say during the debate on the floor this afternoon that instead of the figure 205

as being card-carrying Communists, he said the figure was 57.

Mr. NEELY. I also heard that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator from West Virginia hear his colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia, read two affidavits pertaining to the meeting at Wheeling, W. Va.?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, with unusual interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator from West Virginia feel it was appropriate for the special subcommittee of the Senate making an investigation of these charges to verify once and for all where the truth lies in those figures?

Mr. NEELY. It is my intention to urge that the Tydings committee perform that highly important service, because it is obvious that someone whose identity has not yet been officially determined is lying as deliberately and outrageously as Ananias did just before he was struck dead for his sin. If there are not 205 Communists in the State Department, there are brazen, vile and vicious Ananiases abroad in the land. The Tydings committee should mercilessly run down, expose, and without delay bring the guilty to justice—regardless of who they may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia, in view of the fact that the name of former Secretary of State Byrnes has been brought into this discussion, and his name was brought in on the basis of certain proof that employees in the State Department were being held back from employment by screenings being given to them, whether or not the Senator from West Virginia feels that former Secretary of State Byrnes would have kept on the pay roll of the State Department known Communists or people who he knew were Communists.

Mr. NEELY. If the Senator from Minnesota had served with the distinguished Senator, later Secretary James Byrnes, as many others on this floor have done, he would know that it would have been as impossible for a known Communist to be retained in the Government's service by that outstanding Secretary as it would be for a man to number the days of eternity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want the Senator to know that I hold Mr. Byrnes in the highest regard as a devoted and patriotic citizen, and the purpose of my question was merely to ask the Senator's opinion as to whether or not a man who was a Secretary of State, who lists in a letter a certain number of employees who have been screened out for further examination, would have kept them on the pay roll if he knew them to be, as has been charged, Communists, and the Senator's answer is, obviously, that of course he would not.

Mr. NEELY. That is my unhesitating, unconditional, confident belief and reply. It would have been as impossible for "Jimmy" Byrnes to be guilty of such folly as it would be for dead soldiers to rise from their graves and fight again.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator believe any other inference can be drawn, from the reference made by the Senator from Wisconsin to the letter written by Secretary of State Byrnes, and can any other inference be drawn from the remarks, than that Secretary Byrnes, and that the Secretary of State who followed him, a great Pennsylvanian, George Marshall, knew that Communists were on the pay roll to a certain number? Is not that the plain inference to be drawn from the remarks?

Mr. NEELY. That is obviously true.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have just heard the Senator give very responsive replies to the inquiries of the Senator from Minnesota with regard to Secretary Byrnes. Am I right in assuming that what he has said about Secretary Byrnes goes with equal weight with regard to Secretary Marshall?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I understand that what the Senator has said about Secretary Byrnes and Secretary Marshall goes with equal weight to another great American, Secretary Hull?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly. Both those men are, and always will be, models of patriotism, veracity, and distinguished service. They will ever be as far above suspicion as Caesar wished his wife to be.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I right in assuming that no one in his right mind could doubt the character, the integrity, the patriotism of the present great Secretary of State, Secretary Dean Acheson?

Mr. NEELY. That assumption has my concurrence.

Mr. President, I desire once more to give the Senator from Wisconsin the opportunity to answer "Yes" or "No" my question whether he gave the Wheeling Intelligencer a written copy of a speech which contained the verbatim language I have quoted, and whether he gave a copy of that speech to radio station WWVA on the 9th day of February. Let me entreat the Senator from Wisconsin to answer that question "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator talking to me?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, to the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY. That was my intention.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer——

Mr. NEELY. Once more, will the Senator simply state whether he did or did not hand to the radio station at Wheeling, and to the Wheeling Intelligencer on the 9th day of February written copies of his speech which contained the exact language I have read from the Wheeling paper?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator be quiet while I answer?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I cannot hear what the Senator is saying.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will tell the Senator exactly what I gave the radio station, as far as I know. They were given a rough draft of the speech. It is entirely possible—I have not seen the draft since I gave it—that there was an error and that 205 was used in place of 57 instead of in connection with the Byrnes letter, but there is no doubt in anybody's mind—or in the mind of the Senator—that in that speech that night I used the figure 57 as I stated. I said, "I have the names of 57 people in my hand who are either members of or loyal to the Communist Party." The Byrnes letter and the figure 205 contained therein was used to prove how the loyalty program started, and how it was operated.

I pointed out that of 3,000 screened, 284 were labeled as improper for employment. I pointed out that 79 were discharged, leaving 205, and I asked publicly, and I asked the President in a wire immediately thereafter, to ask the Secretary for the names of the 205.

Mr. President, answering the question——

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the Senator has manifestly determined that he will not answer my question "Yes" or "No." If he cannot say whether he gave the Wheeling Intelligencer and the radio station a copy of the speech which contained the quotation that has been repeated to him again and again, I pity the committee which is endeavoring to obtain from him sufficient evidence to enable it to decide the case which he has sensationally brought to the attention of the Nation and the world. The Senator is an able lawyer and knows the value of responsive answers to important questions. If he presents his evidence to the committee in the manner in which he is resisting my inquiries, the hearing now in progress will be fruitless and never-ending.

Mr. President, men of unquestioned reputation swear that the Senator said precisely what the Intelligencer reported. In such a case as this, a patriot should present his proof. He should not evade or quibble or hide behind others after obtaining thousands of screaming headlines on his own responsibility.

The time has come to submit proof instead of rumor and nonsense in this case. If it is not produced, public opinion ought to sear to oblivion those who are responsible for a Nation-wide clamor that has utterly and foully failed of justification.

I again tell the Senator from Wisconsin: If he will prove the charges he has made against the Secretary of State, I will vote to impeach him and to inflict upon him the severest penalty of the law. I would owe that service not only to myself and to my country but also to my God.

This Nation has been held up to ridicule in every capital of the world as a result of these wild, weird charges—hideous charges that we hire men, known to the Secretary of State to be Communists, to shape the policy of this great and

glorious Republic—Communists who would destroy this Government and all government, wreck all churches, destroy all religions, murder all ministers of the gospel and enslave the world forever.

Mr. President, for ourselves, for our children and for all humanity, let us see to it that the truth and the whole truth about this nationally disgraceful matter is officially ascertained and proclaimed from pole to pole.

I demand that the committee diligently prosecute this case to a final conclusion. I demand that it require the Senator from Wisconsin to produce any scintilla of legal evidence in his possession and if he has none, let the world be informed of that fact now and forever. If it be proved that anyone has, for personal notoriety, political gain, or infamous ends slandered his country, disgraced his government and imperiled the security of the Nation in this—the most critical hour since the creation—let the guilty be scourged from all fellowship with the patriotic and the decent of the land; let him be branded for his crime after the manner of the murderer, Cain; and let him, with his infamy for his only companion and his abomination for his only contemplation, be a wanderer on the face of the earth to the end of his days.

REPORT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 580)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 6264.)

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right, if I can secure it now.

Mr. LUCAS. I was about to move that the Senate take a recess, but I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, after all the colloquy that has taken place this afternoon, during nearly 3 hours of time, I should like to make one observation. I think the demand by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] that the subcommittee proceed to make a thorough investigation, is very timely. Again I wish at this point to read what the resolution calls for:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are or have been employed by the Department of State.

Certainly that is squarely along the line of the admonitions so forcefully given to the subcommittee this afternoon by the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. I agree with the sentiments he expressed. I continue to read from the resolution:

> The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable, and if said recommendations are to include formal charges of disloyalty against any individual, then the committee, before making said recommendations, shall give said individual open hearings for the purpose of taking evidence or testimony on said charges. In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

Mr. President, when the distinguished majority leader this afternoon started the colloquy with many Senators on the Senate floor, he read something from a statement made by Representative KARSTEN. I am told that if an investigation is made, and if the subcommittee subpenas as witnesses Robert L. Lee, Harris Huston, and another man whose name I do not recall, they will testify that they themselves have seen these FBI loyalty files. Let them testify as to what they saw. I am repeating what has been said. I am not charging anything. If that be true, then at one time at least the loyalty files were opened up to a committee of Congress. The men referred to were working for a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Oh, yes; that was before the so-called Executive order was issued, but what difference does that make? So far as the precedents of the Senate are concerned, it makes not one iota of difference. I suggest to the subcommittee that it follow the procedure suggested by the junior Senator from West Virginia; make an investigation, subpena the witnesses needed, and ask them what they found. Ask them how many persons have been discharged for disloyalty; ask them all about the matter. Such procedure will throw a considerable amount of light on the case.

Mr. President, it seems to me that what should be done is to carry out the provisions laid down in the resolution. If the subcommittee would conduct as extensive a cross-examination of the witnesses who have been before them as was done of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] this afternoon, a wonderful amount of evidence might be uncovered. But no, double-barreled questions by the wholesale were asked to smear the Senator from Wisconsin, while the questioners are very light on the questions asked in cross-examination of witnesses who have been subpenaed to appear before the subcommittee. The record shows that to be so.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of the debate this afternoon I again wish to call attention to the provisions of the resolution itself, which goes beyond the Senator from Wisconsin, which provides that investigation shall be made of Communists who are in the State Department today, or who may have been in the State Department. We should be talking about how we are to secure the loyalty files. We should be talking about subjects which go far beyond the mere question of whether we agree with the Senator from Wisconsin or not. Here we have the resolution directing the subcommittee to act. The resolution is the mandate of the Senate to the subcommittee. With the junior Senator from West Virginia, I believe the American people will want to know what the committee brings in by way of testimony, what kind of investigation the committee makes. They do not want an investigation of the Senator from Wisconsin. They want an investigation to be made of subversive and disloyal persons in the Department of State. It is as simple as that. There can be splurges and bombardments against the Senator from Wisconsin for whatever political reasons Senators may desire, but in the final analysis the people of the United States of America will want to know, and they are entitled to know, what is being done by way of a real investigation into the subject matter covered by the resolution. They want to know what is being done to investigate the question of subversives who are alleged to be in the Government.

Mr. President, I have been waiting all afternoon to secure the floor. While I am on my feet I want to say something else. The distinguished majority leader this afternoon read a letter from a man by the name of Peurifoy. In that letter he charged the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] with making an untruthful statement. I do not believe it is in keeping with the dignity of the United States Senate for a Senator to use a letter of that kind—which I think is much different than a newspaper article—a letter from an official in Government, who attempts to besmirch the name of a Senator. It is perfectly all right to bring such a person before the committee. That person has a perfect right to make any charges he wants to before the committee. But when a Senator reads such a letter into the RECORD, I think he steps into the shoes of the writer of the letter. That is the way I feel about it. So long as I am minority leader, I shall not sit idly by and see a secretary of some Government agency or institution call a Senator of the United States a liar.

I think I was acting within the precedents and rules of the Senate when I called the majority leader to order. I can present many precedents for the action I took. Similar action has been taken when attempts have been made to read into the RECORD telegrams and other documents containing objectionable matter. I did not take the action I did with any motive of disrespect, or for any personal reasons. I wish to go along with the majority leader whenever I can. But I took the action I did because I thought it was beneath the dignity of the United States Senate, and the respect that should be shown for Members of the Senate, to permit an individual to attempt to besmirch the name and the character of a Senator, whether he is on one side of the aisle or the other.

I want to see fair play here. Believe me, Mr. President, every time the motives of a Senator are impugned, I cer-

tainly am going to rise and ask that order be maintained, and then make the point of order, and hope that the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. JENNER and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield first to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I wish to ask the Senator what his impression is of a committee which is acting under a resolution of the Senate to investigate communism in the State Department, and which takes up its time calling Communists before it and then asking those Communists whether they know whether there are any Communists in the State Department.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I might respond to the Senator from Indiana by saying that I think that is not giving to the people of the United States the kind of investigation they expect to be made by that committee of the Senate. That is what I have been talking about. If there had been an exhaustive cross-examination of some of the witnesses who have been permitted to wrap the flag around themselves and talk about how their ancestors came over on the *Mayflower*, and if the committee had gotten down to business and had examined those witnesses, we might have gotten into the record more information than we now have to reveal to the American people.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if it is not a little bit like sending Baby Face Nelson to investigate John Dillinger.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a great deal of similarity in that respect, I agree.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator tell us if he knows—or if he does not know, perhaps the majority leader will tell us if he knows—whether the investigating committee has arrived at an opinion as to whether it has legal power to subpena the files and force their production before the committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Missouri asking that question of me?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes, or of the majority leader; either one.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understood the Senator from Maryland to say the other evening, the committee had not determined as to that procedure; in other words, no test had been made. I understand that an executive officer had stated that the Department is keeping the files because of an executive order. Whether or not the committee has complied with the provisions of the resolution, I do not know. I think that is a very pertinent question.

I suppose that in absence of the Senator from Maryland, the distinguished Senator from Missouri should interrogate some other member of the committee, perhaps the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] or any other member of the committee who may be on the floor at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Then I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, if I may, two questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri that he be permitted to ask questions of the Senator from Connecticut at this time? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. I have two questions. In the first place, I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether the direction of Senate Resolution 231 has been complied with, namely:

> In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

The second question is whether the committee has arrived at a conclusion as to whether it has legal power to require the production of those files and records on subpena.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Missouri, insofar as his first question is concerned, I have been informed, as all members of the committee have been informed, that subpenas were served and that the production of the records was refused; at least, the return was made that the files would not be turned over.

I believe that report was made by the chairman of the subcommittee to the chairman of the full Foreign Relations Committee. It has not been discussed in the Foreign Relations Committee as a whole.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that the Senator from Nebraska was objecting to the reading by my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, of a sentence which appeared in the first paragraph on page 2 of the Peurifoy letter.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not seen the letter, and I do not know in what paragraph the statement appears. I am objecting to the words which were used.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The statement is:

> Finally, there is no shred of truth to the Senator's flat statement that this man "has, or until recently had, a desk in the State Department."

That is what the Senator was objecting to; is it?

Mr. WHERRY. I was objecting to the fact that Mr. Peurifoy, an under secretary in a Government department, said there was no truth in the statement made by a Senator. I do not know anything about the facts, of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is a matter of record that the Senator from Wisconsin charged that Mr. Lattimore has, or until recently had, a desk in the State Department. I believe it is a matter of record that the Senator from Wisconsin has made that charge.

Mr. WHERRY. That may be true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Nebraska now saying that it is proper for a Senator to charge that a man has a desk in the State Department, but improper for an under secretary of a department to say that that man has not; and is the Senator from Nebraska also saying that it is improper for another Senator to put into the RECORD a correction?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I say it is beneath the dignity of the Senate and not in accordance with the respect to which Members of the Senate are entitled to let an under secretary of any department charge—either in a letter or by oral statement—a Senator with being untruthful. Such persons have a perfect right to come before the subcommittee and present their case. If it is a question of a decision, they can present the facts, and then let the committee decide.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am answering the Senator's question now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. But regardless of what the letter was about or regardless of what the Senator from Wisconsin did, or anything else, I think it is time to call a halt, because indirectly such action by a department official impugns the motives of a Senator—when it is said that a Senator is untruthful. I take that position regardless of the merits of the case, for I myself do not know about the merits.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois again.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that it is proper for a Senator to make charges against a department or members of a department, but improper for the members of that department to say that the charges are false?

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Illinois has asked that question once, but I shall answer it again, so that there will be no question about my sincerity or my belief regarding the matter.

I say I think it is entirely improper for an under secretary to make such a statement either in writing or orally, because I feel that it impugns the motives of a Senator of the United States. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is this: I do not know anything about the merits of the case. I do not know who is right or who is wrong. But if we are to preserve the dignity of the United States Senate and the respect for Members of the Senate, I think the majority of the Senate, just as quickly as the minority, must not permit such a thing to happen.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator from Nebraska think it impugns the motives of the President for a Senator to charge that the President of the United States

has knowledge of Communists in the State Department, which charge was made this afternoon by the Senator from Wisconsin on this floor?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to go into that kind of an argument, I will say that I do not like to have anyone accuse anyone else of being a Communist; but one of the most severe blows which I have ever had to take was when the President charged the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] with being of assistance to and agents of the Kremlin. What do Senators think of that? Of course they do not like it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; if the Senator has anything more to say after that, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator mean that that statement is such that it should stop us?

Mr. WHERRY. I think that statement by the President is the most unwarranted and most irresponsible statement ever made by a President of the United States; yes, sir. The President of the United States has no corner on loyalty or truthfulness or patriotism, if you please.

I respect the President; I respect the honor of the office of the President, as I said the other evening in my remarks. But I wish to tell the Senator that when any man who is the head of this Government charges a Senator in the way that the President has charged several of us, then I submit that such a statement is a very excessive statement.

So far as concerns comparing that statement with anything else which has been said by someone else, I will let the Senator from Pennsylvania do that for himself.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. I was merely asking the Senator about the comparison to be made when the Senator from Illinois was almost charged with misconduct because he read on the floor of the Senate a statement which indicates that the Senator from Wisconsin has not told the truth. Does not the Senator from Nebraska think that the Senator from Wisconsin himself certainly is not acting entirely properly when he charges the President of the United States—and makes the charge here on the floor of the Senate—with knowing that there are Communists in the State Department?

In other words, if it is good for one, is not it good for the other?

Mr. WHERRY. I have already answered that question.

I wish to make it perfectly clear, also, that I have all the respect in the world for the Senator from Illinois. I made it plain this afternoon when I cited the precedents with respect to reading telegrams into the RECORD, such as occurred when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] was taken from the floor. These are precedents, believe me, which I think would make out of order the reading of messages or letters containing vicious statements indirectly impugning the motives of a Senator of the United States. Possibly the Senator may reply by saying there are precedents holding to the contrary, and if so, that is all right. It may be said it is all right to quote from newspapers. I suppose that is true. Things are twisted in the newspapers at times. But here is a communication from an official, a Deputy Under Secretary of State, which to my mind was used by the majority leader—to do what? To charge the Senator from Wisconsin with making an untrue statement.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator think there should be a denial, if the statement is not true?

Mr. WHERRY. I think its use in this manner is a violation of the Senate rules, and that any Senator should be called to order who uses it in such manner.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator said it was a violation of the rules, and I was called to order. But the Senate did not sustain the Senator from Nebraska, because the Senate voted to allow the Senator from Illinois to proceed in order; otherwise I should have lost the floor. So what the Senator is talking about is merely so much nonsense.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I still have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Illinois. Let me tell the Senator something now.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate sustained me in calling the Senator from Illinois to order. I would have had no objection to the Senator proceeding; in fact, I would have been the first man to move to allow the Senator to proceed in order, provided the Senator would proceed in order.

Mr. LUCAS. I could make a point of order against the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course the Senator could.

Mr. LUCAS. And under the rule, the Senator would have to take his seat. I would not be out of order, either.

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor. I should like to answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is very welcome.

Mr. WHERRY. Naturally, after a Senator is called to order, if a motion is made that he be permitted to proceed in order, I would be the first to vote in favor of it. But I do have in mind as a precedent a case in which a letter was used in an indirect way to impugn the motives of a Senator. I can show the precedent. I think it vindicates the position of the minority leader. I believe every Member of the Senate should cooperate to promote respect for the rules and to preserve the dignity of the United States Senate.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MYERS. I merely wondered what the Senator thought the State Department should do, if they felt, in their opinion, that the Senator from Wisconsin had not been accurate in the statement he made.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the proper procedure would be for the committee to invite Mr. Peurifoy to appear and testify, and to let him state in the record the position of the Department in any way he desires. That should be his privilege. I think the minority counsel should be permitted to cross-examine the witnesses, and those who are interested ought to help in the investigation to determine whether there is anything to the charges, so that the question may be cleared up. If there is anything to them, I think the American people want to know the truth; and I have a feeling that that is what is going to happen—the American people are going to insist on getting the truth.

Mr. MYERS. They are going to get the truth.

Mr. WHERRY. The sooner we quit trying the Senator from Wisconsin and begin trying those we are supposed to try, just that much more quickly will we get the job done.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether he regards it to be of very high importance that the subcommittee determine whether or not it has the legal power to compel the production of the loyalty and employment files and records of the Government employees in the Department of State?

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question in a moment, if I can get him to return to the Senate Chamber. He has stepped out.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Missouri is asking me, I may say I certainly think so, and I think when we get the files it would stop much bickering of the kind we have had, about trying the Senator from Wisconsin. We would ascertain what is in the files. I think the committee ought to exert every effort to carry out its mandate and to get the files if possible, regardless of what may be necessary in order to obtain them.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me first say, in further answer, that as I understand the resolution it only provides that the committee shall see the files; it does not call for their public disclosure. I want to tell the Senator what I said a few moments ago, that the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House saw the files with reference to many of these names, I understand. The Senate committee is now foreclosed from seeing the very files which were seen by another committee in 1947.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit me, by unanimous consent, to address one further question to the Senator from Connecticut, if the Senator from Connecticut will be kind enough to answer it?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri that he be permitted to inquire of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that I am not sure I understood his answer to my second question. I wanted to be certain that I have it right. The second question I asked him was in substance this: Has the committee, which is acting under the terms of Senate Resolution 231, arrived at a conclusion as to whether it has or has not the legal power to require by subpena the production for examination by the committee of the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and other agencies against whom charges have been made? Has the committee made a determination of what is its legal right to enforce the subpenas which it has issued?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the subcommittee authorized the chairman of the subcommittee to report to the chairman of the full committee for the full committee's consideration the refusal to comply with the subpena. If the Senator is asking me as a member of the subcommittee as to what my opinion is as to the right of this committee or of the Senate to compel the Executive to give up his papers, I shall have to reply, I am of opinion that the Senate cannot enforce compliance with the subpena. However, the Senator from Connecticut is only one member of the subcommittee. I was there when the determination was made to report the fact to the full committee. There was no extensive argument on the legal question. I rather think that that was reserved for the session of the full committee. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate very much the answer the Senator has made. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield, to permit me, with unanimous consent, to ask another question of the Senator from Connecticut?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I have very great regard for the legal opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, and I am very glad to have it. I wanted to ask him, however, whether to his knowledge it has even been decided clearly, or at all, by the Supreme Court of the United States whether a subpena issued under the direction of such a resolution as this, or any subpena issued with due authority from the Senate, can or cannot be enforced, to require the production for the examination solely by the committee of the records of the Department of State or other executive department? Has the Senator ascertained what have been the rulings of the Supreme Court, if any, on that question?

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that during the Eightieth Congress the only veto of the President of the United States which was sustained was the veto of a bill introduced by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] which would have compelled the President to submit, with the nomination of a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, the FBI report. That bill was passed on a voice vote, and the President's veto was sustained in the Senate. During the course of that debate, a very extensive argument took place, with the full marshaling of the precedents. I refer the Senator to a reading of that debate. I think it will be most illuminating to him. At least, it was sufficient to convince more than one-third of the Senators of the correctness of the view that we do not have the power.

I am glad to advert to that, because in that debate I made the statement then that I was taking the position that the Senate, as a coordinate branch of the Government, had no legal power to compel the President of the United States to surrender documents in the files of the executive department. I said then, and I reiterate now, that I was making that statement, not because there was a Democrat in the White House, because I said that if he were a Republican, I would take exactly the same position. I merely wanted the Senate to know that my position was made clear, back in the Eightieth Congress, as to this constitutional question.

I have not the time, and I am sure the Senator from Missouri does not want to engage in any long debate as to constitutionality at this time. I think it may well come, after the full committee considers it, to a full-dress debate in the Senate. I am just as certain as I can be, as a lawyer, that the Senate cannot compel the President of the United States to produce papers, any more than a judge of the district court in a recent case in the District of Columbia was able to compel the House of Representatives to produce committee records in the court. The House finally voted to send them down voluntarily, but it specifically pointed out that it was not complying with any subpena at all.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on two occasions the Senator from Connecticut has found it his disagreeable duty to comment upon the progress of the investigation. I assure the Senator from Nebraska that it is by all odds the most disagreeable appointment which the Senator from Connecticut has had in his term as a Senator. I very much regret the aspersions which have been cast upon both the earnestness and the competency of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I will, possibly immodestly, match my competency against that of the Senator from Nebraska in examining any witness. I dare say I have had more experience at it than he has had. It happens that I examine witnesses after the junior Senator from Iowa examines them before the committee, and I want to say that I resent the slur which has been cast on the junior Senator from Iowa, who has been most diligent in his duty, and who has cross-examined witnesses most skillfully, hour after hour.

I invite attention to the fact that representatives of the press, who are now reporting these proceedings of the subcommittee, are also in the hearing room, and they know and have reported to the country fully and fairly what has gone on. No effort by the Senator from Nebraska to besmirch the committee, to mislead the country as to the committee's intentions in what it is trying to do in the way of performing its duties, will make any very lasting impression.

I regret very much, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators have sought, it seems to me, to scandalize the committee. What is said here from day to day in an effort to sway the opinion of the country, in my opinion, will have as an end result very little effect. The thing which is going to count, when it is all over, is the report which the committee will make to the Senate and to the Nation. It is on the result that the committee will be judged.

I repeat that I do not propose to be drawn into any day-by-day running debate on this question. I say to the Senators on the other side of the aisle, including the minority leader, and I say to the press, and, therefore, to the Nation, that I have only one objective, and that is to sit as a judge in this proceeding, and, when all the evidence is in, render my opinion.

I offer only one reservation, Mr. President, to that very firm intention on my part, and that is that if an attack is made upon the honor or integrity of the Senator from Connecticut, outside this body or inside the Senate, the Senator from Connecticut may well have to take the floor to denounce that attack. With that reservation, however, Mr. President, I assure the Senate and the country—and I think I speak for the other four members of the subcommittee—that we have only one desire, and that is to sift these charges and find out the truth, because, if the charges are true, the country should know it, and if they are false, the country should know it. That is the issue. That is what we are going to determine; that is what we are going to be judged by. Let that day come, and the Senator from Connecticut will be able to meet it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Connecticut on the fair statement he has made, especially with reference to the charge that the committee is not doing the job that it should do. I was going to comment on what the Senator from Nebraska said regarding the subcommittee not doing anything. It was a strange statement for the Senator from Nebraska to make, because he had just told the Senate and

the country how he wanted to protect the dignity of the United States Senate. He chastised me because I read a statement into the RECORD. He said the motives of a Senator had been impugned. He was standing at the portals of the Senate, so to speak, to protect this great deliberative body. Then he proceeds to smear one of the group of five Senators on a subcommittee which has the most important and most difficult task, probably, in the history of the United States Senate.

I do not blame the Senator from Nebraska for talking about files; I do not blame him for trying to get away from what he started here today. The Senator from Nebraska has not talked about what happened in Wheeling, W. Va. I have the notion the Senator from Nebraska pretty well believes what those affidavits said with respect to the original charge which was made in Wheeling, W. Va., by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. That, Mr. President, is the reason why we are talking here this afternoon. The charge was made in Wheeling, W. Va., by the Senator from Wisconsin, according to affidavits presented this afternoon, that there were 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department; and not only that, but that Secretary Acheson knew they were there.

Talk about a Senator of the United States slurring someone; talk about the dignity of United States Senators, when the Senator speaks in such language of a Cabinet officer. Yet, on the floor of the Senate today he read into the RECORD exactly what he said he said, which is at odds with what the affidavits show.

We were unable, all afternoon, to get the Senator from Wisconsin to answer the simple question whether he did or whether he did not make the statement referred to.

The Senator from Nebraska talks about politics in this matter. I wonder who started the political angle, Mr. President. It was in Wheeling, W. Va., when the Senator from Wisconsin was on a Republican speech-making tour, that he made the charge that there were 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. He can try to get away from it if he wants to. Senators on the other side of the aisle did not rise to defend the situation this afternoon, other than the Senator from Wisconsin, and he could not defend himself. The statement that there are 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department is important, Mr. President; it is the basis of the proceedings which have ensued.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Senator from Wisconsin made the statement. I suppose some Senator will call me down for saying that, because the statement does not jibe with what the Senator said he said.

Mr. President, the investigation is proceeding. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] said this afternoon, "Let the chips fall where they may." The Senator from Illinois does not want to protect anyone. When the Senator from Wisconsin speaks about smearing, whom is he smearing?

Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. Does not a Cabinet officer have any standing at all in this country? Does not the President of the United States have any standing at all in this country? The Senator from Wisconsin said on the floor of the Senate that the President knew of 57 Communists in the State Department. Why, Mr. President, talk about smearing the Senator from Wisconsin? No one wants to smear the Senator from Wisconsin. He smeared himself all through this thing, from beginning to end. The Senator from Wisconsin is a good lawyer, and he should have known better. I predict, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wisconsin cannot prove or will not be able to prove a single allegation that was made in his speech in Reno, Nev., or in his speech at Wheeling, W. Va., with respect to 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. If he does—and I want the committee to go to the bottom of it—I will be the first one to join hands with the Senator from Wisconsin and tell him he is the hero of the hour, and that he will be, Mr. President, if he proves it. But if he does not, if he does not make good on that statement which startled this country and startled every free country in the world, as well as Communist countries, then, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia said this afternoon, the public will take care of that situation in due course.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield, Mr. President.

INVESTIGATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES—EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, yesterday when Senate Resolution 202 was read for the information of the Senate, I referred to a joint resolution, which was also read into the RECORD for the information of the Senate. At that time I gave notice that if Senate Resolution 202 was adopted, I would immediately introduce the joint resolution. The purpose of the joint resolution, Mr. President, is to enable the special committee to pay up to $17,500 for chief counsel, and not to exceed $12,500 for associate counsel, as well as to exempt counsel from the provisions of the civil-service statute. They are the usual provisions in such cases. I have spoken to the majority leader, to the minority leader, and to the distinguished Senator from Missouri about the resolution, and I understand they have no objection to it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to introduce the resolution and have it considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 176), to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, was read the first time by title, and the second time at length as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of any person as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the special Senate Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, agreed to on May 3, 1950, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

SEC. 2. Such special Senate Committee is authorized to employ a chief counsel at a salary not to exceed $17,500 per annum and an associate counsel at a salary not to exceed $12,500 to be paid out of any funds available for the payment of the expenses of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. MCMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator if the joint resolution does not represent a new departure by way of salaries for counsel of senatorial committees?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it provides more than counsel of committees are usually paid, but it came about at the suggestion of the majority leader, who said he wanted the committee which was set up to have the very best counsel that might be available.

Mr. MCMAHON. I commend the Senator from Tennessee, because unless proper counsel and assistant counsel are engaged in an investigation of this kind the committee might find itself very much at a disadvantage. I wish to say that if we are going to pay attorneys from the outside in accordance with that scale, then it is time we, too, should follow the precedent. Therefore I am delighted with what the Senator has done.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Connecticut, and I wish to say that this afternoon when the Senator was making a speech for 1 or 2 minutes in support of the resolution which was before the Senate, I asked him to yield, but before he could yield his time had expired. I wanted at that time to express my thanks to the senior Senator from Connecticut for his support of the resolution all the way through. He has rendered a great deal more service than many people know about in helping to secure a place for the consideration of both the resolution and the substitute in the Democratic policy committee, and I am very grateful for the assistance and help rendered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on the joint resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I to understand that the salaries that are proposed to be paid to counsel are more than the usual salaries paid to counsel for such purposes?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think there have been some exceptions in the case of some senatorial committees.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I asked the question is that the joint resolution

never came before the Committee on Rules and Administration. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but I may say——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The only reason I am interested in it is I do not like a precedent to be established by providing salaries which are out of line with the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration. So I ask the Senator this question: Has the distinguished Senator taken it up with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have discussed it with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it correct to say that the joint resolution did not go to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell me once again what the top salary is which is proposed to be paid to counsel under the joint resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution authorizes the committee to pay counsel up to $17,500. That is to say, it is not to exceed that amount. Of course, that does not mean that counsel will be paid that sum. The Senator should consider that if we are to get a top-flight man, he will have to give up what he is doing and of course abandon his law practice for a short time. He would be paid at that rate. Also, perhaps he may not live in Washington and it would be necessary under those circumstances for him to sustain himself here.

Mr. WHERRY. The majority leader served for a long time on the committee which handled the contingent expenses of the Senate. I shall not raise a question about this matter, because if it was unanimously agreed to, and the joint resolution is passed, it is agreeable to me. However, I am pointing out that the resolution did not go before the Committee on Rules and Administration, and there is no breakdown for the budget. I, too, wish the committee to have the kind of counsel they need. I want them to have able counsel. However, I desire to point out that because this resolution is brought up late at night and has not gone through the Committee on Rules and Administration, we may be establishing a practice which is different from the usual practice pertaining to salaries ordinarily paid, a question on which the Committee on Rules and Administration has acted, at least during this Congress and I think during other Congresses as well. I am not objecting, but I should like the RECORD to show that even though this action is taken by unanimous consent it does not establish a precedent, in view of the fact that the resolution never went to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This resolution would not go to that committee. This is a joint resolution, which must go to the House, must be acted upon by the House, and must be approved by the President, because it changes the law with reference to compensation.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree entirely with the statement of the Chair, but I submit, as the President of the Senate well knows, that there are certain provisions and rules of the Senate which provide that a breakdown shall be submitted with a resolution, the purpose of it being to have a review of it by the Committee on Rules and Administration. This was not done in the case of the substitute resolution agreed to earlier today, but it was done in the case of the original resolution, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That applies to a Senate resolution, not to a joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas H. Lockett, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Carl Breuer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Kenneth C. Beede, of Massachusetts.
Charles C. Sundell, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Frederick L. Jochem, of Wisconsin.
George H. Reese, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Mrs. Frances H. Baker, of Alabama.
Phillip I. La Sage, of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Margaret R. Parkin, of Ohio.

Lloyd A. Free, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman James P. Rasmussen, Jr. (Naval Academy), to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Emil R. Borgers	Alexander M. McDougal
Wenzell B. Bryant	Richard M. Regan
John P. Donovan	Charles L. Sweeney, Jr.
William F. Gerold	John H. Thorp
Ralph H. Henty, Jr.	
Rothschild H. Holden	
Albert R. Knotts, Jr.	

Richard G. Williams (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950:

James A. Derdick	John P. Plunkett
Johan S. Gestson	Henry F. Schlueter
Kenneth C. Johnson	Roderick M. Stewart
Theodore H. Kruse	Taylor J. Tucker
Robert D. Morse	Anthony H. Winchell
Richard E. Packard	

Norman F. Lattin (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps, as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated:

Philip B. Ezell	Albert E. Shaw, Jr.
Richard D. Flynn	Paul J. Uhlig
Helge R. Hukari	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Homer S. Arnold	William F. Hughes
Edward W. Bird	Roger G. Ireland
Louis F. Brignac, Jr.	Melvin A. Kutschbach
Robert J. Cales	John W. McAllister
Charles M. Callis	James L. May
Halvard J. Davidson	William R. Moore
Thomas F. Dillon	Benjamin P. Owens
Malcolm D. Dinges, Jr.	Earl Peterson
	David L. Spence
Owen W. Doyle	Richard C. Stevens
Frank L. Golbranson	Francis J. Sweeney
John H. Griffin	Winston F. Whipple
David H. Hosp	McClure Wilson
James R. Householder	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert W. Elliott, Jr.
William A. Ruel
Chester H. Tiberii

Henry B. Wilson (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

Joan Rhodarmer to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Lewis D. Williams

LIEUTENANT

Sidney H. Cohen

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Loy T. Brown
Francis L. Giknis
Charles H. Howarth

The following-named officer (woman) to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Norman C. Furtos

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Marjorie C. Chilcott

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of corps indicated:

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Harry L. Day

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in and by whom we live and move and have our being, there is no one unto whom we may draw nigh with such confidence.

There is no one who understands our needs so perfectly; no one unto whom we may unburden our hearts so completely; no one of whom we may ask so much; no one so willing to grant our requests

and give us strength and victory in every struggle for truth and righteousness.

Help us to believe and know and feel that Thou art seeking to be our counselor and guide in all that we think and say and do. We humbly confess that we are often so self-willed and so unlike Thee in thought and word and deed.

We pray that our plans and purposes during this day may be a clear and glorious testimony that we are striving to mediate to all mankind the blessings of freedom and peace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. JACKSON of California (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not like to begin entertaining that request unless the Journal be very long; its reading will take but a moment.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 27, 1950:

H. R. 3462. An act for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole;

H. R. 3769. An act for the relief of Doris M. Faulkner;

H. R. 3924. An act for the relief of Dr. T. F. Harrison;

H. R. 4502. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property;

H. R. 5704. An act for the relief of Janis Shimada; and

H. R. 6093. An act for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiroya.

On April 28, 1950:

H. R. 33. An act to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933;

H. R. 1726. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs, Ark., a perpetual easement for the construction and operation of a water-main pipe line;

H. R. 2554. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act of 1932;

H. R. 3010. An act for the relief of Walter E. Parks;

H. R. 3138. An act for the relief of Arthur Holbert; the estate of Ernest L. Gass, deceased; and the estate of James L. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 4070. An act to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah;

H. R. 4316. An act to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4380. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay;

H. R. 5753. An act for the relief of Jean Clark;

H. R. 5921. An act to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eivor Anne-Britt Jedlund;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Johny Nielsen;

H. R. 6345. An act for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr.;

H. R. 6475. An act to amend the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to provide for the consideration of claims for the payment of certain postal notes filed later than 1 year from the last day of the month of issue;

H. R. 6694. An act for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi; and

H. R. 6695. An act for the relief of Edgar F. Russell, Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward.

On April 29, 1950:

H. R. 715. An act for the relief of Manual Uribe;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Lt. (sg) Giacomo Falco;

H. R. 1871. An act for the relief of Hilde Flint;

H. R. 2591. An act for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur;

H. R. 3150. An act to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other puposes;

H. R. 3482. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico;

H. R. 3771. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian;

H. R. 4408. An act to amend the act, approved May 27, 1924, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," so as to grant rights to members of the United States Park Police force commensurate with the rights granted to members of Metropolitan Police force as to time off from duty;

H. R. 4285. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II;

H. R. 4289. An act to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4959. An act to reimburse the Fisher Contracting Co.;

H. R. 6003. An act for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White;

H. R. 6539. An act to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building; and

H. R. 6696. An act for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams.

On May 1, 1950:

H. R. 1600. An act for the relief of Gustav Schilbred.

On May 2, 1950:

H. R. 2895. An act to authorize the sale of select base material at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads;

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; and

H. R. 7846. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

HIS EXCELLENCY LIAQUAT ALI KHAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, May 4, 1950, it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to declare a recess in order that the House may receive His Excellency Liaquat Ali Khan, the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 580)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948, I transmit herewith the report of the War Claims Commission required by that section. In the absence of a thorough review by interested departments and agencies, the report should be considered as representing only the views of the War Claims Commission and not my own views or those of the executive branch as a whole.

The intent of section 8 of the War Claims Act was clearly to provide for a thorough study and evaluation of all of the many types of claims arising from World War II so that legislation dealing with the war-claims problem could be considered as a whole rather than approached on a piecemeal basis.

However, as the Commission points out in the opening paragraphs of its report, it has not had sufficient time to make the kind of study intended. While making certain specific legislative recommendations, the Commission was unable to be equally specific in other areas. Thus, Congress is still not provided with a comprehensive analysis of the total war-claims problem which is needed in order to make intelligent decisions in regard to individual types of claims. Such an analysis cannot be completed by the Commission without several more months of intensive study.

Under these circumstances, I recommend that legislation dealing with additional types of claims be limited at this session of Congress to that which may be necessary to enable the Commission to develop comprehensive recommendations as to what claims should be authorized in legislation and what the standards of eligibility should be. These recommendations should be submitted to me in time for full consideration by other interested departments and agencies and preparation of a coordinated set of recommendations from the executive branch to the Congress early in the next session of the Congress.

In the meantime, the Commission will, of course, proceed to adjudicate and pay those claims which have already been authorized by the Congress in the War Claims Act of 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1950.*

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN RIVER AND HARBOR WORK

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1968)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 85, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 7, lines 19 and 20, strike out "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 13, 1949;" and insert in lieu thereof the following, "Senate Document Numbered 117, Eighty-first Congress; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $21,300,000 for the initial and partial accomplishment of the project;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 8, line 2, strike out the figure "$89,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$80,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out the words "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949;", and insert in lieu thereof "House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 15, line 14, change the date "June 30, 1949" to "June 30, 1950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 22, line 22, after the comma, insert the following: "consisting of approximately one thousand and nine hundred linear feet of pressure conduit and seven hundred feet of earth dike", and, on line 24, delete the period at the end of the sentence and substitute a comma in lieu thereof and add the following: ": *Provided*, That the provisions of local cooperation applicable to the Hartford, Connecticut, project heretofore authorized, as amended, are applicable to this modification at an estimated cost to local interests of $150,000."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 24, line 6, change the figure "$68,377,000" to "$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 30, line 3, strike out the comma after the word "times"; line 4, strike out the words "sixty-nine thousand acre-feet of"; line 5, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add the following: "as authorized by existing law."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 36, line 12, after the comma following "1948", insert the following: "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 2, change the period to a comma and add the following: "as set forth in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-first Congress."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 8, strike out the following: "dated September 12, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as contained in House Document Numbered 530, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 20, after the comma following "1949", insert the following: "and the Chief of Engineers in his report dated December 12, 1949,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 38, line 24, strike out the following: "dated June 27, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof "as contained in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 39, line 15, after the comma following "1949", insert the following: "and as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated November 15, 1949,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 89 through 106, inclusive: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 89 through 106, inclusive, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language in the said amendments and in lieu thereof, on page 45, after line 10, add the following paragraphs:

"In addition to previous authorizations and authorizations herein, the projects listed below for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin (including the Willamette River Basin) substantially in accordance with the plans recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949, and approved in the letter dated February 1, 1950, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for construction by the Corps of Engineers, both contained in House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress, second session, are hereby approved, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $75,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of those projects and for the continued prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Willamette River Basin approved in the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress:

"Power facilities at Lookout Point Dam, Middle Fork of the Willamette River, Oregon.

"Hills Creek Dam, Middle Fork of Willamette River, Oregon.

"Dexter reregulating dam, Middle Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, Middle Fork-North Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Fall Creek Dam, Fall Creek, Middle Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Holley Dam, Calapooya River, Oregon.

"Willamette Falls Fish Ladder, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Willamette River channel improvements, bank protection works, and channel clearing and snagging.

"Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Montana.

"Priest Rapids Dam, Columbia River, Washington.

"John Day Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon.

"The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon.

"Local flood protection project at Pendleton, Oregon, and Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

"Local flood protection projects in the Columbia River Basin, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, provided that with respect to these local flood protection projects the following conditions shall apply:

"(1) Not to exceed $15,000,000 of this authorization shall be available for these local flood protection projects,

"(2) All of the local flood protection projects undertaken pursuant to this item shall be economically justified prior to construction,

"(3) Local cooperation specified in the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended shall be required."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 55, line 15, change the figure "$1,337,000,000" to "$1,250,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 58, beginning with line 5, strike out all of section 219, and insert on page 49, betwee. lines 20 and 21, the following:

"Arkansas, White and Red River Basins, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Kansas, and Missouri, with a view to developing comprehensive, integrated plans of improvement for navigation, flood control, domestic and municipal water supplies, reclamation and irrigation, development and utilization of hydroelectric power, conservation of soil, forest and fish and wildlife resources, and other beneficial development and utilization of water resources including such consideration of recreation uses, salinity and sediment control, and pollution abatement as may be provided

for under Federal policies and procedures, all to be coordinated with the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, other appropriate Federal agencies and with the States, as required by existing law: *Provided*, That Federal projects now constructed and in operation, under construction, authorized for construction, or projects that may be hereafter authorized substantially in accordance with reports currently before or that may hereafter come before the Congress, if in compliance with the first section of an Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), shall not be altered, changed, restricted, delayed, retarded, or otherwise impeded or interfered with by reason of this paragraph."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 155: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 70, line 3, change the figure "220" to "219"; and the Senate agree to the same.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HARRY P. CAIN,
GEO. W. MALONE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Title I of the bill, Rivers and Harbors, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 65 projects in the amount of $119,469,975. The Senate by amendments added 29 navigation projects costing $108,903,150, making a grand total of $228,373,125 for rivers and harbors. The navigation projects added by the Senate were based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. The conferees feel that they should now be included, since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

Title II of the bill, Flood Control, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in a total amount of $998,116,200. The Senate, by amendments, added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects contained in the House bill in a total amount of $366,384,000, which includes $30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, making a grand total of $1,334,321,200 for flood control. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were, as in title I, based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers, but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. As in connection with title I the conferees agree that these new projects should now be included since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

The results of the conference are as follows:

For rivers and harbors the total additional amounts of $108,903,150, as passed by the Senate, were reduced by agreement among the conferees by $24,650,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers. The total additional amount for rivers and harbors, therefore, included by the Senate and agreed to in conference, is $84,253,150.

With respect to flood control, the total additional amounts added by the Senate of $366,384,000, of which $30,179,000 is for work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation, were reduced by $84,630,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Savannah River Basin and the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The total additional amount, therefore, added by the Senate and agreed to in conference, for flood control, is $251,575,000.

As the bill passed the House the following projects were included under Title I—Rivers and Harbors:

Items (sec. 101, unless otherwise indicated)

Projects	Document number [1]	Federal cost of new work	Annual maintenance
Scarboro River, Maine, between Prouts Neck and Pine Point.	H. 69, 81st Cong.	$133,570	$3,600
Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the Pool at Biddeford.	H. 49, 81st Cong.	68,700	3,240
Winthrop Beach, Mass., beach-erosion control.	H. 764, 80th Cong.	216,000	[2]
Mystic River, Mass.	H. 645, 80th Cong.	2,908,000	4,000
Mattapoisett Harbor, Mass.	H. 664, 80th Cong.	33,000	1,500
Stonington Harbor, Conn.	H. 667, 80th Cong.	34,500	1,500
Eightmile River, Conn.	H. 666, 80th Cong.	18,000	1,000
Fire Island Inlet, N. Y.	H. 762, 80th Cong.	228,000	85,000
East Chester Creek (Hutchinson River), N. Y.	H. 749, 80th Cong.	664,000	4,800
Jamaica Bay, N. Y.	H. 665, 80th Cong.	377,000	7,500
Arthur Kill, N. Y. and N. J.	H. 223, 81st Cong.	11,561,000	[3]
Sandy Hook Bay at Leonardo, N. J.	H. 108, 81st Cong.	45,000	7,500
Lake Ogleton and Walnut Lake, Anne Arundel County, Md.	H. 712, 80th Cong.	76,000	1,000
Hellens Creek, Calvert County, Md.	H. 663, 80th Cong.	10,400	1,000
Governors Run, Calvert County, Md.	H. 670, 80th Cong.	59,450	2,000
Saint Patricks Creek, Md.	H. 671, 80th Cong.	18,200	4,800
Potomac River and tributaries at and below Washington, D. C., elimination of water-chestnut.	H. 113, 81st Cong.	----------	9,470
Kings Creek, Northampton County, Va.	H. 193, 81st Cong.	93,000	9,500
Rappahannock River at Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va.	H. 109, 81st Cong.	118,000	2,800
James River, Va.	H. 191, 81st Cong.	----------	46,000
Inland waterway in vicinity of Fairfield, N. C.	H. 723, 80th Cong.	112,400	[2]
Far Creek, N. C.	H. 770, 80th Cong.	80,600	6,000
Waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Harbor, N. C., harbor improvement at Marshallberg.	H. 68, 81st Cong.	19,400	750
Taylors Creek, N. C.	H. 111, 81st Cong.	82,200	4,500
Cape Fear River and below Wilmington, N. C.	H. 87, 81st Cong.	1,331,000	[3]
Savannah River, Ga. and S. C.	S. 6, 81st Cong.	3,137,000	236,900
Brunswick Harbor, Ga.	H. 110, 81st Cong.	1,532,000	40,000
Saint Marys River, Ga. and Fla., and North River, Ga.	H. 680, 80th Cong.	918,600	18,000
Fernandina Harbor, Fla.	H. 662, 80th Cong.	242,000	5,000
Saint Augustine Harbor and vicinity, Florida.	H. 133, 81st Cong.	1,892,200	11,600
Palm Beach, Fla., beach erosion	H. 772, 80th Cong.	$7,500	----------
Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.	H. 704, 80th Cong.	305,000	$1,000
Charlotte Harbor, Fla.	H. 186, 81st Cong.	214,000	[3]
St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla.	H. 70, 81st Cong.	208,300	4,000
Horseshoe Cove, Fla.	H. 106, 81st Cong.	194,000	5,000
La Grange Bayou, Fla.	H. 190, 81st Cong.	99,000	2,500
Fly Creek, Fairhope, Ala.	H. 194, 81st Cong.	14,000	2,000
Pascagoula Harbor, Dog River Cut-off, Miss.	H. 188, 81st Cong.	41,000	[3]
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma.	H. 758, 79th Cong.	70,000,000	[4]
Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, vicinity of Port Arthur Bridge.	H. 174, 81st Cong.	609,270	1,000
Galveston Harbor and Channel, Tex. (sea wall).	H. 173, 81st Cong.	5,550,000	[2]
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in South Galveston Bay, Tex.	H. 196, 81st Cong.	300,000	20,000
Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex.	H. 768, 80th Cong.	----------	----------
Freeport Harbor, Tex.	H. 195, 81st Cong.	356,000	26,000
Little Bay, Tex.	H. 114, 81st Cong.	$29,800	3,000
Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.	H. 192, 81st Cong.	3,050,000	60,600
Trinity River, at Dallas and Fort Worth, Tex.	H. 242, 81st Cong.	3,410,000	[4]
Mississippi River at Hannibal, Mo.	H. 67, 81st Cong.	50,420	1,420
Mississippi River at Davenport, Iowa.	H. 642, 80th Cong.	91,200	100
Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa.	H. 733, 80th Cong.	129,495	900
Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa.	S. 197, 80th Cong.	257,770	----------
Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis.	H. 71, 81st Cong.	131,100	1,100
Mississippi River at Alma, Wis.	H. 66, 81st Cong.	29,500	100
Hudson Harbor, St. Croix River, Wis.	H. 184, 81st Cong.	58,100	100
Grand Marais Harbor, Minn.	H. 187, 81st Cong.	114,000	1,500
Kenosha Harbor, Wis.	H. 750, 80th Cong.	4,500	[3]
Manistique Harbor, Mich.	H. 721, 80th Cong.	308,000	[3]
Grand Marais Harbor, Mich.	H. 751, 80th Cong.	398,000	[3]
Detroit River, Mich., Trenton Channel.	S. 30, 81st Cong.	1,356,800	1,000
Toledo Harbor, Ohio.	H. 189, 81st Cong.	329,900	4,000
Redwood City Harbor, Redwood Creek, Calif.	H. 104, 81st Cong.	322,000	14,000
San Joaquin River and Stockton Channel, Calif.	H. 752, 80th Cong.	4,214,000	[2]
Westport slough, Oregon	H. 134, 81st Cong.	112,000	8,500
Columbia slough, Oregon	[5]	905,100	16,700
Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, V. I.	H. 771, 80th Cong.	261,000	5,000
Total		119,469,975	698,480

[1] "H" indicates House document, "S" indicates Senate document.
[2] None required.
[3] No additional maintenance cost.
[4] Additional authorizations.
[5] Report of Chief of Engineers dated Dec. 28, 1948.

List of projects added to title I of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 101)

Projects	Document number [1]	Estimated cost	Projects	Document number [1]	Estimated cost
Ash Creek to Saugatuck River, Conn., beach erosion	H. 454, 81st Cong.	$203, 500	Biloxi Harbor, Miss	H. 256, 81st Cong.	0
Shrewsbury River, N. J.	H. 285, 81st Cong.	363, 000	Ouachita River, Ark. and La.	S. 117, 81st Cong.	$21, 300, 000
Waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del.	H. 304, 81st Cong.	85, 000	Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.	H. 758, 79th Cong.	[2] 10, 000, 000
Twitch Cove, Big Thoroughfare River, and Levering Creek, Md.	H. 340, 81st Cong.	21, 000	Mississippi River at Hamburg, Ill.	H. 254, 81st Cong.	50, 400
Colonial Beach, Va., beach erosion	H. 333, 81st Cong.	35, 000	Mississippi River at Rock Island, Ill.	H. 257, 81st Cong.	18, 600
Quinby Creek, Va.	H. 241, 81st Cong.	116, 000	Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.	S. 100, 81st Cong.	29, 238, 000
Davis Creek, Va.	H. 309, 81st Cong.	85, 000	Bayfield Harbor, Wis.	H. 260, 81st Cong.	119, 000
Winter Harbor, Va.	H. 319, 81st Cong.	205, 000	Cheboygan River and Harbor, Mich.	H. 269, 81st Cong.	163, 000
Channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.	H. 310, 81st Cong.	860, 500	Port Bay, N. Y.	H. 293, 81st Cong.	466, 600
Masonboro Inlet to ocean, Cape Fear River, N. C.	H. 341, 81st Cong.	1, 980, 000	Redondo Beach, Calif.	H. 303, 81st Cong.	3, 456, 000
Tampa Harbor, Fla.	H. 258, 81st Cong.	7, 787, 000	San Francisco Harbor and Bay, Calif.	H. 286, 81st Cong.	850, 000
Hudson River, Fla.	H. 287, 81st Cong.	258, 700	Bake Bay, Columbia River, Wash.	S. 95, 81st Cong.	442, 000
Channel and turning basin, Ozona, Fla.	H. 326, 81st Cong.	70, 100	Columbia River at Umatilla, Oreg.	H. 531, 81st Cong.	416, 250
Gulf, Intracoastal Waterway from Big Lagoon to Pensacola, Fla.	H. 325, 81st Cong.	88, 000	Kawaihae Harbor, T. H.	H. 311, 81st Cong.	5, 525, 500
			Hampton Roads, Norfolk Harbor, Va. (sec. 102)		50, 000
			Total		84, 253, 150

[1] "H." indicates House document, "S" indicates Senate document.
[2] Increased authorization.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

List of projects in bill as passed by the House:

Items (sec. 204)

Project	Document number	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects	Project	Document number	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects
Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa.	H. Doc. 113, 80th Cong., 1st sess.		$6, 000, 000	South Platte River Basin, Colo.	H. Doc. 669, 80th Cong., 2d sess.	$26, 300, 000	
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md.	H. Doc. 202, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	$4, 531, 200		Elkhorn River Basin, Nebr.	H. Doc. 215, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	2, 428, 000	
Savannah River Basin	H. Doc. 657, 78th Cong., 1st sess.		40, 000, 000	Mandan, N. Dak.	H. Doc. 294, 79th Cong., 1st sess.		$76, 000
Central and southern Florida	H. Doc. 643, 80th Cong., 2d sess.		10, 000, 000	Ohio River Basin			75, 000, 000
Red River backwater area			15, 000, 000	Orleans, Ind.	H. Doc. 105, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	202, 000	
St. Francis River Basin, Mo. and Ark.	H. Doc. 132, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	20, 000, 000		Bradford, Pa.	S. Doc. 20, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6, 467, 000	
Cache River Basin, Ark. and Mo.	S. Doc. 88, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	10, 000, 000		Wabash River—New Harmony Bridge, Ind. and Ill.	H. Doc. 197, 80th Cong., 1st sess.		500, 000
Emergency fund (lower Mississippi River Basin).			5, 000, 000	Red River of the North Basin			4, 000, 000
Lower Mississippi River Basin Authorization.			200, 000, 000	Rio Grande Basin			34, 000, 000
Lake Ponchartrain, La.	(1)	4, 050, 000		Santa Ana River, Calif.	H. Doc. 135, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	15, 092, 000	
Calion, Ark.	H. Doc. 427, 76th Cong., 1st sess.		430, 000	Los Angeles and San Gabriel Basin.			40, 000, 000
Genesee River, N. Y.	H. Doc. 232, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	609, 000		Willamette River Basin			40, 000, 000
Arkansas River Basin			15, 000, 000	Johnson Creek, Oreg.	(2)	332, 000	
Grand (Neosho) River, Okla., Kans., Mo. and Ark.	H. Doc. 442, 80th Cong., 1st sess.	36, 220, 000		Portland, Oreg.	(2)	14, 000, 000	
Grand Prairie region and Bayou Meto Basin, Ark.	H. Doc. —, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6, 000, 000		Albeni Falls, Idaho	S. Doc. 9, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	31, 070, 000	
White River Basin			35, 000, 000	Lower Columbia River bank protection.	(2)	4, 900, 000	
Upper Mississippi River Basin			15, 000, 000	Modification of existing projects in lower Columbia River.	(2)	14, 722, 000	
Canton, Mo.	H. Doc. 107, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	1, 086, 000		Levees along lower Columbia River.	(2)	2, 973, 000	
Cape Girardeau, Mo.	H. Doc. 204, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	4, 756, 000		Kawainui swamp, Hawaii	H. Doc. 214, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	848, 000	
Missouri River Basin			250, 000, 000	Total		213, 110, 000	785, 006, 000
Yellowstone River, Wyo., Mont. and N. Dak.	H. Doc. 216, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6, 524, 000		Grand total		998, 116, 200	

[2] Report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated Feb. 21, 1949 (H. Doc. 531. 81st Cong.).

List of projects added to title II of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 204): Flood control

Projects	Document number	Estimated Federal cost	Projects	Document number	Estimated Federal cost
Hartford, Conn.		[1] $239, 000	Barbourville, Ky.	H. 345, 81st Cong.	$1, 765, 000
Monkey Run at Corning, N. Y.	H. 305, 81st Cong.	[1] 2, 370, 000	Cumberland, Ky.	do	67, 000
Pasquotank River, N. C.	H. 306, 81st Cong.	110, 000	Red River of the North Basin		4, 000, 000
Hartwell Dam, Savannah River, Ga.	H. 657, 78th Cong.	10, 000, 000	Rio Grande Basin		[2] 5, 000, 000
Central and southern Florida		10, 000, 000	Meadow Valley Wash, Muddy River, Nev.	(3)	1, 986, 000
Grants Canal, Lake Providence, La.		11, 000	Painted Rock Reservoir, Gila River, Ariz.	H. 331, 81st Cong.	25, 800, 000
Amite River bank protection, Louisiana		50, 000	Humboldt River, Nev.	(4)	7, 679, 000
Des Arc, Ark.	H. 485, 81st Cong.	228, 000	Sacramento River Basin		3, 500, 000
Oklahoma City floodway, Oklahoma		[1] 10, 460, 000	Russian River, Calif.	(4)	11, 552, 000
Pueblo, Colo.	H. 327, 81st Cong.	209, 000	Columbia River Basin, including Willamette River Basin.	H. 531, 81st Cong.	75, 000, 000
Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River, Okla.	S. 107, 81st Cong.	37, 273, 000	Eagle Gorge Reservoir, Green River, Wash.	H. 271, 81st Cong.	16, 300, 000
Illinois River at Beardstown, Ill.	H. 332, 81st Cong.	2, 976, 000			
Ohio River Basin		25, 000, 000	Total		[2] 251, 575, 000

[1] Modification of previously authorized project.
[2] $30,179,000 of this amount does not include work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation.
[3] Report of Chief of Engineers dated Sept. 12, 1949.
[4] Reports of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated Apr. 22, 1949.

The following is an explanation of each of the Senate amendments, some of which cover minor amendments:

Amendment No. 1, Winthrop Beach, Mass., beach erosion control: Due to emergency, local interests performed certain work at their own expense, which work was in accordance with the recommended plan for which it is proposed that local interests be reimbursed, such reimbursement not to exceed the cost as if the work had been performed by the Federal Government. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 2, Ash Creek to Saugatack (area 1), Conn.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers authorizing Federal participation in the amount of one-third of the first cost of protective and improvement measures for Jennings, Sasco Hill, Southport and Burial Hill Beaches, Sherwood Island State Park, and Compo Beach. The total cost of the project is estimated at $610,500 with the Federal share estimated at $203,500. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 3, Shrewsbury River, N. J.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a shallow draft channel and turning basin at an estimated cost to the United States of $363,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 4, waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 6 feet deep from Rehoboth Beach to water of the same depth in Indian River Bay by way of Big Ditch. Estimated cost to United States, $85,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 5, Twitch Cove, Big Thoroughfare River, and Levering Creek, Md.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide modification of the existing project by the provision of an anchorage basin 7 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and 700 feet long, connecting with the existing channel at Ewell and an extension of the existing channel in Levering Creek 6 feet deep, 60 feet wide, and 1,000 feet long. Cost to the United States is $21,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 6, shore protection at Colonial Beach, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide protective measures at Colonial Beach. Cost to the United States is $35,000, which is one-third of the total cost of the project. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 7, Quinby Creek, Accomack County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 8 feet deep to Quinby Landing with a mooring basin of same depth. Cost to the United States is $116,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 8, Davis Creek, Mathews County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a channel 10 feet deep with a mooring basin of the same depth. Cost to the United States is $85,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 9, Winter Harbor, Mathews County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a 12-foot channel leading from Chesapeake Bay to a mooring basin of the same depth. Cost to the United States is $205,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 10, channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a bar channel 14 feet deep in Pamlico Sound and in Oregon Inlet to and including a turning basin of the same depth and a side channel 12 feet deep from the Manteo-Oregon Inlet Channel in Roanoke Sound to wharves in Mill Creek near Wanchese, including a turning basin. Cost to the United States is $860,500. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 11, Masonboro Inlet to Ocean, N. C.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for initial stage construction consisting of a channel 14 feet deep over the ocean bar at Masonboro Inlet thence 12 feet deep to the channel of the inland waterway at Wrightsville by way of Banks and Motte Channels, and a turning basin 15 feet deep on the east side of Banks Channel near the inlet with three 15-pile tie-up dolphins. If experience shows that it is impracticable to maintain the proposed channels and turning basin by dredging alone, a final stage of construction, consisting of jetties on each side of the bar channel across the inlet is proposed. Cost to the United States is $390,000 for initial stage; $1,980,000 for final stage. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 12, Palm Beach, Fla., beach erosion control: Correct typographical error.

Amendment No. 13, Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.: A portion of the harbor is maintained by local interests by periodic dredging. The Federal project recommended in House Document 704, Eightieth Congress, provides for extension of the existing turning basin. This extension was required to accommodate increased vessel traffic. Dredges operating in the area under contract to local interests were able to do the work at a saving in cost of mobilization and demobilization of the dredge equipment. The work was so performed in accordance with the project modification. Reimbursement to local interests for the cost of the work performed, not to exceed the sum of $305,000, is recommended. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 14, Tampa Harbor, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide deepening of Egmont Channel to 36 feet; enlarging Mullet Key Cut to a depth of 34 feet and width of 500 feet; enlarging Tampa Bay, Hillsboro Bay, and Port Tampa Channels to a depth of 34 feet and a width of 400 feet; enlarging Port Tampa turning basin to a depth of 34 feet and a width of 750 feet; deepening Sparkman Channel and Ybor turning basin to 34 feet; revoking the authorized improvement of Alafia River and substituting in lieu thereof a channel 30 feet deep and 200 feet wide from Hillsboro Bay Channel to and including the existing turning basin to be enlarged to a depth of 30 feet, a width of 700 feet, and a length of 1,200 feet. Cost to the United States is $7,780,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 15, Hudson River, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 6 feet deep from the Gulf of Mexico to the head of Hudson River. Cost to the United States is $258,700. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 16, channel and turning basin at Ozona, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide a 6-foot channel from the authorized Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River, Fla., to and including a turning basin 6 feet deep. Cost to the United States is $70,100. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 17, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Big Lagoon to Pensacola Bay, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for abandonment and closure of existing channel between Big Lagoon and Pensacola Bay, and construction of a new channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide from existing channel in Big Lagoon to Pensacola Bay. Cost to United States is $88,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 18, Biloxi Harbor, Miss.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for assumption by the United States of maintenance to a depth of 6 feet and a width of 40 feet of the existing channel from the main channel in Biloxi Harbor to the entrance of Ott Bayou. Cost to the United States, none for new work. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 19, Ouachita River and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana (S. Doc. No. 117, 81st Cong.): Item adopts project as approved by the Senate providing for modernization of the navigation channel for the Red River to the mouth of the Black River thence from the mouth of the Black River to Camden, Ark., mile 351, on the Ouachita River, to be obtained by lengthening the existing six locks to 525 feet and deepening them to accommodate 9-foot draft navigation, also provides for channel realinement, cut-offs where necessary, rehabilitation of the dams and contraction works. The project also provides for a comprehensive plan of improvement for flood control, power production, and other purposes on the Ouachita River and tributaries, to include, in addition to all existing projects and portions thereof in the basin above the lower end of the levees on the east bank of the Ouachita, the following improvements: (1) Construction of the DeGray multiple-purpose reservoir on Caddo River, and the Murfreesboro flood-control reservoir on Muddy Fork of Little Missouri River; (2) extension of the flood wall at Monroe, La.; (3) construction of a levee and appurtenant works for flood protection of Bawcombville, La.; and (4) channel improvement and closure of high-water outlets on Bayou Bartholomew, Ark. and La., channel improvement on the tributary Pine Bluff outlet canal, construction of an intercepting canal from the head of Harding drain to Bayou Bartholomew, and channel improvements of Deep Bayou and Overflow Creek. Total cost to the United States is $36,950,000, which includes $13,900,000 for a 9-foot navigation channel. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to a substitute amendment. The substitute amendment reduces the amount of the authorization as originally proposed by the Senate from $36,950,000 to $21,300,000. This authorization will be available for the local protection projects at Bawcombville, Monroe, and Bayou Bartholomew, Pine Bluff outlet canal, Deep Bayou and Overflow Creek; for the DeGray Reservoir and navigation improvements. It is the understanding of the conferees that the Murfreesboro Reservoir will be deferred pending a further showing of the need and justification.

Amendment No. 20, Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana: The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to same with an amendment which provides for a reduction in the amount authorized. This amendment reduces the Senate figure from $89,000,000 to $80,000,000 for the further accomplishment of the approved plan for the Arkansas River and tributaries (H. Doc. No. 758, 79th Cong.), it being the understanding of the conferees that of this amount not to exceed $30,000,000 may be used for bank stabilization works at any location on the Arkansas and Verdigris Rivers from the mouth of the Arkansas River to Catoosa, Okla.

Amendment No. 21, Trinity River at Dallas and Fort Worth, Tex.: This amendment authorizes the document number to be inserted. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 22, Mississippi boat harbor opposite Hamburg, Ill.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a small-boat harbor on the Missouri side of the river opposite Hamburg, Ill., with an entrance channel 6 feet deep and appurtenant works. Cost to the United States, $50,400. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 23, Mississippi River at Rock Island, Ill.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a small-boat harbor in Lake Potter at downstream limits of the city of Rock Island, Ill., by deepening and widening en-

trance channels to the Mississippi River into Lake Potter to a depth of 6 feet and a width of 100 feet. Cost to the United States is $18,600. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 24, Monongahela River, W. Va. and Pa.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for replacement of locks and dams 12 to 15, inclusive, by two locks and dams of higher lift with single lock chambers having usable dimensions 84 feet by 600 feet; construction of movable crest gates on dam 8 to increase the pool elevation; and construction of a navigable channel 9 feet deep and 300 feet wide from lock and dam 8 to the head of the river and thence of the same depth, and 200 feet wide where attainable, for a distance of about 2.1 miles up Tygart River. Cost to the United States is $29,238,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 25, Bayfield Harbor, Wis.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a small-boat harbor by dredging and protective works. Cost to the United States is $199,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 26, Cheboygan River and Harbor, Mich.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for modifying existing project by deepening the channel and basin to 21 feet. Cost to the United States is $163,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 27, Port Bay, N. Y.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for channel 8 feet deep from Lake Ontario into Port Bay protected by arrowhead breakwaters. Cost to the United States is $466,600. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 28, Redondo Beach Harbor, Calif.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for reconstruction of about 1,485 linear feet of the existing breakwater, construction of a 2,800-foot extension of the existing breakwater and a south breakwater 700 feet long; and for maintenance of the entire existing breakwater as reconstructed the breakwater extension, and the south breakwater. Cost to the United States is $3,456,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 29, San Francisco Harbor and Bay, Calif.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers for the establishment of a separate project for collection and disposal of debris in the San Francisco Bay area. Cost to the United States is $850,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 30, Baker Bay, Columbia River, Wash.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a mooring basin 10 and 12 feet deep, about 20 acres in extent, with protecting breakwaters; and for a west channel 10 feet deep connecting the basin with deep water in Columbia River. Cost to the United States is $442,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 31, Columbia River at Umatilla, Oreg.: Item as amended, and as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, provides for removal of blocks and boulders between the waterfront at Umatilla, Oreg., and the navigation channel to provide for a depth of 7.5 feet at the present low-water datum. Cost to the United States is $416,250. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 32, Kawaihae Harbor, Island of Hawaii: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for adoption of a project for the improvement of Kawaihae Harbor to provide for a basin 35 feet deep below mean lower low water and 1,250 feet square with an entrance channel 40 feet deep, 400 feet wide, and approximately 2,900 feet long extending northwestward to deep water in the ocean; and a protective breakwater about 4,400 feet long with maximum crest elevation 13 feet above mean lower low water, of which the seaward 3,200 feet shall be protected by heavy stone revetment. Cost to the United States is $5,525,500. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 33, collection and removal of drift in Hampton Roads and the harbors of Norfolk and Newport News, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for the prosecution of a regular program for the collection and removal of drift from the Hampton Roads area as is now being carried out in New York and Baltimore Harbors. Initial cost to the United States is $50,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 34, Chief Joseph Dam, Columbia River, Wash.: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 35, Kentuck and Otter Slough, Oreg.: This amendment provides authority to the State of Oregon acting through its highway department, and to a local drainage district and county court, to construct, maintain, and operate dams and dikes to control the flow of tidal waters into these sloughs at points suitable to the interest of navigation and in accordance with plans approved by Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, in accordance with conditions and stipulations which they deem necessary. No cost to the United States is involved. Similar authorizations have been included in previous River and Harbor Acts. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 36: Provides for change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 37, Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River. This amendment would authorize the Chief of Engineers to select the most feasible route as an alternate for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Venice, Fla. It is the understanding of the conferees that it does not eliminate the existing proviso that the cost of the selected route shall not exceed the cost of the original route. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 38, Red Fish Bay, Tex.: This amendment provides for changing the name of the navigation channel and turning basin in Red Fish Bay to Port Mansfield in honor of the late and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Congressman Joseph J. Mansfield. This change is desired by the Governor of Texas, the Texas Legislature, and the citizens of the State. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 39, revision of compilation of preliminary examination, survey and review reports: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Army to prepare and transmit to Congress a compilation of these reports, the last previous one having been published as House Document 106, Seventy-sixth Congress. This compilation is of considerable value in the administrative work of the Corps of Engineers and to the congressional committees and the Members of Congress, as well as to other organizations interested in river and harbor and flood-control investigations. It is understood by the conferees that the information is already available and that the only expense will be for printing. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur to same with an amendment to bring the date of the compilation up to June 30, 1950, in lieu of June 30, 1949, in view of the lapse of time since the bill passed the House.

Amendment No. 40: This amendment authorizes the conveyance of bridges owned by the United States and maintained and operated by the Corps of Engineers to local interests and will operate to effect a considerable saving to the Federal Government. The House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 41: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 42: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Round Pond Harbor, Maine. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 43: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Bass Harbor, Maine. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 44: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Sesuit Harbor, Mass. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 45: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of New Creek, Staten Island, N. Y. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 46: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Main Channel, leading from Turkey Point to Havre de Grace, Harford County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 47: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Severn River, with particular reference to Ringgold Cove, Anne Arundel County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 48: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Apes Hole Creek, Somerset County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 49: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Chincoteague Bay, with a view to establishing a harbor of refuge at Chincoteague, Accomack County, Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 50: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Middle Creek, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 51: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Choctawatchee Bay, Fla.; small-boat channel at Bay Bridge. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 52: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Pensacola Bay, Fla., channel at Bayou Texar. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 53: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey to determine the feasibility of providing a permanent channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Fort Myers Beach, Estero Island, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 54: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of channels in Lake Minnetonka, Minn. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 55: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Seabeck Harbor, Hood Canal, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 56: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Eagle Harbor, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 57: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Port Townsend, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 58: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of coasts of the Hawaiian Islands with a view to the establishment of harbors for light draft vessels for refuge and other purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 59: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 60: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 61: Provides for changing the citation of the River and Harbor Act of 1949 to the River and Harbor Act of 1950. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 62: Provides for changing the word "title" to "Act". House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 63: Provides for changing the word "title" to "Act". House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 64, Connecticut River basin: This amendment modifies the existing project for Hartford, Conn., in the Connecticut River Basin to provide for the Folly Brook dike and conduit consisting of 1,900 linear feet of pressure conduit and 700 feet of earth dike at an estimated cost to the United States of $239,000, and at an estimated cost to local interests of $150,000 to

cover the provisions of local cooperation applicable to the previously authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the project by a description of the length of the dike and conduit and by inserting the estimated cost of local cooperation. This change was made to further identify the modification of the existing project and to make clear that the usual conditions of local cooperation are applicable.

Amendment No. 65, Susquehanna River Basin: This amendment modifies an existing project authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936, which provides for local protection works on Chemung River at Corning, N. Y. The recommended modification provides for the improvement of Monkey Run Creek at Corning, N. Y., by the construction of an open flume and conduit between the existing works on Monkey Run Creek above Sixth Street and the Chemung River at Pine Street, together with auxiliary works consisting of storm sewer outlets and a pumping plant. The estimated cost to the United States for construction is $2,370,000. Local interests must furnish the usual requirements of local cooperation and also contribute $250,000 in cash or in an equivalent amount of construction or reconstruction work, and must also restore city streets and pavements over the flume and conduit and provide adequate pumping capacity for disposal of storm waters draining through the property of the Corning Glass Works and not intercepted by the project. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 66, Pasquotank River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the construction of a dike and other appurtenant structures for flood control and related purposes in the vicinity of the Pasquotank River at an estimated cost to the United States of $109,900, subject to the provisions of local cooperation specified by present law with respect to local protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 67, Savannah River Basin: This amendment would increase the authorization for the construction of the Hartwell project in the Savannah River Basin from $40,000,000 to $68,377,000. House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment reducing the amount of $68,377,000 to $50,000,000. The conferees considered that the reduced amount would be sufficient authorization for a 3-year period.

Amendment No. 68, central and southern Florida: This amendment would increase the additional authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the act of June 30, 1948, from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 69, Orleans Parish levees: This amendment modifies the improvements contemplated by the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, by extending the scope to include such improvements in the parish of Orleans, La., and to permit retention of jurisdiction by the Board of Levee Commissioners of the Orleans Levee District, State of Louisiana, over the completed improvements covered by this amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to include these levees in the Federal project for the control of floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River in the same manner as for other communities on the main stem of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley. In this connection, for the purpose of clarification, the conferees considered and concluded that the project for Lake Pontchartrain, La., page 27, lines 1 through 20 of the bill which was not in conference is now adequately covered in and prescribed by Senate Document No. 139, Eighty-first Congress, which it is the intent to authorize. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 70, Grants Canal, La.: The purpose of this amendment is to permit the Federal Government to fill a stagnant ditch which was dredged during the War Between the States and which has been partly filled by local interests. The conferees feel that the filling of the remainder of the ditch by the Federal Government to avoid the present health menace to the community is properly an item of Federal expense. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 71, Des Arc, Ark.: This amendment adopts a new project for flood protection at Des Arc, Ark., to alleviate present dangerous flood conditions in this area. The project would provide for construction of an earth levee, drainage facilities, pumping plants, diversion ditches, and sewer modifications. The total length would be about 1½ miles. The estimated cost to the United States is $228,000, and local interests are required to assume the customary requirements of local cooperation required by existing law in connection with flood-control projects. The project is particularly necessary in view of the fact that completion of levees on the east bank of the White River presently authorized will increase the severity of floods in Des Arc. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 72, bank erosion on Amite River, La.: This amendment adopts an emergency bank protection project to prevent serious bank caving which has caused damage to Amite Cemetery, Livingston Parish, La., and which will continue to destroy graves unless checked. The project, which is estimated to cost $50,000, provides for the construction of a cut-off channel and a pile deflection dike. The conferees consider that the necessary corrective measures proposed by this amendment should be undertaken. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 73, Arkansas River Basin, Optima Reservoir: This amendment provides that the conservation storage for irrigation now authorized by existing law to be maintained in the Canton Reservoir shall be achieved by coordinated design, construction, and operation of the three reservoir system comprising the Optima Reservoir, the Fort Supply Reservoir, and the Canton Reservoir. The amendment would result in an eventual reduction of flood control storage when silt encroachment in the reservoirs infringed on the total live storage capacity. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment to maintain the integrity of the flood control storage provided at the expense of the Federal Government and to permit the conservation storage in the Canton Reservoir as authorized by existing law to be maintained insofar as practicable until such time as silt deposits threaten to encroach upon the capacity for flood control.

Amendment No. 74, Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River and tributaries: This amendment modifies the general comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as amended, and by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, by substitution of Keystone Reservoir on the Arkansas River for the Mannford Reservoir on the Cimarron River and by the deletion of the Blackburn and Taft Reservoirs on the Arkansas River. The estimated cost of the Keystone Reservoir is $89,500,000. The estimated cost of the Mannford, Blackburn, and Taft Reservoirs, as approved, was $52,227,000. Although the difference in these costs is $37,273,000, there will be an actual saving in excess of $24,000,000 by the substitution of the one reservoir for the three because of the increase in costs since the three reservoirs were authorized. The project will also provide essentially complete protection from floods on the Arkansas River from the Keystone site to the mouth of the Verdigris River and a much higher degree of protection downstream from that point than would be provided by the Mannford Reservoir and will permit a more flexible operation of the reservoir system with increased benefits and will effect savings in the costs of certain local protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 75, Oklahoma City, Okla.: This amendment provides for modification of the existing project which consists of levees along both banks of the North Canadian River by substitution of an improved channel through Oklahoma City. The estimated cost to the United States is $10,460,000 and to local interests $6,040,000. The conferees feel that the modification would result in a materially better project due to changed conditions. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 76, Arkansas River, Pueblo, Colo.: This amendment adopts a new project for a levee along the Arkansas River in the vicinity of Pueblo at an estimated cost to the United States of $209,000, subject to the customary provisions of local cooperation required by existing law for local protection projects with special conditions applying to this project. The conferees note that local interests have expended about $5,000,000 for flood protection works at Pueblo and consider the improvement well justified because of the protection afforded to this important railroad, industrial, and distribution center. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 77, Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Ark.: This amendment inserts the proper document number left blank in the House bill. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 78, Illinois River at Beardstown, Ill.: This amendment adopts a new project providing for construction of a new section of flood wall to replace that lost and damaged and for raising, strengthening, and extending the remaining portion of the flood wall and levees, all located at Beardstown, Ill., on the south bank of the Illinois River, at an estimated cost to the United States of $2,976,000, subject to the usual provisions of local cooperation required by existing law in connection with flood protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 79, Ohio River Basin: This amendment increases the monetary authorization for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 to provide a sufficient monetary ceiling to permit the completion of projects under way and to permit the prosecution of the comprehensive plan. Initiation of work on new projects can be accomplished within the $100,000,000 additional authorization by the excess of this authorization over the deficit in connection with the cost of projects completed or under way. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 80, Mining City Dam and Reservoir, Ky.: This amendment insures that the Mining City Dam and Reservoir in Kentucky or its alternates will not be constructed if such construction would have an adverse effect on Mammoth Cave National Park. The conferees understand that construction under existing authorization would be undertaken in such manner as to have no adverse effect upon the Mammoth Cave National Park. It is the understanding of the conferees that the purpose of the amendment is to emphasize the necessity of preserving this national park. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 81, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the protection of the towns of Cumberland and Barbourville, Ky., by channel improvements and a system of levees, subject to the customary provisions of local cooperation required by ex-

isting law in connection with flood protection improvements. The estimated cost to the United States for the Cumberland improvement is $67,000, and for the Barbourville improvement, $1,765,000. The conferees feel that improvements at these localities are feasible and justified. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 82, Red River of the North Basin: This amendment increases the amount adopted by the House from $4,000,000 to $8,000,000 which will be sufficient to complete the authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the printed report for this project.

Amendment No. 83, Rio Grande Basin: This amendment increases the House amount by an additional $5,000,000 which will be sufficient for completion of the Corps of Engineers' portion of the project. It also adds an authorization of $30,179,000 for the work to be prosecuted by the Department of the Interior as provided for in the authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement and agree to the amendment with an amendment identifying the printed report for the project.

Amendment No. 84, Colorado River Basin: This amendment adopts a project for flood control consisting of the Pine Canyon and Matthews Canyon Reservoirs in the Meadow Valley Wash Basin at an estimated Federal cost of $1,986,000. This project has a favorable benefit to cost ratio of 1.32. The House conferees recede from their disagreement and agree to the amendment with an amendment identifying the report printed in House Document No. 530, Eighty-first Congress.

Amendment No. 85, Gila River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project for a flood-control basin, Painted Rock Reservoir on the Gila River, 126 river miles above Yuma, at an estimated cost to the United States of $25,800,000, subject to the conditions that local interests must adjust all water-right claims and keep the flood channel of the Gila River downstream from the dam free from encumbrances. The conferees understand that the improvement is needed not only to prevent flood damage in the lower Gila River and lower Colorado River areas, but also in the Imperial Valley in California. The project according to representatives of the State Department and the International Boundary Commission is an integral part of the plan contemplated in the Mexican water treaty of 1944. The House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 86, Humboldt River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project on the Humboldt River and its tributaries in Nevada providing for three storage reservoirs, supplementary channel improvements, and a system of drainage canals and appurtenant works in the lower basin. The total estimated cost to the United States is $7,679,000. Local interests must furnish assurances that they will provide the customary requirements of local cooperation covered by existing flood-control laws in connection with local protection projects, and must furnish certain supplementary cooperation in connection with the drainage improvements and the reservoirs, including the contribution of $2,762,000 in cash toward the reservoir construction costs. The improvement is also subject to the conditions that local interests agree on the method of operation of the reservoirs. The conferees note that the Department of Interior and the Corps of Engineers agree that authorization would be desirable and necessary to permit the solution of the problems involved in arriving at satisfactory arrangements between local interests and the Federal agencies. The conferees also understand that construction of the reservoirs will not proceed until satisfactory arrangements are worked out among the Federal, State, and local agencies for repayment of a proper portion of the cost allocation for conservation storage. The conferees understand that the channel improvements in the lower portion of the basin recommended by the Corps of Engineers have been coordinated fully with the works proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and may be undertaken without affecting the other features of the plan. The conferees agree that the improvements are feasible and desirable and should be authorized at this time. The House conferees recede from their disagreement with the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment providing for clarification and identification of the project by reference to the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Amendment No. 87, Sacramento River Basin: This amendment provides for modification of the flood-control project for the protection of Butte Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. The proposed plan which is in the nature of interim protection provides for a leveed bypass through Butte Basin so designed and constructed as to fit into and become a part of the authorized project. The estimated cost to the United States is $3,500,000 and local interests must provide the usual local cooperation required by existing law in connection with local protection projects. The conferees feel that construction of this improvement to provide interim protection is fully justified and necessary prior to the completion of the previously authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to this amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the project by including a reference to the appropriate House document number.

Amendment No. 88, Russian River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the immediate authorization as an initial stage, channel stabilization works on the Russian River and Coyote Valley Reservoir on the east fork of the Russian River. This initial stage would be part of an ultimate development which would involve increasing the storage capacity of Coyote Valley Reservoir and the construction of an additional reservoir on Dry Creek. The estimated cost to the United States of the initial stage is $11,552,000 and local interests would be required to contribute $5,598,000 in cash toward the reservoir construction. The conferees note, as developed during the hearings on this project before the Senate Committee on Public Works, that local interests are prepared to pay in full their share of the costs of the project allocable for water conservation storage and that the Interior Department has agreed that as soon as this payment is made the funds would be transferred from the Interior Department to the Corps of Engineers which is charged with the construction work, and that the interests of the Interior Department in the administration of the project would then be turned over to local interests for their own operation and administration. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment providing for clarification and identification of the project by reference to the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Amendments Nos. 89 to 106, inclusive, Columbia River Basin, including Willamette River: These amendments modify and augment previous authorizations for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin and in the Columbia River Basin by authorizing additional improvements consisting of dams, power facilities and appurtenant works, levees, overflow-channel closures, channel improvements, bank protection works, channel clearing and snagging, improvements for preservation of fish, local protection works, and navigation harbors, all as specifically itemized in these amendments.

The conferees have given careful consideration to the amendments and to the general question of additional authorizations for improvements for flood control, navigation, and related purposes in the Columbia River Basin. The conferees feel that the development of the Pacific Northwest for these purposes in accordance with the plans of the Chief of Engineers as contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, recently transmitted to the Congress, is urgent because of the necessity of providing protection from major and devastating floods and because of meeting as soon as practicable the ever-increasing demands for hydroelectric power in the rapidly expanding economy of the area. The conferees feel further that approval of units which will fit into the over-all development should be recognized at this time.

The conferees agree that the intent and purpose of amendments 89 to 106, inclusive, can best be accomplished by approving those projects in the Senate amendments which are in the comprehensive plan of development as contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress and have also been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by authorizing for appropriation an amount which will be sufficient to start construction work on the most important units. The conferees note that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in his letter dated February 1, 1950, transmitted the President's views on the Columbia River Basin projects, and althought approving the greater number of projects included in the Senate amendments and also in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, excluded some as being not in accord with the program of the President at this time. The conferees feel that the projects which should be approved and for which partial authorization should be granted should be limited at this time to those included in the Senate amendments and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

In this connection, the conferees note that the House bill and the Senate amendments include all projects of the Corps of Engineers which had Budget approval except for a few in the Willamette River Basin involving the construction of dams at alternative sites in substitution for dams previously authorized in the comprehensive Willamette River Basin plan which are no longer feasible of construction because of changed conditions principally due to World War II and the general expansion of the population in the Willamette River Basin, which have taken place in the period subsequent to authorization. In connection with the alternative dams at the Cougar, Blue River, and Green Peter sites approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the conferees are of the opinion that the Corps of Engineers has authority to construct these projects under existing law as alternatives for the projects originally authorized.

In connection with the projects in the Willamette and Columbia River Basins as contained in the House bill, the conferees note that the identification reference is to the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated February 21, 1949. These projects inserted by the House are a part of the comprehensive plan for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, and are contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, which was not available at the time of passage of the House bill. Since these items were not the subject of conference, their proper identification by substituting House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, in lieu of the report of the Board of Engineers could not be accomplished, but the conferees desire to make clear that these projects are in the House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress. The partial authorization of $75,000,000 proposed in the substitute amendment of the conferees represents

a reduction from a total of $141,253,000, which was the total of the authorizations in the Columbia and Willamette Basins contained in the Senate amendments. With respect to the projects in the Senate amendments, the proposed amendment of the conferees would result in elimination of the project for modification of Fern Ridge Dam, Oreg., the reduction of the total sum for local flood protection works on the Columbia Basin from $28,000,000 to $15,000,000, the elimination of the project for Hepner Dam, Oreg., and the elimination of the item for harbors at various locations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 89 to 106, inclusive, and agree to the same with an amendment which strikes out the language now contained in Senate amendments Nos. 89 through 106, inclusive, and substitutes in lieu thereof an amendment which approves the projects for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, substantially in accordance with the plans recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949, and approved in the letter dated February 1, 1950, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for construction by the Corps of Engineers, both contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, these being the projects which are listed in the bill, and which authorizes to be appropriated the sum of $75,000,000 for partial accomplishment of the listed projects and for continued prosecution of the previously approved plan for the Willamette Basin.

Amendment No. 107, Green-Duwamish River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for a dam and reservoir in the Green River upstream from Seattle, Wash., for flood control. The estimated cost to the United States is $16,300,000, and local interests are required to contribute $2,000,000 to the cost of the project. The conferees feel that the project is needed to protect parts of the city of Seattle. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 108: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries, and such other streams in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, where power development appears feasible and practicable, to determine the hydroelectric potentialities, in combination with other water and resource development. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 109: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Israel River, at and in the vicinity of Lancaster, N. H., in the interest of flood control and related purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 110: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Nanticoke River and tributaries, Maryland and Delaware, in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 111: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Mattaponi River, Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 112: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Perquimans River, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 113: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Filberts Creek at Edenton, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 114: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of streams on Johns Island and vicinity, South Carolina, in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 115: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Combahee River, Broad River, Black River, and their tributaries, all in the State of South Carolina. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 116: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Satilla River, Ga.; Saint Marys River, Ga. and Fla.; Suwannee River, Ga. and Fla.; for flood control, navigation, and other beneficial uses. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 117: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Streams in Saint Johns, Flagler, and Putnam Counties, Fla., for flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 118: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Manatee River, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 119: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of coastal streams flowing into the Gulf of Mexico between the Suwannee and Apalachicola Rivers, with a view to their improvement in the interest of flood control and related purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 120: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Blackwater River, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 121: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Yellow River, Fla. and Ala. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 122: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Blackwater and Perdido Rivers, Ala. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 123: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Nine Mile Drain and Carlow Ditch, Macomb County, Mich. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 124: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Hatchie and Tuscumbia Rivers, Miss. and Tenn., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 125: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey and study of alternate sites for the Millwood Reservoir, Ark., in the Red River Basin. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 126: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Dry Cimarron River, Union County, N. Mex., and Cimarron River, Okla., Colo., and Kans. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 127: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Salt River, Ky. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 128: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Lower Rio Grande Valley, including streams in Starr, Hidalgo, Cameron, and Willacy Counties, Tex., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 129: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Buffalo Creek, Marion County, W. Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 130: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of waterway from Rangeline Lake to Oconto River, Wis., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 131: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Milwaukee River and tributaries, Wisconsin. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 132: Iter provides for preliminary examination and survey of Sacramento River, Calif., in the interest of bank protection and channel improvements below Red Bluff. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 133: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Walnut Creek drainage area, Contra Costa County, Calif. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 134: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Reclamation District No. 768, Humboldt County, Calif. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 135: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Martin Creek, at and in the vicinity of Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nev. House conferees concur.

Amendments Nos. 136 and 137: These amendments change the House provision authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Gleason Creek, Robinson Watershed, in the vicinity of White Pine County, Nev., by providing that the survey shall apply to the section at and in the vicinity of Ely, Nev. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 138: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Samish River, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 139 (sec. 206): Provides that the dam site known as West Peterborough Dam in the Merrimack River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and modified by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, shall hereafter be known and designated as the Edward MacDowell Dam, and any law, regulation document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of West Peterborough Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Edward MacDowell Dam. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 140 (sec. 207): Provides that funds hereafter appropriated for a specific and heretofore authorized project for a river, harbor, or flood-control works shall be merged with and be accounted for under the regular annual appropriation title applicable to such item. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 141 (sec. 208): Provides that section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 is hereby amended by adding to the item therein for harbors and rivers in Alaska the following: "and that Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways in Alaska, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and allied purposes shall be continued under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Army under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers." House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 142 (sec. 209): Provides that the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army are directed to review their previous studies and to report to the Congress the amount of the total cost of the Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River, N. Mex., which is properly allocable to flood control, in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 143: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 144: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 145: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 146: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 147: The effect of this amendment is to change the total amount authorized by the bill so as to conform to the action of the conferees. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 148: Provides that the sum of $1,500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended by the Federal Power Commission for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act or any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by the Federal Power Commission. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 149: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 150: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 151 (sec. 216): Provides that section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, as amended by section 15 of the act approved December 22, 1944, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized in his discretion to undertake such emergency measures for run-off retardation and soil-erosion prevention as may be needed to safeguard lives and property from floods and the products of erosion on any watershed whenever fire or any other natural element or force has caused a sudden impairment of that watershed: *Provided*, That not to exceed $300,000 out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement or measures for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds may be expended during any one fiscal year for such emergency measures."

House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 152: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 153: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 154, Arkansas-White and Red River Basin Study Commission: The purpose of this amendment is to create a Commission to make studies and recommend a coordinated plan for conservation and development of the soil and water resources of the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins. It is the opinion of the conferees that such a study can be accomplished and the results coordinated with the appropriate Federal and State agencies under existing procedures of the Corps of Engineers as governed by law and administrative procedure. The conferees felt, therefore, that the purposes of amendment No. 154 can be adequately accomplished by adopting a substitute amendment and has inserted the substitute amendment in its proper place in the section of the bill dealing with such surveys. The purpose of the substitute amendment is to enable the Corps of Engineers to assemble all existing data and to perform such studies as necessary to prepare a comprehensive report for the basins included and to utilize the surveys and data available from other Federal agencies within their respective spheres of operations as defined by law, and in cooperation with State agencies.

Amendment No. 155, change in section number: This amendment provides for change in section number. House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment which provides for an additional change in section number necessitated by changes made by the conferees in prior sections.

Amendment No. 156, change of date: This provides for change in the date of title II from "1949" to "1950". House conferees concur.

WILL. M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is unanimous. All amendments inserted by the Senate and agreed to by the House are described fully in the statement by the managers on the part of the House. All amendments adopted by the Senate and modified or amended by the conferees are described in detail in the conference report. Moreover the statement by the managers on the part of the House contains the name and the amount of the authorizations in the House bill together with a list of the items as agreed to in the conference for both rivers and harbors and flood control. There were reductions in most of the material increases in the authorizations contained in the Senate amendments.

The statement by the Managers on the part of the House is very full, and contains the projects in the bill as it passed the House and the projects inserted by the Senate and approved by the conference with the estimated costs in both the river and harbor and flood control titles of the bill of all projects approved by the conference. All amendments inserted by the Senate are described in detail in the report.

The Senate devoted much time to the debate of the bill. Amendments were offered that would have materially increased the authorizations and would have changed existing laws with respect to reclamation projects in the Columbia River Basin, and after extensive debate the amendments were rejected by the Senate.

The Senate rejected substantially all amendments offered on the floor of the Senate after extensive debate. The bill as passed by the Senate, therefore, contains the amendments as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, and the Senate rejected, as stated, other material amendments offered on the floor. The Senate committee opposed amendments offered on the floor that had not been considered by that committee. It will be observed, therefore, that the bill as passed by the Senate rejected amendments that would have materially increased the authorizations and really changed existing laws. The Senate is to be commended for the course adopted in the passage of the bill. The Senate amendments are largely confined to the adoption of amendments authorizing projects transmitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers after the bill passed the House and were carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

The river and harbor amendments of the Senate on the Arkansas and the Ouachita Rivers were reduced by $24,650,000. The largest project approved by the conferees for rivers and harbors is the Monongahela River in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, at an estimated cost of $29,000,000. This is a large project, but if Congress is to continue to promote navigation the project is thoroughly justified. If Congress is to discontinue river and harbor improvements, the project for the Monongahela River should be rejected.

The Senate amended the flood-control authorization for the Ohio River by increasing it $25,000,000. The authorization in the House bill would only have provided for substantially completing the projects under way. The conferees believed the $25,000,000 to be justified.

In the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, the report with the favorable recommendations of the Chief of Engineers as approved by the budget was transmitted to Congress after the House reported the bill. It involves flood control and river and harbor projects in the Pacific Northwest aggregating approximately $1,500,000,000. The Senate properly approved the report of the Chief of Engineers and authorized about $142,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of the projects. The conference agreed to reduce this amount to $75,000,000. I believe the economy will be promoted by approving the conference report. There are bills pending in both the House and Senate for the establishment of Columbia Valley Administration. Such an administration would supplant the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Columbia and Willamette River Basins. The adoption of the conference report contemplates that the river and harbor and flood-control projects in that basin shall continue to be planned and constructed by the Chief of Engineers, just as they are planned and constructed by the Chief of Engineers in all other river basins.

The pending bill is for authorizations. They are essential for general flood control after the appropriations are made as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations in the House, for the next fiscal year the remaining authorizations will be less than the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year for general flood control. If flood control is to continue, additional authorizations for general flood control must be made. The conference report contemplates authorizations for a period of 3 years. There have been no authorizations except for emergencies for flood control since 1946. If in the interest of economy it is necessary to reduce the annual appropriations that policy may be followed. On the other hand if widespread unemployment should obtain, the public interest would be promoted by having a shelf of approved projects that can be constructed not only for flood control, but at the same time to provide for unemployment. The conference report increases the authorizations for general flood control in the House bill by $250,000,000, but this increase includes, among others, the increase in the basin authorization of $25,000,000 along the Ohio River, and includes $75,000,000 for the initiation of the projects along the Columbia and Willamette Rivers. The authorization for the Keystone Reservoir, while for $37,000,000 more, will result in a saving of authorizations amounting to $24,000,000, for this reservoir as agreed to by the conferees is to be substituted for three other reservoirs, the Mannford, the Blackburn, and the Taft Reservoirs along the Arkansas. In the State of Washington the Eagle Gorge Reservoir at an estimated cost of $16,000,000 was included as a Senate amendment. It was transmitted in regular course and recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The report had not been transmitted to the House at the time the House bill was reported.

The Senate agreed to all of the projects in the House bill. On the other hand, the House approved the Senate amendments for projects where recommended by the Chief of Engineers in some cases with modifications, and reductions of the amounts authorized. The House conferees feel that the Senate conferees were most liberal in agreeing to take all House authorizations and in agreeing to modify in essential particulars so as to definitely show that the works in the Columbia River and Willamette River Basins as recommended

by the Chief of Engineers were approved, and that partial authorizations were made for their partial accomplishment as approved by the Director of the Budget.

I emphasize that the pending bill is the first comprehensive bill, including both river and harbor and flood-control authorizations agreed to by the conferees since 1946 except for emergencies in 1948, and I further emphasize that the total authorizations in the pending bill in the conference report are in reality smaller than the last general authorization for both rivers and harbors and flood control in 1946, 1945, and 1944.

While there were 156 amendments adopted by the Senate, the vast majority of these amendments embraced preliminary examinations and surveys for rivers and harbors and for flood control. Amendments 42 to 58, inclusive, embraced Senate amendments providing for 17 preliminary examinations and surveys for river-and-harbor projects.

Amendments 108 to 138, 31 in number, cover preliminary examinations and surveys for flood-control projects. The most important of these examinations covers the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries and other streams in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. Provision was made for a comprehensive study of the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins in the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, and Louisiana.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR 3 YEARS

The authorizations in the bill as reported to the Senate amounted to $1,564,814,825, and as passed by the Senate amounted to $1,592,873,325, which includes $30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, as against a total of $1,117,586,175 as passed by the House. The total amount carried in the bill as agreed to in the conference is $1,453,414,325, exclusive of $30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, or there is a substantial reduction of the Senate amendments of $109,280,000. The largest of these reductions are authorizations contained in Senate amendments for the Arkansas and Ouachita Rivers, for the Savannah River Basin, and for the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The authorizations will provide for construction for substantially 3 years.

APPROPRIATIONS

The total appropriations for the current fiscal year for rivers and harbors and flood control aggregated substantially $684,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1951 as reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, they aggregate $301,000,000.

COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

The House will recall that the pending bill is the first major combined river-and-harbor and flood-control bill that has been considered since the reorganization of the Congress. A rather modest authorization was passed primarily for emergency projects in 1948 and the authorizations in the act of 1948 aggregated for both rivers and harbors and flood control $87,619,000, including $30,444,000 for rivers and harbors and $57,175,000 for flood control.

In 1946 the aggregate amount was $1,387,395,070 adjusted to today's cost index with the aggregate of the two bills amounting to $1,760,000,000, which is approximately $372,000,000 in excess of the authorization of the pending bill as agreed to by the conferees.

The total authorizations in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the River and Harbor Act of 1945 amounting to $1,341,968,332 adjusted to today's cost index amounted to $2,080,000,000 or about $639,000,000 in excess of the authorizations in the pending bill as agreed to in the conference.

THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1950—THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Title I of the bill covers rivers and harbors, and as it passed the House it embraced 65 projects at an estimated cost of $119,000,000. After the bill passed the House, additional reports with favorable recommendations by the Chief of Engineers were transmitted to Congress. The Senate approved the projects in the House bill and conducted hearings on the additional projects transmitted to Congress with favorable reports by the Chief of Engineers after the House bill was reported. By amendments, the Senate added 29 navigation projects recommended by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $108,903,150. The conferees agreed to a reduction in the amounts authorized to be appropriated amounting to $24,650,000, representing primarily reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers.

Title II of the bill covers flood control, and as it passed the House it carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in the total amount of $998,116,200. The Senate by amendments added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects in the total amount of $366,384,000, which includes $30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were based upon reports transmitted to Congress with favorable recommendations by the Chief of Engineers since the House bill was reported. They were not considered by the House because they had not been transmitted to Congress.

The managers on the part of the House carefully considered all Senate amendments, and they agreed to the Senate amendments with reductions in the amounts authorized for flood control amounting to $84,630,000, which are reductions in the Savannah River Basin and in the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. There were other reductions, but these are the principal reductions. The comprehensive report on the Columbia River Basin had not been transmitted to Congress when the House reported the bill. It was transmitted to Congress before the bill was passed by the Senate. The bill approves the report of the Chief of Engineers as modified by the Director of the Budget but reduced the authorizations carried in the Senate bill for the initial and partial construction of the projects to $75,000,000 instead of $142,000,000 as carried by the Senate amendments.

The Corps of Engineers has planned and executed river and harbor projects for the past 125 years. Many projects previously authorized are outmoded and will never be constructed. However, the total estimated costs of the balance of all river and harbor authorizations available up to the 25th of April 1950 were approximately $2,051,616,000, or for authorizations for projects not under partial construction the difference between the said sum of $2,051,616,000 and $1,560,000,000, while on the other hand the total balance of authorizations available for general and Mississippi River flood control aggregates only about $647,000,000. Additional authorizations especially for flood control are imperative. The conferees in making additional authorizations for rivers and harbors kept the balance of authorizations in mind, and for that reason the pending bill provides for vastly larger amounts of authorizations for flood-control projects than is provided for river and harbor projects.

The need at present is primarily additional authorizations for flood control to protect lives and property and to provide for the generation of much needed power especially in the Pacific northwest. The authorizations, therefore, for flood control as agreed to by the conferees are substantially six times as much as the authorizations for rivers and harbors. The managers on the part of the House believe that the bill as agreed to in conference will result in the passage by Congress of the most constructive river and harbor act and the most constructive flood-control act ever passed by the Congress.

The improvement of our national resources adds to the national wealth. Flood control and river and harbor improvements are valuable national assets. When Congress authorizes and appropriates for the improvement of our rivers and for the protection of our valleys, we are building America.

I cannot close without saying to the House that I have been a member of the Committee on Flood Control and of other important committees during the years, but I have never been a member of a committee whose membership was more industrious and faithful in attendance upon all hearings, and whose membership studied and considered more carefully all proposals submitted to them than the House Committee on Public Works.

I would like to make my acknowledgments to the former chairman of the committee and the present ranking minority member of that committee, my valued friend, GEORGE DONDERO. He has been indefatigable in his investigation of all proposals submitted to the committee, and his mature views have been most helpful. He has promoted through the years the national rather than the partisan view respecting the improvements of the national resources of the Nation. There is no more capable or faithful Member of the House of Representatives than my friend the gentleman

from Michigan, GEORGE DONDERO. He is a patriotic citizen and a most able Representative. I will always treasure my associations with all the members of the Committee on Public Works.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who desires to ask me a question.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman has answered my question about the New England survey about which I was going to inquire, which I appreciate very much.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I trust this report which in my judgment materially improves the bill as amended by the Senate will be approved by the House as the original bill was by a vote of 202 to 1, on August 22, 1949.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows of the terrible floods that are now raging in the Missouri Valley, and have been for the past couple of weeks, and the great problem that we have with floodwaters in the Missouri Valley.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am aware of the problem and the floods mentioned.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman feel that the Missouri Valley has been treated properly in the way of flood-control authorization in this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do. One of the largest authorizations is for the Missouri River Basin. That was approved by the House without dissent. It was also approved by the Senate and it was agreed to in the conference.

I now yield to my colleague, the ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], 7 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the kind and generous remarks made by our very able and distinguished chairman in regard to myself. My only hope is that I deserve what he said about me.

This House does not contain a Member who works harder, is a more thorough legislator, and a more brilliant Member of this body than our very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. It is with keen personal regret that the news has come to me that he has chosen to withdraw voluntarily from the Congress of the United States. His district, his State, and our Nation will lose one of the ablest men in this body. I personally regret that he is leaving. I am sure he has the best wishes of all of us.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman made reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] about the gentleman who now has the floor. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] never says anything unless he firmly believes it.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very large river and harbor and flood-control bill. For more than 17 years I have served on that committee, and have never come to this floor in opposition to a river and harbor or flood-control bill.

We passed the last bill in 1948, in the Eightieth Congress. When this bill went to the Senate some additions were made to it. If this bill did not cover an intended 3-year period, which makes 5 years in all, I think I would vote against it because of the amount. But when we divide the amount contained in this bill over a 3-year period it is not so large and is not out of line with previous legislation passed by this body for rivers and harbors and flood-control work. It is true the bill carries with it nearly a billion five hundred million in authorization, but I want to point out that when the bill passed the House last year $785,000,000 of it was for increased authorization on projects already under construction, and some of them nearing completion. The total bill was $1,100,000,000. That was necessary because of the increase in the cost of constructing this kind of work in the United States. When that amount is deducted, even with the additions made by the Senate, this bill is not out of line with other legislation which this Congress has passed for river and harbor and flood-control work of the Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have noticed in the tables that have been presented by the engineers very large increases resulting from changes in plans and increased plans for certain projects. Frankly, that has disturbed me. When bills have come before the Appropriations Committee for the purpose of providing funds to continue projects the result has been that the sponsors would come in to get their initial appropriation of a small amount and then come back for a large amount the next year. It has been very disturbing to those of us who have tried to keep things at all within bounds.

Mr. DONDERO. I realize the force of what the gentleman says. I, too, have had my differences with the Army Engineers on the question of increasing authorizations; but I recognize, and I think everybody else does, that within the last few years the costs of all construction work have increased very materially.

Mr. TABER. But these estimates have gone up way beyond what increases in cost would justify, and have been the result of large additions to the projects which were not disclosed to the Congress at the time the initial appropriations were made. That policy should not be continued.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. While I appreciate the force of the statement, the fact remains that practically all, and certainly all of the major works, are let on competitive bids. Regardless of the amount authorized or appropriated, the country gets the benefit of those competitive bids in the amount of the award.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The bill as it comes back to us lists many projects not contained in the bill at the time it left the House. Does the gentleman feel that at this particular time we should add over $400,000,000 to the bill, which is the effect of the increases?

Mr. DONDERO. I think I know what the gentleman alludes to. I would not have included them if I had my say about it, or if it were left to my decision. They were included in the other body. They are mostly in the Pacific Northwest. No doubt that region, because of its rapid increase in population, needs more river and harbor flood-control work, and power dams. However, the conferees of the House did obtain a substantial reduction of $85,000,000 in the flood-control amount included in the bill by the Senate. No items were deducted from the House bill; they were deducted from the Senate projects.

Mr. RICH. Does the bill now carry new projects in addition to what were contained in the bill at the time it passed the House?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; it includes the larger amount that was put in by the Senate for projects in the northwestern part of the United States.

Mr. RICH. Is the other body figuring on building these great power projects with the idea of socializing the Northwest? The Southwest?

Mr. DONDERO. This House and the committee know my stand on that question. I do not object to the Federal Government's producing the power; what I do object to is the Federal Government's going into the retail business of power and thereby coming into competition with private enterprise.

Mr. RICH. They not only furnish the power on a lot of these projects, but they build transmission lines that compete with private enterprise. The trouble is that eventually they will want to take over distribution to the consumer, socializing our country.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman. I have always opposed that policy.

Mr. RICH. We ought to oppose it. We do not want anybody to get the idea that we are for socialization. The Congress is supporting Great Britain now, a Socialist country. We want to stop this socialization and aid to socialism.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, I must decline to yield further; there are other matters to which I wish to address myself.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction.

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly.

Mr. LARCADE. If the gentleman will refer to the tabulation he will find that the House conferees were responsible for reducing the Senate projects by $109,280,000, rather than $85,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. I had reference to the flood-control section. You are correct; the total reduction in the bill is $109,280,000.

One thing more to which I wish to call attention: I asked the Army engineers

to make a tabulation of all the authorized projects now on the shelf. The total they gave me is $2,160,000,000. When this amount is added to this bill we will have about three and one-half billion dollars. Since that amount is spread over an average period of 5 years you can see it is not far out of line with the amount we are appropriating each year for the continuation and construction of this work. We are now appropriating approximately $600,000,000 annually for this work.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The fact of the matter is that many of the projects have been adopted years and years ago, many of them will not be constructed because they are outmoded at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman inform us in dollars how much was added to the bill by the Senate?

Mr. DONDERO. The amount in dollars added by the Senate for river and harbor work was $108,903,000, and the amount added in the Senate for flood-control work was $366,384,000.

Mr. KEATING. So that almost one-half billion of the billion and a half involved in the bill has been added by the Senate?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. When we had the bill here before it was approximately one billion?

Mr. DONDERO. That is right. The other body put in projects that were not ready for report to the House committee at the time the bill was before the House last year. They were reported to the Senate this year.

Mr. KEATING. I feel sure the gentleman shares my view, knowing his general feeling, that there are times such as the present when we might have to curtail on projects, that we might put them through at a different time and in a different state of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. The remedy for that is to withhold appropriations.

Mr. KEATING. The pressure is greater for them once they have been approved.

Mr. DONDERO. I have learned something about pressure in the years I have been here.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. The Federal Government does not engage in the retail sale of electricity. Where this power is owned by the Federal Government it does build transmission lines and sells at wholesale. It does not retail the power.

Mr. DONDERO. I am willing to debate that question with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to ask the gentleman one question. In connection with these items placed in the bill in the Senate were there budget estimates for those items?

Mr. DONDERO. I understand there were budget estimates, and we were so informed in conference.

Mr. RABAUT. None were put in on the floor over there?

Mr. DONDERO. That is my understanding. Perhaps the chairman can explain that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has made a correct statement. If I may be permitted to say in response to the question, the bill as agreed to in conference accomplishes the very thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is undertaking to bring to our attention. We only approved works to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Pacific Northwest just as they have been constructed everywhere else. We are not departing from that and permitting any other agency to construct them. There are no authorizations for transmission lines.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to ask this further question: Are the projects that have been placed in this bill in the Senate there with a budget estimate?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They are substantially with budget approval just as projects in the House bill were generally with budget approval.

Mr. RABAUT. Why does the gentleman say "substantially?"

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I use the word as the equivalent of immaterial, minor, or small. That is what I mean. In some cases, Congress does not agree with the Director of the Budget. But the big projects like the Columbia River Basin are in here with the approval of the budget and it is specifically stated in the conference report that in approving that project we approve it as recommended by the Chief of Engineers and upon the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that some of these things that are immaterial in the Senate appear quite gigantic in the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We understand that, and for that reason we are asking for partial authorization. And, I will say further that one of the largest items included in this conference report was recommended since the bill passed the House, and that is the $29,000,000 for navigation along the Monongahela River, on which river there is more navigation today than any other river of its size in the world.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me to make that statement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As the gentleman has stated, the Senate increased the amount about $500,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. FORD. The House was the saving influence, so to speak. Would anything be gained by returning this conference report to conference in an effort to cut the added amounts put on by the other body?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think so.

Mr. FORD. In other words, the gentleman feels that they would not recede if we should return the conference report.

Mr. DONDERO. No. We struggled with this matter for 2 days before we came to an agreement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that the items put in by the other body and agreed to by the conferees in most instances take care of projects where there were worn-out locks, worn-out dams, and also construction partially completed?

Mr. DONDERO. Only some of the projects.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And failure to support in the main what was put in by the other body would result in loss rather than a saving over a long period.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the joys and pleasures of my 22 years of service in this body has been, and is today, by association with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, WILL WHITTINGTON. We are all sorry to hear that our distinguished friend and colleague is not going to seek reelection. We know the confidence that the people of his district have in him, and that if he sought reelection, that he would be renominated and reelected without opposition.

When I first came here 22 years ago one of the first Members that I met was the gentleman from Mississippi, WILL WHITTINGTON. During my 22 years as a Member of this body a very close friendship has developed. I know of no Member during my period of service that has had more potent influence in the House than WILL WHITTINGTON; a man of unusual ability, a man of devotion to service, a man of loyalty to those great fundamental truths that he believes in. He has left his imprint in the Halls of Congress.

Today we are considering the final stage of the rivers and harbors bill, which will be the last rivers and harbors bill that our distinguished friend will sponsor as a Member of the House of Representatives, a bill in which he adopts the role of leadership in its passage through the Congress of the United

States. Many rivers and harbors bills have passed under his leadership. The one we are now considering is a great tribute, as will be evidenced by the unanimity by which it will be adopted, and shows the confidence that the House has in WILL WHITTINGTON, and the respect that we have for him and for his leadership. As majority leader for about 8 years I want to in that capacity express the deep gratitude that I have for WILL WHITTINGTON in the ever loyal way in which he has supported my leadership. I know in that statement I express the sentiment of Speaker RAYBURN.

Speaking for all of our colleagues without regard to party, and I think I can do so without anyone taking issue, everyone who ever served with WILL WHITTINGTON has the highest respect for him and a complete feeling of confidence in him. If ever a man has impressed me with his intellectual honesty it has been WILL WHITTINGTON. His ability I have referred to, and his integrity is above reproach.

Above all, the trait in him that I have admired is his loyalty, his loyalty to his spiritual beliefs, his loyalty to his country, his loyalty to the House, his loyalty to his committee, his loyalty to his party, his loyalty to his leadership, his loyalty to his friends, and his loyalty to his constituents.

I regret very much that he is not coming back to the House because the country needs the services of a man like WILL WHITTINGTON at all times, but particularly in a period of stress and troubles such as we are undergoing today.

I take these few minutes to pay tribute to a great legislator, a great American, and a great man, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report to the House the death of my constituent, a former illustrious Member of this House from 1906 to 1920, the Honorable J. Hampton Moore.

"Hampy," as he was so affectionately well known, had a long and honorable career in public service. He was one of the most active and energetic men it has been my privilege to know. His background was unusual; it spelled "activity" always. He was a reporter on the old Public Ledger in Philadelphia—probably his greatest story having been a report on the Johnstown flood; he was a court reporter, chief clerk to the city treasurer, secretary to a mayor, city treasurer, first Chief Clerk of the Bureau of Manufactures of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and president of a Philadelphia trust company. He will also be remembered for his long service as president of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association.

Mr. Moore will be remembered by many of our colleagues as an active member of the Ways and Means Committee and an outstanding leader in the councils of the Republican Party when that party was in control of Congress and the national administration. He left Congress to serve as mayor of Philadelphia, in which capacity he served two terms with great distinction.

Philadelphia and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen, a patriotic American, and a noted public servant. We mourn his passing; he will never be forgotten.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the appropriation bill is pending, as the Members realize, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this rivers, harbors, and flood-control bill at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak in behalf of the Green-Duwamish River flood-control project, which is situated in my congressional district. The Green River rises in the Cascades at an elevation of approximately 5,000 feet and flows in a northwesterly direction for about 60 or 70 miles, where it empties into the Puget Sound at Seattle, Wash. The flood plain begins just above the city of Auburn, which has a population of approximately 6,000. The river flows through a fertile valley, which is about 2 or 3 miles in width. The river joins with the Black River, and from the junction to the sound, about 12 miles away, the river is known then as the Duwamish River. The property on the lower Duwamish is prospective industrial-site property for the city of Seattle.

The two most recent and disastrous floods occurred in 1933 and 1946 inundating approximately 13,000 acres and 12,000 acres, respectively. The estimated damages from the 1933 and 1946 floods are estimated at about $1,750,000 and $1,350,000, respectively, on the basis of 1947 prices. These damages include both damage to valuable agricultural and to urban areas, floodwaters actually coming into the city of Kent. Just recently we had another flood which, although not as severe as the other two, did considerable damage. There is always the danger of another.

This proposed project has been carefully surveyed and approved by the district and division engineers of the United States Army, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Chief of Engineers. It also has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The total estimated cost of the dam is $18,300,000, of which $2,000,000 will be contributed by the State and local governments. The 1949 Legislature of the State of Washington has appropriated $1,500,000, to be made available when the project is authorized by Congress and funds appropriated. The Board of King County Commissioners has set aside $500,000, to be made available as soon as the project is authorized. I am in receipt of a telegram from the board of county commissioners, which reads as follows:

County and State are ready financially to proceed with Eagle Gorge Dam work. Urgent need that this project receive all possible attention.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, the dam is urgently needed.

The estimated benefits are $893,000 annually and include abatement of floods, pollution control, and benefit to fish life. More particularly, this item is broken down in the following manner: $429,000 from benefits of tangible flood damage; $214,000 from increased return from protected agricultural lands; $191,000 from increased returns from industrial lands; $59,000 from benefit to fish life.

The annual carrying charge is estimated at $823,139. With $2,000,000 of the cost being borne by the State and county, the total carrying charges would be $831,628, due to the interest rate of 3.5 percent applied to non-Federal cost. Maintenance and operation are estimated at $80,000 annually.

I urge favorable action upon this project, which is of tremendous concern and importance to the people in the area affected.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the members of the conference committee, both on the House and Senate side, for their agreement on the full $8,000,000 authorization for the completion of the plan approved in the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, for the Red River of the North Basin.

We have recently had a tremendous amount of flood damage both in Minnesota and North Dakota in the Red River of the North drainage basin and it is now more necessary than ever to expedite the surveys and develop the various projects which are included in the comprehensive plan so that these damaging floods will not recur each spring.

I certainly will support this conference report as I believe projects of this kind benefit the people of the area and in the long run return dividends to the United States Treasury.

I am of course happy that the bill includes my own suggested legislation calling for an examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes, including final and major drainage improvements under the direction of the Corps of Engineers for the following streams in northwestern Minnesota: Mud River, Thief River, Moose River, Lost River, Snake River, Tamarac River, Two River, Big Joe River, and Little Joe River, tributaries of the Red River of the North.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of year when the columnist and commentator declare open season on the omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill by declaring it a pork-barrel measure. The inference is that most of the projects in the bill are there not because they do anyone any good except the Congress.

Not all and, I believe, very few of the projects in the bill are what can be called pork.

Let us examine a project in my own district as to whether it is a pork barrel or a worthy, needed undertaking.

The project to which I refer calls for the expenditure of $16,000,000 to provide flood protection for the lower side of the Columbia River and to protect

some 8 miles of river bank from being eroded.

Now, $16,000,000 is, I suspect, a large sum of money. However, the floods in this area of 2 years ago cost property damage estimated by the Army engineers at $104,000,000 and 50 lives. The $16,000,000 that this bill carried for flood-protection measures in this area will prevent the possibility of a repetition of this disaster.

If we do not build these $16,000,000 of dikes, we may save that money, but, if a flood comes, we may suffer the loss of another $104,000,000 of property. The spending of $16,000,000 on these dikes, it seems to me, is good insurance and in the long run is less expensive than taking the chance of suffering the danger and damage of another great flood.

In short, we will pay for these dikes whether we build them or not. If we build them, we will be spending $16,000,000, but if we do not build them, we may lose $104,000,000 as the result of flood damage.

The total amount carried as estimates on the cost of projects in this bill are approximately $1,600,000,000. Many will think Congress is spending that much money on river and harbor projects at this one time.

That is not the case. The projects authorized in this bill will not be constructed in any one year. Their construction will extend over several years or many years.

This is not an appropriation bill. It does not appropriate funds for any project. It merely states in effect that the projects in this bill are, in the opinion of the committees and of Congress, worthy to be constructed at some future time.

The Appropriations Committee later will determine which of these projects shall be started and when, and how many years it will require to complete any project in this bill.

Some of these projects will be started next year, no doubt, these being of an emergency nature. Others of the projects in this bill may not be undertaken for years.

This bill merely places the projects in it on the advance planning board for use when the Government has the available funds to undertake their construction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the discussion which was had between me and the gentleman from Mississippi relative to building these transmission lines and getting into socialism I want the gentleman from Mississippi to know that I know he is one of the advocates of power and while I would like to see a lot of power and cheap power I want to see more power in the House of Representatives to stay away from socialism. If you will use your energy to keep this country out of socialism as much as you are to try to get power you will be doing this country a great service. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that in the Southwest you are distributing power from these transmission lines through these cooperatives and these cooperatives are not paying any taxes to the Government. If that is not socialism or the next thing to it, why, then I do not know anything about socialism. What we have to do is to stop it. I want you to help to stop it. That is what I want to impress on you right now. The Members of Congress should remember that we have about $11,000,000,000 of work now in progress on rivers and harbors and $13,000,000,000 worth of flood-control work approved by Congress. This bill has been approved by the Congress. You have the Army engineers trying to help this country getting these flood-control projects ready. They have $20,000,000,000 worth of work on the drafting boards approved by the Army engineers. That is a total of $44,000,000,000. You cannot do this work all at one time. It must be distributed over a period of years. Years, I say, many years. Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Mississippi, or we go broke. Yes, bankrupt. Be wise and economize.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is just mistaken to the extent of about $40,000,000,000, that is all.

Mr. RICH. Forty-four billion dollars, and forty-four billion dollars to me is a whale of a lot of money but to some people it does not seem to be too much. You must stop going in the red.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and at the same time wish to state that there is nothing about power transmission in this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Truman submitted to the Senate for its ratification, a treaty between the United States and Canada covering the uses of the waters of the Niagara River. To implement this treaty, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN and I are today jointly introducing the Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950. The first objective of the treaty, and our joint proposal, is to maintain Niagara Falls as a majestic American scenic spectacle. For generations the Falls have been a symbol for the whole Nation of the lavishness with which God endowed our country. It is estimated that about 1,000,000 people visit Niagara Falls each year; that is tribute enough to how much the Falls mean to Americans.

For some years, however, the scenic grandeur of Niagara has been imperiled. Uncontrolled erosion and uneven pressure of the turbulent waters has seriously threatened the crestline of the Falls. The treaty submitted by the President yesterday was negotiated primarily to fix permanently the spectacular grandeur that is Niagara Falls. Provision is made in the treaty for restoration of the Falls where erosion has damaged the crestline, so that the slow transformation of the Falls into a mere cascade can be stopped. Specific arrangements are provided in the treaty for guaranteeing the minimum amount of water that will roar over the Falls, and for building works to remedy the damage that is being done to the Falls.

If the sole consequence of this treaty, and our implementing bill, was to preserve the Niagara as an historic American institution, they would certainly be worthwhile. But far more is involved. As a result of the division of the water resources, we will have a greater opportunity to expand prodigiously the electric energy available in New York and the States which surround it. So much power potential exists in the Niagara that it staggers the imagination. Generation of 1,330,000 kilowatts of electrical power will be made possible on the United States side alone. Every year, the Niagara—if properly redeveloped—can yield 7,900,000 kilowatt-hours of new electrical energy. In magnitude, the Niagara power development proposed here would rank second only to the Grand Coulee in power generation capacity, and would just about equal it in the energy produced.

Such a vast increase in available electrical energy will naturally be of great concern to many interested parties. The interests of these parties must be reconciled so that the greatest public benefit results. In the State of New York alone, there are 3,800,000 consumers of residential electric service, 667,000 commercial users, and 22,000 industrial clients. All of these—and their neighbors across the State lines—will be affected by how much power is generated, how it is distributed, by whom, and how much it costs. A review of the section-by-section analysis of the bill will indicate how we propose to protect the legitimate interest of the various governments involved—and above all, of the people to whom this great resource belongs.

It is unthinkable that a development of public resources of this size should be made for the primary benefit of any profit-making individuals or groups. Yet there is not, at the moment, any public body authorized to develop the project. As of now, the Federal Power Commission is the only public agency with authority to grant licenses to private individuals or groups.

The bill which I am introducing puts the whole development question squarely up to the government of the State of New York. If New York cannot come to an appropriate agreement with the Federal Government for public development of the Niagara, then the Federal Government will act. In fact, the bill goes a little further than that. It authorizes the Corps of Engineers to begin construction at the Falls, even before the State of New York acts. The State of New York may then signify its willingness to assume responsibility for its operation, with guaranties for the rights of others.

Public development of the power at Niagara will mean the accomplishment of a goal that has been a New York State tradition since the beginning of this century. Again and again, the State's leaders—Democrats and Republicans alike—have called for public development. Here are some typical expressions of opinion.

Charles Evans Hughes, Governor of New York, 1907–10:

> It is well to consider the great value of the undeveloped water powers * * * under State control. They should be preserved and held for the benefit of all the people and should not be surrendered to private interests. It would be difficult to exaggerate the

advantages which may ultimately accrue from these great resources of power if the common right is duly safeguarded. (Annual message to the legislature, January 2, 1907.)

These great natural sources of power should not only be developed in a manner which the State alone can make possible, but should be held for the benefit of the people under conditions which will insure the protection of the common right and fair return for privileges granted. (Annual message to the legislature, January 6, 1909.)

Theodore Roosevelt, Governor of New York, 1899–1900:

You have in this section a most valuable asset in your natural water power. You have elected too many men in the past who have taken what belongs to the Nation. Coal and oil barons cannot compare to water-power barons. Do not let them get a monopoly on what belongs to this State. * * * Do not give up your water power for a promise of quick development. We are poor citizens if we allow the things worth most to get into the hands of a few. (Address at Watertown, N. Y., October 10, 1914.)

Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York, 1919–20; 1923–28:

"The cost of energy developed from falling water is determined very largely by the cost of the capital employed in the development. A public corporation such as you propose, whose securities would be exempt from taxation under the Federal law and the State law, should produce, if properly set up, the required money substantially cheaper than a private corporation could obtain it."

The authority for this statement also made the following statement:

"I see no objection, but on the contrary, I can see some advantages, to the development of the great water powers on the St. Lawrence and in the gorge of the Niagara by a public corporation rather than by a private corporation, and to the ownership of all lands, water rights, flowage, dams, powerhouses, and structures by such a public corporation."

The author of the statement above is Owen D. Young, chairman of the board of directors of the General Electric Co. * * *

There is only one issue at stake and it is this: Shall the State of New York, through a corporation of its own creation develop these great water-power resources for the benefit of all the people of the State or shall it give a license for a long term of years to a private corporation to develop for their own purposes? * * *

Such a public corporation is just as capable of carrying on the developments as a private one. It can hire the same brains and engineering ability that a private corporation can hire. It can float its securities against the earning power of the development a great deal cheaper than the private company can. Nothing stands in its way but the desire of a small group of men, powerful and influential, to retain for themselves and the private interests that they represent, the right to own and control these great water-power resources. * * * (The) legislature should adhere to a policy long ago suggested and once adopted, to develop these water powers by the State itself for the benefit of all the people as against private development for the benefit of the few. (Public statement, Albany, February 27, 1926.)

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Governor of New York, 1929–32:

In the brief time that I have been speaking to you, there has run to waste on their paths toward the sea, enough power from our rivers to have turned the wheels of a thousand factories, to have lit a million farmers' homes—power which nature has supplied us through the gift of God. It is intolerable that the utilization of this stupendous heritage should be longer delayed by petty squabbles and partisan dispute. Time will not solve the problem; it will be more difficult as time goes on to reach a fair conclusion. It must be solved now.

I should like to state clearly the outstanding features of the problem itself. First, it is agreed, I think, that the waterpower of the State should belong to all the people. There was, perhaps, some excuse for careless legislative gift of power sites in the days when it was of no seemingly great importance. There can be no such excuse now. The title to this power must vest forever in the people of this State. No commission, no, not the legislature itself has any right to give, for any consideration whatever, a single potential kilowatt in virtual perpetuity to any person or corporation whatsoever. The legislature in this matter is but the trustee of the people, and it is their solemn duty to administer such heritage so as most greatly to benefit the whole people. On this point there can be no dispute. (Inaugural address, Albany, January 1, 1929.)

HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Governor of New York, 1933–42:

And this brings me to speak of another great power resource the State possesses in the falls of the Niagara River. There the potentialities are comparable to those of the St. Lawrence. I hope to see a public development of the latent power resources of Niagara so that the people of the State, whether in New York City, Buffalo, Binghamton, Albany, or on the farms, may participate in its benefits as well as those of the St. Lawrence.

Both of these great water powers belong to the people of the State and must be protected. I have on two former occasions recommended a constitutional amendment, designed to write into the State constitution the safeguard that the water-power resources owned by the State shall forever remain inalienable for the use of the people and not of private utility companies. I again recommend the adoption of this amendment to the constitution. (Special message to the legislature, January 14, 1941.)

Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York since 1943:

I have always strongly advocated the development of the power resources of the State by government, for the benefit of all the people and not for any private monopoly. (Public statement, Watertown, October 10, 1942.)

There are many, many more similar statements on the record. They leave no doubt about the long-standing almost universal commitment in New York State to public development. Public development will be practical as well as principled. With the credit of the people of New York State behind them, the interest charges on money for construction—a major factor in hydroelectric costs—will be practically cut in half. If the State of New York takes these works over—and I sincerely hope they do—they can finance the cost through private investment channels, and reimburse the Federal Government for any outlay. Should the State fail to exercise option we propose Congress to extend it; then it seems to me that Congress itself should set up an instrumentality to permit the Treasury to be reimbursed for the capital outlay by refinancing through private channels.

Right at the outset, I want to warn against the possible misrepresentations of this proposal by selfish, vested interests. We are not advocating nationalization of the electric power industry. Neither the Federal nor the State Governments are in the business of retailing electricity. I am not advocating that they go into that business. What I am advocating is that the State or Federal Government be permitted to develop this great natural resource for the benefit of the people—all of them—to whom it belongs. The power produced can then be sold wholesale, with transmission to the load centers, to private companies, provided that preference goes to municipalities and nonprofit cooperatives. This is being done in many other parts of the country, and is completely consistent with our country's long-established power policy.

The enactment of this bill will be the first step in meeting a power deficiency in New York and the adjacent States. This deficiency caused grave concern during the war to our military and war-production leadership. Just a few days ago, continuing concern was expressed by the Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr., about this situation, before the House Committee on Public Works.

There is a great advantage—

Said the Secretary of the Army—

in having for national-defense purposes the large source of cheap, dependable power which would result if the project were completed. Specifically, it would be of material benefit in the production of strategically important aluminum.

He was testifying on the St. Lawrence River proposal, but his words obviously apply with equal force to the Niagara.

Just as this deficiency is inexcusable with respect to our national defense, it is inexcusable with respect to our economy. New York, and the region of which it is a part, have not kept pace with the expansion of power achieved by the rest of the country since 1920. Using 1900 as the base year (index 100), the Federal Power Commission reports that the national production of energy had gone to 717.4 by 1948. The New England States had gone to only 550.6; the Middle Atlantic States to only 585; New York lags in having reached an index rating of only 482.3.

Every responsible expert body has expressed complete confidence that the new energy created at the Niagara could be absorbed by the area in very short order. This has been generally true throughout the country. The late Senator George Norris is quoted as having said:

Wherever in this world an abundance of low-cost power has been developed, its very existence has immediately created a shortage.

The additional energy from Niagara would be absorbed by the farms, factories, and homes as a blotter absorbs ink. In 1948, New York was near the bottom of the list of States in the average amount of residential electricity used by its homes. The Empire State ranked forty-first in the list of States. It ranked forty-second in terms of the average cost of residential electricity; only six States had higher rates for home users. Public development of the Niagara would expand the power available, and would almost surely cut the costs to business, home, and farm users substantially.

It is impossible to forecast exactly what the rate reductions and average use expansions would be. But the Province of

Ontario right across the river offers some point of comparison, since there has been considerable public development of hydroelectric power. If we in New York had been paying the Ontario rates, we would have saved in 1948 alone, $317,889,538. About $112,000,000 of this saving would have gone to home users, about $51,000,000 to industrial users, and about $153,000,000 to commercial users.

Every home, business, farm, factory, and labor union has a dollars-and-cents interest in these figures and in the prospect of achieving savings like them. Expanded markets for consumer goods of many kinds would be created. The job of finally completing the electrification of our farms—more than 90 percent done—will be eased. Every day that we needlessly lose these great benefits, every day that we see them fall into the great gorge at the Niagara—damaging the falls in the process, must be a day of bitterness to those concerned with the fruitful use of our national abundance.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] such time as he desires.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on the part of the House on this conference report, I want to express my approval of the statement made by the chairman of our committee, Mr. WHITTINGTON, and the ranking Republican member of the committee, Mr. DONDERO. First let me join with Mr. DONDERO in commending the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, for the outstanding public service he has performed for the Nation down through the years as a Member of the House of Representatives. I join with my colleague, Mr. DONDERO, in stating that no Member of the House during my service here has been more diligent in his duties, more efficient in his work, and more considerate of the members of the committee over which he presides than has the gentleman from Mississippi. I am sure that every Member of the House has a deep feeling of regret that his service in the Congress will be terminated at the end of the Eighty-first Congress and that he is voluntarily retiring from public service. It will be a great loss to his district, to the State, and to the Nation.

The conferees of the House and Senate, as has been said, devoted much time to the consideration of the amendments to H. R. 5472 which were added in the Senate. After long conferences, the unanimous agreement was reached in which material savings in monetary authorizations were effected by reason of the insistence on the part of the House conferees that cuts in some of the authorizations be made. However, I feel certain that no great injury will be done to projects where the full amount was not allowed. My own projects in Oregon shared with other parts of the country in taking cuts in these authorizations. It should be remembered, of course, that this is an authorization bill and no part of the authorization in the bill can be expended until Congress by appropriations passes upon each individual project. It should be said also that the conferees followed a uniform rule to withhold approval of any project that had not been approved by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, with one or two exceptions where special circumstances justified such approval. A major portion covers increases in existing appropriations or authorizations. It should also be pointed out that while this bill in the aggregate authorizes a large appropriation, nearly a billion and one-half dollars, it covers a long-range program extending for 3 years or more in the monetary appropriations allowed and also covers at least 2 years in the past for which authorizations have been provided. As a result, it covers 5 years in monetary authorizations, and the total amount allowed is not disproportionate to the annual appropriations that have been made in the past for the combined projects under rivers and harbors and flood control.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 5472, recommended:

Title I of the bill, rivers and harbors, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 65 projects in the amount of $119,469,975. The Senate by amendments added 29 navigation projects costing $108,903,150, making a grand total of $228,373,125 for rivers and harbors. The navigation projects added by the Senate were based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. The conferees feel that they should now be included, since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

Title II of the bill, flood control, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in a total amount of $998,116,200. The Senate, by amendments, added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects contained in the House bill in a total amount of $366,384,000, which includes $30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, making a grand total of $1,334,321,200 for flood control. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were, as in title I, based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers, but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. As in connection with title I the conferees agree that these new projects should now be included since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

The results of the conference are as follows:

For rivers and harbors the total additional amounts of $108,903,150, as passed by the Senate, were reduced by agreement among the conferees by $24,650,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers. The total additional amount for rivers and harbors, therefore, included by the Senate and agreed to in conference, is $84,253,150.

With respect to flood control, the total additional amounts added by the Senate of $366,384,000 of which $30,179,000 is for work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation were reduced by $84,630,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Savannah River Basin and the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The total additional amount, therefore, added by the Senate and agreed to in conference, for flood control, is $251,575,000.

The totals in the bill as recommended by the conferees covering titles I and II only with the reductions effected by the conferees are as follows:

Action of conferees on H. R. 5472

RIVERS AND HARBORS—TITLE I

Total as passed by House	$119,469,975	
Added by Senate	108,903,150	
Total House and Senate		$228,373,125
Reductions made by conferees:		
Ouachita River (from $36,950,000 to $21,300,000)	$15,650,000	
Arkansas River (from $89,000,000 to $80,000,000)	9,000,000	
		24,650,000
Total river and harbor as reported from conference		203,723,125

FLOOD CONTROL—TITLE II

Total as passed by House	$998,116,200	
Added by Senate (includes $30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande)	366,384,000	
Total House and Senate		1,364,500,200
Reductions made by conferees:		
Hartwell Reservoir (from $68,377,000 to $50,000,000)	$18,377,000	
Columbia River Basin (following items added by Senate were deleted by conferees):		
Modification of Fern Ridge Dam, Oreg	$133,000	
Willamette River supplemental levees and overflow channel enclosures (no effect on monetary authorizations)	0	
Hepner Dam and downstream channel improvements, Willow Creek, Oreg	3,771,000	
Harbors at 21 locations, Oregon, Washington, Idaho	2,300,000	
Local flood protection projects reduced from $28,000,000 to $15,000,000	13,000,000	
Reduction in general authorization	47,049,000	
Total reductions in Columbia River Basin ($141,253,000 to $75,000,000)	66,253,000	
Total reductions by conferees		84,630,000
Total flood control as reported from conference (includes $30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande)		1,279,870,200
Total title I and title II		1,483,593,325
Total excluding $30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande		1,453,414,325
Total reductions by conferees—title I and title II		109,280,000

This omnibus authorization bill, H. R. 5472, for rivers and harbors and flood control covers the entire United States. I am particularly interested in it as it involves the great natural resources of the Columbia River Basin. As a member of the Public Works Committee which approved this bill in the House in the last session and by reason of being ranking member on the Flood Control Subcommittee, I was appointed by the Speaker as one of the conferees to consider the disagreeing votes between the House and the Senate on this bill.

There is included in the House bill a number of essential projects not only for the development of our natural resources in the Pacific Northwest area but also for flood control. These included the Albeni Falls Dam on the Columbia River in Idaho, which will firm up power in Bonneville and Grand Coulee and be the most available project for early completion to help meet the power shortage in the Portland area. The House bill also contained $40,000,000 additional authorization for the Willamette Basin projects, authorization for the Johnson Creek project in the Portland area, levees on the Willamette River to protect Portland, at an estimated cost of $14,722,000,000; lower Columbia bank protection and modification of levees along the lower Columbia, aggregating $22,595,000. The total for Columbia River projects as the bill passed the House amounts to $107,997,000. These items were unchanged by the Senate.

At the time the House bill was reported out of committee, the comprehensive 308 report had not been released by the Budget Bureau and therefore the House was unable to consider the projects contained in it. However, when the Public Works Committee of the Senate considered the bill recently this report had been released and the Senate included a number of additional projects in the Columbia River area, including the Willamette River. There were projects in disagreement considered by the conferees. The conferees approved all of these projects which had been approved by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. They cover with a few exceptions all of the projects in the Columbia River Basin and Willamette River Basin which were to be constructed by the Army engineers and which were included in the comprehensive 308 report, providing for the long-range development of the resources of the Columbia River Basin. In addition to the approval of the projects themselves there was approved a monetary authorization for partial construction and for planning, the sum of $75,000,000. This sum was a reduction from the amount authorized in the Senate amendments, but was in keeping with reductions made in other projects in the bill in order to bring the total amount of the bill to a minimum in monetary authorizations. The Army engineers advised me that this reduction in monetary authorizations will not militate against our interests in these developments. They are long-range developments extending over a number of years and additional authorizations can be made from time to time as needed as the over-all program is developed by the Army engineers.

The authorizations in the Columbia and Willamette River areas added by the Senate and now approved by the conferees are as follows:

Power facilities at Lookout Point Dam, middle fork of the Willamette River.

Hills Creek Dam, middle fork of the Willamette River.

Dexter reregulating dam, middle fork, Willamette River.

Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, middle-north fork, Willamette River.

Fall Creek Dam, Fall Creek, middle fork, Willamette River.

Holley Dam, Calapooya River.

Willamette Falls fish ladder, Willamette River.

Willamette River channel improvements, bank protection works, and channel clearing and snagging.

Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Mont.

Priest Rapids Dam, Columbia River, Wash.

John Day Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg.

The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg.

Local flood-protection project at Pendleton, and Jackson Hole, Wyo.

Local flood-protection projects in the Columbia River Basin, Mont., Wyo., Utah, Nev., Idaho, Oreg., and Wash., provided that with respect to these local flood-protection projects the following conditions shall apply:

First. Not to exceed $15,000,000 of this authorization shall be available for these local flood-protection projects.

Second. All of the local flood-protection projects undertaken pursuant to this item shall be economically justified prior to construction.

Third. Local cooperation specified in the flood-control act approved June 22, 1936, as amended, shall be required.

During the 12 years I have served Oregon here in the Congress I have devoted a major portion of my time to the development, conservation, and utilization of the great natural resources of the Columbia River Basin, particularly as they appertain to power development, navigation, reclamation, and water utilization. The Columbia River, the second greatest in the United States and the greatest in power potentialities, is the cornerstone of the economy of the whole Northwest area. Its full development and utilization not only means success to industries in providing pay rolls, but also is a great boon to agricultural development and land utilization. Over 40 percent of the hydroelectric power of our Nation is bottled up in this great river and only about 10 percent of it has been developed thus far. These authorizations in this bill cover projects which, when constructed, will put the Northwest in the forefront of hydro-power development. It should not be overlooked that these great power developments are self-sustaining and every dollar with interest invested in them by the Federal Government is repaid in full. In fact, Bonneville is 10 years ahead of schedule in its repayment programs. The Federal Government should spend more money on these projects which pay their own way and curtail expenditures in many of the activities which it has been carrying on of doubtful worth and which make no returns to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am a sincere advocate of economy in Federal expenditures and believe that we should cut out every expenditure which is not essential for the best interests of our country at this critical time. However, I do feel that it would be a grievous mistake to fail to make adequate appropriations for the conservation, development, and utilization of the great natural resources of our Nation upon which the very economy of our country depends. Unless we utilize these resources to the greatest economical extent we will not be able to meet our commitments at home and abroad and meet the ever-increasing financial obligations resting upon the Federal Government. For that reason I sincerely urge the approval of this conference report so that these great internal improvements in our country may be carried forward efficiently and expeditiously in order to maintain the economy of the Nation. Many of the projects, particularly those involving hydroelectric power, are self-liquidating and in the long run will repay the Federal Government all the moneys expended thereon.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I well recall last fall, in the first session of the Congress, when we had given consideration to this flood-control bill and had taken a wide range of testimony, then we drafted the bill. After we drafted the bill, the illustrious chairman of this committee will recall that we then went into executive session again, and we attempted to reduce, in every paragraph of this bill, every dollar that could possibly be cut out of it. That is exactly what we did. We reduced it by many millions. Then it went to the Senate. It has recently been acted upon by the Senate and is now before the House on a conference report. It is true the Senate added some few million dollars, because they were not able to get their testimony in earlier, but the entire, over-all bill at the present time amounts to a little less than $1,500,000,000. Naturally, we would like to make some reductions that were written in by the other body, but it is the consensus of the leadership, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] that it would be futile to make these reductions and send it back to the Senate because they would put the amount back and we would have the bill in conference again. But when you consider this is spread over a 3-year period, we would be spending about $500,000,000 a year to protect the cities and towns and villages and the rich farm land in the valleys in the entire Nation, it is certainly an investment that will pay off in big dividends.

If we do not pass this bill, we give no relief to our people at home. Do you know we are probably spending, through the ECA in other countries over the world, for flood control, industrialization

of plants, and so forth, amounts running to over a billion dollars a year. Here we are asking for flood control for this great country of ours only about $500,000,000 a year, when you consider it is spread over a 3-year period. Let us do this much for our own people in protecting our own resources. We had better do this and cut down on our overseas spending.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable apprehension that I find that in the final draft of the flood-control bill, as embodied in the provisions of the conference report, the appropriation for the revetments and flood protection at Bonner's Ferry, Idaho, have been left out. That means that if we do not build the Libby Dam first and protect the extensive areas behind the levees in the diking districts of the Kootenai Valley at Bonner's Ferry, by striking out that appropriation, that country will be left to the mercy of the floods of Kootenai River. We must build the Libby Dam first, to take care of and protect the rich farming land in that valley.

I hope some subsequent appropriation will be made to take care of Bonner's Ferry and the Kootenai Valley district, since they have been left out of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere regrets that our very distinguished and able friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] will not be a candidate again for Congress. As chairman of the Public Works Committee he will be greatly missed. His long years of experience in the Congress, particularly on rivers and harbors, eminently qualified him for the chairmanship of this great committee. He has been a willing servant of public duty, conscientiously performing his work with energy and resourcefulness on all public matters that were before him.

Over the years he has turned in a remarkable performance of which he can well be proud. He has been fair and square and tolerant and patient with us on all of the many problems that have been presented to him. His work has won for him the hearty commendations, respect, and admiration of the membership of both sides of the aisle. He is an outstanding American and I regret that he is leaving the Congress of the United States.

Now I want to say a word to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I might tell the very distinguished gentleman that if he will look after his own State of Mississippi, we who represent Pennsylvania, will look after the affairs of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is a great State of 10,000,000 people, a State that sent 1,400,000 men and women into the last World War, a State that produced some 30 to 35 percent of the war materials, a State that has a magnificent record. Nature has blessed Pennsylvania with great natural resources—coal, oil and gas. We are the leading steel-producing State in the Nation and we have built a great system of highways, waterways, and railways. We have the finest workmen in the world. We are one of the leading agricultural States in the Union. All these factors combine to make our State the industrial titan of America. This great State of ours built soundly and well on the foundation of free enterprise—the American way.

Pennsylvania pays into the Federal Treasury approximately 10 percent of all the taxes collected by the Federal Government. So if the TVA, about which the gentleman is talking, cost $800,000,000, Pennsylvania has contributed $80,000,000 to make possible the development of the TVA to produce cheap power for the industrial rehabilitation and protection of the Tennessee Valley. Instead of being critical of the great State of Pennsylvania, which I am proud and honored to represent, I think the gentleman from Mississippi should be paying tribute to us as a great State because without our energy, industry, and resourcefulness, and without our great natural resources and without our tremendous contribution to the Federal Treasury TVA would not have been possible.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I shall find it necessary to vote against this conference report on rivers and harbors and flood control. It amounts, according to figures submitted, to $1,538,044,325, of which $228,300,000 is for rivers and harbors, and $1,334,000,000 for flood control.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I am in favor of flood control, and I am in favor of the improvement of the rivers and harbors in this country where it is the obligation of the Federal Government to appropriate funds for that purpose. However, I want to direct your attention to this particular bill.

As near as I can figure it out, this bill has been increased by the Senate to the extent of $335,828,150. In other words, after the bill was voted by the House it went to the other body, where more than a third of a billion dollars was added. Not only that, but these items, making up $335,000,000, were not even considered or debated in the House of Representatives and were not considered by the House Committee on Public Works, except over a period of about 2 days. So the situation is this: The House, upon the recommendation of the Public Works Committee, after prolonged hearings were held, approved a bill amounting to a billion dollars. Then it went to the Senate, where a half billion dollars was added, and the House has reduced the Senate increase about 30 percent, leaving a net increase of $335,000,000 that was put in by the Senate and is about to be approved by the House without any debate and without hearings in the House committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a real "pork barrel" bill. There is something in it for almost every area and every section of the country. I wish I had time to read the items to you, but you will find them—East, West, North, and South, Middle States, and all.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that where projects have been started and are presently under way, those projects should be completed in regular order. There may be a few additional projects because of critical circumstances that ought to be considered, but I call your attention to the fact that more than one-half of the amount allocated under this bill is for new projects of various kinds that have not yet been started, and you know that when a project is once authorized and some allocations are made, the Federal Government is obligated to continue and complete such projects. So let no one misunderstand that when you vote for this bill today, you are obligating your Government for another $1,500,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to obligate the Federal Treasury and the taxpayers of this country for any amount more than is absolutely necessary, and these authorizations should be made in consideration of absolute need and not on the basis of the demand for the authorization and expenditure of more and more funds.

I concede that many of these projects are worthy and are entitled to every reasonable consideration that may be granted, but in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, and considering the fact that our expenditures during the fiscal year will be $6,000,000,000 more than our revenue, the fair and reasonable thing to do is to send this bill back to the committee for further consideration.

It is not fair, neither is it right, that this House should be called upon to authorize the expenditure of such a tremendous amount of money, a great part of which was never debated in the House and barely considered by the great House Committee on Public Works. I know it will be said that this only authorizes the expenditure of funds, but Members of this House know full well that once you authorize and obligate your Government, you are expected to appropriate funds to pay the bill. This is too much money. I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD. Having no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 101, noes 33.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 210, nays 137, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—210

Abernethy	Gathings	Monroney
Addonizio	Gavin	Morris
Albert	Gillette	Multer
Allen, Calif.	Golden	Murdock
Allen, Ill.	Gore	Murphy
Allen, La.	Granahan	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	Nicholson
Angell	Green	Norblad
Aspinall	Gregory	Norrell
Auchincloss	Gross	Norton
Bailey	Hagen	O'Konski
Barden	Hale	O'Neill
Baring	Hardy	O'Sullivan
Barrett, Pa.	Hare	Passman
Barrett, Wyo.	Harris	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Patten
Beckworth	Havenner	Perkins
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ark.	Peterson
Bentsen	Hébert	Philbin
Bishop	Hedrick	Phillips, Calif.
Blackney	Heffernan	Phillips, Tenn.
Blatnik	Herlong	Potter
Boggs, La.	Hill	Poulson
Bolton, Md.	Hinshaw	Preston
Bonner	Hobbs	Price
Bosone	Hoeven	Priest
Bramblett	Holifield	Rankin
Brooks	Holmes	Redden
Brown, Ga.	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Bryson	Howell	Richards
Buchanan	Hull	Rivers
Buckley, Ill.	Jackson, Wash.	Rodino
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenison	Rooney
Burdick	Jensen	Roosevelt
Burnside	Johnson	Sadowski
Camp	Jones, Mo.	Sanborn
Carnahan	Karst	Saylor
Carroll	Kearns	Scudder
Case, S. Dak.	Kelley, Pa.	Secrest
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheppard
Chiperfield	Kerr	Sikes
Christopher	Kilday	Simpson, Ill.
Colmer	King	Spence
Combs	Kirwan	Staggers
Cooper	Lane	Stefan
Corbett	Lanham	Stigler
Cox	Larcade	Stockman
Cunningham	LeCompte	Sullivan
Curtis	Lemke	Tackett
Davenport	Lovre	Talle
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Thompson
D'Ewart	Lynch	Thornberry
Dollinger	McCormack	Tollefson
Dolliver	McDonough	Trimble
Dondero	McGuire	Vinson
Donohue	McKinnon	Vursell
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	Welch
Eberharter	Mack, Wash.	Werdel
Ellsworth	Magee	White, Idaho
Engel, Mich.	Mansfield	Whitten
Evins	Marcantonio	Whittington
Fenton	Marsalis	Williams
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Willis
Flood	Merrow	Wilson, Tex.
Forand	Meyer	Winstead
Frazier	Michener	Withrow
Fugate	Miller, Calif.	Wolcott
Fulton	Mills	Wood
Furcolo	Mitchell	Woodhouse

NAYS—137

Abbitt	Canfield	Eaton
Andersen, H. Carl	Cannon	Elston
	Case, N. J.	Fallon
Andresen, August H.	Celler	Feighan
	Chatham	Fellows
Arends	Chesney	Fogarty
Bates, Mass.	Clemente	Ford
Beall	Clevenger	Garmatz
Biemiller	Cole, Kans.	Gary
Boggs, Del.	Cole, N. Y.	Gordon
Bolling	Cotton	Gorski
Bolton, Ohio	Coudert	Graham
Brehm	Crawford	Gwinn
Brown, Ohio	Dague	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bulwinkle	Davis, Wis.	
Burleson	Delaney	Halleck
Burton	Doughton	Hand
Byrnes, Wis.	Durham	Harrison
Harvey	McCulloch	Scott, Hardie
Hays, Ohio	McGregor	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Herter	Mack, Ill.	
Heselton	Macy	Scrivner
Hoffman, Mich.	Mahon	Shafer
Hope	Marshall	Simpson, Pa.
Huber	Martin, Mass.	Sims
Irving	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Md.	Smith, Va.
James	Morton	Smith, Wis.
Javits	Murray, Wis.	Stanley
Jennings	Nelson	Steed
Jonas	O'Brien, Ill.	Taber
Jones, N. C.	O'Hara, Ill.	Tauriello
Judd	O'Toole	Teague
Karsten	Patterson	Towe
Kearney	Pickett	Van Zandt
Keating	Poage	Vorys
Kennedy	Polk	Wagner
Kilburn	Rabaut	Walter
Latham	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel
LeFevre	Rees	Widnall
Lesinski	Ribicoff	Wier
Lichtenwalter	Rich	Wigglesworth
Lind	Riehlman	Wilson, Okla.
Linehan	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton
Lodge	Sadlak	Yates
McCarthy	St. George	Young
McConnell	Sasscer	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—83

Andrews	Harden	Pfeiffer, William L.
Battle	Heller	
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Ill.	Plumley
Boykin	Jacobs	Powell
Breen	Jenkins	Quinn
Burke	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Kean	Ramsay
Carlyle	Kee	Regan
Cavalcante	Keefe	Rhodes
Chudoff	Keogh	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Klein	Sabath
Crook	Kruse	Shelley
Crosser	Kunkel	Short
Davies, N. Y.	McGrath	Smathers
Dawson	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	McSweeney	Sutton
DeGraffenried	Madden	Taylor
Denton	Miles	Underwood
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Velde
Douglas	Morgan	Wadsworth
Elliott	Morrison	Walsh
Engle, Calif.	Moulder	Wheeler
Fisher	Nixon	Whitaker
Gamble	Noland	White, Calif.
Gilmer	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Goodwin	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Ind.
Gossett	Pace	Woodruff
Grant	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Hall, Leonard W.		

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smathers for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Kean against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Burke with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Battle with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Crook with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Dean with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. White of California with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SASSCER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. KARSTEN, Mr. JACKSON of California, and Mr. WAGNER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the Unitel States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include an editorial.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain information.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Alvin Bloch on the subject Cargoes and Pacific Northwest Power.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the magazine Machinists.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech commemorating the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Congressional Subpena Upon the President."

Mr. GORSKI, Mr. CHESNEY, and Mr. ELSTON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of the bill entitled "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950" and an analysis of the bill.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and in each include extraneous matter.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VII. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on all chapters of the bill has been concluded.

The Clerk will now continue reading the bill for amendments, beginning with chapter VII, page 216, line 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

WORKING-CAPITAL FUND

For establishment of a working-capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part requirements of the bureaus and offices of the Department in the city of Washington and elsewhere; (4) a central library service; (5) health services; and (6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis; $300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of bureaus, offices, and agencies for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 217, lines 4 to 6, beginning with the figure "6," and reading as follows:

(6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis.

I ask leave to reserve the point of order and to propound a question of the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Will the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking minority member of the committee explain the purpose of this provision?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, may I say that the purpose of this language is to centralize the service functions within the department of the office of the Secretary. It does not involve any additional expenditures. Frankly, the purpose of it is to save money.

Mr. KEATING. Has this language been carried in previous appropriation bills?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The identical language has not been carried before, but the substance has been very much the same.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, to remain available until expended, $10,350,000, of which not to exceed $5,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $6,000,000: *Provided,* That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head "Construction, operation, and maintenance, power transmission facilities" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 218, starting in line 5, reading as follows: "And, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $6,000,000: *Provided,* That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head 'Construction, operation, and maintenance, power-transmission facilities' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation" on the ground it involves legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same thing that has been happening around here for several years and occurs every time we have reached the item covering the Southwestern Power Administration. I think every Member of the Committee will agree with me when I say that the Southwestern Power Administration has given one demonstration in the United States of America where the Government and private industry can get along.

About 2 or 3 years ago the Southwestern Power Administration and the Department of the Interior made a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co. for the interchange and the distribution of power at this place. It is one contract that the Southwestern Power Administration has lived up to 100 percent and that the Texas Power & Light Co. has lived up to 100 percent. It has been a valuable contract both for the Government and for the Texas Power & Light Co., and neither the Government nor the Texas Power & Light Co. would for a moment think of doing away with that contract today.

The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration sat down with the utilities of the State of Oklahoma and they have drawn a contract that the utilities themselves are very much for and that the Southwestern Power Administration is also for. That contract is on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior now. If it is signed the $6,000,000 provided for in this bill will not be expended because instead of building these lines there will be a contract between them.

When this thing first came up for consideration here I stood up on the floor of this House and said: "I do not believe in the confiscation of property."

There is a certain group of people in the United States who do not think there ought to be any public power. There is another group that does not think there ought to be any private power. I do not belong to either group. If we are allowed to, we are going to endeavor to make a satisfactory contract with every power company in that part of the country that, as I say, will be mutually beneficial to the Government and beneficial to the power companies themselves.

We have never paralleled a line of any power company. I made the statement here, and let me repeat, that I am not out to confiscate anybody's property, that where the power companies with an existing line had the capacity to carry the power of the Southwestern Power Administration and would carry it at a reasonable rate, that we would not parallel or build any line adjacent thereto, and that has not been done in one instance in the State of Texas where the Texas Power & Light Co. operates. We hope to get that same kind of an arrangement in Oklahoma, and we will have it if this contract that is now lying on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior is approved by him.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that the distinguished Speaker has explained this matter exactly and in accordance with the facts, and that we are, as the gentleman has just explained, working out a very satisfactory program between the Southwestern Power Administration and the private utilities in the Southwest area. Now, for the first time in the history of this Nation, do we have a working agreement that is going to be good for everyone concerned. I am happy to say that the Speaker and I see this thing exactly alike. As the Speaker has just said, there are some folks who think

there should be no public power and there are some folks who think there should be no private power. The Speaker and I belong to neither one of those groups. Certainly, by striking this out, it would interfere with the program that we have in progress now and we are working out and solving these differences which have bothered us for years and years. I am sorry the gentleman from New York made the point of order, and I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I trust that under the circumstances the gentleman may feel that he could, in good conscience, withdraw his point of order, because, following up exactly what the gentleman from Iowa has said, we are trying to make things work down in the Southwest, and as far as we have been able to go, they are working.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I associate myself with the views of the Speaker and the gentleman from Iowa in reference to public and private power. Do I understand from the Speaker that, if the negotiations pending are concluded, that this $6,000,000 contract authority will not be exercised?

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is right. The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration stated before both a House committee and a Senate committee that, if this contract was signed, this money would not be expended.

Mr. KEATING. And the Speaker, from his knowledge of this situation, would be led to believe that the contract is likely to be signed?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I hope that the contract is signed. I have seen it; I have gone over it very thoroughly, as I did the Texas Power & Light Co. contract. I think it is a good contract, and I trust that the Secretary of the Interior does sign it.

Mr. KEATING. This particular contract authority would only need to be exercised in the event the contract did not come into being.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I would like to reserve it further, if I may.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I did not hear the point of order submitted, Mr. Chairman, but I fail to see where the debate we have had up to this time touches on any point of order. Merely as a matter of information, what is the purpose of the debate?

Mr. RAYBURN. The purpose of this debate was that I was hoping, feeling that I was right, that I could prevail upon the gentleman from New York to withdraw his point of order. That was the purpose of my taking the floor for the only time I have taken it in the 2 or 3 weeks since this bill has been under consideration.

Mr. CANNON. I am told that the Secretary and the friends of REA are opposed to the Texas contract and do not think it ought to be signed in this form.

Mr. RAYBURN. It does not make any difference to anybody whether or not they are opposed to the Texas contract. It has been in operation for more than 2 years.

The Secretary of the Interior found some parts of the contract to which he is objecting. I am trusting that Mr. Wright and the power companies can get together and yet bring about an amendment to that contract that the Secretary of the Interior will sign.

Mr. CANNON. I am not familiar with the merits of the various forms of contract but it is my understanding that the cooperatives in my State and other States do not favor the Texas contract and as a result this particular contract has been on the desk of the Secretary for many weeks; for a very long time, at least.

Mr. RAYBURN. It has not been there a very long time. I hope the gentleman does not get me into personalities, but I know there is one man in the country that claims to represent the co-ops of the country, but the principal thing he is doing is going around stirring up trouble between the Southwestern Power Administration and the co-ops of the country. He is performing no service, in my opinion, either to public power or to the co-ops.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the Speaker and to the House that I think you know how I have felt all along about public and private power. They tell me the Texas contract has acted decently, and has been a constructive step in the relationship of public and private power. It was a good step.

The Speaker is correct when he says that the Oklahoma utilities will enter this same contract. May I say to the Speaker that the Arkansas utilities will do the same thing.

I join the Speaker in asking that this contract, similar to the Texas contract, be approved by the Secretary of the Interior regardless of what somebody may say because, as the Speaker has so well said, some people want to take over the whole thing and make it public, while others would not have any public power at all. As the solution is reached here, public and private power can live together, if the Interior Department will be governed by what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has said.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I join my colleagues in saying that Mr. Wright made a very fine presentation to the subcommittee. Everything the Speaker has said is absolutely true, because I took occasion to call up the Secretary of the Interior a day or two ago and ask him the status of the various contracts that were on his table. He said he was hopeful that very shortly he could make final arrangements for those contracts.

Mr. Douglas Wright is to be commended on his explanation. He made a very fine presentation. Of course, he has taken the position that we do, that where private enterprise can supply power it should be supplied by them, and the same goes for transmission lines. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Texas will try to expedite these contracts so that we can protect free enterprise in this business.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is what the gentleman from Texas is trying to do.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I want first to make clear that I am not claiming to speak for all the REA cooperatives throughout the Nation. I have felt that they have done great work, their leadership was good, and that I do not claim to have done more than my share, but there have been times when I have tried to be as helpful toward this program as possible. I do, therefore, believe I can fairly speak as a friend of the REA program and as one who lives in the area that is served by the Texas Power & Light Co. and by some of these REA-financed cooperatives and some public dams, and by one of the largest REA transmission cooperatives, I want to point out that the "Texas contract" has been working in our area over the past 2 years and that we now have the best relations between the private power companies, the public dams, and the REA cooperatives, both local and transmission cooperatives, that we have ever had. It seems to me that, under this contract, we have the assurance we are going to have all of these agencies working in cooperation without any duplication of effort or lines. A few years ago we had no cooperation and no way of getting the private companies to cooperate except to build competitive facilities. When we proved we could and would do just that the companies signed the Texas contract, and we are today enjoying the best of relations. If you deny the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas the bargaining power that this bill gives, I fear that you are going to force them into a useless war of duplication, which should be avoided.

Mr. RAYBURN. The contract has worked. We are getting plenty of power and getting it at reasonable rates.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman feel that to eliminate this provision would interfere with the negotiations and arrangements which are under way to which he has referred?

Mr. RAYBURN. It might take away from one side a little of its argument, I am afraid.

Mr. KEATING. In view of the representations of our Speaker, in whom we

all have so much confidence, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel I care to take the responsibility of striking this provision out on a point of order. If some other Member wishes to do so that is their privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, some of the preceding speeches, unintentionally I am sure, have tended to becloud the issue. Some of the preceding speakers, both pro and con, have assumed that the provision in the pending bill to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has interposed a point of order in some way involves a conflict or controversy between the Southwestern Power Administration and private utility companies. This is completely erroneous. My colleague from Texas, the distinguished Speaker of the House, pointed out in the course of his speech that a contract has been negotiated between the Southwestern Power Administration and all of the utility companies of the area, which contract is now awaiting approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The contract is a lengthy one, and I have made no special study of it. But I have read it and understand the purpose it is intended to accomplish.

The contract in no wise gives private electric companies a monopoly on federally owned power. The effect is just the opposite. It would give priority to such preferred customers as REA and others which the Government desires to sell power from the federally owned generating plants and installations. What it would do is to intergrade the power transmission facilities owned by the Southwestern Power Administration and those owned by the private companies, thus making it unnecessary for the Government to spend large sums of money in the construction of transmission lines paralleling those of the private companies. These contracts have been strongly recommended by Mr. Douglas Wright of the Southwestern Power Administration. As has already been stated, Mr. Wright told the Appropriations Committee that if the contract is approved he will not need to spend a penny or contract for a penny of the $5,000,000 authorized to which the point of order has been interposed. By intergrading the distribution system of the private companies and the Southwestern Power Administration millions of dollars will be saved to the public in the years ahead. It is foolish and wasteful to duplicate distribution systems when by proper cooperation and coordination it is wholly unnecessary.

The negotiation of the contract, in my judgment, is a fine thing. I think it will set a proper pattern for the distribution of public power. It will mark out the territory and proper field of service of such Government instrumentalities as Southwestern Power Administration and the private utility companies. I, for one, do not want to see private utility companies or other private enterprises absorbed or driven out of business by the Federal Government. On the other hand, power produced by these huge hydroelectric plants, made possible and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, belongs to all our people and should never be allowed either to be owned or monopolized by private concerns. I think the contracts in question point the way to a proper cooperation between the private companies and Government power corporations. It will mean cheaper and better electric service than either the Government or the private utility companies could supply alone. It is subject to Government regulation and supervision in the interest of the public good. The approval of the contract by the Secretary of Interior, and I sincerely trust he will approve it, will go a long way to stop the clamor of those who argue that it is the purpose of the Government to take over or socialize the private utility business. And it will, in my judgment, work to the great benefit of the users of electric power and to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $760,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with what has been said about my distinguished friend Clyde Ellis, former Member of the House, and the association which he represents.

This is public power that is generated by the Southwest Power Administration. It is created by the Government and belongs to the public.

We had the same battle in the Tennessee Valley. If we had capitulated and turned it over to the Electric Bond & Share, and that is who the Texas Power & Light Co. is, we would be paying through the nose for our electricity today.

The State that ought to have the cheapest electricity on earth is the State of Texas. They have natural gas spouting into thin air, enough to generate electricity for four or five States the size of Texas. They also have an abundance of oil to run all the Diesel engines necessary to supply electricity to the people of Texas. Yet, I want to read you the statistics for 1948. In 1948 the State of Texas used 8,484,641,000 kilowatt hours of electricity for which it paid $165,000,000. That is the ultimate consumers paid $165,000,000. Under the TVA rate they would have paid $86,000,000 and would have saved about $78,000,000. I know some of you will say that the TVA pays no taxes. We pay more money in lieu of taxes than was paid by the private power company before the TVA was established.

In 1948 the people of Texas used 8,484,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity, and the people of Tennessee used 4,848,000,000 kilowatt hours. The people of Tennessee paid $68,000,000 for their electricity, and the people of Texas paid $165,000,000, or $97,000,000 more than did the people of Tennessee.

Let us see what would happen under the Tacoma, Wash., rates. I have used Tacoma, Wash., for years, because it is one city in America which has a public power system operated by water power generated at dams 100 miles around the city. Tacoma has built her own dams. Instead of paying $165,000,000 for that power, the people of Texas, under Tacoma rates, would have paid $74,000,000, or about $90,000,000 less than they did pay. They would have paid $82,000,000 under the Ontario and would have saved about the same amount—$82,000,000.

I do not agree that this power should be monopolized by the Electric Bond & Share Co. I know what the Electric Bond & Share Co. is, because I have had to fight them in Mississippi. They do not own an insulator in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if the area in which Tacoma, Wash., is located is not the only area that had a power shortage during the war and after the war.

Mr. RANKIN. The area in which Tacoma is located did what they did on the Tennessee River. They helped produce the atomic bomb. If it had not been for the Columbia River development and the Tennessee Valley Authority, there would not have been any atomic bomb. The reason was that they put these enterprises there because they had the power; and because they used more than anybody thought they would use, there was a shortage in some of the area.

Mr. NORRELL. There was a power shortage.

Mr. RANKIN. Not in Tacoma, Wash., where they have their own power facilities.

The situation in Arkansas is worse than it is in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spends considerable time at every opportunity telling you people how much money you are losing by allowing private enterprise to survive. He tells you exactly how many dollars you could save on your electric bill if the Government owned and sold all of the electricity. He could just as easily tell you that you could buy your clothes a lot cheaper at a Government-owned clothing store that is free from taxation and is being subsidized by the taxpayers. There is not one speck of difference in the arguments.

Those who would have public power and drive private enterprise out of the field are the same ones that would like to see the Federal Government run and own everything in this whole country.

I was amused the other day when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] jumped up on the floor of the House during the farm-program debate and said, "If you keep going like you are going now, it is not going to be long until the Federal Government is going to be telling you farmers exactly how many

hogs you can raise, how many chickens you can feed, and how many cows you can milk." He was exactly right at that time. But when public power is concerned he does not seem to care if the rural people of this country are regimented even by a contract circumventing the wishes of those people, and their Congress. You notice he never could find Arkansas in his list of mistreated people because of high rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. Not now. You have had the floor ever since I have been here. The little rural electric co-ops in the Tennessee Valley are paying more for their electricity than they are in Arkansas. The cheapest electricity to the rural co-ops in the whole United States of America is in the State of Arkansas, and we do not have any Tennessee Valley Authority that is dodging taxes and having their accounts so hidden that you cannot tell what it costs to make electricity.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Douglas Wright testified before my subcommittee that the utilities in Arkansas, especially in my area, were selling power cheaper to the REA than the Southwest Power Administration could sell or the TVA. That is in the public hearings.

Mr. TACKETT. And that is exactly correct. The electricity being sold to the co-ops in my district is sold at between 4.6 mills and 4.9 mills. Can you buy it like that over in the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. RANKIN. I will give you the figures. The residential consumers of Arkansas last year paid $10,260,00 for electricity which, under the TVA yardstick would have cost $4,980,000. In other words, they paid a hundred percent more than they should.

Mr. TACKETT. What would they have paid for it from the Federal Government?

Mr. RANKIN. They would have paid just what I am talking about. You are plundering the ultimate consumers of electricity all over the State of Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. What would they have paid for it?

Mr. RANKIN. They would have paid a whole lot less than they paid in Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman does not know what electricity is selling for and does not seem to care; he is just trying to fool the people. TVA does not and cannot sell electricity for 4.6 or 4.9 mills.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Arkansas does not seem to realize the difference between public and private business.

Mr. TACKETT. I think I have sense enough to know that if the Federal Government is running something for the people that it is public business. When private people in this country get out here and compete on the theory of supply and demand, that is the kind of business that has made this the greatest country upon the face of the earth, but it cannot be for long if we are going to permit the Federal Government to gobble up the business of the people of this country. Did the gentleman from Iowa want me to yield to him?

Mr. JENSEN. I think it might be well to point out that private industry, whether it be private utilities, the farmer, the peanut vendor on the corner, the corner grocery store, or anything else, pays taxes, and if it were not for those taxes coming into the Federal Government, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated a while ago, there would be no money to build these great things like TVA. The private utility companies last year paid over $650,000,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes. That is considerably more than what the gentleman from Mississippi said, and all the figures he puts in the RECORD trying to prove benefit to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman from Mississippi, if the gentleman will pardon me, has proved one thing, that the Federal Government without paying taxes, that the Federal Government being subsidized by the taxpayers, that the Federal Government by hiding the figures that it actually costs to produce electricity can sell electricity cheaper than private enterprise can produce and sell it. That is exactly what he said; and the same thing is true of groceries, clothing, or anything else. I am wondering how the gentleman proposes to operate this Government after taxpaying enterprise has been abolished.

I should like to call your attention for just a moment to the Southwestern Power Administration. It came before this House and asked for money to build steam power generating units and transmission lines. Congress said: "No; we are not going to put the Federal Government into competition with private enterprise; we still believe in the principles of democracy."

They came back again and they said: "We have got to have the money to build steam-power units and transmission lines because there is just so much water coming down the river at certain seasons of the year; we need to firm up the power and sell it the year round."

Congress said: "No; we are still not going to build a TVA all over the United States."

Then, what did the Southwestern Power Administration do? They oozed over here and got hold of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's executive manager from my great State of Arkansas, Mr. Clyde Ellis. They said: "Now, Clyde, we cannot get Congress to go along with us, but we can work out a deal here whereby we can circumvent the very Congress that is refusing to go along with us. Here is what we will do: Let us enter into a contract whereby rural co-ops will build electric generating and transmission facilities for the use and benefit of the Southwestern Power Administration. We will pretend that those facilities are for the use and benefit of the co-ops, and thereby circumvent Congress and fool the people. Mr. Wickard will do whatever you want him to do; he has a blank check provided by Congress to do whatever needs to be done for the REA program. You ask for loans to build some facilities down there in the State of Arkansas and elsewhere. Then you go in there and build for the SPA some steam power units and transmission lines that Congress would not give us, and then the Southwestern Power Administration will use those generating facilities and transmission lines for a period of 40 years for a certain rent to be paid by the taxpayers that will retire the construction cost. Southwestern Power Administration is all set to operate and to buy those transmission lines from the date they are constructed. The generating facilities will be worn out before they are paid for, but we will have the transmission facilities and be well on our way toward the abolishment of private enterprise."

The SPA gets the money from the taxpayers through the continuing fund to carry out the very thing the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is working for, the abolition of free enterprise in the power field. That contract even provides, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi who has been fighting FEPC with all the power at his command, for the civil-rights program, including the FEPC features so detested by the gentleman from Mississippi. If the gentleman would read what he is hollering about, he would not be so condoing of the public-power contract. That contract provides that the Southwestern Power Administration shall determine the policies of the little rural electric co-ops in your State and in my State. In other words, that little group of rural electric co-op board members will no longer determine the policies; and the wishes of the little co-ops will not amount to a tinker's hoot because the Federal Government through the Southwestern Power Administration is going to socialize, federalize, and nationalize the electric industry and regiment the farmers of this county to such an extent that it will not be long until the Government is going to be telling the farmers, as you have predicted Mr. RANKIN, how many chickens they can feed, how many hogs they can raise, and how many cows they can milk.

I wish that the gentleman, if he actually believes in what he has been saying in the past, would find out what the electrification program of the Southwestern Power Administration is actually doing to our rural people.

Mr. RANKIN. Doing them more good all the time. Public power is doing the people I represent more good than anything that has ever come along.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman is unable to distinguish public power from rural electrification. Public power is socialistic, while rural electrification is operating in free enterprise.

Mr. RANKIN. The Electric Bond & Share Co., which is a holding company, is bleeding the people of Arkansas and Texas to the extent of over $150,000,000 a year in overcharges.

Mr. TACKETT. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that every Socialist who has even advocated taking over the principles of democracy has advocated, first, taking over the electric-power systems, second, taking over the telephone and communication systems, and third, taking over the railways and other transportation systems, the necessary steps to socialize America. The gentleman is helping them to climb these steps.

Mr. RANKIN. When I took this up in 1934——

Mr. TACKETT. That is popular, Mr. RANKIN, but it is not right and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad we do not have something in the House to blow the smoke away so we could take a look around. We have just listened to a Power Trust speech so good that I doubt if anybody on the left-hand side of this aisle could equal it. I do not think I ever heard a better one from that standpoint.

There are a few little things I want to discuss that are happening out in Missouri. You know, we are not so far from Arkansas. In fact, I have been across the State line down there two different times at least. My REA co-op, the Osage Valley Electric co-op, is paying 1.6 for current wholesale right now, and I hope to be able to hitch on with a couple of lines in the State of Arkansas and get a little hydroelectric current up there so that we can reduce the price at wholesale.

We have had two steam plants authorized for our State and there has been quite a lot of objection to it. I want to tell you Members of the House something. Independence, which is the home of President Truman at the present time, is a suburb of Kansas City. When you drive out Truman Road you cannot tell when you are driving out of Kansas City and entering Independence. It is all one town.

The Kansas City Power & Light Co. has been one of the utilities that has been fighting the construction of these lines into Missouri and those two steam-generating plants on the Missouri River. But I want to tell you something. Independence, Mo., will not buy its current from the Kansas City Power & Light Co. although it is generated in the same city. Independence has its own municipal power and light plant and generates its own current. I do not know that the following is a fact but it is a suspicion of mine that the reason they do not buy current from the Kansas City Power & Light Co. is because they can build their own plant and generate their own current and save money. Those men in Independence are good hard-headed businessmen and they try to get a dollar's worth of current for every dollar they spend.

Let me tell you another thing. There are 41 other cities and towns in the State of Missouri that have their own municipal light plant and that generate their own current. Why? The only reason they do it is because they can do it cheaper than they can get the power from the Power Trust in Missouri. If it is all right for 42 cities and towns in the State of Missouri to generate the current they use and distribute it to their customers, why in the name of all things good is it wrong for all the farmers in all the State of Missouri to have two transmission lines and two generating plants? If it is all right for cities and towns in Missouri to have 42 generating plants why is it wrong for all the farmers in that great State to have two such plants?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] does not seem to know that the power business is a public business and that the clothing business is a private business. His argument is the same old "stuff" we heard when they were fighting against the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If the Government was producing the wool that the clothes were made out of, we would have a case in point, but the Government does not.

Mr. RANKIN. We also heard the same stuff when they were fighting the development of the Columbia River. If we had not succeeded in those two enterprises the American people today would be paying from one to three billion dollars more for their electricity than they are paying.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If the private power companies in the State of Missouri would sign a contract to sell to REA wholesale at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and deliver the current to the points of need for a period of 20 years, we would not need the lines and we would not need the generating plants, but they will not do it. They have not done it, and they are not going to do it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman think that the REA's in Missouri are building those cooperative generating plants down there?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. They will be, if they get the money.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman not know that the Federal Government, through the guise of the Southwestern Power Administration, will build them?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. And every dollar of the money will be repaid into the Federal Treasury with interest, so whose business is it?

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman not know that it is not going to be repaid, as long as SPA takes the produced power and spend the proceeds from the sale there of nationalizing the electric industry? None of the proceeds from the sale of such electricity reaches the United States Treasury. Does the gentleman know anything about what he is talking about?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The REA is already ahead on its entire schedule of payment and will pay for these lines and plants with interest. I do not know what the gentleman considers I know or I do not know, and I am not worried about his consideration along that line.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As a matter of fact, is not the gentleman from Arkansas, and the rest of the gentlemen, for that matter, talking about an entirely different contract? We started out talking about a contract between the power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration to use the power that is being generated by the Southwestern Power Administration. The gentleman from Arkansas is discussing a contract that somebody has with some local cooperative, or maybe it is a transmission cooperative down in the State of Oklahoma. We are talking about an entirely different contract; and when he is talking about whether or not it will be paid back, it will all be paid back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that I think the people in your State ought to build your generating plants yourselves. Why do you have to come and ask the Federal Government to do such work; if you need the power, build your own plants. Up in my State of Pennsylvania last year in the city of Warren, Pa., in my district, the Penelec Co. built a $14,000,000 generating plant. They did not ask the State to help, and they did not ask the Federal Government to help. The need for power was evident. The plant was built. They put their own cash on the barrel head to do the job to furnish the power needed in the area.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The Government put up the cash to build the White River Dam as a flood-control and generating project, and its cost will be repaid from the sale of current generated; and we have as much right to that current as the Arkansas Power & Light Co. has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimou sconsent that the gentleman from Missouri be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to point out some facts to the gentleman in regard to the Arkansas Power & Light Co. There was never before gathered in America such a group of licensed burglars working for the Wall Street monopoly which owns the company as the group running the Arkansas Power & Light Co. for Electric Bond & Share. If the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] will read the hearings of the subcommittee for the Department of Interior of the House Appropriations Committee of which I was a member, I believe it was back in March of 1946 for fiscal year 1947, he will see ample justification for the statement that I make. The greatest thing that ever happened in the five great States of the Southwest has been the creation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has said. What I am afraid of is this: I am afraid of these attempts to turn that power over to the power trust, that is the Electric Bond & Share, not the Arkansas Power & Light Co., not the Texas Power & Light Co., not the Louisiana Power & Light Co., not the Mississippi Power & Light Co.; it is the Electric Bond & Share, a holding company which is really owned in Wall Street, New York. And what I am afraid of is that they will bleed those people for this power, that is public power to begin with, and that the consumers should get at the lowest possible rate. I have been in this fight a long time. In 1933 I along with Senator NORRIS introduced a bill and fought it through to create the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I led the drive here for rural electrification when Arkansas had 1.2 percent of her farms electrified. If we had lost that fight, there would not have been an electric light in the average home in Arkansas for the next 40 years. This is not a question of the Government going into private business; the power business is a public business. Our water power is public property, and we do not intend for it to be taken over and monopolized by the Power Trust.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield to me further, I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] has ever heard of the acquisitions of properties by Ham Moses' Arkansas Power and Light in the State of Arkansas, where properties were acquired at one price and put on their books at a phony price which was millions and millions of dollars over the price at which they were actually acquired? The facts in regard to this may be found beginning at page 379 of part 3 of the hearings on the 1947 Interior appropriations bill.

I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas knows that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. is well represented in every golf club in the State of Arkansas. Ham's boys are in every Chamber of Commerce, Lions Club, Kiwanis, and everything else. In a great number of instances the cost of dues and contributions is added to the farmers' electric bills. They sell the bill of goods that good old Arkansas Power & Light belongs to Arkansas, not Wall Street, New York, the real owner. In the interest of their alma mater, Electric Bond & Share, they have opposed the building of every dam and transmission line in the Southwest. Very few members from the State of Arkansas do not hear from the various organizations in which the Arkansas Power & Light is so well represented and from the newspapers in every town in which the Arkansas Power & Light advertises.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. The gentleman from New York is interested in Arkansas, and I am glad he is, and cheaper rates, but I just want to ask him what he is doing to get cheaper rates in New York and to clean out the crookedness in that State?

Mr. ROONEY. We are not as fortunate in New York in getting cheap power rates as the people are in the gentleman's State. I have always supported public power and the best interests of the people of Arkansas, as the gentleman well knows, from my service with him, in the subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations. There is no good reason why, if in my State we have to pay 7 and 8 times as much for electric power, I should take it out on the good people of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I just want to say to my distinguished friend from New York, too, that there is no reason why the taxpayers of Pennsylvania should put their money up to build power plants all over the United States.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, while some of these gentlemen are taking credit for having brought electricity to the rural areas of Arkansas, I should like to take some credit for assisting to electrify rural Arkansas. A glance at the legislative record of 1937 within the State of Arkansas will reveal that BOYD TACKETT voted to bring rural electrification to the State of Arkansas when it was not nearly so popular as now. I have never yet failed to vote at every possible opportunity for rural electrification, and I shall never vote against rural electrification. But I want to tell you who are hollering long and loud for public power to replace the rural electrification program and to allow the rural electrification system to be abolished by the greatest monopoly that was ever known to man, that you can talk about electric power monopolies all you like, but there is no greater or more drastic monopoly than a Government monopoly, and all of you know that. You public power advocates condemn monopolies on one hand while creating on the other hand the most dangerous monopoly known to man—a great Government monopoly.

When a boy on the farm, like my neighboring boyhood friends, I longed for the day when I could live in the small town nearby that I might enjoy some of the comforts and entitlements of life principally afforded by electric service. However, it is now possible to visualize a near future when the people of the metropolitan areas will be living for that day when it will be possible for them to move to and reside within the wide open rural spaces where they will at the same time be afforded equal comforts of life to those within the metropolitan areas.

Hamstring the rural electrification program? No. I would do absolutely nothing detrimental to this great enterprise and will always use every honorable means at my command to further this most meritorious project. I am a devout advocate of rural electrification, and I am just as anxious as any person in this country to see every farm within the United States electrified at the earliest possible date.

The REA and the SPA are distinct and separate programs, and the SPA has contributed nothing to advance or promote the high standards of rural electrification. The rural electrification program is a successful, meritorious, free, and independent organization—the respective electric cooperatives being owned, controlled, governed, and operated by and for the membership, with justifiable authority under our American way of life to freely engage in bringing electric service to the rural areas of our country.

The Southwestern Power Administration, on the other hand, is an agency of the Federal Government under the Department of the Interior with limited congressional authority to pool power and energy produced from Government multiple-purpose dams and distribute such power and energy as provided by law at rates to be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

I wholeheartedly concur in the statements of one of my fellow colleagues that rural electrification has been a long and hard struggle; that the remaining unserved 33 percent of rural Arkansas should be electrified under the splendid rural electrification program without delay; and that rural electrification is just now coming into full fruition. However, these facts do not in anywise justify the activities of the SPA. It cannot be contended that the SPA should be credited with having electrified 67 percent of the rural areas within the State of Arkansas, but, to the contrary, these

achievements have been realized under the authority granted by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. It is not necessary to allow the Department of the Interior, through the Southwestern Power Administration, to nationalize, federalize, and socialize the rural electric cooperatives in order to bring electricity to the remaining 33 percent of the unserved rural area of our State.

Yes; the rural electric cooperatives should be and are authorized and entitled to construct electric-generating units and tranmission lines that the cheapest possible electric energy may be made available to the membership in accordance with good business principles under our system of free enterprise. However, I insist that the Southwestern Power Administration is not justifiably entitled to similar authorizations if we are to maintain our principles of democracy, assist our rural electrification program, and uphold our belief in private ownership.

To allow the Federal Government, through its SPA agency, to establish and dictate policies for the rural electric cooperatives, and to use, control, and receive all benefits from electric generating and transmission facilities constructed by the cooperatives is nothing less than an authorization to federalize the rural electric cooperatives, permit the SPA to expand its legal jurisdiction, and place the Government in direct competition with its citizens.

Those proposing to place the Government into the power field as a competitor in order to assure cheaper energy than the electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry can produce could just as successfully contend that we should have Government-owned parallel and duplicating railway and streetcar tracks; airplane, boat, bus, and truck routes; telephone and telegraph lines; and radio and television channels. Petroleum, gas, and coal could be produced cheaper by the Government. No doubt all of these businesses are in the plans of those seeking to use the Government as a competitor to free enterprise. The ultimate results of such a plan can only mean Government operation and eventual ownership.

The rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest have today three sources of electricity:

First. Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own and operate themselves;

Second. Private power companies;

Third. Electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves.

Right now the rural cooperatives have the private companies and the Federal Government SPA agency right where they should want them. Both are doing everything possible to do business with the cooperatives. The Southwestern Power Administration and the private companies are competing for the cooperatives' business, and they fully realize the possibility of the cooperatives' building their own steam-power units and transmission lines should the electric rates not be sufficiently low to make justifiable such action on behalf of their membership. As long as this situation prevails it is the rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest that stand to benefit. They have their freedom of choice—the American way.

Once, however, these cooperatives lose their advantage by negotiating a long-term contract, permitting themselves to be tied irrevocably to the apron strings of the SPA for a period of 40 years, the opportunity to buy electricity upon a competitive market is gone and the right to produce and transmit electricity by means of their own facilities has vanished.

SPA is not in the power field with the rural cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry with my good graces. TVA was established not only for flood control and navigation but as a "yardstick" of electric costs for regulating private-power companies. The Public Service Commission in my State of Arkansas, as well as the Federal Power Commission, regulates the involved electric rates. The SPA must sell electricity from the Government flood-control dams at rates approved by the Federal Power Commission. The SPA renders only a power marketing service. The Corps of Engineers build and operate the flood-control dams, and could distribute the electricity from that source to the rural electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry over transmission lines built by the engineers, the private companies, or the cooperatives at a great savings to the taxpayers. Were the SPA completely out of the power field the rural electric cooperatives could still obtain electricity from the Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, the private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves. Alternative sources would come from private power companies or from electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, operate themselves, and tie in with the Federal power projects.

If the rural electric cooperative membership throughout this country could in some manner be given the true picture of the situation at hand, it would take no action by Congress to preclude the federalization efforts now being made through the SPA plan. A great majority of the people are aware of the Federal Government gradually encroaching more and more upon the lives, happiness, and freedom of the American people. My people do not want Federal regimentation; they will not stand for it; and so long as I am a Member of Congress I shall do all in my power to keep it from being forced upon them.

I hold no brief for the private electric utilities; recognize them as monopolies requiring strict Federal regulation and supervision; but I feel that all water, telephone, electric, fuel, and like utilities have a definite place in our economic picture, and should not be permitted to be abolished by the competition of the Federal Government. No monopoly could ever exist so dangerous and devastating to democracy as a Federal Government monopoly.

However, you may be assured that I do hold a brief, and a strong one, for the American system of free enterprise upon which this Nation was founded and has become the greatest upon the face of this earth. It alarms me and it should concern all of us tremendously when we see the Federal Government taking steps toward nationalization, which would result eventually in a completely socialized state. The founders of American democracy never intended that we employ such a system. The great strength of America today lies in the fact that our individuals and industries have been encouraged and inspired by the right of free enterprise—the right to earn a legitimate, honest dollar without working in direct competition with the Federal Government, or without being taken over, lock, stock, and barrel, by the Federal Government.

The Southwestern Power Administration activities are of far-reaching significance—going beyond the electric-power field—going into the very heart of our right for free enterprise which was guaranteed to each and every one of us by the pioneers who built our Nation and our Government. I, for one, want to preserve that right, and the future rights of our children to which they are justly entitled by American democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] never touched side, edge, or bottom of the real issue before us.

The power business is a public business. The water power of this Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

It was 17 years ago that we had this same fight on the floor of the House. They were trying to force us to turn the power generated in the Tennessee River over to the private power interests. If we had done that, and had turned the power on the Columbia River over to them, the average householder today would be paying from 15 to 25 cents a kilowatt-hour for his electricity, and the average farmer would not have seen an electric light in his home during this generation.

He criticizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. We have tried for years to develop the St. Lawrence to give them a yardstick which would probably save the people of New York State $150,000,000 a year on their light and power bills.

The gentleman from Arkansas confuses the issue when he attempts to talk about private business being owned by the Government. Why, the clothing business is a private business, but the power business is a public business. Why? Because electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It has to be handled by a monopoly and the water

power already belongs to the Federal Government. It is public power to begin with, and that applies to the energy generated by the Southwest Power Administration.

So we are dealing here with a public business. As the result of the battle that we have carried on for the last 17 years, we have managed to reduce power rates to the American people, while prices of everything else has been increasing. If it had not been for these yardsticks, such as the TVA, you would not only be paying the rate you are paying now in other areas, but you would be paying twice or three times as much. The American people would be paying from two to three, and probably four, billion dollars a year more for their electricity than they are now paying. In Arkansas they had 1.2 percent of their farms electrified before 1934. Today they have more than 70 percent. Where did it come from? It came through the REA. That is where it came from.

I remember the battle I had here in 1938 to secure the first $100,000,000 for rural electrification. I just won by seven votes. If the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] had been here, I probably would have won by only six votes. That was when the REA really began to move forward.

Now, do not forget this: There are 33,000,000 residential power consumers in this country; people who turn on electric switches every day and every night. They are not willing to be robbed and plundered by the power trust in order to gratify the cupidity of a group of monopolists in Wall Street. There are 66,000,000 voters in this country that are not going to sit idly by, even in Arkansas or in Texas—they are not going to sit by and see this monopoly overcharge them with rates that are outrageously unreasonable.

Suppose you paid as much for electricity as you do for your telephone. The telephone trust has a complete monopoly. If you paid as much for electricity as you pay for your telephone, you would probably have not more than one light in each room—if that. I put a telephone in my office at home. I paid more for that telephone, even if I never picked up the receiver, than I paid for both gas and electricity in my home. I pay more for my telephone in Washington than I pay for both gas and electricity in my apartment. If it were not for these public-power systems, such as they have in Columbus, Ohio, Springfield, Ill., Lansing, Mich., and Austin, Tex., and these public-power systems that we have along these streams such as the Tennessee and the Columbia, to keep this monopoly from getting its hands on the water power of the Nation; if it were not for that you would be paying 15 to 25 cents per kilowatt-hour, and the average farmer in this country probably would not have seen electricity in his home for the next 40 years.

I have no apology to make to the gentleman from Arkansas, I have no apology to make to the Electric Bond & Share Co., and I have no apology to make to anyone else for my fight to see that the American people get the benefit of the greatest wealth in America, outside of the soil upon which we live, that is the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, $5,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 220, line 9, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,500,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1950, we allowed $4,000,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville power transmission system. Dr. Raver, the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, appeared before the committee to justify his 1951 request of $5,250,000. While he was testifying he told the committee how well they had been able to operate and maintain the Bonneville power system with the $4,000,000 which we had appropriated last year; and he said that everyone who was hired under this item had done a wonderful job. I asked Dr. Raver, then, if he did not think the Congress should have a little credit for holding the appropriation down to $4,000,000. They had asked for considerably more, but the committee did not see fit to give it to them. Dr. Raver, in answer to my question, said: "Yes," that he thought the Congress should have some credit and that the committee should have some credit for holding this appropriation down to $4,000,000; nevertheless, he asked for $5,250,000 in this appropriation bill. The committee reduced that to $5,000,000.

The purpose of my amendment is to reduce the amount further to $4,500,000. It is true they have more responsibilities this year than last, but not to the extent of 25 percent. This will give them better than a 10-percent increase for operation and maintenance, and I think it is only fair and just that they be held down to $4,500,000, for certainly we need to save a few million here and there in a lot of places.

The amendment is very reasonable and should be adopted by all means.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I invite the Committee's attention to the fact that the original estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget was $5,250,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration. Our subcommittee in its judgment saw fit to cut this item by a quarter of a million dollars, leaving the total amount available for operation and maintenance $5,000,000.

I believe it is generally agreed that the Bonneville Power Administration, under the able direction of Dr. Paul Raver, is one of the more efficient, if not the most efficient, of the agencies and bureaus within the Department of the Interior. That great organization has been operated in a businesslike manner. The Bonneville Power Administration will turn into the Treasury during the coming fiscal year approximately $33,000,000 in revenue. During the current fiscal year, that is, fiscal 1950, the total expenditures that have been approved by the Congress for construction, operation, and maintenance, aggregate some $46,000,000. For the coming fiscal year our subcommittee has approved the total sum of $68,250,000, an increase of some $22,000,000. We are engaged in a tremendous expansion program, and I believe the cut we have already made is more than adequate. Certainly it is not much of a reward to a great organization that is doing an efficient job to cripple it with a limitation of funds. As we expand the transmission lines, in keeping with the new dams that will be coming into operation, it is most essential that sufficient funds be provided to operate that great organization in an efficient manner.

I invite the Committee's attention to the fact that in 1952 the great McNary Dam will come into operation on the Columbia River, as well as the Hungry Horse project in northwestern Montana. This will add to the responsibilities of the Bonneville Power Administration. It is only a businesslike protection of the taxpayers' investment to expand the staff that will assume these added responsibilities.

I think the committee has done a prudent thing in trimming this expenditure somewhat. However, I do not think any further cut would be wise. I hope the Committee will vote the gentleman's amendment down.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as many of you gentlemen know, my district includes the Bonneville project on the Oregon side. I have had quite a bit to do with that undertaking while I have been a Member of Congress. I have served on the Public Works Committee which authorized all these various projects throughout the United States, including Bonneville.

With reference to this particular project, it must be conceded by those who are familiar with what is being done on the Columbia River that the Bonneville Administration through Dr. Raver is doing a good job. As a matter of fact, it is the one operation in the United States where Uncle Sam is getting back dollar for dollar all of the money he has put in by way of investment. The pay-out schedule on Bonneville is 10 years ahead of the program. In other words, if Bonneville continues this pay-out schedule it is making at the present time, the Federal Government will be paid back all of its investment 10 years ahead of the time originally prescribed for amortization.

The Bonneville Administration, as has been said and as admitted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], has increased responsibilities by reason of

the heavy increased development of hydroelectric power in that area. The State of Oregon has increased in population 59 percent in the last 10 years. It holds the lead in the United States of all States for percentage increase in population, which means that we have an increased demand for hydroelectric power and services of all sorts from public utilities. As a result, the Bonneville Power Administration has an increased burden. Every kilowatt of power that is produced at Bonneville is being sold at market price and those funds are going back into the Federal Treasury. As a result, it is not only paying out the Federal investment, but it is helping to build up the economy of the great Northwest where apparently so many of our people from other States want to make their permanent homes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I can understand why the gentleman opposes this amendment. I know he is greatly interested in the development of his State. The gentleman also knows that the Eightieth Congress treated the Bonneville Power Administration very generously. I was chairman of the committee that gave them more money than they ever had before in history. We do not want to stop that development. However, they had only $4,000,000 last year, which is a lot of money for administration and operation. If my amendment is adopted, we will be giving them $500,000 more this year than they had last year.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that I realize he has done an excellent job. He has been very kind, indeed, to Bonneville. While he served on this great committee he visited our area a number of times, he has gone over these projects, and is perhaps as well informed on them as any man who does not live in the area. But the fact is, we have increased responsibilities so far as Bonneville is concerned which requires more money for operation and maintenance in order to maintain the efficient service the agency is rendering the people of the Pacific Northwest. Many new generators are coming in. There is the Grand Coulee project, which has increased generating capacity. It will not be very long before the McNary Dam power will be brought in, then Hungry Horse, Albany Falls, and others. In the meantime Bonneville has to provide the transmission facilities to take care of this increased load. Every kilowatt-hour that is produced is being sold. We are not wasting a single kilowatt. As a matter of fact, we have gone 10 percent plus above the rated generating capacity of those projects to supply needed power, and even then we are not able to supply the hydroelectricity to the industries and the farmers that need the power in the area. There is a great dearth of power in the area. The committee already has cut $250,000 below the budget estimate. If we cut the item an additional $500,000, as this amendment will do, it means that you are just going to curtail the activities of one great agency of this Federal Government, among the few, which is paying its way and doing a good job in serving a fast-growing area. I think it would be a grave mistake, and I think the gentleman from Iowa himself will realize, after the years have gone by, that it will be a mistake if we curtail these activities of this efficient Federal agency.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I think it is opportune here to express the point that the Hanford Engineering Works is in the Pacific Northwest, in the central part of the State of Washington, which, in turn, is consuming a tremendous amount of power from the services of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman's observation is true. If it were not for the Bonneville Power Administration, that great atomic energy undertaking at Hanford in Washington could not be carried forward. It has performed an outstanding service in our national defense program.

It seems that not a year can pass without some sort of an attack being made on the Bonneville Power Administration. This year, as in many years past, the attack is on their appropriations requests, which, of course, is the most vulnerable spot of any Federal agency. It does not seem to make any difference that the management of this agency has constantly demonstrated that their operations are on a par with the best private operations in the country, that they not only meet but exceed statutory requirements as regards payout, or that the Administrator is fully aware of the wise use of the money appropriated to him. No; no matter what degree of efficiency is demonstrated by this agency, they can still expect to be attacked whenever they ask for appropriations to carry on the duties imposed upon them by law. This year the attack is centered on appropriations for operation and maintenance. It is the most vulnerable spot of any type of enterprise, public or private.

It is in this part of the Bonneville activity where the most stringent requirements have always been imposed by Congress and which has caused the most difficulty to the Bonneville Administrator.

Funds for operation and maintenance for the Bonneville Power Administration have been annually set up in the appropriation bill as a limitation within the total funds appropriated. Congress, in its wisdom, feels that such limitations are necessary in order to control the activities of the Federal power agencies. Personally, I am not in sympathy with that view. The record of the Bonneville Power Administration over the past 10 years indicates that its management is certainly of the highest order. You do not have to take my word for it—a copy of Bonneville's annual report can be made available to you upon request. That report will show you that over the period of its operations to date, this agency has not only met all repayment requirements as set up by law, but shows a comfortable surplus of nearly $43,000,000 more than the cash appropriation requested this year for capital expenditure. And remember that this financial picture has been compiled from power revenues based on the lowest wholesale power rates in this country. When an Administrator can show such a record, I do not think he needs to be told how far he can be permitted to go in expending funds for any given operation or activity. He knows that if his overhead is too great, he is not going to pay out. He has demonstrated that he knows this important fact, so why hamstring him by limitations that can have no other result except that of forced inefficiency.

I know that at times the Bonneville Administrator has been at his wit's end in trying to determine how to handle the various necessary activities that must be performed in an operation of the magnitude of that encompassed by the Bonneville Power Administration. A few statistics will very quickly indicate why this is so.

I do not intend to burden this body with a long recital of these statistics, but will indicate some figures for 2 years, showing comparisons of Bonneville operations with private operations. In the general debate on this chapter last Friday I discussed Bonneville operations at some length. In 1947, operating expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration were 11.4 percent of operating revenues. A comparable figure for all of the combined class A and B utilities in the United States for that year is 21.8 percent. Also in that year, the operating utilities in the Pacific Northwest used from 18.2 percent to 31.4 percent of their operating revenues for operating expenses and this range covers all of the utilities operating in that area. Let me put this matter on another base. Operating expenses on a basis of mills per kilowatt-hour sold were 0.32 for Bonneville, 3.50 for the combined class A and B utilities in this country, and the range for the Pacific Northwest utilities was 1.3 to 4.11.

Now let us go to 1948. In that year, the operating expenses as a percent of operating revenues were 13.2 percent for Bonneville, 21.4 percent for the combined A and B utilities, and a range of 20.9 percent to 29.2 percent for the Pacific Northwest utilities. On the basis of mills per kilowatt-hour sold, Bonneville's cost was 0.31, the combined A and B utilities 3.55, and the range for the Pacific Northwest utilities 1.54 to 5.66. In all of the foregoing figures, production expenses have been deducted in order to make the figures comparable, since in the private operations production expenses are a very large part of their operating cost.

I would like to cite one other comparison. In 1947, Bonneville's operating expenses as a percent of total electric plant were 3.4 percent as against 14.4 percent for the combined class A and B utilities. In 1948, the comparison was 3.3 percent for Bonneville, and 15.3 percent for the combined A and B utilities. In 1949, Bonneville's percent is still 3.3

percent, but I do not have a comparable figure for the combined A and B utilities.

My colleagues, do you need any further demonstration of the effectiveness of Bonneville's operations? Do you need any further evidence that they have been forced to do a job with lesser tools than any private operation requires, or are you willing to admit that the Bonneville Power Administration operations are far more efficient than the best private operations in this country? It is my opinion that it is a combination of the two. You have not allowed this agency sufficient funds to properly operate and maintain their system, and the fact that they have gotten along as well as they have with the funds available certainly is a tribute to the efficiency of their operations.

There is a saying that one can be penny-wise and pound-foolish. If you gentlemen are sincere in your statements that you want to save money for this country, then you certainly do not want to be accused of being penny-wise and pound-foolish; but I can assure you that that is what you will be if you continue to curtail operation money for this agency. At least, let us be fair and put them on a par with private enterprise, of which we have heard so much in recent years.

I did not intend to burden you with any further statistics, but I will make another comparison which I think is very pertinent. This pertains to administrative and general expenses. In 1947 cost in this category for Bonneville as a percent of operating revenues was 4 percent. For the combined class A and B utilities it was 6.5 percent. For the Pacific Northwest systems it varied from 6 to 9.5 percent. Comparable figures for 1948 are 5 percent for Bonneville, 6.3 percent for the combined A and B utilities, and a range of 6.2 to 9.1 percent for the Pacific Northwest utilities. In 1949 this figure remained at 5 percent for Bonneville. I do not have a comparable figure for the other utilities for that year.

It is my considered opinion that we do not need to impose any type of limitation for operation and maintenance for the Bonneville Power Administration. They have demonstrated that they can do more with a dollar than most private operations in this country. The Bonneville people are proud of their record, and I am absolutely certain that they do not intend to jeopardize that record by any ill-considered use of funds. However, there is such a limitation. There is a specific appropriation for operation and maintenance. If we must have it, then let us make it high enough to permit the Bonneville Administrator to do the job in the way that it should be done. The amount of $5,000,000 that is in this appropriation for operation and maintenance for this agency will still not bring them up to the comparable expenditure by private utilities, so I ask you to let that figure stand without any further reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be voted down so that the operations of the Bonneville Administration may not be curtailed and service to the fast-growing area in the Pacific Northwest be set back. Such a course will penalize the residents of the area.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I wish the Members on both sides of the aisle would realize and that is this, that we are not giving the Bonneville Power Administration a dime; we are not giving any of these agencies a quarter. They are going to pay back this money. Now, if you want them to go ahead and construct Bonneville and everything else out of the Northwest, as well as the rest of the power projects in this bill, you should realize that we are not giving any one of them a dime. Sixty-one percent of this money is coming back. They are going to pay it back; in fact, that is one branch of the Government, one department, that pays back. There is a little over $100,000,000 in this bill to operate other parts of the Department of the Interior—surveys and matters like that.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member in the House who has made a more diligent and determined fight for economy in the Congress of the United States than my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the proposer of this amendment.

I recognize it is necessary to bring economy to the Government if our Nation is to remain solvent. I honor the gentleman from Iowa for making his fight for economy. I usually support him. At the same time, I think we must be selective in reducing Government expenses, for merely cutting an item may prove false economy rather than wise. There is such a thing as being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The Bonneville Power Authority operates a great and growing business. Last year it did a business of $27,881,000, sold that much power and electricity. During the coming year Dr. Raver, the administrator, estimates Bonneville power sales will total $32,231,000. In other words, the Bonneville Power Administration will increase its electricity sales by more than $4,000,000 or by more than 15 percent.

Due to this about 15 percent expansion in Bonneville power sales more lines and substations must be operated. This will require more people to supervise its power distribution and more persons and materials to keep its lines in repair and in efficient operation.

Also as these lines and substations grow older they require more repairs and greater sums must be spent on their maintenance. Every businessman knows it usually is cheaper to maintain a machine in good condition than to repair one. To allow machines or power lines to deteriorate is, in my opinion, false economy. We may, if this amendment carries, save $500,000 this year, but in future years may, as a result of this attempted saving, be confronted with much larger and more costs in repairs.

Our industrial situation in the Pacific Northwest, by which I mean the States of Oregon and Washington, is rather unusual. We have very little coal. We have no gas and no oil. We are almost solely dependent on hydroelectricity to operate the multitude of machines in our many and varied industries. If our power supply were broken by a transmission line break or a substation closure we have no easy or ready way of restoring the means of driving the machines in our industries. Such breakdowns mean tremendous losses in employment to workers and large extra costs to manufacturers as well as a loss of income-tax revenues to the Government.

Power is of no value unless it is delivered to the places of consumption, and delivered there in abundance and uninterruptedly. Reduction of the item of $5,000,000, provided in the bill for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration, to $4,500,000 as is proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is, in my opinion, not wise. I hope his amendment will be rejected. This item has already been reduced below the Budget Bureau's recommendation by $250,000 in committee. I believe it is poor economy to reduce it any further.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. As a matter of fact, when you boil the whole situation down, you have the power installations that produce the current. What you need this money for is to extend your lines and sell your electricity when it comes from these power-producing plants.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Power is of no value, of course, unless it is delivered to the ultimate consumer, and delivered in an uninterrupted manner.

Mr. JENNINGS. Over a line of wire strung on poles.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Let us keep the record straight. This does not take anything away from the construction.

Mr. MACK of Washington. No; that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. It takes nothing away from the building of lines or related facilities. It simply reduces by 10 percent the amount to be spent for administration and operation. The facts are that they need no sales force because they have more demand for the power than they have power. We are giving them more for the year that starts July 1 than we did for this year, the fiscal year 1950, by the amount of $500,000.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Yes; but the lines will carry 10 or 15 percent more current than it has in former years. Bonneville will be a bigger business and naturally the bigger the business the more money needed to operate it.

Mr. JENSEN. That does not make so much difference. You do not have to follow that current along the wire. It gets there without your pushing it along too much.

Mr. MACK of Washington. There are also more substations to maintain and operate.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true, is it not, that the reduction in this allowance will take away money which is provided for the maintainence of these lines which are now carrying heavier loads than they should be required to carry? Last year they had two or three breakdowns due to the overloading of the lines. It threw out of operation many of the industries, practically, in that area. There is an additional expense in the maintenance of the transmission lines. It is true there is no money in this for construction purposes. It is maintenance.

Mr. MACK of Washington. As the lines get older they also require more maintenance.

Mr. ANGELL. That is true.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Along the line of what the gentleman from Oregon has said, I would remind the House that we had a very, very severe winter last year, and that always has its effect upon the items that have to be maintained in any transmission lines. That is a factor that should be taken into consideration at this time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 57, noes 78.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 74, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed 17 of which 12 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed two) of aircraft; and printing and binding. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 220, after line 21, add the following new paragraph:

"Not to exceed $1,000,000 of the funds herein provided for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for travel expenses."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NORRELL. I desire to offer an amendment to amend the force account on page 220, line 21, by inserting a new paragraph. If the gentleman's amendment is considered before my amendment, will my amendment be out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] seeks to add a new paragraph.

Mr. NORRELL. My amendment will be in order after his amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not seen the gentleman's amendment but would assume it would be offered after the pending amendment is disposed of. The gentleman may offer his amendment after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I ask unanimous consent to revise the remarks I previously made in Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to reduce the travel item which of course does not appear in the bill, but the information we have been able to obtain from the Department is to the effect that there is $1,564,175 requested in this bill for travel for the Bonneville Power Administration. The amendment which I have offered reduces that figure to $1,000,000. The business of the Bonneville Power Administration is mostly within the States of Washington and Oregon. It is difficult to understand how they can even spend $1,000,000 for travel. Of course, we realize there are some officials of the Bonneville Power Administration who must come to Washington occasionally, especially to testify before the House and Senate, but certainly there is no reason for allowing more than $1,000,000. We do know that many of the higher officials of the Bonneville Power Administration do travel all over the country making speeches to every kind of organization you could imagine. It is not their business to do that.

The business of the officials of the Bonneville Power Administration is to look after the business of the Bonneville Power Administration and not to run all over this United States and Europe telling the people of America and of the world the virtues of the Bonneville Power Administration.

That is about all there is to it, Mr. Chairman; it is a very modest cut, considering the amount we should allow for such travel expenses, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman and shall, of course, support his amendment. I note that in this paragraph there is no reference at all to travel, whereas in other sections of the bill we have had specific authority for travel. I wonder if the gentleman would explain why there is not anything under that item in this paragraph?

Mr. JENSEN. I might answer the gentleman by referring him to the criticism of the Interior Department by the chairman of the committee in the report, criticism for the method they used in coming before the committee to justify their appropriations and for many other things that are going on in the Department of the Interior which is not pleasing to any of the members of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. So, when the gentleman asks me why certain things in this item did not appear in the bill, the facts are there are just a lot of things that do not appear in this bill because they were not willing to give us the facts that we should have had in order to write a bill and in order to appropriate properly.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, this portion of the bill was written, in substance, down in the Interior Department; is that what I am to understand?

Mr. JENSEN. No; I would not say that; I would say that with the information the committee had the chairman wrote this report and this bill. We did not have enough information to write a bill that could be very specific, as it should have been.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the committee's attention the fact that the reason the word "travel" does not appear in the item is because it is contained in the basic Bonneville Act. As I understand it, the words "travel allowance" are included in the appropriation bill only where there is no basic authority for travel allowance. The allowance for this year is $1,345,024. As the gentleman from Iowa has pointed out, such travel funds for fiscal 1951 will be $1,564,175. This item was broken down and presented to our subcommittee in connection with the justification. Again, I should like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that there are certain increases that apply to travel generally in all of these items that are being presented this year. As the gentleman knows, last year the House ap-

proved the increased per diem allowance from $6 a day to $9. In addition there have been increases in fares. I invite attention to the fact also that the area now covered by the Bonneville Power Administration is expanding very materially. In the pending bill there is a substantial increase for new transmission lines into southern Oregon. Lines are also running from the State of Washington through Idaho over to the Hungry Horse Dam; in other words, this item, I think, is pretty much in keeping with the necessary expenses of this great agency. As I pointed out in my previous statement in connection with the operation and maintenance expenses, the Bonneville Power Administration has done an outstanding and efficient job and it has operated its agency in a businesslike manner.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman tell the Committee with respect to the auditing of these accounts and whether there has been any criticism of the manner in which they kept their books and accounts?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This is the first time I have heard of that.

Mr. REES. I am talking about the Department of the Interior in general.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There may be some other bureau subject to criticism, but speaking with specific reference to the Bonneville Power Administration I may say that it has been commended for the businesslike way in which it has kept its accounts.

In that connection I call attention to the fact that the Bonneville Power Administration was audited by Arthur Anderson & Co., one of the leading certified public accounting firms in the country and that organization gave it a very clean bill of health. That is a private auditing firm. In addition to that, it is my understanding there has never been any criticism, at least to my knowledge, by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. REES. That may be true with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, but I have heard some criticism with respect to the manner in which it has kept their books and their accounts and that the General Accounting Office is attempting to work out a system so that we will have some understanding with respect to the manner in which these funds are expended.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman understands I am directing my statements to a specific amendment that is pending.

Mr. REES. I appreciate that, but I thought the gentleman could enlighten us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to corroborate what the gentleman from Washington says to the effect that the books of the Bonneville Power Administration have been audited by this eastern firm and I think the Bonneville Power Administration is to be commended for its good work in this respect.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I quite agree with the gentleman. It is the first time that a firm of national reputation has been called in to audit the books.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I say to the gentleman from Washington that the whole item of travel of our Federal employees should be investigated. I have no doubt but what this would be a fertile field for examination. However, I do object to the amendment on the basis that I would rather see it departmental-wide, rather than picking on one particular part of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, each subcommittee has the responsibility of reducing or adding to the budget requests. I have no particular inside knowledge of items in other subcommittee hearings, but in this instance we have heard all the testimony. We know the problem, we know the situation and certainly anyone who knows the conditions as exist would have to agree that a million dollars is more than the Bonneville Power Administration should have for travel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 43, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: Page 220, after line 21, insert "not to exceed 12 percent of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired labor basis except in cases of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, this only restores existing law; it adds nothing to it. For many years there has been a limitation on the amount of construction money that the Bonneville Power Administration could use itself and thereby not contract out to private enterprise. This merely puts back into the law, which was, I think, inadvertently omitted by the committee, the existing law, and I think there will be no objection to it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time briefly to propound an inquiry of the members of the committee. I have been advised and have observed that through either design or inadvertence the funds available for the Oil and Gas Division for the Director and his staff, Department of the Interior, have been practically deleted. The purpose of my taking this time is to inquire of the committee if it was really the intention of the committee in the consideration of this measure to do away with this division which has been in effect an operation and serving the people over a long period of time. If some member of the committee could answer that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In reply to the gentleman from Arkansas I can state that in the first place this specific activity is not authorized by law. The committee has in effect delegated to the Secretary the authority to expend funds in this area. The committee felt that discretion should be vested in the Secretary of the Interior to let him determine whether or not the expenditure should be made. The funds are made available but the mandatory expenditure of the funds is not required.

Mr. HARRIS. I am advised by the Secretary's office that they are very much in need of this. This is a very vital part of their service. It is rendering a very fine service to the people of the country, and it is badly needed, because without it they are very much at the mercy of certain of the industries who get themselves in a position with cooperative arrangements.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman will refer to page 160 of the report accompanying the omnibus bill he will find the committee has stated the following:

It is noted that the Oil and Gas Division was established after the war to continue certain functions performed by the Petroleum Administration for War. There was a need to have active Government cooperation with the petroleum industry during the period of maldistribution of oil products just after the war, but the committee is cognizant of no such condition or need at present. Therefore, the Oil and Gas Division should be either abolished or substantially reduced. Specialists in the petroleum field can be made a part of the program organization to advise the Secretary on policy and coordination of those matters for which the Department is responsible by law.

May I state as a follow-up that the committee has not taken away the funds for that particular activity. The committee has in effect suggested that this ought to be coordinated and tied in with the work of the Secretary.

Mr. HARRIS. I respectfully submit to the gentleman that this is a very worthy function of the Government. The need for it now seems to be much more apparent than it was even during the war or immediately after the war. The Secretary has only recently submitted to the National Petroleum Council the request to make certain investigations and to

report thereon, on the vitally important subject of the importation of crude oil.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The money has not been taken away from the Secretary.

Mr. HARRIS. The Secretary says different; $148,000, either indirectly or directly.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. My understanding of legislative procedure is that what I am saying here is making a part of the legislative history of this item. It may be that the Department will want to use this money for some other activity, but that is not the fault of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that is not altogether the case, as it is understood by the Department. The Secretary himself has so said, as I understand.

May I ask the gentleman if his committee will, then, as the appropriation bill takes its way through this Congress, if it develops later on through the information that he obtains from the Secretary of the Interior that there is a need for this, give consideration to providing him just such funds as are absolutely needed.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I suggest to my friend from Arkansas that the appropriate way to approach this problem is the regular way, that is, to introduce legislation to authorize this activity.

Mr. HARRIS. This matter is authorized, and the Department of the Interior has set it up under Executive order of the President of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I regret to differ with my friend. It is not authorized by law. It would be subject to a point of order if specifically provided for in this bill. The gentleman is much better off from his own standpoint that it is not included as a separate item. If it were, it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. I would suggest that the gentleman look into it a little further in the course of the appropriation bill going through. If it does appear that it is needed, as the bill goes through the other body and then into conference, the gentleman will find that he can perform a very worth-while service.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the colloquy that has taken place here provides the basis for a solution to the gentleman's problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, $6,756,800: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, although I am not going to offer any amendment to increase the appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management, I feel that our committee in this instance has cut a little too deep.

When we review the committee report in relation to the original President's budget, and the bill as reported out, we find certain items that have been cut too closely for the people's good.

The wise administering of the public lands is important to the whole country, not only from the standpoint of food production, but from that of revenue producing activities such as oil, potassium and other minerals that are developed through private leasing of these lands, timber production and conservation, grazing and selective disposal of lands under the various land laws.

The agency responsible for the management of the lands is the Bureau of Land Management which has been seriously cut in several major activities of its appropriation.

This agency may be likened to a business—it takes money for it to make money. On its limited appropriations it has been turning in Federal revenues amounting to more than $37,000,000, in other words approximately $7 return for every $1 appropriated. But with greatly increased business it needs more help to carry the load. Actually the number of employees has decreased since 1940. It occurred to me that the subcommittee may have lost sight of the above important aspect of the Bureau's work. In our effort to reduce Government expenditure we must not confuse gross expenditures with net expenditures.

Actually this agency has done a good job of increasing efficiency in the last 2 years, more than trebling the output per man. The small number of personnel cannot possibly keep speeding up the job to keep pace with the increasing volume of business. In my own State, Mr. Paul Roach, a land office manager, died in office as a result of overwork.

There must also be additional funds for development of resource programs that are vital to other conservation jobs. I am speaking specifically of the Bureau's need to provide protection of the watersheds on the public domain lands. In the Rio Grande area of my own State this is especially serious. Siltation of lands from neglected watershed areas is a threat to our very livelihood. The public lands contribute much of the silt flowing into Elephant Butte Reservoir. This is rapidly making useless a great reservoir, upon which our irrigation agriculture is based. Siltation also is filling the river channel, necessitating large public investments in flood-control structures. It is not economy to curtail work for watershed management and improvement, neglecting causes of trouble and spreading all our money—millions of dollars—on relief to the distressed situations caused by it.

I sincerely hope that before the bill returns to the House an adjustment may be made, and I strongly urge that the committee will yield in those cases where the approriation of added funds will actually in effect decrease the net spending through the added revenues returned, and when the final analysis is made that sufficient funds to do at least the minimum essential management job will be appropriated for the Bureau of Land Management.

The Clerk read as follows:

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, as range-improvement fees under the provisions of section 3 of the act of June 28, 1934 (43 U. S. C. 315), and 25 percent of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, under the provisions of section 15 of said act (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 from either of such sources but not yet appropriated), shall be available until expended for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of said act.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph appearing on page 222, lines 18 through 25, and page 223, lines 1 through 3, which is as follows:

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, as range-improvement fees under the provisions of section 3 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U. S. C. 315) and 25 per centum of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, under the provisions of section 15 of said Act (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 from either of such sources but not yet appropriated), shall be available until expended for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of said Act.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Iowa intends to make points of order to subsequent items relating to the same subject matter, namely, the Bureau of Land Management. Would it be in order for the gentleman from Iowa to submit the various points of order dealing with the same subject matter and that they be considered in bloc; and also, is it in order for me to offer an amendment which will make the appropriations on an annual basis in lieu of the language to be stricken on the points of order?

The CHAIRMAN. That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have the following points of order to make.

I make a point of order against the language on page 223, lines 4 through 12, which language is as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

Five percent of the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials from public lands received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to 5 percent of all moneys received prior to June 30, 1950, as net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials from public lands but not yet appropriated), shall be available for payment to the States in which such lands are situated for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements.

I make a point of order against the language on page 223, lines 13 through 24, which language is as follows:

PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

Thirty-seven and one-half percent of the royalties received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to 37½ percent of all royalties re-

ceived during the fiscal year 1950 but not yet appropriated), from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), shall be available for payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under said act, to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191).

I make a point of order against the language on page 224, line 1 through 8, which language is as follows:

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 but not yet appropriated), from grazing fees for State, county, or privately owned lands leased in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 28, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m–4), shall be available until expended for leasing of such lands.

I make a point of order against the language on page 224, lines 9 through 16, which language is as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Thirty-three and one-third percent of all grazing fees received after June 30, 1950, from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-lands laws, shall be available for payment to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language I have indicated, in each instance, has the effect of making appropriations on a permanent basis, which goes beyond the scope of the bill and also constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, is not in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the points of order made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 222, after line 17 insert the following:

"RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

"For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received as range improvement fees under section 3 of said act and of 25 percent of all moneys received under section 15 of said act during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated, to remain available until expended.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

"For payment to the several States of 5 percent of the net proceeds of sales of public lands lying within their limits, for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the aggregate of receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

"PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

"For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to 37½ percent of the royalties received during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of June 12, 1926.

"LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

"For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 28, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m–1), sums equal to the aggregate of receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with the act of June 28, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m–4), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

"Sums not in excess of 33⅓ percent of all grazing fees received during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to be paid to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j)."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JENSEN. Reserving the right to object, this simply reasserts existing language?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This has the effect of placing these items on an annual basis, instead of on a permanent basis, and there is no other change.

Mr. TABER. It is the same language that was used last year?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Whether it is exactly the same language, I cannot say for sure, but the effect is to carry it as heretofore; that is, on an annual basis. That is the only change. The net effect is to continue it as heretofore. There is no change in the substance.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand that in the amendment the gentleman has just offered there is no additional authority given to any officer of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. In reading the last paragraph, I understood the Clerk to read "33½." I understand the previous language was "33⅓."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the "33½" be changed to read "33⅓."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. May I inquire of the gentleman from Washington—I have already propounded the question once, and I did not get a satisfactory answer—in the language which is proposed now, there is some new language which is not in the fiscal 1950 bill? Is that a fact?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. To be completely frank and honest with the gentleman, I have not compared the language with the 1950 bill, but I want to assure the gentleman that the purpose of offering this is not to change the substance in any way of the language heretofore carried in the 1950 bill. Of necessity we have relied on our technicians to prepare this in keeping with the general coverage of the 1950 appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Was this change of language which the gentleman has just submitted written by the Department of the Interior or by our own staff?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This was prepared by our own committee clerk.

Mr. JENSEN. I have no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. This is not entirely familiar to me and I should like to ask the gentleman what would happen if we did not adopt the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. As I understand, there is substantive law which provides that these receipts shall go into specific funds in the Treasury, that under the basic law heretofore passed by the Congress certain people are entitled to these receipts. I have offered these amendments simply in order to accommodate the point of order offered by the gentleman from Iowa. They introduce no new substance into the bill. Therefore, nothing will be accomplished by a failure to adopt these amendments. In fact, it will simply confuse the situation. There will be no savings by not agreeing to the amendments which we are offering in lieu of the matter stricken by the points of order.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, to put it another way, if we did not adopt the amendments offered by the gentleman from Washington, it would not result in these sums being gathered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Oh, no. It is my understanding that they are primarily funds allocated for a specific purpose and they do not go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. They would not go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury if the amendment that I have offered in lieu of the language stricken out on the point of order were voted down.

Mr. KEATING. And that is because of legislation heretofore enacted.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. I wish to say that these amendments carry out the purpose of the Nicholson report, which was the result of a study under the direction of the President relating to the management and handling of public land. That report was made 2 or 3 years ago to the Secretary of the Interior. It contains certain recommendations in regard to the disposition of funds and the management of public lands, and these provisions in this bill carry out those recommendations of the so-called Nicholson report.

Mr. Chairman, we are at this time taking a second look at the Appropriations Committee report. Before we put the final seal of approval upon it, we must be sure that in our attempt to place the accent on economy, we have not actually increased the net Government expense through the curtailment of money making and money saving activities.

Certain items of this nature are found in the program of the Bureau of Land Management, a program with which I am especially familiar. The items for land classification, for grazing administration and for range and watershed improvement are of great importance to the West as well as to potential users of the public domain wherever they may reside.

Land classification activities have made possible a realistic program for land use and land rehabilitation of abused public lands. Classification enables the Bureau to dispose of those isolated tracts of Federal land where productive management is not practical. It discloses areas where erosion may cause excessive siltation of water storage facilities, an extremely important consideration at this time when we are spending so much money for the construction of multipurpose dams and reservoirs on western rivers. All of this work, which saves money and reduces the cost of government, should be continued with adequate land classification personnel.

The committee has made reductions in the request for Grazing Administration, an item which I feel should be restored both in the interests of proper administration of the public domain and in the interests of the users of this land. This item is necessary to carry out the full program of the Taylor Grazing Act, which includes, as you will recall, five principal purposes: First, to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; second, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; third, to effect an equitable apportionment of the grazing privileges among the owners of base properties outside of the districts and to issue grazing licenses, permits or leases in accordance with these determinations; fourth, to provide adequate supervision in order to insure proper use and to prevent trespass use; and fifth, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

The public domain is a great resource, of tremendous value to all the people of our Nation. It is an essential part of our economy in the West. It is in the interests of all of us that it be properly managed, maintained, and used to the fullest advantage, and the comparatively small sums required to achieve these purposes are money well spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this administration may well be proud of the job it conceives in the field of management—a job which the President's budget fully reflected this year. Many cuts have been made in this budget where there was evidence that these cuts could be made without danger to the Nation's economy.

At the same time the President's budget recommended increases in appropriations to a few agencies whose essential workload had increased greatly and whose operating load had demonstrated that they had wisely managed the funds allotted to them. An outstanding example is the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior. This agency, as you know, is responsible for the management of the public domain lands. The workload of this agency through applications of individuals, small businessmen, and large industrialists has more than doubled, yet the number of persons available to handle these applications has decreased. The Bureau has cut corners in administration to the point that they have trebled the output per worker in the past 2 years. Still the individuals and businesses wanting to develop and use the public lands pour in with applications. With increased appropriations it had hoped to permit an even better program for use of the public domain. Curtailment of funds from the President's budget will slow down the work and cause a terrific load to be placed on the Bureau of Land Management's meager staff.

In my own State of California I have observed the job land office personnel are doing. They are carrying too heavy a load and that load is increasing as applications for public land use increase. The item of $884,210 in contrast to the requested amount of $1,119,600 provides only for present operation in leasing and disposal of lands and mineral resources. In California and other States the Bureau of Land Management has received thousands of applications from disabled and other veterans of World War II for desert homesites. These applications cannot be handled promptly in spite of the recognized personal urgency of such cases without added appropriations.

Increased appropriations to the land management functions of the Bureau of Land Management will actually result in a net decrease in Federal costs, since last year this agency collected $7 for every $1 spent. Added funds will, similarly, more than pay for themselves.

In my considered judgment, the original estimate of $9,750,000 in the President's budget for the Bureau of Land Management is an amount well justified on the basis of returns. Furthermore, Bureau officials have demonstrated that they know how to spend the Government money appropriated with the same care that would be exercised if it were their own.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD where debate was concluded on the point of order first offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], which was subsequently withdrawn, and on which the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] spoke.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

For expenses, necesary to provide health, education, and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenace of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of Indians participating in folk festivals; $37,929,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have just approved the item in the appropriation bill which provides funds for the general activities and services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

In this connection, I wish to point out the need for an improvement in the administration of law and order on the average Indian reservation and particularly on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota.

I am told that so bad have conditions become that very few residents, white or Indian, within the boundaries of the reservation, feel safe to go out at night and particularly to attend dances or other social gatherings after dark.

There has been a complete breakdown of police protection. Within the past few years, several murders have been committed without charges being filed against suspects, much less convictions.

Delegations have appealed to the Governor of the State, but dispatch of representatives from the State justice department have been met by the statement that they lack jurisdiction on Indian lands. Now a movement is under way to create a sort of vigilantes organization among the people for their own protection.

The situation seems to be the result in part of trying to turn the problem of law and order over to the so-called law and order set-up under the Indian reorganization act and in part the result of inadequate appropriations or improper allocation of funds.

Whatever the cause, the situation merits a definite investigation by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and although I have previously discussed it with officials

of the Bureau, I wish to make it a matter of public record in connection with the passage of these appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, $21,922,000, of which not to exceed $3,737,500 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ:

On page 225, line 24, strike out "$21,922,000" and insert "$22,422,000."

On page 226, line 5, strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,500,000."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in this appropriation bill our committee has cut down items affecting New Mexico, but I am not going to quarrel with the judgment of the committee as to those items with the exception of this particular one for the reason I believe that our committee in striking out the item which I attempt to restore by my amendment committed a very grievous error.

In order that we may get the full facts before the committee, let me give the committee a short history of this situation. The purpose of my amendment is to restore $1,500,000 authorized last fall by an act passed by the Congress for the construction of an Indian and non-Indian hospital, a cooperative hospital to be used by Indians and non-Indians, in Bernalillo County.

The county of Bernalillo, of which the city of Albuquerque comprises about 90 percent, 2 years ago floated bonds to build its own little hospital, and after it had floated these bonds, Mr. Hageberg and Mr. Brophy, two of the finest men employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, went to the county commissioners and said, "We need a hospital for the Indians, and we are going to have to ask the Federal Government for an appropriation to build such a hospital. Why do we not join hands and build a joint hospital for both the use of the Indians and the use of the non-Indians?" After several weeks of negotiations they finally came to an agreement. This agreement was put into the form of a bill which was introduced by the New Mexico delegation and it was approved unanimously. It passed the House and the Senate and went to the President for his signature. The President in signing the bill took the very unusual step in commending it in these words:

I wish to express my full approval of the basic objective of this legislation which is to encourage the integration of hospital facilities for the care of Indians and non-Indians in the same community.

The bill was approved by the President and the Bureau of the Budget approved the item of $1,500,000; $500,000 in cash and $1,000,000 in contract authorizations. When it came to the committee, some of the members of the committee, particularly the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], felt the same way about the excellent policy established by such a law. But, when it came to marking up the bill there was some concern about the exact wording of the law and because of a misunderstanding, I am sure, the appropriation was disallowed.

The misunderstanding came about because of some of the language in the bill. The bill provided that for this $1,500,000, 100 beds be made available at all times to the Indians. It provided that the Federal Government pay for 80 percent of those beds made available to the Indians and the State would then have to carry the other 20 percent free of charge. It also provided that whenever it was thought necessary by the commissioners, the number of beds set aside for the Indians may be reduced, and that that may be done if in return the operator agreed that the minimum charge would be proportionately reduced. The committee was not sure whether under that language, if the number of beds were reduced at any time, the county would have to agree or whether it was discretionary with the county. We at all times have interpreted the law to mean that whenever they reduced those beds, the county, of course, would reduce the minimum payment, but, of course, because of that misunderstanding, the item was disallowed.

Since that time, after consultation with the members of the subcommittee, I have taken up the matter with the county commissioners, so as to have a complete understanding about it, and I have now before me a telegram signed by the chairman of the county commissioners, Mr. Cornelius, and by Mr. Brunacini, chairman of the hospital board of trustees, which reads as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *May 2, 1950.*

Hon. ANTONIO FERNANDEZ,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Contracts with Commissioner of Indian Affairs will include a provision whereby if pursuant to the act authorizing the appropriation for county-Indian hospital at Albuquerque, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reduces to less than 100 the number of beds required to be made available for Indians, the minimum payment to be made by said Commissioner will be proportionately reduced, and whereby if beds reserved for Indians are occupied by non-Indians said minimum payments will be reduced by the operators in proportion to such non-Indian occupancy. This provision is entirely satisfactory to the Bernalillo County commissioners and the hospital board of trustees. We have always understood this to be the intent of the authorization act as passed last fall.

W. H. CORNELIUS,
Chairman, County Commissioners.
CHARLES C. BRUNACINI,
Chairman, Hospital Board of Trustees.

I think that that settles the question as to that rather ambiguous language.

Let me call to your attention one reason why I am so anxious, and why I plead with you, that this be restored. If this were an appropriation which we could consider next year, which could be postponed, I would not ask the House now to amend the bill. However, the county commissioners have their $1,000,000 in the bank, and other moneys besides the bond money, on which they are paying interest to the bondholders. They have waited this long for the Federal Government to do its part in authorizing and in carrying out its part of the agreement. If this money is not made available this year, then the county commissioners of necessity must go ahead and build their own little hospital, and our opportunity to build a joint hospital will be gone. As a result, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will have to come to Congress and get appropriations for a separate hospital. It will be much more expensive to the Federal Government, because it will have to construct, equip, and operate it, through its own personnel.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I have been interested in the title to the hospital and the ground on which it is to be constructed. Will the gentleman explain how the title is going to be held, who will own it, or what part, or something about that?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The tract of land on which the hospital will be built, if it is a joint hospital, is a tract of land where the Indian tuberculosis hospital is now located. This building will be adjacent to it. Under another act passed by the Congress, the Indian Office is authorized for this purpose to donate this land to the county. Consequently, the county will hold the title.

Mr. NORRELL. Will there be any record title in the Federal Government for its share of the funds extended, including the lot on which it is being constructed?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No; but of course the hospital will be dedicated to that purpose. Under the contract, it will be dedicated to that purpose in perpetuity. If at any time the county commissioners under this law should cease to operate it, then the Government may take it and operate it.

Mr. NORRELL. Then when the hospital is constructed, as far as the legal title is concerned, it will be vested in the county in which it is located?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I could not make the assertion definitely without checking the law, but I think it is vested in the county with the right of reversion if it is not used for that purpose. I am not certain about that.

Mr. NORRELL. At any rate, it would not be vested, or any part of it, in the Federal Government?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No; because it is a county hospital.

Mr. NORRELL. That is the objection I have had to the item all the time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is a county hospital, to be used for both the Indians and the non-Indians. In the use of the hospital, the county makes itself responsible for all expenses including any additions to the hospital and all the equipment of the hospital. The Federal Government is guaranteed the use of 100 beds, at least. Of course, we expect eventually to take over the health and hospital services for all Indians, and this is a step in that direction. That I think is the policy set by Mr. Nichols, the present Indian Commissioner, which is being followed by those two fine men in New Mexico, whom I mentioned, Mr. Brophy and Mr. Hagberg.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As I said if the appropriation is not made at this time then the law which was passed under the direction of the Committee on Public Lands will be completely nullified. It may be if our committee had been writing this law and had been making the arrangements we might have made different arrangements perhaps as to the title, I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas, and perhaps as to the formula for participation. But we did not write this law. The legislative committee of this House, the Committee on Public Lands, after full study by the Bureau of the Budget and taking the amendments which the Bureau of the Budget suggested, passed the authorization. They had the responsibility and gave the terms of the law most careful consideration. Consequently if we do not appropriate the money this year we will have completely nullified the act passed by this Congress for that purpose, and we will be arrogating to ourselves the responsibility already discharged by the legislative committee.

There is another thing I want to call to the attention of the Congress and particularly to the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas who is worried a little bit about the title. Under this bill the authority to pay for these 80 percent of beds expires by the specific provisions of the act in 1954 and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is then required to come back to the Congress and submit a report to us, in the light of its experience in this enterprise. Then the Congress is at liberty to make any kind of formula for the operation of this bill that the Congress sees fit. That is a rather onerous provision which was imposed on the county commissioners, for despite the fact that the authority to pay for these 80 percent of beds expires in 1954, the provisions that the county shall continue to carry and maintain not less than 100 beds for the use of the Indians does not expire. They are obligated under this contract to that. So that if there is something in favor of the county commissioners which we might think is a little bit too favorable to them, there are these other provisions far more favorable to the Government, which we accepted because of the amendments suggested and required by the Bureau of the Budget. This is an experiment subject to adjustment, and the county authorities are willing to trust the good faith and good judgments of the Congress. Are we here to have less trust and confidence in the good faith and judgment of the Congress in the future?

Before I conclude let me read to you from the testimony given in the committee a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], in the consideration of this bill, which I think should be given consideration. He said:

> I would like to say also, Mr. Chairman, for the record that one of the greatest handicaps for the Indian Bureau working out some of these cooperative arrangements I think is a lack of getting through appropriations on time. It makes it very difficult to work out these cooperative arrangements with local people when appropriations are delayed and uncertain. I think that is quite a handicap to the Indian Bureau in that regard and I wish that some sort of a plan might be promoted to give local people a little better assurance in the future as to what you will do here so far as appropriations are concerned.

I fully agree with that. If this appropriation is not now granted despite the fact that the county commissioners have made their plans in reliance upon this law and have expended upward of $75,000 in drawing up plans and specifications, and have waited this long, paying interest to bondholders on their money in the bank, if we do not now appropriate the money notwithstanding the fact that they have acted in reliance upon this act, then we will thereby discourage any further attempts along these lines in the future by these various communities, and it will be a retrogressive step in the attempt to integrate the health services of the Indians with those of the State. Such integration will save the Federal Government many more millions of dollars in cost of hospital operations alone. Certainly one large hospital can be operated more efficiently and more economically.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the time this matter was considered in the committee I had some grave doubts as to the protection being accorded the Federal Government. Since that time I have had a number of discussions with the gentleman from New Mexico. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment on the following conditions, and I desire to make this a part of the legislative history of this amendment:

> That no part of the appropriation or authorization herein made shall be available for the construction of a hospital pursuant to Public Law 438, approved October 31, 1949, unless the contract relating to such hospital between the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the proper authorities of the county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, shall include a provision whereby if pursuant to said act the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reduces to less than 100 the number of beds required to be made available for Indians, the operator shall agree that the minimum payment to be made by said Commissioner will be proportionately reduced, and whereby if beds reserved for Indians are occupied by non-Indians said minimum payment shall be reduced by the operator in proportion to such non-Indian occupancy.

With that statement and on that condition, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I certainly do appreciate the action of the gentleman from Washington. He has looked into this matter just as thoroughly as I have. We have been working at it ever since the committee met. This telegram which I have from the county commissioners does explicitly agree to those terms. Furthermore, the Indian Office has advised me, and were supposed to have sent me a letter to this effect, but I have not yet received, that that has been a part of the contract. It will be made a part of the contract.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The telegram has been read into the RECORD?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The telegram has been read into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, certainly I believe this House knows of my great interest in preserving the health of our Indian population. I do not believe the Indian service has any better champion than I have been to that service. But it seems to me we are certainly deviating from the straight and narrow path as far as this Government is concerned.

I have no objection to building a general hospital for the Indians, but in Albuquerque we have a very fine tubercular institution for the Indians. Why we should help the State of New Mexico to build a hospital, not only for the Indians but for themselves, is beyond my comprehension. Certainly the other States of the Union are entitled to some consideration. The great State of New Mexico is to be lauded for its part in the matter, but, at the same time, it seems to me they are helping themselves too, by getting a very fine hospital and wanting the Federal Government to pay a million and a half dollars toward that, and at the same time maintain hospital beds for a certain proportion of the Indian patients when they are there. I just cannot see that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a matter of fact, it was not the county commissioners that wanted this done. It is a new policy of the Federal Government in try-

ing to integrate the health services of the Indians with those of the whites. It was the Indian Office that brought the proposition to them. It was the Indian Department that negotiated this matter. It is the Indian Office that wants us to do that.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico that if we listen to the Indian Bureau, on medical matters, according to their past performance, then the Indians are in a poor way. That is all I have to say about that.

Now, may I refer to the report. This is not my language in the report, but it reflects the opinion of all the members of the subcommittee:

> The amount of $500,000 cash and $1,000,000 in contract authority requested for the construction of a hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex., is not approved.

I did not write that language but it did reflect the opinion of all members of the subcommittee. Although the construction of this hospital is authorized by act of Congress, the committee is unwilling to recommend the appropriation requested for this purpose. This does not appear to be a hospital which would provide benefits for Indians commensurate with the expenditures planned. Certainly, for $1,500,000, if there are only a few Indians in the hospital, they are not getting full value for what we are putting into it.

> The proposed arrangement for having this hospital operated by the county in which it would be located, and the ambiguous provisions of the law respecting its operation have convinced the committee that it would be a bad precedent to appropriate funds for this construction.

I call particular attention to that portion of the report.

The subcommittee was in full accord; and, certainly, I for one have been very favorable to helping the Indians. I am not convinced that a general hospital for the Indians is so necessary in that particular section of the country. If additional Indian hospital facilities are to be built from money appropriated by this Congress, I think it should be in the form of an addition to the present Indian hospital in Albuquerque.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to inform the House that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], a medical doctor, has been very active in trying to do everything he could for sick Indians. I can understand why he takes the position he does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly hesitate to go against Dr. FENTON's position, and I shall not do it, because not only myself but most of the members of the committee have followed the gentleman from Pennsylvania on everything pertaining to the health of Indians.

The gentleman knows, does he not, that we made recommendations—or at least, I did after visiting the TB hospital in Albuquerque a few years ago; I recommended that we double the capacity of that hospital. There are something over 120 beds there now. The head of that hospital told me that with an extra doctor and a couple of extra nurses they could handle another 120 patients. No attention was paid to that recommendation. I am sorry they did not follow through in building an addition to the present TB hospital.

I hesitate, as does the doctor, to do anything that would hinder the Indians from getting the benefits they deserve and need; but I also hesitate to take issue with Dr. FENTON, who has taken care of this matter of Indian health not only for the minority side but also for the majority side of the committee for quite some years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman contend that this amendment is not necessary or desirable in the interest of Indian health?

Mr. FENTON. That is absolutely correct, and I believe the subcommittee was of that frame of mind. We have no objection to hospitals being built for the Indians, but we feel that we should have some say in the matter; and, certainly, as my friend from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] pointed out, there are certain legal aspects of this problem as to title that are far from being cleared up.

Mr. TABER. In view of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, it seems to me that we ought to follow the judgment of those who have studied this thing thoroughly, as he has.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization bill in regard to this matter came to our committee first, the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, it then went to the Public Lands Committee of the House and was reported in turn by that committee. I hope the members of this Committee of the Whole will restore this amount and will approve the pending amendment because it seems to me that to do otherwise is to more or less abandon a program that we have already agreed upon. We want to assimilate the Indians fully into our society. We just passed a bill here a day or so ago involving the city of Salamanca in New York based upon that very theory of assimilating the Indians into our society of giving them more autonomy of not considering them second-rate citizens but of giving them fuller status of citizenship.

This amendment is in keeping with that program. It will be a good economic move in the long run and is a move in the right direction, not only in the matter of assimilation but in the matter of integration of integrating the resources and the strength and the financial power of the local community, the county in this instance, with the United States Government so that each may supplement the other and help the other, a joint effort, if you please, beneficial to both parties, beneficial to the good people in that particular county and beneficial to our Indian friends.

Mr. Chairman, certainly this is in keeping with the program that we have, so far, it seems to me, already agreed upon. The authorization bill is a public law now and the authority therefore has been given. As I recall it, the President of the United States complimented the Congress at the time it passed such a law. I know a great many people did. So it seems to me in the long run it would be for economy, it would be in keeping with a program we have already agreed upon, it would be doing justice to our Indian friends, it would be helpful to everybody involved and, really, I cannot see why there should be any opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I know the gentleman is a great admirer of the Indians and rightly so because he comes from a great State which has treated the Indians very fine.

Mr. MORRIS. We have tried to.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, the great State of Oklahoma does not ask for a hospital like this for its Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. FENTON. The great State of Oklahoma would not come in and request this kind of legislation?

Mr. MORRIS. We would have no objection to this kind of legislation, I am certain we would not; in fact, we hope to have some similar legislation in the future.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. May I say to our distinguished friend this hearing was a very complete one. We had people from Bernalillo County who went into the matter very thoroughly with the Committee on Public Lands and the committee unanimously agreed that this is a very worthwhile project. We complimented the people in that area for the attitude they were taking in connection with our Indian brethren. We felt it was one of the most forward steps we had taken in trying to make the Indians a part of our society. I would feel very bad, I would regret very much, if now we would break faith with the people who had confidence in the Committee on Public Lands in its dealing with that problem.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is a member of our committee, he works faithfully and is interested, intensely, in the Indian problem and has given it a lot of study. His judgment, in my opinion, should carry great weight with this Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This law is merely one of the various laws that we have been adopting here lately in pursuance of a new policy which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], on the other side of the aisle, has stressed time and again, and one that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and many others have stressed who have been studying the Indian problem. That is the problem of integrating rather than segregating the Indians. Our country would be happy to take them over and they expect to do it in time, but in building this hospital they want a little help at the present time, and that is all they asked for when the suggestion was made to them. It was done, as I say, by Mr. Brophy and Mr. Hageberg, who believe in that policy; a forward-looking policy. If this is not accomplished, it will be a retrogressive step in that policy. I do not know whether they have one in Oklahoma, but they passed one in Montana exactly like this. We have complained about the fact that the Indians do not have a single, solitary accredited hospital. They are unable to do so, because the Government has to spend a lot of money trying to get staffs and have not been able to do it. Now, in joining hands with the State, under a State administration, the hospital will be constructed and it will be fully accredited, and the Indians as well as the non-Indians will gain. Furthermore, it will be more expensive to the Government to turn this thing down, after it has been passed by the Congress, and that will be the effect unless we have the appropriation this year. It will be penny wise and pound foolish. It is not economy to deny these funds; it is economy to provide them and have the State run this hospital through its own staff and through its own officials in its own integrated system.

Mr. MORRIS. Let me say this in conclusion. The Indian problem, I think, is recognized, by practically all, if not all of us, as being a national problem. Uncle Sam, the Federal Government, has been building Indian hospitals for a long time and maintaining them, and it is now doing so. It seems to me that we ought to be grateful to the people in the great State of New Mexico who offer to help pay the bill. This is a program of economy for Uncle Sam. Heretofore Uncle Sam has been footing all the bills in matters of this kind and certainly we must take care of those Indians out there and see that they are given the same health opportunities that our other Indian friends are given, and unless we do this jointly then it will be incumbent upon Uncle Sam to pay all of the bills. But these people in New Mexico offer to pay about half of the bills, or at least a large part of them, so why should we object to that. It just does not seem reasonable to me that we should.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FERNANDEZ), there were—ayes 32, noes 29.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FERNANDEZ and Mr. FENTON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 57, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, under the heads "Construction, and so forth, buildings and utilities, Indian Service," "Construction, and so forth, irrigation systems, Indian Service," "Roads, Indian Service," "Navajo and Hopi construction and maintenance services," and "Acquisition of lands for Indian tribes," shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation for the Indian Bureau came before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations certain testimony was given that subcommittee regarding money provided for Indian education in California, and other costs of the supervision of the Indian Bureau in that State.

The gentlemen on the committee will concur with me that certain Indians testified they desired independence from the Indian Bureau. Whether or not those Indians could be properly said to represent all the Indians of California or whether the testimony they gave was complete is not for me to discuss today. Neither is it for me to discuss whether or not the Indian Bureau should remove itself completely, or when, from the State of California.

The fact that we have for some 100 years professed to be trying to give the Indians their own independence, especially those Indians of the so-called Mission Indian Bands, and yet have not given them freedom, is something that requires discussion and action by the legislative committee. It is a fact that, whatever the case may be, it would be very difficult for the Indians if the subcommittee were to maintain the situation which now exists in this bill. The subcommittee removed all appropriations for Indian education, for the building of Indian schools, and for educational facilities in California.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. Last fall I had the opportunity to visit your mission school at Riverside, Calif., which is attended by several hundred Navajo Indians. I was amazed at the good work that school is doing and the education they are giving to the Indians. I think it would be too bad if the school is not carried on.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I believe it is the contention of the chairman of the subcommittee that the funds for this particular school were not excluded from the bill.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommitee.

Mr. KIRWAN. If an injustice has been done to the Indians in California, I can assure the gentleman that when this bill goes to conference, after the Senate holds its hearings and we mark up the bill, I will make every effort to see that the injustice is corrected.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I knew he would do that. My point was simply that, even if the intent of the subcommittee to give independence to the Indians were carried out, it should not be done suddenly but should only be done when the State itself is given sufficient notice to arrange for educational facilities, the responsibility for which would then devolve upon the State.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the legislative subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. This matter has disturbed me greatly, inasmuch as I am chairman of the subcommittee dealing with it. After I found out the status of the present bill, I started an investigation to determine just what the effect is. I believe I have been reliably informed that all funds for the great State of California involving Indians have been completely eliminated.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That would be a very serious matter.

Mr. MORRIS. I think it is a serious matter. I know the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] will see that that wrong is righted, if it is humanly possible for him to do so. I hope we will not continue with a situation like that. For certainly, in my judgment, we should not cut off all the funds from the great State of California for the Indian Service, at least in one fell swoop. If we are going to do it, it should be done gradually.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to confirm what the gentleman has just stated. I do not believe the Indians who appeared before the committee were testifying for all the Indians of California. This is a very serious matter and I hope the cut that has been made can be restored.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see the trend of thought here today because a great injustice has been done to the California Indians. The supposed representatives of the Indians, appearing before the committee, made statements which were not facts. The Hoopa authorization bill passed by the Congress last year, which I introduced and which was signed by the President, provided the necessary funds for the construction of the school facilities at the Hoopa Reservation, which funds are deleted entirely in the appropriation bill. The Indian and Federal holdings in that area do not develop any taxable property. The tax rate in the area is $1.55 and the entire amount raised by taxes every year is $560 on a small amount of personal property. They cannot build their own school facilities and must depend on Federal contribution; the State of California provides funds for the education of these Indian children; the Federal Government most certainly should provide the housing facilities. I have taken this problem up with the Senate committee and hope that the funds are reinstated.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I concur with the gentleman and say in conclusion that I shall offer no amendment here, to restore the funds deleted, having confidence that the matter will be corrected in the other body.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. California has been mistreated in the striking of all of the funds for the Indians of California. It was done on the statement of one man to the effect that he represented the Indians of California. The State authorities were never given an opportunity to be heard, nor were any other Indian groups who dispute the statement that they were properly represented, or represented at all, by the gentleman who appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee. As a matter of fact, the Governor of California, the superintendent of public instruction, and many of the officials of local government vigorously protest the withdrawal of these funds. Many Indian groups have protested to me and to other California Congressmen. It will inflict an unfair hardship on the Indians of California and upon local and State school and health agencies. It is discriminatory against California. When all Indians in every State are deprived of Federal funds as a matter of national policy we will be willing to take our cut along with the rest. But as long as that is not done, the California Indians should not be treated any differently than the others, and our State should not be required to take over and carry a burden which is a Federal obligation and which is not imposed similarly on other States.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed 227, of which 220 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger-motor vehicles, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; printing and binding, including illustrations and purchase of reprints; purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to exceed $5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 227, after line 12, add the following new paragraph:

"Not to exceed $1,000,000 of the funds herein provided for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for travel expenses."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the same category as the one I offered earlier in the afternoon in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration.

The amendment seeks to reduce the travel pay for the Bureau of Indian Affairs from $1,400,000 to an even $1,000,000, a reduction of $400,000.

If every Member of this House, if every American who can understand the American language, would have the privilege of knowing some of the things that are going on in the Indian Bureau, I am sure there would not be very little opposition to this amendment. Certainly the Bureau of Indian Affairs has done a great many things that were neither good for the Indians nor good for America in general as most of you know, I am sure.

Here they are asking for $1,400,000 just for travel expenses. It is criminal, purely and simply criminal, for the American taxpayers to pay $1,400,000 just for travel expenses for the officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Of course, a lot of us do not know anything about this. Where are they going to travel?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, we have an Indian Office here in Washington. Then we have a half dozen regional offices scattered all over the country. Then we have district offices, and we have local offices, and we have reservation offices, and they are filled with a lot of folks that do not have much else to do than travel around over the country, and so they just travel, when a letter or a telephone call would do just as well and possibly better. That is the answer. In fact, if I had my way, every regional office in the Indian Bureau would be abolished; in fact, we did abolish some of them during the Eightieth Congress, and it was good for the Indians.

Mr. VURSELL. How much are we spending on the Indians now?

Mr. JENSEN. The budget request for the fiscal year 1951 was the sum of $85,996,375. Our committee reduced that amount to $76,293,000, a reduction of $9,703,375, which is by far the greatest amount ever before requested for the Bureau. But I am afraid the Indian people will not benefit anywhere near in proportion.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I intend to offer such an amendment as the gentleman has suggested on page 229, to abolish these regional Indian offices and cut out the appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. I shall be glad to support the gentleman's amendment if it is clean-cut and will actually save some money.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Talking about travel expense, that is where the great increase comes in, traveling back and forth between regional offices.

Mr. JENSEN. And doing nothing but trying to tell the Indians what they should do; when, generally speaking, the Indians are smarter than the white folks who are trying to tell them a lot of stuff they already know.

I am sorry that Mr. William Brophy was not able to continue his work. He was the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for a couple of years and was doing fine work. Then he got sick and had to resign over a year or so ago. Since that time we have been going back to about the same kind of mess we had when Mr. Collier was Commissioner of Indian Affairs. For the past few months we have had a Commissioner of Indian Affairs by the name of Nichols, but he had too much common sense; he was doing too good a job. They could not handle him and so they replaced him with one Dillon Myer, who tried to handle the Japanese concentration camps during the war, and I have been told by good authority that they had more trouble with Dillon Myer than they did with all the Japanese in those camps.

Listen to this, my colleagues: Here is what Col. W. D. Archie, of military police, who had considerable to do with Japanese concentration camps during World War II, had to say in his own newspaper, the Shenandoah Sentinel, of Shenandoah, Iowa, about the recent appointment of Dillon Myer as Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

ALONG THE BANKS OF THE NISHNA

(By W. D. Archie)

Dillon F. Myer has been chosen as head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by President Truman. It sickens me to think such a thing can happen in our Government. It shows what a low state we are in, and why such men as Senator MCCARTHY are forced to such extremes to try to clean up the sordid Washington mess among Government employees. Not that Myer is not a good American. He is just inefficient.

This Dillon Myer is one of the original New Dealers. He has little ability but plenty of pull. He gets into trouble in every job he is given but is immediately transferred to a better one every time this happens. During the war he headed the Japanese relocation camps and I personally had contact with these camps. He made more trouble

than did all the Japs in the camps. Every decision he made was on the basis of new dealism. Along toward the end of the war it got so bad he was transferred. But he didn't lose his job with the Government. Instead he was soon found to be heading one of the big housing jobs.

Now he is to head the important Bureau of Indian Affairs. The poor Indians. They have been mistreated by our Government from the very beginning and now they must suffer with this man Myer. And as I said in the beginning it is sickening that such a thing can happen in our Government.

I trust my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the one previously offered in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration. I hope the Committee will vote it down.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. How do they spend all this million and a half? What is it used for?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the amount approved for the current fiscal year is $1,030,000. The Budget estimate for the fiscal year was $1,400,023.

We must take into consideration that the program, particularly for hospitalization, and for schools, represents a substantial expansion in this bill. In addition, per diem costs were raised from $6 to $9 by the Congress last year and we are bound by that law; also, the mileage cost for the use of private automobiles was also increased. Furthermore, the area covered by the Indian Service is very substantial. If you look at a map of New Mexico and Arizona you will see what tremendous areas have to be covered and what a transportation problem this offers. The Indian reservations in these States are larger than some States of the Union. To administer such a tremendous program entails some expense.

Our subcommittee wants to hold costs down and we have cut the Indian Bureau substantially. We have tried to approve those items relating to hospitalization, education, and to approve also programs that have been suggested to get the Indians off the reservation into jobs where they can be assimilated into the community. That is our objective.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON, of Washington) there were—ayes 40, noes 51.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1950.

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

After June 30, 1950, not to exceed the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, shall be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 227, lines 13 to 18, inclusive, and on page 227, lines 19 to 25, inclusive, and page 228, lines 1 and 2 on the ground that it is permanent legislation on an appropriation bill.

The language to which the point of order is made is as follows:

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1950.

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

After June 30, 1950, not to exceed the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, shall be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede both points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the points of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 227 after line 12 insert the following:

"CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

"For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary during the current fiscal year.

"PROCEEDS FROM POWER

"Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated $2,525,465 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; printing and binding; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That $100,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available from the judgment fund appropriated for the Indians of California by section 203 of the act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 77), to be advanced for compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians of California under contracts approved by the Secretary, each such advance creating a charge on any judgment or settlement won by such tribe, band, or group, reimbursable out of such judgment or settlement, with interest at 4 percent per annum, to the judgment fund of the Indians of California: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the next succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, against the language commencing with the word *"Provided"* in line 3, page 229, reading:

That $100,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available from the judgment fund appropriated for the Indians of California by section 203 of the Act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 77), to be advanced for compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians of California under contracts approved by the Secretary, each such advance creating a charge on any judgment or settlement won by such tribe, band, or group, reimbursable out of such judgment or settlement, with interest

at 4 percent per annum, to the judgment fund of the Indians of California.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 229, after line 21, insert the following:

"No part of the funds herein appropriated under the head 'Bureau of Indian Affairs' shall be used for the establishment or maintenance in the United States, exclusive of Alaska, of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by whatever term such offices may be designated or for the compensation of employees in such offices, but this limitation shall not prevent the allocation of funds, otherwise expendable in connection with such area offices, for use in the improvement of services rendered to Indians in their home communities."

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, this amendment when passed will abolish the so-called area offices of the Indian Bureau located in various cities of the United States. In offering this amendment it is not proposed to reduce the appropriation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but that such funds be utilized for the improvement of services in their home communities. The program of maintaining an area office by the Indian Bureau has been in existence for several years. Many of these regional offices have been abolished at one time or another, but have always managed to crop up again under different names, and at the present time 11 area offices are now in existence. The contention of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is that they can give better services to Indians by decentralizing authority between Washington and the Indian reservations. Under this three-level system of administration the Indians have experienced such inconveniences as lack of local government services, delay by additional red tape, and general inefficiency which has stymied the progress of the Indians whom the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is intended to help.

The following data, compiled from the many communications received in favor of this proposed amendment, produce irrefutable evidence to justify the abolishment of the area-office method of administration of Indian affairs.

DISADVANTAGES OF AREA OFFICES

First. Geographic locations: Area offices are usually located in cities hundreds of miles away, where the Indian Bureau representatives are not in contact with Indian problems and are not aware of reservation needs.

Second. Misleading theory in authority delegation: While the area-office idea of the Bureau of Indian Affairs was to decentralize authority from Washington to the field where it would be readily accessible to Indians on reservations, this theory of middleman-area office by rank of position has automatically absorbed essential authority from reservations; it is the belief of the Indians that, because of their proper locations in the field, the reservation superintendents are in daily contact with their Indians' problems and should, therefore, retain the final authority in important recommendations to Washington.

Third. Slows up procedures: In matters requiring immediate decisions, the problems are first routed to the area offices to secure their recommendations, before they are passed on to the final authority, which is the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington, D. C.

Fourth. Encourages irrational decisions: In many cases, recommendations in important decisions are given arbitrarily by the area directors who, being miles away from Indian reservations, and, due to lack of sufficient time for thorough investigations of cases involved, would naturally lack first-hand information to give such problems just recommendations.

Fifth. "Mice will play when cat is away": When authority is delegated from Washington to the field, it should be given to the reservation superintendents; or, better still, to the Indians themselves. No authority should be delegated to a "no-man's-land" between Washington and the reservations. What is done by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and his staff in Washington is under constant scrutiny by Congress; and what is done by the reservation superintendent and his staff in the field is under constant scrutiny by the Indians. But what is done in area offices far from Washington and far from any Indian reservation is not subject to anybody's scrutiny and is productive of waste and delay.

Sixth. Prevents Indian participation: Where an area office is hundreds of miles away, in some cases, more than 600 miles, the Indians cannot participate in a program intended for them because of lack of proper guidance and protection by Indian service personnel, and hence lose all interest in any beginning toward the Government's plans for Indian self-government. This system encourages the Bureau to cling to the now obsolete idea of working out problems for the Indians, rather than the doctrine they preach of working with them to solve their own problems.

Seventh. Deprives Indians of needed services: The operation of the area office system of administration has resulted in the separation of personnel badly needed on the reservation agencies, such as extension workers, nurses, Indian police, judges, and other positions most essential to the needs of the reservations; and funds denied from these positions have been used to establish and maintain the area offices.

Eighth. Waste of taxpayers' money: The three-level system of Indian Bureau administration is a waste of taxpayers' money, since it is used to maintain an expensive yet mythical branch of the Indian service which is of no value to Indians in their intended program of progress. It misrepresents what would be the true objectives of the Indian service, with its top-heavy emphasis in merely perfecting standards of operations within the Bureau to protect its employees, at the expense of denying the Indians' greatest need for moral, social, and economic development. The existence of any branch of the Indian service can only be justified by the services it renders to Indians, and the area offices are a far cry in their present status, to be of any value whatsoever to Indians within their reservations.

Ninth. Establishment lacks Indians' consent: The establishment of area offices which unjustly deprived the Indians of Indian service personnel on their reservations, was carried out in secrecy, without due consent of the Indians.

Tenth. Road to false freedom: Ninety percent of the Indians residing within Indian reservations are at present against the program of so-called Indian emancipation. Although the Indians have never been directly informed, this area-office program of withdrawal from Indian reservations fits into a pattern using the area-office system as a painless method of emancipating the Indians, better referred to by the Indians as "false freedom." The Indians' reason for opposing such a measure is that if in their present status, and without further preparations, their wardship should be removed, they would fall prey to land-hungry, non-Indian exploiters who would eventually deprive them of land and property upon which hinges their very existence. This area-office method, withdrawing personnel from reservations, is a make-believe that Indians are about ready to be turned loose, and is certainly paving the way to just such a false freedom.

Eleventh. Area-office abolition recommended by NCAI: Under date of September 24, 1949, at the convention of the National Congress of American Indians, held in Rapid City, S. Dak., the following resolution was proposed and aproved by an overwhelming majority of the more than 200 Indian delegates present, representing more than 25 of our 48 States:

Whereas the proposed system of area offices of the Indian Office will involve expenditures of additional money that could be better used at the agencies themselves; and

Whereas it is more efficient to place local power in the superintendent, instead of vesting it in area or national officials; and

Whereas the Commissioner has promised the abolition of district offices so that more money will go to the reservations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians opposes the plan for establishment of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and request more powers be vested in local superintendents and local councils.

I have read with great disappointment Indian Office Order No. 549, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, September 13, 1949, a program of Indian Bureau reorganization. This program of reorganization, while it could have been designed to meet the Indians' greatest needs, is in substance patterned merely to better intra-Bureau relationships. It

selfishly aims, at prohibitive cost, to keep the Bureau of Indian Affairs in line with regulations prescribed by such agencies as the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Civil Service Commission, thus protecting heads of departments as well as subordinate employees within the Bureau. It fails in its entirety to meet the needs of the Indians themselves, in their honest efforts to attain standards of progress established by our civilization.

At this critical time, when foreign countries are watching us with critical eye, looking for shortcomings of our Government in dealing with minority groups, it is best that we deal with greater zeal and sincerity with our local Indian people. At present we are going all out to feed and support foreign countries, even to the extent of jeopardizing the economic soundness of our country, yet we forget to take care of our just obligations at home. Our assistance to foreign nations is charity. But we cannot look upon our aid in the form of services to our Indians as charity. These services which we can render them are restitutions and part of the price we have offered to our American Indian people from whom we have ruthlessly confiscated lands rich in resources, that have made our country the greatest in the world today.

With all the handicaps and limitations circumstances have placed upon them, our Indian people on the reservations are striving wholeheartedly to meet the requirements set forth by our fast-moving civilization. With their population of less than 400,000 in the United States, they without question answered our country's call in time of war, thus joining us in our efforts to retain the American way of life. As an example, on the Coeur d'Alene Reservation, with a population of less than 700, more than 30 Indian boys entered the services of our armed forces; 11 of them were volunteers; and 6 of them gave their lives for our common cause. In return for which, rather than gratitude, the Bureau of Indian Affairs continues to employ irrational methods of administration, many of which have resulted in pushing our young Indian men into the gutters of failure and despair. This method of area-office administration, in itself, holds an intrinsic evil in that it utterly uses funds for a purpose other than for what it is intended.

I, therefore, strongly urge my colleagues in Congress to adopt this worthy amendment to abolish the area offices in order that our Indians may realize the justice and securities that we have so solemnly promised them in past treaties.

May I again emphasize that the area-office plan of administration of Indian Affairs seeks only to protect its heads of departments and its employees within the Bureau and hence does not attain the purpose for which Indian-service funds are annually appropriated. Let us disperse this idea and reestablish personnel back to the Indian reservations to serve as guidance, and to protect our Indians in their own efforts to attain eventual total self-sufficiency.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Just what does the gentleman's amendment do? May I ask him whether it is a clean-cut amendment to abolish the regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and by so doing will it reduce this appropriation by the amount that the regional offices are costing? Just what does the amendment do?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. What this amendment proposes to do is to abolish the regional offices so that the money will go to administer the affairs of the Indians on the Indian reservations which will otherwise be spent for traveling and for maintenance and for salaries of an area office force far removed from the Indians.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman's amendment were clean-cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, if we are interested in economy, if we are interested in carrying out the policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in contracting the Indians and administering their affairs, we should abolish these regional offices.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with the gentleman that we should abolish the regional offices, but I am afraid the gentleman's amendment is not going to do much good for the Indian service. Certainly we need to do more than just abolish the offices and then take the same personnel which they will put into all these reservation headquarters so that we will have the same bunch to contend with again. They will just make regional offices out of every one of the reservation offices under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I do not think that would be done.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sorry, but I just cannot see that.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I think money would be saved by abolishing these offices and the money saved would help the Indians rather than be spent to maintain distant offices which will not be in contact with the Indians and which defeat the purpose of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I hope the gentleman will vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is inserted herewith a letter from Lyzeme Savage, manager of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, which is one of a large number of letters received in support of this legislation.

MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE,
Cass Lake, Minn., April 28, 1950.

Representative WHITE, Democrat, Idaho,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: I am sending along a clipping taken from the Minneapolis Star of Wednesday evening, April 26, 1950. The amendment you propose to have added to the section covering the Interior Department bill, Bureau of Indian Affairs, is in agreement with the thinking of the Minnesota Tribe, which includes 15,000 enrollees. As you probably are aware, Public Law 841, Eightieth Congress, for the fiscal year of 1949, stipulated and provided funds for district offices at Billings and Portland only; however, the upkeep of three others were maintained notwithstanding. This undoubtedly was done with the hope and plan of reestablishing a better and more elaborate set-up.

For the fiscal year of 1951, there were set up 11 area offices which is nothing more than the old district offices. The decentralization so far has done nothing to reduce the housekeeping work at the agencies, neither has it benefited the Indians more—on the contrary it has increased the load of our skeleton forces. Elimination of the needless district, regional, and area offices perhaps would be gained if the title of appropriations were changed from "Field" Administration to "Reservation" Administration, and if stipulation were included in your amendment that appropriated funds are to be used only for those reservation agencies which were established prior to the setting up of the so-called district, regional, and area offices.

Example after example can and has undoubtedly been presented to you showing the inefficiency of operations, the overlapping of work phases, and the last but not least, excessive cost of over-all operations. The procedure is simple, for if overhead costs are cut, the profit is greater. What the Indian needs is greater profit from the funds a generous Congress appropriates.

As manager of the tribe here and speaking in their behalf, I urge you to have an amendment to the bill made as stipulated and I trust other lawmakers will aid in its becoming law. Such would mean much to the Indians; we need more aid, and do not desire to be used as tools for a "build-up to brass."

Very truly yours,

LYZEME SAVAGE, *Manager.*

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, last fall I had opportunity to visit the Indian school at Riverside, Calif. The school is attended largely by several hundred Navajo Indian boys and girls, from the ages of 9 or 10 to 17. These pupils do all their own work, under the supervision of a few teachers. They keep their rooms, maintain the buildings and grounds in immaculate order; they prepare their own meals and even cobble their shoes. I visited the shops, as well as the class rooms where they learn to read and write, and by doing all of these things, they become proficient in home economics and various trades.

I have never visited a school which was run more efficiently or where the students were more attentive and interested in their studies.

I was much impressed by this school and I am glad to have this opportunity to tell the Congress about this splendid institution.

I would like also to mention briefly the matter of education of Indian children in public schools through tuition contracts between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the States. One of these contracts covers the education of Indian children in the public schools of Montana.

This is an excellent system of securing a proper education for the Indian children, and beyond that it is the best possible step toward making the Indian a real citizen and equal member of our society. The Indian and non-Indian children work and learn and play together. It is a healthy situation and one which will contribute greatly to the eventual end of the wardship status of the American Indian.

At present there is some difficulty in my State about the amounts of tuition to be paid by the Federal Government. State education authorities feel that they must have sizable increases over the amounts appropriated in 1950 and in the present bill. A matter of policy is involved which must be settled before it jeopardizes the success of this education program. One thing is certain: Where the Indian children are attending public schools in large numbers, in reservation districts where the trust status of Indian land reduces the tax base to a point where any kind of school is difficult to support, the Federal government must be prepared to pay its proper share of the cost of operating the schools. There should be no quibbling and no shirking of responsibility in this important obligation. It is an obligation both to the Indians and to the non-Indian citizens who are cooperating in this public-education program.

Mr. Chairman, the question raised by this amendment, concerning the operation of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, is one which has been discussed frequently in recent years and one with which I am familiar.

The original idea of decentralizing Indian Bureau affairs by establishing area offices, close to the reservations, where the bulk of Indian business could be transacted, was a good idea. The objections we are now hearing from many Indian tribes is not, I feel, an objection to this idea. It is an objection to the manner in which the system has operated.

I think the Indians would have no objection if they were able to send their business to the Billings, Mont., office, for example, and have it handled there speedily and effectively by men who were close enough to the problems to have a real understanding of them. When in the past I have defended the area-office system, I have done so because I believed that this was the intention of the Bureau.

We find, however, that the Bureau has in many instances failed to give the area offices a sufficiently clear outline of responsibility or sufficient authority to enable them to operate effectively and as the time-saving agency they should be.

Recently there has been an oil development on the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana. Oil leases have been signed which mean money to the Indians. Amounts of from several hundred to perhaps several thousand dollars are coming to the Indians as a result of this development. The leases were sent to the Billings area office for review. They were reviewed there, fully and in detail, or so I am informed. If the area-office system were working properly, that should have been enough. But now we find that these same leases have been in Washington several weeks where a man has been detailed by the Indian Office to review them once again. Final approval has been delayed. There is an apparent duplication of effort. The money these Fort Peck people need so badly, money they should have so that they can get started again after a very difficult winter, is still held up by the rigamarole of review and review.

If we are going to have area offices, we should let them do the work. If we are not going to let them do the work, we may as well not have them.

I have found that in many instances the Billings area office has been of real value. However, to the individual Indians who have business to transact, it appears to be just another bureau where their business is delayed. No one can blame them for wanting to do away with this extra delay. However, in my own opinion it is the Washington office rather than the Billings office that has failed in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE of Idaho) there were—ayes 7, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STIGLER: On page 228, line 6, strike out "$2,525,465" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,530,965."

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment resulted from a request by the Creek Tribe of Indians of our State for $5,500 of their tribal funds to acquire approximately 35 acres of land adjoining the Creek Indian school located at Eufaula. A resolution was passed by the Creek Tribal Council and a request was sent to us. I appeared before the committee. It was thought after the bill was marked up that sufficient authority was contained in this section to grant the request of the Creek Indians. Upon contacting the budget officer and the budget officer for the Indian Office, it was thought that this amount of $5,500 should be added to the total so that there could not be any question about the authority. Subsequent to that time I have contacted the majority members of the subcommittee, as well as the minority members, and I was advised that there is no objection to offering the amendment on the floor.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in order, and we accept it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Since the amendment was prepared by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] I invite his attention to the fact that a point of order has been made to the item appearing on page 229, beginning in line 3 running through line 14, which had the effect of removing $100,000 that had been previously included in the bill for attorneys' fees for the California tribe. In view of that, I desire to offer a substitute amendment which will reduce the over-all figure by that amount, $100,000, which will have the effect of taking care of the item reduced by the point of order, and will also take care of the item that the gentleman has spoken of, which I accept.

Mr. STIGLER. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington to the amendment offered by Mr. STIGLER: Strike out "$2,530,965" and insert "$2,430,965."

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATION

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, $5,150,000, of which $4,400,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the amount available for surveys and preconstruction work in connection with the North Side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho, stated in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, is increased from $725,000 to $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER:

On page 230, line 15, strike out "$5,150,000" and insert "$2,500,000".

On page 230, line 16, strike out "$4,400,000" and insert "$2,200,000".

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to reduce the funds for general investigations, economic investigations, and engineering investigations on proposed Federal reclamation projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, by $2,500,000. This is my objective; let me

state my reasons: In the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control set-up we have wiped out the provision for planning to develop new projects. At this time, when there is absolutely no excuse for embarking on any new reclamation projects, why we should continue planning for additional reclamation projects is beyond me. The situation at the present time, a situation that will probably continue for a great many years, is that we have a production of wheat nearly double the requirements of the United States and what we can sell, and there is a similar picture with reference to corn and other agricultural products. Why, at a time when we do not need the land, we should spend enormous sums of money for the development of plans for new reclamation projects is beyond any reasonable conception.

I am not hostile to the development of reclamation projects where we need the resources, but to develop new agricultural lands and new agricultural production for the purpose of providing a surplus which the Department or somebody else must immediately take off the market by an expenditure of Federal funds is beyond my comprehension. There must come a time when we approach this situation honestly and fairly, and do not approach it with the idea of just spending money and destroying the United States. I appreciate that people like to have expenditures made in their territory; frankly, there are a lot of people in my own territory who would like to have Federal money poured in there, but at this time when we have not the money to pay for it, when we have a deficit in sight, an admitted deficit of $6,000,000,000 for this year, and perhaps $7,000,000,000 for next, at a time when we have declining revenues, how we can afford not to cut down at every opportunity that presents itself, how we can afford to go on developing plans for something we ought not to embark upon and that we know we ought not to embark upon for a great many years, is way beyond my comprehension.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will take advantage of the opportunity to save $2,650,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I certainly share the gentleman's views. I call his attention to the fact that with the condition of the Federal purse what it is today, we have a provision in this bill for investigation for new projects that is even greater than a similar provision carried in last year's bill.

Mr. TABER. That is correct and there is absolutely to excuse for it because our situation is such that we ought to avoid every possible unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

This reads:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs.

Is there any Member of this Congress who wants to cut investigations down to $2,500,000 for Alaska where we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars right now on defense projects? Suppose the armed forces—Army, Navy, or Air Force—asked for houses and water up there in that part of our country? Who is going to give it to them? Where is the information coming from? It has got to come from the Department of the Interior primarily.

Mr. TABER. There is plenty of money available to take care of the Alaskan situation in the two and one-half millions I have left in the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. No. This is the one part of this bill where we made a really substantial cut.

Mr. TABER. A cut was made there, yes, but the committee still has allowed more money than this agency had last year.

Mr. KIRWAN. There is, as the gentleman well knows, more work going on in Alaska today than ever before and necessarily so.

Mr. TABER. You do not need anything outside of the Alaska job.

Mr. KIRWAN. You do not need it?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. KIRWAN. If there is any information needed anywhere in this country who is going to furnish it? We have robbed this Nation for the last 200 or 300 years of its resources. Now we could spend millions of dollars on investigation to find out how to go about the work of replenishing some of our vanishing resources, putting back into the Nation what we took out of it. I repeat, again, there is not a Member of this Congress who wants to see the terrible situation in Alaska as it is depicted in the magazines.

We should have learned our lesson in the recent war when we built the Alcan Highway. We did not have the proper information, and we never allowed the Army and the Bureau of Public Roads money for investigation. The Army came along and spent hundreds of millions of dollars on a highway that should never have been built. Yet we protest vigorously about allowing $2,000,000 for investigations. When we want to do something we are not prepared to do it because we are afraid to face up to realities.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the justification for this item, pages 168 and 169 of the hearings, there is not anything said about Alaska. It all has to do with other places insofar as any of them are specifically mentioned.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman, as the RECORD will show, wants to make a cut in the $5,000,000 item reading "and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska."

Mr. TABER. The Alaska investigations are only $250,000. The two and one-half million dollars that are left would take care of that 10 times over.

Mr. KIRWAN. Does the gentleman realize how much water it takes to make 1 ton of steel?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. KEATING. Water is our finest and greatest mineral. It takes about 250 tons of water to make 1 ton of steel. That is a part of the investigation.

Mr. TABER. There is no steel in this bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. This is for investigations to get water to make steel and other beneficial uses.

Mr. TABER. Where do you get steel anywhere around where this Territory is located?

Mr. KIRWAN. This item is for an investigation of our water and other resources all over America. The Geological Survey has men all along the streams, in all our steel valleys, testing the water datum. That comes out of the fund for this Department, whether it is in Youngstown, Ohio, Chicago, Utah, or Alaska. All over this Nation you will find men setting up the instruments along the streams investigating the water.

I again say do not start cutting or trying to cut this one thing which covers investigations of our natural resources, and which is what we need to keep this country in a proper perspective.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I have already had complaints from my area that this committee, with the pending provision—not the amendment suggested, but the existing provision—has cut this to the bone.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; and you are not alone.

Mr. CARROLL. I find that during the fiscal year 1951 that the Bureau of Reclamation asked for $12,500,000, and the Bureau of the Budget cut that to $7,800,000, and then the committee cut it again to $5,500,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is the one part of the bill that our committee cut more than any other part.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 42, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment apply to

the section just read and the succeeding section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the amendment to the succeeding section affect the dollar amount in those sections?

Mr. HOLMES. It will not affect the over-all total of the bill but it will affect the dollar amount in both sections; both the section first read and the succeeding section.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will it affect the dollar amount in the next succeeding section?

Mr. HOLMES. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]:

On page 230, line 13, after the word "expended", insert the sum "$4,975,000", instead of "$5,150,000."

Page 230, line 16, after the word "which", insert the sum "$4,225,000", instead of "$4,400,000."

Page 231, line 11, after the word "expended", insert "$297,642,000", instead of "$297,467,000."

Page 231, line 12, after the word "which", insert "$23,072,700", instead of "$22,897,700."

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, while this amendment sounds a little intricate, it is a very simple amendment, which is why I submitted the request I did. It takes from the general investigation funds $175,000 and adds to the construction funds this same $175,000.

The reason for this amendment is this: The Budget allowed the Kennewick extension of the Yakima project in the State of Washington $175,000 of planning money. It therefore will not affect the planning or investigation moneys for any other projects.

The Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations in its report on page 172, at the bottom of the page, states as follows:

The committee does not agree with the determination of the Bureau of the Budget in rejecting appropriations for the construction of the Kennewick division, Yakima project, Washington, under this expression of policy. The committee has considered this division and has determined that it is not a new project but is part of the Yakima project under such policy.

Therefore, the purpose of this amendment, without interfering with budget approval or without interfering with investigation moneys for any other projects in the United States, is merely to transfer the $175,000 for planning on the Kennewick division of the Yakima project from that category of investigation to the category of construction money for that project, under the suggestion of the committee's statement that it is not considered by the committee as a new project.

I urge that this amendment be adopted and that the $175,000 be placed in the category of aid to construction.

In closing, may I add that the transfer of these moneys will not in any way change the total sum of money involved in the entire bill. It merely transfers $175,000 from general investigations to the construction moneys in the succeeding chapter, under the unanimous consent to offer the amendment in this form.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that much investigation, in fact, sufficient investigation has already been made on the Kennewick project in years gone by, and that the gentleman's amendment, instead of costing anything, will actually save $175,000 because that $175,000, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, will now be used on the construction of the project. We know the project will be constructed because it is authorized.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a very worthwhile project.

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I call your attention to the importance of starting construction with this money in the manner I have suggested by this amendment. When the Hanford Engineering Works came into existence in this area of the State of Washington there was taken out of production approximately 7,000 acres of irrigated land under that condemnation. This will in turn start the construction of this division, which seeks to put back into economic balance the agricultural economy of that area.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. What is the nature of this project?

Mr. HOLMES. An irrigation and multiple-purpose project.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington made a request of me when we started on the bill this afternoon and the request was fine and quite in order. I gave him my word that I would not object to the statement which he has just made. He has made a request to shift $175,000 from investigations to the Kennewick project. He made this request on the basis of the fact that the committee said in its report they thought this was not a new project. We did make that report but there was no money in the budget for this project. We did give our opinion that we thought it was not a new project.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. There was $175,000 of investigational money allowed for this project, was there not?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, for investigations but not for construction.

Mr. HOLMES. Would not the gentleman agree that having carried on the investigation as far as it has gone, and we know we are capable of going ahead with construction, that the transfer of this $175,000 which is a budget item would not in any way interfere with any other investigation and we could just as well go on with the construction of the project in the face of the fact that the committee reports they do not think this is a new project and it would not be ruled out on that basis?

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Washington is correct in that statement.

The committee made that report that they did not think it was a new project. But there is no money in the budget for construction. I, as a member of the committee, do not think that is a good thing to transfer funds for investigation purposes to start construction. If we set this precedent practically every Member who has a project in his district would ask for the same consideration.

Mr. HOLMES. Would it not be a point of importance in relation to this amendment to try in the face of the committee's opinion that it is not a new project to get this land into irrigation and under cultivation as fast as we can, to take the place of the land which was taken out by the condemnation of the Hanford Engineering Works under the war emergency? I believe that makes for a unique situation with respect to this particular amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. I agree with what the gentleman has said. There may be several things in his favor here but there is no money requested from the budget for construction. This committee made the determination when they sat down that they were going to try to cut this bill. Many Members wanted some money for a project in their district which the committee would not allow.

Mr. HOLMES. The fact that there was no money in this bill recommended by the budget for construction is because it was ruled that it was a new project. But since the committee has disagreed with the Bureau does that not make a difference? And give the power of authorizing this money for construction?

Mr. KIRWAN. This is why the committee disagreed. They said that when the Bureau of the Budget read our report, if they do read it, then maybe next year they would come to an understanding that the Congress recognized this project as not being a new project and they would make a request for funds.

Mr. HOLMES. Because of the emergency situation caused by the great influx of population there and the condemnation that took approximately 7,000 acres of land would you not consider it a matter of wisdom without changing the over-all amount of the appropriation contained in this bill for construction in the Bureau of Reclamation that this particular transfer could be made to get these acres under construction and under irrigation?

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman has heard me say in the well of the House that any money that is spent on America cannot be wasted. I have that same belief and philosophy as I stand here now. But we also made an agreement in committee that we would not add any new construction money if the budget did

not see fit to ask for it. We do not think it is a new project. Next year they can come in and ask for funds. We have to keep our word with our committee as well as with the Congress and I do not want to turn around and ask to spend money to start on any new construction when we already have an ironclad agreement that we would not do so.

Mr. HOLMES. In the face of this emergency and in view of the fact that the chairman of your committee has sat in on the hearings on this particular project and the committee does not believe it a new project, would you not still think it wise to try to get this extension under way as quickly as possible, especially when it can be done so easily and readily by the transfer of these funds? It seems to me with the committee so ruling it not a new project that those funds could be authorized now for construction.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would try to get it in another body; not with a committee that already said they are not going to spend a dime on new construction.

Mr. HOLMES. What would be the purpose of trying to get it in another body when we have an opportunity to do it right here?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because the committee is objecting to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this paragraph to reduce the figure on line 11, page 231. Is it necessary for me to offer it at this time as a substitute, or may I offer it after the disposition of the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. In reply to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will have to state that if the pending amendment is not adopted, the gentleman could then offer his amendment, but if the pending amendment is adopted, then it would not be in order to offer the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Then I offer the amendment at this time as a substitute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. The unanimous-consent request that was granted does not extend to others the opportunity to offer amendments to a paragraph that has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement it certainly would open the door for that to be done. Otherwise, Members who might want to increase the other amount would be prevented from doing it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was exactly why I raised the question I did at the time the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] offered his amendment. I am sure the RECORD will show that I raised that question at the time. It occurred to me that once this figure was changed, it could not subsequently be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asked the gentleman from Washington a question about his amendment. The Chair did not reply to it. The gentleman from Washington made reply to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. His reply was that it did not change the figure in the next paragraph.

Mr. HOLMES. I am sorry I must have misunderstood you. I said in the succeeding section and I understood you to say the next succeeding section.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Had he said it would change the figure in the next paragraph, I was contemplating raising the very question which has now come up.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Is this not the situation: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] should be adopted, then no further amendment changing the figure in the paragraph beginning on line 8, page 231, would be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. HOLMES: On page 231, line 11, strike out "$297,467,000" and insert "$240,391,125."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in support of his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment at least has the merit of simplicity. I realize that it will probably be vigorously opposed. It does simply this: It reduces the amount for construction of reclamation projects 25 percent below the budget estimates; not below the amount in the bill, $297,000,000, but below the budget estimate, $320,000,000. It cuts $80,000,000 from the budget figures, but only $57,000,000 from the bill before us.

This omnibus bill contains reductions below the requests submitted by the Corps of Engineers for rivers and harbors and flood control projects amount to 25 percent, but there was a reduction in the reclamation projects of only 7 percent. I see no reason for making any such distinction. There is nothing sacrosanct about the amounts allowed for the activities of either of these Government agencies. No doubt, every Member has one or more projects in his district which he would like to see advanced as quickly as possible. But it seems to me that if there was ever a time in the financial history of our Nation that we needed to view this problem with our minds focused on the over-all picture rather than on our own individual local problems, that time is now.

The continuation year after year of deficit financing and our plunge deeper and deeper into the sea of red ink presents to me an extremely disturbing picture. If this were happening to us in our own business or our own family, we would be lying awake nights worrying about how we could ever make ends meet. Ours is the responsibility to bend every conceivable effort to see that the Federal cloth is cut to fit the pattern, which can mean only one thing, reductions all along the line, painful as they may be.

Specifically, if the financial condition of this country were different, it might be prudent to bring about equalization between the engineer projects and the reclamation projects by an across-the-board increase in the former. But certainly, in the face of our national debt of over a quarter of a trillion dollars—a new word on which Uncle Sam has an exclusive copyright—in the face of the added fact that we are confronted with the sobering realization that the tragic state of our finances is bound to be worse before it is better, it seems to me the prudent course for us is to make at least as great a reduction in the provision for reclamation projects as the Appropriations Committee has made in the civil functions bill on projects handled by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand that the gentleman's reduction will be applied as a 25 percent reduction straight across the board?

Mr. KEATING. I do not think I am in a position to decide that question. I notice that in the proposed reductions which are set forth on page 170 of the report the Interior Department has not done that to date; in other words, they have not made a 7 percent reduction across the board; they have reduced some projects more than 7 percent; they have left others just as they are. How they have determined where to cut and where not to cut is something that is entirely beyond my knowledge.

The result of the adoption of this amendment would be that 25 percent less than the budget estimates would be available for all phases of this particular activity.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The Missouri Valley item was reduced 10 percent; the rest of the item from this bill for reclamation was scarcely touched. I offered an amendment in the full committee to bring the rest of the items in line with the cut which was made for the Missouri Valley and was roundly whipped by the members of the opposition. But I want the gentleman to understand that I have possibly a better economy record than has the gentleman who has offered this amendment. I also want him to understand that I resent his taking upon himself the privilege of offering this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I am sorry that the gentleman feels as he does.

Mr. JENSEN. I say that because the gentleman knows exactly nothing about it.

Mr. KEATING. I refuse to yield further; I am very sorry.

Mr. JENSEN. And you are not running my business.

Mr. KEATING. I am very sorry the gentleman feels as he does.

Mr. JENSEN. I helped cut out of this bill $47,000,000 in committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. And you are not running my committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that I have the highest regard for him and the splendid record he has made for economy in this Congress. I appreciate all that he has done. I commend him for it. I realize that perhaps his interests or his views at times may not coincide with mine. I hope he will accord me the same sincerity of purpose which I am very happy to accord to him. I assure him that I am not trying to interfere with his fine service on this important committee. If his conscience dictates opposition to this amendment, that is his decision which I would be the last to criticize. I trust he will equally recognize my privilege to take the position that my sense of duty dictates.

I feel that it would be only fair to treat all projects on the same basis whatever their origin. That is the effect of my amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. But you are not doing it. You have taken 35 percent out of the Missouri Valley project. I have got around 100,000 acres of land out there right now lying under water because we have not had necessary flood-control funds, and now you are proposing to take 25 percent off the rest of them.

Mr. KEATING. My amendment is not directed to any particular project. It is an over-all figure of 25 percent and involves only the total figure contained in the budget estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN STUDENT NURSE DAYS, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 455.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the nursing profession, which provides one of the vital health services of the Nation, there is a continuing shortage of registered professional nurses; and

Whereas in order to provide adequate numbers of graduate nurses in future years, 50,000 new students should be enrolled in schools of professional nursing in 1950: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That in order to emphasize the needs of hospitals and health services for additional nurses, and to direct attention to the satisfaction of careers in nursing and the opportunities for service to humanity within this profession, the 6th and 7th days of May 1950 be designated American Student Nurse Days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIUS ZAFFARENI — VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 581)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1481, a bill for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the estate of Julius Zaffareni, a Work Projects Administration employee, late of Boston, Mass., the sum of $2,559.05. This payment would be in full settlement of all claims of the estate against the United States arising out of Mr. Zaffareni's death on November 16, 1939, when he was killed by a backing truck operated by another Work Projects Administration employee. The bill recites the fact that the same amount had been awarded as damages and costs to the estate by a Massachusetts State court on July 29, 1941, in a suit against the truck driver, and that this judgment remains unsatisfied because of the defendant's inability to pay. Under the terms of the bill, this sum would be payable only upon the assignment to the United States of all rights of the estate under such judgment.

It appears from the files of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, which administers the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, that when the fatal injuries were inflicted upon the decedent by the negligent act of his fellow employee, the decedent was in the performance of his duty, and that the case was therefore one cognizable under the Compensation Act. Under the terms of that act, however, compensation for death, except burial expenses, is payable only to certain classes of dependents specified in the act.

On June 15, 1940, a claim for compensation was filed on behalf of Sabina Loriso, who is said to be the only surviving sister and heir-at-law of the decedent and is the administratrix of his estate. The claim could not be allowed, both because there was no showing that she was dependent for support upon the employee at the time of his death and because she was married, married brothers and sisters being excluded from benefits. It appears, however, that a burial payment of $200 was made under the Compensation Act to the undertaking firm which had conducted the funeral of the decedent.

The report of the Senate Judiciary Committee—Senate Report No. 1459—indicates that the Congress based its action in passing this bill upon the judicial finding of negligence in the State court proceedings, and upon the premise that if the accident had occurred after the effective date of the Federal Tort Claims Act—January 1, 1945—the claimant could have sued and collected against the Government and that, therefore, to deny relief in this case would be an arbitrary avoidance of a just obligation.

It would seem, however, that in basing the bill on these premises the Congress overlooked the vital fact that the fatal injuries suffered by this Government employee occurred during the performance of his duties, and that the Congress has provided a carefully designed system of workmen's compensation to cover such injuries and deaths regardless of the question of negligence and has designated the classes of persons who should be beneficiaries and the conditions which they must meet in order to qualify as such. The basic principle of the United States Employees' Compensation Act in this respect was to provide compensation to those persons who were dependent upon the deceased and were deprived by his death of a means of support, not to accord a monetary award for grief or mental suffering or other damages for which compensation may be awarded in a State court proceeding.

The Congress also appears to have overlooked the recent enactment of Public Law 357, Eighty-first Congress, providing, in substance, that the liability of the United States to persons entitled to receive benefits under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall be exclusive and in lieu of any other liability to such persons under other applicable Federal statutes. While it is true that this limitation, which also applies with respect to most of the State workmen's compensation laws, was not a part of the Compensation Act at the time of this accident, such limitation was unnecessary since the Government could not then be sued in tort.

In my opinion, the Congress acted wisely in removing any cause for doubt as to the exclusiveness of the remedy afforded by this act to Federal personnel. In view of the blanket coverage which is provided by this legislation, it is reasonable to conclude that these employees have, by entering the Federal service, waived rights to which other persons not so employed are entitled. They have, in other words, relinquished any right of action against the United States which might accrue to them as a result of injury or death sustained

during the course of Federal employment, in exchange for the assured and orderly protection, independent of the question of fault or negligence, which the Federal Employees' Compensation Act affords not only to such employees but also to their surviving dependents in case of death. This view is supported by the legislative history of Public Law 357, Eighty-first Congress.

No sound reason is perceived why, under similar circumstances, the foregoing principle should not apply to the legislative as well as the judicial process.

Accordingly, I have withheld my approval from this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1950.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and the accompanying message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., and that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Friday at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are some committees of this House that have very important matters before them. When the House convenes at 11 o'clock every day it simply means that these committees cannot get their work done. I certainly do not like to put myself in the position of going against the will of the leadership, but I know that our committee has had very little time in which to do the job we have to do. If we are going to meet at 11 o'clock every day it will probably be a very long time before we get any tax measure out of the committee, and I know the membership of this House is very much concerned about the long time it has taken to get that bill out. I am wondering whether or not some arrangement could not be made so that this appropriation measure would not stifle all other important legislation at this session of the Congress. It seems that this one-package appropriation bill has upset the procedure that has been in existence in this House for many, many years, and I think it is a detriment to the enactment of legislation which we could properly class as "must" legislation. I seriously doubt whether this unanimous-consent request should be granted, but not having talked the matter over with the leadership at this time, I will not object. I hope, however, that he confines his request to tomorrow only, though.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, after conferring with my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], I was going to confine my unanimous consent request to tomorrow. Of course, my friend from Pennsylvania realizes, as one of the responsible leaders of the House, being a democratic member of the Committee on Ways and Means, that the leadership knows that he always cooperates, and I compliment the gentleman. Of course, we are not meeting every day at 11 o'clock, and the leadership would not do this unless there were urgent reasons. We have to consider a certain number of reorganization plans under the law, and the leadership is under a trying situation. We have certain responsibilities to carry out, and we have got to get these reorganization plans up on or before May 23, and it is imperative that we do so because the law provides for it. The leadership, I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania will admit, is very tolerant and understanding.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations, by having priority on this so-called one package appropriation bill, has practically taken over the leadership of the House insofar as legislation is concerned. We are not able to consider any legislation unless we have the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and that has been true for the past 3 weeks and probably will be true for the next 2 or 3 weeks. I want to call attention to that fact so that the leadership is not taken away from the Speaker and the majority leader, in cooperation with the minority leader. I do not want the leadership taken away from those three gentlemen.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that, but I assure my friend that that is not so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Further reserving the right to object, the majority leader will admit that he is not able to bring in legislation unless the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations gives up his priority insofar as that bill is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, with the appropriation bill up, there would be no other legislation that would be brought up anyway.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And there never will be if we meet at 11 o'clock every morning. We met one week practically every day at 11 o'clock and as the result the committees could not work, unless they sneaked away in the afternoon, and as a result we are not here on the floor to vote on amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, unfortunately I have business in the interest of my constituents tomorrow morning, and I cannot be here at 11. Being all alone here, being neither a member of the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party, I have got to look out for myself and my constituents. So, therefore, I object.

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on that bill. I may say that the probabilities are that this conference report will be considered the first thing tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OHIO SWISS CHEESE

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1950, my friend, Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH of Wisconsin, inserted an article entitled "Monroe Issues Challenge" in the RECORD. The good citizens of Monroe were enraged over the criticism given of Wisconsin Swiss cheese by Bill Jones in the Minneapolis Tribune in which he claimed that Ohio Swiss cheese was far better than that made in Wisconsin. Last week, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] challenged me to a "taste test" between Wisconsin and Ohio cheese. This test is to be made in the House dining room on Friday, May 19. As representative of the Sixteenth District of Ohio, composed of Holmes, Stark, and Tuscarawas Counties, where almost all of the 32 Ohio Swiss cheese plants are located, and on behalf of the Ohio Swiss Cheese Association and its members, I proudly accept the challenge made by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, with full faith that the distinctive flavor of Ohio Swiss will whet the appetite of my colleagues here assembled and cause them to vote unanimously in favor of our product.

The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association has sent to me a wheel of its cheese. This wheel was made by Mr. John Schneider, of the Ragersville Dairy and his assistant, Mr. Carlos Meeks. I believe that you Members will be interested in the story of Ohio Swiss cheese manufacture. Sugarcreek, situated about 12 miles west of New Philadelphia, is the Swiss cheese capital of Ohio and compares in that position with Monroe, Wis. There are a total of 32 cheese factories in Ohio as of April 1950, with 8 factories within a 9-mile radius of Sugarcreek. The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association has as members 27 of these 32 factories. Three of the remaining 5 produce cheese full time, while the other 2 make cheese only during the surplus milk months in the summer. Ohio, at the present time, ranks third in Swiss cheese production and makes approximately one-tenth of the Nation's total production. At one time, Ohio was second but recently has lost out to Illinois. Wisconsin is in first place. The amount produced by each State in 1948 is as follows: Wisconsin, 43,192,000 pounds; Illinois, 10,372,000 pounds, and Ohio, 7,000,000 pounds. The total United States production is 70,665,000 pounds. There are only three Swiss cheese factories east of Ohio, all of them in

Pennsylvania. In Ohio, Tuscarawas County is generally considered the focal point of the industry, but Holmes County has 11 factories to Tuscarawas County's 9. Swiss cheese making in Ohio is confined entirely to Tuscarawas, Holmes, Wayne, Stark, and Coshocton Counties.

As can be seen from the production records, Ohio can never compete with Wisconsin in quantity; but quality and flavor are two other things. It is generally felt in Ohio and by men who know both States well, that Swiss cheese produced in Ohio is in general a higher quality product than that produced in Wisconsin and in Illinois. Ohio cheese is not, however, sold in as many places as Wisconsin cheese because of the large demand for Ohio cheese in its home State. Among the largest retail outlets for Ohio Swiss are Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and points serviced by these cities; Pittsburgh, Erie, Indianapolis, Philadelphia, New York City, and Toledo are some of the other cities that use a large amount of Ohio Swiss. There are, of course, many other large Ohio cities that use a lot of our local product. The first Swiss cheese factory was started in Ohio more than 75 years ago when immigrants from Switzerland arrived in Tuscarawas County. The hills of Tuscarawas County are said to have closely resembled their homeland as any section of America they had seen. Originally all of the cheese makers were born in Switzerland but there are now some second generation and even some who have only indirect Swiss ancestry. However, most of the cheese makers are still "Swiss."

The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association was organized in 1918 to improve the quality and selling conditions for Ohio cheese. Each December the Association holds a "Cheese Day" meeting at which the best cheese maker of the year is selected. Other contests between Ohio producers are held annually at county fairs held at Wooster and Dover and at the Ohio State Fair. In 1940 a few factories set up another association known as the Federated Ohio Swiss Cheese Producers. The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association along with the State and Federal Government, has a full-time technician at work aiding factories in problems they may encounter in manufacture. At the present time the technician is Fred Ryser. He operates a modern laboratory in Sugarcreek and visits the various member factories regularly. Most of the Ohio factories are cooperatively owned by farmers who supply the cheese maker with milk. Only six plants are privately owned, in most cases by the cheese maker himself.

On behalf of the Ohio Swiss Cheese Association, its member dairies and all the Ohio cheese makers and the people of the Sixteenth Ohio District, I proudly accept the challenge laid down by my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I now wish to invite you all to try our Ohio Swiss which will be served in the House dining room on Friday, May 19. I leave final judgment to you, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, whether the flavor of Ohio Swiss is better than that of Wisconsin.

FORMER OFFICER ASKS MILITARY JUSTICE BILL VETO

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to an article that appeared in the Evening Star of May 2, wherein Capt. Robert B. Ritchie, who served for a considerable period in the Judge Advocate General Corps in Germany, has requested the President to veto a military-justice bill that was recently approved by the House and Senate, the bill being H. R. 4080.

In order to get this matter before the House, I am asking unanimous consent that I may include the newspaper article, also a copy of the letter directed to the President of the United States, wherein Captain Ritchie calls attention to what he believes to be defects in this bill. He points out that in his judgment the legislation does not reach the objective intended by the Congress. The newspaper article and letter follow:

FORMER OFFICER ASKS MILITARY-JUSTICE BILL VETO

A former Army legal officer asked President Truman today to veto the military justice bill so that several vicious features of the measure might be corrected by Congress.

Capt. Robert B. Ritchie, who served in the Judge Advocate General Corps in Berlin until leaving the service on March 31, wrote the President that the bill passed last week falls short of its aim to improve the military court-martial system.

Congress, he declared, was on the right track in trying to lessen the power of the chain of military command over courts martial. It made headway in efforts to eliminate the danger of improper influence by high-ranking officers in appointments and deliberations, he said.

But the provision for a civilian court of appeals and the over-all section specifying penalties for violation of the general act would not provide sufficient safeguards, Captain Ritchie declared.

"The Judge Advocate General," he explained, "has the authority to increase the work load of the court at will by ordering cases sent to it. Thus he can influence the court by harassing it; or if the court should not have enough business, he can influence it by throwing it enough work to justify its existence.

"None of these influences would exist if the Judge Advocate was required to go to the court by certiorari."

Captain Ritchie, who lives in Wichita, Kans., said a more serious defect in the bill is that it would take away from the Army and Air Force personnel the long-standing right to demand trial. Under the present system, in many cases, they may agree to accept nonjudicial punishment, or may insist on a court martial.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 28, 1950.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: After my separation from the Army March 31 as a captain in the Judge Advocate General Corps I completed my study of H. R. 4080, now before you for veto consideration, and submitted my analysis of its defects to a Member of Congress with the hope that if the bill passed without substantial change, amendments necessary to make it carry out the congressional intent would be affected. Unfortunately this effort was unsuccessful. I now submit in abbreviated form the mentioned defects to you for consideration:

1. Congress, rather than establish an independent judicial system for the armed services, which it thought was desirable but impractical, formulated, to overcome improper domination of courts martial, two devices. These were article 98, thought to make it a penalty to violate article 37, prohibiting unlawful influencing of court members, and article 67, believed to establish a civilian-composed Court of Military Appeals free from the possibility of military control or influence. Neither device performs its intended function, because—

(a) Article 37 is not a provision regulating the proceedings before, during, or after trial of an accused.

(b) The Judge Advocate General has the authority to increase the work load of the court at will by ordering cases sent to it. Thus he can influence the court by harassing it, or if the court should not have enough business, as may happen, he can influence it by doing it the favor of throwing it enough work to justify its existence. Neither of these influences would exist, if the Judge Advocate General was required to go to the court by certiorari, the method in all cases except those involving high-ranking officers and death penalties.

2. Following are three other vicious features of the bill:

(a) Article 15 takes away from Army and Air Force personnel the law prescribed protection of the right to demand trial rather than to submit to nonjudicial punishment because the Navy felt it could not maintain discipline aboard ship unless it had the right to confine a man on bread and water without trial. This right is unnecessary if it understands and uses properly the judicial punishment system.

(b) Articles 3 and 43, when combined, would permit many individuals formerly subject to military law to be brought back into the service and tried for practically any offense at any time during their natural life, because all offenses are punishable by at least life imprisonment—"as a court martial may direct"—and the statute of limitations may be tolled by filing charges in a nonpublic office.

Since the defects pointed out above result probably from a failure to consider details, and since they can be easily corrected, I recommend to you, Mr. President, that the bill be vetoed.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT BOWLAND RITCHIE.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from Liberty magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the Members of the House today on what in my opinion is one of the most important problems facing our country today, it is my earnest desire to call to their attention a piece of legislation that will do much to rectify a very serious condition. The bill I refer to is H. R. 5939, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman TOM BURKE, and known as the teachers' salary bill. It provides for Federal assistance in such a manner that it in nowise could be

considered controversial or discriminatory except by those who might be opposed to providing a better education for the children of our Nation through Federal aid.

For those Members who perhaps have not had the opportunity to become familiar with the critical situation now existing in this field I recommend and solicit their reading of the following article which appeared in the May issue of Liberty magazine which I intend to include at the conclusion of my remarks. We of the House Committee on Education and Labor who have been working so diligently on this subject know of the great need for this legislation as well as the serious need for assistance for other phases of this broad problem. Yesterday I called your attention to some of those in the extension of my remarks on pages A3211 and A3212 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

While I appreciate that the subcommittee of which I am a member has been working continuously for many weeks drafting and perfecting the necessarily complex bills 7940 and 8113 which deal with a small but very important portion of this over-all problem and which are now practically ready for the full committee's consideration and action, I urge the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], the chairman of this great committee, along with the chairman of its various subcommittees to postpone any conflicting meetings or any others that might interfere with immediate and full consideration of and with the definite view in mind of getting these vitally needed pieces of legislation—H. R. 7940, 8113, and 5939—to the floor of the House for speedy passage.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not my intention or wish to create the erroneous impression that these gentlemen have not in every way given full cooperation along with much of their valuable time. However, I feel that more encouragement to all of us to work harder, giving our full attention to these specific bills, would be of great value.

I am sure that the President is very much in favor of such a program as I have outlined and I cannot too strongly urge your full support. I have been deeply interested in the proposition that all of our children whom we must realize are our future citizens and leaders be given an opportunity for good educations. Also that those giving their lives to the teaching of these children be treated fairly and equitably so that they may live and enjoy a life more nearly commensurate with their worth to our society.

In a democracy it is essential that our youth get the kind of education that will prepare them for responsible citizenship. The American way of life will grow and flourish only as we maintain a strong system of education.

[From Liberty magazine]

WE ARE STARVING OUR TEACHERS

(By Benjamin Fine)

(America's future depends on the schooling our children get today. Yet we pay schoolteachers less than rat exterminators; less than charwomen and garbage collectors. In this article Liberty presents the shocking truth about teachers' salaries.)

Let's begin by being brutally frank about it.

We are starving our teaching profession. We aren't paying our teachers a living wage.

Our teachers' low salaries have become a national disgrace. We are weakening our democratic way of life because we are unwilling to pay our teachers enough to make them want to teach. Hundreds of thousands of them are constantly in debt, trying to make ends meet. Many communities pay their garbage collectors more than their teachers. It is not unusual to find the street cleaners, prison cooks, dog catchers, and comfort-station attendants getting more than teachers. Policemen, firemen, bus drivers, and other city workers are financial aristocrats compared to classroom instructors.

The average teacher today gets $2,880 a year—just about $55 a week. That sounds like a lot of money compared to her prewar salary. But inflationary costs have cut into her purchasing power. The $55 of 1950 is not worth as much as $40 was in 1940.

Two hundred thousand teachers in the United States make less than $35 a week now. Half this number get less than $30. Some teachers get as little as $10 a week. Could you hire a dog catcher for that salary?

Here are some painful facts to mull over: Three out of every four teachers in Mississippi get less than $30 a week. One out of every two gets less than that in Kentucky, Arkansas, Georgia, and North Dakota. In 10 States—Arkansas, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, and South Carolina—one out of every two teachers gets less than $35 a week.

But that isn't all. In a survey I made for the New York Times not long ago, I found that the minimum wages paid teachers are fantastically small. For example, some teachers are getting as little as $450 a year in Nebraska, $500 in Mississippi, $524 in Kentucky, $696 in Tennessee, $700 in Arkansas, and $900 in Alabama.

With the cost of eggs, butter, meat, and coffee being what it is, how can you live on $450 a year ($8.65 a week) or even $500 ($9.62 a week)?

"I can't hire a decent janitor for that," a school superintendent said plaintively. "How can I get a teacher to work at starvation wages?"

It just doesn't make sense.

Here's a letter that a teacher wrote his county superintendent.

"DEAR SIR: I don't think I'll teach any more. I'm now earning $8.25 weekly. I can't get married on that. I reckon I'll go to work on the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad. They pay section hands $7 a day.

"If you can pay more, write me. I like to teach. If not, I'll be over Tuesday with the books and blackboard."

The implications are startling. From 8 to 12 years of their formative period our children are in constant contact with their teachers. No one in our community—not even bus drivers, policemen, or firemen—plays such an important role in molding the minds of youth. The shape our country will be in tomorrow depends upon the schooling our kids get today.

I spoke to the chairman of the board of education in a small town not long ago. "What do you pay your teachers?" I asked. He called in the business manager and was informed it was $25 a week.

"Why, that's impossible!" he exclaimed. "My office boy gets more than that!"

Teachers get less money than members of any other recognized profession. They are far below, in average earnings, members of the medical, dental, engineering, and law professions. They make less than the average newspaperman does, or the average truck driver. Oftentimes they make less than unskilled laborers; they rarely make as much as a carpenter, plumber, electrician, or bricklayer.

In 1948, for example, the average net remuneration in medicine was $11,300; and for civil engineers in private industry, $9,000. Dentists earned $7,039. The teacher's average salary in the United States for 1948 was $2,500, or less than a fourth of that of the medical profession. In 1943 all manufacturing employees earned an average of $3,040, compared with about $2,500 for teachers.

In New York City, building construction workers get more than $5,000 a year. Teachers start at $2,500, and reach $5,000, if they are lucky, after 15 years of service.

Maybe that is why most of the 75,000 teachers in New York State—where salaries are among the highest in the country—have to work on the side to supplement their income. Just listen: One man sold cemetery lots to pay his bills. Another took a job in a hotel scrubbing floors. Teachers hold all kinds of part-time jobs: truck drivers, welders, shoe salesmen, florists, ticket sellers, real-estate salesmen, carpenters, milkmen, waiters, cooks, barbers, and chambermaids. Sixty former teachers in Chicago took jobs as waitresses or dice-game girls—and earned from $36 to $70 a week, plus meals.

Perhaps it's not bad to work in your spare time, but what about your professional growth? You just don't have time to serve as a barber from 6 to 12, as one teacher did, if you're in the classroom from 9 to 3, and expect to keep up with modern-teaching methods.

If your salary for teaching is $60 a month, and school is open only 6 months of the year, you may find it tough living on $360 for 12 months. Maybe you, too, would feel puzzled, as did the country school teacher in Copiah County, Mississippi.

"What do you do the rest of the time when you are not teaching?" the Mississippi miss was asked.

"The last four summers I worked, beginning the last of March until June, at a factory," she replied. "We made containers for vegetables."

After a moment's pause she said wryly, "I make more in 1 week in the factory than I make in a month teaching."

The obvious question comes to mind: Why does she continue to teach?

"Teaching is my profession," she replied with dignity. "I would rather teach than do anything else."

When a teacher earns more making vegetable containers than she does teaching children, just what is her profession anyway? Is she a teacher or a vegetable-container maker? Not long ago a teacher in West Virginia, earning $178 a month—not enough to keep himself and family in food and clothes—was suspended for digging coal on the side. He made $320 a month for his part-time job. And when a Brooklyn war veteran, getting $50 a week for teaching, found that he needed the $60 a week he made as a bartender in the evening hours, his social status, and even his job, was endangered. But what about the Tennessee school principal who worked Saturdays as a grocery clerk, or the teacher who hired himself out as a cotton picker? Can they carry full-time jobs on the side and still expect to be good teachers?

A Buffalo teacher gave a frank answer. After 30 years in the profession, he can't support his wife and two children on the $50 he takes home weekly.

"I make more selling vacuum cleaners than I do teaching," he confessed, "but my teaching suffers."

When we pay shoe salesmen and charwomen more than we do our teachers, we are not getting the best brains for our chil-

dren. Our schools are the very cornerstone of our democracy. Let's not chip away at the corners.

A Nation-wide survey conducted by Liberty shows the vast gap that exists between salaries paid to teachers and those paid to other city employees. In virtually every one of the Nation's largest cities, rookie policemen, firemen, as well as transit workers and garbage collectors, get a higher beginning salary than do teachers.

Now, it may well be that our large cities couldn't get along without policemen, firemen, transit workers, and garbage collectors. But can we get along without adequately trained teachers? Unless we are willing to pay teachers at least as much as we do garbage collectors, we can't expect to get our best youth to enter the teaching profession.

Here are beginning salaries for policemen, firemen, transit workers, garbage collectors, and teachers in 15 of our largest cities—a shameful eye-opener for all of us:

City	Policemen	Firemen	Transit workers	Garbage collectors	Teachers
New York	$3,150	$3,150	$2,979	$3,250	$2,500
Chicago	3,012	3,012	3,224	2,756	2,500
Philadelphia	4,024	2,944	3,692	2,643	2,400
Detroit	3,257	3,257	4,400	3,037	3,046
Cleveland	2,748	2,640	3,600	3,070	2,700
Baltimore	2,600	2,700	3,619	2,845	2,600
St. Louis	3,144	3,144	2,240	2,580	2,400
Boston	2,800	2,800	3,120	2,613	2,484
Pittsburgh	2,979	2,979	3,224	2,912	2,200
San Francisco	3,420	3,420	3,759	4,368	2,700
Minneapolis	3,036	3,036	3,162	3,016	2,400
Houston, Tex	2,700	2,700	3,772	2,496	2,403
Seattle	3,120	3,120	3,360	3,575	2,600
Louisville, Ky	2,400	2,400	3,350	2,600	2,400
Milwaukee	3,360	3,360	3,500	3,096	2,807
Average	2,983	2,977	3,400	2,990	2,609

What a grave indictment. Virtually every one of our largest cities pay policemen, firemen, transit workers, and garbage collectors more than teachers. The entering teacher gets, in our largest cities, an average salary of $2,609. But the garbage collector can count on $2,990.

Of course, through annual increments of $100 to $150 a year, the teachers' salaries frequently pull away from the collectors of garbage. But it takes long years of preparation to be a teacher. In each of the cities reached by Liberty, the teacher is required to have at least a 4-year college education before she gets her certificate. It is doubtful whether that is expected of garbage collectors or even the higher-paid bus or subway drivers.

If teachers' salaries are so out of line in the large cities, what about the small rural communities, or the cities and towns below 25,000 population? Here we find the salaries even more pitifully inadequate. To quote but a few instances: Teachers in Stuttgart, Ark., get $1,230 a year; in Madisonville, Ky., $1,329; Van Buren, Maine, $1,631; Aberdeen, Miss., $1,080; and Ripley, Tenn., $1,427.

How can a teacher live on $20 or $25 a week and expect to keep up with modern educational practices, dress well, and serve as a model to the youth of the community? Does it make sense that tens of thousands of teachers get paid less than garbage collectors and rat exterminators?

Maybe that is why the superintendent in a Georgia rural-school system got this puzzling letter of complaint from one of his teachers: "Dear Sir: When I since [signed?] up Wednesday I was to since up for four check and I just since up for two check and that made four time for me too. If this don't go to the write place send it on to the one to—and since you up. Ever two week. I don't you to since me my other checks to me because the money is hard to made for me not to get them so sense them out to me at once.

"P. S.—Answer real soon."

The disturbed board officials finally puzzled out what the teacher meant: She had received only two checks in 4 months. Dr. John I. Allman, Georgia's deputy State superintendent of schools, pronto sent her the missing two checks. Perhaps she could continue to teach reading and 'rithmetic, but could she be entrusted to teach 'riting to the young trustful souls under her care?

"We have no control over her," explained Dr. Allman. Then he added wistfully, "Perhaps she is the best they can get for $67.50 a month."

If we pay a teacher $15 or $16 a week we'll get our money's worth all right. It's a wonder the Georgia teacher could write at all.

I have seen teachers who couldn't. Not far from Detroit I met a $35-a-week teacher who boasted of the lacing he gave one of his students: "He won't get out of bed for a week." And then he added, "If I can't l'arn 'em, I wham 'em." Or how would you like your child to be taught by the female ancient mariner come to life who told her pupils in a Rocky Mountain State, "Wait till the women get the right to vote in this country. We'll show the men how to run it."

The present salaries cannot possibly bring the best minds into the teaching profession. When a college graduate can enter business, industry, or the Government at a higher salary than he can the teaching profession, why shouldn't he take the better-paying job? A recent study shows that teachers are the lowest paid among the Colgate graduates, while those in industry are the highest. Teachers in the class of 1928 averaged $4,105, while men in industry made $12,510 annually. Graduates of the class of 1938 showed a similar disparity: Those who graduated 12 years ago and went into industry are now making $6,144 each; those who went into teaching are making $3,513. It has been estimated that a teacher has 1 chance in 2,500 to earn $10,000 or more a year, and 1 chance in 400 to earn $7,500 or more.

Indeed, New York, the richest State in the Union, illustrates the disparity that exists between salaries paid to teachers and those received by other professions. This table shows the entering annual salaries of several groups:

Engineer, $2,898.
Economist, $2,898.
Statistician, $3,036.
Architect, $3,450.
Insurance examiner, $3,846.
Bank examiner, $4,242.
Physician, $4,636.
Teacher, $2,500 ($2,700 with M. A. degree).

Again we find the teacher on the lowest rung of the financial ladder.

A survey of 169 well-known industrial concerns by the Northwestern University's bureau of placement estimates that the average salaries for college graduates this year will be $245 a month. Beginning engineers will get $260; sales personnel, $240; accountants, $238; general business trainees, $234; and those in other fields, $252. Teachers will get $185 a month.

Alarmed at this trend, the High School Teachers Association of New York City warned: "Teachers who are forced to pinch pennies to maintain a decent professional standard of living certainly will not be enthusiastic about recommending the teaching profession to capable young people."

Perhaps that is why one-third of all the teachers of the Nation said, in answer to a questionnaire: "I would not recommend that my bright students go into teaching." Or why one mother said bitterly, "I'd break my son's neck if he decided to become a teacher. It's bad enough that his dad is in this racket."

The low teaching salary is the most important reason for the growing teacher crisis. This year our teaching training institutions will prepare less than 20,000 elementary school teachers. We will need 100,000. During the next 10 years the Nation will need 1,000,000 teachers—and will have one-fifth that number available. How can you expect the bright students to go into teaching if they can start at a higher salary in almost any other profession?

During the war and postwar years 350,000 teachers, many of them the best in the profession, deserted the classroom for better-paying jobs. Sometimes a small rural school may have five or six teachers come and go in 1 year. Of course, some teachers stick because of loyalty to their students and because they love teaching. A southern teacher with 14 years' experience, now getting $886 a year, gave this reason for remaining on the job:

"I enjoy working with children and feel that I am making a worth-while contribution to my community. Otherwise I would have left the teaching profession long ago."

Only recently the southern schoolma'am said she was offered a position as a maid for an elderly lady which would have paid her considerably more than she's now getting as a teacher. She didn't quit although, in her own words, "Almost any position I might get as waitress, cook, factory worker, or beauty-parlor assistant would pay me more money than I am now making teaching school."

Listen to the testimony of Mrs. Marie R. Turner, superintendent of Breathitt County schools, Jackson, Ky., who appeared before the House Education Committee last June, where she testified in behalf of Federal aid for schools:

"We are able to pay our best-qualified teachers—on a 12-month basis—$118 a month. Our least-qualified teachers earn $70 a month. As a result we are not holding our more capable teachers, nor are we attracting new material of the best caliber."

This is a real problem. Until we pay teachers as much as we pay others for less important jobs, we'll not get competent teachers.

Everywhere the story is the same: The American teacher is being sold short. She is not getting enough to attract our best brains. If we cheat our teachers, we cheat our children too. Then society is the loser.

In a democracy it is essential that our youth get the kind of education that will prepare them for responsible citizenship. The American way of life will grow and flourish only as we maintain a strong system of education. Underpaid teachers will mean undereducated boys and girls. As the richest Nation in the world we can afford to pay our teachers a decent living wage. Let's throw away our peanuts attitude, and encourage the best among our citizens to become teachers.

Without good teachers we will not have good schools. And without good schools our democracy is endangered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GLOOMY OBSERVANCE

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today, wherever there beats a Polish heart, we can be sure it is more keenly attuned to the ever-present thought of liberty because May 3 marks the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution 159 years ago. It is Poland's national holiday and to exiled Poles scattered over the globe it is a day dedicated to undiminishing hope in the ultimate

attainment of freedom for a long-suffering fatherland.

One of the greatest documents in world history, the Polish Constitution burst upon the scene in Europe in the midst of enemies who were determined to suppress this courageous and liberal venture in self-government. It was, at that time, the brightest shaft of light to penetrate the deep darkness of a continent bogged down by inequalities, serfdom and rule by the privileged class. But the forces in opposition saw to it that this exemplary and revolutionary document did not receive an opportunity of being exercised to their detriment. Soon after the unholy partnership, Russia, Germany, and Austria dismembered and plunged Poland into a period of subjugation that lasted 150 years and terminated after World War I in the achievement of independence.

What joy and hope and enthusiasm a nation reborn can know after a century and a half of slavery can scarcely be visualized. Peace and independence attained, Poland looked forward with confidence in the future and with the honest expectation that the worst of its unhappy history was a thing of the past. That this was to be but an interim, brief, elusive and fleeting as a dream, none could believe. Yet an aspirant to world domination with the first blitzkrieg descended upon Poland with full fury and ended the beautiful dream by aerial and artillery shelling that struck down men, women, and children in methodical destruction aimed at eliminating for all time a nation that had scarcely sufficient time to catch its breath and to rise to its feet after 150 years of abuse at the hands of three ruthless tyrants.

The Hitler horde pressed through in its brutal attack and gained its objective for the time. But, worse yet was the agreement Germany made with Russia to partition Poland. Engulfed, deserted, alone, and helpless, this courageous peace-loving nation was faced with extermination. It must be remembered that the promised assistance never materialized. When at long last the Nazi juggernaut had been repelled, a spark of hope was rekindled that perhaps the independence that was so criminally interrupted might again be restored. And, in spite of the terrific cost, the winning of freedom seemed to be worth the price. The word of the Allies was the guaranty upon which was placed unlimited faith despite all the cruel adversities and the indescribable suffering experienced. This then was the child-like faith of the Polish people. Patience and trust and belief in the ultimate resurrection of its country with the help of the United States prevailed in Poland and throughout the world wherever there exists sympathy for this most harassed of nations.

Though May 3 is here again and the world over Polish people turn their thoughts to that glorious, freedom-giving document, the Constitution of 1791, there is little cause for rejoicing, for there is no Poland where there is no freedom. In its place there is Communist brutality, aided and abetted by the grievous errors of the Yalta agreement. The present government in Poland is the direct result of a sell-out by pro-Communist elements in our Government that guided the foreign policy of the United States at the time the infamous secret agreements were consummated. Our current programs of foreign relations are still slanted in that direction and the authors of these volatile policies wield their influence yet to the detriment of world peace.

And the pledges to Poland lie forgotten.

History can do nothing other than to saddle the United States with the accusation that it eliminated one enemy of Poland and invited another to take its place. This truth will become increasingly prominent as the Russian bear with its grasping, clawing paws reaches out to embrace more and more territory. Nations are falling before the military and diplomatic onslaughts of the Communists and are being absorbed into the Russian orbit the while we piddle away valuable time and condone an utterly irresponsible foreign policy that is fast leading the world toward that dreaded peace crusher—war. It must be admitted by even the most naive that Russia is extremely busy on all fronts, the diplomatic, the economic, and the military. She wastes no time but exploits every opportunity to advance her projects of eventual world domination.

The same old dream of world conquerors is shared by Joe Stalin and one would have to be stone deaf and black blind not to recognize that this ominous dream is being transformed, at this moment, into a cold, frightening and destructive reality by the Kremlin boss. Who can claim, in all honesty, that the present role of Communist Russia does not follow the time-worn pattern of subjugation. I have no patience with apologists who insist the United States does not understand Russia. What is there left to understand in the barbaric and shameless conduct of Soviet Russia whose brazen reluctance toward achievement of world peace is convincingly indicated each and every day. While we accept almost meekly the endless diplomatic and cold war shenanigans of the Kremlin our foreign policy remains sleazy, disintegrated and exposed to lampooning.

We have international responsibilities. That cannot be denied. They are serious, we all know. But we must meet the gravest of our problems—head on. Not with a chip on our shoulders. Not with any implied threats, but with realistic firmness that shall inspire a sound declaration of policy based on well-known concepts of righteousness. There are no alternate avenues by which we can reach a solution. Right is right and the mistakes made by our Red-tinted policymakers can be rectified.

I call for an unqualified repudiation of the Yalta agreement.

I entreat that a beginning be made, here and now, to pull down that wall of iron that keeps our tried and true ally, Poland, imprisoned behind it. If peace is truly the aim of Russia, then the release of Poland from its clutching grasp would entail no difficulty whatever, would clear the atmosphere of world suspicion and prepare the path to peace. I address myself to the Russian nation and invite its attention to this fundamental truth.

Peace is simple to achieve. Peace is possible if it is truly desired.

A start toward that goal can be made in Poland. Withdrawal of Russian forces and restoration of Polish independence would be acclaimed by the world at large. That is a clear and perfectly obvious assignment of Soviet Russia in the present cold war that is rapidly warming up to a dangerous degree. The duty of the United States in this instance is to remember the pledges made to heroic Poland, devout believer in the principles of freedom and constitutional government, and friend and ally.

The valiant people of Poland look to this country for encouragement and support in the hope that through the efforts of the United States the next observance of Polish Constitution Day will be an occasion for rejoicing in a free, happy, and prosperous country.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut in his tribute today to the liberty-loving people of Poland. I hope that the Voice of America carries a complete account of his address today to those people behind the iron curtain.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] has expired.

THE THIRD OF MAY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on this one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution—known simply by its date: The 3d of May—let us once again pause and pay tribute to that once-great nation, and reflect on its present-day tragedy.

To all Americans of Polish ancestry, and to the millions of Poles scattered throughout the continents of the world, this anniversary will always remain full of special significance. In all walks of life, in all fields of endeavor, in all conditions, they will always find inspiration and example in their forefathers' achievements and spirit, of which the Constitution of the Third of May 1791, is a worthy embodiment.

While sanguinary revolutions and upsets were marking the history of other nations through the eventful years of the eighteenth century, the Poles have peacefully and joyfully set themselves to the task of writing and adopting their great constitution, which gave to the common man of Poland the freedoms inherent in democracy. The manner in which this democratic document was born, though astounding to the rest of

the world, was merely in keeping with the tradition of the Poles who, from the earliest times, have shown deep respect for the dignity of man, and unwavering devotion to parliamentary principles.

It is well known that this enfranchisement of the Polish masses came too late to be enjoyed by them. Within a few years the third partition dismembered the old Republic, and for over a century it ceased to exist as a free nation. Yet this same spirit which motivated the adoption of the Constitution of the 3d of May, and which shaped the current of events of Poland's history, once again asserted itself as Poland gained freedom and independence in 1918.

The hour of freedom was brief. Torn between the rivalries of the East and the West, the totalitarian ambitions of her neighbors, Poland was once again dismembered, this time by the Nazis, whose reign of terror was soon to be replaced by the tragic Communist domination.

As we recall the history of Poland, and ponder over her present plight, we must ask ourselves, "How long must her people suffer?" And we must also ask ourselves, "How long must the other people suffer—the other people who also love freedom and independence, democracy and peace, and who, because of the rapacious actions of their neighbors, have already suffered so much?"

The end must come to the incessant warfare, to the oppression of the smaller nations, to bloodshed and pain, to intolerance and insatiable greed that have frustrated all the attempts at establishing peace and freedom in the world, and have brought tragedy to the lives of countless millions.

Our Nation has been, and is, working for the achievement of that goal—the thought of Poland must spur us in our efforts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and also the other gentlemen who have spoken on this occasion in paying honor to the great people of Poland and in properly commemorating the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Polish Constitution. Every student of history is aware of the great contribution made toward the progress of mankind, toward the existence of the dignity of man and of the establishment of democratic institutions of government by the people of Poland in past generations. Every student of government is well aware of the deep faith that the people have always possessed, which has been an inspiration and a strength and a guidance to them in making their great contribution to the progress of man.

The people of Poland have been through many trying periods, but they have never been defeated. The people of Poland today are undergoing another period of pain, but the great courage, as a result of the faith that the people of Poland possess, will have them emerge from this period of pain and again enjoy their independence as a nation and their freedom as a people. Persons of all races and of all racial origins are looking forward to the day when the heel of the oppressor, the vicious dictator, is removed from the soil and the people of Poland. Once that is done the alien regime that is in there now will be very quickly hurled out and again a government "of the people, by the people, for the people," as the great Abraham Lincoln well said so many years ago, will exist in that great land abroad.

May I say to the gentlemen who have made remarks today, some of whom are Americans of Polish descent, like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], that the people of America are proud of the Americans of Polish blood and of the contribution they have made to the progress of our country. They have always been liberty-loving people, and they always will be, and with the help of God and the power of America we will look forward and pray for that day when the heel of the totalitarian oppressor will be removed and again liberty restored to the fine, brave people of Poland.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall always remember a remarkable address made on the floor of this House on Polish Constitution Day several years ago when the now Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] paid great compliment to the liberty-loving people of Poland, and reached a great peroration when he said:

> Poland's battle is our battle, and our battle is Poland's battle.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today on Polish Constitution Day may have the privilege of extending those remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution, which contains her famous bill of rights.

Americans of Polish descent and Poles in all free countries today are celebrating one of the greatest Polish holidays. Not only is this anniversary commemorated by people of Polish extraction, but they are joined by all freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Over a century and a half ago Polish leaders, encouraged and inspired in part by the American Revolution, proclaimed a new bill of rights for the Polish Nation. Many documents are of great historic significance, but the Polish Constitution is truly one of the world's great documents of freedom. I might say it was the most liberal and the most democratic of its day, and it served as an inspiration to other struggling nations to assert themselves.

The Third of May is to all Poles what the Fourth of July is to all Americans—it is a day among days. Today in the hearts of millions of true Poles, those still behind the iron curtain, and millions of our own Polish-Americans, burns the light of freedom that some day will bring to that heroic nation a new independence.

I need not recall today the glorious history of the Polish people, its record of unsurpassed valor, fearless courage, and unblemished honor. People all over the world recall Poland's magnificent heritage which has served her as a guiding light throughout all the years of her trials and tribulations. We recall that spirit which never yielded its devotion to an ideal.

Through the centuries her great leaders have given their aid and assistance to all countries which were struggling for the right of self-determination. In our own fight for independence, those men of extraordinary capabilities and courage—Pulaski, Sobieski, and Kosciusko, as well as countless Polish patriots—contributed heavily to our victory. To them and to all the Polish people we owe an unceasing debt of gratitude.

In the present state of affairs, Poland finds herself a victim of Soviet aggression like so many other countries—in spite of the fact that in none of these countries are the Communists in a majority.

Poland was first in the fight against the German aggressor in 1939 and was justly called the inspiration of the world by President Roosevelt. Her heroic stand at that time in the face of aggression by a superior force is an example of courage unparalleled in history. She inspired freedom-loving nations and brought home to them the first realization of the Axis threat to civilization.

By thus engaging Hitler in the early days of the war, Poland prevented a surprise attack on France and England who were unprepared at the time. Had Poland compromised instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed.

As a faithful ally, Poland obtained the promises of the great powers that she would be free and independent, yet today she is under the yoke of another aggressor, which plans eventually to dominate the entire world.

Poland's contribution to the success of the Allied Nations during World War II and her people's struggle to preserve western civilization throughout the years make it incumbent upon us here in America to keep faith with the Polish people, especially at the present time when her long-cherished freedom is once again enslaved.

The Polish people are known as resolute people who can endure a great deal in defense of their liberty. They believe

in the principles of Christianity as opposed to Communist doctrine and practices.

Our ultimate goal, and the ultimate goal of all liberty-loving people, should be the destruction of communism, since it is a doctrine contrary to the spirit of real liberty and one which violates human rights.

Therefore, I again urge that the United States continue every effort to restore Poland to her prewar glory. We are morally obligated to render every possible assistance, both directly and through the United Nations, to help her in her underground struggle to break the chains of totalitarianism which threaten to engulf the Western World.

With the Polish people, I firmly believe that justice and democracy will eventually triumph, but I believe we must furnish concrete proof and assistance to achieve this end as soon as possible.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. It symbolizes the successful achievement of individual liberty through the untiring efforts of the Polish people.

It is appropriate that this honorable body take cognizance of the situation facing the Polish people in their effort to attain stability and independence as a nation.

History shows Poland as the battleground of Europe, torn between powerful conflicting forces surrounding her, the partitions and the frequent changes in sovereignty over the areas inhabited by Polish peoples, is well known. Polish contributions to art and science are also well known. Poland's aid, through great leaders in the cause of our own independence, has frequently been recognized by the American people. The suffering of the Polish people through the changing conditions of power politics in Europe through the centuries and the persistent courage of her people and her leaders in fighting unflaggingly against overpowering forces seeking to thwart Polish independence have aroused the admiration of mankind.

Not the least in Poland's long history of oppression and tribulations is the history of the Polish people in World War II. The world will long remember the courage of the Polish people in 1939, when they refused to submit to the unrighteous demands of the powerful Nazi war machine. The world will not forget the 1,000,000 military casualties and the 9,000,000 civilian casualties and the devastation of Polish cities and farms as armies surged back and forth across Polish territory in World War II.

The nations of the world owe an obligation to Poland and other small nations like her to make certain that the continual conflict and unrest resulting from the conflicting ambitions of power politics shall cease. A tremendous responsibility rests upon the United Nations organization to guarantee and assure the opportunity to peoples like the Poles to live their lives and enrich their existence without molestation and oppression from any source. The nations of the world owe a duty to the Polish people and others similarly situated under the chaotic conditions existing in the aftermath of the war to guarantee that the people themselves shall have the right to select the kind of government they desire in a free election in which there cannot be any doubt that the results are the expression of the free will of the citizens without coercion or improper influence exerted by outside forces.

As a representative American of Polish descent I await the day when Poland will be free of the Red army bayonets that control Poland today. I await the day when freedom and democracy will be enjoyed by the Polish people as we in America are blessed.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1950, we are again privileged to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day. It was on May 3, 1791, that Poland adopted this great document granting far-reaching freedom to her people.

Just as we Americans celebrate Independence Day on July 4 so the people of Poland would jubilantly celebrate today if it were possible for them to do so. But Poland cannot rejoice today. Russia will see that they do not but even the iron heel of Russia cannot prevent the Polish people from a silent and hopeful observance of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of their great day. Let us all hope that in the not too distant future the Polish people will again be free to openly and happily celebrate Constitution Day.

Poland has been the unfortunate battling ground of Europe in many wars. During World War I armies crossed and recrossed her land, destroying homes and fields. I believe that Poland has encountered more misery from wars than any other country in Europe.

During World War II Poland would not yield to Hitler and his barbaric hordes. Poland had the courage to stand and fight the invaders in an effort to preserve her independence. The defense of Warsaw will long be remembered as one of the monumental battles of all times. When she was defeated her brave soldiers did not surrender but fled to other lands and carried on the battle with their allies.

On the slopes of Monte Cassino thousands of these brave men gave their lives and in so doing they saved the lives of many American, British, and French soldiers. They gave their lives but their fathers, mothers sisters, brothers, friends, and relatives did not reap the fruits of the common victory. Not for them the freedom which their allies are now enjoying—not for them the independence for which they so valiantly fought.

Let us all have faith in the future of Poland. Let us all fervently hope that she will once again proudly stand erect, side by side with the United States, free and independent, as a testimonial to an indomitable courage and unconquerable spirit which has always marked the history and background of that land of hard-fighting, liberty-loving people.

I think we should pause in the midst of our legislative business to silently pray for the end of all aggressive global wars. If the money which has been spent for wars could be spent for the advancement and benefit of humanity this would be a good world to live in. Poland and the other nations now under the domination of Russia could once again enjoy freedom, liberty, and peace on earth.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a real privilege to stand before this microphone in this House of Representatives, to freely and under no restrictions, address the Members on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, adopted in 1791, by the Congress of the Republic of Poland, which was the most liberal, most democratic of its day. Upon rereading it today, one is profoundly moved at its wisdom and magnanimity which assured rights and freedom to the people of Poland.

It was in 1939, which means 11 years ago when Poland and the Polish Nation observed the so-called constitution of May 3 as a free, independent, and sovereign state, on their own soil.

Since that time the Polish Nation has suffered the consequences of war, occupation, and most severe destruction of their homeland. Since that time the great Polish Nation could not observe this memorable and historical day. Yes—11 years have elapsed since Poland went under another era of foreign control and influence.

Here—in this country—we are cognizant of the unparalleled tragedy that the Polish Nation is going through. And today on the day of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, we express our deep heartfelt sympathy and at the same time convey our sincere sentiments as a brotherly nation.

But, aside of the geographical and political Poland which at the present time experiences results and tactics which is so strange to her—there is another Poland—the spiritual Poland which exist, lives, and grows outside of her natural boundaries. For there is a proverb in the Polish language which in English sounds something like this: "Wherever beats Polish heart, wherever Polish blood flows, there is Poland." Yes, west of the iron curtain, there is another Poland. Just as strong physically, morally, and spiritually, as the one which is known for courage, knighthood, and untiring efforts in their pursuit for freedom, liberty, and independence. We cannot overlook the enormous contribution of the great Polish Nation in their fight to protect the western civilization and the Christian world from being overrun or even annihilated by evil forces all through the history of mankind.

And today this same nation—Poland—observes its one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the constitution of May 3, which, as our own, embodies all the fundamentals of freedom, equality, and independence. And—as stated before—there is another Poland which we might as well call "west of the iron curtain Poland," which is thoroughly democratic and religious, is seeking shelter and refuge from the present "regime" set up after World War II over in Poland.

Many settlements have sprung up all over the world; many new colonies were established where our good friends, Poles, are trying to start living anew. These new settlements are becoming strong outposts of true democracy and Christianity. Many of them came to our shores, where they are enjoying our hospitality—where they are extended all the possible help in their sincere effort to adjust themselves and rehabilitate themselves according to the new conditions and customs existing in this great country of ours.

As long as I am on this subject, mention should be made about the great Polish people, whose gallant sons contributed so much to the independence, growth, and development of these United States of America. The Poles are known to us—well enough. And we know well enough that the present new generation represents just as valuable and desirable element, as the old pioneers and old Polish settlers in this land of plenty.

Today all freedom-loving Poles of two decades unite to pay tribute to their heroes, to the creators of the greatest document of its time, "The constitution of the 3d of May." All those living outside Soviet-dominated Poland assemble in order that they may on this very day express their wishes, their thoughts, their sorrows. Here, on our free and brotherly soil, we consider it an honor and privilege to join our fellow citizens of Polish descent, also all those who came to this country as DP's in their observance of this memorable day, the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the constitution of May 3.

We extend our brotherly hands to all those who so gallantly fought in the last World War, and in all the previous combat encounters in the field of freedom, and on this very day, which is today, Wednesday, May 3, 1950, convey our most sincere hope and most earnest wishes that the great Polish Nation will soon again cherish all the blessing of true freedom, liberty and sovereignty to the fullest extent.

Christianity and democracy are the most precious possessions of mankind, and no nation shall be deprived of these priceless virtues. The Constitution of Poland, often referred to as the Constitution of the 3d of May, was built upon these fundamentals. And we may assure our Polish friends that with their determination, patience, and firm belief in God, as proven by history, they shall regain and achieve complete restoration of Poland which again will take due place in the great family of Christian and democratic nations.

Permit me to stress again that the Poles in Poland of today are forbidden to observe the Third of May Constitution Day. But they are forced to participate in the May 1st day celebrations on the orders from the Kremlin.

Therefore, our commemoration of the Polish national holiday has a twofold purpose. First, to join the Polish people in their observance of the one hundred fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of May the 3d; second, to express our deep sympathy to all those, who by no fault of their own, are unable to join our ranks, and who are subjugated to a form of government which they do not like, nor approve of.

General characteristics of the Polish people are nearly the same as ours—their love of freedom, recognition of human rights, and understanding of peoples' needs are the same as ours. Our conception of christianity and democracy—is no different. History tells us that.

So on this day, the one hundred fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of May the 3d of Poland, let us give our Polish friends our most sincere assurance of our moral support to cheer them to encourage them in their continued fight for freedom in full sense of the word. Long live Poland. Let their culture, traditions, and art enrich our new American culture.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of one of the world's most precious documents, the Polish Constitution.

That document lives today, its spirit and meaning as vigorous as on May 3, 1791, when its birth marked a new advance in European concepts of human liberty and dignity.

It lives not alone in the hearts of those tragically subject to the brutal and foreign tyranny of Soviet Russia, but in the hearts of the millions of countrymen of Kosciusko and Pulaski who helped to build this country in the spirit of the common ideals of the Polish and American Constitutions.

Poland has a tragic history. The insistence of its people on real freedom has always offended those of its larger neighbors who have had good reason to fear a Polish example of vigorous independence on their borders. Poland has again and again suffered invasion and bondage, but the Poles have always thrown off the yoke of their oppressors. I venture to predict that they will do so again.

Only last week, Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of the Marshall plan, said there are two nations now under Communist domination which will lead the ultimate breakaway from the Soviet Union. It is significant that the first name he mentioned was that of Poland.

One of our great objects in the year ahead should be to hasten the day when the democratic spirit of the Polish people can thus express itself without bringing the utter destruction of a great people. May 3 will then become a day of rejoicing as well as of remembering.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

INIQUITOUS OPINIONS OF ITALY AND ITALIANS

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on March 13 of this year the Federal Communications Commission began hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., against radio stations KMPC, Los Angeles; WGAR, Cleveland; and WJR, Detroit. I am not concerned about the merits or demerits of this case. I am, however, very much concerned about the type of witness used by the Government.

I would like the RECORD to show that the Federal Communications Commission recently concluded their case against KMPC in Los Angeles and the defense will begin its case on May 15.

In these proceedings the star witness for the Federal Communications Commission was one Clete Roberts, a former employee of Station KMPC, who had been discharged by this station and who admitted he had been fired from every other good job he ever had.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for becoming very interested in this case is that this star witness of the Federal Communications Commission, Clete Roberts, did, while on the witness stand during these hearings on March 17, 1950, and while being cross-examined by Mr. Hugh Fulton, chief trial counsel for Mr. Richards, admit that in a letter he had written he had characterized the people of southern Italy, and I quote, as "charming" but not, in his opinion, "worth a tinker's damn." He further admitted the authorship of a statement that the people of southern Italy were "a lazy and indolent people," that "they wanted"—the United States—"to feed them and think for them" and that these Italians would not "even say thank you for the favors they had received from our country."

When Mr. Fulton asked this man Roberts if he intended to include every clergyman, every farmer, every artisan or mechanic, banker, lawyer, or statesman in southern Italy as not being worth a tinker's damn, or whether these expressions were just unfortunate ones which this man Roberts had written in a letter, this same star witness, Roberts, said several times with great positiveness that such statements were true and that he still stood behind them.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to visit the southern part of Italy in the fall of 1949 and I also visited the birthplace of my mother and my father who were born about 100 miles from Naples. The people of southern Italy may not possess all the worldly goods we enjoy in this country, and that is admitted—but they are a hard-working, honest, and God-fearing people. Like every Member of this House, I am proud of my ancestry.

During my visit to the southern part of Italy, where my people came from, I made it my business to inquire as to whether they had heard of the Marshall plan or if they had received any benefits from it—either directly or indirectly. Their answer to me was that they had never heard of our Marshall plan. In other words, Mr. Speaker, these southern Italians have been, and are, a race of people who earned what they have by the sweat of their brow. The reason that so many Italian immigrants migrated to the United States was because they were ambitious, hard-working, and wanted to become a part of this land of opportunity. I think that it is an accepted fact that the Italian-Americans in the United States have played a great part in building this great country of ours.

With all the above in mind it is understandable, therefore, why I deeply resent the remarks of such a man as

this individual, Clete Roberts. In what manner, shape, or form can he possibly look upon himself as a 100-percent American? In my judgment he has no understanding at all of what begins to constitute good Americanism. When a witness like this man Roberts places all the Italians of southern Italy in one class as not being worth "a tinker's damn," he forfeits any support whatsoever from any real Americans.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and with very deliberate and emphatic feeling, I want it understood that it is more than amazing to me that a man of this type, who expresses under oath such opinions as have been placed in this RECORD today, could possibly be advanced and supported by any agency of our Government as a credible witness. I respectfully draw the attention of all Members of the House to my remarks on this one point because I intend to explore this matter a great deal further, so that the Federal Communications Commission will, in the future, take a great deal more care in investigating the credibility and Americanism of a witness whom it has supported, and apparently continues to support, as one of its star performers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a part of this record a translation of an editorial from the Italian-American paper in Los Angeles, Calif., dated March 24, 1950:

[From L'Italo-Americano, Los Angeles, Calif., of March 24, 1950]

LANTERN

(Full text translated from the Italian of column by Clete Baroni, editor and publisher)

Iniquitous opinions of Italy and of the Italians—ever since I sailed the ocean to come into a land discovered by an Italian and called by the name of another Italian—I have heard and read so many opinions that now I succeed somewhat not only to control my nerves but also to forgive in a Christian manner those, who through their ignorance or through their inborn prejudice, express these opinions.

I am referring to foregiveness not to gain a seat in heaven or to soften the pious women, but because, distance having been abolished by the airplane, today, for each stupid, evil defamer of Italy, there are thousands and thousands of persons who instead exalt Italy for her beauties and for her glory and for the superb qualities of her people. So, I was not impressed when I learned during the course of instruction that the Federal Communications Commission is conducting among us in reference to the radio stations KMPC, WJR, and WGAR, of a letter which has been carried here and there and written years ago by the accusing Clete Roberts, to his exboss Mr. G. A. Richards. This illustrious gentleman, who went to Italy immediately after the surrender, expresses himself of the Italians thusly: "The people of southern Italy, although charming, are not, in my opinion, worth a tinkers damn. They are lazy, indolent, they want us to feed them, think of them, and they won't even say 'thank you' for the favors."

Without any differentiation and not realizing that the Italians have gone from suffering to suffering—moral suffering and unmentionable physical suffering—Roberts so expresses himself of the Italians, from the donkey land down, as though those from Rome and north were not also Italians. Time does not seem to have changed this opinion of his when at the request of Attorney Hugh Fulton if he wished to modify what he had written word for word he answered: "No, I will stand behind that letter."

We do not care so much that he changes it, I repeat. It isn't what he thinks of us which may lift or lower us in the opinion of the same people of the world.

One item I would like to bring forth is that this gentleman evidently has open prejudices for a race. He is the same who testified against his exboss, accusing that he, his exboss, tried to influence him into the transmission of telegraphic news to the radio in reference to the Jews and certain political groups.

From what pulpit does the preaching come. I will say and you will say.

I have said above that for each defamer, there are thousands and thousands of persons ready to exalt Italy. Here for example is what the famous American reporter, Maren Schwarzschild, writes of Italy after a tour from one end to the other: "At the end of my Italian experience, I can only tell you this: I adore Italy and her people rich of so many natural talents, and I suggest to whosoever has not visited her to do the impossible to have it become a reality the dream of knowing her as soon as possible. Every minute of stay in Italy will be a discovery and a joy."

I also want to make a part of this RECORD the exact language this witness Roberts used in a letter he wrote to his former employer, in which he attacks the people of southern Italy:

MY DEAR MR. RICHARDS: Periodically, it seems, I feel inclined to drop you a short note and let you know what's happened to me and what I've witnessed in my wanderings abroad.

I've been in Italy and central Europe as well as the Middle East for the past 6 months. I've been pretty fortunate in my assignments, having seen the surrender in northern Italy and the break-up in Germany proper. I've had some contacts with our "ally" the Russians, and I've been thinking quite a bit about this unholy mess over here. And, believe me, Dick, it is a mess. Most discouraging it is, to witness the end-product of all our labors, all our fighting. To me, the muddled picture here is most discouraging. I, personally, have come to feel rather keenly about this war and what it has cost in terms of human life and human suffering. I am inclined to believe that for all we, and by "we" I mean America, have given, we should have some guarantee of peace in return. But, I'm damned if I can see any guaranty of anything but further uncertainty over here for many years to come.

There is, I believe, some hope for Italy providing the industrialists of the north can get the wheels turning in their factories again. There is a heavy Communist flavor all through northern Italy. The partisans are, as you know, dominated by the Communist party. They often display the hammer and sickle red flag alongside the Italian flag. However, I believe some intelligent handling of the economic situation in northern Italy would soon make them forget about Russia, Communism, and everything that goes with it. All the people of Italy want, like people everywhere in this world, is a job, a home and food on the table. Incidentally, I was really impressed by the northern Italians. They are hard working, industrious, intelligent. Their industry, by the way, is not too badly smashed. Our bombing during the strategic phase of the air battle was excellent. We smashed only the key plants. We did not level everything in sight. As a result, I think northern Italy has a fairly good chance of getting back on its industrial feet. At least it can be done faster than anyone previously thought possible. The people of southern Italy, although charming, are not, in my opinion, worth a tinkers damn. They are lazy, indolent, they want us to feed them, think for them. And they won't even say "thank you" for the favors. The fact that Italy's new prime minister, Ferruccio Parri, came from Milan, in the north, is indication enough as to which way the wind is blowing as far as political influence in this country is concerned.

* * * * *

Please give my kindest personal regards to Mrs. Richards and to your charming daughter.

Sincerely,

CLETE ROBERTS.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAURIELLO. I yield.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO] for his condemnation of this very un-American and this very intolerant attitude on the part of the man who is being used by an agency of our Government. It happens that in my district there are tens of thousands of people whose ancestors migrated from southern Italy. They are the people who are the brawn and brain that helped build our great democracy. They built the railroads across the country and helped build the buildings, and have distinguished themselves in every walk of life. I join with the gentleman in condemning this very intolerant attitude on the part of this Mr. Roberts.

Mr. TAURIELLO. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

May I interpose at this point that the ancestors, the mothers and fathers of every Member of the House of Representatives who is of Italian extraction migrated to the United States from the southern part of Italy. They all came within a radius of 100 or 150 miles of where my people came from. Certainly that does not detract from the type of people who came from southern Italy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include certain printed matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permisison to extend his remarks in two instances and in the first to include a resolution and in the second certain remarks.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. POULSON) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Naugatuck, Conn., and a resolution from the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. REES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness;

To Mr. STIGLER, until May 9, 1950, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor;

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Stella Avner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect;

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Nancy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor;

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Avner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1428. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $3,000,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 582), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of Committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7695. A bill to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; with amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 8221. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7155. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRISON: Committee of conference. H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Hatch Act (Rept. No. 2004). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 469. An act for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener; without amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2229. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster; Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster; William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders; and John S. Bantham, station examiner, at Albany, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; with amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of William A. Cross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4140. A bill for the relief of the Great American Indemnity Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarence F. Moore; John Robert Lusk 3d; J. R. Lusk, Sr.; Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk; Mrs. Willie Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4803. A bill for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney; with amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5252. A bill for the relief of W. M. Tindal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5799. A bill for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6416. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Rocke; without amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6644. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7991. A bill for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2225. A bill for the relief of William B. Buol; with amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertrude Mulders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3805. A bill for the relief of Yuk Onn Won; with amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5221. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5947. A bill for the relief of Alfio Batelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6066. A bill for the relief of Cheng Sick Yuen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7315. A bill for the relief of Daijiro Yoshida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7564. A bill for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 65. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7966. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806; without amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8339. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 8340. A bill to extend the rights and responsibilities of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8341. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HUBER (by request):

H. R. 8342. A bill to provide automobiles for blind veterans of World War II who are entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8343. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 8344. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 8345. A bill to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to recordable contracts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 8346. A bill to provide for the repeal of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 8347. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, relating to insurance of accounts in Federal savings and loan associations, so as to increase the maximum insurable account from $5,000 to $10,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 8348. A bill to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8349. A bill to authorize deductions from the wages of seamen for payment into employee welfare funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 8350. A bill to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8351. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing for continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abacá by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8352. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 8353. A bill to amend Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 8354. A bill to require the execution of a loyalty affidavit by every officer or employee in or under the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8355. A bill to amend sections 174, 200, 200a, and 200b of title 21, United States Code; section 2557 (b), title 26, United States Code; and section 2596, title 26, United States Code, to provide minimum and maximum penalties upon conviction of violation of the act of May 26, 1922, as amended; the act of December 17, 1914, as amended; and the act of August 2, 1937, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8356. A bill authorizing the Missouri River Basin agricultural program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8357. A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8358. A bill to prohibit the purchase by the Federal Government of prison-made goods which compete with goods made by free labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 8359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn W. Cheatham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 8360. A bill for the relief of Victor Z. Bergere and Greta S. Bergere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 8361. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Murai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8362. A bill for the relief of Bernard Croft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 8363. A bill for the relief of Harry Chilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Richard Raines, bishop of the Methodist Church, Indianapolis, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, without whose knowledge not a sparrow falleth, whose purposes cannot be frustrated, Thou hast committed to us the swift and solemn trust of life and set us amid circumstances so perplexing and uncertain that we know not what a day may bring forth. We do know that the hour for serving Thee is always present. Awaken us to the claims and guidance of Thy holy will. Grant us in all our doubts and uncertainties the good sense to ask what Thou wouldst have us to do, that the spirit of wisdom might save us from all false choice.

Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet must go, and the humblest work will shine and the rough places be made plain. Lift us above unrighteous anger and vengeance and suspicion into faith and hope and charity by a simple and steadfast reliance on Thy holy will.

We pray in the name of Thy blessed Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 3, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 3, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 455) authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Maybank
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hill	Mundt
Brewster	Hoey	Murray
Bricker	Holland	Myers
Bridges	Humphrey	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Jenner	Russell
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Darby	Kem	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kerr	Stennis
Douglas	Kilgore	Taft
Dworshak	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Leahy	Thye
Ecton	Lehman	Tobey
Ellender	Lodge	Tydings
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wherry
Flanders	McFarland	Wiley
Frear	McKellar	Williams
George	McMahon	Young
Green	Magnuson	
Gurney	Malone	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

VISIT OF HIS EXCELLENCY LIAQUAT ALI KHAN, PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

The VICE PRESIDENT. As announced on yesterday, the Prime Minister of Pakistan is present as our guest. He will deliver an address to the Senate. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] as a committee to escort the Prime Minister into the Chamber.

Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, until our honored guests have departed. The Chair hears no objection.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), the Senate stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

His Excellency Liaquat Ali Khan, Prime Minister of Pakistan, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned to him at the desk immediately in front of the Vice President.

The members of the party accompanying the Prime Minister of Pakistan, consisting of Begum Liaquat Ali; His Excellency M. A. H. Ispahani, Ambassador of Pakistan; the Honorable M. Ikramullah, Foreign Secretary of Pakistan; Mr. Ghulam Ahmad, officer of special duty; Prof. Ahmed S. Bokhari, civil aide; Brigadier N. A. K. Raza, military and air attaché, Embassy of Pakistan; Mr. A. A. Hamid, private secretary to the Prime Minister of Pakistan; Mr. Majid Malik, Principal Information Officer; Mr. Raymond D. Muir, chief ceremonial officer, Department of State; Mr. Jack McFall, Assistant Secretary of State; and Mr. George McGee, Assistant Secretary of State, were escorted into the Chamber by the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms.

Begum Liaquat Ali was assigned a seat in the first row on the left of the Vice President's desk, next to Mrs. SMITH of Maine.

The other members of the party of the Prime Minister of Pakistan were assigned seats in the rear of the Chamber to the left of the middle aisle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, we are honored today by a visit from the Prime Minister of Pakistan. The whole world knows the process by which in recent years India and Pakistan, which were originally united as India, have acquired their independence.

We are glad to welcome the Prime Minister of Pakistan, which originally was a part of India, and which, through negotiation and friendly cooperation, has become a free and independent nation, as free and independent as India itself is at this time.

We are glad to welcome to the Senate any representative of freedom-loving, self-governing, and independent people; and particularly are we happy to welcome the Prime Minister of Pakistan, His Excellency Liaquat Ali Khan, whom I have the pleasure now to present to the Senate, and who will address us.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY LIAQUAT ALI KHAN, PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

Prime Minister LIAQUAT ALI KHAN. Mr. President, honorable Members of the Senate, in welcoming me within these walls and giving me an opportunity of addressing this august assembly, you have bestowed upon me high prerogative and honor for which I am deeply grateful to you.

This is my first visit to your great land, but I have long been an admirer of the vigor of your enterprise, your indefatigable spirit of inquiry, your optimism, your high respect for individual effort, your belief in equal opportunities for all, your reverence for the sanctity of the home, the frankness of your speech and manner and the liveliness of your language. Above all I have admired your jealous and uncompromising regard for the supremacy of the people's will, your firm belief that civil liberty gives man the greatest scope for his faculties and your faith that "morality is the best security of law and the surest pledge of freedom." In seeing America, I hope to see more than America. I hope to see the men and women whose enterprise and vitality have made your country great and the faith that sustains them in their efforts.

I thank you for your welcome, and value it the more because the people whom I have the honor and privilege to represent, although the inheritors of ancient faiths and cultures, are, as a nation among sovereign nations, young; and on the threshold of new experiences, both exciting and grave.

In the geography of the world, Pakistan's name is not yet 3 years old. What led to the emergence of this new state on the map of Asia, is perhaps not universally known. Nor do I expect it yet to be common knowledge what urges stir and inspire us in the task that we know lies ahead of us.

Pakistan was founded by the indomitable will of a hundred million Muslims who felt that they were a nation too numerous and too distinct to be relegated forever to the unalterable position of a political minority, especially when, in the vast subcontinent which was their homeland, there was enough room for two great nations—the Hindus and the Muslims—to enjoy peace and full sovereignty in their respective dominions. They believed that thus alone would the vast multitude of the followers of Islam be uninhibited in the development of their culture and free to follow their own way of life. Pakistan was founded so that millions of Muslims should be enabled to live according to their opinions and to worship God in freedom. That self-same freedom which they sought for themselves, they conceded to others, with the determination to live as peaceful neighbors when to live as more than neighbors seemed to be more than hazardous. Like some of the earlier founders of your great country, these Muslims, though not Pilgrims, nevertheless embarked upon an undertaking, which, in aim and achievement, represented the triumph of an idea. That idea was the idea of liberty which has had its ardent followers in all climates and all countries. When our time came, its call summoned us, too, and we could not hold back. The partition of our subcontinent into two independent sovereign states did not, nor was it expected to, eliminate or

efface minorities. But it brought magnitudes within focusable limits and saved the political architecture of the new Asia from a strain which might well have proved excessive and dangerous.

But this, we realize, is only the beginning of a new life. The achievement of freedom is not an instantaneous event; it is a process. The seed is planted, but before the tree can take root and grow and spread it has to be nurtured untiringly by innumerable hands. Our constitution is yet on the anvil and elected representatives of the people are engaged in making it a true mirror of our live beliefs and our sincere aspirations. To frame a genuine constitution, a people need to scrutinize their own mind and soul very closely. Time-honored maxims and hallowed principles embodied in a constitution are of little validity, unless a nation feels that it possesses the spiritual strength to live up to them, unless they echo the voice that is heard unfalteringly in the innermost recesses of its soul. We have earnestly searched our hearts; and though much yet remains to be done, the main features of our constitution to which we can put our seal with a conscience free of all restraints, doubts, or qualms, are to us unequivocally clear.

We have pledged ourselves a federation with autonomous units, wherein shall be guaranteed fundamental human rights, equality of status and opportunity and before law, social, economic, and political justice, freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, and association.

We have pledged that the Muslims in our state shall be enabled to order their lives in accordance with their faith; but not forgetful of that perpetual fear of the majority from which Pakistan has delivered millions of Muslims and in humble thanksgiving to God for this deliverance, we have solemnly pledged that our minorities shall enjoy full rights of citizenship and shall freely profess and practice their religions and develop their cultures and that their legitimate interests and the interests of the backward and depressed classes shall be adequately safeguarded. [Applause.]

We have pledged that the state shall exercise its powers and authority through the chosen representatives of the people. In this we have kept steadily before us the principles of democracy, freedom, equality, tolerance, and social justice as enunciated by Islam. There is no room here for theocracy, for Islam stands for freedom of conscience, condemns coercion, has no priesthood and abhors the caste system. It believes in the equality of all men and in the right of each individual to enjoy the fruit of his or her effort, enterprise, capacity and skill—provided these be honestly employed. It firmly believes in the right of private ownership, although it frowns on large accumulations of unearned wealth and is greatly concerned over menacing inequalities.

These are articles of faith with us and by them we are irrevocably bound. They are our way of life; and no threat or persuasion, no material peril or ideological allurement can deflect us from the path we have chosen. In proclaiming the objectives of our Constitution, we have called on almighty God, to Whom alone sovereignty over the entire universe belongs, to bear witness to our resolve and to guide our footsteps so that the people of Pakistan may prosper and attain their rightful and honored place among the nations of the world and make their full contribution toward international peace and progress and happiness of mankind. [Applause.]

In our short life as a free nation, we have learned not a little about the world and the times we live in and about ourselves. We have learned that freedom, whether of the individual or of countries, is not everywhere and at all times safe and that the integrity of our own homeland which is dearer to us than our lives will demand of us unceasing vigilance. Our people are deeply distressed at the thought that world-wide destruction might overtake not only the fuller life to which they aspire but the entire human civilization with all its magnificent achievements and illimitable opportunities for good. For youthful countries like ours, which are experiencing but the first pulsations of a free existence, this prospect is profoundly disturbing and not without a touch of irony. We sincerely hope that leaders of world opinion will pursue the path of understanding and will use their wisdom and power to dispel and not to enhance the fears of an apprehensive world. Though freedom has had many births, greed, aggression, and intolerance continue, alas, to rear their ugly heads. This is the century of great awakenings in all parts of the globe; and it depends entirely on the leaders of the world whether mankind will awaken to the horrors of darkness or to a glorious dawn.

We have learned much about ourselves too. Our State began under a number of handicaps, both natural and man-made, and almost before we had time to unfurl the flag to which we now bear allegiance, millions of refugees—the largest number in world history—crossed our borders and sought shelter within our territories. This put us to a test which might have proved disastrous; instead of which our calamaties strengthened the determination of our Nation, and the hard work demanded of us fortified our faith. If the test was to come, we are glad that it came early and when we least expected it. For it gave us the measure of our moral and spiritual resources and even in our immature years filled us with courage for the future that has yet to unfold itself. The task that lies before us is truly immense and we are fully aware of it. We are aware that liberty does not descend upon a people, a people must raise themselves to it. We are aware that recent centuries of progress and advancement in the world have bypassed us, leaving our resources untapped, our capacities unused and our genius inactive. In all humility but with great faith in our destiny, we the people of Pakistan are resolved to make up for lost centuries within the shortest possible time so that we shall never be a source of disquiet to our friends or a temptation to our adversaries. Peace is essential for progress, but progress is no less essential for peace. As peace and war today are indivisible, so is progress, and in its name we offer our good will to all nations great and small and earnestly ask for theirs. [Prolonged applause, Senators, distinguished visitors, and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. On behalf of the Senate, and through it, on behalf of our country, we wish not only to express our appreciation to the distinguished Prime Minister for his visit to us, but also for his constructive and eloquent speech which has just been delivered. We have had many distinguished guests who have addressed the Senate of the United States. The Chair would not wish to draw any comparisons, except to say that none has been more inspiring, more appreciated, than this one delivered by the new Prime Minister of a new free country. It is an inspiration and a source of encouragement that from the other side of the world has come to us this distinguished representative of democracy and self government. [Applause.]

The Prime Minister has brought with him a distinguished company, whose names have been inserted in the RECORD. The Chair cannot present all of them, but there is one in particular whom the Chair would like to mention. We in America, rather belatedly, accorded to women equal rights with men in the processes of government. We learned rather lately that injustice, intolerance, bad government, bad economic and moral conditions affect the home and the guardian of the home and the guardian of the children of the home more acutely probably than these things affect the men. With the distinguished Prime Minister has come his charming cultured wife, and the Chair should think the Senate would be disappointed—certainly the Chair would—if he did not ask Madam Ali Khan to rise in order that the Senate may greet her as the wife of her distinguished husband.

[Begum Liaquat Ali rose, and was greeted with applause, Senators rising in their places.]

His Excellency Liaquat Ali Khan, Begum Liaquat Ali, and the members of the party accompanying them having been escorted from the Chamber, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) reassembled, when called to order by the Vice President.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair, as is usual, will recognize Senators for routine matters, such as the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, without speeches or debate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing the President and Congress to revise present Federal-aid program to eliminate inequities

Whereas Federal aid to State governments, to local governments, and to individuals

(excluding payments to veterans) amounted to $2,190,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; and

Whereas such aid will exceed $3,000,000,000 for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and will approach $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending 1951; and

Whereas pending legislation, if adopted, for public-health aid and Federal aid to education will increase Federal grants-in-aid by more than $500,000,000 per year; and

Whereas the present session of Congress will be requested to grant an additional $2,000,000,000 in borrowing authority for the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, according to the President's budget, for the agricultural price-support program; and

Whereas the citizens of the State of New York, in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, paid $401,906,789, or 18.35 percent of the total cost of Federal-aid programs and received back only $131,158,580, or 5.98 percent of such total, making a net loss of $270,748,209 to the citizens of the State (as shown in attached schedule A), i. e., the citizens of the State received back less than $1 for every $3 paid; and

Whereas the reserve for losses in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is $315,308,500, and the net loss for the first 4 months of the current fiscal year from July 1 to October 31 amounts to $129,369,849; and

Whereas many commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation are and will be given away and a large percentage of the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation has deteriorated and has become unusable; and

Whereas these commodities are still being carried on the financial statements of the Commodity Credit Corporation at values wholly disproportionate to the present market sale price; and

Whereas prudent business-accounting methods would indicate a loss of $800,000,000 rather than the $315,000,000 set up as a reserve for losses in the financial statement of the Commodity Credit Corporation and that adequate recognition of losses would demonstrate that the Commodity Credit Corporation is now insolvent; and

Whereas the taxpayers of the State of New York will be called upon to bear a relatively large percentage of this loss, namely, 18.35 percent; and

Whereas the farmers of the State of New York have been grossly discriminated against and the citizens have received practically no benefits from the operations of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation, having received only 2 percent of Government payments to farmers and only one-third of 1 percent of price-support benefits (as shown by the following table); and

Federal aid to farmers in New York State and total United States

	New York State	Total	United States percentage
Government payments to farmers 1948 [1] (calendar year)	$5,159,000	$256,505,000	2.0
Agricultural price support:			
Loans 1948 crops [2]	6,533,894	2,197,419,289	.3
Loans 1949 crops [2]	3,600,876	819,543,497	.4
Federal tax payments 1949 (fiscal year)	7,427,220,562	40,463,125,018	18.35

[1] U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Statistics 1949.
[2] Commodity Credit Corporation, Report of Financial Condition and operations as of Oct. 31, 1949.

Whereas the Congressional Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has recommended during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress that a permanent national bipartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations be established for the purpose of appraising, clarifying, and systematizing Federal grants-in-aid; and

Whereas the glaring discriminations in benefits received by New York State under the various Federal-aid programs has resulted in a tremendous financial drain upon our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to revise the present Federal-aid program so as to remove its present inequitable and injurious effect on the people of the State of New York; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York, and to each Member of Congress of those States which are similarly discriminated against, and that these Members of Congress be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI, *Clerk.*

In senate, March 22, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING, *Secretary.*

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y., relating to the extension of time for demolition of Hyde Park Village; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by Local 220, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, CIO, of Bristol, R. I., protesting against any reduction or modification in tariff rates on canvas or rubber footwear; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 3258. A bill to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1951; with amendments (Rept. No. 1533);

S. 3282. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534); and

H. R. 7147. A bill to change the effective date of the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1535).

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 1488)

Mr. HUMPHREY, as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted his minority views on the bill (S. 3050) to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and the companion bill, H. R. 7185, which were ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3532. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a certain tract of land in the District of Columbia for use as a park or memorial site; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3533. A bill for the relief of Louie Gam Yean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3534. A bill to promote the economic recovery of the Blackfeet Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Blackfeet Reservation, and for other purposes; and

S. 3535. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act of May 25, 1948 (Public Law 554, 80th Cong.), relating to the Flathead Indian irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT (by request):

S. 3536. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1949; and

S. 3537. A bill to amend section 128 of Public Law 76, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3538. A bill to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to recordable contracts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3539. A bill to provide for the payment of extra compensation for certain work heretofore performed by customs officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 3540. A bill for the relief of Sisters M. Crocefissa, M. Reginalda, and M. Leonida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HENDRICKSON introduced Senate bill 3541, to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law" and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and Mr. IVES) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 177, to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach and Oriental Beach, Kings County, N. Y., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CORPORATION ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of May 5, 1870, as amended, to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3541) to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law" and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as folows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law" (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 29–216), be amended to read as follows:

"It shall not be lawful for any company to use any of their funds in the purchase of any stock in any other corporation: *Provided, however*, That this provision shall not apply to charitable, educational, and religious corporations incorporated under the Code of the District of Columbia or under any act of Congress."

The statement presented by Mr. HENDRICKSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HENDRICKSON

Some of the leading charitable, educational, and religious corporations of the District of Columbia find themselves frequently confronted with serious embarrassment and difficulty in respect to their investment policies as a result of judicial interpretation of existing provisions of the District Code.

For example, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the diocese of Washington, incorporated under a special act of Congress, is bound by the same legal restrictions as those which confront corporations incorporated under chapter 6 of title 29.

No doubt many other religious bodies find themselves in the same situation. The purpose of this bill is merely to end this dilemma by permitting nonprofit philanthropic institutions to invest their holdings in investments which are legal investments for trust funds.

OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN LANDS AT MANHATTAN BEACH, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for an equitable solution to the long-standing controversy between the State of New York and the Federal Government as to the ownership of certain lands in Manhattan Beach, located in Brooklyn, N. Y., and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement issued by us and Representative CELLER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach and Oriental Beach, Kings County, N. Y., introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and Mr. IVES), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The joint statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS LEHMAN AND IVES AND REPRESENTATIVE CELLER

We have this day introduced in the House of Representatives and in the Senate a joint resolution providing for an equitable solution to the long-standing controversy between the State of New York and the Federal Government as to the ownership of certain lands in Manhattan Beach, located in Brooklyn, N. Y.

The joint resolution has the full support of the New York State authorities, as well as the support of several Federal agencies concerned with the problem.

We are hopeful indeed that our efforts will prove successful this session.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to convey to the State of New York all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real estate (except buildings and improvements thereon under contract of lease between the Public Housing Administration and the State of New York) at Manhattan Beach, Kings County, N. Y., formerly used by the United States Coast Guard and at present under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

"(b) The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall be made only (1) in exchange for a conveyance by the State of New York to the United States of all right, title, and interest held or claimed by that State in or to any real estate at Manhattan Beach under the jurisdiction and control of the United States Maritime Commission or the Administrator of General Services, and (2) when the Attorney General of the United States is given assurances satisfactory to him that the State of New York will cede to the United States appropriate jurisdiction over all lands at Manhattan Beach under the jurisdiction or control of the United States Maritime Commission or the Administrator of General Services."

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 455) authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there was introduced in the Senate on June 14, 1949, by former Senator McGrath, for himself, and on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and former Senator from New York, Mr. Wagner, Senate bill 2066, to amend title X of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to provide for the encouragement and stimulation of aid to the blind recipients to become wholly or partially self-supporting. I have conferred with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the remaining co-sponsor of the bill now in the Senate, regarding the addition of my name as one of the co-sponsors of the bill. I ask unanimous consent at this time that my name be placed on the bill along with the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], former Senator McGrath and former Senator Wagner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Stanley Woodward, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Canada, vice Laurence A. Steinhardt, deceased, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ABROGATION OF TREATY RIGHTS IN MOROCCO, AND MOROCCO'S EMBARGO ON UNITED STATES PRODUCTS

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Committee on Foreign Commerce of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York concerning the abrogation of American treaty rights in Morocco, and the text of a press release of the Textile Export Association of the United States concerning approval of the United States Department of State of Morocco's embargo on many United States products, which appear in the Appendix.]

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION AND BATES MANUFACTURING CO.

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Bates Manufacturing Co., of Lewiston, Maine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREAT TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY AND LABOR BY IMPORTATIONS OF CHEAPLY MADE COMMODITIES — ARTICLE BY GEORGE SOKOLSKY

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing the threat to American industry and labor by importations of commodities made by cheap or slave labor, written by George Sokolsky, published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROBERTO ROSSELLINI—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO AND GUSTAVO GARZIA

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between himself and Gustavo Garzia, of Italy, regarding Roberto Rossellini, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUNYON'S LAST STORY—ARTICLE BY ALBERT Q. MAISEL

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Runyon's Last Story—By His Friends," written by Albert Q. Maisel, and published in the April 22, 1950, issue of Collier's magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials relating to the so-called Kerr natural-gas bill, one from the McAlester (Okla.) News-Capital of April 12, 1950, entitled "Kerr Bill in the White House," and the second from the Frederick (Okla.) Leader of April 17, 1950, entitled "Adverse to Oklahoma's Welfare," which appear in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF RENT DECONTROL IN DALLAS, TEX.

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report of what happened in Dallas, Tex., since rent decon-

trol, written by Dorothea Lyle, housing editor of the Dallas Morning News, and published in the Kansas City Star of April 30, 1950, together with a brief item under the head of "Rents down in Wichita," which appear in the Appendix.]

WHAT PRICE AN EXPANDING ECONOMY?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUNDT

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a transcript of a speech delivered by him before the American Retail Federation, in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF SECRET STATE DEPARTMENT PAPERS FOR EXAMINATION—ARTICLE BY BERT ANDREWS

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "State Department to Let Service See 'Secret' Papers Senate Couldn't," by Bert Andrews, published in the New York Herald Tribune on May 4, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today beginning at 2 o'clock.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning tomorrow and continuing an indefinite period of time.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DARBY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on May 8, 9, and 10, 1950.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Friday, May 5, 1950.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HENDRICKSON was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate this afternoon, and, on request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. FREAR was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate this afternoon, in order to enable both Senators to attend hearings being held before the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the committee may continue its hearing in the postal-rate bill for approximately another hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate until it has completed its deliberations.

POINT 4—DEBATE BETWEEN SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO AND JOHANNES STEEL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I was invited by the publisher of the Daily Compass to submit a statement taking the negative position on the question of Is There Danger of Point 4 Becoming a Purely Political Device?

My statement, together with a statement by the editor, and the statement of Johannes Steel, who took the affirmative on the question, were published in The Daily Compass on April 25, 1950.

I made it clear to the publisher before I submitted my statement that I would insist upon many reservations.

I now ask unanimous consent that the page from the Daily Compass of April 25, 1950, covering these matters, be printed in the body of the RECORD, since it pertains to a question which is before the Congress at the present time. I ask that the insertion be made in this order:

First, the statement of the publisher under the title of "Background."

Second, the statement by Johannes Steel in the affirmative.

Third, my own statement, on the negative side of the question.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUE OF THE DAY: IS THERE DANGER OF POINT 4 BECOMING A PURELY POLITICAL DEVICE?

BACKGROUND

There is often a danger of false emphasis when an attempt is made to secure a yes-and-no split on a complex issue which spreads across several aspects of world affairs. Today's page may be taken as a case in point. It is not that either contributor begs the question, but that they present differing views which more or less nullify the original formulation of the question.

Senator JOHNSON, for instance, does not give an unqualified no. He starts right out by saying that up until now point 4 has been purely political and then goes on to show how, in his opinion, it may be developed so that its major purpose will be more economic than political, although he accepts the political motivation for barring the United States from markets in eastern Europe and Asia. He is less concerned with the raising of the standard of living in backward countries than he is in finding some outlet for our manufactured products. His aim is economic rather than humanitarian.

The dangers of such an economic and political approach were pointed out by various religious leaders at the recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Dr. Walter van Kirk of the Federal Council of Churches said that the program should be handled through the United Nations, that he did not think that friends could be bought on a unilateral basis.

Clarence E. Pickett of the American Friends Service Committee, speaking for the Quakers, said: "Under the pressure of what is termed a cold war there is a temptation to use gifts of commodities or of technical personnel to further political ideologies and not primarily because of our interest in helping underdeveloped people. To follow that pattern, in my judgment, is fatal. People are not deceived—even those with relatively little opportunity for education and modern technical knowledge. There is deep suspicion now in the world that Americans are primarily interested in using their power for the purpose of buying the support of allies. If we want to expand the value of a democratic system we must not use these duller instruments of political expediency to make a lasting contribution to a richer world."

Johannes Steel, publisher of Report on World Affairs and columnist of the Sunday Compass, has been a newspaper correspondent for newspapers in America, Europe, Russia, and Asia. From 1938 to 1947 he broadcast daily as a news analyst and he is the author of a number of books including Will the Marshall Plan Renazify Germany (1948) and the Case for Peace (1949).

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado, was born in Scandia, Kans., in 1884 and was raised on a cattle ranch in Nebraska. Former executive of a farmers' cooperative and twice governor of his State, he was first elected to the Senate in 1936.—*Clip Boutell.*

YES—SEES PROPOSAL AS INSTRUMENT OF THE COLD WAR AND BLOW TO UN

(By Johannes Steel, columnist and author)

Since President Truman announced his bold new program on January 20, 1949, hundreds of essays and articles and brochures have been written on this subject by various Government and business institutions. The avalanche of material on point 4 has been so overwhelming that it has convinced some of the writers themselves that it actually exists and that it is indeed a vehicle of American foreign policy in the underdeveloped countries.

Within a week after the President's initial announcement, many important institutions and personalities had paid homage and had pledged their support to this bold new program. A delegation from the National Association of Manufacturers visited the White House; British Foreign Secretary Bevin announced that England would welcome American capital; a special session of the French Cabinet met and instructed the French Ambassador at Washington to obtain more data on the matter. And so on down the line.

When President Truman's first press conference after the inaugural speech took place on January 27, the New York Times White House correspondent understated the anticlimax by reporting blandly: "The President acknowledged that he did not know the specific details, the when nor the how of his plan."

Yet, ever since, Government and business propaganda machines have been working overtime to sell point 4. What is the meaning of this seeming contradiction? Does point 4 exist or does it not? The answer is that it exists only in large-scale capital investment in colonial and semicolonial countries. As for the development of the underdeveloped countries, it does not exist. Under the guise of technical assistance it contains a new machinery (new as compared with the old-fashioned British imperial set-up) for creating a favorable climate throughout the world for the flow of American capital. In both respects point 4 is an institutionalization of American colonial policies in Latin America during the last half of the century. Let us analyze briefly these two aspects of American capital exported under point 4.

Private investments: It is naive to assume that American private investments abroad are going to shift from the traditional field of ultraprofitable extractive enterprises to manufacturing or irrigation projects under the sheer weight of the proclamation of point 4. Of the $17,000,000,000 in total American investments abroad, over $11,000,000,000 belongs to private investors. Of the latter amount, close to one-half is invested in oil, and the rest—except for some manufacturing in Canada, England, and western Europe—is represented in mines and plantations of Latin America, Africa, and south Asia.

The only field in which the American businessman is going to invest is in the old gold-banana category, where the political climate is balmy, such as in the oil kingdom

of slave-holding Saudi Arabia, in the coup-d'etat-ridden banana republics, and in pro-Nazi South Africa. Overseas profits must be around 30 percent to justify the risks, according to the prevailing opinion in Wall Street today.

Technical assistance: Without exception, every published piece on point 4 is silent on the when and the how of this aspect of the program except in citing United States experience in Latin America in the former activities of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and the Interdepartmental Committee for Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. The long list of technical-assistance outfits working under these two organizations is impressive and rich in terminology. But the record of their achievements and their scope is insignificant.

The Abbinck mission, which last year returned from Brazil, reported that that country, with a population of 50,000,000, could boast of a hundred thousand plows, mostly of primitive design. According to the EAO figures, the caloric values of food consumption in Latin America, with the exception of Argentina, is among the lowest in the world. The yearly rate of increase in food production in Latin America is 1.6 percent, which is more than leveled off by the rise in population through births and immigration.

This is the record of American technical assistance in Latin America, and this is what the State Department says it is going to give to the rest of the world.

The very proposal of point 4 struck a blow at the UN, which should be the organization to undertake any program such as was ostensibly envisaged under the plan. The manner in which the program has been formulated and the character of the implementation make it quite clear that point 4 can develop only into a crude device to force underdeveloped areas to abandon their development of native industries in order to produce strategic raw materials for the United States.

Finally, the reason why all plans under point 4 must of necessity be stillborn is the fact, as we have seen, that President Truman conceived it as an instrument of the cold war and the means of containing communism, which, as far as the backward areas are concerned, is merely a slogan to oppose all anti-imperialist manifestations and the struggle for independence on the part of people who have been hitherto held in one form of colonial bondage or another.

NO—PROPERLY ORGANIZED, PLAN CAN PROTECT OUR ECONOMIC FUTURE

(By Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee)

Up to the present hour the point 4 proposal has been a political device only. Up to now it has been a visionary dream of undefined ghostly proportions. Nevertheless it is loaded with constructive potentialities. If properly implemented, it could develop into the most cogent statesmanlike concept of this century. It ought to be used to displace the Marshall plan and retire to oblivion that stopgap scheme whose mission has been fulfilled.

As a device to relieve hunger and distress in the discouraged and war-torn western Europe sector the Marshall plan has fulfilled well a worthy humanitarian purpose. But its American creators never conceived it to be what it actually is—a relief measure. Its proclaimed objective was to put western Europe back into the manufacturing business in a big way. However, the planners overlooked one vital detail. Where were the markets for these vast quantities of new goods? To keep going western Europe must exchange them for her vitally necessary supplies of raw products, but with whom? The United States has food and fibers to spare and for sale, but also we have 4,000,000 unemployed now. Our shelves are loaded already with heavy invoices of manufactured articles and burdensome surpluses of every sort plague us. We don't need anyone's industrial output; we need buyers ourselves. Our production of most goods is being reduced month by month because of progressively fewer buyers.

Historically economically, eastern and western Europe have complemented each other; eastern Europe, a large natural-resource area, has furnished the raw materials for industrialized western Europe. Whether so intended or not, the fact remains that the operation of the Marshall plan has closed the iron curtain much tighter between these two neighboring areas.

It is well understood and universally agreed that the outpouring of Marshall-plan dollars must end in 1952.

Obviously western Europe needs something more realistically based than "pie in the sky" hand-out dollars if its recovery is to be permanent.

President Truman has warmly pushed the point 4 program, an intelligent and bold policy for the investment of American capital in the underdeveloped areas of the world. But is it the answer to our dilemma? Correctly organized, I believe that it is.

It is my belief that the answer to this pertinent query is Africa. Here is a huge continent whose vast virgin natural resources are virtually untapped and untouched. Here is a tremendous area which can produce minerals to fill every need and where, when developed, her agricultural products can feed hundreds of millions. Here is a continent hungry for the gadgets, conveniences, and comforts of modern civilization. Western Europe and Africa fit together like the pieces in a jigsaw puzzle.

Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, recognizing the failure of the Marshall plan to solve anything of a permanent nature, now points up sharply the necessity for American purchase of vast quantities of western European manufactured goods. Accordingly, the State Department plans to promulgate sharp tariff cuts on some 2,500 items of potential imported commodities. A 40-nation trade conference will be held in September at Torquay, England, at which time our delegation is to negotiate with 17 nations for a lowering of our tariff rates. What-in essence, does this program mean? However proper or necessary it may be to western Europe, it will fall flat on its face in the United States politically. American industry will not endorse it. American labor will not buy it. Six months after it is made effective, any such program will raise such a political storm in the industrial States that in comparison the Nagasaki atomic bomb will sound like a firecracker. The hour is here when the Marshall plan, with all of its glaring failures for permanent cures, must be replaced by the Johnson plan.

The United States with more debt than all the rest of the world combined, cannot give away any more dollars. But we can set up an RFC in Africa to finance reclamation projects and the development of vast areas of agricultural lands in the dark continent on a project-by-project basis. We should remember with pride that in the depression the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loaned billions to American railroads and other industries. These loans saved essential industries from bankruptcy, but out of them the RFC made a handsome profit. It can do the same thing in Africa and while it is doing it, provide jobs and homes for 100,000,000 western Europeans. The Johnson plan is the sensible way to save western Europe from communism.

To bolster western Europe; to relieve American taxpayers from the burdensome flow of dollars to western Europe; and to protect our domestic industrial economy and employment we must get busy on point 4 in Africa with plenty of privately owned American dollars.

All this can be done through a program of guaranteeing private American investments without any burden whatsoever upon our Federal Treasury. The bold new program which President Truman has envisioned and which he has named the point 4 program will get the job done if it be implemented with the Johnson plan.

AWARD OF THE 1949 PULITZER PRIZE FOR EDITORIAL WRITING

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, recently Carl M. Saunders, editor of the Jackson Citizen Patriot, of Jackson, Mich., was awarded the Pulitzer prize for distinguished editoral writing. He received it upon the recommendation of the trustees of Columbia University. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the telegram from the university to Mr. Saunders announcing the award.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARL M. SAUNDERS,
The Jackson Citizen Patriot,
Jackson, Mich.:

On behalf of President Eisenhower, I have the honor to advise that university trustees have awarded Pulitzer prize to you for distinguished editorial writing.

GRAYSON L. KIRK,
Provost of the University.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which won the Pulitzer prize be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS EDITORIAL WHICH WON PRIZE

Here is the editorial, entitled "First Things First," for which the Pulitzer prize was awarded to editor Carl M. Saunders of the Citizen Patriot:

"A year ago the Citizen Patriot proposed that a period during Memorial Day be set aside to pray for peace.

"Our suggestion was approved by the Congress of the United States in the form of a resolution sponsored by Senator HOMER FERGUSON and Representative EARL C. MICHENER. The resolution called upon President Truman to proclaim a period of Memorial Day for prayers for peace.

"The White House issued the proclamation. From Arlington Cemetery the chief of chaplains of the United States Army delivered the prayer for peace, the phrasing of which we proposed.

"America, commemorating the memories of the men who have fallen on far-scattered battlefields that this Nation and its way of life might endure, prayed that further sacrifice of war be avoided.

"What's more logical than that Memorial Day be marked by such a prayer for peace?

"We recite these circumstances only for the purpose of urging that again this year the President proclaim a period of Memorial Day as the proper occasion for Nation-wide supplication for peace.

"Last year the original suggestion was made only 2 weeks before Memorial Day.

This year we make the suggestion early enough to permit normal, routine procedure in Congress and again we remind our readers that this is inspired only with realization that armaments and men alone cannot mold the shape of things to come in this world. First things should come first, and a nation which believes in God should not depend upon the materialism of earth to save it from the great tragedy of war.

"We repeat in part the editorial of last May:

"'The United States is generally classified as a "Christian nation."

"'If it means anything at all, it means that the vast majority of our people accept the basic tenets of Christian faith. Beyond that there is a large minority of Americans who worship in the Hebrew faith. Both Christian and Hebrew believe in God as the maker of heaven and earth.

"'Yet as a Nation we seem utterly unaware of God or His place in the making of history.'

"As individuals many Americans worship. Many pray to God daily or more often.

"Why then should not America pray as a nation in the time when as a nation we are in dire need of help and guidance?

"We do have one day in the year supposedly dedicated to thanksgiving when we as a people are expected to offer thanks to the Supreme Being for the blessings showered upon us.

"But we have no day or hour or minute when as a people we turn to prayer.

"If we are a Christian nation, isn't a national moment of prayer a logical natural course?

"Differences in creed or systems of worship or dogma need not enter into this discussion if as a people we believe that there is a God who shapes the course of our lives.

"It should be possible for Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and others to join in a common appeal to a common God.

"The world is troubled today. America is deeply troubled. The threat of war hangs over all of us. Yet we want peace. We are not a warlike people. We cherish the lives of these young people who become sacrifices in war. We are ready to be tolerant of all nations which do not menace us, regardless of divergent ideologies.

"So far as this newspaper is concerned, it believes that the preparation for defense of our country is wise and is not in contravention of basic religious beliefs. We appreciate, of course, that some good people disagree with us. They do not believe a fire department is needed to protect us from war's flames even though conflagration threatens.

"But first things should come first.

"And the first defense against disaster should be prayer. The first appeal for peace should be to the Omnipotent Master of the universe."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is very appropriate that General Eisenhower, a distinguished and able military leader, is the president of Columbia University, and that the editorial relates to the moral strength of our Nation rather than to its military strength. It recognizes that man does not live by bread alone and that a nation cannot be saved by guns and bombs alone, but that we need more than guns and bombs to enable us to keep the peace. The conflict now going on in the world is a conflict of ideologies. It centers around a belief in a Supreme Being and the lack of such a belief. America and her allies in thought believe in a Supreme Being. It is, therefore, essential that we affirm our faith with our allies who believe as we do, that we may have in our cause the faith of our people and make sure that our cause is just.

Mr. President, I am hoping that Memorial Day may be made a day of prayer for peace, as suggested and sponsored by the editorial which won the Pulitzer prize and as provided in the resolution which I had the honor of presenting to the Senate and which was passed by the Senate.

RATIO OF REPRESENTATION ON SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have an opportunity to suggest that a correction be made in the RECORD, or, at least, to make a constructive observation, so that there will be no misapprehension about the number of majority and minority members on Senate committees. I refer to page 6243 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3. The Vice President was making some observations relative to the appointment of members to the Special Committee on Small Business, and he made this statement:

> The minority leader did submit a list, and two of the five minority members were chosen from that list. The Chair made the committee eight Democrats and five Republicans, because that is the ratio of all the committees of the Senate at this time.

It was then that the junior Senator from Nebraska asked to be recognized. Not that it is pertinent, now that committee appointments have been made, but I feel that the representation on committees should be set forth correctly. I am sure that when the Vice President examines the list of committees and the number of members of the respective parties who constitute the committees it will be self-explanatory. However, for the attention of the Vice President, I wish to state that one committee has a ratio of 13 to 8. Six committees have a ratio of 7 to 6. Eight committees have a ratio of 8 to 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not recall whether he referred to all committees. He meant that he was guided by the ratio of membership on standing legislative committees.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the distinguished Vice President. No doubt that was his intention. I wish to point out that even then the ratio is 5.687 to 7.313. Therefore I felt the statement did not include all committees. Six committees have a ratio of 7 to 6. Because the committee which is about to be appointed is supposed to be as nearly nonpartisan as a committee can be, I felt the ratio should be at least 6 to 7, in accordance with the precedents of the Senate in the Eighty-first Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1069) to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 4, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1069) to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit at this time a privileged matter, the conference report on H. R. 5472.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the report for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 85, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, and agree to the same.
>
> Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 7, lines 19 and 20, strike out "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 13, 1949;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Senate Document Numbered 117, Eighty-first Congress; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $21,300,000 for the initial and partial accomplish of the project;"; and the Senate agree to the same.
>
> Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 8, line 2, strike out the figure "$89,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$80,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.
>
> Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out the words "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949;",

and insert in lieu thereof "House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 15, line 14, change the date "June 30, 1949" to "June 30, 1950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 22, line 22, after the comma, insert the following: "consisting of approximately one thousand nine hundred linear feet of pressure conduit and seven hundred feet of earth dike", and, on line 24, delete the period at the end of the sentence and substitute a comma in lieu thereof and add the following: ": *Provided*, That the provisions of local cooperation applicable to the Hartford, Connecticut, project heretofore authorized, as amended, are applicable to this modification at an estimated cost to local interests of $150,000."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 24, line 6, change the figure "$68,377,000" to "$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 30, line 3, strike out the comma after the word "times"; line 4, strike out the words "sixty-nine thousand acre-feet of"; line 5, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add the following: "as authorized by existing law."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 36, line 12, after the comma following "1948", insert the following: "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-first Congress,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 2, change the period to a comma and add the following: "as set forth in the House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-first Congress."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 8, strike out the following: "dated September 12, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as contained in House Document Numbered 530, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 20, after the comma following "1949", insert the following: "and the Chief of Engineers in his report dated December 12, 1949,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 38, line 24, strike out the following: "dated June 27, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof "as contained in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 39, line 15, after the comma following "1949", insert the following: "and as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated November 15, 1949,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 89 through 106, inclusive: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 89 through 106, inclusive, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language in the said amendments and in lieu thereof, on page 45, after line 10, add the following paragraphs:

"In addition to previous authorizations and authorizations herein, the projects listed below for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin (including the Willamette River Basin) substantially in accordance with the plans recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949, and approved in the letter dated February 1, 1950, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for construction by the Corps of Engineers, both contained in House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress, second session, are hereby approved, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $75,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of those projects and for the continued prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Willamette River Basin approved in the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress:

"Power facilities at Lookout Point Dam, Middle Fork of the Willamette River, Oregon.

"Hills Creek Dam, Middle Fork of Willamette River, Oregon.

"Dexter reregulating dam, Middle Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, Middle Fork-North Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Fall Creek Dam, Fall Creek, Middle Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Holley Dam, Calapooya River, Oregon.

"Willamette Falls Fish Ladder, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Willamette River channel improvements, bank protection works, and channel clearing and snagging.

"Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Montana.

"Priest Rapids Dam, Columbia River, Washington.

"John Day Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon.

"The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon.

"Local flood protection project at Pendleton, Oregon, and Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

"Local flood protection projects in the Columbia River Basin, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, provided that with respect to these local flood protection projects the following conditions shall apply:

"(1) Not to exceed $15,000,000 of this authorization shall be available for these local flood-protection projects.

"(2) All of the local flood-protection projects undertaken pursuant to this item shall be economically justified prior to construction.

"(3) Local cooperation specified in the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended shall be required."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 55, line 15, change the figure "$1,837,000,000" to "$1,250,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 58, beginning with line 5, strike out all of section 219, and insert on page 49, between lines 20 and 21, the following:

"Arkansas, White and Red River Basins, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Kansas, and Missouri, with a view to developing comprehensive, integrated plans of improvement for navigation, flood control, domestic and municipal water supplies, reclamation and irrigation, development and utilization of hydroelectric power, conservation of soil, forest and fish and wildlife resources, and other beneficial development and utilization of water resources including such consideration of recreation uses, salinity and sediment control, and pollution abatement as may be provided for under Federal policies and procedures, all to be coordinated with the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, other appropriate Federal agencies and with the States, as required by existing law: *Provided*, That Federal projects now constructed and in operation, under construction, authorized for construction, or projects that may be hereafter authorized substantially in accordance with reports currently before or that may hereafter come before the Congress, if in compliance with the first section of an Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), shall not be altered, changed, restricted, delayed, retarded, or otherwise impeded or interfered with by reason of this paragraph."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 155: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 70, line 3, change the figure "220" to "219"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HARRY P. CAIN,
GEO. W. MALONE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida give the Senate a summary of the changes which were made in conference?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the intention of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the conference report for the conferees on the part of the Senate. The action of the conferees, 5 representing the Senate, and 5 representing the House, was unanimous. Approving action by the House has already been taken.

The changes in the bill in form from the bill as passed by the Senate are very few. I wish to submit, and ask that it be included as a part of my remarks at

this point, a brief statistical table showing the relatively few changes which were made in conference.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Data on H. R. 5472 as agreed to by the conferees

	Rivers and harbors		Flood control		Total	
	Number of projects	Amount	Number of projects	Amount	Number of projects	Amount
House bill	65	$119, 470, 000	40	$998, 116, 000	105	$1, 117, 586, 000
Added in Senate	29	108, 903, 000	24	366, 384, 000	53	475, 287, 000
Subtotal (bill as passed by Senate)	94	228, 373, 000	64	1, 364, 500, 000	158	1, 592, 873, 000
Reduction by conferees	(1)	24, 650, 000	(1)	84, 630, 000	(1)	109, 280, 000
Bill as agreed to by conferees	94	203, 723, 000	64	1, 279, 870, 000	158	1, 483, 593, 000

[1] No projects were eliminated by the conferees. The reductions made by the conferees are as follows:

Rivers and harbors	Reduction	Flood control	Reduction
Ouachita River, Ark. and La	$15, 650, 000	Savannah River	$18, 377, 000
Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla	9, 000, 000	Willamette and Columbia Rivers	66, 253, 000
Total	24, 650, 000	Total	84, 630, 000

Total reduction by conferees: $109,280,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. To call attention to the figures involved, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the total amount of authorizations added by the Senate to the House bill, and therefore the total amount of authorizations subject to conference, was $475,287,000. In conference there was a reduction agreed upon by all conferees of items amounting to $109,280,000, or a little less than one-fourth of the total amount subject to conference.

I may report that no authorizations were completely eliminated in conference, but reductions in amounts were made, as well as deletions of certain parts of authorizations, such as, for instance, in the items affecting the Columbia River Basin, which did not have budget approval. All such unapproved items were deleted by unanimous action of the conferees.

To make brief report upon the specific items eliminated, the reductions under the rivers and harbors title were on two projects only. The Arkansas River Basin was reduced $9,000,000, but the House agreed to the Senate amendment removing the previous House restriction on bank stabilization in the lower portion of the river. That is, no restriction will apply, and the amount available will be equally available on the lower portion of the river and on the upper portion. The Ouachita River project was reduced $15,650,000, which will result in deferment of a part of this work.

In the flood-control title, the Savannah River project was reduced $18,377,000. I may say for the record and for the information of the distinguished Senators from Georgia that the total addition to the authorization appearing in the amendment adopted by the Senate was $28,377,000. In conference it was thought desirable, though regretted by the Senate conferees, to reduce that amount by $18,377,000. That means that the authorization previously included in the House bill will be raised from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000. I may say for the assurance of the Senators from Georgia that it was quite clear from the report of the engineers that the diminished amount of $50,000,000 would be ample and adequate to cover the actual expenditures which may be expected to be made for some years in the future.

With reference to the Columbia and Willamette Rivers, I wish to report to the Senate that the increase in authorization which was voted by the Senate, of $142,000,000, was reduced to $75,000,000, or a reduction of approximately $67,000,000. This reduction was accomplished by eliminating works which did not have the approval of the Budget Bureau and by reducing the amount available for general application to the approved works. The conferees felt that the reduced amount would be sufficient for a 3-year period.

The conferees agreed to all the surveys added by the Senate, except that in the case of the proposed comprehensive survey of the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins—and I call this to the attention of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]—it was felt that this survey could be adequately accomplished by existing agencies and procedures, without setting up a separate commission, as proposed in the Senate amendment to the bill. In other words, instead of having the work done by a separate commission, as proposed in the Senate amendment, it is now transferred to the category of a survey to be handled by existing agencies.

Lastly, as to the totals involved, as agreed to by the conferees and now reported, the bill carries a total authorization for rivers and harbors and flood control of $1,484,000,000. In terms of current price levels this is a smaller bill than we have had in many years, being considerably smaller than the bills of 1944 and 1946, in particular. I think it may be illuminating to contrast the size of this bill with the appropriations for the current year in these two fields, and the appropriations requested by the President's budget for fiscal 1951.

In connection with the current year's appropriation, the original appropriation for 1950 for these two fields was $635,000,000, which has been augmented somewhat by deficiency appropriations.

The President's budget estimate for 1951 amounts to $798,000,000, so it is readily apparent that in 2 years alone, if the current rate of expenditures should be continued, the amount of the authorizations embraced in the bill could be expended. I do not wish to create the impression that all the authorizations which would be upon the books would be included in this bill, because, as the Senate well knows, there are numerous authorizations already existent, but I do desire to make it clear that in the opinion of the conferees in no case is any project left in a condition in which it might suffer in the next 2 or 3 years, which will probably be the period of time elapsing before a new bill on this subject will be presented.

Mr. President, without going more exhaustively into the matter, but with perfect willingness to report upon any phase upon which any Member of the Senate may desire more specific information, I would like to say again that the conference was unanimous in its final action, and that the House has already taken favorable action upon the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on agreeing to the conference report I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Magnuson
Anderson	Hayden	Malone
Benton	Hendrickson	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Myers
Butler	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	Robertson
Connally	Jenner	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Darby	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Taft
Eastland	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Leahy	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Tobey
Ferguson	Lodge	Tydings
Flanders	McCarthy	Wherry
Frear	McFarland	Wiley
George	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Can the order for the yeas and nays be suspended or vacated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand. The presence of a quorum has just been ascertained. I wonder if the Senator from Massachusetts is willing that we may have a viva voce vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered. I will have to insist on my request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who is also absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—44

Anderson	Hayden	Magnuson
Benton	Hill	Malone
Butler	Hoey	Maybank
Cain	Holland	Millikin
Connally	Humphrey	Mundt
Cordon	Hunt	Myers
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Donnell	Kefauver	Russell
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Kilgore	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Lehman	Thye
George	McCarthy	Wherry
Green	McFarland	Young
Gurney	McKellar	

NAYS—24

Aiken	Frear	O'Conor
Brewster	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bricker	Ives	Schoeppel
Bridges	Jenner	Taft
Byrd	Kem	Tobey
Douglas	Knowland	Tydings
Ferguson	Lodge	Wiley
Flanders	McMahon	Williams

NOT VOTING—28

Capehart	Langer	Robertson
Chapman	Long	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Lucas	Sparkman
Downey	McCarran	Taylor
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	Martin	Vandenberg
Graham	Morse	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Murray	Withers
Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney	
Johnston, S. C.	Pepper	

So the report was agreed to.

WINNING THE COLD WAR—V

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to make another one of my weekly suggestions on the conduct of the cold war, looking forward to winning it.

On April 11, 1950, the Russian Government announced that its fliers had found "a four-motored military airplane B–29 (Flying Fortress) with American identification signs" 13 miles inside the coastline of Latvia; that Russian planes arose from a nearby airdrome, demanding that the American plane follow them for a landing; that the American plane refused this demand, and opened fire on the Soviet airplanes; that the leading Soviet fighter returned the fire; and that the American plane turned toward the sea and disappeared.

The reply of our Government to this information was prompt and definite. We stated that the only American military aircraft which was in the air in the Baltic area at that time was a Navy Privateer, a converted B–24, and was making a flight over the Baltic Sea; that the plane was overdue and had not been heard from. Furthermore, it was stated that this plane was not armed.

The replying note was a reiteration of the Russian claims. A later news item stated that the fliers who had found and shot at the American plane had been decorated. The next news was that a life raft which was of the type issued to the Privateer had been found in the Baltic Sea many miles from the scene of the incident as given by the Russian Government, and later that pieces of wreckage which were identifiable as presumably parts of the missing plane had also been discovered.

Mr. President, this incident has given the American people serious concern. It is too plainly reminiscent of the notes which used to pass between President Wilson and the German Government, which were intransigent on both sides and led us into conflict. It is likewise uncomfortably reminiscent of the way in which Hitler progressively tried out the firmness and stamina of England and France, which finally resulted in opening the conflict of the Second World War.

It is not possible to predict at this time what the result of this incident will be. In the minds of everyone it represents a stepping up of the tension of the cold war; and, as in the whole history of the cold war, the initiative is in the hands of the Russians. They determine where the blow shall fall; they take the offensive; they initiate the incidents; we toil along in the rear and pick up the pieces.

Mr. President, I am convinced that we should and must take the initiative in bringing this latest attack to a clear-cut and decisive issue. Both Russia and ourselves are members of the United Nations. Russia boycotts it whenever it suits her purpose, as it usually does. We meekly submit to allowing its machinery to rust in idleness, solacing ourselves with spending millions of dollars on an elaborate structure on the East Side of New York.

In other ways than this we are unfair to the United Nations. We carry on our painful efforts outside its organization. The aid to Greece and Turkey was conceived as operating independently of the United Nations. Only by an ingenious modification was the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] able to show a semblance of connection between our undertaking and the great enterprise within whose field of action the Grecian troubles were presumed to lie.

Our next great enterprise, still persisting, is the Marshall plan. This likewise, by force of events, has found itself outside the United Nations organization, on which the hopes of the world were

focused. This great organization lies before us helpless and deserted. Mr. President, it is time to use it.

The Charter of that organization provides procedures for such disputes and situations as might lead to international friction. The question at issue between this country and Russia over the shooting of an unarmed American aircraft should be referred to the United Nations as it can be under article 34. Let me read the entire article:

ART. 34. The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Security Council may then, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 33, put into effect paragraph 1 of that article, which reads as follows:

ART. 33. 1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Should one or both parties refuse to proceed thus, it is then appropriate to apply article 36, paragraphs 1 and 2 of which read as follows:

ART. 36. 1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

Finally article 37 seems appropriate:

ART. 37. 1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

Now, of course, there is a catch to all this. Russia and ourselves are both members of the Security Council. The presence of China and Yugoslavia in the Security Council is challenged by Russia. It would be appropriate under article 27, section 3, for Russia and the United States to refuse to vote in the Security Council on this matter. Russia might, however, refuse reference to that procedure just described. Article 14 provides that the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful settlement of matters of this sort, and article 11, paragraph 3, provides that they may be brought to the attention of the Security Council, while articles 10, 11, and 12 provide for full discussion in the General Assembly and the making of recommendations to the Security Council and other members of the United Nations. But the General Assembly is not in session. In accordance with article 20:

The General Assembly shall meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as occasion may require. Special sessions shall be convoked by the Secretary-General at the request of the Security Council or of a majority of the members of the United Nations.

Since we are facing a situation in which the Security Council may not act, it will be necessary to canvass a majority of the members of the United Nations to bring this dispute before the Assembly.

Admittedly, the results of procedure in the United Nations might be limited, but we should have a public examination before a world forum of critical incidents which, if unexamined, point toward the destruction of the peace of the world.

This procedure, in my judgment, should be immediately and vigorously followed through to whatever conclusion can be reached, inconclusive though the results may be. It is a test of the United Nations which must be made. We may feel confident that whether in the Council or in the Assembly our representative, Ambassador Austin, my predecessor on this floor, and such other members as may be appointed to the Assembly, will pursue our cause with discretion, wisdom, and courage. But the time has come for a show-down.

One event that is possible, if we are determined enough in our attack, is that Russia, instead of walking out, in detail, will walk out altogether. To my mind, that is an event far preferable to the proposals made by ex-President Hoover in his speech to the newspaper publishers on April 27. He advised abandoning the United Nations and starting all over again with a membership confined to the free peoples. It is inevitable that we should sympathize with Mr. Hoover, but is it not better to have an objectionable tenant bow himself out, rather than to get rid of him by burning the house down?

The American people have put years of hope and faith into the United Nations. It is time for that great institution to justify that faith and hope. It may do so, Mr. President, if it resolutely goes to battle on the issue which the Russian Government has presented to us and to it. If we side-step the United Nations again there is danger that it will die on our hands.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. From what the able and distinguished Senator from Vermont has just said concerning the opportunity of the Security Council, I gathered that the Security Council has sufficient authority to undertake the investigation of a dispute, without being requested to do so by either of two parties to such dispute. May I inquire of my friend from Vermont whether my understanding is correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. It is my understanding from a study of the Charter that the Security Council can initiate an investigation, and does not have to be requested to do so, though the primary method is by request.

Mr. CAIN. It would be natural to assume that one of the parties to a dispute would request an investigation by the Security Council. But that is not being done in the case before us. I wonder if the Senator from Vermont has any conclusions as to why the Security Council, together with the United Nations, is not affirmatively and positively grappling with this dangerous predicament.

Mr. FLANDERS. The only suggestion I can make, which seems to me to be a trivial one, is that we have got out of the habit of referring anything to the United Nations excepting minor questions. We have got out of the habit of asking them to intervene on any of the major questions affecting peace. There has been a reason for that, in many instances, because so many questions have been tied up with the matter of treaties in the settlement of World War II, and such questions, as I understand, lie outside the purview of the United Nations. This seems to be a matter which is outside that area, and so it should come within the purview of the United Nations.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator from Vermont permit me to say that the junior Senator from Washington thinks he understands the position taken by the Senator from Vermont, and I should like to associate myself with the position he has just expressed. The only reason I make mention of the matter is in the hope that the Senator from Vermont, the junior Senator from Washington, and nearly all other Senators, in expressing similar urgings with reference to the Security Council of the United Nations, will bring about an investigation which I believe to be imperatively necessary. The Senator from Vermont is probably conscious of a speech several days ago made by one of our very distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], in which he said he hoped, but thought there was reason to doubt, that we could longer avoid war with Russia. If there be any substance to that fear, I think if the United States does not ask for an examination by the Security Council, the Security Council itself should, automatically, and at an early moment, grapple with this world-wide dilemma.

Mr. FLANDERS. I agree completely with the Senator from Washington. The Security Council thus may find itself stymied by the veto of Russia, from the standpoint of the question of taking up the subject. But there are ways of getting around that, as I indicated, such as an appeal to the Assembly.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on Senate bill 3304——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on the last item?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator indicated that the Security Council has authority, under its charter, to go into the matters to which he has referred. I wonder whether he can advise the Senate if the Security Council, on its own motion, has ever gone into a similar set of facts and made an investigation?

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish I could remember what happened in connection with the Grecian border and the Iran situation. Whether an appeal was made to the Security Council, or whether the Council itself took initial action, I do not remember. But there were two examples of going into questions of this sort.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I recall the Iranian matter. I think that was on the application of the Prime Minister of Iran, but I am not clear as to the Grecian situation. I wonder if the Senate can have that checked and put the result into the RECORD as a part of his remarks.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have just been informed by my assistant, who has been checking the matter, that there has been no case in which the Council has acted without request.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator. Here is a case in which it could act, and there is no reason why the Security Council should not, on its own motion, take up the matter, as well as on petition.

Mr. FLANDERS. That seems to me to be the case. I hope it will do so.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to speak for a few moments on the bill which is presently before the Senate. As I have watched the operations of ECA, the broad purposes for which it was established have been effectively forwarded, and it has been moving toward the completion of those broad objectives, the economic recovery of the countries of western Europe, and a parallel and continuing movement toward the restraint of communism. We know what has taken place. We know that, so far as statistics go, there is evidence of real recovery in all European nations. In fact, the recovery has exceeded the predictions originally made.

So far as helping to stop the spread of communism is concerned, I doubt that anyone can deny the proposition that communism was stopped politically in France and Italy very largely, and most importantly, as a result of ECA activity. It has a fine record of achievement for the time in which it has been in operation. It is a self-liquidating and self-terminating undertaking. The proposal has been made, and is still urged, that we reduce our contributions by approximately $1,000,000,000 a year for 4 years in which the ECA is to be in operation. I think it is always wise in providing for liquidating any project of this sort, which is tied in so tightly to the economy of other nations and the economy of our own Nation, that its abandonment should be by orderly processes, because we have found how difficult it is, for instance, to liquidate our war controls in any except an orderly manner.

What I wish particularly to address myself to is the proposal made in a number of amendments presented that the amount of the ECA appropriation for this year should be decreased by more than $1,000,000,000 of the amount originally called for. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a few days ago made a very clear presentation of the case for cutting off a large part of the appropriations for England, in view of the fact that it had materially improved the position of its dollar reserves. That increased improvement in dollar reserves is a real undertaking, but, viewed not from quarter to quarter, but viewed over the year, it is not at all impressive.

The sum in March 1949, was $1,912,000,000. On March 30, 1950, it was $1,984,000,000, a difference of only $72,000,000. That sum represents only a small percentage of increase for the year. It is true that in September 1949, the dollar reserve went down to $1,425,000,000, which is more than $500,000,000 below the present figure. That dip, however, was due to special causes and not to any broad general improvement in the movement of goods and services in the channels of international trade. It was due very largely to the expenditure of dollar reserves abroad in anticipation of devaluation, and the recovery is the return of funds of that sort to the balance. In other words, there is a condition somewhat analogous to the drawing out of deposits in a bank on the occasion of a run, and the return of funds to the bank as the run has been stemmed and depositors regain confidence. Therefore, it does not seem to me that the present position of the dollar balances of Great Britain, as compared with what they were a year ago, and in consideration of the temporary and accidental elements in the broad quarterly changes, warrant a reduction in that part of the funds which are allocated to Great Britain.

There are many other elements aside from the size of the dollar balances which give us grave concern with regard to Great Britain. Great Britain is not organized at present in its economy or in its Government in a way for which we can have the slightest sympathy. It is quite true that the support we have given Great Britain has enabled her to continue along on her present course, which otherwise she could not have done. However, it is also quite true that this has been an advantage to the economy of the world as a whole and all the nations dependent on Great Britain's monetary standard. So that, while we have had the embarrassment and distaste of lending support to an economic plan or method to which we cannot give sympathy, the over-all results, I believe, have been good. With regard to this and to a number of other criticisms which have been raised on the floor, among which I would include the criticism of shipping goods in categories which we do not allow our own people to ship by countries whom we are assisting under the Marshall plan to countries beyond the iron curtain. It is well that such criticisms should be brought out in discussion on the floor of the Senate, so that they may become a part of the RECORD, and thus come to the careful attention of those who administer the Marshall plan. At the same time, we must recognize the difficulties they encounter.

There is one other proposal to which, because of its source, I feel I must give special attention. The senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has been a supporter of the Marshall plan from the beginning. He has spoken for it, worked for it, and voted for it. Therefore, when he suggests a reduction of $500,000,000, it comes from a source to which thoughtful attention must be given. One point came to my mind immediately when he made his proposal, namely, that we might seem to be in the position, having greatly increased an expenditure for rivers, harbors, and flood control, of taking it out on ECA. There is, of course, no connection between the two except that this question arises: Do we apply the same kind of judgment, do we apply the same kind of anxiety, and do we apply the same kind of experience, to the rivers, harbors, and flood-control bill, that we do to ECA? We are bound to do so, Mr. President. It seems clear to me that if we do so, we shall find ourselves somewhat embarrassed in being so lavish over the budget and over the House allocations in the rivers and harbors bill, on the one hand, and making an exceedingly careful analysis of the ECA bill, on the other, if we are to justify ourselves for upping the one and downing the other.

I may say at once that any criticism of our action which may be involved in this matter does not apply to the senior Senator from New York, because he voted against the rivers, harbors, and flood-control allocations. His record is clear in that respect.

It was also a satisfaction to me today to see the considerable measure of dissent to the rivers, harbors, and flood-control bill from both sides of the aisle. I trust that the next bill will be more carefully considered.

The proposal to cut $500,000,000, it seems to me, should be left to the administrative judgment of ECA. It has had administration of a very high order indeed. The past year it did not spend, as I remember, an amount within $150,000,000 of the sum appropriated. If various criticisms, suggestions, and objections are put into the RECORD, and if they can be carefully studied and considered by the ECA, I personally feel that we can trust their judgment as to whether the amounts can be cut. I would not be surprised, Mr. President, if we received, sometime in the next few days definite suggestions as to the possibility of lowering some of those allocations.

So my plea, Mr. President, is for supporting the full sums allocated in the bill and for the ECA Administration, Mr. Hoffman and his assistants, to make a careful scrutiny of the debate on the floor, in order that all possibilities of improvement in operation and cutting down of expenditures may have due consideration.

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, there is on the desk an amendment to the pending measure to continue the work of the children's fund under the United Nations.

From my personal experiences abroad, I think there is no phase of our foreign-aid program which has as worthy an objective as UNICEF—United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

I feel highly honored as one of the cosponsors of the amendment, that former President Herbert Hoover supports this view and that the Ladies' Home Journal and other publications have expressed themselves similarly.

I invite attention of the Members of the Senate to a communication from Mr. Hoover, directed to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and to an editorial from the May issue of the Ladies' Home Journal entitled "For All of the World's Children."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Hoover's letter and the editorial in question, be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with a brief statement by me on this important subject.

There being no objection, the letter, editorial, and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 27, 1950.*

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your inquiry as to the desirability of continuing the work of the Children's Fund under the United Nations.

As you know, I was largely responsible for the establishment of this agency soon after the end of the war and have taken a great interest in it ever since. It has been magnificently managed by Maurice Pate, who served with us in the First World War in similar work. The agency is gradually transforming itself from a famine relief agency into one of broader support of the health of children over the world. I do not believe there is any foreign activity in which our Government can engage that has as many returns both from a human and from an economic point of view.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

FOR ALL THE WORLD'S CHILDREN

(By G. M. White)

Fear never rises so hollowly in a woman's heart as when her child is suffering. The terror comes in questions: Have I done everything possible to help? Has my child had the best medical care? The most nourishing food? Throughout our land the answer is most often "Yes." Most children in this country can be well fed and cared for. Our mothers seldom hear the whimpering cry of hunger gone too long, or watch a sick child, unattended by a doctor, writhe and scream in pain.

But every day, from Italy to Yugoslavia to China, this happens. All over the world are children—some the homeless waifs of war, some with parents who share their anguish—suffering from the lack of food and medicine. They are the innocent victims of world conflict. You have heard of them. They cannot be fed once and forgotten. A child gets hungry every day; the conditions under which he lives do not improve as rapidly as his stomach empties. "The needs are the same," a missionary in China reports, "no matter what the political rule, for there isn't enough food here to fill empty stomachs." Starving, ailing children are the seedbed for still more horrible wars. Providing for the health and well-being of all the world's children is the surest way to a better world.

Knowing this, one practical United Nations agency works doggedly on to help hungry, ill and destitute children on both sides of Europe's iron curtain and in other parts of the world. This is UNICEF—the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. A strictly nonpartisan organization, UNICEF has allegiance to no single country, but to the children of all. Last year, with the help of people of every race, creed, nationality, and political belief, it provided food or other assistance to over 20,000,000 children.

This was paid for by voluntary donations from governments and private citizens in 60 lands. Nobody is compelled to support UNICEF, but the contributions come. Rather than diminishing through administrative expenses, every dollar contributed doubles in value as it goes to work. To get UNICEF aid for its children, a country must add a dollar's worth of its own products to every dollar's worth sent in. Our Government and private citizens have been generous, although the contributions of many other nations, in terms of ability to pay, have also been impressive. The need continues to be great. Sixty million of the world's children need help.

It is common sense to cooperate for the survival of all the world's children—the next generation on which our future depends. It cannot be put off until next month or next year. "The needs of these children cannot wait," writes the Chilean poet and Nobel prize winner, Gabriela Mistral. "We cannot answer tomorrow. The child's name is today."

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S FUND

Why the United Nations Children's Fund should have our continued support:

(1) Humanitarian measure—

(a) Important in itself.

(b) Important as a demonstration of American humanitarianism against Communist charges of ruthless imperialism.

(2) Dollar value—

Children's Fund is a unique program, both from American and International point of view:

Based on Hoover principles first tried out in the American Relief Administration, now carefully followed by an American businessman, who worked with Mr. Hoover in the American Relief for Belgium, and the American Relief Administration.

In essence these principles are:

When a donor government outside the United States of America gives the equivalent of $28, this is matched by the United States Government with $72. In addition, many governments have sponsored private campaigns yielding $11,000,000, which are not matched by the United States Government.

On an average, the resulting $100 is matched by the government or municipality or other organizations within the country whose children are assisted by the provision of local supplies and services. In this way the United States Government contribution is actually tripled in value by the time assistance reaches the children.

The results of these provisions are:

(a) The United States commodity dollar is tripled before it reaches the recipient child.

(b) Contributing governments constantly review the value of the UNICEF program and have no commitment to continue support.

In a period of dollar starvation, the ability of UNICEF to accept contributions in local currencies, which can be converted into supplies for children, has made it possible for many financially pressed countries to support this United Nations program.

(c) Recipient governments are encouraged to help themselves because they must assume new financial responsibility for this international assistance and must demonstrate that the programs will be used to strengthen permanent services on behalf of children.

As of this date, the UNICEF matching provision has stimulated $30,000,000 in voluntary contributions from 42 governments for the use of children in other countries, and the equivalent of more than $100,000,000 for the use of children in receiving countries.

It is for these reasons that Mr. Hoover has stated, "I do not believe there is any foreign activity in which our Government can engage that has as many returns both from a human and from an economic point of view."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long with what I have to say on the bill now pending. I speak simply to urge my colleagues to vote for the entire foreign assistance bill, and especially for the full authorization requested for the European-aid program.

Mr. President, there are a number of amendments pending before the Senate to cut the authorization for the ECA program by $1,000,000,000, or $500,000,000, and other cuts, too, may be proposed. These amendments must be seriously considered. They must be given, and have been given, earnest and objective study. The justification for the amendments lies in the heavy tax burden

under which the American people now labor, and in the fact that our national budget shows a deficit.

In my opinion, these are strong considerations. I have no doubt that great numbers of our people—including people of good will and fair mind—are concerned over the deficit and over the high cost of Government. I share their concern. I am worried about an unbalanced budget in these times of relative prosperity. I would like to see Government income balanced against Government expenditures, and a margin provided for the retirement of our huge national debt.

But, Mr. President, these are not ordinary times. These are times that are extraordinary and exceptional. These are times of peril and threat to our very national existence and to our way of life. These are times of peril to our very freedom to debate such questions as the one we are now discussing. Today we are spending 73 cents of every tax dollar on the so-called cold war, in defense appropriations, or in paying for previous wars. The dollars we propose to spend under the ECA program and the rest of the foreign-assistance program are as much expenditures for defense of our way of life, for defense against the imperialistic aggression and infiltration of Soviet communism, as expenditures for planes and tanks and guided missiles, and our other weapons.

We cannot afford to be penny-wise in this regard. To skimp and save at the expense of this program—to save a billion or a half billion on ECA—would be the most wasteful extravagance I know. To do that would be to invite the necessity for expending vastly greater amounts, astronomically greater amounts, at a later and even more perilous time than today.

Mr. President, I heard told on the floor of Congress some weeks ago, and I have heard it referred to on other occasions, how, during the war, the Senate by a voice vote, after a few moments of debate, approved a national-defense appropriation of $59,000,000,000, mostly for the needs of the Air Force. That was just one single appropriation of a great many made during those dynamic days. Those appropriations had to be made, and they were made. There was no attempt then to cut five hundred million, or a billion, or ten billion off those appropriations. Today we are in a position where we may, and God grant that we shall, avoid the necessity of appropriations such as those I have just referred to. I hope and pray that we shall avoid the necessity for the unreimbursable appropriation of the lives of our sons. We can help avoid such a situation by such measures as the Foreign Assistance Act and the ECA program.

Mr. President, I have the perhaps unique distinction of being a Member of the Senate who has also been an official of ECA. I was a member of the Public Advisory Board for 2 years, and resigned from that board only to take my seat in the Senate. Moreover, I have spent considerable time in Europe studying and surveying at first-hand the results of the ECA program. I know from personal observation with what care the schedule of needs is worked out in each instance by ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman, Ambassador Harriman, and their many skilled researchers.

I know, too, from personal observation, that the administrators of this great program, both here and abroad, are men of ability, vision, and patriotism, whose sole and controlling inspiration is a deep desire for peace and security of our country, and of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

It is my firm conviction that the ECA program has worked a miracle in western Europe. I have been able to make comparisons with conditions which existed a year or two ago. It has not put Europe back on its feet as yet. Europe is not wholly recovered. I would not venture to say to what degree Europe's basic economic problem has been solved. I do not think that it is possible to rebuild a healthy economy under the terrible shadow of fear and the threat of aggression.

But we have given the countries of Europe not only a breathing space but a substantial lift upward toward recovery. They have been enabled, through our assistance, to marshal all their internal resources for the common struggle. Those resources are inadequate in many cases. Conditions peculiar to the people and the countries in question have held back recovery in some cases. Some of the steps which we believed desirable, such as a greater economic integration and coordination in Europe, have not been taken with as much speed as we should like. But, despite all this, and despite some failings on our part, we have helped western Europe take giant steps on the road back to economic health. We have enabled those countries to strengthen their internal regimes and to establish beyond immediate challenge the rule of law and order and the sanctity of the basic freedoms.

Mr. President, while we debate this issue, while we waive these authorizations and expenditures, the world smolders. Mighty forces contend for mastery. Disaster could overtake us all. Let us not economize foolishly. That thrifty soul, Benjamin Franklin, who said, "A penny saved is a penny earned," also said that "A stitch in time saves nine." The ECA is such a stitch. It must not be a half stitch or a quarter of a stitch. I hope the Senate will approve the full ECA authorization as requested.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he knows as to shipments of goods from the Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the satellites. Is the Senator informed as to whether or not military goods or potential war materials are being sold by Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not informed with regard to the condition today, because I resigned as a member of the ECA Advisory Board 6 months ago, when I was elected to the Senate, but I can say that I do know from the reports that were continually made to the members of the Board that while no steps were taken by ECA to stop trade between the east and the west, every effort was made to stop any shipments of actual war materials from the western countries to the countries behind the iron curtain.

Mr. KEM. Has the list of war materials now being shipped, or materials which were shipped during the year 1949, from Belgium and Luxemburg, and from the United Kingdom and from France, to Russia and the satellites, respectively, which I put into the RECORD under date of April 19, 1950, come to the attention of the able Senator from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I have not seen those records.

Mr. KEM. Was the Senator present on Monday last, when I again addressed myself to that subject?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have heard the able Senator from Missouri on many occasions. I have heard him speak on this subject, but I do not recall the exact remarks to which he refers, or the tables which he used.

Mr. KEM. I call the attention of the Senator to some of the items which are passing from France, let us say, to the countries behind the iron curtain, which appear in the following list, which I have heretofore put into the RECORD:

Chemicals: inorganic, organic; rubber and rubber products; steel-mill products, hot-rolled, sheets and plates; steel-mill products, cold-rolled, tubular products and wire; aluminum, crude and semimanufactures; aluminum alloys; lead and lead alloys; metal manufactures; machinery and apparatus; machinery, electrical and apparatus; transportation equipment; optical, surgical, scientific, and photographic instruments and apparatus.

Would the Senator agree that such items as those add to the war potential of Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York would have to have much more information than is given in the short statement made by the Senator from Missouri. He would need to know to what countries these materials were shipped, and when, and under what circumstances. The Senator from Missouri would also have to demonstrate that these were supplies which were purchased through ECA moneys.

Mr. KEM. The Senator means that they were not purchased through ECA moneys? Is the Senator perfectly willing that the Marshall-plan countries ship such supplies to Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. My recollection is that the western European countries have carried on trade relations with the eastern countries of Europe for many years. The western nations have not wished to destroy or wipe out those re-

lationships, because the economy of the western European countries depends to a great extent on the continuation of the trade with eastern European countries; to stop that trade would involve a loss to the economy of western Europe as great in volume as the aid which they have received from the United States.

Mr. KEM. May I invite the attention of the Senator from New York also to a list of war materials shipped in 1949 from Belgium and Luxemburg to Russia and the satellites: Arms, iron, case iron, steel, copper, lead, zinc, tin, other base metals and alloys, boilers, machinery, mechanical apparatus and appliances and parts, electrical machinery and apparatus and articles for electrotechnical use and parts, railway and tramway rolling stock and material, optical, measuring, precision, and other instruments and apparatus; chemical products, explosives, fireworks, matches and other inflammable materials, rubber, and manufactures.

Is the Senator from New York willing that such materials be shipped to Russia and the satellites while we are at the same time supplying Belgium and Luxemburg with ECA aid?

Mr. LEHMAN. In the first place, the Senator from New York does not know that all or any special part of the list the Senator from Missouri has read is a direct war potential. The Senator from Missouri mentioned explosives, but it may be explosives which have no particular war potential. The Senator referred to matches and to certain metals. I do not know about them. But quite aside from that, it was never contemplated, so far as I know, that the ECA was to demand the cessation of normal trade relations between the western European countries and the eastern European countries. Such a proposal was never contemplated.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think I can make a contribution which may answer the question asked by the Senator from Missouri. In 1938 east-west European trade amounted to more than $2,600,000,000. In that same year United States trade with eastern Europe amounted to $149,000,000.

In 1949 east-west European trade amounted to not quite $2,600,000,000, and United States trade with eastern Europe, in spite of the severe export license restrictions, amounted to $110,000,000.

So eastern Europe has always been, as the Senator from New York correctly stated, a big source of trade for western Europe. Obviously eastern Europe can obtain manufactured products it needs from western Europe without the use of dollars.

It is impossible, in the light of these figures, which show approximately the same ratio in 1949 as existed in 1938, to point to any unfair discrimination against United States businessmen insofar as that east-west trade is concerned. I just wanted to bring the figures to the attention of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Is the Senator from New York familiar with the so-called positive list in the regulations of the Department of Commerce, the Office of International Trade, which forbids the shipment of certain articles from the United States to Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me so I may show to the Senator from Missouri that the positive list does not restrict——

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from New York a question.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from New York yielded to me.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has the floor and he yielded to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York yields to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. The Senator from New York can yield for only a question.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from New York to yield for a question. If we are going to be legalistic and technical, I suppose I can be legalistic and technical, too. I do not think we accomplish very much by being legalistic and technical. I will ask the Senator from New York a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from New York to yield, and he yielded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York yields to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true, I will ask the Senator from New York, that the Senator from Missouri is in error when he says that the positive list of the Department of Commerce is the list of items which are prohibited to be sent in the foreign trade; is it not true that the positive list is merely a list of commodity classifications which require an export license and regarding which an embargo and a prohibition is not placed at all?

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to. I have already told the Senator from Nebraska that I yielded the floor.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that the merchants and manufacturers of the United States are prohibited, under the present regulations of the Office of International Trade, from shipping a large quantity of goods, that is, a large number of items, from the United States to Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe it is required that before goods can be shipped from this country an export license be obtained from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. KEM. Is it not further true that export licenses are not issued for goods that are considered war materials or potential war materials?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think there is a considerable list issued by the Department of Commerce of certain items whose export is restricted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that a large number of the items that are being shipped from the United Kingdom, from Belgium, and from France to Russia and the satellites, are items that the merchants and manufacturers of the United States are prohibited from shipping to Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. I cannot make exact comparisons, because I do not have the two lists in front of me, but may the Senator from New York point out to the Senator from Missouri that as he has explained, and as the Senator from Massachusetts has explained, it was never contemplated that under the ECA program the countries of western Europe would have to discontinue all trade with the eastern European countries, because so much of their economy depended on that trade. More than $2,500,000,000 of trade was carried on 12 years ago, in 1938, and the same amount of trade is presumably still being carried on, or at least a comparable amount. For the western European countries to give up that trade would have completely prevented any economic recovery or improvement in those countries.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am sure the Senator from New York understands that I am not directing my attention to the normal trade between these Marshall-plan countries and Russia and the satellites, except so far as war materials and potential war materials are involved. My question to the Senator from New York is whether we should send Marshall-plan aid under the ECA program, and munitions of war under the armament program, to these countries of western Europe who are in turn sending to Russia and its allies materials that can have no other effect but to increase the war potential of Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, on the list which the Senator from Missouri read there were a great many items which are in normal trade.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator one or two questions. Is it not

true that there are instances in which an American firm is denied a license for a certain item, which a European firm is allowed to ship, for the very reason that the American firm has a secret process or prototype which is particularly unusual, that it is not desired to have get into the iron-curtain countries? Is that not true?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite true.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that these goods can be broadly classified as follows: Articles that are of direct and specialized military value, which are completely prohibited; articles which have a quasi-military significance, but are largely of a commercial character, which are subject to license and restriction; and finally articles that have no direct military value at all, but in the manufacture of which there is maybe a secret process which could be adopted, and which in their turn are subject to control? Is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is an exact analysis.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not further true that every single item that is shipped into the East today from the West, that is from the United States or from the Marshall-plan countries, is either shipped following a clearance by the American military authorities, or else is shipped with the knowledge of the American military authorities, and that there has been no complaint from those American military authorities? Is not that true?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not entirely familiar with the exact procedure that is followed, but I have no doubt that the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts is completely accurate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether the Department of Commerce has objected to the shipment by Marshall plan countries into Russia and the satellite countries of articles which our own merchants and manufacturers are prohibited from sending to Russia or the satellite countries.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very glad to reply to that question. If that is true, I have no knowledge of it. I do not know of any objections which have been filed by the United States Department of Commerce with regard to the trade that is carried on. I do not know that of my own knowledge.

Mr. KEM. Has the attention of the able Senator from New York been directed to an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, under date of May 4, by John N. Hightower, reading in part as follows:

Secretary of State Acheson is being urged by the Commerce Department to bring strong pressure on western European leaders to tighten their controls on trade with eastern Europe. He will see these leaders at London next week. Commerce officials are reported to be concerned at what they consider discriminations against American business arising out of differences in the control systems operated by the western European countries and the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. I can only reply that I have no knowledge of any conversations between the Department of Commerce and the Department of State, nor do I know the extent or the seriousness of the conversations, nor do I know anything about the statement the Senator from Missouri has read.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator from New York mean to suggest, in reply to the questions asked by the Senator from Massachusetts, that he did have knowledge with regard to the matters about which the Senator from Massachusetts inquired?

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator from Missouri repeat the question, please? I did not hear it clearly.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator from New York by his replies to the question asked a moment ago by the Senator from Massachusetts mean to indicate that he did have knowledge of the matters about which the Senator from Massachusetts inquired?

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Senator from Missouri will recall, the Senator from Massachusetts asked me certain questions with regard to the procedure followed; and I said I did not know from my own knowledge what the procedure was, and therefore I could not either confirm or deny the procedure the Senator had outlined.

Mr. KEM. I think that is correct.

So the Senator from New York wants to be understood as not having any knowledge in this field, in either case; is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, no. I want it very clearly understood that until 6 months ago I was deeply interested in the work of the ECA. Although I was not in the administrative end, I was in the advisory end; and as a result of that observation or training, if I may call it that, I have come to believe strongly in the efficacy and the usefulness of the ECA as it is now carried on.

Mr. KEM. At the time when the Senator from New York was connected with the ECA, was this traffic in war materials and materials which potentially might be war materials going on between Marshall-plan countries and Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. I know there was no traffic going on between this country and the iron-curtain countries. I was and am aware that trade relations were being maintained between the western European countries and the eastern European countries. As to the exact nature of those trade relations, I cannot give information of my own knowledge.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from New York know whether during that period materials which might be materials of war were being shipped by Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. I know that trade relations were being carried on. Into what exact categories or classifications they fell, and whether they fell into those suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, I cannot inform the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator from New York approve the shipment of war materials from Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the satellites?

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly would not approve such shipment of war material which was distinctly war material. But in regard to the shipment of materials which the able Senator from Missouri might consider war material but which others might not consider so, I certainly would not advocate the stoppage of all trade relations between the west and the east.

Mr. KEM. I notice that in the partial list of exports from Belgium and Luxemburg during 1949 to Russia and the satellites, the following appears: "Arms to Czechoslovakia."

I have been told that those arms were either hunting rifles or shotguns.

Would the Senator from New York approve the shipment of hunting rifles or shotguns from Belgium to Czechoslovakia under existing circumstances?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would have to know what was the character of the arms. If they were little .22's, I would not object to it. If they were .30–30's, I probably would object to it or certainly I would have some reservation about it.

But I think the Senator from Missouri must give the facts before he asks questions to which he should expect an intelligent answer.

Mr. KEM. What would the Senator from New York say about such shipment of cast iron and steel?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think they necessarily have a direct war potential.

Mr. KEM. What would the Senator from New York think about such shipment of copper and tin?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think they necessarily have direct war potentials. Those materials could be used for a great many other purposes.

Mr. KEM. What would the Senator from New York say about similar shipments from the United States to Russia and the satellite countries?

Mr. LEHMAN. I know the United States Department of Commerce has certain regulations which reflect its point of view. I certainly have no right to question—or no desire to question, as a matter of fact—the decision of the Department of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. KEM. Is not the Department of Commerce of the United States preventing shipments of that character from the United States to Russia and the satellite countries at this time?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me very respectfully point out to the distinguished and able Senator from Missouri that that matter already has been explained, namely, that it was never contemplated that the ECA program would prohibit trade relations between the east and the west.

Mr. KEM. But I am asking the Senator from New York a question. If he will pardon me, I wish to repeat it, for

perhaps I have failed to make myself clear.

I am asking the Senator whether such shipments from the United States to Russia and the satellite countries are being prevented at the present time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no doubt that that is so.

Mr. KEM. Then I ask the Senator from New York whether he approves the shipment of similar materials from Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the satellite countries.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have explained to the Senator from Missouri that unless he explains what the material on the list from which he has read actually is and whether it has a direct and immediate war potential, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. KEM. I am giving the Senator from New York a hypothetical case. Assuming that such materials are prohibited from being shipped from the United States to Russia or the satellite countries, does the Senator from New York feel that it is proper to ship materials of an identical nature from the Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the satellite countries?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to explain to the Senator from Missouri that I feel perfectly justified in approving or disapproving or criticizing in any way the acts of my own Government. I do not feel qualified to pass judgment on the acts of the governments of other countries.

Mr. KEM. Does not the Senator from New York feel that so long as we are sending aid in the form of dollars and commodities and goods and arms to the countries of western Europe, we certainly have a right to suggest that they should not ship war materials to our potential enemies?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no knowledge as to whether that suggestion has been made by our Government to other governments. I have no means of knowing that.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from New York——

Mr. LEHMAN. If the able Senator from Missouri will please permit me to complete my reply before he asks another question, I shall appreciate it.

I also wish to point out again—although I am not very hopeful of being able to make this clear to the Senator from Missouri—that at no stage, at no time, was it contemplated under the ECA program, that trade relations between the western European countries and the eastern European countries should be prohibited.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] made a few observations earlier in the session, he apparently stated that those who might have voted for the conference report on the rivers and harbors and flood-control bill would be in an untenable position if they were to vote for that bill and then view with equanimity a cut in ECA authorizations. I should like the record to show that so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned, most of the works provided for in that particular bill, with necessary surveys, and so forth, consist of projects already on the shelf, projects which have come before the Senate for authorization, and that the bill referred to is not in itself an authorization bill. I should like to tell my distinguished colleague, and to state for the record, that if the Senate will wrap up all 12 of the so-called appropriation bills, into 1 appropriation bill, which will include appropriations for the Interior and appropriations for rivers and harbors, the junior Senator from Nebraska will vote to make a cut. But such a unified bill must include all bills, ECA and everything else. All the appropriations must be wrapped up in one package. The junior Senator from Nebraska will vote to make whatever cut is necessary in order to balance the budget. I did so at the last session, and I shall do it again at this session. So I want the record to show that, when it comes to actual appropriations, they must all be viewed as one. Different allocations may be made for particular objectives, I imagine, but in the final analysis, if the budget is to be balanced, the cut ought to be made on a unified appropriation bill. I shall be glad to do that, and I shall support it when the time comes.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate in considering the pending ECA authorization find themselves lacking in sound information, and they find themselves bombarded by much misinformation. I could not ask for a better example than what has just transpired on the floor of the Senate.

For instance, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has raised a vital question, at least, I think it is vital. It does not matter what the purposes were in the beginning, the results show, as the Senator from Missouri has already indicated, that there are being exported from western European countries into so-called satellite countries and into Russia, goods which cannot be exported by American industry to the same destination. I care not whether responsibility is that of the Department of Commerce, or the Department of Defense, or whatever department it may be, it presents a vital question. The Senator from Missouri has presented it to the Senate with evidence from official sources, showing that while the United States pours billions of dollars into western Europe for the purpose of staving off communism and that countries receiving this aid through ECA are sending war materials into Russia and eastern European countries behind the iron curtain.

It cannot be justified merely by passing the buck from one department to another, or by this, that, or the other thing; it is an actuality. The junior Senator from Missouri has presented evidence that the United States has a so-called positive list which prohibits the exportation from the United States of identical war materials which the ECA countries are sending to Russia and her so-called satellite countries.

As a member of the Committee on Small Business for many years, I have learned something about export licenses. I know something about what the military authorities regard as war matériel. The point made by the Senator from Missouri is that if war materials are being reexported from the satellite countries—and I certainly think steel would be so classified—it presents a very vital question indeed. Steel used to be classified as war matériel. We are told that the strength of a nation depends upon its production of steel. In fact, when appropriations are requested for the national defense, the first thing we hear is that Russia's production of steel amounts to 18,000,000 tons, while ours is over 90,000,000 tons. Therefore, we must absolutely keep our production above that, or else we shall be unable to defend the United States properly, and not only the United States, but whatever territories we may be called upon to defend.

It is possible to enumerate many materials of war. Yet, despite this amazing situation, there is no information in the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which throws any light on the subject whatever. Look at the bill, and look at the report. There is nothing in the report to furnish the required information. When the question was asked recently on the floor of the Senate, even the Senator from Massachusetts was not informed as to the so-called positive list, at least until that time.

For example, the lack of information upon which to legislate wisely is illustrated in connection with the much advertised dollar gap. It is argued that we should support the pending bill in an effort to close the dollar gap, and that if we can close the dollar gap by transacting business with all the countries of the world, we shall benefit, and they will benefit; they will be on their own, and we will be on our own. Supposedly reliable figures were presented showing that the so-called dollar gap is not really so great as the windmills of propaganda would have the Senate believe.

Recently, on the floor of the Senate, the junior Senator from Nebraska sought to ascertain whether dollars received by countries in the Pacific from sales to the United States found their way into the receipts of the mother countries in Europe. It seems to me that is a perfectly intelligent question, which ought to be answered, in arriving at what the dollar gaps really are. For example, the United States pays dollars for rubber from the Far East. The junior Senator from Nebraska inquired whether those dollars eventually reached the mother country in Europe; but no member of the Foreign Relations Committee, at that time on the floor, could offer any answer to the question. The question certainly has a bearing upon the claimed need of more dollars from the American taxpayers.

The junior Senator from Nebraska, on this floor, asked whether the Administrator of ECA, Mr. Paul Hoffman,

could produce for the Senate an audit of the ECA money spent by recipient countries abroad, whether any check is made upon expenditures of funds by the ECA countries after the funds are given by the United States Treasury to a foreign country.

I am sure that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], will recall that one of the amendments I offered to the UNRRA bill provided that check be made, that our representatives in those countries check the food deliveries, to see that the food was distributed where it rightfully belonged, rather than being sent somewhere else for the benefit of those who were not intended to receive it.

The junior Senator from Nebraska has been told by observers of ECA that ECA makes no effort to audit the books of the recipient countries, to see that ECA money received by them is spent for the purposes for which it is given. I suppose there will be those who will think it offensive that we should make such an inquiry and that we have no right to inquire into the subject, but I submit we have a right to know where these gifts and grants in aid which are received by foreign countries ultimately go.

It seems to the junior Senator from Nebraska to be highly pertinent to the question now before the Senate, whether ECA funds are being squandered by the receiving countries, and whether the American taxpayers' money actually is being used to bolster socialistic governments abroad.

It would be interesting to have some approximate figures on the number of dollar millionaires that have been created in Europe with ECA funds.

But, again, there was no information forthcoming and there appears to be no effort to supply the information.

Most Senators will agree, I believe, that in voting for ECA authorizations they have done so with hope and faith, hope that it would accomplish all the goals of the authorization, faith in the wisdom of the countless numbers of persons through whom the American taxpayers' money is being channeled.

The broadcasting of American dollars and goods in western Europe has accomplished some good, of course, but the results obtained have been very expensive. An appearance of prosperity could be obtained anywhere by tossing dollar bills from airplanes or automobiles, but it would be artificial prosperity.

Needs of the destitute have been met and tools have been provided for self-progress, but it is plain to any competent observer that the fundamental economic problems of the western European countries have not yet been solved.

The productivity of these countries has been increased above prewar levels—with the aid of the American taxpayers—but the machinery for accomplishment of the prime essentials to permanent prosperity in Europe, free convertibility of currencies and free flow of trade, have not been attained.

That is self-evident by the testimony of the Administrator who is now asking that a fund of $600,000,000 be set aside as a sort of penalty to compel countries to trade with each other to make up the difference in the soft-currency dollars.

Unless these objectives are attained by 1952, ECA will have been a ghastly failure, a gigantic waste of the people's money.

It was this situation that the junior Senator from Nebraska expected to result from the European recovery plan, or the ECA as it is now called.

That was why the junior Senator from Nebraska voted against the original authorization, though he voted for the appropriations after the authorization became law.

The junior Senator from Nebraska tried to persuade the Senate to approve a European-aid program that would provide procedures for a transition from the American dole to self-sustaining, free enterprise in the ECA countries.

Mr. Hoffman is quoted as saying a miracle would have to occur by 1952 to effect the integration of Europe that is needed to enable Europe to get along on its own steam, and off the backs of the American taxpayers.

The junior Senator from Nebraska, with his limited resources, has made an effort to penetrate the mysteries of ECA, and he proposes this afternoon—to give the Senate the results of some of his findings.

We have had a nightmare of foreign commitments, foreign aid, foreign loans, flashing before our eyes, again and again and again.

The Congress is caught in a propulsion toward passing legislation which will extend and add authorities to prior commitments and theories, which were no more than trial balloons, in their first authorization.

We have lost sight of how those authorities may be back-tracked, mushroomed, or spread all over creation, to the ultimate dissipation of our national resources.

Mr. President, I have found little substantiation in either the presentations by the proponents of this legislation, or in the hearings and reports by the Foreign Relations Committee, for continuation of this kind of foreign-aid program. Nor has any reasonable evidence been adduced to substantiate that the ECA program is still needed by most of its participants, or that the program continues to serve the purposes for which it was created.

We are being lulled into a belief that European economic aid should be continued on the theory that it is a diminishing program for which only a little more money is needed to get it over the hump, and that this authorization is practically the last step that will be necessary to accomplish economic rehabilitation for Europe.

Mr. President, there are certain specific sections of the current ECA legislation, and the reports on that legislation, to which the junior Senator from Nebraska wishes to address himself.

Certainly, in authorizing this ECA legislation, it should be done in the light of the needs abroad and also our ability to provide.

During the war, and in the first authorizations of foreign aid, this country did not have saddled upon it the debt that it now has. This theory that two and one-half billion dollars is nothing compared to the cost of war is not ample evidence to justify this appropriation.

Is it a good investment for the future?

Well, the best way to determine that is to review what has happened not just in postwar years but, let us say, for the last 10 years.

In view of the great debt that is saddled upon our shoulders, it is imperative that every Member of the Senate make this authorization in the light of our current fiscal situation, in which our Treasury is being operated on a deficit at the rate of, roughly, six and one-half billion dollars a year.

There has been no recapitulation made by any Member of the Senate or by any committee, so far as I know, that reveals the amount of loans, grants, and all manner of assistance which this Nation has extended to European nations and to the whole world—billions which the United States, the taxpayers, have not the slightest chance to recover, either in the cash repayment of debt or in the exchange of goods.

The tabulation has been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress from factual data. It shows all of the aid extended by the United States to all foreign countries for the period July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1949. This was a terrific undertaking, covering 6 months, to trace the expenditures through the different agencies to find out what occurred.

The tabulation is broken down into grants and credits for the war period, 1940–45, and the postwar period, 1945 to June 30, 1949.

The report shows that during the period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949, the United States allowed foreign entities a total of $29,356,768,280 in grants-in-aid and in credits. Of this amount, $2,631,447,661 was paid out in the war period and $26,725,320,619 in the postwar period.

The total includes shares deposited by the United States with the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

It does not include, however, the two and one-half billion dollars which was granted the International Bank on a contingent basis, nor does it include expenditures by the United States Government for international agencies, such as United Nations, UNESCO, and others; nor does it include allowance payments in foreign areas, supplies and materials, dependency payments, transportation services, and so forth.

The report states there is no conclusive figure for such disbursements during the war and postwar periods.

But the report points out that a conservative estimate would be that approx-

imately $20,000,000,000 have been spent on such disbursements since 1940.

Mr. President, this Legislative Reference Service report has not been generally distributed, although some parts of it have been asked for by individual Members of Congress.

Perhaps it is understandable why this report has not been widely reproduced and distributed. It is most revealing.

The give-away artists of the Truman administration never tell the cost, and they certainly are not anxious to have such a complete analysis of our total, country by country, grants-in-aid and credits published for scrutiny by the American taxpayers.

The Senate is told that this authorization of nearly $3,000,000,000 is a mere driblet as compared with what the cost of a war would be. And the Senate is asked:

Do you want this three billion authorization, or do you want to risk war?

That is the technique which has been used so successfully through recent years.

Do you want to prevent war, or spend this mere pittance?

The Congress is always asked to view requests for new and continuing funds for foreign-aid programs on a piecemeal fiscal basis, and not in relation to other and overlapping programs.

While one pipe dream for spending the American taxpayers' money runs out, a dozen more are incubated to carry on the give-away show, the biggest give-away show on earth.

But, Mr. President, this Legislative Reference Service report rounds into one compilation the total outlay by the United States for the last 10 years and gives a glimpse of the burden that generations upon generations—Americans yet unborn—will have to bear.

And when there is a tabulation of this two billion and that two billion, which we are told is only a mere pittance, and is necessary to prevent war, a grand total is reached which shows that the cost of our fumbling and bungling with the peace is approaching the cost of a hot shooting war.

These figures in the report come from official records of the Bureau of the Budget and other Government agencies.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the tabulation of the Legislative Reference Service included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

[Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service]

AID EXTENDED BY THE UNITED STATES TO ALL FOREIGN COUNTRIES

(Period July 1, 1940–June 30, 1949; war period July 1, 1940–June 30, 1945; postwar period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1949.)

CONTENTS OF REPORT

This report contains the cumulative totals of assistance rendered to foreign countries by the United States since the beginning of the Second World War until June 30, 1949. A breakdown for the war and postwar periods show the utilized totals of such assistance.

ASSISTANCE

The totals for grants and long-term credits utilized is the most generally accepted measure of assistance given abroad by the United States Government. Strictly speaking only grants should be regarded as assistance. Credits are a further means of aid though such assistance creates an obligation to repay. Grants are not synonymous with "gifts" since they include foreign aid currently extended on an indeterminate basis and which is subject to future settlement.

TOTAL OF ALL AID

During the period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949, the United States allowed foreign entities $75,430,468,280 which include the shares deposited by the United States with the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The deposit with the bank does not include the $2,500,000,000 which was granted the bank on a contingent basis nor do the totals include expenditures by the United States Government for international agencies such as United Nations, UNESCO, and others; nor military agency disbursements such as military pay and allowances in foreign areas, supplies and materials, dependency payments, transportation services, overseas cemeterial expenses, and so forth. There is no conclusive figure for such disbursements during the war and postwar periods. However, a conservative estimate would be that approximately $20,000,000,000 have been spent on such disbursements since 1940.

WAR AND POSTWAR PERIODS

During the war period of July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945, the United States of America expended $48,705,147,661. A major portion of this aid naturally consisted of lend-lease.

It is with the postwar period commencing with July 1, 1945, that we are vitally concerned. Until June 30, 1949, during the four postwar years the United States actually distributed aid to the value of $26,725,320,619. Of this, total grants comprised $13,260,417,976 and credits $10,079,872,643.

AID BY FISCAL YEARS

During the four postwar fiscal years, aid extended through grants and credits utilized are divided as follows:

1946	$5, 620, 786, 232
1947	9, 410, 055, 225
1948	5, 387, 417, 675
1949	6, 307, 061, 487
Total	26, 725, 320, 619

The 1947 total was larger than the sum expended in each of the other 3 years because of the deposits with the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank and the special British loan.

GRANTS

The section on grants gives a detailed statement of aid by the United States Government on other than credit or cash terms, that is on aid for which no repayment is expected or where the conditions of reimbursement are not sufficiently clear to justify the creation of a credit. Specifically, such grants are: (1) The economic cooperation subdivided into European recovery and Chinese and Korean aid; (2) civilian supplies furnished by the United States Army for civilian use abroad; (3) relief other than supplies furnished by the military through international or national agencies abroad; (4) other grants, such as Greek-Turkish aid, Philippine rehabilitation funds, aid to China, and cultural and economic programs in the American Republics.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The totals for the ERP include those given to the dependencies of the mother countries. ERP supplies furnished to foreign governments are reported at the landed cost abroad, which is designed to include all costs chargeable to the United States Government for delivery at the end of ship's tackle at the port of final debarkation. During the first 15 months—till June 1949—of the duration of this program the Economic Cooperation Administration spent $3,615,934,533 in grants, and the Export-Import Bank, on behalf of the ECA, made loans of $854,409,381. During the current fiscal year the ERP received an appropriation of $3,628,380,000 and $150,000,000 of additional loan authorizations for Marshall plan countries from the Export-Import Bank.

CIVILIAN SUPPLIES—MILITARY

Civilian supplies furnished by the United States Army in occupied areas have been generally considered a form of assistance for which the local government should be financially responsible. While no direct payments have been received for such supplies, the obligations for such supplies have been or will be included in the war-account settlements. Not only do such supplies include petroleum transfers, diversions from Regular Army stores, but also incentive materials for Germany and Japan. The War Department has included under "Government and Relief in Occupied Areas"—Garioa fund—the money spent for relief purposes. These Garioa expenditures amounted to the following totals:

1947---$675,000,000 for relief out of $725,000,000.
1948---$1,025,000,000 for relief out of $1,083,000,000.
1949---$1,240,000,000 for relief out of $1,300,000,000.
1950---$912,500,000,000 for relief and government.

RELIEF

The larger portion of the relief total as shown in the various tables comprise shipments made by UNRRA and post-UNRRA aid.

OTHER GRANTS

Aid to cultural and economic programs for the American Republics represent grant programs primarily distributed by the Coordinator of American Affairs in the Department of State.

Aid to China was extended by the Treasury Department such as cash and supplies, by the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, and through the three Departments of the National Military Establishment.

Assistance to Greece and Turkey was provided in 1947 and again in 1948, and during the fiscal year 1949–50 a further $45,000,000 have been appropriated.

Philippine rehabilitation includes disbursements for war damage claims, surplus property, and rehabilitation and improvement of public property.

CREDITS

United States Government credits comprise loans and surplus property credits and commodity programs.

LOANS

Loans are direct disbursements by the Treasury on the special British loan and disbursements by the Export-Import Bank; also by the Export-Import Bank on behalf of the European Cooperation Administration. Originally the aid rendered on behalf of the ECA was on an indeterminate basis, but was subsequently determined to be on a loan basis.

PROPERTY CREDITS

Surplus property credits resulted from the sale of United States surplus property abroad. Bulk sales often are merely estimates and subject to revisions. Lend-lease settlements are for materials in the pipe lines. Merchant ship credits are really the mortgages received from foreign purchasers as part payment for ships sold by the Maritime Commission.

Commodity programs comprise the value of raw cotton advanced to occupied areas. The $150,000,000 natural fibers revolving fund of the Army is also included in this program.

TABLE 1.—*Summary of utilized foreign grants and credits by the United States Government, by program for 3 periods: Total period July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1949; war period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945; postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*

Type of assistance	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Total	$75,430,468,280	$48,705,147,661	$26,725,320,619
Paid to International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	635,000,000		635,000,000
Paid to International Monetary Fund	2,750,000,000		2,750,000,000
Grants and credits utilized	72,045,468,280	48,705,147,661	23,340,320,619
Grants	60,728,897,785	47,468,449,809	13,260,447,976
Economic Cooperation	3,615,934,533		3,615,934,533
European recovery	3,425,306,075		3,425,306,075
Chinese aid	179,850,076		179,850,076
Korean aid	10,778,382		10,778,382
Civilian supplies	4,473,659,841	813,309,277	3,660,350,564
Lend-lease	47,286,300,000	46,073,700,000	1,212,600,000
Relief	3,804,024,113	148,216,275	3,655,870,838
Interim aid	557,382,676		557,382,676
UNRRA	2,659,570,345	82,696,421	2,576,873,924
Post-UNRRA (Public Law 84)	299,509,880		299,509,880
Refugee assistance	156,675,193	3,356,720	153,318,473
International Children's Emergency Fund	58,287,524		58,287,524
American Red Cross	72,598,495	62,163,134	10,435,361
Other grants	$1,548,979,298	$433,224,257	$1,115,755,041
Greek-Turkish aid	517,386,535		517,386,535
Philippine rehabilitation	346,404,841		346,404,841
Chinese stabilization	500,000,000	380,406,157	119,593,843
Chinese military aid	103,725,407		103,725,407
Inter-American aid	81,462,515	52,818,100	28,644,415
Credits	11,316,570,495	1,236,697,852	10,079,872,643
Loans	7,548,839,571	489,484,928	7,059,872,643
Economic Cooperation	854,409,381		854,409,381
Export-Import Bank	2,944,430,190	489,484,928	2,454,945,262
British loan	3,750,000,000		3,750,000,000
Property credit and commodity programs	3,767,730,924	747,212,924	3,020,518,000
Surplus property and merchant ships	1,340,731,852		1,340,731,852
Lend-lease	1,669,609,507	329,838,493	1,339,771,014
Occupied areas and commodity programs	757,389,565	417,374,431	340,015,134

TABLE 2.—*Foreign grants by agency: July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1949; war period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945; postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*

Type of assistance	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Total	$60,728,897,785	$47,468,449,809	$13,260,447,976
American Red Cross (ARC)	72,598,495	62,163,134	10,435,361
Economic Cooperation Administration:			
Chinese aid	179,850,076		179,850,076
Dollar funds (CA)	166,742,576		166,742,576
Counterpart funds (CA-C)	13,107,500		13,107,500
European recovery	3,425,306,075		3,425,306,075
Dollar funds (ERP)	3,411,632,305		3,411,632,305
Counterpart funds (ERP-C)	13,673,770		13,673,770
Interim aid (Public Law 389)	557,382,676		557,382,676
Korean aid	10,778,382		10,778,382
Dollar funds (KA)	7,035,052		7,035,052
Counterpart funds (KA-C)	3,743,330		3,743,330
Post-UNRRA (Public Law 84)	299,509,880		299,509,880
Executive Office of the President:			
Chinese military aid (EOP)	103,725,407		103,725,407
National Military Establishment:			
Army and Air Force Departments (Army)	4,309,854,664	807,260,067	3,502,594,597
Navy Department (Navy)	24,905,528	6,049,210	18,856,318
Army and Navy Departments (Army and Navy)	4,412,881		4,412,881
Refugee assistance (IRA)	$8,937,000		$8,937,000
Philippine War Damage Commission (private claims) (P-I)	174,696,145		174,696,145
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC)	2,435,325	$2,382,134	53,191
State Department:			
Greek-Turkish aid (GT)	517,386,535		517,386,535
Institute of Inter-American Affairs (IIAA)	79,027,190	50,435,966	28,591,224
Philippine rehabilitation:			
Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner (P-II)	100,000,000		100,000,000
Public Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (P-III)	71,708,696		71,708,696
International programs:			
For refugees (IRS)	136,381,473		136,381,473
For Palestine relief (UN)	8,000,000		8,000,000
For children (ICEF)	58,287,524		58,287,524
UNRRA	2,659,570,345	82,696,421	2,576,873,924
Treasury Department:			
Chinese stabilization (Treasury)	500,000,000	380,406,157	119,593,843
War Refugee Board (WRB)	3,356,720	3,356,720	
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division:			
Lend-Lease (LL)	47,286,300,000	46,073,700,000	1,212,600,000
Civilian supplies (YB)	134,486,768		134,486,768

TABLE 3.—*Foreign grants—by country, by agency: Total period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949; war period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945; postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*

Country	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Total	$60,728,897,785	$47,468,449,809	$13,260,447,976
American Republics	454,466,309	423,821,894	30,644,415
American Red Cross	3,794	3,794	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,435,325	2,382,134	53,191
Institute for Inter-American Affairs	79,027,190	50,435,966	28,591,224
Lend-lease	373,000,000	371,000,000	2,000,000
Argentina	1,320,703	1,192,291	128,412
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,876		4,876
Institute for Inter-American Affairs	1,315,827	1,192,291	123,536
Bolivia	$3,481,393	$1,831,059	$1,650,334
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	25,000		25,000
Institute for Inter-American Affairs	3,456,393	1,831,059	1,625,334
Brazil	16,086,731	12,015,391	4,071,340
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	328,507		328,507
Institute for Inter-American Affairs	15,758,224	12,015,391	3,742,833
Chile: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	6,379,890	2,623,982	3,755,908

TABLE 3.—*Foreign grants—by country, by agency: Total period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949; war period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945; postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*—Continued

Country	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Colombia	$2,917,404	$1,929,285	$988,119
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	999	999	
Institute for Inter-American Affairs	2,916,405	1,928,286	988,119
Costa Rica: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	2,562,613	1,448,317	1,114,296
Cuba: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	250,897	220,107	30,880
Dominican Republic: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	741,542	330,732	410,810
Ecuador: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	5,241,746	3,764,530	1,477,216
Guatemala: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	2,721,657	1,230,893	1,490,764
Haiti	3,098,854	994,037	2,104,817
American Red Cross	3,794	3,794	
Institute for Inter-American Affairs	3,095,060	990,243	2,104,817
Honduras: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	3,032,560	2,581,086	451,474
Mexico: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	12,671,797	7,445,428	5,226,369
Nicaragua: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	1,210,158	1,069,947	140,211
Panama: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	1,046,914	906,897	140,017
Paraguay: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	3,903,056	2,329,944	1,573,112
Peru (IIAA)	4,770,604	2,906,770	1,863,834
Salvador: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	1,531,057	871,498	659,559
Uruguay	1,396,898	757,547	639,351
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	10,414		10,414
Institute for Inter-American Affairs	1,386,484	757,547	628,937
Venezuela: Institute for Inter-American Affairs	3,457,491	2,414,293	1,043,198
Unclassified—Americas	376,642,254	374,957,860	1,684,394
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,065,529	2,381,135	315,606
Institute for Inter-American Affairs	1,576,725	1,576,725	
Lend-lease	373,000,000	371,000,000	2,000,000
Albania: UNRRA	20,444,496		20,444,496
Austria	540,505,770	1,021,763	539,484,007
European recovery plan	216,482,001		216,482,001
Public Law 389	68,046,773		68,046,773
Public Law 84	88,069,666		88,069,666
Army	95,211,159	1,021,763	94,189,396
UNRRA	72,696,171		72,696,171
Belgium-Luxemburg	279,491,212	67,700,000	211,791,212
American Red Cross	17,153		17,153
European recovery plan	149,336,914		149,336,914
UNRRA	1,137,145		1,137,145
Lend-lease	129,000,000	67,700,000	61,300,000
British Commonwealth	31,223,817,362	29,952,216,162	1,271,601,200
United Kingdom	31,222,716,951	29,951,358,073	1,271,358,878
American Red Cross	16,206,589	16,158,073	48,516
European recovery plan	1,001,041,791		1,001,041,791
UNRRA	8,368,571		8,368,571
Lend-lease	30,197,100,000	29,935,200,000	261,900,000
Australia	347,265	108,433	238,832
American Red Cross	108,433	108,433	
UNRRA	238,832		238,832
Bermuda: American Red Cross	990	990	
British East Africa: American Red Cross	300,803	300,803	
Hong Kong: American Red Cross	368,223	368,223	
India: American Red Cross	77,088	77,088	
Jamaica: American Red Cross	3,490		3,490
Trinidad and Tobago: American Red Cross	2,552	2,552	
China	2,764,964,270	1,231,915,616	1,533,048,654
American Red Cross	6,451,630	4,562,703	1,888,927
Chinese aid:			
Dollar fund	166,742,576		166,742,576
Counterpart fund	13,107,500		13,107,500
Public Law 84	41,193,830		41,193,830
Executive Office of President	103,725,407		103,725,407
UNRRA	363,043,327	146,756	362,896,571
Treasury Department Chinese stabilization	500,000,000	380,406,157	119,593,843
Lend-lease	1,570,700,000	846,800,000	723,900,000
Czechoslovakia	$189,365,966	$5,916,679	$183,449,287
American Red Cross	75,363		75,363
UNRRA	189,090,603	5,716,679	183,373,924
Lend-lease	200,000	200,000	
Denmark	63,280,005		63,280,005
European recovery program	63,275,680		63,275,680
UNRRA	4,325		4,325
Egypt	2,041,990	1,699,621	342,369
American Red Cross	1,545,433	1,545,433	
UNRRA	496,557	154,188	432,369
Ethiopia	1,439,162	1,000,000	439,162
UNRRA	439,162		439,162
Lend-lease	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Finland	3,492,636	1,488,810	2,003,826
American Red Cross	1,652,206	1,488,810	163,396
UNRRA	1,480,430		1,840,430
France and possessions	3,774,996,594	2,581,380,186	1,193,616,408
France	3,758,757,765	2,565,248,511	1,193,509,254
American Red Cross	9,594,726	7,448,511	2,146,215
European recovery program	800,334,297		800,334,297
Public Law 389	312,867,800		312,867,800
UNRRA	3,060,942		3,060,942
Lend-lease	2,632,900,000	2,557,800,000	75,100,000
Algeria	16,051,834	15,945,136	106,698
American Red Cross	283,490	274,042	9,448
Army	15,017,532	15,017,532	
UNRRA	750,812	653,562	97,250
French Equatorial Africa: American Red Cross	118,448	118,448	
French Morocco: American Red Cross	68,091	68,091	
Indochina: UNRRA	456		456
Germany	2,040,804,701		2,040,804,701
European recovery program	405,971,372		405,971,372
Army	1,631,217,512		1,631,217,512
UNRRA	3,615,817		3,615,817
Greece	942,025,965	78,927,202	863,098,763
American Red Cross	1,420,567	1,385,479	35,088
European recovery program	125,030,643		125,030,643
Public Law 84	37,124,289		37,124,289
Greek-Turkish aid	415,153,303		415,153,303
UNRRA	281,997,163	2,241,723	279,755,440
Lend-lease	81,300,000	75,300,000	6,000,000
Hungary: UNRRA	2,359,429		2,359,429
Iceland	3,105,209	99,440	3,005,769
American Red Cross	99,440	99,440	
European recovery program	3,005,769		3,005,769
Iran: American Red Cross	353,209	353,209	
Ireland: American Red Cross	329,856	308,087	21,769
Italy and possession:			
Italy	1,646,619,624	310,166,264	1,336,453,360
American Red Cross	3,183,112	2,991,944	191,169
European recovery program	389,026,335		389,026,335
Public Law 389	176,468,103		176,468,101
Army	410,106,584	300,159,735	109,946,843
UNRRA	416,768,896	7,014,585	409,754,318
Civilian supplies	134,486,768		134,486,768
Public Law 84	116,579,826		116,579,826
Former dependency: Eritrea: American Red Cross	14,625	14,625	
Japan and possessions:			
Japan: Army	1,224,781,805		1,224,781,805
Ryukyu Islands	44,235,262	4,048,185	40,187,077
American Red Cross	12,558		12,558
Army	21,361,891		21,361,897
Navy	18,447,932	4,048,185	14,399,741
Army and Navy	4,412,881		4,412,881
Miscellaneous Islands: Navy	86,423	73,825	12,598
Korea	238,652,893		238,652,893
Korean aid:			
Dollar fund	7,035,052		7,035,052
Counterpart fund	3,743,330		3,743,330
Army	227,328,200		227,328,200
UNRRA	546,311		546,311

TABLE 3.—*Foreign grants—by country, by agency: Total period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949; war period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945; postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*—Continued

County	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Netherlands and possession	$315, 863, 956	$108, 724, 641	$207, 139, 315
Netherlands	308, 133, 584	105, 100, 000	203, 033, 584
American Red Cross	121, 889		121, 889
European recovery program	173, 613, 065		173, 613, 065
UNRRA	1, 898, 630		1, 898, 630
Lend-lease	132, 500, 000	105, 100, 000	27, 400, 000
Indonesia: Army	7, 730, 372	3, 624, 641	4, 105, 731
Norway	67, 257, 068	31, 270, 330	35, 986, 738
American Red Cross	241, 045	70, 330	170, 715
European recovery program	35, 044, 673		35, 044, 673
UNRRA	771, 350		771, 350
Lend-lease	31, 200, 000	31, 200, 000	
Philippines	434, 975, 747	52, 514, 589	382, 461, 158
American Red Cross	458, 384	447, 119	11, 265
Army	80, 412, 702	52, 067, 470	28, 345, 232
Philippine War Damage Commission (private claims)	174, 696, 145		174, 696, 145
Philippine rehabilitation:			
Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	100, 000, 000		100, 000, 000
Public reconstruction and rehabilitation	71, 708, 696		71, 708, 696
UNRRA	7, 699, 820		7, 699, 820
Poland	387, 470, 494	22, 284, 833	365, 185, 661
American Red Cross	913, 494	58, 393	855, 101
UNRRA	374, 057, 000	10, 026, 440	364, 030, 560
Lend-lease	12, 500, 000	12, 200, 000	300, 000
Portuguese Possession: Cape Verde Islands, American Red Cross	971	971	
Saudi Arabia: Lend-lease	7, 100, 000	7, 100, 000	
Spain: American Red Cross	1, 759, 204	1, 759, 204	
Sweden	19, 087, 286	766, 059	18, 321, 227
American Red Cross	815, 355	766, 059	49, 296
European recovery program	17, 722, 865		17, 722, 865
UNRRA	549, 066		549, 066
Switzerland: UNRRA	1, 802, 644		1, 802, 644
Trieste	29, 115, 290		29, 115, 290
European recovery program	14, 097, 623		14, 097, 623
Public Law 84	12, 009, 949		12, 009, 949
Army	3, 007, 718		3, 007, 718
Turkey	$141, 891, 824	$34, 800, 000	$107, 091, 824
European recovery program	5, 241, 080		5, 241, 080
Greek-Turkish aid	101, 850, 744		101, 850, 744
Lend-lease	34, 800, 000	34, 800, 000	
U. S. S. R	11, 025, 985, 801	10, 783, 205, 189	242, 780, 612
American Red Cross	17, 005, 388	15, 205, 189	1, 800, 199
UNRRA	186, 380, 413		186, 380, 413
Lend-lease	10, 822, 600, 000	10, 768, 000, 000	54, 600, 000
Yugoslavia	331, 001, 094	32, 228, 267	298, 772, 827
American Red Cross	719, 122		719, 122
UNRRA	229, 081, 972	1, 028, 267	298, 053, 705
Lend-lease	31, 200, 000	31, 200, 000	
Trust Territory of the Pacific:			
Caroline Islands: Navy	815, 179	90, 483	724, 696
Marianas Islands: Navy	5, 109, 043	1, 595, 305	3, 513, 738
Marshall Islands: Navy	446, 951	241, 412	205, 539
International Organizations:			
Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees	5, 667, 719	2, 017, 874	3, 649, 845
IRO and ICR	3, 649, 845		3, 649, 845
War Refugee Board	2, 017, 874	2, 017, 874	
International Children's Emergency Fund	58, 287, 524		58, 287, 524
International Refugee Organization	141, 668, 628		141, 668, 628
Refugee assistance	8, 937, 000		8, 937, 000
IRO and ICR	132, 731, 628		132, 731, 628
United Nations	8, 000, 000		8, 000, 000
UNRRA	420, 430, 005	55, 714, 221	364, 715, 784
Unclassified areas:			
Europe	620, 143, 644	435, 368, 926	184, 774, 718
British zone (Army)	231, 518, 718	123, 855, 456	107, 663, 262
United States zone (Army)	272, 157, 026	221, 510, 743	50, 646, 283
Balkans (Army)	90, 003, 445	90, 002, 727	718
Other Europe	26, 464, 455		26, 464, 455
European recovery program	12, 408, 197		12, 408, 197
European recovery program counterpart funds	13, 673, 770		13, 673, 770
Greek-Turkish aid	382, 488		382, 488
Miscellaneous (world)	1, 243, 342, 940	1, 236, 615, 937	6, 727, 003
American Red Cross	8, 271, 774	6, 177, 091	2, 094, 683
Public Law 84	4, 532, 320		4, 532, 320
War Refugee Board	1, 338, 846	1, 338, 846	
Lend-lease	1, 229, 200, 000	1, 229, 100, 000	100, 000

TABLE 4.—*Foreign credits utilized by agency: July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1949; war period, July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1945; postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*

Type of assistance	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Total	$11, 316, 570, 495	$1, 236, 697, 852	$10, 079, 872, 643
Agriculture Department (AGR)	214, 353, 092		214, 353, 092
Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA)	854, 409, 381		854, 409, 381
Export-Import Bank (EIB)	2, 944, 430, 190	489, 484, 928	2, 454, 945, 262
Maritime Commission (MC)	229, 001, 030		229, 001, 030
National Military Establishment: Army Department (ARMY)	27, 339, 120		27, 339, 120
Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC)	503, 984, 238	417, 157, 251	86, 826, 987
State Department: Proper	$11, 465, 935		$11, 465, 935
Institute of Inter-American Affairs (IIAA)	247, 180	$217, 180	30, 000
Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner (OFLC)	1, 093, 710, 842		1, 093, 710, 842
Treasury Department: Proper (TREAS)	3, 750, 000, 000		3, 750, 000, 000
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division (FACD)	1, 669, 609, 507	329, 838, 493	1, 339, 771, 040
War Assets Administration (WAA)	18, 019, 980		18, 019, 981

TABLE 5.—*Foreign credits utilized—by country, by agency: July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1949; war period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945; postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*

Country	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Total	$11, 316, 570, 495	$1, 236, 697, 852	$10, 079, 872, 643
American Republics	703, 017, 669	374, 271, 276	328, 746, 393
Export-Import Bank	565, 715, 727	280, 446, 816	285, 268, 911
Maritime Commission	12, 197, 440		12, 197, 440
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4, 594, 974	2, 541, 418	2, 053, 556
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	247, 180	217, 180	30, 000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	11, 094, 058		11, 094, 058
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	109, 017, 337	91, 065, 862	17, 951, 475
War Assets Administration	150, 953		150, 953
Argentina: Export-Import Bank	$594, 785	$390, 000	$204, 785
Bolivia	22, 302, 393	4, 510, 228	17, 792, 165
Export-Import Bank	19, 899, 754	2, 129, 754	17, 770, 000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2, 402, 639	2, 380, 474	22, 165
Brazil	182, 804, 079	95, 692, 339	87, 111, 740
Export-Import Bank	166, 592, 682	95, 692, 339	70, 900, 343
Maritime Commission	6, 242, 400		6, 242, 400
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1, 998, 031		1, 998, 031
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	7, 970, 966		7, 970, 966

TABLE 5.—*Foreign credits utilized—by country, by agency: July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1949; war period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945; postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*—Continued

County	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Chile: Export-Import Bank	$75,518,655	$22,467,330	$53,051,325
Colombia	42,464,208	22,435,330	20,028,878
Export-Import Bank	41,639,818	22,435,330	19,204,488
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	28,170		28,170
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	796,220		796,220
Costa Rica: Export-Import Bank	7,259,607	7,174,607	85,000
Cuba: Export-Import Bank	56,168,473	45,678,473	10,490,000
Dominican Republic: Export-Import Bank	3,283,932	3,283,932	
Ecuador	12,179,580	5,566,654	6,612,926
Export-Import Bank	11,529,170	5,405,710	6,123,460
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	166,134	160,944	5,190
Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	484,276		484,276
Haiti	10,830,953	10,320,000	510,953
Export-Import Bank	10,680,000	10,320,000	360,000
War Assets Administration	150,953		150,953
Honduras	1,117,519	895,000	222,519
Export-Import Bank	1,000,000	895,000	105,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	117,519		117,519
Mexico	110,012,278	16,218,279	93,793,999
Export-Import Bank	109,795,098	16,001,099	93,793,999
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	217,180	217,180	
Nicaragua: Export-Import Bank	4,650,000	4,650,000	
Panama: Export-Import Bank	2,693,578	2,487,704	205,874
Paraguay: Export-Import Bank	6,200,000	5,405,000	795,000
Peru	5,937,016		5,937,016
Export-Import Bank	444,159		444,159
Maritime Commission	4,099,500		4,099,500
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	1,393,357		1,393,357
Salvador: Export-Import Bank	1,476,000	900,000	576,000
Uruguay	16,403,948	7,085,849	9,318,099
Export-Import Bank	14,186,688	7,085,849	7,100,839
Maritime Commission	1,855,540		1,855,540
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	30,000		30,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	331,720		331,720
Venezuela: Export-Import Bank	7,491,063	5,144,078	2,346,985
Unclassified: American Republics	133,629,602	113,966,473	19,663,129
Export-Import Bank	24,612,265	22,900,611	1,711,654
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	109,017,337	91,065,862	17,951,475
Austria	23,164,487		23,164,487
Export-Import Bank	11,361,553		11,361,553
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	8,850,712		8,850,712
War Assets Administration	2,952,222		2,952,222
Bahrein: Reconstruction Finance Corporation	17,047,575	17,047,575	
Belgium-Luxemburg	221,645,837		221,645,837
Economic Cooperation Administration	50,900,000		50,900,000
Export-Import Bank	132,000,000		132,000,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	38,560,000		38,560,000
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	185,837		185,837
British Commonwealth	5,510,179,217	607,461,525	4,902,717,692
United Kingdom	5,138,216,860	434,281,061	4,703,935,799
Economic Cooperation Administration	313,000,000		313,000,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	390,000,000	390,000,000	
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	60,000,000		60,000,000
Treasury	3,750,000,000		3,750,000,000
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	625,216,860	44,281,061	580,935,799
Australia	16,621,719	8,371,719	8,250,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	7,750,000		7,750,000
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	8,871,719	8,371,719	500,000
United Kingdom—Continued			
British East Africa: Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	$81,655		$81,655
British Honduras: Reconstruction Finance Corporation	481,755	$468,258	13,497
Canada (including Newfoundland and Labrador)	172,785,000	32,785,000	140,000,000
Export-Import Bank	165,685,000	25,685,000	140,000,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,100,000	7,100,000	
India	176,110,782	131,555,487	44,555,295
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	13,063,636		13,063,636
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	163,047,146	131,555,487	31,491,659
New Zealand: Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	4,332,732		4,332,732
Pakistan: War Assets Administration	136,464		136,464
Union of South Africa: Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	1,412,250		1,412,250
Burma: Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	5,042,501		5,042,501
China	346,973,636	118,501,339	228,472,297
Export-Import Bank	201,159,765	118,501,339	82,658,426
Maritime Commission	16,387,120		16,387,120
Army Department	20,000,000		20,000,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	59,081,782		59,081,782
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	50,344,969		50,344,969
Czechoslovakia	30,377,258	794,444	29,582,814
Export-Import Bank	22,778,151	794,444	21,983,707
Office, Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	7,599,107		7,599,107
Denmark	52,040,989		52,040,989
Economic Cooperation Administration	31,000,000		31,000,000
Export-Import Bank	20,000,000		20,000,000
Office, Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	1,040,989		1,040,989
Egypt	15,372,010		15,372,010
Export-Import Bank	4,687,579		4,687,579
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	10,684,431		10,684,431
Ethiopia	5,734,540	4,357,778	1,376,762
Export-Import Bank	1,250,000	500,000	750,000
Office, Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	426,762		426,762
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	4,057,778	3,857,778	200,000
Finland	141,880,604	26,211,330	115,669,274
Export-Import Bank	117,027,262	26,211,330	90,815,923
Maritime Commission	1,167,520		1,167,520
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	18,671,763		18,671,763
War Assets Administration	5,014,059		5,014,059
France	2,120,378,927		2,120,378,927
Economic Cooperation Administration	172,000,000		172,000,000
Export-Import Bank	1,200,000,000		1,200,000,000
Maritime Commission	56,036,250		56,036,250
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	331,857,981		331,857,981
Foreign Accounts and Collections Division	353,300,000		353,300,000
War Assets Administration	7,184,696		7,184,696
Germany	125,535,070	4,559	125,530,511
Agriculture Department	34,206,079		34,206,079
Export-Import Bank	4,596,662	4,559	4,592,103
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,655,861		2,655,861
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	84,076,468		84,076,468
Greece	111,117,241		111,117,241
Export-Import Bank	14,563,313		14,563,313
Maritime Commission	41,298,000		41,298,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	55,255,928		55,255,928

TABLE 5.—*Foreign credits utilized—by country, by agency: July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1949; war period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945; postwar period, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949*—Continued

Country	Total, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1949	War period, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1945	Postwar period July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1949
Hungary: Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	$16,023,655		$16,023,655
Iceland	2,673,747	$590,000	2,083,747
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,996,989		1,996,989
Export-Import Bank	590,000	590,000	
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	86,758		86,758
Iran	38,107,365	462,429	37,644,936
Export-Import Bank	462,429	462,429	
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	29,103,895		29,103,895
Foreign Accounts and Collection Division	8,541,041		8,541,041
Iraq: Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	889,350		889,350
Ireland: Economic Cooperation Administration	39,012,392		39,012,392
Italy	380,820,067	13,376,265	367,443,802
Economic Cooperation Administration	67,000,000		67,000,000
Export-Import Bank	104,525,761	13,376,265	91,149,496
Maritime Commission	65,222,110		65,222,110
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	144,072,196		144,072,196
Japan	239,534,833		239,534,833
Agriculture Department	180,147,013		180,147,013
Export-Import Bank	25,909,910		25,909,910
Army	7,339,120		7,339,120
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	12,104,073		12,104,073
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	14,034,717		14,034,717
Korea: Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	24,927,596		24,927,596
Latvia: Export-Import Bank	10,782	10,782	
Lebanon: Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	1,550,280		1,550,280
Liberia: Foreign Accounts and Collection Division	14,805,433	1,801,259	13,004,174
Netherlands and possessions	530,186,663	40,346,554	489,840,109
Netherlands	467,319,099	40,346,554	426,972,545
Economic Cooperation Administration	144,500,000		144,500,000
Export-Import Bank	205,284,546		205,284,546
Maritime Commission	9,559,840		9,559,840
Office, Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	18,750,912		18,750,912
Foreign Accounts and Collection Division	88,346,554	40,346,554	48,000,000
War Assets Administration	877,247		877,247
Indonesia: Office, Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	$62,867,564		$62,867,564
Norway	115,396,463	$226,612	115,169,851
Economic Cooperation Administration	35,000,000		35,000,000
Export-Import Bank	50,448,000	226,612	50,221,388
Maritime Commission	18,963,000		18,963,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	4,465,790		4,465,790
Foreign Accounts and Collection Division	5,900,000		5,900,000
War Assets Administration	619,673		619,673
Philippines	79,217,764		79,217,764
Maritime Commission	2,081,480		2,081,480
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	70,000,000		70,000,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	6,051,618		6,051,618
War Assets Administration	1,084,666		1,084,666
Poland	80,969,722	3,547,412	77,422,310
Export-Import Bank	43,188,027	3,547,412	39,640,615
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	37,781,695		37,781,695
Portugal and possessions	1,335,866	1,335,866	
Portugal: Export-Import Bank	1,270,866	1,270,866	
Angola: Export-Import Bank	65,000	65,000	
Saudi Arabia	27,038,130	8,558,773	18,479,357
Export-Import Bank	10,000,000		10,000,000
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	1,880,000		1,880,000
Foreign Accounts and Collection Division	15,158,130	8,558,773	6,599,357
Spain: Export-Import Bank	13,681,074	13,681,074	
Sweden: Export-Import Bank	6,266,000	4,111,000	2,155,000
Thailand (Siam): Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	6,215,270		6,215,270
Turkey	34,117,844		34,117,844
Export-Import Bank	21,902,783		21,902,783
Maritime Commission	6,088,270		6,088,270
Office Foreign Liquidation Commissioner	6,126,791		6,126,791
U. S. S. R.: Foreign Accounts and Collection Division	221,916,703		221,916,703
Yugoslavia: Foreign Accounts and Collection Division	900,000		900,000
International organizations, United Nations: State	11,465,935		11,465,935

Sources: Latest releases from Clearing Office of Foreign Transactions, Department of Commerce, Department of State, Treasury, Export-Import Bank, National Military Establishment, RFC, Maritime Commission, UNRRA, International Monetary Fund and International Bank, plus official tabulations by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I would prefer to finish my remarks, and then I shall be very glad to yield for questions.

An additional table furnished by the Legislative Reference Service, brings this information on appropriations up to date through the current fiscal year, adding another $6,344,880,029 to the foreign aid total, making the figures as follows:

In total grants and credits for the period ended June 30, 1949, $29,356,768,280.

Amount appropriated for fiscal 1950, $6,344,880,029.

Our subscription to the contingent fund of the International Bank for Reconstruction, $2,500,000,000.

Estimate of expenditures to international agencies and disbursements by military agencies in foreign areas since the war, $20,000,000,000.

Mr. President, the total is $58,201,648,309.

This does not include 1 dime for the shooting war. Neither does it include 1 dime of war lend-lease.

There has been excluded, particularly, $46,073,700,000 for lend-lease during the war, which could be credited to help in winning the war.

I ask that the additional table be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service]

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATED, FISCAL YEAR 1950

During the fiscal year 1950, comprising a period from July 1, 1949, through June 30, 1950, the following totals have been appropriated:

1. European recovery program, July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1950	$3,628,380,000
2. European recovery program: Loan funds through the Export-Import Bank	150,000,000
3. Aid to Greece and Turkey	45,000,000
4. Government and relief in occupied areas: Economic relief in occupied areas	925,000,000
5. Military aid program	1,450,000,000
6. Aid to Korea	60,000,000
7. International Refugee Organization	70,000,000
8. Relief of Palestine Refugees	16,000,000
Total	6,344,380,000

Mr. WHERRY. If wartime lend lease were included in the total, the total aid and credits would be the staggering sum of $104,275,348,309.

Authorities have stated that the cost of World War II when finally ascertained will be more than $350,000,000,000.

The statement has recently been made by former Secretary of War Gordon Gray that World War II will have cost the United States $1,300,000,000,000 before it is finally paid for.

Think of that, fellow Americans. Let us think of that when we are making these commitments. Somebody will have to pay the bill. When and where will it be paid, and who will pay it? What about the stability of the United States of America? The time to consider these questions is now, when authorizations are asked for, as well as later, when appropriations are requested.

Mr. Hoffman used that cost reference in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as added emphasis to what he called the small amount of money requested for ECA.

In my opinion, it is impossible to compare the cost of a hot war with the cold war we are now experiencing.

At the same time it is misleading to use the $2,950,000,000 now being asked for by ECA, or all of the ECA funds thus far authorized, in comparison with the cost of war, or as anything but a small proportion of our accumulated foreign aid, which is now over $58,000,000,000, or $104,000,000,000 if we include lend-lease.

Our efforts to bolster the economies of western European countries have been costly and ineffectual in accomplishing the integration of European trade and commerce, and might eventually result in their independence and our relief from the millstone around our necks.

We have enabled foreign nations, through our gifts, to reduce their internal debts, balance their national deficits, build up their gold reserves, and increase their over-all production to 20 percent above prewar levels.

We have sat helplessly by while our free-enterprise dollars are used to foster socialistic forms of government.

We have continued aid, and the ECA countries are still asking for more, to countries who are carrying on active trade with Red Russia, in contravention to our national efforts, and with materials supplied in whole or in part by American dollars.

As several of my colleagues have stated in the past few days, Great Britain has entered into 96 trade agreements with Russia since the war, and both France and Great Britain have nonaggression pacts with U. S. S. R.

British steel, French steel, and Belgian steel is going behind the iron curtain, and we have been powerless to prevent it, or to stop the transshipment of American products by our so-called cooperating countries.

The very idea of putting any requirements upon our dollars in the way of protections to our trade, or limitations upon what our debtor nations may do with the dollars we are giving them, is repugnant to the State Department and to ECA.

The blank check is shoved in front of us.

Ask no questions, Mr. American Taxpayer.

Every country in the world has its hands, up to the elbows, in the American taxpayers' pocket, and we are being asked for more.

Last week press statements referred to conversations between Great Britain and the United States in which the United Kingdom is stated to have asked for more United States help in shouldering her burden of debt to the Sterling bloc nations of the Far East. Those conversations took place last September 7, Mr. President, right in our own backyard, yet the American people and the Congress have been kept in the dark about such proposals.

And I assure the Senate it has been impossible for one Senator of the United States, the junior Senator from Nebraska, to find out from the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury what was said or agreed to at that meeting.

It was a secret until it broke in the press on April 24, but evidently the British make no bones about what it is they are seeking.

The following is a quotation from the New York Journal of Commerce, of Tuesday, April 25, 1950. It is entitled "Britain Asks United States Share Debt Load. Wants Aid on Pakistan, India, Asia Obligations." I read a portion of it:

The British Government has proposed the United States take over a big share of Britain's economic burden in India, Pakistan, and southeast Asia. The British plan would call for the United States to pay off in dollars to such countries as India and Pakistan part of Britain's $9,000,000,000 wartime debt to sterling bloc nations.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN ASKS UNITED STATES SHARE DEBT LOAD—WANTS AID ON PAKISTAN, INDIA, ASIA OBLIGATIONS

WASHINGTON, April 24.—The British Government has proposed the United States take over a big share of Britain's economic burden in India, Pakistan, and southeast Asia.

Officials disclosed today the British Embassy has put forward this idea in an exploratory proposal now under consideraton by high administration officials.

The British plan would call for the United States to pay off in dollars to such countries as India and Pakistan part of Britain's $9,000,000,000 wartime debt to sterling-bloc nations.

FOLLOWS DOLLAR CRISIS TALKS

The main idea behind the suggested program is to help non-Communist countries in Asia fight off Communism while at the same time ease the huge debt which is jeopardizing Britain's economic comeback.

The British memorandum stems from last fall's American-British-Canadian dollar crisis talks. At that time, it was decided to examine the sterling debt and other economic problems to determine what steps could be taken.

The United States long has been urging Britain to get its creditors to agree to scale down these debts. But the countries like Indian which need financial aid have resisted this.

Informed officials said the British paper is the first concrete proposal of what might be done even though it is highly tentative and intended mainly for discussion.

They added, in response to questions, that the paper does not go into detail on what return the United States could expect for helping Britain pay off the sterling debt.

Presumably the dividends would be measured in cold war gains—a healthier southeast Asia and a sounder British economy to bolster western Europe.

Mr. WHERRY. Two weeks before that, Sir Stafford Cripps, the British Chancelor of the Exchequer, in an official announcement, boasted that in the first quarter of 1950 the sterling area had earned a net gold and dollar surplus of $40,000,000, the first surplus since before the war.

British gold and dollar reserves rose by $296,000,000 during the quarter, so that on March 31, they stood at $1,984,000,000, closely approaching the $2,000,000,000 which Sir Stafford considers a safe point in British economy.

The socialistic British Government has been supported by ECA dollars for 2 years. Its hand is outstretched for another $687,000,000 of ECA money—free money—for the coming fiscal year, and Britain has been trying to wangle another separate and special loan to ease British debt obligations to India and south Asia.

The quarterly surplus referred to by Sir Stafford Cripps means only that Britain has $40,000,000 which she can apply against her internal debt.

As of March 31, 1950, the British internal debt was $66,112,622,800.

Their external debt was $6,139,285,600, most of which is owed to the United States. Their frozen debts, incurred to their own Dominions during the war—and this is the important part—was $14,000,000,000 and has been reduced to $9,000,000,000.

It is that latter $9,000,000,000 that Britain is trying to get us to take over for her on another "hold-back-the-tide-of-communism" plea.

Mr. President, for the past year we have been importuned with the idea of "embarking upon a great world program to help the underdeveloped areas of the world."

The President of the United States announced it as a "bold, new program" in his inaugural address of January 20, 1949, and again in a special message to Congress on June 24, 1949.

The only thing that is new about it is the name—point 4.

It is the same old give-away program we have been "new-dealing" in for the past 10 years.

We are just not doing enough to suit our world-minded Government do-gooders.

Fifty-eight billion dollars, plus $46,000,000,000 in lend-lease, is not enough.

We must dress up the old programs, give them some more money, and a new 5-year lease on life.

Once the point 4 is on the books, we will find ourselves saddled with a new "gimmick" and told we are duty-bound to support our commitment—ad infinitum.

The $45,000,000 asked for today will just lay the cornerstone of what is to follow.

We are told that there are limitations, but I have been in the Senate 8 years,

and I find that once an agency gets its toe in the door, it says, "Oh, yes, it was authorized; now let us get the appropriation." Just as sure as the sun rises that is what is going to happen, in my opinion, if this allocation is made.

This is what the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, said when he testified on the point 4 legislation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 30, 1950. I quote his statement in part:

> But our foreign policy is not based on security alone. We have never been satisfied merely to resist a threat—of communism or any other ism. Our policy is broader than this. It is essentially constructive. It is based on the assumption that, in the world as it is today, our own welfare is closely related to that of other peoples. * * *
>
> The bill now before you (the point 4 amendment) establishes economic development of underdeveloped areas for the first time as a national policy.

For the first time it is a national policy.

The line of approach has shifted. The Marshall plan ballyhoo, which for 2 years has been dinning "hold back the tide of communism" in our ears, is moving into another area of appeal. All the stops are out, it is a real tear jerker, we must underwrite all of the economic ills of the world in order to stop communism, and for our national security. That is the new cry.

Mr. President, with all the statements which have been made, the truth is that we are losing the cold war, despite the billions we have poured into Europe. General Bradley says we are losing the cold war. High Commissioner McCloy, in Germany, says we are losing the cold war. Everybody can see the way Russia is taking over China and sending shivers through the South Pacific.

Mr. President, is it not about time that we take stock of our situation, and consider how fast we are going down the road of bankruptcy? Is it not about time to ask questions?

The most deceptive snare is that the proponents of the point 4 proposals have ignored the grants-in-aid, the financial assistance, and all manner of scientific and technical guidance that has been given to all the so-called underdeveloped areas of the world by the United States Government over a period of years, exclusive of ECA.

Mr. President, I turn to tabulations 3 and 5 in the Legislative Reference Report, to which I referred earlier. These tabulations give a breakdown, by countries, of all the grants and credits that have been made by the United States over the past 10 years, and the account source of the funds so donated.

The American republics have received $454,466,309 in grants and $703,017,669 in credits, a total of $1,157,483,987 in RFC loans and scientific and technical assistance. The countries so benefited include Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

"Come one, come all." That is the slogan. "Get in, get some money from Uncle Sam." Let us close the dollar gaps throughout the world. Everybody get in for the big give-away show.

Africa, the Far and Near East, British East Africa, Union of South Africa, Egypt, Ethiopia, Algeria, French Equatorial Africa, French Morocco, Liberia, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, Bahrein, Saudi-Arabia, India, Burma, Siam, China, Indochina, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Ryukyus Islands have received aid in amounts varying from thousands to millions of dollars. And this does not include ECA money and materials and counterpart funds which may be spent by European countries in their dependent areas.

Later I shall go into more detail on just what those programs have been.

EUROPEAN PAYMENTS UNION

Mr. President, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 clearly sets forth in its declaration of policy that—

> The accomplishment of these objectives calls for a plan of European recovery, open to all such nations which cooperate in such plans, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, and the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers.

The first objective was to rehabilitate Europe's industrial machine and restore manufactures and agriculture. The second, and interlocking, objective is to bring about greater trade and interchangeability of currencies between the European nations, in order to promote interdependence upon themselves and less dependence upon American dollars.

Having established the beachhead of increased production effort in the 16 participating countries, ECA is now faced with the fact that it must accomplish the trade unification of Europe, or it has no reason for further existence.

ECA must make the second half of its policy work, or the production effort will tumble like a house of cards when ECA dollars are withdrawn.

At this crucial point there are signs of reviving nationalism in many of the cooperating countries, and prewar rivalries and struggles for trade supremacy have been reopened. Trade unification of Europe, if it still is as desirable as it seemed, is certainly as far away as at any time in the postwar period.

In recent hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, February 21, 1950, both the Secretary of State and ECA Administrator Hoffman spoke in glowing terms of the production gains which have been made by the 16 Marshall-plan countries.

An average of 20 percent above 1935–38 production levels has been attained. An increase up to 40 percent has been reached in some countries in manufacture. Gains in agricultural production have been less marked.

Testimony has indicated, however, that real progress toward convertibility of currencies and elimination of other trade barriers between the European nations has not been accomplished.

Various plans have been tried in the past 2 years. At present there is in effect, but due to expire on June 30, an intra-European payments agreement between ECA and the 16 Marshall-plan countries.

A part of the ECA dollar aid apportioned to each country, which it needs to pay for necessary imports from the dollar area, is given only on condition that the recipient country extends a grant-in-aid in the same amount in its own currency to the other participating countries with which it has a trade deficit.

Belgium, for example, receives dollar financing to pay for goods and services from the United States and elsewhere in the dollar area, on condition that it make a grant of Belgian francs to Greece with which Greece can buy steel in Belgium.

In other words, ECA dollars act as the come-on to persuade two of the participating countries to trade with each other. However, the limitation has been that the intra-European payments plan is based on a series of bilateral arrangements between pairs of countries, rather than providing for multilateral trade movements.

The drawing rights that Belgium might give Greece can be used only in Belgium. Greece cannot shop around and buy its steel in the most advantageous market.

However, the ECA dollar stimulus has not been sufficient up to this point to induce the individual countries to bring their trade into balance.

Therefore, Administrator Hoffman is anxious to try another step, which he hopes will make European currencies freely convertible one into another. He also has hopes it will further break down quantitative restriction, price differentials, and tariff barriers which are still very much in evidence between the European nations.

This new step is called the European Payments Union. It might almost be called a figment of Mr. Hoffman's imagination at this point, for certainly it has not reached the point of being acceptable to the countries who will participate, nor is it clear how Mr. Hoffman proposes to go about setting up what amounts to a separate European monetary fund.

We will not see the European Payments Union identified as such in the present legislation. In fact, we will not find much discussion of it anywhere.

In the bill, at the top of page 2, it is proposed to add a paragraph (d) to section 111 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The paragraph reads:

> (d) The Administrator is authorized to transfer funds—

Note the expression, Mr. President, "transfer funds"—

> not to exceed a total of $600,000,000 directly to any central institution—

To any central institution, if you please—

> or other organization formed to further purposes of this act by two or more participating countries, or to any participating country or countries in connection with the operation of

such institution or organization, to be used on terms and conditions specified by the administration, in order to facilitate the development of transferability of European currencies, or to promote liberalization of trade by participating countries with one another and with other countries.

According to this rather vague wording, the ECA Administrator will be able to transfer $600,000,000 of ECA funds to an outside institution or organization, on terms and conditions which he personally sets up, to promote the hoped for trade integration.

Thus far Mr. Hoffman has not needed any additional legislative authority to run the present or previous intra-European payments plans, because they involved only the withholding of ECA dollars if a country did not extend a grant-in-aid in its own currency to the other participating country with which it has a trade deficit.

It is amazing that the Administrator has found it necessary to ask for authority in addition to that already contained in the ECA act.

If paragraph (d) can be called a firm definition, it is evidently needed in order that ECA may immobilize $600,000,000 and transfer it, I think, to a separate institution.

And what do we know about the European payments union proposal? There is not much in the report about it, and it has not been discussed fully, at least on the floor of the Senate, by any member of the Foreign Relations Committee. It has been presented, yes, but its ramifications have not been explained.

Nothing but the briefest of explanations have been offered by officials of ECA who thought it up.

Mr. Acheson addressed himself to it in general terms in Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings; Mr. Hoffman testified in slightly more detail; and Mr. Bissell of ECA attempted to clarify the proposal.

So far as I know, the committee has not asked for testimony on the European Payments Union proposal from representatives of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank, from participating countries, or from experts in international trade and banking who would be in a position to advise us as to its feasibility under existing law, or its conflict with the interests of American industry and business.

In my opinion, Mr. Hoffman is now sending up another expensive trial balloon, this time with $600,000,000. It will be added to the $800,000,000 he spent on a similar, and unsuccessful plan, during the present fiscal year.

Testimony has shown an equal amount, or more as admitted by Mr. Bissell, was spent in the same effort during the first year of ECA.

Mr. President, there is no doubt about the integration of European currencies and trade being a pressing problem. I agree to that. I mentioned it time and time again when the first authorization was made. That is why I felt the loan should be made through some sort of international RFC which could accomplish this integration so that individuals in the other countries could take a part of the responsibility, put up a part of their own capital. But no, that has not been done.

Two years of the Marshall plan have gone by and integration, one of the important principles of the plan, has not been accomplished. I am speaking about the elimination of trade barriers and the convertibility of currency.

It stands out crystal clear that the European countries are not cooperating to the extent necessary to foresee their possible independence from ECA support at any near point in the future. If they were, Mr. Hoffman would not ask for the $600,000,000.

It is plain that we are about to prime the pump with another $600,000,000 in order to persuade certain European countries to do business with each other, perhaps with a few more requirements this time, but certainly with the same idea of taking up the slack in their trade deficits.

Mr. President, at what point is western Europe going to stand on its own feet? That is a question which ought to be answered. At what point is it going to stand on its own feet? If the plan is to end in 1952 what, then, is going to happen to the ECA countries? What about trade barriers, what about convertibility of currencies then, if we are not giving them any more money?

Is the United States the only party to the plan that is cooperating?

The only satisfactory information that has been published about the European payments union proposals that I can find is contained in a report by the Senate ECA "watchdog committee," for which the junior Senator from Nebraska is grateful. This is Senate Document No. 144, issued March 8, 1950.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I asked that I be permitted to continue until I had concluded my presentation, but I shall be glad to yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LODGE. On this particular point I wanted to ask the Senator from Nevada whether the report had been approved by the membership of the watch-dog committee.

Mr. WHERRY. It is published without comment.

Mr. LODGE. It was not approved?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether all the members of the committee have gone into all of it; I do not know whether all the members of the committee have signed the report; but I understand they are continuing to investigate the program. Whether they are in total agreement with the report, I cannot tell the Senator. I will say, however, that they raised the very point respecting the pending legislation that I am raising. We established the watch-dog committee for that purpose. I am glad the committee is functioning. Until we create some other committee to watch the funds and find out how the program is working, I shall continue to look to the watch-dog committee for whatever advice it can furnish on these questions, respecting matters I cannot find anywhere in the report issued by the committee, and which I cannot find in the evidence of Mr. Hoffman or in the evidence of Dean Acheson.

Mr. LODGE. The report was not approved by the watch-dog committee, although it had the opportunity to approve it if its members wanted to.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know. I have great faith in the chairman of that committee, whether the committee has approved it or not. The report of the watch-dog committee was issued on March 8, 1950, as Senate Document No. 144. To my knowledge this is the first time the point has been brought to the attention of the Senate that the watch-dog committee did not approve. That does not really make any difference so far as the point I am making is concerned.

In it ECA has submitted a memorandum on the proposed European Payments Union, which the committee published without comment. This memorandum is followed by a staff report on the proposed European clearing organization, which I have found very revealing. I recommend that each Senator read the committee's report before final action comes on the ECA legislation.

Following are a few excerpts from it—page 6:

Mr. Hoffman apparently feels that the ECA makes a poorer showing in bringing about European integration and removing intra-European trade barriers than on other aspects of its program. Some people believe that Mr. Hoffman hoped to bring home from his recent trip to Europe an agreement to establish a clearing organization as evidence to Congress that something tangible had been accomplished in this direction.

The European response to the ECA proposal has been disappointing to the ECA. The Marshall-plan countries have agreed to study the matter to see if something can be worked out, but nothing more.

The ECA clearing house proposal apparently stirred up a certain amount of conflict among the United States agencies represented on the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (Treasury, State, Commerce, Federal Reserve, Export-Import Bank, and ECA). It was necessary for the ECA to change the original proposal which it sent to the European countries and on which these countries had been working for a month before the approval of the National Advisory Council was obtained.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree with that statement?

Mr. LODGE. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, I will not repeat it.

Mr. LODGE. I was engaged in consultation. If the Senator will repeat it——

Mr. WHERRY. What I stated runs to the very question the Senator asked. The Senator can find it in the RECORD between now and tomorrow's session, and I hope he will answer the question.

As to conflicting views of United States agencies the report states:

The first is the relation of the Payments Union to the International Fund. Ever since the Bretton Woods Agreement it has been the policy of the United States to work toward the free convertibility of all the world's currencies and the International Monetary Fund has been the instrument for attaining this objective. * * *

The other major issue which appears to exist in the minds of the National Advisory Council members is the question as to whether or not it is desirable for the United States to foster in Europe a regional soft-currency area which is protected from United States competition by trade restrictions, and which develops an artificial economic structure within its walls. To a considerable extent this is what the economic integration of Europe does.

Mr. President, I believe I have read enough to show that the Senate does not know much about the carte blanche authority which paragraph (d) proposes to hand over to the ECA Administrator.

It is quite evident that Mr. Hoffman needs new authority, or he would not ask for it—authority even in addition to the broad powers of the ECA Act—in order to establish a regional European Monetary Fund, which I think will be separate and distinct from anything we have had before.

It is evident that the National Advisory Council, established to coordinate Government policies on the International Fund and Bank, has grave reservations in regard to what relation a European Payments Union would bear to the International Monetary Fund. It also doubts whether it is desirable for the United States to foster a regional soft-currency area which could exclude United States competition and could develop an artificial economic structure in western Europe.

It is evident that Mr. Hoffman is promoting an idea that has not been received with any enthusiasm by Marshall plan countries. An article in the New York Times, April 19, entitled "Mystery Over British Aims Delays Monetary Compact," bears the subtitle "Real Issues of Payments Union Await Discussion Till This Uncertainty Ends."

I ask unanimous consent to have this article included in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MYSTERY OVER BRITISH AIMS DELAYS MONETARY COMPACT—REAL ISSUES OF PAYMENTS UNION AWAIT DISCUSSION TILL THIS UNCERTAINTY ENDS

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

THE HAGUE, THE NETHERLANDS, April 18.—Uncertainty about the intentions of British monetary policy is having a pronounced deterrent effect on the economic progress of Europe.

Unlike previous phases of the prolonged crisis of the pound sterling the tendency in Continental central bank and treasury circles is less to blame the British for doing the wrong thing than to ponder the very grave consequences for the world of what seems to them to be British inability to decide just what it is they are standing for in international monetary affairs.

There is no lack of understanding on the continent of the special problems of the sterling area as it has emerged from the war. There is a great lack of understanding of why Britain will not face these special problems on a technical level and work out some kind of a system that will enable the 15 other monetary areas participating in the Marshall plan to get away from the now very costly bilateralism in their payments relationships.

TECHNICAL PROBLEMS EMPHASIZED

Uncertainty in Europe as to Britain's real intentions explains much of the emphasis on "technical problems" as a factor in delaying agreement on the new European Payments Union. Discussions will resume tomorrow in Paris on this project, which has acquired the status of a kind of fetish both in Europe and in Washington. Everybody says it is something that must be done, but few of those building the structure are certain in their own minds that it is a good thing.

There are no technical difficulties in bringing sterling into a European Payments Union supported by several hundred million dollars of Marshall aid. Any competent European or American financial technician can draft one or more plans that would achieve that result without costing Britain a penny in dollars or gold beyond what she is paying anyway under existing arrangements.

The British are among the best financial technicians in the world and it is inconceivable to their colleagues on the continent that the British don't know the difference between sense and nonsense in matters of this kind. Yet the issues as they emerge from technical discussions are nonsensical in the light of the present pattern of trade and payments in Europe and in world.

QUESTIONS ON BRITISH AIMS

The real issues cannot be discussed until the other parties know what the British want with respect to the real issues. Do they, as many Continental and American experts have come to suspect, want to maintain indefinitely a system that makes them arbiter of the terms of trade of other European countries? Are they afraid that a United States depression is imminent that would make the sterling area a kind of haven for a Europe unable to earn dollars and deprived of Marshall aid? This would make sense to many Continentals. Do the British want to force the creation of a third monetary area that would practice discrimination against the dollar and thus indirectly put sterling in the position of a mediator in world trade?

These are all real issues, but they are not being discussed. Meanwhile, a country like the Netherlands has to face the prospect, if a European payments union is formed without British cooperation, of being deprived of its present right to sell freely in the sterling area—the derivative of its right to accept sterling freely in payment for exports. This is a very grave matter for a country whose second largest traditional market is Britain and whose trade is now nearly half financed through sterling.

It is a measure of the fears of British intentions that the Dutch are prepared to accept this outcome if necessary rather than trade indefinitely on British terms. Meanwhile, here and elsewhere in Europe plans are delayed, business is uncertain, and the sense of western solidarity is weakening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if it can be assumed that a more effective kind of financial clearing house is necessary to achieve the trade cooperation we seek between Marshall plan countries—and I know of no quarrel with that argument—the proposals suggested in section 102 of the ECA bill are premature and unexplored, and more testimony should be taken, so that we may understand exactly what authority is being requested under this section.

The vague commitments of the proposed paragraph (d) to section 111 of the act, as contained in section 102 of the ECA bill, provide neither definitions nor limitations that would be in the interest of American industry and trade. It simply says, "Here is another $600,000,000 for you, Mr. Administrator, to play around with as you see fit."

If the Senate wishes to extend new authorities to the administration with respect to a European Payments Union, in my opinion it is more appropriate that such proposals be clearly introduced in separate legislation and subjected to the scrutiny of full committee hearings. I think it is a question to be studied by the Banking and Currency Committee, as well as the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not mean that in this respect the Foreign Relations Committee does not have equal authority with the Banking and Currency Committee, but I think this matter also relates to the banking and currency field. And I think it should be thoroughly explored by means of additional hearings, in order to determine what is sought in connection with this newly requested authority.

III. POINT 4

Mr. President, there seems to be an inclination on the part of the proponents of the point 4 to propound it as a new idea—a bold, new program in our world-saving foreign policy.

Others view the proposed point 4 idea more reasonably as a device for opening up new fields for American business investment and outlet. At least, that is the way it is being sold to the Members of the Senate.

With this latter viewpoint I might feel some sympathy if I could be sure of a foreign investment program that would be a two-way street, and that enterprise so sponsored would be free enterprise, in cooperation with free governments, for the benefit of free peoples.

However, there is no such assurance under existing conditions.

Let me remind the Senate that we are considerably ahead of ourselves in speaking of a program for investment expansion. The bill before us does not contain any such provision; and the proposals for a point 4 program are contained in an amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, limiting point 4 to scientific and technical assistance only. The amendment asks for only $45,000,000, which is expected to be supplemented by another $40,000,000 contributed by other nations.

It is ridiculous to imagine that we could raise the standard of living in backward countries, explore their natural resources, and improve their participation in world trade, without the expenditure of billions upon billions of dollars.

No, Mr. President, the $45,000,000 just starts the ball rolling, and then commits us, I think, for another 5 years. Although it may be said that this particular measure commits us only to the initial authorization, yet once a toe gets in the door, I think it will be very difficult for us to avoid having to make additional authorizations and appropriations in the future.

The junior Senator from Nebraska has not received one letter from an American businessman or firm, large or small, which has urged the passage of a point 4 program.

I doubt seriously that there is any general understanding of its proposals.

In hearings held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 30 and April 1, which really were held on the broader proposals for international development as contained in the House bill, as I view the matter, and not on the Senate version as reported by the committee, I was amazed to notice that so few witnesses appeared in behalf of the program.

What I deplore most in the promotion of point 4, as a national policy, is that it is assumed we have not already put millions of dollars into underdeveloped areas in the world. We are told that because the ECA concentrates its efforts, in technical assistance for western Europe, we must add a coordinated program to take care of the rest of the world.

One would think we had left these poor people out in the cold on foreign assistance, while devoting all our effort on western Europe.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

If the tabulations I have previously submitted for the RECORD are not sufficiently convincing, I should like to go still further into the amount of scientific, technical, and financial assistance we have extended over a period of years to all corners of the world.

The third semiannual report by the Department of State on its information and educational program states that under the Institute of American Affairs the United States has—

Sent to Latin-American countries approximately 1,700 technicians from the United States Government.

Brought from Latin America over 2,000 younger scientists and technicians for training in United States Government agencies.

Given grants to over 1,500 university students to come to the United States for advanced study.

Sent over 200 United States professors to lecture in Latin-American universities.

Brought to the United States on travel grants approximately 560 bureau chiefs and other key officials from Latin-American countries for observations and discussions.

Since the origination of this earlier program the work of technical assistance has continued on a very much expanded scale, under new authorities set forth in Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948 granted to the Department of State much broader authorities than those now being sought under the point 4 amendment to the ECA bill.

Sections 301, 402, and 403 of the act permit the Secretary of State to send technical missions to any part of the world and to call upon every agency of government in accomplishing the programs set forth.

It would seem, then, that what is proposed by this new point 4 amendment is to merge the scientific and technical assistance now being carried on under Public Law 402, and to set up a mushrooming authority to be superimposed upon existing programs.

Point 4 would be separate and additional to the ECA technical and other economic assistance being rendered to western European nations and their dependent areas.

Mr. President, presently under way under the scientific and cultural cooperation program in the State Department are a wide range of scientific and technical projects, not limited to Latin-American countries at all.

For example, Department of Agriculture specialists are now working in Egypt to improve the development of the onion and other vegetable crops.

Believe me, Mr. President, our Government has some employees in South America helping to develop potatoes which will be sent to this country, to be sold on a free-trade basis; and then we shall have to raise our price supports in order to pay American potato farmers the cost of production in the United States and to take care of the surplus besides.

A civil aviation mission is working in Turkey.

Technical assistance by the Bureau of Mines has been extended to Afghanistan, and plans are under way to give metallurgical and mining assistance to Siam and India.

Public Health officers are assisting Iran in an antimalaria campaign.

Meanwhile, scientific and technical assistance is going on full tilt in the American Republics. Everything from library exchanges and child-health programs to even a 1950 Latin-American census are now in prograss, believe it or not.

The State Department reports that for the 6-month period January 1950 through June 30, there were 188 United States Government experts abroad on projects from the Department of Agriculture, Commerce, Federal Security Agency, Interior Department, Labor Department, Library of Congress, Smithsonian Institution, and the Bureau of the Budget. For the same period 293 technical trainees were in this country on study grants.

All that is exclusive of other informational and cultural programs in progress by the State Department, which include the Voice of America, publications, and motion-picture projects.

In the State Department report it is also stated that during the war period funds were made available from the President's emergency fund for the exchange of specialists with a number of far eastern, near eastern, and African countries.

Technical cooperation activities have been carried out in the Philippines since 1946 under the authority of Public Law 370, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Technical assistance has also been a significant part of the Greek-Turkish aid program, separate from ECA.

The Department of the Army has provided technical assistance in the occupied areas under military government to help such areas become self-supporting.

The different kinds and sources of scientific and technical aid to Latin-America and to the other so-called underdeveloped areas of the world, the Near and the Far East and Africa, run like a checkerboard through Government funds and through the assignment of specialist personnel.

To arrive at the total amount spent by the State Department and other Government agencies in this effort over the past 10 years, would be a technical project in itself, and certainly one which I think the Committee on Foreign Relations should undertake before it proposes legislation for a new program—the point 4 program.

The Department of State estimates that from 1940 to June 30, 1950, $58,975,300 has been spent in technical cooperation under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, alone. It would be necessary to add to that the total funds spent in the past 2 years under the Educational and Informational Act.

For the same period, the Legislative Reference Service estimates that over $81,000,000 has been spent in grants for inter-American technical assistance, and a grand total of $1,157,483,978 in all aid, loans, and credits to the American Republics.

Aid and loans and credits to other countries of the globe enumerated in the Legislative Reference report, outside ECA countries, has in the past 10 years reached a total of $5,748,317,178.

In addition, millions have been spent yearly in the so-called underdeveloped areas by private industry, and by religious and other institutions.

This does not look as though the underdeveloped areas are being neglected.

We now come to the consideration of technical assistance programs carried on directly with ECA funds and by the use of counterpart funds.

Under section 111 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, as amended, the Administrator of ECA may approve the procurement and furnishing of technical information and assistance to the extent he deems necessary and proper.

He may extend to any person, guaranties of investments in connection with ECA projects, or the expansion of existing projects in Marshall-plan countries and dependencies, that he may approve.

He has an authorization of $150,000,000 to insure such investments.

As the Senate knows, the United States gets nothing back from ECA funds, except 5 percent of the counterpart money, which is supposed to be set aside for use by the United States in either purchasing or developing strategic materials.

As the participating country uses its ECA dollars, it must set up in its own currency a counterpart fund, which the foreign government may use on approved projects within its continental or dependent areas.

ECA reports that, as of February 28, 1950, it has authorized $6,100,400 in technical assistance. This will amount to $8,840,200 by the end of fiscal 1950, and it is estimated that the cumulative total will amount to $16,359,900 in 1951.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing ECA technical assistance, commitments, actual and estimated, through 1951.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Technical assistance—actual and estimated commitments—by country

[Thousands of dollars]

Country	Fiscal year					Country	Fiscal year				
	1949 (actual)	1950			1951 (estimated)		1949 (actual)	1950			1951 (estimated)
		First half (actual)	Second half (estimated)	Total				First half (actual)	Second half (estimated)	Total	
Total	2,637.6	2,589.3	6,250.9	8,840.2	16,359.9	Denmark	21.3	5.5	176.5	182.0	374.4
						Austria	0	3.8	115.1	118.9	341.9
OEEC	0	20.5	277.0	297.5	3,017.8	Norway	24.9	[1]—2.8	119.5	116.7	336.9
United Kingdom	94.9	426.4	1,448.6	1,875.0	2,684.4	Ireland	1.7	20.7	36.5	57.2	254.8
Greece	2,081.1	1,743.1	1,813.8	3,556.9	2,200.7	Belgium-Luxemburg	0	2.2	25.5	27.7	201.6
Turkey	0	170.5	851.3	1,021.8	2,058.3	Sweden	0	0	33.3	33.3	152.7
France	10.6	57.6	408.1	465.7	1,560.1	Trieste	0	0	15.0	15.0	50.0
Italy	124.7	14.2	314.8	329.0	1,080.2	Iceland	0	0	10.0	10.0	25.0
Germany (Federated Republic)	0	19.8	198.3	218.1	811.5	Unallocated miscellaneous and program costs [2]	0	84.7	175.3	260.0	300.0
Netherlands	8.4	23.3	197.1	220.4	473.0						
Portugal	0	0	35.0	35.0	436.7						

[1] Represents cancellations of previously authorized projects.
[2] Includes management costs which are charged to specific projects on their completion and cannot be determined precisely in advance.

Mr. WHERRY. Now, as to investment guaranties by ECA.

Cumulatively, through February 28, 1950, ECA has issued guaranties totaling $8,967,823, of which $6,042,627 is capital investment and $2,925,196 is to guarantee distribution of information media abroad by private American concerns.

The capital-investment projects include a carbon-black plant, a watch and clock plant, production of sewing-machine parts, medical and pharmaceutical products, drill-chuck manufacturing plant, regulating instruments, miners' safety lamps, streptomycin, metal spraying equipment, soluble coffee plant, refractories, railway equipment, materials handling equipment, electrical insulating materials, and a stone-cutting yard.

In informational media, ECA has issued guaranties for motion-picture projects, magazine projects, book projects, and newspaper and news-agency projects.

The use of counterpart funds is equally interesting. As of January 31, 1950, local currencies equivalent to $3,598,200,000 have been authorized for withdrawal by ECA for use by Marshall plan countries.

The report issued by ECA as of January 31, 1950, shows the types of program and the country-by-country use of counterpart funds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in my remarks the chart which shows the breakdown of approvals and withdrawals of European counterpart funds.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA approvals for withdrawal of European counterpart funds and actual withdrawals, cumulative, through Jan. 31, 1950

[Dollar equivalents of the local currency, in millions of dollars]

Purpose	Total		Public Law 472		Public Laws 84 and 389		Purpose	Total		Public Law 472		Public Laws 84 and 389	
	Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals	Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals	Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals		Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals	Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals	Approved for withdrawal	Withdrawals
Total	3,598.2	3,385.4	3,103.5	2,906.7	494.7	478.7	Promotion of production—Continued						
Monetary and financial stabilization	1,114.0	1,114.0	1,068.7	1,068.7	45.3	45.3	Transportation, communication, and utilities—Con.						
Debt retirement	1,114.0	1,114.0	1,068.7	1,068.7	45.3	45.3	Roads	27.1	27.1	26.0	26.0	1.1	1.1
Promotion of production	2,079.9	1,882.2	1,647.2	1,464.5	432.7	417.7	Waterways and harbors	19.7	19.7	15.3	15.3	4.4	4.4
Agriculture	187.2	172.2	153.7	153.7	33.5	18.5	Communication facilities	12.2	12.2	7.1	7.1	5.1	5.1
Land reclamation	73.7	73.7	73.5	73.5	.2	.2	Electricity, gas, and power facilities	590.5	590.5	423.3	423.3	167.2	167.2
Forestry	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	.1	.1	Water systems	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4		
Other agricultural programs	110.5	95.5	77.3	77.3	33.2	18.2	Deficiency materials	38.2	38.1	38.2	38.1		
Extractive industries	300.1	300.1	266.0	266.0	34.1	34.1	Technical assistance	4.4	3.2	3.6	2.4	.8	.8
Coal mining	296.6	296.6	262.5	262.5	34.1	34.1	Loans to commerce and industry (n. e. c.)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5		
Metal mining	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5			Undistributed promotion of products	253.1	182.0	247.2	176.1	5.9	5.9
Manufacturing	150.8	150.8	129.4	129.4	21.4	21.4	Other purposes	404.3	389.2	387.6	373.5	16.7	15.7
Primary metals	54.6	54.6	49.7	49.7	4.9	4.9							
Food products	24.1	24.1	24.1	24.1			Construction of public buildings and housing facilities	146.5	146.0	136.0	136.0	10.5	10.0
Machinery	17.1	17.1	12.1	12.1	5.0	5.0							
Petroleum and coal products	11.5	11.5	3.8	3.8	7.7	7.7	Housing	136.8	136.3	130.7	130.7	6.1	5.6
Fertilizer	8.4	8.4	7.0	7.0	1.4	1.4	Public buildings	9.7	9.7	5.3	5.3	4.4	4.4
Textiles	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5			Special relief projects	61.7	60.6	58.6	58.0	3.1	2.6
Chemicals and chemical products	4.8	4.8	4.1	4.1	.7	.7							
Pulp, paper, and paper products	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8			Care of refugees and miscellaneous social services	51.0	50.5	50.0	50.0	1.0	.5
Stone, clay, and glass products	3.4	3.4	2.5	2.5	.9	.9	Health and sanitation	5.2	5.2	3.1	3.1	2.1	2.1
Rubber and rubber products	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4			Transportation of relief packages	5.5	4.9	5.5	4.9		
Other manufactures	13.2	13.2	12.4	12.4	.8	.8							
Transportation, communication, and utilities	1,143.6	1,033.3	806.6	696.3	337.0	337.0	Payments to German exporters	143.4	143.4	143.4	143.4		
Railroads	402.3	292.0	272.7	162.4	129.6	129.6	Tourism	5.9	5.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9
Merchant and fishing fleet	89.4	89.4	59.8	59.8	29.6	29.6	Undistributed other purposes	46.8	33.3	46.6	33.1	.2	.2

NOTE.—"Dollar equivalents" are used as a rough measure of transactions which occur in local currency. Dollar equivalents of withdrawals are computed at the conversion rates in effect at the time of withdrawal and amounts approved but not yet withdrawn are computed at the current rates.

Mr. WHERRY. An interesting item, the first on the tabulation, is $1,114,000,000, which has been used to retire the national debts of several of the participating countries.

The United Kingdom has used $784,000,000 for that purpose; France has used $171,400,000; Norway has used $73,500,000; and Austria, $85,000,000.

No breakdown is given of how much of the counterpart funds are spent in the dependent areas of the Marshall-plan countries. In requesting such information from ECA, I was told that France is the only country that has used counterpart funds overseas, but I find it hard to believe.

At any rate, France has spent $85,000,000 of counterpart money in Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, the Cameroons, French Equatorial Africa, French West Africa, Madagascar, New Caledonia, and miscellaneous overseas locations.

This is quite a point 4 program already in progress.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I have tried to demonstrate that present scientific and technical assistance programs, the furnishing of commodities and materials, and the guaranteeing of American investments abroad, are going on full-tilt under present legislation and with present authorizations.

Is it true that this is a diminishing program with respect to ECA?

But there is no time limit set upon the Information and Educational Act of 1948.

What then is the purpose of setting up a new scientific and technical assistance commission if it is not for the purpose of perpetuating ECA and entering upon a new world foreign-assistance program to extend for many more years?

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment providing for the so-called point 4 program.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator also vote against the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Colorado. and the Senator from Massachusetts present their amendment and explain it, the Senator from Nebraska will then determine how he will cast his vote. As always, he will be guided by his best judgment. On any amendments, I withhold my decision as to how I shall vote until the amendments have been thoroughly explained and I have had opportunity to make up my mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. The amendment referred to has been pending here for a long time.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; there are pending numerous amendments which have not been explained. That is one difficulty regarding the ECA bill—it has not been sufficiently explained. The necessary explanation cannot be found in the report. The answers to the questions which the junior Senator from Nebraska has been asking, not only today, but for several days during the consideration of this measure, cannot be found in the report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I know there are other Senators who desire to speak. I am trying to conclude. This is the only time I have spoken on the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, if the Senator declines to yield, I shall sit down.

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the Senator, just as soon as I have finished for any questions the Senator may desire to ask. I always endeavor to treat the Senator from Texas with utmost respect, because of my love and affection and admiration for the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think the amendment providing for the so-called point 4 European program has been properly explored from the standpoint of what we are now doing in the field. The interest of and the benefit to American industry and labor have not been shown.

The drain upon the American taxpayer is evident.

It is my opinion, that point 4 legislation which after all is to be administered by the State Department, should be separately considered, and exhaustive hearings and studies conducted upon it, in which the full facts would be developed.

The time has long since passed when we should have stopped signing blank authorizations of any sort for the conduct of our national and international affairs.

During the war we became accustomed to huge outlays, which had to move quickly, and we were forced to place most unusual confidence in the administration of men.

It is high time that we return to the administration of our affairs by law, and the Constitution.

We cannot undertake at this point in our financial situation any expenditures without the most careful scrutiny as to their ultimate costs and benefits.

When the Republican Eightieth Congress passed the original ECA authorization, there was a Treasury surplus, the first surplus in 16 years. Today our Nation's financial situation is drastically different. Compared with the Treasury surplus of $8,500,000,000 on June 30, 1948, the United States now faces a deficit of about $6,000,000,000 for the present fiscal year, and, I am told, a deficit of $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 for the succeeding fiscal year.

Some of us are having difficulty in reducing the punitive, wartime excise taxes. A billion dollars of tax relief here would work wonders on affected industries. And, yet, we are asked to scatter billions upon billions around the world.

The root cause of Europe's present economic situation is the failure or refusal of those countries to work together for their mutual benefit.

American dollars will not teach them how to put aside their ancient grudges and rivalries.

American dollars will not accomplish integration of European economies, because as long as our taxpayers are willing to give, there will be those in Europe who reason, why should they work?

America cannot forever arm and support half the world.

Our national debt again is rising. It is now about two hundred and sixty billion. And that two hundred and sixty billion debt is in bonds held by banks, insurance companies, other business establishments, and by millions of individual American citizens.

The junior Senator from Nebraska has confidence in the wisdom of the American people to put a stop to spendthrift government and keep America strong and dynamic, by maintaining the free-enterprise system.

This system has produced, over 2,000 years, more wealth and happiness than all the other systems together.

We do a disservice to the people of western Europe when we assume their responsibilities.

No one begrudges aid to suffering humanity, but Europe's productivity is far above prewar, and there is no moral or legal obligation upon the United States to finance England, France, and other countries to goals of commerce they never have reached.

Above all, American foreign policy should be to help preserve freedom for the individual, and the opportunity for initiative, enterprise, and skill to flourish. These wholesome virtues are being destroyed by the present give-away show.

Why, the same principles of survival seem to apply to animals.

The seagulls at St. Augustine, Fla., have for years followed the fishing fleet and fed off the refuse from the fishing boats.

Recently, the fishing fleet has moved down the coast to do its shrimp fishing off the Keys.

The seagulls, accustomed to depending upon the fishing boats for food, have been dying by the thousands. In the years of following the fleet they have forgotten how to fish and dive for food.

A few clever ones have followed the fleet; the others are dying off.

Mr. President, the pending authorization should be reduced by at least $1,000,000,000, and there is urgent need for a thorough investigation and accounting to the American people for the billions of their money that has been spent by ECA.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. KEM addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should be glad to yield, but I do not want to detain any other Senator who may wish to make a speech. There are 12 speakers today, and I do not want to be in the position of holding the floor if some other Senator wants to proceed

to address the Senate. If the Senator from Massachusetts wants to ask a question, of if any other Senator wants to ask a question, I shall yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, because of the statement I have made, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have a few remarks to make on the subject, and I plan to yield two or three times during the course of my remarks if Senators have any questions they want to ask me. I suggest doing it in that way, rather than to interrupt the continuity of each subdivision of my speech.

First, Mr. President, I should like to set down a few observations on the Republican record with regard to this particular adventure in foreign policy. I want to do so because I think the record is a good one; it is one in which the Republican Party can take pride and one of which the Nation, as a whole, I think, approves.

This piece of legislation came out of a Republican Congress and was signed by a Democratic President. It represents not only Republican participation, but, in a very real sense, it represents Republican leadership. I know that all through the debate on the basic law of the Marshall plan the words which came from the brain of our beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and, to a lesser extent, from the brains of other Senators on this side of the aisle, contributed important features to the law. The initial stages which led to the formulation of the act, the appointment of the Harriman committee, the elimination of the $17,000,000,000 authorization which was at first proposed, the decision to get the opinion of the Brookings Institute on what the figure should be, the appointment of such an eminent and distinguished American as Paul Hoffman, who has had so much to do with the success of the operation—all these things can be traced directly to Republican leadership and Republican interest.

It must be considered, I think, in conjunction with the North Atlantic Pact. That pact sprang directly from the Vandenberg resolution, which is to me a classic example of the use of the Senate's power to advise in the conduct of foreign relations. In my judgment, the North Atlantic Pact is the finest thing that has happened since the end of hostilities, insofar as measures to prevent the occurrence of world war III are concerned. It is largely Republican in inspiration.

Mr. President, the Republican platform of 1948, which, of course, is the official doctrine of the Republican Party and the only official doctrine we have, has this to say regarding foreign relations:

> We dedicate our foreign policy to the preservation of a free America in a free world of free men. With neither malice nor desire for conquest, we shall strive for a just peace with all nations.
>
> America is deeply interested in the stability, security, and liberty of other independent peoples. Within the prudent limits of our own economic welfare, we shall cooperate, on a basis of self-help and mutual aid, to assist other peace-loving nations to restore their economic independence and the human rights and fundamental freedoms for which we fought two wars and upon which dependable peace must build. We shall insist on businesslike and efficient administration of all foreign aid.
>
> We welcome and encourage the sturdy progress toward unity in western Europe.
>
> We shall erect our foreign policy on the basis of friendly firmness which welcomes cooperation but spurns appeasement. We shall pursue a consistent foreign policy which invites steadiness and reliance and which thus avoids the misunderstandings from which wars result. We shall protect the future against the errors of the Democrat administration, which has too often lacked clarity, competence, or consistency in our vital international relationships and has too often abandoned justice.
>
> We believe in collective security against aggression and in behalf of justice and freedom. We shall support the United Nations as the world's best hope in this direction, striving to strengthen it and promote its effective evolution and use. The United Nations should progressively establish international law, be freed of any veto in the peaceful settlement of international disputes, and be provided with the armed forces contemplated by the Charter. We particularly commend the value of regional arrangements as prescribed by the Charter; and we cite the Western Hemispheric Defense Pact as a useful model.

That is an excerpt from the Republican platform, which, I think, establishes the very foundation on which can be based support of the pending legislation. Taken in conjunction with the part which Republicans have played in the enactment of the Marshall plan, its administration, and the establishment of the North Atlantic Pact, it represents an achievement of which we can be proud. Speaking for myself, I will say that no retreat from that Republican record can have my approval.

We now come, Mr. President, to the question of economy and the cost of the project. In order to give myself some respectability in the discussion of that subject, I should like to submit some of my own credentials. A short time ago today I voted against the river-and-harbor authorization bill. I think I have voted for every motion which has been made for a pro rata reduction of Government expenditures. I am the Senate author of the so-called Lodge-Brown Act, which established the Hoover Commission, which is the most far-reaching attempt at Government economy ever undertaken, as well as being the first overall attempt to reorganize the Government.

There is no one who is more strongly in favor of economy and efficiency in Government than I am. I agree with Calvin Coolidge, who said, "I favor economy, not because I want to save dollars, but because I want to save people." Or we can quote Franklin D. Roosevelt, who said, "Liberal governments are often wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy." There is nothing partisan about it. I have always been for rigid economy, and reckless Government finance alarms me profoundly.

But the last place in the world where one should want to bring about any false economy or dangerous economy is in those expenditures which involve the very security of our country in a world which is full of instability, full of dangers, and in which large amounts of dynamite are lying around loose. This ECA program must be viewed as a part of a general attempt on the part of the United States to protect itself. We cannot put a magnifying glass on it to see the amount of dollars we must put into it and the money we will immediately get back. A proposal such as this cannot be measured in that way. The measure of worth of this proposal is the security it gives to the men, women, and children of America, the hope it gives that there will be peace in this world, and the assurance it gives, if the worst should happen and we should once again be involved in the tragedy of war, that, because of what we have done now, we shall have much more chance of being successful.

Testimony has been given with respect to the cost of the project. Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of ECA, said in the hearings:

> You will recall that I gave my solemn pledge to the Congress that if, as things developed, we found any way of saving money which would not jeopardize the success of the program, we would do so. It gives me great pleasure to report to you that, according to our present estimates, it will be possible to save $150,000,000 out of the appropriation money for the present fiscal year. We have tried to overlook no opportunity for saving consistent with contingent recovery, and we have had good luck in several directions, notably the excellent European harvests of last year.

Later on in the hearings he said:

> Well, I don't think the man lives that can say what might or might not happen within the next 3 or 4 or 5 months. I can assure you of this, that if there is any change which will make possible cutting out items or perhaps lowering costs, such as would affect the cost of the program, we would take that into account, of course.

It has been pointed out in the committee report that this program would cost less than what was first anticipated. The first authorizations aggregated $9,930,000,000. It was originally estimated that the 4-year program would cost approximately $17,000,000,000. It now appears that the total amount required may be less than $15,000,000,000.

Mr. Hoffman said further:

> I would like to call attention to the rapidity with which American aid to Europe is declining from year to year. You will recall that American aid to western Europe for the fiscal year 1948–49 was about $5,800,000,000, including the special appropriation for Germany.
>
> The appropriation for 1949–50 was about $4,200,000,000, including Germany.
>
> The requested appropriation for 1950–51 is $2,950,000,000, including Germany.

That indicates the spirit in which this project has been administered. It is the spirit, of course, of one who speaks from the experience in business which Mr. Hoffman possesses. If there is such a thing as getting a bargain in the conduct of government, I think this is precisely the kind of bargain we are getting.

I have not been able to be present throughout the debate on this measure.

I have, however, gone through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have culled out representative statements which have been made. One comment was made that "anyone who contends that the ECA program should be continued indefinitely certainly puts the burden of proof upon himself." Of course, Mr. President, no one has said that the program should be continued indefinitely. The present bill is for a single year's authorization. Congress authorized a 4-year program in principle, and the bill carries out the express intent of the original ECA Act.

There is nothing anywhere about carrying on this program indefinitely. It seems to me that is merely using argumentative language without much substance.

The statement has been made that the European countries have returned to normal. That statement was made by a distinguished Senator. I do not believe that he would have made it if he had thought the matter over very carefully, because it is a known fact to everyone who visits Europe, studies Europe, or keeps in touch with the situation in Europe that, while European nations have made tremendous progress in production, have made tremendous effort, and have shown a degree of industry which surpasses all other previous records, they are not back to normal. Damage of war is not repaired as quickly as that. The population of Europe has increased 10 percent since 1938, which makes added demand on the limited supply of the necessities of life. The supply of raw materials from the Far East and the reduction of trade with eastern Europe have created all sorts of economic problems. There is no justification for saying that European countries have returned to normal. There is justification for saying that they have made great progress and that their production has increased. When I hear Senators complain and use that as an argument for reducing or cutting off ECA, I cannot help but come to the conclusion that they are against this program no matter what happens. If those nations had made no progress at all, those Senators would be here saying how shiftless those ECA nations are and how lazy they are, and we should stop aid to them. Now that they do well, some Senators get on the floor and say that we must stop it because they are doing well and they are getting rich. As usual, the truth is not entirely a thing of white or black. Truth is somewhere in between. If one wants to be a realistic policy maker, with a sense of responsibility for the facts, and not just make arguments for the sake of rhetoric, he must take realities into consideration.

The statement has been made that the figure in this bill has been taken out of the air. In my judgment, Mr. President, if ever there was a figure which was not taken out of the air, this is such a figure. It was reached after long and detailed studies. Of course, it was made on the basis of estimates and not on the basis of certainties, and it was made with the express understanding that when the time came to make appropriations, the Appropriations Committee would take into account changes in costs which would have come about due to local conditions at that time. When I heard that remark made I asked the ECA to furnish me with a statement showing exactly how the figures are arrived at. I shall read excerpts from the statement:

After prolonged study and consultation with the ECA staff in Paris, the experts and technicians of the OEEC, the ECA staffs in the country missions, and Government experts of the participating countries, the conclusion was reached that, in view of the very substantial recovery already achieved, a general target should be set for the fiscal year 1951 at 25 percent below the aid for the fiscal year 1950. It was recognized that it would be quite possible to show that requirements would be considerably higher than this figure, but that the amount indicated would suffice provided the participating countries took the most vigorous actions in various areas designed to reduce their requirements for aid.

Following this determination the individual countries were requested to submit programs indicating how they proposed to continue the momentum of their recovery within the limits of the aid indicated. These programs were then carefully reviewed by the ECA staff in the missions, the office of the special representative in Paris and by the Washington staff of ECA.

The balance of payments data and the commodity-import programs for fiscal year 1951 were presented to the committees of the Congress and are contained in the record of the hearings are the result of a detailed reevaluation of all the factors entering into each country's balance of international payments and recovery programs. One of the important elements in the computations was the balance of payments status, and this item has not been abandoned as an essential element in the determination of the aid figures, as indicated by Senator TAFT. Thus, there was a double check, country by country, on the original judgment about the size of the total aid figure required for the fiscal year 1951 and as a matter of fact this double check resulted in a further reduction of estimated requirements.

* * * * *

As to the $600,000,000 to be used in connection with the multilateralization of trade and payments, this sum is not an extra amount over and above the dollars required for imports from the Western Hemisphere but is vitally needed in order to maintain the necessary level of dollar imports into the participating countries. It will be provided in part through ECA financing of goods and services for participating countries, and in part through a new central institution (the proposed European Payments Union) to several of the participating countries, who, in turn, will use these dollars to make essential purchases in the dollar area. These countries will either receive no direct aid at all from the ECA or an amount of direct aid insufficient to maintain the necessary level of dollar imports. Consequently, they will have to rely on receiving a part of the $600,000,000 withheld to promote trade liberalization. This sum will be withheld by the ECA only until the participating countries have agreed on the details of a satisfactory European Payments Union, or upon other satisfactory trade liberalization measures which will require dollar support and will then be released as needed during the course of the fiscal year in order to carry on the operations of the EPU and enable the countries who liberalize trade to receive the dollars they need to pay for necessary dollar imports.

Mr. President, that shows how inaccurate it is to say that these figures were taken out of the air. They are very carefully worked out, and they are entitled to respectful consideration on that basis.

Mr. President, the broad aspect of this matter is not simply summed up by consideration of the dollars involved. Mr. Hoffman made a statement in trying to assess the broad significance of ECA in the world as it is today, which I should like to quote. He said:

The vortex of today's struggle is in western Europe. I know that the Kremlin is losing no chance to try to wreck European recovery and for a very sound reason—the reason is that if Moscow can halt recovery and can win in western Europe, its schemes for world domination will be given terrible impetus. And Moscow knows that its failure to halt recovery will mean that its ambition to dominate the world will be blocked.

Six months ago, the Communists in western Europe showed themselves discouraged and despairing. The Marshall plan has frustrated them and turned them back. But there are undeniable signs that they are taking heart again. Their hopes have been renewed in part by the unhappy plight of China and by their wishful propaganda that some in the United States are becoming weary in their resolution to carry on firmly in their support of the European recovery program.

It is against this background that we ask you to consider our request for 1950–51 appropriation of $2,950,000,000. I am fully conscious of the hugeness of this sum. As far as we are concerned, $3,000,000,000 is three thousand million dollars—and that is a lot of money. I hold it in the greatest respect—every penny of it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I have not yet concluded, but I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I was much interested in the Senator's explanation of the various criticisms, or at least some of the criticisms, which have been raised against the Marshall-plan operation. I recall with a great deal of interest that during the Eightieth Congress, in the debate when the first authorization for the Marshall plan was before this body, the junior Senator from Massachusetts profoundly impressed me by his statement that he would be opposed to the shipment of raw commodities to the Marshall-plan countries for processing and subsequent export to countries behind the iron curtain. I recall that the Senator from Massachusetts felt that it would be unwise to make shipments of any equipment, machinery, or anything else which originated in the Marshall-plan program, into western European countries, which might have potential war use in eastern Europe.

Recently I have read that many trade agreements have been negotiated between the Marshall-plan countries, or at least some of them, and Russia, whereby huge shipments of potential war goods are going behind the iron curtain.

I wonder if the Senator from Massachusetts has had recent occasion to study that particular aspect of the Marshall

plan, and if so, whether he could give us some enlightenment on the subject at this particular time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to try to do so. I do not believe I ever said I was opposed to sending commodities back of the iron curtain for processing. I believe that what I did say was that I was opposed to the Marshall plan being used as a device to build up the military strength of any of the countries behind the iron curtain, which, of course, is not the same thing. We can send commodities into those countries and get things back in exchange for them whereby the trade may be very profitable for us.

In general, my understanding is that the goods which are sent from the United States and from the Marshall-plan countries in behind the iron curtain can roughly be classified, broadly speaking, into, first, those goods which are of direct specialized military value; and those are prohibited, and are not sent either from the United States or from the Marshall-plan countries. So much for that category.

Then there is the category of goods which are predominantly commercial in nature, but have a certain military value, for instance, an automobile. Those are subject to licensing.

Then there are goods which in themselves have no military value, but in the production of them there may be trade secrets, or matters of that kind, which might be of use in other ways. Those are subject to licensing also.

It is further my understanding that all the categories that are not prohibited are either subject to the approval of the American military authorities, or, in the case of certain foreign countries, the shipments are known to the American military authorities, and the American military authorities are satisfied to have the shipments go on.

This is not a subject about which it is possible to make a quick and easy answer. The term "war materials," for instance, is a very broad term. It covers a wide variety of articles, and each situation has to be judged separately, and has to be judged by men who make a profession and a life-long study of that subject. It is emphatically a field in which there must be administrative discretion, because it is a highly technical field.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator misconstrued my original question. I did not refer to commodities to be shipped behind the iron curtain for processing. I thought I made it clear that I referred to commodities, raw products, which would be shipped under the Marshall plan to countries in western Europe, I will say, to be processed there and shipped to countries behind the iron curtain, where they might have potential war use.

In furtherance of that phase of the program, I am wondering whether, under the trade agreements which have been negotiated, for instance, between Britain and Russia, the Senator is reasonably sure that there are no Diesel engines, or any parts of equipment which might be used by the satellite countries for war purposes, which are being shipped by Britain to Russia and Russian satellite countries.

Mr. LODGE. I shall try to answer the Senator's question. Practically everything that is shipped behind the iron curtain could be used for war. Such an article as soap, for instance, has military value. A screwdriver has military value. An ice pick has military value. It is hard to mention anything that has not some military value, and, as I said the other day, this is a subject on which honest men can have differences of opinion. It is impossible to be completely dogmatic about whether a certain product ought to go or not, once we get out of the strictly military field. Of course, we all agree that articles in the strictly military field should not go, but getting into the field of where things do not have a strictly military character, it is impossible to be dogmatic, and one of the reasons why it is not possible to be dogmatic is that we have to figure on the likelihood of hostilities.

If one thinks there is going to be a war in 6 months then he would probably shut down everything. If one has a hope of world war III being avoided, if one does not believe in the inevitability of war, if one hopes we can jostle the situation along and nurse it along year after year, and that every year that passes is that much gained, then one has another opinion of the matter.

Another factor which would influence one's judgment would be the quid pro quos we would get. We do not know what some of them are. But I know that it was stated in executive session that we are getting some things back. That would influence one's judgment. If we were going to send 10,000 screwdrivers to these countries, and not get anything in return, we might feel differently than if we were sending them 10,000 screwdrivers and receiving something in return which would be more useful than the screwdrivers were. Those are some of things which would make one feel willing not to be rigid in one's thinking about the matter.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude these observations with a few remarks on the general result of the Marshall plan to date. There are some respects in which it has been a very real disappointment. When the original ECA Act was passed many Senators, of whom I was one, hoped that as a result of the Marshall plan there would be some real integration in Europe, that there would be some reduction of the trade barriers, and that there would be a unified European market on the basis of which the European standard of living would be raised and on the foundation on which the dreadful military weaknesses of western Europe would begin to disappear. Unfortunately that has not taken place. It is a great pity that it has not. The European Payments Union, which is provided for in the bill, is a new step to try to promote that objective. It is hard for me to understand Senators who complain because Europe has not integrated and in the same speech complain because we are placing something in the bill for the purpose of integrating Europe. To me that does not add up, it is not consistent. So much for the disappointment.

The accomplishments have been miraculous. The increase in production, the increase in living standards, the generally more optimistic human outlook that has come into being because the basic factors of European strength were spark-plugged, one might say, by the Marshall plan, has been a sensation. Take my own experience. I was in Europe during the war. I was there in the fall of 1946 and then in 1947 and then in 1949. So I have been able to see the situation with my own eyes. It is easy to remember back to 1946 and 1947. One can remember all sorts of things. The goods that were in the shops. The way the people were dressed, the typical diet people had, the way they talked when they were spoken to. There has been a dynamic and a sensational change in that respect. That would not have happened without the Marshall plan.

In France the Communist movement has been stopped absolutely dead in its tracks. Of course, that is due in part to the good sense and the essential strength of the French people. But it is also due in large part to the Marshall plan, which came along and acted as the coordinator for all the basic French factors.

The check to communism can be seen in the elections which have been held in the French legislative districts. It can be seen in the way the circulation of the Communist newspapers has decreased. That is not simply a figment of the imagination. It is a practical fact.

That, Mr. President, is worth something. That is worth a good deal more than whether they are grateful to us or not. So many people ask me whether they are grateful to us. I do not know whether they are. I do not think that is terribly important, Mr. President. I think we are in the position of the doctor who is taking care of a sick man, and one morning he comes in and the man feels so much better that he picks up the glass of water by the side of the bed and throws it at the doctor. If the doctor has any sense at all he will be delighted that the patient is becoming so healthy. It seems to me that should be our attitude.

We do not want them as satellites. We are not trying to forge a chain of allies. We are not. We hope these people will become strong enough so that life will be worth something to them. That is all we want. That is the strength of our position. We are not trying to create any satellites or slave states. They are becoming strong. When they get strong they will fight for themselves, not because we want them to, but because they want to, and that is much better. When a man fights for that reason he really puts his back into it.

I do not believe any Member on the floor of the Senate would be surprised to hear me say that the international situation has not improved in the last year or two. I do not mean to say that I think war is going to break out in the near future. I am by no means a fatalist. I do not think world war III is inevitable at all. But whereas 2 years ago we thought we might have 10 or 15 years in which to make everyone strong and self-reliant, I now think we probably have only three or four. That is a very different thing from saying we have got to have a war. I think we can still avoid it. But we have lost time in which to get the free world on a strong footing. To talk about reducing the amount for the ECA in the face of the present world situation strikes me as being very shortsighted.

Let us consider the rearmament of Europe under the North Atlantic Pact. I am often very much worried as to whether that is proceeding fast enough, whether enough is being accomplished with respect to it. I think it is very false economy and very wishful thinking to imagine that we would be justified this year or next year in reducing the amounts which we spend, either for our own national defense or for the Marshall plan, or for military aid tc Europe—as all three function in a large sense for the same purpose. I am afraid that any Senator who votes to cut down these large amounts now will, when he looks back or historians look back on his record 10 or 15 years from now, find that it will then look as though he did not have very much foresight. So, for all the reasons I have stated. I hope the bill will be approved and the amount will be kept as it is, because I think it offers the best hope we have of keeping the peace.

Regrettably, at the end of the war in 1945 we allowed our whole armed forces to disintegrate. I do not say we demobilized. That is much too orderly a word. The whole Army and Navy which we built up, perhaps the greatest that had ever been seen—it had never been defeated in battle—all of a sudden simply disintegrated, and we lost the great position of influence we had at that time and which we had earned by our own efforts. I am not going to say whose fault it was, because I think it was a little bit of everybody's fault. But now we are in the position of a man who has fallen off the edge of a precipice. One falls off the precipice in about 3 or 4 seconds, and then it takes 10 or 15 years to climb back up again. Now we are trying to climb up again to the high ground we occupied in 1945. It is a long, slow process. The Marshall plan is one of the steps in that process. If it plays a part in preventing world war III, and if it plays a part in making us stronger to resist whatever tragedies or disasters may befall us, I think we will all agree that it will have been well worth the price.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, less than an hour ago the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on this floor propounded the question: What will happen in 1952 afte- the Marshall plan?

I do not wish to let that question remain a purely rhetorical one. Therefore, I shall take a few minutes to give a partial answer, which of course applies to only a small, tiny part of the present ECA activity, but has a relevance far beyond that. Indeed, it is so relevant that, in line with the President's eloquent speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, I feel that the ECA experience in this area can and should illuminate and prove to be of great value in the whole conduct of our foreign policy. What we learn from our experience with this one, small part of ECA has a bearing on the implementation of the resolution, which I submitted a few weeks ago in behalf of myself and 11 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I refer to Senate Resolution 243, which calls for a new kind of campaign throughout the world—nothing less, as I said then, than a campaign of ideas.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has just pointed out, there never has been a time when the United States was in such a critical position. We now occupy a role which calls upon us to rally the ideals and the strength of the free world, to take leadership in marshalling the hearts and the minds of mankind against the siege apparatus of tyranny.

I have been gratified, Mr. President, and honored beyond the legitimate expectations of so junior a Member of this distinguished body, by the action of the President of the United States in specifically endorsing Senate Resolution 243 in his speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

I mention this resolution again now because I believe that the ECA measure now before us represents the same essential spirit as that of my resolution—in the ideological field as well as in the economic. Our Marshall plan is indeed a fundamental part of the American story to which the President referred when he endorsed a world-wide campaign of truth. It is a dramatic expression of democracy at its best—of democracy acting boldly and imaginatively to meet a threat to the peace and security of the world before that threat has had a chance to secure a strangle hold. The Marshall plan has placed us on the offensive in the struggle now at flood tide in western Europe. In it we have not only a great humanitarian project, unique in history, a project which appeals to the generous hearts of the American people—a project which millions among us would back on humanitarian grounds alone—but we have at the same time a weapon in the cold war which is potentially more important than our jet planes and our battleships.

However, I am not now going to try to review those broad aspects of our foreign-aid program which have been debated at such length in the past 2 years. Instead, I shall limit my remarks to one small phase of that program—a small phase, yet one which illustrates the potential power and impact of the American way on our friends overseas when they are fairly and impartially exposed to it.

The ECA's so-called technical-assistance program to my mind belongs to the category of policy which, though inconspicuous and unheralded, expresses the essence of what we hope to accomplish in western Europe. Here in this little noticed and unpublicized activity we are at the very heart of our problem in dealing with western Europe—and, for that matter, with the rest of the world. In this policy we have the rivets required by our mighty ECA structure—the kind of rivets without which great structures have been known to fall.

This program is not point 4, but perhaps we can call it a blood cousin of point 4.

The technical assistance program is a businesslike little venture which recognizes the manifest fact there is more to the economic reconstruction of the free world than simply filling up the pipelines with American goods—or even filling up the factories of western Europe with American machine tools. The technical assistance program recognizes that it is the people we are after—the people who consume the goods and who man the tools. If the people lack the knowledge, our pipelines will run empty and our tools will fail.

Through this program, which is only 14 months old, the United States is beginning to make available the accumulated technical knowledge of the United States to assist the Marshall-plan countries to undergo a constructive kind of revolution—not the kind of revolution that starts out with mass executions and winds up as a cold-blooded dictatorship, but the kind of healthy mental revolution which can bring life and vigor and vitality to the economic systems of the countries we are trying to aid.

We, through this program, are now making a tiny beginning in what I hope will become a vast national effort to export abroad the imagination and genius which are the core of what we call our free-enterprise system. Here is our chance to develop great and potent customers as well as great and powerful allies. This technical assistance can grow into a mighty bloodstream of transfusion into the enfeebled and anemic economies of Europe.

In France, where the Communist threat posed itself in the economic ruins left by the war, American experts were put to work to help rehabilitate the railroads, coal mines, and power plants. France has already increased its supply of electrical energy to 50 percent, and by 1952 the supply of electric power will be double the prewar level.

In Greece, where civil war with the Communists came to an actual head, the whole economic machinery that men live by approached a complete breakdown. American technical assistants not only ran the soil-reclamation service and public roads, but also, I am told, they reorganized the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Supply, and the Customs Service. The effects of the American technical-assistance program in Greece should be felt for decades to come.

Trial plantings of American hybrid corn have boosted production in some European farm areas by 25 percent.

American methods are rehabilitating the great port of Rotterdam, which was laid flat by the Nazi blitz. In Austria, an ECA mission has undertaken a complete productivity survey to help Austrian business attain the efficiency and output without which no country can compete successfully in the modern world.

But my principal point today is the findings of the so-called teams from Europe that come to the United States under ECA's technical-assistance program.

In these teams we see how an intimate exposure to the United States affects visitors to the United States from abroad. We do not bring these visitors here to make them like us. We do not bring them here so that we can brag or boast at them. We merely invite them to come here and see us as we are—to observe our factories, our production techniques, our labor unions, our way of working and producing, of playing and praying and living. These men and women from Europe then go back strong in their knowledge of us. Even though they may see many things they do not like—even though there are many American traits and habits they may not wish to emulate—they know we are not the warmongers of the Russian propaganda machine, nor are we the stereotypes of the Hollywood motion pictures. They have been in our factories and our homes and our churches. They cannot be easily fooled about us again. The ECA so-called productivity teams have been selected to represent one industry. Management, labor, and technicians all have had a voice in their make-up. They come here and travel through the United States and study the United States economic system with its high productivity and high returns to both labor and management. Furthermore, they arrive at some very startling conclusions—that is, startling in the eyes of some Europeans.

Many Europeans believe that America's productive advantage lies in our heavy and expensive machines, which, they think, they themselves cannot afford to buy. Instead, these teams find that in the great mass of American industry, heavy machinery is far less important than the productivity-mindedness of management and of labor. The people contribute more than the machinery. Without the people, the machines are only machines.

The visiting teams go home with a sense of the cooperative spirit, which, despite all differences that may occasionally make for industrial disputes, actuates us far more than it does any of the people in Europe. Indeed it is our most distinctive and productive asset. Furthermore, these teams find that the great majority of Americans are convinced that high and ever higher output is necessary for the development of the American standard of living. This most obvious fact has never been widely recognized in Europe.

Our European visitors realize for the first time that they can begin to close the gap that separates them from the American standard of living if they apply themselves to the task of revamping their economies to produce a high volume of goods at low cost. Here is profit for the worker as well as for the management. Such a realization, once impressed on all classes of people, rips the foundation out of the Communist doctrine that the free-enterprise system impoverishes the worker. Indeed, the contribution these technical-assistance teams are making to the enlightenment of the European labor movement is immeasurable. Let me cite examples.

Right at the start of the technical-assistance program, a group of Norwegian labor leaders came here to study the American system. When they returned to Norway they found that a similar group had just visited Russia. By a mere comparison of the findings of the two groups, it was directly seen how infinitely better the workers fare in the free-enterprise economy of the United States than in the economy of the U. S. S. R. This was strongly brought home to the Norwegian people.

Here is another specific illustration for the benefit of Senators who are on the floor.

Here is the testimony of the British steel foundry team, whose findings in the United States created a sensation in Great Britain:

> First, last, and all the time (American) managements are actuated by the belief that high rates of production are essential to individual and collective success. First, last, and all the time (American) workers at the bench, at the machine, and in the offices subscribe to that same belief.

This does not sound radical to our ears. In fact, it sounds so commonplace that perhaps it is to be wondered that I read it. It sounds like common sense. For us here in the United States it is very hard to realize how radical this statement sounds in England, where there have been no antitrust laws, where British business leaders have conspired to limit production and to hamstring competition, and where, not so many years ago, the London financial world bitterly assailed an irregular steel manufacturer for the introduction of improved methods which stepped up production and cut costs.

Mr. President, this example, and the others to which I shall refer show how visiting labor leaders learn from us. They can and do return to Europe convinced that the sum of the things that American management has in common with labor is far more greater than the sum of the things that divide them. This is a very important discovery.

Here is another example. This is what an English woman worker, also a member of a productivity team, had to say when she went back to England:

> I am going back an ambassador; I came out with not much faith. I asked operatives about their jobs; whilst they did work harder, they did get the wage. Some of the women of England work harder (and do not get the wage?). I see no fear now of the stretch when I go home. I will have a rough time, I may get a few hairs pulled out, but I will be an ambassador.

Here is another. Recently a group of some 60 Dutch farmers, most of them between the ages of 20 and 28, came to the United States to work on American farms and study American farming methods for a period of about 7 months. They worked at the usual chores of American farm hands and they were given an allowance by their American farmer hosts. They not only took a wealth of modern American farm information back home with them; they also left a gap in the hearts of their hosts. This is what one American farmer said about his experience with the Dutch:

> Even with all our freedom and education, the last 6 months made me ashamed that I had known so little about Holland. Let's have more of this exchange to get better understanding among the common people of the world who pay the taxes and fight the wars. The experience from this project will long be a cherished memory to me and my family.

This farmer's testimony shows how the ECA program works helpfully both ways. We give much, we get much as well.

These are samples only. Perhaps most important is the day-to-day work of the labor leaders on these visiting delegations. They learn here that the American worker is not averse to talking back to his boss and going out on strike, if he feels that he is underpaid or not treated fairly. But they also learn that it is possible to have a healthy, vigorous labor movement that is not dedicated to those two Marxian gods—class warfare and social revolution. They can and do return to Europe convinced that the sum of things that American management has in common with labor is far greater than the sum of things that divide them.

However, the labor leaders are not the only ones who are being educated by these visits. The management representatives also arrive at conclusions which to them at first seem surprising. To many Europeans the very word "competition" is an anachronistic concept which they pride themselves on having outgrown. They come to the United States and find how competition spurs trade, how it helps develop products at the lowest prices. On their return home, some will take, we can hope, a new look at their easy-going gentlemen's agreements to split markets as well as at their philosophy of low volume at high unit profits. The management representatives also join labor in the discovery that high productivity is first and foremost a problem in human relations and that the many techniques designed to make products both good and cheap, which they observe in the United States, are the result of a cooperative effort between management and labor. Here I shall cite a single example.

The members of a French industrial team were astounded by the comparatively small part that expensive machinery played in our high productivity and by the large part played by relatively inexpensive gadgets which were the fruit of productivity-mindedness of American industry. They returned convinced that their own French industry could compete in world markets, by nothing more than a mental reorientation of its personnel.

Mr. President, it is through such ideas as these, and only through such ideas, that Europe's second industrial revolu-

tion can be promoted. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts referred to the fact that he had been in Europe four times since the end of the war. I visited Europe on six different occasions between the end of the war and my appointment to the Senate last December. I can attest to the fact from personal observation that these ideas are beginning to permeate and are beginning to take hold.

How is Europe's industrial revolution progressing? For my taste, it is progressing much, much too slowly, and I lay part of the blame on ECA's slow start with its technical assistance program. A few simple figures will show you what I mean. Since the beginning of the program, in March of 1949, only a year ago, only some 900 Europeans have visited this country under technical assistance auspices, and only a handful of American experts have made special trips to the participating countries. This is not the scale on which we should back up one of our proven and biggest weapons in the cold war.

Moreover, the full propaganda and educational value of the technical assistance idea is not being sufficiently exploited. How many Americans know about the program? Very few. How many Americans in factories, on farms, in colleges and business schools and labor unions, would be happy to do their part in making this program more effective? I submit that the answer to this question must be given in millions.

I believe the same is true for Europe. There is enormous scope for broadening the base of the entire program throughout Europe. I would like to see the trickle of a few hundred Europeans enlarge into thousands—making these same study trips. In these trips are values that will far outlast 1952. In them we can build for the future, as indeed we must, when the Marshall plan ends.

As an American who is dedicated to the proposition that the United States and its peaceful aims must be understood throughout the world—as one of the goals of our foreign policy—I would like to see this ECA program greatly and immediately expanded so that it can play its full part in the struggle for men's minds and souls, in which we are now engaged. I have discussed this with Mr. Paul Hoffman. He agrees that this type of activity is highly productive and that the only limitation upon it out of ECA funds should be our capacity to organize the visiting foreign groups, to get them here to the United States and to handle them properly after they are here. Mr. Hoffman goes so far as to say that no other ECA effort is as productive per dollar invested as is this one.

This is the testimony of this great American business leader, out of the wealth of his experience as head of the ECA program.

I therefore propose two concrete suggestions to make this ECA program more effective. I propose first, that the ECA now lay plans for future step-ups of this technical assistance program far beyond its present magnitude so that it will become a means for the mass interchange of peoples between the United States and its western allies. Such plans take a long time to mature. They should be laid with an eye to the decade ahead, and not merely to 1951 and 1952. The ECA should now know that in this area, if in no other, it is the present judgment of the Senate that the ECA is to have a successor in 1953–54–55–56. The present ECA 4-year plan of technical assistance should be followed at least by another 4-year plan. Let us here in the Senate, as practical men who want the great benefits and values of long-range planning, let us face up to this question now so that Mr. Hoffman and his aides can intelligently plan this long-range program not only for themselves but for their successors of 1953. Let us express ourselves as in favor of such a program.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he care to yield at this time?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut whether he is not referring, in respect to prolonging ECA, to the technical side of it?

Mr. BENTON. I am referring to the technical assistance program only.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wanted that to be clear.

Mr. BENTON. This is the great area, Mr. President, which was discussed at such length by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska; and from my own experience with Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, and from my experience in the State Department, I am very happy to attest my belief that it should be developed. In this area there is no question that the ECA should have successors. What the successors will be called, who they will be, what duties, activities, and opportunities may be assigned to them, I am not now discussing. I am confining my remarks here only to the technical assistance program, though indeed I am sure there will be other areas also in which the ECA will inevitably have a successor, regardless of the name by which it may be called.

As a further step on such a development, I had intended to submit on Friday an amendment to the Foreign Aid Act that would earmark $30,000,000 for technical assistance in 1950–51, instead of the 15 million which I understand is proposed. However, Mr. Hoffman tells me he doubts whether the program can be efficiently expanded as rapidly as that.

Further, he tells me he will and can aim toward the $30,000,000 mark and come as close to it as he can, even without a special directive from Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, I am persuaded that the special earmarking of funds in the ECA budget by Congress is unsound policy. So, after my talks with Mr. Hoffman and other ECA officers, I decided to abandon my amendment.

However, I urge the Administration to give special attention to formulating a technical assistance program for the next 5 or 6 years, instead of merely for the next 1 or 2 years, based on the experience of Mr. Rockefeller and his organization, of the ECA, of the State Department, and of other organizations. This program should be formulated for the purpose of greater efficiency. It should be a program aimed at strengthening the nations of the world, striving to create a climate of resistance to Soviet aggrandizement and aggression. Indeed, it should be a fundamental point of study for Mr. Gordon Gray, who is charged with making recommendations for improving the dollar gap after 1952. Our help in making these economies healthier and better will be an important factor in improving this dollar gap. I hope the administration will present to Congress next year a program for the continuation of the technical assistance beyond 1952.

Secondly, Mr. President, I urge that the ECA proceed with an expanded educational program which will effectively call on American industry, agriculture, and labor for full support of this technical assistance program. This educational campaign in the United States should be matched by a publicity campaign in Europe, so that the European people, not merely their labor leaders and industrialists who visit us, will be fully aware of the great and unprecedented service we are placing at their disposal.

I am not proposing additional appropriations for these educational campaigns, Mr. President, because I believe they can be carried on effectively with present authorizations.

That concludes my remarks, Mr. President, and I shall be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, after having had the privilege of listening to the very splendid addresses of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], I feel that there is not much more that can or should be said in reference to the value and the worth-whileness of the continuation of the ECA program, commonly known as the Marshall plan. However, I desire to make a few observations with reference to the general economic assistance program, and then to spend the major portion of my time on that portion of the program which is known as point 4, or foreign economic assistance for the undeveloped or backward areas.

The first observation I want to make in reference to the ECA is that I believe the entire amount of $2,950,000,000 as an authorization for the fiscal year is definitely needed. I again invite the attention of the Members of the Senate, and of as many members of the public as is possible, to the fact that the general outlines of this program as proposed 2 or 3 years ago have been pretty well followed in the application of the program. There has, however, been this one change or alteration, that, despite the increase in the cost of the commodities which are sent to European countries under the terms of the ECA program, despite the costs involved in transportation and in administrative matters, the over-all cost of the foreign

economic assistance program has been held down to a basic minimum. It is estimated that it will not exceed $15,000,000,000 at the end of the 4-year period.

I believe we can ascribe a good deal of the recent reduction in cost to the splendid administration of the Administrator of ECA, Mr. Hoffman, as well as to his assistants, and to the Foreign Relations Committee for the manner in which it has operated.

Much has been made of the fact that this is the time to start to economize on our foreign-aid program. I wish to direct my remarks for a moment toward that matter, because I believe the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] brought it into sharp focus. In view of the fact that there is a series of amendments before us calling for a substantial reduction of the ECA authorization, I believe it merits some further consideration.

The first point is that ECA has done its job. No one ever said that the Marshall plan or ECA would save the world or would totally rebuild and rehabilitate the European economy or remove from Europe all the causes of dissension, distrust, and disunity. The primary purpose of the foreign economic assistance program was to rehabilitate the economies of Europe so they would be on a relatively self-sustaining basis. The political purpose was to check the onrush of Communist aggression and infiltration.

It appears to me, Mr. President, that the argument of those who are either openly opposed to ECA or those who are asking for a substantial reduction, is the best testimony that the ECA program has fulfilled, up to this date, its responsibility.

When I hear Senators say that ECA has worked well to serve the economy of Europe and that we ought now to curtail some of it, it appears to me that we have testimony as to its effectiveness.

The Senator from Massachusetts emphasized a point which needs to be reemphasized. Those who want to cut down on the foreign economic assistance program at this time because it has succeeded would be the very first to criticize had it not succeeded.

It appears to me, Mr. President, that once we have the program of economic rehabilitation in Europe on the upgrade, and making progress, that is the time to continue with a methodical, well-programed type of effort; not to retrench, not to draw in, but to continue on with an aggressive economic assault upon the conditions of poverty, distress, disunity, and political breakdown. I do not think there can be any one thing that would please the Kremlin agents or the Politburo more than to know that the Congress of the United States was beginning to retreat from its original intentions or purposes under the ECA.

I believe the thing that would make the Communists happiest would be to know that the Congress of the United States thought that now is the time to cut off a billion dollars, or, as some persons have mentioned $500,000,000, from the authorization of the foreign economic assistance program. That would tell the Politburo, the master minds of the Communist organization, that this is the time for them to put on the pressure and to drive America and its programs completely out of Europe.

It is strange, it seems to me, to note that some Senators who now want to cut down on economic assistance to Europe are the same ones who only a short time ago asked that we go to Formosa. It was proposed to go to Formosa to stop communism. If we are to prognosticate what will happen, we should base our prediction on what we have seen happen. I believe the Marshall plan and its operation in Europe has done more to strengthen the hands of free governments, to strengthen the free economy of Europe, and to stop the political infiltration of communism than all the naval units or military or armed contingents that we could send to any country anywhere, including Formosa. I find in that argument a glaring type of inconsistency. On the one hand, there seems to be a desire on the part of some of our colleagues to get out of Europe, where we have a fighting chance, and to go off on an excursion more than 6,000 miles distant, all the way to Formosa, where we do not even have a base.

Mr. President, one or two further observations. It is said that some of the ECA nations are trading with countries behind the iron curtain. I want to say that if there were no trade with the countries behind the iron curtain, there probably would be little or no trade among countries in western Europe. It is perfectly obvious that the United States cannot buy all the exportable products of western Europe. It is perfectly obvious, also, that the historical pattern in this world of economics is that there has been a traditional trade between western Europe and eastern Europe.

I believe the Senator from Massachusetts fully answered the argument as to whether or not ECA was aiding and abetting countries behind the iron curtain. The fact is that our friends in western Europe must trade. If we are not prepared to buy their goods, they must find markets for them some place else. In some instances they are finding markets by trading with countries behind the iron curtain or by trading with countries who are not too friendly with us.

I was pleased to hear the analogy presented by the Senator from Massachusetts with reference to the question of whether participating European countries appreciate what we are doing. It reminds me, Mr. President, of the early days of the 1930's. I recall that certain interests in our country were saying at that time, "We must have help." The very first group who were helped through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were banks, railroads, insurance companies, and some of the great financial institutions. Once they had been given help, they did not come around and say, "Thank you very much." It seems to be a matter of human nature that once a person starts to feel a little better he forgets to thank his benefactor.

I am quite pleased to see a United Kingdom and a France standing on their own feet and talking back to us. As a matter of fact, it is a sign of their health. It is a sign of the improvement of their economic structure. All of us have witnessed the situation of an individual on his deathbed who starts confessing his sins and promising to live a good life. Suddenly there seems to be some improvement, either through medical care or perhaps through a miracle, and the individual becomes a little regretful that he told his family quite so much of the sins of his life. Immediately he starts to take back some of the things he said, denies confessions, and perhaps even becomes a bit intolerant of those who wish to criticize or interrogate him.

What we are seeing in Europe is a stronger France, a France which does not want to be tied as a satellite or stepchild to the United States of America. We are seeing a United Kingdom which is making many sacrifices with her balances and with her trade in order to have dollars which she needs to keep her economy on an even keel.

Once in a while we hear a Frenchman or an Englishman say some unkind thing about the United States. When such remarks are heard, some people say it indicates that Europeans are ungrateful and unappreciative of what we are doing for them. I repeat what the Senator from Massachusetts has said, that what we are looking for today are not satellites. The Communists have a monopoly on that sort of thing. We are looking for free and independent nations who will stand with us on the basis of principle for a common cause against a common enemy. It appears to me that we are gaining that objective.

Mr. President, I should like to make one more observation on a subject which has not been dwelt upon too much. Just a year ago today Congress ratified the North Atlantic Pact. Inasmuch as we have joined other nations in the North Atlantic Pact, we should see to it that they will be strong and able to fulfill their obligations under the terms of the North Atlantic Pact. Therefore I believe it incumbent upon every Senator who cast his vote in favor of the North Atlantic Pact to cast his vote in favor of the economic assistance program so that the European nations will be worthy allies. We do not need paper allies. We do not need facsimiles of allies. We do not need fictitious allies. What we want are strong contributing and cooperative allies.

Therefore, Mr. President, the ECA program is a fundamental part of the defense structure of western Europe.

We are exporting a large amount of armed assistance to countries in the North Atlantic Pact. Every sensible person knows that those arms will for the most part be outdated soon. Every sensible person realizes that America cannot arm all those countries. It appears to me that our objective should be the rebuilding of the economic structure of these countries, so that they themselves

can make very much larger contributions to their own defense and security.

In concluding my remarks on ECA, let me say that its original purpose of offering economic rehabilitation is well under way of being realized and achieved. Its political purpose of stopping the onrush of communism has surely been achieved. At least, it has held the line. Certainly it has provided the opportunity for the western European countries to develop and to strengthen free political institutions. This is no time to quit the game. This is no time to walk about. Mr. President, if we were at this time to reduce sharply ECA authorizations or appropriations, this great Congress and this great Government could be accused of having wasted the amount of money which we have spent up to now. What we have done up to this time has prepared the way for the final ? years of this program.

I strongly support the full authorization of $2,950,000,000. I do not believe that is too much, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, I believe that when Mr Hoffman testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations he indicated that he felt that that was a basic minimum. Mr. Hoffman, at page 6 of the hearings, said:

> I wish to repeat again that we are laying before you our best carefully screened estimates as to the requirements for the fiscal year. This is the minimum we think we shall need. But, if we can save any of it without wrecking the recovery program, I again pledge you my word we shall do so.

Mr. President, there is one other factor to which I wish to return. Too many people are beginning to think that the ECA is an American hand-out to someone across the seas. Frankly, the ECA program could well be called a self-defense program for the United States. It is about time we made up our minds that we are either going to have friends in the world capable of standing with us, or we are going to stand alone. While I do not want to be accused of being a pessimist, I submit that the United States of America, with 150,000,000 people, cannot stand alone in the world, for, if the western nations of Europe, the so-called North Atlantic Pact countries, or the Marshall-plan countries, were overrun and taken over, either by an inside Communist Party, or by outside aggression, the European economy which would be under Communist control would be far superior in industrial capacity and in numbers to any amount of industrial output or manpower we could organize in the United States.

What is the alternative to the program outlined? The alternative is spending many times more than the amount of money requested to make America an armed camp, a garrison state, involving such an expenditure for the armed services that $15,000,000,000 will seem a small appropriation, indeed merely peanuts.

By spending $2,900,000,000 in the next fiscal year we can increase our strength manyfold, because that amount of money will go into productive processes in Europe, and strengthen Europe far out of proportion to the amount we spend. It can be used for productive purposes, which will result in making strong nations.

Now, just a few words in reference to the point 4 aspect of the program, the Act for International Development, title V, of the amendment to S. 3304.

Mr. President, I am very much interested in point 4. I am interested in it because I remember the day when the President of the United States called for a "bold new program." I know how the diplomats of the friendly countries, our allies, our associates, seemed to be happy in knowing that the great United States Government and its President had in mind a program of technical assistance, scientific assistance, to the undeveloped and backward countries of the world.

It appears to me that the point 4 program, or, as it is more formally known, the program for international development, is a proper partner to the ECA program. The ECA program is primarily directed to the more fully developed and industrialized areas of the world. The ECA program goes to that great section of the world economy known as western Europe, which is a workshop, literally an industrial establishment. The ECA program went to that part of the world which was largely destroyed and damaged as a result of World War II, and it was the kind of a program that could be used effectively by an intelligent, modern, trained, skilled group of people, who had enjoyed pretty much the same culture we enjoy, and who had many of the same ideas and much of the same economic orientation.

The purpose of the point 4 program was certainly well outlined in the first page of the supplemental committee report, where it is said:

> The declared purpose of title V is to aid the efforts of the peoples of the underdeveloped areas to "develop their resources and improve their working and living conditions by encouraging the exchange of technical knowledge and skills."

Mr. President, there is one particular factor in American life of which we are justly proud. We are proud of our technical skills, we are proud of our skilled craftsmanship, of our technical know-how. Just as we have great economic strength in terms of dollars, we have equally as great technical strength, the strength that comes from technical skill.

Title V, or the point 4 program for international development, is a program to tap the intellectual, the scientific, the technical resources of this Nation. Frankly, I believe its dimensions as outlined in the committee report are very limited. I believe it is held down to a basic minimum, when we consider the dimensions of the problem.

Why do we want a point 4 program? We want a point 4 program so that we can tap the hidden resources or the untapped resources of the great areas of the world. There have been speeches by the millions all over America about the kind of a world we could live in if man could but put his skill and ingenuity to work to utilize the God-given resources of the land, the water, and the skies in the development of a better society. We all know that there are fabulous resources in many of the countries of Africa, Asia, and South America, resources which have never been touched. We also know that there are great dimensions of poverty, hunger, sickness, and malnutrition, and all the other evils of humankind, in these undeveloped and underprivileged areas of the world.

We know by now that if there should be another war it might not break out in Europe. It could break out in the poverty-stricken fields and swamps of Asia. It could break out where people are hungry for a little medical treatment or a little food. Time after time very profound and able men have stated again and again that if there be a third world war it may well not start in Europe, it may start in Africa, it may start in Asia, and it may start because of the illiteracy, the ignorance, the sickness, and the hunger, of the great masses of peoples in those areas of the world.

If world war III should come upon us, $45,000,000,000 would be but a token appropriation, and there would not be very much debate about it; $45,000,000,000 would not even send the fleet on a long excursion into battle, for any considerable period of time, against a powerful foe in any section of the earth. So I am convinced that what we have to do is at least extend a program we have found quite successful in limited areas.

Here are a few facts which should be known. Two-thirds of the people of the world are living in lands whose resources are not being fully utilized. They lack the skills needed to turn their resources to the benefit of mankind. These two-thirds of the world's population receive only one-fifth of the world's income.

At the other end of the scale is the United States, whose 150,000,000 people receive one-fourth of the world's income. This will give Senators a rough measure of the great differences in the standards of living.

At least three-fourths of the people in the less developed or underdeveloped areas are engaged in agriculture. Yet these three-fourths are underfed, victims of malnutrition, starvation, and poverty. The average diet is less than 2,000 calories a day—hardly enough to live on. Disease goes without cure. Every child born in an undeveloped country in 1939 had a life expectancy of only 30 years—less than half of the life expectancy of children born in the more developed countries. The death rate from tuberculosis in the undeveloped countries is five times higher than the death rate from tuberculosis in the developed countries.

Mr. President, we are not talking about giving people Packards and Cadillacs, beautiful yachts, and homes. We are talking about whether or not we can cut down the rate of tuberculosis. We are talking about whether or not there is a possibility, by means of harnessing scientific information and the technical information and skill, of increasing living standards. We are talking about

whether or not it can be possible to help a great portion of the people of the world who are living in an agricultural economy, but who are starving to death—we are talking about whether it is not possible to lift their standard of caloric intake just enough so they can survive. I do not say that is a very bold program, but I say it is a worth-while one, and it is one to which we can make a contribution.

It will do little good to talk about having freedom in India and having freedom in the subcontinent of Asia, or even trying to have some freedom in China, so long as people are dying of starvation, hunger, sickness, and disease.

Two-thirds of the world's peoples are at the crossroads. All the information we send them over the radio, and all the nice resolutions we adopt on their behalf, are not going to save them. These two-thirds of the people of the world are not asking the people of the United States of America to come and feed them. There has been no formal request that I know of, from the subcontinent of Asia, that we come and take care of their hundreds of thousands of people who are dying of hunger. There is a hope however that this great, powerful country of ours, blessed with skill, knowledge, and information, industry and technological know-how, will be able to lend or to send to them by some means, or in some manner, a few of our technicians, so those technicians can work with their people so that their people can create their kind of economy, so that their kind of economy can provide at least a modicum of subsistence or a reasonable living for their own people. To me that does not appear to be too much to ask for. It seems to me that if there is anything at all to the old story of Cain and Abel, when Cain asked "Am I my brother's keeper?" it applies to the point 4 program.

Mr. President, I repeat, the people of the subcontinent of Asia are not saying "Send us your corn, send us your wheat to feed us." They do not ask that. The Prime Minister of Pakistan, who addressed the Senate during the earlier part of the session today did not at any time in his speech ask for any hand-out from the Government of the United States. Nor did the Prime Minister of India, who addressed the Senate at an earlier date, ask for any hand-out from the people of the United States. If they did ask, we should perhaps respond, but the point 4 program is much more minimal—it is an investment, not a gift.

Mr. President, if we want to stop communism we ought to find how communism starts in the first place. Communism is a political virus born in the diseased, impoverished, hungry, and famishing minds of men. We do not find communism starting or getting anywhere in a country which is economically sound, socially integrated, and having a great heritage of political freedom. Communism is born in poverty. One of the best ways in the world to stop communism, unless one wants to stop it on the battlefield, with great loss of life and treasure, is to stop it in the more humane, decent way, and that is to provide for the people, to let the people have use of the services that are here on this earth to rebuild their own economy and to remake their own lives.

Mr. President, there are two choices before the two-thirds of the world's people. Hungry stomachs generally do not make people meditative, and do not make for philosophical minds. Hungry stomachs generally make for empty heads, and empty heads generally find room for Communist ideology.

Mr. President, one choice which these two-thirds of the people of the world have is the choice of communism, which means slavery to the state. The other choice is the democratic choice; that we give technical aid through which these people can improve their own standards of life and develop their own political institutions.

Mr. President, some people believe we ought not to rush into this matter. They say, "Let us wait a while. Let us study the situation. Let us study it some more." I say to such people, there are times when we have to quit studying and go to work. There are times when ultimately we have to pick up the books and fold up the notes and make up our minds that we have to enter upon a program.

The time is running short. Someone once said that Chiang Kai-shek never lost a war on the battlefields; that he lost them on the rice fields. I am not an expert on China. We have some self-appointed experts on China without the junior Senator from Minnesota having to join that illustrious band. But I want to say that there seems to be a reasonable degree of merit to the statement that something happened on the rice fields. We ought not to be kicked around too long before we catch on to what is going on. We ought to find out, if it is possible, whether something can be done to prevent the same thing happening in other areas.

Mr. President, to the peoples of the less developed areas the alternatives are very real. It is up to us to support President Truman's great forward-looking program to give our neighbors throughout the world the chance to fulfill their economic desires, at the same time letting them choose their own political systems. If we let them down, they may well fall prey to the serfdom of Communist totalitarianism.

Madam President [Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair], to those who say about point 4, "It is just a beginning, and a great deal more must be done," I wish to say quite frankly that a great deal more will be required. If we are to have any kind of success with a $45,000,000 program, it will be the greatest bargain that 150,000,000 Americans ever had in their history, if the program works at all.

This is one time when we have a chance to be on the moral offensive. This is one time when we have a chance to say to the underprivileged peoples of the world, "We are going to try to help you help yourselves. Under this program we are not sending you arms or dollars; we are not even asking you to eat Wheaties or Rice Krispies. All we are doing is saying to you that in America and in other parts of the world there are people who are working through American agencies or through the United Nations and its agencies and related establishments, people who know how to check malaria, people who know how to improve and enrich the soil and to check soil erosion, people who know how to purify water; and these people are going to help you work out these problems in your own country."

In my great State of Minnesota we produce about 90 percent of the iron ore used in this country. That iron ore was not worth anything when the Indians were the only ones who were living there. For thousands of years that iron ore lay just under the surface in that part of this land. Until the white man found it and developed it, it was worth nothing.

However, there came a time when that iron ore became productive and useful, when a few intelligent citizens explored that area and found, just a few feet below the surface of the ground, vast quantities of that red earth. They said, "This is iron ore." They knew that because of their scientific and technical knowledge. They began to mine the iron ore and to ship it down the Lakes to the blast furnaces. The industrial society which we have in America today would never have been developed had it not been for the technical skill and know-how and ability of those who knew how to tap the resources of Mother Earth.

I feel strongly about this matter, Madam President, because to me this is a program of peace. This program fortifies our moral offensive, our psychological and political offensive in this world.

In addition, this program gives the United Nations' agencies important functions to perform. I think much of the trouble with the United Nations is that they do not have enough to do. Certainly an idle man is the devil's workshop. At the present time, too much emphasis in the United Nations is in argument. We should give the related organizations of the United Nations important functions to perform. Organizations such as the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the Economic and Social Council, and the other agencies of the United Nations must function.

I assure you, Madam President, that the only hope we have for world peace is to develop the fingers and the toes, so to speak, small apparatus of the United Nations. Almost everyone wants to get the Security Council of the United Nations working; but how about getting the Food and Agricultural Organization working, and how about getting the World Health Organization working, even more than it is today. Today it is doing a reasonably good job, but it is just beginning.

I submit that the one, real hope of making the United Nations a reality, rather than just a political fiction, is to have the agencies of the United Nations do the job they are capable of doing.

In the consideration of this problem, the first question which generally is asked is, "How much will it cost?" Madam President, I yet have to hear any-

one ask, "How much will it cost if we do not do this?"

How much will it cost if we do not have a sound ECA program that really works? I want someone to tell us how much it will cost if we ignore human needs in two-thirds of the world. Once we find that out, we will learn what a bargain we are getting by means of this program.

The committee report shows that very well. This program is not solely a program of the United States Government, but it is a program to which contributions will come from the other nations—from the members of the United Nations, as well as from the countries which will receive assistance.

The over-all total cost will be $85,500,000. Out of that $85,500,000, the United States of America is being asked to authorize $45,000,000. Of that $45,000,000, $10,000,000 is already committed in connection with programs which are under way.

Thirty-five million dollars out of the forty-five million dollars is for new activities.

Madam President, I wish to conclude my discussion of this matter by pointing out what the committee report says, so as to make this matter quite clear. I read now from page 3 of the committee's supplemental report:

> Because of some misunderstanding that has arisen about the nature of this program, it should be made clear at the outset that it is neither an ECA for the world nor in any sense a capital investment program. Because of the limited nature of the program it will not require the expenditure of large sums of money. Its chief cost will be for the salaries and expenses of technicians and other personnel and not, for example, to purchase machinery, food, and raw materials.

Let me say to those who are interested in our business and industrial picture that with point 4 we will find markets. We cannot sell American goods to paupers. We can beat our chests for the next 10 years; but until the people of the world have raised their own standards of living and until they have the means to buy our goods, we cannot do business with them.

Mr. President, I ask to have incorporated at the conclusion of my remarks the statement which I have prepared on the point 4 program, as it pertains to health. I am very much interested in the health problems of our people, and not only of our people in America, but people all over the world. I have outlined in these pages what can be done under the international development program in this one field of health, and I want to say that if we can get one-tenth of what is outlined in these pages out of the $45,000,000 this program is supposed ot cost, it will be again a great bargain for the people who are interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, just one other matter. It is my privilege to be a cosponsor, along with about 16 other Senators, of an amendment to be offered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], for himself and other Senators, pertaining to the International Children's Emergency Fund. I am one of those who are moved by programs which in a way help people. I have been brought up with the notion that people are quite important. I found that this program had performed a good service during the years it has been in existence, and it is my belief that it ought to be continued. I recognize that the State Department has recommended against continuation of the program. I also recognize that about a year ago it was felt that this program possibly could be terminated at the end of 1950, or in June 1950. However, I think it is important to know that this is the only program, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, which actually provides food and other commodities and materials to children.

The World Health Organization provides shots of penicillin. It goes around cleaning up the mosquitoes with DDT. It provides many preventive health measures. It provides health protection in some of the critical areas of the world. However, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund is directed specifically to the purposes of child health. It has two purposes—postwar emergency needs of children in war-devastated and occupied areas, and, secondly, health purposes generally. There are many good reasons why we should be interested in children, including very pertinent quotations from scripture, as well as ordinary observations by parents. I can think of no particular activity of the United Nations, of a specialized nature, that has done a better job or that is more vitally needed than the International Children's Emergency Fund. The amount of money involved is not large, an additional $25,000,000 being requested.

I have outlined in rather succinct language in the pages I have asked to have printed in the RECORD how this was created, and what the financial resources of this program are. I have also outlined the nature of the program, and I find that primarily what it has been doing is supplementary milk feeding, school lunches, with the funds of the UNICEF, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, and that the funds of this organization have been matched by the governments where the program is carried out, and by voluntary agencies.

First of all, then, we get this sort of picture: The United States Government dollar was first matched by other governments, and the resulting total was matched by the recipient country with an equal caloric value of foods, doubling the value of the United States contribution by the time it reached the recipient child. I believe some 32 countries participating in the fund made their contributions, and then the recipient country, in which the child was a resident, in which the child received the food, made an equal amount of contribution.

What has been the work of the organization? It has carried on, as I said, the school-lunch program on a mass scale. It has carried on a very vigorous anti-tuberculosis campaign. Twenty-five million children have been tested and vaccinated, when necessary, against the dread disease of tuberculosis. It has been able to assist in the field of providing clothing for children. It has provided benefits to orphaned, dependent, and delinquent children left in the wake of war. It has provided training in citizenship and in productive work for literally thousands of children in many, many countries of Europe and Asia.

These are merely some of the highlights of the UNICEF fund. There are other medical programs designed to control syphilis, malaria, and fly-borne diseases which create high infant mortality. There is the milk conservation program, to provide clean, safe milk in countries with little refrigeration. There are the refugee projects in Palestine, Ecuador, and Pakistan, where UNICEF assistance has made the difference between life and death for millions of children.

So, Mr. President, I rather feel that, when our great Nation, which poured out its treasure in war in order to protect the free way of life, has an opportunity in time of peace to insure the conditions of a free way of life, or to preserve them and to expand them, we have a noble cause. I do not think America will ever be criticized either by its own citizens or by people from without for having been interested in the underprivileged and particularly in children.

I know there may be some diplomatic reason or some reason of protocol why we ought not to continue the program such as the emergency fund for children. But I am convinced that we build more good will with one glass of milk under a program such as that of the UNICEF than we do with all the confounded negotiations and discussions which are held in the Embassies, for at least we are talking about citizens, about people—little people, and very little people, who someday can either be our friends or our enemies. On the basis of all that, I think it is good to deposit what we have in terms of good will, in terms of hope for the future, with the young and with the underprivileged. These people will respond, and they will be our friends in the days to come. But, be that as it may, I do not believe anyone who has any sense of moral justice can sit idly by in a world in which there is sickness and hunger, and, when we have excess supplies of powdered milk, excess supplies of powdered eggs, letting them rot in caves, not do something with them. Believe me, the Communist propagandists must be having a field day, in view of the millions and millions of pounds of eggs, hundreds and thousands of pounds of butter, millions of pounds of dried powdered milk, and other commodities which we do not know what to do with.

People who are hungry do not have time to listen to explanations as to how we got into this mess; all they know is that there are millions of hungry children, and they know that, with a reasonable program that does not run into the military-assistance program for $25,000,000, we would be able literally to help millions of children. I submit that we would even strengthen our defense

structure by doing this. I do not know how many guns we can send under the Military Assistance Program for $25,000,000, but I would hazard a guess that it would not be very many.

I am convinced that if we are willing to cooperate with other peoples in providing a program for child assistance under an international organization, we shall be starting to build the kind of a world in which we want to live. We are working with young people, through an international body; we are trying to develop a new attitude with reference to the kind of world we want to have in the future.

Mr. President, I should like to offer for the RECORD, first, some facts on the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, and also a letter from Representative BLATNIK, who is a member of a select committee which investigated the activities and the work of the emergency fund. The letter gives an evaluation, as an official report to the Congress, of the work of the committee and why he felt that the fund ought to be continued.

I ask unanimous consent that my prepared remarks and the letter to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

(Background information by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

I. CREATION OF UNICEF

UNICEF was unanimously established by the First General Assembly of the United Nations to meet (a) the immediate post-war emergency needs of the children in war-devastated and occupied areas and (b) child health purposes generally.

The Assembly's action was a result of two recommendations:

1. In the spring of 1946, Herbert Hoover made a world food survey at the request of President Truman and on his return reported that:

"There are somewhere from 20 to 30 million physically subnormal children on the continent of Europe, and millions more in Asia. After the First World War, we gave restorative food to 10,000,000 undernourished children. I deplore that this special aid for children has had no counterpart after this war and suggest the redemption of these children be organized at once. The job could be done with three or four hundred million dollars—a charge beyond any organized private charity but not a great sum from the world as a whole."

2. The last UNRRA council meeting in August 1946, recommended that a United Nations childrens' fund should be established to continue the work which had been started by UNRRA for children. This fund should utilize any existing UNRRA residual assets.

II. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The fund never received the three or four hundred million dollars which Herbert Hoover recommended as a minimum amount to undertake this program, nor did it receive any substantial residual assets from UNRRA. For a while, it looked as though the world had established a pious hope with no resources to make it operative. Then, the United States Congress took the lead, and voted an amendment on the floor of the House providing $15,000,000 to be made available immediately for this program and another $25,000,000 to be made available as other governments contributed.

The matching formula established by the United States Congress has proven a remarkable success. As of this date, Congress has appropriated $75,000,000 to the children's fund and 43 other governments have voluntarily contributed enough money to match this amount by more than $600,000. In addition, individual persons and organizations have contributed more than $11,000,000 for this program, which were not matched by the United States.

All of this adds up to only $148,000,000 which UNICEF will have had to spend over a 3-year period to meet the needs of children all over the world.

III. PROGRAM

Supplementary feeding

By general agreement of the Executive Board, UNICEF's initial resources were used to meet the immediate postwar emergency needs of children in Europe. Even here the assistance was limited to programs which would yield quick results for a small cost, such as dried skim milk for supplementary feeding, and fats, such as cod liver oil, lard, and margarine. More than 85 percent of the UNICEF resources in the first 15 months was used for this program.

The UNICEF contribution to the supplementary milk, or school luncheon, was matched in turn by governments or voluntary agencies of the assisted countries. Thus, the United States dollar was first matched by other governments, and the resulting total was matched by the recipient country with an equal caloric value of foodstuffs, doubling the value of the United States contribution by the time it reached the recipient child.

Over a period of 2 years, five and a half million children received this supplementary feeding assistance daily. This winter, the use of American skim milk surpluses, made it possible for UNICEF to increase the number to 8,000,000 children, nursing and pregnant mothers receiving a cup of milk daily.

Antituberculosis campaign

But feeding the children was not enough, tuberculosis had reached epidemic proportions among the children of war devastated countries. In an effort to check the spread of this serious disease, UNICEF joined forces with the Danish Red Cross and its Scandinavian associates in the first mass preventive disease campaign in history. The campaign, based on the use of BCG (Bacillus Calmeet-Guerin), a vaccine developed in the early part of this century, reduces the chances of infection by 80 percent and costs only a few cents for each child. The World Health Organization cooperated in the campaign with technical assistance and a research project to evaluate the efforts of the campaign.

Twenty-five million children have been tested and vaccinated when necessary against this disease and another 25,000,000 are expected to be reached before January 1951.

Clothing

UNICEF has never been able to do more than scratch the surface on the problem of clothing. Where recipient governments will bear the cost of processing raw materials into shoes, layettes, coats, or socks, the fund has provided raw materials for this purpose. More than 3,000,000 children have directly benefited from the program, and many older children have indirectly benefited through jobs provided by this program.

Training

To help the thousands of orphaned, dependent and delinquent children left in the wake of war, the fund has assisted the training of specialists in various phases of child health and welfare. These specially devised courses in social pediatrics for selected personnel have been carried out in cooperation with the Governments of France, Switzerland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

Probably even more valuable than this form of training is "on the ground" training of local personnel in the underdeveloped countries in Southeast Asia, Middle East, and Latin America. This training and practice can be only undertaken where there are actual supplies to teach the local personnel "how" to care for children.

Summary

These are only some of the high lights in the UNICEF program. There are other medical programs to control syphilis, malaria, and fly-borne diseases which create high infant mortality. There is the milk conservation program to provide clean safe milk in countries with little refrigeration. There are the refugee projects in Palestine, Ecuador, and Pakistan where UNICEF assistance has made the difference between life and death for millions.

IV. COMMODITIES

All of these programs—in fact the very life of the fund—has been made possible because it is not a discussion organization, but a supply operation.

There has been a great deal of loose talk about technical assistance to underdeveloped areas Technical assistance for long-range economic development is a very important concept to be fully supported. But children cannot wait for the long-range results of economic development—their need is for today. In meeting their needs today, we are at the same time providing the best method of teaching these underdeveloped countries how to care for the long-range needs of children. Children's programs must have supplies to supplement technical assistance.

There are other advantages to a supply program: A supply operation based on the principle of national governments matching international imports is a guaranty that the governments will actively participate in the program.

It is easier to control and maintain international standards through a supply operation than with a servicing program.

It is a practical tangible demonstration of the benefits of participating in international effort, and from the public information point of view, it is the best possible method of selling the United Nations.

A program utilizing supplies can accept contributions in kind which makes possible contributions from governments who are dollar starved, but are anxious to demonstrate their support of the United Nations, through the channeling of food surpluses such as milk, wheat, fish oils, and so forth—from food-producing areas to needy children throughout the world. Moreover, the channeling of surplus foods into noncompetitive markets, such as refugee projects or school-lunch programs, will not affect the national or international price of these commodities.

V. EVALUATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE

(See Representative BLATNIK's letter attached.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1950.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBERT: It is my understanding that you are one of the sponsors of S. 3420, a bill to continue United States participation in the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

As you know, the Select Committee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments made a careful survey of this organization last summer and fall. We not only visited the headquarters

of the organization and interviewed the personnel in every section of its work, but our committee also examined the field program in 14 countries of Europe and the Middle East.

As chairman of that committee, I would like to draw your attention to some of the outstanding characteristics of this program which I believe merit the support it appears to have in the Senate.

First, I would like to pay tribute to the executive director, Mr. Maurice Pate, of Cape Cod, Mass., formerly of Denver Colo. Mr. Pate first learned how to handle the problems of an international supply program when he served with Herbert Hoover in the American relief for Belgium and the American Relief Administration in Poland. During the second World War, he served as director of the civilian relief program for the American Red Cross. In spite of submarine warfare and the bombing of Red Cross trucks overseas, 98 percent of Mr. Pate's supplies reached their destination.

The story of UNICEF is even more remarkable. Less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all UNICEF supplies have been lost through damage, pilferage, or mismanagement. A detailed system of commodity accounting is maintained for each step in the transportation of supplies from producer to ultimate consumer. Thus, UNICEF officials can tell at any moment the exact location of a load of Chicago meat or Wisconsin powdered milk.

This seems like a lot of work involving a big staff—but such is not the case. By wise planning and constant spot checking, UNICEF officials have reduced the cost of administration to less than 4 percent of the total program. Moreover, 2 percent of this cost is used to pay for technical experts associated with the milk conservation and medical programs.

In a world of distrust and fear, the Children's Fund is a concrete demonstration that international organization can work for the benefit of mankind.

Our committee was deeply impressed with the effective and efficient manner in which the international tuberculosis campaign was being conducted. We visited a state serum institute in Copenhagen where the tuberculin and vaccine were being produced to protect millions of children against this dread disease. Without UNICEF supplies, this joint endeavor (UNICEF, the Scandinavian Red Cross Societies and the World Health Organization), to conduct the first mass international medical campaign would never have been made. Today, more than 30,000,000 children have been examined and vaccinated when necessary against tuberculosis.

In Vienna, we saw the gigantic soup kitchens built by the Nazis to feed their occupation troops, now producing a nourishing hot meal for school children in all four zones. For UNICEF supplies are given without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or political belief.

Wherever these supplies go, however, the children and their parents know where they come from. In every country we found posters acknowledging this program as a United Nations effort. No one was surprised to see a United States congressional committee interested in these expenditures because American supplies and American personnel were prevalent in the program.

In Italy, His Holiness the Pope, expressed his deep concern for the future of international assistance to children. And well he might. We found millions of children in Europe who would have died without this international humanitarian enterprise. In Asia and in Latin America, UNICEF programs are just now getting under way. The United States Congress cannot afford to let this program terminate.

The United States Congress was responsible for starting this program. Our matching formula has provided the incentive to make it successful. I earnestly hope we will continue to take the lead necessary to insure its continuation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Member of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe that the point 4 program is a practical approach to the great human problem that the world faces today. Two-thirds of the people of the world are caught in a vicious circle of poverty, hunger, and disease. These people want to improve their lives. But they are now barred from improving their lot by a lack of the technical skills which are necessary to spur their economic development.

The President has emphasized to the world that greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. I believe that under the point 4 program we can provide the people of the underdeveloped areas at a comparatively low cost with the technical know-how which is the main key to greater production.

One of the principal problems in the underdeveloped areas is the improvement of the health of the people in those areas. Without improvement in health, economic development will be impossible. Under the point 4 program, therefore, it is proposed that the United States extend technical aid to these people in combating the serious disease problems that they face. Such a program can pay rich dividends not only in human lives but in economic progress.

The areas of the world in which the people have the best health also have the highest productivity. We have witnessed sensational results in the improvement of the economic life of wide areas when endemic diseases are eliminated. In some cases, as a matter of fact, the wiping out of an acute disease problem has resulted in the doubling of agricultural production.

In 1945, for example, a campaign was started against malaria in Greece. Before the campaign began, one-third of the workers were unable to work 2 to 4 months a year because of attacks of malaria. The infant mortality from the disease in some villages was close to 100 percent.

UNRRA, and later the World Health Organization and the Public Health Service Division of the ECA mission to Greece, have used the magic DDT to reduce the number of people suffering from the disease from 2,000,000 to 50,000 in the past 4 years. This is a reduction of almost 98 percent. DDT was sprayed from the air and crews of native workers sprayed the walls of all buildings in infected areas.

DDT has made it possible to control malaria at a relatively low cost. The work against malaria in Greece is estimated to have cost less than 20 cents per person, the local cost of two quinine tablets.

The economic results are dramatic. Farm production in some areas of Greece has improved more than 40 percent. It is estimated that the campaign is resulting in a saving of from 30,000,000 to 60,000,000 man workdays a year.

Similar results have been obtained in other regions. The discoveries of medical science have provided us with new weapons which make possible real progress in halting preventable diseases. The use of DDT against malaria, and penicillin against the venereal diseases are two of the most striking examples.

Countries that have been able to use modern know-how to prevent and treat disease have made great progress. On the other hand there are large areas of the world where disease takes the same high toll as in past centuries. In India, for example, at least a million deaths each year are attributed to malaria.

In the United States our great progress in preventing communicable diseases is well known. However, much of the new medical knowledge that has made this progress possible is still confined to the better-developed areas. The lack of water and sewerage systems, for example, is responsible for the high rates of typhoid fever, cholera, and other diseases in wide areas. The use of even rudimentary sanitary methods in water supply and waste disposal can greatly reduce these diseases.

I believe that by sharing our technical know-how in the field of health with the people of the underdeveloped areas we can help them overcome one of the principal obstacles to their economic development. We possess the knowledge and the skill which is the key to many of their most tragic disease problems.

The health projects proposed under point 4 are practical proposals. They are based on the experience that we have gained in operating such programs on a bilateral basis in Latin America, and on multilteral basis through the World Health Organization.

It is proposed that point 4 projects be carried out as far as practicable through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The World Health Organization was conceived 4 years ago as the United Nations agency to conduct an integrated international health program. Through its programs of field demonstrations, technical training of medical people, and technical advice, the World Health Organization has established a firm foundation upon which an expanded program under point 4 can be based.

The United States has also developed through various inter-American health programs practical methods of meeting regional health problems. The Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency has worked closely for a number of years with the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, now the regional office of the World Health Organization for this hemisphere. Under the programs sponsored by the Bureau, United States experts have been detailed on scores of assignments to Latin American Republics. Hundreds of Latin Americans have been given training in this country. These activities over the past 40 years have aided materially in strengthening health services in Latin America.

Similar programs have been carried on by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, an agency of our Government. I believe that the Institute's programs indicate one line of approach in tackling health problems under point 4. The Institute sends a field party of doctors, nurses, and sanitary engineers to work with specialists of other governments in a common agency. The work includes the operation of health centers, projects for the control of diseases, and construction of water supply and sewerage systems. Health education campaigns, hospital work, and training activities are also carried on.

Through these programs we have developed tested procedures which will constitute basic guides for the proposed health projects under point 4. Technical assistance in health, as well as other fields, is not a new concept. Our activities under the program can be solidly based on the experience gained over a number of years.

The improvement of the health of the underdeveloped areas is of direct interest to the American people. Due to the great increase in the speed and amount of travel, the people of this country are now neighbors of disease infested areas throughout the world. Freshly infected persons from these areas can now step aboard planes and arrive in the United States before symptoms of

illness appear. Because of this new situation control of diseases at their sources—such as is planned under point 4—is increasingly important to the people of the United States.

The democratic nations of the world have another great stake in the point 4 program. Disease and poverty provide a fertile soil for the introduction of totalitarian systems that threaten peace. By helping the people of the underdeveloped areas to conquer their pressing problems, we will help overcome what Prime Minister Nehru has called "the apathy of despair." We will demonstrate the dynamic productivity of the democratic way of life.

Democratic ideals cannot survive in a world in which the present dangerous economic inequalities are continued. In terms of nations we have learned that there is considerable truth in the old saying that "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer" when such inequalities exist. Back in 1939—before we had embarked on the tremendous war induced program of industrial expansion—our per capita income was $554. In that period the average citizen of one of the less developed countries earned about $40 a year. By 1947, however, the per capita income of the United States had more than doubled, reaching $1,400, while the lot of the people in the underdeveloped areas had not improved, and in many cases had declined.

Thus the glaring inequalities in the world division of the essentials of life have become progressively more apparent in the last 10 years. There is little doubt that one of the fundamental objectives of communism is to seize upon the misery of the people of the underdeveloped areas to create suspicion and distrust of the more favored nations—principally the United States.

The point 4 program offers us an unsurpassed opportunity to give the people of these areas a tangible hope for the future. It offers the people of the United States the prospect of improved relations with people everywhere. It is a necessary program. It is a practical program. I believe it should receive the full support of the Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, 2 years ago the Congress passed the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. It was the intent of the designers of this legislation, based on the popular Marshall plan of the time, that this should be a 4-year program. We are now considering the third authorization for funds with which to carry out the purposes of the original act.

I shall not dwell on the motivating facts which made a program such as this necessary. At the time of the first authorization, the economy of the European nations was on the verge of a complete collapse. Loss of income, dislocations of trade patents, inflation, and other financial problems, and unproductive war-worn machinery were the results of 6 years of war. Coupled with repeated Communist attempts to sabotage recovery, the general state of European morale was at a dangerously low level.

In the face of these conditions, it was necessary that the Congress of the United States, with the support of the American people, act as quickly and as forcefully as possible. As a result, the first authorization for the European recovery program was necessarily little more than stop-gap legislation.

It is my firm conviction, Mr. President, that this foreign-assistance program has served a very definite purpose. There is indisputable evidence of the part it played in slowing the tide of communism which was sweeping across the borders of our wartime allies. From my own personal observations, and from what I believe to be authentic reports, the program has served a useful purpose.

Mr. President, I lived in Europe a great deal before the war, and I was there when the war ended. I saw the havoc and the destruction wrought in Europe. I remained there some time after the war, and, as a Member of the Senate, and I tried to make a study of conditions in 1945. I had the pleasure, last fall and winter, of visiting in 20 countries in Europe, and I should like to say that the work the Marshall plan has accomplished for European recovery is almost beyond belief. The production of Europe has increased over what it was in the prewar years by from 120 to 130 percent. So I think the Marshall plan has been very useful, and I compliment those who have handled the plan for the remarkable results which have been accomplished from its inception up to 1950. I realize that it cannot be discontinued and cut off completely.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The program has been successful and has worked wonderfully. Therefore the Senator does not feel that it should be cut back, does he?

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe it should be reduced in total authorization, but I do not believe it should be abolished at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator making that general statement, or is he fortified with facts? Does he know where cuts should be made in the program?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina is not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and is not as well versed, perhaps, in matters connected with the ECA as is the Senator from Texas, but it is my judgment that cuts could be made in the case of most of the European countries, though perhaps not in the case of Italy or Greece. But from what I saw with my own eyes, I think the plan has been a success. I think that some money could have been saved in some places, for instance, where expensive engineers were hired to arrange plans. I think there may be many places in which the authorization could be cut.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator aware that in the present fiscal year the Administrator has saved $150,000,000 from the appropriation which was made available to him?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina is aware of that, and he is making this speech at this time because he thought at least that amount could have been saved when the appropriation bill was before the Senate last year. However, various points of order which were made, when amendments were offered to the bill at that time prevented a reduction being made. It is my purpose to be present at all the meetings of the Appropriations Committee when Mr. Hoffman and his representatives appear and to do everything I can to aid in bringing about reductions wherever possible. The hearings have not yet started, because we can have no appropriation before us until an authorization bill is passed.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator has in mind can be done within the authorization. But is not the fact that Mr. Hoffman has saved $150,000,000 in the present year evidence of his good faith and his intention to economize and cut down wherever possible? Is he not in a better position to know about the situation than are we on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Texas is correct in his estimation of Mr. Hoffman. I hold him in the highest esteem. I want to have an opportunity, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to question Mr. Hoffman as I did last year. There is always the story, as the Senator well knows, "Oh, this money has been authorized, and we have got to appropriate it." I do not say that the Senator from Texas makes that statement, but that is the way it is talked around. In many instances, and in connection with many types of bills, such as the rivers and harbors bills and the rent-control bills, we hear it said "We have authorized it. Now it is up to the Appropriations Committee to furnish the money."

Mr. CONNALLY. But the Senator from South Carolina knows that is not true, and I am sure the Senator, knowing that, is not going to be influenced by someone's statement that we must appropriate all that is authorized. That has never been true, and I hope it never will be true. When Mr. Hoffman appears before the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from South Carolina or any other membor of the committee has a perfect right to interrogate him thoroughly, and if the committee thinks the appropriation should be reduced, it can vote to reduce it.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is very difficult to cut an appropriation below the authorization.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would vote what my head tells me to vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Texas well knows that I vote what my head tells me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand, but the Senator has just said that because of the claim that the authorization is so much and that the committee must appropriate so much, the committee cannot resist the pressure——

Mr. MAYBANK. I can resist any pressure.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not speaking of the Senator, personally, but about the Appropriations Committee. If the Appropriations Committee is governed by rumor and outside talk, and not by the facts, we should have some changes in the membership of that committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina did not say that the committee was governed by rumor and outside talk. He said that persons appear before the Appropriations Committee and say, "This amount of money

has been authorized, and the Appropriations Committee should approve it." Not that the committee always does so, because it does not, but on many occasions that has happened.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Appropriations Committee does the voting. The witnesses who come before it and talk to the committee do not have any votes. It is up to the Appropriations Committee to vote after it has heard the testimony and the facts. If the Committee on Appropriations is so plastic as to accept the advice of someone who does not know anything about the subject but who says, "Well, so much money was authorized and you have got to appropriate so much money," it does not make much sense.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina did not say that the amount must be appropriated because it has been authorized. The Senator well knows that at one time the authorization act and the appropriation act were one and the same thing. Now we have an authorization in a certain amount. Then the agency which is affected comes before the committee and says, "The bill has been passed and such and such an amount has been authorized," and the agency asks for that amount. I did not say that the committee had to appropriate the amount asked for. I know I would not do it, and the Senator from Texas knows that the committee would not do it. However, the authorization is a talking point in favor of those who seek the appropriation.

Mr. CONNALLY. All the authorization does is to give permission to the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate that amount or any amount below the authorization.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. That does not mean that the committee must appropriate the amount of the authorization. I hope the Committee on Appropriations is beyond being influenced by so-called semilobbyists who come before it and say, "Congress authorized a million dollars and you have got to appropriate a million dollars." That is not so. That is not true. Of all committees, the Appropriations Committee should know that that is not true.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Committee on Appropriations certainly knows it is not true. The Senator from South Carolina certainly knows it is not true. The Committee on Appropriations certainly will not be influenced by lobbyists, to whom the Senator refers. However, the Senator knows that when authorization bills are passed, those who are concerned with them, Government agencies, or whoever may be affected by the bills, come before the Committee on Appropriations and ask for the amount that was authorized.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be so; but I thought we had men on the Committee on Appropriations who know how to say "No."

Mr. MAYBANK. We certainly have such men on the committee. I am one who will say "No" to the full ECA appropriation.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is all right. That does not mean that the authorization which the Senate is now discussing must be cut, or that the Senate cannot authorize the full amount that is asked for. This is not the appropriation. This is the authorization. The Senator from South Carolina has two bites at the chew. The Senator from Texas has only one. All he can vote on is the authorization. The Senator from South Carolina has a vote on the authorization and also a vote on the appropriation. He has a vote whether or not the authorization should be cut down to the bottom. It can be cut down to the bottom if that is what is wanted. But the Senator should not tie the hands of all the rest of us.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no intention of trying to tie anybody's hands. I am sorry the Senator feels that way about it. Last year I voted for a reduced appropriation. I thought the amount could be reduced. Mr. Hoffman has been able to save $150,000,000. If we can appropriate a little less for rivers and harbors and cut down all the other agencies, except the armed services, I think it would be a wise course to follow in the interest of American taxpayers if we were to make some reduction as well in the amount of money provided for ECA.

Mr. CONNALLY. As the Senator from South Carolina knows, the pending bill calls for practically a billion dollars less than a year ago.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina certainly does know that. Mr. Hoffman has told us that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is that not cutting it? Is that not cutting a billion dollars off?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Now the Senator wants to cut off much more. I do not know how much he proposes to cut off. He wants to slice some more off, without knowing any of the details involved. He wants to get a big butcher knife and slice off a hunk.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Texas can say something about getting a butcher knife and slicing off a hunk, but I visited various ECA countries last fall and winter and I think that some money can be saved.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many days did the Senator spend in each country?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not remember exactly.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator need not name them all.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was in France for quite a while. I was in Germany, too. Of course, Germany is not covered by this program. I was in Belgium.

Mr. CONNALLY. How long did the Senator spend in Italy?

Mr. MAYBANK. I was in Italy only 5 days, I believe.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. I thank the Senator. I did not mean to interrupt him.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield. I spent a month in France and Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not privileged to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the sublime committee which is above everything, and knows everything about everything.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator knows that the committee does not feel that way about it, and neither does the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not talking about the Senator from South Carolina. I am talking about the other Members. I think we can trust them. I can trust them to go below the authorization if they want to. I want to trust the committee. The Senator does not want to trust them.

Mr. MAYBANK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. CONNALLY. He wants to cut the authorization so that the Committee on Appropriations cannot appropriate as much as I want them to appropriate if the facts justify it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. President, in this program there have also been certain inherent weaknesses. Let me say that in many cases they were possibly unavoidable, but I think we would be doing the American citizen a disservice if we failed to take into account, while we are considering another authorization, the defects of this program.

Before I get into the principal subject of my discussion at this time, I want to remind the Senators of the termination date of this program just 2 years hence. I cannot urge them too strongly to begin to think now in terms of this cut-off date. It has been foremost in my mind since the original authorization was made 2 years ago. We must not allow 1952 to find us without a specific, well-thought-out plan with which to meet the expected demand for an extension.

It is my belief at this time that I shall be unalterably opposed to an extension of this type of program. After 4 years of such a financial crutch as we have extended to the nations of western Europe, they should certainly be prepared to administer their own economy on a self-sustaining basis. They must become financially independent.

When this condition prevails, the time will have come when the merchant traders of our country may deal directly and in free and open competition with the businessmen of any other friendly country of the world.

It is time we give serious consideration to the implementation of a less socialized technical assistance program than that proposed by the State Department. It would be well to head off this growing trend toward controlled economics right at this point. I would also recall the comments I made to witnesses from the State Department and the Export-Import Bank when hearings were held on the guaranty portion of the point-4 program: It is well and good to develop underdeveloped areas abroad, but let us not overlook our own under-developed areas at home. A program such as this must be geared to our own domestic requirements.

It is time now, before we even enter into a program of this nature, that we dispel forever the unsound current

thinking of business and aid on a government-to-government basis. It is not necessary. I do not believe that it is even honestly wanted by the businessmen of the intended recipients.

If there is ever to be an end of this so-called cold war and to the instinctive habit of foreign nations looking to us for grants and loans, we must plan now to buy, sell, and trade on a people-to-people and business-to-business basis. Until we finally accept a sound businessman's program on a bipartisan basis, we will continue to be forever and eternally concerned with rising imports, falling exports and increasing domestic unemployment.

Mr. President, with these words of caution, I shall dwell for a few moments on the immediate subject we are considering.

It was just a few days ago that I made a speech on the Senate floor calling attention to the alarming figures recently released on our exports and imports. I shall not bore the Senators with a repetition of these figures. They are available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, April 14.

This condition of our foreign trade is germane to the discussion of the business presently before the Senate. My personal concern is over the decrease in our exports of cotton textiles and the increase in imports of these same materials.

This condition is directly related to what I consider to be an ill-advised use of this foreign-aid program. I have cautioned against this in the past, and supported and voted for the Commodity Credit agreements last year, because of my fear that something like this might happen.

I say to the Senators again, Mr. President, that we are disrupting our own domestic economy in supplying our excellent machinery to European nations in order that they may process our raw cotton and return a finished cotton textile to be dumped on the American market at competitive prices below those at which our own mills can produce and market the same products. A continuation of this condition will inevitably lead to unemployment of our textile workers whose machines will be standing idle.

I may say, Mr. President, that since I made the speech the other day I noticed that several of the larger labor organizations, whose memberships include textile workers and other union workers, have likewise shown concern about the situation.

My previous remarks concerning the export-import trade gap were general in nature and have not referred to any particular instance or country. I have referred particularly to textiles, because I consider them to be just as necessary in any economy as radios, soft drinks, or automobiles.

I am going to call to the attention of the Senators some of the deficiencies of this program as experienced by one country. It could well be the ECA "test tube."

I have in the past pointed out that our textiles were banned from Morocco, and that those of many other nations, including Poland and Czechoslovakia, were replacing them. The Department states, as appears on page 10764 of the RECORD of August 4, 1949:

> Unrestricted imports from the United States are impossible at the present time. Imports from countries not in the dollar area are, of course, subject to other criteria.

That ruling places in a more favored position than the United States the countries of Argentina, Bulgaria, Egypt, Czechoslovakia, Portugal, and Spain.

I have here a statement released by the Textile Export Association of the United States. I ask permission that it be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I call attention to the following paragraph from a report by the association:

> The association has questioned the exclusion of United States goods from Morocco and the State Department's abrogation of an existing treaty which assured an open door for our trade there. It has not actively protested heretofore because the Secretary of State has insisted the measures were necessary to conserve Moroccan dollars. * * * However, since the embargo began, United States' total exports to Morocco have increased. * * * On January 1, 1950, Morocco freed certain imports including cigars of all categories, cigarettes, soft-drink ingredients, and radio sets, while still banning more essential United States products, among them textiles. These facts * * * indicate that the embargo is for some other reason than economic necessity.

Now, Mr. President, when I read the above statement, I checked on it. The Department of State's press release of December 31, 1949, No. 1021, lists 11 items which can be imported into Morocco, and the products mentioned by the association are included, while many more useful items, including textiles, are left off.

I ask that the State Department's release of additions to the free list be inserted after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how do the natives feel about these regulations? I find this in a statement released at Lake Success by the Committee for Freedom of North Africa, quoting a letter sent to the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. This statement says:

> As one example of French exploitation, we may point out a regulation permitting unrestricted imports of radios and cigars from the dollar area, while keeping embargoes on cotton cloth, used clothing and other necessities urgently needed by the naked, indigenous populations.

Mr. President, I do not know what answer the Department of State will make to that, but I do not believe there is any answer except that our decisions are dictated, in many instances, by officials who are not as thoroughly schooled and experienced in practical business as such conditions as this would demand. I also believe that in setting aside our treaties, the Secretary of State is usurping a prerogative of the Senate. When he decides that we may export radios and may not export textiles to a given country, he is regulating foreign commerce, a function of the Congress. Even if the Constitution permitted it, which it does not, I believe that these legislative functions should not be delegated to persons who can be convinced that radios are more essential than cotton sheeting; that a country's economy can be improved by importing luxuries and embargoing necessities; and that one of our most hard-pressed industries should give up a market, acquired for it by the hard work of our veterans, in order to make way for products made behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, this leads me to the conclusion that my objections to the centralization of all these powers and function in the Department of State are perfectly valid. I do not mean to propose that any such major change be made at this time in the administration of this current foreign aid. I do, however, charge the Members of the Senate to think in terms of 2 years from now when this aid is supposed to have served its purpose. Even now we are looking to that day as we propose to make reductions in the amount of money for this third authorization. I shall support the move for a material reduction, in the belief that a lesser amount will be sufficient to carry out the purposes of the program during the second and final half of the life of ECA.

I do not in any way intend to propose the termination of ECA at this time. It has been essential to the recovery from war, even though there are many who fear it is only temporary. It is my firm conviction that it has been worth every cent it has cost. Even though there are instances where it has raised the standard of living beyond even the best prewar years, the scales are balanced by the over-all improvement in western European economies and additional security to our own people.

This third authorization, in a reduced amount, will have my wholehearted support.

EXHIBIT 1

TEXTILE EXPORT ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., March 27, 1950.

For release Thursday a. m. papers, March 30.

The Textile Export Association of the United States has complained to the Secretary of State against the Department's approval of Morocco's embargo on many United States products, including textiles, according to Mr. John H. Judge, president of the association. Mr. Judge said that the association has questioned the exclusion of United States goods from Morocco and the State Department's abrogation of an existing treaty which assured an "open door" to our trade there. He added that they have not actively protested heretofore because the Secretary of State has insisted that the measures were necessary to conserve Moroccan dollars.

Mr. Judge points out, however, that since the embargo began United States total exports to Morocco have increased 33 percent and that on January 1, 1950, Morocco freed import including cigars of all categories, cigarettes, soft drink ingredients, and radio sets while still banning more essential United

States products, among them textiles. These facts, he asserts, indicate that the embargo is for some other reason than economic necessity.

(American traders in Morocco have repeatedly maintained that the embargo affects goods formerly sold in free competition by independent Americans, while most of the free list consists of products which French concerns control by exclusive agencies or otherwise.)

Mr. Judge said that in 1948 when free competition prevailed in Morocco, the United States sold over $3,000,000 worth of cotton goods to that country and that sales were $600,000 in the month of January 1949, but became negligible thereafter when the embargo was applied. The potential market is estimated at more than 6,000,000 yards. Much of this business, which formerly went to the United States, has been given to Poland and Czechoslovakia whose bilateral trade agreements with France are observed while our treaties, of longer standing, are set aside.

EXHIBIT 2

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
December 31, 1949.

For release at 7 p. m. eastern standard time, Monday, January 2, 1950. Not to be previously published, quoted from or used in any way.

Today, the protectorate authorities of the French zone of Morrocco made public a list of goods which they have decided to add to the list of items which can be imported into the zone without official allocation of exchange.

The list is as follows:

1. Raw jute fiber.
2. Raw cotton fiber.
3. Manufactured tobacco.
4. Certain pharmaceutical products: antibiotic, radioactive and antimalarial products in quantities authorized by the central pharmaceutical service in accordance with the need for each product.
5. Raw materials for soft drinks.
6. Radio sets, including spare parts and tubes.
7. Passenger-car tires of special sizes.
8. Station wagons, not to exceed in value $2,250 factory list price.
9. Jeeps (all classes) and similar four wheel drive vehicles.
10. Sewing machines (all kinds) including needles and spare parts.
11. Steel tubes and joints.

AMERICAN STUDENT NURSE DAYS, 1950

Mr. MILLIKIN obtained the floor.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 455, authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950, and that its consideration be proceeded with at this time.

I make this request for unanimous consent at the suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], because of the shortness of time. The dates set in the joint resolution are for May 6 and 7.

The House of Representatives by unanimous consent passed this joint resolution yesterday, which is similar to one introduced by me a few days ago and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The purpose of the resolution is to help focus attention on the work of American nurses, and to help attract and retain students in the schools of nursing throughout the country.

The nursing profession offers much to the young women of today, not only by way of building better citizenship, but through the opportunity for truly constructive service among their fellow human beings.

The Senate can help to dramatize effectively this honorable profession and student training, which means so much to the health of our people, by passing this joint resolution today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 455? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution at this time?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 455) authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950, was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the Senator from Colorado for giving me the opportunity to have this joint resolution considered.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me to make a statement on the unfinished business?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as one who always has been annoyed and irritated by duplication, overlapping, and waste, whether of action or of words, I shall most certainly resort to an economy of effort both for myself in speaking, and my colleagues in listening, as I endeavor to make my position clear on the unfinished business, S. 3304, to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. President, we confront an issue today which has had world-wide publicity and attention. Its impacts and influences have been tremendous, and will no doubt continue so to be for some years to come.

A year ago, as a new Member of this body, I supported ECA both in word and deed, despite personal reservations which I expressed on the floor of this distinguished body. What I said then I shall not repeat, because those who are sufficiently interested have the RECORD to turn to, and the RECORD speaks for itself. But, sir, I shall say that intervening events have served to support the reservations which I then had in mind.

I am firmly convinced today, Mr. President, that despite Mr. Hoffman's complete integrity, despite the hopeful optimism of all who supported the program then envisaged, it has fallen far short of some of its well-intended purposes, and yet, I am ready to concede, even in the face of its faults, which have been pointed out again and again in the course of this debate, that it has served its major purposes, and has been, therefore, quite worth the well-known burdens which the American taxpayer has had to carry as the result of its enactment.

But, Mr. President, the time has arrived when the Congress must start to think and act in the interest of that same American taxpayer. Too long now has he been the forgotten man merely because of his own patience and generosity. With this program and all other programs before us, consideration must be given to retrenchment. We cannot continue to finance ourselves and support other parts of the world on book entries, whether they be written in black or red ink.

Estimated deficits of our Nation now figure between five to eight billion dollars, and all of these estimates stem from reliable authorities.

The tax and tax, spend and spend programs which have been so glibly advocated in many quarters will never serve to relieve us either of our deficits or our debts, but rather only jeopardize and seriously impair the very fiber and muscle of our internal structure, which is so essential to our own welfare, as well as the welfare of free men in other parts of the world.

Of little value is a well-conceived foreign policy if our Nation is without the vitality and strength to stand on its own two feet and vigorously defend its own principles.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator feel that the ECA has been a great success and help in Europe?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have already said that the ECA has served a very great and important purpose in the world. I have already said or implied in no uncertain terms that the ECA has had its faults.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about its benefits.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. So far as I am concerned, it is conceded that the ECA has been essential; that it has done much good in the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it is an essential organization and has done much good, why does the Senator want to cut off one of its legs?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I do not believe it is necessary to cut off one of its legs. I merely believe it is necessary to trim its wings a bit.

Mr. CONNALLY. And in doing so cut off the fingers of its right hand.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I say these tax and tax and spend and spend programs will never serve to relieve us either of our deficits or our debts, but rather only jeopardize and seriously impair the very fiber and muscle of our internal structure, which is so essential to our own welfare, as well as the welfare of free men in other areas of the world, who depend upon America today.

Of little value is a well-conceived foreign policy if our Nation is without the vitality and strength to stand on its own two feet and vigorously defend its own principles.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I have concluded to join as cosponsor with the distinguished senior Senator from New York, in what to me seems a most reasonable effort to make a reduction in the authorization proposed under the pending bill from $2,950,000,000 to $2,450,000,000, and in doing this, may I say that I concur with my distinguished colleague from the great State of New York, in his thought that our foreign policy will be promoted rather than impaired if the Congress indicates by something more than words, a clear dissatisfaction with the extent of the progress made during the past 2 years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I refuse to yield until I have finished my statement. Then I will gladly yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey declines to yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I think the action proposed to be taken will serve notice on our neighbors abroad that by reasonable economies we intend to enable ourselves to see them through their difficulties.

To me such a reduction constitutes a sound declaration of policy in which we declare our good faith, but that in so doing we insist upon that degree of cooperation and good faith on the part of our neighbors which we should have had from the very beginning.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that the Ives amendment will receive the approbation of every Member of this body.

Now, Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. While the Senator is siding with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who is not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who resides in another State, the Senator is also disagreeing with his own colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is on the Foreign Relations Committee and who is a member of the so-called watch-dog committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it is not the first time in our long and friendly lives that we have differed. The distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey and the junior Senator from New Jersey have frequently disagreed on matters of policy and matters of political action.

Mr. CONNALLY. I simply wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact though that the senior Senator from New Jersey is not only a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and intimately acquainted with all the operations of ECA, but he is a member of the so-called watch-dog committee, which supervises and looks after the ECA, and which has an intimate acquaintance with all its affairs.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey is one of the greatest Members of this body. I have a tremendous respect for his ability, and on most things we agree. But on this particular issue I expect we will disagree, although I have heard no word from the Senator since his last speech on the floor of the Senate on this subject.

Mr. CONNALLY. The senior Senator from New Jersey is in Washington I understand, and will be in the Senate tomorrow. If the Senator has any doubt about his colleague's position I think he can find out what it is. He prepared a speech on the subject which he was not able to deliver, but which he placed in the RECORD, and which everyone may read.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, if the senior Senator from New Jersey makes a speech tomorrow I shall listen very carefully.

Mr. CONNALLY. And then disregard it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I very much fear that on the subject of economy in this country my mind is about made up.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it is made up on the question of economy, why does not the Senator vote against the whole program? Why does the Senator want to whittle off a little here and whittle off a little there? Why not cut it all off in the interest of economy?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to say that I believe it was most unfortunate that, when we embarked on this program we did not think about economy in the first place. I believe it would have been well if we had curtailed a little bit in the beginning and stepped up as the need asserted itself. Had we done so I do not believe we would have developed the obligations to the point where we are now embarrassed in trying to take either from this program or any other spending program, a fair share of the tax moneys for the citizens of America to which they are entitled.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator aware that the pending bill is $1,000,000,000 less than the bill for last year? Is not that stepping it down?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am aware of that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not only does the Senator want to step it down, but he wants to jump it down.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No; I do not want to jump it down; but I rather regret that we did not step it down a little bit last year.

Mr. CONNALLY. We did.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. We could have gotten by with a lesser sum last year. Last year was a good time to step it down. The remarks I made on the floor of the Senate at that time indicate that I felt that way.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for his courtesy in having yielded to me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am speaking against the proposed point-4 amendment to the ECA extension bill and in favor of the proposed amendment by the senior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Colorado, which provides for a commission to study and report on all pertinent phases of the matter, and to make recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CONNALLY, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, viz: At the end of the bill, insert the following new title:

"TITLE V

"SEC. 501. That this title may be cited as the "Act for International Development.'

"SEC. 502. It is declared to be the policy of the United States and the purpose of this title to aid the efforts of the peoples of economically underdeveloped areas to develop their resources and improve their working and living conditions, by encouraging the exchange of technical knowledge and skills.

"SEC. 503. Within the limits of appropriations made available to carry out the purposes of this title, the President is authorized to make contributions to the United Nations and the Organization of American States and their related organizations, and to other international organizations, for technical cooperation programs carried on by them which will contribute to accomplishing the purposes of this title as effectively as would participation in comparable programs on a bilateral basis.

"SEC. 504. The President is authorized to undertake and administer bilateral technical cooperation programs carried on by any United States Government agency and, in so doing—

"(a) to coordinate and direct existing and new technical cooperation programs;

"(b) to seek the participation of private agencies and persons to the greatest extent practicable;

"(c) to make and perform contracts or agreements with, and make advances and grants to, appropriate persons, corporations, or other bodies of persons, or to State, local, or foreign governments for technical cooperation programs: *Provided*, That with respect to contracts or agreements which entail commitments for the expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to the authority of this title, such contracts or agreements, within the limits of annual appropriations or contract authorizations hereafter made available, may not run beyond June 30, 1952;

"(d) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111).

"SEC. 505. In carrying out the programs authorized in section 4, the President shall make assistance available only where he determines that the country being assisted pays a fair share of the cost of the program; provides all necessary information concerning such program and gives it full publicity; seeks the greatest possible coordination of its technical assistance programs; and cooperates with other participating countries in the mutual exchange of technical knowledge and skills.

"SEC. 506. The President is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out this title, and to exercise any power or authority conferred on him, through the Secretary of State or through any other officer or employee of the United States Government.

"SEC. 507. In order to carry out the purposes of this title—

"(a) the President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint one person who, under the direction of the President or such person as he may designate pursuant to section 7 to exercise the

powers conferred on him by this title, shall be responsible for planning, implementing, and managing the programs herein authorized. He shall be compensated at a rate fixed by the President without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 but not in excess of $15,000 per annum;

"(b) such additional civilian personnel, including attorneys, may be employed without regard to subsection (a) of section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 219), as amended, as may be necessary to carry out the policies and purposes of this title. Experts and consultants or organizations thereof may be employed as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and individuals so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem;

"(c) persons employed for duty outside the continental limits of the United States and employees of the United States Government assigned for such duty shall receive compensation at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), as amended, together with allowances and benefits which shall not exceed those established thereunder, and may be appointed to any class in the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff in accordance with the provisions of such act;

"(d) alien clerks and employees employed for the purpose of performing functions under this title shall be employed in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended;

"(e) officers and employees of the United States Government may be detailed to offices or positions to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or foreign government agency or with any international organization: *Provided*, That while so detailed any such person shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his privileges, rights, seniority, or other benefits, an officer or employee of the United States Government and of the United States Government agency from which detailed and shall receive therefrom his regular compensation, which shall be reimbursed to such agency from funds available under this title: *Provided further*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government.

"SEC. 508. In order to carry out the provisions of this title, there shall be made available such funds as are hereafter authorized and appropriated from time to time for the purposes of this title: *Provided, however*, That for the purpose of carrying out this title through June 30, 1951, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $45,000,000, including any sums appropriated to carry on the activities of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and technical cooperation programs as defined in section 10 herein, under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 6). Activities provided for under this title may be carried on under such appropriations or under authority granted in appropriations acts to enter into contracts pending enactment of such appropriations. The President may allocate to any United States Government agency any part of any appropriation available for carrying out the purposes of this title. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes of this title in accordance with authority granted hereunder or under authority governing the activities of the Government agencies to which such funds are allocated.

"SEC. 509. The President shall transmit to the Congress an annual report of operations under this title.

"SEC. 510. As used in this title, the term "technical cooperation programs" means programs for the international interchange of technical knowledge and skills designed to contribute to the balanced and integrated development of the economic resources and productive capacities of economically underdeveloped areas.

"SEC. 511. All authority granted in this title shall expire on June 30, 1955, unless extended by Act of Congress."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, viz: At the end of the bill insert the following new title:

"TITLE V

"Whereas there are presently before Congress proposal for stimulating an atmosphere for capital investment in and providing technical assistance for underdeveloped areas of the world, such as Africa, the Near and Far East, and Central and South America; and

"Whereas it is contended that Congress has already enacted laws dealing with various phases of these proposals such as: Public Law 643 of the Eightieth Congress, authorizing membership in the World Health Organization; Public Law 863 of the Eightieth Congress, providing for acceptance of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; Public Law 565 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Public Law 174 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing membership in the Food and Agriculture Organization; Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948; Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing student exchange with foreign countries; Public Law 369 of the Eightieth Congress creating the Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Public Law 173 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, establishing the Export-Import Bank; Public Law 171 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, providing for United States participation in the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and others; and

"Whereas many colleges and universities, religious organizations, business firms, and private agencies, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Near East Foundation, the Institute of International Education, and others are presently engaged is some types of techical assistance to various foreign nations; and

"Whereas the magnitude and important nature of these proposals and their relationship to existing legislation, activities, and programs demand intensive study and evaluation prior to congressional action:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

"SEC. 501. There is therefore created a bipartisan commission for the purpose of making a study of such proposals, existing legislation, activities, and programs intended to stimulate capital investment in and technical assistance for underdeveloped areas of the world.

"MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 502. (a) Number and appointment: The commission shall be composed of 24 members, as follows:

"(1) Eight appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and four from private life;

"(2) Eight appointed by the Vice President, four from the Senate and four from private life; and

"(3) Eight appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, four from the House of Representatives and four from private life.

"(b) (1) Political affiliation: Of each class of four members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than two members shall be from each of the two major political parties.

"(2) In selecting the Republican representatives from the Senate and from the House, the Vice President and Speaker of the House are respectfully requested to give due consideration to the recommendations of the minority leader of the Senate and House, respectively.

"(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 503. The commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"QUORUM

"SEC. 504. Thirteen members of the commission shall constitute a quorum.

"COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 505. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

"(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the commission, plus such additional compensation, if any (notwithstanding section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended; 39 Stat. 582; 5 U. S. C. 58), as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

"(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 506. The commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

"EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 507. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 508. Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in section 509 (b) the commission shall cease to exist.

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 509. (a) Investigation: The commission shall make a comprehensive study of the proposals and existing legislation, activities, and programs of the type described in section 501.

"(b) Within 60 days after the Eighty-second Congress is convened and organized the commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress with attention to the relationship between the commission's recommendations and the peace, security, and solvency of the United States.

"POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 510. (a) Hearings and sessions: The commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions

of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the commission may deem advisable. Any member of the commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the commission or before such member.

"(b) Obtaining official data: The commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman or by a majority of the commission."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the point-4 amendment presented by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, if enacted into law, would be the intended first step into a foreign policy for this Nation of enormous consequence and of highly controversial nature.

Secretary of State Acheson, when he appeared before the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations on March 30, of this year, stated the general purpose of the amendment as follows—hearings, page 3:

The proposed measure which is now being considered as an amendment to ECA legislation is the underlying legislative authority for carrying out a program to assist the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world in their efforts to develop their economic resources. It is an integral part of a general program outlined by the President as a basis for assuring peace and personal freedom in the world. This program contained four interrelated courses of actions. The first course is the continuing of our unfaltering support of the United Nations and its related agencies. The second course is the continuing of our programs for world economic recovery. The third course is the strengthening of freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggression by providing military advice and aquipment to those nations which will cooperate with us in the maintenance of peace and security. The fourth course is the program which you are now considering. It involves making available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our technical knowledge and skills. It also involves cooperation with other free nations in fostering capital investment in areas needing development. Its aim is to help the free peoples of the world through their own efforts to produce the things they need for a decent life.

A little later the Secretary said, page 4:

Why did he (the President) single out this policy and this enterprise as one of the four cardinal aims of American foreign policy? Only by answering these questions can we appreciate the overriding importance of the legislation that is before you.

Further on, the following appears in the Secretary's testimony, page 5:

The bill now before you establishes economic development of underdeveloped areas for the first time as a national policy. Its purpose is to encourage the exchange of technical skills and promote the flow of private investment capital where these skills and capital can help to raise standards of living, create new wealth, increase productivity and expand purchasing power.

I emphasize the official interpretation of the magnitude of the program to clear up in advance any thought or contention that this is a modest, unpretentious, single-shot program, unconnected with the larger investment phases of the point 4 program.

The relation of the point 4 amendment to the investment phase of the whole program is further developed by the following statements from Secretary Acheson while under examination by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], as appears on page 8 of the hearings:

Now we point out here that protection for some of the risks of doing business abroad cannot be provided by treaty, no matter how sincere the intentions of the participating government. Therefore, a bill has been introduced and favorably reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which will permit the Export-Import Bank to sell certain kinds of guaranties, in other words, insurance to investors; specifically, against expropriation, confiscation, and seizure, and against inability to convert local currencies.

Later the Secretary said, as appears on page 9:

Fortunately, we can go ahead with a program of technical cooperation, while we are trying to develop what the economists call a "favorable climate" of investment. In fact, it seems clear that one of the best possible ways to create that climate is to get on just as energetically as we possibly can with technical cooperation.

Taking the Secretary's estimate of what is sought by the point-4 amendment, we must, I respectfully suggest, conclude that we are being asked in the dying days of the ECA program itself surcharged with controversy and difficulties, to intrude a new and different program of "overriding" importance.

The program received only 2 days of hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Significantly also, there was not the slightest effort to develop in a preliminary way a wide consensus of favorable opinion among the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. In other words, no attempt was made to enlist so-called bipartisan or unpartisan support for this policy of alleged "overriding" importance.

We have heard much talk for and against bipartisan or unpartisan foreign policy. Obviously, to have it, there must be full preliminary information to all Senators. Opinions must be solicited; questions must be answered; there should be orderly advance consideration of the policies and problems involved. Appropriate legislation must be drawn and offered and considered on its own bottom. Hearings accommodating all sides, and of scope appropriate to the importance to the subject, must be had.

One thing is clear, namely, that we will never have bipartisan or unpartisan foreign policy of any kind in any field if it is to receive the glancing and cavalier approach distinguishing the treatment of this particular matter.

Let us either stop talking about bipartisan or unpartisan foreign policies or do the things necessary to give such policies a fair chance to come into being. In the case before us, and I might say in others which have come to our attention recently, the prerequisites have not been met.

Accepting the Secretary's estimate of the overriding importance of this subject, we cannot, with a sense of responsibility, dispose of it in connection with the ECA extension bill. We at once see the need for the kind of study that preceded the ECA program and the creation of the Hoover commission for study of Government reorganization.

In a letter dated March 24, 1950, to Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], anticipated that there might be proposals for foreign aid to succeed the expiring ECA program. As to this he wrote:

I venture this suggestion. I was one of those who insisted that ECA had to be preceded by the studies of the Harriman commission—mobilizing the best brains available for consultation—to determine what role is wisest and safest for America, for her own self-interest, in facing the threats of postwar crisis. The ECA was the result. As we approach the statutory end of ECA in 1952, I think it would be well for another such commission—equally unpartisan and equally impeccable in character—to resume independent, advisory studies of our new responsibilities as the world's largest creditor Nation and the world's spearhead in the quest of dependable peace.

The amendment to be called up for action by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, and the junior Senator from Colorado, would set up a bipartisan commission for study of pending proposals, existing legislation, activities and programs intended to stimulate capital investment in, and technical assistance for, underdeveloped areas of the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Colorado calls for an examination to be made in reference to foreign investments of American capital, does it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It proposes an investigation of the subject matter of the Senator's amendment, of everything having to do with the entire point 4 program.

Mr. CONNALLY. But is not one of the purposes of the amendment to stimulate foreign investments of American capital?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I take it that the purpose of the point 4 amendment is to stimulate foreign investments of American capital.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree as to that at all.

I ask the Senator whether it is the purpose of the amendment of the two Senators, after stimulating foreign investments of American capital, to have Congress guarantee the foreign investments of American capital.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is the furthest thing from my intention.

The Senator from Massachusetts and I approach this matter from different standpoints. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts is more strongly committed to the point 4 program than I am. From my standpoint, I want a full investigation to be made of all the facts, and I want expert advice to be had.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Massachusetts wants the same thing, from his standpoint, although, as I said before, I think there is some divergence between our two viewpoints. Perhaps the fact that two Senators of differing viewpoints think that a study of this kind is required may add some persuasion as to the need for adoption of the amendment.

The Commission to which I have referred, within 60 days after the Eighty-second Congress is convened and organized, would be required to make to the Congress a report of its findings and recommendations, and would give special attention to the relationship between its recommendations and the peace, security, and solvency of the United States.

The Commission would make its report in ample time to give us a real foundation for point 4 legislation, if this should be deemed advisable. If there is to be action, it would then be free of the faults and criticism which inhere in this kind of an approach to that kind of a problem.

To the infirm procedures already noted for plunging us into a foreign policy of transcendent importance must be added the fact that there is no emergent need for this first-phase program. Indeed, it is highly questionable whether there is any need for it at all.

In a word, the proposed amendment merely duplicates the provision of existing laws.

On January 27, 1948, the President approved Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress. The act is cited as the "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948." It is also known as the Smith-Mundt Act. The objectives of that measure are as follows:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. Among the means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people, and policies promulgated by the Congress, the President, the Secretary of State, and other responsible officials of government having to do with matters affecting foreign affairs;

(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

(a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(b) the rendering of technical and other services;

(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences.

This law is in force and, according to the testimony, is operating effectively.

On August 1, 1946, the President approved Public, 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, commonly known as the Fulbright Act. This act contains the following provision:

(2) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to enter into an executive agreement or agreements with any foreign government for the use of currencies or credits for currencies, of such government acquired as a result of such surplus property disposals, for the purpose of providing by the formation of foundations or otherwise, for (A) financing studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities of or for American citizens in schools and institutions of higher learning located in such foreign country, or of the citizens of such foreign country in American schools and institutions of higher learning located outside the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska (including the Aleutian Islands), Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, including payment for transportation, tuition, maintenance, and other expenses incident to scholastic activities; or (B) furnishing transportation for citizens of such foreign country who desire to attend American schools and institutions of higher learning in the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska (including the Aleutian Islands), Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and whose attendance will not deprive citizens of the United States of an opportunity to attend such schools and institutions.

In addition to these laws, with which we are well acquainted, there are others touching various phases of the same subject matter, such as Public Law 643 of the Eightieth Congress, authorizing membership in the World Health Organization; Public Law 863 of the Eightieth Congress, providing for acceptance of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; Public Law 565 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; Public Law 174 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing membership in the Food and Agricultural Organization; Public Law 369 of the Eightieth Congress creating the Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Public Law 173 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, establishing the Export-Import Bank; Public Law 171 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, providing for United States participation in the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and others.

The hearings developed that many colleges and universities, religious organizations, business firms, private agencies such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Near East Foundation, the Institute of International Education, are also engaged in various types of technical assistance in many foreign lands.

Great Britain, Belgium, and France have their own programs for technical assistance to their colonies and dependencies.

The only additional features which I could find in the proposed point 4 amendment are to increase the appropriations for the contemplated activities and to create a new supercoordinating agency on top of those already dealing with the subject. If there is any need at all for this additional agency, it certainly is not an emergent one.

I should add that it was alleged at the hearings that the point 4 amendment would allow the President to pay money directly to the United Nations to carry on the same type of work. There is no reason why the United Nations cannot submit to the United States the programs of this nature which it desires to pursue and thus give the Congress the opportunity of accepting or rejecting our own participation in them. This is the intent of the United Nations Charter. There is no emergent or other showing which would warrant circumvention of the intended procedures.

The criticisms which I have made on the content of the point 4 amendment and of the State Department's tactics for securing its adoption were all voiced by members of the committee during the hearings.

After discussing the Smith-Mundt bill and the Fulbright bill with Mr. Thorp, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] summarized his then conclusion as follows:

I won't detain the committee by a discussion of the specifics. All I am saying is I am strongly in favor of the objective and I am in doubt whether we might not achieve it more effectively through the expansion of the programs now under way and already organized, with the very fine staff members in the Department, as opposed to launching a new one under a different agency. That is a question I am very interested in. That is all. (Hearings, p. 14.)

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] said:

What I would like to get at first is this: Do you feel that this is an expansion of the spirit and purpose of the other act? Do we need a different act? Can't we use, as Senator FULBRIGHT suggested, the machinery and the set-up of the Smith-Mundt Act which already has a place in the State Department under Mr. Barrett, who is Assistant Secretary, to expand all those activities, to urge larger appropriations, which I have always felt he should have, and do everything that has been planned here, except that one area of the business expansion? That seems to me to be the new matter in this bill. (Hearings, pp. 16–17.)

Later on, the Senator from Wisconsin made this significant contribution:

My second question is this: This looks to me to be what might be a long-range program. You are speaking of 10 years, etc. I agree with you that in the lives of men and nations that is a short period. But we are putting this in now into the ECA bill, which we have looked upon as a program which is to culminate in 1952. I have thought myself that from the standpoint of getting results with our ECA legislation it would be unwise to complicate it in any way with other projects that are not immediately related to ECA. So I am wondering whether it is not putting this in some jeopardy with our ECA bill by putting in that bill; whether we should not have a separate bill entirely, or whether we cannot deal with it by an expansion of the Smith-Mundt bill. (Hearings, p. 17.)

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said:

Might I just make this suggestion. I feel, as one of those who feels a real sense of responsibility for carrying through with the ECA bill in the Senate which is coming up presently, and being very eager to see our attention focused on that and not have that embarrassed or possibly confused by controversial matters such as this can be, a question of a practical way to approach it.

You think we have better put it all in one bill. I am just raising the question whether it would be wiser to deal with this in separate legislation. It is a separate subject; it is a long-range proposition as distinguished from a short-range proposition which the ECA is. The ECA is announced to terminate in 1952 and I see danger from the practical legislative standpoint of confusing

these two things and getting some opposition to ECA because somebody did not like something in this bill. (Hearings, pp. 17–18.)

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in referring to the powers of the President contained in the point 4 amendment, said:

That looks like a very formidable list of powers. Somebody is sure to say, "This is making the President an economic dictator." I remember in the military assistance bill we had a lot of language like that which all proved to be entirely unnecessary. It scared everybody to death. We took it all out. I hope that is there because it is necessary, and it is not in there because somebody wanted to give everybody else the benefit of doubt. I think you are going to have trouble with these big words. (Hearings, p. 20.)

The chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, repeatedly expresed grave doubts as to the wisdom of the program and putting it in the ECA extension bill. For example, he said:

A good many people are apprehensive of this program, that while we are only appropriating $35,000,000 at the beginning, it is just getting a foot in the door and the expenses of this thing will go from year to year, and just as Secretary Thorp mentioned a while ago there, they will come up with a project, some country will say "Oh, now you have sent these experts over here and they have smelled around, we have a big project for $100,000,000 and we want you to carry out your promises now and give us the $100,000,000." Do you apprehend anything like that? (Hearings, p. 23.)

Although building the program up at the beginning of his remarks as the point 4 program with all of its implications, Secretary Acheson replies with soothing language that the program for technical assistance is not a big money program. He said, as will be found on page 23 of the hearings:

Secretary ACHESON. No, sir. I tried to make it very clear in the statement I made and I will be glad to say again, that this program for technical assistance is not a big money program.

The CHAIRMAN. Not now.

Secretary ACHESON. And it never can be.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you are right.

Secretary ACHESON. I feel very sure that that is so, and so far as the specific projects which may develop under it are concerned, as I pointed out in the statement, if those are found to be sound, they will be financed either through private capital, private investors from United States or other countries, or through the International World Bank, or through the Export-Import Bank.

IS THE REQUESTED AMOUNT ONLY THE BEGINNING?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course that is your purpose now, and that is your objective now, but as time goes on I can feel the pressure already coming in through the windows there on us to do this and do that and do the other. "We have a great project out here. We have talked to Mr. Thorp about it, and Mr. Thorp thinks it's fine. Give us $100,000,000 now and we will just fix it all up."

Secretary ACHESON. You and I will cooperate on sitting on Mr. Thorp in that event.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you keep up increasing your weight so that when you do sit on him we will sit on him hard.

Are there any more questions? I wanted to bring that out, because there are a lot of people very apprehensive about this program. You say it costs only $35,000,000. That is fine, just $35,000,000. But we don't know what they are going to do and these people are apprehensive, and I wanted to bring out your testimony on that point very clearly.

I may say that Secretary Acheson will never increase his weight sufficiently to sit on Mr. Thorp hard enough to deter him from his phobic fear that this country and all of the rest of the world will fall into complete chaos unless it has the benefit of his planning. He is the gentleman who, in connection with the extension of our reciprocal trade legislation, appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means and said, at page 6 of the 1949 hearings on House bill 1211:

Under the act which the President has requested (the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act) every officer concerned will be mindful of the need to safeguard the American economy, but at the same time we shall have a clear mandate to broaden the bases of United States foreign trade, to create purchasing power for American exports, and to guide the economy as a whole into the most productive lines possible.

The solution is not to increase the weight of the Secretary. It is to decrease the weight of Mr. Thorp.

Senators have observed the shifts in position of the State Department witnesses. At one point of the hearings the amendment is a matter of overriding importance, ranking right along with the other three points of the President's point 4 program. And then under the riddling examination by members of the committee—and I have quoted from all of the members who attended the hearing—the program becomes a teeny weeny thing which can be disposed of in a light-hearted, open-hand way.

The transition reminds one of a third-rate burlesque performance. The curtain goes up, the orchestra blows an enormous trumpet fanfare, then it goes into a rendition of Pomp and Circumstance, after which the rolling drums build up a crescendo of anticipatory excitement. The customers sit forward on their seats saying to themselves "Something stupendous is going to happen here." The spotlight moves to the wings and out comes a ludicrous midget doing grotesque hand stands, pin wheels, and bumps himself off the stage with callipygian falls.

Look that one up.

The gist of Secretary Acheson's testimony as closely as I can figure it is: Take it as a big program or as a little program, according to the way you want to look at it, but vote for it, because I think you should do so. Answering questions as to the relevancy of the point 4 program to the ECA extension bill, he said, at page 17 of the hearings:

I have finally come to a conclusion that this is the wisest way to do it.

That is, putting it into the ECA bill.

After giving most careful thought to it, although it could possibly be done in a great many other ways, I think if we want legislation, as we do, the thing to do is to go ahead with it in this way.

Ambassador Jessup said that the Smith-Mundt program is very effective. He made the interesting disclosure that he had been discussing the proposed point 4 program with 14 countries in Asia prior to the time that it had been approved by Congress. I hope that the day will come when we shall weary of that kind of insolence.

The chairman asked the Ambassador, at page 26 of the hearing:

Isn't there the danger of a let-down too if we do not go over there and spend a lot of money on projects? They will say, "The United States told us all about sending these experts and they are going to revive and reestablish our economy and all that." When we do not do that won't they say, "Well, now, there you are"?

The Ambassador did not think so.

Then Mr. Thorp came on, and he admitted, in effect, that the point 4 program as now presented is not to displace other programs. It is "essentially to coordinate other programs."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] asked Mr. Thorp, at page 33:

Without any new boards and new machinery but to utilize the existing machinery. Could that be done?

Mr. THORP. I think so far as the Advisory Board is concerned I think it would be a question as to whether, if it were an expanded program—and that is what we are talking about—one would not want to have an Advisory Board of the sort suggested here which is representative of the farm groups, the labor groups, the business groups, the health groups, etc.

So that in following these strange circumlocutions we are now at the point where Mr. Thorp has reduced the President's point 4 of his four-point program—this program described by the Secretary of State as of "overriding" importance—to the need for an advisory coordinating board for existing programs which everyone has stated were working well or could be made to work well.

The security of the United States and the future well-being of the backward regions of the world at this point depend upon the creation of this bureaucratic gadget of microscopic importance.

After reducing the whole thing to the need for a needless advisory council, the chairman then took after Mr. Thorp and developed that the program is in fact inseparably connected with a later Government investment program.

I excerpt from the hearings pages 36–37, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. I want to go back a minute to section 103, on page 4.

Mr. THORP. Yes, sir.

ROLE OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INVESTMENT

The CHAIRMAN. You have told us all along that all we were going to do was to furnish the technical aid, and we were not going to finance any projects, and so forth and so on, have you not?

Mr. THORP. That this bill did not provide it and that any financing that we contemplated was by private capital, the World Bank, or the Export-Import Bank.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Now let's see about our money:

"It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that in order to achieve the most effective utilization of the resources of the United States, private and public, which are or may be available for aid in the development of economically underdeveloped areas, agencies of the United States Government, in reviewing requests of foreign governments for aid for such purposes."

That is part of your plan. You are going to look over their projects, and so on, is that right?

Mr. THORP. This is a policy declaration which essentially would control the Export-Import Bank in its operation.

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly.

Mr. THORP. The Export-Import Bank is operating at present making loans to other governments or to American exporters, and this is a statement of policy which would rather limit the Export-Import Bank in terms of what some people fear might be its tendency to make loans which it should not.

The CHAIRMAN (reading): "Shall take into consideration (1) whether the assistance applied for"—whatever they wanted to ask for—"is an appropriate part of a program reasonably designed to contribute to the balanced and integrated development of the country or area concerned."

Then: "(2) whether any works of facilities which may be projected are actually needed in view of similar facilities existing in the area and are otherwise economically sound."

It takes money to build works, doesn't it?

Mr. THORP. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing): "And (3) with respect to projects for which capital is requested, whether private capital is available either in the country or elsewhere upon reasonable terms and in sufficient amounts to finance such projects.

So you do get your fingers, in this bill, into projects and works.

Mr. THORP. Mr. Chairman, the first part of this bill is a declaration of policy with respect to the flow of capital to other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. It means something, or you wouldn't have put it in the bill.

Mr. THORP. That's right, and this is a statement which limits the kind of Government assistance which will be given in the capital field.

The CHAIRMAN. How does it limit it, when we don't give any now?

Mr. THORP. We are making Export-Import Bank loans from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. I know you are, but that is not this case.

Mr. THORP. That is the case that this provision is directed to as a matter of statement of policy. This is a statement of policy.

The CHAIRMAN. What are you asking $35,000,000 for? Why don't you get it from the Export-Import Bank?

I won't ask any more questions, though. Go ahead and make your statement.

The whole subject was well summarized at the committee hearings in the following discussion between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the distinguished chairman of the committee, hearings, page 39:

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. * * * I raised the question of the Secretary of State whether it could not be incorporated in our existing legislation. I am still troubled by having a new over-all approach to this, because I think we have to feel our way. I think if we try to cover the whole scope of it in this thing now, and especially if we try to add it on to the ECA bill, we are going to have real resistance.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are right, and I thought that we were just simply going to utilize the ECA bill for this year and appropriate money for this year, and let this thing come up on an independent basis.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I would rather see it as separate legislation. I think it is a very worthy project, but it needs a lot of study.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; because this ECA is just an annual appropriation, and if we are going to bring this in and tie on to it a lot of permanent legislation we are going to be in difficulties. I think we ought to handle this on the basis of this year in the ECA bill and then take it up as an independent measure. That is the way I feel about it. However, I will be governed by the committee's action, of course.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I share your feelings at this moment. Of course I may be open to conviction if the House insists on an over-all bill, but I think it is a very dangerous thing.

Of course, cutting out all the double-talk and the opportunism of the State Department witnesses before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, this is, and is intended to be, the entry into the full point 4 program, whatever form it may finally take, whether through loans by the Export-Import Bank, whether by direct Government investment, whether by subsidized investment, whether by guaranteed programs, or insurance programs.

It is not my purpose to make an attack upon the larger aspects of the point 4 program for the simple reason that I do not know what they will be, and no one else does, which in itself is a sufficient reason for not making a start at it.

I shall now discuss some of the questions which arise on the main purposes of the point 4 program whatever particular form it may take. Those questions I respectfully suggest, are so important, and the answers to them will be so fateful for the country that we should not legislate until we have the studies, facts, and recommendations which can be brought before us by a commission approaching the stature of the Hoover Commission.

One of the reasons urged for the point 4 program is that it will aid in hindering the spread of communism.

We cannot blindly accept statement to that effect. Can it not be strongly argued that it will aid in spreading communism in these underdeveloped regions? Will it not be urged, as it has already been effectively urged in connection with the ECA program, that we are spreading Yankee dollar imperialism; that we are entering upon a course of exploitation and political domination for the benefit of the capitalistic system of the United States?

Can it not be argued with great effect that an American business going into a foreign country and entering into competition with native business, and which has the benefit, not enjoyed by native business, of guaranties by our Government of convertibility of native currencies into American dollars, which has immunity, not enjoyed by native business, from the confiscations, expropriations, and seizures by local government is Yankee dollar imperialism in the most flagrant form?

What foreign merchant does not want the privilege of foreign convertibility? Will he be happy that his American competitor next door can put his profits into American dollars while he, the native, must content himself with weaker, local money?

Will not the native competitor consider that the United States Government, as such, is bringing into his country a competitor whose principal is always safe from the policies of the native government while his investment is always under the sword of them?

Can anyone argue with assurance of the correctness of his position that this will make for international good will, that it will promote friendship among the peoples of foreign governments subject to that kind of competition? Let Senators draw their own conclusions but let us not draw them prematurely from the infinitesimal amount of testimony and expert opinion which is before us.

Would such a policy enhance the contentment of our own people with its own Government? American business operates on the dollar but there is no guaranty of the substance of expropriation, confiscation, or seizure resulting from the domestic hazards of business, including, for example, those resulting from Government taxing and spending policies?

It is said that the business community wants this program. Is that fact sufficiently established? Has the American business community been sufficiently consulted? Has the significance of the program been fully appreciated?

The American business community, at least when its spokesmen speak before chamber of commerce meetings, talk about free enterprise and they say that if they can take the profits which are legitimately theirs, they will stand the losses; that this is inherent in the maintenance of the free enterprise system. Of course, many of those fellows while talking that way, have another compartment in their minds which yearns for cost-plus contracts with nice fat guaranteed profits. Will the business community not come to see that when they ask for guarantees of safety of their capital abroad, by simple transference, the premise of their claim could be turned against them in this country by other groups of citizens?

If the safety of American capital is to be guaranteed abroad, why not guarantee it at home? If it is to be guaranteed at home, why not put a Government guaranty behind a fixed amount of annual income for the worker? Why not put a Government guaranty behind the productive capital value of our farms, and so forth? Members of the business community, have you given sufficient attention to the precedent values of point 4?

Do we have a surplus of technical skill available for work in connection with these foreign projects?

What about the health and the economic levels of our Indians, and of the people of the Virgin Islands, and of Puerto Rico, and of our Eskimos?

Should we not give first attention to our own?

How much will these programs improve the welfare of foreign countries? There is nothing new or bold about such programs. Before its withdrawal from India, Great Britain maintained point 4 programs in that country. A considerable part of the reason for the resentment of the people of that country against former British rule arose out of the economic and social dislocations which resulted from those programs. Fine railroads were built through India, fine ports established, excellent steamship connections with the rest of the world were created, steel and textile mills and other industries were encouraged and established. But these activities had disrupting side effects which

were never overcome. I am thinking of what happened in the way of depressing food supplies and the harmful dislocations to communal life.

I am not making a full-scale argument on this point. There are things to be said on the other side. What I am saying is that we have not begun to commence to start to study the implications of this program and that we should know what we are doing if and when we decide to do it.

In our programs, are we going to deal from government to government, or, where it suits us to do so, are we going to short-circuit and go over the heads of the local dictators and chiefs of the countries to be helped by us? If we deal from country to country, we will find that the benefits will line the pockets of the dictators, and very little, if anything, will reach the ordinary citizen whose lot in life we would improve. If we short-circuit the heads of those governments and deal with particular groups or individuals, will we not have the unforgivable enmity of those who have been bypassed, and who, for better or worse, have the controlling power? Should not that be given some thought? None of these things will be found in the hearings preliminary to the proposed entry by this Government into programs of that kind.

What will be the rate of progress, assuming that there will be progress? How much are we paying to increase the productivity of the undeveloped regions of the earth in contrast to what could be achieved in the way of productivity dollar for dollar of expenditure in this Nation or in any other nation which already possesses the techniques of production. Should it not be kept in mind that the economic position of the United States is the evolutionary result from beginnings made here more than 300 years ago. How soon can progress of that kind be duplicated, or even remotely approached in the underprivileged areas?

Just what do we expect from these programs? What will be their rate of progress? What will be their ultimate cost? How much increase in world trade and in general world benefits do we anticipate? What is the factual basis of the predictions?

Will the intrusion of these foreign-inspired programs and their operation on the ground accentuate the cleavages between races and classes?

Can it not be argued with great effect—the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] argued it at the hearings and did not receive a satisfactory response—that capital guaranties encourage rather than discourage expropriation?

Will not the superior position of the American competitor in the foreign country incite the natives to incite their governments into programs of seizure, confiscation, expropriation?

Can it not be argued that this war-threatened world makes a farce out of any guaranty system for foreign investments?

Is there actuarial basis for an insurance system to make good American war losses abroad? Do not all of these plans come down to the fact that the American taxpayer will be called upon to make them good?

The attempt to insulate the repercussions of failure to the Export-Import Bank is hardly a frank statement of the situation.

At the hearings, Secretary Acheson argued against conclusions of this kind by pointing out that we have fire insurance here at home.

But is this sound? Is it not a gross misanalogy? Is the alleged analogy answered by the facts that here at home we have had several hundred years of experience on the occurrence and habits of fires, the losses connected with fires? We have developed efficient fire departments. We have developed building codes and fire-prevention campaigns which have been effective in reducing fire losses to a point which can be borne by insurance resting on long histories of fact.

Has this world developed efficient extinguishing programs, as we hope it will, against the hazards of wars and domestic turbulence of all kinds within the countries we would help? Have our preventative campaigns become effective? Can we talk about a sound insurance system for American investment abroad until they do become effective? What is the risk to the Export-Import Bank, or any other lending agency, or, more important, what is the risk of the American taxpayer? Let us go into these matters a little deeper. There is much to be studied and much to be thought of.

It is claimed that we can go into these foreign countries, study the local economy, and tell the natives what ought to be done. Does it help our foreign affairs, our standing in the world, if after doing that we find that our own financial situation or other predicaments are such that we cannot help in the doing of that which should be done? That is like a doctor giving a sick man a prescription when there is no available drug store.

Are we ready to make new commitments before we exhaust those already made? May it not be fairly argued that our situation is such, militarily and otherwise, that we had better concentrate for the time being on bringing our own ship safely into port.

What is the limit of scatteration of programs and objectives which our economy will bear? And this necesarily requires consideration of the trend of our own productive power, the trend of the cost of Government, the existence of a national debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars, the fact that through deficit financing we are living off of our children and our children's children. That is an appropriate field for study, Mr. President, in connection with embarking upon new programs.

Is it not a fact that the development of resource-poor areas may create more economic and social problems than it solves? Is it necessarily true that nations develop a love for freedom and that world commerce would expand under the development of underdeveloped regions? How about Russia? How about development of freedom in Germany? How about development of freedom in Japan? Indeed, what are the impacts on freedom of the present government of Great Britain?

Is it or is it not true that when we get behind the silken words of the State Department in these matters, our guaranties, if we ever get into them, of foreign investments, are a confession of failure in our own foreign relations?

To put it another way: Can there be any sound foreign investments unless the countries where those investments are made recognize, and, more important, practice, the protection of property and human freedoms?

These are just a few of the questions which present themselves. I merely repeat, this is important business, this is important foreign policy, what is done here may serve for good or evil for generations to come, and we do not have the basic facts upon which to determine that policy at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the Senate reject the point-4 amendment and adopt the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Colorado setting up the study commission to make available the facts and expert opinions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado will permit me, I should like to be associated with him, not only in the remarks he has made, but in the amendment that is proposed. I have enjoyed listening to him not only because he has made a forceful address, but for a deeper reason, that I believe in the fundamental philosophy he so eloquently put into his address. I hope that each and every Senator will have a chance to read the address before he votes on this important amendment tomorrow.

Mr. President, I have been asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to request unanimous consent that an address he had prepared on the pending bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a statement, in view of the fact that he has returned to his home State of Iowa on business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, Mr. HICKENLOOPER's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

Mr. President, this distinguished body was told last year about a group of United States citizens, mostly veterans of World War II, who invested their savings in French Morocco but were being put out of business by French chicanery, disregard for our treaties and general opposition to foreign competition.

I and my staff have followed this matter closely for well over a year. I am convinced that our citizens have been and still are being subjected to discriminations and illegal treatment designed to detract from their prestige and our own, to impair their capital, destroy their earnings, and eventually, to make them quit and leave the field to their foreign competitors.

I am convinced that in doing this the French protectorate, far from being grateful for the unprecedented prosperity our aid has brought them, is using that very aid to advance the interests of its favorites over those of our citizens. It is certain that

our treaties have been set aside and that Moroccan trade not only with France but with many Communist countries is favored over that with the United States. I am convinced that the reason is not to benefit Moroccan economy but to destroy our trade.

When these abuses were discussed on this floor on April 5 of last year, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee stated:

"We are sending a top man from Paris to Morocco who is on his way to investigate all these cases and if there is any discrimination or violation of fundamental American rights they will be corrected and corrected promptly" (p. 3870, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

On July 29, 1949, a formal statement by the Department of State was sent to the able Senator from Massachusetts (SALTONSTALL) by Assistant Secretary of State Ernest Gross. (It will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4, 1949, on p. 10764). It lists the more urgent grievances of Americans in Morocco as—

"Failure to allocate to Americans a reasonable amount of dollar exchange, the employment of delaying tactics in granting import licenses for goods which Americans needed for the maintenance of enterprises they were operating * * * the assessment of customs duties on the basis of arbitrary valuations of imports; the assessment of consumption taxes * * * and other matters such as the failure to install telephones, furnish adequate gasoline rations, etc."

When the abuses were debated again on August 5, 1949, the able Senator from Pennsylvania stated: "On June 10 the State Department negotiated a tentative agreement with France under which * * * all illegitimate and discriminatory treatment of American business interests in Morocco were to be corrected. I am informed that since this agreement has been entered into the Consulate at Morocco has not received a single complaint * * *."

Shortly after that, on September 27, 1949, the State Department held a public hearing on the Moroccan situation. Eleven business firms and associations and the national headquarters of the American Legion were represented. They were unanimous in their criticism. An example is the testimony of Mr. Morris Ernst, a well-known international lawyer of Washington and New York, discussing the State Department document of proposed agreement with France:

"Somebody mentioned here what the natives would like and that is the basis of the dilemma, that the millions of people in Morocco have had no say, and I think as long as that happens, the American interests are in for real trouble. * * *

"I am concerned that this is a temporary device. I should think the difficulty will increase in Morocco rather than lessen if the French attitude is not changed. As to point 4 mentioned, I take it point 4 is not for the purpose of helping Americans sell goods abroad but for the purpose of developing a backward country, and that leads me to observe in regard to the document that this was intentionally left out. * * *

"* * * It seems to me that we have a document of the State Department which is asking for an indictment of discrimination on all of us. It is rank, outrageous, blatant, discrimination. The claim of our client alone will run in my opinion around 50,000,000 francs and maybe more on outrageous discrimination clearly proved.

"Discriminations proceed and the people around the table on all levels without exception have had permits held up, permit seizures, refusals to allow drugs to come in for employees of an American company to save the life of an employee of that company. There has been no limit it seems to me to the discrimination. I say it with some caution but I think we have proven it and proven it in documentary form at times.

"I don't think it is the duty of Americans to have to prove more than a prima facie case. We are not supposed to be policemen to get a criminal indicted, but I should imagine if anything like that happened in the way of charges against any American official anywhere in the world, he would not only be withdrawn but he would be indicted for such discrimination.

"I am fearful, moreover, that they have gotten into a mood of changing without talking it over first—they change the rules on the way."

Other testimony, from Mr. Arthur Stanton, of the firm of Craig Stanton & Co., was:

"Another small point, for instance, you take annex 3. * * * It concerns heavy-duty tires. It starts out with the statement:

" 'Eighty-five percent of the credits are reserved for importers who received exchange under the distribution of credits ERP 5 (second quarter 1949).'

"Why, if we have all admitted the discrimination * * * in granting of dollar-exchange rights, why perpetuate this discrimination by maintaining this proportion? That is all it does, in effect. I mean, admitting the violations to be accurate, of which we all have photostatic copies and have submitted [them] time and again to Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Martin, the arrant discrimination Mr. Ernst has described, why continue this in terms of proposals * * *."

I am reliably informed that these speakers are not connected with the American Trade Association of Morocco, who are the most bitter complainants. Other complaints were that manganese ore could not be exported; that Americans were not permitted to open plants; that French syndicates controlled ECA funds; that our textiles were excluded. All this is found in the State Department's Transcript of Proceedings of Meeting on Trade Problems in French Morocco, September 27, 1949. It will be unnecessary to include it in this record.

A letter commenting on the French proposals and a set of recommendations were submitted to the Department but not included in their transcript. I ask that they be placed in this record immediately at the conclusion of my remarks. In this letter, the American Trade Association pointed out that the proposals violated treaty terms fixing customs rates; favored illegal monopolies and cartels; prevented real competition; stifled free economy and failed to achieve any of the remedies the Department had promised.

The National Foreign Trade Council and the American Legion both criticized the proposals. In spite of unanimous criticism at its public hearing, the State Department decided to accept the French proposals and informed interested Senators:

"You will observe that the comments of the businessmen frequently extended beyond the indicated scope of the meeting, and included statements (1) that the United States is not now fully enforcing its treaty rights; (2) that certain merchandise for which there is a popular demand may not be imported; (3) that no proposals were made with respect to American investments; and (4) that Americans have been subject to discrimination in the administration of the import controls."

Now, Mr. President, if a public hearing on our foreign trade is to exclude all that, what earthly good is it? In view of all the Department's assurances, I was shocked to find that it was no longer concerned with discrimination against Americans. However, it accepted temporarily the French proposals continuing drastic restrictions on our export trade with no provision to end the abuses.

On January 1, 1950, the arrangement was continued indefinitely on the same basis except that 11 products were removed from an embargo list, increasing the importable products from 9 to 20.

The Americans claim that the list was selected to give added business to their French competitors, pointing out that textiles, agricultural insecticides, motortrucks, building materials, and other products which these independent Americans formerly sold still are banned while less necessary articles controlled by French agents enter freely.

The addition to the list, taken from the Department of State's Press Release No. 1021 of December 31, 1950, follows: 1. Raw jute fiber. 2. Raw cotton fiber. 3. Manufactured tobacco. 4. Certain pharmaceutical products * * * in quantities authorized by the central pharmaceutical service * * *. 5. Raw materials for soft drinks. 6. Radio sets, including spare parts and tubes. 7. Passenger car tires of special sizes. 8. Station wagons not to exceed in value $2,250, factory list price. 9. Jeeps (all classes) and similar four-wheel drive vehicles. 10. Sewing machines (all kinds), including needles and spare parts. 11. Steel tubes and joints.

I must admit that the import of radios and station wagons, while trucks and textiles are excluded, convinces me that the selection was not prompted by economic necessity.

Comprehensive, documented testimony submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee during its hearings last month convinced me that the situation in Morocco had still not improved and that the Department of State was unable or unwilling to better it. However, ECA again assured us that all abuses were being adjusted by a mixed commission which had been functioning in Morocco since January 1, 1950. (It was not claimed that the abuses were ended in June of last year, as previously stated.)

The American Trade Association of Morocco and the newly formed American Chamber of Commerce of Casablanca, a member of the United States Chamber of Commerce, both emphatically deny that there is any improvement whatever. Furthermore an ECA statement about Morocco on page 347 of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's hearings report admits that the consent to the French proposals was given "on the basis of proposals which partially met our requests" and it ends with the sentence, "The Department of State proposes to continue its efforts to reach an equitable agreement with the French in this matter." In other words, after more than a year the State Department still found itself unable to reach an equitable agreement for its citizens with a country to which we are about to give another half billion dollars.

I have here a letter from the American Trade Association of Morocco to the Secretary of State and a cable from the American Chamber of Commerce of Casablanca I request be inserted in this statement.

Mr. President, you will see that all the original abuses still are prevalent—Americans' goods are held in port while that of their competitors is released; Americans are not allowed to export many products to the United States. Illegal taxes are collected and withheld. Discrimination is shown in granting licenses. Americans are prevented from opening and expanding businesses in Morocco, are even prohibited from bringing in their personal automobiles, a privilege granted any tourist.

I hope that my colleagues will note this list of anti-American acts, Mr. President, because none of these acts aids Morocco's dollar balance, and Morocco's need to conserve dollars is the general excuse given for the French program.

Now, Mr. President, what is the real result of all this?

Department of Commerce figures (millions of dollars) for our trade with Morocco since 1947 show:

	United States exports to Morocco	United States imports from Morocco
1947	36.1	2.6
1948	28.2	6.7
1949	30.6	5.8

Free competition was established in Morocco in March 1948; ended on Jan. 15, 1949; resumed May 23; finally ended June 25.

The Moroccan Economic and Social Bulletin of October 1949 on page 106 states that dollar-paid imports have risen from 18.9 percent of the country's total to 20 percent and that dollar exports have fallen from 5.3 to 2.5 percent during the first 9 months of 1949.

Page 107 of the same publication contains this statement: "The (trade for first 9 months of 1949) situation with the dollar zone is definitely worse. Exports to the United States which improved a little in the preceding year are declining again, in spite of the stimulus of the rise of the dollar on the free market. We see that the exports of olive oil have stopped because of competition. This product was sold almost entirely to the United States."

Page 109 of the same shows that 55 percent of all dollar imports during this period were consumer goods and that almost 50 percent of all imports were consumer goods.

Page 101 shows six times as much being spent for the construction of villas as was spent in 1938 (dollar value) and more spent for these villas, occupied only by a well-to-do fraction of the European population, than for all construction to house Moroccans, who are 96 percent of the country's total.

I have here a beautifully engraved menu of a Casablanca restaurant. It would be difficult to find anything comparable this side of New York. The first appetizer is Russian caviar at $3.50 a portion.

Mr. President, if Morocco really wanted to save dollars it would begin by curtailing its luxury spending. It would not have run its over-all trade deficit up from $20,000,000 per annum in 1938 to $118,000,000 in 9 months of 1949. If France wanted to save dollars, she would not have pumped four times the tonnage and six times the dollar value of merchandise into Morocco in the first 9 months of 1949 than in the entire year of 1938. Last year's ECA's France Country Study stated: "The competing attraction of inflation-fed demand in French overseas areas diverts goods which might otherwise find a foreign market."

Mr. President, I am convinced that the embargoes against our traders, like the other abuses and like the recent Coca-Cola episode, are not for economic but for chauvinistic reasons. The committee heard unrefuted testimony that the Moroccan Finance Director stated publicly: "I have always considered competition with French merchants by foreign merchants very vexing. It is to remedy this that free imports were suppressed."

Mr. President, here are two sets of statistics showing Morocco's prewar and present trade pattern. I ask that they be inserted in the RECORD after the conclusion of my remarks and I recommend their examination by my colleagues, in determining whether our aid to France is excessive.

Now, Mr. President, I shall explain why the treatment we are receiving in Morocco is even more exasperating than it would be elsewhere. The United States has three treaties with Morocco which are in full force:

The treaty of 1886 (8 stat. 484) states:

Article XXIV: "Whatever indulgence in trade or otherwise shall be granted to any of the Christian Powers, the citizens of the United States shall be equally entitled to them."

Article XVII: "(United States) merchants may buy and sell all sorts of merchandise except those that are prohibited to the other Christian nations."

A treaty of 1880 (22 Stat. 817) and one of 1906 (34 Stat. 2905, 2944, 2946), signed by France as well as Morocco, guarantee the United States equal trade rights with France and Spain in Morocco and confirm the validity of the treaty of 1836. The 1906 treaty fixes customs duties at 12½ percent, establishes valuation procedure and prohibits monopolies or concessions unless subjected to competitive bidding.

In 1912 France arranged a Protectorate agreement with the Sultanate of Morocco. In 1917 the United States recognized this protectorate, which gave France the right to represent the Sultan in foreign affairs. This recognition specifically reserved United States rights, explaining that only the Senate could alter them. (See Hackworth Digest of International Law, vol. 1, ch. 2, pp. 88, 89, 90.)

In spite of all this, United States citizens are forbidden to export many products, including manganese and hides, and have less favorable trading rights than France or any country having a bilateral agreement with France — including Argentina, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Hungary, and many others.

The Secretary of State has set aside our treaties by the mechanism of approving local Moroccan laws which violate them. This applies to exports, imports, and taxes.

The American Trade Association is suing the Secretary to enjoin him from giving the purported assent of the United States to the Moroccan import and embargo decree of December 30, 1948, or from "any act which would in any way temporarily or permanently waive, relinquish, impair, and/or extinguish the rights in Morocco guaranteed to citizens and commerce of the United States by the aforementioned treaties without first obtaining the advice and consent of the Senate, as required by the Constitution." (Federal District Court, D. C., Record of case CA 3756–3749.)

Mr. President, the Secretary's answer to that is that he has given his assent and that "Assent by the Secretary of State is a matter of diplomatic, as well as national, concern. Consent may be granted upon the basis, inter alia, of what the President and the State Department believe will most facilitate accords with other countries as well as our own national well-being. The factual foundation of the Secretary's action will frequently not be public or susceptible to judicial review."

That disturbs me very much, Mr. President, especially in these days when treaties play such an important part in our national existence. If a treaty ratified by the Senate may be set aside by an Executive act, then the formality of Senate ratification is meaningless. This attitude indicates a new conception of Executive power. It should be compared with the decision of Secretary Knox who, in refusing similar consent in connection with these same treaties, wrote the French Ambassador:

"As the adherence of this Government to such an agreement would seem to imply the modification of certain of its existing treaty rights, the consent to such adherence on the part of the United States involves the conjoint action of the treaty-making powers of this Government and our acceptance of the agreement in question could therefore be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." (Foreign Relations, 1911 at 622.)

Furthermore, Mr. President, there is some tendency on the part of the administration to assume that the ECA Act implied authority to modify treaties in execution and interpretation of the bilateral agreements. I have voted consistently for the ECA program, but it never occurred to me, Mr. President, that I was delegating or could delegate the power to modify our treaties to the ECA Administrator or the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, there is an amendment proposed by the committee which states "the sense of Congress" about discrimination against American firms or citizens. It specifically makes an exception of discrimination authorized by existing treaties. The Foreign Relations Committee's report also states (p. 22) that it "recognizes * * * that there may be instances when some such measures (restrictions) are sanctioned under existing international agreements."

Mr. President, I maintain that many discriminations are expressly forbidden under existing treaties and that these are more important to preserve than the provisos that are to our disadvantage. I believe it is essential at this time to reiterate the sanctity of our treaties and to take measures that will protect our citizens in Morocco from foreign rapacity and State Department weakness.

WASHINGTON, D. C. *April 16, 1950.*

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Page 22 of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's report on ECA extension states that legislative remedy of American complaints in Morocco "was not necessary in view of the arrangements which ECA, the Department of Commerce, and the State Department have made with the French Government * * *." Informally, I was told by Col. Tyler Wood before the committee that since January 1, 1950, a mixed commission had dealt effectively with our complaints and that, were I to return to Morocco, I would find the situation totally different. I stated that I was in constant touch with the situation and knew of no improvement.

A check shows the following conditions, all of which are known to your Consulate General in Casablanca and should have been reported to your Department:

1. Customs duties admitted by your Department to have been arbitrarily valued and paid under protest on advice of your officers, still are retained.

2. Customs still are not appraised as required by our treaties and the 12½ percent fixed by treaty is supplemented by consumption taxes and cessions in kind.

3. No consumption taxes have been reimbursed and their collection continues although your Department wrote us, in July 1948, that we were "in no way required to pay these taxes" and has repeatedly admitted their illegality. Furthermore, on March 24, 1949, your Department agreed, among other things, to require reimbursement of unauthorized taxes and customs before considering the French proposals which it accepted on June 10, 1949.

4. Forced cessions of 50 percent of sugar cargoes still continue. Other cessions have ceased but Americans have not been compensated for those to which they were illegally subjected.

5. Forty-five cars belonging to three Americans have been held on the Casablanca dock since last November. They were shipped under licenses issued when our goods were not embargoed but arrived later. One hundred cars belonging to a French concern were freed although they were not covered by legitimate licenses. I showed your officials photostats of licenses issued clandestinely for 70 cars in spite of the official embargo.

6. Edwin Sendro, who arrived in Morocco with his personal car, licensed and driven by him in the United States, is being forced to send it back, although this decision violates the agreement between your Department and Moroccan officials and your Department has photostatic proof that cars have been admitted for resale subsequent to the arrival of Sendro's car, and in violation of the regulations which Moroccan officials and your Department jointly promulgated. (See par. 5.)

7. Carl Humphrey still is unable to expand his bus line. He desires to add seating capacity for 144 persons but is forbidden, although one of his French competitors has licensed capacity for 7,000 unused seats. While this situation has been known to your consulate since September 24, 1948, its efforts have been unable to remedy it.

8. Humphrey, on March 7, 1950, gave your consulate well-documented proof that licenses for spare parts he needed had been delayed since September 1949 in spite of the French agreement to "remedy" what Assistant Secretary Gross lists as "urgent grievances" including "the employment of delaying tactics in granting import licenses for goods which Americans needed for the maintenance of enterprises they were operating" (p. 10764, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4, 1949).

9. Humphrey has also been denied licenses to import spare parts for the Piper Cub planes for which he is agent and which he sold before your department arranged the embargo. This prohibition is patently to discredit the American product and agent.

10. Willy C. Laudon was refused export licenses when identical licenses were granted to three of his French competitors.

11. Francis R. Frenville still is unable to buy hides and skins in Morocco because of the illegal prohibition of their export to the United States. This and similar cases have been brought to your department's attention for almost a year without results.

12. The list of 20 products which enter Morocco without restrictions was chosen primarily to give an insuperable competitive advantage to French cartels and exclusive agents, over the Americans who were winning out under free competition. Even with this advantage, France is now trying to supply Morocco through barter transactions arranged in Paris, depriving Americans in Morocco of the little trade that was left after your negotiations. It is understood that your Department is making representations about this, as being contrary to Morocco's agreement. My formal request to the protectorate to arrange barter transactions was refused in writing as "forbidden with the Anglo-Saxon countries."

13. All of the above abuses are set forth in communications dated between March 22 and April 12, 1950. To the best of my knowledge, all still continue. Cables dated April 15, 1950, from both the American Trade Association of Morocco and the American Chamber of Commerce at Casablanca assure me that conditions on that date were worse than in 1949.

Claims about the "mixed commission" and "improved conditions" should be considered in the light of the history of this case:

As far as I can ascertain, "negotiations" still are between the same United States consular personnel and French officials as before. The House Foreign Affairs Committee asked ECA about our situation in Morocco on March 7, 1950. The resulting prepared statement reads in part (p. 348, House hearings): "It was also agreed that the United States and French Protectorate Government would maintain close liaison and consultation regarding the implementation of the measures agreed upon. The American consul at Rabat is carrying out this latter phase of the agreement." No mention was made of the mixed commission which, according to ECA's assurance to the Senate committee had been operating effectively since January 1, 1950.

The Senate was informed on April 5, 1949 (p. 3870, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): "We are sending a top man from Paris to Morocco, who is on his way now, to investigate all these cases, and if there is any discrimination, or any violation of the fundamental rights of Americans, they will be corrected, and corrected promptly"; and again on August 5, 1949 (p. 10820, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): "On June 10 the State Department negotiated a tentative agreement with France under which * * * all illegitimate and discriminatory treatment of American business interests in Morocco were to be corrected."

Both of these statements and many similar ones were made when the Senate was considering legislation to end the Moroccan abuses. However, your Department held a public hearing on September 27, 1949, to determine whether to accept or reject Moroccan proposals. Your Department decided for Morocco, brushing aside proof of her widespread bad faith and officially ruling that evidence "that Americans have been subject to discrimination in the administration of import controls" was "beyond the scope of the meeting." This was explained frankly in letters to interested Senators—after all possibility of remedial legislation had passed.

This record, known to several Senators, may have prompted ECA to tell the Senate committee last month of the mixed commission, not considered important enough to mention in the House, and charged with the same functions that had been attributed a few days before to the Rabat consul. It also may explain the lack, in the Senate hearings record, of admissions like these made in the statement for the House: "American businessmen in Morocco had certain legitimate grievances against French protectorate officials" and agreement was reached "on the basis of proposals that partially met our requests" (obviously permitting the continuance of "legitimate grievances"). The statement ends: "The Department of State proposes to continue its efforts to reach an equitable agreement in this matter."

It seems obvious that any change in Morocco has been for the worse and that the recent claims of satisfactory adjustments are unfounded. I hope that you will correct any misapprehension that the Foreign Relations Committee and ECA may have about this.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT EMMET RODES,
President, American Trade Association of Morocco.

[Translation of p. 7 of "Note de Documentation" No. 46, published by the Moroccan Government Department of Commerce and Merchant Marine, dated Apr. 1, 1950]

Study of the balance of trade of Morocco by monetary zone

[Value in millions of francs]

	1938		1947		Base index 100 in 1938			
					1948		1949	
	Value	Index	Value	Index	Value	Index	Value	Index
Franc zone:								
Imports c. i. f.	747	100	21,404	2,865	49,066	6,568	70,434	9,429
Exports f. o. b.	908	100	14,222	1,566	28,397	3,127	31,788	3,501
Balance	+161	100	−7,182	−4,460	−20,669	−12,838	−38,646	−24,000
Dollar zone:								
Imports	547	100	7,888	1,442	12,769	2,334	19,405	[1] 3,547
Exports	103	100	659	639	1,957	1,900	1,394	1,353
Balance	−444	100	−7,229	1,628	−10,812	2,435	−18,011	4,056
Sterling zone:								
Imports	98	100	1,132	1,155	2,171	2,215	2,894	2,953
Exports	138	100	1,697	1,230	3,004	2,177	7,243	5,249
Balance	+40	100	+565	1,412	+833	2,083	+4,349	10,872
Other zones:								
Imports	793	100	2,894	365	10,859	1,369	10 587	[2] 1,335
Exports	363	100	1,745	481	3,831	1,055	12,590	3,468
Balance	−430	100	−1,149	267	−7,028	1,634	+2,003	−466
Total:								
Imports	2,185	100	33,318	1,525	74,865	3,426	103,320	4,729
Exports	1,512	100	18,323	1,212	37,189	2,460	53,015	3,506
Balance	−673	100	−14,995	2,228	−37,676	5,598	−50,305	7,475
Trade with participating countries:								
Imports	530	100	1,874	353	15,918	3,003	8,526	[3] 1,609
Exports	436	100	2,819	647	5,508	1,263	16,650	3,819
Balance	−94	100	+945	−1,000	−10,410	11,074	+8,124	−8,643

[1] 1949 imports from the dollar zone are up 50 percent; exports for dollars are down 33 percent.
[2] 1949 imports from other than dollar, sterling, and franc areas (many of them Communist) are steady; exports to these countries are up 330 percent.
[3] 1949 imports from participating countries are down 47 percent; exports to them are up 300 percent.

In March 1948 Moroccan commerce was opened to free competition. In January 1949 embargoes and restrictions were instituted against United States textiles, agricultural insecticides, etc., "to conserve dollars."

GENERAL NOTES ON MOROCCAN 1949 TRADE STATISTICS

Page 26 shows that the largest single item of import, 14 percent of the total, is 14,600,000,000 francs ($42,000,000) spent for 202,000 metric tons of "manufactured food products" including cigars and wine, caviar, canned goose liver, and so forth. The average price was 730 francs a kilogram or 95 cents a pound, arrival value, for 44,000,000 pounds of these luxuries. The probable average retail value, after duties and profits, is $2 a pound. All of these products have world-market values in dollars.

On page 29 a typical explanation is found: "Wines totaled 17,637,000 liters and included 7,015,000 from Spain. In 1948 they totaled 13,156,200 with none from Spain." (A trade agreement published January 1, 1950, permits Morocco to send hides to Spain which are prohibited for shipment to the United States.)

The second largest item is textiles (11,800,000,000 francs, $32,700,000).

These two items alone exceed Morocco's total 1938 imports by 20 percent in spite of vastly increased local production.

Page 25 shows that imports of consumer goods amounted to 51,000,000,000 francs ($146,000,000), or 50 percent of the total imports.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have printed and lie on the table. I call it to the special attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who has offered an amendment to the bill. My amendment is as follows:

On page 3, beginning with line 5, strike out through line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(m) (1) It is the sense of Congress that no participating country shall maintain or impose any import or export, currency, tax, license, quota, or other similar business restrictions which discriminated against products of the United States or its citizens or any corporation, partnership, or other association substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States, engaged or desiring to engage in the importation into or exportation from such country of any commodity, which restrictions are not reasonably required to meet balance-of-payment conditions or requirements of national security: *Provided*, That international agreements (to which the United States and such country are parties) which permit or prohibit any such restriction, shall remain in full force and effect unless expressly modified as required by law.

"(2) The Secretary of State and the Administrator, acting jointly, are authorized and directed to obtain compliance with the intent expressed in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and the Administrator shall not agree to the expenditure of any of the local currencies required to be deposited in local currency accounts by section 115 (b) (6) of this act, by any such country which fails to comply with such intent."

Mr. President, I am quite satisfied that the amendment which I have submitted will, if adopted, help the distinguished senior Senator from Texas to accomplish the purposes of his amendment. A year ago, when the ECA authorization came up for consideration, I took considerable interest in the matter of the influx of petroleum into the United States, where it now is being sold competitively with that of the oil producers of the United States, and especially of Texas, and also in the problems presented because of the existence of the sterling bloc. Because of the sterling-bloc situation it is impossible now for American investors to sell in the sterling-bloc countries by reason of license requirements and restrictions. I feel that such restrictions should be eliminated and that American businessmen should have an opportunity equally with producers in those areas, to sell to sterling-bloc countries.

Mr. President, while I am satisfied that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas now realizes that what was prophesied a year ago has come true, yet I do not feel that simply calling to the attention of the Administrator that it is the sense of Congress that he do thus and so will help the situation. I hope the distinguished Senator from Texas will accept the proviso contained in my amendment, so that the Administrator will have something to back him up when he requests countries of the sterling bloc area to permit the oil producers of our country to sell oil to the sterling-bloc countries on the same basis and terms as their own producers are permitted to sell, especially since they have developed their oil fields, at least in part, with American money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. As the minority leader, and as the acting majority leader, I have the honor once again to move that the Senate recess until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 5, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 4 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Stanley Woodward, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada, vice Laurence A. Steinhardt, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. L. C. Sparks, Jr., St. Luke Evangelical Lutheran Church, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast ever been gracious to our Nation, accept this day our thanksgiving unto Thee.

We make our earnest prayer that we may be worthy of Thy love and protection. Make us equal to our high trusts; reverent in the use of freedom; just in the exercise of power; generous in the protection of weakness.

In these days of crisis give us the calmness thoroughly to think through the issues, that we may arrive at sound policies and safe actions.

May wisdom and knowledge be the stability of our times, and our deepest trust in Thee.

Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1069. An act to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 50–21.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 149]

Abbitt	Holifield	Pfeiffer, William L.
Barrett, Pa.	Jacobs	Poulson
Battle	Jenkins	Powell
Bennett, Mich.	Kee	Priest
Bishop	Keefe	Quinn
Blatnik	Kennedy	Redden
Bolton, Ohio	King	Regan
Boykin	Klein	Rhodes
Byrne, N. Y.	Kunkel	Rogers, Fla.
Carlyle	LeFevre	Scott, Hardie
Cavalcante	Linehan	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	Lodge	Smathers
Chiperfield	McGuire	Smith, Ohio
Chudoff	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Cox	Madden	Stigler
Crook	Marshall	Taylor
Crosser	Merrow	Underwood
Davies, N. Y.	Miles	Vorys
Dawson	Miller, Calif.	Vursell
Deane	Miller, Nebr.	Wadsworth
DeGraffenried	Morgan	Walsh
Douglas	Moulder	Wheeler
Durham	Nixon	Whitaker
Elliott	Noland	White, Calif.
Gilmer	Norton	White, Idaho
Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Granger	Pace	Wilson, Tex.
Grant	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Woodruff
Harden		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 344 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE OF ESCORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort our distinguished guest to the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF THE PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

During the recess the following proceedings occurred:

At 1 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency Liaquat Ali Khan, Prime Minister of Pakistan.

His Excellency, Liaquat Ali Khan, Prime Minister of Pakistan, escorted by the committee of Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Speaker's right. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it is my great pleasure, speaking for you, to welcome our distinguished guest to this Chamber, an illustrious citizen in his own country and of the world, the head of a government made up of a great and proud people, an important democracy toward which we feel friendly, and we believe its people feel friendly toward us. We trust that throughout the years this good feeling, this friendship, and this cooperation may abide.

It is my high privilege and my great pleasure to present to you the Prime Minister of Pakistan. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

His Excellency the PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN. Mr. Speaker, honorable Members of the House of Representatives, in welcoming me within these walls and giving me an opportunity of addressing this august assembly, you have bestowed upon me high prerogative and honor for which I am deeply grateful to you.

This is my first visit to your great land, but I have long been an admirer of the vigor of your enterprise, your indefatigable spirit of inquiry, your optimism, your high respect for individual effort, your belief in equal opportunities for all, your reverence for the sanctity of the home, the frankness of your speech and manner and the liveliness of your language. [Applause.] Above all I have admired your jealous and uncompromising regard for the supremacy of the people's will, your firm belief that civil liberty gives man the greatest scope for his faculties and your faith that "Morality is the best security of law and the surest pledge of freedom." [Applause.] In seeing America, I hope to see more than America. I hope to see the men and women whose enterprise and vitality have made your country great and the faith that sustains them in their efforts.

I thank you for your welcome and value it the more, because the people whom I have the honor and privilege to represent, although the inheritors of ancient faiths and cultures, are, as a nation among sovereign nations, young; and on the threshold of new experiences, both exciting and grave.

In the geography of the world, Pakistan's name is not yet 3 years old. What led to the emergence of this new state on the map of Asia is perhaps not universally known. Nor do I expect it yet to be common knowledge what urges stir and inspire us in the task that we know lies ahead of us.

Pakistan was founded by the indomitable will of a hundred million Muslims who felt that they were a nation too numerous and too distinct to be relegated forever to the unalterable position of a political minority—specially when, in the vast subcontinent which was their homeland, there was enough room for two great nations—the Hindus and the Muslims—to enjoy peace and full sovereignty in their respective dominions. They believed that thus alone would the vast multitude of the followers of Islam be uninhibited in the development of their culture and free to follow their own way of life. Pakistan was founded so that millions of Muslims should be enabled to live according to their opinions and to worship God in freedom. That selfsame freedom which they sought for themselves, they conceded to others—with the determination to live as peaceful neighbors when to live as more than neighbors seemed to be more than hazardous. Like some of the earlier founders of your great country, these Muslims, though not pilgrims, nevertheless embarked upon an undertaking, which, in aim and achievement, represented the triumph of an idea. That idea was the idea of liberty which has had its ardent followers in all climates and all countries. When our time came, its call summoned us too, and we could not hold back. The partition of our subcontinent into two independent sovereign states did not, nor was it expected to, eliminate or efface minorities. But it brought magnitudes within focusable limits and saved the political architecture of the new Asia from a strain which might well have proved excessive and dangerous.

But this, we realize, is only the beginning of a new life. The achievement of freedom is not an instantaneous event; it is a process. The seed is planted, but before the tree can take root and grow and spread it has to be nurtured untiringly by innumerable hands. Our constitution is yet on the anvil and elected representatives of the people are engaged in making it a true mirror of our live beliefs and our sincere aspirations. To frame a genuine constitution, a people need to scrutinize their own mind and soul very closely. Time-honored maxims and hallowed principles embodied in a constitution are of little validity, unless a nation feels that it possseses the spiritual strength to live up to them, unless they echo the voice that is heard unfalteringly in the innermost recesses of its soul. We have earnestly searched our hearts, and though much yet remains to be done, the main features of our constitution to which we can put our seal with a conscience free of all restraints, doubts or qualms, are to us unequivocally clear.

We have pledged ourselves a federation with autonomous units, wherein shall be guaranteed fundamental human rights, equality of status and opportunity, and before law, social, economic, and political justice, freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, and association. [Applause.]

We have pledged that the Muslims in our state shall be enabled to order their lives in accordance with their faith; but not forgetful of that perpetual fear of the majority from which Pakistan has delivered millions of Muslims and in humble thanksgiving to God for this deliverance, we have solemnly pledged that our minorities shall enjoy full rights of citizenship and shall freely profess and practice their religions and develop their cultures and that their legitimate interests and the interests of the backward and depressed classes shall be adequately safeguarded. [Applause.]

We have pledged that the state shall exercise its powers and authority through the chosen representatives of the people. In this we have kept steadily before us the principles of democracy, freedom, equality, tolerance, and social justice as enunciated by Islam. There is no room here for theocracy, for Islam stands for freedom of conscience, condemns coercion, has no priesthood and abhors the caste system. It believes in the equality of all men and in the right of each individual to enjoy the fruit of his or her effort, enterprise, capacity, and skill, provided these be honestly employed. It firmly believes in the right of private ownership, although it frowns on large accumulations of unearned wealth and is greatly concerned over menacing inequalities.

These are articles of faith with us and by them we are irrevocably bound. They are our way of life; and no threat or persuasion, no material peril or ideological allurement can deflect us from the path we have chosen. In proclaiming the objectives of our constitution, we have called on Almighty God, to whom alone sovereignty over the entire universe belongs, to bear witness to our resolve and to guide our footsteps "so that the people of Pakistan may prosper and attain their rightful and honored place among the nations of the world and make their full contribution toward international peace and progress and happiness of mankind." [Applause.]

In our short life as a free nation, we have learnt not a little about the world and the times we live in and about ourselves. We have learnt that freedom, whether of the individual or of countries, is not everywhere and at all times safe and that the integrity of our own homeland which is dearer to us than our lives will demand of us unceasing vigilance. Our people are deeply distressed at the thought that world-wide destruction might overtake not only the fuller

life to which they aspire but the entire human civilization with all its magnificent achievements and illimitable opportunities for good. For youthful countries like ours, which are experiencing but the first pulsations of a free existence, this prospect is profoundly disturbing and not without a touch of irony. We sincerely hope that leaders of world opinion will pursue the path of understanding and will use their wisdom and power to dispel and not to enhance the fears of an apprehensive world. Though freedom has had many births, greed, aggression, and intolerance continue, alas, to rear their ugly heads. This is the century of great awakenings in all parts of the globe; and it depends entirely on the leaders of the world whether mankind will awaken to the horrors of darkness or to a glorious dawn.

We have learnt much about ourselves too. Our state began under a number of handicaps, both natural and man-made, and almost before we had time to unfurl the flag to which we now bear allegiance, millions of refugees, the largest number in world history, crossed our borders and sought shelter within our territories. This put us to a test which might have proved disastrous; instead of which our calamities strengthened the determination of our nation, and the hard work demanded of us fortified our faith. If the test was to come, we are glad that it came early and when we least expected it. For it gave us the measure of our moral and spiritual resources and even in our immature years filled us with courage for the future that has yet to unfold itself. The task that lies before us is truly immense and we are fully aware of it. We are aware that "liberty does not descend upon a people, a people must raise themselves to it." We are aware that recent centuries of progress and advancement in the world have bypassed us, leaving our resources untapped, our capacities unused and our genius inactive. In all humility but with great faith in our destiny, we the people of Pakistan are resolved to make up for lost centuries within the shortest possible time so that we should never be a source of disquiet to our friends or a temptation to the avaricious. Peace is essential for progress but progress is no less essential for peace. As peace and war today are indivisible, so is progress, and in its name we offer our good will to all nations great and small and earnestly ask for theirs. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., His Excellency, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS DURING RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 392) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for Nation-wide prayer for peace. I have cleared this through the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader, and am calling it up at the direction of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. An identical resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 138, has passed the Senate and has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am directed to ask unanimous consent that the House consider Senate Joint Resolution 138 in lieu of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe each May 30, Memorial Day, by praying, each in accordance with his religious faith, for permanent peace; designating a period during such day in which all the people of the United States may unite in prayer for a permanent peace; calling upon all the people of the United States to unite in prayer at such time; and calling upon the newspapers, radio stations, and all other mediums of information to join in observing such day and period of prayer.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 392) was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution which we have just passed unanimously, was inspired by editorials written by Editor Carl M. Saunders, of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, one of the leading daily newspapers of our State. At Mr. Saunders' suggestion, resolutions were presented to and enacted by the Congress in 1948 and again in 1949 calling upon the President to proclaim a period of Memorial Day for prayers for peace. The only difference between these resolutions referred to and the pending resolution is that this resolution makes the law permanent; therefore, hereafter this Presidential proclamation for prayer for peace will follow each year without the necessity of further action by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, one of the honors most coveted by the newspaper fraternity is the annual award of the Pulitzer prize and, when Carl M. Saunders, editor of the Jackson Citizen Patriot, was given this award the other day, we from Michigan were much pleased and feel greatly honored. Mr. Saunders' editorials are outstanding. They are concise, written in plain English, not too long, and are always readable and worth while. A news story appearing in the Citizen Patriot on April 30, 1950, quotes a part of the Pulitzer prize-winning editorial, and reads as follows:

THIS IS EDITORIAL WHICH WON PRIZE

Here is the editorial, entitled "First Things First," for which the Pulitzer prize was awarded to Editor Carl M. Saunders, of the Citizen Patriot:

"A year ago the Citizen Patriot proposed that a period during Memorial Day be set aside to pray for peace.

"Our suggestion was approved by the Congress of the United States in the form of a resolution sponsored by Senator HOMER FERGUSON and Representative EARL C. MICHENER. The resolution called upon President Truman to proclaim a period of Memorial Day for prayers for peace.

"The White House issued the proclamation. From Arlington Cemetery the Chief of Chaplains of the United States Army delivered the prayer for peace, the phrasing of which we proposed.

"America, commemorating the memories of the men who have fallen on far-scattered battlefields that this Nation and its way of life might endure, prayed that further sacrifices of war be avoided.

"What's more logical than that Memorial Day be marked by such a prayer for peace?

"We recite these circumstances only for the purpose of urging that again this year the President proclaim a period of Memorial Day as the proper occasion for Nation-wide supplication for peace.

"Last year the original suggestion was made only 2 weeks before Memorial Day. This year we make the suggestion early enough to permit normal, routine procedure in Congress and again we remind our readers that this is inspired only with realization that armaments and men alone cannot mold the shape of things to come in this world. First things should come first, and a nation which believes in God should not depend upon the materialism of earth to save it from the great tragedy of war.

"We repeat in part the editorial of last May:

" 'The United States is generally classified as a Christian nation.

" 'If it means anything at all, it means that the vast majority of our people accept the basic tenets of Christian faith. Beyond that there is a large minority of Americans who worship in the Hebrew faith. Both Christian and Hebrew believe in God as the Maker of heaven and earth.

" 'Yet as a Nation we seem utterly unaware of God or His place in the making of history.'

"As individuals many Americans worship. Many pray to God daily or more often.

"Why then should not America pray as a Nation in the time when as a Nation we are in dire need of help and guidance?

"We do have one day in the year supposedly dedicated to thanksgiving, when we as a people are expected to offer thanks to the Supreme Being for the blessings showered upon us.

"But we have no day or hour or minute when as a people we turn to prayer.

"If we are a Christian nation, isn't a national moment of prayer a logical, natural course?

"Differences in creed or systems of worship or dogma need not enter into this discussion if as a people we believe that there is a God who shapes the course of our lives.

"It should be possible for Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and others to join in a common appeal to a common God.

"The world is troubled today. America is deeply troubled. The threat of war hangs over all of us. Yet we want peace. We are not a warlike people. We cherish the lives of these young people who become sacrifices in war. We are ready to be tolerant of all nations which do not menace us regardless of divergent ideologies.

"So far as this newspaper is concerned, it believes that the preparation for defense of our country is wise and is not in contravention of basic religious beliefs. We appreciate, of course, that some good people disagree with us. They do not believe a fire department is needed to protect us from war's flames even though conflagration threatens.

"But first things should come first.

"And the first defense against disaster should be prayer. The first appeal for peace should be to the omnipotent Master of the universe."

Mr. Speaker, to me it is significant that these experts, who had the responsibility of selecting the best editorial written in 1949 and appearing in any newspaper in the United States, should select an editorial having to do with prayer. Ours is a Christian nation. We believe in the efficacy of prayer. I am sure we all join in congratulating Mr. Saunders on this merited honor that has come to him. It is hoped our people will join in the spirit of this resolution, and that the day will soon come when war will be no more.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, OF MISSISSIPPI

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom whenever an outstanding Member of the House who is greatly esteemed by his colleagues, and one who has rendered distinguished service to the Congress and to his country has a birthday—the happy occasion is brought to the attention of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, in this instance, while the occasion is one of felicitations, and an opportunity for us to express our sentiments and acknowledge our respect, admiration, and thanks to one who has rendered such distinguished and unfailing service and devotion to his work and to his country; there is also a pang of regret and sorrow combined in our feelings, for we learn that our distinguished colleague has announced that at the end of this session he will retire from the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have therefore asked for this time to call to the attention of the House, and to express to our colleague, the Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, our sincere wishes for a happy birthday, on this his seventy-second anniversary, and to wish him future health, success, contentment, and a full measure of happiness, all of which he has so well earned, and to which he is so deserving.

Mr. Speaker, I am not able to properly express myself; however, I do not know of a finer tribute which could be given to anyone than that given to Mr. WHITTINGTON by a resolution, adopted by a standing vote, adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in annual convention assembled in Washington, D. C., on March 25, 1950, and which I shall read at this point:

RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS OF HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

Since the Government of the United States has recognized its obligation and responsibility in regard to the development and utilization of our water resources, and over a period of nearly 30 years in the Congress of the United States there is one man who, at great personal and financial sacrifice, over and above all others has made the greatest contribution in the study, initiation, securing authorizations, appropriations, and completion of the great programs and projects of navigation, flood control, power development, irrigation, and water resource development.

During the long period of years as member and chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, and later upon the reorganization of House committees, as chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, his unlimited energy, outstanding ability, sound judgment, administration, and guidance has made possible great public works which will inure and endure to the benefit and protection of our country and people, and which will be living and lasting monuments to their author and champion.

In our organization his service covers State vice president for the State of Mississippi, national director, and senior national vice president.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress regrets profoundly the announcement of the decision of Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, to retire as a Member of the Congress of the United States, for especially at this time the country can ill afford to lose in the Congress the presence and influence of such a statesman and patriotic American of the stature of our friend and coworker.

Our gratitude goes to Mr. WHITTINGTON in his unselfish contribution to the cause to which he was devoted, and we extend our sincere wishes for his health and happiness, and notwithstanding the above, we express the sincere hope that it may yet be possible for him to reconsider his decision to retire.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Mississippi delegation, and the people of Mississippi generally, I wish to join in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana with reference to my honorable colleague, Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON. Alexander Pope said that "An honest man is the noblest work of God." Few men have had more experience—more controversial experience—I will say, in this House than I have. But I have learned the value of common honesty as the greatest attribute a Member of Congress can possess. My distinguished colleague, WILL WHITTINGTON, possesses that virtue to the fullest extent. Not only that, but he has two other great qualifications—ability and moral courage, the courage of his convictions.

He has rendered great service to the people of this country. The people of Mississippi will all join in honoring him for the great services he has rendered to his State and his country.

May he spend the evening of his career in quiet and ideal peace, conscious of a well-spent life and confident of its everlasting good, is my earnest prayer.

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy on occasions like this to talk. But on an occasion like this, a special occasion, I cannot remain silent. I have known our colleague from Mississippi intimately during all the years of his service in the House of Representatives. It has been my privilege to appear before his committee when he was chairman. There might, in my experience of many long years, have been as good chairmen of committees but there never has been a better chairman of a committee than WILL WHITTINGTON. When he brings a bill to the floor of the House he knows all about it and the reasons therefor. He is one of the most capable, one of the most efficient, and one of the most industrious Members of the House I have ever known. He is in the top bracket of effective and able Members of the House of Representatives with whom I have served.

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to follow our eminent Speaker and to join with him, as a fellow Member and as majority leader, in his eloquent remarks about our dear friend WILL WHITTINGTON. Yesterday I spoke about our distinguished friend and told of the high regard I have for him. Therefore, I will not speak further today, but I do want at this moment to join with my colleagues in extending our congratulations to him and expressing to him the deep esteem and strong feeling of friendship we have for him.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 5 years ago I came to this body and immediately became acquainted with Chairman WILL WHITTINGTON. During the ensuing months I came to admire and respect him greatly. It became my good fortune in July 1947 to be placed upon the Committee on Public Works, where Mr. WHITTINGTON was then the ranking Democrat. Succeeding to the chairmanship when the Democrats took control as a result of the 1948 election, I have continued to serve with and under WILL WHITTINGTON as a member of the Committee on Public Works to the present time. I can say to you that I know of no man of my acquaintance, outside of my own family, for whom I hold a higher regard, greater respect, or more enduring appreciation than WILL WHITTINGTON. He has a wealth of knowledge,

a boundless energy, an infinite capacity that far transcends that of the average Member of this Congress.

I regret exceedingly, Mr. Speaker, that we of this House, that the people of this Nation, and his State and district will no longer have the benefit of his services at the end of this session.

I congratulate you, Mr. WHITTINGTON, upon your many years of faithful service, and I wish you many more years of equal enjoyment in life.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. As one who served on the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] for 10 years, I want to pay tribute to his honesty, integrity, and ability.

I have seen various chiefs in the Corps of Engineers come before the committee, and I have seen various other engineers come before the committee and discuss flood-control problems all over the Nation, but the information possessed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was not surpassed by anyone. The knowledge which he had of flood-control problems all over the Nation was astounding. You could not mention a creek or a river anywhere in the Nation but what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] could tell you a great deal about it, what had been done, and what was proposed to be done. His knowledge was astounding to all of us. I consider him today the greatest living authority on the subject of flood control in general.

I am happy to pay tribute to him. We in Louisiana have appreciated throughout the years the work which the gentleman from Mississippi, WILL WHITTINGTON, has done for flood control. We regret to see him leave this House. Our good wishes go with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as the junior member of the Mississippi delegation in Congress, I may say that I started to school the year that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] began his long and productive career in the House of Representatives. Throughout my years in school, and since, I have learned to associate the name of WILL WHITTINGTON with public service and statesmanship.

I join the Mississippi delegation and my other colleagues in the House in extending my congratulations to Mr. WILL WHITTINGTON on this birthday occasion, and to wish him and his charming wife many more such happy occasions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to serve on a committee whose chairman is thoroughly familiar with every piece of legislation and all of the subject matter back of every piece of legislation that comes before that committee. It is nice to serve on a committee with a chairman who is courteous and kind to every witness, and yet, at the same time, compels those witnesses to hew to the line and not waste the time of committee members. It is nice to serve on a committee whose chairman is courteous and gracious and fair to each and every member of his own committee. It is nice, Mr. Speaker, to serve under a chairman who is equally fair and considerate of the members of his own committee at all times, whether in committee or on the floor of the House.

All of those qualities, as well as many others, are possessed by our chairman of the Committee on Public Works, Mr. WILL WHITTINGTON. I personally have considered it a great honor to serve on the Public Works Committee under Mr. WHITTINGTON's leadership. I regret exceedingly that he has decided not to remain with us. Mississippi's gain will be America's loss.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress 10 years ago I was fortunate enough to be assigned to the Committee on Flood Control. The chairman of that committee at that time was the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. I was a youngster then. I learned a great deal about the conduct of committees in the House of Representatives. I do not know of a chairman who has served in this body presiding over a committee who has done as effective a job as has the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. One thing of which you could always be sure was that if you had a meritorious case to present to his committee, you would always get justice from the gentleman from Mississippi, for he is possessed of judicial temperament, and a basic sense of fairness that would insure to each and every Member of this body his day in court, so to speak. I have always counted it a great pleasure and a great experience, a great lesson in fairness also, to have been a member of the committee presided over by our distinguished friend from Mississippi; and I want to join my colleagues in wishing him, his wife, and his family much happiness in the years to come.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago the Triple Cities area of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott were the victims of the ravages of the Susquehanna River in one of the most disastrous floods in history. Thousands of workers were left homeless, factories were washed out, and our section suffered irrecoverably as a result of that terrible flood. We had one friend at the time on the Committee on Flood Control, its chairman, Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman from Mississippi personally visited our district and was responsible more than any other one man for bringing about the passage of the appropriation which erected flood walls in Binghamton. Today, 15 years later, we are beset with the same challenge farther down the Susquehanna.

Five years ago the gentleman from Mississippi enabled a start to be made on the flood-control project which we are still anxious to see completed. In spite of the personal opposition on the home front, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Hall amendment, accepted by Chairman WHITTINGTON and the Congress, was and still is the only successful legislative action taken by either House to forward and construct our Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City floodwalls. Oh, we have the powers that be who like to gloss over this but it is true, nevertheless. It has been Mr. WHITTINGTON's friendship in each case, in each request that I have made, and others interested in it, that has brought about a friendly attitude on the part of the House for this project. Although we did not get what we wanted yesterday, it was not Mr. WHITTINGTON's fault. I know a few who helped block this and they got encouragement from right back home from a handful who have worked day and night against our people out of personal spite toward me.

I wish to rise on this occasion and pay tribute to the man whom I consider to be one of the foremost and most constructive chairmen this committee has ever had. He will be missed by the country; he will be missed by our section, and will be missed by the Congress.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a minority member of the Committee on Public Works, I, too, wish to add my words to the commendation that has been given to our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Mississippi. I deem it one of the great pleasures I have had in the Congress to serve on this committee under the very fine chairmanship of the gentleman from Mississippi. I can certainly testify, as has already been said, that no one has been more diligent in the work he has had to perform than has he. The remarkable career he has had here in the House is due to his great energy, his great understanding, and his great sense of fairness. I think every Member of the House on both sides joins with me in that statement with reference to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. LARCADE. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as a Mississippian and a colleague of my distinguished friend, I feel some humility here in addressing my colleagues on this occasion, because as a Mississippian this is a tribute, in my opinion, to a great Mississippian and, therefore, a tribute to the State of Mississippi. Of course, we in Mississippi regret seeing our distinguished colleague retiring from the Halls of this Congress where he has served so long and so ably. Whether you always agree with him or not, the meticulousness of his mind, the depth of his energy and the boundless nature of his industry have always been most admirable as you find it in this distinguished man.

WILL WHITTINGTON, in addition to being a great Mississippian, is a distinguished Member of this Congress. His career reflects the possibilities of what America means. A man, who was born not of great wealth but of an average southern family, by his own industry and

by his own effort achieved not great wealth but a substantial amount of this world's goods, so that his family, his devoted wife and children, should anything happen to him, would not have to worry about their economic lot. Under the private-enterprise system, which has made America the envy of the civilized world, this man has been able by his own efforts to rise to a position of prominence and substantial stability.

WILL WHITTINGTON has been desirous of retiring from the Congress for a number of years. Members of his family have wanted him to retire. Two years ago he announced that he was going to retire, but the people of his congressional district, with the faith that they had in him, persuaded him to reconsider and the three distinguished men down there who had announced they would be candidates to succeed him withdrew and gave him that honor again without opposition, a great tribute to a great Mississippian. He could stay in Congress from that district, and I know whereof I speak, as long as he desires; but he feels, with justification, that after 26 years of faithful service to his people and his country he is entitled to retire.

I am sure that when he goes out of the Halls of this Congress he will carry with him the respect and devotion of his colleagues who have served with him throughout these years. We appreciate this great honor that you have paid our colleague here on this occasion.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of the House, it has been a great pleasure and a great education for me to serve under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. There are few people who could handle the complex and multitudinous problems before the Committee on Public Works as effectively and as intelligently as he.

This is Mr. WHITTINGTON's seventy-second birthday. I regret that he will not be a candidate so that we could join in future celebrations in his honor. The House will lose an invaluable Member and the Nation a great statesman with his retirement. We all wish him the very best in health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed to me that the House of Representatives with its 435 Members in many, many ways, is just about like other organizations of comparable membership existing in our land. In such organizations, whenever we have a colleague or an associate who is honest and able and helpful and sincere and courageous, whom we respect and admire, it is always with deep regret that we have him retire from our membership. I am sure that all of us who have been privileged to serve here with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] experience that regret in his decision to retire from this body. Certainly we shall all miss his wise counsel, his able leadership as chairman of the great committee on which he has served, and his general interest in not only the problems of the Nation but the problems of all of us as we have had occasion from time to time to take them to him.

But certainly, sir, to my colleague from Mississippi may I say that you have well earned this retirement. I hope you will have many pleasures in the years that are yet before you, that you get to do some of the things that possibly you have not been able to do because of your very arduous service here in the House of Representatives, but above and beyond all that, I trust that from time to time your path will again lead you to the city of Washington, where we can again greet you and grasp your hand.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this occasion pass without paying tribute to our splendid friend and colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WILL WHITTINGTON. Like most matters coming to the Congress, flood control does not apply the same and therefore is not always taken the same way in all areas, and there have been times when the people in my area and myself have differed with some of the programs that have become effective in my area as a result of legislation passed before I came here. On an occasion like this we come to realize, more than ever, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], has rendered long and splendid public service. He is a splendid American and a credit to the Nation. While this occasion comes up today on his birthday, and at a time when we are considering flood control, we cannot help but think that his services have been much broader and much wider than his service on his committee, because there is mighty little that goes on in this Congress that many people know more about or are more fully informed on than the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WILL WHITTINGTON. Mr. WHITTINGTON has made the statement that he wishes to retire while he is active and able to carry on his personal affairs back home, where the people have been so good to him, at a time when he can thoroughly appreciate and enjoy them. Certainly he is quitting at a time when he is most active and influential. I hope he will have many, many years to come to do those things he has wished for many years to do. In his zeal and effort to serve his people and the people of the country he has stayed here. We hate to see him go. Frankly, many of us tried to talk him out of it, but we could not argue with his viewpoint, and that is, that he is entitled to at least the years ahead to do as he wishes and not give the same attention to public affairs that he has through the years he has been here.

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1943 my colleague from New Mexico, the then Congressman CLINTON P. ANDERSON, now Senator ANDERSON, pointing out the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] to me the first day in the House, said, "There is a man you can follow with full confidence. You want to get acquainted with him."

Through my years of service here I have found that everything CLINT ANDERSON said about the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is absolutely true. My life has been made richer by my good fortune in being acquainted with him and by my having had the opportunity of observing him in action here in Congress. Always the perfect gentleman under any and all circumstances, he has been an inspiration to the rest of us.

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word to what has been said about our distinguished chairman the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. It has been my privilege to serve with him many years and serve under him as my chairman.

I do not know whether it has already been said, but the Committee on Public Works intends to honor him tonight by giving a dinner at one of the hotels here in Washington, and at that time to express our esteem for him personally and our appreciation for the splendid service he has rendered the Nation.

It has been said that of all the achievements a man can attain, success is the one that stands uppermost in the minds of his fellow men. Some people think success comes as a matter of luck or as a matter of birth or as a matter of circumstance. I am not of that opinion. Success usually comes as a matter of hard work. If there is any man in this body who typifies and is the symbol of hard work, it is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

I do not know, of course, what his future plans and program may be. I do know that he has achieved success in three different fields: Success as a legislator in public life, success as a planter, and success in a material way. We are proud of him because of that success. He has made his contribution to his country, to his State, and to his district. When he leaves us we will lose one of the ablest men of the House of Representatives. We wish him well wherever he goes and whatever he does.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the first lessons we learn when we come to the House is that no man is indispensable. Great men have served in this House and have affected profoundly the history not only of our own Nation but of the world, and then have passed across the stage and disappeared in the obscurity of time, leaving no notable mark behind them, and have been completely forgotten.

But there are a chosen few who are exceptions to that rule, men who have rendered such outstanding and distinguished service in the House of Representatives that they have left an imprint on the pages of history and in the record of the House which will never be

erased. One of those is our colleague from Mississippi, WILL WHITTINGTON.

I have often thought, Mr. Speaker, there should be an amendment to the Constitution under which no Member who has rendered valuable service here who seeks to retire voluntarily should be allowed to retire without a vote of approval by the House. If that were the law now and if a vote were taken today on the retirement of the gentleman from Mississippi he would find himself in a hopeless minority and his colleagues would vote unanimously to retain him here in the House where his work has been so fruitful throughout his long and distinguished career and where he is so needed in the years to come. It is possible, Mr. Speaker, that one reason such an amendment to the Constitution has not been adopted is that some of the rest of us here perhaps might be asked to retire before we were ready to go. But the gentleman from Mississippi has left such indelible footprints on the sands of time in his service to his constituency, to the Congress, and to his country that he can look back, and we can look back, to his tenure here and to his lovable personality with affection, pride, and gratification through all the years to come.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point on the life and services of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have this opportunity to pay my respects to one of the finest men I have ever met and who is a great glory to the House of Representatives—WILL WHITTINGTON. It has been my privilege to serve on the Rivers and Harbors Committee and later the Committee on Public Works since I have been a Member of Congress, and I have had the great experience of being associated with Mr. WHITTINGTON when he was chairman of that committee.

His outstanding clarity of thought, his fair-mindedness in approaching any subject under discussion, his dignified firmness in handling witnesses appearing before the committee, and his keen darts of wit which were always without barbs, not only endeared him to those who were associated with him but also marked him as a leader of extraordinary ability.

His decision not to run again for membership in the House is indeed a great loss, not alone to the House itself but more particularly to the committee to which he has given such great service, and I know that the memory of his association will linger long.

But this note of sadness at his leaving his work in the Congress of the United States must be tempered at this time with our joy in knowing that on this, his seventy-second birthday, he enjoys such robust health. WILL WHITTINGTON can never grow old with his active mind and his young outlook on the great problems which face us, and I extend to him my wishes for many happy returns of this great day. May the friendships which he has formed here lighten his path the rest of the days of his life, and may he realize that those friendships are enduring.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues to pay tribute to one of the finest men ever to serve in the Congress.

Congressman WILL WHITTINGTON was elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress. He has served the people of his district and the Nation for 26 years. It has been my privilege to serve under his leadership as a member of the Public Works Committee, and I know firsthand of the valuable contribution that he has made, not only to the State of Mississippi but to the good and welfare of our Nation as a whole.

It will be a distinct loss, not only to the people of his district but to the Congress of the United States and the Nation, to have a man of his ability, honesty, courage, and leadership leave us. Especially today does this country need men of his caliber than ever before in its history.

I would like to also congratulate him on this, his birthday, and wish for him and Mrs. Whittington good health and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of this body in congratulating our distinguished colleague, Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, on the occasion of his seventy-second birthday and in paying tribute to him as one of the ablest, most honest, and courageous men who has been privileged to serve in this body. His voluntary retirement from Congress at the end of his present term of office is not only a great loss to his district and the State of Mississippi, but also to the entire Nation. Mr. WHITTINGTON enjoys the friendship, esteem, and respect of every Member of this House. He has not only been successful as a Member of the House of Representatives, but also outstanding and successful in the business field. He is not only a man of unusual ability, but one who has devoted his time and energy to the task at hand, finding no time to waste but ample time to counsel and advise with fellow Members, both young and old, on matters in which they were interested or needed help.

Again I wish to congratulate him and wish for him, his charming wife, and distinguished family many years of continued happy and prosperous living.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, all of us on the Public Works Committee are happy today to see such great numbers of our colleagues speaking in high praise of our distinguished chairman, Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi. We feel that we know him just a bit better than many. However, it is a real delight now to recognize more fully than ever before that his good works have endeared him to our colleagues regardless of the section of the country from which they come and without regard to political party.

This is his birthday. Fortunate are we to be able to congratulate him in his presence and on the floor of the House while he is in vigorous health, quick of mind, and can foresee many happy and useful years yet ahead.

With all due deference to all committee chairmen, and we have some mighty good ones, we think that the chairman of our committee is the greatest of them all. There is no more methodical, more thorough, nor more able man in the Congress of the United States. He seems to have abundant energy and a capacity to remember details. He knows the history of every river in the United States. He has an unlimited knowledge covering over-all flood problems and an uncanny way of remembering specific local requirements. When he conducts a hearing on any matter, be it rivers and harbors, flood control, public buildings and grounds, or roads, it is done faithfully, thoroughly, intelligently, and nothing ever seems to be left out of the record. Motivated always by the noblest impulses, with a big heart and a well-trained mind, he is courteous to members of the committee, to witnesses, to all associates, and certainly ever loyal to that which is right and that which is to the best interest of his country.

Mr. WHITTINGTON enjoys a beautiful home life. His two sons are very successful. His daughter is accomplished and well educated. His wife is one of the loveliest persons anyone has the privilege to know. Devoted as a husband, loved as a father, and a genuine friend, he has crowned his career with eminent success and distinction.

While we are happy to congratulate him on his birthday and to wish him many more years of happiness and usefulness, we are saddened at the thought that he is voluntarily resigning from the Congress at the conclusion of this session. It seems too bad that in these days when men good and true and well qualified are so much in demand that we should lose his valued services. But we cannot be selfish. He is entitled to seek some of the pleasure which hard work and attention to public duty has denied him.

It is with a feeling of genuine gladness and yet sincere sadness that we give him humble praise today and express regret that we shall not have him actively among us in the next Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I want to raise my voice along with the others who have paid tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON has rendered a great service to the entire Nation. His record in this body has been outstanding. He always possesses an abundance of information concerning the matters coming under his jurisdiction. He is a tireless worker and a man of high character.

It was my privilege to serve on a committee of which he was the chairman. He was always fair, courteous, and considerate. I think he is one of the outstanding committee chairmen of all time. As a presiding officer in this House he has few equals and no superiors. He is rated by all as a most able and effective Representative. He has brought great honor to his district, his State, and his Nation.

As he leaves this body, I want to extend to him my very best wishes for many years of happiness and contentment. He has earned his retirement.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I am happy to add my words of praise for our esteemed chairman of the Public Works Committee. As a freshman Member of the House and also a member of the Public Works Committee who has relied heavily upon the wise counsel and guidance of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], I regret exceedingly his intention to retire from this body.

Having attended many hundreds of meetings of all kinds in the business world; in labor-management conferences; in chamber of commerce and civic work, I can truthfully say that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is the most efficient chairman I have ever seen in operation. It has been a pleasure and an education to attend the meetings of the Public Works Committee conducted by the illustrious gentleman from Mississippi. Mr. WHITTINGTON, with his vast knowledge and experience, possesses the knack of getting right down to the essentials, the important facts pertaining to the issues which come before his committee. His streamlined, businesslike methods will be sorely missed.

I believe I speak for our senior Senator from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS MYERS, as well as for Representatives GUS KELLEY, HERMAN EBERHARTER, FRANK BUCHANAN, JAMES FULTON, and ROBERT CORBETT, in expressing our deep gratitude to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] whose great work in flood control has so richly benefited the people of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania. We in Pennsylvania say: "Thank you, Mr. WHITTINGTON and the fine hard-working members of your hard-working committee for the Conemaugh River Dam, the Tionesta Reservoir, the Crooked Creek Reservoir, the Mahoning Creek Reservoir, the east branch Clarion River Reservoir, the Youghiogheny River Reservoir.

Only the other day, this House passed the rivers and harbors bill which includes $29,000,000 for navigation improvements along the Monongahela River in western Pennsylvania.

No man has better earned the gratitude of all Americans than the gentleman from Mississippi; no Member of this House has better deserved the affection we all have for him. We can ill afford to lose Members of his great attainments in the field of public works. The results of his great achievements will continue to bring benefits to the American people, to American economy for a long, long time to come. The example of his tireless efforts as chairman of the Public Works Committee is an inspiration to all of us to endeavor to become as worthy and as valuable public servants as the great Congressman from Mississippi, Mr. WILLIAM WHITTINGTON.

HIS COLLEAGUES AND THE COUNTRY SO RICHLY ENTITLED HIM "A REAL STATESMAN"

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I, as one of the newer members of the House Committee on Public Works, wish to associate myself with my distinguished colleagues who have just spoken in paying tribute to the able and forthright chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Daily, as I have sat upon that committee I have been amazed at the tremendous fund of information the gentleman from Mississippi possesses on all the river-and-harbor and flood-control projects of this great and growing Nation. It seems almost unbelievable that one man could ever have assembled such a mass of detailed data about all of these many and varied projects as has our chairman. I doubt if there is in all the country, in either the Congress or in the Corps of Army Engineers which has direction of these projects, anyone with so much knowledge about the river-and-harbor and flood-control projects of our country.

But even of deeper impression upon me has been our chairman's unfailing courtesy and kindness to every member of the committee and his unfailing fairness, frankness, sincerity and honesty.

I have observed that everyone, new member as well as veteran member, and Republican as well as Democrat, gets a full and fair hearing at his hands. The same impartiality and objectiveness marks his final decisions for he passes on all projects on their merits and their value to the national economy.

This is as it should be and, in my opinion, makes it fitting and appropriate that our chairman, Mr. WHITTINGTON, should come within that select group who properly can be called statesmen.

I felt deep regret when I learned that our colleague, Mr. WHITTINGTON, is not to seek reelection and is retiring at the end of this term from the Congress. His work here, however, will live on long after his departure from this Chamber, for his career and conduct here remains as an example and inspiration to all of us who may remain. All of us, I am sure, will ever seek to emulate the fine example he has set for us. I wish Mr. WHITTINGTON, as a colleague and a friend, the happy future in private life to which the great service he has rendered entitles him.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join at this time in the sincere expression of regard for the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable WILL WHITTINGTON.

Since our colleague first made known his determination to retire at the end of his present term of office, he has been the subject of numerous and heartfelt tributes from his friends.

What has been said has been tinged with regret. While it is pleasant to contemplate the richly deserved leisure which will come to Mr. WHITTINGTON, it is difficult to reconcile ourselves to his leaving the chairman's chair in the great Committee on Public Works.

Under his conscientious and effective leadership, this important agency of the House has come to be regarded as one of our most efficient committees. Mr. WHITTINGTON has presided with fairness and has been an uncompromising defender of the principle of adequate and intelligible public hearings.

All of us are familiar with the scrupulous attention to detail for which our colleague is most notable. His day-by-day attention to the agenda of the committee has made it possible at all times to learn quickly the exact status of any matter under its consideration.

From time to time, I have had occasion to confer with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works with respect to problems affecting my State and district. On every occasion, I have found him ready to listen attentively, to give valued counsel and to assist in every way within his power. I know how much this can mean to a Member of the House who does not happen to be a member of his committee and who must, of necessity, fall behind in his information on proceedings of the Committee on Public Works.

I know it is the wish of every Member of this body that Mr. WHITTINGTON will enjoy many years of less strenuous and more pleasurable life, but that he will carry with him in retirement the realization of the high respect, admiration and friendship which his colleagues have been most happy to accord him.

He has given honored service to the people of Mississippi and the Nation.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes."

AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. DOC. NO. 2004)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 9 of the Act entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', approved August 2, 1939, is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:

"'(b) If in the case of any person violating the provisions of this section it is found by the United States Civil Service Commission that such violation warrants removal

he shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any Act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. If the Commission finds by unanimous vote that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission: *Provided,* That in no case shall the penalty be less than thirty days suspension without pay: *Provided further,* That in the case of any person who has heretofore been removed from the service under the provisions of this section, the Commission shall upon request reopen and reconsider the record in such case. If it shall find by a unanimous vote that the acts committed were such as to warrant a penalty of less than removal it shall issue an order revoking the restriction against reemployment in the position from which removed, or in any other position for which he may be qualified.

"'(c) At the end of each fiscal year the Commission shall report to the President for transmittal to the Congress the names, addresses, and nature of employment of all persons with respect to whom action has been taken by the Commission under the terms of this section, with a statement of the facts upon which action was taken, and the penalty imposed.

"'(d) Records containing testimony or other evidence relevant to charges and allegations of a violation or violations of this Act in proceedings had pursuant to this section shall be made available to either the Senate or the House of Representatives upon the request of any committee thereof.'

"SEC. 2. Section 16 of such Act is amended by striking out 'to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons' and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided,* That no regulations promulgated under this section permitting any person to take part in political management or political campaigns shall impose any restrictions on his doing so through the medium of any political organization or political party of his own choosing, including participation as an individual, candidate or manager in primaries, conventions, caucuses, or meetings of any such political organization or politcal party.'

"SEC. 3. Section 612 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'§ 612. Publication or distribution of political statements

"'Whoever willfully publishes or distributes, or for the purpose of publishing or distributing the same, knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, or knowingly transports in interstate commerce any card, pamphlet, circular, poster, dodger, advertisement, writing, or other statement relating to or concerning any person who has publicly declared his intention to seek the office of President, or Vice President of the United States, or Senator or Representatives in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress, in a primary, general, or special election, or convention of a political party, or has caused or permitted his intention to do so to be publicly declared, which does not contain the names of the persons, associations, committees, and corporations responsible for the publication or distribution of the same, and the names of the officers of each such association, committee, or corporation, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

BURR P. HARRISON,
CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN C. STENNIS,
G. M. GILLETTE,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference.

The House bill would have amended section 9 (b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939 (hereafter referred to in this statement as the "Hatch Act"), to provide that after any agency which is responsible for enforcing the Hatch Act with respect to an employee has determined that such employee has violated section 9, he shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him if the Civil Service Commission should find that the violation warranted removal, but that if the Commission should find that the violation did not warrant removal a lesser penalty should be imposed by direction of the Commission. The House bill also provided that removals which occurred prior to the date of enactment of the bill should be reconsidered and that, if the Commission should find that the violation did not warrant dismissal, it should issue an order revoking the restriction against reemployment in the position from which the employee was removed, or in any position for which he might be qualified.

The Senate amendment contained provisions similar to those in the House bill except that it would permit the lesser penalty to be imposed only if the Commission, after hearing, found by unanimous vote that the violation was not willful, and would have provided that in no case could the lesser penalty be less than 60 days' suspension without pay.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the language of the House bill but provides in addition that a penalty of less than removal can be imposed only by unanimous vote of the Commission, and that in no case shall a penalty of less than 30 days' suspension without pay be imposed. The provision of the Senate amendment requiring a hearing to be held before a penalty of less than removal is imposed, and the provision that the lesser penalty could be imposed only in cases where it is found by the Commission that the violation was not willful, are not included in the conference substitute.

The Senate amendment would have added two new subsections to section 9 of the Hatch Act. No similar provisions were contained in the House bill. The first of these would have provided that the Civil Service Commission should make a report to the Senate and House of Representatives at the end of each calendar month containing certain information respecting cases on which action had been taken under section 9 during that month. The conference substitute provides that such information shall be reported to the President for transmittal to the Congress at the end of each fiscal year.

The second subsection added to section 9 by the Senate amendment would have provided that testimony in all hearings had pursuant to section 9 should be made available to the Senate or House of Representatives upon request of a committee thereof. The conference substitute provides that records containing testimony taken in any hearings or other evidence relevant to charges and allegations of a violation or violations of the Hatch Act in proceedings had pursuant to section 9 shall be made available to either the Senate or House of Representatives upon the request of any committee thereof.

Section 16 of the Hatch Act would have been revised by the Senate amendment. The House bill contained no similar provisions. Section 16 at present reads as follows:

"SEC. 16. Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission determines that, by reason of special or unusual circumstances which exist in any municipality or other political subdivision, in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in the States of Maryland and Virginia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States, it is in the domestic interest of persons to whom the provisions of this Act are applicable, and who reside in such municipality or political subdivision, to permit such persons to take an active part in the political management or in political campaigns involving such municipality or political subdivision, the Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations permitting such persons to take an active part in such political management and political campaigns to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons."

This section would have been revised and rewritten by the Senate amendment to provide that whenever, in any municipality, county, or political subdivision of a county in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital in Maryland or Virginia, 10 percent or more of the qualified voters are employed by the Federal or District of Columbia Government, or, in any municipality, county, or political subdivision of a county of any State, the majority of the qualified voters are persons employed by the Federal Government, it shall be lawful for any resident of such an area to whom the Hatch Act applies to participate actively in certain political activities of a partisan nature on a local level, including participation in primaries, conventions, caucuses, or mass meetings sponsored by political parties and including participation as a candidate seeking office as the nominee of any such party.

In order to avoid problems of administration and difficulties of interpretation which were present in the Senate amendment, the substitute agreed upon in conference strikes out of the present section 16 the words "to the extent the Commission deems to be in the domestic interest of such persons" and inserts in lieu thereof: "*Provided,* That no regulations promulgated under this section permitting any person to take part in political management or political campaigns shall impose any restrictions on his doing so through the medium of any political organization or political party of his own choosing, including participation as an individual, candidate or manager in primaries, conventions, caucuses, or meetings of any such political organization or political party."

The amendment of the Senate would have added a new paragraph to section 612 of title 18 of the United States Code (which makes the publication or distribution of certain political statements a crime) which would make it a crime to deposit in the mail any of the political statements the publication or distribution of which is forbidden by the present section 612, and would have provided that a person violating the paragraph should be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The conference substitute uses different language to reach a result the same as that reached by the Senate amendment, except that the conference substitute adopts the penalty provision at present in section 612

and makes it a crime to knowingly transport such political statements in interstate commerce.

BURR P. HARRISON,
CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain the report?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, the main part of this bill provides for an amendment to the Hatch Act to change the punishment prescribed in that act. Under existing law, any violation of the Hatch Act must be punished by dismissal. That has worked considerable hardship in many cases. The purpose of the provision of the bill dealing with that is to permit the Civil Service Commission, by a unanimous vote, to impose a lesser penalty, provided such penalty is not less than 30 days' suspension without pay. As I say, the vote to do so must be unanimous.

The second feature of the bill provides that the Civil Service Commission shall make an annual report to the President for report to the Congress, of the cases acted upon and the reasons why a punishment less than dismissal was given in such cases.

The third feature of the bill provides that either the House or the other body may call upon the Civil Service Commission for the testimony submitted in any case. It is the legislative intention here to limit that right to such testimony as was taken and not to authorize the calling for other matters which may be confidential.

The fourth feature of the bill is to take care of a local situation existing in nearby counties of Virginia and Maryland.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just what does that provide?

Mr. HARRISON. Under existing law, a Federal officeholder in those counties may participate in local elections, under regulations to be approved by the Civil Service Commission. That is limited under existing law to local elections. The Civil Service Commission has issued a regulation that enables such Federal officeholders to participate, provided they do so in a nonpartisan manner.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is in city elections?

Mr. HARRISON. City and county elections. The purpose of this bill is to allow them to participate in any party of their choice. If they want to be Republicans, they can be Republicans. If they want to be Democrats, they can be Democrats.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How do you construe that as nonpartisan?

Mr. HARRISON. It is not our object to construe any organization that holds conventions, adopts platforms, and so on, as not being a political party.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A national political party?

Mr. HARRISON. Well, I do not regard it as any sin to belong to a national political party.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And I do not, but you bring out the fact that it is supposed to be nonpartisan. If he contests either as a Republican or as a Democrat, it certainly is not nonpartisan.

Mr. HARRISON. The purpose of the amendment is designed to change the existing regulation, which permits participation, and allows him to run for office, provided he does not run on either the Democratic or the Republican ticket. The purpose of this is to allow him to participate in any way he wants to, provided it is a local election.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This practically puts the act out of the window?

Mr. HARRISON. No; I disagree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This conference report represents a compromise like much of the legislation of Congress. I think I might say to the minority leader, this is special legislation for a peculiar situation in the adjacent districts. I do not like special legislation for the benefit of a special area or a special group. The bill gave the conference committee a great deal of difficulty. The version of the bill as it passed the House was far different from the bill that was adopted by the Senate. As a matter of fact, this bill passed the House more than a year ago. Finally, it was agreed that if we are going to have participation in politics in the area adjacent to the District of Columbia, we had better have it at the local level, and have participation in both the regularly organized parties, rather than to attempt to confine it to only so-called nonpartisan movements, and minority groups. There are nonpartisan movements, as we discovered, in the territory adjacent to the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then the act is to discourage nonpartisanship in local elections?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes. As a matter of fact, that is about it. In other words, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission has held that a man, even employed by the Government, living in the territory adjacent to the District of Columbia, may participate in politics at the local level, even to the extent of running for office, if he confines it to a nonpartisan movement. But he could not contribute cash or accept nomination on either the Democratic or Republican ticket or any regularly recognized ticket. That gave rise to a great deal of difficulty, and we felt that if we were going to have participation in politics at the local level in those counties adjacent to the District of Columbia we had better have it in the regular way.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What do you call adjacent? Would Massachusetts be adjacent?

Mr. LECOMPTE. No. The law as it exists at the present time applies to the territory adjacent to the District of Columbia. That is Montgomery County, Arlington County, and Prince Georges County. I think that was the extent of it. There are a number of features in the bill in addition to the provision referred to. The paragraph which restricts the circulation of political propaganda by anonymous groups or individuals in interstate commerce or in the mails will be helpful, I think. The provision which permits the Civil Service Commission by a unanimous vote only to reduce the penalty for minor or technical infractions of the Hatch Act seems very good. The report was finally accepted by all members of the conference committee. On the whole I think the report should be adopted.

Mr. HARRISON. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts there has been a statute on the books for about 10 years, an act authorizing the Civil Service Commission to permit participation in politics on the local level in these areas immediately adjacent to Washington where there are a great many Federal employees. There is a situation in these adjoining counties where most of the people, probably a majority of them, are Federal employees. Naturally, they are interested in their local school boards, their local mayor and council, boards of supervisors, and so forth; yet, under the provisions of the Hatch Act they were absolutely restricted from any participation in their local affairs.

To remedy that situation, about 10 years ago the Congress passed an act allowing the Civil Service Commission to issue regulations authorizing such participation in local affairs. Pursuant to that the Civil Service Commission issued a regulation authorizing participation provided such participation was not in one of the regular standing political parties. In practice this has worked a great injustice. The so-called Nonpartisan League is in fact a political party, and Federal employees who want to be members of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party and who do not want to give up their political affiliations and join a party whose principles they do not subscribe to, have to join such a party in order to participate in their local affairs.

This amendment simply does this: It still leaves the matter under the control and discretion of the Civil Service Commission to the extent that it allows the Commission to determine whether or not they should participate in local affairs, but it does go on to provide that if the Commission does allow participation, the Commission cannot restrict them as to how they are going to participate nor may the Commission examine the platform or the party plan of the party the individual wants to join to determine whether the Federal officeholder should participate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not that leave the Civil Service Commission in complete control of the politics of the adjoining counties, giving them authority to tell an individual how he may participate?

Mr. HARRISON. The purpose of the bill is to do exactly the opposite. The

Civil Service Commission is doing that now.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman just said they had to look to the Civil Service Commission for permission.

Mr. HARRISON. Under existing law, yes. The purpose of the pending bill is to take that away so that if the Civil Service Commission allows them to participate at all they may participate in any political organization they wish to.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the law and the civil-service regulations provide that in the filling of jobs in the Government service each State is entitled to a certain proportion. I came up against that proposition when I became interested in certain individuals from my congressional district. I was given the answer that Pennsylvania already has its quota of civil-service appointments and, therefore, they cannot get any more. My question is whether this is special legislation to benefit Virginia residents and Maryland residents? I have in my congressional district many employees of the Federal Government, not as many as I should like to have, I will say frankly, but the constituents of mine who are on the Federal payroll are not able to participate in local politics. Maryland and Virginia payrollers, however, are able under this legislation to participate in local politics. I am wondering whether or not this is special legislation, and I wish to call that to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. HARRISON. If there is any special legislation here it became special legislation 10 or 12 years ago. The law already provides that the Civil Service Commission may issue a regulation permitting participation in local affairs in these few counties. This simply says that the Commission shall not prevent such activity in the Democratic or Republican Parties. That is all this does.

Mr. EBERHARTER. When the gentleman a few minutes ago specified Maryland and Virginia counties he said they are able to participate in local politics. What about my county? What about the county of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader? What about the county of the majority leader from Massachusetts? They are not able to participate in local politics, but simply because these people are in Virginia or in Maryland we are going to give them a few special privileges. I do not think, as a matter of principle, this House should adopt such a procedure of special regulation.

Mr. HARRISON. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact it does not do that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If it does not do that, why does the gentleman make the statement he does?

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, in order to attempt to briefly clarify what apparently is a misunderstanding, this bill has nothing at all to do with State quotas. Instead of it being nonpartisan, it is in reality bipartisan. I would like to state to the minority leader it has the support and endorsement of the Republican State central committees of the two adjoining counties in Maryland, as well as the Democratic committees. It is aimed at a situation where in some of these precincts voters are 95 percent Government employees. It is to permit them to participate in the same degree in public affairs that the nonpartisans are participating. They can as nonpartisans be for and against candidates, whereas the members of the other parties cannot. It also removes the drastic penalty of mandatory dismissal for slight and unintentional violations, and leaves the matter of punishment in the discretion of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Is it not a fact this repeals part of the Hatch Act for Maryland and Virginia?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, no. The basis for this whole matter was passed some 10 years ago.

Mr. SUTTON. Will not the gentleman agree that the bill I introduced to repeal the Hatch Act all over the country should be adopted if this conference report is agreed to?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Civil Service Commission and the committee are confined to testimony and evidence?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and the final feature, Mr. Speaker, is to make it a criminal offense to publish or distribute anonymous literature in a political campaign.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I did not quite understand the gentleman. Did he in his explanation state that the last provision of this bill undertakes to require the distribution and the publication of campaign material to be properly signed by responsible parties?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Did the gentleman mention that that is in the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 57, noes 56.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. CRAWFORD demanded tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 140, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—203

Abernethy	Garmatz	Mitchell
Addonizio	Gary	Monroney
Albert	Gathings	Morris
Allen, La.	Gordon	Morrison
Andrews	Gore	Morton
Aspinall	Gorski	Multer
Bailey	Gossett	Murdock
Barden	Granger	Murray, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Green	Nicholson
Beall	Gregory	Norrell
Beckworth	Hagen	Norton
Bennett, Fla.	Hand	O'Brien, Ill.
Bentsen	Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.
Biemiller	Hare	O'Konski
Blatnik	Harris	O'Neill
Boggs, La.	Harrison	O'Sullivan
Bolling	Hart	O'Toole
Bolton, Md.	Harvey	Passman
Bonner	Havenner	Patman
Bosone	Hays, Ark.	Patten
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Perkins
Brooks	Hébert	Peterson
Brown, Ga.	Hedrick	Philbin
Bryson	Heffernan	Pickett
Buchanan	Herlong	Poage
Buckley, Ill.	Hobbs	Polk
Buckley, N. Y.	Holifield	Preston
Burdick	Holmes	Rabaut
Burke	Hope	Rains
Burleson	Horan	Ramsay
Burnside	Howell	Rankin
Burton	Irving	Richards
Byrnes, Wis.	Jackson, Wash.	Rivers
Camp	Javits	Rodino
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Carroll	Jones, Mo.	Sadowski
Chelf	Jones, N. C.	Sasscer
Chesney	Karst	Secrest
Christopher	Kee	Shelley
Clemente	Keefe	Sikes
Colmer	Kelley, Pa.	Sims
Combs	Kelly, N. Y.	Spence
Cooley	Kennedy	Staggers
Cooper	Keogh	Stanley
Cox	Kerr	Sullivan
Crook	Kilday	Tackett
Davenport	King	Tauriello
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Teague
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Thomas
Davis, Wis.	Larcade	Thompson
Delaney	LeCompte	Thornberry
Denton	Lesinski	Trimble
Dingell	Lind	Wagner
Dollinger	Lucas	Walter
Donohue	Lyle	Welch
Doughton	Lynch	White, Idaho
Doyle	McCarthy	Whitten
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Whittington
Evins	McGrath	Wier
Fallon	McKinnon	Williams
Feighan	McMillan, S. C.	Wilson, Okla.
Fernandez	McSweeney	Winstead
Fisher	Magee	Withrow
Flood	Mahon	Woodhouse
Forand	Mansfield	Yates
Frazier	Marsalis	Young
Fugate	Marshall	Zablocki
Furcolo	Mills	

NAYS—140

Allen, Calif.	Cunningham	Halleck
Allen, Ill.	Curtis	Herter
Andersen, H. Carl	Dague	Heselton
	Dawson	Hill
Andresen, August H.	D'Ewart	Hinshaw
	Dolliver	Hoeven
Angell	Dondero	Hoffman, Ill.
Arends	Eaton	Hoffman, Mich.
Auchincloss	Eberharter	Huber
Barrett, Wyo.	Ellsworth	Hull
Bates, Mass.	Elston	Jackson, Calif.
Bishop	Engel, Mich.	James
Blackney	Fellows	Jenison
Boggs, Del.	Fenton	Jennings
Bolton, Ohio	Ford	Jensen
Bramblett	Fulton	Johnson
Brehm	Gamble	Jonas
Brown, Ohio	Gavin	Judd
Canfield	Gillette	Karsten
Cannon	Golden	Kean
Case, N. J.	Goodwin	Kearney
Case, S. Dak.	Graham	Kearns
Clevenger	Gross	Keating
Cole, Kans.	Gwinn	Kilburn
Cole, N. Y.	Hale	Kruse
Corbett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lanham
Cotton		Latham
Coudert	Hall, Leonard W.	Lemke
Crawford		Lichtenwalter

Lodge	Phillips, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
Lovre	Phillips, Tenn.	Smith, Kans.
McConnell	Potter	Stefan
McCulloch	Poulson	Stockman
McDonough	Price	Sutton
McGregor	Reed, Ill.	Taber
Mack, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.	Talle
Mack, Wash.	Rees	Tollefson
Marcantonio	Rogers, Mass.	Van Zandt
Martin, Iowa	Sadlak	Velde
Martin, Mass.	St. George	Vorys
Mason	Sanborn	Vursell
Meyer	Saylor	Weichel
Michener	Scott, Hardie	Widnall
Miller, Md.	Scott,	Wigglesworth
Murray, Wis.	Hugh D., Jr.	Wilson, Ind.
Nelson	Scrivner	Wolcott
Norblad	Scudder	Wolverton
O'Hara, Minn.	Shafer	
Patterson	Short	

NOT VOTING—87

Abbitt	Klein	Ribicoff
Anderson, Calif.	Kunkel	Rich
Baring	LeFevre	Riehlman
Barrett, Pa.	Linehan	Rogers, Fla.
Battle	McGuire	Roosevelt
Bennett, Mich.	McMillen, Ill.	Sabath
Boykin	Macy	Sheppard
Bulwinkle	Madden	Simpson, Pa.
Byrne, N. Y.	Merrow	Smathers
Carlyle	Miles	Smith, Ohio
Cavalcante	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Celler	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Morgan	Steed
Chiperfield	Moulder	Stigler
Chudoff	Murphy	Taylor
Crosser	Nixon	Towe
Davies, N. Y.	Noland	Underwood
Deane	O'Brien, Mich.	Vinson
DeGraffenried	Pace	Wadsworth
Douglas	Pfeifer,	Walsh
Durham	Joseph L.	Werdel
Elliott	Pfeiffer,	Wheeler
Fogarty	William L.	Whitaker
Gilmer	Plumley	White, Calif.
Granahan	Powell	Wickersham
Grant	Priest	Willis
Harden	Quinn	Wilson, Tex.
Heller	Redden	Wood
Jacobs	Regan	Woodruff
Jenkins	Rhodes	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Murphy with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Noland with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Battle with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. McGuire with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Baring with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Linehan with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Werdel.

Messrs. WELCH, MAGEE, O'HARA of Illinois, DAVENPORT, HOLIFIELD, WITHROW, and CHRISTOPHER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. LEMKE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VII. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES], and the amendment to that amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. The Committee had agreed that all debate on the Holmes amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HILL. If this amendment to the section for construction and rehabilitation carries, will there be an opportunity to further amend that section? The question relates to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]. His amendment affects the general investigation, and by unanimous consent he is given the privilege of seeking to amend the appropriation fund in the construction and rehabilitation paragraph. My question is this: After his amendment is adopted, can we further amend the section on page 231?

The CHAIRMAN. If the Holmes amendment is adopted you can still amend the paragraph, but not the amount.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] had offered an amendment to cut the appropriation for reclamation projects by $57,000,000. Of all the spending in the United States, none is more justified than this $297,000,000 on reclamation, and now we are asked to cut it by $57,000,000.

When a necessary operation is going on, whether it is on a human being, an animal, a tree, or anything else, you cannot postpone it, you cannot stop it and expect to be successful. In this bill being presented to the Congress today there is no new work. There is not one dime presented in this bill for new construction. Everything has already been under construction. If you cut this $57,000,000 and let it lie right there for a year or two, what happens? That is why I ask, please do not cut this bill. We do know what will happen. I am not condemning anybody in the Eightieth Congress. They probably cut a little too deeply. However, we paid almost $1,000,000 to the contractors on various projects which were stopped for having their vehicles lying right on the job and not at work. Think of the damage that created and think how much it cost the Government. We have not even yet gotten over that. I say again, I hope the Members will not cut $57,000,000 off this appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the record should show that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is not a member of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. The leadership of the Republican Party did not recommend this cut. Also, since the gentleman mentioned the $1,000,000 that was paid to the contractors, the sum was not that large, and that money was allowed during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, the money was allowed, but the damage had been created in the Eightieth Congress. The contractors could not work. The money was, of necessity, appropriated by the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. The Eightieth Congress did not act on the recommendation that we pay back these engineers that were stopped because the Bureau of Reclamation said they were out of funds. Then when we checked the books, we found they had $7,000,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not blame anybody. The fact is we did it. That is what I am trying to put over.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think it ought to be borne in mind, too, that in connection with this particular item in the appropriation bill all the funds for reclamation are reimbursable and will be returned to the United States Treasury. The comment was made yesterday that a 25 percent cut had been made in civil functions, and that, therefore, some similar cut should be made in these items. It should be pointed out that the Budget estimate for reclamation for 1951 was cut substantially under last year, whereas the Budget estimate on civil functions for the fiscal year 1951 is higher than it was in 1950.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his contribution. He is correct. Not one dime of this money is the Government giving to any of the States in which the work is being performed. They all have to pay it back. It all comes back to the Treasury, all this money that is invested in dams or any other part of reclamation. It is not like cutting a service that is being rendered. You are stopping the construction of something that is vital to the United States and the welfare of our people.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. All of the funds are reimbursable except those which are rightly charged to flood control.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, and administration and other such items; but all the funds come back to the Government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I compliment the committee and the gentleman who is now addressing us for the fine work they have done. If you should make a straight-across-the-board 25-percent cut on the project in the district which I have the honor of representing, which project is over 60 percent finished, a 25-percent cut on a project such as that would absolutely delay the completion of the project, and I would not even hazard a guess as to when it would be finished. If we put the money in it now, we would actually be saving the Treasury of the United States money. Is that not correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. We would not only be saving the Treasury's money but we would be saving the money of the people who have to pay it to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Of course.

Mr. KIRWAN. These projects are necessary, are not new, and should be completed. The Congress authorized these projects. The people are paying the money back to the Government, so you are not saving anything for the Government. You are only wasting money by letting projects stand unfinished.

Mr. HILL. We are actually delaying the day when we are going to get water from the project.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. LEMKE. May I also suggest that we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish. Irrigation has brought more money into the Treasury of the United States in the form of income-tax payments than has ever been expended.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Keating amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 23, noes 126.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOLMES) there were—ayes 51, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $297,467,000, of which $22,897,700 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That hereafter when funds appropriated under this head are transferred to the credit of the appropriate regional disbursing officer of the Treasury Department for expenditure in connection with Hoover Dam and related works, such funds, solely for the purpose of computing interest on advances under the provisions of section 2 of the act of December 21, 1928, as amended (43 U. S. C. 617a (b), 617a (d), 618e), shall be considered as if advanced to the Colorado River dam fund.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARROLL: On page 231, line 11, strike "$297,467,000" and substitute "$298,395,000", of which $928,000 is appropriated for the following items of the Colorado-Big Thompson project: Estes-Leyner-Plains 115 kilovolt line and substation, $160,000; Leyner substation, $264,000; and Brighton-Hoyt-Brush portion of Flatiron-Leyner-Brighton-Brush, 115 kilovolt line and substation, $504,000, and".

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, one of the most brilliant fights that was put on in either House of Congress last year was led by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. It was a part of the Democratic platform; it was a plank that we carried to the people and upon which we were elected as a part of that program. We went to the people and we said: We are going to install transmission lines carrying power to the farmers.

The purpose of this amendment is very simple. What I have asked here in substance is that we continue the program that we started at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress to see if we can have something more constructive come out of this session.

Last summer I happened to be with the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], at the time we visited northern Colorado. The farmers in northern and northeastern Colorado came in pleading with us to give them more power to pump water for their farms, to put water on the soil; and some of the greatest 5-minute speeches I ever heard were made by the farm leaders of the rural electrification co-ops.

What I ask here is not appropriations for new work, but that we extend the work that we started in the last session, that we extend the work that we have been carrying on from 2 to 4 years.

I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from northern Colorado [Mr. HILL]. He understands what the people are demanding in his district.

This is not pork barrel; this money is reimbursable; this money will come back to the Government. It is necessary that this program go forward. I should like to say without impugning the motives of this committee, for they have done excellent work. It is true that after the last Interior appropriation bill went over to the Senate the other body struck some of these items. I am merely asking this body to assume its own responsibility.

I note on page 172 of the report there has been an exclusion from the Colorado-Big Thompson project of transmission lines; will the gentleman from Washington be kind enough to tell me why these were excluded?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I shall be pleased to answer the gentleman. First let me commend the gentleman for the very fine stand that he has taken on behalf of public power and the support that he gave the committee a year ago when these transmission lines or similar ones were included by our subcommittee, the full committee, and then by the House. The gentleman will recall that the bill went over to the Senate and these lines were excluded by the Senate Appropriations Committee along with many other lines in the West. Subsequently on the floor of the United States Senate all of the transmission lines that had been deleted by the committee were restored to the bill with the exception of the transmission lines in Colorado and California.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman at that point permit me to interrupt? They were all restored except for California and Colorado?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct; they were all restored except in the States of Colorado and California. When the committee met this year our subcommittee took the position that on those lines which had been excluded by the Senate it would be futile for us to attempt to again include the lines. For that reason and that reason alone these lines were excluded from the bill.

My own position has been that these lines are necessary; they are an integral part of the well-established policy of this Government to provide transmission lines to bring power from the great reclamation and power dams throughout America. In this same connection I may say that it is also an established policy of this Government that public bodies and REA cooperatives should have first preference in the purchase of public power. It follows from this, I believe, that it should also be our policy to build those lines which are necessary to make public power available to such organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. If the gentleman will permit, you must understand the position in which the gentleman from Colorado and other Members find themselves. We should like to press for the passage of this amendment. If we resist the committee, which seems to have so much confidence reposed in it, and if we are

defeated in this amendment, then the record goes to the other body that there has been a rejection of it in the House. If we do not do so, we become derelict in our own duty insofar as the northern part of Colorado and other parts of Colorado are concerned.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Nothing that has been done by this committee in excluding these two lines should be considered as a dereliction of duty on the part of the gentleman from Colorado. It is being done solely because this committee felt there is no point in making futile attempts to include transmission lines that are going to be excluded by the other body. For that reason, and that reason alone, they were excluded. I want to commend the gentleman for his excellent stand on behalf of the entire public-power program and for his diligence in prosecuting his amendments to the bill to include these lines.

Mr. CARROLL. Many of us from Colorado have testified before the Senate committee concerning these transmission lines. Now, may I ask the gentleman without attempting to bind the other members of the committee this question. We have given testimony that these lines are vital to northern and northeastern Colorado. Can we say with any degree of certainty that in the event we are successful in the Senate, it will not be resisted by this committee?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I can only speak at the moment for myself because I have not taken that question up with my colleagues, but based on the history I have given, I think the gentleman would be safe in saying that the committee would in such event certainly go along and approve these lines. I certainly hope that the Senate will change its mind and include these items. On the other hand, the gentleman can see the position of the House committee in attempting to include these items again only to have them taken out in the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. I can appreciate that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the Senate committee will restore these two special items I will do everything I can to see that they are approved when they are brought back. They are in the budget and I think they are needed.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman can appreciate the position I find myself in. If I submit this amendment, if the committee objects to it and it is rejected, then the Senate can say it has been rejected in the House. We are caught in a legislative trap. In the meantime the farmers in northern and northeastern Colorado are the losers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish to commend the gentleman from Colorado for his diligence in presenting this particular amendment. We find ourselves in exactly the same position on the other transmission lines which were referred to by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. In my opinion, these particular lines should have been included in the bill that is before us.

Mr. CARROLL. California has been cut over $4,000,000 and your great electrical program out there has suffered a great set-back. Whether it is because of a fight in the other body or not, the fact remains that both Colorado and California have been unduly discriminated against.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. While I do not want to put myself in the position of criticizing another body, I would say if the same diligence had been shown in the other body in a regard for these particular lines affecting these two particular communities, I am sure they would all be a part of the law of the land.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I would like to say to the gentleman that those of us in California, as our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has said, are in very much the same position. We considered offering an amendment to restore the funds which we thought we should have for transmission line, and the steam plant firming facilities in the Central Valley project, but we decided finally not to do it in view of the position of the subcommittee, as just stated by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. We have a deep regard for the work which this subcommittee has done in sustaining the cause of western reclamation. This subcommittee has been kind to western reclamation, and especially friendly to California, and that is the reason we have not presented an amendment, but we appreciate the opportunity the gentleman from Colorado has provided to clarify the record. That is the reason we have not offered an amendment. But I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado that we thoroughly agree with the necessity for these transmission facilities and the necessity for the steam plants for the Central Valley project. In summary, Mr. Chairman, we agree with the gentleman from Colorado, and we appreciate the opportunity he has afforded to clarify the record.

Mr. CARROLL. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

May I say to the gentleman from California, the colloquy following the offering of my amendment should make the record crystal clear that the items not included by the Committee in the Interior Appropriation bill for both Colorado and California have not been rejected by the House and, further, we have been given strong hope that in the event we are successful in having these items included by the other body, we shall expect a full measure of support as this bill returns to the House.

In view then of this record as it now has been made, and for that reason alone, I am going to withdraw my amendment in order that there will be no possibility of misunderstanding.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I want to associate myself enthusiastically with the statement which the gentleman from Colorado has made.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. However, I shall defer to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] in the event he desires to speak at this time.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object to the withdrawal of the amendment, and of course I am not going to object, I take this time, however, in order to briefly review the record, believing that there is some degree of responsibility on me as a member of this subcommittee to advise you as to the status of the reclamation construction projects. I want to say that all members of the committee are sincerely interested in the Reclamation Service. We have done a good job. At least we think so and this includes Colorado-Big Thompson project. If you will look at page 170 of the committee report you will see a table of the construction items. You will see the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado had a Budget estimate of $21,700,000. We allowed $20,772,000. Now an effort is made to restore that insignificantly small cut. I call your attention to a few of the other Reclamation projects. The full Budget request was assessed by the subcommittee. Gila project in Arizona $6,508,000; Boulder-Canyon $6,600,000; Davis Dam $14,320,000; Hungry Horse project $30,500,000; Columbia Basin project $53,500,000; and we only cut about $10,000,000 out of a Budget estimate for the Missouri River Basin of over $102,000,000. The total cut, considering all construction projects for Reclamation was only about $23,054,500. The total amount of construction funds from the General Revenue Fund allowed is $297,467,000. I voted a while ago against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, because his amendment would have cut the construction fund by 25 percent. This is too severe, but this item should be cut by 10 or 15 percent. This would, of course, be a severe cut. However, I believe we must make all reduction possible and try to get our receipts and expenditures in a more equal status. Probably the Budget will even then not be balanced, but the deficit will be reduced. I am interested in flood control. On page 263, of the committee report, you will find that flood control construction was cut $197,000,000. Every project, or nearly so, throughout the United States has been cut. In reclamation no project has been cut except a few where we had transmission lines involved. Now I hope, you will not ask the committee to allow you any more. I believe we must practice economy. It may be bad medicine to take, but we must take it. And, gentlemen, with the Budget running out of balance, with the Committee on Ways and Means coming in with a reduction in taxes, with all of this coming on us, to think about increasing this bill is beyond my imagination. Gentlemen, for God's sake, do not try to increase the construction fund for reclamation. It may be that the other body may make reductions in the bill that we have not made. I hope they do, not that the money could not be

profitably spent, but because we actually do not have the money. I voted for cuts in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and floor of this House. The cuts have not been made. I still think further reductions are necessary. I do not see how we can continue to spend money that we do not have. I am willing to take my part of the misery of economy and I hope that no section will be required to do more than bear its part of the burden of economy.

You have about everything requested by the Department of the Interior. I urge you to be satisfied with such action by the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] that he be permitted to withdraw his amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on this appropriation, especially for the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

I am proud of the fact that this committee put every dime in the bill for the actual irrigation construction. The funds they took out, amounting to $928,000, are for transmission lines—high-power lines. We need those, too, if we are going to extend REA throughout the district. The transmission lines are just as necessary as it is to build power plants. There is no need of constructing power plants up in the mountains and generating power if we do not have the transmission lines in the valley to take the power around to the farmers in the district.

The REA projects spread out like spider webs over this area.

I have supported rural electrification since its inception. It has been a fine thing to have assisted in making possible electric service for American farm homes. Local REA associations have been run on a business basis, and electric service is now enjoyed by more than 75 percent of the Nation's farmers. Government loans are being repaid with interest. The program has been a good investment.

I wonder how many farmers remember some of the misleading propaganda that was dished out by Democratic leaders in the campaign of 1948 about the attitude of the Eightieth Republican Congress toward rural electrification. I would like to call your attention to what candidate Harry S. Truman said about the subject in several speeches and particularly the one he made at Crawfordsville, Ind., on October 12, 1948. I quote the following from his speeches. President Truman said:

> They (Republicans) cut the rural-electrification program. And, yet, the Republican Party is still fighting REA at every turn of the road.

I feel that this would be an appropriate time to point out that the Eightieth Republican Congress appropriated $800,000,000 for the REA, which was the largest sum ever appropriated by any Congress to provide funds for the extension of electric service to American farm homes. The REA was created in 1936. From 1936 to and including 1946, more than 10 years, the Democratic Congresses in control of appropriation had only provided $1,075,428,288 for the REA, whereas the Eightieth Republican Congress in the 2 years of its existence, appropriated $800,000,000. During the same 2-year period, the Republican Congress reduced taxes, cut Federal spending by $5,000,000,000 and paid off around $8,000,000,000 on the national debt.

The truth eventually catches up with incorrect statements, and that is what has happened in the case of Presidential utterances made in 1948. The inaccuracy of the President's statements are completely refuted by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the REA, who on April 11, 1949, said that more farmers were provided with electric service in 1948 and more miles of electric lines constructed, than in any other year of REA history.

I believe in agricultural cooperatives. I have defended the right of farmers to form and operate cooperative associations as a part of our farming business today. However, I am opposed to certain selfish vested interests who would exploit the farmer and the public by using the term "cooperative" to describe their business, as a guise for their own selfish purposes. Because of my stand in this matter, I have been maliciously attacked and falsely accused by my enemies. They have distorted my statements to make it appear that I have been against farm cooperatives. Nothing is farther from the truth, as a careful look at my record will show.

There are many sections of the country that do not have power lines of any kind. Those are the places where we should be building lines. They are the very places where some of these lines have been taken out of the bill. I feel they should be put back in the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not a fact that the line running from Brighton to Brush will connect and serve a great farming area and that there is a great demand on the part of the farmers for electricity?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman that the Brighton-Hoyt-Brush transmission line is just as essential as any other line in the whole territory. There is no competition on many of these lines as the gentleman well knows. There are no high power lines even in the community so they do not compete with any private service.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I compliment the gentleman on fighting for these transmission lines, because as he has pointed out these farmers will be without that service, and in the beginning it was understood that this great project was to have these power transmission lines. Is that not correct?

Mr. HILL. Of course. In the beginning this was a straight irrigation project and power was only a small part of it. But at the present time the whole thing has changed so that power is one of the most important parts of this great irrigation project.

Mr. CARROLL. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe the gentleman might like the RECORD to show whether or not this really is a new project and whether it has not been planned for some time and what the general plan is.

Mr. HILL. In working out this appropriation, the House Appropriations Committee cut the Colorado-Big Thompson project $928,000. The committee based its decision on its interpretation of the President's statement in his budget message for 1950–51 that there were to be no appropriations for Bureau of Reclamation projects that were not already under construction. The President made a similar statement in his 1948–49 budget request. These lines, however, were planned 2 and 4 years ago. They have been planned and some of them are already being constructed. If these lines are not built, farmers way out at the end of these REA lines will not be able to get any current at all.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the gentleman not agree that because of the legislative situation in which we find ourselves it would be extremely dangerous perhaps for us to proceed?

Mr. HILL. I agree. It was in my mind to offer an amendment from the floor but because I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] when he said because of our respect for this committee which has been so wonderful to me and to all our projects, and I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania standing, he knows this project, I have decided not to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 231, line 21, strike out the period and insert ": *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this head for construction of transmission lines in South Dakota shall be available only for connecting the load centers of Armour with Watertown via Sioux Falls, of Midland with Rapid City, and of Winner with Randall Dam."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the chairman and the ranking minority member and I think there is no objection to it. The amendment merely earmarks some of the money provided in the bill to insure that it will be spent on certain sections of the trans-

mission grid that will most quickly provide needed service for some of the REA cooperatives so that the Government can get return revenue at an earlier date than would otherwise be possible. I have here a letter from REA Administrator Claude Wickard which I have shown the gentleman which goes into the importance of this advance program and I have discussed the matter with officials in the Bureau of Reclamation who made suggestions on the wording of the amendment so that it is in harmony with their program. I shall ask permission to extend my remarks and include Mr. Wickard's letter.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, under permission obtained in the House, I insert at this point a letter to me by Mr. Claude Wickard, Rural Electrification Administrator, on the importance, feasibility, and urgency of the transmission lines mentioned in my amendment:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1950.

The Honorable FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: Thank you for the suggestion made in your letter of March 22 relative to solving power and transmission problems of five of our borrowers west of the river in South Dakota. We appreciate the interest you have taken in our program and especially your interest in problems in western South Dakota.

You may be assured that we are doing everything possible to solve this power problem. It will be extremely desirable if Congress should see fit to accelerate construction of the proposed transmission line from Rapid City to Midland by the Bureau of Reclamation.

This would result in a substantially smaller investment for the cooperatives and may be the only feasible method by which the 5-county group in the Midland area will be able to obtain an adequate source of low-cost power. However, if Congress decides not to advance construction of the proposed transmission lines, it may be necessary to defer consideration of the loan application for the 5-county group and consider a more expensive solution to the problem for the other cooperatives.

After discussing the power problem with the South Dakota cooperatives and their engineers, it appears the plan that will result in the lowest possible cost of power with the least investment by all parties concerned is the plan whereby—

1. The cooperative will install a 10,000-kilowatt generating unit adjacent to the Black Hills Power & Light Co. plant at Osage, Wyo. The plant will be operated by the company for the cooperatives.

2. The Bureau of Reclamation will build in advance a transmission line from Rapid City to Midland.

3. A proposed transmission line from the Bureau's line to Martin, for the LaCreek Electric Association, Inc., will be studied to determine the practicability of such a line.

4. The Cherry-Todd Electric Cooperative, Inc., will receive power from the Consumers public power district or Nebraska public power system with a connection at Valentine, Nebr. We had an opportunity to discuss the proposed arrangement for this cooperative within the last few days and have received reasonable assurance that an adequate source of power will be available.

We should like to give consideration to the suggestion you made for serving the five cooperatives. However, with the deficits involved, it would be very difficult to deliver power from Osage, Wyo., over a 69-kilovolt transmission line extending to Mission and still maintain an economic source of power. Preliminary calculations indicate that the annual operating cost of 169-kilowatt transmission line from Rapid City to Midland would result in a cost of power which would be in the initial period 4.6 mills per kilowatt higher than the cost of power delivered over the Bureau's lines. Ultimately this figure would be reduced to 1.91 mills per kilowatt.

Due to the fact that the Bureau would charge the cooperatives only a pro rata share of the annual cost of the transmission line until it is used for distribution of Missouri Basin power and a cooperative would be required to pay the entire charges on a transmission line constructed by them, we find this wide discrepancy in cost.

A transmission line constructed by the cooperatives could not be financed under our act to supply loads other than rural loads. Therefore, any transmission line constructed by the cooperatives would be inadequate for the distribution of Missouri Basin power, thus necessitating construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of a higher-voltage line which would deliver more power at a future date.

We again thank you for your suggestion and shall be pleased to furnish you with any further information that you desire.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wickard's letter makes clear that not only is the proposed construction important and feasible but that without it certain potential REA customers might not get any service. Also, that if they were to construct some lighter lines they would be a useless duplication of load-center lines later to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I may also say that there is now pending in another body a supplemental estimate by the Bureau of the Budget which specifically recommends construction mentioned in the amendment agreed to. And I think it also makes clear that it is for the service of cooperatives entitled to preference under existing Federal law.

There is no controversy anywhere, as far as I know, over the building of these lines. Private and public power people agree that they are needed. As Mr. Wickard's letter brings out, these lines are to be built eventually; starting them now avoids costly expenditures by REA bodies now to create lines that would be duplicated if the load-center transmission lines were built later. Moreover, construction now means getting quicker returns, as they will earn money at once, while lines between the dams would be idle for 3 or 4 years.

The language of the amendment leaves approximately $1,518,000 available for the lines near or around the big dams in the coming year and there remains ample time for building the tie-in lines between the dams before the big river generators start producing power. I believe the amendment is designed to get the maximum benefit from the money spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: On page 231, line 11, strike out "$297,467,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$294,247,846."

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike the item of $3,217,154 allowed for the construction of the Keyhole project in Wyoming from the appropriation provided for in this section. I may say that this dam is located in the northeastern part of my State.

At the outset let me give you the history of this project. It was mentioned first in Senate Document No. 191, presented in the Senate in April 1944. The Keyhole Dam was originally proposed to be a reservoir 90 feet high, storing 276,000 acre-feet of water and to cost $750,000. The purpose of the dam was to provide supplemental water for 11,300 acres in the Belle Fourche project in South Dakota and for flood and silt control. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that a dam of that size would flood about 6,000 or 7,000 acres of land.

We find now that the Keyhole Reservoir is to be 165 feet high for the purpose of storing a maximum of 628,000 acre-feet of water and to cost $5,980,000. If the maximum amount of water is stored in a dam of that size, then 20,500 acres of subirrigated hay lands above the dam site and along the river bottom will be destroyed because of inundation. I call your attention to the fact that the lands which will be destroyed in Wyoming because of this reservoir are the base lands of several ranches and that these lands provide the feed for livestock running during the summer on thousands of acres of adjoining grazing lands. It goes without saying that the value of these ranches will be seriously impaired if the hay lands that provide the winter feed are acquired for reservoir purposes.

The States of Wyoming and South Dakota negotiated a compact on the Belle Fourche River, and my State raises no objection to the construction of a reservoir at the Keyhole site. In fact, a statute was enacted by the Legislature of Wyoming in 1943 expressly agreeing to such a reservoir. It may be assumed, however, that the legislature had clearly in mind a dam to store approximately 276,000 acre-feet of water and not one of the proportions now proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that under the Flood Control Act of 1944, the Bureau of Reclamation is required to submit to the States affected a report and a detailed plan for the construction of projects in the Missouri Basin. The Bureau of Reclamation filed its report and its plans for the Keyhole project with the State of Wyoming for the first time the day before yesterday.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that the annual discharge at the Keyhole site from 1929 to 1947 is on the average

28,500 acre-feet. Under the compact, farmers and ranchers have the unrestricted right to construct stock-water dams of not to exceed 20 acre-feet capacity in the Belle Fourche River Basin in Wyoming. I am reliably informed that some 3,000 such small structures have already been built above the Keyhole Dam site and that in all likelihood 2,000 more such structures will be built in the years that lie ahead. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that after the stream has been depleted by present and future developments in Wyoming, the intake at the Keyhole site will average 26,600 acre-feet per year. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that this fact is disputed by residents of the area, and it is their contention that the water available at the dam site will be materially less than that figure. At any rate, it is self-evident that it will take many years to fill a dam with a capacity of 628,000 acre-feet.

The Bureau of Reclamation has filed a permit with the State of Wyoming for the construction of a dam at the Keyhole site to store approximately 628,000 acre-feet of water, itemized for the following purposes:

That part commencing from an elevation of 4,016 feet to an elevation of 4,078.7 feet to store 70,000 acre-feet of sediment.

The part starting at 4,078.7 elevation to 4,099.3 elevation to store 130,000 acre-feet for irrigation purposes.

The part starting at 4,099.3 elevation to 4,111.4 elevation to store 140,000 acre-feet for flood control.

The part starting at 4,111.4 elevation to 4,128.2 elevation to store 288,360 acre-feet for emergency flood control.

The crest of the dam is set at an elevation of 4,134 feet. If the dam were constructed to an elevation of 4,111.4 feet, it would store 340,000 acre-feet of water and would destroy something less than 12,000 acres of bottom land in Wyoming for the benefit of supplemental water for about the same number of acres on the Belle Fourche project in South Dakota.

None of the money heretofore appropriated by the Congress has been expended for the construction of this dam. The Bureau of Reclamation reports to me that as of March 31, 1950, $1,099,515 has been spent on Keyhole Dam. The break-down of the total expenditure thus far is as follows:

Investigation and development of unit plan	$247,540
Reservoir and dam surveys and investigation	333,388
Temporary property (housing and offices)	390,829
Equipment and supplies	9,008
Undistributed (CPA, designs, and special)	118,750
Total accrued expenditures	1,099,515

The conclusion is irresistible, Mr. Chairman, that the funds provided in this bill for the Keyhole Reservoir are nearly eight times as much as the estimated cost of the project in 1944, and that the capacity of the dam is about two and one-half times larger than was estimated at that time. It is clear that construction has not been started on the reservoir at the present time, and it is self-evident that the proposed construction is much larger than is needed to supply supplemental water for the Belle Fourche project in South Dakota and for flood-and silt-control purposes, and, furthermore, that it is extremely doubtful if there will be water available for a dam of the proportions presently proposed.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress itself should withhold appropriations for construction of projects until the Bureau of Reclamation has complied with the provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and has submitted its report and plans for the construction of such projects to the States affected for their comments and observations. The Bureau of Reclamation filed its report on the Keyhole Dam with the State of Wyoming the forepart of this week, but evidently proposes to proceed with the project regardless of any action the State of Wyoming might take in its consideration of the plans, designs, and report. It is obvious, therefore, that the Bureau of Reclamation has not complied with the plain intent of the law with respect to this project. It would seem to me, therefore, to be the better part of wisdom to hold up funds for this project until the people of Wyoming have had an opportunity to consider the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation and, for that reason, I trust that my amendment will be agreed to so that this matter can be considered in the light of the facts as they exist.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I wish to read a telegram which I received a few days ago from the two farm bureaus in that area:

> We wish to restate our opposition to the Keyhole Dam in line with our previous correspondence and resolutions. Not only the landowners at the site of Keyhole but our entire farm bureau membership which consists of well over 50 percent of our agricultural population are vitally concerned over the potential enormous expenditure to complete Keyhole. Your support in our behalf will be appreciated by our membership.
>
> MYRON GOODSON,
> *President, Crook County Farm Bureau and Northeast District Farm Bureau.*
> RUTH FROLANDER,
> *Secretary, Crook County Farm Bureau.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment, for the time that I did not use previously.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the Keyhole project does rest in Wyoming, but it is the outgrowth of an interstate compact which the Congress and both State legislatures have approved. The Congress has also appropriated construction funds for 2 years for this project, and according to the table appearing on page 879 of the hearings, $765,916 had been obligated up to the 30th of last June; so if you kill this reimbursable reclamation project now, the Federal Government has $765,000 outstanding that it spent before the 30th of last June and that nobody is going to pay for.

This Keyhole Dam is the result of a compact negotiated between the United States and the two States, ratified by both legislatures. The compact reserved certain water to Wyoming; it reserves to Wyoming all the stock water dams they want; it reserves 10 percent of the water in the dam. The Bureau of Reclamation has spent three quarters of a million on the project so far. The Bureau of Reclamation has a contract with the water users whereby they are to pay for the irrigation storage in the reservoir; but, of course, they are not going to pay for it unless it is completed.

There has already been appropriated in the prior 2 years $765,000 plus $1,724,000. That is, about $2,500,000 has already been appropriated for the construction of this project, $750,000 of which was spent before the 30th of last June. How much since then, I do not know. If you stop it now you probably have over a million dollars spent for nothing on a project costing less than six million—with the need for the reservoir still existing. The merits of the project were thrashed out when both States and the Federal Government negotiated the compact and the Congress and the legislatures approved it.

This is not the time to abandon our investment and I respectfully submit that in the interest of the Government we ought not to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I also want to offer my thanks for the generosity of this committee. I have had very fine treatment from the committee during the last 8 years.

I wish, however, to put myself on record as indicating to those who may read the RECORD that there are items that this committee took out that I think were unwisely taken out. I refer to one item on page 171 of the report, the Folsom power facilities, including switchyards.

We passed a law several years ago providing for the transfer of electricity generated at the Folsom Dam to be integrated into the Central Valley project system of transmission lines, and it is very important now while the Folsom Dam is being built that the power facilities be built concurrently with the dam. The civil-functions bill contains several million dollars for the construction of this great dam, with a storage capacity of 1,000,000 acre-feet. We think that as they are building the dam they should have a plan and the money to carry out the plan which will take the power generated at that great dam and transmit it over to the transmission lines of the Central Valley project.

One other item that I think should have been left in the bill is an item of $300,000 on page 171 of the report. It is referred to as the West Side transmission line. It may be that we do not have to go into the steam-plant problem now, but I am convinced that we should have a transmission grid to take care of the

electricity produced at the Shasta Dam and Keswick Dam. It may be that in the future we may be able to integrate that juice with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s system and in that way avoid the necessity of building a steam plant by firming up our power with the supply we may be able to get from the private utility. I am sorry that item was taken out, because the rights-of-way have been acquired, and part of the line has been built.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Referring to the remarks made by the gentleman in regard to the Folsom Dam and the necessity of building power lines, I wish to call attention to the fact that that dam is now under construction by the Army engineers. Legislation passed at the last session of Congress authorizes the powerhouse. If the powerhouse is not attached in front of the dam at the time it is finished, that power will be wasted and will not be generated for the use of the people of California. So it seems to me the objective should be to make the two come out together. That is, the powerhouse and the power facilities finished when the dam is finished, so that we can immediately start using the power that is so necessary in California, of which we are so short.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman is correct. I am glad he agrees with me on that problem.

I want to offer one other suggestion that may seem critical, but it is not intended in that way at all. The last witness in the hearings on this particular problem every year is Mr. Black, of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Now, I have not a thing against Mr. Black. He is a very able and successful businessman. But I wish that the committee next year would give some of us a chance to answer Mr. Black, and hear us after he has made his statement, which always comes after our statements. He gets copies of our testimony from the reporter. He analyzes it and then presents his testimony according to his views. I respect his sincerity and ability, but we would like to have a chance to have a little rebuttal in order to give you a dispassionate view of the entire problem which we do not now have a chance to do.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the honorable gentleman from Colorado in offering his amendment to provide funds for urgently needed power development in his State has voiced a plea which I, or any other Representative from California, might well have made in the interests of our own State, with particular reference to the building of the Delta steam plant as a vital part of the Central Valley project. However, our distinguished colleague from Washington, who has so ably and candidly voiced the position of his committee with respect to these appropriations, has touched upon a situation which is sorely trying to the people of California.

It is indeed regrettable that the failure of our colleagues on the other side of this building to act, on occasion after occasion, has served to place us in the parliamentary difficulties in which we now find ourselves in the effort to obtain needed funds for the Delta steam plant.

The output of that plant, serving to firm up the power supplied by existing and projected water power units, is essential to the full and dependable operation of the Central Valley project power system. That power has been needed in the past and it is even more urgently needed today.

It was needed during the winter of 1948, when there occurred a power shortage in northern California so alarming as to cause the Governor to put our part of the State under emergency daylight savings; a shortage so severe as to cause shut-downs in many of our industries, and throw many working people out of their jobs. At that time the State conducted a survey of the effect of this shortage upon 39 California factories. It found that this shortage had reduced the average weekly earnings in these factories from $62.04 in February of 1948 to $53.17 in March of that year. Many of the people who took this pay envelope cut are my constituents, and the memories of the people of San Francisco are not so short that they have forgotten the winter of 1948, nor are their minds so dulled that they cannot properly assess where the blame and the responsibility lie.

My people voted for the full development of this power program—steam plant, transmission lines, and all—in 1933; they need it much more urgently today than they did 16 years ago, despite the objections voiced by the private power interests opposing the steam plant. The objectors have been forced to shift their ground in the face of hard, cold facts such as were highlighted by the emergency of 1948—at one time they told us it was not needed at all, now they tell us that the steam plant would only needlessly duplicate facilities of the private utilities now being rushed to completion. The one argument is as fallacious as was the other, and is based upon the same will to put the desire for private gain above the public good.

The people of California continue to live under the shadow of insecurity. The population of California continues to grow, and power works continue to fall short in assuring us a safe margin of power to meet these growing demands. The early completion of the full power program—transmission trunk lines, feeder lines, and the Delta steam plant—would give us a measure of security pending the authorization and building of additional units as we need them.

Mr. Chairman, how long are we to permit supplying the power needs of California, and the power needs of Colorado and other States as well, to be stymied by the delaying tactics of shortsighted and greedy opponents of this and other programs? Those of us in either the House or Senate who fail to respond to the real needs of our States, or who by inaction, either advertent or inadvertent, serve special interests who oppose fulfilling those needs, must answer that question to the satisfaction of the people who return us here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I introduced a bill calling for the rescission of the recent order of the Postmaster General of the United States curtailing the postal services. I have hundreds of letters daily from my constituents in the Borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York protesting the Postmaster General's order.

Under the plans just announced by the United States postmaster at Brooklyn, N. Y., Hon. Edward J. Quigley, pursuant to a directive from the Postmaster General here in Washington, residential areas in Brooklyn will receive only one mail delivery a day. Brooklyn business districts will have but one delivery on Saturdays. Ordinary mail other than perishable matter and parcels of obvious value no longer will be given directory service by which postal clerks hunted for the correct addresses for improperly sent mail. Eight hundred substitute clerks and mail carriers will have their work cut and may be furloughed. After June 1 the Postmaster General proposes that only one delivery of parcel post will be made Monday through Saturday except in exceptional cases. Many residential areas will receive their one daily mail delivery in the afternoon. There will be a curtailment of the facilities for the public at the main post office in Brooklyn, a community of over 3,000,000 people, where at certain times only one window will be open for the acceptance of first class mail, air mail, newspapers, and emergency mailings.

The people of Brooklyn are not going to stand for this curtailment of their postal service. They are not going to approve legislation such as the Marshall plan which sends billions of American dollars abroad to assist the economic restoration of European countries at the expense of curtailment of Government postal services to which they have long been accustomed.

In view of the Postmaster General's action in directing a reduction in service to the public and the threatened lay-offs of more than 10,000 postal employees we might well focus our attention on a reform recommended by President Truman in his budget message to the Congress last January: the separation of subsidies from air-mail pay.

Under orders made by the Civil Aeronautics Board the Post Office Department is presently paying the commercial air lines a ridiculously high rate for flying the mails. It was admitted in testimony before my subcommittee on appropriations for the Departments of

State, Justice and Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, that of each dollar of public money appropriated to the Post Office Department for cost of air mail, 30 to 50 cents is given to these commercial air lines as pure, unadulterated subsidy. These air-line subsidies, which run into millions and millions of the taxpayers' dollars, add substantially to the Post Office deficit. Their separation from the Post Office Department budget would naturally help reduce the postal deficit.

This separation reform would make the Civil Aeronautics Board accountable to the Congress. At the present time the Board does not appear before any committee to justify the gift of these huge subsidy payments to the commercial air lines. It, in effect, writes a check drawn on the Post Office Department's annual appropriation.

We should amend the Civil Aeronautics Act as quickly as possible by passage of the bill known as H. R. 2908, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Civil Aeronautics Board should be accountable directly to the Congress and should publicly justify the appropriations for commercial air-line subsidy money and account for the money it expends for that purpose. The amount of subsidy money paid to Pan American, TWA, United, Eastern, American, and all the scheduled air lines should no longer be concealed in the budget of the Post Office Department. The taxpayers of America are entitled to know the extent of their beneficence to these huge corporations which contribute merely a pittance to the terrific cost of the Federal airways.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I commend both the effort and the strategy of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] in calling our attention to the needed transmission lines on the Big Thompson project in eastern Colorado. I want to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation of the gentleman's efforts to see to it that these transmission lines are not again omitted. I note, too, that the gentleman has more than one reason for his fight for these needed transmission lines and it is not a selfish reason which prompts him. The gentleman represents the city of Denver and he has an urban rather than a rural constituency and yet we find him here fighting for rural electrification which this project should have.

However, one of the important reasons which prompts our colleague from Colorado to strive for these transmission lines, built by the Bureau of Reclamation, is that it is a part of the policy of the party which elected him to office to furnish cheap power with irrigation if at all possible, and to coordinate the two. The Democratic Party has promised western farmers a liberal program of development through the Bureau of Reclamation, making hydroelectric power production a paying partner with irrigation. Let us keep that promise not only in the State of Colorado but throughout the West.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of the amount appropriated under the preceding paragraph, $1,600,000 is for liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appropriation "Reclamation fund, special fund, construction, Santa Barbara County project, California, Cachuma unit," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949; $225,700 is for partial liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appropriation "General fund, construction, advances to Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal)" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950; $1,000,000 is for liquidation of the contract authority provided under the appropriation "General fund, construction, Fort Sumner project, New Mexico," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950; and $1,770,000 is for partial liquidation of the contract authority granted under the appropriation "General fund, construction, Missouri River Basin," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested year after year in the bill appropriating money for the Department of the Interior and more especially for the work of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Bureau of Reclamation is doing an important work in the Republican Valley of Nebraska. In addition to providing much needed irrigation, I would point out that a very major part of their work is flood control. This is both important and urgent. From the standpoint of floods, the Republican River is a bad actor. Almost yearly we have disasterous floods that wash away millions of dollars of property and often take human lives. In 1935, more than 110 people lost their lives by a flood in that valley and in 1947 there were about 15 lives lost.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not mention all of the detailed work now going on in that valley. It is all important. I do want to say something about Trenton Dam. This dam is being built pursuant to a direct mandate by the Congress, expressed in an act of 1948, for its rapid construction to prevent floods. Following disasterous floods throughout the Missouri River Basin the President of the United States called upon the Bureau of Reclamation to recommend a list of dams which upon completion would prevent such flood loss. Among such projects sent by the President again, was the Trenton Dam.

During the Eightieth Congress the initial appropriation was made and the committee report at that time urged the immediate construction of the dam. I hope that from the funds herein provided that structure can proceed as rapidly as possible. The other dams now being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as the diversion dams, canals, and other words, are likewise important, but time will not permit me to specifically refer to them.

May I take this occasion to thank this committee for the consideration they have always given to the needs of this territory. The gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KIRWAN, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and all the others have been most diligent and helpful. We are always glad when they visit the valley. We appreciate the difficult task that is theirs and the demands that are made upon the Federal Treasury.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, $7,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 233, line 8, strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment as read speaks for itself. I do desire to elaborate on it to some degree.

This amendment seeks to reduce the amount the committee allowed, of $7,000,000 to $5,000,000, for general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation. In the fiscal year 1950 appropriation bill, the Bureau of Reclamation was allowed for this item $4,300,000. My amendment would allow $700,000 more than was allowed in the fiscal year 1950.

I suppose this amendment will suffer the same fate as the other amendments I have offered to reduce this bill. From the beginning of the reading of this one-package appropriation bill I have learned, as all the rest of the Members have, that whenever this side of the aisle has 60 Members on the floor you Democrats always throw in enough reserves to beat us by 10 or 15 votes. If we have 70, you run in 80 or 85. If we have 80, you will run in 90 or a hundred, and so on up the line. Because of the fact that they have a majority of over 90 in the House, you have your needed shock troops all ready in the back room or close at hand to do the job. Of course, your very able whip the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] sees to it that we are always outnumbered to the end that some of our Members feel it a hopeless effort, but I will be here every minute to the bitter end, win, lose, or draw.

I had hoped, however, that sooner or later that you spending Members of the Congress would see fit to go along with us on some of these amendments to reduce appropriations, such as this amendment, which is modest and certainly very justified. I offer the amendment, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, as I have every amendment I have offered up to this time and every amendment I shall offer after this time, but I know now quite well that regardless of all the pleading I or any other Member of Congress may put forth we will be defeated because, as I said before, the reserve shock troops in the back room will come in and outvote us. So, Mr. Chairman, nevertheless, we must keep trying.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I would be happy to yield to my good chairman the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. I notice the gentleman did not say "smoke-filled room."

Mr. JENSEN. No. It may be smoke-filled, but I wanted to be nice about it. I think you are nice, easy-going folks, but you just have us outcounted and outnumbered, and, of course, each one of us has only one vote; if we had two votes each, we would go places.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Is it not the will of the people that you should be outnumbered?

Mr. JENSEN. There was an election down in Florida the other day. Take heed, my friend.

Mr. FORAND. Perhaps the gentleman is afraid that we will be here when he is gone.

Mr. JENSEN. I shall try to stick around awhile yet, if the fates are willing. I shall leave that to destiny and the people of the Seventh Iowa District to decide.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Members on the majority side are also interested in economy. I think it ought to be pointed out in response to our mutual good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that the Budget submitted a figure of $7,800,000 for this item of general administrative expenses. The committee saw fit to cut that item by more than 10 percent, cutting it to $7,000,000. In addition to that, the House should be reminded that for the current fiscal year the Bureau of Reclamation is spending $7,644,700 for this item. We have not only cut the budget by $800,000, but we have cut general administrative expenses below the current spending for the current fiscal year. I believe we have acted prudently and wisely in the interest of a sound reclamation program and in the interest of sound economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I know the fishing industry is rejoicing. A short time ago the State Department told me they had received word from our Ambassador Thurston in Mexico that at 5:15 yesterday afternoon the five fishing vessels seized by Mexico had been released and were on their way to Brownsville. They had to pay a fine of $500, which they did under protest. I hope that the fine will be refunded. It was a very serious thing that these vessels were seized. They were within their rights in fishing off the coast of Mexico. We are grateful that no unfortunate incident occurred as a result and that the vessels are on their way. If the shrimp fishing vessels are not allowed to catch shrimp off the coast of a country, it is going to be a serious thing not only for the workers in the industry but a very serious thing for the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than 12 months in the payments of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 237, after line 6, add the following new paragraph:

"Not to exceed $2,000,000 of the funds herein provided for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for travel expenses."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to limit the allowance for travel expenses for the Bureau of Reclamation to the amount of $2,000,000. There is in the bill the sum of $3,200,962. Spending $3,200,962 for travel pay alone for the Bureau of Reclamation is certainly not justified, by any stretch of the imagination. I only wish we could bring some order out of chaos in some of these departments that insist on traveling all over the globe, spending money no end, for things that the American people receive no benefit from whatever. In fact even $2,000,000 is too much money to spend just for travel pay for the Bureau of Reclamation. The Interior Department as a whole is asking for over $10,000,000 in this bill for fiscal year 1951 for travel expenses. That is to pay plane fares, train fares, automobiles, yes and some ship fares, and to pay hotel bills and such things for the people in the bureau.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman point out any instances where employees of the Interior Department took ship voyages all over the world for no good reason at all?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, I might say that the chief of the Bureau of Reclamation has been designated as one of the members of this World Resources Commission which plans great irrigation and hydroelectric projects in Europe, over in India. That is pretty much all over the world.

Mr. ROONEY. That is of no benefit at all? Is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, I wonder if it is. I wonder if it is not going to hurt us more than it helps us over the long pull.

Mr. ROONEY. When the gentleman addresses himself as he does to this particular travel item and proposes such a drastic cut as from over three million to two million dollars for the Bureau of Reclamation, I wonder if he could justify such a cut by showing that this amount for travel is absolutely unnecessary, other than his bare statement.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] was a member of the Committee on the Interior Department Appropriations for several years. I remember very well how critical the gentleman was at that time of many of the requests of the Bureau of Reclamation. He did not say much on the record, but I remember how critical he was when he talked off the record.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I may say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] is just as critical as the other members of the subcommittee and as was the gentleman from New York when he was a member. We figured it so close that we did not give them 5 cents too much in the travel item. But we did not come out here on the floor as does the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee, and make such a proposal as to drastically reduce a $3,000,000 item to $2,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. We did not reduce it on the floor; we did it in the committee and most of the cuts we made in committee stuck.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman want these huge reclamation projects costing so many millions and billions of dollars properly policed in the interests of the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman will remember that when I was chairman of this committee we reduced the personnel of the Bureau of Reclamation, we limited the amount of dollars they could spend, and 11 months and 17 days after operating under the appropriations made in the last session of the Eightieth Congress the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation testified over in the Senate to the effect that never before in the history of America had so much been accomplished by the Bureau for the development of the country as had been accomplished in those 11 months and 17 days under the appropriation made by the last session of the Eightieth Congress, and, of course, that was due to the fact that they did not have millions to waste or play with, but were obliged to make every dollar count.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The committee has considered the appropriations for the Bureau very carefully. I see no need for this limitation. I hope that the House will vote down the

limitation submitted by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 237 after line 6 insert the following:

"Not to exceed 12 percent of the construction allotment made by the Bureau of Reclamation for any project from the appropriation 'construction and rehabilitation' contained in this chapter shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis; except that not to exceed $225,000 may on approval of the Commissioner be expended for construction work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit when the work is unsuitable for contract or when excessive bids are received; and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so declared by the Commissioner."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will do to the reclamation construction fund what the amendment yesterday will do to the Bonneville construction fund. It is existing law, but it simply puts existing law back into the bill. The Committee accepted the amendment yesterday, and I am sure there will be no objection to the amendment today.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, on this side the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of chapter VII be considered as read, to be open to amendment and points of order at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remainder of this chapter?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order, on the ground it is permanent legislation on an appropriation bill and not in accordance with the rules of the House, to the language appearing in lines 18 to 24, page 246, and reading as follows:

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION FUND

For carrying into effect section 4 of the act of March 16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718–718h), amounts equal to the sums received during the current year and each fiscal year thereafter from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available until expended.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and at the proper time will offer an amendment in lieu of the language appearing at that point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] makes a point of order against the language mentioned by him, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] concedes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order to the remainder of this chapter? If not, the Chair will consider points of order waived.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 246, line 18, insert the following:

"MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION FUND

"For carrying into effect section 4 of the act of March 16, 1934, as amended (16 U. S. C. 718–718h), an amount equal to the sum received during the current fiscal year from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly and to remain available until expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to thank the members of this committee on both sides of the aisle for the favorable consideration they have given us in the Great Lakes region in combating a menace that has virtually destroyed a $12,000,000 industry. In this bill there are $203,000 to combat the sea lamprey, which is a parasite and is ruining our fishing industry in the Great Lakes.

As an example, in Lake Huron it used to be that the catch of lake trout would average a little under 200,000,000 pounds a year. Last year the catch of lake trout in Lake Huron was less than 300 tons.

In Lake Michigan the average catch of lake trout normally is 6,000,000 tons. Last year the catch was under 1,000,000 tons.

Mr. Chairman, the sea lamprey has caused a great deal of unemployment among our fishermen. Our Fish and Wildlife Service has done a good job so far and I wish to commend the Fish and Wildlife Service. Mr. Day, the director, is a very able administrator. I am sure that with the funds made available to him by the committee that, along with the professional people, he will be able to conduct research on the sea lamprey so that eventually some means will be developed whereby we can bring this parasite in the Great Lakes under control.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I happened to read the article the other day about the sea lamprey and I was amazed at the great destruction in Lake Huron, particularly. But, this seems to me to be just a simple factual illustration of the necessity for the Federal Government to aid States and communities who are suffering great hardships. As I read the article, they really do not know what to do about the situation.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Chairman, this matter involves many other States. It involves the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Ontario, Canada. So, it is more than a State problem. My own State of Michigan has made efforts to combat this sea lamprey, but one State cannot do the job because of the waters that are involved.

The sea lamprey has a most unusual history. It is a salt water parasite that came into the Great Lakes through the Welland Canal. It is interesting to note that they go up into our streams to spawn, and after they spawn the adults decompose and the larvae embed themselves in the mud of the stream where they lie for approximately 3 years. So, our only hope is that we will be able to find some means to combat this parasite while it is in the larva stage in the stream. I know that the Fish and Wildlife Service plans on treating the stream beds with chemicals, the muddy bottoms where the larvae might be bedding. They are planning also on working with electric shock in the various mud beds to see if they cannot kill them that way. They have also brought in another type of eel. I believe they call it the American eel, from the Atlantic coast. This eel does not breed in fresh water. It, however, acts as a parasite.

I wish to warn the committee that next year enough evidence will be presented as to what will have to be done to bring the sea lamprey under control, and it will necessitate coming before the committee and asking for more money.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to, at this time, pay my respects to the chairman of this subcommittee, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio, for the unfailing interest he has shown in the welfare and security of America.

He is truly an all-American Congressman, handling the all-American bill—as he often refers to the Interior appropriation bill—and rightly so. No one Member of Congress has contributed so much toward the development of our American West and those of us who come from that part of the country are truly and deeply appreciative for his fine leadership, his keen understanding, and his feeling of tolerance and friendship.

We are also deeply indebted to the Honorable HENRY JACKSON of Washington who comes from the same part of the country as I do—the Northwest. He has been a stalwart fighter in the effort to develop our natural resources and the people of his State and district are extremely fortunate in having him represent them and the rest of the country is indebted to him for his fine work in behalf of America.

The Honorable WILLIAM NORRELL, of Arkansas, has always shown himself to be a true friend of reclamation and irri-

gation and his consistent support down through the years has greatly benefited the development of the State of Montana and the West.

The ranking minority Member, the Honorable BEN JENSEN, of Iowa, and his colleague, the Honorable IVOR FENTON, of Pennsylvania, have always shown me every consideration and, while at times we disagreed, they always listened to my side of the argument and recognized the need for the development of our country.

I am extremely pleased that this committee and the House, has approved the full amounts requested for the projects allowed in my district. All of these will be of great benefit to my State and will do much to further Montana's development and give security to our people.

To MIKE KIRWAN and the members of his committee I want to extend my thanks for their help and contribution toward the building of Montana and the development of our natural resources. The all-American chairman of the Interior Appropriations Committee has once again proved his interest in the development of our country.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions the Members of the House have heard me speak on the need for soil conservation on our public lands, and especially on the lands of the Navajo and the Hopi Indian Reservations.

I have also spoken about the problem among the Navajos, which comes about because of the fact that their milk goats were taken away from them in great numbers during the Collier reign of the Indian Service. Since that time the standard of living of the Indians on the Navajo Reservation has gone down, down, down, because the milk goat is the foster mother of the Indian just as the milk cow is the foster mother of us white folks.

In the last session of the Eightieth Congress we provided $100,000 to be loaned to the Navajo Indians to buy milk goats to help build up their herds so that they could have some milk for their children and themselves. I see my good friend from Arizona, JOHN MURDOCK, nodding his head. He knows all about the problem I am talking about.

It appears that the Indian Office has seen fit to make it difficult for those Indians to borrow from that fund which the Congress provided. We instructed the Indian Service to be just as lenient with those suffering Indians in order to help them purchase milk goats, so they could have milk to supplement the food which they are able to grow on that rocky, sandy desert in addition to the food sent by kindly hearts from all over the United States. Now we learn they are trying to charge those Indians $75 to $100 for a milk goat, and then they want good security which most of the Indians cannot furnish. That was not the purpose at all; that was not the intent of the Congress.

I have here a letter from the managing director of Navajo Assistance, Inc., which explains this problem in full. It is as follows:

NAVAJO ASSISTANCE, INC.,
Gallup, N. Mex., February 20, 1950.

Hon. J. R. NICHOLS,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. NICHOLS: Referring to the widespread publicity alleging that Navajos spurned United States loans to purchase milk goats:

Looking at it from the Navajo standpoint, the facts are as follows:

Fifteen years ago thousands of Navajo goats were slaughtered by Government agents, without reimbursement, thus depriving these poor people of badly needed milk and meat.

Since that time the Navajos consistently pleaded that goats were needed for their sustenance, and that the goats destroyed be replaced. Finally, a year or so ago, they were happy to be told that $100,000 had been appropriated for this purpose.

But then disappointments came:

1. The Indian Bureau insisted that the goats must be covered by present sheep permits. The poor people, for whom the goats were intended, had no sheep permits.

2. There must be proper security to borrow from this goat-loan fund. The poor Navajos had no security.

3. The goats were to be paid for at high prices. How could the poor Navajos possibly pay from $75 to $100 for a milk goat? Fifteen years ago the Indian Bureau wastefully slaughtered their goats, in some cases paying the Navajo nothing, and in other cases about $1 per goat. Those goats suited their purpose for both milk and meat. Why should they now pay such terribly high prices for purebred goats which would cause them too great a loss if one died or if they were impelled to kill one for direly needed food for their families?

So, when the Navajos were given to realize the complications in connection with obtaining goats from the Government, they threw up their hands in despair. In their minds, it was just another case of flowery promises with resultant shattered hopes.

The Navajos are still pleading for goats. They need goats, not only for milk but also for meat. There is nothing finer for the sustenance of poor families isolated in the hills and along the arroyos. They cannot afford to purchase canned milk. That is not the solution. Neither is their problem solved by providing surplus powdered milk. The enormous amount of powdered milk promised has not materialized, and reports are coming in that such as has been distributed is causing vomiting and diarrhea. Bad water supply on the reservation doesn't mix well with such foodstuffs.

The Navajos are experienced in raising goats. A small goat herd gives them confidence that their families can be carried through adverse conditions, and not starve.

It would bring great joy in Navajoland—and I believe even the angels in heaven would rejoice—if the Indian Bureau would atone for its sins of 1935 and now give these poor people goats they so direly need.

Yours in the service of these neglected fellow-Americans.

NAVAJO ASSISTANCE, INC.,
BERT POUSMA, *Managing Director.*

I have also received a letter from a gentleman in Albuquerque, N. Mex., who explains the problem of the Navajo Indians and what has brought them to their present sad state. His letter is as follows, although I am leaving out his name because I have not asked permission to use his name:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *March 29, 1950.*

Representative BEN F. JENSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From my observation and experience as an Indian trader for 25 years, I can say that you are absolutely right in your stand that a sound soil conservation program is essential to stabilize the economy of the American Indian.

Probably nowhere is this true fact more clearly demonstrated than in that part of the Navajo country that in pre-John Collier days was designated as the eastern Navajo jurisdiction. This desert country with an Indian population of over 10,000 people, is the original habitat of the Navajo Tribe, and is roughly outlined by the Mexican town of Cuba, N. Mex., on the east, the AT&SF railroad tracks on the south, the Navajo Reservation to the west, and the San Juan River to the north. It is called the Allotted Indian Country, and is not part of the Navajo Reservation proper. Ownership is a crazy checkerboard of land titles: Indian allotments, railroad land, State school sections, and a few white homesteads, and public domain. However, although next to the Federal Government the Navajos are the largest land owners, they do not receive their prorated share of the public domain range under the present system of yearly individual grazing permits.

At present the grazing rights to this huge range country is under the management of Taylor Grazing District No. 7. Grazing permits are supposed to be issued impartially to both white and Indian stockmen according to their base rights of owned land and water. Unfortunately, the Indian Department, for some unknown reason, stopped allotting 160-acre tracts to the Navajos of this country back in the 1920's. Therefore the young Indians of today, owning no land, are denied grazing permits and cannot enter the livestock business in their own country which for centuries has been the economic backbone of the tribe's self-supporting existence.

Here is a large population of landless Indians that is increasing and piling up more misery, sickness, and poverty each year, with apparently no sound program offered by the Indian Department to solve the problem.

From my long residence in this Indian country I knew first hand that their economic conditions were terrible, but GI's returning from tour of duty in Europe tell me that nowhere in their travels did they see more poverty, misery, and sickness than among our own Navajo Indians of the eastern Navajo jurisdiction.

When I first came to the eastern Navajo jurisdiction in 1919, the dipping records of three of the Indian Department vats, Kinebito, Carson, and Ojo Encino, showed that these Indians owned 125,000 head of sheep and goats. This number of Indian livestock steadily declined to 36,752 head by the year 1935. In 1935, Commissioner John Collier came out with his Navajo livestock-reduction program on the reservation proper. Why he ever included the allotted country of the eastern Navajo jurisdiction in this stock-reduction order, he was never able to explain. This order was so idiotic that many people now refuse to believe that any responsible official of the United States Government ever issued it. However, the records prove that he did.

Here was the eastern Navajo jurisdiction, an open-range country where both the white and Indian livestock men grazed their herds—a public range where the Indian livestock numbers were declining, while the whites' herds were increasing. Over the violent protests of the Indians, and violating a solemn agreement made between the Indian Department and the Navajo tribal council that Indian herds of 100 head or less would not be required to reduce, the Indian Department moved into the eastern Navajo jurisdiction and forced a livestock reduction of one-half of all the goats owned by the Indians of the eastern Navajo jurisdiction.

It is very hard for me, an average citizen, to try and figure out just how the minds of

those "screwballs" in the Department of Indian Affairs really work.

The Indian Department purchased these reduced goats for $1 per head, and then they turned right around and offered to sell the same Indians milk goats for $75 to $100 per head.

That was in 1935. A few days ago I read in the public press that the Indian Department again offered to sell Navajos milk goats for $75 to $100 per head, and were very surprised when the Indians refused to buy.

There is, in my opinion, a simple solution to the Navajo problem. Changing Indian Commissioners won't do the job, but a thorough house cleaning in the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington will.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad the gentleman has brought this matter to our attention. May I remind him that in the recent rehabilitation bill passed by the Congress provision was made for a watchdog committee of five Members from each House. I feel that this and other pertinent matters ought to be called to the attention of that watchdog committee so that any such matters may be corrected.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; that was my purpose in bringing this to the attention of the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I received today a release from the Department of the Interior Information Service concerning the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to the effect that four employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs were on the list of the Department of the Interior's sixth honor awards. I doubt that many people in the Indian Service deserve gold medals for the job they are doing and have done in the Indian Service while the Indians suffer.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the last minutes of consideration of chapter 7, the Interior Department appropriation, I want to say a few words about the Indian service to remind the committee that anything I said yesterday with regard to the hospital at Albuquerque was genuine and that I meant it for the benefit of the Indians. I take advantage at this time as I see several members of the Committee on Public Lands present to ask them to read the testimony of Dr. Foard, Director of the Medical Service of the Indian Bureau. I believe they will be enlightened at the grand testimony he gave. I know the Indian service, particularly the health department of the Indians, and the health of the Indians themselves will be greatly benefited if the recommendations of Dr. Foard are carried into effect. In his testimony he recommended, for instance, that the service be permitted to staff the hospitals with doctors without regard to civil service. He said that he cannot recruit his medical service as it should be recruited under the present limitations. I refer specifically to his being hampered by the civil-service requirements for doctors. I am sure if the great Committee on Public Lands would present some authorizing legislation so that the health department of the Bureau of Indian Affairs might be permitted to staff the hospitals with doctors without regard to civil service, they would be in a better position. I recommend to the Committee on Public Lands the testimony offered by Dr. Foard and I will be glad to cooperate with them in trying to solve the problems of the health of our first Americans.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, on page 254 of the bill there is an item of $474,000 for the Virgin Islands Corporation. This is an item which should never again occur in an appropriation bill, provided the Virgin Islands Corporation is put on a business basis; otherwise, additional losses will occur.

The last 2 weeks of March I spent in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico further looking into the operations of that company, along with some other programs that are in effect down there. The Members of the House will probably recall that some months ago we passed a bill reorganizing the Virgin Islands Corporation. It went to the other body, where the bill was very substantially amended, if not somewhat emasculated. But, in order to get any kind of bill at all, the conferees had to accept what was eventually drafted.

We have had several months of experience under the Virgin Islands Corporation new law. In a report which I submitted to the Public Lands Committee and the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, a copy of which I have here, under date of April 19, I made 29 specific recommendations with respect to our program in the Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico. Some of those referring to the Virgin Islands Corporation I wish now to read:

Public Law 149, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, should be amended by providing in section 9 that the Board of Directors shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and five businessmen to be appointed by the President of the United States.

The possibility of leasing lands in the British Virgin Islands for livestock grazing purposes should be explored by the management of the Virgin Islands Corporation.

The management of the Virgin Islands Corporation should explore the possibilities of producing cattle feed from a mixture of bagasse and molasses.

The management of the Virgin Islands Corporation should give consideration to the development of local food crops as a substitute for imported fresh or canned fruits and vegetables—

And so on through the 29 recommendations.

This mixed food program, if successful, would enable them to market at a profitable price certain products, instead of giving the molasses away, which they are now doing substantially.

When I say these deficits should no longer appear, I say that on the ground that if business management is put into this operation down there you will have a profitable operation and these deficits will not occur. There are tremendous possibilities in the Virgin Islands for profitable operation. As I argued when the bill was before this House, I did not believe we would ever reach profitable operations the way the company was then conducted, and I think what has happened in the last 18 months justifies my argument at that time. I think that the present Board of Directors of the Virgin Islands Corporation from which too much is now expected due to their many duties, said Board having been set up by this new law which conforms substantially to the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget—I think that Board is satisfied that changes should be made and that we should amend that law so that more genuine business experience and policies may be put into that corporation.

In addition to this loss of $470,000, you will be faced with a deficit of about $745,000 in connection with the two municipal councils of the Virgin Islands, St. Thomas and St. Croix. The whole of the Virgin Islands operation should be on a profitable basis. We are doing those people an injustice when we force them to operate in such a way that they have to come here and ask us for approximately a million dollars per annum to cover their deficits.

In this report I point out that we have no justification whatsoever for having a municipal council in the Island of St. Thomas and also a municipal council in the Island of St. Croix, two legislative bodies there, when only one should exist.

I hope that the Appropriations Committee will look into these matters and give our committee cooperation in correcting some of these bad practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

All time has expired on the pending chapter.

CHAPTER VIII. EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now read chapter VIII for amendment.

All points of order to this chapter have been waived.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of the Budget, personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; exchange of books; newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $200); teletype news service (not exceeding $900); printing and binding; not to exceed $20,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; a health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and the payment of tort claims pusurant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); $3,486,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 259, line 5, strike out "$3,486,000," and insert "$3,386,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the members of the committee will follow me, I think they will want to adopt this amendment. My amendment proposes to reduce the funds for the Bureau of the Budget by $100,000. The purpose of the reduction would be to deny the Bureau of the Budget two proposed new regional offices.

There is not a Member of the House but who has declaimed somewhere about the expanding Government and about adding regional offices and starting new empires or something of that sort.

The Bureau of the Budget asked in its estimate two additional regional offices for itself. The amount was $50,000 each. I have in my hand the hearings. On page 1516 you will find under the paragraph entitled "Field Service" the following, which is their justification for this added $100,000:

The Bureau now has four small field offices in western and midwestern cities where Federal field activity is concentrated. These cities are Chicago, Dallas, Denver, and San Francisco. The Bureau is requesting authority and funds in 1951 to establish two new field offices, one to cover the southeastern part of the country and one for the northeastern part.

What that means is that at the present time the northeastern and southeastern part of the country are serviced by the main office of the Bureau of the Budget here in Washington, D. C., which is pretty well situated for the northeast and southeast part of the country.

The Bureau has these little field offices, mentioned, at Chicago in the Midwest, at Dallas in the South, and at Denver and San Francisco. So, from a travel standpoint those are pretty well distributed. Washington is well located to serve the southeastern part of the country and also the northeastern part of the country.

It is just as simple as that. It is merely a question of whether or not you want to add another $100,000 to establish two new field offices and move a part of the Bureau of the Budget out of Washington. It costs $50,000 apiece to open these new field offices. There is really no justification for starting them unless you want to see the Government expand more and more.

So I have offered this amendment which would reduce the amount for the Bureau of the Budget by $100,000 and save the expense of the establishment of two new field offices. I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we recognize there is weight and force to what the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has said. We will accept the amendment and see if we can strike a balance in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and employment of aliens; purchase of land and interests in land; services authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of not to exceed 150 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); publication and dissemination of atomic information; payment of tort claims pursuant to law; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed $8,000) and travel expenses; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $5,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; and payment of obligations incurred under prior year contract authorizations; $647,820,000, together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1950, of prior year appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, of which amounts $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended; from which appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred; and in addition to the amount herein provided, the Commission is authorized to contract for the purposes of this appropriation during the current fiscal year in an amount not exceeding $300,150,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee (except such officers and employees whose compensation is fixed by law, and scientific and technical personnel) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, if such act were applicable to such position, at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used—

(A) to start any new construction project for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year;

(B) to start any new construction project the currently estimated cost of which exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in such budget; or

(C) to continue any community facility construction project whenever the currently estimated cost thereof exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in such budget;

unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such construction project or its continuation and a detailed explanation thereof is submitted forthwith by the Director to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; the limitations contained in this proviso shall not apply to any construction project the total estimated cost of which does not exceed $500,000; and, as used herein, the term "construction project" includes the purchase, alteration, or improvement of buildings, and the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That whenever the current estimate to complete any construction project (except community facilities) exceeds by 15 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget or the estimated cost of a construction project covered by clause (A) of the foregoing proviso which has been approved by the Director, the Commission shall forthwith submit a detailed explanation thereof to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: *Provided further*, That the two foregoing provisos shall have no application with respect to technical and production facilities (1) if the Commission certifies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that immediate construction or immediate continuation of construction is necessary to the national defense and security, and (2) if the Director agrees that such certification is justified: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where the fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where the fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but think, when I hear all these arguments on this appropriation bill, just how far it goes in affecting the economy of our country; not only the economy of our country, but I am thinking more today about the children that are coming on, your children and my children, and our grandchildren who will have to bear this burden. I do not know how our children are going to carry on when we Members of Congress are spending so much money, and when we are short approximately seven or eight billion dollars in tax revenue toward balancing the budget. I feel that the people in this country are being taxed to the limit. Why we do not use a little good common sense and balance the budget and not pile this debt on to our children and our children's children, we ought to assume the obligation ourselves. You know, some times I just cannot understand why we are not big enough for the job, and I wonder whether we are ever going to arrive at the point where we will have a President of the United States who will exercise economy and balance the budget. You are never going to get any place until you have a President and departments of Government that want to balance the budget. You are not going to get any place until you do that, and we do not have anybody in the White House or in the Cabinet offices today that seems to have any desire to do it.

A very interesting article came into my office which was gotten out by the Aluminum Specialty Co., general office, Manitowoc, Wis. It reads:

ATTENTION AMERICANS

Our country now has loaned over $260,000,000,000 to countries having a less per capita debt than ours and allowing foreign-made goods, made with our money, to be imported thereby putting United States labor out of work.

This is nearly double the amount of the combined national debt of England, France, Italy, and all nations to whom we are giving aid.

A debt of about $2,000 for every man, woman, or child in the United States.

Why did we inflate our currency?

Today there is nothing bought or earned on which you are not taxed directly or indirectly or both, and still money is given abroad, not for charity, but money which will be used to import goods into the United States to put our labor out of employment.

Don't forget every dollar given or loaned abroad is your money and you must pay for this in added taxes on everything you buy.

The WPA pays no share of the debt and its upkeep is paid by the worker.

Our forefathers came to this country to get away from foreign oppression and gain freedom but we seem to be willing to give away the liberty of our children by helping foreigners who have less debt than we have.

A bankrupt country means slavery to its citizens the same as a dictatorship.

What country would lend us money?

We cannot run our own country (strikes) but we think we can rule the world.

Why allow 400,000 foreigners into this country to displace our own people after the billions of dollars we have given abroad to keep them there, when we have so many unemployed. Increased costs have killed our export business. After loaning Canada 300 million she put an embargo on all American goods which could be bought from Great Britain.

Money sent abroad does not buy your product.

The people pay the bill. If you don't think so compare the cost of running your home now and before the war.

Note what the great Samuel Gompers said: "The greatest crime a company can commit against its employees is not to make a profit."

What has become of our Monroe Doctrine?

Why elect people to public office no employer would hire?

ALUMINUM SPECIALTY CO.,
General Office, Manitowoc, Wis.

That is a pretty broad statement to make, so be careful, men, about what might happen to us.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 265, line 22, strike all beginning with the words *"Provided further"* down to and including the word "annum" in line 4 on page 266.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. SCRIVNER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 8, noes 46.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-seven Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the order issued by the Secretary of National Defense that the Waltham General Hospital, the Percy Jones Hospital, and the Valley Forge Hospital, all Army hospitals, be closed, and I also understand that Navy hospitals are being closed, is not only a great blow to the service men and women and their families who are entitled to hospitalization and care but also to the veterans who are in the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

I do not need to remind the Members of the House that those men who are hospitalized in the Army and Navy hospitals are all service-connected cases. There are not enough beds in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. Those men would be out on the streets, as well as the service men and women and those who are now serving in the Army and Navy, and their families. With the draft bill reported out of committee, it seems the height of folly to close down these Army hospitals. The need will increase for additional hospital beds in all the armed service hospitals with more and more patients coming in each day. And the need for additional beds is increasing daily in the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

How you are going to take care of the disabled, I do not know. It looks to me as if they did not care what happened to the sick.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SATURDAY SESSION

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, tell us if there is to be a session on Saturday? There has been some conflicting opinion about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. There will be a session on Saturday for consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No other legislation except that?

Mr. McCORMACK. No other legislation except that.

HOSPITALIZATION FOR VETERANS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Armed Service Committee reported out the selective-service legislation to extend selective service for a period of 2 years in preparation of the country's national-defense program in event of an emergency.

And, at the same time, with 2,700 veterans in Pennsylvania awaiting hospitalization, orders are issued to deactivate and close up Valley Forge General Hospital. This is presumably an economy move. To me it is preposterous to talk about economy in the face of human misery and suffering.

This hospital provides regional-type hospital care for over 100,000 troops in the area and for approximately 75,000 oversea troops which are provided general medical and surgical care. Over a million troops are provided hepatic-metabolic care; approximately 900,000 troops are provided plastic surgery care; approximately 700,000 troops are provided neuropsychiatric care; also provides care for veterans of the two World Wars. This hospital should be retained for those in the services and the veterans of Pennsylvania. The closing of this hospital leaves but one general hospital east of the Mississippi—the Walter Reed Hospital—a 1,800-bed hospital with 2,000 patients at the present time and many on the waiting list.

I am in receipt of a letter from the Milton Jarrett Norman Post of the American Legion, Sunbury, Pa., which is in the district of my good and able friend and colleague, IVOR D. FENTON, who has been making the fight to retain this hospital. It expresses in a forceful manner my feelings in this matter, and I quote:

It is, indeed, an ignominious reward for the preservation of this Nation's heritage. It is sheer mockery to flaunt in the face of those who gave so much more the word "economy." It is pure callousness to minimize the afflicted, wounded, and maimed.

In my opinion, in view of the evident needs, to close this hospital at this time is a grave and serious mistake.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

AS A RESULT OF DELEGATING POWERS TO FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES, THE CONGRESS WILL SOME DAY BE CALLED UPON TO REPEAL "LAWS" WHICH IN FACT IT NEVER PASSED

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 16, President Truman signed H. R. 2023, a bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine imposed

by Congress in the year of 1886, now 64 years ago.

I have long been an ardent supporter of the proposal to repeal both the licenses as well as the Federal taxes on both white and yellow oleomargarine. I voted for the repeal of this unfair legislation when it was first considered by this House, and I want it clearly understood that I have always opposed the license and the tax on oleomargarine.

It was utter nonsense to compel the grocer or storekeeper to take out a license and pay a tax in order to sell an American housewife a pound of oleomargarine. It was ridiculous for the laws to make the housewife take the little yellow capsule or tablet and color her own spread, when the margarine producers could work the color into it at no additional expense when they made the product.

The record of this House will disclose that not alone did I advocate the repeal of the Federal taxes by the Congress and vote for the repeal, but additionally thereto, in a press release on February 11, 1948, I said in part as follows:

> The need for oleomargarine * * * grows and grows in importance as high prices make the homemakers' problem increasingly difficult. * * * Wholesale distributors of yellow margarine pay $480 annually, distributors of the white product only $200. Retailers pay $48 and $6 respectively. Great effort is being made to repeal these taxes, as well as the 10-cent Federal tax on the yellow margarine. * * * In Ohio, however, our situation is not like that of many States, because our State laws absolutely prohibit both the manufacture and the sale of yellow margarine. Even if Congress removed the 10-cent Federal tax, we in Ohio would not benefit. So * * * I would urge those of you who do not want to pay extra for a very real bit of labor-saving, to take it to our Ohio Legislature and see what you can do with it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for granting me this special order and the privilege of addressing this House for 30 minutes today. I want to thank the great number of my colleagues who are here present for giving up important duties to lend their ears to this talk on a subject which is daily becoming of greater import to all of us.

I want to talk to you about the oleo bill, the penalties which it imposed, and the administration of Federal statutes by various agencies concerned with construing legislative action which is some day going to make it necessary for this Congress to repeal so-called laws which the Congress in fact never passed.

Mr. Speaker, that statement may seem paradoxical, but nevertheless it is true.

There are today a number of Federal agencies charged with administering the affairs of agriculture, labor, banking, industry, commerce, and trade that are now legally empowered to make rules and regulations which have the full force of law.

These departments, bureaus, commissions, and other agencies of government have been clothed by this Congress with powers to indict a man, bring him to trial, sit as his judge, and impose such penalties and other punishments as they deem fit. These are matters to which Congress will shortly have to direct its attention in order to abate in part, if not in toto, many of these discretionary powers in the name of equity and justice to American citizens and taxpayers.

Some few weeks ago there was returned to this House from the conference committee handling the oleo bill, H. R. 2023, a conference report for final passage and adoption by this House. However, the bill that came back to us from the conference was not the bill that we had passed and sent to the Senate. It was not the bill for which I voted and which I wholeheartedly approved. It had been changed in several of its more important particulars, and it was in opposition to this vicious change that I cast my vote.

Mr. Speaker, of a certainty, it is presumed, the common and the ordinary penalties imposed against the violation of statutes of these United States should be imposed against those who would violate the new law with respect to the labeling, marketing, and the serving of oleomargarine. That is but normal to all legislation that passes our body.

While this bill was in the Senate, however, added to it was a sleeper or a rider that was wholly indefensible and which introduced matters into this legislation that were entirely extraneous, not germane, and in nowise whatever related to oleomargarine. This rider provided that the penalties for a violation of the Oleomargarine Act would apply with equal force to any violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act by businessmen who produce and distribute thousands of other commodities.

We in this body here have long been mindful of the fact that every last parliamentary practice that could be invoked, would be invoked and brought into play against the passage of the oleo bill. Certainly there was none within the circle of my friends in this House who ever anticipated that we would see a bill drawn up to remove Federal taxes on oleo, leave this Chamber in such language that it would expose business houses in these United States which made anything from carpet tacks to locomotives—to a penalty of $5,000 per day for some violation of a rule or regulation.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the remarks of the honorable Representative from the Second District of Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] on the floor of this House on March 7, 1950, in opposition to the proposed rider. He stated in part:

> This proposed amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act is subject to the following objections:
>
> First. There has been no demonstrated need for such unusual authority;
>
> Second. There have been no hearings of any kind on the proposal;
>
> Third. It has never been considered by the proper committee of the Congress;
>
> Fourth. It violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act in that it amends basic statutes by means of a rider which is not germane to the main purposes of the legislation;
>
> Fifth. It is not offered in good faith by its supporters, since its primary purpose is to get Members of this House to vote against the oleomargarine bill.
>
> I have no intention of going into the pros and cons of butter versus oleomargarine.
>
> But I do object, and strenuously, to this attempt to amend the organic act of the Federal Trade Commission without any consideration as to the final effect of such legislation.
>
> This is no way to legislate.
>
> I shall, therefore, vote against this conference report. This is without reference to the difference in opinion in reference to the oleo controversy.

Mr. Speaker, when the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Pure Food and Drug Administration, and other bureaus and agencies of the Government were established the Congress in its wisdom saw fit to delegate to these arms of the Government the power to issue rules and regulations in order to effectuate the declared purpose of Congress in enacting the law that gave birth to the various activities.

Additionally thereto this Congress delegated to those that were charged with the administration of that law the right to make the rules and the regulations to see that the organic law as passed by Congress was made effective with respect to the commerce and trade of these United States.

This Congress went even further. It clothed these agencies with the power to issue citations, edicts, cease-and-desist orders, and other instruments, and to designate fines for failure to comply in acting under the powers which we have delegated to them for these many, many years.

As time went on usage and custom gave their rules and regulations the full force of law, and too often other Members of this House and myself have heard of penalties imposed by these agencies for what at times appeared to seem frivolous rules and regulations in restraint of trade.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress certainly had reason to believe that these agencies would construe the organic law as passed by this House by the ordinary use of good common sense.

Certainly I for one never expected to see a law so construed as to find an American farmer denied the right to haul his neighbor's spinach to market in his farm wagon, because they both had washed the sand out of their spinach to make it more marketable. Yet there is a case now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission which in substance holds that spinach is a farm product only as long as it remains unwashed and contains sand. If the farmer washes out the sand, the spinach becomes a manufactured product—and thereby is subject to a different classification under ICC license regulations applicable to common carriers.

Fact, logic, reason, and common sense dictate the frivolity of a ruling—that if you take oysters or clams out of their shells, they too became manufactured goods, or if you knock the head and tail off a shrimp, a different law applies to its shipment.

I take a very dim view of a current regulation which says that a tomato plant is not a farm commodity. Separate the cream from the milk—take the shells off peanuts or any other nuts—and

you remove them from the class of a farm or agricultural product and therefore are compelled to obtain special permit and license to transport them in your own conveyance down a Federal United States highway built with your own tax money. Inasmuch as certain preserved farm products are classed as manufactured goods by the ICC, who knows but what if you wrap an apple in a piece of paper, or wax a turnip to preserve it, and the same is brought to the ICC's attention, the apples and turnips so wrapped and so waxed will also be classed as manufactured goods.

Mr. Speaker, ponder on this fact. The oleomargarine law as signed by President Truman includes oleomargarine under the Federal Trade Commission Act regulating advertising. Subsection (1) of section 5 of that act specifically provides that—

> Any person, partnership, or corporation who violates an order of the Commission to cease and desist after it has become final, and while such order is in effect, shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each violation, which shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States.

The rider inserted by the Senate provided:

> Each separate violation of such an order shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through continuing failure or neglect to obey a final order of the Commission each day of continuance of such failure or neglect shall be deemed a separate offense.

And for each succeeding day a penalty of not more than $5,000 may be charged.

In the passage of the oleomargarine bill, these undue penalties which would be assessed against the violators of oleomargarine legislation, were not alone made applicable to such violators, but were made applicable to all business houses in the United States which come within the provision—not of an oleomargarine administrator—but of the Federal Trade Commission.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress the Honorable JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota, introduced H. R. 3871 to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission and to define the powers of the FTC and its other duties in order to cure the inequities which have crept into bureaucratic administration. The bill proposed to take from the Federal Trade Commission the powers to decide when the law was violated, and to transfer that power to the United States district court where it belongs, leaving to the Commission only the function of initiating and prosecuting proceedings under the act. Thus, in that way would the Federal Trade Commission be a true administering agent and no longer sit as grand jury, judge, prosecuting attorney, and trial jury all in one.

H. R. 3871 further provided that from the time such a suit is filed in a court of competent jurisdiction, the trial would be governed by the rules applying to other court cases under the rules of civil procedure and judicial code, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the way the laws of the United States ought to be administered.

In rendering decision, one Federal district court judge would be substituted for five commissioners.

H. R. 3871 provided that the fines for false advertising of foods, drugs, devices, or cosmetics under section 14 of the present act remain, and that the injunction provided against such advertising by section 13 of the present act could in the future only be sought at the time of filing complaint in the district court under section 5.

In short, H. R. 3871 was a bill to cure the evils that have long been apparent to all in the Federal Trade Commission Act as it now stands, and repose the judicial procedures with respect to the enforcement of this act in the United States district courts where they belong.

Mr. Speaker, in the time which you have so graciously allotted for this speech I cannot address myself to the many, many provisions for improving and making more effective the declared purposes of this Congress when they created the Federal Trade Commission, and belatedly clothed it in the robes of judicial procedure. Contrary to the checks and balances system of our founding fathers, the Federal Trade Commission makes its own laws, which are called rules and regulations, and then tries violators and adjudges them guilty or innocent of violations. This is not good practice under the American way of life.

Extensive hearings covering pages of testimony were held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 3871. Many witnesses were heard, among them the general counsel for the Federal Trade Commission; the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission; professor of law and acting dean, George Washington University Law School; the vice president of Johnson & Johnson Co., New Brunswick, N. J.; the general counsel for the Advertising Federation of America, and communications were received from the National Small Business Men's Association.

Let me quote from the document submitted by the National Small Business Men's Association in support of this bill to cure the evils that have grown into the administration of the Federal Trade Commission:

> The various acts conferring jurisdiction on the Federal Trade Commission give it great latitude and discretion in the matter of authorizing and issuing complaints against business enterprises and individuals; clothe it with tremendous investigatory powers and vest it with the right of adjusting complaints, by means of stipulations to cease and desist from practices which the Commission charges are in violation of the several statutes under which it operates, both before or after formal complaints are filed; and, finally, enable it to seek enforcement of its orders through our Federal courts.
>
> The Commission acts as an administrative agency, a bureau of investigation, a division for prosecution, a jury determining the facts, and a court in interpreting and applying the law, and finally reverts to a prosecuting agency to enforce its own edicts.
>
> In this administrative agency there has been embodied the ability to legislate through interpretation; to act as a branch of the executive department; and to function as a judicial tribunal.
>
> This is not the American way of conducting government, and it contributes to a centralization of far too much power in an administrative body—power, the exercise of which is too often without adequate judicial review.
>
> Furthermore, the cost involved in defending one's conduct before the Federal Trade Commission is prohibitive to all but large and wealthy concerns. Proceedings drag out over months and years, hearings are held in numerous places throughout the country and small enterprise is financially and physically exhausted when decisions are finally reached—the record becomes so voluminous that the cost of preparing the same for appeal is ofttimes beyond the ability of small business to pay. It is well known that many smaller businesses have consented to stipulate against using certain trade practices which they believed were perfectly proper and which they would have defended before the Commission had it been possible for them to defray the expense incidental to such proceedings. When the cost of defending one's liberty is made prohibitive by a government, then justice is denied.
>
> We believe that the enactment of H. R. 3871 will correct much of these faults without weakening the service the Federal Trade Commission can continue to afford in matters within its jurisdiction. The right of trial by a court established in the duly constituted judicial structure of the Republic and entirely independent of the Commission or any other agency is not only desirable but essential if we are to have and preserve our democratic form of government rather than further to develop it with a highly centralized and concentrated bureaucracy.
>
> The removal of the trial of a complaint from the Commission to the United States district court as provided in H. R. 3871 will eliminate the costly step in procedure and restore confidence through the knowledge that business will have its day in court before it has been drained white by the costs of first defending itself before the investigator who turned prosecutor and then mounted the woolsack to confirm his first judgment of authorizing the complaint to be filed.

Now it was in defense of the small-business men of our country in general, and in defense of the small as well as the large business interests in the great city of Cleveland in particular, which I represent here in this Congress, that I cast my final vote in opposition to the "sleeper" or the "rider" that was attached to the oleomargarine bill when it came back from the conference committee for vote on the floor of this House.

Instead of doing the things that the small-business men of these United States requested, this bill has made these onerous and vicious practices applicable to every commodity in the United States, and has placed the threatening hand of Federal Government upon every business agency of this country.

Now let me quote what Mr. Leslie D. Taggart, member of the New York bar and member of the trade-mark committee of the patents, trade-marks, and copyright section of the American Bar Association, had to say with respect to the way the Federal Trade Commission is enforcing this law. He says:

> First you have the fact that the prosecutor is the judge and jury of his own case, and I believe that many district attorneys would like to have that power, but for the sake of the community, they do not have that power.
>
> The second point is this, the only restriction on the evidence—and this restriction

comes from the appeal provision—the only restriction on the evidence is that when an injured party or party deeming himself injured appeals from the Federal Trade Commission to the appropriate circuit court of appeals, if the court of appeals finds that the findings of the Commission as to the facts are supported by evidence, that shall be conclusive. In other words, we have a situation where not only is the Federal Trade Commission the prosecutor and the judge and jury, but unlike the average court case, the circuit court of appeals, the appellate court, has not the power to inquire into the facts. It must accept the facts as found by the Commission, whether or not those are supported by competent evidence or relative evidence. All that is required is that there be evidence to support the findings.

Mr. John Dwight Sullivan, general counsel of the Advertising Federation of America, testified that H. R. 3871 was a bill which would "correct a procedure that calls for remedy."

Mr. Speaker, please note this well, it is a judge who, in his decision with respect to a case brought before his court against the Federal Trade Commission, speaks as follows:

In our opinion * * * the bill * * * would * * * correct a procedure and practice which call for remedy.

The crux of the present situation was stated by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of *John Bene* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (299 Fed. 468, 471) as follows:

"The Trade Commission * * * is called upon simultaneously to enact the roles of complainant, jury, judge, and counsel."

Under the present act, when the Commission believe that the act is being violated, it issues a complaint against the alleged offender, who must come in and defend; but all the proceedings from beginning to conclusion are controlled by the Commission and its staff, to and including the issuance of a cease and desist order.

The act specifically provides that—"the findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by evidence shall be conclusive"—in the event that the respondent appeals to the circuit court of appeals for a review.

I might read the precise language from subsection (c) of section 5 of the act, which concludes with these words:

"The findings of the Commission as to facts if supported by evidence shall be conclusive."

In actual practice, when the Commission believes that a person or company is operating in violation of the act and issues its complaint, its own staff prepares the case by obtaining witness, subpenaing documents and other evidence. Its own attorney thereupon presents the case before the trial examiner, who is also an employee of the Commission—Mr. Taggart referred to that fact. The trial examiner presides at all the hearings. After the hearings close he files an advisory report with the Commission. The members of the Commission do not see the witnesses nor attend the hearings; they have no means of exercising a judgment as to the creditability of the witnesses as does a court or jury, by hearing them and seeing them.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt but what the Congress passed the Clayton Act in 1914 to arrest at their inception certain specific acts which were promotive of monopoly. The act of the Federal Trade Commission was to be preventive, and not punitive.

Will you not agree that to impose a $5,000-a-day fine is altogether punitive? Mr. Isaac W. Digges, who appeared in behalf of the Association of National Advertisers with a membership of approximately 500 manufacturing companies, and representative of a great cross section of American industry, had this to say with respect to the Federal Trade Commission and its procedure and court trial methods. In testifying before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, Mr. Digges spoke in part, as follows:

But let us assume, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission has carried out the congressional mandate, and certainly I do not question its good faith at any stage during its history. But it seems to me that now we have his (the O'Hara) bill before us, it might be well to look at the roots of this existing legislation to see whether they are imbedded in fertile soil. When we look at the roots, Mr. Chairman, we find, however, that a grafting job has been done. Originally there was one important difference between an FTC procedure and a court trial—the lack of penalty to be assessed against the offenders. That has now been changed by the Wheeler-Lea amendment, which provides that the violation of a Federal Trade Commission order to cease and desist subjects the offender to a civil penalty of $5,000 for each violation. That may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States.

Thus, we have introduced into our civil law the proposition that the determination of a fact by an administrative agency may be translated into a penalty of large proportions. Where such power resides, it is my view that justice requires that there be the usual judicial safeguards for the litigant who might be faced with such a penalty. I consider this a matter of principle, and I believe it proper that we examine, or reexamine the commingling of administrative procedures and judicial sanctions as embodied in the legislation under which the Commission presently operates.

Mr. Henry B. King, representing an association of 160 manufacturing companies, testified before the committee in part, as follows:

Let me say at this time that our association is very much aware of the good work accomplished by the Commission and of the deep sense of public duty that its personnel hold. Nevertheless, we believe as a matter of principle that the Commission should be required to try its cases before an impartial court so as to put a stop to the multiple functions of the Commission as investigator, prosecutor, judge, and jury in its own cause.

Let me quote James Landis, former dean of Harvard Law School, who himself served as a Commissioner of the FTC during 1933 and 1934. When testifying before the House committee during hearings on H. R. 2390, he said:

When I went to the Federal Trade Commission I found that the findings of that Commission were, as a matter of practice, drafted by the Commission's attorneys in the case and the prosecuting attorney. It seemed to me absolutely wrong that that should be so. True, the Commission exercised an independent judgment before it said, "Issue an order" or "Don't issue an order," but the findings supporting that order were drafted by the attorneys who presented the case. Naturally, he tied the respondent so that the respondent could not move with the findings he drafted.

Mr. Speaker, that is not justice under the laws of these United States.

Let me here quote from a report of the President's committee of 1937 on a matter with which you in this House are undoubtedly familiar:

There is a conflict of principle involved in their make-up and function. * * * They are vested with duties of administration * * * and at the same time they are given important judicial work. * * * The evils resulting from the confusion of principles are insidious and far-reaching. * * * Pressures and influences properly enough directed toward officers responsible for formulating and administering policy constitute an unwholesome atmosphere in which to adjudicate private rights. But the mixed duties of the Commission render escape from these subversive influences impossible. Furthermore, the same men are obliged to serve both as prosecutors and as judges. This not only undermines judicial fair means; it weakens public confidence in that fairness. Commission decisions affecting private rights and conduct lie under the suspicion of being rationalizations of the preliminary findings which the Commission, in the role of prosecutor, presented to itself.

On page 134 of the hearings held before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H. R. 3871 is presented a travel table that is the travel table of the case of the Federal Trade Commission against Miles Laboratories, Inc., Docket No. 4993; Federal Trade Commission against Capudine Chemical Co., Docket No. 4852.

There was a total of 14 hearings held at 14 different locations, ranging from St. Augustine, Fla., to Ann Arbor, Mich., in the north, and from New York City in the east to San Francisco on the west coast.

The hearings were held in 14 different cities. In 11 cities, but a single witness was heard. In the three remaining cities two witnesses were heard in each city. There was an average of five persons present, traveling from city to city to conduct these hearings, and they traveled a total distance equivalent to 69,288 miles. The hearings opened on October 16, 1944, and they closed on December 9, 1946, and all of that to hear 17 witnesses.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that in a statement made before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of this House a short 2 years ago, Mr. Kenneth Perry, vice president of the Johnson & Johnson Co., one of America's finest business organizations, in testifying against the present practices of the FTC, spoke in part as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to give the businessman his day in court. That court is to be the traditional common-law court, the district court of the United States in the district where the businessman had his business.

Under a creeping process of administrative encroachment, sustained by judicial legislation, the businessman has become restricted to a day out of court before his adversary. This adversary has previously investigated the businessman's conduct and found it suspect. Accordingly, he prosecutes the businessman for the accused conduct. As an advocate this adversary then adduces evidence which at the same time he hears as a jury. Next he finds the facts with respect to this conduct. Finally, on the basis of these proceedings, as a judge, he orders the businessman with respect to present and future conduct.

The businessman does not like it. He has the uncomfortable feeling that he is not sure of getting a square shake from an adversary who is investigator, prosecutor, jury, and judge all in one. It strikes him as an unholy quadrumvirate.

It is because in part of the foregoing that after having advocated the adoption of the oleomargarine bill to repeal the Federal taxes imposed upon the sale of colored and noncolored oleomargarine, that I was compelled to vote against the bill because of the unholy sleeper or rider that had crept into it after it had left this House and gone to the Senate. As that bill came out of the conference committee it had imposed even greater authority and even more punitive powers to harass and cause unending expenses to big- as well as little-business men all through the United States, and particularly so in the Twenty-second District of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to insert into the RECORD a telegram which I received from one of my constituents, president and chairman of the board of the Harris-Seybold Co., one of Cleveland's oldest and most reputable business organizations. The Harris-Seybold Co. makes neither butter nor oleomargarine. It has for many years been engaged in manufacturing offset lithographic printing presses, power paper cutters and other similar machinery as used by printers and allied craftsmen. The telegram reads:

> Am advised oleomargarine bill up in the House today. Contains sleeper amendment amending Federal Trade Commission law by providing a $5,000 fine for initial violation of any Federal Trade Commission order and additional fine of $5,000 for each day the order is not complied with. Such a provision should be considered on its merits and not passed as a sleeper. Federal Trade Commission rulings are so numerous, comprehensive and in some cases so contrary to accepted good business practice that the average manufacturer would require a staff of high-priced attorneys and investigators constantly checking his operations at an impossible cost to be sure he is not unknowingly violating some ruling. Burden placed on industry by this sleeper amendment is out of all proportion to any possible benefits to the country.
>
> R. V. MITCHELL,
> *Chairman, Harris-Seybold Co.*

This would seem to state the case with great clarity.

In casting my vote against the sleeper or rider which had been appended to the oleomargarine bill, I did so wholly and solely because I in conscience knew that its enactment would have serious effects upon the continuing employment of hundreds of thousands of our Cleveland workers, and possibly upon every business house in the district which I have the privilege of representing here in this Congress.

TWO IMPORTANT POINTS FAVORABLE TO BRANNAN PLAN ARE SELDOM MENTIONED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are two important points which highly recommend the Brannan production-payment plan that are seldom mentioned by those who so vigorously oppose it: one is that it will get the Government out of a big-size business, and the other is that it will encourage family-size farms by restricting the payment to not exceeding $25,000 per year. Although this seems large, it is so much smaller than a $576,000 payment to one Boston banker, who happened to own potato land in Maine.

GET GOVERNMENT OUT OF BUSINESS

There is a loud cry going up now to get the Government out of any kind of business. I agree that the Government should be out of any business that should be operated by private enterprise. It is very strange that people, who are making this clamor, are opposed to the Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation getting out of the business of making loans on, handling, transporting, storing, accepting title to, and selling perishable products running into hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

The Brannan plan will get the Government out of this business. These services represent a large part of the cost to the Government, in many instances as much as one-third, in the price-support programs.

Under the Brannan plan, the Government would never touch these commodities. They would be sold in the open market and the producers would have the same protection through support prices that the manufacturers have had since 1789 through the protective tariff.

The Government, since the first general law—the Protective Tariff Act—was passed in 1789 at the First Congress, has forced the farmers to pay higher prices for practically everything they buy in a protected market, and forced them to sell their products in the open markets of the world. If the Government pays the entire cost of support prices it will not be doing any more for the farmers than it has always done for industry through the protective tariff.

FARM PROGRAM OUTMODED

The Brannan plan is receiving unusual attention throughout the country, as well as on Capitol Hill in Washington. I believe that the prosperity of the family farmer is an important bulwark of democracy. Our working farmers want an opportunity to earn a fair income in return for their abundant production. Present price-support legislation is not wholly adequate for this purpose. Under the present program, we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on price supports for potatoes, eggs, milk, and butterfat. The Government buys up enough of these commodities to keep the market price at the support level; then it transports them to various caves and warehouses; pays the freight; puts them in storage; and pays the storage cost. And to top it off, most of these stored, perishable commodities are eventually spoiled. This sort of thing, if it is continued for very long, will endanger the public support for a continuation of the entire farm program.

It is my belief that we need the changes outlined a year ago by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, speaking for the administration. Federal funds should not be used to increase the number and the size of industrialized, factory-type farm enterprises. What public purpose is to be gained from using Federal funds to pay a $576,000 potato subsidy to a Boston banker, who happens to own land in Maine?

Working farmers operate 98 percent of all our farms. They need, and the best interest of the Nation demands, the immediate enactment of the administration's farm-price-support proposals. We cannot continue a farm program without the help of Members of Congress from the big cities. Under the Brannan plan, perishable products will seek their price level in the market place; the consumers will get the benefit of lowered prices on many of them; and the cost to the Government of making up the difference to the farmer will be much less than under the present program.

The opponents of the Brannan plan have failed to suggest a plan that can be considered one-half as good as the Brannan plan.

THE PEOPLE'S MANDATE: ECONOMY

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am here today having just completed a race for reelection to Congress in the Democratic primaries of Florida, which are tantamount to election in my State.

I just want to point out to the House that in my opinion the people throughout the country, and particularly those whom I represent in Florida, are more interested in economy in Government than in any other issue before the Congress, for they realize that it is a part of our national defense as well as necessary to our domestic security. I appreciate the fact that it is difficult to balance the budget, I realize it is difficult to keep within our tax revenues, but I do wish to point out as a man who has just gone through a political race, that the people of my State, at least, are more interested in their country's coming back to good sound business judgment in government than in any other issue.

I hope we can all cooperate to reduce governmental expenditures.

ASSISTANT PARLIAMENTARIAN, PAY INCREASE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 587) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That, effective May 1, 1950, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation at the basic rate of $1,000 per annum to the Assistant Parliamentarian of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon, and include a letter from Mr. Claude Wickard, of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a citation for distinguished journalism awarded to the Star-Times of St. Louis.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report.

Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include the tenth article by Mr. Frank Waldrop.

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. LANE) was given permission to extend his remarks.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by S. Res. 202, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5472. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1069. An act to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARING, for Thursday, May 4, 1950, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 5, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1429. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $28,000 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 583), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5968. A bill to vest in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia control over all public swimming pools, playgrounds, and parks situated in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8364. A bill to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach and Oriental Beach, Kings County, N. Y.; to the the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 8365. A bill to increase the excise tax on imported crude petroleum and crude petroleum derivatives, and to limit importations of petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 8366. A bill to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8367. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife-refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 8368. A bill authorizing the payment of allowances in lieu of quarters or rations in kind to certain enlisted men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 8369. A bill to authorize grants and loans to cooperatives and nonprofit associations, operating medical and hospital-care plans, for the acquisition, construction, and equipment of needed facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8370. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 8371. A bill to authorize credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood-protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 8372. A bill to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 8373. A bill to provide for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, conversion, and joint utilization of facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the armed forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 8374. A bill to provide for extended unemployment-compensation benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8375. A bill to provide that the absence of any individual for 20 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 8376. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a certain tract of land in the District of Columbia for use as a park or memorial site; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8377. A bill to abolish the positions of mail handler and substitute mail handler in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 8378. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial, of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to revising the present Federal-aid program to eliminate inequities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8379. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Blair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 8380. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Scavone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 8381. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joseph C. Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUGATE:

H. R. 8382. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Misao Hatanaka Deskins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:
H. R. 8383. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gerald Goodwin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JOHNSON:
H. R. 8384. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Hori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JUDD:
H. R. 8385. A bill for the relief of Fukuko Endo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McKINNON:
H. R. 8386. A bill for the relief of Burr Stalnaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:
H. R. 8387. A bill for the relief of Linda Ann Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. TOLLEFSON:
H. R. 8388. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna Nordstrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2101. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolution of the Minnesota Retail Jewelers Association petitioning complete repeal of jewelry excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2102. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution of the Philathea Society, North Congregational Church, Middletown, Conn., expressing disapproval of legislation designed to inaugurate compulsory health insurance in this country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2103. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John W. Church, town clerk, Bristol, R. I., opposing any reduction or modification in tariff rates on canvas or rubber footwear in order to avoid additional lay-offs and resulting distress among the employees in the industry and the United States as a whole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2104. By Mr. HART: Resolution of north Hudson communities, New Jersey, urging the United States to call upon Great Britain to discontinue shipments of arms to the Arab States and in the meantime requesting the Government of the United States to permit Israel to purchase arms to equate its defense forces with aggressor Arab armies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou only art the light of all our seeing; our helper Thou, amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. We thank Thee for memories of our fathers who in turbulent days maintained their souls in faith and came forth more than conquerors. Beget in us, their children, the secret of their strength. And in these days, let us not be affrighted. To our Nation and to ourselves, grant inner steadfastness that the rage of men may not shake. Our puny, mortal strength is unequal to the tests and tasks of these terrific days that are upon us. The arm of flesh fails us. We dare not trust our own devices and counsels. By Thy sustaining grace may our hearts be steadied and stilled, purged of self, emptied of strain and stress, filled with peace and poise, satisfied each new morning just to wake and find Thee there; for Thine is the kingdom to which the future belongs, and the might and majesty, and the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1950, was dispensed with.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time between 11 o'clock and 1 o'clock is equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the pending bill, and shall be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois such time as he may require.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace; and

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting permanent residence (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason for ordering suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on war contract terminations and settlements, for the period January 1 through March 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate resolution relative to memorializing Congress to consider and act upon legislation for the economic security of aged persons

"Whereas the economic security of aged persons is of vital interest to all citizens, and the need for an adequate and sound program whereby aged citizens will become economically secure is a matter of national concern; and

"Whereas the social-security laws of our Nation have thus far proven inadequate to make a general pension program a reality, and over 13,000 pension systems of various types have been instituted by private and public agencies which nevertheless provide for only a small percentage of the population, with a consequent lack of uniformity and equity; and

"Whereas a uniform, national, and economically sound pension plan, adequate to furnish a proper retirement is needed to solve present problems and to remove the questions and issues of pensions for aged people from the realm of local politics: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to consider, introduce, and enact legislation for a national and comprehensive pension program; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and each member of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

"Senate resolution read, and adopted, April 14, 1950.

"GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"JOSEPH A. BEEK,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Missouri State Society, Daughters of the

American Revolution, of St. Louis, Mo., signed by Mildred Shepardson Goding, relating to the removal of the name of the State of Missouri from a list of 20 States petitioning for world government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., at Des Moines, Iowa, relating to the salmon industry of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Cambria County Dental Auxiliary, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Human Relations Committee of Germantown and Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa., signed by Howard Stoertz, cochairman, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Ferguson bill, S. 2311, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4—TELEGRAM OF WISCONSIN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, no one here needs an introduction to the great organization—the American Farm Bureau Federation. We are all familiar with the invaluable services performed by farm bureaus at the grass roots of America. We in Wisconsin are indeed proud of the Farm Bureau Federation in our State.

Naturally, the federation, like all other agricultural organizations, is deeply interested and concerned in connection with the plans for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. I have in my hand a brief telegram just received from the distinguished president of the federation in my State, Curtis Hatch, of Madison. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hatch's telegram opposing the delegation of wider authority to the Secretary of Agriculture be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *May 1, 1950.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

We today sent following wire to Senator J. L. MCCLELLAN: "We believe it important that original intent of Organization Plan 4 be carried out as urged by Hoover Commission. Oppose delegating wider authority to Secretary of Agriculture."

WISCONSIN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
CURTIS HATCH, *President.*

CAPITAL-GAINS TAX ON SALE OF BREEDING HERDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE AMERICAN HEREFORD JOURNAL

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, the American Hereford Journal, in its issue of March 15, 1950, published an editorial which carries a message of broad importance. It states an issue which is of concern not only to the raisers of the fine breed of cattle whose name the Journal carries, but also to the breeders of other beef and dairy cattle, to the breeders of sheep, to commercial ranchmen, dairymen, and sheepmen, and, through them, to the general public, the consumers of meat and dairy products.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue has proposed an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which would discriminate against these breeders, ranchers, and farmers by depriving them of capital gains treatment on the sale of their breeding herds. It is obvious, and the courts have recognized, that these breeding herds are production assets like the factory of a manufacturer, and that the breeder should be entitled to the same capital gains treatment on the sale of his production assets which the manufacturer has on the sale of his. To hold otherwise would be to discriminate against the producer of meat and dairy products—to increase unfairly his share of the tax load. Such discrimination could have only the effect of discouraging those engaged in the livestock industry, those performing a public service in improving the quality of our herds, and providing meat for our tables. Such discouragement would result in higher prices to the consumer.

Accordingly, I present this fine editorial for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ETERNAL VIGILANCE

Stockmen are disturbed, and understandably so, over the tax rumblings coming from Washington these days. A new tax bill is under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee, with congressional action probable within the next month or two. Hearings were held last month at which it became apparent that the Treasury Department has ideas inimical to the interests of the cattle breeder. Its recommendations seem discriminatory to stock raisers who are aware of the consideration accorded other businesses which have similar situations.

His breeding herd is the equipment a cattle raiser utilizes in producing his product. When certain cows or bulls have served their period of usefulness in his herd, no cowman can understand exactly why he is not entitled to the same tax consideration on the selling price of those animals as the manufacturer who sells machinery no longer useful in his plant; or the truck-line operator who decides to retire from service some of his older trucks and replace them with new ones.

In the case of the manufacturer or the truck-line operator, the proceeds from the sale of the obsolete machinery or the old trucks is treated as capital gain rather than ordinary income, and is thus subject to a more favorable tax rate. Yet when the general counsel for the Internal Revenue Bureau appeared before the Ways and Means Committee last month he recommended that a provision be written into the new law which would in effect set aside the favorable court decisions of the past year and thus deny the livestock raiser the right to report the income from the sale of livestock used for breeding purposes as gain from the sale of a capital asset.

The Treasury Department looks out for the Treasury Department. It surely isn't out of order to suggest that even it would expect stockmen to look out for the stockman's interests. Especially when the stockman's aim is merely to obtain the same tax treatment that other industries get without question. He can't be blamed for not liking the idea of being singled out for what he definitely feels is discriminatory tax treatment.

That is the tenor of communications received in the past 2 weeks from stockmen and those interested in the stockman's welfare. They feel that most stockmen do not know anything about the tax bill now being considered. They urge that livestock raisers be advised of the Treasury Department's recommendations. Stockmen thus will have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with what is going on and to take proper steps to protect their interests.

The danger is that this damaging provision may slip through Congress practically unnoticed. For it is probable that it would be but one small part of a larger revenue bill containing a great many provisions. Many parts of the bill would likely be beneficial and relatively popular. Thus the measure as a whole is likely to pass and become the law of the land. So what the livestock breeders must do is try to keep this undesirable provision from getting into the bill at all. For if it does the fat is in the fire.

Stockmen need not feel helpless. They have spokesmen in Congress. Those spokesmen were elected by their vote. Many of them may not be personally familiar with the implications of what the Internal Revenue Department proposes with reference to the livestock industry. If they are not, it is up to their constituents to advise with them. For if the people's elected representatives do not know what the people want, and do not want, how can they adequately represent the people?

The stockman must be eternally vigilant. Not just about taxes, but about every hazard incident to a hazardous business. He doesn't like taxes any better than the next one, perhaps, but he accepts them as a necessary evil. And he thus expects to pay his share. But he doesn't expect to pay one cent more. Nor should he.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 6743. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1536).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 3527. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1537).

IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report an original bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products, and I submit a report (No. 1538) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 5, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUNT (by request):

S. 3542. A bill to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3543. A bill to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Winnebago Indian Agency, Nebr.; and

S. 3544. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Eva Smith Austin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 3545. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 3546, to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ROBERTSON introduced Senate bill 3547, to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and to require the divestment of nonbanking assets, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ECTON (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 3548. A bill to authorize the construction of certain irrigation and power projects in the Clark Fork and Kootenai River Basins, of Montana and Idaho, to establish a Clark Fork, Kootenai River Basins Account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 3549. A bill for the relief of Stephen Karpatjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar.)

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES—EXTENSION OF ACT OF JUNE 6, 1933, TO PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement and a section by section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement and the section by section analysis presented by the Senator from Utah will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3546) to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah is as follows:

EXPLANATION BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH OF S. 3546, AN ACT TO EXTEND THE ACT OF JUNE 6, 1948 (48 STAT. 113), AS AMENDED, TO PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Wagner-Peyser Act (act of June 6, 1933), as amended, created a national system of public employment offices on a Federal-State cooperative basis. The act provided for grants-in-aid on a matching basis to States (defined as including Hawaii and Alaska) cooperating with the United States Employment Service in carrying out the purposes of the act.

This bill would remove the matching requirement so that the Federal grants would cover the entire cost of administering the public employment service, as has been done through authority given in the appropriation acts of Congress since 1946. The bill would also extend the operation of the Wagner-Peyser Act to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. At present, by virtue of the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, the United States Employment Service is authorized to maintain a public employment service in Puerto Rico for veterans only.

Since 1938, when the States commenced paying benefits under their unemployment insurance laws, the administration of the public employment offices has been closely associated with the administration of unemployment insurance. Claims for unemployment insurance benefits are filed in local employment offices where the claimants are also required to register for work. Until 1942, when the public employment offices were taken over by the Federal Government, the costs incurred by the public employment office in performing services for claimants for unemployment insurance was included in the grants for the administration of unemployment insurance under title III of the Social Security Act. Since 1946, when the public employment offices were returned to the States, the entire cost of the public employment service has been paid by the Federal Government and the matching requirements of the Wagner-Peyser Act have been waived by Congress in the applicable appropriation acts. Since July 1, 1948, when the administration of the unemployment insurance and the employment service programs was consolidated in the Bureau of Employment Security, a single annual appropriation has been made for grants to the States for both of these programs and the appropriation acts have contained requirements similar to those set forth in this bill. The amendments, therefore, would write into permanent legislation provisions which have in substance been contained from year to year in annual appropriation acts.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF S. 3546, AN ACT TO EXTEND THE ACT OF JUNE 6, 1933 (48 STAT. 113), AS AMENDED, TO PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This bill would amend the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended (act of June 6, 1933, 48 Stat. 113, as amended).

Section 1 of the bill would amend section 3 (b) of the act to make it applicable to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. While at present the Wagner-Peyser Act is not itself applicable to Puerto Rico, by virtue of the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act the United States Employment Service is authorized to maintain in Puerto Rico a public employment service for veterans only. There is no authorization, however, for maintaining any public employment service in the Virgin Islands. Section 1 of the bill would extend the Wagner-Peyser Act to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the same manner as it now applies to the several States and to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The proposed amendment to section 5 (a) of the Wagner-Peyser Act contained in subsection (a) of section 2 of the bill would contain the basic authority for the appropriation of funds to carry out the purposes of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Under the proposed amendment to section 5 (b) provided for in subsection (b) of section 2, a State would be eligible for grants for administering the public employment service only if it has an unemployment-compensation law approved by the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and is found to be in compliance with section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and with the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, however, would not be required to have unemployment-compensation laws approved by the Secretary of Labor under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act or to be in compliance with section 303 of the Social Security Act since at the present time they are not covered by these statutory provisions.

Subsection (b) of section 2 also contains authority for the Secretary to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of funds to be paid to each State for the administration of its public employment offices. This authority is presently contained in section 7 of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

The effect of the proposed amendments to section 5 would be to eliminate the present provision in the Wagner-Peyser Act requiring the States to match grants made to them by the Federal Government for the administration of the public employment offices and to provide for the payment by the Federal Government of the entire cost of administration through grants to the States. The formula presently provided in section 5 for apportioning funds among the States would also be eliminated. Since the return of the public employment offices to the States in November 1946, the matching requirement and the apportionment formula have been waived by provisions in the annual employment

service appropriation acts. Since July 1, 1948, when the administration of the unemployment insurance and the employment service programs were consolidated in the Bureau of Employment Security, a single annual appropriation has been made for grants to the States for both of these programs and the appropriation acts have contained requirements similar to those set forth in the proposed section 5 (b). The amendment, therefore, would do no more than write into permanent legislation requirements which have been contained from year to year in annual appropriation acts.

The proposed deletion of sections 6 and 7 of the Wagner-Peyser Act provided for in section 3 of the bill is merely a perfecting amendment required by the proposed amendments to section 5.

BANK HOLDING ACT OF 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and to require the divestment of nonbanking assets, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Virginia will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3547) to define bank holding companies, control their future expanion, and to require the divestment of nonbanking assets, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERTSON IN CONNECTION WITH INTRODUCTION IN THE SENATE OF HIS NEW BANK HOLDING COMPANY BILL, FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1950

Last August, on behalf of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. MAYBANK, and myself, I introduced without knowledge of its contents a bill on this subject which was presented to me by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. During rather extensive hearings on that bill, which were conducted this year and now are available in printed form, I discovered that the bill carried a larger grant of discretionary powers to the Federal Reserve Board than I could approve and did not, in my opinion, adequately safeguard the interests of the States with respect to State laws affecting banks and bank holding companies. So I proceeded to draft a substitute bill covering the three major points mentioned above and eliminating many of the objections to the original bill, which had been pointed out in the course of the public hearings. In the drafting of the substitute bill, I had the assistance of the three Federal agencies immediately concerned, namely, the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the FDIC. I also consulted with representatives of the American Bankers Association, the Association of Independent Bankers, the Association of State Bank Supervisors, and a substantial group of bank holding companies.

My aim was to prepare a simple bill which any layman could understand, a bill that said what it meant and meant what it said, and a bill that would afford proper protection to independent banking and the existing system of dual banking without being unjust and unfair to bank holding companies, many of which, according to the testimony before us of Chairman McCabe of the Federal Reserve Board, were rendering a commendable service to the communities which they served.

After many conferences and no little time and effort on my part to fully grasp what is involved in a subject which is highly technical as well as highly controversial, I succeeded in drafting a substitute bill which I was willing to call my own, which I was willing to sponsor in committee and on the floor of the Senate and which I was able to explain to my colleagues both in committee and on the floor.

Copies of that substitute bill were distributed among the various agencies and associations who had assisted in its preparation and I was highly gratified to find that the substitute so drafted, with a minor change suggested to strengthen State control, met with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Chairman of the FDIC, the American Bankers Association, the Association of Independent Bankers, the Association of State Bank Supervisors and was not seriously objected to by a majority of the registered bank holding companies. It was, however, strenuously objected to by the Federal Reserve Board and by two members of my subcommittee. With a view to meeting those objections and with the hope of securing an unanimous report from the subcommittee, I reluctantly agreed to accept a number of amendments, which were presented at a meeting of the subcommittee held on May 2. But two members of the subcommittee were not present at that session and one of those present who held a proxy for one who was absent indicated that, under no circumstances, would he be willing to accept even the amended substitute bill unless it carried a provision for wide discretionary powers on the part of the Federal Reserve Board to institute proceedings against those who were in violation of the law or who might become violators of the law, in addition to the very severe criminal penalties which could be enforced under the provisions of the substitute bill by the Department of Justice.

At my request, the three agencies of the Federal Government directly concerned were requested to cooperate in the drafting of such a proposed amendment, which was to be submitted at a meeting of the subcommittee to be held on the morning of May 3. Such an amendment was at that time proposed but accompanied with a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the FDIC who said that the suggested amendment did not meet with their approval. The meeting of the subcommittee on May 3 was scheduled for 10 a. m., but only two members were present and, when it became apparent that a quorum would not be present for the transaction of business, the meeting was adjourned until 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 10. However, one of the members of the subcommittee who did not attend the meeting on May 3 sent word to the chairman that, unless the proposed enforcement powers for the Federal Reserve Board, which exceeded any enforcement powers now granted to that Board, were included in the bill, he would be forced to vigorously fight the bill in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and on the floor of the Senate if the bill ever reached the floor.

Despairing of any hope of preparing a bill that would meet the views and wishes of all interested parties but desiring to discharge to the best of my ability the responsibility that I had assumed in the introduction of the original bill to bring to the floor some appropriate legislation that would accomplish the three major objectives of the original bill, I have decided to introduce as my own bill the original substitute which I presented to our subcommittee and which was not favorably acted upon.

Our banking system has developed under our unique American system of private enterprise. Unlike the majority of foreign countries, including Great Britain, France, and Canada, to take outstanding examples, the United States is traditionally a nation of numerous locally owned independent banks. In recent decades the number of such banks has substantially diminished, but even today there are about 15,000 banks in the country. A bank in a small town in an agricultural area may hold a couple of millions of dollars in deposits; one in a great metropolitan center may hold a thousand times as much. In either case the bank is the depository of the most liquid resources of its community, the lifeblood of its commercial and industrial organism.

The great majority of our American banks operate in a single place of business and were organized and are owned by individuals resident in the area served by the bank. However, there are also a substantial number of situations in which a number of banking offices in different communities are under the control of a single ownership or management.

So-called branch banking is the best known form of multiple office banking. Some of the States prohibit branch banking within their boundaries. Others permit branch banking within a single city, or within a county or contiguous groups of counties, and the like. Finally, there are some States, particularly in the far West, which permit State-wide branch banking.

The existence of branch banking, particularly on a State-wide basis, presents very serious and complex questions which, in my opinion, call for legislative action that is long overdue. Nevertheless, branch banking is, in any event, confined within the limits of a single State, and its extension even within those limits depends upon the approval or permission of State or Federal bank supervisory authorization. Consequently, bank expansion through establishment and operation of branches is subject to definite geographical and governmental limitations, and cannot get completely out of hand.

The same is not true of what is known as group banking, that is, control of many banks through ownership of their capital stock by a single group known as a holding company. At the present time, there is no law and no regulatory or supervisory authority to prevent a single corporation from controlling almost all the banks of the United States through ownership of their stock or by any other means that might be devised. Today any corporation which can obtain sufficient funds may lawfully, and without anyone's permission, buy up the stock of banks in Maine, Virginia, Florida, Ohio, Arkansas, Minnesota, Montana, California, and almost any other State. As long as the people managing such a holding company can raise the necessary funds, the sky is the limit.

Actually a number of corporations and similar organizations of this character exist today. Those of greater magnitude are relatively few in number; less than twoscore of any real importance. Some of these have grown up in States which prohibit branch banks and are frankly a substitute for a branch-bank system within a single State. Others have a similar basis, but extend their operations over half a dozen States or more. The furthest extreme is represented by an organization which controls a great part of the banking resources of a large section of the country and at the same time is the largest stockholder in one of the Nation's biggest banks thousands of miles away.

It is very generally recognized that this situation is not a healthy one and that we have been fortunate heretofore in escaping serious consequences. The sound instinct of the American people warns them against permitting our banking system, through which circulates the Nation's economic lifeblood, to come within the control of one group or a few groups of men acting through giant intercorporate structures.

Out of this awareness of danger—and desire to confine it—have emerged, over two decades, a number of legislative proposals. The first Congress of which I was a Member attempted to meet the problem with the Banking Act of 1933, and the next Congress sought to improve this effort by numerous amendments in the Banking Act of 1935. A few years experience with the approach taken in those Acts showed its inadequacy, and since then bills have been introduced in every one of the last six Congresses which aimed at more effective dealing with the subject. Some of these bills have been short; others very long. Some aimed at breaking up holding company systems (so-called "death sentence bills"), more or less along the lines of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. Some were willing to accept the status quo but sought to prevent further expansion of holding company banking by the enactment of a "freeze bill." In more recent years energetic efforts have been made to enact a law which would subject bank holding companies to control through Federal supervision and regulation, in the hope that this would confine the growth of such organizations within safe and reasonable limitations. All of these bills have encountered difficulties, and none has come close to enactment.

S. 2318, which was introduced at the first session of this Congress, was along the lines which I last mentioned. At the hearings, it was subjected to numerous criticisms, requests for exceptions and modifications, and so on. It became clear that amendments designed to satisfy or placate one group would antagonize two other groups, and so it went. Furthermore, there was considerable criticism of the extent to which S. 2318 committed the problem to the administrative discretion of a single agency of the Federal Government.

The conclusion has been that the situation requires, at the present time, measures which will meet the two major aspects of the problem, will apply only within the field where definite need for governmental supervision is necessary, and will do this in the simplest possible manner and with a minimum of administrative discretion.

We have attempted to work up a relatively brief and comprehensible bill which will meet the existent need without excessive burdens or handicaps on the business world, without greatly increasing administrative activity and paper work, and without extending the legislation into fields where no problem is known to exist.

In any legislation of this nature, one of the primary matters for consideration is the group of persons or organizations to which it is applicable. As originally introduced, S. 2318 defined a "bank holding company" quite elaborately, one criterion being ownership of more than 10 percent of the stock of two or more banks by a corporation or "any similar organized group of persons." We have become satisfied that the situation does not call for so broad a definition. Experts in the field have assured us that all bank holding companies which require restriction and regulation can be covered by a definition along the general lines of that adopted in the Banking Acts of 1933 and 1935. Accordingly, we have made the primary test of "bank holding company" status, the ownership or control of a majority of the shares of an insured bank, or a majority of the shares voted for the election of directors of an insured bank. To take care of the unlikely contingency that a device will be developed for domination of banks otherwise than through stock ownership, we have also covered any corporation or other organization which controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors of an insured bank. In order to avoid hardship in the event of "accidental" or incidental controls of banks by companies which are not within the purpose of the law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System would be authorized, within circumscribed limits, to exempt companies which actually are not in the business of managing or controlling banks.

Having decided what are "bank holding companies" which must be controlled, the next matter was the means by which their expansion within the field of banking was to be restricted. It is clear that in some cases bank holding companies have performed meritorious service by establishing or continuing banking facilities in communities which otherwise would lack such facilities, and by furnishing expert counsel and guidance to a large number of small banks which otherwise could not afford those advantages. It is reasonable to anticipate that additional situations of this nature will arise in the future, and consequently it has been generally agreed that a complete prohibition of further bank holding company expansion would not be desirable or justified.

In view of these considerations the proposed measure, in general, forbids holding companies to acquire any bank stock except with the approval of the Federal bank supervisory agency which is most familiar with the particular bank involved. In other words, if a bank holding company proposed to acquire shares of a national bank, it would have to obtain the approval of the Comptroller of the Currency, who supervises national banks. In the case of State banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System, the approval of the Board of Governors of that system would be a prerequisite. In the case of a bank which is not a national bank or a member of the Federal Reserve System, the approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would be essential.

For the guidance of the agencies in the exercise of their discretion in this matter, the proposal contains a declaration of congressional policy in favor of local ownership and control of banks and competition in the field of banking. It is our sincere conviction that this approach will result in a satisfactory measure of control over further expansion of bank holding company systems, which at the present time—as I mentioned before—are wholly free from any governmental regulation or control as far as such expansion is concerned.

Years of study of this field have brought to light only one other major subject which clearly requires legislative control. At the present time, corporations which control banks and their resources are completely free also to own or have interests in any and all kinds of unrelated business activities—mercantile, industrial, real estate, financial, or otherwise. The banks in holding company systems, along with other banks, are the chief repositories of the Nation's liquid wealth. Their primary function should be effectively safeguarding, transferring, and properly utilizing these resources. It is obvious that a company which owns department stores, manufacturing plants, insurance companies and other such nonbanking enterprises, to that extent cannot maintain the high degree of disinterested trusteeship which should be the standard of our banks.

For this reason our proposed bill forbids bank holding companies to be interested in nonbanking corporations or organizations. Holding companies are given a maximum of 5 years during which they must dispose of such interests now held by them. This should enable them to liquidate these interests without the sacrifice which a forced immediate sale might entail. Furthermore, bank holding companies are permitted to invest, within definite limits, in high-grade securities of the types which national banks and State member banks are permitted to hold. This will provide a means for profitable investment for reserves and other funds of holding companies, in a diversified manner, without involving any material danger of the conflicts of interest that are inevitable when a bank holding company has investments in the stocks of nonbanking corporations or is directly engaged in nonbanking businesses.

The sanctions which will compel compliance with the law provide that any organization violating the act shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 for each day during which the violation continues, and an individual who violates the act will be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both.

What I have outlined is the core of the substitute we propose. I have not attempted to cover every detail, but a reading of the bill itself will reveal that it is as readily understandable as a bill of this nature can be.

It will be observed that the inherent rights and powers of the States within the field of banking control have been explicitly and scrupulously protected. One section of the bill, prepared with the assistance of the Congress' expert advisers in the field of taxation, avoids unjust tax burdens upon holding companies and their stockholders as a result of distributions or exchanges of property which will be compulsory if this proposal becomes law.

The bill does not contain any specific provision for judicial review of the acts of administrative agencies which are within the limited discretion conferred upon them by this proposal. Governmental supervision in the banking field, with its quasi-judicial aspects, has never been the subject of routine judicial review, and has functioned more efficiently for this reason, without injustice to individuals or concerns affected thereby. It is hardly necessary to mention that the acts of administrative agencies in the banking field, like the acts of all administrative agencies, are always subject to judicial examination upon a showing of fraud, manifest illegality, arbitrary or capricious conduct, or abuse of discretion. These potential controls upon improper administrative action have proven entirely adequate in the past, and there is no reason to doubt that they will continue to be equally effective in the future. To provide for a judicial trial de novo of every administrative decision of the Federal bank supervisory agencies, even within this small segment of their field of operations, would make a Roman holiday for lawyers both inside and outside the Government service to no good end.

The present proposal, as I have emphasized, is limited in its scope and coverage. It seeks only to deal with a few clear and existing problems. Fundamentally, it merely requires administrative approval of the acquisition of additional banks by bank-holding companies, and requires the divorcement of nonbanking businesses from banking businesses. No administrative action is involved in the divorcement phase; in the event of violation, enforcement would rest with the Department of Justice, which is adequately equipped for that purpose. Consequently, it is unnecessary to require additional reports, or provide for investigations or examinations. We have endeavored to develop a proposal which does not subject any member of the public to unnecessary

governmental red tape, paper work, or regulation.

This bill, if enacted, would stand by itself; it would not be dependent for its effectiveness upon any other law, nor would it amend or repeal any existing legislation. Certain sections of existing Federal banking law apply to holding-company affiliates of member banks. They are of a regulatory nature. There is no inconsistency between this proposal and those existing laws. However, it is probable that experience under this bill, if enacted, will reveal that some or all of such previously enacted statutes are no longer necessary or require amendment. This can and should be done on the basis of experience with the present proposal in actual operation.

There are situations where bank holding companies will be required to divest themselves of certain nonbanking businesses which would seem at first blush not to be detrimental to the banking businesses controlled by such companies. However, we have concluded that we should adhere to the principle that the banking business should be completely divorced from nonbanking businesses of any nature whatsoever, and thus avoid potential conflicts of interest. To provide exceptions or to take care of the borderline or doubtful cases would tend toward discriminatory legislation, and in the long run would prove unsatisfactory. However, because of our awareness of the difficulties to be encountered in disposing of nonbanking businesses, we have attempted, as I mentioned before, to ameliorate the difficulties by appropriate tax relief.

It will be noted that administrative power over expansion of bank holding companies has been diffused among the three Federal bank supervisory agencies in order that it might be exercised by the agency which is best informed concerning the bank whose stock is being acquired and the way in which that bank is meeting the needs of the public. Some contend that this authority should be vested in a single agency in order to obtain uniform administrative action. We believe that uniformity of action, while desirable, is outweighed by other considerations, one of which I have just mentioned. It should suffice to state that the placing of the administrative power in the three Federal agencies to be exercised by them within the area of their present jurisdiction in the banking field bears the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the American Bankers Association, and is not objected to by the Association of State Bank Supervisors.

In the light of the foregoing, S. 2318, as amended, is submitted with the sincere conviction that it deals effectively, reasonably, and fairly with a difficult problem and does so in a straightforward, nondiscriminatory manner which is simple to comprehend and will be uncomplicated in operation.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and the withdrawal of a postmaster, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT IN MAIL DELIVERIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding the proposed cut in delivery services by the Post Office Department, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLORADO'S SENATOR JOHNSON—ARTICLE BY THOR SEVERSON

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Colorado's Senator JOHNSON," by Thor Severson, from the April 15, 1950, issue of Frontier, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Merchant Fleet," from the New York Times of May 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TERMINATION OF RENT CONTROL

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters addressed to him, and several letters addressed "To the Editor," relating to the termination of rent control, which appear in the Appendix.]

SENATOR McCARTHY'S CHARGES—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column by John Fisher, from the Washington Times-Herald of May 5 an editorial from the Dubuque (Iowa) Witness of May 4, and an article by Father William H. Rowan from the Dubuque (Iowa) Witness of May 4, relative to the charges made by Senator McCARTHY as to communism in the Government service, which appear in the Appendix.]

AWARD TO MAJ. FREDERICK SULLENS FOR BEST EDITORIAL OF THE YEAR

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Maj. Frederick Sullens, editor of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, adjudged the best editorial of the year at the annual meeting of the Education Writers Institute, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DAY OF FINAL APPEAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK JOURNAL OF COMMERCE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Day of Final Appeal," written by Edward P. Tastrom, and published in the Journal of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALE OF SURPLUS NAVY FRIGATES TO EGYPT—ARTICLES IN THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles from the New York Herald Tribune relating to the sale of two surplus United States Navy frigates to Egypt, which appear in the Appendix.]

ELECTRICITY AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST—ADDRESS BY GORDON R. CLAPP

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject "Electricity and the Public Interest," delivered by Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in considering the program of economic aid to our western European allies, I feel that we must always think in terms of our total foreign policy.

We cannot pick the Marshall plan out of its context in the whole pattern of our foreign relations. To do so distorts the picture of our total efforts to achieve peace in collaboration with other peace-loving nations. The whole picture must be viewed in its vast entirety. The Marshall plan must be studied in its relation to the entire foreign policy.

Certainly it is undeniable that the Marshall plan is the basic section, the economic keystone, of the bridge to peace that we are attempting to build.

But there are other sections of that bridge also. There are other vitally important phases of our foreign policy which are carefully interlocked with the Marshall plan. In any consideration of the lessening of the strength of one element of the structure, we must take into consideration the effects on the other elements.

There are at least three other major elements in our foreign policy. One is our leadership in the United Nations, where our representatives have constantly sought to adjust differences among nations by diligent and patient negotiation.

Another major factor of our foreign policy is our sponsorship and participation in the Atlantic Pact. Here we have undertaken to make clear to any potential aggressor that an attack against one of the Atlantic nations will be regarded as an attack against them all.

A final very important part of our foreign policy has been to see to it that the United States remained economically and militarily strong, that we remained in a position where we could rapidly mobilize in the case of aggression. This consideration dictated our decision to go forward with the construction of superbombs, distasteful as that was to us.

All these factors are delicately balanced and they interplay with one another in supporting the stresses and strains of our bridge toward peace. Let us consider some of these interrelationships and how they might be affected by any abrupt lessening of the strength of the keystone—the Marshall plan.

First, there is the effect on the United Nations. There can be no doubt that the moral force of the United States made possible the foundation of the United Nations and has held it together despite tremendous international pressures. It was our leadership in the United Nations that has been the decisive factor in ending dangerous conflicts in Iran, Palestine,

and Indonesia. Our moral force is upholding the United Nations as a forum where the efforts toward peace can continually go forward in spite of the threats and attitudes of individual member nations. No aspersions can be cast on the sincerity of our efforts to outlaw war.

Mr. President, if the United Nations had done no more than to be the decisive factor in ending the conflicts in Iran, Palestine, and Indonesia, there would be justification for its existence.

We in the United States sometimes expect a little too much with respect to a great organization such as the United Nations in seeking world peace. I am confident that if world peace comes, it will come through the work of the United Nations, and nothing has happened which will cause the Senator from Illinois to lose faith in this great venture.

What has given the United States its moral force in the United Nations? No one, I think, can deny that our example in committing ourselves to a vast 4-year program to help rebuild the economies of war-devastated nations has been unparalleled in the history of the world. This has given the real authority to our voice in the United Nations. To waver in carrying through the Marshall plan to its scheduled completion would be to admit doubt in our own leadership. This would inevitably weaken the will to work for peace in people throughout the world. Our clever friends in the Kremlin would know well how to exploit this in the corridors at Lake Success. Can we afford to take any step that might further close the door to peaceful negotiation of differences? I do not believe so. Our economic aid to the nations of Europe, and key countries in Asia is our greatest asset at the peace table.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald as of this day, under the date line of Paris, May 4. I quote:

> Bing Crosby today plugged American aid to Europe as necessary to stop communism. He interrupted a wise-cracking speech to the American Club of Paris to promise that "When I get back to the United States I'm gonna go on the air with the story that the Marshall plan is doing a job. I didn't realize until I got here, but now I see that we've got to maintain this bulwark in western Europe against what's going on the other side of the curtain."

Mr. President, Bing Crosby is one of the leading crooners and comedians in America. I doubt if there is anyone better known, aside from the President of the United States, than Bing Crosby. I doubt if anyone in America has a better grasp of what is going on in America than Crosby. Yet, when he saw what the Marshall plan was accomplishing in containing communism in the satellite countries and keeping it from running over the western democracies of Europe, he said that he was going to take to the air to explain to the American people the effectiveness of the Marshall plan. It is men like Bing Crosby, who have the confidence of the people of America, who can help do needful work by calling attention to this important program. They can help unite the people behind a program, which looks down the road to world peace.

Mr. President, in the second place, we must consider the relationship of the Marshall plan to the Atlantic Pact and what effects heavy cut-backs on the economic-cooperation program would have on the plan of military cooperation.

In my opinion, the two programs are inextricably combined. When we proposed the Atlantic Pact, it was with the understanding that military cooperation would go hand in hand with economic cooperation. We, in effect, assured the Atlantic nations that our military aid would not be given at the expense of economic help. Opinion was unanimous on both sides of the Atlantic that successful joint defense could never be reached until economic recovery was approached.

In this respect, France, the key nation in European defense, is already finding her military commitments under the pact a heavy drain on her economic recovery program. Premier Georges Bidault made this very clear in his recent address at Lyons.

The question, therefore, is this:

If economic aid is below the recommended safe minimum, will it not have a hampering effect on the Atlantic Pact defense program? The answer is obvious. European nations will have to cut their defense spending—little as it is compared to ours—to fill the vacuum on the economic side.

At a time when the fate of Berlin is hanging in the balance, when the dwindling Communist forces in France and Italy are girding for a last-ditch stand over arms aid under the pact, can the United States afford to risk possible disruption of the defense situation by slashing the corollary economic aid? That, I claim, would be reckless and ultimately costly economy at a most inopportune moment. Any cut in the Marshall plan would have an immediate effect on the strength and vitality of the joint defense program under the Atlantic Pact.

Let me add one point in this connection which I think is vitally significant. Nations which have joined in the Atlantic Pact are literally under the guns of the only possible aggressor. They know that if trouble broke out they would be immediately attacked by ruthless armies. They have gambled with their lives that economic and military unity with the United States would be a deterrent to aggression. Let us, we who are not quite so close to the powder keg, be sure that our aid is not so little that we wake up some day to find that it is too late. I think we would find ourselves in a grim kind of isolation.

The fourth point in our foreign policy has been to keep the United States militarily and economically strong so that every potential aggressor would be perpetually aware that an attack would be met by our rapid retaliation.

This program, too, has been carefully dovetailed into our programs of foreign economic and military aid. We learned from very practical demonstration in the recent war how much cheaper it is to fight the enemy on his own soil rather than wait until he sweeps to our borders. By coordinating our defense economically and militarily with the defenses of our western European allies we have avoided the necessity of building a fortress here in America which would be astronomical in cost.

Mr. President, I wish to digress for a moment. There are Members of the United States Senate who honestly believe that no money should be appropriated for the Marshall plan. There are Members of the United States Senate who believe the Marshall plan appropriations should be cut to a point where, in my humble opinion, they would be totally ineffective in affording economic aid to the countries of western Europe. I should like to have Senators who disbelieve in the Marshall plan and who intend to vote against the authorization at some time propose to the Senate and to the country an affirmative program and tell the Senate and the country what they believe ought to be done. I wish they would do so rather than constantly, in a negative way, attempt to tear down the bipartisan foreign policy of this Nation.

I should like to have them tell the country whether they believe we ought to pull out of Japan at the present time and bring our troops home; whether we ought to pull out of Germany and leave Berlin to its fate, to the mercy of the Communists; whether we ought to withdraw our military and economic missions which are now in Turkey, Greece, France, Italy, and other western democracies, which we are helping. I should like to have them say whether they believe we should finally retire from Europe, withdraw to this country, live alone, and let the rest of the world go by. I wish they would at some time tell the country whether they believe in that kind of policy. I wish they would say whether they believe in a strictly isolationist policy. Then I should like to have them tell the country also what they propose should be done in the way of building the defenses of America after all our representatives and our forces have been drawn back to this country. I wish they would say what should be done in the way of meeting the onrushing challenge of a totalitarian aggressor, which would come sooner or later under such a policy.

Mr. President, just as sure as we destroy the Marshall plan, just as sure as we destroy the program of aid to Turkey and Greece, just as sure as we pull out of Japan, retire within our own borders and live in an isolationist shell—it is certain that we will begin to live in a garrison state. We can prepare to appear before the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who for so many years has been chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and ask his committee, not for $13,500,000,000 for national defense, but for a vastly larger sum. Mr. President, I share the view of Paul Hoffman. I believe he knows what he is talking about when he said, "Just as sure as you destroy the Marshall plan you can get ready to appropriate,

not $13,500,000,000 for national defense, but you can prepare to provide not less than $25,000,000,000 and maybe $30,000,000,000 a year for national defense alone."

Rather than constantly attacking the Marshall plan from the front, the rear, and the flank, without telling the people what they would do if they were in power, Senators should tell the country if the kind of program I have just outlined is the kind of program in which they believe. If not, what is their plan? It is high time the American people be advised.

Mr. President, it is easy to talk about socialism in England, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] does. He denounces England for carrying on a socialistic program, and tells the country he is not going to support the Marshall plan unless England does certain things with respect to her socialistic program. But if he should destroy the Marshall plan in its entirety, what program has the Senator to present to the American people?

Again and again some Senators complain that England is socialistic. Why is it that they constantly denounce England for her socialism, but never say anything about Norway, Sweden, or Denmark, who also participate in the Marshall plan, and whose governments are as socialistic as that of England. The basic reason is, Mr. President, that there are more of our citizens of Scandinavian descent who vote in Missouri, Iowa, and other sections of the Midwest than there are citizens of English descent. There are few voters of English descent in that area of the country, for that matter. The result is that no Members of the Senate denounce the Scandinavian countries for being socialistic. It is always poor old England that is belabored.

Mr. President, if today an aggressor started to march, England would be the major country in western Europe upon whom we could depend. We know what the British have done in the past when the chips were down.

Mr. President, today we are spending at the rate of $13,500,000,000 a year for the national defense. If we drop the $4,000,000,000 we are spending for economic and military assistance to our allies in Europe, and let the Communists take over France, Italy, and other key nations, we shall probably, as I have said before, have to double the $13,500,000,000 we are now spending for the national defense.

Today the United States is spending 71 cents out of every tax dollar that it collects to meet the cost of past wars and the prevention of future wars.

Mr. President, I should like to refer briefly to that situation. There are few aspects of government requiring more constant attention on the part of all of us than the financing of the Federal Government. At the same time there is no phase of government that is more technical and complex. Because of this, it is essential to have the facts on Federal expenses before any estimated savings can be evaluated and before we talk about slashing the Marshall plan. Everyone knows that taxation and spending are completely interrelated.

Like all other taxpayers, I am keenly interested in reducing taxes wherever possible. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives is now working on a bill which will adjust certain inequities in the present excise tax law. Sooner or later the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, will receive that bill; and I am heartily in favor of reducing a number of those wartime excise taxes.

Many statements have been made concerning the billions of dollars which might be cut from Government expenditures. Mr. President, I am only discussing this matter now as it relates to the Marshall plan and to the national defense. The most usual figure given for a possible reduction in Government expenditures is approximately $6,000,000,000. We are told by some Senators that $6,000,000,000 can be cut from the budget at the present time.

One of the things which most of these estimates have in common is that they do not enumerate any specific items which can be cut in order to achieve this estimated saving. They are merely hopeful guesses, but guesses nevertheless. I have not found anyone yet who has a blueprint to show where $6,000,000,000 can be saved from the President's budget at the present time without crippling national defense or the Marshall plan or functions of government which are absolutely indispensable to successful administration.

Mr. President, I should like to go over for a moment some of the items appearing in the 1951 budget, so that we may have before us the facts in regard to Federal expenditures.

As I said before, it is important to remember that 71 cents out of every dollar paid in Federal taxes go for the payment of the cost of past wars and the prevention of future wars.

Here is a break-down of the expenses: The direct budget costs of World War II amounted to nearly $350,000,000,000. The interest on the debt therefrom has become a heavy fixed charge in the budget each year. In 1951 it will amount to $5,600,000,000.

Services and benefits for 19,000,000 veterans, including medical care, pensions, and readjustment benefits under the GI bill, will require expenditures of $6,100,000,000.

Appropriations for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, all devoted to providing a sound and adequate national defense, total $13,500,000,000.

Our international obligations under the Marshall plan, aid to Turkey and Greece, the Atlantic Pact, and the implementation thereof with arms, total, for the present fiscal year, $4,700,000,000.

Mr. President, the last two items constitute 45 percent of the total budget.

In contrast to the 71 percent of the budget required for past wars and the prevention of future wars, 29 percent, or $12,500,000,000, finances all other governmental programs, including the development and conservation of natural resources, and the promotion of health, housing, and education, as well as many other governmental services. Also included in the $12,500,000,000 is $3,300,000,000 in Federal grants and loans to State and local governments, much of which at least is not an expenditure in reality, but is money loaned, which will be returned over a long period of time to the Government.

Of the $12,500,000,000, $1,600,000,000 is for loans to industries and cooperatives and for the purchase of housing mortgages. Experience has shown that much of this will be returned to the Federal Government over a long period of time, and that part is in reality not an expenditure, but is a loan to be repaid.

These figures show that a marked change has taken place in Federal expenditures. In 1939 the cost of national defense and international affairs, veterans' programs, and the interest on the debt amounted to 29 percent of the budget. All other Government activities cost 71 percent of the total budget. In the fiscal year 1951, that situation is exactly reversed.

In making these comparisons it is interesting to note that the cost for social welfare, health, and security programs was $3,900,000,000 in 1939, but was only $2,700,000,000 in the estimate for 1951. This figure included the cost of public assistance, such as aid to the blind, the school lunch program, public health measures, and so forth.

Mr. President, no one in Government is more interested than I am in economy. I have always paid my debts. I budget my accounts, and I have always lived within my means. I have always hoped that my Government could do the same. However, these are not the ordinary peacetimes which we experienced 25, 30, or 40 years ago. I undertake to say that these are the most extraordinary and the most dangerous days in the peacetime history of the Republic.

All of us who are interested in economy must be aware of the realities of the world about us. If we can reduce the $12,500,000,000 by an amount which will not in any way cripple or break down the functions of Government, obviously I will lead in the efforts to achieve such economy. I am hopeful that when the Appropriations Committee reports the appropriations bill this year, a reduction can be made along that line, wherever possible.

The fact of the matter is that if we intend to balance the budget by reducing expenditures $6,000,000,000, a considerable portion of that amount must come from national-defense expenditures and expenditures for our international obligations, which constitute 71 percent of the budget. Of these items, which ones would Senators cut?

The interest on the national debt is $5,600,000,000. I think it safe to say that no one desires us to default in the payment of the interest on the debt.

Six billion, one hundred million dollars is for the Veterans' Administration. When the appropriation bill comes before the Senate I am anxious to see

what proportion of the Members of Congress, whether Democratic or Republican, will vote to make a severe reduction in the veterans' budget. I think it is safe to assume that a sum approximating $6,100,000,000 will be appropriated, and that even those who talk most about economy will vote for it.

Our national defense budget includes $13,500,000,000. On March 29, 1950, General Eisenhower came before the Committee on Armed Services and testified that another half billion dollars is necessary in order to round out our national defense sufficiently to meet the present-day challenge of Kremlin aggression. I am sure that very few persons desire to do much reducing in that particular item.

Our international obligations, including the Marshall plan, aid to Turkey and Greece, the Atlantic Pact, and its implementation with arms for our western European friends, will require $4,700,000,000. All of the above items total $29,900,000,000.

Mr. President, as you know, I have been for a bipartisan foreign policy all these years. I stood back of the administration on the foreign policy previous to Pearl Harbor, when it was apparently unwise to do so because of the strong isolationist sentiment in Illinois and the Midwest. I was in those days close to Cordell Hull and close to Franklin D. Roosevelt. I was in a position to listen to what they had to say about our condition at that time with respect to world affairs. I followed their lead. I have been vindicated ever since for so doing, Mr. President, and I shall continue to follow the lead of the men in the State Department and the President of the United States, who are responsible for a forward looking, if you please, foreign policy, that has done so much for the European countries.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not vote to reduce expenditures for the Marshall plan or the expenditures for national defense, unless the top men of the Nation, who know more than anyone else what is necessary, advise that it is safe to do so from the standpoint of the national security. In the absence of such advice, I shall not vote to reduce the expenditures referred to even though it costs me a seat in the United States Senate. I shall never have a Pearl Harbor on my memory through failure on my part to vote to appropriate a sufficient amount of money for national defense and for an international program, which I believe looks toward peace rather than toward war.

What we are trying to do is to keep our boys from going to war again by the wise expenditure of several billion dollars in peacetime. If war should break out tomorrow, we would probably appropriate $100,000,000,000 overnight. We would go before the distinguished and able Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, with the military authorities of the Nation, who would say, "War is here; we need $100,000,000,000 to start our factories going, to start making the implements of war, and to mobilize the armed services." All that would be for the purpose of destroying human beings and property. Yet when we try to bring about peace through the Marshall plan and other related programs, the administration is charged with running a "gravy train," with a give-away program, with socialistic spendthriftism. Many other similar epithets are hurled for political reasons.

I say that the same individuals who make these charges would be glad to vote for $100,000,000,000 tomorrow if war should come. I do not say the Marshall plan is a guaranty that war will not come, but, Mr. President, it is the only program we have which looks in the direction of peace—the only one. And I say that those who make these charges are unrealistic in a realistic world.

I, too, should like to see the budget balanced; I, too, should like to see something paid on the national debt; but I should also like to see peace in this world. If peace is not attained, Mr. President, Senators will not be worrying about socialism in England. If peace is not attained, they will not be worrying about hard-earned dollars in New Jersey or elsewhere. If peace is not attained, they will not be worrying about whether the budget should be balanced or about economy: If we get into an atomic war, we shall be struggling for survival. That is what we shall be worrying about then, Mr. President. And no one will win the next war, for the victor and the vanquished both will go down into the ashes of ruin. That is why I cannot, under any circumstances, vote to cut a half billion dollars, a billion, or a billion and a half from the authorization carried by the pending bill.

The honorable Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], for whom I have great respect, recently said, if the press quoted him correctly, that he was willing, he thought, to make a cut in the authorization of a half billion dollars, a billion dollars, or even a billion and a half dollars.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio does not know whether to cut a half billion dollars or a billion dollars or a billion and a half dollars from a program that is designed to keep the peace of the world, then it seems to me he should take steps to find out. If I were in a position of that kind I would go to the experts who have done nothing but study this program from beginning to end, men like Paul Hoffman, and I would at least get all the information I could from those gentlemen before I started to meat ax the Marshall plan. I do not know why the Senator from Ohio and other Senators do not say definitely, "We are opposed to the Marshall plan," rather than attempt to cripple it through a back-door attack and destroy it in that way. If they are against it, let them say so; that is one thing; but let them not cripple the program by meat axing it to the extent of a few billion dollars on the theory of economy.

There is another point to be considered in this connection. We did not conceive the Marshall plan as a method primarily of aiding American industry, agriculture, and commerce; nevertheless, it has certainly had its beneficial effects in those fields. I do not think any economist will dispute that in the period of transition from our huge production of wartime to the lesser consumption of a nonwar period, the Marshall plan has had a stabilizing effect on the entire American economy by siphoning off the crest of the wave of surplus. That, too, has had its effect in keeping America strong.

We should remember that, in this day and age, no nation can live in an economic vacuum. A strong, healthy America depends to a considerable extent on a strong, healthy trade with other nations. The Marshall plan has certainly played its part in building toward that end. Its mission during the next 2 years will be largely aimed at the restoration of healthy, unsubsidized trade between America and Europe, and within Europe. A strong America, I submit, depends on as close an approach as possible to that objective.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that we must hew to the course we have set. We must continue to aid in rebuilding the strength of our allies. I am convinced that this is the course of true economy and that it will go a long way toward preventing the crushing cost of a third world war.

It seems to me to be downright silly for anyone to think we should even take a chance on losing the friendship of 270,000,000 people in the western European democracies. I undertake to say that never before in the history of the United States have we needed friends and allies as we need at this moment the 270,000,000 people in the western European countries.

I do not think there can be any doubt that a third world war would be truly global and would cost many times what the last one cost. No one can estimate what it would amount to, but we can get some idea from what the last one cost. The last war cost us $1,300,000,000,000 in terms of what we have already spent and what we shall spend in order to pay off the obligations we incurred during the years of battle. That is Paul Hoffman's statement, not mine.

Break this down over the 44 months that we were actively at war, and it comes out at nearly $30,000,000,000 a month. The Marshall plan—the keystone of our program to prevent another war—will cost us, under the recommended authorization, a little less than $3,000,000,000 for the coming year. In other words, it will cost for a full year only a tenth of what the last war cost us in 1 month. Project this in terms of atomic warfare when the civilian population of every large city of our Nation would be in the front rank, and the cost would be inconceivable.

Mr. President, the best testimonial for the Marshall plan is being given day after day by the people who most bitterly oppose it. Since its inception every propaganda weapon of the international Communists has been trained on this program.

The Communists believed at the end of the war that the economy of the west-

ern world, including the United States, would topple of its own weight from the stress of the war years. Western Europe was devastated physically, politically, morally. The United States was saddled with huge debts and, to the Communists, its economic structure appeared certain to be washed away under the impact of its huge flood-tide of surpluses.

The wily men in the Kremlin licked their lips in anticipation as postwar inflation soared on both sides of the Atlantic. They thought the time would soon be ripe to take over the whole Western World by default.

But a great man, Gen. George C. Marshall, and his associates, among them our present Secretary of State, had vision and courage.

Mr. President, George Marshall is not a small, pathetic figure, as was recently charged by a Senator. I was at the Paris conference a year ago last September, and saw George Marshall in action. I can testify that there was no man in that conference who was held in as high respect and esteem as was George Marshall. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] were there and could bear witness to the accuracy of my statement.

Secretary Marshall came up with this plan for mutual economic aid and cooperation, not merely for our western European allies, but for all the nations of Europe.

The men in the Kremlin saw their dream blasted. They forbade their satellite nations to participate. They sought to arouse Communist minorities in every nation of western Europe to do everything short of armed attack to defeat the plan. Every moment of the last 2 years the international Communists have worked to halt the march of the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, I do not need to recite the achievements toward recovery that have been made in the past 2 years. I do not need to reiterate how the Communist influence has been reduced in western Europe in the past 24 months. Many of my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber have made those accomplishments infinitely clear. I simply want to reemphasize with all my strength that the people who have the most to lose by the success of the Marshall plan—the leaders of Soviet Russia—have recognized the Marshall plan as their No. 1 target in their battle for world domination. The opposition of the Kremlin to this program is the best possible recommendation for its continuation on the progressively reducing basis for which it has been scheduled until its conclusion in 1952.

I do not want to suggest that the task ahead is not going to be difficult. It will undoubtedly be more difficult to aid European nations break down trade barriers that have grown up over centuries than it was to rebuild the devastation of war and restore agricultural and industrial production.

However, the matter is no less important and no less challenging. We know that if progress is not made, the gains of the past 2 years may be rapidly lost when we withdraw 2 years hence.

We must remember that the war and its aftermath did not leave Europe the same, no matter how much reconstruction has been made. The prosperity of Europe has always depended on the flow of trade between the agricultural east and industrial west. This trade has been greatly reduced by the creation of the Soviet bloc behind the so-called iron curtain. The trade patterns of the western European nations must be drastically revised to make up for the loss of these markets.

We have learned recently that Moscow is further tightening economic control of its satellite nations through the establishment of a complete ruble economy in those areas. This means further diminution of trade between the dollar areas of the west and the ruble bloc of the east.

This is certainly additional evidence of Communist efforts to halt the recovery of western Europe should the United States retreat from its scheduled program of economic aid.

Every time we give hint of wavering we can expect the alert commissars to come forward with some method of exploiting the situation. That is the technique of cold war. We can keep on winning only by continuing to move forward with the brave, bold, imaginative steps which have done so much so far to win the peoples of the world to our side in the vast global battle for the minds and souls of men.

There is in the pending measure provision for the beginning of another one of these important steps to further strengthen the resistance of free people against the march of communism.

I refer to the technical assistance phase of the point 4 program which is provided for in title V of the measure before us. The relatively small sum of $35,000,000 is recommended for new activities in providing technical assistance in the coming year to backward areas in the Far East, Near East, Africa, and South America.

I read not long ago, Mr. President, that if we can raise the standard of living for 1½ percent of all the people in these backward areas, we could sell all the surplus we could produce in this country to the people who live therein. Maybe that was a guess; maybe that was "moonshine"; but, nevertheless, that statement has been made, and that is another reason for technical assistance in the backward areas. Mr. President, we in this country are so efficient, our soil is so productive, our natural resources so great, the machinery in our factories is so efficient that we can produce more than we can use. We must have a market for the surplus if we are to continue the high standards of living we are now enjoying in the most successful nation in the world.

To my mind this is, indeed, "a bold new program," representing the same kind of far-seeing imagination with which the Marshall plan has appealed to the latent idealism of freedom-loving people throughout the world.

It is not suggested that we build great improvements, or underwrite vast industrialization. This is a program to share our famous American "know-how" with people of backward areas to teach them how to help themselves.

This program provides for sending American technicians to areas where ignorance, disease, and poverty have made people ripe for the cure-alls and nostrums of communism. These technicians will attempt to teach people how better to use what resources they have to feed, clothe, and shelter themselves and fight against disease.

Technical assistance assumes real importance now that we see communism attempting to take over and pervert to its own ends the yearning of the nations of Asia for true freedom and independence. If we can demonstrate through friendly aid without exploitation that the Western World stands ready to welcome the new nations of the East as equal partners in the society of nations, we shall have gone a long way toward winning friends in the Orient.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it is wise that we are proposing to launch this program now, 2 years in advance of the scheduled end of the Marshall plan. It serves notice on the whole world that our drive for peace is dynamic and constant. It tells the wavering people of the world that our kind of democracy, which believes in the dignity and freedom of the individual, is still youthful and is forever pressing on to perfect itself.

I see this new program as a fitting addition to the broad, strong, interlocking structure of our foreign policy. It will mesh well with and serve to reenforce our activities in the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, the United Nations, and our own national defense.

It is certainly closely related, furthermore, to other important economic aid programs also provided for in the measure before us. I refer to the economic aid to China, to Korea, and the refugees in Palestine.

Mr. President, viewing the whole program of economic aid provided for in this bill in the light of our total foreign policy and the alternatives which face us, I feel we can accept this as a reasonable program, reasonably sure of producing sound results.

These various phases of economic aid are the essential elements in our total foreign policy to win the peace and avoid a devastating third world war. I think extension of this program as recommended will be good for America and good for the world. I believe when we have authorized this program we shall be able to march forward confidently, knowing that we have added to the defense of our Nation and the rest of the free world in the drive to assure peace and a little prosperity to all freedom-loving peoples.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed a while ago when a quorum call was suggested be equally divided.

Mr. KEM. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Illinois suggested the absence of a quorum on his own responsibility. He did not consult the Senator from Missouri or any other Senator on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CONNALLY. He did not have time to consult any other Senator. I hope the Senator from Missouri will not object.

Mr. KEM. I am sorry, but we have allocated full time among the Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CONNALLY. There will be plenty of time on the amendments. If the Senator will not agree, I shall adopt the Senator's methods myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KEM. I object.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in opening the debate on the pending bill to extend the Economic Cooperation Act, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] made an eloquent plea in behalf of bipartisan or nonpartisan foreign policy.

From time to time other Senators from both our major political parties have made the same plea. Men of good will throughout the Nation endorse this call for America to speak with one voice in world affairs. No one will deny the clear urgency for a united America in these critical times. Yet the fact remains that our State Department and the conduct of our foreign policy has been under bitter attack, some of it plainly partisan.

Analysis of this criticism, which has become more widespread and bitter in recent months, discloses some of the chief reasons for our disunity. Many men in this body are thoroughly dissatisfied with the way bipartisan foreign policy operates. They are strongly suspicious, and I submit there is some ground for their suspicion, that the administration deliberately employs bipartisan appeals as an instrument in political strategy. They have the feeling that the administration carefully hand-picks the men the administration wants to represent Republicans in bipartisan councils. They have watched the administration utilize bipartisan aid in some topics and areas of foreign policy but not in others. Wherever this has occurred, partisan criticism has been inevitable.

Republicans throughout the country have observed that whenever bipartisan action has been successfully employed, the administration took all of the political credit for it. Further, Republicans who made constructive suggestions in foreign affairs, and even those who actually took part in bipartisan councils, have found themselves ridiculed and attacked by administration spokesmen from the President down the line.

Is there any wonder that there is an air of cynicism and suspicion in political circles concerning bipartisan policy?

It is time that the administration and the majority leadership on this floor awaken to the plain fact that it will take more than a plea for unity to restore good faith in bipartisan policy. It will take more than the selection by the administration of a few Republicans to serve on foreign-policy advisory bodies. It will take more than a rearrangement of the subcommittees of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Eloquent pleas for bipartisan agreement are no substitutes for good faith, and there is a strong suspicion on this side of the aisle that such good faith is lacking. It is lacking because the very concept of bipartisan policy seems to have been left purposely vague. It is lacking because there have been no simple rules or understandings by which bipartisan action is to be guided. Bipartisan policy calls upon both parties to unify their action on matters of foreign policy. Yet there are no rules and no machinery to determine how this unity is to be achieved and operated.

Speeches, no matter how eloquent, cannot establish the solid basis of understanding necessary to good faith in bipartisan action. Men in the parties must know what is expected of them. When action is taken, they must feel confident that it is according to rules and agreements which they recognize to be a fair basis for bipartisan relations.

Bipartisan policy has to be a two-way street. The privileges accorded to each party and the obligations cast upon each party by the idea of nonpartisan action must be clear. So long as the rules are nonexistent or vague, there will be loopholes and excuses to tempt men in both parties to make partisan capital out of American foreign policy.

I am not so foolish as to call for written rules as in a game of cards, football, or baseball. We are dealing in the vast area of human relations and in matters of opinion and judgment. Here good faith requires only that there be some clear meaning to the terms we use and some workable understandings of the way in which we propose to conduct our relations.

In an effort to arrive at this simple basis for genuine party cooperation in foreign affairs, I presented a series of 12 questions on this floor on April 18 at page 5298 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If the administration and the majority leadership wishes to reestablish bipartisan policy on a firm and workable basis, let them help this body to answer those questions.

Briefly, we ought to know what is the State Department's conception of the bipartisan or unpartisan foreign policy. Is this policy supposed to restrain political parties from making political capital out of American foreign affairs? How is the policy expected to work, and by what arrangements between the parties is the policy to be operated? How is the personnel for party cooperation to be selected, and who is to do the selecting? If the bipartisan policy holds room for criticism of the conduct of foreign relations, how and in what forms is this criticism expected to be made?

If controversy between the parties develops over the execution of foreign policy by the executive branch, what machinery is there to reconcile the party views? Is bipartisan policy to be directed only toward some topics for foreign affairs and only to some areas of the world, or is it to embrace all American foreign policy? And who is to decide upon these applications of bipartisan policy?

Mr. President, these are not all the questions I ask, but they are among the most important. I cannot see how we can bend political party action toward a single voice for America unless we reach an understanding on these questions. The discord we experience on almost every issue in our foreign affairs can be traced directly to the lack of understanding that now prevails. A workable understanding, clearly defined and completely aboveboard, is absolutely essential to good faith.

I am firmly convinced that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee could render signal service to the President, to the State Department, and to both our major political parties, if he would ask his committee to spend a few sessions on exploring the requirements for operating a genuine bipartisan foreign policy.

If we want unity, we shall have to work as well as plead for it. If we are to have unity, let us build the basis for it in clear understandings between the parties.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last fall, through the encouragement of my genial and esteemed friend, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I was able to arrange and to make a fairly brief trip to Europe. I visited all the countries that are involved in the European recovery program. I wish especially to thank the Senator for this experience, and I recommend such a trip to anyone who has the responsibility of serving in the Senate.

Mr. President, I viewed the operations of the Marshall plan in Europe through very friendly eyes. I have supported every phase of this program by my vote on the floor of the Senate, and have voted for all appropriations. My impressions of its operations were gained largely at the grass-roots level. I did not spend very much time in the chancelleries or official offices. I visited the people on the farms, in the fields, and in the small towns. I went into the fields and into the barns, and I visited them in their homes. I talked with dock workers, taxi drivers, and farm hands. I talked with industrial workers at their places of work. I talked with them at their machines. I talked with various and sundry citizens throughout these great lands. My ideas, which I shall try to reflect here, were gained from those contacts.

Mr. President, I supported the Marshall plan in 1947, 1948, and 1949, due mainly to three reasons. The first was that I was greatly impressed with the argument of the necessity to try to check communism in western Europe. The second was that I wanted to see the wheels of machinery in Europe start moving, and to see industrial and agricultural production revived.

Personally, I am just one generation removed from the experiences of a conquered people, and I knew something

about the slow—miserably slow—progress and the heavy strain involved in the long road to recovery.

The third reason that appealed to me was the good will that I thought we would create through this plan.

I want to say frankly that I was greatly impressed with what the Marshall plan has done in Europe toward turning the countries against communism. I think it has been a great contributing factor, and perhaps the decisive factor. I saw such a degree of development, relative prosperity, and industrial and agricultural production that I was convinced in my own mind, that so far as making a decision for or against communism is concerned those people now are able to make their own decision, and we shall have to abide by what they do about it. In the light of their improved conditions and what has already been done, a reasonable continuation of this program will certainly put them on their feet to the extent that they will have no economic reasons for turning toward communism. If they do turn toward communism, it will be their own choice.

My second point is that last fall I found the wheels of commerce in motion, and I found agricultural and industrial production advanced far beyond my expectations. That was evidenced not only in the factories and on the farms, but in the faces of the people. They are not living in a land of plenty, but neither are they living in extreme want. There is activity and production. One can see goods in the shops, and one can see the production in the fields and on the farms. They are getting along pretty well, Mr. President. I believe that very soon in the western European countries there will be a saturation of goods, rather than a scarcity. When that saturation point is reached, we shall find the same trade barriers, the same tariffs, and the same restraints on the use of funds and money that existed before the war. We shall find, I am afraid, the same stagnation of trade and the same overproduction and the same unemployment. Very soon a number of these countries will have reached that saturation point. This is not being said in any spirit of "I told you so," because I did not say so. However, I think we missed a great chance by not making some kind of conditions for the economic integration of Europe at the very beginning on this program. I did not see the point then. I am not saying, "I told you so." That is where we missed our best chance so far as a permanent economic European recovery and foreign trade is concerned. That is the point that dampens my spirit about the Marshall plan.

My third point was with reference to the good will we were going to create. There has been a great deal said about that, and there is a tremendous appeal in it. However, I was disappointed with reference to what I found on that point. I found that the rank-and-file people of Europe, with exceptions, of course, do not realize what we are doing with reference to this program. I give only two illustrations, since I must speak briefly.

Through an interpreter I asked a Greek farmer, who owned 28 olive trees 20 miles south of Athens, on a barren, rocky hill, what he thought about the American program, and the purpose behind it. He said it was a scheme by the United States to get control of his land.

I asked dock workers in London what they thought about the American Marshall plan, and the substance of what they said was that America would send them a million dollars one day, and then raise prices and get it back the next day. They said it was a scheme to transfer control of the markets of the world from their hands into our hands, and that the officials of their government had better not let us get by with it. Those are two illustrations of many sentiments of like kind which I found throughout these areas.

I think one of the main reasons why the people do not understand our program is because the administrations in the Marshall plan countries claim the credit for their recovery for themselves, rather than share the credit with us.

I found some evidences of good will, but we need not think that it is coming through the rank and file of the people, as a result of the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, I, myself, would not like to have someone come to my door every morning and ring the door bell and tell me, in the presence of my wife and children, that the food on my table was put there by him rather than put there by me, or that he brought the bottle of milk on which I feed my children. I do not think there is anyone connected with the administration of the ECA who is to blame for that situation.

Mr. President, my time is brief, and I shall merely say that I am going to support reduction in the program in the amount of $1,000,000,000 for the following principal reasons: I am satisfied in my own mind that some kind of a program will have to be extended beyond 1952, and I believe we are fooling ourselves if we do not realize that now. I am satisfied in my own mind that we can do far more good by reducing these expenditures in amount now, but extending them for a longer period of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement of my views on the extension of the ECA program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN C. STENNIS

Last fall it was my privilege to visit for some 40 days the Marshall-plan countries of western Europe with the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. It seems to me that anyone who has had this experience owes it to the rest of the membership of the Senate to give at least a brief review of his impressions, particularly relating to the questions raised by this Economic Cooperation Act.

Let me quickly remind you that I fully realize one cannot make a thorough study of these many problems in so short a time. I am forcibly reminded of what my friend and Congressman, Representative ARTHUR WINSTEAD, of the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi, said to me when I sought his advice as to whether or not I should make the trip. He said, "By all means, go. You will not come back with the answers, but you can at least better tell whether or not the other fellow has the answers." I found his advice to be sound.

I saw these problems there through the eyes of a strong adherent to the Marshall-plan program, and I had voted for all of its major provisions and appropriations. What impressions I did get of the European picture were obtained at the grass roots level, rather than in the chancelleries and council halls of our own or their official offices. I went out into the villages and into the country and out on the farms and down in the fields. I went in the barns and up in the lofts; I went into their homes, their living rooms, their bedrooms, their kitchens. I talked to these people in their homes, their fields, in the villages and in the small stores. I talked with the laborers on the docks, to the craftsmen in the factories, to the village storekeeper in his store, to the taxi drivers and to the farm hands. What impressions I did get are direct from the people and on the level of their everyday living and everyday problems.

When I voted for the preliminary stages of the Marshall plan in 1947 and for the plan itself in 1948 and 1949, I was prompted to do so for three principal reasons. First, to stop the spread of communism in its westward sweep through the continent of Europe; second, I wanted to put the wheels of machinery to turning in these nations that had been either conquered by us or by our former enemies; and third, I thought that we would be building up good will among those nations, thus insuring as nearly as possible a united front in years to come.

I am glad to report that in my opinion, based on what I saw and learned in Europe, the Marshall-aid plan actually did play a big contributing part and was a deciding factor in saving western Europe from the death grip of communism in the 1946–48 period. Under conditions then prevailing there, our aid did turn the tide. The people then had little food and insufficient clothing. They were largely without medicine. They had little or no seed and no fertilizer. There was little machinery and no capital to start agricultural production. Under these conditions they were approached by the seductions of the Communists and if we had not given them cause for hope and a helping hand in their distressing conditions, I think they would have followed the communistic lead. Whatever may come in the future, I think our helpful attitude toward western Europe in those distressing years will be one of our highest and best points in the history of our Nation.

However, I am fully satisfied in my own mind now that the situation has changed, so much that we should materially reduce the sums to be appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year. With their present situation, to which I shall refer again soon, plus the aid that will come from this continuing program, the people of western Europe will have to make their own choice this time as to communism. They are in a position now to make that choice, and it is up to them. We cannot make it for them.

In addition to the threat of communism as such, it appealed to me greatly in 1947–48 to vote for the full amount of the Marshall plan in order to put the wheels of commerce in motion and the cultivated land in production, thus giving the people of the conquered and liberated countries the chance to make a living. This appealed to me for one reason because I already knew what it is to live in a conquered country. I was only one generation removed from the long, slow, hard strain of the miserable years following

a devastating war, and I thought that we could bring about a recovery in a few years with the aid that would take many, many years to come without the aid.

When I got to Europe in October of 1949, I was amazed and highly pleased at what I found in the way of production and the general productiveness of both farm and factory throughout most of the areas of western Europe. This production was quite evident everywhere—in the fields and in the factories; it was reflected in the shops of the cities and in the villages and cross-road stores. It was also reflected in the faces of most of the people, who showed every evidence of being well fed and well clothed, and most of whom seemed to be thrifty and industrious. I have checked the actual records of industrial production and find them to be in excess of the year 1938, and that of agricultural production to be approaching the same year. Those figures have been discussed already in the main and I will not repeat them here. My point is that production has already been restored to the point that there is no longer any great emergency and that we can well afford to level off the volume of the aid that we provide through this program.

For the immediate future I see these nations of western Europe fast reaching their saturation point in production of goods. When they do, trade barriers, tariffs, and money restrictions will preclude them from trading with each other; overproduction will pile up; unemployment will result. Even after they are on their feet, they have too few ways of earning dollars so as to trade with us. We are going to be driven to a system of barter or to a system of bank credit, confined to those nations who will align their trade policies to meet the realities of these new conditions. This is the only basis for any real hope by us, as I see it, for future trade of appreciable amounts with western Europe.

We hear a great deal of talk about the integration of the economy of the nations of western Europe. In my opinion we missed our chance in not making strong and definite demands for such an integration as a condition precedent to the inauguration of this program. The 20 percent that we propose to set aside for this purpose now is not enough, and it comes too late. I am merely pointing this out as a fact as I see it, and not in a spirit of "I told you so," because I did not tell you so and did not then fully realize the question involved, but I did think that we leaned over backward in the whole program trying to avoid suspicion. When I got to Europe I found that we were saturated in suspicion in the minds of most Europeans anyway.

The third principal reason why I voted for the Marshall plan in the beginning was the idea of creating good will among the nations of western Europe. On this point I was much surprised and disappointed with what I found as to the attitude of the average European with reference to our part in the Marshall aid program, but I am not nearly so severe in my judgment on these people for their attitude since talking to them and seeing their conditions and better understanding why we are misunderstood. You will remember that this is a report of my impressions gained at the grass-roots level. I shall illustrate briefly two conversations that could be repeated many times in several of the countries. Through an interpreter, I talked to a Greek farmer and his three grown sons on their very, very small olive orchard consisting of only 28 trees on a rocky hillside some 20 miles south of Athens. After learning that he was fairly familiar with the fact that Greek aid had been coming from the United States since the war, I inquired as to his idea of the reason for this assistance. He said it was planned by the United States to get control of the land of the farmers in Greece. I looked at his and the countryside's scanty acres, and compared them with the vast domain of our American lands, and thought what a pity it was that he did not see the entire picture. Nevertheless, he was firm in his convictions as to our motives.

In London, I went on three successive nights to Hyde Park and remained there until midnight talking with various groups, and learned directly from the dock workers there that their version of the American aid to England was as follows: They said that we would send England a million dollars one day and then go up on prices to get it back the next; that it was all a scheme to transfer the markets of the world from British hands into American hands, and that their Government had better not let America get away with it. I do not say that these sentiments represent all the sentiments of the English people and do not think that they do. I am telling you directly what I found at the grass roots.

All over western Europe the rank-and-file people do not realize nor understand what part we are playing in this economic recovery program, and it is very difficult to tell them. There is a natural resentment just as there would be with me personally if someone undertook to come to my front door every morning and remind me in the presence of my wife and children of how much they had done for me the day before.

I have found throughout western Europe, that the administrations of the various governments do not emphasize to the rank-and-file people the part that we are playing in this economic recovery program, for the simple reason that to do so would detract from the success of their own administrations.

Specifically, I am going to support the Kem amendment to reduce the authorization in round numbers by $1,000,000,000. I am driven to this conclusion for the reasons heretofore given but mainly because I am convinced that this program, or one like it under some other name, must go beyond the year 1952 and perhaps for some 10 years beyond 1952—on a smaller scale, of course. I believe that more good can be done from here on out by extending the same amount of money over a greater period of time. I believe it is definitely a mistake to be in such a hurry with such extensive replacements of machinery and highways, docks, and everything else on such an ambitious program.

Further, I am unable to see that it is wise to spend additional sums on Belgium and Holland under present conditions. I believe it is a mistake to spend the money so rapidly in England. There is a situation there wherein it will become apparent the British Isles cannot support 50,000,000 people. There is a socialistic upheaval in progress with the final outcome an unknown quantity. I do not know what the remedy is, but I am absolutely sure it won't be found by the rapid spending of American dollars. Because of their frontier positions I feel that we must necessarily continue to spend money in Greece, Austria, and Germany. It is a mistake it seems to me to travel along on the idea that this spending will stop in 1952. We must condition our minds to the idea that this program may have to continue on some scale beyond this period, and I urge the reduction in amounts now in preparation for the likely necessity of continuing expenditures beyond 1952.

Mr. President, I am also influenced by the realization that our tremendously heavy military program at home is mounting in cost rather than being reduced. We hear the urgent demands for new guns, new planes, new military materials on all sides. I am entirely familiar with the old arguments that the dollars we spend on the European frontier will equal, two, three, or four dollars spent at home. We hope they will, but we must also spend the dollars where we know they will count and that is on our direct defenses controlled by us.

I am further influenced by the fact that every dollar appropriated in this ECA program for the next fiscal year will be borrowed money. We are already some $7,000,000,000 behind with a mounting deficit day by day, with growing obligations at home and abroad and with increased strain on our national economy. I think the first necessity for a strong defense at home and the first necessity for a stabilizing influence in the world is a sound money program for our own Nation. If we ever let it reach the point where this soundness is endangered, then the battle will gradually be lost on all fronts. I feel confident in my own mind that this program can be carried on almost as soundly with $2,000,000,000 as it can with the three billion, and I shall, therefore, strongly oppose going beyond the $2,000,000,000 figure. Let us carry this extra billion dollars forward for the fiscal year 1953, and decide in 1952 whether or not it shall be spent.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

DOLLAR TROUBLE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, one of the greatest hoaxes that was ever sold to the American public is the "dollar shortage" or "dollar trouble." There is no dollar problem. There is a pound-sterling problem.

The dollar-shortage idea has been propagandized by the sixteen Marshall-plan countries and by the State Department to such an extent that they have been able to switch the problem and make our people believe that it is a dollar problem.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to consider what would happen if the situation were reversed. What would England do and say? Would we have a pound problem or would we have a dollar problem? I will say, Mr. President, that the foreign countries, including England, would see that our people understood that it was a dollar problem.

STERLING DEBT

England is asking us to take over the sterling debt. They owe so much to the sterling countries that they control the trade of these nations, forcing these nations to trade with England because England owes them so much money that England is kindly letting them trade it out with her, so that it is not necessary for England to be efficient in their manufacturing and processing, because they will write off the sterling debt to the extent that we furnish them goods and funds, and in the meantime England holds their trade through the debt obligations. So now England wants us to furnish the money to the sterling areas, meantime holding the obligations over the heads of such countries, so that they can continue to force the trade into their own channels while the debt is being reduced through still another siphon into the Treasury of the United States. This is a colossal nerve, to say the least.

Mr. President, we should treat the money of the taxpayers of this country in the same way that a cashier of a bank treats the depositors' money, that is, we should handle it in a businesslike way,

through adequate security for any of such money loaned.

I would ask, Why should the foreign recipient nations and the majority party on this floor resent any suggestions in the matter of safeguarding the taxpayers' money?

Mr. President, I intend to discuss briefly now, and this afternoon in more detail when the four separate amendments which I have offered come to the floor. The first is the amendment providing that any further aid from the United States should be loaned to private business, through the World Bank, in line with and under the same conditions which RFC loans are offered to private business in this country.

Second, that each participating country will guarantee the integrity of private investments within its borders against socialism, nationalization, or confiscation, as we protect investments in this country.

The third amendment provides that each such country will join in a concerted effort with the other participating countries to form a United States of Europe, similar to the United States of America, with Germany included.

The fourth amendment provides that each participating country will eliminate any currency manipulation which prevents its currency from reflecting its actual purchasing power in terms of the United States dollar on the free monetary markets of the world.

Mr. President, in addition to those four amendments, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] has an amendment to stop the ECA nations, or to stop any nation, from continuing to supply the goods necessary to enable Russia and the iron curtain countries to fight a world war III with us, or to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and in China. They are doing the latter through the 96 trade treaties existing at this moment—between the 16 ECA nations and Russia and the iron curtain countries. A list of these treaties will be submitted for the RECORD in connection with amendments to be brought up later in the day.

Mr. President, we remember that when the ECA was first being foisted upon our unsuspecting taxpayers, we were told that by helping European recovery we would establish European markets for American products—American workingmen and American investors. That is conveniently forgotten now, and we are told that "Buy European" is the slogan; that when unemployment hits us—and it is hitting now—the workers will be taught new jobs and put on relief. Tutors will be furnished by the ECA to teach the unemployed new jobs and the management how to create new industries after they have lost their stockholders' money. The current propaganda is to the effect that, if Congress does not provide continuous ECA appropriations for the European nations with which to buy our goods, we face a great depression in this country. What childish reasoning will be offered next? Perhaps we will now face such a depression since we continued to build our heavy industries higher since the war—with taxpayers' money without regard to the legitimate market.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that when the $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan was first proposed, in March 1948, that is, first proposed on the Senate floor, the emphasis was placed on three things which must be done for Europe:

First. Feed the hungry people.

Second. Rehabilitate industry.

Third. Stop communism.

I said in the first debates upon this important subject in March 1948, that the three suggested problems could not be intelligently discussed together, but that they must be separated and analyzed to make sense.

Upon that occasion I said that before any intelligent approach to these three problems could be arrived at, the executive department of our Government, which is charged with fixing foreign policy and which should largely devolve upon the State Department of the Department of National Defense, must decide after full consideration and understanding the latest methods and weapons of offense and defense and the areas, naming the nations, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, in addition to the Western Hemisphere, whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety, and then within those areas plan to accomplish separately the three objectives:

First. Feed hungry people within such emergency areas, compatible with our domestic economy, and do not expect a return of the money any more than we would if we sent $100,000 into an area devastated by flood or fire in this country. We would not be sending the money to reelect the mayor or government—we would be sending it to feed, clothe, and house the people until they could accomplish that objective themselves.

Second. In the rehabilitation of industry, we should loan the money to private industry within those areas, again taking careful note of our own economy structure, under the same rules and regulations, no more stringent or no more lenient, than the RFC loans money to our own individuals and business people in times of stress in this country. Certainly money should not be loaned to an Englishman or a Frenchman or an Italian on more lenient terms than to a GI or a sick business in this country.

Third. To stop communism we should extend the 125-year old Monroe Doctrine that has been so successful in the Western Hemisphere in preventing foreign nations from extending their system of government in that area to cover the nations named by the executive branch, whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety, and simply repeat the words of President Monroe, uttered in 1823, leaving out the words "Western Hemisphere" and say:

> We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Then we should proceed immediately to rebuild a national defense organization spearheaded by an air corps and a submarine fleet that would bear silent evidence to any nation that we can and will enforce our pronouncement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the recovery of the ECA nations since 1946.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA nations—index numbers of industrial production—1937=100 (except where otherwise noted)—annual, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and latest monthly figure

	1946	1947	1948	1949	Latest monthly figure	Date
Austria	[1]	51	78	104	114	December 1949.
Belgium	74	86	93	49	95	Do.
Denmark	101	116	129	137	145	February 1950.
France	73	87	102	112	119	January 1950.
Germany bizone	[2] 34	40	60	[3] 89	[3] 95	December 1949.
Greece	53	67	73	87	97	Do.
Ireland	109	113	130	[4] 135	138	Third quarter 1949.
Italy	[1]	93	98	104	108	January 1950.
Luxemburg	[1]	89	[1]	113	103	Do.
Netherlands	75	95	114	127	135	Do.
Norway	100	115	125	132	135	Do.
Sweden	137	141	149	[1]	148	December 1949.
United Kingdom	90	98	109	116	124	January 1950.

[1] Not available.
[2] Base 1936=100.
[3] Federal republic.
[4] 3 quarter average.

Source: Statistical Bulletin of the United Nations, April 1950.

Mr. MALONE. The table shows that their recovery from 1946 to 1947 was about the same percentage without the Marshall plan, as their recovery has been in any year since with the Marshall plan. At this moment the rates of recovery range all the way from approximately 100 percent to 138 percent. I ask, Mr. President, what are we trying to do? Is this recovery or is it something else? Our objectives have advanced materially since the program was first discussed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD showing the operation and the members of the sterling bloc and the original objectives and suggestions for the Marshall plan:

CURRENCY MANIPULATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, most of the nations of the world have established methods of manipulating their currencies for trade advantage.

For example, the English have their sterling bloc—with a large number of nations blocked in—and a large number blocked out. The Dutch have their guilder and the French their franc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a list of the sterling bloc area nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

"THE STERLING AREA

"(Prepared by State Department in consultation with United Kingdom Treasury Delegation)

"(As of March 25, 1949)

"The term 'sterling area' means the United Kingdom and the following territories excluding Canada and Newfoundland.

"I. BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AND EMPIRE COUNTRIES

"(a) any Dominion: Australia, New Zealand, South Africa.

"(b) any other part of His Britannic Majesty's dominations: India, Burma, Southern Rhodesia, Ceylon.

"Principal colonial territories: Aden[1] (colony and protectorate); Bahamas; Barbados; Basutoland; Bermuda; British Guiana; British Honduras; Cyprus; Falkland Islands and dependencies; Fiji; Gambia[1] (colony and protectorate); Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands colony; Gold Coast[1] (1) Colony, (2) Ashanti, (3) Northern Territories; Hong Kong; Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands); Kenya[1] (colony and protecorate); Leeward Islands; Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands; Malta; Mauritius; Nigeria:[1] (1) Colony, (2) Protectorate; St. Helena and dependencies; Seychelles, Sierra Leone[1] (colony and protectorate); Straits Settlements; Trinidad and Tobago; Windward Islands: Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent.

"(c) Any territory in respect of which a mandate on behalf of the League of Nations has been accepted by His Britannic Majesty and is being exercised by His Britanic Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom or in any Dominion: Cameroons (British), Tanganyika, Togoland (British), South West Africa, Western Samoa, Nauru.

"(d) Any British protectorate or protected state: Bechuanaland protectorate; British Solomon Islands protectorate; Malay States (1) Federated Malay States; Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (2) Unfederated Malay States; Johore, Kedah, Gelantan, Perlis, Tregganu, Brunei; State of North Borneo; Northern Rhodesia; Nyasaland protectorate; Sarawak; Somaliland protectorate; Swaziland; Tonga; Uganda protectorate; Zanzibar protectorate.

"II. INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES

"(a) Iraq.
"(b) Iceland.
"(c) Ireland."

THE STERLING BLOC

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there is a large number of these nations, and I think it will be of great interest to Senators to study the list, because this sterling bloc area is controlled just as wholly as if it were one nation, and the economics are controlled.

On my visit to Italy toward the end of 1947, I met an Italian banker who was crying his eyes out. He had about 25,000,000 sterling pounds in his vaults, and he said he thought he had been doing all right. He was getting ready for trade. But now his pounds had been blocked, and he could expend this money only in the sterling bloc area. Therefore he was unable to buy anything any place except in the sterling bloc area.

* * * * *

OBJECTIVES OF ORIGINAL MARSHALL PLAN

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I said last year that what we wanted to do under the Marshall plan was to feed hungry people, to rehabilitate industry, and to stop communism. I continue to read:

"HUNGRY PEOPLE—COMMUNISM—REHABILITATION OF INDUSTRY

"It is impossible to consider the feeding of hungry people—the stopping of communism—and the rehabilitation of industry as one subject. We only confuse ourselves.

"As a result we mix our emotions with the facts and become unwilling victims of the greatest propaganda machine ever established in Washington; let us take them one at a time:

"FEEDING HUNGRY PEOPLE

"Feeding hungry people of Europe or of any other emergency area is a matter of charity and must be so considered apart from other considerations."

Departing from the text for a moment, the amendment which I have just been discussing, which was submitted on Wednesday of last week, was to exclude medicines and food, and then lend money on the same basis on which we lend it to American citizens for the rehabilitation of industry.

I continue the quotation:

"FEEDING HUNGRY PEOPLE

"Feeding hungry people of Europe or of any other emergency area is a matter of charity and must be so considered apart from other considerations. The Congress of the United States has appropriated nearly $1,500,000,000 during the last 12 months for that purpose alone, and has appropriated $24,000,000,000 and handed it to the nations of the world without hope of repayment since the close of World War II in 1945."

We have given them the money. None of it will ever come back. I know that the Senator from Rhode Island is not naive enough to think that any of it will ever be repaid.

"INDUSTRIAL REHABILITATION

"The rehabilitation of the industries of the 16 Marshall plan European countries, entirely separate from feeding hungry people, can then be accomplished as a purely business transaction in the same manner as such industrial plants were financed in this country by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during depression and World War II years.

"A reasonable amount of money, say $1,000,000,000 could be appropriated and made available to the RFC or to the World Bank for that specific purpose, simply providing that the RFC rules and regulations be applied to any foreign-business loans."

The only difference between that suggestion and the one made in my amendment is that, so long as we have created the ECA, we should let the ECA do it under our RFC rules. What are those rules?

"Their rules provide for an investigation of the feasibility of such an industry by an experienced investigator in the respective field, with an estimate of cost, together with a list of the needed machinery and supplies. They further provide for a lien or mortgage to be taken on such equipment—the stock or shares of the existing organization to be hypothecated as additional security for such loan, and then the signature of the applicants is required."

PLEASANT SURPRISE ON BUSINESS BASIS

In other words, it is a loan, exactly the same as a loan which might be made to a citizen of Rhode Island.

I continue reading:

"It will prove a pleasant surprise to both the Congress and to the State Department the relatively small amount of funds that the European nations will require for industrial plant refinancing, if such loans must be secured on a business basis.

"The entire thesis and point of my argument is that the feeding of hungry people, whether located in this or any other nation—the international policy of protecting the integrity of foreign areas in the interest of our own ultimate safety—and the rehabilitation of industrial plants in such foreign nations, must be considered separately to make sense and to be understood by our own people.

"The extent that we can and should feed the hungry people of the world—and the amount of money we may loan for rehabilitation of industrial plants on a business basis throughout the world—is the particular business and responsibility of the Congress of the United States—while the international policy, the determination of the areas and nations of the world that we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety is a State Department matter.

"COMMUNISM—INTEGRITY OF NATIONS

"Stopping communism through protecting the integrity of the nations of the world that we decide, after full discussion and study, we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety, is a matter of our own integrity and frankness with our own citizens—and with the nations of the world.

"If we should decide, after full consideration of our experience through two world wars—and our improved methods of defense and offense—that a threat to the integrity of any member nation of the United Nations Organization, by any other nation would constitute a threat to our ultimate safety—then President Monroe's exact words could be utilized in announcing an extension of the established Monroe Doctrine, leaving out any reference to the Western Hemisphere, and say, in effect, to the world and to the American people that:

" 'We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system, as dangerous to our peace and safety.'

"We should then build at once a military force, spearheaded by an air corps that would bear silent evidence to all concerned that we were ready and able to enforce the extended doctrine, just as we have enforced the original Monroe Doctrine covering the Western Hemisphere for more than 125 years, and which kept us out of a major war for more than 75 years.

"The Congressional Air Policy Board has recommended a long-range military plane purchase program, which would provide a 35,000-plane striking force costing $16,800,000,000 over a 5-year program. The President's air policy board's recent report closely parallels this document."

The reports were made at almost the same time.

"The Armed Services Committees of Congress should immediately check these reports and if found correct recommend their adoption and the appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress of the United States for the entire 5-year program.

"Congress could apply the Marshall plan 4-year funds of $17,000,000,000 to the $16,800,000,000 5-year plane purchase program and have approximately enough left to continue the necessary European nations' feeding program until they raise a third crop and to furnish the necessary funds to the RFC or the World Bank for the rehabilitation of the European nations' industry under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation rules, as applied to American citizens.

[1] Colonies contiguous to protectorates of the same name or within the same administrative unit.

"Under the 125-year-old Monroe Doctrine we would only declare war when we judged that our own ultimate safety was threatened, and we were the sole judge in that event."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an article published in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Leak of $700,000,000 Found in United States Outgo Abroad Last Year." It shows the amount of additional foreign money invested in the United States as a result of the leak.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAK OF $700,000,000 FOUND IN UNITED STATES OUTGO ABROAD LAST YEAR—FOREIGNERS' SCRAMBLE TO INVEST IN THIS COUNTRY COST UNCLE SAM A FOREIGN AID SAVING

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam could have saved several hundreds of millions of foreign aid dollars last year, but for a secret scramble on the part of foreigners to get good United States investments.

The Federal Reserve Board yesterday as much as acknowledged that foreigners had $700,000,000 more United States dollars last year than policy makers here realized. That was at a time when the United States was pouring out billions to help needy governments in Europe and Asia.

The elusive $700,000,000 was mentioned in the Board's latest monthly bulletin in an article called "The Balance of Payments Position of the United States."

Government figures indicate United States income from abroad last year was $15,900,000,000. Since outgo was $9,800,000,000 net income was $6,100,000,000. If nothing else had happened, the foreigners would have drawn down their holdings by $6,100,000,000.

But Uncle Sam loaned and gave away $5,700,000,000, private United States citizens made investments and donations of $1,000,000,000 abroad, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Monetary Fund had net outlays of $100,000,000. That means foreigners got $6,800,000,000 to cover a $6,100,000,000 deficit. They should have been $700,000,000 to the good, and this $700,000,000 should have shown up in their private or government assets. But it didn't.

This isn't the first time this has happened. Back in 1948, the Board noted, foreigners apparently had $1,200,000,000 that somehow went uncounted in statistics here.

What happened to these lost dollars? The Board figures a lot of this money is salted away in unrecorded investments foreigners made in the United States. Sometimes these deals are unrecorded simply because there are gaps in the statistics Uncle Sam collects—some of those bothersome questionnaires the bankers and securities dealers get from Federal agencies aren't quite complete enough.

Sometimes the investments are just plain evasions of rules laid down by other governments. Foreigners decide United States securities, commodities, real estate, or bank accounts are sounder than similar holdings at home. But regulations—in Britain, for instance—say they can't use their dollars this way. So they invest under cover. They get a friend or business associate who is a United States citizen to make and hold the investment or bank account for them.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Can We Sell What We Now Give Away?" written by Junius B. Wood, and published in Nation's Business of February 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE SELL WHAT WE NOW GIVE AWAY?

(By Junius B. Wood)

Two world-shaking explosions out of the clear skies of last September jolted the United States back on its heels. Moscow's atomic blast could be a warning of wars to come. London's devaluation of the pound sterling was positive notice that a worldwide trade war has already started.

The trade war, with devaluation as the opening shot, is directed at the United States, the greatest of producing and trading nations. The war's declared objective is to capture a sizable share of this country's world trade and to make deep inroads in our home markets.

Our industry and agriculture have built a nation which can supply not only the needs of its own people but can export $20,000,000,000 worth of its products in a single year.

America's markets, domestic and foreign, will pay the cost of the war. Our casualties can be heavy in industry and employment. But the competitors across the street—in this case the streets are oceans—believe our losses are necessary for their own economic well-being.

Devaluation is a powerful weapon in the foreign markets which mean so much to the United States. Our exports, though modest in percentage of national income, are a vital part of our economy, often called "the extra 5 inches on the blanket which keep the bed warm." To a firm exports may be the difference between profit and loss. The Labor Department says 3,164,000 American jobs depend on exports alone.

If a national economy is working smoothly imports are paid for by exports, investments, services, and free-spending tourists. Nations, like individuals, feel secure when income equals outgo. When the former falls short they must borrow, put it on the cuff, or tap "uncle" for a gift.

Our exports for recent years are almost double our imports—roughly $13,300,000,000 against $7,500,000,000 in 1948. Foreign countries' shortage in their exports to us has been met by gifts from the Economic Cooperation Administration and other Government agencies. Their export shortage and our export surplus are the same thing under different names—the gifts to them for which American taxpayers have paid $80,000,000,000 in the past decade.

ECA's present $10,000,000,000, almost all spent, runs to June 30, 1950. Paul G. Hoffman, its Administrator, says five to six billion dollars more may be needed before ECA expires on the same day in 1952.

As war-racked countries move out of the hardship stage, ECA and other spenders of American taxpayers' dollars are expected to pass out. Devaluation and voluntary concessions by the United States are on the march to fill the void after their demise. Instead of continuing its gifts, the United States is expected to buy more and sell less. The burden will thus be transferred from Government and all taxpayers to American producers and their employees.

If not complicated by other factors—market demands, quality, raw-material costs, production capacity, delivery dates, and others—devaluation could reduce the price of goods sold to America by 30 percent and increase by 44 percent the cost of American exports to the same country. Nations which devalue will buy less and sell more in the United States. Our trade and employment face a two-edged sword.

Devaluation is a shaky floor built by governments with controlled currencies. Even with the most rigid controls, the law of supply and demand can burrow under it to a lower though illegal level. The pound sterling was officially pegged at $2.80 on September 18, and the next day was being offered in Chicago for $2.65. Once the United Kingdom made the break, other nations followed with cuts varying from 9 percent in Canada to 46 percent in Argentina.

Devaluation also brought the painful realization that another of the organizations which the United States has heavily endowed to bring cooperation among nations had failed. The International Monetary Fund exists to stabilize world currencies. Its $7,000,000,000 fund—40 percent subscribed by the United States, 20 percent (before devaluation) by the United Kingdom, and the balance by 45 other nations—was bypassed.

Powerful as devaluation is, trade agreements are the more serious weapon which the United States faces in a trade war. They include multilateral tariff concessions, quotas, and favored-nation treaties. Our Government approves of these. To them can be added barter agreements limited to two countries, subsidies, state monopolies, embargoes, currency controls, and other restrictions which the United States deplores, though not without sin itself.

In 1947, the United States staged another of those delights of dining diplomats, a convention of 23 nations at Geneva, Switzerland. These and 10 others were at Annecy, France, in 1949. In addition, the United States has agreements with 14 nations which did not provide convention transportation for their diplomats.

Ground rules are that, when two countries agree to a reduction of import tariff rates, all other countries at the convention will enjoy the same rates. The United States is even more liberal. It makes the slash general, including countries which do not have a favored-nation treaty. Colombia terminated its agreement at Annecy but 99 percent of its exports—coffee, bananas, and petroleum—continue to enter duty free due to our agreements with other countries.

A convention agreement does not become effective until approved by a home government—May 30, 1950, is the latest deadline. At Annecy, 33 schedules and some 5,000 items were discussed.

The delegates were happy. World trade had been freed from more shackles. But the jokers are already emerging from the agreements. A farmer tells the neighborhood kids to pick all the apples they want but a high fence is around the orchard and a lively pack of dogs inside to nab any who climb over. Trade agreements are just like that.

A country reduces its import tariffs on a commodity and then slaps on an embargo against importation of that commodity. Or it agrees on an import tariff to be available to all countries at the convention and then signs a barter agreement with one country. A recent one between the United Kingdom and Argentina is typical. A quota is fixed, equal to the amounts in the barter agreement, and imports from other countries are barred. Again, most countries have currency and other controls. The government decides what, where, and how much its importers may buy. Naturally this does not apply to what the United States provided through ECA.

At the same time, the country erecting the roadblocks at its own frontiers can enjoy the reduced tariffs which the United States has granted. This country's import barricades, only on price-support commodities and vastly fewer than those of other nations, provide a sparkling example.

Denmark, a dairy country, wants to ship butter to the United States. At Annecy, Uncle Sam reduced the tariff from 14 to 7 cents a pound and fixed an annual quota of 60,000,000 pounds to be imported from Denmark and other countries. Under our

farm-price-support program, the Department of Agriculture has 87,000,000 pounds in storage and an embargo forbids the importation of any butter.

In return for this generous gesture, Denmark granted tariff concessions on imports of dried fruits, cereals, and vegetables. Denmark issues import permits only for such essential commodities as machinery and then only from pound sterling and "soft" money countries. Each country has its joker and the net result of the agreements is zero in other than ECA's one-way trade.

The United States denounces barter, subsidies, and dumping but occasionally takes a nip itself. Our 41 to 48 cents a bushel subsidy under the international wheat agreement approaches $500,000,000 while the Commodity Credit Corporation barters surplus for whatever it can get.

Compared to other nations, however, the doors of the United States are wide open for imports. Devaluation and trade agreements have reduced the price of admission to less than the luxury tax which an American pays on a movie ticket.

"Why hail a trade agreement as a great diplomatic accomplishment when the other country has regulations which nullify its part of the agreement?" the State Department was asked.

"Countries expect—hope rather—that sometime in the future the prohibitions will be removed and the agreements can operate," was the explanation. "Agreements set a pattern for the unselfish world toward which we are striving."

Awaiting that happy day, the United States is to buy more from abroad and sell less everywhere. Increasing the market demands of backward areas by raising their standards of living is a slow process measured in generations. Cutting prices in consuming nations by devaluation and reduced tariffs brings quick results.

The effects of devaluation showed within 24 hours. Our Commerce Department reported that applications by American firms for export permits, a necessary preliminary to accepting an order from abroad, were being canceled. Permits are required to prevent depletion of our stockpiles and to keep strategic goods from countries whose future intentions are suspect. Metal export permits dropped 30 percent in the first month.

Producers who waved good-by to their export orders were only a dribble among the protests and inquiries which flooded the Department. A vastly greater number feared the effects which lowering the floodgates against imports would have on their own home markets. The inquiries showed a fairly clear division between large and small producers.

"The possible impact of a greatly expanded import program upon the present vulnerable economy of the United States will be far reaching," said America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, a union group of 50,000 affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. "The idea of promoting trade at the expense of industries to be sacrificed in behalf of a general policy is both false and dangerous."

"Not the mass-production industries but the many times more numerous producers of consumer goods and miscellaneous commodities will suffer most," O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary of the conference, explains.

Among American industries listed by him and others to be hardest hit by devaluation and trade agreements, are: pottery, bottle and flat glass, shoes, leather goods, furs, cutlery, scientific and surgical instruments, typewriters and office machines, citrus and dried fruits, watches, liquor and wine, ball bearings, bicycles, textiles, olive oil, caustic soda and chemicals, hats and millinery, matches, fisheries, wallpaper, costume and imitation jewelry, toys, and smokers' articles.

Scotch whisky is selected to prove that devaluation will not reduce prices appreciably. The demand for it does not depend on price and there is no American competition. As the retail cost is mostly taxes on a quantitative instead of a price basis, the producer could not make much reduction and there is no pressure to make any. In fact, his prices increased to meet devaluation.

At the other extreme are vitrified products where two-thirds of production costs go into payrolls. Hourly wages, according to trade officials, average: United States, $1.30; United Kingdom, 43 cents; Germany, 30; France, 26; and Japan, 9. Pottery and glass manufacturers of Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, and California view devaluation and tariff cuts as a raw deal at their expense.

"They will be ruinous to America's glass, pottery, and handicraft industries," Charles W. Carlson, president of the United States Glass Co. says.

Meanwhile the State Department awarded a big contract for gold-decorated dinnerware to a German firm for—of all places—American embassies.

Army tableware sports less gold leaf but James M. Duffy, president of the National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, has protested similar discrimination against American producers by that branch of the service.

When Secretary of State Acheson did not reply to a protest against American embassy banquets on foreign-baked chinaware, Robert F. Martin, executive secretary of the Vitrified China Association, offered to supply British embassies in Washington and other capitals with fine American chinaware at nominal prices. F. S. DeMoleyns of the Embassy Commercial Department, replied:

"I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter and would point out that, as the United Kingdom is itself the manufacturer of some of the finest chinaware in the world, we are not in the market for china manufactured elsewhere; nor do I think any other embassies in the British Commonwealth would be interested in your proposal."

Agriculture must face the same changes as industry and commerce with all that depend on them in cities and villages. Some 40 percent of our wheat crop, one-third of our raw cotton, and a tenth of our cotton textiles were exported last year. ECA absorbed the bulk of these exports. Now new cotton textile mills in other countries, and rayon, have reduced the world market by one-half, and competition will be fiercer for what remains.

The competition spreads like autumn frost over large and small. Tulip bulbs from Holland will be cheaper. A firm in South Africa cancels its order because devaluation has raised American prices 40 percent, and the Government will cut dollar import permits by half. Britain cut import permits 25 percent. Books from London were $1.45; now $1. Airplane tariffs east of Paris are devalued, but American lines pay for maintenance and crews with dollars. Signs in a New York City store window read: "Buy British footwear at devalued prices; now $24, formerly $30." The dealer has not devalued to the limit, but $24 is now £8.57 for Britain, while $30 was formerly only £7.44.

The Soviet Union takes its cut from the American cake through a favored-nation treaty, and our silver fox and mink farms are closing their kennels.

Display advertisements in American newspapers invite: "Come to Britain, where your dollar goes farther." Tourist dollars beat export dollars. Scenery and Old World atmosphere save production costs. Tourists are advised, however, that haircuts in London's best shops are now 28 cents, formerly 21. Devaluation lowers Britain's export prices but raises those at home.

The trade war is dividing the globe into four worlds, each with its internal trade and interchangeable currency—dollar, pound sterling, western Europe, and the Soviet Union. The American dollar is stable in all, and all want free entry to American markets to get the dollars.

In a world bumping from crisis to crisis, the United States has been prodigal with its resources and help to salvage other nations. As scare followed scare, American taxpayers were assured: "This will finish the job." The Four Freedoms served for the war and went into the discard. The loan to put Britain on its feet in 3 years melted away in half that time. Greek-Turkish aid, ERP, North Atlantic Military Pact, and Military Assistance Pact for Europe have been lavishly financed but the job is never finished.

The latest, point 4, goes farther afield in searching out backward areas for the benefit of billions. A home freezer or a germproof mattress in every jungle hut may tickle village fancy, but the promise that the village will be transformed, even in our children's lifetime, into a market for American industry is hard to take.

Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, which is to work the miracle, says:

"With a low level of education and health and without intelligent, skilled, and vigorous manpower, the economic progress of any country will be slow, however amply it may be endowed with natural resources and however ample the assistance of foreign capital."

Even those who shovel the dollars from the Federal Treasury are growing cautious. The proposal of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization for a $5,000,000,000—the United States contributing two-fifths—International Commodity Clearing House to feed the world has been put on ice for a while at least.

Other nations have stepped out on their own with devaluation as their weapon. They believe the time has come to cut loose from American apron strings and wage their own fight for a greater share of world trade. It is to their credit. The American Aladdin rubbed the lamps of Europe and competition came forth. The world changed overnight and the United States becomes a competitor instead of a patron.

Can this Nation which grew strong in a rough, competitive world meet the breaks as it faces a new trade war? The test will come when ECA and other give-away agencies are taken off American taxpayers' backs.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, when the war ended we suddenly found that we had given Manchuria, the bread basket of China, to Russia, and had forced the Chinese Nationalist Government to accept the inevitable and approve our gift to Russia.

It gave Russia a foothold in China and Asia and, as everyone knows now, the people who were held out to us as being agrarian Communists have developed into the same kind of Communists that they have in Russia and are dealing exclusively with them.

This all happened at Yalta where Mr. Hiss, now convicted of perjury in connection with his traitorous acts against this Government, was adviser to an ailing President.

We also gave Berlin to Russia and held our Army on the banks of the Elbe in 1945 until the Russians could take possession, and we have been busily engaged since in giving Russia, through the 96 trade treaties that the 16 Marshall-plan countries have made with Russia and the iron-curtain nations since World War II, the material they need to arm themselves for a third world war and to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and China.

We have also been busily engaged in dividing our atomic bomb and other secrets with Canada and England, and suddenly found a couple of years ago that a British scientist named May had been dealing with the Russians through Canada, giving them all of the secrets available to Canada, and now we suddenly wake up and find that in Britain itself another scientist having access to all of our secrets and having been accepted as an equal in this country, has been handling all of the secret data as it has been worked out to the Russians. We should know by this time that these nations are showing themselves perfectly cynical and have little regard for the safety of this Nation.

They are now attacking us economically all over the world as witness their petroleum development, which we have financed, and then they are manipulating the business so that our American companies are at a disadvantage in Europe and Asia and in South America. They are beginning to show the same disposition in the steel and other industries and are attempting—with considerable success—to edge us out of the world markets everywhere.

The 16 Marshall-plan countries have 96 trade treaties with Russia and the iron-curtain countries so they have neither shown themselves friendly to us economically nor in the matter of the protection of our own Nation.

When will we come to our senses and realize that we cannot continue to go billions of dollars in the red each year in peacetime while the unemployed number approximately 6,000,000 at this time and the partially unemployed nearly 12,000,000 while we continue to bleed our taxpayers white?

Let us end this stupid, senseless approach and put our own house in order and any assistance to any foreign nation on a business basis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in a recent speech which was broadcast to the Nation, President Truman described his administration's fight against communism in terms of the highest praise.

He called the Federal employees loyalty program an outstanding success. He declared that the Loyalty Review Board, made up almost equally of Democratic and Republican members, had rid the Government of all employees who were found to be disloyal.

President Truman further said:

> Not a single person who has been adjudged to be a Communist or otherwise disloyal remains on the Government payroll today.

In that speech, as in previous public utterances, the President belittled the influence of communism in this country. He said:

> The greatest threat to us comes not from the Communists in this country, where they are a noisy, but small and universally despised group. The greatest threat comes from Communist imperialism abroad where the center of its military might and economic strength lies.
>
> The real danger is that communism might overrun free nations and thus strengthen itself for an ultimate attack on us.

Mr. President, in recognition of the danger which President Truman emphasized, we need in this country a new type of loyalty program.

We need a new loyalty pledge in order to strengthen the United States, militarily, financially, and spiritually, so that we may be prepared to hurl back in complete defeat any attack that might be launched against us.

It is not enough to drive the Communists, the fellow-travelers, and the misguided "pinks" out of the Government. We must also be awake to the danger from those who advocate ruthless and reckless spending without regard for the inevitable end of such a course—national bankruptcy.

The loyalty program I now suggest is one demanding loyalty to the fiscal needs of our Nation and loyalty to the financial strength and stability of the United States without which we will not be able to defend our shores against aggression from abroad.

While we are rooting out subversives let us make sure that American freedom is not endangered by those who would innocently play into the hands of communism.

Remember the ominous warning contained in the words of the Communist, Lenin, who said:

> We will force the United States to spend itself into destruction.

It is urgent that we have men and women in the key positions of our Government who realize the dangers of deficit spending at the rate of $7,000,000,000 a year.

Such public officials would willingly pledge themselves not to propose or support any plan, program, or project that would increase the Federal debt—that would require an increase in taxes, or would result in inflation.

They would not give encouragement to any pressure group, no matter how worthy or desirable its purpose, if its objective was to obtain special privilege for one section at the expense of the whole country.

Such public officials would cooperate to the fullest extent with every proposal to save money for the taxpayers.

Today many department and bureau heads find a way of stirring up public protest when it is suggested that perhaps they might get along with a reduced appropriation.

They demand more—never less—always more.

The fundamentals of economics are not complicated. The same principles apply in the case of an individual, a family, a business, or the biggest of all enterprises, the United States Government.

Yet we have been brought into a time of unprecedented debt through fiscal policies directed by officials who either have no understanding of those fundamentals or deliberately ignore them.

Mr. President, I submit that in considering the amount to be authorized for the continuance of ECA for another year we must be guided by the proper balance between what is needed and what we can afford with safety to the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Don't Just Preach Economy: Vote for It," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T JUST PREACH ECONOMY: VOTE FOR IT

Against the background of new estimates that the Federal deficit may total $14,000,000,000 for this fiscal year and the next, the actions of Congress on important spending legislation in recent days show an alarming lack of concern over one of the Nation's chief domestic problems.

The problem is that of a Federal Government spending, without any apparent thought, billions more than it takes in. It is a problem that must be solved if the Federal Government is to maintain its own financial stability and to remove one of the most dangerous sources of inflationary pressure on the national economy.

But instead of being warned by the estimates that the Federal deficit is steadily edging upward, most Congressmen, in both House and Senate, have acted as if the Government were operating under an unlimited surplus of revenue.

It is all the more discouraging to advocates of financial sanity in the Government that these estimates come from the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue taxation—a body of experts whose job it is to advise Congress on financial matters.

This staff now has put out figures indicating that the deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30 will be $6,700,000,000 not the $5,500,000,000 estimated by President Truman when he submitted his revised budget figures. Moreover, the deficit in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, will be $7,300,000,000, instead of the $5,100,000,000 envisioned by the President and his advisers.

It would seem to be the most elementary common sense for Congress to demand retrenchments in this situation, even if Mr. Truman does not. Cutting out all wasteful and unnecessary spending would seem all the more imperative in view of the growing needs for additional military strength, reflected in the request last week for an extra $350,000,000 in the defense budget.

But Congress is taking just the opposite tack. It is adding expenses rather than cutting them, and adding them in a way that has no justification except that of political patronage.

By dint of cutting out a few thousands here and there, the House has managed to reduce the $29,000,000,000 omnibus appropriation bill before it by some $7,700,000.

And, at the same time, it has added thus far about $76,000,000 to the measure. It boosted an appropriation for training of Coast Guard Reserves by $1,000,000, and raised an appropriation for a Federal-State hospital program by $75,000,000 over the figure set by its own Appropriations Committee a few weeks earlier.

This would be bad enough in itself. But last week the House shot through another bill setting aside $279,000,000 for veterans' hospitals—which the Veterans' Administration says it doesn't need and couldn't staff if they were built.

The Senate has been little better in voting, as distinct from preaching, economy. Recently a $1,500,000,000 authorization for a rivers and harbors bill, denounced by some Senators as the worst sort of pork-barrel legislation, went through the Senate by a comfortable margin.

The deficit isn't going to be reduced if the administration blithely ignores it in all its requests for funds; nor is it going to be cut, and eventually eliminated, if Congressmen in

both Houses put sectional hand-outs before the financial stability of the Government.

It's time that Congressmen stopped trying to explain away their votes for huge spending on the grounds that this is an election year. There are elections every 2 years, and the Government never will live within its means if campaigns are offered as excuses for refusing to stand up and be counted as opposed to concrete examples of waste, as well as extravagance in the abstract.

The deficit is growing—on the word of Congress' own experts. If the administration won't do anything about it by chopping out the waste in Government, it's up to Congress to do so by voting for cuts, not increases, in the Federal spending program.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the editorial is not against an appropriation for ECA, but that it reminds us of the dangers arising from the continuous spending of the public's moneys. I was greatly impressed by the statement made the other day on the floor of the Senate by the able and energetic Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who demonstrated the fact that the British budget had been balanced both internally and externally. Our budget is not in balance.

I have been impressed from month to month by statements made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Finance Committee, that the United States was spending beyond its means, and that additional taxes probably would result in diminishing returns.

A few nights ago, Mr. President, I had the privilege of hearing the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] speak to 1,200 of the outstanding business and professional men of eastern Ohio, northern West Virginia, and western Pennsylvania. He explained the condition the United States is getting into because of unbalanced budgets, which are causing inflation and destroying the purchasing power of the dollar. The great audience was impressed by the statesmanlike address made by this great American.

Mr. President, I have voted in favor of ECA appropriations, and I am not opposed to the program. But it is necessary for us to look all the way around the barrel. We must decide what we are able to spend. To my mind we cannot impose more taxes at this time.

We must decrease Government expenditures so that we shall have a balance left at the end of each fiscal year and be able to make payments on the public debt. That is the only way to keep America solvent.

Mr. President, if America is to fight communism in the world, we must be solvent. The bomb that I fear more than anything else just now is the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy. A nation in bankruptcy means a totalitarian government of some kind, and then the freedom of the individual is lost.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there have been at least 27 programs for siphoning American money, matériel, and credit abroad since World War II ended; and by the end of this fiscal year, on June 30, the total value of our assistance to foreign countries since the cessation of hostilities will be approaching $35,000,000,000.

Expenditures proposed in this ECA bill and other foreign-assistance programs for the fiscal year 1950 would total almost another $5,000,000,000.

The fixed Federal debt is now a quarter of a trillion dollars. The President has proposed an unbalanced budget which will increase the debt by another $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000. And he says what is needed is more taxes.

To say taxes are not already oppressive is to be blind to the pressure which is now on the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee for reduction of the tax burden. If the tax cuts already tentatively approved by the House committee should be adopted, the 1951 deficit will be increased by another billion dollars or more.

We talk about another foreign program, generally referred to as point 4. The money recommended in the budget for such a program would be only the beginning. But, more important, it contemplates the use of American capital to establish and expand industry abroad. The fact is that under the present Federal fiscal situation, and with the President demanding more taxes from business, venture capital is drying up here at home. This means that our productive capacity will not increase sufficiently to guarantee our own defense. Let us make no mistake, Mr. President, it is the productive capacity of our free-enterprise system which Russia fears most. No amount of money sent to impotent nations in Europe would deter Russian aggression, if it were not for the fear of the might of free American industry which is capable of outproducing all the rest of the world combined in war materials and machines, although we have only 6 percent of the world's population.

Our problem was summed up by former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, who, when addressing the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, said:

America must be strong if Americans are to remain free. If a choice ever has to be made between providing long-term economic aid to Europe, and providing funds for the national defense, there must be no question that our duty is to provide for our armed services. Freedom-loving people throughout the world are just as much interested as are the American people in our maintaining our military strength.

This sound advice by a man of long public service, a former Senator and former Secretary of State, should be measured against the propositions which now confront us.

We have General Bradley painting a dismal picture of the military defenses; we have the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee demanding more and more defense preparation and money on the basis of advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff; we have the former Secretary of the Air Force saying we do not have enough air power.

Yet we continue to pour money abroad. This bill proposes that we spend almost as much in foreign assistance in 1951 as we did in 1948. And what happens? Of course, we hear much on the good side through the ECA propaganda and publicity mills. But I quote to you now from private correspondence of an American official now in Warsaw—and this correspondence is authentic and official, but written to me privately:

American automobiles are everywhere and also American generosity, and yet never a day passes but the Government-controlled press slanders and insults the United States of America. And there is no redress. Our Veterans' Administration spends $50,000 monthly paying Poles who served in our Army insurance, pensions, and claims. The United Nations Welfare Branch (UNICEF) has spent $17,800,000 to date in Poland, of which we pay 72 percent. Much of the stuff is wasted or spoiled. Dried milk, for example; they don't know how to reconstitute it or store it, and it just rots. United Nations is giving them three powdered-milk processing plants at $250,000 each, and nobody knows how many layettes to provide for Polish children so they will reach healthy maturity and be better able to destroy us. Maybe it makes sense, but not to me. All of this goes in my reports, but whether there is any halting remains to be seen.

Mr. President, we cannot buy the friendship of these nations. Thus far we have bought—but we have not finished paying for—a mess of socialism in Britain. Whether we can buy any military security through the military-assistance program is doubtful, and certainly remains to be seen.

What happens to this ECA money, who spends it, who receives it, what we get in return for drenching the European Continent with American dollars, is difficult, if not impossible, to determine.

We make the appropriations authorized in these ECA bills, and the money is spent by virtually every agency in the Government. The money "goes in here"; but, Mr. President, if you want to learn where it comes out, I suggest that you take a look at the charts which I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table I shows a budgetary breakdown by programs.

Table II shows agencies receiving appropriations and those making expenditures. (There is an unusual volume of interagency transfer and allocation of funds appropriated to foreign programs making it difficult in some instances to trace their course from appropriation to expenditure.)

Both tables embrace:

(a) Conduct of foreign affairs (exclusive of State Departmental administration).

(b) International recovery and relief.

(c) Foreign economic development.

(d) Foreign military assistance.

All fiscal year 1950 figures are the President's January 1950 estimates; and

All fiscal year 1951 requests are those made by the President in his January budget document.

It should be noted that—

(a) All figures within both tables are rounded to thousands, and that totals at the end of the tables are rounded to billions.

(b) There is minor variation between total figures in these tables and those shown in the

budget for the over-all international affairs and finance item. This is due largely to the exclusion from table totals of State Departmental administration items, inclusion of funds for care, handling, and disposal of surplus property abroad which affects dollar balance, etc.

(c) There is some variation between some figures within these tables and budget grouping; for instance, when participation in international organizations ties into a major program the funds are charged to the program, whereas in the budget it may be lumped into an item for international organizations.

(d) In these tables contract authorizations are regarded virtually as appropriations in the year in which they are made. Therefore appropriations to meet prior year authorizations are omitted from the appropriations side of the tables. However, all expenditure columns include expenditures to be made during the respective years against contract authorizations.

(e) Wherever funds are from special accounts the fact is noted, as in the case of the Philippine Alien Property Administration.

TABLE I.—*Programs: International affairs and finance, including conduct of foreign affairs (exclusive of State departmental administration), international recovery and relief, foreign economic development, foreign military assistance*

[Showing by programs: Appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations and expenditures as estimated for fiscal year 1950, and as requested by the President for fiscal year 1951. (Appropriations to liquidate prior year authorizations are omitted from appropriation figures. Expenditures to prior year authorizations are included.)]

[NOTE.—Figures within table rounded to thousands; totals at end of table are rounded to billions]

Programs	Appropriations, reappropriations, contract authorizations, etc.		Expenditures, estimated	
	Actual and requested, 1950	Recommended, 1951	1950	1951
1. Economic Cooperation Foreign Assistance	$4,028,545	$3,100,000	$3,895,088	$3,250,000
2. Government and relief in occupied areas (including Navy)	913,800	351,785	1,011,641	307,573
3. Relief assistance to war devastated countries			4,713	
4. Assistance to Greece and Turkey	58,864		197,107	
5. Foreign aid, Austria, France, and Italy			108	
6. Miscellaneous payments to Finland, Great Britain, Norway, and Switzerland	20,195		19,966	
7. Assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (point 4)		35,000		25,000
8. Displaced Persons Commission	4,246	3,840	5,971	3,716
9. International Refugee Organization	70,448	25,000	70,448	25,000
10. Relief of Palestine refugees	31,000		15,800	20,320
11. International information and educational activities	47,309	37,645	35,864	39,748
12. Assistance to China	[1]	[1]	1,553	4,677
13. Assistance to the Republic of Korea	125,000	115,000	89,998	111,152
14. Philippine rehabilitation	30,031	16,285	22,763	26,652
15. Philippine Alien Property Administration	250	215	250	215
16. Philippine War Damage Commission	187,442	42,100	190,485	62,150
17. Care, handling, and disposal of surplus property abroad	7,500		10,938	2,500
18. Cooperation with American Republics	[2]	[2]	1,753	185
19. International Children's Emergency Fund, United Nations	16,712		16,712	
20. International commissions	2,535	9,144	7,008	12,656
21. International organizations	35,562	51,897	64,240	41,847
22. International contingencies	3,300	3,300	2,379	3,990
23. Defense aid, including lend lease liquidation	100		2,873	
24. Mutual defense assistance	1,314,010	647,500	160,000	645,000
25. Export-Import Bank of Washington, checking account (net)			71,442	47,800
26. Discharge of investment guarantee liabilities (permanent indefinite special account)	180		180	
27. (Deduct) International affairs and finance, international recovery and relief			−38,500	−38,500
Total	6,900,000,000	4,400,000,000	5,800,000,000	4,700,000,000

[1] Funds from allocations.
[2] Funds from transfers.

TABLE II.—*Agencies—International affairs and finance, including conduct of foreign affairs (exclusive of State departmental administration), international recovery and relief, foreign economic development, foreign military assistance*

[Showing by agencies: Appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations and expenditures, as estimated for fiscal year 1950, and as requested by the President for fiscal year 1951. (Appropriations to liquidate prior-year authorizations are omitted from appropriation figures. Expenditures to prior-year authorizations are included.)]

[NOTE.—Figures within table rounded to thousands; totals at end of table are rounded to billions]

Agencies receiving appropriations and making expenditures	1950 appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations					1951 appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures		Remarks
	Actual	Anticipated supplementals	Reappropriations	Contract authorizations	Total	Actual	Contract authorizations	Total	Estimated, fiscal year 1950	Requested, fiscal year 1951	
Executive Office of the President:											
Bureau of the Budget:											
Cooperation with the American Republics (transfer).									$16	$8	
International information and educational activities, Department of State (transfer).									12	6	
Office for Emergency Management: Philippine Alien Property Administration.	$250				$250	$216		$216	250	216	Expenditures are from funds in checking accounts with commercial banks; use of such funds limited to administrative expenses.
Funds appropriated to the President:											
Assistance to China:											
China aid:											
Economic									See note	See note	Appropriations exclude reappropriations; 1950 and 1951 expenditures are shown against agencies to which funds are allocated.
Military											
Assistance to Greece and Turkey.	45,000		$13,864		58,864				See note		1950 expenditures are shown against agencies to which funds are allocated.

TABLE II.—*Agencies—International affairs and finance, including conduct of foreign affairs (exclusive of State departmental administration), international recovery and relief, foreign economic development, foreign military assistance*—Continued

Agencies receiving appropriations and making expenditures	1950 appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations					1951 appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures		Remarks
	Actual	Anticipated supplementals	Reappropriations	Contract authorizations	Total	Actual	Contract authorizations	Total	Estimated, fiscal year 1950	Requested, fiscal year 1951	
Funds appropriated to the President—Continued											
Assistance to the Republic of Korea.	$60,000	$65,000	----------	----------	$125,000	$115,000	----------	$115,000	$10,000	$110,000	
Economic Cooperation Administration.									13,535	----------	
General Services Administration.									40,000	----------	
Department of Commerce: Civil Aeronautics Administration.									350	----------	
Department of Defense: Army.									5,584	----------	
Department of the Interior.									50	----------	
Post Office Department.									2	----------	
Department of State.									479	----------	
Care, handling, and disposal of surplus property abroad.	----------	----------	$7,500	----------	7,500	----------	----------	----------	See note	----------	1950 and 1951 expenditures shown against agencies to which funds are allocated.
Defense aid:											
Administrative expenses, defense aid, liquidation, lend-lease program.	100	----------	----------	----------	100	----------	----------	----------	See note	See note	1950 expenditures are shown against agencies to which funds are allocated.
Obligations, defense-aid liquidation, lend-lease program.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,000	----------	
Defense aid, special fund (permanent indefinite, special account).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	See note	----------	
Economic cooperation: Foreign assistance.	3,900,680	----------	127,865	----------	4,028,545	3,100,000	----------	3,100,000	----------	1,700,000	
Department of Agriculture.									176	12	
Department of State.									135	----------	
Expenses, economic cooperation:											
Economic Cooperation Administration.									3,147,725	1,515,214	
Federal Security Agency.									147	19	
General Services Administration.									3,054	1,679	
Department of Agriculture.									691,398	20,000	
Department of Commerce:											
Civil Aeronautics Administration.									354	30	
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.									69	2	
Bureau of Public Roads.									4,000	1,000	
Department of Defense:											
Department of Army.									38,647	12,000	
Department of Navy.									−134	----------	1950 net deduction due to excess of repayments.
Department of Labor.									15	----------	
Post Office Department.									8,988	----------	
Department of State.									426	44	
Expenses, Foreign aid, Trieste, ECA:											
Department of Agriculture.									----------	----------	
Department of Defense; Army.									88	----------	
Foreign aid, China	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	See note	----------	1950 expenditures are shown against agencies to which funds are allocated.
International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations.	----------	----------	16,712	----------	16,712	----------	----------	----------	See note	----------	Do.
Mutual defense assistance:											
North Atlantic area.											
Greece and Turkey.											
Iran, Republics of Korea and Philippines.	814,010	----------	----------	$500,000	1,314,010	647,500	----------	647,500	160,000	645,000	1951 appropriation figure is shown also as an appropriation to liquidate contract authorization.
General area of China.											

TABLE II.—*Agencies—International affairs and finance, including conduct of foreign affairs (exclusive of State departmental administration), international recovery and relief, foreign economic development, foreign military assistance*—Continued

Agencies receiving appropriations and making expenditures	1950 appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations					1951 appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures		Remarks
	Actual	Anticipated supplementals	Reappropriations	Contract authorizations	Total	Actual	Contract authorizations	Total	Estimated, fiscal year 1950	Requested, fiscal year 1951	
Funds appropriated to the President—Continued											
Relief assistance to war-devastated countries (relief assistance to countries devastated by war).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	See note	----------	1950 expenditures are shown against agencies to which funds are allocated.
Relief of Palestine refugees.	$4,000	$27,000	----------	----------	$31,000	----------	----------	----------	$7,000	$20,000	In addition to direct expenditures 1950 expenditures are shown against agencies to which funds are allocated.
Surplus property, care and handling overseas.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	See note	----------	1950 expenditures are shown against agencies to which funds are allocated.
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation: liquidation expenditures.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	do	----------	Do.
Assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (point 4).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	$35,000	----------	$35,000	----------	25,000	
Displaced Persons Commission.	4,210	36	----------	----------	4,246	3,840	----------	3,840	1,983	3,153	
Economic Cooperation Administration:											
Assistance to Greece and Turkey (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,085	----------	
Assistance to Republic of Korea (transfer from GARIOA).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	16,691	----------	
Expenses, China aid (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	−5,465	141	1950 net reduction due to excess of repayments and collections.
Government and relief in occupied areas (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	166,538	----------	
Relief assistance to countries devastated by war (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	34	----------	
Discharge of investment guaranty liabilities (permanent indefinite, special account).	180	----------	----------	----------	180	----------	----------	----------	180	----------	
U. S. Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses, Philippine rehabilitation, State Department (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	272	254	
Export-Import Bank of Washington: Checking account.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	71,442	47,800	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation: International affairs and finance: international recovery and relief.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	−38,500	−38,500	Net reductions in 1950 and 1951 due to excess of repayments and collections.
Philippine War Damage Commission:											
Salaries and expenses	184,800	----------	----------	----------	184,800	40,200	----------	40,200	165,110	60,200	
Salaries and expenses, Philippine Rehabilitation, Department of State (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	22,732	50,000	
Federal Security Agency:											
Office of Education: Cooperation with American Republics (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	36	----------	
Public Health Service:											
Assistance to Greece and Turkey (Executive Office of President, allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	6	----------	
Cooperation with American Republics (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	31	----------	
Displaced Persons Commission (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	339	102	
Salaries and expenses, American sections, international commissions (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	32	53	
Salaries and expenses, Philippine Rehabilitation, Department of State (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,290	174	
Social Security Administration: Cooperation with American Republics (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	3	----------	

TABLE II.—*Agencies—International affairs and finance, including conduct of foreign affairs (exclusive of State departmental administration), international recovery and relief, foreign economic development, foreign military assistance*—Continued

Agencies receiving appropriations and making expenditures	1950 appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations					1951 appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures		Remarks
	Actual	Anticipated supplementals	Reappropriations	Contract authorizations	Total	Actual	Contract authorizations	Total	Estimated, fiscal year 1950	Requested, fiscal year 1951	
Federal Security Agency—Continued											
Office of the Administrator:											
Cooperation with American Republics (transfer).									$283		
International information and education activities, Department of State (transfer).									321	$17	
General Services Administration:											
Administrative expenses, defense aid, liquidation of lend-lease program (allocation) (Federal Supply).									105	5	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey, Executive Office of the President (allocation) (Federal Supply).									219		
Assistance to Republic of Korea, ECA allocation (Federal Supply).									2,771	1,000	
Expenses, China aid, ECA, Executive Office of President (allocation) (Federal Supply).									3,009	1,736	
Foreign aid, Executive Office of President, allocation (Federal Supply).									1		
Defense aid, special fund (allocation) (Federal Supply).									346		
Housing and Home Finance: International information and educational activities, Department of State (transfer).									4		
Department of Agriculture:											
Assistance to Greece and Turkey (allocation).									28		
Assistance to the Republic of Korea, ECA (transfer).									172		
Cooperation with American Republics (transfer).									250	21	
Expenses, China aid, ECA (allocation).									2,223		
Foreign aid, Austria, France, and Italy (allocation).									1		
Foreign aid, China (allocation).									1		
International information and educational activities, Department of State (transfer).									1,097	232	
Department of Commerce:											
Cooperation with American Republics (transfer).									238	76	
International information and educational activities, Department of State (transfer).									418	185	
Salaries and expenses, Philippine rehabilitation, Department of State (transfer).									500	50	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey, Executive Office of President (allocation) (Bureau of Public Roads).									458		
Salaries and expenses, Philippine rehabilitation, Department of State (transfer).									14,000	15,533	
Salaries and expenses, Philippine rehabilitation, Department of State (transfer) (Weather Bureau).									790	249	
Department of the Army:											
Assistance to Greece and Turkey (allocation).									171,718		
Assistance to the Republic of Korea, ECA (transfer).									2,369	152	
Care, handling, and disposal of surplus property abroad (allocation).									9,541	2,500	

TABLE II.—*Agencies—International affairs and finance, including conduct of foreign affairs (exclusive of State departmental administration), international recovery and relief, foreign economic development, foreign military assistance*—Continued

Agencies receiving appropriations and making expenditures	1950 appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations					1951 appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures		Remarks
	Actual	Anticipated supplementals	Reappropriations	Contract authorizations	Total	Actual	Contract authorizations	Total	Estimated, fiscal year 1950	Requested, fiscal year 1951	
Department of the Army—Continued											
Displaced Persons Commission (allocation)									$800	$320	
Expenses, China aid (allocation)									111		
Foreign aid, Austria, France, and Italy (allocation)									107		
Relief assistances to countries devastated by war (allocation)									4,591		
Salaries and expenses, International Refugee Organization, Department of State (transfer)									5		
Surplus property, care and handling overseas, Executive Office of President (transfer)									1,330		
Government and relief in occupied areas	$912,500				$912,500	$320,000		$320,000	802,000	308,000	
Revolving fund for purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials									29,000	−29,000	1951 deduct due to excess of repayments and collections.
Department of the Navy:											
Expenses, island governments in liberated and occupied areas	1,300				1,300	1,785		1,785	1,100	1,900	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey, Executive Office of President (allocation)									17,694		
Care, handling and disposal of surplus property abroad, Executive Office of President (allocation)									40		
Defense aid (allocation)									2,322		
Department of the Interior:											
Cooperation with the American Republics (transfer)									58		1950 deduct due to excess of repayments and collections.
International Information and Educational Activities, Department of State (transfer)									320	50	
Salaries and expenses, American sections, international commissions (transfer)									125	119	
Department of Labor:											
Cooperation with American Republics (transfer)									90		
International information and educational activities, Department of State (transfer)									39	154	
Post Office Department:											
Expenses, China aid, ECA, Executive Office of the President (allocation)									−27		1950 deduct due to excess of repayments and collections.
Contributions to international organizations						29,761		29,761		29,237	
International Refugee Organization						25,000		25,000		25,000	
Missions to international organizations						1,637		1,637		1,504	
United States participation in international organizations	29,216		$1,595		30,811				28,195	4,216	
International Refugee Organization	70,448				70,448				70,448		
International contingencies	3,300				3,300	3,300		3,300	2,379	3,990	
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:											
Salaries and expenses	1,120				1,120	1,380		1,380	1,237	1,343	
Construction	900				900	7,185		7,185	5,100	10,700	
Rio Grande emergency flood protection	15				15	50		50	134	98	
Salaries and expenses, American sections, international commissions	500				500	529		529	308	342	

TABLE II.—*Agencies—International affairs and finance, including conduct of foreign affairs (exclusive of State departmental administration), international recovery and relief, foreign economic development, foreign military assistance*—Continued

Agencies receiving appropriations and making expenditures	1950 appropriations, reappropriations, and authorizations					1951 appropriations and authorizations			Expenditures		Remarks
	Actual	Anticipated supplementals	Reappropriations	Contract authorizations	Total	Actual	Contract authorizations	Total	Estimated, fiscal year 1950	Requested, fiscal year 1951	
International information and educational activities.	$47,300	----------	----------	----------	$47,300	$36,645	----------	$36,645	$30,655	$39,104	
Government in occupied area of Germany, Army (GARIOA transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	30,000	----------	30,000	13,013	26,673	All 1950 expenditures and part of 1951 expenditures are from funds transferred from "Government and Relief in Occupied Areas" item under Army.
Salaries and expenses, Philippine rehabilitation.	17,166	----------	----------	----------	17,166	13,000	----------	13,000	1,112	1,002	1950 appropriation figure included $13,400,000, and 1951 appropriation figure includes $13,000,000 to liquidate contract authorizations.
Payment to Government of Finland.	5,575	----------	----------	----------	5,575	----------	----------	----------	5,575	----------	
Payment to Government of Great Britain.	15	----------	----------	----------	15	----------	----------	----------	15	----------	
Payment to Government of Norway.	5	----------	----------	----------	5	----------	----------	----------	5	----------	
Payment to Government of Switzerland.	14,600	----------	----------	----------	14,600	----------	----------	----------	14,371	----------	
Assistance to Greece and Turkey, Executive Office of President (allocated).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,949	----------	
Assistance to the Republic of Korea (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	768	----------	
Care, handling, and disposal of surplus property abroad, Executive Office of President (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	180	----------	
China aid, Executive Office of the President (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,600	1,400	
Contribution by the United States for relief of Palestine refugees, Executive Office of the President (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	8,000	----------	
Cooperation with American Republics.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	705	49	
Displaced Persons Commission (transfer).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	849	240	
International Children's Emergency Fund of the UN, Executive Office of the President (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	16,712	----------	
Loan to UN for construction and furnishing of permanent headquarters in New York City.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	29,750	14,000	
Relief assistance to countries devastated by war, Executive Office of the President (allocation).	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	88	----------	
Salaries and expenses, surplus property disposal.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	46	----------	
United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, and bureaus.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	72	----------	
United States participation in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	10	----------	
The Institute of Inter-American Affairs.	4,752	----------	----------	----------	4,752	5,500	$14,000	20,500	4,752	6,500	
Veterans Administration: Philippine rehabilitation.	12,685	----------	----------	----------	12,685	3,285	----------	3,285	4,800	9,400	
Treasury Department: Philippine war damage.	2,642	----------	----------	----------	2,642	1,900	----------	1,900	2,642	1,900	
Total (in billions)	6.1	$0.1	$0.2	$0.5	6.9	4.4	(1)	4.4	5.8	4.7	

[1] Less than 100 million.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with much effort and a painstaking chase through the whole budget document, I think I have managed to find most of the foreign-aid programs and most of the agencies through which the money is spent. I hope Senators will read these charts carefully. But I challenge anyone to record who gets it, or the tangible results or the prospective results of these vast sums we are draining out of American taxpayers' pockets.

The very maze of programs and administrative organizations required for the expenditure is evidence of waste which would be sufficient justification for reduction in this authorization, even if there were not the compelling fiscal situation which confronts us.

In order that our national defense may be kept invulnerable, we must knock the waste and nonessentials out of these give-away programs abroad, as well as out of the domestic civilian programs at home for which the President is asking more than $12,000,000,000—twice as much as he asked for in 1948, 2 years ago.

The budget could be balanced by means of making reductions in the foreign-assistance expenditures and reductions in the domestic civilian programs here at home, exclusive of the interest on the debt.

It is my purpose to vote to reduce both of these programs—to vote to reduce the pending foreign-assistance authoriza-

tions, and also to vote to reduce the domestic civilian programs here at home.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Senate is now about to draw the curtain on the third act of the Marshall plan. It is my humble opinion that never before has the Senate been reduced to such a spectacle, or, from the point of view of protecting the interests of the American people, never before has it sunk so low.

It was Woodrow Wilson who stated in his book, Congressional Government:

> The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function. The only really self-governing people is that people which discusses and interrogates its administration.

The way the Marshall plan has been handled is a sad commentary on the depth to which the Senate has been dropped, through the administration's manipulations of its political puppet strings. Why, President Truman would not dare to try to sell any of his Fair Deal or internationalist schemes either to Congress or the American people on their merits.

What has happened in the third act of the Marshall plan is a convincing case in point. Has President Truman tried to put this third act of the Marshall plan over on its merits? No, Mr. President.

First came the usual parade of hand-picked witnesses. Second, came the fanfare of manufactured, war-crisis propaganda. Third, we were treated to a revival of Mr. Truman's bipartisan buffoonery in which the Republicans were invited for another ride on his "Harry-kari-go-round." And last, Mr. President, has been the refusal of the administration to go through even the motions of debate on the Senate floor to explain, justify, or defend its requests. Mr. Truman and his bipartisan spokesmen have deliberately schemed to shove this third installment of the Marshall plan through the Senate without even making an attempt to subject their requests to honest and critical debate.

Why should these men risk their necks in the political arena, when they need only to indulge in shadow-boxing by rigging the fight beforehand? And how this fight has been rigged.

There were only four or five Senators on hand to hear the opening speech on the Marshall plan debate by my colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Since that time members of both parties, whether for or against this proposal, have been left talking to themselves in an empty Senate Chamber, with an empty Press Gallery.

On Tuesday, May 2, 1950, the majority party requested unanimous consent for 78 Senators to be absent from this Chamber during debate. And the administration has done everything it could to conduct this debate in a vacuum.

Mr. President, I now want to back up these charges with hard facts. We are here going into the third year of the operation of this hand-out program, which will eventually cost the American taxpayer a minimum of $17,500,000,000. And yet, at this halfway mark, Mr. President, the New York Times admits "Marshall aid is not going to be enough." And the Washington Post admits "What has been insured by the Marshall plan is not the recovery of Europe in the sense of the restoration of what former Secretary Marshall called 'a working economy' for Europe, but the subsidization and the building up of separate economies for the nations of Europe."

The Post continues:

> The development of autarchy or separate economies is not the bargain that was struck when the American people decided to finance the Marshall plan. It was certainly not the reason that this newspaper backed the Marshall plan. What has happened in point of fact is directly contrary to our hopes and expectations.

Mr. President, there can be only one reason why the present administration would continue to peddle such a swindle as the Marshall plan to the American people as a panacea for the ills of Europe, when, in fact, it has only aggravated and postponed an inevitable crisis. The reason is that the President and his internationalist advisers are using the Marshall plan to develop new projects and schemes which are infinitely more far-reaching, and which they dare not present to the American people as a whole.

Proof of this fact lies in the following series of crucial questions which the defenders of the Marshall plan have deliberately ignored and refused even to discuss during the past 3 years. Yet I submit that without intelligent answers to these questions the Marshall plan is the most irrational adventure ever undertaken by a so-called sane and civilized people.

First, Mr. President, what is the relation of the European economy to the economy of the Far East? Secretary Acheson himself admitted during the ECA hearings that there has been no relation between what he has been doing in Europe and what he has been doing in the Far East. On April 26, 1950, Anne O'Hare McCormick admitted that the forthcoming Foreign Ministers' Conference in London will meet for the first time as a board of strategy to deal with this problem.

The second question is, How much of the dollar earnings of the colonial and dependent areas of Britain, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands are reported or accounted for in the budgets of those nations? Nowhere, either during the hearings or under direct questioning on the Senate floor, has the Foreign Relations Committee or the administration even raised this question.

Third, What is the relation between Marshall plan aid to these nations and the retirement of their own debts to colonial areas?

On September 7, 1949, the Alsop brothers wrote:

> Only an Anglo-American political-economic-strategic organization wielding the largest powers and disposing of very great resources can halt the march of communism in Asia today.

Yet, Mr. President, although this is a recognized fact, and although this administration, last September, attempted to make a separate deal with the British to underwrite their $9,000,000,000 sterling debt, apart from Marshall plan considerations, the minutes of those meetings are not available to the United States Senate. They, too, are an administration secret.

Fourth, why are the individual requests of Marshall plan countries not screened prior to their submission to the committees of the Senate for acceptance? A further part of this question is, Why is there no postaudit of the uses to which Marshall-plan grants are put after they have been made available to recipient countries? How can any intelligent evaluation be made of the so-called success of the Marshall plan, unless such safeguards are enforced?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KEM. I yield 2 minutes additional time to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for two more minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Fifth, how can anyone intelligently legislate on the requirements for Germany, upon which the whole success of the European recovery program depends, when the testimony of Mr. McCloy, our own High Commissioner, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, March 10, 1950, has never been revealed?

Sixth, unless the administration is willing to play politics with our own national security, why is it that the question of how much war materials is being shipped by Marshall-plan countries to Russia will not be either honestly faced nor honestly answered?

Seventh, there is also the question, Mr. President, which this administration has never attempted to discuss, of how much of Russia's rearmament is being financed with American dollars through her control of Russian trade monopolies with which 16 Marshall-plan countries are doing business to the tune of $3,000,000,000 a year?

Finally, Mr. President, why is it that in spite of all the solemn assurances that the Atlantic Pact needs would be correlated with Marshall plan economic objectives, we now are told these Marshall-plan countries cannot bear even the initial costs of the beginning of their North Atlantic Pact commitments?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield whatever time I have left to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I can finish in about 2 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have some time to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri has 4 minutes left.

Mr. KEM. I yield whatever time I have to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, is it not disgraceful that in spite of the fact that

the United States Senate does not have the answer to any of these questions, this third installment of the Marshall plan is going to be saddled on the backs of the American taxpayer and help to build up the inevitable crisis which may mean the life or death of our form of Government and our way of life?

I realize this authorization bill will pass the Senate, but again I want to warn my colleagues that the Marshall plan is being used, not only to finance the destruction of Europe's economic life and not only to finance our destruction, by driving us every day deeper into the red; it is also being used to underwrite a new set of international schemes in which we shall lose control, once and for all, of our own resources, our wealth, our economic freedom, and our national defense.

Why, at this very moment, Mr. President, Gen. Omar Bradley is working to get us into an economic military and political union with the British, and the internationalists of both parties are backing him up to the hilt.

This is why I want to serve notice, when the requests for appropriations under this authorization act reach the Senate floor, I shall do everything in my power to point out specifically and in detail the steps that are being taken by this administration to surrender our sovereignty and enslave us in a semi-superslave state without our ever having had a chance to defend and protect ourselves.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has only 4 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, according to the last report I received, I had 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is following the information given by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. CONNALLY. I had 6 minutes, and I have not given away a minute. Is 4 minutes all the time I have?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Idaho proceeds, I yield a minute to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement which I had intended to make.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

I regret exceedingly that limitations of time prevented my having discussed thoroughly before this in the Senate a vital provision of the ECA Act as it was passed by the House. I refer to section 111 (b) (3) (H. R. 7797), providing for the guaranty of private investments abroad in the ECA countries and their dependencies. This provision, as approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the last Congress and in this one, and as passed by the House of Representatives last year and again as an amendment to the ECA Act this year, is as follows:

"The guaranty to any person shall be limited to assuring the following: (1) The transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies received by such person, as earnings or profits from the approved project, as repayment or return of the investment therein, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof; and (2) the compensation in United States dollars for loss of all or any part of the investment in the approved project which shall be found by the Administrator to have been lost to such person by reason of one or more of the following causes: (a) Seizure, confiscation, or destruction by any government; (b) destruction by revolution or war; (c) any law, ordinance, regulation, decree, or administrative action (other than measures affecting the conversion of currency), which in the opinion of the Administrator prevents the further transaction of the business for which the guaranty was issued. When any payment is made to any person pursuant to a guaranty as hereinbefore described, the currency, credits, asset, or investment on account of which such payment is made shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be subrogated to any right, title, claim, or cause of action existing in connection therewith."

Last year, after this amendment was adopted in the House, the Senate members of the conference committee insisted on dropping the so-called political guaranties in paragraph (2) quoted above, and left in the amendment only paragraph (1), permitting a guaranty of the convertibility of currency. Of course, the guaranty program has not succeeded under those circumstances.

Only $6,130,000 in guaranties have been issued out of a total of $70,000,000 applied for, and the reason for this failure was clearly stated in answers to inquiries sent out by the ECA to all parties who had made applications or inquiries regarding guaranties and had withdrawn them. First and foremost among the reasons stated by these parties was that the coverage was too limited in scope and should cover political risks, exchange risks and countries other than the Marshall plan countries. The analysis of these answers is set forth in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, on the act for international development, March 30 and April 3, 1950, at page 88.

I have spent a great deal of time studying the application of the guaranty principle as a means of drafting the productive and managerial resources of private industry to lift the load undertaken by our Government of bringing technical aid and assistance, and the know-how of production, to other countries in the interests of increasing world employment, wider distribution of goods and better standards of living, as the only permanent barriers to the spread of totalitarian government.

Let no one say that the object is to guarantee any enterprise going abroad against the possibility of business losses. There could be no greater misconception of the guaranty clause than this one. The whole object of the guaranty is to recognize only that in a world in revolution certain political risks lie properly upon the level of American foreign policy and not upon the level of private risks to be incurred by private investors. No board of directors will vote to spend stockholders' money with the normal incentives of American enterprise in face of the risks of inconvertibility of currency, risks of confiscation and seizure, destruction by revolution or war, or wrongful interference by a subsequent hostile government (as actually occurred in Yugoslavia, requiring the abandonment of millions of dollars of American property), but if the Government assumes these limited risks, private enterprise would assume all of the remaining normal business risks.

This clause as passed by the House, after 2 years of study by the able members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, merely seeks to place those enterprises going abroad to do the job which we want done there on approximately the same level as industries at home.

There is a further reason which we might consider one of enlightened self-interest, in that exports of American products are declining, inevitably because of lack of dollar exchange abroad. It is far better to go behind the soft currency curtain with dollar investments and help increase production on a partnership basis with local capital than to continue to pump billions of American taxpayers' dollars into those countries with no positive assurance that these enormous sacrifices by the American people will result in permanent outposts of production, employment, improved standards of living, and the increased buying power with which to swell the demands of world commerce. We must have the courage to see that production increased abroad, particularly that which is done with the aid of American skills, will inevitably create the export of many complementary parts of products which are made in mass production cheaper in the United States than they can be in most other countries. We must have the courage to do for others what England, France, Germany, Holland, and Italy and other western European countries did for us when we were an undeveloped wilderness country, in bringing investment capital and know-how to help build this country and create the richest trade in the history of the world. The resulting North Atlantic triangle trade between England and Europe and the United States and Canada was the richest the world had even seen, producing better living conditions and a wider distribution of goods for everyone living in those areas.

Can we not see that in this guaranty principle the private investments for approved projects, designed to aid the economy of the receiving countries, is the nucleus of a program to pick up where the Marshall plan ends? With this principle, we can move gradually from enormous direct appropriations to contingent liabilities which may never materialize if the guaranteed investments succeed. In other words, the Government only assumes the risk if a loss occurs by one of the designated political risks. We actually have assumed the same risks of every dollar of ECA money which we spent abroad—with no possibilities of tangible returns.

A guaranteed investment in an industrial project theoretically might never result in a liability to the United States. The whole program of western Europe is toward freer convertibility of currency, an objective of all of our efforts in western Europe, and if no war ensues there is every reason why such projects should be successful. If they succeed, and there are no losses from the risks designated in the above amendment, the Government pays nothing. If the projects fail for other business reasons, the Government pays nothing.

Another obstacle to the greater use of the guaranty clause was a deficiency as to the definition of the word "investment." The House version of this act adopts the following definition, based upon experience of ECA:

Investment "means any contribution of capital goods, materials, equipment, services, patents, processes, or techniques by any person in the form of a loan or loans to any enterprise to be conducted within a participating country and approved by the Administrator as in furtherance of the purposes of this act, the purchase of a share of ownership in any such enterprise, or participa-

tion in royalties, earnings, or profits of any such enterprise."

Obviously, an investment need not always be in cash. The value of any patent, process, or property right which would constitute an asset as understood by sound businessmen in this country, or the cost of any professional service, machinery, equipment, or supplies required for the development of a project, should be considered as a part of the total investment for which a guaranty would be issued. The purpose of the definition is to indicate the intention of the Congress that the agency administering the act should have the widest discretion in its administration and apply the same flexible and common sense standards of judgment in determining those items which constitute an investment as are sanctioned by standard business practice in the United States today, and to incorporate such items within the terms of the guaranties which are issued. The primary objective of the definition is to facilitate the general purposes of the bill in terms of sound business judgment rather than to retard administration in a labyrinth of legal problems and accounting theories.

The definition of "investment," quoted above, in substance was recommended by the committee on foreign economic cooperation of the American Bar Association, of which I am a member. My colleague Senator WAYNE MORSE, former dean of the Oregon University Law School, is also a member of that committee. We are convinced, with other members of the committee, that this guaranty clause can be made to work vigorously in aid of American foreign policy. The international law section, and the board of governors and house of delegates of the American Bar Association endorsed the guaranty of the above-mentioned political risks at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in January of 1949, and recommendations were accordingly made to the Congress.

We must practice what we preach. If we believe in private enterprise, we must use it. There is no denying that we have subsidized Socialist governments in Europe with our government-to-government grants and loans. I do not quarrel with what we have done. It has been a splendid program to meet an emergent situation, and we have met it. Now, however, it is time to recognize squarely that whatever be the degree of nationalization in any country, there are wide areas of economic life between the principal avenues of nationalization which can never be controlled by government—not unless totalitarian government obliterates human liberty in those countries.

With all the hue and cry about nationalization in England, probably at least 70 percent of productive enterprise is still in private hands. The Socialist government of France recognizes the principle here contended for and seeks in every way to encourage private investments, offering many advantages and encouragements to private enterprise in its decree of September 2, 1949 (Avis No. 419), which I cannot discuss here. Other inducements are being offered by other countries. These inducements can best take the form of concrete assurances in bilateral treaties and undertakings, agreeing to equality of treatment for foreign investments. Already a number of such treaties are in full force and effect, setting a climate for participation of private enterprise in that freedom of competition which is so intimately identified with individual liberty.

We must grasp firmly that in spite of assurances by treaties another element is necessary before American private capital will go abroad in a large way, because it cannot accept completely and fully the assurances of many countries, no matter how well intentioned or in what good faith those assurances are given. It is impossible for them to guarantee against the political risks of the future or their own economic instability under world conditions as they are, facing the current struggle between east and west in Europe. Guaranties are necessary, too, from the country in which American capital places its full confidence.

All the technical aid and assistance which we can give will not in the areas of industrial production, and in certain spheres of construction and engineering work, give results in production. The Government does not have the know-how in certain fields, although it is preeminent in the field of soil conservation, forestry, conservation of wildlife, and other such spheres of action. One of the most monumental achievements of American civilization in the material realm is the solution of the problem of production. Production won the war. Joe Stalin recognized that when he proposed a toast to American production at Tehran.

The whole purpose of this speech is to urge the members of the conference committee from the Senate, in meeting with the conference committee from the House to reconcile differences in the amendments to the ECA Act, to adopt and approve the amendments passed by the House in respect to guaranties of private investments. The House has placed an upper limit of $300,000,000 on guaranties.

Surely, with the billions which we have appropriated for government-to-government grants, we can afford to give the guaranty principle a full opportunity to succeed by assigning to private enterprise, on the basis of the Government assuming only contingent liabilities, $300,000,000 worth of the work to be done abroad. I urge the Senate committee to approve this amendment. These projects must be gotten under way and the machinery of the guaranty operations fully developed if they are to assume their full significance at the expiration of the Marshall plan in 1952.

In conclusion, I have noted the debate in the House of Representatives on March 27, and I congratulate the men of both parties who united in the Foreign Affairs Committee to support this nonpartisan program of principle. I hope we may also act wisely in this matter in the Senate, and that the conference committee will bring back to us a bill fully approving the House amendments in respect to guaranties.

I must add that everything which I have said here applies with equal force to guaranties which ought to be made available to implement the President's point 4 program for the so-called undeveloped areas. I hope these suggestions may be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee in expanding the powers of the Export-Import Bank with specific provisions patterned after the above amendment. No doubt at some future date guaranties will merge under a common management whether they be for ECA countries or for the rest of the world, and there should be a basic consistency in the pattern of those guaranties.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the statement I placed in the RECORD today, a telegram which has come to me from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 5, 1950.*

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN,

Senate Office Building:

Please express for me on the floor of the Senate or by inserting this telegram in RECORD my complete approval of the amendments to the ECA Act adopted by the House of Representatives respecting the guaranty of private investments abroad.

I strongly urge that the conferees from the Senate in meeting with the representatives of the House to reconcile amendments adopt and approve in full the amendments approved by the House respecting guarantees. There is little chance of escaping from continued government to government grants and loans unless we widen the participation of private enterprise in increasing production, employment, and bettering world conditions.

Regards.

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield for a moment to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I prepared with reference to the pending measure be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

Mr. President, just a little over 2 years ago, Congress enacted a law which had as its basis a contemplated 4-year program to bring about economic recovery in the democracies of Europe. That program was first outlined by our great soldier-statesman, George C. Marshall, as a necessary and vital step if peace in a troubled world was to be attained. And that program was received with all the enthusiasm and support a mature Nation should receive it. The United States had become the leading power in the world, and the people of the United States knew that as a Nation we must play our rightful role in assuring to the other peoples of the world freedom and peace in the future.

And now, for the second time, the Senate has before it a further extension measure to enable the ECA to carry out its huge task. What we in the Congress of the United States do about this measure may well decide future world events—both politically and economically—and it therefore deserves the most serious consideration by every one of us.

Let us go back for a few moments, Mr. President—let us recall why we have the ECA.

In 1945, World War II ended in a resounding victory for the Allies and for freedom. The peoples of the world hailed the end of the worst war in history as the beginning of an era of freedom and good will among men. In Europe, however, the jubilance with which the people greeted the end of the war was short-lived. The devastation brought on by the war left the peoples of Europe weary, hungry, homeless, jobless, and hopeless. The task of reconstruction was so huge as to seem almost impossible. The hope that came with the end of the war turned to despair. I do not like to think what might have happened if the American interim-aid program had not stemmed the tide of starvation in 1946.

And events soon followed which showed that, though the war had been won, the peace had not been won. The Allies which had won the war split into two opposing camps—the forces of freedom on one hand, and the forces of communism on the other. In the United Nations, the Russian veto

was freely used time and again to block the efforts of the free peoples to achieve a real peace. In eastern Europe, one by one the Communists gained control of governments which were too weak to resist threats from their powerful neighbor. And in western Europe, the Communists tried every trick they knew to throw those countries into economic collapse—knowing only too well that when people haven't enough to eat some of them will be willing to sell their freedom for a promise of three meals a day. It became increasingly clear that unless the countries of western Europe could once more get back on their feet, the possibility of Communist domination would become a certainty.

The United States rose to meet this challenge to freedom and peace in the world. Congress enacted the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948—one of the greatest peace-making programs of all time.

Two years ago, Mr. President, the countries of Europe were almost hopelessly unstable politically. It was anybody's guess as to what the components of the governments would be from one week to another. The Communist menace was ever present and vocally very powerful. And the foundation of this political instability was—as it always is—economic crisis. The peoples of Europe had been unable to successfully convert from a wartime to a peacetime economy—partly because of the dislocation of industries and the devastation of lands during the war, partly because Europe's population had increased by 20,000,000, and partly because the Communists ruthlessly used the implements of strikes and riots to prevent reconstruction and recovery.

It was in this picture of turmoil that the ECA began its operation. And in two short years, Mr. President, the effect has been to bring about, as Mr. Paul G. Hoffman has put it, a "near miracle" in Europe.

On the economic side, industrial production in the countries of western Europe is one-third higher than it was in 1947 and 20 percent higher than prewar production levels. Agricultural production has risen steadily, and the people of Europe are no longer starving. Through necessary deflationary measures the countries have been able to stem the tide of inflation. Trade among the various countries is improving steadily. The people of Europe once more have work to do, have enough to eat, and once again have hope in the future.

And there can be no question about the effect this economic recovery has had on the political scene. In country after country, the Communists have been repudiated at the polls. Each election has brought a greater victory for democracy. The Communists are daily becoming less powerful in the internal politics of the western European democracies.

I wish I could say at this point, Mr. President, that final victory for freedom has been won in western Europe—that the Communists have given up—that they have realized that they can never hope to conquer freedom-loving peoples. That is a dream that we hope will someday be fulfilled, but we would be under a sad delusion if we thought, even for a moment, that such is the case.

After the Marshall plan had been in operation for a time, the Communists began to realize that they could not hope to conquer and dominate Europe through internal movements. And the alternative to this was external threats of force. The Russians are ever tightening their controls in the eastern European countries. They have let the world know that they, too, have the atomic bomb. The implied threats of military force are growing bolder and bolder.

Thus it became evident that economic recovery alone was not enough as a defense against the forces of communism. The countries of western Europe must also be prepared to defend themselves militarily. This necessity grew into the Atlantic Pact and the military-aid program. It also grew into the necessity for the participating countries to spend greater and greater amounts for military preparation. And unfortunately, this very expenditure works against economic recovery, for the more any nation must spend for the military protection of the country, the less there is available for economic expansion.

What does all this mean to the United States? Does it mean that we should give up ECA as a lost cause and put all our emphasis on military aid? Does it mean that we should give up our efforts entirely and let Europe find her own way out of the maze, and thus surely fall prey to the Communists? Does it mean that we should count the $9,000,000,000 we have already spent on ECA as money down the drain, and should go ahead and spend thirty to thirty-five billion dollars on our own defenses?

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that each one of these questions can be answered with an emphatic "no." Economic recovery, stabilization, and future expansion still remain the most potent factors in world peace and security. There is yet a great deal of work to be done in Europe before real recovery is achieved. Agricultural production must be improved by at least 15 percent before it will reach the prewar levels. The flow of trade among the various countries is a vital force in expansion of economy, and the countries must cooperate fully in their efforts to achieve economic integration in order to assure Europe a real economic stability. The aid given by the United States is vital if the democracies are to reach this goal, and we must assure ourselves and the participating nations that our aid will be effective.

Mr. Hoffman has requested for ECA aid to the European countries the sum of $2,950,000,000 for the coming year. This amount was arrived at after careful screening of the plans submitted by the participating countries as to why certain amounts were needed, and where the money was to be spent. The countries have had to prove that every cent they receive from the United States will be put to the most effective use. The anticipated program for the coming year has been completely detailed expenditure-wise.

Mr. President, I do not underestimate—no one does—the costliness of this program. The very nature of the task that ECA is called upon to perform is costly. But we in the Senate must not, as the House did several weeks ago, fall into the pit of not authorizing enough funds so that ECA can do its job effectively. If too little funds become available for this work, and if, as a result, the European nations fall once more into an economic crisis and become prey to the Communists, every cent of over $9,000,000,000 already spent would be lost.

I submit, Mr. President, that spending $2,950,000,000 now is far less costly than facing the possibility of losing $9,000,000,000 and then adding the necessity of spending $30,000,000,000 to $35,000,000,000 for defense purposes—which, military experts agree, would be necessary if the United States became an island in a world of communism. We simply cannot afford to adhere to any sentiments of economy which would, in reality, be false economy. I urge that the Senate authorize the full amount of $2,950,000,000 as outlined in the budget.

And in authorizing funds for ECA, I ask that the Members of the Senate remember that one of the reasons that Mr. Hoffman and his Administration have achieved so much success thus far has been because of the flexibility of the law with which they have had to work. Because of this flexibility, Mr. Hoffman and the participating nations have been able to meet changing conditions head-on, thereby reaching decisions which have resulted in greater effectiveness and efficiency, and in fact a probable saving of almost $2,000,000,000 for the United States by 1952.

Any attempt by the Congress to dictate the absolute terms of ECA aid would be a grave error, I believe. We cannot possibly foresee the events of the coming year, on the European scene, and we must be prepared to meet any changes by having a well-defined, but flexible piece of legislation. If Congress should fall into the pit of trying to dictate by law to other countries, the total effectiveness of ECA may be lost. I urge that the Members of this body keep this in mind when voting on any amendments that may be proposed, or have already been proposed, to the bill reported from the Foreign Relations Committee—which is, I believe, on the whole a very fair and liberal measure.

Before closing my remarks, Mr. President, I should like to say a few words about two amendments which have been proposed as title 5 of the present bill.

I have joined with 18 other Senators from both sides of the aisle in sponsoring an amendment which would authorize funds for another year to the International Children's Emergency Relief Fund, which is administered through the United Nations. I think I hardly need urge that the Senate help continue this vital work in aiding the unfortunate children of the world.

The other amendment I should like to discuss is that submitted by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. CONNALLY, which is an authorization of $45,000,000 to be used for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world.

This amendment embodies about one-half of the principles set forth in the point 4 program of the President. The other half, as we all know, is concerned with investment guaranties in those great areas of the world which so desperately need improvement in living conditions.

The concept of technical assistance is not a new idea by any means. It has been in operation in South America for about a decade and has proved its worth. We are using it as part of our ECA program. The newness here lies in the areas to which this technical know-how would be exported. The peoples of the eastern part of the world have long suffered under conditions of poverty and misery, simply because they have not been able thus far to make the fullest use of the resources they do possess. Overpopulation, too, of course, is one of the reasons these people live on bare subsistence levels. However, the people of these areas are awakening to the fact that something must be done if they are to become economically self-supporting, and if they are to achieve a decent living standard.

The Communists have made overtures to these people. In these areas too they are counting on misery to win support. Our answer to the problem is the democratic one—the one of helping people grow economically and politically by the exchange of ideas and knowledge. And as such, this program is of vital importance to the growth of the democratic way of life and the defeat of totalitarianism.

The amount of $45,000,000 authorized under this amendment is the first step in the direction of bringing vital aid to people who have long needed it. Later on we shall, in all likelihood, consider the second feature of this aid, which is, as I've said, investment guaranties. I feel that this part of point 4 is also vital and must eventually come into being. However, if at this time the Senate authorizes the full amount of $45,000,000, a most important first step will have been taken. And I should like to add that

I will oppose any attempt made to lower this amount for any reason whatsoever.

Let us remember, Mr. President, that the programs for which we are to authorize working funds are programs that are working toward freedom—programs that are bolstering the democratic way of life—programs that are helping to achieve peace in our world. I cannot repeat too often we in the United States simply cannot afford to destroy them, either by false-economy moves or by misguided clausal restrictions. These programs may not solve the world's problems, but it cannot be doubted, I believe, that they are steps in the direction of solution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, in the past I have opposed the foreign-aid plan, whether it be called the Marshall plan, ECA, or what not, but I have never been opposed to the principle or the idea of helping needy peoples abroad in their struggle to rehabilitate themselves from the ravages of war. I am wholeheartedly in favor of doing anything possible to help any people, anywhere, to protect themselves from the inroads of communism. However, Mr. President, since the foreign-aid program has now gone far along, and since we are approaching what we have been told is its end, or, at least, the time set for its ending, that I feel I cannot longer oppose the program. I feel that there is no possibility of changing it at this late date. So we shall just have to make the best of what we have.

I opposed foreign aid in its original form, because I felt it should be channeled through the United Nations and thus build up that organization. I think it would have been much more successful, that it would have been less expensive, and would have won more good will among the peoples of the world if that procedure had been followed.

Mr. President, during the war I worked in a war plant. I went to that plant with a fresh point of view. I had never worked in a plant of that nature before. I entered it new, just as I did when I came to the Senate of the United States. At any rate, I saw things going on that I thought could be done better, possibly because I had a new point of view and was not accustomed to the old ways of doing things in that particular plant. There were great numbers of articles to make for the armed services, the Maritime Commission, and other Government agencies engaged in prosecuting the war. I felt that we could make jigs and assemble the parts much faster, but the orders were to make them singly, measure each one individually, and then weld them together. I tried to get the ear of the management for my ideas, and I argued about it until most of the articles had been made by handicraft, so to speak. Then I stopped mentioning it any more, because at that point it was too late to save any money on the project. It was a case of either doing it that way or not doing it at all. So I did the very best I could in that war plant, the way I was told to do it, after my protests had come to naught.

Mr. President, I feel that we have reached that point in the foreign-aid program. My ideas have not prevailed. We must do something to prevent the spread of communism. So at this time, Mr. President, I shall vote for the appropriations as they have been requested by the administration. I shall vote against any cuts, because if it should turn out that the general feeling should be that not too good an approach had been made, when the whole thing has been done, I do not want it to be said that at the last moment my vote possibly hamstrung the program, and that was why foreign aid had failed. I want it to have every chance to succeed.

Simply because I have been against the methods and procedures which have been followed does not mean that I hope it fails. On the contrary, I hope it will be successful beyond the wildest dreams of those who proposed it in the first place.

So, for those reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote for this measure. If I had an argument with an individual in planning a cross-country trip, and he wanted to buy one kind of a car and I wanted to buy another kind, and it turned out that he had his way and got the kind of car he wanted, and we started across the country and found ourselves away out in the desert somewhere and the car needed repairs, or needed more gasoline to proceed with the trip, I would not vote against buying gasoline to get out of the desert, even in a car I did not like in the first place and which I thought was not the kind we should have had.

So I shall vote, Mr. President, for the appropriations authorized by the bill and against any cuts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, all time for general debate has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$2,950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,950,000,000."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Butler	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Darby	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tobey
Fulbright	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Young
Hayden	Malone	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], on which there may be 10 minutes debate on each side.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the pending bill, if passed, would continue the so-called European recovery program for another year. During the 2 years the program has been in operation nearly $10,000,000,000 have been funneled overseas to 16 countries of western Europe. The question which the Senate must decide today is: Do the results of the Marshall plan to date justify this lavish outpouring of money of the American people when bankruptcy for themselves is just around the corner, and when we have many needs of our own people which demand attention?

Mr. President, the administration has turned again to operating in the red. Printing presses at the Treasury are working 24 hours a day printing I O U's, to be paid—by whom? By our children and our children's children.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimates that the deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, will amount to $6,700,000,000. The staff further estimates that the deficit for the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, will amount to $7,300,000,000.

Mr. President, if 2 and 2 make 4—and they always have—during two short years our already monstrous national debt will be increased by the gigantic sum of $14,000,000,000. Of course, Mr. President, this sort of thing cannot go on indefinitely. No country can drift along in the red year after year without its people waking up some day and finding their savings bonds, insurance policies, and money in the bank not worth much more than the paper they are written on. Government spending must be reduced right down the line. Mr. President, I ask in all solemnity: Is there any reason why the Marshall plan should not take its share of the cut? After all, does it make sense for us to pour out our money to other countries, so that they can balance their budgets and reduce their national debts, at a time when our Government is not making ends meet by far, and our national debt is zooming up hour by hour?

Mr. President, as the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] pointed out the other day, our gifts to the Socialist Government of Great Britain have enabled that government to balance its budget, internally and externally, and make substantial reductions in its national debt.

The national debt of the people of the United States is just under $1,700 per person, that is every man, woman, and child in the United States owes approximately $1,700. The per capita debt of the people of Great Britain, on the other hand, is considerably less, about $1,560. So I ask again, as I have asked before during the course of this debate, who should be aiding whom?

Mr. President, the administration admits that this so-called recovery program is not bringing about genuine recovery in western Europe, as its sponsors

originally told us it would. Mr. Acheson, when he appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, was asked specifically whether we could depend on getting out from furnishing aid by 1952. His reply was:

No, I do not think that all American aid, certainly in the world, and certainly to some parts of Europe, will end in 1952.

It is clear, then, that this is not a genuine recovery program, but is merely another one of the long line of relief programs, of doles, furnished by the American people to the governments of western Europe.

The pending bill would authorize an expenditure of $2,950,000,000 to continue the ECA for another year. My amendment would cut that amount to $1,950,000,000, plus an estimated $45,000,000, which, it is expected, will be carried over from this year's appropriation.

When we consider the fact that a considerable portion of the ECA funds have been used for the purpose of making no effective contribution to European recovery, that is, genuine recovery, when we consider that our own Government is operating in the red, when we consider the fact that our own people are being neglected in order to prop up socialistic governmental experiments abroad, it seems to me that the proposed reduction is modest enough.

Mr. President, I wish to say one thing more, and I shall then be through. The Marshall plan was sold originally to the American people as an insurance against war. We were told that we had two alternatives, that we could adopt the Marshall plan, or that we could arm ourselves to the teeth. The ink on the President's signature to the Marshall plan was hardly dry when we were asked to make the greatest appropriation ever made for national defense in time of peace. That was followed by the program to arm the countries of western Europe, and I ask soberly, Are we any further from war now, after we have poured out these billions of dollars on this relief program, than we were when it was adopted?

The trouble with the Marshall plan as an insurance against war is that it does not insure. The trouble with it is that the premium we pay for the insurance does not get the job done.

The Truman doctrine, with which the Marshall plan is tied in, was to encircle Russia. The Truman doctrine is dead, because we saw that it was impossible for us to completely encircle Russia with a wall of arms or a wall of American dollars. So we are asked to limp along with the Marshall plan, to continue this vast outpouring of money which the American people cannot afford.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to be back with my colleagues again, and to say a word on the pending question, because I am deeply interested in it.

I think the best contribution I can make to the discussion of the pending amendment, which calls for a reduction of $1,000,000,000 from the request of the ECA, is just to state to my colleagues my experience with Mr. Hoffman, and my impression of the way in which he has handled this whole matter from the beginning.

Mr. Hoffman has kept his word right straight through with regard to authorizations and appropriations. We have had authorizations right through the years of substantially more than the amounts we have had to appropriate ultimately, and the ultimate appropriations were based on the revised figures which Mr. Hoffman furnished.

In round numbers, the first year we actually appropriated around $5,000,000,000, the second year around $4,000,000,000, the third year we expect to appropriate somewhat less than $3,000,000,000, and I am pleased to be able to say that Mr. Hoffman has absolutely kept to the program from the beginning. There has not been a thing Mr. Hoffman's administration set out to do they have not followed along, except in the one matter of the integration of the European countries, and what happened in that regard we all regret. So I think the proper course for us to take in dealing with this matter, if we are to have any confidence in the program at all, is to give Mr. Hoffman a vote of confidence, give him the authorization he feels he should have, give him a chance to present to the Committee on Appropriations figures as to whatever savings he can make, and have the matter carried out in the way it has been carried out heretofore.

I differ entirely with those who criticize the way the ECA program has been carried out. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I oppose the pending amendment, because I think it is not in order at this time, and I think we would handicap our whole program if we adopted the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 8 minutes left.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the Senator from New Jersey more time, if he desires more.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have prepared a little statement, in light of the analysis which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made in the early part of the debate with regard to the improved British position during the past few months. I had a very careful study of that matter made, and I should like to discuss very briefly the dollar reserve position of Great Britain, which is closely related to the question of how much money should be appropriated for the ECA this year. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the statement I have had prepared inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on April 25 the able senior Senator from Ohio called attention to the rapid improvement in the gold and dollar reserves of Britain between last October and March of this year. He pointed out that the British reserves had increased by over $500,000,000 in 6 months' time, and now actually exceed the reserves of a year ago. On this basis the Senator from Ohio asked "Why, if the British Government is able to balance its dollar budget, we should advance anything to the United Kingdom during the following year?"

I have studied this matter carefully, Mr. President, and have had a memorandum prepared with the assistance of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I commend this memorandum to the attention of all Senators, because in my judgment it shows conclusively that this encouraging improvement in the British dollar reserve position is largely of temporary origin. Its most significant cause was the devaluation of the pound in September.

Some part of this improvement, I am informed, is of a more permanent nature, and the ECA is now engaged in a careful analysis of this development in order to recommend to the Appropriations Committee such reductions below the over-all authorization for the fiscal year 1951 as the new British position seems to make possible.

I discussed this personally with Mr. Hoffman, and the figures are being prepared now. But the ECA feels that any reductiaon they may be able to recommend will be much less than $500,000,000, and, of course, less than the $1,000,000,000 recommended in the pending amendment. In view of these facts, I feel it would be most imprudent for the Senate to prejudge the case by authorizing less than the full amount at this time. Studies have not been completed on which an intelligent reduction could be based. I hope very much that when the studies are completed they will give the Appropriations Committee a sound basis for a sizable reduction.

Mr. President, I think we are all indebted to the Senator from Ohio for having called attention to this development, in the interest of governmental economy. I am advised that some hundreds of millions of dollars can be cut off, based on the over-all British position. But the study has not been completed, and it seems to me that the wise course is to give Mr. Hoffman his requested authorization, and then let the matter be handled, so far as the final figures are concerned, by the Appropriations Committee.

EXHIBIT 1

MAY 5, 1950.

MEMORANDUM ON SENATOR TAFT'S REMARKS OF APRIL 25 ON ECA REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Senator TAFT has rightly drawn attention to a surprising improvement in the British dollar position during the past 6 months. In that period a $500,000,000 gain in reserves has completely offset an equal $500,000,000 loss in the previous 6 months before devaluation of the pound.

Judging from his remarks, Senator TAFT appears to feel that no change should be made in the United Kingdom aid figure for the present fiscal year, but that a considerable reduction is necessary from the original estimate for 1950–51.

The restoration of British dollar reserves to tolerable levels was essential, and the

British have achieved this restoration in 1949–50 through a major effort. But Senator TAFT is correct in believing that there is room for downward revision of the original British aid estimates for 1950-51. In preparing these original estimates 6 months ago, the ECA did not and could not foresee that the British effort would prove so successful, because the main causes of the success—capital movements, price changes, and so forth—were of a nature which the most thorough review of trade developments could never reveal.

Since the improvement has taken place, however, ECA is now once again revising its aid estimates. The submission of revised estimates for 1950–51 within a few days to the Senate Appropriations Committee should meet Senator TAFT's request. The point yet to be determined is the size of the reduction which is justified by the improvement in the British dollar reserve position. This improvement has been due primarily to temporary factors which have now permitted a necessary and desirable restoration of earlier reserve losses. Therefore a reduction in the estimate of aid required for 1950–51 should by no means equal the ground regained in the past 6 months.

Before elaborating this point, let us see precisely what did happen to the British dollar reserve position.

The first thing to note is that tremendous swings occur in the dollar balance from one quarter to another. If the developments in any one quarter are isolated, they could be used to justify almost any volume of aid. For example, if Senator TAFT last year had singled out the second quarter of 1949 (April to June), he could on this basis have supported a greatly increased appropriation for ECA. In that one quarter alone, the British dollar deficit approximated $540,000,000, which could have been used to justify annual aid exceeding $2,000,000,000 for the United Kingdom alone. But obviously any one quarter alone is totally misleading, and the whole year at least must be taken into account. Over the last year the British gold and official dollar assets have been as follows (in thousands of dollars):

March 1949	1,912
June 1949	1,651
September 1949	1,425
December 1949	1,688
March 1950	1,984

From these figures it is plain that wide upward fluctuations in some quarters have offset wide downward fluctuations in other quarters. Over the whole year ECA aid has not been accompanied by a substantial increase in British reserves; it has only allowed that country to maintain its holdings within a very narrow margin—small in comparison with normal variations—of the position at the beginning of the year. The net change has been from $1,912,000,000 to $1,984,000,000. That this change is relatively small may be seen from the record over the first 2 years of the Marshall plan. Within this 2-year period the smallest quarterly fluctuation has been an increase of $60,000,000—September-December 1948—while the largest fluctuation—April-June 1948—was a loss of $320,000,000. As may be seen from the figures just quoted, the year which ended March 31, 1950, witnessed a heavy loss of dollar reserves by the United Kingdom during the first 6 months and a complete recovery of this loss by the end of the period. The speculative outflow of dollars prior to the devaluation of sterling resulted in a loss of about $500,000,000. Immediately upon devaluation in September this speculative outflow was reversed, and this reversal was continued through the first quarter of 1950.

The extreme width of these fluctuations dramatically illustrates the need for maintaining British dollar reserves at satisfactory levels. The Marshall plan was initiated at a time when gold and dollar reserves of the western European countries had generally sunk to levels dangerously low, both for the backing of national currencies and for the financing of international trade. The United Kingdom was no exception to this condition. Reserves had dropped to $2,241,000,000, roughly one-fourth in real value of prewar levels. They had been depleted by the emergency need for dollar goods in the war and postwar periods.

This new low must be evaluated in terms of the enormous volume of trade financed through London. The total volume of merchandise trade of the sterling area with the dollar area alone has in recent years exceeded $4,000,000,000. In addition, nonmerchandise transactions also involve very large amounts. The financing of this level of trade, to take one exemaple, requires the holding of bank deposits in the United States amounting to several hundred millions of dollars. The level of such deposits, as a matter of historic experience, fluctuates widely due to seasonal and other factors and is in turn reflected in the United Kingdom reserve position.

One purpose of the Marshall-plan appropriations has been to permit European countries to continue to import minimum recovery requirements for dollar goods without further endangering their dollar reserves. Yet over the whole 2-year period of ECA activity British reserves have fallen below the level of April 3, 1948, when the program began. The recovery of the past 6 months has still only raised reserves to less than $2,000,000,000, which is considerably less than the $2,241,000,000 of 2 years ago. It has never been the United States intention to reduce European dollar holdings below the low levels of early 1948. The partial restoration of the British position which has occurred to date must therefore be regarded as a favorable development, which should continue if British financial strength and stability are to be regained.

These facts, then, are clear. The improvement in the British dollar position has succeeded only in offsetting equally sharp declines in the previous 6 months and has not yet restored British reserves to anywhere near the minimum levels existing at the beginning of the Marshall plan. But what of the future? The question has been reasonably asked whether recent gains may not be expected to continue. Were they entirely due to temporary factors which must disappear completely next year? Or do they also reflect a fundamental improvement in the whole British balance of payments?

To this latter question the ECA answer is a qualified affirmative. The partial restoration of reserves must be ascribed largely, but not wholly, to temporary factors. It may not be taken as justification for an equivalent reduction of aid, but limited reduction and revision of estimates is, as Senator TAFT has pointed out, possible. First, however, we should clearly understand what part of the improvement was only temporary. The figures previously quoted on the quarterly fluctuations may be reinforced by a brief economic analysis of the temporary factors which underlie them:

(a) The most important single factor, as has already been noted, was the devaluation of the pound in September 1949. Widespread expectation of devaluation produced a serious dollar drain on Britain for the previous 6 months. Despite all controls a speculative flight of capital from sterling occurred between March and September 1949. This flight took a number of forms, of which two of the more important were haste in exchanging sterling for dollars to prepay dollar obligations, and delay in exchanging dollars for sterling to pay off sterling obligations. In addition, dollar buyers stayed out of sterling markets to avoid possible devaluation losses. During the past 6 months, following devaluation, the capital flight was completely reversed through opposite phenomena. Thus devaluation is undoubtedly the most important single factor in explaining the sharp downward and upward fluctuations of the past 12 months. Three less important ones also played their part:

(b) The last and first calendar quarters are normally the best quarters seasonally for sterling area earnings, mainly because of very high seasonal dollar receipts for wool and cocoa, and secondarily because certain important seasonal payments for United Kingdom dollar imports (e. g., tobacco) need not be made. The third calendar quarter is normally the heaviest of the year for dollar payments by the United Kingdom and the lightest of the year for dollar receipts by the sterling area.

(c) The inventory recession which occurred in the United States last summer cut both the prices and the sales volume of raw materials exported by the sterling area to the United States. Since September, however, United States manufacturers have increased their purchases to rebuild depleted inventories, and raw material prices of such items as rubber, wool, and cocoa have risen sharply. These increased purchases, superimposed on the normal seasonally high sterling area dollar exports in the January-March quarter, have contributed to an unusual and temporary rise in recent sterling area dollar receipts.

To elaborate on one important commodity exported by the sterling area, it may be recalled that, in the 3 weeks before devaluation in September, spot prices for rubber in the United States averaged 18 cents a pound; lately, they have risen to 26 cents. But the present price cannot be expected to last, if only because the price of natural rubber is now well above the production cost of synthetic. It may be explained by hoarding of rubber in Indonesia for reasons connected with domestic economic conditions in that area, and to some degree by panic buying from Malaya on the part of those who are concerned about the trend of political events in southeast Asia.

(d) The first quarter of 1950 witnessed the first significant reflection of the emergency steps agreed among the Commonwealth countries last July and August to reduce the dollar imports of the sterling area. The cuts in dollar imports which were undertaken last summer necessarily took several months to become fully operative, and were recognized to be emergency measures to meet the immediate dollar crisis of that period. It is now evident that at least India has cut its expenditures much more than agreed upon, and, that in view of that country's political and economic condition, continuance of such drastic cuts in dollar outlays cannot be expected.

The effects of all the factors described above are essentially temporary. As these are dissipated, the sterling area's dollar position will again show a substantial deficit which will need to be financed by ERP aid. Experience to date during the life of ERP indicates that British dollar reserves can and do fluctuate widely over short periods of time, and that the upward fluctuation from September 1949 to March 1950 means neither that the sterling area's dollar deficit has been erased nor that the United Kingdom no longer needs ECA assistance.

Nevertheless the recent improvement can be expected to continue, although on a much reduced scale. Part of the gains must be ascribed to permanent rather than to temporary factors. During the past 9 months dollar imports into the sterling area have been sharply reduced. With the probable exception of Indian imports, these reductions can probably be maintained at least partially. The ECA is now completing a quantitative review of this and other factors of permanent improvement in the British position. A revised program of dollar assistance

to the European countries is to be presented within a few days. That program will provide for as great a reduction as can be justified by permanent improvements in the British position, rather than by those temporary gains which have merely counterbalanced previous losses.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want the Senate to remember who is leading the fight for the amendment. It is the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who voted against both authorizations for European relief in former years. Of course, he wants to cut the authorization by $1,000,000,000. He would like to cut it by $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000. He would like to cut it all out, because he is opposed to the program absolutely. He is trying to influence the Senate now to chisel off nearly $1,000,000,000, when in his heart he would like to chisel off every nickel and every dime and every penny in the bill.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri painted a terrible picture of the financial situation in the United States. But the reports show that corporate incomes are higher than they have been in a long period of time. Reports show that our national income is higher than it has ever been. Yet the Senator from Missouri predicts all the terrible things that are apt to happen, when we know they are not going to happen now. They may happen someday. The Senator from Missouri would have the Senate believe all the terrible things he speaks of.

Mr. President, I say the bill is not a charity bill. It is not a hand-out, as some Senators would say, to European countries. The bill is in the interest of the United States. We want to have a bulwark in western Europe against the hordes of Communists. We want to have economic strength in western Europe so that if the countries of western Europe are attacked, and we have to carry out our pledge under the North Atlantic Treaty, they will have the resources and the will to resist and to fight. The bill is not a charity bill. It is a bill for the safety and the security of the United States.

Some Senators want us to economize in this matter. Let me remind the Senate that last year's bill was cut about $1,000,000,000 below the first bill. The bill now before the Senate contains $1,000,000,000 less than was provided for in last year's bill. Does that not show good faith? Does it not show that the program is being administered economically? Mr. Hoffman has saved $150,000,000 out of the appropriation which was given him last year.

Mr. President, Senators who are against the whole program should vote with the Senator from Missouri, because that is what he believes in. That is what is in his heart. That is his motive. That is the spring behind what he is trying to do here. His purpose is to kill it all. I want to vote for an American bill, for the safety of our homes, for the safety of our people, for the safety of our territory. I want some aid provided for western Europe. I do not want a bunch of cripples in western Europe trying to help us. I want soldiers there who can stand on their own legs and can fight, and, if need be, can die defending themselves against the onslaught of communism.

O, Mr. President, beware of those who come bearing gifts. Search their consciences. Find out what their objective is. When that is done it will be found that the objective of the Senator from Missouri is to kill the bill. His objective is to drive a dagger right into its heart. But he is a little timid, because he is afraid he will not have anyone to help him drive the dagger in. So he says, "Oh, we have got to save money. We have got to save money. We are going to be in a terrible fix."

Mr. President, I want to read two telegrams. The first is as follows:

The League of Women Voters of the United States—

The telegram came this morning—

at its national convention just concluded, voted unanimously to support authorization of adequate funds for the European recovery program. We oppose any reduction that would impair the effectiveness of the program, and urge your continued opposition to such a cut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will have to read the other telegram in my next installment of remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] on page 4, line 2, to strike out "$2,950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,950,000,000."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate, and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—17

Brewster	Jenner	Russell
Bricker	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Butler	Kem	Wherry
Byrd	McClellan	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Ecton	Martin	

NAYS—62

Aiken	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Cain	Humphrey	Murray
Connally	Hunt	Myers
Cordon	Ives	Neely
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Eastland	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Knowland	Sparkman
Flanders	Leahy	Taft
Frear	Lehman	Taylor
Fulbright	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
George	Lucas	Thye
Graham	McCarthy	Tobey
Green	McFarland	Tydings
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—17

Capehart	Langer	Robertson
Chapman	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Downey	Morse	Watkins
Gillette	O'Conor	Withers
Hickenlooper	Pepper	

So Mr. KEM's amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, in line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$2,950,000,000," and in lieu thereof insert "$2,450,000,000."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, several days ago I spoke regarding the necessity for making a reduction in this authorization. At that time I gave the reasons; and those reasons were not answered until today, when the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] spoke. It seems to me that his answer is completely unsatisfactory.

I have stated that a reduction in the amount proposed by this amendment represents a cut of 16½ percent in the ECA authorization.

In view of the present fiscal situation, I say to the Senate that we must be prepared to make cuts of at least 16½ percent in every appropriation, domestic or foreign, which is not a fixed obligation of the United States. If we are going to make any reasonable reduction in the tremendous deficit the Government now has, we have to face the fact that a 16½-percent cut can be made and should be made in every reducible appropriation. Even then we shall not balance the budget, as I view the situation, because there are some items which cannot be reduced.

However, if we are going to come anywhere near balancing the budget and making a reduction in the amount of $6,000,000,000 in such items, we must make cuts both in items pertaining to foreign or international affairs and also in items pertaining to our domestic affairs, items in which the people of the United States themselves are particularly interested, and for which they ask the Congress to make appropriations. Senators who have talked about economy cannot refuse to vote for this reduction in the authorization if they really want reasonable cuts to be made.

This authorization item is more indefinite and hazy than almost any other. No one can tell what the foreign governments will spend this money for. The list has not been made, in any case. After we appropriate the money, some young fellows in Paris get together and decide what French projects the money will be spent for, in order to fill out their quota. In Britain, others decide as to that for the British part of the funds.

Then come the counterpart funds; and in 6 months' time someone decides what will be done with them—whether the participating nations will apply them on their debts or on their budgets or for any other purpose regarding which the ECA authorities may agree.

In any case, there is no definite project to support any figure of $3,100,000,000.

In particular, 10 days ago I pointed out that the British figures are completely inaccurate today. The ECA has based the entire amount on a so-called estimated balance of payments, and that balance of payments is set forth in the record, as I gave it. It shows, for instance, that in the current year the British had a deficit or lack of dollars amounting to $956,000,000. However, during the current year the British have received from us approximately that amount.

The actual result is that today the British have no external deficit in the 6 months' period from October 1 to April 1. The ECA itself in the statement submitted by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] admits that is so. The ECA says the recent improvement can be expected to continue, although on a much reduced scale. Those in the ECA say, "We will take that into consideration, and perhaps $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 can be saved when we come to the question of appropriations, on the British budget."

But, Mr. President, the British budget is only one-fifth of the entire amount. If we are prepared to save $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 on the British budget, then certainly we can expect to make comparable savings on the budgets for the other countries with which we are dealing.

The figures for the British, which have been submitted to us, are $200,000,000 out of balance, as shown beyond the possibility of contradiction in the statement which was submitted to the Senate earlier today. We have given the British $200,000,000 more in the current year, up to July 1, than their actual deficit in balances of payments required, and the same situation, it is admitted by this statement, will continue during the next year.

The estimates are based on a condition which did not take into account the extraordinary results of the devaluation of the pound. The devaluation of the pound has resulted in improving the British balance of payments, as we thought it would. Of course that is a great disadvantage to us. It has put the British ahead of us in every dollar country, in their ability to sell more British goods and reduce the volume of goods we can sell, which has injured our position. I do not object to that. The British have to get back on a self-supporting basis. But certainly, when they get back on a self-supporting basis, they ought not to expect us to continue to provide more dollars merely in order that they may put them into their treasury and build up the surplus, which already has been augmented by our payments within the past 6 months by $600,000,000, and to continue to increase their reserves indefinitely for the general purposes of the British Government.

The whole estimate, if there is any estimate, based on balance of payments is thrown completely out of relation to real facts by the developments growing out of the devaluation of the pound.

Sir Stafford Cripps admits that the British in the last quarter had a surplus of $40,000,000 in exports over their imports, and there is no reason I can see why that general improvement should not continue. That was for 3 months and it is not merely temporary. The situation as shown by the figures for the last quarter of 1949 probably was temporary, but the figures were even better in the first quarter of 1950.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me, on their own figures, on the statements they have presented, there is today reasonable opportunity to show that we can cut this appropriation. I say again, if we are not prepared to cut 16 percent from the appropriations which come before the Congress, and if we are going to have a deficit of $6,000,000,000 this year and $7,000,000,000 next year, the result will be most unfortunate. I do not know of anything that will do more harm to the British or to any of the other European countries than the financial collapse of the United States.

That is what we are leading to. If we continue to incur deficits, we are going to have gradual inflation. We are going gradually to build up prices again and start the spiral of inflation which inevitably leads to a boom, and then, finally, to another depression. I know of nothing that would be more fatal, not only to us but to all Europe, than a financial collapse in this country. The financial stability of the United States is the first requirement for world stability. We are not going to realize that fact, and cut the various appropriations, foreign and domestic, a reasonable amount. I never saw a program yet that could not get on with 16 percent less, if it was necessary to get on with 16 percent less—16 percent less personnel, 16 percent less goods.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In order to clarify the point, since I am uncertain about it, does the amendment which the Senator from Ohio is offering propose a cut of $500,000,000 or a cut of $600,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. It proposes a cut of $500,000,000. We have consolidated the positions of those who wanted to make a cut of $600,000,000 and those who wanted to make a cut of $500,000,000 and we have agreed to a $500,000,000 amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator I have never heretofore voted for a reduction of ECA appropriations, but I intend to support this amendment, which I understand is the same as the one offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], for the reason that if we do not begin reducing here, I do not see how we can possibly reduce on the domestic side of the budget. For the first time in the history of ECA appropriations, I shall support this reduction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the conservative position, the position which any persons responsible for the finances of the Government should take, is that a reasonable cut should be made. I may say that I do not think it would disappoint Mr. Hoffman. In the bill he presented last year, a cut of $400,000,000 was made. I have never heard him complain. If he has any reasonable knowledge of political considerations, he certainly has not thought he would be treated any better this year than he was treated last year. I do not think he could have expected

that we would give him every cent he asked for.

I voted with some doubt against the cut of $1,000,000,000, but I felt that that might possibly really hamstring the program. I think the program ought to be carried to its conclusion. But I cannot see that a 16-percent cut is going to do more than require economy, and those who have been in Europe know there are some things the ECA has done which are subject to criticism. They know that there is a long list of projects of varying importance. It seems to me this will give the money necessary for every single important project which can be really shown to benefit any of the European countries and which can be really shown to be for the advantage of the people of the United States. In my judgment a cut of 16 percent would do no harm to the program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I simply want to say in answer to the Senator from Ohio that no one is more desirous of effecting a saving or more desirous of bringing about economy than I am. All I have pleaded for is the giving of a vote of confidence to Mr. Hoffman. I want to show by the figures what he has done. In the fiscal year 1948–49, there was authorized for this program $6,450,000,000, and there was actually appropriated $5,215,800,000. For the fiscal year 1949–50, Congress authorized $4,280,000,000, and there was actually appropriated $3,778,380,000. That indicates that Mr. Hoffman is just as keen to make savings as are any of us, and that he is going to sharpen his pencil. He assured me, in bringing his figures before the Foreign Relations Committee, that he simply does not want to go past the danger point, which it appears we might do if we do not authorize the amount called for in the bill. The question raised by the Senator from Ohio can be taken care of through the appropriations, and I am convinced it will be.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator intend to enlighten the Senate on his views regarding the statement which he presented, and which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] considered not to establish the point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be very glad to do that. The statement presented to me by the ECA would indicate that the figures which the Senator from Ohio presented simply showed the situation for the first quarter of this year and evidenced the fact that the British had made a splendid comeback, but for the first three quarters of last year the British situation was so much less favorable that we could not take the one quarter as the basis for making such a radical reduction. ECA suggested they were making a study of this matter at this time, and that they were going to submit before the Appropriations Committee recommendations for every cent of saving they could make, but they did not want an arbitrary figure, such as $500,000,000, to be taken from the authorization, which might put them in an embarrassing position in attempting to carry out the whole program.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio that some cut can be made, and I am prepared to go as far as to say to the Senator from Ohio that when we come to the over-all appropriations, if the over-all appropriations amount to X dollars and it would take a 10-percent cut to bring them down to within reach of our expected collections from taxes, and so forth, I am prepared to make a reduction of 10 percent right across the board, not only with respect to ECA but with respect to everything else. But I object to taking a 20-percent or a 16-percent cut from ECA, which I think has already been pared down from the early estimates as far as can safely be done, and which will be further pared down when the question is taken up by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator realizes, does he not, that the over-all appropriation bill does not contain ECA appropriations? It is separate, and the Senator also realizes, does he not, that a 10-percent cut on the general appropriation bill would not apply therefore to ECA.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It seems to me if I may answer the Senator from Ohio, we can deal with that when we come to it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The ECA appropriation will be included. A House Member told me today they were going to put it in the general appropriation bill, the single bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, if the Senator will yield, I may say that certainly all these things are going into one bill so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned, and when we get them all in one bill, I am going to favor cutting enough from that one bill to balance the budget.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is exactly the point I was making in answer to the Senator from Ohio. That is what I would be glad to do. I think that is the only way to make it mean anything.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the proposal of the Senator from Ohio, Great Britain would be penalized, because she is making progress, she is coming back under the Marshall-plan aid, she is becoming rehabilitated. Therefore, according to the Senator from Ohio, the amount provided for her should be sliced off and she should be crippled, so she cannot make as much progress during the remainder of the year as she did during the first quarter.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say that as I interpret the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, he does not want to affect Britain alone, but he is citing Britain as one case in which there can be a saving.

Mr. TAFT. The reason I cite Britain is that it is the only country as to which I could get any exact figures at all. The other countries are pretty indefinite so far as their budgets are concerned, and their figures on exports and imports. Britain is quite up to date, and it is possible to get their figures to April 1. That is the only reason. I took Britain only as an example.

I should like to say another thing to the Senator. Of course, if this item is cut, then it ought to be one of the items exempted from whatever general cut may be made in the general appropriation bill. But the effort to make a general cut was not successful last year, and whether it will succeed this year seems to me to be very improbable.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It seems to me that is the way to approach the matter, to make a general cut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield so that I may clarify this question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry, but I am pressed for time.

Mr. THYE. Then I hope, Mr. President, that the able Senator from Texas will explain whether the appropriation for ECA will be in the general over-all appropriations bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. A Member of the House told me today they were going to try to put it in, and that he thought that could be done. That is all I know about it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is not in the general appropriation bill now as reported by the House committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. He did not say it was. I said they were trying to put it in, and I think they will succeed.

Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I feel that if all the dreadful things which have been said about this item are correct, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] should have voted for the $1,000,000,000 cut. I think his arguments in favor of reducing the appropriation are very fallacious. He has been referring to it as a foreign appropriation. This is not an appropriation bill; it is an authorization bill. There certainly will be a chance, whether the ECA appropriation is contained in an over-all bill or a separate one, to reduce the amount when it reaches the appropriation stage.

We cannot consider it an appropriation which is truly foreign, when we consider the dangerous world situation and the fact that this bill must be considered in connection with our own national defense and the military upbuilding of

Europe in the interests of our own security. It is not really descriptive to refer to it as a foreign appropriation. Nor do I think we should accept the reasoning that unless we vote to cut this item we are not in favor of economy. That, it seems to me, does not hold together at all.

This is an item which has probably had a more careful consideration than most other appropriations have had. It is an item for which an American businessman of the caliber of Paul Hoffman is personally and conscientiously responsible. It is not a figure taken out of the air.

I hope Senators will take a look at yesterday's RECORD in which the procedure is set forth in detail. If any figure has been taken out of the air, it is not the figure in this bill; it is the figure in the amendment which is now before the Senate. It seems to me that figure has been taken out of the air, and can be accurately so described.

I do not think it helps to say that the expenditure is all settled by a lot of young fellows in Paris. It is not settled by a lot of young fellows in Paris or in London or a lot of young fellows anywhere else. It is all worked out by careful, responsible men.

When the European nations begin to work and to produce, some Senators want to cut off aid because they do not need it. If these nations had not accomplished anything, some Senators would want to cut off the aid because they would say the program is not any good. There are some Senators who are against it, and they will find arguments for their point of view, no matter what has happened.

Mr. President, I want to balance the budget. I think I have done as much as has any other one Senator to that end. I was the Senate author of the bill which created the Hoover Commission. One distinguished Senator inferred a moment ago that he wanted to balance the budget regardless of the dangers of the world situation, regardless of the fact that there are all sorts of perils lurking along this shadowy road. I think that is a very short-sighted policy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have a minute, I believe.

The good faith of Mr. Hoffman and of the Marshall plan is being attacked in an effort to cut off $500,000,000. A billion dollars was cut off the second year, and this bill cuts off another billion dollars. Is not that proof that those in charge of ECA are trying to administer the law within the rules of economy and good judgment? The cuts which are proposed are purely arbitrary; they are not supported by any accurate estimate. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], with one eye cocked on Ohio and the other on his office, says we should cut off $500,000,000. Why? He does not give one estimate; he does not know how much money is going to the various countries involved; he does not know anything about the projects. I wager that if he were put to the test he could not name the projects, but he takes them all and says, "We will slice off $500,000,000. That will sound good over the radio and television." Five hundred million dollars taken away from the recovery of Europe and from our own defense. We are trying to help the people of western Europe to stand on their own legs and not depend entirely on us.

Mr. President, I warn the Senate, do not follow the fatuous leadership of the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. O'CONOR's name was called). On this vote my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who is absent on public business, is paired with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Maryland would vote "nay" and the junior Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is also absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business and is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 40, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—40

Brewster	George	Millikin
Bricker	Gurney	Mundt
Bridges	Hendrickson	Russell
Butler	Ives	Schoeppel
Byrd	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Darby	Kem	Tobey
Donnell	Knowland	Wherry
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wiley
Ecton	McClellan	Williams
Ellender	Malone	Young
Ferguson	Martin	
Frear	Maybank	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Humphrey	Murray
Anderson	Hunt	Myers
Benton	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Eastland	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Flanders	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
Graham	Lodge	Taylor
Green	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McFarland	Thye
Hill	McKellar	Tydings
Hoey	McMahon	
Holland	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—16

Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chapman	Long	Vandenberg
Chavez	McCarran	Watkins
Downey	Morse	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	
Hickenlooper	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 40 and the nays are 40—a tie vote. The amendment is rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$2,950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,700,000,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this amendment is very simple and can be simply stated. It provides for a cut of $250,000,000 in the authorization. In other words, it provides for a cut of approximately 8¼ percent. Anyone who

says the authorization cannot be cut by 8¼ percent is using plain bunk for an argument. Of course, the amount can be cut 8¼ percent. If we cut the authorization 8¼ percent, it would be the same amount as the figure in the House bill. Every argument which was made for the $500,000,000 cut is doubly effective for this cut, and the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio would carry double weight so far as an 8¼ percent cut is concerned.

It has been suggested by some Senator that a cut in the proposed authorization would indicate lack of confidence in Paul Hoffman. Mr. President, such is not true. I am supporting the ECA Act. I believe Mr. Hoffman has done a good job. I do not agree with all the decisions he has made in the administration of the ECA Act, but in general I think he has done a very good job. The act has accomplished in general the purpose and objective which was sought. Therefore I say that cutting the authorization 8¼ percent would be extending a vote of confidence, rather than showing lack of confidence, in Mr. Hoffman, an able businessman. Mr. Hoffman certainly can administer the act just as efficiently and just as effectively with a cut of approximately 8 percent.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Committee on Appropriations and undoubtedly is well acquainted with contemplated action on some domestic appropriations which will probably result in a 10-percent cut. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. We hope that the omnibus bill will be approved with a cut across the board. The exact percentage of the cut has not been determined. It will depend largely on the estimated deficit.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I was rather hopeful that the previous amendment, calling for a cut of a half-billion dollars, would be agreed to. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he would be agreeable to accepting an amendment to his amendment providing for a cut of a flat 10 percent. I have heard remarks to the effect that because domestic programs may be cut 10 percent, this foreign program should likewise be cut 10 percent. At any rate, that is my feeling in the matter, and I hope that the Senator will accept my amendment to provide a cut of an even 10 percent.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in answer to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I wish to say that I do not care to change my amendment, because its adoption would bring the amount of the authorization to the same level as is provided in the House bill, and may obviate some dispute in conference. Therefore I believe it to be an appropriate figure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am very glad to join the senior member of the minority on the Committee on Appropriations in his proposed amendment. I voted against the $500,000,000 cut because I felt that the Committee on Appropriations should have a little leeway in reaching the proper figure when the question of the appropriation comes before them. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire proposes the same figure which is now contained in the House bill. I am confident this will give an adequate authorization. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations, after careful review of the justifications, will be able to cut it further when the appropriation bill comes before it, and this proposal does give the committee some leeway.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope that the proposed amendment will gain some support on the other side of the aisle. I believe that here we have an opportunity to apply bipartisanship on a foreign-policy bill. I voted against the billion-dollar cut. I voted for the 16-percent cut, because I believe it is essential that we take away from Russia the one great weapon they have, and that is the possibility of an insolvent America. In my opinion there is an area for absolute bipartisanship, to protect this country against insolvency.

Mr. President, fiscal matters are of vital importance throughout the Western World. While we are taking the lead in so many ways we must also set the example to all the nations that they must economize, so far as government is concerned, and must balance their budgets. We are urging other countries to balance their budgets, and they find that here at home we use an entirely different yardstick. Let us look attentively to the figures from the last report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue, which shows that there is a possibility of a deficit of 7.3 billion dollars in fiscal 1951.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. In connection with the budget-balancing procedure, it must be kept in mind that some of the countries already have their budgets balanced, and all of them come closer to balancing their budgets than we do.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true, and moreover, we sometimes find ourselves paying money out of our Treasury for the express purpose of balancing their budgets.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have supported the ECA program during the time it has been before the Congress, but it seems to me that the cut now proposed is a modest one, in connection with which the Senate has a responsibility to the country.

We have a public debt in excess of $256,000,000,000. We have a budget which is out of balance, for the current fiscal year, by more than $5,000,000,000, and a recent report prepared by the joint congressional committee dealing with tax revenues indicates that the figures of the administration are wrong, and that on the basis of present estimates we will be in the red by more than $7,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, I do not believe the Congress of the United States will even be able to start putting the budget in balance for the next fiscal year unless we apply a part of the reduction to this economic-aid bill. Such a reduction should have the support of everyone who is interested in trying to maintain a solvent Federal Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the pending amendment should be agreed to, although I am glad that none of the former amendments, which I believe would have crippled the program, were adopted.

It seems to me that the Senator from New Hampshire has struck a note which should be clearly voiced in this debate, when he says he has confidence in the Administrator and in his handling of the ECA funds. I have confidence in the administration of the fund, and I think we all should have, when we look at the budget and realize that $150,000,000 of the amount appropriated last year was not expended. It is due to that fact alone that the budgeted item of $3,100,000,000 is reduced to $2,950,000,000 in the measure now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope the pending amendment will prevail, and I believe that if the amount authorized should prove to be a little bit more than is needed, the Administrator will see that any amount which can be conserved and saved will be saved.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the very "courageous" political speeches which have been made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. Some have said, "I will vote to cut the omnibus appropriation bill $5,000,000,000." That was indeed a "courageous" speech. Others say "we will vote to cut foreign economic assistance a billion, or five hundred million, or two hundred and fifty million," but oh, Mr. President, they do not seem to know what is going on in the rest of the world.

We have heard much talk on this floor about communism at home, and some gentlemen who talk so much about communism at home do not seem to want to do very much about communism abroad. In fact, many of them have voted against the entire ECA program, and if it had not been for this program Europe indeed would have been overrun by Communists, and, the Communists today would have the manpower and the natural resources of a continent at their beck and call.

Mr. President, let me refer to just a bit of history. I had intended to speak during the debate, and had prepared a statement, but unfortunately the time was divided this morning, and I was unable to obtain any of the time, but did place the statement in the RECORD.

In that statement I said "Two years ago the countries of Europe were almost hopelessly unstable politically. It was anybody's guess as to what the components of the governments would be from one week to another. The Communist menace was ever present, and vocal, and powerful. The foundation of this political instability was, as it always is, an economic crisis. The people of Europe had been unable successfully to convert from a wartime to a peacetime economy. It was this picture of turmoil that confronted the world, and it was this picture of turmoil that confronted the Congress, when we were voting upon the Marshall plan." Yet some could not see the hopelessness, the despair, and the danger of communism in Europe, as they were unable to see the war clouds gather in Europe before Pearl Harbor, as they voted in the House of Representatives, and were almost successful, except for the matter of one vote, in disbanding the draft 3 weeks before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. President, we need a little more foresight, we need to think a little more about the next generation, and a little less about the next election. If we look at the situation from that viewpoint, we will vote at least an authorization that will enable the Committee on Appropriations to screen the whole problem.

Some people besides the Russians were hopeful, I believe, that the Marshall plan would be unsuccessful, but it has been so successful that Mr. Hoffman has called it a near miracle. Despite its success, its opponents while there is still a crisis in the world, when the menace of communism is still great, and the shadow of communism still extends over western Europe—desire to sabotage this program, and defeat the Marshall plan, if they can, by cutting appropriations or the authorization for appropriations.

This is the back-door approach. They don't dare stand on this floor and oppose the program in its entirety and offer an amendment to strike out the entire authorization.

Mr. President, I repeat this, the program has been successful, more successful than we had ever hoped, and I think this vote, to reduce the authorization for it, will go a long way in determining whether or not we still really believe in the program.

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the program will not be cut. Let those interested in reducing it go before the proper committee, the Committee on Appropriations, which will carefully screen the amounts requested, and if they believe that a reduction is possible now after a thorough and complete screening then I am quite sure they will recommend it. But do not make it impossible for the Appropriations Committee to recommend the full budget estimate when it is proven before the committee—and I am sure it can be—that the full amount requested is absolutely necessary for the proper and legitimate administration of foreign economic assistance.

Mr. President, this is a serious matter, this is a critical moment, and I do believe that Senators should not arbitrarily say, "We will cut 10 percent, we will cut 5 percent, we will cut 8 percent." Let the Appropriations Committee look into that. Let them determine it. But by voting for this amendment you deprive the committee of the opportunity to determine it.

Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be defeated, because I believe we are now voting on a program not yet completed, and if we begin to cut now, the $9,000,000,000 we have already spent on foreign aid may be lost, and instead of $13,000,000,000, it might even cost us $30,000,000,000, $35,000,000,000, or $40,000,000,000 for a military organization. If we are not successful with the Marshall plan, then Mr. President, we must spend three times as much as we are spending on the military for our own safety and our own security.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Five minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is rather curious to observe that some Senators vote against one cut and vote in favor of another cut for reasons which are not easily understandable. Most of those who have spoken have praised Mr. Hoffman. As to the Senator from Ohio, it is funny how anything which does not fit in with his mental apparatus——

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Ohio is funny; not what he says. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. I am glad to receive that notice from the Senator from Ohio, who is up in the heights. When he is not dreaming heights he runs into heights.

Mr. President, some Senators say, "Oh, we have confidence in Mr. Hoffman." Well, he should have convinced Senators that they should have confidence in him. For the second year of the program he recommended a cut of $1,000,000,000. That should have justified their confidence in him. In connection with the pending bill, he recommended a cut of another $1,000,000,000. Does not that prove that he is worthy of being trusted? Even from the appropriations for the current year he actually saved $150,000,000. Does that not show that he is worthy of confidence? No, but some Senators say, "We are not willing to trust him with this $250,000,000. We are willing to trust him with $500,000,000; we are willing to trust him with $3,000,000,000, but not with $250,000,000. Ah, no; he will spend that, he will waste that."

Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter from Mr. Hoffman which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1950.

The Honorable TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: I am concerned by various amendments now before the Senate which call for large reductions in the authorization of funds for the European recovery program next year. I am convinced that their adoption would not only seriously affect the program for fiscal 1951 but would place in real jeopardy the important recovery results already attained at a cost to the American taxpayer of some $10,000,000,000. Any reduction which runs this risk of destroying not only future prospects but also past achievements seems to me "penny-wise and pound-foolish."

I want to make it clear that my concern over the suggested reductions does not indicate any dissent from the position repeatedly taken by the Senate, in which I wholeheartedly concur, that European aid should be on a rapidly declining scale. The record will bear out the fact that this principle is being followed. For fiscal 1949 the aid figure was approximately $5,800,000,000 including the special appropriation for Germany and for 1950 about $4,200,000,000 including Germany.

Our estimate for 1951 was and is of a requirement of $3,100,000,000 from which we deducted $150,000,000 which we felt confident could be saved from this year's funds and carried over to next year. On this basis we have requested an authorization of $2,950,000,000. We are continuing to study the program for further possible reductions both with respect to further savings out of this year's funds and change in the estimates for fiscal 1951. Any reductions that can be made in either category will be presented in detail to the Appropriations Committee so that any necessary adjustments can be made in the appropriation legislation.

There is one point about which I feel strongly. Our estimates of Europe's needs for the next fiscal year have been attacked on the ground that we will not in fact spend all the money appropriated to us for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. May I point out that these savings have resulted from our determination to hold expenditures to the lowest figure consistent with attaining the objectives of the program. I am astounded that such vigilance should be made the basis for attacking next year's estimates. I hardly need point out that every penny appropriated could have been obligated without the slightest difficulty.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL HOFFMAN,
Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on page 4, line 2, to strike out "$2,950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,700,000,000."

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. On this vote my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who is absent on public business, is paired with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the junior Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma

[Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who also is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business and is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Gurney	Maybank
Brewster	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Russell
Butler	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Darby	Kem	Taft
Donnell	Knowland	Thye
Dworshak	McCarthy	Tobey
Ecton	McClellan	Wherry
Ellender	McKellar	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Williams
Frear	Malone	Young
George	Martin	

NAYS—33

Anderson	Douglas	Fulbright
Benton	Eastland	Graham
Connally	Flanders	Green
Hayden	Leahy	Neely
Hill	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Humphrey	Lodge	Robertson
Hunt	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Johnson, Tex.	McFarland	Sparkman
Kefauver	McMahon	Taylor
Kerr	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Kilgore	Myers	Tydings

NOT VOTING—16

Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chapman	Long	Vandenberg
Chavez	McCarran	Watkins
Downey	Morse	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	
Hickenlooper	Pepper	

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 176) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment C, dated April 26, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. —. Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title on June 30, 1950, to any participating country unless, on or before such date, such country (1) has eliminated any currency controls imposed by it that prevent its currency from reflecting its actual purchasing power in terms of the United States dollar on the free monetary markets of the world, and (2) enters into an agreement with the United States that it will not reimpose any such currency controls prior to July 1, 1952."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this amendment would require each participating country to agree "to eliminate any currency manipulation which prevents its currency from reflecting its actual purchasing power in terms of the United States dollar on the free monetary markets of the world."

The single, most important factor for the chaotic conditions of intra-European trade and the European trade deficits is the continued maintenance of exchange controls and currency manipulation.

Import licensing and bilateral trade agreements are largely the results of an unfair and discriminatory determination of the value of each country's money. All those barriers against the establishment of a larger and freer European market for European goods will be broken down if currencies again become freely convertible, both in terms of one another and in terms of dollars. In some countries it may be necessary for the people to delay or swear off expensive social welfare schemes for awhile. Let us not forget that $9,000,000 of ECA aid has made the American people, also, pull in their belts.

At this point I want to read an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of May 3, 1950, which gives a cogent argument for the pending amendment:

A BILL OF DIVORCEMENT

This newspaper has long argued that the objectives of our European aid program—which necessarily involve the lowering of trade barriers among the countries—are irreconcilable with the objectiveness of a controlled economy.

This week there have been indications that the same thought is occurring to others. The London press reports are now noting a "feeling in high quarters" that the domestic policies of the British Government represent an obstacle to the economic integration of western Europe.

Since these stories have come from correspondents of several different news organizations, they seem to be what are known as "inspired" stories—that is, they reflect the views of officials who cannot, for one reason or another, be identified. And since it is unlikely that the Labor government would inspire such stories, it seems probable that they represent the current opinion of ECA officials abroad.

The awakening is both interesting and disturbing. Interesting because it strips away the illusion that an economy can be Socialist at home and globally cooperative in its foreign trade. Disturbing because it casts considerable gloom about the brave hopes for destroying the economic barricades of Europe.

Let us look at just one barricade, that erected against the transfer of trade payments from one country to another.

Under the present system a Frenchman cannot freely sell his goods in Britain, take his pounds sterling and buy in Belgium while the Belgian in turn uses the pounds to buy in Britain. The pounds are not freely exchangeable.

The disadvantages of this to commerce are manifest; the smallest exchange of goods becomes a complicated matter of government negotiation and the result is a hobbling of trade. So the ECA has endeavored to set up some sort of payments union, a central pool of currencies which could be drawn upon in the course of trade. This would not mean free trade so long as export-import quotas are retained, but it would be a small step in that direction.

The ECA has failed in even this modest undertaking. Although approving "in principle," the British Government has rejected every concrete plan made.

The reason for the British objection, reduced to its simplest form, is that without currency control it is hard for the British Government to control the Britain-France-Belgium-Britain trade cycle. For instance: France, if she had free use of pounds, might compete in Belgium for goods which Britain wants to get with its own pounds or France might buy in Belgium goods that the British would prefer to sell France themselves.

Quota restrictions, of course, will control the flow in and out of Britain anyway. But currency controls can do more; they can help influence the course of trade between two other countries—in this example, France and Belgium.

Dropping currency curbs could play hob with the Labor Government's home plans. When the plans called for more of this from Belgium, the planners might find that France was there betimes—and with British pounds. Or the plan to export more of that to France might be stymied because France had found a better buy in Belgium.

The simple fact is, and always has been, that currency controls abroad are essential to a dictated economy at home. And in the case of a country like Britain, which is a big buyer and seller in world markets, these currency controls will be used to influence the trade patterns of other countries to its own purposes.

This is, admittedly, a gloomy fact for the ECA planners to have to face; their ambition to promote freer trade in Europe is a most commendable one. But it is a hard fact better faced late than later.

The policy of promoting economic union in Europe and the policy of supporting with subsidies the Socialist Government in London are mutually incompatible.

Mr. President, some of the European participating countries have as many as 28 values for their currency, depending upon the area and particular uses to be made of such currencies. For example, the little country of Colombia, in South America—a country far removed from Europe, but operating on the same general principle—the peso has several values, with the result that a person in Colombia who wishes to buy goods from this country to be shipped to Colombia may be charged two or three times as much for the dollar in terms of the peso as he will be charged in a country where imports are favored, thus effectively preventing the imports from this country. The free convertibility of currency should be the first consideration and condition in connection with our advancing funds to any foreign country to prevent such manipulations.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a summary of licensing and exchange-control requirements and the status of private trading with the United States for European countries and certain African areas.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Department of Commerce, Office of International Trade, Areas Division, Western and Eastern European Branches, April 1950]

SUMMARY OF LICENSING AND EXCHANGE-CONTROL REQUIREMENTS AND STATUS OF PRIVATE TRADING WITH UNITED STATES FOR EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND CERTAIN AFRICAN AREAS

A. IMPORT TRADE

Albania

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to license.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

Austria

Licensing requirements: Import licenses are required for all but a few commercial imports. Import and exchange permits are approved simultaneously as a general rule.

The usual validity period of an import license is 6 months, but this period can be extended. The validity period of an exchange permit is 1 month, but this may be extended for 1 or 2 months, and longer periods in exceptional cases. Merchandise imported under an import license must be cleared through customs before the expiration date of the license.

Exchange controls: Full control. Permit of Austrian National Bank required for the purchase of foreign exchange to pay for imports, and exchange permit must accompany all commercial imports for clearance through customs.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative. Trade in salt, tobacco, and explosives is reserved to monopolies.

Belgian Congo

Licensing requirement: All commodities subject to import license issued by the Exchange Commission valid for a period of 6 months.

Exchange controls: When an import license is granted by the Exchange Commission, this same office also grants an exchange license providing for the required exchange.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative within framework of licensing and exchange controls.

Belgium-Luxemburg

Licensing requirements: Import licenses are required for items amounting to approximately 30 percent of import trade. Application for import licenses must be made to the Office Central des Contingents et Licenses (O. C. C. L.) by the Belgian importer.

For other items, a "declaration in lieu of license" may be used.

Exchange controls: Banks which have been approved by the Belgo-Luxemburg exchange authorities are authorized to make available the necessary foreign exchange upon presentation of an approved import license.

For the exchange requirements of items imported under a declaration in lieu of license, these same banks generally make available the required foreign exchange upon presentation of the declaration. In certain instances, however, declarations are referred to the licensing authorities by the banks for approval before exchange is granted. No list of these items has been made public.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative within framework of licensing and exchange controls.

Details on import licensing: Import licenses generally carry with them the right to foreign exchange.

The period of validity of each license depends on circumstances, but it is usually 2 or 3 months or longer. The merchandise must be cleared through the Belgian customs before the expiration date of the import license.

Whether the amount indicated on the license cover is FOB, FAS, or CIF depends on the terms of the application.

No specific percentage of tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license, but small deviations are usually permitted.

The maximum value permitted for merchandise shipped without an import license is 500 francs for a parcel-post package and 2,500 francs for a package sent by railway express. Samples, gifts, advertising material, and other items not for sale are generally exempt from import license requirements.

Bulgaria

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to license. Ministry of Foreign Trade license issuing authority.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange. License automatically assures foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

Czechoslovakia

Licensing requirements: Almost all imports are handled by foreign-trade monopolies. Licenses from Ministry of Foreign Trade required for all imports.

The usual validity period of an import license is 3 months. The bill of lading must be dated on or before the expiration date. Goods must be shipped before the expiration date, that is, they must be out of the hands of the exporter. However, this does not mean that the vessel or other means of conveyance must clear the port or point of shipment, nor does it mean that the vessel or other means of conveyance must arrive at the port of discharge before the expiration date, provided that the documents have been issued directly for Czechoslovakia. Merchandise need not be cleared through customs before the expiration date, but must be cleared within 3 weeks after expiration date—provided that the goods have been shipped prior to the expiration date and the documents have been issued directly for Czechoslovakia.

Exchange controls: Exchange permits required. Granting of import license automatically provides for allocation of necessary foreign exchange from National Bank of Czechoslovakia.

Status of private trade: Very little private trade; all foreign trade is being nationalized.

Denmark

Licensing requirements: On most commodities imported from United States. Goods Supply Board is the issuing authority.

Exchange controls: On practically all import transactions involving United States goods.

Application for exchange and import license made simultaneously, when import license is required.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative, within framework of existing licensing system. Imports of a number of important commodities effected on a centralized basis.

Details on import licensing: Import licenses carry with them the right to foreign exchange.

The period of validity of each import license varies considerably, but is usually 6 months for imports from the United States. The merchandise must be cleared through the Danish customs before the expiration date.

The value indicated on the import license is c. i. f. port of discharge.

No tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license.

Import licenses are required on goods of United States origin, irrespective of value of shipment, with the exception of a limited number of articles comprising a free list, for which no licenses are required for goods of any origin. These include books, periodicals, and other printed matter in a foreign language. Personal effects of travelers, settlers' effects and some other classes of goods entering under special circumstances are also exempt from license requirements. Samples valued at less than 50 crowns and not constituting part of a larger shipment of samples do not require a license. Gifts are exempt from license requirements up to a maximum value of 500 crowns, but if value exceeds 25 crowns a signed statement of the recipient confirming the gift status of the shipment is required.

Finland

Licensing requirements: On all commercial imports, with minor exceptions. Import licenses generally issued only for essentials.

Exchange controls: On all import transactions. Exchange becomes automatically available with the issuance of an import license.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative, within the framework of existing licensing and control system, except for monopoly articles, notably alcohol and sugar.

Details on import licensing: Import licenses carry with them the right to foreign exchange if the amount required is stated in the application.

The period of validity of each import license is 1 year, but extensions have been procurable without difficulty when more time was required for delivery.

The value indicated on the import license is usually f. a. s. port of shipment, but if payment for freight requires foreign exchange, the c. i. f. port of discharge value may be stated.

A 10-percent maximum tolerance in quantity or value may be allowed on the import license.

In general, commercial shipments are exempt from license requirements only if of very small value.

France

Licensing requirements: All commercial imports (outside Government procurement), regardless of value, are subject to individual import license (form PRE for ECA imports; form AC for other imports). Licenses must be obtained by the importer from the French Exchange Office (Office des Changes), Paris, before shipment of the merchandise.

Certain types of shipments are specifically exempted from the import license requirement. These types include gift food packages, and samples which are to be reexported. The latter require special documentation.

Licenses are granted on the basis of essentiality of the product and availability of exchange. They are nontransferable. Licenses for imports from extra-European countries are valid for 6 months, at expiration of which the merchandise must have been despatched in direct shipment to France. Licenses may not be renewed.

The amount indicated on the import license covers the c. i. f. value, port of discharge, f. o. b. value should also be shown on the license. No percentage of tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license.

Exchange controls: With minor exceptions, all foreign-exchange proceeds and payments are strictly controlled. Import licenses carry with them the right to acquire foreign exchange of the amount and kind shown on the license, or indicate that no foreign exchange is required (license without payment).

Prior authorizations are sometimes issued by the exchange office to facilitate placing of orders which require considerable time to fill. These authorizations which are not import licenses and have no value for customs purposes authorize the importer to effect exchange and bank operations, in conformity with exchange regulations, necessary for placing this order. To actually effect the importation an import license must be obtained in the usual manner, but it is issued automatically to the extent that it conforms to the currently valid prior authorization against which it is charged.

Status of private trade: While the importation of some products, such as coal, fats, and liquid fuels, is restricted to special national groups or offices, and the importation of certain other products is restricted to Government-sponsored and controlled "groupements d'importation" (associations of importers and/or manufacturers), the importation of most products is now open to private trade. The number of articles still subject to "groupement" purchasing is steadily declining.

French North Africa

Licensing requirements: Import licenses required on all products. Granted as a rule for essentials only.

Name of license-issuing organizations:

Algeria: Office Algérien du Commerce Extérieur, 13 rue d'Isly, Alger, Algeria.

Tunisia: Office du Commerce Extérieur de la Tunisie Tunis, Tunisia.

French Morocco: Office Chérifien du Commerce Extérieur, Casablanca, French Morocco, or Directorate of Commerce, Rebat.

Exchange controls: Full controls; import license carries the right to foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: According to prewar commodity distribution, about nine-tenths of the trade is restored to private channels. This constitutes the major proportion of the value of the trade with the United States. (This refers to Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco.)

French West Africa

Licensing requirements: Import licenses required on all products. Granted as a rule for essentials only. License issuing organizations. Office Colonial des Changels, Dakar, French West Africa.

Exchange controls: Full controls; import license carries the right to foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: Only limited list of products (comprising about 10 percent of trade by prewar pattern) not returned to private channels.

Germany

Western Germany and Western Sectors of Berlin

Licensing requirements: Licenses required for all commercial imports. Obtained from German foreign trade banks (Aussenhandelsbanken).

Exchange controls: Control exercised over all foreign exchange transactions. Administered primarily through German foreign trade banks. Import license carries with it release of foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: Most imports handled through private trade channels.

Soviet Zone of Germany and Soviet Sector of Berlin

Licensing requirements: Almost all imports handled by Government trading monopolies.

Exchange controls: Control exercised over all foreign exchange transactions.

Status of private trade: Contracts may be made only through Government trading companies.

Greenland

Licensing requirements. Exchange controls. Status of private trade: No private trade; trade is a monopoly of Danish Government.

Hungary

Licensing requirements: Almost all imports are handled by government trade monopolies. Licenses required for all imports. Licenses issued by the Hungarian National Bank.

Exchange controls: Full control. Permit of National Bank required for the purchase of foreign exchange to pay for imports. Granting of import license automatically provides for allocation of necessary foreign exchange.

State of private trade: Foreign trade concentrated largely in government trading companies.

Iceland

Licensing requirements: Licenses required for all imports. Licenses are issued, at present, only for essentials, such as foodstuffs, grain, fats, sugar, fertilizer, feeds, and machinery.

Exchange controls: Exchange control on all transactions. Import licenses constitute foreign currency permits, unless otherwise stipulated, but transfer of exchange conditioned on priority and availability of exchange medium involved.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative, within framework of existing licensing system, except for monopoly articles, notably tobacco, artificial fertilizers, alcohol, matches, and cigarette paper.

Italy

Licensing requirements: Import license or special permit, required to be presented to customs for the importation of nearly all goods, is issued by the Italian Exchange Office upon instructions of Foreign Trade Ministry and after presentation to Exchange Office of authorized bank declaration that payment is made from or earmarked in 50 percent export proceeds account. Exception: A few industrial raw materials (List A, as amended) importable upon presentation to customs of simple bank declaration as above.

"Franco Valuta" imports: The expression "franco valuta" (free of exchange) is used to denote imports financed with foreign exchange resources available to importers outside of Italy and, therefore, without having recourse to funds in the "50 percent foreign exchange accounts" or, with foreign exchange to be obtained from Italcambi; limited to—

(a) Bona fide gifts,

(b) Imports financed with funds originating from moneys inherited abroad by Italian nationals,

(c) Imports financed by Italians resident in countries where exchange restrictions prevent transfers of their funds to Italy,

(d) Imports financed with funds pertaining to Italians returning to Italy for permanent residence.

(e) Very exceptionally, imports only for their own use by the Italian branches of American companies.

Exchange controls: Exporters of domestic goods are credited with 50 percent of dollars and other "hard currency" (at present, only free Swiss francs), proceeds left at the disposition of private trade for importation within 60 days from the end of the month in which it became available, subject to the "licensing requirements" outlined above—or for sale at the "export" rate quoted in Milan or Rome exchanges on day before selling. The 50 percent in question may be purchased by importers through banking channels. The remaining 50 percent must be ceded to the Italian Exchange Office at a rate corresponding to the average, as of the day of surrender, of the closing quotations for export currency of the Rome and Milan Exchanges.

Status of private trade: Private trade is restricted to imports deemed essential by the Foreign Trade Ministry, and by exclusive government purchase, at the present time, of wheat (also flour), coal and a few other critical goods.

Importation of tobacco (unmanufactured), salt, matches, lighters, quinine, etc., is reserved to the monopolies.

Netherlands

Licensing requirements: All imports from the dollar area are subject to import licenses, issued by the Central Bureau for Imports and Exports, "Rijksbureaux" and monopoly holders. Licenses must be applied for by the Netherlands recipient. Usually granted only for commodities vital to national economy and reconstruction, not for luxury goods, and only if not obtainable domestically or from nondollar sources. Applications must be accompanied by pro forma invoice in triplicate.

Exchange controls: Payment attest required for all payments to a party abroad, which, if foreign exchange is available, is usually affixed to the import license. This attest must be obtained from the Nederlandsche Bank, Amsterdam.

Status of private trade: Private import trade mostly resumed, within the framework of existing licensing system. Official purchasing commissions for a few vital commodities still exist in United States of America and Canada. Importing for an entire industry group is favored by more easily obtainable licenses.

Full restoration of free trade with the dollar area cannot be expected in the near future.

Norway

Licensing requirements: All commodities subject to import license. Licenses granted only for essentials, such as grain, coal, industrial machinery, chemicals, steel, and medical supplies. Quantitative restrictions removed on several items, especially capital goods, coming from certain other OEEC countries. Licenses for United States goods

are hard to get since dollar exchange is scarce.

Exchange controls: Rigid exchange control in effect. Import permit allows holder to obtain foreign exchange but a separate exchange permit from the Bank of Norway must be obtained.

Status of private trade: Except for a few commodities in short supply, foreign trade has been restored to private channels.

Trade in almanacs and calendars, spirits, coal, and grain and flour is reserved to Government, or Government-authorized private monopolies. Creation of Government monopoly over import and wholesale distribution of cattle, feed, and drugs is under consideration.

Details on import licensing: Import licenses do not carry with them the right to foreign exchange. The importer must obtain a separate exchange permit from the Bank of Norway.

The period of validity of each import license may be 3, 4, or 6 months, usually 3 months. The period of validity is extended if valid reasons for extension are given. The merchandise must be cleared through the Norwegian customs before the expiration date of the license.

The period of validity of the exchange permit is also 3, 4, or 6 months, usually 3 months. Here, too, leniency is shown in extending the period of validity if valid reasons for extension are given. The merchandise covered by the exchange permit must be cleared through the Norwegian customs before the expiration date of the permit.

The amount indicated on the import license and on the exchange permit covers f. o. b. vessel or f. a. s., port of shipment, depending upon the request of the importer.

No percentage of tolerance is allowed on the import license or on the exchange permit.

Exempt from import license requirements are samples up to a value of 10 crowns and gifts up to a value of 100 crowns.

Poland

Licensing requirements: Almost all imports are handled by government state monopolies; almost all imports are subject to licensing by the Polish Ministry of Industry and Commerce. Existing controls favor imports of basic essentials.

Exchange controls: Application for foreign exchange must be made to Foreign Exchange Control Commission, after receipt of import license.

Status of private trade: Hardly any private trade; all foreign trade is being nationalized.

Portugal

Licensing requirements: "Prior registration," equivalent to import license, required for all imports. Licenses are issued by the Corporative Technical Council.

Exchange controls: Full control. Foreign exchange license required.

Status of private trade: Permitted, subject to control of corporative organizations.

Details on import licensing: Import licenses carry the right to foreign exchange. The usual period of validity of a license is 90 days, which may be extended in exceptional cases. Actual arrival of the goods before the expiration date is not required, but the bill of lading must be dated prior to the date of expiration noted on the license.

The amount indicated on the import license covers the total amount of dollar exchange required to effect the transaction. Thus, if insurance and freight charges on an individual shipment require payment in dollars, the additional amounts under these headings should be added to the f. o. b. value at the port of shipment in making out the import license.

A tolerance of 10 percent is allowed when the license indicates approximate value. The import license must also state a quantity. However, if the volume of the shipment upon arrival does not correspond to this quantity, the importer may request a rectification of the quantity figure given in the original license application.

There are no exceptions from license requirements granted by virtue of the character of the merchandise. However, gifts and commercial samples are generally accorded favorable treatment in the issuance of license.

Portuguese colonies (Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, Portuguese Guinea, San Tomé, and Principe)

Licensing requirements: "Prior registration," equivalent to import license, required for all imports.

Exchange controls: Full control. Foreign exchange license required.

Status of private trade: Permitted, subject to control of corporative organizations.

Rumania

Licensing requirements: All imports are handled by government trading monopolies. Licenses required for all imports.

Exchange controls: Full control.

Status of private trade: Private trade not operative.

Spain

Licensing requirements: All imports. Imports largely limited to essential raw materials. Special combined import-export transactions are authorized. (See FCW of October 5 and 12, 1946.)

In applying for import license Spanish importer must furnish a pro forma invoice in quintuplicate, prepared by prospective exporter, giving weights, and f. o. b. foreign port and c. i. f. prices.

Import licenses are issued by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce.

Exchange controls: All imports. Exchange must be obtained through Foreign Exchange Institute which usually, but not mandatorily, grants it in accordance with the terms of the import license. Special exchange rates established for many import products.

Special exchange rates established for various commodities.

Status of private trade: Permitted, subject to control at all stages by syndical organizations. Trade in tobacco, petroleum, matches, cottonseed, and playing cards is reserved for monopolies.

Spanish possessions in Africa

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to license.

Exchange controls: All imports. Exchange must be obtained through Foreign Exchange Institute which usually, but not mandatorily, grants it in accordance with the terms of the import license.

Status of private trade: Permitted, within the framework of existing licensing system, subject to control at all stages by syndical organizations.

Sweden

Licensing requirements: Rigid general import license regulations effective March 15, 1947, although several items were controlled before that time. Goods on special free list, principally books and publications, exempt from import license.

Exchange controls: Rigid exchange control. Import licenses carry with them the right to foreign exchange, but license must be registered at a foreign exchange bank within 2 months after issuance, and separate application filed for exchange when desired.

Status of private trade: Import trade is largely in the hands of private merchants and firms, except for liquors, sugar, and tobacco. State-owned enterprises, such as railways, National Economic Defense Board, and Board of Roads and Waterways, do, of course, engage in trade on their own account. Government authorized private monopoly exists in importation of almanacs and calendars.

Details on import licensing: Import licenses carry with them the right to foreign exchange, but a separate application must be made for exchange; import licenses are not now issued unless exchange is available or unless it is agreed that the shipper will wait for payment. American exporters should ascertain that the Swedish importer has obtained the required import license and made the proper arrangement for payment.

The period of validity of each import license extends to the end of the quarter ending between 6 and 9 months from the date of issuance, and may be longer, if necessary. The means of conveyance must arrive at the point of discharge and the customs declaration must be filed with the Swedish authorities before the date of the expiration of the import license. Exceptions are sometimes made by special announcement. The period of validity of the exchange permit is usually 15 days shorter and payment must be effected before the expiration date of the exchange permit.

The amount indicated on the import license and on the exchange permit cover the f. o. b. vessel or c. i. f. port of discharge value, depending upon the terms of the application. A 5-percent tolerance in value may in exceptional cases be allowed on the import license, as well as on the exchange permit.

The maximum value of merchandise which can be imported without an import license or exchange permit is 200 crowns, subject to careful examination in each case. Exempt from import license requirements are samples under 200 crowns in value, gift packages, and advertising material, subject to careful consideration in each individual case.

Switzerland

Licensing requirements: Import licensing requirements have been practically eliminated, with the exception of continued restrictions on certain agricultural products.

Licenses freely granted on most commodities to established importers.

Licensed by Service des Importations et Exportations du Departement Federal de l'Economie Publique in almost all cases.

Exchange controls: Imports from dollar countries may be paid for in any currency acceptable to the seller.

Payments to most countries must be made through clearing accounts.

Status of private trade: Private trade in operation, except for trade in sugar, cereal and fodder grains, coal, oils, and fats, which is handled by the state-supervised organizations.

In addition, importation of monopoly articles, notably alcohol, salt, and gunpowder, is reserved to monopoly holder.

Details on import licensing: The import license carries with it the right to foreign exchange.

The original period of validity of an import license is 2 months. A license is renewable twice for a period of 3 months at each renewal. In practice, the authorities are very liberal in granting license renewals.

The amount indicated on the license covers the value at the Swiss border.

A tolerance of 5 percent on both quantity and value is allowed on an import license.

If the commodity in question requires an import license, the license must be obtained regardless of the value.

Actual samples which can be used only as samples and which possess no commercial value are exempt from license requirements. Import licenses are not required for gifts sent by parcel post. Although many items require import licenses, licenses are freely granted on most commodities to established importers.

U. S. S. R

Licensing requirements: All imports are subject to licensing by the Ministry of Foreign Trade. This particular requirement

does not, however, present any difficulty to the potential American exporter inasmuch as the official Soviet trading agency in the United States (the Amtorg Trading Corporation in New York City), through which all transactions with the Russian market are effected, assumes responsibility for attending to all the documentation required by the Government of the U. S. S. R.

Exchange controls: The possession and disposition of foreign exchange and gold is a government monopoly in the U. S. S. R., administered by the state bank. Import transactions approved by the Ministry of Foreign Trade are automatically assured of the required allocation of foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: The entire field of foreign trade is operated as a government monopoly.

Yugoslavia

Licensing requirements: All imports subject to license. Ministry of Foreign Trade license issuing authority.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange. License automatically assures foreign exchange. Foreign exchange for payment of imports made available by the National Bank of Yugoslavia.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

B. EXPORT TRADE

Albania

Licensing requirements: Licenses are required for all exports.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

Austria

Licensing requirements: Licenses required for the majority of exports. The new foreign-trade law, effective December 31, 1948, liberalizes and simplifies foreign-trade regulations; commodities requiring export license are specified in list A.

Exchange controls: Full exchange control.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative.

Belgium-Luxemburg

Licensing requirements: Export licenses are required for items amounting to approximately 50 percent of export trade. Application for export licenses must be made in the Office Central des Contingents et Licenses (OCCL) by the Belgian exporter.

For other items a declaration in lieu of license may be used.

Exchange controls: Payments for goods exported both under license and declaration in lieu of license must be assigned by the Belgian exporter to an authorized bank within 8 days of receipt of payment.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative within framework of licensing and exchange controls.

Bulgaria

Licensing requirements: Licenses are required for all exports. Licenses are issued by Ministry of Foreign Trade.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange. All foreign exchange proceeds resulting from export trade deposited with Bulgarian National Bank.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

Czechoslovakia

Licensing requirements: Almost all exports are handled by Government foreign-trade monopolies. Licenses from Ministry of Foreign Trade required for all exports.

Exchange controls: Full control over foreign-exchange transactions, exercised by National Bank.

Status of private trade: Very little private trade; all foreign trade is being nationalized.

Denmark

Licensing requirements: Licenses required for many exports of importance. Goods Supply Board and Ministry of Agriculture are license-issuing authorities.

Exchange controls: Full control on all export transactions.

Status of private trade: Private trade operative, within the framework of existing licensing system, but many exports centralized.

Finland

Licensing requirements: All exports technically subject to license. Licensing board is license-issuing authortiy.

Exchange controls: On all export transactions.

Status of private trade: Private-trade operative, within framework of existing licensing system.

France

Licensing requirements: Export licenses are now required for a comparatively small percentage of commodities in French export trade, notably essential foods, textiles, and raw materials, and equipment for industry. Gradual relaxation of export license control has accompanied improved domestic supplies.

Exchange controls: All exports require an exchange commitment ("engagement de change") executed by the exporter guaranteeing surrender of the foreign-exchange proceeds of the transaction within a given period in exchange for francs. The export license (form 02) is sufficient and takes the place of an exchange commitment for products subject to export license; a special form (DE) must be executed at the French Exchange Office (Office des Changes) in the case of exports not subject to license.

Status of private trade: Exports from France to the United States are on a private trade basis, within the framework of the existing licensing system.

French North Africa

Licensing requirements: Export licenses required for all exports.

Exchange controls: Exchange controls require exporter to surrender 90 percent of the foreign exchange in all cases.

Status of private trade: Private exportation is in operation, within the framework of existing licensing system.

French West Africa

Licensing requirements: Export licenses required for most products, obtainable from the Office de Commerce Extérieur, Dakar, French West Africa.

Exchange Controls: Exchange controls require exporter to surrender foreign exchange in all cases.

Status of private trade: Exportation of crude products reserved to members of authorized trade groups. Other exports returned to private trade, within the framework of existing licensing system.

Germany

Western Germany and Western Sectors of Berlin

Licensing requirements: Licenses required for all commercial exports. Obtained from German foreign trade banks (Aussenhandelsbanken).

Exchange controls: Control exercised over all foreign exchange transactions. Payments must be made through German banking system; payments direct to German exporters are prohibited.

Status of private trade: All export trade in private hands.

Soviet Zone of Germany and Soviet Sector of Berlin

Licensing requirements: Licenses required for all commercial exports.

Exchange controls: Control exercised over all foreign exchange transactions. Payments must be made to specially designated bank.

Status of private trade: Private firms permitted to conclude contracts only through government trading companies.

Greenland

Licensing requirements. Exchange controls. Status of private trade: No private trade except for exports of cryolite. Trade is a monopoly of the Danish Government.

Hungary

Licensing requirements: Almost all exports are handled by government trade monopolies. Licenses required for all exports. Licenses issued by the Hungarian National Bank.

Exchange controls: Full exchange control on all export transactions.

Status of private trade: Foreign trade concentrated largely in government trading companies.

Iceland

Licensing requirements: All exports must be declared to customs authorities for approval before shipment.

Exchange controls: Exchange control on all export transactions.

Status of private trade: Private trade operating.

Italy

Licensing requirements: Exports of domestic commodities are subject to Government control. The Ministry of Finance, upon request of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, has delegated to the customs officials the power to authorize the exportation of almost all goods to hard-currency countries (the United States, Canada, and Switzerland), the exception consisting of a few commodities forming export list A, and requiring a special ministerial export license.

Exchange controls: Exporters of domestic goods are credited with 50 percent of dollars and other hard currency (at present, only free Swiss francs) proceeds left at the disposition of private trade for importation—within 60 days from the end of the month in which it became available, subject to licensing requirements outlined above—or for sale at the export rate quoted in Milan or Rome exchanges on day of selling. The 50 percent in question may be purchased by importers through banking channels. The remaining 50 percent must be ceded to the Italian exchange office at a rate corresponding to the average, as of the day of surrender of export currency quotations in Rome and Milan (as outlined in the section on import trade—exchange controls).

Status of private trade: Exports are encouraged, especially those bringing in dollar exchange. The rate applying to exports currently has been about 625 lire=$1.

Netherlands

Licensing requirements: Most exports subject to export licenses, issued by the Central Bureau for Imports and Exports, by the Rijksbureaux, or by the monopoly holders.

Licenses ordinarily always granted for exports to the United States of America. In case of a time lag between placing of order and possible export, an assurance for obtaining export license at a given time may be applied for, All applications must be filed by exporter and must be accompanied by an invoice or certified copy thereof.

Exchange controls: License of Nederlandsche Bank or delegated offices necessary for payments to be made from abroad.

Status of private trade: Private trade resumed, within the framework of existing licensing system. Export organizations being established in many industries which market the entire output of a certain industry group.

Norway

Licensing requirements: Exports under strict government control. Licenses are required for all products.

Exchange controls: Rigid exchange control in effect.

Status of private trade: Foreign trade is largely in the hands of private merchants and firms, within the framework of existing licensing system, except for liquor, sugar, and tobacco.

State-owned nonmonopolistic enterprises do, of course, export on their own account.

Portugal

Licensing requirements: All exports subject to license. Licenses are issued by the Corporative Technical Council.

Exchange controls: Full control of all other transactions.

Status of private trade: Private trade permitted, subject to control of corporative organizations within the framework of existing licensing system.

Portuguese colonies (Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, Portuguese Guinea, San Tomé, and Principe)

Licensing requirements: All products subject to export license, issued by the Export Regulating Commission or delegated agencies.

Exchange controls: Full control of all dollar transactions.

Status of private trade: Private trade permitted, subject to control of corporative organizations, within the framework of existing licensing system.

Poland

Licensing requirements: Almost all exports are handled by Government state monopolies. Licenses required for almost all exports and are issued by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce.

Exchange controls: Full exchange control on exports.

Status of private trade: Hardly any private trade; all foreign trade is being nationalized.

Rumania

Licensing requirements: All foreign trade now nationalized. Licenses required for all exports.

Exchange controls: Full exchange control on exports.

Status of private trade: Private trade not operative.

Spain

Licensing requirements: All exports subject to license by Ministry of Industry and Commerce or delegated agencies.

Exchange controls: Foreign exchange from exports must be turned over to Foreign Exchange Institute. Special exchange rates established for many export products.

Status of private trade: Private trade in operation subject to control by syndical organizations within the framework of existing licensing system.

Spanish possessions in Africa

Licensing requirements. Exchange controls. Status of private trade. See Spain.

Sweden

Licensing requirements: Exports subject to permit regulations (see FCW of April 7, 1945) with only certain books and publications and limited noncommercial tourist purchases exempt.

Exchange controls: Rigid exchange control.

Status of private trade: Export trade is in the hands of private merchants and firms, within the framework of existing licensing system, except for liquors, sugar, and tobacco products. State-controlled nonmonopolistic enterprises do, of course, export on their own account.

Switzerland

Licensing requirements: Export license requirements have been abolished, with the exception of products of the watch industry and certain strategic raw materials.

Licensed by Service des Importations et Exportations de Departement Fédéral de l'Economie Publique.

Exchange controls: Dollar proceeds from exports to dollar countries are converted in full at current rate of exchange.

Proceeds from exports to other countries converted at official rates through Swiss Clearing Office.

Status of private trade: Private trade in operation, within the framework of existing licensing system.

U. S. S. R.

Licensing requirements: All exports are subject to licensing by the Ministry of Foreign Trade. This particular requirement does not, however, present any difficulty to the potential American importer inasmuch as the official Soviet trading agency in the United States (the Amtorg Trading Corp. in New York City), through which all transactions with Russian suppliers are effected, assumes responsibility for attending to all the documentation required by the Government of the U. S. S. R. as well as import documentation required by the United States.

Exchange controls: The Soviet Government exercises complete control over all foreign exchange and gold, the possession and disposition of which is a government monopoly in the U. S. S. R., vested in the state bank.

Status of private trade: The entire field of foreign trade is operated as a government monopoly.

Yugoslavia

Licensing requirements: Licenses are required for all exports. Licenses issued by Ministry of Foreign Trade.

Exchange controls: Government exercises complete control over foreign exchange. All foreign exchange proceeds resulting from export trade deposited with National Bank of Yugoslavia.

Status of private trade: All foreign trade is nationalized.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, exchange controls and export controls absolutely regulate and control the goods leaving such nations and the goods entering such nations. In other words, there is no such thing as fair play in trade through the arrangements we have made with any of these nations, for when we make such a trade agreement or agreements to slash tariffs or take other steps in that direction, they simply impose quotas, exchange controls, money manipulations, and thus defeat every agreement which has been made with us.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a summary of import licensing and exchange-control regulations in British Commonwealth areas, in the United Kingdom, and in some of the sterling bloc countries.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U. S. Department of Commerce, Office of International Trade, British Commonwealth Branch, August 1948]

SUMMARY OF IMPORT LICENSING AND EXCHANGE CONTROL REGULATIONS IN BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AREAS

UNITED KINGDOM

Import licenses generally carry with them the right to foreign exchange, and an import license is essential before an exchange permit is issued. The usual validity period of import licenses is 6 months, with 3 months extension (longer periods are allowed only with special authority). The merchandise must be cleared through the United Kingdom customs before the expiration date of the import license. The amount indicated on the license covers the c. i. f. value, port of discharge. No specific percentage of tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license, but the customs officials are understood to exercise their discretion in all cases.

There is no maximum value at which merchandise can be shipped without an import license. Bona fide trade samples, personal or household effects, and unsolicited gift packages to United Kingdom residents are exempt from licensing requirements. Small lists of essential goods may enter under open general license.

Exchange permits are applied for separately from import licenses, and ordinarily the validity period of the import license determines the validity period of the exchange permit. The merchandise must be cleared through the United Kingdom customs before the expiration date of the exchange permit, and the exchange control copy of the customs entry must be produced. The amount indicated on the exchange permit usually covers the c. i. f. value, port of discharge, but as this is normally a condition of the individual contract, the value may be governed to some extent by the amount of exchange called for by the contract. No percentage of tolerance in value is allowed on an exchange permit, but in practice customs officers may make an allowance of up to £5 on imports by parcel post. Apart from gifts, no merchandise can be shipped without an exchange permit, except for the concession mentioned above respecting imports by parcel post, which may be allowed as a matter of customs convenience.

IRELAND

Ireland has not instituted an import licensing regime such as that of the United Kingdom, and most goods, including samples, gifts, and advertising material are not affected by import licensing restrictions. However, a few products are restricted on importation and require covering import licenses, but these regulations were made prior to World War II principally for the protection of domestic industry or agriculture, and not as a result of wartime dislocations in trade or balance of payment. In the few cases where licenses are required, the validity period of the import license varies with the particular product imported, but the usual period is 6 months. The issuance of an import license in no way carries a right to foreign exchange, since the exchange-control system operates entirely apart from the other import restrictions in force. Where goods require licenses, the merchandise must be cleared through the Irish customs before the expiration date shown on the license. The amount indicated on the import license covers the c. i. f. value, port of discharge. No specific percentage of tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license but small deviations may be permitted.

The Irish importer is required to obtain an exchange permit from the Minister for Finance before he can make payment in dollars for imports from the United States. The validity period of the exchange permit varies with the contract of sale, but it is usually from 3 to 6 months duration. The merchandise must be cleared through the Irish customs before the expiration date shown on the exchange permit. The amount indicated on the exchange permit usually covers the c. i. f. value, port of discharge and no percentage of tolerance in value is provided for. There is no maximum value at

which merchandise can be shipped without an exchange permit.

AUSTRALIA

The import license automatically carries the right to the corresponding amount of foreign exchange and there is no need for any exchange permit. The usual validity of the import license is 6 months. The validity period of capital equipment is 12 months and may be extended for the manufacture of heavy machinery often takes considerably longer than 12 months. Import licenses covering the following items also have a validity of 12 months: ball bearings; chrome, copper, and alloy cables and wires; cinematograph films, unexposed and component raw materials for processing and packing; electric equipment; electric filament lamps and materials for the manufacture of electric filament lamps; electric motors and replacement parts therefor; felts and wires for paper making and similar purposes; motor vehicle chassis and parts therefor; raw materials for manufacture of sensitized photographic paper and film (other than cinematograph film); replacement parts for industrial machinery; steel sheet of all kinds; telephone equipment; tinplate; tools of trade; tractors and parts; typewriters, cash registers, adding and computing machines; watches and watch parts. Provision is also made for a period of 3 weeks grace on all licenses.

Import licenses must be obtained by importers for all goods from nonsterling areas in advance of shipment. The application for an import license gives the name of the applicant's bank and that bank is informed by the import licensing branch of the Department of Trade and Customs when the license is granted. The holder of the license may then open a letter of credit or may obtain the necessary dollar exchange against documentary drafts. If a remittance is deposited prior to shipment of the goods, an application for foreign currency must be made to the exchange control division of the Commonwealth Bank. This is also true in the case of an application for foreign currency for traveling purposes.

The vessel must arrive at the port of discharge before the expiration date of the import license. The amount indicated on the import license covers the value of the goods c. i. f. port of discharge. No specific provision is made by the regulations for any tolerance in the value of quantity stated in an import license. However, an increase due to an increase in ocean freight rates may be granted on application to the import licensing branch of the Department of Trade and Customs.

The maximum value at which merchandise may be shipped without an import license is £1 Australian c. i. f. port of discharge. Samples of advertising material are not exempt from import license requirements. Gifts are exempt up to £10 Australian including Australian duty.

NEW ZEALAND

The import license automatically carries the right to the corresponding amount of foreign exchange. The usual validity period of the import license is 12 months. The vessel or other means of conveyance must clear port of shipment before expiration date. The amount indicated on the import license covers the value of the goods c. i. f. port of discharge. No specific provision is made by the regulations for any tolerance in the value or quantity stated in an import license. However, an increase due to a rise in ocean freight rates may be granted. Import licenses must be obtained by importers for goods in advance of shipment. No import licenses are required for bona fide gifts.

BRITISH COLONIES

At the present time, foreign trade operations continue to be subject to close governmental control in all British colonial dependencies, inasmuch as dollar exchange must be granted for purchases from the United States and licenses for all imports and most colonial exports are required. Such licenses must be obtained from the competent authorities[1] in the colonies concerned by the local foreign firm proposing to engage in foreign trade.

Owing to the shortage of dollar exchange, relative to demands, licenses to import from the United States are usually granted on the basis of priority of need. Thus, if the colonial government concerned considers as unessential the items for which such licenses are requested, or if the items can be obtained from the United Kingdom, import licenses are generally refused. The issuance of an import license, however, generally assures the release of the necessary dollar exchange.

Inasmuch as applications for import licenses may be refused in many cases, United States exporters, before making shipment, should assure themselves that their customers have obtained an appropriate import license and exchange permit. Goods not covered by a valid import license may be refused entry and even if allowed to enter the respective territory, payment in dollars cannot be remitted.

INDIA

The granting of an import license by the Government of India ordinarily carries the right to foreign exchange. The validity period of an import license for most items is 6 months from the last date of the month in which the license is granted. Certain specified categories, however, are valid for 1 year, and licenses for "capital goods" and "heavy electrical plant" equipment may be valid for periods up to 3 years. The bill of lading must be dated on or before the expiration date of the import license.

The value of goods for which an import license is granted is based on c. i. f. at the port of discharge. A tolerance of 10 percent of the value stated in the import license is allowed if there has been an increase in price. Although import licenses state both quantity and value, the latter is usually the controlling factor.

Shipments such as samples, advertising matter and gifts which are supplied free of charge may be imported without a license, provided the value of each parcel does not exceed 100 rupees (about $30). Parcel post shipments intended for the personal use of the addressee likewise require no licenses. With these exceptions, import licenses are required for all shipments from the United States.

PAKISTAN

The granting of an import license by the Government of Pakistan ordinarily carries the right to foreign exchange. An import license is valid up to the end of the shipment period during which the license is issued. Current shipment periods are January 1 to June 30, and July 1 to December 31. The vessel on which the goods are carried must clear the port of shipment before the expiration date of the license.

The value of goods for which an import license is granted is the actual value of the foreign exchange needed. No specific percentage of tolerance in value or quantity is allowed on the import license, but the value may be raised if conditions warrant.

No import license is necessary for gifts, samples and advertising matter supplied free of charge. A license is necessary, however, for any item sent as a gift, if it is on the list of items which are prohibited from importation except as gifts. With the exceptions noted above import licenses are required for all imports from the United States.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

At present very few restrictions are imposed on foreign trade by the Union of South Africa. The information provided below was valid as of August 1, 1948. Should any modifications occur, full details will be published in Foreign Commerce Weekly.

Import permits are required on the following items only: Cereals, wheat and wheat products, maize and maize products, rice, barley, oats and rye and their products; cocoa; animal and vegetable fats and oils; salted fish; meats; dry beans, peas, and lentils; and jute products. All other commodities, including gifts, samples, etc., are exempt from licensing requirements.

Import permits are valid for 90 days, but may be extended if necessary. Merchandise must be cleared through customs before the expiration date of the import license. The value shown on the import permit may be f. o. b., f. a. s., or c. i. f., as the importer may request.

Tin and tinplate and leather require certificates of essentiality from the South African Government before they can be imported into the Union, but no import permit is required.

At present, dollar exchange is freely available on all imports from the United States. No foreign exchange permit is required. However, before an importer can secure dollar exchange, he must go to one of the local banks designated as an agent for the South African Reserve Bank and present evidence that he has placed a bona fide order in the United States and that the goods are either ready for shipment or have been shipped. If these conditions are met, the local bank will then make the required amount of dollars available in exchange for South African currency. Dollar letters of credit approved by the local banks will be valid for up to 6 months, but may be extended if necessary.

The amount of dollar exchange approved by the local bank will be sufficient to cover the cost of the merchandise plus any additional costs, depending on whether the goods were sold f. o. b. vessel, f. a. s. point of shipment, or c. i. f. port of discharge.

Forward purchases of foreign exchange are not permitted for nonessential consumer goods, but are permitted for producers' goods up to a maximum of 6 months. Dollar and other hard currency exchange is, however, made available for current purchases of all classes of goods. In the case of nonessential consumer goods, dollar exchange is made available at the rate of exchange prevailing at the time the goods are ready for shipment. As stated above, evidence of the availability of goods must be presented to the local banks when an application for foreign exchange is made.

The reexport from the Union of goods imported from countries outside the sterling area is prohibited, except with treasury permission. Permits will be granted if the Union exporter recovers from the importer in the country of destination the same currency and in the same amount as originally paid by the Union importer. For example, a Union importer who has obtained dollar exchange to pay for goods from the United States cannot reexport the goods to Southern Rhodesia unless he receives the equivalent amount of dollar exchange in payment from the Rhodesian importer.

Dollar exchange approved by the local bank depends on the amount required to pay for merchandise and other costs covered by the contract.

[1] Each of the colonies has its own control agency or agencies to which various titles are given, but which exercise more or less similar functions relating to the licensing of imports and exports, the authorizing of payment for imports and the handling of exchange proceeds arising from the exportation of colonial products.

CANADA

Since November 17, 1947, Canada has had import control for exchange purposes but the control is effected through commodities, a considerable number of which are subject to restriction via (a) embargo; or (b) quotas; or (c) individual or project licensing of producers' goods. Goods not subject to embargo may be imported without permit from any port of the British Empire.

Importers only may obtain import permits or allotments which must be presented to clear customs. This clearance carries the right to exchange on presentation of the port-dated invoice showing receipt of the goods. Prepayment is permitted on special arrangement with local agents of the Foreign Exchange Control Board. Acceptance of Canadian dollars by the exporter does not remove the import restrictions. The importer is required to obtain a permit for any payment to a nonresident.

The kind and duration of the permit is determined by the commodity. For quotaed goods, importers' allotments of exchange are established quarterly, on the basis of a national quota and the importer's participation in trade in the base year. Quotaed goods now require permits only where the import is from scheduled countries of which the United States is one. These permits cover groups of related items—e. g., food, textiles, etc.—and may be applied at the importer's convenience to any or all of the individual commodities within the group. Some producers' goods imported in large quantity are also on a quota basis but in general these goods are governed by allotments which are issued on a project basis against which individual imports are checked off. The permits are issued through the port at which the importer normally enters goods, but they are transferable to other ports on notice.

The import restrictions do not apply to gifts valued at not more than $5. They do not apply to bona fide birthday gifts, and in the Christmas season, Christmas gifts, valued at not more than $25. They do not apply to bona fide wedding gifts of any value.

NEWFOUNDLAND

Import licenses are required only for food, oils and fats and soap. No license is required for other goods. Exchange must be applied for but is normally available for permitted imports on proof of entry. Prepayment requires arrangement with the Foreign Exchange Control.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a reprint of my remarks in the Senate in March 1949, at which point I named the countries in the sterling bloc—approximately 58 countries and entities—which in the British Commonwealth system have different values allocated to the pound sterling, depending upon the classification of the areas.

There being no objection, the reprint was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Most of the nations of the world have established methods of manipulating their currencies for trade advantage.

For example, the English have their sterling bloc—with a large number of nations blocked in—and a large number blocked out. The Dutch have their guilder and the French their franc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a list of the sterling bloc area nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

"THE STERLING AREA

"(Prepared by State Department in consultation with United Kingdom Treasury Delegation)

"(As of March 25, 1949)

"The term 'sterling area' means the United Kingdom and the following territories excluding Canada and Newfoundland.

"I. BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AND EMPIRE COUNTRIES

"(a) any Dominion: Australian, New Zealand, South Africa.

"(b) any other part of His Britannic Majesty's dominions: India, Burma, Southern Rhodesia, Ceylon.

"Principal colonial territories: Aden[1] (colony and protectorate); Bahamas; Barbados; Basutoland; Bermuda; British Guiana; British Honduras; Cyprus; Falkland Islands and dependencies; Fiji; Gabia[1] (colony and protectorate); Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands colony; Gold Coast[1] (1) Colony, (2) Ashanti, (3) Northern Territories; Hong Kong; Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands); Kenya[1] (colony and protectorate); Leeward Islands; Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands; Malta; Mauritius; Nigeria:[1] (1) Colony, (2) Protectorate; St. Helena and dependencies; Seychelles; Sierra Leone[1] 1 (colony and protectorate); Straits Settlements; Trinidad and Tobago; Windward Islands: Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent.

"(c) any territory in repect of which a mandate on behalf of the League of Nations has been accepted by His Britannic Majesty and is being exercised by His Britannic Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, or in any Dominion: Cameroons (British), Tanganyika, Togoland (British), South West Africa, Western Samoa, Nauru.

"(d) any British protectorate or protected State: Bechuanaland protectorate; British Solomon Islands protectorate; Malay States (1) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (2) Unfederated Malay States; Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Tregganu; Brunei; State of North Borneo; Northern Rhodesia; Nyasaland protectorate; Sarawak; Somaliland protectorate; Swaziland; Tonga; Uganda protectorate; Zanzibar protectorate.

"II. INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES

"(a) Iraq.
"(b) Iceland.
"(c) Ireland."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, let me point out that the sterling-bloc countries in which the pound sterling is freely interchangeable are very few in number. Aside from those countries, there are certain convertible sterling countries—including Russia, but not including the United States of America, which country must pay the full price for the pound sterling in any trade relations which may be had between the United States and those countries, thus preventing an even break in such international trade from the outset.

Mr. President, it is simply out of the question for us to do any business with countries which control their exports and exchanges to that extent. In other words, with the ECA funds we are simply building those 100-year-old feuds higher and higher; and more export controls, more embargoes, more import controls and quotas, and more industrial specifications and almost every other known kind of obstacle are put in the way of fair trade between the United States and the European countries which we are now supporting to a large extent, and also between those European countries themselves.

So instead of bringing about the objective we say we want to reach, we are simply building higher and higher the obstacles to such objectives and making it difficult if not impossible to reach our goal at all. So I say, Mr. President, that any further aid to Europe should be conditioned upon abolishing the manipulation of currency values, which simply stifles the very trade we say we are promoting.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. I realize as much as does anyone that there is not a free exchange of moneys across international lines, and that conditions are not such that we can overcome subsidies and quotas. But the aim of the ECA program is to attempt to get the nations on their feet, so that these evils can be overcome. The implications of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada are not completely clear. His last statement is very much clearer than the amendment itself, but it seems to imply two things: First, that the participating countries must abolish currency controls; and second, that the exchange rates of the participating countries must be allowed to fluctuate freely in the free money markets of the world in order to reflect their actual purchasing power in terms of United States dollars.

There are, of course, no free money markets in the world. I wish there were. I think that one of the greatest mistakes made in wartime was that we did not allow our money to seek its proper level. Another mistake we made in wartime was that we did not pay our soldier boys in our own dollars and let those dollars seek their natural level in relation to the moneys of the rest of the world. I think it was a great mistake that we did not allow all our contractors who put up buildings in foreign countries to hire laborers and pay them in American dollars. But we did not do that, and the dollar did not seek its natural level, nor did other currencies seek their natural levels in relation to the dollar. But merely because we did not do those things, and merely because the world is not on a free money basis, it does not follow that we should force that issue in connection with ECA.

The general convertibility of all currencies is an important objective of United States foreign economic policy, not as an end in itself but as an indispensable means for making possible a high level of multilateral trade and the steady improvement of economic well-being throughout the free world. One of the objectives of the Marshall plan,

[1] Colonies contiguous to protectorates of the same name or within the same administrative unit.

therefore, is to enable the participating countries to make their currencies freely convertible at the earliest possible moment. But this objective cannot be achieved at one jump. The Marshall plan still has 2 years to run and it is not even certain at this time that by June 30, 1952, all of the participating countries will be in a strong enough position politically and economically to make their currencies freely convertible into the dollar after that date.

By the free convertibility of European currencies into dollars we mean that each country will be able to earn by its own efforts, through the sale of its goods and services abroad, enough dollars to satisfy whatever demand there may be within the country for the importation of dollar goods. In order for a country to be able to do this, its dollar trade must be in reasonable balance and it must have a sufficiently large monetary reserve of gold and dollars to take care of seasonal and other short-term fluctuations in its dollar earnings. For a European country in particular to have free dollar convertibility would also require that its political situation and its defense security be sufficiently good so that there would not be a massive capital flight the minute exchange controls were abandoned.

None of these preconditions of free dollar convertibility now exist in western Europe. Western Europe is not yet earning sufficient dollars through the sale of their goods and services abroad to make dollars freely available to any private European who wished to import dollar goods. Monetary reserves of gold and dollars are so low that they would not be adequate to take care of seasonal and other short-term fluctuations in dollar earnings and dollar payments. And political and security conditions in western Europe have not yet improved to the point where the possibility of a massive capital flight to the United States can be dismissed, and that would be disastrous both to us and to Europe.

In these circumstances it would also not be possible for the participating countries to allow their exchange rates to fluctuate freely in the free money markets of the world. Despite the recent devaluations, it is more than likely that several of the European currencies would rapidly depreciate to low levels. The cost of imports would therefore steadily mount; new inflationary pressures would be generated within these countries; both the cost of living and the cost of production would rise rapidly; and any temporary gain in the sale of exports would soon be wiped out by the renewed inflation. All of the good work which the Marshall plan has accomplished in checking inflation, holding down the cost of living, raising consumption and thereby improving political and social stability would soon be wiped out.

For these reasons, the ECA believes that the adoption of Senator MALONE'S amendment would force a premature convertibility on to the Marshall-plan countries, would seriously depreciate their currencies and would wipe out a large part of the gains which the ERP has achieved to date. The ECA believes that the participating countries are making as rapid progress as can be expected toward the objectives which Senator MALONE desires to achieve, but a premature convertibility and freeing of exchange rates would be a disastrous blow to the ultimate achievement of permanent currency convertibility.

Mr. President, one further word. Each of the participating countries which is to convert must operate in accordance with its own economy and in accordance with the sovereign notion of its own good. For the United States to attempt to do something against the will of another sovereign country would destroy completely all the aims and objects of the ECA program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE.] [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Butler	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Darby	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tobey
Fulbright	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Young
Hayden	Malone	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject this amendment. If we wanted to kill this bill, we might as well strike out the enacting clause as to adopt this amendment. The amendment provides:

> The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title on June 30, 1950, to any participating country unless, on or before such date, such country (1) has eliminated any currency controls imposed by it that prevent its currency from reflecting its actual purchasing power in terms of the United States dollar on the free monetary markets of the world, and (2) enters into an agreement with the United States that it will not reimpose any such currency controls prior to July 1, 1952.

Mr. President, that is so outrageously ridiculous that if we do not want anything in the bill, we should vote for that amendment. If we do want our efforts to be successful in the rehabilitation of Europe, we should vote against the amendment. We might as well kill the whole bill as to adopt such an amendment. How can a nation promise the United States in a contract that its parliament some time in the future will not do something about currency controls? It is absurd. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I did not use all my time——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute left.

Mr. MALONE. All I ask in this amendment is that those nations turn honest. When they manipulate the price of their currency, all we do, in the long run, is to to make up the difference. A pound can be obtained anywhere in the world for approximately $2.25 or $2.30. No one pays more than $2.40 for it. There is no manipulation of the price of the dollar; the price is fixed in terms of commodities. Therefore, the only reason for manipulation of the price of currency in European nations or in any other nations, as between themselves and this country, is simply a way of gaining trade advantage. In other words——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is my amendment E.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 107. Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country whenever he determines that such country exports or permits the exportation, to Russia or any of its satellite countries, after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, of any article or commodity which, in the opinion of the Administrator, could be used to maintain or expand, directly, or indirectly, the military forces of any such country."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have heretofore presented to the Senate evidence that a large trade in war materials, including arms, has been going on between the Marshall-plan nations, on the one hand, and Russia and the countries behind the iron curtain, on the other hand. These shipments are set out in tables which I have heretofore incorporated in the RECORD in reference to Belgium, Luxemburg, the United Kingdom, and France, as the shipping countries. This evidence is authentic. It was obtained by me from the International Trade Office of the Department of Commerce, and I think it can be relied on as being absolutely correct.

Mr. President, let us look at the picture. It will not be a complete look, because the information I have in my possession applies only to three of the

Marshall-plan countries. They are Great Britain, France, and Belgium-Luxemburg. First, a few of the articles which Belgium has shipped to Russia and her satellites last year were firearms to Czechoslovakia, and also, iron, cast iron, steel, copper, lead, tin, and zinc. Belgium also sent behind the iron curtain substantial quantities of electrical machinery, articles for electrical technical use, as well as measuring and precision instruments.

Great Britain: Last year, the British Socialist Government permitted more than $45,000,000 worth of machinery, including electric generators and machine tools, to be sent behind the iron curtain. Substantial shipments of ball and roller bearings also were sent behind the iron curtain from the United Kingdom. The British Government also let the Reds have a sizable shipment of barbed wire and railway construction material. They have permitted all sorts of war material to go to Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain and also aluminum, lead, transportation equipment, chemicals, and scientific instruments and apparatus, and so on. Many of the materials which are being sent to Russia and her satellites by the Marshall-plan countries are being supplied to them by the United States under the Marshall plan. The difference is that they are sent by the people of the United States to the Marshall-plan countries as gifts from the American people. They are sold by the Marshall-plan countries to Russia and her satellites.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] said a few minutes ago that during the course of the discussion there had been a good deal of talk about communism here at home. He wondered why there had not been any talk about communism abroad. I think I will fill the hiatus and talk a little bit about communism in the Marshall-plan countries.

Mr. President, socialism and communism are fruit of the same tree. They have their roots in the doctrines of Karl Marx, and they have the same objective: The abolition of private property and private means of production. The only difference is that the Communists are willing to resort to arson, bloodshed, murder, and revolution. The Socialists prefer to reach the same end by peaceful means. There are many members of the government in several of the Marshall-plan countries who have long records as Communist workers and Communist writers. Let us look at only a few of them. The Minister of War in Great Britain is Mr. John Strachey. He has written that the coming communism can alone render our problems soluble. Mr. Ernest Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary, the same Mr. Bevin who wants to redistribute the Fort Knox gold, by the way, has said:

> Russia would deal better and with greater confidence with a Socialist government in Britain. Left can speak to left in comradeship and confidence.

The present British Minister of Defense, Emanuel Shinwell, has said that he has no quarrel with the objectives of communism.

Aneurin Bevan, British Minister of Health, has said:

> Because of its policy the Socialist Party is best fitted to cooperate more and more closely with Russia.

Another Socialist member of Parliament has said:

> We have got to drop all this confounded nonsense of anticommunism.

And so it goes, Mr. President.

It is the settled plan of many persons active in the governments of western Europe to bring on as soon as they can a further development of marxism, which is communism. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I was looking for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I do not see him on the floor at the moment. I wanted to yield some time to him on this amendment. He is very much interested in it. In the meantime, Mr. President, I have in my hand a statement from the ECA with regard to this amendment. ECA is very much opposed to the amendment on the ground that arms, munitions, or direct military aid are not going from western Europe to the satellite countries. If the amendment were adopted, the countries of western Europe would not be able to trade with eastern Europe, because the amendment would prohibit anything that affects defense directly or indirectly. Any food article would be indirectly of military aid.

The attitude of ECA is that trade between western Europe and satellite countries in many instances is very desirable. They want these countries to purchase food and other things from some satellite states and exchange products with them; not military supplies or equipment, or munitions, but trade which went on prior to the war. Therefore I very much hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], if he cares to discuss this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas yields 7 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to say that the adoption of this amendment would do a great deal more harm than good. It would impose restrictions on our officials in dealing with a matter in which it is absolutely vital that they have administrative discretion. It is impossible for us on the Senate floor to determine what article at a given time has military value and what article does not have military value. It is impossible for us to determine whether or not an article which has a certain amount of military value is nevertheless worth more to us if we can send it over there and get something back in return for it which confers a still greater benefit on us.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Massachusetts realizes, does he not, discretion is given to the Administrator to decide about those matters when in his opinion and in his discretion it is desirable to withhold permission that shipments may be made?

Mr. LODGE. He has that discretion now. If the amendment means anything, it means that the Administrator would be prohibited from permitting a country to send anything which either directly or indirectly—I am quoting the exact language of the amendment—would help the military forces of any such country. The word "indirectly" includes every single article that is known. If the amendment does not mean that, it does not mean anything and is just so much waste paper.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. The language of the amendment is so broad that, if carried to its logical conclusion, a country which shipped pens made out of steel to Russia or a satellite country would be directly or indirectly helping the military forces of such country. Is that not correct?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Because we know that steel is of value. The amendment provides no limitation. It covers the whole field.

Mr. LODGE. It covers the whole field. If its provisions were carried to their logical conclusion, all east-west trade between Marshall-plan countries and eastern Europe would be stopped, and that would mean an increase in the dollar gap of $3,000,000,000. It would put us in front of an economic obstacle the like of which we have never seen.

I think it is important for Senators to realize that this is something which appears to be well organized at the present time. Military secrecy prevents the revelation of the details, but it is possible to inform the Senate that the categories of articles which are to be sent behind the iron curtain are, broadly speaking, classified as follows:

Articles which are of strictly military use, and which are prohibited, and none of them are sent either from this country or from the Marshall-plan countries.

Second, there are the goods which have a certain amount of military value, which, used in a certain way, might be classified as war materials. Those are subject to licensing.

Then there are the goods that are not military articles in any sense of the word, but in their production there might be some secret processes employed. Those articles are also subject to licensing, so that the secret processes that could be applied in other countries may not become known.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that everything that goes behind the iron curtain is either approved by the American military or is sent with the full knowledge of the American military. Therefore it seems to me that the interests of the United States are well protected. Our administrative officials now

have the discretion to run this administration in such a way that the United States will get the benefit of changing conditions as they develop, and will be able to get a quid pro quo here and there, when the possibility of such a thing occurs, and that the chance of such articles being used against the United States is therefore very small.

Mr. President, if the pending amendment were agreed to, I believe it would do more harm than good.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, in order to meet the criticism of the able Senator from Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be amended by striking out, in the last line, the words "or indirectly."

Mr. CONNALLY. I object.

Mr. KEM. I modify my amendment to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time for debate has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Missouri asked unanimous consent to change the amendment, and I had a right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has a right to modify his own amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly he has. I am not objecting to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAIN (when Mr. MORSE's name was called). I voted in my own right, but I neglected to recall that on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and his pair has been announced previously by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—24

Brewster	Frear	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Jenner	Schoeppel
Butler	Kem	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Thye
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Young

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hoey	McMahon
Anderson	Holland	Magnuson
Benton	Humphrey	Maybank
Connally	Hunt	Myers
Cordon	Ives	Neely
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Kilgore	Sparkman
Fulbright	Leahy	Stennis
George	Lehman	Taylor
Graham	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Green	Lucas	Tobey
Gurney	McClellan	Wiley
Hayden	McFarland	
Hill	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—20

Cain	Downey	Long
Capehart	Gillette	McCarran
Chapman	Hickenlooper	Morse
Chavez	Langer	Murray
O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.	Watkins
Pepper	Tydings	Withers
Russell	Vandenberg	

So Mr. KEM's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) So much of section 112 (d) of such act as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'surplus agricultural commodity' as used in this section is defined as any agricultural commodity, or product thereof or class, type, or specification thereof, produced in the United States which is in excess of domestic requirements. Any agricultural commodity, or product thereof or class, type, or specification thereof, shall be deemed to be in excess of domestic requirements (A) if so determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, or (B) if, in the case of an agricultural commodity or class, type, or specification thereof, such commodity is selling at less than its support price, if any, or (C) if, in the case of a product of an agricultural commodity, such product is selling at less than a price sufficient to reflect to producers of such commodity the support price, if any, of such commodity. In providing for the procurement of any such surplus agricultural commodity for transfer by grant to any participating country in accordance with the requirements of such country, the Administrator shall give effect to the following:".

On page 3, line 3, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the amendment is designed to do exactly what Mr. Hoffman, of ECA, Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, and Dr. FitzGerald, of ECA, claim they are supposed to do under ECA, that is, to furnish ECA dollars to buy food in offshore countries only when there is no surplus in this country. In other words, that if ECA dollars are used to buy foods they must be spent under ECA to buy our surplus.

Mr. President, during the time the ECA has been in operation, for 2 years, the Department of Agriculture has accumulated about $4,500,000,000 worth of agricultural surpluses. During that same time I believe there have been some bad abuses in the use of ECA funds. Millions of United States dollars have been used to buy food commodities in other countries when we had surpluses here. For example, Mr. President, wheat has been a surplus commodity in the United States since the inception of ECA. Yet from April 3, 1948, to December 31, 1949, ECA financed the purchase of $424,000,000 worth of wheat and flour in Canada, and by the end of this fiscal year ECA will have purchased in Canada more than one-half billion dollars' worth of wheat, while during this time we had a surplus in the United States. On the one hand we have spent a half billion dollars to dispose of Canada's surplus wheat. On the other hand, here in the United States we have a 450,000,000 bushel surplus of wheat and do nothing for our farmers. With

$4,500,000,000 invested in surpluses, our Secretary of Agriculture is calling for curtailment of agricultural production all along the line, and offering to our farmers what is in effect a Government dole in place of a good market for their products.

Just across the line in Canada, because ECA spent a half billion of United States dollars to get rid of their surpluses, the head of their department of agriculture is urging their farmers to produce to the limit. Produce all they want.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I am sorry; my time is limited. I will yield a little bit later. I send to the desk an article from the Winnipeg Free Press, dated Tuesday, April 24, 1950, and ask that the first four paragraphs be read. The information in this news story should be of great importance to every Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BRANDON, MANITOBA, April 4.—Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner, federal minister of agriculture, Monday night opened the Manitoba annual winter fair at Brandon by urging farmers to "produce to the limit." About 3,000 were in attendance from all parts of Manitoba.

"Agriculturists have never been in a better financial position," declared Mr. Gardiner. "Give production all you've got and there will be markets for the sale of your products."

Mr. Gardiner, who addressed the largest audience ever to attend the official opening of the winter fair, declared, "the financial situation offered the farmer today is better than ever before in history."

He urged the Manitoba farmer to turn present high profits back into livestock and equipment, and advised purchase of "nothing but the best."

Mr. YOUNG. This news story sounds like something from another world. No surpluses, produce as much as you want, and if there are surpluses Uncle Sam will take care of them even before we take care of our own farmer.

Mr. President, nearly one-half billion dollars—and there will be more than one-half billion dollars spent before we get through with the program—have been spent in Canada to relieve them of their grain surpluses. This wheat was purchased for Great Britain in Canada with ECA dollars at prices higher than our own. For example, last year the average Canadian price was $2.06 a bushel f. o. b. Fort William or Port Arthur. The average price Great Britain paid for a comparable grade wheat in the United States was $1.85 a bushel f. o. b. at Port Arthur, and they could have purchased it under the international wheat agreement for $1.80 a bushel. It is most difficult to understand why United States officials would approve such a deal. It was even arranged by ECA officials and later approved by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan.

Canada is a good neighbor of ours and I believe in being fair to them. I am sure though that their farmers do not expect the United States to provide more opportunity to produce and make money than we do for our own. I wish we had a Secretary of Agriculture that could do as much for our farmers as Mr. Gardiner had done for Canadian farmers.

It is worth noting that while we gave Great Britain a half billion dollars to buy wheat in Canada, the per capita debt in Canada is only $860. In the United States it is $1,697. The per capita tax in Canada is $202. The per capita tax in the United States is $256. Great Britain even has a balanced budget while we will spend seven billion more this year than our receipts. It just does not make sense.

It must be very difficult indeed for the farmers living along the United States side of the international border line to have to cut their acreage on the average of 19 percent and in individual cases as high as 60 percent or 70 percent while on the Canadian side, farmers are urged to produce to the limit.

Even worse, the excellent situation Canada finds itself in is almost entirely because the United States, with the approval of our Secretary of Agriculture, spent one-half billion dollars to relieve Canada of its wheat surplus—and at the same time must have been fully cognizant of our vast accumulation of wheat. According to his own estimate, the surplus will reach close to 450,000,000 bushels by July 1 next.

As previously stated, the average reduction of wheat required in the United States for 1950 is 19 percent. The reduction required in the State of Texas is 23.2 percent. In Colorado it is 37.3 percent. In Kansas 16.9 percent and in North Dakota 13.2 percent. These are Department of Agriculture figures.

Besides this, Mr. President, we have imported large quantities of rye, oats, barley, and other commodities from Canada. To be exact, we imported 19,261,389 bushels of oats, 10,365,621 bushels of barley, and more than 7,000,000 bushels of rye from Canada.

Mr. President, while we imported from Canada more than 7,000,000 bushels of rye, we only exported through our Army of occupation in Europe and all other sources 5,000,000 bushels. For the last 6 months Canadian rye has been supplying practically all our domestic requirements.

On top of that we imported large quantities of potatoes which certainly helped wreck our potato-price support program which price-support program was afterward repealed and may not be reinstated by this Congress.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I am sure that every Member of the Senate admires the very assiduous and intelligent way in which the Senator from North Dakota interests himself in the problems which confront the wheat growers. The Senator from North Dakota has already spoken to me about this particular matter. Because of his interest and his enthusiasm I directed an inquiry to the ECA, and I have received an assurance from them. It is very brief, just one short paragraph. I should like to read it.

Mr. YOUNG. May that be done, Mr. President, on the time of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LODGE. It will be what the Senator wants to know.

Mr. YOUNG. I cannot yield in my own time. I only have a couple of minutes left and have much more I want to get in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. It is an assurance which the Senator wants.

Mr. YOUNG. Let me say that I have received assurance after assurance from Mr. Hoffman, Dr. FitzGerald, and Secretary Brannan. They have told me before that no more wheat would be purchased in off-shore countries and later large purchases in other countries were approved. I have not too much faith in their assurances.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in the following understanding? Under the present law the term "surplus agricultural commodity" is defined to be "an agricultural commodity or product thereof produced in the United States which is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of domestic requirements." The Senator's amendment, I think very appropriately, substitutes in place of that, the provision that "The term 'surplus agricultural commodity,'" and so forth, "as used in this section is defined as any agricultural commodity," and so forth, "which is in excess of domestic requirements."

Then the amendment states the requirements in connection with the making of a determination as to whether production is in excess of domestic requirements.

In other words, the Senator's amendment removes, does it not, the element of discretion and determination by the Secretary of Agriculture, although it makes that one of the points on which the determination can be made, but establishes other standards, so that the Secretary of Agriculture does not have the unlimited discretion which he has under the present law. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. That is entirely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me also ask whether I am correct in my understanding that the present law provides that the Administrator shall, insofar as practicable, and where in furtherance of the purposes of this title, give effect to certain requirements, whereas the Senator's amendment provides that—

The Administrator shall give effect to the following—

Thus removing, again, the area of determination and discretion on the part of the Administrator. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. President, a year ago when the ECA gave $354,000,000 to Great Britain, to permit Great Britain to buy wheat in Canada, the ECA said it was not practical to buy wheat in the United States at that time. I thought that was a very thin excuse, and I believe that part should be eliminated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from North Dakota will recall that I offered

a similar amendment to the appropriation bill for the ECA last year.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, I recall.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At that time we were assured that the ECA would not continue the policy of purchasing from other countries commodities of which we had a surplus in the United States. However, the ECA officials said they did not want such a provision written into the law.

I wish to state that I am going to support the Senator's amendment. I have at the desk a similar amendment, but I am perfectly willing to support the Senator's amendment, inasmuch as it does not make sense for us to tax the American people in order to give money to other countries, and then permit those countries to use our money to buy the surplus production of other countries, when we have in our own country a surplus of the same material or commodity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, may I add a further word, in order to state——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota cannot be recognized further, inasmuch as his time has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, for himself and the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment is opposed by the farm organizations, almost solidly. The farm organizations recognize that their own best interest and the self-interest of the farmers of the country will be most adversely affected if it is sought to make the European countries a dumping ground for our surpluses. That position on their part is well summarized in the following telegram which has been received from Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

> American Farm Bureau has consistently opposed amendments to ECA legislation that would make program an agricultural surplus disposal program rather than program for maximum economic recovery. We recommend that in consideration of S. 3304 no amendments be adopted that will violate this principle.
>
> ROGER FLEMING,
> *Secretary-Treasurer,*
> *American Farm Bureau Federation.*

Mr. President, I was proud of the association I had with farm organizations a year ago when they solidly took the position that they would oppose amendments of this character.

I wish to comment on some of the points which have been mentioned by the Senator from North Dakota.

He had the clerk read a letter from a distinguished Cabinet officer of Canada, Mr. Gardiner, recommending that the Canadian farmers go into the livestock business and get nothing but the best.

Mr. President, most persons recognize that when agricultural products such as wheat are used for feeding to livestock, rather than for domestic consumption, that is a method of reducing a surplus. It should be pointed out that the Canadian minister was trying his best to cure that problem, by recommending that the Canadian farmers go into the livestock business and purchase the best livestock, and feed their surpluses to their livestock—not increase their production of wheat.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not interrupt the Senator from North Dakota when he was speaking, and I hope he will not ask me to interrupt my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I point out that Mr. Gardiner, while at the Annual Dominion-Provincial Agricultural Conference last December, repeated his previous warnings that the Canadian wheat farmers should reduce their acreage; and at that December conference he suggested 23,000,000 or 24,000,000 acres as the target. He suggested then that 20,000,000 acres of wheat might be their long-time goal.

Recently, when speaking at Saskatoon, Mr. Gardiner pointed out to the 1,200 councilors from the rural districts who participated in that conference that they should reduce their acreage; and the agricultural minister of that Province was in agreement with him.

The statement has been made that the Canadian wheat farmers have greatly increased their production, and have been doing so since the conclusion of the war. However, Mr. President, the fact is that from 1935 to 1939 the average wheat acreage of Canadian farmers was 25,600,000, whereas their postwar acreage is 25,400,000. In other words, their postwar acreage is 100 percent of what it was prewar, whereas our postwar acreage is 127 percent of what it was prewar.

The Canadian postwar production is an average of 121 percent of their prewar average, and ours is 164 percent of our prewar average.

So I think the shoe is on the other foot. Our wheat farmers have been increasing their prewar acreage, and the Canadians know it.

Mr. President, I hope action on the measure now before the Senate will not be influenced by that situation. That is a matter which I hoped we might deal with when the McClellan amendment was before us.

The amendment now pending has in it some provisions which are terrifically bad.

For instance, subparagraph (B) provides that "if, in the case of an agricultural commodity or class, type, or specification thereof, such commodity is selling at less than its support price, if any," then the ECA cannot buy such commodity abroad. After all, Mr. President, prices fluctuate from day to day and from market to market. If an ECA agent is trying to buy a certain commodity for shipment 6 or 8 weeks later, he cannot then predict what the market will be 6 or 8 weeks later.

Mr. President, I think I have had nearly as much experience with the purchase of grain for export shipment as any other Member of this Senate has had. I say that the steamships have to be ordered months in advance, and it is necessary to have them put on berth weeks before the grain reaches the port. Then the cars loaded with grain must be started rolling from the interior points to the port. If we say to the ECA Administrator that he cannot buy wheat unless he knows that the price of wheat on the day when he ships it will be more than the support price, then we have put the program into great jeopardy.

Subparagraph (C) of the amendment is almost as bad. It provides that "or (C) if, in the case of a product of an agricultural commodity, such product is selling at less than a price sufficient to reflect to producers of such commodity the support price, if any, of such commodity."

That provision would put the program into real difficulty, because in the case of corn alone there are 15 products of corn, to my knowledge, that are shipped abroad, for use in other countries. If just one of those products happened to be selling at a price which did not reflect to producers of that commodity the support price, then the ECA could not buy any of those products.

We have had to ship all sorts of products abroad. We have had to buy corn meal wherever we could buy it. Not enough corn meal was being manufactured in this country in that time of need, and we had to buy it wherever we could buy it.

So if we tell the ECA Administrator that he cannot buy such products for shipment abroad until every other by-product of such an agricultural commodity is selling above the support-price level, we cannot expect him to operate properly under such circumstances.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, who really knows what he is talking about in respect to the matter involved in this amendment.

Mr. President, the American Farm Bureau Federation, which has connected with it some of the finest and most able men in agriculture whom I know, also takes the position that the Senator from New Mexico takes. In that connection I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have received from the American Farm Bureau Federation:

> American Farm Bureau has consistently opposed amendments to ECA legislation that would make program an agricultural surplus disposal program rather than program for maximum economic recovery. We recommend that in consideration of S. 3304 no amendments be adopted that will violate this principle.
>
> ROGER FLEMING,
> *Secretary-Treasurer,*
> *American Farm Bureau Federation.*

Certainly this amendment would violate the very principle the American

Farm Bureau Federation refers to in its telegram, and the amendment would also violate the very principle the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has been discussing.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to permit a further inquiry?

Mr. ANDERSON. If I am going to yield, I should yield first to my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] who previously asked me to yield. After I have yielded to him, I will yield to the Senator from Missouri; but first I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has just stated that the Canadians were encouraging the feeding of more wheat to livestock. However, that was not the substance of the news story I read, at all. They were encouraging the production of wheat.

I do not believe the Farm Bureau Federation or the Grange know the present situation. Otherwise, they would not oppose the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to say to the Senator, I listened carefully to the reading of the news story, and I am quite sure what the Minister of Canada would recommend. I have talked with him many times about this problem. I listened intently while the item was read in which he said that the Canadians should go into the feeding of livestock and should get the very best.

When the Senator from North Dakota examines the RECORD tomorrow, he will find that is what is in that news story. I recognize that there is an inference that Canada should increasingly produce and produce, and that is all right within limit, but also the Canadians recognize that the best way to dispose of their surplus is to feed it to livestock, and the American farmers realize that, too.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Mexico feel that he has time enough to yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very anxious to proceed and to make a short statement. When we come to the McKellar amendment, I hope that Senators will read the figures on what we have been doing and what has happened to our wheat surplus this very year, when we are having the smallest wheat crop since 1943. We are going to be very glad we have got a surplus of wheat in this country that is going to reflect itself in the price that is paid for bread here in America, and we are not going to be saying nearly so much about agricultural surpluses when we get through the next year as we have in the past. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in connection with the telegram read by the Senator from Illinois, in which, as I understood, the American Farm Bureau Federation suggests that the ECA should not be made a surplus-property-for-disposal bill, or words to that effect, I ask the Senator whether that is not the effect of the existing ECA law, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, which provides "that the Administrator shall authorize the procurement of any such surplus agricultural commodity only within the United States," with certain provisos?

Mr. ANDERSON. But it is the provisos that are important, and that is exactly what happened. The purchase of Canadian wheat has been referred to here. I think we ought to discuss that a little bit. The British Government had an arrangement with Canada running for several years, by which the British were obligated to buy about $300,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat during the current fiscal year, and the ECA purchase of $175,000,000 worth of wheat in Canada did not decrease British purchases of wheat in the United States in the slightest, as they had to fulfill their contract obligation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for himself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. YOUNG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McMAHON (when Mr. BENTON'S name was called). The junior Senator from Connecticut is engaged on official business, in conference with the President of the United States. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. O'CONOR'S name was called). On this vote my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who is absent on public business, is paired with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the junior Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Ecton	Mundt
Brewster	Frear	Russell
Bricker	Gurney	Schoeppel
Bridges	Jenner	Stennis
Butler	Kem	Taft
Cain	McCarthy	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Wherry
Darby	Magnuson	Williams
Donnell	Malone	Young
Dworshak	Martin	
Eastland	Millikin	

NAYS—46

Anderson	Hunt	Maybank
Byrd	Ives	Myers
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Ferguson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Kerr	Smith, Maine
George	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Graham	Knowland	Sparkman
Green	Leahy	Taylor
Hayden	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Lodge	Thye
Hill	Lucas	Tydings
Hoey	McFarland	Wiley
Holland	McKellar	
Humphrey	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—19

Benton	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chapman	Long	Vandenberg
Chavez	McCarran	Watkins
Downey	Morse	Withers
Flanders	Murray	
Gillette	O'Conor	

So the amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG, for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the

desk and ask to have stated. It is entitled "A." For some reason—there must have been a misprint of some of the amendments—there appears on the second page of some of them the words "aid to the Flathead Indians." [Laughter.] Of course, Mr. President, if we are going to aid anyone, I am in favor of aiding the Flathead Indians. But that is not covered by the amendment which I should like to have read; it does not have anything to do with aid to Indians.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, beginning with line 5, to strike out through line 16, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(m) (1) It is the sense of Congress that no participating country shall maintain or impose any import or export, currency, tax, license, quota, or other similar business restrictions which discriminate against products of the United States or its citizens or any corporation, partnership, or other association substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States, engaged or desiring to engage in the importation into or exportation from such country of any commodity, which restrictions are not reasonably required to meet balance of payment conditions or requirements of national security: *Provided*, That international agreements (to which the United States and such country are parties), which permit or prohibit any such restriction, shall remain in full force and effect unless expressly modified as required by law.

(2) The Secretary of State and the Administrator, acting jointly, are authorized and directed to obtain compliance with the intent expressed in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and the Administrator shall not agree to the expenditure of any of the local currencies, required to be deposited in local currency accounts by section 115 (b) (6) of this act, by any such country which fails to comply with such intent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the main, this amendment adds a new section which gives the Secretary of State and the Administrator, acting jointly, power to obtain compliance with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. There are one or two changes in the language of paragraph (m) to which I wish to speak very briefly. But that is the purpose of my amendment.

I am in total agreement with the intention of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am in complete accord with the objectives of the committee. But the second section gives Mr. Hoffman a leverage by requiring that it be done, if and when he feels it should be done, thus expressing a pious hope, because it is the sense of the Congress that it be done.

The committee report, at page 21, tells of discriminations against United States oil interests in Britain, and states:

The committee hopes that a solution can be found which will not involve unfair discrimination against American companies.

The committee also says its amendment is—

In order to make clear the position of Congress and to assist the Administrator in dealing with such discriminatory practices.

My amendment would give the Administrator a lever, which he could use if the weight of selfish nationalism against him were too heavy to move otherwise.

Apart from giving the Administrator authority to act, and a mandate to exercise such authority, the amendment I offer eliminates what seem to be flaws in the committee's amendment.

The committee's amendment makes an ambiguous provision about international agreements. Boiling it down, it says:

No participating country shall * * * impose * * * restrictions which * * * are not authorized under international agreements to which such country and the United States are parties.

It may not mean that treaties which prohibit restrictions are to be enforced.

It apparently does not apply to a treaty that prevents restrictions.

I do not know whether that would prevent restrictions, which are outlawed by our treaties or agreements, or not. I am inclined to believe that it permits discriminations that our agreements and treaties permit, but makes no provision for enforcing agreements which prohibit discrimination.

The committee's report says:

It (the committee) also recognizes that there may be instances when some such measures (discriminations) are sanctioned under existing international agreements.

Mr. President, there are also many cases where discrimination against our citizens and trade are prohibited by our treaties.

We are all just as much concerned about treaty provisions which protect us as we are about those which protect foreign nationals and trade.

I recommend that the amendment make this entirely clear. If any treaty or international agreement permits restrictions, we stick to it, until it is altered by mutual consent; and, in the case of a treaty, by ratification by the Senate. But, Mr. President, the converse also holds. If the agreement, or treaty, protects us from discrimination, its provisions are just as binding as if the converse were true.

Two other changes in the committee's amendment would be valuable. One is the provision to eliminate discriminations against the United States in Europe's export trade. We have a number of cases, such as hides, pig bristles, manganese ore. Those are some that I recall having been mentioned to the appropriations committee. They get dollars free from us, but they have to earn European currencies.

Europe claims to be trying to export to us, but, in reality, it is depriving us of many raw materials we formerly purchased from her or her colonies. We should also stop these discriminations.

The committee amendment only prevents discrimination against our citizens and firms. That is fine for a concern which has its own agent or subsidiary abroad. However, there are thousands of smaller businesses which sell through export channels and foreign concerns. To prevent discrimination against them, my proposal will bar discrimination against United States products as well as against United States firms.

The committee amendment includes a phrase which I consider as nullifying the whole amendment, or, at any rate, as making it so evasive as to render it almost meaningless. It is the sense of Congress that our citizens are to be protected, only if they are engaged in the furtherance of the purposes of this title.

I do not know what this means, but I am suspicious of weasel words like that. It seems that if we allow discrimination for reasons of balance of payments and for reasons of "national security"—that is, the foreign nation's security—we have done enough.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please. I have left out the necessity of proving that a firm victimized by discrimination is furthering the purposes of ECA.

According to some theories, our domestic businesses can further the purposes of ECA only by closing down their manufacturing processes and putting their sales forces at the disposal of their foreign competitors.

Returning to the necessity of giving ECA and the State Department a mandate to enforce the amendment, Mr. President, I believe this is absolutely essential for two reasons.

Small businesses cannot maintain the top-level contacts necessary to get action that is not mandatory. A mere expression of "the sense of Congress" may help the head of an oil company who can pound Paul Hoffman's desk, but it does not help a baseball manufacturer in St. Louis, who cannot buy horsehides in Europe as he did before ECA came into the picture.

My amendment provides for withholding counterpart funds from nations that refuse to end discriminations.

The second reason is that "the sense of Congress" should not be trifled with by nations who receive our aid. If they respect our wishes, the reprisal will not come into play. If they choose to ignore our wishes, there is no reason for us to be timid when we are giving away billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money.

Our prestige should not permit our expressed desires to be set aside or ignored with impunity.

Summing up, Mr. President, I agree with the usefulness and the necessity of the committee amendment.

I want to compliment the committee for placing it in the bill, but I propose to remove discriminations in both export and import trade and against United States products as well as United States firms.

I propose to remove the vague requirement that permits discrimination against firms unless they are "engaged in the furtherance of this title."

I propose that treaties benefiting United States trade be enforced as rigidly as those benefiting foreign trade.

Finally, I propose to hold up release of counterpart funds to nations who insist on ignoring the will of the Congress

whose act makes their recovery possible.

Mr. President, I wish to read a news item from the New York World-Telegram of May 4, 1950. It reads as follows:

UNITED STATES TRADERS TOLD TO PROTEST BRITISH CURBS—FOREIGN CREDIT GROUP DISCUSSES ACTIONS

American foreign traders should "stand up on their hind legs and roar" over British discriminations against United States trade, asserted a speaker at a round-table meeting of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau.

This was in response to a question asking if it is not evident to all that the United Kingdom not only is defaulting on her undertaking not to practice discriminations, but also is bringing strong pressure to bear on members of the so-called sterling area to shut out United States trade.

EXCLUDING BY FIAT

Through exchange controls and under the plea of dollar shortages, Britain is excluding by fiat United States goods from markets which United States exporters have served through many years of shortages, members agreed. "England is giving us the business," one spokesman said facetiously.

When ECA ends in 1952, one of the panel speakers asserted, it is of vital concern to the United States that Europe does not come out a closed, compartmentalized economy. Europe should have greater freedom in the use of her dollars, which are now in somewhat better supply several members agreed.

There was less agreement on pending sweepingly more rigid import controls by the Philippines. One member said that if the Philippines is compelled to ration her dollars, United States traders hardly can object, other than to hope that it will be done efficiently. Others placed great emphasis on the idea that the controls already imposed have forced up prices to Philippine buyers. This was asserted to be especially true of textiles and apparel items previously obtained for the United States.

WOULD BE IN STRAIT-JACKET

The worst part of the more rigid controls now under consideration in the Philippines, one speaker said, is that it will put the economy of the Islands in a strait-jacket not good for the democratic process.

It was estimated that the loss in export sales to the United States this year as the result of the Philippine import controls could run to about $200,000,000.

It is doubtful that United States traders can object to the principle of import controls to preserve slim dollar reserves, one speaker said, but it is proper for this country to suggest that the controls be on a temporary, flexible, and workable basis.

The meeting was under the chairmanship of John Fischer, assistant treasurer, Bank of New York and Fifth Avenue Bank. Panel members were E. C. Butland, credit manager, the Quaker Oats Co.; John F. McKiernan, directer regional office, Department of Commerce, and George E. Quisenberry, vice president of McGraw-Hill International Corp.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield if I have any time left.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has 2 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Would not the effect of this amendment be to require a Marshall-plan country to purchase American petroleum, for example, even if the American petroleum cost more in dollars than petroleum costs from some other place?

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment would provide that an American producer of petroleum located anywhere would have the right to export his products into any ECA country without restriction.

Mr. LODGE. Without regard to price?

Mr. WHERRY. Without restriction. He would have the same opportunity which any other oil producer would have anywhere in the world. That is provided in the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for another question.

Mr. LODGE. Does not that mean that the rank and file of the American people would be asked to vote a great big subsidy for certain favored large oil companies?

Mr. WHERRY. That is not true at all. What I am asking for is exactly what the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] calls for.

Mr. LODGE. Why does not the Senator from Nebraska leave the amendment as it is?

Mr. WHERRY. Because I am asking that the provision in the amendment be made mandatory. All that the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas provides is that it is the sense of the Congress that this be done. I am asking that it be made mandatory. I am asking that oil-producing companies, producers of textiles or producers of leather goods, or any other producers, not be discriminated against, either in the case of exports or imports so far as ECA countries are concerned.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. One minute.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking that these manufacturers be not discriminated against by having imposed on them licenses or taxes.

Mr. LODGE. That is not all that the Senator's amendment is trying to do. The Senator from Nebraska has a joker in his amendment. He inserts the word "products." That is what section 104, on page 2 of the bill is aimed to avoid.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want at least the last half minute of my own time. All I am asking is that American manufacturers have no license restrictions imposed upon them, and I am asking that they may sell to sterling area countries, as they were able to sell before ECA came into existence. The Senator from Texas wants to do the same thing. There is no joker in the amendment. A clothespin manufacturer in Massachusetts ought to have the right to ship his product into Paris, and I feel that there should not be placed a tax of 50 percent on his product and thus shut him out of trade to which he is entitled. That has happened in the case of an exporter in the State of Maine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Chair give me 5 seconds more?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot give the Senator even 1 second more.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts if he wants to discuss the amendment further.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wish to say that it is a pity the Senator from Nebraska did not present his amendment to the committee, so that it could be discussed at length. It is a highly technical and complicated amendment, and I think it has some hidden meanings in it. If he had presented it to the committee, we could have worked it out. I am always suspicious of amendments which are presented to the Senate at the last minute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I use the word "products" in the amendment for the reason that large operators have subsidiaries in foreign countries. If we want to eliminate discrimination, why not eliminate discriminations against small-business men who do not have large subsidiary companies in other countries?

Mr. LODGE. The small-business man does not come into the picture at all. Standard Oil, Esso, and three other huge companies have between them, I think—I am speaking from memory—60 percent of all this oil business. Mr. President, if the time comes that we convert ECA into a subsidy for certain vested interests, I think we ought to know about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any difference in the provisions I propose and those in the committee amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I think there is. The difference is that under the language of the committee amendment on page 3 a British oil company, a French oil company, and an American oil company are operating, and the price of the oil in dollars is the same in each case, the American oil company shall not be discriminated against. That is a fair proposition, and I am for it. However, I think it is utterly inexcusable to require Marshall-plan nations to take oil or anything else that has a high dollar content when they can get the same thing somewhere else in a soft currency area.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope that the Senator from Nebraska will not insist on the entire amendment. I am agreeable to the first paragraph of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Texas is perfectly agreeable to the first paragraph of my amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Texas is not speaking for me.

Mr. WHERRY. He certainly is. That is what the Senator from Massachusetts argued about.

Mr. LODGE. I am not in favor of it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Was not the time of debate on an amendment to be divided equally, 10 minutes to each side, rather than 20 minutes to those who favor the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has used his 10 minutes. Whatever time is left of the remaining 10 minutes may be used by the opponents.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not understand that the Senator from Texas is speaking in opposition.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said I was opposed to the second paragraph. It has an "a" in it. I am not opposed to the "a."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, would it be possible to vote against the second paragraph?

Mr. CONNALLY. Any Senator may offer an amendment to strike out the second paragraph, but I was going to explain that the committee adopted a provision on page 3, which had this matter in mind. The Administrator says that under the amendment carried in the provisions of the bill he would administer the directions contained in it as though they were mandatory, because he would take it as the will of the Congress that that be done. If he is going to do that, why should we tie his hands, and put shackles and handcuffs on them, or put leg irons on him?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. My amendment does not tie his hands. If other countries refuse to do what the Senator from Texas seeks to have done by the first section of his amendment, under my amendment Congress gives the Administrator this additional power to require them to do it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not in favor of putting any sanctions or any hard-boiled requirements on the Administrator. This is what he says:

The Connally amendment—

That is the language in the bill—

gives the Administrator an explicit basis in granting dollar assistance or in acting on proposals to release counterpart funds for taking action to see that the discriminatory restrictions against United States citizens are terminated. The Administrator states—

Listen to this—

that he would consider himself bound to take suitable action in accordance with the intent of this provision in cases where it is established to the satisfaction of the responsible United States Government authority that such discriminations are not corrected. Hence the Connally amendment gives assurance that discriminations against American businessmen can be dealt with promptly and effectively.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary to consider the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, and therefore I am against it. The bill already has in it language which is sufficient to accomplish the purpose. We have the assurance of the Administrator that he is going to carry it out. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is there one more minute left, or has the time expired?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has three more minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the Senator from Massachusetts 2 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I cannot lay my hand on the statement at the moment, but in the hearings there is complete factual evidence to show that insofar as the oil business abroad is concerned, the little oil man is not interested at all. In fact, we took testimony from the representatives of the independent petroleum producers, all the little oil men throughout the country, who objected because they did not share any of this business. This is not a little business amendment. This is a big oil company amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is detained on official business at the White House.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—21

Brewster	Ferguson	Martin
Bricker	Gurney	Millikin
Bridges	Jenner	Mundt
Butler	Kem	Schoeppel
Darby	Knowland	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	Wiley

NAYS—52

Aiken	Humphrey	Maybank
Anderson	Hunt	Myers
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Dworshak	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Frear	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Leahy	Sparkman
George	Lehman	Stennis
Graham	Lodge	Taylor
Green	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McClellan	Thye
Hendrickson	McFarland	Tydings
Hill	McKellar	Williams
Hoey	McMahon	
Holland	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—23

Benton	Gillette	Pepper
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Thomas, Okla.
Chapman	Langer	Tobey
Chavez	Long	Vandenberg
Cordon	McCarran	Watkins
Downey	Morse	Withers
Eastland	Murray	Young
Flanders	O'Conor	

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, between lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) Section 111 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) In providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, the Administrator shall take such reasonable and practicable steps as may be necessary to assure that such commodities or the containers thereof (including inner containers as well as outer packaging) are plainly, indelibly, and appropriately labeled by the supplier thereof in such manner as to indicate, by emblem and wording in the language of the recipient country, that the commodities have been supplied by the United States for European recovery. No payment shall be made by the Administrator under letters of commitment or other financial arrangements made with respect to the procurement of commodities under this title except upon receipt of an affidavit of the supplier, whether within or without the United States, that the requirements of this subsection have been complied with in the case of such commodities. The Administrator shall immediately commence negotiations with the several participating countries with a view to the inclusion in the respective bilateral agreements entered into with such countries in accordance with section 115 (b) of this title of provisions designed to insure the continuation of such labeling within each such country, of bulk raw materials including coal, grain, petroleum, oil, lubricants, fibers packaged in bales, and metal and lumber-mill products of a semifinished nature."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is the so-called labeling amendment. It was offered to the ECA bill, last year and was defeated by a few votes. The wording of last year has been changed so as to insert the words "reasonable and practicable." There cannot be the objection leveled at the amendment which was urged last year, when it was said, "We cannot do this because we are dealing with coal." One Senator said, "We cannot label each piece of coal and we cannot label each kernel of corn." Of course, such never was intended. So this mandatory labeling provision is amended to read "where reasonable and practicable."

Mr. President, we have had the background of our experience with UNRRA and of many other foreign aid programs under which the United States gave of her substance to the people of other countries. We gave money. We gave commodities, some of which were given to the people of other countries at a sacrifice to our people. We gave them scarce materials. In no instance did we receive proper recognition, nor was there a spirit of good will shown by reason of the program we carried out.

Today we are spending tens of millions of dollars, through the Voice of America and by other propaganda means, to create good will in Europe. All the labeling amendment would require is that it shall be mandatory where reasonable and practicable that the products which we are giving away shall be labeled. Thus it will be known to the people in the recipient countries that the products are contributed by the United States of America. I do not see how any Senator who has taken the oath of office in the United States Senate can vote against a measure which will require the labeling of these products, the cost of which the people of America are paying. We are giving these products in connection with a good-will program. I think it is fundamental that this requirement for labeling be put into effect.

I now yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to associate himself with the views just expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire, and to add an observation in his own right. Adoption of the amendment will recognize and provide some relief for the disappointment shared by so many of us in America over the sad fact that too many Europeans are unaware of the nature and size and cost of the steps taken by America to aid recovery in western Europe. I believe the average American will support the amendment as being sensible, reasonable, and workable. The people of Europe ought to know that the people of America are really the ones who pay the bill which makes the Marshall plan possible. The pending amendment, if agreed to, will help to bring about this worth-while objective. Too many Europeans think the Marshall plan is merely a series of complicated maneuvers——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Hampshire for 15 seconds?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield the Senator from Washington a half minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Too many Europeans think the Marshall plan is merely a series of complicated manuevers between national governments. If commodities carry an American label, a greater number of Europeans will become conscious and appreciative of the willingness of the average American to help the average European in their period of temporary need. I can think of no sound reason why the amendment should not prevail.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] a minute and a half.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for a minute and a half.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the distinguished Senator who has just spoken, and with the Senator from New Hampshire respecting his amendment. I recall that last year when a similar amendment was voted upon, it was defeated by only a few votes. The other day on the Senate floor, and a few weeks ago on the Senate floor, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] made an eloquent plea that the United States should advertise its wares and show to the people back of the iron curtain just what America is doing. The amendment offers such an opportunity. We are an advertising Nation. Our Nation is proud of the commodities its people produce. I can see no justifiable reason for any American to have any hesitancy, even though it would cost us money, to label the products which are sent from the United States, we should be proud of those products.

I am happy to vote for the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it should be pointed out that one very important argument in behalf of the labeling amendment is the fact that the people who receive these goods in Europe have to pay for them. They purchase them, and a great many of the people purchasing this American lend-lease material now have no way in the world of learning that the material they are getting comes to them because of the lend-lease program of this country. I certainly hope that no member of the Foreign Relations Committee will rise and oppose this important program, which is in complete harmony with the whole Voice of America concept, with the whole program with which we are all so vitally concerned, that is of having the American ideal and the American purpose represented honestly and appropriately and adequately abroad. This amendment should be adopted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FERGUSON. I simply wish to speak from my personal observations in the European-aid countries. It has been my observation that the people there who are not connected with the Government do not have knowledge of the aid which is being given to them. This amendment affords a method to correct that situation. By adopting this amendment the Senate will make possible a method of conveying to the common people of Europe the idea that we are furnishing this aid directly to the people, that we are not doing it for materialistic purposes or reasons in connection with their governments, but we are doing it to aid the people of Europe themselves. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment so the people of Europe may have a full understanding of what we are doing for them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to point out that in the case of foreign goods coming into this country they must be labeled. By the amendment we are only asking the people whom we are benefiting in Europe to accept the same provisions which we apply in the case of goods brought into this country. So I think "Made in U. S. A." and "Furnished by U. S. A." are entirely proper labels to put upon the goods which we assist in supplying.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I now yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Senators who have spoken in behalf of the amendment. I believe it to be a good amendment. I know the argument will be advanced that it is a costly amendment, that labeling provided under its terms cannot be done in the case of bulk products, such as coal and wheat; that the cost of labeling will be too high.

First of all, I wish to cite an experience I had in Austria when I was there checking up what became of the food which went there through UNRRA. I was told by one of our high-flight, top generals, that the first trainload of food which came into the territory occupied by us in Austria, into Vienna, came by railroad; that pictures of Premier Stalin appeared all over the railroad cars, intimating that the food had come from the East, from Russia, that it had not come from its actual source, the United States of America.

It may be that every grain of wheat and every piece of coal cannot be labeled. I know that argument will be made. But I believe we must make clear to the recipients where the products come from. Those who receive the products should know from whom they come. If it is worth while to broadcast over the Voice of America that we are giving aid to Europeans, it is worth while to label products which are sent by us to European people under the ECA program wherever it is possible and feasible to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 9 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am in full sympathy with the objectives of the amendment, but I am forced to disapprove of the plan proposed by it. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD section 201.13 of ECA regulation No. 1, indicating what are the present marking requirements, and how they are now being carried out.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 201.13. Marketing requirements: Commodities furnished under the act will be stamped, tagged, stenciled, or labeled with with the official ECA Emblem, bearing the test "For European Recovery, Supplied by the United States of America" translated into the language of the recipient country; samples of the Emblem, and translations, may be obtained from ECA, Washington, D. C.

If it is not practicable to mark the commodities themselves in such manner, the containers in which the commodities are packaged will be so marked. The shipping containers, whether boxes, cases, barrels, drums, hogsheads or of other types, will also bear the official ECA Emblem. The size of the ECA Emblem may vary depending upon the size of the commodity, package, or shipping container to be marked. In addition, the shipping containers will be stamped, branded, stenciled or labeled as follows:

ECA

(Procurement Authorization No.)

(Participating country)

(Shipper's marks)

The procurement authorization number and name of the participating country shall be in characters at least equal in height to the shipper's marks. The height of the ECA Emblem on the shipping container should, whenever possible, be at least twice the height of the lettering used in the shipper's marks.

Any raw materials (including coal, grain, and petroleum, oil and lubricants) not shipped in containers; fibers packaged in bales; and metal and lumber mill products of a semifinished nature which are not packaged or crated are excepted from these marking requirements. If compliance with the provisions of this section is found to be impracticable with respect to other commodities, the participating country will promptly request ECA, Washington, D. C., for an exemption from the requirements of this section.

Mr. President, we are advised by the ECA Administrator that he is doing all within his power at the present time to mark our goods and let the recipients know where they are coming from. He believes we are accomplishing a pretty good job. But he advises us, first, that if we adopt an amendment of the kind now proposed it will disrupt the standard method of marking. Second, he calls attention to the fact that we could not label coal and wheat and other bulk products of that kind. Third, the amendment calls on the ECA Administrator to reexamine and amend bilateral agreements. That is within the function of the State Department, and not that of the ECA.

He also calls attention to the fact that it often happens that ECA wants to buy some products which were manufactured for our domestic market. Maybe there is a surplus of such products, maybe the producers are willing to give a close price in order to have the products move and go abroad. But under the pending amendment ECA could not buy them, and so the producer in this country would be hurt, and the recipient nations would be unable to secure articles that may be available at low prices.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan referred to his interest in marketing. I want to ask him how successfully the Post Toasties manufactured in his State would be marketed if the packages had to be marked both on the inside and on the outside with such labels. However, under this amendment unless the boxes of Post Toasties are marked with such labels on both the inside and the outside, they could not be shipped overseas under this program. I do not think the Senator from Michigan would enjoy that situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will yield in 8 minutes. First, there are some other matters to which I wish to refer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am happy to inform the Senate that the ECA believes that the participating countries are now fully cooperating with it in letting their people know, from the standpoint of the marketing of these products, where they come from. In the language of Mr. Hoffman, this amendment "would cause administrative burdens, delays, and expenses which would substantially impede the operation of the European recovery program without appreciably increasing the publicity which is now being given to United States contributions."

Mr. President, I wish now to turn to a different subject. I regretted very much that I missed participating in the yea-and-nay vote on the first amendment voted on today, that calling for a $1,000,000,000 reduction in the amount of the proposed ECA authorization. I happended to be in the cloakrooms at the time, where I was so absorbed in preparing an amendment on the bank-holding-company bill that I did not hear the bell ring to announce the vote.

However, I oppose both the amendment calling for a $1,000,000,000 reduction and the amendment calling for a $500,000,000 reduction.

After the Foreign Relations Committee has submitted a report favoring the full amount as now carried in the bill, I think that in the absence of any personal knowledge on my own behalf I should not vote to make a reduction in the amount of the authorization, especially in view of the fact that I have the privilege of sitting in the Appropriations Committee, and that last year in that committee we went more fully into the needs of the ECA program than did the Foreign Relations Committee, and I hope we can do so again.

In any event, every Member of the Senate has the privilege, when the appropriation bill comes before the Senate, of voting for any amendments which he sees fit to support.

Certainly I am as much interested in economy as is any other Member of the Senate. I do not wish to vote to include in this program anything it is not necessary to include in it.

However, Mr. President, in recent months we have heard much discussion about the loss of China and about who was responsible for the loss of China. I do not know who was responsible for the loss of China, and I do not know whether we could have saved China. I do know that that loss was a serious one. I also know that we in the Congress made the deliberate decision—and the same decision was reached by the State Department—that our first obligation and our primary defense against the tide of communism was in western Europe.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to mention a subject about which I feel very deeply, and it is this: In my opinion we are not going to save western Europe unless we save Germany. On one side of the Brandenburg Gate, willy-nilly, the Germans have gone communistic. On the other side of that gate the Germans are making a fight for the principles of self-government and for a so-called democracy. Even though it is not exactly

like ours, it certainly is not like communism.

I had an interesting conference last week with the Lord Mayor of Bremen. He told me that he could see no reason, and neither could the other Germans of western Germany, why they could not manufacture ships, at least, and sell them to the nations which are willing to buy ships from them. He said:

> We can give employment to at least 10,000 men, in Bremen alone, to make ships for Sweden and other Scandinavian countries and for South Africa who now are offering us the money for such ships. We need no help or no materials from anyone. All we need is the permission to go to work.

Mr. President, at the London Conference that matter should be strongly urged by our State Department. Why should we permit such opposition action to be taken by Great Britain or France or any other country which does not want to see Germany reestablished and is willing to have Germany remain on our necks for the next 50 years, which does not want to see a German merchant marine established, which does not want to see the German shipyards compete with its shipyards, and takes that position at our expense, when we are pouring out such vast sums of money for the relief of the western European countries?

I wish that more of us had heard the speech of my distinguished desk mate and colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], one of the ablest and finest Members of this body. I was with him in Greece. I went out to see the undernourished and undersized olive trees from which the Greeks were picking the small olives, enough to produce perhaps $5 worth of olive oil from 28 olive trees, which were all the particular farmer had. He said that as he understood the Marshall plan, it was to enable us to get control of his olive trees. Of course, Mr. President, we would not have his olive trees if they were offered to us; even if they could be transported to the United States, we would not want them.

The Senator from Mississippi said—and I agree with him—that we are not going to be through with this problem in 1952; we are not going to be through with it then in Germany or in Austria or in Greece.

Mr. President, here is a chance for us to save some money, by persuading our allies in western Europe to agree that the shipbuilding plants of western Germany may resume operation—our allies who either are so afraid of a reconstructed Germany or are so jealous of the ability of the Germans in western Germany to compete with them, that they want to dismantle the German plants.

Thank goodness, the Petersberg agreement last November stopped the dismantling program. However, apparently these allies of ours do not want the Germans to get back on their feet.

Mr. President, we need a reconstructed Germany. Germany is essential to the industry of western Europe, and she can be one of our most valuable allies.

I welcome this opportunity to voice my hope that at the London Conference the representatives of the State Department will take a firm stand in favor of the rehabilitation of Germany—not from a military standpoint, but from an economic standpoint—so that eventually we shall be relieved of the terrible burden which now rests upon our taxpayers—a burden which I feel we could not safely avoid in the first place because of the threats of communism to our own national security.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, now I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired, and he does not have remaining any time which he can yield to any other Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much hope the Senate will reject this amendment. Of course we have wished to make it known to the people of Europe that these goods are coming from the United States. However, the Administrator says that the difficulties and the expense of operating in accordance with the terms of the amendment now proposed would be interminable and would create an almost impossible situation. He says the difficulties which would be caused by the amendment would be almost impossible to overcome.

The amendment would require the proposed labeling to appear both on the inside and on the outside of the packages. No doubt the labels would have to be printed in all the languages of Europe.

So I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is detained on official business at the White House.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate and if present and voting would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Ives	Russell
Brewster	Jenner	Saltonstall
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Butler	Kem	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Tobey
Darby	McCarthy	Wherry
Dworshak	McClellan	Wiley
Ecton	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Young
Gurney	Millikin	
Hendrickson	Mundt	

NAYS—39

Anderson	Hill	McKellar
Connally	Hoey	McMahon
Cordon	Holland	Magnuson
Donnell	Humphrey	Maybank
Douglas	Hunt	Myers
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Ellender	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
George	Leahy	Stennis
Graham	Lehman	Taylor
Green	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McFarland	Tydings

NOT VOTING—20

Benton	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Capehart	Langer	Sparkman
Chapman	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Downey	Morse	Watkins
Flanders	Murray	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BRIDGES, for himself and Mr. WHERRY, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment E, offered on the 26th of April.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. . Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country (including the zones of occupation of Germany) if such country refuses to join, within 30 days after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, in a concerted effort with the other participating countries (including the zones of occupation of Germany) to form a Federation of a United States of Europe, under a constitution which would vest in the federation all power relating to (1) tariffs, trade, and currency within and among such countries or states and between such countries or states and countries which are not members of the federation; and (2) the defense of the federation.

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this amendment would require each participating country to agree it will join in a concerted effort with the participating countries to form a united states of Europe similar to the United States of America.

The pending amendment makes further aid under the ECA dependent on the willingness of each of the OEEC countries to join, within 30 days after the passage of the pending act, in a concerted effort to form the united states of Europe. All efforts of the ECA to break down the isolationist and nationalistic trade barriers within the European realm have been of little avail. Exchange controls like import and export licensing regulations, bilateral trade treaties, and other barriers to the free flow of trade cannot properly be eliminated without the establishment of the united states of Europe. Any hope that we may have to strengthen European resistance against Communist aggression is unfounded and will only lull us into a false sense of security. The only salvation of European and perhaps western civilization lies in a complete negation of all the historic feuds and enmities of the European nations.

The United States, in giving billions of dollars of aid to the European countries, may well force such conditions upon the recipients of our largess. It is really no more than the conditions a banker may attach to a loan. The united states of Europe can be born if we lead the way. We cannot expect all Europe to take that historic step without necessary inducement and an assurance that such a step will not only be sanctioned, but actively supported by the United States. This is the opportunity to bring about a most necessary alliance.

Mr. President, to avoid chaos in Germany and ultimate economic failure in all of Europe there must be a united states of Europe, of which Germany is a part. Only within the context of European unity is there the opportunity to direct the economic, political, and spiritual forces of Germany and other European countries into healthy and peaceful channels.

Prompt action is needed because today the west has an opportunity to unite for defense, Germany is in a formative stage, the idea of unity has a strong hold on the minds of the people, and, lastly, the United States of America would assist the united states of Europe in getting established, as a condition of further aid.

With a united states of Europe, Germany would no longer be the problem she is at this time. We are now torn between allowing Germany to become strong industrially, with the danger that she may join Russia and, through that union, seek to dominate the world, or to turn her into a harmless agrarian state with our endless financial support and with the always present danger that a frustrated Germany would ultimately join Communist Russia anyway, since Russia is offering her industrial independence.

Russia is holding out to Germany the opportunity to produce the processed and manufactured goods necessary for Russia, to a large extent, and also furnish Communist China with such supplies—it will be a great temptation to a Germany now being subjected to the stupid insane policy of turning them into an agrarian state.

Europe could become a strong nation, no longer subject to rivalries, distrust, and suspicions. We could deal with Europe as one nation. This nation could deal with a united states of Europe as with Russia or China, through treaties, and not contribute to the expense of maintaining a separate government within each of those small countries.

Each of these small countries maintains a king, a dictator, or a president, together with a full set of officials and hangers on, including the deposed kings and dictators. The King of England draws an annual salary of approximately $1,500,000. This was of no concern to the junior Senator from Nevada until such funds became a part of our budget. A united states of Europe would ultimately end such foolishness.

Mr. President, each separate country of the 16 ECA countries has made a separate treaty with Russia and with the iron-curtain countries, and they are furnishing them enough goods to make a start toward world war III. They are furnishing the goods necessary to consolidate their gains in eastern Europe and Communist China. That is done through the 96 trade treaties which the ECA nations have made with Russia and the iron-curtain countries, selling everything from monkey wrenches and locomotives to ball bearings and tool steel, electrical equipment, and freight cars.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a list of such 96 treaties.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

List of most recent trade agreements between OEEC countries and countries of eastern Europe

[NOTE.—Insofar as possible the effective date, the date of signature (in parentheses), and the expiration date are noted under "Period"]

Agreement partners	Period	Special provisions
Austria-Bulgaria	Dec. 17, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949; supplemental July 7, 1949	
Austria-Czechoslovakia	July 1 (July 15), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Austria-Hungary	Sept. 1 (Sept. 13), 1949, to Aug. 31, 1950	
Austria-Poland	July 15 (July 5), 1949, to July 31, 1950	
Austria-Yugoslavia	Oct. 25 (Nov. 12), 1949, to Oct. 24, 1950	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Bulgaria	Apr. 21, 1947, to Apr. 21, 1948	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Czechoslovakia	Oct. 1 (Nov. 30), 1949, to Sept. 30, 1950	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Finland [1]	Nov. 6 (Dec. 16), 1948, to Nov. 5, 1949; extended to May 5, 1950	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Hungary	Feb. 18 (Feb. 18), 1949, to Feb. 17, 1950	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Poland [1]	Apr. 13, 1950, to April 1951	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Rumania	Sept. 3, 1948, to Sept. 3, 1949	
Belgium-Luxemburg-Yugoslavia	Sept. 11, 1948, to September 1949	
Belgium-Luxemburg-U. S. S. R	January (Feb. 18), 1948 to 1949	Soviet deliveries scheduled for 1948. Belgium deliveries scheduled for 1948-49.
Belgium-Luxemburg-Germany (Soviet zone)	Nov. 10, 1947, to Nov. 9, 1948	
Denmark-Bulgaria	May 9, 1947, to May 9, 1948	
Denmark-Czechoslovakia [2]	Dec. 1 (Dec. 17), 1949, to Nov. 30, 1950	
Denmark-Finland [1]	May 1 (Mar. 22), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950; supplemental Jan. 14, 1950	
Denmark-Hungary	Mar. 1 (Feb. 24), 1950, to Feb. 28, 1951	
Denmark-Poland	Oct. 1 (Dec. 7), 1949, to Sept. 30, 1950	
Denmark-Rumania	Aug. 3, 1949	
Denmark-Yugoslavia	Apr. 1 (Apr. 8), 1949, to Mar. 31, 1950	
Denmark-U. S. S. R	July 1 (July 8), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949	
Denmark-Germany (Soviet zone)	Jan. 1, 1949 (Dec. 20, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949	
France-Bulgaria	June 15, (June 10), 1947, to June 1, 1948	
France-Czechoslovakia [1]	Aug. 1 (Aug. 6), 1948, to Aug. 1, 1949; supplemental March 1949; extended to Mar. 31, 1950.	

[1] Indicates new agreement, extension, or other change in status of agreement since preparation of DRE-IP-EER-64, Jan. 16, 1950.
[2] Change due to new information on agreement previously included.

List of most recent trade agreements between OEEC countries and countries of eastern Europe—Continued

Agreement partners	Period	Special provisions
France-Finland	May 1 (May 20), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
France-Hungary [1]	Nov. 1 (Dec. 2), 1949, to Oct. 30, 1950	
France-Poland	Jan. 1, 1949 (Dec. 29, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949	Investment agreement, Mar. 19, 1948, to 1952.
France-Rumania	July 15 (July 6), 1946, to completion	
France-Yugoslavia	May 21, 1949, to May 21, 1950	
Greece-Czechoslovakia [1]	Aug. 1, 1948, to Aug. 1, 1949	August 1947 agreement reported to have been automatically renewed for 1 year.
Greece-Finland	Mar. 24, 1949—indefinite period	
Iceland-Czechoslovakia	Mar. 1 (Feb. 16), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
Iceland-Finland	June 1 (May 29), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Iceland-Poland	Jan. 1, 1950 (Nov. 18, 1949), to Dec. 31, 1950	
Iceland-U. S. S. R	No renewal of 1946 agreement	
Italy-Bulgaria	November 1948 to November 1949	
Italy-Czechoslovakia	October 1948 to July 1949	Barter deals within framework of agreement of July 2, 1947.
Italy-Finland	Nov. 1, 1949—indefinite	
Italy-Hungary [1]	Jan. 1 (Feb. 9) to Dec. 31, 1950	
Italy-Poland	July 1 (July 15) 1949, to June 30, 1952	Investment agreements, Nov. 1, 1949 (Jan. 23, 1950) to Nov 1, 1952.
Italy-Yugoslavia	Aug. 4, 1949, to Aug. 3, 1950	Investment agreement, Nov. 28, 1947, to November 1952.
Italy-U. S. S. R	Dec. 11, 1948. to Dec. 31, 1949	Investment agreement, December 1948 to December 1951.
Italy-Germany (Soviet zone)	June 1949 to completion	Interim agreement.
Netherlands-Bulgaria [1]	Jan. 1, 1950, to Dec. 31, 1950	
Netherlands-Czechoslovakia	May 10 (May 10), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
Netherlands-Finland	June 1, 1949, to May 31, 1950	
Netherlands-Hungary	Jan. 1, 1949 (Dec. 20, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949; supplemental: Sept. 23, 1949	
Netherlands-Poland [1]	(Mar. 22, 1950) Dec. 31, 1950	
Netherlands-Rumania	Feb. 16 1948, preliminary agreement	Efforts for new agreement unsuccessful, February 1949.
Netherlands-Yugoslavia	Nov. 1 (Nov. 7), 1949, to Nov. 1, 1950	Investment agreement, Feb. 1, 1948, to January 1951.
Netherlands-U. S. S. R	June 10 (July 2), 1948, to 1953	Investment agreement.
Netherlands-Germany (Soviet zone)	July 30, 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Norway-Czechoslovakia	Mar. 1 (Mar. 30), 1949, to Feb. 28, 1950; supplmental July 16, 1949	
Norway-Finland	Nov. 1 (Sept. 30), 1949, to Oct. 31, 1950	
Norway-Hungary	Nov. 4, 1947, to Aug. 31, 1949; extended to Dec. 31, 1949	
Norway-Poland	Jan. 1, 1950 (Dec. 21, 1949), to Dec. 31, 1950	
Norway-Yugoslavia	Apr. 30 (Apr. 2), 1949, to Apr. 30, 1950	
Norway-U. S. S. R	Jan. 1 (Jan. 10), 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	
Norway-Germany	Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	
Portugal-Finland [1]	Jan. 1 (Jan. 12), 1950, to Dec. 31, 1950	
Sweden-Bulgaria	Oct. (Sept. 22), 1947, to Dec. 1948; extended to Dec. 31, 1949	
Sweden-Czechoslovakia [1]	Feb. 1 (Mar. 30), 1950, to Jan. 31, 1951	
Sweden-Finland	Apr. 1 (Mar. 29), 1950, to Mar. 31, 1951	
Sweden-Hungary [1]	Dec. 1 (Nov. 30), 1949, to Nov. 30, 1950	Agreement reported suspended.
Sweden-Poland	Oct. 1 (Oct. 29), 1949, to Oct. 31, 1950	Investment agreement, Mar. 19, 1947 to 1954.
Sweden-Yugoslavia	Apr. 15 (Mar. 22), 1948, to Apr. 15, 1949; supplemental Jan. 2, 1950	Investment agreement, Apr. 15 (Apr. 12), 1947, to Apr. 15, 1954.
Sweden-U. S. S. R	Jan. 1, (Apr. 2), 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	Investment and credit agreement, October 1946 to Dec. 31, 1951.
Sweden-Germany (Soviet zone)	July 1 (July 19), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Switzerland-Bulgaria	Jan. 1, 1949 (Nov. 9, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949	
Switzerland-Czechoslovakia	Jan. 1, 1950 (Dec. 22, 1949), to Dec. 31, 1950	
Switzerland-Finland [1]	Sept. 1 (Aug. 21), 1948, to Feb. 28, 1950; extended to Aug. 31, 1950	
Switzerland-Hungary	Oct. 1 (Oct. 22), 1948, to Sept. 30, 1949	
Switzerland-Poland	July 1 (June 26), 1949, to 1954	Investment agreement.
Switzerland-Rumania	March 4, 1947, to March 1950	
Switzerland-Yugoslavia [1]	Apr. 1, 1950	Investment agreement, October 1948-53; annual quotas.
Switzerland-U. S. S. R	Apr. 1 (Mar. 17), 1948, to Apr. 1949; extended to December 1949	Investment schedules, Apr. 1, 1948 to 1951.
Switzerland-Germany (Soviet zone)	July 20 (July 20), 1947, to July 20, 1948	
Turkey-Czechoslovakia	July 1 (July 9), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Turkey-Finland	June 20 (June 12), 1948, to June 1, 1949	No quotas scheduled.
Turkey-Hungary	June 1 (May 12), 1949, to June 1, 1950	
Turkey-Poland	Aug. 1 (July 18), 1948, to July 31, 1949; extended to July 31, 1950	
Turkey-Yugoslavia [2]	Jan. 5, 1950, to June 30, 1951	
United Kingdom-Czechoslovakia	Sept. 28 (Sept. 28), 1949, to June 30, 1950	
United Kingdom-Finland [1]	Mar. 13, 1950	
United Kingdom-Hungary	Aug. 1 (Aug. 9), 1947, to July 31, 1950	
United Kingdom-Poland	Jan. 14, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1953, annual quotas	Investment agreement, not all goods have annual quotas.
United Kingdom-Yugoslavia	Dec. 26, 1949, to 1954	
United Kingdom-U. S. S. R	Dec. 27, 1947, to 1951	Investment agreement, U. S. S. R. deliveries February to September 1948, United Kingdom deliveries, 1948-51.
Germany (Trizone)-Bulgaria	Oct. 4, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1947; extended to Dec. 31, 1949	
Germany (Trizone)-Czechoslovakia	Dec. 3 (Oct. 1), 1948, to Sept. 30, 1949; protocols supplementing and extending agreement to Sept. 30, 1950; Mar. 16, 1949, to Oct. 1, 1949.	
Germany (Trizone)-Finland [1]	Jan. 1, 1950 (Dec. 17, 1949), to Dec. 31, 1950	
Germany (Trizone)-Hungary	Oct. 1 (Oct. 20), 1949, to Sept. 30, 1950	
Germany (Trizone)-Poland	July 5, 1949, to June 30, 1950	
Germany (Trizone)-Yugoslavia	Jan. to Dec. 31, 1950	
Germany (Trizone)-Germany (Soviet zone)	Oct. 8, 1949, to June 30, 1950	

[1] Indicates new agreement, extension, or other change in status of agreement since preparation of DRE-IP-EER-64, Jan. 16, 1950.
[2] Change due to new information on agreement previously included.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I hope my distinguished colleague from Nevada will permit me to say that in the considered view of the junior Senator from Washington, Europe is foredoomed in every conceivable way if it does not agree to federate. I am not an authority as to how such federation can best be secured. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada what the meaning of the language in the Senator's amendment is, beginning on line 6, reading as follows:

If such country refuses to join, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, in a concerted effort with the other participating countries—

What is the meaning of that language?

Mr. MALONE. I would say, in answer to the question of the Senator from Washington, that it would be impossible to force a union immediately, but they could at least show a concerted effort immediately to do what the Administrator of the ECA says he is trying to get them to do, but in which he is making no progress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should first like to say to the Senator

from Nevada that I think he is aware of the fact that I sponsored amendments to the original ECA Act last year. Prior to that time, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and I introduced a resolution. That has been more than three years ago.

I endorse the idea of a European federation, and I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator's argument with regard to the matter. I would hope to prevail upon our State Department to promote such a movement. However, I do not think this is the proper way to achieve it. I think it is too arbitrary to require it as a condition of aid. In fact, I do not think there is anything effective that can be done until our own Department of State is brought around to the idea that it is a good thing.

The Senator will recall that in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, earlier this year, the Secretary of State stated quite definitely that he did not think the peoples of Europe or the governments of Europe were ready for the move. I disagree with that, purely as a matter of judgment. I would hope that the Secretary of State would agree that it is a timely move. In fact, I think a much better time was 2 years ago.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For a brief question.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator from Arkansas believe that unless there is some reward held out for a concerted effort on the part of the nations of Europe to form a federation, it is unlikely to come about?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that that is what I had in mind. It was in the form of a reward, for encouragement. In fact, the amendment which I offered last year was in that form. But I did not make it a condition precedent to aid that they should, within 30 days, join in such a confederation. I think it would be impossible for them to agree to that. Even though they are inclined to favor and would like to achieve such a confederation, our own Government has never endorsed or approved it. I do not think we can require them to do something which our own Department of State has not yet accepted as a good idea. I profoundly regret that it has not accepted it, but I cannot jump from that and say that European countries must do it within 30 days. I think that would be entirely too harsh a requirement. It cannot be met, and it would cause resentment on their part.

I must admit that I think the Senator is entirely correct about the importance of it. I think it should have been part of the policy in the original ECA Act. I think it is a great mistake that it was not done. I think that by this time we would have made some progress and would have provided real enthusiasm for the project.

While I am supporting the idea, so far as my own hope for achieving real accord in the situation in Europe is concerned, I am much less sure of that today than I had hoped I would be. We have bought time, and I hope that before long the light may strike our State Department.

Furthermore, I want to say, Mr. President, that Mr. Hoffman came around to the view, last September, that there should be an effective campaign carried on. I think he has done everything he can do to persuade the people and the Secretary of State that such a confederation is necessary.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that Mr. McCloy, the director of our policy and operations in Germany at this time, stated a few weeks ago that unless there is such a union of European states nothing can really be accomplished?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I hope that statement, together with what Mr. Hoffman has said, will come to the notice of the Department of State, and that that Department will adopt it as a policy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I have one more minute, please?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the idea should have the backing of the Department of State.

I do not think the Senate should adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada in its present form, although, at the same time, I think the Senate should consider very seriously the question of ways and means to bring about a federation of the European nations. It is very much in line with the resolution recently introduced by the junior Senator from Connecticut with regard to the Atlantic community. The whole idea is to find ways and means by which the power and influence of the western European nations may be better coordinated and made more effective in the building up of western civilization in its struggle with communism.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has again expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am in favor of a federation of Europe, and have been for a long time. I believe as thoroughly as anyone that we shall not have peace and the right kind of integration until such a step is taken. However, Mr. President, a federation cannot come from without, and it cannot come by force.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It cannot be brought about by forcing a situation. What must be done is everlastingly to hold before Europe the promise that federation will bring their own salvation. When they once become convinced of that, federation will come about. However, until they do become convinced of it, it will not come about.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator think that there is little propriety in our country attempting to tell the nations of Europe what kind of government they should have?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is absolutely contrary to the spirit of international law and to the spirit of independent states. We cannot impose our wills on them without destroying theirs. That is not the way to bring peace to the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 107. Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provisions of assistance under this title to any participating country if the government of such country, or any agency or subdivision thereof, shall, after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, acquire or operate, in whole or in part any basic industry thereof, other than industries the acquisition of which was completed prior to the date of enactment of such act."

Mr. KEM. Members of the Senate are familiar with this amendment. It was offered last year to the ECA authorization bill and also to the ECA appropriation bill. Therefore I shall not detain the Senate long in discussing it. The purpose of the amendment is not to forbid any European country to do anything it has in mind to do. It simply says that if a country continues to socialize or nationalize basic industry it cannot be done with money of the American people. There is no attempt made to unscramble any eggs. So far as the amendment is concerned, what they have done is so much water over the dam. The amendment simply says: "From this time on you cannot use the money of the American taxpayers as a slush fund for experiments in socialism."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], in referring to the argument that was made sometime ago by me regarding this amendment, expressed some surprise that I had said so much about England and not very much about the other Marshall-plan countries. I should like to invite the attention of the able Senator from Illinois to the fact that the amendment does not apply to England alone. It applies to any Marshall-plan country which continues to socialize or nationalize basic industries.

In the second place, I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois—and I am sorry that he is not on the floor—that the reason I directed my attention in the discussion to England is that England by all odds is the largest beneficiary under the Marshall plan. Let us look at the allotments. I have before me the cumulative list to March 15, 1950. United Kingdom, $2,417,000,000. The Senator from Illinois mentioned particularly the Scandinavian countries.

Let us see what they received. Denmark, $197,000,000. Norway, $182,000,000. Sweden, $88,000,000.

I do not have before me the census figures, but to relieve the Senator from Illinois from any concern about the motives of the Senator from Missouri in this matter, I venture to say that there are many more people of English and Scottish descent resident in Missouri than descendants of all the Scandinavian peoples put together. If that fact had any effect on the position of the Senator from Missouri, it certainly would not have led him to discuss the situation in England and Scotland.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the adoption of the Senator's amendment affect industries which have been socialized or nationalized in the past, or would it apply only from the date of its adoption?

Mr. KEM. It looks entirely to the future. It makes no effort to unscramble any eggs. Since the amendment has been before the Senate, a very important fact has taken place. The British Socialist Government has continued its lease on life with American dollars. It seems clear that only the vast array of gifts from the American people has enabled the present Government of England to come through another election and to impose on the British people further and additional experiments in socialism.

There is one more fact in that connection to which I wish to refer, and that is that there is no disposition whatever on the part of the Government of Great Britain to abandon the Socialist program. The nationalization of steel takes effect on January 1. Prime Minister Attlee has been asked whether the Government had any intention of abandoning that. He said, "Any statute on the statute books will be enforced." In other words, the British are going right ahead with that program. The great British Government-owned cartel will hang like the sword of Damocles over so many producers in this country in so many varied fields of activity.

The only argument against the amendment which has any force at all is that we would be interfering with the internal politics or economy of a foreign country. I wish to say a few words about that. In the first place, the Administrator of the ECA never has hesitated to impose regulations, requirements, and restrictions on the beneficiaries of American aid.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not one of the purposes of ECA to keep the various nations from going communistic, and is not a further purpose of ECA, if not the real purpose, to bring about such a climate in the participating countries that they will not adopt communism? Therefore, are we not already attempting to interfere in the internal management of these various nations?

Mr. KEM. Mr. Hoffman has done that, and he has not hesitated to say that he has done it in the past and intends to do it in the future. Under those circumstances, how can it be argued with any sincerity that the Congress should not do something which its agents, Mr. Hoffman and the other officials of ECA, are themselves doing?

Furthermore, the State Department has done the same thing. A few days ago I read a letter from Mr. Henry F. Grady, the American Minister to Greece to the Prime Minister of Greece, in which Mr. Grady set forth in great detail exactly what America would expect Greece to do in connection with its internal constitutional structure and in connection with its economy if the Greek people were to continue to enjoy ECA aid.

I also read a letter from the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, addressed to the Government of Korea, in which he laid down the law to Korea in no uncertain terms. He told them that if they did not discontinue certain practices, political and economic, aid from America would be discontinued.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is there not this additional fact—and I think the Senator has clarified his amendment—that in times past apparently there was a tendency in amendments proposed to interfere in the internal affairs of countries by dealing with situations where the countries had already socialized industry? I understand the Senator's amendment does not do that. It seems to me the Senator may be on sound ground. If anyone feels that the competitive system is more apt to function better than any program of socialization he should support this amendment. This is even more true if one is convinced that more socialization is going to be detrimental to the economy of the country. As I understand the Senator from Missouri, he does not say in the amendment that the countries cannot go ahead and socialize if they care to do so. He merely says that they cannot do it, directly or indirectly, with funds furnished by the United States from taxes levied upon the free-enterprise system. If they feel that they can close the dollar gap by completely socializing, they are at perfect liberty to do so. The amendment only prevents the use of American dollars for this additional socializing process. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. The Senator is exactly correct. I invite the attention of the able Senator from California to the fact that Mr. Hoffman in his appearance last year before the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from California is now a member, said that in his judgment socialism slows up the productive process.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield for one more brief question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that in Great Britain one of the most efficient industries has been the steel industry, which is not socialized? I am sure I have read in British papers that even many of the British union people in the steel industry have been very much opposed to the socialization of that industry, because they think there is a better opportunity for both the British workingman, as well as for the others, in keeping the industry from being socialized.

Mr. KEM. I think that is entirely correct, and I thank the Senator from California for his contribution.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the American dollars we have sent to the participating European countries which are socialized have served to cushion the people there from the severe privations which would have inevitably accompanied the socialistic schemes upon which they had entered. The British Government has nationalized or socialized 10 basic industries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to argue this question. It has been voted upon before in connection with the other Kem amendments, and I do not think the Senate would care for argument on it. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment and let us go on with something more constructive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from

Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—17

Brewster	Ecton	Martin
Bridges	Ferguson	Mundt
Butler	Jenner	Wherry
Byrd	Kem	Williams
Darby	Knowland	Young
Dworshak	Malone	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Hoey	Maybank
Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Benton	Humphrey	Myers
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Connally	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Douglas	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Leahy	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Stennis
George	Lodge	Taft
Graham	Lucas	Taylor
Green	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	McFarland	Thye
Hayden	McKellar	Wiley
Hendrickson	McMahon	
Hill	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—24

Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capehart	Langer	Schoeppel
Chapman	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Downey	McCarthy	Tydings
Flanders	Morse	Vandenberg
Gillette	Murray	Watkins
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	Withers

So Mr. KEM's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the Chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections."

On page 6, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 5.

On page 6, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

(i) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used to provide assistance to any nation, or to pay the salary of any individual, engaged, subsequent to the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1950, in destroying, restricting, or limiting operations of the peacetime industrial potential of any area, people, or nation which may be receiving assistance under this act.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to stop the further dismantling of plants capable of producing peacetime goods in Germany. If any blind, stupid foreign policy has been pursued by our country over a long period of time, it is the dismantling program in Germany. The American taxpayers through their Government are paying very substantial sums each year to help maintain the self-sufficiency of Germany. With few exceptions, every plant which is dismantled makes it more difficult for Germany to become self-sufficient.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The amendment applies only to peacetime industries, does it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely, yes. This dismantling program had its inception under the old Morgenthau plan, which certainly represented a blind, stupid program, and which since has been so recognized by most people.

There was some reason for dismantling and transferring various plants which were declared to be in excess of Germany's needs, to some of the Allied countries which had suffered as the result of German aggression in the last war. But, to me, there seems to be very little excuse for dismantling or destroying plants, or removing them to Russia and to the satellite countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator realize that Great Britain is wantonly destroying peacetime industries which will compete with her, because she knows that a Socialist economy cannot compete with private industry, and that by that destruction in Germany and also by what she is attempting to put over in Japan by sending trade missions there, she is piling billions of dollars on the shoulders of the American taxpayers?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator states exactly what is happening.

But in spite of protests which have been made in this country, in spite of various conferences and meetings which have been held on the subject, dismantling continues. I remember, in the fall of 1947, meeting with a representative of the State Department in New York, before members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate left for an inspection of Germany and other European countries. We were told by this individual that dismantling had stopped. In a week's time we saw with our own eyes that it continued.

For instance, one of the scarce items, at that period in Germany and in other countries of Europe, was soap. Soap was rationed. The monthly ration was a little piece about as big as one finds in a hotel in the United States, somewhat blown up with air. Only through ration cards was such soap given to patients in hospitals, other invalids, or nursing mothers.

Mr. President, we have carried the dismantling program too far. I hold in my hand a list of commodities we have furnished under ECA to Germany during the fiscal year 1948–49. The list comprises articles which could be manufactured by some of the plants which have been or are in the process of being destroyed.

When the war ended, together with Russia, Great Britain, and France, we divided Germany into four zones. The Russians were given eastern Germany, the breadbasket of Germany. Great Britain, France, and the United States took the industrial sections of Germany. That division of Germany into zones caused a serious economic upheaval in Germany. If Germany is ever to be on a self-sufficient basis she must be allowed to manufacture not only the products which her own people need but products in sufficient excess so she can go into the world markets and exchange them for food products.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] earlier today made an impassioned plea for the economic rehabilitation of Germany.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am in thorough sympathy with what the Senator wants to do, but what bothers me is whether the problem is one which relates to ECA, and whether a provision respecting it should be placed in an ECA bill, or if it should be handled, through the State Department, with Great Britain and France in the forthcoming conference on the very issue of the rehabilitation of Germany.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know how it can be handled unless it is taken care of in a bill providing aid for Europe.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The British are destroying peacetime industries. They are now destroying the harbor of Hamburg. How can such things be prevented except through an amendment to the ECA legislation providing that no funds shall be authorized for destroying, restricting, or limiting peacetime industries? How anyone who is interested in the ECA program can oppose the amendment is beyond my comprehension. Adoption of the amendment would result in decreasing the amount of money necessary for us to expend in Germany and other countries of Europe.

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as dismantling is concerned, I have not approved all of the program which has been carried out to date. I could see reasonable justification for the removal of some plants to countries allied with us which suffered destruction of their own plants during

the war. The amendment, however, in no way affects what has been done in the past. The amendment looks only to the future, to the period subsequent to the enactment of the act. If we continue to pour out millions of American dollars in order to maintain German economy on a reasonable basis, then in justice to Germany as well as to the American taxpayer, let us take this step to strike the shackles off Germany. Then Germany can begin, in an effective way, to help herself, and in turn be of great benefit to the American taxpayers.

I have here on my desk pictures showing the dismantling which is going on at this very moment.

I also have before me a picture showing hundreds of German workers protesting the dismantling program.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Virginia has said, this is a difficult problem; but we have to start to work on it somewhere.

We have discussed this matter time and time again, but the buck has been passed from one agency and from one department to another, to our organization in Germany, to the ECA, to the State Department, and around and about.

Mr. President, this amendment proposes a definite step in the right direction, an end to this buck passing.

So far as I am concerned, I am interested in seeing how the Senate will act in regard to this matter. We have had some very interesting issues handed to us today in the Senate. When a majority of the Senate voted against the proper labeling of American goods going to Europe under this program—doing so by a vote of 39 to 37—the majority gave us quite an issue. I will enjoy talking with the people in our country about this issue.

If we are going to permit a continuation of the dismantling program, thus saddling more millions of dollars on the backs of American taxpayers, certainly this is the time to talk about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that a continuous argument is being made by the ECA Administrator to the effect that dismantling is about over, and that nothing much in the way of dismantling is contemplated in the coming year, whereas the fact is that in an executive session of the Appropriations Committee it was developed that a document which the junior Senator from Nebraska had received shows the exact status of different installations in Germany and reveals that plant after plant is still being dismantled?

Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so at this point, I should like to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an exhibit comprising a formal British order for the destruction of certain German plants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me ask unanimous consent that I may submit that order for printing at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISARMAMENT GROUP,
LAND COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
Hannover, Baor 5, February 27, 1950.

MINISTRY OF ECONOMICS,
Herr Ing. Kiehle,
4, Hinueberstrasse, Hannover.

REICHSWERKE

The above plant has been reviewed and as a result it has been decided that the buildings and foundations of buildings will be treated as follows, provided the use to which the site is to be put is approved.

(*a*) Buildings to be permanently retained: 102, 104, 106, to 112, 201 (2 Bldgs.), 202, (2 Bldgs.), 203 to 206, 207 (2 structures), 208 (2 structures), 209 to 216, 217 to 236, 247, 253 (destroy foundations adjoining), 306, 308 (building only, destroy tank foundations), 313 A, 315, 316 to 332, 333 B, 338, 342, 344, 348, 403, 405, 407, 409, 414 to 420 512, 601, 602, 603, 606, 607, 609 (destroy pill box inside) 701 to 724, 750, 751, 756, 773, 802, 803, 805 901 to 905.

(*b*) Buildings to be retained subject to modification: 246, 248 to 252, 254, 304, 304 A, 305, 305 A, 306 A, 339, 345, 404, 406, 408, 501, 507, 510, 510 A, 608 A, 609, 753 to 755, 762, 764, 766, 804.

(*c*) Buildings to be destroyed: 216 A, (DB 4964), 239 to 241, 6 harbour bunkers between buildings 235 and 260 A, 260 A, 262, 263, 264 (2 Bldgs.) 265 (2 Bldgs.), 267, 268 (2 structures), 269 (incl. 4 chimneys adjoining), 270, 301, 301 A, 302, 302 A, 303, 303 A, 314 (DB 4962), 340, 346, 347, 402, 403 A, 410 to 413, 501 A, 501 B, 502 (DB 4969/1), 503 (DB 4969/2), 509, 511, 514, 604, 605 (DB 4963), 609 A, 752, 752 A, 758 to 761, 763, 767 (3 structures), 768 (3 structures), 769 (3 structures), 771.

(*d*) Buildings to be removed and foundations destroyed: 401, 504.

(*e*) Foundations to be destroyed: 237, 238, 242 to 245, adjoining 253 and 254, 255 to 261, 261 A, 266 (2 structures), 307, 307 A, 308 and 308 A (tank foundations), 309, 310 to 312, 309 A to 312 A, 313, 333 (but retain crane runway), 334, 337 (but retain crane runway), 341, 343, 508, 608, 611, 757, 765, 772, 801.

(*f*) Buildings and foundations to be modified if plant removed: 101, 103, 105.

(*g*) Buildings already removed or destroyed: 113, 271, 315 A, 349, 513, 602 A, 610, 770.

The retention of roads, railways and other services will be considered later.

The details of obnoxious features in the various buildings which are for modification will be sent to you in due course. When you have received these you will be asked to prepare and submit a detailed scheme for the use of the plant.

It is pointed out that the above decisions have been taken by the Regional Demilitarisation Committee and the Land Commissioner and that no question of the future use of buildings and foundations shown above for destruction will be entertained.

J. LEE,
Secretary, Regional Demilitarisation Committee, Land Niedersachsen.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much hope the Senate will reject the amendment. It is not the way to handle this matter.

Mr. McCloy is abroad now and is taking all the steps he can take to rectify the situation.

If we adopt this amendment or other amendments of this sort, we shall simply hinder and hamper and hogwash and hog-tie this program.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate, and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—27

Brewster	Butler	Dworshak
Bricker	Cain	Eastland
Bridges	Douglas	Ecton

Frear	McClellan	Stennis
Gurney	McKellar	Taft
Jenner	Malone	Thye
Kem	Martin	Wherry
Knowland	Mundt	Wiley
McCarthy	Russell	Williams

NAYS—44

Aiken	Holland	Magnuson
Anderson	Humphrey	Maybank
Connally	Hunt	Millikin
Cordon	Ives	Myers
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
George	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Graham	Kilgore	Sparkman
Green	Leahy	Taylor
Hayden	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Lodge	Tobey
Hill	Lucas	Tydings
Hoey	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—25

Benton	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Byrd	Langer	Schoeppel
Capehart	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Chapman	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McMahon	Watkins
Darby	Morse	Withers
Downey	Murray	Young
Flanders	O'Conor	
Gillette	O'Mahoney	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BRIDGES, on behalf of himself, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. EASTLAND, was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the wish of the Senator from Texas that the amendment be read, or that it be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it had better be read, because I want it considered immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following new title:

TITLE V

SEC. 501. That this title may be cited as the "Act for International Development."

SEC. 502. It is declared to be the policy of the United States and the purpose of this title to aid the efforts of the peoples of economically underdeveloped areas to develop their resources and improve their working and living conditions, by encouraging the exchange of technical knowledge and skills.

SEC. 503. Within the limits of appropriations made available to carry out the purposes of this title, the President is authorized to make contributions to the United Nations and the Organization of American States and their related organizations, and to other international organizations, for technical cooperation programs carried on by them which will contribute to accomplishing the purposes of this title as effectively as would participation in comparable programs on a bilateral basis.

SEC. 504. The President is authorized to undertake and administer bilateral technical cooperation programs carried on by any United States Government agency and, in so doing—

(a) to coordinate and direct existing and new technical cooperation programs;

(b) to seek the participation of private agencies and persons to the greatest extent practicable;

(c) to make and perform contracts or agreements with, and make advances and grants to, appropriate persons, corporations, or other bodies of persons, or to State, local, or foreign governments for technical cooperation programs: *Provided*, That with respect to contracts or agreements which entail commitments for the expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to the authority of this title, such contracts or agreements, within the limits of annual appropriations or contract authorizations hereafter made available, may not run beyond June 30, 1952;

(d) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111).

SEC. 505. In carrying out the programs authorized in section 4, the President shall make assistance available only where he determines that the country being assisted pays a fair share of the cost of the program; provides all necessary information concerning such program and gives it full publicity; seeks the greatest possible coordination of its technical assistance programs; and cooperates with other participating countries in the mutual exchange of technical knowledge and skills.

SEC. 506. The President is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out this title, and to exercise any power or authority conferred on him, through the Secretary of State or through any other officer or employee of the United States Government.

SEC. 507. In order to carry out the purposes of this title—

(a) the President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint one person who, under the direction of the President or such person as he may designate pursuant to section 7 to exercise the powers conferred on him by this title, shall be responsible for planning, implementing, and managing the programs herein authorized. He shall be compensated at a rate fixed by the President without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 but not in excess of $15,000 per annum;

(b) such additional civilian personnel, including attorneys, may be employed without regard to subsection (a) of section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 219), as amended, as may be necessary to carry out the policies and purposes of this title. Experts and consultants or organizations thereof may be employed as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and individuals so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem.

(c) persons employed for duty outside the continental limits of the United States and employees of the United States Government assigned for such duty shall receive compensation at any of the rates provided for the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999) as amended, together with allowances and benefits which shall not exceed those established thereunder, and may be appointed to any class in the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff in accordance with the provisions of such Act;

(d) alien clerks and employees employed for the purpose of performing functions under this title shall be employed in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended;

(e) officers and employees of the United States Government may be detailed to offices or positions to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or foreign government agency or with any international organization: *Provided*, That while so detailed any such person shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his privileges, rights, seniority, or other benefits, an officer or employee of the United States Government and of the United States Government agency from which detailed and shall receive therefrom his regular compensation, which shall be reimbursed to such agency from funds available under this title: *Provided further*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government.

SEC. 508. In order to carry out the provisions of this title, there shall be made available such funds as are hereafter authorized and appropriated from time to time for the purposes of this title: *Provided, however*, That for the purpose of carrying out this title through June 30, 1951, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $45,000,000, including any sums appropriated to carry on the activities of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and technical cooperation programs as defined in section 10 herein, under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 6). Activities provided for under this title may be carried on under such appropriations or under authority granted in appropriations acts to enter into contracts pending enactment of such appropriations. The President may allocate to any United States Government agency any part of any appropriation available for carrying out the purposes of this title. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes of ths title in accordance with authority granted hereunder or under authority governing the activities of the Government agencies to which such funds are allocated.

SEC. 509. The President shall transmit to the Congress an annual report of operations under this title.

SEC. 510. As used in this title, the term "technical cooperation programs" means programs for the international interchange of technical knowledge and skills designed to contribute to the balanced and integrated development of the economic resources and productive capacities of economically underdeveloped areas.

SEC. 511. All authority granted in this title shall expire on June 30, 1955, unless extended by act of Congress.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the junior Senator from Colorado, I send to the desk and ask to have read a substitute to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas, and call it up for action. I believe it would be well to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the end of the bill the following new title:

TITLE V

Whereas there are presently before Congress proposals for stimulating an atmosphere for capital investment in and providing technical assistance for underdeveloped areas of the world, such as Africa, the Near and Far East, and Central and South America; and

Whereas it is contended that Congress has already enacted laws dealing with various phases of these proposals such as: Public Law 643 of the Eightieth Congress, authorizing membership in the World Health Organization; Public Law 863 of the Eightieth Congress, providing for acceptance of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; Public Law 565 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; Public Law 174 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing membership in the Food and Agriculture Organization; Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948; Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing student exchange with foreign countries; Public Law 369 of the Eightieth

Congress creating the Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Public Law 173 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, establishing the Export-Import Bank; Public Law 171 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, providing for United States participation in the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and others; and

Whereas many colleges and universities, religious organizations, business firms, and private agencies, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Near East Foundation, the Institute of International Education, and others are presently engaged in some types of technical assistance to various foreign nations; and

Whereas the magnitude and important nature of these proposals and their relationship to existing legislation, activities, and programs demand intensive study and evaluation prior to congressional action:

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 501. There is therefore created a bipartisan commission for the purpose of making a study of such proposals, existing legislation, activities, and programs intended to stimulate capital investment in and technical assistance for underdeveloped areas of the world.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 502. (a) Number and appointment: The commission shall be composed of 24 members as follows:

(1) Eight appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and four from private life;

(2) Eight appointed by the Vice President, four from the Senate and four from private life; and

(3) Eight appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, four from the House of Representatives and four from private life.

(b) (1) Political affiliation: Of each class of four members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than two members shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(2) In selecting the Republican representatives from the Senate and from the House, the Vice President and Speaker of the House are respectfully requested to give due consideration to the recommendations of the minority leader of the Senate and House, respectively.

(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 503. The commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 504. Thirteen members of the commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 505. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the commission, plus such additional compensation, if any (notwithstanding section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended; 39 Stat. 582; 5 U. S. C. 58), as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 506. The commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 507. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 508. Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in section 509 (b), the commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 509. (a) Investigation: The commission shall make a comprehensive study of the proposals and existing legislation, activities, and programs of the type described in section 501.

(b) Within sixty days after the Eighty-second Congress is convened and organized, the commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress with attention to the relationship between the commission's recommendations and the peace, security, and solvency of the United States.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 510. (a) Hearings and sessions: The commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the commission may deem advisable. Any member of the commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the commission or before such member.

(b) Obtaining official data: The commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman or by a majority of the commission.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the junior Senator from Colorado approach the subject of the point 4 program from somewhat different viewpoints, but both of us believe that the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], to which we have offered a substitute, is the beginning of a point 4 program; or, if it is not that, it is simply a duplication of existing programs.

We, therefore, believe, on the theory that it is, in fact, an opening step to a point 4 program, that the subject is of such paramount interest that it should be submitted to complete study and investigation by a special commission having authority and prestige, such as has the Hoover Commission.

We have proposed a commission which is bipartisan. We hope it will be a commission which can assemble the facts in connection with the subject, which, so far, has been almost completely unexplored.

The Secretary of State, when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, said that this is an underlying move for the full point 4 program. He said it is of overriding importance and that it occupies a place of equality with the other three points of the President's 4-point program. If that be true, we should not be approaching the subject in this glancing side-door way. If it is not true, then, Mr. President, because various aspects of the intended functions of the bill are already covered by existing legislation, such as the Smith-Mundt Act, the Fulbright Act, and a half dozen others which have been described, and it is covered by activities of private organizations, by the Export-Import Bank, the United Nations, there is no point in including a new program of that kind in what we hope is a bill looking to the approaching end of the ECA program.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have only a few minutes remaining of the 10 which have been allotted, but I yield for a brief question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that Mr. Budenz testified a few days ago that the head of the technical staff under the point 4 program was a Communist——

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I have only 5 minutes of the 10 allotted minutes, and I certainly do not intend to get into a Budenz discussion in this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado declines to yield further.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, since, under the State Department's theory, this is a measure of overriding importance, then it is something which affects and has a fateful influence on the whole future of this country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not want to yield, because I have only a few minutes left out of my 5 of the 10 allotted to us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado declines to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee showed that every member of that committee present at the hearings expressed extreme skepticism as to the wisdom of bringing this into the ECA legislation. We need go no further than to consider that testimony. There is no emergent need for this program under its present guise. As I said before, the Smith-Mundt bill has in it everything necessary to carry on the program which is proposed. In addition, there is the Fulbright bill and there is the program

of the United Nations. There is no logical reason for going into it at all at this time.

Before it should be gone into, by reason of its importance, it should receive the finest type of study, and we should have the benefit of the best type of recommendations that can be obtained.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for a moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. This amendment is offered as a substitute. I want to have that made clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment is offered by the junior Senator from Colorado and myself as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas as to point 4.

I am in favor of the principles of the point-4 program. It consists, so far as the Government is concerned, in creating a favorable atmosphere so that private investors and business enterprises may go into other countries and help build up their trade so that they can trade with us. We in the United States want to continue to go ahead. We want to be able to trade to a greater degree with other nations of the world.

There are many difficulties involved in creating such a favorable atmosphere. How many employees can be taken into the other countries? How shall their families live? How can the money be gotten out? How can the goods be gotten in? All those questions arise. It takes time, it takes study to resolve them.

The House bill provides in some detail for such an atmosphere, but the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] provides nothing on that score at all. For the purpose of providing technical aid it creates a new division in the State Department, the director of which is to have a salary of $15,000 a year. As the Senator from Colorado has said, we are providing technical aid in South America through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. We have other operating enterprises throughout the world. We have the Smith-Mundt bill and the Fulbright bill. If we do what the Senator from Texas proposes to do under his amendment, we would permit the Government of the United States to give technical aid anywhere in the world without any restrictions. It would be done as part of this ECA program.

Mr. President, at the present time we are spending $65,000,000 for technical assistance throughout the world. We are spending $27,000,000 more in contributions to the budgets of international organizations, exclusive of technical assistance. We are spending a million and a half dollars for missions to international organizations. That makes a total of approximately $94,000,000. The study proposed by the amendment would not interfere with any of the present government technical programs. It would permit the one in South America to go ahead. It would permit operations under the Smith-Mundt to continue. Under present legislation the amendment might or might not permit assistance to areas around China. There is some question about that. However, I believe that that can be taken care of in other ways.

Mr. President, if the Connally amendment is to be adopted, it seems to me we ought to provide for it a separate authorization. We ought to consider and discuss how far we wish to go with technical aid throughout the world, and not tie it to a plan which is going to stop in 2 years in Europe.

This is a long-range undertaking. Primarily it is an undertaking for private enterprise, for our citizens as private individuals, stimulated through a favorable atmosphere created by the Federal Government, and not merely a technical-assistance program, which may last over many years, carried out entirely with Government funds collected from American taxpayers. We should not create a new division in the State Department for such a purpose. There is reason for it if we go the whole way and create a favorable atmosphere for the point 4 program in the broad conception of the word.

I hope the amendment may be substituted for the Connally amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has correctly pointed out the nature of the Connally amendment. It should be defeated. We shall set up an administrative monstrosity if it is adopted. Since it provides just one more agency and activity for doing precisely what can now be done under the Smith-Mundt Act. At the present time there are provisions for a loyalty check and for an advisory commission, as well in the Smith-Mundt Act. Secondly, we would have a confusion and duplication of authority, plus the fact that all public personnel would rather operate under the proposed Connally amendment, which provides salaries as high as $1,800 a month at $75 per diem fees, while there are no such lush jobs for those rendering the same service under Public Law 402, the Smith-Mundt Act.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, one of the earliest recollections I have of my service in the Senate is that when I first came here, one afternoon the Senate by voice vote appropriated $19,000,000,000 for the prosecution of the war. Today the United States is engaged in a war which is commonly called a cold war. I believe the program proposed by the Senator from Texas is a very fit complement to the ECA program and to the military-assistance pact. It is true that the line which divides the world in many places is a geographical line. However, that line also runs through the minds of men. We can talk about economic strength and military strength, but unless there is a passionate conviction in the minds of men that they are willing to fight and die for freedom, freedom's cause is lost. The inspiration for that fight must come from the United States of America, or it will not come from anywhere. We are going to provide it and we are going to save the world, or we are going to lose it and lose ourselves. Mr. President, no money we could spend would do more for the safety and security of civilization at this moment than would be done by our saying to the world that we hope to bring to them a higher standard of living. Of the 2,000,000,000 people on the face of the world, two-thirds of them will go to bed tonight with empty stomachs.

The sum of money involved in this amendment is not very great when compared to the $16,000,000,000 we are spending on our Military Establishment. I dare say that what is here proposed will do more to bring hope and bring a new standard to our friends than anything else we can do. It is calculated to give technical assistance to them; not to buy things, not to buy materials, but to give of our skills. The giving of those skills will result in a better standard of living, as it has in South America, where the program, although relatively new, has produced really tremendous results.

Something has been said about the fact that this program should be delayed, that we have plenty of time, that a new study should be made, and that, in view of the fact that we have other programs which are working in this field, we should delay the program until the rather grandiose commission which is now proposed can make a survey over the course of a couple of years. But, Mr. President, this project will not wait that long. It is marching faster than the sponsors of the substitute apparently realize. We have a number of programs, it is true, and in this bill provision is made for the coordination of this expanded program in the State Department.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I have only a short time, but I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My suggestion now is that the existing program covers the same field that is covered by this amendment. I suggest again that under this amendment, after there is set up a new organization for doing the same things, now under way under existing law that at the end of 5 years, the new effort will be chopped off, and where will that leave the people who are going to bed hungry at night?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if we already have the existing organization, as has been stated, why does the Senator want a commission of rubbernecks going around studying this matter for 2 or 3 years?

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, Mr. President, the answer given by the Senator from Texas is, as usual, to the point. The programs which already exist are to be continued and coordinated under the Administrator appointed under the proposed point 5. It is a move to coordinate that program; it is a move to extend it; it is a move to strengthen the

moral position of America before the world. Without that moral position we may have all the guns, we may have all the economic strength, we may have all the talk, anyone may desire, but everything will tumble before the onslaught of the wave called communism which is sweeping over the earth.

Mr. President, this is the time to build with this program among the masses in India and in Pakistan and the other undeveloped sections of the earth, and if we build there, and start now, and start under this program, we will be doing a great service for the United States and the world.

Many thoughtful Americans are aware, Mr. President, that the worldwide struggle between freedom and totalitarianism is being decided in part at least in the human mind. Voices, my own included, have been raised, here in the Senate and elsewhere, urging that our Government take positive, constructive steps that will appeal to the peoples of the world and kindle their enthusiasm for the common cause of freedom. It is not enough to be against communism. To win the cold war we must be for something—something that the masses of people throughout the world also are for.

The bill for which I speak is such a measure. It serves notice that we do not intend to defend freedom with arms alone, but that we place our reliance on the enduring values created in the minds and spirits of free men. It means that we are prepared to demonstrate and to share with aspiring people the material and spiritual benefits derived from a free society. The purpose of this legislation is to prove to millions of people that a free society can deliver the goods in the form of increased productivity and a decent standard of living and at the same time exalt the individual, not enslave him. It is based on the assumption that when these truths are manifest to the millions who inhabit the underdeveloped areas and when they learn that they too have a recognizable stake in the preservation of freedom and democracy, then they will join wholeheartedly in the fight against communism.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to point out that when this matter came up in the Committee on Foreign Relations we definitely did not adopt the point 4 program presented by the Secretary of State. We said that we were not prepared to do that, and attach any such long-range program to the ECA program. Therefore we merely saved the exchange of technical knowledge and skills as provided in the amendment. We provided further that contracts or agreements made under the amendment may not run beyond June 30, 1952. Thus it becomes coextensive with the ECA.

The purpose in adopting the amendment was to continue the technical knowledge and skills we were providing in connection with ECA, and so far as I am concerned, if the committee—Connally—amendment can be agreed to, I am perfectly willing to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Massachusetts for a full study of this whole subject, after the ECA is wound up. I think that is in line with what the Senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] suggested in his letter to Mr. Hoffman, where he recommended that we should have a special nonpartisan committee set up to study what we will do with the whole situation after 1952.

I do not think there is any inconsistency in adopting the Connally amendment, and going ahead with the Saltonstall-Millikin amendment to set up the investigating committee. I think both should be done if we are to have a complete picture.

I emphasize again, that the Connally amendment, which is the committee amendment, will expire, so far as contracts are concerned, in 1952, when the ECA expires, and the whole program provided for in the amendment will expire in 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to keep the Senate more than a moment. The amendment I have offered was different from the House provision. The House provision envisions a long program, covering lots of territory, and in the Committee on Foreign Relations we trimmed off everything except the technical aid, the technical assistance.

The truth of the matter is, however, that there are several who are in favor of this scheme in order that they can push foreign investments. If one will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, he will find he brings in the question of foreign investments, seeking to induce Americans to take their money into foreign countries and invest it. Then, when they get their money invested, they will come back and ask the Government to guarantee their foreign investments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. MILLIKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there is no provision anywhere providing for guaranteeing foreign investments. The Export-Import Bank states that under a bill which is before the Committee on Banking and Currency, there will be guaranties against expropriation and convertibility of currency, but there is no guaranty of profits or anything else.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry, I cannot yield further, I have but a few minutes.

If the authors of the substitute amendment did not have something of that kind in their minds, why did they put into the amendment a clause that the question of foreign investments must be studied? When those who may be affected get their foreign investments, they will come back here and ask the Government of the United States to guarantee them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senate to reject the substitute and adopt my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—33

Brewster	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hunt	Robertson
Bridges	Ives	Russell
Butler	Jenner	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kem	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Ecton	Martin	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	Young

NAYS—41

Aiken	Hill	McFarland
Anderson	Hoey	McMahon
Benton	Holland	Magnuson
Connally	Humphrey	Maybank
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ellender	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Kerr	Sparkman
Fulbright	Kilgore	Stennis
George	Leahy	Taylor
Graham	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Green	Lodge	Tydings
Hayden	Lucas	Wiley
Hendrickson	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—22

Capehart	Langer	Pepper
Chapman	Long	Schoeppel
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Darby	McKellar	Vandenberg
Downey	Morse	Watkins
Flanders	Murray	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

So the amendment offered by Mr. MILLIKIN, on behalf of himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to insert at the end of the bill a new title, title V.

Mr. DONNELL and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is the pending question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I send forward an amendment to the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 509. The advancement of technical assistance or the preparation of plans for projects as authorized under this title does not constitute any obligation whatsoever on the part of the Government of the United States to make any loans or grants for the execution or construction of any project or for the completion of any program devised under this title. The President or the person administering this title under his direction shall give written notice to each recipient of funds or beneficary under this title that such assistance in planning or programing shall not be construed as an obligation on the part of the United States to make funds available for the construction or execution of any project.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment, and modify my amendment accordingly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Texas, as modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate not to vote another international program.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the time has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask time of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. CONNALLY. The time has expired. The question is on agreeing to my amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] had expired, and a vote was taken on it. There are 20 minutes of time on the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Chair rule that 10 minutes are permitted to each side on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; 10 minutes to each side.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I know during the present debate no intelligent presentation has been made of the reason for any program of the kind represented by the Connally amendment. I have been present day after day listening to the debate. The proposed new title, so far as I know, has never been elaborately explained, except as it was explained by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] last night when there was nobody present to hear him. Here we have a provision for a brand-new international program at a time when we ought to be stopping international programs and only finishing those which have already assumed a certain importance, to which we are committed.

The amendment opens up a new field for spreading money around the world for technical assistance. Technical assistance is the kind that private organizations have been giving throughout all our history. We have provided engineers, we have provided all kinds of technicians throughout the world whenever there was any possibility of a project being a sound economical project. We have done that at all times. We are prepared to do it now. If projects are sound there are plenty of big American companies prepared to send their experts to assist in their development.

As I read the proposed program, that is not what it provides for. It provides for all kinds of welfare services for the people of the world, of health services of every conceivable kind, of welfare service which is not adequately performed at home. If we are going to provide welfare services I will say I have been interested in seeing to it that such services are more elaborately provided for the people of the United States. But as one reads the program and the report it seems to me they show that it would simply be opening up a kind of wide-open distribution of all kinds of aid to all kinds of people anywhere in the world whom the President might desire to help. Under it it is proposed that $45,000,000 more of the American taxpayers' money be spread around the world in places where there is no particular demand for it. It is simply an idea summoned out of someone's mind of some other way the Government money can be spent, of some other way the United States can go around the world and assume to interfere with the affairs of other people and try to improve the standards of living of other people.

Mr. President, this Nation is wholly incapable of improving the standards of living of the peoples of India and China. That is beyond our capacity. We cannot do it. We are already spending $6,000,000,000 more than we are able to obtain in taxes; $6,000,000,000 more than the President says can possibly economically be imposed on the people of the United States and retain a sound economic system at home.

Why on earth should we go out all over the world undertaking to pass out different kinds of relief and different kinds of American dollars throughout the world?

Mr. President, I am in favor of finishing up the ECA. I am in favor of finishing up the International Children's Fund. I am in favor of cooperating with other nations. I think it is reasonable to present to Congress specific projects which are economically sound, which can help the rest of the world and help us, the kind of projects the Export-Import Bank is considering.

I supported the Export-Import Bank loan to Brazil for the development of a steel mill in Brazil, for the benefit of Brazil and, I think, in the long run for our benefit.

Mr. President, I assume the proposed aid under the amendment would go to at least 50 countries throughout the world. I do not favor the spreading out of America's money for the purpose of advising the peoples of those countries how to operate their departments of health and how to operate their departments of education. Those interested in education have said that all the money proposed to be spent under the amendment should be spent for educational purposes. In the long run only the peoples of other countries can solve their own housing problems and their problems of health and education.

Why on earth should we undertake to enter upon this brand new program? It seems to me to be inconsistent with practically everything the best thought in the United States has advocated. So far as I can see there has been no substantial or persuasive argument made in favor of any such program. This is merely a kind of a tag end, anyway,

to the other idea. The other idea was that we should spread money all over the world actually to bring about improvements in undeveloped countries and help them develop their economy. That has been dropped out. That is not popular enough. Instead of that we are going to take the tag end of that program and hand out money for relief, for health, for education, and for all sorts of purposes and things, and particularly advice, which we think we are so well capable of giving—and we are not. By the way, we have not done too well in our own country. We are simply asked here at the end of the consideration of the bill to distribute under another program $45,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, to the point that this field is already covered, I should like to read briefly from the Smith-Mundt bill. I read from section 2 of the bill:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. Among the means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people, and policies promulgated by the Congress, the President, the Secretary of State, and other responsible officials of Government having to do with matters affecting foreign affairs;

(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

(a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(b) the rendering of technical and other services;

(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences.

The Fulbright bill allows for the exchange of students.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a brief question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Colorado familiar with the fact that on page 9 of the bill as reported by the committee, under the amendment proposed to title IV of the China Aid Act of 1948, by extending that to the general area of China there will be $44,000,000 available for economic assistance, even without this point 4 program, so that for any emergency assistance in that area of the world the funds will be provided without the title V assistance?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I appreciate the Senator's contribution.

Mr. President, I should like to add that about the only novel feature which is provided by this measure over the Smith-Mundt bill is the provision for a coordinator. That simply means that there will be a new job for some person to coordinate activities which are operating with success according to the testimony presented before the committee.

However, there is another feature of this measure, namely, that all the authority granted in this title is proposed to expire on June 30, 1955. There will be a great many new technicians employed under the provisions of this measure, although there already is a shortage in the supply of such technicians. Those technicians will, if employed to do the work proposed to be done under this measure, give up their homes and go abroad and will get settled there, and will start to give technical assistance; but then within 5 years they will be called back to the United States.

What good will that do to the conduct of foreign affairs? What good will any of the steps proposed by this amendment do?

There are already a number of efficient agencies which are working on the job, not only agencies of our Government—and probably half a dozen or a dozen of our Government's own agencies are mentioned in this measure—but probably there are 50 or 75 private agencies working on this job all over the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that the so-called Connally amendment was taken from the House bill, which went a great deal further than this amendment does; and is it not also true that the attempt made by means of this amendment is to do what was done by the Smith-Mundt bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I reply that the amendment is a condensed version of the House bill, providing exactly the same powers, word for word, that were provided in the House bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Colorado no doubt is familiar with the fact that under the title IV program in the ECA Act, when carried on in the program known as the joint Chinese rural rehabilitation program, it is my judgment that under the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee, so far as it relates to the general area of China, which would cover neighboring countries, that type of program could be carried on without the adoption of this title IV proposal?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly. I should like to add that Great Britain has its own technical-assistance program for its colonies and dependencies; Belgium has the same thing; France has the same thing. I believe that Holland has a similar program.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that this amendment would give the President great, broad, blank-check powers to make contributions to the United Nations, whereas it is intended by the Charter of the United Nations that those programs shall be submitted to the Congress and shall receive the approval of Congress before they are put into effect.

I think the amendment proposes a very radical change in the conception of this country's relations to the United Nations, insofar as that provision is concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from California outlined certain things which we could do in China. Certainly the need for work in China is very evident. However, after all, China is not the only area of the world which requires assistance. India, North Africa, Indonesia, and many other parts of the world can be helped inexpensively, without our making any commitments. We can raise the standards of living there by giving technical assistance and technical guidance to those people. By doing so, not only can we raise their standard of living and develop a more stable society there, but we can raise our own trading possibilities with those countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not know what kind of balance sheet we can draw in contrast to the statements which have been made in opposition to the adoption of this amendment. However, I should like to call attention to the fact that under title V it is proposed to provide public health doctors and sanitary engineers to show people who live under deplorable conditions of disease and filth how to practice elementary sanitation, install safe water supplies, and practice effective health measures that we take for granted. We propose to provide consultants in the field of education to help other people bring down illiteracy rates, which in some countries are as high as 90 percent. We propose to provide experienced administrators to help train necessary personnel for the new, understaffed governments now learning to operate public services for the first time.

Mr. President, how do we know we can do those things? I assume that all of us agree that they are worth while. We know that they can be done effectively, with benefit to ourselves and to other countries, because we are doing those things now on a modest scale in various areas of the world. Some of the most spectacular examples are found in the field of health.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. On page 2 of the printed amendment, in lines 17 to 21, I note the following provision:

(c) to make and perform contracts or agreements with, and make advances and grants to, appropriate persons, corporations, or other bodies of persons, or to State, local, or foreign governments for technical cooperation programs.

Under that provision, apparently both local and State governments both in foreign countries and in the United States would be eligible to accept the benefits of this provision. Is that correct?

Mr. McMAHON. I believe that is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Connecticut mean to say to the Senate that this amendment proposes to launch an additional and a new local and American welfare program, in addition to an international program?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I misunderstood the Senator's question. That provision of the amendment refers to foreign countries and their State and local subdivisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield one more minute to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 minute additional.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, let us consider, in this connection, the field of malaria, for instance. Malaria has been an immemorial enemy of man. It affects 300,000,000 people every year, and kills 3,000,000 of them. It is predominantly a rural disease; and by disabling millions of agricultural workers, it seriously limits the production of food crops.

Malaria has been a scourge of Greece since the days of Hippocrates. In 1942 there were at least 2,000,000 cases of malaria in Greece. In 1946 the UNRRA launched a large-scale antimalaria campaign there, with DDT spraying and the draining of swamps. The program has been continued by ECA. By 1948, the number of malaria cases had been reduced to about 50,000, with an estimated saving of 30,000 to 60,000 man-days of work a year. This is equivalent to adding 100,000 to 200,000 workers a year to the labor force, without the addition of more mouths to feed.

Mr. President, that is an indication of what this program is designed to do.

I insist that by means of this proposal we will do more to stop the march of communism in those areas than we will do by means of any amount of money we may appropriate in connection with other provisions. Under this proposal, in connection with the ECA, we shall do more, dollar for dollar, in making progress along those lines than we can do in any other way in these countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Jersey want some time?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely want to make one or two observations. I have listened to the presentations by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Massachusetts, in which it has been said that this program is not needed because we already have this kind of program in operation. Then I listened to the Senator from Ohio saying that we are opening up an entirely new field of activity under this program. There seems to be some conflict. I think it would be well, for the understanding of the Senate, if those who are in opposition to title V would come to some agreement as to whether we are opening up an entirely new field, or whether we have in operation already a program such as this.

I also heard the comment made that there has been no intelligent presentation made as to the need of this program. Having some sense of personal pride, I should like to refer the Senator from Ohio to the remarks as of yesterday, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which I tried to make some presentation of the need for title V.

One further observation: There has been at least one remark, possibly two, made by the Senator from Ohio, that this program would be entering upon a broad, new welfare-service enterprise. I think it should be made crystal-clear that this program is limited specifically to an outstanding surplus this Nation has. It is limited to the exchange of technical assistance, technical personnel and skill and scientific knowledge, and I think the Senator from Connecticut has surely stated the case in the affirmative. He has stated that what we are doing under this program, if enacted, is not to offer a hand-out, it is not to offer charity, but it is to offer our knowledge, to offer our scientific information, to work with countries, other than China, countries such as Indonesia, Pakistan, India, Burma, and Siam, the countries of South America, and the countries of Africa, to help them help themselves, but to offer our scientists to work with their scientists, to offer our educators to work with their educators. It is a help program of self-help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator for Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. We need an arithmetician as well as a Parliamentarian. Mr. President, I hope very much that the Senate will adopt this amendment. It was very carefully studied and considered in the Committee on Foreign Relations, in view of the provisions in the House bill which were trimmed down to the very bone.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If there was a man in America who wanted to go along with the Democratic Party, that man is myself. But I do not know where we are going. Where are we going to get the money? How much is this going to cost, when it goes into operation?

Mr. CONNALLY. Thirty-five million dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is $35,000,000 for plans for the present year; but, when we make the further plans——

Mr. CONNALLY. We are going to get the money out of the Appropriations Committee; that is where we are going to get it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. For that reason, I am not going to vote for this amendment, under the circumstances. I have gone the limit.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry if I offended the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has not offended me, but I am merely replying to his statement. I am opposed to the amendment, and I shall oppose it in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will probably kill it, if he opposes it in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall do my best, I assure the Senator. I think we are going wild, we are going mad, and I do not intend to go along with any such process.

Mr. CONNALLY. We shall certainly miss the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may miss me, but I am going to keep my record straight. I am not going along on this thing.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has a very fine and splendid record, and I hope he will keep it untarnished and unblemished, legislatively, socially, and otherwise. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I cannot yield further, but the Senators who have been speaking, including the Senator from Colorado—if I may have his attention—the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Ohio, all want to say that we already have all these things, making references to the Smith-Mundt bill. I have heard of the Smith-Mundt bill. Of course, we have it. But do we need nothing more? The substitute amendment provided for the appointment of a commission consisting of 24 people—24 distinguished, outstanding people, who were to find out what we already have. If we need a mechanism like that, where are we going, I ask the Senator from Tennessee? If it would take a new Hoover Commission—I hope it might be better than the last Hoover Commission. The Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct. But to find out what we need, Mr. President, we have already some of the features of this program in operation, and $10,000,000 is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad my time has expired, and that all the time has expired. My friends are ready for a vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, following line 20, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 511. No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties by the Government un-

der this act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State.

And to renumber the sections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope we will not confuse the situation. We have plenty of investigations now.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Am I correct in believing that I have 5 or 10 minutes in which to discuss the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall not take 10 minutes. This is a very simple amendment. It would simply write into the Connally amendment precisely the identical protective language which was written into the Smith-Mundt bill and in other ECA and foreign-aid legislation. I hope the chairman of the committee will accept it. The absence of this language from the Connally amendment comprises the major difference between existing law—the Smith-Mundt Act—and the so-called Connally amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will take it to conference.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator agrees to it, my speech is over.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know what will happen to it after it goes to conference.

Mr. MUNDT. On that basis, I think perhaps we should have a vote, if the Senator is going to take it to conference so he can show the conferees the extent of the Senate's support.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I offer several amendments to the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. They are in the nature of clarifying amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 4, line 20, before "employees," to insert "officers and."

On page 4, line 21, to strike out "shall" and insert a comma, followed by "may."

On page 4, lines 24 and 25, to strike out "together with" and insert "may receive."

On page 4, line 25, to strike out "it shall."

On page 5, line 1, to strike out "exceed" and insert "in excess of."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Humphrey	Magnuson
Anderson	Hunt	Myers
Benton	Ives	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Kerr	Sparkman
Frear	Kilgore	Taylor
Fulbright	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Graham	Lehman	Tobey
Green	Lodge	Tydings
Hayden	Lucas	Wiley
Hendrickson	McFarland	
Hill	McMahon	

NAYS—36

Brewster	George	Martin
Bricker	Gurney	Millikin
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler	Holland	Robertson
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Stennis
Donnell	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Eastland	McClellan	Wherry
Ecton	McKellar	Williams
Ferguson	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—23

Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Langer	Pepper
Chavez	Long	Schoeppel
Darby	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Flanders	Morse	Watkins
Gillette	Murray	Withers
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	

So Mr. CONNALLY's amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment relating to China, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That not more than 10 percent of such funds (including the $50,000,000 mentioned in the foregoing proviso) shall be available for relief on humanitarian grounds, through the American Red Cross, or other voluntary relief agencies, in any place in China suffering from the effects of natural calamity, under such safeguards as the President shall direct to assure nondiscriminatory distribution according to need and appropriate publicity as to source and scope of the assistance being furnished by the United States."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is now in the relief funds which were voted for China some time ago $94,000,000 unexpended. The purpose of this amendment is simply to make available, if the President so desires, as much as 10 percent of that sum, which would be approximately $9,000,000, for humanitarian aid in China because of the famine and misery prevailing there. It would be administered through the American Red Cross or any other voluntary organization.

That is all I have to say regarding the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I join with the able Senator from Texas in supporting this amendment. It will take from the funds which are already available not to exceed 10 percent which can be used, as the Senator from Texas has pointed out,

for the humanitarian purpose of relieving famine sufferers, and to be supervised by American voluntary relief organizations. I think it is a good and a humanitarian amendment, and should be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I send to the desk and ask to have stated an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment was read earlier. Does the Senator want it read again?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would suggest that it be not read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, viz: At the end of the bill insert the following new title:

"TITLE VI

"Whereas there are presently before Congress proposals for stimulating an atmosphere for capital investment in and providing technical assistance for underdeveloped areas of the world, such as Africa, the Near and Far East, and Central and South America; and

"Whereas it is contended that Congress has already enacted laws dealing with various phases of these proposals such as: Public Law 643 of the Eightieth Congress, authorizing membership in the World Health Organization; Public Law 863 of the Eightieth Congress, providing for acceptance of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; Public Law 565 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; Public Law 174 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing membership in the Food and Agriculture Organization; Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948; Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, authorizing student exchange with foreign countries; Public Law 369 of the Eightieth Congress creating the Institute of Inter-American Affairs; Public Law 173 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, establishing the Export-Import Bank; Public Law 171 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, providing for United States participation in the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and others; and

"Whereas many colleges and universities, religious organizations, business firms, and private agencies, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Near East Foundation, the Institute of International Education, and others are presently engaged in some types of technical assistance to various foreign nations; and

"Whereas the magnitude and important nature of these proposals and their relationship to existing legislation, activities, and programs demand intensive study and evaluation prior to congressional action:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

"SEC. 501. There is therefore created a bipartisan commission for the purpose of making a study of such proposals, existing legislation, activities, and programs intended to stimulate capital investment in and technical assistance for underdeveloped areas of the world.

"MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 502. (a) Number and appointment: The commission shall be composed of 24 members as follows:

"(1) Eight appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and four from private life;

"(2) Eight appointed by the Vice President, four from the Senate and four from private life; and

"(3) Eight appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, four from the House of Representatives and four from private life.

"(b) (1) Political affiliation: Of each class of four members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than two members shall be from each of the two major political parties.

"(2) In selecting the Republican representatives from the Senate and from the House, the Vice President and Speaker of the House are respectfully requested to give due consideration to the recommendations of the minority leader of the Senate and House, respectively.

"(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 503. The commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"QUORUM

"SEC. 504. Thirteen members of the commission shall constitute a quorum.

"COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 505. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

"(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the commission, plus such additional compensation, if any (notwithstanding section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended; 39 Stat. 582; 5 U. S. C. 58), as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

"(c) Members from the private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 506. The commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

"EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 507. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 508. Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in section 509 (b), the commission shall cease to exist.

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 509. (a) Investigation: The commission shall make a comprehensive study of the proposals and existing legislation, activities, and programs of the type described in section 501.

"(b) Within 60 days after the Eighty-second Congress is convened and organized, the commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress with attention to the relationship between the commission's recommendations and the peace, security, and solvency of the United States.

"POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 510. (a) Hearings and sessions: The commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the commission may deem advisable. Any member of the commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the commission or before such member.

"(b) Obtaining official data: The commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman or by a majority of the commission."

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is the same amendment which was offered as a substitute to the Connally amendment, except that it has been conformed, it will be noted, so that it reads "Title VI." It would add a new title to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that if this amendment is adopted, the section numbers may be conformed accordingly.

Mr. President, so that Senators may realize the attitude of the State Department with respect to what we are doing here, I should like to read briefly from the testimony given Secretary Acheson before the committee. He said:

The proposed measure which is now being considered as an amendment to ECA legislation is the underlying legislative authority for carrying out a program to assist the people of undeveloped areas of the world in their efforts to develop their economic resources. It is an integral part of the general program outlined by the President as a basis for assuring peace and personal freedom in the world. This program contains four interrelated courses of action.

The Secretary describes the other three. Then he goes on to say:

The fourth course is the program which you are now considering.

Therefore, in the State Department view—and they would carry out these laws—we are introducing the first step to point 4. As I said yesterday if this is an isolated measure, if it has no relation to point 4, if it has no more than a 5 year life, we are writing prescriptions for people with no drug store available. I think we must consider this further realistic fact. The State Department will consider the result of these studies and observations which are authorized

as a preliminary basis for the rest of point 4.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in writing to Mr. Hoffman, suggested that before we go into these far-reaching plans that we have a study committee similar to that which preceded the ECA program. I hope that the Commission we are proposing would reach the prestige of a Hoover Commission. The committee would be in a position, without interfering with anything that has been done here today to examine all the existing laws on the subject, examine into the private activities on the subject, examine into the Mundt bill, the Fulbright bill, and the Connally amendment. We would get a study started which would come back in time for us to legislate, if we should decide to legislate, before the ECA program is ended in 1952. If it should be decided that there should be some kind of carry-on program, we would be equipped with the facts upon which we could reach our decision. I earnestly urge that we may now approve the amendment, because there is no conflict in it with anything that is in the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The point is that the fact that it is called a substitute at one time and a new amendment at another time, does not change the fact that the Senate has already voted on it. It is identically the same amendment. There is not one "i" dotted, not one "t" crossed, not one period, not one comma in this amendment that is different from anything contained in the previous amendment. It is identically the same proposition. It is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the precedents of the Senate, the point of order is overruled. Previously the amendment was offered as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Texas. The situation now presented is that it is presented as an independent amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I claim the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, may I be advised as to the present parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I still have some time, I believe.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. How much time do I have, please?

The VICE PRESIDENT. One more minute.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will accept the amendment and take it to conference. I am heartily in sympathy with the point 4 program as the President outlined it in his state of the Union message. What we have adopted in the Connally amendment is a very small section of that whole program. The program is not for 2 years or 5 years, but for the next 25 or 50 years, and it is the basis on which our country has gone ahead and the basis on which we want to keep it going ahead. We want to make the world a better place in which citizens can trade, and thereby better the lot of many people throughout the world. It is a great program, with many problems involved. It deserves the careful study of the best brains of our country, and on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield the remainder of my time to the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I voted in favor of the Connally amendment because I think no one can build as much good will toward America as American doctors and American engineers. As time goes on these countries can be prosperous, but I feel that more is required than technical assistance and that the amendment for which we have voted this afternoon is not enough to carry out a long-range program. There must be private enterprise. A very far-reaching undertaking is involved. We need the best brains we can get. The amendment which we voted merely confines itself to one small facet of this whole subject. I think the amendment of the Senator from Colorado and of my colleague from Massachusetts is extremely well thought out and can lead to good results. I hope the amendment will be adopted. I shall vote for it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am reminded of the gentleman who became so excited that he rushed out, got on his horse, and rode off in all directions. The sponsors of the bill do not even agree among themselves. The Senator from Massachusetts is in good faith. He is for the program, for expanding the program, and for studying it over a period of years. The Senator from Colorado is not for that. He is for barely enough to sort of smell around and investigate a little with a commission of 24 investigators to find out something that he does not want to do at all. The Senator from Colorado is not for either one of these plans in their broad aspects on a long-range basis. He is not for that. The object of the commission is to slow down the program and to tire everyone out. The object is to have points of no quorum made in the commission. Slow them up. Call it off. He would not kill anyone. He would merely cut all their veins and arteries and let them bleed. If they had no more sense than to bleed to death, that would be their own fault.

I hope the Senate will vote down this amendment. Under my amendment this question will be studied all the time. It will be under trial. It will be under investigation. We shall find out what is being done. We are already finding out what is being done. $10,000,000 is being expended in Latin America. We have proven a great many valuable things under that program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully point out to the Senator from Texas, for whom I have the highest regard, that there are many divergent points of view in this country. There may be points of view in one State which are against the idea of a business enterprise spreading outside this country. On the other hand, there may be business interests in another State which want to spread out their industries in another land and to strengthen them there. All those divergent points of view are capable of study and of being worked out.

If the President's program as set forth in the state of the Union message in January means anything, it does not cover only technical aid. That is all right so far as it goes, and in its way, but the program must be much broader than that. The amendment of the Sentor from Texas merely provides for technical aid without any means of studying this big program which will mean so much to the private citizens of the United States for years to come.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for that question. It is a piercing question. [Laughter.]

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a question right on the point. It is a question which just went through the mind of the Senator from Texas and went on out the rear. [Laughter.]

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would simply say that my question to the Senator was just as good as when he said the horses were going in opposite directions. My question was a statement, and not a question. It was going in one direction.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I realize that we have many things to learn, but the Senate is capable of finding them out. If we are not, we ought to go home. We ought not to ask the people to put us on the pay roll if we are not capable of determining a question of this kind. It does not require 24 people, 24 tax eaters, to tell how to administer a little, simple program similar to the one we are already administering. We are administering a similar program in Latin America. We are sending only $10,000,000 there, but we are generating movements which are going to be valuable to the people of Latin America, and to the people of the United States as well.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for himself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator

from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Ferguson	Millikin
Brewster	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hunt	Smith, Maine
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Kefauver	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Thye
Donnell	Lodge	Tobey
Douglas	McCarthy	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	Wiley
Ecton	Martin	Young

NAYS—39

Anderson	Hoey	McKellar
Benton	Holland	McMahon
Byrd	Humphrey	Magnuson
Connally	Jenner	Myers
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Frear	Kem	Russell
Fulbright	Kerr	Sparkman
George	Leahy	Stennis
Graham	Lehman	Taylor
Green	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McClellan	Tydings
Hill	McFarland	Williams

NOT VOTING—24

Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Chapman	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Langer	Pepper
Darby	Long	Schoeppel
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Maybank	Vandenberg
Gillette	Morse	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Murray	Withers

Footnote: In the daily RECORD of May 5, 1950, the result of the vote on the amendment proposed by Mr. MILLIKIN for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL was announced—yeas 32, nays 39, and Mr. BREWSTER was recorded as not voting. On May 10, 1950, on the statement by Mr. BREWSTER that he was present and voted "yea", at his request and by unanimous consent, the RECORD and Journal were ordered to be corrected so as to indicate that he so voted. Therefore the vote and the totals have been corrected accordingly.

So the amendment offered by Mr. MILLIKIN on behalf of himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and myself, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add a new title at the end of the bill, as follows:

TITLE VI

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

SEC. 501. In order to enable the President through June 30, 1951, to carry out the purpose of the International Children's Emergency Fund Assistance Act of 1948 (title II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948), the date "1950," wherever it appears in such act, is hereby amended to read "1951."

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 502. Funds appropriated by the second paragraph of title I of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949, shall remain available through June 30, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator offer this as an amendment to title V?

Mr. TAFT. I offer it to come at the end of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be title VI.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. TAFT. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator take the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered A, dated 5–1–50, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 6, it is proposed to insert a new subsection (c) to section 104, reading as follows:

(c) Section 112 (1) of such act is amended by adding thereto the following sentence:

"A bulk purchase within the meaning of this subsection does not include the purchase of commodities customarily sold in containers or packaged form."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I agree to take that amendment to conference—not necessarily with a return ticket.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The amendment has the effect of restoring the interpretation, first placed by the ECA Administrator on the meaning of the phrase "purchase in bulk of any commodities," as will appear from the letter dated August 4, 1948, to the Administrator of ECA, from Frank L. Yates, Acting Comptroller General of the United States, which I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 4, 1948.

The ADMINISTRATOR,
Economic Cooperation Administration.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Reference is made to letter of July 21, 1948, from the Acting Administrator, requesting to be advised whether certain interpretations placed by the Economic Cooperation Administration on section 202 of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949, Public Law 793, approved June 28, 1948, are correct.

Section 202 of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, supra, provides as follows:

"No funds made available under the authority of this act shall be used for [the purchase in bulk of any commodities] (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended), at prices higher than the [market price prevailing in the United States at

the time of the purchase] adjusted for [differences in the cost of transportation to destination], quality, and terms of payment: *Provided*, That no funds available under this act shall be used for the purchase of wool other than from existing stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such stocks are exhausted."

Specifically, you request my opinion as to the correctness of the interpretation placed by your agency on the words in brackets in the above-quoted language.

It is stated to be the view of your Agency that the phrase "purchase in bulk of any commodities" means the purchase, for movement as bulk cargo in ocean vessels, tank cars, and similar methods of transportation, of commodities and raw materials, such as coal, grain, oil, sulphur ore, pig iron, pulpwood, etc., but that it does not cover the purchase of manufactured goods such as steel pipe, copper sheet, lumber, nor commodities customarily sold in containers or packaged form, such as flour in sacks, raw cotton in bales, mercury in flasks, or petroleum products in cans or drums.

The foreign aid appropriation bill as passed by the House of Representatives provided in section 202 that—

"No funds * * * shall be used by any procurement agency of the United States Government for the purchase of any commodities * * * at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase."

The said language was deleted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in its consideration of the measure, and the reasons therefor are stated at page 15 of Senate Report No. 1626 as follows:

"4. The committee has removed a House provision that banned the purchase of commodities for the program at prices higher than those prevailing in the United States. Although the Senate committee is entirely sympathetic with the intent of the House, it considers the House provision to be unworkable. Language has been written in this report to instruct the Administrator to act in accord with the House intent."

The language referred to is found at page 11 of the report where it is stated to be the belief of the committee that no funds should be used to purchase commodities, except under limited special circumstances, at more than the current market price in the United States, making adjustments for differences in cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment. It is stated further that, while some deviations from this general price policy will occur, the Administrator is expected to limit strictly material deviations therefrom and to consider flagrant or constant violation thereof as reason to terminate assistance to the country involved, as provided for by section 118 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, Public Law 472, approved April 3, 1948. The language now contained in section 202 of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act was inserted by the committee of conference between the House and Senate on the bill, and it is stated by the managers on the part of the House at page 9 of the conference Report (House Rept. No. 2440) that such action "restores provision of the House establishing price limitations on commodities purchased with funds provided for in the act."

From the foregoing, it is apparent that the prohibition in section 202 was intended as a general price limitation policy to prevent extravagant spending of money appropriated by the act. Nowhere in the hearings, reports, or debates on the bill is it suggested that the applicability of section 202 was intended to be determined by the type of commodities purchased. If, as seems evident, the purpose of the section was to establish a price limitation, the criterion for determining its applicability properly should be based on the quantity of goods purchased rather than on their character. In view of the foregoing, I am of the opinion that the restrictions of section 202 are applicable to purchases in large quantities of all commodities.

With respect to the maximum price specified by section 202, namely, "the market price prevailing in the United States," it is stated to be the view of your agency that the said price is any price which is within the limits of the quoted prices in the United States at which the commodity is available for export in sufficient quantity on the day as of which the purchase price is established, or, in the absence of such quoted prices, the price at which the commodity is available in the United States for export in sufficient quantity on such day. It is stated further that section 202 is deemed to be inapplicable in cases where the commodity is not available for export from the United States in grades and quantities required. The foregoing interpretation as to what constitutes the market price prevailing appears to be consonant with the purpose and language of section 202, and, in my opinion, is correct.

The phrase "at the time of the purchase" is interpreted by your agency to mean the day as of which the purchase price, or the method for determining the price, is established between the buyer and the seller. In the case of United States Government procurement, it is stated that the time of purchase is considered to be the time the Government department or agency buys from the private seller, rather than the day as of which the Economic Cooperation Administration procures the commodities from or transfers funds to the Government procurement agency. Also, it is stated that, in the case of purchases made by a Government procurement agency over a period of time, the weighted average price of the purchases made by the Government procurement agency will be taken as the price at which the Economic Cooperation Administration procures. You are advised that the administrative interpretation of the language in question appears to be correct.

The provision in section 202 for adjustment in the prevailing United States market price for differences in the cost of transportation to destination is interpreted by your Agency as requiring a comparison between the cost of the commodity, where purchased, plus the cost of transportation to ultimate destination, and the market price in the United States plus the cost of transportation from the United States to the same destination. I am of the opinion that the administrative interpretation of this part of the section is correct.

There was transmitted with the aforesaid letter a draft of a regulation which your Agency proposes to issue in connection with the administration of section 202, which, inter alia, requires (1) the supplier to furnish a certificate, in the case of purchases in bulk, that "to the best of his information and belief, the purchase price is no higher than the market price * * * prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase," and (2) provides for full reimbursement by participating countries of any improper or unauthorized payments upon demand by the administrator. The letter requests a ruling as to whether compliance with the proposed procedure will be sufficient to relieve from any liability for violation of section 202, (a) those suppliers who have acted in good faith and have been paid either by the Economic Cooperation Administration or by a bank, (b) the banks which make payments against reimbursement by the ECA, and (c) the disbursing officers of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

It is recognized that in making certificates of compliance with section 202 of the act, it might be impossible in many instances—especially in the case of some foreign suppliers—for suppliers to determine accurately the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of purchase. However, in order to assure that suppliers will act in good faith in fixing their purchase prices with relation to prevailing market prices in the United States, it is felt that the regulation proposed should require a certification by the supplier that, on the basis of information obtained from such sources as are available to him, the purchase price, to the best of his knowledge and belief, is no higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase, adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality and terms of payment. Hence, you are advised that, if the proposed certificate be modified accordingly, this Office will accept the same as sufficient to relieve suppliers, banks, and certifying or disbursing officers of the Economic Cooperation Administration from liability from violations of section 202 of the act in absence of fraud or bad faith otherwise on their part. In such connection it is noted that the proposed regulations submitted with the aforesaid recognize that, in administering the act, it is the duty of your Administration to take such steps as may be taken administratively to insure compliance with said section 202.

Respectfully,

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General
of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendment be incorporated in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

The explanation is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF SENATOR ELLENDER'S AMENDMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Cotton is not a bulk commodity. Each bale is tagged with an individual number at the gin and is again tagged at the compress. It retains its individual entity until after arrival at the cotton mill. It is generally shipped from this country in units of 100 bales with a four-letter mark, yet the tags are retained as is evidenced by the fact that in the case of claims on items such as false-packs, the bale number is generally given when the claim is made.

In a letter dated July 21, 1948 from the Acting Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration to the Comptroller General it was stated that ECA did not consider bulk commodities would include the purchase of manufactured goods such as steel pipe, copper sheet, lumber nor commodities customarily sold in containers, or packaged form, such as flour in sacks, raw cotton in bales, mercury in flasks, or petroleum products in cans or drums.

The Comptroller General, in a letter dated August 4, 1948 addressed to the Administrator of ECA, ruled that the restrictions as to price limitations, based on section 202, are applicable to purchases in large quantities of all commodities, quoting section 202 in support of his decision.

Section 202 of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act is in part as follows:

"No funds made available under the authority of this Act shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498), as amended), at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment."

In further support of his decision he stated:

"The foreign-aid appropriation bill as passed by the House of Representatives provided in section 202 that—

"'No funds * * * shall be used by any procurement agency of the United States Government for the purchase of any commodities * * * at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase * * *.'

"The said language was deleted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in its consideration of the measure, and the reasons therefor are stated at page 15 of Senate Report No. 1626 as follows:

"'4. The committee has removed a House provision that banned the purchase of commodities for the program at prices higher than those prevailing in the United States. Although the Senate committee is entirely sympathetic with the intent of the House, it considers the House provision to be unworkable. Language has been written in this report to instruct the Administrator to act in accord with the House intent.'"

ECA in following the decision of the Comptroller General as to the price limitations on all commodities has adopted rules and procedures pertaining to cotton which have proved to be unworkable, as the Senate committee stated.

Rules and procedures are as follows:

1. Statement of sales price and execution of beneficiary certificate certifying that the sale price is no higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at time of purchase, adjusted for differences in the costs of transportation, quality, and terms of payment.

There is no objection on the part of exporters to this requirement.

2. Requirement that all cotton exported to ERP countries, be sampled and forwarded to the PMA governmental classing office in Memphis, Tenn. The percentage of bales sampled varies with the size of the shipment. For lots of 100 bales or over, 1 out of every 10 bales must be sampled.

It has been the custom for many years, recognized by the trade, sellers and buyers, that 100 percent of a shipment be arbitrated if there is a difference of opinion as to the quality.

3. The PMA Classing Office in Memphis is required to class the samples of all the shipments and report its findings to ECA.

PMA classers are not permitted to value cotton but must class it against established standards for grade and color. Differences between grades and staples are very wide. Strict Low Middling is worth from 375 points, or $18.75 per bale, to 425 points, or $21.25 per bale, under the next higher grade, Middling. Many well-known descriptions of the trade, better than Strict Low Middling, but not equal to Middling, will sell freely at from 75 points, or $3.75 per bale, to 150 points, or $7.50 per bale, under the value of Middling. PMA under its regulations must class this cotton as Strict Low Middling with differences ranging from $18.75 per bale to $21.25 per bale.

If through ECA rules intermediate grades cannot be sold and shipped to ERP countries without the serious probability of substantial claims eventually being made to the ERP countries, a serious loss will be experienced by cotton producers. It is not good salesmanship for the exporters, and it is not to the advantage of the cotton producers to make sales with the realization that ECA will in all probability make claims to the purchasing mill's government, which in turn will take the claim up with the cotton mill.

For example: Middling Leaf, Strict Low Middling color is currently worth approximately 150 points under the value of Middling. Under the regulations governing PMA classers they have no choice; they must class cotton of such a description as Strict Low Middling or approximately 375 points under the value of Middling, a value of 225 points, or $11.25 per bale, under the current market value of the quality sold. If ECA follows through on its formula it will eventually eliminate the sale of intermediate grades to ERP countries, which would eventually mean that the farmer would be severely penalized in the sale of such qualities.

4. Upon receipt of the PMA report on the classification ECA values the cotton on the basis of the published differences for grades. It makes no allowances for cotton better than the class sold, but does take a full allowance on cotton classed at a lower grade than the quality sold.

While there are no rules requiring an offset for bales in the shipment of a better quality than the description sold, many foreign mills consider the value of the cotton as a whole offsetting some of the lower grades against some of the better grades.

5. In arriving at a market price in the United States ECA uses the cotton quotations of the 10 designated spot markets as published daily by the United States Department of Agriculture. These quotations are prepared by committees of cotton men at each of the 10 designated spot markets. This quotation sheet states: "Quotations are for mixed lots, equal to the official standards, uncompressed, in public warehouses."

The quotations are supposed to represent the avergae values being paid by the cotton shipper to the farmer for various grades and staples. These quotations do not fairly represent and are not intended to represent the sale value of cotton to cotton mills in the United States. The Department of Agriculture does issue quotations on the sale value of cotton in southeastern mills, but ECA objects to the use of this sales quotation sheet on the basis that the information is secured from cotton shippers which may not be dependable and that the quotations are not sufficiently broad.

6. After arriving at the PMA class, based upon 10 percent of the shipment, and after taking at the buying market value as above mentioned, ECA then allows inadequate expense of handling and 40 points overhead cost and profit. If the sale price is higher than the value of the cotton as classed by PMA, plus the estimated cost of handling and shipping as compared with the quoted buying market value, a claim is then made against the shipment.

ECA's estimate of the handling cost is some $5 per bale lower than the average handling cost. Its allowance of 40 points to cover overhead, cost, and profit, approximately 1⅛ percent of the sale price, borders on the ridiculous. It is estimated that the overhead cost of the average firm in the handling of cotton is 30 points, which upon ECA's formula, would allow the shipper 10 points or 50 cents per bale profit on an investment of approximately $150 to $175 per bale.

The formula, in effect, provides that the estimated 50 cents per bale profit must take care of any losses on sales made. It is believed that every exporter at times experiences substantial losses on certain sales.

Under the ECA formula, with the restrictions placed on PMA classers, compared with the customary purchase and sale of intermediate grades, with the use of a buying rather than a selling value and with the allowance of inadequate cost, overhead, and profit, claims probably will be made on a large percentage of the cotton shipped.

ECA representatives in most, if not all, ERP countries have been quite active in questioning the quality of cotton being received as compared with the quality of cotton purchased and have repeatedly warned the cotton mills in ERP countries, as well as their governments, that claims will be made by ECA on shipments, which, based on its formula, indicate that the purchase price was higher than prices in the United States.

The Raw Cotton Commission of England, a governmental agency handling all of the cotton exported to England, was recently advised by an ECA representative that a certain shipment was not up to the quality sold and that Raw Cotton Commission would have to make a claim against the shipper of some $1,100 and remit to ECA, or that amount would have to be collected from the English Government. The claim of approximately $1,100 was based upon PMA class. The Raw Cotton Commission had classed the cotton upon its arrival, and based upon its class, had previously made a claim for some $90 which was paid by the shipper. The difference between PMA's class and RCC's class was more than $5 per bale.

A mill owner in Holland, as well as the Cotton Control of the French Government have been approached by ECA representatives in the same way as was the Raw Cotton Commission of England although in each case the quality in question had been accepted as satisfactory by the buyer.

The buying of cotton by foreign mills and the selling of cotton by American exporters has been mutually and satisfactorily worked out for generations. All export cotton is sold subject to arbitration by recognized arbitration committees. Each bale is sampled upon its arrival at the port or at the mill. If the quality of the cotton received by the mill is, in its opinion, not up to the quality sold, the mill has the right to make an amicable settlement or to demand an arbitration. If the arbitration results are not satisfactory to the buyer or the seller, either has the right to appeal the decision of the arbitration committee to an established appeal committee.

ECA, despite the regulations PMA classers must work under, considers it a court of the last resort for the exporters, for the foreign governments, and for the individual foreign mill.

There probably is no commodity business more competitive than the cotton business. There are more than 150 American cotton exporters who are actively competing for business throughout the world. With the exception of fraud or collusion, which, if any, is nominal, the competitive price at which cotton is purchased in ERP countries is a proper safeguard as to ECA grants for cotton.

It should be remembered that no cotton mill in ERP countries is receiving a grant from ECA. They must pay to their governments their currency to cover the value of the cotton at the exchange rates for dollars fixed by their country. There is no reason why cotton mills in ERP countries should now deviate from their long-established policy in force since they commenced buying American grown cotton at the lowest possible competitive price, quality considered.

When ECA make a claim against any shipment, which through its formula it finds the price paid was higher than the market value in the United States, it requires the recipient country to reimburse ECA for the amount of the claim. When ECA receives a credit in dollars for the amount of the claim it promptly again credits the cotton fund of the recipient government with the amount involved. From this it would seem that the only result of cotton being considered as subject to the bulk commodity price limitation is irritation, suspicion, and ill-will which must eventually react against the use of American grown cotton and will prove detrimental to the farmer.

The cotton exporters have no ulterior motive in suggesting the amendment. The Comptroller General in his letter of August 4, 1948 states:

"It is recognized that in making certificates of compliance with section 202 of the act, it might be impossible in many instances—especially in the case of some foreign suppliers—for suppliers to determine accurately the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of purchase. However, in order to assure that suppliers will act in good faith in fixing their purchase prices

with relation to prevailing market prices in the United States, it is felt that the regulation proposed should require a certification by the supplier that, on the basis of information obtained from such sources as are available to him, the purchase price, to the best of his knowledge and belief, is no higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase, adjusted for difference in the cost of transportation to destination, quality and terms of payment. Hence, you are advised that, if the proposed certificate be modified accordingly, this Office will accept the same as sufficient to relieve suppliers, banks, and certifying or disbursing officers of the ECA from liability from violations of section 202 of the act in absence of fraud or bad faith otherwise on their part."

All exporters are required to sign the beneficiary certificate.

LOAN TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES ON BUSINESS BASIS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered D, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, assistance rendered under such act to any participating country after the date of enactment of this act shall be on the basis of loans only; except that this subsection shall not apply to assistance rendered in the form of food or medicines for the relief of human suffering in a participating country if the Administrator finds, and the President approves such finding, that due to temporary conditions an emergency exists in such country which the Government thereof is unable to meet.

(b) All such loans shall be fully and adequately secured. The Administrator, under such terms and conditions as he shall prescribe, may take over or provide for the administration and liquidation of any collateral accepted by him as security for such loans. Such loans may be made directly upon promisory notes or by way of discount or rediscount of obligations tendered for the purpose, or otherwise, in such form and in such amount and at such interest or discount rates as the Administrator may approve. Each such loan may be made for a period not exceeding 3 years, and the Administrator may from time to time extend the time of payment of any such loan, through renewal, substitution of new obligations, or otherwise, but the time for such payment shall not be extended beyond 10 years from the date upon which such loan was made originally. Such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this amendment would require each participating country to agree that any further aid from the United States would be loaned to private business through the World Bank, in line with RFC loans to private business in this country.

As long as the ECA will meet trade-balance deficits of the ECA nations by dollar grants, there is little chance that those deficits will ever be materially reduced or eliminated. If we pick up the check each time a balance is due, the European nations will only find their appetites increased. Having the ECA nations on an annual dole demoralizes them and effectively prevents the very thing the ECA is to accomplish: Increasing industrial efficiency and expansion of production.

Only by making them realize that dollars will ultimately have to be repaid and thus must be invested in enterprises which have the best chance of success, can we teach the ECA nations to specialize in those fields of economic endeavor in which they have been outstanding in the past.

Mr. President, if we loan money on the basis of RFC rules and regulations to private business in this field it means that when applications are made for money those applying do not receive a check. Private business here does not receive a check when it applies for a certain amount of money from the RFC for the purpose of rehabilitation of business in times of stress. Instead, an economic expert or an engineer in that particular line is sent to the plant, a survey is made as to whether or not there is a place for such business, whether the market is available or whether the raw materials have been exhausted, or whether other factors such as transportation may prevent it becoming economically feasible even though the additional investment is made.

After the report is in and it has been determined to grant the loan, the applicant still does not receive the money. The applicant receives the money as it is needed to meet the payroll and to buy supplies for the rehabilitation. Then the business is inspected from time to time after it is in operation, and the lending institution thus knows what is going on. Finally if the business is not self-supporting, it is liquidated.

By putting all further European aid on a flexible loan basis we shall find the requirements for dollars very greatly reduced and we will materially aid in a vigorous resurrection of private initiative and fiscal stability among the European nations.

The loans would not be extended on the principle of making money. The interest rate on those loans can be kept low, at the cost to the Government, of 2½ percent, or whatever it is. But the requirement for repayment will assure their use only for essential and worthwhile enterprises.

The acceptance of this amendment does not outlaw the granting of aid on a gift basis in those cases in which emergency conditions require assistance in the form of food and medicine. The amendment is designed to build Europe on a business basis, and will be a morale builder and a boost to free enterprise and the healthy economic expansion of European economy.

CONGRESS DOES NOT HAVE MONEY

The Congress does not have money. Before we can give anyone or any nation money we must first take it from the taxpayers of the Nation. We should respect the money we expend here in the same manner that a cashier respects a depositor's money when he is arranging loans. What we do practically always results in just another siphon being set up to siphon money out of the United States Treasury.

An article in the Washington Post of April 24 shows that in addition to the regular ECA aid it is proposed that further aid be given. Britain wants the United States to assume her war debt too, although already with the aid of the Marshall plan, Britain has been able to reduce her total debt by approximately 1,300,000,000 pounds out of a total indebtedness of 24,844,000,000 pounds. Much of that reduction has been accomplished through the use of Marshall plan counterpart funds. Counterpart funds are those funds that are paid into a special ECA account in each of the Marshall plan countries. The money is derived from the sale of the goods given to each nation by the United States. Five percent of those funds are withheld for the use of the United States, 95 percent may be used at the discretion of the ECA for capital investment and for the promotion of internal monetary and financial stability of the ECA countries. In Great Britain the majority of the counterpart funds have been used for debt reduction.

As part of Britain's debt, she has so-called sterling balances accruing to India and Pakistan and also to Egypt, Ceylon, Iraq, Brazil, and Uruguay. These debts to members of the sterling area totaled about $9,300,000,000 in pounds sterling at the end of last year. By that time already $1,800,000,000 in pounds sterling had been repaid since the war, largely to India. Without American aid the reduction of Britain's debt would have been impossible. While the United States is constantly increasing its national debt, we are actually using the taxpayer's money for the reduction of Britain's internal and external war debts. Although Great Britain in the past has not been too shy to repudiate war debts owed to the United States, she today clings to the highly moral principle of wanting to pay her World War II debts owed to sterling area countries. The reason, by paying off her debts to foreign nations, excluding the United States, she keeps the members of the sterling area in her control and, furthermore, has practically guaranteed overseas markets for her exports. A large part of her production is used for the payment of debts owed to members of the sterling area. Each year she permits her sterling area creditors to withdraw a certain amount of their holdings. This of course amounts to the same thing as trade discrimination, because a country will not fail to buy from Great Britain if these purchases amount to a repayment of Britain's war debt. By the end of 1947 Britain had released $450,000,000 worth of sterling balances; in 1948 she released $747,000,000 worth, and in 1949 $610,000,000 worth. By the middle of this year India alone will have been repaid sterling credits amounting to $650,000,000. It is largely the sterling balance that makes India Britain's best customer. Now Britain wants to send more of her exports to dollar and other hard currency markets and she asks the United States to purchase her sterling debts.

The guaranteed markets provided through the existence of the sterling balances are largely responsible for the

continued inefficiency of the high cost British industrial machine. In those foreign markets which she continues to hold on to, competitive factors are not present. Through the payment of the sterling balances, made possible through American aid, she keeps her prices up, is guaranteed export markets, keeps the sterling area together, reduces her war debts, and then asks us to assume the responsibility for the rest of those sterling balances.

Heretofore, we have paid for the maintenance of the sterling area with all its preferences and trade discriminations indirectly. Now we are asked to do it directly, and in addition to further help reduce Britain's internal debt. If we continue as we have in the past, the United States finally will pay almost the entire cost of World War II.

This amendment would stop the manipulation of the American taxpayers' money in such a way as finally to place the entire burden of the war expenditures upon their shoulders. By means of this amendment, foreign governments no longer could manipulate the money of our own taxpayers to further the socialistic schemes of such foreign governments.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think this amendment should be rejected, and I trust that it will be rejected. It is completely out of harmony with the entire ECA program.

Moreover, Mr. President, the amendment would start a whole series of new undertakings on a loan basis, which might be entirely disastrous in connection with what we are trying to do in Europe. It could be very disastrous, once it was tried.

So I trust that the amendment will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] I offer and send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, in line 3, it is proposed to strike out the quotation marks.

On page 7, after line 3, it is proposed to add the following:

(1) None of the local currencies required by subsection (b) (6) to be deposited in local currency accounts, shall be made available for expenditure by any recipient country as long as any dependent area of such country fails to comply with any treaty between the United States and the said dependent area.

On page , after line , it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. 107. Title I of such act is amended by the addition of a new section as follows:

"TREATIES

"126. The terms of any treaty to which the United States and any participating country are parties shall remain in full force and effect until superseded by a new treaty ratified by the Senate unless, prior thereto, it exp'res by its own terms."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is the so-called Moroccan amendment, which was before the Senate a year ago. At that time a great many promises were made in regard to what would be done.

This amendment relates to what apparently is a very decided injustice.

The report of the Foreign Relations Committee states, on page 22, that legislative remedy of American complaints in Morocco "was not necessary in view of the arrangements which ECA, the Department of Commerce, and the State Department have made with the French Government."

It is obvious that this decision was based on ECA's specific claims. These claims are not supported by any evidence in the report or by the evidence which I have before me. They are not supported by the State Department's representative, the United States consul general in Casablanca.

Mr. President, I wish to quote at this point from a letter dated April 28, 1950, received from the Secretary of the American Trade Association of Morocco:

I met Madonne (that is the consul general) in the consulate the other day after having been in for the renewal of my passport and he said: "This import-export question is a hopeless case. You (meaning Americans in general) ought to get out while the getting out is good and save what's left of your shirts."

The writer of that letter is a veteran of our Air Forces, Mr. President. He helped to fight our war in North Africa; and when it was over he invested his savings and 4 years of hard work there to build up a legitimate export-import business and to establish a line of Greyhound busses which is an asset to Morocco. While the State Department is telling the Foreign Relations Committee about its equitable arrangements with the French Government, it is advising him to get out and save his shirt. There are more than 20 others in the same situation.

The Chief of the Africa Division of the Department of State has said that the French have flagrantly violated their latest agreement on Morocco and that our official protests have been brushed aside and ignored.

When the Moroccan abuses were debated on this floor on April 5 of last year, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee stated:

That is the function of the State Department. We want the State Department to handle these matters (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 3, page 3871).

He stated also:

We are sending a top man from Paris to Morocco who is on his way to investigate all these cases and if there is any discrimination or any violation of fundamental rights of Americans they will be corrected and corrected promptly (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 3, page 3870).

But, Mr. President, they have not been corrected.

Four months later, on August 5, 1949, it was stated by the able Senator [Mr. MYERS] from Pennsylvania:

This group of businessmen should not come to Congress for relief * * * they can obtain this through the offices of the State Department.

And so it has gone.

None of those promises to correct abuses have been carried out.

So, Mr. President, this amendment is up again, proposed on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The same problem exists in spite of the promises which have been made in the past on this floor and by our executive agencies.

I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this situation came to my attention over a year ago. It came to my attention because it seemed unfair to our citizens who are in Morocco.

As Senators will recall, at the last session of Congress there was before us an amendment on the same subject.

I do not think for one moment that the pending amendment, in the form in which it now stands, is in satisfactory shape. I think it must be improved.

I hope the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will take the amendment to conference, because I think a great injustice is being done.

Yesterday I talked with two members of the State Department on this subject. This morning I received a letter from Jack McFall, Assistant Secretary, Department of State, and from his letter I wish to read three sentences:

However, recent protests by this Government against certain French proposals regarding the importation of raw sugar could not be successfully settled within the consultative group. It was, therefore, necessary for us to institute discussions with the French Foreign Office in Paris regarding the matter. The outcome of this latest development is by no means certain at the present time; however the Department is pursuing the matter vigorously.

Mr. President, this morning the Craig-Stanton Co., of New York, sent word that it had received a cablegram from Casablanca, stating that calls for bids in the "barter sugar deal" are being issued from Rabat "this morning"—in other words, today—in direct disregard of protests by the United States State Department.

One week ago—on Friday, April 28—the State Department made vigorous protests against this move through Paris, Tangier; and Rabat, based on the fact that it is in flagrant violation of the September 4 agreement. The protests have been ignored. The French authorities have replied only by announcing that the operation will be carried out as planned.

So, Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will take this amendment to conference.

The language of the amendment must be improved, for the amendment is not now in satisfactory shape.

However, our citizens in Morocco have over the years been carrying on business

against unfair competition. Their rights are being discriminated against with relation to a treaty between the United States and France in respect to Morocco.

I believe there is justice in their claim and in their position.

How this matter can be remedied is, of course, another question; but I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the facts in this case are well known, and have been admitted. They have been admitted by the State Department time after time.

All that is sought in this case is simple justice and a requirement by the United States that its treaty be complied with.

Mr. Dean Acheson, when appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee in support of what is now title V of this measure, said that the policy in connection with this measure was to assist in getting domestic money into foreign investments.

I now quote from his statement:

When those treaties are made—

In other words, the treaties then proposed to be made—

we shall insist that other countries live up to their obligations just as we expect them to insist that we live up to ours. I think it is becoming increasingly clear in the world that you cannot expect investment without such assurances and that the penalty for nonprotection of investors comes by itself through lack of investment.

I have read that from page 7 of the hearings on the Act for International Development.

I now refer to the testimony of Secretary Acheson on page 6 of those hearings, when he said that this bill, which is now title V, recognizes the fact that investors must have confidence that their property will not be confiscated without fair compensation, that they can take the legitimate profits of their capital out of the country, and that they can have reasonable freedom to manage their own business, subject to local laws which apply to everyone equally. The philosophy, enunciated there by Dean Acheson, which he wants to apply in the future to new business investments in foreign countries, might well be made applicable to American investments now existing, particularly those existing in Morocco.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall require only a minute. I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from New Hampshire the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon. I have received a great many letters on this subject, as I am sure other Senators have, from American exporters and importers and other American businessmen. I very much hope the amendment will be taken to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

MOROCCO AMENDMENT ECA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the senior Senator from New Hampshire in urging the adoption of this amendment. These abuses are not new. They are practiced in every ECA nation to a greater or lesser extent and in different ways, through the manipulation of currency, through quotas and embargoes, and in every way that the United States can be diverted from the foreign-trade lanes, and to freeze out the very private industry that the amendment adopted this afternoon, proposed by the senior Senator from Texas, is supposed to establish. There is too much latitude furnished that ECA director, because there is nothing written into the bill that would prevent the continuation of this business.

PURPOSE OF MALONE AMENDMENTS

That was the purpose of the amendments offered this afternoon by the junior Senator from Nevada. I hope we make this an example, and, through the passage of this bill, have one nation tied down so that it cannot ruin the industry already established by citizens of the United States, who are already doing business there, while we are spending millions of dollars with the avowed purpose of trying to establish new business.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield one-half minute to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to associate myself with the distinguished Senators who have spoken on this amendment. A large part of what I had to say yesterday afternoon had to do with this very point. This is another one of the discriminations against the American people. We buy supplies, which we cannot even ship out of the ports, because of the restrictions that are imposed. It should be made mandatory that there shall be no discrimination against Americans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has given this matter consideration repeatedly, and we have had the State Department before us. They have entered into an agreement with the French authorities in Morocco, an agreement which they think is going to solve this problem. But, on account of the insistence of several Senators—I believe it was the Senator from Massachusetts, particularly, who wanted it to go to conference—I will agree to take it to conference, but I do not want to agree on any return ticket. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open for amendment.

PROTECTION OF PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "B," dated April 26, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. . Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provision of assistance under this title to any participating country if the government of such country, or any agency or subdivision thereof, shall, after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, (1) acquire or operate, in whole or in part, any basic industry thereof, other than industries the acquisition of which was completed prior to such date of enactment; or (2) seize, confiscate, or destroy any private property of any citizen of the United States, or by any law, ordinance, regulation, decree, or administrative action prevent the transaction of business in connection with a business or industrial property in such country owned or controlled by a citizen of the United States."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this amendment would require each participating country to agree. It will guarantee the integrity of private investments within its borders against socialization, nationalization, or confiscation, as we protect investments in this country.

In support of the amendment to make aid conditional on the integrity of private investments, I want to say that there is no unwillingness on the part of American investors to put loans into European enterprises and businesses if the investor could be sure that such investments would remain in private hands, and would not be swallowed up in the various nationalization schemes that are rampant in Europe.

Investors will take the business risk, but they cannot risk the nationalization, socialization, and confiscation policies prevailing in many of these countries.

The guaranty of American investments abroad by the United States Government will merely further the socialistic welfare schemes in the European countries and will hold back the initiative of free enterprise. American investments abroad should be guaranteed against seizure or confiscation by those nations in whose territory such capital is invested. That is the only fair way and it will result in an immediate readiness to invest in the European economic future.

Mr. President, there is more money available in this country for private investments anywhere in the world where the climate is agreeable to private investments, where such capital is not in danger of confiscation and nationalization, more money than was ever before available in the history of this country.

AFTER CIVIL WAR—MONEY AND KNOW-HOW FROM EUROPE

It may be remembered that after the Civil War, this country had very little financing ability, and very little know-how, so where did the money and the know-how come from? A large part of

it came from Europe together with the organization and the know-how to build these enterprises, such as the transcontinental railroads and heavy industries. But did their governments give any money to the United States of America? They gave no money to the Government, and the industrialists gave no money to the investors in this country. What they did was to invest the money and keep the stock and the shares. We had integrity, and they made money, and we prospered.

It is fear of total loss that prevents American capital from going abroad. Let the ECA nations guarantee the integrity of foreign investments and the lack of venture capital will be eliminated. This can be accomplished by this amendment.

A favorable climate for private investments can be created by ECA nations, and it is their responsibility to create a favorable investment climate. The banker making the loan does not guarantee the investment. So I say to you, Mr. President, there is no reason to invest the money of our Government in such fantastic schemes in order to rehabilitate or to establish industries, or to investigate the feasibility of industries such as is proposed to do through point 4. That can properly be done, and would be done through business investments.

Ample investigations would be made by private industry, if the investment climate were suitable for private investment. So, when we go to foreign countries and spend our money without such assurances, we are doing nothing but promoting the schemes of the nationalistic countries who have this very idea in mind, of taking the investments and nationalizing them and ofttimes confiscating the property, once they are made.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the amendment is entirely out of harmony with the ECA program. It should be voted down. It goes so far as even to make it necessary for the Administrator to terminate his cooperation with other nations, if the nations should go so far as to use the right of eminent domain to establish some public project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea", and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is also absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—60

Aiken	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Anderson	Hill	Martin
Brewster	Hoey	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Myers
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Knowland	Sparkman
Ellender	Leahy	Stennis
Ferguson	Lehman	Taft
Frear	Lodge	Taylor
Fulbright	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
George	McClellan	Thye
Green	McFarland	Tobey
Gurney	McKellar	Tydings
Hayden	McMahon	Wiley

NAYS—8

Dworshak	Kem	Williams
Jenner	Malone	Young
Johnston, S. C.	Wherry	

NOT VOTING—28

Benton	Graham	O'Conor
Byrd	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chapman	Langer	Schoeppel
Chavez	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Darby	McCarran	Vandenberg
Downey	McCarthy	Watkins
Ecton	Maybank	Withers
Flanders	Morse	
Gillette	Murray	

So the bill (S. 3304) was passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, House bill 7797, to provide foreign economic assistance, is automatically taken up, all after the enacting clause is stricken, the text of Senate bill 3304, as amended, is inserted, the amendment is ordered to be engrossed and the House bill read the third time.

The question is on the passage of House bill 7797, as amended.

House bill 7797, as amended, was passed.

The title to House bill 7797 was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the proceedings on the passage of Senate bill 3304 are vacated, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr.

WILEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill the Senate has just passed be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESSES — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 584)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has had on the desk all day a message from the President, which he wishes to lay before the Senate and have read.

The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the message.

(For President's message see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 6544-6546.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message of the President will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and is called to the attention of the Committee on Small Business.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent the following additional routine business was transacted:

POSTPONEMENT OF DEMOLITION OF CERTAIN BUILDINGS IN HYDE PARK VILLAGE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y. This resolution asks that the demolition of a temporary housing project known as Hyde Park Village be postponed until January 1, 1952, in view of the housing shortage in the city of Niagara Falls.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is located on Hyde Park Boulevard in the city of Niagara Falls a war housing project constructed under the Lanham Act by the Federal Government which is known as Hyde Park Village and which was erected for temporary use only; and

Whereas said Hyde Park Village is now being demolished as various buildings in said project become vacant; and

Whereas under present Federal legislation, Hyde Park Village must be demolished completely by December 31, 1950, unless such date is extended by act of the United States Congress; and

Whereas it is probable that all of the tenants of Hyde Park Village will not have vacated their homes prior to the date when the project is to be demolished in accordance with present requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council does hereby request the Congress of the United States to extend the date upon which the removal of the buildings in Hyde Park Village is to be completed to January 1, 1952, and the City Clerk is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to John A. Kervick, Director of the New York Field Office of the Public Housing Administration; WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, Congressman; Senator IRVING M. IVES; Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN; Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Clerk of the Senate of the United States.

Witness my hand and seal this 26th day of April 1950.

JAMES E. COLLINS,
City Clerk.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT—REPORT OF COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS

Under the order of the Senate of October 17, 1949,

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted a report, together with the views of himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN, and the individual views of Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, on the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, which was ordered to be printed as Report No. 1539.

Mr. HILL, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted his minority views on Senate bill 1728, supra, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1539.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 3551. A bill for the relief of Joseph MacGuffie and Eugene Rohrer; and

S. 3552. A bill for the relief of Remo Sciuchetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas) introduced Senate bill 3553, to provide an additional amount for the Emergency Fund for the President for the fiscal year 1950, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 3554. A bill for the relief of Jose Manzano Somera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials. One is from the Boston (Mass.) Globe of February 21, 1950, and the other is from the Boston (Mass.) Post of February 22, 1950. The editorials concern the Honorable James A. Farley.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Post of February 22, 1950]

FARLEY BOOM

Reports from New York that a strong boom has started to nominate James A. Farley as the Democratic candidate for governor of that State are not surprising. The New York Times calls the boom one of substantial proportions and says that it is centered in the up-State regions where Mr. Farley has always been extremely popular. If the former Postmaster General responds to the call there is every reason to believe that he will be a strong candidate. It seems almost inevitable that a man of his ability and political experience should be brought back into active political duty. His rare talents, that the business world has utilized in recent years, are admirably suited to that need for wise and skillful direction in governmental affairs so obvious today.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe of February 21, 1950]

FARLEY RETURNS

James A. Farley is being boosted for the Democratic nomination as Governor of the State of New York. Mr. Farley has long been politically prominent, as State and then national Democratic chairman and as Postmaster General. It would be strange if a man of his wide experience should not know what his friends within the party are doing in his interest. Unless and until he takes himself out of the reckoning it may be presumed that he would like to preside at Albany.

He has shown marked ability to get along with Democrats all over the country. This would include the southerners, even the Dixiecrats. It may be that Governor Dewey would like another term. If so, he should be able to be the Republican candidate for governor to succeed himself.

It is quite within the range of possibility that both Messrs. Farley and Dewey would like to be President, or influence the selections made by their parties. New York State gives 47 electoral votes to the winner. Only 8 months remain before the fall elections, which will set the stage for the 1952 presidential race. The reemergence of Mr. Farley in active politics in the Empire State at this moment suggests an extremely lively political year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words on my own account concerning Mr. Farley. As everybody knows, he served as Postmaster General from his appointment by President Roosevelt on March 4, 1933, until September 11, 1940, when he resigned. During those nearly 8 years the Post Office Department was never operated more efficiently or more successfully. Mr. Farley made one of the finest and best Postmasters General we have ever had.

He was able, genial, and friendly. He knew the Department in all its divisions and ramifications, and kept up with it splendidly. Except for a short time during the Second World War, the Department made a better record than at any time in its history. Jim Farley is one of the best men I have ever known in my nearly 40 years of public life in Washington.

Mr. Farley was and is handsome, attractive, engaging, and considerate of others in all of his dealings. So far as I can recall, no Postmaster General ever made a better, more efficient, or more honest record. There was little or no criticism of the Department during the time he was its head, and it ran like clockwork. He was always diplomatic to a degree and wonderfully popular. Efficiency and success were his watchwords. I was chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the Senate during a portion of his term of service, and it gives me the greatest pleasure to put these editorials in the RECORD and to wish Mr. Farley every success that can come to a man in this world. He deserves success and every other good thing.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated May 2, which was delivered to the President of the United States yesterday. It is signed by 35 Members of the United

States Senate. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter which was sent to the President on June 24, 1949, almost a year ago. The letter was signed by 21 Senators. The letters express opposition to the recognition of Communist China.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 2, 1950.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of the Senate of the United States respectfully urge that this Government, in the development of a far eastern policy, promptly make clear:

1. We have no present intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China; and

2. We shall actively oppose the move by representatives of the Soviet Union to unseat the representatives of the Republic of China and to extend membership to the representatives of the Communist regime of that country in the United Nations.

We firmly believe that a prompt clarification of our position in this matter is in the national interest.

Sincerely yours,

PAT MCCARRAN, GUY CORDON, KARL E. MUNDT, JOHN W. BRICKER, RALPH E. FLANDERS, CHAN GURNEY, W. E. JENNER, G. W. MALONE, JAMES B. EASTLAND, HARRY DARBY, HARRY F. BYRD, FORREST C. DONNELL, HUGH BUTLER, HENRY C. DWORSHAK, EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, HERBERT R. O'CONOR, CHARLES W. TOBEY, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, STYLES BRIDGES, OWEN BREWSTER, MILTON R. YOUNG, EDWARD THYE, EDWARD MARTIN, ROBERT A. TAFT, KENNETH S. WHERRY, ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, HARRY P. CAIN, ZALES ECTON, HOMER FERGUSON, JAMES P. KEM, ROBERT HENDRICKSON, JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, IRVING M. IVES, JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

JUNE 24, 1949.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned Members of the Senate have been greatly concerned by reports that this Government might be contemplating the recognition of the Communist regime in China.

Any such policy would appear to be inconsistent with the position this Government took in Greece and Turkey when the Truman doctrine was enunciated and with the substantial support we have given through the Marshall plan to the nations of western Europe and with the North Atlantic Pact against aggression in western Europe.

Communist control of China means the ultimate negation of the open door trade policy; loss of freedom and independence in a real sense for the people of China and a major victory for international communism with a corresponding threat to the national security of the United States.

We believe that the time has come for the adoption of an affirmative friendly policy toward the constitutional government of China and the forces opposing communism in that country.

We further believe that this Government should make it clear that no recognition of the Communist forces in China is presently contemplated and that we shall make clear that a free, independent, and non-Communist China will continue to have the friendship and assistance of the United States of America.

Respectfully yours,

William F. Knowland, Pat McCarran, Styles Bridges, Warren Magnuson, Owen Brewster, Clyde Reed, Sheridan Downey, Karl Mundt, Homer Ferguson, Wayne Morse, Milton Young, Raymond Baldwin, Edward Thye, Robert A. Taft, John Bricker, Spessard Holland, Richard B. Russell, Edward Martin, Hugh Butler, Guy Cordon, Harry Cain.

DISASTER RELIEF FOR FLOODED AREAS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this morning there was a conference among the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], Representatives from North Dakota and Minnesota, who represent districts where the flood is now in progress, and at this conference there were members of the Bureau of Public Roads, Community Vicinity Service, members from the General Services Administration, and a member from the Bureau of the Budget, as well as a representative of the American Red Cross. We discussed the possibility of introducing legislation which would result in the appropriation of some emergency funds to deal with the catastrophe in the flooded area.

In reviewing what had been introduced in the past, we know of the bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] proposing a $10,000,000 appropriation to deal with the flood situation in North Dakota. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself had introduced a bill for the appropriation of $5,000,000 to deal with the flood situation in Minnesota.

Some of these measures are new legislation, and we are fearful that new legislation may take considerable time for enactment. It is for that reason that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], my colleague [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself are introducing a bill which would increase the appropriation to the President from $1,000,000 to $10,000,000. That increase would permit an emergency fund on which the President could draw to afford immediate relief in the flooded area, to take care of the emergency which exists in the sections which are so devastatingly flooded at the present time.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an additional amount for the emergency fund for the President for the fiscal year 1950.

The bill (S. 3553) to provide an additional amount for the emergency fund for the President for the fiscal year 1950, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S FUND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement relative to the International Children's Fund, and to be permitted to introduce into the RECORD certain documents in connection with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very glad the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has agreed to take to conference the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and some 19 other Senators, continuing the authorization of the $25,000,000 for the International Children's Fund. I hope he will not only take the amendment to conference, but that he will fight for it in conference.

I think I should warn the Senate and the country that if the past affords any precedent, the amendment will meet with the determined, the bitter, and the relentless opposition of the United States State Department. It was the State Department which killed, or tried to kill, the children's fund in the United Nations. They cast the only vote against the continuance of the fund. They have been insistent that there should be no provision for it in the ECA appropriation. We may expect their opposition to continue.

Mr. President, I think it would be a great tragedy if the State Department, which gives verbal adherence to the United Nations, which says that it wants to strengthen the United Nations in every way, should try to asphyxiate the children's fund, which, with the World Health Organization, is one of the two groups which I think are doing actual work to benefit the people of the world. I think it would be a black mark upon this country and upon the State Department itself.

I do not agree with much of the current criticism of the State Department, and I feel a certain reluctance in criticizing them at a time when they are being subjected to a great deal of unfair criticism, but the truth of the matter is that the State Department has never appreciated the importance of the services of the United Nations to individuals. Their preference has always gone to organizations which confine themselves to talking, and which have a minimum of action.

I hope very much that the will of the Senate may be sufficiently strong so that this amendment will not only be taken to conference, but will be brought back from conference in the final report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement of the program of the United Nations International Children's Fund; a statement of the estimated use of funds by the United Nations Children's Fund in 1950 and 1951; a comparison of the alleged program of the State Department with the actual program of the International Children's Fund; telegrams and letters which have come to me from leading American organizations supporting the International Children's Fund.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United Nations International Children's Fund—Supply, training, and services programs

Type of program assisted or training offered	Major types of supplies and assistance	Value of assistance [1]	Countries assisted under each program by year [2]		
			1948	1949	1950
Supplementary feeding; large-scale and demonstration programs.	Powdered skim and whole milk, cod liver oil, margarine, lard, butter, canned and dried meats and fish, cocoa, sugar, cheese, grains and rice, dried fruits and jams.	$78,000,000	Europe: Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Palestine refugees. Asia: China.	Europe: Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Palestine refugees. Asia: China, India, Japan, Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines, UK territories. Latin America: Ecuador.	Europe: Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia. Middle East: Israel, Palestine refugees. Asia: Burma, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, UK territories. Latin America: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Ecuador.
Children's clothing and shoes; layettes for infants; piece goods; linens, etc., for children's institutions and hospitals, blankets for refugees.	Cotton, wool, leather and hides, blankets and sleeping bags.	7,250,000	Europe: Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia.	Europe: Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia. Middle East: Palestine refugees. Asia: China, Japan.	Europe: Austria, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy. Middle East: Palestine refugees.
Tuberculosis-control programs: BCG vaccination, diagnostic equipment, BCG production equipment, BCG pilot testing centers.	BCG vaccine; tuberculin; hypodermic syringes and needles; X-ray units and films; diagnostic laboratories; vehicles; assorted drugs, chemicals, and biologicals; laboratory equipment.	7,000,000	Europe: Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia.	Europe: Austria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia. Middle East: Israel Palestine refugees, Lebanon, Egypt. North Africa: Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria. Asia: Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Philippines.	Europe: Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Greece, Italy, Malta, Poland, Yugoslavia. Middle East: Israel, Lebanon, Egypt, Palestine refugees, Syria. North Africa: Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria. Asia: Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Philippines. Latin America: Ecuador, Mexico.
Demonstration treatment centers for use of streptomycin for TB meningitis and miliary TB in children (including training).	Streptomycin, laboratory equipment, syringes.	727,000	----------	Europe: Bulgaria Czechoslovakia, Germany, Greece, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia.	Europe: Austria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland Yugoslavia.
Reduction of infant and child mortality and morbidity through insect-control and antimalaria campaigns (including training).	Insecticides (especially DDT), sprayers, microscopes, chemicals and drugs, vehicles, field laboratories.	1,740,000	Middle East: Palestine refugees.	Europe: Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia. Middle East: Palestine refugees. Asia: India, Pakistan, Thailand.	Europe: Bulgaria, France, Poland. Middle East: Palestine refugees. Asia: India, Pakistan, Thailand. Latin America: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, British Honduras, Bolivia, Peru.
Antisyphilis treatment of children and mothers as part of national, regional, or demonstration campaigns; antiyaws campaigns in Tropics.	Penicillin, syringes, antigens, laboratory supplies, refrigerators, vehicles, microscopes, field equipment.	1,490,000	Europe: Austria, Hungary, Italy, Poland.	Europe: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia.	Europe: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Greece, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia. Middle East: Palestine refugees. Asia: Indonesia, Thailand. Latin America: Dominican Republic, Haiti.
General maternal and child health programs, e. g., school health programs, vaccine production and immunization projects, aid to handicapped children (polio victims, etc.), dental programs, premature baby care, teaching of nurses and doctors, various infectious diseases affecting children (including training within the country or for a specific country program aided by UNICEF), nutrition surveys.	Scales and thermometers, incubators, X-ray units, vaccines, laboratory units, iron lungs, obstetrical kits, anatomical models, film projectors, pediatric, surgical, and therapeutic instruments and machines, testing services, vehicles.	7,555,000	Europe: Rumania----	Europe: Bulgaria, Finland, France, Greece, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia. Middle East: Palestine refugees. Asia: China, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, UK territories.	Europe: Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Poland, Yugoslavia. Middle East: Israel, Palestine refugees. Asia: Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, UK territories. Latin America: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Chile, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay.
Improving indigenous supplies of milk for benefit of children (also infant food production plants).	Dry milk plants, pasteurizers, coaling units, bottling machines, veterinary supplies, laboratory supplies, vehicles.	4,416,000	----------	Europe: Austria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia.	Europe: Malta.

[1] Represents $108,000,000 for supplies and direct technical services and training for which programs have been developed as of Mar. 27, 1950. An additional $17,000,000 allocated by the executive board in area reserves and unprogramed balances are in process of development. Another $2,000,000 has been allocated for various international schools and courses attended by specialists from UNICEF beneficiary countries. $12,000,000 has been allocated for freight and $6,000,000 for administration out of total allocations of over $145,000,000.

[2] All countries do not receive each item of supplies.

ESTIMATED USE OF FUNDS BY THE UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S FUND IN 1950–51

All allocations are made by the UNICEF executive board at periodic meetings, usually about 3 months apart.

This practice has resulted from the voluntary nature of UNICEF resources and the necessity of making allocations as resources are definitely pledged. As a result, no precise forecast can be made for the use of funds during the fiscal year 1950–51. This will be a matter for future board decisions, in the light of funds received and requests for aid. In general, the executive board action will follow the policy it developed for 1950, which was specifically approved with regard to the future by the last general assembly, in resolution No. 318 (IV) paragraph 5, "Notes with approval the decision of the executive board of the fund to devote henceforth a greater share of the fund's resources to the development of programs outside Europe." The table of supply programs on page 15 is an indication of this shift in the use of UNICEF supplies to the development of child welfare programs outside of Europe for 1950.

By June the executive board may have about $3,000,000 in new resources. This would exhaust the United States appropriation and all other current resources except new Government contributions, not matchable by the United States unless the remaining $25,000,000 authorized are appropriated.

If the United States Congress extends the current authorization and appropriates the authorized $25,000,000, this amount plus the $10,000,000 from other countries needed to match the appropriation, would give total additional resources of $38,000,000 for new grants of supplies in the year ending June 30, 1951.

The UNICEF Administration would estimate the main supplies on which these amounts would be spent, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Food—mainly milk, for aid to supplement feeding programs, children's institutions, and demonstrations---	10
Health supplies and equipment for maternal and child health services and use against preventable diseases	20
Freight, administration, and other----	8
Total ----------	38

The main areas from which requests are forecast are:

Asia----------	10–15
Europe----------	8–12
Latin America----------	5–10
Freight, administration, and other----	6
Total----------	38

ANALYSIS OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT PLAN FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO CHILDREN AND THE PRESENT ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND

STATE DEPARTMENT PLAN

Object: Technical assistance for children with supplies only for demonstrations. (Value, $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 a year.)

Organization: Governmental board to allocate funds and coordinate all United Nations activities for children.

Financial contribution:

1. Assess all United Nations members by addition to UN budget.

2. Supplementary voluntary contributions.

Stated advantages:

1. More permanent.

2. All UN members forced to contribute on assessed plan.

3. Better coordination with specialized agencies.

UNICEF ORGANIZATION

Object: Supplies for approved country plans for child welfare. (Value, $38,000,000 a year.)

Organization: Governmental board to allocate funds. Coordination left to existing United Nations machinery.

Financial contributions: All contributions voluntary from both United Nations and non-United Nations members, as well as individuals and organizations.

Stated advantages:

1. Meets needs for direct assistance to children. (Technical assistance no substitute.)

2. The grants-in-supplies principle stimulates recipient governments to new activity on behalf of children.

3. Voluntary contributions for a supply program makes possible contributions in local currencies and contributions from non-UN members. Assures a continuing review of the program.

4. The United States matching principle stimulates governments to make voluntary contributions otherwise not available for child-aid programs, and protects the United States from assuming responsibility unless other governments contribute.

COMMENT

The United States plan as introduced at the Social Commission of the United Nations was rejected 13–1 by the other members because:

1. Government representatives emphasized that there is a continuing need for direct assistance to children in the form of supplies, both from the humanitarian principle—that children cannot wait for technical assistance—and the practical value of an international program that can effectively utilize local currencies and services.

2. Other governments opposed the United States proposal to increase the over-all United Nations budget causing additional dollar assessment from dollar-starved governments to support a new technical assistance program for children.

3. Granting supplies direct to governments on the "local matching" principle was supported because the UNICEF experience has demonstrated that this is a sound practical basis on which to establish long-range services for children.

4. Coordination of all United Nations activity for children should be on the high level of the Economic and Social Council—not on the level of a subordinate machinery. The Executive Directors of both WHO and FAO have highly commended the field coordination of the Fund and the specialized agencies.

5. Fundamentally the Commission was opposed to scrapping an on-going efficient machinery which has won world acclaim for the United Nations in favor of a new technical assistance program for children.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 3, 1950.*

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building:

American Friends Service Committee is well acquainted with services rendered by UNICEF and believes its services of urgent and central importance for another year in protecting oncoming generation and enabling local governments to develop facilities to provide their own child care.

CLARENCE E. PICKETT,
Honorary Secretary,
LEWIS M. OSKINS,
Executive Secretary,
American Friends Service Committee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 25, 1950.*

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building:

American Farm Bureau Federation supports legislation to extend for 1 year authorization for appropriation for International Children's Emergency Fund as contained in S. 3420.

JOHN C. LYNN,
Assistant Legislative Director,
American Farm Bureau Federation.

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1950.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: We would like to register our support of S. 3420 authorizing a continuance of the work of United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund for another year beginning July 1, 1950.

This great humanitarian effort represents one of the most constructive efforts to help feed the millions of unfortunate children in the present world that have largely been the victims of war. It, we believe, offers one of the most constructive means of moving surplus food supplies into channels of great service in a trouble world.

We believe that this work carried on through the United Nations has been conducted at a high humanitarian and nonpolitical level.

We, therefore, trust that your full support can be given to it.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. SANDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

APRIL 28, 1950.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: On behalf of the Cooperative League of the United States of America I would like to draw your attention to Senate bill S. 3420 which we understand is being entered as an amendment to S. 3304 as a separate title.

This is the bipartisan bill authorized to continue United States participation in the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

As background of this bill it is important to know that it is a bipartisan measure introduced by 11 Democratic Senators and 9 Republicans, and that although it continues the authorization for United States participation it makes no outright appropriation but makes it possible for the United States to continue to play an important role in a United Nations agency and to use effectively the remaining part of the earlier appropriation.

It is often said that the United States is paying the entire bill on these international relief operations. It is important therefore to understand that the United States participation, which has been substantial, has also brought in substantial contributions from the other governments, which have already contributed $30,000,000 for children outside of their borders and $100,000,000 for use within the borders of countries making such appropriations. These have been matching funds which have matched the United States contributions and are funds which otherwise would not have been available.

The governments of 41 nations contributed and children in 54 countries have been recipients of food, medical supplies, and clothing material which have crossed borders in important world-wide operations.

It is important that the actual work of distribution of goods handled by the UNICEF has been done by the permanent UN agencies, the FAO and the World Health Organization. The local governments have put at the disposal of UNICEF the facilities of their ministries of food, welfare, internal affairs, and health, as well as their foreign ministries. Local distribution has, by and large, been handled by voluntary committees or by voluntary agencies familiar with the local situations. Although there has been some politics involved in local and national relief operations, every attempt has been made to try to minimize it. Even where there has been obvious politics we feel that it is more important to continue the child-feeding program than to discontinue it where some politics has crept in.

The UNICEF program has also helped to channel United States surplus commodities where they could be of best use, and more than 150,000,000 pounds of dried milk, for example, were taken out of the market in the United States and channeled into school lunch programs overseas with no effect on the price structure.

The Cooperative League believes—as we understand is United States Government policy—that every effort should be made to use the facilities of the United Nations wherever available. We feel that UNICEF, in spite of the criticisms we may level against it, has done a much needed job, and that the current authorizations should be extended. We hope you will give this your very serious consideration when it comes to debate on the floor of the Senate very shortly.

Sincerely yours,

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
WALLACE J. CAMPBELL.

(Sent to Senators THOMAS of Utah, GREEN, MCMAHON, WILEY, LODGE, TYDINGS, PEPPER, FULBRIGHT, SMITH of New Jersey, MORSE, TOBEY, AIKEN, SPARKMAN, CONNALLY.)

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND,
Lake Success, N. Y., February 14, 1950.

UN CHILD FUND TO AID 2,000,000 MORE EUROPEAN CHILDREN—OTHER AREAS ALSO BENEFIT THROUGH PURCHASE OF MILK FROM UNITED STATES SURPLUS

Milk from United States surplus stocks, purchased recently by the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, is now moving in great quantity to Europe, the Middle East, and Asia, and is making possible large increase in the numbers of children aided, it was reported here today. Arrangements have now been made for distribution of most of the 105,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk purchased last December at an advantageous price from the United States Department of Agriculture.

In Europe alone, an additional 2,000,000 children will benefit from this transaction. That number represents an increase of 50 percent in the numbers planned for prior to the milk purchase, and brings the total to more than 5,500,000 beneficiaries.

In Israel, the number of beneficiaries has been doubled, from about 80,000 to 160,000. An increase is also contemplated in the number of refugee children and mothers to be

aided in the Palestine area, but even more significantly, the milk-feeding program there can be carried through the summer, and probably to the end of this year.

In Asia the number benefiting is likely to be trebled. Plans are already made for including nearly a quarter of a million more children in demonstration programs now reaching some 125,000 children. In addition to expanding those programs milk is to be provided for children in orphanages, hospitals, and other child-caring institutions.

Increases are likewise contemplated in the number of children to be aided in the Central American countries where child-feeding programs are now being undertaken with the Fund's assistance.

This milk purchase, which represents the first use of a food surplus through a United Nations agency, came as a windfall to the Fund, struggling as it was to meet the many requests made of it for assistance. The transaction represented no new outlay of funds, it was explained, but simply that, because of the advantageous price, a far larger quantity could be obtained. Thus more children could have a single cup of skim milk a day, for "in terms of children that is what this purchase means."

"The speed with which the countries acted in making their plans," said Maurice Pate, the fund's executive director, "is proof enough of how greatly the milk is needed. Countries had to show that they were prepared to handle the milk and to distribute it to the neediest children, a sizeable undertaking for all those responsible. The generous price offered to the fund by the United States Commodity Credit Corporation and the response of the assisted countries is a heartening and inspiring instance of international cooperation. We are glad that the Children's Fund is being used as the means through which the surplus of one country is being brought to the aid of such impressive numbers of the world's needy children."

UNICEF beneficiaries for skim milk in 7 European countries, first 6 months 1950

[Figures in thousands]

Country	Total included in previous plan	Total included in new plan
Austria	200.0	300.0
Bulgaria	188.0	500.0
Czechoslovakia	200.0	615.0
Greece	482.0	900.0
Italy	1,200.0	1,400.0
Poland	620.0	700.0
Yugoslavia	627.5	1,120.0
Total	3,587.5	5,535.0

In addition, some 345,000 infants are receiving whole skim milk.

POSSIBLE USE OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES BY UNICEF

The following are conservative estimates, based on past experience. The ability to make a concrete offer from surpluses, would expand a number of the outlets.

DRIED SKIM MILK

UNICEF could distribute 100,000,000 pounds which corresponds to a daily glass of reconstituted milk for 3,800,000 children for 1 year. UNICEF has distributed dried skim milk at the rate of about 100,000,000 pounds a year. In November of 1949 the fund bought 105,000,000 pounds from surplus at a special price. The bulk of this has now been placed for use before the fall of this year. Through supplies for the relief of children in war-devastated countries in 1947, 1948, and 1949, channels for mass distribution of reconstituted milk have been built up through schools and institutions, and there is a willingness on the part of the countries concerned to meet the considerable local expenses and to make the necessary arrangements for organization. The main receivers would be school feeding programs in Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Bulgaria, and the Palestine refugees.

Subsequent to the purchase of surplus milk, milk-feeding programs have also been expanded in Latin America, in Ecuador, and Central America; and in Asia, in the Philippines, and child-feeding demonstrations in India, Pakistan, and Indonesia. Perhaps 20,000,000 out of the 100,000,000 might be used in these two continents.

BUTTER

UNICEF could distribute 10,000,000 pounds of butter, which is a daily spread for 1,500,000 children for 1 year. This would be used in conjunction with school-feeding programs as a supplement to skim milk. The number of suggested recipients is less than for the skim milk owing to the expense of canning butter for use in conditions where it cannot be kept in refrigeration.

CANNED MEAT

UNICEF could distribute 10,000,000 pounds, which is a ration of one-quarter of a pound a week for 1,000,000 children for 1 year. This also would be used in conjunction with school-feeding programs. The number of suggested recipients is less than for milk because it generally requires more elaborate facilities for distribution.

EGGS

UNICEF could distribute 5,000,000 pounds of eggs, or a daily ration for one-half million children for 1 year. These also would be used in conjunction with child-feeding programs, but again require more elaborate cooking equipment.

COTTON

UNICEF could distribute 10,000,000 pounds, which would provide raw material for a layette, or a garment, or institutional supplies for about 10,000,000 children. According to UNICEF's principles of operation, this would have to be made up in receiving countries at their expense which limits the amount that can be so used.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N. Y., May 4, 1950.

Hon. PAUL DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is very actively interested in continuation of United States support for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. For that reason we wish to place ourselves on record as supporting S. 3420 which we understand has now been introduced as title 5 of the Foreign Assistance bill.

The types of programs assisted by the Children's Fund are important not only because they help large numbers of children now, but because they have a large dramatic appeal and can be easily understood by the peoples in underdeveloped areas. At this particular juncture in the history of the world it is especially important to have such a concrete evidence of interest. Its value in giving these peoples a psychological uplift will certainly be equal to its value in giving tangible assistance to their children.

No protestations that we are sincerely interested in helping to raise the living standards and improve the social conditions in underdeveloped areas would overcome the damage caused by our failure to continue support of the Children's Fund.

The work of the Children's Fund, in which we have had an honorable part, has had a far-reaching effect in building mutual confidence among peoples. We cannot imagine that our Government will do less than continue to take the lead in this enterprise.

Very sincerely yours,

ROY WILKINS,
Acting Secretary.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1950.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is attached a copy of my letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, a duplicate of which was also sent to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, dealing with a proposed amendment to S. 3304, to further amend the Economic Cooperation Act.

As a sponsor of the pending amendment, I believe you will be interested in having a copy of my letter to the chairman.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1950.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: This is the endorsement of the American Federation of Labor of the amendment to S. 3304, adding a title V to the appending ECA bill.

This title and its two subsections 501 and 502 are intended to facilitate the task of carrying out the purposes of the International Children's Emergency Fund Assistance Act of 1948 as a part of the United Nations work in the important field of children's relief.

The manner in which this fund has been administered to date and the widespread, useful work it has accomplished, is so clearly on the record that I am sure it is not necessary for me to detail the accomplishments. I bespeak full encouragement of the Senate in the adoption of this amendment to S. 3304 and trust that in conference it will be maintained in its entirety.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

CRITICISM OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN BY HAROLD E. STASSEN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the evening of May 2 a former Governor of the State of Minnesota, a gentleman who, according to a newspaper story of Sunday, May 3, in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune is a Presidential aspirant—and may I say, parenthetically, a perennial presidential aspirant, and I refer to Mr. Harold E. Stassen—made a very derogatory, a very impolite, and an unfair criticism of the President of the United States when he said:

Mr. Truman is the worst President ever to occupy the White House.

Mr. President, it will be my pleasure to answer my fellow Minnesotan over the combined network of the American Broadcasting System on the evening of next Tuesday, at 9:45 o'clock. At that time I intend to set the record straight, and to pay the respect to the President of the United States which he justly deserves.

One other comment. The former Governor of the State of Minnesota does not speak for the two million seven hundred and some thousand citizens of Minnesota. The results of the last election clearly indicate that the President of the United States has the confidence, the respect, and the faith of the people of Minnesota, where he received in 1948 a vote which exceeded any majority given to a President in Minnesota since 1936.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I be recognized for just one moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. THYE. As the junior Senator from Minnesota has just spoken relative to a former Governor of Minnesota, Harold E. Stassen, and states that he is going to answer former Governor Stassen next Tuesday, I will just say that while Mr. Stassen may not speak for all the people of Minnesota, he speaks for a large percentage of them; and do not ever forget that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, apropos of what has been said by the two Senators from Minnesota, I should like to remark that, as I recall, Mr. Stassen said that President Truman was also the best politician who ever occupied the White House. It is somewhat difficult for me to understand how a man can be the best politician who ever occupied the White House, and at the same time be the worst President who ever occupied the White House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Possibly the standard by which to judge whether the President is the best politician or the worst President is the political appetite of his critic—Mr. Stassen.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is not difficult for me to understand why Mr. Stassen is constantly on the front pages of the newspapers of America. I have never seen a man who was so ambitious to be President of the United States as Harold Stassen. Not long ago, in fact, last week, he wanted to come before the Committee on Foreign Relations to tell them what was wrong with the foreign policy of the United States. If I were the Senator from Texas, the chairman of that committee, I would ask him to send his complaints on a postal card, before I would invite Mr. Harold Stassen to come before the committee to advise the distinguished members of that committee about foreign policy.

Furthermore, Mr. President, how the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, one of the greatest institutions of learning in America, will permit the President of that institution at this time to use the University of Pennsylvania as a sounding board for his candidacy for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, is more than I can understand.

I have always looked upon those who head our great universities as men who were not in the political game, at least not 24 hours a day. In view of what Mr. Stassen is doing in a political way I will say that if I had a boy who was registered at the University of Pennsylvania, that great university, I would withdraw the registration in a hurry.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator has just expressed the sentiments I was about to express. There has been some conversation here this afternoon as to whether or not the former Governor of Minnesota represents a majority or a minority of the people of Minnesota. I certainly hope and trust that his recent statement was not representative of the thoughts and sentiments of a majority of the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. As the majority leader said, that is a great institution, and it is indeed unfortunate, and I think a reflection upon the State of Pennsylvania that the president of that great institution would inject himself into politics.

The President of the United States is not a candidate for office at this time, and I see no reason why there should have been the reflection, the bitter remarks, the political, intemperate remarks, which were uttered by the president of the University of Pennsylvania. They are not in keeping with the high traditions of that great university. I repeat, I certainly hope the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania will make it known to the people of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania that they are not in accord with the remarks which were recently made by their president.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I shall not participate in the debate with respect to Governor Stassen. I think it is a very wholesome fact, however, that any citizen, whether he be the president of a university or not, has the right to express himself with regard to public officials. I realize that the University of Pennsylvania is a very great institution. It has chosen a man whom it regarded to be a great man as the president of the university. I have no doubt the university trustees are well qualified to determine whether or not Mr. Stassen should be disciplined in any manner for the remark he has made.

I think it is not only appropriate that we have in this country freedom of speech, as we do, but that it extends to the members of both political parties and may be used in connection with criticism or commendation, as the case may be, of public officials. I think it is eminently appropriate that not only should Mr. Stassen present his side of the matter, but that our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota, likewise should do so, and I have no doubt that the people of the United States will listen with much interest to his comments.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENTS CONCERNING ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska found it advisable, and I think necessary, to leave the floor a few moments ago because of other engagements. He asked me to make, in his behalf, a short statement, which, if I may have unanimous consent to do so, I shall read in the language which he presented it to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. It reads as follows:

Mr. President, much discussion has followed the recent amazing statements by President Truman in which he assumed to himself the credit for such favorable economic conditions as exist presently in the United States. Probably the most beneficial result of the President's statement is that it has forcefully brought to public attention that fact that a temporary period of high business activity and apparent prosperity based on war and postwar inflation was clearly seen by sound economists, even while the war was yet in progress.

In the public attention that has come to this subject because of the President's statement, the American people likewise have received forceful reminder that a house built on sand is not secure and our present state of economic affairs in the United States certainly is a house built on sand.

A cogent editorial on this subject which appeared on April 15, 1950, in the Charlotte, N. C., Observer, entitled, "Canute and the Tides," recalls to my mind that elder statesman Bernard Baruch stated in London in 1945 on, I believe, April 5, that American soldiers soon to be released from the services of war "had nothing to worry about for 5 to 7 years—that much prosperity is certain no matter what is done or not done. What happens after that depends on the peace the big boys are preparing for us now."

Mr. President, that concludes the statement as prepared by the junior Senator from Nebraska and handed to me for presentation to the Senate. He likewise requested me, however, in his behalf and, "in appreciation," as he puts it "of this"—that is to say the foregoing—to ask, and I now do ask on behalf of the junior Senator from Nebraska unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of his remarks, a copy of the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, the editorial to which reference is made in the Senator's statement.

Mr. DONNELL subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. A few moments ago I requested permission, on behalf of the junior Senator from Nebraska, that the copy of the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer editorial be placed in Appendix of the RECORD. That was the request as it was handed to me. I think it perhaps would be more appropriate, notwithstanding the admonitions from time to time by my distinguished friend, the majority leader, that inasmuch as the Senator from Nebraska desired the editorial to be a part of his remarks, and that his remarks will appear in the body of the RECORD, that also the editorial appear in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANUTE AND THE TIDES

President Truman says he has a right to take credit for the prosperity that the country has enjoyed during his administration, and he intends to take it.

Yes, that is a President's prerogative, because he must also take the responsibility if we have a business recession during his administration, whether he has anything to do with it or not. Mr. Hoover found that out 20 years ago. A President's compensation, therefore, is to take credit for prosperity, whether he had anything to do with that or not. That's politics.

It seems rather a waste of time to argue the point, because the economic conditions were such that the United States could not have avoided a period of prosperity if it had tried. Bernard Baruch predicted in 1946 that we would have 7 years of prosperity after the war, because it would take that long to supply the demand that had accumulated during the war years.

Our own country had done without consumer goods for 4 years. The rest of the world had done without for 6 years. Not only that, but the enormous amount of goods destroyed during the war had to be replaced, and the United States was at first the only country that could replace them. The whole world was clamoring for goods, and the goods just had to be made and sold. Baruch studied the situation and came to the conclusion that it would take 7 years to get the world back to a state of normal supply.

As long as goods are in demand, they will be made. The name or the political complexion of the man in the White House has nothing to do with it, because he cannot control a tide like that, any more than King Canute could control the tides of the sea when he had his throne carried to the beach and ordered the waves to stop where they were.

The plain fact is that we have had this prosperity in spite of Mr. Truman's policies and not because of them. In any normal time his policies of burdensome taxation and wasteful Government spending would have run us into a depression. The goods could be made and sold because the accumulated demand was there. If the demand had not been there, the goods could not have been made and sold under the handicap of such taxes and spending.

Government spending does not create prosperity, because it is nonproductive. The Government can spend nothing that it does not take away from the people, and, when it takes money away from people, it leaves them that much less to spend. In that way it decreases demand. It can, of course, act as a stopgap by creating boondoggling work for the unemployed, but it does not bring prosperity, because boondoggling is also nonproductive.

Genuine prosperity must be based on productivity. Based on anything else it is artificial and must sooner or later collapse.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. The statement just made on behalf of the minority leader reminds me of a story which I recently heard and which might well be a reply to the statement of the minority leader. Two gentlemen were talking and wondering who might be the next candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency of the United States. After some conversation one said, "Well I am for Dewey in 1952." His friend said, "I cannot quite understand, that you will be for Dewey in 1952." "Yes," the other said, "I am for Dewey. I voted for him twice, and business has never been so good as it is today."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I may say I am quite interested to note the interest which is evidenced by the whip of the majority party as to who will be the Republican candidate for President. I can well see the reason for his intense interest on that subject, and I trust we shall have an adequate candidate. It is entirely possible, at least according to some of our brothers, that we may see, at some time in the comparatively near future, some Republican in the White House as not only a representative of his party, but as President of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Republicans will have an adequate candidate if they nominate Mr. Dewey again.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to comment very briefly on the little recitation that was made by the whip of the majority party, the able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. Business may be good, but in the Middle West we find there is some business distress, primarily because the farmer's income is sliding downward, and has already declined considerably. The dairy industry in the Middle West is in distress. We are there confronted with huge surpluses of butter which we find now the Government must take, and the Government is taking it in a manner that is disrupting normal butter-sales channels in Minnesota. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will go out into the Middle West he will find that there is great concern amongst the farmers.

I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that business may be good, but the farmers of the Midwest are greatly alarmed. Poultry prices are down more than 33 percent. Dairy prices are dropping. Huge surpluses of butter are now in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and we are just commencing to feel the effects of the legislation Congress enacted whereby oleomargarine was put in direct competition with the dairy farmer. That legislation is destroying the opportunities of the dairy farmer in the Midwest day by day.

The Senator from Pennsylvania may quip about the splendid condition of the United States, but if he should go to the Middle West and talk to the Midwest farmers he would find that they are more gravely concerned now about the agricultural situation than they were 2 years ago.

It was for that reason, Mr. President, that I said a great percentage of the farmers and a great percentage of the people of Minnesota, as well as of the people of the Northwest, are commencing to wonder if the former Governor of Minnesota, Harold Stassen, was not speaking much common sense in the remarks he made the other night.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret that the hour is late, and I regret that so many Senators have had to stay here to hear me move to have the Senate take up the next bill.

I see a great many of my friends from the South here. I have never known them to stay so late before. [Laughter.]

I see that there are only two Republican Senators on the other side of the aisle, but there are some eight or nine Democratic Senators on my side of the aisle; almost all my friends from the South are still here.

If I could obtain unanimous consent from those Senators to have the Senate vote on Monday at 4 o'clock on this bill, I should be glad to do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1728.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I trust that the good feeling which obtains in this Chamber at this time may be carried over for the next several days.

I should like to inquire as to the attitude of the Senator from Illinois in regard to having the Senate proceed further this evening.

On a bill of this importance, we certainly should have a quorum present; and I shall be compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum, if we are to proceed further with this measure this evening.

Ordinarily, a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill is not resisted on the floor of the Senate, in usual cases. However, we have in connection with this measure a most unusual situation. We have a bill which it is generally admitted is revolutionary and far reaching in its effect, but on which the committee to which the bill was referred to did not hear a single word of testimony.

The bill lays a great predicate in its findings and declarations of policy, commencing with the usual language that—

The Congress hereby finds—

Thereafter a great many findings are set forth; but if the committee found them, it did so by means of a crystal ball, not on the basis of any testimony which was submitted to the committee.

The truth of the matter is, of course, that this is a very hot political issue. The committee held it as long as it could, and then dumped it on the floor of the Senate, without making any recommendations.

So the situation is very unusual. No hearings were held, and we have no committee recommendations. No views were

filed by any member of the committee, except for the dissent of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] until today.

I understand that today some committee views were filed. However, the bill was reported without recommendation on October 17, 1949.

There having been nothing usual about this bill, we will feel constrained to express ourselves as to the reasons why the Senate should not take up a bill which has so checkered a record behind it.

Before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Illinois as to what his intentions are in regard to proceeding this evening.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Georgia that I have no intention of pressing for action on the bill, so far as debate upon it is concerned, tonight. We have had a long day, with many votes on amendments to the ECA program bill. My only thought was to have this measure taken up tonight, with a view to bringing it up on Monday next for debate. At that time I am sure that a number of Senators who will be in favor of this bill will be ready to explain the various phases of the bill as it has been reported from the committee.

It is not my intention to debate it any further tonight. My intention is to move to have the Senate take a recess until Monday; and the motion to take up the bill then will be open for debate at that time.

I may say that under the rule which the Senate adopted last year, as I understand the parliamentary situation, it will be possible at the proper time to file a petition for cloture on the motion to take up Senate bill 1728.

I have no desire to cut off debate either by the opponents of the bill or by the proponents of the bill. I should think probably we might debate this bill all next week, even on the motion to take it up, because we shall probably get into the merits of the bill on the motion to take it up, and then sometime the following week perhaps file a petition for cloture, to see whether or not we can get the necessary 64 votes which are required under the rule which the Senate adopted last year.

Of course, I had hoped that perhaps my friends who are opposed to this measure might let us take up the bill in the first instance, and not compel us to debate the motion to take it up, but let us take it up, debate it upon the merits for any length of time that would be necessary to give to the Senate and to the country all the points which are involved in the measure, and then at the proper time file a petition for cloture.

I wish to assure my friends from the South that I have no disposition to file a petition for cloture, so far as I personally am concerned, until the merits of the bill are fully debated.

Mr. RUSSELL. How about the demerits of the bill, Mr. President? We intend to discuss the demerits.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall accept that amendment, so far as the Senator from Georgia is concerned. I know how he personally feels about the bill; and I will say that the merits and the demerits of the bill will be adequately and fully discussed before a petition for cloture is filed.

As the Senator well knows, any Senator can, of course, circulate a petition for cloture; and if he can obtain the signatures of a sufficient number of Senators, the Senate will act upon the petition for cloture within 48 hours, as I understand the rule, after the petition is filed.

So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to file a petition for cloture even on the motion to take up the bill, until the merits of the bill have been fully discussed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Illinois has said that he would not file a motion for cloture—at least, so far as the majority is concerned—during the coming week, but not until the following week.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course the Senator from Illinois understands the situation regarding the reorganization plans which now are pending in the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A number of them are pending. Two of them have been acted upon by the committee; that is to say, resolutions of disapproval have been acted upon by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and two resolutions of disapproval have been reported favorably and are now on the calendar.

I may say to the able majority leader that six other resolutions of disapproval regarding some of the 21 reorganization plans have been processed by the committee up to the point of the conclusion of hearings upon them; and it is expected that the committee will take action in executive session either to vote to report to the Senate the resolutions of disapproval or to vote to reject them.

I do not make any predictions in that connection. I do not know whether any further resolutions of disapproval will be reported favorably to the Senate. But as the able majority leader knows, there is a deadline, a time limit within which those resolutions must be acted upon. The time expires under the law at midnight, on the 23d of this month.

The rule which was adopted in conformance with the Legislative Reorganization Act provides for 10 hours' debate on each of the resolutions of disapproval. I wish to inquire of the able Senator whether, if the motion is pressed, and if the debate on it continues, the Senator will resent a privileged motion to take up the resolutions concerning the reorganization plans in order that the Senate of the United States may have the opportunity to express, as authorized under the Legislative Reorganization Act and the rule accompanying it, its approval or disapproval of the plans, which will become law without congressional action, and without Senate action, unless we have an opportunity of voting upon the resolutions of disapproval before midnight on May 23.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator's question is in order. I shall answer him in this way: It is the hope of the Senator from Illinois that the House of Representatives will proceed to act upon some of the reorganization plans, which will be reported adversely in the House, the same as in the Senate, before the Senate acts. I say that because of the fact that we have pending a motion to consider the FEPC bill, and I should, of course, dislike very much to lay it aside until we make final disposition of it.

We have until midnight of May 23, as the Senator says, as the time within which action may be taken upon the adverse reports on the reorganization plans. Under the law we must do that. I shall make no definite commitment to the Senator at this time, because it is a long time until May 23, and I am hoping that the House may have an opportunity to act upon resolutions disapproving certain of the plans one way or other while we are in the throes of debating the FEPC. I should have to resist a motion to set aside S. 1728, for instance, if it were made immediately. The Senator from Ohio talked to me about it recently and wanted me to agree to permit S. 1728 to be set aside on, I think, the 10th of this month. I cannot agree to that. If the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from Arkansas desires to move at the proper time to set the FEPC bill aside and to take up plan No. 12—I think that is the number—or any other plan which is reported adversely, that is obviously the Senator's privilege.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. While that is true, yet the country has gotten along for about 175 years without an FEPC law. It has gotten along, too, without reorganization plans. But, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, and under the power delegated to the President and the powers reserved to the Congress, if we should become involved in a lengthy controversy and discussion over the pending motion, it could well operate to deny to the Congress the powers and rights reserved to it to pass upon such plans and to say whether the Congress desires them to become law or not; in other words, to exercise a veto power. I should feel it my duty as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make every effort possible to bring up those plans and to give this body an opportunity to exercise its legislative functions and powers of expression, in approving or vetoing the plans. I would feel compelled to do that, not out of any spirit of antagonism, but merely as a matter of the performance of my duty as chairman of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I fully appreciate and understand the chairman's position, which the Senator from Arkansas has now been made very clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to my colleague, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say in all friendliness on this matter, if it is desired that the Senate pass on the reorganization plans by the 23d of May, which is the time they would otherwise go into effect, that objective can be attained by the very simple device of not spinning out the debate on S. 1728.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield now to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am certain the distinguished majority leader realizes the importance of early action on Calendar 1380, the bill H. R. 6567, to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I am wondering whether he has in mind calling up that bill at an early date.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree wholeheartedly with my friend from Louisiana that the bill involving an increase in the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation is a very important one. It is on the calendar, and the Senator knows I have tried to assist him once or twice in an effort to have it considered, and that we were unable to do so. I do not believe we can take it up, however, until we finish, one way or another, the FEPC bill.

I dislike to say that, because the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants within the Department are vitally interested in having the CCC bill passed, and as the Senator well knows, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am vitally interested in the bill. But let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that I have been kicked around a good deal on the FEPC program. I have been charged with many things as a result of not bringing it up sooner than I have, I think any Senator who is a member of the Democratic policy committee knows that the charges are unfounded so far as my connection with FEPC is concerned; but I do not propose, as majority leader, to continue to take complaints such as those that have been lodged against me by a number of people throughout the country, and by some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, by reason of the failure to secure action on this measure.

I know that the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is extremely important. The ECA bill is important. The FEPC bill is important. It is probably one of the most important bills that has ever been before the Senate. I should like to have it disposed of one way or the other. It so happens that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not suffering greatly at the present time as the result of what is happening in the Midwest. The dairymen and chicken farmers may be in distress, but the corn farmers, the cattlemen, and the hog raisers in my section are on top again, as the prices of their commodities are above parity at the present time. I talked today to the head of the agricultural association in Illinois, the Farm Bureau, Mr. Charlie Shuman, who said corn is starting to move out of the storage bins at no loss to the Government of the United States, as a result of the increase in the price of corn. I think perhaps we can get along for a little while longer without becoming too greatly exercised about the passage of the Commodity Credit Corporation measure, although, as the Senator well knows, I am very much interested in it.

The Senator from South Carolina was on his feet a moment ago, and if my good friend desires me to yield to him, I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I merely want to say to the Senator from Illinois that I certainly hate his taking up this bill. He, of course, knows as well as I do that it means it will be discussed here for several days. There is much in it to be discussed. I want to join in what the Senator from Georgia said. The bill has many demerits, and we are going to bring out a great many of them.

Mr. LUCAS. I should expect my friend to say there are a great many demerits connected with it. Of course, there are others who think there are merits in it. Both the merits and the demerits will be discussed, pro and con, and we shall probably get to a vote some day.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The principal thing I was interested in, when I was trying to get the floor a few moments ago, was to find out whether the Senator intends to press for action this evening.

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Or whether he is going to wait until Monday.

Mr. LUCAS. I am going to wait until Monday.

Let me say that I see no point in holding any around-the-clock sessions. In other words, under the rule as it is at this time, we can file a petition for cloture on Monday and get a vote. It is not a question of changing the rule, which is the question we had before us last year; it is a question of whether we can get the bill before the Senate for a vote. We all know about the rule under those circumstances. So I see no reason why we should hold night sessions, and I see no reason why the subject should not be debated in an orderly fashion, day after day, on the merits and demerits of the bill, until finally a vote is reached on it, under the rules of the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was very much pleased to hear from the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] that the debate would be only for several days. I think that is the most encouraging news we have had, because I had thought the debate would last for several weeks. I think the people of the country should know that the debate will last only several days and that the news is accepted with great pleasure.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate I have been deeply moved by the cries of economy. Only recently the economy expert of the Senate, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] reminded the Senator from Minnesota that it cost $80 a page to have material printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I thought that some Senators who oppose this bill and who are likewise advocates of economy could, by shortening the debate, save on the cost of hearings. In the Eightieth Congress the hearings ran hundreds of pages, and they have all been printed in official documents.

In the Eighty-first Congress, on the House side, exhaustive, complete, and comprehensive hearings have been held. In view of the move for economy in Government, since the persons who testified at the hearing had to pay their own expenses to Washington and return, and it took the time of Members of the House, I felt it would be very well if we used the hearings of the House, since they are on a bill which is a companion bill of Senate bill 1728. The majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have issued a collective report or individual reports supporting Senate bill 1728.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota, as a matter of information, whether the report to which he refers has ever been submitted to all the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I happen to be a member of that committee, and I did not know, until a few moments ago, that the report had been prepared or filed. I should like to have an opportunity to see the report, so that I can know whether to join in it or not to join in it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say for the information of my colleague and friend that since the Senator from Missouri voted against the bill in committee, it was the wish of the individual members of the committee to file individual reports. Those on the Democratic side who filed reports in support of the bill agreed to join together in one composite report. It is my understanding that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the Republican side will make a separate report. That is their wish, and we certainly want to respect their wish.

I should be delighted to show the report to my friend from Missouri, and possibly we can win a new recruit, if he has had a change of mind.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and I filed a composite report. There were two reports on the Republican side. That is a majority of 8 out of a committee with a membership of 13 Senators. It indicates to me that it is to be presumed that the Senators who have filed reports know what they are filing and know why they are supporting

the measure and have read the testimony pertinent to the measure. That testimony is in volumes. I shall see to it that our friends obtain those volumes, because they make wonderful reading. To quote a Biblical admonition, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a moment, in the light of the statement just made by my friend from Minnesota?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Minnesota referred to the Senator from Missouri having voted against the bill in committee. I recall to the Senator's recollection the fact that what the Senator from Missouri did was to vote against reporting favorably the bill to the Senate, because of the fact that no hearings had been held on the bill and that, although there had been previous hearings held on an earlier bill, in fact, on two bills—one in the Seventy-ninth Congress and the other in the Eightieth Congress—I had the honor, as I recall, to be chairman of the subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress which considered the question—nevertheless, I felt we should hold hearings on Senate bill 1728, and, accordingly, voted against a favorable report on that bill, on that ground solely, as I recall.

I recall to the Senator's attention further that my opposition to the bill on that point having been overruled by the committee, by a very close vote, as I recall, 7 to 6 or 6 to 5, thereafter a motion was made to report the bill to the Senate without recommendation, and the Senator from Missouri voted in favor of that motion, but one dissenting vote being cast by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is assured of reelection to the high office which he now holds.

In line with the matter which the Senator from Arkansas brought up, it is my information that the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Republican floor leader, has been informed that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will move to take up for consideration the President's Reorganization Plan No. 12, on Thursday, May 11.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot let pass, without some comment, the statement by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I had said the debate would take only 2 or 3 days.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Several days.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have made no predictions whatever as to the length of time that will be consumed by the debate. My distinguished friend is one of the youngest members of the Senate. His hearing should be good. If he understood me to fix any time limit at all he needs a hearing-aid device.

I am very much interested in his comment regarding the committee hearings. I know that hearings have been held on FEPC bills at great length in the House and in the Senate, in times past. There is a question called taxes which is considered by the Senate, but because extensive hearings were held on that subject in 1945, there is no reason why we should not hold hearings on a tax bill introduced in 1950. Conditions change.

Senate bill 1728 was introduced in the Senate in the present Congress as a new bill. It is not identical with the House bill. In fact, it varies widely from the bills on which extensive hearings were held. I am not at all impressed by the fact that the House has held hearings. I do not know whether the House bill is similar to the Senate bill, but I am not impressed by the Senator's argument that the House held hearings on it. I still cling to the fond belief—it may be a delusion—that the Senate is a coordinate branch of the Congress. We have our responsibilities and we should hold hearings, particularly on bills of this importance and magnitude.

I think I have read most of the hearings to which the Senator refers.

He mentioned economy and the cost of printing. I might say that we might also take that into consideration in creating this vast new agency which is to police all business and agriculture in this country, and which will employ a great many persons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since our good friend from Georgia shares our concern for reducing expenses of printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I know he will make a contribution toward economy by abridging the debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall not adopt any penny-wise-pound-foolish policy if I can avoid it. It would be foolish to favor the creation of an agency which could cost many millions of dollars a year. I am much interested in economy in the long-range program, but not in small amounts of money for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If I thought that anything I had ever said would persuade the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota on this subject, I certainly would not be restrained by any item of cost involved in printing anything in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That would not enter into my conclusion or deter me in the slightest degree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wanted to come to an understanding with my friend from Georgia with reference to the comment I made regarding several days of debate. I feel somewhat let down.

Mr. RUSSELL. I made no such statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I note that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] has left the Chamber. He has been conducting extensive investigations into organized crime. Since he has left the Chamber, I feel free to wager the Senator from Georgia a good hat that if we were to read the RECORD I would be borne out in my statement that the comment was "several days." However, I am sure that it was nothing more than a matter of lifting me up into the clouds and then letting me drop, "kerplunk," into a filibuster on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not recall any such statement. I might say, however, Mr. President, that it is only when a bill of this nature is brought before the Senate that we hear discussion of the cost of printing the RECORD and charges of filibuster, even before a single speech has been made on it. Of course, Senators have had great education in that respect, because columnists and commentators have seen to that. If the Senator from Illinois had asked unanimous consent to take up the bill, and I had risen on the floor and said, "I object," the newspapers tomorrow morning would have had in the first column on the first page the statement: Southern Filibuster Rages in the Senate. That would have happened, Mr. President, if I had merely risen to say I objected to the unanimous-consent request to take up the bill. A bill may be discussed in the Senate for as long as 8 weeks and no one will say anything about a filibuster. However, if a bill is taken up to which some of us are strongly opposed, talk is heard about the cost of printing and a great filibuster convulsing the Senate. However, we shall not be deterred by such charges, but shall give the country, as completely and as fully as we can, our views on the iniquities of Senate bill 1728.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 8, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 5 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Norman Armour, Jr., of New Jersey.
Miss Dorothy M. Barker, of Louisiana.
Robert J. Barnard, of Wisconsin.
Carl E. Bartch, of Ohio.
Frederic H. Behr, of New Jersey.
Emerson M. Brown, of Michigan.
Douglas V. Bryan, of California.
Charles T. Butler, Jr., of Indiana.
William A. Chapin, of Illinois.
George T. Churchill, of Connecticut.
James D. Crane, of Virginia.
Robert W. Dean, of Illinois.
Gordon L. Deegan, of Minnesota.
Adolph Dubs, of Illinois.
Warrick E. Elrod, Jr., of Illinois.
Michael A. Falzone, of New York.
Richard T. Foose, of West Virginia.
Robert M. Forcey, of California.
Emmett B. Ford, Jr., of North Carolina.
Jack B. Gabbert, of Missouri.
John I. Getz, of Illinois.
Culver Gleysteen, of Pennsylvania.
Gerald Goldstein, of New York.

John D. Gough, of Colorado.
Pierre R. Graham, of Illinois.
Pierson M. Hall, of Kansas.
Miss Martha C. Halleran, of Pennsylvania.
William N. Harben, of New York.
Harry W. Heikenen, of Minnesota.
Harold L. Henrikson, of Missouri.
Henry L. Heymann, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas F. Hoctor, of New York.
Miss Priscilla Holcombe, of the District of Columbia.
Borrie I. Hyman, of California.
William M. Johnson, Jr., of Massachusetts.
John M. Kane, of Illinois.
Bayard King, of Rhode Island.
Clive E. Knowlson, of New Jersey.
Francis X. Lambert, of Massachusetts.
Donald E. Larimore, of Illinois.
Herbert B. Leggett, of Ohio.
Earl H. Luboeansky, of Missouri.
Dayton S. Mak, of Iowa.
Doyle V. Martin, of Oklahoma.
Kenneth W. Martindale, of Illinois.
Robert A. McKinnon, of Michigan.
John A. McVickar, of New York.
Sam Moskowitz, of Missouri.
Clifford R. Nelson, of California.
Daniel O. Newberry, of Georgia.
Howard F. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
Robert L. Ouverson, of Minnesota.
Charles H. Pletcher, of Minnesota.
Lawrence P. Ralston, of Connecticut.
Joseph H. Raymond, Jr., of California.
Marion J. Rice, of South Carolina.
Lloyd M. Rives, of New Jersey.
Lucian L. Rocke, Jr., of Florida.
William F. Ryan, of Michigan.
Frederick H. Sacksteder, Jr., of New York.
Stanley D. Schiff, of New Jersey.
Edwin E. Segall, of Nebraska.
Richard R. Selby, Jr., of New Jersey.
John P. Shaw, of Minnesota.
Jack M. Smith, Jr., of Georgia.
Matthew D. Smith, Jr., of South Dakota.
Ralph S. Smith, of New York.
Moncrieff J. Spear, of New York.
Daniel Sprecher, of New York.
Myles Standish 3d, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas C. Stave, of Washington.
Lee T. Stull, of Pennsylvania.
Harold C. Swope, of Missouri.
Adelphos H. TePaske, of Iowa.
Malcolm Thompson, of Massachusetts.
David R. Thomson, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur T. Tienken, of New York.
John T. Wheelock, of Illinois.
J. Robert Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
Park F. Wollam, of California.
Douglas J. Worcester, of Hawaii.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 2, 1950, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Robert Milton Abelman
John Patrick Ahearn
Charles Edgar Allbaugh
Clark Hickmott Allison
William George Aman, Jr.
Joe Emory Anderson, Jr.
Bert Benton Aton
Robert Anthony Basil
Edward Batchelor
John Jay Baughan
Thurston Richard Baxter
Walter Hope Baxter III
Jesse Coleman Bean II
George Wardman Bell
John Walton Best, Jr.
Medon Armin Bitzer
Frederick Ramon Bonanno
Frank Borman
Edmund James Boyle
Carl Locklin Brunson
Lynn Holt Camp
David Anderson Campbell
George Curtis Cannon, Jr.
Thomas Francis Casserly III
Robert William Clement
Clyde Ross Cloar
Richard Neal Cody
Monty Dale Coffin
Kenton Parkes Cooley, Jr.
Donald Anthony Coscarelli
Theodore Pyle Crichton
James Cronin
William Donald Curry, Jr.
Bennie Luke Davis
Michael Edward DeArmond
Gene Alton Dennis
John Adams Dille, Jr.
Richard Taylor Drury
Donald Foster Dunbar
J. Clark Duncan
Ernest Cook Dunning, Jr.
George Norman Earnhart, Jr.
George Baylor Eichelberger, Jr.
Eugene Charles Etz
Lincoln David Faurer
Seymour Fishbein
Joseph Ross Franklin
Alan Clarke Fuller
William Goodjohn Fuller
Charles Alvin Gabriel
Nathaniel Ambrose Gallagher
John Mansell Garrett, Jr.
James S. German
Wendell Gillham
Tyler Greene Goodman
Harold Aaron Gottesman
Robert Pettigrew Groseclose
Charles Wilbur Hammond
Elliot Eclipse Heit
Ward Wertman Hemenway
Matthew Thomas Henrikson
Robert Frew Henry
Walter Filmore Hester, Jr.
Robert Milton Hoover
James Clarence Horsley, Jr.
Anderson Owen Hubbard
Paul Mason Ingram
Carl Alfred Johnson, Jr.
Earl Johnston
Martin LaVerne Kammerer
Ralph David Kaseman, Jr.
Albert Vernon Kinner
Elliott Reynolds Knott
John Edward Kulpa, Jr.
Charles Frederick Goodwyn Kuyk, Jr.
Joseph Nicholas Laccetti
Lloyd Richardson Leavitt, Jr.
Russell Eugene Leggett
Louis Gene Leiser
Herschel Herbert Liechty, Jr.
Samuel Whittingham Lockerman
Richard John Lorette
John Francis Loye, Jr.
Robert Thomas Luckese
William Irving MacLachlan
John Arthur Magee, Jr.
Mauro Elasio Maresca
John Matheson McAlpine
Cleyburn Lycurgus McCauley
John Wade McCormick, Jr.
Harold Eugene McCoy
Robert Kirtland McCutchen
Arthur Alten McGee
Patrick Edmund McGill
Malcolm McMullen
Maurice Edward Melton
William Robert Miller
Carl Berg Mitchell
Kenneth Lee Moll
Gerald Harry Monson
George Edward Morrissey, Jr.
Richard Whittier Nelson
Richard Yates Newton, Jr.
Owen Smoot Nibley
Samuel Newton Nicholson, Jr.
Don Gerald Novak
Allan Richard Packer
Lewis Anderson Page, Jr.
George Kenneth Patterson
Don Howard Payne
John David Pennekamp, Jr.
Merlin Ernest Pettigrew
Emil Austin Pohli, Jr.
Harvey William Prosser, Jr.
William Arthur Rapp
David Davis Ray
Edward Joseph Reidy
Howard Frank Reinsch
Ralph Allan Ritteman
Daniel Lindsey Rogers
Gerald Archie Rusch
Harry Eugene Rushing
Malcolm Edward Ryan, Jr.
William Hayward Schwoob
Thomas David Scofield
Winfield Wayne Scott, Jr.
Vaughn Lee Shahinian
William Bonner Slade
James Richard Slay
Norman Richard Smedes
Donald Sprague Smith
Ronald Robert Smith
James William Smyly III
Harry Raymond Steffensen
Ralph Wilson Stephenson, Jr.
William Robert Stewart
Carl Evald Stone
John Paul Streit
Harold Wade Strickland
William Howard Lee Sweidel
Tyler Winslow Tandler
Ernest Collins Thomas
Francis Eugene Thompson
Henry Edward Tisdale, Jr.
William Simmons Todd, Jr.
Peter Blain Todsen
Arthur Francis Trompeter
Everett Lee True
Kelly Tresher Veley
Bobby Gene Vinson
George Frederick Vlisides
Jerome Noel Waldor
James Wallace, Jr.
Michael Joseph Walsh
Frank Norwood Watson
Robert Irven Weber
Clay Deck Weight
William Franklin Whitfield
Robert Dale Willerford
Robert Allen Williams
Archie Lee Wood
Paul Saxton Wood
Martin White III
Robert Edward Whiting
Theodore Robert York
Frank John Zagorski

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 2, 1950, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

William R. Abercrombie, Jr.	Robert E. Bowyer
John C. Akin	Roger E. Boyd
David A. Ameen	Daniel W. Bradford
Thomas A. Anderson	Christopher Braybrooke
Carl H. Arvidson	Martin M. Bretting
John T. Ashley, Jr.	Donald P. Brubeck
Bobby R. Avery	Guy P. Buck
Robert H. Babbe	Harold R. Buehler
Ambrose J. Baltz, Jr.	Arthur G. Builta
Jack Barry, Jr.	Scott C. Burgess
Frank S. Beal III	William J. Burke
Stanley B. Bellis	Jeremiah S. Burns
William L. Berger	Kenneth R. Burns
James S. Bier	Richard W. Bush
Kenneth E. Bixby, Jr.	Anthony S. Butler
John M. Bolger	James H. Caldwell
John E. Booth	Joseph W. Calhoun
James R. Bowers	Francis J. Cirencione
Ray L. Bowers, Jr.	Sherman L. Coffin

Henry A. Collin, Jr.	Edward Mendel
Philip J. Conley, Jr.	George D. Michie
Clifford E. Crafts, Jr.	Thomas S. Miller
Craig E. Crowley	George D. Moore, Jr.
Lorenzo J. Daleo	Warren L. Morgan, Jr.
Charles A. Davidson	Frank H. Moxley, Jr.
Richard D. Davison	Kenneth H. Munroe
Theodore A. DeBacker	Robert H. Murdock
George G. Deranian	George J. Murphy
Brewer Dixon, Jr.	John F. O'Malley
Albert E. Drew	Edward N. Ostroff
George W. Duncan, Jr.	Leighton R. Palmerton
Frank E. Dungan	John R. Parmer
John R. Dunham	Cedric A. Peterson, Jr.
Samuel C. Durham	Louis T. Ransom, Jr.
Thomas K. Dyer	Gerald L. Rasmussen
Harold F. Erickson	William T. Rassieur, Jr.
Howard M. Estes, Jr.	John E. Reid
Robert F. Fahey	William G. Reitz
Carl S. Fairbank, Jr.	William M. Riddle
Walter H. Flint	Wells P. Rollins
Roger M. Freeman, Jr.	Thomas H. Saltsman
Robert F. Gaylord	Richard W. Satterlee
Edwin I. Golding	Joedan J. Saunders
Gordon M. Gray	Marvin V. Schlappi, Jr.
Rob R. Greenley	Robert P. Schneider
Carroll R. Griffin, Jr.	William S. Schwind
William B. Haidler	Tilghman H. Sharp, Jr.
James H. Hall	Ronald D. Shero
Leland D. Halleck	John S. Sieg
Earl Halpern	William E. Simons
Floyd E. Hammett	John D. Skien
George F. Hampton	George C. Smith, Jr.
Norris J. Hanks	Richard M. Smith
William J. Hardy, Jr.	Robert Eugene Smith
Richard D. Harrell	Robert G. Smith
Lloyd E. Harrison, Jr.	Paul S. Soteropulos
Harris O. Hinnant	Edwin E. Speaker
Charles O. Hirsch	Wilbur R. Spradling, Jr.
John J. Hobson	LaVerne G. Stange
Lovic P. Hodnette, Jr.	John G. Stinson
Harvey H. Hogue	Dennis B. Sullivan
Robert A. Horner	Daniel D. Taylor
Edward C. Hotz, Jr.	Richard E. Taylor
Charles T. Howard	William B. Taylor
Thomas R. S. Ikeler	William S. Taylor
Leo J. Innerbichler	John M. Totri, Jr.
Ted W. Isles	Daryle E. Tripp
Eugene R. Joblonski	Kenneth R. Vander Vennet
Jack C. Jackson	Norbert J. Walecka
Bruce M. Jennings	Robert W. Walker
Frederick W. Johnson	Harold V. Walsh, Jr.
Jack deL. Jordan	John E. Walsh, Jr.
Murray L. Kaplan	Russell D. Weedlun
Richard E. Keebler	Adam C. White
Henry P. Kilroy	Alexander J. White, Jr.
John M. Kirk	Allie B. White, Jr.
Budd F. Knapp	Isham R. Williams, Jr.
Donald S. Kobey	James W. Wills
Charles F. Kyger	Frank L. Young
Bernard B. Lane	Joseph M. Young, Jr.
John D. Lesser	Stephen C. Young
Warren N. Loar III	George A. Zetkov
William H. Loomis	
Lawton W. Magee	
Orlando J. Manci, Jr.	
Edwin L. Mauzy	
Gayle L. May	
William W. McCreedy	
Hamilton E. McDowell, Jr.	

The following-named former cadets, United States Military Academy, class of 1950, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 2, 1950, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Tommy Francis Butler (Distinguished Aviation Cadet).

Harold George Vielhauer (Distinguished Military Graduate—ROTC).

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 5 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

POSTMASTER

Rufe Dalton to be postmaster at Doniphan in the State of Missouri.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we are coming unto Thee with needy and aspiring hearts. We penitently confess that our human nature is feeble and fickle.

At times our hearts are filled with love and good will, and then again with hatred and bitterness; at times we are magnanimous and considerate, and then again so selfish and complacent; at times we are kind and merciful, and then again so harsh and cruel.

Grant that the good within us may be victorious. May the soul of men and nations be regenerated by the Holy Spirit. Show us how we may build a nobler civilization, one that is aglow with faith in God and love for humanity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 3, 1950:

H. R. 4857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katsuke Nakahara Huntley;

H. R. 5276. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia (Iole) M. Stefani Lencioni;

H. R. 6553. An act to provide uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service; and

H. R. 6825. An act to extend the time limits for the award of certain decorations, and for other purposes.

On May 4, 1950:

H. R. 1861. An act for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi);

H. R. 4393. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5580. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour on the subject The Making of a Congressman, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REQUESTS TO SPEAK OUT OF ORDER IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. ROONEY asked and were given permission to speak out of order in the Committee of the Whole today.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 151]

Abbitt	Hare	Noland
Barrett, Pa.	Havenner	Norton
Battle	Hays, Ohio	Patten
Bolton, Md.	Hébert	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bonner	Heffernan	Pfeiffer, William L.
Boykin	Heller	Powell
Buckley, Ill.	Jacobs	Price
Buckley, N. Y.	James	Priest
Bulwinkle	Javits	Quinn
Burton	Jonas	Ramsay
Byrne, N. Y.	Keefe	Redden
Carlyle	Kelly, N. Y.	Reed, Ill.
Cavalcante	Kilday	Regan
Chatham	Klein	Rhodes
Chiperfield	Kruse	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Kunkel	Riehlman
Clemente	Latham	Roosevelt
Colmer	LeFevre	Sasscer
Coudert	Lemke	Scott, Hardie
Cox	Lichtenwalter	Shelley
Crosser	Linehan	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	Lodge	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	McGuire	Smith, Wis.
Deane	McKinnon	Stigler
DeGraffenried	McMillen, Ill.	Taylor
Denton	McSweeney	Towe
Dingell	Macy	Underwood
Dollinger	Madden	Walsh
Douglas	Mahon	Wheeler
Fogarty	Merrow	Whitaker
Gamble	Miles	White, Calif.
Gilmer	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Golden	Morgan	Wilson, Ind.
Gossett	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Granahan	Morton	Wolcott
Granger	Moulder	Woodhouse
Grant	Murphy	
Green	Murray, Wis.	
Gwinn	Nixon	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). On this roll call 316 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY OF HON. JOHN TABER

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we have a busy day ahead, and it is not my intention to delay the House too long. But I think it would be well to pause for a few minutes that we may pay honor and tribute

to a distinguished Member of this House, who today is celebrating his seventieth birthday, the gentleman from New York, Mr. JOHN TABER. This is an eventful day in his career.

This demonstration at the mention of his name speaks more forcefully and more eloquently than I can the esteem and the respect in which JOHN TABER is held by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. He has been in Congress 28 years. During this long period of time he has served his country with faithfulness and with a fidelity rarely exceeded. Upon JOHN TABER falls the inevitable lot, perhaps, but a very necessary lot, to help preserve the solvency and the integrity of the country and the value of the American dollar. At the present he is the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and previously served as chairman of this important committee. Mr. TABER has worked zealously to keep down unnecessary spending and to bring more efficiency into the Government. He comes frequently in this work into conflict with many. But whether or not we always agree with his views, no one questions his honesty and sincerity. He puts the welfare of the country first.

Today we are happy to congratulate him on his threescore and ten birthday, with appreciation that at 70 he is still going strong, rugged, with a zeal to serve his day and generation. I congratulate Mr. TABER on his birthday and wish him many years of health and happiness.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and my other colleagues in conveying to JOHN TABER not only our congratulations but the great respect and esteem we have for him. In congratulating him, I also congratulate Mrs. Taber. The influence and the guidance of a good wife is always powerful in any man's life, and the influence and guidance of Mrs. Taber has been a powerful, constructive force in JOHN TABER'S life.

We all respect JOHN TABER without regard to political considerations. How many times have I heard Members say that the middle aisle means nothing in our friendships, and how true that phrase is. I have not only a personal regard for JOHN TABER but a deep feeling of respect for him. He and I have been very close through the years we have served together. I find it difficult to express in words the feelings of respect and friendship I have for him.

From the point of view of official status, my respect for him as a colleague and an American is deep, strong, firm, and intense. On the personal level, my regard and friendship for him is equally deep, intense, firm, and strong.

Every time I see him take the floor and see him shake that head of his in the unique way he does I know he is going to express himself strongly on the subject he is going to discuss, but he is going to express himself in a clean and wholesome way.

JOHN TABER is truly possessed of nobility of character. He is a strong-minded man, an honorable and trustworthy man who even in the intensity of debate never utters an unkind word about any of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, his services have brought great contributions to the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives is a cross-section of America. JOHN TABER and the views he entertains represents a powerful factor in American life and his firmness of conviction and expression has made a marked contribution to the cross-section of America like here in the House of Representatives.

I join with my colleague, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] and our other colleagues of the House in congratulating JOHN TABER, and Mrs. Taber, and in expressing the hope and prayer that God in His infinite wisdom will bless JOHN TABER with many, many more birthdays and that Mrs. Taber will be with him on those many birthdays in the future which we all want him to enjoy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great privilege to serve here a very considerable part of the time that JOHN TABER has served in the House of Representatives. For anyone to work as diligently, as vigorously, as hard and honestly, and as conscientiously as JOHN TABER has worked, and yet live to be 70 years old, is really some accomplishment. So, John, I certainly want to congratulate you. And in extending these congratulations, may I say that as I have observed you even in recent days struggling with the intricacies of the measure now pending before us, I predict with complete assurance that you will enjoy many, many more years of life and be as vigorous, as strong, as energetic, as helpful and useful as you have been throughout the years that I have known you. To be chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, or to be ranking minority member of that committee is one of the toughest jobs in the House. It is not an easy assignment. First of all it requires the most careful attention through days and days of hearings to determine first of all where money should be appropriated and where money should not be appropriated. After that determination is made it requires strength and courage and wisdom to apply the decisions and determinations which are arrived at after the hearings are over.

Your service, John, has been without fear or favor. You have served your country well. In these days when expenditures of the Federal Government are so great and are still increasing and are the concern of us here in the House of Representatives, and of every thoughtful person throughout the country, what an assignment it is to carry a major part of the responsibility for seeing to it that these appropriations are kept in line.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege some years ago to go to JOHN TABER'S home town in New York to speak with him at a meeting in his district. On that occasion I had the opportunity of meeting his friends in his own community. JOHN TABER has the respect of all of us who have served with him here in the House of Representatives, and in his home community and among the people with whom he and Mrs. Taber live, this respect is accompanied by affection and devotion. I do not know of any greater tribute that could be paid to any man.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and service of Hon. JOHN TABER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I pay my tribute to my long-time chairman and minority leader of the Appropriations Committee. A man with acumen never excelled; integrity never questioned; comprehension so broad as was ever the necessity whenever involved; not a statesman, for to be such he would have to be a dead politician, which he is not, and otherwise he qualifies—one of the most forceful fighters for his country in all the annals of congressional history.

May you and Mrs. Taber live as long as both or each of you wish and have all each of you wish so long as both of you shall live.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I join with the membership of this House in congratulations extended to JOHN TABER on this his seventieth birthday. Mr. TABER has the respect and confidence of every man who ever served in this distinguished body with him. No Member of this body has rendered more sincere service than our distinguished colleague from New York, and when I think of the hard, sincere work he has accomplished, I am reminded of these lines of Kipling:

When Earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colours have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and faith we shall need it—lie down for an aeon or two,
Till the Master of All Good Workmen shall set us to work anew.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to congratulate Mr. TABER on his seventieth birthday.

I admire; yes, envy him—his boundless energy, his driving zeal, and painstaking analyses, all so necessary, particularly through all these days and weeks and months of the consideration and presentation of this so-called "one-shot" appropriation bill.

A man of lesser stature having the bitter defeats of recent days would have given up in despair.

Mr. Speaker, his failure to admit defeat, his dogged determination to continue his efforts to reduce the amounts now being appropriated, is an admirable example of the character and worth of Mr. TABER.

It has been an inspiration to have served with him on the Appropriations Committee.

May he live, and may Congress and the American public have the benefit of his knowledge, courage, and devotion for many, many years.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago when I first came to the House, my dear friend Bert Snell was kind enough to give me his ideas and sugtions. One of the first things he told me was that JOHN TABER was honest, honorable, and a strong character and he suggested that I seek his advice.

Over the last 10 years that I have been down here our friendship has developed and means a great deal to me.

It is a great satisfaction to have a friend like JOHN TABER. He is, in my opinion, one of the most valuable men serving in Washington and on this, his seventieth birthday, I congratulate him and his nice wife and wish him many more birthdays.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, may I, at this time, join my colleagues from the New York delegation, and all the other Members of the House of Representatives, in congratulating Mr. JOHN TABER on his seventieth birthday?

Since I have been in the House, nothing has been of greater help and inspiration to me than the advice and friendship of JOHN TABER.

In spite of his vast responsibilities and the hard work for which he is so justly famous, he always had time to help answer some of the numerous questions that were puzzling to a new Member.

But I think, above all, JOHN TABER'S courage and his absolute uncompromising truthfulness have been of the greatest inspiration to me during my service in this House.

May you have many more years of happiness with Mrs. Taber, my dear colleague, who is also to be congratulated, on this most happy and auspicious occasion.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on his seventieth birthday. Mr. TABER has served in this House more than a quarter of a century. I have been privileged to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee during the past 14 years. The outstanding record he has made on that committee is unsurpassed in the history of the House of Representatives. He has represented both the majority and the minority on that committee during a most crucial period of American history, passing through the greatest depression this Nation has even seen—through a prewar period—and then the war period—and then through what is considered by some as a reconstruction period of the world history. I served with him on several committees working side by side. The record of testimony on the bills that came before his subcommittees, and particularly during his chairmanship of the full committee, is a record which is unparalleled in its clarity and thoroughness. His speeches on the floor of this House during debates, together with that record, contain much that the historian of the future will find valuable when the history of this period is written. He is a great American, a great legislator, and was a great chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He has made an outstanding contribution to the history and welfare of his country which he has served so long, so faithfully, and so well. I sincerely hope and pray that despite his years, the almighty God will continue the health and vigor with which He has blessed him, that he may continue the valuable service he has rendered to his Nation. I wish him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, may I take the liberty to join my colleagues on both sides of the House in extending my sincere felicitations to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on the occasion of his seventieth birthday today.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the Members of the House have the greatest respect, admiration, and esteem for our friend, Mr. TABER, as I have, and I especially believe that all of us particularly admire him for his fine qualities exhibited in his fighting spirit, consistency, and his indomitable courage and energy.

Mr. Speaker, the saying "as strong as the Rock of Gibraltar" still stands, and this is one instance where we can apply this saying with full propriety. That is Mr. TABER.

Mr. TABER is a patriotic and fine American, and I hope that he will accept my best wishes and congratulations on his anniversary.

May he live as long as he likes and may he continue to fight as long as he lives.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my heartiest congratulations to my good friend JOHN TABER on this his seventieth birthday. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to me to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. He is an indefatigable worker and his untiring efforts have been rewarded by outstanding accomplishments. His skill, thoroughness, and sincerity make him an outstanding Member of this body and I trust that he will enjoy many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to extend my brief but nonetheless sincere greetings and felicitations to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on this his birthday. There is no man in the Congress of the United States for whom I have greater respect than JOHN TABER. I have served through 6 years of appropriations hearings and debates with him. We have had many conflicts during that time in our ideas on appropriation issues, but I say now that there is no Member of this House more decent, more sincere, and more trustworthy in his day-to-day dealings with his fellow Members than the esteemed gentleman from New York. His word has always been his bond. It is my sincere wish that he shall continue to enjoy many, many more birthdays and that each and every year between them shall be filled with the best of health and happiness.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this tribute to our friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

For over 18 years, I have served with him as a Member of the House Committee on Appropriations. During 17 of those years he has been either chairman or ranking minority member of the committee.

In this capacity, I have worked closely with him over the years, including the period from the outbreak of World War II in Europe until its conclusion when the Congress remained in almost continuous session and when the work of the Appropriations Committee seemed to require both night and day including holidays.

I know the tremendous responsibility which he has shouldered. I know the tremendous amount of detailed consideration that that responsibility has involved. I know the tremendous contribution which he has made to America under most difficult conditions.

By his integrity, his courage, his ability and his vitality, he has commanded widespread respect and affection on both sides of the isle.

I join in wishing him many happy returns of the day and continued success and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join those members who have today paid such a fine tribute to the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. TABER, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee for more than 9 years. He is an indefatigable worker, a leader in the field of economy, and a fearless representative of the people. I wish for him every success and good health in the future, and I am sure he will render this House and the country many more years of faithful and efficient service.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that one of the rare privileges afforded me by service for these many years in the House has been a close association with my friend, colleague and political neighbor, the distinguished gentleman, Mr. TABER.

Repeatedly, through the years as temptation arose for me to cast a vote upon impulse of political expediency, I have been mindful of the example which Mr. TABER has set for all of us including myself. His personal integrity and intellectual honesty are always far above any political or personal impulses. Of course, he and I have not agreed on all issues or problems. What a dull and uninteresting service this would be if there were not serious and conscientious divergence of views.

Those who know him realize that behind the gruff and sometimes abrupt appearance which he displays when he is most aroused over a matter of public interest, lies a heart of gold, a jolly companionship, a mind of great capacity and integrity and a will of consummate perseverence.

In joining with his host of friends who congratulate him upon this achievement in the milestone of his life marked by the symbol of three score and ten, I am happy to wish for him personally many continued years of happiness, not only in

his public but private life as well, and to wish for the public generally and the congressional district which he has so ably represented for nearly half his lifetime, that they may have the benefit of his counsel and service so long as he wishes to serve.

I feel sure that, of all the wishes we might extend to Mr. TABER, the one which would appeal to him most is that, at an early date, we may have a balanced budget.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying a sincere tribute to my beloved friend, Hon. JOHN TABER on this his birthday of three score years and ten.

The reason that our good friend has been returned to a seat in this House so many times is no secret to those who have served with him. It has been said that character is the invulnerable armor which will withstand every assault and march triumphant to the highest position of honor and trust within the gift of a grateful people.

JOHN TABER has worn this invulnerable armor of character and that is why he is here today, and let us hope he will be here many, many years to come.

I wish for him and for Mrs. TABER years of happiness, health and prosperity.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this is the birthday of the Honorable JOHN TABER. I want to join with all of his other friends in wishing him a happy birthday and many happy returns of the day.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in encomiums of praise for JOHN TABER, on his seventieth birthday today. To me he has been an inspiration and a dear friend ever since I came to Congress—an immense source of knowledge on all affairs of government and Federal spending—largess as well as waste. He deals in facts and figures. He stands like the Rock of Gibraltar against this country going on the rocks financially. He has saved his Government in its mad spending spree billions of dollars. Over the years he will continue to do so. John, I salute you as a friend and companion. To you and Mrs. Taber, long and happy lives together.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two articles from the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205, and further to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address on the hydrogen bomb delivered by Dr. Robert Bacher, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $273.34.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include the eleventh article by Mr. Frank Waldrop.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in connection with the retirement of Admiral Kincaid.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report by the Petroleum Import Commission which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $400.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, and to include in one an article appearing in the New York Post, and in another a letter to the Secretary of State.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remanks in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on annual leave appearing in the current issue of Government Standard.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include newspapers articles.

Mr. BURLESON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

ATTORNEYS EMPLOYED BY SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 176) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of any person as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the special Senate committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, agreed to on May 3, 1950, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

SEC. 2. Such special Senate committee is authorized to employ a chief counsel at a salary not to exceed $17,500 per annum and an associate counsel at a salary not to exceed $12,500, to be paid out of any funds available for the payment of the expenses of the committee.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VIII, EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] to page 265, line 22, of the bill. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Holifield amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 265, line 22, strike all beginning with the words *"Provided further"* down to and including the word "annum" in line 4 on page 266.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this particular subject affected by the amendment has a great effect upon our national defense, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding my high personal regard for the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, I have offered this amendment, because I sincerely believe it is a good amendment, and that striking out this particular rider on the appropriation bill will be of great benefit to the atomic energy and the hydrogen energy production program. I offer it to prevent the membership from making what I consider to be a bad mistake affecting our national defense. The subject of community maintenance of these atomic-energy towns has been a matter of constant scrutiny by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the past 4 years. We have succeeded in getting the

costs of community management down in the town of Alamos from over $8,000,000 to about $1,700,000. We have succeeded in getting management maintenance costs in the city of Oak Ridge down from a little over $8,000,000 to a little over $3,718,000.

Our joint committee had a hearing on this particular point; we scrutinized it carefully, and most of us came to the conclusion that the present mode of operation was the best mode of operation we could have at the present time.

Operating these municipalities in these atomic-energy towns is a problem, because it is a joint free-enterprise Government operation; it is conducted on Government reservation land, and the buildings are owned by the Government.

The town of Oak Ridge has about 32,000 people, the town of Hanford has about 23,000, the town of Los Alamos about 12,000. It is a complicated and difficult matter for which we have no absolute solution. You have two methods of operation: First, whether the Government shall completely own, control, and operate these towns; or whether the Government in conjunction with free enterprise shall operate the towns. The latter method is the method which is being used at the present time. The Government owns the residences, it owns the business houses, it owns the land; but it is contracting on a fee-rental basis to the merchant and letting the merchants operate free-enterprise business in these different store buildings owned by the Government.

The operation of the great production facilities is by contract, a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract with great corporations such as General Electric, Carbide & Carbon, Bendix Corp., and many other great corporations. I point out to you that the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts in these instances run between 3 percent and 4½ percent net profit to the Carbide & Carbon and Bendix corporations.

In the operation of the Roane-Anderson Corp., which has the responsibility of community maintenance in Oak Ridge, they are allotted a net fee above all costs of 1½ percent. The reasonableness of that fee, if I have time, I will show later. This corporation, the Roane-Anderson Corp. in Oak Ridge, is rendering not only the municipal functions, such as street maintenance, fire and police protection, sewage disposal, that are necessary in any normal community maintenance; but it is also rendering service of collecting rents on houses, collecting rents, building maintenance, utility service to residents, and negotiating contracts with the free-enterprise operators in the different stores in these towns, and many other functions which are not part of the normal operations of a normal American community of the same size.

We are maintaining the profit motive in handling these towns under contract, between the Atomic Energy Commission and private enterprises.

What would be the result of the appropriation rider if it were carried into effect? First, it would mean an arbitrary repudiation of a good faith contract between the United States Government and free enterprises before the date of termination of their present contracts. This will undoubtedly have an adverse effect upon other contractors and free enterprises who wish to come into these towns and enter contracts with the Government. It will be a warning to future contractors provided we can, by rider on an appropriation bill—which would be subject to a point of order had not a special resolution been brought in waiving points of order on this chapter—arbitrarily cancel good faith contracts of the United States Government. Unless that rider is defeated today, it will mean that we will be participating in a breakdown of good faith with these contractors who are operating these towns. That is the first thing. That will have a bad moral effect upon future contractors, we are told by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The second result will be that we will replace these private concerns with direct Government operation of the municipalities.

You talk about putting the Government into business, but Mr. Chairman, you are really going to put the Government into business unless you strike out this rider, because the Government is going to have to go into these towns, it is going to have to operate directly all of the municipal services, including the bus lines, the police and fire departments, and all of the other services which these contractors are at present rendering on a cost-plus fixed-fee contract basis. It will mean an additional cost. There will be no saving. According to the testimony given by Mr. Pike one of the Atomic Energy Commissioners before our committee on April 18, it will result in an additional cost of from a half million to a million dollars per year, because these municipal employees who are now employed by private contractors will have to be placed on the Federal payroll, we will be obligated to give them their annual leave, sick leave, their workday hours and retirement benefits, all of which will cost, according to the testimony, another half million to a million dollars.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I do not want to take the gentleman's time unnecessarily, but I do not think the gentleman wants to give the impression that this covers the entire cost. This is the fee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not want to given the impression that the $180,000 covers all of the cost. That is the net profit to the operating company. I call to your attention the fact it is on the basis of 1½ percent of the gross cost of the operation of this town.

The Carbide & Carbon Co. in the same town has a contract with the Government on a similar cost-plus a net fixed-fee basis computed at the rate of 3½ percent and if I had the figure as to what that 3½ percent means, I am telling you that the $180,000 would be very small in comparison.

The Bendix Corp. has a contract on a cost-plus fixed-fee basis in the same town with a net fee that averages 4½ percent and if I had the figures as to what the 4½ percent means and could balance it against the 1½ and the 1¼ percent of the Community Management contractors, it would be much greater.

The General Electric has a cost-plus contract at the Hanford operation for the complete operation of factories, laboratories and towns. The testimony shows that the per capita cost of operating the town of Hanford is $7 higher than it is in Oak Ridge. I do not have the total exact figures, but that is according to the testimony heard on April 18.

Now, as to the reasonableness of this fee, in the few minutes I have left may I make this statement? John C. Treadwell and George Goldstein, members of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, have testified that real-estate management is entitled to from ¾ to 1¼ percent for management. That is for the collection of rents, maintenance, and so forth. The breakdown of the Oak Ridge contract allows ¼ of 1 percent to Roane-Anderson in place of the ¾ to 1¼ percent referred to.

Frederick M. Babcock & Co., real-estate consultants of Washington, D. C., say that management fees granted to Roane-Anderson on the complete contract is a minimum fee which would be necessary to obtain responsible management for that particular type of operation.

The Fidelity Bankers Trust Co. of Knoxville, Tenn., has testified that a 5-percent gross for real-estate collections is allowable and a 2 percent earned net is allowable.

The Tate Realty Co. of Knoxville, Tenn., in a letter signed by George S. Tate, dated June 1, says that the customary allowance is 5 percent of the gross or 2½ percent of the net on residences, stores, rentals and 1¼ percent or 1 percent at present allowed Roane-Anderson is less than the customary commercial rate for like services.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment is accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California has offered an important amendment; therefore I have requested five additional minutes in which to present as lucidly as within my capacity the issue.

The gentleman from California refers to the provision in the bill as a rider. That is a slightly prejudicial term. The Committee on Appropriations considers the provision to be a limitation on amounts. That we regard as the proper function of your Committee on Appropriations. The determination of amounts, the determination of the

proper limitation on the use of the sums appropriated, we feel is the prerogative and is the duty which this House expects the Committee on Appropriations to make recommendations upon. That is how we regard the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On the point of whether this is a rider or not, the technical point, is it not true that, unless points of order had been waived by a special resolution, that this would have been termed by the Parliamentarian as legislation on an appropriation bill and subject to be ruled out on a point of order?

Mr. GORE. I do not so understand it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is my information direct from the Parliamentarian.

Mr. GORE. Let us square away on the issue here and see what is involved. Whether it is a rider or a limitation is really immaterial.

First, this does not involve the technical operations of the production facilities at Oak Ridge or Hanford, Wash. It involves the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors who operate the municipal activities and the real-estate operations of the Government in wholly owned Government communities.

Now let us take the exact corporations involved. There are three of them. One is the Roane-Anderson Corp., a Tennessee corporation, which operates the community and realty operations of the community of Oak Ridge. Another is the Transportation Corp. that operates transportation at Oak Ridge; likewise a Tennessee corporation. The third is the Zia Corp. I believe that corporation is domiciled in Texas, though I am not sure as to its domiciliary situs.

The fees involved are these: The Roane-Anderson Corp. fee is $180,000 per year now. The Transportation Corp. receives a fee of $90,000 a year. The Zia Corp. receives a fee of $154,000 a year.

The next question in your minds, I suppose, is for what function and purpose do they receive this fee. Well, to begin with, the Roane-Anderson Corp. is virtually without financial investment in the operations at Oak Ridge. All of their expenses are reimbursed. All expenses from lead pencils to good salaries for their officials are reimbursed. On top of that, the Atomic Energy Commission has been paying a fee, a net profit, of $180,000 per year.

Now, your Committee on Appropriations has felt that this is an unreasonably high fee to pay for the services of a corporation over and beyond all of their expenses, including good salaries for all of their officials, for the performance of a function which, I am sorry to say, they have not demonstrated any unusual proficiency in doing. Therefore, the committee has recommended that this fee be limited next year to $90,000 a year. Your committee feels that that is a pretty handsome fee. I do not suppose I will be violating any confidence to say that a majority of the subcommittee wanted to limit it to a much lower fee. I think except for perhaps my intercession, for fear that we might do something precipitant, the subcommittee would have fixed it at maybe $10,000, and I am not sure that would not be enough. But for fear that we might precipitate an action that would hinder the atomic program, we limited the Roane-Anderson fee to $90,000 a year.

We likewise recommend a 50 percent cut in the fee of the other two corporations.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wanted to ask the gentleman when he was making reference to Roane-Anderson whether or not he was advised as to the extent of their capital investment. It is my understanding that Roane-Anderson has no capital investment upon which it could be expected to receive a capital return. I wanted to know whether or not that understanding is correct.

Mr. GORE. The corporation, of course, would be established with some capital investment. I think it is more or less a nominal one. They own no equipment; they own no property. What capital they have is liquid. They are not paid a fee for reimbursement for capital invested; they are paid a fee for the exercise of so-called know-how, which I am sorry to say they have not adequately demonstrated.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As a matter of fact, in the employment of business-management concerns it is not customary for such a concern to have any investment except the brains of the organization. Therefore, the gentleman's argument on investment falls by the wayside. If you hire a doctor and pay him $5,000 for an operation, you do not pay him on the investment in his tools, but upon the way he uses them. The point at issue here is whether the fee is reasonable in relation to other fees for business-management-consultant services.

Mr. GORE. The officials of the Roane-Anderson Corp. are paid salaries, sufficient, in my opinion, for all of the know-how or performance of same they have demonstrated. All of those salaries are completely reimbursed. It seems to me the fee is entirely net profit.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is emphasizing what I wanted to mention, that this is, as the gentleman from California said, a matter of comparative values of service. This is the management of a city. This compares to city management in any community in the United States.

The gentleman refers to hiring a doctor to perform an operation, but there is a comparison condition there. If you hire a building management firm, that management firm ordinarily pays the cost of its own operations. In this case they do not. The United States pays all those costs, and on top of that pays the several companies named, for nothing but community management, a sum which the gentleman has mentioned as $180,000.

This has been a very serious question before this particular subcommittee for 4 years. Each time we have said that that must not continue, and each time there has been at least a tacit admission that it was a high cost. Yet it has not been reduced. At the same time the subcommittee put in a stipulation that it must be stopped. The subcommittee having heard the details of this for 4 years unanimously think it is time to establish a reasonable fee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to address one thought to the members of the committee with respect to these Government-owned communities. They are islands not of free enterprise, as my distinguished friend from California seems to indicate, but instead they are islands of complete governmental dominion over the realty of the community and the local governmental affairs of the people who live there. I think we must move in the direction of traditional American practices and principles of civic affairs. I think we need to give some opportunity for home ownership in these communities. We need to provide opportunities for some competition in the mercantile establishments. We all know in America that competition is a pretty good thing. We have heard that trite phrase that competition is the life of trade. Competition means better services. At Oak Ridge the production facilities are now in a compound separate and apart and fenced in from the residential area. The residential area is some 8 or 10 miles away in another valley. I know of no reason why we cannot move in the direction of free enterprise, home ownership, and self-government in this area.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have moved in the direction of free enterprise within the limitations of the Atomic Energy Act which sets up the atomic energy production as a private Government monopoly. But in the towns which are in isolated areas, such as Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and other large cities, with the purchase of Government property there, the particular policy has been adopted of allowing firms to come in and build their own stores. We are moving toward it just as fast as it is possible. But by this action we are moving back to complete Government ownership and operation.

If the gentleman will yield further, I want to correct one thing that my colleague, the gentleman from California, said. This does not compare to normal town operation, because additional functions are performed by these corporations besides the municipal functions such as the collections of real estate rents for all of these facilities and maintenance of the residences and the

collection of fees for lights, the maintenance of a sewerage system, and so on and so on.

Mr. GORE. What the gentleman says about the functions of this corporation is true. However, I want to emphasize that the Roane-Anderson Co. is not called upon to operate any part of the gaseous diffusion plant. They operate the realty and the community facilities.

Just one word about the Transportation Corp. Their total function is the operation of some busses to and from the plants and within the residential area. Why we should pay a $90,000 fee for that I do not know. There is no unusual technical know-how required for the operation of a bus.

Your committee has recommended that the fee be limited to $45,000. The only doubt in my mind is that perhaps we have not limited it sufficiently.

Now as to the Zea Corp., their fee is $154,000. We likewise limited that. We think this is a prudent move.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 35 minutes, the last 7 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, that means there will be 29 minutes left for nine Members to consume. I must object to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph, and all amendments thereto be limited to 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire—What's going on in the world? What's going on in the country? Who knows? Who is telling who what? On yesterday President Truman blithely announced to the press that he is not alarmed over the cold-war situation which he described as much better now than in 1946. He said that the military spending budget for the 1951 fiscal year will be lower than expenditures for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

On yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the House Armed Services Committee by a vote of 31 to nothing favorably reported the extension of the Selective Service Act for a period of 2 years. We did this after 3 days of hearings, 2 of them in executive session. At the public hearing on Tuesday General Bradley asked the committee, "Is there anyone here who believes that our situation in the cold war has improved since January?" General Bradley then answered his own question as follows:

As far as I can see there has been no improvement. There has been no let-up in the pressure that the Soviet Union has exerted wherever there has been an opportunity for disagreement; and as far as I can see, there has been no let-up in the aggressive extension of communism toward its goal of world domination.

In concluding his brief remarks, General Bradley also said:

May I point out again that the international situation has not improved in the last 8 months.

Can it be that President Truman is not receiving the same information from his military advisers that the Congress is receiving? Can it be that the Commander in Chief is not familiar with the facts? Can it be that Congress is being misinformed?

The security of the country is involved. The American people are concerned and the Congress should know the facts. Let us have them.

In this regard the following editorial from a recent edition of the Washington Star is of interest:

A SECOND LOOK AT DEFENSE

It is a good thing that General Eisenhower takes seriously his job as military adviser to the Secretary of Defense. Because he considers his postwar defense assignment as something more than an honorary position, he felt obliged to speak out strongly against cuts in the defense budget which he feared would weaken the Military Establishment in key sectors. As a result of his public criticism of the pending defense budget—a criticism which evidently had the backing of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Defense Secretary Johnson wisely has taken a second look at the defense set-up. After consultation with the JCS he has asked Congress to increase by $350,000,000 the funds for new planes and additional antisubmarine ships and equipment. The inescapable conclusion is that Mr. Johnson, in his commendable efforts to eliminate the fat from the military budget, had sliced too deeply into vital defense spots.

One of these spots is the Air Force, already chafing under the restraint of a 48-group limitation on its air fleet. Air Force officials declared that the $1,350,000,000 earmarked for plane purchases next year was not enough to keep the 48 groups at proper strength. Similarly affected was naval aviation, restricted under the original budget to $650,000,000 for new planes. Mr. Johnson now asks that $200,000,000 be added to the Air Force fund for plane buying and $100,000,000 to the Navy for the same purpose.

Another critical spot is antisubmarine warfare, a phase of defense of increasing importance with the disclosure of Russia's expanded submarine operations. The Defense Secretary agrees with General Eisenhower that it would be wise to allocate more money to antisubmarine craft and special weapons and instruments essential to combat the menace of the long-range snorkel submersible. In addition, with savings from other economy moves, Mr. Johnson proposes to speed up research and development of antitank and other weapons.

It did not take the House Appropriations Committee long to approve the Defense Secretary's supplementary requests. Chairman Vinson of the House Armed Services Committee already had called for restoration to the defense budget of more than half a billion dollars for plane procurement and antisubmarine warfare. In fact, Mr. VINSON has become so concerned over cold war developments that he has withdrawn his opposition to extension of the draft. That there will be little if any opposition to the increased appropriations is indicated by the attitude of economy advocates. House Minority Leader MARTIN summed up this attitude in the sensible comment: "While we are for economy in Government, we have always made an exception of national defense, because we must keep our defenses strong, and we have to rely on what the Joint Chiefs of Staff think necessary." That is the only prudent policy in these times of international tension.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has quoted from the President's military advisers. His State Department advisers were before our committee this week in executive session; I cannot repeat what they said but from recent public statements of theirs, if they are right, President Truman is wrong, and if President Truman is right, they are wrong in the views they have given the public.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Unfortunately, of course, members of the committee cannot disclose to the Congress, nor to the country, information we obtain in executive session, but what the gentleman from Ohio has just said is absolutely correct. If the military advisers are right, then the President is wrong; on the other hand, if the President is right, then the military advisers are wrong. Whom are we to believe?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Gladly.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The chairman of the Senate Armed Service Committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] said: "It will be remarkable if the United States can avoid war with Russia."

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Another statement to implement what we did in the committee.

Mr. GAVIN, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. While our military leaders, as the gentleman pointed out, including General Bradley, asked us to report favorably a 2-year extension of the Selective Service Act, they are closing down five general hospitals which would be needed in the event we suddenly found ourselves catapulted into an emergency. How can they justify their positions?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I do not understand it either.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. A newspaper in Nebraska recently stated that General Penney, a four-star general, stated in Kansas that it would be a miracle if the United States did not blunder itself into war almost at any moment.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is what the Congress and the Armed Services Committee of both the House and the Senate are trying to avoid. But how are we to act properly if we do not have the facts?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. If the shooting down of an American Navy plane by Soviet Russian fliers and the loss of the lives of 10 men on that plane is not some indication that conditions are not getting any better, I do not know what the President needs by way of evidence to convince him.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. And in addition to that, the complete collapse of the situation in Asia. What more is needed to convince and prove to the President that the situation is worse today than it was in 1946?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

ATOMIC LABORATORIES IN JAPAN

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to ask the chairman of the committee or the ranking minority member of the committee to give us some information about atomic laboratories in Japan. When I was in Japan last November it came to my attention—and I visited at Nagasaki and Hiroshima, the areas where the atomic bombs fell—a project which had for its purpose the constructing of a laboratory at both places. Another laboratory at a third town was being constructed on atomic energy reactions. In Hiroshima and Nagasaki I was amazed at the type of construction of the laboratory buildings and the houses for personnel. I do not know how much it cost and I have been unable to find, in looking at the hearings, any reference to the laboratories that were being built, these three laboratories in Japan, two of them where the atomic bombs fell, and the other for a control laboratory. I mentioned to the general who showed them to me that it was fortunate that we did not have half a dozen bombs dropped in Japan, or we would have had half a dozen laboratories to find out what the end results might be of the atomic radiation. Then I said that the reaction from the explosion from an atomic bomb would be the same in Nagasaki that it was in Hiroshima, and he said "I suppose so." But here there are three large constructions, beautiful laboratories, and housing facilities for atomic reaction study.

Can the chairman of the committee inform me as to why the three laboratories are being built in Japan and what they cost? Would not one laboratory have been sufficient to find out what happens after an atomic bomb explodes? Perhaps it does not come under this section of the bill, but I am anxious to know.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I may say in regard to the laboratory work in Japan that Hiroshima and Nagasaki are two different locations, and that laboratory work on the effects of atomic irradiation on the victims who survived is probably one of the most important medical research programs that there is, in view of the fact that American cities may be exposed to some type of radiation in a very short time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They were at different places and different people were affected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Granted, but the irradiation from the bomb that exploded at Hiroshima was the same as that that exployed at Nagasaki.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The bombs were different in types.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They contained different ingredients.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But they were both atomic bombs and the radiation from each would be the same. I understand that the experts said at the time that the effects of the explosion would make the place uninhabitable, that it would be a desert for a hundred years. You know, those Japanese were back there in 90 days building their houses of tissue paper and whatnot and you would hardly have known that the places were bombed. It rather discouraged me to learn that they were going to build two of these atomic hospitals or laboratories and another one for control. If there are some different kinds of gases involved, maybe there is some reason for it.

Is anyone able to tell me how much these three laboratories will cost? Does the Congress have any control over what they will cost?

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the gentleman that this is a lump-sum appropriation and the Atomic Energy Commission can do with any and all of this money as they wish.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Has anyone on the committee seen these beautiful laboratories they are building?

Mr. THOMAS. I have not been to Japan yet, but I hope to get there some day.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They are excellent. They look, though, as if there were a lot more lace and velvet in them than is necessary to carry on research in reference to what happens when an atomic bomb explodes. There are three laboratories being built. I suppose if we exploded a half dozen bombs we would then build a half dozen laboratories. It looks to me like duplication and waste of the taxpayers' money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 265, line 4, insert the following after the word "that": "after existing contractual obligations of the Commission have expired."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it so happens that a novel situation has arisen in which I feel impelled to speak not only on the pending amendment but on the subject matter recently mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. So I shall undertake to divide the very limited time allowed me between those two subjects.

Mr. Chairman, the average citizen cannot help but wonder what sort of comedy of errors his Government actors are engaged in playing on the Washington scene. Measured by the size of the stakes involved and the enormous costs of any error in judgment, it could better be called a tragedy.

Last week, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after reappraisal of the world political situation, asked Congress for an additional $350,000,000 for defense. All this week the Committee on Armed Services, in public and executive sessions, has given close attention to the frank testimony of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of the Secretary of Defense, of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and of others who are in a position to give accurate information and wise counsel. The committee, so impressed with that information and advice, yesterday morning reported a bill to extend the draft law for another 2 years by a unanimous vote.

At the very moment that the committee was making its deliberations, the President at his news conference made the assertion that world conditions today are much less tense than in 1946; that the outlook for peace was more favorable than 4 years ago and that the size of future military budgets would be decreased.

The people long for peace, they shun war, dread its approach and protest the costs of maintaining a military machine. Any words of encouragement that peace is at hand and that Government costs will be less, coming from a person of responsibility and knowledge, are glad tidings. Whoever gives that assurance is acclaimed. Those who see the threat of war and who urge unusual measures and additional expenditures to avert the danger are unpopular and such views are unwelcomed, to say the least.

As the clouds of gloom and pessimism on the world outlook were pictured on Capitol Hill, only a short distance away pollyanna rays of sunshine broke from the windows of the White House. It may be that the President's information is not limited to that of his military advisers, as is the case with Congress. His statement certainly has made more difficult the task of those in Congress who must pass upon these matters and face the electorate.

On the one hand, we have the President saying that the hope of real peace is hovering on the horizon and, on the other hand, we have the military high command urging that the Nation prepare for war, build up the fighting machine and extend the draft.

What a travesty—what confusion.

The easy course for us to follow is to reject the advice of the military people and take the President at his word, refusing both to appropriate the additional funds sought and to extend the draft. However, fearless, sober, unpolitical judgment will not let us do that.

One cannot help but wonder if the President's statement was intended to fool somebody. Fool whom—the Congress, the American people, Stalin, our European friends—just what was its purpose?

Much as I wish that the facts could support the White House conclusions, I feel that the President's expression was untimely, ill-advised, and deplorable.

It is to be hoped that as he meets the American people face to face on his cross-continent tour, he will take them

into his confidence, a privilege he has denied Congress, and explain the basis for his optimism.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the amendment I have just offered, let me say that I concur completely in the objective sought by the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations with respect to dealing with these contracts on city management. However, I am fearful, and I am quite certain that the effect of their provision in the bill will be to immediately cancel the contracts now in existence, upon the enactment of this appropriation bill. So, the purpose of the amendment which I have offered is to allow the existing contracts to expire—some of them have 6 months and some of them have a year yet to run—and that thereafter the limitation imposed by the committee under the appropriation bill will be made applicable. Otherwise, if we cancel these contracts, summarily, then the contractors have one of three courses: Either to immediately suspend their operations in these communities, which will require that the Government and the Atomic Commission immediately undertake the work, or that the contractors will have a valid claim against the United States Government for damages as the result of this limitation in the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think that we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] but if that cannot be supported, then the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is imperative in order that these contracts which are now in existence and have some months yet to run, be not cancelled forthwith upon the enactment of this legislation.

But, there is another fault in this provision beginning in line 22, page 265, which to me renders it absolutely unlike what the committee had in mind, no doubt, when they actually drew it.

Let me read this to you, and I would like to have the attention of the members of the committee: "That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where the fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000."

Do you know that this provision as presently drawn would cause the cancellation of the Carbon and Carbide contract, the General Electric contract, and every other contract that the Commission has in reference to those three installations, because it states, "That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authorization shall be used in connection with the payment of any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission?" Now, that is going to cancel all of the operating contracts as well as the present contracts for town management. I am sure that the committee had no such intention, but all you have to do is to read the language and you will find that it places in jeopardy every contract on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis that the Commission has.

I want to say one more thing in connection with this matter. It seems to me that while it is the duty of the subcommittee on appropriations to make recommendations to the Congress of the United States concerning these things, it is not their province to "determine," as my friend from Tennessee said a moment ago, what these appropriations shall be. That is a matter for the Congress to determine and not the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I feel that the gentleman must have misunderstood my statement, or at least the intent of it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I listened quite carefully to the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. I do recognize that it is not the prerogative of the committee to determine finally, but it is the prerogative of the committee to determine what it recommends to the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will accept the amendment of the gentleman. It can determine what it recommends.

These contracts for town management are the best contracts the AEC could get for the purposes for which the contracts were made. There are serious ideas on the part of the contractors at the moment that they cannot afford to go ahead even on the present basis. If you want Government operation of these towns, if you want the Government to step in with civil service and run these towns, then you just let this language stay in the bill, and you will have civil-service operation, because there is no responsible operator who is going to take over these responsibilities at any such price as you mention.

The Roane-Anderson Corp. is a subsidiary of the Turner Construction Co. of New York. The Turner Construction Co. has better business for its employees at better profits than to run around on any contract of this sort in the State of Tennessee. The same thing is true of other corporations who operate AEC towns in other parts of the United States.

If you want to insist upon Government operation with civil-service employees and all that entails, then you just go ahead and place this kind of limitation on the Atomic Energy Commission. I think you should have gone just a little bit further into it and discovered that these people are not so happy about staying under these contracts even with the present rates of fixed fees which they get for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, first I want to speak to the question raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. Certainly, in my judgment, it would be a strained construction of this proviso to say that this limitation would apply to contracts of the Atomic Energy Commission which do not deal with community management itself. If one reads the entire proviso, it is clear that this is applicable only in connection with contracts for community management. Personally, I would have no objection to any clarification on that point, but that certainly is the intent of the language the way I read it.

Then I want to speak with respect to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. It is my understanding that all these contracts carry cancellation clauses. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from Tennessee if that is not also the understanding of the majority members, that all these contracts have termination clauses.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota that it has been testified in the committee, as he well knows, time and time and time again, that each one of these contracts has an escape clause in it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. What the gentleman says is entirely true. Every contract does have an escape clause, but that escape clause is predicated upon a 6-months' notice in some cases, a year's notice in other cases, and 3 months' notice in still other cases. So it is my idea that during that period of time during which the notice of cancellation is running, this Government is going to be subject to damages if the committee amendment sticks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It occurs to me, if that be true, if the contract is on that basis, that the obligation could be taken care of.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Furthermore, had the Atomic Energy Commission exercised due prudence, in my opinion, it would, upon the reporting of this provision in the bill, have given notice of intent to terminate the contract.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There has been no notice to the membership of the committee, or at least none has come to my attention, so far as I know, that the Atomic Energy Commission has been disturbed by this provision. The thing which has disturbed the members of the Committee on Appropriations, not only this year but also last year, in this community management problem is that there have been so many instances where after a contractor gets a contract he immediately proceeds to have subcontracts and subcontracts and amendments to contracts until, under the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, we have vastly excessive charges for the operation of these communities.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. In making any such cancellation on a contract of this kind, or on any of these contracts, I hope the gentlemen of the committee will come up

with the name of someone who will be glad to take it over at the price limitation they have placed in this bill. The Commission apparently is unable to find anyone. If you could then tell us what you are going to do with these towns when these people move out, I would like to know.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from South Dakota knows a good many experienced city managers who would take the job at far less salary.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The members of the joint committee each received a letter signed by the Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I read just a portion of it:

> We would be unable adequately to fulfill our responsibilities for expanded production of fissionable material and development of new weapons if the community contract fee limitation rider, as reported by the House Appropriations Committee, is enacted into law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If that letter has been addressed to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and has never been brought to the Committee on Appropriations, which handles funds, I will go on record as saying that it illustrates the oversights and sloppy management which have been responsible for the committee's low estimate of the quality of management we have been getting.

I have repeatedly said that the Atomic Energy Commission needs to tighten up with some practical, hard-headed management.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] read the Atomic Energy Act under the authority of which the Atomic Energy Commission was created. Under that act the Atomic Energy Commission must report to the joint committee. I do not know about reporting to the Committee on Appropriations, but they do have to report to our committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does it not occur to the gentleman that it would be prudent for the Atomic Energy Commission, when they are asking for funds and it has some problem like that, to discuss the problem of funds with the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult problem. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that this community problem has worried me since I became a member of this committee and at the present time its vice chairman.

We have studied this problem. I do not suppose that any appropriation has come before this body which has been as carefully scrutinized by this joint committee as this appropriation has been. We have gone over it carefully. We recommended that some of the items come out. I think there could be better coordination. I am sorry to say there has not been. But that is another problem.

The problem today is this, and this is the point that worries me. I do not agree with this method of operation entirely, because it is pure socialism, and we all know it, but if somebody has a better method of producing atomic bombs, I hope they will come forward with it. That is my point in this whole thing. If you disturb these people on the community level, and if you people knew the trouble and difficulty we are facing today in trying to get personnel to go to these places right now, you would see this differently. We sit over there day after day with this problem, listening to people from all over the country, people who know something about this problem. It is highly technical. I do not often oppose the Committee on Appropriations, which has given long study and thought to these problems, but if you do this, in my opinion, you are going to disrupt and confuse the whole problem at the community level, and it will spread through every plant we have in the country. Not only at Oak Ridge and Los Alamos, where these two contracts are, but it goes on out to Arco, and Chicago, and everywhere else. The fee may be large. There are 1,300 people or more employed by the Carbide Corp. at Oak Ridge. Every one of those people are specialized in whatever they are doing. It is true we reimburse them for all salaries. But a fee of 1½ percent or less is not exorbitant, in my opinion. To change over at the present time, I doubt whether we can do it in 6 months under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. We have appointed a committee to study this problem and try to take some action on it through the regular channels and through a sensible approach to the problem. I am hoping that this House will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. If he had not offered it, I would have.

Today our main effort is to get atomic weapons. When we took over this project we did not have any stock pile of atomic weapons. We might just as well know the facts. Today we have, and that is the security of America. To do this, eighty or ninety thousand dollars might jeopardize the problem. I am not sure whether it would or not. But when you have to carry out the functions at the local level, and carry out community functions, it becomes necessary we make them feasible and interesting if we expect weapon production. I do not like this socialized scheme of operating these communities; I have tried to be helpful in solving the problem—but to go out here and hire a city manager as has been suggested at the present time is not the proper way to proceed. The Atomic Energy Commission will have to have every one of these employees cleared by the FBI, and that will take 6 months to do that, let alone the cost of the clearing. If this provision remains in the bill it will affect production and when you do this it retards weapons production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, let us keep this as simple as possible. We are talking about the supervision of community management, something which can be done anywhere in the United States for more or less established amounts of money.

For 4 years this matter of the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission in its housekeeping activities, its operating activities—not the cost of making bombs, not the cost of any of the laboratory experiments, but in its managerial and supervisory details—has been before the subcommittee, first under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and now under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. We have been able to get an increasing amount of information from the Commission, but we have found when we went into those details where we could make a comparison with similar costs in business, the operation of the cafeteria, the running of a bus line, that in almost all cases the costs to the Atomic Energy Commission were higher than the costs would be to anyone else.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the management of the municipal features under the Atomic Energy Commission has seeped with irresponsibility from the very date that they started?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would say that they had seeped with inexperience and therefore waste and extravagance, but that is something we have to divide into two categories; those for the making of bombs, which is highly secret, and under the emergency of war, and therefore the operation of facilities, which can be compared with known industrial costs. I want to point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] that we have been discussing these details with the Atomic Energy Commission; and yet the statement from which he read has not yet been furnished this subcommittee, which is responsible for the appropriation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The joint congressional committee has already tackled this problem. Let me read from the letter signed by the acting chairman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. My time is very limited.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is a matter of only a few words:

> The community problem should be attacked on a complete basis and not in piecemeal fashion. Accordingly, we propose immediately to set up a panel of outstanding men and conduct an independent examination into these community operations. This panel will include people of recognized competence in the field of municipal affairs, in the field of economics, and in the field of real estate management. Their job will be to make an over-all study of the problem.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think that is in the right direction and should have been done several years ago.

I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will not be adopted, because it will increase the difficulty of operation.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, more and more as we delve deeper into the financial morass facing our Federal Government we find that there is too much waste, too much spending, too much debt, too many taxes. Unfortunately the present administration in control of the executive department of the Government and the Congress is evidencing no intention nor desire to reduce the tax load or cut down the exorbitant spending by the Federal Government. On the other hand President Truman himself has announced that taxes should be increased at least a billion dollars.

The Ways and Means Committee now are considering the wartime excise nuisance taxes. There seems to be no plan by this big committee to do away with these wartime excise taxes. It is reported that the committee has tentatively agreed upon some substantial cuts in the wartime excise taxes which, of course, is commendable, but these cuts are not enough to bring full relief to the American taxpayers. These taxes were imposed during the war strictly as a war measure with no consideration being given to the merits of the taxes but only to the one question of grabbing as many tax dollars as possible from any source possible to prosecute the war and defend our country in the great war emergency. The taxes for that purpose were justified but it was the intent and announced aim that they would be repealed at the end of the war. The war has now been over for almost 5 years and the administration is still sticking to its time-worn program of tax and tax, spend and spend, and is refusing to repeal the wartime excise taxes.

The March income tax reports and receipts have been most discouraging as the revenues to be received by the Federal Government from income taxes as shown by these reports will be drastically reduced from the estimates upon which the Government was relying. Furthermore the report of the Joint Senate-House Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation reports that it is now predicted that there will be a $6,700,000,000 Federal deficit for the 1950 fiscal year ending June 30 which is one and two-tenths billion more than President Truman's January estimate. There is a further prediction of a seven and three-tenths billions deficit for the fiscal year 1951 starting July 1 if the spending rate of President Truman is approved by the Congress and if the present taxes are maintained. President Truman had estimated a $5,100,000,000 deficit for 1951. It is thus seen, according to this report that there will be a $14,000,000,000 deficit for the two fiscal years which will be added to the Federal debt unless the administration yields to the demands of the Republicans and cuts down on wasteful Federal spending. The President, however, takes the position that Federal spending should be increased by setting up a number of new programs and increasing outlays in many existing programs and upping the whole tax schedule to cover this increased spending. There does not seem to be at the present time here in the Capital much support for such a program as the President proposes. Many of the Congressmen, both Democrats and Republicans, feel that it is time for retrenchment and that wasteful and profligate spending should be eliminated and the budget brought into balance at the earliest date possible. As consideration of the appropriation bill progresses in the House amendments are being offered on the Republican side to reduce the spending in various departments where savings can be made without crippling the efficiency of the Government but in almost every instance thus far on the Democratic side there has been nearly a solid block against reduction, only two or three Democrats voting for any cuts. Even the Budget Bureau itself forecasts a deficit of $6,200,000,000 for the next fiscal year, an increase of one and one-tenth billions over its January estimate. While President Truman has indicated that he would approve excise tax reductions perhaps aggregating $650,000,000 he has served notice on the Congress that he will veto any bill that does not provide for replacement of even these tax reductions he has suggested.

The major load of the tax burden is due to overseas expenditures and war costs, past and present, and war preparation at home and abroad. Some 75 percent of the whole tax load is in these categories. It is generally conceded that great waste is taking place in these expenditures and that by tightening their belts the heads of the departments responsible therefor could effect material savings and give some relief to the over-burdened taxpayers.

In addition to direct taxes an immense number of hidden taxes are being paid by millions of Americans every hour of the day such as: Quart of milk 13 cents, taxes 8 cents; loaf of bread 10 cents, taxes 5 cents; pack of cigaretts 8 cents, taxes 11 cents; meat 50 cents, taxes 20 cents; cake of soap 5 cents, taxes 2 cents; baby powder 29 cents, taxes 18 cents; movies 40 cents, taxes 20 cents; telephone $4, taxes $2; television $400, taxes $70; new house $7,000, taxes $3,000; rent $40, taxes $20; light $3.25, taxes $1.75; refrigerator $150, taxes $75; coal $13, taxes $7; clock $2, taxes $1; automobile $1,400, taxes $700; gasoline 14 cents, taxes 11 cents; tire $15, taxes $3; battery $15,59, taxes $2,36; lawn mower $14, taxes $7; railroad ticket $12.75, taxes $2.25; perfume $9.75, taxes $2.45; hosiery $1, taxes 50 cents; shoes $6, taxes $3; purse $10, taxes $5; camera $11.23, taxes $1.77.

One big item in Uncle Sam's tax budget is armament costs. The Atlantic Pact countries are spending approximately $20,000,000,000 a year on armaments and the United States is carrying 75 percent of this load. As was carried in a United Press dispatch from London April 23, a survey of the current budget of the Atlantic Pact nations shows total government expenses are $66,719,000,000; total budgeted for defense, $17,881,000,000; America's military-aid program, $1,000,000,000; United States defense budget, $13,100,000,000. Thus the United States is spending 74.6 percent of all the money budgeted by the Atlantic Pact members for defense. Even in these days of astronomical figures $18,881,000,000 for defense—the budget totals plus America's military aid to Europe—is a lot of money. It amounts to more than $50 a year for every man, woman, and child under the Atlantic Pact; it is as much as the United States spent for everything from 1789 until after 1900; it is about half the total cost of World War I, including pensions. It behooves Uncle Sam to stop, look, and listen, tighten his belt, cut out every possible dollar of wasteful, unnecessary spending at home and abroad, eliminate the wartime excise nuisance taxes and lessen the tax load on the American public. If this is not done the whole financial structure of the United States will crack up and our ability to meet our commitments as the one great nation defending human rights will be gone.

Many of us are working early and late to cut out wasteful and profligate spending by the Government and bring expenditures and receipts in balance. I agree with economists and governmental experts who hold that in times of prosperity such as these we should not only live within our income but should make substantial payments on the Federal debt.

The administration reveres the memory of its great leader, Thomas Jefferson, but it fails to put into practice the sound philosophy and precepts he advocated. Jefferson said:

> I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. * * * We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. * * * If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

How sound that advice is and how appropriate when we consider that we are spending $80,000 a minute, and $5,000,000,000 more yearly than we take in, with a debt approaching $270,000,000,000.

Senator BYRD, the great modern Democrat, fighting for the preservation of our financial integrity, recently said:

> We are rapidly approaching a financial crisis in the fiscal affairs of our Government. When Congress convenes next January, it will be in the fateful position of determining whether: (1) To retrench drastically; (2) to impose staggering new taxes; (3) to embrace deficit spending again. To me the third course would be the road to certain ruin, for if we again deliberately embark on deficit spending during peace and prosperity, it is doubtful whether we shall ever balance the budget thereafter. The only

course remaining open is to reduce expenditures to the point of a balanced budget under existing taxes. Reduction in tax rates would have a wholesome influence if it could be done without deficit spending. The solvency of our Government can be preserved only by the mobilization of public sentiment.

While we exert every effort to curtail unnecessary expenditures we should not make the error of failing to preserve, develop, and put into full utilization the great natural resources of our own country and build up our industries and American enterprise so that we can keep our own country strong, the wheels of industry turning and our great labor forces employed. I have fought with all the powers I possess while here in Washington to develop and utilize the great resources of the Northwest, particularly the land, water, and power resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries. I think it would be foolish economy to fail to appropriate the necessary funds for the development of this great natural resource. The funds put to this use are only invested in a profitable enterprise which will return to the Government manyfold the moneys invested. This is not the place to make our cuts and savings in expenditures. In fact, we should increase the investments in these great enterprises, including our industrial plants, so that we may produce the goods and services to meet our necessary obligations in other fields.

There are many places, however, even in our own economy where immense savings could be made. The administration is spending money with a lavish hand. It is said that a straw in the wind shows which way it is blowing and small matters indicate the trend and spendthrift philosophy of the present administration. For instance you may have seen in the press that the administration is securing 10 passenger cars for the use of the President and the White House which cost $30,000 apiece. They have 12-cylinder motors and a speed of more than 100 miles per hour. While it is true these cars will be acquired on a rental basis it does not require much imagination to reach the conclusion that Uncle Sam in the end pays the bill for these 10 deluxe cars.

I cite another example which comes with great force to us in Oregon, involving the battleship *Oregon*. Recently I made some remarks in the House detailing the final chapter in the disgraceful treatment of the old battleship *Oregon* by the Federal Government. Few battleships in the long history of our heroic Navy have performed more gallantly for the Nation than did the *Oregon* in the Spanish-American War and yet after the old ship was decommissioned and was a shrine at rest in the Portland Harbor, the Federal Government yanked it from its moorings and sold it to a junk dealer for $35,000, and then bought back portions of the salvage for which the Government paid $101,731.73 and is still subject to a lawsuit for further payment for the hull. The old battleship floats and rusts away in ignominy in the waters of the far Pacific.

Another example of Federal waste is the immense sums the taxpayers are providing to buy up surplus potatoes and other surplus commodities. The Government is paying $2.10 a hundred pounds for potatoes and have spent some $30,000,000 for the 1949 crop and still is committed to buy some forty-five or fifty million bushels more. The Government is now advertising these potatoes for export at 1 cent for 100 pounds and the potatoes are in bags which cost some 18 cents apiece. If there are no bidders they will probably be destroyed as was done last year, yet the housewife is paying handsomely for potatoes for her table. When it comes to finances Uncle Sam, under the present administration, takes the prize for the monumental spender of all time.

Mr. Chairman, from time to time I have called attention on the floor to the bungling program of the administration in dealing with surplus foods. It was brought forcibly to our attention by the destruction of millions of bushels of potatoes by the administration, which had been purchased with taxpayers' money, and at a time when many needy citizens were in want and on a starvation diet and could have used this edible food product as well as many other food products stored by the Government. Another chapter is being added to the potato fiasco. I quote from an article appearing recently in the Scripps-Howard papers by Earl Richert, entitled "Perpetual-Motion Potato-Buying," as follows:

PERPETUAL-MOTION POTATO BUYING

(By Earl Richert)

Perpetual motion has nothing on the Government's potato-buying program to hold up growers' prices.

It goes on and on, unaffected even by the seasons.

The Government now is buying 1950 crop potatoes in Florida, while still taking 1949 potatoes off the market in Maine and North Dakota at the rate of 500,000 bushels daily.

And Florida purchases are bigger than last year—the 248,000 bushels purchased so far being 50,000 more than at the same time last year.

DIDN'T WANT 'EM

Florida, incidentally, is the State whose potato growers don't want Government price supports, according to Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND (Democrat, Florida).

But the Senator explains that Florida growers "naturally are going to participate" in any program set up for the Nation.

Senator HOLLAND says Florida growers believe they would be better off with no potato price support because they are doing well with other vegetable and citrus crops which are not supported.

Agriculture Department officials don't think the bigger Florida purchases indicate Government will have to buy even more potatoes in the country this year than last. The Florida crop is not under marketing agreements—which regulate movement to market by grades and quantities—while most other commercial potato areas will be.

The Agriculture officials think the general use of the marketing agreements will reduce materially the cost of supporting the 1950 crop.

FIFTY-SIX MILLION BUSHELS

The Government has bought 56,000,000 bushels of 1949 crop potatoes at a cost of $60,000,000—almost enough to run the entire legislative branch of the Federal Government for 1 year.

And at the rate of current buying, it is estimated that still another 10,000,000 bushels of 1949 potatoes will be purchased.

Destruction to date of Government-owned 1949 potatoes totals about 5,500,000 bushels. Agriculture officials estimate another 5,000,000 bushels may be destroyed.

Of the 50,000,000 bushels of Government potatoes that have gone to useful outlets, 31,000,000 bushels have gone for livestock feed. The rest has gone for export, starch, potato flour, and to welfare and school-lunch programs.

Exports at the rate of 1 cent per 100 pounds have provided an outlet for 5,000,000 bushels.

I recently called attention to the fact that the administration's potato program is a national scandal. The Department of Agriculture recently announced that it planned to destroy some millions of bushels of potatoes which the Government purchased under the support program. Last year a similar policy was followed by the administration and great quantities of edible potatoes were destroyed by being saturated with gasoline, dumped, allowed to rot, or converted into fertilizer. Uncle Sam pays about $2.10 per 100 pounds, or approximately $1.25 a bushel for these potatoes and has already spent $30,000,000 on the 1949 crop and still contemplates buying forty-five or fifty million bushels more. About 13,500,000 bushels have been sold at 1 cent per 100 pounds for livestock feed. In many cases the Government paid the freight charges in addition. Sometimes the potatoes are soaked with chemicals or coloring to make them unfit for human consumption. Secretary Brannan stated that the Government is prepared, if necessary, to dump 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. The administration's potato program from its inception has cost almost one-half billion dollars, namely $495,169,000 for the period 1943 to 1949. The administration has further bungled the problem by importing large quantities of Canadian potatoes which undersell the American potatoes and thereby cut the throats of American producers as well as milk Uncle Sam for heavy payments under the support program.

In addition to potatoes, the Commodity Credit Corporation is holding 465,000,000 bushels of wheat which is about 40 percent of last year's total crop, valued at approximately $1,000,000,000. Its estimated holdings of corn total 510,000 bushels or 13.5 percent of the 1949 crop, valued at almost $750,000,000. It holds six-million-plus bales of cotton which is 27.45 percent of the 1949 crop, valued approximately at $1,000,000,000. In addition, the Commodity Credit Corporation is holding the following:

	Quantity	Amount
Dried milk.....pounds..	254, 490, 784	$31, 615, 535. 72
Dried eggs.....do....	49, 445, 878	98, 645, 444. 68
Butter.....do....	98, 675, 801	61, 003, 323. 06
Cheese.....do....	23, 935, 157	8, 030, 266. 80
Prunes.....do....	49, 985, 455	5, 006, 203. 64
Raisins.....do....	22, 972, 380	2, 210, 133. 26
Edible dried beans hundredweight...	4, 850, 795	42, 859, 926. 40
Rice.....do....	431, 820	2, 936, 252. 60
Turkeys.....pounds..	725, 480	309, 173. 80
Canned Mexican meat pounds..	49, 445, 878	12, 468, 074. 26

This involves some 277,480 tons of surplus commodities costing $265,000,000. These huge Government surpluses of edible products are mounting day by day.

It is reprehensible to destroy nourishing edible foods which have been produced by American farmers and paid for by American taxpayers. I therefore introduced a bill last week making it mandatory on the Federal Government to make these surplus food products available to charitable institutions, schools, welfare agencies, and thousands of needy Americans who are receiving starvation allotments from welfare agencies.

The immediate problem is the disposition of the huge surpluses which the Government now is holding, which have been purchased with the hard-earned tax dollars of the American public. We are confronted with a condition and not a theory. It would be a scandalous procedure to dump or destroy these edible foods and not make them available to American citizens in need. However, the larger problem is the maladministration of the Federal Government under its present controls in failing to solve this great industrial and agricultural problem—the production and distribution of the necessities of life.

As a Nation under our mass production, labor-saving machines, and skilled workmen, we are able to produce more of the necessities of life than the existing markets will absorb. The Government is boosting the market prices of these products, potatoes, eggs, butter, cereals, to the consumer by purchasing vast quantities of the products with tax dollars. Thus the taxpayer is hit twice, first by having the prices of his everyday needs boosted skyward and, secondly, by hooking him with a heavy tax to pay for controlling the market, buying up the surpluses and, as is now proposed, destroying them. The administration not only has not solved the problem but is hopelessly bogged down in a program which if pursued to its end will bankrupt the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, with all this waste and extravagant expenditures, is there any wonder that the present administration has spent in less than 5 years $191,081,394,191, while 32 Presidents in 156 years spent only $179,620,113,645? These huge expenditures mean increased taxes.

Hidden taxes make up a big share of the tax load on the housewife. In a loaf of bread there are 151 hidden Federal and State taxes. The grocer paid 4 Federal taxes; the baking concern 8 Federal, and the grocer and baker together, 15 State taxes; the flour mill paid 7 Federal taxes and 8 State taxes; then there was transportation tax and the sugar-refining concern's tax—all in all a stupendous tax load for one loaf of bread. The new Easter bonnet will have 150 invisible taxes on it. There are 206 invisible taxes on a new automobile, 11½ cents in hidden taxes on a pack of cigarettes, 116 in a man's suit, 639 on a $10,000 new home. A breakfast egg has 100 taxes involved in it from the production stage to the table. A new pair of shoes has 502 hidden taxes paid on it. The Government as it is run today does not have the word "economy" in its vocabulary.

One of the big items adding to the Federal deficit is the fact that Uncle Sam imports millions of pounds of foodstuffs which are in oversupply in the United States and upon which he is paying billions of dollars for support prices. From July through December the United States imported as follows: 19,435,000 pounds of cheese, with the Government holding on December 31 nearly 24,000,000 pounds; 795,000 bushels of wheat with Government stocks on December 31 being over 475,000,000 bushels; 359,000,000 bushels of corn with Government stocks on December 31 being above 180,000,000 bushels; 8,260,000 bushels of barley with Government stocks on December 31 being nearly 53,000,000 bushels; 9,478,000 bushels of oats with Government stocks on December 31 being 42,000,000 bushels; 7,436,000 bushels of rye with Government stocks on December 31 being 760,000 bushels; 48,940 bags of dried beans with Government stocks on December 31 being 10,850,000 bags; 701,000 bushels of apples while the Government was paying an export subsidy on more than 1,500,000 bushels; 86,000 pounds of raisins while the surplus of raisins under marketing agreement orders was estimated at 100,000,000 pounds; 2,202,000 pounds of pork and pork products while domestic hog prices were declining. From July through December, Canada sent 1,587,000 dozen eggs to the United States; during the same period Communist China shipped 1,746,000 pounds of dried eggs to the United States; 283,000 pounds of frozen eggs also were received in the United States; the Government stock pile of eggs on December 31 totaled more than 73,500,000 pounds of dried eggs and the Department was still buying them at the rate of more than 2,000,000 pounds a week.

Imports of food and agricultural commodities continue to enter United States ports, piling up the already huge surpluses in this country. Table shows the imports over comparable periods, from July 1 to Feb. 28 of the last 2 fiscal years

	Unit	1948–49	1949–50
Butter	Pound	392,000	6,000
Cheese	do	15,511,000	29,365,000
Dried milk	do	2,132,000	6,608,000
Corn	Bushel	323,000	468,000
Barley	do	7,532,000	10,095,000
Oats	do	15,370,000	13,966,000
Dried beans	Pound	9,106,000	5,762,000
Potatoes	do	348,109,000	393,661,000
Apples	Bushel	1,732,000	1,213,000
Pears	Pound	189,000	1,949,000
Raisins	do	56,000	86,000
Pork:			
Fresh and frozen	do	214,000	506,000
Pickled	do	427,000	4,665,000
Eggs:			
Shell	Dozen	1,618,000	2,952,000
Dried yolks	Pound	294,000	2,005,000
Whole	do	28,000	99,000

In 1932 the tax load was divided in this manner—54.8 percent for local taxes, 23.2 percent for State taxes and only 22 percent for Federal taxes. Now the local taxes only amount to 14.3 percent of the total taxes paid; 14.8 percent go for State taxes while the Federal taxes take 70.9 percent. No wonder the administration has plenty of money to buy votes with Federal grants and pork barrel political deals. So the next time your neighbor puts up a beef about high taxes tip him off as to why he is getting skinned. An average family of four now pays $1,135.12 a year in taxes. It pays the Federal Government $958.92, the State $199.56, and $193.64 in local taxes.

Our neighbor to the north, Canada, has reduced the taxes three times since the war and the only substantial reduction in the United States was put into effect by the Republican Eightieth Congress. By the way, that Congress is the only one that balanced the budget and finished with a surplus in the Treasury. Every other year since 1932 when the late President Roosevelt assumed office we have spent more than we took in. This fiscal year the red-ink deficit will be approximately $5,500,000,000, maybe more. The next fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, according to official estimates, will be between five and eight billions in the red depending upon how the revenues keep up to the present rate of income.

It is significant to point out that the outlay of the United States for war purposes is more than twice that of all 11 other Atlantic countries. Now the United States has in its current budget $13,500,000,000 for defense costs. The combined total of Great Britain, France, Canada, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Portugal, Luxemburg, and Iceland is only $5,100,000,000. In other words Uncle Sam is footing most of the bill for the cold war. The budgets of the nations allied with us give a much smaller slice to national defense. This does not include the program of the administration to arm western Europe. The portions of the national budgets spent on arms in these nations is as follows: United States, 31.9 percent; Italy, 25.2 percent; Netherlands, 20.8 percent; Portugal, 20.8 percent; Britain, 20 percent; France, 16.3 percent; Canada, 15.2 percent; Norway, 14.1 percent; Denmark, 11.9 percent; Belgium, 8.5 percent; Luxemburg, 2 percent; Iceland, none.

These are pertinent facts which led me to say that we could reduce the costs of government and the national budget in the allocation of funds to be spent overseas by 25 to 50 percent in many cases, and not only thereby save the American taxpayers billions of dollars and enable us to balance the budget and cut out deficit spending but we would in the long run be giving a bigger boost to these foreign countries. Under the present procedure we are educating foreign nations and their nationals to lean on Uncle Sam for their bread and butter and the sooner we adopt a sensible program which will put them on a self-sustaining basis, the better it will be for the nations themselves as well as for the United States Treasury. Foreign aid should be a springboard for self-help and not a wheel chair of permanent doles. We have already spread abroad since the war's end over thirty billions of dollars wrung from American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, we could effect material savings by the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations for cutting down the expense of Government.

I favor the adoption of the Hoover Report economies and have voted for the bills embodying it that have thus far been submitted. As I point out later,

there are 288 recommendations each of which must be considered on its merits in order to achieve the economies desired. The Eightieth Congress under Republican control enacted the law, which I supported, making possible this report to modernize the Executive Department and to reduce the cost of government.

Former President Hoover estimates savings of $2,000,000,000 could result from enactment of this new eight-point reorganization program which he says should be given priority of action at this session of the Eighty-first Congress. The eight-point program is:

First. Civil Service reorganization.

Second. Budget and accounting reorganization.

Third. Post Office Department reorganization.

Fourth. Federal hospital service unification.

Fifth. Water conservation services unification.

Sixth. Grazing and forest lands unification.

Seventh. Establishment of a Central Transportation Agency.

Eighth. Reducing the number—65—of agencies which must report to the President.

According to the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report the Armed Services Unification bill has resulted in a saving of $1,250,000,000 and the establishment of the General Services Administration a saving of $250,000,000. Legislation to accomplish this was adopted by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and resulted from recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Adoption of the eight-point program would not complete action on all of the reorganization plans recommended by the Commission.

Adoption of the complete Hoover plan would mean possible savings of from four to five billion dollars a year, the Citizens Committee reports. This would be a per capita saving of $30 yearly and the average family saving would be $120 annually. I point out, however, these savings can be achieved only if the administrative agencies in charge have the will and determination to make them.

The Hoover Commission has made 288 recommendations, 124 of which require legislation. Of these 36 have already become law. I hope the Congress will go forward with enacting into law these recommendations as rapidly as possible considering, of course, each on its merits, in order to effect all economies possible.

There are some recommendations of the 288 made by the Commission which were difficult of solution by the Commission itself and which did not receive the support of all of the members of the Commission and which will require careful consideration by the Congress, among which may be mentioned the recommendations with reference to the Veterans' Administration and the Army engineers.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons that I have enumerated, and there are many others, it is apparent that Uncle Sam is riding for a fall unless he stops, looks, and listens, and cuts out wasteful spending, reduces the tax load and restores our Government to sound American principles based on a pay-as-you-go plan with a balanced budget. For that reason I have advocated the following program: curb wild spending orgy at home and abroad, oust the Communists and spendthrifts from Government, reduce taxes, end war excise taxes, balance the budget, end deficit spending, ban bureaucratic regimentation and restore sanity and honest constitutional government, adopt Hoover report economies, and save free enterprise and human liberties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to use part of this time to answer some of the things that have been brought up. I want to concur in what my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] said, that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy meets almost as many times a week, I believe, as the subcommittee on appropriations, and that we have studied this problem for 4 years; and we do not relinquish to the subcommittee on appropriations any degree of excellence in this subject compared to the Committee on Atomic Energy and the subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], who with his subcommittee has visited these communities and studied this community-management problem.

I grant that we of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy also know that it has been impossible to get other corporations to bid on these community-management projects. It was so testified by one of the AEC Commissioners before our committee. It was also testified and we have letters indicating that some of these contractors intend to give up these community-management projects at the end of their term.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. We have information to the effect that General Electric wants to get out of Hanford, one of the most important projects in this country today. We have also in the last 24 hours had a letter containing the resignation of the general manager of the project, who draws a salary of $17,500.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is right, and testimony before our committee shows that in the town of Hanford the per capita cost of community management is $7 compared with the $5 or $6 per capita cost in the other towns, and there have been many complaints to the Commission by General Electric, which has an over-all contract, including both laboratory and municipal management in Hanford.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the joint committee has received protests advising if this rider is approved it will interfere with the production of atomic weapons?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly. If this rider is approved it means that the Atomic Energy Commission will have to take part of its present staff, which is devoted to the production of atomic energy and the hydrogen-research program and charge them with the responsibility of actual management of these towns. It means that every Congressman will get complaints by individuals involving any type of municipal fault finding. Instead of taking them to the particular corporations, they will come directly to the Government. It means that the Government will enter into the operation of the municipalities on a completely Government-operated basis in place of the free-enterprise operation which is now being pursued.

These contracts have been let on a competitive basis, and I wish to bring this information particularly to the members of the committee. The cost of operation of the towns has been continually scrutinized and the cost of operation of the town of Los Alamos has been reduced since 1948 from over $8,000,000 to less than $2,000,000. In the town of Oak Ridge, town operation cost has been reduced from less than $9,000,000 to slightly less than $4,000,000 since 1948.

I do not know the temper of the committee. I hope the temper of the committee will be to support the amendment I have offered, then let this thing be ironed out in conference in a proper manner because the Atomic Energy Commission wants to make a study of this matter. It has just finished its security study and has promised our committee it will go into the municipal-operation problem on the basis of a panel suggested by our committee. If my amendment is voted down, I take this unusual course to say that I hope the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] will be accepted, because it will mean that we can continue in good faith on the present Government-contractor, free-enterprise arrangement until the end of the contract. Then let such change as is necessary take place.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The letter received by members of the joint committee has this to say:

> We firmly believe that the enactment into law of the fee-limitation rider would expose the atomic-energy program to unnecessary risks which would adversely affect the early accomplishment of critical projects.

Would the gentleman comment on the risks mentioned?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to conclude the debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let us see if we can summarize this matter in a very few minutes. Let us stick to the issue. In the first place this limitation, and that is all it is, has nothing in the world to do with the security of any of these installations, it has nothing in the world to do with the production of the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb. I stand on those two statements and they cannot be contradicted.

You are appropriating hundreds of thousands of dollars for security other than this $180,000 for a city manager's job that there are thousands upon thousands of men in this country, who

are well experienced, would be tickled to death to have at $25,000 a year. If your subcommittee erred, Mr. Chairman, it was on the side of being overgenerous.

All in the world that these corporations are doing is a job that is comparable to that which every city manager does every day in this country. You are paying a city manager in a town like Oak Ridge, with less than 35,000 people, $180,000 as a fee. Why, in my town of over 300,000 several years ago we had a city manager, and do you know what we paid him? Twenty-five thousand dollars a year.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to that you have a company that runs the bus system in this town of less than 35,000 and you pay a fee of $90,000 for running it. Bear in mind that the taxpayers pay for the gasoline, the drivers' salaries, the Government buys the busses, it pays for the maintenance and repair of the busses and everything else. Then on top of that you pay somebody $90,000 for managing it.

One of the biggest operators of transportation systems in the United States is Stone & Webster. They own the transportation system in my town, and they own them in a good many of your towns. Do you imagine that Stone & Webster would pay their manager $90,000 a year for running a transportation system in a city of less than 35,000 people? This is a very practical problem, and I venture to say that there is not one of these three managers who will quit his job, and if they quit, I will guarantee you that there will be 100 applicants before Monday morning.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is there a president of a great transcontinental railroad company in this country that gets $90,000 a year for filling that position?

Mr. THOMAS. Judge, I do not know, but there is a thousand times more responsibility on the president of a railroad than there is on this man.

Mr. JENNINGS. A Member here volunteered the information that the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. pays its president $125,000 a year.

Mr. THOMAS. And he has 5,000 times more responsibility than this city manager has at Oak Ridge, if my arithmetic is correct.

So, it all adds up to this, gentlemen. This amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from California, [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and there is no finer man here than he, he knows his subject—ought to be defeated. And, I can say the same thing about my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. He is a fine gentleman, and just as patriotic as any human being in this world could be.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let us discuss this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well, let me discuss the amendment. His amendment says in effect, "Let us go ahead and let them finish out the contracts." That is what it says. These contracts are for 2 and 3 years' duration, if my memory serves me correctly, and for 4 years we have begged and pleaded with this Atomic Energy Commission not to throw away the taxpayers' money in this regard, and they have failed and refused to do anything about it, and therefore we had to protect the taxpayers of this country by putting that limitation in there. There is an escape clause in all of these contracts, and the Atomic Energy Commission has so testified not once but a dozen times.

Mr. COLE of New York. What is the escape clause?

Mr. THOMAS. If you will look in the RECORD you will find that I asked the question: "Can you not get out of these contracts whenever you get ready?" They said, "Yes." Now, if there is any hardship on the Atomic Energy Commission in that regard, gentlemen, they brought it on themselves, because we have talked to them literally with tears in our eyes for the last 4 years about this thing. It is time that it be brought to an end, and now I ask you to vote down both of these amendments.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may correct him?

Mr. THOMAS. Surely.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman said these contracts had 2, 3, and 4 years more to go.

Mr. THOMAS. No. I said if my memory serves me correctly, they were 2- and 3-year contracts, and I will stand corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. COLE of New York. The longest any of them has to go is 1 year, to the first of July 1951. Others expire sooner than that.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, they are 2- and 3-year contracts then.

One further thing, at Hanford, Wash., we have a little city there of less than 25,000 people. Do you know what they pay the city manager at Hanford? Why, they have a contract with him for $1 a year for doing everything they do down in good Tennessee for about $270,000. Why in the world should they give the General Electric Corp. $1 and then come to these other towns and pay anywhere from $154,000 to $270,000? General Electric is not exactly foolish. No one has ever accused that great corporation of working entirely for love and affection. I think they still pay a pretty good dividend. How can the Atomic Energy Commission consistently come over to your committee and say, "Why, we pay that great corporation only $1 a year for running this town of 25,000, and then we go down to a little town 700 or 800 miles from there, at Los Alamos, N. Mex., a town of about 9,000 or 10,000, and pay another corporation $154,000?"

Mr. DURHAM. If the gentleman will yield, I might say that the gentleman who was getting the $1 a year is resigning today.

Mr. THOMAS. The only reason he has resigned is that we have been riding him for 3 years.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, in submitting my amendment I offered it as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment, and offer it as a straight amendment to the bill by way of perfecting it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: In line 24 of page 265, after "that" insert "after existing contractual obligations of the Commission have expired."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of New York) there were—ayes 27, noes 64.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Holifield amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOLIFIELD) there were—ayes 19, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

For all expenses of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion as authorized by Public Law 40, Eighty-first Congress, $20,000, together with not exceeding $30,000 of the unobligated balances of funds appropriated for such purpose in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, and the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I was at a meeting of my committee on Monday when my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] commented upon the untimely death of my good friend Generoso Pope, prominent New York businessman and publisher of the Il Progresso Italo-Americano. I would otherwise have joined him in expressing my keen sense of personal loss upon the passing of such a valued and distinguished citizen who died suddenly and unexpectedly in New York on Friday morning, April 28, 1950.

Gene Pope was a true friend for a number of years and his departure from this earthly sphere was all too sudden. The acts and deeds that he molded into living realities during his lifetime transcend anything in importance that might be said of him now. His life is best typified in the record of constructive service, his aggressive and dynamic personality, his courage and forthrightness, and a dominant and driving force that never knew defeat.

He came to the United States from Italy at the age of 10 and when he landed in New York City he was virtually without funds and had no knowledge of the English language. Such handicaps, however, did not deter him from finding employment. During the course of the years that followed he rose from an immigrant boy to a man of tremendous stature and influence. He shall always be remembered as a man of outstanding qualities, a patriotic and loyal American, and a constructive and civic-minded citizen.

As publisher of the Il Progresso Italo-American he was successful in making it one of the outstanding newspapers of our country. It attained the largest circulation of any newspaper printed in the Italian language in America. His attention was always focused on defending and enriching our American tradition of Christian liberty and positive democracy. He was a pioneer crusader in exposing the Communists' vicious anti-American propaganda in Italy and was a leader and a tremendous inspirational force in advocating the letter-writing campaign by American citizens to relatives and friends in Italy during the critical weeks prior to the Italian elections held in April 1948. That campaign played a major part in preventing the country of his birth from going communistic.

Gene Pope leaves to his wife and sons the heritage of a good name and the achievements of a career upon which the people of the city and State of New York and the entire country can look with pride. Because of his greatness of character and sincerity of purpose he enriched the lives of all who came in contact with him. I have lost a good friend. I take this occasion to express to his devoted wife and family my deepest sympathy. May Almighty God, in His infinite wisdom and mercy, grant him the peace and rest which he has so richly earned.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (Public Law 774, approved June 25, 1948), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; $455,100: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, coporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with governmental and private agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this act.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 270, line 10, after the word "expenses" insert a comma and the following: "including traveling expenses outside continental United States".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a correcting amendment and merely puts travel in the United States under the $9 limitation, which it presently is, instead of allowing an unlimited traveling allowance as is the case sometimes in Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of five-passenger motor vehicles; and printing and binding; $633,608,240, to remain available until expended, of which $240,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head; and in addition to the amount herein appropriated, contracts may be entered into for the purposes of the said act of July 23, 1946, in an amount not in excess of $100,000,000: *Provided*, That any funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under said act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with subsection 6 (a) of the act of July 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 598), may be transferred to stock piles established in accordance with said act.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 277, line 25, after the second comma, insert "of which not to exceed $25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of said act of July 23, 1946, through purchase contracts negotiated with operators within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and in making advance payments on such contracts to the extent determined to be necessary to the performance thereof, and."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, as the Committee knows, there is about $733,000,000 in here in cash and contract authorization for the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials. During the hearings it was suggested by the General Services Administration that some of these funds could and should be used to develop critical and strategic materials situated within the United States for stockpiling purposes, and this amendment merely earmarks $25,000,000 of the $733,000,000 for that purpose. We hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Texas, of course, recalls that during the hearings we had considerable discussion with Mr. Larsen and Mr. Mack and others charged with carrying out this stockpiling program, and we found that they were quite concerned over their failure to get much of this material from sources within the United States. We suggested to them that we thought part of their difficulty was due to their method of procurement; that is, they were demanding firm delivery contracts from new producers, and called attention to the fact that new producers of these critical materials could not make firm delivery contracts; that what was necessary was to give them a contract which would be a firm price on the part of the Government so that they then could go out and make their commitments and engage in the production necessary.

I may say that in my talks and correspondence with Mr. Larsen he has since been carrying out a different policy and is making better progress.

As far as this amendment is concerned, I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has a point of order pending.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reserve the point of order until the gentleman from Montana has concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, in making this statement I wish to give due credit to our efficient and hard-working mining specialists for the Committee on Public Lands, Mr. George Soule.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because it has as its objective a desire that the mining States of the West have worked toward for a long time. The Public Lands Committee has reported two bills with that objective. One was vetoed by the President and one failed of enactment in the House. This amendment, at least in part, carries out the objectives that we have had in supporting the small mining industry of the west, an industry that is in trouble. Use of funds and contract authorization, as intended under "The Buy-America

Clause" of the Stockpiling Act can be of great help to the small mining industry.

ANALYSIS OF THE MUNITIONS BOARD STOCKPILING PROGRAM, WAR REQUIREMENTS, AND THE EXPLOITATION OF DOMESTIC MINERAL DEPOSITS IN TIMES OF EMERGENCY

An analysis of the Munitions Board stockpiling program, the magnitude of war requirements, and the possibility of exploiting our domestic mineral deposits in time of war reveal a number of startling facts that should be of vital concern to the Congress and the people of the United States.

ESTIMATED COST OF CURRENT MUNITIONS BOARD STOCKPILE OBJECTIVE

The estimated cost of the Munitions Board stockpile objective stands today at $3,773,000,000 for a total of 71 items, including natural rubber, sisal and manila cordage, fibers, castor oil, coconut oil, palm oil, sperm oil, shellac, quinine, opium, and other materials, including minerals and metals.

MINIMUM STOCKPILE OBJECTIVE ADMITTEDLY INADEQUATE

What does this Munitions Board stockpile amount to if fully attained? The Munitions Board, in its report dated January 23, 1949, informed the Congress:

> The objectives of the program are minimum ones; even when these objectives have been fully attained, the stockpile would not be able to cure all wartime shortages. It would do no more than ease the desperately critical shortages that might otherwise block our war production completely.

ASSUMPTIONS USED FOR DETERMINING THE MINIMUM STOCKPILE REQUIREMENTS

On what basis was the admittedly inadequate Munitions Board stockpile objective established? The Munitions Board report to the Congress, dated January 23, 1949, states that—

> Long-range or total stockpile objectives are established on the basis of estimates as to the requirements of the United States during an assumed 5-year period of war for each strategic and critical material, in excess of estimated available production and reserve stocks (exclusive of the Government stockpile).

Add this statement to the more comprehensive outline and information given in the Army and Navy Munitions Board report of January 2, 1945, and it is found that the Munitions Board minimum stockpile objective, now estimated to cost $3,773,000,000 was established on the following basic assumptions or computations:

First. Stockpiled materials will be needed during an assumed 5-year period of war only.

Second. Estimates of United States consumption during a third world war were based on the rates of consumption during the period of the peak year of World War II to January 1945.

Third. Estimates of available domestic production during a third world war were based on the production rates during World War II modified by forseeable increases or decreases in the near future.

Fourth. It is assumed that a continuing flow of large quantities of materials will be available and obtained from overseas sources during a third world war.

Fifth. The minimum stockpile objective for each nonperishable material was determined as the difference between the total estimated requirements for the 5-year war period less the supplies estimated to be available from both domestic and foreign sources during the war period.

STOCKPILE ACQUISITIONS FAR BEHIND ORIGINAL SCHEDULE

What progress has been made toward the acquisition of the Munitions Board minimum and grossly inadequate stockpile requirements? When the Stockpiling Act was passed on July 23, 1946, the Munitions Board expected to acquire the full amount over a 5-year period. However, the Munitions Board report of January 23, 1950, reveals that on January 1, 1950, 3½ years after the current stockpiling program commenced, only 30 percent of the minimum stockpile objective had been accumulated; one-half of this accumulation was obtained from surplus Government stocks of World War II, ECA purchases, and the stockpile commenced in 1939 under Public Law 117. Of great significance is the fact that only 16 percent of the minimum stockpile requirements has been obtained with appropriations authorized by the Stockpiling Act of July 23, 1946. At the rate of accumulations of stockpile materials programed for delivery in the fiscal year of 1950 it is obvious that an additional 6 years or more will be required to fill the minimum stockpile—a stockpile which, when accumulated, will be of great aid, but will fall far short of providing the measure of security that is due the people of the United States and that is wholly within the power of the Congress to provide.

COMPARISON OF MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM STOCKPILE REQUIREMENTS INCLUDING THEIR COSTS AND SECURITY AFFORDED

The question arises as to the means by which the people of the United States may be assured sufficient strategic and critical raw materials during a future war emergency. First, it should be pointed out that the Stockpiling Act of 1946 authorizes and directs the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, acting jointly through the agency of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, to determine which materials are strategic and critical under the provisions of this act and to determine the quality and quantities of such materials which shall be stockpiled under the provisions of the act. In accordance with this provision of the Stockpiling Act the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior, through their representatives and acting through the Munitions Board, have established both minimum and maximum stockpile objectives.

There is a great difference between the minimum and maximum stockpile objectives, both as to the amount of security provided the people of the United States and the cost. The basic differences between the two objectives are given, after a fashion, in the Army and Navy Munitions Board report to the Congress of January 2, 1945. However, they are more lucidly indicated in a document submitted to the Committee on Public Lands by the Department of the Interior. The assumptions on which the minimum stockpile objectives were based have been stated. The assumptions on which the maximum stockpile objective or requirements were based are as follows—quoting the Department of the Interior:

> Maximum stockpile objectives were computed for the same period of emergency as was used in determining minimum objectives. The same method of calculation also was used. However, a substantially larger factor of safety was obtained by the following changes in the assumptions as to total requirements and the availability of supplies from foreign and domestic sources during the emergency.
>
> 1. Total requirements for maximum stockpile objectives were determined on the basis of maintaining the civilian economy at a higher level of efficiency than that prevailing during the recent war by minimizing the drastic dislocations caused by critical shortages in civilian goods. Provision also was made for larger future civilian needs resulting from an expanding population.
>
> 2. The strategic assumptions regarding the accessibility of foreign sources during the emergency were further discounted to reflect political and economic factors, in addition to military contingencies, that might prevent access to foreign supplies.
>
> 3. Estimates of domestic production in a future emergency were determined on the assumption that the extreme measures adopted during the last war to increase output would be avoided by the provision of larger stockpiles.

We find that both minimum and maximum stockpile objectives are based on estimates as to the requirements of the United States during an assumed 5-year period of war. These stockpile objectives make no provision whatsoever for the distinct possibility of a future war lasting 6 to 8 years or longer, nor do they include any requirements for the several critical years following a period of war when world shortages of minerals and metals retard recovery, inevitably lead to inflation, and endanger the economy of the United States.

As to the requirements of a future world-war emergency, experience has proven that they cannot be determined in advance. A number of studies on the subject of stockpiling and war requirements were made over a period of 22 years prior to Pearl Harbor, and yet our military planners failed completely to anticipate the vast amount of materials actually required in World War II. Nevertheless, the maximum stockpile objective, if fully attained, would minimize the drastic dislocations caused by critical shortages in civilian goods and provide for increased civilian needs resulting from a larger population than existed prior to 1945. Conversely, the minimum stockpile requirements, if fully attained, are not calculated or intended to be sufficient to prevent or avoid drastic and costly dislocations to the civilian economy during a future war emergency. Remember that the Munitions Board itself has stated that the minimum stockpile objectives if fully attained would do no more than ease the desperately critical shortages that might otherwise block our war production completely.

It is highly doubtful that even this would be accomplished; for the minimum stockpile requirements, which represent the present Munitions Board objective, obviously were based on the remote possibility that the United States would con-

tinue to obtain enormous quantities of strategic and critical minerals and metals from overseas sources of supply throughout a future war period, including South America, Africa, and possibly India, the East Indies, and Australia.

As to the difference in costs of the minimum and maximum stockpile requirements, the Munitions Board minimum stockpile requirements are estimated to cost a little in excess of $3,500,000,000 whereas the maximum stockpile requirements for a 5-year war period were estimated a year ago to cost approximately $15,000,000,000 or 4 times as much.

Serious consideration should be given to the fact that the Secretary of the Interior, to whom the Congress gave joint responsibility, together with the Secretaries of War and Navy, to determine stockpile requirements, last year stated before the Committee on Public Lands that the maximum and not the minimum stockpile requirements are the ones that should be established as the true stockpile objective for the proper security of the United States. Although an adequate stockpile, or its equivalent in actively producing domestic mines, is equally essential to meet industrial and civilian requirements and to protect the economy of the United States, the military viewpoint and decisions with respect to stockpiling prevail. Unless the situation is corrected, the calamity of a third world war can be expected to prove that the $3,773,000,000 Munitions Board stockpile, even if fully attained, amounts to nothing more than a stockpile for the use of the military exclusively. Do not expect that the materials in the minimum stockpile will be available or permitted for use to save the national economy from disaster. In time of war military requirements are paramount and must be served regardless of the havoc wrought within a nation by the lack of raw materials essential to its economy.

A REALISTIC INDICATION OF EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS

One failing to realize the enormous quantities of raw materials required by the United States in war and peace may well be given to believe that 3½ billion dollars represents a large and safe stockpile of materials for a future war emergency. To the uninformed the maximum stockpile requirements for 71 materials, estimated to cost in the vicinity of $15,000,000,000, might appear to be excessive.

Three billion seven hundred and seventy-three million dollars for a stockpile of 71 items may be viewed more realistically when one considers the probable total requirement for one item alone over a 5-year war period. During the 5-year period of 1941 through 1945 the apparent domestic consumption of new and old copper was approximately 12,369,000 tons. Assuming an average price of 19½ cents a pound, which is the current price for new copper, this amount of copper would cost a little less than $5,000,000,000. During the three postwar reconversion years of 1946 through 1948, the apparent consumption of copper was 5,305,000 tons which, at the same price, would cost slightly in excess of $2,000,000,000. By the same method of calculation, an 8-year period of war and a 3-year period of reconversion and rehabilitation would require in excess of 25,000,000,000 tons of copper costing approximately $10,000,000,000 or more. Alongside such possible total requirements and costs for one item alone a stockpile costing 3½ billion dollars or more for 71 items pales to insignificance. Consider also that on the first of this year, after 3½ years of activity, the stockpile contained materials valued at only $1,149,000,000.

UNITED STATES LACKS TIME IN WHICH TO ACQUIRE ADEQUATE STOCKPILE

Whereas another 6 years or more will be required to accumulate the minimum stockpile requirements, an additional 25 to 30 years or more apparently would be required to obtain the maximum objectives at the rate of stockpile accumulations anticipated for the fiscal year 1950.

Judging from the continuing deterioration of world affairs, there appears to be a possibility that the United States may be drawn into a third world war in the near future. Can we afford to wait even 6 years to complete the accumulation of the wholly inadequate, minimum stockpile?

LARGE ENEMY SUBMARINE FLEET AND OTHER FACTORS WOULD PROHIBIT SUBSTANTIAL ACQUISITIONS OF MATERIALS FROM OVERSEAS

Lacking an adequate stock pile of strategic and critical minerals and metals at the outbreak of a war, the United States must rely on large and continuing supplies of materials from Africa, India, the East Indies, South America and other overseas sources of supply or obtain such materials from domestic deposits.

It was our great fortune that Germany probably had no more than 75 submarines of a type now obsolete when the United States entered World War II. Although there were many costly sinkings early in the war, we were able, at considerable cost, to obtain large quantities of manganese, chromite, tungsten, mercury, mica, copper, lead, zinc, and many other materials from Russia, China, Africa, India, South America, and other distant sources.

Reports indicate that if the world should become engaged in a war within the next few years, use of the sea lanes by the United States would be challenged by 250 to 1,000 or more superior-type enemy submarines. In view of the great fleet of submarines that may be used against us and the greater probability that enemy seizures, sabotage, and political factors would prevent access to foreign sources of supply, it appears highly improbable that the United States would be able to obtain more than a small fraction of our mineral and metal requirements from overseas sources of supply.

The Munitions Board states in its report of January 23, 1950, that—

> Changing world conditions resulting in new strategic concepts point to a substantial increase in the ultimate objectives of some materials.

Considerable concern regarding the vulnerability of South American copper production is found in an intradepartmental memorandum of November 12, 1942, in which the Chief of Production of the War Production Board Copper Branch warned that—

> The shelling or bombing of power plants on the Pacific coast of Chile, or the bombing of mine plants near the coast, could cut off 550,000 tons of copper per year.

It was also pointed out that—

> Water-borne imports totaling 569,800 tons per year are constantly exposed to the danger of sinking.

ADEQUATE STOCKPILE UNATTAINABLE; IMMEDIATE PROGRAM FOR EXTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF DOMESTIC MINERAL DEPOSITS ONLY FOSSIBLE SOLUTION

We are faced with the fact that an adequate stockpile of minerals and metals is not contemplated by the Munitions Board and is impossible of attainment before another 25 or 30 years have passed. We are also confronted with the fact that the possibility of acquiring substantial quantities of minerals and metals from overseas sources of supply during a future war emergency is extremely remote. Obviously, the only possible solution is an immediate program calling for the extensive exploration, development, and mining of thousands of undeveloped domestic mineral deposits and the maximum expansion of existing mining operations in the United States, Canada, and Mexico. A grave error is committed if we delude ourselves into believing that such a program can be accomplished if deferred until immediately preceding or following the outbreak of war. The experience record of our abortive efforts in World War II stands as irrefutable evidence that little or nothing can be done to effectively utilize the undeveloped mineral resources of the United States and expand the production of going mining operations—coal, and possibly iron ore mining excepted—if such efforts are deferred until after or shortly before the outbreak of war.

EXTREME MEASURES ADOPTED IN LAST WAR TO INCREASE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF MINERALS AND METALS A MISERABLE FAILURE

The Army and Navy Munitions Board report of January 2, 1945, refers to the extraordinary measures adopted during World War II in order to increase the production of copper and zinc. The report also cautions that—

> Considerable time is required to develop new sources of supply and to increase the production of existing mines and smelters.

A communication from the United States Bureau of Mines refers to the extreme measures adopted during the last war to increase domestic production of minerals and metals. For unexplained reasons, the Munitions Board and the Department of the Interior, as well as other agencies of the Government, choose to ignore the experience record of World War II and the fact that, with few exceptions—notably bauxite and aluminum production—the so-called extraordinary and extreme measures adopted to increase the domestic production of minerals and metals failed miserably of their purpose. Not only did such measures fail to increase production as anticipated but they failed to so much as maintain the production of a number of

vital commodities, including copper, lead, and zinc. The few exceptions such as bauxite and aluminum are accounted for by the fact that the bauxite mines and aluminum plants were located in areas with a relatively dense population. Also, the bauxite deposits were susceptible to fairly rapid development and ore extraction by open pit mining and shallow underground workings.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE RESPONSE TO DEMANDS OF WORLD ARMAMENT ACTIVITIES, NOT UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, EXPANDED DOMESTIC MINERAL AND METAL PRODUCTION PRIOR TO PEARL HARBOR

The domestic production of a number of minerals and metals increased considerably during the several years preceding Pearl Harbor, reached its peak in 1942, and declined rapidly thereafter. However, the so-called extreme and extraordinary measures taken by the Government of the United States a little previous to and following Pearl Harbor had little or nothing to do with this increase in production.

The considerable expansion of the domestic mining industry and the great increase in production of essential minerals and metals during the several years preceding Pearl Harbor resulted almost entirely from the individual initiative and efforts by private enterprise in response to the large and steadily increasing world demands for minerals and metals caused by universal armament activities, including those of Germany, Russia, and Japan. Apparently, sheer coincidence also played a part, as with the great Morenci open-pit copper mine, concentrator, and smelter in Arizona. The Morenci, the second largest copper mine in the United States, required 5 years and $45,000,000 to develop and place in operation. Fortunately, production commenced at the Morenci operations as the United States entered World War II. As another example, tungsten was accidentally discovered in a substantial gold and antimony deposit being opened in Idaho in the spring of 1941. Fortunately, this deposit was close to the surface, which permitted rapid development and extraction of ore by open-pit operations. This one deposit alone supplied approximately 25 to 30 percent of the domestic production of tungsten during World War II.

The effective expansion of going mining operations and opening of certain new deposits to meet the mounting demands for essential minerals and metals was readily accomplished in the years preceding Pearl Harbor due to the availability of a large and excess supply of experienced mine labor, mine operators and technical personnel, materials, and equipment resulting from the depression and the high prosperity of the gold-mining industry, employing some 25,000 production workers. Indirectly, the gold-mining industry was undoubtedly a great contributing factor in the Western States during this period, serving as an attractive training ground through the years and as a reservoir of experienced mine labor and personnel required for new or expanding operations preparing to produce strategic and critical minerals and metals.

FACTORS WHICH PROHIBIT UTILIZATION OF UNDEVELOPED MINERAL RESOURCES AND EFFECTIVE EXPANSION OF EXISTING OPERATIONS IN TIME OF WAR

Critical shortages of mine labor, equipment, and supplies, as experienced during and following a period of war; numerous physical limitations; the length of time required to bring many deposits and abandoned mines into full production; and in some instances the lack of processing technology and know-how beyond the laboratory stage—either collectively or singly—will prevent any material expansion of the domestic production of most minerals and metals if a program for the intensive exploration, development, and mining of undeveloped mineral deposits, and the expansion of existing operations is deferred until immediately preceding or following the outbreak of a war. Such was the unfortunate experience of the United States in World War II.

THE EXTRAORDINARY AND EXTREME MEASURES ADOPTED TO INCREASE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION IN WORLD WAR II

What were the so-called extraordinary and extreme measures adopted by the United States Government in World War II in order to increase the domestic production of strategic and critical minerals and metals—measures that completely failed in most instances to produce the expected results? Such measures included:

First. War Production Board Limitation Order L–208 was issued to close the gold mines remaining in operation in order to release and divert their residual labor to copper, zinc, and other nonferrous metal mines. WPB officials estimated that a year after the order was issued not over 100 workers from the closed gold mines were working in the copper and other essential nonferrous metal mines.

Second. In 1942 and 1943 the Army released 8,700 soldiers to work in the copper and zinc mines. Only a small number are believed to have remained at the mines for any length of time. It is known that approximately 40 percent of the 4,200 soldiers released for the purpose in October 1942 had left the mines within 6 months.

Third. In 1942 the Government issued orders freezing nonferrous metal mine workers in their jobs in 12 Western States. Only by obtaining a certificate of separation was a miner supposed to be free to obtain employment elsewhere. Recruiting campaigns also were conducted to obtain labor for the essential metal mines. The miners in general resented the freeze order and large numbers left the mines without bothering to obtain the required certificate of separation.

Fourth. Defense plant mining projects were attempted by the Government. Some were successful, while many either failed of their purpose or were not completed when the war ended.

Fifth. Incentive payments for some metals, Government purchase programs, access-road construction by Federal agencies, RFC mine loans, and RFC small-lot purchase depots were attempted during World War II. In most of these instances it was a matter of too little and too late.

THE WORLD WAR II RECORD OF THE DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM

The extreme and extraordinary measures taken by the Government of the United States in World War II to increase the domestic production of certain strategic and critical minerals and metals is in sharp contrast to the results obtained and rapid deterioration of the domestic mining industry.

The sobering fact is that over a 4-year period, commencing only 2 months after Pearl Harbor, the domestic metal-mining industry, excluding smelting and refining, lost over 50 percent of its production workers. The estimated number of production workers in the metal-mining industry dropped, month by month, from a high of 111,600 in March 1942 down to a low of 55,500 in April 1946, a loss of 56,100 production workers. Nearly half of this manpower loss was suffered by the copper, lead, and zinc mining industries alone.

During the same period the loss of mine labor resulted in a 44-percent drop in the domestic production of copper, a 32-percent drop in lead production, and a 25-percent drop in the production of zinc. The production loss over this 4-year period would have been much greater but for the fact that the normal exploration and development work carried on in order to find and block out ore and prepare working places well ahead of ore extraction was stopped or limited in order to use all available manpower for immediate production.

Our Government attempted to develop and obtain substantial quantities of chromite from the large Stillwater deposits in Montana and failed for the lack of labor alone. Intensive exploratory work was conducted on the Montana Stillwater deposits by the United States Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey for a period of 2 years prior to Pearl Harbor. An additional 2 years were spent in developing three mines on the deposits, constructing concentrating plants, and modern housing facilities. Some $12,000,000 were spent on the defense-plant portion of the two larger projects alone, exclusive of operating and maintenance costs. Money was no object; time-and-a-half and double-time was paid for Saturday and Sunday work. Failure to obtain sufficient labor caused the RFC to close the two smaller projects in order to transfer the labor to the larger and more efficient project. Even so, the continued shortage of labor permitted the concentrating mill at the Mouat chromite operation to be operated at only 25 percent of its capacity.

In 1941 the Government considered and authorized the construction of a manganese beneficiation plant at Henderson, Nev., which was in operation for 14 months. The defense plant portion of the cost amounted to $7,662,000, exclusive of the operating and maintenance costs of mine and plant. The RFC has stated:

This project was highly experimental, using a new process, and never passed from

the experimental stage. The process was unsatisfactory throughout the contract and the project was discontinued for that reason.

This is a typical example of failures due to the lack of technology and know-how beyond the laboratory stage.

In the fall of 1942 and early 1943, the copper division of the War Production Board recommended that clearance be given to a select list of 36 domestic copper projects. It was believed that additional production could be obtained from these copper properties more quickly than others. Fourteen of the projects represented expansions to existing operations. Over $53,000,000 of capital, critical materials costing $19,500,000, and an additional 5,872 workers were estimated to be required for the 36 projects which, when completed and in full production, were calculated to yield 148,000 tons of copper per year. These 36 projects were turned down by the War Production Board Facility Review Committee or Facility Clearance Board because of the critical shortages of manpower and equipment.

After the United States entered World War II, the opening of many deposists, abandoned mines, and districts was realized to be impossible of attainment. One example is the Conglomerate mine of the Calumet and Hecla Copper Co., located in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. The Conglomerate mine is over a mile deep and is known to contain at least 250,000 tons of copper. The economic conditions of the depression years forced this mine to be abandoned; the workings have caved in and are filled with water. The company estimates that under today's conditions 5 years and $20,000,000 would be required to open the Conglomerate mine and get it into production—a financial risk which private enterprise cannot afford to undertake.

In view of the facts, it becomes obvious that the countless inactive mineral deposits in the United States cannot possibly be utilized to any advantage during a future war emergency unless the Government of the United States finances an all-out and intelligent program to induce private enterprise to undertake the opening and mining of such mineral deposits well in advance of the outbreak of war.

APPARENT REASONS FOR INDIFFERENCE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TOWARD CONDITION OF MINING INDUSTRY AND NEED OF ALL-OUT DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM

Why have we failed to take appropriate action to assure the maximum utilization of the mineral resources of the United States during a war emergency that may be upon us in the near future?

In the first place, apparently we have failed to heed the warning of the Army and Navy Munitions Board which stated in its report of January 2, 1945, that, "We must not delude ourselves by adopting a Maginot line psychology by relying solely or too heavily on stockpiling as a measure of national defense."

Secondly, the executive departments apparently believe that such action would interfere with our current foreign policy of furthering the interests of foreign nations by developing their mineral deposits, expanding their operating mines, and importing as much foreign mineral and metal production as possible as a means of providing dollar exchange, regardless of the great damage done to the mining industry of the United States. In addition, the executive departments either are utterly indifferent to the problem or have been so occupied with other matters that they have failed to make a realistic analysis of the minerals security of the United States. This may explain the indifference displayed in a statement appearing in the Munitions Board report of January 23, 1950, as follows:

> The Munitions Board has not taken a position as to the expediency of any action to keep domestic mines in operation. Nevertheless, the Board does recognize the impact both on military strength and on stockpiling, of any decline in domestic minerals production. A strong, prosperous, and efficient domestic mining industry is basic to the national security.

What other explanation may there be for the fact that the Department of the Interior on the one hand contends that the attainment of the maximum stockpile objective is necessary for the minerals security of the United States and on the other hand, while knowing that a $15,000,000,000 stock pile not only is not contemplated, but is incapable of realization for many years to come, and realizing that a war emergency may be upon us within the next few years, makes no effort whatsoever to arouse the people of the United States and the Congress to the alternate necessity of an all-out Government-financed program to put thousands of idle domestic mineral deposits into production before it is too late.

MUNITIONS BOARD WARNS MINIMUM STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES IF ATTAINED INFER NO GUARANTY OF SUFFICIENCY IN A FUTURE WAR; CONGRESS NOW RESPONSIBLE FOR SUCH GUARANTY

In its last stockpiling report to the Congress, dated January 23, 1950, the Munitions Board once again sounded this ominous warning:

> At the time these stockpile objectives were established it was made clear that they were minimum objectives. They inferred no guaranty of sufficiency in a future war, being intended merely as a guide in the maintenance of a balanced procurement program.

If the Munitions Board, the Department of the Interior, or the National Security Resources Board will not take appropriate action to recommend and initiate a domestic minerals program which will guarantee a sufficiency of minerals and metals throughout any future war emergency, it becomes the obvious duty and responsibility of the Congress itself to take the action necessary to provide such a guaranty to the people of the United States.

PROGRAMS REQUIRED TO GUARANTEE A SUFFICIENCY OF MINERALS AND METALS IN A FUTURE WAR EMERGENCY

In order to guarantee that the United States will have an adequate supply of strategic and critical minerals and metals, or a supply as nearly adequate as can possibly be obtained at this late date, to meet all military and essential civilian requirements throughout a 5- to 8-year period of war and during a 3-year postwar reconversion and rehabilitation period, the Congress must face the problem squarely and realistically, regardless of outside influences and the apathy of the executive agencies. The Congress must enact enabling legislation, appropriate the funds required, and direct that the following policies and programs be carried out immediately:

First. The Munitions Board and the General Services Administration must abandon the policy and practice of off-again, on-again purchases in order to keep the quantity of each stockpile material in theoretical balance and of never paying above market prices for strategic and critical materials.

With a few possible exceptions, all available world surpluses of strategic and critical materials must be purchased for the stockpile.

Purchasing missions, including staffs of technical personnel, supplied with contractual authority, small tools and equipment, must be sent to foreign sources of supply to increase production and obtain the maximum quantities of materials to the extent not obtainable from the undeveloped mineral deposits in the United States. This method was used by the Board of Economic Warfare to obtain greater quantities of mica, beryl, tantalite, and other materials during World War II and should be adopted at this time.

Second. An independent agency must be established to commence immediately and carry out an intensive, all-out, 10- to 12-year Government-financed program designed and geared to have private enterprise explore, develop, and mine the Nation's undeveloped mineral deposits and expand existing operations in order to obtain maximum domestic production of strategic and critical minerals and metals in the shortest possible time.

All production derived from such efforts must be delivered to the stockpile until the outbreak of a war, at which time the flow shall be diverted to meet consumer requirements as directed by the Federal Government.

COST OF THE REQUIRED DOMESTIC MINERALS PRODUCTION PROGRAM

The Munitions Board has pointed out that the daily cost to the United States of World War II reached about $500,000,000, and that, measured in these terms, the cost of the entire stockpile when completed would be equivalent to the cost of only a few days of war. The expenditure required to carry out the domestic minerals production program required to guarantee that the United States will have the minerals and metals needed in a future war emergency probably would be equivalent to the cost to the United States of 10 to 14 days of the last war.

It is highly important to remember that unlike planes, guns, tanks, and ships that have no commercial value and sooner or later are expended or become obsolete and are discarded, mineral and metal acquisitions represent an exchange of dollars for indestructible materials that, in general, have an increasingly greater monetary value with the

passage of time. In the words of the Munitions Board, "The stockpile is an inventory of raw materials with a cash value; it is a recoverable asset owned by the people of the United States. In this sense it is an insurance policy, the outlay for which would be returned many-fold should the stockpile be used, and yet until it is used it retains value indefinitely.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it would be well to ponder the statement of Commodore Lewis L. Strauss, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, which he made 4½ years ago, in October, 1945, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. Commodore Strauss representing the Secretary of the Navy, stated in part:

After a war has begun—and it is now conceded that the next war, if we have one, is likely to come suddenly with no advance warning—it may be too late to acquire these materials from other countries. We may be denied access to the principal world sources of many strategic materials, and we can well remember how, in early 1942, when the Japanese had cut our sea communications to the Far East, we were denied access to our principal sources of supply for tin, rubber, manila fiber, quinine, and other necessary commodities.

While the Far East was completely shut off, other areas became inaccessible to varying degrees as the result of enemy action.

Shipping routed to India, the East and West Coasts of Africa, and South America, suffered costly losses, and the Mediterranean was practically closed to traffic.

In the winter of 1942–43, for example, substantial tonnages of bauxite from the Guineas, then critical in our airplane program, were lost due to enemy submarine action. Such quantities of strategic materials as we did successfully import from those areas which were not completely cut off, were imported at considerable cost to the war effort. Combat vessels needed elsewhere had to be assigned to protect this shipping. Ships which were needed for the transport of personnel and supplies required by the armed forces had to be diverted from that use and their destruction risked.

Furthermore, a substantial tonnage of heavy materials had to be flown from China, Africa, India, and South America at great cost and uneconomic use of fuel, trained personnel, and airplanes.

These desperate efforts did not save us from many delays and set-backs in our production program caused by the shortages of needed strategic materials.

The lesson to be learned is, obviously, that we cannot afford to gamble with our security on the chance that in another national emergency we could again be so fortunate.

Shall we heed such warnings and take required action or shall we gamble the future of the United States against the remote chance that United States merchant ships may be successful in running the gauntlet of 250 to 1,000 or more enemy submarines and return with large quantities of strategic materials, and the equally remote chance that enemy action, by one means or another, may not succeed in shutting off overseas sources of supplies?

The cold facts reveal that after a major war has started it is, with few exceptions, impossible not only to utilize the Nation's undeveloped mineral deposits effectively but it is impossible to maintain the production of operating mines. It is a fact that once war has started, the undeveloped mineral deposits and idle mines of the United States may just as well be in the hands of the enemy for the little good they could contribute to the winning of the war and the economy of our Nation.

In the light of present world conditions and the evidence before us, it becomes imperative that the Congress immediately initiate an all-out program that will provide the people of the United States with the strategic and critical raw materials from or with which all military, industrial, and essential civilian supplies, materials, and equipment required to win a future war and maintain our basic economy must be made.

A partial or half-hearted effort will not save our Nation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 277, line 25, after the second comma, insert "of which not to exceed $25,000,000 may be expended in accordance with the purposes of said act of July 23, 1946, through purchase contracts negotiated with operators within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and in making advance payments on such contracts to the extent determined to be necessary to the performance thereof, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska public works: For an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 264), relating to the development of the Territory of Alaska, to remain available until June 30, 1955, $9,000,000, of which $4,000,000 shall be for the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head and of which not to exceed $500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure on any project until a certificate has been received from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 279, line 24, after "vehicles", strike out the colon and all that follows down to the period in line 3 on page 280.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered seeks to strike that language which would give the Secretary of Defense authority and, in fact, direct him, to approve all applications under the Alaska Public Works Act. I do not think that authority is needed. The Secretary of Defense has never asked for it. The law itself, in my opinion, and I should say in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense, because he never offered any objection to it, sets up sufficient safeguards.

Mr. Chairman, through forces beyond my control the subcommittee in charge of the bill, in inquiring into the appropriation request probably did not receive the adequate presentation to which it was entitled. As I understand, the facts were not available at that ime. As a consequence, the budgetary request was reduced and this language was added.

Mr. Chairman, the Alaska public works bill came into being primarily, I think, as the result of a special Alaska message sent to the Congress in May of 1948 by President Truman, in which he asked for legislation of this character. The bill was enacted last year. It provides for a program of public works in Alaska over a period of 5 years, in the amount of $70,000,000, $35,000,000 to be paid by the Federal Government and $35,000,000 by municipalities in the Territory and by the Territorial government. That is intended to be an aid in the over-all development of the Territory, so more people will go there to live, so more business will be established, and so there will be more industry. Naturally, whatever occurs in that respect in any one part of the Territory will help the entire Territory, and thus will be of aid in the military effort in that area.

It was not intended that the work should be confined only to those communities where the armed services are principally located, but was intended, as I say, to be a general program for the entire Territory.

The Secretary of Defense sent a representative before the legislative committee in the Senate that was considering the authorizing legislation and he spoke of the need for the general development program as contrasted with the special program of the type that might be made necessary if this language were adopted. The testimony of Major General Gardner was specifically in favor of the bill which was adopted. The Secretary of Defense at that time had additional opportunity to present the point that he should have the veto power, as it were, over this public works act if he desired it, but he did not so indicate.

Section 4 of Public Law 264 of this Congress in conjunction with section 3 sets up a system of safeguards which I think is adequate. It provides that no application shall be approved unless the Administrator of General Services gives his assent. In addition to that the Governor of Alaska must give his approval and likewise the Secretary of the Interior. That is not all. Those officials must call upon and consult with such other Federal agencies as have a substantial interest in the public works program. I think that is sufficient, and this language ought not be added.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is especially pertinent or at all pertinent to say that we ought to spend money in this country because we are spending it somewhere else but the other day I read that this Government is going to spend $80,000,000 for a public-works program in Berlin to relieve unemployment. This Alaska Act is not one for the relief of unemployment, but to build up what is now a most important part of our own country. If we are going to spend $80,000,000 in Berlin and if Berlin is a front line then we can spend that much for Alaska since Alaska is surely a front

line of our defenses, in another part of the world. I surely do not quarrel with any decision which may have been reached to strengthen our position in Germany, but surely we must give equal consideration to Alaska.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the sterling qualities and fine ability and great contribution of the distinguished Delegate from Alaska. He proposes to strike out a proviso which would require the certification by the Secretary of Defense that a project was needed in the interest of national defense before funds could be granted for that purpose. Since the committee held its hearings the Delegate from Alaska has presented to the gentleman from Tennessee personally some further enlightenment upon the program which was most inadequately, I regretfully say, presented to the subcommittee. But the information supplied by the gentleman is not yet sufficient to justify the granting of funds to the Territory for these purposes in contradistinction from programs applying to other Territories and States unless it is based upon the question of national defense. I regret to say what I am about to say because it involves a gentleman for whom I have a high personal regard. The administrator of this program, Mr. Larson, is an able and fine man. He is a very sociable gentleman, too. But I think I ought to say to the Congress that neither he nor any member of his staff seemed to know what they were talking about regarding this program nor were they able to convince the committee that they had justified this program. On the basis of what we heard, I confess to you I do not believe we should have appropriated any money for this program. We made a drastic cut. We should not have appropriated any on the basis of the presentation to the subcommittee. That is not to say that some of this work is not needed. I think it is. The distinguished Delegate from Alaska has convinced me that some work is needed but he has not convinced me nor other members of the subcommittee that we should proceed with these projects unless it is certified by the Secretary of Defense as in the interest of national defense.

Let me give you just one example, and I could give you many examples, of the type of project requested of the subcommittee in this program. I see in the hearings, for instance, a water project for Port Alexander which is a city with the great population, according to the census figures, of 50 men, women, and children. Yet the program called for the expenditure of $50,000, merely for a water supply. Can anyone justify spending $1,000 per capita—man, woman, and child—not for sewage disposal and water, but merely water supply? That is the kind of evidence that was presented to this committee. I suggest to the Administrator that the next time he appears before the Appropriations Subcommittee I hope, and his friends expect, that he and his agency will show more diligence and knowledge and concern.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman knows I agree with him that many of the projects submitted could not be defended, and that is the reason I did not seek any increase in the amount here. We hope to present, on the basis of data now accumulated, a good case before the other body. But I want to say this, that no Alaskan municipality has ever defaulted on a loan, nor has any other political subdivision of the Territory of Alaska. When the loans are granted it will be on a sound basis, and every cent owing to the Federal Government will be repaid.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the truth and the force of the gentleman's statement. I appreciate, too, the diligence and excellence of his service. Had he presented the case before the subcommittee, with the full facts and justification, which I am sure he can marshal at a later time in support of some of these projects, the subcommittee might have felt more favorably inclined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman not concede with me that on the basis of the testimony presented to the committee, the subcommittee must have been generous in approving any appropriation for the program?

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, I cannot quarrel with the gentleman from Tennessee on that. I was surprised that we got any money. Naturally, I do not blame Mr. Larson. He cannot know all the details, but I think his people should have. But at any rate, these data are assembled and will be presented, and I think the subcommittee will agree that projects now sought are financially sound. I should add that I did not try to make a technical presentation to your committee because the figures were not available to me. That, after all, was the proper business of the agency.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the gentleman for stepping into what I most regretfully say is a void and lack of information. The gentleman has contributed valuable service. The gentleman made one additional statement, to which I would like to make reference. The gentleman said that no municipality in Alaska had defaulted on its debt. For that I applaud. But some of these projects asked for thousands of dollars for communities that were not even incorporated. For instance, the village of Homer. They have no officials authorized to sign a bond or to incur indebtedness for the municipality. There was no municipalty. A large project was asked, and we just could not give it approval.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to say that before application is submitted from any such district, it will come through a school district or a public utility district or the Territorial government of Alaska. The gentleman is right.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman. I have talked with the gentleman, and he has contributed valuable service in trying to put this program on a sound basis, because he realizes that the Congress of the United States does not wish to appropriate money to be spent in an irresponsible manner. The gentleman is correct, in my opinion, in the course he is pursuing.

Mr. BARTLETT. We do not want to waste a dime of Federal money in Alaska.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without entering into the merits that my friend is discussing, I was glad to note his reference of respect to Mr. Larson for his ability and fine character.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. He is a very outstanding man and a great administrator. We on the Expenditures Committee have had him before us a number of times, and the committee has a deep feeling of respect for him personally and as a public official.

Mr. GORE. He is an able gentleman and in fairness to him I should say that his is a comparatively new agency with many new problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us have respect for the services of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. Personally, I have been much interested in Alaska; I voted for the Alaska statehood bill; I have supported many measures to encourage development up there. But I think we ought to understand exactly what the situation is here before us. The gentleman from Alaska has offered a motion to strike a proviso which the committee put in this bill. The paragraph proposes a $9,000,000 appropriation for some public works projects in Alaska; then we added this proviso:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure on any project until a certificate has been received from the Secretary of Defense that the installation of such facility will be of value in connection with national defense.

In other words, the committee merely was endeavoring to insure that the money that we provide here would be spent on the essential projects. There is a table which appears in the hearings at pages 1624 to 1627 to which the gentleman from Tennessee has already alluded. If the Members would only take that table and go through it, I am sure they would want every safeguard possible to insure that the money we appropriate will be used on the meritorious projects and not on those which are not meritorious. For instance, here is one proposal to spend $1,100,000 for a school, sewer, and power supply in a community of 300 population. Here is another request for $400,000 for a small town by the name of Petersburg. It may be that they need this hospital in Petersburg,

but the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] very properly questioned whether or not the people in Petersburg could operate or support that hospital if it actually were established there.

It should be borne in mind that the United States Government is putting up this money. We could require the local communities to put up some; they have a nominal liability in general of 50 percent; they could get it on a 25-percent basis, but the Administrator assured us he was trying to get them to agree to put up 50 percent. Originally the Federal Government puts up the money. There are $75,000,000 worth of projects. All the committee does with this proviso is to say: "Do not go ahead on it until you have a certificate from the Secretary of Defense that it is needed for national defense." Or, to put it another way, this money must be used first so that we will consider national defense needs and so that it will have national defense value.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to take this occasion to join the gentleman from South Dakota in paying my respects to the Delegate from Alaska. It is my impression during the years that he has served here that no Member of this House has worked harder or more assiduously in behalf of the constituency he represents; and I may say that he has got a big load to carry, because he has a big Territory to represent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. He has; and whatever may be the attitude of this Committee with respect to this amendment should not minimize what the gentleman has said. But I do feel that this proviso should stay in the bill; it is the only guaranty that this money will be used on the most urgent projects, those vital to national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government (which shall include all departments, independent establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations) shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines (except typewriting machines for veterans under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) unless the Administrator of General Services certifies that he is unable to furnish such agency with suitable typewriting machines out of stock on hand. The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed at such times as he may determine to be necessary to survey and determine the numbers and kinds of typewriting machines located in the continental limits of the United States which are at any time surplus to the requirements of any agency in the executive branch of the Government (which shall include all departments, independent establishments, and wholly owned Government corporations). Upon such determination, the Administrator of General Services is authorized to direct, upon such notice and in such manner as he may prescribe, the head of any such agency to surrender to the General Services Administration any and all typewriting machines surplus to its requirements, the costs of packing, shipping, and handling thereof to be charged to the general supply fund. Each such agency shall furnish the Administrator of General Services such information regarding typewriting machines, wherever located, as he may from time to time request. The General Services Administration is authorized and directed to receive, hold, sell, exchange, or supply to any branch of the Government, including the District of Columbia, typewriting machines surrendered to it hereunder. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to charge each agency to which typewriting machines are supplied hereunder amounts equal to the fair value thereof, as determined by him, and such amounts shall be credited to the general supply fund.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the current appropriation bill contains no appropriation for the Office of Housing Expediter for the year 1951 for the purpose of administering any rent control act which may be passed by this Congress, and that is as it should be because no authorization act has as yet been passed by the Congress. Without such an authorization act obviously there can be no appropriation of funds for any such purpose.

I am sure that had an extension of the rent control act been passed by the Congress by this time this subcommittee with its customary excellence would have seen fit to include an appropriation for rent-control administration in this bill. I have been informed that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House will begin hearings on extension of the rent-control act beginning next Monday. I have further been informed that the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of another body have already been completed and that it will begin its deliberations on extension of the act within a short time. Yet all of these deliberations may very well go for naught if hearings are not undertaken immediately in connection with a deficiency appropriation for the year 1950, exceedingly important appropriation of rent control is even to last until June 30, as is authorized by the present law.

This alarming situation was called to the attention of this Congress and of the Committee on Appropriations specifically by the President when on April 20 he sent to each branch of the Congress a request for a deficiency appropriation in the amount of $800,000 for the Office of the Housing Expediter. After pointing out the drastic cuts in appropriations which this agency has already suffered during the year, the President's message stated:

The situation is more serious, however, in that the amount provided by the Congress is insufficient to permit minimum administration of rent control to the end of the fiscal year. In order to stay within the amount appropriated by Congress, it will be necessary for the Housing Expediter immediately to serve separation notices to more than 1,200 of the remaining employees or to disband the organization completely before June 1, 1950. Despite Federal, State, and local decontrol measures taken to date, or to become effective soon, approximately 8,000,000 dwelling units will still be under Federal rent control on May 1, 1950.

I would like to proceed further and say this, that in order for the Rent Control Administration to continue in force and effect, at least for the balance of its authorized term—and I think it is exceedingly important that it do continue in force and effect certainly until June 30 at the very least—it is necessary that the Committee on Appropriations act on the President's request for a deficiency appropriation.

I have here an article which appeared in the Evening Star of Saturday, November 19, under the headline "Real estate men told to beat control by curb on funds." All of us, I think, are aware of the excellent job being performed by the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities in ferreting out the activities of the real-estate lobby, and showing how it actually works. This article clearly reveals that it never admits defeat. If the Congress passes an act, do not accept it. Kill the appropriation, so that the law withers.

Let me read to you from this article which, incidentally and ironically enough, comes from my home city, the city of Chicago:

Kendall Cady, past president of the Institute of Real Estate Management, believes the real-estate industry must battle rent-control indirectly through whittling down appropriations for enforcement rather than by a frontal attack.

"The time to fight this battle against rent control is now and not next July 30, when rent control expires, and I think I have a gimmick to fight this battle," he told a session of the convention of the National Association of Real Estate Boards yesterday.

Explaining the plan, Mr. Cady said that essentially it amounted to influencing Congress "to tell Tighe Woods (the National Housing Expediter in charge of rent control) that he has had all the money he is going to get and give him no more.

"We must go to see our Senators and Congressmen now," he continued, "They're ready to listen now, and in June they will be thinking of November and not of ending rent control. We must go to them now, and we must send our bankers to them, and our ministers and every friend we have.

"If we can send enough Members of Congress back to Washington with this idea, we can win this fight before the Appropriations Committee."

Mr. Chairman, that is the plan of the real-estate lobby. At this moment it stands on the threshold of victory. It can be defeated and it must be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee on Appropriations keeps faith with the President of the United States, keeps faith with the people of the Nation, rather than with the real-estate lobby, and permits hearings to be held, on the deficiency appropriation, so that the House may be given the opportunity to vote on the question of providing necessary funds. This is essential in order that rent control may last, at least until June 30.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. May I suggest that the gentleman propound a question during this minute to the Committee on Appropriations as to whether or not they will bring out the bill they have before them to give an additional appropriation to the office of Housing Expediter so that it may continue, at least until June 30 the work that it is doing, without which appropriation it will have to close up before the month is over?

Mr. YATES. I will be happy to ask that question of the chairman of the subcommittee. If the chairman of the subcommittee wishes to comment on the question propounded by the gentleman from New York, I would be glad to have the benefit of his comment.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I would be glad to comment. Is the gentleman intimating that the real-estate lobby has been working on the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. YATES. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, let me say to the gentleman that I know that I have not been approached by the real-estate lobby, and I feel quite confident that the gentleman and the other members of the Committee on Appropriations similarly have not been approached. Yet, I would like to point out to the gentleman the vital necessity for the continuation of rent control in the great municipalities of this country and the vital necessity of obtaining hearings on the deficiency appropriation bill, as requested by the President. Rent control must not be allowed to fail for lack of funds.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for bringing to the attention of the House a dangerous and appalling situation. On May 26, within a matter of weeks, rent control in this country may collapse, not by expiration of legal authority but for lack of money to operate—unless we do something about it. The President has already submitted to the Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation to continue the administration of rent control until June 30, 1950, the date the present law expires. It is imperative that immediate action be taken to appropriate additional funds.

I say this situation is dangerous because of the substantial cuts that already have been made in the appropriations for the Office of the Housing Expediter it has been necessary to dismiss since last summer over 2,000 employees. At the present time approximately 8,650,000 dwelling units in 42 States are being administered by this office. I say it is dangerous because if the necessary funds to administer rent control are not forthcoming, it may be necessary to disband this agency. Law and order require that so long as a statute is on the books, it should be enforced—and the duty of each of us is to see that it is enforced, regardless of our personal feelings or beliefs.

I say the situation and the prospects are appalling if action is not taken immediately to supply these funds because of the great hardships that would be caused to millions of persons by the abrupt termination of rent control in this still acute housing shortage.

How acute is the housing shortage? Here is what the greatest fact collecting body in our country today, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, says: Based on recent official surveys of vacancies in 25 areas located in all regions of the country from coast to coast, BLS states clearly that over-all vacancy rates are far below normal, generally between 1 and 2 percent as compared with normal rates of 5 to 6 percent. Vacancy rates for habitable dwellings for rent are generally less than 1 percent and many of them are less than one-half of 1 percent.

In my own city of St. Louis, a survey made in December, 1949, showed an overall vacancy rate of 1.3 percent, and an habitable rental vacancy rate of 0.4 percent. Habitable rental vacancy rates, and remember these surveys were made in December, 1949 and January and February, 1950—I repeat habitable rental vacancy rates were between 0.5 and 0.9 percent in Buffalo; Detroit; Portland, Maine; Memphis; Jacksonville; Cincinnati; Nashville; New Orleans; Baltimore; and Los Angeles. The rate was 0.4 percent in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh, and in New York City and it was 0.1 percent in Kansas City and Minneapolis-St. Paul. These extremely low vacancy rates, so small in many instances as to make it truthful to say there is no vacancy, underline the acute housing shortage.

Hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee on the extension of rent control beyond June 30, 1950, begins next week. An abrupt ending of rent control at this stage, in my opinion, would create turmoil, confusion, and suffering, not only in St. Louis, but also over the entire country.

Action on landlord petitions for adjustments in rent, on tenants' complaints, on compliance actions, on requests for evictions, on reduction for overcharges would be abruptly stopped—all a direct thwarting of the intention of this body that the law be administered to June 30, 1950. To terminate the St. Louis office and the offices in other parts of the country prior to the time determined by this Congress would be an injustice to landlords, tenants and the general public alike. It is not fair to landlords because during the period from April 1949 through March 1950, three out of every four landlords who applied for a rent increase obtained it. It is not fair to tenants because in studies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, rents have increased on the average up to 41 percent in cities that have been decontrolled. It is not fair to the public since an unreasonable rise in rents affects all of us by reducing the purchasing power for food, clothing, transportation and other commodities.

I urge that we give priority to the consideration of the President's request for additional funds to continue rent control, and that the House take action promptly to appropriate the necessary funds.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Agency; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and transportation expenses and not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation as members of any advisory committee established pursuant to Title VI of the Housing Act of 1949; $4,200,000; *Provided*, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this account from funds of the constituent agencies such sums as relate primarily to functions which are consolidated in the Office of the Administrator as authorized by Title III of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 288, line 17, strike out "$4,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to increase by $800,000 the appropriation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The agency in its budget estimate asked for $6,000,000. The subcommittee has allowed that only to the extent of $4,200,000. By this amendment I am asking that it be increased to $5,000,000.

You will probably recall that the appropriations granted to the agency for this fiscal year were not for the entire fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, but started in October 1949. The result is that now the agency is employing some 600 men and women, and although on the record it appears that you have increased the appropriation by $225,000, if you figure it on the entire annual basis you actually have cut it. The result will be that instead of its being able to employ these 600 men and women it will have to cut back its personnel to 520, so that an agency that because of legislation we enacted in this Congress needs at least 85 more persons to do the job we entrusted to them and directed them to do will have to cut back by 80 men. In other words, in order to give them the manpower they need to be able to do this job, it is necessary that you increase this appropriation by the $800,000 my amendment seeks to put back into the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will not the restoration of these funds according to the budget estimate prepare the Housing and Home Finance Agency for going ahead

with slum clearance and urban redevelopment work in the communities of this Nation?

Mr. MULTER. That is absolutely correct.

May I say that no part of this $800,000 is for research. The $1,000,000 the committee said they should not have this year I am not touching. I am not asking you to put it back. This $800,000 is absolutely essential if this agency is to do the work the Congress has ordered it to do.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I rise in support of the gentleman from New York, and commend him as well as the gentleman from Illinois for calling to the attention of the House and the American people the very, very imminent danger of the end of rent control in the United States. I happen to know by visiting many metropolitan areas that thousands and thousands of American families are living in constant fear and dread that the ax may fall on them after June 30. So let us do everything we can to continue the very necessary and vital rent control in the United States.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Permit me to call to the attention of the committee that no part of this $800,000 which I seek by this amendment has anything to do with rent control. I heartily agree with all that has been said on the floor here today about rent control and the necessity of giving the Housing Expediter an appropriation to carry on this work without which he must close up. This is not for the Office of the Expediter. No part of this is for rent control. We will meet that separately, I hope in the very near future. I urge upon you to increase this appropriation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency by $800,000 so that it can do its job. The Agency itself says:

> It is clear that, far from representing an increase, the amount recommended by the House Committee is, in fact, a severe cut that would cripple and delay the Agency's programs at the very time when every effort should be made to continue their development so as to meet the urgent needs which the Congress had in mind in enacting the new legislation—

Directing it to carry on these functions.

I urge upon you the approval of this amendment which will give the Agency the $5,000,000 which my amendment would then call for.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New York for his interest in housing. Since he has been a Member of Congress I know I can say with every degree of accuracy and sincerity that his contribution to the problem of housing has been an outstanding one.

Mr. Chairman, his amendment seeks to increase this appropriation by $800,000. Frankly, there was a pretty substantial cut in this item. We cut that from $6,000,000 down to $4,200,000. Let us see what this money is for. It is not going to add or subtract one single house which is going to be built in the United States in the year 1951. This money is for one thing and one thing alone and that is what we call salaries and expenses. The sum total is split up into some four or five parts. Research and development for housing is a major one of the items. The Administrator asked for $3,300,000. If my memory serves me correctly the committee was unanimously of the opinion that $2,300,000 was ample in view of the fact that very little of their 1950 funds have been allocated even though the year has already passed to the extent of 5 or 6 months. The indications were that they could not allocate and certainly could not spend more than $2,000,000 for 1951. Yet we gave them $2,300,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We gave them $225,000 more than they had for the current year.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Most of this money is going to be spent for salaries and expenses. In this one office for the fiscal year 1950 they had 601 positions. They wanted to increase that—not decrease it, do not misunderstand me, but increase it by 158 jobs. What is the function of this Office of the Administrator? It is the top layer over five agencies and with the exception of the Administrator it cannot change the substantive law one whit of these agencies, namely, Public Housing, the FHA, the HOLC, the FSLIC, and the Home Loan Bank Board. Those are the five activities and this is the top layer. Bear in mind when you have 759 employees in that office you are going to have duplication in each 1 of the subordinate agencies. I will just use a simple example. The Administrator will have his budget officer and then the HOLC, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Public Housing Administration, and the FHA will have their budget officers and their legal staff and all of their experts. We are not attempting to cripple housing in the slightest. We are just trying to be a little bit economical. Certainly there is no gentleman on the floor who is going to be misled into believing whether erroneously or otherwise, that something in excess of 600 people cannot do this job, some phases of which will probably be duplicated by the subordinate agencies. These funds will allow them more than they had last year, and give them more employees.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my distinguished and good friend from New York, whom I admire very much.

Mr. MULTER. I thank you for the kind things you have said about me.

First, let me point out that my amendment does not ask to add anything with reference to the cut of the public housing provisions. I did not intend to imply that any part of this money would build any houses. This amendment is not to restore any part of that, but what you say is an increase of $225,000 actually is not that. The agency is operating with 600 men. If you allow them only what you have allowed in this bill now they must cut back to 520 men.

Mr. THOMAS. They will be able to operate and carry on successfully. If they are not, we will be glad to reconsider it. We are not trying to cripple them at all. We are just trying to get them to be a little economical. Certainly they can get along with this amount of money and do an excellent job. If not, we will see that they get more money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the debates in this Chamber and the arguments on various items in the appropriation bill we are considering. I have taken little part in the discussions because I have realized that the distinguished gentlemen on the appropriations committee, having accorded many weeks of study and hard work to the proper and wise distribution of available funds among the many meritorious uses, have a much better understanding of the over-all picture than one who is not a member of the committee and, moreover, is a recent arrival in this body.

But the matter of roofs over the heads of American families is one that properly does concern me in my relation to my constituents and to my duty in the House as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee—the only member on the committee from the second largest city in America, Chicago. I cannot take lightly the responsibility of representing one of the great urban centers of America on the committee which is charged with providing a real answer to the housing problem.

In the city of Chicago, if rent control ends on June 30 of this year there will be a most unhappy condition of distress and of chaos. I do not believe that any Member on either side of the aisle would wish to see thousands of families, many of them with children and with babies in arms, thrown onto the streets, with no place to go. This is exactly what would happen in Chicago if abruptly, and before there had been provided housing within the rental means of our people, the protection of rent control should be terminated.

The prospect is so grave in Chicago and in other cities of Illinois that the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, Governor of Illinois and grandson of the Vice President of the United States in the second Cleveland administration flew to Washington to testify before the committee of the other body and to alert us in the Congress to what is ahead if rent control ends before there is available housing within the means of our people.

But regardless of what we do in the Banking and Currency Committee, and regardless of the support that may be given us on the floor of the House, it all adds up to nothing if appropriations necessary to carry forward the purpose of the legislation we enact are cut and cut so that the legislation becomes im-

potent and deadwood because there is no money for its adequate administration.

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who is the only member from Chicago on the Appropriations Committee and who is rendering such an outstanding service in the interest of the people of that city, has called attention to the fact that rent control really will end on the 25th of May unless we in the Congress authorize an additional appropriation for the Housing Expediter to carry on after that date, when the money for the administration of his office will be gone entirely. I commend my distinguished colleague for bringing this so forcibly to the attention of the House.

Now the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], whose tireless industry and keen intellectuality have won for him the profound respect of his fellow-members on the Banking and Currency Committee, points to another spot where the failure to provide adequate funds in bills of appropriation is defeating the purpose of the Congress and is smashing into smithereens all that we have been trying to do to solve the housing problem in a way that the American people have a right to expect of us. American families, Mr. Chairman, are entitled to decent roofs over their heads. If we fail in the name of a false economy to provide reasonable and equitable means for them to have decent roofs, and within their financial ability, we may be sure they will not be in any mood to listen to our lame attempts to excuse ourselves.

The Eighty-first Congress provided for public housing and slum clearance, and also for necessary research work. Unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is adopted, because of a lack of money the purpose of the Congress will be defeated. I bring this to the very serious attention of my colleagues.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished and universally admired gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I admire my distinguished friend sincerely, but I am afraid he is a little in error in his last observation. The construction money to build slum clearance projects has already been provided, and there is not 1 penny for construction involved in this bill.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The purpose of my amendment is to give to the agency sufficient funds with which to administer the program. This is for personnel of the agency, not for building, but for personnel that will supervise the plans and the building and the site acquisition and the slum clearance. Without personnel you cannot administer the program.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. That I appreciate. This money is simply for administrative purposes. Unless you have money to pay people to administer it you are not going to have any program. That is as simple as 2 times 2. The gentleman from New York has presented it accurately. The most effective way to end anything is to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery that makes it go; that is the machinery of administration. I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be adopted. Every time we strike in the name of false economy at well-considered plans for putting roofs over the heads of American families we are striking at the welfare of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MULTER) there were—ayes 26, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administrative expenses: For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, $11,700,000, to be merged with and expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this chapter.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 290, line 2, strike out "$11,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,750,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the bill as reported proposes $11,700,000 for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration. The budget estimate was $13,000,000. Many members of the committee thought we could very well make a 25 percent cut. My amendment proposes a 25 percent cut; that is, it proposes to allow $8,750,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration for fiscal 1951. During the current year the Public Housing Administration has $4,250,000. My amendment will give them more than twice that amount. It will give them $8,750,000, which is a quarter-million dollars more than twice what they had this current year.

The Public Housing Administration has several functions. It has the war lease housing, subsistence homesteads, veterans' housing, and the homes-conversion program, but all of those programs I have mentioned are taken care of out of funds which they get from the operation of those respective programs. The bill contemplates they will get $6,024,000 for the operation of those programs out of their operating funds. So the money mentioned in my amendment relates to no funds for the programs I have referred to.

This administrative fund which I have proposed, $8,750,000, is exclusively for the United States Housing Act program under title III, which is the proposal to build public housing authorized by the 1949 act over a 6-year period. They have had a hard time spending the $4,200,000 this year. If they get a half million dollars more than twice that amount for the new year it should be sufficient to take care of their needs. If they do not get by with it they can always come in and ask for a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, the committee was instructed when we were preparing our bills this year to examine every estimate not on the basis of is this good, but on the basis of what is the least amount that we can recommend and at the same time do the job. It seems to me self-evident that if we give them more than twice as much as they had this year they have enough to get along with this program.

There are many people who see in the public-housing program today evidences that we are commencing to get caught up with housing needs in many communities. In Washington, and its environs, for example, there are empty apartments today, and there are going to be in other communities where some of these large public-housing programs are going into operation. So I suggest if we give this activity in its administrative expenses a half million dollars more than twice what it has this year, it will have plenty to operate on.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman inform the committee how many persons this agency employs?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The number is 364, which was given us in the table supplied in response to my inquiry, and this table appears on pages 1862 to 1864 of the hearings.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. Chairman, under the Housing Act of 1937 the administrative costs were borne by the housing agency. Under the new act of 1949 that administrative cost has been put squarely on the taxpayers.

The committee was not unanimous in this cut of approximately 10 percent. We did think they had far too many economists over there, far too many this, far too many of that, including far too many publicists; but, after all, the Congress voted this program and it has got to be enforced.

If the Committee sees fit to adopt this amendment we might be able to make some adjustments in conference with the other body. Frankly, I think the cut we have already given them is a fairly reasonable one. They may be able to stand a further reduction, but that is problematical. I cannot really recommend to the Committee that it vote up or vote down this amendment. I have just tried to give the Committee the facts as I see them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution: For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and

the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrovphysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts; for the administration, and for the construction and maintenance, of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration of a national air museum as authorized by the act of August 12, 1946 (20 U. S. C. 77); including personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); traveling expenses; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); printing and binding, including printing the report of the American Historical Association; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; $2,606,490.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget made a request for $65,000 for the Smithsonian Institution for paleontological investigations. I appeared before the subcommittee on Appropriations for the Independent Offices in regard to this amount. In my statement I said:

Mr. Chairman, my appearance here is in support of an item carried by the budget for paleontological investigation in those points where the Government is building irrigation and reclamation dams.

I am not unmindful of the budgetary problems that this committee is facing. The sum requested is not large and it is a type of work that cannot be postponed. Whenever an excavation is made for a dam, there is usually uncovered bones, fossils, tools and other evidences of prehistoric civilizations. Unless there is someone right there to collect and preserve these they are lost forever. If they are preserved, they make a contribution to science and education for all time to come. I wish it was the type of expenditure that could be postponed until another time, but that is not the case. It is a question of spending a small amount of money now or losing this very valuable information.

May I say that this work is carried on at a minimum of expense. It is done on a cooperative basis with the colleges and universities. I know that the University of Nebraska conducts this work with a very minimum of expenditures. I am sure the other institutions do likewise.

I hope that you can act favorably on this item.

The subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee rejected this item, it is not in the bill. In bowing to the decision of the Appropriations Committee I am mindful of the financial situation of this Government, but I am disappointed that at the same time there is an increase for salaries and expenses of the Smithsonian Institution over last year's appropriation of $306,490. In other words, the taxpayers are going to have to pay more money for the maintenance of this Government agency, but will not receive the additional work needed to be done.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including purchase (not to exceed two) and hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft; the purchase (not to exceed 225 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $102,714,000 to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the proposed appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority is necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 as amended.

A large part of the present appropriation will add power to the capacity of the TVA system. The two new dams known as the Boone Dam and the Fort Henry Dam, which will be located on the Holston River system below the Watauga Dam and the South Holston Dam are needed to meet the increase in the power demands in the Valley, and to further strengthen the flood-control program.

The proposed Boone Dam will provide a power capacity of 75,000 kilowatts when completed, and will provide flood control for the industrial city of Kingsport, which is downstream from the Boone Dam.

The Fort Henry Dam would provide for power installations of 30,000 kilowatts. The two projects together will add about 105,000 kilowatts to the northeastern part of the system. The power load for several years has been gradually increasing. Electricity sales to municipalities and cooperative distributors of TVA power has shown a great growth from 1945 on through 1949.

At the present time more than 1,000,000 customers are served. There is an additional reason for the construction of these dams in Sullivan County, Tenn. In view of the world situation, national defense needs must not be overlooked.

Vast Federal agencies with a great industrial potential in the interest of national defense exists in this valley. These extra dams will give the necessary support to Oak Ridge, Holston Ordnance, the aluminum plants at Alcoa, and the many other industries of a national defense character. I am supporting this legislation in the interest of our national well-being.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Ship construction: For new-ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, as authorized by title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (except for construction of one prototype vessel under title VII of said Act), $35,000,000, of which $30,000,000 is for payment of obligations for new-ship construction incurred under authority granted in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948; and, in addition, the Commission is authorized to enter into contracts for new-ship construction in an amount not to exceed $63,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used to start any new-ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year, nor to start any new-ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term "budget" includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana: On page 304, line 5, after the colon, strike out all language thereafter through the colon on line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that we have not reached that portion of the section yet.

The Clerk read as follows:

Operating-differential subsidies: For operating-differential subsidies, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, $26,450,000, together with funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, not to exceed $16,770,000 from the special deposit account established with receipts from sales under Public Laws 44 and 305 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and not to exceed $3,529,000 from the special deposit account established from the refund of unobligated amounts out of the working fund established with the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for development of reserve fleet sites, all to be available until expended for payment of operating-differential subsidies for the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951, to grant operating-differential subsidies on a long-term basis and to obligate the United States to make future payments in accordance with the terms of such contracts: *Provided*, That to the extent that the operating-differential subsidy accrual (computed on the basis of parity) is represented on the operator's books by a contingent accounts receivable item against the Commission as a partial or complete offset to the recapture accrual, the operator (1) shall be excused from making deposits in the special reserve fund, and (2) as to the amount of such earnings the deposit of which is so excused shall be entitled to the same tax treatment as though it had been deposited in said special reserve fund. To the extent that any amount paid to the operator by the Commission reduces the balance in the operator's contingent receivable account against the Commission, such amount, unless it is forthwith deposited in the fund, shall be considered as withdrawn under section 607 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act, or in any prior appropriation act, shall be construed to affect the authority of the Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 603 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (1) to grant operating-differential subsidies on a long-term basis, and (2) to obligate the United States to make future payments in accordance with the terms of such operating-differential subsidy contracts: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of ships receiving such subsidy as of January 1, 1950: *Provided further*, That the balance in excess of $16,-

770,000 as of June 30, 1950, in the special deposit account established with receipts from sales under Public Laws 44 and 305 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, together with any receipts after that date from such sales, shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 304, strike out the proviso beginning in line 5 and ending before the colon in line 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of ships which are entitled to receive an operating-differential subsidy pursuant to provisions of any contract, authorization, commitment, or obligation by the Commission in existence on January 1, 1950, including within said limitation as to number any ships being constructed or contracted for on said date under a construction-differential subsidy contract and including also any ships the operation of which may be authorized by the Commission under any contracts which may result from any formal applications filed with the Commission prior to January 1, 1950."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, that amendment involves the same section as the amendment which I just offered. My amendment preceded that of the gentleman from Texas. It is the exact section, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not entitled to recognition because that paragraph had not been read. Of course, after it was read, the chairman of the subcommittee was entitled to first recognition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment we offer is in substitution for the language on page 304, beginning in line 5 and ending with "1950" in line 10. The language we are now asking the committee to consider is the language submitted to the committee by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, with only a slight variation. What it does is put a limitation on the number of ships as of January 1, 1950, that can legally receive an operating-differential subsidy. That language is the language of the gentleman from New Jersey with the minor exceptions I have mentioned.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very much pleased that the gentleman and the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission are evidently attempting to put further restrictions on the activities of that Commission and its expenditures.

As a member of the Hoover Commission, I recall quite vividly that we made a rather thorough study through the task force of the Maritime Commission and its activities. We found that it had been very wasteful and very extravagant, that the records had not been kept properly, that they could not explain many of their expenditures, and that they could not explain to the task force, as I recall, where many of the ships were or what had happened to them or what they had done or anything else. It was one of the most loosely operated agencies of the Federal Government we found in the entire service.

I should like to express the hope here that the gentleman's committee and the full Committee on Appropriations will ride careful herd on the Maritime Commission and its activities and expenditures not only this year but in the years to come, and insist upon rigid economy and proper accounting.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution. I may state that the committee is practically of one mind, and that is that everything the gentleman from Ohio has said can be 100 percent substantiated.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I make clear that that amendment does have the approval of both sides of the committee. It is offered as a committee amendment. I consider it to be a clarifying amendment to the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my thanks to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the fine cooperation that he has extended in the negotiations over this language. The language as submitted meets with the approval both of the ranking minority and majority members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I want to express my appreciation to the very able chairman of the subcommittee which has handled this chapter of the bill with such ability. I am glad that he is offering this amendment.

The proviso under consideration, as presently worded, could result in the denial of any and all operating subsidies during the fiscal year 1951. The subcommittee, I know, did not intend this result. The Congress as a whole would not, of course, approve any such result.

It is imperative that the proviso be deleted or so amended as to meet the objections to it.

As I understand it, the proposed amendment would take care of all ships entitled to receive operating subsidies on January 1, 1950, of all ships under construction with an agreement for an operating subsidy on January 1, 1950, and of all ships that may become entitled to operating subsidies as a result of applications filed with the Maritime Commission prior to January 1, 1950.

I believe the amendment will meet the immediate situation if the proviso as a whole is not to be eliminated.

An adequate merchant marine, equipped to serve as auxiliaries in time of war, is vital from the standpoint of national defense.

The preservation of our skilled staffs of workers at essential shipyards is also vital from the standpoint of national defense.

I understand that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have indicated that in their opinion our merchant marine is definitely short of our needs in time of emergency. The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Navy, and the President's Commission on the Merchant Marine have given similar testimony.

Numerous types of ships which are required do not exist. In passenger-cargo ships we have far less than prior to Pearl Harbor and those that we have are often not sufficiently modern to compete with the ships of other countries.

The situation confronting our staffs of skilled workers is a grim one. Employment is deteriorating rapidly. Little or no naval construction is in sight. There will only be eight merchant ships under constuction in our Atlantic shipyards after December 31, 1950, and only one ship after December 30, 1951. Two of our major yards on the Atlantic coast threaten to close in a few months if something is not done.

I quote from the President's Advisory Commission on the Merchant Marine:

Unless new contracts are placed in the immediate future, the American shipbuilding industry will suffer such a loss in its technical and engineering staffs and in its skilled laboring personnel that years will be required to restore it to a basis of substantial and effective operation.

The amendment should be adopted or the proviso deleted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I likewise want to express my appreciation for the consideration that has been given to this compromise substitute amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] and the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. There is nothing, in my opinion, more important than that the Congress should consider the welfare of our merchant marine and of all of our shipping. I am fearful that Congress does give this matter the consideration which its importance entitles it to have. I can see by the willingness of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the subcommittee, to offer this compromise amendment that he and those who have considered it have given some consideration to the importance of our merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, I am in support of the amendment as a compromise. I do not like to see even the limitation that it proposes, because I am fearful it may not either directly or indirectly discourage the building up of our merchant marine.

During the years I have been a Member of Congress, I have been intensely interested in legislation to promote and maintain our shipbuilding industry at a high level of efficiency. Why have I been so greatly interested in this subject?

My interest is due to a firm conviction that our national welfare, in times of

peace and war, is so intimately connected with the building of ships, that we cannot as a Nation ignore this industry or do otherwise than maintain it in a state of efficiency that will keep it constantly ready to perform any task that is required of it. To do otherwise is to court national disaster.

Twice in one generation this country has been forced into emergency shipbuilding programs of huge size.

In World War I only a few of the ships begun under our war program saw service because the conflict ended before we could complete more than a comparatively few ships under that program.

In World War II the results were better, for then we had the advantage of a modest shipbuilding program started about 3 years before Pearl Harbor. With that as a start, we were able to get into high gear on our shipbuilding program with less waste of time, money, and lives. But even with that preparation, it was several years after Pearl Harbor before our full shipbuilding potential could be made effective.

Next time we may not have time, distance, and allies behind which we can work until we are ready. Our best hope of preventing a next time is to get ready now. We must act now to be strong tomorrow.

Many can readily understand the necessity for up-to-date ships of war, but, do not understand why it is also necessary to have a strong merchant marine, composed of passenger and cargo ships.

The answer is that if we are to maintain our position in foreign commerce we must have up-to-date passenger and cargo ships. Foreign trade is highly competitive. Any nation that must depend upon foreign ships to carry its commerce is at a disadvantage. We cannot afford to let our Nation's commerce depend upon the good will of others. It would be foolish for us to do so.

Another question that is appropriate is how important is a merchant marine in time of war?

My answer to that question is that in any war emergency, passenger and cargo carrying ships are a No. 1 requirement. At the time of Pearl Harbor we had only 113 ships in active passenger service, with a capacity of only 38,000 passengers. Consequently, our early troop movements were critically delayed by this lack of troop carriers. Likewise our supplies, both food and weapons, were greatly delayed. It is a miracle that we were able to accomplish so much with so little. Fortunately, we did get assistance from allies that had not been so derelict as we had been in this important auxiliary means of defense. Notwithstanding, the experience gained in two World Wars, today, we have only approximately 50 ships with a capacity of 20,000 passengers.

Another question of prime importance is: What is the present situation with respect to the shipbuilding industry in the United States?

Those who have studied this question will agree with me that the situation is pitiful. The industry is languishing and dying. As of January, this year, private shipyards in the United States only had under construction or on order 39 merchant vessels. The present employment in new construction in the entire shipbuilding industry in the United States is only approximately 30,000 workers.

If delivery schedules are met by the shipyards, by the end of 1950 the present 639,000 gross tons of merchant shipbuilding will be reduced to 137,000 gross tons. This will mean the closing of most yards entirely and the dismissal of approximately 24,000 workers, leaving only about 6,000 workers engaged in ship construction in the entire shipbuilding industry throughout the Nation. And even this small number by this time next year, unless something is immediately done by our Government to provide new construction, will have almost disappeared.

It is natural to inquire what effect does this dispersal of shipyard workers have upon the ability of the industry to meet future emergencies.

The effect is disastrous. The building of ships requires more trained men, skilled in a greater variety of trades than any other industry. When these skilled men are dismissed they naturally go into other industries and remain there because of greater assurance of continuous work. They are lost to the shipyard industry. Consequently, it becomes necessary in time of emergency to find new workers. These new workers must be trained over long periods of time with consequent delay in the construction of ships, and at vastly greater cost. Time and money could be saved if the Government would see that our shipyards are kept busy and a nucleus of trained men kept in constant operation, to provide a working force that could be rapidly expanded in time of emergency.

You may be interested to know how foreign countries are meeting this problem. The answer to that question makes our Nation look ridiculous. Foreign nations are busy building ships. Bankrupt though most of them are and dependent upon our aid, yet, nevertheless, they are building ships. Let us illustrate by the case of Great Britain. According to Lloyd's Register of June last, Great Britain and its possessions were constructing nearly 50 percent of all ships under construction in the world. The United States of America only had 13 percent of the total. Great Britain in June last was constructing 432 ships, the United States shipyards less than 50. I think it is time that Uncle Sam woke up and started to use our American dollars to build ships in American yards instead of enabling British, French, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Italian yards to do so. It is also well to note that Great Britain has greatly increased its shipping since the war. Today it has 26,000,000 tons as against 20,000,000 tons before the war. In other words, it is 30 percent better off today than before the war.

There is much more I would like to say in support of a shipbuilding program by our Government but the time allotted, unfortunately, does not permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to ask the gentleman this question to clear up some matters which are of interest to all of us, to the gentleman from Virginia as well as the gentleman from Georgia. This amendment makes these companies that are qualified to apply for or receive subsidies and who had applied for them prior to January 1950 eligible for the subsidies even though they never before received any subsidies?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct. This language is broad enough to include everybody in the world who made an application in any shape, form, or fashion prior to January 1950 but the limitation applies as to the number as of that date.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. How does that apply to new ship construction now going on?

Mr. THOMAS. The language expressly covers that.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman give us the answer for the benefit of the committee?

Mr. THOMAS. Let us put it this way. If they have already made an application and the ship is under construction in January 1950 and come within that limitation as to numbers the merchant marine can grant that subsidy.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the question I want to ask about. Suppose they start building a new ship on July 1, what is the situation there?

Mr. THOMAS. July 1 of what year?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Of 1950.

Mr. THOMAS. That is after January 1, 1950?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the language is very clear that then they would not be entitled to it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman mean that we are not going to build any more ships?

Mr. THOMAS. I think we have about $100,000,000 in this bill for new ship construction.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If no ship which is applied for after January 1950 is included how are you going to build them?

Mr. THOMAS. Are you talking about building them or giving them a subsidy? Let us not get those two things mixed up.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. This refers to the operating subsidy as the gentleman from Louisiana knows.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Ships to be constructed now would come under the operating subsidy for the next fiscal year.

Mr. HARDY. If they are under construction as of now, it would be some time before they could be put into operation and they could not even apply for an operating subsidy.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The amendment which the gentleman from Texas offers contains a stipulation regarding obligations; not merely actual payments, but obligations.

Mr. HARDY. I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one or two questions about this matter myself, because I am particularly interested in it.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and his subcommittee have done one of the most outstanding pieces of work that I have seen in a long time with reference to aiding the Maritime Commission to clean up its own house and get its affairs in order. You and your committee are to be commended.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman for that, but I want to commend the committee for changing the language in this bill. Although the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has been rather critical of some conditions in the Maritime Commission, we want to be fair, and we want to be sure that the maritime industry is adequately protected. I just want to be certain that I do understand this, that this language would enable any ship that has applied for a subsidy to be eligible to receive that subsidy.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right, within the limitation as to number as of January 1, 1950, provided.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. In order that I may understand the gentleman's amendment, I would like to ask him this specific question: Is is the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee that this language would permit more than 250 ships, or just exactly 250 ships, to come under the provisions of this language?

Mr. THOMAS. I doubt if it would be that much. I imagine it would be nearer 236.

Mr. PRESTON. In that event, this language has little effect on the language as it appears in the bill before your amendment was offered.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; it broadens it considerably.

Mr. PRESTON. Will this language which the gentleman has offered take care of a company which has applied and received certification for four ships to operate on a route declared to be essential by the Maritime Commission, but for which no contract has actually been consummated?

Mr. THOMAS. Has it been operating?

Mr. PRESTON. It has been operating.

Mr. THOMAS. On a certificate of convenience and necessity?

Mr. PRESTON. They have.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Government now owe them any money?

Mr. PRESTON. They have never received a contract.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the language is broad enough to cover that.

Mr. PRESTON. It is not the intention of the chairman to preclude such a situation as that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that particular point?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As I understand the language, it is quite clear what it does. According to my understanding, there were 250 ships entitled to operating subsidy as of January 1, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no. There were 236, and they wanted 19 additional, which would make about 250.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, on January 1, 1950, there were a definite number of ships eligible for operating subsidies.

Mr. THOMAS. Or entitled to receive it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes. In addition to that, there was a definite number of ships under construction which had agreements with the Maritime Commission for operating subsidy. And in addition to that, there was a definite number of applications for operating subsidy pending with the Maritime Commission.

As I understand the language of the amendment you have suggested, those ships, and no more, are included?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct, within the limitation as of January 1, 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, lest any stranger reading the record think that the desire of the committee or the Congress is to pass out a lot of operating subsidies, I think some attention should be directed to what the Comptroller General said about this whole program. Of course, the operating subsidy program takes into consideration the construction subsidy program. I just want to put into the RECORD a few of the things that the Comptroller General said: I am quoting excerpts from testimony we developed in the hearings. At page 1257 of the hearings I brought to the attention of Mr. Goertner, the counsel, this statement of the Comptroller:

> Aside from the question as to Standard's right to a section 9 adjustment, our review of the adjustment made revealed that the Commission had overpaid Standard by approximately $473,000 as a result of an overstatement of the cost of the *Dartmouth*.

That is the kind of stuff we are dealing with when we deal with these subsidies.

I have no objection to strengthening the merchant marine and think that we need to do so, but unless the Maritime Commission is going to play fair with the taxpayers of the country in the handling of this operating subsidy, certainly we ought not to be doing any liberalizing.

At another point in the hearings, page 1265, I point out that the Comptroller General says:

> The importanc. of that decision led the Supreme Court to grant a petition for certiorari. That Court held that a market value which included enhancement caused by the Government's needs in time of national emergency was not a fair market value and that all such enhancement should be excluded in determining just compensation.

Then later the Comptroller General says:

> The Supreme Court's decision, however, has had little discernible effect on the settlement of these cases in the first 5 months following its release. The Commission's general counsel has stated that "the inaction is directly attributable to a divergence of opinion between the Government and the former shipowners as to the effect of the Supreme Court's decision."

The Commission's general counsel stated that the inaction is generally attributable to a divergence of opinion between the Government and the former ship owners as to the effect of the Supreme Court's decision. In other words, the Maritime Commission itself was disposed to disregard the Supreme Court's decision.

Bear in mind that the Comptroller General, Lindsay Warren, is a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. Under the heading "Assumptions" he says:

> Insufficient effort has been made to obtain more satisfactory information. There are many assumptions discussed in the following paragraphs which need not have been made; there are others which run counter to common sense.

And he was speaking of assumptions that the Commission was making as to what interests were involved.

It must be borne in mind that the law requires that when the Commission gives a differential exceeding 33⅓ percent that the Commission must have in its possession substantial evidence. In commenting on that in his report the Comptroller General cites the case submitted to the Supreme Court. The committee not only had no such evidence presented to the Commission as a body in the cases discussed in this report, but it was not even in the possession of the staff of the Commission making the recommendations.

I hope that the Members who are really interested in the welfare of the maritime industry of the country will take the time to read the report of the Comptroller General and see how necessary some housecleaning is.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has suggested to the Members of Congress that we read the report of the Comptroller General. A reading of that report, I believe, will indicate no objection on his part to the principle of subsidy that is involved in the discussion that is now taking place.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is correct; what he objects to is the way it has been administered.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes; I wanted to make that plain, because I think anyone who examines into this subject will certainly come to the conclusion that our merchant marine is requirement No. 1 in considering the welfare of the Nation either in time of peace or of war.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think, if I may have the attention of the gentlemen interested, it is important that we clear up certain confusions regarding the number of vessels involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. We are not discussing the theory of the operating subsidy, nor are we discussing the theory of the construction subsidy. We are discussing the limitation placed in the bill by the subcommittee in order to determine in some way just how many vessels might properly be eligible for the subsidy.

There were on January 1, 243 privately owned vessels and 7 charter vessels which under the limitation would have been eligible to receive the operating subsidy. There were 4 vessels under construction, and the vessels operated by the companies which had filed applications prior to January 1, if all came under subsidy, would total 25, of which only 23 would be ready in fiscal year 1951.

The question arose whether the vessels which had made application for subsidy prior to January 1 would be eligible. My understanding, and the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is, that they would be eligible to such subsidy under his amendment. The number of those vessels which would be ready in the 1951 fiscal year would be 23 vessels, as I have just stated. This would make a total of 281 vessels as a maximum which would be eligible.

It is not necessarily that number, however, Mr. Chairman, because it is the contention of the General Accounting Office, and Mr. Lindsay Warren as the Comptroller General, that some of the vessels now under contract are not properly receiving that subsidy. It is the hope of the subcommittee and of the Congress that a review will be made of that fact. We cannot, however, decide it today. We cannot set a figure which is lower than 281 because of the technicalities involved in taking a vessel off subsidy, if it should be taken off, or of putting a vessel under operating subsidy, if it should be put under. There is the necessity of a hearing, the probability of trial, and the question of the statements in the Comptroller General's report, which we have not yet seen. So all we can do is to amend the language and make a possible total of 281 vessels.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman stated there were approximately two-hundred-and-forty-some-odd ships that would be eligible, and I understood him, 23 new ships.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That have applied prior to January 1. If the Maritime Commission gave them a subsidy for which they asked, that is the total.

Mr. COLMER. Would there be included in that 23 any ships under construction?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Four ships are under construction.

Mr. COLMER. How about new contracts?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. New contracts? If they had been filed prior to January 1 they would be eligible. If they had not been filed on January 1 they would not come in this fiscal year, therefore, it is not necessary that they be included in this amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Let us take the case of where a contract is under negotiation with the Maritime Commission for the construction of a vessel.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Construction or operating subsidy?

Mr. COLMER. For both.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We are talking only about operating subsidies.

Mr. COLMER. Then a ship that is not under construction would not be eligible?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If it has applied for an operating subsidy prior to January 1.

Mr. COLMER Even prior to the awarding of a contract?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Prior to approval by the Maritime Commission?

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is the reason for the amendment because those vessels under the wording of the subcommittee's restriction would have been barred.

Mr. COLMER. Then, to put it as concisely as I can, if the Maritime Commission were negotiating with a ship company on January 1, 1950, for the construction of a vessel and an operating subsidy, it would be eligible under this?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is my understanding and intent. I will ask my chairman to confirm that, but that is the understanding of the subcommittee in presenting the amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman gave the figure of 281 ships a moment ago as being the total number eligible to receive subsidy; is that correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That could be eligible.

Mr. HARDY. That could be eligible to receive subsidy.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There is no evidence that that number would be finally approved to be eligible, but that is the number possible.

Mr. HARDY. If in the determination of the number under the formula you arrive at a figure of 281 ships, then even though some of those 281 ships might not be granted a subsidy, would it not be possible for the committee to pay subsidies to ships whose applications have come in since, because they did not exceed the number?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. They would have to have the application in before January 1, 1950.

Mr. HARDY. I do not understand the amendment that way. As I understand it, the amendment does two things. It provides for a numerical limitation on the number of ships, the operation of which the Maritime Commission may subsidize, and it establishes a formula for arriving at that number. The date, January 1, 1950, seems to me to be merely a part of the formula for arriving at the maximum number of ships with respect to which the Commission may pay operating subsidies.

Therefore, if after this maximum number has been determined the Commission should decide against granting subsidies for the operation of some of the ships which went into the establishment of that number, it would be possible for the Commission to approve subsidies with respect to ships for which no application has as yet been submitted. The Commission would, of course, have to determine the eligibility of such ships for construction subsidies in accordance with the act.

Of course, I do not know whether this interpretation of the language is what the committee intended, but the wording certainly contains that meaning to me, and it may well be that this interpretation is as it should be. I fully support the committee in its effort to impose some restraint on the haphazard expenditure of public funds by the Maritime Commission. The law has been administered carelessly, and the Commission has approved and paid construction and operating differential subsidies without meager support for its action.

While deploring the laxity of the Commission, I think it is essential that we be fair to the maritime industry and that we take no action which might have serious adverse effects upon it. It seems to me, therefore, that the language in this bill should provide some latitude for the granting of operating subsidies to ships in essential trade routes which are eligible and entitled to receive such subsidies, but for which no applications may have yet been submitted.

I think it entirely proper that we impose limitations upon the Commission. Certainly none of us want to put the merchant marine industry in a straitjacket.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I now understand the interpretation the gentleman from Virginia places on the amendment. I think it it quite possible he is correct. I am compelled to add that it was not the intention of the subcommittee to make any vessels eligible for which applications would be filed after January 1, 1950, but I also state that I concur in the statements of the gentle-

man from Virginia regarding both the Maritime Commission and the support of a merchant marine industry for the United States. I take for granted that any uncertainty in the language can be worked out between now and the time the bill comes back to us from the conference committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to insist upon opposition to this amendment because I think what it demonstrates above anything else is that many Members of this body are dissatisfied with the administration of the Maritime Commission. I am not prepared to comment on that one way or the other. There has been a lot of criticism of the Maritime Commission, and there has been a lot of internal bickering going on within the Commission. The Commission never agrees on anything. They fight among themselves, and different members of the Commission come running up here to various Members of Congress and various committees of Congress complaining about what the other members are doing. It is a very tragic thing, because the United States merchant marine is absolutely essential for this country.

Now, what has really happened here has been that the Comptroller General has severely criticized the Maritime Commission. The Hoover Commission has severely criticized the Maritime Commission; the Members of Congress, and the Hardy Committee, have criticized the Maritime Commission, and this is an effort to put the affairs of the Maritime Commission in order. I admit that it must be put in order. I am hopeful that the reorganization plan which has been proposed will do that. I am certainly very doubtful and very skeptical about what is proposed here, because in order to strike at maladministration we are striking at the very foundation of the American merchant marine.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which is the basis for the construction and the operating differentials, we were mandated to build and to maintain an American merchant marine. Why were we given that mandate? Because in 1908 American ships were carrying about 10 percent of our cargo, and in 1917, when we entered World War I, we had no American merchant fleet and our cargoes piled up in every port of this Nation and we were completely dependent upon foreign bottoms to carry our cargo in that great World War. At the end of the war, when the war was over, we had built a merchant fleet, but we immediately proceeded to junk that fleet, and the United States Shipping Board came along, and the Black Committee came along, and we had investigation after investigation, and finally by 1935 we had no merchant fleet again.

Be it said to the everlasting credit of that great and distinguished statesman from Virginia who lately passed away, Judge Bland, that it was largely through his efforts that we adopted the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, making it possible to build and maintain a fleet.

This amendment strikes at the heart of that act. If the theory behind this amendment is carried out, the net effect will be that this year and next year we will snipe and cut down and cut back, in order to get at possible maladministration in the Commission, until in the next three or four years we will no longer have an American merchant fleet.

I regret, I sincerely regret, that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the members of that committee have accepted this amendment. Unless it is changed in the other body it may prove to be a death blow to the American merchant marine.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything to the very splendid statement my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] has just made on this subject, but I cannot refrain from an attempt to add something to it. I cannot permit this amendment to be adopted without at least voicing some protest.

If this philosophy is carried through, I go further than my friend and colleague from Louisiana and say it will mean eventually the driving off the seas of the American flag. I do not like subsidies any more than the chairman of this subcommittee, but we all know as a matter of common knowledge that under the standard of living in America, under the standard of operation of our merchant marine, we cannot compete with foreign-flag ships without a subsidy. Our merchant seamen receive much higher wages, they have better accommodations, they have better food, so the operating expense of a merchant ship under the American flag is tremendously higher than that of a ship under a foreign flag.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I believe my colleague will agree with me that to maintain a merchant fleet a constant effort must be made. To put on a limitation or set a total figure, such as they have proposed in this amendment, means that ultimately every shipyard in the United States will close down, because you must have continuous construction. As the gentleman well knows, today the foreign competition with the American shipyards has put practically all of them out of business.

Mr. COLMER. I am not critical of the English; I think they are a great people. However, today the English shipyards are buzzing, and in all the shipyards of the United States there is a total of only seven ships under construction.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. On the point the gentleman is making, it is also noteworthy that at the present time the shipbuilding construction work being carried on in Great Britain and its colonies, as taken from June last issue of Lloyd's Register, constitutes nearly 50 percent of all such construction throughout the world, whereas as of June last in our own country we were only constructing about 13 percent. Further, at the present time the British have 26,000,000 tons of shipping as against 20,000,000 tons before the war, a 30-percent increase. I am in full accord with the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. All that is being done at the expense of the American taxpayer.

I am not so sure that this amendment should not be voted down, and that then by appropriate amendment this language in the bill should be stricken.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in all the discussion there has been no talk about the money involved. Actually, what we are driving at is an appropriation bill and the cost to the taxpayers. No member of the committee can demonstrate that the insertion of that proviso in this legislation is going to save one nickel, because an over-all limitation is contained in the amount of money appropriated, and all this is going to do is to bring pandemonium into the shipping industry in this country.

Mr. COLMER. My friend again has proved most helpful. I think we should give very serious consideration to this matter. I want to help these foreign nations, but I do not want to see the merchant fleet of America driven off the seas, nor do I want to see our shipbuilders and shipworkers in this country walking the streets while we are furnishing the money to foreign countries to construct their ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman knows this has been a continuing fight. The gentleman and many of the other Members of this body remember when the Committee on Foreign Affairs failed to recommend that 50 percent of our cargoes under the ECA program be carried in American bottoms. The gentleman offered an amendment, which was opposed by the committee but which was carried by this body, which was a further indication that we desire to maintain in peacetime the American merchant fleet, and yet, here the Committee on Appropriations comes in and cuts it.

Mr. COLMER. I recall that most vividly.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment under consideration.

I have always been a stanch advocate of a strong merchant marine in the United States, as I believe that it is essential to national defense.

During World War I this country was caught totally unprepared to transport the men and matériel of war to Europe, and we had to depend almost wholly upon foreign bottoms manned by foreign seamen and officers.

After World War I, I remember very well the stir that was made in the Congress about the establishment of a strong merchant marine. As a matter of fact, I remember well that one of the principal campaign issues of my predecessors was their being in favor of an American-built and -manned merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House knows that under our American standard of living that we cannot compete with operating costs of the European nations, and the only way that we can keep our flag flying on the seas and not be at the mercy of foreign nations is to maintain a numerous and strong merchant marine. We also know that in order to do this it is necesary to subsidize the merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that there has been dissension in the department among the administrators of the organization, and much criticism has been leveled against the merchant marine, however, recently a change in the Administrator has been made, and knowing General Fleming as I do, with his experience and ability, I feel certain that he will be able to reorganize this department and that he will be able to resolve all of the differences between those charged with the administration of this governmental agency which is so vital, not only in times of peace, but also if we should be forced into another war.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Members will give their consideration to the facts which I have pointed out before they vote, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS), there were—ayes 46, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the operating differential available under this appropriation, including the reappropriation is $81,65$,157. My understanding is that the Comptroller General has been investigating this set-up in the Maritime Commission, and he has found that a very considerable portion of the subsidy which is being paid to these ship operators is being illegally paid. I have made this motion for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if there is any way in which we can determine the amount of these illegal payments, because if such payments have been made, it would seem that we ought to cut this appropriation down accordingly. Can the chairman of the subcommittee tell me about that situation?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman they came to the committee and asked for $93,380,000 for an operating differential subsidy alone. The committee ought to bear in mind just what items are subsidized when a ship operator runs a boat. First, it is subsistence; second, wages; third, insurance; fourth, repairs; fifth, maintenance. It covers everything. They asked for $93,380,000. They finally admitted, under cross-examination, they could get along with considerably less, and upon further examination we reappropriated some $34,910,000 that had been appropriated in 1949 and 1950, and came up with a total of about $85,000,000, which they estimated would be required for expenditure for 1951.

Mr. STEFAN. Does that break-down include mail subsidies?

Mr. THOMAS. No, indeed. For 1951 the Post Office Department will pay $14,-020,000 for carrying the mail by water. I do not mean to say that these 13 subsidized lines get all of that $14,000,000, but they get probably anywhere between 50 and 75 percent of it.

Mr. STEFAN. That will make approximately $103,000,000 subsidy, including the mail.

Mr. THOMAS. Close to it.

Mr. TABER. Is there any way we could tell how much of these payments that the Maritime Commission has been making are illegal, in accordance with what the Comptroller General has intimated?

Mr. THOMAS. The Comptroller General has pointed out two or three examples where he contends that the Maritime Commission is paying a subsidy without any authorization in law. By virtue of his finding in those one or two cases, we have asked the Comptroller General to make an intensive study of the entire 235 ships that are now receiving a subsidy, with the idea of finding out first whether they are entitled to receive any amount under the law; and second, whether or not they are getting not only a fair amount, the right amount, but the amount that they should get according to the terms of the law. He has been making that study for 6 weeks, and he says he will complete it before this bill goes to conference. My guess is that he will come up with quite a few number of ships which are receiving subsidies they are not entitled to receive, as a matter of law, and with an additional number of ships that are receiving more than they are entitled to receive under the law. That is purely a guess on my part.

Mr. TABER. Would it not be better if he might make a cut of, say, $10,000,-000, or something like that, so that we would be prepared to take advantage of that situation when the report arrives?

Mr. THOMAS. We have already cut this subsidy about substantially below their request. I think we have a good point, if you will just bear this in mind. You will recall that under the basic act of 1936, which is perhaps the most one-sided act that has ever been passed since I have been a Member of this Congress, it has as little regard for the pocketbook of the taxpayer as any act that has ever been put on the books, and I defy anyone to deny it.

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I ask unanimous consent for two additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. It is stated in that law that when they start one of these operations on a subsidized line, then it becomes a debt of the United States and must be paid. Therefore, if we cut the entire $93,000,000 out of here, lock, stock, and barrel, if it is found that they are operating legally and within certain limitations as to those five items as to cost, then it is a debt against the United States and you have to pay it whether or not you appropriate the money or not.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If these were illegal payments, could not the Comptroller General stop payment on them or not allow them to be paid?

Mr. TABER. Anything that he finds is illegally paid he has the right to proceed to recover.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It would seem to me that instead of the Congress doing that, the Comptroller General either ought to do it or call it to our attention and make an investigation.

Mr. TABER. He is making the investigation. I have been disturbed by the enormous amount of these subsidies. While the appropriation is only $26,000,-000, the reappropriation is $55,000,000 which makes a total of $81,000,000. Out of an accumulation of old funds they will have available $55,000,000 at the end of this year that can be reappropriated, indicating that while the committee has been trying to find out what the situation was and correct it, the committee has provided more funds in times past, and we have not recovered other funds that we should have. They have had too much money available.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I am thoroughly in accord with the distinguished gentleman from New York in that no subsidy should be paid to an operating company for any purpose other than those authorized legally.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. COLMER. But the gentleman, I am sure, will agree with me that involved in this whole matter is the question of whether the merchant marine of America is going to be able to stay on the high seas in competition with foreign ships.

Mr. TABER. There is that question, but there is no question but what a very considerable number of our ships with the rather liberal subsidies that are allowed can get along.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get an agreement as to time on the Maritime section. I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the

Maritime section be considered as read, and open to amendment, and that all debate on the Maritime section be closed in a reasonable time. What would the gentleman from New York suggest?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the section should be read. I would not be willing to consent to the gentleman's request.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which provided for operating subsidies, I believe received the support of most Members of Congress. That subsidy has been granted and the American taxpayers are footing the bill for only one reason, our national defense. I do not believe we have any right to provide subsidies for any individual shipping line or any company in order to insure a profitable operation unless it is subsantiated on the basis of national defense. I believe that the majority of the Members of Congress have supported the operating subsidy program and the construction subsidy program for that reason. If we assume that that is the reason for our operating subsidies, then we must also look at another important factor: These subsidized operators have the privilege of purchasing war-built vessels under the Merchant Marine Ship Sales Act of 1946. Some of these vessels were purchased from the Maritime Commission at 1 percent of their actual construction cost. In the past 2 or 3 years there has been an effort by Members of Congress from the Great Lakes section to reestablish package freight and passenger service on the Great Lakes. The Maritime Commission has many ships in its laid-up fleet which we are paying substantial sums of money to keep in repair. This year there were over 30 Members of Congress from the Great Lakes section of our country who introduced identical bills to amend the Ship Sales Act to allow operators of the Great Lakes to purchase war-built vessels under the same conditions that now exist for the salt-water operators. We have spent a great deal of money for our merchant marine based on its need for national defense. Our bill for the sale of vessels to the Great Lakes is also needed for national defense. The subsidized operators that have received all of the windfalls from a generous Congress and from the American taxpayers in the form of construction and operating subsidies and also have received the benefits under the Ship Sales Act are the same operators who through the American Federation of Shipowners through which they speak came into our committee and opposed legislation which would give equal treatment to the Great Lakes. We are not asking for a subsidy but for an opportunity to purchase war-built vessels now owned by the Federal Government. Not only have the salt-water operators who are being subsidized opposed it but the Maritime Commission also opposes it.

The Maritime Commission has constantly given us a great deal of lip service and sympathy so far as the Great Lakes region is concerned. They say it would be desirable to reestablish this package freight service on the Great Lakes. Prior to the war we had 27 package freight vessels in operation on the Great Lakes. The Government took those vessels and today we do not have one package freight vessel sailing the Great Lakes. Our Maritime Commission says, "Yes, we agree with you, something should be done, we offer you a great deal of sympathy, but we oppose your legislation" and offers no suggestion to aid in solving the problem.

Last year we had legislation pending and the Maritime Commission opposed it. We did not press it because we hoped we could work with the Maritime Commission in an effort to devise legislation where there would be some agreement. As a matter of fact, the Maritime Commission created a little committee to study our problems of shipping on the Great Lakes, but still nothing was done.

This year we introduced legislation which we thought would meet the objections of the Maritime Commission. When hearings were held on the legislation we found the same commissioners trotting up here opposing the legislation. I do believe that when Members of Congress from inland areas support wholeheartedly legislation which provides subsidies for our salt-water friends, legislation which gives them the benefit of the Ship Sales Act where shipping companies can buy vessels for a small percent of the total cost of construction, these gentlemen should receive a little consideration and get equal treatment so far as the Great Lakes region is concerned.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maritime training: For training personnel for the manning of the merchant marine (including operation of training stations at Kings Point, New York; Sheepshead Bay, New York; Alameda, California, and the United States Maritime Service Institute), including not to exceed $2,229,300 for administrative personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); not to exceed $2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in his discretion; not to exceed $77,000 for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered the Commission; $3,342,660, including uniforms and textbooks for cadet midshipmen, to be provided in kind at an average yearly cost of not to exceed $200 per cadet: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for compensation or allowances for trainees or cadets.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS:

On page 305, line 18, strike out "$2,229,300" and insert "$1,853,100."

On page 306, line 3, strike out "$3,342,660" and insert $2,966,460."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It seems funny to me that the maritime training program cost over-all is $3,342,660 and that it requires $2,229,300 for personal services, which would be cut down to about $1,800,000 by the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. It is quite high.

Mr. TABER. I know that is cut down by the amendment, but it still sounds high. Two-thirds of the money is for administration.

Mr. THOMAS. They have quite a large number of employees, and the committee cut it about 10 or 12 percent, and perhaps it could stand a little more.

As to the amendment pending now, let me explain what it does. Through an oversight on the part of the committee we allowed for the administrative personnel of the maritime training a pay increase comparable to that which was granted to the Coast Guard under the recently enacted military pay bill. We were advised that the personnel, the instructors in the military training school, came under that act. Upon subsequent investigation by the committee it was pointed out to the committee by several gentlemen on the floor, the gentleman from Tennessee, and particularly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], who authored the legislation and piloted it through the House, that it was not the intention of the Armed Services Committee to include this personnel in the Maritime Training Service in that pay increase, and therefore this amendment covers 524 of them and reduces the amount carried for salaries and expenses by $376,200. The committee asks for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Is it not a matter of fact that this $484,000 increase in pay for these gentlemen in the Maritime Commission was taken away from the cadets' pay of $485,000? The Maritime Commission said they were saving $1,000 there, and yet they were taking it away from the cadets and at the same time increasing their pay.

Mr. THOMAS. No, I doubt if that is true, because the Budget did not allow this $65 pay.

Mr. SUTTON. But the Bureau of the Budget did allow this $485,000 increase in pay, and it came under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, and at the same time in the military pay increase they were not mentioned.

Mr. THOMAS. It was my understanding that it was $376,000, and the committee believes that it should be reduced by $376,000 on the theory that they were not entitled to receive it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]:

On page 305, strike out all of lines 14 to 25, both inclusive.

On page 306, strike out all of lines 1 to 7, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following wording:

"Maritime training: For training personnel for the manning of the merchant marine (including operation of training stations at Kings Point, N. Y.; Pass Christian, Miss.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Alameda, Calif.; St. Petersburg, Fla. (including Training Vessel *American Mariner*); and United States Maritime Service Institute) including not to exceed $3,175,000 for administrative personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of five passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; printing and binding; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150), not to exceed $2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, to be expended in his discretion; not to exceed $100,000 for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered the Commission; $5,886,000, including the monthly pay of Cadet-Midshipmen and other trainees at the same rates provided in fiscal year 1950."

Mr. TABER and Mr. THOMAS reserved a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been offered not only today, but, if I remember correctly, for the past 3 years, at about the same time each year. I regret exceedingly that it is necessary for me to continue to offer this amendment. I am very happy to say that in the past 3 years this body and the other body have agreed on the amendment. I regret, too, that my good friend the gentleman from Texas is opposed to this program. It is not new. He has been opposed to it.

This amendment seeks to continue the operation of the splendid United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and the subsidiary institutions at Sheepshead Bay, at St. Petersburg, Fla., and at Pass Christian in Mississippi. None of these institutions are located in my congressional district.

The total amount of money involved is something over $5,000,000. The question, however, is whether or not we of the United States, today the world's most powerful Nation, spending $16,000,000,000 in one way or another on the armed services of the United States, will refuse to spend $5,000,000 to keep and maintain an adequate, competent personnel in the merchant fleet. That is the only issue involved.

The Government of the United States has spent millions of dollars at Kings Point, N. Y. I believe some Members of this body were at Kings Point in connection with the tour of the great city of New York just a week or so ago. I am certain many of you saw first hand the splendid job that is being done there, and it is a splendid job because they are bringing into that institution young men from all over the United States, from the Midwest, from the Southwest, and from the central sections of the United States, many of whom have never seen a ship, and they are teaching them the fundamentals of navigation and the other knowledge they must have to go to sea. As a result, we are sending out today on our American ships well-trained, well-educated, American officers and seamen who act as ambassadors for the United States.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Louisiana. We all know the magnificent contribution that the maritime schools made to victory in this last global conflict. Those of us who have visited these Academies—and I was one of the many Members of the House who were at Kings Point just last Sunday—know that the training these boys receive in this Academy is comparable in quality and character with the training given to the boys at West Point and Annapolis. Though I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services and do not want to trespass upon the authority or jurisdiction of any other committees of the House, I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana that it is supreme folly to spend fifteen or sixteen billion dollars a year on our armed services and then not spend a few paltry million dollars to build up a strong and powerful merchant marine to transport the men and material in time of emergency.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I might add in connection with the gentleman's contribution, which has been a very helpful one, that all of you are familiar with the battle which has gone on in the maritime unions for the past several years to clean the Communists out of those unions. If it had not been for the infiltration of these real American boys trained in the ideals of our country, I doubt seriously if those unions would have won the battle against the Communists who were all over the ships for many, many years.

This is a case of false economy if there ever was one. The gentleman from Texas talks about the pay of the instructors. What are the facts involved? The gentleman from Texas has said that he does not like the Merchant Marine Act. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is the Magna Carta of the American merchant marine. It makes it possible for us to have a privately operated American merchant marine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I appreciate the indulgence of the committee. I should like to ask the Members of this body who are opposed to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 what they would substitute for it? The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 makes it possible for us to have a privately operated American Merchant Marine. Does the gentleman from Texas want the Government to operate the American merchant marine? Does he have any notion that would save any money?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly I would not mind having a merchant marine. I would like to have one, where the American taxpayer gets, say, as little as 50 cents on the dollar for the money he spends. As it is now the Club 13 gets all of this money. The 13 subsidized lines, and no one else. The rest of the people are in the wrong business, as far as "gimme" is concerned. The Club 13 gets more money in the way of a subsidy than anybody in this country, and you cannot deny it. Just go back and consider again the original act of 1936 and amend it, so that the taxpayers will get a break, rather than Club 13.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman has of course demonstrated that in order to get what he calls the Club 13—that is the first time I have heard that expression—but in order to get what he calls the Club 13, he wants to junk the American merchant marine. That has been the history of the American merchant marine ever since we have had it. We have had people come in here who want to get the Club 13, or one of these phrases that people pick up—a few words—you hear it all the time, just catch phrases to try to get you off the track. As a matter of fact, I know a lot of people that you are talking about in this so-called Club 13, and, as far as I know, they are good, honorable, decent, Americans. This whole attack on the training program, on the proviso that you put in the bill, is an effort to scuttle the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and that is all it is. The net effect of it will be that Great Britain, France, Italy, Greece, and perhaps even Russia will be getting all of our commerce.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. One of the greatest competitors of all countries in shipping in this world is Norway, a little bit of a country. What has built her merchant marine? The fact that she has schools that are equivalent to our West Point, to train her sailors to go out on the high seas and handle billions of dollars worth of valuable cargo.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I appreciate the contribution of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. And the gentleman also knows that the Government has millions of dollars invested in the best equipment and the latest weapons and all that is necessary to the adequate training of a modern merchant marine. They have excellent libraries. I talked to scores of these young men on last Sunday, and they say that if Congress cut this any further there would be no Merchant Marine Academy left, because they could not continue.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Of course the gentleman also knows, as does everyone who has looked into this matter, that back of all this attack upon this training program in the merchant marine is a certain organized maritime union that wants to see these men in these top positions in our merchant marine come up from the ranks, rather than to take these fine, splendid young high-school graduates and educate them in these training schools. The gentleman knows further, I am sure, as do others who are familiar with the facts, that the whole attack has come from that source and that source alone. They have been to the White House and they have been to the Maritime Commission, and everybody else, working on this program from its very inception. The gentleman further knows, I am sure, if he will bear with me, that during the war the Communists had infiltrated more into that union than any other union in the entire United States.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I pointed out a minute ago that it was because of this program of bringing in young Americans that the Communists had been defeated in the unions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and provides for schools not authorized by law, and requires additional duties of the Administrator of this training.

I refer the Chairman to the following language of the substitute amendment:

Maritime training: For training personnel for the manning of the merchant marine (including operation of training stations at Kings Point, N. Y.; Pass Christian, Miss.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Alameda, Calif.; St. Petersburg, Fla. (including training vessel *American Mariner*); and United States Maritime Service Institute) including not to exceed $3,175,000 for administrative personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the Chair please, the amendment is germane to the section; it covers the training program of the United States Maritime Commission. I regret that I did not hear all of the argument of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The main ground of the point of order made by the gentleman from New York is that the gentleman's substitute amendment constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from New York especially invited attention to the additional schools included in the gentleman's amendment, and stated that those schools were not authorized by existing law as training stations.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the Chair please, that language is identical to language which has been in the bill in previous years, and those schools have been specifically stated in the language of appropriation bills for the past 3 years. I presume that the gentleman from New York refers specifically to the school at St. Petersburg and the school at Pass Christian.

Mr. TABER. I refer to the law which does not name them.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. They have been named in the law in all previous years.

The CHAIRMAN. Named in what law?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The Appropriation Act.

The CHAIRMAN. An appropriation bill is not authority of existing law. Their inclusion heretofore in an appropriation bill might have been due to a point of order not being made, and that could not be accepted as authority of existing law.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would it be in order to strike out the legislative language and permit the amounts to stay?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I be heard on the point of order before the matter is determined?

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to reply to the parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman of course could ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment and revise it if he so desired.

The Chair might point out that the pending bill has certain of these training stations included, but a rule was adopted waiving points of order against this chapter of the bill. The rule did not waive points of order, however, as to amendments to be offered; so if the gentleman's amendment does include provisions that are not authorized by existing law that would be the particular point to which the point of order was directed by the gentleman from New York.

The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I first propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The same unanimous-consent request to remove the language we are now discussing could be made after the Chairman's decision as to whether or not it is in order; am I right?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, it could be made; but the Chair fails to see any point in making it should the Chair overrule the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. My point, Mr. Chairman, is that I think the point of order is not correct. Should the Chair rule the amendment out of order, the gentleman from Louisiana could still submit his consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman now on the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the Chairman. I do not have the basic law before me. These two schools are in operation, therefore whatever justification there might have been for these schools, under basic law or any other law, still exists. A point of order might perhaps have been made against the action of the committee in eliminating these schools, but we have waived points of order. A point of order, in my opinion, may not lie against the inclusion of them by amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana because they presently exist. They were not removed from the bill by action of the Congress. They were removed by the elimination of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to ask the gentleman if he can point out to the Chair any existing law that authorizes these training schools or training stations?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Whatever law authorized all of the training Academies authorizes these. They have been in existence and are presently in existence.

The CHAIRMAN. No law has been cited to the Chair authorizing these training stations. That citation will have to be presented for the Chair to be able to pass on this matter intelligently.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman and again requests that he point out any provisions of existing law which authorizes these training stations. That would be very helpful to the Chair.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, on the spur of the moment I do not have the law, but I do wish to point out that the law authorized the training program, therefore it is not essential to set out or spell out where the special schools are to be operated. They are authorized under the general substantive law.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment in order to revise it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say anything about the famous or infamous Club 13 because I know nothing about it. I could not even call out the names of its membership. But I would like to talk to you for just a moment about the young American boys who are in our State maritime schools and in our Federal maritime schools.

As a member of this committee I assure my very distinguished, gracious, and charming chairman of the subcommittee that I do not like to take this position in opposition to him because I know full well that whatever he does is with his usual charm. I want to speak about the "charm" of the young boys who when they finished high school had a chance to go to a name college, had an opportunity to have their afternoons off and on Saturday to go to football games and take their girls out to dances; but they made a decision. They decided to go to maritime schools because there was an opportunity for these boys, and many of them are poor boys, to receive $65 a month so that they could be trained, so that they could go out every morning

and as the American flag was raised on the pole make their salute and make their demonstration of American faith.

They believed in us, they believed in the Congress of the United States, and they thought they had a contract for 4 years. Perhaps it was a quasi contract. I suppose that is a better way to explain it. Now, some of them have been 3 years, some 2 years and some only 1 year.

Once again, like last year, we are faced with the situation in the Congress of the United States saying, "No longer can we pay you or will we pay you; we repudiate our contract." That is not the Congress of the United States, in my conception. We did not repudiate last year when, the distinguished gentleman from Texas came here and told you no other boys were being paid this money. I say we have a contract with these youngsters. They gave up their liberties to subject themselves to the rigors of naval authority and discipline. When the last war came they answered the call.

The gentleman from Texas—and I am going to anticipate his argument—is going to hit the table and say, "We are not paying any money to the boys that go to the medical schools." Well, the answer to that is obvious; it is twofold. First, we made no contract with the boys who went to medical schools and, secondly, these young lads will be in the Reserve and subject to the call, the instant call of this country when, God forbid, another war might come.

I say to you Members of this House, this is small, very small, if we are not going to go along and say to the American boys, "You can rely upon the Congress of the United States."

A distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Dr. HEDRICK, at lunch today told me a story about a little lad he met from his State. Mark you this well, these are not students from New York State; they are students from your State, and your State, and every State in the Union. This little lad from West Virginia came up to Dr. HEDRICK and he said, "Doctor, my father is dead. My mother is working, and if this $65 a month is cut out, I cannot continue; I must leave Kings Point."

I hope that we have not reached that stage, and I know we have not reached the stage when over the portals of those four State schools will be a sign reading, "For Rich Men's Son's Only." I would rather see the banner that is there now, the American flag, and alongside of it the open arms of those gates that welcome to their portals every American boy who has the willingness to sacrifice and who has the mind and the desire to serve his Nation.

Oh, I recognize, too, that when the distinguished gentleman from Texas addresses you he is going to tell you that these boys are not compelled to immediately go into the service of their country. But, that matter was answered so well by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] last year, when he said, at page 4660 of the RECORD:

> In October 1940, the cadets were enrolled in the United States Naval Reserve, and have been so enrolled ever since. They may not withdraw from the naval service and thus escape liability for active duty in the Navy except at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Navy. Upon graduation they are commissioned as ensigns in the Naval Reserve and cannot withdraw except at the pleasure of the President.

I ask this committee to take into consideration our promise to these young men, and our duty in these trying days with threatening war, so that we will have a merchant marine that will forever protect our Nation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments to the entire paragraph dealing with maritime training close in 1 hour, the last 8 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 305, line 18, strike out "$2,229,300" and insert "$3,175,000"; and on page 306, line 3, strike out "$3,342,660" and insert "$5,886,000."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this is a clarifying amendment to take care of the objections raised by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Did the gentleman's amendment leave in or strike out lines 6 and 7 on page 306?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. It is the intent of the amendment to strike out the language following the colon in line 6 on page 306 and ending in line 7.

Mr. TABER. That was not included in the amendment?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; it was not.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I inquire if the amendment at the desk strikes out the provision beginning on page 306?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair heard the reading of the amendment, it seeks only to change the amounts. Is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the language on page 306 after the colon and running to the end of the paragraph be stricken.

Mr. THOMAS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, of course everybody here knows what we are trying to do. The chairman of the committee is urging all the technical objections he can possibly devise. I trust the Members of this body will properly respond to that type of obstructionist tactics. Everybody knows what is involved here. I regret very much that the chairman of the committee refuses to permit us to vote on the merits of the issue involved.

I shall not take your time any further. I am quite certain we can offer clarifying language to include this necessary revision.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman has no objection to an amendment to his substitute amendment which will strike out those additional words?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I have not the slightest objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. As the amendment now is before the Committee does it provide for the operation of these schools?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because the intent of the amendment, and this is important, is to provide funds for the operation of training institutions at Kings Point, N. Y.; Pass Christian, Miss.; Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Alameda, Calif.; and St. Petersburg, Fla., including the training vessel *American Mariner*, the United States Maritime Service, the Maritime Institute, as well as personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States. It also intends to provide funds for the reimbursement of services provided by the Public Health Service. It is further the intent of the amendment as it will be amended to provide for the continuation of the pay of the cadet midshipmen and the trainees who are now attending or will attend these institutions during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. COLMER. In order to clarify the situation and perhaps this question should more properly be addressed to the Chair as a parliamentary inquiry, the gentleman's amendment is being offered as a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No, my amendment is offered as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], which seeks to further reduce the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and to make clear the situation which now exists. The Congress of the United States has repeatedly expressed itself in favor of these maritime schools. The objection to the maritime schools comes primarily from the Bureau of the Budget and one of the maritime unions. We have regretted, and we have expressed our regret that this argument should be brought to the floor each year by voting the money back into the bill. I am sorry, as the gentleman from Louisiana expressed himself to be, that we cannot have the amendment in the proper language. I am quite content that the wording should be worked out between the two bodies, or in conference, to make clear the intent of the Congress. If we close the school at St.

Petersburg we will eliminate training being given the maritime students. If we reopen the school at Pass Christian there is a question whether there is any duplication between the training at Kings Point and Pass Christian. But there is no question that the school at St. Petersburg is giving training which is not given elsewhere. Therefore when this comes to our subcommittee and we reduce the amount it raises the question of whether we are not changing a policy of the United States which may shortly react upon us unfavorably. If we are going to vote in a few days an increase of $350,000,000 for defense equipment in this very budget, then, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you we certainly need men to man the ships which are going to be used in the defense program. These men would not be available if this program is cut down to the extent indicated in the amendment proposed by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas. I support the amendment which is being offered today subject to future clarification. I hope it will receive the support of the Congress.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 152]

Abbitt	Granger	Norblad
Anderson, Calif.	Grant	Norton
Arends	Green	Pfeifer,
Barrett, Pa.	Gwinn	Joseph L.
Bates, Ky.	Hare	Pfeiffer,
Battle	Harrison	William L.
Blatnik	Havenner	Plumley
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Boykin	Hébert	Price
Buckley, N. Y.	Heffernan	Priest
Bulwinkle	Heller	Quinn
Burdick	Hinshaw	Ramsay
Burton	Hope	Redden
Byrne, N. Y.	Jacobs	Regan
Canfield	James	Rhodes
Cannon	Jennings	Ribicoff
Carlyle	Jonas	Roosevelt
Carroll	Jones, Mo.	Sabath
Case, S. Dak.	Kearns	Sadlak
Cavalcante	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadowski
Celler	Keogh	Saylor
Chatham	Kilday	Scott, Hardie
Chudoff	Klein	Shelley
Clemente	Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Latham	Smathers
Corbett	LeFevre	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Wis.
Crosser	Linehan	Stanley
Dague	Lucas	Stigler
Davies, N. Y.	Lynch	Taylor
Dawson	McConnell	Teague
Deane	McGuire	Towe
DeGraffenried	McMillen, Ill.	Underwood
Delaney	Macy	Vinson
Dingell	Madden	Walsh
Dollinger	Merrow	Werdel
Douglas	Michener	Wheeler
Eaton	Miles	Whitaker
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	White, Calif.
Engle, Calif.	Morgan	White, Idaho
Feighan	Morrison	Whitten
Fenton	Morton	Wickersham
Fulton	Moulder	Widnall
Gillette	Multer	Winstead
Gilmer	Murphy	Woodhouse
Golden	Nixon	Young
Granahan	Noland	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 292 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEONARD W. HALL to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana: On page 306, line 3, strike out all after the amount down to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the substitute because I am certain that the gentleman from Louisiana did not in his substitute intend to limit the allowance which the cadets in the maritime service are now getting.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I want to say that he is correct in that statement.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the substitute offered by the gentleman from Louisiana. I am doing so for this reason. We have 794 cadets at Kings Point. We have a contract with those boys to pay them $65 a month. Last year the Budget tried to eliminate that allowance and on the floor we were able to put it back in the bill. At that time the great push to eliminate this amount of allowance for these cadets came from some of our left-wing CIO unions and before the appropriation bill came on the floor last year their papers had gloating articles saying that they were putting an end to the Maritime Academy at Kings Point.

The Government's investment at King's Point is over eleven millions of dollars. Servicing this great institution there are over 400 personnel. The Academy is not a wartime measure. This I would like to emphasize. It was authorized back in 1938 and it came into being, really, out of recognition of a strong national demand for the establishment of a permanent national merchant marine service institution. You gentlemen, I am sure, will recall the ignoble position of our merchant marine in the late twenties and middle thirties. The establishment of this Academy was only second in importance, so far as planned maritime progress is concerned, to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

This summary background is given you so that the membership may correctly evaluate what is inherent in the Budget recommendation. The proposed cut is a blow to the Academy and to maritime progress.

Today, at the Academy, we have young American boys from all sections of the Nation. To qualify for entrance these young Americans must pass a stiff competitive mental examination—just as difficult as those given at West Point and Annapolis. They must be physically fit. A condition of entrance is their fitness for enrollment in the Merchant Marine Reserve of the Navy, and I know from personal experience that on physical examinations the Navy will never waive any physical defect. And, these young Americans must show that they have a real ambition to follow a sea career. There is another requirement—one, however, that the Government does not now impose—the financial ability of the boy who wants to go to the Academy. We have a great many young men going to Kings Point whose families simply are unable to help them pay their way, even for small incidentals. We have seamen of the merchant marine, men from the ranks, who are at the Kings Point Academy, and these men are often very poor in pocketbook. It may interest the committee to know that there are 80 seamen, men from the ranks, who have qualified and are now at Kings Point.

Just a little while back the Alumni Association of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps made a survey which is very revealing and also very discouraging in its import. They found that if the training allowance of $780 a year is eliminated, that 119 cadet midshipmen feel that they may be forced to quit. Neither these boys nor their families are able to get the cash anywhere that they need in order to meet the expenses at the Academy, including incidentals, for 1 year. The Alumni Association also found that 202 cadet midshipmen were uncertain whether they could continue and that 348 boys stated that they would have to get help from home.

It seems to me to be a most desirable and indicated policy to have young men at Kings Point from all over the country and that not only boys from rich or well-to-do families should have the opportunity of going there. This is really a national institution and anything that threatens the enrollment at the Academy from all income groups of our people would certainly be a real blow.

I urge strongly the injustice and inequity of reducing this allowance to $200. It is easy to understand the protest that has been aroused. Our people do not want to see this any more than they would want to see the allowances at West Point, Annapolis, and New London cut down to the bare provision of a few items of uniform and textbooks. Why the $200 proposed figure would not even provide the boys with a winter overcoat not to mention dress uniforms which under present regulations they are absolutely required to have.

I am as much for economy as anybody else. But I must state frankly that I want no part of this kind of effort. I am ashamed that the proposal has come before us from the administration.

This proposed cut has nothing to do with the elimination of wastes. The Budget Bureau does not claim there are wastes. It is not being urged on the basis of increased efficiencies.

If this proposed slash is not defeated we will be accomplishing the potential destruction of one of the finest Academies

in the Nation, and also a very severe setback to the training of vital personnel to service our merchant marine security arm. I should certainly not be against a percentage reduction in the over-all maritime-service appropriation, but I am against undermining and sabotaging established policy commenced under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. If there is to be a change in the allowance, it seems to me that this is more properly a function of the legislative committees of the Congress rather than that of the budget or the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is it not a fact that we made a contract with the students that are already there that we would pay them this money during their term in the school, and therefore, if we adopt the amendment, we would violate that contract? And is it not also a fact that if a change in policy as basic as that should be made, it should be made by the Congress?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. The gentleman is right. It should be made in the basic law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, with $2,000,000 we seek to maintain the flow of trained men into the American merchant marine. On yesterday the great Committee on Armed Services voted 31 to nothing to extend the Draft Act for another 2 years. Why? Because that committee, in its wisdom—that committee is close to world affairs—knows that there may be an emergency which will demand an immediate flow of trained men into the armed services. But who, in the event of such emergency, will man the merchant fleet? We have to keep this thing alive. It is not going to cost much money to do it.

St. Petersburg, one of the schools mentioned, is one place where new hands, beginners, 700 of them each year, can be trained for seamen's ratings, enginemen, oilers, deck hands, cooks, and bakers. The other schools train cadets for officers' ratings. It keeps a supply of strong, wholesome young men coming into the merchant marine from the homes of this country.

Do not forget that ships are still the vital lifeline. We are dependent on ships in time of emergency. During the last war the ships carried 722,000 tons of cargo every day. They moved millions of troops both ways across the ocean. Without that cargo and without those troops we would not have won World War II. The men who man the merchant fleet are now 10 years older than they were in 1940, when the emergency began before. The records show that the average life of a merchant seaman is only 10 years. Most of the men who served in the merchant fleet during the last great emergency are already passing out of the peak period of usefulness.

This is our responsibility. We have to decide whether we want it or not. We have to decide whether we need it or not. I submit it is an investment we cannot afford not to authorize.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in support of his motion.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not insist upon this motion, but I am anxious to gain the floor at this time because I think the amendment should be supported and adopted.

I looked over some of the records of the young men that I have appointed to the various Academies, either West Point or Annapolis. Of course, they could not all be accepted. There have been many who have fallen by the wayside and have been unable to make the grade. This does not mean they are inferior material for any school. Oftentimes those young men have other avenues of opportunity and they are able to enter places like the Maritime Academy and other schools. These places should be kept open to all young men from every walk of life, because young Americans today deserve the very finest education that they can obtain. I believe that this is an opportunity for the House to go on record as being in favor of education for all young Americans.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I happen to be a member of the Board of Visitors to Kings Point. I just completed a week ago the tour of inspection. I am very happy to report that nowhere have I found such splendid Americanism, so much willingness and anxiousness to serve. I sincerely hope the House will not disappoint these fine young men.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the graduates of Kings Point fill a very definite need in America's merchant marine. I believe that we should maintain our merchant marine and that we should have these young men trained in such schools. They come out as well trained in their field as do the men at West Point, the Coast Guard Academy, and the Naval Academy.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I feel that there is every merit in this amendment. I think we ought to recognize the fact that it pays to educate the younger men of America, because within the next few years we want to see the strength of this Nation brought up to a point where we can command respect at the peace table, that in deliberations in the United Nations and other organizations our delegates and our representatives can go before those other nations and command the respect that we deserve in the world today. The only way to do it is to see that America is strong, to see that our younger men, our youth, those who are to take their places in various capacities in our armed services of tomorrow are well equipped so that we can make our armed forces the strongest in the world. These young men, these men who enter West Point, the Naval Academy, and the maritime schools must be prepared.

Someone once said to me that it cost Uncle Sam $25,000 for every young man sent through one of these Academies. I am not in position to evaluate that statement, but I do know that the taxpayers of the country are paying the shot, and they want to see dollar for dollar received. They want to see these young men get the best of education that they can possibly get, in order that these young men, regardless of race, creed, or color, will be able to be selected and appointed to the academies so that they may receive an education which is second to none in the United States, and also in the world. They have every right to expect this, and I for one want to join with my colleagues at this time to support this amendment and the principle of greater education for our young people.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I wish to take this opportunity, if I may, to express my concurrence with the sentiments that the gentleman from New York has so admirably expressed.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, although I made the parliamentary motion I did, it was manifestly to obtain time to speak for the putting into the bill money for the monthly allowances of the cadets at the Merchant Marine Academy, at Kings Point, instead of to speak upon my own motion.

I had the great privilege of personally visiting this very splendid Academy just last Sunday. About 40 other House Members did so too. It was a revelation and inspiration to us, and I heard no colleague who was not in high praise at what he saw and heard.

With capacity for 2,000 cadets in peacetime, but 1,000 were in attendance this year. The buildings and grounds were sturdy, clean, splendidly in trim, and so were all the cadets. I never saw a finer looking lot of young American men. They were proud of their school and its morale and accomplishments in scholarship, athletic prowess, military and marine competition. Recently they defeated the Navy and all other comers in sailing small craft. They took second to the Army in the Academy-drill competition.

A hard-working, ambitious California lad, from my own native State, was my courteous host to escort me about the buildings and grounds. He explained to

me that if this $65 monthly allowance was discontinued, as our Appropriations Committee proposes, about one-third of the cadets would have to stop school. This, he said, was because so many of these cadets came from homes which could not contribute more financially to their education. And, gentlemen, it is a 4-year course. Hundreds of these ambitious, patriotic, hard-working boys will have their life ambition dissolved suddenly, and without fault of their own, too.

Granting that the Government does not have to finish everything it starts in this case, these boys won attendance by honest-to-God, open competition and were induced to compete upon a frank representation that there was a 4-year course ahead of them.

This $65 expense account goes for clothes, haircuts, books, local carfare. It certainly is no financial inducement.

But these lads have chosen the sea. My host proudly told me his grandfather had been a distinguished sea captain. America needs American youth choosing the sea. America needs an adequate merchant marine in peacetime. If we do not have it in peacetime, it is too late when and if war comes. It is imperative that America have a well-officered merchant marine. These cadets I saw Sunday form the backbone of the officers for the merchant marine. The American steamship lines seek these youth upon their graduation from this splendid Academy which this cut will paralyze to a certain extent.

Yesterday the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, voted favorably 35 to 0, to approve a registration, examination, and classification law for American youth who would be subject to a draft in a national emergency. We believed it in the interest of our national defense and security that we do so. That bill affects millions of youth and costs millions of dollars. Yet this cut relates to a mightly important group of dedicated youth. Our Nation would immediately need their expert training should emergency come. There is no substitute for them.

To eliminate this allowance of $65 a month will effectively make this training Academy a rich man's school. Money talks enough already. American youth should not be eliminated from fair competition on the dollar mark. Character is more important than cash; yet this cut will freeze out—of the present students—about one-third of them already there and all future deserving and qualified lads, merely because they do not have the cash in their family.

If we put the dollar mark on these lads then we should do the same thing as to Annapolis and West Point; should we not? If not, why not? We need the Army Academy, the Navy Academy, this Merchant Marine Academy, too. Why talk about subsidizing an American ship marine when we deliberately plan to eliminate future officers of an American merchant marine? If you wish to further make it so that American goods are increasingly carried in foreign ships, then this is another step toward that result.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for entertaining my parliamentary motion so I could speak these views. I vigorously urge adoption of the amendment putting in the necessary money to make unnecessary the discontinuance of the marine education of several hundred American lads who were promised same. They need it. The Nation needs them as trained merchant-marine officers. Peace is surer with a well-officered American merchant marine. And, if emergency comes, we have then lost too much, too soon. Let us not make such a mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee of the Whole will not only approve the Boggs substitute but will also be sure to approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL]. In short, this is the one that takes out the proviso which would prevent the payment of the monthly allowance we all want to see paid or that a good many of us want to see paid to the cadets.

There have been two points that have not been made and which I would like to emphasize, and one's only reason to speak now is to say something important that has not been previously said.

A great deal has been said by a number of Members about left-wing unions. That is a pretty generic phrase and can cover a lot of territory. In this discussion we are dealing with the hard realities of national security, and when you are dealing with that reality I am confident, and I think most Members are, that the great bulk of the rank and file of any union is for measures which will go toward perfecting the security of our country. Today the logistic support, and there are many men here who served in the Army and Navy and know of logistic support, of the merchant marine is absolutely essential to the logistic support of any force operating in any part of the world. We know that difficulty comes in a hot war where the merchant marine will be required to operate, so we are dealing here particularly with the national security of the country.

Point 2: Many veterans in this House know it is not too difficult for American machine power to build guns and tanks and planes. We can do that pretty quickly. We can do it in a year, we can do it perhaps in 9 months, but you cannot cram learning down a man's throat quite that fast. It takes a number of years to give us trained personnel to do the highly technical jobs of leadership. That is exactly why it is so important to continue this in peacetime.

The evidence is clear that this whole program will break down unless these youngsters are taken care of, because they depend on this allowance. I will put in the RECORD as a part of my remarks how they spend the $65 a month, going right down to the infinitesimal items such as haircuts, which they have to provide themselves.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I hope that my colleague from New York will set forth during the course of his remarks that the Navy thinks so highly of Kings Point and its graduates that when they complete their studies the Navy itself commissions them with the same rank as the graduates from Annapolis.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. As a Representative of the great State of Pennsylvania I want to highly commend the gentleman on a very fine statement and heartedly support what he has to say and concur in his recommendations. It is my intention to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I would just like to enthusiastically join my friend from New York [Mr. HALL], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] in the remarks that they have made. I had the privilege a while back of being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy. Nowhere is American spirit and American morale more in evidence than at the Merchant Marine Academy, and I am fearful if this provision is struck out it will destroy that morale and eventually, perhaps, destroy the school.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak in support of the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], as later clarified by the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

I am not constrained to do so, however, upon any partisan or labor-baiting grounds, or because the United States of America, if this amendment as clarified does not pass, in effect would be violating the obligations of its contracts with the present-day students of these Maritime Academies.

I know full well, as a lawyer, that the United States of America can, under existing constitutional law, violate the obligations of any contract, and on occasions has done so. The argument therefore that the law as drafted in this section of the omnibus appropriations bill would impair by nullification the obligations of preexisting contracts is entirely without legal merit. The constitutional inhibition is against the right of the States and not the National Government to impair the obligations of contract.

I do feel, however, that there should be a moral obligation, and not a legal one, for our Government to endeavor to scrupulously perform its contracts in accordance with their letter, and spirit, as well.

I think that the broad theory of justice should prompt this Congress not to disappoint the fine young men who are presently taking training at the various Maritime Academies now functioning in our Nation, by virtue of previous, well considered congressional action.

Our Nation needs trained capable and loyal men to officer our boats in peacetime as well as in times of war.

Persons, firms, and corporations engaged in coastwise and transoceanic shipping also need trained, capable, and loyal men to man their vessels in peace time as well as in time of war.

Ordinary seamen need trained, capable, and loyal men in command on voyages which they may be required to take in peacetimes as well as in time of war.

If I held a position of maritime responsibility with my Government, or owned and operated ocean-going vessels, or was an able seaman, I would want the best man it was possible to secure to be entrusted with the lives and property aboard the vessel I was on.

Just how any thinking person could leave important tasks of leadership in the hands of men who have not had the latest nautical training or A1 patriotism is beyond my power to comprehend. I always wanted to follow the best leadership it was possible to secure, and I believe that every other person who can think constructively is of the same mind.

Unlike the candidates from West Point and Annapolis the candidates seeking admittance to the Maritime Academies do not owe their appointments to Members of the Congress, but on the contrary gain their admittance by virtue of competitive examinations, thus the young men with the very best minds, bodies, and aptitudes are selected. No political pull plays any part in their selection. Merit alone is the determining factor.

The student body attending these Maritime Academies is made up of bright, alert, and loyal young men from every State, Territory, and possession of the Union. They now represent all stratas of our society, financial, and otherwise, and are composed of young men of almost every race, color, and creed, which go to make up our great population.

This bill in its original form seeks to take away from the present trainees their $65 per month allowance, and in lieu thereof restricts them to a paltry allowance of $200 per year, while it permits the present Annapolis and West Point cadets to receive $75 per month as usual.

If this bill is permitted to remain in its original form many of the fine present-day trainees will have to abandon their courses and leave the schools.

These schools are splendid schools, with fine accommodations, many of them constructed by the students themselves with the aid of their most competent teachers.

Last Sunday when I had occasion to visit the Maritime Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., which has about 800 students. I was greatly impressed with what I viewed there. I saw equipment and classrooms where navigation, radar, advanced radar, and engineering were taught, as well as where the electrical, machinist, plumbing, pipefitting, and other trades were imparted, and where many other things were transmitted to the students, all of which are so necessary for seafaring activities, and so necessary for men to have a knowledge of who hope in the troubled future to command or have charge of our ships at sea.

The young man who took us through a part of this Maritime Academy at Kings Point told me he was one of 13 children. He was a boy from Massachusetts. After some searching questioning I realized that if this bill in its present form is passed by the Congress, that he might have to quit the Academy for lack of funds.

Please fellow Members of Congress let us not make these Maritime Academies places for rich men's sons alone, but places of learning for every financial and other strata of sterling American manhood.

I think that this amendment should be adopted. It is fair and right and just and most truly American to my way of thinking.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation carries more than just the $65 for the students at these Academies. As I understand, it restores the amount the academies previously had for their instructors. If we are going to have these schools, we might just as well educate as many students as we can. If, as we are led to believe by the newspapers and other sources, we are going to be called upon in the next few weeks to vote on a draft bill so that the authority to draft the boys of this country will be extended for 2 years and I understand that already one committee has granted the Department of Defense another $350,000,000—it seems to me this is one of the poorest times to cut down an educational system that means so much to this country in time of war.

In the next place, Mr. Chairman, we are educating United States citizens so that we may have on our ships people we can trust if we have to go to war.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a poor time to cut down the appropriation for these Academies. Ordinarily, as far as I am concerned, they could do away with them if it were best for the economy of our country, but when we are in a situation such as the present, when some overt act may be made that will throw us into trouble, we want all the experienced men we can get.

Our maritime school in Massachusetts was the first one in the Nation, I think, and it has been a credit to Massachusetts for over 80 years. In the last war 80 percent of the graduates of that school were either running ships or were chief engineers.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, we will go along with this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have greatest admiration and affection for the distinguished gentleman from Texas who is chairman of the subcommittee. He is one of the outstanding Members of the House. I am, therefore, especially regretful that it is necessary for me to disagree with his views concerning the merchant marine.

Let me first reassert and reemphasize my oft-expressed support of economy and efficiency in conducting the affairs of the Government. I have supported and will continue to support every proposal to cut down the expenses of the Government which will not eliminate or impair essential services to the States and the people, or jeopardize the national security of the Nation.

I believe sincerely and wholeheartedly that the maintenance of a strong, well-equipped, adequate, well-trained merchant marine is almost as vital to the national defense and the national security as the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Indeed without American shipping this Nation in wartime would be virtually at the mercy of our enemies. It is most unsound to spend billions for defense and stint on mercantile vessels to render that defense effective. Moreover, in peacetime as a matter of national policy, this Nation should maintain the strongest and best merchant marine in the world to carry our trade and commerce throughout the world and preserve the strength, prestige, and influence of American maritime intercourse with other nations.

This bill and some amendments offered, whether we like it or not, whether we intend it or not, will result in the ultimate destruction of our merchant marine policy as laid down in the act of 1936. It will in the end make this Nation dependent on other nations for ocean transportation. It cannot be justified. It is contrary to the interests of the Nation. It is unfair and unjust to our shipping industry which has already made great contributions to the building and development of our sea-borne commerce and is even now proceeding with plans to extend and perfect these vital services. It is unfair and unjust to thousands of worthy, highly qualified Americans, young, and in vigorous middle-age alike, who are following avocations and professions at sea under the American flag, and patriotically working to implement a thriving, well-knit merchant marine.

I disagree sharply and uncompromisingly with that group which believes under the doctrine of unlimited, or virtually unlimited, free trade that other nations should carry our commerce because they can do it more cheaply. This argument accepted by some here carried to logical conclusion would leave this country in peace and war at the mercy of our competitors or our enemies.

Is it not a travesty, my colleagues, at a time when we are lavishly showering billions upon certain nations which they are using in part to build up their own shipping and shipbuilding industries that

we should refuse to appropriate sufficient funds to insure the existence and operation of an adequate merchant marine for our own Nation.

In my view, seapower, military, and civil, is intertwined and interrelated. Both are necessary and indispensable, not only to our commerce but also to the national safety. For these reasons I will vote in this instance as I have voted since I came to this House, to build and strengthen the merchant marine, to keep it strong, powerful, and commensurate with the mercantile and military needs of the Nation, and to resist every proposal which like some of those contained in this bill will result in emasculating our merchant marine and leaving our Nation vulnerable in peace and in war.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from New York, LEONARD W. HALL, and the amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

In my district the State of California operates a maritime academy. The academy has done excellent work in turning out fine, young Americans who will devote their lives to the merchant marine. They may be called upon in the future to perform work of great importance to our Nation. It is conceivable that, as in the past, they may be called upon to carry supplies to the armed services of the United States in their defense of our country. Whether they perform in peace or in war they should be trained for the job, and we should offer an opportunity for young Americans who have the desire to go to sea to get the training and education they desire and need to make leaders of them. I am proud of the fact that the California Maritime Academy is in my congressional district and pleased that I have had most cordial relations with its officers. I hope this amendment will be passed by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the merits of the amendment of my colleague [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL] have been thoroughly and ably discussed. I think the House is fully aware of the importance to our Nation of an efficient merchant marine, and the necessity of having well-trained officers and men in our merchant marine. Our ships cost millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. They carry very valuable cargoes, and they carry human beings by the hundreds of thousands annually.

May I point out what it means when you have trained men and officers on your ships. In traveling on one of our large ships we received an SOS call, a ship in need of assistance. It took 10 hours to reach the vessel that was in distress. The SOS came from a ship which had an officer who was badly injured, with a broken arm, fractured skull, and other serious injuries. The ship in distress had no hospital facilities.

It was an inspiring sight to see how easily trained men could handle the facilities to bring the injured man over to our ship, which had a well-equipped hospital. It seemed that our ship had hardly come to a stop before you could see the other ship lowering its injured man into a boat, and then by motorboat came rapidly to our ship. The man was in the hospital without the slightest delay. His life was saved.

It is no easy thing to be on one of these ships in a severe storm. On another occasion a wave 75 feet high stove in the front of the pilot house and cut the pilots with the broken window glass. It was 75 feet from that pilot house down to the water. Those things can create great confusion and great danger to the passengers on our ships. We can ill afford, if we are going to have a creditable merchant marine, not to have men who are so thoroughly trained in seamanship that they can discharge their full duty and responsibility in any emergency on the high seas. I do not need to say how important it is to have trained officers and sailors on our ships in time of war.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be given to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, there is little anyone can add to what already has been said in regard to maintaining our Maritime Academies. There are no coast lines in the State of Missouri. We have no Coast Guard Academy and no Maritime Academy. This is not a local but a national problem. I was happy to speak for and vote for the $1,000,000 to train Reserves in the Coast Guard, and I am happy to vote for this amendment and lift my feeble voice in favor of it.

There are a few things we should not forget. These four schools already are in existence. They give the best training that is offered. In weather, meteorology, engineering, and navigation they receive the best instruction. Some donations were given to the Federal Government, but the taxpayers of this Nation have invested millions of dollars in these institutions which are now going concerns. They made a magnificent contribution toward the winning of the war. They are now filled with students from all over the United States. Practically every State is represented. These young men come from the middle-income and lower-income families of America. If we do not adopt this amendment, I feel that these academies will become rich men's schools; that is, if they can remain in existence at all.

The Federal Government has made a contract in good faith with these young men, who gave up certain considerations to enter these schools. Furthermore, these young men upon graduation will become ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve, subject to call at a moment's notice, with their skill, training, and experience to do the job that may have to be done.

By all means I think we should adopt this amendment and keep these institutions going, not only in time of peace but in time of war. Without an adequate merchant marine your battleships, carriers, destroyers, and cruisers in remote parts of the world will be helpless, because it requires merchant ships to carry the food to feed our soldiers and to carry the implements and munitions of war that they may be able to fight. The problem of logistics is one of the most important.

In World War II we had to transport originally 6 tons of supplies to each soldier we sent to Europe and thereafter 2 tons per month to sustain him. Only one who has fought in a devastating and modern war can realize the tremendous amount of food, clothing, and munitions of all kinds, including planes, tanks, guns, and gasoline, that are required to support an individual soldier. Without the help of our merchant marine we never could have won two World Wars—in Asia and Europe, in the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Gentlemen, no line of defense is stronger than its weakest link, and we must support both the Coast Guard and the merchant marine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, over the past 3 years we have had a repetition of just what is going on here today. When the committee has seen fit to cut out this training program for the merchant marine, the Congress has had to write it in on the floor of the House.

In order to clarify the situation, possibly, in the minds of some of the Members, let us see where we are.

First, we have the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] which would put in the necessary funds to keep in operation the existing maritime training schools at Kings Point, N. Y., Pass Christian, Miss., Sheepshead Bay, N. Y., Alameda, Calif., St. Petersburg, Fla., and the training vessel, *American Mariner*.

I say advisedly that so far as I can tell and be honest with myself, I do not believe there is any man on the floor of the House who is more interested in economy and in seeing that this budget is balanced than I am. I place only one thing above that, and that is our national security. This is a necessary part of our national defense program. In the brief time I have left, I would like to point out to you again, as I have on previous occasions, where the opposition to this program comes from. It has been touched upon today in the absence of some of you. It comes largely, if not entirely, from the maritime unions who want to see the officers of your merchant marine come

up through the ranks of the seamen. They do not want to see these boys taken out of the high schools, from these homes, and sent to these schools and educated as they are at Annapolis and West Point.

I want to congratulate the unions upon the tremendous progress they have made in getting rid of Communists in the unions. But you know, and I know, that the Communists infiltrated into the maritime union, as one of the chief and strategic points from which to operate.

You are not going to believe what I am going to say to you now. I will be glad to give you my authority for it and let you check on it yourselves.

At the close of the war over 70 percent of the men who were in the communications division of our Army transports, transporting these secret documents, the movement of ships, and so on, carried Communist cards in their pockets. That is how far they had infiltrated into this thing.

In the interest of national defense I think this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I can see from the debate that the Members are pretty familiar with the training program and seem to be in accord therewith.

We have an amendment which, if this amendment should fail, we contemplate introducing. My colleague [Mr. SIKES] has an amendment for less than a million dollars to continue the training of merchant seamen at St. Petersburg, but we hope we will not have to do it, because we favor the amendment that has been introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL]. That Government training program, the training of seamen at St. Petersburg, as well as the provision for Kings Point, was initiated as a part of the Merchant Marine Act. For a long period of time we were proud of the great American merchant marine. Then there came a period of time when gradually we let foreign ships carry the cargoes of this Nation, until we reached one of the lowest points in the carrying of American cargo that was ever known in the history of the Nation. Then we decided to build an American merchant marine. We provided for the building of ships. The Congress, in its wisdom, at that time, realizing that it was just as important to have trained men as it was to build ships, provided for a training program. They wrote that into the Merchant Marine Act. On the anniversary of the passage of the Merchant Marine Act, I was impressed with the speeches emphasizing the importance of training men as well as building ships. I have seen many of the men who have been trained in these institutions. It is a system under which boys from every State in the Union could go to these schools to be trained to follow the sea. It was no longer a period when you just reached out and grabbed a man off the dock at night and tried to make him a seaman overnight. Today he must be trained for service on great ships, with machinery and equipment, and he must know what he is doing. A man cannot become a seaman overnight. He must be trained in the handling of the ship. These schools do this.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does the gentleman feel that this war proved that the merchant marine is no longer an auxiliary service, but that it takes its place side by side with the Army and the Navy?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; I do. Under the Merchant Marine Act we built tankers and ships and trained men to man them. Had we not done so the history of the war on the sea might have been very different. From these seamen we trained gun crews, and many lost their lives as their ships went down with their guns blazing in order to protect the cargoes of the United States and carry the men of this Nation. We reached out then and got competent men and trained them to follow the sea; if necessary, we must be prepared to reach out again to train men to follow the sea. These amendments should pass.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] told me I might have the time allotted to him.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may use the time allotted to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am for any amendment which will advance the interests of this maritime group out of which we make the navigators and seamen on whom we depend in the event of a necessity which may occur.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, due to the lateness of the hour and everybody's being tired, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CREDIT REQUIREMENTS OF SMALL BUSINESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 584)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress major problems of small and independent businesses, and propose several important steps which should be taken to help them solve these problems through their own efforts.

In my January Economic Report, I stressed the need for a constantly expanding economy. Expansion of our economy is required to provide full markets for the rising productive capacity of our factories and farms. It is needed to provide adequate employment opportunities for our growing labor force. It is essential if we are to continue to play a strong part in working for peace.

Measured by any standard of the past, to be sure, we are now enjoying prosperous times. Output is high. Profits are rising. Business is generally optimistic. These are good signs. They reflect the fundamental strength of our economic system; its power to rally from the reversal of last year.

But while our business system is thriving, it is not growing fast enough. While employment remains at a high level, we are not creating all the new jobs necessary each year to absorb the growth in our labor force. Despite the upturn in business, we now have more unemployment than we had a year ago. The output of our farms and factories and the investment programs of business must not stand still, even at high levels; they must steadily expand.

I am fully aware that there are no simple or easy answers to the problem of assuring a stable and expanding economy. The efforts to improve the functioning of our economic system must be constant and tireless.

I have often stressed the key role that small and independent business must play in providing jobs, in promoting the vigorous competition necessary for the future growth of our economy, and in preserving our economic and political freedoms.

In some industries, it is true, large productive units can make the most effective use of modern technology. The American people value the benefits of mass production. Without prosperous, forward-looking big business, with its sights adjusted to the growing needs of an expanding economy, we cannot have the degree of prosperity that is within our power.

But we should not forget that the task of economic expansion requires using all the resources of this great Nation. Of the nearly 4,000,000 business concerns in our country, more than 90 percent are usually classified as small. These small concerns provide jobs for over 20,000,000 people—roughly half of private nonfarm employment. If we are to have an expanding competitive economy, small business must provide its share of the additional jobs needed. In doing so, it will not only create new payrolls for workers; it will also enlarge markets generally for business and agriculture.

Small businesses serve a necessary function in developing and pioneering new ideas and techniques. Most large efficient firms began as small business. They were started by men with big ideas but small capital. Our economy would become soft and slothful were this vitalizing force to be impaired.

The drive to do something now is strongest among those who cannot maintain themselves by doing what is already customary. It is strongest among those who have to work hard to hold their own and who feel keenly the urge to grow.

Vigorous small businesses are essential to effective competition. Competition stimulates efficiency. It prods inventive genius. It helps to keep prices at the lowest levels consistent with a fair and adequate return to business, and to maintain consumer buying.

A program to promote expansion of opportunity for small business thus plays a vital role in invigorating competition and encouraging technical progress and economic expansion.

The Government can and should promote conditions under which well-managed small businesses have ample opportunities for growth. This does not mean that anyone who may wish to start a business should be given financial assistance. Neither should the Government guarantee the success of any individual enterprise. Such a policy would rob small business of its basic characteristics of initiative and self-reliance.

The Government's first responsibility to small business is to promote a stable and prosperous economy. Every successful effort toward general economic stability will specially benefit small business. Last year we observed the striking vulnerability of small business to even a mild business down-turn. Sales and profits of small concerns declined much more than those of large corporations. No special program will provide adequate assistance to small business unless we achieve reasonable economic stability.

Another major responsibility of the Government is to prevent monopolistic and unfair trade practices and to curb undesirable concentration of economic power. Our antitrust laws have done much to help smaller business retain its independence. These laws and their enforcement should be improved. Encouragement of small and independent business, however, is one of our strongest weapons against monopoly.

To encourage the growth of small business specific and positive measures are needed to help overcome two handicaps affecting even the most efficient and vigorous smaller concerns. The first of these handicaps is the cost and difficulty of getting new capital. The second is the cost and difficulty of keeping abreast of new techniques of production and management.

A generation or more ago local financial institutions and investors ordinarily took care of the capital needs of expanding small businesses. Then, as now, the original funds usually came, for the most part, from the owner's personal savings. If the business weathered its initial period of losses, additional money was frequently forthcoming from friends or relatives, or the local banker might well provide substantial financing—almost as a partner—for small ventures with good prospects. With an outlook for further profitable expansion, the small-business man often could obtain long-term-capital aid from wealthy individuals or from larger financial institutions. In this way the vigorous smaller concern could make use of its opportunities for growth.

With the increased mechanization of industry, the capital needs of small business have greatly increased. Adequate venture capital, however, is no longer available from traditional sources. This is not because there is any shortage of savings. There are ample savings; the problem is to channel them into the hands of small-business men who need more capital to expand their operations.

Due to our remarkable gains in raising the level of incomes and in improving their distribution, the bulk of personal savings today are made by people of moderate means. They prefer to put their savings into insurance, savings accounts, or Government bonds, or into the purchase of their own homes. Wealthier people, better able to take risks, usually prefer securities of large, established concerns. Large firms rarely offer their surplus cash to small businesses except in exchange for control.

Nor do small businesses fare much better at the hands of the financial institutions through which the bulk of those savings pass. Most commercial banks of necessity grant loans to smaller concerns only if the security is ample, and then usually only for relatively short periods. A few of the largest banks whose resources permit adequate diversification have successfully engaged in long-term lending to small business on a large scale. But their facilities are available in relatively few communities, and the demand is still largely unfilled.

Insurance companies and investment trusts do engage in long-term and equity financing, but principally in the well-seasoned securities of large corporations.

Floating securities on the open market is virtually out of the question for small or medium-sized businesses.

It is clear, therefore, that our financial institutions are not meeting the expansion needs of small business. This gap should be filled.

In my January tax message to the Congress, I proposed some changes in the revenue laws for the benefit of all business and particularly to equalize the opportunity of small business. Additional tax changes of this character are not now feasible and, in any case, could be only a partial solution to the financial problems of small business.

In addition to these financing handicaps, smaller business often has real difficulty in obtaining or developing information on new techniques in production and management. Larger concerns can afford their own research facilities and can employ skilled staffs to advise them on recent developments in purchasing, production, labor relations, financing, accounting, marketing, and other specialized fields. Most small-business men lack experience in many of these areas, and cannot afford the heavy overhead costs required to hire full-time staffs to assist them.

In the modern economic system the margin between success and failure is often measured by the ability of the businessman to keep step with his competitor in applying new techniques and methods. The small-business man too frequently has to substitute long hours for the latest and most efficient methods. Freedom of enterprise should mean not only the opportunity for every man to go into business for himself—to be his own boss—but also the privilege of ready access to the best information on managerial and production techniques for his business. Competition works most effectively and the interests of the public are best served by assuring the highest possible efficiency in small as well as large operations.

After careful consideration of these problems, I am proposing that the Federal Government take five major steps to reduce the handicaps under which small business now operates and to broaden the opportunities for further vigorous expansion.

First, to help meet the credit and capital needs of very small business concerns, I propose legislation to provide for the insurance, on a self-sustaining basis, of bank loans up to $25,000 and repayable within 5 years. The great bulk of the loans insured under this plan would probably be under $5,000, but the authority to insure loans should not be limited to that figure.

This insurance would be quite similar to the present Federal insurance of loans for home improvements, which has proved highly successful since its establishment in 1934. Each bank would pass upon loan applications and the loans it approved would be insured against loss, subject only to compliance with federally-prescribed standards. No prior approval of individual loans by any Government officer would be required. Banks would, however, bear a portion of the risk on each loan, and thus would have a positive inducement to exercise sound judgment in their lending policies.

Thus local banks, without undue risk or expense, could apply their own funds and knowledge to serve more adequately the financial requirements of small local business concerns. This insurance would be particularly helpful to very small business concerns with good earning prospects which cannot yet effectively use large amounts of long-term capital. An insurance premium would be fixed adequate to cover all probable expenses and losses. Except for the initial appropriations to establish the insurance fund, ultimately repayable to the Treasury, no Federal expenditures would be involved.

Second, to increase the availability of venture capital to small and independent enterprises with somewhat larger financing requirements, I propose that the Federal Government be authorized to promote and charter national investment companies. These companies would be established and owned by private investors and institutions, but, as in the case of national banks and Federal savings and loan associations, the Federal Government would have the responsibility of enforcing observance of sound financial practices.

The major purpose of these companies would be to provide equity capital and long-term loans for efficiently managed businesses unable to finance themselves on reasonable terms through the organized securities markets. They should also be authorized to participate, to the

fullest extent possible, in the administration of the new program for insuring bank loans to very small business. In addition, they should make managerial aids and technical services available to smaller businesses in general.

These companies would be limited in their financing to small and independent enterprises. Thus, they are designed to fill the most serious remaining gap in the business financial structure. They would pool the savings of individual investors and financial institutions, and provide a channel through which they could be more safely invested in small-business ventures. Many such investors and institutions could not properly invest directly in individual small and independent businesses, but they could purchase the securities of the new investment companies. The more substantial resources of these companies would permit them to hire competent staffs and to reduce the risks by investing in a wide range of separate enterprises. Thus the new companies not only would provide a sound outlet for these savings, but also would supply a badly needed source of capital for small business.

Each investment company would work in close cooperation with banks in the region which it serves. It could participate jointly with local banks in financing businesses with good earnings prospects, in cases where legal loan limits or lending policies prevent the banks from providing all the funds required, or where the business needs more equity capital which banks cannot legally provide. In view of these prospective benefits for the banks, their customers and their communities, I am sure that most progressive bankers will want to take an active part in establishing the the investment companies.

This program will represent a pioneer undertaking in this country. In its early years, therefore, our approach will necessarily be experimental. To help launch the program, the Federal Government should provide positive incentives and aids to the new investment companies. Thus, tax provision should recognize their special character, particularly by permitting them to build up adequate reserves. Also, in order to assure sufficient funds in their early years, the Federal Reserve banks and their member banks should be authorized to invest in the stock of the companies.

Third, to make sure that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will have adequate authority to take care of the legitimate credit requirements of business when private financing is unavailable—through these two programs or otherwise—I am proposing that its lending powers be broadened in several important respects. The Corporation should be permitted to relax its collateral requirements on loans to small businesses, if management abilities and potential earnings of the borrower afford reasonable expectation of repayment. This amendment will merely give the Corporation the same discretion which many bankers already successfully exercise. The Corporation should also be authorized to increase its participation with private banks on such loans. In addition, I again recommend that the present 10-year minimum maturity on all types of business loans be increased to at least 15 years.

The two new programs which I have already recommended to strengthen the private financial system should materially reduce the need for reliance on RFC. The basic statute of the Corporation now prohibits it from making any loan unless the borrower cannot obtain financing on reasonable terms from private sources. This prohibition should be extended to any financing which is obtainable from the proposed new investment companies.

As the last line of defense, however, the Corporation should be equipped to handle all reasonable demands for credit which private institutions are unable or unwilling to provide. Our experience last year, when a relatively minor down-turn in business was accompanied by a 100-percent increase in application for RFC loans, illustrates the fundamental importance of not only retaining but strengthening this backstop for our financial structure.

Fourth, to help smaller businesses become more efficient, I propose strengthening and improvement of the technical and managerial aids now provided by the Department of Commerce. Specifically, I recommend that the Secretary of Commerce be authorized to establish a clearinghouse to collect, disseminate, and exchange scientific, engineering, and managerial information. I also propose that new authority be provided for him to undertake research on technical problems of interest to small business, including developmental work on new products and processes. In these new programs, as well as in existing business and technical programs of the Department of Commerce, the Secretary should be directed to give special emphasis to the requirements of small business.

These proposals would apply in the business field some of the lessons we have learned through our long and successful experience in promoting the use of modern methods in agriculture. Our farmers, though they cannot individually afford research laboratories, are able through Government assistance to obtain current information and to adopt new techniques. So far as is feasible, we should organize similarly effective services for our smaller business enterprises.

Fifth, to assure the most effective and coordinated direction of our aids to small and independent business, I recommend that, with one exception, general responsibility for each of these new programs be placed in the Secretary of Commerce. In addition, and for the same reason, supervision over the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be entrusted to the Secretary of Commerce. I expect to submit a reorganization plan in the near future to accomplish the RFC transfer.

It is most desirable that we group these functions together under common supervision. This would simplify Government administration. More important, it would make it easier for the small-business man to take advantage of the various types of Federal assistance already available or newly provided.

The Department of Commerce is the agency now charged with major responsibility for promoting the development of American business and industry. It will be able to discharge these responsibilities more effectively if it supervises both financial and nonfinancial aids to business. The advantages of combining these two types of assistance in the same agency have already been successfully demonstrated in the fields of agriculture and housing. Moreover, by concentrating in the Secretary of Commerce the supervision of the principal services to small business, we can more effectively mobilize the variety of resources available to the Government in meeting these problems.

In the case of the national investment companies, however, it appears appropriate that supervision be placed in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. These are to be private companies. It is essential to integrate their operations with those of other private financial institutions. Moreover, the Federal Reserve Board and the 12 Federal Reserve banks already have the personnel and facilities necessary for the effective supervision and examination of these national investment companies.

At the same time, the success of the national investment company program requires that it be tied in closely with the programs of assistance to small business under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce. Therefore, the Secretary of Commerce should be authorized to assist in the promotion of these companies and to advise the Federal Reserve Board on how the investment companies can best contribute to accomplishing the objectives of the Government's small-business program.

To simplify the Government's financial and nonfinancial aids to business, I repeat my previous recommendation that the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to make industrial loans to business be terminated. This program has long been largely inactive. The funds made available for it, amounting to $139,000,000, would be returned to the Treasury.

To put this five-point program into effect will cost the Federal Government very little. It will yield the Nation great returns. It will do so by lessening the obstacles that impede the progress of small and independent business and by providing incentives which encourage its expansion. It will promote the broad opportunity and vigorous competition which are the basis of our system of free enterprise. Thus, while retaining in the hands of private enterprise full responsibility for ownership and management, it will help to stimulate the flow of investment necessary for our continued prosperity.

I, therefore, urge the enactment of legislation to carry out these recommendations before the adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 5, 1950.*

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KARSTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a platform of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial of recent date appearing in the Lincoln Belmont Booster, a newspaper of Chicago.

Mr. HARRISON (at the request of Mr. DAVENPORT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

REPUBLICANS PLAN CAMPAIGN OF SMEAR, FEAR, HATE, AND SUSPICION

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 months the people of this Nation have witnessed one of the vilest and dirtiest headline hunting smear campaigns in the history of the Nation. Republican Senator MCCARTHY spearheads this campaign. It is evident that the object of this campaign is not to get Communists, but that it is a blunderbuss operation, and the shots are fired at every Democrat, from the President on down.

These attacks did not stop with Secretary Acheson, but they also went after Secretary Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes, and Gen. George Marshall. These dirty smear tactics on the part of the Republicans clearly point up the bankruptcy of the Republican Party. They have no issue for the coming campaign. They are devoid of all progressive plans and ideas. They plan to campaign and operate on a basis of smear, fear, hate, and suspicion. That is by appealing to the vilest emotions of humanity. Well, of course, it did work for Hitler, but I am confident that that sort of a political attack is deeply resented by decent Americans, and that it will boomerang at the Republican Party.

President Truman gave the answer in one word: "Politics." President Truman, speaking before the Federal Bar Association, stated further:

> We are not going to transform our fine FBI into a Gestapo-like secret police. We are not going to try to control what our people read and say and think. We are not going to turn the United States into a right-wing, totalitarian country in order to deal with a left-wing totalitarian threat. In short, we are not going to end Democracy. We are going to keep the Bill of Rights on the books. We are going to keep those ancient, hard-earned liberties, which you have done so much to preserve and protect.

Another great Democrat, Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, of North Carolina, speaking on the occasion of the two hundred and seventh anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the father of the Democratic Party, and America's great leader in the fight for freedom of ideas, stated:

> While we guard our freedom against conspiracies, infiltrations and aggressions of fanatical international communism, we must not ourselves go totalitarian and lose our own historic liberties. Freedom must resume again its upward human pilgrimage of the centuries of struggle and faith. America must be made safe for both democracy and differences, where the answer to error is not terror; where democracy is achieved without vulgarity, and excellence without arrogance; where the majority is without tyranny, the minority without fear, and all people have hope.

Yes, I wish to say to you that the United States did not become great on a diet of hate and fear. Last week General Eisenhower stated:

> We must stand for individual freedom, and for those things that are going to preserve the political and economic freedom of each one of us. We must combat relentlessly any needless invasion of those freedoms, because the attack on any freedom will never, in any country, be isolated and individual. It will be a creeping thing that will be on the door front and will attack all.

With the birth of Thomas Jefferson began the era of the lives of the greatest Democrats and humanitarians, and I am not ready to concede that with the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt the liberal, progressive, and humanitarian forces within the Democratic Party have ceased to exist or have been frightened into silence.

It should be clear to everyone that the recent Republican attacks are especially aimed at all liberals, progressives, Roosevelt New Dealers, and Truman Fair Dealers. Behind this fight are the same old Republican reactionary forces that we Democrats have met on previous occasions and who for the past 18 years we have whipped successfully. The best answer to these dirty smear attacks was given by a great liberal, President Abraham Lincoln, who wrote:

> If I were to try to read, much less answer, all attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can—and I mean to keep on doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

This statement by President Lincoln expresses my personal attitude toward these vicious un-American smears.

Last week one of the spokesmen for the reactionary Republicans, Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, before the House Committee on Lobby Activities, stated:

> I do not believe in democracy. I think it stinks. I don't think anybody except direct taxpayers should be allowed to vote. I don't believe that women should be allowed to vote at all.

Here is a real Republican for you.

The citizens of the country must have been shocked to hear another great Republican, former President Herbert Hoover, advocate the destruction of the United Nations by making it just another Atlantic Pact organization. The creation of the United Nations as an instrument for peace and for future world understanding is the one bright beacon left in a dark and gloomy world. Hoover would put out the light for the world and give them nothing but despair, fear, and hate. The United Nations is the great masterpiece, the great monument that will ever be identified and related with the great name of Frankin D. Roosevelt. The United Nations is the only workable bridge that we have today between two hostile camps on either side of the chasm. I should think that all of those people who desire peace would also desire to see a strengthened and workable United Nations. It seems to me that there are entirely too many people who are too old to fight who are always valiantly leading us in the direction of war. I confess that it is most discouraging to see how much publicity the press has been giving for the last couple of years to those who speak for war, and how little publicity is given to those who speak for peace.

Hoover's idea is to break up the United Nations immediately and to make the world choose sides, and countries like India and Indonesia would be forced to make an immediate decision. I do not like to say it, but it would appear that there are those in the Republican Party who would lead us into a police state and into another war. Every intelligent man that I have spoken to agrees that if it had not been for the United Nations we would undoubtedly be engaged in a third world war already. I am more than certain that if the decision was left to the common people of the United States and the common people of Russia, the cold war would be ended tomorrow. People would be thinking in terms of jobs, homes, schools, churches, human fraternity, and all things constructive. The common people are all praying for peace. They do not want war. They dislike politicians who preach hate and fear. Why is it so difficult for the political leaders in the world to lay down the armor and approach the problems of the world in a spirit of peace and a desire to do good?

In the last few weeks hearings before congressional committees have disclosed our dwindling national resources. We have overtaxed our mineral wealth. Two costly wars have brought ominous scraping sounds on a number of different barrels. It is said that known oil and gas reserves have shrunk from 20 to 30 years' remaining supply. The steel interests have stated that there is only enough high-grade ore left in Minnesota's Mesabi Range for just another 10 years at the present rate of depletion. According to these steel experts, industry must develop other foreign sources of iron ore before 1960 to keep the steel output going.

We have great technological challenges confronting us if we are to surmount complex problems posed by our waning national resources. Harold Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, pointed out several years ago the great danger that lies in depleting the Nation's natural resources. Those who talk glibly of a third world war should read these congressional hearings relating to our natural resources, which we must preserve for posterity.

We liberal and progressive Democrats have much work to do. I believe that Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt were three of the greatest Democrats who ever lived. The reason they were great Democrats was because they believed in the capacity of the average man and woman, given proper leadership, to govern themselves. They were all called radicals. All the world remembers the names of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Franklin Roosevelt. But try as we will, it is difficult to remember the names of those little termites who were their slanderers, detractors, attackers and enemies.

I am proud to be a Democrat, and I always want to be identified as being a liberal and progressive Democrat. I have had the privilege to work with, to know, and admire great and liberal leaders in our State and Nation.

Yes, I believe in a strong, two-party system. That is why I disagree with those mislabeled wishy-washy Democrats who would make out of the Democratic Party another Republican Party. I wish to remind everyone that the Democratic Party could not get to first base as long as it tried to play the part of a gold-dust twin to the Republican Party before Franklin Roosevelt became our leader.

Yes, we have work to do. Let us strike out fearlessly for a broadened and increased old-age pension. I believe that everyone should be covered—domestic workers, farmers, farm workers—yes, even lawyers, doctors and dentists. No one should have to fear old age and the insecurity which comes with it. Let us speak up boldly for better education, for more hospitals and better health insurance. Let us who are liberals speak out fearlessly for civil rights, and against those who would shackle the Bill of Rights. We liberals should not rest content until every American is a home owner, and we liberal Democrats must speak out for the downtrodden and the oppressed throughout the world. A great battle of ideologies is being fought in the world today. The battle can be won without firing a bullet, but it is self-evident that the leadership to win this battle cannot come from reactionary Republicans who cannot provide the spiritual leadership for victory.

The older citizens will not forget that when the Republicans were last in power they showed utter incompetence. That is why the people chose a Democratic administration, which under two Democratic Presidents has fought and beat the biggest depression in history; a Democratic administration which fought and beat the biggest enemy of human liberty in the greatest war in history; a Democratic administration which beat the biggest problem of reconversion from war to peace in our history. This Democratic administration has given the great mass of our people more jobs, more wages, more savings, more individual security than has been enjoyed by any people in the history of the world.

When you hear the Republicans say that the Democrats and President Truman are sponsoring a welfare state, just remind that person that in 1933 the national income was 39 billion dollars, and in 1949 it was 221 billion dollars. In 1932 American corporations showed a collective loss of 3½ billion dollars. In 1948 they earned 21 billion dollars, after taxes, and 17 billion dollars in 1949 after taxes.

It would seem to me that these figures on corporate profits should refute any propaganda that the Democrats are promoting a welfare or socialistic state. I think that every reasonable man and woman in this country knows that the Democratic administrations of President Roosevelt and President Truman have made this Nation strong in every way. This country is so powerful that it is the envy of the world. Let us keep it that way. We liberal Democrats shall continue to fight for progressive legislation for the benefit of our citizens and to make them and our Nation stronger and happier.

Yes, we Democrats can answer the sneers and smears of Senator MCCARTHY and the Republicans. We Democrats introduced the spirit of humanity into our Government; we outlawed child labor; the sweatshop. Insured bank deposits, protected millions of home owners and farmers from foreclosure, and established national social security. We Democrats stood at the helm and led the Nation to victory in the war. We Democrats, no matter how tough the job may be, shall lead our Nation and the world toward peace. We Democrats shall continue to assure a world in which peace and justice shall prevail; to achieve security, full protection and full employment. We Democrats have led the way and joined with the other United Nations in the establishment of an international organization for the prevention of aggression, and the maintenance of international peace and security. This is the time for everyone to give their wholehearted assistance—not to sneer and smear and spread hate, suspicion, and fear among our own people.

ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5876) to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 9, line 18, strike out all after "thereof" over to and including "fifty-three" in line 2, page 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING PAYMENT TO BENEFICIARIES OF EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREST SERVICE KILLED WHILE COMBATING FOREST FIRES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8162) to provide a lump sum death payment to beneficiaries of employees of the Forest Service killed while combating forest fires, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHUDOFF (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FREIGHT-RATE INCREASES ARE GREAT DANGER TO PACIFIC NORTHWEST ECONOMY

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people in the district in eastern Oregon which I represent tell me that they are experiencing increasing difficulty in marketing their products. They tell me that their freight bills have gone up so much more than have the freight bills of their competitors in other parts of the country, that the producers in my part of the country are losing out in the eastern and midwestern markets.

It is a fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been increasing freight rates since June 30, 1946. It is a fact also that the prices received by farmers for their products have been generally declining, beginning some time during the program of freight-rate increases.

On the very face of the matter, for the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit a raise of the freight rate on any article that is experiencing a declining price trend would seem to be a questionable procedure. The people in my part of the country are losing out in the very markets where common sense would indicate that such a policy of freight-rate increases would hit the hardest. There is, I am convinced, cause for alarm, and cause for investigating the thinking behind the freight-rate increases which have been allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The extent of the increases in freight rates is in itself startling. These increases vary for different parts of the country and for different products. The over-all average increase since June 30, 1946, according to the Interstate Commerce Commission, is 57.3 percent. Even more startling than the amount of the increases, is the way in which they have been assessed. I am referring to the percentage method of increasing freight rates.

The percentage method of increasing freight rates hits the west coast and Mountain States with greater force than it does any other part of the Nation. The increases probably constitute the most serious economic blow ever struck against that part of the country. It is important to realize just how this percentage method of increasing freight rates works to the peculiar disadvantage of the Western States, and I will develop that for you in due course.

The thinking of the Interstate Commerce Commission in respect to its method of increasing freight rates is reflected, no doubt, in its letter to me of February 20 of this year. I want to quote from it:

> The distant producer who once was able to absorb a freight differential and still compete profitably in a given market, is less able, or unable, to compete in that market now that the freight absorption is greater by reason of horizontal increases in all the rates. He is faced with the alternatives of going out of business; of reducing his production to the demand which can be served profitably; or of cultivating new markets where he has either a natural advantage or less disadvantage.

I disagree with the ideas expressed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the letter just quoted. Before giving some actual examples of freight-rate increases which my part of the country has experienced, I will draw briefly from a thoroughly prepared report on the freight rates of the Northwest before the increases. This report sets forth the geographical and freight-rate fundamentals of the Northwest's marketing problem.

This report develops and points out the fact that the Northwest and the far West generally suffer from two natural disadvantages in marketing their products: First, the sparseness of population and, therefore, limited markets in the West; and second, the long distances to the East where exist the large cities and, therefore markets. The report and analysis show that of all the 48 States, Washington and Oregon have the poorest natural positions from which to reach the large markets of the Nation. The people of no other State have to buy as many miles of transportation to market their goods. In fact, 11 western States occupy the 11 poorest position in this respect. Under such circumstances, freight rates are an extremely touchy matter for the West.

The letter to me from the Interstate Commerce Commission carefully explained that, on the one hand, the railroads' costs have increased a great deal more than the Commission has allowed freight rates to increase, and points out, on the other hand, that our important products have been given most considerate treatment in the matter of freight-rate increases. I shall use some of the examples cited by the Interstate Commerce Commission in that letter.

On lumber, the information in the letter shows that before the war, Oregon's rate to Philadelphia was 38 cents higher than Mississippi's rate to Philadelphia. Now, after the war and all of the freight-rate increases, Oregon's rate is 46 cents more than Mississippi's. The letter cites this commodity as the first example of how well we have been treated. But note that even this favored commodity now has a 46-cent differential instead of the earlier 38-cent differential. When the building industry catches up a bit, the increased differential may then begin to take its toll.

On apples, the rate from Hood River, Oreg., to Chicago before the war was 78 cents more than from Virginia. But we have been treated so well that now our rate is only 94 cents more than Virginia's.

Before the war, the freight rate on canned peas from Pendleton, Oreg., to Philadelphia was higher than from Le Sueur, Minn., by 38 cents. Now, by reason of the very kind treatment accorded by the Commission, we have to pay only 69 cents more than Le Sueur. Even the percentage was against us in this case. Le Sueur's rate has increased 64 percent; ours 70 percent. Nevertheless, it is implied that we should feel fortunate—that it could have been worse.

It seems to me that we have been given the principle in these freight-rate increases, but that someone else got the favorable freight rates. Allow me to draw an analogy. You will recall from your youth that the seat of learning often seemed to be located out in the woodshed. If my memory serves me correctly, after "woodshed" advice has built up a certain degree of sensitivity, an additional application hurts about the same, regardless of the size of one's person. As already pointed out, the people of the Northwest have to buy more miles of transportation per person than do people elsewhere in the United States. In consequence, our freight bill is up to the point where an additional dollar hurts us as much as it would anybody else—and maybe more. These freight-rate increases are hurting more than skin deep.

The foregoing examples are drawn from the letter to me from the Interstate Commerce Commission; they illustrate, I am told, how the important products of my part of the country have been most considerately treated. In the case of each of the articles discussed in that letter, it is denied that freight-rate increases have been responsible for any difficulty in marketing western products. And yet, as I quoted earlier from that same letter, it is admitted and stated that the distant producer, by reason of the percentage increases in freight rates, is now less able to compete in a given market.

Let me draw from another recent letter to me, one from the Northwest Canners Association. This association points out from the figures available, that Washington's and Oregon's proportion of the total United States production of canned vegetables has decreased from 15.6 percent to 13.8 percent from 1947 to 1948. In canned fruits the decline in the same 1 year's time has been from 18.9 percent to 14.1 percent.

These declines are in 1 year's time, and freight rates have been increased further since then. The full and cumulative effect of the freight-rate increases probably is yet to come. The various associations representing the shippers of livestock, wheat and flour and other grain and grain products, apples, pears, canned and dried foodstuffs, and frozen fruits and vegetables, all have applied to the transcontinental railroads' organization for relief from the percentage principle of freight-rate increases. In each case the applicant has pointed out that the recent percentage increases are pushing the long-haul shippers out of the eastern and midwestern market.

A few days ago the Pendleton and Milton-Freewater Chambers of Commerce held a joint meeting and discussed the effects of the uneven, unequal, and unfair increases in freight rates. They reported that 18 pea-processing plants have been closed in the Northwest in the last 3 years. They claim that their freight rate on canned peas to New York has increased 71 percent. They urged that a congressional investigation should be made of freight rates. That exactly expresses my view of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I am maintaining that our freight-rate disadvantage in eastern markets should not have been worsened by the increases in freight rates. The right formula or fair way of increasing freight rates was offered by the railroads themselves, for instance, in regard to citrus fruits. I understand that in their last petition, the railroads proposed an increase on oranges of 12 cents a hundred pounds from Florida to New York, from Texas to New York, and from California to New York. Thus, no one of the three producing areas stood to face greater or lesser competitive difficulty in the eastern markets, by reason of an increase in freight rates. But yet, as earlier quoted, the Interstate Commerce Commission advises me that the distant producer, by reason of the horizontal increases, "is faced with the alternatives of reducing his production, of going out of business, or of cultivating new markets."

Presumably, the Commission's advice to cultivate new markets would include the developing and marketing of commodities now produced by us in unimportant volume or not at all. Let me show

you how the freight-rate increases make that impossible: Our less-important commodities, and the commodities which we might conceivably develop, have received far worse freight-rate treatment than that already cited. If we cannot succeed on our more important products, how can we be expected to do so on products which have received even less enlightened treatment in the matter of freight-rate increases? And even if we were able to develop some new products, what assurance or evidence do we have that another ill-conceived policy of freight-rate increase would not partially or wholly put us out of business?

I want to cite some examples of the general rate disadvantage of my district and the Pacific Northwest. The freight-rate study to which I earlier referred, shows that, on the average, the general or class rates east of the Rocky Mountains, in 1946, were approximately one-fourth lower than west of the Rocky Mountains. Since then, these rates have been increased 67 percent as a United States average, according to the Commission. This percentage increase, of course, increases the dollars and cents disadvantage for the West, as the following examples will show.

Before the war the freight rate on goods rated first class was $4.09 a hundred pounds from Boise, Idaho, to Topeka, Kans. But Boston, which is farther from Topeka than is Boise by some 150 miles, could reach Topeka for $1.28 less money than could Boise. The percentage increases have added to Boston's advantage by 56 cents, making a total disadvantage for Boise of $1.84. I am using Boise in the examples because the rate position of Boise is similar to that of eastern Oregon.

Take another example. From Boise to Oklahoma City the freight rate on goods listed as taking the full first-class rate had a rate of $4.62 a hundred pounds before the war. At the same time Burlington, Vt.—a hundred miles farther away from Oklahoma City—could undersell Boise by $1.09. Today, after the percentage increases, Burlington can reach Oklahoma City for $1.86 less money.

These examples are not isolated ones. It is entirely likely that they can be multiplied thousands of times. And yet I am told in the Commission's letter to me that "the commercial and industrial interests of your State would not be interested in, nor particularly desire an investigation of, the transcontinental class rates." I realize that freight rates are extremely complicated, but I submit that no amount of complication can make the application of common sense something to be avoided.

When I contacted the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to broadening its investigation of the general or class rates to include rates on the important products of eastern Oregon, I was answered that to do so would be utterly impractical. In one paragraph of its letter the Commission told me that the rates carrying our important commodities have not "the slightest relation to class rates"—that is, the rates which carry the unimportant commodities. And yet, two paragraphs later the Commission said that the general- or class-rate structure is "basic and it must be fixed first." Now, one of these statements must be in error. Either basic rates are not basic, or if they are basic, they must be basic to the other rates.

Although very little traffic moves on class rates—probably less than 2 percent—class rates are the basic rates, while commodity rates are bargained downward from the class rates, as I understand it. And I might add here that even the present investigation of these basic rates does not extend to traffic moving across the Rocky Mountains in what is called transcontinental movement. This investigation applies only to traffic moving on class rates within the area of the 11 Western States. In other words, it seems to me that the important traffic waits and suffers while the rates on traffic which is not moving, is being investigated.

It seems to me that the presently-proposed investigation is not designed to get at the heart of the trouble. Why delay trying to save a burning house, in order to complete an inspection of a house that is not on fire? Make the investigation where the trouble is, and let the principles discovered and tested there be allowed to apply also to the unimportant and nonexistent traffic.

I do not mean that I am uninterested in rates which carry little or no traffic. To answer that nothing moves on an unfair or discriminatory rate is not an acceptable and democratic answer. I do not want freight-rate discrimination of any kind against the district which I represent in eastern Oregon—not on any commodity, important or unimportant.

To me, freight rates are freight rates, regardless of what special names are attached, or what commodities move on them. I have seen enough to convince me that a complete investigation of this subject is necessary in the public interest. Even before the war, freight rates gave us great difficulty, but since the war they have been made unbearable by the impractical and unfair method of increasing them.

The railroads have had great increases in their costs; there is no denying that fact. They have gone to the Commission and asked for and received increases on the basis of a showing that the railroads' costs have increased. The railroads contended and the Commission accepted, evidently, the railroads' claim that increases in freight rates would not cause a decline in traffic. Common sense tells me that an increase in the other fellow's costs does not influence me to be willing to pay him a higher price for his product. For example, the price a farmer is willing to pay for a tractor will not be beyond his opinion of its capacity to produce a profit for him. An increase in the price of the tractor—or in the freight bill to get it to him—positively will reduce for him the value of that tractor.

My investigation to date convinces me that the method of increasing freight rates has been so impractical that nothing short of a full-fledged congressional investigation will bring sufficient recognition of the proper principles of rate making and the making of increases in freight rates.

In this connection, I want to point out that the Interstate Commerce Act requires the Commission to be responsible for the welfare of the railroads which they regulate. I agree that the railroads are a public necessity and their welfare is to the people's interest, but my question is: Are the people supposed to serve the railroads first, or are the railroads supposed to serve the people?

I recommend that the act be amended to make it perfectly clear that the general welfare of the people is to be subordinated in neither time nor degree. Regulation should be applied equally in behalf of all shippers, important and unimportant, actual and potential, and in all areas, and regulation should be directly—rather than indirectly—in behalf of the people.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

THE MAKING OF A CONGRESSMAN

Mr. PLUMLEY. First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this made a matter of record as a preliminary to what I have to say and what I have to offer. It is not of my own volition; it really is against my own wishes that I have complied with the urgent request of many Members of this Congress to revise and to offer the document entitled "The Making of a Congressman." I have been invited by the Library of Congress to have it copyrighted. It has been suggested to me by members of the Joint Committee on Printing that I have it made a document. I have no such desire, I have no such intent, and I have no such purpose. I am putting it in the RECORD as I have done heretofore for the use and the information, such as it may be, of the Members of Congress.

I will say this, however, that I propose only to pay for the publication of 1,000 copies, of which I shall distribute six or seven hundred in my State to the libraries and to the people interested. If any of you wish to have other copies or more copies, it is up to you to let me know within a week. This is the revision of 1950 of the document The Making of a Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of June 1930 the Honorable Guy U. Hardy, who had been for 14 years a Representative from Colorado, inserted in the RECORD a compilation of information. After I became a Member of Congress I undertook to revise it. I have heretofore made three revisions. I have made this revision at considerable personal expense. I pay my tribute to my secretaries and to those who have contributed to make possible a careful erudition, if I may say so, to bring this down to date as the 1950 revision of information which every Member of Congress ought to have, seeking no glory for so having done.

Since that date other contributions have been made based on Representative Hardy's original, none of which has contained all of the subject matter, and none of which has entirely brought up to date the information contained therein.

Both the Honorable Arthur P. Lamneck, a Representative from Ohio in the Seventy-second through the Seventy-fifth Congresses, and I have undertaken at one time or another to use a part of the material.

When Mr. Hardy spoke in the House on the works and ways of the Congress he started something the value of which is evidenced by the demand, then, for reprints of his address and, later, for copies of my own speech, The Making of a Congressman, made in the Seventy-sixth Congress, on February 24, 1939, and based largely on his earlier contribution which I endeavored to revise and to extend along certain informative lines.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress—which embodies the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, necessarily made obsolete or incorrect some of the information contained in the original and in the 1940 revision of The Making of a Congressman. The 1947 revision was intended to remedy that situation. During the last 3 years of operation under the Reorganization Act, we have had an opportunity to evaluate its effect more precisely. As the United States has continued its development as a great world power, the Congress has grown in world importance.

In view of these facts, and since, as I say, I have had over the years a great many requests for copies and since the demand continues even today, I feel the speech should be brought up to date. Therefore, at the request of many Representatives, I have attempted to correct and extend the speech I made.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I submit this 1950 revision.

On the 27th day of February 1882, the then Senator James G. Blaine, of Maine, delivered a memorial oration before the two Houses in commemoration of the life and death of President James A. Garfield. In the course of his oration Senator Blaine said:

> There is no test of a man's ability in any department of public life more severe than service in the House of Representatives; there is no place where so little deference is paid to reputation previously acquired, or to eminence won outside; no place where so little consideration is shown for the feelings or the failures of beginners. What a man gains in the House he gains by sheer force of his own character, and if he loses and falls back he must expect no mercy, and will receive no sympathy. It is a field in which the survival of the strongest is the recognized rule, and where no pretense can deceive and no glamour can mislead. The real man is discovered, his worth is impartially weighed, his rank is irreversibly decreed.

The truth of the above statement is just as obvious to all of us who sit in this Chamber today and observe its inexorable demonstration as it was 68 years ago.

"The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small" might well be a text for a sermon to those who in any session of Congress attempt the rapids before they have learned to swim.

How, then, may a newly elected Representative fit himself for efficient service and the discharge of his duties? This is an everrecurring question with which all of us are confronted. So it may not be out of place, and I hope may not be considered presumptuous, Mr. Speaker, if, with a due appreciation of my own limitation, I undertake to pass on to others some of the answers, counsel, and advice so generously given by those older and more experienced in sevice to whom we have turned for such counsel as has helped us to steer past whirlpools wherein we most surely would have at least capsized and has saved us from many prospective bumps and bruises and made life bearable for us.

One of the wiser and more farseeing of my friends advised me to familiarize myself with Lewis Deschler's Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives.

Says House Parliamentarian Deschler:

> From the beginning of the first Congress, the House has formulated rules for its procedure. Some of them have since gone out of existence. More of them have been amplified and broadened to meet the exigencies that have arisen from time to time. Today they are perhaps the most finely adjusted, scientifically balanced, and highly technical rules of any parliamentary body of the world. Under them a majority may work its will at all times in the face of the most determined and vigorous opposition of a minority. * * *
>
> I believe that I am not making too broad a statement when I say that the parliamentary practice of the House is a system of procedure that ranks second to none. It has proven adequate to meet all the emergencies that have arisen in the past. It will meet the emergencies and problems of the future with the same degree of success.

Having done that, my friend advised me to study Representative CLARENCE CANNON's Procedure in the House of Representatives.

CLARENCE CANNON, as you know, is our colleague, the distinguished Representative from the State of Missouri, former Parliamentarian of the House and long the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. In the foreword to his work, he says:

> The time of the House is too valuable, the scope of its enactments too far-reaching, and the constantly increasing pressure of its business too great to justify lengthy and perhaps acrimonious discussion of questions of procedure which have been authoritatively decided in former sessions.
>
> The purpose of this book is to provide a synopsis of the procedure of the House for use on the floor where the authorities and sources, because of their bulk and diversity, are not always immediately available. While comprehensiveness and detail have been sacrificed to brevity and accessibility, no notable decision has been omitted, and each topic is, for practical purposes, a complete résumé of the procedure on that subject.

Having studied these, it was suggested then that I make it my business to attend the sessions of the House regularly in order to learn by observation and assimilation the application of the rules and how the House operates thereunder.

Then one man of long years of service said to me:

> PLUMLEY, you will never know what it is all about and why unless and until you read legislative procedure, legislative assemblies, legislative principles, and legislative problems, four recognized works of authority written by Robert Luce, the eminent parliamentary authority from Massachusetts.

In legislative procedure, Mr. Luce states:

> Lawmakers must themselves be governed by law, else they would in confusion worse confounded quickly come to grief.
>
> It is true that with Coke and Blackstone and Kent we do not ordinarily class Hatsell and Hinds. It is true that the literature of parliamentary law is scanty and that it deals with minutiae of seemingly little consequence to human rights. Yet think what the law and the practice of legislative assemblies really mean. They make it possible under a representative form of government for the will of the people to be ascertained. Starting with the assumption that this will is the will of the majority, we can give it expression and effect only by processes that at the same time endow it with form and win submission by the minority. Lacking either achievement, chaos follows.

Again he says:

> Herein lies the safety of the minority, and this it is that makes parliamentary law and procedure of the greatest consequence to the public safety. Government survives because the lesser part yields to the greater part. Teutonic peoples have had more success than others in self-government because with them the minority, however convinced of its own wisdom, consents to be ruled by the majority until in orderly fashion the minority can make itself the majority. The minority insists on only the right to be heard. Theirs is the cry of Themistocles to Euripides, "Strike, but hear me." Give them but the chance to present their arguments fairly, fully, and they will abide the issue. This is what we call liberty, though just why it would be hard to tell. * * *
>
> Thomas Jefferson took the same view. Referring to Hatsell in the introductory words of his Manual, he recalled that Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons, used to say: "It was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by your ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were in many instances a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power." So far, said Jefferson, the maxim is certainly true and is founded in good sense, that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary from time to time and are become the law of the House; by a strict adherence to which only the weaker party can be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

A valuable reference work published in 1949 is the United States Congress, Organization and Procedure, written by Floyd M. Riddick, Senate editor of the Daily Digest of activities in the Congress which is appended to each day's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I commend the foregoing references to your careful consideration, and I also suggest a thorough study of the provisions of Public Law No. 601, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

And now we come to the practical proposition which has confronted us all, as to the source of information with respect to our daily duties, and as to where we can get information, and from whom, and what shall we do next.

With certain deletions, therefore, and with several additions of my own, I now offer for your consideration the Hardy original brought down to date:

WHAT IS CONGRESS?

Congress is the legislative body of the United States Government. The functions of the National Government are divided into three parts: Executive, judicial, and legislative. States have their State legislatures. Cities have their city councils. The Nation has its Congress. Its existence, authority, and limitations are provided by the Constitution. Article I, section 1, reads:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be invested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The framers of the Constitution provided for two Houses of Congress to insure that policies and measures involving fundamental matters, such as the protection of our civil rights, have to be carefully weighed and checked by two legislative bodies, instead of just one, before they are approved.

HOW LONG HAVE WE HAD A CONGRESS?

The First Congress met 161 years ago, on March 4, 1789, in New York City, where the first and second sessions were held; subsequently, including the first session of the Sixth Congress, Philadelphia was the meeting place; since then Congress has convened in Washington, D. C.

The earlier Continental Congress, 1774–89, to be sure, had various places of meeting and included Philadelphia; Baltimore; Lancaster, Pa.; York, Pa.; Princeton, N. J.; Annapolis, Md.; Trenton, N. J.; and New York City.

Incidentally, the President is authorized by proclamation to convene Congress at such place other than Washington as he may judge proper when "from the prevalence of contagious sickness, or the existence of other circumstances, it would, in the opinion of the President, be hazardous to the lives or health of the Members to meet" in Washington.

WHEN DOES CONGRESS MEET?

The Constitution, article I, section 4, provides that—

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year * * * on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Pursuant to a resolution of the Continental Congress, the first session of the First Congress convened March 4, 1789; up to and including May 20, 1820, 18 acts were passed providing for the meeting of Congress on other days in the year. Beginning in that year, Congress met regularly on the first Monday in December until 1934, when the twentieth amendment to the Constitution became effective, changing the meeting of Congress to January 3, unless the Congress shall, by law, appoint a different date.

A Congress ordinarily begins on January 3 of each odd-numbered year and continues for 2 years. The Eighty-first Congress, for instance, began on January 3, 1949, and will continue until the Eighty-second Congress convenes on January 3, 1951, unless Congress shall appoint a different date.

WHAT IS A SESSION OF CONGRESS?

Congress is usually considered to be in session when both the House and the Senate are meeting for the transaction of business. Ordinarily there are two regular sessions of a Congress, one each year. Each House fixes the time of day at which it will meet. Usually, both the House and the Senate meet at 12 o'clock noon. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 calls on Congress to adjourn its annual meeting not later than July 31, except in time of war or a national emergency. No Congress can bind its successors in such matters, however, so the date may be changed by a later Congress.

In addition to the regular sessions, the President may call the Congress to meet in extraordinary session at any time he thinks the interests of the country justify it.

There has been only one four-session Congress, the Sixty-seventh, during President Harding's administration.

The longest session of the Congress was the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, from January 3, 1940, through January 3, 1941. The shortest session was the 10-day session called by President Pierce to enact an Army appropriation measure in 1856. The Senate, alone, has been called into special session even for 1-day or 2-day sessions, but in such cases it was for the purpose of confirming presidential appointments; the latter body may be called in extra session, without the House, to consider treaties, try impeachments, and confirm appointments.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

After extensive hearings and study, Congress passed the so-called La Follette-Monroney bill for the reorganization of Congress. It was signed by the President on August 2, 1946, and became Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. I will refer to many of the specific provisions of this act as I go along. In general, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 made substantial changes in the rules of the House and the Senate, streamlined the committee structure, banned certain classes of private bills, increased the research assistance available to the Congress, and dealt with the compensation and retirement pay of members. Title III of the act is known as the Federal Registration of Lobbying Act and provides for the registration and filing of information by all persons lobbying before the Congress. Title IV, the Federal Tort Claims Act, provides for the adjustment of tort claims against the United States of $10,000 or less by the Federal administrative agencies, rather than by the Congress as formerly. Title V, the General Bridge Act of 1946, gives the advance approval of Congress for the construction of bridges over the navigable waters of the United States, provided that the location and plans for such bridges are approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War—now the Secretary of the Army—before construction commences. Previously Congress had to approve a separate bill for each bridge, a time-consuming process.

WHAT IS A CONGRESSMAN?

Strictly speaking, a Member of either the Senate or the House of Representatives is a Congressman. However, in general practice we speak of a Member of the Senate as a Senator and of a Member of the House as a Congressman, although the official title of the latter is Representative in Congress.

HOW MANY MEMBERS?

There are 96 United States Senators, 2 from each of the 48 States in the Union.

There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives, each State being entitled to the number its population justifies. The number of Members of the House to which each State is entitled is determined on the basis of the decennial census. There are two methods under existing law which may be followed in making the apportionment: one method is known as that of "major fractions," and the other is known as "the method of equal proportions." The number of Representatives may not exceed one for every 30,000 population, but under no circumstances shall any State have less than one Member.

While Congress, by law, apportions the number of Representatives to each State, the State legislatures establish the districts from which the selection shall be made.

In addition to the Members of the House from the various States, Alaska and Hawaii each have Delegates, and Puerto Rico has a Resident Commissioner. The Delegates and Resident Commissioner have the right of debate but have no vote upon legislation appearing before the House for action.

WHAT QUALIFICATIONS ARE REQUIRED FOR MEMBERSHIP?

The Constitution provides that a Member of the House of Representatives must have attained the age of 25, have been a citizen of the United States for 7 years, and be an inhabitant of the State in which he is elected. In practice he is usually a resident of the district which he represents, but that is not a constitutional requirement. A United States Senator must have attained the age of 30 years, have been a citizen of the United States for 9 years, and be an inhabitant of the State which elects him. No Representative or Senator may hold, while in Congress, "any office under the United States." Women are eligible under the same qualifications as men. Miss

Jeannette Rankin, of Montana, was the first woman to be elected a Member of Congress. She served in the House of Representatives from 1917 to 1919 and from 1941 to 1943. Mrs. Rebecca Fulton, of Georgia, was appointed to fill the vacancy in the Senate caused by the death of Senator Watson in 1922 and was the first woman to serve in that body. Mrs. Hattie Caraway, of Arkansas, was the first woman elected to the Senate—1932.

WHAT OATH DO MEMBERS TAKE?

The oath of office taken by the Members of the House is administered by the Speaker, and by the Vice President to the Senators. It reads:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me, God.

The Constitution provides that the President of the United States, Senators, Representatives, members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution.

HOW ARE MEMBERS ELECTED?

Members of Congress are elected by popular vote, the qualifications of voters for Representatives and Senators being the same as for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The general elections held in the fall of every even year determine the membership of the House of Representatives for the ensuing 2 years, with the Members-elect subscribing to the oath of office and being inducted into office in the January following. While Congress, by law, apportions the number of Representatives to each State, the State legislatures establish the districts from which the selection shall be made. A Congressman at Large is one who does not represent a regular or specific district within the State.

Senators are elected for 6-year terms. Only one-third of the Senate membership is elected every 2 years. Since in any election year, two-thirds of the Senate membership is not affected, the Senate is sometimes called the "House that never dies." Senators were originally elected by the State legislatures, but direct election by the people was provided by the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, adopted on May 31, 1913.

HOW ARE VACANCIES FILLED?

Members do die in office, and occasionally one resigns, usually to take what he considers to be a better office, however. When a Senator dies or resigns, the governor of his State may appoint his successor to serve only until an election is held, providing his State legislature has given him the authority. If a Representative dies or resigns, his place cannot be filled by appointment. The governor of his State may call a special election to fill the place, if he desires, or, as is done in many cases, the place may be left vacant until the next general election.

WHAT PAY AND PERQUISITES ARE ALLOWED?

The Constitution provides that Members shall receive compensation for their services, to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. Until 1855 Members received only a small per diem allowance. Since that time regular salaries have been paid. Beginning with the Eightieth Congress, both Senators and Representatives have received $12,500 a year plus a tax-free allowance of $2,500 a year to assist in defraying expenses connected with official duties. Members of the House of Representatives are allowed $12,500 a year for clerk hire, and small sums for stationery, air-mail and special-delivery stamps, and telephone and telegraph service. The salaries of the Vice President—or the President pro tempore if there is no vice President—and the Speaker of the House were increased to $30,000 by Public Law 2 of the Eighty-first Congress. They also receive tax-free expense allowances of $10,000 a year. Senate allowances for clerical hire are based on population since Senators with the greatest number of constitutents need more help in answering correspondence and performing other duties. Senators also receive allowances for stationery, air-mail and special-delivery stamps, and a certain number of long-distance telephone calls. Members pay income taxes on their regular salary, and campaign expenses may not be deducted. Members are expected to entertain freely and to contribute generously to all worthwhile causes. While the allowances appear on the surface to be liberal, they are in reality far from adequate, and many Members are forced to engage in outside activities to make ends meet.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 extended to Members of Congress the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act. Participating Members contribute 6 percent of their base pay, just as do other Federal employees, and are eligible for annuities starting at the age of 62, provided they have at least 6 years of congressional service.

Other perquisites include a travel allowance for one round trip each session between the Member's home and Washington at the rate of 20 cents a mile. This is intended to help pay the cost of transportation for the Member's family. The Delegate from Alaska and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico receive lump-sum payments instead of mileage. Offices are provided for each Member in special office buildings adjacent to the Capitol. Official mail may be sent under frank without postage, as may official telegrams under certain restrictions. Members must pay the regular rates for other mail.

WHAT PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ARE GRANTED?

No Member of Congress may be arrested while attending a session, or while going to or from a session, except in cases of treason, felony, or breach of the peace. He cannot be questioned in any other place for any speech or debate in either House, but he may be censured or even expelled by the House to which he belongs. The privileges granted a Member are designed to protect his freedom of attendance, speaking, and voting. No Member is protected against criticism by the press and the public on matters of public interest and policy.

WHAT ARE THE POWERS OF CONGRESS?

The Constitution lists many of the powers of Congress, including the power to lay taxes, provide for the national defense, regulate commerce, coin money, establish post offices, constitute courts, declare war, raise an Army and a Navy, legislate for the District of Columbia, admit new States, propose amendments to the Constitution, and "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" the powers vested in the Federal Government. Congress may not pass any bill of attainder or ex post facto law, grant any title of nobility, suspend the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus except in great emergency, make any law respecting an establishment of religion, and may not abridge the freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and petition for a redress of grievances. Each House is the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and may determine its own rules of procedure and discipline. All bills for raising revenues, including all general appropriation bills, must originate in the House of Representatives, which also has the sole power of impeachment, and selects the President in the event no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes. The Senate has the sole power to try all impeachments, ratify treaties, confirm executive nominations, and select the Vice President in the event no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes.

WHAT ARE THE DUTIES OF A MEMBER?

They are many and manifold. He should study legislation and attend the meetings of his House. He should listen to a good deal of the debates, but not all of them by any means. Many Members are kept in committee meetings many hours of many days of every session. The average Member develops a large office business. The Members get a vast amount of mail. This requires much study, dictation of replies, and often visits to different executive departments downtown. The departments are far away and often far apart. Many ex-servicemen bring their problems to their Congressman, and he is always glad to help them out when and wherever he can, although he has not the power always to do as much as he would like.

A Member will get a thousand letters, or maybe several thousand letters, in a session from citizens advocating or opposing proposed legislation. Usually a Congressman answers every letter, though he cannot tell everybody what he thinks about every bill that has been introduced. He must wait developments through committee hearings and give thought to those measures that are being brought forward by favorable committee action.

WHAT RESEARCH ASSISTANCE IS AVAILABLE TO MEMBERS?

One of the chief reasons for the new legislative reorganiaztion was a growing recognition of the fact that proper and effective functioning of the Congress depends upon adequate preparation, and of the further fact that a Congressman's day, like everyone else's, has just 24 hours.

What is available, then, in the way of time-saving and preparation beyond a Member's own staff? The new Legislative Reorganization Act points up some of the aids, but I would emphasize to you that developments under the new system are matters of degree rather than of kind. Congress did not in 1946 become for the first time aware that it needed expert assistance in the drafting of legislation, or that its committees needed specialists in the fields of their particular interest, or that the resources of the Library of Congress could be of tremendous assistance if adequately interpreted and brought to bear on specific problems. Committees had hired experts before, but on a special-job basis. Congress had set up for itself a drafting service back in 1919; and ever since 1915 it has had a Legislative Reference Service, in the Library of Congress, expanding as we have increased our calls upon it, and recently equipped to undertake even more varied and important research than ever before.

Do you have questions of fact or law which must be answered and which your office staff is not equipped to handle readily? Telephone or write Legislative Reference Service; put your question frankly and clearly; they are your confidential agents for the purposes of your particular inquiry. They will identify and analyze the law for you; they will analyze a given issue and line up the arguments pro and con; they will run down facts and present them without bias. They are not field investigators, but so far as published sources are available to them, they will ferret out, compile, and analyze data at your request and to the extent of their staff capacity.

It is this matter of staff capacity which is forwarded by the Legislative Reorganization Act. Under its provisions the staff of the Legislative Reference Service is being strengthened all along the line, but especially at the top levels, with the intent to have at the service of Congress research men of the very highest ability in the fields where they are most likely to be useful.

If any Member wants to do research himself, excellent facilities are available to him. He need only call the congressional reading room at the Library of Congress and a desk will be reserved for him with attendants to give him every possible assistance.

Do you want to follow the significant periodical press and yet find you have not time to do it? Call the Public Affairs Abstracts Unit of the Legislative Reference Service and have them send you their digests of selected current articles on matters of prime importance.

Do you want to discuss some problem personally? Call the Director of the Legislative Reference Service. If he has someone on his staff versed in the subject matter, he will suit your convenience. At present there are experts available in American government and public administration, congressional organization and procedures, taxation and fiscal policy, social welfare, labor, conservation, agricultural economics, international trade, industrial organization and corporate finance, international affairs, geography, engineering and public works, transportation and communications, and housing.

We have in the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress a tool of proven value and enlarging possibilities. It is Congress' own answer, based on experience, to the need of committees and individual Members for further help in the complex business of legislating for the Nation.

In addition to the Legislative Reference Service, a Member may address an inquiry to any of the Government departments and agencies in Washington. The United States Government Organization Manual, published annually by the Division of the Federal Register in the National Archives Establishment, contains integrated authoritative information on the organization and functions of agencies of the Federal Government. It is most helpful in determining to whom to address inquiries.

Incidentally, in this connection, I want to call to the attention of newly elected Members that valuable compilation entitled "Our American Government; the Answers to 1,001 Questions on How It Works," prepared by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. Since the material for this document, too, was gathered some time ago, it may be in need of revision, but it contains a tremendous amount of information which is still authentic and reliable. It well repays examination.

HOW ARE OFFICERS CHOSEN?

Each House chooses its own officers. The Speaker of the House of Representatives is the chief officer of that body. In the Senate, the Vice President ordinarily presides, but in the event there is no Vice President or in his absence, the chair is taken by a President pro tempore elected by the Senate to hold office at its pleasure. Other officers chosen by each House include the chaplain, clerk, sergeant at arms, doorkeeper, and postmaster. The sergeant at arms is the chief disciplinary officer and at the direction of the presiding officer may compel the attendance of absent Members. In addition, he serves as disbursing officer, purchasing officer, and executive officer for his House. There are also a number of pages in both the Senate and the House who serve as messengers, run errands, and answer telephones.

WHAT ARE THE DUTIES OF THE SPEAKER?

He presides over the House, appoints the Chairman to preside over the Committee of the Whole, appoints all select and conference committees, has the power of recognition of Members, makes many important rulings and decisions in the House. The Speaker may vote, but usually does not except in a case of a tie. He may appoint a Speaker pro tempore but not for more than 3 days at a time without the consent of the House.

WHAT ARE THE CHAPLAINS' DUTIES?

Both Senate and House have a chaplain, who offers prayer at the opening of each daily session, usually at 12 o'clock noon. Both are eloquent and godly men. The prayers are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the proceedings each day.

WHAT IS A PARTY LEADER?

There is a majority leader and a minority leader. In talk on the floor we do not refer to Democrats and Republicans usually. It is more dignified, it seems, to refer to the majority and the minority. The majority leader has the more influence, of course, since he has the majority of the membership back of him.

The leader is all the title implies. He leads in party debate, brings forward party programs and policies. His advocacy of or opposition to proposed legislation indicates the party preference. The majority leader has much control over what comes up, and when, on the legislative program from week to week. When he makes a motion it is nearly always carried. He usually makes the motion to adjourn, and it always carries. If someone else, not authorized to do so, makes a motion to adjourn, it is nearly always defeated.

WHAT ARE THE DUTIES OF THE WHIP?

The whip is not an official position. It is a party designation. Both parties have their whips. The whip looks after the membership of his party, advises them of weekly programs, and endeavors to have all present when important measures are to be voted upon. When the vote is apt to be close, the whip checks up, finds out who is out of the city, and advises the absent Members by wire of the important measure coming up.

The efficacy of the majority in securing the legislation it desires and of the minority in making felt its opposition depends upon the efficiency of the party machinery on the floor. The party whips are vital cogs in this machinery.

WHAT OF THE INFLUENCES OF SENIORITY OR LENGTH OF SERVICE?

In no other place, perhaps, in this broad land of ours does seniority or length of service cut so much figure as it does in the Congress of the United States.

It is the first discouraging thing the new Member meets, and many have been the bitter denunciations of its rule. Right or wrong, however, the rule of seniority has long been an important factor in the Congress, and no one these days has the optimism to predict that it will soon be abolished.

The new Member meets the rule of seniority when he applies for his first office room. He gets only what is left after all older Members have made their selections. He may file on a vacant room in the House Office Building. Another Member who has served before may come along and take it away from him. He may file on numerous rooms and see them go to older Members. The oldest Member, in point of service in the Congress, requesting a vacant office room gets it.

He meets with the seniority rule at any official dinner he attends. The new Member sits near the foot of the table; the older Members, in the order of their term of service, near the head of the table.

The new Members find the rule of seniority when they apply for committee assignment. The older Members are given the favored places; the new Members must work their way up. The new Member finds it in the committee room when he attends the first meeting of his committee. He finds his name on his place at the foot of the table. The oldest member of the committee will probably be the chairman at the head of the table. And by length of service they rank down to the newest members at the foot.

New Members are welcome and are shown every courtesy on the floor. They are never hazed or snubbed. But there are some years in the beginning of their service when new Members must feel that they are hardly in the thick of things—when they must think that they would like to sit, even in the committee room, up near the middle of the table.

The important places in the House go to the older Members. Choice committee assignments as a rule go to the older Members who desire them. The chairman of every committee is, almost without exception, the longest-serving majority member on the committee. Chairmen of committees have a good deal of influence and get their names on the most important bills.

A great deal of legislation is written by or determined by the conferees on conference committees between the House and Senate. Almost invariably the conferees appointed by both House and Senate are the oldest—in point of service—Republicans and the oldest Democratic Members serving on the committees reporting out the bills in each House. Conferees have had much to do with the final writing of appropriation and tariff bills especially, as well as with many other important bills in which there is a difference between House and Senate. Members may orate and the two Houses may vote, but the conferees, the old boys, bring back the language agreed upon, and it will be adopted.

Of course, this seniority influence is not unique or original in the Congress. It works similarly in every legislative body in the country, from the city council up. It works in the local lodges and grand lodges of every order. It is especially strong in the national meetings of a number of church organizations. It is particularly noticed in the Congress and commented upon because the Congress is more or less a permanent working body of long standing and represents all the people of our country.

Legislation is unquestionably much influenced by the men who have served long and occupy these important places in the organization of the House, and greater influence in and with the departments is certainly felt by those who have had the advantage of knowledge and acquaintance gained by years on the job. This long service in the House brings Members in contact with the personnel of the several departments and helps them to be of service in many little and some big ways to their constituents back home.

Seniority or length of service in the House of Representatives is certainly a large factor in giving a Member position and influence in the Congress and in Washington. Brilliance and unusual ability, of course, count for much, but without years of service they do not get one far here. Those districts which have returned their Members of proven ability term after term have contributed much toward the cause of good government and are today represented in Congress by Members who have standing and influence in Washington.

THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

One of the chief objects of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to revise the organization of congressional committees. When a bill is introduced it is assigned to a committee according to the subject matter with which it deals. The committee considers the merits of the bill and may then, first, report the bill back to the House or Senate without amendment with the recommendation that it pass; second, report the bill favorably with amendments; third, report the bill unfavorably; fourth, report the bill without recommendation; or fifth, make no report at all, in which case the bill dies in committee. Much of the work of Congress is done in the committees and their importance cannot be overemphasized. The Legislative Reorganization Act reduced the number of permanent or standing committees to 15 in the Senate and 19 in the House. In addition, there are six joint standing committees, composed of Members of both the Senate and the House. Select committees are appointed from time to time for limited periods and usually for a specific temporary purpose. Each standing committee is entitled to four professional and six clerical staff assistants to aid it in its duties. If a bill is of great importance, will affect a great number of people, or is of a controversial nature, the committee to which it is referred will almost certainly hold public hearings on it. Interested and well-informed individuals and organization representatives will be given an opportunity to appear before the committee to give testimony and answer questions put by the committee members. The committee then meets in executive session and makes its decision on the disposition of the bill.

WHAT ARE THE IMPORTANT COMMITTEES?

The two most important are probably Appropriations and Ways and Means. All bills that relate to the appropriation of money must be considered by and reported out by the Appropriations Committee of the House. This committee consists of 43 members and is the largest committee of Congress. It reports out bills that carry appropriations for billions each year.

The Ways and Means Committee has to consider and report out all bills that have in any way to do with raising revenue, tariff, or any sort of taxes. This committee consists of 25 members. All revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives and come out of the Ways and Means Committee.

HOW ARE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS MADE?

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provides that—

All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more.

The act provides, further, that—

Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more, except that Senators of the majority party who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia or of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may serve on three standing committees and no more.

In actual practice the selections for committee assignments are made for the Republicans by their committee on committees, and for the Democrats by their party caucus. These selections are then confirmed by election by the House. Members of the majority party receive the larger number of seats on each committee.

As a rule, once on an important committee a Member stays there as long as he is in Congress. If a vacancy occurs on an important committee, a Member from another committee may be given the place by the Committee on Committees if he desires it, and if he has the seniority and influence to get it. New Members get the places left available.

WHO APPOINTS THE CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES?

They are elected by the House. In actual practice, however, the Member of the majority party who has served longest on any committee is selected as chairman. Here seniority plays an important part. The chairman, of course, all come from the majority party, and the majority of the members of all committees are of the dominant party.

WHAT IS THE COMMITTEE ON RULES?

This is one of the most important committees as it controls the destiny of more proposed legislation than any other. Bills from the Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees have the right-of-way, so to speak, and can always be brought up for consideration. Other committees have only a few calendar days in any one session on which their bills may be brought up. Thus, many bills reported out cannot be brought up for consideration. The Rules Committee can report a rule for consideration of a bill any day. It can bring in a rule for the consideration of any bill that has been reported out of any committee any time. In the last days of a session special rules to bring out special bills are much in demand. The Rules Committee has much power, certainly has the power of selection, but it must be fair and discriminating, selecting what the majority of Congress seems to want most, as the rule it brings in must be acceptable to the House.

WHAT IS THE STEERING COMMITTEE?

This is a committee not much heard of nor mentioned in the newspapers. And I dare say that hardly two dozen Members of the House can tell the names of all the members of the steering committee. This is a little party adjunct to help promote legislation the majority is interested in, and to help iron out a program of procedure, especially in the closing days of a session. It is composed of a varying number of Members. The majority leader acts as chairman. When important matters are up for consideration the Speaker and the chairman of the Rules Committee sit in. This committee really has a good deal of influence in helping to shape up the legislative program.

In the Senate there are, in addition, a majority policy committee and a minority policy committee which perform generally the same functions for their respective parties.

WHAT ARE CONFERENCES AND CONFEREES?

The House passes a bill, for instance. It goes to the Senate and may be much amended over there, as are appropriations and tariff bills usually. The House will not accept the amendments. So the bill is sent to conference. The House appoints three or five Members as conferees and the Senate appoints an equal number. These gentlemen meet and hold a conference and discuss the points in disagreement. The conferees of the Senate give up some items and the conferees of the House agree to some. Finally they get together on a bill somewhere between the position taken by each House. Sometimes the conferees do not give up easily; sometimes the conference drags on for days or weeks, and they have run for months. Usually they get together, and usually the conference report is adopted by both Houses. Which end of the Capitol is the most subborn? Well, the other end, of course.

HOW ARE BILLS WRITTEN?

Although many bills are written by the Members themselves, the Congress has wisely provided for legislative counsel to aid the Members and the committees in drafting measures of a more complicated nature. This corps of expert legislative draftsmen take note of the general objective sought to be attained by the Member and mold his idea into parliamentary legal form.

When his bill is written up, the Member drops it in the basket on the Clerk's desk. It is then referred to the appropriate committee. Many bills lie in committee undisturbed and are never heard from again. In some cases they have served their purpose without further action. The have advertised the Member and the project. Many bills are introduced that have not the slightest chance of serious consideration or passage.

STAGES OF A BILL IN THE HOUSE

First. Introduction: By a Member by laying the bill on the Clerk's table informally. A Member sometimes introduces a petition only, leaving to the committee the drawing of a bill, such a petition referred to a committee having jurisdiction over the subject giving authority to report a bill. Sometimes communications addressed to the House from the executive departments or from other sources are referred to committees by the Speaker and give authority for the committees to originate bills. Messages from the President also are referred by the Speaker of the House and give jurisdiction to the committees receiving them to originate bills.

Second. Reference to a standing committee: Bills are referred under direction of the Speaker. A bill is numbered and printed when referred.

Study of the bill is then undertaken by the committee membership, oftentimes by a subdivision of the committee, before whom proponents and opponents of the contemplated legislation are heard. The various governmental subdivisions to be affected are consulted, and Members of Congress other than committee members are heard.

Third. Reported from the committee: Committees having leave to report at any time make their reports from the floor; other committees make their reports by laying them on the Clerk's table informally. The bill and the report are printed when reported.

Fourth. Placed on the calendar: Occasionally a privileged bill is considered when reported, but usually it is placed with the unpriviliged bills on the calendar where it belongs under the rule by direction of the Speaker.

Fifth. Consideration in Committee of the Whole: Bills which do not raise revenue or make or authorize appropriations of money or property do not go through this stage. All other bills are considered in Committee of the Whole. The stages of consideration in Committee of the Whole are: General debate; reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule; order to lay aside with a favorable recommendation or to rise and report; reporting of the bill to the House.

Sixth. Reading a second time in the House: Bills not requiring consideration in Committee of the Whole are read a second time in full, after which they are open to debate and amendment in any part. Bills considered in Committee of the Whole are read a second time in full in that Committee and when reported out with or without amendments are not read in full again, but are subject to further debate or amendment in the House unless the previous question is ordered at once.

Seventh. Engrossment and third reading: The question on House bills is taken on ordering the engrossment and third reading at one vote. If decided in the affirmative, the reading a third time usually takes place at once, by title. But any Member may demand the reading in full of the engrossed copy, in which case the bill is laid aside until it can be engrossed. Senate bills come to the House in engrossed form, and the question is put on third reading alone. When the question on engrossment and third reading of a House bill or third reading of a Senate bill is decided in the negative, the bill is lost as much as if defeated on the final passage. The question on engrossment and third reading is not made from the floor, but is put by the Speaker, as a matter of course.

Eighth. Passage: The question on the passage of a bill is put by the Speaker as a matter of course, without awaiting a motion from the floor.

Ninth. Transmission to the Senate by message.

Tenth. Consideration by the Senate: In the Senate, House bills are usually referred to committees for consideration and report, after which they have their several readings, with opportunities for debate and amendment. The same procedure takes place in the House as to bills sent from the Senate.

Eleventh. Return of, from the Senate without amendments: If the Senate passes a House bill without amendment it returns it to the House, where it is at once enrolled on parchment for signature. A bill thus passed without amendment goes into possession of the Clerk and is not laid before the House prior to enrollment. If the Senate rejects a House bill, the House is informed. Similar procedure occurs when the House passes a Senate bill without amendment.

Twelfth. Return of, from the Senate with amendments: House bills returned with Senate amendments go to the Speaker's table. If any Senate amendment requires consideration in Committee of the Whole, the bill is referred by the Speaker informally to the standing committee having jurisdiction, and when that committee reports the bill with recommendations it is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to be there considered and reported to the House itself. When no Senate amendment requires consideration in Committee of the Whole the bills come before the House directly from the Speaker's table.

Thirteenth. Consideration of Senate amendments by the House: When a bill with Senate amendments comes before the House, the House takes up each amendment by itself and may vote to agree to it, agree to it with an amendment, or disagree to it. If it disagrees, it may ask a conference with the Senate or may send notice of its disagreement, leaving it to the Senate to recede or to insist and ask the conference.

Fourteenth. Settlement of differences by conference: When disagreements are referred to conference, the managers embody their settlement in a report, which is acted on by each House as a whole. When this report is agreed to, the bill is finally passed and is at once enrolled for signature.

Fifteenth. Enrollment on parchment: The House in which a bill originates enrolls it.

Sixteenth. Examination by the Committee on House Administration to see that the bill is correctly enrolled.

Seventeenth. Signing by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate: The enrolled bill is first laid before the Speaker for signature, whether it be a House or a Senate bill, after which it is transmitted to the Senate and signed by the President of that body.

Eighteenth. Transmittal to the President of the United States: It is the duty of the Committee on House Administration to carry the enrolled bill—when it shall have originated in the House—to

the President. This duty is performed in the case of bills which have originated in the Senate by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Nineteenth. Action by the President: He may, first, promptly sign the bill, whereupon it becomes law as of its effective date. He may, second, hold it without taking any action, in which case it becomes law at the expiration of 10 days—Sundays excepted—without his signature, provided Congress is still in session. He may, third, hold the measure, and by so doing, kill it, if Congress adjourns before the bill has been in his hands 10 days—the so-called pocket veto. He may, fourth, veto the bill outright.

Twentieth. Action on, when returned disapproved: The House to which a disapproved bill is returned has the message read and spread on its Journal. It may then consider at once the question of passing the bill notwithstanding the President's objections, or may postpone to a day certain, or refer to a committee for examination. The vote on passing the bill notwithstanding the President's objections must be carried by two-thirds. If the bill fails to pass in the House to which it is returned, it remains there; but if it passes it is sent to the other House for action.

Twenty-first. Filing with the Secretary of State: When approved by the President a bill is deposited in the office of the Secretary of State; and when the two Houses have passed a bill notwithstanding the President's objections, the Presiding Officer of the House which acts on it last transmits it to the Secretary of State.

VETOES

Contrary to the practice followed in most of the State governments, the Chief Executive must approve or disapprove a bill in its entirety; he cannot accept part and reject part.

Nevertheless, not so many bills are vetoed as one might expect. By and large, the opinion of Alexander Hamilton that the veto would "generally be employed with great caution" has been borne out. Grover Cleveland set an all-time high, however, with 358 vetoes, until the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, whose vetoes exceeded Cleveland's considerably.

It is interesting to note that seven Presidents made no use of the veto power whatever, the last of these being President Garfield.

ARE MANY BILLS INTRODUCED?

The all-time high record is held by the Sixty-first Congress, during which 33,015 bills were introduced in the House, and 10,897 in the Senate. More nearly normal, although still above the average, is the number introduced in the Seventy-sixth Congress, 18,754 bills.

Not all the bills introduced are enacted, however. The chances are, roughly, about 1 in 10 that the bill introduced will be enacted into law.

WHAT IS A RIDER ON A BILL?

A "rider" is a provision attached to an appropriation bill which has no relation to the main subject of the bill. The idea is that the added provision may "ride" through to passage on the merits of the main bill. The rules make such riders fairly easy to dislodge in most cases, but occasionally a rider gets past both Houses. The President then has the alternative of accepting the rider or of vetoing the entire bill even though he objects only to the rider.

HOW ARE THE RULES OF PROCEDURE DETERMINED?

The Constitution authorizes each House to determine its rules of procedure. The rules and the parliamentary practices are based upon the Constitution, rules adopted by previous Congresses, and past decisions of presiding officers. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 made important changes in the rules, but either House can revise its rules at any time. Every Member should make himself familiar with the rules of his House.

WHAT IS UNANIMOUS CONSENT?

Many little actions are taken in the House by unanimous consent. The Member asks for unanimous consent to do this or that—to correct the RECORD, to speak for 5 minutes or more out of order, to insert remarks in the RECORD, to change an amendment he has offered, to have a letter read. If there is no objection on the part of any Member, then consent is granted. Frequently a gentleman says, "I object," and that settles that.

The leader of the majority makes many unanimous-consent requests, and usually they are granted. He may ask consent to meet at a certain hour, to adjourn over for a day or two, to hold a night session, to have so many hours for debate on a bill, to take up specified matters on certain days out of order, to set days for the Private and Consent Calendars. The granting of the request saves the passing of motions or the making of rules.

Many bills are passed by unanimous consent. All bills of a private character go on the Private Calendar.

And another character of bills go on the Consent Calendar. On days when these bills are in order the Clerk reads the title of the bill, the Speaker asks, "Is there objection?" Any Member may say, "I object," if he desires, in which case the bill cannot be taken up; and the next title is read. If no objection is made, the bill is read and passed very quickly, usually. The theory is that if no one cares to object to a bill certainly many would not vote against it, so it ought to be passed. Both party organizations have several Members who make it their business to study all bills on the Consent Calendars and be ready to object or insist on what they think proper in the way of amendments before consent is granted for the bill to be considered.

Often a Member will arise and say: "Reserving the right to object," and ask questions about the bill. This gives the author of the bill a chance to explain or defend it, and sometimes quite a little debate is stirred up even on consent days. After a while somebody may shout, "Regular order!" The Speaker says, "Regular order is demanded"; whereupon the gentleman who started the trouble by "reserving the right to object" must immediately make his objection or withdraw it. He may be just as apt to do one as the other, and on his decision rests the destiny of some anxious Member's important bill—for all bills are important to their hopeful authors. On consent days Members with bills on the calendar are most patient, polite, and persuasive in their ways toward the gentlemen who sit at the table and whose business it is to inquire into the merits of bills coming up.

HOW ARE THE VOTES TAKEN?

Four different ways. Usually the Speaker puts the question in this form: "As many as are in favor (of the motion) say 'Aye'," and then, "As many as are opposed say 'No'." In most instances the vote taken thus is decisive enough to satisfy. But if the Speaker is in doubt, or if it sounds close, any Member may ask for a division. In this case the Speaker asks those in favor to stand up and be counted. Then those opposed to the proposition are asked to stand up and be counted. The Speaker does the counting and then announces the result. But if he is still in doubt, or if a demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum—that is, 20 in the Committee of the Whole or 44 in the House—tellers are ordered. The Speaker appoints one gentleman on each side of the question to make the count. The two tellers take their place at the head of the center aisle. All Members favoring the proposition walk through between the tellers and are counted. Then those opposed walk through and are counted. This vote settles most questions.

But a roll call may be demanded by anybody on any question in the House, and if supported by one-fifth of those present it is ordered. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution. The Clerk reads the names of the whole membership, and as his or her name is called the Member answers "Aye" or "No." The names of those not voting the first time are read a second time, so that all Members in corridors, cloakrooms, committee rooms, or offices, who have been notified of a roll call by signal bells, may come in and vote.

Roll calls are ordered sometimes to get a full vote on a measure, because of a lack of a quorum, sometimes because Members want to be on record on a measure, and sometimes to put the other side on record against the measure for imaginary political advantage. The roll calls are published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are sometimes quoted to a Member's advantage or disadvantage, as the case may be.

Many bills of lesser importance and some of greater importance are passed without a roll call. This can be done if a quorum is present when the vote is taken and as many as one-fifth of those present do not demand a roll call. This is done often to save time and sometimes to save Members the embarrassment of having to be recorded for or against a measure.

WHAT KINDS OF RESOLUTIONS?

There are three kinds of resolutions as distinct from bills, which are used in the Congress. A simple resolution, commonly cited as House Resolution or Senate Resolution plus a number, is one

which deals with matters which require the action of only one House. A concurrent resolution—House Concurrent Resolution or Senate Concurrent Resolution—deals with matters over which the two Houses have concurrent jurisdiction. The same words are used, but each House acts independently. Concurrent resolutions are not signed by the President, even though they are approved by both Houses, unless they contain matters of legislation. A joint resolution—House Joint Resolution or Senate Joint Resolution—requires action by both Houses and, if passed by both Houses and signed by the President, has the force of law. In fact, a joint resolution when passed by Congress and signed by the President is numbered as a public law. The President does not have to approve a joint resolution for the submission to the States of a proposed amendment to the Constitution.

WHAT IS A QUORUM?

Everybody who ever attended a literary society knows that it requires a quorum to do business. In the House of Representatives a quorum is a majority of the membership. When there are no vacancies in the membership a quorum is 218. There are usually a few vacancies—Members who have died or resigned and their places yet unfilled. So an actual quorum is usually a little under that figure. Much business is transacted without a quorum. But no business of any character, except to adjourn, can be transacted without a quorum present if any Member objects. All any Member has to do to get a full House is to arise, address the Speaker, and make the point of order that "no quorum is present." The Speaker says, "I will count." If he cannot count a majority present, the doors are closed, the signal bells are rung in the corridors and House Office Building, and the roll is called. This usually produces a quorum, and business proceeds.

When the House is in Committee of the Whole, a hundred Members make a quorum.

Much time is wasted in quorum calls. During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, there were in the House 115 quorum calls which consumed 20 to 25 minutes each and 121 calls for the yeas and nays which took approximately 40 minutes each. On the basis of 5 hours a day spent in actual session, approximately 25 days were spent by the House in quorum calls and calls for the yeas and nays. At least as much time was wasted in the Senate.

WHAT IS A FILIBUSTER?

The word "filibuster" is used to denote the practice of taking advantage of the privilege of freedom of debate to deliberately delay or prevent action on a pending measure. Since debate in the House is limited, with 1 hour the longest period a Member may speak without unanimous consent, and since the House rules are generally more stringent, filibustering is limited almost entirely to the Senate. It may take several forms, including dilatory motions, demands for quorum calls, reading of books or other materials, or just talking which need not be relevant to the subject under consideration. Filibusters may be undertaken by individuals or by groups of Members. The Senate has a cloture rule by which debate may be limited but it is difficult to invoke and efforts to do so have not often been successful.

IS LEGISLATION MUCH INFLUENCED BY ORATORY?

Not much. People back home may picture the House as a forum for debate upon the merits of the many bills they read about. It is in a way, but most of the debate is as potent as a sham battle. Very few bills that are brought up in the House for action under general or special rules are defeated. I think more than 95 percent of bills thus brought up are passed, despite the forensic display of oratory that may be directed against them, and usually is, by the minority or the opposition. Hardly one amendment in 40 offered to bills on the floor is adopted unless offered or accepted by the committee reporting out the bill which is up for consideration.

Legislation enacted by any Congress is largely that originating with or sponsored by the majority party. Important measures brought up have had thorough scrutiny and a favorable report by a well-organized committee. They have probably had strong backing from the country. Some have had the approval of the steering committee and some have been reported out by the Rules Committee. Such measures are on the program for passage, and long debates and much oratory cannot defeat them. On the other hand, bills that are not slated for passage do not often get up for action in the House.

Committee responsibility is great and committee action influential. On most amendments and on most bills a majority of the Members vote most of the time with the committee—and it is difficult to break into that influence even with fine oratory.

HOW MAY A CITIZEN EXPRESS HIS VIEWS TO CONGRESS?

The Constitution guarantees the people the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. Petitions received by the Congress are noted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are referred to the appropriate committee. As I have already mentioned, anyone may write to an individual Member. Every Member tries to answer every letter he receives as promptly as possible. It is not necessary to send return postage since the Member may send letters on official business without postage under his franking privilege. Then, of course, a Member talks with a great many people both in his office and in his home district. There is just simply not enough time for him to see everyone because so much of his time is occupied by his official duties, but I am sure that every Member sees as many people as he possibly can. Both Houses have visitors' galleries, built to promote the full publicity of sessions. In addition, a citizen may request the opportunity to testify at committee hearings on subjects in which he is particularly interested or qualified to speak. If it is at all possible, he will be given an opportunity to appear. Letters addressed to the chairman or members of a committee are usually inserted in the record of the hearings and are considered by the committee. Most committee hearings are open to the public. Finally, candidates for a seat in Congress customarily indicate their views on matters with which they will be concerned if elected. A citizen may give a general expression of his views by casting his vote for the candidate who most adequately represents his own position on these matters.

WHAT IS PRINTED THAT BEST TELLS OF THE CONGRESS?

The Constitution of the United States is the most informative thing printed dealing with the Congress. It provides the authority for Congress, specifies its duties, powers, privileges, and much of the procedures in both Houses of Congress. The Constitution is not very long, is easily obtainable in any city or town, and should be read occasionally by every citizen. It will surprise you how much information it contains.

HOW OLD IS THE CONSTITUTION?

It was adopted by the Federal Constitutional Convention in 1787, ratified by the several States, and the new Government provided for by it became fully operative with the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States on April 30, 1789.

HOW CAN THE CONSTITUTION BE AMENDED?

A proposal to amend the Constitution must be passed by the Congress by a two-thirds vote of the Members present in both House and Senate. The proposed amendment then must be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States or by conventions in three-fourths of the States; the choice of method of ratification rests with the Congress.

HAVE MANY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS BEEN ADOPTED?

No, not very many; only 21 in 161 years, and this question brings out some interesting figures and dates.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution were proposed by the First Congress in 1789 and were practically agreed to before the adoption of the Constitution. It is these first 10 amendments which make up our Bill of Rights.

The eleventh and twelfth amendments were proposed in 1794 and 1803. Since 1804 when the twelfth amendment was ratified, over a period of 146 years, only nine amendments have been adopted to the Constitution.

The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments relate to abolition of slavery, rights of citizenship, and the franchise, coming after the Civil War, and were proposed and ratified between 1865 and 1870.

Since the Civil War period only six amendments have been ratified, as follows:

Sixteenth amendment provides power for Congress to levy a tax on incomes. It was ratified in 1913.

Seventeenth amendment provides that United States Senators shall be elected by popular vote. Previous to its adoption Senators had been chosen by State legislatures. Proposed in 1912 and ratified in 1913.

Eighteenth amendment provides for prohibition. It was proposed in 1917 and ratified in 1919; subsequently it was ratified by all States in the Union except two.

Nineteenth amendment provides the right of suffrage to women. Proposed in 1919, it was ratified in 1920.

Twentieth amendment is the so-called lame-duck amendment. It relates to the terms of the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives and sets the time the Congress shall convene. It was adopted in 1933.

The twenty-first amendment repealed the eighteenth or prohibition amendment to the Constitution. It, too, was adopted in 1933.

ARE AMENDMENTS SOMETIMES PROPOSED BUT REJECTED BY THE STATES?

Yes; that has occurred several times. Amendments were proposed in 1789—two—1810, 1861, and 1924, that were not ratified by the States. All of these except the last one are out of date, of no use now, and time has shown the wisdom of their rejection.

The one submitted to the States in 1924 was known as the child-labor amendment and reads in part:

The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age.

So far 28 States have ratified this proposed amendment. Since 36 States must ratify an amendment to make it effective, it would appear that this one also has been lost. Recent social legislation on the part of the various States has materially decreased the alleged necessity for its enactment, however.

WHAT ARE THE JOURNALS OF EACH HOUSE?

Each House keeps a journal of its proceedings, which, except for such parts as require secrecy, are published each session. The journals do not report the debates but only the parliamentary proceedings.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, printed daily and later collected and bound, contains the complete verbatim record of everything said on the floor of either House, including roll calls and votes. The Appendix contains material inserted by Members as extensions of their remarks but not actually spoken on the floor. The Legislative Reorganization Act established the Daily Digest which is now printed at the end of each daily RECORD. The Digest contains a summary of action taken by both Houses and by committees, as well as a list of scheduled committee hearings and future legislative programs.

WHAT IS THE CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY?

Compiled under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, the Congressional Directory which is ordinarily issued as of January and June each year, contains biographical sketches of the Members, lists of Members by States and by length of service, committees and committee assignments, as well as a great deal of information about the organization and functions of the Government agencies.

WHO PAYS FOR SPEECHES MEMBERS MAIL OUT?

The Senator or Congressman pays for the speeches he sends out. They are printed usually at the Government Printing Office and are charged for at cost price, but the cost price is about what they would cost in a privately operated print shop. A Member will often send out another Member's speech on some subject he thinks will be of interest to his own constituents.

In the fiscal year 1939, Members paid the Public Printer $60,438.47 for speeches. Ten years before, in 1929, the sum was $66,400.07.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include an editorial from the Boston Traveler regarding the sleeping-pill menace, also an editorial from the Boston Traveler entitled "Kindness to Foreigners Overdone," and to print in the Appendix an article from the Southern Textile News entitled "Japanese Competition Threatening Industry.")

SLEEPING-PILL MENACE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how long, oh, how long, we must wait to have barbiturates regulated as narcotics are. I introduced a bill in the last session and the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Knutson, promised to help with the passage of the bill, but he is no longer in Congress. I asked at this session for hearings to have the bill passed, but the departments have not recommended it and nothing has been done. It should be passed—passed immediately if we are to save life and reason.

The Boston Traveler recently carried the following editorial comment on this subject:

SLEEPING-PILL MENACE

Some shocking statistics on barbiturates were revealed at yesterday's session of the American College of Physicians.

It seems that 25 percent of the poisoning cases admitted to hospitals are caused by barbiturates, commonly known as sleeping pills. Three hundred tons of the stuff are manufactured every year.

There is no question but what the use of sleeping pills is indicated in many instances, but there is equally little doubt that restrictions governing their use are casually enforced. Theoretically, such pills can be dispensed only under a physician's prescription. Some drug stores blithely ignore that injunction and refill a prescription at will. Occasionally physicians themselves are careless in prescribing.

We don't know what to suggest exactly except better enforcement and perhaps greater public warning about the dangers involved. Sleeping pills can be habit forming. They can produce the same kind of intoxication as too much alcohol. And they can be fatal.

At least that is the American medical viewpoint. Coincidentally, word has come out of Russia that sleeping pills are being used there to cure all sorts of diseases, from ulcers to peritonitis, carbuncles or concussions. You just sleep off whatever the ailment is, even if it takes a week or two.

We would rather put our chips on the American doctors and advise you to do the same if you aspire to a long life and a healthy one.

I also warn that if you try to sleep disease and nervousness off, you are likely to sleep yourself into heaven or the other place.

While we are speaking of the Committee on Ways and Means which has this bill before it, and is now working on taxes, I should like to quote the following editorial from the Boston Traveler:

KINDNESS TO FOREIGNERS OVERDONE

We are all for eliminating excess taxes where reasonably possible and for trimming them down everywhere. But the proposal made by the Treasury Department that Congress exempt from all taxation mail-order purchases from foreign dealers where the wholesale price is $10 or less seems to us as outrageous as it does to the Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

No import duty on a sweater if you order it by mail from Montreal? No tax on a piece of jewelry if Mexican made and mailed from Mexico City, but a tax on it if American made and mailed from North Attleboro? How long would it be before we had a new set of 5 percenters, fellows who would save you a goodly fraction of the excise tax by "expediting" such foreign purchases?

We are all for promoting foreign trade, but we are all against promoting it at the expense of our own. Why give foreign traders preferential tax treatment and thus divert business to them and away from our own factories and stores?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article on textiles from the Southern Textile News to which I have referred be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow and 20 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

BASING-POINT HISTORY SINCE SUPREME COURT DECISION IN CEMENT CASE—BIG STEEL INAUGURATES PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN—PLAN FOR SCUTTLING ANTITRUST LAWS REVEALED—SMALL BUSINESS STILL IN PERIL AS THE BASING-POINT BILL, S. 1008, IS PRESSED FOR PASSAGE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1948, the Supreme Court of the United States announced its decision condemning the basing-point conspiracy in the cement industry. Thus, after 12 years of legal battles, a notorious price-fixing system had lost out in the Court

of highest appeal, and the cement monopoly had at last reached the point that it had either to accept the Federal Trade Commission's cease-and-desist order or somehow to manage to get Congress to change the two antitrust laws under which it had been convicted. On the next day after the Court's decision was announced, Mr. Irvin S. Olds, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., called a press conference and announced to the world at large he was launching a campaign to change the antitrust laws. This was the occasion of Mr. Olds' famous statement that industry was faced with two alternatives—either to get Congress to change the law or to educate the Supreme Court. Since it was overwhelmingly clear from the Court's opinion in the Cement case that the Supreme Court has more education to give than to receive on the matter of basing-point conspiracies, it was equally plain that the only course Mr. Olds had in mind was to have Congress change the law. To this end, the United States Steel Corp. got busy mending its political fences. Three days after the Cement decision, in the middle of a period in which the corporation was pushing prices up generally, it suddenly decreased prices at its Geneva, Utah, plant. The announcement, made in a press release by Mr. Benjamin Fairless, declared that the $3 premium which had been charged at this plant would be dropped and that for the first time in history western customers would be able to buy steel at a price on parity with Pittsburgh. Parity with eastern prices for western steel buyers was, said Mr. Fairless, one of the aims of the corporation when it bought the Geneva plant from the Government in 1946. Yes, parity at this plant was also one of the things the corporation had promised western leaders when it was negotiating for this plant, at 20 cents on the dollar, and was soliciting the support of western leaders in these negotiations. Since the part the Western States played in defeating the Pittsburgh-plus system can hardly have been forgotten, it is not surprising that the corporation should suddenly decide to keep its overdue promise to the West. When the Federal Trade Commission was trying to break up the Pittsburgh-plus system some 25 years ago, western States and communities aired their grievances against that discriminatory system in no uncertain terms. In fact, western feeling against the Pittsburgh-plus system was so strong that, when the Federal Trade Commission issued a cease-and-desist order, United States Steel did not even bother to appeal it to the courts.

LOBBIES FORMED TO UPSET COURT DECISIONS

But fence-mending was only a small part of the United States Steel's campaign to change the antitrust laws. Lobbies were formed to carry the campaign both into the Halls of Congress and into the various communities throughout the country. The campaign cry at this time was "dislocation of industry." This slogan was taken from Mr. Olds' public statements made the day following the Cement decision. Mr. Olds had been headlined as warning that the Cement decision would cause widespread dislocation of industry. As an added inspiration, Mr. Olds had also charged that the Federal Trade Commission was trying to carry out the academic theories of a college professor of some generations earlier, and that the Commission thought the country could have "a little steel mill in every back yard." These statements proved so successful in frightening the businessmen of Pittsburgh and, in fact, the whole community of Pittsburgh, that the hired lobbyists took the same formula into every other community of the country where they could find a concentration of some industry producing more goods than the local market could consume. Working through traveling committee-organizers and planting stories in the local newspapers, the lobbyists succeeded in convincing a great many communities that they were destined to become "ghost towns." Thus, Pittsburgh was told that the basic steel industry would have to move to cities in which the steel-consuming industries are located, and the steel-consuming cities were told that the steel-consuming plants would have to move to Pittsburgh. All industry, according to this propaganda, would have to move from where it was to some other place. The other major steel companies and the cement concerns all joined in this campaign. Company executives carried on letter-writing campaigns to customers, threatening that prices would be higher or that customers would be cut off altogether. In some cases, these executives even succeeded in frightening their labor unions into joining the campaign for new legislation.

STEEL AND CEMENT TRUSTS WANT BASING-POINT PRICING LEGALIZED

The steel industry has led every successful public campaign on behalf of basing-point price fixing and was, therefore, the logical leader in the new campaign. In the first place, the steel industry is heavily involved in the cement industry. The United States Steel Corp. owns outright the world's largest cement firm and was, therefore, directly affected by the decision in the Cement case. In the second place, at the time the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case was announced, the steel industry was itself being tried by the Federal Trade Commission for engaging in a conspiracy to maintain a basing-point system in steel identical to that which the Supreme Court had condemned in the cement industry. It was plain enough, therefore, that, unless the antitrust laws were drastically revised, the steel monopoly would ultimately find its basing-point price-fixing system in the same boat with the cement system.

Of all the lobbies that were put to work in this campaign, the grand daddy of them all was the steel lobby which masterminded the whole propaganda campaign, with the able help of William Simon, later counsel of the Capehart committee. This committee was the Trade Policies Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Eightieth Congress, a subcommittee headed by Senator CAPEHART and established as a result of a resolution introduced in the Senate by this distinguished Senator on May 20, 1948—Senate Resolution 241. On June 12 the Senate passed a revised resolution authorizing the subcommittee to investigate monopoly as well as the Federal Trade Commission and the antitrust laws. For this purpose, the appropriation was increased to $50,000. This subcommittee, working through its chief counsel, William Simon, and its advisory council, subsequently carried on a great deal of investigating the antitrust laws, but its final report admits that it never got around to investigating monopoly. One of Senator CAPEHART's first steps for this subcommittee was to appoint an advisory council of some 45 or 50 members. This council included many special-interest representatives. In the first place, the advisory council was made up almost altogether of representatives from the Eastern and Central States, there being only a very few members from Western and Southern States. In the second place, 15 of the members of this council represented corporations which had been formally charged with violation of the antitrust laws, and no less than 7 represented corporations which had been on the losing side in basing-point litigation with the Federal Trade Commission. In short, this so-called council represented a coalition of the monopoly interests which had lost out in recent court decisions involving violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act or the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

UNITED STATES STEEL MAKES PIOUS ANNOUNCEMENT

Early in July, the United States Steel Corp. suddenly announced that it was required, by the Cement decision, to price steel f. o. b. mill and to absorb no freight whatever. Why the corporation felt that its pricing of steel was affected in any way by an order covering cement, particularly when the steel case was still in the trial stage, the corporation never satisfactorily explained. Nor was it explained by the other steel corporations who suddenly found they were likewise required by the cement order to price steel f. o. b. mill and in no other way. But this was a time of severe steel shortage—a time when steel executives were predicting that the shortage would last for another 18 months—and the shift to f. o. b. mill pricing at this particular time had several happy results for the steel corporations. In the first place, it was an indirect way of raising steel prices. Since the steel mills had been absorbing freight when they shipped into one another's base territory, the shift to rigid f. o. b. mill pricing at a time of shortage meant that they could sell their total output without absorbing freight. By retaining the same base prices as before and making the customers pay all the freight, net mill prices were raised by the amount of the freight previously absorbed.

In the second place, a solemn announcement by the biggest industry executives in the country that the law required rigid f. o. b. mill pricing raised doubts, at least in the minds of executives of other industries who follow innocent, and completely legal, delivered-price practices. Thus, they helped along

the campaign to stir up business agitation for new legislation.

PROPAGANDA SQUEEZE PUT ON STEEL CONSUMERS

But the fright caused to industry in general was nothing compared to the vicious squeeze that was put on steel customers. This is what happened: Steel customers who had, under the basing-point system, bought their steel from outside sources now found they had to pay higher delivered costs than their nearby competitors who were fortunate enough to be on the order books of a nearby mill. For example, a steel customer in Cleveland who had been getting his steel from Pittsburgh at the Cleveland delivered price, now found that he had to pay freight from Pittsburgh, while his competitors in Cleveland who had bought their steel from a nearby mill were still able to get their supplies at the old delivered costs. Moreover, when such a customer went to the adjacent mills for his steel, he was told that, because of the shortage, the mills there could not serve him. "We must take care of our old customers first," the steel people would say.

Similarly, the steel customer in Pittsburgh who had bought his steel from Youngstown was in the same squeeze. He was forced to continue to buy his steel from Youngstown and to pay the freight. Both customers were at a disadvantage with their local competitors who were fortunate enough to be on the books of a local mill. This kind of squeeze was destined to be temporary—to last only as long as the shortage lasted—for as soon as the mills had idle capacity, the customer in Cleveland shifted his business to mills close to his plant and, correspondingly, steel capacity at Pittsburgh was freed to take care of the local customers there. But the steel shortage did not ease until the summer of 1949, and in the meantime the squeeze on customers caused them to protest and to help along the campaign to get the antitrust laws repealed.

By the time the big-steel lobby got organized and got its battle lines formed, it had become clear that the old battle cry about dislocation of industry was beginning to lose its charm. Moreover, it became apparent that as the months rolled along in preparing the public for new legislation—and the relocation of industry which had been predicted did not materialize—the general public would be less and less frightened by this bogy. Therefore, it became clear that a new campaign slogan and a new battle cry would have to be found.

CAPEHART COMMITTEE STUDIES CASES WHICH HAD EFFECTIVELY STRENGTHENED ANTITRUST LAWS

The Capehart committee then began to study the six cases of recent years which seemed to offer something new, or some different interpretation of the law from that of hundreds of old standard cases which could hardly be attacked. These cases were, according to Mr. CAPEHART and his chief counsel, the following: The Cement case, the A. E. Staley case, the Corn Products Refining Co. case, the Morton Salt case, the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana case, and the Rigid Steel Conduit case. The first four of these had already been decided in favor of the Federal Trade Commission in the Supreme Court, and the other two had been decided in the lower courts. But the study of these cases must have revealed that no supporting material could be found there. No sponsor of a bill to weaken the antitrust laws could stand up and defend the law violators in these cases. At least none has done so yet.

CLARIFICATION—A BATTLE CRY OF FREEDOM FOR THE STEEL AND CEMENT TRUSTS

No Member of Congress would care to advance the proposition that the defendants in these cases were not engaged in monopolistic practices; or that the FTC should not have ordered these practices stopped. Failing to find in these decisions any defense for the corporations against whom the decisions had gone, the basing-point boys then hit upon the happy inspiration that, while the decisions themselves were all right, they had caused confusion. Ergo, confusion became the new slogan, and clarification of the law became the new battle cry. Clarify! Every time I hear that someone wants to clarify the laws of the land, I know for a fact that he has first raised that synthetic fog. He simply does not like the law which the Congress of the United States has enacted—and what the Supreme Court has said the law means. This slogan and this battle cry were taken up by the supporting chorus among the trade press. And this slogan and this battle cry were taken home to the various States and communities by so-called forums and other traveling circuses sent out by the basing-point lobby. The basing-point lobby finally became officially the Council for Clarification of Pricing Policies, with Mr. William Simon, former chief counsel for the Capehart committee, continuing to carry on the campaign as a registered lobbyist; and Senator Albert Hawkes, one of the original members of the Capehart committee and now retired from the Senate, serves as the head of this lobby. Confusion is the slogan we still have with us today, and clarification is still the battle cry. These are the solemn explanations, moreover, which the congressional sponsors of the basing-point bill have put forward to justify legislation which would nearly destroy the Federal Trade Commission Act and would without question repeal the Robinson-Patman Act amendment to section 2 of the Clayton Act. Indeed, it cannot be denied that one way to clarify the antitrust laws is to repeal them.

Soon it will be 2 years since the Congress began its so-called attempts to clarify the American antitrust laws. For 2 years, one of the best organized lobbies in this country has sown confusion about the pricing practices which are legal, and always have been legal, so that they could clarify them. They have raised a fog about the decisions of our Supreme Court which should make these beclouding lawyer-lobbyists eligible for top positions as "weathermakers." Let us kill this threat to small business and to our antitrust laws—now and forever.

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF BASING-POINT LEGISLATION

The Capehart committee held public hearings in November and December of 1948, during which it heard 109 witnesses. Representatives of the large steel and cement corporations who had engineered this so-called investigation were conspicuous by their absence from the proceedings. Instead they sent their customers and fabricators, who, in order to continue to receive their steel and cement in the tight market, had little choice but to do the bidding of their suppliers. But the committee simplified their job of supporting the need for clarification. Both in the questioning of witnesses and later in their report, committee members and counsel gave only two possible alternatives: legislation to end the so-called confusion or strict f. o. b. pricing. No wonder, the committee's report later summarized that not a single small-business man, union representative or other witness—with but two exceptions, favored the f. o. b. pricing system.

The committee did not confine its activities to the hearing room. It went around the country trying to raise a clamor from the grass roots. According to the magazine Western Industry, December 1948, one meeting in Denver organized at the behest of the committee backfired a little. After hearing speeches by a member of the committee's advisory council, a cement manufacturer and a representative of the Chamber of Commerce, some of the small manufacturers in the audience rose and said they hated to seem out of order but they were darn glad the basing-point system was out.

Although the Senate committee changed chairmen with the incoming Eighty-first Congress, it continued its work where it had left off. After hearing another 21 witnesses in January and February, it issued an interim report March 11, 1949, and turned the whole problem over to the Judiciary Committee. Its general conclusion amounted to this: a required f. o. b. pricing system would be bad for competition.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, who had taken over the Capehart committee, meanwhile had introduced two bills—S. 236—two versions—to legalize freight absorption, delivered pricing, and abolish the good-faith defense. On his second bill, he joined Senator CAPEHART in a measure that went even further than the first. It said that the existence of a common pricing formula shall not alone be sufficient to prove the existence of an alleged conspiracy. Senator MYERS on the same day introduced his moratorium measure, S. 1008.

The Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings on these measures during March and April. One of the witnesses on this occasion was William Simon, the former general counsel of the Capehart committee. Simon, point by point, objected to the criticism and suggestions which the Federal Trade Commission had made of the moratorium bill. Here, for the first time, he shifted his role officially from that of counsel to that of advocate and lobbyist.

On April 27 the Senate Judiciary Committee reported Senator MYERS' moratorium bill, S. 1008, which would have suspended for 16 months the application of the antitrust laws to cases involving freight absorption and delivered pricing. As its reason for reporting this measure, rather than the permanent legislation sponsored by Senators JOHNSON of Colorado and CAPEHART, the committee gave the length of time that would be required for a study of such permanent measures. Only a temporary, interim bill, they thought, could receive the quick action they were seeking.

Senator LANGER wrote a ringing dissent, which warned of the danger to the antitrust laws which would be the certain result of this bill.

THE O'MAHONEY SUBSTITUTE

The Senate took up this bill on May 31, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] announced that he would introduce substitute, permanent legislation. Most of the Senate debate concerned the moratorium. On the afternoon of June 1, the O'Mahoney substitute came formally before the Senate. Senators had had little chance to study it. Alert to the dangers of a measure which modified the language of our basic antitrust statutes, Senators KEFAUVER and LONG probed the effect which the language of this bill would have on competition and small business. Under questioning Senator O'MAHONEY conceded that section 3 of the bill would overrule the circuit court decision in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, which Judge Sherman Minton had recently issued. It would permit Standard to plead good faith as a complete defense in discriminating in price against the small, independent gasoline dealers. It would, in other words, tear the heart out of the Robinson-Patman Act, and carry us back to the old Clayton Act with its big loopholes, which we have so strenuously tried to close.

Senator O'MAHONEY agreed to two modifications which the Senator from Tennessee suggested as off-the-cuff improvements. In section 2 (b), which relates to freight absorption, the modification prohibited such freight absorption if its effect would be to lessen competition. In section 3, which relates to price discrimination in general, the Kefauver language provided that the good-faith defense could be a complete defense in only those cases of price discrimination where the effect of the discrimination would not lessen competition. Both proponents and opponents after a short hour of debate on this bill, expressed their approval of it, and the Senate adopted it by voice vote. Only the junior Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG, expressed some concern, lest the Senate had bought a cat in the bag.

When everyone is as happy about a piece of legislation as Senators appear to be—

He said—

someone is going to be fooled when he wakes up and sees what is in it.

On June 6, Senator LANGER moved to reconsider the action, but the Senate would not go along.

NO PUBLIC HEARINGS ON SENATE SUBSTITUTE, S. 1008

So S. 1008 came over to the House, where the Judiciary Committee hastily held only executive hearings on the pernicious bill. A subcommittee headed by the Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], himself the author of a companion moratorium to Senator MYERS' bill, H. R. 2222, heard only two witnesses, the Senator from Wyoming and Herbert A. Bergson, chief of the Antitrust Division. Both urged adoption of the measure. Mr. Bergson, in his position, is entrusted with the enforcement of the Sherman Act, but not with the Federal Trade Commission Act, and at least not primarily, the Clayton Act, the two statutes which the pending bill would amend. But not only did he support the bill as it came from the Senate, he went further and suggested that the Kefauver amendments be deleted. And these amendments were the only slight safeguards for small business which the measure then contained. By this time a great number of people had asked for an opportunity to testify on the measure. The subcommittee rejected these requests, and reported to its parent body the same day, June 8. Following the recommendations of Mr. Bergson the group stripped the Kefauver amendments from the bill which it reported, and made one other change. They modified section 4 (d) with respect to the definition of the phrase "the effect may be," so that it read "resonable probability" of the specified effect.

NO HEARINGS ON MEASURE OF OVERWHELMING IMPORTANCE

Now, Mr. Speaker, these were the first hearings, the only hearings by either the House or the Senate Judiciary Committees on a measure which is of such tremendous importance to the economy of this country. Hardly could they be called hearings, at that. The only two witnesses were the Senate sponsor and the representative of a Government department not directly concerned in the legislation. I, therefore, urged that other witnesses be given an opportunity to express their opinion on this all-important legislation. The full Judiciary Committee consented to have a closed meeting, at which I was privileged to testify along with my good friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], and two Representatives from the great States of Pennsylvania and Illinois, Mr. CORBETT and Mr. VELDE. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] and I told the committee that we thought the bill would not only legalize the basing-point system but that it would repeal the Robinson-Patman Act and open up the law to every kind of price discrimination. The Robinson-Patman Act is the only protection which small-business men have against destructive and predatory price discrimination. I implored them not to wipe the Robinson-Patman Act from the statute books without, at least, making a thorough study of the effect this bill would have on the free-enterprise system.

In spite of our urgent pleas the Committee on the Judiciary reported the bill to the House 1 week later, on June 21. It held no further hearings. Moreover, it reported the bill again without the Kefauver amendments.

The only good thing that can be said for the bill at this stage is that it contained in section 4 (D) not the Senate's definition of the phrase "the effect may be" to mean that there is substantial and probative evidence of the specified effect, but language suggested by Mr. Bergson, which required only "reasonable probability" of the specified effect.

SMALL BUSINESS OBJECTED TO S. 1008 AND REQUESTED HEARINGS BY SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Small-business groups from all over the country, Mr. Speaker, had been trying to voice their objections to the bill. They wrote and called me, to see what I could do to give them an opportunity to be heard. The only thing I could do, since the Judiciary Committee had already acted, was to open to them the only forum at my disposal: The Select Committee on Small Business. Fifteen witnesses appeared during five full days of hearings. Fifteen representatives of small and independent business and of farmers, trained and experienced economists, and members of the staff of the Federal Trade Commission, which is charged with the enforcement of the Clayton and the Robinson-Patman Acts. All spoke as one in condemning the bill, urging that Congress think twice before striking this blow at the heart of our laws against monopoly.

Even while these witnesses were testifying, the Committee on Rules heard members of the Judiciary Committee urge that it send this bill speedily to the floor of the House. I left my own committee hearings to request the Rules Committee to stop, look, and listen, and to permit more hearings by the proper legislative committee which had reported the bill. I warned them that this was dangerous legislation which would set us back decades in antitrust enforcement.

But the Rules Committee sent the measure to the floor June 30, even while the Small Business Committee held its hearings.

The bill came up on the floor of the House July 7, with the time—1 hour—evenly divided between my good friend, the learned gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and myself. We had 1 hour's debate for a bill which would in a large measure set at naught the body of antimonopoly laws which the Congress of the United States had slowly and painstakingly evolved over the course of 60 years. As in the earlier debate in the Senate, those of us who were concerned about the fate of the small-business man, if S. 1008 were passed, tried not only to stop passage of the measure; we also tried to make it less dangerous through amendments similar to the Kefauver amendments. We told the House that the bill would perpetuate the basing-point system with all its implications. We told them that it meant price fixing, that it would hold back the industrial development of the South and the West of the United States, and that it would, in fact, say to the big national

corporation, "Go right ahead and discriminate against your small local competitors."

FRIENDS OF SMALL BUSINESS OFFER AMENDMENTS IN EFFORT TO SAVE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

First Mr. WILLIS and then Mr. CARROLL tried to insert language similar to, but stronger than, that suggested in the Senate by Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. WILLIS saw the danger of section 1, which would make it difficult for the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act to bring action against any system of delivered pricing, however unfair a method of competition it might find it to be. But the House rejected the proposed modification, which would have made this section somewhat less noxious. That left section 1 beyond repair.

At this point Mr. CARROLL stepped into the breach, and successfully persuaded the membership of this body to adopt safeguards in section 2 (b) and 3, similar to the Kefauver amendments which the Judiciary Committee had deleted. In section 2 (b) the Carroll language provided that freight absorption would not be permissible if its effects were those prohibited by the Robinson-Patman Act, that is, that the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or otherwise violate the act. In section 3 the same phrase was attached to the good faith defense provision, so that the good-faith defense could no longer serve if the price discrimination might have the same effects of causing injury to competition.

MEMBERS STILL DISSATISFIED, SEEK RECOMMITTAL

Alert to the dangers that the bill still contained, even with these amendments, two of my colleagues, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] rose to ask for its recommittal. But the House rejected the motion, and then passed the bill.

The next move came in the Senate. Reports in the press meanwhile had carried the story that the conferees would try to knock the safeguarding Carroll amendments back out of the bill, and if any, leave only the weaker Kefauver amendments. To forestall any such action, if it were actually contemplated, the friends of the small-business man in the Senate decided they would try to concur in the House version of the measure, unless they could kill the bill outright. They almost missed an opportunity to make this move, because the bill had been quietly called up and sent to conference without the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] being notified, although an understanding to this effect had been previously agreed upon. The Senate later, however, agreed to take up Senator LONG's motion for reconsideration on the appointment of conferees. And the Senate, in discussing the motion, finally on August 10, 11, and 12 for the first time really debated the bill itself. Scholarly Senator DOUGLAS, a former president of the American Economic Association, delivered a masterful analysis of the bill. He said flatly that it would legalize the basing-point system. Senator LONG showed that without any question it would repeal the Robinson-Patman Act and permit the destruction of small business through price discrimination. He also openly expressed the fear that the conferees would try to dilute the few safeguards which had been written into the measure by Senator KEFAUVER and Representative CARROLL. But the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], who had been appointed to the conference committee, told him that no such effort would be made. Mr. O'CONOR pointed out that the conferees were bound by the Senate language on the one hand, and the House language on the other, and that if conferees were to go outside these bounds the report would become subject to a point of order. By a vote of 28 to 49 the Senate rejected, on August 12, the move to reconsider.

TWO CONFEREES REFUSE TO SIGN CONFERENCE REPORT, WHICH IS INFINITELY WORSE THAN ORIGINAL BILL

The House, August 16, voted to insist on its amendments and sent the bill to conference, appointing Messrs. CELLER, WALTER, WILLIS, MICHENER, and CASE of New Jersey to the conference committee. The conferees labored long—they did not report back to the House until almost 2 months later, October 13.

They brought forth a horse of a different color. Section 1 remained unchanged, since House and Senate versions were identical. In section 2 (b) conferees struck out the Carroll amendment, and inserted a version of the weaker Kefauver amendment, permitting freight absorption to meet the equally low price of a competitor in good faith, except where such absorption of freight would be such that its effect upon competition will be substantially to lessen competition—instead of may be substantially to lessen competition—a more difficult point to prove. In section 3 they took out not only the Carroll amendment; they also eliminated the corresponding Kefauver amendment completely, thus denying the intent of both Senate and House, and leaving the good-faith defense as a complete defense in all price-discrimination cases. In section 4 (d) they again went beyond the intent of either the House or Senate by writing a new definition of the term "the effect may be," the crucial phrase of the Robinson-Patman Act. They required that there be reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence of the specified effect—forcing the Federal Trade Commission to adduce positive evidence of facts not yet in existence.

Only three members of the eight-man conference committee actually signed the report in person. These three signed as proxy for another three of the conferees. The remaining two refused to sign at all. One of these was the chairman of our Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the other was my good friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] announced on the floor of the House on October 14 why he could not sign this report. He said it did not reflect the wishes of the House; it "would seriously interfere with antitrust enforcement, enable offenders against the Robinson-Patman Act to go unwhipped of justice, and hobble the Federal Trade Commission." Those are the words of a man who, as a member and chairman of our great Judiciary Committee, has long made a study of our antitrust laws, who last year shepherded through the House the antimerger bill, to close the loophole in the Clayton Act, and who, during several months last fall, held intensive hearings on the entire field of economic concentration and monopoly. Several others of us warned the House to beware of this bill, S. 1008, in the strongest language we could muster, and I tried to have it recommitted. But the House rejected my motion by a vote of 138 to 178, and then voted 200 to 104 to adopt the report.

DOUGLAS WARNS OF LEGAL BOOBY TRAPS AND MINE FIELDS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The Senate found itself in its third basing-point debate on October 17. The measure before it, however, was again different from those considered earlier. Senator DOUGLAS said the innocent language of the bill had taken in many thoroughly well-meaning persons and legislators, but he warned it was "full of legal booby traps which will enable big business to free itself from the antitrust laws, and it lays a mine field for the small-business men of the country." He then moved to defer furthur consideration of the conference report until January 20. Senator O'CONOR attempted to block the delay with a move to table DOUGLAS' motion, but the Senate, by a tie vote, 29 to 29, rejected the O'Conor proposal, and then voted to wait until January 20.

GIANTS OF INDUSTRY AWAIT PASSAGE OF S. 1008 TO RETURN TO BASING-POINT PRICING

Some newspapers speculated that the recent steel price increase was a move preparatory to a return to the basing-point system, on the date when the Senate should adopt the conference report. It can now be said that this speculation was somewhat premature. Apparently convinced that the bill was now so bad that it would no longer be acceptable even to its most ardent Senate supporters, the Senate on January 20 sent the bill back to conference. It had become obvious that the definition of section 4 (d) as written by the conferees, would have the effect of not only creating an impossible burden of proof under section 2, but also under sections 3 and 7 of the Clayton Act. Section 7, you may remember, is that part of the Clayton Act for which we only last year passed the loophole-stopping antimerger bill, which is still pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee. To undo thus, with one stroke of the pen, the effort which we have made over many years to tighten up section 7 was more than even the bill's strongest supporters could accept.

Sponsors of the measure supported the recommittal because the Department of Justice had raised serious objection to the definition of the key phrase of the Robinson-Patman Act in section 4 (d) and wanted to restore the language originally reported from the House Judiciary Committee. The only change they suggested to the conferees is in that section.

The term "the effect may be" was to be defined that there should be "reasonable probability" of the specified effect.

SECOND CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1008

After the Senate, on January 20, sent S. 1008 back to conference, it was necessary for the House of Representatives to agree to the further conference requested by the Senate. The matter was brought before the House by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER] on February 28. I immeditaely asked unanimous consent, in view of the importance of the subject, to have the time for debate extended 30 minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] objected. Therefore, the total debate concerning the reappointment of conferees was of 1 hour's duration. Of that 1 hour the opponents of the bill were granted a total of 13 minutes, while the proponents of the bill, of course, consumed 47 minutes of the time allowed for debate.

Not only were there no public hearings on S. 1008, as it embodied the O'Mahoney substitute—which, to be exact, is a permanent moratorium on the antitrust laws—but the debate on the floor was inadequate. There was not sufficient debate on the floor of the House to allow examination of all the examples of mayhem which S. 1008 commits on the Fedtral Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

In the short time that I had on February 28 I tried to point out the inequality of opportunity which small-business opponents of the bill had had in trying to express their opposition. This inequality of opportunity applied equally, of course, to the farm groups, the labor groups, and the consumer groups, who had worked earnestly and hard to make themselves heard over the clamor of the proponents, with reverberations of clanking open-hearth steel furnaces and the noisy crushing of cement rock in the background. Despite the earnest efforts of the opponents of S. 1008, the House voted to send the bill back to conference.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] endeavored to restore his protecting small-business amendments which had been adopted in July by moving that the conferees be instructed to insist upon the House amendments. This motion was defeated on a tabling motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], with 76 Democrats and 135 Republicans voting to table and 141 Democrats and 19 Republicans voting against tabling.

SMALL BUSINESS CONTINUES THE FIGHT ON S. 1008

The second conference report came before the House on March 14. Meanwhile, however, having lost the first round on February 28 by 59 votes in the House, small business renewed its fight with vigor and determination. Once again they had valiant support from the farm, labor, and consumer organizations—organizations with a Nation-wide membership. Some of these groups were the Associated Retail Bakers of America, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Cooperative League of the United States, the International Association of Machinists, the National Association of Retail Druggists, National Candy Wholesalers Association, National Council of Petroleum Retailers, the National Farmers Union, the National Federation of Independent Business, the National Food Brokers Association, the National Grange, the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, and the United States Wholesale Grocers Association. State associations of retail grocers also voiced their opposition to the passage of S. 1008.

Why are small business, labor, the farmer, and the consumer, as represented by these Nation-wide organizations, so opposed to this bill? The answer appears to be a fundamental belief in our antitrust laws and a pronounced antipathy to the monopolistic forces which control many of our industries. Furthermore, it is, I believe, a sense of fairness which prompts these great organizations to oppose measures such as S. 1008. They do not believe in price discrimination and unfair trade practices, and they do not believe in an economy totally controlled by a set of artificial pricing systems. These groups did effective work in their efforts to save section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which will be destroyed by section 1 of S. 1008, and in saving the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, which would be effectively destroyed by sections 2 and 3 of this bill.

BIG BUSINESS ALSO BUSY

During this period between February 28 and March 14, the representatives of the Steel Trust, Cement Trust, and the Oil Trust were also busy. This powerful lobby, which now seems to have effective help from the financial management controlling the eastern railroads as well as from the chemical combines and other self-seeking groups, put on an intensive campaign. The trade journals and certain newspapers favoring big-business tactics were filled with articles pressing for the passage of S. 1008.

GAINS MADE BY OPPONENTS OF S. 1008 IN HOUSE VOTE ON MARCH 14

When the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] called up the second conference report on March 14, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] asked unanimous consent to extend the debate one-half hour beyond the usual hour. Objection was again made to any extension in the time of debate. Again the opponents of the bill could only hit the high spots during the debate. However, during the course of the debate, one of the real purposes of the bill was frankly stated by one of its proponents. That purpose, as stated, was the reestablishment of the basing-point system and the continued desire to concentrate most of our steel production within a small circumscribed geographical area.

Several attempts, in addition to that of Mr. BOGGS, were made during the course of the debate in the House on March 14 to extend the time of the debate. Each request met an objection. Members from the South and West pointed out the injury to those sections which had taken place in the past under the basing-point system as practiced by heavy industries, and others in the short time available endeavored to press home the points of injury to small business by the emasculation of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Robinson-Patman Act. Members from the West and South were accused of being selfish because they wanted industry to thrive in their areas and because they wanted their constituents to be relieved permanently of artificial pricing systems in our basic industries. Although the House debate was short, it did serve to clear the atmosphere to some extent, and it permitted Members for the first time to listen to frank admissions of the desire to continue to concentrate, particularly the steel industry, within a very small area of our country.

FIFTEEN VOTES WOULD HAVE CHANGED THE RESULT IN THE HOUSE ON S. 1008

Had the debate continued and all of the available information been given to the Members of the House, I am sure the result would have been different. As it was, 15 votes would have changed the result on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] to recommit the conference report on S. 1008 to the committee of conference. The vote for recommittal was 175 yeas and 204 nays. One hundred and fifty-four Democrats and twenty Republicans voted to recommit, while 132 Republicans and 72 Democrats voted against Mr. CARROLL's motion to recommit. Sixteen Democrats were paired for recommittal, while 7 Democrats and 9 Republicans were paired against recommittal. Thus the conference report was adopted by the House, and future action was in the hands of the Senate. On April 10, a motion was made by the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Mr. MCCARRAN, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on S. 1008. The motion was defeated 36 to 35. Twenty-seven Democrats and nine Republicans voted against taking up the conference report, and 11 Democrats and 24 Republicans voted in the affirmative. This vote is significant although not conclusive as a guide to future Senate action. In making an analysis of the vote, one must conclude that certain of the Senators voting to consider the conference report and certain others voting against consideration will in all probability be found for or against the report when a vote on the report itself is taken.

It is more significant, however, that in the House vote the opponents of S. 1008 had made great gains over any previous vote. It is equally clear that as time has elapsed both the membership of the House and of the Senate have a better understanding of the destructive force to our antitrust laws embodied in the bill, S. 1008. To this better understanding a large measure of the credit must go to small business and its friends in their unrelenting fight to prevent the destruction of our antitrust laws and to upset a long line of court decisions upholding those laws. The organizations

mentioned above, arrayed on the side of small business and free enterprise, have met the forces of greed and monopoly and have stopped them in their tracks.

WILL SMALL BUSINESS WIN ITS BATTLE ON S. 1008 IN THE SENATE?

Several times since April 10, discussion has taken place as to when S. 1008 will come up for consideration. As a privileged matter, a motion can be made at any time to bring up S. 1008. However, when such a motion is made, in all probability a vote will be taken on the question. A great many Senators publicly and privately have indicated a growing opposition to the bill. It is expected that, if the required number of votes are found to bring the conference report before the Senate for consideration, the debate will be long and exhaustive. The debate in the Senate should be long. The debate in the Senate should be extensive and informative, because we have had no public hearings on the measure and little debate in either the House or the Senate in view of the issues involved in this legislation. The conference report on S. 1008 I hope will be voted down. If the proponents of this type of legislation insist upon pressing it for passage, the appropriate committees of the House and Senate should conduct public hearings of sufficient length to allow the opponents of such legislation to have their day in court. It may be worthy to reiterate that the one and only chance which small business has had to voice its opposition was in the hearings of the Small Business Committee of the House, entitled "Small Business Objections on Basing Point Legislation, Particularly S. 1008," which were not concluded because of the haste in which the O'Mahoney bill was catapulted to the floor of the House for consideration last July.

The efforts to prevent the passage of S. 1008 have been long and arduous. It is a fight that small business should not have had to make. It is a fight in which small business should not have been forced to call upon its friends in the farm, labor, and consumer organizations for aid. It has been a fight in which the money, power, and propaganda of the privileged interests have been pitted against the home-town merchant and manufacturer and their customers.

MONEY, POWER, AND PROPAGANDA PITTED AGAINST HOME-TOWN MERCHANT

It is my belief that it will create an unhappy situation for the sponsors of this legislation should it become law. Without in anywise reflecting on the sincerity of purpose or the high motives of the sponsors of S. 1008, it is my conviction that, should the bill become law, within a period of a few years the structure of our antitrust laws will have been so weakened and wrecked that the progress we have made in the past 50 years will be for naught.

Many Senators have aptly warned that this is a bad bill. At almost every stage of its course through Congress it has come out a worse bill than before. It is my sincere hope that, when the conference report does come before the Senate, it will reject it for what it is—the most destructive piece of antitrust legislation ever to come before the Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CASE of South Dakota (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of important business.

To Mr. LARCADE, for 5 days, on account of attending Democratic State Central Committee meeting in Louisiana.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5472. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, May 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1430. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 9, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Hatton Creek, Wicomico River, on western shore of Maryland, in the vicinity of Rock Point, Charles County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1431. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the development of improved commercial transport aircraft by providing for operation, testing, and modification thereof"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1432. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1433. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1948 (Public Law 774); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2811. An act to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters; with amendment (Rept. No. 2017). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6826. A bill to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604) for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1145. An act for the relief of Persephone Poulios; without amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER. Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth; without amendment (Rept. No. 2007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2258. An act for the relief of Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis; without amendment (Rept. No. 2008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2308. An act for the relief of William Alfred Bevan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2427. An act for the relief of Masae Marumoto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2431. An act for the relief of Sumiko Kato; without amendment (Rept. No. 2011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgette Ponsard; without amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2479. An act for the relief of A. D. Strenger and his wife Claire Strenger;

without amendment (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2568. An act for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon; without amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6482. A bill for the relief of Antonio Artolozaga Euscola; with amendment (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 8389. A bill to provide for the construction of post-office buildings in local communities where the residents purchase bonds in an amount sufficient to finance the construction cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 8390. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota which were damaged or destroyed by recent floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 8391. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the armed forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 5 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 8392. A bill designating September 2 of each year as Victory Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 8393. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8394. A bill for the relief of Dodge County, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 8395. A bill to provide for site acquisition and construction of a general medical and surgical Veterans' Administration hospital at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8396. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 8397. A bill for the relief of Phil (Triantaphyllos) P. Petrou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 8398. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 8399. A bill for the relief of Calcedonio Tagliarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8400. A bill for the relief of Shizue Sawai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 8401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maurice N. Goss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 8402. A bill for the relief of Maj. Thomas H. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 8403. A bill for the relief of T. H. Richardson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. Res. 588. Resolution for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2105. Mr. HAGEN presented a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Food Retailers Association, St. Paul, Minn., petitioning for sound Federal and State fiscal policies, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

MAY 6, 1950.

I hereby designate Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the great source and inspiration of the true, the beautiful, and the good, we pray that Thou wilt create within us and in the heart of all mankind a more Christlike spirit.

Thou hast endowed us with wonderful moral and spiritual capacities. May they be brought to fulfillment and fruition.

Help us realize that when, as individuals or a nation, we transgress Thy righteous laws and commandments we do not break them, for they cannot be broken, but we break ourselves, for "he that sinneth wrongeth his own soul."

Inspire us with a steadfast loyalty to the ideals and principles which Thou hast ordained for the peace and prosperity of the world.

Wilt Thou bless our beloved Speaker and the members of his bereaved family with the consolations of Thy grace.

We are sending them our thoughts of love and sympathy through the God of all consolation. In Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE JAMES RAYBURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair requests the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to take the chair.

Mr. SABATH assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce the death of the Speaker's brother, James Rayburn.

The Speaker left last night to return to his home in Bonham, Tex. I know I express the sentiments of the House when I say we deeply regret the sorrow that has come to the Speaker and his family. They have our deepest sympathy.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Texas delegation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation, we would like to extend our deep sympathy and understanding to the Speaker and other members of his family in the loss of his oldest brother, Jim.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Republicans in the House, I want to join the Texas delegation in expressing our heartfelt sympathy to the Speaker and his family in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Democratic Members of the House, I join with the Texas delegation in the expression of sympathy to our beloved Speaker in the death of his brother, and extend to the widow of his brother and his late brother's family, to the Speaker and his brothers and sisters, our profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point on the death of the brother of our beloved Speaker, and that they may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed unhappy upon learning that our beloved Speaker's brother, James Rayburn, had passed into eternity. I know that I am expressing the sentiments of the Illinois delegation as well as every Member of this great body in saying that we all profoundly regret this sad happening.

I know that our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, feels keenly about the loss of his older brother, and we extend to him our deep-felt sympathy.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Texas delegation and a long-time friend of our beloved Speaker, I feel with unusual keenness the sorrow that has come to him and his family.

The Rayburn family is particularly close-knit. They have never lost in any slight degree the devotion which was taught them from infancy.

Knowing of this affection for one another, I realize how deeply they must feel in this loss. Each one has my profound sympathy.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the absent Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 589).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD administered the oath of office as Speaker pro tempore to Mr. MCCORMACK.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the enforced absence of the Speaker and of a large number of other Members of the House, I think we should not continue this measure today. I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion to permit the submission of consent requests?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the motion.

PERMITTING FREE ENTRY OF ARTICLES FOR EXHIBITION AT FIRST UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR, INC., CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 466) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., from August 7 to August 20, 1950, inclusive, by the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing or maintaining foreign exhibits at the said trade fair, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said trade fair to sell within the area of the trade fair any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure the duties if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said trade fair under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, sec. 1524).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a report on House Joint Resolution 466 explaining the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the report and statement (H. J. Res. 466, Rept. No. 2016) submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means is as follows:

PERMITTING FREE ENTRY OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXHIBITION AT THE FIRST UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR, INC., CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. DOUGHTON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 466) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

This joint resolution follows the pattern of previous legislation enacted by the Congress in connection with various international exhibitions, expositions, and fairs held in the United States. It has long been the policy of the Congress to facilitate the participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at these expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The First United States International Trade Fair is to be held at Chicago, Ill., from August 7 to August 20, 1950, inclusive, by the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc. This corporation, in the interest of greater international collaboration in the interchange of newly developed products, will assemble a number of industrial products made in the various countries of the world for the purpose of educating the American people concerning these item.

The joint resolution provides that the imported articles shall not be subject to marking requirements of the general tariff laws except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States. Articles so admitted may be lawfully sold at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

It is understood that the interested Government agencies are in favor of enactment of the joint resolution. The language of the resolution is identical in terms with that approved in earlier legislation providing for the free importation of goods for display at other expositions or world fairs.

RELIEF NEEDS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I note in the press this morning the President recommends another loaning and spending program. This time guaranteed long-term loans to very small business. If the President should stop the destruction of small business his administration has brought about through high taxes, that is the relief small business needs and would appreciate.

The all-wise doctors of this administration think they have found a unique way to help business. "The doctors of

the Treasury Department bleed the patient to cure its ills, while the doctors of the RFC give the patient economic transfusion. The trouble is that the Treasury Department and the administration are so enthusiastic in bleeding the patient through the tax process they take out more than the input coming from the RFC. The patient lingers and dies."

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 51, noes 44.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. A quorum is not necessary on a motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 98, nays 170, not voting 162, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—98

Allen, Calif.	Hale	O'Hara, Minn.
Allen, La.	Hall,	Passman
Andersen,	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
H. Carl	Hall,	Rains
Anderson, Calif.	Leonard W.	Rankin
Andrews	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Arends	Hare	Rees
Auchincloss	Hart	Rich
Bates, Mass.	Harvey	Rivers
Bennett, Mich.	Hedrick	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Herlong	Rogers, Mass.
Bishop	Herter	St. George
Blackney	Heselton	Sanborn
Boggs, Del.	Hill	Scudder
Boggs, La.	Hobbs	Shafer
Bramblett	Hoffman, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Brehm	Hope	Smith, Va.
Brown, Ga.	Jackson, Calif.	Taber
Burleson	Jenkins	Talle
Chiperfield	Jennings	Teague
Christopher	Jensen	Thomas
Clevenger	Johnson	Thompson
Cole, Kans.	Jones, N. C.	Tollefson
Colmer	Keating	Vinson
Curtis	Kerr	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	Kilburn	Wadsworth
Dondero	Lucas	Wigglesworth
Durham	Martin, Mass.	Williams
Fellows	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Gathings	Meyer	Wilson, Tex.
Gillette	Michener	Wolverton
Goodwin	Miller, Md.	Wood
Gossett	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
Graham	Nelson	

NAYS—170

Abernethy	Burdick	Elliott
Addonizio	Burke	Ellsworth
Albert	Burnside	Elston
Andresen,	Byrnes, Wis.	Engel, Mich.
August H.	Camp	Evins
Angell	Chelf	Fallon
Aspinall	Chesney	Feighan
Bailey	Cole, N. Y.	Fernandez
Baring	Combs	Fisher
Barrett, Wyo.	Cooper	Flood
Battle	Cotton	Forand
Beckworth	Crawford	Frazier
Bennett, Fla.	Crook	Fugate
Blatnik	Cunningham	Furcolo
Bolling	Davis, Tenn.	Garmatz
Bolton, Md.	Davis, Wis.	Gary
Bosone	Denton	Gavin
Breen	D'Ewart	Gordon
Brooks	Dolliver	Gore
Bryson	Donohue	Gregory
Buchanan	Doughton	Gross
Buckley, Ill.	Eberharter	Hagen
Hand	McMillan, S. C.	Potter
Harden	Mack, Ill.	Poulson
Harris	Mack, Wash.	Preston
Hays, Ark.	Magee	Rabaut
Hébert	Mahon	Richlman
Hinshaw	Mansfield	Rodino
Hoeven	Marsalis	Rooney
Hoffman, Mich.	Martin, Iowa	Sabath
Holmes	Miller, Nebr.	Scrivner
Huber	Mills	Secrest
Hull	Mitchell	Shelley
Irving	Monroney	Sheppard
Jackson, Wash.	Morris	Short
Jones, Ala.	Murdock	Sikes
Judd	Murray, Wis.	Spence
Karst	Nicholson	Staggers
Karsten	Norblad	Steed
Kean	Norrell	Stefan
Kearney	O'Brien, Ill.	Sullivan
Keefe	O'Brien, Mich.	Sutton
King	O'Hara, Ill.	Tackett
Kirwan	O'Konski	Thornberry
Lanham	O'Neill	Trimble
LeCompte	O'Sullivan	Van Zandt
Lemke	O'Toole	Velde
Lesinski	Pace	Vorys
Lind	Patman	Welch
Lyle	Patten	Whitaker
McCarthy	Perkins	Whittington
McCormack	Peterson	Wier
McCulloch	Phillips, Calif.	Wilson, Okla.
McDonough	Phillips, Tenn.	Withrow
McGrath	Pickett	Yates
McGregor	Poage	Young
McKinnon	Polk	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—162

Abbitt	Grant	Noland
Allen, Ill.	Green	Norton
Barden	Gwinn	Patterson
Barrett, Pa.	Hardy	Pfeifer,
Bates, Ky.	Harrison	Joseph L.
Beall	Havenner	Pfeiffer,
Blemiller	Hays, Ohio	William L.
Bolton, Ohio	Heffernan	Philbin
Bonner	Heller	Powell
Boykin	Holifield	Price
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Priest
Buckley, N. Y.	Howell	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Ramsay
Burton	James	Redden
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Jenison	Regan
Cannon	Jonas	Rhodes
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Ribicoff
Carnahan	Kearns	Richards
Carroll	Kee	Roosevelt
Case, N. J.	Kelley, Pa.	Sadlak
Case, S. Dak.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadowski
Cavalcante	Kennedy	Sasscer
Celler	Keogh	Saylor
Chatham	Kilday	Scott, Hardie
Chudoff	Klein	Scott,
Clemente	Kruse	Hugh D., Jr.
Cooley	Kunkel	Simpson, Ill.
Corbett	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Larcade	Sims
Cox	Latham	Smathers
Crosser	LeFevre	Smith, Ohio
Dague	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Wis.
Davenport	Linehan	Stanley
Davies, N. Y.	Lodge	Stigler
Dawson	Lovre	Stockman
Deane	Lynch	Tauriello
DeGraffenried	McConnell	Taylor
Delaney	McGuire	Towe
Dingell	McMillen, Ill.	Underwood
Dollinger	McSweeney	Wagner
Douglas	Macy	Walsh
Doyle	Madden	Walter
Eaton	Marcantonio	Weichel
Engle, Calif.	Marshall	Werdel
Fenton	Merrow	Wheeler
Fogarty	Miles	White, Calif.
Ford	Miller, Calif.	White, Idaho
Fulton	Morgan	Whitten
Gamble	Morrison	Wickersham
Gilmer	Morton	Widnall
Golden	Moulder	Willis
Gorski	Multer	Winstead
Granahan	Murphy	Wolcott
Granger	Nixon	Woodhouse

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Priest with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Cannon with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Stanley with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Celler with Mr. James.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Wolcott.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Case of New Jersey.
Mr. Harrison with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Tauriello with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Corbett.
Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Redden with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Lovre.
Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Carroll with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.
Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Messrs. BURDICK, CUNNINGHAM, and HINSHAW changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is the third week of debate by the House on the over-all omnibus appropriation bill which calls for an expenditure of more than $29,000,000,000. The debate will continue for at least another week.

Final result? My guess is that when the House and Senate get through with this bill it will provide for the spending of more of your dollars than when it hit the floor of the House.

If there ever was an honest-to-goodness economy drive by this Congress, it has not only stalled, but is sliding backward. That is bad news for you but you might just as well have it.

If there is anyone in these United States of ours who does not know that unless the Federal Government mends its ways, it is riding for a fall—and a bad one, too—then he has been paying no attention to national affairs.

Every day that the sun sets, your Government has spent around a million dollars more than it had, and it borrowed

the money to do that spending. If you followed that policy you would go broke and so will the Government when it has taxed everyone so much that the gross return from taxation begins to dwindle. There are indications now that no matter how much the Government may increase the tax rate, the total take is going to be less. The more the tax collector takes out of you, the less you will have left out of which to meet your tax bill.

If you can't figure that one out, just talk with any businessman, farmer, or anyone else who, by experience, has learned that if you pile too much on the wagon—if you can remember that far back—the horses just cannot pull the load.

The answer, do I hear you ask?

Well, if, when you wake up tomorrow morning, you decide to go somewhere, you know very well you will never get there unless you start.

The administration and those in control of both the Senate and the House show not the slightest indications of making any real economy move—by that is meant that here in Washington where the appropriations are made, as day after day the Congress meets, instead of making a start and cutting the spending, spending is increasing. Again, that is bad news, but there it is.

Now, are you angry, disgusted, and do you feel thwarted? If you want something done, then you had just better keep on boiling and seething inside until an opportunity rolls around for you to get someone else to run your business, for the present crew does not propose to quit deficit spending, make an effort to balance the budget, or even to give you real efficiency for the money you pay.

When you get a chance to select some new hired men, do not forget to use it and do not forget to separate the goats from the sheep. Just keep your eye on the record and then get yourselves an outfit, including a big boss who will put this country back on a sound, going basis.

It is your country, it is your business—and the Federal Government is big business—but it is not going to run itself, and you do the hiring and the firing.

Do not blame and fire those who are serving you well and faithfully; just get rid of the indolent and incompetent hired men.

Keep those who have the courage to do what they know to be the right thing.

CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, while we are in the midst of the debate on the appropriation bill, and discussing possible economies to be effected, I should like to call to the attention of the Members a letter I have addressed to the Postmaster General suggesting the adoption of a new policy with respect to the construction of Federal buildings. The letter follows and speaks for itself. I will be pleased to have the comments of Members of the House upon it.

MAY 3, 1950.

Hon. JESSE M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In a great many communities throughout the Nation there is an urgent need for new post offices and Federal buildings, the construction of which were delayed during the war years. Congress has recognized this need and last year authorized the beginning of a construction program. About $70,000,000 have been appropriated for the drafting of plans and the acquisition of sites. Before the program is completed it will be necessary for Congress to appropriate many hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of the buildings.

With the Government operating at a deficit and unable to balance its budget, I am concerned about the possibility of Congress refusing to appropriate the necessary funds quickly enough to meet the needs. Therefore, I am writing you to ask that you give consideration to the adoption by the Government of a policy of permitting private enterprise to construct these facilities and lease them to the Government. Such a policy would have certain definite advantages.

First, it would eliminate the necessity of Congress appropriating and the Government spending many hundred millions of dollars (perhaps several billions in the final analysis) for construction of the facilities. In other words, the huge initial outlay of funds at the time when the Government is having financial worries would be eliminated.

Secondly, the total cost to the Government over a period of time would be considerably less. That is the opinion of private builders to whom I have talked. It is also the opinion of those in your own Department with whom I have discussed this problem. The standard of construction for public buildings is much higher than for others. In fact that standard has been so high in some instances that public buildings have become outmoded before their full useful life has been reached.

Thirdly, the buildings leased for postal and other Federal purposes would be kept on the local tax rolls. The Federal Government could reduce its real-estate holdings, which have grown to an alarming figure. These holdings are not taxable and local governments have lost tax revenues to a point where they are unable to meet their own costs. As a matter of fact there are several bills pending before Congress providing for payments in lieu of taxes to meet this situation.

Finally, the communities which need the new facilities so desperately would obtain them much quicker.

It is possible that your Department has given consideration to this proposal in years past. Nevertheless, it strikes me that it is worthy of renewed consideration at this time in view of present conditions. The buildings, of course, would be constructed according to the specifications and requirements of your Department.

I would appreciate your comments upon this suggestion.

Very truly yours,

THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered at the fortieth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington on Friday, March 24, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by Glenn McCarthy to the combined service clubs of Gainesville, Tex., on April 19, 1950.

Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. ENGEL of Michigan) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by the president of the Dow Chemical Co., entitled "Twelve O'clock Noon."

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Antihistamines Fail on Colds, Army Service Tests Show."

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Star on rent control.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short speech by the president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial and two articles.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters in reference to the cut of the critical appropriation at Kings Point Coast Guard Academy in New York and the short-sightedness of that cut.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia, notwithstanding the fact that it may exceed two pages of the RECORD.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to include extraneous matter in the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and in one to include an article from the Chicago Daily News on the acute housing shortage in Chicago.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Mr. Raymond Mathews.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a memorial adopted by the New York State Assembly and other extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. WILLIAMS asked and were given permission to revise and extend the remarks they expect to make in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter and statistics.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VIII. EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES

The CHAIRMAN. Before rising on yesterday the Committee agreed to limit debate on the Thomas amendment and all amendments thereto and to the entire paragraph dealing with maritime training to 1 hour, the last 8 minutes to be reserved to the Committee. There are now remaining 17¾ minutes of debate, 8 minutes of which are reserved to the Committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. THOMAS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have been rather disappointed at the approach which has been made to this set-up and to this problem. This item appears on page 1104 of the hearings. Just think of it. This is supposed to be a training program for marines who will ultimately become officers. This is supposed to be a program for the training of marine officers, and what do we get? A total of 1,842 civilian employees to train over-all approximately 800 students, and of those 1,842 employees, 1,083 are set up for the bureau in the District of Columbia. It is the most ridiculous thing you can imagine. The idea of having more than a couple of hundred civilian employees for that kind of a set-up.

If this were approached on a business basis and a fair basis I should not object to the elimination of that surplus and ridiculous number of employees in the bureau in Washington and the setting up of the continuance of the training on a basis where these men might have some kind of allowances in the schools.

The school at Kings Point is probably the largest of the lot. There they have a set-up of 883 students with 363 instructors. That is not so bad. Some of these other set-ups are on a specialized basis and are not so bad. But this idea of having 1,083 employees in the District of Columbia is ridiculous. The amount for personal services in the District of Columbia, in my opinion, should be reduced at least to $700,000.

I think we are approaching this thing altogether wrong. I think there is money enough in the appropriation, if it were properly distributed, to take care of the real needs of the trainees. I hope the Committee will not vote for these amendments that increase this amount and keep that ridicuous number of civilian employees in Washington.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the debate concerning the various ramifications of the Maritime Commission leaves me very much puzzled. Some strange charges and countercharges have been passed and now, after reflecting on the entire procedure, I still wonder exactly what motives may lie behind it all.

Knowing intimately the leaders of both sides, I immediately dismiss from my mind any thought of personal prejudice or vindictiveness, as the motive of anyone.

I would think it could be an antipathy for subsidies and yet it is well recognized that every maritime nation subsidizes its merchant fleet. Certainly, the United States with its high scale of living could hardly be expected to compete without subsidies. No one will deny that the Maritime Commission has had its unfortunate experience since the war. They have been loose in their administration; and in common with many other Federal and private agencies during the war years and those immediately afterward they have had trouble with personnel.

Admittedly, the members of the Maritime Commission have not seen eye to eye and the many evidences of their internal disorder have led to widespread doubts and misgivings especially among those of us who must lean on them for competent and authoritative advice. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that the House seems determined in the name of economy to take steps which may cripple the merchant marine of the United States at a time when international relationships are on the most critical basis in the lifetime of anyone of us.

The merchant marine is a vital part of our national defense and if we permit it to deteriorate now, it may very well be that we will be unable in the event of war to transport our troops and supplies across the seas and to the shores of the aggressor nation. This would simply mean that by our action in crippling the merchant marine we are condemning the United States to fight the next war on our own soil.

I hold no brief for the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 except that it has established a merchant marine and except, too, that it was drawn by the master hand of the late Schuyler Otis Bland of Virginia, than whom there has never been a finer patriot in Congress. I do not believe there is anything wrong with his law that cannot be adjusted through the normal procedure of amendment and I believe that anyone who would seek to intelligently modify it would be cordially received by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of which I am a member.

I hope that all Members of Congress when they consider this matter in any of its ramifications will bear in mind that if they deteriorate or seriously cripple the merchant marine they are condemning this Nation to a fight on the home grounds in the next war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the Members on the splendid manner and the high order on which they have conducted this debate. On behalf of your humble servants on the committee, we want to thank you for the courtesy with which you have treated us. After all, we are just your servants. When there is any difference of opinion between our colleagues and your committee, I want to say on behalf of the committee we love you for your difference of opinion and we respect you for it. Whatever you gentlemen do, whatever your decision is, your committee is going to take it with a smile. Let me see if I can be of any help to you. I want to summarize what this is all about and give you the facts without any fanfare. In the first place the committee offered an amendment which would reduce this appropriation by $378,200 which covers a pay increase for 524 persons who are engaged in teaching and in the general work of the maritime training schools. We offered that as a committee amendment for the reason we were given to believe at the time we considered this item of a salary increase that these civilian employees were included under the terms of the Military Pay Increase Act which passed the House last session. On further investigation I called in our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], who sponsored that bill, and followed it through the House. He said unequivocally, and if there is any doubt about it he may be present and he can speak for himself, that it was not the intention of the committee to include the personnel of the maritime training service in this pay-increase bill; that they had not appeared before the committee and had not asked to appear before the committee. In all fairness I must say there is some loose language in the old Maritime Act of 1936 which gives the Maritime Commission doubtful authority to increase their pay along with the Coast Guard. With that in mind and for the reason that we were not a legislative committee and that neither our friends on the legislative committee in the House or the Subcommittee on Appropriations had ever considered it, we therefore move to strike

it out. Then came the Boggs amendment which will nullify the committee amendment and add $2,500,000. Then there came the amendment of the gentleman from New York which merely struck out the limitation and fortified the Boggs amendment. That is the legislative picture as it stands.

Let us talk about dollars and cents now and get the facts there. Your committee has not done a thing in the world but support the budget estimate as to these schools. The school at Pass Christian which is an officers' school, and the school at St. Petersburg, Fla., which gives skilled rating training, have been closed for between 30 and 60 days. Many of the personnel of the officers' school has been moved to Kings Point, N. Y., and some of the other personnel have been moved to Sheepshead Bay and perhaps some of them to Alameda, Calif. Under the committee bill, as it has been presented to you, you are giving these cadet officers a free education; you are paying for their house rent and schooling; you are paying for their food and for their books and uniforms to the extent of about $3,200,000 a year. Now comes the Boggs amendment and not satisfied with that free will offering, it seeks to give each one of these cadets in addition to free tuition, uniforms, clothing, food, rent, and books, $65 a month. Now there is your picture. Of course, that will cost, including restoration of the schools at Pass Christian and St. Petersburg, an additional $2,500,000, which is not now included in the budget.

Let us examine into the need for this. We have been hearing talk about economy. Yes, everybody is for economy but not in this particular instance. We have heard many statements to the effect: "Why, my record is as good as anybody's on the floor so far as economy goes, but this is not the place." We are all for it, but do not touch too close to home. Well, I cannot fall out with that. Perhaps I would do the same thing, even though I live in the third largest seaport town in America.

Now let us see about the need. In the first place, proponents are trying to make this comparable with Annapolis and West Point. Of course, those boys in Annapolis and West Point are under compulsion of law to remain in the service. These cadets have no obligation in the world to give 5 minutes of their time after they have received a free education at the expense of the taxpayers, to serve the United States in any shape, form, or fashion. They go into the Naval Reserve for 2 years, but that means nothing. There is no legal obligation on them to serve.

Here is the record, but I will not burden you with reading it all. There are now 15,000 of these young men. In the fiscal year 1950, out of 15,000, 300 will be called into active service for 14 days, and perhaps 300 for duty in the Navy for a somewhat longer period.

Now, they say, "Here are a lot of poor boys and they are entitled to this." There is not a Member on this floor who does not get letters every day from poor boys who write like this: "I want to go to college next year. Are there any Government agencies that will loan me some money like the Government used to under NYA? I will pay that money back." Of course they will pay it back, but your answer to them is just one thing: "Son, I am sorry there is not a governmental agency that will loan you any money to go to school on." He has not asked you for a free ride. He wants to borrow it, and he will pay it back. All of you have dozens of letters every week from worthy boys who want to go to medical college or dental schools, not free of charge. They just want to borrow a little money. They will pay it back. You have to write them and tell them there is no governmental agency that will loan them any money. There are lawyers and engineers in the same position. How can we go back home and look those deserving boys in the eye and tell them that we cannot loan them any money, even though they are not asking for a free ride? Yet with this group of fine boys, we are not making a loan to them—no, we are paying for their uniforms, their books, and so forth, giving them free education for 4 years and then giving them $65 a month in addition to that, without any legal obligation to serve the taxpayers one day after they get it for free.

Now, gentlemen, there is the picture. Is there any need for this? The Maritime Commission is as tender on this point as a sore boil in your nose. When you ask them how many of these boys ever go on a boat and serve in the Maritime Service, they do not know. They cannot tell you. They will duck and dodge. I am not saying that they are withholding any facts, but there is no man who knows anything about this who will tell you that as many as 20 percent of them ever see a ship after they get that free education. They go into other activities. It is all for free.

Admiral Knight, the head of this maritime-training service, gave you about all the information he could. He was being honest about it. Here is what he said, on page 220 of the report:

> Further demand for our graduates has lessened. There is unemployment in the merchant marine today. A number of ships have been laid up. A number of ships that have been chartered have been returned, and there will be continuing reduction in the Navy.

We do not get the entire picture until we realize that there are thousands of men on the beach today who cannot get jobs in the shipping industry, yet you want to turn on the faucet of the taxpayers' money to train more men to enter this overcrowded field.

Do you realize that in addition to these schools there are four other very famous schools conducted by States, and that some of the schools are very old? For instance, New York has a maritime training school which is 76 years old; Massachusetts, a school which is 57 years old; California has a school that was commissioned in 1931, and Maine has a school that dates from 1941, training men for the command of ships or for the filling of important posts on ships.

Bear in mind that in addition to the appropriation now under consideration that is going to cost the taxpayers $2,543,000 over and above the budget recommendation, we give to their State schools $50,000 each per year, and in addition we give an allowance for each cadet-midshipman amounting to $475 at these State schools, which, for 710 cadets, would amount to about $340,000 in the fiscal year 1951. And these 710 cadets will be added to the ranks of the unemployed in the merchant marine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Boggs of Louisiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the motion on the ground that it is a dilatory motion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order against the motion that no amendment has been adopted since the last such motion was disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that while it is true that no amendment has been adopted and there has been no alteration in the bill since the last motion to strike out the enacting clause was disposed of, nevertheless this is a different day.

The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order made by the gentleman from New York would not lie against the motion.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the gentleman has not stated that he is opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the gentleman from Louisiana is not qualified to offer the motion. The Chair will endeavor to qualify the gentleman.

Is the gentleman from Louisiana opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman qualifies.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill in its present form. On yesterday we debated this matter for several hours. In the course of that debate 15 or 20 Members of this body rose in support of the amendment which I offered as amended by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL]. Included in those who supported the amendment as amended were members of the subcommittee who conducted hearings on this proposed legislation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I merely wish to say that I do not want that to be misunderstood. Of the five members of the subcommittee, three intended to vote for this amendment. I see one is not on the floor today.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. Of

the five members of the subcommittee three are intending to vote for my amendment. In addition, only two members have risen in opposition to this amendment, and those two gentlemen do not agree among themselves.

My good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made the astonishing statement that there were 1,083 people involved in this program in Washington.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I refuse to yield.

Immediately following that the gentleman from Texas rose and said that there were 540 people employed in the program all over the United States. What my good friend from New York was really referring to was all of the civilian employees of the Maritime Commission working here in the District of Columbia, and not the employees of this program.

Mr. Chairman, the issue involved here is very simple and very clear.

The issue involved is whether or not in peacetime we are willing to spend a few dollars to maintain an American merchant marine, that is all. The gentleman from Texas has very frankly admitted in debate on yesterday that he is opposed to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but I say in all seriousness, and if you will study the proposal, I am certain you will agree with me that without the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 we would not have an American fleet on the seas today. He wants to junk it. He objects to the fact it is operated by private enterprise. I say the only alternative to private enterprise is Government operation and Government operation rather than costing a few million dollars for training and a few additional million dollars for operating and construction differentials, will cost many, many hundreds of millions of dollars.

The gentleman from Texas complains about the fact that these young men who graduate from these institutions do not necessarily have to enter the merchant fleet. In answer to that, I say that is because it is a private fleet. The only way that the gentleman from Texas could change that situation would be to militarize the American merchant marine. If he wants to do that, and if he wants to debate that honestly on the floor and change the basic law, let us do it that way, but let us not do it by this back-door method.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at my amendment for just a moment which the gentleman considers a raid on the Treasury. I say that the gentleman has swallowed a camel and choked on a gnat, or whatever the saying is. The amendment involves but $2,000,000. It is a million dollars less than was approved by this Congress last year. The whole program involves about $5,000,000, including what the gentleman from Texas has already put in his bill.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity and with every ounce of conviction at my disposal, are we in this country, after we vote fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen billion dollars for the armed services, and we will have a new request for $350,000,000 additional, going to choke over an amendment calling for a continuation of a vital program which cost, in its totality, $5,000,000?

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be agreed to and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

(Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks just prior to the remarks of Mr. THOMAS.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished and able gentleman from Louisiana offered a motion in order to obtain 5 minutes additional time for debate. During that 5 minutes the gentleman did not answer one of the arguments made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. He did admit the truth of a few of the statements of the gentleman from Texas but refuted none.

This subcommittee under the leadership of the able gentleman from Texas has worked hard and has tried to bring about some reduction in unnecessary governmental expenses, and I say to you advisedly that I know of no reduction that this subcommittee has made that was made with more justification than in this item. Of course, I know that the hearts of my colleagues bleed for economy only they have difficulty finding someone willing to submit to it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it a fact that the schools at Pass Christian and in Florida have been closed, and the personnel dispersed to the other schools?

Mr. GORE. That is my understanding. And, I did not hear one iota of testimony to justify this sum which the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana seeks to add and refers to as a few dollars. Two million five hundred thousand dollars is not a few dollars to a taxpayer who has to dig down deep to get it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is a fact, is it not, that if the committee proposal is adopted and the Boggs amendment is voted down, that there will be schools maintained under this appropriation sufficient to take care of any demand that may exist?

Mr. GORE. Absolutely, and adequate and sufficient. The amendment would add an unnecessary burden upon a government already deep in debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL] to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana) there were—ayes 87, noes 51.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GORE and Mr. LEONARD W. HALL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 54.

So the amendment to the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana and Mr. THOMAS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 61.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For necessary expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, in carrying out the functions pursuant to all laws for which the Administration is charged with administering, including personal services in the District of Columbia; health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); purchase of 93 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and 1 without reference to the provisions of this or any other act; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); maintenance and operation of farms; recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained by the Veterans' Administration; expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration except burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended; aid to State or Territorial homes in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888, as amended (24 U. S. C. 134), for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; not to exceed $5,600 for newspapers and periodicals; payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); not to exceed $44,000 for the preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educational information and descriptive material, including the purchase or rental of equipment; and not to exceed $800,000 for research work in connection with prosthetic appliances; $875,847,795, together with not to exceed $179,000 of the unobligated balance of funds appropriated for this purpose in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, from which allotments and transfers may be made to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disbursement by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of 70 persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be

expended for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for the purchase of any hospital or home; and not more than $4,708,000 of this appropriation may be used to repair, alter, improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and the purchase of materials: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Administrator shall assign as his representatives, as provided for in the last sentence of section 1100 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 696f), only such numbers of regional or sectional representatives as he finds necessary to provide for the processing of readjustment allowances in an efficient and economical manner.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: On page 310, line 18, strike out the figures $875,847,795" and insert the figures "$925,847,795."

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to include $50,000,000 more for the operation of veterans' hospitals. I believe in economy. I want to balance the budget as fast as possible, but there are some obligations we have to meet, and veterans' hospitals come in that group. I do not propose to take from sick veterans the medical services promised them. My amendment is a test as to how you want to operate veterans' hospitals.

I have some information on this. We now have over 4,000 beds vacant because we cannot get doctors and nurses to operate them. In the next fiscal year we will have 5,420 more beds available under the new construction that will be finished in the next fiscal year. I have it from the highest authority in the medical service in the Veterans' Administration that we are not going to be able to operate these hospitals, even those we now have, with the money included in this bill.

The committee cut the budget estimate nearly $12,000,000. We members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee have been trying for a great many years to bring these hospitals up to the highest standard. A number of years ago it was charged by some writers that we had third-rate medicine. That was not true, but, unfortunately, the hospitals were not as good as we wanted them to be at that time. Your Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been working hard for years to strengthen the veterans' hospitals and bring them up to the point of greatest service and efficiency. We have found that it has been hard to get ample doctors and nurses to properly staff them and it has been hard to keep a sufficient staff of doctors and nurses. This is true partly because of the shortage of doctors and nurses all over the country, but it is true largely because of the fact that private practice is far more remunerative than Government service. We have been striving therefore to get adequate staffs and to keep them. In numerous veterans' hospitals I have personally urged the doctors and nurses to stay with the service. I am told now that many doctors are leaving the hospitals. They do not know what to depend upon. A budget was proposed that does not take care of the hospitals fully, and the doctors do not know what to depend upon. Some of the doctors are leaving now and more of them will leave later. Unless Congress provides enough money to properly take care of these hospitals, deterioration in service will logically follow. I have been in a great many veterans' hospitals and I know something about the problem we are facing, and I am merely seeking by this amendment to get the amount of money which the highest medical authority in the Veterans' Administration says he must have to run them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the able chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this the amount the Veterans' Administration says they need?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The highest authority on medical service in the Veterans' Administration told me this morning that the actual need ran to some $48,000,000 above what was included in this bill. I understand the whole matter was set forth before the Finance Committee in the other body a few days ago, clearly, by General Gray. I called over there this morning to see if the hearings had been printed, and they have not yet been printed. Therefore I cannot read the Senate hearings to you, but I am reliably informed that General Gray did testify over there and did ask for additional funds to operate the veterans' hospitals. Since the need has been made known to us by Dr. Magnuson in his message to me today, and since General Gray has clearly stated the need to the Senate committee, why should not this House do its duty and act now? It will probably be suggested that we should let the Senate act on the matter first, but here are the facts and our responsibility is now before us and no argument will excuse our failure to act now and do our part to see that these veterans' hospitals receive sufficient funds to operate properly.

Now, it is a simple question of whether you want to operate veterans' hospitals up to standard or whether you want to let them go along without adequate doctors, without nurses, without attendants, and without other help that they must have.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Your amendment is on line 18, page 310?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is right.

Mr. TACKETT. What does that provide under that same section on the first line on the following page, 311:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of 70 persons engaged in public relations work.

I was particularly interested in that proviso.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I do not know about that, but I may say to the gentleman that it has nothing to do with what I am trying to do in my amendment. My amendment seeks to do one thing and that is to provide the funds which the medical authorities in the Veterans Administration say is necessary to operate the hospitals up to the normal standard.

Mr. TACKETT. We would have to know that to know whether you need the additional money.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I have discussed this with the clerk of the committee which prepared this bill, and he advised me that this was the proper place to offer the amendment, because the paragraph starts:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services.

I am advised that this is the proper place to offer it.

Mr. RANKIN. Public relations has nothing to do with doctors and nurses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The Veterans' Administration is going to be told—get this, this is important—the Veterans' Administration is going to be told that it must use one-quarter of this fund each quarter. It cannot, therefore, be said by the able Chairman who may follow me that if necessary a deficiency will come next year. A deficiency appropriation next year will not answer the weakness at all, because if you are going to use 25 percent of the fund each quarter as I understand VA is going to be required to do, then it means that hospitals will be operating substandard the entire year.

I appeal to the members of this Committee not to let the veterans' hospitals down. As I stated, we have had a hard time keeping these doctors and nurses there. Many of them will go into private practice because they can make a lot more; they are leaving the hospitals now. With this program of reduced expenditures and substandard conditions you can expect more of the doctors and nurses to leave. The result will be substandard hospitals. I believe this Congress does not want to do that. Let us not fail these veterans now. Hospitals are put up to cure the veterans, if possible, and to help them when sick generally. Shall we properly staff these hospitals? Shall we give them the doctors, nurses, attendants, and other help necessary to operate them? Shall we operate them efficiently with the view of giving the veteran the best service we can? If you want to do that, you simply have not provided enough money in this bill to accomplish that purpose. We are told by the highest authority that it will take the additional sum provided in my amendment. I put the question squarely up to you as to whether you will give these hospitals the necessary funds or not. This bill does not do it. My amendment will do it. So far as I am concerned, I am going to stand by the

sick and disabled veteran in these hospitals, just as I have always done. I urge this House not to turn these veterans down.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the veterans' section close in 15 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I object to that. I think the Members ought to be present to hear this debate; this is very important. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that motion I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. RANKIN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 17, noes 58.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count on the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that a quorum is not present. [After counting.] One hundred and nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the section of the bill relating to veterans and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 30 minutes, the last 7 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

SPIRITUAL VALUES VERSUS BOMBS AND GUNS FOR WORLD PEACE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the world is sick and in trouble. The nations of the world are beset on every hand with problems which are taxing the brains of the wisest citizens of every nation to find a solution. In our own generation the world has been devastated by two world-wide conflicts of arms which have cost millions of lives and billions of dollars in treasure and left many nations bankrupt, not only in material goods but in spiritual values as well. Leaders of world thought are more and more coming to the conclusion that to settle the ills of the world we must draw upon spiritual values rather than material values and that we must build world peace by international agreements to outlaw war atomic and H-bombs while keeping strong our national defenses. Bombs and guns have been tried and have failed.

Our Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., yesterday at the opening of the session of the House delivered an inspiring prayer. May I repeat it here?

Most merciful and gracious God, we are coming unto Thee with needy and aspiring hearts. We penitently confess that our human nature is feeble and fickle.

At times our hearts are filled with love and good-will and then again with hatred and bitterness; at times we are magnanimous and considerate and then again so selfish and complacent; at times we are kind and merciful and then again so harsh and cruel.

Grant that the good within us may be victorious. May the soul of men and nations be regenerated by the Holy Spirit. Show us how we may build a nobler civilization, one that is aglow with faith in God and love for humanity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

Every session of the Congress of the United States is opened with prayer since the days of Benjamin Franklin, who on June 28, 1787, in support of his motion for the offering of prayers in the daily proceedings of the Constitutional Convention, said:

We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that, without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel: We shall be divided by our partial, local interests, our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages.

In the Holy Scripture it is written:

Righteousness exalteth a nation * * * and blessed is the nation whose god is the Lord * * * for except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.

The Quaker philosopher Thomas R. Kelly admonished us:

The deepest need of men is not food and clothing and shelter, important as they are. It is God. We have mistaken the nature of poverty, and thought of it as economic poverty. No; it is poverty of soul, deprivation of God's recreating, loving peace. Peer into poverty and see if we are really getting down to the deepest needs, in our economic salvation schemes. These are important. But they lie farther along the road, secondary steps toward world reconstruction. The primary step is a holy life, transformed and radiant in the glory of God.

The late President Woodrow Wilson, in reporting the armistice to the Congress at the ending of World War I, observed:

The present and all that it holds belongs to the nations and the peoples who preserve their self-control and the orderly processes of their governments; the future to those who prove themselves the true friends of mankind. To conquer with arms is to make only a temporary conquest; to conquer the world by earning its esteem is to make permanent conquest. I am confident that the nations that have learned the discipline of freedom and that have settled with self-possession to its ordered practice are now about to make the conquest of the world by the sheer power of example and of friendly helpfulness.

It is of interest to note that the Pulitzer prize-winning editorial of the year, written by Carl M. Saunders, of the Citizen Patriot, is based on the efficacy of prayer and the placing of first things first and that an appeal for peace should be made to the Omnipotent Master of the universe. I include the editorial in these remarks, which is as follows:

A year ago the Citizen Patriot proposed that a period during Memorial Day be set aside to pray for peace.

Our suggestion was approved by the Congress of the United States in the form of a resolution sponsored by Senator HOMER FERGUSON and Representative EARL C. MICHENER. The resolution called upon President Truman to proclaim a period of Memorial Day for prayers for peace.

The White House issued the proclamation. From Arlington Cemetery the chief of chaplains of the United States Army delivered the prayer for peace, the phrasing of which we proposed.

America, commemorating the memories of the men who have fallen on far-scattered battlefields that this Nation and its way of life might endure, prayed that further sacrifice of war be avoided.

What's more logical than that Memorial Day be marked by such a prayer for peace

We recite these circumstances only for the purpose of urging that again this year the President proclaim a period of Memorial Day as the proper occasion for Nation-wide supplication for peace.

Last year the original suggestion was made only 2 weeks before Memorial Day. This year we make the suggestion early enough to permit normal, routine procedure in Congress, and again we remind our readers that this is inspired only with realization that armaments and men alone cannot mold the shape of things to come in this world. First things should come first, and a nation which believes in God should not depend upon the materialism of earth to save it from the great tragedy of war.

We repeat in part the editorial of last May:

"The United States is generally classified as a 'Christian nation.'

"If it means anything at all, it means that the vast majority of our people accept the basic tenets of Christian faith. Beyond that there is a large minority of Americans who worship in the Hebrew faith. Both Christian and Hebrew believe in God as the maker of heaven and earth.

"Yet as a nation we seem utterly unaware of God or His place in the making of history."

As individuals, many Americans worship. Many pray to God daily or more often.

Why, then, should not America pray as a nation in the time when, as a nation, we are in dire need of help and guidance?

We do have one day in the year supposedly dedicated to thanksgiving when we as a people are expected to offer thanks to the Supreme Being for the blessings showered upon us.

But we have no day or hour or minute when as a people we turn to prayer.

If we are a Christian nation, isn't a national moment of prayer a logical natural course?

Differences in creed or systems of worship or dogma need not enter into this discussion if as a people we believe that there is a God who shapes the course of our lives.

It should be possible for Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and others to join in a common appeal to a common God.

The world is troubled today. America is deeply troubled. The threat of war hangs over all of us. Yet, we want peace. We are not a warlike people. We cherish the lives of these young people who become sacrifices in war. We are ready to be tolerant of all nations which do not menace us, regardless of divergent ideologies.

So far as this newspaper is concerned, it believes that the preparation for defense of our country is wise and is not in contravention of basic religious beliefs. We appreciate, of course, that some good people disagree with us. They do not believe a fire department is needed to protect us from war's flames even though conflagration threatens.

But first things should come first.

And the first defense against disaster should be prayer. The first appeal for peace should be to the Omnipotent Master of the universe.

Thursday of each week a group of Members of Congress meet at a breakfast at 8:15 in the Nation's Capital where a brief period of prayer is ob-

served and the need of spiritual values in world problems is stressed. At a recent meeting the Reverend William Franklin Graham, better known as Billy Graham, was a guest speaker. This young evangelist is performing a remarkable service in his appeal for the consideration of spiritual values in life and a return to the faith of our fathers in divine providence. I am happy to note that Billy Graham will shortly conduct a series of services in my own city of Portland, Oreg. An interesting discussion of his activities appeared in the May 1, 1950, issue of Newsweek under the title "Billy and His Beacon," as follows:

BILLY AND HIS BEACON

"Tonight is the beginning of Boston's greatest week end. * * * I am not disappointed that there are empty seats here tonight. After all, I understand that last year the Red Sox started slowly and look what happened."

Thus spoke the Reverend William Franklin Graham, better known as Billy Graham, as he reached the climax of a 28-day whirlwind tour of evangelistic revivals in New England. For 5 days beginning April 19, he fought his battle against sin and Satan in Boston—with the crowning rally last Sunday afternoon on the historic greens of Boston Common. Billy Graham was right about his slow start: some 9,000 had attended the opening Boston Garden meeting, but on Sunday, even though it rained, 15,000 milled about the Common, which had loudspeakers wired to every tree so that all might hear. Almost everyone brought a handkerchief to wave.

The Reverend Billy Graham had clinched his title as America's greatest living evangelist. The blond, handsome, 31-year-old Southern Baptist minister who has been compared to another Billy named Sunday, had been sweeping the country from coast to coast with old-fashioned revivals that alternately threatened his listeners with hell fire and brimstone and pleaded with them to make your peace with Christ.

Although he and his evangelistic team had been conducting revivals since 1943, Billy Graham didn't hit the big time until last fall on the west coast. In Los Angeles he stayed for 7 weeks and preached to more than 300,000 people—6,000 of whom made their way weeping and happy down the aisles of the tent to declare themselves for Christ. Amid screaming "Hallelujahs" and "Amens" Mr. Graham took Boston by storm this January, chalking up 3,000 repentant New England sinners.

Then he moved South and climaxed a visit to South Carolina by packing 40,000 people into the football stadium in Columbia. During the 5-week Carolina stay, 12,000 penitents publicly professed Christ. During the current New England tour Billy himself collapsed once from sheer physical exhaustion.

And no wonder. For the sharply dressed soul saver goes full-out in sermons which often run for more than an hour. Dramatizing Bible stores (but not quite as athletically as Billy Sunday used to), he moves freely about on his platform with a lapel microphone. He may shout that without God America has only three or four more years at the most and then it will all be over and we will fall as Rome fell and Germany fell. He may slap the Bible and thunder against rampant illicit sex relations. Then he will cajole and plead that sinners repent. Mr. Graham is as modern as the flashy handpainted ties he wears and as colorful as his advertising.

"JUST A FARM BOY"

And yet Billy Graham takes little credit for his achievements. "I am not seeking converts for any particular sect," he says. "I only want people who have wandered far from God to make public acknowledgment of Christ and walk in His footsteps. I have measured my success only by the service I have been to my Master."

"I was just a farm boy," he reminisces. "My father was and is today a dairy farmer near Charlotte, N. C. There are four children—my brother Melvin, two sisters, Mrs. Katherine McElroy and Jean, who is going to Bob Jones University at Greenville, and me." Billy Frank's parents are American Reformed Presbyterians and brought him up simply. He milked cows, went to school in Charlotte, and was a member of the baseball and basketball teams. His closest friend was a boy named Grady Wilson, who is today the Reverend Grady Wilson, mainstay of the Graham evangelistic team.

Grady and Billy Frank hit the sawdust trail in 1935 at a revival meeting conducted by the Reverend Mordecai Ham. From high school Billy went to Bob Jones (after a summer as a Fuller brush salesman), then transferred to Trinity College in Tampa, Fla. There he met Dr. W. B. Riley, founder and president of Northwestern Bible School in Minneapolis. At Dr. Riley's death in 1947, Billy promised to carry on for him, and Mr. Graham is today president of Northwestern Schools, consisting of a Bible institute, a divinity school, and a liberal-arts school.

At Trinity, Billy attended a lot of revival meetings. "I knew I wanted to be a preacher, a revivalist preacher," he says, "and I practiced sermons hour after hour, preaching right from the Bible. Any old stump along the river was a good pulpit, even if I didn't have anyone to listen to me." Billy filled in as preacher and then decided to go to Wheaton College in Illinois (scene of the recent spontaneous student confessions—Newsweek, February 20). There he met Ruth Bell, daughter of missionaries. They were married in 1943 and now have two daughters 2 and 4. These days, Mrs. Graham seldom sees him at their home in Montreat, N. C.

THE BIG TIME

After the start of his first pastorate in the First Baptish Church at Western Springs, Ill., in 1943, he met George Beverly Shea, radio gospel singer, and added him to the team. The triumvirate of Shea, Mr. Graham, and Grady Wilson began staging revival meetings. They made three trips to Europe for Youth for Christ, packing the stadium at Nimes, France, with 18,000 people. Cliff Barrows, trombonist, and hymn leader, joined the group and they all hit the big time at Los Angeles last fall.

Mr. Graham, unlike many evangelists, will not visit a town until invited by local ministers—he has had more than 700 bids to date. A local group has arranged a Washington visit after the New England tour which closes in Hartford this week. Billy will speak to the Senate in its dining room and offer prayers in the House.

Also unlike many evangelists, Mr. Graham doesn't emphasize "love offerings." His salary at Northwestern Schools is $8,500 a year—his main source of income. Local committees must guarantee his expenses and "an honorarium" which is divided among the revival group. Communities which lose money from his visits are reimbursed by those which profit.

Billy Graham is sure that a great religious revival is sweeping the United States. He believes that he is only part of it. "My feeling as a worker in the vineyard is that there is a great upsurge of faith in the country which seeks a way back to Christ," he says. "That is my sole mission—to hold a beacon light for the soul-sick, hopeless, and repentant to seek their way back to the comfort of Christ."

Mr. Chairman, Elder Francis Nichol, editor of the Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, of world-wide experience in evangelistic work, recently said "from a purely economic standpoint the world is less hungry, its people are more industrious in the pursuits of peace and in general the world conditions are far more stable than they were in 1946 and 1947," but he points out that we are in grave danger of another international war unless the greatest possible wisdom and unity of thinking can be exercised by the western nations in dealing with what he terms the "almost ineluctable angles" of the cold war being waged in the hot spots or danger zones of the world. After his world-wide travels he said: "What impressed me most, is that all peoples, their leaders included, are turning to a higher spiritual being as the ultimate answer to their problems." An account of the work of Elder Nichol appears in the Sunday Star of April 30, 1950, which I include here:

WORLD ECONOMIC OUTLOOK HELD FAR BRIGHTER THAN POLITICAL ONE

(By Jessie Fant Evans)

"From a purely economic standpoint, the world is less hungry, its people are more industrious in the pursuits of peace, and in general world conditions are far more stable than they were in 1946 and 1947," according to Elder Francis Nichol, editor of the Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, general church paper for the Seventh-Day Adventist denomination.

But this trained observer is far less optimistic from the political viewpoint. In fact, he definitely fears we are in grave danger of another international war, unless the greatest possible wisdom and unity of thinking can be exercised by the western nations in dealing with what he terms the "almost ineluctable angles" of the cold war being waged near the hot spots or danger zones of the world. (Ineluctable means "not to be overcome, inevitable or inescapable.")

Elder Nichol has just returned to the General Conference Headquarters of the Seventh-Day Adventists in Takoma Park. He bases his impressions upon observations during a 5-month air journey of 46,000 miles to his church's mission centers in 24 countries. His 9,000 miles of travel per month parallels one he made for the church in 1947.

The trip just completed included the British Isles, France, Belgium, the Isle of Patmos off Asia Minor, where St. John was imprisoned, the Fiji Islands, Turkey, India, Burma, Australia, New Zealand, and the reaches of the Sepik River among some of the world's most primitive people where the aborigines smear pig's grease on their faces and bodies and dye their hair white.

Sometimes Elder Nichol rode in little three- and five-passenger biplanes with a stalling speed of 48 knots an hour, whose landing fields were merely close-cropped grazing areas that became bogs of mud after torrential rains. Once he shared a passage with a bathtub "with no questions as to the bathtub's priority."

TURKEY CHECKS ON VISITORS

"Turkey," said the elder, "is fully conscious of its tinderbox situation." Its surveillance of possible enemies from within as well as from without is complete. It insists upon knowing where any guest, checking out of even its humblest inns, plans to spend the next night. He walked through that hospital in Turkey where Florence Nightingale made nursing history when, with British support during the Crimean War, she cut through official red tape to care for the wounded prisoners.

"The poet's vale of Kashmir may call up visions of soft breezes and wondrous shawls, but this is a land of grim realities today," Elder Nichol said. Quite apart from the age-old tensions which continuingly incite

riots and massacres between Hindu and Moslem, its northernmost boundaries point like a ladder to Soviet-dominated territory. Only 35 miles away lies Afghanistan, reached by the famous Khyber Pass which Kipling immortalized and which the British guarded with their lives. Elder Nichol received a pass from the Pakistan Government which enabled him to ride up to the border of this forbidden land bristling with camouflaged gun emplacements. No missionary is allowed entrance to it and all foreigners are suspect.

In Burma he could not get far out of Rangoon because of the guerrilla warfare and the road blocks of barbed wire.

"India is a land of 341,000,000 of people, exclusive of the millions of Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma, in former times vaguely viewed by most of us as a part of India," I was reminded. "From the missionary standpoint, the encouraging thing about this vast present-day commonwealth of Asiatic countries is that its over-all constitution guarantees religious liberty," he emphasized.

POOR ASLEEP ON THE STREETS

How those millions live Elder Nichol was unable to enlighten me. But he discovered where part of the poorer ones sleep in Calcutta at least. As he walked its streets at 10 p. m. one day he saw human beings lying on the steps of the public buildings and on the sidewalks against buildings.

His plane stopped in Singapore, great crossroads of three races, Malay, Indian, and Chinese, among others. "Though Malay is spoken by millions there is not a copy of the Bible in Malay currently available," he told me. Stops also were made at Basra, the Iraq port of the Arabian Sea, and at Damascus, capital of Syria. In Damascus, one of the oldest cities in the world, there is close military surveillance and great suspicions about the possible activities of spies.

To India recently have gone a number of Seventh-Day Adventists missionaries from Communist-dominated China. Unable to continue their work in China, they are being sent to new mission sites on the border of Tibet.

Elder Nichol considers Australia the great outpost of western civilization in the South Pacific, a land of tremendous potentialities awaiting the development of its natural resources and of hydroelectric power.

What impressed him most, Elder Nichol said, is that all peoples, their leaders included, are turning to a higher spiritual being as the ultimate answer to their problems.

As I remarked in the House last year, are we not overlooking the admonitions of the Sermon on the Mount and the great spiritual values of life and placing our dependence on material things, the war engines of destruction and the atomic bomb?

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard.

The Great Architect of the universe has been good to America. He has given us the greatest country on earth. It is rich in natural resources; we have great fertile fields, broad rivers charged with almost boundless hydroelectric power, great forests, an industrial system, with skilled workmen, the greatest and most productive for human welfare and needs in all history and a garden spot in which to spend our days during the short span we are permitted here on earth.

We have indeed, a wonderful world to live in, yet we are spending most of our time in petty, intolerant jealousies, selfish grasping for wealth and power, and in waging world-wide wars, preparation for war, or the sordid business of cleaning up the mess after death and devastation wrought by war. It is out of place today here in this great legislative body, men and women who believe in the promises of a just God, in saying that we need in America today more good will among men and less war, more of the spirit of cooperation, brotherly love, and fellow feeling and less of selfishness, hatreds, animosity, and jealousies which are abroad in the world? I agree with James Keller, founder of the Christophers, when he said, in the home, in all our personal relationships, we must practice love and we must pass on the message of the good life. As you grow in love for others, you will find your own power increasing. You will learn how to disagree without being disagreeable. You will become more approachable. You will better understand why all people want to be truly loved and not just tolerated. You will emphasize more and more of the good side of even the worst people. You will develop an inner warmth, an abiding sense of humor; naturally you will made mistakes, but you will always be able to laugh at yourself. Your never-say-die spirit will give courage to everyone you meet. Life itself will take on a new and exhilarating meaning, because you will be fulfilling the purpose for which you were created; to love God above all things and your neighbor as yourself.

If we fortunate Americans could in this great freedom-loving Republic put into practice such a program, would we not be taking the most forward step toward abolition of war and the restoration of peace and brotherhood among the nations of the world? And could we not then say with the poets—

The day is done
And the night shall be filled with music,
And the cares that infest the day
Shall fold their tents like the Arabs,
And as silently steal away.

* * * * *

When earth's last picture is painted,
and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded,
and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and faith, we shall need it—
lie down for an eon or two.
Till the Master of All Good Workmen
shall set us to work anew.

At best we will be here but a little while in this great adventure of life. We brought nothing into this world when we came and we can take nothing out when we go. It behooves us during our brief span of life to garner well our resources and put them and our talents to good use and to extend the hand of friendship and good feeling to our neighbors before we are called home forever.

Mr. Chairman, every American citizen can take just pride in the great humanitarian efforts of this freedom-loving Nation in attempting to bring peace to a war-torn world. We have not only contributed billions of dollars in food and essential commodities and credits to the war-devastated nations of the world but we have sacrificed hundreds of thousands of our youth in an endeavor to insure peace and stability to the world. We cannot help but feel discouraged at the results achieved and the seeming inability of all of our efforts to achieve peace among men.

Are we not proceeding down the wrong road as is indicated by the observations of the world leaders to which I have called attention in these remarks. May it not be that we are depending too much on our own endeavors without that simple faith of our founding fathers in Divine guidance? Let us all join with our chaplain in his prayer for divine guidance:

Grant that the good within us may be victorious. May the soul of men and nations be regenerated by the Holy Spirit. Show us how we may build a nobler civilization, one that is aglow with faith in God and a love for humanity.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Magnuson, the head of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration, says that this money is necessary, if we are going to continue to properly conduct our veterans' hospitals.

I do not have to tell you that I have always been in favor of the very best service we can render our disabled veterans. If we can give money by the billions to foreign countries, surely we can provide the necessary assistance to take care of these disabled men. We have the hospital facilities provided. As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] has said if we are now going to take away the funds necessary to provide the doctors and nurses, you might as well close those hospitals and throw these veterans out on their own.

These boys did not bring on the war. They fought and won the war; that is, they won the fight, and then the victory was thrown away by others proposing to represent this country. These veterans, of both wars, are suffering, many of them, from service-connected disabilities. They are registered as nonservice, because they tried to carry on until it was too late to prove their service connections, and I am not willing to turn them out and deny them hospital treatment, the proper treatment, if you please, to which they are entitled as the men who fought our battles in time of war and who are now entitled to our assistance in their present disabled physical and mental conditions.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. The gentleman realizes, and I think all of us realize, that the great problem, though, is that we have not sufficiently developed our medical schools to get the doctors. We would not have this talk of socialized medicine if we would do our basic job and get enough doctors.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia that the American Medical Association has become a closed shop, so to speak, and has driven untold thousands of young men from the medical schools that would be today preparing for or practicing medicine. In one county I know they once had at least 25 doctors. The young

school teachers would go off and study medicine and make some of the best doctors I ever knew. Today those boys cannot even enter medical college, most of them. There are only about six doctors in that county now, and most of them are above 70 years of age.

But these servicemen are not responsible for that condition. These disabled men are entitled to our consideration and to the best service we can give them, and I, for one, am not willing to vote against an amendment which Dr. Magnuson says is absolutely necessary to provide that care and that treatment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the lady from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that with the closing of these service hospitals there will be some six to eight thousand service-connected disability cases thrown onto the Veterans' Administration hospitals without enough beds.

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely. It is a debt that we owe these men that we call on to fight the Nation's battles in time of war, and I hope the House will meet that responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House should know that only about 15 percent of the budget for the Veterans' Administration is used for hospital purposes. We think of the Veterans' Administration budget, in the order of $5,800,000,000, as being for hospitalization, but actually only 15 percent of that applies to the hospital program. Therefore, a general increase in the Veterans' Administration budget as proposed in this amendment is not going to apply necessarily to the hospital program.

I understand from the committee that they have increased the amount in this appropriation this year for hospitalization over what was allowed in the three previous years.

May I call your attention to one more thing that is not generally known. By a directive of the President of the United States, the number of beds that can be operated by the Veterans' Administration is limited to 131,171. I have a very strong suspicion that the present Administrator of Veterans' Affairs asked for that limitation himself, although he uses it as an excuse every time someone talks to him about the bed-shortage situation presently developing. That limitation of 131,171 beds does not apply to contract beds, but contract beds can be used only for service-connected cases.

In my own area, that of southern California, three military hospitals have been or are being closed. Available in these hospitals are contract beds for service-connected cases to the number of 725. One of these hospitals, the Long Beach Hospital, is now directed to be taken over by the Veterans' Administration through Presidential directive. The transfer of patients and facilities now located in what is known as the Birmingham facility at Van Nuys, Calif., to Long Beach, where there are already 400 cases, simply means that 400 cases have to go out of the hospitals and stay out, because there will be that many fewer beds than there were before, and the veterans population in the area is on the increase. I have entered the strongest kind of protest against this move but to no avail.

It seems to me that if we are going to approach this situation in a reasonable and fair way, the President of the United States should increase his limitation of 131,171, as every time he closes a military hospital he closes out contract beds. But in the President's news release of the other day, in which he stated that the Veterans' Administration was to take over the Long Beach Naval Hospital, he said there was to be no change in the limitation of 131,171 beds. This means that 725 fewer beds will be available in southern California than there were in recent months and years. That situation should not be allowed to persist, because veterans from your States, from all over the country, are flocking into California at the present time, where they hope to find a favorable climate and medical assistance for their disorders.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a fact that the veterans, especially disabled veterans, are flooding into California from practically every other State in the Union?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct.

We have 3,000 neuropsychiatric veterans, many of whom are now in the county jails and city jails because there is no other place to put them, as we cannot find hospital space to take care of them. Most of these cases have not yet been set up as service-connected. It is my feeling, however, that as these fellows were taught all the battle tactics and went through perfectly terrific war experiences, they should be service-connected and taken care of by the Federal Government and not by the States and counties. A very high percentage of these NP cases in California today are veterans whose home before the war was in some other part of the United States. We in California should not be called upon to pay for their care and for the buildings required for their care. Our mental institutions are already miserably overcrowded. This should be a Federal responsibility.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. SCRIVNER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 5, noes 46.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 154]

Abbitt	Gwinn	Murphy
Allen, Ill.	Hand	Nixon
Barden	Hardy	Noland
Barrett, Pa.	Harrison	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Hart	O'Konski
Beall	Havenner	Patterson
Biemiller	Hayes, Ohio	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Blatnik	Hébert	Pfeiffer, William L.
Bolton, Ohio	Heffernan	Philbin
Bonner	Heller	Plumley
Boykin	Hobbs	Powell
Breen	Hoffman, Ill.	Price
Brown, Ohio	Holifield	Priest
Buckley, N. Y.	Horan	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Howell	Rains
Burton	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Byrne, N. Y.	Jacobs	Regan
Canfield	James	Rhodes
Cannon	Javits	Ribicoff
Carlyle	Jenison	Richards
Carnahan	Jonas	Roosevelt
Carroll	Jones, Mo.	Sadlak
Case, N. J.	Kean	Sadowski
Case, S. Dak.	Kearns	Saylor
Cavalcante	Kee	Scott, Hardie
Celler	Keefe	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Ill.
Chesney	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Chudoff	Kennedy	Sims
Clemente	Keogh	Smathers
Cooley	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Corbett	Klein	Smith, Wis.
Coudert	Kruse	Stanley
Cox	Kunkel	Stigler
Crosser	Lane	Stockman
Cunningham	Larcade	Sutton
Dague	Latham	Taurlello
Davies, N. Y.	LeFevre	Taylor
Dawson	Lichtenwalter	Towe
Deane	Linehan	Trimble
DeGraffenried	Lodge	Underwood
Delaney	Lovre	Wagner
Dingell	Lynch	Walsh
Dollinger	McConnell	Walter
Donohue	McGuire	Weichel
Douglas	McMillen, Ill.	Werdel
Eaton	McSweeney	Wheeler
Feighan	Macy	White, Calif.
Fenton	Madden	White, Idaho
Fogarty	Mansfield	Whitten
Ford	Marcantonio	Wickersham
Fulton	Merrow	Widnall
Gamble	Meyer	Willis
Gilmer	Miles	Winstead
Golden	Miller, Calif.	Woodhouse
Gorski	Morgan	
Granahan	Morrison	
Granger	Morton	
Grant	Moulder	
Green	Multer	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK) having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 255 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

UNITED STATES IN GOOD CONDITION—BUDGET, NATIONAL DEBT COMPARED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about the budget. In view of the fact that 76 cents out of every dollar is chargeable to the cost of past wars and providing for an adequate national defense, we only have 24 cents out of every dollar to consider when we talk about reducing the budget.

TAXES HIGH, BUT NOT DANGEROUSLY HIGH

Now, this budget is about $40,000,000,000, and I know that is a large amount of money. I can hardly conceive the size of the national budget. We often hear the statement made that no Nation can survive if it draws in, in the form of taxes, as much as 20 or 25 percent of its national income. That is the part I want to talk about. We are approaching 20 to 25 percent now, but our country is not broke; it is not nearly broke. It is not even in bad shape, although we owe a large national debt. I wish the debt was much smaller, and I would be willing to vote for taxes to make it smaller. I regret exceedingly that we are operating on a deficit. I voted against the tax-reduction bills in the Eightieth Congress because I knew any tax reduction would throw us into deficit financing. I would be willing to vote taxes for the purpose of balancing the budget and not having any deficit if we are unable to reduce our national expenditures to balance the budget.

We often hear people say we owe about as much as our national wealth. That statement is not nearly true, either. Our national wealth, as estimated by the Department of Commerce is about $684,000,000,000. Our national debt is about 40 percent of that amount. When we add to the national debt the debts of the States, counties, parishes, and political subdivisions, it will probably run up to more than 50 percent. But even with that we are not in such bad condition.

UNFAIR COMPARISON

I do not think it is a fair comparison to compare the amount of the national budget with the national income. I do not think it is comparable at all. A lot of people I know will not agree with me. If we take out $40,000,000,000 in taxes from our national income of, say, $200,000,000,000, that is 20 percent. Our national income is over $200,000,000,000, so it is about 20 percent or less. If we were to siphon that money off in taxes and bury it in the ground, or send it to Fort Knox and bury it there, that would be devastating to our country, and I would agree with the people who make the statement that no nation can survive if we do that. But that is not what happens. We draw the money in in the form of taxes, but we immediately pay it out and it keeps going. Money has velocity. It travels not only 10 times, but 20 times or 30 times or 40 times a year for each dollar, so when you make the right comparison you should say that the $40,000,000,000 is compared to our total transactions, because the Government's part is only one transaction.

In this country last year the 330 largest banks cleared checks aggregating $1,250,000,000,000. There are other transactions besides that. The $29,000,000,000 that we have in the pockets and tills of the people in actual cash will travel much more rapidly than the bank transactions. So when you consider the velocity of the money and the total transactions aggregating about $2,000,000,000,000 a year—two thousand billion dollars a year—the right comparison is to compare that $40,000,000,000 with the $2,000,000,000,000 of transactions a year. If you do that, you have 2 percent of the total transactions it costs the National Government, which is not terribly large, after all.

Federal debt, national income, and national wealth

Year	Total Federal debt (end of fiscal year)[1]	Total national income (calendar year)[2]	Total national wealth (end of calendar year)[3]
1931	$16,801,281,492	$58,873,000,000	$318,800,000,000
1932	19,487,002,444	41,690,000,000	238,800,000,000
1933	22,538,672,560	39,584,000,000	
1948	252,292,246,513	226,204,000,000	684,245,000,000
1949	252,770,359,860	221,500,000,000	[4]

[1] Treasury Department.
[2] Department of Commerce.
[3] Figures for 1931 and 1932, estimated by Robert R. Doane, The Measurement of American Wealth. Figures for 1948 based on estimate by former Secretary of Treasury Vinson for 1945, to which were added Commerce Department estimates of net capital formation.
[4] Not available.

Our national income is about $225,000,000,000 a year now, and about that much during the years 1948 and 1949, as compared to a national income of $41,000,000,000 in 1932 and $39,000,000,000 in 1933. As high as the national debt seems, it can be paid with less inconvenience and less trouble today than a debt one-tenth its size could have been paid in 1932 or 1933.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the fact that this is an election year and that all the Members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate are due to meet the judgment of the voters at the polls in November has a great deal to do with the tone and content of many speeches made by Republican Members of the Congress.

Many of these speeches and extensions of remarks boil down to charges that the Government is ruining business, that private initiative is being stifled, that the flow of capital is being impeded, that corporate business is being endangered, and that free enterprise is being throttled.

I sympathize wholeheartedly with the situation of those gentlemen who find their political future so hazardous as to believe it necessary to resort to such wild, exaggerated, incorrect and irresponsible remarks.

My heart goes out to those business interests whose continued success in their chosen fields of enterprise rests upon the foundations of integrity and fair dealing for the suffering and losses which they must endure from their alleged political champions. After all, business success rests upon mutual confidence between the seller and the buyer. If Republican spokesmen think they are serving the interests of business by undermining public confidence in the strength of the business structure they are far wrong. They are doing just the opposite.

Now I am a Democrat. I represent small-business men, home owners and wage earners. And yet, although I do not claim to be a champion of big business, I am happy to see big business as well as little business enjoy success and profits.

Because, as long as they do I know that the wage earner is going to have a job and will have the money to buy from the little-business man in the neighborhood stores.

For those reasons, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wish to include in my remarks the following facts:

First. The Federal Trade Commission on January 19, 1950, transmitted to the Congress, and made public, a report comparing the rates of return—after taxes—on stockholders' investments in 25 selected manufacturing industries for the years 1940, 1947, and 1948.

Reflecting a study made by the Commission's Bureau of Industrial Economics, the report is based on the financial returns of 528 identical manufacturing corporations.

In 15 of the 25 industries surveyed, the report shows rates of return were higher in 1948 than in 1947. In all but two of the industries, 1948 rates of return showed an increase over the prewar years of 1940.

Just for a few examples, the rate of return in the metal smelting and refining industry was 15 percent, in floor covering 16.4 percent, in motor vehicles and equipment 24.1 percent, in industrial chemicals 19 percent, in tobacco products 13.1 percent, and in bakery products 18.3 percent.

Second. The United States Department of Commerce reported on February 10, 1950, that the publicly reported cash dividend payments by United States corporations totaled $6,495,800,000 in 1949, or 7 percent more than in 1948.

Third. The General Motors Corp. announced that in 1949 it made a profit of more than $500,000,000—the biggest profit for 1 year of any business in history.

I am sure that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will agree that all of this is very bad news to them, but not to business or to the country.

It is a tribute to the leadership of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, to President Truman, and to the Democratic Party.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. PHILLIPS of California.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, there would be no item in an appropriation bill to which we would find less resistance in the Congress than an item which would do anything necessary for the veterans, and particularly those veterans who suffered illness or injury during the war. But we have here a figure without authentication by the Veterans' Administration; a general suggestion to raise this item by $50,000,000. I think it is proper, therefore, that I should call your attention to the fact that the

subcommittee gave the Veterans' Administration all the money for the hospitals and for the servicing of the hospitals it asked for. It is my understanding a subsequent request is to be made by the Veterans' Administration for additional money for next year but that it is not going to be made in the House, and the amount of money is not half the amount suggested by the gentleman from Louisiana. Therefore I feel the least the House should do is to wait until the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration asks specifically for the amount of money he feels he needs, with the realization that the House of Representatives will follow its usual custom and appropriate every cent which is necessary for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, with all sympathy to the objective of the gentleman from Louisiana, I feel this amendment should not be adopted until we know exactly what the Veterans' Administration is about to request. Therefore I suggest the amendment be not adopted.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. What better authority is there in this country as to the needs of the veterans' hospitals than the chief medical director in the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We have no word from the chief medical director of the Veterans' Administration. It seems if he has a request for additional money that request should properly come to the committee which will give him the money and which has in the past always given him the money. Both the Administrator to whom I referred and the medical director to whom the gentleman refers have come before the subcommittee and have expressed themselves as to the amount of money they needed. We have a deficiency appropriation before the subcommittee now which has not yet been discussed, but which will be discussed on Monday, which is only for about 4 percent of the amount of money for which the gentleman from Louisiana is asking.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the legislative committee.

Mr. RANKIN. The head of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration cannot come before the committee and ask for money. He has to go around through this Budget Bureau and nobody knows what that Bureau will recommend.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman intimated that this might be taken care of in another body. Why should the House of Representatives sit down and let another body do it? I understand that these facts were made clear to the committee in the other body by General Gray. I did not reach up and get these figures out of thin air as the gentleman seemed to intimate although he did not exactly say so. I got the information from the head of the medical service that he would have to have about $48,000,000 and I simply wrote the figure $50,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. To answer the gentleman as to why we should not do it or that the other body should do it, I am very much in accord with the gentleman that we should do our own work, but we cannot do it until we know what the figures should be, or at least we could not do it intelligently. I would point out to the gentleman that we had a very similar situation about a year ago in which there was a great deal of concern on the part of the Members of the House that we had not given the Veterans' Administration money enough properly to carry out the care of the veterans. I should like to refresh my memory from my chairman or from the clerk of the committee—I think they ended up with a surplus of $18,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. It was $16,000,000.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. WIER. This is one of the items I am going to vote against. I had 2 years of experience with the waste and inefficiency and squandering of money in the Minnesota Veterans' Hospital. Therefore I am sure a sufficient saving can be made. This is not the place for me to make a lot of charges but I just want to make this one broad statement that waste and inefficiency compels me to vote against this appropriation in the amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Let me supplement what the gentleman says by calling attention to the fact that when the gentleman from Louisiana seeks to increase this item he is not increasing an item which is exclusively for the care of veterans but he is putting an amount of money in round figures in the general appropriation measure which without any further stipulation on our part could be used for any purpose. A very small portion of it percentage-wise would go for the care of the veterans whom he seeks to aid.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Does the gentleman know any more proper place in the bill to offer the amendment than at this point? I was advised by the clerk of the committee who prepared the bill that this is the proper place to submit it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman put it in merely as an addition without further stipulation. I still think it is better to follow the procedure of having a justification before the committee and finding out exactly how much the Veterans' Administration wants and then let us put in that amount as we have always done. I can express my very great sympathy and agreement in what the gentleman seeks to do, but I believe it should be done under the usual procedure.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman accept an amendment if the gentleman from Louisiana limits the purpose for which the money should be used? Would that make it any better in the eyes of the gentleman?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It still would not correct the fact that I happen to know the Veterans' Administration is asking for about half this amount. We should, therefore, know why the amounts differ, and we should act intelligently upon a matter which is affecting the 19,000,000 veterans, who are taxpayers themselves, as well as the nonveteran taxpayers. We should be very careful what we do. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts knows that very well, because she has done so much for the veterans herself and has always insisted on the figures and the amounts being determined in conformity with the needs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to state that I have just checked with Dr. Magnuson, of the Veterans' Administration, and he states that the amount contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana is what the gentleman asked for when he appeared before the Deficiency Appropriation Committee. I think I do know enough about hospitals to realize that you must have enough doctors and nurses. The cut that was made means that probably 2,000 nurses will be put out of the Veterans' Administration. They have the finest service in the country anywhere today. I hate to have the doctors and nurses feel that they have no future. They are going somewhere else, into some other service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, the total amount recommended for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1951 is $5,801,782,795. Nearly $5,000,000,000 of the amount contained in the bill for 1951 cover benefit appropriations over which we have little control, as funds are paid out to or for veterans or their dependents entitled thereto under existing laws.

This leaves the apppropriation "Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services" for which $875,847,795 is recommended. This item covers the operation of all VA hospitals, homes, out-patient services, the central office in Washington, and the regional and district offices in the field. In other words, in addition to the medical-care program it also covers the operational costs of the various benefit programs such as pensions and compensation, insurance, education and training, and the guaranty of loans for homes, farms, and business under the so-called GI bill.

It is interesting to note that the amount proposed for this purpose in 1951 will be less than that available or to be available for any year since General Gray became Administrator of the Veterans' Administration on January 1, 1948. While the medical program continues to increase, it has been possible to offset this increase by reductions in

other programs. These decreases in personnel and appropriations have not been accomplished at the expense of the veteran but are due to the able leadership of the present Administrator and the increased efficiency and experience of existing personnel.

On January 1, 1948, the average employment in nonmedical activities totaled 89,055. This was reduced to 81,469 on January 1, 1949, and by February 28, 1950, it had been further reduced to 69,671. In the medical-care program the full-time equivalent of full- and part-time employees totaled 103,895 on January 1, 1948. This increased to 113,823 by January 1, 1949, and to 118,251 on February 28, 1950. It will be noted that the total increase of 14,356 in the medical program has been more than offset by a reduction of 19,384 in the other group so that total average employment on February 28, 1950, was 5,028 less than the comparable figure on January 1, 1948.

MEDICAL PROGRAM

The medical program has developed under the able leadership of Dr. Magnuson. The committee has complete confidence in his professional ability and his administrative capacity. The standard of medical personnel and the service provided has improved under his leadership. The hospital program is on the upgrade—new hospitals are being opened and it will, of course, be necessary to increase operating expenses and provide more personnel.

In January 1948, when Dr. Magnuson assumed the office of Chief Medical Director, the Veterans' Administration was operating 126 hospitals with 103,400 available beds. Patients in hospitals at that time numbered nearly 94,000, which means that the bed utilization ratio was about 90 percent. A year later, there were 126 VA hospitals with 104,400 available beds and 97,000 patients. The bed utilization ratio had risen to 93 percent. As of March 31, 1950, the Veterans' Administration was operating 133 hospitals with nearly 107,000 available beds and 99,000 patients. At this time, the bed utilization ratio is over 92 percent. On an over-all basis, the Veterans' Administraation is making greater use of its hospital beds than civilian hospitals whose bed utilization ratio averages around 85 percent.

Thirteen new hospitals will have been opened by the end of the present fiscal year, providing about 6,300 additional beds for veteran patients. During fiscal year 1951, the Veterans' Administration expects to open 22 additional hospitals now under construction, to provide 7,000 additional hospital beds. Twenty-one more new VA hospitals are expected to be opened during fiscal year 1952 with 12,300 more beds to care for our veterans.

An indication of the scope of the VA medical program may be obtained by comparing the number of patients treated at VA hospitals during the past 3 years. During fiscal year 1948 509,000 patients were treated at VA hospitals. For fiscal year 1949 the number had risen to 529,000 and for fiscal year 1950 will probably reach 546,000.

At the present time there are approximately 97,000 full-time personnel of all categories in VA hospitals to provide care for over 99,000 veteran patients. During fiscal year 1949 the personnel-patient ratio in VA hospitals averaged 97 employees per hundred patients. This ratio compares very favorably with the patient-personnel ratio in the best nonveteran hospitals throughout the country.

At the end of February 1950 there were nearly 26,000 veteran applicants declared eligible for VA hospitalization who could not be admitted to hospitals because of the shortage of beds or personnel. It should be emphasized that this waiting list is non-service-connected cases, as all service-connected veterans are admitted without delay. This is the highest figure in nearly 3 years. The waiting-list situation will, of course, be alleviated to some extent as additional hospitals are opened and additional personnel are made available. Doctors, dentists, nurses, and other professional and technical medical personnel will be required for the 12 new hospitals and 6,300 beds that will be ready to receive patients by the end of the present fiscal year and for the 21 new hospitals, with their 7,000 additional beds, to be opened during fiscal year 1951.

In my opinion, the Congress and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs are in agreement that there should be no reduction in the quality of the medical care provided for our disabled veterans. If the Veterans' Administration lacks adequate funds to maintain high standards of medical care for all the hospital beds it is operating it has but one choice. That is to reduce the number of beds, because I do not believe that either the Congress or medical men now serving in the VA medical program will be a party to a lowering of the standards of medical care and that this is a contingency we must avoid.

In order to keep within available funds for the current fiscal year, the Veterans' Administration was obliged to consider a reduction in force affecting over 4,800 personnel in the medical, hospital, and domiciliary-care programs. With the opening of new hospitals during the remainder of the fiscal year and the need for adequate personnel to staff these hospitals, such a reduction in force could only result in a deterioration of the quality of VA medical care, with unfortunate and costly implications for the well-being of our sick and disabled veterans. I am advised that employment of the proposed 3,070 personnel in the new hospitals to be opened and the proposed retention of 1,700 professional, technical, and other personnel in the outpatient clinics will require an additional appropriation of $2,191,000 for the remainder of the present fiscal year, and an increased appropriation of $17,287,000 for fiscal year 1951. Approximately 2,000 additional personnel will be required to provide adequate staff for the new hospitals to be opened during next fiscal year, at an estimated cost of $6,000,000. I understand that these facts are now before the Budget Bureau and that consideration is being given to the submission of supplemental estimates for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951. In recent years the Appropriations Committee and the Congress have provided all funds for personnel required for the medical care of veterans. I am confident that this will continue to be the policy and I shall be glad to support adequate supplemental requests when they are approved and transmitted to the Congress. This is the orderly way and, as for me, the Veterans' Administration should be handled in an efficient, economical, orderly manner.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM

The cost to the Federal Government for subsistence, tuition, equipment, books, and supplies for veterans of World War II who have taken education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has already exceeded $9,402,000,000.

More than 9,313,000, or 61 percent, of the 15,331,000 civilian veterans of World War II have already applied for an original certificate of eligibility and entitlement; 97 percent of these applications have been approved. More than 6,745,000 have entered training. More than 94,000,000 months of education and training have been provided. More than 2,176,000 individuals were in training on February 28, 1950, only 3.2 percent below the number a year earlier and only 14.5 percent less than the all-time peak of 2,546,000 which was reached in November 1947. Thousands of veterans are still entering training for the first time, especially in trade and vocational courses, even though actual hostilities ceased more than 4½ years ago.

On February 18, 1948, the director of the Bureau of the Budget advised the Congress that training pursued for recreational or avocational purposes under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act does not appear to be accomplishing the intended purpose of the act and is adding more than $200,000,000 a year to the cost of veterans' educational and training activities."

As a result, language was included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1949 which prohibited the payment of benefits for any course determined by the administrator to be avocational or recreational in character such as dancing schools, and this provision was continued in amended form by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1950.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has stated recently that the annual savings due to the one-year limitation on new schools contained in the 1950 act will be at least $100,000,000 and that the additional cost to the Government, if the customary cost of tuition formula of the Veterans' Administration had not been confirmed by the courts and by the Congress, would have been at least $50,000,000 per year.

The appropriation bill for fiscal year 1951 now before the Congress includes, without change as recommended by the President, the language which was incorporated in the 1950 appropriation act.

It is very important for all of us to remember that while the American people are demanding economy, the education and training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has

grown beyond all expectations, with a possible expenditure of $2,754,000,000 occurring during the present fiscal year, the highest level of expenditure since the beginning of the program. The only real, effective way to safeguard the veterans' program is to keep it on a sound basis.

The most important problem confronting the Government and the Congress in the administration of this program at the present time, more than 4½ years after the termination of hostilities, is whether our appropriations are yielding a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole. In other words, to distinguish between the worth-while and the frivolous.

The Appropriations Committee has taken cognizance of the recommendations of the President and the problems confronting the Veterans' Administration by placing certain limitations on the expenditures of funds for education and training which have resulted in the saving of several hundred million dollars a year without denying benefits to any veteran who sincerely desires a bona fide course of education or training for a useful purpose. These limitations are in the right direction. They are in the interest of a sound veterans' program. They prevent veterans from taking, for avocational or recreational purposes, such courses as ballroom dancing, bartending, mixology, horseback riding, swimming, skiing, golf, tennis, and bowling. If we allowed the program to run wild in such regards it might ultimately destroy the worthy and needed phases of the veterans' program.

Of course, I know there are a few irresponsible people who shout loud for most anything proposed in the name of veterans. Such people are not the real friends of the veterans. The Veterans' Administration must not be discouraged from tightening up within the framework of existing law in order to prevent violations of the intent and spirit of this law. The bureaucratic cost must be held to reasonable levels. The program must be for the benefit of veterans rather than employers.

In order to assure that our expenditures for this program yield a proper return both to the veterans and to the Nation as a whole, the Appropriations Committee, and I am sure the Congress, will continue to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration and veterans' organizations in the solving of problems which confront the Veterans' Administration in the administration of the law.

As the law now stands, this readjustment program will continue until July 25, 1956—11 years after the fighting was over.

I am pleased to say that Gen. Carl Gray, the Administrator, is working hard and has shown vast improvements in the efficiency and economy of the agency since assuming the responsibilities.

I have visited numerous veteran facilities and will continue to do so in the hope of contributing to an effective, serviceable, sound veterans' program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there is no disposition on the part of the committee to cripple the operations of the veterans' hospitals in the slightest. May I give the facts as they came from the Veterans' Administration.

It is well known that about 66 to 70 percent of the patient load in all veterans' hospitals is composed of veterans with ailments which are non-service-connected. The Veterans' Administration has been before this subcommittee, if I remember correctly, four times this year since January. At no time up to this moment has the Veterans' Administration asked this committee for any more funds than they have been given.

There is pending before the subcommittee—and we received it only the day before yesterday, and, of course, we could not be in the committee and on the floor also, so, as the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has just stated, we will consider it Monday——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman realizes that the Veterans' Administration cannot come before the committee and ask for money without being so instructed by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. THOMAS. If you can keep the gentlemen in the Veterans' Administration from asking for money—and I say that affectionately, because I admire them—that is news to me. They even burst forth in the paper the other day and said they were going to have to fire so many medical employees in the hospitals, without ever mentioning it to your subcommittee whose duty it is to furnish them the money, and in face of an admonition carried for two consecutive years, telling them in no uncertain terms:

If you ever reduce your personnel, do not reduce any employees of the hospitals.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] recommended that provision 2 years ago when he was chairman. We carried it last year, and there you are, in violation of that provision.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will just allow me to finish my statement, please, then I will yield to the gentleman. There is no man on this floor who has done more for the veterans than the gentleman from Mississippi, and we love him and respect him.

This figure of $875,000,000, do you have any idea how many employees it covers? That figure, I may say to the gentleman from Louisiana, covers every employee not only in the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration, but all over the United States for education and training, for finance, for everything else; and the total to be granted by the committee for this year for medical personnel was 1,600 more than last year, making a total of 186,000. For hospitals alone for this present fiscal year they had 117,000, and we gave them 1,600 more this year, I mean 1951, in this bill, than they had for the current fiscal year. Do you know what they cover? They have hundreds of employees charged to hospitals that have no more to do with hospitals than does that wall. They are warehouse employees, they are maintenance employees, they are repair employees, they are finance employees, and ought to be charged to the appropriated divisions; and they have enough money for that purpose. They are employees for education and training; and, mind you, for the education and training program for the fiscal year 1950 we have already provided $2,900,000,000.

When General Gray comes before your subcommittee we are going to take care of him, of course, just like you want us to. Do you know how many hospitals they have today? One hundred and thirty, and during this fiscal year they are going to bring in 26 more, which will provide, 5,420 more beds by the end of the fiscal year. The next year we will substantially wind up the program which will necessitate the appropriation of additional funds. There is $160,000,000 in this bill for hospitals. You will have a total of 149,548 beds—that is, in 1952. But for 1951 the Medical Department has testified you are going to have 142,662 beds, and they doubt if they can fill and staff more than 131,174.

We have heard through hearsay—we want to be perfectly honest about it—that General Gray went over to the Senate side, after he had been before your subcommittee four different times and not even mentioned it, and said he needed $23,000,000 additional over and above what is in the budget for 1951. The Senate has not passed on it. General Gray has not asked your committee for a single nickel.

Do you not think it is better to do this thing in an orderly fashion since we know that you want to do the right thing for the sick soldiers and know that you realize that your subcommittee wants to do the right thing just as much as you do? Do you not think it is better to vote down the amendment and let it go through regular channels? We will take care of it; we will do it just exactly as you want us to.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the pending amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel; printing and binding; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; and advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the functions of the Commission; $600,000, to be derived from the war claims fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948).

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly on the subject of the War Claims Commission which has been set up for the purpose of providing benefits to our

former prisoners of war, largely prisoners of Bataan and the civilian internees who were interned by the Japanese Government in places like Santo Tomas and elsewhere in the Philippines.

We provided in that bill that all of the funds which belonged to our former enemies that were in the hands of any agency of the United States should be liquidated into cash and made available for the payment of these claims of our own people. The funds necessary to operate the War Claims Commission, while necessarily appropriated from the Treasury of the United States, come out of this war-claims fund which is set up in the Treasury Department as a special fund to carry these former funds of the Germans and Japanese which are being liquidated by the Alien Property Custodian; consequently, appropriations for the administrative costs of the War Claims Commission, while coming out of the Treasury of the United States, will come out of this special fund and not out of the taxpayers' pockets.

There were approximately 6,000 American internees in the Philippines who suffered untold cruelties and maltreatment at the hands of the Japanese. These are American citizens, they are not somebody else's citizens; these are our people. There were some 40,000 soldiers who were taken by the Japanese on Bataan and horribly maltreated, as you well know. These people have valid claims against the war-claims fund, and we should expedite the handling of the war-claims fund so these people will not all be dead before they get their claims adjudicated.

The committee in its wisdom has reduced the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget for the administrative expenses of the War Claims Commission from $800,000 to $600,000. Even at the $800,000 rate for administrative expenses it would be possible for the Commission to handle only 400 claims a day which on the basis of 200 working days a year would mean about 80,000 claims a year. There have been several hundred thousand claims filed by people who hope to get something out of this fund in addition to those for whom the bill was drawn.

I respectfully suggest to the subcommittee handling these appropriations that as this is not tax money, it is money that we have taken from the Japanese and German Governments and their people, and we should make adequate appropriations, fully adequate appropriations, for the administrative expenses of this War Claims Commission so that these people can get that money as soon as possible. They need it and they need it badly. Many of them were rendered destitute by the war and many are ill as a result of their maltreatment by the Japanese.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As to those that were interned in the Philippines, while they get their money there, they must spend the money in the Philippines, and for some of them who have returned to the States, that is impossible.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; that is not true. The gentleman may be talking about the Filipinos, but, so far as the American citizens are concerned, there is no inhibition whatsoever on their receiving the money here and spending it here. Most of them have been returned to the United States. Shortly after VJ-day all of them were returned to the United States that could be found.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I say that a lady came into my office just this week who spent 2 years as a civilian internee in a Japanese prison camp. She lost her husband there, and she showed me a letter that I have in my office which says that you may get your money in the Philippines, but that money must be spent in the Philippines.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no such inhibition in the War Claims Act, and if that sort of thing is going on, we would like to know about it in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We have had no such information.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There are two sets of claims. The so-called war claims are to be paid to the individual, and they can be spent here or anywhere for any purpose that the individual wants. But money that is paid out under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act to an individual must be spent in the Philippines for some constructive purpose, because it was not to reimburse the individual for his loss but to help the Filipinos restore their economy.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right. I think that my colleague from Nebraska is mistaken, because the matter he discussed comes under an entirely different bill and was passed out of a different committee than the one of which I am a member.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we were talking about the same subject, even though they might be different bills. But, under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, those American citizens who have since returned to this country cannot get their money.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is quite possible; I do not know anything about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The very purpose of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act is to rebuild the property that was destroyed in the Philippines, the churches, business and other physical property.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe that that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the main purpose of it.

Mr. HINSHAW. As to the Filipino people who had their property destroyed in the Philippines, many, many hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated directly out of the Treasury of the United States in order to rebuild the Philippines. The people whom this bill, the War Claims Act, seeks to take care of are American citizens, our own people, if you please, who live in the United States. They are a part of us, and yet we seem to pay less attention to our own people than we do to people anywhere else in the world. I think that it is about time we gave our own people all the consideration that they so much deserve.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman entirely, but under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act we did make payment to American citizens, and they cannot get that money unless they spend it in the Philippines.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let us not talk about that here, because that is another act. Let us talk about that when it comes up. Let us talk about this act. I wish the committee would authorize enough money so that the War Claims Commission can get through with all of its work. We have been trying now for two to two and a half years to get it started. The more it is extended the more it is going to cost, and fewer living people will get the benefits to which they are entitled. The War Claims Commission needs more administrative money than the pending bill provides in order to expedite the adjudication of the claims of the ex-prisoners of war and the civilian internees.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the chapter be considered as read.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I think there are some provisions remaining in this chapter that should be read, and I shall have to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, several Members have spoken on the floor about it and I know there is considerable interest in the seizure by the Government of Mexico of five American shrimping vessels that were operated out of Texas, Louisiana, and Georgia.

I made inquiry to try to obtain information for the benefit of my colleagues and other persons, as well as myself, who are interested. I have here a statement regarding the detention of five United States shrimping vessels by Mexican authorities. It is dated May 2, 1950. It reads:

Five American shrimping vessels operating out of Texas, Louisiana, and Georgia were seized in the Gulf of Mexico at about 6:30 a. m. on April 23 by a Mexican naval patrol vessel and brought under guard to the port of Tampico. When apprehended the vessels were operating about 120 miles south of Brownsville, Tex., in waters off Mexico stated by the Mexicans to be 5¼ miles and by the fishermen to be 10 miles.

The vessels are now in Tampico awaiting disposition of charges of fishing in Mexican territorial waters without Mexican licenses. Masters and crew (16 men in all) are aboard the vessels but have freedom to go into the city. The catch, about 7 tons of shrimp, has been transferred to the custody of the Mexican Government. The American consul at Tampico (Mr. Elvin Seibert) met the vessels at the dock early Monday morning upon ar-

rival and has since been exerting every effort to assist the crews and secure immediate release of the vessels.

In Mexico City Ambassador Thurston made full inquiries of the Foreign Minister on Monday, within a few hours of the arrival of the vessels in Tampico.

The situation arises because of conflicting claims of the United States and Mexico over the zone of coastal seas appropriately to be termed territorial waters. The Mexican Government has, within recent years, claimed that Mexican territorial waters extend nine marine miles from the coast and that fishing operations by foreigners can be undertaken within that zone only under licenses bought from the Mexican Government.

The United States Government does not recognize an extent of Mexican territorial waters greater than three marine miles. For 150 years the United States has supported the 3-mile limit as a basic principle of international law. When Mexico sought by Presidential decree of August 29, 1935, to amend existing law so as to extend the territorial waters of Mexico in breadth from three to nine nautical miles, the United States Government, in a note dated March 7, 1936, reserved all rights of whatever nature so far as concerned any effects upon United States commerce from enforcement of the legislation. The United States Government reiterated these reservations in the note of August 25, 1936, to the Government of Mexico. With respect to the General Law of National Wealth published August 6, 1944, which purported also to define the extent of Mexican territorial waters as nine marine miles, the United States reaffirmed its position, stating that it could not recognize or accept the application of that law or any similar law to United States fishing vessels or other commerce operating in waters at a distance of more than 3 miles from the coast of Mexico. That remains the position of this Government today.

Coming down to the present situation, the statement proceeds:

The Department is devoting all its energies to the protection of the United States interests involved. It is seeking the prompt and expeditious release of the vessels without prejudice to United States claims that the high seas commence 3 miles from land. At the same time the Department is attempting to lay the basis with Mexico of an amicable permanent solution of the long-standing dispute over the extent of territorial waters.

In view of the information contained in this statement and the number of Members who are interested in this matter, not only from Texas but wherever there are any fishing activities that extend into the high seas, I thought I should transmit this information to the House.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I personally appreciate, and I know all the Members affected appreciate, the interest of the gentleman in helping to work out this troublesome problem affecting the Gulf seafood industry.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. It is a matter of vital concern not only to our country as a whole put particularly to various sections of it.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. I, of course, appreciate the fact that the Government is trying to get this matter of fishing adjusted with Mexico, but I call attention to the fact that the boundaries of Texas are fixed at 10½ miles. The United States Government at the time Texas came into the Union agreed to claim those boundaries, and they were so fixed by the treaty between the United States and Mexico in 1948.

Several of us Texans dropped a little resolution on this fishing matter into the hopper here the other day, and in that resolution the term "3 miles" is used instead of "3 leagues." It is a typographical error. Insofar as the boundaries of Texas are concerned, we think the United States Government is bound to claim that they are 10½ miles, or 3 leagues, from the shore line, instead of 3 miles.

Mr. McCORMACK. The importance of this is that the traditional position of our country for 150 years is being adhered to. Not only the immediate situation of these five vessels but the long-term, friendly adjustment of the basic question is involved and under consideration. The statement shows that both matters are being met as far now at the State Department can do so.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the consideration of this chapter it is the intention to move that the Committee rise. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the chapter be considered as read.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman to move that the Committee rise at the conclusion of the consideration of this chapter?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this section of the bill provides funds for the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has proved to be the greatest organization of its kind the world has ever known.

As every Member of Congress knows, I was coauthor with Senator Norris of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority 17 years ago. We struck out all of the provisions of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted the Norris-Rankin bill, creating the Tennessee Valley Authority and clothing it with those powers which have enabled it to accomplish the greatest development of ancient or modern times, as well as to provide the yardstick showing what electricity is worth, thereby saving the consumers of electricity in this country billions of dollars on their light and power bills in recent years.

Let me remind you that rural electrification grew out of this development of the Tennessee Valley Authority. At the time the TVA was created we had less than 10 percent of the farms in this country electrified, while Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified, Germany had 90 percent, and Italy and France each had 94 percent of their farms electrified. Even far-away New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified, when, as I said, less than 10 percent of our farmers throughout the United States even had electric lights in their homes.

With the assistance of the Tennessee Valley Authority, I managed to organize power associations in every county in the district which I have the honor to represent, and which touches the Tennessee River for several miles. We were building power lines to farm homes in that district long before the law creating the Rural Electrification Administration was enacted.

When the REA Act was reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and passed, there were so many unnecessary restrictions in it that it would have been utterly impossible to electrify the farm homes of this country under it, at least in your lifetime and mine.

It took us 8 or 10 years to get those restrictions removed. Under that law we could provide only $40,000,000 a year for loans to build rural power lines throughout the country. The amortization period was fixed at 20 years and the interest rate was all out of reason. It would have taken us a hundred years, or longer to electrify the farms of this country under that law as it was originally passed.

In 1938 I managed to force through an amendment to one of the large spending bills, against which points of order had been waived, by which amendment we secured the first $100,000,000 for rural electrification which, added to the $40,000,000 provided by the then existing law, gave us $140,000,000 to loan the farmers of this country to build power lines to their homes. That is when rural electrification really got started. We won that amendment on a tellers' vote by only seven majority. If we had lost it, the chances are that we would still be operating under that old law, and the average farmer in this country would not have seen electric lights in his home during this generation.

We secured an additional appropriation for each of the two following years, and with the help of Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, and our distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. POAGE, we managed to get the law changed so as to take the ceiling off the amount that could be provided for rural electrification each year, extend the amortization period to 35 years, and reduce the interest rate to the lowest figure commensurate with financial safety.

The result has been that today instead of having 10 percent we have 85 percent of the farm homes in this country electrified.

I am urging that this program be pushed in every State in the Union until we have electrified every farmhouse that

can be reached by the draft in times of war, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace.

It is the greatest thing that has ever been done for the American farmers in all the history of this Government; and I might add, that I have not overlooked the district I have the honor to represent. Every county, and every precinct in every one of the 10 counties in that district are connected up with the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the people get their power from the TVA at the TVA yardstick rates, which saves the users of electricity in that one district anywhere from three to five million dollars a year.

Not only are the farmers benefiting, but every consumer of electricity in that area is receiving TVA power at TVA rates, which enables them to use all those appliances necessary to operate their business establishments, as well as to light their homes, lift the burdens of drudgery, and bring to them the comforts and conveniences of modern life.

It takes to the farmer everything you have in the city, except the noise and city taxes, and provides him and his wife and children with a new servant, the like of which they had never known.

We have as fine cooperative power associations in the district I represent, and as fine a set of managers, as can be found anywhere in the United States. The result is that a vast majority of the farm homes in every one of those 10 counties is now electrified, and we are driving forward as rapidly as possible to try to reach them all.

When I started in this fight less than 1 percent of the farm homes in the district were electrified. Now we have something like 90 percent of the farms in that district electrified and as I said we are striving to reach them all.

THE POWER BUSINESS IS A PUBLIC BUSINESS

You are hearing a great deal of hue and cry from the power trust about private enterprise. The power business is not a private business. It is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It is the lifeblood of our advanced civilization. It must be handled by a monopoly. No town, city, or community can afford to have a half dozen different concerns supplying electricity to its people. The overhead expenses would be so enormous they could not pay the bills. Besides the water power of the Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

The Power Trust is simply trying to monopolize a public business.

Therefore, we are dealing with a public business, and not a private enterprise, and I do not intend to sit idly by and see a monopoly seize the water power of this Nation and burden the American people with outrageously exorbitant rates throughout the years to come. I took that position when we were creating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I have taken the same position with reference to the power generated on the Columbia River, and by the Southwestern Power Administration, and on all the rest of our navigable streams and their tributaries.

Last year there was produced and sold by public and private interests 248,541,466,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, as compared with 37,181,123,000 the year I came to Congress and entered this fight.

There are 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. If it were developed and distributed in a proper way, it would tremendously enrich this country from every standpoint. That 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, that is now going to waste every year could be firmed up to the peak of the average years with 116,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam power generated with coal, gas, or oil, which, added to it, would make 510,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Added to our present consumption that would give us 758,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

The industries of this country that generate their own power produced more than 53,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours last year, which added to that 758,000,000,000 would give us 811,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually.

That is enough to run every factory, every commercial establishment, electrify every home, including every farm home, and heat every residence in the United States.

It may seem strange to some Members of Congress whose constituents are paying through the nose for their electricity, to hear anyone talk about electric heat for the homes of this country. But I want to call your attention to the fact that they have been heating homes in Ontario, Canada, with electricity for more than 30 years, to my certain knowledge. We are heating homes in the Tennessee Valley Authority area, as well as in the Columbia River area, with electricity now. It is the finest, cleanest, purest heat in the world. It produces no ashes, no cinders, no smut, no grease, no noxious fumes or poisonous gases; it does not sweat the windows, and does not burn the oxygen out of the air, but heats it whole. As I said, it is the finest, purest, cleanest, and most desirable heat on earth; and the time will come when the average home throughout this Nation will be heated with electric energy.

I am speaking from experience. Many homes in the district which I have the honor to represent have been heated with electricity for the last 10 or 15 years.

The enemies of public power, that is, the friends of the Power Trust, will tell you that the TVA is operating at a loss. That is not true. Not only is the TVA paying back the money invested in the power development, but in course of time it will pay back with interest every dime that is invested in flood control and navigation, to say nothing of the service the TVA rendered in helping to win the war. Every human being in this country owes the TVA a lasting debt of gratitude for that service. It probably saved the lives of a million men, for without it and the Columbia River development the atomic bomb would not have been produced in time to stop the war as it did. But it might have been produced abroad and dropped on us.

Neither is the rural electrification program operating at a loss. It will pay back every dime loaned by the Government with interest, and at the same time double the value, and in many instances, treble or quadruple, the value of the farm homes of America.

SILLY CHARGE OF COMMUNISM

Every once in a while I see where some Power Trust advocate refers to the TVA and rural electrification, and public power generally, as communistic. I can think of nothing more silly or more stupid.

No man in either House of Congress has fought communism harder than I have.

No man in Congress has fought harder to uphold the Committee on Un-American Activities than I have. It was my amendment to the rules that created the Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee of the House in 1945; and with all the smears that have been directed at that committee it has rendered the greatest possible service to this Nation in exposing the enemies within our gates.

But, as I said, the power business is a public business, just as the water works of your city is a public business. That has been recognized by everybody, except the Power Trust, since electricity first came into use. Capitals of such States as Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Nebraska, Texas, and other large cities that I could mention, have had public power systems for years and years, as have large numbers of municipalities throughout the country, from Maine to California. I could name you probably a thousand towns and cities throughout the country, in every State in the Union, that have had public power systems for the last 40 years.

At this point I am going to insert a table showing the total amount of electricity purchased by the ultimate consumers in the United States in the year 1949, together with the overcharges, according to the TVA rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville Power Administration rates, and the Ontario rates.

Tables showing the overcharges paid by residential, commercial, and industrial consumers in each State will follow.

I am using the TVA rates because the TVA is the outstanding development of its kind in all the world. I am using the Tacoma, Wash., rates, because it is one city that has built its own dams to supply its people hydroelectric power for all purposes. It is paying more in lieu of taxes than the power companies are paying in the average city of its size, and yet it has about the lowest rate of any municipality in the entire country.

I am using the Bonneville Administration as an illustration of what is being done on the Columbia River and what

can be done throughout the entire Nation.

I am using the Ontario rates to show what the people throughout Ontario have been able to do with the water power of that country, just across the line from New York, in which State the people were overcharged $293,000,000 for their electricity last year, according to the Ontario rates.

I want every Member of the House to examine these tables and see how much your people are overcharged for their electricity; and, remember, that electricity at the TVA rates could be supplied to every home in every State in the Union. But instead of that, the people were overcharged last year more than $2,000,000,000 for their electricity, as these tables show; and I might add, that had it not been for the TVA yardstick, showing the American people, for the first time, what electricity is really worth, they would be paying more than another billion dollars overcharges—or as much more as the entire TVA development has cost up to this time.

TOTAL OVERCHARGES BY STATES IN 1949

Here is the table showing the total sales for electricity in 1949 by States, and the overcharges which the people in each State were compelled to pay, according to the TVA, the Tacoma, the Bonneville, and the Ontario rates.

Someone may come back and say that Mississippi was overcharged more than $16,000,000 last year. That is true; but those overcharges were imposed on the power consumers outside of the TVA area. If all of the people in Mississippi received their electricity at the same rates now being paid by the people in the district I represent, they would have paid $16,000,000 less for their electricity last year; and if it had not been for the TVA yardstick they would have paid probably many times the amount they did pay for the electricity consumed.

The table to which I refer follows:

TABLE 1.—*Total electric sales and overcharges by States, 1949*

State	Estimated sales data for 1949			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	674,500	6,257,490,000	$65,810,300	$41,702,621	$24,107,679	$34,739,774	$31,070,526	$48,035,129	$17,775,171	$43,872,897	$21,937,403
Arizona	196,285	1,518,982,000	25,595,300	12,656,915	12,938,385	11,554,279	14,041,021	15,380,208	10,215,002	13,175,196	12,420,104
Arkansas	432,681	1,642,104,000	35,665,400	19,189,093	16,476,307	16,193,050	19,472,350	22,292,219	13,373,181	20,273,554	15,391,846
California	3,470,066	21,463,431,000	342,618,300	238,569,356	104,048,944	199,735,061	142,883,239	276,558,047	66,060,253	255,287,526	87,330,774
Colorado	380,883	1,427,792,000	35,416,100	18,407,367	17,008,733	16,184,025	19,232,075	21,735,306	13,680,794	18,821,280	16,594,820
Connecticut	638,262	3,079,329,000	77,935,900	34,587,236	43,348,664	20,857,868	48,078,032	40,404,842	37,531,058	35,323,710	42,612,190
Delaware	95,047	515,687,000	11,519,700	5,030,159	6,489,541	4,353,711	7,165,989	5,895,563	5,624,137	5,181,855	6,337,845
District of Columbia (included in Maryland data)											
Florida	779,646	3,234,550,000	85,761,200	33,479,388	52,281,812	30,126,258	55,634,942	39,858,969	45,902,231	33,391,631	52,369,569
Georgia	761,270	4,201,562,000	75,795,000	40,131,274	35,663,726	35,265,526	40,529,474	47,291,735	28,503,265	40,657,289	35,137,711
Idaho	188,701	1,511,402,000	20,138,100	12,675,377	7,462,723	11,144,481	8,993,619	14,889,471	5,248,629	12,692,575	7,445,525
Illinois	2,562,940	15,681,342,000	313,165,000	156,606,885	156,558,115	133,284,240	179,880,760	182,517,190	130,647,810	163,863,344	149,301,656
Indiana	1,225,154	7,107,968,000	141,967,400	71,218,753	70,748,647	60,817,012	81,150,388	82,912,518	59,054,882	73,897,953	68,069,447
Iowa	815,643	3,090,042,000	78,341,900	37,421,575	40,920,325	32,649,190	45,692,710	43,944,345	34,397,555	38,038,017	40,303,883
Kansas	568,646	2,366,305,000	54,010,600	26,703,369	27,307,231	23,103,390	30,907,210	31,259,469	22,751,131	27,483,723	26,526,877
Kentucky	661,376	3,171,547,000	60,505,700	33,028,265	27,477,435	28,276,981	32,228,719	38,402,579	22,103,121	33,967,951	26,537,749
Louisiana	620,393	2,956,808,000	54,982,700	26,107,626	28,875,074	22,781,457	32,201,243	30,716,298	24,266,402	26,755,373	28,227,327
Maine	302,216	1,202,198,000	27,921,400	12,818,941	15,102,459	11,116,269	16,805,131	14,967,187	12,954,213	12,978,967	14,942,433
Maryland and District of Columbia	799,848	5,106,635,000	98,591,100	55,036,967	43,554,133	46,967,184	51,623,916	64,426,729	34,164,371	58,307,875	40,283,225
Massachusetts	1,496,935	5,809,709,000	162,669,600	67,291,942	95,377,658	57,577,523	105,092,077	78,256,976	84,412,624	69,299,176	93,370,424
Michigan	1,913,144	11,428,896,000	232,374,500	113,090,750	119,283,750	99,101,067	133,273,433	133,111,005	99,263,495	114,831,458	117,543,042
Minnesota	921,295	3,653,635,000	94,490,800	44,506,398	49,984,402	39,133,089	55,357,711	52,327,269	42,163,531	44,720,569	49,770,231
Mississippi	412,422	1,426,938,000	32,361,900	16,255,360	16,106,540	14,240,866	18,121,034	19,117,258	13,244,642	16,480,430	15,881,470
Missouri	1,119,480	5,006,567,000	105,711,800	55,553,240	50,158,560	48,571,105	57,140,695	65,484,894	40,226,906	57,147,146	48,564,654
Montana	173,076	2,159,178,000	22,425,700	13,548,291	8,877,409	11,406,800	11,018,900	15,687,334	6,738,366	14,219,481	8,206,219
Nebraska	376,318	1,370,043,000	31,581,100	17,113,326	14,467,774	15,248,017	16,333,083	20,302,168	11,278,932	17,159,243	14,421,857
Nevada	46,677	496,706,000	7,351,000	3,790,233	3,560,767	3,331,933	4,019,067	4,497,605	2,853,395	3,943,930	3,407,070
New Hampshire	191,878	715,440,000	19,006,700	8,897,695	10,109,005	7,690,673	11,316,027	10,388,975	8,617,725	9,040,290	9,966,410
New Jersey	1,538,736	7,026,664,000	171,313,600	74,325,723	96,987,877	64,398,382	106,915,218	87,181,216	84,132,384	76,515,872	94,797,728
New Mexico	149,489	535,612,000	13,913,300	5,959,569	7,953,731	5,281,464	8,631,836	7,074,466	6,838,834	6,110,839	7,802,461
New York	4,670,028	23,658,879,000	499,037,600	199,245,601	299,791,999	177,620,048	321,417,552	238,013,736	261,023,864	205,354,439	293,683,161
North Carolina	945,918	5,271,857,000	87,149,316	49,564,073	37,585,243	42,127,660	45,021,656	57,504,431	29,644,885	51,399,101	35,750,215
North Dakota	146,086	415,919,000	14,919,400	6,119,047	8,800,353	5,646,463	9,272,937	7,368,516	7,550,884	5,977,918	8,941,482
Ohio	2,400,454	16,719,941,000	303,878,700	156,318,242	147,560,458	132,686,644	171,192,056	181,468,373	122,410,327	163,143,770	140,734,930
Oklahoma	593,785	2,046,921,000	49,409,000	24,794,458	24,614,542	21,389,441	28,019,559	29,012,744	20,396,256	25,649,227	23,759,773
Oregon	482,932	5,230,353,000	52,626,200	38,816,719	13,809,481	34,040,249	18,585,951	45,598,068	7,028,132	38,644,831	13,981,369
Pennsylvania	3,043,443	21,100,935,000	383,477,200	199,515,544	183,961,656	167,347,885	216,129,315	230,546,402	152,930,798	209,665,115	173,812,085
Rhode Island	252,097	965,909,000	27,870,100	11,373,406	16,496,694	9,706,881	18,163,219	13,243,979	14,626,121	11,804,168	16,065,932
South Carolina	455,441	2,538,302,000	39,705,584	22,995,119	16,710,465	19,591,572	20,114,012	26,708,382	12,997,202	23,823,353	15,882,231
South Dakota	162,375	448,077,000	14,994,500	5,853,286	9,141,214	5,309,502	9,684,998	6,996,399	7,998,101	5,811,399	9,183,101
Tennessee	770,505	9,142,193,000	75,541,900	58,200,001	17,341,899	49,391,355	26,150,545	67,391,295	8,150,605	59,981,121	15,560,779
Texas	1,973,195	9,273,209,000	184,798,700	97,695,823	87,102,877	84,781,321	100,017,379	115,002,730	69,795,970	101,756,177	83,042,523
Utah	193,415	1,030,700,000	18,937,400	10,967,646	7,969,754	9,525,767	9,411,633	12,815,526	6,121,874	11,057,479	7,879,921
Vermont	123,412	479,724,000	12,791,100	6,029,700	6,761,400	5,192,731	7,598,369	7,019,089	5,772,011	6,123,813	6,667,287
Virginia	756,993	3,821,340,000	77,332,400	39,862,643	37,469,757	34,740,796	42,591,604	46,887,832	30,444,568	40,875,798	36,456,602
Washington	730,805	11,580,150,000	84,449,900	62,808,804	21,641,096	54,637,372	29,812,528	73,796,953	10,652,947	64,264,092	20,185,808
West Virginia	489,325	3,926,573,000	62,163,200	31,586,996	30,576,204	25,885,028	36,278,172	36,146,909	26,016,291	33,676,296	28,486,904
Wisconsin	1,071,834	5,443,624,000	118,420,100	59,448,659	58,971,441	51,714,397	66,705,703	69,991,682	48,428,418	61,534,735	56,885,365
Wyoming	75,731	282,478,000	7,635,400	3,540,280	4,095,120	3,201,725	4,433,675	4,239,030	3,396,370	3,565,753	4,069,647
United States total	42,850,781	248,541,646,000	4,614,078,800	2,380,439,741	2,233,639,059	2,048,667,512	2,565,411,288	2,784,669,136	1,829,409,664	2,467,547,735	2,146,531,065

Mr. Chairman, I hope every Member of Congress will study carefully the figures which I have submitted, and note the burden of overcharges imposed upon the people of his own State.

OVERCHARGES PAID BY RESIDENTIAL CONSUMERS IN EACH STATE IN 1949

Now let us take the residential consumers and see what overcharges they are paying in each State. Remember, there are more than 35,000,000 residential consumers of electricity in this country, which means at least twice that many men and women, to say nothing of the children.

Congress had better pay more attention to the way these residential consumers of electricity are being treated, for they not only hold the balance of power, but they constitute a majority of the voters in every State in this Union; and they are going to be heard from.

You will note that these people are being overcharged more than 100 percent for their electric lights and power; and if it were not for the TVA, the Columbia River development, and the large number of municipalities, cities, and towns,

with public power systems throughout the country, the Power Trust would have a fixed monopoly, just as the telephone companies have now, and the chances are your people would be paying many times the overcharges with which they are now burdened.

Remember, that when we created the TVA and started our REA program in 1933, less than 10 percent of the farm homes of America were using electricity. At that time Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified, Germany and other European countries had 90 percent. Italy and France each had 94 percent of their farms electrified. And, as I pointed out a little while ago, even far away New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified.

If it had not been for the Tennessee Valley Authority, in my opinion, the average farmer in this country would not have seen an electric light in his home for the next generation. Today, instead of having 10 percent of our farms electrified, we have 85 percent of them electrified, and I hope to see the time when we will have electricity extended to every farmhouse that can be reached by the draft in times of war or by the tax collector in times of peace.

Here is the table showing the number of residential consumers in each State, the amount of electricity consumed, the price paid for it, and the overcharges, according to the TVA rates, the Tacoma rates, the Bonneville rates and the Ontario rates.

You will note that the residential consumers in Mississippi were overcharged $6,949,751, but remember that they are the ones who are outside the TVA area. If they received their power at the rates paid by the people in the district I represent, they would have saved that $6,949,751, which is equal to the value of more than 500 bales of cotton in every single county in Mississippi, outside of the TVA area.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 2.—*Residential electric service and overcharges for the year 1949*

State	Estimated sales data for 1949			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	515,895	983,559,000	$21,487,700	$13,859,567	$7,628,133	$12,871,132	$8,616,568	$16,244,701	$5,242,999	$11,710,797	$9,776,903
Arizona	168,674	336,325,000	9,591,700	4,608,325	4,893,375	4,285,267	5,216,433	5,406,467	4,095,233	3,895,697	5,606,003
Arkansas	305,418	327,146,000	12,459,200	6,055,171	6,404,029	5,631,558	6,827,642	7,101,744	5,357,456	5,120,731	7,338,469
California	2,510,571	3,908,453,000	102,414,400	64,828,315	37,586,085	60,322,082	42,092,318	76,093,899	26,320,501	54,894,118	47,520,282
Colorado	299,429	446,250,000	14,687,500	7,725,625	6,961,875	7,182,188	7,505,312	9,062,188	5,625,312	6,535,938	8,151,562
Connecticut	556,263	931,871,000	29,824,100	14,941,874	14,882,226	13,898,031	15,926,069	17,536,571	12,287,529	12,645,418	17,178,682
Delaware	81,027	119,673,000	4,607,700	1,985,919	2,621,781	1,843,080	2,764,620	2,326,889	2,280,811	1,677,203	2,930,497
District of Columbia (included in Maryland data)											
Florida	667,913	1,199,796,000	39,557,200	16,811,810	22,745,390	15,625,094	23,932,106	19,699,486	19,857,714	14,201,035	25,356,165
Georgia	673,441	1,296,901,000	32,166,800	18,270,742	13,896,058	16,984,070	15,182,730	21,423,089	10,743,711	15,440,064	16,726,736
Idaho	155,572	581,147,000	10,073,300	6,215,226	3,858,074	5,772,001	4,301,299	7,282,996	2,790,304	5,258,263	4,815,037
Illinois	2,114,756	3,213,074,000	100,992,600	55,242,952	45,749,648	51,405,233	49,587,367	64,837,249	36,155,351	46,759,574	54,233,026
Indiana	1,001,678	1,692,790,000	51,779,100	26,769,795	25,009,305	24,905,747	26,873,353	31,378,135	20,400,965	22,627,467	29,151,633
Iowa	637,870	1,008,653,000	35,554,800	16,639,646	18,915,154	15,466,338	20,088,462	19,519,585	16,035,215	14,079,701	21,475,099
Kansas	448,818	601,865,000	21,501,200	10,750,600	10,750,600	9,998,058	11,503,142	12,599,703	8,901,497	9,095,008	12,406,192
Kentucky	552,222	754,827,000	23,460,200	13,395,774	10,064,426	12,457,366	11,002,834	15,694,874	7,765,326	11,331,277	12,128,923
Louisiana	525,282	599,401,000	22,320,900	10,870,278	11,450,622	10,111,368	12,209,532	12,767,555	9,553,345	9,196,211	13,124,689
Maine	256,934	359,093,000	13,172,400	5,795,856	7,376,544	5,387,512	7,784,888	6,796,958	6,375,442	4,900,133	8,272,267
Maryland and District of Columbia	654,147	1,002,391,000	30,296,400	17,190,445	13,105,955	15,981,374	14,315,026	20,155,739	10,140,661	14,540,960	15,755,440
Massachusetts	1,300,374	1,521,454,000	62,120,900	27,084,712	35,036,188	25,158,965	36,961,935	31,743,780	30,377,120	22,922,612	39,198,288
Michigan	1,670,374	3,198,036,000	89,500,700	50,299,393	39,201,307	46,719,365	42,781,335	58,980,961	30,519,739	42,512,833	46,987,867
Minnesota	765,868	1,331,207,000	42,945,500	21,558,641	21,386,859	20,055,549	22,889,951	25,294,900	17,650,600	18,251,838	24,693,662
Mississippi	334,963	486,224,000	14,299,900	7,350,149	6,949,751	6,835,352	7,464,548	8,622,840	5,677,060	6,220,457	8,079,443
Missouri	917,103	1,322,290,000	40,632,800	22,713,735	17,919,065	21,129,056	19,503,744	26,614,484	14,018,316	19,219,314	21,413,486
Montana	148,594	316,260,000	8,790,700	4,588,745	4,201,955	4,263,490	4,527,210	5,379,908	3,410,792	3,876,699	4,914,001
Nebraska	307,905	513,743,000	15,293,600	8,396,186	6,897,414	7,799,736	7,493,864	9,849,078	5,444,522	7,096,230	8,197,370
Nevada	37,213	155,540,000	2,923,700	1,391,681	1,532,019	1,292,275	1,631,425	1,631,425	1,292,275	1,175,327	1,748,373
New Hampshire	156,263	227,686,000	8,467,500	3,979,725	4,487,775	3,700,298	4,767,202	4,674,060	3,793,440	3,370,065	5,097,435
New Jersey	1,322,090	1,720,628,000	63,649,900	29,979,103	33,670,797	27,878,656	35,771,244	35,198,395	28,451,505	25,396,310	38,253,590
New Mexico	124,542	160,215,000	5,869,000	2,476,718	3,392,282	2,306,517	3,562,483	2,905,155	2,963,845	2,095,233	3,773,767
New York	3,965,952	5,094,189,000	182,753,000	80,411,320	102,341,680	74,745,977	108,007,023	94,300,548	88,452,452	67,984,116	114,768,884
North Carolina	786,401	1,245,088,000	34,765,910	18,564,996	16,200,914	17,243,891	17,522,019	21,763,460	13,002,450	15,679,425	19,086,485
North Dakota	120,718	209,366,000	7,661,100	3,470,478	4,190,622	3,232,984	4,428,116	4,075,705	3,585,395	2,934,201	4,726,899
Ohio	2,010,322	3,479,954,000	103,653,800	56,594,975	47,058,825	52,656,130	50,997,670	66,338,432	37,315,368	47,888,056	55,765,744
Oklahoma	478,252	510,424,000	20,913,900	9,578,566	11,335,334	8,909,321	12,004,579	11,230,764	9,683,136	8,114,593	12,799,307
Oregon	404,642	1,760,495,000	25,666,200	17,607,013	8,059,187	16,375,036	9,291,164	20,635,625	5,030,575	14,886,396	10,779,804
Pennsylvania	2,571,523	4,029,903,000	130,820,200	66,842,122	63,971,078	62,139,595	68,680,605	78,361,300	52,458,900	56,514,326	74,305,874
Rhode Island	220,039	229,896,000	9,995,200	4,277,946	5,717,254	3,978,090	6,017,110	5,017,590	4,977,610	3,618,262	6,376,938
South Carolina	378,637	599,487,000	15,839,490	8,775,077	7,064,413	8,173,177	7,666,313	10,295,669	5,543,821	7,428,721	8,410,769
South Dakota	131,269	195,016,000	7,139,300	3,012,785	4,126,515	2,805,745	4,333,555	3,533,954	3,605,346	2,548,730	4,590,570
Tennessee	687,220	2,001,597,000	31,070,300	23,240,584	7,829,716	21,624,929	9,445,371	27,279,723	3,790,577	19,667,500	11,402,800
Texas	1,576,912	2,014,234,000	69,597,900	35,564,527	34,033,373	33,059,003	36,538,897	41,689,142	27,908,758	30,066,293	39,531,607
Utah	174,107	369,646,000	8,779,100	5,162,111	3,616,989	4,802,168	3,976,932	6,057,579	2,721,521	4,363,213	4,415,887
Vermont	101,834	163,762,000	6,129,300	2,666,246	3,463,054	2,476,237	3,653,063	3,125,943	3,003,357	2,255,582	3,873,718
Virginia	638,701	1,077,621,000	32,059,700	16,606,925	15,452,775	15,452,775	16,606,925	19,492,298	12,567,402	14,042,149	18,017,551
Washington	623,898	2,712,085,000	35,992,600	26,742,502	9,250,098	24,870,887	11,121,713	31,385,547	4,607,053	22,603,353	13,389,247
West Virginia	400,118	509,206,000	18,089,800	9,062,990	9,026,810	8,429,847	9,659,953	10,636,802	7,452,998	7,670,075	10,419,725
Wisconsin	829,168	1,520,008,000	41,681,200	23,091,385	18,589,815	21,507,499	20,173,701	27,092,780	14,588,420	19,548,483	22,132,717
Wyoming	64,454	100,878,000	3,573,300	1,661,585	1,911,715	1,547,239	2,026,061	1,951,022	1,622,278	1,404,307	2,168,993
United States total	35,375,366	58,139,346,000	1,716,532,700	904,717,841	811,814,859	841,297,288	875,235,412	1,061,086,697	655,446,003	765,269,294	951,263,406

If any Member of Congress doubts these figures, let him take the records of rates paid in his home town and his home District, and compare them. He will see that these figures are extremely conservative.

OVERCHARGES PAID BY COMMERCIAL USERS OF ELECTRICITY IN EACH STATE IN 1949

We now come to the burden of overcharges paid by commercial consumers throughout the country—the businessmen, and especially the small-business men in every State.

We are constantly being reminded of the burdens imposed upon the businessmen of this country, and especially upon those small-business men, who constitute, you might say, the backbone of American enterprise. Yet these people are overcharged more than 100 percent for their electric lights and power, which means that the rates are so high in many localities that they are unable to use the amount of electricity necessary for the economical operations of their establishments.

They are entitled to relief from these overcharges and I hope you Members will join me in my efforts to get that relief for them.

Examine the table which I am inserting at this point, and you will see what that burden means to the businessmen of your State.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 3.—*Commercial electric service and overcharges for the year 1949*

State	Estimated sales data for 1949			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	59,075	486,684,000	$10,292,200	$5,825,385	$4,466,815	$5,568,080	$4,724,120	$7,492,722	$2,799,478	$6,741,391	$3,550,809
Arizona	26,090	929,091,000	12,795,000	6,128,805	6,666,195	5,847,315	6,947,685	7,856,130	4,938,870	7,062,840	5,732,160
Arkansas	43,212	329,777,000	9,393,900	3,879,681	5,514,219	3,710,591	5,683,309	4,969,373	4,424,527	4,462,103	4,931,797
California	491,423	4,029,593,000	87,580,200	49,657,973	37,922,227	47,380,888	40,199,312	63,408,065	24,172,135	56,927,130	30,653,070
Colorado	47,758	466,117,000	11,577,100	5,163,387	6,413,713	4,920,268	6,656,832	6,587,370	4,989,730	5,915,898	5,661,202
Connecticut	75,013	529,799,000	18,359,400	6,554,306	11,805,094	6,260,555	12,098,845	8,408,605	9,950,795	7,564,073	10,795,327
Delaware	11,910	129,641,000	3,293,700	1,198,907	2,094,793	1,142,914	2,150,786	1,531,571	1,762,129	1,373,473	1,920,227
District of Columbia (included in Maryland data)											
Florida	105,398	865,701,000	29,833,400	10,053,856	19,779,544	9,606,355	20,227,045	12,858,195	16,975,205	11,545,526	18,287,874
Georgia	85,198	896,097,000	22,793,800	9,755,746	13,038,054	9,322,664	13,471,136	12,513,796	10,280,004	11,237,343	11,556,457
Idaho	24,728	259,095,000	5,088,300	2,747,682	2,340,618	2,620,475	2,467,825	3,505,839	1,582,461	3,144,569	1,943,731
Illinois	314,831	2,367,296,000	77,122,200	31,542,980	45,579,220	30,154,780	46,967,420	40,566,277	36,555,923	36,478,801	40,643,399
Indiana	139,225	1,095,060,000	30,334,800	13,923,673	16,411,127	13,286,642	17,048,158	17,836,862	12,497,938	16,016,774	14,318,026
Iowa	107,506	615,723,000	19,538,500	8,460,171	11,078,329	8,069,401	11,469,099	10,824,329	8,714,171	9,730,173	9,808,327
Kansas	69,944	491,701,000	14,232,700	5,991,967	8,240,733	5,721,545	8,511,155	7,657,193	6,575,507	6,874,394	7,358,306
Kentucky	69,898	484,906,000	12,869,100	5,997,001	6,872,099	5,713,880	7,155,220	7,669,984	5,199,116	6,897,838	5,971,262
Louisiana	74,153	623,202,000	17,975,600	6,543,118	11,432,482	6,237,553	11,738,067	8,358,654	9,616,946	7,513,801	10,461,799
Maine	37,133	209,789,000	6,384,400	2,464,378	3,920,022	2,349,459	4,034,941	3,134,740	3,249,660	2,809,136	3,575,264
Maryland and District of Columbia	103,227	879,049,000	24,502,200	13,650,783	10,851,417	13,037,188	11,465,012	17,542,442	6,959,758	15,774,644	8,727,556
Massachusetts	183,284	927,974,000	37,109,900	12,357,597	24,752,303	11,800,948	25,308,952	15,808,817	21,301,083	14,213,092	22,896,808
Michigan	211,771	2,209,755,000	62,717,000	27,281,895	35,435,105	26,090,272	36,626,728	34,933,369	27,783,631	31,358,500	31,358,500
Minnesota	111,978	791,072,000	25,050,200	9,594,227	15,455,973	9,168,373	15,881,827	12,274,598	12,775,602	11,022,088	14,028,112
Mississippi	40,590	340,210,000	9,026,700	3,773,161	5,253,539	3,601,653	5,425,047	4,829,285	4,197,415	4,332,816	4,693,884
Missouri	137,262	1,189,864,000	31,779,200	14,491,315	17,287,885	13,855,731	17,923,469	18,590,832	13,188,368	16,715,859	15,063,341
Montana	21,449	196,692,000	4,819,500	2,356,736	2,462,764	2,250,707	2,568,793	3,017,007	1,802,493	2,708,559	2,110,941
Nebraska	50,939	407,895,000	9,592,400	4,633,129	4,959,271	4,422,096	5,170,304	5,947,288	3,645,112	5,342,967	4,249,433
Nevada	8,259	165,627,000	2,874,900	1,221,833	1,653,067	1,167,209	1,707,691	1,566,821	1,308,079	1,408,701	1,466,199
New Hampshire	21,633	115,798,000	3,950,900	1,623,820	2,327,080	1,552,704	2,398,196	2,078,173	1,872,727	1,868,776	2,082,124
New Jersey	206,924	1,483,196,000	48,398,900	17,084,812	31,314,088	16,310,429	32,088,471	21,876,303	26,522,597	19,649,953	28,748,947
New Mexico	19,318	169,794,000	4,816,900	1,830,422	2,986,478	1,748,535	3,068,365	2,345,830	2,471,070	2,104,985	2,711,915
New York	680,741	7,576,634,000	206,324,400	68,912,350	137,412,050	65,817,484	140,506,916	88,513,168	117,811,232	79,641,218	126,683,182
North Carolina	94,000	763,026,000	18,391,127	8,938,088	9,453,039	8,533,483	9,857,644	11,402,499	6,988,628	10,225,467	8,165,660
North Dakota	23,688	155,062,000	5,992,800	2,109,466	3,883,334	2,013,581	3,979,219	2,696,760	3,296,040	2,421,091	3,571,709
Ohio	265,451	2,203,663,000	60,693,100	28,282,985	32,410,115	27,008,430	33,684,670	36,294,474	24,398,626	32,652,888	28,040,212
Oklahoma	69,699	435,520,000	13,024,600	5,639,652	7,384,948	5,379,160	7,645,440	7,215,628	5,808,972	6,473,226	6,551,374
Oregon	61,698	852,465,000	13,681,900	9,153,191	4,528,709	8,729,052	4,952,848	11,684,343	1,997,557	10,480,335	3,201,565
Pennsylvania	399,424	2,642,081,000	74,839,600	32,555,226	42,284,374	31,058,434	43,781,166	41,760,497	33,079,103	37,569,479	37,270,121
Rhode Island	29,854	160,509,000	6,378,400	2,232,440	4,145,960	2,130,386	4,248,014	2,857,523	3,520,877	2,564,117	3,814,283
South Carolina	45,259	367,383,000	8,379,073	4,122,504	4,256,569	3,938,164	4,440,909	5,262,058	3,117,015	4,717,418	3,661,655
South Dakota	25,794	140,701,000	5,526,300	1,862,363	3,663,937	1,779,469	3,746,831	2,381,835	3,144,465	2,133,152	3,393,148
Tennessee	75,248	747,104,000	12,524,500	8,666,954	3,857,546	8,278,695	4,245,805	11,071,658	1,452,842	9,931,929	2,592,571
Texas	237,073	2,412,841,000	57,718,800	26,377,492	31,341,308	25,223,116	32,495,684	33,880,936	23,837,864	30,417,808	27,300,992
Utah	17,242	170,909,000	4,289,300	1,973,078	2,316,222	1,883,003	2,406,297	2,526,398	1,762,902	2,269,040	2,020,260
Vermont	13,965	91,403,000	2,627,800	1,072,142	1,555,658	1,022,214	1,605,586	1,363,828	1,263,972	1,221,927	1,405,873
Virginia	86,632	891,441,000	22,590,100	9,600,793	12,989,307	9,171,581	13,418,519	12,311,605	10,278,495	11,046,559	11,543,541
Washington	79,898	1,485,500,000	20,684,300	14,375,589	6,308,711	13,713,691	6,970,609	18,471,080	2,213,220	16,609,493	4,074,807
West Virginia	55,205	278,587,000	7,975,500	3,644,804	4,330,696	3,485,294	4,490,206	4,681,619	3,293,881	4,203,089	3,772,411
Wisconsin	121,962	1,090,080,000	30,085,900	15,223,465	14,862,435	14,531,490	15,554,410	19,525,749	10,560,151	17,540,080	12,545,820
Wyoming	8,806	110,614,000	2,895,200	1,227,565	1,667,635	1,172,556	1,722,644	1,569,198	1,326,002	1,409,962	1,485,238
United States total	5,290,768	46,261,721,000	1,228,725,700	531,758,893	696,966,807	507,788,473	720,937,227	681,461,326	547,264,374	612,324,481	616,401,219

OVERCHARGES PAID BY INDUSTRIAL USERS OF ELECTRICITY IN EVERY STATE IN 1949

We now come to the burdens of overcharges paid by industrial consumers in every State—those enterprises that furnish employment to millions of our people.

Remember, that many of the big industrialists generate their own power, because they can do it for so much less than they could buy it and pay these overcharges. Those private industries that produce their own electricity generated and used more than 53,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours last year, or more than was used by the entire country when I first came to Congress. I have consulted some of those big industrialists, and I find that they can produce power with natural gas, or Diesel engines, or with coal in those States where coal is produced, so much cheaper than they can buy it and pay those overcharges, that they are driven to the production of their own electricity in self-defense.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services and overcharges for the year 1949*

State	Estimated sales data for 1949			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	99,530	4,787,256,000	$34,030,400	$22,017,669	$12,012,731	$16,300,562	$17,729,838	$24,297,706	$9,732,694	$25,420,709	$8,609,691
Arizona	1,521	253,566,000	3,298,600	1,919,785	1,378,815	1,421,697	1,876,903	2,117,701	1,180,899	2,216,659	1,081,941
Arkansas	84,051	985,181,000	13,812,300	9,254,241	4,558,059	6,850,901	6,961,399	10,221,102	3,591,198	10,690,720	3,121,580
California	468,072	13,525,385,000	152,623,700	124,083,068	28,540,632	92,032,091	60,591,609	137,056,083	15,567,617	143,466,278	9,157,422
Colorado	33,696	515,425,000	9,151,500	5,518,355	3,633,145	4,081,569	5,069,931	6,085,748	3,065,752	6,369,444	2,782,056
Connecticut	6,986	1,617,659,000	29,752,400	13,091,056	16,661,344	9,699,282	20,053,118	14,459,666	15,292,734	15,114,219	14,638,181
Delaware	2,110	266,373,000	3,618,300	1,845,333	1,772,967	1,367,717	2,250,583	2,037,103	1,581,197	2,131,179	1,487,121
District of Columbia (included in Maryland data)											
Florida	6,335	1,169,053,000	16,370,600	6,613,722	9,756,878	4,894,809	11,475,791	7,301,288	9,069,312	7,645,070	8,725,530
Georgia	2,631	2,008,564,000	20,834,400	12,104,786	8,729,614	8,958,792	11,875,608	13,354,850	7,479,550	13,979,882	6,854,518
Idaho	8,401	671,160,000	4,976,500	3,712,469	1,264,031	2,752,005	2,224,495	4,100,636	875,864	4,289,743	686,757
Illinois	133,353	10,100,972,000	135,050,200	69,820,953	65,229,247	51,724,227	83,325,973	77,113,664	57,936,536	80,624,969	54,425,231
Indiana	84,251	4,320,118,000	59,853,500	30,525,285	29,328,215	22,624,623	37,228,877	33,697,521	26,155,979	35,253,712	24,599,788
Iowa	70,267	1,465,666,000	23,248,600	12,321,758	10,926,842	9,113,451	14,135,149	13,600,431	9,648,169	14,228,143	9,020,457

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services and overcharges for the year 1949*—Con.

State	Estimated sales data for 1949			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Kansas	49,884	1,272,739,000	$18,276,700	$9,960,802	$8,315,898	$7,383,787	$10,892,913	$11,002,573	$7,274,127	$11,514,321	$6,762,379
Kentucky	39,256	1,931,814,000	24,176,400	13,635,490	10,540,910	10,105,735	14,070,665	15,037,721	9,138,679	15,738,836	8,437,564
Louisiana	20,958	1,734,205,000	14,686,200	8,694,230	5,991,970	6,432,556	8,253,644	9,590,089	5,096,111	10,045,361	4,640,839
Maine	8,149	633,316,000	8,364,600	4,558,707	3,805,893	3,379,298	4,985,302	5,035,489	3,329,111	5,269,698	3,094,902
Maryland and District of Columbia	42,474	3,225,195,000	43,792,500	24,195,739	19,596,761	17,948,622	25,843,878	26,728,548	17,063,952	27,992,271	15,800,229
Massachusetts	13,277	3,360,281,000	63,438,800	27,849,633	35,589,167	20,617,610	42,821,190	30,704,379	32,734,421	32,163,472	31,275,328
Michigan	30,999	6,021,105,000	80,156,800	35,509,462	44,647,338	26,291,430	53,865,370	39,196,675	40,960,125	40,960,125	39,196,675
Minnesota	43,449	1,531,356,000	26,495,100	13,353,530	13,141,570	9,909,107	16,585,993	14,757,771	11,737,329	15,446,643	11,048,457
Mississippi	36,869	600,504,000	9,035,300	5,132,050	3,903,250	3,803,861	5,231,439	5,665,133	3,370,167	5,927,157	3,108,143
Missouri	65,115	2,494,413,000	33,299,800	18,348,190	14,951,610	13,586,318	19,713,482	20,279,578	13,020,222	21,211,973	12,087,827
Montana	3,033	1,646,226,000	8,815,500	6,602,810	2,212,690	4,892,603	3,922,897	7,290,419	1,525,081	7,634,223	1,181,277
Nebraska	17,474	448,405,000	6,695,100	4,084,011	2,611,089	3,026,185	3,668,915	4,505,802	2,189,298	4,720,046	1,975,054
Nevada	1,205	175,539,000	1,552,400	1,176,719	375,681	872,449	679,951	1,299,359	253,041	1,359,902	192,498
New Hampshire	13,982	371,956,000	6,588,300	3,294,150	3,294,150	2,437,671	4,150,629	3,636,742	2,951,558	3,801,449	2,786,851
New Jersey	9,722	3,822,840,000	59,264,800	27,261,808	32,002,992	20,200,297	39,055,503	30,106,518	29,158,282	31,469,609	27,795,190
New Mexico	5,629	205,603,000	3,227,400	1,652,429	1,574,971	1,226,412	2,000,988	1,823,481	1,403,919	1,910,621	1,316,779
New York	23,335	10,988,056,000	109,960,200	49,921,931	60,038,269	37,056,587	72,903,613	55,200,020	54,760,180	57,729,105	52,231,095
North Carolina	65,517	3,263,743,000	33,992,279	22,060,989	11,931,290	16,350,286	17,641,993	24,338,472	9,653,807	25,494,209	8,498,070
North Dakota	1,680	51,491,000	1,265,500	539,103	726,397	399,898	865,602	596,051	669,449	622,626	642,874
Ohio	124,681	11,036,324,000	139,531,800	71,440,282	68,091,518	53,022,084	86,509,716	78,835,467	60,696,333	82,602,826	56,928,974
Oklahoma	45,834	1,100,977,000	15,470,500	9,576,240	5,894,260	7,100,960	8,369,540	10,566,352	4,904,148	11,061,408	4,409,092
Oregon	16,592	2,617,393,000	13,278,100	12,056,515	1,221,585	8,936,161	4,341,939	13,278,100		13,278,100	
Pennsylvania	72,496	14,428,951,000	177,817,400	100,111,196	77,706,204	74,149,856	103,667,544	110,424,605	67,392,795	115,581,310	62,236,090
Rhode Island	2,204	575,502,000	11,496,500	4,863,020	6,633,480	3,598,405	7,898,095	5,368,866	6,127,634	5,621,789	5,874,711
South Carolina	31,545	1,571,432,000	15,487,021	10,097,538	5,389,483	7,480,231	8,006,790	11,150,655	4,336,366	11,677,214	3,809,807
South Dakota	5,312	112,360,000	2,328,900	978,138	1,350,762	724,288	1,604,612	1,080,610	1,248,290	1,129,517	1,199,383
Tennessee	8,037	6,393,492,000	31,947,100	26,292,463	5,654,637	19,487,731	12,459,369	29,039,914	2,907,186	30,381,692	1,565,408
Texas	159,210	4,846,134,000	57,482,000	35,753,804	21,728,196	26,490,202	30,982,798	39,432,652	18,049,348	41,272,676	16,209,324
Utah	2,066	490,145,000	5,869,000	3,832,457	2,036,543	2,840,596	3,028,404	4,231,549	1,637,451	4,425,226	1,443,774
Vermont	7,613	224,559,000	4,034,000	2,291,312	1,742,688	1,694,280	2,339,720	2,529,318	1,504,682	2,646,304	1,387,696
Virginia	31,660	1,852,278,000	22,682,600	13,654,925	9,027,675	10,116,440	12,566,160	15,083,929	7,598,671	15,787,090	6,895,510
Washington	27,009	7,382,565,000	27,773,000	21,690,713	6,082,287	16,052,794	11,720,206	23,940,326	3,832,674	25,051,246	2,721,754
West Virginia	34,002	3,138,780,000	36,097,900	18,879,202	17,218,698	13,969,887	22,128,013	20,828,488	15,269,412	21,803,132	14,294,768
Wisconsin	120,704	2,833,536,000	46,653,000	21,133,809	25,519,191	15,675,408	30,977,592	23,373,153	23,279,847	24,446,172	22,206,828
Wyoming	2,471	70,986,000	1,166,900	651,130	515,770	481,930	684,970	718,810	448,090	751,484	415,416
United States total	2,184,647	144,140,579,000	1,668,820,400	943,963,007	724,857,393	699,581,751	969,238,649	1,042,121,113	626,699,287	1,089,958,960	578,861,440

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to make to any Member of Congress, or to any of that vast number of Power Trust lobbyists that are swarming around this Capitol, for my fight for the power consumers of America during my service in this House.

If we had not succeeded in our battle for the creation and development of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which provides a yardstick for electric-light and power rates throughout the country—if we had not succeeded in those efforts, the chances are the American people would be paying several billion dollars more in overcharges, and as I said the average American farmer would not have seen an electric light in his home during this generation.

There is one thing about the water power of this Nation of which I am extremely proud, and that is that it cannot be exported. It must be used at home—here in the United States.

As I have pointed out, we have enough of it yet undeveloped, when harnessed and firmed up to the peak of the average year, to electrify the entire country, and make it the richest, most prosperous, and most powerful Nation the world has ever seen.

Our country can then lead the rest of humanity by precept and example into a more glorious civilization as she moves on through the centuries—holding high the torch and making light the way "up which all the nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the remainder of the pending chapter do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to chapter VIII? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Debate and consideration of amendments to chapter VIII of the pending bill has been concluded. When the bill is next taken up, chapter IX will be considered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JUDD, for an indefinite period, on account of official business as congressional adviser to the American delegation to World Health Assembly in Geneva.

To Mr. LANE, for Saturday, May 6, 1950, on account of official business.

To Mr. WAGNER, for Saturday, May 6, 1950, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a reprint of an article appearing in the Journal of Property Management of December 1949.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole and include certain statistics and other extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by S. Res. 202, Eighty-first Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, May 8, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 8404. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8405. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. Res. 590. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the curtailment of postal services; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 8406. A bill for the relief of Master Sgt. Robert A. Espe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8407. A bill to authorize the restoration of Edwin M. Rosenberg, lieutenant commander, retired, to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8408. A bill for the relief of Karlis Lobe and Milda Lobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 8409. A bill for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 8410. A bill to provide for the conveyance of two tracts of real property in Power and Oneida Counties, Idaho, to Burl B. Byerley; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2106. By Mr. KEARNEY: Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to adopt a resolution for a plebiscite in Ireland under the auspices of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2107. Also, memorial of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, requesting the Congress to confirm ownership in the States of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2108. Also, memorial of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, respecting the earmarking of funds collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to each State to be used in the administration of the unemployment-insurance law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2109. Also, concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing the President and Congress to revise present Federal-aid program to eliminate inequities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou seeking shepherd of our souls, from the arid wastes of our own foolish and perverse ways lead us into green pastures and beside still waters. We lift our hearts to Thee in the amazing wonder that Thou hast ordained for Thyself no completion without us; and for us, no peace, no lasting joy, apart from Thee. May we be worthy of the high trusteeship of power and opportunity which Thou hast committed to us. May this Nation under God be purged of its own failures to practice genuine democracy. With the anxious eyes of the world upon us, keep us in America from all that is narrow, selfish, and petty, by the solemn remembrance that on a global field tyranny and freedom are battling for the bodies and souls of men. We ask it in the name of that Holy One whose face was the home of all men's dreams and the answer to all men's prayers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 5, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 5, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift; and

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5876) to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 466) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow, and Mr. MCCARTHY was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Malone
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Ives	O'Conor
Butler	Jenner	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Smith N. J.
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Donnell	Kilgore	Stennis
Douglas	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Langer	Taylor
Ecton	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Lehman	Thye
Ferguson	Lodge	Tydings
Flanders	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Lucas	Wiley
George	McClellan	Williams
Gillette	McFarland	Withers
Green	McKellar	Young
Gurney	McMahon	
Hayden	Magnuson	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1728, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the motion, which the Senator from Illinois made on Friday, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Emil Rohwader, of Brookline, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase social-security compensation; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Mrs. Thornton Whipple, of Binghamton, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 1103) to readjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, to the Committee on Public Works:

"Concurrent resolution to protest the action of the United States Corps of Engineers in not completely clearing the Clark Hill Basin of all trees and debris

"Whereas the building of a reservoir adjacent to the lands of South Carolina and Georgia, to be known as the Clark Hill Dam, has been contemplated for many years; and

"Whereas the reservoir when completed will store millions of gallons of water and will inundate a large area; and

"Whereas the original plan for the construction of the reservoir called for a complete clearing of all trees and debris from the basin before water would be raised; and

"Whereas it has now become apparent that this plan is only to be partially completed and that the basin will not be completely cleared; and

"Whereas, with the remaining trees, stumps, and other debris which are planned to be left intact, a serious menace to the health of thousands of inhabitants will be affected by the resultant malaria-breeding spots; and

"Whereas such a condition will be a serious blight upon the scenic beauty of the reservoir; and

"Whereas which is most serious of all there will be created a decided hazard to human life resulting from the use of small boats by persons engaged in fishing and other pleasureful uses of the waters: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That we respectfully protest the failure to clear properly the reservoir of the Clark Hill project before the filling of the reservoir; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully memorialize our Senators and Congressmen to request the Corps of Engineers to take such action as may be necessary to restore the complete clearing of the reservoir as originally planned; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the two Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in Washington."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12—RESOLUTION OF DISTRICT NO. 2 COUNCIL, URCL AND PWA-CIO, FALL RIVER, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by district No. 2 council, URCL and PWA-CIO, of Fall River, Mass., favoring the adoption of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 12.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON PRESIDENT'S REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12

Whereas the division of authority between the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and the National Labor Relations Board resulting from the provision of the Taft-Hartley law has created confusion, chaos, and delay in the administration of that law; and

Whereas the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board in arrogant disregard of the decisions and policies established by the National Labor Relations Board has, and continues to, exercise the authority vested in him under the Taft-Hartley law to employ its antilabor provision to the end of harassing and oppressing the labor movement to the greatest possible extent; and

Whereas there is now pending before Congress the President's Reorganization Plan No. 12 which, if approved by the Congress, will abolish the office of the general counsel and restore the powers, now vested in that office, to the National Labor Relations Board as under the Wagner Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the district No. 2 council, URCL and PWA-CIO, go on record as fully endorsing the President's Reorganization Plan No. 12; and be it further

Resolved, That each Senator and Congressman from New England immediately be notified of the passage of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That all locals affiliated with the district No. 2 council be notified of this action and that they be urged immediately to send letters to each Congressman and Senator from their State and congressional district; and be it further urged that all said locals immediately take action to have their members send similar messages by way of telegrams or letters to their Congressmen and Senators.

PROPOSED CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF SALEM, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Salem, Mass., protesting against the proposed curtailment of postal service.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF SALEM, MASS.,
April 27, 1950.

Ordered, That the city council go on record as being opposed to the proposed curtailment of postal service and the suggested cut in personnel and that a letter be forwarded to the Massachusetts members of Congress requesting them to join forces in opposition to any cut in this all important public service.

Adopted in city council April 27, 1950.

Attest:

AUGUSTINE J. TOOMEY,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. Res. 252. Resolution calling on the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for a codification of Federal laws relating to housing; without amendment.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 8, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 176) to suspend the applications of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO PERSONNEL AND PAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment and pay in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of March 1950, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH FEBRUARY–MARCH 1950, AND PAY JANUARY–FEBRUARY 1950

NOTE WITH REFERENCE TO PERSONAL SERVICE EXPENDITURE FIGURES

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of February and that they are compared with

personal service expenditure figures for the month of January, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are the month of March and are compared with the month of February. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for March 1950 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch		
	In March numbered	In February numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February was—	In January was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,091,895	1,951,968	+139,927	$510,698	$542,589	−$31,891
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment [1]	1,349,054	1,206,741	+142,313	319,882	335,475	−15,593
2. National Military Establishment	742,841	745,227	−2,386	190,816	207,114	−16,298
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of Secretary of Defense	1,755	1,751	+4	636	850	−214
Department of the Army	298,351	309,442	−11,091	76,560	85,298	−8,738
Department of the Air Force	149,586	150,524	−938	36,971	40,478	−3,507
Department of the Navy	293,149	283,510	+9,639	76,649	80,488	−3,839

[1] Includes Department of Commerce employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: February, 2,899; March, 145,055; increase, 142,156. February pay figure reflects temporary Census employment to the extent that it had progressed that month.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Table V shows personnel counted in tables I, II, III, and IV who are assigned to the mutual defense assistance program by the State Department, Economic Cooperation Administration, and the component units of the National Military Establishment, together with their pay.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1950, and comparison with February 1950; and pay for February 1950 and comparison with January 1950*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	January	February	Increase	Decrease	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	$20,603	$19,058		$1,545	74,321	75,431	1,110	
Commerce [1]	14,917	14,046		871	46,980	189,215	142,235	
Interior	15,674	14,848		826	54,993	56,285	1,292	
Justice	9,576	8,837		739	26,257	26,203		54
Labor	1,838	1,734		104	5,682	5,516		166
Post Office	132,176	131,085		1,091	513,192	512,745		447
State	7,300	6,859		441	24,330	24,394	64	
Treasury	28,206	26,142		2,064	90,373	91,415	1,042	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	123	107		16	254	261	7	
Bureau of the Budget	260	237		23	536	542	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	18	16		2	74	64		10
National Security Council [2]	7	9	$2		16	17	1	
National Security Resources Board	152	141		11	297	304	7	
Council of Economic Advisers	23	18		5	32	32		
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	2	2			5	5		
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	104	101		3	255	255		
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,475	1,580	105		4,433	4,513	80	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	8	11	3		18	18		
Office of the Housing Expediter	1,535	1,360		175	4,113	4,096		17
Philippine Alien Property Administration	8	9	1		80	80		
Philippine War Damage Commission	232	210		22	978	738		240
War Claims Commission	21	21			53	54	1	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	42	44	2		394	418	24	
Atomic Energy Commission	1,882	1,685		197	4,965	4,948		17
Civil Aeronautics Board	270	244		26	641	635		6
Civil Service Commission	1,198	1,101		97	3,705	3,637		68
Export-Import Bank of Washington	63	58		5	124	126	2	
Federal Communications Commission	525	473		52	1,317	1,302		15
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	400	366		34	1,077	1,071		6
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	190	176		14	345	344		1
Federal Power Commission	313	289		24	735	727		8
Federal Security Agency [3]	9,734	8,808		926	34,085	34,315	230	
Federal Trade Commission	292	267		25	639	639		
General Accounting Office	2,853	2,587		266	8,526	8,490		36
General Services Administration	6,536	5,874		662	22,916	22,781		135
Government Printing Office	2,392	2,218		174	7,088	7,073		15
Housing and Home Finance	4,225	4,631	406		12,579	12,816	237	
Indian Claims Commission	7	6		1	10	10		
Interstate Commerce Commission	847	783		64	2,145	2,133		12
Maritime Commission [4]	1,736	1,589		147	5,451	5,309		142
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,436	2,230		206	7,527	7,532	5	
National Capital Housing Authority	84	77		7	319	318		1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	2	2			20	18		2
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	5	6	1		17	28	11	
National Gallery of Art	86	76		10	321	321		
National Labor Relations Board	558	541		17	1,830	1,606		224
National Mediation Board	49	48		1	122	125	3	
Panama Canal	3,173	3,170		3	21,351	20,960		391
Railroad Retirement Board	739	669		70	2,434	2,413		21
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,854	1,685		169	4,494	4,570	76	
Securities and Exchange Commission	455	412		43	1,032	1,023		9
Selective Service System	483	433		50	3,469	3,457		12
Smithsonian Institution	173	158		15	563	564	1	

[1] Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: February ,2,899; March, 145,055; increase, 142,156. February pay figure reflects temporary Census employment to the extent that it had progressed that month.
[2] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[3] Includes personnel and pay for Howard University and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[4] Exclusive of 75 seamen and 2,056 seamen trainees on the rolls of the Maritime Commission and their pay.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1950, and comparison with February 1950; and pay for February 1950 and comparison with January 1950*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	January	February	Increase	Decrease	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued.								
Tariff Commission	102	94		8	224	226	2	
Tax Court of the United States	60	55		5	126	126		
Tennessee Valley Authority	3,892	3,572		320	12,442	12,535	93	
Veterans' Administration	53,561	49,024		4,537	196,436	194,275		2,161
Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment	335,475	319,882	520	16,113	1,206,741	1,349,054	146,529	4,216
Net change, excluding National Military Establishment			15,593				142,313	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [5]	$850	$636		$214	1,751	1,755	4	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	73,906	66,960		6,946	268,348	256,667		11,681
Outside continental United States	11,392	9,600		1,792	41,094	41,684	590	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	36,104	32,891		3,213	126,279	126,570	291	
Outside continental United States	4,374	4,080		294	24,245	23,016		1,229
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	74,100	71,273		2,827	257,664	267,648	9,984	
Outside continental United States	6,388	5,376		1,012	25,846	25,501		345
Total, National Military Establishment	207,114	190,816		16,298	745,227	742,841	10,869	13,255
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			$16,298				2,386	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	542,589	510,698	520	32,411	1,951,968	2,091,895	157,398	17,471
Net change, including National Military Establishment			31,891				139,927	

[5] Includes 14 employees assigned to North Atlantic Treaty Organization and 172 employees assigned to Munitions Board, Cataloging Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1950 and comparison with February 1950*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	71,549	72,775	1,226	
Commerce [1]	43,173	182,703	139,530	
Interior	49,560	50,635	1,075	
Justice	25,786	25,734		52
Labor	5,603	5,435		168
Post Office	511,336	510,847		489
State	8,573	8,567		6
Treasury	89,618	90,651	1,033	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	254	261	7	
Bureau of the Budget	536	542	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	64		10
National Security Council [2]	16	17	1	
National Security Resources Board	297	304	7	
Council of Economic Advisers	32	32		
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	5	5		
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	89	90	1	
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,131	1,137	6	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	18	18		
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,088	4,071		17
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2		
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	6		
War Claims Commission	53	54	1	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	15		
Atomic Energy Commission	4,962	4,944		18
Civil Aeronautics Board	625	619		6
Civil Service Commission	3,700	3,632		68
Export-Import Bank of Washington	123	125	2	
Federal Communications Commission	1,287	1,276		11
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,077	1,071		6
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	345	344		1
Federal Power Commission	735	727		8
Federal Security Agency [3]	33,582	33,821	239	
Federal Trade Commission	639	639		
General Accounting Office	8,526	8,490		36
General Services Administration	22,881	22,742		139
Government Printing Office	7,088	7,073		15
Housing and Home Finance	12,528	12,764	236	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Indian Claims Commission	10	10		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,145	2,133		12
Maritime Commission [4]	5,436	5,294		142
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,525	7,530	5	
National Capital Housing Authority	319	318		1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	20	18		2
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	17	28	11	
National Gallery of Art	321	321		
National Labor Relations Board	1,817	1,592		225
National Mediation Board	122	125	3	
Panama Canal	632	620		12
Railroad Retirement Board	2,434	2,413		21
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,483	4,558	75	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,032	1,023		9
Selective Service System	3,388	3,376		12
Smithsonian Institution	558	559	1	
Tariff Commission	224	226	2	
Tax Court of the United States	126	126		
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,442	12,535	93	
Veterans' Administration	194,785	192,647		2,138
Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,147,748	1,287,684	143,560	3,624
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			139,936	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,739	1,741	2	
Department of the Army	268,348	256,667		11,681
Department of the Air Force	126,279	126,570	291	
Department of the Navy	257,664	267,648	9,984	
Total, National Military Establishment	654,030	652,626	10,277	11,681
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			1,404	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	1,801,778	1,940,310	153,837	15,305
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			138,532	

[1] Includes temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census as follows: February 2,899; March, 142,859; gross increase, 139,960 (net departmental increase, 139,530).
[2] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[3] Includes personnel for Howard University and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[4] Exclusive of 75 seamen and 2,056 seamen trainees on the rolls of the Maritime Commission.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1950, and comparison with February 1950*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	2,772	2,656		116
Commerce [1]	3,807	6,512	2,705	
Interior	5,433	5,650	217	
Justice	471	469		2
Labor	79	81	2	
Post Office	1,856	1,898	42	
State	15,757	15,827	70	
Treasury	755	764	9	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	166	165		1
Economic Cooperation Administration	3,302	3,376	74	
Office of the Housing Expediter	25	25		
Philippine Alien Property Administration	78	78		
Philippine War Damage Commission	972	732		240
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	379	403	24	
Atomic Energy Commission	3	4	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	16	16		
Civil Service Commission	5	5		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1	1		
Federal Communications Commission	30	26		4
Federal Security Agency	503	494		9
General Services Administration	35	39	4	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	51	52	1	
Maritime Commission	15	15		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2	2		
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Labor Relations Board	13	14	1	
Panama Canal	20,719	20,340		379
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	11	12	1	
Selective Service System	81	81		
Smithsonian Institution	5	5		
Veterans' Administration	1,651	1,628		23
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	58,993	61,370	3,151	774
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			2,377	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	12	14	2	
Department of the Army	41,094	41,684	590	
Department of the Air Force	24,245	23,016		1,229
Department of the Navy	25,846	25,501		345
Total, National Military Establishment	91,197	90,215	592	1,574
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			982	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	150,190	151,585	3,743	2,348
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			1,395	

[1] March total and the increase figure include 2,196 temporary employees (enumerators, supervisors, and clerks) engaged in taking the Seventeenth Decennial Census.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1950 and comparison with February 1950*

Department or agency	February	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	1,125	1,177	52	
Interior	4,543	4,913	370	
State	557	561	4	
Treasury	8,032	7,858		174
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	143	139		4
General Services Administration	144	150	6	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	17	19	2	
Panama Canal	1,747	1,728		19
Smithsonian Institution	7	8	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,216	6,308	92	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	22,531	22,861	527	197
Net increase, excluding National Military establishment			330	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	136,857	126,586		10,271
Outside continental United States	23,243	23,940	697	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	70,131	70,535	404	
Outside continental United States	18,382	18,473	91	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	165,932	175,084	9,152	
Outside continental United States	18,739	18,472		267
Total, National Military Establishment	433,284	433,090	10,344	10,538
Net decrease, National Military Establishment			194	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	455,815	455,951	10,871	10,735
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			136	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program* [1]

Department or agency	Civilian personnel			Payroll (in thousands)		
	In March numbered—	In February numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February was—	In January was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	5,864	4,771	+1,093	$1,249	$651	+$598
State Department	70	69	+1	31	32	−1
Economic Cooperation Administration	13	9	+4	7	2	+5
Office of the Secretary of Defense	35	24	+11	11	12	−1
Department of the Army	4,412	3,865	+547	984	383	+601
Department of the Air Force	598	589	+9	163	221	−58
Department of the Navy	736	215	+521	53	1	+52

[1] See note with reference to table V.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR H. F. BYRD, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, IN CONNECTION WITH THE MONTHLY REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY, FEBRUARY-MARCH 1950

Temporary employment by the Department of Commerce incident to the seventeenth decennial census probably reached its peak during March when the total of census enumerators, supervisors, and clerks mounted to 145,055. This was an increase in the temporary census employment of 142,156 over those on the rolls in February.

These temporary census employees increased total civilian employment in the executive branch in March to 2,091,895. Exclusive of temporary census employees total civilian employment in the executive branch during the month was 1,946,840.

Exclusive of temporary census employees there was a net decrease of 2,229 in the other civilian employment in the executive branch.

Exclusive of the temporary census employees there was a slight net increase in the civilian agencies of the Government, while total civilian employment in the Military Establishment continued to decline for the seventh consecutive month since the Johnson retrenchment order last August.

The March civilian employment decreases in the Military Establishment totaled 2,386 bringing this employment down to 742,841. Employment in the civilian agencies in March, exclusive of the temporary census roll, totaled 1,203,999 as compared with 1,203,842 in February, an increase of 157.

Civilian agencies reporting major increases were Commerce Department (in addition to temporary census employees), Agriculture Department, Interior Department, Treasury Department, Federal Security Agency, and Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Agencies reporting major decreases included all of the components of the National Military Establishment, along with Post Office Department, Philippine War Damage Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Panama Canal, and Veterans' Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3555. A bill defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3556. A bill to authorize the construction of certain irrigation and power projects in the Snake River Basin, Idaho, Wyo., and Oreg., and Crooked River, Oreg., to establish a Snake River Basin account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3557. A bill for the relief of Maia Andre and her mother, Mrs. Juliane Altenbrun; and

S. 3558. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3559. A bill to permit suit to be brought on the claims of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivak, and Irving Weinberg against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3560. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3561. A bill to provide that the absence of any individual for 20 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

INVESTIGATION ON SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in reference to it not to exceed 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the investigation of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee into charges against the loyalty of the officials and employees of the State Department has been going on since March 8, 1950; and

Whereas on the present method of procedure it appears that said investigation can be continued indefinitely to the detriment of the morale of the Department and to the handicapping of our foreign relations abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Foreign Relations Subcommittee be required to continue its subsequent proceedings on this subject in executive session; and also be it

Resolved, That the Committee shall in addition to the above investigation address itself to a study of present methods for assuring loyalty of departmental officials and employees, and also make such recommendations to the Senate as it may see fit for the improvement of such procedures.

Mr. President, the resolution just read is a result of serious concern on my part with the history and the results to date of the investigation of the charges against the State Department and its personnel. I have long been disturbed by State Department policy. I was particularly disturbed to learn how close was the agreement between the official party line of the Chinese Communists and the attitude and actions of the State Department with reference to China.

We all realize that there was no easy answer to the Chinese situation. Many of us believe that the courses actively taken have not been justified by the events, and that the doubts and fears we have felt for some years past have been justified by the events.

The time has come when proceeding further along the present lines in the State Department investigation can do little good. It can do much harm. As the resolution indicates, it is affecting unfavorably the morale of able and conscientious public servants and it is causing astonishment and uncertainty in our relations abroad.

It is therefore proposed that the investigating committee, without ceasing its investigations, shall now carry them on in executive session. I would earnestly suggest also, as I did on March 31, that in executive session all pertinent records be made available to the committee, so that any suspicion of a whitewash can be completely removed.

It is further urgently suggested that the committee address itself to constructive criticism and suggestion as to future policy. It will be most unfortunate if constructive action does not come out of the investigation and if nothing results from it but political charges and countercharges.

The resolution (S. Res. 268), submitted by Mr. FLANDERS, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF TAX BILL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. MAYBANK each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to H. R. ——, a tax bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 466) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Incorporated, Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate, messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REVIEW OF REPORTS ON CHARLESTON HARBOR, S. C.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, for information, a resolution which it is my purpose to submit to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, concerning reports of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on Charleston Harbor, S. C.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors be, and is hereby, requested to review the reports on Charleston Harbor, S. C., submitted in House Document No. 259, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, and previous reports, with a view of determining if the existing project should be modified in any way at this time, with particular reference to the desirability of increasing the present authorized channel depth of 30 feet in Cooper River east and north of Drum Island to a depth of 35 feet.

NATIONAL DEFENSE WEEK—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "If You Were Joe Stalin," written by him, and published in the magazine the Reserve Officer for May 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY MUST BE COMPLETED—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIS NATION UNDER GOD—SENATE CHAPLAIN'S ENDORSEMENT OF BOOK BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris commending a recent book by Senator THOMAS of Utah entitled "This Nation Under God," from the Washington Star of May 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEWEY AT ANNUAL NEW YORK STATE REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE DINNER

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Governor Dewey of New York at the annual New York State Republican Committee dinner, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, May 4, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECLAMATION IN THE ARID AND SEMI-ARID WEST—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM E. WELSH

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Reclamation in the Arid and Semi-Arid West," delivered by William E. Welsh, secretary-manager, National Reclamation As-

sociation, before the Fortieth Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, at Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

RIVER VALLEYS DEVELOPMENT—ARTICLE BY WILLARD R. ESPY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on river-valley development, written by Willard R. Espy, and published in the magazine section of the New York Times of May 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOSTON HERALD ON ADDRESS BY JOSEPH A. ERICKSON

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New England Rallied," published in the Boston Herald of May 3, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO HELP MR. ACHESON—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROVIDENCE JOURNAL

[Mr. LEAHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Help Mr. Acheson," published in the Providence (R. I.) Journal of May 3, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TERMINATION OF RENT CONTROL

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several letters and an editorial pertaining to termination of rent control, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Real Reason for Kerr Bill Veto," from the Southeast Oklahoman of April 20, 1950, of Hugo, Okla., and an editorial from the Texhoma (Okla.) Times of April 20, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA—LETTER FROM FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated May 6, 1950, addressed to me by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, relative to a letter which was sent to President Truman and was signed by 35 Members of the Senate of the United States, which letter appears on page 6492 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 5.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 6, 1950.*

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You ask my view of the request you and your colleagues have made for a positive declaration that the United States will not recognize Communist China and that it will oppose its membership in the United Nations.

I do not assume there is any such intention, but it is certain that such a declaration would clear up some of the fog in these questions.

Certainly the recognition of the Moscow satellite government in China would be a further surrender in the cold war which General Bradley intimates we are losing. It would be a further acceptance of the sweep of the Kremlin's aggressive militarism, agnosticism, and Red imperialism. It is a system of immorality and without compassion that we cannot accept. It would plant another nest of Communist propagandists and agents in Washington and in every Chinese consulate over the land. It would betray millions of Chinese still struggling against a slave state.

The admission of Communist China into the United Nations with the support of the United States would inevitably result in all of the above effects. In addition it would add further to the already dominantly destructive forces in the United States.

If the United Nations is ever to be useful to the human race, it must free itself of Communist domination, not add to it.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA—LETTER FROM SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week before I got back to the Senate after my recent illness my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and 34 other Senators, joined in a letter to the President with regard to our policy in the matter of the recognition of Communist China.

As I was not present when this letter was sent, I was unable to join in it but I immediately wrote a letter to the President expressing myself along similar lines, and I ask unanimous consent to insert my letter to the President in the body of the RECORD in connection with these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 5, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because I have been away from the Senate on account of my recent appendix operation, I was not present yesterday when my colleagues in the Senate addressed a letter to you on the subject of the recognition of the Chinese Communist government. From the newspaper reports I note that 35 Senators addressed this communication to you and took the position that the American Government should promptly make it clear that:

"(1) We have no present intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China, and

"(2) We shall actively oppose the move by representatives of the Soviet Union to unseat the representatives of the Republic of China and to extend membership to the representatives of the Communist regime of that country in the United Nations."

I want to take this occasion to identify myself completely with this communication and to urge on you the vital importance, as I see it, of adopting the policy set forth in the letter.

My trip to the Far East last fall made it very clear to me that what has happened in China has been the conquest by Russia of that unfortunate country through the Russian method of infiltration and boring from within. To recognize the Chinese Communists would mean to recognize Russia's indefensible conquest.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, because of my recent illness I was not present in the Senate during the week the new State of Israel was celebrating its second anniversary. It was, therefore, not possible for me to make any statement on the floor at that time. I had prepared a brief statement in connection with this anniversary which was published in one of the important Jewish newspapers of my State, and I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR H. ALEXANDER SMITH, OF NEW JERSEY, IN CONNECTION WITH THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE RECOGNITION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Just 2 years ago, after a long and courageous struggle, the free State of Israel was added to the growing family of the world's free nations. It is fitting that all Americans should mark this anniversary, not only because Americans made a major contribution to the success of this great venture, but in a larger sense because the birth of a free democratic nation anywhere in the world strengthens the cause of freedom for which so many Americans have labored and died over the centuries.

I am happy to add my greeting to the people of Israel on their second anniversary of independence, and to wish them many years of prosperity in a peaceful world.

THE FLORIDA PRIMARY ELECTION—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA (NEBR.) HERALD-TRIBUNE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Can Be Done," appearing in the May 4 issue of the Omaha World-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT CAN BE DONE

It can be done.

The phony liberals, the vote-buying, and deficit-spenders can be beaten.

The Florida primary proved that.

CLAUDE PEPPER was no mere underling in the left-wing crowd. He was a leader, a member of the New Deal and Fair Deal politburo. During the campaign just closed he boasted that he had supported Roosevelt and Truman administrations virtually 100 percent since entering the Senate in 1936. The only blot on his left-wing record was this: he temporarily deserted Harry Truman in 1948—because he thought the President had become too conservative. But that rift was quickly healed. In the Eighty-first Congress, Senator PEPPER again became the bellwether of big-spending radicalism.

In the campaign, CLAUDE PEPPER exploited his record to the utmost. But he was beaten resoundingly by GEORGE SMATHERS, a 36-year-old Congressman and veteran of the Marine Corps.

More important than SMATHERS' victory is the way in which he won it.

So far as press dispatches reveal, there was not one word of me-tooism in his campaign. He slugged it out with his adversary, swapping punches on every issue.

PEPPER wanted to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. SMATHERS said he had voted for the act in the House, and would fight to save it.

PEPPER excused deficit spending, and said it was all due to the war. SMATHERS denounced it and said it could be and should be stopped.

PEPPER advocated the President's health-insurance plan. SMATHERS denounced it as state medicine.

PEPPER called for more Federal financing, broader public service, increased old-age assistance and all the other trappings of the Truman program and the welfare state. SMATHERS denounced the whole program, said the welfare state was a hoax and would actually turn out to be a jail state.

In summation, SMATHERS said the campaign was a fight between the socialistic trend—erroneously called liberalism—and the preservation of a solvent Government which can pay for social reforms only if it retains a sound economic base.

These two men, to the credit of both, had enough courage to stand and fight on their basic political philosophies. And the man who rejected and denounced the whole hocus-pocus of bankrupt, welfare government won a smashing victory.

SMATHERS and PEPPER are both Democrats, running in a State in which nomination is equal to election.

But what Congressman SMATHERS did should stand as a lesson, dramatic and inspiring, to those timid Republicans who have been afraid to challenge spendthrift dogoodism.

They say you can't lick the payroll vote. They say you can't overcome the benefit vote. They say you dasn't shoot Santa Clause.

But GEORGE SMATHERS did all those things.

He didn't say, "I could do it better." He said, "I wouldn't do it, period." And he won.

The fight he made and the victory he won should bring new hope to those sober-minded Americans of all parties who, in recent years, have acquired a defeatist complex and think there is no use struggling against the inevitable.

In some States, at any rate, possibly in all the States, the battle for a decent solvent government of free men can be won.

The need is for men, candidates and political leaders, who will have the guts to stand up and fight. Let the leaders of the party of opposition take note.

SHOW-DOWN FOR HAWAII'S DEMOCRATS—EDITORIAL FROM HONOLULU ADVERTISER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a short editorial entitled "Show-down for Hawaii's Democrats," appearing in the May 2 issue of the Honolulu Advertiser. I wish to assure the Members of the Senate that there is nothing partisan in the editorial, and that my sympathy is with the minority party which met there a week ago yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOW-DOWN FOR HAWAII'S DEMOCRATS

A split in Hawaii's Democratic Party leadership led to the holding of two Territorial conventions on Sunday, instead of one. Both claimed to represent the party's rank and file membership in the Territory. One, the smaller numerically, stood firmly on the straight-line principles of Jeffersonian democracy. The larger group took its position on the extreme left, condoning and applauding its members who refused recently to assist the Walter congressional committee in its efforts to unmask communism here.

The straight-liners took prompt action to rehabilitate and cleanse the local Democratic organization. They declared vacant the offices in the precinct clubs whose machinery had been seized by the leftists, and called for a show-down election to refill them.

The leftists attempted to dismiss National Committeeman Charles E. Kauhane and National Committeewoman Victoria K. Holt, denounced Governor Stainback, and lionized the witnesses who refused to swear that they were not Communists because to do so "might tend to incriminate them."

Oscar L. Chapman, who as Secretary of the Interior is the President's Cabinet member representing Hawaii in national administrative affairs, quickly endorsed the straight-liners for withdrawing from Sunday's first convention when it was shown to be dominated by extreme leftists.

Mr. Chapman recognized Communist infiltration into Hawaii's Democratic Party ranks and admitted that it was a difficult situation to remedy because so many Communist sympathizers could not be identified. The islands' problem, he explained to the United States Senators who are hearing the Territory's claim for statehood, is to keep Harry Bridges out of Hawaii. Governor Stainback's long fight on communism, he asserted, was a 100-percent battle for Hawaii statehood.

This attitude by the man highest in the national administration as it relates directly to Hawaii confirms the position taken and the warnings that were given to Hawaii's Democrats by members of their party on the Walter congressional committee. They were told by Congressman WALTER and his colleagues that they must clean house in their local party if they expect it to attain the dignity and respect to which it is entitled. Now Mr. Chapman tells them the same thing forthrightly and in plain words.

Whether they heed these warnings or not depends their chances for future approval by the people of Hawaii generally. Their chance for a housecleaning comes in the new precinct elections that have been called by the straight-line Democratic convention.

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and in the New York Herald Tribune there appeared an open letter from the renowned journalist, Mr. Joseph Alsop, to the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] dealing with the current investigation of alleged Communists in the State Department and the relationship of that investigation to our China policy. I do not myself have original knowelge of the truth of the assertions in regard to our China policy made by Mr. Alsop, but I feel that these statements, coming from an individual of such high standing in the journalistic world, should have the attention of the entire country. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert this open letter into the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCCARTHY'S VICTIMS

(By Joseph Alsop)

AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR TYDINGS

After long hesitation, I am impelled by the appalling effects in Europe of the MCCARTHY witch hunt to offer my testimony to your committee, for what it may be worth.

I do so for two reasons. First, I have already sharply criticized the conduct of our affairs in China on several occasions. Second, I was intimately involved in the events which led to the loss of China, whereas Senators MCCARTHY, WHERRY, and TAFT and their informants are offering second-hand evidence. This evidence is so obviously corrupted by political and other pressures that it is a duty to correct the impression conveyed.

Stating the case as briefly as possible, I think it fair to say that the really crucial years in China were those when Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell commanded the China-Burma-India theater, from 1942 to 1944. In this period, Professor Lattimore, who was always at best a fringe figure, played his most important role in our China policy, as a personal adviser to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. In this rather brief assignment he accomplished nothing, but he was quite obviously loyal both to the American Government and to Generalissimo Chiang.

Professor Lattimore had no part whatever in the real debate about China policy, in which the different points of view have been fantastically misrepresented by Senator MCCARTHY and his friends. No informed person ever supposed that offering blank checks to the National Government of China would accomplish anything. Those who advocated a strong policy of aiding the National Government only did so with the proviso that the aid given would be closely controlled by American representatives on the spot, as it was during the short and successful period of General Wedemeyer's command. It should be noted that the congressional advocates of postwar aid to China specifically rejected the responsibility involved in this sort of local, on-the-spot control, in the first major bill appropriating funds for the purpose during General Marshall's secretaryship of state.

Return to the vastly more important war period, the other school of thought was composed primarily of General Stilwell and his political advisers. General Stilwell, so far as one could judge, was chiefly animated by his personal detestation of Generalissimo Chiang, arising from their disagreements. His political advisers, among whom was Mr. John Stewart Service, were operating on a more reasoned theory, however.

They asserted, first, that the National government was too feeble and corrupt ever to be reformed, even with direct American help and under direct American pressure. They said, second, that the Chinese Communists were therefore bound to win in the end, no matter what measures might be taken by the United States. In the third place, they argued that the Soviet Union, insofar as it had intervened in China at all, had given all its assistance to the regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek rather than to the Communists, who received no tangible Russian aid whatever until the war was over. Fourthly, they suggested that the Chinese Communists might be induced to declare their independence of the Kremlin if they were treated as friends and allies by the United States.

Opening friendly relations and offering aid to the Chinese Communists was frankly admitted, at the time, to be a bold gamble. The gamble now looks better than it did then. On the one hand, the Yugoslav Communists, whose experience was precisely what the experience of the Chinese Communists would have been if they had received American aid, have now rebelled against the Kremlin. On the other hand, the recent behavior of the Japanese Communist leader, Nosaka, a wartime refugee at Yenan and intimate friend of Mao Tse-tung, clearly suggests that the idea of independence of the Kremlin must have been in the air in Communist China in wartime.

My right to speak, if I may be said to have a right to speak, derives from the fact that in wartime I was one of the chief American opponents of the school of thought I have summarized above. As a member of the staff of the American Volunteer Group, as chief of the Lend-Lease Mission to China, and finally as an assistant to Dr. T. V. Soong, I did everything in my power to present the

pro-Nationalist point of view in influential quarters in Washington.

Those who wished to develop an American policy of friendship toward, and aid to, the Chinese Communists were finally and decisively defeated with the dismissal of General Stilwell, in October 1944. This occurred many months after I had finally succeeded in getting into uniform, as a member of Gen. C. L. Chennault's staff in the Fourteenth Air Force. But although I had long before become a mere junior officer in the Air Force, the effect of my letters to Harry L. Hopkins and the other representations I had made was acknowledged by implication in General Marshall's first instructions to General Wedemeyer.

These are, so to speak, my credentials. Having known the situation in wartime China far more intimately than any of the pro-McCarthy witnesses you have yet heard, I think it my duty to say that while I disputed the judgment, I never had the faintest doubt of the loyalty of any of the American officials or others whom McCARTHY had attacked. They were serving the United States to the best of their ability, with courage and fidelity. This should be sufficient to protect them from the kind of vulgar attack McCARTHY has made, even if their judgment was incorrect.

Although our views clashed sharply, I was particularly well acquainted with Mr. Service. To the best of my knowledge, although I thought then, and think now, that he was gravely in error, he was a most conscientious and decent American public servant. It is difficult, of course, to offer hard evidence to support such contemporary impressions. But I may cite one fact, at least, to show how erroneous it can be to judge situations from the viewpoint of a later time.

Former Vice President Henry A. Wallace has been, in effect, a pliable stooge for the American Communist Party for more than 2 years. From this, many people have inferred that Wallace was a Communist stooge in wartime. In fact, however, nothing could have been more contrary to the party line in wartime than to urge the dismissal of General Stilwell; yet Wallace recommended the dismissal of Stilwell and his replacement by Wedemeyer in a telegram from China to President Roosevelt in the late spring of 1944. Incidentally, the telegram was sent with the full knowledge of Mr. John Carter Vincent, who entered no protest whatever, although he too has been under attack as a Communist stooge.

In conclusion, there are two points which I feel I must make. First, I do not think I was wrong in opposing the policy of gambling on winning the friendship of the Chinese Communists and inducing them to declare their independence of the Kremlin. I do not think I was wrong, simply because I, and the others who took the same view, could not possibly foresee that when this policy of winning the friendship of the Chinese Communists had been defeated with the dismissal of General Stilwell, there would be a long period after the war during which we had no China policy at all.

None of the men now under attack by Senator McCARTHY had any important responsibility, to my knowledge, for this singular hiatus. Speaking for myself, if I could have foreseen that the only alternative to a policy of gambling on the friendship of the Chinese Communists was a kind of vacuum of policy, I should have been on the other side in the struggle in China. The gamble on the Chinese Communists, although unnecessary, in my opinion, was at least a reasonable gamble, such as could be reasonably advocated by entirely loyal Americans.

Second, I should like to suggest to your committee that, if the test of loyalty is following the line of the Communist Party, you had much better launch an investigation of Senators McCARTHY, WHERRY, and TAFT, than an investigation of Messrs. Lattimore, Service, and Vincent. Let the test be a tabulation of the key votes of the three Senators above mentioned on the great postwar measures of foreign policy, and especially of their votes on key amendments by which bills can be nullified.

Unless I am gravely mistaken, such a tabulation will show that these three Senators, and most of the others who have joined them in the present clamor, have voted the straight Communist Party line on every major issue of foreign policy, as laid down in the Daily Worker, ever since the end of the war. If temporary agreement with the party line is to be made the test of loyalty, let these men be called to the bar to explain their records.

In summary, I do not attempt to excuse or palliate the grave American mistakes in China, which I have often before denounced. But I submit that we may as well abandon all hope of having honest and courageous public servants, if mere mistakes of judgment are later to be transformed into evidences of disloyalty to the state. And I submit further that the Members of the Senate who are now persecuting these men who made, as I think, mistakes in China, have far more to explain, excuse, and rationalize in their own records. I still believe that the loss of China was unnecessary. But I think it far more important that we should not destroy the decent traditions of American political life. These now seem to be endangered.

THE POTENTIAL DANGERS OF THE POINT 4 PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on the implications of the point 4 program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA MUST BE WARY IN ADMINISTRATION OF POINT 4 SET-UP

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE TO WORK ON ECA BILL

It is my pleasure to serve as a member of the conference committee between the Senate and House of Representatives which will consider the ECA bill, H. R. 7797. I have reference at this point, however, only to the point 4 phase of this legislation.

Naturally, no one knows what we on this conference committee will work out eventually on this score, but I do want to make it unmistakably clear to the State Department and to the other agencies which will actually handle the administration of the point 4 program that the Members of the Senate will, like myself, be watching with very close attention the ultimate handling of the point 4 phase. It is my earnest hope that some of the comments which I am presenting below may serve as an indication of at least one Senator's position on the issue, and actually, I believe the position of many other Senators as symbolized by the excellent comments of the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the very able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] among others, last Friday evening.

On that day, May 5, the Senate passed by a vote of 60 to 8, H. R. 7797, to extend the ECA Act of 1948 until June 30, 1951, after having substituted the provisions of our Senate version, S. 3304, for the House draft.

MY VOTE ON POINT 4 AMENDMENTS

Mr. President, I voted for the amendment of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] initiating the technical knowledge and skills portion of the point 4 program—a limited amendment which was adopted by a close vote of 37 to 36. I voted against the substitute amendment which would have only created a bipartisan commission to study all programs to stimulate capital investment in and technical assistance for undeveloped areas. That amendment was defeated by a vote of 33 for, 41 against. Finally, I voted for Senator MILLIKIN's amendment which would have supplemented title V (the point 4 program) with a new title VI, to create a bipartisan commission to study all programs to stimulate capital investment in and technical assistance to undeveloped areas. That amendment was, however, defeated by 32 for, to 39 against.

BIPARTISAN COMMISSION WOULD HAVE BEEN HELPFUL

I am indeed sorry that this latter amendment was defeated, because (a) I think it was perfectly consistent with the Connally amendment and (b) it is quite obvious, I think, that the Connally amendment which we adopted merely provided for technical aid without any means of studying all of the tremendous implications of the over-all development program which could potentially have grave fiscal consequences to our country.

As pointed out by Senator MILLIKIN, the great Senator from Michigan, Mr. VANDENBERG, in writing to Administrator Hoffman, of the ECA, suggested that before we go into these far-reaching plans that we have a study committee similar to that which presided at the ECA program. Senator MILLIKIN advanced the hope that the Commission we are proposing would reach the prestige of a Hoover Commission. The committee would be in a position without interfering with anything that has been done here today to examine all the existing laws on the subject. * * * We would get a study started which could come back in time for us to legislate * * * if it should be decided to legislate before the ECA program is ended in 1952. If it should be decided that there should be some kind of carry-on program, we would be equipped with the facts upon which we could reach our decision.

I think that is a very lucid explanation indeed of the Millikin-Saltonstall amendment which would have added a new title VI to the bill.

It is quite obvious I feel that even those Members of the Senate who voted in support of this point 4 legislation did so with some misgivings.

SCREENING OF POINT 4 MISSIONARIES

Let me recall, if I may, that when I cross-examined the Secretary of State during the point 4 hearings, I emphasized that we needed American-minded missionaries, American-minded salesmen of freedom, so to speak, going abroad under this or any other program. That is why I will fight in committee for retention of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the Connally amendment for thorough screening by the FBI of point 4 personnel.

Now, let me say further that our people are becoming more and more anxious over the potentialities for good and on the other hand the dangers of evil in the President's and the State Department's original suggestion for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world.

When title V was reported unanimously in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I was glad to lend my support of it, but at the same time I pointed out that there are many grounds on which other supporters and I feel this program could go astray and in effect boomerang against our American people.

WORLD DOES NEED TECHNICAL AID

We are all acquainted with the dismal facts regarding underdevelopment throughout most of the world—the incredibly low income, appallingly low consumption throughout practically all of the earth. One and one-half billion peoples—two-thirds of the world's population—are living barely on or under subsistence. Yet, they dwell on lands which are rich in minerals and other commodities—spices, rubber, tin, coal, precious metals, and a variety of other products. Two-thirds of the world has a life expectancy of only 30 years, whereas in the west there is a life expectancy of 63 years. At the start of World War II well over three-fourths of the world's population over 10 years of age was illiterate.

We could add to these gloomy statistics the dismal economic story on underdevelopment Recently a booklet was published by the Public Affairs Institute entitled, "Two-thirds of the World" by Mr. Harold R. Izaacs. He breaks the world down as follows:

Developed countries—population 384,000,000;

Intermediate countries—population 388,000,000;

Undeveloped countries—population 1,565,000,000.

I do not propose at this time however, to try to present a complete memorandum of all the pros or cons of this point 4 issue because the record is already quite replete with facts. I do, however, want to indicate that I have consulted with many sources both in person and by reading literature—materials of, for example, the Friends' Committee on National Legislation—the Quaker organization which has vigorously supported title 5 program. I have read the views of the Department of International Justice and Good Will, of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. This department states in a recent brochure the close relationship between the role of missionary pioneers of the various faiths abroad—meeting the spiritual and material needs of foreign peoples in underdeveloped regions—the close relationship between these missionaries and the work of the economic and social committee of the United Nations General Assembly, together with the forthcoming work under the point 4 assistance program.

ADVICE OF RENOWNED ENGINEER

Yes, I have consulted with these groups and with outstanding experts in private life—with Mr. Michael J. Deutch, for instance. Mr. Deutch is a consulting engineer of international experience and repute, and he certainly wishes well as I do, to our American officials working on this program. But he has soundly indicated as various Senators have, that this point 4 program if it is to be successful, will require far more engineering know-how than has been evidenced in the past in the foreign assistance field.

Neither Mr. Deutch nor the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] intend, I am sure aught but good, for American aid abroad, aught but good to the State Department in the tremendous challenge before it. But these gentlemen's eyes are clearly open to the realities of the situation.

It is these realities which I am mentioning now, in view of the fact that the debate last Friday was of such length and the hour so late that evening that a detailed treatment was not possible then.

THE SUM FOR POINT 4

In total appropriations involved in this program, title V authorizes some $45,000,000. This sum, while large in terms of private industry, amounts to only 3½ percent of our military-aid expenditures—$45,000,000 in relation to $1,314,000,000. I am sure that all of the American people will agree that insofar as we are concerned, we would indeed prefer that if circumstances allowed, that more money be devoted to peaceful efforts than to machinery for war. However, we have no alternative in view of the present cold war in which we find ourselves.

Lest, however, anybody misconstrue the $45,000,000 as mere peanuts, let us bear in mind the fact that some of the global do-gooders have been talking in terms of immense $5,000,000,000 projects in the same breath as they have mentioned this technical assistance program. Now, Mr. President, if some of our maladministrators propose to visit some desert area or some other underdeveloped region and say to the folks in that area: "You people could use a nice $5,000,000,000 project for hydroelectric power." Such information could boomerang terribly against America. Why? Because we do not contemplate any such aid in actual construction projects and we do not want these foreign peoples to be disappointed into believing that we are going to lend or give them billions of dollars for huge industrial projects.

POINT 4 MUST NOT BE WPA

In other words, Mr. President, point 4 is not intended as a basis for a world-wide WPA, and I, for one, will fight with all the power at my command against it becoming one. We are not intending to buy sympathy all over the world on a global give-away program. We are not intending to pour billions of dollars into foreign countries to develop their potentialities at the very same time America is facing a grave fiscal situation here at home.

Now, Mr. President, in talking and writing with many distinguished business leaders, engineers, and investors, I find, as I have indicated, a grave amount of apprehension over the State Department's plan of the point 4 program. It seems that the State Department has in its previous discussions and writings of point 4 merely given a voluminous recital of what various sections of the UN have done in this field or what numerous traveling officials of our own Government have done. However, we do not have a clear picture of what the State Department itself intends to do. Yes, we know that the Institute of Inter-American Affairs will continue to carry out certain of its existing programs, that the United Nations will continue to handle a certain share of the programs, but what specifically will the new agency to be set up within the State Department for coordination purposes do?

FUNDS MUST NOT BE MISUSED

I trust that this coordinating agency will not spend the funds by exclusively distributing them among existing Government departments for huge travel allowances for American officials and for printing thousands of technical pamphlets. Yes, it may be well and good to send an $8 per diem TVA or Bureau of Reclamation expert abroad. But in spite of all the reports this expert would make, he could still not in the slightest remedy the lack of natural resources in a particular land or the severance of an economic artery with the iron curtain.

I trust, moreover, that the State Department will not construe the point 4 program as meaning that it has a blank check to hire college faculties en masse to prepare studies here in our own country. While I have a tremendous appreciation of the work that has been done and can be done in American colleges, in both the social and physical sciences, I do not feel that we are aiming this program merely toward the production of some literary epics which will thereupon become principally reference tools for college libraries throughout the country. In other words, Mr. President, I am emphasizing the theme that as much as we need TVA or Bureau of Reclamation experts in certain types of work, as much as we can benefit (as we have benefited) from college faculty personnel, our basic need is for more engineers with solid business experience abroad.

And let me point out that I do not have in mind large construction engineering firms exclusively. On the contrary, these huge engineering firms specialize in the erection of big plants in the United States and we must make absolutely sure that we do not send engineers abroad who have been exclusively conditioned to think in terms of huge, ambitious industrial projects to sell.

WE MUST TEACH AMERICAN WAY

Our basic challenge is to teach other countries of the world American methods of work—the aggressive, practical, free, efficient way of doing things. We must give them data, advice, and know-how to develop their own resources, to assist these people in helping themselves. We can do this principally through engineers and other substantial business experts. But these engineers, I repeat, must not go out with the thought in back of their mind that they will ultimately get huge contracts for their firms to build multi-billion-dollar projects.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that American investments abroad have had a very bad history of being mistreated. Why? Well, in part because for the last 18 years, United States business has been subjected to all sorts of local demagoguery and socialistic encroachment. Does the State Department, for example, propose that we beg some foreign labor government to allow an American mining investor to take a minority position in a new mining venture under a stringent local decree which will, say, limit profits to 3 or 4 percent when this same investor can right here in the United States get what amounts to a blue-chip yield of 8 percent? Why should any of our investors go abroad for 3 or 4 percent—even if that sum is guaranteed by the overburdened American taxpayer—when without, comparatively speaking, such problam of socialistic interference, the same investor might get 8 percent here at home?

In other words, these investors will go abroad when they get sufficient return on their investment and when they are sure that the governments abroad have developed a genuine appreciation of the need for a favorable climate of investment. It is up to us therefore, to sell the American way, the pioneering way, to foreign governments, to demonstrate to them how research has pioneered in the creation of new synthetic products and other new products, how research has developed new needs and new employment to fill those needs. Once we can convince these foreign governments, they will appreciate the fact that the American investor is entitled to a sufficiently attractive capital yield.

SUMMARY

In summary, Mr. President, I do not believe that our own government channels are set up for a completely impartial assessment of foreign-country resources and shortcomings. I would like to see our country get into the habit of consulting expert internationally-experienced engineers who are not trying to sell multi-billion-dollar projects but are merely trying to give unbiased professional advice. I don't want to see this point 4 program degenerate into a world-wide WPA or degenerate into a grab bag for a few favored private firms or degenerate into a convenient way for administration agencies to increase their budget or degenerate into an excursion or junket medium for American Government officials who have a yen to visit foreign countries.

These are the dangers—these are the big potential liabilities.

On the other hand, we do have an opportunity to render genuine albeit limited technical service to that two-thirds of the world which is indeed underdeveloped and which looks to America for real leadership.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1—NOTICE OF RESOLUTION TO DISAPPROVE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement about Reorganization Plan No. 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand it is the present purpose of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to call up his resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 12 next Wednesday, with a view to having a vote on it the following day, Thursday. I wish to give notice that following the vote on Reorganization Plan No. 12 I shall call up my resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1, which involves the independent status of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SPEECH BY HAROLD E. STASSEN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in view of the comments made by some Senators on the floor last Friday evening concerning a speech delivered by a former Governor of Minnesota, Harold E. Stassen, who is now president of the University of Pennsylvania, and inasmuch as there was quite a discussion about the speech, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that all may know what the speech actually was.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I inquire if Mr. Stassen in that speech made the remarks the press attributed to him in respect to the President of the United States being the worst President in the history of this Nation? If it does, I am compelled to object. Then I want the Senator to read the speech on the floor at a later date if he desires to do so, so at that time maybe I can use rule XIX as it was used against me the other day.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Indeed, I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Illinois remember what the President said about the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. LUCAS. I remember what he said about the Eightieth Congress, but we are not talking about that now. We are talking about what Stassen said about the President of the United States. I can remember some of the things the Senator from Ohio has been saying, too, if the Senator desires to go into that category. But I am not talking about that now. I am talking about the speech which was made by the former Governor of Minnesota, and I shall be compelled to object at this moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois objects.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator objects, I should like to have the opportunity to read the speech into the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I object to that at the present time, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

PROGRAM FOR DAILY SESSIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to ask the majority leader, in view of his statement as to his plans on Friday, appearing at page 6499 of the RECORD, as to how late he contemplates the session today will continue, and so on throughout the coming week? He states in this brief statement that he expects the Senate to sit usual hours. I should merely like to know what he contemplates by that statement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts, I may say it is a little difficult for me to inform any Senator the exact time the Senate will recess. As the Senator from Massachusetts knows, we have been taking recesses anywhere from 5 to 8 o'clock, and I presume we shall follow the same procedure. I cannot exactly tell when the Senate will recess.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, on an ordinary day, would it be around 6 o'clock, or thereabouts?

Mr. LUCAS. Thereabouts, yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But not to run on into the evening?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, unless some Senator is in the throes of a lengthy speech and desires to continue with it, in which case I shall remain as long as any Senator desires to talk. That I am unable to anticipate or to control.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RESOLUTIONS ON REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in response to the statement made by the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], with respect to the calling up of certain reorganization plans which will be reported adversely by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Under the rules, as I understand, we have until midnight of May 23, within which time to pass upon any of the reorganization plans. Insofar as I am concerned, I am going to oppose any motion to take up one of these plans on the 11th of this month, in view of the fact that there still remain 12 days within which the Senate may act on any of the plans which may be reported adversely by the committee. I say that for this reason: It is my hope that the House of Representatives will pass upon some reorganization plans, and I understand it probably will do so. Then, if the House votes against a plan, that, of course, ends it. If the House votes in the affirmative for a plan, of course it would come to the Senate then for consideration. I am not going to be stampeded into the consideration of this subject simply because some Senator desires to take up one of the plans on a certain day.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment. At that time, if the Senate by a majority vote desires to take up a resolution of disapproval, that is one thing. But the Senator from Illinois will resist the taking up of any one of the reorganization plans at that particular time, because we are just beginning debate on the fair-employment-practices bill. Yet, all of a sudden, we have two notices of intention to seek consideration of two of the reorganization plans this week. I repeat, I shall resist such a move. I have no disposition to delay the final determination on these plans, in the event that the House does not pass on them one way or other, but I am not going to be stampeded into the taking up of the plans almost on the very eve of taking up the FEPC bill. I now yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I can assure the distinguished majority leader that I have no desire to stampede him. I do not assume that I could do so, if I wanted to. But is not the distinguished majority leader in error in assuming that both Houses must act on a reorganization plan?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not in error. If either House acts adversely upon a reorganization plan, that is the end of it, Senators, I am sure, feel that they have the votes to disapprove both plans referred to. I have never seen Senators so anxious to get something before the Senate as are the able Senator from Virginia and the able Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio has talked about Reorganization Plan No. 12 almost every time he has had the opportunity. I am sure he is very, very much interested in getting it before the Senate. It must be that he has the votes, otherwise he would not be so anxious to get it up.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia is quite confident that on Reorganization Plan No. 1 he has the votes.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I am sure he has.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the junior Senator from Virginia in error in assuming there is the possibility that we shall still be on the FEPC measure on May 23?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Virginia could be correct about that. He knows more about that than I do.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the Senator from Virginia in error in assuming that, between now and that time, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may report, four, five, six, or more disapproving resolutions?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has the privilege of moving to take up any of them at any time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Under those circumstances, with the Senate likely to be engaged steadily on FEPC until past May 23, and with a number of other matters coming up, does the distinguished Senator from Illinois think that the Senator from Virginia is trying to stampede him, in asking for the privilege of having his resolution voted on before it is too late for a vote?

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps the word "stampede" was applied incorrectly to the Senator from Virginia. I still would apply it to the Senator from Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely want to say, in closing, Mr. President, that, while I realize that FEPC is apparently important to some of my colleagues, I hope they will not overlook the attitude of

the bankers of the Nation and that of a great many other people, as well as the position definitely taken by the Secretary of the Treasury, that there will be neither economy nor efficiency as a result of Reorganization Plan No. 1, and that they do not want any part of it. That situation should not be too calmly ignored.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is correct, and perhaps the majority leader might vote with him at the proper time. But I still repeat what I said a moment ago.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not want to put the majority leader in any definite position, but I had a feeling that that would probably be his position.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, rather than ask the majority leader a question, I should like to make a statement in my own time, if the majority leader is through.

ORDER IN DEBATE—RULE XIX

Mr. LUCAS. I am not through, Mr. President. I should like to ask unanimous consent to raise a hypothetical parliamentary inquiry, in view of what occurred in the Senate on May 3, 1950, as shown by page 6246 and the following pages, of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that he may have to give the Senator from Illinois a hypothetical parliamentary answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. In keeping with the dual hypothetical question and order, Mr. President, I should like to say that on May 3 in the discussion of certain problems relating to the investigation now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Illinois was reading a statement which had been prepared by the State Department, which had been released to the press, and which the press carried throughout the Nation. When the Senator from Illinois came to that part of the statement released by the State Department, in which it was said the claim that Mr. Lattimore had a desk in the State Department was untrue, at that moment the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] rose majestically and called the Senator from Illinois to order rule XIX. Before I could say a word, I was ordered by the Chair to take my seat under rule XIX.

I propound this inquiry, Mr. President: Can a Senator, at any time when another Senator is speaking, merely rise and say in substance that the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Illinois, or whoever might be speaking, is violating rule XIX, and that he therefore demands that the Senator take his seat? Under those circumstances, is it necessary for a Senator who is speaking to take his seat? And can one Senator discipline another Senator under those circumstances, whether the Senator is guilty of violating rule XIX or is not guilty?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is bound to say that the language of the rule gives the Chair no authority whatever to pass on the question of whether a Senator is violating rule XIX. It provides that whenever a Senator is speaking, and another Senator calls him to order on the ground that he is violating the rule, he must take his seat. No matter what he has said, no matter what he is talking about, regardless of whether there is any offense given or any violation of the rule, the Senator must take his seat until the Senate permits him to proceed in order.

The Chair would not hesitate to say that it is a rather peculiar rule, but even if a Senator is repeating the Lord's Prayer, some other Senator may call him to order, and the Senator must take his seat until he is permitted to proceed in order. That is the rule, except that in one instance former Senator La Follette while in the chair attempted to pass on the question as to whether a newspaper article which a Senator was reading, and which he proposed to place in the RECORD, was a violation of the rule. The Chair does not see what authority the Presiding Officer has to pass on that question. Under the rule as it reads, the Chair must advise the Senator from Illinois and all other Senators that no matter what a Senator says, if another Senator calls him to order and says he has violated rule XIX, he must take his seat.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment.

Mr. President, if that is the proper interpretation of the rule, I am constrained to say that, in my opinion, it is absurd, ridiculous, and arbitrary to think that one Senator can be the disciplinarian of another Senator as to anything he says and can cause that Senator to take his seat by simply applying rule XIX to anything he might say.

I raise the point because the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] intends to read a speech into the RECORD, in a few moments, attacking the President of the United States, through Harold Stassen. Consequently, he will make that statement as his own, under the rule. I shall be in position to "call him to order," and get big headlines in newspapers all over the country for compelling the Senator from Minnesota to take his seat, which, to me, just does not make sense.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Please give the Senator from Illinois a chance to finish his statement.

I say it is not right or fair, Mr. President. If that is the proper interpretation of the rule, certainly the Committee on Rules and Administration ought to do something about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, without regard to the statement which the Senator from Illinois tells us the Senator from Minnesota proposes to make, and regardless of what transpired on the floor a few days ago, I should like to say that I heartily concur in the statement by the Senator from Illinois as to the effect of the rule as it is presently construed. I recognize that the construction placed upon the rule by the Chair is that which has prevailed in the Senate for a number of years, but, to my mind, any such construction of a rule of the Senate does not comport in any way with the dignity of this body as a deliberative body, and can be used to destroy freedom of speech in the Senate. If there were a ruthless majority, a majority of one, it could, under the construction of the rule, absolutely silence 40 Senators who might desire to speak. A Senator could rise in his place and arbitrarily call another Senator to order. Under this far-fetched construction of the rule, the Chair would have to order the Senator to take his seat. If a motion were made that the Senator be permitted to proceed in order, and a ruthless temporary majority of the Senate voted against that motion, it would muzzle Senators of sovereign States and would gag large segments of our population. Such a construction is not in keeping with all the functions and prerogatives of this deliberative body.

I hope the Chair will give consideration to changing that construction so that before the Chair may order a Senator to take his seat he must be of the opinion that the Senator has infringed upon the rules. It is an unwise and an arbitrary rule which can be used in such manner as to destroy the freedom of the American people.

Mr. DONNELL rose.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to express my gratitude to the Senator from Georgia for the concise and constructive statement he has made regarding this rule, and I am happy that he agrees with my position.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to be yielded to by the majority leader for just a moment——

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment, but before I yield I want to say that any statement I made in nowise reflects upon the credibility, the good faith of, or my affection for, the Vice President of the United States. He was merely following the rule which has been with the Senate since 1857.

In view of the outcry of my friend from the rear, I now yield to him.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am very happy that the majority leader recognized my request as an outcry, because any Senator should make an outcry if there is a reference made to him on the Senate floor and he is not given an opportunity to be recognized so that he can make a statement in reply.

I have read rule XIX and have checked it with the Parliamentarian, and I believe that, if the majority leader wishes to resort to rule XIX to prevent my reading into the RECORD the statement of the former Governor of Minnesota, I could question his right to object under rule XIX, because I do not think the Parliamentarian would support his position.

I am sorry this has happened, and I say to the majority leader that I believe he should permit the speech to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all might read the text of the speech, and let it go at that.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care anything about it, I will say to my friend. What I

am trying to do is not to use the Senator from Minnesota or Harold Stassen to get the question before the Senate; I am using my own case in order to bring to the attention of the people of the country what appears to me to be an arbitrary rule. No one pays any attention to Harold Stassen, anyway.

Mr. THYE. Then will the Senator withdraw his objection and permit the speech to be printed?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I withdraw it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by the former Governor of Minnesota, now president of the University of Pennsylvania, before a women's Republican group on Tuesday, May 2, 1950, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Rule XIX has no application to anything said about the President of the United States or anyone else except Senators. That may also be a peculiar ruling, but rule XIX has no application otherwise. No Senator can rise and object to anything anyone says about the President, the Vice President, or anyone else except a Senator, with the exception that derogatory remarks cannot be made on the floor of the Senate about the other branch of the Congress.

With reference to rule XIX, regardless of the Chair's opinion of that rule, the Chair hopes it will not be offensive to suggest that he agrees entirely with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Georgia. But the rule is there, and for a hundred years it has been interpreted as the Chair in this instance has interpreted it. It is always possible and feasible for the Committee on Rules and Administration to recommend a change in any rule that exists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I simply want to say, in the capacity of acting minority leader, that I agree with what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said with reference to the interpretation of the rule. For approximately 8 years I tried to interpret the rules of the House of Representatives in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and listened to much discussion of this subject. I agree with the Chair's interpretation of rule XIX, but I call attention to the fact, in connection with the interpretation of this rule, which the Chair has just stated has been in existence for over a hundred years, that the rule applies only when a Senator "in a debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator."

I should like to invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that we are sworn to uphold our duties in this body. We are working with each other from day to day. I have not seen any indication of a desire on the part of any Senator intentionally to call another Senator to order in open debate when he did not think there was some ground for his action.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is not present today. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Illinois the fact that I believe the Senator from Nebraska, whether rightly or wrongly—and I do not wish to go into the merits of the question—did what he did on Friday last, because he believed at the time—and perhaps he was wrong in proceeding so quickly—that it was a case properly coming within an interpretation of rule XIX. It was not an instance of using the rule for wrong motives.

I hope this incident will be forgotten. I should like to say in behalf of the Senator from Nebraska that I think he would be the last man in the world to ask that the Senator from Illinois be seated or to ask the Chair to have him take his seat because of any remark of his which might be interpreted as using the rule for purposes other than those for which the rule is established. I hope I say that with the approval of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the Chair should have an opportunity to interpret the rule, but I believe also that the rules will not be misused under ordinary circumstances to accomplish what the Senator from Georgia said, because from my brief experience in the Senate for the past 5 years I have found every Senator to be courteous and honorable with every other Senator, whether he agrees with him or not.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with respect to the question raised by the Senator from Illinois and the ruling of the Vice President, I most respectfully make the point that rule XIX, clause 4, is not an absolute provision that, if any Senator or the Presiding Officer call a Senator to order, he shall sit down. Nor is there any absolute right on the part of any Senator or the Presiding Officer to call any Senator to order.

Mr. President, clause 4 of rule XIX is a conditional clause. It starts with the condition "if any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order." In other words, as I read it, it is entirely conditioned on the fact that a Senator, in speaking or otherwise, actually transgresses the rules of the Senate that any right exists in either the Presiding Officer or any Senator to call the alleged offending Senator to order.

I fully appreciate the point that may arise as to who would determine whether a Senator has or has not transgressed the rules. I do not agree with the illustration which was used somewhat facetiously—or perhaps earnestly—by the Vice President to the effect that if a Senator were to engage in reciting the Lord's Prayer, he could be called to order. In my opinion, there is no section of the rule which would sustain any such ruling, because a Senator in saying the Lord's Prayer would not be transgressing the rules of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator permit me to make an observation at that point?

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to say one further word. Reference was made to criticism of the President of the United States. I am very glad that the Vice President corrected any possibility or implication from what had been previously said, because there is nothing in the rules of the Senate so far as I know which prohibits criticism, or any statement, with regard to the President of the United States or any member of the executive department.

I conclude with this statement: The Vice President said—and I think quite correctly—that the only one, for imputing unworthy motive to whom, a Senator may call another Senator to order is a Senator. I call attention, however, to rule 19, clause 3, which provides:

> No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

So the reference to a call to order, quoted by the Senator from Massachusetts about an imputation against another Senator of conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator, applies also with reference to a Senator's offensive reference to a State of the Union. Both situations authorize a call to order. However, I again repeat that, although I realize the difficulty of who is to determine whether a transgression has occurred, clause 4 of rule XIX is a conditional clause. It does not give absolute right to the Presiding Officer or to a Senator to call another Senator to order.

Mr. LUCAS. The last statement which the Senator from Missouri made disputes what he has tried to prove. The rule says:

> If any Senator * * * transgress the rules of the Senate—

And so forth. Who is to say whether the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Missouri, for example, transgresses the rules of the Senate? If a Senator is repeating the Lord's Prayer or is attacking the President of the United States, another Senator may rise and say that the Senator is transgressing the rules of the Senate and call the Senator to order. Under the present ruling of the Chair, he is bound to take his seat. It is not a question of whether the rule is enforced to the point where the Senator cannot again rise and proceed to speak, because last week when the Vice President ordered the Senator from Illinois to take his seat a motion was made for the Senator from Illinois to proceed in order. That motion was carried. I do not believe there was one vote cast against it. In other words, the damage is done by a Senator calling another Senator to order and compelling him to take his seat. There is nothing in the rules which will prevent that being done if a Senator wants to do it. Had the Vice President had an opportunity to consider what the Senator from Illinois was talking about, namely, merely reading a statement which had been made

by the Under Secretary of State, the point of order, in my opinion, would have been overruled. The Chair never had an opportunity to do so.

I merely raise the question because of its importance to individual Senators. It is as important to the Senator from Missouri that this rule be correctly and properly interpreted as it is to the Senator from Illinois. It may be that some day the Senator from Missouri may be ordered to take his seat.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Illinois that I think the purpose of the rule was that before a Senator proceeded further there be a ruling of some kind by the Chair which would ultimately have to be acted on by the Senate. Whether the Chair makes it or whether the Chair does not make it, apparently, under the present rule, it is made finally by the Senate. If the Chair makes it, anyone may appeal from the decision of the Chair. So really it does not make any difference. If there is to be such a rule—and I think there should be—the question of whether a Senator violates it is decided by the Senate in the last analysis. Perhaps the phrasing of the rule is not clear, but I cannot see any great objection to the substance of it.

Mr. LUCAS. It is true that when the Vice President makes a ruling, we can appeal from the decision, and the Senate can overrule the Chair. However, certainly in the first instance the Vice President ought to have an opportunity to make a ruling. In 99 cases out of 100, rulings made by the Vice President, regardless of whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, are usually sustained and no appeal is ever taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I entirely disagree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio in his interpretation of the rule. No one ever decides whether words spoken are out of order. The only motion that can be made under the terms of the rule are that the Senator proceed in order. The fact that a motion is made that he proceed in order, assumes that he was out of order. The rule is not ambiguous to me. I agree fully with the interpretation of the rule by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], that the Chair should hold that the Senator is out of order before he orders him to take his seat. But that is not the precedent of the Senate. The precedent of the Senate is that the Senator having the floor is presumed to have transgressed the rules of the Senate if any single Senator calls him to order. The Chair does not pass upon it, and the Senate does not pass upon it, because the only motion to be made is a motion that the Senator shall proceed in order.

My idea of the proper construction of the rule is that if a Senator calls a speaking Senator to order for words spoken in violation of subdivision 2 or subdivision 3, referring to another Senator, or to a State of the Union, the Presiding Officer should say, "The words are out of order, and the Senator will take his seat." But if there were a case such as the one to which the Presiding Officer referred, when a Senator was reciting the Lord's Prayer and another Senator called him to order, then the Chair would certainly state that in the opinion of the Chair the words were not out of order, and he should not command that the speaking Senator take his seat.

To me, the rule is clear. I think it has been misconstrued. The rule says that if a Senator transgress the rules of the Senate certain action shall be taken. Yet the method of enforcement which the Senate has adopted does not permit anyone to pass upon whether the Senator has actually transgressed the rules of the Senate or not. The only motion that can be made is that he proceed in order, thereby assuming he has been out of order, though under the construction of the rule the Chair does not get an opportunity to rule that he was speaking out of order.

As I have said, to me the rule seems very clear. I think it has been misconstrued in all the precedents which the Chair has followed. I think the Chair has a right to say "The Senator is out of order and shall take his seat," or to say to the objecting Senator that in the opinion of the Chair the speaking Senator is not out of order and is not speaking in violation of the rules.

Of course, as the Senator from Ohio rightly says, the Senate naturally concludes the matter in any event, but under the rule neither the Chair nor the Senate ever passes upon the question whether the Senator was actually out of order in the words spoken, but he is permitted by the Senate to proceed in order, thereby presuming he was out of order, though the words spoken may have been perfectly proper and not violative of any rule of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The penalty is inflicted without the Vice President or the Senate having a right or the opportunity to pass on the charge.

Mr. RUSSELL. No one ever passes on it under the present construction. The rule says that if a Senator transgresses the rule, he shall be called to order, but under the technical method of enforcement, no one, either the Presiding Officer or the Senate, ever passes on the question as to whether the words were out of order.

The proper construction would be, if a Senator is called to order, for the Chair to pass on the point. If the Chair says that the words spoken are derogatory of another Senator or of a State of the Union, he should immediately order the Senator who has the floor to take his seat. But if there is nothing offensive in the words, he should tell the Senator who makes the point of order that in the opinion of the Chair the words complained of are not violative of the rule.

In any event, an appeal could be taken, as the Senator from Ohio has said. But we have the very peculiar situation, under the present construction; that, impliedly by the requirement of the motion that he proceed in order, a Senator is found guilty without anyone passing on the question.

Mr. President, there is another provision of the rule whereby on a question of order being raised, on the demand of any Senator the words shall be taken down, very much as is done in the House of Representatives, and that rule is clear and the construction is clear. The particular rule we are now discussing, in my opinion, has been misconstrued during the years, and at the first opportunity the ruling should be changed so that the Presiding Officer would be compelled to pass upon the admissibility of the spoken words.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the point of the Senator from Georgia is well taken, because under clause 5 of this particular rule, even if a Senator is called to order, it may be asked that the words be taken down and read to the Senate, in order that a determination may be had as to whether or not he was out of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. If clause 4 is applied, he is ordered to take his seat.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to make one additional remark. The Senator from Illinois a few minutes ago, just before the Senator from Georgia spoke, referred to the abuse of power the rule might make possible on the part of one Senator. I am confident the Senator will agree with me that there has been no intention to abuse the power given under the rule in the past few years, and I hope he will agree with me that it was not an intentional abuse of power in any way, shape, manner, or form, when the Senator from Nebraska invoked the rule on Wednesday last. I say intentional abuse of power.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not contend that the Senator from Nebraska intentionally invoked the rule unless he thought he was right. But what I am discussing, and I come back to my original premise, is the infliction of the penalty upon a Senator without the Vice President having an opportunity to pass on the question in the first instance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator in that.

Mr. LUCAS. As the Senator from Georgia stated a moment ago, if a Senator may be found guilty merely by one statement on the part of another Senator, then he is pilloried throughout the country as having been called to order and having to take his seat for something which, when the Senate passed upon it, actually did not happen. If the Senate had thought that I was out of order by transgressing Senate rule, as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Illinois would have lost the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not agree with the last statement, because I think the Senate could have permitted the Senator to proceed in order even if he had been out of order.

But the cold fact is that under this construction the penalty of the speaking Senator is the same whether he has transgressed the rules of the Senate or has not. If the point of order is made against him that he has transgressed, he must take his seat, whether he has or not, whether his language was proper or improper. Any proper construction of the rule would certainly require that the Presiding Officer in the first instance should hold whether or not the words complained of were out of order.

Mr. LUCAS. Obviously, it does not make any difference whether or not a Senator believes that the speaking Senator was violating the rule. He may have acted in good faith, his intentions may have been good. He may have thought he was preserving the dignity of the Senate. But even though acting in good faith, the Senator compelled to take his seat is the one who is damaged, and not the dignity of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. According to my construction of the rule, the Chair should have authority to pass upon the fact whether or not the speaking Senator has transgressed the rule.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Inasmuch as this matter is before the Senate, the Chair would like to clarify it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I take one moment of the Senate's time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Missouri is correct in his position, and that the Senator from Georgia is also correct, and I should like respectfully to call to the attention of the Presiding Officer certain words in the rule which have not been mentioned at all in the discussion up to now, and which I think have a very large and clear bearing on the consideration of the question before the Senate, if I may have the attention of the majority leader and of the minority leader.

I refer to the words "the Presiding Officer shall," in subsection 4 of rule 19, which follows subsections 2 and 3.

Subsection 2 has to do with the imputing to a Senator of conduct or motive unworthy of or unbecoming a Senator—to a Senator—not to anyone else. Subsection 3 has to do with offensive reference to a State.

Subsection 4 reads:

> If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate—

And attention has been properly called to those words "transgress the rules" by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Georgia—

> the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order.

The point I make is that the first obligation under this rule is placed upon the Presiding Officer himself; that is, to make a ruling, which of course would be predicated upon his opinion and finding that the rules of the Senate had been transgressed, because that is the condition stated.

I refer again and return to the first condition upon which the Senator speaking can be called to order:

> the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order.

Mr. President, it seems to me very clear that before the Presiding Officer shall act, it is quite conclusive that he must have come to a conclusion, must have made a finding, and must have announced that conclusion and finding when he acts by calling the speaker Senator to order. That finding must have been, necessarily, that the rules of the Senate had been transgressed, or that at least the words used were prima facie a transgression of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, the only right that any Senator has to act is secondary to that first declaration that the Presiding Officer "shall," because it is stated in the alternative "or any Senator may call him to order." It seems to me it is quite clear that proceeding upon that first responsibility of calling him to order does absolutely require a conclusion and a finding on the part of the presiding officer before he invokes the rule by his own independent action. He must have predicated that action upon a finding, upon a conclusion, and upon his ruling that the speaking Senator either had transgressed the rules of the Senate or that his words prima facie transgressed the rules of the Senate.

Returning to the second aspect of this matter, the question is: Can any right be given to any Senator other than the Presiding Officer to do more, or to handle the matter from a different point of view, to do it more effectively, to do it for a more careless reason or for a less sound reason, or for any different reason than the reason for which the Presiding Officer is given the right to invoke the rule. It would seem to me to be perfectly clear that by no possible rule of construction could it be held that any Senator rising on the floor of the Senate would have greater right, would be proceeding upon greater privilege, or upon any different approach from that which would have to be proceeded upon by the Presiding Officer himself in the event that he had been the one who, designated as the first one charged with this responsibility, had made his conclusion and his finding, and had announced by his independent ruling that the speaking Senator was transgressing the rules of the Senate or that his words at least prima facie transgressed the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am not sufficiently familiar with the precedents to dwell greatly upon them. It seems to me so very clear from the reading of the rule that the Vice President is required, or that the Presiding Officer is required to make a finding, if this first path is followed, and that certainly no wider or looser possibility is opened up by the rising of any Senator in his place, and that the Presiding Officer, if he permitted a Senator rising in his place to claim a wider privilege or to abuse his privilege in a way in which the Presiding Officer would not have abused it—would not claim the right or privilege to abuse it—that the Presiding Officer would not only have the right, but that it would be his very clear duty to require just as sound a conclusion on the part of any Senator who rose as he would require in his own mind or conscience before he could himself invoke the rule.

I hope the Vice President will reexamine the rules and reconsider his ruling, because otherwise it would seem to me that there would be only two possibilities before the Senate if it wants to have a reasonable rule of conduct for this matter; one would be the revision of the rule so as to spell out what was intended by it; the other would be to create a test case under which the Vice President, or the Presiding Officer, would make a ruling along the lines suggested by him, where a speaking Senator would be doing something so innocent, so clearly inoffensive as the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and a point of order would be made, and an appeal made from the ruling of the Vice President so that the Senate itself would have the opportunity to be clearly on record as not approving any such interpretation of the rule which it seems, at least to the junior Senator from Florida, would be very clearly a misinterpretation of the rule.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RESOLUTIONS ON REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, some time ago the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois made the statement that I was trying to stampede the Senate into taking action with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 12, because I mentioned it several days ago. The obvious reason why I mentioned it was because there must be 49 affirmative votes cast in order to adopt the resolution. Consequently it is important that proper notice be given of the time when a vote shall be taken on the resolution, in order that a sufficient number of Senators may be present when the vote is taken. In that respect such a resolution as the one which deals with reorganization plans is different from all other measures. The distinguished majority leader has refused to fix a date for voting on the resolution, so he has left us with no alternative except to fix the date ourselves.

Mr. President, the Reorganization Act is an extraordinary law. I voted for it with hesitation. It permits the President of the United States to make a law, that is, it authorizes the President to send to Congress a reorganization plan which has the force of law unless it is disapproved, within the required period, by a majority of the authorized membership of either House.

Consequently the men who drew the law were very careful to go into the greatest detail in order that there might be no doubt whatever that, before the 60 days expire, the matter could be brought before the Senate and the Senate obliged to vote upon the question, so that delay could not interfere with such right as we have to veto the President's plan. So the Reorganization Act provides that a motion to consider a resolution of disapproval shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable.

Mr. President, the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 was on the calendar for 2 weeks before the majority leader moved to take up the FEPC bill. The motion to consider the FEPC bill, therefore, was made with the knowledge that the resolutions dealing with reorganization plans must come before the Senate shortly. It was suggested that we ought to put them off further. After the day on which I propose to call up the resolution on Thursday, May 11, there remain only seven more working days in the Senate during which it can be considered.

Beside the plan to which I refer there are six or seven other plans to come before the Senate. We cannot possibly wait until next week. I understand a cloture petition will be filed then. There may be all kinds of complications in the procedure next week. The resolution to which I refer is a highly privileged matter. Whether it is more highly privileged than a cloture petition I do not know. I do not know what other measures will compete with the resolution of disapproval for consideration. If we allow the pendency of a measure, no matter how important, to interfere with our bringing up the resolution, we may deprive the Senate of the final power to act on what is a vital constitutional matter, made so by law, and now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I have no intention of delaying the FEPC bill. When it is brought up, I shall be very glad to help limit debate, which can be done upon agreeing to a cloture motion, so the debate will be conducted within the shortest possible time.

Personally it seems to me that 3 hours would be amply sufficient time in which to debate the resolution dealing with the reorganization plan. I should be glad to move to limit debate to that length of time. While the senior Senator from Illinois is in a great hurry, I notice that he has taken a whole hour of the Senate's time in debating the question of whether he should have been compelled to take his seat or not to take his seat on a previous occasion. He apparently does not mind an hour or so being devoted to that kind of a discussion. In view of that fact he certainly cannot regard us as being unreasonable if we ask for 3 hours' time during the debate on the FEPC bill to discuss the resolution dealing with the reorganization plan. So far as I can see it would not affect in any way the time in which the cloture petition is filed. I cannot see any reason why a definite time cannot be fixed for taking up the Senate resolution dealing with the President's reorganization plan, so notice will be given to the Senate of the time at which the vote will be had upon it.

Therefore, I propose to move either on Wednesday or Thursday next to take up the Senate resolution in order that a vote can be taken on it on Thursday, the 11th day of May.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, these charges and counter-charges about consumption of time need not concern anyone. The Senator from Ohio need not worry about the possibility of the Senator from Illinois charging up to him delay in considering the FEPC legislation. And the Senator from Illinois need not be worried over the fact that he has taken an hour in complaining about what happened to him recently, because when it is all said and done it will be all charged up to a Southern filibuster, just as has been done on other occasions.

ORDER IN DEBATE—RULE XIX

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of the discussion, the Chair will ask Senators to suspend for a moment, because the Chair desires to try to clarify for the RECORD the rule which has been discussed today.

The rule has been read; but for the RECORD and for the benefit of the statement which the Chair wishes to make, the Chair will ask the clerk to read the pertinent part of the rule again.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

RULE XIX

DEBATE

* * * * *

2. No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

3. No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

4. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him to order, and when a Senator shall be called to order he shall sit down, and not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate.

5. If a Senator be called to order for words spoken in debate, upon the demand of the Senator or of any other Senator, the exceptionable words shall be taken down in writing, and read at the table for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks the clerk to read a brief memorandum setting out the history of this rule.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Paragraph 4 of the present rule XIX is based upon rule 16 of the original code of rules adopted on April 16, 1789, as follows:

16. When a member shall be called to order he shall sit down until the President shall have determined whether he is in order or not; and every question of order shall be decided by the President without debate.

In the revisions of March 26, 1806, and January 3, 1820, the rule was reincorporated without change, being numbered, respectively, as rules 15 and 6.

In the revision of February 14, 1828, the rule was revised to read as follows:

6. When a member shall be called to order by the President, or a Senator, he shall sit down; and every question of order shall be decided by the President, without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate; and the President may call for the sense of the Senate on any question of order.

On June 26, 1856, the first part of the rule was amended to read:

6. If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall, or any member may, call him to order, and when a member shall be called to order by the President or a Senator, he shall sit down, and shall not proceed without leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. From the reading of the memorandum as to the history of the rule, it will be observed that prior to 1856 the Chair had the power, under the rule, to determine whether a Senator was out of order in speaking words concerning another Senator, and that the Chair was to decide that question without debate. An appeal was allowable from the Chair's decision.

Obviously the Senate had something in mind when it changed the rule in 1856 by taking away from the Presiding Officer the power to determine whether a Senator was actually in order, if called to order by another Senator.

The rule, as it was adopted then, and as it exists now, provides, of course, that the Chair shall call a Senator to order if he violates the rule. That presupposes that the Chair has the right to exercise some discretion or judgment in determining whether a Senator is out of order. If the Chair does not call a Senator to order after he has violated the rule, the Chair is presumed not to believe that the Senator is out of order. However, if the Chair fails to call any Senator to order for any violation which the Chair thinks has occurred, any other Senator may do so; but in both cases the Senator must take his seat and must not proceed until permitted to do so by the Senate.

The Chair's illustration earlier in the day about the Lord's Prayer was probably hyperbolical, but the Chair had in mind the actual text of the rule as it has been since 1856—nearly 100 years ago—during which time the Chair has held, and the Senate has acquiesced in the holding, that whenever a Senator is called to order, either by the Chair or by another Senator, the Senator so called to order must take his seat. Under that change in the rule, apparently the Chair was derprived of the power to pass upon the question of whether a Senator has violated the rule, except in a case where the Chair himself thinks so, not upon the demand of any other Senator. In that case, of course the Chair must exercise his judgment as to whether it is a violation of the rule; but even there, all the Chair can do is to require the Senator to take his seat; and he must remain seated until the Senate permits him to proceed in order.

SPEECH OF HAROLD E. STASSEN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I could not help but register in my mind the remark of the able majority leader that no one paid any attention to what Harold Stassen said or would say. I must say to the able majority leader that if no one would pay any attention to what Harold Stassen might have said or might say, then the majority leader and some of his colleagues might have avoided a great deal of delay or a great amount of fuss last Friday night about Harold Stassen's speech as it appeared in the press throughout the Nation.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senate now has before it the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1728. I ask that I be permitted to make a brief statement regarding the bill without being interrupted, in

order that the beginning of the debate on this question may be presented in simple, straightforward, and uninterrupted style.

Mr. President, I cannot refrain from the remark that it is nice to be able to take up a noncontroversial question at this time, after the discussion of the last hour and a half.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have requested that I not be interrupted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah declines to yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this is a difficult and exciting subject to open even under the most favoring circumstances. I appreciate fully the fact that some small sacrifice to the good of the proposal may be involved in a refusal to engage in or permit development of the subject through debate as we proceed. However, in view of the further fact that every possible view has been expressed on this floor abundantly in past sessions of Congress, I believe a greater gain may be achieved if I may preserve the continuity of my short presentation.

Senate bill 1728, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to be known as the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act, was reported orally to the Senate last October, without recommendation, pursuant to a vote of 11 to 1 in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. At that time I was instructed by the committee that the report should be a simple statement showing the number of Senators voting on the various motions of the day, and that permission be requested for Senators to file separate statements of their individual views at such future time as might be convenient to Senators. As will be recalled, the McGrath bill, S. 1728, was placed on the calendar near the closing days of the first session of this, the Eighty-first Congress. Permission to file statements of individual views, without stipulation with respect to future date, was granted by the Senate; and, accordingly, within the past few days the very short principal report was made and a number of separate statements were printed in the first part of the report, as requested by the respective Senators who contributed thereto; and a separate paper, which was designated as part 2, containing one statement, was ordered printed by itself, pursuant to the request of the Senator submitting it. Every safeguard was taken to satisfy the wishes of all Senators affected. If there is the slightest deviation from their wishes, I shall be happy to request unanimous consent for a star print to conform to every Senator's wish.

There has been one change in the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the interval between the granting of permission to file separate statements of individual views of Senators and the actual presentation of the views in the Senate, namely, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] formerly was a member of this committee, and presently the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is a member of this committee. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] joined with a number of Senators in presenting his and their joint statement.

Thus the whole subject is before us. At the time when the bill was ordered placed on the Senate Calendar, the bill was reported, as stated, without recommendation, a motion to report favorably having been defeated in committee by a tie vote of 6 to 6.

Today the bill is before us, technically, and, I concede, actually, without recommendation.

As will be seen by an inspection of the expressions in statements of Senators of their individual views, 8 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare comprising 13 members, indicate in their views a desire for passage of the Senate bill now on the calendar. If my interpretation presents the slightest variation from the truth I shall be happy to stand corrected at the conclusion of my remarks.

To begin the presentation proper of the terms of S. 1728, permit me to say it was not amended in committee, nor should it have been, for it was the development by a slow and careful evolution through the years, a circumstance suggested in the views of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as outlined at page 29 of the document now on the desks of Senators.

Moreover, if the provisions of S. 1728 presented in any way the elements of, or the open or hidden threat of a social revolution, I, for one, should be chary, for I am one who believes in much education, the exhibition of considerable patience, and the offering of every reasonable opportunity for gradual compliance with a new law, the terms of which seem to appeal to the honest suspicions and early antipathies rather than to the immediate sympathies of an otherwise law-abiding segment of our population and citizenry. Even the charge, I may say the fact, that correction of injustice has been long overdue would not justify a remedy, the imposition of which is or might be, or even could be delivered with an administration applied with ruthless and shocking force.

I shall leave it to lawyers to argue about police power of the States, Federal police power, and constitutional aspects, if any questions along this line may be raised, but will content myself to say that when we are toying with the stem which gives us the words "police," "policy" and "politics," we may give pause and consider its neighbor, "politeness." I believe, as I have indicated, that the proposal before us contains all the guaranties of a polite launching of an old, established right, the right to an equal place in our democracy for all its citizens in the matter of consideration for that important element of every man and woman's life, the getting and holding of a job worthy of his talents.

Mr. President, in the United States, which is today, of course, a democracy depending on private property, and, because of the type of money we have, a dollar democracy, the right to a job is probably the greatest factor connected with any other one thing in the national life. It is the source of all liberty. It is the source of nearly all rights under democracy. Therefore, one cannot overstress importance of the opportunity for a job. When I said that, I wanted to add the further statement in regard to the bill that it has in its origin probably certain prejudices, though the bill has nothing to do with prejudice as such. The bill is merely a legal attempt to guarantee a right which should be enjoyed by everyone under the Stars and Stripes, as that right is defined to the citizens of the United States.

As one who has grown up in a State in which important struggles for equality of consideration and treatment were beset with many difficulties, I am by nature sympathetic with the position of minorities whose appeal for human equities seems to meet only with the classic rebuff, "Your cause is just, but I can do nothing for you."

This thought, it seems to me, has been well sustained throughout the decades, and the situation of the American Negro and the other large minorities, struggling for the establishment of that one right, the denial of which, more perhaps than any other, depresses their personal economies to a point of sharp contrast with their fellow citizens. The existence of discrimination in employment has been one of the most stubborn dislocations in our national life.

Of course, lawyers learn early in their studies the legal maxim which, roughly put, is to the effect that a wrong suggests a remedy.

If we have equal citizenship, the fullness of which is unattainable because specific laws to give assurance to an organic right are lacking, so that an equality exists on paper but is not attainable through a simple omission, then that missing statute should be supplied. That is the simple justification for the presentation of the bill now on the calendar of the Senate.

Discrimination in employment because of the failure to give substance to equality already abundantly expressed is a statutory omission amounting to a flagrant wrong, and fairly shouts for its remedy.

The greatest mistake of the hour would be, of course, to consider the subject of antidiscrimination in employment as any but a nonpartisan or bipartisan concern. As will appear in the views of Senators, the record will show that in the previous Congress, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, then under Republican control, had a bill readily identifiable with the current proposal, and that in the tortuous path to the Senate floor the then bill of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] fared better than the present bill, for it came to the Senate floor with the full and unrestricted and more readily decipherable blessing of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare than does the McGrath bill. There are distinctions between the 2 bills but no real differences, such as to suggest that the comparison is not an honest one, as will undoubtedly be revealed clearly in the forthcoming debates. I believe I have made my point.

Let us get this measure to a vote. It then will be shown to be as nonpartisan, or bipartisan, as any measure ever advocated, not even excepting the support of an emergency involving armed conflict.

Since 1944 there have been a number of bills designated to create a national FEPC. Hearings were conducted by committees of the Senate and of the House in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, by a Senate committee in the Eightieth, and by a House committee in the Eighty-first. Knowledge has been assembled from these activities such as to make well informed even a casual student of the whole problem. It would be wrong to pyramid hearings upon hearings. Moreover the floor debates have been long and full. There seems to be little left untold and unsaid. Incidentally, the House of Representatives spent 43 days in hearings upon this question. I know many of the searches by many of our new Members for the truth. Men like the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] from our committee, and others who might be named, are among not the least, but the most tutored in this grave problem. It would be an act of sheer indolence to hold hearings for their review. If it is true that absence of 1950 Senate hearings would serve but to delay or prevent an important consideration, such overattention would be a mischief and a nuisance. There may be points of attack; failure to gild the lily of accumulated information on the subject must not be seriously considered as one of them.

The Federal fair employment practice bill now on the calendar declares that persons are being denied employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; that it is essential to the general welfare that these rights be protected; and that this bill is necessary to remove obstructions to commerce, to insure complete enjoyment of constitutional rights, to promote observance of rights and freedoms undertaken by the United Nations Charter, and to further national policy with respect to universal declaration of human rights proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The foregoing policies are expressed in section 2 of the bill.

Section 3 provides definitions including the definition of an employer as a person engaged in commerce employing 50 or more, except States and political subdivisions or nonprofit organizations which are of a religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian character.

Section 4 exempts employers of aliens working outside the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions.

Section 8 makes it an unlawful practice—

For an employer to refuse to hire, to discharge, or discriminate against a person with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; or to utilize in hiring any employment agency, placement service, or other source which discriminates.

For a labor organization to discriminate against any persons or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership because of race, color, and so forth.

For either an employer or a labor organization to discharge, expel, or discriminate against a person because he has opposed such unlawful employment practice or participated in any proceeding under this act.

Section 6 creates a Fair Employment Practice Commission in the executive branch composed of five members appointed by the President, with advice of the Senate, for 5-year terms.

The Commission shall have power to appoint officers and employees under civil-service rules; to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies; to pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts; to furnish technical assistance to further compliance with the act; to assist an employer whose employees refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of the act; to make technical studies to effectuate the act, and to appoint local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils to aid in effectuating the act and to make studies and recommendations for that purpose.

Investigatory power is contained in section 9, as follows:

Power to issue subpenas; to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence; and to apply to United States district courts to enforce subpenas, and so forth, against contumacious persons.

Section 7 provides that the Commission shall have exclusive powers to prevent unlawful employment practices under the act but may cede jurisdiction to State and local agencies where State and local acts are comparable to this act. The Commission on a written sworn charge shall investigate and endeavor to eliminate the unlawful practices through informal conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

On failure to obtain voluntary compliance by informal methods, a formal hearing may be held before a member of the Commission designated agent with the right to counsel and to cross-examine witnesses, and so forth. At conclusion of the formal hearing the record thereof shall be transferred to the Commission, or three designated members for decision. The Commission shall then issue a cease-and-desist order or a dismissal. The whole proceedings hereunder shall conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.

Judicial review is provided in section 8. It authorizes a petition, by either the Commission or a party aggrieved by a final order of the Commission, to the United States Court of Appeals under the procedures established by the Administrative Procedure Act. Decision of the court of appeals is subject to a review by the United States Supreme Court.

Self-incrimination is safeguarded in section 9, which states that no person shall be excused from testifying or producing evidence in obedience to a subpena on the ground that the testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture but no such person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture on account of such testimony or evidence except perjury in so testifying.

Section 10 authorizes the President to make Federal practice conform to the policies of the act and to prescribe administrative remedies by Executive order with no judicial review. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with the Commission's orders. This section also authorizes the President to make regulations to prevent Government contractors with respect to contracts exceeding $10,000, from continuing unfair employment practices. The Commission shall enforce such regulations.

Section 11 requires employers and labor organizations to keep a notice prepared by the Commission, with excerpts from the act, posted in conspicuous places on their premises under penalty of a $500 fine.

Section 12 provides that the act shall not modify Federal, State, Territorial, or local veterans' preference.

Section 13 provides that the Commission shall make, modify, and rescind rules and regulations to carry out the act. The regulations must conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.

Section 14 specifies that to forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate or interfere with a member, agent, or employees of the Commission in the performance of duties under the act or because of the same is punishable by a $500 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

The usual provision concerning separability is stated in section 15.

Mr. President, having made that simple statement and having presented that description of the bill which is to come before the Senate for consideration, I feel that my part of the debate, at this time, is concluded, and I thank the Members of the Senate for listening to me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. IVES. I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New York should yield, in view of the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not want to disturb any Senator at this time. If the Senator from Alabama desires that a quorum be called, I shall be very glad to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this time to enter upon a protracted discussion of S. 1728. Later in this debate, when its chief issues become more clear, I may desire again to speak upon this subject, and in such circumstance I shall deal at greater length and more specifically with the issues themselves.

Right now I merely desire to point out a few of the fundamental matters which pertain in the consideration of this particular legislation. These are matters which have received emphasis during the many months in which the question of discrimination in employment has been before the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses.

In the first place, there has been a growing tendency, which I deplore, to play partisan politics with the whole question of civil rights. This kind of attitude can prove only harmful to the civil-rights program, and in the long run it is likely to boomerang on those who are actuated by it.

Civil rights, and especially S. 1728, are fundamental in the American concept of freedom and of equality of opportunity. They are part and parcel of our American creed. They are above party—even as are the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

The elimination of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, or national origin is the most important part of the civil-rights program. As a matter of fact, the enactment of S. 1728 would contribute more than anything else to the solution of the whole civil-rights problem in the United States.

S. 1728 is very similar to S. 174, which in turn was S. 984 in the Eightieth Congress. This latter bill was introduced in each instance by four Democrats and four Republicans—the senior Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ; the senior Senator from California, Mr. DOWNEY; the senior Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY; the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. MYERS; the senior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL; the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH; the junior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE; and myself.

I am sure that I speak for my colleagues and cosponsors of S. 174 when I state that all of us favor S. 1728 just as strongly as we have favored the bill which we have sponsored. As a matter of fact, both our bill and S. 1728 are patterned after the New York State law against discrimination, which in turn was the product also of bipartisan cooperation and effort. In fact, this New York State statute was introduced in the New York State Senate by the minority leader, Senator Elmer Quinn, a Democrat, and in the New York State Assembly by the majority leader, myself, a Republican. Furthermore, both the New York State bill and S. 174 were drafted almost entirely by the same person, the Honorable Charles H. Tuttle, of New York City.

I understand that the antidiscrimination statutes of the States of Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington have been patterned largely after this New York State law. Moreover, I understand that in the formulation and enactment of these other statutes, every effort was made to divorce partisan politics from their consideration.

So I implore my colleagues who are actively supporting S. 1728 to forget that they are Democrats or Republicans in their support of this measure. Rather let us work together in harmony, united in our determination to advance a program which we believe is essential to the welfare of our country.

In discussions and commentaries upon this legislation, a great deal has been spoken and written about seeking a compromise or a middle-of-the-road course. S. 1728 is in fact a compromise and provides a middle-of-the-road course. It is the end result of tremendous effort to steer between those extremists, on the one hand, who have demanded huge penalties—both fines and prison sentences and other enforcement sanctions—and those extremists, on the other hand, who have insisted that the problem of discrimination in employment can only be solved effectively through so-called permissive legislation, without penalties or sanctions and with merely pleas, exhortation, and supplication to bring about the desired results.

Neither of these extreme courses can accomplish the purpose which is intended. To impose heavy fines or to throw people into jail for violations of a law against discrimination in employment can only increase the problem and make bad matters worse, while solely to advocate and exhort can accomplish little in overcoming genuine resistance. Too much is unworkable and unenforceable; too little is useless and futile.

The middle course to which I have referred has been proved to be the sound approach in the solution of this problem. This middle course neither emphasizes, sanctions, nor compels obedience through fear.

On the contrary, while requiring that the law must be observed, this moderate method of approach places first emphasis on the utilization of the so-called voluntary processes by which to obtain observance. Recognizing that in the field of human relations it is impossible to produce happy relationships among human beings by legal compulsion, resort to conference, conciliation, and persuasion is made mandatory in the first instance. Every effort to bring about mutual understanding and agreement by these voluntary means is employed and exhausted.

In addition, a broad program of informal education is called for by the terms of the bill. Citizens' advisory and conciliation councils, consisting of representative citizens in the various segments of the community life, are to be established for the purpose of enlisting united community effort in support of observance of the law.

I know that some will argue that all this proposed procedure is very fine in theory, but it will not work. But it has worked and is working successfully in the State of New York, where, during the almost 5-year period in which the New York law has been in effect, no penalty has been imposed, and no cease and desist order has been issued, and no case has even gone to court.

In the debates which have occurred in the Congress and in various observations which have been brought to my attention, I have noted with regret that there are those who claim that because under it no cases have gone to court and no penalties have been imposed, the New York law is not being enforced and is a failure. I deplore these criticisms because they indicate an utter lack of understanding of the true purpose and intent which are inherent in this kind of statute. Enforced as these persons would have such a law enforced, it could only be a failure, and might even bring disastrous consequences.

The fact remains that, since the enactment of the New York law, discrimination in employment in the State of New York has diminished very materially. And the further fact remains that among those for whose principal benefit the law was enacted no responsible person has complained of any lack in its enforcement. And the final fact remains that these same New Yorkers are among those most active and most enthusiastic in support of S. 1728.

There are also those who insist that a suitable commission to administer the law, as required in S. 1728, could never be appointed. These persons feel sure that the members of the commission would not possess the personal qualities which are essential to a just or realistic administration of the law. I can appreciate most thoroughly these fears. They were held by many when the New York law was enacted, and in those days there was some provocation for them, for until that time nothing of the kind had ever been undertaken.

But experience under the New York law has demonstrated that these fears are groundless. Indeed, largely because of the character and quality of the members of the New York State Commission, the law in New York State has met with outstanding success. If such a commission can be established in the State of New York, surely a similar commission of equal quality and capacity can be appointed in the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York declines to yield until he has completed his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. IVES. An able presentation of the terms and provisions of S. 1728 has been made by the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Further comment on this subject by me at this time, therefore, would be superfluous.

At this point in my remarks, however, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD the text of the brief submitted by the Honorable Charles H. Tuttle, in support

of S. 984 in the Eightieth Congress. This brief is as pertinent today as it was on the date of its submission, and it is applicable generally to S. 1728. I urge Senators to peruse this brief because it is enlightening and it is short.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, IN THE MATTER OF SENATE BILL 984, ENTITLED "A BILL TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF RACE, RELIGION, COLOR, NATIONAL ORIGIN, OR ANCESTRY"

BRIEF SUBMITTED BY CHARLES H. TUTTLE IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL

Mr. Tuttle was counsel for the New York State Temporary Commission Against Discrimination, which drew the New York law against discrimination enacted in 1945.

He has been active in advocating like legislation in the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey, and is now vice-chairman of the New York City Council of the State Commission Against Discrimination.

In the submission of this brief, Mr. Tuttle feels especially privileged and honored to have the opportunity to appear before this congressional committee in support of this bill initiated by Senator IRVING M. IVES, who was chairman of the New York State Temporary Commission Against Discrimination, who was foremost in securing the enactment of the New York law, and who by his leadership in the field of right human relations has given his name to the New York law and to this bill.

Summary of provisions of the bill

This bill is a departure in approach and concept from the former FEPC bills which annually appeared in Congress without success.

In grappling with the problem of discrimination in employment, this bill shifts the initial emphasis from naked police power to conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

It provides the means for rallying the local forces of good will within our communities to study the problem of specific instances of discrimination in employment and to foster, through community effort or otherwise, cooperation among all the elements of our population, and to aid in the deyelopment of remedial policies and procedures in general and in specific instances.

It provides for cooperation with regional, State, local, and other agencies.

It provides for studies of the subject by the Commission and the making of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmetal agencies.

It provides for furnishing to persons under the Act such technical assistance as they may require or request for compliance with its policies.

It extends assistance to employers whose employees, or some of them, may refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate with the policies of the act.

If all these preliminary approaches fail and a trial of a complaint becomes necessary, the bill provides fair procedure for a hearing before three members of the commission who were without participation in the earlier efforts at conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

The provisions for a trial before the commission and for judicial review of the results of such trial are carefully molded in accordance with the standard provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act and the traditional concepts of fair play.

Subpenas may be issued only by the Commission or some member thereof.

Any agent designated by the commission to conduct any investigation or proceeding must be a resident of the Federal judicial circuit within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

Unlawful employment practices as defined in the bill

These unlawful employment practices are four in number. They are set forth in section 5, and are, in summary:

1. For an employer to refuse to hire, or to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate in the matter of employment, because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

2. For an employer to utilize any employment agency, training school, or labor organization which does so discriminate.

3. For a labor organization to discriminate against any individual, or to segregate or classify membership or limit employment opportunities, on any such ground.

4. For an employer or labor organization to penalize anyone for opposing any such unlawful employment practice.

Exemptions

Section 4 specifically exempts any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, not organized for private profit, other than labor organizations.

The definition of employer specifically exempts any employer having in his employ less than 50 individuals.

As to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or any officer or employee thereof, the commission is authorized to request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with its orders; and the President is empowered to establish rules and regulations for compliance by any person who contracts with any agency or instrumentality of the United States if such contract requires the employment of 50 or more individuals.

The model for this bill

The bill is modeled on the New York law against discrimination enacted on March 12, 1945, and commonly known as the Ives-Quinn law.

It was passed by the legislature overwhelmingly, as a nonpartisan measure. It gave the State of New York primacy in the enactment of an integrated program against racial and religious discrimination.

In signing the bill the Governor described it as a reaffirmation by the people of New York of their faith "in the simple principles of our free republic," and said:

"It expresses the rule that must be fundamental in any free society—that no man shall be deprived of the chance to earn his bread by reason of the circumstances of his birth."

The leadership thus taken by the State of New York in this social advance has stimulated the enactment of similar laws in the States of Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Like legislation is pending in some other States.

The bill was framed by a commission appointed in the previous year by the legislature and the Governor. Hon. IRVING M. IVES was chairman of the commission. The commission had extended public hearings on the subject and on the commission's preliminary draft in all the principal cities of the State. The law as proposed by the commission was enacted without any change. It can truly be described as the work of the people of the State of New York themselves.

While the phrasing of the new law constituted legislative pioneering, the principles which it applied to the betterment of human relations were as old as American democracy and as basic as the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

Senate bill 984 sets forth these same principles and gives them embodiment in the national field, subject to the constitutional restrictions applicable to Federal legislation.

The obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations

This bill, in declaring the policy which it proposes to further, says, among other things (p. 2):

"(c) This act has also been enacted as a step toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote 'universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.'"

Subdivision 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States provides that:

"All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Nature of civil rights

Section 2 of this act provides (p. 2):

"(b) The right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States."

The New York law against discrimination enacted in 1945 declared:

"SEC. 126. Opportunity for employment without discrimination a civil right. The opportunity to obtain employment without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right."

Much has been written as to the nature of civil rights. But all authorities agree either that included in civil rights are such rights as the legislature shall recognize and declare to be such, or, in the absence of any such declaration, that they include such rights as under a free society are recognized as essential to the freedom of the individual and as part of the inalienable right of everyone to live.

As said by the Supreme Court of the United States in *U. S.* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. (1875) 542, 553):

"The rights of life and personal liberty are natural rights of man. 'To secure these rights,' says the Declaration of Independence, 'governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.' The very highest duty of the States, when they entered into the Union under the Constitution, was to protect all persons within their boundaries in the enjoyment of these 'inalienable rights with which they were endowed by their Creator.' Sovereignty, for this purpose, rests alone with the State."

In *People* v. *Barber* (289 N. Y. 378), our State court of appeals recently said, per Chief Justice Lehman (p. 385):

"It (the Bill of Rights) is a guaranty of those rights which are essential to the preservation of the freedom of the individual—rights which are part of our democratic traditions and which no government may invade."

The classic juridical definition of civil rights is that they are distinct from political rights, and that the terms "in its broadest sense includes those rights which are the outgrowth of civilization, the existence of which necessarily follows from the rights that repose in the subjects of a country exercising self-government" (*Grooms* v. *Thomas* (93 Okla. 87), *Simpson* v. *Geary* (204 Fed. 507, 512), *City of Dallas* v. *Mitchell* (245 S. W. (Tex.) 944, 945), *Friendly* v. *Olcott* (61 Or. 580), *People* v. *Barrett* (203 Ill. 99), *People* v. *Washington* (36 Calif. 658, 662), *Blackman* v. *Stone* (17 Fed. Supp. 102, 107)).

The right to life, the most primary of all civil rights, can have no fulfillment without the right to work.

Denial or curtailment of the right to work by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin, deprives minorities "of their constitutional right to earn a livelihood" (*Carroll* v. *Local 269*, 133 N. J. Eq. 144, 147 and cases cited), "menaces the institutions and foundation of a free democratic state" (New York L. 1944, ch. 692, sec. 1), and draws the Nation toward the shattering abyss of racism and intolerance.

In the Carroll case, just cited, the court said (p. 146):

"The right to earn a livelihood is a property right which is guaranteed in our country by the fifth and fourteenth amendments of the Federal Constitution, and by the State constitution."

OPPOSITION

Opposition to the enactment of this bill, like the opposition to the enactment of like legislation in New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Connecticut, is largely on the ground that the law may unsettle tranquillity of business, promote harassing and blackmailing suits, and divide employees into racial groups.

Even if this fear were well founded, it would not follow that the racial and religious minorities must pay with peonage, second-class citizenship, and frustrated lives, the price of preventing such annoyances. But this legislation does not take such a pessimistic view of the American character or of democracy or of sound economics. Rather does it regard the business and industrial consequences as much better measured by the profound words of Mr. Eric A. Johnston, when president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, when he said publicly in January 1945:

"Wherever we erect barriers on the grounds of race or religion, or of occupational or professional status, we hamper the fullest expression of our economic society. Intolerance is destructive. Prejudice produces no wealth. Discrimination is a fool's economy. * * * The withholding of jobs and business opportunities from some people does not make more jobs and business opportunities for others. Such a policy merely tends to drag down the whole economic level. Perpetuating poverty for some merely guarantees stagnation for all."

It is also Mr. Eric Johnston who reminds us of another vital aspect of this matter of discrimination, by quoting Walt Whitman's famous lines: "This is not a nation, but a teaming of nations." It is this all-American team, its unity strengthened by its diversity, that has victoriously brought the Ship of Liberty through the most evil wind that ever swept the world.

The test of experience

In New York, not one of the evil consequences that were feared by opponents of the legislation has materialized. The new law has fitted easily and smoothly into the economic structure. It has been wisely administered, in a spirit of statesmanship and with a view to the progressive accomplishment of sound and constructive results.

Of course, time is essential to its full development. As said on May 15, 1947, by one of the members of the New York Commission concerning achievements under the New York law:

"Necessarily it will take time before a full equalization of employment is achieved, for those groups barred from certain types of employment must necessarily become aware that opportunities in those fields are now open to them, and they must prepare themselves to take advantage of those opportunities.

"This takes time, but it is important for us to know today that the barriers of employment to any group in New York State are being eliminated in all types of occupations, and that the sound administration of this law will inevitably bring a complete equalization of opportunity to all people within our State."

However, full fruition of the New York law or of any like law in any other State will not be completely attainable until uniformity and support are supplied by like national legislation.

Not only in a few States but throughout the Nation as a whole there can be no true democracy without equality of opportunity to work and live without discrimination by reason of the accidents of birth or the differences of creed.

The means and the end contemplated are no innovation or revolution. They are merely a fresh affirmation of the American faith in one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Recently our national legislation imposed, for the preservation of our country, equality of obligation on the battlefield; but such equality of duty has as its counterpart and necessary implication equality of opportunity in the paths of peace.

At the height of the present crisis in the world between democracy and the police state, this country cannot afford a verdict at the bar of world opinion that racial and religious discrimination is too thoroughly established in our economy to be outlawed.

Let us have faith in our minorities throughout our land, and be fair with them. They also hold the title deeds to God's blessings upon America.

Constitutionality

Opposition also voices the thought that the underlying principles embodied in this bill may be unconstitutional.

But the recent course of judicial decisions has been such that it is scarcely conceivable that any court would attempt to nullify any portion of democracy's ark of the covenant, the Bill of Rights itself. To do so would be close to declaring democracy itself unconstitutional.

In *New Negro Alliance* v. *Sanitary Grocery Co.* (303 U. S. 552), the Supreme Court said (p. 561):

"The desire for fair and equitable conditions of employment on the part of persons of any race, color, or persuasion, and the removal of discriminations against them by reason of their race or religious beliefs is quite as important to those concerned as fairness and equity in terms and conditions of employment can be to trade or craft unions or any form of labor organization or association. Race discrimination by an employer may reasonably be deemed more unfair and less excusable than discrimination against workers on the ground of union affiliation."

In *People* v. *Barber* (289 N. Y. 378), the New York Court of Appeals said (p. 386):

"We know now, more surely than ever before, that callousness to the rights of individuals and minorities leads to barbarism and the destruction of the essential values of civilized life."

In *James* v. *Marinship Corp.* (155 Pac. (2d) 329), the Supreme Court of California, in a decision announced on January 2, 1945, granted an injunction against the refusal of a local union having a closed-shop agreement to permit members of a Negro auxiliary union to work in the shop. The court said:

"Its (the union's) asserted right to choose its own members does not merely relate to social relations; it affects the fundamental right to work for a living (citing cases). * * * The discriminatory practices involved in this case, are, moreover, contrary to the public policy of the United States and this State."

In *Railway Mail Association* v. *Corsi* (326 U. S. 88), the Supreme Court considered the constitutionality of section 43 of the civil-rights law of the State of New York. That section prohibited any labor organization from discriminating in the matter of membership and privilege on account of race, creed, or color. In upholding constitutionality, the Supreme Court said:

"We have here a prohibition of discrimination in membership or union services on account of race, creed, or color. A judicial determination that such legislation violated the fourteenth amendment would be a distortion of the policy manifested in that amendment, which was adopted to prevent State legislation designed to perpetuate discrimination on the basis of race or color. We see no constitutional basis for the contention that a State cannot protect workers from exclusion solely on the basis of race, color, or creed by an organization functioning under the protection of the State, which holds itself out to represent the general business needs of employees."

In *Steele* v. *Louisville & N. R. R. Co.* (323 U. S. 192), the Supreme Court held that a Negro railway fireman who was discriminated against because of color by the union chosen by the majority of his craft as bargaining representative under Federal Railway Labor Act, could properly invoke the protection of the court by injunction, notwithstanding that such discrimination was buttressed by the contract between the union and the employing railroad. The Supreme Court said:

"We think that Congress, in enacting the Railway Labor Act and authorizing a labor union, chosen by a majority of a craft, to represent the craft, did not intend to confer * * * power upon the union to sacrifice, for the benefit of its members, rights of the minority of the craft, without imposing on it any duty to protect the minority.

"The discriminations based on race alone are obviously irrelevant and invidious. Congress plainly did not undertake to authorize the bargaining representative to make such discrimination."

To the same effect are: *Tunstall* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen* (323 U. S. 210 (1944)); *Morgan* v. *Virginia* (328 U. S. 373); Yale Law Journal, April 1947, page 731, volume 56, No. 4—Discrimination by Labor Union Bargaining Representatives Against Racial Minorities; California Law Journal, September 1945, page 388, volume 33, No. 3—The Right to Equal Opportunity in Employment.

No violation of the right of contract

Freedom of contract is not absolute. Like all other rights of persons and of property, it is subject to reasonable regulations and prohibitions in the interest of the common welfare and of a sound and consistent democracy. As said by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Nebbia* v. *People of the State of New York* (291 U. S. 502, 527):

"The Constitution does not guarantee the unrestricted privilege to engage in a business or to conduct it as one pleases."

And in *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish* (300 U. S. 379), the same Court, per Chief Justice Hughes, said (O. 391):

"What is this freedom (of contract)? The Constitution does not speak of freedom of contract. It speaks of liberty and prohibits the deprivation of liberty without due process of law. In prohibiting that deprivation the Constitution does not recognize an absolute and uncontrollable liberty. Liberty in each of its phases has its history and connotation. But the liberty safeguarded is liberty in a social organization which requires the protection of law against the evils which menace the health, safety, morals, and welfare of the people. Liberty under the Constitution is thus necessarily subject to the restraints of due process, and regulation which is reasonable in relation to its subject

and is adopted in the interests of the community is due process. This essential limitation of liberty in general governs freedom of contract in particular."

Hence, the courts have steadily upheld legislative authority to regulate labor conditions and relations, and to prevent the right to hire and discharge from being used to impair the countervailing right of employees. (*Phelps Dodge Corp.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (313 U. S. 177); *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin* (301 U. S. 1); *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100)). The phrase "affected with a public interest" is no longer accepted judicially as the determining characteristic of businesses which can be subjected to the economic and social programs of the States (*Olsen* v. *Nebraska* (313 U. S. 236, 246)).

Conclusion

Senate bill 984 rests on sound principles.

It is a workable and moderate but effective expression in the economic field of the basic American doctrine of equality of opportunity.

It is supported by the precedent and experience of like legislation in several of the States.

It is called for by the Charter of the United Nations and by the leadership which this Nation must take in strengthening and validating the principles and practice of democracy throughout the world.

It is constitutional and it is statesmanlike.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES H. TUTTLE.

JUNE 10, 1947.

Mr. IVES. The United States of America furnishes the last bulwark for freedom in the world. Without equality of opportunity, a basic privilege of freedom is destroyed.

Discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, or national origin denies equality of opportunity and makes a mockery of our pious boasting about our American way of life. There is no room in America for second-class citizenship; either we are united in ideals and purpose and example, or ours is a union in name only, torn by resentment and dissension among heterogeneous minorities in conflict with whatever majority may be in the ascendancy at the moment. To those of us who constitute the immediate over-all majority is given the task of translating our lofty ideals and principles into a living reality.

This is the challenge confronting us as we consider S. 1728.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion and yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. I withhold the suggestion, and yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I noted the reference by the distinguished Senator to the history of the enforcement of the State FEPC law in the State of New York with which the Senator is, of course, familiar, and of which law he was, I understand, one of the distinguished authors.

I ask the distinguished Senator, first, what was the sentiment in the two houses of the Legislature of the State of New York at the time of the passage of the State FEPC measure, with reference to the support of the measure by the members of the two houses?

Mr. IVES. The sentiment was divided. It was not unanimous. It never is unanimous on a question that is controversial.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator remember the vote?

Mr. IVES. No, the Senator does not happen to know the vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the vote by which the measure was passed was very heavy in both houses?

Mr. IVES. There was a large number of votes cast. A large percentage of the members in both houses voted, if that is the Senator's question.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; my question is whether a large percentage of those voting voted for the passage of the act.

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was passed almost unanimously, was it not?

Mr. IVES. No; it was not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think that the history of the enforcement of that act is the history of the enforcement of a State measure in a State which, by and large, strongly favors the State FEPC measure and its enforcement?

Mr. IVES. The history of that particular act in New York is the history of the administration of an act in a State where the preponderant sentiment is undoubtedly in its favor. But I can assure the able Senator from Florida that there was articulate in the State of New York a great deal of opposition to this particular kind of legislation. I am very happy, particularly in the last year or two, to hear from people who were bitterly opposed to the act in the State of New York, and are now solidly behind it, informing me, as they do, that their fears have not been realized, nor were they ever justified.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has stated, has he not, that the preponderant majority of the people in his State favored the enactment and enforcement of their State FEPC law?

Mr. IVES. I would assume the preponderant majority of the people favored it, because a substantial majority of the legislature favored it. So far as a legislative body is able to carry out or does carry out the intent of the constituents whom the members represent, then in the State of New York the action of the legislature in that particular instance probably was representative of the sentiment of the people of the State of New York.

Mr. HOLLAND. Assuming that in the State of New York the preponderant majority of people favored the legislation, and the overwhelming majority of both houses of the legislature favored it, I wonder if the Senator has any opinion as to whether the enforcement of the law in such a State and under those conditions would be a much simpler problem than the enforcement of a similar Federal law in States where the preponderant majority of the people did not favor an FEPC law.

Mr. IVES. I think the Senator's question really answers itself. Quite obviously where there are a majority of people in a State favoring legislation of this kind, enforcement or observance is much easier than would be the case in a State where the majority of people were opposed to it. But the fact still remains that in those areas in the State of New York where obviously, because of local conditions, or for other reasons, there were majorities opposed to it, this particular act of the State of New York has worked successfully. I can give as a reason for that the fact that New York State, as I indicated in my previous remarks, has a very fine commission administering the law, a commission with great intelligence, great fairness, great understanding, and a fundamental and basic belief in what they were trying to do. That is why I emphasized the importance of the commission aspect.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether as many as one citizen or one business in his State has ever opposed the enforcement of the FEPC measure to the degree of requiring that it go to court.

Mr. IVES. No; it has not gone to court.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is saying, then, if I understand him correctly, that notwithstanding the fact that he says there has been much sentiment in the past against the law, not one citizen, not one business, of the great State of New York, felt so keenly in opposition to the measure that it took the measure to court, took it where its constitutionality and its other aspects could be subjected to court analysis and determination.

Mr. IVES. No, and for the very simple reason that the procedure which the Senator from New York outlined in brief, under the terms of the New York statute, which is substantially the same type of procedure provided in the bill with respect to which a motion to take up has been made, offers a medium, through conference, conciliation, and persuasion, mandatory in the first instance, by which people are enabled to get together and work out their problems among themselves. That is why we have had no cases go to court. That is why the resistance in the State of New York, bitter as it was in some particular situations in the beginning, has gradually been eliminated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not know it to be a fact that whereas eight States, including his own, have seen fit to adopt compulsory FEPC laws, more than twice that many have, in the exercise of their State sovereignty, declined to adopt such laws?

Mr. IVES. I am not aware of the statistics with regard to those declining so to act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Well, stating, as a matter of fact, in my next question, that more than twice as many States have taken exactly the opposite position to that taken by the State of New York, namely, have refused to adopt a State FEPC law, I ask the distinguished Senator if he feels it to be a wise, prudent step, from the standpoint of the enactment of sound and enforceable legislation, to attempt to impose legislation

which has been found to be acceptable to only 8 States of the Union, upon all the other States of the Union, when some 18 of them have declined to adopt FEPC legislation, and when most of the others have been so hostile to it that no such legislation has ever been introduced in their State legislatures?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, again the answer to the question posed by the able Senator from Florida would appear to be obvious, but it is not as obvious as it would appear to be. Yes, Mr. President, administered as the law of the State of New York has been administered, with the thought and understanding and deep feeling of fairness, of trying to get people together and work out the problems together—I say regardless of the number of States indicated by the Senator from Florida that have turned down such legislation, there need be no cause for fear concerning a Federal statute of this kind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether he feels it is wise to try to enact such legislation in the face of such a showing of determined opposition as I have recited in my earlier question, and in the face of the refusal and failure of the advocates of FEPC up to this time ever to subject it to a court test in which a determination could be made on the question of the constitutionality of such legislation?

Mr. IVES. I think I answered that question in my previous answer. I want to say, though, to the able Senator from Florida that the idea that everything has to be done by compulsion, by force, is something which is utterly aside from the point, completely foreign to the whole thought in connection with the effort being made in the State of New York to resolve the particular problem inherent in the question of discrimination in employment. The whole effort is directed toward getting people together, to understand their common and mutual problems together, and then recognizing those problems, that in understanding of those problems—because most people are reasonable—they are enabled to work out the solutions which they desire. That is the whole thought back of the legislation. It is not a question of passing a law with such heat that people will be thrown into jail. I mentioned that in my earlier statement. It is not a question of imposing tremendous penalties because of a possible violation somewhere. It is a question of using common sense, understanding, and justice in the administration of the act.

I do not believe the able Senator from Florida noted when I remarked that conference, conciliation, and persuasion are mandatory in the first instance. That is the whole idea. People are brought together by voluntary processes. People are not brought together by the force of the policeman's stick. That is inherent and basic in the whole matter.

On top of all that are the citizens, councils of conciliation and conference in the various localities which the act provides for and in the States and in the Union. In New York State they have been regional, they have been local. I think there are eight large councils already established in the State for the purpose of disseminating information, through the process of education, so that people can understand the law and know what it is about, and, in turn, understanding and knowing it, believing as undoubtedly most Americans do believe, that there are some fundamental things which are basic in our whole American philosophy, they can get together and work out the solution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is not by any means seeking to create the impression that compulsion does not exist in Senate bill 1728, does he?

Mr. IVES. The Senator is very definitely seeking to convey the idea that the compulsion in the bill, if the Senator wants to call it that, is there for the very simple purpose of requiring those affected by it to give attention to it, to carry out on their part the processes which the bill itself establishes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the great State which the Senator represents so ably is that State in the Union which has the largest problem, insofar as the size and variety of its minorities are concerned; that is, does it not have the largest minority proportions of citizens by race, by color, by national backgrounds, and from various standards covered by the bill?

Mr. IVES. The Senator is not able to answer that statistically, but the Senator would imagine that the State of New York has as many so-called minorities among its population, proportionately speaking, as has any other State in the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him if he would be so kind as to state for the record the various minority groups of citizens which in his State exist in very large numbers.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would be unable, actually unable, to list completely all the minority groups in the State. Religions are dealt with. There are a number of religious groups there. Race is dealt with. We have at least two groups there. Nationality is dealt with. I think the guess of the Senator from Florida as to nationality is just as good as is that of the Senator from New York. I do not know how many nationalities are represented in the diversified population of the State of New York. But we work together. We are a living demonstration that we can work together with one thought, one idea, that the problem of each one of us is the problem of all of us. If the Senator wants a living example of the way in which our great diversified population in this country can get together, with our conflicting ideas, even with some conflicting basic beliefs, he will find it in my State, because we realize that there is something higher, something more noble than simply sitting down and quarreling over many picayune things.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to explore one rather technical question with the distinguished Senator from New York. Am I correct in my understanding of his bill that he does not claim there is any existing right to employment, as he seeks to create such a right in this bill, but that, instead, he is desirous of creating by this bill a right to employment free from discrimination on the ground of race, religion, color, or nationality?

Mr. IVES. I believe the bill has in it a provision slightly different from the provision of Senate bill 984 of the Eightieth Congress, in which the earlier provision of the right to employment without regard to discrimination on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry was declared to be a civil right. In this bill that right is merely declared as an outright right—I am not playing on words, but that is what it is—without referring to the matter of civil rights.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, to restate my question, am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from New York seeks by his bill to declare a right to exist, to create that right——

Mr. IVES. Very definitely.

Mr. HOLLAND. And not, may I say, again to take advantage of any declaration of a right or existence of a right under the Constitution or elsewhere?

Mr. IVES. I believe very definitely that the right which I am urging be established indisputably through the enactment of this proposed legislation is inherent in the Constitution of the United States and also in the Declaration of Independence of our country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It has been my understanding, after listening to the opening and able remarks of the Senator from New York, after reading his able report on Senate bill 984 in the last Congress, and also after reading other utterances attributed to him, that he has never claimed heretofore the existence of a right to employment free from any discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national derivation, but that, instead, he is seeking to create such a right by the passage of this measure.

Mr. IVES. No; I am not seeking to create anything which I do not believe existed. I am merely endeavoring to emphasize and place in a statute, with the force of law itself behind it, something which I do believe has existed from the very beginning of our country, ever since the Constitution of the United States was formulated in 1787.

Mr. HOLLAND. Pursuing that point further, would the Senator from New York mind stating for the RECORD what

provision of the Constitution it is that he feels creates or gives a right to employment without any question of discrimination on the ground of race, color, religion, or national derivation?

Mr. IVES. The whole spirit of the Constitution of the United States—without going into any specific section of it—and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, where the matter of equality is definitely and specifically referred to, carry out the thought of the Senator from New York.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator state just one provision of the Constitution upon which he relies in declaring the principle which he has just announced?

Mr. IVES. I do not happen to have a copy of the Constitution before me; but I think that principle presumably is established by the Bill of Rights itself—perhaps not in any specific terms dealing with employment, because, in the Bill or Rights I know of no terms dealing with employment, but that the whole principle established basically by the Bill of Rights is inherent to the idea of freedom of opportunity.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he does not think the Four Freedoms themselves, which were more or less basic in the concept of the recent war itself, from our standpoint, as the war progressed, have also inherently in them the point the Senator from Florida has raised and the point the Senator from New York is now talking about.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. IVES. First, I should like to have the Senator from Florida listen to the closing statement of my remarks, which I should like to read now:

Without equality of opportunity, a basic privilege of freedom is destroyed.

I do not believe the Senator from Florida would want to go so far as to say that he himself does not believe in equality of opportunity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course the Senator from New York is an able constitutional scholar——

Mr. IVES. I am not a constitutional scholar. I am not even a lawyer.

Mr. HOLLAND. Well, I may say to the Senator from New York that everything he has done since he has been in the Senate has made others of us feel that he is a constitutional scholar. If that be not the case——

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Florida is very flattering and encouraging, but I still recognize full well my lack of qualifications.

Mr. HOLLAND. If it be not the case that the Senator from New York is a distinguished scholar in that field, I hope he will indulge me and will allow me to attribute that quality to him, because I really think he is entitled to have it attributed to him.

Mr. IVES. Again I say I deeply appreciate the Senator's very kind thought.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. A moment ago, when he was making his able argument, the Senator from New York referred to the Bill of Rights, by which of course is meant the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I assume that the Senator from New York is familiar with the ninth and tenth amendments to the Bill of Rights, is he not?

Mr. IVES. No; I am not. I will get a copy of the Bill of Rights, if I can find it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without recalling any of the remarks I made a few minutes ago, I am perfectly willing to have the Senator from New York refresh his memory at this time by referring to the ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution, if he will be good enough to do so, referring to page 473 of the Senate Manual.

Mr. IVES. Yes; I now read them.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note that the distinguished Senator from New York has turned to the ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution, as they are shown in the Senate Manual.

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator if his interpretation of those amendments differs from mine. I understand that the first eight amendments in the Bill of Rights were to spell out specific rights, which were not given or recognized by the original text of the Constitution as being possessed by individual citizens, whereas the ninth and tenth amendments were intended to show specifically that the rights and powers which were not spelled out in the Constitution were not intended to be given to the Federal Government. In referring to the ninth amendment, which reads:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

And the tenth amendment, which reads:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I understand that those two amendments were put in the Constitution at the insistence of some of the great patriots who were among the founding fathers of our Nation, who worked out the understanding that the Federal Government should be formed and that the Constitution should be approved, but that the Bill of Rights, including those two sections, would promptly be written into the Constitution, so from those two amendments it might be very clearly established eternally, during all the time the Constitution should stand, that there were powers and rights which were not given to the Federal Government, the ninth amendment making it clear that rights not enumerated should be retained by the people, and the tenth amendment making it clear that powers not delegated nor prohibited to the States are reserved to the States or to the people.

I should like to ask the Senator to comment upon this situation, as to whether his understanding of the ninth and tenth amendments is in accordance with or distinguished from the interpretation of those two great amendments as just stated by the Senator from Florida in his question.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York, not being a lawyer, to begin with, and, least of all, a constitutional lawyer, is at a great disadvantage when it comes to arguing with an eminent member of the bar such as the distinguished Senator from Florida. However, the Senator from New York would like to read, from the brief submitted by the Honorable Charles H. Tuttle, a certain comment dealing with this question of civil rights and the Bill of Rights itself. This happens to have been a statement by the chief justice of the New York Court of Appeals, the highest court in the State of New York, which, though of course, it may be subject to dispute, is nevertheless, next to the Supreme Court of the United States, insofar as the people of New York are concerned, the highest court in the land. Speaking of the Bill of Rights, the chief justice said:

> It is a guaranty of those rights which are essential to the preservation of the freedom of the individual, rights which are part of our democratic tradition and which no government may invade.

I think the Senator from New York can do no better than to quote that opinion by the chief justice of the New York Court of Appeals. I am sure that, to get down to the common sense of this matter, the Senator from Florida will readily agree with the Senator from New York, as the Senator from New York has emphasized already several times, that freedom so-called without equal opportunity for getting along together, working together, living together, is a pretty empty thing. Equality of opportunity itself is, as the Senator from New York believes, fundamental in freedom. I think that is all the distinguished chief justice of the New York Court of Appeals had in mind when he himself made that statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have wearied the Senator unduly, but I do have one or two more questions I should like to ask him, if he will be gracious enough to yield further.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York will yield, but he will not yield for technical legal questions. The Senator from New York is at a great disadvantage with the Senator from Florida on technicalities of a legal nature. The Senator from New York has very deep and abiding convictions, but he prefers to stick to the basic idea, the basic concept back of this kind of legislation rather than to get into technicalities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida also has very deep and abiding convictions, one of which is that the Constitution of the United States means something and should be observed.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York agrees fully with that. The inter-

pretation of the Constitution by the Senator from New York may differ somewhat, as it apparently does, from that of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. That would enable perhaps the Senator from Florida to state his next question, which the Senator hopes will not be regarded as a technical one. It is simply this: Adverting to the ninth amendment, which has to do with the absolute guaranty that the enumeration of rights in the Constitution shall not be construed to deny or disparage other rights which are retained by the people, my question is, What rights retained by the people does the Senator from New York understand are referred to in the ninth amendment just read?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York does not know. The amendment itself does not indicate. It says "certain rights."

Mr. HOLLAND. Certain rights not enumerated in the Constitution.

Mr. IVES. It says "certain rights." It does not say what they are. They may not be enumerated in the Constitution, but it does not say what they are. It is a negative declaration, not an affirmative one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, turning to the tenth amendment, the Senator from Florida would like to address to the distinguished Senator from New York this question which he does not think is a technical one. That amendment reads:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The question would be, What rights or what powers is it that are understood by the Senator from New York to be reserved to the respective States or to the people by this very carefully spelled-out wording of the provisions of the tenth amendment of the Federal Constitution?

Mr. IVES. I think the tenth amendment itself answers the question. Does the Senator from Florida want the Senator from New York to read that? "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States."

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator understand that amendment to mean that unless powers are delegated to the United States by the Constitution, or unless they are prohibited by the Constitution to be exercised by the States, they are reserved to the States, or to the people?

Mr. IVES. That is the way the Senator from New York would construe the amendment. But, if the Senator from Florida is referring to this particular proposal before the Senate, with which this matter is concerned, the Senator from New York will again refer to the statement by the distinguished chief justice of the New York Court of Appeals. As a matter of constitutional interpretation, the chief justice thinks that these things are included; the Senator from Florida apparently does not think so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Florida is still on his feet.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for one more question—and he has been most gracious—I should like to ask him whether, in view of the fact that the Constitution is wholly silent on the delegation to the United States by the Constitution of any power to control employment practices of the people in the several States of the Union, he does not feel that by reason of that fact the power and jurisdiction in that field are reserved either to the States or to the people themselves?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York does not so feel, for reasons which he stated in his prepared remarks, or in the reference that he made to the statement of the chief justice of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and in other statements he has made in the course of this discussion. The Senator from New York very definitely feels that the question raised in connection with the bill, S. 1728, is constitutional.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. He has been most patient, and I am grateful to him.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York also thanks the distinguished Senator from Florida for his extreme courtesy and kindness.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota wants to tell his friend the Senator from New York that the Senator from Minnesota is no expert on constitutional law, but, possibly together we may——

Mr. IVES. The Senator means that we are a couple of practical individuals.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed. I wonder how the Senator from New York would view article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which provides:

> The Congress shall have power to * * * regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

I ask the Senator whether that particular provision, which was used for the establishment of the Labor Relations Act, may not be applicable?

Mr. IVES. It is very definitely applicable. That, however, is not the point which was raised by the able Senator from Florida. So far as that is concerned, there is no question whatever about the constitutionality of the bill. I do not think the point raised by the Senator from Florida was well taken, and I think the statement by the chief judge of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York very clearly shows it was not well taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But it is true, is it not, that, insofar as we need to have a basis for constitutionality, in order to set at rest the worries of constitutional lawyers, we do have article I, section 8, of the Constitution?

Mr. IVES. We certainly do; and to the extent that the bill follows the pattern, from the standpoint of its applicability, from the standpoint of its administrative procedure, from the standpoint of its general substantive provisions, and the way in which it is proposed to carry out the matters which it undertakes to solve, to that extent there is no question. Just as the labor-relations statutes in the Nation have been declared to be constitutional, so this measure is also constitutional.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his comment.

Let us return to that portion of the Constitution which was referred to by the Senator from Florida and see whether we cannot reach some agreement as to just where the sovereign power of this country rests. May I ask the Senator from New York to refer to amendment IX, which provides:

> The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

I ask the Senator whether that is not the phrase in the Constitution which may be called the keystone phrase as to popular sovereignty—the power of the people.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York very definitely would feel that it can be so interpreted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the theory behind constitutional government, the theory behind the Constitution of the United States, is a theory of the power being in the people and the people being equal?

Mr. IVES. That has been the theory upon which our constitutional government was established.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that amendment IX emphasizes the final phrase, "the people," and amendment X, by its final words, emphasize "the people," and that whenever States are referred to in the terminology of the Constitution the language is always buttressed, either before it or after it, by the phrase "the people"?

Mr. IVES. That is correct, in connection with those two amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those two amendments are known as the saving amendments, are they not?

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, in view of what the Senator from New York has very brilliantly and cogently said, is it not true that there is within the Constitution the inherent equality of rights or equality of opportunity which are supposed to be a part of the fabric of the Constitution?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from Minnesota, by very able reasoning, has brought out the point which the Senator from New York quoted from the statement by the chief justice of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York. Undoubtedly, that is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One further question. There is an amendment known as amendment XIV. In section 1 of that amendment there is the following language:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

Is not that amendment the one which is often referred to as the dual citizenship amendment?

Mr. IVES. I believe so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the Constitution of the United States, in its requirements as to citizenship, not only lists the requirements of the State, but also has its own requirements as to a citizen of the United States?

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The final question which I should like to ask the Senator from New York with regard to amendment XIV is this: In reference to amendment IX and to amendment X, which merely buttresses that amendment, is it not very evident that within the framework and the words of the Constitution the principle of individual equality and individual freedom is inherent and is a living force in the constitutional system?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York profoundly believes that to be a fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope, then, we can avoid a long, tiresome debate on constitutionality, because, when it is all said and done, is not the Supreme Court of the United States the only body in the Government which can ultimately decide as to constitutionality?

Mr. IVES. That is correct. On the other hand, the Senator from New York, if he felt the proposal were unconstitutional, would not favor it. I do not think the Congress of the United States should be passing measures of obvious unconstitutionality. But the Senator from New York does not feel that this bill is unconstitutional. The Senator from New York believes profoundly, as he has already stated, that the bill is constitutional, and that its whole idea rests solidly on the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have all taken an oath to uphold the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further comment?

Mr. IVES. No; the Senator from New York is weary and wants to take his seat, and the Senator from New York will yield the floor. Before I yield it, however, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Lodge
Anderson	Green	Long
Benton	Gurney	Lucas
Brewster	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	McFarland
Bridges	Hill	McKellar
Butler	Hoey	McMahon
Byrd	Holland	Magnuson
Cain	Humphrey	Malone
Chapman	Ives	Maybank
Chavez	Jenner	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Dworshak	Kem	Russell
Ecton	Kerr	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ferguson	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Langer	Smith N. J.
Fulbright	Leahy	Sparkman
George	Lehman	Stennis
Taft	Tydings	Withers
Taylor	Watkins	Young
Thomas, Utah	Wiley	
Thye	Williams	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, today's proceedings have been heralded in advance as a southern filibuster. I am happy I am able to enter into the discussion today after so much time has been consumed by non-card-carrying members of the group who are labeled "Southern Democrats."

Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1728 should be rejected by the Senate. Only an extreme national emergency can justify the abandonment or the nullification of our committee system in the case of any legislation. When we consider the checkered paliamentary history of this bill, we must recognize that the Senate cannot proceed to its consideration without violence to a system of procedure which has served us well. There is nothing in the measure which would justify the adoption of this motion, and such action could only mean that we had adopted a new method of paliamentary procedure in this body. The bill has not been subjected to any of the tests which we require of all other proposed legislation. The Senate should refuse to consider adopting the motion until the bill has passed through the gestation of committee hearings and amendments, and has been christened by committee recommendation.

Not a single witness appeared before the Committee on Education and Public Welfare to testify on either side of the measure. Not one line of testimony is offered by the supporters of the bill to justify its pious and unusual oratorical findings and declaration of policy. There is no explanation from any source of the terms and the provisions of the bill. There is no description of the manner in which it will operate or how it will be applied. Some of its provisions are vague and nebulous. Even its proponents admit that it is of doubtful constitutionality. Eminent and unbiased experts on the Constitution have repeatedly asserted that the whole theory of the legislation is in conflict with our basic law, but not a single witness was called before the committee to attempt to reconcile the provisions of the bill with the mandates of our National Constitution. There was not even one witness to tell the committee that there were any evils in existence in our land which the bill might undertake to cure.

Mr. President, the committees of the Senate are the servants of the Senate with definitely defined duties. Even if the insistent clamor for action upon any bill is so great as to stampede and confuse a committee, the committee should at least go through the process of hearings. Senators are entitled to present proposed amendments to a committee, and to have them receive committee study and action.

Even if we were to adopt the philosophy of the bill, which the Senator from Illinois seeks to have the Senate consider, it has many defects which should be cured by amendments and studied by a committee. But in this case the committee undertakes to throw before the Senate a bill of great consequence, covering 22 pages of printed matter, without a single word of hearings, without a recommendation or a suggestion as to its virtues or its defects, and without having proposed or considered a single amendment even to the dotting on an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also true that in reporting the bill under these most unusual circumstances, the majority of the committee that voted to report it was not even willing to say in a committee report, "We recommend the adoption of the bill"?

Mr. RUSSELL. It comes before us without recommendation or suggestion as a hot potato which the committee wished to get rid of, and having no other method or recourse, they dumped it, as the Senator from Alabama says in his extraordinarily fine minority views, as a foundling on the doorstep of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator now speaking issued a report in support of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would say that the Senator is issuing a report with respect to the bill. The manner by which the report is issued is in keeping with all the tactics and methods which have been employed with regard to the bill. The bill was reported to the Senate without recommendation, as of October 17, 1949. I heard that some Senators had been working on a report, and I called the Document Room every day last week and was told there was no report available. So after the motion had been made to consider the bill, certain Senators come here with a belated report filed many months after the bill was reported to the Senate, and not altogether consistent with all the views of those who signed the varying reports.

That is the very feature of the procedure which I am complaining about because this issue is shot through and through with politics. It is given special handling. Senators are brought reluctantly finally to a position where they have to express their views. Last fall heat was applied, and the bill was reported without any recommendation. Copies of the views of some members of the committee were printed and placed on the desks of Senators only today. I say that is in keeping with all that has been done in connection with the bill. No Senator has had an opportunity to

study the views presented in the various majority and individual reports. I have not even had an opportunity to read them, because they were filed here only today. Ordinarily they are filed when a bill is reported.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that this is the first day we have given consideration to the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator is not bound by any of the rules and policies and precedents of the Senate, but he knows that it is customary to file a complete report when a bill is reported to the Senate, so that we can have an opportunity to study it. In this case we have had no opportunity to study it. It is filed after the bill is brought up for consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator know that on bills identical or similar to this bill in purpose and in language, since August 1945, 254 witnesses have appeared on a total of 43 days, and that there have been 2,231 pages of testimony taken, and that the most recent testimony was taken on an identical bill in the House of Representatives?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator made some such suggestion on Friday afternoon, and I must say in all frankness that I was greatly disappointed to hear a Senator of the United States present the proposition to the Senate that because hearings had been held a year ago on a bill which had the same general objectives, it was unnecessary to hold any hearings now. Mr. President, we have had tax bills pending here since the First Congress. Hearings are held on every such bill which is introduced. Any person would have been laughed out of Congress who suggested that because we held hearings on a tax bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress we should not hold any hearings on a tax bill in the Eighty-first Congress.

Not only that, Mr. President, but I am totally unimpressed by the argument that because committees of the House of Representatives have held hearings on the bill, the Senate committee should not hold hearings on the bill. If such a policy as that is adopted, it will be in derogation of the dignity of the Senate as a body coequal with the House. It will rather relegate us to an unequal position if we accept hearings held in the House, and do not hold hearings of our own. Hearings are held in both Houses in order that one may check up on the other in order that if issues are not raised before one body, they may be raised when the measure comes before the other body.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Certainly, since this bill attempts to deal with unfair discriminations, would it not seem that the least the committee considering the bill could do would be to investigate to discover whether any improvements have been made in the situation since the last hearings were held.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. That is the reason why committees hold hearings. Farm bills dealing with various matters have been introduced from Congress to Congress, and each time the committees, in discharging their responsibilities as servants of the House or of the Senate, have held hearings in an effort to see what new developments have occurred since the last hearings were held. Witnesses who may have had experience in agricultural development have been called before the committee to testify. I cannot think of any one thing which would be more destructive of our entire parliamentary system than the adoption of a theory that because hearings were held before a Senate committee years ago, or because hearings were held before a House committee, there was no responsibility upon us to conduct hearings now when a bill is before a committee. If such an idea shall prevail in this country the rights and liberties of no man will be safe from congressional action.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the motion in the committee to hold hearings was defeated by a tie vote? In other words, is it not true that half the Senators, members of the committee, acting as agents and servants of the Senate, who were present and voting, felt just as the Senator from Georgia feels, that there should be hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to hear from the distinguished Senator from Alabama that half the members of the committee were willing to assume the responsibility placed upon them by law and tradition; that they did not propose to treat their duties lightly and say, "Hearings were held back in 1944; therefore we will try to dig up some of those old hearings and read them." Or that "Hearings were held in the House; we will get the House committee hearings and follow in their footsteps, and subordinate the Senate to the House of Representatives." The Senator from Alabama cheers me with the news that five members of the committee were willing to assume the responsibilities which are theirs as members of a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. HILL and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. It is not true that one of those five members was the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who was the chairman of the subcommittee of the full committee which in the Eightieth Congress held hearings on the bill which was pending at that time to establish an FEPC?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

I know of no more conscientious Senator than the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. That Senator has a very fine grasp of the duties and responsibilities which devolve upon the Members of this body. I cannot say that I am surprised that even though he held prolonged and protracted hearings upon a similar bill in the Eightieth Congress, yet he was willing to discharge in full his duties in the Eighty-first Congress by conducting hearings in accordance with law and custom.

Mr. HILL. Is it not in fact true that one of the main reasons why the Senator from Missouri was unwilling to vote to report the bill favorably to the Senate was the fact that the committee would not meet its full responsibility by having hearings on the bill before acting upon it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard the Senator from Missouri make that statement, which is greatly to his credit, on the floor of the Senate on Friday evening, when the pending motion was first made.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the distinguished Senator from Georgia think that possibly the members of the committee, who were unwilling to have hearings and were unwilling to bring the bill before the Senate on the basis of pro and con testimony and on the basis of a report pro and con setting forth what is in the bill and why it is necessary and what it would do, assumed that the Senate would not pass the bill anyway and that they could make a demonstration as well without hearings as with hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not my intention to discuss the motives of any Member of the Senate, but the conclusion stated by the Senator from Virginia might be drawn by a Senator, if he so desired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the Senator whether it is true that in the closing days of the first session of this Congress, in October of last year, the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], put the Members of the Senate on official notice and gave public notice of the fact that the debate on this bill would come very early in this session, in that the bill would be the second bill to be taken up after the Senate reconvened following the first of the present calendar year, sometime late in January, as predicted by the majority leader at that time, but that notwithstanding that fact, no report was even filed here in the Senate by the committee until May 5—last Friday——

Mr. RUSSELL. No; that happened to be the calendar day on which the report was filed; but the report was not printed and available to any Member of the Senate except the signers of the report until this very calendar day, today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, that is correct; but none was filed, even to go to the Printing Office, until Friday of last week, notwithstanding the announcements I have mentioned; is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is absolutely correct. Although I am not sure of my facts as to this matter, I think I am correct in saying that the vote in the committee to wash its hands of this bill, to

get rid of this hot political issue, which was scorching some of the members of the committee, was taken long before October 17, the date when it appears the bill was reported, and undoubtedly the bill was held by the clerks of the committee long enough to enable all members of the committee to have ample time to file a report in the last Congress; but none was filed and available until this morning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The subject of hearings reminds me of the margarine bill. Does the Senator know that for 50 years the hearings on that bill were precisely the same, in regard to the proposal to repeal certain taxes on oleomargarine, and yet hearings were held on that bill every year it was brought up. Is not that so?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. President, this is the first time I have ever heard it contended before either body of the Congress that because a bill was brought up in one Congress and not passed that in a subsequent Congress, there was no necessity for hearings to be held on the bill in that Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I notice in the hearings of 2 or 3 years ago, which we now have before us, some articles and editorials from magazines; and I notice that some of them are dated as far back as 1943. For instance, on page 127 of those hearings there appear excerpts from an article from the January 1943 issue of the American Magazine.

Does not the Senator from Georgia think that if we are to have the present-day views regarding this matter, we should be able to find something in magazines—and should have the benefit of having it printed in the hearings—which have been issued since 1943?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can well understand why the proponents of the bill might desire to rely upon ancient documents in its support.

This bill bears the label of "fair"—"fair employment practice" bill.

The American people want to be fair in all things, of course. If any one of us were to go to any man and ask him, "Do not you believe in fair employment practices?" any man—North, South, East, or West—of whom that question were asked would say, "Of course."

So when the bill was brought forward, with its attractive label, aided and abetted, as it was, by the tremendous propaganda drive among minority groups all over the Nation, many persons unwittingly fell for the idea that that was all that was involved, namely, that it was a simple proposition declaring in favor of fair employment practices. So the bill had considerable support when it started.

However, I am quite confident that the public sentiment throughout the country, in support of this bill has diminished from day to day as the terms of the bill have been made clear to the people of this land. So I can understand why those who advocate the passage of the bill might wish to rely upon a 1943 document, rather than to bring such evidence up to date.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when the hearings which are now before us were held. One of the main things discussed at that time was the way in which the New York law and the New Jersey law had been serving the people of those States.

As I recall, as a result of the New York law, for each 37,000 persons employed, only one act of discrimination was shown; and during the first 23 months of the operation of the law, although there were 5,000,000 persons employed, only 6,887 cases were filed, as I remember.

Does it not seem to the Senator from Georgia that the Senate should be advised further as to how that law has been at work since the last hearings were held?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that would be a very interesting sidelight on this issue. It would be most appropriate, according to my own view, in the consideration of a bill along the lines of the one proposed by the Senator from Ohio. However from my viewpoint, it matters not what takes place under a State law, because there is a great difference between the Federal power to deal with discrimination and the State power to deal with it. Certainly, however, that would have been most informative evidence, and should have been brought down to date.

Mr. President, I say that the issue presented by the pending motion involves the integrity of our parliamentary procedure. If we are to set a precedent of taking up bills of far reaching consequences and doubtful constitutionality without hearings and without recommendations of a committee of this body to guide us in our deliberations, without any opportunity for a Senator to present amendments to the committee, we will plunge the Senate into confusion and will change the whole character of our processes.

There is more involved here in the motion to take up the FEPC bill than the issue of FEPC legislation. As momentous as this revolutionary bill is admitted to be, its immediate consideration cannot be more important than our obligation to maintain the integrity of the institutions of the Senate. The Senate should not sacrifice the dignity and usefulness of this body upon the altar of political expediency. If we yield in this instance to the clamor of vocal and well-organized minorities who threaten reprisals at the ballot box, we will be disarmed hereafter when other pressure groups bring forward other radical proposals that are un-American in their nature, and demand short cuts to their passage.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that under the rules of the Senate, before a bill may be considered by the Senate, it must go to a committee of the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is so.

Mr. HILL. Is it not so for the reason that the committee may hold hearings on the bill, may explore the evidence, may go into the entire question of the bill fully, and also that the Senate may have the benefit of the committee's judgment on the bill by way of a report?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is elementary to any student of our parliamentary process that the committee is the keystone of the entire legislative structure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has outlined in a most persuasive and cogent way the legislative procedure of this body. Will the Senator tell us who was the author of our Senate Manual?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should think that the Senator from Virginia would be the last man on earth to need any instructions as to the authorship of the Senate Manual, because we all know and are proud of the fact that we are guided in our deliberations by the rules which were enunciated by Thomas Jefferson, to whom I understand the Senator from Virginia is related.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the distinguished Senator from Georgia recall King Solomon's proverb, "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set?"

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and I should like for people to be impressed with that passage. However, in some quarters both the Bible and the Constitution of the United States are considered out of date, I may say to my friend from Virginia. There are things that some people regard as being progressive and liberal, which run into absolute conflict not only with the Constitution but with Holy Writ, as quoted by the Senator from Virginia. In this new day of excess liberalism, we slur over the Constitution and the Bible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Could it possibly be that there are some people who do not want to apply the precepts of the Bible and the Constitution?

Mr. RUSSELL. I refuse to become involved in a religious discussion with my friend from Minnesota, because if he were as specious in his reasoning on the Bible as he is in his conception of the function of a committee of the Senate of the United States, we would speak for a very long time and never make any progress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Possibly the Senator from Minnesota should say that he thinks possible the Bible's authors and the Constitution's authors to be even more worthy than parlimentary tactics or the committee system of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator, of course, desires to draw that distinction or

comparison, he may do so. But I know there are those who desire change, who are always restive against resort to the usual procedures. I think that is the case with the Senator from Minnesota in regard to the instant bill.

Mr. President, in my opinion there are some things which are more important than a few votes. It would be well to remember that the constitutional rights of the very minorities whose clamor threatens to panic the Senate into taking this extraordinary step and into disregarding its normal procedure and the rights of all American citizens could be circumscribed and stricken down without a hearing before a committee, without a recommendation of a committee, if the processes that are urged here in this bill be adopted as the policy of the Senate.

I think I have some understanding of the pressures that have been brought to bear to force this unusual action. I know that pledges have been made in high places that this bill in some form or other would be rammed through at this session of Congress. The consideration for the promise—in the form of votes—has been delivered by the recipients of the pledge. The delay of performance in trying to force passage of the bill has stirred up the political lions of the minority groups. I have read the articles in the newspapers—I have one before me, on my desk—stating that sixty national organizations sponsoring this bill, headed by the NAACP, are planning ways to put the political heat on Senators to force action.

I have seen the angry telegrams and statements to which the majority leader referred on Friday, last, charging breach of faith because the bill was not taken up earlier.

I have been a candidate for public office many times. I can easily imagine the anguish of soul of those who are up for reelection this year in the bloc-voting States, if they are unable to deliver this bill. I would undertake, however, to comfort my colleagues, Mr. President, with the assertion that the vast majority of any constituency in this land would not favor the Senate's taking any action which would destroy or impair its power to function in an orderly way. They would not favor any action which would take away from the Senate its proud title of the greatest deliberative body on earth. Such ill-considered pressure tactics may appear to be good vote bait, as related to the votes of the minority groups, but the great masses of the American people are proud of the characteristics which distinguish the Senate of the United States from every other parliamentary body on this earth.

Mr. President, I well remember another occasion in this chamber when, in time of hysteria, the demand was made of the Senate that it pass a bill of somewhat similar import, without committee hearings or affirmative recommendation. That bill had behind it the insistence of the high office of the President of the United States. There were back of it the clamor and demand of those who were panic stricken by the thought of the economic convulsions that would ensue if the great strike them impending came to pass. Another body had yielded to the demand and had passed a bill without any committee action or consideration or any opportunity for hearings. Sentiment may be out of place today, but I was proud of the Senate of the United States for resisting that clamor and insisting that the bill follow the ordinary legislative processes which would afford a hearing to any citizen who might desire to protest against that proposed legislation. We would do well to consider the precedents of the past when we come to voting upon the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LONG. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator had expected to mention it later I would not want to interrupt him, but I should like to have him specify what bill he had in mind.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was talking about the measure which was introduced in the Congress to prevent an impending and imminent strike on all the railroads of the Nation. I do not even remember what year it was, but I remember the occasion very well indeed.

Mr. LONG. Was not that a bill which in effect would deny to working people their freedom to work or not to work as they saw fit, by action of the Federal Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was so construed by a great many people, and of course I shall touch upon the fact later on that, if we have the power to pass the bill which is the subject of this debate, we undoubtedly have the power to pass bills affecting the right of the citizen and saying for whom he shall work.

Mr. President, anyone who has studied this bill in detail, who has gone into all its far-flung ramifications and implications, can understand why it is necessary to resort to extraordinary tactics in the effort to jam the bill through the Senate. The fact that it is before us in this fashion is a classic example of the power which may be exerted in this body by minority pressure groups. The bill itself, and in the philosophy of its application and operation—is shot through and through with hypocrisy. It will not and cannot stand the light of careful examination. It may serve as a trap to catch votes, but a thorough examination and analysis will reveal a legislative monstrosity which, if enacted, will change the whole philosophy of our Government and will materially alter what we have come to call the American way of life. Brought forward in the false guise of securing civil rights, this bill would destroy natural rights guaranteed every citizen by the Constitution. It would take away inalienable civil rights from all our people, which we cherish as the heritage of free men. It would strike down the remaining rights which have not already been pilfered from the several States of the Union.

I shall not at this time go into any details as to my views of the constitutionality of the bill. I may do so at a later date. I know that some of my colleagues, who are able lawyers, have made a careful study in this field, and they will clearly demonstrate that the enactment of this bill would be, in effect, an effort by statute to repeal and to annul express provisions of the Federal Constitution.

It is well to remember, Mr. President, that the Constitution is a compact between the States, and it limits the powers of the Federal Government to those expressly conferred by that document. Without going into the details of constitutionality, I assert that there is not one line or one syllable in the Federal compact to justify the contention that the Federal Government has the power to compel one citizen of the United States to employ another citizen of the United States, if it be against his wishes. In this bill, Mr. President, it is sought to create the right on the part of one citizen to demand a job of another citizen. Indeed, by its express terms the bill would bestow such a right upon persons who are not citizens, to bestow it upon aliens, even upon persons who may be in this country illegally and against its laws.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can the distinguished Senator from Georgia see any just distinction between an act of Congress which would tell a man he had to work and an act of Congress which would tell him for whom he must work?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall deal with that subject in a few minutes, if the Senator from Virginia will forgive me.

I again assert, Mr. President, that there is no scintilla of power in the Constitution to permit the Congress to place the responsibility upon one American to provide a means of support for any person, as defined in the bill, by giving him a job, if the employer does not wish to employ him. Any such concept as that is completely totalitarian in nature and is repugnant to all for which this Republic stands.

There is a great hue and cry that we establish new civil rights for private jobs for those who happen to be members of a minority group. In this hue and cry let us not lose sight of the fact that every American citizen, whether a member of a majority or of a minority, possesses a fundamental civil right which distinguishes our system of government from that prevailing in socialistic and communistic states. I refer to the blessed right to acquire and to enjoy property.

I was interested, in looking in one of the oldest standard law dictionaries, in studying the definition of "civil rights" to see if there could possibly be anything in the contention that Congress can create this situation for the benefit of a minority group. I found that the first definition given was:

> The right to acquire and enjoy property.

The right of property ownership is the hallmark of the American system. Where is right to own property, if the Federal Government assumes the power to tell one of its citizens who is fortunate enough to own some property that he,

must against his wishes, employ another citizen to work upon, or to operate, or to manage the property which it is his right to possess? The assertion of any such power would, of course, strike down the right of ownership of property. It would destroy that great civil right which distinguishes and sets us apart from a socialistic or communistic state.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from Georgia intend, as he develops this very pertinent phase of the subject, to link up one of Jefferson's "unalienable rights," the pursuit of happiness, with the right he has just described?

Mr. RUSSELL. I had not proposed to deal with the question in detail, today. I hope my distinguished colleague from Virginia will pursue that thought when he delivers his remarks on the subject, for, knowing, as I do, how he feels about it, I am sure he will wish to make a speech before the question shall be voted upon.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope to have that privilege. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Does a person have the full privilege of the pursuit of happiness if he is denied the possession of property?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. That is the very point I was trying to make. That is an elemental and essential civil right, and it is specifically embodied in the Constitution. It is inherent, it is inalienable, and it is in the Constitution. It is now proposed to strike it down by a simple statute.

Mr. President, if any such statute as is here proposed is ever enacted by the Congress and sustained by the courts, our much vaunted Constitution instead of being a citadel of our liberties, will become a dead letter, a legal fiction.

I wish to advert now to the specious argument, which has been repeatedly made, that the bill does not compel any employer to hire anyone or to promote anyone. I submit, Mr. President, that if any further proof of the hypocrisy of the proposed legislation is needed, that argument is convincing evidence. The bill, by its express terms, declares that it is unlawful for an employer to refuse to hire or to refuse to promote, or to discharge, any individual because of the alleged discriminatory reasons set forth in the bill. If the employer persists in his refusal, he may wind up in jail. I have in my time heard a great deal of legalistic hair-splitting, but no one can split this hair fine enough to distinguish between the compulsion of jailing a man for refusing to hire and of a man being compelled to hire under penalty of a jail sentence.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that he would go to jail without any right to trial by his peers?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. The bill would strike down the whole Anglo-American system of justice which comes down to us stained by the blood of patriots who have fought and died for our liberties over a period of hundreds of years.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is there not a provision which states how he shall be tried?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a catch-all provision. It would strike down all our judicial system, from long before the Magna Carta and down to the present time, all that went into the development of the administration of justice and government, which protects the individual rights and liberties of the people.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. If the bill did not have for its purpose the objective of compelling the employment or promotion of someone, would there be justification either for its consideration or demand for its enactment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The question of the Senator from Oklahoma embraces the whole subject in a nutshell and answers itself. If the bill did not have compulsion in it, it would not be before us. If it did not provide compulsion to require employment it would not have the support of the groups who are demanding its passage.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator say that it would either bring compulsion or would prove to be the greatest legislative disappointment of the Eighty-first Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly would be to those who are interested in its passage. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the Senator to say that one accused of violating the act could be tried wherever the Commission wanted him to be tried.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. A man could be taken from Texas to Michigan, for example, or from California to Maine. There is no provision requiring him to be tried in his home district.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. HILL. And he must be served notice of the charge within 10 days.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not know the bill provided any period of time. I am glad there is a limitation provided on the power of the Commission. I did not know that there was any such limitation. If there is a provision which limits the power of the Commission and requires that it give 10 days' notice, I am glad to hear of it. I am glad to hear that there is at least that much sanity in the bill, if 10 days can be regarded as sanity. If a man refuses to hire or promote, and persists in his refusal, he goes to jail. If he discharges an employee contrary to the edicts of this Federal agency he goes to jail. I should like to see some of the Senators who say there is no compulsion in the bill, explain to the man in jail how he got there.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the bill it would be an offense to refuse to promote anyone?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Who is going to say who ought to be promoted and who ought not to be promoted?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. They have the authority to say that?

Mr. RUSSELL. They have the authority to punish an employer for his refusal to promote if they find his refusal is based on any of the discriminatory reasons outlined in the bill. No amount of political eyewash or tedious legalism can obliterate the hard fact that there is compulsion in the bill. As the Senator from Oklahoma said, the bill would not be here but for the compulsions which are embraced within it.

Mr. President, if the Congress has the power to jail an employer for refusing to hire or promote a person who a Federal agency holds has been discriminated against, no one can blink away the fact that Congress likewise has the power to punish another citizen for refusing to work for an employer selected for him by a Federal agency, under such terms and for such wages as the agency prescribes for him. If the Congress has the power to tell one American citizen whom he shall employ, it has the power to tell another citizen for whom he shall work. It would be an absurdity to state that the Congress had the power to jail one citizen for refusing to employ, but did not have power to punish another citizen for refusing to accept an employer.

It would be well for the leaders of the minority groups to ponder this fact well as they go around the country with their campaign to whip up self-pity among their groups in trying to fan it into a spirit of vengeance over a discrimination which is imaginary in most instances.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Before the Senator leaves that comparison or analogy between the power to tell an employer whom he shall employ and the power to tell a man where he should work, is it not correct to say that some American citizens who do not view with alarm what some of us regard as creeping socialism in this country, think that the citizens of Great Britain, who have nationalized a number of their industries, have not lost any of their political liberties? Is it not a fact that Great Britain, not being tied down as we are by a Constitution protecting private enterprise, has a law today by which a citizen may be told where he must work? The law has not been enforced, but it is on the books.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood that there was some such measure in effect in England but I am not familiar with the details.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assure the Senator that there is such a law. They have

that law. In order to socialize industry in Great Britain it was necessary to pass such a law.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that it would be necessary under a system of state ownership and operation.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I think the control which the British Government has over its employees is not on the basis of fair employment practices. It refers to permitting a person to leave a job and seek other type of employment. It is a restriction which applies with regard to staying on a certain job. It is not based on fair employment practices in any sense.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. There is no fair employment in this bill for an employer. There would not be for an employee, either, if we passed a law which required him to work for whomever the Federal agency said he had to work for.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not say that Great Britain had a fair employment practice act. So far as I know, they would not adopt such a law. What I wanted to point out was that they had already, under the socialistic program, impinged upon the liberty of their citizans to work where they please.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we follow the road of nationalization in this country, it will be as inevitable as the sun follows the night that a law of that nature will be necessary to carry on as industrial plants are nationalized. It is not possible to apply a distortion of the Constitution of the United States to one group without being able to apply some other distortion to another group. If the Constitution is violated to provide an advantage for one individual, it may likewise be violated to work an injury to the same individual. The pendulum of opinion among people of a State swings to and fro with the years. The Constitution, and more particularly the Bill of Rights, was largely written to protect a temporary minority from the excesses of a temporary majority. It may well be that other years will see another bill adopted which would provide vicious sanctions against American citizens for refusing to work for an employer selected for him by an agency of the State. If that day should come, Mr. President, I doubt not that sanctimonious demagogs will stand on the floor of the Senate and say that the bill does not compel any person to work for anyone at all. They will stand on the floor of the Senate and say that it does not compel anyone, but will merely punish a person if he refuses to work for the employer who is selected for him by a Federal agency.

We may be assured that in any bill which is considered there will be set forth reasons, in its pious declarations and findings of fact, that will be equally as cogent for the passing of the bill as any discrimination against an individual on account of race, color, or religion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Did not the Senator say a while ago that under the terms of the bill a person could in effect be criminally prosecuted and tried and convicted without a jury?

Mr. RUSSELL. I challenge anyone, I care not how he feels about the bill, to show how an individual can ever get before a jury, if he gets into the toils of this Federal Commission proposed to be set up.

Mr. STENNIS. And he could be prosecuted in some State remote from the place where the alleged offense was committed, could he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I challenge the Senator or anyone else to point out a provision in the bill under which a person could be tried in the vicinage where the offense was alleged to have been committed. He will be tried where the agency chooses. And that is not all, but he can be taken hither and yon across the United States, together with his books and papers.

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator like to have the RECORD show the wording and the spirit of the sixth amendment, on this very subject matter, which provides:

> In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law.

In other words, I point out that those who framed the Constitution wrote into the organic law of the land a provision localizing hearings and trials, even down to the district in a State beyond which proceedings could not be had.

Mr. RUSSELL. Or course, Mr. President, this bill was carefully drawn in an effort to evade the very constitutional provision to which the Senator refers.

As I have stated before, in the very powerful and unanswerable argument made in the minority views filed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, he pointed out some 9 or 10 specific provisions of the Constitution which this bill would invade and violate. It is a travesty on our constitutional system even to consider it.

Mr. STENNIS. It would be a violation not only of the letter, but of the spirit of the sixth amendment, would it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Completely. It would undertake to repeal it by a simple statute, not in the method prescribed in the Constitution. I thank the Senator for his contribution. He will find the other mandates of the Constitution with which the provisions of the bill come in conflict.

Mr. President, I repeat, the advocates of the unrestrained power of a Federal agency will do well to consider the possibilities of legislation which would require an employee to work for an employer selected by a State agency if the bill were enacted.

The Federal Constitution does give assurances to our citizens. These assurances extend to every citizen. Whether of a majority or minority, however he may label himself, they assure him the right to create a job or establish a business of his own. That is a constitutional protection of all citizens, whether belonging to so-called minorities or majorities.

This bill, of course, has been advertised as being a great blessing to the members of the Negro race. In the exercise of their constitutional rights many Negroes in the South have now accumulated more than a million dollars. Many of our good Negro citizens have built banks and insurance companies which afford employment to hundreds of their race. What would be the effect of legislation of this kind upon those businesses? It is a part of the boast of the American people that every citizen is protected in the opportunity to pursue happiness and acquire property, while we are here considering a bill saying that one American citizen must give an alien a job. Yet we have so many proud stories of the immigrant boy who came to the United States, and, through his own efforts, built up an establishment and afforded employment to hundreds. It is proposed to strike down the Constitution which protected him in that right by the perversion of the Constitution sought by this bill.

Mr. President, that opportunity is still open to every citizen in the United States. The enactment of a bill like this would destroy the incentive which has driven the American people to develop new businesses and create new job opportunities. What sane man would hazard his money in the construction of a new plant and give jobs if a Federal bureau was to have the power to say who was to operate the plant for him?

Mr. President, we are now engaged in a so-called cold war, and that is as good a label as any that might be given to it. No man knows when it may turn into a shooting war, but unless it does the cold war between our representative democracy and the ideologies of communism will continue for many years. The free world looks to America for support, economic support, and for arms with which to defend the freedom that remains. The men who sit in the Kremlin have not been deterred from aggression by fear of our armed might or that of our allies. Russia now has the atomic bomb, and with their callous disregard of human life, the fact that we possess the atomic bomb would not deter them from an atomic war.

There is one powerful weapon in the arsenal of democracy of which they stand in awe. This weapon is the industrial system created under the American system of free enterprise which enables us to outproduce the whole world. Free enterprise and free labor give us the power to produce which the Russians fear and which heartens our friends. This bill is a direct assault upon free enterprise. Our industrial plant will not expand and cannot long remain free if a Federal bureaucracy takes away from private enterprise the right of selection of employees and the right to control policies of promotion within the organization. This bill will inevitably bring about the nationalization of industry. The destruction of the system under which we have grown great and strong and which has given us the highest standard of living for all of our people that the world has ever known would be as great a calamity as the loss of a major war.

We will not, Mr. President, strengthen ourselves so as to enable us to contribute to the support of France and England, and our other allies, by adopting a system of state socialism. They have that system, and their production limps.

We will not defeat Russia in either the cold war or a shooting war by copying any part of the Russian system. I would be the last to say that every person supporting this bill is a Socialist or Communist. Many good Americans have been deceived. Many Members of Congress who abhor communism and dislike socialism have been so unwary as to be caught by the fair label of this bill without considering all of its implications. I do, however, unhesitatingly assert that every Socialist and every Communist in the United States, every person who believes in Government ownership and operation of our industries, are ardently supporting this meassure and all its sanctions. The Daily Worker claims credit for originating the idea and places this bill as No. 1 on the agenda of the Communist Party. These people know well that the enactment of the bill will reduce the effectiveness of the American industrial plant, and is the longest step forward toward the communistic state we could possibly take.

It follows the Russian idea in that it creates for the first time in America an army of thought police. The bill would create a new crime under our system which is labeled discrimination. It does not require the commission of an overt act before subjecting a defendant to punishment. As a practical matter it undertakes to punish and jail free American citizen for a mental attitude. No one but a thought policeman clothed with the power of this FEPC organization could possibly determine what is in the mind of a man who employed A in preference to B where both are applicants for the job. No wonder the bill is carefully drawn to avoid a trial by jury. Under our system of justice it is impossible to get a jury anywhere to convict and punish any person for what he thinks or for a mental attitude. We therefore are confronted with this demand that a Federal agency be created to prosecute, persecute, and jail American citizens for a state of mind of which the agency does not approve. And all this without a trial by jury.

This police state bill not only denies and circumscribes the right of property, it seeks to deny to an American citizen the right to choose his own associates. More than that, it gives to some petty Federal bureaucrat the power to probe the minds of men to determine what motivated them to promote one employee instead of another to positions of trust and responsibility.

The enactment of the bill would mark the beginning of the end of the Anglo-American system of justice. It would deny the precious rights which we have long enjoyed which were won through the sacrifices of thousands of men over hundreds of years in our long quest for freedom and individual liberty. It would cause us to surrender the fundamental rights won upon the signing of Magna Carta. Adoption of the system of administration proposed by that bill would mark the return to the star chamber and Lord Jeffries.

Under this monstrous proposition, if some petty Federal bureaucrat suspects a citizen of being motivated by prejudice in employment or in promotions, he summons the citizen before him. The complaining bureaucrat sits as judge and jury and acts as prosecuting attorney. The defendant is denied the sacred and blood-won right of appearing before a jury of his peers. He has no assurance under this bill that he will be tried in the vicinage of the alleged discrimination. The bureaucrat may drag him and all the books and records essential to the operation of his business to any place within the United States. If there is any shred of evidence, even from a complaining witness, of this nebulous charge of discrimination in employment, in promotion, or condition of employment, he may be found guilty and sent to jail. The bill professes the right of judicial review, but the restrictions upon it are so carefully drawn that the right of judicial review is to all intents and purposes denied. Nowhere along the line does he have a chance to appear before a jury.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Even though an employer had the right of judicial review of his case, would not his business in the meantime practically have come to a halt, after he had been dragged all around the country, wherever the Commission wished to drag him?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, in many cases it would result in the destruction of the employer's business.

Mr. President, the persecutions of this thought police will not only harass many men until they are driven from business, but it will create a state of mind on the part of management which will result in a preferred status for minority groups in all matters of employment and promotion. The bill, if enacted, is sure to discriminate against the average, garden variety American citizen, who cannot claim connection with a minority group, in the competition for jobs and promotions in business and industry. The American businessman does not like to be involved in litigation. He knows that it takes him away from his business for days on end. From experience he has found that the lawyers are expensive and that court costs mount rapidly. In such proceedings as may be had under the bill he also stands in danger of being confined in jail as a common criminal. There is no specific term of punishment or limitation upon it prescribed. If the defendant sees fits to continue in his refusal to comply, the judge may keep him in jail till he rots.

Under the terms of the bill the employer may be required to pay back pay to any person alleged to have been discriminated against in employment or promotion. After one brush with this unfair and un-American thought police organization, every businessman would thereafter resolve every doubt in favor of the potential prosecutor.

Let us suppose for example that two girls, one a Negro and one a white girl, an ordinary, average, garden variety white girl, not in a position to claim credit with any minority group, applied in a newspaper office for one opening. Even if the employer were of the opinion that the ordinary garden variety white girl was slightly the more efficient of the two he would be afraid to give her the job. He would know that the Negro girl could go next door to the FEPC office and charge discrimination. Why, even if the employer were to win the case, it would be only after he had lost days from his business to answer and to go before the FEPC, it would be after he had incurred the expense of a lawyer to fight the case, and after he had been compelled to waste days of his most valuable employees before this agency testifying as witnesses.

The plaintiff is afforded a Government lawyer. He is expressly provided in the bill with the power of subpena from any place within the United States without any expense to him. He has nothing to lose. If the defendant loses his case he would not only have wasted valuable days and the expenses of his lawyer and the time of his witnesses, but he would be compelled to pay the Negro girl applicant back pay and employ her. If the defendant refused, he would go to jail.

I assert that those who would be faced with the danger of being subjected to prosecution before this Federal kangaroo court on a charge of discrimination, could not be fair to the average American in matters of employment or promotion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Under those circumstances, could the employer be sure that on the basis of the very facts given he would not be persecuted by the white girl for favoring the colored girl?

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, I do not see how on earth the average garden variety of white American could possibly sustain a claim that he was discriminated against on account of race, color, or religion. That is the cross this bill would put upon the average American, because by the very nature of this proposal a person would almost have to be a member of one of the so-called minority groups before he would have any chance whatever before the commission to be set up under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. LONG. Or suppose an employer had told one of his subordinates that he would like to employ the white girl because she was more able and more capable, but that, unfortunately, because he had very few colored people working

in his plant, he would have to hire the colored girl. Suppose there were in that case evidence showing that actually he had discriminated against the white girl by leaning over backwards in favor of the colored girl. How about that situation? Would not that amount to discrimination against the white girl?

Mr. RUSSELL. Theoretically that would be the case, but I do not think there would be any demand whatever of that sort on the part of an organization of the nature of the one we had under the Executive order on FEPC, under such circumstances.

Mr. LONG. But certainly if the commission wanted to be fair, under such circumstances it would have to find that the employer had discriminated against the white girl by hiring the colored girl.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think that finding would be had by such a commission under the terms of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that under the previous FEPC Commission, 80 percent of the persons employed by the Commission were colored?

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought the percentage was 79.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That shows how fair that Commission wanted to be in its work.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, that is what I alluded to in my remark to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad the Senator referred to the FEPC we had during the troublous times of the war, because an investigation of a somewhat restricted nature was conducted by the Appropriations Committee, and it found that what the Senator has referred to literally occurred, in that the business people were persecuted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the power of that organization was only to harass and annoy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, that is all.

Mr. RUSSELL. That commission did not have one-tenth of the power which this bill proposes be established.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. However, I am sure the Senator is quite familiar with the harassment and annoyance which were inflicted upon the people of Maryland.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I shall refer to that before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad the Senator will do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, not only in matters of promotions and employment would this bill handicap the average American citizen, but also in periods of slack business and necessary lay-offs, if it became necessary for an employer to lay off 10 or 15 persons, no employer would be likely to select for dismissal those who could take him into this unfair and un-American court and subject him to great expense or severe punishment. The operations of a Federal law of this nature would do more to foster race and religious consciousness in this country and to array race against race and to create confusion and prejudice among our people than a thousand hate groups or almost anything else we can imagine. Under the false guise of fairness it would inevitably work to the detriment of the majority of our people who cannot identify themselves with a minority group, and it would handicap them in their efforts to a livelihood and get ahead in the world.

Mr. President, the other day I was reading the orders issued by the Department of the Interior in regard to fair employment practices. Those orders emphasize the point I have just made. I do not challenge the right of the Federal Government to establish any kind of a fair-employment-practice group that it may see fit to establish by means of legislation for Federal employment. That is the only kind of FEPC which I think could be had under the Constitution.

However, I now hold in my hand a memorandum which was sent to the heads of all bureaus and offices in the Department of the Interior by the Secretary of the Interior. The memorandum is on the subject of the application of fair-employment-practices policy. I shall not read all of it, although I shall submit it for the RECORD. However, it emphasizes the determination of that executive department to see that there will be no discrimination whatever on account of race, creed, or color; and it contains a statement which answers the question which has been asked by the Senator from Louisiana, I may say. I read from the order or memorandum:

> It is recognized that the current form of application for employment deliberately does not reveal the race, color, or religion of an applicant.

Of course, that is within the power of the Federal Government.

I read further from the memorandum of the Secretary of the Interior:

> Nevertheless, the responsible officer frequently knows, despite the fact that it is not disclosed by the applicant's papers, that the applicant is a Negro, or Indian, or other nonwhite, or what is, in fact, his religion or his national origin.

I skip some in reading from the memorandum, and then read the following:

> Since, among the four grounds mentioned, complaints of discrimination have most frequently been based upon race and color—

Mr. President, this is the crux of the matter, and I ask Senators to note this—

> I should like each officer (whether the personnel officer or a supervisory official) in the several bureaus and offices of the Department who has authority to make or finally recommend selections for either appointment or promotion, to prepare in cases in which he passes over either for appointment or promotion an individual known to him to be Negro, Indian, or other nonwhite, a statement of his reason for rejection or nonselection of such individual.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that those officials were required to give a reason for their action?

Mr. RUSSELL. If a Negro is not employed or promoted, or is discharged in a time of lay-offs his superiors must give a reason. I am showing how this discriminates against the average garden variety of white person.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is almost as strong a preference as we give to servicemen today.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask Senators to listen to the reading of this memorandum, which requires that in the case of all promotions and appointments in the Interior Department, only in the case of a Negro who is passed over either for promotion or for appointment does the officer in charge have to file a written statement as to why he did not hire or promote that person.

I read further from the memorandum of the Secretary of the Interior to the heads of all bureaus and offices in the Department of the Interior:

> Similarly, in reductions in force, such a statement should be prepared in each case in which a Negro, or Indian, or other nonwhite employee is selected for separation instead of a white employee of lesser status or seniority. It is my intention, by this direction, that the preparation of this statement shall be the personal responsibility of the final recommending or selecting official of whatever rank, and that he shall not delegate this responsibility.

The memorandum goes on to prescribe that—

> Two copies of this statement shall be submitted promptly after the personnel action has been taken, direct to the fair employment officer of the department, one copy to the head of the bureau or office, and one copy shall go through supervisory channels to the personnel officer of the bureau or office. In addition, the bureau or office may provide for such other copies as its own needs require. This statement may be brief, but it should be comprehensive—

And then the memorandum proceeds to state what must be included in the statement.

Mr. President, I contend that this business of equality of treatment is as broad as it is long. If the bureau head is subjected to the possibility of being discharged unless he prepares all those papers to show why he did not hire or promote a Negro or why he discharged a Negro, does not that serve as an undue handicap and does it not operate to the disadvantage of the average, garden variety of white American who is working in the Interior Department? If it does not, then I do not know what could.

I wish to say here that the bill now under discussion would give the proposed commission the right to issue a regulation to that identical effect, applicable to every business and every enterprise in this land employing more than 50 persons. I have not a doubt that a regulation with similar requirements would be among the first prepared by the commission.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire memorandum printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1949.

Memorandum to: Heads of all bureaus and offices.

From: The Secretary.

Subject: Application of fair employment practices policy.

I am transmitting herewith a memorandum on the above subject which was signed yesterday by Secretary Krug. I take this opportunity of stating that I am in thorough accord with the policy therein stated. I request its complete observance. I request, also, that in making the memorandum available as is intended, you distribute with each copy of it a copy of this memorandum from me.

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C. November 30, 1949.

Memorandum to: Heads of all bureaus and offices.

From: The Secretary.

Subject: Application of fair employment practices policy.

In my memorandum to heads of all bureaus and offices dated May 19, 1949, I stated that I think the Department has done well in the application of its long-observed policy of nondiscrimination against individuals because of race, color, religion, or national origin, but I suggested that there has been a negative rather than a positive approach in this application. I asked for reexamination of our practices in the light of Executive Order 9980 dated July 26, 1948, and directed that there be a new advertence by each responsible official and supervisor in the Department and in its bureaus and offices to that segment of these practices for which he, as an individual, is responsible. I expect that in the interim considerable thought has been given in that direction by those officials.

I should like now to see some implementation of this plan to bring about desired results. Therefore, I ask the head of each bureau and office to direct the head of each of his main organizational units, including each field office, to conduct within his division, branch, section, office or other unit, a series of training sessions to be concluded by April 1, 1950, for the purpose of instructing selected employees in relation to carrying on a positive fair employment program. These selected employees should include (a) all major and minor supervisory employees and (b) all other employees who have any authority (1) to select or reject applicants for appointment, or (2) to select or reject employees for promotion, or (3) to select or pass upon selections for separation because of reductions in force, or (4) to make or approve assignments. In short, every employee who can in any way, through his assigned duties, affect the success or failure of a forthright program of nondiscrimination should be given thorough basic instruction to assure that discrimination shall be effectively abolished and withstood.

In the course of training sessions, the responsible official who conducts the sessions shall stress:

1. The basic and fundamental concept that there shall be no discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

2. The corollary to that concept, namely, (a) that all personnel actions, including appointments, promotions, and selections for separation upon reduction in force, shall be based solely upon merit; and (b) that all assignments including (1) assignment of duties, (2) assignment of working space, and (3) assignment or arrangement of any other working conditions, likewise shall be based solely upon merit.

It should be made clear—

1. That all positions, including those embracing supervisory duties, are open to all alike on the basis of merit only.

2. That mixed-group assignments and mixed-group supervision can normally be expected to result from an impartial application of this nondiscrimination policy.

It would be well in each group to start off this series of training sessions by distributing and reading aloud (1) Executive Order 9980, (2) my order No. 2520, (3) my memorandum of May 19, 1949, to heads of all bureaus and offices on the subject of "Fair Employment Practices," (4) this memorandum; and (5) any consistent supplemental written instructions on the subject that may be issued by the heads of bureaus and offices to the personnel under their direction. This will give each member of each group first-hand knowledge of the President's program and of my wishes as to carrying it out.

Following this distribution and oral reading, there should be group discussions, and question-and-answer periods, in which the material may be thoroughly reviewed. In such sessions, it should be made clear to all that the policy can be wholly successful only by a full understanding of it and cooperation on the part of all officials to make it work. It should be made clear, too, that there is to be no temporizing with regard to this policy and that periodic surveys will be made to determine that it is receiving thoroughgoing application in all units of the Department.

As in my memorandum of May 19, I want again to emphasize that merit is the keynote of this whole program. It should be considered one of the fundamental requirements in an official for meeting the responsibilities of supervision, appointment, selection or assignment, that he be able impartially to observe this policy, just as one of the prerequisities of the assignment of an employee to the job of chauffer is his ability to operate an automotive vehicle. The inability to meet the essential requirement may well be considered as disabling in the one case as in the other. In selecting employees to fill supervisory or administrative positions which will involve responsibility for action that may affect the success or failure of this nondiscriminatory policy, responsible officials shall carefully examine into the ability of each such individual to promote this basic policy.

An assignment of duties which requires segregation, whether it be of a member of the Caucasian, Mongoloid, or Negroid race, need not necessarily be discrimination. There can be no doubt that instances will arise in which there will occur, by the very fact of assignment on merit, segregation in fact without discrimination. For example, an individual assigned as the sole operator of a photographic darkroom may be either white or nonwhite without there being involved the slightest element of discrimination.

It is recognized that the current form of application for employment deliberately does not reveal the race, color, or religion of an applicant. While the form requests an applicant to state his place of birth, doing so may not reveal his national origin. Nevertheless the responsible officer frequently knows, despite the fact that it is not disclosed by the applicant's papers, that the applicant is a Negro, or Indian, or other nonwhite, or what is, in fact, his religion or his national origin. Of course, in the case of promotion or consideration for promotion, or for separation because of reduction in force, the official responsible for selection must know some of these facts and may know others of them about each of the employees on the job who are eligible for consideration. The official's knowledge of the race, color, religion, or national origin of the individual under consideration is the important factor, not how he came by such knowledge. This is not to imply that any special effort is to be made to ascertain these facts, and in the absence of knowledge on the part of the official no discrimination on that basis would be present.

In the application of the "merit only" principle of our fair employment policy it is recognized that there is involved the exercise of individual judgments, and that such judgments may differ. There is in this memorandum no implication that any preferences other than those provided by applicable laws and regulations shall be shown any person in order to avoid a charge of discrimination.

Since, among the four grounds mentioned, complaints of discrimination have most frequently been based upon race and color, I should like each officer (whether the personnel officer or a supervisory official) in the several bureaus and offices of the Department who has authority to make or finally recommend selections for either appointment or promotion, to prepare in cases in which he passes over either for appointment or promotion an individual known to him to be Negro, Indian, or other nonwhite, a statement of his reason for rejection or nonselection of such individual. Similarly, in reductions in force such a statement should be prepared in each case in which a Negro, or Indian, or other nonwhite employee is selected for separation instead of a white employee of lesser status or seniority. It is my intention, by this direction, that the preparation of this statement shall be the personal responsibility of the final recommending or selecting official of whatever rank, and that he shall not delegate the responsibility.

Two copies of this statement shall be submitted promptly after the personnel action has been taken direct to the fair employment officer of the Department, one copy to the head of the bureau or office, and one copy shall go through supervisory channels to the personnel officer of the bureau or office. In addition, the bureau or office may provide for such other copies as its own needs require. This statement may be brief, but it should be comprehensive, as, for example, "Considered for this appointment (or for this promotion, as the case may be) five applicants, and Mr. A (Negro, Indian, or other nonwhite) not appointed (or not selected) because Mr. B had superior educational qualifications," or "had superior experience," or "had longer experience," or "had a superior work record," or whatever the fact or facts may be. Any number of such facts or combination of facts as are warranted and applicable in a given instance should be stated. This will permit a reviewing official to determine by a review of the record, including such statement, whether he agrees, on the face of the record, with the action taken. In this way the reviewing or supervisory official is enabled to form his own conclusions as to the observance of this departmental policy and as to the quality of judgment that is being exercised in matters of this kind. The copy sent to the bureau personnel officer shall be made a part of the official personnel file of the individual to whom it relates.

Heads of bureaus and offices should require their responsible officials periodically to examine, and should themselves periodically examine, into the manner in which this official policy of nondiscrimination is being observed within their bureaus and offices, so that timely inquiry can be made into any case that requires it. In this way it should be possible to avoid claims of discrimination. Certainly we can in this way minimize them.

The wholehearted cooperation of all heads of bureaus and offices and other responsible

officials in this further implementation of this policy will be expected and appreciated.

Upon receipt of this memorandum please inform the fair employment officer of the Department of the number of copies of it that will be required in your bureau or office to make distribution for the instruction sessions that I have outlined and for other purposes.

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. RUSSELL. What are the efficiency experts in private firms going to say? They are going to say we have got to hire all these stenographers, we have got to hire many typists, we are compelled to spend all this money to explain why we should not promote this Negro, why we did not employ this Negro, or why we laid him off when it was necessary to cut our force. We do not have to go to this expense if we do not hire or promote a white man or if we discharge a white man. What will result? It is obliged to discriminate against the garden variety of white man who can not claim affiliation with any minority group in every job opportunity. There is no escape from that, by any process of logic or reason which can be applied.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I may say to the Senator that what he has just read into the RECORD leads me to think that it amounts to a preferential right being given to them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it creates a clear preference for the minority affected and is intended to have this effect.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, when we give to a person a right such as that, he certainly should have given to the United States some service different from that of other individuals. The only person I know of to whom the Civil Service Commission gives that right is a person who has been in the armed services. I think the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who is a member of the committee, will agree with me. I cannot understand why such a letter—such an intimidating letter, I may say, should be written to anyone. I think we should look into the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe in fair employment practices, I deplore such tactics of favoritism by an agency in the Government of the United States. The Government might have a right to create or recognize a preferred status among its own employees, even if it discriminates in favor of a minority but I insist that all those employed in private enterprise should not be subjected to any such order as that. The Commission would have the right to issue such a regulation, undoubtedly, under the terms of this bill. When it does, it means that a preferred status will have been created in employment; which is the real objective, or one of the objectives, if not the primary one, back of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I notice from what the Senator has read that there is also set up what is known in the Department as a Fair Employment Bureau.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; they have had that for some time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know that they go into details which require the keeping of additional records, at a cost to the Government of thousands upon thousands of dollars. That department ought to be investigated. So far as I am concerned, we can cut off a little bit of its appropriation and save the money.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, along the line suggested by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the provisions of the veterans' preference law are similar, in that, at present, under the law, when a veteran is passed over, it is unnecessary for the person passing over the veteran to send in a written statement of the reason for passing him over. The testimony before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the subcommittee studying the matter, has been that even though the veteran can be passed over, after giving reasons, the fact that the person who would have to give the reasons would have to go into a full explanation almost invariably means that the veteran gets the job, and I suppose that would be the case under this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the intention, of course, of the order issued by the Secretary of the Interior. Such an order could have no other result.

Mr. LONG. As I recall, in the case of veterans, it results 90 percent of the time in the veteran's getting the job.

Mr. RUSSELL. If this bill should ever be enacted, the person in the hinterlands who is employed in a plant, and who cannot claim to be a member of a minority group, can expect to contend with a regulation of similar import applying to every enterprise in the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia will give us the name of the signer of the Interior Department letter?

Mr. RUSSELL. The letter has been placed in the RECORD. I have another copy of it, showing that it was signed on November 30, 1949, by J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, but was transmitted to the bureaus under date of December 1, 1949, under the signature of Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior. I have placed it in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake at this time to discuss all the infirmities of this bill. We are told that despite its infirmities and weaknesses, there is a great public demand throughout the country for the enactment of this bill. We are told that such a demand is contained in the political platforms of both major political parties. It is stressed in some quarters that it is supported by a number of active political groups and organizations.

I sometimes wish that under our representative system of government it were possible for us to submit measures such as this to the people for a decision by way of referendum. I would gladly submit this bill to a plebiscite. More than that, I would submit it to the vote of either all Democrats of the country or of all the Republicans, and I would have no fear as to the outcome of such a referendum.

The fact that this bill is here clearly demonstrates the threat to the American system posed by bloc voting by minority groups whose votes are alleged to control the outcome of elections in the larger and more populous States. Bidding for the votes of special groups may be an old American custom, but it has never been carried so far as the high bids threatening our very form of government and our way of life, made by both of the majority parties for the votes of minority groups pressuring this bill. These groups are claimed to represent the balance of power in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and one or two other States which supposedly control presidential elections. From my own observation, I can say that I have found no great enthusiasm among the rank and file of the American people to adopt a socialistic system in America.

I think that the feeling against socialism is spreading throughout the English-speaking world. It started in New Zealand, proceeded to Australia, and was evidenced by the close election in England and the result of elections in this country. I observed yesterday that in the State of Texas a Republican had been elected. I do not know whether that was brought about by the most recent slogan of "Liberty versus Socialism." I believe that if the Republican Party is sincere in its protestation that it stands for individual liberty as against the doctrine of socialism, and would prove its faith by its votes, it would carry great appeal to the American people at this time.

Mr. President, I do not believe that either of the party platforms, which it is said were relied upon to support an FEPC bill, ever contemplated one that had sanctions as drastic as those contained in this bill. The truth of the matter is, and frankness requires the statement, that under our present system of elections, both major parties are most vulnerable to the demand of voting blocs, even if they be small. In the instant case both of the major parties are political prisoners of the minority groups behind the bill. In bidding against each other they have both come under minority direction.

Mr. President, there have been more misrepresentation, propaganda, and pressure behind the philosophy of this bill, on both the State and National levels, than there have been on perhaps any other issue in my time. Despite this, adoption of the idea has not spread like any prairie fire. FEPC laws have been proposed in towns, cities, and in States

throughout the Nation, as well as in the Federal Congress. In all these cases those persons in public life who did not immediately welcome the idea have been charged with intolerance, in addition to being threatened with reprisal.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the reconstruction day, when all the foul punishments one could think of were visited upon the southern people, did Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, with all his wild radicalism, ever think of introducing a bill like this?

Mr. RUSSELL. Thad Stevens was a man of great ability. I do not admire his methods, and I resent the legislation by which he sought to humiliate and punish the South. He would have opposed this bill because he had sufficient intelligence to see that its enactment would set in motion a train of events which would eventually pull down the temple of individual freedom in this land. Of course he never would have tolerated any such measure as that which is proposed. This is not sectional legislation. It will be as disastrous to the North as to the South. It will destroy the American way of life and annul the rights of freemen everywhere.

No, Mr. President; the members of State legislatures as well as the Members of the National Congress have all felt this pressure and have seen this propaganda, but, in spite of it, only 8 of the 48 States have passed any real FEPC laws. They are all much milder in their sanctions than is the case with reference to this monstrosity.

I want the Senate to bear in mind that none of these laws has sprung from any general and widespread demand. Every one of them has been the product of the pressure of minority groups. We need no better illustration of that than the referendum which was conducted in the State of California. I do not suppose anyone would charge that California is a reactionary State. It was in that State that we saw the birth of the ham-and-egg movement, the Townsend plan, and many other ideas which would not be considered reactionary. As a matter of fact, many of our self-styled and labeled liberals look upon California as the paradise of liberalism. But when this issue was submitted to a vote of the people, after minority groups at the state house working on the legislature had failed, the question was taken to the people at the grass roots. Two and a half million of them voted, and by a margin of 2 to 1, in every county of the State, the people of California said that this idea was too un-American, too radical, and too destructive of our form of Government and the rights of property to appeal to them.

Some of the proponents of the measure, Mr. President, say that the system has worked well in some of the States. We are told that not many persons have been sent to jail in connection with it, and it has not caused any great confusion in the States which have such laws. Under the ninth and tenth amendments to the Federal Constitution a State may have—I doubt it—some right to legislate in this field, but the Federal Government clearly has no such right. The fact that a State law may not have caused confusion may be a reason for another State to pass such a law. I lean over backwards in sustaining the rights of the States, but I not only question and deny, but I challenge the production of proof of any power in the Federal Government, under the Federal Constitution, to enact such a law as the one which is proposed.

There is a great deal of difference between the manner of enforcement of a State law and that of the enforcement of a Federal statute. Thomas Jefferson knew whereof he spoke when he advised us to keep the power of the Government, and particularly the police power, close to the people. Most State statutes, in fact, all of them, I think, at least permit the right of trial by jury. That is a great restraint upon captious prosecutions under a law of this kind. It is not only a restraint upon captious prosecutions, but it serves as a restraint upon the power of bureaucracy which is always reaching out and grasping for more and more power. Not only that, Mr. President, but those who enforce the State laws are usually appointed by the State administration, and they are a little slow to jump on a fellow citizen of the State without some sound reason, for fear that it may cost the State administration a few votes. In other words, they walk lightly in the enforcement of statutes of this character. The governor has an effect upon the enforcement of law in a State. He is interested in politics, and will see to it that there is not too extreme action within the State.

There is a great difference in the approach of an agent of the New York FEPC in enforcing a State FEPC law in New York than would be the case if the same individual were seeking to enforce a Federal law on a citizen of Michigan or on a citizen of Georgia. That is one of the virtues of local self-government. It is a reason for preserving the rights of the States. It is a reason for opposing any such vast bureaucracy as this bill would undertake to establish.

Mr. President, we had some experience with a wartime FEPC. Its powers were limited and were sustained only by an Executive order. There was no act of Congress. But we saw it operate. We saw that those persons with an ax to grind, those with a special interest or a special group to serve, were most likely to be appointed as members of the commission. The enforcement of the law—such enforcement as it was possible to have, as it was an Executive order which had never been approved by the Congress—was left in the hands of those who were special pleaders and prosecutors for particular groups.

When the FEPC Board went out of commission it had one member who represented the CIO, and another who represented the American Federation of Labor. The Chairman of the Board was a man of very brilliant mental attainments, but I doubt if anyone would ever charge him with being a stalwart defender of the capitalistic system, or that he was exactly unbiased when any alleged minority citizen was involved.

It has been brought out that an overwhelming percentage of the members and employees of that Board—and it ran from general counsel through regional managers to stenographers—were members of the Negro race. So the Executive order was issued for their benefit. About three quarters of the employees were Negroes, though Negroes constitute only approximately 10 percent of our total population.

I had some experience with that Board. I examined into its operations. If it had had only a fraction of the powers which this bill seeks to have the Congress place in a board which would bear the same name, but which would have much greater powers, I shudder to think of what would have happened to our production during the critical war years, and I shudder to think what would be its effect upon the maintenance of this industrial empire which has grown up under our free-enterprise system.

Mr. President, the unalterable opposition to this FEPC bill on the part of the overwhelming majority of the people of the South grows out of our experience with the limited-power agency to which I have referred. We found from that experience that while the directors and employees of the FEPC talked about economic opportunities for minorities, their actions disclosed that their principal interest was in social reform. They discussed equal job opportunity and equal pay, but their outstanding cases did not deal with those subjects at all. They involved, rather, matters which had to do with customs and local laws.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I was very much pleased to hear the distinguished Senator from Georgia make that statement, because I was on the Committee on Appropriations during the war years when we went into this subject. I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Georgia has said as to what the Commission wanted to do. They wanted to go into social organizations. Let me say for the record that, speaking purely from a local standpoint in my State and my city, there were hundreds of colored people who rendered valuable services in the navy yard, and I never had a complaint from those people about being discriminated against by civil service. I never had any complaints from colored people about the Post Office Department discriminating against mail carriers. Practically all the complaints I heard were complaints of the type of the Senator from Georgia has brought out, namely, with reference to certain facilities and certain social aspects which we ran into day after day in committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the South, we have customs and attitudes toward the problem which are different from those of citizens in other sections of the country. In my judgment the average decent Southerner believes as earnestly as Americans in other sections in the doctrine of equal pay for the same work. Southerners do resist, and will continue to resist with every power at

their command, the use of the Federal power to invade their rights and destroy their system of separation of races in social activities. This policy of separation is considered important in those areas of the country where whites and Negroes are more equal in number. We believe the system of segregation in all things social, which prevails in the South, is necessary to preserve peace and harmony between the races, and that such a system promotes the welfare and progress of both races. We insist that separation does not mean discrimination except in the minds of politicians who have appeals to make, and those who are unfortunately afflicted with an inferiority complex and have no pride of their own race.

Mr. President, we saw during the war that the three outstanding decisions before the wartime FEPC had nothing whatever to do with discrimination or rates of pay. The most important, I believe, was the one which arose in a large electrical appliance manufacturing plant at Point Breeze, Md. There several thousand employees, both white and Negro, were working harmoniously producing telephones for the Army. The FEPC agent visited the plant. He found no difference in working conditions or rates of pay as between employees of either majority or minority groups. He did notice, however, in walking through the plant, that the restrooms, while identical in nature, bore labels which distinguished between the races. One restroom was labeled "White Women's Restroom," and one was labeled "Negro Women's Restroom." They were identical in nature. The same thing was true with respect to the men's restrooms. The plant had a Government contract and was therefore bound by its contract to adhere to an FEPC order. The agent cited the plant before the Commission for being guilty of unfair employment practices.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Senator mention the name of the plant?

Mr. RUSSELL. I forget the name of the plant. It is in the RECORD. The plant was located at Point Breeze. I think it was the Western Electric plant.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. It was the Western Electric plant.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Commission sustained the charge that this was an unfair employment practice. The Commission ordered the signs taken down and the partitions between the rest rooms to be removed. It ordered the plant to make all its rest rooms available without regard to race. This caused the employees of the plant to walk out on strike. The strike lasted for several weeks. That order of the Commission, Mr. President, had nothing whatever to do with any economic opportunity. It stirred up racial feeling and confusion unnecessarily where there had been none before.

Mr. President, of course, this bill seeks to punish all who protest orders of that nature. I have studied the bill, at first I was somewhat interested to know why it was drawn so carefully to prevent any employer from getting before a court before a jury, but had a little section, section 14, which makes it a crime to resist the Commission or its representatives. I could not understand why that section was tacked on when the framers of the bill had the poor employer down where they could drag him through the courts without his ever getting before a jury. Then it dawned on me that the purpose of the section was to go to each of those who might strike in protest to such orders and say, "If you don't come back, you are impeding an order of the FEPC Commission, and we will prosecute you and send you to jail and fine you not more than $500." That is why the section is in the bill. It prevents anything like any resistance to an order, such as this great order on economic job opportunities in the Point Breeze case.

There was another very famous case, Mr. President, which was known as the seaman's case. It was a little unusual, in that the protest against the order came from the head of a labor union. He wrote to the House committee, which was going into the matter of the executive order. I shall not read all of the letter. I shall ask to have the remainder, which I do not read, inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall ask that it be printed as part of my remarks. It is not necessary to read all of it. I shall read a portion of it and ask that the remainder of it be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. Hawk writes:

I consider it an urgent obligation to direct the attention of your committee to a situation which is fast developing to a point where it may hamper the delivery of the cargoes so desperately needed by our fighting forces.

I have reference to the arbitrary, dangerous, and unrealistic interpretation being applied to the President's executive order establishing the Fair Employment Practice Committee by a pair of starry-eyed fellow travelers heading the Atlantic coast district of the recruitment and manning organization of the War Shipping Administration.

These gentlemen, Mr. Craig S. Vincent, Atlantic coast representative of the RMO, and Mr. Frank Pollatsek, Chief of the RMO office in New York, are insisting that the President's order is being violated in connection with the hiring of ships' crews because our union requires that white seamen shall not be forced to eat and sleep in the same quarters with Negro seamen, and vice versa.

Under this arrangement, each race is respectful of the other's rights, just as prevails in the armed forces of our country.

Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek are trying to compel our union to abandon a sound and tested policy which has resulted in harmonious relationships between Negro and white members over a period of many years. This policy, which is supported by the more than 2,000 Negroes in our membership, provides for a rotary hiring-hall system, fair and equitable in every way, which enables whites to share ships' quarters with whites and Negroes with Negroes. There is not the slightest vestige of discrimination in the running of our union. In fact, a number of our officers are Negroes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of this letter, which is very lengthy, because the gentleman was very much outraged, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair.) Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The union lives up in every regard to our section of the President's order which calls for the elimination of discrimination with relation to hire, tenure, terms or conditions of employment, or union membership because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Negro members of our union receive the same wages and voting privileges and enjoy precisely the same working conditions as our white members.

It is this particular section of the President's order which is being twisted and distorted by Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek to conform to certain social reformist theories which they are seeking to experiment with at the expense of the American seaman and the war effort, and in defiance of the sober judgment of practical men who have spent the greater part of their lives in the maritime industry.

If the views of these two officials are permitted to prevail—and they have the enthusiastic endorsement of every Communist and sympathizer infesting the waterfront—in other ports throughout the country they inevitably would create a state of chaos in the maritime industry in a critical hour for our country. We would see a mass exodus of trained seamen to other jobs; we would see a flare-up of race hatreds, and we would pay for all this in costly delays in the shipping of supplies and equipment to our fighting fronts.

It should be pointed out here that the RMO, in the Atlantic coast district, is misrepresenting or concealing the facts when it recruits boys from American homes and then tries to compel them to depart abruptly from old-time family traditions to share eating and sleeping quarters on American ships with members of another race, particularly when such condition is not at all necessary and is disruptive of, rather than helpful to, the war effort.

The interpretation which Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek are so zealously trying to read into the President's order is a flat violation of the statement of policy which our union signed with the War Shipping Administration on May 4, 1942. This statement of policy reaffirms article 3 of the service agreement signed between general shipping agents and the War Shipping Administration and states specifically: "If the general agent has contracts with unions and those contracts require, for example, preference of employment or use of union hiring halls, the agent would be required to procure men in accordance with the contracts."

What Messrs. Vincent and Pollatsek are trying so hard to do is to disturb our existing and harmonious policy with regard to this union's hiring-hall system in order to grind their own pet reformist ax. Apparently they have no concern over the inevitable consequences.

The views of these men also run counter to the statement of principles governing wartime policy which was signed on December 18, 1941, following negotiations by representatives of the maritime industry, the maritime unions, and the Government.

In arriving at the statement of policy it was agreed that the hiring-hall system embodied in our contracts was to be respected and not interfered with in any way. The union agreed to waive its right to strike for the duration and that pledge has been lived up to faithfully. There have been no strikes or delays on our ships since the war started.

There have been repeated instances where the RMO office in New York has refused to send Negroes to our hiring hall in order to be dispatched to our contracted ships.

This resulted in these ships sailing undermanned. On other occasions when our hiring hall was closed for the night or over Sunday the RMO deliberately dispatched Negroes to vessels with white crews, thereby arousing protests and unnecessary ill-feeling.

Our understanding is that the RMO was set up for the explicit purpose of supplementing the unions and the operators in the supplying of seamen personnel in order to prevent delays in sailings.

This is clearly a situation which calls for a thoroughgoing investigation by your committee in the interests of the American seamen and the maritime industry.

The taxpayers' money which is being appropriated for the running of the RMO office in New York could be agent to far more useful and constructive purposes. I am sure our Congress never intended to countenance the use of Government funds to promote theories and reforms inconsistent with American traditions and with plain ordinary common sense.

Yours very truly,

JOHN HAWK,
Secretary-Treasurer and First Vice President of the Seafarers International Union of North America.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is another classic case. We are told that job opportunities are being denied, and that it is necessary to create a commission of the kind proposed. Where does this case touch job opportunities? In this case everybody was content with the arrangements. There was no claim whatever that there was any discrimination in pay or employment against any seaman on account of his race, but because they had separate sleeping quarters, because they were fed, one race on one side of the kitchen and another on the other, though from the same pot, the same food, it was claimed there was an unfair employment practice, and this labor organization was cited and brought to book before the commission.

Mr. President, the other case was the St. Louis cartridge case. I have forgotten the name of the company, but I have it in my files.

This company was making cartridges for the Government. They had three buildings, two occupied by white employees, one occupied by Negro employees. The plant occupied by the Negro employees had a Negro superintendent, had Negro foremen, had Negro supervisors all down the line, exactly of the same rank as those managing in the two white plants, and all received identical pay. The FEPC Commission came in and cited that plant for unfair employment practices. There was not the slightest difference in pay, there was not the slightest difference in working conditions, there was not the slightest difference in hours of employment, or in the facilities that were furnished to the employees.

It is a pious fraud to talk about this bill being designed to give economic opportunities. Experience has shown us that when we had such an organization as this in the country, even with its limited powers, it spent its time dealing with matters which were social in aspect, rather than economic.

Mr. President, that is what disturbs and concerns the people of the South. We of the South do not accept the idea which is being promoted throughout the country that the way to solve our grave racial problem is to do it through a process of miscegenation and amalgamation of the Negro race with the white. We know that where laws require the races to associate on intimate terms in all things social, miscegenation and amalgamation will eventuate. That is why we oppose the creation of any such agency as is proposed, and shall oppose it unalterably and to the end, because it will have, and has, as its primary purpose, the breaking down of the separation of races which we regard as necessary to our progress and peace in the South.

Mr. President, I do not believe that any man who honestly considers this question will reach any conclusion other than that the members of this Commission will be rather radical in their point of view. Laying aside for the moment the racial issue, let us consider the effect these vast powers over American citizens and American businessmen can have upon our economic system. I do not suppose anyone doubts the devotion of Governor Dewey, of New York, to the cause of social equality. He is not, however, counted among those who desire violent change in our economic system. I am not sure, but I think that Governor Dewey claims to be the author of the New York State law which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] defended here this afternoon.

I recall that in the debate in 1946 the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] put into the RECORD a letter from Governor Dewey, after reading it, and there was something in that letter which lodged in my mind, and I went back to the RECORD of January 25, 1946, and found that it was a significant statement. Here is an extract from Governor Dewey's letter:

> The crux of this matter is the type of individuals who would be appointed to administer the law. If it were left to a collection of reformers and social dreamers, it would crash with a mighty bang and perhaps take down a good segment of our economy with it.

Mr. President, Governor Dewey may be able to control the type of people who constitute the New York State commission, but no man or group of men can through the years control the type of people who, from the Federal standpoint, would apply the vast powers which this bill seeks to place in a Federal agency. I doubt not that it would crash our industrial system with a mighty bang, and take down our total economy, not part of it, into socialism.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal recently about economy in Government. Few candidates for a Government office today would have the temerity to fail to have at least some reference to economy in their platforms. Economy is the theme of many speeches of this body and throughout the land. I am constantly amazed, however, at people who talk economy in Government and do not consider it when they cast their votes in this body.

Another favorite theme of our political orators is the denunciation of bureaucracy, Government interference in the lives of our people. This bill will provide a fair test of the sincerity and the good faith of these advocates of economy and foes of bureaucracy.

The Senate does not have the advantage of any committee report on the bill, as I have stated heretofore. It was apparently blown out of the committee by a political bomb. We do not have any estimate as to what it would cost to maintain the proposed establishment, and I do not think that in the wild political furor which has attended this bill since it was first introduced any committee report had ever undertaken to estimate any cost.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator stated that there never had been any estimate of the cost of the bill. The Senator will agree with me that in 1943 and 1944, in the Committee on Appropriations, the agency which then existed was always asking for a great deal more money than we ever gave it.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no doubt about that, and such a body will follow the same course right down through the years.

If alleged economy advocates and foes of bureaucracy, and those who pretend they are against the Government putting its blighting and withering hand on business, combine to pass this bill, they will have created a bureaucracy whose tentacles will reach into every corner of this country, and they will have done it without even an estimate of what this establishment would cost. Give this agency the mission proposed, and the powers advocated, and the appropriations will mushroom to gigantic proportions.

I understand the Budget submitted a very modest estimate for this year, but I have read the bill, and I have seen other agencies created with initial modest estimates. But the very nature of this agency shows it will be a tremendous expense to the American taxpayer. The chairman of this agency will receive $20,000 a year. Four members of the Commission will receive $17,500 a year. There will be a great horde of thought policemen, investigators, and auditors. Local, State, and regional advisory boards are provided for in the bill. There is no way to estimate its cost. It will muster one of the greatest armies of Federal employees that have ever been enrolled beneath the banner of any one department since the beginning of the Government, except the National Military Establishment in time of war. It will place a real expense upon the taxpayers. There will be the expense of compensation, travel expense, the expense of automobiles. Think of the number of lawyers who will be required, Mr. President. I believe I am as devoted to the profession from which I earned a livelihood for some 12 years as are most other lawyers. I am very proud of the fact that I am a lawyer. But I see no necessity for opening up, as the bill would do, a veritable bonanza for the lawyers. Hundreds and thousands of them will be required to prosecute cases, because when a person

does not have any expense involved in the hiring of a lawyer he certainly will enter into litigation. No members of the minority will have to pay the cost of a lawyer. They simply may file claims and the Government must pay the lawyers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Do I understand correctly that the Government will use Government attorneys or hire private attorneys to plead the cases?

Mr. RUSSELL. I imagine the Government will have an immense army of Government attorneys to go around the country and handle the various cases. The Government does not ordinarily employ attorneys in individual cases. It gets them by the year. Let us consider the various bureaus and departments. The Department of Justice has hundreds, perhaps thousands of attorneys. Every other agency also has its attorneys. The mere fact that the Department of Justice employs hundreds of attorneys does not relieve other departments from hiring their own attorneys. The Department of Agriculture employs many attorneys. The Department of the Interior has a great legal staff. So do many other departments and agencies. But we may be sure that once the FEPC organization is created it will come to the fore in the number of attorneys it will employ. The agency is a litigating one. People from all over the country will come to this agency to air their grievances, real or imaginary, and litigate at the expense of the American taxpayers. It does not cost the claimants anything by way of legal expenses. It is the poor businessman who incurs the expense of defending himself.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Great as the cost would be to the Government if it were to use the attorneys employed by it to prosecute cases of discrimination, actually it would cost the Government even more if it were to hire private attorneys, especially when times are not good, and when attorneys may be looking for business, even though most of them may not be inclined to indulge in the practice, imputed to some, of ambulance chasing.

Mr. RUSSELL. If an individual comes to the proposed agency and files his complaint, he has no responsibility for hiring an attorney. The Government supplies the attorney. Of course, in the initial instance the FEPC representative is the prosecuting attorney, the jury, and judge, under the monstrosity proposed to be created by passage of the bill. If the bill is passed a haven will be provided for attorneys. If any minority group is justified in applying pressure behind the bill, it is the lawyers of America. If the bill were to pass, there would be no unemployed lawyers. Adoption of the bill would result in the requirement of the services of hundreds and thousands of lawyers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. A moment ago the Senator from Georgia mentioned the standard of pay for the chairman and the members of the Commission.

Mr. RUSSELL. Twenty thousand dollars for the chairman, and $17,500 for each member. Oh, it is claimed this will be the most important thing that has ever been created by statute. If we can repeal the Constitution by statute, I think the chairman and members of the Commission are entitled to such high salaries, $20,000 for the chairman and $17,500 for each of the commissioners. Then we must consider the pay of all the lawyers who will be hired, the thought police, and other employees.

Mr. HOLLAND. Bearing in mind that the salaries of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force are each considerably below the salaries provided under the bill for the chairman of the Commission, is it not rather clear that the sponsors of the bill regard the proposed activity as even more important than any single branch of the armed forces?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there is a great deal to that. There are those who think the proposed agency is very important. Of course there is no group lobbying behind the Secretary of the Army. The Army officers are prohibited by law from lobbying. Most of them do not vote.

Mr. President, I want to point out that those who believe in economy in government, those who are truly opposed to increased governmental bureaucracy, those who in good faith oppose interference on the part of the Government in the private lives and businesses of our people, those who have made such assertions, will have a chance to stand up and be counted when the roll is called on this measure. If a man is sincere in his protestations respecting economy and his opposition to extending bureaucracy, he cannot conscientiously yield to the demands of organized groups, even if by so doing he would snare a few votes.

Mr. President, there has never been an agency proposed to be created which will so reduce the income to the Federal Government and impair it in its ability to pay the cost of government as will this bill. American business cannot and will not expand if control of employment and promotion is placed in a Federal agency.

Mr. President, the American businessman is a peculiar creature. If we pass a tax bill which takes 90 cents out of his dollar in the upper brackets, he will still have the incentive to strive for the dime he will get out of that dollar. But if we say to him, "We are going to take away from you the control of your business," we cannot get him to invest a dollar to save our lives. How could we blame him? If Congress passes this bill it will dry up the sources of revenue in the United States. There will be no new plants created, no businesses expanded if those who put up the money cannot see a possible profit on their investment, as will result if this bill passes and hastens the day when the Government will take over the plants and businesses and operate them. That is the motive inspiring some of those who are supporting the bill most vigorously.

Mr. President, I have already referred to the fact that our friends of the Republican Party have adopted the slogan "Liberty versus socialism." That heartens me greatly in my belief and faith that the bill will be defeated.

There can be no doubt that S. 1728 is the most socialistic measure that has ever been proposed in the American Congress. The so-called socialized medical bill stands as a symbol of free enterprise when it is compared to this FEPC monstrosity. The medical bill does allow each citizen the freedom of choice of a doctor or dentist. This FEPC bill denies to the employers of America any freedom of choice in selecting and promoting their employees if it runs counter to the dictates of a Federal agency. Those who sincerely believe in liberty versus socialism cannot support a bill of this kind. Again I say, when the roll is called on this measure we will be able to separate the guardians of individual liberty from believers in the socialistic state.

I was interested to observe that in the creation of this misnamed Fair Employment Practice Commission there is no provision, as has always been the case in other Government agencies, that both of the great political parties should be recognized in the membership of the Commission. Here are five jobs, varying from $17,500 to $20,000 a year, that will most likely go to deserving Democrats. There have been times when the Democratic membership in this body was limited, but the few that were here when a bill was brought forward insisted that when any new board was created there should be bipartisan representation upon it. The bill carries no requirement for minority representation on the board. I believe, however, there are still a number of Republicans in the United States who are willing to offer themselves on the altar of public service at $20,000 or $17,500 a year. But that fact is completely overlooked and disregarded in the drafting of the bill. I do not see how any Republican with self-respect can support this bill for that reason alone. To do so is a complete admission that the once proud GOP is now politically bankrupt and ready to be relegated to the limbo of forgotten things.

Mr. President, the southern Democrats are not considered too highly in some quarters, but under this bill we would enjoy all the benefits that the Republicans would have, because the bill contains the provision that the Senate shall advise and consent to the nominations. So the bill really makes more of a gesture to the southern Democrats than it does to the Republicans, because I would say we are at least considered a part of the Democratic Party, whereas the Republicans are supposed to have standing as the opposition party.

Mr. President, this bill has no place in the Senate at this time. We have upon our calendar a number of bills which are not designed altogether as vote bait for minority groups. We have before us bills which are supposed to benefit all of the

people of the United States, whether they are members of so-called minorities or whether they are members of majorities. That is the way the Congress of the United States should legislate. Those bills have been subjected to the tests which we in Congress apply to proposed laws under our system. Hearings have been held on them by the respective committees. Recommendations on them are before us from the committees which have had the courage to say what they thought about such bills, instead of just laying the bill before us a political hot brick which the committee could not hold any longer, and was pressured into reporting to the Senate without any hearings or any suggestion in the way of recommendations.

Mr. President, let us be done with this monstrosity, which would serve no useful purpose, even if it were enacted, and which, if enacted, and if it were approved by the Court of last resort, would, I am convinced—and I am sure I do not exaggerate in making this statement—be the beginning of the end of all that has contributed to the building of the greatness of America.

Mr. President, I have about concluded.

I wish to say there is nothing whatever about this bill that is fair, except the word "Fair" in its title. That is the only thing about the bill that is fair. It is an unfair and and un-American bill.

Mr. President, I wish to say, likewise, that this bill does not create one job, except jobs for a vast horde of Federal employees and thought-police and agents who would harass business in this country at the expense of the American taxpayers. Instead of creating jobs which would be productive and would help support the Government, this bill would dry up jobs and the sources of revenue to our Government. The bill, if enacted, would harass and badger American businessmen, even as they are borne down by taxes imposed to enable us to support the Government and to carry on the cold war.

If the bill were enacted, it would distort and twist the entire system of our vaunted Anglo-Saxon justice, upon which we have become accustomed to rely for the maintenance of our lives and our liberties. The bill, if enacted, would inevitably result in the nationalization of industry and in the destruction of the free-enterprise system. It would create a preferred class in employment and in promotion, would generate racial consciousness and hate, and would develop confusion and prejudice. If enacted, the bill would stir up national fear and bitterness, Mr. President.

Indeed, this bill, if enacted, would eventually be a Frankenstein which would destroy those who seek its creation.

AMERICAN RELATIONSHIPS WITH CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Herald-Tribune under date of October 16, 1942. The article relates to a visit which Mr. Earl Browder made to the State Department at that time and the discussion he had with Mr. Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State.

I wish to say that following the testimony of Mr. Earl Browder before the investigating subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Commission which is going into questions relative to the existence of alleged security risks in the State Department, Mr. Browder testified that he had received a message from Mao Tze-tung, the Communist leader in China, which he, in turn, passed on to the Government of the United States, and which it was his best belief was ultimately brought to the attention of the President of the United States.

He further testified before the subcommittee to the fact that he had a conference with Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, and that Mr. Sumner Welles had given him a statement which he, in turn, had passed back to China, to Madam Sun Yat-sen, who now is one of the vice chairmen of the Communist regime in China.

On the afternoon of the day when that testimony was given, I inquired of the office of the Secretary of State as to whether or not it would be possible to furnish me both a copy of the message which Mr. Browder purportedly had received from Mao Tze-tung and also a copy of the memorandum which had been presented to Mr. Browder for transmission to China.

I did not receive the information, so I took it upon myself personally to call Mr. Dean Rusk, who now is the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Far Eastern Affairs. He promised to look into the matter for me.

He has given me a verbal report in which he says that to date they have not been able to find a copy of either message. However, he referred me to the New York Herald Tribune of the date I have mentioned, and also to one other publication in which I might find some information.

Mr. President, let me say that I think this is a rather unusual way for a United States Senator to be informed of what transactions took place between the Government of the United States and at that time the head of the Communist Party in this country.

Nevertheless, since the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Far Eastern Affairs had referred me to the article in the New York Herald Tribune, I sent to the Library of Congress, had the volume delivered to my office, and had my office copy the article in question, which is the one I have asked and received unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I intend to pursue this matter further, because I think it is a part of the American history which apparently was overlooked in presenting, by means of the China white paper, what was supposed to be a comprehensive view of American relationships with China over the past number of years.

Along with this——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. When the Senator referred to having asked and received consent to have the article printed in the RECORD, was he under the impression that while the Senator now speaking was in the chair, that consent was given?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I thought it had been given.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say that I do not think it was.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I now ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, following my preliminary statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 16, 1942]

BROWDER SAYS HE ERRED ON UNITED STATES ROLE IN CHINA—REVEALS WELLES CALLED HIM IN AND REFUTED CHARGE OF BLOCKING UNITY OF WAR

Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, issued a statement yesterday at his office, 35 East Twelfth Street, retracting without reservation charges he made in the Sunday, October 4, issue of the Worker, Communist organ, to the effect that reactionary officials of the State Department were hindering the war effort in China.

In that October 4 issue of the Worker Mr. Browder wrote in part:

"I charge that powerful appeasement forces in the State Department in Washington are deliberately withholding 1,000,000 of the most effective soldiers in Asia, keeping them out of the fight against the Japanese and thereby releasing that many Japanese soldiers for action against our boys in the South Pacific."

Mr. Browder wrote that "it is on the advice of reactionary officials in the State Department that Chiang Kai-shek is keeping his best armies out of the war." He charged that the Chinese armies under Gen. Hu Chung-han and Gen. Tank En-po, totaling almost 1,000,000 men, "the best equipped and trained in all China," were "being confined to blockading the Chinese Communist armies and territories because the State Department in Washington has informed Chungking's representatives that our Government would be displeased if complete unity was established in China between the Kuomintang and the Communists."

In his retraction, which he read to reporters yesterday, Mr. Browder said: "Upon the invitation of Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, I visited him in his office on October 12 in company with Mr. Robert Minor (member of the national committee of the Communist Party) and heard from him and from Mr. Lauchlin Currie, administrative assistant to the President, a detailed refutation of my charges in this respect.

"The information received from Mr. Welles and Mr. Currie convinced me that my charges had been made on the basis of incomplete information. I believe it is established that no responsible official of the State Department is contributing to disunity in China and that the policy of the United States Government is being exerted in the opposite direction. I am therefore happy to retract those charges without reservation."

Mr. Browder said he had a 45-minute visit with Mr. Welles at the latter's invitation.

He declined to state what information led him to write his October 4 story, which carried the page 1 heading: "Browder accuses State Department clique. It hampers our war in Pacific, Europe."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, since that time great changes have taken place.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD—it is simply a coincidence that this article also comes from the New York Herald Tribune—an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 8, with a date line of Hong Kong, May 7. The article is by Christopher Rand, the well-known foreign correspondent. The heading of the article is "Nationalists face defeat by Soviet planes. Russian-piloted jets seen ready to aid in crushing obsolete Formosa craft."

Mr. President, I now submit the article for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONALISTS FACE DEFEAT BY SOVIET PLANES—RUSSIAN-PILOTED JETS SEEN READY TO AID IN CRUSHING OBSOLETE FORMOSA CRAFT

(By Christopher Rand)

HONG KONG, May 7.—The best information now coming from the Chinese mainland indicates that the Nationalist air force, at Formosa, is already outclassed by the new air force which Soviet Russia has put at the disposal of the Chinese Communists. Barring intervention by some foreign power, such as the United States, it is possible that the Nationalist air force will soon and suddenly be destroyed. After that, a Red conquest of Formosa should be easy.

In late April, there were about 30 Russian jet planes in the Shanghai area. They were the latest models, produced during the last year or two and believed to have a cruising speed of 350 miles an hour, with perhaps a top speed of 500 miles an hour.

The best planes the Nationalists can use against them are wartime American P–51 Mustangs, which have a cruising speed of 250 miles an hour and a top speed of 350 miles an hour. It is doubtful that a meeting between the two could be called a contest. The jets are expected to eliminate the Mustangs promptly if they meet.

It is believed generally that the jets have Russian pilots. So far as is known, they have carefully avoided combat up to now and may be waiting for the Chinese to finish training. The whole Chinese Communist air force seems to be holding back for a sudden heavy blow in the future.

Fifty single-engine fighter-bombers, similar to the American P–47 Thunderbolts—a late World War II model and better than anything the Nationalists have—have also been reported in the Shanghai area. It is believed that these are piloted by Chinese.

These planes are in addition to the few of Japanese design—fighters known during the Pacific war by the American code names of Zeke and Oscar—which have been seen in China. Russian bombers are also expected at Shanghai, but it is not known when. Nor is it known whether Chinese crews are being trained for them.

There has apparently been a large Russian training program for Chinese Communist air-force personnel since last fall, principally, it is believed, in northern Manchuria, in a triangle formed by Harbin, Kiamusze, and Mutankiang.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So, Mr. President, a little more than 7½ years have elapsed since the first article I have submitted appeared on October 16, 1942, when Mr. Earl Browder was helping to lay the groundwork for the destruction of the National Government of China and for the benefit of the Communist regime in that country, down to the article which appeared today in the New York Herald Tribune, wherein it is said that the Soviet Government is now supplying jet planes for the ultimate destruction of what is left of the Republic of China. I think this information is of vital interest to the Senate and to the country.

NOMINATION OF JOHN W. KERN TO TAX COURT—PROCEDURE IN NOTIFYING THE PRESIDENT OF CONFIRMATIONS

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to certain matters which ultimately will be appropriate for consideration in connection with the Executive Calendar of the Senate. I appreciate that the Senate is not now in executive session, but I think it advisable that the attention of the Senate be directed to these matters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I am about to make shall not be charged to me as a speech on the motion to take up for consideration of the bill, S. 1728, as my remarks will relate in no wise to that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on April 20, 1950, there were received by the Senate the nominations of Charles R. Arundell, of Oregon; John W. Kern, of Indiana; and Clarence V. Opper, of New York, to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1950. These gentlemen, were the recipients of reappointments at the hands of the President to the offices which they had previously occupied, and are yet occupying, according to my understanding, under earlier appointments.

The date of April 20, 1950, was on a Thursday of the week. The nominations, as I understand from later allusions, were referred to the Committee on Finance of the Senate, on April 20, 1950. Rule XXXVIII of the Senate prescribes that the final question on a nomination shall not be put on the day on which it is reported by a committee, unless by unanimous consent.

On April 25, 1950, Tuesday of the next week, the three nominations were reported favorably from the Committee on finance. On the same day, April 25, 1950, the nominations were by unanimous consent confirmed, and it was announced by the Vice President, "The President will be immediately notified of the confirmations."

Mr. President, I hope that I may have the ear at this moment of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] because of my reference at this moment to a matter in which he was engaged on that day.

By reference to page 5679 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, 1950, it will be observed that it was the senior Senator from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, who reported favorably from the Committee on Finance the nominations of the three gentlemen whose names I have previously given. The distinguished Senator from Georgia pointed out that "each of these judges is now in service, and has been in service for quite a length of time." He further stated:

They have been endorsed by the Senators from the States from which they come, and since the court has an enormous volume of work before it, and has to assign hearings in different parts of the country, it is of course proper and advisable, and almost necessary, that the nominations of these present judges be confirmed at the earliest possible time in order that they may go to the various parts of the country to which they have been assigned.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia pointed out that the nominations of these three judges, all of whom are now in service, as I have said, were unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Finance, that "no objection has been filed," and that he, the Senator from Georgia, therefore asked "unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations may be presently considered, and, if confirmed, that the President be notified at once."

The Vice President thereupon inquired, "Is there objection?" Whereupon, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said:

Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia tell the Members of the Senate whether it is absolutely necessary that the judges be confirmed today, rather than that the nominations take the regular procedure?

The Senator from Georgia replied as follows:

I am able to say that it is very proper. The chief judge has advised me that assignments have already been made, but that the judges would hesitate to go to hear cases, or he would hesitate to request them to go, until their nominations were acted upon.

The Senator from Georgia further said:

I, therefore, think it is necessary that the Senate act at this time.

The Senator from Nebraska thereupon inquired as follows:

Was there a full membership present when the unanimous reports were ordered by the committee?

Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I shall read the colloquy which ensued:

Mr. GEORGE. A reasonably full membership.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the distinguished Senator would say there was no opposition?

Mr. GEORGE. There was no opposition. This is the fourth appointment on the bench of Judge Arundell; Judge Opper, of New York, I think, has received two appointments; and Judge Kern, of Indiana, has also served two terms, or is serving his second term. He is now the presiding judge of the court.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall depart from my regular course about confirmations of appointees. I still maintain that the nominations of all judges of civil courts should follow the regular procedure. I stated once on the Senate floor, and I wish to repeat, that when it comes to the appointment of Federal judges, who handle the judicial procedure in the courts, their nominations should follow the regular order. But

in view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have the profoundest respect, in the emergent situation he sets forth I shall not interpose objection at this time, and therefore do not object to the immediate consideration of the nominations.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I would not make this request if the judges were not already in service, and if they had not heretofore been confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Kern, of Indiana, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles R. Arundell, of Oregon, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence V. Opper, of New York, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmations.

Mr. President, I desire to state at this point that nothing which I have heretofore said or shall hereafter say is intended in even the remotest extent as being critical of the Committee on Finance or of its distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Georgia, for whom, as he well knows, I have the highest regard. I am sure that the committee and the Senator, as the chairman of that committee, acted in utmost good faith and with the utmost feeling that the facts justified the action taken.

Mr. President, on April 27, 1950, the senior Senator from Missouri received at his office a letter dated April 20, 1950, from Mr. O. O. Owens, suite 1002, Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. The Chair will observe the date of the letter, April 20, 1950. I hold in my hand the envelope transmitting the letter, which is postmarked "Tulsa, April 25, 4:30 p. m., 1950, Oklahoma." The explanation of the difference in the date of the letter and that of the postmark will be the subject of later mention in one of the letters which I shall present. The letter from Mr. Owens, dated April 20, 1950, reads as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *April 20, 1950.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DONNELL: The top personnel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue shapes that Bureau's policies to the typical Communist pattern, directs its procedure accordingly, and uses that Bureau as an engine of destruction against citizens who expose the conspiracies, the frauds and other communistic types of corruption employed by officers, agents, attorneys, and other representatives of that Bureau.

About February 10 last you should have received by first-class mail a copy of the enclosed brochure (petition)—

Mr. President, I pause to say that I received with this letter, dated April 20, 1950, the brochure or petition to which Mr. Owens referred. I continue with the reading of the letter—

the first 16 pages of which concisely describe the Communist type of conspiracies and frauds employed in a particular case while pending before the Board of Tax Appeals to rob a taxpayer. Without doubt, similar methods have been employed in hundreds of other instances to intimidate, to punish or to destroy.

The purpose of this letter is to advise you that the member of the Board of Tax Appeals—now the United States Tax Court—who permitted himself and his office to be used to effectuate the typical Communist types of conspiracies and frauds described in the enclosed brochure was John W. Kern, now presiding judge of the United States Tax Court.

I am informed the term of his appointment will expire June 1 next—less than 60 days hence. Anticipating his reappointment, I desire to timely protest Senate confirmation because of his proved and demonstrated lack of ability and integrity or, worse, his demonstrated willingness to permit himself to be used as the dupe and pawn or his office to be used as the tool of a Communist-type conspiracy to rob a taxpayer and to destroy a citizen who resisted and exposed the conspiracies and frauds of officers, attorneys, agents, and other representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The irrefutable record, evidence, and proof of such conspiracies and frauds has been preserved—and cannot be destroyed or suppressed by Communists in an investigation.

I sincerely hope you will take time to read the enclosure—at least the first 17 pages of it; that you will demand and support an investigation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and that you will prevent confirmation of the reappointment of John W. Kern to the United States Tax Court.

Very truly yours,

O. O. OWENS.

Mr. President, as indicated, this letter was received by me 2 days after the confirmation of the nomination had occurred. On the day following its receipt, namely, April 28, 1950, I wrote to Mr. Owens a letter as follows:

APRIL 28, 1950.

Mr. O. O. OWENS,
Tulsa, Okla.

DEAR MR. OWENS: This acknowledges receipt of your letter, April 20, 1950, and of the petition which arrived with the above-mentioned letter. Although your letter is dated April 20, it and the petition were contained in envelope postmarked April 25 and reached my office yesterday afternoon. The nomination of John W. Kern to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for a term of 12 years from June 2, 1950, was confirmed by the Senate on April 25, 1950.

Thanking you for communicating with me, I am,

Yours very truly,

FORREST C. DONNELL.

Mr. President, a telegraphic message was received at my office on May 1, 1950, reading as follows, omitting, of course, the numbers, and so forth, which appear at the top of the message:

TULSA, OKLA., *May 1, 1950.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Answering your letter 28th in re confirmation appointment of Kern to Tax Court, please be advised I wrote identical letters to each Member of Senate about him. All were dated 20th instant but were mailed as prepared. February 8 last I mailed to each Member of Senate and House a copy of petition. On same date I mailed extra copies of petition to Secretary of Senate, to Senate Finance Committee, to Senate Appropriations Committee, to Clerk of House, and to Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees of House. Later I received letter dated February 14 from Leslie L. Biffle reading, "The copies of your petition have been received and have been placed before the proper people."

I spent first 2 weeks of March in Washington interviewing Members of Senate and House, but, unfortunately, failed to contact you. Senator BRICKER suggested subcommittee of Committee on Executive Expenditures should investigate the matter. His secretary, Mr. Minor, arranged a conference for me. Left copies of petition and supporting records with Mr. Flannagan, of subcommittee, who advised he would investigate soon as possible. I also called at office of Secretary of Senate and requested advice as to what was meant by statement "Proper people," in above-mentioned letter. Was advised meant proper committee.

I take CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Watched it diligently for Kern's nomination. When it did not appear before 20th instant I prepared my protest that day, stating anticipated it. Four days are required for delivery of RECORD here. RECORD for 20th received morning 25th. RECORD for 25th and your letter and letters from Senators BREWSTER and MAYBANK received in same mail today. Yesterday received letters from Senators BRIDGES, GILLETTE, and ROBINSON. None but you knew of confirmation. The nomination was filed with the Senate April 20.

Have examined RECORD for 25th. Page 5679 clearly reveals Senator GEORGE was deceived by Kern's false representations of the urgency of confirmation which was presented for Senate consideration without proper committee consideration. The reasons assigned for the urgency are ridiculous in relation to Kern, who is presiding judge of Tax Court, and, as such, I understand does not hear cases outside Washington. His conduct in this matter is typical of and consistent with his conduct complained of in my petition and my letter of the 20th instant. His false representations to and his deceiving Senator GEORGE in this matter with themselves should be sufficient to justify reconsideration by Senate of his confirmation and allowing time for hearing protest.

The RECORD also demonstrates Senator WHERRY was suspicious of the unusual haste and speed and relied solely on Senator GEORGE's assurances, which in turn were based entirely upon Kern's own statements, obviously designed to procure his own confirmation before objections and protests he anticipated would be filed could be considered. I regard Kern's tactics as an outrage and his confirmation obtained by deception a calamity. It seems to me the Senate can reconsider its action any time before Kern begins serving his new term. Please wire collect if such action can be taken. Please show this wire to Senator WHERRY. I made several unsuccessful attempts to personally contact him while in Washington in March.

O. O. OWENS.

Mr. President, subsequent to the receipt of the telegraphic message which I have read I conferred with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who is the ranking member on the Republican side of the Committee on Finance, and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I also spoke very briefly, without going into the details of the case, but mentioning the general point which Mr. Owens had in mind, with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

I have caused to be made, Mr. President, an examination of two cases which involve the subject matter of what Mr. Owens has referred to, the cases of *Owens* v. *The Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (125 Fed. 2d 210), circuit court

of appeals, and *Owens* v. *U. S.* (176 Fed. 2d, 692), circuit court of appeals. I have had certain telephone conversations with Mr. Owens, confined to May 4, 5, 6, and 7. In conversation over the telephone, on May 5, I suggested that Mr. Owens send to me an affidavit with respect to the subject matter.

I received on Sunday, May 7, a letter from Mr. Owens, dated May 5, 1950, which was contained in an envelope postmarked "May 5, Tulsa, Okla., 9:30 p. m." The letter reads as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *May 5, 1950.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to your request, I enclose herewith an affidavit concisely stating what I think are the most essential facts—you and the other Senators would like best to know—in support of my petition to Congress for an investigation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and also in support of my request that the precipitous confirmation by the Senate of the reappointment of John W. Kern to the United States Tax Court for another 12-year term beginning June 2, 1950, be reconsidered by the Senate and a full investigation of the charges made.

The enclosed affidavit was hurriedly prepared because of the necessity of promptly mailing it so that you will receive it tomorrow (Saturday), the 6th instant. I could have given many more facts and details, but to have done so would have prevented completion of the affidavit in sufficient time for it to reach you tomorrow.

You indicated that if I desired I might send copies of the affidavit to some of the other Senators. Since you did not identify any certain Senators, I have mailed a copy of the affidavit to Senators WALTER F. GEORGE, SCOTT W. LUCAS, CLYDE R. HOEY, ROBERT S. KERR, FRANCIS J. MYERS, JOHN W. BRICKER, EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, OWEN BREWSTER, and STYLES BRIDGES, with an appropriate covering letter of transmittal to each.

If you have any doubt about the accurateness or correctness of any statement contained in this affidavit, you are advised that every statement made has already been proved and established by official records and other documents and that neither the Commissioner of Internal Revenue before the Board and later before the circuit court nor the United States Government has ever denied a single allegation of fraud nor attempted to refute the proof.

I had numerous extra copies of the 800-page record, filed in the court of appeals, printed for the specific purpose of having all of the proof readily available for a congressional investigation.

Yours very truly,

O. O. OWENS.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the affidavit to which reference is made. It was subscribed and sworn to by O. O. Owens before William G. Tobler—I believe the name is—notary public, on May 5, 1950, the commission of Mr. Tobler expiring on January 16, 1954. The affidavit is approximately nine pages in length, and is double spaced. Among other things, it contains this language:

Affiant further states that the said John W. Kern, now presiding judge of the United States Tax Court, in his capacity as a member of the Board of Tax Appeals, wilfully, knowingly, fraudulently, and corruptly based his opinion and decision—purporting to sustain said deficiency in affiant's income tax for 1920 in an amount of $28,260.61—upon the pretended, but falsely stated, facts of affiant's case which said John W. Kern knew were false and falsely stated, and which he also knew had been fraudulently stipulated to be the facts of affiant's case; that only by using such falsely stated and fraudulently stipulated facts in lieu of what he knew were the true facts proved and established by documentary evidence in affiant's case could the said John W. Kern render an opinion and decision adverse to affiant and in favor of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; that the said John W. Kern's opinion and some of his findings of fact were knowingly, wilfully, and corruptly based upon the aforesaid fraudulently stipulated, falsely stated facts; that said John W. Kern's knowingly and wilfully substituting the facts stated in the opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals in *Commissioner* v. *Owens* (78 F. 2d 768) which he, the said Kern, knew was based also upon such fraudulently stipulated, falsely stated facts demonstrates said John W. Kern is so lacking in integrity that he is unqualified to sit or serve on the United States Tax Court.

Affiant further states that the reasons assigned by the said John W. Kern to the Honorable Senator WALTER F. GEORGE for the necessity of immediate confirmation of his reappointment, as reflected on page 5679 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings of the Senate on April 25, 1950, are ridiculous and deceptive, and were a fraud upon the Honorable Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, and upon other members of the Senate Finance Committee and upon the entire membership of the Senate, and were designed to procure confirmation of his reappointment before the Members of the Senate or the Senate Finance Committee could have time or opportunity to review affiant's petition then and therefore on file with the secretary of the Senate and with each and every Member of the Senate; that such conduct is typical of and is consistent with the fraudulent conduct of said John W. Kern, as hereinabove described, and his knowingly substituting fraudulently stipulated, falsely stated facts for what he knew were the true facts of affiant's case; that such deception of and fraud upon the Senate Finance Committee and upon all the Members of the Senate, within themselves and standing alone, demonstrate said John W. Kern is corrupt, that the confirmation of his reappointment should be reconsidered and a hearing should be held upon affiant's petition on file with the Senate. Further affiant saith not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire affidavit, from which I have read excerpts, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the affidavit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
County of Tulsa, ss:

O. O. Owens, of lawful age, being first duly sworn, deposes and states that heretofore, on February 8, 1950, he mailed to the Secretary of the Senate and to the Senate Finance Committee several copies, and to each Member of the United States Senate and to each Member of the United States House of Representatives one copy of his petition concisely describing the frauds and exhibiting a forgery perpetrated and committed by officers, attorneys, agents, and other representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue pursuant to a prolonged continuous series of conspiracies to extort more than $80,000 from this affiant in the false guise of income tax for 1920 with interest thereon;

That all the facts stated in said petition are true; that this affidavit is furnished to supply additional facts and to support said petition.

Affiant states that notwithstanding numerous hearings and court decisions the true facts upon which the deficiency in income tax for 1920, referred to in affiant's aforesaid petition heretofore filed with the various Members and various committees of the Congress, have not been considered in any hearing or decision of the merits of the aforesaid deficiency in tax but that, on the contrary, all such decisions have been based upon a false statement of facts fraudulently prepared by an assistant to the chief counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue and fradulently stipulated by such attorney for the Bureau of Internal Revenue and by an unauthorized attorney who fraudulently pretended to represent this affiant.

Affiant further states that as a result of the aforesaid frauds of such attorney for the Bureau of Internal Revenue in conspiracy with said unauthorized attorney the case *Commissioner* v. *Owens* (78 Fed. (2d) 768) was decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit upon the aforesaid falsely stated and fraudulently stipulated facts.

That after such decision had been rendered July 3, 1935, the Bureau of Internal Revenue sought to apply such falsely stated and fraudulently stipulated facts as the facts of affiant's other cases then pending before the Board of Tax Appeals; that before the aforesaid appeal was taken affiant discovered he had been defaulted in his appeals to the Board of Tax Appeals from deficiencies for the years 1920 and 1926 and was led to believe that such default and abandonment of his said appeals resulted from accident, confusion, and mistake.

That by diligent effort he caused to be procured an order of the Board of Tax Appeals vacating the decisions adverse to him in his 1920 and 1926 appeals and was furnished documents evidencing the fact those adverse decisions had been vacated, the cases restored to the calendar of the Board and allowed to pend until decision of the aforesaid appeal in *Commissioner* v. *Owens* (supra).

Affiant further states that long after the circuit court had decided the appeal in *Commissioner* v. *Owens*, the Bureau of Internal Revenue sought to enforce the deficiencies in tax for 1920 and 1926 in a proceeding denominated "settlement under rule 50" of the Board; that in resisting such attempt affiant for the first time discovered the unauthorized appearances and conduct of the unauthorized attorneys briefly related in affiant's above-mentioned petition, heretofore filed with all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives;

That in the course of resisting such efforts of the Bureau of Internal Revenue affiant discovered the forgery exhibited as exhibit A to exhibit 1 attached to his aforesaid petition filed with Congress; that as a result of affiant's efforts the aforesaid adverse Board decisions in his 1920 and 1926 appeals were vacated by Board orders and those cases were restored to the Board's docket, ostensibly for hearing on the merits.

Affiant further states that in the later hearing, ostensibly on the merits, of his 1920 appeal the issue presented and to be considered and decided by the Board of Tax Appeals was affiant's liability for the tax asserted by the aforesaid deficiency and, having been ostensibly relieved from the effects of the unauthorized appearances and acts of the aforesaid unauthorized attorneys, the appearances and conduct of said unauthorized attorneys was no longer an issue to be presented or to be considered and decided by the Board and that therefore only the facts of the various transactions upon which such alleged and pretended deficiency was based could properly be presented and as a result were presented by affiant for the Board's consideration.

Affiant further states that in said hearing the Bureau of Internal Revenue defended said deficiency upon the sole ground of affiant's method of accounting and reporting income for taxation; urged that affiant was on the cash basis of reporting income; that affiant had not previously reported and paid tax on the principal deduction claimed by him for 1920 (the $75,989.20 extorted from affiant in 1920) and, in consequence, affiant was not entitled to take as a deduction the loss of such funds which the Revenue Department insisted had not been previously reported.

Affiant further states that in said hearing the attorney for the Bureau of Internal Revenue took the position and urged that affiant was bound by the statement of facts previously prepared by attorneys for the Bureau of Internal Revenue and stipulated by an assistant chief counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue and one of the aforesaid unauthorized attorneys who pretended to represent affiant.

Affiant further states that John W. Kern, a member of the Board of Tax Appeals, presided at said hearing ostensibly on the merits of affiant's 1920 case; that after affiant pointed out the erroneous and falsely stated statements of fact in said stipulation said John W. Kern required affiant to use said stipulation but permitted affiant to correct same by the substitution of duly authenticated copies of court records and other public records to establish the true facts.

That after the true facts had been thus established, said John W. Kern, in preparing the opinion of the Board of Tax Appeals in said case, abandoned the true facts thus established in his presence by official records, and based his decision, adverse to affiant, in part upon the identical falsely stated facts previously fraudulently stipulated by an assistant chief counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue and by one of the aforesaid unauthorized attorneys who had pretended to represent affiant.

Affiant further states that after said John W. Kern rendered said memorandum opinion this affiant, by proper motion, sought to have the same vacated or corrected; that the said John W. Kern changed some of his findings of fact which were based upon the aforesaid falsely stated and fraudulently stipulated facts but, to avoid changing his decision to conform to the true facts, said John W. Kern willfully and corruptly substituted the same facts stated in, and based his decision upon, the aforesaid opinion of the circuit court of appeals in *Commissioner* v. *Owens* (78 F. (2d) 768) (which, as above stated, was based upon the falsely stated fraudulently stipulated facts), and said John W. Kern, in deciding said case in a reduced amount adverse to affiant, expressly held affiant was bound by the aforesaid falsely stated and fraudulently stipulated facts and, in consequence, that affiant was bound by the frauds previously perpetrated upon him by attorneys for the Bureau of Internal Revenue and said unauthorized attorneys.

Affiant further states that in rendering his decision the said John W. Kern expressly refused to consider or decide the facts of the issue of capital investment or additions to capital; that neverthless, on review by the circuit court of appeals in *Owens* v. *Commissioner* (125 F. (2d) 210) the Commissioner raised the issue of capital investment or additions to capital, and urged that the amount extorted from this affiant in 1920 represented "the amount of his share of an increase in the purchase price of an Indian allotment the title to which was then in litigation," nothwithstanding the record facts established that by final decree, which remained unappealed from, affiant's title to the land and the income therefrom, which had been impounded by a receiver appointed by a Federal court, had been quieted and perfected and possession had been awarded to affiant on June 17, 1919.

Affiant further states that under the revenue acts and all the decisions of all the courts then and since rendered the court of appeals had no jurisdiction to consider the new issue urged by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which new issue was presented because the Commissioner occupied an untenable position and sought to sustain an indefensible deficiency; that notwithstanding complete lack of jurisdiction and complete lack of power to make independent findings of fact, and notwithstanding the court's jurisdiction was limited exclusively to reviewing the decision of the Board, nevertheless the circuit court of appeals considered such new issue presented by the Commissioner, made its own independent findings of the facts thereof, but avoided deciding the decisive question of law arising out of the facts so found.

That the point of law thus raised, if decided, sustained affiant's contentions that the deficiency in controversy was utterly void—for the reason it was grounded upon the denial as a deduction from gross income of $75,989.20 extorted from affiant in 1920 by a public official;

That, after having thus made its own independent findings of fact, after having avoided deciding the decisive question of law, the circuit court arbitrarily affirmed the decision of the Board previously rendered by said John W. Kern and thereby held affiant bound by the effects of frauds previously perpetrated upon him.

Affiant further states that the United States Supreme Court denied his petition for writ of certiorari from the aforesaid circuit court's decision; that during the next ensuing 5 years representatives of the Treasury Department, distinguished from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, repeatedly admitted affiant had been the victim of fraud but urged affiant to make an offer in compromise to settle said tax claim; that affiant refused unless the Treasury Department would stipulate that the determination in the first instance of the aforesaid deficiency had been fraudulent and that all subsequent conduct of the officers, agents, attorneys, and other representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and their efforts to enforce said deficiency had also been fraudulent; that said representatives of the Treasury Department admitted affiant's position was correct and affiant's refusal to condone the aforesaid frauds and fraudulent acts in connection with said deficiency was commendable.

Affiant further states he steadfastly refused to become a participant in or to condone the aforesaid frauds or efforts to further conceal them; that ultimately a credit of $350, ostensibly paid by an unauthorized third party, was applied upon the aforesaid deficiency and thereafter, in May 1947, a suit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma, styled *United States of America, Complainant,* v. *O. O. Owens, Defendant,* was filed for the purpose of reducing to judgment the aforesaid fraudulent deficiency.

Affiant further states that in his answer filed in said case he pleaded all the facts of the frauds previously perpetrated in determining said deficiency and subsequently in procuring Board decisions and a court decision pretendedly sustaining the same; that the trial court sustained the Government's motion to strike all allegations of conspiracy and fraud in affiant's answer, which motion was premised upon the grounds and for the reasons that the same are redundant, immaterial, impertinent, and scandalous; that affiant filed his amended answer and alleged in general terms that the aforesaid deficiency had been unlawfully determined in the first instance and thereafter unlawfully pretendedly sustained.

Affiant further states that his records, necessary to establish his defense in said suit, which had previously been surreptitiously obtained or stolen from his former attorney of record before the Board of Tax Appeals and had been delivered to assistants to the chief counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue have never been returned to affiant; that affiant obtained from the trial judge an order authorizing him to demand of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and from the Department of Justice his own records and other records of the Government indispensable to his defense and also the testimony of the officers, agents, attorneys, servants, and employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and proceeded to Washington, D. C., for the purpose of obtaining such records and testimony;

That attorneys in the Justice Department refused to recognize said order; that affiant was limited to the records he could obtain from the files of the Board of Tax Appeals but was unable to obtain any of the records in the files of the chief counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue; that affiant was forced to go to trial with part only of the records necessary for his defense; that the trial thereof was recessed and affiant afforded another opportunity to recover his own records and procure other records and the testimony of officers, agents, and employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; that affiant enlisted the aid of the honorable Senator E. H. Moore, and also made formal written demand upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to produce such records and witnesses but the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, at all times, ignored such demand and suppressed all documentary evidence and the testimony of all witnesses whose testimony was indispensable to affiant's defense.

Affiant further states that after 7½ months' recess the trial of the case was resumed; that in such interim affiant had obtained photostatic copies of sufficient additional documents and correspondence not under the control of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to prove and establish the conspiracy and frauds previously perpetrated upon him, and the further fact that the Board's decision pretendedly sustaining the deficiency in controversy was based and rested upon the frauds of the aforesaid unauthorized attorneys, who pretended to represent affiant, acting in conspiracy and collusion with the attorneys for the Bureau of Internal Revenue;

That in such resumed hearing affiant introduced such documentary proof but the trial judge, who was then ill and who about 14 months later died from the ravages of cancer, without reading, examining, or considering such documentary evidence immediately theretofore offered, made findings of fact favorable to the Government on affiant's allegations of conspiracy but did not make findings of the facts of the frauds which affiant's documentary evidence conclusively established and which the plaintiff, the United States of America, made no attempt to deny or to refute.

Affiant further states that the aforesaid trial judge, in making his findings of fact and in deciding the case, adopted the decision of the circuit court of appeals in the case of *Commissioner* v. *Owens* (125 F. (2d) 210, supra), as his decision of the case on trial, and held that all the issues in the case on trial had been previously considered and decided in the former appeal whereas, in truth and in fact, no issue of conspiracy, collusion, and fraud was in issue in said appeal; that in consequence the trial judge completely ignored and disregarded all the evidence offered—which evidence proved the allegations of conspiracy, collusion, and fraud, none of which had been denied or had been attempted to be refuted by the Government—and in consequence affiant was

again held bound by all the frauds previously perpetrated upon him and further held to the effect of the falsely stated facts previously fraudulently stipulated as aforesaid.

On appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, affiant sought to have the three judges who had previously rendered the opinion in *Commissioner* v. *Owens* (125 F. (2d) 210), disqualify because the pending appeal put in issue the propriety and correctness of their former opinion, but said judges denied affiant's motion and proceeded to hear the case which affiant orally argued; that thereafter, in its opinion *Owens* v. *United States* (177 Fed. 2d 692) the court made glaring misstatements of the record facts and, after conceding that the stipulation of the facts previously made by counsel for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and one of the unauthorized attorneys might be incorrect, the court held:

"Conceding that such stipulation might have been incorrect, it is of no moment here since the Board specifically found that it was unauthorized in its order vacating its prior opinion, and restored the case to the calendar for another hearing in due course. The subsequent decision of the Board redetermining the deficiency was rendered after a full hearing, at which revised stipulations and evidence were adduced by the taxpayer and the Commissioner."

Notwithstanding the record facts before the court demonstrated that after such "revised stipulations and evidence were adduced by the taxpayer and the Commissioner" the Board (Kern) had ignored such stipulations and evidence of the true facts and had resorted to the identical falsely stated facts, fraudulently stipulated by counsel for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and one of the aforesaid unauthorized attorneys as the basis for its decision sustaining the deficiency in controversy.

Affiant further states that by such court opinion in *Owens* v. *United States* (177 F. 2d 692), he was again held bound by the frauds of the unauthorized attorneys, who pretended to represent him before the Board of Tax Appeals, in conspiracy with attorneys for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; that his case has never been decided upon its true facts notwithstanding the several court decisions that have been rendered; that as a result of the aforesaid conspiracies and the frauds perpetrated pursuant thereto affiant is now held liable for the fraudulently determined deficiency in tax of $28,260.61 with interest thereon at 6 percent for more than 24 years, making a total of almost $100,000.

Affiant further states that the said John W. Kern, now presiding judge of the United States Tax Court, in his capacity as a member of the Board of Tax Appeals, willfully, knowingly, fraudulently and corruptly based his opinion and decision—purporting to sustain said deficiency in affiant's income tax for 1920 in an amount of $28,260.61—upon the pretended, but falsely stated, facts of affiant's case which said John W. Kern knew were false and falsely stated, and which he also knew had been fraudulently stipulated to be the facts of affiant's case; that only by using such falsely stated and fraudulently stipulated facts in lieu of what he knew were, the true facts proved and established by documentary evidence in affiant's case could the said John W. Kern render an opinion and decision adverse to affiant and in favor of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; that the said John W. Kern's opinion and some of his findings of fact were knowingly, willfully, and corruptly based upon the aforesaid fraudulently stipulated, falsely stated facts; that said John W. Kern's knowingly and willfully substituting the facts stated in the opinion of the circuit court of appeals in *Commissioner* v. *Owens* (78 F. 2d 768) which he, the said Kern, knew was based also upon such fraudulently stipulated falsely stated facts demonstrates said John W. Kern is so lacking in integrity that he is unqualified to sit or serve on the United States Tax Court.

Affiant further states that the reasons assigned by the said John W. Kern to the Hon. orable Senator WALTER F. GEORGE for the necessity of immediate confirmation of his reappointment, as reflected on page 5679 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings of the Senate on April 25, 1950, are ridiculous and deceptive, and were a fraud upon the Honorable Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, upon the other members of the Senate Finance Committee, and upon the entire membership of the Senate, and were designed to procure confirmation of his reappointment before the Members of the Senate or the Senate Finance Committee could have time or opportunity to review affiant's petition then and theretofore on file with the Secretary of the Senate and with each and every Member of the Senate; that such conduct is typical of and is consistent with the fraudulent conduct of said John W. Kern, as hereinabove described, and his knowingly substituting fraudulently stipulated falsely stated facts for what he knew were the true facts of affiant's case; that such deception of and fraud upon the Senate Finance Committee and upon all the Members of the Senate, within themselves and standing alone, demonstrate said John W. Kern is corrupt, that the confirmation of his reappointment should be reconsidered, and a hearing should be held upon affiant's petition on file with the Senate. Further affiant saith not.

O. O. OWENS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me the undersigned Notary Public this 5th day of May, 1950.

[SEAL] WM. G. TOBLER,
Notary Public.

My commission expires January 16, 1954.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, subsequent to the mailing of the affidavit and letter dated May 5, 1950, Mr. Owens talked with me over the telephone. I think he called me, although I am not certain as to who originated the call. In the course of his conversation, which occurred on May 6, he informed me of an inadvertent omission from the affidavit due to haste in transcription. At any rate, it was an inadvertent omission. I suggested to him that he confirm the statement to me over the telephone, the gist of which I had jotted down in pencil. I suggested that he confirm his statement to me by letter. I have received such a letter from him, which is dated May 6. It reads as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *May 6, 1950.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In my telephone conversation with you this morning I advised you a 13-word clause had been omitted from the last paragraph on page 2 of my affidavit. Upon retranscribing the stenographic notes of that paragraph it developed a 19-word interlineation in such notes had also been omitted.

When corrected the paragraph should read:

Affiant further states that in the later hearing, ostensibly on the merits, of his 1920 appeal the issue presented and to be considered and decided by the Board of Tax Appeals was Affiant's liability for the tax asserted by the aforesaid deficiency and, having been ostensibly relieved from the effects of the unauthorized appearances and acts of the aforesaid unauthorized attorneys, except as to the amount of interest, if any, due on said deficiency for the 8 years and 4 months delay, caused by said unauthorized attorneys, in the decision of affiant's appeal, the appearances and conduct of said unauthorized attorneys was no longer an issue to be presented or to be considered and decided by the Board and that therefore only the facts of the various transactions upon which such alleged and pretended deficiency was based could properly be presented and as a result were presented by Affiant for the Board's consideration.

Very truly yours,

O. O. OWENS.

Mr. President, on April 28, 1950, an executive session of the Senate occurred. It is the only executive session of the Senate which has occurred since April 25, 1950. The second day of an actual executive session since April 25, 1950, has not yet occurred. Mr. President, rule XXXVIII of the Senate provides, in part:

When a nomination is confirmed or rejected, any Senator voting in the majority may move for a reconsideration on the same day on which the vote was taken, or on either of the next 2 days of actual executive session of the Senate; but if a notification of the confirmation or rejection of a nomination shall have been sent to the President before the expiration of the time within which a motion to reconsider may be made, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the President to return such notification to the Senate. Any motion to reconsider the vote on a nomination may be laid on the table without prejudice to the nomination, and shall be a final disposition of such motion.

Mr. President, the day on which the confirmation occurred, namely, April 25, 1950, the senior Senator from Missouri was absent by leave of the Senate. While not material, I may say, in explanation of my absence, that it was due to the fact that I had been in attendance on the funeral of my uncle, which occurred at Fairfax, Atchinson County, Mo., on the day previous, and I had not yet returned to Washington.

I have conferred with the Parliamentarian of the Senate with respect to that portion of the rule which states that any Senator voting in the affirmative may move for reconsideration, and so forth. Mr. President, obviously, I did not vote, because I was not present. Furthermore, the vote does not appear to have been a record vote. I hope I am not misquoting the Parliamentarian. If I am, and if he will so advise me, I shall see to it that my statement is corrected either later in the afternoon or subsequently. However, I understood from him that the portion of the rule which I read, which grants only to a Senator who voted in the majority the right to move to reconsider, applies only in a case where a record vote was taken. If I am not correct in that, I hope I shall be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the conclusion of the Senator from Missouri is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate both the courtesy of the Chair and the Parliamentarian in so stating. I may state that before determining the exact course of conduct which I shall follow at the next executive session, I should like to have the benefit of the precedents to which

the Parliamentarian alluded, in order to determine whether I am entitled to file a motion. As the distinguished Parliamentarian has advised, I would not be precluded from filing a motion because of the fact that I was not present, inasmuch as the precedents indicate that the grant referred to applies only in cases where there is a record vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been advised that the precedents are uniform regarding Senators not present at the time of voting on a question when a yea-and-nay vote was not called.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask as a parliamentary inquiry, so that I may be perfectly clear on the matter, does the Chair rule that the Senator from Missouri, although not present in the Senate on the 25th day of April 1950 at any time on that day, and consequently not voting with the majority on the nomination of Judge Kern, is nevertheless entitled, under rule XXXVIII of the Senate rules, to move a reconsideration of the vote by which the nomination was confirmed, and that his absence does not preclude him from the exercise of that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so rules, on the advice of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it is my intention, therefore, on the next day on which shall occur an actual executive session of the Senate, to move a reconsideration of the vote by which was confirmed the nomination of John W. Kern, as aforesaid, and also to cause my motion for such reconsideration to be accompanied by a motion to request the President to return to the Senate the notification to him of the confirmation of said nomination.

Mr. President, the Parliamentarian very kindly assisted the Senator from Missouri, as he has done on so many other occasions. When I discussed this subject matter with him recently he called to my attention the case of United States versus George Otis Smith, 286 United States, page 6, and also kindly called a citation to my attention, namely, volume 75, part 12, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 18, 1932, at page 13329.

I read this portion of the syllabus preceding the opinion in the George Otis Smith case, not part of the opinion, but the syllabus:

> Held, that when the Senate had confirmed the nomination and on the same day had by unanimous consent caused the President to be notified of the confirmation, and the President thereupon had commissioned the nominee and the latter had taken the oath and entered upon the duties of his office, the rules did not contemplate that the Senate thereafter, within two executive sessions following that of the confirmation, might entertain a motion to reconsider the confirmation, request return by the President of the notification, and upon his refusal to return it, might reconsider and reject the nomination.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of that decision, and I desire to have the RECORD show at this point that in the George Otis Smith case, from the syllabus of which I have just read, it will be observed that the President had commissioned the nominee, and that the latter had taken the oath and entered upon the duties of his office, whereas in the instant case, while I am not advised as to whether the President has commissioned Judge Kern under the confirmation of April 25, 1950, obviously it is an impossibility that Judge Kern could have entered upon the duties of his office under that appointment, because it will not be until June 2, 1950, that his previously existing and presently existing appointment will have expired.

Mr. President, I desire at this point to digress very briefly with respect to this subject matter. It has occurred to me to inquire—and I shall be very much pleased to have advice from time to time from some Senators or Senators who are far better informed upon the subject than I—as to whether the Senate is adopting the course of wisdom in causing the President to be immediately notified of the confirmation of any ordinary nomination. There may be some situations in which notifications should be immediately sent to the President, where there is urgent need for his being immediately notified so that he can issue a commission, but in the case I am discussing the term will not begin until June 2, 1950, the confirmation being on April 25. It occurs to me that there may be some real question of the Senate in the future following the action of causing immediate notification to the President to be sent to the President.

I raise this question, not as undertaking to decide it at all, but it has occurred to me that in the event of a confirmation for a term of office that is to commence within a few days, if the notice of confirmation is immediately sent to the President after the confirmation is made, the Senate may be precluded thereafter from the opportunity of passing, on the nomination by reconsideration, and thus let the President, having been notified, issue the commission, and the appointee having entered upon the performance of his duty, we may be confronted with a situation in which, under the George Otis Smith case, the Senate will be precluded from making an objection which might otherwise result, and reconsidering the nomination.

Mr. President, digressing entirely from the case at hand, for the moment, I at least raise the caveat, so to speak, of whether or not the Senate should in the future, unless in exceptional cases, follow the plan of causing the President to be immediately notified of a confirmation.

Mr. President, I desire to state, in conclusion, that I am not at this time determining or undertaking to determine or expressing any opinion upon the merits or charges made by Mr. Owens against Judge Kern. I am only asserting, as I do assert, that in my opinion under present circumstances the charges should be investigated, and that consequently a reconsideration should be had to make possible the investigation.

Before I take my seat I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the other Senators with whom I have conferred, for their uniform courtesy and patience in discussing this matter with me, which is so thoroughly characteristic of each of the Senators to whom I have referred.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my brief statement—and it will be very brief—be not counted as a speech upon the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. I have only this to say, that sometime in February, and I doubt not that it was about the 10th of February, a lengthy printed petition reached the Senate Committee on Finance. As chairman of the committee, I think I received a copy of the petition. I am quite sure that a petition was sent to the committee by the Secretary of the Senate or by the Vice President.

The petition was, as I said, a printed petition, and lengthy. I immediately looked it over. As I now recall, it did not name Judge Kern. I would not say that it did not name him at some point in the petition, but it was primarily a complaint against the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the disposition of a tax matter in which the writer of the petition was interested.

The petition did refer to a proceeding before the Board of Tax Appeals, the case having been tried many years ago. After I read it, I referred the petition to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. I referred it specifically to Mr. Colin Stam, who is the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

I referred the petition to Mr. Stam because it was a general complaint against the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with reference to the subsequent hearing of a case by the Board of Tax Appeals, and perhaps some other steps taken by the petitioner in order to obtain what he thought was justice in his cause.

The petition was signed by O. O. Owens, of Tulsa, Okla. I do not know Mr. Owens. But at that time there was no nomination of any member of the Tax Court of the United States pending before the Finance Committee or in the Senate. In other words, the President had not nominated anyone. The petition itself had not specifically referred, as now I recall, to Judge Kern. I am sure I am correct in saying that if it referred at all to Judge Kern it was only an incidental reference. Anyway, I referred it to Mr. Stam, Chief of the Committee Staff, for the purpose of looking into the complaints, and Mr. Stam, busy, of course, with the Ways and Means Committee of the House in tax matters, has made to me no formal report on the petition. Although he has made some report, there has been no formal report made.

On April 20, the President sent to the Senate the names of three judges now serving on the Tax Court of the United States, among them Judge Arundell, as

I recall, Judge Opper, and Judge Kern. I caused the usual inquiry to be made of the two Senators from each State involved. There was no objection to any of those men by any Senator. On the contrary, I was urged by one or two Senators to bring the nominations before the Finance Committee as early as practicable. That would have been done in any event.

On April 25, 5 days after the nominations came to the Senate, and after the committee clerk had canvassed the Senators from the States involved, the nominations were laid before the Senate Finance Committee, and they were ordered to be favorably reported to the Senate. As chairman of the committee I made the report immediately after the convening of the Senate on the 25th of April, the same day upon which the committee had acted. I did so for the reasons stated in the RECORD particularly, and also because, having before the committee the amended social-security bill, House bill 6000 as it was numbered, I found it inconvenient to be on the floor very much of the time, and I therefore asked for the immediate consideration of the nominations. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has correctly recited precisely what happended. Each of these names was laid before the Senate as in executive session, and each was approved by the Senate, there being no actual dissent, but no record vote.

I am satisfied that the distinguished Senator from Missouri might make a motion to reconsider by reason of his absence from the Senate at that time, and inasmuch as he did not vote at all upon the matter. There would be no disposition on my part to raise any question about it.

Some question might arise as to whether the motion would now be timely. On that point I express no opinion further than to say that I have no disposition to raise even that question.

There is only one feature about the matter to which I wish to call specific attention. Mr. Owens in his letter to me of April 20, which was not received until late in the afternoon of April 25, after the Senate had already confirmed the nominations of the three judges to the United States Tax Court, for the first time mentioned the name of Judge Kern. I advised him, of course, that the Senate had acted before I received his letter. His letter is postmarked either at Tulsa at 4:30 on the afternoon of April 25, or Washington, 4:30 on April 25. I know it was after I had gone back to my office and had gone over to the Finance Committee, and I know it was after the Senate had acted.

There was no undue haste in bringing the nominations before the committee. That is the only point I wish to stress. Mr. Owens seems to have the impression that these nominations were presented to the committee hastily, because of the statement of Judge Kern that he thought it highly desirable to have the nominations acted upon. As I now recall, I did not hear from Judge Kern until after the committee had acted. Nothing was said before the Finance Committee as to any necessity for speedy hearing upon the nominations. They were simply nominations in course. They had run the regular course. They had been in the committee for 5 days, and there was no disposition to hurry the procedure, because there was no objection whatever filed in opposition to any one of the three judges. Since all these judges had been confirmed on more than one occasion by the Senate, I anticipated no objection from any source. Had I received any specific objection to Judge Kern prior to the time the committee acted I would not have asked for immediate consideration of the nominations.

I wanted to make that point clear, because so far as the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is concerned, I have no objection to a reconsideration. I would not want to preclude or prejudice the rights of any other Member of the Senate if he is or should be of the opinion that the motion now made is not timely. However, upon that question, as I have already indicated, I myself would not raise any objection.

I wished to make this statement in view of the record in the case.

I believe now, Mr. President, that——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Georgia is about to move a recess. Is he?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator indulge me for a moment in the interest of having a complete recital of the correspondence? I note that I omitted to place in the RECORD certain correspondence, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so and that it will not be counted as another speech on the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. The first is a letter dated May 1, 1950, from O. O. Owens to me, with which I also offer a copy of a confirmation night letter of April 30, 1950, from him to me. And if there is no objection on the part of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I offer for the RECORD a copy of a letter dated May 1, 1950, from Mr. O. O. Owens to the Senator from Georgia, enclosed by Mr. Owens in his letter to me.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection. The letter was, of course, written after the confirmation.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; it certainly was.

Finally, a carbon copy of a letter dated May 1, 1950, to the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, United States Senator, from Mr. O. O. Owens, and a telegram dated May 6, 1950, from Mr. Owens to me.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TULSA, OKLA., *May 1, 1950.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith the carbon copy of the Western Union night letter I sent you last night and also sent to Senator WHERRY, nothwithstanding in my wire to you I requested you to show it to Senator WHERRY.

I am also enclosing a carbon copy of my letter of even date in response to a letter from Senator GEORGE; also a carbon copy of my identical letter to Senators A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, STYLES BRIDGES, GUY M. GILLETTE, BURNET R. MAYBANK and OWEN BREWSTER.

Sincerely yours,

O. O. OWENS.

TULSA, OKLA., *April 30, 1950.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Answering your letter 28th in re confirmation appointment of Kern to Tax Court please be advised I wrote identical letters to each Member of Senate about him. All were dated 20th instant but were mailed as prepared. February 8 last I mailed to each Member of Senate and House a copy of petition. On same date I mailed extra copies of petition to Secretary of Senate, to Senate Finance Committee, to Senate Appropriations Committe, to Clerk of House, and to Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees of House. Later I received letter dated February 14 from Leslie L. Biffle reading: "The copies of your petition have been received and have been placed before the proper people."

I spent first 2 weeks of March in Washington interviewing Members of Senate and House but unfortunately failed to contact you. Senator BRICKER suggested Subcommittee of Committee on Executive Expenditures should investigate the matter. His secretary, Mr. Minor, arranged a conference for me. Left copies of petition and supporting records with Mr. Flannagan of subcommittee who advised he would investigate soon as possible. I also called at office of Secretary of Senate and requested advise as to what was meant by statement "proper people" in above-mentioned letter. Was advised meant proper committee.

I take CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Watched it diligently for Kern's nomination. When it did not appear before 20th instant I prepared my protest that day stating anticipated it. Four days are required for delivery of RECORD here. RECORD for 20th received morning 25th. RECORD for 25th and your letter and letters from Senators BREWSTER and MAYBANK received in same mail today. Yesterday received letters from Senators BRIDGES, GILLETTE, and ROBERTSON. None but you knew of confirmation. The nomination was filed with the Senate April 20.

Have examined RECORD for 25th. Page 5679 clearly reveals Senator GEORGE was deceived by Kern's false representations of the urgency of confirmation which was presented for Senate consideration without proper committee consideration. The reasons assigned for the urgency are ridiculous in relation to Kern who is presiding judge of Tax Court and as such I understand does not hear cases outside Washington. His conduct in this matter is typical of and consistent with his conduct complained of in my petition and my letter of the 20th instant. His false representations to and his deceiving Senator GEORGE in this matter within themselves should be sufficient to justify reconsideration by Senate of his confirmation and allowing time for hearing protest.

The RECORD also demonstrates Senator WHERRY was suspicious of the unusual haste and speed and relied soley on Senator GEORGE'S assurances which in turn were based entirely upon Kern's own statements obviously designed to procure his own confirmation before objections and protests he anticipated would be filed could be considered. I regard Kern's tactics as an outrage and his confirmation obtained by deception a calamity. It seems to me the Senate can reconsider its action any time before Kern

begins serving his new term. Please wire collect if such action can be taken. Please show this wire to Senator WHERRY. I made several unsuccessful attempts to personally contact him while in Washington in March.

O. O. OWENS.

MAY 1, 1950.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of the 28th ultimo acknowledging receipt of my letter of the 20th, enclosing petition, protesting confirmation of John W. Kern as judge of Tax Court received this morning. To avoid repetition I enclose herewith carbon duplicates of Western Union night letters I sent last night to Senators DONNELL and WHERRY, which detail my efforts and describe my diligence in presenting this matter to the Senate far in advance of the filing with the Senate April 20 of the nominations of Judge Kern and two others.

The petition forwarded February 8 last to you, to all the other Senators, to the Members of the House, and the extra copies of the petition filed with the Secretary of the Senate, with the Clerk of the House, and with the committees, including particularly your own Finance Committee, were identical and requested a thorough investigation of the Revenue Department, also the removal from office of all persons connected with that Department who had anything to do with effectuating the frauds described in that petition or with concealing, by the suppression of evidence or otherwise, the facts of such frauds. Such petition also requested the removal from office of all others who had sought to protect those in the Revenue Department engaged in the conspiracies described.

I know of no way to make a stronger protest to the confirmation of the reappointment of a particular person than to ask that he be removed from office for corruption in office. In preparing my petition I assumed that since the Tax Court had been given judicial status, whereas the Board of Tax Appeals had only administrative jurisdiction, the nomination for reappointment of any member of the Tax Court would be referred to your Senate Finance Committee and rereferred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

After having mailed on February 8 last a copy of my petition to each and every Member of the Senate and the House and after having spent the first 2 weeks of March personally contacting as many of the Senators and Representatives as I could in an effort to concentrate their attention on the charges and to enlist their support of an investigation, and since this matter, at Senator BRICKER'S suggestion, was referred in March to the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Executive Expenditures, it seems to me that I have done everything that could be expected of a citizen to call this matter to the attention of Congress and to correct a condition injurious to all taxpayers and no doubt ruinous to many.

In the face of the charges pending with the Senate and your own committee, and in the face of the tactics employed by Judge Kern to precipitously procure confirmation of his renomination, it occurs to me that if if the Senate will not reconsider such confirmation and investigate the charges, the truth of which cannot be denied and has not been denied by the Revenue Department, there is no use in making further attempts to root the Communists out of the administration of our Government.

It is immaterial to taxpayers whether they are robbed by the Revenue Department, particularly by corrupt tactics used and employed by the chief counsel's office and the Board of Tax Appeals, before we go completely communistic or whether we go communistic first and have our possessions confiscated thereafter.

I anticipated the renomination of Judge Kern would be sent to the Senate about May 1. I sent my letter of the 20th and an additional copy of the petition to each Member of the Senate and the House as a "fresher-upper" and reminder for fear that my petition, having laid on file with your own and other committees and with each Member of the Senate and the House since February 10, might be forgotten by May 1. However, I did not anticipate that when the renomination of Judge Kern was received by the Senate it would be rushed through Senate confirmation within 5 days in any event, and particularly with the charges contained in my petition on file with your committee and under investigation by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Executive Expenditures.

I have carefully studied the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 25 and am convinced you were deceived by Judge Kern. Of course not only Judge Kern but most others in the Bureau of Internal Revenue were cognizant of the fact my petition had been filed with Congress. From your own statements appearing in the RECORD of the 25th it is obvious to me that Kern used the false representations and flimsy excuses presented to you as a means of avoiding the customary hearing.

I regard his deceptive tactics as a fraud upon you, upon the Senate Finance Committee, and upon the Senate as a whole, equally as flagrant as the frauds he perpetrated in the case described in my petition. It seems to me his false representations of the urgency of the confirmation of his own nomination should be resented by you and every other Member of the Senate; that the Senate should unanimously vote to reconsider the confirmation of Kern, and should conduct an investigation of his record in the light of his tactics and deception employed in procuring his confirmation.

Sincerely yours,

O. O. OWENS.

MAY 1, 1950.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo which, in turn, acknowledges receipt of my letter of the 20th ultimo opposing the confirmation of John W. Kern for another term on the United States Tax Court.

To avoid repetition I enclose herewith a carbon duplicate of my Western Union night letter sent last night to Senators WHERRY and DONNELL, also carbon copy of my letter of even date to Senator GEORGE protesting the precipitous confirmation of Judge Kern on the fifth day after nomination was received by the Senate.

If the Senate will not reconsider this confirmation and investigate the charges made against Judge Kern the taxpayers of this country—who support the Government, the bureaucrats, the pensioners and others "who toil not, neither do they spin"—had as well give up now and let the Communists take over.

If the taxpayers are to be destroyed and their destroyers rewarded, the consequences to them will be the same as if they are destroyed by the Communists. I sincerely hope you will exert yourself to bring about reconsideration of this confirmation and an investigation of the charges contained in my petition, the truth of which has never been denied by the Revenue Department.

Sincerely yours,

O. O. OWENS.

TULSA, OKLA., *May 6, 1950.*

Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

At 9 tonight I mailed original affidavit by air mail special delivery to you and at 10 o'clock tonight I mailed executed carbon duplicates of affidavit to nine other Senators also by air mail special delivery. All should be delivered tomorrow morning.

O. O. OWENS.

Mr. DONNELL. I also hold in my hand, Mr. President, a copy of the brochure or petition to which Mr. Owens refers. In the interest of economy I am not offering that for printing in the RECORD. It is open at any time to any Senator or anyone else, for that matter, for examination, but it is somewhat lengthy, and I do not think it is necessary to encumber the RECORD with it at this time.

RECESS

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the Fifth Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

Howland H. Sargeant, of Rhode Island.
George D. Stoddard, of Illinois.
Miss Bernice Baxter, of California.
Isidor I. Rabi, of New York.
George F. Zook, of Virginia.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Lee C. Anderson	Eugene T. Howard
William P. Annin	Earle F. Hubacker
Frank J. Bardecki	Harold J. Hubinger
Max G. Baumgardner	Gerald Huelsbeck
Kenneth L. Beckman	George H. Irelan
Robert H. Belter	John A. Jacobs
Ralph F. Bennie	Owen A. Kidd
William B. Bircher	Georg C. Klieser
Morton McK. Boyd II	Harold H. Knight
Robert F. Brennan	Griffith H. Knoop, Jr.
Robert S. Brown	Harold R. Larson
Gerald C. Canaan	Raymond W. Littel
James N. Carr	Theodore A. Loyer
Porter E. Clemens	LeRoy H. Ludi
Edwin M. Crow	Charles R. MacDowell
Richard E. Davis	Allan E. McNally
Raymond E. Demming, Jr.	Ross A. Mathews, Jr.
	Marvin J. Miller
Joseph J. Dupnik	Donald W. Mitchell
Alwyn L. Eisenhauer	Joseph Molnar
Raymond H. Foster	George L. Nicholls
Francis T. Gamble	Frank I. Nulton
James W. Godshalk	Raymond H. Oakes
Howard A. Goldman	Bernard T. O'Laughlin
Joseph C. Grote	Richard J. Owens
Berkeley W. Hall	Gerald "J" Parent
James E. Halle	James A. Parkes
James R. Harrison	John W. Petrick
Allen D. Hauge	Jack Q. Quinn
James A. Helle	John J. Radican
Howard F. Hofmeister	John M. Reynolds, Jr.

Kenneth C. Reynolds	George E. Taylor
Samuel I. Rogers, Jr.	Leonard J. Treichler
Richard N. Romkema	Clyde H. Tuomela
Robert A. Rulis	Martin J. Twite, Jr.
Arthur F. Schneider	Robert J. Vollmer
Joseph E. Sherin	Francis G. Wachowiak
Byran McC. Smith, Jr.	Robert H. Wagner
Jack E. Speiser	Philip E. Webb
Norman E. St. Louis	William A. Wilkinson
Robert F. Stratton	James R. Williams

James W. Greenwood, Jr. (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

Richard L. Baker (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Francis B. Quinlan	John B. Sherman
Alois E. Schmitt, Jr.	Max L. Washington

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy as previously nominated:

Robert G. Adams	Louis Huszar, Jr.
Lawson I. Ainsworth	John P. Jaso, Jr.
Eldon D. Aldred	Seward R. Keim
Richard L. Allen	Addison H. Kermath
Leonard L. Attwell, Jr.	Kenneth E. Klotz
Emory D. Ayers	Walter S. Kmak
Edward McC. Baty	Wilbur S. Leinberry
Gerald L. Bearer	Robert H. Lindquist
Robert L. Berg	Douglas R. Lynch
Robert T. Billington	James H. McFadden
William H. Boden, Jr.	Richard O. McNerney
Stephen R. Caliento	Lonnie A. Marshall
Carrol A. Carr	Robert W. Muery
Edgar S. Carr, Jr.	Robert C. Ockerlund
Billy R. Catherwood	John R. Patterson, Jr.
Victor Chacho	Stanley D. Penny
Stanley L. Clewett	Richard E. Powell
James W. Deardorff	Harland A. Riker, Jr.
Paul G. Eppes	Stanley H. Saulson
Norton H. Falls	Lynn E. Schrier
Richard W. Ferris	John A. Sheffield, Jr.
John W. Ferry	Charles B. Simison
Harold L. Goyette	Porter J. Smith, Jr.
Alfred G. Granieri	Donald E. Stocking
Elmer D. Hamann	Tom D. C. Thomas
Carl C. Hanke, Jr.	Brooks F. Warner
Kenneth E. Heidelberg	William B. Whalley
	James A. Whelan
William B. Henderson	Frank J. Young
Richard W. Huston	Richard M. Young

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Renato T. DiStefano, Jr.	Harvey M. Soldan
	Gene F. Straube
Byron A. Nilsson	

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated:

Lewis D. Cassell	Walter P. Harris, Jr.
Stanley Cohen	John I. Harrison
James J. Connell	Theodore J. Newton, Jr.
Theodore J. Fussell	
Lewis E. Gary	Thomas C. Simons
Jack E. Gove	

George R. Wentz (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated.

Carl Birdwell, Jr. (Naval Reserve aviator), to be an ensign in the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Leon L. Cepparo	Rocco H. Mautone
Lloyd B. Chaisson	William A. Ruel
Robert W. Elliott, Jr.	George E. Sanquist
Theodore C. Enger	Louis F. Snyder, Jr.
David J. Knoedler	Edward F. Sobieski
Howard S. Kramer, Jr.	Carl H. Wilkens, Jr.
Robert F. LeGendre	

Violetta J. Kellagher to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDERS

Julius M. Amberson
Russell H. Blood
Joseph M. Coppoletta

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Oliver P. Smith

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William E. Riley
Robert H. Pepper

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Harry B. Liversedge
Walter W. Wensinger

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James H. Strother	George F. Good, Jr.
Raymond P. Coffman	Merrill B. Twining
James A. Stuart	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Eustace R. Smoak	James M. Masters, Sr.
Sidney S. Wade	William A. Kengla
Guy M. Morrow	Wilbur J. McNenny
Paul E. Wallace	Robert O. Bowen
James F. Climie	

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marlin C. Martin, Jr.

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Pauline E. Perate

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Albert Hartman	John E. Worlund
Robert B. Carney, Jr.	John N. Swartley
Frank Johnson	Marshall C. Gregory
Merwin H. Silverthorn, Jr.	Herbert E. L. Zastrow
	Thomas L. Randall
William L. Dick	Joseph S. Gardner
Joseph E. Fogg	Robert G. McMaster
Fred F. Harbin	Herman Poggemeyer, Jr.
Victor F. Wojcik	
John V. Downs	Allen C. Hendley
Edward L. Roberts	Robert H. Twisdale
Walter Gall	Robert B. Laing
George H. Linnemeier	John W. Bowman
John M. Walker, Jr.	Richard L. Sullivan
John G. McAllister	George W. McHenry, Jr.
Thomas D. Stockwell, Jr.	Angus J. Cronin
Henry M. Bourgeois	William C. Chip
George M. Faser	Joseph F. Donahoe, Jr
William M. Johnston, Jr.	Morris R. Snead
	Ralph H. Spanjer
Fred J. Gilhuly	Harold A. Langstaff, Jr.
Frank H. Brinkman	
Henry P. Huff	Arthur R. Boag
Ernest P. Freeman, Jr.	John E. Hays
Stanley S. Hughes	Archie D. Simpson
Robert E. Kelly	Donald D. Kennedy
William Pelon	John H. Carroll
William N. Case	Frank Mick
Charles W. Korf	John Lowman, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ralph H. Hobbs	Samuel L. Slocum
Caryll A. Price	Joseph C. Schwalke
William F. Watson	Beldon Lidyard
George T. Perschau	John F. Ricard
Robert L. Dickey	Michael J. Sisul
Robert E. Wall	Albert H. Keith
James P. Evans	Irvin H. Elrod
Michael J. Hogan	Walter H. Eastham
John P. Grando	Raymond F. Gotko
Arthur J. Noonan	Robert G. Straine

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Clarence B. Kyle	James B. Shimel
Milton D. Hill	Stuart F. B. Wood
John M. Kusiak	Robert L. Williams
Harry J. T. Ellzey	Vernet R. Fitzgerald
John K. Hogan	Walter Sandusky
George E. Wasson	Donald W. Swanson
Percy F. Avant, Jr.	Clifford A. Fairbairn
David R. Moak	Earl W. Dunsmoor
Alfred G. Carlson	Joseph H. Madey
Thomas A. Durham, Jr.	Alan M. Stewart
Jefferson D. Smith, Jr.	Clarence S. Wick
John I. Loy	Charles W. Byers
Frank C. Caldwell	William Oberhoff
John A. Conway	Gordon L. Rea
David W. Thomson	Lester D. Cox
Harry V. Leasure	Henry L. Knopes
David W. McFarland	Nicholas P. Lengyel
John J. Jarvis, Jr.	John R. Gray
Robert B. Prescott	Dewey D. Raynor
John T. Quinn	Felix T. P. Michaelis
Maynard W. Schmidt	Kenneth L. Shaw
Carl E. Walker	Wilson D. Haigler
John L. Tobin	Laurence A. Duensing
Michael Mosteller	John C. McClelland, Jr.
Charles C. Henderson	Jesse L. Massey
Frank E. Sullivan	William O. Adams
Robert E. Baldwin	Willard T. Henry
Paul C. Trammell	Frederick E. Sparling
Horace W. Card, Jr.	Frederick Bove
Charles S. Rumbold	Paul H. Mikkelsen
Howard I. Dunlap	Joe B. Wrenn
Theodore Edwards	Ralph Barefoot
William E. Mitchell	Oscar W. Cargile
James D. Connolly	Bert A. Green
Leon E. Matthews	John Smolinski
Wayman H. Imus	Bernard E. Kilday
Clifton L. See	Lawrence R. Darner
Robert P. Warner	James C. Wilson
Roy L. Green	

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Margaret M. Henderson
Elsie E. Hill

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Edward H. Rice	Richard E. Moody
Charles W. Weitzel, Jr.	Boyce L. Lassiter
Daniel R. Kingsley	George L. Wineriter
Albert H. Risner	William M. Sigler, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Walter P. Landis	Conrad J. Morgan
John H. Tomlinson	Dudley J. Hagen
Howard E. Morris	David R. McGrew, Jr.
Lornie Leslie	Charles M. Whitley
St. Clair Tant	Russell Tarver
Bill E. Grimes	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the

grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Merle G. Richard
Ralph G. Kregoski
William H. Beckett
Mercer R. Smith
Donald J. Hallameyer
John S. Perrin
Philip J. Keleher
Gerald D. Allen
Gene M. Badgley
Richard S. Togerson
George E. Petro
Samuel F. Martin
John E. Purvis
Ralph M. Head
Gilbert A. Barrett
Darwin B. Pond, Jr.
Edwin T. Carlton
Paul N. Taylor
Samuel E. Helm, Jr.
Marvin L. Berg
Joseph T. Murphy
Harvy C. Hinckel
Emidio Briganti
John McCabe
Walter J. Klimek
Charles R. Leutz, Jr.
Allen R. Semb
John F. Sutkus
Wayne E. Wolcott
Kenneth T. Dykes
"W" "C" Hall
Roy J. Leite, Jr.
Samuel G. Beal
John S. Bostwick
Edgar P. Holt
Edward M. Fleming
Alfred F. McCaleb, Jr.
Walter C. Stewart, Jr.
Walter D. Phillips, Jr.
Ernest W. Payne
Robert W. Allen
Bennett W. Alford
Paul A. Schmuck, Jr.
John H. Thomas
Goodwin C. Groff
James W. Bateman
William R. Gould
Norman C. Wiley
Arthur O. Schmagel
Leroy A. Seipp
John W. Sullivan
Richard A. Winters, Jr.
Charles H. Coppedge
Samuel "J" Griffin
Robert F. Marr
Edward D. Smith
Harrel K. Jobe
Robert W. Shirley
Edwin Pendrey
George S. Mansfield
William J. Halligan
Richard A. Ward
Charles A. Salser
Albert Fowler
Stone W. Quillian
Charles F. Dizney
Harold W. Hawkins
Grady W. Ray
Nicholas J. Dennis
Donald E. Francke
Charles H. Gould
Lynn F. Williams
Howard Ferguson, Jr.
Harry B. Hanson
Kenneth E. Huntington
Frank K. Reilly, Jr.
Roland S. Helstrom
George H. Albers
Norman R. Reichwald
Jesse R. Crone
William A. Danckaert
Elmer Amundson
John W. Johnson
Donald Conroy
Bertram "E" Cook, Jr.
Jerry B. Smith
Richard C. Andrews
Bill E. Horner
George A. Phillips
Arthur W. Ecklund
William E. Register
Lee R. Miller
Edward H. Walker
Paul W. Seabaugh
George H. Cearley, Jr.
Owen G. Jackson, Jr.
Elmer J. Zorn
James D. Johnson, Jr.
John N. Snapper
Wilbur O. Nelson
Philip A. Davis
Daniel G. Murray
George W. Parker
Charles T. Caldwell
William P. Brown, Jr.
Frank J. O'Hara, Jr.
Dale L. Ward
Russell A. Andres
John DeCloud
Arthur W. Newendorp
Byron C. Allison
John M. Jagoda
Thomas A. Gribbin II
Albert A. Grasselli
George J. Collins
George E. Mouzakis
Charles W. Egan
Charles E. Boswell, Jr.
Ralph P. Ward, Jr.
Robert L. Smith
Leland C. Ritter
Merlin L. Dake
Charles R. Howe
Eugene W. Meyer
John J. Fischer
Jack A. Miller
Kenneth G. Fiegener
Donald A. Panska
Charles C. Angle
Guy M. Washburn
Lenhrew E. Lovette
Richard J. Sullivan
Robert F. Warren
Roderick J. Munro
Henry G. Holmes, Jr.
Ruel H. Corley, Jr.
Harry F. Painter
John M. McLaurin, Jr.
Urban A. Lees
William Bradford
Clarence H. Schmid
Bernard J. Stender
Charles D. Dawkins, Jr.
Thomas E. Cooney
Lewis E. Bolts
Donald F. Mileson
Oliver J. Koester
Ward L. Hooper
Robert B. Robinson
Lawrence R. Denham
Alexander Wilson
Robert D. Green
Dwain L. Redalen
Jefferson A. Davis, Jr.
Robert J. Wright
Harold G. McRay
Kenneth L. Anstock
Russell G. Patterson, Jr.
Richard B. Newport
Cornelius T. Montgomery, Jr.
Harvey E. Wendt
Harry O. Taylor
Robert J. Graham
Varge G. Frisbie
John F. McMahon, Jr.
Jack H. Hagler
James W. Ferris
Robert King, Jr.
Roland B. Heilman
Henry J. Jadrich
William L. Atwater, Jr.
Walter E. Daniel
Daniel P. Githens, Jr.
Forrest "I" Townsend
William H. Bortz, Jr.
Harry G. C. Henneberger
William Whitehill
Earl A. Trager, Jr.
William P. Brown
Robert "J" Zitnik
Arnold W. Barden
William H. Roley
Don G. Derryberry
Crawford B. Malone
John J. Hill, III
George Mottl
Joseph B. DeHaven
Dan C. Holland
Sylvester F. Leis
James E. Meehan
William R. Lucas
Robert E. McCarville
Walter N. Roark, Jr.
John O. Kaylor
Richard H. Peacock
Thomas E. Mulvihill
Otis R. Waldrop
Clark Ashton
Thomas H. Hughes
Casimir C. Ksycewski
William J. Peter, Jr.
Donald S. McClellan
Joseph F. Kirby, Jr.
Elmer F. Koehler
John L. Greene
Dail D. Fine
Kenneth L. Fellows
Judson J. Bradway
Dennis E. Byrd
Raymond H. W. Pett
"J" "E" Wellman
Herbert N. Rapson
Joseph Northrup
William J. Kopas

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Virgil W. Head, Cleveland, Ala., in place of M. A. Bynum, resigned.

Oscar Taylor, Holly Pond, Ala., in place of A. C. Byrd, retired.

Otto C. Eppes, Waterloo, Ala., in place of Effie Sego, resigned.

ALASKA

Doris A. Wirsching, Annette, Alaska, in place of R. C. Hutchins, resigned.

James E. Evans, Metlakatla, Alaska, in place of M. M. Benson, declined.

James M. McLean, Nome, Alaska, in place of S. D. Mazen, resigned.

ARIZONA

Ethel R. Parkhurst, Bowie, Ariz., in place of W. I. Welker, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Lois C. Feimster, Wilmot, Ark., in place of E. H. Dunning, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Adeline M. Johnson, Forest Knolls, Calif., in place of Elsie Kramer, deceased.

Zita M. Carriere, Glenn, Calif., in place of M. A. Beat, retired.

Pittman L. Davis, Hermosa Beach, Calif., in place of R. E. Meacham, resigned.

Dorothy A. Abert, Hopland, Calif., in place of Dorathea Dooley, retired.

William Ray Cox, Inyokern, Calif., in place of C. F. Ives, resigned.

Grover A. Deininger, June Lake, Calif., in place of E. H. Hamilton, resigned.

Marie D. Chaffey, Klamath, Calif., in place of E. A. Knudsen, resigned.

Paul E. Geer, Live Oak, Calif., in place of S. H. W. C. Geer, retired.

Elmer M. Martin, Montague, Calif., in place of Thomas Sawkins, resigned.

John D. Orchard, Sr., Pacific Grove, Calif., in place of L. E. Clay, resigned.

Lilliam M. Friedman, Pacoima, Calif., in place of C. C. Foulk, resigned.

James E. Hawkins, Palermo, Calif., in place of I. L. Nelson, resigned.

Gertrude C. Bostrom, Pioneer, Calif. Office established June 1, 1947.

Clara A. Conner, Torrance, Calif., in place of C. E. Conner, deceased.

COLORADO

John T. Weaver, Fruita, Colo., in place of W. E. Gore, deceased.

Glen I. Harshbarger, Victor, Colo., in place of M. W. Huber, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Willis J. Gillette, Roxbury, Conn., in place of A. H. Buckingham, retired.

DELAWARE

Willard Howard Carey, Milton, Del., in place of Otto Dickerson, transferred.

William Berl, Jr., Wilmington, Del., in place of J. J. Cahill, retired.

FLORIDA

Arthur L. Shaw, Callahan, Fla., in place of G. H. Stokes, retired.

Lottie Stripling, Westville, Fla., in place of I. G. Arnold, resigned.

GEORGIA

Carl C. Hobbs, Butler, Ga., in place of C. E. Benns, retired.

Robert E. Nelson, Eatonton, Ga., in place of J. D. Watterson, retired.

Wilber L. Harris, Jonesboro, Ga., in place of J. W. Mundy, retired.

Thomas E. Hicks, Lizella, Ga., in place of W. L. Mosely, resigned.

IDAHO

Ruby G. Bishop, Bliss, Idaho, in place of G. D. McIntosh, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Ray B. Dewhirst, Edinburg, Ill., in place of I. V. Hill, declined.

Robert A. Hanser, Edwardsville, Ill., in place of W. C. Gerke, resigned.

Martin Glenn Weger, Flat Rock, Ill., in place of H. L. Reinoehl, deceased.

James F. Cahl, Glenwood, Ill., in place of M. R. Shine, resigned.

Alvina B. Ensley, Laura, Ill., in place of Jananne McDonnell, transferred.

Mike Kopuster, Livingston, Ill., in place of G. A. Kreuter, resigned.

James Earl Brewer, Makanda, Ill., in place of G. V. Rosson, resigned.

Thomas J. Price, Jr., Oblong, Ill., in place of W. P. Carlton, deceased.

Orville W. Hinton, Ramsey, Ill., in place of D. W. Leigh, retired.

Rann O. Lackey, Tamms, Ill., in place of R. C. Thomason, retired.

Frances M. E. Stueve, Wayne, Ill., in place of W. M. Hennings, deceased.

Robert W. Fletcher, Wyanet, Ill., in place of E. M. Bickford, retired.

INDIANA

Lowell K. Sheese, Bowling Green, Ind., in place of C. W. Woods, resigned.

Harry G. Bollinger, Columbia City, Ind., in place of Ervin Sell, retired.

John Francis Dunmire, Elkhart, Ind., in place of H. M. Hayes, resigned.

Oliver R. Weddle, Hebron, Ind., in place of Grover Wilson, deceased.

John D. St. John, Middletown, Ind., in place of S. M. Fattic, transferred.

Howard S. Zody, Nashville, Ind., in place of C. C. Robertson, deceased.

IOWA

Fred V. Jacobson, Blencoe, Iowa, in place of S. J. Gray, retired.

James M. Townsend, Britt, Iowa, in place of E. F. MacVey, transferred.

Edward Hadden, Churdan, Iowa, in place of Charles FitzPatrick, retired.

John W. Miller, Harper, Iowa, in place of K. A. Clarahan, retired.

Eddie C. Wirds, Iowa Falls, Iowa, in place of O. K. Dick, deceased.

Frederick J. Carolan, Ridgeway, Iowa, in place of P. J. Carolan, retired.

Merrill R. Williams, Shell Rock, Iowa, in place of Dan Jerolaman, resigned.

Edmund C. Maher, Sidney, Iowa, in place of L. C. Thorp, resigned.

Carl M. Hansen, Thornton, Iowa, in place of J. F. Courtney, deceased.

KANSAS

Jack D. Vance, Coldwater, Kans., in place of Eyman Phebus, retired.

Mary Charlene Arrington, Haviland, Kans., in place of H. R. Ellis, declined.

Muriel M. Metz, Hudson, Kans., in place of A. J. Mueller, transferred.

George D. Massey, Hugoton, Kans., in place of M. E. McCreery, resigned.

Floyd C. Swain, Soldier, Kans., in place of G. F. Riley, retired.

Velma R. Crowley, Wilsey, Kans., in place of H. M. Otis, retired.

KENTUCKY

Emily I. Coy, Boston, Ky., in place of M. H. Shawley, resigned.

Clyde V. Moorhead, Brooksville, Ky., in place of J. B. Pope, transferred.

Fred M. Lindsey, Crestwood, Ky., in place of C. W. Hardin, retired.

William H. Lillard, Crittenden, Ky., in place of M. L. Allphin, retired.

Flurry Edward Thomas, Dry Ridge, Ky., in place of Lola McCoy, resigned.

Nathan W. Carter, Jr., Fulton, Ky., in place of R. B. Huddleston, deceased.

W. Lewis Horton, Grayson, Ky., in place of M. S. Heard, resigned.

Lee C. Ray, Harlan, Ky., in place of N. B. Myers, resigned.

Martine S. Hughart, Island, Ky., in place of M. K. Hall, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Lester S. Gonzales, Gonzales, La., in place of L. M. Coroy, transferred.

Earl E. Spencer, Hammond, La., in place of L. A. Sims, resigned.

MARYLAND

Ruth B. Parent, Betterton, Md., in place of T. B. Crew, deceased.

Gertrude L. Hopkins, Cordova, Md., in place of N. J. Hutchison, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

Patrick J. McAndrews, Adams, Mass., in place of J. P. McAndrews, resigned.

Robert Earle Taylor, Berlin, Mass., in place of K. E. Andrews, deceased.

Raymond H. Horton, Hadley, Mass., in place of E. C. Pelissier, retired.

Helen M. Mann, Hampden, Mass., in place of M. B. Sargent, removed.

Jacob Greenberg, Manchester, Mass., in place of H. T. Swett, deceased.

William J. Houlihan, Tewksbury, Mass., in place of A. J. Fairgrieve, retired.

MICHIGAN

William Bombyk, Applegate, Mich., in place of E. E. Hawes, retired.

William R. Shortridge, Big Bay, Mich., in place of H. L. Hansen, resigned.

Elmer L. Wittenberg, Constantine, Mich., in place of G. W. Pidgeon, retired.

Merle E. Kinney, Davisburg, Mich., in place of C. K. Nelsey, resigned.

John T. Fahey, Goodells, Mich., in place of G. H. Fowler, retired.

Glenn R. Sabourin, Hillman, Mich., in place of K. B. Slattery, transferred.

Robert L. Taylor, Lapeer, Mich., in place of G. D. Thompson, deceased.

Theodore W. Johnson, Ludington, Mich., in place of W. H. Cuthbertson, deceased.

Lucile M. Mayer, Merrill, Mich., in place of Matthew O'Toole, retired.

Calvin F. McDivitt, Jr., Morrice, Mich., in place of K. I. Stanley, retired.

Mary Lee Hawkes, Orchard Lake, Mich., in place of M. I. Asher, resigned.

Hubert A. Marcotte, Wolverine, Mich., in place of Jettena Watson, retired.

MINNESOTA

Joseph I. Malerich, Akeley, Minn., in place of C. F. Olafson, transferred.

Urban F. Grunloh, Avon, Minn., in place of R. A. Schmid, transferred.

Duane W. Bellefeuille, Callaway, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ellsworth J. Peterson, Chisago City, Minn., in place of Eric Lind, deceased.

Verona B. Bloedow, Clements, Minn., in place of H. E. Pederson, resigned.

Milton L. Paus, Eitzen, Minn., in place of Bertha Bunge, retired.

Clayton L. Guthier, Emmons, Minn., in place of William Guthier, retired.

Maud R. Olson, Lake Crystal, Minn., in place of B. W. Cole, resigned.

Russell A. Dickey, Loretto, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Roe R. Waterfield, Milaca, Minn., in place of C. A. Allen, deceased.

Vivian L. Guse, Withrow, Minn., in place of D. S. Kelson, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

William W. Cochran, Merigold, Miss., in place of V. L. Harrington, deceased.

MISSOURI

Lindall L. Arndt, Clever, Mo., in place of Rolla Hayes, resigned.

Johnny C. Everett, Gower, Mo., in place of Fannie McClintock, deceased.

Joseph H. Goeke, Greentop, Mo., in place of Z. C. Miller, retired.

Francis B. Bockwinkel, Liguori, Mo. Office established April 1, 1948.

Doyle H. Hurley, Livonia, Mo., in place of I. B. O'Briant, retired.

Jesse Clyde Butler, Macon, Mo., in place of C. E. Sears, retired.

Richard Woodson, Middletown, Mo., in place of H. L. Cohagen, resigned.

Kenneth H. Perry, Noel, Mo., in place of J. R. Howerton, transferred.

Stiefel J. Wilkerson, Novelty, Mo., in place of Christena Ramsey, retired.

MONTANA

Glen E. Roose, Eureka, Mont., in place of L. W. Fetterly, retired.

Charles L. Beers, Judith Gap, Mont., in place of C. J. Morgan, retired.

NEBRASKA

Dale M. Larsen, Hardy, Nebr., in place of K. C. Pedersen, declined.

Byrel M. Lang, Litchfield, Nebr., in place of J. W. Jensen, transferred.

Dora E. Waldo, Nehawka, Nebr., in place of L. L. Kime, resigned.

Harold J. Camp, Petersburg, Nebr., in place of E. H. Mack, deceased.

Russel E. Polly, Wauneta, Nebr., in place of O. E. McCallum, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Lewis Marshall, North Stratford, N. H., in place of H. H. Hinman, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Clifford H. Smock, Bedminster, N. J., in place of M. A. Smock, deceased.

Frederick G. McKeon, Butler, N. J., in place of J. J. McMinn, transferred.

Peter F. McGlade, Gloucester City, N. J., in place of L. C. Parker, retired.

Edna V. Sharp, Island Heights, N. J., in place of John Netterman, resigned.

Joseph Murray, New Milford, N. J., in place of G. W. Eggers, resigned.

John P. Reilly, West Milford, N. J., in place of Margaret Butterfield, deceased.

Emma Walls, Zarephath, N. J., in place of Louis Meretta, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Mable A. Wimberly, Hollywood, N. Mex., in place of A. V. Young, resigned.

NEW YORK

Hoysradt Porter, Ancram, N. Y., in place of W. H. Porter, Jr., deceased.

Fletcher R. Ward, Bemus Point, N. Y., in place of Gerald Aldrich, resigned.

Robert C. Benedict, Broadalbin, N. Y., in place of H. E. Benedict, resigned.

Clyde L. Nightingale, Byron, N. Y., in place of S. G. Simmons, deceased.

John J. McTiernan, Central Islip, N. Y., in place of James O'Doherty, deceased.

Michael S. Valvo, Forestville, N. Y., in place of H. A. Dye, resigned.

Charles K. Myers, Frewsburg, N. Y., in place of A. W. Stitt, removed.

George F. Byrne, Fulton, N. Y., in place of W. J. Hartnett, retired.

James V. Corrigan, Gardenville, N. Y., in place of Albert Werner, deceased.

Chauncey A. Campbell, Glen Cove, N. Y., in place of J. E. Burns, retired.

Esther M. Bell, Glen Spey, N. Y., in place of M. H. Ellison, resigned.

Margaret M. Humes, Great Bend, N. Y., in place of F. A. M. Humes, deceased.

Roger B. Griffiths, Keuka Park, N. Y., in place of A. J. Griffiths, retired.

Amelia M. Trainor, Monsey, N. Y., in place of E. M. Trainor, retired.

James J. Sullivan, Quogue, N. Y., in place of E. H. Stevens, resigned.

Harland Smith, Springfield Center, N. Y., in place of B. P. Wood, retired.

Claude Willett Mount, Three Mile Bay, N. Y., in place of W. W. Mount, retired.

Frank M. Colwell, Walden, N. Y., in place of Fred Burns, retired.

David H. Miller, West Chazy, N. Y., in place of H. D. Carlton, retired.

Harry Northrup, Wurtsboro, N. Y., in place of C. E. Meyers, resigned.

Thomas A. Brown, Wyandanch, N. Y., in place of C. J. McMahon, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Zeb Meadows, Franklin, N. C., in place of T. W. Porter, retired.

Earl S. Holliman, Lake Lure, N. C., in place of H. L. Adams, declined.

Lottie M. J. Buie, Wagram, N. C., in place of M. S. Cooley, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Clarence A. Nelson, Drake, N. Dak., in place of E. R. Christensen, retired.

Eugene F. Simek, Fullerton, N. Dak., in place of J. P. Ackerman, transferred.

OHIO

John F. Shumway, Avon, Ohio, in place of C. T. Wilford, retired.

Harold L. Caylor, Bath, Ohio. Office established September 1, 1948.

Carl E. Schaad, Burbank, Ohio, in place of C. W. Hanna, resigned.

Lawrence A. Pheifer, Collins, Ohio, in place of G. M. S. Reer, retired.

Mary C. Debney, Corning, Ohio, in place of Virgil Davis, resigned.

Eldon L. Martin, Cygnet, Ohio, in place of E. R. Martin, deceased.

George M. Hanlon, Jr., Hamersville, Ohio, in place of G. M. Hanlon, deceased.

James E. Snee, Massillon, Ohio, in place of F. W. Justus, retired.

Harold W. Keiser, North Fairfield, Ohio, in place of J. W. Graham, resigned.

Roger M. Beal, Oxford, Ohio, in place of R. W. Schocke, retired.

William M. Widmer, Pioneer, Ohio, in place of F. F. Wyman, transferred.

Franklin E. Smith, Portsmouth, Ohio, in place of G. L. Gableman, retired.

James R. Schroth, Ripley, Ohio, in place of W. W. Norris, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Howard D. Francis, Blair, Okla., in place of J. K. Jones, retired.

George A. Wilson, Jay, Okla., in place of L. E. Capehart, resigned.

Willie B. Austin, Locust Grove, Okla., in place of E. L. Smith, resigned.

James W. Wheeler, Mangum, Okla., in place of W. L. Norman, deceased.

Jack A. Drury, Olustee, Okla., in place of B. F. Pryor, resigned.

Marie C. Forbes, Ralston, Okla., in place of O. E. Spaulding, retired.

Roy H. Marlatt, Ringwood, Okla., in place of O. E. Marlatt, transferred.

Ralph O. Farmer, Tyrone, Okla., in place of W. N. Wadley, transferred.

Raymond F. Frizzell, Weatherford, Okla., in place of J. M. Crabtree, resigned.

John W. Nicks, Wetumka, Okla., in place of J. T. Watson, removed.

OREGON

Josephine C. Zadina, Chiloquin, Oreg., in place of A. M. Elliott, resigned.

Lawrence L. Story, Malin, Oreg., in place of P. A. Carsley, resigned.

Lloyd R. Johnson, Moro, Oreg., in place of J. C. Freeman, retired.

Ray L. Jenkins, Toledo, Oreg., in place of Rosemary Schenck, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Minnie Mae Grey, Boston, Pa., in place of Marjorie Lowery, removed.

Chester J. Kukleski, Braddock, Pa., in place of Jennie Moran, retired.

Daniel J. Cullinan, Cambridge Springs, Pa., in place of A. F. Ellis, resigned.

Rosemary F. Schettig, Ebensburg, Pa., in place of A. M. Schettig, retired.

James S. Newton, Ellwood City, Pa., T. A. Wilson, retired.

Donald J. Watts, Millville, Pa., in place of J. C. Watts, deceased.

Arthur E. Stanfield, Renfrew, Pa., in place of Lafayette Lawrence, retired.

Ralph M. Henry, Rochester Mills, Pa., in place of W. M. Stewart, transferred.

David M. Barnhart, Stoystown, Pa., in place of F. J. Fulton, retired.

Carrie M. Ketner, Strausstown, Pa., in place of C. W. Henne, retired.

Sarah E. Vensel, West Alexander, Pa., in place of C. C. Davis, resigned.

Jerry J. Kasprisin, Yukon, Pa., in place of Jenny Paterson, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William L. Antley, Elloree, S. C., in place of E. B. Mack, removed.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John Obenauer, Eureka, S. Dak., in place of E. L. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Vaino E. Bajuniemi, Lake Norden, S. Dak., in place of F. L. Hayes, resigned.

Ralph L. Fossum, Lily, S. Dak., in place of D. I. Olson, deceased.

Delmar J. Hamiel, Reliance, S. Dak., in place of F. J. Bowar, deceased.

Ardean A. Twite, Veblen, S. Dak., in place of T. H. Simpson, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Clayre Wesley White, Bethpage, Tenn., in place of L. D. Seay, retired.

Garland T. Wilson, Cottagegrove, Tenn., in place of W. B. Olds, retired.

Harry M. Patillo, Eagleville, Tenn., in place of H. K. Stephenson, transferred.

R. Ray Tate, Estill Springs, Tenn., in place of R. G. Leech, transferred.

Thomas H. Graham, Jr., Taft, Tenn., in place of J. T. Malone, deceased.

TEXAS

Charles V. Speer, Carrizo Springs, Tex., in place of M. E. Cook, deceased.

Mary D. Maxwell, Country Campus, Tex. Office established September 1, 1948.

Billy B. Holland, Estelline, Tex., in place of G. J. Ballard, resigned.

Edna B. Smith, La Vernia, Tex., in place of W. L. Wiseman, transferred.

Miriam S. Chatelle, Los Fresnos, Tex., in place of H. W. Derda, resigned.

Mittie L. Taylor, New Willard, Tex., in place of J. H. Victery, resigned.

Prentice F. Vance, Orangefield, Tex., in place of F. N. Bland, retired.

Guy H. Holman, Pittsburg, Tex., in place of C. C. Truitt, transferred.

Ellen C. Woodruff, Port Aransas, Tex., in place of M. V. Denton, resigned.

Celestia Dodson, Sandia, Tex., in place of M. C. Cox, resigned.

VERMONT

Robert F. Brown, Groton, Vt., in place of G. N. Clark, retired.

VIRGINIA

James R. Jones, Holland, Va., in place of B. W. Councill, retired.

Mary R. J. Sizemore, Hurley, Va., in place of N. J. Carroll, removed.

Carl S. Hendricks, Lebanon, Va., in place of H. W. Easterly, declined.

WASHINGTON

Margaret Hedrick, Creston, Wash., in place of I. G. Spencer, retired.

Earl C. Carey, Hartline, Wash., in place of R. E. Carey, deceased.

Florence Opal Hurl, Malden, Wash., in place of E. E. Cain, retired.

Nels D. Nelson, Naselle, Wash., in place of M. J. Rasmussen, resigned.

Donald M. Richardson, Tonasket, Wash., in place of D. S. Farver, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Merriman S. Smith, Bluefield, W. Va., in place of R. L. Bailey, resigned.

Paul M. Satterfield, Carolina, W. Va., in place of T. W. Alkire, resigned.

Helen M. B. Joyce, Crumpler, W. Va., in place of N. V. Duncan, retired.

Pansy Lee Seacrist, Montcoal, W. Va., in place of C. M. Nestor, resigned.

Johnny A. Aliff, Oceana, W. Va., in place of Vida Chambers, retired.

Junior Lee Gerrard, Wolf Summit, W. Va., in place of J. N. Flanigan, retired.

WISCONSIN

Cecil H. Pandow, Brodhead, Wis., in place of A. G. Anderson, transferred.

Henry A. Rechlicz, Hales Corners, Wis., in place of W. F. Schreiber, deceased.

Arthur E. Carstens, Hilbert, Wis., in place of C. H. Eldridge, transferred.

Bernice M. Matson, Taylor, Wis., in place of C. M. Dunn, retired.

Hazel B. Mason, Wales, Wis., office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Ray J. Heinzen, Whitelaw, Wis., in place of J. A. Heinzen, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we daily be inspired with fidelity to our high calling and trust as leaders in the affairs of government by being loyal to that which is noble and true.

Grant that we may understand that our first loyalty must be to Thee and that this is the basis and inspiration of all the other loyalties of our mortal life.

We confess with sorrow and shame that we are continually violating and breaking faith with the sanctity of this supreme loyalty.

We have failed to see that this is the reason why our social order is weak and in peril and why we are making so little progress in achieving a finer and nobler civilization.

Search and cleanse our minds and hearts and fill them with a greater and more steadfast loyalty to Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 6, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 5, 1950:

H. R. 2919. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse;

H. R. 4080. An act to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice;

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H. R. 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps;

H. R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations;

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950.

On May 6, 1950:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7797. An act to provide foreign economic assistance.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FIRST GENERATION AMERICANS WHO ARE IN CONGRESS FORCIBLY ILLUSTRATE OPPORTUNITIES OPEN TO AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I took a census of Congress to determine how many Members were the sons of immigrants.

It is interesting to note that about 18 percent of the Members of the Eighty-first Congress have one or both parents who came from a foreign country. In other words, almost one out of every five Members is an American citizen of the first generation of his family to live in America.

This illustrates forcibly the advantages and opportunities which the United States offers to its citizens. This group of Members probably have a better conception of the benefits of our citizenship than any other of our citizens. The reason is that they have heard from the lips of their parents the great advantages which this country

offers to its people, compared to the opportunities elsewhere.

Look magazine heard of this and was interested enough in the information, and its importance, to devote a page of their national magazine to printing the list of those who are the sons of immigrants in the present Congress. Look magazine should be congratulated on publishing this information, which so forcibly points up American opportunities.

Following is a list of these Members indicating from what countries their parents migrated to America:

SENATORS

Austria: WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota, mother.

Czechoslovakia: ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Kansas, mother.

England: GUY CORDON, Oregon, father; SHERIDAN DOWNEY, California, mother; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado, mother; ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah, father and mother.

Germany: HERBERT H. LEHMAN, New York, father and mother.

Ireland: EDWARD L. LEAHY, Rhode Island, father; PAT MCCARRAN, Nevada, father and mother; JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana, father and mother; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming, father and mother.

Norway: HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota, mother; EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota, father and mother; ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin, father and mother.

Sweden: CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico, father; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado, father.

REPRESENTATIVES

Alsace-Lorraine; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan, father and mother.

Austria: JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota, father and mother; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, New York, father and mother; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania, father; JACOB K. JAVITS, New York, father; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York, father and mother; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska, father.

Canada: JAMES V. BUCKLEY, Illinois, father and mother; AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island, father and mother; DONALD L. O'TOOLE, New York, father; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Connecticut, mother.

Czechoslovakia: ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois, father and mother; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska, mother.

Denmark: H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota, father and mother; REVA BECK BOSONE, Utah, father; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa, father and mother; NORRIS POULSON, California, father.

England: WESLEY A. D'EWART, Montana, father; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, California, mother; RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington, mother; NOAH M. MASON, Illinois, father; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania, mother; JOHN SANBORN, Idaho, mother.

Germany: LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois, mother; ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, North Carolina, father; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan, mother; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland, father and mother; WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah, mother; RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, Illinois, father; WILLIAM LEMKE, North Dakota, father; EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, Nebraska, mother; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wiscopsin, father.

Hungary: ARTHUR G. KLEIN, New York, father and mother.

Ireland: FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming, mother; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, father and mother; CLYDE DOYLE, California, father; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Pennsylvania, father and mother; JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, New York, father and mother; EDNA F. KELLY, New York, father and mother; PAUL J. KILDAY, Texas, father; THOMAS J. LANE, Massachusetts, father and mother; NEIL J. LINEHAN, Illinois, father; CHRISTOPHER MCGRATH, New York, father; MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana, father and mother; MARY T. NORTON, New Jersey, father and mother; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois, father and mother; HARRY P. O'NEILL, Pennsylvania, father and mother; T. VINCENT QUINN, New York, father and mother; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, father and mother; JOHN F. SHELLEY, California, father; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California, father and mother.

Italy: HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey, father and mother; ANTHONY CAVALCANTE, Pennsylvania, father and mother; L. GARY CLEMENTE, New York, father and mother; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan, father; FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts, father; VITO MARCANTONIO, New York, mother; PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey, father; ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, New York, father and mother.

Luxemburg: JOHN B. BENNETT, Michigan, mother.

Norway: AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota, father and mother; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota, father and mother; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington, father and mother; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Washington, father.

Palestine: JACOB K. JAVITS, New York, mother.

Poland: CHESTER A. CHESNEY, Illinois, father and mother; THOMAS S. GORDON, Illinois, father and mother; CHESTER C. GORSKI, New York, father and mother JOHN LESINSKI, Michigan, father and mother; ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, Connecticut, father and mother; ANTONI N. SADLAK, Connecticut, father and mother; GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, Michigan, father and mother; CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, father and mother.

Rumania: LOUIS B. HELLER, New York, father and mother.

Scotland: FRANK BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania, father; ROBERT CROSSER, Ohio, father and mother; WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah, father; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, California, father; HUGH B. MITCHELL, Washington, father; ROBERT L. RAMSAY, West Virginia, father and mother.

Spain: ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico, father.

Sweden: LEROY JOHNSON, California, father; WALTER NORBLAD, Oregon, father.

Wales: IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania, father and mother; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio, father and mother; NOAH M. MASON, Illinois, mother; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania, father; EDWARD H. REES, Kansas, father.

These Congressmen are foreign-born: ROBERT CROSSER, Scotland; NOAH M. MASON, Wales; ROBERT L. RAMSAY, England; ADOLPH J. SABATH, Czechoslovakia; KARL STEFAN, Czechoslovakia; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Canada.

COST OF THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, we still have before us this huge deficit-spending bill of around $29,000,000,000.

I think the record should show that while we struggle here—week after week, day after day, last Saturday included—trying to reduce these proposed expenditures, President Truman left Washington yesterday afternoon on a tour to advocate new ways of spending money.

If he were making this tour into 16 States to explain to the American people the country's precarious fiscal situation and the absolute necessity of saving every dollar possible, the taxpayers would probably consider this extraordinary expense estimated at $250,000 to pay for this trip to be a good investment.

Unfortunately, that is not the purpose of the trip. He is making this trip to repeat his promises of something for everyone which in the end mean nothing for anyone.

The American people recognize that we are in a period of ruinous inflation and well on the road to national bankruptcy, and I do not think President Truman will be able to persuade them to commit financial suicide by adopting his socialistic spending program.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, Dear Mr. President: Bon voyage. The eyes of Texas are upon you.

SEVENTH REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foerign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the seventh report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) as well as the programs of economic aid to China under section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.), and Public Laws 154 and 196, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States Foreign Relief Program (Public

Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States Foreign Aid Program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended December 31, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 1950.*

MILK PRODUCTION IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this House to a fact that is quite frequently overlooked, namely, that the State of New York is the greatest milk-producing State after the great State of Wisconsin.

Our State, I think, most unfortunately, is too often confused and overshadowed by New York City and people outside of our borders are prone to look upon all New Yorkers as city slickers.

I have the honor to represent Delaware County, which county has again, for the tenth consecutive year, been declared in first place as the leading milk-producing county in the State of New York. The 381,000,000 pounds of milk received from this county at pool-approved plants during last year had a value of more than $15,500,000 at uniform prices, according to the Milk Marketing Administrator. The 10 top counties listed in order of value of milk produced in the State of New York are as follows: Delaware, St. Lawrence, Jefferson, Oneida, Chenango, Madison, Otsego, Herkimer, Orange, also in my district, and Portland Counties.

The total value of milk products produced in the State of New York in the year 1949 was $366,995,000.

It is therefore fair to say that the dairy industry is one of the most important as well as the most necessary industries in our whole State and also in our Nation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 155]

Angell	Cooley	Gwinn
Barden	Cox	Hall,
Barrett, Pa.	Crosser	Edwin Arthur
Bates, Ky.	Davenport	Hare
Bolling	Davies, N. Y.	Hart
Boykin	Dawson	Hays, Ark.
Breen	Deane	Hébert
Buckley, N. Y.	Douglas	Herter
Carlyle	Eaton	Huber
Carnahan	Fernandez	Javits
Case, N. J.	Gilmer	Judd
Case, S. Dak.	Gore	Kearns
Cavalcante	Granahan	Kelley, Pa.
Chatham	Grant	Kennedy
Chudoff	Green	Keogh
Kunkel	Morton	Simpson, Pa.
Lane	Moulder	Smith, Ohio
Larcade	Nelson	Staggers
Lichtenwalter	Nixon	Stigler
Linehan	Norton	Towe
McConnell	Pfeifer,	Underwood
McGrath	Joseph L.	Walsh
McMillen, Ill.	Powell	Werdel
Mack, Ill.	Priest	White, Calif.
Macy	Quinn	Wickersham
Madden	Redden	Willis
Merrow	Rhodes	Wilson, Ind.
Miles	Richards	Wolcott
Miller, Calif.	Roosevelt	Wood
Morgan	Sadlak	
Morrison	Scott, Hardie	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and forty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE TOUR OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's speech-making, handshaking tour is a desperate attempt to convince the voters of Iowa and other States into believing that the President and his party, now in control of Congress and the White House, are in no way responsible for the drop in farm income, wages, and business, which has taken place since his party took control of Congress on January 3, 1949, after 2 years of Republican congressional control during which time farm income, wages, and business was at an all-time high, because during that time our free-enterprise system was permitted to operate full speed ahead without threats, reprisals, or hindrance from Congress.

That free American breathing spell came to an abrupt end in November 1948, because there were too few deep-thinking people who took the time to vote. And what a terrific penalty they and every American has paid ever since.

Also, I have no doubt that the President will tell the people that he and his party have rid the Government of the immoral perverts and communists, when the fact is that had it not been for such fearless, patriotic, public servants as our Senator Hickenlooper, of Iowa, Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, and J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, America might well this very moment be dominated completely by the Socialists and Communists in Government, to whom the President has never missed a chance to give aid and comfort.

Now, of course, some folks will go to see the President of the United States. We Americans are big enough to pay due respect to the highest office of our land, but we have also the right as free-born Americans to expect the man who holds that high office to live up to the oath of office he solemnly took and which made him President of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Mr. Boris Shishkin, Director of the European Labor Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a statement on Home Demonstration Week.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an article on Alaskan statehood and in the other a statement by Mr. Benjamin Fairless.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Star.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include newspaper and magazine articles.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Chicago Sun-Times, also an editorial.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter concerning certain imports into the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two

instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in one to include a statement by the distinguished Ira Dean McCoy, doctor of medicine, on the subject The Truth About Federal Health Insurance appearing in the Huron (Mich.) News of February 17; in another to include a letter from the distinguished Admiral C. E. Rosendahl in support of the metal clad lighter-than-air ship; and in another to include a statement, letter, and resolution of the International Union of Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Mr. JACKSON of California as given before the Marine Corps Association on Saturday last.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER IX. CIVIL FUNCTIONS

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to announce that consideration of amendments to chapter VIII of the pending bill was concluded on Saturday last. The Clerk will now begin reading chapter IX on page 332, line 1 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SIGNAL CORPS

ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Alaska Communication System, including purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $3,000,000, to remain available until the close of the fiscal year 1952, and in addition not to exceed 15 per centum of the current fiscal year receipts of the Alaska Communication System may be merged with and used for the purposes of this appropriation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I can hear a 13-car presidential train going down the track with smoke coming out of her old smoke stack, costing the taxpayers $250,000 for a 10-day political jaunt. It seems to me that is a lot of money, and we ought to know where we are going to get it, and I do not know why we should spend it. Whoo-whoo-whoo! Whistle stop.

Ladies and gentlemen of America, we are now going to tell you that the Brannan plan is the proper thing for this country to take upon yourselves, and just remember that the subsidies that we are going to pay all of you people are going to help you greatly. Who cares for expenses. Choo-choo-choo rolling down the track. Whoo-whoo-whoo! Here that old train is stopping again.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is on the wrong road. He is in Alaska.

Mr. RICH. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you that the Taft-Hartley Act ought to be changed, but the Congress of the United States would not change it in 2 weeks as I thought they would; months have gone by. It is going to take us 2 years to change it. You will have to elect a lot of people to Congress this fall so that we can change the Taft-Hartley Act, and it is going to cost you a lot of money to do that.

Just remember this, that the train is rolling along now, and the President is telling the people of this country just what is going to happen. If they do not obey his orders.

Choo-choo-choo! Whoo-whoo-whoo! Now here we come, citizens. We are going to tell you about the economy that we want in Government. You know, we talk economy and yet we want to spend all the money you can spend, and now we are going down the road $7,000,000,000 in debt. Just remember this, $7,000,000,000 does not mean much, because we expect our children to pay that debt. But, we are going to ask for more taxes. Now, when we give you more taxes, then you ought to be happy in this country.

Choo-choo-choo! Here we come. Whoo-whoo-whoo! Now we are going to tell you ladies and gentlemen of America that we are going to have a draft. We want a draft so that we can get more people in the Army. You know, it did not work very well the last couple of years; we did not need it, but we are going to get closer to war, and as we get closer to war we are going to need the draft and we are going to spend more money to aid the Army. The bigger our Army the more the cost.

Choo-choo-choo! Whoo-whoo-whoo! Just remember, ladies and gentlemen of this country, what is happening in foreign countries. We have got to spend money to help all these foreign countries. They need it badly, and we do not care anything about taxes in this country. So, let us give them the money and give them all they want. That is the way we will make this country prosperous—by trying to aid them. We care nothing for debt.

Choo-choo-choo! There goes that train going down the track. Whoo-whoo-whoo! Communism in America. That is just something that the Republicans talk about. You know that it is just a red herring that they are trying to draw across the trail of efficient government.

Choo-choo-choo! Whoo-whoo-whoo! Little business. Little business is coming into its own now. We are going to help little business. Little business needs the money. The bankers will not lend them the money and we are going to give it to them. We care nothing for debt or taxes. Who says we are going bankrupt? Only the Republicans.

Choo-choo-choo! Whoo-whoo-whoo! On the road down to socialism. As we come down the road to socialism and pump priming we are going to tell the people of this country that that is what we have to do. Choo-choo-choo! Have the Government run business. Stop that train, Mr. Conductor. This is America, and I want to tell the people that we will run the country for them. Be patient, America, we will take you all for a ride.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is a rather peculiar time in the history of our country for us to be descending to discourses on petty politics such as we have just had here. I think we ought to recognize that in times like these we have some serious problems on our hands, problems with which you and I are trying to grapple.

But I cannot help, as long as there have been some observations made on the floor, to recall that only last Saturday I paid a visit to the State of the gentleman who just preceded me in the well of the House. I made a speech at Philadelphia last Saturday. While I was there I took occasion to consult with some of the leading citizens of that area to find out what was happening in the State of Pennsylvania.

I found in one sense nothing new. I found the same old crowd that for years has been dominant in the politics of the State of Pennsylvania is still very much on top of the heap. I am referring, of course, to what is commonly known as the Grundy machine. Many years ago when I taught at the University of Pennsylvania the Grundy machine was on top of the heap. It still is. Anyone who has ever taken the trouble to study even in the most casual manner the politics of Pennsylvania and, for that matter, the politics of the United States, knows very well what the Gundy machine has meant. The Grundy machine has been an organization concerned only with the interests of one group of citizens. It has been concerned exclusively with the interests of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and the kind of legislation which the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association wants.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority floor leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it not true that Governor Duff has accused Grundy of controlling the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, and accused them in turn of controlling and owning the Republican Party and controlling the State? I would be interested to know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is a Duff man or a Grundy man.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am for a good, sound administration in the State of Pennsylvania, and we are going to have it. We are not going to ask anybody from the State of Wisconsin or Massachusetts to tell us how to run the State of Pennsylvania, because we get along up there and we always have. We are a hard-working people, industrious, honest, and conscientious.

Mr. Grundy is one of the citizens of this country who asked for labor to have jobs by having a high tariff, and I am with Mr. Grundy on that. I am against the reciprocal-trade agreements because they are going to wreck this country, throw labor out of employment, and close down industry.

If that is what you want, you are going to get it. The quicker you turn back, the better it will be.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. About all the gentleman from Pennsylvania said was that he is opposed to sin—but what does he stand for on the positive side?

Mr. BIEMILLER. While I was in Pennsylvania, I made an observation on the subject referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts. There is a very interesting internecine warfare going on in the Republican Party of Pennsylvania. The Governor of Pennsylvania, as correctly stated by the majority leader, has been out, really been out against the Grundy machine and has pointed out facts that many of us have known for a great many years—but which not many Republicans are willing to talk about. That is that the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and their allies in the power trust, through Joe Grundy, have been running the State of Pennsylvania. In the course of this very interesting internal fight, some interesting things have happened in the politics of the State of Pennsylvania. We have found, for example, that one self-styled Republican liberal who came originally from the Middle West, Mr. Harold Stassen, who is now president of the University of Pennsylvania, is obviously more concerned with using that high position as a sounding board for self-seeking politics than he is in trying to administer the affairs of the University of Pennsylvania because he is now in this campaign with everything he has. This alleged liberal, this self-styled liberal, is now lined up with the Grundy machine in this fight, a rather interesting transition for one who was prating during recent months of what a great white hope he was for liberalism in the Republican Party. Of course, we in the Middle West are not overly surprised for we have long known that Mr. Stassen is concerned primarily with just one project—the self-advancement of Harold Stassen. Evidently he is convinced the Grundy machine will win in Pennsylvania.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances and utilities, at stations of the Alaska Communication System, as authorized by act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims as authorized by law (28 U. S. C. 2672); $1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) a cost per family unit in excess of $28,000 for construction, including kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of $5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 334, line 20, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,877,920."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment sought to bring the construction appropriation for the Alaska Communication System to $2,877,920 from the House committee allowance of $1,000,000 represents construction of buildings for technical equipment in the amount of $2,216,000 for radio transmitters, receivers, and the necessary power equipment for the operation of the equipment and construction of 28 sets of family quarters in the amount of $661,920 to be used mainly for noncommissioned officers.

In the entire Alaska Communication System of 42 stations there is technical equipment valued at about $3,000,000. It is imperative that this equipment which is now installed in the wartime buildings which are either tar-paper-covered shacks or quonset huts be replaced with new buildings as the old buildings have now deteriorated to a point where they are beyond economical repair.

The Department of the Army has recently advertised for bids for the construction of four types of family houses to be built at Fort Richardson, Alaska, and the type of construction and the size is reduced from the previous standards built in this area. The low bid for a single unit of the military construction, on the assumption that 400 would be built, was $15,000. The unit cost at Anchorage for the Alaska Communication System program has been estimated at $19,700 since the estimate is based on individual units rather than a block bid on the Army construction of 400 units. Since the funds in the appropriations bill for the construction program of the Alaska Communication System for family quarters are at distant points from Anchorage, such as Fairbanks, Big Delta, Cathedral Bluffs, Northway, Skagway, and Naknek, it is obvious that single units at these distant points will cost more. The computed average price is $23,640. Following is a short chart giving a break-down of the $661,920 for family quarters sought by the amendment:

Estimated cost of ACS family housing for fiscal year 1951

Bids were recently opened for 50 8-family row houses (400 units), at Fort Richardson. Based on low bid the total cost per family unit including furnished materials and cost of engineering, design, inspection, supervision, and administration is	$15,000
For ACS duplexes add—	
5 percent for individual heating	$750
10 percent for size of program (1 to 8 units instead of 400)	1,500
10 percent for more costly design (duplex 1-story instead of 8-family (2-story)	1,500
Total	18,750
Contingencies 5 percent	938
Per unit cost at Anchorage	19,688
Round figure	19,700

Amount recommended based on above estimate for Anchorage and applying the construction factors for more remote locations:

Station	Factor	Unit cost	Number of units	Budget amount
Anchorage	[1] 1.0	$19,700	8	$157,600
Fairbanks	1.2	23,640	8	189,120
Big Delta	1.4	27,580	2	55,160
Cathedral Bluffs	1.6	31,520	2	63,040
Northway	1.6	31,520	2	63,040
Skagway	1.0	19,700	2	39,400
Naknek	1.2	23,640	4	94,560
Total			28	661,920
Average per unit				(23,640)

[1] Base.

The favorable bids on Fort Richardson resulted from a new design which incorporated reduced standards of construction from those of last year. The figures recommended for the ACS budget assume a similar reduction in standards for ACS houses.

It must be emphasized that the Alaska Communication System was provided $2,159,548 in the 1949 fiscal year which permitted the building of some very modest family quarters. In the 1950 fiscal year, although many millions were appropriated in the military budget for quarters in Alaska, none was appropriated for the Alaska Communication System. Therefore, for the fiscal year 1951 this request of only $661,920 for the construction of 28 family quarters is a very modest request considering the total requirement.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the people who staff the ACS are doing a grand job. They handle all communications for the Army, the Air Force, and some of the Navy communications and for the civilian population of Alaska. They are required to live at distant points, often under unfavorable circumstances. The ACS has been, by and large, the most valuable training ground we possess for Signal Corps personnel. The people who came out of the system during World War II were the backbone of the Signal Corps' expanding functions. Those people ought to be taken care of in respect to family dwellings, along with the other persons in the armed services in the Territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I would say that a study is being made by the Department of Defense, which has perhaps now been concluded, but the results of which have not yet been made to the committee. It is true they asked for $3,000,000, and it is set forth quite explicitly on page 48 of the hearings, and detailed to some extent. The committee thought it was doing very well by this item in allowing $1,000,000. There has been a state of confusion in the building business in Alaska, and it has been a very expensive proposition. Accordingly, the committee feels it has done the best it could under the circumstances, and the newness of the program, and we ask for a vote on the amendment and that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for surveys of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins, and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States; for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed 76 student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535); for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; for printing and binding and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, including such printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; $187,678,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of the Army may, in his discretion and on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed $2,700,000 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 756), and the act of August 14, 1946.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN:

Page 337, line 1, after the semicolon, insert the phrase "for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized."

Page 337, line 10, strike out "$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$189,178,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to get into the bill language that would permit the Corps of Army Engineers to continue their planning program and to provide $1,000,000 in planning money. The Bureau of the Budget recommended for rivers and harbors $240,714,000. The bill before you provides only $187,678,000, a reduction by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the amount of $53,036,000. The amendment before you will provide only $1,000,000 in planning money against the Budget's recommendations of $2,000,000.

I shall offer another amendment under "Flood control, general," which, if adopted, would provide $2,000,000 in planning money. Under "Flood control, general," the Bureau of the Budget recommended $478,447,000. The bill before you provides only $341,055,000, a reduction by the committee in this item of $137,393,000. The amendment I shall offer under "Flood control, general," will provide for only $2,000,000 in planning money against the Budget's recommendation of $4,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, elimination of planning money for the fiscal year 1951 will bring planning work to a standstill and prevent the preparation of plans and specifications for useful and necessary projects which should be started in the near future. To my way of thinking, it is false economy to eliminate planning money and hamstring the Corps of Army Engineers. I should like to direct to the committee's attention that in recent years the Bureau of the Budget has required strict limitation on new projects started, with the result that the Bureau's recommendations and estimates, defended by the chief of engineers, for the last three fiscal years, provide for 1949 only 19 new projects; 1950, only 5 new projects; 1951, no new projects.

The recommendation of the Budget that no new projects be started is a very drastic curtailment, but in addition to that curtailment, if we deprive the Corps of Army Engineers of planning money, we are going to paralyze and, to a large extent, destroy rivers and harbors and flood control development. I am of the opinion, and I believe the majority of the committee will concur, that the Corps of Army Engineers are doing a creditable job. Many things have happened in the past 2 years which, on the surface, appear to have been planned to embarrass the Corps of Army Engineers and to discredit them in the great job they are doing.

Those of you who have kept up with construction work of the Corps of Army Engineers know very well that projects of the civil works program which are now complete and in operation have already returned to the Nation about $2.15 for every dollar expended. It would be nothing less than false economy, and certainly it would endanger the lives of our citizens and destroy their property to interrupt or defer progress on rivers and harbors and flood-control construction work.

Is it not true that we have billions of dollars in rivers and harbors and flood-control authorizations outstanding? Is it not also true that the Congress passed a flood-control bill only a few days ago in the amount of $1,500,000,000? This bill passed the House by a vote of 210 for with only 137 against. What would be the purpose of passing a new rivers and harbors and flood-control bill authorizing additional expenditures if it is the purpose of the Congress to eliminate planning money and to paralyze the normal operations of the Corps of Army Engineers?

Mr. Chairman, we are all in favor of greater economy in all branches of our Federal Government. My record will indicate that I have worked to effect greater economy. I am on record as having voted against many appropriation bills, but there are certain public improvement expenditures that are absolutely necessary and these expenditures give us a large return on the investment. Rivers and harbors and flood-control work give us a very satisfactory return on our investment and protect the lives and property of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Appropriations Committe, it has been my privilege to cooperate with the chairman and all members of the committee.

In my own subcommittee I voted for certain reductions. On the floor of this House I opposed an amendment that had for its purpose to increase the appropriation bill in favor of a new program, but my amendment does not in any way start any new program. It merely provides for a very minimum of planning money for the Corps of Army Engineers and I am of the opinion, in the long run, if this amendment is adopted, it will save the taxpayers untold millions of dollars. Certainly if we permit the Corps of Army Engineers to disrupt their planning work and lose trained personnel, when the planning program is again started it will cost many additional millions of dollars to get the planning program back on a current basis. We experienced such a disruption in the President's freeze order of 1946 and it has been estimated that that order cost the taxpayers many millions of dollars.

I wish to direct to the attention of the committee that rivers and harbors and flood-control development are almost Nation-wide and not localized in any sense of the word.

I have a very high regard for every member of the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee. They have worked hard and untiringly to report out a good bill and I shall not complain too much about the unusual reduction made in this chapter. However, I certainly disagree with members of the committee when they attempt to paralyze and hamstring the Corps of Army Engineers by eliminating planning money. I hope that you support this amendment and also the amendment that I shall offer under "Flood control," generally because, in my opinion, to do so will save the taxpayers many millions of dollars in the long run, and prevent the destruction of one of the finest organizations in the Government, namely, the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment, as I understand, applies to plans or projects heretfore authorized and hereafter authorized.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. If it applies to projects hereafter authorized, it is subject to a point of order. I suggest to the gentleman that he make it apply to projects heretofore authorized so that he will have some basis for his argument.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There was no point of order made againt it, and that language was carried by the committee. I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a good suggestion, and I suggest that the language "or hereafter authorized" be eliminated from the gentleman's amendment, and then it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to eliminate the word "hereafter".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as now modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN:

On page 337, line 1, after the semicolon, insert the phrase "for the execution of detailed investigation and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore authorized."

On page 337, line 10, strike out the figure "$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$188,678,000."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. His amendment now will authorize what amount for planning?

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the Bureau of the Budget recommended $2,000,000 for rivers and harbors, and I am asking that the committee approve only $1,000,000. That is half of what the Bureau of the Budget requested.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman's amendment carry the sum of $1,500,000?

Mr. PASSMAN. No; it is $1,000,000. That is half of what the Bureau of the Budget requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his reservation on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; since the amendment has been changed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman says that he has increased the amount by how much?

Mr. PASSMAN. One million dollars.

Mr. RABAUT. According to the figures that we have received from the gentleman he increased it $1,500,000. We are not conceding it, but we just want to know what the figure is that the gentleman is increasing this amount by.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wish to have the amendment read "an increase of $1,000,000."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that the figure be corrected so that it will read $188,678,000, and that will make the increase $1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BROOKS. I object, Mr. Chairman. I think the full budget request for planning ought to be in the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, then the increase is how much?

Mr. PASSMAN. One million dollars is what I intended to ask for in the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. How can the gentleman intend to make it $1,000,000 when he increases the figure from $187,678,000 to $189,178,000? That difference is $1,500,000.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Passman amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct the figure in the amendment so that the increase will read $1,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I am in favor of the budget amount or any amount that will reach toward the budget amount. I think the amount in this amendment is too low.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I suggest to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] that, so that his colleagues may try to accomplish his purpose, he offers an amendment to the amendment later, and let the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] submit his amendment as he intended.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN:

On page 337, line 10, strike out "$187,678,000: *Provided,*" and insert in lieu thereof "$192,678,000: *Provided,* That of this appropriation, $2,000,000 shall be available for the work of construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway heretofore authorized by law (Public Law 525, 79th Cong.), and $2,000,000 shall be available for construction of the Demopolis lock and dam in the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers project: *Provided further.*"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish all Members would move around in front where they can see this map clearly, because I want to talk about a project that affects the entire Nation.

In the first place, we are increasing the appropriation for the Demopolis Dam, but we are holding it down to $4,000,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. There is no question about both these projects being a part of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

I want to appeal to you today from the standpoint of national defense first. We cannot afford another Pearl Harbor.

We cannot afford to wait until our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb, as happened at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

This project will cut the water distance between Mobile on the Gulf and the atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles. It will cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf to Oak Ridge by anywhere from 50 to 75 percent. Remember, we have already delivered approximately 2,000,000 tons of material into Oak Ridge by barge. But if you take that material from the Gulf now, you have to fight the swift current of the Mississippi River for 869 miles, go up the Ohio River 47 miles, then up the Tennessee River 215 miles to reach the point where, by following this slack-water route, you would only travel 481 miles in slack water.

In other words, you go 1,131 miles out of the way, and every foot of it upstream.

Someone has said that we have been on this project for 100 years. That is true; but they never could build this project until the Pickwick Dam was built in 1938, because of the sand ridge between the Tombigbee and the Tennessee, where you would have had to have lifts going both ways, with no water supply at the summit. When that dam was built in 1938, raising that water level 54 feet at the mouth of Yellow Creek, the Army engineers came back and said that that entirely solved the problem. They said they could put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River and have all the water we would ever need.

Let me show you another thing. This is not only the missing link, in our program of national defense; but it is also the missing link in our program of internal waterway transportation, for the simple reason that it cuts the cost of transportation on a bargeload of 14,000 tons going into the Ohio River by more than $22,000 on the fuel bill alone. We have 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River, 13 on the Monongahela, and 8 on the Allegheny. It gives us virtually a slack-water route for returning traffic all the way to Pittsburgh, Pa., Cincinnati and Wheeling, and all other points on the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, and the Missouri Rivers, and at the same time saves the swift current of the Mississippi River for downstream traffic. It does the same thing for the Great Lakes. I would like the lady from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] to pay particular attention, because I am coming to Cleveland. We have had more people appeal to us from Cleveland, Ohio, to develop this project, than I ever dreamed would enter this fight. It means a slack-water route all the way back from the Gulf to the Great Lakes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman be able to tell us how far it is from New Orleans to Mobile?

Mr. RANKIN. It is 156 miles along the intracoastal waterway that is protected by a string of islands and is slack-water every step of the way.

Going back to Cairo, it would cut the cost on a 14,000 barge load from the Gulf of Mexico to Cairo above $20,000 on the fuel bill alone. That means that saving on every barge load that goes into the Great Lakes up the Illinois River, or up the Mississippi River all the way to Minneapolis and St. Paul, or up the Missouri River.

Again let me call to your attention the fact that the iron-ore supply in America is being rapidly depleted, and unless something is done to find a source of iron ore, you are going to find your great industrial plants in the Middle West, in Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and all the other cities in that area seeking locations elsewhere. The iron-ore supply in that entire area is rapidly declining.

But they have discovered the greatest high-grade iron-ore deposit in the world in Venezuela. Let me read to you what someone has written in the interests of the steel producers of this great area. He says:

> They have discovered a huge mountain extending upward 2,000 feet, 1 mile wide and 11 miles long. It is practically all high-grade iron ore, the richest and largest high-grade ore deposit in the history of the world.

These barges that go down the Mississippi River, when they come back not only can bring this iron ore from Venezuela, but they can bring back bauxite that the people of that area are using to manufacture aluminum. They can also bring back oil. One man wrote me that he was shipping 15,000 automobiles a month from Detroit down the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers. He said, "I want to bring back oil," which he can get right at the Demopolis field, and save him $30,000 on one barge load.

But the way it is now, he said:

> The swift current of the Mississippi River eats up my profit.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I wonder if the gentleman could supply us with the figures of traffic density on this river, caused by the development of the South American iron-ore fields.

Mr. RANKIN. With this development it will double, treble, and quadruple the traffic on the Mississippi River. The traffic will go counterclockwise down the Mississippi, across to Mobile, up through the Tombigbee to the Tennessee and then downstream to Paducah and Cairo.

This traffic would move counterclockwise, go down the Mississippi, across to Mobile, back up through this slack-water route to the Tennessee and then downstream to Paducah and Cairo. When you get above St. Louis you have 26 locks and dams on the Mississippi between there and Minneapolis and St. Paul. You have seven locks and dams on the Illinois River, that provides a slack-water route into the Great Lakes. Yet that traffic is bottled up, simply for the want of this missing link in the greatest inland waterway system the world has ever seen.

If this project were in Europe it would have been developed long ago. If it were in Europe now, they would be developing it at the expense of the American taxpayers under the so-called Marshall plan.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi for the fine work he has done for years on this project. I believe that the Members of Congress are gradually becoming alive to the fact that this will be not only of benefit to the South but of benefit to the entire Nation as a defense project.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Alabama that it will extend its immediate benefits clear up to the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. It will extend its benefits to all of that entire western section of Pennsylvania, over all of the State of Ohio, over all of the States of Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, North and South Dakota, and Montana. Nearly every one of those States will really enjoy at least as much, if not more, benefits from it than will the State of Mississippi.

I sincerely trust that the committee will accept this amendment and let us move forward to the development of the missing link in our inland waterway system, as well as the missing link in our national defense program.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I want to compliment the gentleman for his fine presentation. I propose to support his amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska. I hope my amendment is adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the national defense is vitally involved in this project.

This project gives our Nation a short slack-water route.

And why is that important to the national defense?

It shortens by more than 800 miles the distance from the Gulf of Mexico to our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge.

It cuts the cost of transportation by 50 to 75 percent.

It gives us an additional outlet to the sea in time of emergency.

It gives us a connecting, highly important slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Ohio River, to the upper Mississipi, to the Missouri River, to the Great Lakes.

In this day of snorkel submarines, of guided missiles shot from submarines against our coastal cities, possibly with atomic warheads, how vital can a slack-water inland transportation network be?

Of course, we have no way of knowing, in time of peace.

But in time of war its importance can be incalculable.

As an example, I think of the terrible depletion, in the last war, of the Mesabi iron-ore range.

Two years ago the Armed Services Committee had a forecast from an industry leader that in the very near future our great Nation will be substantially dependent upon Brazil and other South American countries for high-grade iron ore.

Now, just how, in time of war, will we get that iron ore, if we have to have it?

That is the kind of defense question that has interested me in this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

I recall only too vividly our tragic experiences with German submarines in the last war.

Why, members of the committee, even the Caribbean became almost impassable.

Ships were being sunk, one after the other, right off New York Harbor.

And that was before the snorkel submarine.

That was before guided missiles.

That was before atomic energy.

I shudder to contemplate the next submarine war—with submarines fighting submarines—with homing devices guiding torpedoes—with submarines serving as carriers of long-range missiles guided by radio to their targets—missiles armed, possibly, with such terribly destructive warheads that it may well be that the future submarine will be able to devastate the coastal areas of the entire Nation.

The grief we had in the last war in trying to get our tankers, our coastal shipping, or Liberty ships through is all too vivid in my mind.

We missed only by an eyelash the losing of the war to the submarine.

And today, Russia has far more submarines—about six times as many—including the modern, deadly snorkel type, than Germany had in her possession at the outbreak of World War II.

Its potentialities in time of war are enormous.

To my way of thinking, with national defense our No. 1 requirement today, that fact must play an important role in the decision of the House on this project.

It will save vast amounts of transportation costs.

It permits the newly discovered, extremely rich iron ore deposits of Venezuela to be brought more cheaply—and, of much greater importance, far more safely—to our great steel centers such as Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Youngstown, Chicago, Detroit, and St. Louis.

I have checked into the feasibility of the project.

The Army Chief of Engineers terms the project not only possible but entirely feasible.

He reports that the construction of the Pickwick Dam in 1938 across the Tennessee River, just below the point where this project reaches the Tennessee, raised the water level at that point 54 feet.

And that event changed the entire completion of this project, which has had a long and troubled history.

For, theretofore, because of a sand ridge between the Tombigbee River and Tennessee River, it was impracticable to consider the project. The geography of the situation required the construction of expensive locks.

Now, however, thanks to the Pickwick Dam, the Army engineers can assert—and have officially reported—that because this dam raised the water level 54 feet, the offending sand ridge can be cut through, the summit of the project can be put in the Tennessee River, and there will be ample water for its operation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to consider this project with greater sympathy than heretofore.

Its national defense implications are truly tremendous.

And, as in the case of great weapons of war, it is far too late to attempt to build such an enterprise once an emergency is upon us.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I am quite sure the gentleman is quoting General Wheeler.

Mr. VINSON. I am; the gentleman is right.

Mr. RANKIN. General Wheeler was Chief of the Army Engineers and was the Washington representative of the Army engineers when the survey of this project was made back in the 1930's. In my opinion he is one of the ablest men who have ever been Chief of the Army Engineers. He says this project is absolutely necessary for our national defense.

Mr. VINSON. There can be no doubt of that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that one reason given by the United States Steel Corp. for the recent increase in the price of steel was to procure capital to develop its resources in Venezuela. If they consider it necessary now to begin opening up that area, it is an indication to us that if we are to profit by it in time of national emergency we must provide a safe means of getting the raw material to the industrial areas.

Mr. VINSON. Why, of course. During World War II right out of New York Harbor ship after ship was sunk. How are you going to get this material into the industrial centers unless you adopt a measure of this kind and permit the ships to come through the Caribbean, then up the Warrior River, up the Tombigbee to the Ohio, and thence on up to Pittsburgh, Chicago, Detroit, and that whole section of the country?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that 4 years ago this project was authorized by a majority vote of both Houses but they said at that time, "Wait and let them finish the planning." The planning is now complete. We have spent $858,000 on the planning of this project, and the plans are now complete, as General Pick said the other day.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee. I want to make a statement which I trust will not be taken personally by any Member. Because of what happened a year ago I will make a personal objection to the assignment of time from one Member to another, so those who want to speak on the amendment will be asked to speak in their own right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, is the gentleman's request limited to the amendment proposed by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] or to the original amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. To the amendments that are on the Clerk's desk and all amendments thereto.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan may not know it, but he cannot object to a Member yielding to another Member for an interruption.

Mr. RABAUT. I did not say that. That statement has not been made.

Mr. RANKIN. No; but this is an attempt to shut off debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, there are 20 Members standing who wish to be heard personally, and I do not think it is right to cut debate on an important subject like this; therefore, I am forced to object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members ought to know something about this, and I think I ought to call the attention of the members of the Committee to a few of the facts that relate to it.

The length of this waterway is 268 miles; 180 on the Tombigbee River, 49 from Maceys Creek to Yellow Creek, and 39 down Yellow Creek into the Tennessee. That is just about the same distance as the distance from Albany to Buffalo. There we built the enlarged Erie Barge Canal of just about this same size, but with only just a few locks, and 40 years ago, with costs much lower than now; the cost of that construction was $400,000,000.

Let me tell you this, in arriving at estimates which totaled $170,000,000 a year ago, the engineers put in locks and dams at from $3,350,000 to $8,000,000 over all. Let me say to you that single locks and dams, with the capacity to carry tows that would be required here, are set up as costing $20,000,000, and I have got one of those right in front of me. Many of them up through the Ohio

and the Mississippi, in the upper reaches, cost $15,000,000, and the cost of just the 18 locks and dams, in my judgment—and I am basing that on my experience with the engineers and the things that they have done—would run $270,000,000.

The excavation is enormous. Why, a lot of that river is 6 feet wide and 6 inches to 3 feet deep. The width of the waterway is to be not less than 170 feet at the bottom of the channel. With respect to the 49 miles between Maceys Creek and Yellow Creek there is no water at all. The entire distance must be excavated, necessitating the removal of 88,000,000 yards of dirt. The elevation is 170 feet from the water level, which means excavating 170 feet deep. The width of this excavation will flare out about 2,000 feet in order to provide protection against soil erosion. It is, of course, impossible for anybody to estimate what it might ultimately come to; $350,000,000 would be a low estimate of what it would run.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. General Pick testified the other day that the limit would be $189,000,000.

Mr. TABER. But I have given you the details, and the gentleman will realize, if he studies General Pick's operations, that he runs his figures up. Why, on one dam on the Missouri River he ran it up from $75,000,000 to $225,000,000. Oh, he is a good man to run the figures up. He does not run them up, though, until after he gets something started. I think we ought to understand that first. The figures that I gave you of from $350,000,000 to $400,000,000 are low. If you get into this project you will get in it away beyond $400,000,000 before you are through.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us the dates the calculations were made as to the estimates on which he says the Chief of the Corps of Engineers was in error, so the record can be kept straight?

Mr. TABER. It is very hard to go by that, because the Corps of Engineers redesign a project after construction is started on it, and they enlarge on it so that it costs a great deal more. One of those items was raised like that between 1943 and 1944 and the present time. Others have been raised enormous amounts in 1 year. They have doubled the cost of one proposed project up there this yast year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does the gentleman mean the calculations were made in 1 year, or the original estimates——

Mr. TABER. The original estimates sometimes are raised on the basis of increased size of the project. Sometimes they are raised because they had given us very low figures to start with. You cannot tell anything about the figures they give you. That is our experience, and it has been a very distressing experience, one that is exceedingly difficult for anyone to put up with.

Let me show you another thing. It is 156 miles from New Orleans to Mobile. It is 268 miles up here. You have 18 blocks to go through with great big tows. The length of time is enormous. You cannot make speed in that way.

As to this iron-ore business, let me tell you how that is working. The United States Steel Co. has wharves set up in Baltimore and Philadelphia to take the ore that comes from their new project in Venezuela. That is the farthest advanced of all the South American ore projects. They have gone so far as to spend millions of dollars on those projects. If they had been figuring on bringing that ore into Mobile, you would have heard a lot more about that, and you would have heard about schemes for deepening the harbor and all that sort of thing. But they can haul that ore more cheaply in the large boats up to Baltimore and Philadelphia and thence by rail than they can transship it and haul it by barge up the Mississippi, and they can do it much more quickly.

Let no one get the idea this is going to save a lot of money, or that it is a major item of defense. It is one of those things that have been dreamed up by certain people. I do not object to their having the dream, but I hate to see the United States Treasury embark on a project that I cannot see a chance in the world of working out for less than $350,000,000 to $400,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will reject this proposal.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to read $188,678,000" rather than the figure previously submitted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, then what would the effect be?

Mr. PASSMAN. It would increase rivers and harbors by only $1,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I want to say I objected originally to the change because I favor the higher figure as recommended in the budget. I withdraw my objection at the present time because I have presented an amendment at the Clerk's desk which will insert the full budget amount.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, in the event the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Louisiana is granted, what then would be permitted by way of amendment to the gentleman's amendment in view of the fact that a substitute amendment has been offered?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment may be offered to the Passman amendment.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN:

Page 337, line 1 after the semicolon, insert the phrase "for the execution of detailed investigation and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore authorized."

Page 337, line 10, strike out the figure "$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$188,678,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that since my amendment is a substitute amendment, I may add a similar amount to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN: On page 337, line 4, strike out "$187,678,000: *Provided*", and insert in lieu thereof "$192,178,000: *Provided*, That of this appropriation $2,000,000 shall be available for the work of construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway heretofore authorized by law (Public Law 525, Seventy-ninth Congress), and $2,000,000 shall be available for construction of the Demopolis Dock and Dam in the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers project: *Provided further*,".

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] or an amendment to the substitute?

Mr. BROOKS. I have an amendment to each of those amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Which amendment does the gentleman desire to offer?

Mr. BROOKS. I want to offer both amendments. I should like to be recognized on either amendment. I will now offer the amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS as an amendment to the substitute: Strike out "$192,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$193,678,000."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment to the substitute and I have an amendment to the Passman amendment as originally offered. My purpose in both instances is to ask that the committee provide the budget figure for planning for this purpose which is $2,000,000. For years we have been appearing before the Committee on Appropriations and asking for money for rivers and harbors projects.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RABAUT. What is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BROOKS. It is to provide for the budget amount for this particular item. That would be $2,000,000.

Mr. RABAUT. How much is the full amount?

Mr. BROOKS. The additional amount would be $2,000,000. As I said, for years we have been going before the Committee on Appropriations speaking for this type of project and we have been talking

with them, and almost the first question that comes from the Appropriation Subcommittee in charge of this work is, Did the Budget recommend that figure? You answer "No," and you are out of court, so to speak.

In this instance the Budget did recommend $2,000,000 for this particular item. I thought it was a small figure for planning purposes.

This item, plus the one for flood control, totals $6,000,000 for planning. That is all the money that the Budget recommended for planning purposes to this particular civil-functions bill; yet, in spite of that fact, every cent of it was stricken out when the bill came to the floor of the House of Representatives.

It is my purpose today to present to you the proposition of restoring to this bill the amount the budget recommended for planning purposes in the rivers and harbors and flood-control provisions of the act.

Just let me say this: There is no single small item—and in a bill of over $29,000,000,000, an item of $6,000,000 is a small item, comparatively speaking—there is no small item that will mean so much to so many Members in so many scattered areas of the United States as will the restoration of planning money in this particular bill. I think in both rivers and harbors and flood control, the restoration of planning means some eighty-odd projects throughout the United States will continue in a planning stage and at a cost of a total of $6,000,000, and in this particular phase of the bill for rivers and harbors at a cost of $2,000,000. If that amount is restored, plans on these projects can go ahead. As some of my colleagues have told you, we have trained workers in this particular work. They have been devoting their lives to the planning of river and harbor and flood-control purposes. Those people will be released and with them will go their training. The continuity of the work will be interrupted. If we do not restore the planning money, our action will mark the beginning of the end of flood-control and rivers and harbors work until we can restore planning. It is extremely important to the people of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. We have no objection to the increase of this planning money.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very thankful for the kind support of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand correctly that the amendment proposed here is that our colleague from Louisiana, a member of the committee [Mr. PASSMAN], proposes an amendment to provide $1,000,000 for planning, and the gentleman's amendment would increase that amount to the total recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for planning purposes?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. On all rivers and harbors and flood control?

Mr. BROOKS. No; not flood control. It is simply rivers and harbors. This is the rivers and harbors phase of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman's amendment, as I understand, is to increase the $1,000,000 proposed by his colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] to a total of $2,000,000?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; and for the reason that the budget recommended $2,000,000. I want to exhort my friends on the subcommittee who year after year have called on us to support the budget, to come forward and support the budget in this little phase of this important matter.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted to ask if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] was adopted, how would the $1,000,000 be utilized for this project if it requires $2,000,000 to do the work that the Army engineers say they need?

Mr. BROOKS. It puzzles me very much indeed——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have been puzzled about that. The amount here is so small, and I can say it is needed, if a program of planning is worthy of being carried on without interruption. It is certainly worthy of the amount the budget recommended. If we do not allow that amount it will cause considerable confusion, for the great difficulty in equitably dividing a small amount.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. As I understand the amendment of the gentleman now pending, it is offered as a substitute.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. I may also say that I also have present an amendment to the Rankin substitute.

Mr. PICKETT. But the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to make the amount as it is in the Rankin substitute?

Mr. BROOKS. Right.

Mr. PICKETT. Which would result in a total increase in the amount of money of some $6,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; the difference there would be simply $1,000,000 more for rivers and harbors planning——

Mr. PICKETT. What the gentleman really wants to do is to increase the amount for planning; that is what the gentleman is seeking.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct; I want to stand by the budget recommendation of $2,000,000.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Passman amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT as an amendment to the Passman amendment: Strike out "$188,678,000" and insert "$189,678,000."

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, the situation is that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] offered an amendment to this bill to put in $1,000,000 of planning money for rivers and harbors projects. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] offered a substitute which proposes to appropriate money to prosecute the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and allow some planning money. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who just preceded me, has offered an amendment to the Rankin substitute in which he seeks $2,000,000 for planning money. If you adopt that amendment you will be putting $2,000,000 of planning money in the Rankin substitute, together with money to further construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. In just a moment.

My amendment is to the Passman amendment. Bear in mind that the Passman amendment seeks to put $1,000,000 for planning in the bill. If my amendment to the Passman amendment is adopted, and the Passman amendment as amended is adopted, you would have $2,000,000 for rivers and harbors and planning, the same sum of money approved by the Bureau of the Budget. That is the sum of money that has been appropriated by this Congress annually for the past several years for planning purposes in rivers and harbors construction.

Let me say there is not a single rivers and harbors or flood-control project now under construction in my district; there is not a single one now in course of planning that has been authorized that will be constructed in my district. But I do believe in all sincerity that unless you have funds to carry on an adequate coordinated planning program for rivers and harbors and flood-control work that you are going to find the day come when you have no backlog of those things to be done when it is necessary to do them.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very glad the gentleman has offered his amendment. I had no objection to planning; my objection to the Passman amendment was that the amount for planning was being reduced. I am going to be very happy to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PICKETT. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman in support of my amendment. If you favor the Tennessee-Tombigbee proposal for construction then, of course, you would want to vote for it, but the situation is such that if you do not favor appropriation for construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee and you do favor the appropriation of $2,000,000 by the current bill for planning rivers and harbors work for the next fiscal year, you can still vote against the Rankin substitute; vote for the Pick-

ett amendment to the Passman amendment, adopt the Pickett amendment, then adopt the Passman amendment as amended, and you will have $2,000,000 in planning funds for rivers and harbors in the next fiscal year.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say that I am heartily in favor of allowing $2,000,000 additional for planning. It has been demonstrated in the past that this money has always been well spent; it has been informative to the Members of the Congress so that they know how work on these projects is proceeding and how to appropriate. So I hope the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] will be adopted.

There has been a tendency in some quarters to attempt to belittle the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, but let me remind you that this project has the approval of the Corps of Engineers. There is no bureau in the Federal Government which is more constantly praised for its objective manner in looking into these projects. So keep in mind this project has been approved by the engineers; keep in mind the sum asked for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. That Bureau knows something about how to spend the taxpayers' money. It has examined into this thing, the Corps of Engineers has examined into this thing, so why should we come up here with only a few hours' consideration, even less than a few hours' consideration, and toss out the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget? This project is going to be built, it is going to be finished, and if it is not done this year it will be done ultimately and within the next very few years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have had an amendment at the Clerk's desk for several days, waiting to reach this section. My amendment increases the amount in the Passman amendment and the Pickett amendment $1,000,000. What is the status of my amendment at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. Is it intended as an amendment to the Passman amendment?

Mr. FALLON. My amendment goes to the original sum, but subsequent amendments have been offered which puts my amendment in the third degree so that I cannot offer it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman cannot offer his amendment until the pending amendments are disposed of.

Mr. FALLON. If the pending amendment is adopted, what position is my amendment in then?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the gentleman will bear in mind that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has offered an amendment; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] offered a substitute for that amendment, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] offered an amendment to the substitute. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] offered an amendment to the Passman amendment. Those four are all we can have pending at one time. Of course, if the gentleman has in mind desiring to offer an amendment to the Passman amendment after the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment is disposed of, and if it should not be adopted, then the gentleman could offer his amendment as an amendment to the Passman amendment, but if the Pickett amendment to the amendment is adopted, he could not offer it then.

Mr. FALLON. My amendment has been on the desk for 2 days, and I just could not get recognition, and I am ruled out on a parliamentary situation from getting my amendment in.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Chair would have been delighted to recognize the gentleman, but he just cannot recognize everybody at the same time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the gentleman may make a statement respecting the amendment he proposes to offer under his allotment of time, and that it can be read for the information of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is on the list and he may use that time to explain the amendment. He may also have the amendment read for the information of the House, if he desires.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON: On page 337, line 10, strike out "$187,678,000" and insert "$1,300,000 additional."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer two amendments to H. R. 7786.

On page 337, line 10, strike out "$187,678,000" and insert "$187,978,000."

On page 337, line 13, after the word "law", insert "*Provided further*, That of the amount herein appropriated $800,000 shall be expended on the improvement of Baltimore Harbor, Md." These amendments both pertain to the same subject matter, to increase the appropriation allocated to the port of Baltimore from the present $500,000, which the Appropriations Committee approved, to $800,000.

President Truman, in making his recommendations, recognized the importance of this item and suggested a sum of not less than $800,000 and the Bureau of the Budget approved this amount as being the minimum for the continuation of the deepening of the main channel. However, the House Appropriation Committee reduced the amount of $500,000 without, I am sure, recognizing the damage that would be done to the project.

The $800,000 figure recommended by President Truman and his budget aides is actually $200,000 short of the sum urged by those with an intimate and expert knowledge of the channel problems. In January of this year, I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and in a detailed statement asked the members to authorize $1,000,000 for continuation of the deepening of the main harbor channel to 39 feet as essential to the expected large volume of foreign iron ore through the port. I pointed out that shipping and related activities which provide employment for some 40,000 persons result in the inflow of some $200,000,000 annually into the port's economic system, and generally affects every other business in the area and the entire economy of the United States. All of the dredging which has been planned for the coming year is required in a general channel deepening and widening program given Federal approval in the Seventy-ninth Congress which is now Public Law No. 14. The $1,000,000 figure is vitally necessary in order to keep dredging work going throughout the 12 months of the year. Further reduction of $300,000 by the committee cuts the needed sum in half. It will delay the completion of the work and the usefulness of the port. It is, in fact, a wasteful economy.

In the past 8 months Baltimore's position in the economic lifestream of the country has increased vastly in importance. I am sure you are all acquainted with the huge import ore movement announced for the immediate future. Baltimore has been selected by major steel companies of the country as the point of entrance for the bulk of this import ore. The announced plans of these firms include the use of ships of substantially greater tonnage than our present channels can accommodate. On different occasions ore ships going to Bethlehem Steel from Venezuela, Chile, and Africa dragged the Chesapeake Bay bottom because the channel was not deep enough. With Baltimore now becoming the ore-importing center of the United States it is more important than ever to accommodate huge ore carriers, tankers, and freighters as far as the inner harbor if the port is to be utilized to the fullest extent.

It is a recognized fact among port authorities that the potential flow of import iron ore will give Baltimore the position of the leading tonnage port of the United States if we have the channel and facilities to accommodate the huge volume that is expected to flow into the country within the next few years. Expansion of existing facilities for the handling of iron ore is already under way, particularly the new projects of the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Western Maryland and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroads, which run into millions, with private companies making substantial investments in preparation for this vastly increased inflow of iron ore. This is being done on the assurance that the Federal Government will carry through its portion of the program by speedily completing the much-needed 39-foot channel. Though these facilities are being built, failure to speedily complete the main channel would be a major obstacle, for no substantial amount of iron ore can be received. Without the proper approach to the port, we can expect large portions of this ore will be lost to this country.

Conservative estimates by responsible industrialists, transportation officials, and others indicate that the importation of iron ore at Baltimore should increase from its present rate of about 2,000,000 tons per year to approximately 10,000,000 tons per year in the immediate future. Only a fraction of this iron ore will be consumed at Baltimore. The major portion of it is destined for the inland mills in Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Cleveland, and Ohio Valley vicinities and to points even further west where the greatest steel producing center in the world is located.

It hardly needs to be emphasized here, that upon steel depends the economy of our country and steel production definitely depends on the availability of iron ore. This is not just a local project but very definitely one that will have far-reaching effects on great sections of our country and on the over-all economy of the Nation.

The importance of Baltimore to the West as a major outlet for grain, livestock, coal, iron, lumber, and many other products in which the shippers of the Western States are greatly interested should not be overlooked. Baltimore serves as a gateway for the agricultural and commercial products of the inland East and the Mid-West. It is through this gateway that raw materials vital to our industrial life enter the country and the products of our fields and factories flow to foreign markets.

The Appropriation Committee apparently did not accept my factual statement, or in an economical mood, decided to reduce the sum without taking into account the importance of the port of Baltimore in peace and war, now, and for all our future time.

I cannot stress too strongly the need for intelligent spending and intelligent economy. I personally have supported and worked to accomplish economy in Government. However, there is such a thing as being penny wise and pound foolish and, in my opinion, the $300,000 reduction could not have been considered by the committee with full knowledge of the results that must follow in the crippling of the Government's work in connection with the deepening of this channel. This is not a matter of politics, nor city, county, or State importance. It is presently a matter of commercial national interest and could very well become one of national safety.

Let me point out also, should the cold war develop into a fighting war, which is not impossible nor too improbable, the port of Baltimore might conceivably be the terminus of the lifeline of our Nation.

Repeating what I said before the committee, "What affects the port of Baltimore affects the world and in this case, specifically, the entire economy of the United States," is not a theory but a fact and the sum of $500,000, which has been approved by the committee, when compared to allocations of smaller port developments, is not reasonable nor practicable and should be increased at least to $800,000. This $800,000 was recommended in the President's budget and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and should be properly restored. Even this sum should be supplemented to the full $1,000,000 which was arrived at as a result of careful planning. Work of this kind cannot be done overnight and should a national emergency arise, it will be the responsibility of this Congress if our ports are unable to properly function.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I direct my thought to the amendment my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] has at the desk which we hope will be voted upon. This amendment is directed to obtaining $300,000 additional for the great harbor of Baltimore.

The city of Baltimore is among the first three ports of the United States. It has been second for some time, and for several months last year was first, but in ratio of the amount of money spent to the tonnage going into that harbor, it has in no way been receiving a just allocation of the money directed to rivers and harbors.

There are approximately 40 miles of shorelines, most of which border upon the district I represent, with vast berthing facilities, and industrial plants among the leaders of the country, airplane plants and steel plants that are vital to the economy of America. When river and habor projects are directed to commerce, the basic justification for Federal river and harbor projects, and with Baltimore the center of commerce, the spending of this additional money, which will only permit a 65-percent improvement, is well justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my appeal to that of my colleague from Maryland, in urging that the appropriation for the civil functions, Department of the Army, the rivers and harbors section, be increased to provide $800,000 for the Baltimore Harbor and channels, instead of the $500,000 in the appropriation bill.

Most of this money would be used for deepening the channels of the Baltimore Harbor. This work has been going on for several years and the appropriation now requested would permit work on the extension of this project. So far, the amount allotted each year has enabled the engineers to go ahead with the work for several months only, and then it is discontinued until the appropriation for the next fiscal year is granted. With the amount requested by my colleague, the project would be about 65 percent complete.

For the past few years Baltimore has been the second highest port in the country in volume of foreign commerce handled and for several months last year was the leading import tonnage port of the United States. It is fast becoming the Nation's largest and most important port. There are 45.6 usable miles of water front comprising the harbor, and three-fifths of this has been developed. There are 40 miles of berthing space with 290 piers. The harbor provides warehouse facilities with storage space of 2,858,590 square feet; three huge grain elevators capable of delivering a total of 4,250,000 bushels of grain in 10 hours; rail yards capable of storing 4,500 freight cars; coal piers capable of loading 97,000 tons of coal in 10 hours. In addition, there are 14 shipbuilding and repair yards along the water front.

About 140,000 Baltimoreans are supported by the port; that is, they are the families of men and women directly engaged in the port's activities and those whose businesses are patronized by shippers and sailors.

Since water transportation is the cheapest form of transportation, Baltimore holds great interest for shippers of foreign freight, because its port brings ocean freighters farther inland than any other port on the east coast.

A very large percentage of the merchandise sent abroad under the European relief program passes through the port of Baltimore.

Recently a large expansion program was announced by the Bethlehem Steel Co., which includes an additional $30,000,000 program for its Sparrows Point plant. They now import between four and five million tons of iron ore into Baltimore annually and expect to increase this amount when their expansion program is completed.

The United States Steel Corp. recently announced that Baltimore will be one of the principal ports of entry for its importation of iron ore from its recently developed fields in Venezuela.

The Republic Steel Corp. plans to import 1,000,000 tons of ore annually through the port from Liberian deposits.

A new pier is now under construction for the exclusive handling of ore, and this, with the expansion of existing facilities and the increased imports, is expected to make Baltimore the No. 1 port of the country.

In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Monday, Secretary of the Interior Chapman said that today the steel industry must look to foreign raw-material sources because do-

mestic iron-ore supplies are approaching depletion, and this may make necessary the restricted steel production in the foreseeable future. He emphasized that lack of domestic ore ties in with the need for, among other things, the choosing of sites along the Atlantic seaboard at such spots as Sparrows Point, Md., and eastern Pennsylvania for new mills required to meet the Nation's needs. And these places were specifically mentioned as being accessible to ocean shipping.

An adequate supply of raw materials for the steel industry could mean the difference between victory and defeat in an emergency. Therefore, the work on the deepening of the channel in the Baltimore Harbor becomes of even greater importance.

A glance at the House report on the bill will show that a number of ports far smaller in size and in amount of tonnage handled have been allotted much larger amounts than Baltimore.

While the port of Baltimore and its activities are indispensable to the economic life of the city, I urge the adoption of this amendment, because the completion of the work on the harbor is of vital importance to the welfare and safety of the entire Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BOLTON].

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am naturally interested in the port of Baltimore because I represent a large section of the city, and any improvement in the harbor or port facilities is sure to benefit some of my constituents. But much more important than the personal equation is the vital necessity of widening and deepening of the channel from the seacoast to Baltimore in order that deep draught ships may have ready ingress and egress to the port in time of war. This is especially important when we realize that we do not have enough iron in this country to supply the demand in time of emergency and that Baltimore is the gateway from the sea to the inland steel industries around Wheeling, West Virginia, Pittsburgh, Youngstown, and other inland steel centers.

I do not consider the harbor work contemplated in this appropriation as a local project but rather as a part of our great national defense program.

As one of America's chief gateways to the world, our port has always functioned for the Nation as a whole. Baltimore's pride in its shipping and its men of the sea has always been tempered by this feeling of national responsibility. In peace and in war it has responded promptly to the country's need.

You may well ask, why Baltimore? What peculiarity does this port have that would make it the choice as the chief entrance point for the importation of iron ore? The answer to these questions is based on irrefutable facts. Many of the large steel manufacturing concerns basicly concerned with the economies of this situation have stated that they intend to use the port of Baltimore for the importation of their ore. Beyond this lies the fact that Baltimore enjoys a unique geographical position among United States ports and is situated only 313 rail miles from the great iron and steel center of Pittsburgh. Philadelphia, the next closest port, is 360 miles from Pittsburgh, while New York is 426 miles from this steel metropolis in western Pennsylvania. Youngstown, Ohio, another great producer of iron and steel, lies 378 rail miles from Baltimore while it is 424 miles from Philadelphia and 500 miles from New York. This substantial rail advantage in favor of the port of Baltimore prevails as far west as Chicago with its huge lake-side mills stretched along the shore of Lake Michigan to Gary, Ind. Chicago is 767 rail miles from Baltimore as compared with 814 to Philadelphia and 890 to New York.

In view of these shorter rail distances and the fact that freight rates are based on the mileage haul clearly explains the choice of Baltimore as the major entrance point for such a heavy and bulky commodity as iron ore where transportation costs will form a major portion of the over-all cost of this product vital to steel manufacture.

We have bulk cargo piers for the transshipping of grain in bulk, which are owned and operated by the three trunk line railroad companies serving the port of Baltimore. The average capacity of the three grain elevators in Baltimore average 334,000 tons each. The shiploading capacity per hour is about 1500 tons. In 1945 1,886,000 tons of grain were handled by the port of Baltimore. Since that time shipments of grain abroad have decreased.

The coal tipples, like the grain elevators, are owned and operated by the three trunk line railroads. Coal is delivered at the rate of 2,000 to 2,500 tons per hour. The Pennsylvania Railroad's coal pier has three movable coal towers which are capable of loading a vessel at the rate of 800 tons per hour.

The Western Maryland Railway Co. delivers coal to vessels at the rate of 3,500 tons per hour.

The average daily rate of all coal tipples is 6,500 tons per hour. In 1947, 11,491,170 tons of coal passed through the port of Baltimore.

Oil-handling facilities are available at 11 piers operated by the leading oil companies. All petroleum products are brought in, in bulk tankers from the Gulf coast and the Caribbean, except Gulf Oil Corp., which barges its oil from Philadelphia, and the Sinclair Oil Co., which has a pipe-line connection from Philadelphia. The total storage capacity of all oil installations in Baltimore is 4,900,000 barrels or about 735,000 tons. The receipts of petroleum products from 1936–45 averaged 3,875,000 tons per annum.

Several piers and wharves in Baltimore have loading equipment for handling ore, iron, and other bulk commodities. These facilities are owned and operated by the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Western Maryland Railway, the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the Canton Railroad Co. The Bethlehem Steel Co. ore-receiving dock is 11,200 feet long. The depth of the water alongside is 35 feet. Ore-loading capacity of the dock is 2,600 tons per hour. This facility is purely for the local steel plant supply and is being worked to capacity.

The Western Maryland Railway ore pier is 832 feet long and 66 feet wide and the depth of the water alongside is 35 feet. It is equipped with one 9-ton electric crane and with two boxcar loaders, each with a capacity of 300 tons per hour.

The Pennsylvania Railroad pier is 1,200 feet long and 64 feet wide. On the west side of the pier the depth of the water alongside is 30 feet all the way and on the east side the water varies from 14 to 30 feet depth. The pier is equipped with an electrically operated conveyor capable of 675 tons capacity per hour.

The Canton Railroad pier is 1,250 long and 80 feet wide. It is equipped with two 35-ton traveling-bridge cranes handling from 400 to 500 tons per hour.

Concrete bins with a capacity of 10,000 tons for storage are available for storage of ore or other bulk commodities at the inshore end of the pier.

The Copper Works pier on Clinton Street, near the foot of Holabird Avenue, is equipped with one 15-ton steam-locomotive crane. This is an exclusive plant facility for the American Smelting & Refining Co.

There are several other piers in the port operated by local industries. The city of Baltimore owns a large pier which is leased by the National Gypsum Co., and is equipped to receive gypsum ore. The Mutual Chemical Co. handles chrome ore on its pier. The General Chemical Co. handles sulfur ore and the Davison Co. handles phosphorus rock. There are 30 feet of water alongside the Gypsum and Davison Chemical piers and 24 feet at the Mutual Chemical pier.

In 1948 the imports of ores and metals were 6,341,069 tons, the highest in Baltimore history.

More numerous and, from the standpoint of commerce, equally important are the industrial and commercial piers in Baltimore. Their size and adequacy varies with the needs of the particular company involved.

We also have a number of suitable sites for additional ore terminals in Baltimore and the Port Development Commission of the city of Baltimore is in a position to finance the construction of an ore terminal in the event private capital for such an undertaking is not available.

While I was a member of the Maryland State Senate I heard one of the officials of the Bethlehem Steel Co. testify before a committee that we did not have enough iron ore in this country to carry on another war. God forbid that we may ever have another war, but if war should come, then surely we could not wait to dredge the harbor so that ships drawing 37 feet of water could unload their cargo on the docks in Baltimore for shipment to Pittsburgh and the other large steel producing localities throughout the Middle West.

Under the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, it was provided that a uniform main channel of 39 feet depth from the ocean be dredged through York Spit Section and Craighill entrance to Fort McHenry, as well as other projects vital to the safe usage and continued growth of the port of Baltimore. The total estimated cost for the harbor and

channel improvements is $10,400,000. Up to the present time there has been allocated $6,176,400. Last year in spite of urgent recommendations of the Baltimore district engineer and General Feringer, the then Chief of Army Engineers, the allocation for this main ship artery and related harbor work was reduced to $650,000. This work, which was begun in June 1947, is now 65 percent completed. The allotted funds proposed for the fiscal year 1951 amounted to $800,000. The additional funds required to complete the main channel to a depth of 39 feet to Fort McHenry are $2,300,000. Baltimore Harbor interests are enthusiastically recommending an expenditure of $1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. The Bureau of the Budget approved $800,000, but the House Committee on Appropriations has reduced the amount to $500,000.

This is not a local project. Baltimore serves as a gateway for the agricultural and commercial products of the inland East and Midwest. It is through this gateway that raw materials vital to our industrial life enter the country, and the products of our fields and factories flow into foreign markets.

Tentative plans to use this port at the head of the Chesapeake Bay as a main entrance for foreign iron ore have solidified. Expansion of existing facilities for the handling of iron ore is already under way. Other facilities are far beyond the planning stage and are expected to be under construction within the next few months. Conservative estimates by responsible industrialists, transportation officials, and others indicate that the importation of iron ore at Baltimore could jump from its present rate of about 2,000,000 tons per year to approximately 10,000,000 tons per year in the near future. Only a fraction of this iron ore will be consumed in Baltimore. The major portion of it is destined for the inland mills in Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Cleveland, and Ohio Valley vicinities and to points even further west where the greatest steel producing center in the world is located.

The Western Maryland Railway has already expended substantial sums in lengthening its ore pier at Baltimore. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is expected to complete a new ore terminal in Baltimore in 1951 at a cost in excess of $5,000,000; and while private companies are making substantial investments in preparation for the vastly increased inflow of iron ore, they are doing so with the firm belief that the Federal Government will carry through its portion of the program by speedily completing the much-needed 39-foot channel in the port of Baltimore. That substantial expenditure of private funds for dredging to meet the channel will be made, goes without saying; but to assure the full utilization of the facilities now under construction or planned for the immediate future, the main ship channel is a project of first priority.

The deepening of the main channel to 39 feet is required because the present depth has caused navigational difficulties and costly delays to deep-draught vessels. These difficulties will continue until completion of the deepening of the entire main channel is accomplished.

At the present time, vessels carrying the bulk of ores to the port of Baltimore use the Sparrows Point cut-off which lies some distance outside Baltimore Harbor proper. The new ships engaged in this ore movement are rated at 24,000 tons and when laden draw 37 feet of water. To assure the safe passage of these carriers, the Bethlehem Steel interests in Sparrows Point are undertaking privately additional dredging off the cut-off to provide needed clearance for these huge vessels.

I cannot resist the opportunity at this time to add a word about the importance of this improvement to the people of Baltimore who depend upon the port activities for a living. More than 5,000 ships enter Baltimore Harbor every year, carrying close to 50,000,000 tons of cargo valued at about $1,000,000,000. Forty-two thousand people earn their livelihood from operation of the port of Baltimore. This figure is exclusive of waterfront industries. Of the total, 30,000 can be assigned to ship repair and shipbuilding yards; 7,000 to the stevedore group, and 5,000 to miscellaneous categories such as railroad terminals, chandlers, shipceilers, tugboats, lighters, pilots, ship servicing, and so forth. Keeping those people in jobs is of real importance to the people of Baltimore, and keeping the port open and in such repair that all types of ocean-going vessels may readily reach the port in time of emergency is of paramount importance to our Nation's future security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

It is a pretty well acclaimed adage that it is not a good practice to place all of one's eggs in one basket.

The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] should be supported by every Member of the Congress who is really interested in rounding out a nearly perfect peace and wartime transportation program for our Nation.

In this day and age and in these troubled times, we cannot afford to turn thumbs down any more on the immediate development of this most vital project.

Its sponsor is today manifesting the same uncanny legislative wisdom which he showed in the House of Representatives when he fought so fearlessly and valiantly for the Tennessee Valley Authority which enabled us to win World War II and without which the atom bomb would most probably never have been developed.

All modes of transportation in our land should be developed to the largest measure. We need railway, bus, air, and water transportation if our country's future safety and potential progress is to become a reality.

It comes with pretty poor grace for any of these modes of transportation to attempt to hamstring or thwart the development of another vital mode of transportation, as has been suggested was the fact on many occasions when this very proper improvement has been discussed in this House of Representatives.

All modes of transportation should work together toward doing the greatest good for the United States of America, instead of trying to scuttle the efforts of some other mode of transportation.

I was elected to this Congress to work in the best interests of the people of the Nation and my State and not to pick hot chestnuts out of the fire for any person, firm, or corporation.

If this amendment is adopted it will not be creating an additional burdensome public debt but it will be making a most important improvement which will pay dividends to the people many fold in the years to come. It is truly a capital investment.

If war ever comes again, and I hope it never does, this project will then be hailed as a great defense program. It is a real security measure for this land of ours regardless of what any other Member of Congress or anyone else may say to the contrary.

In times of peace it will be a real transportation boon to the States of Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, West Virginia, Michigan, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana.

As to the benefits which Nebraska would derive they would be immense, when one remembers that Nebraska, a great business and agricultural State, has 415 miles frontage on the Missouri River. It is now being penalized by one-way freight rates and as a result is unable to get its products to market without the burdens of unnecessary transportation expenses. This project will really enrich Nebraska and every State in the Union not only when it is fully developed but also for many years to come.

An effort has been made to scare the general public and the Congress with the frightening reactionary words that the cost of the project will mount to untold millions and billions of dollars, but I for one refuse to heed such ridiculous and child-mind-swaying language.

In the recent hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, second session of the Eighty-first Congress, General Pick, the present head of the Army engineers, estimated the total cost of the improvements to be $169,117,000 exclusive of the costs of the Demopolis Dam, the estimated cost of which is $20,843,000.

General Pick agreed also with the former head of the Army engineers, General Wheeler, that the project was proper and feasible.

Just how long this project can be delayed by fearsome and reactionary Members of Congress is not certain, but if it is not adequately financed at this time then the States which I have named heretofore should get ready to say "So long—a long so-long" to some of their present-day Congressmen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. We are going to build the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, and I think we are going to begin on it today, right here in this House. The gentleman from New York says it is just a dream. Well, the Erie Canal was just a dream. The Panama Canal was a nightmare. When they proposed to cut the Chicago drainage canal through into Lake Michigan so that they could use the water of Lake Michigan to maintain a stage of water in the Illinois River that comes down to St. Louis and on out into the Gulf, they said that was a dream and that it would drain Lake Michigan into the Gulf of Mexico and that it was not practical. But all those things are past the dream stage now.

Members of the House, we can thank God that the American people can still dream, because you have to think about a thing and you have to dream about it before you can begin to do it. This is past the dream stage. The gentleman from New York says he is afraid it is going to cost $350,000,000. I do not know what it will cost. The figures of the gentleman from Mississippi indicate it will cost less than $200,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I have the figures of General Pick as of June 30 and he says it is $169,117,000. We are faced with a yearly expenditure of $15,000,000,000 for nobody knows how long to support national defense and we must sustain our country and improve it or we will not continue to be able to support our defense budget. I hope this committee approves the Rankin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have this privilege of speaking in behalf of the proposed amendment, which would appropriate $2,000,000 with which to begin actual construction on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, and $2,000,000 with which to continue construction of the Demopolis Lock and Dam, located at a point a short distance below the confluence of the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, near Demopolis, Ala.

The Demopolis lock and dam is located so as to be of material importance to the further development of both the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers.

Last year, we appropriated $1,000,000 with which to begin construction of the lock and dam at Demopolis, and $200,000 with which to complete the engineering plans on the Tombigbee project, which would connect the lower Tombigbee with the Tennessee.

For more than 100 years there has been agitation by farsighted men for a project to connect the Gulf of Mexico with the Great Lakes, and with the interior industrial cities of this country. Until this Government built the Pickwick Dam across the Tennessee River in 1938, the plan was not considered feasible. However, with the building of the Pickwick Dam, the project immediately became practical, and the Corps of United States Engineers surveyed a plan whereby, by placing the summit of the project in the Tennessee River, a slack water route could be provided from New Orleans or Mobile, Ala., to the Tennessee River.

Thus, boats and barges from the industrial cities of the North, laden with the manufactured products of that region—automobiles, grain products, farm machinery, appliances, and a hundred others—could navigate the swift downstream current of the Mississippi, and return to their points of origin over the Timbigbee slack-water route, loaded with the raw materials of the South—iron ore from Venezuela, timber, oil, and natural gas from Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, coal from the Warrior Alabama coal field, brown iron ore from Franklin County, Ala., the commercial clays and chalks of the region.

Survey after survey has shown this route to be economically justified. Shippers and users of this waterway would reap great savings. The great raw material resources of the South would be opened to industrial and commercial development and expansion. New jobs would be created in an area where unemployment is now very high, and in an area where the ravages of the boll weevil in 1949 destroyed the farmer's chance to make a profit on his crop.

It is particularly urgent that we start construction on this project this year. The progress of our great atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., depends upon the use of millions of tons of various raw materials. The transportation costs on these materials from the port of Mobile, Ala., to Oak Ridge, Tenn., would be cut in half.

The state of our relations with Russia today is such that we cannot discount the possibility of another war. We all hope and pray that it will not come. But we must take cognizance of the fact that 5 years after the close of the greatest, most terrifying and destructive war in all history that there is no peace in the world.

We must take due notice of the fact that only a few weeks ago, one of our planes with 11 American airmen aboard was wantonly shot down by the Russians. We face the threat of an attempt to push our forces out of Berlin, Germany. The wicked masters of the Russian people seem to be bent on trying to communize the world.

In the event that war should come with Russia, or with any other great Nation for that matter, this Tombigbee-Warrior-Tennessee waterway would immediately assume the utmost strategic importance.

If we start this project today, it will likely take from 5 to 10 years to complete it. If it is to be of value to us in time of war, we must construct it in time of peace.

If we build this project we cannot be accused of wasting the tax moneys of the Treasury. Instead, we will be making a capital investment on this great country of ours, an improvement that will pay big dividends in time of peace, and infinitely greater dividends in time of war. In time of war the Tombigbee will be a protected inland waterway that it will be hard for the enemy to get at.

The Corps of United States Engineers says this is a practical project. At the direction of the Congress $868,000 has been spent for engineering and planning. The logical next step is for this Congress to appropriate the money with which to start construction on the project.

The amount of money asked for in the pending amendment does not exceed the budget recommendation made in January for development on the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers.

I urge the Members of the House to pass this amendment. If we do, the generations that come after us will approve our foresight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] gets off the beam and runs up into hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a wonder to me he had not made it billions. He is thinking about foreign spending.

General Wheeler, in my opinion one of the ablest men who has ever been Chief of Engineers, testified that it would cost $136,000,000. General Pick said on June 30, and I will read his testimony, in answer to Senator McKellar's question: General Pick said, "$169,117,000 is our present estimate."

This is not a new project. It is an extension of our defense program, to give us a slackwater route into the Oak Ridge project. It is an extension, if you please, of our transportation system. The average man does not know that in 1948 on the Ohio River the traffic was 16,000,000 tons more than it was on the Panama Canal. On the Monongahela River it was 6,000,000 tons more than it was on the Panama Canal. Yet this traffic is bottled up. They cannot get that traffic back when it comes down this swift current of the Mississippi without being penalized by having to fight that swift current to get back.

We have 26 locks and dams on the upper Mississippi.

This project is merely an extension of our present inland waterway system, and our program of national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississipi has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to take this opportunity to amplify the statements previously made in regard to the iron-ore deposits in Venezuela, and the plight of the steel corporations in looking to the future, the next 20 years, insofar as the depletion of the rich content of the ore deposits in the Mesabi Range of Minnesota are concerned. We had better plan ahead in terms of alternative routes, as far as our

inland waterways are concerned, with regard to the future of the steel industry of this Nation. I do not want to contend with the gentlemen from Maryland and their ports of entry at Baltimore, and in our areas in eastern Pennsylvania, but I do feel that if we are to fan out our shipments of ore deposits that are now being mined, especially in Venezuela, it will be necessary to look to further development and planning that goes with the inland-waterway system of this great Nation. I believe that as a further measure of national defense, and thinking in terms of our national interest and the future of this great Nation, we had better consider this amendment very seriously.

I refer you especially to the Joint Economic Committee hearings, held in January of this year, on the increased steel prices effective in December 1949. I beg of the membership that they carefully consider these amendments, especially in the light of steel price rise hearings in the light of the facts that they brought out.

The entire future of our shipments of ore deposits from Venezuela is tied in with the problem of our future development of our inland-waterways system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, somebody said something about the cost of this set-up. Eighteen locks at other places and they cost fifteen to twenty million dollars. Here they put in something like $80,000,000. It is perfectly apparent that they cost $217,000,000. Eighteen times $15,000,000 is $270,000,000. With the terrific excavation that is the equivalent of 88,000,000 yards of dirt to move I wonder if anybody here is going to be deluded into believing that there is not any cost to doing such an enormous job. I only want the Members of this House to realize what they are getting into if they stick their necks out to start this terrific project.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The estimates of the Army engineers have not worked out very well. Their estimates are very unreliable according to past performances.

Mr. TABER. That is the record they have submitted to us.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York referred to this Tombigbee project as a half-billion-dollar project. There is some argument about the figures, but I wish to set forth for the Committee just a few figures that the Committee has actual cognizance of, figures that have bounded upward in quotations made to us in succeeding years in the rivers and harbors and flood-control budget. The flood-control situation is worse than the rivers and harbors situation.

Here is a figure of $6,228,000 in 1949, which in 1951 becomes $10,300,000. Here is a 1949 figure of $13,216,000 that has gone up to $17,123,000. Here is another one, $28,771,000 that is now up to $42,208,000. Here is one of $164,000,000-plus which is now up to $185,000,000. Here is another, $9,860,000, that is now $15,090,000. Here is one of $3,144,000 that is now $4,615,000. So there is some justification for the statement and the apprehension expressed by the distinguished gentleman from New York when he refers to the Tombigbee as a half-billion-dollar proposition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Not now. The gentleman has talked two or three times, and this is the first time I have spoken on the subject.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to correct the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. I decline to yield.

There is no evidence before the Appropriations Committee that the Tombigbee project is a security measure; and there is no approval of the Bureau of the Budget for construction. Understand that, there is no approval by the Bureau, it never has been approved for construction by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will not yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is making a mistake.

Mr. RABAUT. I will not be interrupted by the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; but you ought not to make a misstatement like that.

Mr. RABAUT. I want that out of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. I will put it back in the RECORD.

Mr. RABAUT. You can do it, but in your own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan declines to yield. The gentleman cannot put anything in the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan unless the gentleman from Michigan yields to him.

Mr. RABAUT. Let me remind you that we have a debt today of $257,000,000,000. If you could print a debt in red because it was red and because it was great, I do not know where you could get the color. It is getting redder every day, yet this House is filled with voices who say: "I am for economy but," "I am for economy but."

We have an example of that here today. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for $1,000,000 plus, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for $2,000,000 plus, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] four and one-half million dollars plus, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] $2,000,000 plus, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] $1,300,000. They are not all to be added together, but these are the sums that are offered by gentlemen who are for economy but.

When are we going to get down to economy? When are we going to take a straight look at this figure of $257,000,000,000 in the red?

Why did the committee take this action? Why did it stop planning for 1 year? So that we might concentrate on the pending projects that are with the engineers at this time, just like any businessman would stop and take stock of a tremendous undertaking. That is our reason. That is why we stand here.

It is not a popular position that I take, but I am charged with the legislative responsibility to bring this bill before you as reported by the committee, and for that reason I present it to you and tell you the reasons why I hope we will not be hearing this whole afternoon "I am for economy but."

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there are now four proposals pending—the Passman amendment, the Rankin substitute, the Brooks amendment to the substitute, and the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment. Am I correct in my understanding that the first vote will be on the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment, followed by a vote on the Brooks amendment to the Rankin substitute, then we will vote on the Rankin substitute, whether amended or not, then, finally, if the Rankin substitute is not adopted we will vote on the Passman amendment, as amended, if it is amended?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. It may obviate further parliamentary inquiries if the Chair might be indulged a moment. On page 6 of Cannon's Procedure a diagram will be found that illustrates the present situation very clearly and if the Chair may be indulged further he will further illustrate by the use of his hand.

Here is the text of the pending bill, here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the Passman amendment, here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi as a substitute for the Passman amendment, here is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] as an amendment to the substitute.

They will be submitted in the order, first, the amendment to the Passman amendment, next the Brooks amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, then on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, then on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Louisiana offered an amendment which in part applied to line 1 and in part to line 10, on page 337. To which of these parts does his amendment apply?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state, in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has offered one amendment; his original amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Which is his original amendment then? To what line does it apply? Does it apply to both places?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] offered an amendment which applies to two different lines in the pending paragraph.

Mr. RABAUT. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Does the Rankin amendment omit reference to line 1?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be difficult for the Chair to explain all four of these amendments when we have had nearly an hour of debate here. By having the amendment again reported, that should answer the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Passman amendment may be divided into two parts, one of which is a proviso, and the second part of his proposal is to another and independent part of this bill 10 lines further on. The Passman amendment is susceptible of a division. The Rankin amendment and the Brooks amendment to the Rankin amendment only amend one part of the Passman amendment. If the Rankin amendment is adopted, the first part of the Passman amendment remains. Is not that the situation?

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing to respond to. The gentleman is simply explaining the amendment.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Pickett amendment to the Passman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes 38, noes 121.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Passman amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON to the Passman amendment: Strike out "$188,678,000" and insert "$188,978,000."

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The amendment to the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 57, noes 116.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is the amendment as amended, increasing it merely $1,000,000?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Passman amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PASSMAN) there were—ayes 51, noes 112.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio: On page 337, line 10, after the sum and before the colon, insert "of which $75,000 shall be available for dredging in the Old River, Cleveland, Ohio, out of amounts allotted to other purposes for Cleveland Harbor as authorized by law."

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It does not call for any increase or decrease in the funds. It merely grants authority to the engineers to use $75,000 of the already allocated sum for the Cleveland Harbor for the very important deepening of what we call the old river from 21 to 23 feet. This is particularly important at this time because of the fact that the Lake Erie level is in a down cycle and this increases the problem of getting the large barges to the docks on this river.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to without any difficulty.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very familiar with that project and I think it is extremely deserving. I hope it will receive the unanimous support of the membership.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this particular project is not budgeted. It is dredging to a private dock. The engineers considered it not important enough to budget at this time.

That is my whole argument about the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it appears that everybody wants to get in on the Democratic act these days—particularly when the act has proven as successful as the operation of of the Grand Coulee Dam, which President Truman will dedicate this Thursday.

I was surprised—and a bit dismayed—to learn that the Republican Party is now trying to get in on the act by taking credit for Grand Coulee. Former Gov. Harold Stassen—whose Presidential ambitions are apparently not satisfied by the mere presidency of a great university—made the interesting and daring statement in a political speech last week in New York that the plans for Grand Coulee Dam were prepared under President Hoover.

Now I know that the president of a unversity as great as Pennsylvania is interested in getting at the facts. So here are some facts about the development of Grand Coulee—so that it will be very clear as to just who did what.

The plans for Grand Coulee were not prepared overnight, during the administration of any one President. The idea for Grand Coulee and the entire Columbia Basin irrigation project originally appeared in the first annual report to the Congress of the Federal Reclamation Service. The date was 1903—not during Mr. Hoover's administration.

Over a number of years, more detailed surveys were made. The construction of the dam was not authorized until May 15, 1928—10 months before Mr. Hoover was inaugurated as President—not during his administration.

But billions of dollars of projects are authorized which are never built. Authorization does not mean construction. It only means that the funds can be appropriated. But without the money, you can not even buy a bag of cement.

So what actually did happen during Mr. Hoover's administration, when Governor Stassen says the plans were prepared? The answer is "Absolutely nothing."

It was not that the subject was not brought up, mind you. On January 7, 1932, while Mr. Hoover was still in the White House, the Chief Engineer of the

Bureau of Reclamation submitted a report to the President, recommending the construction of Grand Coulee and the Columbia Basin irrigation project.

Apparently, President Hoover took little notice of this recommendation—for he had 14 months left in the White House to take action on it. What did he do? The answer again is—absolutely nothing.

It was not until 1933 that President Roosevelt, who realized the potential of the dam and the irrigation project, allotted funds under the National Industrial Recovery Act for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam. The irrigation project was authorized later in a specific statute—under a Democratic Congress.

These are the facts, Mr. Chairman. They show that the Republican Party—and the Hoover administration—were apparently quite ready to plan and wait. But President Roosevelt, and the Democratic Party, were not satisfied with planning and waiting. They believed—and still believe—in action.

There is hardly a person in the Northwest—including our businessmen—who does not, now that the deed is done and the dam is built, realize the far-sightedness of President Roosevelt in giving the green light to the construction of Grand Coulee. The chief engineer of one of the biggest pulp and paper concerns on the west coast acknowledged publicly, not long ago, that he had once opposed the public power program—but that he knows now that his business could not have survived without it. So I do not wonder that the governor is so anxious to get in on the act.

Thirteen of the 18 huge generators have already been installed, and can now produce a peak load of nearly 1,700,000 kilowatts, enough electricity to illuminate well over 3,000,000 homes. The ultimate capacity at the dam will be just under 2,000,000 kilowatts.

This power has formed the basis not only for tremendous industrial growth in the Northwest, but also for the largest atomic reactor in the world, at Richland, Wash. This power enabled the Northwest to produce half the Nation's aluminum during the war. Our amazing production records for airplanes would not have been possible without the foresight of President Roosevelt.

It is highly appropriate that President Truman will also dedicate, on Thursday, the largest man-made lake in the West, created by Grand Coulee Dam—for the lake is to bear the name of the great American leader who caused this man-made Niagara Falls to be built—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

At Grand Coulee, work is being rushed to complete the world's largest pumps, driven by the world's largest motors, which will soon boost water from Lake Roosevelt into a feeder canal, and from there to enough irrigable land to accomodate 13,000 family-sized farms.

The over-all cost of Grand Coulee Dam, and the Columbia Basin irrigation project, will be about $773,000,000—but every cent of this investment will be returned to the Federal Treasury—three-fourths of it from the sale of power, and one-fourth from irrigation revenues. That is a sound investment of the taxpayers' money.

So Mr. Governor Stassen, I am glad that you feel that Grand Coulee has been such a tremendous success that you are anxious to give the credit to Mr. Hoover.

But please, Mr. Governor, let us get the facts straight.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER: On page 337, line 10, after the semicolon, strike out "$187,678,000" and insert "$188,178,000."

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore to the bill the amount recommended by the budget for the improvement of the Monongahela River near Morgantown, W. Va., known as lock No. 10.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended $2,000,000. The engineers, I assume, desire that amount. It seems to me, that without any rhyme or reason, the subcommittee reduced this amount by half a million dollars. The project has been nearing completion, and if this half million is cut from the amount recommended by the budget, it will necessitate allowing to remain as an obstruction to navigation two old locks that have been lying there for years and years. It would mean, in addition to that, a considerable increase in the total cost of completing the project. I can see no reason whatsoever for cutting this half million dollars off of the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. When you realize that these barges loaded with coal, iron, and other material are going up and down the river, and they are confronted with two old locks that remain in the river as an obstruction to navigation, so that the tows cannot use even the new locks that are practically completed, there seems to be no sense whatever in reducing the budget figure, just for the ostensible showing of saving a half million dollars. New bids will have to be asked for. Perhaps new contractors will bid. Perhaps new equipment will have to be brought onto the scene, and it would be a waste of money to reduce this $2,000,000 asked for by the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers to $1,500,000.

This is really a worth-while project. If we complete a 9-foot project but cannot use it, then all the money is wasted for a year or maybe two. If you cut off this half million dollars it means that for 12 months you have to use something that is outmoded and has been outmoded for many years. In other words, you have to break up your tow and go through the old locks twice; it is either that or attempt to use the new locks and break up your tow because this obstruction is in the river. I submit, and I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will agree with me, that at the present time tows and barges can only be used to 60 or 70 percent of capacity. If we cut the budget recommendations by half a million dollars the benefits of the 9-foot channel will be delayed another 12 months. The gentleman will agree that $2,000,000 is necessary to complete the project. Why cut this half million from it and delay its use to maximum capacity? No industrial concern would ever cut half a million out of a two-million project and leave it worthless for another 12 months. It will cost more in the long run to make this one-half million cut than it will to appropriate the full amount now. I sincerely hope that the subcommittee will agree to this addition of $500,000 to the $1,500,000 now in the bill as reported. The adoption of my amendment will actually save Government expenditures in the long run.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to debate with my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania who at times has been my genial fishing partner and associate, but I just want to say with regard to this Monongahela River project that the reason for the action of the committee can be told in one short sentence: That project has an unobligated balance of $937,400. The committee in its wisdom felt that that was enough money for them to proceed with this year in view of the condition of the Treasury.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman will not deny that the project will be delayed 12 additional months by cutting off this half million.

Mr. RABAUT. But I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that no family faced with a purse that is in the condition of the purse of Uncle Sam today would indulge in any needless expenditure.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman will also admit that the ultimate cost will be greater if we cut off this half million.

Mr. RABAUT. The committee is advised that the project has $937,400 unexpended. We felt they had enough for this year.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman will not deny the logic of what I have said, will he?

Mr. RABAUT. I admire the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his defense of projects in his district and in the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 21, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 337, line 10, strike out "$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$192,923,000"; and on page 338, line 10, for the period insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That $5,250,000 of the amount here-

in provided shall be available for planning and initiating the construction of the Ice Harbor Dam on Snake River, Wash."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, this is an item that was carried in the last annual appropriation bill and the project has been authorized. The item was put in the construction project program by the Army engineers, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, carried in an appropriation bill and it passed the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order, too.

Mr. Chairman, I read from the report of the Army engineers on this particular project:

The division engineer has restudied the problem of water use in the Columbia and Snake Basins in the light of changed conditions.

He finds the most suitable plan for the ultimate improvement of the two streams between the Bonneville Dam and Lewiston, Idaho, to be a series of 4 locks and dams for complete canalization of the middle Columbia between the head of the Bonneville pool and the mouth of the Snake, and a series of 10 locks and dams for complete canalization of the Snake from its mouth to Lewiston.

He accordingly finds that the Umatilla Dam and the four dams proposed for the Snake River should be constructed before undertaking slack-water improvement of the Columbia below Umatilla, where a fairly adequate channel already exists.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs in the view that the foregoing plans constitute a satisfactory, comprehensive, and integrated program for the initial and ultimate development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers between Bonneville and Lewiston, Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the committee that the Columbia River is now navigable all the way up to its confluence with the Snake River at Pasco, Wash. The construction of three dams already approved by the Army engineers will permit navigation to Lewiston, Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, for many years we have had navigation on the Snake River in the high-water season. What we need now is a slack-water route up to Lewiston, Idaho. We have in the making of the great Columbia River Basin a project of 200,000 acres down river from the country surrounding Lewiston, the Columbia Basin project nearing completion and the people are eagerly waiting to go on the land. In order to move the products from the forest, in order to move building materials, stone, lime, and things like that downstream, we needed to improve the river for navigation between the confluence of the Snake River at Pasco and the confluence of the Snake and the Clearwater Rivers at Lewiston, Idaho.

This project has been approved and voted on and has been passed by the House of Representatives. It failed of passage in the Senate last year due to the fact it was stated no fish ladders had been provided for the Fish and Wildlife Service. We now find that the fishways have been provided for and now this project has been dropped out of this appropriation bill after being put in by the Army engineers. I ask that it be restored and included in this bill.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Would not the establishment of the Ice Harbor Dam give us transportation facilities as well as power facilities to serve that whole inland empire?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is correct.

Mr. HOLMES. And, in turn, these transportation facilities would effect the clearance of wheat and the products of the Inland Empire down through the Snake River to its confluence with the Columbia and on to the coast.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is exactly correct. This transportation system has been in use since the early settlement of the country, but only during high-water times, but now, with the construction of the Umatilla Dam we will have transportation facilities upstream to transport the materials needed to build this great project that is now under construction.

Mr. HOLMES. The slack-water pool created by the construction of McNary Dam would fit right into this series of dams on the Snake River.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is correct.

Mr. HOLMES. And the Ice Harbor Dam is the pivotal dam in relation to the lower dams, as well as serving the power-development program.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is 100-percent correct. It is a very short-sighted policy to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Idaho that there was $250,000 in the budget for planning, but this year, as we explained earlier and as the gentleman has heard, we have allowed no money for planning on any new project, seeking to have the Army engineers get up to date. We are taking stock of everything, and I am sorry that the gentleman's project falls in that category, and for that reason the amount was not allowed. There is no particular antagonism to the gentleman's project. I want him to know that. This falls in the category that we are not allowing planning here for new construction, and this project seeks $250,000 for planning.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman appreciates the fact that this item was contained in the last annual appropriation bill, not only for planning but for construction, and it passed this House. It passed the House in the annual appropriation bill, and when it came back this time it was reduced to planning.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I remember the incident.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. This project has already been approved by this House.

Mr. RABAUT. The amount was cut out last year because of a controversy. The Senate cut the amount out because of the fact that a controversy developed about the fish ladders, and under the situation the committee did not know what to do. So, naturally, when in doubt, do not act. We refused to act until they settled the matter of the fish climbing the ladders.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman knows that that question has been resolved and the fish ladders have been provided for, and there is no objection to the project on that score.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. In order to clarify the fish-ladder controversy, it is my understanding that the fish-ladder problem connected with the construction of this dam has been cleared up by an agreement that was arrived at last year with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. RABAUT. That may be true, but it is not now budgeted for construction. It was budgeted this year only for planning. It comes under the general heading of planning and for that reason falls under our general rule that there shall be no money for planning this year. We have nothing against this particular project, it is just that there is no money in the bill this year for the planning of this project or any other project. They are all treated alike; there is no money for planning.

I know the gentleman's devotion to this proposition and I admire him for it, but it is just one of those cases where it was eliminated last year because of the controversy over the fish, and it is eliminated this year because of the ruling of the committee about allowing money for planning.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. As a Member of Congress representing the great fisheries area of Oregon, I will say that the controversy has not been settled as to the fish ladders. The fish industry objects to this. I should also like to say that the Portland Oregonian, the biggest paper in Oregon; the Seattle Post-Intellengencer, the biggest paper in the State of Washington; and the Yakima Herald, in the congressional district of the gentleman from Washington, the biggest paper in his district, are all opposed to it, and I could name a half a dozen

others. I am very much opposed to it myself.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLSON: On page 337, line 10, strike out "$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$188,995,600, of which amount there shall be available for projects in Massachusetts the following sums: $106,700 for the Cohasset Harbor project; $124,000 for the Duxbury Harbor project; $18,300 for the Buzzards Bay to Buttermilk Bay Channel project; $95,100 for the Wellfleet Harbor project; $756,000 for the Provincetown Harbor project; $182,500 for the Hyannis Harbor project; and $35,000 for the Falmouth Harbor project.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I had the idea that by putting all these projects in I might get one or two or three or four, but it looks as though I am rather in the position of the fellow who went fishing. Someone asked him how he got along, and he said, "Well, I didn't get what I expected, but I didn't expect I would."

These propositions have all been studied and passed on by Congresses for a great many years. The United States Army engineers have approved them all. The engineers have shown in their reports to the Congress that it is economy for the Government to help out the State of Massachusetts and the towns where these harbors are. We have to pay half the expense of either dredging or putting out jetties. We have been in rather a tough situation because we have had two hurricanes in the last 12 years that did a terrible lot of damage to these harbors. As a matter of fact, you cannot get into some of them except at high tide. Of course, the tide ebbs and flows every 6 hours, and it is kind of tough when you have to wait 6 hours to get in with your catch.

We are going to have sent to us by the President of the United States a communication to take care of the small business of the country.

Here are a thousand or two thousand people who are in small business. They get their living at this business. They pay their taxes to the town and the State and Federal Governments. They make a living because they have a harbor to come into to unload their catch.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up any more time. I know that the Bureau of the Budget did not recommend this. Well, they did not recommend anything else. The only place a Member can urge that a bill be passed or that an item be included in this bill is not down at the Bureau of the Budget, but here in the Halls of Congress. I will take the advice of the Bureau of the Budget occasionally, but when they are wrong, I reserve the right to stand up and vote against the Bureau. I am sure the rest of you do likewise, and here is an opportunity for you to exercise your right.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There are many worth-while projects which have been left out by the Bureau of the Budget. I presume that the four projects referred to by the champion of the fishermen were some of those projects. But the committee has eliminated some budgeted projects this year and certainly it would be difficult for us to go along or ask the House to go along on unbudgeted items.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 337, line 10, strike out "$187,678,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$185,878,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Do I understand the gentleman is reducing the figure?

Mr. SUTTON. It seems queer and funny, but I am trying to reduce it by $1,800,000 on a project in my own district.

Mr. Chairman, there is a project in the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee by the Army engineers which has a low dam known as the Cheatham Lock and Dam and Dover Dam on the lower Cumberland River. This project is very controversial. It has been a matter of controversy for something over a year. On January 27, 1950, Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Congressman PRIEST, Congressman GORE and I wrote the President of the United States and requested that the TVA make a survey of the lower Cumberland River to find out which place it would be better to have a dam and whether it should be a high dam or a low dam. The Army engineers have wanted to build a low dam for several years, but there has been much controversy in all the counties affected. So on February 2, 1950, the President requested that the TVA make a survey to see what would be inundated and what would be best to recommend to the people. In this appropriation there are $1,800,000 for this project. I am asking the committee to go along and cut this $1,800,000 so that the dam will not be built until this survey has been made by the TVA. Then we can find out what will actually be done to the people's land in that district.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. When do you expect that report to be made, so that we can act intelligently on this matter.

Mr. SUTTON. The TVA suggested that it might be 11 months before the report came in. Actually there will be no project this year if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. GOLDEN. Has the President ordered the survey?

Mr. SUTTON. He has ordered that survey. So here is a chance for you to economize and cut this $1,800,000 out. I am of the opinion that no dam should be built until we find out actually what should be done. As I say, this is in my own congressional district and I hope until a survey is made that the Committee on Appropriations and the House will go along and eliminate this money until the time comes when we find out what is best for the people down there as a result of this survey which is to be made at the President's request.

I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. At the time the engineers were before us there was $1,300,000 of $1,400,000 that was appropriated last year that had not been obligated. I was wondering if the gentleman could tell us whether that money had heretofore been obligated, since the engineers were before us.

Mr. SUTTON. It is my understanding that it has not, but I am not sure.

Mr. TABER. You understand it has not been?

Mr. SUTTON. That is correct. In 1949 the Army engineers estimated this would cost $9,900,000. They came before the committee this time and estimated it would cost $15,264,000. Actually, they do not know yet. In fact, I think everything should be held up until a complete survey is made.

Mr. TABER. Does this not sound reasonable?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am really surprised to receive this information. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I assure the Committee I will not take 5 minutes.

The purpose of taking the floor is to make an inquiry of the committee. Out of $341,000,000 in this bill for flood control, Michigan has but one item of $490,000. The total amount of that project, and it is the Red Run project in southeast Oakland County, affecting eight cities, was $1,010,000. Five hundred thousand dollars was appropriated last year in a previous bill. That leaves a balance of $510,000 to complete the work. The committee has seen fit to reduce that to $490,000, or a cut of $20,000. On the bottom of page 255 of the report on this bill is a notation that the project is to be completed within the amount recom-

mended. That is completed with $490,000. My inquiry is this: Was there any evidence submitted to the committee by the Army engineers or those in charge of the work—the project is already under construction—to show that $490,000 is sufficient to complete the work, that would justify a cut of $20,000.

Mr. RABAUT. The study of the committee indicates that there was an unexpended balance of $479,900. They had not got started. Prices were higher at the time the work was started than they are at the present time. They wanted $565,000 and the committee, in its wisdom, figured that $490,000 would complete the transaction.

Mr. DONDERO. The only thing I am interested in is to know that the amount in the bill is sufficient to complete the work.

Mr. RABAUT. We feel that it would.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I have a similar situation in a flood-control project at Portville, N. Y. There is a notation at the bottom of the report of the subcommittee that the work must be completed within the amount set forth. The contractor refuses to sign the contract on the ground that he cannot complete the work in the area, that will save the people in case of another flood. If he cannot do the work the way it ought to be done, he will not do it. The Army has restricted him to an area that does not cover the whole flood district.

Mr. RABAUT. The engineers have been told by the committee to complete the work.

Mr. TABER. An $850,000 project.

Mr. REED of New York. It works an injustice because they restrict the work of the contractor to an area that falls short of taking in what ought to be covered under the contract, and he will not take it because he can only make his money in the other part of the territory which the Army said he could not cover at this time.

Mr. DONDERO. The purpose of my inquiry was, regarding the Red Run, because of the vitally important nature of this project to a population of over 150,000 people in eight cities in my district. That is the reason I wanted to be sure that the amount included by the committee was sufficient to complete the work.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not know whether the gentleman knows it or not, but I went out personally to view the project. The gentleman will remember the support the project received last year when the project was allowed.

Mr. DONDERO. I do, and I thank the gentleman for his support of the project.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of explaining the situation that exists with reference to the Portville project in New York. I have checked it and have found an astounding situation that I think the House should know about and that the head of the War Department should know about.

At the time the hearings were held that project had an unobligated balance of $371,300. The committee carried an item of $850,000 to complete the job. That makes a total of $1,221,300. The Army engineers have received a bid to complete the projects from this contractor, the whole project, not just part of it, for $1,186,464; or $34,836 less than the amount they will have available, and still the Army engineers refuse to let the contract unless they get $250,000 more. What for, goodness only knows. That is the kind of job that has been done there.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. And the trouble is that they have started a fire and now expect me to correct the situation when they tell the people that under the present allowance of money they cannot complete the job so that it will save them in the event of another extraordinary flood. These people have been flooded so badly that they have had to be taken out from the second stories of their houses at night in boats. They have these terrific floods and now they are told that they cannot do the job on the money allowed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I pointed out in my statement of April 7, my understanding is that after this project was adopted, after it was authorized, that there was an increase in the population up and down the stream there and it was clearly evident that unless the project were extended it would not protect the lives and property of those people. The engineers asked for an increase in estimate. There is nothing personal about this so far as I am concerned, for it is not in the part of the country in which I live.

Mr. TABER. But there has been money enough provided in the bill and in the carry-over to cover the cost of the contract at the price that the contractor has bid to do the whole complete job, yet they will not let the contract. They have $34,000 margin and still they will not let the contract. There is no sense at all to that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not mean to delay, but they maintain that if they do let the contract it will not under the appropriation previously made and under the limitations of this appropriation provide for an extension of the project that will protect those people who are not being protected.

Mr. TABER. Why would the contractor bid less than the amount available and have that situation except on the basis of doing the whole job? I cannot see; it is beyond me.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All I know is that evidently the contract has not been let for the amount that is to be appropriated here; otherwise there would be no occasion for the appropriation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: On page 338, line 10, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For work on the Barcelona project in the State of New York, $100,000."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for a moral obligation involved in my amendment, I would not take the floor at this time, but I believe that moral obligations should be kept, by an individual or by a nation, and as a Representative in this Congress I feel I owe it to a community which has acted in good faith to take this floor at the present time and do everything within my power to persuade the committee to accept my amendment.

This is a unique community for which I am speaking today. It has a very ancient harbor located on the south shore of Lake Erie between Buffalo and Erie. It has been a fishing harbor for many years, it has been a harbor of refuge for a century, it has been a navigation school for the training of young men in practical seamanship for many years. It has also been a life-saving station during its entire existence as a harbor.

Barcelona, N. Y., was made a port of entry as early as 1831. They built up a very fine community there and the Government gave them some aid in the early days. The Federal Government in days when it was not so affluent as it has been at other times needed a lighthouse. Who built that lighthouse? A public-spirited man in that community built a very fine lighthouse that stands there today. It has sent out its beams of warning to the commerce on the Great Lakes for years and years to keep the ships off the dangerous shoals and rocks near the shore. It is impossible to know how many human lives it has saved.

There is a great fishing ground just off this little harbor of Barcelona and for years they have brought in their countless tons of fish to feed the Nation, particularly in time of war. It is 17 miles to a harbor of refuge to the east and 38 miles to the west. There are thousands upon thousands of small boats today operating along the shores of our Great Lakes. They need this as a harbor of refuge.

To show you how far the civic-minded people have gone to maintain this harbor which they need, they have built wharves, they built the lighthouse, they built storage facilities there, they put their own money into these projects over a period of 119 years.

The Government ceased appropriating for Barcelona Harbor, the port of Westfield, N. Y., with the result that the silt and the sand and the dirt and the rocks have been thrown into the harbor due to the action of the heavy and frequent storms. The community itself is

being devastated. These fishermen cannot get their boats into the harbor to unload their catch, and as a consequence they are obliged to desert their homes and move to other ports. In 1945, $303,000 was authorized by the Congress for this project with the condition precedent imposed by the Federal Government that the community would bond itself for $7,500 to do its part toward the construction of this project. That condition required the citizens to go to Albany, the State capital, at great expense, with their attorneys, to obtain an enabling act to authorize the taxpayers to vote a bond issue. When that bond issue came up to be voted on under the enabling act it was the first time in the history of the community, which is more than a century old, that the village of Westfield had voted a bond issue. They passed the bond issue by a vote of more than 30 to 1, showing that the people were united in favor of the project, and they believed, of course, when they bonded themselves, that the Federal Government would perform its part. I say frankly that the Bureau of the Budget did not see fit to recommend this item but here is the moral obligation of the transaction. The moral obligation is that if this improvement is suffered to be delayed another year before beginning this work, every fishing boat will be driven out of the Barcelona Harbor, and they will be forced to go miles and miles from their fishing grounds. In other words, it will deny the fishermen and others a harbor of refuge for the fishing boats, and it will compel the boats to go out many miles from other ports and thus run the chance of sudden storms which might wreck them before the sailors could return to safety. If you fail to begin construction now, many lives may be lost because the Congress failed to restore this harbor of refuge.

Here is a community that since 1831 has been putting in its own money; it built the lighthouse necessary for commerce on the Great Lakes. Even when the sailing vessel days were passing out of the navigation picture the people raised money, incorporated, and built a steamboat which operated out of this harbor. So I feel that I am not making an unreasonable request of this Congress as a moral obligation of the Government to approve at least $100,000 in this bill to start the restoration of Barcelona Harbor.

Now, just stop and think of it. Most of you Members have been to Europe. We have been supplying money to a socialistic government, and I have no quarrel with the free-enterprise people themselves in that country. But they have been using their own tax money to pay short-term bills; they have been using our taxpayers' money to buy wigs, monacles, and other nonessential articles at our expense. It seems to me that the time has come for us to measure up to our own moral obligation at home and not devastate and destroy a fishing harbor, a harbor of refuge, just because we have the power to do it. I am not criticizing the subcommittee. The subcommittee has treated me with every courtesy, but when the Bureau of the Budget fails to act in a crisis like this I feel that Congress represents the people of the United States and that they should meet the home emergencies instead of financing emergencies all over the world.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. What is the population of that community?

Mr. REED of New York. The population is three or four thousand. Is that worth destroying or keeping?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, it is not a question of destroying it. We do not want to destroy it. I just wanted to ask a question, that is all.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be allotted to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to quote from the hearings before this subcommittee on page 593:

> Mr. TABER. What is the estimated cost of this project, Mr. REED?
>
> Mr. REED. The amount authorized is $791,000, as I recall.

This is $791,000, and three or four thousand people are involved.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. That figure is not correct. It was a typographical error. The amount is $303,000. I am asking for only $100,000 to commence the work.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows that no new projects are being started this year. I admire the gentleman for his devotion to his district, but there is a time when we have to take cognizance of the condition of the Treasury. The gentleman's project is in the same category as all the rest of them.

I ask for a vote on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REED of New York) there were—ayes 17, noes 30.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: On page 338, after line 10, insert "$100,000, appropriated in the bill, be made available for improvement of Barcelona Harbor, New York."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think I have presented this case very fairly. I hope I can impress the committee with this thought: The condition of this harbor has become such, as a result of the heavy storms that have afflicted it that the failure to improve the harbor now will result in driving the few remaining small boats out of there thus rendering the Barcelona Harbor absolutely useless for commercial purposes. If the work is commenced now, this year, and $100,000 made available, then we can save this harbor for the citizens and thus save this community asset for a community that has met its own civic responsibility as well as a part of the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York seeks to take $100,000 from other projects to which the money has been assigned. Every penny in the bill is earmarked for some particular thing. The gentleman is asking that $100,000 be assigned to this project. I do not feel the committee can start going on record in favor of a request such as this because it would be very discriminatory against others who have planned their projectcs and made certain justifications whereby the money was allocated to their projects. The amendment pretty well answers itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of confidence in this subcommittee and in its work, but I question the wisdom of a cut inflicted by the subcommittee in the Jim Woodruff Dam project in the great and important Apalachicola Waterway. That project was cut from $5,000,000 to $3,500,000.

During the Easter recess I visited the site of the dam and talked at length with the engineers in charge of that project. They are there on the ground and they have all the facts. They told me without qualification that a cut from $5,000,000 to $3,500,000 in that project is, for valid and sound reasons, going to mean a delay of 2 years in the completion of the project.

Once that project is completed, the Government will take in $1,033,000 a year from hydroelectric power. The 2 years' delay which the present cut may entail will mean that we are going to lose over $2,000,000 in revenue and to lose badly needed electric power and the use of the waterway for 2 years in order to delay—not save—the expenditure of $1,500,000. Therefore, I question the wisdom of the committee in cutting the funds for that valuable project and I trust that they will be restored.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to offer an amendment, but I want to ask several

questions of the subcommittee with reference to two of the projects in California. I am interested in the item on page 250 of the report referred to as the Sacramento River, $1,500,000. We were able to convince the Bureau of the Budget that they should give us $2,500,000 for the project. I think the reason was that by making a Federal appropriation it would release $3,750,000 of local money. Another matter about which I am concerned is this: the purpose of part of this Federal money is to build a short canal from the Sacramento River to the turning basin of the deep-water channel, or the artificial channel which the engineers will build. On that little canal a large grain elevator is being constructed on the supposition that this appropriation might be large enough to build that canal which will connect the Sacramento River with the turning basin of the Sacramento ship channel. What I would like to know is just how did the committee happen to reduce the amount? Was it just a general economy move, or was there some other specific reason for it?

Mr. RABAUT. There was an unobligated balance of $1,419,500 on December 31. In this appropriation they got $1,700,000. So they have a considerable sum of money left.

Mr. JOHNSON. We got $1,500,000?

Mr. RABAUT. Just a minute. Last year the appropriation was $1,700,000, of which they had an unexpended balance on December 31 of $1,419,500. So they had only scratched the amount given last year. Now we have added to that this year $1,500,000. So they have a very substantial sum of money. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think it does, too. I would like to ask about another project on page 254 of the report. The item is in California and is referred to as the Farmington Reservoir, $500,000. We were able to convince the Bureau of the Budget that they should give us the total amount required for the completion of that dam. The total amount that they estimated would be required to complete the dam was $1,674,000. The Bureau of the Budget allowed the full amount in order to get the dam out of the way and completed this year, which is good economy. It is better to get these things completed and out of the way instead of dragging them out year after year. I would like to know what impelled the subcommittee to make such a drastic cut in that Bureau recommendation?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, the situation is practically the same. They have more money to work with now than they have needed. Last year we gave them $1,700,000. The unexpended balance as at the end of the year was $1,510,800. We have given them $500,000 additional. So they have over $2,000,000. In view of the situation of Uncle Sam's purse, I think the committee did pretty well by them.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to explain this. I think a good part of that first appropriation is tied up in contracts for the purchase of land. We have not paid for the property but we have committed it. So it means that the construction money will be reduced very drastically. Apparently the Budget Bureau was motivated by the idea that they would recommend the full amount and this year build the entire dam. But whatever the committee decision was I will have to abide by it. I thank the gentleman for giving me the explanations. I wanted to get this in the RECORD so that anybody reading it will know exactly what the committee had in mind when they made the cuts. I appreciate the courtesy and the generosity of this committee very much.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: On page 338, after line 10, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Inland waterway, Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay, Del.: For prosecution of the works of improvement with respect to the inland waterway, Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay, Del., as authorized in the River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945 (Public Law 41, 79th Cong.), $122,000."

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, in the brief space of only a few minutes which have been allotted to me, I shall earnestly strive to justify and to obtain the support of the Members for the amendment which I have submitted and you have just heard.

The amendment provides for the inclusion of an appropriation of $122,000 for the improvement of the inland waterway and Roosevelt Inlet at Lewes, Del.

This project is not a new one. This existing Federal project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, and provides for the deepening of the existing channel from a present depth of 6 feet to a necessary depth of 10 feet.

The district engineer, the division engineer, and the Chief of Army Engineers specifically recommended in the 1951 budget request that there be included $122,000 to be used for dredging this waterway channel to a depth of 10 feet. This specific request for funds to complete a necessary project authorized by the Congress 5 years ago was deleted by the Bureau of the Budget, and no satisfactory explanation for the deletion of this appropriation has as yet been given.

This authorized Federal project at the Roosevelt Inlet is the key to several other river and harbor projects. It is also the key to the effectiveness of other vitally important operations which are largely dependent upon the existence of a 10-foot channel from Roosevelt Inlet to the turning basin at Lewes, Del. One of the other Federal projects of long standing and recognized importance which is dependent upon the deepening of this channel is the Harbor of Refuge in Delaware Bay. This Harbor of Refuge is used by naval and commercial vessels whenever severe adverse weather conditions exist on the Delaware Bay or the adjacent Atlantic Ocean area.

Immediately adjacent to Lewes, Del., is Fort Miles, an Army installation of real importance to our seaboard defenses. The Army finds it necessary and essential to use seagoing vessels in connection with its extensive mine-laying and antiaircraft training programs. These Army ships must use the Roosevelt Inlet, and the present depth of the channel is considered inadequate for fullest utilization.

The United States Coast Guard is also dependent on the use of this waterway. The Commandant of the Coast Guard has stated that a channel depth of 10 feet would be advantageous to Coast Guard operations in that locality. He has also pointed out that patrol boats used by the Coast Guard have a draft of 5½ feet. Since the channel is only 6 feet deep, it allows very little clearance. The Commandant further stated that in heavy weather this condition becomes hazardous and at times may interfere with rescue operations. Thus the project cited doubtless would be advantageous to Coast Guard operations at this place.

Let me also point out that the Delaware Bay is one of the most important in the United States with respect to the tonnage of commercial shipping bound to and from the ports of Philadelphia, Pa., Camden, N. J., Baltimore, Md., Chester, Pa., and Wilmington, Del. Each of these commercial vessels of any considerable size takes on or discharges a bay and river pilot at Lewes, Del. The vessels used for transporting these pilots from shore to ship must use the inland waterway and the Roosevelt Inlet. Furthermore, at the location of this authorized Federal project, for which an appropriation of $122,000 is sought, there is the second largest menhaden fishing industry in the United States. At present this industry is greatly handicapped by the lack of adequate depth of the channel at the Roosevelt Inlet and in the portion of the inland waterway to which I am referring.

Therefore, gentlemen, from the standpoint of national defense, including operations of the Army and the Coast Guard, and from the standpoint of seaborne commerce, commercial fishing industries, and distressed shipping, it is to be seriously doubted if there is any single project in the United States which can better justify an appropriation. In spite of that fact and the obvious justification for an appropriation for this necessary and important project, the appropriation request for $122,000 was deleted by the Bureau of the Budget. Consequently, I now seek your support in having this item reinstated by the acceptance of the amendment which I have submitted.

Gentlemen, I sincerely believe that I have shown the necessity and the complete justification for the appropriation provided for by my amendment. Nevertheless, I want to use the remaining portion of the brief time allotted to me to give you some other startling facts which, as fair-minded men, I am sure you will consider. The State of Delaware is a small but extremely important and valuable State. It is for that reason that it is frequently referred to as the Diamond State. I am sure that the Treasury Department, and especially the Bureau of Internal Revenue, consider Delaware as the Diamond State. I make this statement because official statistics

of the Treasury Department reflect that the Federal Government collects in taxes slightly more than $1,000 per capita from Delaware, whereas the average per capita Federal tax receipts throughout the Nation are only about $280. In other words, gentlemen, the Federal tax receipts from Delaware are more than three and a half times the national average on a per capita basis. Treasury Department statistics also reflect that the average individual Federal income tax per capita in the United States is about $140 per year. Compare this, please, with the fact that the average per capita individual Federal income tax derived from Delaware is about $380 per year. In other words, the per capita Federal individual income tax return from Delaware is only slightly less than three times the national average.

Now you may ask why I have presented these figures, and I am only too happy to anticipate that question. Other statistics show that on the average each State receives in Federal grants to States and individuals $13.57 for every $100 of Federal taxes collected in the States. Delaware, which contributes out of all proportion to our tax revenues receives the smallest return in Federal grants. Delaware receives only $3.25 in Federal grants for every $100 it contributes to Federal tax revenues. On the other hand one State receives $107 for each $100 of Federal revenue.

The particular appropriation under consideration is for approximately $187,000,000. Thirty-three States, in addition to Alaska and the District of Columbia, would share in that appropriation. Delaware is not one of those States even though the authorized Federal project for which my amendment provides an appropriation was approved by the Congress 5 years ago. In addition, gentlemen, the appropriation which I seek here today represents only slightly more than six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total amount of the rivers and harbors appropriation recommended by the committee. Let me repeat—six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the recommended appropriation.

Now it is probable that many of you gentlemen are saying, "Yes, but we cannot increase this appropriation. We must have economy. We must reduce, not increase appropriations." No one, Mr. Chairman, has been more outspoken on behalf of greater economy in government than I have, and I do not now propose to change that position by one iota.

Consequently, I direct your attention to page 250 of the committee's report on this appropriation measure. There in the fourth paragraph you will find the committee's statement that this recommended appropriation includes the amount of $1,000,000 for "river and harbor studies," and another $1,000,000 for "miscellaneous inspections, investigations, and so forth." In other words, the committee is recommending an appropriation of $2,000,000 to be used in finding new river and harbor projects when we have before us a Federal project authorized 5 years ago which is considered by the Army, the Coast Guard, and commercial interests as vitally important completely omitted from this appropriation. The appropriation which my amendment provides for is in the sum of $122,000. Gentlemen, that sum represents only a little more than 6 percent of the $2,000,000 which is carried in this bill for the study and investigation of projects. How, I ask you, can this be justified or considered in any manner to be consistent? Here in this $2,000,000 for additional studies can be found without any increase in the total appropriation the complete sum of $122,000 called for in my amendment and recommended as necessary by so many governmental and private interests.

As Delaware's sole representative, I know that I stand alone in this Chamber. You know that I have no powerful delegation to lend me support. You know that it is highly improbable that any other Member will seek time or take the effort to speak on this floor on behalf of my amendment. Therefore, I earnestly request that as fair-minded men seeking the greatest return from the funds which you are about to appropriate that you consider the facts which I have presented which serve to justify your support for my amendment.

And I may add, if the members of the committee will permit, that I can give full assurances that the entire Delaware delegation in the House favors this amendment and urges its adoption.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I find myself confronted with the entire delegation of the State of Delaware on this amendment which, together with the fact that the gentleman from Delaware is so beloved in the House, makes it difficult for me to proceed. This project falls in the category of those projects that there is no budget estimate for.

For the same reason that has been advanced several times today, the committee must be opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard many times from this very able and hard-working subcommittee that because a project is new it sees fit not to include it in this year's estimate. I feel that there is a deep concern among many Members of this House, as well as myself, who have worthy projects that are much needed in their home districts, that have met all of the requirements and have been approved by the various Corps of Engineers, including the Chief of Engineers. I would like to make a very serious inquiry of the committee or some member thereof who may be informed. If there is a policy I would like to know when we may expect to get in some new projects.

Last year I appeared before this committee and explained the Pineville, Ky., project, where the people are almost destroyed every year by devastating floods. I received a very courteous hearing. The same procedure was repeated this year.

If there is a policy, or if the members of the subcommittee can advise myself and other Members of the House as to when we may receive consideration for new projects, I would like some member of that committee to advise us.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman repeat his request?

Mr. GOLDEN. I appeared before the gentleman's committee on two different occasions and received a very kind and a very courteous hearing on my Pineville, Ky., project. I realize that the committee has many serious obligations to meet. But I am in the same position that many other Members of this House are in. We have new projects that are worthy and that are badly needed, where our local communities have raised the money to furnish their part of the necessary funds to build these flood walls.

If a policy has been adopted by the gentleman's committee or if he could inform us when we may be able to successfully present our new projects, that information would be worth a great deal to the Members of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. First, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky that it is true he has been very diligent for his district before the committee. He came and presented all of the facts in reference to his project and he presented them in a most praiseworthy manner. But in view of the monetary situation of the country at this time, the existing deficit, and the deficit spending that is going on, the committee has taken a firm position against some projects. The gentleman knows as a legislator here that we cannot bind future committees and we cannot bind future Congresses.

Mr. GOLDEN. I realize that.

Mr. RABAUT. We are going to make no hard-and-fast rule about this. We did think that as a business proposition this year we should simply stand by and take stock of the great work that is being done all over the country by the Army engineers and that no new plans or projects this year be considered.

Mr. GOLDEN. I would like to point out to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I have no endeavor to undertake to bind the committee. I just simply ask if there has been any thought given to the need for new projects and as to when we may be considered.

A year's delay may mean the destruction of the town, and if there is any information that the gentleman can give us that would throw light on that, I would appreciate it. We have to answer to our constituents, and we are vitally interested.

Mr. RABAUT. Of course, the procedure is to present this matter to the Bureau of the Budget. The engineers first present this to the Bureau, and sometimes the Bureau sees fit to approve

and forward it to the Congress, and at other times they do not. So, that is the first hurdle that the gentleman must overcome.

Mr. GOLDEN. I want to say to the Members of the House that some time I hope to get this project through. We have annual damages in Pineville, Ky., that are in excess of the entire cost to build a flood wall around that town of about 4,000 people. My town has already voted bonds. Something over one-third of the cost has been apportioned to the local citizens, and we voted $490,000 of bonds, and we are hoping that before long, before another flood strikes, that we may find our financial affairs in such shape that we can approve of this project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what has been said about commencing new projects in view of the present financial condition of the United States Treasury. However, I would like to ask the distinguished Chairman of the subcommittee whether he feels enough money has been appropriated in this bill to take care of emergency flood-control measures. I make special reference to emergency work required on the Missouri River in the section designated in the report as Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska.

Mr. RABAUT. $3,000,000 has been appropriated.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am particularly concerned about great damage which may result to Gordon Drive on United States Highway No. 77 at Sioux City. This is a highway recently constructed by the Iowa State Highway Department along the Iowa bank of the Missouri River at Sioux City. During the ice run this spring, which was one of the heaviest in years, approximately 830 feet of the pile structure protecting this road was completely destroyed and the river was threatening about 1,500 feet of highway fill immediately shoreward and downstream from this structure.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I know of that damage. We had more water there than we had in 1943. That is right across the river from my district. On my side of the river we had approximately a million dollars worth of damage. Now, this $3,000,000 for emergency is an over-all emergency fund. Very little of that could be used on the Missouri River, although the engineers did go up there and do some sand bagging and gave some relief. But, the damage is there, and very little of this $3,000,000 is going to be applicable to give these people the relief they need now in the emergency.

Mr. HOEVEN. That is the very point I want to make. The $3,000,000 would not seem sufficient in view of the fact that this amount is all that is allowed for flood emergencies all over the country.

Mr. STEFAN. It is an emergency appropriation for emergencies all over the United States.

Mr. HOEVEN. So the proportionate part which could be allocated for Missouri River emergency work might prove very insignificant indeed.

Mr. STEFAN. It is very, very small.

Mr. HOEVEN. The Iowa State Highway Commission has invested a lot of money in the construction of Gordon Drive, to which project Sioux City has also contributed. This highway adjacent to the Missouri River is threatened with being washed out whenever the Missouri goes on a rampage. Twice within the last 2 years the Army engineers at Omaha have been called upon to construct emergency work for the protection of this very road. It is a hazard which must be taken care of.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Iowa and the rest of us along the river have been working on this problem from the very minute the matter was called to our attention. We got busy when we learned of the breaking up of the ice jam in North Dakota. The Army engineers have been on the job, but the subsequent damage is there today. We are getting complaints from our constituents all up and down that river.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is correct and he also realizes that there is a great investment of money involved. There should be some assurance on the part of subcommittee or the Congress, at least, that we are going to have enough money in the emergency fund to take care of the very things the gentleman from Nebraska and I have mentioned.

Mr. STEFAN. This is a real emergency.

Mr. HOEVEN. What is the Congress going to do about it?

Mr. STEFAN. I understand the Army engineers are willing to help all they can, but how much of this $3,000,000 can we get now?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is the question. I took the matter up with the district engineer at Omaha, who contends he does not have enough money to take care of all these emergency needs along the Missouri River. We are absolutely subject to the whims of nature and the weather and never know how much damage we are going to have when the river rushes down upon us.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman's statement on the floor should induce the Army engineers to give some more of that $3,000,000 where it is needed, where the emergency now exists.

Mr. HOEVEN. I do hope the Army engineers will disburse the funds where needed the most. However, requests for assistance come from all over the United States to participate in this $3,000,000. Just where it is to be allocated we never know. It is our duty to speak up for our individual needs. I want to impress upon the subcommittee that if Gordon Drive at Sioux City again comes into immediate danger and adequate emergency funds are not available that I may be called upon to ask for some emergency legislation to help solve our problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control, general: For the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including printing and binding, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, and for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with the flood control, $341,055,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys, and prepare plans and specifications, necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, chapter IX of the bill under consideration covering civil functions of the Department of the Army under the heading of "Flood control, general" includes an item for flood control at Hutchinson, Kans.

This project is designed to protect the city of Hutchinson and adjacent territory from recurring flood damage from Cow Creek, a tributary of the Arkansas River which flows into that river near Hutchinson. The project as approved by the Army engineers will protect 17,500 acres of land having a value of $64,000,000 exclusive of annual crops. Six thousand acres of the 17,500 are in the city of Hutchinson. Recurring floods have occurred for many years and a number of them have been quite disastrous. The records of the Army engineers show that especially disastrous floods occurred in 1929 and in 1941. The 1929 flood caused estimated damages of $2,500,000 and that occurring in 1941 damages of $2,000,000. Over the years there has been some flood damage at least every 3 years and major floods have occurred approximately every 9 or 10 years during the period from 1877 down to date as shown by the records of the Army engineers.

The total estimated Federal cost of this project is $3,030,000 of which $1,460,000 has been allotted previous to the coming fiscal year. The Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of $750,000 for 1951, which, if made, would leave $870,000 necessary to complete the project after the fiscal year

1951. No funds were appropriated for the fiscal year 1950.

This project is the result of plans which have been under consideration for several years. In 1945 the Army engigeers submitted plans to the city of Hutchinson and these plans were approved by the city and in the same year the city gave its assurances to the Secretary of War covering that part of the project and its costs which were to be assumed by the city.

The project has also been approved by the chief engineer of the Division of Water Resources of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture. Since the project will require the relocation of State highways and the construction of bridges and culverts, it has been necessary to work with the State highway commission, and that commission has agreed to carry out the necessary construction work needed to relocate highways and build culverts and bridges.

However, considerable delay occurred in connection with the project, due to a legal action brought against the city of Hutchinson by the Cow Creek Valley Flood Prevention Association, composed of landowners who felt they would be adversely affected by the construction of the project. This litigation was not finally concluded until January 1949. The decision was in favor of the city, and since that time rapid progress has been made.

Pursuant to the agreement between the city and the Army engineers, the city of Hutchinson has proceeded to obtain rights-of-way for the project and to date has issued its temporary notes for land acquisition and damages in the amount of $429,812.37. The city has also contracted to pay for the relocation where necessary of the facilities of the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., the Kansas Power & Light Co., the Consolidated Gas Utilities Corp., and the Gas Service Co., and is expected to spend in this connection not to exceed $139,867.79.

It is my understanding that if the amount of $750,000 called for in the budget estimate is made available, work on the project including the relocation of railroad lines, the cost of which is to be paid by the Government, the construction of earthworks and dikes, the relocation of the utilities mentioned above and the relocation of highways by the State highway commission will proceed without interruption and toward early completion. The appropriation of the full amount of $750,000 will not only permit the Army engineers to relocate the railroad lines involved but will enable them to let a continuing contract for the construction of the earthwork necessary to complete the project. If the amount is reduced to $400,000 as recommended in the report of the House committee it will mean that contracts for only a very small portion of the earthwork can be let for the coming fiscal year and that the Army engineers will not feel justified in letting continuing contracts. While this will not affect the ultimate completion of the project in any way, it will delay it for at least a year and it is felt by the municipal officials of the city of Hutchinson that this delay may result in increased costs to the city on its part of the project. I think I should point out also that in view of the history of recurring floods in the Cow Creek area there is a possibility that the delay might result in serious flood damage to the city of Hutchinson.

For that reason the mayor and commissioners of the city of Hutchinson are much concerned about the delay which will be caused by this reduction of $350,000 made by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and on April 7 last adopted a resolution with reference to the matter urging that proper steps be taken to secure the appropriation of sufficient funds by the Congress to construct the project. As a part of my remarks I include herewith a copy of the resolution to which I have just referred and urge its most careful consideration by the House and the Senate in connection with the appropriations for flood control contained in this bill:

Whereas the city of Hutchinson, Kans., by resolution duly adopted on the 27th day of August 1943, directed its city engineer to contact the proper officials and engineers of the United States Army and endeavor to obtain their assistance and cooperation in the development and construction of the city's flood control project; and

Whereas on the 14th day of March 1945, Colonel Wilson and his staff of the United States Army engineers presented their flood control plans for flood protection for the city of Hutchinson, Kans., and the city approved said plans; and

Whereas the city of Hutchinson made assurances pledging compliances with the conditions of local cooperation in accordance with the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, which authorized the improvement and construction of levees on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Arkansas River, to protect people and property, and the Secretary of War approved the assurances on July 4, 1945; and

Whereas the city of Hutchinson has procured through condemnation and eminent domain, gift, or purchase rights-of-way, easements, and exclusive occupancy and possession over, through, and upon the parts of rights-of-way described and known as lot II of the Hutchinson flood control project as approved by the chief engineer of the division of water resources; and

Whereas the city in acquiring such rights-of-way has expended the sum of $429,812.37 issuing its temporary notes to obtain such funds; and

Whereas the city of Hutchinson has granted rights of entry to the lands so condemned for flood-control purposes by the city of Hutchinson, Kans., to the United States Government; and

Whereas the city of Hutchinson has taken all other necessary steps requisite to comply with local cooperation requirements as set forth in the Flood Control Act approved by the Congress of the United States the 22d day of June 1936; and

Whereas special counsel for the city of Hutchinson has announced that upon inquiry to the district engineer of the Tulsa district, Corps of Engineers, that moneys currently appropriated for the Hutchinson flood-control project plus those proposed for appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 by the House Appropriation Committee would be inadequate to permit the award of a contract during the fiscal year 1951 for work on the levee portions of the project; and

Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the City of Hutchinson, Kans., deem it necessary for the public good and convenience that the bridges, streets, alleys, public buildings, public property, public utilities, and private property located within the corporate limits of the city of Hutchinson, Kans., be protected from overflow from streams and natural water courses and general flooded conditions and that the Hutchinson flood control project be constructed without further delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Hutchinson, Kans.—

SECTION 1. That the Congressmen and Senators from the State of Kansas be requested to take all necessary and proper steps to procure the appropriation of sufficient funds by the Congress of the United States to enable the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army to construct the Hutchinson flood-control project.

SEC. 2. That the city clerk of the city of Hutchinson shall forward forthwith a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Congressmen and Senators of the State of Kansas.

Passed and approved this 7th day of April A. D. 1950.

L. E. BAIRD, *Mayor.*
FRED HENNEY,
WM. C. SHAW, Jr.,
J. W. VANDAVERE,
RICHARD BELITZER,
City Commissioners.

Attest:

F. C. SMITH, *City Clerk.*

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN: On page 339, line 1, strike out "$241,055,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$343,055,000."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before you provides $2,000,000 for planning for "Flood control, general." The Bureau of the Budget recommended $4,000,000. This is half of the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Last week the Congress passed a flood-control bill in the amount of approximately $1,700,000,000. If this amendment is not adopted, there will not be a dime for plans and specifications for "Flood control, general" because in the bill before you the amounts have been specifically assigned. I am sure the committee wishes to be fair. If you will consider reclamation, which is the counterpart of flood control, you will find the committee allotted $5,150,000 for plans and specifications whereas the Corps of Army Engineers under "Flood control, general," is not allowed one dime for planning.

Unless this amendment is adopted, you are certainly going to paralyze the activities of the Corps of Army Engineers and these new projects about which you have spoken this afternoon will not have funds for plans and specifications. This is a reasonable amendment. It does not necessarily affect my State because most of the flood-control funds for my State are provided in the appropriations for the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries, and that includes planning. I urge you to support this amendment because you have provided, as I have just stated, $5,150,000 for reclamation. That covers 17 States, whereas "Flood control, general" covers the entire United States. Members of the committee, I certainly hope you will support this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on April 5, shortly after general debate on the comprehensive bill began, I made a statement respecting the appropriations for civil functions and pointed out that while personally there were no rivers and harbors projects in the district I represent, and there are no general flood-control projects in my district, I felt, in response to the requests of many of my colleagues on both sides of the chamber, that as chairman of the Committee on Public Works I should make a statement, especially respecting planning funds.

In that statement I urged this subcommittee, voluntarily reminding them that I had generally supported them in their bills for appropriations through the years, to make provision for planning both for rivers and harbors and for general flood-control work, because in the pending report of the committee it had been stated that no provisions were made for planning for rivers and harbors and general flood control. I then called, as I now call, attention to the language of the paragraph of the bill under consideration which is the identical language carried in the appropriation for the current fiscal year, Public Law 355, Eighty-first Congress. That language includes planning. The bill includes planning. Yet the report of the committee said no funds are included for planning. I do insist, in all fairness to the committee and the membership of the House, that this matter should be clarified, although the language of the bill, if different from the report, will control. Furthermore, I say if this House is to allow, as they have done in this comprehensive bill, substantially $5,000,000 for planning for reclamation when the Interior bill carries $297,000,000 for construction of reclamation projects, there is no reason why there should not be a provision for planning for general flood control. That is the situation. They may have the right to continue to plan for the projects which are under construction without any additional authorization, and these funds can be used for such planning. If, as the chairman of the subcommittee maintains, the language of the bill rather than the report of the committee controls, the planning is authorized, with no limits on the amount as there is no limitation of the amount in the breakdown in the report of the committee.

The paragraph on rivers and harbors contains no language authorizing planning, and the report states that no provision is made for planning for rivers and harbors. The bill must be amended in the other body to provide for such planning. The pending paragraph for general flood control authorizes and provides for planning funds. The report states that no funds are authorized. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], I believe, will state before the consideration of the chapter on civil functions is concluded, that the language of the bill rather than the language of the report will control. I agree. I believe such to be the intent of the Congress. Provision, therefore, will be made for planning for general flood control, but there will be no limit on the amount that may be used as would be the case if the Passman amendment were adopted. I ask for clarification, but under the language of the bill, the funds appropriated without any limitation as has always been the case, may be used for planning.

Under the terms of the bill, the appropriations for the Mississippi River and tributaries and for the Sacramento River may be used for planning. But I say to the membership that no other projects, emergency or otherwise, except those embraced in this bill and that are under construction, can be planned, without planning funds.

I call attention to this language in the bill. The bill itself provides for planning in this language, and I read from page 339, line 1:

Provided, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River in Alaska. * * *

Provided further, That the funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys and prepare plans and specifications necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized.

That is exactly the language that was carried in the act for the current year when $3,000,000, as I recall, was given in the break-down for planning. Unless we mean to stop all future general flood control, unless we mean to scrap substantially the staff of experts that is now assembled in the Corps of Engineers, Congress should provide funds for planning. I do urge the committee, where there has been a recommendation by the budget for $4,000,000, to approve the rather small appropriation—smaller than that carried for the current year—contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. I repeat, no matter what State or what district you represent, unless this amendment is agreed to, or unless the committee itself clarifies the language of the report, that no other project in the future, until plans have been made, can be appropriated for.

Keep in mind that there will remain, after the passage of the pending bill, authorizations for general flood control amounting to approximately $343,000,000, which is substantially the amount carried in the pending bill for general flood control. In the general public interest I think the committee would do well definitely and in a definite amount to appropriate for planning, thus clarifying the language in the report.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in economy, but I am interested in sound, sensible economy.

News releases have been carrying many items concerning the floods in Minnesota this spring. We have had a very severe and very disastrous flood condition. Aitkin County in my district at the present time is faced with the most severe flood in the history of that county. Fifty thousand acres flooded, 487 miles of county and State-aid and 812 miles of those township roads are badly damaged. Last week a farm home burned because the fire apparatus was unable to get to this farmhouse, with water all around it; yet it was impossible to put the fire out.

The damage done to property at this time is immeasurable, as far as monetary cost is concerned.

We had a severe flood in 1948, almost as severe as the flood we are having this year. The cost in relief, the cost to the Army engineers in moving people out of the area, the cost to the State and Federal Governments in providing feed for the livestock and providing housing for the people are costly. Taxpayers' money spent for this purpose is expensive. Taxpayers' money spent to solve the situation can be a saving.

We have worked in that area for a number of years in an attempt to relieve that situation. Last year the appropriation bill carried the sum of $25,000 for planning. This year the Bureau of the Budget figured that $50,000 would be needed to complete that planning. That is a total of only $75,000 for planning. Now, will this $25,000 be lost because we do not complete the job? Will we be faced with the possibility of delaying this flood-control work that is needed in that area? The cost of the floods in 2 years has been far more than the cost of building this particular project.

We can save the situation by some sensible planning, and I appeal to you in connection with this item of restoring planning for flood control to proceed cautiously and do some of these things at a time when it is economical to do them. I am sure that is what the gentleman from Louisiana intended when he talked about the item being put back. It would make this fund include just such projects as I have mentioned on which some planning has already been started. This would enable the Army engineers to retain their experienced technical staff to complete the work started.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. The Budget requested $4,000,000 for planning under "Flood control, general." My amendment provides only $2,000,000. I am cooperating with the Committee on Appropriations trying to effect economy. I think it is a very sound investment. It is my understanding, according to the language in the bill at this time that if this amendment is not adopted all of the projects will have to be placed on the shelf until at some future date the Congress appropriates money for additional plans and specifications.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is the way I understood the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana. I am heartily in support of it. I believe it will help the situation. I merely want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that it will be a saving and an economy to proceed with this work of planning now and keep the experienced personnel on the job.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. When the gentleman speaks of adding $4,000,000, is that in addition to the $341,055,000 carried in the bill?

Mr. MARSHALL. I will let the gentleman from Louisiana answer that.

Mr. PASSMAN. It merely adds $2,000,000 for planning which will be used for plans and specifications, not $4,000,000. I am in hopes no amendment will be offered to my amendment to increase it to $4,000,000, for I think we can get along very nicely on the $2,000,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS as a substitute for the Passman amendment: Page 339, line 1, strike out "$341,055,000" and insert $345,055,000."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not against the Passman amendment, but I do believe that $4,000,000 is not a large amount of money for planning. The engineers tell me they are working on some 60 to 65 projects. They will need this money if they are to continue this work. I call attention to the fact that already this portion of the bill has been cut 25 percent, whereas the rest of the bill has received an average over-all cut of only 5 percent. Even if we appropriate every cent the Budget recommends in this chapter of the bill we will still be cut more than 20 percent over other chapters of the bill. Therefore, I say to you it is going to be difficult to take 50 percent of the $4,000,000 which the Budget recommends and divide that between 60 or 65 projects and keep it within the allocation in such way that the planning can be economically carried on to completion. So I offer this substitute to stand by the Budget recommendation for planning, if for no other purpose in the flood-control chapter. The Budget in recommending the $4,000,000 recognized that the engineers badly need this for this work.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allowed me be given to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe that most of the taxpayers of this country fully realize that flood control, irrigation, navigation, and electric power provided by multiple-purpose projects are essential to the development of the economy of this country. This is not money wasted, and regardless of how strongly you may feel toward curtailing governmental expenditures, it is absolutely necessary that we go forward on our flood-control projects if we expect to utilize, preserve, and maintain the fine soil that is and could be made available to the people.

Lack of flood control upon any river of any importance in this country is destroying yearly billions of dollars in property and in soil. Human suffering should be considered in these matters. I do sincerely feel that we should not at this particular time say to the world: "We are not going to have any more planning money. The engineers are going to do nothing in the future. They are going to sit back, and," as the subcommittee chairman said, "take stock of what they have been doing in the past and let the people's land continue to be washed down the river."

I cannot feel that the Congress believes we should not appropriate planning funds so that we can go forward with this program. I hate to mention this, but it is the truth. I have not been so strong for foreign aid since I have come here. I campaigned on the theory that there was some need for our "dishing out" some money to help those democracies overseas that had helped us in time of need. I still feel that way, but I have not yet been able to justify the enormous expenditures, knowing that a great deal of the money is not going where it has been intended in the foreign program. You folks do know that a great deal of money we have given to those governments overseas is being used for the very purpose that the Congress today is being told that the people of this country should be denied. That is exactly right.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Right along that line the committee might be interested in a weekly summary of developments in the Economic Cooperation Administration prepared by the Public Advisory Board of April 7, this year, in which it is stated:

Seventeen districts in Sicily have received a total allocation of 2,673,321,000 lire (equivalent to $4,277,300) to finance land reclamation projects, the ECA Special Mission to Italy has announced. The projects will include construction of drainage ditches and a vast irrigation network. Aqueducts and some country roads are to be built and work is to be done for stream control in the area. Including this allocation, Sicily has received a total of 526,569,696,000 lire (equivalent to $8,425,100) for land reclamation projects to date.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask you, Can you conscientiously tell your people: "No; you go on and be drowned when the rains come. We are going to give our aid to the people overseas?" You think it is economy and the papers are going to say: "Look at those people down there. They are voting economy for a change." Curtailment of money for flood-control planning for the benefit of our people is false economy.

We are not allowed to question one penny when the ECA program is under consideration, but when we are considering the welfare of our own people, all the newspapers rather enjoy referring to any flood-control projects as pork-barrel legislation. I do not give a hoot what the newspapers say. I believe that the floods of this country should be curbed, and it is foolish not to curb them. For this committee to take the arbitrary position that the activities of the Army engineers should be hampered is a short-sighted proposal. The Army engineers make up one of the most outstanding organizations of our Government, rendering vital services to our people. Their program is to build, protect, maintain, and preserve our natural resources. Do you think for 1 minute that the Army engineers will not continue to spend money in the future just as they have in the past? You are just prohibiting them from doing something worth while. That is about what it amounts to.

Now, gentlemen, let us be serious about this thing. It just so happens that my little State of Arkansas is situated on the banks of the Mississippi. Enormous quantities of water flow through the State of Arkansas to the Mississippi, thereby greatly affecting my area of the State and portions of the States of Mississippi and Louisiana as the water flows to the sea.

Since the north and northeastern portions of the United States, along with some other sections of our country have been pretty well taken care of on flood-control projects in the past, those sections should not arbitrarily decide at this time to curtail the efforts of the southern portions of this great country from rendering a like service to our people.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. This particular amendment in the sum of $2,000,000 provides for planning throughout the entire Nation.

Mr. TACKETT. That is right. That is exactly right. I shall vote for the Passman amendment and I shall also vote for the Brooks amendment, for the simple reason that the Passman amendment merely asks for half of what the Bureau of the Budget says we should have and the Brooks amendment is just asking for what the Bureau of the Budget has requested.

I want to tell you something, when we go before the Appropriations Committee and we do not have the Budget Bureau with us, the committee says, "We cannot listen to you; we cannot tolerate an unbudgeted request; the Budget Bureau is not with you"; but when the Bureau of the Budget approves flood-control projects, then we are advised that the committee cannot agree with the Bureau of the Budget. The lack of approval by the Bureau of the Budget is used by the committee to refuse an appropriation for a worthy project, while a budget-approved request is denied upon the theory that the budget is wrong.

Truthfully, gentlemen, we are spending too much on foreign aid while allowing our own natural resources to deteriorate. We should spend less on foreign aid and less for the welfare of our own economy while balancing the budget. Construction of flood-control projects is a humanitarian effort to preserve life, property, and natural resources, and is one of the greatest national defense moves. We are willing to take our share in appropriation cuts for economy purposes, but surely the flood-control projects should not take all the cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the last speaker that the budget figure, I would say 99 percent of the time, is always considered as the ceiling figure. The Committee on Appropriations has always treated it in such a fashion. Further, I hope that no others here will be making a comparison about spending at home for local projects and spending abroad for the preservation of the world and the winning of the cold war. That has been explained so many times on this House floor and in the press that I do not feel it ought to be brought in here and made another part of this controversy today.

Now, the situation is the same here. The House treated these projects as consistently as they treated the rivers and harbors program a few moments ago. So often we hear the remark made, "We are for economy, but; we are for economy, but." Now, we are either for economy or we are not for economy; either we forget or we remember the debt of the United States.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is talking about economy. It seems we can have flood control and irrigation in Europe but cannot have it in this country.

Mr. RABAUT. Variety of opinion makes a horse race.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Right now the "but" is only $4,000,000; that is all.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that the committee provided planning money for reclamation, but would not allow planning money for flood control?

Mr. RABAUT. We do not have charge of the reclamation projects, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am speaking of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. RABAUT. All right, but do not load me with the whole Appropriations Committee. I have charge on the floor of this work of the Army engineers, set out in this particular chapter of the bill. The other chapters of the bill are not controlled by this subcommittee, and the gentleman knows it well. That is just muddying the waters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will show its consistency again and defeat this amendment. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PASSMAN) there were—ayes 29, noes 45.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: On page 339, insert before the period in line 14 a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That in the allocation for individual flood-control projects of funds appropriated herein, the rate of reduction in the fiscal year 1951 budget estimates for individual flood-control projects shall be the same for all such projects."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for withholding his point of order. I believe he ought to accept this amendment. It follows exactly the procedure the distinguished chairman brought before this House in this same appropriation bill last year.

The purpose of my amendment is not to increase the amount of money appropriated herein. It is not to add any new projects or any new works. My amendment boils down to this: That all the projects carried in the bill shall all be treated alike. Frankly, I believe there would be a better way and that would be to first give the necessary money to those projects that could be completed in the next fiscal year and thus bring protection to life and property. That procedure has not been followed. No such formula has been presented to the committee. Therefore, I believe the fairest thing to do would be to treat all projects in all sections of the country and in all States in the same manner.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Under such a provision, with an equal division of the money, the Garrison Dam and the other dam which would be completed in 2 or 3 years would perhaps be completed in a year or even sooner, so that they could hold the water up above the river and prevent the disastrous floods that have occurred around Sioux City this year.

Mr. CURTIS. That may be true. I am not quite familiar with those projects.

Mr. STEFAN. I am talking about Garrison and Randall.

Mr. CURTIS. It would help all projects that have been cut more than 25 percent.

Mr. Chairman, the project I have in mind is one on the Republican River where they have disastrous floods and where the loss of life on one occasion exceeded 100 persons in a single year. As late as 1947, 15 lives were lost on that river.

If the Harlan County Dam were to receive the full budget estimate, the opening of the dam could be completed this fiscal year, thereby holding back these floodwaters and protecting the lives and property of the people there. That project, even though it is near completion, has been cut 33⅓ percent. Other projects have been cut a mere token 2 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent. There is no reason that can be offered as to why some projects should receive a punitive cut and others little or no cut at all. I sincerely hope this amendment can be adopted. It merely provides that the same percentage cut shall apply to all streams and all States and all sections of the country. It is in the interest of sound and orderly procedure. I think it is fair. In the absence of any systematic working out of a plan whereby a project nearing completion might have sufficient funds for its completion, I think that we should treat them all alike.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended $18,000,000 for the Harlan County Dam. If that amount had been provided in the bill the opening of the dam could have been closed in this next fiscal year. This bill carries the sum of $12,000,000 for this project. Should a flood of the proportions of some of our past floods occur on the Republican River, much of the work already in, might be destroyed. It should also be pointed out that by delaying the completion of this dam a year there will be an added estimated cost to the administrative expense of a quarter of a million dollars. My amendment, while not increasing the total amount for all flood control would make one and one-half million more dollars available for the Harlan County Dam.

Mr. Chairman, may I also take this occasion to comment upon the Red Willow Dam to be built in the Republican River. This is one of the five tributary dams which was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944 for construction by either the Army engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation. By interdepartmental agreement it has been decided that the Army should build it. It is not a new and separate project. It would be a part of the Frenchman-Cambridge project now under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Red Willow Dam is very necessary to protect the irrigation works now being built in the Republican Valley from disastrous floods. There have been times that the floodwaters from the Red Willow have caused damage in the valley of the main stream of the river as far down as Oxford, Nebr. It is hoped that this work

can be approved by the Bureau of the Budget and that funds can be provided to get this important part of the Frenchman-Cambridge project under way.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

I fail to see where a point of order should lie against the amendment. It appeals to me as an amendment that is very much in keeping with the rules of the House. Amendments of like nature have been adopted by this House on numerous occasions in the past. So I hope the gentleman's point of order will not be sustained.

I agree with what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has said about the project in his district. All up and down the Missouri River Valley in our section of that great valley, we have just experienced another terrific annual flood that washed out agricultural levees no end, the floodwaters pouring down on us from that huge watershed upstream broke through and flooded hundreds of thousands of acres of the finest land that lies out of doors. I can assure you, my colleagues, that the people of my district, like the people of every district in the Missouri Valley, especially in the lower reaches, are not shouting for joy because of the action taken by this committee, which has reduced the request of the Bureau of the Budget for flood control in the neighborhood of 28 percent. The Democratic leadership of the Interior Department Subcommittee also saw fit, against my wishes, to take 10 percent off of the budget request for the Missouri Valley, while at the same time they scarcely touched any of the other reclamation projects. It seems we are to be used as a sort of whipping boy in that valley, and we do not like it especially in light of the fact that the spending party in power are demanding billions to spend for all kinds of worthless things.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. It does seem to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is a fair one; that it does not increase the appropriation but equalizes the amount. I feel that what the gentleman is saying will really mean that these emergency dams, such as Garrison, and others, will be given a little more speed so that they may be finished in order to hold back the water so that we do not continually get these disastrous floods.

Mr. JENSEN. Right. Every Member of Congress wants to be fair. I feel sure if he or she are permitted to vote their own convictions they would support this amendment. The laws of our land are based on common sense and fairness. When a law goes beyond that, that law soon falls flat or at least that used to be the case when we operated on a square-deal basis. This amendment certainly is based on fairness and equality of treatment to the people affected in this bill.

So I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I talked to Colonel Potter, of the Army engineers, just a few minutes ago, and he tells me there is yet thousands of acres of land under water in my district even though the high flood crest has passed and which will not drain off until outlet ditches are dug. It is going to take a lot of the farmers' own dollars to get that water off the land in order to put it into crops this year. Many acres will not be cultivated this crop year because of the fact the farmers cannot get the water off of that land in time to put in the crops.

The only assistance the United States Army Engineers can give those farmers is to help repair and rebuild those levees. Where they have drainage districts established and a request is made to the Army engineers for the rebuilding of those levees, the engineers have only the authority to repair them, to put them back in the same shape they were before the flood; but they have no authority to enlarge, or strengthen, or heighten the levees which were built by the people themselves. The money provided in this bill is to build strong permanent levees to hold future floodwaters off this valuable farm land.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read into the RECORD the justifications for agricultural levees on the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth which appears on pages 247 to 249 of the hearings. The budget request was for $7,000,000, the committee reduced it to $5,000,000. Also I want to read into the RECORD the hearings on the Little Sioux flood-control project. For the Little Sioux the Bureau of the Budget requested $500,000. The committee cut this right square in half. Certainly we are not treating the people of the Missouri Valley fairly and equitably in those instances.

In all fairness, this amendment should be adopted. Please give us a square deal.

LITTLE SIOUX RIVER, IOWA

Mr. KERR. Item No. 42 is Little Sioux River, Iowa. Total estimated Federal cost, $4,100,000; allotments to date, $572,100; tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951, $500,000; additional to complete after fiscal year 1951, $3,027,900; 1950 appropriation, $372,100.

Colonel POTTER. Little Sioux River is in the Missouri Basin on the Iowa side. This is a project we are asking $500,000 for, to continue channel work.

Mr. RABAUT. You have quite a few floods there, it says here.

Colonel POTTER. Floodwaters come down out of the hills. A lot of farms are up on the hills, sir, and then they extend down to this very broad flat land that goes down to the river. It is a cooperative project, between ourselves and the Soil Conservation Service. They are doing the upstream work and we are seeing that the water gets down the river without damage.

Major floods have occurred on this river 16 times since 1851.

Mr. TABER. May I ask, have you got a complete record of them?

Colonel POTTER. Yes, sir; we have.

Mr. TABER. How much have you obligated?

Mr. BOUSQUET. $456,900; and that is scheduled for obligation in March.

FALL RIVER RESERVOIR, KANS.

Mr. TABER. Is it not completed now?

Colonel POTTER. It has been in operation since it was dedicated last fall. Governor Carlson came to the dedication.

Mr. TABER. And they are going to put in a crane for operation?

Colonel POTTER. $23,000 to complete purchase of a crane for gate operation and $17,000 for construction of facilities for reservoir management and public use.

Mr. TABER. How much of an unobligated balance have you got?

Mr. BOUSQUET. $489,000, sir.

Mr. TABER. It is all gone?

Colonel POTTER. It is all scheduled for obligation this fiscal year, sir.

Mr. KERR. Fall River Reservoir, that does not call for anything; that is continued.

HUTCHINSON, ARKANSAS RIVER, KANS.

Now, the next one is No. 44, Hutchinson, Arkansas River, Kans., total estimated Federal cost, $3,080,000; allotments to date, $1,460,000; tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951, $750,000; additional to complete after fiscal year 1951, $870,000; 1950 appropriation, none.

You are requesting $750,000. Justify that, Colonel.

Colonel POTTER. This $750,000 will finish lot II of the project, except for relocations. We propose to use it as follows: Earthwork, $325,900; relocations, $424,100.

I might bring out for the record that the floods of 1929 and 1941 caused estimated damages of $2,500,000 and $2,000,000, respectively.

This is a project where considerable time elapsed in the local interests getting together. We believe that it is all straightened out now.

Mr. TABER. How much is unobligated?

Mr. BOUSQUET. $859,000 as of November 30.

Mr. TABER. When is that scheduled?

Mr. BOUSQUET. That is scheduled for obligation in January and May; $500,000 in January, and $354,000 in May.

Mr. TABER. That will pretty near finish it; won't it?

Mr. BOUSQUET. That will just about take care of our unobligated balance.

Mr. TABER. How will it finish the job?

Mr. BOUSQUET. The contract on which we are obligating $500,000 in January, is going to cost us $868,000. And $522,000 is the estimated cost of the work obligated in May. They will be continuing contracts.

Mr. TABER. Well, that $750,000 will finish it.

Colonel POTTER. It will require $870,000 more after 1951 to finish the entire project.

KANSAS CITYS, MO. AND KANS.

Mr. KERR. Item No. 45, Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans., total estimated Federal cost, $41,389,000; allotments to date, $24,912,100; tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951, $7,000,000; additional to complete after fiscal year 1951, $9,476,900; 1950 appropriation, $5,000,000.

You are requesting $7,000,000 more for 1951 fiscal. What do you have to say about that?

Mr. TABER. How much?

Mr. BOUSQUET. January of 1950, $525,000. And December of 1949, $1,873,000.

Mr. KERR. What about the account obligated for December 1949?

Mr. BOUSQUET. Our latest records are as of the 30th of November, sir. About the fifteenth or sixteenth of this month we should be getting our figures for December.

Colonel POTTER. It takes about 10 or 15 days for those reports to come in after the end of the month, Judge.

MISSOURI RIVER AGRICULTURAL LEVEES, SIOUX CITY, IOWA, TO THE MOUTH

Mr. KERR. Item No. 46, "Missouri River agricultural levees Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth." Total estimated Federal cost, $119,700,000; allotments to date, $21,622,700; tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951, $7,000,000; additional to complete after fiscal year 1951, $91,077,300; 1950 appropriations, $5,952,700.

Colonel, what have you to say in justification?

Colonel POTTER. The entire project's scheme is made up of over 100 separate levee units

roughly corresponding to the levee organizations that presently exist along this river.

The river is subject to flood, and the entire valley is subject to flood, I would say, once out of every 3 or 4 years.

To protect themselves on a valley which ranges up to 5 miles wide, the local people have formed together into drainage and levee units.

Based on the 1941 and 1944 Flood Control Acts, we have worked together with these local units in forming Federal flood-protection projects, several of which are under way at the present time.

The moneys we are requesting this year will provide for the continuation of levee units already under construction, the alteration of highways and bridges, and the completion of some of the units already under construction.

Mr. TABER. How many acres would be protected by this protection?

Colonel POTTER. About a million and a half acres, sir; 50 communities; and the flood of 1947 caused damages of $65,000,000 in this particular stretch of the river.

The people are constantly faced with this threat, and I have seen them plant, be flooded, replant, and be flooded out again.

Mr. TABER. What is your unobligated balance there?

Mr. BOUSQUET. The unobligated balance on November 30, 1949, was $5,548,400. And that is scheduled for obligation in December, January, February, March, and April.

Colonel POTTER. Each one of these units, or a part of the unit, will be advertised as a separate contract.

Mr. KERR. Without objection, we will put pages 464, 465, 466, and 467 in the record.

(The pages referred to are as follows:)

"Justification of estimate

"Item No. 46, Missouri River agricultural levees Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth:	
Total estimated Federal cost	$119,700,000
Allotments to date	21,622,700
Tentative allocation for fiscal year 1951	7,000,000
Additional to complete after fiscal year 1951	91,077,300

"1950 appropriation: $5,952,700.

"Authorization: 1941 and 1944 Flood Control Acts.

"Location and description: The project consists of a series of levees and appurtenant works along both sides of the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth, for the protection of agricultural lands and small communities against floods.

"Status: Construction of unit L–575 levees has been completed. Raising and alteration of C. B. & Q. Railroad Plum Creek Bridge (unit L–575) has been completed. Raising and alteration of the C. B. & Q. Railroad Nishnabotna River Bridge (unit L–575) is 12 percent complete and will be about 50 percent complete on June 30, 1950. Construction of underseepage facilities for unit L–575 are 25 percent complete and will be 80 percent complete on June 30, 1950. Construction of unit R–562 levees, Buck Creek drainage structure and alterations to the C. B. & Q. Railroad in connection with unit R–562 have been completed. Construction of underseepage facilities for unit R–562 are 2 percent complete and will be 75 percent complete on June 30, 1950. Construction of unit L–561, section 1 (Nishnabotna River) levees, has been completed. Construction of unit L–561, sections 2 and 3 and unit L–550, section 1 (Nishnabotna River and High Creek) levees, is 90 percent complete and will be completed by June 30, 1950. Construction of unit L–550, sections 10 to 12 (Rock Creek) levees, is 30 percent complete and will be about 60 percent complete June 30, 1950. A continuing contract has been awarded for unit L–550, section 20 (Rock Creek) levees and construction will be about 25 percent complete June 30, 1950. A contract for raising and altering the C. B. & Q. Railroad High Creek Bridge (L–561) has been negotiated and work will be completed by June 30, 1950. Construction of unit R–573 levees is 90 percent complete and will be completed by June 30, 1950. A contract has been initiated for alterations to the C. B. & Q. Railroad tracks near Minersville, Nebr. (unit R–573), and work will be 80 percent complete by June 30, 1950. Construction of unit L–627–624 levees is 80 percent complete and will be completed by June 30, 1950. A contract has been initiated for raising and altering the Wabash Railroad Mosquito Creek Bridge (unit L–627–624) and work will be completed by June 30, 1950. Construction of unit R–548, sections 1 to 4 (Missouri River) levees is 10 percent complete and will be 40 percent complete June 30, 1950. A contract for alterations to the C. B. & Q. Railroad tracks in connection with unit R–548 has been initiated and work will be completed by June 30, 1950. Continuing contracts will be awarded for construction of levees for unit L–614, section 1, unit L–536, section 1, unit L–614, section 2, unit L–550, sections 2 to 9, and unit L–550, sections 13 to 19, and work under each of these contracts will be about 30 percent complete June 30, 1950. Continuing contracts will be initiated for raising and altering the C. B. & Q. Railroad Mosquito Creek Bridge (unit L–627–624) and the C. B. & Q. Railroad Rock Creek Bridge (unit L–550) and work under these contracts will be 40 and 45 percent complete, respectively, by June 30, 1950. The construction of levees in units R–513–512 (secs. I and II), L–488, L–476, L–488–443, and R–440 is under way by continuing contracts. Levees for units L–448 and L448–443 will be completed during fiscal year 1950 and levees in units R–513–512 (secs. I and II), L–476, and R–440 will be about 84 percent complete by June 30, 1950. The construction of levees in units R–513–512 (sec. III), R–500, L–497, R–482, and L–400 will be initiated by continuing contracts and from 33 to 67 percent of the work completed by the end of fiscal year 1950. The raising of one railroad and three county highway bridges in unit 5–513–512, a State highway bridge in unit L–497, and a railroad and a State highway bridge in unit L–400 will be initiated and partially completed by the end of fiscal year 1950. The project as a whole was 7 percent complete on June 30, 1949, and will be about 18 percent complete by June 30, 1950.

"Proposed operations, fiscal year 1951: Funds are needed in fiscal year 1951 for continuation of construction of the project. The allocation of $7,000,000 will be utilized as follows: $110,000 to complete continuing contract for alterations to C. B. & Q. Mosquito Creek Bridge (unit L–627–624); $340,000 to complete construction of unit L–550, sections 2 to 9 levees; $410,000 to complete construction of unit L–550, sections 13 to 19 levees; $180,000 to complete unit L–550, section 20 levees; $360,000 to complete unit L–614, section 1 levees; $200,000 to complete unit L–614, section 2 levees; $180,000 to complete unit L–536, section 1 levees; $160,000 to initiate construction of unit L–614, section 3 levees; $150,000 to initiate construction of unit L–536, section 2 levees; $150,000 to initiate construction of unit R–548, Little Nemaha section levees; $170,000 to initiate construction of underseepage facilities for unit L–627–624; $190,000 to initiate construction of underseepage facilities for unit L–561–550; $150,000 to initiate construction of underseepage facilities for unit R–573; $100,000 to initiate construction of unit R–580 levees; and $150,000 to initiate construction of unit R–652 levees; $3,450,600 to complete continuing contracts for construction of levees in unit R–513–512, R–500, L–497, R–482, L–476, R–440, and L–400; raising of a railroad bridge and three highway bridges in unit R–513–512; raising a highway bridge in unit L–497, and raising a railroad and a highway bridge in unit L–400; and $549,400 to initiate construction by continuing contract of underseepage facilities for units L–488 and L–448–443. With the expenditure of the allocation of $7,000,000 for fiscal year 1951, the project will be carried to 24 percent completion.

"Work remaining to complete after fiscal year 1951: After the expenditure of $7,000,000 for fiscal year 1951, funds would be needed to complete construction on units in progress during fiscal year 1951 and to construct the remaining units located on the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth.

"Justification: The agricultural levee project is a part of the comprehensive plan for improvement for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin. The plan will provide complete protection to agricultural lands and small communities in the Missouri River Valley against destructive floods. Approximately 1,500,000 acres of land and 50 small communities of 100 or more population between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth of the Missouri River will benefit from the flood-protection works to be constructed under this project. It is estimated that property losses, crop losses, and other damages along the main stem of the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth have amounted to approximately $140,000,000 in the past several years. The severe flooding in 1947 caused damages of $65,000,000 in this reach. In view of the constant threat of recurrence of these disastrous floods, it is essential that funds be provided to continue the levee program as scheduled. The allocation of $7,000,000 is the minimum amount necessary to continue the work as scheduled and provide for the early completion of the more urgently needed protection."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I now make the point of order against the amendment and desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Michigan on the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the report contains recommendations and persuasions on the Army engineers as to the individual projects. The committee recommendation is not mandatory. This amendment would make such allocations mandatory. It is clearly legislation and imposes additional duties on the agency in question. The language in the bill is that which is mandatory upon the engineers, not the language in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Nebraska has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order against the amendment and has presented the grounds for his point of order.

The Chair has examined the amendment and is of the opinion that the amendment seeks to apply a uniform rule for the reduction of funds provided in the bill with respect to all flood-control projects covered and is of the further opinion that the amendment is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that in arriving at the size of appropriation the committee took into consideration the unobligated balances that were available for the project and the speed with which the engineers had indicated that they might act? Is not that the fact?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely right. This amendment seeks to make engineers out of Congress. The Congress last year left discretion over percentage cuts in the hands of the engineers. There is a vast difference between that and what this amendment proposes. If we wish to make engineers out of the Members of Congress and to set these cuts in this body, that is one thing. If we want to leave this discretionary power for the engineers, that is quite another thing. I prefer to leave it with the engineers.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support and to speak in favor of that portion of the appropriation bill (H. R. 7786) which includes an item of $5,000,000 for the central and southern Florida flood-control project.

I believe if there is one meritorious appropriation contained in this bill it is this appropriation for this project. I say this for many and various reasons among which are the following:

First, this appropriation will be the means of the completion of the levees and dikes in the Everglades area which will prevent not only the damage and destruction to property but will be the means of saving human lives. I know of no comparable area in the country which has been afflicted with three successive years of floods—aggravated by storms of hurricane force. Such floods struck my area in 1947, 1948, and most recently in August of 1949. I may state that the storm in August 1949 would have perhaps been the most destructive of life and property but for the fact that the Federal levees around Lake Okeechobee withstood their most severe test and prevented overflow of the lake into the populous upper Everglades area. The work on this project will ultimately give us a high degree of flood protection and water control and will largely eliminate the burden of successive flood losses which threaten the orderly development of southern Florida.

Second. Because I believe that this project which is a joint venture by the Federal Government and the State and people of Florida, is an outstanding example of how the State and Federal authorities can operate in the control and conservation of water and land resources. This project is significant to the entire Nation and not alone to my State.

Third. This Federal project is one of primary importance to the entire State of Florida and its progressive accomplishment is essential to an orderly development of about one-third of the State which is dependent upon water control for its very existence. I cannot stress upon you too greatly the importance that construction of this project proceed as rapidly as possible. Every year of delay means another year of flood losses, and disruption of our economy. Furthermore the nature of the project and the close interrelation of its various elements, are such that they should be accomplished progressively and rapidly. Otherwise the protectior afforded by one element of construction may tend to aggravate flood damages in another unprotected section. This hazard during construction is present in most flood-control projects, but the vast area covered by the project for southern Florida, the uniformly level terrain, and the exposure of this area to hurricane-driven floods, make it particularly applicable to this case.

Fourth. I urge this appropriation for continuing this project because of my personal familiarity with the need for this work. The Sixth Congressional District, which I represent, includes six counties which are wholly or in part within this project area, and a large part of the improvement will be located within my district. I know from first-hand experience, and from the experience of thousands of my constituents, of the tremendous difficulties which they have experienced in developing southern Florida in the face of recurring periods of floods and drought; and I am convinced that this project is essential to their welfare and progress.

Briefly, the accomplishments of the improvement will be as follows:

First, it will afford flood protection to the highly developed urban and farming areas along the east coast and south of Lake Okeechobee. The first phase of the plan of improvement which has been authorized, will give the most urgently needed part of this protection. Subsequent phases, if authorized by Congress, will protect additional areas.

Second, the entire plan of improvement, when ultimately constructed, will benefit over 2,000,000 acres of agricultural land by removing the flood hazard and by affording improved water control in wet and dry periods. This will include over 700,000 acres of fertile new lands which will be made suitable for agricultural development. Without this water control, thousands of acres of this muckland will be lost forever by burning.

Third, the plan of improvement, by conserving floodwaters in parts of the Everglades which are not suitable for agricultural use, will improve water supplies along the east coast of Florida, and in the Caloosahatchee Valley on the west, where the encroachment of salt water is threatening the very existence of the cities and towns and adjacent farming operations.

Fourth, the conservation areas in their natural state will afford unexcelled refuges and breeding grounds for fish and wildlife of many kinds, and provide a large incidental benefit of both commercial and recreational value. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Agriculture has approved the plan from this conservation standpoint.

May I say to the members of the Committee that the sum of $7,500,000 was included and recommended in the President's budget estimate for this project; however, the Subcommittee on Civil Functions Appropriation reduced the recommendation of the President to $5,000,000 and it is this sum that I am requesting and pleading be approved in this bill. The quickest way we can get something done to make our people secure against the scourge of floods is too slow. Another flood this coming year will undoubtedly cause damages many times the amount of this appropriation. While I would like to see a much larger appropriation because I know from experience how urgently protection is needed, however, I realize that you must consider other desirable and needed projects and that there are definite limits on appropriations.

I earnestly urge, however, that this sum of $5,000,000 for continuation of this urgently needed work, which is truly a joint venture of the Federal Government and the people of Florida, be approved by this Committee and then by the House of Representatives.

In conclusion, I most urgently request and most sincerely appeal that you approve the sum of $5,000,000 which has been recommended by the subcommittee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 339, line 9, strike out "$341,055,000" and insert "$343,000,000."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases the amount appropriated by this bill for flood control from $341,055,000 to $343,000,000. It raises the amount authorized by this appropriation bill almost the sum of $2,000,000 in order to take care of the budget amount originally put in for the Conemaugh Dam in the Ohio River Valley, which is a flood-control dam. The amount of increase is just less than $2,000,000. I have made the amendment in an odd amount because there had previously been an amendment put in of exactly $2,000,000 for another purpose, the general flood-control study.

The Bureau of the Budget estimate for this year had approved the sum of $9,000,000 flood-control funds for the continuing of the 1951 construction of the Conemaugh Dam, which is 65 miles up the river from Pittsburgh. The cutting of this amount from $9,000,000 to $7,000,000 will reduce the amount by approximately 20 to 25 percent and, of course, will increase the time that it will take to complete this dam.

This dam is not a new structure. It has been under construction from 1946 through 1950; $26,715,000 has been appropriated through various bills up to

1950, leaving the balance of the cost of constructing this dam, $17,484,700.

The question is, first, whether it will be more costly or less costly to reduce this appropriation amount at this time. Because the dam is now in course of construction, it will be most costly, because the present structures which are built, the engineering facilities and the equipment which are now there, cannot be used for the purpose for which they are assembled, and will be moved out into accessible areas for other work if feasible.

Consequently, I have today asked the Army engineers of the Department of Defense whether the reduction in funds will cause a delay in the actual construction of the dam. Their office has assured me today that the delay in initiation of clearing up operations and relocations would delay the completion of the project by 1 year, with possible damages to low lines, highways, and utilities not yet acquired necessary to the impoundment of floodwaters. The following was the statement of Mr. Harry Cohen, of the Army engineers, to my office this afternoon:

> The reduction in funds will defer the clearing of the reservoir area, the relocations of Indiana branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and certain partial payments for crop damage, and reduce the allocation of funds to land acquisition and relocation of highways and utilities in the reservoir area. Reduction of funds allocated to land acquisition and relocation of highways and utilities will not permit sufficient progress on these items to keep pace with the construction program on the dam.
>
> Delay in initiation of clearing operations and relocations would delay completion of the project by 1 year with possible damages to low lying highways and utilities not yet acquired as a result of the impoundment of floodwaters by the partially completed dam.

You may ask me, "FULTON, are you talking just for Pittsburgh?" No; I am not; I am talking for the defense of the country, because you will remember in 1936 we, in the Pittsburgh area, had a flood that covered the complete downtown area and the whole industrial area along the Ohio, the Monongahela, and the Allegheny Rivers, with inundation clear down the river to Cincinnati. The water in Pittsburgh was up as high as the tops of the street cars, and it took us 6 months in that industrial area to recover. We, in America, constantly hear of the threat of Russia. If we run the risk on one more year's flood in the Ohio, the Monongahela and the Allegheny River Basin, as well as in the Mississippi Valley, you will find that we might be at a terrible disadvantage should world war III break out. I feel that if the Army engineers say that the risk of one more flood in this great industrial area will be incurred by cutting simply $2,000,000 from this bill, that we had better, for the defense of the country, not do it. For example, the amount of water held back by this one dam is, in floodtime, one-half the amount going over Niagara Falls, so, it is a tremendous dam that is going to hold back the floods that have already once wiped out one of our main towns in Pennsylvania, Johnstown, and, I believe, killed 3,000 people when the previous dam broke.

Under those circumstances, for the defense of the country, it is no small matter. It is not just a local matter that involves one industrial area. I do not believe that anyone on the floor or in the committee can refute the statement of the Army engineers that this will cause a 1-year delay in the construction of this large project, simply by trying to save $2,000,000 in appropriations during the current year that will have to be put out anyway within the next year or two. We must expeditiously complete the remaining work to be done on the dam, anyhow.

The total cost of the dam is $44,200,000. The lack of this small amount will cause a great danger to the defense of the country, as well as endanger the productivity of the heart of this industrial center of the Nation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment my colleague from Pennsylvania has offered is really worthy of considerable attention. I know it has been the mood and the temper of the Committee to turn down all these amendments, but sometimes we come to one that is extraordinarily important. The Conemaugh Dam is not located in the districts of either of us. It is located to the north of the city of Pittsburgh. If you will recall, in 1936, when the great flood paralyzed the industrial heart of the United States, there was inaugurated there a program of withholding and impounding the floodwaters of the Monongahela, the Allegheny, and the Ohio Rivers. That program is now well on its way to completion. I know that many of you have read that because that program is on its way to completion Pittsburgh has become one of the boom cities of the Nation. Currently, that great city is building dozens of skyscrapers. New industries are moving in along the waterways. New transportation facilities are being stretched across the State to it.

If this appropriation is cut by $2,000,000 it will create a gamble of 1 year on the weather. This big dam will cut the possible maximum flood level by some 5½ feet in the city of Pittsburgh. As my colleague pointed out, it will give that great steel-producing center and munitions-producing center a degree of safety which is, I believe, much more vital than many of the things we are currently doing for defense.

We know that the ultimate cost of the project will be increased if the dam is not finished with economic speed. So I say to the Committee that I do wish you would give this amendment very serious consideration.

The amount of funds involved is small and the need is great. If we can get this dam finished on time, the Nation will be safer. The prosperity of one of its greatest income-producing areas will be safer. I can assure you that in the long run it will pay dividends to the United States of America to have this dam finished on time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I think it should be pointed out in relation to this investment of $2,000,000 that the Pittsburgh area pays its share by paying over a billion dollars every year in Federal income taxes.

Mr. CORBETT. I not only thank the gentleman for his contribution, but I wish to point out also the completion of this dam is going to mean the completion of the flood protection of the Pittsburg area. There are presently no other projects in their flood-control scheme being pushed by either the city or the area. So I do hope you will consider this amendment and support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment on the Conemaugh River Reservoir, as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, seeks to increase the amount by $1,945,000. The budget allowed $9,000,000 and the committee cut it to $7,000,000. The reason for the cut and the reason for the action of the committee, I think, will even satisfy the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We found they had an unexpended or unobligated balance of $4,337,200. That was in November. In December they had practically $2,600,000. So this sum, added to the $7,000,000 takes us up to a figure above the $9,000,000 which was approved by the budget. I think there is very little room here for complaint as to the action of the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. The statement that the gentleman made there might stand some correction. The funds which he says are not obligated, I take it to mean that such funds have not been earmarked and set aside and actually put under contract; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. That is what we understand.

Mr. CORBETT. Here is the difficulty with reference to that. In the impounding of the floodwaters there has to be certain reallocations of railroads, utility lines, public highways, and the like. It is right there that the delay is. It is true that the money has not yet been contracted, but they cannot go ahead and impound the water until they have made these reallocations.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot yield further to the gentleman, since the time has been limited by the action of the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. But they have in excess of $9,000,000. They have $7,000,000 from the committee, $2,000,000 as a carry-over, and the sum I referred to as two-million-six-hundred-thousand-odd dollars actually is $2,589,800. which makes a

total of nine million and practically six hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was defeated.

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NOLAND: On page 339, line 1, strike out "$341,055,000" and insert "$341,555,000, of which $500,000 shall be exclusively available for the flood wall at Vincennes, Ind."

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the only reason that I presume upon the time of the House at this late hour in the afternoon is because in January of this year the lives of 25,000 people in the town of Vincennes were severely jeopardized from a tremendous flood in the Wabash River. I might say at this time that I plead guilty to being a member of the economy cut faction. I will always be against economy when stacked up against human life. The $257,000,000,000 debt mentioned was incurred because it was thought in time of war it was proper to spend money instead of wasting lives. That is where we are on some of these emergency flood-control projects. To my mind, this is one of the most important projects in the Midwest, and it is entitled to highest priority. The seriousness of the recent crisis at Vincennes, Ind., has been attested to by the Corps of Engineers, and their representatives have stated that this is one of the most necessary flood-control items in the entire Midwest. Past Congresses have already appropriated $90,000,000 for plans and specifications, so this project is ready to go, as soon as sufficient construction funds are allocated.

In January of this year the city of Vincennes experienced a flood crisis. This makes the second time that this entire city has been in extreme danger of being flooded. Previously, in 1943, the city was in great danger and had it not been for 3,500 soldiers sent from Camp Atterbury to fight the flood, the city would probably have been inundated at that time.

In January of this year a second crisis of similar proportions was experienced. One thousand soldiers from Fort Knox spent approximately 3 weeks in Knox County under the direction of the Louisville district engineer fighting a flood crest which topped the existing flood wall.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. NOLAND. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I have a telegram from Governor Schricker, of Indiana, who is not in favor of pork-barrel legislation and who has the reputation of being very economical. Here is what he says:

Understand you are to appear before the Budget Director on Monday with respect to an added appropriation for the Vincennes flood-wall project. This is the most important item from the standpoint of Federal assistance in Indiana today. The next flood could easily represent the loss of millions of dollars. It was saved only this time by the heroic efforts of the military forces and the men, women, and children of the community. This is a most critical situation and deserves precedence over many other projects. I want to support your efforts with my strongest possible recommendation.

HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor.

I may say I live directly south of Vincennes and the people of my district are especially interested in this project, because, if Vincennes is inundated, all communications to the north and east are cut off. It would cut off all traffic on the main roads south from Chicago.

I am supporting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. NOLAND. I think that is very important, and I would like to say that I went to Vincennes to see the concrete flood wall there. It is an actual fact that it is about a 12-inch concrete wall, and there are cracks in that wall as big as your hand. The engineers went in there and sandbagged the cracks. They built a secondary sandbag levee 45 feet behind it. As a matter of fact, the waters of the Wabash actually topped the PWA-built concrete wall, and the only way they stopped it was by putting a frame box extension on top of the concrete wall and filling it with mud. The water actually went several inches above the top of that wall. It is a real crisis there. It looks like we will be able to escape a flood this spring, but those are things that will be repeated. The strange thing about it is that the Bureau of the Budget is willing to recommend millions of dollars to repair these agricultural flood levees. The situation at Vincennes is that the agricultural levees, both on the Indiana and the Illinois side, protect those farm lands, and they funnel the water right down to Vincennes where it forms a bottleneck. The only thing that saved the city was because the levee broke way up above Vincennes on the Indiana side, and directly across the river at Lawrenceville, Ill. Go back in there with engineers, rebuild those levee walls, form the funnel, and Vincennes will be endangered again in another flood crisis. For that reason I believe that the men, women, and children, who got out and filled sandbags in this last flood crisis are entitled to some Federal help to protect their cities.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment end in 8 minutes, the last three to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I live north of Vincennes, but I was born and raised south of Vincennes. I have seen the floods down the Wabash and the Ohio Rivers, and I have seen homes washed away. I remember in 1937 I had to have a police escort to get to my father's home, with no communications intact, before I could find out whether or not their home had been washed down the river.

I believe in economy, but I am not opposed to investing money to save lives. I assume that although we are called upon to spend $13,500,000,000 for defense in this country that life is going to go on, and it is a part of the progress of this country to protect those people.

I suppose this amendment is not going to have much chance of passing—like all the rest of the amendments that have been offered here this afternoon. It reminds me of what the judge said along about the middle of the morning; after holding court for a couple of hours he threatened to clear the courtroom unless he had order, that he had had to send six men to the penitentiary and had not heard a word of the evidence.

But I want to say this to you, Mr. Chairman; this is the one point I want to make: $300,000 was spent at Vincennes, Ind., in January of this year to build up a sandbag wall to keep Vincennes from being washed down river. We are asking for $500,000 to increase the height of the wall, to make it permanent. Before another 12 months roll around you may have to spend another $300,000 to build up a sandbag wall to save the city.

Is that not a question of being penny-wise and pound-foolish? I respect the Bureau of the Budget, but that is not a sufficient answer to me.

In conclusion, let me say that neither is it a sufficient answer to the people who live in Knox County, Ind., especially when last year this Congress was called upon to vote and did vote over my protest, if you remember, six times this amount to subsidize what they call Freedom Fair here in Washington. Now, most of those Knox County people down there who live under that flood wall are not going to come to Washington to enjoy that celebration, but they are going to help pay for it whether they are washed down the Wabash River or not. This is $500,000 to start making permanently safe Vincennes. Remember, you spent $300,000 in January of this year to save the city. I hope that this will be the one amendment where this House shows that the representatives of the people are making the determination, and not the Bureau of the Budget. This is a meritorious amendment. I appeal to my colleagues to support it on behalf of those people down on the Wabash River.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

The injection of the words "Freedom Fair" into this discussion is very much like talking about Europe. We are today talking about Uncle Sam's pocketbook and our necessities, just how much screening is necessary so that we may continue to go along and take care of the huge problems that we in the Eighty-first Congress find upon our doorstep.

I want to particularly compliment the three gentlemen from Indiana, all of whom appeared in justification of this project before the committee, Mr. NOLAND, Mr. DENTON, and Mr. JACOBS. Their constituents may well be proud of them. But we cannot differentiate in these projects.

This project is in the same category as any other unbudgeted project this year. There is no need for us to dwell upon

the argument of an unbudgeted project. We have had that up several times today; so with the same argument I presented before I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NOLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NOLAND) there were—ayes 11, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to allot 2 minutes of the committee's time to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 339, after line 14, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Lewiston-Clarkston, Idaho and Washington; for the initiation of construction on the Lewiston-Clarkston project, authorized in the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Cong.), $1,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground it calls for a reclamation project and is not germane.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I withhold it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, recently this Congress was called upon to appropriate $25,000,000 not for flood control, but to repair flood damages on the Columbia River in the Northwest. This committee has slaughtered the Army engineers flood-control program on the Columbia River in bringing in this bill. We are getting practically no consideration at all in the Northwest.

The Army engineers, in recognition of the danger of floods at Lewiston requested an appropriation in the budget submitted this year of $1,000,000 for planning and initial construction on this project. The Bureau of the Budget, failing to understand the urgent need for flood protection at Lewiston, cut the item to $25,000 for planning only, and the House committee has struck out all planning projects.

So that you may know how urgent and important this project is, I am going to read a letter to the Committee, addressed to me, from General Pick, of the Army engineers, and also a letter to Senator DWORSHAK, who kindly gave me a copy, and I ask your support in restoring the item to the appropriation bill:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, October 28, 1949.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: Reference is made to your letter of October 20, 1949, enclosing a communication from Mr. William P. Hughes, city engineer of Lewiston, Idaho, concerning the availability of funds for the strengthening of the North Lewiston dike.

As you may recall, the River and Harbor Act of 1945 authorized a project for navigation and other purposes on the Snake River, which included, among other items, the reconstruction and strengthening of the levees and flood walls on both banks of the Clearwater River and on the right bank of the Snake River at Lewiston. To date, however, no funds have been appropriated by Congress for this work, and we are unable to initiate the authorized construction until the necessary funds are appropriated for that purpose.

The Corps of Engineers fully recognizes the importance of the authorized levee rehabilitation work at Lewiston and the benefits that will be realized upon completion of that construction. Accordingly, you may be assured that we are prepared to initiate the work promptly when the necessary funds are appropriated by Congress for that purpose. In this connection, I may mention also that when hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1951 are held by the Appropriations Committee of Congress we will be prepared to answer any questions the committee members may ask concerning the funds required for the construction of these flood-protection works at Lewiston.

I trust that this information will be sufficient for your present purposes. In the event, however, I can be of any further assistance to you in this connection, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General,
Chief of Engineers.

During the limited time at my disposal, Mr. Chairman, I am unable to present all of the facts, but I want to say to you that this project has been authorized, and you will find it on page 13 of Public Law 14, approved March 2, 1945; and when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] presses his point of order, I will be prepared to meet it.

I would like to also read a letter from the Chief of Engineers to Senator DWORSHAK under date of November 3, 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, November 3, 1948.

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: Further reference is made to your letter of August 30, 1948, and its accompanying enclosures from Mr. William P. Hughes, city engineer at Lewiston, concerning the construction of dikes at Lewiston, Idaho. By letter of September 1, 1948, you were advised that Col. Theron D. Weaver, the division engineer of the North Pacific Division, was requested to submit a report thereon, which has now been received, based on information furnished by Col. O. E. Walsh, the district engineer at Portland, Oreg.

As you know, the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, authorized the modification of the Federal project for the Snake River in general accordance with a plan contained in House Document 704, Seventy-fifth Congress. This authorization provides for construction of such dams as are necessary and open channel improvement between the mouth of the river and Lewiston, Idaho, for purposes of slack-water barges navigation, irrigation, and power development. The plan of improvement now developed consists of four dams with high-lift locks to overcome a differential in elevation of 375 feet between the Columbia River and Lewiston, fish-passing facilities, and hydroelectric installations. The dam sites tentatively selected are located 10, 45, 72, and 113 miles, respectively, above the mouth of the Snake River. To date no river and harbor funds have been appropriated by Congress with which to construct this authorized project.

The levees that local interests are desirous of having constructed at this time are an integral part of the ultimate plan for the development of the lower Snake River and are required in connection with the proposed Lower Granite Dam, the uppermost of the four dams to be constructed between Lewiston and the mouth of the river. This dam, which is scheduled to be the last of the four dams to be constructed, will create a navigable pool extending to the vicinities of Lewiston and Clarkston. As the normal pool of the reservoir will be approximately 10 feet above ordinary low water at the confluence of the Snake and Clearwater Rivers, levees at this locality have been included in the approved plan.

The levee plan consists essentially of three units, of which one would be located on the Snake River adjacent to the city of Clarkston, and two would be located on the Snake and Clearwater Rivers, adjacent to the city of Lewiston. These levees, which normally would be constructed concurrently with the dam, are primarily intended to prevent such additional damage as the existence of the lower Granite pool might cause during major floods. These levees would also provide continuous protection against all natural stream flow conditions up to the designed flood stage. It is this latter protection that is now desired by local interests, in the interim before the construction of the lower Granite Dam. On the basis of the present price levels the probable cost of the proposed levees is estimated to be $1,200,000.

As indicated above, the initiation of construction of this authorized Federal project is dependent upon the appropriation of the necessary construction funds therefor by Congress, and the early construction of the levees in the vicinity of Lewiston would require a specific appropriation of funds by Congress for that purpose. You may be assured that prompt measures will be taken toward accomplishing the desired levee protection as soon as the required funds are made available.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General,
Chief of Engineers,

Copy to North Pacific division, Portland district.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take the time of the House at this late hour. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 339, before the period in line 14, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided, further.* That there is hereby appropriated an

additional sum of $750,000 for flood control work at Bonners Ferry, Idaho."

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, both the committee and the Bureau of the Budget have made a very serious mistake in striking this item from the appropriation bill.

We have in north Idaho a beautiful, productive valley known as the Kootenai Valley in Boundary County. It surrounds the county seat of Bonners Ferry. Many years ago the people on their own initiative organized drainage districts, bonded themselves, and raised the money for flood protection, and built what you call levees in the South but are called dikes in our country, and diked out 13 drainage districts in this beautiful productive valley of the Kootenai, where they raise as much as 80 bushels of wheat to the acre.

In 1934 extra high water broke through most of these dikes and the Government incurred a very heavy expense in rehabilitating the dikes and refinancing the people on the land. Only 2 years ago the floods came in and broke the dikes and flooded the drainage districts and the town of Bonners Ferry again. The Army engineers who came to the rescue of the town and the districts spent a large amount of this emergency appropriation of $25,000,000 to rehabilitate the dikes, strengthen them, and protect the town of Bonners Ferry.

Now the Bureau of the Budget comes out with the proposition that as long as they are going to build a flood-control dam at Libby upstream the repair of these dikes will be only an interim project, and will not be needed after the Libby Dam is built, and so appropriation for flood protection of Bonners Ferry and drainage districts was stricken from the bill. But who knows when the Libby Dam is going to be built? It may be 15 or 20 years, and in the meantime the town of Bonners Ferry and the beautiful farmland of the Kootenai Valley will be left at the mercy of the floods of the Kootenai River and the Kootenai Valley may be destroyed.

It is my contention that both the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee made a very serious mistake in taking this item out of the program of the Army engineers to complete a work that is so well begun and means so much to north Idaho and the welfare of the country, particularly of the transcontinental railroads that serve that district. That valley is crossed by the main line of the Great Northern Railroad and also a branch of the Canadian Pacific, the Spokane & International.

It is my contention that this amendment should be adopted and this item should be restored to the bill. The town of Bonners Ferry should be protected just as was intended by the Army engineers in putting this item in the program. I ask the gentleman from Michigan to accept the amendment, and I hope that if he ever gets his assignment changed he will take over the ECA and give the people of America a little protection when it comes to economy.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the compliment. This is an unbudgeted item. The same reasons that have been advanced before against unbudgeted items apply here. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, in providing for flood control we are strengthening the economy of our country, and it cannot be considered an out-of-pocket cost that offers no return. It was primarily this recognition that caused the Federal Government to assume responsibility of flood control.

By providing economic projects in flood-control programs we preserve the soil of our Nation. Until a comparatively few years ago the soil of this Nation was being depleted to an unreasonable and incredible extent. Therefore, flood control and soil conservation, together with power development, go hand in hand in preserving and strengthening the economy of America.

It is recognized that flood-control projects usually require years from the time of first recognition from an engineering standpoint is given until its completion as an actual reality. It is well recognized that it will require years and years of consideration and action to complete even a minimum flood-control program. It, therefore, becomes necessary to approach these projects as it is finally decided to have the least possible impact on our budget from year to year as we build to strengthen our future economy. In parceling out the funds for projects, I think attention should be given to those that would give the greatest immediate return and the most justifiable relief and protection.

There are several projects in our State under construction; some of which are highly important to my own district.

I wish to call attention to a few of these that have particular significance and importance in my part of the State. This in no way minimizes the importance of others that affect our State or other sections and States of our great country.

BLAKELY MOUNTAIN

Blakely Mountain project was authorized a few years ago as a multiple purpose project, power dam, and flood control reservoir. The total estimated ultimate cost to complete the project will be approximately $31,000,000. Already we have provided almost $7,000,000 toward this project and it is now well under construction.

This appropriation carries an additional $2,500,000. This will provide sufficient funds to carry on this year's construction that this project may get pretty well along toward ultimate completion.

This project is important to our area because it is a main reservoir to control the upper waters of the Ouachita River which traverse the heart of my district. It, together with other projects when ultimately completed will furnish the flood-control protection that will inure to the benefit of that whole area, and thus as a small segment to the economy of our country.

NARROWS RESERVOIR

The Narrows project likewise just above my district also provides protection to the Ouachita watershed. It is on the upper Little Missouri River, which is a tributary of the Ouachita and will contain the water out of the mountains in the upper part of that stream, adding to protection of our people below where floods frequently occur.

The Narrows project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1941.

I am proud of the fact to have also had some part in the authorization and providing funds for this project. It is, however, a small project with an ultimate total cost of $13,500,000. Already more than half of the funds have been made available to complete this project.

In this bill an additional $1,500,000 is provided which will mean that with this year, the project will be 75 or 80 percent complete. This, too, is a multiple purpose project providing benefits for both hydroelectric power and flood control.

OZAN CREEK, CHANNEL CLEARANCE

In connection with the Narrows Reservoir project, there was authorized some $58,000 for the channel clearance of Ozan Creek in Hempstead County.

Out of the funds made available here, Mr. Chairman, I am going to insist that $53,700 be used and the engineers enter into a contract for this work to proceed.

This is a small project but there is no project in the bill that is more justifiable and to which there is a greater responsibility of the Government. The engineers included this as a part of their request to the budget. The budget reduced the amount for the entire project. There is some question that this might be a new project but notwithstanding this viewpoint by some, it cannot be considered anything except a part of the Narrows project because it is in the same area.

There are only approximately 12 miles of channel clearance but this 12 miles is important in that it provides an outlet of three forks of Ozan Creek, and in as fine alluvial soil as there is in the Nation.

Four thousand three hundred dollars has already been allotted and the planning completed, and only $53,700 is needed to do this work.

The reason I insist on this, Mr. Chairman, is because it was in this area the Federal Government took over some 60,000 acres which it used during the war as a testing area for ammunition. The heart of this county then went for war purposes, affecting seriously the economy of the county.

After the war the Government abandoned the area and after a long continuous fight, we got it returned to production, giving the people the opportunity of reclaiming this land in order that it may again be returned to agriculture.

Private interests before it was taken over had constructed their own private canals for drainage. By road beds and other obstruction, the Government in

utilizing it for war purposes has practically destroyed the drainage and outlet that private interests had previously, at their own expense, provided to drain this area.

These three channels come together, providing an outlet for the water and it is necessary to channel these 12 miles to let this water get out.

I submit to you in all fairness and in justice to those people this should be done and I believe will be done during this fiscal year.

The members of this committee indicated to me a year ago that as this property was just being returned to production they would endeavor to include it this year.

The engineers have made their request recognizing its importance and made a statement to the committee on it. I have obtained the complete breakdown on the Narrows project and there is every justification that this amount of funds can be used for this channel clearance a few miles below. This can be done by using $53,700 of the $1,500,000 in this bill for the Narrows Reservoir and Little Missouri River project. I have discussed it with the engineers and I am fully confident that it would not greatly interfere with the progress of the dam and reservoir. It would provide immediate relief to the people in the area of these three forks of Ozan Creek, by only requiring the channeling of this 12 miles.

OUACHITA RIVER

These projects are part of the comprehensive plan of the Ouachita River program giving protection to the watershed which covers many thousands of acres.

A few days ago the Congress authorized the entire program, which when completed will be as fine and complete a flood-control program, including power and navigation as there will be found anywhere in the country.

In this additional authorization to complete the program for which appropriations will be made in the future, $21,300,000 was authorized. Though the total funds required to complete the project is estimated to be a little more than $36,000,000, the entire project was approved, but deferring a reservoir and a large measure of the navigation costs.

DEGRAY DAM AND RESERVOIR

The Congress provided this authorization $18,950,000 for DeGray multiple-purpose dam and reservoir on the Caddo River above Arkadelphia in Clark County. This is below Blakely Mountain by several miles and will provide an important reservoir as part of this comprehensive program.

BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW

For the Bayou Bartholomew project in Ashley County and Louisiana, there was authorized $1,520,000 which will give drainage to a highly important agricultural area. There were other smaller projects authorized adding to this ultimate program of flood control protection. Though the Murfreesboro Reservoir was approved, the $2,500,000 required was deferred pending the developing of these other projects first.

NINE-FOOT CHANNEL

There is at present a 6½-foot navigation channel on the Ouachita River up as far as Camden, Ark. Funds in this appropriation are being made available to continue the necessary dredging which was started from funds made available during this fiscal year to make this a 6½ foot channel all the year.

The Congress authorizing a 9-foot channel by lengthening the existing locks to 525 feet and deepening them to accommodate 9-foot draft navigation, providing for channel realinement, cutoffs, and so forth, will add to the economic benefits of the area and provide navigation outlet to the Gulf of Mexico. Though there will be much time required, in fact, it will be years completing this program, we feel substantial progress has been made and this entire project well under way from which not only the people in the area but the Government will start receiving benefits and returns from the investment.

BAYOU MACON-TENSAS RIVER

A few years ago the people of southeast Arkansas were constantly flooded by what was then known as the fuse-plug in the levee on the west bank of the Mississippi. After long and careful consideration, the Congress closed the fuse-plug and provided levee protection on this side of the river as it had previously provided on the east side. It was thought that this would provide needed protection for this area in Chicot, Desha and other counties.

Many drainage districts had been constructed by local interests. It developed that the drainage was not adequate and the Congress authorized in the act of 1946, the Bayou Macon and Tensas drainage program, extending this program up from the confluence of these rivers in Louisiana.

For 3 years, we have been working toward obtaining sufficient appropriations to carry out this authorization to provide this needed relief.

The entire project is a large one, covering an area of 3,000,000 acres. There are some 750 miles of streams to be enlarged and improved, all at an estimated cost of more than $20,000,000.

Thus far during the last 2 years the Congress has appropriated $4,235,000; all of this, and necessarily so, must go to the lower end of the project in Louisiana and as the project progresses upstream, it will provide relief for the Arkansas part of the project.

To my consternation and great dismay, there is only $725,000 in this bill to carry forward this program. I understand this was the amount the engineers recommended within ceiling of the budget. This will bring the work up to the junction of Bayou Lafourche and Tensas River. As I understand, this will complete the lower outlet and then the work will proceed with greater expedition as the funds are made available.

In that the lower end will be opened up, it will be my intention to insist that the Army engineers utilize a greater portion of the funds we appropriate each year for the lower Mississippi area, of which this is a part, in order that this drainage program may proceed at a much faster rate.

RED RIVER LEVEES—BANK STABILIZATION

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in this appropriation bill, $500,000 is provided for levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam on Red River in Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana. The Red River levee and bank stabilization program is a highly important one to our area and well under way. Over two and one-half million dollars has been appropriated and utilized for bank stabilization, levee and bayou program. With this, the total project would be a little less than half completed. The committee has been very considerate in providing these funds as indicated could be used in carrying forward this program. The people in Hempstead and Lafayette Counties in my district, in Miller County, and the entire southwestern part of our State are anxiously awaiting the completion of this program, which will give protection to a fine and prosperous agricultural area.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas has been very, very interested in this project. He has spoken to me on ever so many occasions and I know he has spoken to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Judge Kerr, about it on several occasions and as a result the judge and I have had several conferences about the project. Both the Army engineers and the budget regard this project as a new project. It is unbudgeted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say personally I talked to the engineers and they do not regard it as a new project. That is what they told me, even though the budget marked it out when it was sent here. The Army engineers made a request for it to the budget and the budget sent to the Congress a reduced amount from what was requested by the Army engineers, and the committee itself has reduced that amount by about $250,000.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to my distinguished friend, a member of our staff has had a contact with the budget on this particular project and the information brought back to us is that they do regard it as a new project. Now, that is the information which we received, and it resulted really from the great work that the gentleman placed upon me with his continual questioning of me as to how it was going to be handled.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the members of the committee and I do want to apologize for bothering them about this. But I do feel the Government, even though it is a small project, has a responsibility for what it did during the war. The Army engineers advised me they do not consider it a new project. It is part of the whole area.

If this could be worked out without increasing the amount of funds to be used for this purpose it would be very helpful if the gentleman and his colleague on the committee would help me to work it out.

Mr. RABAUT. I can say for myself that I have every confidence in the ability of the Army engineers to select projects. If they see fit to cooperate with the gentleman, certainly there will be no complaint coming from me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the chapter.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MCCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CHUDOFF (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

COMPETITION FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIAN FOOTWEAR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the special order that I have for tonight, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the New England Shoe and Leather Association have written me that an investigation being made by the Commissioner of Customs and the fact that the Commissioner has also ordered a substantial increase in the bonds required of importers of Czechoslovakian shoes is already having a beneficial effect for the New England shoe industry.

The letter from Mr. Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association reads as follows:

NEW ENGLAND SHOE AND LEATHER ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 4, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: We are happy to advise that the Commissioner of Customs has ordered an investigation, requested by our Association, of current imports of Czechoslovakian-made women's shoes. This investigation will determine whether these shoes are being sold in violation of the Antidumping Act of 1921, as claimed by our association.

The Commissioner has also ordered a substantial increase in the bonds which the importer is required to post on all such future imports. In the opinion of many members of our association, this requirement of additional bonds will go far to deter further imports of these shoes from Czechoslovakia.

Your personal assistance in communicating with both the Treasury and State Departments on this vital matter was most helpful in securing such favorable and prompt action by the Commissioner of Customs. Our association members are deeply appreciative of your cooperation and support.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

MAXWELL FIELD,
Executive Vice President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ADMINISTRATION ENCOURAGES COMMUNISM

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present at the recent dinners addressed by the President and Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Therefore I did not hear their statements about the charges made by Senator MCCARTHY concerning Reds in the State Department. These charges are currently being aired before a Senate investigating committee.

I did read the newspaper accounts of the speeches made by the President and the Secretary of State. They both constituted blanket denials of Communist infiltration in the State Department and other departments of the Government. The denials were unsupported by anything more than demagogic intimations that, if any criminality exists, it must be on the part of Senator MCCARTHY.

This, it was said, because he is seeking to destroy the confidence of the American people in our Government and its foreign office at a time of international emergency.

It should be apparent to anyone that Senator MCCARTHY, far from seeking to destroy any confidence, is seeking to correct a scandalous situation which has already destroyed the confidence of many Americans; not in our Government but in those who are now in control of the Government, including the Department of State.

Senator MCCARTHY is seeking in the only way possible to restore that confidence in any degree. That only way is to clean out of our Government the Reds and fellow travelers for whom the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations alone are responsible.

I know something personally whereof I speak. It may be recalled that it was only at my insistence that you have continued to hear about the notorious Amerasia case.

By this time many of you must know how frantically the administration and the State Department fought to protect six persons arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on charges of stealing hundreds of documents, many of them top secret, involving national security, from the State, War, and Navy Departments. You may recall that the handling of this case shocked even supporters of the administration.

In that case, the remarkable efforts of the FBI were deliberately and wantonly nullified. Through the connivance of leading officials of the Justice and State Departments, in the Amerasia case, traitors within our Government were given protection and absolution.

In his speech, before the Federal Bar Association, the President suggested that Communists are a small minority in the United States, harmless though noisy. He suggested that our only real danger from communism comes from outside. He asserted that no Communists are now working for the Government; or working, rather, for the Kremlin within the American Government. He asserted also that his loyalty-screening program is completely successful.

If these statements by the President are true, then how did it happen that this harmless Communist minority, through one of its cells in our Government, stole hundreds of documents from the State, War, and Navy Departments? They did so; no one can deny it. It has been proved in a Federal court that they did so. How does it happen, too, that members of another Communist cell in our Government stole the secrets of the atom bomb and gave them to the masters of the Kremlin?

If the President's loyalty-screening program is so successful, how is it that George Shaw Wheeler thrice was cleared by Government loyalty boards? All of you must know that only a few weeks ago Wheeler sought refuge in Czechoslovakia, behind the iron curtain, saying that he did so in order to escape the gestapo methods of the American occupation government in eastern Germany. During the years when Wheeler was a trusted, policy-making official of the occupation government, in the employ of our own Defense Department, I stood on this floor to protest, pointing out

Wheeler's record. His conduct since then has amply confirmed and corroborated my charges, for which I was vilified by administration supporters at the time.

The President declared that Senator McCARTHY was an asset of the Kremlin. If the Senator's effort to rid the Government of those who have infiltrated the Federal payroll to wreck the Nation is an asset to Russia, then how much greater asset is the President who has belittled the efforts of a congressional committee doing the same, by calling it a red herring, and issuing an order denying the right of the committee to examine the files of Government employees suspected of disloyalty.

Such statements and action by the President not only shielded and protected those who would destroy our Government but, consciously or unconsciously, actually encouraged them to greater efforts in their treasonable work. How the Kremlin must have laughed when it learned how the President of the United States was playing into its hands.

Secretary of State Acheson told the American Society of Newspaper Editors that the attacks by Senator McCARTHY on the State Department are a filthy business. He had the cheek to tell the editors he stood before them to clear away some of the trash. Of course a cleanup such as Senator McCARTHY seeks is a filthy job. But where is the filth? In the United States Senate, or in the Department of State?

John E. Peurifoy told the Senate investigating committee that the Department has fired in recent months nearly a hundred moral perverts—bad security risks, all of them, because of vulnerability to blackmail—and nearly 200 Communists or Communist sympathizers. Does this sound as if there is no dirty business in the State Department? If there is any trash to be cleared away, perhaps it consists of many who hold confidential jobs in the Department.

Both the President and Dean Acheson made a great point in their speeches of the assertion that the State Department new employs no disloyal persons whatsoever. It is to be supposed, then, that they are so naive as to believe that espionage agents like Alger Hiss ever are found alone. Almost anybody would know better than that. No man can operate an espionage system alone. And now that I am on the subject of Alger Hiss, I would like to ask a question, one that perhaps has been asked here before.

Have the President and Secretary Acheson ever considered the deadly parallel between the Hiss case and those now before the Senate investigating committee? In all of these cases, the statute of limitations has run. Hiss would be a free man today, if he had not perjured himself in an attempt to preserve his career. Possibly Truman, Acheson and company have considered this parallel. Perhaps that is the reason for the present frenzied campaign of denials.

Pending now before the Rules Committee is my resolution which would authorize a bipartisan committee to reopen and thoroughly investigate the Amerasia case. Authorization of this committee, I believe, would mean that justice at long last would be meted out to those who seek the downfall of our Government. The proof of the President's sincerity would lie in the reopening of the Amerasia case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SPECIAL INTERESTS MAY WRECK HOOVER COMMISSION PROPOSALS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, by and large, endorse the objectives of the Hoover Commission. Not a day goes by but that some Member receives a letter from a constituent urging speedy action on the recommendations proposed by that distinguished group of public-spirited citizens who comprised the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Every individual knows from his own experience and contact with Government agencies that there is room for improvement in the working of Government. Every taxpayer rightly insists that he should get full value for his tax dollar.

Efficiency and economy have become watchwords of the American people. They recognize that to meet the difficult problems of the atomic age, our democratic Government must be sound and strong and efficiently organized.

The Hoover Commission set out with a mandate from Congress to study our complex Government machinery and to make recommendations for overhauling it. Agencies and functions were to be regrouped by major purpose to reduce their number, to eliminate overlap and duplication wherever possible; in short, to make the structure of Government more compact and coherent and more amenable to effective management by the Chief Executive. Within each department and agency, lines of authority and accountability were to be clearly drawn, centering full authority and responsibility in the Executive head and allowing him to delegate to subordinates. Adequate staff assistance was to be provided and the management activities of Government improved and strengthened.

These broad objectives were laudable, commanding support and approval, not only by the people, but by the Congress and the administration. The Congress established the legal framework for the exercise of Presidential initiative in Government reorganization by passing the Reorganization Act of 1949. Other vital reorganization bills were passed, holding forth the real promise of large savings. Prominent among these enactments were the military unification law and the law establishing the General Services Administration. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, I have been privileged to take an active part in the legislative work on reorganization.

The President, for his own part, promptly directed the departments and agencies of the executive branch to search out and put into operation every possible administrative improvement. He appointed an eminent committee of citizens to advise him on administrative management and to keep watch on reorganization progress in the executive branch. One series of reorganization plans was submitted to the Congress by the President last year and another series is pending before us now.

Experts in public administration say that we have accomplished more in the past year by way of Government reorganization than in any like period in all our history. Mr. Hoover himself, while pointing out that the job of Government reorganization cannot be done overnight, that it is a long-term process, has said recently that the progress made by this Congress and administration to date is "truly astonishing." President Truman estimated in his message accompanying the 21 reorganization plans of 1950 that approval of these plans will bring us to the half-way mark in carrying out the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a most strange and peculiar event. The President's reorganization plans, submitted in good faith and with serious regard for the objectives sought by the Hoover Commission, are being assailed from every quarter of the business community. One group opposes one plan; another group opposes another plan. The loud lip service for the Hoover Commission report in general has changed into loud lip noises against the Hoover Commission reports in particular. Many of those organizations who so dutifully went on record in support of the Hoover Commission report are now finding reasons—at least their Washington lobbyists and spokesmen are finding reasons—why one or another of the President's reorganization plans should be opposed and rejected.

The American Bankers' Association has undertaken a grass-roots campaign to work up opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1. The organized bankers do not like this plan because they do not have faith in the administrative supervision that some future Secretary of the Treasury might exercise over the Office of Comptroller of the Currency. I say "future Secretary" because, in this instance, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder shares the views of the banking community. He has joined then in expressing opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1, ignoring the judgment of his own Chief Executive and the Director of the Budget.

The patent lawyers of this country do not trust the Secretary of Commerce. They see in Reorganization Plan No. 5 a device whereby the Secretary of Commerce will award patents to his political friends and tear down the American free-enterprise system.

The ship-owning interests would perhaps like to join in the hue and cry by opposing Reorganization Plan No. 21, transferring the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce. They have been less vocal, I dare say, because the quality of administration of ship subsidies in the presently constituted Maritime Commission is something less than is to be desired.

Ex-Senator Joe Ball has articulated the views of those who do not trust the Attorney General of the United States.

His business letter, I am told, expresses opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 2 because he sees in it a device whereby the Federal Bureau of Investigation will come too much under the thumb of the Attorney General.

The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers are opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 12 relating to the National Labor Relations Board, because they like the administrative absurdity created by the Taft-Hartley Act better than they like good government.

These and other assorted business and financial organizations are also opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 6 because they do not accept the Hoover Commission recommendations that the Department of Labor should be resurrected and the Secretary of Labor given full authority to administer certain laws relating to labor. A Secretary of Labor, in their eyes, has less integrity and less conscientiousness as a public servant than the secretary of some other department.

I do not know where the big farm organizations stand on Reorganization Plan No. 4, but it is safe to say that they do not greet with joyous acclaim the centering of full authority and responsibility over the Government's agricultural activities in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Nor will the mining interests greet with joyous acclaim Reorganization Plan No. 3, which would make the Bureau of Mines, among other Interior units, wholly responsible to the Secretary of the Interior. Perhaps the same can be said for some of the reclamation interests which have been backstopping the Bureau of Reclamation in its hardly concealed opposition to the proposed CVA which the Secretary of Interior has fully endorsed.

I have been reliably informed, Mr. Speaker, that opposition has been expressed by one group or another to 15 of the 21 reorganization plans submitted by the President and pending before the Congress. My latest count shows there are now 17 separate resolutions of disapproval which have been formerly introduced in either the House or Senate on 14 of the 21 reorganization plans.

I venture to say that more such resolutions of disapproval will be forthcoming as the various interests in opposition become more vocal. It is the right and privilege of every Member to introduce such resolutions. I do not question the good faith of any Member who may take objection. Each case may have some merit from the standpoint of the group affected. The question I wish to raise is: Where will this process end, Mr. Speaker? If every particular group or private interest is to be satisfied by a resolution and by a vote of disapproval, the work of the Hoover Commission will go down the drain. The $2,000,000 spent by that Commission will have gone for nought. The grandiloquent sentiments of support for the Hoover Commission, which so many business organizations were quick to make, will turn out to be the hollow voices of hypocrisy.

A citizens' committee has been established for some time to educate the public on the findings of the Hoover Commission and to mobilize support for the Commission's recommendations. Many solid and respectable businessmen are to be found among the sponsors of the citizens' committee. They have contributed money to the organization. They have spread the gospel of the Hoover Commission far and wide. But now in many cases, they find their own business interests opposed to reorganization. Perhaps that explains the fact that the citizens' committee has been less than a bold advocate of the President's reorganization plans.

As these plans come before our Committee on Expenditures, and hearings are held on the resolutions of disapproval, we try to hear all views, despite the limited time allowed under the Reorganization Act. Oftentimes, the points advanced by opponents of a plan are sincerely made and worthy of serious consideration. Nevertheless, I must say that it is amusing and almost pathetic to note some of the arguments which are being used to justify opposition to these basic recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The twinge of conscience is readily apparent, Mr. Speaker. Of course, they support the Hoover Commission—but.

Some accuse the President of bad faith, as did a spokesman for the United States Chamber of Commerce, when he told our Committee on Expenditures that Reorganization Plan No. 12 was a device to "get Denham," general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Some profess to be doubtful of the legality of a proposed reorganization, and as creators of the doubt, urge against the acceptance of a measure of doubtful legality.

Eagerly they search the four corners of the Hoover Commission reports, the reports of the task forces, the staff memoranda, to find some phrase, some shade of meaning, some equivocation that will give a breath of support to their views.

Some deny that economy or efficiency will result from the proposed reorganization, and cover their retreat by stoutly maintaining that even economy or efficiency are too high in price to pay for the immeasurable harm that allegedly will be done by the particular reorganization.

Where the Hoover Commission made a recommendation covering all analogous departments or agencies, arguments now are put forth to the effect that this or that agency should be exempt, either because it is so different from the rest or because the Hoover Commission did not single it out for special mention when the general recommendation was made.

Behind these and similar arguments lies a simple and understandable desire by many of the special groups concerned to let well enough alone, to oppose any change in organization lest an entrenched interest or a favored position be disturbed in relationships carefully built up with the agencies of Government.

More than that, Mr. Speaker, I detect frequently behind these arguments of opposition, a lack of faith in the basic principles of Government organization which the Hoover Commission so clearly and repeatedly advocated. The Commission went ahead of the assumption that democratic government must be based on trust, not on mistrust. The Commission believed that the placement of full authority in the executive heads of regrouped departments and agencies was good, not bad, because accountability goes with authority. We cannot hold a public administrative official fully responsible unless we give him the necessary and complete authority to do his job.

The opponents of these reorganization plans too often take the opposite view. It seems almost as if they cultivate conflict and diffusion of responsibility in administration because they do not really approve of the law designed to carry out a given public policy. Where they cannot succeed in getting the law rescinded or modified, they seem determined to prevent its proper execution.

It frequently happens that private interests affected by a law build up an advantageous relationship—advantageous to them—with the public agency or commission that administers the law. The organized bankers of this country quite frankly regard the Comptroller of the Currency as their sponsor in Washington, D. C. To cite another example, the Interstate Commerce Commission is regarded by some as overfriendly to the railroads. I would suppose that these agencies were created to protect the public interest rather than to act as the sponsor or guardian of some private interest.

Naturally, these groups that enjoy a favored position are reluctant to have any change, any reorganization that might jeopardize their position.

This leads me to observe that if we are sincere about our concern for the objectives of the Hoover Commission, if we are going to get the job of reorganization completed, we must hold high the concept of the public interest—high above the clamor of private interests opposed to specific reorganization plans. We must protect the main body of the Hoover Commission recommendations from being torn to shreds as if it were a carcass surrounded by snarling jackals.

Let me emphasize, as I have done before, that we are not committed to adopt each and every proposal made by the Hoover Commission. Each of these 300 or more recommendations is to be considered upon its merits. Sincere persons may differ about the worth and desirability of a particular reorganization proposal. There is no uniquely correct answer to every problem of governmental organization.

My remarks are not a brief for the Hoover Commission proposals in their entirety. Instead I plead for preservation of those basic principles which guided the Commission's work. To preserve those basic principles, we cannot allow ourselves to say that the Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of Labor or some other department or agency head is not to be trusted with full authority over the affairs of his department or agency. We cannot justifiably oppose the reorganization plans of the President which are designed to establish the organization framework for good ad-

ministration throughout the executive branch.

Let us have these considerations in mind when we come to pass judgment in this House on those reorganization plans. Let us have an anxious regard for the public interest which must be served above all else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MERCHANT MARINE OPERATING SUBSIDIES

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the debates on Friday, May 5, 1950, with respect to the revision of the provision in the appropriations for the Maritime Commission which imposed a limit on the granting of operating subsidies and discussions with several of my colleagues in the House lead me to believe that it would be appropriate to amplify the record in several particulars.

I wish at the outset to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and to the members of his subcommittee for their understanding and patience in the many conversations which led to the revision of the provision referred to.

The following facts may be of some interest to the Members of the House.

There are presently 13 subsidized lines. These lines held contracts, commitments, authorizations, or obligations from the Maritime Commission on January 1, 1950, covering the operation of 243 privately owned vessels and 11 chartered vessels, 4 of which were of the freighter category. It appears that the four chartered freighter vessels will not continue under charter after July 1 of this year, although the passenger vessels probably will continue. The total number of vessels covered by existing subsidy contracts, authorizations, commitments, and so forth, as of January 1, 1950, is therefore 254. After adjustment to reflect the elimination of the chartered freighters, it is 250.

On January 1, 1950, there were six vessels under construction or contracts for construction by three companies. Three of these vessels are for the American President Lines, two for the American Export Lines and one for the United States Lines. I understand that only four of the six vessels are likely to be delivered during fiscal year 1951.

On January 1, 1950, there were applications for subsidy under consideration for 25 vessels. These applications have been filed by Arnold Bernstein Steamship Corp., South Atlantic Steamship Co., Gulf & South American Steamship Co., Pacific Far East Line, and Pacific Transport Lines. However, the 25 vessels covered by these applications include two major reconversions which may not be completed during fiscal year 1951. The two reconversions are passenger ships for the Arnold Bernstein Steamship Corp.

The minimum number of vessels required to take care of the vessels outlined in the preceding three paragraphs would be 277 after eliminating vessels that may not require subsidy in fiscal year 1951, either because of redelivery of chartered vessels, reconversion, or delay in delivery of vessels under construction. The maximum number of vessels that could be covered by the three preceding paragraphs would be 285.

The amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole on May 5 permits the Maritime Commission to award operating-differential subsidies covering the full number of vessels in all three categories above outlined—namely, 285. It accomplishes this objective by fixing a ceiling on the number of vessels equal to the cumulative total of the vessels outlined in the three paragraphs before referred to. Assuming that the existing subsidized lines operate 250 subsidized vessels in fiscal year 1951, the Commission may subsidize 35 more vessels.

On January 1, 1950, there were about 600 American-flag vessels, excluding tankers, operating in the foreign trade. The 600 vessels in actual operation on that date represent a substantial reduction from the number previously operating, which exceeded 800 vessels during the fiscal year 1950. Moreover, the entire American-flag fleet carried substantially less than 50 percent of the cargo in the foreign trade in fiscal year 1950. The downward trend has been truly alarming. The effect of the appropriation bill would be to limit subsidies to a maximum of 285 of these 600 vessels. Therefore over 50 percent of the American-flag vessels engaged in the foreign trade will thus be precluded from receiving subsidy aid during fiscal year 1951.

Because of the growth of the foreign-flag merchant marine and the ability of foreign-flag vessels to operate at lower rate levels due primarily to lower wage costs than American-flag vessels, it has now become apparent that unsubsidized American-flag vessels are likely to be driven from the foreign trade except to the extent that they are embraced within the subsidy program. As a result, we are faced with the serious threat that the American-flag fleet in the foreign trade will be cut in half—from 600 to less than 300 vessels. This would be a condition adverse to the United States, its national defense, the national economy, and the foreign trade.

The purpose of an operating differential subsidy is to place the American shipowner in a position to compete with his foreign competitors in world trade without being at a substantial disadvantage with regard to wages and subsistence of officers and crews, repairs, and other items with regard to which Americans are at a substantial disadvantage in foreign competition. The payment of shipping subsidies never guarantees a profit to the operator. The operating subsidy is the only subsidy paid by the Government to any industry that is subject to repayment by the receiver. The operator must repay to the United States one-half of any profit in excess of 10 percent per annum upon the operator's capital investment necessarily employed in the operation of the subsidized vessels. During the 11 years from 1938 to December 31, 1948, inclusive, the total operating differential subsidy payments to all the lines were approximately $87,953,000. The amount of such subsidy repaid or repayable to the Government as recapture was approximately $52,438,000. The net subsidy for the 11-year period was, therefore, approximately $35,515,000.

The seriousness of the situation with which we are confronted cannot be exaggerated. We are faced with a drastic reduction in the size and scope of our American merchant marine. We are confronted with the threat of reducing the participation of the American-flag merchant marine in the foreign trade to less than 25 percent, as contrasted with our objective of 50-percent participation. What this means in terms of idle vessels, less employment, impaired usefulness of the merchant marine as a naval auxiliary, loss of revenue to repair yards, stevedores, port authorities, and other business dependent upon patronage of American-flag vessels, as well as shipping interests dependent upon regular American-flag service is too obvious to need elaboration. The situation calls for action which will make it clear that the United States Government does not intend to abandon the seas to foreign-flag operators.

This matter is of particular concern to California and the area which I represent. On the west coast there is a substantial unemployment problem insofar as seamen, longshoremen, and other workers dependent on maritime employment are concerned. Any development which threatens a further reduction in employment of seamen, longshoremen, shipyard workers, and similar employees represents a serious danger to the economy of my area. It threatens the existence of the going organizations and the nucleus of skills which are required in times of emergencies to build, operate, and repair our ships, organizations and skills which we have desperately needed and found woefully inadequate in many of our seaports in the two great emergencies of the past few years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FREEDOM FAIR

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] mentioned the Freedom Fair, whereupon the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] said that talk about the Fredom Fair is like talking about Europe and he added, "What we are talking about here today is Uncle Sam's pocketbook."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say just a word about the Freedom Fair and Uncle Sam's pocketbook.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Washington Evening Star of last Friday captioned "Truman rejects plan to set up corporation for Freedom Fair" with a subheading "McGrath calls proposal of doubtful authority, urges Congress action."

I read the first two paragraphs of that article:

The White House today rejected a proposal by the National Capital Sesquicentennial

Commission to set up a nonprofit corporation to direct the business affairs connected with the operation of the Freedom Fair next year.

An opinion from Attorney General McGrath which went to the Commission from President Truman said that the plan was of doubtful legality and suggested that the Commission should seek specific authority from the Congress if it desires to proceed with its plan.

On Saturday last the Washington Evening Star ran another story captioned "Sesqui Commission studies decision on Freedom Fair," a story written with the byline William A. Millen. I read two paragraphs from that story:

The National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, now at the crossroads, will have to decide whether to hold a Freedom Fair or concentrate on a series of special events.

Mr. Massmann, the Commission's general manager, believes that if Freedom Fair is not held, about $2,000,000, set aside for that purpose, will have to be returned to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I have had sent to me copies of the minutes of the meeting of the Sesquicentennial Commission of March 15, 1950. There was a discussion at that meeting regarding a letter dated March 7, 1950, directed to the President regarding three problems facing the Commission.

These three problems being first, the necessity of finding a site; second, the necessity for a ruling as to whether or not the Commission can grant authority to a nonprofit corporation; and third, the need for a survey to determine the interest of industry in participation.

I quote from the minutes:

The letter dated March 7, 1950, states in effect that if an adequate site is available, and if we have the authority to create a nonprofit corporation, it is the recommendation of the executive committee that a survey of industry be undertaken for a period not to exceed 4 months and that our liability for such a survey shall not exceed $150,000 if we do not proceed with Freedom Fair. After full discussion of the problems involved and with the clear understanding that further action with regard to Freedom Fair must await a favorable ruling from the Attorney General, there was a motion by Mr. (Joseph C.) McGarraghy that the report and recommendations of the executive committee be approved.

This was seconded by Commissioner John Russell Young and the motion was unanimously carried.

I read further from the March 15 minutes:

Mr. Barron—

Meaning Mr. Carter T. Barron, Executive Vice President of the Commission—

voiced the opinion of those present when he stated that we owe it to Congress and ourselves to take steps and proceed with Freedom Fair or to abandon it.

Mr. Bastian—

That is Mr. Walter M. Bastian, general counsel of the Commission—

said he thought a ruling from the Attorney General might be forthcoming in about a week. It was agreed that if the ruling of the Attorney General is negative, we must announce the abandonment of Freedom Fair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of this action by the Commission and the recent ruling of the Attorney General of the United States, I propose to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that he have the appropriate subcommittee hold immediate hearings to ascertain whether the $2,000,000 said to be unexpended can now be returned to the Federal Treasury in the interest of all of the taxpayers of the United States. Our committee should call in the executive officials of the Commission before we complete action on the omnibus appropriation bill. It can be done; it should be done tomorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on chapter IX, civil functions, general appropriation bill, 1951, today, may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH (at the request of Mr. TABER) was granted permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HAND (at the request of Mr. TABER) was granted permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. D'EWART (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances and attach to each extraneous matter.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Dr. R. L. Meiling, Director of Medical Services under the Secretary of Defense; and also an address by Admiral William H. P. Blandy.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein certain material from a high-school student body in California, notwithstanding that it exceeds two pages and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $451.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 5, 1950, and two editorials from the Chicago Tribune of the same date.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. MCCONNELL (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1434. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7339. A bill to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 593. Resolution for the waiving of points of order against chapter XI of H. R. 7786, a bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and providing further for the waiving of points of order against an amendment to chapter XI, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 78. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 8411. A bill to provide for certain per capita payments to members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 8412. A bill to authorize the construction of certain irrigation and power projects in the Snake River Basin, Idaho, Wyo., and Oreg., and the Crooked River, Oreg., to establish a Snake River Basin ac-

count, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 8413. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 8414. A bill to authorize credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood-protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8415. A bill to extend and improve the unemployment-compensation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 8416. A bill to amend Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 8417. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the regulation of motor carriers engaged in commerce to and from the Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 8418. A bill to authorize loans to make available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 8419. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8420. A bill to provide for the reconstruction and repair of roads, bridges, or streets in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by floods in the spring of 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. Res. 591. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Rose Margaret Torrance; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 592. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6826, a bill to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8421. A bill for the relief of Bartula Posidel, Jordan Gic, Louis Bercari, Liberat Belulovic, Ivan Zgaljierdic, and Josip Peras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 8422. A bill for the relief of Carmenciata von Plettenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 8423. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Mizumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 8424. A bill for the relief of Kenneth R. Kleinman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8425. A bill for the relief of Hiroichi Hamasaki and Shizu Hamasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8426. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Yabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 8427. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Lui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2110. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Portland (Maine) Central Labor Union, opposing the reduction in mail service as ordered by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2111. By Mr. POLK: Petition of the Council of the Village of Hillsboro, Ohio, signed by Karl Doebele, Mayor, Charles L. Barger, President of Council, and W. J. Ludwick, Clerk, petitioning Congress to amend H. R. 6000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2112. By Mr. RICH: Resolution of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Galeton, Pa., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, bowing our heads and our hearts at this noontide altar, we would be still and know that Thou art God. When so many hopes are dashed to the ground, so many dreams shattered, help us to rest our minds in Thee and in the strength of those everlasting values which nothing can destroy.

Grant us sweet reasonableness in all our dealings with our fellow men and with each other. Make us large-hearted in helping and generous in criticizing. Keep us from unkind words and from unkind silences; yet sure and strong in the faith that is in us wherever we are called to stand in this epic hour may we strike our blow for the truth of God and the freedom of man. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 8, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7797) to provide foreign economic assistance; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEE, Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. VORYS, and Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, the Committee on Finance and a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Martin
Anderson	Hoey	Maybank
Benton	Holland	Millikin
Brewster	Humphrey	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	Myers
Bridges	Jenner	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Ecton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Lucas	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the seventh report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) as well as the programs of economic aid to China under section 12 of Public Law 47, Eighty-first Congress, and to the Republic of Korea under the provisions of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.) and Public Laws 154 and 196, Eighty-first Congress.

There is included in the appendix a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84, 80th Cong.) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389, 80th Cong.).

This report covers the quarter ended December 31, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 1950.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Julian Evelio Valdes-Rodriguez or Evelio Valdes Rodriguez from a report relating to aliens whose deportation was suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on June 1, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, on operations under the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROCEDURES IN ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN TRUST FUNDS BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize revision of the procedures employed in the administration of certain trust funds administered by the Veterans' Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE TEXTILE FOUNDATION

A letter from the chairman of the Textile Foundation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foundation for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Concurrent resolution to provide for a report of sanatoria services provided by the State of South Carolina for veterans; to indicate the inadequacy of federally supported sanatoria services afforded veterans who reside in South Carolina; to acquaint Congress with the dilemma of veterans suffering from tuberculosis, mental illness, and other disabilities; and to further provide for sanatoria for veterans in South Carolina

"Whereas the greatest and most urgent need of war veterans of this great country at this time is prompt and adequate hospitalization for those suffering from physical and mental diseases and infirmities; and

"Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that State supported sanatoria of South Carolina, such as the State hospital and State park sanatorium, have established and approved policies of giving preferences to nonveterans on the theory that the Federal Government was responsible for the hospitalization of veterans, whereas nonveterans must be accepted as the State's responsibility; and

"Whereas in spite of this fact our State institutions have found it necessary to accept some veterans for treatment, due to the urgency of this need, and there are now approximately 100 veterans in our State hospital and at least 9 veterans in our State TB sanatorium; and

"Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that all presently available hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration of the Government of the United States are being utilized to capacity and there is a clearly demonstrated need for providing additional facilities, especially for cases of mental disorders and tuberculosis; and

"Whereas a recent order of the President of the United States has necessitated plans in the Veterans' Administration for cancellation of 24 proposed hospitals and the canceling of proposed additions to 14 other hospitals, eliminating 16,000 proposed beds; and

"Whereas such curtailment of bed facilities is calculated to increase the suffering of veterans throughout this Nation because the Veterans' Administration lacks facilities to hospitalize many veterans who may be in real and immediate need of hospital treatment; and

"Whereas failure to hospitalize veterans promptly will ultimately result in aggravation of injuries and suffering which, in turn, will result in increased compensation and pension claims against the Government; and

"Whereas the policy of present curtailment appears to be a penny-wise, pound-foolish action aimed at present savings which may mean future costs of several times the amount saved now; and

"Whereas there is a lack of sanatoria space for veterans who are TB victims in South Carolina in both State-supported and federally operated sanatoria and as a result many are spreading this disease among the rest of the population at the same time that a drive to eliminate the disease is being waged on a national scale; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the Federal Government immediately take the necessary action to insure prompt and adequate care for all physically and mentally sick, or disabled veterans to the end that the States will not have to accept the responsibility for them; and

"Whereas in the meantime the State of South Carolina must not stand idle, placid, and apathetic, and allow any disabled veteran, sick in mind or body, to be shunted from one agency to another, but must on the contrary give him aid and succor; and

"Whereas the crest of veterans suffering from mental, spiritual, and physical illness as a result of the holocaust of World War II is rising and will not reach its peak until 1979, when need for hospitalization will be most acute, as estimated by experts of the American Red Cross and other interested and concerned agencies; and

"Whereas the protection of sick and disabled veterans and their dependents is a primary responsibility of all able-bodied veterans, their organizations, and the people of the United States, and is the main reason for the existence of veterans' organizations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

"1. That Congress be advised of the unfortunate conditions existing as outlined above, with the request that action be taken to alleviate this situation;

"2. That State institutions of the State of South Carolina be instructed not to refuse to admit any patient on the supposition that he or she is a veteran, adequately provided for elsewhere, until such time as the service organizations of this State are satisfied, and state that all veterans needing hospitalization are adequately provided for by the Federal Government;

"3. That the administrative heads of State hospital agencies of South Carolina be requested hereby to report to this assembly not later than the 1950 session what services they are rendering to disabled veterans and what the cost for such service is, together with an estimate of the amounts of money which will be required to provide expanded facilities for veterans, on a permanent basis, in the event the Federal Government makes no further provision to accept full responsibility for the mentally and physically sick and wounded who took up arms to preserve the democracy of the United States of America."

A resolution adopted by the members of the Resolutions Committee of the Midwest Agricultural Price Stabilization Farm Forum, in the State of Minnesota, relating to production quotas and limitations imposed on farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Middle Atlantic Regional Council of the National Association of Housing Officials, of Buffalo, N. Y., signed by Clarence C. Klein, president, remonstrating against any reduction in appropriations for the Public Housing Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of Social Workers, at Atlantic City, N. J., endorsing the proposed plan for

technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, and for the full amount of $45,000,000 to be appropriated the first year therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Rev. M. J. Divine, New York City, N. Y., praying for the admission into the Union of Australia and New Zealand as States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Georgia Association B'Nai B'rith Lodges, in Macon, Ga., favoring the ratification of the Genocide Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Veterans of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, Military Intelligence Service, and the One Thousand Three Hundred and Thirty-ninth Engineers, favoring the enactment of legislation granting statehood to Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Ninety-first Division, Southern California Sector, Los Angeles, Calif., relating to communism in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Boston Life Underwriters Association, Inc., of Boston, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by Independent Chapter 641, B'nai B'rith, of Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1527, providing home rule for the District of Columbia; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram embodying a resolution adopted by the Arlington County (Va.) Board of County Commissioners, signed by Daniel A. Dugan, chairman, protesting against the pending amendment to the Hatch Act, relating to the participation by Federal employees in the process of local government; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Building and Construction Trades Council, of Monterey County, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill, to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1950—RESOLUTION OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY (MD.) BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the attitude of the banking fraternity of Maryland toward the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950 is clearly reflected in a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County Bankers Association on April 20, 1950.

The resolution stresses the relationship of trust and confidence which the members of the county bankers association have enjoyed with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which is in line with the expressed conviction of several hundred bank officials and directors who have corresponded with me on this plan.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Montgomery County Bankers Association be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION MADE BY MONTGOMERY COUNTY BANKERS ASSOCIATION APRIL 20, 1950

Whereas on March 13, 1950, the President of the United States transmitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, prepared in accordance with Reorganization Act of 1949; and

Whereas the plan provided for reorganizations of the Department of the Treasury, which, among other things, would have the effect of transferring all the functions of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Secretary of the Treasury; and

Whereas such transfer would, in the opinion of our association, destroy the prestige of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, established 86 years ago, and be a serious blow to our national economy; and

Whereas the principal objective of the Reorganization Act of 1949 is to reduce the expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with and the efficient operation of Government to which program we, as bankers, heartily subscribe; and

Whereas the transfer of the Comptroller's Office would not accomplish this objective because it is one of the few administrative agencies of Government that uses no tax funds and is supported entirely by assessments upon the banks it supervises; and

Whereas the banks supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency own over thirty-eight billions of Government securities and can envision situations in the future where serious matter of policy in the management of the public debt might place the Secretary of the Treasury in the embarrassing position of representing both debtor and creditor at the same time; and

Whereas the members of the Montgomery County Bankers Association have enjoyed the value of a relationship of trust and confidence with this agency and have been impressed with the high quality of service rendered by the career men that guide its destinies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Bankers Association in regular meeting assembled on this 20th day of April 1950 do hereby go on record opposing any change in the existing status of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Senate Committee on the Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the United States to report out favorably Senate Resolution 246, and thereby disapprove Government Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950; further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to each Senator from Maryland; and

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Bankers Association of Montgomery County, Md., is unalterably opposed to the passage of H. R. 6840, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our representatives in Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 7889. A bill to postpone the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain employees of the Selective Service System; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541).

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 269), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3562. A bill for the relief of Zigmund Danilewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 3563. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3564. A bill to extend the benefits of sec. 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who are involuntarily separated after having rendered 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Archibald S. Alexander, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. W. H. ARNOLD

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on national security delivered by Maj. Gen. W. H. Arnold, before the Reserve officers' convention at Oklahoma City, Okla., May 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RECORD OF SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement setting forth his labor record, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUEL RESOURCES AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY RODERICK STEPHENS

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Fuel Resources and the National Defense," delivered by Roderick Stephens at the Eighth Annual Anthracite Conference of Lehigh University on May 4, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. LANGER, by separate requests, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD 46 newspaper editorials and articles regarding the curtailment in postal service, which appear in the Appendix.]

SOME COMMENTS ON THE CURRENT UTILITY SCENE—ADDRESS BY DONALD C. COOK

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Donald C. Cook, Commissioner, Securities and Exchange Commission, before the New York Society of Security Analysts, on March 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDUCT OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS—ARTICLE BY HENRY H. GLASSIE AND THOMAS M. COOLEY II

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tentative

draft of suggested committee rules for conduct of congressional investigations, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLAN FOR A NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—LETTER FROM W. H. WASHINGTON

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from W. H. Washington submitting a plan for national defense, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREE GOLDEN BALLS—EDITORIAL FROM THE TIMES-NEWS

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Three Golden Balls," published in the Times-News, of Twin Falls, Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "REA's 15 Years of History Tells Story of Progress," published in the Farmers Union News, on May 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REFUSAL OF COMMUNISTS TO ACKNOWLEDGE MEMBERSHIP IN COMMUNIST PARTY—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARRISBURG (PA.) EVENING NEWS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why No Answer," published in the Evening News, of Harrisburg, Pa., May 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM AND SOCIALISTIC TRENDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE YORK (PA.) DISPATCH

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Aren't You Grown-Ups Ashamed?" published in the York (Pa.) Dispatch, of April 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY MR. BROWDER AS WITNESS?—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (PA.) OBSERVER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Mr. Browder as Witness?" published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARTHY BEFORE MIDWEST COUNCIL OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Fifth Annual Convention of the Midwest Council of Young Republicans, at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on May 6, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE—STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on Tuesday, May 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIPARTISAN COMMISSION RELATING TO AMERICAN POLICY IN GERMANY—ANALYSIS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 260 BY CHARLES COLLINGWOOD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point the text of an analysis of Senate Resolution 260 which was made by news commentator Charles Collingwood in his radio broadcast over CBS on April 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 260 AS MADE BY NEWS COMMENTATOR CHARLES COLLINGWOOD IN HIS RADIO BROADCAST OVER CBS, APRIL 29, 1950

There is a very interesting movement under way in the Congress of the United States. It is a movement to investigate the content and results of American policy toward Germany. Perhaps "investigation" is not the right word—it is a word when associated with Congress which has come to imply spies, melodrama, and bitter passion—that is apparently not the purpose of the movement in Congress. What has happened is that a group of Senators, including GILLETTE, of Iowa, who is a Democrat; IVES, of New York, who is a Republican; DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a Democrat, HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey, a Republican, and several others have introduced a resolution calling for a bipartisan Presidential commission to study American foreign policy in Germany. Next week a bipartisan group in the House will put forward a similar measure. Their purpose, as far as one can tell, is not to embarrass anyone, or seek for any scapegoat, but rather to focus attention on current trends in Germany and see whether what we have been doing is right, and whether we should do anything else in the future.

We haven't worried very much about Germany. It is a curious thing that we would fight the most costly war in history, expend unprecedented amounts of blood and treasure to bring Germany to her knees, and then turn aside, as it were, and say this is finished, we will worry about something else. But Germany is still there, weakened, debilitated, to be sure, but still there, potentially strong, marvelously recuperative, still the key to the future of Europe. The Russians know this and they have set in motion a competition for the sympathies and support of the German people, the outcome of which will have a profound influence on the course of the future. Of late there has been coming out of Germany a stream of reports profoundly disquieting to many. The same old people are coming back to power, it is said. Chancelor Adenauer, our hand-picked west German chancelor, is leading Germans in singing the old nationalist anthem, Deutschland Uber Alles. German authorities are becoming more and more defiant of the occupation authorities. In other words, it is being said, Germany hasn't changed at all. And even more ominous, there are bits and pieces which seem to fit together which seem to indicate that powerful forces in Germany, western Germany, may be supporting a new alliance with Russia, may be plotting to cast their lot with their giant eastern neighbor as Hitler once did, as Germany did at Rapallo in 1920, as Bismarck, the iron chancelor, advocated. It is a frightening picture, and not, many are convinced, a fanciful one. But whatever the truth of it, there is no doubt whatever that the future orientation of Germany will be a tremendous factor. And there is no doubt whatever that German recovery is not proceeding precisely along the lines which we had hoped.

Which brings us back to the study being urged upon Congress. Its sponsors are not trying to find a villain, an Owen Lattimore, they are not trying to secure the resignation of Secretary of State Dean Acheson. They are only, so they say, trying to find out what is happening in Germany, and how our policy might accomplish its ends. As Senator GILLETTE said in introducing the resolution, "Now, while there is still time, I urge that the Congress and the people commence the long overdue debate on Germany and our policy there." Let's find out what's going on in Germany, said Senator GILLETTE, before we wake up as we did in China, and find it is lost to us before we even knew what was going on. It would be a novelty, at that, to have an investigation in these days before the event rather than after it.

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

During the course of Mr. LANGER's remarks, when requesting separately the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, of various editorials commenting on the curtailment in the postal service, the following occurred:

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from North Dakota have, for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, editorials from all the newspapers in the United States which comment upon the postal situation?

Mr. LANGER. I have all of them that have my point of view, I may say, and they have appeared in newspapers in practically every State of the Union, criticizing the order of the Postmaster General.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not object to the Senator's request to have them printed, but I think it is a trespass upon the RECORD and upon the Senate to fill up the RECORD with repetitious material.

If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to put two or three editorials into the RECORD, that is one thing. On the other hand, to put in a whole bale of that kind of stuff is unreasonable, because it costs a considerable amount of money to print them. I do not know the exact amount that it costs to print such editorials in the RECORD, but it costs a great deal of money.

I wish to say that I very much disagree with a policy of cramming the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with waste paper and trash simply to give weight to some view of a Senator, in an effort to bolster up his view.

The Senator from North Dakota already has taken his position on this matter, and the material he is submitting is not going to influence him, because he says the editorials represent his view. I doubt very much whether they will affect the view of any other Member of the Senate, although I will not pass judgment as to that.

I simply want the RECORD to show that I dissent and disagree with this wholesale filling of the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am surprised that the distinguished Senator from Texas would call a Texas newspaper editorial waste paper and trash for among the editorials I have offered are some from Texas newspapers and the Sherman Democrat, published at Sherman, Tex., the editorial being entitled, "Postman Rings Once," is the last editorial I have submitted for the RECORD.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I trust that the statement of the Senator from Texas is assurance that during the next week we shall not have any repetitious material included in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not unless the Senator speaks twice.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yesterday at Galesburg, Ill., the President stated, according to the press, that the next few months would determine whether there would be a third world war.

Last Thursday the President stated that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was unduly alarmed about the situation in feeling that there was any imminent danger.

I think it will help to clarify the possible confusion if an article from the Manchester Evening Leader of Thursday, May 4, reporting the President's interview at that time with the press, is inserted in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT HOLDS SITUATION NOT AS BAD AS IN 1946—HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE APPROVES EXTENSION OF DRAFT

WASHINGTON.—President Truman said today that the defense budget for fiscal 1952 will be lower because this country is not alarmed about the international situation.

Mr. Truman's press conference statement seemed to contradict warnings by military and congressional leaders that the cold-war situation has worsened and that defense spending probably will be higher in the future.

SEES STEADY IMPROVEMENT

Admitting that he might be optimistic because a President has to be that way, Mr. Truman said that the international situation is not nearly as bad as it was in the first half of 1946 and that it has improved steadily.

Nonetheless, the House Armed Services Committee heeded warnings by the Nation's top military leaders and approved a 2-year extension of the draft law. But it stipulated that there can be no actual inductions unless Congress gives the word.

Mr. Truman rejected suggestions that the United States cannot afford to keep the Marshall plan going. He said the plan is one of the most effective means of fighting the cold war and reminded that a cold war is cheaper than a shooting war.

At the same time, Mr. Truman said he completely disagrees with former President Herbert Hoover's proposal to revamp the United Nations to exclude Russia and her satellites.

The President, who saw Mr. Hoover yesterday, said he was friendly with him but that he definitely did not agree with his proposal to reorganize the United Nations.

The Chief Executive said he discussed this with Mr. Hoover when he called at the White House yesterday.

Mr. Hoover's proposal to reorganize the UN without Russia also has been cold-shouldered by John Foster Dulles and John S. Cooper, former Republican Senators now serving as advisers to Secretary of State Dean Acheson; and Warren Austin, another former Republican Senator who is now the chief United States representative to the UN.

Mr. Truman's forecast of lower military spending in 1952 developed after a reporter asked whether he planned greatly increased defense expenditures in his next budget. Mr. Truman will submit the 1952 budget to Congress next January.

Actually, the President said, the defense budget will be smaller because this country is not alarmed in any sense of the word about the international situation.

He said his program is to merely maintain the defenses of the Nation at the point of necessity.

The President said that he has not invited Senator GLEN TAYLOR, Democrat, Idaho, the former Wallace progressive, to accompany him on a forthcoming tour of Idaho.

The President also was questioned about the primary defeat of another liberal Democrat, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

Mr. Truman said he did not consider PEPPER'S defeat by Representative GEORGE A. SMATHERS to be a rebuke for his administration. He said he did not believe the Florida primary vote indicated any national trend. He said it was a Florida campaign and that certain issues got into it that had no national basis or foundation.

TAYLOR, who bolted the Democratic Party in 1948 to run for Vice President on the Progressive Party ticket headed by Henry A. Wallace, said yesterday that Mr. Truman had given him such an invitation.

The report had aroused Democrats who hope this year to defeat the former Progressive Party candidate in the August 10 Idaho primary.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE—THE AMERASIA CASE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on May 3, as appears at page 6249 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I inserted the first three of a series of articles dealing with the Amerasia case, as published in the Washington News.

I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the installments appearing in the Washington Daily News on Thursday, May 4; Friday, May 5; Saturday, May 6; Monday, May 8; and Tuesday, May 9. I ask that they be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire how much it will cost to print the articles in the RECORD. All of us talk about economy, of course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the cost will be. The first three articles of the series have already been printed in the RECORD. This matter is one of grave importance to the American people. I do not wish to impinge upon the time of the Senate by reading the articles, but I feel that they are of sufficient importance so that if they cannot be printed in the RECORD in the way I have requested, I shall be prepared to read them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the articles being placed in the RECORD. All I inquired about was the probable cost involved. As the Senator from Texas said a moment ago, we apparently do not have much care about what we spend for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These articles are very important. I have read them all, myself, and they all perhaps ought to go into the RECORD. I was merely wondering about the expense. I have noticed that the legislative branch of the Government has very little compunction about spending money, but we are constantly criticizing the executive department for what it spends.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California to print the articles in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 4, 1950]

BUDENZ SET TO TESTIFY—AMERASIA BREAK UPSET COMMIES

(By Frederick Woltman)

Louis F. Budenz has notified the Tydings Senate subcommittee he is prepared to testify about a series of frantic meetings called by the top leaders of the Communist Party after the Amerasia arrests on June 6, 1945, it was learned here today.

The ex-Communist sent the subcommittee the name of a new mysterious figure who attended at least one of the secret Amerasia sessions of the party's all-powerful politburo in New York City.

He is Robert W. Weiner, formerly national treasurer of the Communist Party, who was convicted of passport fraud in 1940. At congressional hearings here Weiner has been described as head of the party's conspiratorial fund.

At an emergency session of the party's inner circle, Mr. Budenz wrote the Tydings subcommittee, Weiner proposed that the Communist Party raise money for the Amerasia defense.

Present also, in one of his rare appearances at party headquarters, said Mr. Budenz, was the late Joseph R. Brodsky, chief counsel for the Communist Party.

ARRESTS THREW PARTY INTO A FRENZY

The Amerasia arrests threw the Communist Party into a frenzy.

The American Communist movement, its leaders agreed had a major crisis on its hands.

For Philip J. Jaffe, editor of Amerasis, had been a close friend and coworker of Earl Browder. On at least three occasions he had visited Browder's home in Yonkers while under FBI surveillance before his arrest. And he had made calls on the Soviet consulate in New York City.

When Mr. Jaffe was arrested the Justice Department charged him with acting as ringleader of a conspiracy to violate the Espionage Act in the theft of highly secret Government documents.

Although Browder was on his way out, the Communist Party could not afford to be linked with such a scandal.

At one of the Amerasia sessions, someone suggested that the party turn against Mr. Jaffe and accuse him of spying for Japan. This proposal was disapproved.

WHERE BUDENZ SAID HE HEARD HISS MENTIONED

Then, it was proposed that the party try to use influence on the Government. The name mentioned was Alger Hiss, the State Department official since convicted of perjury in the famous Whittaker Chambers pumpkin papers trial.

This recommendation, the political committee was told, originated with Lt. Andrew Roth, one of the six arrested in the Amerasia case, according to testimony of Mr. Budenz at an executive session of the House Un-American Activities Committee on August 1948.

Formerly, Mr. Jaffe's researcher on Amerasia, Lieutenant Roth had been assigned to naval intelligence where he served as liaison officer with the State Department. The grand jury subsequently indicted him. But, later, on motion of the Justice Department, the indictment was dismissed.

In the 1948 House committee hearing, Mr. Budenz was asked if he could recall any specific incidence "where the name of Alger Hiss was mentioned in Communist circles."

The witness recalled a meeting of the political committee after the Amerasia case broke. There, he testified, "it was mentioned that Lieutenant Roth—his first name starts with an A—I do not know whether it is Andrew or Arnold, or what—who was a member of the party, had recommended the

possibility of getting Mr. Hiss to use some influence in the matter.

"I do not know what disposition was ever made of that."

WEINER WIELDED GREAT INFLUENCE IN PARTY

It was a different Amerasia conference that Weiner attended, Mr. Budenz recalls.

Born Welwel Warszower, Weiner had been sentenced to 2 years in Federal prison. He had used a fake birth certificate to show his birthplace to be Atlantic City instead of Radanjonko, Russia. Because of a heart condition, he never served time.

As president of the International Workers Order, propaganda arm of the party among foreign-language groups in America, Weiner wielded great influence in the party apparatus.

The special party fund he administered, according to previous testimony, was used to finance illegal trips of Communist functionaries abroad as well as other secret enterprises that could not be entered in the books. It was always in cash.

Mr. Budenz never found out what happened to Weiner's proposal of an Amerasia defense fund, to be put up by the Communist Party. The Daily Worker managing editor was called into the ninth-floor Amerasia sessions only on special occasions—mostly to get instructions on how to handle the delicate Amerasia story in his news columns.

Jack Stachel, a member of the politburo, was present at some of the meetings. He was one of the 11 Communists convicted last year in New York.

BROWDER VISIT TO JAFFE EMBARRASSING TO PARTY

Another possible source of embarrassment to the party was Browder's visit to Mr. Jaffe's apartment on April 22, 1945. Present also was Tung Pi-wu, en route to the United Nations organization conference in San Francisco as a delegate of the Chinese Reds. The session lasted 5 hours.

A former resident of Russia, Tung had been one of the three ranking Chinese Communists who, through the years, masterminded the Red opposition to the Nationalist Government.

The Browder-Jaffe-Tung meeting was witnessed by FBI agents working on the Amerasia investigation. But last week, while testifying before the Tyding subcommittee, Browder protected his friend, Mr. Jaffe. He refused to say whether Jaffe was present.

Browder's refusal to name Mr. Jaffe may help lay the groundwork for contempt charges the subcommittee is preparing against the ex-Red boss.

One line of action came out of the party's Amerasia conferences. The Communist Party started a counter-offensive to discredit the Amerasia charges. It called them a "Red-baiting attack on democracy," excoriated J. Edgar Hoover, FBI chief, and called for a deluge of protests to President Truman.

PARTY SHOWED GRATITUDE TO AMERASIA GROUP

Five weeks after Mr. Jaffe was let off with a $2,500 fine on a guilty plea, the Communist Party demonstrated its appreciation for the Amerasia group.

Joseph Starobin, the party's foreign policy expert, glowingly reviewed Mr. Jaffe's "Frontiers in Asia" in The Daily Worker of December 3, 1945.

Starobin praised not only Mr. Jaffe's book, but also books by Lieutenant Roth, Kate Mitchell, Jaffe's co-editor on Amerasia who was arrested but later cleared by the grand jury, and Owen Lattimore, who had served on Amerasia's editorial board from 1937–41.

He termed their works "a remarkable outpouring of progressive literature about Asia," "a virtual renaissance of American writing and thinking on the Far East."

These wites, said Starobin, "are almost unanimous * * * in their sympathy for the Chinese Communist program."

[From the Washington Daily News of May 5, 1950]

McCARTHY OFF ON NEW CHARGE—AMERASIA DIDN'T GET ATOMIC DATA

(By Frederick Woltman)

Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY's sensational charge that the Amerasia case involved the transmission of atomic secrets to Russia is not borne out by facts gathered by the FBI, which investigated the case, or the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), which first broke it.

His statement that, 6 months before the bombing of Hiroshima, reports found in Amerasia's office showed that the magazine's staff had been collecting atom bomb secrets is based on the flimsiest of evidence.

On the contrary, an intensive, 3-months' investigation convinced the FBI that Amerasia and its editor Philip J. Jaffe, were not concerned with atomic secrets. Their interest was to collect secret Government records which might be useful in promoting the cause of communism in the Far East.

In a statement which made headlines throughout the Nation yesterday, Senator McCARTHY based his charge on what he said was the testimony of Frank Brooks Bielaski in an executive session of the Tydings Senate subcommittee.

The Bielaski testimony has not been made public.

THE NEWS PUBLISHES THE CORRECT STORY

But, on the basis of earlier talks with Mr. Bielaski and his superiors in the Office of Strategic Services, the News publishes the correct story:

Mr. Bielaski, wartime drector of undercover investigations for OSS, raided the offices of Amerasia magazine on March 12, 1945. He acted on the authority of Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, OSS chief, after Amerasia published a confidential OSS report.

There he found hundreds of classified records stolen from the State Department.

The discovery set off the FBI inquiry which ended in the Amerasia arrests on June 6, 1945.

OSS AGENTS DIDN'T RECALL A-BOMB TITLE

The atom bomb exploded over Hiroshima August 6, 1945. This was Mr. Bielaski's first knowledge that atomic energy was being harnessed for war purposes. But the recollection came to him that one of the documents he saw at Amerasia's headquarters 5 months earlier may have been marked "A-Bomb Plan for Japan." He wasn't certain. But it started him wondering.

NONE RECALLED DOCUMENT WITH A-BOMB IN TITLE

In the next few months, Mr. Bielaski consulted the three other OSS agents who had been on the raid with him. None of them recalled a document with any such title.

One secret Government record they had seen dealt with the location of strategic bombing targets in Japan.

At the time of the raid, he would not have known the difference between an A-bomb, B-bomb, or C-bomb, Mr. Bielaski recently told me. But he did seem to remember that the document in question had to do with the systematic bombing of Japanese industrial centers.

NO A-BOMB DOCUMENTS SEIZED IN FBI RAID

When the FBI raided Amerasia June 6, 1945, its agents confiscated hundreds of Government documents. None was titled "A-Bomb Plan for Japan." And none concerned atomic bomb research.

During his service with OSS, Mr. Bielaski's superior was Archbold van Beuren, the security chief for OSS. It was he who brought the Amerasia discoveries to General Donovan and sat in on the high policy conferences which led to the FBI investigation.

Mr. van Beuren, now editor of Cue magazine in New York City, told me Mr. Bielaski had not mentioned the A-bomb angle to him until a couple of years later.

There was some question as to whether the title might have been "A Bombing Plan for Japan" or "A Bomb Plan for Japan."

"Frank's attitude," said Mr. van Beuren, "was 'of course, I can't be sure what it was, but I've always wondered.' That was still his attitude when I saw him a few weeks ago."

DOUBTS DOCUMENT WOULD HAVE BEEN AVAILABLE

Because the atom bomb secret was guarded so closely, the former OSS security had expressed grave doubts that such a document would have been available, even to the State Department.

"It was all so long after the fact, as far as I'm concerned," said Mr. van Beuren, "that it doesn't make any sense at all."

General Donovan, it is known, has no information that atomic bomb records were found in the OSS raid on Amerasia.

Meanwhile, Senator McCARTHY yesterday urged the Tydings subcommittee to subpena both General Donovan and Mr. van Beuren.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 6, 1950]

DONOVAN URGED SPEED AFTER RAID—BUT AMERASIA ARRESTS TOOK 3 MONTHS

(By Frederick Woltman)

The telephone rang in the Wardman Park Hotel suite of Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. It was 8:30 p. m., March 12, 1945. The Secretary, already in bed, was trying to catch up on his sleep.

"I've got something of the greatest importance," said the voice on the other end, "and must see you at once." It was Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, head of America's wartime espionage Office of Strategic Services (OSS).

Clad in his dressing gown, Secretary Stettinius shortly received General Donovan; his security chief, Archbold van Beuren, and his legal aide, Maj. J. J. Monigan, of the Judge Advocate's office. Present also was Assistant Secretary of State Julius C. Holmes.

General Donovan laid 14 secret Government documents on the table. They had been found earlier that morning during a midnight raid by his investigation unit on the offices of Amerasia magazine in New York City, the OSS director explained.

All had been stolen from State Department files. Six came originally from OSS; the rest, from the War, Navy, and State Departments and the Office of Censorship.

"Oh, my God!" exclaimed Secretary Stettinius.

"Julius," he said, turning to his Assistant Secretary, "if we can find out where this came from, we'll get to the bottom of the whole thing and stop these leaks."

General Donovan proposed that the whole thing be turned over to the district attorney so he could start a John Doe grand jury proceding the next morning. That way, he explained, Philip J. Jaffe, the editor, and everyone else connected with Amerasia could be subpenaed and questioned at once with no chance to compare notes.

FBI GOT THE CASE AND 3 MONTHS PASSED

This was the dramtic start of the Amerasia case. The signals changed, however, and it was given to the FBI instead. After a 3-month investigation, the FBI arrested Jaffe and five associates. But, within 4 or 5 months, for reasons still a mystery to the public, the Justice Department kissed off the Amerasia case.

The Tydings Senate subcommittee heard the story of its origin in executive session last Thursday, as told by Frank Brooks Bielaski, General Donovan's undercover investigations chief who led the March 12, 1945, raid. Mr. Bielaski's testimony has not yet been made public.

But the documents he found, Mr. van Beuren told me since, "were of real importance, not just fourth-rate stuff as has been claimed since."

The six OSS records were confidential reports from its Research and Development Division in the Far East, said the ex-OSS security officer who now edits Cue magazine in New York. Jaffe's Amerasia concentrated on promoting Communist aims in the Far East.

One of the documents the raiding party left behind was a secret report on the household of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. It was signed by Clarence Gauss, Ambassador to China, according to William J. Losty, one of Mr. Bielaski's three OSS aides on the raid.

"It was apparently intended for the confidential information of the Secretary of State," Mr. Losty, a former FBI agent, told me. "As I recall, it indicated the Chiangs were not getting along."

RAIDERS WERE AMAZED AND HORRIFIED

"We were amazed and horrified. We had no right to see it, much less Jaffe."

No sooner had he stepped into the editor's office, said Mr. Losty, than he picked up 50 to 60 original State Department documents from Jaffe's desk. Lying there also were photostats of about 15 of them.

Another document, he recalls, was marked: "For the Office of the Chief of Naval Intelligence only." Mr. Losty is now an investigator in the inland marine department of the Insurance Co. of North America.

Mr. Bielaski told me he counted at least 160 documents he considered of primary importance. One OSS report, originating in China, was marked: "Not to be released under any circumstances to the OWI." (The Office of War Information).

The raiders found in an inside room an elaborate photo-copying laboratory, capable of reproducing documents in wholesale quantities. "We couldn't understand what that had to do with magazine publishing," Mr. Bielaski commented.

What led OSS to crack the Amerasia case in the first place was a stroke of luck and the sharp eye of an OSS official.

OLD AMERASIA ARTICLE GAVE THE TIPOFF

Glancing through the obscure magazine, Amerasia, he ran across an article criticizing British aims toward Thailand. A month or so before, he remembered, a secret report on the same subject, intended for the State Department, had passed over the desk of his boss. He was Dr. William Langer, chief of OSS research and analysis and now a history professor at Harvard.

The two were almost identical.

General Donovan was consulted and acted quickly. For the Thailand report was one of a series prepared by OSS. Each analyzed fundamental disagreements between British and United States policy on the Far East.

Their publication could have seriously embarrassed relations between the two allied powers at the peak of the war.

TWENTY-FOUR-HOUR WATCH PUT ON AMERASIA

Mr. Bielaski put a 24-hour surveillance on Amerasia's offices. For 10 days the magazine staff worked through the night—running the photo-copying equipment—it was learned later.

Then one Sunday night the office finally closed. With the aid of a lock expert, Mr. Bielaski and his three aides entered. And made their sensational astonishing discoveries.

Several years later Mr. Bielaski received from Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson a certificate of appreciation for his services with OSS.

The Justice Department, meanwhile, had quietly whitewashed the Amerasia case.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 8, 1950]

AMERASIA EDITOR DUPED COFOUNDERS

(By Frederick Woltman)

Philip J. Jaffe concealed his Communist record from his cofounders of Amerasia magazine when he got them to join his editorial board in 1937 to give it an air of scholarly respectability.

Two of them, both college professors, resigned in 1940. They were fed up with the way Mr. Jaffe kept slanting its editorial policies.

Yet, in court 5 years later, when Mr. Jaffe pleaded guilty to the stolen documents charge, his lawyer named these same two professors as "distinguished academic people" who helped the defendant set up Amerasia.

NOTHING SAID IN COURT ABOUT THE RESIGNATIONS

Nothing was said about the resignations. And the true story of Amerasia—how Mr. Jaffe fooled his cofounders as well as his readers—never came before the judge.

Instead, Mr. Jaffe was pictured to the court as a hard-working, conscientious magazine editor, moved by "an excess of journalistic zeal" but "for a trustworthy purpose." The Justice Department seconded this whitewash and he got off with a $2,500 fine.

The two professors who had a different experience were Dr. Cyrus H. Peake, of Columbia, and Dr. Kenneth W. Colegrave, of Northwestern. Both rank high in the academic field. Dr. Peake, a widely recognized authority on Asia, is now intelligence officer for the Division of Far Eastern Affairs in the State Department.

Both had agreed to join Amerasia on the assurance it would be a scholarly journal, appealing to students and presenting conflicting points of view. They eventually found otherwise.

"AN UNHAPPY EPISODE ONE REGRETS"

Dr. Peake told the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers today he and other cofounders of Amerasia were completely unaware of Mr. Jaffe's Communist background. They had no notion that Mr. Jaffe's closest associates on Amerasia, Frederick V. Field and Ch'ao-ting Chi, were Communists and that all three had operated under aliases.

Asked if he would have joined the venture, knowing these facts, Dr. Peake replied:

"Definitely not. That was an unhappy episode in my life, one of those things one regrets."

OUTGROWTH OF BROWDER BRAIN CHILD, CHINA TODAY

What the cofounders, the judge, and the public weren't told was that Amerasia, where the FBI found hundreds of classified wartime documents, was an outgrowth of China Today. China Today was a brain child of Earl Browder, Communist Party boss. Browder picked Mr. Jaffe to run it. Under Mr. Jaffe, it stridently called for a Red revolution in China.

In its first issue, China Today's masthead listed its three editors: J. W. Phillips, Hansu Chan, and Frederick Spencer. All were fake names.

These three organized Amerasia. Phillips became Philip J. Jaffe, managing editor. Hansu Chan became Ch'ao-ting Chi, a member of Amerasia's editorial board. Spencer became Frederick Field, chairman of the Amerasia board.

BROWDER ASSUMED FIELD WAS COMMUNIST

Mr. Field, great, great-grandson of Com. Cornelius Vanderbilt, is a wealthy ex-Socialist turned Communist. Financial angel to many Red causes, he had done useful jobs for the Communist Party. He wrote for the Daily Worker and, during the Hitler-Stalin peace pact, ran the American peace mobilization which tried to scuttle America's defense program.

Mr. Field's party membership was confirmed here for the first time April 27. Asked about it by the Tydings Senate subcommittee, Earl Browder testified he had cooperated closely with Mr. Field and added: "I assumed he was a Communist."

Asked if he knew Mr. Jaffe to be a party member, Browder replied: "I did not. I accepted him as a friend."

CHI WAS LEADING CHINESE COMMUNIST

The third man, Ch'ao-ting Chi, alias Hansu Chan, wrote numerous articles and book reviews for the magazine. Mr. Jaffe described him in Amerasia as "a young Chinese scholar."

Actually, Chi was a leading Chinese Communist who attended Moscow Congress of the Communist International. He came to America as a student, subsequently married Mr. Jaffe's niece, Harriet Levine. She became secretary of Amerasia's editorial board.

For a period Chi helped edit a Chinese Communist newspaper from the ninth-floor politburo office of Communist Party national headquarters in New York City.

According to recent news dispatches from Hong Kong, Chi today is waiting there to head Soviet China's delegation to the United Nations, if and when the Nationalist Government delegates are kicked out in favor of the Chinese Communists.

AMERASIA PLUGGED PARTY LINE ON ASIA

Amerasia was no China Today. Its approach was subtle. But it kept plugging the official party line on Asia. Every so often, both magazines ran articles simultaneously. Thus, the February 1941 issues each carried "Political Crisis in China," by Kate Louise Mitchell, Mr. Jaffe's later coeditor who was arrested but cleared of charges in the Amerasia case.

Amerasia's principal function was to explain, justify, and defend Russia's role in the Far East; and discredit the Nationalist Government when Moscow so ordered.

Mr. Jaffe wrote the lead article for the November 1940 issue. He titled it "China Faces New Danger." The danger, according to Mr. Jaffe, lay in America's aid to Britain. That was during the Hitler-Stalin friendship pact, when the British Isles were faced with a Nazi invasion.

Mr. Jaffe wanted all the aid to go to China.

After Stalin signed a neutrality pact with Japan on April 13, 1941—less than 3 months before Hitler invaded Russia—Mr. Jaffe went to bat for it in Amerasia's May issue.

KEPT URGING COMMUNIST COALITION IN CHINA

Long before Russia's last-minute entrance into the Pacific war, Amerasia was arguing that the Soviet Union must be included in the Far East peace settlement. In other words, get a foothold in postwar Asia.

Amerasia kept urging that the United States press a Communist coalition on Chiang Kai-shek, which it eventually tried to do. And the magazine kept decrying what it called the red menace school of thought, meaning that bloc of American opinion which feared an eventual red China.

AMERASIA'S INFLUENCE IN STATE DEPARTMENT

Through all this period, Amerasia was the "bible" of the pro-Soviet China group in the State Department.

After the Amerasia case blew up, Jaffe's codefendant, Emanuel Sigurd Larsen, disclosed the magazine's influence in the State Department. When arrested, Mr. Larsen was a specialist in the China Division of the State Department's Office of Far Eastern Affairs.

Mr. Larsen paid a $500 fine without contesting the charge of conspiracy to steal Government documents. He contended Mr. Jaffe had misled him.

"Probably not one informed American in 20,000 ever heard of Amerasia," Mr. Larsen wrote in the magazine Plain Talk. "But those of us who had to do with research or policy making in the field of our international relations in Asia were well aware of the potent influence that almost unknown publication exercised upon the conduct of American foreign policy."

"HOW DID IT HAPPEN" CHINA POLICY SWITCHED?

"How did it happen," he asked, "that the United States began to turn in 1944 upon its loyal ally, the Chiang Kai-shek government, which had for 7 years fought Japan, and to assume the sponsorship of the rebel Communist regime which collaborated with the Japanese during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact?

"How did it come to pass that Washington since 1944 has been seeking to foist Communist members upon the sole, recognized and legitimate government of China, a maneuver equivalent to an attempt by a powerful China to introduce Earl Browder and William Z. Foster into key positions in the United States Government?"

Amerasia, Mr. Larsen concluded, was one answer.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 9, 1950]

JAFFE'S 1,700 STOLEN FILES STILL SECRET

(By Frederick Woltman)

Nearly 5 years have passed since FBI agents raided Amerasia. They found between 1,500 and 1,700 records or copies of records taken from Government files. Yet the contents of those records are still a carefully guarded secret of the Justice Department.

The Government never even made public a list of them. Nor did it ever give out a general description of the items that filled four steel drawers in the office of the magazine's editor, Philip J. Jaffe.

On the day Mr. Jaffe was let off with a $2,500 fine on a guilty plea, Government attorneys failed to show the court even one of the stolen records. They referred to them simply as several hundred documents dealing with the Far East.

And they neglected to tell the court that Amerasia, in which Mr. Jaffe used data from the stolen records was really a propaganda journal, subtly selling the Communist Party line on Asia.

When the Hobbs House Judiciary Subcommittee looked into the Amerasia case in 1946, its members were allowed to glance through stacks of the stolen records. But Justice Department representatives stood by to make sure no notes were taken.

At least 428 of the records were marked "confidential," "secret," or "top secret."

REVELATION VIOLATED ESPIONAGE STATUTE

Some bore the imprint:

"This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, 50 United States Code 31–32, as amended. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law."

Most or all of the documents came from State Department files. Originally, they were prepared by the State Department, naval intelligence, military intelligence, Office of Strategic Services (OSS), and Office of War Information (OWI).

Descriptions of a few of the records confiscated in Mr. Jaffe's office were assembled by the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Here they are:

REPORT TOLD WHERE JAPANESE FLEET WAS

A top secret report on the disposition of the Japanese Fleet before the battle of Leyte in October 1944. It gave the location and class of each Japanese warship.

A secret report on the Far East by the office of Postal and Telegraph Censorship. It has been described as of current and vital interest to our Government and the Nation's welfare.

A description of the prevailing winds and lengths of runways at landing fields in Korea.

A report known as "Document 48" and entitled "Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—Decline of His Prestige and Criticism of and Opposition to His Leadership." This one was prepared by the State Department.

CONTAINED COMPLETE DATA FOR BOMBING JAPAN

A secret naval report on the schedule for bombing Japan, including the location of strategic targets. This was found in Mr. Jaffe's possession early in the spring of 1945. This was after the program started but before it was effected.

A report on Philippine strategy.

A highly confidential OSS report criticizing Britain's aims in Thailand. Mr. Jaffe's use of this document in Amerasia alerted the State Department through OSS that its files were being systematically rifled.

Twelve personal, confidential reports or letters to Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

A State Department report on the domestic life of Generalissimo Chiang.

CONTAINED COMPLETE DATA ON NATIONALIST ARMIES

A military intelligence report of information obtained by interviewing Japanese prisoners of war. The contents could not be ascertained. Ordinarily, POW's are questioned for military information about enemy plans.

A lengthy, detailed report on the disposition of the Chinese Nationalist armies. It gave the location, military strength, and armaments of all Nationalist forces, division by division.

Some of these were called order-of-battle reports by military intelligence. The category of "top secret" was created during the war to protect order-of-battle intelligence. That's because the most reliable order-of-battle intelligence about Japan came from radio intercepts. Since it was vital that the Japs not know we had broken their code, all information from this source was made top secret.

So strict was the security guard that even two-star generals who had not been cleared for top secret were barred from rooms where top-secret material was handled. It is doubtful if Mr. Jaffe was ever cleared for top secret.

HERE IS BREAKDOWN OF DATA'S SOURCES

Of the 428 known classified records taken from Mr. Jaffe's office at Amerasia, there were:

A total of 267 prepared by the State Department, including 2 copies of "top secret" and 20 originals and 14 copies marked "secret."

Fifty prepared by OSS, including two original and one copy of "secret" records.

Nineteen prepared by naval intelligence, including one original marked "secret."

Thirty-four by military intelligence, including nine copies of "secret" documents.

Fifty-eight prepared by OWI, including copies of three "secret" documents.

All the rest were marked "confidential."

DISCLOSURE WOULD HARM NATIONAL SECURITY

Under wartime-security regulations of most Government departments, the "secret" classification was defined as "material and information, the unauthorized disclosure of which would endanger national security, cause injury to the interest or prestige of the Nation, or any governmental activity thereof, or would be of advantage to a foreign nation."

"Top secret" was defined as secret material "the security aspect of which is paramount, and the unauthorized disclosure of which would cause grave danger to the Nation, or embarrassment to the Government."

"Confidential" material, "while not endangering the national security, would be prejudicial to the interest or prestige of the Nation, or any governmental activity or individual, and would cause administrative embarrassment or difficulty, or be of advantage to a foreign nation."

With the war so far in the past, many of the 1,500 to 1,700 documents taken from Amerasia could probably be declassified. But so long as the Justice Department keeps them under wraps, their contents will remain secret.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to obtain the floor in my own right for the purpose of offering some personal remarks, rather than for the purpose of putting anything in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Michigan when he gets around to him, but the Chair feels that, under the circumstances, he should recognize the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who has indicated a desire to speak on the FEPC bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement that will not take over 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make this statement in order that Senators on both sides of the aisle who are very much concerned and vitally interested in the passage of Senate bill 1728 may stay close to Washington next week. It seems that perhaps after a week or 10 days of debate on the measure we ought to be able to exhaust discussion on the merits and demerits of the bill. If it seems that the debate is to continue longer than that, and that the merits of the bill are not being discussed, then at that time we shall try to exercise our rights under rule XXII. I merely mention this now in order that Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle and also Senators on the Republican side of the aisle may try to arrange their affairs so that they will be present around Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, when we hope perhaps to get a vote on a cloture petition which may be filed along the latter part of this week or the first of next week.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator from Illinois presuppose that it is any more important for Senators to stay around for the next week, in reference to the importance of Senate bill 1728, than it is for them to be present when other important measures are coming up in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not say that to my friend at all. It is always important for Senators to be here, but I am satisfied a great number of Senators will want to vote on this question, which is a little different from the average matter coming before the Senate, because under the present rule it is necessary to have 64 votes before it is possible to transact any business with a bill of this kind. So I merely mention that in the best of spirits and of good faith. I am merely trying to say in advance to Senators, so that no one may come to me later on to say, "Why did you not give me that notice a week or so ago? I already have an en-

gagement in the West some place to make a speech, and I cannot fail to keep it."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I can assure the distinguished majority leader that some of us on the Democratic side of the aisle will heed his admonition and will be here next week. I should like to ask the Senator whether the plan he has announced will be carried out without regard to the action of the Senate on other measures this week.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot control the action of the Senate upon other measures. I cannot anticipate what the Senate will do with any measure which might be taken up as a substitute for the pending question. I understand that a certain motion probably will be made in respect to Reorganization Plan No. 12, although I am assured by the leadership in the House of Representatives that they hope to be able to take up that plan on Thursday of this week.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. First, I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to say to the Senator that it has been widely advertised throughout the country that a southern filibuster is in progress, and I wish to express the hope that a few of my colleagues from the South, who wish to speak on the Senate bill 1728, may have an opportunity to do so before the cloture petition is filed.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia will have that opportunity, I assure him, even if we have to go further than that. I do not want to cut off any legitimate debate in this proceeding, and there has been until now, of course, legitimate debate, regardless of whether anyone has said it is a filibuster. It has not been. The Senator from Georgia yesterday talked on the subject before the Senate, as did the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. There were numerous questions and colloquies having to do strictly with the merits of the bill. We are, of course, technically debating the motion to take up the bill, and there is not very much talk about the motion, but, for this debate, I think we are compelled to consider the motion more or less with the bill itself so far as debating the merits are concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's assurance, because some of my colleagues are very anxious to be heard on the merits of the bill and on the motion to consider it.

Mr. LUCAS. There are a number of Senators, I may say, who are proponents of the measure, who also desire to speak. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only wish to say that regardless of what the House does, I shall have to move tomorrow afternoon to take up Reorganization Plan No. 12. A great many Senators have arranged to be here on Thursday, so they may vote on it. That notice has been given, and I fear I shall have to proceed, regardless of other business that may be before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand the position of the Senator from Ohio, and, since he is determined to take up Reorganization Plan No. 12, there is not much the Senator from Illinois can do about it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On yesterday I announced that I understood it was the intention of the senior Senator from Ohio to begin debate on Reorganization Plan No. 12 on Wednesday. From what the Senator said this morning, I do not know now whether he proposes to bring up Reorganization Plan No. 12 on Wednesday or on Thursday, and I should like to be advised about that, because I explained that my purpose was to call up the resolution affecting Reorganization Plan No. 1 following action on Reorganization Plan No. 12. But, if Wednesday is not going to be occupied in that way, with all due deference to those who want to discuss FEPC, I see a closing date coming on us, May 23, and a great deal of other business, by reason of which I feel that I shall have to make a move to have considered the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, my contention is that however the resolution disapproving Plan No. 12 is taken up, it should be taken up and the debate limited so it may be disposed of by not later than 2 o'clock on Thursday, in which case the Senator will then have time to dispose of his resolution also on Thursday.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to say that so far as the Senator from Virginia is concerned, he would be entirely agreeable to accepting a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on Reorganization Plan No. 1 to 1 hour, of which the Senator from Virginia, the patron of the resolution, would not take more than 10 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely yielded——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am in full accord with the majority leader's attempt to keep before the Senate the pending question. There are, of course, privileged matters. I should like very much if the majority leader would find it possible to work out some arrangement whereby at least these two reorganization plans, Nos. 12 and 1, might be taken up by the Senate, with a division of the time provided for. In view of the fact that they are privileged, they might come up at any time. Whether that is done depends upon his wishes in the matter. If they do come up for a vote, Reorganization Plans 1 and 12 must be acted upon.

The junior Senator from Nebraska, speaking for himself, feels that the pending motion should be supported. In saying that, I should like the majority leader to know that I feel that ample time should be given in connection with the motion to take up the FEPC bill, because it is my opinion that the merits of the bill must be debated on the floor of the Senate. They have never been so debated. I hope the majority leader will not seek to apply cloture too early. I feel that many Members might vote for it if they knew what the merits of the bill were, or they might vote against it; but they have a right to know what is in the bill.

I am in full cooperation with the majority leader in suggesting that the FEPC bill be kept before the Senate until it is finally determined whether the motion to consider is successful or unsuccessful. I assure him of the cooperation of those Senators who are interested in the motion. I hope that the minimum amount of time may be allowed to other measures. I believe that would work for their expeditious handling, and it would not interfere too much with the debate upon the FEPC bill.

I submit that suggestion, constructively, to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the rule is going to be varied and that only those Senators who wish to speak on the pending measure will have recognition?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has made no announcement in that respect, except that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] advised the Chair that he had to attend a Tariff Commission hearing at 2 o'clock and that he would like to deliver an address before that time, and the Chair indicated that if he were on his feet he would be recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Chair for the explanation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in explanation and clarification of what I stated a moment ago. I told the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in reply to a question he propounded to me, that under no circumstances would the debate be closed until the merits and demerits of the bill had been fully debated. There is much on both sides of the question to be discussed, and it will be discussed well and thoroughly.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Chair in permitting me to proceed at this time.

I

In the debate on the proposed FEPC legislation, other Senators will speak on the domestic aspects with far greater authority and experience than I possess. I desire to make some observations on the international aspects of the proposed legislation, in response to my own experience and convictions in the field of international relations. I feel that there is involved a problem which goes much deeper than most of us realize; in fact, it goes to the very foundations, in some respects at least, of our international relations. This bill is, therefore, very closely and intimately related to the question of our national security.

Few Americans know that there is this very, very close relationship when they see the sign "whites only"—or read the words "restricted clientele" in the summer resort ads—if they wince at all, they shrug their shoulders but they do not stop to think how these four words add greatly to the danger and peril of the United States from a hostile world—a peril from which our jet planes and our submarines can offer at best only partial, and indeed dismal, protection.

As Assistant Secretary of State in charge of public affairs for two years after World War II, it was my unhappy responsibility to study how Communist propaganda twisted and distorted our civil-rights problems in the channels of world communication. It was then my responsibility to try to counteract that propaganda insofar as the true facts and our meager appropriations allowed.

As an American delegate to three conferences of UNESCO in 1945, 1946, and 1947, I further saw how our unsolved civil-rights problems hampered our efforts and our prestige in reaching out—gropingly as it were—for the hearts and the minds of men. I am not referring merely to the Sovietized minds, nor even to the minds of men whose skins are black or yellow. I am also referring to the minds of those very races from which we early American whites in the United States are descended; yes, the Dutch and the French and the British. Further, I am referring to our neighbors in the many-hued countries of Central and South America, as I learned from the advisory committees on Inter-American Affairs on which I served with Mr. Nelson Rockefeller.

As chairman of the American delegation to the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, in Geneva in 1948, I saw the enormous need of free peoples everywhere not simply for the sinews of communication, but for the expanding goals of human rights.

It is against this background that I venture to try to contribute what I can to this debate or, as I would prefer to say, to contribute to a better understanding on the part of the American people of the civil-rights issue in all its enormous but little understood world-wide impact. There is nothing I expect to say on the floor of the Senate to which I attach as much importance as this. Here is an issue to the understanding of which I hope to try to contribute for the remainder of my life.

II

World War II tested as never before the resources of our land and the strength of our institutions. In many ways the cold war now tests us even more severely. We are now living and working under the shadow of the atom bomb, yet we lack the urgent spur of actual hostilities. We know we are in a struggle for the survival of freedom and decency in the world, yet we have not learned how to win victories by the ways of peace instead of war, by superiority of example instead of arms, by the voice of truth instead of the roar of cannon.

The motion to consider the FEPC bill which we are now debating gives me the opportunity to plead that we stop and ask ourselves three questions: What is the greatest single factor in our national life which mars the mobilization of our forces of human freedom in the cold war? What is the national handicap which most tarnishes and dims our torch of liberty as seen beyond our shores? What defect in America's armor of democracy contributes most to the poisonous effectiveness, the tremendous and terrible effectiveness, of the Soviet propaganda? The answer to all three of these questions is the same. It will continue to be the same until we heed the Lord and mend our ways. The answer is our failure fully to live up to our democratic preachments on civil rights for all Americans, regardless of race, religion, color, or national origin.

III

For years the Soviet Union and its satellites have been telling their own people, and in hundreds of languages and tongues have been beaming into every available short-wave radio channel in the world, that in America there is widespread discrimination and violence against minority races, colors, and religions, and against persons of foreign origins. The Soviet propaganda reiterates and continues reiterating that our vaunted democracy is a sham; that our bid for world leadership in human rights is so much hypocrisy. I have in my office a collection of hundreds of examples taken from Soviet and Soviet-inspired broadcasts and periodicals.

On January 27 of this year the Moscow radio broadcast a report that "The Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress have made up their minds to hamper the setting up of a committee to deal with the establishment of fair labor practices." Of course, that statement is false, as I know from watching the majority leader in his efforts to secure action on the FEPC bill. Our debate at this moment proves the Soviet propaganda statement to be false, and the efforts of the leadership of the Senate likewise proves its falsity. There is no deal behind the scenes, and there can be no deal behind the scenes to silence public demand for this proposed legislation or to stop the fight by its congressional proponents for its passage in effective form.

Let me give another recent example of the Soviet lie. On March 7, 1950, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] called our attention to the vicious article in Pravda alleging that we have in this country "mass Negro pogroms," and falsely quoting the Senator as saying that there were 530 lynchings in 1948.

Unhappily, Mr. President, these lies are often believed. They are believed partly because of ignorance or gullibility, but partly, unhappily, because they bear a cousinly resemblance to things which have been true or have an element of truth in them. There have been deals. There have been lynchings.

Here, however, is another type of Communist propaganda statement. This is indeed exaggerated in detail, but it is closer to the painful realities. This was broadcast in the Soviet home service on February 2 of this year. Speaking of Negro unemployment in the industrial North and West, the broadcast said:

> The economic crisis which is at present developing in the United States particularly affects the position of Negro workers. Employers invariably adhere to the unwritten law of employing Negroes last and dismissing them first.
>
> The Negroes are not only the first to go. When a Negro is employed he receives, as a rule, a considerably lower wage than a white worker doing the same job.

The same kind of arguments, compounded of falsehood, fact, and distortion, are repeatedly made by Soviet representatives in the meetings of UN committees, in international bodies such as UNESCO, and on the floor of the General Assembly. The Soviet radio tells the Russian people that our Constitution was written by representatives of exploiting classes and does not truly guarantee civil rights; that our judiciary is a corrupt instrument of the same exploiters; that our Congress—and, Mr. President, Congress is one of their favorite targets, as one of the objectives of the U. S. S. R. is to pillory, vilify, and destroy the United States Congress—is an "unimaginable tangle of amendments, explanations, interpretations, and precedents"; and that the will of the majority does not truly prevail because of the poll tax and the filibuster.

The Soviet radio is very skillful, Mr. President, in the way it keeps track of promises on civil-rights questions by our political parties and our statesmen in political campaigns, and in the way it plays up any failure to make the promises good.

The Communist-inspired press and radio throughout Europe exploit the same anti-American civil-rights line, especially directed to working people and intellectuals. Italy is told about discrimination against Italians; Slavic countries are told that the Slavs hold a very low place on the "American racial ladder," as the Communist propaganda puts it. The radio of one satellite, that of Bucharest, even broadcast a report on January 17, 1950—and note this characteristic Communist twist—that "Joe Louis is forced to take up boxing activities again because racial laws hinder his finding other means of livelihood."

In Latin America the Communist propaganda cleverly exploits these same conditions, particularly centering on our treatment of the large Spanish-speaking

population in the States bordering on Mexico.

However, by far the most active use made of the civil-rights issue by the Soviet propaganda machine is in the Far East—in Korea, China, India, Indonesia, the Malay Peninsula, French Indochina, and Burma—and, of course, Africa is not overlooked. George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, who has just completed a personal survey of the areas for which he is responsible, listed the barriers to better understanding between them and ourselves in a speech before the Foreign Policy Association on April 11, 1950:

> Another important factor in our relations with the peoples of the underdeveloped areas is their attitude toward racial or color discrimination in this country. Instances of such discrimination appear prominently in their press reports and are, of course, ably exploited by Communist propagandists.

I have listened to much debate on this floor about our China policy. I have not heard this grave problem emphasized, though it may have been. Our dollars and our bullets sent to Asia have a tremendous handicap to overcome which originates neither in the machinations of the Kremlin, nor in the corruption of the Kuomintang.

This, Mr. President, is a quick description of one facet of the type of propaganda that is being used against us in the cold war. But behind the Communist propagandists there is a policy. To understand the policy, we must listen to its words.

IV

The first and most obvious aspect of this policy is the typical propagandist's device of sticking his thumb in the observer's eye, as it were, so that the observer cannot see clearly what the propagandist is doing. In this case the observers are the Russian and satellite peoples themselves as well as those in the free world outside. The Moscow radio exaggerates our civil-rights problems and emphasizes our shortcomings in order to cover up the Soviet's utter ruthless suppression of every vestige of human rights at home, its slave-labor camps with millions of inmates, its suppression of labor's right to strike, its enslavement of whole populations and countries such as Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. The Soviets hope that their loud talk about Hitlerite racemongering in the United States will prevent realization of the appalling extent of anti-Semitism now prevalent behind the iron curtain, as disclosed by the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. LEHMAN] in a speech on the floor of the Senate on March 30, 1950.

The second reason for the Communist propaganda on our civil-rights front is equally obvious—to sow and fertilize seeds of disunity among our diverse population, to divide us, to get us fighting each other, to weaken our democratic faith. As the world's leading democracy, as well as the leading capitalist nation, we are the obvious target; and in the U. S. S. R. we have an opponent who will spend billions to exploit our weaknesses in an effort to provoke us into destroying ourselves.

The third and most fundamental reason for the Soviet's civil-rights propaganda I have touched on before. It is most easily seen by even a casual glance at the map. This shows that in what is known as the critical periphery, in the areas where the cold war is raging most fiercely, the Soviet's anti-American civil-rights propaganda is being pressed most vigorously. These sensitive areas, where the fate of mankind may be decided, are in Latin America, in Germany, and the Slavic countries of Europe, among the dark-skinned nations of Africa and southeast Asia, and among the yellow-skinned peoples on the Asiatic mainland and the nearby island areas. All of these peoples are judging our preachments of democracy by our actual practices in relation to their own counterparts in the American population. We are reminded by the President's Committee on Civil Rights, headed by the distinguished business leader, Charles E. Wilson, of the General Electric Co.:

> Discrimination against, or mistreatment of, any racial, religious, or national group in the United States is not only seen as our internal problem. The dignity of a country, a continent, or even a major portion of the world's population, may be outraged by it. A relatively few individuals here may be identified with millions of people elsewhere, and the way in which they are treated may have world-wide repercussions. We have fewer than half a million American Indians; there are 30,000,000 more in the Western Hemisphere. Our Mexican American and Hispano groups are not large; millions in Central and South America consider them kin. We number our citizens of Oriental descent in the hundreds of thousands; their counterparts overseas are numbered in hundreds of millions. Throughout the Pacific, Latin America, Africa, the Near, Middle, and Far East, the treatment which our Negroes receive is taken as a reflection of our attitudes toward all dark-skinned peoples.

Mr. President, does not this statement from our own committee on civil rights demonstrate that in this area we are at the heart of one of the main weapons of the Communist propaganda machine, and does it not show that what I am talking about today is vital to the struggle in which we are engaged for the minds and loyalties of men? Where we are weak and unwilling to defend ourselves, the U. S. S. R. presses forward and ever forward.

V

It can be a great and tragic mistake for us if we underestimate this weakness of ours in this highly dangerous world. The shortcomings in our democratic way of life have had a profound effect upon the minds of men, entirely apart from the fulminations and distortions of the Soviets. It is impossible to exaggerate how sensitive other countries are to the question of civil rights in America, and how much single instances of discrimination are magnified in their eyes. When Ralph Bunche revealed that he had declined the post of Assistant Secretary of State because of the segregation pattern right here in the District of Columbia, that fact was promptly noted in newspapers as remote as Singapore—newspapers that normally support and defend the United States. When Mahatma Gandhi's physician was barred from a restaurant in a northern State on a visit here in 1947, that news was carried, for example, in every newspaper in his home city of Bombay, and why should it not be? What could be more newsworthy in Bombay than this?

On January 28 of this year His Holiness the Pope cited the harsh compulsory segregation practiced in Washington, D. C., as an example of the Negro's continued burden in the United States. Senators can well imagine the painful effect on our foreign relations when Negro students from abroad or even official diplomatic representatitves whose skins are colored are subjected to personal indignities in this Capital City of ours. The facts are documented in the 1948 report of the National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital, headed by Dr. George Shuster, famed scholar and educator from my State of Connecticut, who has just been appointed High Commissioner in Bavaria.

In an article on this subject in the February 1950 issue of Woman's Home Companion magazine, the author asks this question: "How can we sell democracy, if we don't dare open our sample case?"

Earlier this year a group of native African students who came to the United States for college training reported they were shocked and embittered by the rigid pattern of segregation and prejudice which they encountered in many places. That appeared in the New York Times on March 19, 1950. These students came here under the auspices of the United States and British Governments financed by the Carnegie Corp. They came to be trained for careers in government, in the professions and industry, to become leaders in the development of the African Continent. What kind of report will they take back about us to their native lands? At best, it will be a mixed report.

The distinguished American Negro leader, Walter White, a resident of my State of Connecticut, has just concluded a trip that took him around the world. In a brilliant article which will shortly appear in Look magazine he and his wife wrote these challenging words:

> America is losing the cold war with Russia right here at home.
>
> While we preach democracy to the world, the racial intolerance we practice is costing us millions of friends.
>
> We recently returned from a trip around the world, and we can say that the ideological war in Asia and Africa will be decided on this issue.
>
> United States ambassadors in virtually every one of the 18 countries we touched around the world called the race question in America "the $64 question we run into all the time, everywhere."

This article concludes:

> Unless we win over these peoples with acts, not empty words, we may be inviting our own doom.

Pandit Nehru, Asia's foremost statesman, uttered this solemn warning in his recent speech at Columbia University:

> The West has too often despised the Asian and the African and still in many places denies them not only equality of rights but

even common humanity and kindness. This is one of the great danger points of our modern world; and now that Asia and Africa are shaking off their torpor and arousing themselves, out of this evil may come a conflagration of which no man can see the range of consequences.

Those who carry the burden of American diplomacy throughout the world have repeatedly warned that the shortcomings in our civil-rights program are a serious obstacle abroad. In 1946, Dean Acheson, while Acting Secretary of State, told the Fair Employment Practice Committee:

Frequently we find it next to impossible to formulate a satisfactory answer to our critics in other countries; the gap between the things we stand for in principle and the facts of a particular situation may be too wide to be bridged. An atmosphere of suspicion and resentment in a country over the way a minority is being treated in the United States is a formidable obstacle to the development of mutual understanding and trust between the two countries.

I think it is quite obvious that the existence of discriminations against minority groups in the United States is a handicap in our relations with other countries. The Department of State, therefore, has good reason to hope for the continued and increased effectiveness of public and private efforts to do away with these discriminations.

Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Asiatic Affairs, recently emphasized that our own example was of the greatest importance to the construction of democratic institutions in southeast Asia as bulwark against Communist propaganda. He added that "our torch of liberty does not shine quite so brightly outside this country as we think." John Foster Dulles joins in the plea to erase what he calls "the worst blot on our national escutcheon."

The Supreme Court of the United States has recalled in a recent opinion that resentment against the discriminatory California land laws passed in 1913 "was so violent inside Japan that demands were made that war be declared against the United States. Anti-American agitation grew rapidly." Prof. Robert K. Carr, of Dartmouth, the distinguished executive secretary of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, has concluded that enactment of this Japanese property discrimination statute passed by one State, by the single act of the State of California—

made it easier for militarists and extremists to guide Japan down a road that brought ruin to that nation and the ravages of war to this Nation. * * * Who can be certain that similar action by American States or communities today may not give similar offense to foreign peoples that will one day bring suffering and death to many Americans? Irresponsible action by some of our people can well do grave damage to all of us. In other words, as a nation in a troubled world we cannot wait for our slowest State or our most backward community to catch up and see to it that all freedoms are guaranteed to all of its people. The international situation creates a sense of urgency with respect to our civil-rights problem which only the National Government can meet.

Perhaps the Senate will recall that once a year Japan went into mourning, on a so-called National Humiliation Day, when black flags hung out, and that this day of mourning in Japan was on the anniversary of the date of the passage of our Oriental Exclusion Act, a wholly unwarranted act which needlessly insulted the proud peoples of the East.

Secretary Acheson ably summarized the situation I am describing—as the State Department sees it—in his speech on April 22 before the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

Today, in a very real sense, the United States represents itself to the world. The world hears speeches which are made in the Congress. The world hears what is said over our radio. The world reads what is said in our press. If there are acts or words of violence, discrimination and irresponsibility, the world sees and hears them. If there are acts or words of justice, understanding and sober determination, the world sees and hears them also.

Thus our friends abroad are listening, not only to words about our weaknesses in civil rights, but for news of the efforts we are making to overcome them. Instances of this abound in the friendly democratic press of many lands. The decision of the United States Supreme Court prohibiting restrictive covenants in deeds of real property was hailed by a newspaper in India as "another victory in the battle for civil rights that is now going on in America." Gandhi's physician, to whom I have already referred, told the Calcutta Rotary Club on his return from the United States that "he sincerely felt that every decent American was outraged by the occurrence." The news abroad of President Truman's election in 1948 led to expressions of hope in the fulfillment of his civil-rights program, in newspapers as distant as Manila and Bangkok. When in 1949, the House of Representatives passed the Judd bill—H. R. 199—to drop the outright immigration ban against the admission of certain yellow and brown races from Thailand and certain other areas in the far Pacific, a newspaper in Calcutta praised this action as showing "imagination and statesmanship that is likely to have happy repercussions. An ounce of performance in these cases is far more important than a pound of precepts." In the friendly liberal press of Sweden, a comment on the American civil-rights problem concludes with the observation "that responsible American opinion aims at reforms and amendments, in accordance with democratic and humanitarian principles." And in Iceland, where some Communist-inspired newspapers flay us for persecuting Negroes, a friendly newspaper writes that "the struggle against racial oppression has been waged with ever-increasing success in most civilized nations. In the United States, for example, many influential individuals have devoted much time and energy to the cause of racial equality."

Thus, Mr. President, we must seek to put our best foot forward. This is our best hope to counteract the Communist propaganda. Let us counteract it like the prize fighter who moves forward, instead of deliberately positioning ourselves with our back against the ropes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the Chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am somewhat confused over the Senator's observation that the way to counteract the Communist propaganda is to pass the FEPC bill. I can understand the Senator's views in supporting the bill because he very properly recognizes it as an instrument to break down any form of segregation of the races anywhere in the United States, but his argument that the Senate should pass the bill because of the Communists' propagandizing a state of affairs that does not exist in this country is confusing. We are told on the one hand that we must pass the Marshall-plan legislation and we must support the arms-to-Europe plan because the Communists are opposed to them. Now we are told that we must pass the FEPC bill because the Communists are in favor of it. That is somewhat confusing.

In addition to the Russian propaganda with relation to civil rights in this country, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut mentioned that the Russians allege that our American Constitution was written by capitalists to exploit the people. Of course, there is a germ of truth in the "capitalist" charge. Washington was probably the richest man in the United States at that time. He presided over the Constitutional Convention. I suppose most or all the members would have been numbered among the three or four hundred richest men in the country. But I hope the Senator from Connecticut does not advocate that we should repeal the Constitution because the Communists have been putting out a great deal of false propaganda about it. I am a little confused as to just where the line of demarcation is, and what we should do to confound the Russians. In one case we must pass a bill because they oppose it, and in another we should pass it because they say it is a desirable piece of legislation.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I evidently have not made myself clear. The Communists do not want us to pass the bill. They are wholly opposed to the passage of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator said they were in favor of it, if I understood him correctly.

Mr. BENTON. I fear the Senator did not understand me correctly, or I undoubtedly did not make myself adequately clear. I want the bill passed because the Communists oppose the bill, as they oppose anything we do in this country which takes us toward equality or brings about a better functioning of the processes of our own democracy.

Nothing the Senate could do today would be a greater blow to the Communist propagandists than the passage of the FEPC bill. Our failure to pass it will be exploited by the Communist propagandists as another mark of our weakness, as another evidence of our preju-

dice, and as another proof that we do not mean what we say and will not live up to the Constitution written by our forebears.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator know that the Daily Worker, which is sometimes considered to be the mouthpiece of the Communist Party in this country, has claimed credit for originating the whole idea of the FEPC legislation, and has supported it constantly since the first day it was introduced in this body So I am still confused by the Senator's statement that the Communists are opposed to the passage of the bill.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I do not approve of taking isolated bits of Russian propaganda and quoting them as the truth, while at the same time denouncing all other Communist propaganda. Of course, the Communists say they favor this proposed legislation, but the words they use in making that statement are just as untruthful as are their words in all their other propaganda statements.

So why should the distinguished Senator from Georgia choose to believe the Daily Worker in this one isolated instance and get guidance from it for his views when I am sure he is not a regular reader of that publication?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not read it in any instance, but of course the Senator from Connecticut has had the advantage of working in the State Department.

Mr. BENTON. Yes; and of studying the Daily Worker.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, after we have been told that we should pass the ECA bill because the ECA has been opposed by the Communist propaganda, now when the Senator says that in connection with the FEPC measure we should take a step which will be in line with the Communist propaganda, and when the Senator says that for us to oppose the Communist propaganda in this case would be to support the Communist position, I am left in a state of utter confusion. Such a line of logic is beyond my simple processes of reasoning, and I cannot follow it.

After all, if we are to base our actions on the theory that we should change or do away with whatever is used by the Communists as a basis for their falsehoods about us, then we should likewise repeal the Constitution, because the Communists tell falsehoods about our Constitution and its application.

Of course, my own position is that I do not think people are greatly deceived by the Communist propaganda. I think they have had enough experience with it so that they do not attach a great deal of credit to any part of it whatever. In my own judgment, there are literally hundreds of millions of people throughout the world who would gladly subject themselves to the so-called great discriminations in this country. If we were to repeal all our immigration laws and were to provide transportation to this country, I think so many of the people who have heard of this Communist propaganda would come to the United States that there would not be standing room in our country.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, although it does not bear directly on my thesis in my remarks today, I should like to comment briefly upon and take exception to the distinguished Senator's comments regarding the effectiveness of Russian propaganda. After all, it has been only 102 years since Das Kapital was written and published, and in that century the name of Marx and the Marxist philosophy have swept across the entire earth, largely by means of propaganda, not by force of arms. Lenin was no soldier; he was a propagandist. The propagandists, not the soldiers, are the ones who are enshrined in the Red Square. There has been nothing else in history that has matched the enormous impact of Soviet propaganda during the 33 years since the train went across Germany and took Lenin into Moscow.

So, I think we are deceiving ourselves dangerously if we do not frankly face the enormous impact which this propaganda has and its strength when used as a weapon against us.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. When the Senator from Connecticut refers to the Marxist theory, I am sure he is too well informed regarding conditions in Russia to contend that the present institutions of government in Russia have any relation to what Marx actually advocated on the basis of his philosophy of government. The present institutions of Russia are no more akin to that than they are akin to utopia.

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to find myself wholly in agreement with the distinguished Senator from Georgia on that particular point. However, in Russia today lip service is still paid to Marx, "the patron saint." It is unhappily true that many Christian churches perhaps do not conform as much as we would like to see them conform to the precepts of Jesus Christ and the New Testament. On the other hand, the alleged goal of the Christian churches is to be found in the New Testament. In the same way, the alleged goal of the Communist state in Russia is to be found in the Marxist ideology. However, I agree entirely with the Senator from Georgia on the point he has just made.

Mr. RUSSELL. That certainly sustains my position that we cannot believe anything which comes out of Russia and that any of us who believes anything that comes from Russia is very foolish.

Mr. BENTON. I concur wholly as to that, and also that we cannot believe anything which appears in the Daily Worker.

Mr. President, I was pleading that we put our best foot forward, and I was suggesting that we try to counteract the Russian propaganda by acting in the way that a prize fighter acts when he moves forward. A good illustration is to be found in the action of the CIO in 1947 when it selected an American Negro as its delegate in a survey of the Far East. This single step and the fine impression this single individual made, disrupted the whole Communist propaganda line on civil rights in the area, and won high praise from General MacArthur.

VI

In recent years the Department of State has developed small-scale and totally inadequate publicity programs in an effort to counteract the effects of Communist propaganda concerning our civil-rights problem. I imagine that very few Senators know that distribution is now given by the State Department to stories about our progress in solving racial problems. So-called Negro notes are sent by diplomatic air pouch to approximately 135 missions of American personnel throughout the world. A special collection of so-called Negro Press Features is sent by air pouch to 16 missions in Africa and southeast Asia. Much of this material so sent has been published and widely circulated in the areas serviced. In addition, a daily photostat clip sheet is airmailed to 32 missions, covering editorials and news stories on favorable racial developments in the United States. Biographical material and photographs of distinguished American Negroes are also widely distributed for overseas publication. All such printed material helps to offset the unfavorable racial developments—the lynchings or race riots—which get the preponderant emphasis because they are more spectacular and thus deemed more news worthy in the output abroad of our great wire services, the AP, UP, and INS. Such stories carried by the great news services receive the greater coverage, because they are spectacular, whereas the kind of material sent out by the State Department is not spectacular. On the other hand, it helps to offset such highly colored news stories and articles which are transmitted overseas.

In the field of motion pictures, a few totally inadequate documentary films are distributed, showing the participation of persons of all races and creeds in the schools, colleges, and community life of our country.

By far the most effective use of material is made by the Voice of America broadcasts. Our broadcasting has reported the truth about our progress in this field, about the President's civil-rights program, about the historical background of our race relations, about the opposition of our most prominent Negro leaders in the Communist system, and also about the great civil-rights decision of our Supreme Court.

Thus, by all available media of communications, although on a tiny, trickling scale, within the limits of its most inadequate budget the Department of State has sent throughout the world the announcement, made here last month, that the United States Army has abandoned its racial quotas for enlistment. That announcement of course climaxes far-reaching advances in racial equality in our Armed Forces, accomplished through the effective work of President Truman's Committee on Equality of Treatment, headed by my old associate in the State Department, the brilliant and talented Judge Charles Fahy. This announcement, incidentally, is the best

possible answer we could have given to the repeated charges on the Moscow radio that the President's committee was appointed in 1948 merely as a gesture, a front, a showpiece in a political campaign, with no effectiveness to it.

How effective are these broadcasts and other publicity efforts? We do not exactly know. We know the effect is all too small, as the effort is all too small. We know that some of this material gets through and makes its impact. A small illustration was given by Gen. Bedell Smith in his recent book, My Three Years in Moscow. He reports how a Soviet youth was asked to comment on his reaction to a Voice of America broadcast in which tribute was paid to George Washington Carver, the distinguished Negro scientist, and to a Jewish religious holiday, among other features. The boy's response, according to General Smith, was indicated eloquently by his spontaneous question: "How can there be racial discrimination in America to the extent suggested by Soviet propaganda?"

The best proof that these messages are still getting through, in spite of the jamming, is that the Moscow radio, I am told, still takes the trouble to answer the broadcasts of the Voice of America.

However, our very real progress in this difficult field all too often, I feel sure, fails to penetrate the fog of Communist propaganda. Walter White, the distinguished Negro leader who visited many countries throughout Asia and Africa, reports in his forthcoming article in Look magazine:

> Nowhere we went did people know about the forthright recommendations of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. They were almost speechless when we told them that a prominent American industrialist, Charles E. Wilson, of General Electric, had headed that committee.

Assistant Secretary McGhee, after a similar comprehensive tour, told the Foreign Policy Association on April 10, 1950, that "the peoples of this southeast Asia area are told little about the real progress which is being made in this country toward solving this difficult problem." Of course, the tragic fact is, as I have previously pointed out on the floor of the Senate, that the State Department's efforts are pitifully weak and inadequate, even to do justice to our present progress, and that throughout the critical periphery as well as behind the iron curtain, "the whisper of truth is all but lost in the incessant blare of lies," if I may use Ann O'Hare McCormick's great phrase.

VII

Smart political propagandists, of course—and this is relevant to my discussion with the Senator from Georgia—do not try to sell directly and to large numbers of people an idea that is completely strange and unfamiliar. The average human being is a walking gallery of convictions, prejudices, predispositions, and miscellaneous information. The smart political propagandist selects from this overflowing pantry the existing ingredients from which to concoct the special dish to suit his own taste. He then offers up these recipes attractively served and delicately flavored. As his recipe fails to appeal to the public taste, he reseasons and recooks. As it begins to be savored widely, he pushes it and exploits it until, if he is a successful cook, it becomes ingrained into the habits and mores of the people.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that this is the opportunistic propaganda of the press agent and of the Communist, and of course it is not the propaganda of faith and truth.

To illustrate: The soap manufacturers did not invent the ideal of cleanliness. Again: the religious evangelist can always count on an existing sense of sin. Surely there is no better example for all of us today than the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. He knows he can count on a vague distrust of the State Department. That is a sure thing, something the Senator from Wisconsin did not originate. Indeed, the distrust of foreign offices, as I have heretofore pointed out to the Senate, seems universal. But, though it may not have occurred to him, the Senator from Wisconsin is proceeding on the standard tactics of the Communist propagandist. Like the Communist propagandist, he is doing his best to exploit his prejudices by any and every means. He does not argue, he does not answer, he does not reason. He hits and runs. I submit that the Senator from Wisconsin is a very talented propagandist of the Soviet type.

Similarly the Russians did not invent the world-wide suspicion that all is not well in race relations in the United States. As smart propagandists they exploit this suspicion and exploit it to the hilt with every possible trick of distortion and exaggeration. They do not argue; they hit and they run. At the same time they try to create the illusion that Russia is a paradise of equality. The fact of the matter, of course, is that in Russia the theory of equality is as much a myth, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has pointed out, as is the theory of freedom.

I am sorry the Senator from Georgia has left the floor, because this is a further answer to his question: I am not arguing that we conduct our domestic policy in terms of its effect on Russian propaganda. We can never win the approval of our Communist critics, no matter what we do, no matter how spotless our record on civil rights or anything else. I am arguing that world opinion—which we once could afford to ignore, or thought we could afford to ignore—is now of paramount importance to us. It is the big, new issue in this civil-rights debate. It is a powerful and a new issue, which is not getting the emphasis it must and should get. I am arguing that whereas our attitude on racial discrimination may once have been deemed to be a domestic matter—or even a matter of States' rights—it is so no longer. It can no longer be permitted to be a matter of States' rights, because the very life of our country is at stake upon it. The people of the 48 United States can no longer afford to give a whip with which to flay us to our enemies who would destroy us. We the people cannot afford to give this human rights issue to the Soviet Union, among the most powerful enemies of human rights in history. And we assuredly cannot afford to give reasonable men anywhere the grounds for reasonable suspicion or justified criticism in this vital area of human rights.

As I see it, our task in the United States is now threefold in this area.

First, the Congress should now frankly face up to our deficiencies in this vital area of civil rights, as President Truman has done in his civil-rights message. The United States should courageously move toward closing the gaps, as rapidly as we can successfully close them, between our precepts and our performance. Self-criticism and self-improvement are the essence of our democratic faith.

As the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] said so well the other day: "Our Nation is weakest where its democracy is weakest—in the partial denial of rights and privileges to racial minorities." The FEPC bill (S. 1728) introduced by Senator (now Attorney General) McGrath, and now pending on the Senate Calendar, would correct one great manifestation of that weakness. It would help assure for all Americans the right to join labor unions, to seek and retain employment, and to advance according to their innate ability, without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. All the FEPC bill does is to guarantee the simple right to equality of economic opportunity to every American—whether his skin be dark or light—whether he worships God as a Catholic, a Jew, or a Protestant—whether his birthplace be Poland or Italy, Kansas or Connecticut.

I ask, Senators, how could any principle more appropriate be the subject of congressional action and sanction? It is ludicrous to argue, as do some opponents of this bill, that it is Communist inspired or would give aid and comfort to the Communists. As I pointed out to the Senator from Georgia, precisely the opposite is true; and the numerous organizations which joined in the sponsorship of the measure have rigidly excluded association with any Communist-front organization.

Effective FEPC laws have been operating in New York, in my State of Connecticut, and in several other States, without any of the dire consequences conjured up by the opposition, without racial disturbance, without partisanship, without injury to business.

The McGrath bill for a National Fair Employment Practice Commission will bring lasting benefits to the whole Nation. It goes to the limit of Federal constitutional power, but no further. It applies in the District of Columbia, which has enormous symbolic value as the capital city of the world's greatest democracy. It makes the utmost use of education as well as of conciliation through local, State, and National channels. Its enforcement machinery is the mildest known to the Federal law. We could not do less and have any pretense of enforcement or respect for law or human rights.

One aspect of the bill which is widely overlooked is that it applies only to employers and labor unions having 50 or

more employees, or members, respectively. This is tremendously important.

Unhappily there are not as many employers in the South as I wish there were, who employ more than 50 persons. More than 98 percent of all enterprises in the United States employ fewer than 50 persons. Less than 4 percent of the manufacturers in the United States employ 50 or more persons. Thus, the bill does not apply at all to employment in the average office or store, farm or factory, where the number of employees is typically less than 50. Indeed—and this is a very important point—without the development of the modern corporation, it may be questioned whether this legislation would be needed. It is in the great corporation, where the man at the top does not know the man at the bottom, where policy becomes not only soulless but discriminatory, it is here that we most need this law.

The freedom and human rights we have won thus far in our history are not trophies to be nailed up on our living room wall. They are not the possessions of any one generation of Americans. Human liberty is a continuing expanding goal. In the unfolding development of our Nation and our people, each generation must fight and win new battles for human rights. The FEPC bill symbolizes the battle of our generation. We must win this battle and we must win it now. If only in the interests of national security we must win it, and win it now.

The first point in my program, Mr. President, is that we now pass this bill, and let us then enact every phase of the President's civil-rights program. Let us erase every stain of racial discrimination and segregation from our statute books. Let us accelerate the progress already made in barring discrimination and segregation from our educational systems, our housing, our civilian Government, and our military forces. Let us project throughout every aspect of our national life the eternal principles of brotherhood and of faith. By such deeds we can forge our greatest victories in the cold war—by triumphs in diplomacy which must be won right here on the Senate floor and cannot be won at a diplomatic conference table in a foreign capital.

The second point in my program is that we must do a far better job in telling the rest of the world the whole truth about our civil-rights problems and progress and to counteract the gross distortions of the facts by Communist propaganda. Not long ago I told Secretary Acheson that when the Indian press features distorted stories about our race riots or our lynchings I favor as an offset sending to India those among our colored citizens who have the experience and wisdom to attest to the fact that we are making progress—indeed, great progress. On March 22, twelve Members of this body joined me in introducing Senate Resolution 243, proposing a world-wide program to use our greatest gift—human freedom—through every existing medium of information and education in order to establish as part of our foreign policy a great new campaign of truth. I am proud to say that the objectives of Senate Resolution 243 have already been sanctioned by the warm endorsement of Senators on both sides of the aisle, by editorials in the country's press, by the approval of leaders of public opinion, by the magnificent addresses of President Truman and Secretary Acheson before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and by the overwhelming evidences of public sentiment now confirmed to us by the Gallup poll.

Here is one instance, at least, where this Senate and the Executive can join hands to make vital policy in a constructive non-partisan way. We must now work out the detailed program and pass the necessary appropriations so that our services for international information and exchange can operate as really effective instruments on our side of the struggle for the minds and loyalties of men.

My third proposal is that this generation play its full part in the recognition and protection of human rights by the world community.

Our foreign policy is committed to a world-wide program of nondiscrimination and to the implementation of that program through international agreements and organizations. In the Inter-American Conference held in Mexico City on March 6, 1945, the Chapultepec Conference, to which I was a delegate, the United States joined other countries in this hemisphere in a resolution recommending that all the participating governments make every effort to prevent in their respective countries all acts which may provoke discrimination among individuals because of race or religion. In the Charter of the United Nations, which this Senate has ratified, the United States undertook to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. Further, in 1948 the United States joined in drafting and cast its vote in the UN General Assembly in favor of the universal declaration of human rights. Article 23 of the declaration reads:

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work, and to protection against unemployment.

2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration, insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade-unions for the protection of his interests.

Of course, by "everyone" this great declaration means—and I am now reading from article 2—"without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status."

We forget, Mr. President, that this is the first international declaration of human rights in all history. There has never been one before. It is a great milestone, and it is our expression not only of religious and political freedoms, but also of the right to work, to social security, and to a decent standard of living.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has well said:

Like its great predecessors in the western world—Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the declaration of the rights of man—the universal declaration of human rights is not in itself a law. Like them, however, it is a source of law. It raises a standard to which all men everywhere can make appeal and by which they can measure the conduct of their government.

Trygvie Lie looks forward to the day, as we all do, when a copy of this declaration will be posted in every schoolroom and on every public bulletin board in the world.

The Human Rights Commission of the UN, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, is drafting a covenant on human rights—on which I worked at the Geneva Conference on Freedom of Information. This covenant casts into treaty form certain of the rights and freedoms enunciated in the declaration, and here again the Soviet bloc is arrayed in opposition to human rights.

The Senate already has pending for ratification the UN convention against genocide. We are moving before the World Court to require the Soviet satellites to answer for violation of human rights guaranteed in the peace treaties. Indeed, since the first meeting of the United Nations, most of the important issues brought before the General Assembly or the Security Council involved the vitality of human rights somewhere in the world. History may record that by far the most significant success and extension of human rights of the United Nations in the first 5 years is the declaration and extension of human rights.

VIII

Mr. President, in the long record of man's progress on this planet, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are best known for the development of political institutions under majority rule. The twentieth century will be judged by its accomplishments in safeguarding human rights of individuals and minority groups. In that context, and in that spirit, we should consider the pending bill on its merits. In that context and that spirit we cannot fail to give it our approval.

We in this Congress will be judged in these terms by the historians of tomorrow, but the responsibility for our acts now cannot be postponed into this distant future. Our responsibility is now. This is not only a matter of justice for our own citizens in our own land—that is the big issue I have stressed today; that is the issue I hope we shall not lose sight of. This is not only a matter of justice for our own citizens and our own prejudices and preconceptions, but our very survival depends more and more on the support and good will of the little people all over the world. And these people, I suggest, are watching, and waiting, and judging us now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 22, 23, 24, AND 25 OF 1950—MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOCS. NOS. 587, 588, 589, AND 590)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plans Nos. 22, 23, 24, and 25, of 1950, which were read, and, with the accompanying plans, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(For President's messages see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 6755–6758.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	O'Conor
Butler	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Sparkman
Douglas	McKellar	Taft
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Frear	Martin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. THYE answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MYERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. ECTON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. AIKEN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. MCFARLAND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WITHERS also entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). A quorum is present. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

NOMINATION OF JOHN W. KERN TO THE TAX COURT

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be happy to yield if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, I may move to reconsider the vote by which there was confirmed on April 25, 1950, the nomination of John W. Kern to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, and that I may accompany said motion with a motion to request the President to return to the Senate the notification to him of the confirmation of the said nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DONNELL. It is a request for unanimous consent that, as in executive session, I may make certain motions with respect to the nomination of John W. Kern to be judge of the Tax Court of the United States. It is the same matter which I discussed rather extendedly yesterday evening on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether he has conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. GEORGE], and whether the motion is agreeable to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say in answer to the Senator from Alabama that, as will appear from the RECORD of yesterday, the Senator from Georgia was fully aware of the action to be taken and was present throughout my discussion of the matter. I hesitate to quote the Senator from Georgia in his absence, but I understood him to say yesterday, in substance—I would rather quote him exactly, Mr. President. The Senator from Georgia, on yesterday, as appears at page 6635 of the RECORD, said:

> I am satisfied that the distinguished Senator from Missouri might make a motion to reconsider by reason of his absence from the Senate at that time, and inasmuch as he did not vote at all upon the matter, there would be no disposition on my part to raise any question about it.
>
> Some question might arise as to whether the motion would now be timely. On that point I express no opinion further than to say that I have no disposition to raise even that question.

Mr. President, I supplement that which I have read by stating that I think it would be necessary, in order to understand exactly what the Senator from Georgia meant, to read the context of his statement. I think I am quite correct, Mr. President, in stating that the Senator from Georgia meant that there would be "no disposition on" his part "to raise any question about" my motion to reconsider, although he stated:

> Some question might arise as to whether the motion would now be timely. On that point I express no opinion further than to say that I have no disposition to raise even that question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is the Senator asking for a vote on his motion at this time?

Mr. DONNELL. My request was for unanimous consent that, as in executive session, I might make the motions to which I referred, and which I propose to make immediately if unanimous consent is given, so that they may be acted on at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, that starts us off on another question different from that we have been discussing, and it would mean that we would have to set aside the pending question to take up another matter in executive session. I served notice in the beginning that I would have to oppose any matters of that kind being brought up. I am afraid I shall have to object.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold it.

Mr. DONNELL. May I inquire of the Senator if he would be willing that I might file the two motions at this time without action being had upon them? I should like to have them filed as in executive session, for the reason that if I do not do so at this time, it will be necessary for me to wait from time to time and perhaps from day to day in order to find a time when the Senate is in executive session, or, do as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] sometimes does, rise and request that as in executive session some certain action may be taken. These motions might be out of time if not now presented.

I note that the Senator from Georgia is in the Chamber. I have no desire, Mr. President, to rush a vote on the motions. I thought it might be appropriate to have a vote on them now, but I should like at least to make the two motions at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I was under the impression that the request of the distinguished Senator from Missouri would be in order, and that if the motions were placed on file they would be in time, and when the motions came up in the regular order they could be debated at greater length. However, I believe I was misinformed on the procedure. I feel that not only the motion to reconsider should be made at this time, but there should be a motion made to have the notification returned by the President. I feel that both motions should be made now. That would require a vote on both motions.

Mr. President, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask if I am correct in my interpretation that the second motion would be considered without debate, so that there would be an immediate vote on it in the event unanimous consent is given. It is my feeling that

long debate would not be necessary, and the motion would be carried or lost immediately.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Chair permit a brief observation? I do not regard it as necessary—although I should like to ask the Chair for a ruling on the motion in a moment—that a vote on either of the two motions be had at this time. As I understand rule XXXVIII, clause 3, it simply provides the time during which a motion may be made. I announced at the outset—and I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Nebraska was present—that I was asking for unanimous consent that, as in executive session, I might make, first, a motion to reconsider the vote by which was confirmed, on April 25, 1950, the nomination of John W. Kern to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, and, secondly, that I might accompany said motion by a motion to request the President to return to the Senate the notification to him of the confirmation of such nomination. I respectfully submit for the consideration of the Chair that it would be entirely appropriate that I make both motions at this time, and having been noted of record, the matter could later be set down for hearing at an appropriate time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest that the motion to reconsider be considered as having been made in executive session, to be disposed of at some subsequent regular executive session of the Senate, and that for the purposes of the second motion unanimous consent be given for a request that the President return to the Senate the notification of the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. With the permission of the Chair, I thought the Senator from Georgia was making a suggestion, rather than a motion. Am I correct?

Mr. GEORGE. It was a suggestion in the nature of a unanimous-consent request. I put it in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask if the Senator from Georgia would be agreeable to making the suggestion in the nature of a motion, to be made by the Senator from Georgia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the motion to request the President to return the notification to the Senate has already been agreed to by unanimous consent, and that it is therefore closed by having been adopted.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Chair. May I inquire if the parliamentary situation now is that there has been filed a motion made by the Senator from Georgia—am I correct?—or made by myself for reconsideration of the vote by which was confirmed, on April 25, 1950, the nomination of John W. Kern, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States?

Mr. GEORGE. The request was that that motion be considered as having been made in executive session of the Senate and to await disposition at a subsequent regular executive session.

Mr. DONNELL. I hope the request will be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has already been granted.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank both the Chair and the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield so that I may make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If unanimous consent had not been granted on the second motion, would not it have been necessary to take the motion up immediately?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to request the President to return the notification would have been voted upon without debate.

Mr. DONNELL. May I propound one further parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to be sure that I correctly understand the parliamentary situation. May I inquire if it is this: First, the motion to request the President to return to the Senate the notification to him of the confirmation of the nomination of John W. Kern, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, has been carried?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion has been agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Second, that there has been made and is now pending before the Senate for future action a motion for a reconsideration of the vote by which was confirmed on April 25, 1950, the nomination of John W. Kern to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider has been entered as in executive session and will be considered in executive session.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes. I thank the Chair.

PRESIDENT'S WESTERN TOUR

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last Friday evening when I had occasion to speak with President Truman, he was in a very happy mood. He said that he was going out on his tour of the country ready for a fight. I told him that I thought someone would accommodate him in the fight he expected to have. He left on Sunday for a nonpolitical tour of the country, and he is now making some nonpolitical speeches. So I come to the floor today to make a nonpolitical speech in response.

In Wyoming early this morning the President was in the fighting mood he had said he would be in. To quote the United Press, he was in the to-hell-with-the-opposition form that he displayed in 1948. According to the press, he still maintained that his trip across the country was nonpolitical. Among his nonpolitical remarks, he told the people of Wyoming that the philosophy which produced Teapot Dome is not dead. He warned the West against returning to the Republican philosophy of greed and privilege. It is on the question of whether or not the philosophy of Teapot Dome is dead that I wish to make a few nonpolitical remarks today on the floor of the Senate, and also as to the returning—I assume he meant to Washington—of the philosophy of greed and privilege.

Unfortunately for the American people the President spoke the truth when he said that the philosophy that produced a Teapot Dome is not dead. We find it rampant in Washington today. The President, being the head of the executive branch of the Government, should know that better than anyone else, for it is in the executive branch that the philosophy is rampant. It is only too true that the philosophy to which Mr. Truman referred is not dead in Washington.

Mr. Truman, as recorded on the radio this morning by direct transcription, said that he had the right—and I concede he has that right—to go forth into the country and give to the people the facts on what is going on in Washington. He said that he was going to give the facts to the people without distortion. Mr. President, I think that the President, being away from Washington quite a bit lately, may be somewhat mistaken as to what has been going on in Washington, and he may have forgotten to tell a few or all of the things that are happening.

He said that the philosophy of greed and privilege that was produced out at Teapot Dome was not dead. He did not say that the Republicans who were in power at that time—and I presume they were what Mr. Truman was discussing, and therefore the speech was not political—recognized that what was done at Teapot Dome was wrong, seriously wrong. The record is clear that the Republicans set out to cure the wrong of Teapot Dome. They even assisted in its exposure. They set out to prosecute those who committed the wrong.

I wish to read from the 1928 Republican platform to indicate whether or not the Republicans as of that time recognized that the Teapot Dome philosophy was wrong and whether they condoned it. The platform said:

> We stand for honesty in Government, for the appointment of officials whose integrity cannot be questioned. We deplore the fact that any official has ever fallen from this high standard and that certain American citizens of both parties have so far forgotten their duty as citizens as to traffic in national interests for private gain. We have prosecuted and shall always prosecute any official who subordinates his public duty to his personal interest.

Mr. President, let us consider what has been happening in Washington more recently. I wonder whether at the time Mr. Truman was speaking he had thought about Mr. Ed Pauley's nomination as Under Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Harold Ickes was in the Halls of the Capitol today, and it reminded me of what he testified before a Senate committee on that subject. As Secretary of the Interior, he said to a Senate committee:

> Mr. Pauley said he could get $300,000 in campaign contributions from the California oilmen if the Department of Justice did not file a test suit on the tidelands oil property.

Mr. President, I think from that statement we are compelled to say that the philosophy which produced Teapot Dome

indeed has not died. We know too well that philosophy is not dead.

It might be considered political if I were to mention on the floor of the Senate the Pendergast machine of Kansas City and how Mr. Truman spoke in behalf of Mr. Tom Pendergast on the Senate floor after Mr. Pendergast's conviction in a Federal court. But I believe that incident is well known to the people of our country and that their memory does not have to be jogged at the present time.

Mr. President, I wonder whether the greed and the privilege represented by Mr. Curley, the former mayor of Boston, and a former Member of the House of Representatives, are still in the memory of the American people. They should be, because the President of the United States recently pardoned Mr. Curley, set him free while he was paying a penalty for his greed and privilege.

I wonder whether the greed and the privilege representated by Mr. Eugene B. Casey, of Maryland, who was at one time an anonymous White House assistant, are in the minds of the people, or Mr. Truman. According to the record, he failed to pay his income tax, and was sentenced by a Federal court.

Mr. President, I wonder whether the greed and the privilege represented by Mr. Louis Campagna, Paul Ricca, Phillip Andrea, and Charles Gioe, who were convicted of a million-dollar extortion case in Chicago, and who were pardoned after serving about a year in a penitentiary, are still in the minds of the people, or Mr. Truman. I wonder whether the people still recall that in that case the parolees were represented by the former manager of Mr. Truman in the city of St. Louis, their counsel being Paul Dillon. He was, by the way, the manager for Mr. Truman in his first campaign for the Senate.

There should be in the people's minds, so that we can keep the facts before them, the philosophy that is represented by Mr. Edward F. Pritchard, former chief counsel of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Board, who was working in the White House under Mr. Truman, and twice Chief Assistant Attorney General under two different Attorneys General. He went back to his home State of Kentucky, and promptly was involved in a vote-fraud case there, and convicted for his part.

What about the privileges of Mr. John Maragon, and of Gen. Harry Vaughan? Are their philosophies laid away in some deep freeze?

Mention of the case involving those two gentlemen reminds us that it is still possible to bring about a prosecution for perjury before a congressional committee. In 1928 the Republicans said they prosecuted those who were responsible for wrongdoing, that they prosecuted them for the crimes they had committed. Today we are finding that the most effective remedy we have for playing upon the privileges of high office and trust is to have people come before congressional committees, and then get them for perjury.

Mr. President, I should like to see the time come when those who entertain this philosophy of greed and privilege are prosecuted for what they do, not for what they say. I would like to see it that some men like Alger Hiss, John Maragon, Carl Marzani, and some other people, were prosecuted for the things they did, rather than for the lies they told.

Oh, yes, Mr. President, we want all the facts before the American people. It is very significant that officials in Washington do not recognize, or are incapable of recognizing, greed and privilege as such. But we in Congress are able to recognize them as just plain lying, and therefore those who perjure themselves are prosecuted.

As I have said, back in the Coolidge days the Republicans recognized the wrong of the Teapot Dome scandal, and they said so. They took every step to prosecute and to disclose to the public exactly what had taken place. But how times have changed, and now the philosophy of greed and privilege is covered up.

Mr. President, I wish to point out to the people today the great difference between the then President, Mr. Coolidge, and the President today. I call attention to the testimony on this subject of Burton K. Wheeler, given on the floor of the Senate. Senator Wheeler had been a minority member of an investigating committee and desired to look into what took place at Teapot Dome. He went to Mr. Daugherty, the Attorney General of the United States, and asked for the files of the Department of Justice. What happened? They were refused him. Immediately the President of the United States, Mr. Coolidge, called in the Attorney General of the United States and dismissed him forthwith for refusing to give to the Senate of the United States the files and records in the Teapot Dome matter. That was the way a Republican administration handled the philosophy of Teapot Dome. To give you that story in more detail, let me read what former Senator Burton Wheeler said on the floor of the Senate, page 10589 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 8:

> I call attention to the fact that in the Daugherty investigation I sent for files myself, I asked for files from the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Daugherty. He refused to give them to me. I have forgotten the ground he stated, but at any rate he refused to give them to me. When he did so, the President of the United States, Mr. Coolidge, called him in and asked for his resignation, and Mr. Daugherty was eliminated from the office of Attorney General. After that time, when the new Attorney General was appointed, every single file I ever asked for, as a minority member of the committee, was furnished to me.
>
> I think what is happening now is very unfortunate. I think, possibly, it is giving the country the wrong impression. I cannot conceive any member of any committee asking for files and being refused them.
>
> As I have stated, my colleague, Senator Walsh, of Montana, was a minority member of the committee investigating the Teapot Dome situation. I know of my own personal knowledge that he got from the Department, and from officials in the Department, information which he afterward used, and if he had not been permitted to do that, and if I had not been permitted to do it. I am sure there would have been a complete failure of the investigation of the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, that is entirely different from what is happening now. I very well remember my own experience as chairman of the subcommittee investigating the workings of the loyalty program. We were concerned with the Remington case, which has since come to light again. The case involved the Commerce Department of the United States and, yes, Mr. President, the very White House. We were refused the files of the Department of the Navy and of various other departments on a direct order from the President of the United States. It has taken almost 2 years for further light to be brought on that case, as a result. So, Mr. President, we should indeed remind the people what is going on.

If the President wanted to give the people all the facts he could have taken a few of the executive branch files with him, and from the rear of the train he could have advised the people in detail as to what is actually going on. He might have advised them of the Amerasia case. He might have explained that strange case to the people from the files themselves. He says he has the right to take the facts to the people, and he certainly has. But he might take the files out and tell the people all the facts and let the votes fall where they may.

Mr. President, who are the "fat cats" of privilege as of today? I read from a few clippings. For instance I pick up a clipping to which is attached this note:

> Mr. Dewey finally allowed a time bomb to explode.

Yet, it was a delayed bomb, but it exploded on the 4th of May 1950. It is too bad it did not explode in October of 1948. All of us should have taken off the gloves in 1948 to handle Mr. Truman the way he says he likes to be handled, to give the people all the facts.

I read from the headlines and part of an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of May 5:

> DEWEY PLACES DEMOCRATS IN "BIG MONEY"—GOVERNOR CHARGES THEY LEVY TRIBUTE FROM UNION TREASURIES
>
> In one of the sharpest attacks on the administration he has ever made, Dewey charged the Democrats with levying tribute from the union treasuries and declared they "shake down wealthy playboys for Government jobs."

Let us consider the words of persons who are a little more friendly to the present administration than is the Governor of New York. I refer to Joseph and Stewart Alsop. What do they say? I read from an article published on February 5, 1950:

> Probably the most generous of these friends were the titans of the motion-picture industry. Among others, Jack and Harry Warner gave $5,000.

The Alsops are writing about the $100-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Democratic Party.

> Sam Goldwyn and Sam Goldwyn, Jr., $3,500, and Marvin Nicholas and Joseph Schenck, $3,000 each. Yet Wall Street and its environs were even better represented than

Hollywood and Vine. Emil Schram, president of the New York Stock Exchange, stumped up with $1,000, as did Robert R. Young, canny, aggressive president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad. Floyd Odlum, of the powerful Atlas Corp., and Thomas J. Watson, of the even more powerful International Business Machines, were hardly lavish; Odlum picked up a tab for a mere $500, and Watson $14,800. Jack Frye, former aviation mogul, who now runs Victor Emanuel's General Aniline Chemical and Dye, was almost insulting with a $300 contribution.

Mr. President, from all over the Nation there came here and sat at the $100-a-plate-dinner people who did not pay for their tickets. They were politicians of various sorts, some on State boards, some were mayors, some were police commissioners, and their tickets were bought by the big interests. Conveniently, official conferences had been scheduled for them in Washington on that day. Mr. President, who are the fat cats of today? Unfortunately such days as the days of Teapot Dome are not over.

Who are the rich of today? If we ever get the investigation really going into the gambling interests and the gambling syndicates, as now ordered by the United States Senate, we will find that the privileged class, the rich of today, are the gamblers and the racketeers, because they can keep from paying a legal income tax, such as is required from the other people of the United States of America.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator read the recent report in the newspapers which I assume is authentic, and what inference would be draw therefrom, that a gentleman who now is deceased, who had been apparently actively identified with the gambling fraternity, had left $1,800,000 in cash in his estate, after spending the last 15 years in Washington? What inference would be warranted from that simple fact?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the only inference that can be drawn is the correct one, that the gentleman—and they would call him a gentleman—did not pay income tax; that he evaded paying the income tax by putting his money in a strongbox. One of the purposes of the Senate committee investigation should be to ascertain what privileges are extended the gamblers and racketeers, and how they are operating in the United States of America.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would all possibility of recoupment by the Government in a case of that character have passed by limitation, or would it be possible, as was done in the Al Capone case, to investigate that situation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I assume that much of that money was earned in the latter years, so investigation would not be barred by the statute of limitations. Although, as I said before, we are becoming accustomed not to prosecute people even if they lie to the grand jury, as Mr. Hiss did in New York. There might be a runaway grand jury, however, which would bring about a prosecution. It will be noted that the questions on which Mr. Hiss' prosecution was based were asked by a grand juror. I believe two of the main questions on which the eventual prosecution was based were asked by grand jurors and not by the Department of Justice.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator familiar with the testimony of Mr. Blaisdell, in the hearings on his confirmation, where he testified that Mr. Remington had lied to him in order to secure a position in the Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am familiar with that. But Mr. Remington is still on the payroll of the United State Government.

Mr. BREWSTER. And apparently nothing has been done about it, so far as concerns misrepresentation in order to secure a Government position.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, as I understand the testimony.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator referred to a recent $100-a-plate dinner held in the city of Washington. In that connection, I should like to ask the Senator whether the excise tax was paid by the persons who attended that dinner.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the entertainment tax was not paid on those tickets, although I am sure the people of the United States believe there were some clowns who were entertaining there.

The Republicans, incidentally, paid an excise tax on their $1-a-plate dinner. There should be a lesson there as to which is the party of privilege in the United States today.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator know the distinction between the two dinners which caused the officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to collect an excise tax from the Republicans who paid $1 a plate for their dinner, but caused the same officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to fail to collect an excise tax from the Democrats who paid $100 a plate for their dinner?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I consider that distinction to be one made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, rather than one caused by a difference between the nature of the two parties or dinners.

Mr. President, the President once made this remark—and how I hope it will sink into the consciousness of even those who are in the administration, and who may lose if they allow the votes to fall where they may:

> We cannot compromise on moral and ethical beliefs and principles.

Mr. President, that is what everyone in public life should stand for. However, Mr. President, we need acts, not only words, to carry out the moral and the ethical beliefs and principles.

I feel certain that if I had not made these few remarks, the President of the United States, after what he told me Friday evening, would have been disappointed. He said he was ready for the fight, that he was going out to do the battle. I told him that I thought we could find someone to do the battle with him.

I am sure the American people want that. Above all, they want to try to get all the facts on the grave issue which now is being presented, on the question of morality and ethics in Government and the philosophy of greed and privilege in Government.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator happen to know whether the President of the United States plans to visit his home State of Missouri on this nonpolitical trip?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have seen the itinerary, and it does not include the great State of Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Apparently the President of the United States does not anticipate making a nonpolitical report to his friends and neighbors in Kansas City on this trip. Is that in accordance with the Senator's understanding?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am informed from the itinerary that on this trip the President does not intend to give the people of Missouri the benefit of the knowledge he has acquired while in the city of Washington.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator happen to know that a great deal of comment is appearing now in the newspapers in the President's home State of Missouri in regard to why the theft of the ballots which occurred in Kansas City on May 27, 1947, has never been prosecuted?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot answer that question. I have some knowledge in that connection, but it is not definite enough, in my opinion, to be stated upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. The Senator knows that there is comment in regard to that matter, does he not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I know there is comment. But as to why the investigation is not being made in the Department of Justice, I say that my knowledge regarding that matter is not in such form that I could state it upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. In any event, the President does not contemplate making a nonpolitical report to his friends and neighbors in Missouri on this trip. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I understand that the President does not intend to go to Missouri. I have not heard that he ever made a report, either to the people of Missouri or the people of the Nation, on the findings of the FBI or the Department of Justice as to what they found when they made an investigation into the theft of the ballots in Kansas City.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it seems to me that the voters of Missouri know the situation around Kansas City a little better than do the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield at this time.

The Senator from Missouri has been talking about the vote frauds in Kansas City, practically ever since he has been in the Senate. Notwithstanding the purported vote frauds were there when Harry Truman was a candidate for President in 1948, notwithstanding the very eloquent and persuasive arguments made by the Senator from Missouri against him in that campaign, as I recall, President Truman carried his home State of Missouri by approximately 250,000 votes, which is a fairly eloquent tribute to the President of the United States and a good indication of how the people of Missouri feel about him.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he believes the ballots in Missouri were counted as cast in the year 1946?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know a thing about the Missouri situation, I say to the Senator. I have never had any personal knowledge of what went on there.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator——

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator to wait a minute, please. I yielded to him, and I am trying to answer his question.

The Senator from Missouri lives there, and he may have some personal knowledge of the situation.

I am just as violently opposed to vote frauds as is the Senator from Missouri. But the Senator from Missouri has asked me a question. In reply, I say that I do not know anything at all about that matter. It is not my business as a United States Senator to go forth and investigate, unless I am placed on a committee for that purpose.

The point I make is that the Senator from Missouri has constantly talked on the floor of the Senate about these vote frauds. Yet he knows definitely that in 1948 the people of Missouri gave the President a tremendous majority. Consequently regardless of what went on in Kansas City or anywhere else in the Senator's home State, apparently the people did not believe that the President of the United States was in any way connected with the alleged theft of ballots or vote frauds or anything else. Otherwise they never would have given him the quarter of a million majority which he received there in spite of the fact that the Senator from Missouri made speeches all over Missouri, so I have been told, on this one question alone in the 1948 campaign, and in spite of the fact that I understand the Senator from Missouri used that one argument more than any other in an effort to try to defeat Harry Truman in that fight.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Illinois also knows, does he not, that the Senator from Missouri spoke on that issue in 1946 in every county in Missouri?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know that.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Illinois know that the junior Senator from Missouri is prepared here, today——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yielded only for a question. I do not know what happened in 1946; but Harry Truman was not running in 1946.

I am talking about 1948. Harry Truman is the subject and the issue now before the Senate, as a result of the speech made by the Senator from Michigan. The Senators on the other side of the aisle are constantly talking about Missouri, and I thought I would remind the Senator of something which apparently he has forgotten in the short space of 2 years; apparently he has forgotten what happened in Missouri in 1948.

I dare say that the Senator from Missouri did not have such a large majority when he was elected to the United States Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Illinois permit me to remind him——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish the Senator from Missouri to remind me of anything. I want him only to ask me a question, if he wishes to do so, because I have been reminded of a good many things all day long.

Mr. KEM. Very well; if the Senator from Illinois will not permit me to remind him, I shall ask him this question: Does the Senator know that on May 27, 1947, 72 persons, including members of the Pendergast machine, with which the President is affiliated were under indictment for one of the foulest of all crimes in Jackson County, Mo.—the crime of depriving their fellow citizens of the right to vote?

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator says there were that many indicted for that particular crime, of course I shall take his word for it.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator know——

Mr. LUCAS. Wait a minute; quiet down, please. I do not propose to defend any crook, at any time, at any place. What I am trying to tell the Senator from Missouri, which he apparently does not understand, is that the people of Missouri in 1948 had a tremendous amount of affection for Harry Truman, and they have had, in every race he has ever made, either for the Senate of the United States, for the Vice Presidency, or for the Presidency of the United States. He has never lost Missouri in all the campaigns he has made. Senators may continue to attack him all they want to on this road trip, and he will——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment; President Truman will love it, and the people will like it. I say to the gentlemen who are raising this question in the Senate: Continue to watch every move he makes; have your airplane scouts go right along with him, all the way through on this trip; do that, and Harry Truman will come back to Washington more popular than he has ever been in the history of his political career.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield to the junior Senator from Missouri for another question.

Mr. KEM. May I remind the senior Senator from Illinois that in every campaign in which Harry Truman has been elected to a State office in Missouri there is sound reason to believe that gross frauds have occurred in connection with the ballots?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I resent that. I resent it.

Mr. KEM. Very well. I stand ready to prove it, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I resent that statement by the Senator from Missouri. In other words, he is now saying that through fraud in the ballot boxes of Missouri Harry Truman carried his own State of Missouri as a candidate for the presidency of the United States.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit me to repeat what I have said?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not yield further to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, these debates can be carried on in a gentlemanly way, without charging the President of the United States in the manner in which the Senator from Missouri has by implication charged him. I know the Senator dislikes Harry Truman, and that is perfectly all right; that is his business. But for the Senator from Missouri to say that Harry Truman's election in 1948 in the State of Missouri was by reason of fraud at the ballot boxes, when he carried the State by 250,000 votes, is practically to accuse every judge and clerk of elections, Democrat and Republican alike, in every precinct, and practically to say that the voters in the State of Missouri are nothing but crooks in the estimation of the Senator representing that State in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. The Senator from Illinois has misquoted the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Missouri said there is sound reason to believe that gross frauds have occurred in every election in which Harry Truman has been elected to Congress from the State of Missouri.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, is that what you call a gentleman?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that, Mr. President, what you call a gentleman? The Senator from Illinois has the floor, and he will not yield——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, may I make a statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that not wonderful? The Senator has been here 4 years, and he does not yet know the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been demanded. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri does not know what the rules are, Mr. President.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I refuse to yield. The Senator from Missouri had just as well sit down, because I am not going to yield further. The Senator does not understand the parliamentary procedure here, and until he learns it, there is no point in my yielding. The Senator just does not understand. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will preserve order.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. KEM resumed his seat.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

No; Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan said that after the conversation he had with him, President Truman was going to be greatly disappointed if the Senator did not make his speech. The President can hardly talk to the people as he goes along on this trip without thinking of the Senator from Michigan. He has him on his mind all the time. He is fearful of the great speech the Senator from Michigan made today in the United States Senate. Mr. President, whatever kind of speeches are being made by the President of the United States, call them political or nonpolitical, the responsibility can well be laid at the door of Guy George Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee until November next, Senator OWEN BREWSTER of Maine, chairman of the National Republican senatorial campaign committee, and Representative LEONARD W. HALL of New York, chairman of the National Republican congressional committee. They prepared a 10-point program for the President to answer on his trip. They gave it to the press. They have made much to do about it. One of the points is directed at the Senator from Illinois, and that is the only reason for my mentioning it. It is No. 7, and I quote:

> Why has the Democratic leadership in the Senate resisted efforts for an investigation of racketeering and crime syndicates, with their link with politics as suggested by the Binaggio murder in Kansas City?

That is not directed at the President of the United States. It is directed at the Senator from Illinois. It is directed at the leadership on this side of the aisle. It is directed at the Senator from Pennsylvania, the whip. I challenge anyone on the other side of the aisle, responsible for that statement to show when or how the Senator from Illinois has ever done anything to delay any kind of investigation with respect to any crime syndicates throughout the country. Mr. President, no one can challenge my integrity or my honor in the Senate of the United States. I did not get here through that kind of reputation. As majority leader I have done my duty with respect to this very investigation in conjunction with the Democratic policy committee, in line with what we believe to be the correct thing.

Mr. President, it may be that the opposition think they are going to win the 1950 campaign upon smear charges such as that. They cannot win the fight upon condemnation and meaningless criticism of the President of the United States or the present Democratic leadership. They have been trying that for years. Nor are they going to win it by directly challenging the Senator from Illinois with respect to his position on any of these matters. I undertake to say that the average individual in Illinois is primarily interested in whether or not the Congress is going to do something constructive for him by way of continuation of rent control. That little fellow who cannot help himself; he is interested in rent control. In fact, that is the main thing he is interested in, because it involves his economic life. He is not interested in what the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Michigan may say on the floor of the Senate. The man in my section, in the slums, who is looking for public housing which has been given to him by this administration, is waiting for the day when he can have a decent place in which to live, under a liberal administration in Washington, D. C., which is attempting to get him out of the slums where disease, poverty, and communism breed. He is not interested in what is being done here on the floor of the Senate today.

The hog farmers, the wheat farmers, and the corn farmers in Illinois are not particularly interested in attacks of this nature and in charges which are being made. They are interested in their economic condition and that of their families.

Mr. President, the persons who are gainfully employed under this administration are not interested in the selfish and bitter attacks which are being made upon the President of the United States. There are 60,000,000 persons gainfully employed. They are looking for continuation of a full dinner pail; they are looking for an opportunity to give their families a decent living and a proper home. With them, Mr. President, it is an economic situation.

I hope that my Republican friends will continue to attack and attack and attack——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. One moment, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope these illogical and highly sophomoric arguments will continue to be made in this campaign. We shall meet the challenge at every crossroads in the country, Mr. President, and we will win.

Mr. KEM and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not want to have any misunderstanding as to what I said in the recent colloquy with the senior Senator from Illinois. I said that each time Harry S. Truman has been a candidate for Congress at the hands of the people of Missouri, gross fraud has occurred in the election. I have not said that I am prepared to prove that sufficient fraud occurred to affect the result of the election, but I am prepared to prove that gross fraud occurred in the year 1934, when Mr. Truman defeated John Cochran in the Democratic primary in my State. Gross fraud again occurred in 1940, when Mr. Truman defeated Mr. Stark and Mr. Milligan in the Democratic primary in my State.

The senior Senator from Illinois appears to be a specialist in denying charges and suggesting the appointment of committees to make inquiry into charges. He recently fathered a resolution to inquire into certain charges made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. I have made charges which the senior Senator from Illinois seems disposed to deny. I suggest to the Senator that he father a resolution for the appointment of a committee to determine the truth or falsity of the facts which I have stated. I should like to repeat them so that there will be no question as to what I have said.

I have said that each time Mr. Truman has been a candidate for Congress at the hands of the people of Missouri, gross frauds have occurred in the election. To be more specific, the time he was a candidate, in the year 1934, in the Democratic primary, against John Cochran, gross frauds occurred, specifically and particularly in the Pendergast-controlled wards on the North Side of Kansas City. Again, in the year 1940, when Mr. Truman was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator, gross frauds occurred in the election, particularly in the Pendergast-controlled wards of Kansas City.

Let me say to the senior Senator from Illinois that if he regards those charges as improper, false, or susceptible of proof to the contrary, let him move for the appointment of a committee, and let that committee take the evidence which I am prepared to present, and let it report to the Senate as to the truth or falsity of the charges.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with the inquiry as to the observance of the Senate rules, is the Senator from Missouri familiar with the unfortunate fact that the senior Senator from Illinois was obliged last week, by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, to be seated for a violation of the rules?

Mr. KEM. I was present when that unfortunate circumstance occurred. I shall be kind enough to assume that the senior Senator from Illinois, although he has served in this body for lo, these many years, was unfamiliar with the rules, or he would not have violated them in such a flagrant fashion as occurred on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. With reference to the moving appeal of the senior Senator from Illinois as to smear campaigns, is the Senator from Missouri familiar with the greatest smear campaign in the history of American politics, when Mr. Herbert Hoover was smeared by a gentleman known as Charlie Michelson, whose smearing tactics have never been equaled in this century by any exponent of the art of smearing? Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. KEM. Yes; and I think it is likely that the senior Senator from Illinois was the beneficiary of that campaign, in view of his long service in this body.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Missouri familiar with the fact that the senior Senator from Illinois came to the Congress within a year or 2 years after the first demonstration of the capacity of Charlie Michaelson as a smear artist?

Mr. KEM. So I gather.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. I gather from what the Senator from Maine has said that if the senior Senator from Illinois is not a direct beneficiary of that smear campaign, he is in the nature of a legatee thereof.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield until I finish the colloquy with my colleague from Maine. I shall then be glad to yield to the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Missouri familiar with the fact that the junior Senator from Illinois once wrote a book?

Mr. KEM. I know the junior Senator from Illinois is a distinguished author. He has written books upon socialism and many other subjects of public interest.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Missouri familiar with the fact that in a book written in 1932 or 1933 the junior Senator from Illinois demonstrated conclusively that the Democratic Party as then constituted, and under the leadership of its then leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, could not possibly be an instrument for advancing the cause of honest or righteous government, because of its inevitable and inextricable alliance with the most vicious forces in American city politics?

Mr. KEM. I did not know that. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I cannot help but wonder whether the junior Senator from Illinois, in his studies of political science, had occasion to investigate the primary in Missouri in 1934 in which Harry S. Truman was the successful candidate, or the primary in 1940 in which he was again the successful candidate, and, if so, I wonder if the junior Senator from Illinois will be good enough to give us the benefit of his research and erudition on that subject.

In view of the fact that the senior Senator from Illinois has exhibited on the floor considerable ignorance of those facts, I think he might well be interested, as we all would be, in the results of the research and erudition of the junior Senator from Illinois on that subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the Senator from Missouri of the opinion that, in spite of the vast reservoir—I might almost say cesspool—of political corruption which unfortunately has been revealed in the city and State from which the Senator from Missouri comes, and whose presence here is due in no small measure to the revelations of what was going on which were made to the public, it would be humanly possible for anyone lacking the pen of Charlie Michelson to do justice in a smear campaign to the situation which prevails in many sections of our political economy, of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois is now the leader.

Mr. KEM. I am sure it would be beyond the powers of the junior Senator from Missouri to do credit to that situation. However, I might say, in view of what the senior Senator from Illinois has said about the votes of the people of Missouri, in the year 1946 the present junior Senator from Missouri visited 114 counties in Missouri. He was at that time a comparatively unknown lawyer. He got into an automobile, accompanied by his wife, and visited 114 counties in his State, to tell a very simple story of fraudulent voting and gross fraud which were going on in the elections of our State. It was a Republican year, and the junior Senator from Missouri is here today.

That is the only reply which the junior Senator from Missouri feels is necessary to make to the broad statements of the Senator from Illinois about gigantic majorities secured in Missouri. I should like to repeat for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois, whose attention was diverted when I said it before, that in the year 1934, when Harry S. Truman was elected to the United States Senate, gross fraud occurred in the Democratic primary in our State. Again, in the year 1940, when Harry S. Truman was elected to the Senate of the United States, gross fraud occurred in the Democratic primary in our State. I stand ready to prove those facts if the senior Senator from Illinois, who has had considerable experience——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield later, after I have finished my statement. I stand ready to prove those facts, if the senior Senator from Illinois, who has had some experience in the appointment of committees for the purpose of making investigations, agrees to have such an investigation made. If he does, I shall be glad to wait on the committee with the facts, figures, and evidence of the charge which I make. I now yield to the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am wondering whether there was any fraud in the election of 1946 when the Senator from Missouri was elected to the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Yes; gross fraud occurred in the Democratic primary in that year in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri.

Mr. LUCAS. Not in the Republican primary?

Mr. KEM. Gross fraud occurred in the Democratic primary of 1946 in that district. It grew out of this situation: Harry S. Truman, who was President, undertook to purge the Democratic Representative in the Fifth Congressional District. Mr. Truman on that occasion called to the White House, Mr. Jim Pendergast, his close political ally and associate. As a result, Mr. Jim Pendergast returned from the White House to the Fifth Congressional District in Missouri and undertook to purge from the Halls of Congress the gentleman who then served as Representative from the Fifth Congressional District, Mr Roger C. Slaughter. On the basis of the returns, it was reported that Mr. Slaughter had been defeated as the Democratic nominee. However, it became apparent that gross fraud had occurred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. KEM. As a result, 72 persons, including many members——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator to suspend until the Senate is in order.

Mr. KEM. As a result, on May 27, 1947, 72 persons, including many members of the Pendergast machine, were under indictment by action of the county grand jury. On that night the office of Board of Election Commissioners in Kansas City was entered, a safe was blown open, and the ballots, which were evidence in those 72 pending cases, were hauled away. The theft of ballots occurred under rather unusual circumstances. I observe from the countenance of the senior Senator from Illinois that what I am saying is rather boring to him. However, I think the people of the United States are interested in it, or would be if they knew about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. No, sir. I prefer not to yield until I have completed my statement to the senior Senator from Illinois. The circumstances under which the theft of the ballots occurred were these. The sheriff of Jackson County had an office in the same courthouse building, with a deputy ostensibly in attendance at all times, day and night. Across the street was the office of the chief of police of Kansas City. The President of the United States was sleeping some five blocks away. That was purely a coincidence, but the important point is that the business section of the city was ostensibly covered by the secret service. It would seem that a crime committed under those circumstances could hardly be said to be a perfect crime. Nevertheless, from that day to this, and although those ballots were hauled down the streets of Kansas City in a truck or some similarly large conveyance, they have never been seen. No arrests have been made. There have been no indictments, no prosecutions, whatever. It so happens that just a few days from now, on May 27, 1950, the statute of limitations runs on that foul crime. After that day the President of the United States, the Department of Justice, the

District Attorney, and anyone else, will be without power to punish those responsible. Yet, Mr. President, to this day, no arrests have been made, and no prosecution has been undertaken.

I wish to yield now to my learned and erudite friend, the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Missouri. May I first make a prefatory statement?

Mr. KEM. If it is not too long.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it will be a very simple statement.

Mr. KEM. If it is a short statement, I have no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The junior Senator from Illinois rose to defend the senior Senator from Illinois, who needs no defense. Thereupon the junior Senator from Illinois found himself in cross-fire between the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Illinois is not indicating that the junior Senator from Missouri was attacking the senior Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I simply said that I found myself in cross-fire, with some of the arrows directed through me by my erstwhile allies on the gas bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Et tu, Brute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was not so much the content of what they said, as it was the indication that friendships formed in the Senate frequently seem to be as evanescent as snowflakes on a hot stove. That is my prefatory statement.

Mr. KEM. I should like to interrupt the flow of language of the junior Senator from Illinois to suggest that our able friend, the senior Senator from Illinois, in connection with the Kerr bill, permitted the time of the Senate to be taken up for some 2 weeks to debate a bill which the President of the United States has said publicly is against the public interest and has denounced as special-interest legislation.

Every time I hear the able majority leader get up to talk about how he wants to conserve the time of the Senate, my mind goes back to those 2 weeks of debate when I engaged, at the side of the able junior Senator from Illinois, as my leader, in attempting to defeat legislation which the majority leader had permitted to come to the floor of the Senate and which was to be subsequently denounced in no uncertain terms by the President of the United States as special-interest legislation. I also say that for some strange reason—passing strange, according to a newspaper in our adjoining State of Missouri—the senior Senator from Illinois was absent from the Senate when the vote was taken on the Kerr bill. So far as I have been able to find out, there has been no public record made since that time of his position on that important measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate very much the magnificent work which the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Missouri did on the so-called Kerr bill. I think their contributions were of great value. I said so at the time, and I say so now.

Mr. KEM. I enjoyed working with the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say further that one of the best features of the bill, so far as the junior Senator from Illinois is concerned, was the opportunity it gave him to work with the two gentlemen, whom he respected very much originally and whom he came to respect more. I may say that the senior Senator from Illinois needs no defense, but——

Mr. KEM. Particularly in view of the fact that he has not been under attack.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He would need no defense, even if he were under attack. But I have always felt that in the case of the Kerr bill, to which I have always objected when the call of the calendar came, while it should not have been passed without debate, I did not want to have it defeated without debate. I thought it was only proper that the issue should come before the country and be settled, and the contributions of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Maine were very fine indeed. I am very happy we joined in defeating the bill, and I hope it will remain defeated forever.

What I was coming to, after this laborious preamble, was that while it is true this is an election year, would it not be much better that all of us, instead of raking up the past, devoted ourselves to the legislation before us? I think we would get much more done, and there would be much less bitterness.

I believe the Senator from Missouri will admit that, so far as the junior Senator from Illinois is concerned, he never has made a partisan attack in the Senate—and he never intends to do so; that he has never made a personal attack in the Senate—and he does not intend to do so. Would it not be much better if we all got down to business and devoted ourselves to the legislation before us? If we were to do that in a constructive spirit, we would find there would be much greater opportunity for cooperation on both sides of the aisle.

It seems to me that these attacks back and forth, while they can be forgiven, do not contribute at all toward constructive legislation. I wonder if the junior Senator from Missouri and the senior Senator from Maine would not consult their better natures, which are generally dominant in their characters, and give up these attacks upon the past political history of the President of the United States. The President of the United States can speak for himself.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say, in reply to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, that, as I recall, the senior Senator from Illinois was the first one to inject into the debate the question which we have discussed at some length.

I should also like to say to the junior Senator from Illinois that it has been said that the greatest encouragement to crime is the hope of escape of punishment. Certainly, if conditions are not brought about so that punishment is meted out to those responsible for vote frauds, and those responsible for the destruction of evidence in vote-fraud cases, how can we ever expect to have in this country clean elections? How can we expect to have in my own State of Missouri conditions under which ballots will be counted as they are cast?

The Senator from Missouri has no apology to make for inviting the attention of the Senate to the deplorable conditions in that respect which have existed in my own State for many years. Kansas City is my home. It has been my home, and the home of my family, for many years. I deplore solemnly the circumstances which bring about this discussion. But, Mr. President, I do not think we will serve the common good by soft-pedaling or hushing up these distressing conditions and saying we prefer not to discuss them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I also regret the conditions which have been described by the junior Senator from Missouri about the vote frauds in Missouri. I also lament the fact that the statute of limitations is about to run. Does not the Senator take some consolation from the fact that if the Department of Justice kept after this matter, even though the statute had run, we might ascertain who stole the ballots, and then we could bring the guilty parties before Congress, where they might commit perjury, and we could indirectly punish them for the fraud by convicting them of perjury before a committee of Congress? That is the present method to which we are put to prosecute very grave crimes in the United States. I am sorry this roundabout way is essential, but it is the only means the people seem to have at the present time. Will not the Senator comment on that?

Mr. KEM. Of course, that was the method used to send Tom Pendergast to the penitentiary. It was the method used in recent years to send a number of wrongdoers to prison. It was the method used to convict Alger Hiss.

I cannot help feeling that the only security the people can have against these outrageous assaults on the people's rights is continued discussion of the conditions as they exist. In view of that, while I often agree with my good friend the able Senator from Illinois, I wholly and totally disagree with him in the suggestion that it is unwise to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country these unwholesome conditions.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in his very fine and able address, spoke of the unusual situation with which the Senate was confronted, in that the

Senate had before it a motion to proceed with the consideration of a bill upon which there had been no hearings whatever by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and which had been sent to the floor of the Senate by the committee without any recommendation.

Mr. President, we have another unusual situation in connection with this motion. The press and the radio have both given great prominence to the accusation that when the motion came up for consideration yesterday there would be a filibuster in opposition to the motion carried on by southern Senators.

I submit that the record of the Senate since 12 o'clock noon yesterday, when the motion to proceed with the consideration of the so-called fair employment practice bill became the pending question before the Senate, shows that if there has been a filibuster in the Senate it has been a counter-filibuster, a filibuster against southern Senators exercising any opportunity to speak and be heard on this floor.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. HILL. If my distinguished friend, the Senator from Georgia, desires to ask me a question, I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my delight that the Senator from Alabama, who has been on the floor of the Senate since 12 o'clock, finally was permitted to speak. It does seem that if we are to bear the odium of a filibuster, we should be permitted to make at least one speech of reasonable length each day. I am delighted that the counter-filibuster has ceased and desisted long enough for us to take the floor and expose this iniquitous measure. Perhaps we need a few more votes to assure the defeat of the bill at this session of Congress, and I am quite confident we will be able to acquire them as we proceed to point out the iniquities of the measure, but if we were to be denied our right to the floor, and were not able to debate the bill and expose its iniquities, we might be in some danger.

The Senator from Alabama is a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the only one of our group who is honored by representation on the committee. He is very familiar with the bill, and I am delighted that his persistence has finally enabled him to gain recognition from the Chair, so that he may have an opportunity to speak on the bill. I appeal to those who might have a design to prevent our speaking to permit us to speak at least 1 or 2 days on the measure, in order that the country may be apprised of the dangers inherent in legislation of this type.

It is understood that tomorrow a motion will be made to take up some of the reorganization plans, and that debate will consume some time. Of course, I have no doubt that that will also be included in the charge of a southern filibuster against the motion to proceed to the consideration of the FEPC bill. There is no way in which we can get the truth before the country; but our colleagues here know the position in which we have been placed, and I hope that they will understand our efforts to get the floor and to point out the unconstitutionality of the FEPC bill, and all the various other infirmities which make it so important for the Senate to reject the motion to proceed to its consideration.

I am delighted that the Senator from Alabama persisted in his efforts to get the floor, as he did.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia. As he has suggested, yesterday he patiently and persistently sought to gain recognition in order that he might bring to the attention of the Senate and the country the unconstitutionality of the bill, the evil effects that would flow from its passage, and the great mischief that would be done not only to our economic welfare but to the welfare of the entire country by the passage of the bill. The Senator from Georgia sought recognition for a long time yesterday before he secured it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if he knows whether the majority leader has in mind any means whereby the debate on this issue will be cut off?

Mr. HILL. I cannot speak for the majority leader. All I know is that distinguished Senators from the Senator's side of the aisle and distinguished Senators from this side of the aisle seem to join together to carry on what would almost seem to be a counterfilibuster to keep southern Senators from bringing to the attention of the Senate and the country what we feel to be the unconstitutionality and the evil character of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as the minority leader is concerned I think the FEPC measure should never have been brought up unless the majority leader was determined to bring to an end a filibuster or a counterfilibuster or any other kind of filibuster. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator why he now is complaining by reason of the fact that another discussion has taken place on the floor of the Senate, not dealing with the FEPC? What is there in his mind that makes him make the statement now that the southern Senators have note been able to obtain the floor?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is not a question of 1 hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; 2 hours.

Mr. HILL. No; it is not a question of 2 hours.

Mr. WHERRY. Or 3 hours.

Mr. HILL. No; it is not a question of 3 hours.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the difference?

Mr. HILL. It is a question of about 4 hours and 20 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, let us agree that it is a question of 4 hours and 20 minutes.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama sat here patiently, persistently, painstakingly——

Mr. WHERRY. So did I.

Mr. HILL. Seeking to obtain the floor so I might bring to the attention of the Senate the unconstitutionality, the iniquity of the bill, the mischief that would be wrought upon the country from the passage of the bill. The Senator from Alabama has been denied that opportunity because Senators on the Republican side of the aisle, the side of the Senator from Nebraska, the minority side, have joined with Senators on this side in consuming time, taking up 4 hours and 20 minutes, Mr. President, on another subject. Yet it is said that the southern Senators are carrying on some kind of a filibuster.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Georgia first and then I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to point out the injustice of it all. We are here waging a battle against a great propaganda machine, which has misrepresented the bill to the American people. The Senator from Alabama is a member of the committee. Despite the fact that no hearings were held, his diligence is such that he studied the bill and was prepared to present a discussion of it; yet Members of the Senate today have been worn out by other debate to the point where at the present time there are only 6 or 7 or 8 Senators on the floor.

Mr. HILL. It is what we might call the fag end of the day.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, we have come to the fag end of the day before the Senator from Alabama obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Yes, Mr. President; it has now come to the fag end of the day before a Senator from the South, who has for many hours sought recognition, has finally been given the opportunity to lay before the Senate the facts, the arguments, the reasons why he believes the bill to be unconstitutional, and so he may point out the iniquities contained in the bill.

I now yield to the distinguished Repulican minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama, for whom I have a wholesome respect. I should like to ask him one question. The Senator from Alabama now has the floor, has he not, to discuss the great bill about which he is speaking?

Mr. HILL. At last, at 4:25 p. m., 4 hours and 25 minutes after the Senate convened.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should be glad to have the Senator speak at the fag end of the day, or the beginning of the day, or tomorrow, so far as I am concerned, in order that he may unburden his soul respecting the viciousness of the bill. That is perfectly agreeable to me. What I want to know now is whether the Senator from Alabama is aware of what is in the mind of the distinguished majority leader respecting what he may do to limit debate. Has the Senator from Alabama been advised by

the majority leader whether he has in mind or intends to cut off debate?

The Senator from Alabama now proposes to make known his views on the bill. So far as the minority leader is concerned, I am willing to sit at the fag end of the day or any other part of the day to hear the distinguished Senator from Alabama or other Senators who wish to debate this great issue. I believe the majority leader should be here so we may hear from him what he has in mind to do respecting debate on this measure. I am willing to remain here as long as the Senator from Alabama or any other Senator to consider a motion to limit debate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought I made it rather plain earlier today that I was not going to cut off debate on the bill. I made that statement, as the RECORD will show. If necessary, we will debate the measure for a week or 2 weeks. I thought that perhaps after 10 days of debate we could probably elucidate the merits or the demerits of the bill and finally get down to the point where we could vote. The Senator from Illinois does not want to rush anyone at all in this debate. Every Senator can have all the time he desires. The Senator from Illinois stayed here until October 19 last year. He can do the same thing this year if necessary.

Mr. President, I do not want the impression which the Senator from Nebraska may have created to remain that the Senator from Illinois is trying to cut off debate. I did, perhaps, suggest that we might be able to get a vote some time next week, and I believe the Senator from Nebraska more or less agreed with me on that. But in any event we consume the time with political arguments, or with reorganization measures, and take up the time of Senators who are vitally interested in the FEPC bill from speaking both pro and con. Of course, we will continue until every Senator has had an opportunity to speak his piece.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for assuring the distinguished Senator from Alabama that plenty of time will be available for all Senators who want to speak on the bill. That answers the question I raised. I gained the impression from the distinguished Senator from Alabama that he was complaining about a counterfilibuster taking place, so he would not have time to make his speech. He complained that he was speaking at the fag end of the day. I hope the Senator from Alabama will be given plenty of time to speak on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska did not understand the proposition at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; I think I did.

Mr. RUSSELL. What the Senator from Alabama complained about and what I complained about was that the odium of filibuster was being placed upon the Representatives of the Southern States, when the time is being consumed by Senators from other States. I have complained about it before, and I shall continue to complain about it. Anyone who says that is fair, to my mind has no idea of what is fair. Senators consume the whole day in discussing other matters, and then through the press and over the radio we are accused of conducting a filibuster. I say that is unfair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Georgia that the junior Senator from Nebraska has never accused anyone of filibustering. I simply rose to protect the rights of the distinguished Senator from Alabama so he might be able to deliver his speech. He was complaining that he could not obtain the floor. I want to make sure that every Senator who wants to speak for or against the bill shall be given the right to speak.

I asked the Senator from Alabama if he knew whether the majority leader had in mind to cut off debate. If the majority leader or any other Senator has that in mind, I am not in favor of it. The motion should be debated. I think the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Alabama and all other Senators who wish to speak for or against the bill should be given plenty of time to do so. I would be the last one to accuse my good friend, my respected friend, from Georgia, of anything that even suggests a filibuster. I have not said one word about a filibuster. I am simply endeavoring to protect the rights of the Senator from Alabama so he can deliver his speech, even though he is doing so now at the fag end of the day.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not understand that the Senator from Nebraska rose in defense of the Senator from Alabama. I appreciate that spirit, but I can assure him that the Senator from Alabama is perfectly capable of protecting himself.

No one has charged the Senator from Nebraska with anything. The Senator from Nebraska injected himself into the debate, as he had a perfect right to do, when we were discussing the unfairness of charging southern Senators with filibustering, inasmuch as the greater part of the time had been consumed by Senators who were not from the South, on matters which were in no way related to the pending motion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit one more reply? I dislike to detain my friend or to delay him in making his speech.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is taking my time, of course.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry.

Mr. HILL. However, I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say again that when the Senator from Alabama rose and complained about the time being consumed, I thought that was a good opportunity for me, as the minority leader, to say that, at least so far as I am concerned, we should take plenty of time in the consideration of this bill, for this bill has never been debated on the floor of the Senate before now.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Georgia that there should be ample debate on the bill. I think that possibly most of the debate in connection with the bill will occur on the motion to take it up for consideration, and I think the merits of the bill should be fully debated.

Mr. HILL. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska will agree that it is very unfair to accuse southern Senators of engaging in a filibuster in this connection.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no; I would not do that. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Particularly when practically all of the time, both yesterday and today, has been consumed by Senators other than southern Senators.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

All that the junior Senator from Nebraska was trying to do was to see to it that every Senator, including the Senator from Alabama, had plenty of time to debate this bill.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and not be accused of engaging in a filibuster when, if there was a filibuster, it was a counterfilibuster coming from those who are proponents and advocates and supporters of the bill, rather than from southern Senators who are very much opposed to the bill.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I understand that another counterfilibuster is proposed. I certainly hope the Senator from Nebraska will join us in an effort to prevent that counterfilibuster, which will be attempted, I understand, when a motion will be made to lay aside the motion to take up the FEPC bill, in order that some reorganization plan, particularly Reorganization Plan No. 12 may be considered. I say to the Senator from Alabama that there is no necessity for the Senate to consider that reorganization plan on Thursday, because I believe the House of Representatives is to consider it on Thursday. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will be so solicitous about the proposed legislation now being discussed and so anxious to permit full and complete debate to be had regarding it, that he will demonstrate his determination in that connection by helping to vote down the motion to take up Reorganization Plan No. 12, because we can easily wait another day or two to see what action will be taken by the House of Representatives.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska is anxious to have the Senate debate the FEPC bill in detail and to have every Senator given an opportunity to do so. Certainly that will not be done if the motion to take up the FEPC bill is set aside during the midst of the debate on that question in order that the Senate may take up other proposed legislation.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska will join us in an effort to prevent that from being done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the statement the Senator from Pennsylvania has made, in the form of a question, about the possibility of laying aside the motion to take up the FEPC measure, in order that other measures may be considered.

Let me say that I would not be in favor of laying aside the motion to take up the FEPC bill in favor of having the Senate take up the bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Act or the proposed amendment to the so-called Hatch Act. I think first things should come first.

I think there should be a limit on debate, if possible. I shall be glad to join the Senator in an attempt to limit the debate to the smallest possible number of hours, so far as the debate on privileged matters is concerned.

However, aside from such matters, I certainly shall join with the distinguished majority whip in doing all that I can to have the debate on the motion to take up the FEPC bill continue until that motion is voted on.

So far as the reorganization plans are concerned—and they are privileged matters—I would join the Senator in making an attempt to have the Senate reach an agreement to allow, for instance, 3 hours for the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 12, and possibly 2 hours for the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

However, the consideration of privileged matters, when they are brought up, is not in the slightest to be regarded as an attempt to filibuster in regard to measures which should receive the full attention of the Senate.

So far as I am concerned—and I am sure I bespeak the sentiments of all Senators on this side of the aisle—I am ready, as I am sure we are all ready, to stay at this job early and late in order to determine as quickly as possible whether this proposed legislation should be brought up for consideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether there was any debate on this measure in the committee.

Mr. HILL. There was no debate; there were no hearings; there was not anything which ordinarily transpires in a committee with respect to even a minor bill, not to mention a bill of the major, sweeping consequences of this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Am I correct in believing—I ask this question because I am not a member of the committee—that the only hearings, which in printed form Senators now have before them, are hearings which were held in June 1947?

Mr. HILL. So far as I know, those are the only hearings available at this time to the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it correct that no hearings have been held on this matter since that time?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. That was almost 3 years ago.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. Since that time, no hearings have been held on this measure; no witnesses have been called regarding it; no communications about it have been received from anyone; no person has testified before the committee in regard to the merits or the demerits or the far-reaching consequences of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. So the Senate is called upon now to vote upon a bill on which hearings were held over 3 years ago. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. And the bill is a most complicated and far-reaching bill, of course.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Furthermore, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings in 1947, some 3 years ago, voted against reporting the bill which now is sought to be brought before this body. The Senator from Missouri was the chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings 3 years ago. Yet last year when he voted against reporting the bill to the Senate, he did so because he said that no action should be taken on the bill until additional and further hearings were held on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Am I also correct in believing that the present membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is quite different from its membership 3 years ago? For instance, I see now in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Am I correct in my understanding that he is no longer a member of that committee?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. He was a member of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which held the hearings in 1947, but he is no longer on the committee. He was not in the committee room, of course, when the committee acted on the bill which now is the subject of a motion for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that the committee took no positive vote on the bill.

Mr. HILL. The committee first refused to report the bill. Then a substitute was offered, and the committee refused to report the substitute.

Then, as I have said in my minority views, the committee, without any recommendation at all, without one word in behalf of the bill, took the bill as it would a foundling, and laid it on the doorstep of the Senate.

It was away back in October, Mr. President, when that foundling was laid on the doorstep of the Senate. Then October passed, November passed, December passed, January went by, and then February and March and April, and then we came up to May. Still no one would claim the foundling. There was no paternity or no maternity of the foundling; it was just a foundling which had been left on the doorstep of the Senate.

But after the motion was made, on Friday last, by the distinguished majority leader, to have the Senate consider that bill, on yesterday a report was filed from the committee.

PERIL OF IMPORTED OIL TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE PROSPERITY OF AMERICAN INDUSTRIES

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HILL. Yes; with the understanding that my doing so will not in anyway interfere with my right to the floor or to my right to have the remarks which I shall make at this time considered as my first speech on the pending motion.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of routine matters tomorrow, I may be permitted to speak for 30 minutes on the subject of the peril of imported oil to the national security and the prosperity of the coal, oil, and railroad industries of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Alabama objects to the request?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. WHERRY. This is not to be a filibuster, is it? Am I correct in understanding that if the consent sought by the Senator from West Virginia is granted, we shall not find ourselves confronted with a filibuster?

Mr. HILL. No; the Senator from West Virginia requests permission to speak for 30 minutes. I would not call 30 minutes a filibuster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, Mr. President; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to clarify the RECORD in one respect. The Senator has made the statement that there was not a single witness or a single person or a single communication in favor of this measure. I am sure the Senator was referring to the situation in the committee.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Because in view of the very unusual action of the committee in reporting the bill without having any hearings on it and without being able to make up its mind as to any

recommendations, someone, somewhere, must have heard from somebody. Otherwise the committee would not have been stampeded into taking this unusual action, if it had not heard from someone.

So, as individuals they undoubtedly heard the voice of minority groups. Undoubtedly that is the situation which has attended the very unusual and checkered course of this bill.

As the Senator from Alabama has said, the bill had no paternity and no maternity, and did not have the benefit of any gestation in the committee; but now it comes before us without any recommendation on the part of the committee. It is purely a political issue, too hot to handle any longer, which is therefore brought up, and now an effort is being made to bring it before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator suggests, it is a political foundling left on the doorstep of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Alabama realizes, however, that, once the voice of political expediency was heard in the Congress, the parents of this measure showed up.

Mr. HILL. They showed up when the motion was made to proceed to the consideration of it, I may say to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. President, this bill, the so-called Fair Employment Practices bill, would grievously violate the basic rights and freedoms of the individual American citizen, and would wipe out and destroy the fundamental provisions of the Constitution of the United States. First, it would deny freedom of contract. Second, it would deny the employer the right of selective judgment in procuring his employees. Third, it would compel the employer to hire a person whom he did not wish to have in his employ, and would deny to the employer the right of selecting an employee of his own choice. Fourth, it would deny to employees the right of selecting their associates. Fifth, it would deny to labor unions the right to determine their membership or to regulate their own affairs. Sixth, it would deny to the employer the right to hire, to promote, or to discharge employees upon the basis of their efficiency, merit, or faithfulness.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the Senator for discussing the different phases of this so-called compulsory bill. Does the Senator intend to speak at all on the voluntary bill which was passed by the House? I am not asking that through any ulterior motive, or to inquire how the Senator feels about it, but I am wondering whether he is going to point out the bad features or the good features of this particular compulsory bill, and also compare it with the voluntary bills, for the benefit of Members of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. No. I may say to the Senator, that neither bill, in the opinion of the Senator from Alabama, has any good features; they are all bad features. The so-called voluntary bill has considerable compulsion in it. I may say to the Senator that when he examines it he will find it is merely opening a door by which proponents could walk in to get this full compulsory bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the very point I asked the distinguished Senator. I am not anticipating his speech at all, but as I understand, the remarks he has made thus far go to the effect of the bill on which the motion to take up has been made—I am wondering whether the distinguished Senator would point out, if he has made a study of the voluntary bill, the difference in the provisions.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, that there is no voluntary bill, for the so-called voluntary bill has compulsory features.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Were any hearings held on the so-called voluntary bill?

Mr. HILL. No hearings were held on the so-called voluntary bill, and the Senate committee refused to report favorably the so-called voluntary bill, just as the Senate committee refused to report favorably the so-called compulsory bill with a recommendation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee, of course, was correct in not reporting any of them without hearings.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. If they had to get out from under what they regarded as an unendurable political situation, I suppose that no recommendation was as good as any that was available to them. In fact, it was the only road that was open to the committee. That does not change the fact, however, that the Senate of the United States is being asked to abandon its parliamentary procedure with respect to this proposed legislation and to take up and enact a bill whose advocates and opponents both concede to be momentous because of its revolutionary character. We are asked to enact it, to put the stamp of approval of the Senate upon it, when the servant of the Senate that is supposed to have handled this bill and to have analyzed it and to have made a report to us after conducting hearings on it, failed miserably in its duty.

That point is involved in the debate on the motion to take it up, as well as the debate on the issues which are involved generally in FEPC legislation. In fact, the Senate is being requested by this motion to abandon the parliamentary practice which has guided it for 150 years, and to adopt a new policy of pushing through half-baked legislation, which no witness has had an opportunity to testify upon, to which no Senator has had an opportunity of offering an amendment which he could explain to the committee and have passed upon.

The fact, Mr. President, that we are asked to abandon our parliamentary system is just as important an issue as is this FEPC bill. If we do it in this instance, what will be our response to the next group that comes along and says, "Push through this bill for us, without any hearings before a committee and without any recommendations. You abandoned your committee system in the case of FEPC—why do you not now abandon it in the case of this legislation?" What would be the answer to that question?

Mr. HILL. It resolves itself into the proposition that, if sufficient pressure could be brought to bear, it would be possible to destroy absolutely the committee system.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be possible to make the Senate abandon its parliamentary processes which safeguard the rights and liberties of every single American citizen.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the observations made by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia and also by the senior Senator from Alabama, I think it becomes more important than ever to remark that, if the Senator would render the most valuable service to the Senate, it would be to point out the compulsion in both bills. I, myself, should very much appreciate it, if the Senator, before he concludes, would not only discuss the compulsory bill, but also would point out the compulsions which he believes are in the voluntary bill. That request, I think, should especially deserve the Senator's consideration, in view of the statements just made.

Mr. HILL. I may say to my distinguished friend that, as I go along, if time permits, I shall endeavor to comply with his request. I think I can assure the Senator that, before this debate comes to an end, if we who oppose this bill are given our right to bring to the attention of the Senate what we so strongly feel to be the unconstitutionality and the evil consequences of legislation of this kind, both bills and the whole subject will be thoroughly explored and examined on the floor of the Senate. We shall do that, even without the benefit of committee hearings.

Ordinarily, when a bill comes to the floor of the Senate, the Senators who wish to address the Senate on the bill have the benefit of committee hearings. Ordinarily we turn to the committee hearings and find a full statement of the facts, a full statement of the case for the bill, and a full statement of the case against the bill. Here we have no such hearings. We have the benefit of no such testimony, no such record, but, in spite of the fact that we do not have the testimony, I think the Senator from Nebraska can be assured that we shall explore fully both the so-called compulsory bill and the miscalled voluntary bill, because it is not, in fact, a voluntary bill; it also contains compulsions. We

shall bring out all the facts and the provisions of those bills.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one more question, if the Senator will yield. I do not want to interrupt him, and if he cares to have me do so, I shall be glad to have my remarks placed in the RECORD following his speech. My question is this: We do have the House hearings on the so-called administration bill, do we not? Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. The House hearings are not available for the Senators. I suppose they are in print.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the bill which was finally passed by the House.

Mr. HILL. The bill which was reported by the House committee was the compulsory bill, so that the hearings are, no doubt, confined primarily and largely, if not entirely, to what is called the compulsory bill in contradistinction to the miscalled voluntary bill which is in itself a compulsory bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Alabama know—I confess that this is the first time I have had an opportunity to look over the hearings—does the Senator know whether any evidence has been adduced on the bill as it finally passed the House, or if there were any hearings on the House bill at all?

Mr. HILL. I think, if the Senator will take time to examine the hearings, he will find very little testimony along the lines of the bill which passed the House. I think the Senator will find that the hearings are devoted in very large measure, if not practically entirely, to the so-called compulsory bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have just been reading the first part of the bill which was reported to the Senate, as stated on the face of it, "without recommendation." I find this statement of findings:

> The Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation with respect to protection of the rights of individuals, the rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of United States to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin are being denied, and that such infringements upon the American principle of freedom and equality of opportunity are destructive of the basic doctrine of the integrity and dignity of the individual upon which this Nation was founded and which distinguishes it from the totalitarian nations, force large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foment industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprive the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, and thereby adversely affect the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States—

And so forth. That is a very broad finding, particularly the statement that great segments of our population, because of the discrimination alleged, are forced into substandard conditions of living.

Upon what did the committee base any such findings, if there was no evidence presented to the committee on which to base them?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's question is a good one. There was no evidence whatever presented as to those facts. A little later in my remarks I shall attempt to deal with the findings. They are nothing in the world but an attempted oratorical justification for a bill which everyone knows cannot possibly hope to stand up under the Constitution of the United States. These findings were placed in the bill merely as oratorical declarations to try to give some color of title to this unconstitutional and iniquitous bill. That is all they are.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If we were examining the findings of a court——

Mr. HILL. We would have some record, some testimony, some evidence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We would go to the record to see if the findings were substantiated. Is there a record to which we can go in this case for substantiation?

Mr. HILL. There were no hearings; no witnesses were called; no testimony was taken. A motion is made to take up the bill without any record whatever, without any hearings, without any testimony, or any evidence, in any way, shape, fashion, or form, even to give color to any such purported findings as are set out in the bill.

Mr. President, I was enumerating the many ill and evil effects of this bill.

It would deny to the employer the right to hire, promote, or discharge employees upon the basis of their efficiency, merit, or faithfulness.

It would subject the employer to investigation, harassment, fines, and penalties, to be determined by a commission located in Washington.

It would give to the commission the power to compel the employer to pay persons who were never in his employ, and then force him to hire them.

It would deny to the employer the right of trial by jury, and give him no right to a review of the facts found by the political Commission.

It would compel the employer to give testimony against himself and to expose his private letters, books, and papers for the inspection and investigation of a horde of employees of the Commission.

Mr. President, the Declaration of Independence asserts:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

By declaring these rights to be God-given rights, natural and unalienable, the Declaration of Independence asserted that no government of men had bestowed them and no government could enlarge upon them, diminish them, alter them, or take them away.

The Constitution of the United States was ratified only when the concept of man's natural rights was firmly embedded in the supreme law of the land through the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which we call the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights enumerates certain natural rights which Congress shall not abridge, including among them, in the first amendment, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly. The ninth amendment makes clear that other rights than those enumerated do exist and are retained by the people. The tenth amendment expressly limits the powers of the Federal Government to those delegated to it by the Constitution, and reserves all other powers to the States or to the people.

The concept of natural rights did not originate in America, and it did not originate with Thomas Jefferson. Its family tree bears the names of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, John Locke, Lord Coke, Blackstone, and many others.

Coupled with their deep conviction of the natural rights of man, the fathers of 1787 inherited a strong distrust of an overpowering central Government. Thus it was inherent that the Constitution of the new United States should contain clear and unmistakable safeguards for the rights of the individual and the power of the States. The founding fathers did not stop with giving the new Federal Government only specific delegated powers. They then proceeded to divide these powers among the executive, the legislative and the judiciary, so that each would check and balance the other. There was no question at Philadelphia as to the sovereign powers of the States. After the preamble, the first sentence of the Constitution begins: "All legislative powers herein granted." I emphasize the word "granted." The closing words of the Constitution declare that the Constitutional Convention acted "with the unanimous consent of the States present." I emphasize the word "consent." The primary authority of the States was made secure by providing that the State legislatures could originate amendments to the Constitution and that amendments had to be ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Even with this recognition of the powers of the States embodied in the Constitution, the people did not ratify the Constitution until they were assured through adoption of the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, of explicit protection of State powers and individual rights.

Senate bill 1728, by establishing the so-called Fair Employment Practices Commission, would effect a basic change in the Federal-State system of Government. It would breach the wall between Federal and State powers. In the face of clear and explicit provisions of the Constitution, Senate bill 1728 proposes that Congress assume a power it does not possess and, in fact, is expressly denied. Senate bill 1728 would have Congress declare:

> That the right to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin is a right of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

I interpolate to remark that the phrase used is "all persons." That includes aliens as well as citizens of the United States.

While S. 1728 purports to establish a new civil right, the bill would recklessly destroy the natural rights guaranteed in the Constitution.

The bill violates the first amendment by abridging freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of association. It violates the fifth amendment by denying an essential liberty of a free people through arbitrary restraints on freedom of association in business, in schools, and in labor organizations; by denying liberty of contract in attempting to compel employers to hire undesired persons and to deny employment to desired persons; by denying to a minority of those operating private enterprises the same liberty of contract and the same freedom of association which are preserved for the majority, thus violating the constitutional guaranty of "equal protection of the laws" which is implicit in the fifth amendment. The bill violates the sixth amendment by denying trial by jury. It violates the ninth amendment by proposing that Congress usurp rights retained by the people. It violates the tenth amendment because Congress would assume a power reserved to the States. It violates the thirteenth amendment by imposing a form of involuntary servitude upon certain groups of employers.

If such a Federal law can be enacted and held constitutional, there is no constitutional protection against laws which, first, deprive employers of their rights, as is attempted in this bill, second, deprive employees of their rights, as is partially attempted in this bill, and, finally, deprive all persons of rights which heretofore have been regarded as permanently preserved and safeguarded by the guaranties of individual liberties set forth in the Constitution of the United States. If this bill should be enacted and held constitutional, we would see come to pass that which Washington warned against in his farewell address, namely, a change of government "by usurpation, * * * the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under this bill, suppose an employer did not want to employ a Communist—not that the Communist was trying to burn up anything, but was merely applying for a job—would the employer have to hire the Communist?

Mr. HILL. Under this bill, if the employer did not wish to employ the Communist because of his national origin or because of the fact that he denied that there is a God, he could not deny him employment on that basis. He certainly could not deny him employment on that basis, because he could not inquire into a man's religion. He could not inquire into the national origin of a man. If an employer should say, "I do not want to employ a man who denies that there is a God; I want to have work in my establishment only those who profess belief in and who have faith in Almighty God," he would be guilty of violating this act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not my good friend from Alabama confusing the original draft of the bill with the present draft of the bill?

Mr. HILL. I think not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The original draft of the bill declared that persons could not be discriminated against because of race, color, creed, or national origin. It was thought that the term "creed" might be interpreted to mean that one could not discriminate against a man because he believed in communism. However, if my good friend from Alabama will turn to page 2, section 2 (b), he will find that the following wording has been substituted:

> The Congress, therefore, declares that the right to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin—

And so forth.

Mr. HILL. It says "religion." Under that language the employer could not inquire into the question of what a man's religion was. He could not inquire into the question of whether or not he accepts or professes belief in God. He could not go into that question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Alabama is well aware of the fact that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, both of whom we properly respect, insisted that the Constitution, in the Bill of Rights, should prevent religious tests.

Mr. HILL. The Constitution provides that there shall be no religious tests for holding office. That is what it refers to. But the framers of the Constitution never thought in terms of an employer not being allowed to exercise his right to refuse to hire a man because that man denies there is a God, as we profess, acclaim, and accept God Almighty.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is a very dubious conclusion, if I may say so.

Mr. HILL. I am sorry the Senator does not agree with me, but I have given considerable thought and study to this bill, and I stand squarely on that proposition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator will find that Jefferson and Madison were very anxious that there should be no tests imposed, even in private employment. The Senator may remember that in connection with the founding of the University of Virginia Jefferson made that a provision in the hiring of members of the faculty. There was a good deal of dispute, for example, as to whether a man by the name of Thomas Cooper, as I remember, should be engaged on the first faculty of the University of Virginia. Jefferson was one of the sponsors of Cooper. So that I think the tradition of Jefferson is that holding or nonholding of religious views should not be used as a ground for discrimination, and that Jefferson applied that in private employment, as well as insisting that it should not be a test for public office.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator will find that nowhere in the voluminous writings of Thomas Jefferson did he in any way suggest anything that remotely smacked of or approached such an invasion of the rights of the employer in choosing those who would work for him and with him, who were to be his partners in his enterprise, in carrying on his business, as to deny the employer the right to choose his employees, or to say he did not want to employ an atheist, or someone who denied God Almighty, or did not profess to believe in the Almighty.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere with the flow of argument and the eloquence of the Senator from Alabama, whom I deeply respect, but is it not true that when the Constitution was formed and the Bill of Rights was adopted men were primarily afraid of governments as instruments which interfered with the liberties of individuals, and that therefore the protections originally adopted were protections of individuals against the usurping powers of the Government?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct, and that is what we are trying to do here today. We are trying to protect individuals against the exercise of a power by the Federal Government which the Federal Government does not at all possess. We are trying to protect individual citizens of the United States, employers, members of labor unions, members of labor associations, and others from unjust action by the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to go further in my question?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that at that time Jefferson and Madison, and the other great defenders of individual freedom, did not see the necessity of protecting individuals against the acts of other individuals which might interfere with their freedom, and is not the reason why they did not see this the fact that the frontiersmen, and the small handicraftsmen, whom they primarily represented, were able to earn their own living, and hence were not dependent upon others for employment? Therefore, Jefferson and Madison believed that if it were possible to protect individuals against the encroachments of governments they would be free, not seeing that a time would come when some persons would employ large numbers of other persons, and it might be necessary to protect individuals against other individuals.

Mr. HILL. Jefferson and Madison were both profound students of history, and they knew, even as we know today, that from the very beginning of time, if men were to have their freedom and to enjoy their natural rights, they must be protected not only from government, but from other individuals. Go back to the feudal era in history, go back even to the beginning of time, and there has always been this struggle caused by some individuals seeking to exploit and impose upon the rights and freedoms of other individuals. So the contest has been one, not only as between men and governments, but also as between men and men.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what I was trying to suggest to the Senator. In the period in which all white men, at least,

owned some property, Jefferson and Madison thought that if it was possible merely to protect men against government, they would have their living beneath their feet, and would be dependent upon no one, and therefore would not need protection against other men.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator suggest that when Madison made such a contribution to the writing of the Constitution that he became known as the "Father of the Constitution," he did not write the Constitution as he should have written it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madison was not able to get the Bill of Rights into the original Constitution.

Mr. HILL. But before the Constitution was ratified, it was understood that the first 10 amendments would be agreed to and become a part of the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that Mr. Madison was the author of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; with George Mason.

Mr. HILL. George Mason, I believe, wrote the bill of rights of Virginia.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois was talking about our Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, adopted by the First Congress, of which Mr. Madison was a member.

Mr. HILL. And he was their author.

Mr. CONNALLY. He was their author.

Mr. HILL. He introduced the resolution. It was Madison's resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course.

Mr. HILL. He submitted the first 10 amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not care, of course, to become involved in a discussion or dispute with my learned colleague from Texas on the real authorship of the Bill of Rights, but it is very fortunate that two great Virginians, both Madison and George Mason, worked out these great ideas.

What I was trying to say was that the absence of the protection of individuals against individuals in the Bill of Rights does not mean that such protection is not needed today. It means that it was not needed at the time of Madison and Mason, at least not by white men, because nearly all white men owned property. They were either small farmers or were handicraftsmen, and no one could deny them employment. But now, when the majority of the population are employees and a minority are employers, it becomes possible for one group of individuals, those who give out the jobs, to deny to others the opportunity of earning a living, by failing to employ them.

We have also broadened our scope so that we now have not merely white men, thank the Lord, but black men, as well. Therefore, what I hope my good friends will realize is that we who support this legislation are merely trying to put into the organic law of the land the protection of individuals, not merely against governments, but against other individuals who may deprive them of their freedom to work, and therefore of their chance for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is it the Senator's suggestion that we amend the Constitution by statute? Is that his idea?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; my suggestion is that we take advantage of the broad powers of the Constitution to make the law of the land conform with the aspirations of the American people.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois says he does not want to engage in any debate. I am not seeking a debate with the distinguished and able academician from Illinois. But let us assume there are two men, one of whom is an employer, and the other is in a different category. How can we protect the man here or the man there from the one over yonder if they let each other alone? If neither one bothers the other, if neither one interferes with the other's business, or disturbs him in his vocation or avocation, how can we protect him? This bill does not provide for that situation. It says, "You have to hunt out the fellow and give him a job. He is not bothering you and you are not bothering him, but if you don't give him a job, you are bothering him."

Mr. HILL. And "You have to give him back pay."

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes, all that sort of stuff. If we are going back to the days of Thomas Jefferson, did Thomas Jefferson indicate that an employer must go forth and drag in a man and give him a job, regardless of his religion or color, and all that kind of thing? I do not call that protecting anyone. No one is being protected at all.

Senators are hunting up some new difficulty for political reasons. The Senator from Illinois will not admit that, but I know it to be true. The bill is a political bill. I am surprised that the learned Senator from Illinois, with all his academic background, with all his reading of history, for the sake of a few little, nasty, soiled votes, little, dirty votes all covered up with slime and corruption—for the sake of a few of that kind of votes would advocate a bill such as this, which violates the very freedom he is talking about preserving, the freedom of a man to conduct his own business, the freedom of a man, so long as he does not hurt anyone else, to conduct his business in his own way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure that when my good friend, the Senator from Texas, reads his remarks in the RECORD tomorrow morning he will repent of the statement that the Senators from Illinois operate on the basis——

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say both of them. I am talking about this one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or that the junior Senator from Illinois is consumed by the desire to get a few slimy votes. I should like to correct the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator resent the word "slimy"? He is trying to get the votes, but they are not slimy; is that it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think Illinois votes are as clean as Texas votes; and the Senator from Illinois is no more assiduous in the pursuit of votes than the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas. He may be as assiduous, but he is no more assiduous.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not claim that the Illinois votes are any different from the Texas votes, but from what I see in the newspapers, if the Senator from Illinois is a candidate for the vice presidency, then the Texas votes will be welcome, whether they are slimy or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois only asks that at the end of his term of service he may be permitted to retire to private life, and that the judgment of the country may be "Let thy servant depart in peace."

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois will find it difficult to be allowed to retire in peace.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the only desire I have. I do not want to interfere with the Senator from Alabama, whom I respect and like very much, and if in the slightest degree my questioning interferes with the flow of his argument I will take my seat. But sometimes I think these colloquies back and forth are interesting in developing points. We are not merely talking to each other, we are in a sense talking to the country and talking for history.

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois, but I would not want him to do anything here that would in any way subject him to the charge of filibustering or of delaying, or anything of that kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want it be be understood that the Senator from Alabama is not filibustering. What we are trying to do is discuss the issue in a broad-minded fashion, without personal and without sectional bitterness.

I should like to ask a further question if I may. The Senator is doubtless aware of the fact that the present draft of the bill limits its coverage to employers having 50 or more employees. I believe that was pointed out earlier today on the floor by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It therefore exempts small employers, and it primarily refers to corporations. The head of such a company does not know the people beneath him, and an order from the head of the company, "Do not hire any Negroes, do not hire any Jews, do not hire any Catholics" can work great discrimination against innocent people. But the smaller employer would be freed from that law. I do not think that is sufficiently understood by Senators, particularly those from the South. The small employer is completely outside the provisions of the bill. Only the employer of

50 or more, which means the corporation, is affected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois, great constitutional lawyer that he is——

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I hasten to say that I am not a constitutional lawyer at all?

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, unconstitutional——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have never studied law. I make no pretension to be a constitutional lawyer. All I know is what I have read and heard, and if I am in error on any point I want to be corrected.

Mr. CONNALLY. I accept the statement. Then the Senator is an unconstitutional lawyer, if he prefers it that way. The Senator says that if an employer employs less than 50 employees he can do as he damn pleases. He can violate the Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Wait a minute now. I have the floor. He can violate the Constitution. He can deny the employees their rights. He can punish them. He can prosecute them. But if he has 51 employees, here is the law after him. "Bring him in here. We are going to see that he does not violate the Constitution." That is the philosophy of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HILL. And that is a denial of the equal protection under the law provided by the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may reply to our good friend, the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not good, but I am a friend.

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not a lawyer, but I believe the Senator from Texas is. The Senator from Texas therefore is doubtless aware of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Miller against Wilson, as I recall the name, handed down by Mr. Justice Hughes, who later became Chief Justice of the Court, but who was then serving his first term, in which he said it was possible for the law to proceed by degrees; that it was not necessary for a given law to encompass the entirety of the situation, but it could take a portion which had the greatest evil, and attack that; and its failure to be universal was not a reason why it should not be applied.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words if an investigator goes to an employer who employs less than 51, that employer is safe. He can say, "You cannot come in here. We do not want you. Get out." But if the same investigator goes next door to a concern who employs 51——

Mr. HILL. To a competitor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, to a competitor who employs 51 persons, he can say to him, "The law applies to you." Yes, that is a great comparison, is it not? Talk about the law proceeding by degrees. Yes, that is by degrees. An employer who employs 49 will be given one sort of a syringe treatment, and an employer who employs 51 will be treated in some other way. Cut his throat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Texas permit me to reply to him?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, I will permit the Senator to reply.

Mr. HILL. I should like to get along with my speech if I may, but I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. After this reply, I shall take my seat. The Senator from Texas has doubtless looked at the spectrum many times, and has seen one color move into another. It is difficult to mark the exact spot where blue ceases and violet begins. But a division has to be made somewhere. The question is, "Do you get that point on the whole accurately?" In the past we have been criticized because it was said that such a law as this would affect the small man. Now we exempt the small man, and my good friend—or my friend, rather, from Texas, says, "Now you get into trouble distinguishing between a firm which employs 49 and one which employs 50." That is a minor trouble compared with failing to make a distinction between a firm which employs 55 and one which employs only 3.

I apologize to my good friend—I say my "good" friend from Alabama, for interfering with him, and I say I shall now take my seat and listen to the remainder of his speech with great interest.

Mr. HILL. I am very happy to have had the Senator from Illinois interrupt me.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois said the Senator from Texas often looks through the spectrum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the spectrum.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I thought the Senator said through it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The spectrum is not a telescope. It is the flow of color.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the distinguished Senator spoke of a blue law and some other kind of a law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said it is difficult to find the exact spot where blue ceases and violet begins.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the Senator is advocating a blue law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not brought up in Connecticut.

Mr. CONNALLY. He is advocating a blue law. That is what it is exactly. He had that spectrum adjusted just properly so I could see the blue law, but the Senator could not.

Mr. President, I am through. I do not want to annoy the Senator from Alabama any more. I think he knows a great deal about the bill. He has studied it. He has it briefed accurately. But I will say that I am outraged by the language of the bill and its purpose and its background. What other country in the world has such a law as is contained in the bill? Does the Senator know of one?

Mr. HILL. Of course, as the Senator from Texas knows, in Russia a man does not even have to worry about securing a job. The Government says to the individual, "You shall work here. You shall live here." If he does not see fit to work where the Government says he should work he is taken to a concentration camp or to the mines the next morning.

Mr. CONNALLY. I had that in mind.

Mr. HILL. Russians who come here ask, "Do you mean to say that you have not placed every person in a particular job? Do you mean to say that an individual has to put on his hat, and go out and look for a job? That he must knock on a door and say, 'I want to come in and talk with you and see if you will give me a job.' In Russia he does not have to do that at all. He is assigned to a job, and the next morning he had better be there on time unless he wants a free ride to Siberia."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I had that in mind when I asked the question. These great statesmen advocating this bill are now taking their example largely from the Soviet Union. If a person does not have a job they propose to put him in a job. That is what those who favor this bill are attempting to do, in a way. If a man did not have a job, he would be told, "We are going to force someone to employ you and give you a good, fat job; and I want you to be sure to be at the ballot box when the election is held."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not wish to delay my colleague's speech; but a statement has been made by the Senator from Illinois—and it is often made—about a man who would not employ any Negroes or any Jews or any Catholics, and so forth.

As a matter of fact, would not this proposed law work just as well the other way? For instance, the Senator knows that in many places in our State an employer will employ only Negroes. I call attention to the fact that at Brewton, Ala., there is a great textile mill employing several hundred persons, all of whom are Negroes. That employer would not be able to do that under the provisions of this bill, if it were enacted; would he?

Mr. HILL. I was going to come to that matter in the course of my remarks. The Senator is absolutely correct about that.

As the Senator knows, in the southern States there are Negroes who own and operate banks and other businesses of all kinds, and they employ only Negroes in those companies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In fact, one of the largest insurance companies in the South employs only Negroes.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is located in Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And a similar company is located in North Carolina.

Mr. HILL. Yes. Only Negroes are employed by those institutions. I was going to discuss that matter a little later in my remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if this bill is passed, those who control those companies will be put in jail, will they not, I ask the Senator, if they continue to employ only Negroes?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I suppose under such circumstances they would have to go to jail, and the Government would have to take care of them and buy their meals until they were freed, I suppose.

Mr. President, reference has been made to Thomas Jefferson. We are maintaining that we should support and sustain the Constitution of the United States, and not take from the States or from the people powers which have never been delegated or given to the Government of the United States, but which expressly have been retained either for the States or for the people.

Thomas Jefferson called upon the people "to keep in all things within the pale of our constitutional powers, and cherish the Federal Union as the only rock of safety."

Andrew Jackson held that the action of the Federal Government should always be strictly confined to the sphere of its appropriate duties, and justly and forcibly urged that our Government is not to be maintained nor our liberties preserved "by invasions of the rights and powers of the several States."

Andrew Jackson said:

In thus attempting to make our Government strong, we make it weak.

Mr. President, I notice that the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] honors me with his presence in the Chamber. He is a devoted student of Andrew Jackson, of his works and career, and of the great, magnificent contribution which Andrew Jackson made to our Government. The Senator from Tennessee knows how truly the quotation I am now giving bespeaks the heartfelt feelings of Jackson and to what a large extent it comprised the chart and compass that Andrew Jackson used to guide his course as a great leader of our people.

He said:

Its true strength—

That is to say, the strength of the Federal Government—

consists in leaving individuals and States as much as possible to themselves; in making itself felt not in its power but in its beneficence; not in its control—

Not in reaching out and trying to control everyone—

but in its protection—

That is to say, in protecting the individual citizens and States—

not in binding the States more closely to the center—

In other words, not in trying to centralize everything in Washington—

but leaving each—

That is to say, each State—

to move unobstructed in a proper constitutional orbit.

Then, Mr. President, Woodrow Wilson, a great liberal, a great historian, and a great political philosopher, had the following to say:

The individual is indisputably the original, the first fact of liberty. Nations are made up of individuals, and the dealings of government with individuals are the ultimate and perfect test of its constitutional character. A man is not free through representative assemblies; he is free in his own action, in his own dealings with the persons and powers about him, or he is not free at all.

In other words, the employer is free to select his associates, his partners, so to speak, in his business, or else he is not free at all.

Woodrow Wilson went on to say:

There is no such thing as corporate liberty. Liberty belongs to the individual, or it does not exist.

Woodrow Wilson then said this:

Undoubtedly the powers of the Federal Government have grown, have even grown enormously, since the creation of the Government; and they have grown for the most part without amendment of the Constitution. But they have grown in almost every instance by a process which must be regarded as perfectly normal and legitimate.

By legitimate extension I mean extension which does not change the character of the Federal power, but only its items—which does not make new kinds but only new particulars of power. Facts change and are taken care of, but principles do not change.

Moral and social questions originally left to the several States for settlement can be drawn into the field of Federal authority only at the expense of the self-dependence and efficiency of the several communities of which our complex body politic is made up. Paternal morals, morals enforced by the judgment and choices of the central authority at Washington, do not and cannot create vital habits or methods of life unless sustained by local opinion and purpose, local prejudice and convenience unless supported by local convenience and interest; and only communities capable of taking care of themselves will, taken together, constitute a nation capable of vital action and control. You cannot atrophy the parts without atrophying the whole. Deliberate adding to the powers of the Federal Government both saps the legal morality upon which a sound constitutional system must rest, and deprives the Federal structure as a whole of vitality. It is the alchemy of decay.

Centralization is not vitalization. Moralization is by life, not by statute; by the interior impulse and experience of communities, not by fostering legislation which is merely the abstraction of an experience which may belong to a nation as a whole or to many parts of it without having yet touched the thought of the rest anywhere to the quick. The object of our Federal system is to bring the understandings of constitutional government home to the people of every part of the Nation, to make them part of their consciousness as they go about their daily tasks. If we cannot successfully effect its adjustments by the nice local adaptations of our older practice, we have failed as constitutional statesmen.

Mr. President, those are the words of Woodrow Wilson.

The Supreme Court of the United States, as we know, is the final arbiter of the constitutionality of laws enacted by Congress, and through the years the Court has held the line between the Federal powers delegated to Congress and those powers retained by the States and the people.

The Supreme Court has given its approval to cooperative effort by the State and National Governments for carrying out public purposes common to both, which neither could fully achieve without the cooperation of the other. These common concerns have grown broader and more complex with the progress of science, invention, and knowledge.

The Constitution has proved itself flexible and adaptable to the needs and problems of a growing, changing Nation. But the powers of the States do not ebb and flow according to the times we live in. Except as the Constitution may be amended with the approval of the States, the Federal Government acquires no new powers and the powers of the States are not lessened.

The Supreme Court has ruled uniformly that any power to create a so-called civil right, unless specifically delegated to the United States by the Constitution, has been reserved to the separate States. My right to say that I have a little business employing 55 people and that I prefer to employ American citizens rather than nazified Germans, or that I will take a Tennessean in preference to a Japanese, follows my right of free speech. That is what the Constitution means, in the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing the right of free speech. The Supreme Court has been steadfast in its defense of freedom of religion, freedom of opinion, freedom of association, and that greatest of all rights, the right which the late Justice Brandeis, one of the great liberals of his time, called "the right to be let alone."

It is not necessary, certainly at this late hour of the day, to dig into the past to find decisions of the Supreme Court which mark out the limitations upon the power of Congress and hold such laws as S. 1728 to be unconstitutional. Recent decisions of the Supreme Court are consistent with earlier decisions. No change of time or condition or circumstance has altered the Court's fundamental concept of the rights of the individual or of the demarcation between Federal and State powers.

The Court has drawn upon the language of earlier decisions to reaffirm its reasoning. In *Hodges* v. *The United States* (203 U. S. 1), the Court in 1906 quoted and gave new vigor to the following language from Justice Miller's decision in the famous Slaughterhouse cases of 1873:

With these decisions, and many others that might be cited, before us, it is vain to contend that the Federal Constitution secures to a citizen of the United States the right to work at a given occupation or particular calling free from injury, oppression, or interference by individual citizens.

Even though such right be a natural or inalienable right, the duty of protecting the citizen in the enjoyment of such right free from individual interference rests alone with the State.

That means one of the sovereign States of the 48 States.

In the case of *United States* v. *Wheeler* (254 U. S. 281), the Court in 1920 demonstrated the continuity of its judgment and the steadfastness of its position by turning again to the Slaughterhouse decision and quoting:

It would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citations of authority that, up to the adoption of the recent amendments, no claim or pretense was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection, beyond the very few express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposed upon the States—such, for instance, as the prohibition against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts. But, with the exception of these and a few other restrictions, the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative power of the States, and without that of the Federal Government.

And now we come to the case of *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U. S. 1), which the Supreme Court decided on May 3, 1948. The decision, as we know, involved restrictive covenants designed to exclude minority groups from the ownership or occupancy of real property. The opinion of the Court was written by Chief Justice Vinson. After referring to the case of *Corrigan* v. *Buckley*, Chief Justice Vinson said the case could present no issues under the fourteenth amendment, and declared "that amendment by its terms applies only to the States." The Chief Justice then further declared:

It cannot be doubted that among the civil rights intended to be protected from discriminatory State action by the fourteenth amendment are the rights to acquire, enjoy, own, and dispose of property. Equality in the enjoyment of property rights was regarded by the framers of that amendment as an essential precondition to the realization of other basic civil rights and liberties which the amendment was intended to guarantee.

Since the decision of this Court in the *Civil Rights Cases* (109 U. S. C. 3 (1883)), the principle has become firmly embedded in our constitutional law that the action inhibited by the first section of the fourteenth amendment is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the States.

That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminatory or wrongful.

We recall, Mr. President, the statement of Mr. Justice Brandeis in the case of *Senn v. Tile Layers Protective Union* (reported in 301 U. S. 468):

A hoped-for job is not property guaranteed by the Constitution.

In 1943, in the case of *West Virginia Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 638), the Court declared:

The very purpose of a bill of rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of public controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officially to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights, may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections.

They depend on no votes, whether they be votes in the United States Senate or votes back home, unless they are votes on a proposal to change or amend the Constitution of the United States itself, as prescribed and provided for in that document.

But freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order. If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein. If there are any circumstances which permit an exception, they do not now occur to us.

In the recent case of *Douglas* v. *City of Jeanette* (319 U. S. 157) in 1943, the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Jackson, declared:

In my view the first amendment assures the broadest tolerable exercise of free speech, free press, and free assembly, not merely for religious purposes, but for political, economic, scientific, news, or informational ends as well.

There are many opinions of the Supreme Court which might be cited, clearly demonstrating that the proposed act flings itself into the very teeth of the Constitution. It is enough to quote here one final passage from an opinion by one of the great liberals of our time, Mr. Justice Brandeis, who declared:

The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government—the right to be let alone, the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.

It will be argued, of course, that the power of the Federal Government to regulate interstate and foreign commerce provides a constitutional basis for the proposed law. But civil rights are rights "assured to every member of a well-regulated community." And the word "civil" is defined as "pertaining to the whole body of citizens."

In this light, the bill reveals its inadequacies so quickly as to be guilty almost of indecent exposure.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. How long does the Senator think it will take him to conclude his speech?

Mr. HILL. I am not exactly sure. A great many questions have been asked me, and there were numerous interruptions in the very beginning. If the Senator from Illinois so desires, as soon as I complete my remarks I shall be very happy to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. LUCAS. How long will it take the Senator to conclude?

Mr. HILL. To reach that point?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. If there are no further interruptions, I should think it would take perhaps 20 minutes or half an hour. The Senator from Alabama will be glad to move to take a recess as soon as he concludes. I will say to my distinguished friend from Illinois that earlier today an order was entered, on a unanimous-consent request of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], that he be recognized the first thing tomorrow to address the Senate.

Mr. President, section 2 (b) undertakes to create a civil right for "all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States." And section 3 (b) promptly limits the application of the act to persons "engaged in commerce or in objectives affecting commerce," and to employers employing more than 50 individuals.

The effort to use the commerce power as the authority for legislation to establish a civil right deserves the condemnation and abrupt dismissal expressed in a dissenting opinion of the late Justice Holmes when he said: "I should regard calling such a law a regulation of commerce as a mere pretense."

In the same opinion, reported in 193 U. S. 197, Justice Holmes made this comment on legislation which attempted "to reconstruct society":

I am not concerned with the wisdom of such an attempt, but I believe that Congress was not entrusted by the Constitution with the power to make it and I am deeply persuaded that it has not tried.

In the case of *U. S.* v. *Joint Traffic Association* (171 U. S. 505), the Court discussed the limitation placed by the Constitution as a whole on the rights growing out of the commerce clause. The Court declared:

The power to regulate commerce has no limitation other than those proscribed in the Constitution. The power, however, does not carry with it the right to destroy or impair those limitations and guaranties which are also placed in the Constitution or in any of the amendments to that instrument.

Again to quote Mr. Justice Holmes, I cite his apt statement in the case of *Davis* v. *Mills* (194 U. S. 451):

Constitutions are intended to preserve practical and substantial rights, not to maintain theories.

It is significant that the States themselves, even though they hold the power to set up in their respective jurisdictions fair employment practice commissions such as that proposed in S. 1728, have been wary of exercising their power. Twelve States have rejected FEPC bills in their legislatures or have seen the bills die because legislative committees refused to take action. All of these 12 States lie outside the South and include Illinois, Arizona, Montana, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Utah, Indiana, California, Delaware, Michigan, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, we recall that when a popular referendum on the question was

held in California, the vote was 2 to 1 against the establishment of an FEPC commission in that State. The vote was 2 to 1 against the proposal in every county in California.

Senate bill 1728 opens with a long and wordy declaration of policy and what purports to be findings of fact. The findings of fact are not factual and the declaration of policy is not conclusive as to the need or propriety or constitutionality of the bill. The declaration and findings are indeed a confession of the weakness of the bill. They seek to prop up the bill with words and to hide its evil character behind rhetoric.

The statement that discrimination in exercising the rights and obligations of an employer constitutes infringements upon the American principle of freedom and equality of opportunity is directly opposed to the belief that liberty and equality of opportunity require freedom in an employer to make a discriminating choice of employees and freedom in the employee to make a choice of an employer. Liberty of contract, freedom of association, and religious freedom are established constitutional principles. These freedoms are subject only to such limitations as are absolutely necessary to protect the good order of society, and to prevent injury to others and undue restrictions upon the freedom of others.

The statement that discrimination operates to force large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living is, to say the least of it, highly debatable. It is difficult to see that the forced employment of one person in place of another can improve the standard of living of the displaced person. In fact, this bill might well be captioned, "A bill to create displaced persons in the United States of America."

The statement that discrimination does deprive the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production is essentially an attack upon the theory of a free, competitive economy. So long as competition is the rule of business, the most successful enterprises will be those utilizing the services of the most capable persons who can be organized to work cooperatively to advance common interests. To insist that the Government shall take an important and perhaps determining hand in the matter of how and what employees shall be selected, and thus restrict competition and the competitive judgment of the managers of private enterprise, is to undermine the very foundations of private enterprise and of a competitive system.

The declaration of policy is simply an attempted oratorical justification of legislation based on assumptions that cannot be regarded as findings of fact.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am certain that the distinguished Senator from Alabama realizes that certainly in the South there are many contractors and other employers who prefer to hire only colored people, feeling probably that colored people work more completely in unison and harmony by reason of the fact that they are of the same race, than would be the case if the employer were to hire colored and white. An employer probably would feel that by hiring only members of one race he would get greater cooperation.

Mr. HILL. He would get better cooperation. He would get better teamwork. Therefore, he would get better production. That is what all of us seek under our competitive enterprise system, namely, to get the best we can through our free and competitive American system.

Mr. LONG. Rather than promoting better production, this type of legislation would hinder or impede better teamwork and better production, because of the restriction on individual employers.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. He has illustrated what is true not only in the South but in every section of the country. An employer hires people of the same religion, of the same nationality, or of the same national origin, because he believes that he gets better teamwork by the adoption of such a policy of employment. He gets better teamwork, he gets better cooperative effort and, therefore, greater production. He reaches his goal quicker and with less cost, and in a more efficient manner. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let us consider the ways in which this bill would do violence to the exercise of opinion and personal judgment, which we hold essential to our American way of life.

We hear a lot of talk today about freedom. The word "freedom" expresses two thoughts: "freedom to" and "freedom from." Freedom to do something is a liberty. Freedom from something is an immunity.

Thomas Jefferson when he urged that the first 10 amendments be added to the Constitution before it should be ratified by the States, and George Mason, when he wrote those amendments as the Bill of Rights, were chiefly concerned with preserving and insuring the individual's immunities from arbitrary interference by government.

The Bill of Rights provides justice for the individual against other individuals, but it is chiefly concerned with providing what Woodrow Wilson called "justice against the Government itself."

Freedom to choose one's associates is a fundamental right reserved to the individual. And an integral part of that right is freedom from compulsion to associate.

Congress has never been delegated any power to interfere with freedom of association except where abuse of this freedom results in a violation of the laws which Congress has the power to enact and enforce.

Under section 5 (a) of S. 1728 it is made unlawful for an employer "to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin."

This means that an employer cannot freely express by speech or advertisement the views that other citizens are free to express as to the desirability of hiring or promoting an individual, if he indicates a preference for persons of a particular race, color, religion, or national origin; or if he indicates a preference against persons of a particular race, color, religion, or national origin. Yet if there is any one subject upon which free men and women have the right to express their opinions, it is upon matters involving race, color, religion, or national origin.

The people of the United States have fought a terrible war with the Japanese, which was begun in treachery and carried on with horrible brutality. It may be that lofty idealism would require that all Americans immediately embrace the Japanese as brothers as soon as they laid down their arms and ceased to torture our friends and relatives. But men and women have feelings and free men and women can express those feelings. To proclaim by Federal law that no employer can express himself anywhere in speech or print in dislike of association with Japanese without making himself liable to the charge that he has refused to employ Japanese is an outrageous invasion of personal right to which other citizens are not subjected.

Something has been said about our Jewish friends. The survivors of Dachau and Buchenwald are not expected to maintain equanimity and objectivity regarding their Nazi oppressors. No one regards it as unwarranted for Jews to dislike association with nazified Germans or with other racial or religious groups that have persecuted them.

To millions of people association with their fellow religious believers may be entirely acceptable regardless of whether they are Catholics or Protestants or Jews, while association with outspoken atheists would be most offensive.

S. 1728 is an attempt to substitute the judgment of a political majority for the individual judgment of an employer as to those persons with whom he wishes to associate himself in the activities of a private business enterprise.

It is a form of political tyranny over a minority, and, in the words of James Otis:

> Tyranny of all kinds is to be abhorred whether it is in the hands of one, or of the few, or of the many.

Even if opinions be considered wrong or evil or prejudiced, the right of expression must remain. In the recent case of *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut* (310 U. S. 296), the Supreme Court declared:

> In the realm of religious faith and in that of political belief sharp differences arise. In both fields the tenets of one man may seem the rankest error to his neighbor, but the people of this Nation have ordained in the light of history that, in spite of the probability of excesses and abuses, these liberties are in the long view essential to enlightened opinion and right conduct on the part of the citizens of a democracy.

Under our Constitution it has never been seriously questioned that a man has the right to set himself up in business,

and to select his own employees on the basis of such qualifications as he might within his own free and uncontrolled discretion consider advantageous to the undertaking. This personal freedom of contract is basic to the free-enterprise system and to the whole American concept of individual freedom.

Yet S. 1728 violates the liberty of contract guaranteed in the Constitution by compelling the making of contracts.

The far-reaching character of this provision of S. 1728 is given its true perspective when we consider that laws that have been enacted governing the form or substance of contracts voluntarily entered into; that laws make illegal certain types of contracts; that the labor laws require collective bargaining as a method of arriving at contracts and affect the scope of contracts. But the right of contract is left free to be exercised between voluntary parties.

S. 1728 would interfere with the free management of capital. The bill purports to give redress to those who do not get jobs or who lose jobs simply because of their minority position. But actually S. 1728 is a basic interference with the exercise of business judgment and the free choice of associates by an employee.

What principle is invoked to justify this governmental interference? I can best answer by quoting from the weekly publication, Human Events:

> The principle is implicit; that society has a stake in capital. The owner cannot claim absolute ownership because it is reasoned that capital is a social product, and the State may therefore intervene in its management. The alleged right of the State, in designating the associates of the capital-owner, rests on the socialistic notion of the collective character of capital. The FEPC proposal then, is merely another denial of the right of private property, another evidence of how far Marxist notions have permeated our thinking.
>
> Putting theory aside, as a practical matter the free exercise of judgment in the selection of its operatives is essential to the best use of capital, and therefore in the best interest of society as a whole.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if it is not true that, in addition to the necessity of a good manager of an enterprise selecting qualified persons, it is also highly necessary for a good executive to be able to pick employees, associates and fellow workers who can work together sympathetically and cooperatively with others? Frequently the quality which marks a good executive and a prosperous and succesful business, in contrast to one which does not succeed, is the ability not only to choose well-qualified persons to be employees, but to choose those who can work together cooperatively, those who like each other, under a management where they will all be happy, and bring out the kind of results which will make the business prosperous?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. In other words, what the Senator has so well said is that the secret of good management is often the ability to pick the winning team. There is nothing that contributes more to the success of a business or an industry than the capacity of the heads of the business or industry to pick people who will work, cooperate, and play together as a team, so as to get the maximum results from those employed. I continue the quotation from Human Events:

> When a capital-owner employs a helper he is entrusting capital to the care of the latter. The lowliest member of the crew has power to do harm to these instruments of production. Incompetence or dishonesty may cause losses.

Then it asks these questions:

> Does society benefit from inefficiency? Does it make allowances for incompetence? On the contrary, it coldly rejects the marginal producer by refusing him its custom. Since society is thus arbitrary in its market selectivity, it has no right to interfere in the management of production. Enterprise can serve only when it is free.

Free, as the Senator from Florida has so well stated, to select the best people, so that he will get the best possible results, so that he will not be a marginal producer and find himself out of the business and in the bankruptcy court.

But under S. 1728, enterprise is not free. The employer is subject to a Commission having wide powers of rule making, investigation, and the issuance of cease-and-desist orders. The right of trial by jury is denied and judicial review is provided with a clearly recognized inferential power to punish contempt of court orders.

The right of trial by jury is one of the individual citizen's most precious protections against the arbitrary action of government. If time permitted I could trace the whole history of the right of trial by jury.

The right of trial by jury is one of the individual citizen's most precious protections against the arbitrary action of government. We can trace the development of trial by jury back through the Anglo-Saxons of England to the Teutonic tribes of the pre-Christian era. The Magna Carta, first great written constitution of man's individual rights, assured trial by jury in chapter 29, which declares:

> No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized of his freehold or liberties or free customs, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any way destroyed; nor shall we go upon him, nor send upon him, but by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

One of the greatest speeches on the subject was made by the great lawyer from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Jeremiah S. Black, before the Supreme Court in 1866, in the famous case of ex parte Milligan, which I am sure the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] well remember. The question in that case was whether three men convicted and sentenced to death by a military commission during the War Between the States could be tried and convicted by a military commission and denied their right to be tried by a jury of their peers. Mr. Black said:

> I do not assert that the jury trial is an infallible mode of ascertaining truth. Like everything human, it has its imperfections. I only say, that it is the best protection for innocence and the surest mode of punishing guilt that has yet been discovered. It has borne the test of a longer experience, and borne it better, than any other legal institution that ever existed among men. England owes more of her freedom, her grandeur, and her prosperity to that than to all other causes put together. It has had the approbation not only of those who lived under it, but of great thinkers who looked at it calmly from a distance, and judged it impartially. Montesquieu and De Tocqueville speak of it with an admiration as rapturous as Coke and Blackstone. No people ever adopted it once and were afterward willing to part with it.
>
> Those colonists of this country who came from the British Islands brought this institution with them, and they regarded it as the most precious part of their inheritance. The immigrants from other places where trial by jury did not exist, became equally attached to it as soon as they understood what it was. There was no subject upon which all the inhabitants of the country were more perfectly unanimous than they were in their determination to maintain this great right unimpaired.
>
> If the men who fought our revolutionary contest, when they came to frame a government for themselves and their posterity, had failed to insert a provision making the trial by jury perpetual and universal, they would have covered themselves all over with infamy as with a garment; for they would have proved themselves basely recreant to the principles of that very liberty of which they professed to be the special champions. But they were guilty of no such treachery. They not only took care of the trial by jury, but they regulated every step to be taken in a criminal trial. They knew very well that no people could be free under a government which had the power to punish without restraint.
>
> Hamilton expressed in the Federalist the universal sentiment of his time, when he said that the arbitrary power of conviction and punishment for pretended offenses had been the great engine of despotism in all ages and all countries. The existence of such power is utterly incompatible with freedom.
>
> I prove my right to a trial by jury just as I would prove my title to an estate if I held in my hand a solemn deed conveying it to me, coupled with undeniable evidence of long and undisturbed possession under and according to the deed. There is the charter by which we claim to hold it. It is called the Constitution of the United States. It is signed by the sacred name of George Washington, and by 39 other names, only less illustrious than his. They represented every independent State then upon this continent, and each State afterwards ratified their work by a separate convention of its own people. Every State that subsequently came in acknowledged that this was the great standard by which their rights were to be measured. Every man who has ever held office in the country from that time to this, has taken an oath that he would support and sustain it through good report and through evil.

Mr. President, our history of encouragement to the men and women who give employment has been one of the compelling reasons for our unparalleled industrial success which again and again has served our Nation so well in time of need.

But under the bill every act of the employer or any of his subordinates in hiring, discharging, promoting, or otherwise regulating conditions of employment is subject to complaint and investigation on the grounds of discrimination.

The inquiries and investigations directed by the bill would vex and harass business to the point where orderly plant management and efficiency would be impossible. The small-business man, already overburdened, would encounter new regulations, investigations, hearings, and litigation far beyond his time, his energy, or his finances.

We would find ourselves in that circumstance of which the Declaration of Independence complained, with "swarms of officers to harass our people."

In the words of James Otis, of Massachusetts, in his celebrated attack on the writs of assistance of 1765, giving unlimited authority of search and seizure, we would be subjected to "power that places the liberty of every man in the power of every petty officer."

Labor organizations would be subject to interference and supervision of their internal affairs. And the law which tells the employer who his workers shall be today, can be reversed and the worker told who his employer shall be tomorrow and where and at what wages.

If S. 1728 becomes law, employment and promotion based on merit would be superseded by governmental decree and the worker would be moved to look with distrust and suspicion on his fellow workers. The worker could not feel secure in his job.

Suppose a plant employs 50 men. Ten of them can be identified with a minority group. If the employer has to lay off 8 men, would he be likely to discharge any of the 10 men who could claim discrimination—whether it existed or not—who could take the case to the Commission and into the courts, causing the employer expense and possible punishment? We know that the natural thing for the employer to do would be to avoid trouble and lay off eight of the average Americans who could not claim discrimination, even if they were better workmen than the employees who belonged to a minority group. We can picture the resulting damage to the efficiency of management and to the morale and productivity of the workers in that plant.

The bill makes it unlawful not only to discharge an existing employee and to refuse to hire a person but also to discriminate against the employee "with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment." Under this language, the privilege of promotion is also subject to Government regulation.

The right of an employer to exercise his best judgment in the matter of promotion is an essential feature of managerial control. By contract with a labor organization or with an individual, management may create in advance, through seniority rules, for example, a right to promotion. In these cases management has presumably been free to make or not to make the contract. Under S. 1728, managerial discretion in promotions would be subordinated to the judgment of a Federal agent.

The bill prohibits the utilization of any employment agency, school, labor organization, or any other source of employees which discriminates against persons because of race, religion, color, or national origin. This would mean that any specialized agency or school would be excluded unless the operators of the agency or school were able to certify not only that their doors were wide open but that the institutions were not conducted in a way to discourage the entrance of all races and religions.

The question would arise as to whether Negro schools and colleges would be permitted to recommend their students or graduates. They might claim, as in the case of Howard University, that they had some white students. But, being recognized as a predominantly Negro school, would it not be contended that they were in reality discriminatory?

Then comes the question as to whether Catholic schools, or Baptist schools, or Methodist schools, would also be regarded as discriminatory, even if they permitted non-Catholics or non-Baptists, or non-Methodists to enter. Or would a school making a particular appeal to persons of one national origin be regarded as discriminatory? For example, an Italian or Polish school to train immigrants not speaking English would be clearly discriminatory—as would any agency to train or find jobs for displaced Jews from overseas.

Section 6 of the proposed act provides for rule making. We know that the issuance of rules and regulations by a commission is law making by the executive branch, under the authority delegated by Congress. But where Congress so obviously has no power to take the action proposed in S. 1728, Congress has no power which it can delegate to a rule-making commission.

And what kind of rules could we expect this commission to prescribe?

If we look at the history of the New York statute we can judge what such a commission would do. Following the precedent in New York it would rule that one cannot mention color or religion in advertising for employees, that one cannot ask for the photograph of an applicant, one cannot ask his birthplace, one cannot ask his original name, one cannot ask what holidays he celebrates. We would see a host of restrictions upon the rights of free speech and free opinion, all under the guise of rule and regulation.

Another aspect of the proposed legislation which has received far too little attention is the fact that if enacted, S. 1728 would be a constant invitation to sabotage. The bill applies to the Federal Government and its instrumentalities as well as to private business. The bill would make it unlawful to discriminate in Federal employment against any job applicant because of his national origin or ancestry. The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, would be precluded from asking an applicant any question as to where he was born, whether he is a naturalized or native-born citizen, what his race is, or even what his original name was.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the next logical step would be to deny the FBI the right to dig into such facts.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the next logical step would be to deny that right to the FBI. Surely it would be.

Under Senate bill 1728 it would be unlawful to request an applicant to produce his naturalization or first papers. Inquiry could not be made as to the racial or religious organizations to which he belongs.

The same situation would prevail in the case of private industry engaged in production for national defense. A company manufacturing the most secret equipment for the armed services would be precluded from securing the very information most likely to throw light upon a job applicant's probable loyalties.

The bill authorizes the creation of local conciliation councils, which could be employed by the Commission to "study instances of discrimination"—in plain language, this means to investigate—and to make recommendations of "procedures in general and in specific instances." In plain language, this means to instigate Commission action. The members of these volunteer councils would serve without pay, but would be entitled to expenses, including the expense of "technical and clerical assistance."

The only jobs created by the bill are jobs in the Government; that is, jobs in the Commission itself. We hear much said about the bill providing persons with jobs. Not one single job would be created by the bill anywhere in the American economy. There would simply be a great many jobs created in the Commission itself and in the advisory councils and local councils, and the jobs of investigators of all sorts and kinds.

All this means that the Commission could finance investigation by volunteer organizations and could create squads of volunteer investigators to stir up and intensify controversies and thereby inevitably promote the racial and religious prejudices and antagonisms which the Commission ostensibly would be organized to allay.

The provisions of the bill would open the way for a propaganda agency, supplied with funds from the Public Treasury, which could easily become the tool of partisan political expediency and sectional interests.

Such a Government Commission might find itself allied with and supporting pressure groups which are completely free from Goverment control. A greater danger is that the Commission, instead of using these groups, might find itself used by them.

Mr. President, it has long been considered that involuntary servitude is something that can be suffered only by an employee. However, involuntary servitude may be of many varieties. A man who accepts obligations to another man is putting himself in the servitude of that

man. A law which says that one man can be compelled, on penalty of paying back pay, on penalty of contempt of court, to hire another man whom he does not wish to hire, means that the first man is compelled by law to make a contract to pay the second man wages, to furnish him with tools, to accept, under the penalty of the law, obligations that the employer accepts voluntarily toward other employees. The employer thus would be forced into a servitude to the employee from a minority group.

Senate bill 1728, and other bills like it, are attempts to write sectional legislation. Senate bill 1728 is an attempt upon the part of States practically free from the race problem to sit in harsh judgment upon their sister States where the problem is always heavy and sometimes acute. Senate bill 1728 is a prohibition bill and a force bill. The Nation has not had happy experience in attempting to legislate social traditions and popular customs.

The bill would not help those it professes to help. Instead, it would magnify antagonisms and would multiply conflicts. It would obstruct the solving of the South's problems in the only way those problems can be solved—by the people of the South. It would impair the understanding and harmony for which most southerners are working so earnestly and which history shows we are achieving in large measure.

Mr. President, some 10 years ago the late Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, which is not a Southern State, declared on the floor of the Senate:

> The southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history dealing with a problem of similar nature.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, one of the country's leading newspapers, recently reported the advancement the Negro has made in the South during the past 10 years. I now quote from the Courier-Journal:

> The number of Negro high-school graduates has doubled. Illiteracy has been all but ended among Negroes between 14 and 24 years. The Negro's average income has nearly tripled, from $500 to $1,400 a year. The death rate has fallen from 13.9 to 11.4 per thousand. Fifty years ago it was three times that much. Migration has taken Negroes from farm-laborers' shacks to cities, and the proportion living in the South has fallen from 74.4 to 63.5 percent.
>
> In the light of these developments, it becomes inevitable that most goals of Negro groups will be reached as a process of natural growth. Legislation becomes secondary, a mere token. Even if legislation were fully accomplished, the chances are that it would be of little effect compared to the natural, dynamic influence of growth, shifts, and improvement of fitness and status in every respect.

No, Mr. President, it is not "token legislation" that will improve the lot of the Negro and other minority groups. It is constructive, affirmative programs—education, hospitals and health centers, public health and prevention of disease, decent homes and housing on the farm and in the city, adequate wages and economic security under our American free-enterprice system.

These are the substance. Senate bill 1728 is the shadow.

Mr. President, I warn against the evils of this bill. It is a snare for those who are zealous but ignorant, well-meaning but without understanding. It is a delusion for those who seek in it the answer to their hopes and needs.

This bill, which seeks to legislate tolerance, is itself pregnant with prejudice and freighted with controversy.

Andrew Johnson, who was more sorely beset than any other man with the passions and emotions, the hysteria and divisions aroused by so-called civil-rights bills, called such measures as this one "legislation which, looking solely to the attainment of political ends, fails to consider the rights it trangresses, the law it violates, or the institution it imperils."

The Supreme Court saw the danger of "slight deviations from legal modes of procedure," and sounded a warning through Mr. Justice Bradley in the case of Boyd against United States, as follows:

> It may be that it is the obnoxious thing in its mildest and least repulsive form, but illegitimate and unconstitutional practices get their first footing in that way, namely, by silent approaches and slight deviations from legal modes of procedure. This can only be obviated by adhering to the rule that constitutional provisions for the security and property should be liberally construed. A close and literal construction deprives them of half their efficacy, and leads to gradual depreciation of the right, as if it consisted more in sound that in substance. It is the duty of courts to be watchful for the constitutional rights of the citizen, and against any stealthy encroachments thereon. Their motto should be obsta principiis (withstand beginnings). We have no doubt that the legislative body is actuated by the same motives; but the vast accumulation of public business brought before it sometimes prevents it, on a first presentation, from noticing objections which become developed by time and the practical application of the objectionable law.

More recently the great Mr. Justice Brandeis cautioned:

> Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding.

Mr. President, Senate bill 1728 carries within it so many seeds of dissension that it is foredoomed to failure. Its enactment would impair and undermine the very foundations of our economic strength—the strength upon which rest our security and our happiness. Its enactment would inevitably undermine established social patterns based on law and custom. Its enactment would disrupt and defeat the progress being made by the States in the area of human relations. Its enactment would do immeasurable harm to the cause of improved race relations. The attempted administration of the proposed bill would be an incalculable mischief.

In the end the bill would be nullified by concerted violation, repealed by an indignant Congress, or stricken down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAGNUSON, because of official business, was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next 10 days.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 9 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Earl Dallam Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Archibald S. Alexander.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we are calling upon Thy great and holy name, compelled by needs which Thou alone canst supply and constrained by a love which is always seeking us and will never let us go.

May we now give ourselves unto Thee in wholehearted surrender and service, which are the only returns we can make for Thy goodness and loving kindness.

Grant that daily we may draw nearer unto Thee for then we shall not be far from one another; then in that closer fellowship we shall find our hearts stirred with longings to serve our generation according to Thy holy will.

Help us to understand that in the communion and companionship of Thy nearer presence we shall find the secret of carrying on courageously and hopefully and possess that joy and peace which the world can neither give nor take away.

To Thy name through Christ we ascribe the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, vacating the special order granted him to address the House for 30 minutes today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow and Thursday, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

POINT OF ORDER AS TO ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not proceeding in the regular order because under section 205a of the Reorganization Act, which is Public Law 109 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, any Member of the House is privileged, and this is a highly privileged motion, to make the motion that the House proceed to the consideration of House Resolution 516.

The gentleman from Michigan being on his feet to present this highly privileged motion, the regular order is that he be recognized for that purpose that the motion be entertained and the question put before the House, and my motion is that the House proceed to the consideration of House Resolution 516.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the resolution disapproving one of the reorganization plans?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right, House Resolution 516 disapproving plan No. 12.

And, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in connection with the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, 1950, as shown at page 4835 of the daily RECORD of that day, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asked and received unanimous consent that the appropriation bill should have the right-of-way over other privileged business under the rules until disposition, with the exception of conference reports. Therefore, I believe the regular order would be to proceed with the further consideration of H. R. 7786.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the RECORD would speak for itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is glad to hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the answer to that argument is that on the 3d of April the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asked unanimous consent "that time for general debate be equally divided, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself [Mr. CANNON]; that debate be confined to the bill and that following the reading of the first chapter of the bill, not to exceed 2 hours of general debate be had before the reading of each subsequent chapter, one-half to be controlled by the chairman and one-half by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee in charge of the chapter."

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] cites page 4835 of the daily RECORD of April 5, which reads as follows:

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the general appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951 have right-of-way over all other privileged business under the rules until disposition, with the exception of conference reports.

Still later and on April 6, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asked unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected. His request was as follows—pages 4976–4977 of the daily RECORD:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on page 4835 of the RECORD of yesterday, the first column carrying the special order made by the House last night reads that the general appropriation bill shall be a special order privileged above all other business of the House under the rule until disposition. The order made was until final disposition. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected to conform with the proceedings on the floor of the House yesterday.

There was no objection.

That would all be very well were it not for the fact that subsequent to that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has yielded, or failed to insist upon the observance of the unanimous-consent requests, and that the House has repeatedly proceeded to consider other business, in violation of the unanimous-consent requests.

Now, if it is to be the rule that a Member of the House can obtain unanimous consent for the consideration of one measure and that thereafter it rests in his discretion as to what legislative business is to be considered by the House, we get into the position where a Member from the floor—not the Speaker, not the majority leader—is controlling the legislative program.

Furthermore, while appropriation bills have a privileged status, but under the subsequent rule of the House, adopted in the reorganization bill, a motion to consider a resolution is highly privileged. Certainly that has priority over this ordinary privilege or special privilege which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] secured.

How can unanimous consent secured by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] on either the 3d, the 5th, or the 6th of April, even though the corrected request states "that the general appropriation bill shall be a special order privileged above all other business of the House under the rule until final disposition," have priority over Public Law No. 109, Eighty-first Congress, when, under title II, we find the following:

SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but aplpicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

* * * * *

SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

If, for technical reasons, the Speaker holds that, because of the unanimous-consent request, this highly privileged motion is not technically in order and that the unanimous-consent granted has not, because of the consideration of other legislation, been waived, and that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] can, by giving or withholding his consent to waive the unanimous-consent request, determine what legislation shall be considered by the House until there is a final disposition of the general appropriation bill—and that would include conference reports on that bill—the legislative program of the House is at the mercy, within the discretion of, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who can keep us sitting here, and at his discretion permit us to consider or not to consider, other bills.

That situation would seem to be an absurdity.

Moreover, it is contrary to the legislative intent when Public Law 109 was enacted.

Permit me to call the Speaker's attention to the fact that when we were considering the basic reorganization bill, Members of the House and our constituents, the people of this country, were assured that if we would grant to the President the power to send down plans affecting the executive departments, that each legislative branch of the Government should have the right, and it is in the debate—and I ask unanimous consent now to include those excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will read those excerpts at this point. An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL REC-

ORD shows that, when the reorganization bill was being debated in the House, it was distinctly understood by all parties that the right of the House to pass upon a proposed reorganization plan sent down by the President would be safeguarded, held inviolate.

Permit me to quote.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 891, Mr. VORYS:

My question is this: Could there be any change in the substantive law of the country by the abolition of a function, or by the abolition of a function would it merely mean a change in who might be required to carry out the law? It is not quite clear to me what abolition of a function means. As I understood it, this Reorganization Act is not intended to change the laws, except the organization which might enforce the law. Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I think there is no question but that the act does not permit the President to submit a plan that changes the basic law. But the abolishment of a function means that where two organizations have been discharging the same function, if that function is given to one of the organizations it may be abolished as far as the other organization is concerned.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. For instance, if two or three agencies were authorized to make loans, the combining of those functions by the abolishment of the function for a number of the agencies could not repeal the authority to make loans? Am I correct?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VORYS. So that we are not changing any substantive law in voting for this?

Mr. LANHAM. Not at all.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 893, Mr. HOLIFIELD:

When the President sends up a plan the Congress then has 60 days in which to consider the plan. If we find out that there is something bad about the plan we have in title 2 of this bill a highly privileged resolution which can be offered on the floor by any Member of the Congress who is in favor of a resolution to disapprove the plan. Any Member of Congress can arise under high privilege and ask that a vote be taken on a particular plan and provision is made for 1 hour of debate on that question. Any committee that is affected by this plan, let us say that it is a plan with reference to the Department of Agriculture, immediately the Committee on Agriculture is on guard concerning this plan to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. Thus the Committee on Agriculture can consider that plan. It can ask for hearings. The hearings can be had in the Committee on Executive Expenditures. The chairman or any member of the Committee on Agriculture can come before that committee and present its case. Then, if the committee itself refuses to bring forward a resolution of disapproval, any member of the Committee on Agriculture can bring to the floor of the House for the consideration of the House a concurrent resolution of disapproval and the House at that time can hear the arguments pro and con and vote it up or down.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is quite true, I assume, as the gentleman said, that any Member of the House can arise and propose the disapproval of a plan submitted.

When the bill became an act, the provision for 1-hour debate under section 205 (a) was not in the act.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 894, Mr. HALLECK:

Certainly there are some in the country and I am afraid some in the Government who would argue that even the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of those great agencies should be brought within the realm of the executive branch of the Government and, hence, subjected to political control. In the previous reorganizations that we have considered some of those agencies have been specifically exempted. It is argued, and I can understand with what force, that it is difficult in respect to any agency to distinguish the executive functions from the legislative or judicial functions. I recognize that and certainly I, for one, want to write the kind of basic legislation that will make effective reorganization possible. But the fact that there was concern about what might happen to these agencies under this system by which in effect, unless the provision is amended, legislation is written by the executive branch and one branch of the Congress, not two, there should be some safeguard so some of these agencies in the past have been exempted. In the act passed in 1945 there were certain exemptions. I think probably it has been pretty well agreed on the advice of Mr. Hoover and others that such exemptions should be kept out of this bill. It is said that no President would think of transferring to the executive branch of the Government these great legislative and judicial functions performed by these agencies. But it has been urged, and I find myself in that school of thought, that the pattern that is provided in this legislation under which the reorganization plans regarding four such independent agencies must come up separately and independent of the plans effecting any other reorganization might well be extended to some of these other agencies.

This does not mean that reorganization plans in respect to those agencies cannot be presented here by the President to be acted upon in whatever manner may be finally prescribed in the House. It simply would require that that plan as it affected one of these great independent agencies should come up here standing on its own bottom. You understand that if this legislation is adopted and a reorganization proposal comes up it might have five or six titles. One of them may be bad; all the rest of them may be good, but you cannot pick the good apples out of the barrel and leave the bad ones; you have got to take the whole barrel or leave the whole barrel.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 900, Mr. BONNER:

I think it is beyond a question of doubt that with the passage of this bill we will have an opportunity to reject or accept such proposals as will come to the Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 903, Mr. KARSTEN:

I do not want to engage in a constitutional discussion, but in my opinion this bill certainly creates no dictatorial powers. In proposing that the President take the initiative and originate plans for the redistribution of executive agencies, Congress reserves a veto power over such plans that he may submit.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 903, Mr. BLATNIK:

In other words, the President initiates plans for reorganization, and the Congress reviews, ratifies, or rejects such plans. This is a democratic procedure to which there should be no objections.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 904, Mr. HARDY:

The legislation provides ample safeguards for the protection of the legislative functions of Congress through the provision by which the Congress can disapprove a plan recommended by the President and thereby make it inoperative.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 905, Mr. DOYLE:

The bill clearly protects the interests of the American people by providing that the President shall first submit proposed changes to the United States Congress; and, then, the bill gives us, as representatives of the taxpayers, a 60-day period within which to state in writing our objections.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 917, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

I spoke earlier, and I will speak later on, if occasion requires, about an amendment which will not only enable but will force the House and the other body to act one way or the other, vote a plan up or down, any and every plan which may come down from the Executive Office.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 918, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

My own opinion is that this bill should provide that either House of Congress should be able to reject a reorganization plan, and that it should not require the concurrent action of both bodies. This bill, as it now stands, would require that it be rejected by both. That reverses ordinary legislative procedure.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 920, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

All this amendment does is to preserve half of the congressional power to legislate. All it requires is that when the President sends a plan here it will not become the law of the land if either House of the Congress puts through a resolution disapproving it, saying that it does not approve of the plan.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 921, Mr. VORYS:

Mr. VORYS. In that way the Members who have been fearful concerning favored organizations will have their chance if their organization is to be damaged to have their say before the House and we can thus preserve the responsibility of the House in legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. If the friends of the engineers or of any other group think that something is going to be done to their pet, if you want to describe it that way, or if you want to express it more accurately, if something is going to be done which they think should not be done, then the House can vote it down. It can just say, "We do not approve of that legislation."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1949, page 922, Mr. HOLIFIELD:

You know, you can always get one side of the Congress to agree for certain reasons to obstruct an act.

Mr. JUDD:

If neither House has disapproved, it goes on its way. If one House disapproves within 60 days he has to take the plan back.

Mr. JUDD, quoting Mr. Cox during previous debate on reorganization plans:

If it is within the competency of Congress to provide for vacating a plan that might be submitted under the bill by the President, by a concurrent resolution, it is of course equally within the right of Congress to provide that the order might be vacated by a simple resolution of either body.

After the House rejected an amendment which would have permitted a reorganization plan to be vetoed by either House, we found in conference that, to get a bill through, we must agree to the Senate proposal that either House, by a constitutional majority, should retain the right to veto a plan.

When the conference report came back to the House, the RECORD discloses that it was still the intention of the House to retain its right to pass upon and veto any reorganization plan sent down by the President.

Note the following quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1949, page 7838—debate on conference report—Mr. HOLIFIELD:

The essential difference between the Senate and House conferees in the beginning and in the present conference report is that the majority of the House conferees thought that both Houses should have a chance to disapprove by resolution any reorganization plan set up by the President.

The other body thought that only one House should have that authority, and that by a majority of those present. The House conferees advanced various solutions, and we finally went from the two-House position to the one-House position. Then a discussion arose as to how much of that one House. The suggestion was that two-thirds of that one House should constitute the necessary disapproving amount of that particular House. Then three-fifths was discussed, bringing it down to 58 Members in the other body. The final solution was not what the other body originally wanted, which was a majority of a quorum, but which was a constitutional majority of 49 in the other body and 218 in this House.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1949, page 7838—debate on conference report—Mr. HOLIFIELD:

These reports will undoubtedly come up in the next few days. When that happens, remember this: that the responsibility for reorganization of the executive branch in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations and such other recommendations as the legislative body shall see fit to embody in substantive legislation, will become the responsibility of 218 Members of this House and 49 Members of the other body. That is a point which I want to get over. The responsibility will then be upon the Congress to go ahead and uphold the President in these reorganization plans, and if any of these reorganization plans are turned down, it will be upon the responsibility of either 218 Members of this body or 49 Members of the other body. The responsibility will not be on the President.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1949, page 7838—debate on conference report—Mr. RICH:

The President has no authority, or power, as I understand it, to grant new legislation without the consent of the Congress. He cannot say that we are going to have certain functions of government performed, and establish those functions This is not the prerogative of this legislation, is it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD:

The gentleman is substantially correct.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1949, page 7838—debate on conference report—Mr. HOLIFIELD:

When the President has sent his plan up to Congress the responsibility is transferred from the executive branch to the legislative branch; and when any coalition of 49 Members in the other body or 218 Members in the House stand on record before the American people that they oppose the plan, that they will block the plan, the responsibility for blocking the reorganization of the executive branch rests with that group.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1949, page 7839—debate on conference report—Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman will admit that the conference report gives the President more authority than he asked for in that it gives him the power to create new departments as well as transfer departments.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is very true, but it also gives to either body of the Congress the right of veto by a constitutional majority, the right to nullify not only the establishment of a new department, but to nullify any other plan that he sends up. You give to him with the one hand but you take away more from him with the other.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] was one of those who most strenuously, during the conference, insisted that a plan should become law unless both Houses vetoed it.

But he, as is shown by the last quotation above, agreed that, under the bill as finally adopted—and I quote again:

It also gives to either body of the Congress the right of veto by a constitutional majority, the right to nullify not only the establishment of a new department, but to nullify any other plan that he (the President) sends up.

It is in the RECORD time and again that the House was to have that right—the right to veto any plan which might be sent down by the President. Now, by this so-called strategy of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and by the ruling of the Speaker, if it is against the motion which I make, what sort of a situation have we? The President can send down here 50 or 100 plans, each varying in minor details from the other, and because of the limitation within the bill, within 60 calender days we would have to consider them all or those not considered nor adversely acted upon would becon.e the law of the land. It is a physical impossibility to adequately consider even the 21, which have been sent down.

It was the unquestioned intent of Congress, when this reorganization bill was adopted, that neither House should be deprived of the opportunity to vote upon the adoption or rejection of each and every specific plan.

The danger of permitting a President to propose a reorganization plan without insuring the right of either branch of the Congress to reject it was time and again pointed out and stressed. It was argued, and with reason, that if this power to initiate legislation having to do with the executive departments of the Government was vested in the President and no right reserved to the House to veto that legislation, the requirements of the Constitution as to the methods of enacting legislation could and would be disregarded.

That such apprehended danger was real is now apparent.

Though the Congress wrote into the reorganization bill a provision that after a committee had reported on a reorganization plan, it should thereafter be in order to move to proceed to the consideration of such a resolution, and that such motion should be highly privileged and not debatable, the action of the Speaker today in refusing to recognize such a motion will demonstrate clearly that it is now within the power of the President and the Speaker, through the exercise of his discretionary power of recognition, to rewrite the law of the land insofar as it relates to the executive departments.

It is strange that a House which passed the Taft-Hartley Act by more than a two-thirds vote and which has since refused to repeal that act or any of its provisions, should permit a President, politically allied with labor unions, to—by failure to act on Reorganization Plan No. 12, insofar as it is concerned—repeal one of the most important provisions of that act, the provision creating the office of general counsel, and defining the duties of the independent general counsel appointed to that office.

Congressmen are elected to perform certain functions, to represent their constituents on controversial, as well as noncontroversial, legislation. They are elected and they are paid to act in the House, not to sit back and wait for the Members of the other body to legislate or to act upon proposed legislation.

It may be, in the opinion of the political strategists, expedient to dodge an important issue like that of a proposal to virtually destroy a major part of the Taft-Hartley Act, but I cannot see it that way.

In my humble opinion, Members of Congress are expected by their constituents to act in the House—not to duck, to dodge, to pass the buck—in the hope that the other body will reject the proposed plan. That they, as Members of the House, may avoid the criticism of the CIO or any other labor organization by a failure to act.

The responsibility for the failure to act upon these reorganization plans rests upon the Democratic Party and the leadership of that party, for it has control of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Under the established rules of practice of the House, when a special order like that is granted, like that which was granted at the request of the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if those in charge of the bill do not present on any occasion a motion to go into Committee of the

Whole, it is in order for the Speaker to recognize other Members for other items that are in order on the calendar. That does not deprive the holder of that special order of the right, when those items are disposed of, to move that the bill be considered further in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. If the 21 resolutions that were presented to the House by the President, a great many of which have been considered by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—of which the chairman is a member, and which have been acted on by that committee—are not presented to the House before the twenty-fourth of this month, they become law. The general appropriation bill does not necessarily have to be passed until the 30th of June, but it is necessary that the 21 orders of the President be brought before the House so they can be acted on by the twenty-fourth of this month, and it seems to me that they ought to take precedence over any other bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has made a statement of fact, not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to say that if this is of the highest constitutional privilege it comes ahead of the present legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order, the substance of which is that the motion he desires to make or that someone else should make in relation to the consideration of a disapproving resolution of one of the reorganization plans takes precedence over the appropriation bill insofar as recognition by the Chair is concerned. The gentleman from Michigan raises a very serious question and the Chair feels at this particular time that it is well that he did so.

The question involved is not a constitutional question but one relating to the rules of the House and to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1949 which has been alluded to by the gentleman from Michigan and other Members when addressing the Chair on this point of order. The Chair calls attention to the language of paragraph (b) of section 201 of title II of the Reorganization Act of 1949 which reads as follows: "with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules so far as relating to procedure in such House at any time in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

It is very plain from that langauge that the intent of Congress was to recognize the reservation to each House of certain inherent powers which are necessary for either House to function to meet a particular situation or to carry out its will.

On April 5, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a unanimous-consent request to the House, which was granted, which has the force of a rule, and which relates to the rules of the House governing the consideration of the omnibus appropriation bill while it is before the House and, of course, incidentally affecting other legislation. The consent request submitted by the gentleman from Missouri was "that the general appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951 have right-of-way over all other privileged business under the rules until disposition, with the exception of conference reports."

That request was granted by unanimous consent. On the next day the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], in correcting and interpreting the consent request granted on April 5, submitted a further unanimous-consent request.

The daily RECORD shows, on page 4976, April 6, that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said:

> Mr. Speaker, on page 4835 of the daily RECORD of yesterday, the first column carrying the special order made by the House last night reads that the general appropriation bill shall be a special order privileged above all other business of the House under the rule until disposition. The order made was until final disposition. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected to conform with the proceedings on the floor of the House yesterday.

The RECORD further shows that the Speaker put the request and there was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let the Chair finish.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is in the process of making a ruling.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the reason I want to propound the inquiry right at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. We for the first time this year have all the appropriations in one bill. Now, if they drag out consideration under the 5-minute rule beyond the 24th, would that not shut the Congress off entirely from voting on any of these recommendations? So we do have a constitutional right to consider these propositions without having them smothered in this way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the House always has a constitutional right and power to refuse to go into the Committee of the Whole on any motion made by any Member, so that the House is capable of carrying out its will, whatever may be the will of the majority of the House.

Continuing, the Chair will state that in the opinion of the present occupant, in view of the unanimous-consent request made by the gentleman from Missouri and granted by the House, if any member of the Appropriations Committee moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union to consider the appropriation bill, that motion has preference over any other preferential motion. It is a matter that the House decides when the motion is made as to what it wants to do and it has an opportunity when that motion is made to carry out its will.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understood the statement of the gentleman from Missouri on April 6 was that the appropriation bill would take precedence over all legislation and special orders until entirely disposed of. Does that include conference reports?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A conference report is in a privileged status in any event.

Mr. TABER. They were specifically exempted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They were specifically exempted. In relation to the observation made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that because other business has been brought up and that therefore constitutes a violation of the unanimous-consent request, the Chair, recognizing the logic of the argument, disagrees with it because that action was done through the sufferance of the Appropriations Committee and, in the opinion of the Chair, does not constitute a violation in any way; therefore does not obviate the meaning and effect of the unanimous-consent request heretofore entered into, and which the Chair has referred to.

For the reasons stated, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a further point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The point of order is the same as I raised before; but, to keep the RECORD clear, I wish to make the same point of order regarding House Resolution 522, House Resolution 545, and House Resolution 546, that is, that the House proceed to the consideration of each of those resolutions in the order named, assuming, of course, that the ruling will be the same, but making a record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will reaffirm his ruling in relation to the several resolutions the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I believe I am correct, Mr. Speaker, in stating that since the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was granted, that the House took up a measure under the new 21-day rule. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not that was taken up because of its high privilege or whether it was taken up because of the sufferance

of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the Chair, of course, is unable to look into the mind of the Speaker who was presiding at the time. But from the knowledge that the Chair has, which, of course, is rather close, it was because the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations permitted it to be done through sufferance. In other words, if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had insisted on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and if the present occupant of the chair had been presiding, there is nothing else that could have been done under the unanimous-consent request, in the Chair's opinion, but to recognize the motion.

Mr. EBERHARTER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I understand the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Missouri, it was that the appropriation bill would take preference over any other matters having a high privilege. My understanding of the new 21-day rule is that that is a matter of the highest privilege, and therefore I am wondering whether the same rule applies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, but that rule can be changed just like any other rule of the House can be changed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. But the gentleman from Missouri did not insist on all matters having the highest privilege. According to the RECORD, he only made his request with respect to motions having a high privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unanimous-consent request, I might advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania, appears in the RECORD of April 6, that the general appropriation bill shall be a special order privileged above all other business of the House under the rule until disposition. The order made was "until final disposition."

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PRIEST. My parliamentary inquiry simply is this, that notwithstanding the question of recognition under the unanimous-consent request ordered by the House at the request of the gentleman from Missouri, the matter of consideration still is in the House, is it not? If the Houses refuses to go into the Committee of the Whole it still is a question for the House to decide; is that not correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Exactly, and the gentleman from Michigan or anyone else making the motion could address the question to the Chair, which question the Chair would then have to pass upon.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 156]

Aspinall	Granahan	Morrison
Barden	Grant	Nelson
Bates, Ky.	Green	Nixon
Blatnik	Gwinn	Patterson
Bolling	Hall,	Pfeifer,
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	Joseph L.
Boykin	Hall,	Powell
Buckley, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Hare	Redden
Burdick	Hays, Ark.	Rhodes
Carlyle	Hébert	Roosevelt
Carnahan	Hobbs	Sabath
Case, S. Dak.	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadowski
Cavalcante	Horan	Scott, Hardie
Celler	Kearns	Smathers
Chatham	Kunkel	Smith, Ohio
Davenport	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Davies, N. Y.	Lemke	Towe
Dawson	Linehan	White, Calif.
Deane	McConnell	White, Idaho
Dingell	McMillen, Ill.	Wickersham
Douglas	Miles	Willis
Gavin	Miller, Calif.	Wolcott
Gilmer	Morgan	
Gore	Morris	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7797) to provide foreign economic assistance, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEE, RICHARDS, GORDON, VORYS, and Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next on the present farm problem, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the New Hampshire Troubadour.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and in each to include extraneous matter; and further to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that they will each exceed two pages of the RECORD and are estimated by the Public Printer to cost $225.50 in one instance and $273.34 in the other.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Elmira Sunday Telegraph of April 30 entitled "Watches and War—Watchmakers Want Tariff, Not Subsidies."

Mr. STANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. John S. Battle, Governor of the State of Virginia, at the dedication of the Patrick Henry School, at Martinsville, Va.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks concerning the false charge of socialism.

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $246; and also to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Secretary of State.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by Beecher E. Hess entitled "Pension Plans and Public Policy."

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Hon. William C. Bullitt, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $205.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances—to include in one a letter and in the other a telegram.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances—in one to include a eulogy, in the other an editorial.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by the soil conservation director of Wisconsin.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain resolutions.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. LESINSKI) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER IN CHAPTER XI, GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 593 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 593), as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, all points of order against chapter XI of said bill or any provision contained therein are hereby waived and all points of order against the following amendment to such chapter are hereby waived:

On page 425, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and now yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] in order to explain why the committee wants this rule.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule which has been presented to you is made necessary for two reasons. First, chapter XI contains what might be termed language changes on an appropriation bill; and second, restore certain language in the bill that has heretofore been stricken because of points of order. For years and years we have been creating corporations, giving them power to incur indebtedness on behalf of the Government and authorizing the Treasury Department to transfer money to them. Today such authorizations have authority to create debts against the Government in a total amount of $26,000,000,000 plus. They do not have to come to the Congress. We know nothing about the current debts they are going to create. The committee is not trying to take any power away from them. We are simply trying to write into this bill the fact that they will have to file with the Bureau of the Budget and hence with the Congress in the beginning of each year the amount of indebtedness they plan to create during that year.

The idea is that the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress at the beginning of each year should have a look at the total indebtedness to be created during ensuing fiscal year by these independent corporations, so that we can weigh that with the indebtedness we create by virtue of our appropriation bills for such fiscal year. Thus, we would have a centralized and controlling look at the total expenditures of Government so that we can have those figures in connection with our total debt which now amounts to about $256,000,000,000, bearing in mind at the same time the debt ceiling, which is at the present time $275,000,000,000, and we must remember that we are going in debt at the rate of $6,000,000,000 plus per year. We are not trying to take any power away from anybody.

Another thing that has made the rule necessary is that for many years the State Department has had a provision in its appropriation bill giving them under certain conditions and circumstances authority to discharge employees without going through the red tape of the Civil Service Commission. That provision has worked well. There has been no harm done. However, it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and when that section was reached the other day a point of order was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and it was stricken from the bill because of the point of order—and rightfully so. We are asking that the rule make in order these amendments in chapter XI, that will give the State Department authority that it had during the years past, and we are going to ask that the provision which we inserted in the Department of Commerce be included. The jurisdictional subcommittees recommended these provisions, and the full committee adopted the same.

There may be a divided opinion as to whether or not we should have those controls. Maybe so. Maybe you differ with me, but the rule only gives us authority to let the majority of the Members of Congress control. That is what we are asking. Vote as you may on the amendments when we offer them to the section of the bill. But permit the majority of the Congress to decide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. As I understand the rule, it is to waive all points of order on chapter XI.

Mr. NORRELL. That is exactly right.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has stated what a certain section of chapter XI does, but he fails to inform the House of the provisions of section 1111, which is a rewrite of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, which has no application whatsoever to what the gentleman has just stated to the House.

Mr. NORRELL. There is nothing in chapter XI in the way of language changes that does not have something to do with what is in this bill. We are here dealing with the budget of the United States for the ensuing year. The only thing this language change does is simply to make those agencies from an administrative standpoint operate on a monthly basis, and the money that we are appropriating to them we are saying, "Now you have got to spend that money on a monthly basis." Oftentimes they have been spending it during the first 8 or 9 months and then return to Congress and say, "We have got to have some more money." Our idea is that the agencies should spend this money insofar as possible in 12 equal payments, so that we will eliminate supplemental or deficiency appropriations. Authority is given to expend the money in other periods, such as seasonal, when the work of the agency necessitates such action.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Can the gentleman name some of the agencies or corporations that will be affected by this review and check, as to the ultimate results on the budget?

Mr. NORRELL. I will be glad to do that. I have a list of all the corporations before me, showing their authority to create debt as of December 31, 1949. The name and amount follows: Commodity Credit Corporation, $2,176,547,333.25; Economic Credit Corporation, $268,514,911.86; Export-Import Bank of Washington, $1,583,000,000; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, $3,000,000,000; Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, $499,008,900; Home Owners' Loan Corporation, $1,260,638,575; Housing and Home Finance Administration—slum clearance and community development and redevelopment—$25,000,000; Panama Railroad Company, $10,000,000; Public Housing Administration, $1,163,000,000; Rural Electrification Administration—electrification, $940,000,000, and telephone, $25,000,000; Secretary of Agriculture—Farmers Home Administration program—$38,000,000; Farm Housing program, $20,000,000; Secretary of the Army, $50,000,000; Virgin Islands Corporation, $8,718,000; and agencies issuing obligations only in payment of defaulted and foreclosed insured mortgages; Federal Housing Administration, $15,559,803,963.77, and United States Maritime Commission, $200,000,000; the total being, as of December 31, 1949,

$26,827,231,703.88 that these corporations can make debt for, due by the United States, without saying anything to us at all now.

We are now reaching the debt ceiling. It is time to take a look and see where we are going.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman furnish the House answers to these two questions? What effect does this legislation on this appropriation bill have on future deficiencies?

Mr. NORRELL. The entire effort is to try to discourage, if not entirely eliminate, supplementals and deficiencies.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman advise the House from what source this amendment originated? Who recommended it? What department of the Government?

Mr. NORRELL. This amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. NORRELL. This amendment comes from the executive subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. VINSON. Is it not a matter of fact that not a single budget officer in any of the departments has recommended these amendments?

Mr. NORRELL. I will not answer that so far as other Members are concerned; but so far as the gentleman from Arkansas is concerned, I never asked any department of this Government if they were interested in this. I believe it is a good amendment and I am sponsoring it and voting for it, regardless of the way they believe.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is to be congratulated on his courage; but I think the gentleman is advocating something he does not himself understand.

Mr. NORRELL. The House can be the judge of that.

Mr. VINSON. They may agree with the gentleman, but the House will not know the effect of the amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. If they can read, they can know.

Mr. VINSON. Well, sir, I will ask the gentleman to explain to the House what section 1111 does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has stated, House Resolution 593 provides a special rule for the consideration of title XI of the pending appropriation bill. This is a nonpolitical and a nonpartisan rule in every sense of the word, and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules after the members of the Appropriations Committee from both sides of the aisle had requested the rule be granted, and expressed themselves as representing the honest opinion of the Appropriations Committee.

As has been explained, the first paragraph of the rule waives points of order on title XI of the bill and does give to the Appropriations Committee of the House, and through it to the entire House itself, the opportunity and power to keep a little more strict control over public spending than in the past. Under the first paragraph of this rule the committee could go a long way toward buying an end to the rather vicious habit which has developed in many Government departments or agencies of taking the appropriation given to that department or agency by the Congress for a whole year and spending it all in 6, 7, or 8 months; and then coming up and saying to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Congress: "All our money is gone; if you expect to continue this governmental service during the last part of this year you simply have to appropriate more money." So this rule does prevent the making of points of order against that section and provides the committee and the Congress may at least require the various agencies of the Government to expend the money appropriated for their use on a fair and somewhat equitable basis so as to last throughout the year.

I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for a moment. As was explained to our committee—and I believe you will find this to be true—there is a provision on page 422, line 14, which would permit the National Defense Establishment, or any other agency of the Government, to meet emergencies involving the safety of human life, protection of property, or the welfare of our citizens, to expend appropriations more rapidly, if such be necessary to take care of the emergency. In such an emergency the gentleman's legislative committee would probably move in with the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations of the Appropriations Committee to watch any situation which might develop and to support an additional appropriation which might prove necessary.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. That would have reference to a hay lift, dropping hay for animals, and doing other things of an emergency nature that probably the Congress should continue to have some control over. What worries me is in case of a national emergency. By this amendment here you are so circumscribing the department that it cannot meet an emergency.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think that is correct. This provision is broad enough, in my opinion, to take care of any emergency, either in connection with the national defense or any other emergency or catastrophe. I do not think a hay lift would be a national emergency, however.

Mr. VINSON. We all have a high respect for the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. I would like for him as a member of the Rules Committee that granted this rule to explain to the House what section 1111, which is a rewrite of section 3679, does. If the gentleman can give the House an explanation and tell us what that will do he will stop one voice. Now, do not tell me to read it because I am asking the gentleman to read it and tell me what it does.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will arrange to extend my time under the rules I would be glad to go into this in detail.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I do not have 30 minutes, and the gentleman has already used a great proportion of my time.

Mr. VINSON. Do not dodge around.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not dodging the issue, as the gentleman well knows, for I realize I cannot compete in that particular respect with the gentleman now on the floor of this House.

Mr. VINSON. But the gentleman is a good second.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was simply calling his attention to a section or provision which should take away any doubts which have been in his mind.

Of course, I want to remind the gentleman of something else. I have never seen him lose very many legislative combats on the floor of this House, especially in connection with national defense questions. This rule will only take away the privilege of one individual Member making a point of order and striking out of some provision of the bill. There is nothing in the world to keep the gentleman from Georgia or anyone else from amending this section of the bill as he may desire if he has a majority of the House supporting him. The gentleman is a great expert on national defense. I know of no one in America or in the world who knows more about our national defense than does the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Please explain the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is a great expert, nationally, and is internationally known as such. He is the greatest expert—and I say this seriously—and the greatest civilian authority we have in America today on national defense matters. I say that with every sincerity. If the gentleman feels there is any provision in this bill that needs to be amended to protect the right of our defense officials to use military appropriations in case of a great national emergency for national security purposes, or to permit his committee and other legislative committees to come to the Congress for action in an emergency, I shall support his amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman point out just what language in this chapter would probably be subject to a point of order that he seeks to protect?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot point out all of them. There are quite a number.

Mr. HARRIS. Any particular language?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, if the gentleman will just permit me to continue for a moment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I might say that I will take the floor when I get a chance and I will try to satisfy the gentleman on that point.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Where can we find hearings on this proposition?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman mean before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think we are entitled to have the hearings on it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, the hearings on the appropriation bill, I understand, have been printed in different sections, but there were no hearings printed of the discussion before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as I understood the gentleman from Arkansas, he said that the point of order which is to be waived is one of very great importance with respect to authorizations which were given to certain agencies of the Government to obligate the Government with respect to payments. Now, my point is this: The legislative committees have set up various governmental corporations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Please ask your question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would not this restrict those corporations from obligating the Government contrary to the authorizations that were passed upon by this House before?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, it would do that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then we would negative every act that we passed setting up these corporations if we adopt this amendment. In other words, we would take control over every legislative committee on matters already passed on by the House, and in this appropriation bill forbid them to obligate the Government contrary to the laws of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order. I yielded only for a question and not for a speech.

Now, to answer the gentleman's question quickly, if he will give attention, let me say to him that the only control the committee could have would be according to and under the law. The Committee on Appropriations could enforce the laws and the orders of Congress, and God knows someone should enforce them in behalf of economy.

The question has been asked me by the gentleman from Arkansas as to some of the other provisions that might be subject to a point of order. The members of the Committee on Appropriations can give you item for item answers as to the first portion of the bill. In addition, if you adopt this rule, section 1113 will not be subject to a point of order. That section is the old McCarran amendment which has been in each appropriation bill for the past several years and simply gives to the Department of State, of which you heard a great deal about lately, the power to discharge persons for security reasons. Now, that language has been in the original law, and in effect, for about 5 years. The provision was stricken out of the pending bill on a point of order because it was legislation on an appropriation bill. If it is included or reinstated by adoption of this rule we will simply continue the same authority to the State Department to get rid of bad security risks that it has had in the past, and God knows it is time we at least do something about these bad security-risk employees. I understand the FBI has been making a very careful check, not only of loyalty matters in the State Department, but of other persons of vicious habits who are not good security risks and who could be discharged under this provision, but under no other.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I might say that it also provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall have the same power.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The question I raise is this. Inasmuch as there are about 4,000 of these sexual perverts holding jobs in the Federal Government, why does the committee see fit to confine it just to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce? These homosexuals are in many departments.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot answer that question. If I had my way, every department of the Government would have this right. But this proposal before us is for the reinstatement of the old McCarran amendment which has been the law for many years. If we fail or refuse to reinstate such a provision, then if any of these departments do not want to get rid of any of these undesirable individuals they can merely say, "Why, the Congress took the power to discharge them away from us."

If we are foolish enough to turn down a rule like this, and an amendment like this, and leave ourselves open to the charge that we have taken away from the State Department and from the Department of Commerce, as the gentleman mentions, the power to get rid of undesirables who are bad security risks, then the responsibility will be ours and not that of the executive branch, or at least the responsibility can be shifted onto our shoulders. I do not think we are going to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has the Department of Commerce been added this year?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; it was in the old law.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman know that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is holding hearings on the bill H. R. 4739, which is concerned with the very thing the gentleman proposes in section 1113? Is there any emergency that would require the House to act on that now?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, because if action on this rule is not taken the present law, which gives the authority I have mentioned, will expire on June 30.

Mr. McCARTHY. But we are holding hearings and Senate action on this appropriation is at best remote.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You have held a great many hearings on many bills which have not become law. But this rule is the way to get immediate action. You can and should bring in your bill to provide a permanent law to meet this situation in every Government agency, and I hope you take some such action soon.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I think it is pretty clear about the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, but in reading this resolution I do not get the point of what the gentleman means by fiscal controls on these independent corporations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That will be explained in detail by the committee members, but, as I understand, we appropriate money to Government corporations, or make loans to them, and authorize them to do certain things. This simply gives the Appropriations Committee the authority to check and be sure the fiscal policies of these corporations are such that they do not spend all the money the Congress grants them in the first few months of the year and then come back and say, "We can no longer carry on because all our money is gone." Instead, they have to sort of spread their operations out over the year, and thus carry out the intent of the Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. That is contained in this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I take this occasion to commend the members of the Committee on Rules for granting this rule and bringing it here, because it restores to the various departments the right to get rid of these individuals concerning whom there has been so much criticism. I cannot see any reason for any type of debate on the subject. We should get rid of them. We should give that power to these departments and have the Congress behind it. I certainly want to commend the Committee on Rules openly on this floor for granting the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. Let me reiterate that this report was a unanimous action by the Committee on Rules, supported by men of both parties. It is not a political or partisan matter at all.

We approved a unanimous request of the Committee on Appropriations. I say to you with all the conviction at my command that not only should we give this authority to these departments to get rid of bad security risks and undesirables in the Government service but we should also give to the Appropriation Committee, as the only committee I know of in the House that can properly police and supervise the money we appropriate, the power to have some sort of check-rein on the expenditures made by the various agencies and departments of the Government.

If we here in the Congress simply appropriate public money and then do not pay any attention to how it is spent, we are failing in our duty.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct in the assumption and in my understanding of the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas that what is sought to be accomplished by one provision of this rule is to give the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress the opportunity to look at the operation of these Government corporations that do not operate on direct appropriations, but which are given the authority to transfer their bonds directly to the Treasury and thus secure the money to carry on their operation without any look or supervision so far as the Congress is concerned at the expenditure of those funds?

Am I correct in the understanding?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is correct. Of course, by doing that, these corporations do obligate us and the taxpayers of the country. The gentleman is also correct when he says that the Committee on Appropriations acts for the whole Congress. It is the only agency the Congress and the people have which can properly supervise and watch these financial transactions.

Mr. KEEFE. If this authority is given, it does not mean that the Committee on Appropriations can change any basic law or activity which has been granted to the corporation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Or any act of the Congress, for that matter.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes, or any act of the Congress. But it will give the Committee on Appropriations the power to look into the matter and report back to the Congress so that we may be able to determine if the legislation is needed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman not think that the legislative committee which created these corporations should at least not be precluded from having a voice in the matter? Why should this additional authority be delegated to the Committee on Appropriations entirely?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I reply to the gentleman?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, the Committee on Appropriations does have the primary control over appropriations. The various legislative committees, such as the committee of which the gentleman from Georgia is chairman, has control over legislative matters and authorizations. The Committee on Appropriations cannot change any law. It can only check on how the money appropriated by Congress is being spent. The gentleman's committee, as well as every other legislative committee, under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, does have authority to check on whether the law is being violated by agencies coming under its jurisdiction. That does give your committee the power to control the situation.

Mr. VINSON. But the law is being changed by this very amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot agree, or take up the time of the House further. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, let the House understand the situation exactly. The Committee on Rules has reported a rule making chapter XI in order. There are a great many good things in chapter XI. Some of them may not be subject to a point of order and some may be subject to a point of order. What is the origin of it? No hearing was ever had by a single committee of the Congress, not even the Committee on Appropriations, as to what is contained in chaper XI. This is the way it came about. The distinguished gentleman of the Committee on Appropriations, which constitutes, you might say, the advisory group of the Appropriations Committee, designated as the Deficiency Subcommittee, wrote in this legislation after those committees had their hearings. I say that, in reference to these corporations which have been created by the Congress, they may be justified in doing something like that, but there are certain phases here concerning which no fiscal man in the Government knows what was in their minds. I submitted section 1111 to a qualified man in the Department of National Defense to advise me what it was. He said he did not know. I asked the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to tell us what it does. He does not know. Let me try to tell you as much as I know about it.

There are two points in this bill against which I intend to raise a point of order. One is on page 418, section 1111, which is a revision of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes. The Revised Statutes say this:

> No department of Government shall spend in any one fiscal year any sum in excess of appropriations made by the Congress for the fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriation.

Here are about 15 pages of a rewrite of that section. I have submitted it to my staff officials who are qualified. I submitted it to the budget man in the Department of National Defense. They sent it back to me, "We do not know what it means." Now, here you are being asked to make it in order. If this is rejected, I propose to make a point of order on that because it is legislation. I am doing it because none of us who has to deal with these matters knows what it means. No hearing was had by the Appropriations Committee.

The distinguished gentlemen here, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, and these learned members of the Appropriations Committee, outstanding Members of this House—and I follow them 99 times out of 100—they wrote this in without calling on the men in the various departments to see the effect of it.

Now there is another amendment here against which I desired to raise a point of order. This is section 601:

> No funds withdrawn and credited pursuant to section 601 of the act of 1930, as amended, shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the act appropriating such funds.

What is the effect of that? The effect is that funds appropriated remain available under the law today for the year they are appropriated and 2 years thereafter. The effect of this amendment is to say they must be obligated in that 1 year. If you adopt that, then you will stymie the research and development that is going on in this country, because the obligations must be made in advance.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The reason that is in there is because department after department has been transferring funds from one fund to another for the purpose of making the funds available for a longer period than the statute allows.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman know that the law today prohibits funds being transferred from one appropriation to another? This goes even further. This is retroactive, as far as the national defense, concerning one branch of it, is concerned. Some $60,000,000 that has been obligated for research and scientific development is cut out by this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON. The sensible thing to do is to defeat this rule, and when the sections are reached in this chapter, let us consider each one on its merits. I have grave doubt that there are any other items in this bill subject to a point of order except the two that I propose to raise.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just for me to point out two errors that the gentleman has made in his remarks. First, I did not say that this could not be explained. I said that it would take some time, and that the gentlemen on the committee could explain it in greater detail than I. Second, the gentleman, of course, indicates that unless this rule is defeated there can be no amendments to this section. The gentleman knows that if he can convince the House, after this rule is adopted, that any portion of it should be amended, it will be amended, and the gentleman can offer any amendment he pleases.

Mr. VINSON. There are certain sections here that are good and helpful, but I am pointing out to you the importance of this section that I am calling attention to. There was no hearing before the Appropriations Committee. It was the brain child of these distinguished men, and, of course, they are proud of their handiwork. But what do you know about the handiwork? What do you know about what is going to happen? The gentleman admits there cannot be a deficiency. So they are asking you to tie your hands by adopting this rule. I ask you to vote it down. I say there will be but two points of order made to chapter XI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a misapprehension as to the meaning of the amendments that the Committee on Appropriations wishes to offer to the bill and that, therefore, the fears which we hear expressed are not well-founded. I have the feeling that we are not dealing quite fairly—certainly not generously—with the great Committee on Appropriations of this House in the debate that is being conducted here this morning. The committee came before the Committee on Rules and asked for this rule in order to accommodate the need of protecting the integrity of the bill. They explained patiently to the Committee on Rules that the adoption of these amendments to which reference has been made would not prevent the consideration of deficiency appropriation measures, but would only discourage the handling of funds appropriated in such manner as to create needs for deficiency appropriations. They further explained that they needed the language stricken by the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] restored in order that the heads of departments of the Government might exercise a very proper power of discharging unsatisfactory employees upon the basis of their own judgment without having to go through the proceedings now necessary. The adoption of the pending resolution would, in my opinion, be in the public interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical error in the resolution: That the figure "1950" in the third line of the resolution be changed to "1951."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the first six subsections are routine sections that have been in the Independent Offices bill for many years, and there is no change in those items. I would assume that there would be no objection there.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Section 1107 is a prohibition on the construction of office buildings or making loans for office buildings, which is a very proper provision.

Mr. VINSON. There is no objection to that.

Mr. TABER. The next section relates to tort claims, and I believe there is no objection to that.

Mr. VINSON. Not a bit. I ask the gentleman to proceed now to section 1110, the last proviso only.

Mr. TABER. Section 1110. That is designed all the way through to prevent the practice of governmental agencies transferring funds between bureaus in their own agency for the purpose of making funds available for more than a year when Congress intended that they should be kept within the year. If the gentleman has a constructive amendment to that, instead of objecting to the rule he should prepare that amendment and submit it. What is the gentleman's objection?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Let me read to the gentleman just briefly what law he is correcting:

> Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury.

The effect of that is that under the law you could not make appropriations for 1 year plus the 2 years. With that amendment in here you would make appropriations for only 1 year.

Mr. TABER. If they do not contract for it within the year, they should not be permitted to go ahead.

Mr. VINSON. But this is retroactive and it catches $60,000,000 right today.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman may offer an amendment, if he wants to, and have that considered. That would be the way to treat it rather than to try to vote down the rule.

Section 1111 is the antideficiency statute designed to prevent expenditure by governmental agencies of funds in such a way that they create a deficiency and then come back and ask for more money. If they have some project that they should like to take up, that has not been provided for, we want to provide that they can come back to the Congress and get the money. It is a very desirable thing.

Mr. VINSON. Was there ever a hearing held by anyone and did I not state the origin of it correctly?

Mr. TABER. There was no hearing, I will admit that. On the other hand, this has been taken up at length with the Bureau of the Budget and its drafting has been gone over very carefully with the Bureau of the Budget so that any suggestions they might have on it would be thoroughly considered. The subcommittee that considered it laid it over a couple of days, over a week end, if I am not mistaken, so that the members of that subcommittee could have an opportunity to study it. For my own part, I spent practically the whole week end studying it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. It is a fact, is it not, and especially so with respect to appropriations for the national defense, that the Congress frequently in making appropriations puts in the provision that the funds are to remain available until expended?

Mr. TABER. That is true on some things. We are not allowed under the Constitution to make appropriations for the Army for more than 2 years.

Mr. KEEFE. And when that language is contained in the bill "for not more than 2 years" it would govern over and above the provisions of this amendment which the gentleman from Georgia objects to, would it not?

Mr. TABER. The constitutional provision would cover that.

Mr. VINSON. Let me ask you this one question, then I am through. What effect on deficiencies as written in this section will there be on the Atomic Energy Commission and atomic-energy work?

Mr. TABER. It will not have any effect.

Mr. VINSON. It has the effect of tying it up.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. It might make them obey the law, and it might make them do things in an orderly way instead of going about it haphazardly.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not a fact that if this language with respect to the dismissal of employees had not been in previous appropriation bills it would have been impossible for Mr. Peurifoy in his campaign to get rid of undesirables in the State Department and to discharge the large number that have already been discharged?

Mr. TABER. And it would have been impossible for the Secretary of Commerce to get rid of people in his department. It is a very desirable provision.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact in recent years and in instance after instance that a department or agency has literally flouted the antideficiency law, thereby depriving the Congress of proper control over appropriations?

Mr. TABER. That is right. That has been done repeatedly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. All this section aims to do is to control that proposition?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If that section is all right for the State Department and Commerce Department, why is it not good for all departments of the Government?

Mr. TABER. For my own part, I would be willing to have it cover all departments.

Mr. VINSON. I raise no objection to those two sections. The only one I referred to was the deficiency section, which the gentleman admits the objective is to wipe out deficiencies. You cannot run this Government without deficiencies.

Mr. TABER. I did not say that I would not have any deficiencies. I never made that statement.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it goes to the extent where it is almost impossible to have a deficiency.

Mr. TABER. I do not want them to have the right to create deficiencies, and if anybody has any respect for the Congress of the United States he does not want the departments to run wild and create deficiencies. That is one of the reasons why the financial condition of the United States is as bad as it is, because they do not pay attention to the things that the Congress of the United States has provided.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is not the question one of whether a deficiency should be created, and then they should come to the Congress and ask for reimbursement, or whether, seeing that the money would not last for the necessary expenditures, to come up and notify the Congress?

Mr. TABER. That is what I said, to start with, that I wanted those people, instead of creating deficiencies, to come up here in advance of their expenditures and ask the Congress for the money in the regular way.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman will recall when I was chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee, Army and Air Force, I had a detailed statement made of over $5,000,000,000 of expenditures for 1946 and prior years, and that of that sum some $2,000,000,000 was used, in part, to build those $74,000 houses in Alaska. We did not find out about these houses until the money was spent.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I wish the gentleman would explain what effect this would have upon the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TABER. It would not be able to build an office building unless it came to the Congress and got authority, and it ought not to be allowed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They do not know just how much they will have to obtain, because it depends upon the size of the crop.

Mr. TABER. If they are going to have an office building they ought to come in here and get authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I am of the belief that this is a very, very dangerous resolution for us to adopt. I have two specific reasons for saying that. In the first place it appears that the Committee on Appropriations is usurping the prerogatives of practically every legislative committee in the House. In the second place, section 1111, the antideficiency section, is giving me a great deal of trouble.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. When I was on the floor the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] asked me what effect this would have on the Commodity Credit Corporation, and my answer was that the only effect it would have would be to prevent them from building an office building unless they came to the Congress and got authority to do it.

Mr. FORAND. Now, coming back to section 1111, Mr. Speaker, the antideficiency section, I assure you that as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means I do not like deficiency appropriations; I do not like any kind of deficiencies, because we have had headaches trying to raise the revenue to meet the need.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York whether this resolution will affect the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TABER. Not a bit.

Mr. FORAND. I am sorry I cannot yield for a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, it is very, very important from the point of view of public assistance that this resolution be defeated and that chapter 11 be stricken from this appropriation bill, because if we fail to do that, and the restrictions of section 1111 apply to old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the dependent children, we are going to be in an awful mess. Remember that under the Social Security Act the Federal Government obligates itself to reimburse the States for part of the cost of grants made to individuals who are aged, blind, and to dependent children up to a specific money ceiling set in the law and for 50 percent of the cost of administering these programs. Since it is extremely difficult to anticipate how many individuals will apply for assistance in any given period and since the Federal grant is made in the form of reimbursement for expenses already incurred on the assumption that Federal aid to the amount necessary will be made each year, it is extremely difficult to estimate what that will be.

For the past several years it has therefore been necessary for the Federal Security Administration to request a deficiency appropriation, which has always been granted without question, since it was considered to fulfill the contractual obligations of the Federal Government toward the States.

It is extremely important to the State welfare agencies and to the millions of needy aged people and other dependents upon assistance that this obligation be fulfilled without question.

The language of subsection (B) appears to give the Budget Bureau discretionary authority to exempt assistance grants from this prohibition, but there is a grave question as to whether or not it would provide reimbursement for administrative expenses, if it is impossible to get the grants for the individual needs.

Even if we get the grants for the individual needs, what assurance have we that the administrative cost will always be taken care of? Under those circumstances, I say to you that you cannot administer welfare of one type or another without administration, and administration costs money.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday in opposition to this rule. At that time I heard the presentation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL]. I can assure the House, and I believe I am accurate in saying this, that their testimony did not occupy over 20 minutes in asking for this rule. My testimony against it occupied only 2 or 3 minutes. At that time I was given the explanation on this point that these different departments could come before the Congress and get their deficiency appropriations just the same. I accepted that at the time, but I got to thinking it over later and studying it, and I decided that would be impossible for a department to obtain a deficiency appropriation if the Congress was not in session, during the time that that deficiency might arise. Therefore, I agree with the gentleman and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that this is a dangerous rule to adopt. Under our form of annual budgeting we cannot foresee emergency deficits, because our budgets are prepared 18 months in advance.

Mr. FORAND. I can say to the gentleman that if there is anybody in this House that has administered welfare at one time or another he knows very well that you cannot anticipate the needs.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the argument of the last speaker I would refer him to subsection (e) on page 422 of the bill. The only part of this legislation on which his argument has any bearing at all is that portion

dealing with administrative expenses of the agencies to which he refers. Not one other thing is affected by the proposed provision. He will find if he reads in that paragraph the following language: "emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law."

That exemption takes care of them. Let no one drag in the kind of an argument that tells you we are not going to take care of our old people or the orphans and the children of this country. That sort of charge cannot be pinned on the Committee on Appropriations either individually or collectively and we are surprised that such a point should be raised against the committee which functions in the manner that it does and performs the work that it does as has been well exemplified during the period of weeks we have been before the House on this bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the two most important questions before the country are, first, deficit spending and impending national bankruptcy; and, second, alleged Communists, pinkos, and Reds, and what-have-you in the departments of Government. We hear a great deal about economy and the necessity for economy. There is no man on the floor of the House who does not realize that we have to have some economy somewhere along the line, or we are going into national bankruptcy. Here is an opportunity to have a little economy. That is the purpose of one provision of the resolution. It gives the great Committee on Appropriations, which committee consists of some 45 Members of the House, all well-balanced, level-headed men, an opportunity to keep a check upon the situation and discourage this system of coming in after a $40,000,000,000 appropriation has been made with additional requests for additional deficiency appropriations. It does not stop this practice, but it has a tendency to discourage it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact today, as it has been for many years, that under the antideficiency law it is a criminal offense subjecting any department head or agency head to removal from office and to a fine if he incurs a deficiency before coming before the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. COLMER. That is my understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we are raising a strawman here today to defeat the real objective which we all want. Here is our good and learned friend, the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the most effective man, I suspect, in the House when it comes to getting his legislation through. He has a subject in which everyone is interested. I am sure my friend knows if the national welfare of this country, from a defense standpoint, is affected he could come here with 5 minutes' notice and get whatever funds might be necessary to put his program across.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman think it is a healthy way for the committee to legislate, for five men to sit behind closed doors without having any hearings and yet bring in legislation of such far-reaching importance.

Mr. COLMER. May I say to my distinguished friend, if that is the only objection he has to this resolution, it is a very, very weak one. Ordinarily he resorts to more powerful arguments. I am not interested in the method of procedure. I am interested in the results that this rule is intended to bring about and which we all hope to get.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman, before his time expires, might dwell on that phase of the amendment that has to do with arming the heads of departments with certain powers.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my friend for the suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in my premise, this is a two-barreled proposition. The papers are full, the committee hearings are full, and the well of the House of Representatives is filled every day with Members getting up and charging the head of these various departments with being derelict in their duty in not getting rid of these pinkos and Reds in the departments. And yet here is an opportunity to give them a weapon to clean their own house, without the Congress having to do it. Are we going to say here today that we are going to deny them that, and at the same time assail them for not doing their job?

Permit me to say to my colleagues that this House will be derelict in its duty today if it fails to take this opportunity to do something about deficit spending on the one hand and the undesirable security risks in the personnel of the Government agencies on the other.

The time to act is now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 137, noes 40.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate and consideration of amendments to chapter IX of the pending bill were concluded on yesterday. The Clerk will begin reading chapter X on page 345, line 1, of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed four, including one at not to exceed $3,000) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $50,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $11,000,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, on April 4 of this year when the Committee of the Whole began its debate upon the pending appropriations bill the very distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of this subcommittee, made what is probably one of the most important statements that one could make on this subject. On page 4685 of the RECORD the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] stated as follows:

> Our air power, great as it is, and our Navy and our Army, great as they are, are not the things that strike terror to the heart of the enemy today and preserve the peace. These things contribute. The thing that makes America the foremost leader of all the world today is America's industrial potential, America's capacity to fight back and continue to fight back until victory has been achieved. That is what the enemy fears, and anything that enters into the body of this America and destroys the pulsing industrial heart of America is something dangerous indeed.

Mr. Chairman, no truer words could have been spoken than were stated by the gentleman from Texas at that time.

It is quite true, and unfortunately so, that the Russian Government does not fear our Army, our Navy, nor our Air Force, but they do fear our great industrial potential. That, Mr. Chairman, is the reason why if a D-day ever occurs in this country, our opponents on that unhappy occasion would strike directly at the industrial potential of this country and try to lay it low on the first blow.

I have brought here a chart which is illustrative of the industrial potential of the United States in respect to the production of aircraft. This chart was prepared for me in the Pentagon Building and is not the product of idle chatter. I would like to call your attention to that chart and to show you what it takes to build from mere industrial potential into the power of production itself.

If you will notice on the chart, it is divided into years and into half years, and the vertical scale is the production of airplanes in terms of millions of pounds of airframe per month. The peak at the top of the chart represents 111,000,000 airplane pounds production per month.

If you will examine this side of the chart, which was July 1 of 1940, after war had been declared in Europe, that was the time when President Roosevelt gave the go ahead on the so-called 50,000 plane production program. At that time the monthly production rate of aircraft was 2,400,000 pounds per month.

Now, notice how long it took to get up to this point, which is about 12,000,000 pounds per month. It took a year and a half. The production rate was a great deal lower than that previously, and if it had not been for British orders for 800 reconnaissance aircraft in 1938, the production rate would not have been 2,400,000 pounds at the end of June 1940. It started away back at a very low rate. But, you see that the production rate even with the all-out-go-ahead program took a matter of three and a half, nearly nearly 3¾ years, to reach its peak.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman translate into number of planes the number of pounds that he is speaking about?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; the reason being that planes come in such varying sizes, from the very small to the very large, it is not possible to translate airframe pounds into terms of number of airplanes except on an average basis under given circumstances.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I notice on the chart there that the go-ahead sign in June of 1940 was for 50,000 planes. Can the gentleman tell us approximately when we achieved that objective?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think we achieved it and passed it before the war was over. That was the total number; not an annual rate. But, my purpose in bringing you this chart is to show you how long it takes to get started on this production program.

Here comes the 7th of December 1941, and that shows you where we were in the production program for aircraft. It was not until we got clear up to late 1943 in the production program that we began to be effective in our war against the Nazi-Goering Luftwaffe, if you please. In the ensuing year with an enormous Air Force it was possible for us to overwhelm the Nazi air power, to get at its vitals—its aircraft and fuel production potential—and destroy it. Then came VE-day, and shortly after that VJ-day, and you will notice the precipitous drop in production to about 2,000,000 pounds per month on the far end of the chart, and that is about where we are today. We are back again on the 2,000,000 pounds per month basis.

I bring this chart to you because I want to show you and demonstrate to the committee, if I can, that production potential is a great thing, but when you are attacked the next time, you are going to be attacked at home and not in Europe. You are not going to have other peoples defend you for a year and a half or 2 or 3 years waiting for your production potential to get into operation. The attack will come direct at the heart of your production potential and the effort will be made to knock it out right then and there. If that happens, then we will wish we had airplanes and not potential airplanes.

Now, I want to show you something else. Suppose that VJ-day came at this point, and that it is June 30 of this year. What would happen? Immediately you start into an attrition rate, and your attrition losses will run on a curve something like that, up to a point in here someplace, and this great area, which shows as a big blank space on this chart, is supposed to represent the aircraft that you have in storage, because without aircraft in storage you are unable to replace the attrition losses except from production which you do not have. But we have nothing but World War II aircraft in storage. So as our modern aircraft are shot down or damaged we would have to trot out the P–51's and others of that vintage to meet attrition losses. That would surely be a second-best Air Force, but slightly better than none. When you bring this attrition line in time over to meet your rising production line, then you are beginning to come on even terms with your enemy. From there on you may be able to overwhelm him if he has not already crippled your aircraft-production potential.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is one of the country's outstanding engineers and has made a great contribution to the Congress and the Nation on these things. Is there any formula or method whereby you can maintain your production potential and still not have such a huge investment in obsolescence?

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me just talk about that briefly. I want to quote to you from the Semiannual Report of the Secretary of Defense for July 1 to December 31, 1949, which includes the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, filed just a few months ago. Listen to this. This will make your blood run cold:

During the period of this report—

This being in the Air Force section—

the Air Force received 783 new aircraft—all purchased with funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 and prior years.

These new aircraft already received, and those now being procured, represent a level of procurement which, even without provision for any modern aircraft reserve—

That is what I was talking about just now—

will not meet the aircraft requirements for a modern 48-group air force.

At the beginning of this fiscal year, the inventory—

That is, the inventory of aircraft—

contained 22,000 planes—13,000 in use and 9,000 in inactive status—7,500 of the latter in storage.

Also, with respect to those 22,000 planes, 10,250 are combat types and the remaining are trainers, transports, and so forth.

You might think from the use of the figure "22,000" that you have 22,000 fighting planes. You do not. You have 10,250.

Now get this one:

Of the 10,250 combat types, 8,246—or more than 80 percent—are World War II type aircraft which will be obsolete by the end of fiscal year 1951.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. All you have to do is subtract 8,246 from 10,250, and it shows you that you have among the combat-type planes in the Air Force of modern planes, postwar types, only 2,000. All the rest of your combat-type planes are obsolete in the coming fiscal year. That was the reason, if I may make bold to say it, why this subcommittee and the Congress last year took the action of adding $800,000,000 to the Air Force budget, because they knew perfectly well, and they know it today, that by the end of 1951 we will have approximately 2,000 modern, fightable aircraft instead of the 22,000 the people ordinarily think about. But the President ordered that the additional appropriation of $800,000,000 for procurement of modern aircraft be impounded—be not spent.

Why, that is frightening to anyone who stops to think about it. You have no reserve aircraft except in World War II types. You have no reserve in modern types whatsoever. Supposing that a D-day should come in 1951 or 1952 or even 1953, 1954, 1955, or 1956, at the present schedule of production you have no reserve whatsoever except these old World War II types. Do you want to send your pilot aloft in P–51's to fight jets? If you do, then you are crazier than I think you are. I know you are

not. I can not understand how the President and the Secretary of Defense could arrrive at the conclusion that we do not need these modern aircraft.

That is the situation. It is an amazing situation, and I think very few people in this Government outside of the armed services themselves—and I am speaking now not of the National Defense Establishment but of the three separate arms of the service—have any comprehension of our position whatsoever. General Eisenhower does.

I might say further to you that a great number of these post-World War II types we have will be obsolete in 1952. They will have served over 4 years and they will be washed up.

Now I want to read you something else. I want to read to you from the report of this subcommittee, in a very important statement to which the distinguished chairman [Mr. MAHON] alluded in the course of the speech he made a month ago. They state in the committee report:

> In signing the National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950, the President issued a statement indicating objections to the action of the Congress in increasing funds for the Air Force and directing "the Secretary of Defense to place in reserve the amounts provided by the Congress in H. R. 4146 for increasing the structure of the Air Force," which amounted to an item veto, a power not possessed by the President.

Now, can you imagine stronger language by a committee of this Congress than to say that the President had exercised a veto which he did not have the power to exercise? Then the report quotes article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, and concludes that brief portion by saying:

> It is evident that the Congress is given the responsibility of providing for the national defense.

I call your attention to these facts because as time goes on, will any man here be blinded to what is going on in our National Defense Establishment? A similar situation to the one I have mentioned in reference to the Air Force is taking place in the United States naval air arm. We are fast becoming an obsolete air arm with obsolete air power because the President and Secretary of Defense refuse to spend the money for procurement of modern aircraft that the Congress has appropriated, and have announced, even if we appropriated more this year, they would not spend it, and yet that is a power which this subcommittee states in its report is not possessed by the President of the United States? How do you like that? That is something that should be considered by the Congress, I assure you. What are we going to do about it? I have no suggestion to make here. There are older Members in the House of Representatives than I who understand these things much better than I do. I have only been a Member of the House for 12 years, but some gentlemen have been here 30 years and more. I hope they will take a look at this situation and do something about it, because otherwise we will find ourselves in the same condition that we found ourselves in the middle thirties. As late as 1934 our Air Force and our Navy were still flying planes with World War I Liberty engines in them. How do you like that? That is the condition we are getting into today in the face of a very, very troubled world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I compliment the gentleman for his statement in connection with the problems of aviation. Would the gentleman tell the committee how many of the recommendations made by the Congressional Air Policy Board are reflected in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, of the 92 recommendations made by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, of which the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska was a member, I think some 21 have been agreed to or have been enacted into law. The remainder are there for anyone to consider. But the principal recommendation of that Air Policy Board was in connection with the production rate of aircraft for the Navy and the Air Force, with the hope that we might not only maintain our present position, but be able to replace these obsolete World War II types by the time 1952 and 1953 rolled around.

As it stands now they will not be replaced. The net result will be that we will have an obsolete and diminished Air Force and an obsolete naval air arm in a year or so, which may be the most critical time that we can conceive of in the history of the world.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. MAHON and Mr. MARCANTONIO to act as tellers.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 7, noes 104.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The teller vote reveals that a quorum is present.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RETIRED PAY

> For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the Reserve components thereof; and retainer pay for personnel of the inactive Fleet Reserve; $342,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 348, line 6, strike out "$342,000,000" and insert "$318,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I am about to make and include therein in tabular form the figures I shall use.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the original budget estimate for this item, "Retired pay of the Defense Establishment" was $356,000,000. The committee recommended $342,000,000 in the bill; and I have suggested in this amendment the reduction of that figure to $318,000,000.

My reason for making this reduction is this: It is a statutory item; that is, the amount that shall be used is regulated by the number of retired persons who are entitled to retired pay under the law. The estimates being so much above last year made me wonder; I therefore asked the Department of Defense for the detailed figures of actual expenditures, and this is what I found: For July, the first month of the fiscal year, and about 3 months after the increased pay bill was passed, it was $22,978,000; for August, $23,094,000; for September $23,682,000; for October, a rather large jump, $25,084,000; for November $25,425,000; for December $25,480,000, an increase of only $55,000. For January it was $25,568,000, an increase of only $86,000.

It is apparent that the big jump that came immediately following the pay bill has stabilized itself and gotten down to a point where a small increase of less than $100,000 a month is coming along month by month. It is therefor apparent that if one multiplies the 12-month period by the figure $26,500,000 we will allow more money than can, with any reasonable expectation, be used. In my opinion, the only way that more money could be used than the $318,000,000 which results from that multiplication would be by a marked reduction in the Armed Forces of the United States and that, very evidently, is not to happen in the coming fiscal year. The budget estimate does not allow for anything like that, and the report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill does not allow for any such reduction. With the figure here you can see that no more than the statutory allowances could be paid out anyway; that is true. On the other hand, I believe that the Congress ought not to appropriate more money than we can reasonably expect should be used or would be used under the law. The only other contingency would be a change in the law, and as we had a change in the law bringing the whole situation up to date a year ago, I do not believe any such contingency will arise.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The figures, as I have rapidly added them up, total July to January $171,707,000.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What relationship does the gentleman intend to convey with reference to the total requirements under the law of retirement?

Mr. TABER. Of course, double that figure would be for 7 months. The total for the first 6 months would be $146,000,000 and twice that would be $292,000,000. I have allowed for a much larger figure than that all the way through and I think I have provided an ample figure.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, I share the desire for economy which has been expressed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Of course, I recognize as he does that his amendment would not produce any economy for the reason that retirement pay is statutory. It is required by law and there is no way to avoid the payment of certain funds to retired military personnel. The whole question resolves itself into a decision as to whether or not the figures of the Defense Department or the figures of the gentleman from New York are more accurate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. These are the figures of the Defense Department, not mine.

Mr. MAHON. The figures which the gentleman has given are the figures of the Defense Establishment, but the interpretation of those figures is where the issue arises.

For the fiscal year 1950, the committee reduced the budget request for retired pay by $10,000,000. The Defense Establishment is now back here asking for a deficiency because these sums are required by law. However, let it be said in defense of the committee that the Defense Establishment is here asking for a deficiency for retired pay at this time by reason of the fact that Congress passed the Career Compensation Act which increased retirement pay, thereby invalidating the figures which the Congress had arrived at for retired pay last year. In other words, the indications are that in making a reduction of $10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 for retired pay we were approximately correct.

This year we used the same basis of argument and we reduced the budget estimate for retired pay by $14,000,000, feeling that that was the most accurate guess, shall I say, we could make under all of the circumstances. It would not be wise, in my judgment, for us in the name of economy to make reductions below the figures which have been submitted by the committee itself. It would not save any money as the law requires that all necessary payments must be made.

So I ask the committee not to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which would reduce the funds for retired pay by $38,000,000. We have already reduced the budget by $14,000,000, and the same procedure used last year was approximately accurate. The gentleman's amendment would reduce the appropriation by the further amount of $38,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Twenty-four million dollars is the reduction involved.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; $24,000,000 is the reduction requested by the gentleman from New York and $14,000,000 is the reduction made by the committee. Thirty-eight million dollars would be the total of both reductions if the gentleman's amendment were approved. I thank the gentleman for his correction.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 38, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL STAFF CORPS

FIELD EXERCISES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, required for the conduct of special field exercises, including participation therein by the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, and including personal services of temporary employees, expenses of troop movements and temporary duty travel of military and civilian personnel, in connection with special field exercises, including special combat training for small units, movement of matériel, maintenance and operation of structures and utilities, rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, and for use or repair of private property, $5,500,000.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURKE: On page 349, line 16, strike out "$5,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,775,000."

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds $275,000 to this particular paragraph for the purpose of reestablishing the national rifle matches at Camp Perry, Ohio. The national rifle matches were held for many years prior to the beginning of the war. Of course, transportation difficulties occasioned by World War II caused the suspension of the matches.

This appropriation will be used for the purposes outlined in this paragraph, that is, to provide duty pay and travel expenses for military personnel who will be brought to this Army installation on the shores of Lake Erie for the purpose of manning the targets and conducting the matches themselves. It will also be used for whatever military service teams might be involved. The civilian teams that participate in these matches pay their own expenses, as they have done in past years.

Last year I took this matter up with the President of the United States, along with many of my colleagues from Ohio, and the President asked me to talk to the Secretary of Defense. This I did. The Secretary of Defense assured me that he was very much in favor of it and would ask that it be included in the budget this year, which he did. This appropriation, to my mind, is the spending of a comparatively small amount to save a great deal later on. We in this Nation have depended in our past wars on a civilian army. The members of our fighting forces have been known as the best gunners in the world. One of the greatest contributing factors to that reputation has been the national rifle matches that were held at Camp Perry. A great part of military training has been accomplished by these national rifle matches, which have prepared many of our people for participation in active fighting later on.

I believe this is an economy. Although I must admit it does increase the amount in the bill, I am fully confident that it is money well spent.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague and friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that in these trying times we should sentimentalize. We should be practical and deal with these great emergencies in a practical way. On the other hand, we must try to keep our Government expenditures down. It is hard for me with my limited capacity to decide what is actually essential for the well-being of our Government and what could well be taken from our budget without hurting the operations of our Government.

I do not think we should try to dramatize a practical problem, but I remember at the time of the First World War going around after the hostilities had ceased and talking with a gunnery sergeant of the German Army. I said, "When did you first learn that the Americans were in the war?" He said, "We did not know until after Chateau Thierry, because it was the first time we had come in contact with real marksmanship."

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] is asking for the reestablishment of an opportunity to continue the contest at our great Lake Erie proving ground. We find that Camp Perry is profitable. It is the greatest range in the world, in fact, the safest range in the world.

I am especially anxious to reestablish the Camp Perry matches because a man by the name of Gen. A. B. Critchfield, of Shreve, Ohio, in my home county, was one who fought in the early days for these rifle contests. Through his efforts we were able to build up splendid competition among the various branches of the Army, which led, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] said, to our producing the finest marksmen of all the contending armies in the First and Second World Wars. Camp Perry is really a monument to the enthusiasm and effort of General Critchfield.

I think it is very penny-wise and pound-foolish to buy splendid equipment, splendid arms, splendid artillery, unless we make it possible for the men who have to use those arms to use them effectively and efficiently. We cannot do that without proper chances for practice. The best way to increase the interest in practice is to have competition. The idea the gentleman from Ohio has is to provide funds so that the Army can send

men from its several units to the competitions held annually at Camp Perry.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it not also true that as a result of the matches held from year to year at Camp Perry prior even to World War I, and prior to World War II, the Army was able to utilize thousands of instructors who were trained at that camp?

Mr. McSWEENEY. That is a very interesting contribution the gentleman has made to our effort to produce sentiment in favor of this program, and no one knows more about it than the gentleman who has just added his fine statement.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the country knows the marines are probably the best marksmen in the world. Every time a match has been staged at Camp Perry the marines have been there in great numbers and they have won many matches. They, like the Army, have turned around and passed on their experience to the younger men. That is the reason we have such an outstanding Marine Corps.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania who, as we know, is a past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who, I feel, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] himself, are both interested in economy.

But we feel to the vast expenditure being made for our war establishment we can add this little amount to make these men who will be the users of the equipment which we make available as efficient and as skilled as possible.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to my friend and distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I compliment the gentleman on the statement that he has made. I have watched these matches and participated in some of them. It is money that is very well spent.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It means a great deal to us to try, if we can, to sift the wheat from the chaff; in other words, we have spent such a tremendous amount of money for past wars and we are spending such a tremendous amount for what we fear is the war to come, so we must give these men who will use this equipment an opportunity to become well-trained and efficient.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BURKE. I think it would be well also to stress the fact that not only servicemen compete, but also civilians participate in these matches.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I did not know that. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Again I must say that the National Guard and the Organized Reserve, of which I am a member, are in reality the ones upon which we must depend if an emergency arises. The Regular Army, as you know, is the establishment which takes care of us in time of peace, but their numbers must be augmented in the event of an emergency. We should give these men who, as our distinguished colleague from Ohio said, may be in a civilian capacity, a chance to learn to use the small arms. In the event of an emergency they will be the ones upon whom we will have to rely.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, I do not like to dramatize, but in the First World War a young boy came to me the night before the Argonne offensive and asked if I would show him how to load the rifle. He was what we called a field clerk and had never had an opportunity to handle a gun. He had been sent by mistake to the front line. I used some excuse to send him back as a courier, realizing that it would be tragic to send a boy into the conflict who had never learned to fix a bayonet or put the cartridges in the breech.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, you realize the necessity of giving our men an opportunity to use the arms of our service effectively. For these reasons I feel that the amendment of my thoughtful and patriotic colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] should be accepted.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with all that has been said about the good work done in the Camp Perry matches. I do differ, however, as to the wisdom or necessity of providing the funds requested. May I point out, no one appeared before our subcommittee and testified that there is a need for a renewal of the Camp Perry matches. The National Rifle Association was before us, as well as representatives of the services.

They pointed out that the marksmanship work being done in other ways is more important and is ample for the time being. They showed that rifle training in the services is much more intensive than it was formerly. They pointed out and the committee subscribed to the fact that we are carrying on junior rifle marksmanship work and appropriating adequate funds for that purpose.

It is known that there are now local and regional marksmanship matches which are serving the same purposes as the old Camp Perry matches, doing just as much good, and involving the participation of a great many more people than could possibly have participated in the Camp Perry matches. These matches do not require the expenditure of funds as requested in this amendment.

Therefore, from the standpoint of the committee we must feel that the funds requested are not now necessary and we ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I stand before you as a former president of a military institution at which instruction and rifle practice was indulged in, to make men competent to serve their country.

I say with some embarrassment, but with no modesty, that when I first came down here I brought all my medals. I had them all. I can show them to you—pistol, rifle, up to "expert." Some of them I won at Camp Perry; but there is no necessity for Camp Perry now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE].

The amendment was rejected.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for sale; commutation of clothing due to warrant officers of the mine-planter service and to enlisted men; altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary, including laundry work for enlisted men while patients in a hospital; operation of laundries, existing or now under construction, including purchase and repair of laundry machinery therefor; authorized issues of articles for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under observation; equipment and repair of equipment of existing dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops, and garbage-reduction works; equipage; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment; expenses of packing and handling and similar necessaries; citizens' outer clothing and an overcoat, when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed $30, to be issued each person upon each release from an Army prison, each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably, to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered interned as an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without internment; $90,000,000;

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment was first reported, I felt it was deficient in certain items. However, I want to congratulate the committee on the supplemental action which it took in adding funds for the Navy and the Air Force. I was particularly gratified to have Admiral Sherman tell our Committee on Armed Services that the Navy's $50,000,000 was going exclusively into antisubmarine preparation as its first mission in the event of war.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call attention to a matter that I think should be made a matter of record and called to the attention of the membership of this House.

That is the fact that the 1951 budget for the Defense Establishment contains, as part of the costs of retired pay for the Military Establishment, an item of $78,300,000 listed under civil functions, retired pay, office of the Secretary of Defense. This does not represent a new increased cost to the Government. Rather, this sum represents the retired

pay costs for 1951 for some 35,154 estimated cases of disability retirement which would otherwise have been paid by the Veterans' Administration and thus contained in the Veterans' Administration budget. However, as the result of an Executive order by the President promulgated pursuant to the Career Compensation Act of 1949, after July 1, 1950, the Army and the Air Force will carry on its rolls the retired-pay accounts of all nonregular officers of World War II who were previously certified to the Veterans' Administration for retirement pay. Of the 35,154 estimated cases for 1951, 31,013 represent the number of officer cases which are being transferred from the rolls of the Veterans' Administration to the rolls of the Army and Air Force and will thereafter be carried as retired officers of their respective departments. The remaining 4,141 cases represent an estimate of nonregular officers who will be retired in 1951. A small portion of this $78,300,000 represents estimated increases brought about by the Career Compensation Act. But the vast majority of the funds involved merely represent a transfer of funds heretofore charged to the Veterans' Administration which will now and hereafter be carried in the budget for the office of Secretary of Defense.

I mention this so that no Member of the House will gain the mistaken impression that this is an increase in retirement costs brought about by the Career Compensation Act or by any abnormal increase in retirement cases. It is merely a fund that heretofore has been paid by the Veterans' Administration and will now be paid by the military departments through the office of the Secretary of Defense.

I should point out that to the extent the defense budge is increased by the transfer of this item from the Veterans' Administration budget, it represents a reduction in the defense appropriation carried this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SIGNAL CORPS

SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

Purchase, equipment, operation, installation and repair of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, signaling, and aircraft warning systems; signal equipment and stores, heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary instruments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, thermometers, and other meteorological instruments; photographic and cinematographic work performed for the Army by the Signal Corps; motor-driven and other vehicles for technical and official purposes in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of communication or signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and maintenance; maps for use of the Signal Corps and in the office of the Chief Signal Officer; telephone apparatus, including rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message, trunk-line, long-distance, and leased-line telephone service, excepting telephone service for the various bureaus in the District of Columbia, and the rental of commercial telegraph lines and equipment, and their operation, at or connecting any Army facility, including payment for official individual telegraph messages transmitted over commercial lines; electrical installations and maintenance thereof, electric time service, fire control and direction apparatus, and matériel for Field Artillery; salaries of civilian employees, including those necessary as instructors at vocational schools; supplies, general repairs, reserve supplies, and other expenses connected with the collection and transmitting of information for the Army by telegraph or otherwise; experimental investigation, research, purchase, and development, or improvements in apparatus, and maintenance of signaling and accessories thereto, including machines, instruments, and other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; lease, alteration, and repair of such buildings required for storing or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel when not otherwise provided for, including the introduction of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading, roads and walks, and other equipment required; for all expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the preparation of plans, and construction, purchase, installation, equipment, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft warning service systems, and their accessories, including purchase of lands and rights-of-way, acquisition of leaseholds and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof; $155,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 361, line 24, strike out "$155,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$157,500,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which grew out of a special study made at the request of the Committee and at the request of the Secretary of Defense by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to any possible deficiencies in the military-defense program. You will recall that during the hearings General Eisenhower appeared before our committee and before the Senate Appropriations Committee. There was considerable discussion as to some possible areas of weakness in our defense program. As a result of this study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff a recommendation was made to our committee that certain additional funds be added to the bill, and the President sent up budget estimates to cover these additional funds. The major portion of those funds is not included in this particular amendment. It was stated that $24,000,000 was needed in connection with our antitank program. This money was to be spent by the Signal Corps and by Ordnance and by some of the other departments of the Army. A budget estimate was not requested. It was stated that these funds could be made available out of funds within the budget, but our committee had already reduced some of the budget estimates that had been submitted. This amendment simply provides that the Signal Corps may have that additional $2,500,000 to carry out the Signal Corps part of this highly important work having to do with antitank warfare.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and former chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, who is one of the leading authorities in the Nation in the field of national defense. Through the years he has been a tower of strength in the Congress, a man who has made a tremendous contribution in days of peace and in time of war to the cause of national security, economy, and good government.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman will recall that at the conclusion of Secretary Johnson's testimony the able and distinguished Chairman, acting on the instructions of the Committee, requested the Secretary to furnish us further information as to any additional funds that he might require in the interest of sound defense.

This is the first of a series of amendments which came after our study was made, as stated by the Chairman, of the needs following the Eisenhower statement. This is the first of a series of amendments; am I right?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. After the request was made, the Committee held supplemental hearings on these additional items at which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the three Departments—Army, Navy, and Air—and the budget officer, appeared and testified. Is that right?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to secure a little information from the chairman of the subcommittee. I notice that this paragraph contains an appropriation for an aircraft warning system. I assume that is the radar system which is being set up all over the country.

I heard over the radio a night or two ago that two Members of Congress had disclosed the location of these radar installations. I was very much surprised to hear that and to read it in the newspapers. A newspaperman called me up and asked me if one of these radar installations was to be established in my district. I said that I did not know and I told him, "Furthermore, that is not information that should be made public in any way."

On the day following I noticed there appeared in the papers of the country the exact location of the communities throughout the respective States where these radar installations were going to be established. I would like to ask the Chairman whether or not that is supposed to be a highly confidential matter.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the fact we are proposing to construct, and are beginning to construct, a radar fence is not a secret. Enabling legislation was passed and $50,000,000 was earmarked last year in this bill for the radar fence. It is most unfortunate if anyone has disclosed the exact location of these particular installations. I heard something over the radio—I have not seen in the paper any disclosure—as to the location of these particular installations. Of course, it is generally known that radar reaches out for about two or three hundred miles and checks on aircraft. Anyone would know, generally speaking,

where we would probably want a radar-fence installation, but I do think it is most unfortunate that the American people, the Congress and the executive branch, and the press have gone overboard in trying to tell the world a lot of things that are injurious to our national security.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Why is it that the Navy Department and the Army are so liberal in giving out information that should be secret? I recognize that there are probably men in all of these agencies who provide the information to our potential enemies, but, certainly, if there are not such men in these different departments giving out the information, there is no reason why it should be published to give our potential enemies secret information over the radio and through the press.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will make a close study of the hearings, he will find that we have persistently over the years—this year and in previous years—demanded that everything be kept out of the hearings that would give aid and comfort to a potential enemy. We have constantly cautioned our defense officials from the top on down that we do not want anything on the air and we do not want anything published that would be injurious to our security. There is nothing in the printed record that gives information as to the location of these radar installations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the committee has conducted its hearings properly in that respect. We have so many conflicting and confusing statements these days. In the past week or so we have had some distinguished members of the upper body tell the American people that war is imminent; then we have the President of the United States coming out last week and stating that the situation is better and that we are nearer peace now than we have been for a long time. I think the American people have a right to find out the truth about this. If we are headed for another war we should prepare for it and the people should be informed, because the people of this country will back up the administration or the authorities if they know the truth. The confusing and conflicting statements that come out from the Commander-in-Chief, from the Chief of Staff and from distinguished men in Congress are certainly making matters more confusing and the people do not know the direction in which we are headed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to say to my colleague that I have a great appreciation and respect for him. I think the ultimate insofar as the dispersal of information about the international situation is concerned could be cataloged in the following category: Your opinion and X's opinion are just exactly as valuable as anybody else's opinion. Nobody can know what is going to happen tomorrow.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Nobody knows.

Mr. SHEPPARD. So, consequently, there can be no factual information.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly, the statement made by the President that the situation is closer to peace now than it was in 1946, is confusing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. And that is still a matter of opinion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am certainly confused, and the matter should be straightened out and the people should be told the truth.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the conflicting statements made by our military leaders and the President of the United States, I feel that it might be worth while to read the following International News item published last week. Certainly the President's statement only adds to the confusion. He should know the truth, and Congress and the people are entitled to learn how the country stands in the present crises.

TRUMAN SEES NO SIGNS OF WAR NOW, SAYS COLD WAR'S COOLER—PRESIDENT BELIEVES SENATOR TYDINGS IS UNDULY ALARMED OVER SITUATION

President Truman said yesterday that the cold-war situation is improving and he sees no prospect of armed conflict in the near future and is optimistic about peace.

The Chief Executive told his news conference that he believes Senate Armed Services Chairman TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, who said Wednesday it will be remarkable if the United States and Russia can avoid a shooting war, is unduly alarmed.

Mr. Truman's assertion that the chances of world war III are far less now than they were in 1946 was in contrast to warnings recently given to Congress by Defense Secretary Johnson and top military leaders.

JOHNSON VIEW MINIMIZED

Johnson and his chief military planners told the House Armed Services Committee Wednesday that the world situation is worse and TYDINGS warned in a speech that the sheerest accident could detonate another world war.

The President, however, insisted that no emergency exists. But he quickly added that the Defense Department has completed secret plans for military and civilian mobilization in event of sudden war. He emphasized that the plans will be kept secret.

Backing up his feeling of optimism about the continuance of peace, the President asserted that next year's defense budget will be smaller than the fiscal year budget now under consideration.

OPTIMISTIC, HE SAYS

The President said:

"I am optimistic."

At the same time, the President took sharp issue with former President Hoover over his suggestion that the United States and other democracies exclude Soviet Russia and other Communist countries from the United Nations.

The President asserted:

"The United States will support the United Nations as long as I am in the White House."

The President said that, while he and Mr. Hoover disagree on the United Nations, they are fast friends.

Mr. Truman again asserted that the Marshall plan is what he described in his own words as the best means of fighting the cold war.

He reminded his news conference: "It's much cheaper than a shooting war."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this situation which does not have to be called to the attention of very many, but it is absolutely embarrassing when you have been contacted by three separate and distinct branches of the Government and have sworn on three Bibles not to release any information as to where or when or what was being done in your area, to have to read in the newspapers that somebody has told the world that a radar fence is being built around the United States, and that a portion of it will be constructed in your own area, and then they write me and want to know what in the devil is going on up in some section in Vermont, I have to act like a know-nothing because of the fact that I said I would not reveal anything, and have had to say, "I do not know what is going on," which, by the way, is substantially true.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hospital supplies for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships and transports, and supplies required for mosquito destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone; operation of the Army Medical Library and Museum under the direct supervision of the Surgeon General; purchase of veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; expenses of medical supply depots and maintenance of branch depots; medical care and treatment of patients when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract, including their care, treatment, and subsistence in private hospitals, whether on duty or on furlough or on leave of absence except when elective medical treatment has been obtained by such personnel in civilian hospitals or from civilian physicians or dentists; medical care and treatment of authorized personnel of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States when such care and treatment cannot be obtained from medical units of their own country; care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof; pay of male and female nurses, not including the Army Nurse Corps, and of cooks and other civilians employed for the proper care of patients, under such regulations fixing their number, qualifications, assignments, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; pay of internes; pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; pay of other employees of the Medical Department; payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; supply of Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; advertising, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, including tuition and fees of military and civilian personnel at civilian educational institutions; $48,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 363, line 16, strike out "$48,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$54,913,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, through the years, particularly in recent years, there has been considerable discussion of our Government-hospital situation and the need for better coordination of the military, veterans, and Public Health hospital programs.

A study was made in the Department of Defense in connection with military hospitals, and during the course of the hearings on this bill a statement was made that certain hospitals previously occupied by the military would be closed, and it was stated that as a result of those changes $25,000,000 in savings might result to the taxpayers. So, the committee, based upon that information and anxious to make possible this saving, made a reduction in the sums requested for the medical and hospital departments of the Army and of the Navy. Upon further hearings and after an investigation had been made by our committee and by the Committee on the Armed Forces, it was determined that the reduction which had been made by our committee was too sharp for the Defense Establishment to take.

So, this amendment will simply increase from $48,000,000 to $54,913,000 the sums provided for the medical and hospital departments of the Army. It is the exact sum requested by the Army for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, maintenance, and issue of utilities, engineer supplies, materials, and equipment; procurement, preparation, and reproduction of maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys, engineering planning, and investigation and design; expenses incident to military and training operations, including operation of the Engineer School; personal services; travel and transportation; rentals, at the seat of Government or elsewhere, maintenance, installation, alteration, repair, protection, and operation of buildings, grounds, and other facilities, including appurtenances thereto; administration of real estate, acquisiton of lands, easements, rights-of-way, or other similar interests in and temporary use of lands, and, in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance; payment of deficiency judgments and interest thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings; relocation of utilities not otherwise provided for; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Department of the Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; and expenses of packing, crating, unpacking, and uncrating of supplies, materials, equipment, and baggage not otherwise provided for; $300,000,000: *Provided*, That the amounts to be assessed and collected from nonmilitary interests on the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, Virgina, for expenditure in the maintenance, repair, and operation of wharves, roads, sewerage systems, and other utilities at said reservation shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Army during the current fiscal year in proportion of the service rendered to such nonmilitary interests.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 364, line 17, strike out "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$300,176,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this sum requested is for the antitank program, which was presented to the committee after a thorough study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, such presentation having been made to us after the bill had been printed as originally approved by the committee.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. This is a part of that $24,000,000 antitank program?

Mr. MAHON. This is a small part of that $24,000,000 antitank program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 364, lines 17 to 24, after "$300,176,000" strike out all after the colon down to and including the period in line 24.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strikes out language having to do with maintenance and repair at Fort Monroe Military Reservation in Virginia. After this bill had been approved by the committee, legislation was approved by the President which brings this operation at Fort Monroe under the general law. This language is no longer needed because the installation at Fort Monroe is taken care of in the regular way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, including research, planning, design, development, inspection, test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance material and aircraft, together with the machinery, supplies, and services necessary thereto; supplies and services in connection with the general work of the Ordnance Department, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines, including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instruments of service; instruction, training, and other incidental expenses of the ordnance service; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; ammunition for military salutes at Government establishments and institutions to which the issues of arms for salutes are authorized; services, material, tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; publications for libraries of the Ordnance Department, including the Ordnance Office: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law not more than $15,000,000 of the amounts received by the Department of the Army during the current fiscal year as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material shall be available for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided further*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress; $600,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and ask that they be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MAHON:

On page 365, line 20, after "Office" strike out all down through line 6 on page 366 ending with the word "Congress".

On page 366, line 6, strike out "$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$621,559,000".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, at the time the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Army some language was placed in the bill which provided that the Army Ordnance Department might utilize for further salvage work certain funds that were secured as the result of the disposition of salvage. As a result of this legislation, which was initiated by the gentleman from Michigan, many millions of dollars were saved to the taxpayers, and the salvage program of the Army was expedited.

The Department of Defense has now requested the committee to make this provision applicable to the three services. This request has the backing of the Budget and is no doubt an economy move. I feel that the House will want to strike out this language. It will be inserted later in the bill if the House approves.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. This provision was placed in the bill at a time when there was a great shortage of scrap. The committee placed a provision in the bill creating a revolving fund. In other words, money which we got through the sale of salvage and scrap went into a revolving fund which was used up to a certain amount to demilitarize obsolete equipment, and so forth, and increase scrap, primarily salvage. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, you are taking this provision out of the Army section and placing it in the general provisions of the bill, which will make it applicable to the entire National Defense Establishment, the three services. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

The second portion of the amendment to this paragraph, Mr. Chairman, provides for $21,000,000 for the antitank program. This will take care of the $24,000,000 requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for this special work in antitank

warfare which is showing such good results.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Some of us are more interested in the item of defense than almost anything else in this appropriation measure. May I ask the ranking members of the committee on both sides whether in these defense appropriations there is anything that could be called excess? Is there any fat, either in the form of items or personnel which could well be done without, or is all this necessary? I think we should have a declaration right on the floor of the House here so that some of us can make up our minds as to where the bill might be cut. We do not want the bill to be cut at any vital point, especially when it comes to our national defense.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. May I say first that during the 14 years I have been a member of this subcommittee we have never had Republicans or Democrats on the committee. They have all been Americans interested in national defense. I have never known of any matter that was decided in a political way. This subcommittee, when the 1948 and 1949 bills were up, took approximately $4,000,000,000 from 1946 and prior year's appropriation, and we cut $1,350,000,000 from the 1948 and 1949 bills. We took 138,000 civilian employees off the payroll. That was for those 2 years and there were 95,000 civilian employees taken off the payroll in the 1950 appropriation. The chairman can give us the information as to the number of civilian employees who are taken off in this bill. I think the gentleman will find very little, if any, fat in this appropriation bill because of the work of the committee, not only with respect to this bill, but over a period of years when we took the fat out, as it appeared in the bills which came before us. I have never seen a bill in the 14 years that I have been a member of this subcommittee which was a cleaner bill with less surplusage than this one which is now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to point out to the gentleman that in going through this bill over a period of more than 3 months we felt certain reductions could be made here and there. We reduced the budget estimates by the sum of $203,000,000. We made those reductions in 48 different items, and we used our best judgment. Of course, we are not infallible. In the fiscal year 1951 we will have 1,500,000 enlisted men and officers in uniform. Every one of those men in uniform will not be busily engaged every day on important national defense matters. But the committee felt we needed an armed force that large if we were to maintain, shall we say, our military posture. Of course, some of these people are not so much needed unless war actually does come. But we have to keep that framework or skeleton force if we are to have a military establishment worthy of the name. Every effort has been made to discover and eliminate waste.

Mr. FULTON. So, then, in the appropriations for the Department of Defense and for our country's defense, I am assured from both sides of the aisle that these items are necessary and that there is no fat so far as the committee can discover.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. May I then ask what effect a straight across-the-board amendment to this bill, which would cut the defense appropriations 10 percent, would have to the defense of our country.

Mr. MAHON. The military leaders who testified before our committee were asked that very question. They said that in some instances it would be almost disastrous. I say as a member of the committee that it would be very bad logic and a very damaging thing to do at this particular stage. There would be no sense in making that kind of reduction.

Mr. FULTON. Because I value the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan, I would like his answer as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. This budget is based on a certain number of men. There are certain payments in this budget which are fixed, and which, if reduced, you are not going to have the number of men. For instance, the pay of the Army is simply a question of multiplication. There are so many men at an average of so much per rank. We cut the subsistence, using the cost-of-living index. Last year they squawked when we cut it, but they found out they had enough money in the end. We cut scientifically, using the cost-of-living index, estimating the cost of living. The same thing was true with clothing. If you are going to have a straight across-the-board cut, you are not going to have the men and equipment that you desire. That is something the House will have to determine upon itself. The committee accepted the figures for the number of men, in the interest of national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the two amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, operating, and training the Army National Guard, including expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities and alterations, and additions to present structures, transportation and erection of temporary structures, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization for a period of not less than 10 years, construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance, and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal services at the seat of government or elsewhere (including personal services in the National Guard Bureau and services of personnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians, without regard to their military rank) necessary for the care, maintenance, modification, and repair of materials and equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting work, and for administrative and such other duties as may be required; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected therewith as authorized by law; pay at a rate not less than $2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing officers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mileage), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army National Guard division and regimental commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard personnel at military service schools; drill pay of the Army National Guard; expenses of temporary duty travel of personnel of the Regular Army in connection with activities of the Army National Guard; procurement and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equipment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-propelled vehicles and airplanes, and repair and modification of such equipment and supplies; $212,400,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to issue to the Army National Guard without charge against this appropriation except for actual expenses incident to such issue, supplies and equipment from surplus or excess supplies or equipment purchased for the Army: *Provided further*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 870, line 25, strike out "$212,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$217,348,579".

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to provide $5,000,000 additional for the National Guard drill pay and summer training. This is an item which the National Guard people in the respective States feel is their greatest, unmet need.

Mr. Chairman, this Government has a contract with the men and officers of

the National Guard. We say to them: "Keep yourselves trained and in readiness to be called into active duty tomorrow, if need be, and to go to any place in the world and to risk your life in the defense of this Nation, and in return we are going to provide you certain emoluments and considerations, including 48 drill periods a year, with pay, and 2 weeks' active duty training." But we are not preparing in this bill to carry out our part of the contract.

I want to quote you the record. I am not going to quote you my thoughts on it. I want to quote you the words of General Cramer, head of the National Guard Bureau, who with his men has done a magnificent job in developing the National Guard.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I wish to say as one who was under General Cramer overseas, that there is not a more able general in the United States than Kenneth Cramer, not a man who has more guts than Gen. Kenneth Cramer. Any time he is in charge of the National Guard we can feel that it is in the hands of an able man. I support the gentleman's amendment. The National Guard deserves this money to keep it up to the standard we expect of it.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very meritorious amendment and state that I hope the committee will accept it and in the event that it does accept it that the House likewise will accept it.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the support of both gentlemen.

I wish to quote General Cramer's testimony before the subcommittee. This is taken from the RECORD. He states that there are four areas in which problems will be presented in National Guard activities and goes on to state:

> The first area is the area of armory drill. The problem which will be presented in that area is based on the fact that this budget was prepared under the assumption that the attendance at armory drill would be 75 percent by the enlisted men and 85 percent by the officers.
>
> Now, during recent months the attendance of enlisted men at the armory drill has almost reached 75 percent, and this is still some months ahead of the initiation of the 1951 budget. The attendance of officers has averaged 90 percent, which is 5 percent more than is provided for in this particular budget.
>
> The attendance is increasing and we feel certain that from all the evidence at our disposal this area is an area in which the appropriation is not sufficient.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In the 17 years intervening between 1923 and 1940 the average attendance of officers over this period at armory drill training was 91.7 percent, which is 6.7 percent higher than is provided for in this budget.
>
> The average attendance of the enlisted men was 84.8 percent, which is 9.8 percent higher than is provided for in this budget.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We feel that we are now reaching a period in which the estimates on which this budget was based with respect to attendance at the armory drill are too low.

Mr. ENGEL. What will happen if you run out of drill pay money?

General CRAMER. Well, if the Congress is in session, Mr. ENGEL, and that condition is approaching the first thing that would be attempted, I presume, would be a request to the Congress for a supplemental appropriation.

If the Congress were not in session we would be confronted with a proposition of suspending drills.

The same argument was advanced with respect to summer training.

Now my distinguished chairman is going to present the argument, I feel, that we can, if this problem develops, come back for a supplemental appropriation or a deficiency item; but, Mr. Chairman, that is not orderly legislation; that is not the way we appropriate for other branches of the Service. We estimate what is honestly believed is going to be their need and we defend that estimate. But here the head of the Bureau says we have not enough money based on all that we know, for an important purpose, and yet we come before the Congress and say we are not providing enough funds to carry out the contract with those men who are our neighbors and friends in the Guard back home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does it not also follow that unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida carries and the Guard has to come before the Congress for a supplemental appropriation, in the meantime the orderly processes of training the Guard and obtaining recruits is going to be materially affected?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is exactly right; that training will have been disrupted. Let me point out that last year the Government broke similar contracts with the Reserves. It disrupted their training by refusing to meet drill-pay obligations and brought their morale down to one of the lowest points ever seen in the Reserve organizations.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I take no exception to the tribute paid to General Cramer as a fighting soldier, but the trouble with him is he talks too much. He talks too much to the governors of the various States to whom he furnishes planes which are operated at Government expense for private use. This is a pet peeve of mine. The subcommittee was told by General Cramer that because the governors by virtue of the laws of the various States are commanders in chief, he provides them with a plane whenever they see fit to fly. Why not save some of that money?

Mr. SIKES. I have great confidence in General Cramer. But his ability to prevent possible abuse by some of the governors of flight privileges is not under consideration at this time. Possibly it is a weakness that should be corrected, but that is not before the committee now.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I will defer to my good friend. But I say it is true.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. May I say that the governors of the respective States are the commanders in chief of the National Guards of the States, so it is absolutely necessary that there be full cooperation between General Cramer and the governors of the States in order that a big National Guard and a strong National Guard may be built up. Through General Cramer's actions with the governors he is doing a wonderful job with the National Guard.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman is correct in that he contacts the governor, the governor contacts the adjutant general, and the adjutant general contacts every member of the National Guard, then they write you and me and there is pressure brought to bear that should not be brought to bear.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to reemphasize the fact that this amendment applies only to authorized drill pay and summer pay of the Guard units in the field. Now why is it that we are not providing enough money for them? Because the Bureau of the Budget—the all-wise, the all-powerful—which appears to attempt to establish the pattern for everything we in Congress do, has decided against it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman indicate in his statement what the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget was for this item?

Mr. SIKES. The Bureau of the Budget estimate is the one on which the committee has based its recommendation, and which is carried in the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand that the amount embodied in the gentleman's amendment is the amount which was requested by General Cramer for this function?

Mr. SIKES. It is the amount which General Cramer testified to the subcommittee would be needed to carry out this function.

Mr. KEEFE. So that the amount the gentleman is requesting by his amendment is about $5,000,000 above the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget; is that right?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, we know that the men in the National Guard are doing a good job, because time after time we see what they are doing. Most of us have seen them training in our home towns or in summer encampments. We know they have achieved a high state of efficiency, that they are ready for service where they are needed. More than that, Mr. Chairman, the National Guard today offers the cheapest form of defense we have. We get seven guardsmen for the price of one Regular. Yes, we get seven guardsmen for the price of one Regular.

I do not think we want to cut the little pay given to those men who are giving their time and their services in training and who are subject to call instantly; I do not think we want to cut them below the contract that we have made with them. We know that drill pay and summer training pay are essential to maintain the state of readiness we want in these men, and this, Mr. Chairman, is an infinitesimal item in a $13,000,000,000 bill, but it is an important one. We have been raising this bill all afternoon, so this does not constitute any precedent.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. In passing let me say that I thoroughly agree with the thoughts and the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee insofar as the ability and the soldierly qualities of Gen. Ken Cramer are concerned. I speak with some knowledge on the subject of General Cramer's military qualifications. He and I served in the National Guard for a great many years, and I know of no one in this country who is more capable of heading the National Guard than General Cramer.

What the gentleman from Florida has stated concerning the drill periods of the National Guard and the summer field training is true.

I believe that the summer field training of 1950 will show an attendance of enlisted personnel pretty close to the 85 percent mark and well over the 90 percent mark for the commissioned personnel. Unless both the enlisted men and the commissioned officers in the Guard are given some incentive to work for, you are going to find all over the United States a breaking down of the morale of the Guard, which today is in the best shape it has ever been.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the national defense budget in its entirety for the fiscal year 1951, Congress and the Nation are faced with a real dilemma. We are faced and confronted with the necessity of economy in government and, in view of the international situation, of keeping our defenses in such a state of readiness that we do not fall below the danger point. Only recently, observations have been made by General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower concerning our steadily reduced strength in our Regular forces. I have been an advocate for many years of a strong and efficient Reserve. By this, I mean a strong and efficient National Guard and Organized Reserve, not only in strength of units, but also in equipment and matériel. It certainly will not avail us if we have the personnel but not the equipment and those civilian components of our defense forces must be maintained in such a manner by training, equipment, and matériel that they will be ready to take the field on M-day.

I call the committee's attention to the outbreak of World War II, when if it were not for the 18 National Guard divisions in being at that time, half trained as they were, the war might have been extended for years to come. I say this with all due respect to our Regular Establishment, for a finer army never existed.

Certain comments have been made regarding economy. I have not supported bills which call for the expenditures of unnecessary funds, but in the case of appropriations which, to my mind, mean the life of the Nation I do not hesitate nor do I quibble.

This bill now under consideration provides for the sum of $316,335,000 for the Guard for the fiscal year 1951. I am now speaking with particular reference to the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], providing for an increased appropriation in armory-drill pay in the amount of $3,562,784, and field training in the amount of $1,385,795.

Today the National Guard of the United States is at its greatest strength. Well over 300,000 young Americans, many of whom are veterans of World War II—yes; and some of World War I—are serving in the commissioned ranks and the enlisted grades of the Guard. These men are civilians and are pursuing a course of instruction day in and day out in order that they may be ready to take the field at a moment's notice. With particular reference to the commissioned personnel of the Guard, I call your attention to the fact that many of these officers, besides the nights set aside for drill purposes, spend several other evenings at their respective armories throughout the country either performing administrative work or are engaged in map exercises of various sorts. These men are not professional soldiers, but are civilians who are intensely patriotic citizens. They are men who give up a great share of their week for the purposes of preparing themselves for any emergency that might arise, spending night after night away from their homes and families. This in itself is a great sacrifice, but to them duty comes first.

I do not know of any time during my many years of service with the National Guard of the United States when the attendance at drills and field training was as high as it is today. I do not know of any time that the National Guard of the United States has reached such a high degree of efficiency as it has today and it is only by doing those things necessary to keep the morale of the Guard up to its high level that will insure the continuation of an efficient, well-trained National Guard of the United States. During the past few years the attendance for armory drills was approximately 75 to 80 percent for enlisted personnel, and in excess of 90 percent for the commissioned personnel. The records for 1928 to 1935 show that the attendance at field training ranged from 86.5 percent to 96.5 percent and it is expected to increase beyond the latter figure. Surely with these figures as submitted from the records and based on an aggregate attendance at field training of 90 percent, the amount requested should be voted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise in opposition to the National Guard. No one in this House would have any disposition to do that. But I do rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman which would increase the appropriation for the National Guard by $5,000,000 above the budget.

We heard the representatives of the National Guard and a number of very interesting and important problems were presented to us. After we had that hearing, we submitted the manuscript to General Collins, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and to General Cramer, and we requested an appraisal of the criticisms which had been made, and as a result of this reconsideration of the request of the Guard, and upon the recommendation of General Collins, we provided the National Guard with $1,700,000 in excess of the budget estimate for certain maintenance work which was necessary for carrying out the training program. I would like to say that, of course, the National Guard could spend an additional $5,000,000 or it could spend an additional $50,000,000. The National Guard is a growing organization. It is admitted by all who are familiar with the work of the National Guard that it is at this time at the highest peak of morale that it has ever enjoyed.

The National Guard is doing a wonderful job. It is an important part of our national defense structure. As a representative of the committee and the Congress I pay tribute to the guard for the great work it is doing under the leadership of General Cramer. But no department has all the money it would like to have, just as the average American home does not have all the money it would like to have for family expenditures. So under the ceiling of a $13,000,000,000 budget it was decided that approximately, $212,000,000, should be the sum provided for the National Guard. So it seems to me our best course is to sustain that well-considered judgment of the committee.

As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has pointed out and as General Cramer pointed out, if the need for this fund becomes imperative, the defense establishment could come to the Congress

and request a supplemental appropriation. I would favor it if the need should arise and it may well be that it will arise. No doubt we will be in session for the last 6 months of the fiscal year, so I see no serious chance for the National Guard to suffer by the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

I compliment the gentleman from Florida as one of the able and efficient members of the subcommittee. He is doing a grand job in the field of national security and otherwise. He is a friend of national defense in general and the National Guard and the Reserves in particular.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 27, noes 32.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Secretary of the Army: Secretary of the Army, Under Secretary of the Army, Assistant Secretaries of the Army and other personal services, $3,265,000;

Office of Chief of Staff, $6,354,700;

Adjutant General's Office, $9,477,400;

Office of the Inspector General, $197,600;

Office of the Judge Advocate General, $577,100;

Office of the Chief of Finance, $1,437,800;

Office of the Quartermaster General, $6,767,400;

Office of the Chief of Transportation, $2,850,000;

Office of the Chief Signal Officer, $2,379,600;

Office of Chief of Special Services, $56,800;

Office of the Provost Marshal General, $112,500;

Office of the Surgeon General, $2,400,000;

Office of Chief of Engineers, $3,636,200;

Office of Chief of Ordnance, $3,776,400;

Office of Chief, Chemical Corps, $792,700;

Office of Chief of Chaplains, $131,100.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. KEEFE.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 12, noes 64.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, hire of quarters, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing Reserve training), $1,145,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 377, line 4, after the dollar sign, strike out the figures "1,145,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "1,162,435,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is one of seven amendments which are designed to clarify a situation with reference to rental allowances for Navy personnel.

The purpose of this and certain other amendments is to reduce Government expenditures. It is true that some of these amendments do increase the amounts, but by making certain increases, certain decreases are made possible. In other words, certain Navy personnel live in substandard housing. These amendments will enable them to draw their rental allowance, and the Government will collect from the Navy personnel the amount of rent which is due for a number of apartments or houses which are occupied. These funds will go into the Treasury. If this is not done, then the Government will have to expend much larger sums for outfitting and furnishing certain quarters which are now occupied, and the funds for the furnishing of those quarters will be greater than any proceeds that the Government might get. By the use for 1 year of this method of procedure, it is believed by the committee, and I offer this as a committee amendment, that some savings can be made, and this substandard housing, and some of it is extremely poor, which is now occupied by Navy personnel, can be taken care of in an orderly way.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this one of several amendments which relates to an increase in the bill, of which $300,000,000 is contract authorization and $50,000,000 is cash?

Mr. MAHON. No. This has nothing to do with that matter. There is no over-all increase or decrease as a result of these amendments in connection with rental housing.

Mr. STEFAN. Was that taken up before the full committee? Is this a part of the matter that was taken up before the full committee which increased it about $350,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It was submitted to the full committee. The full committee considered certain amendments in addition to the $350,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. The other item will come up later, will it?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY PERSONNEL, GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general training, education and administration of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition, cash book allowances of not to exceed $50 for each Naval Aviation College program student, and other costs incurred at civilian schools, general training aids and devices, procurement of military personnel, and authorized annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian members of teaching staffs; maintenance and operation of Navy training and personnel facilities, including the Naval Academy, Naval Postgraduate School, Naval War College, Naval Home, Navy training schools and facilities, disciplinary barracks, and retraining commands; rent; hire of motor vehicles; not to exceed $30 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary for enlisted personnel discharged otherwise than honorably; welfare and recreation; medals and other awards; research and development; care of the Naval Academy collection of ship models; and departmental salaries, $60,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: Page 378, line 8, after the word "necessary", insert a comma.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is just a corrective amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, hire of quarters, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve training), $196,438,700.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, $17,532,000.

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

For necessary expenses of troops and facilities of the Marine Corps not otherwise provided for, including maintenance and operation of equipment and facilities, and procurement of military personnel; training and education of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation; not to exceed $30 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged otherwise than honorably; research and development; procurement and manufacture of ordnance, ammunition, and other military supplies, equipment, and clothing; purchase (for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation of things; industrial mobilization; rent; medals, awards, emblems, and other insignia; care of the dead; and departmental salaries, $81,301,000.

AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; maintenance, operation, and lease of air stations and facilities, testing laboratories, fleet and other aviation activities; procurement of services, supplies, special clothing, tools, materials, and equipment, including rescue boats; research and development; industrial mobilization; aerological services, supplies, and equipment for the Navy and Marine Corps; and departmental salaries; $537,366,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations for "Aviation, Navy, 1947" and "Aviation, Navy, 1948" shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the liquidation of contract obligations incurred

thereunder during the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, respectively, for aircraft equipment and research and development.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments having to do with rental housing for naval personnel. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MAHON:

On page 378, line 20, strike out "$196,438,700" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,301,700."

On page 379, line 18, strike out "$81,301,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,699,000."

On page 380, line 4, strike out "$537,366,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$536,226,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman care to be heard in support of his amendments?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions affecting the status and the efficiency of the Marine Corps. I know this committee has done a great job in the hearings which it held in protecting the Marine Corps and in doing what it could to increase the efficiency and keep up the morale of this outstanding organization. I was wondering if the chairman of the committee would tell us something about what happened at the time the status of the Marine Corps was considered in the committee. I may say that insofar as the Department of Defense was concerned the Marine Corps, under the appropriation requested in January was to have only six land battalions and twelve air squadrons.

Mr. MAHON. The budget itself contains certain restrictive language which was very unsatisfactory to the Marine Corps. The committee complained about this restricted program for the Marine Corps. When General Cates, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, appeared before the committee he testified, and the hearings will support my statement, that those matters, generally speaking, had been worked out to the satisfaction of the Marine Corps. I believe 16 squadrons are provided, and within the framework of the appropriations, insofar as the Marine Corps is concerned, the Marine Corps is satisfied with the funds provided by the committee. The Marine Corps is like the Army and the Navy and the Air Force, it could and would expand if it had additional funds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the chairman and I wish to point out that so far as costs are concerned, the Marine Corps as an organization is a far more economical organization, man for man, and a far more effective organization per man than any other branch of our armed forces.

Am I correct in assuming that on the basis of the action taken by the committee instead of the Marines having a strength of six battalions it is now possible within the framework of the appropriation allowed for the Marines to have eight and possibly nine battalions?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct. The Marines have been given the power within their budget limitation to rearrange their forces as they see fit. I certainly subscribe to the gentleman's statement that they are the most economical branch of all the services in the expenditure of their funds, and I do not think there is any question about that. They will be able to operate the additional forces, as the gentleman pointed out, by virtue of being able to rearrange as they see fit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Florida. If I may, I should like to ask one more question. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], has stated that the Marine Corps aviation will be raised from 12 to 16 squadrons. It is my understanding that if the Marine Corps had a million and a half dollars more it would be able to put into operation 18 squadrons because it has the planes and the men. Now in the increase in the appropriation being considered by this committee, is it contemplated that the million and a half dollars would be allowed in order to activate two more squadrons, thus raising the Marine Corps strength to 18 squadrons?

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman that no additional funds are made available to the Marine Corps to implement the number of squadrons to the 18 figure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the 16 or 18?

Mr. MAHON. By shifting their funds they have increased the number of squadrons they will have but not to the extent, I believe, the gentleman has suggested.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the subcommittee will in conference consider the advisability of allowing a million and a half dollars more, because the Marines have the planes, the pilots, and the mechanics, but they have not got the money to put these two additional squadrons into active service and I think it should be allowed if at all possible. I thank the chairman for the consideration his committee has given to the Marine Corps and I should like to point out in closing, that the danger to the corps' existence as an effective unit does not lie in legislation which may be proposed but in endeavoring to thwart the will of Congress through decreasing the necessary appropriations. I am satisfied that this committee will continue to do all in its power to safeguard the Marine Corps and I know, in so doing, it will be carrying out the intent and the will of the Congress. I only hope that in conference the additional one and one-half million dollars will be allowed to increase Marine aviation to 18 squadrons, and I further hope that when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] presents his bill to the House that the Commandant of the corps will become a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Marine Corps given the recognition it has earned and deserved. This latter, I believe, will happen.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call attention to what I believe and what the Congressional Aviation Policy Board believed is a very wrong practice being conducted not only by the Navy but by the Air Force in respect to the overhaul and maintenance of their aircraft.

In recommendation No. 7 of the Air Policy Board it points out that at the end of World War II there was an enormous reservoir of highly trained, and highly skilled flight and ground personnel, but only a fraction of that number is receiving training and practice in the reserve force today, and even this small force of organized reserves is in danger of disintegration due to lack of a sustained training program while the unorganized personnel is rapidly deteriorating through total lack of training.

Here is what happens in both of these forces with respect to overhaul and maintenance. They have some very large and important overhaul and maintenance depots for aircraft in both services and very large numbers of civil-service personnel who are engaged in that work. They are civil-service personnel. They also have a very large group of officer personnel on top of the civilian personnel whose salaries do not come under the items which we are here discussing, namely, aircraft and facilities, beginning in line 20, page 379, but whose pay comes out of the pay allowances for the Navy and the Air Force respectively. They also operate in Government plants for which no rent is paid and no taxes are paid. Hence, there is no possible way of making any comparison between the costs by private contract and by naval establishments to start with. But, that is not the worst of it. The civil-service personnel cannot be shipped around wherever you want them in time of emergency. It is only your Reserve force that can be called to active duty and sent wherever they should be needed. But your Reserve force, if they are not currently familiar with the types of aircraft then being used, had better stay home, because they will not be able to do the job.

Now, it was the purpose of the Air Policy Board to recommend that a large portion of the overhaul and maintenance work being done by both the Navy and Air Force should be done in private establishments where a portion of the employees would be required to be in the Reserve force either of the Air Force or of the Navy, so that in time of emergency you would have a nucleus of well-trained and currently familiar skilled aircraft mechanics available to call into active duty to be sent wherever they needed to be sent. But, that is not being done today. The private overhaul and maintenance depots are fast disappearing and the work is being concentrated in the Government, that is, the Navy and the Air Force overhaul and maintenance depots.

When we come to the Air Force appropriations on this subject I will be able to give you the figures out of the justifications. The numbers of civil-service employees engaged in this operation in

the Navy I am unable to find in the justifications, but it is a very considerable number. I think it is a very important thing, and the Air Policy Board thought it was exceedingly important because they made it their recommendation No. 7. I certainly would like to see this committee delve into the subject of whether or not a considerable portion of the overhaul and maintenance work for aircraft should be done in private plants before the next bill comes in.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; maintenance, operation, and lease of air stations and facilities, testing laboratories, fleet and other aviation activities; procurement of services, supplies, special clothing, tools, materials, and equipment, including rescue boats; research and development; industrial mobilization; aerological services, supplies, and equipment for the Navy and Marine Corps; and departmental salaries; $537,366,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations for "Aviation, Navy, 1947" and "Aviation, Navy, 1948" shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the liquidation of contract obligations incurred thereunder during the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, respectively, for aircraft equipment and research and development.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question? Do I understand that when the cadets graduate from Annapolis and when the cadets graduate from West Point first get paid after their graduation, that they are treated alike, both as to regular pay, and as to their leave pay? I have had some correspondence from the parents of some of the boys saying that the West Point cadets for some reason have an advantage over the Navy cadets. As a Navy man, myself, I should like to know what the situation is.

Mr. MAHON. There is some discrepancy. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a member of the legislative committee, I think can clarify that point.

Mr. FULTON. Will the gentleman clarify that discrepancy between the two academies? To me, it seems they both ought to be treated alike when they graduate.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. Heretofore, the graduate of the Military Academy received a graduation leave of 60 days that was not counted against his leave account. It was customary for the graduate of the Naval Academy to receive leave upon graduation, but it was counted against his leave account, and he had to make it up in subsequent years.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman says there was heretofore an advantage at West Point?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes. Our committee has reported and the House has passed a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] which corrects that situation and grants both Academy graduates 60 days of graduation leave not charged against their leave account. That bill is now pending in the Senate.

Mr. FULTON. Could such provision well be added to this bill, or is it better to have it in the other bill?

Mr. KILDAY. I think it is legislative. Before we reported it from our committee we added an amendment making it effective June 1, 1950, so that the Naval Academy graduates this year would be on the same basis as the Military Academy graduates, even though our bill should be delayed in passage. I think it is adequately provided for.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman, and compliment the committee and the House on their action on the Cole bill to make sure that both Academy graduates are treated equally, and that current Annapolis graduates in June 1950 will get the benefit of the 60 days' leave provision, without having it charged against their leave account.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that I may ask the chairman of the subcommittee one or two questions about a matter concerning which I have been receiving some correspondence. What effect will the appropriation this year have upon the strength of the Marine Corps? There seems to be an impression out through the country that either through the act of the Committee on Appropriations or in some other way we are in danger of having our Marine Corps wiped out entirely. I was not a member of the Marine Corps, although I would have been proud to be. I am proud of the organization with which I did serve. So that I may properly answer the questions that have been asked me, may I ask what the situation is now as it relates to the Marine Corps as the result of this appropriation measure?

Mr. MAHON. There has been in the country over a period of months some apprehension that an effort would be made to abolish the Marine Corps. Personally, I can say that I have seen no disposition on the part of the military officials who appeared before the committee to abolish the Marine Corps. I do not think the Marine Corps as such is in jeopardy. It is true that our military strength personnelwise will be smaller in the fiscal year 1951 than in the fiscal year 1950. The Marine Corps has taken its proportionate reduction in military personnel. However, there is no disposition, certainly, on the part of the committee to do any injury to the Marine Corps. At this time the Marine Corps is in no jeopardy whatever of being abolished or sidetracked.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So that I may have specific information, and I assume some of the other Members are also interested, what will be the strength of the Marine Corps under this appropriation?

Mr. MAHON. As I recall, it is around 75,000 officers and enlisted men. I will supply the exact figure for the record, but that is my recollection. The correct figure is 72,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have assured these people who have written or talked to me that, knowing the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations as well as I do, they would never jeopardize the Marine Corps.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. If the gentleman will refer to page 1889 of the hearings, part 4, he will find the complete breakdown of the number of battalions and the number of men.

They were eligible before the increase. They were increased after that as the gentleman will recall, by the amended bill.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The total for 1951 is 71,862 officers and men.

Mr. MAHON. The Marine Corps is not too much in jeopardy as long as men of the character of Gen. C. B. Cates and Gen. W. P. T. Hill are at the helm.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, but at the same time even those gentlemen cannot do the job unless the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress supply the money.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to make this observation. Just 1 year ago on this identical subject with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, in the same capacity, I raised this same question and I was assured by the gentleman from Texas, and I believed him then and I believe him now, when he made the same statement. The fact still remains that the Secretary of National Defense Johnson proceeded to exercise his discretion and his ideas regardless of the opinion of the House and of this committee with reference to the Corps. I would like to place the distinguished Secretary of Defense on notice now that we expect the Secretary of Defense to adhere to the opinion expressed by the Committee of the Whole, the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States with reference to the action it takes in connection with the Marine Corps.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modernization of aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public plants, and not to exceed $500,000 for expansion of private plants; procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, $620,000,000, of which $530,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That there is hereby established a 1951 aircraft procurement program (including all purposes and objects provided for under this head) in an amount of $690,293,000, to be provided from (1) this appropriation, (2) the contract authority granted hereinafter, and (3) $124,797,000 of the balance of the contract authority granted under this head in the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," but this proviso shall not be construed to prevent the use in the fiscal year 1951 of other unused contract authority heretofore granted for aircraft procurement: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $475,496,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MAHON:

On page 380, line 23, after the dollar sign strike out the figure "$690,293,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$790,293,000."

On page 381, line 9, after the dollar sign, strike out the figures "$475,496,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$575,496,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these two amendments is to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President in his budget message of a few days ago. The object of the amendments is to provide an additional $100,000,000 in contract authorizations—not cash—for the Navy air arm. It was pointed out last year in our hearings, and again this year, that certain deficiencies exist in the Navy airplane procurement program, deficiencies which prevent the Navy Air Corps from achieving a modern force airplanewise.

Toward the conclusion of our hearings this year we asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense to give consideration to the need for additional aircraft for the Navy. Following the now celebrated Eisenhower statement in the other body a few weeks ago, a restudy was made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed, after full consideration, that an additional $100,000,000 in contract authority should be provided for the procurement of airplanes for the Navy. The purpose of this amendment is to make possible the procurement of this naval aircraft.

The funds will provide for the procurement of 95 additional planes. They are very closely linked with the antisubmarine warfare program of the Navy, which has the highest priority of any program in the Navy. So it is the considered judgment of the committee that the additional funds should be allowed, and these funds have been requested by the Joint Chiefs and approved by the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking not because I oppose this amendment, but because I am considerably disturbed by a deep and abiding conviction that we are not doing enough.

Not long ago the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], made a statement on the floor of this House indicating that he would request an additional $383,000,000 for naval aircraft procurement. That request was based on the minimum needs to maintain the effective combat strength of the naval air arm at its present reduced operating level. We are by this bill reducing the naval operating strength by 1,500 planes for the next fiscal year, from that which applied this year. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has just told us that the $100,000,000 proposed by the committee amendment will provide an additional 95 planes. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us the amount by which the attrition rate of effective combat planes is greater than the replacement rate which this bill will make possible. Does the gentleman have that figure?

Mr. MAHON. I am sorry, but I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. HARDY. I want to know the extent by which the attrition rate, the obsolescence and wearing out of first-line combat planes, is greater than the replacement rate which this bill will permit.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The gentleman's point is very pertinent. I share his concern and I commend him for his good work in the cause of a more adequate defense program. As the gentleman knows the Navy has a large backlog of 14,000 planes, many of which are obsolete, many of them in moth balls, and many of which would never be used. So we are going to reach the point where those planes, produced just at the end of the war, will rapidly become obsolete or obsolescent. This appropriation provides for a total of 912 additional aircraft for the Navy. Of course, they are very expensive, costing more than an average of a million dollars a plane. They are very essential to the Navy program. They are not all the planes the Navy would require.

Mr. HARDY. I am talking about what would be required to maintain the first-line combat strength.

Mr. MAHON. The Navy would like to have for that purpose funds for an additional 435 planes.

Mr. HARDY. Do I understand that even after this $100,000,000 is added, our effective first-line combat strength will annually decline by 435 planes?

Mr. MAHON. It will not necessarily decline by 435 planes each year, but the 435 planes which would be delivered in 3 or 4 or 5 years would be required to maintain this level that the Navy would like to maintain if it is to project a program for modernization in aircraft.

Mr. HARDY. Assuming the continuation of the level of procurement provided in this bill plus your amendment for the next 4 years, would it be accurate to state that our effective first-line combat planes would decline at the rate of 435 a year?

Mr. MAHON. No; I believe not; not 435 per year. There would be a decided deficiency and the deficiency in 1951 would be 435 planes. I would like to point out that this figure of $100,000,000 was a figure agreed upon by the Joint Chiefs, and this position is supported by Admiral Sherman.

Mr. HARDY. I am fully aware of that. I have had some discussion with Admiral Sherman and some correspondence with him.

I simply point out that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee—and I believe his facts are indisputable—stated that an additional appropriation of $383,000,000 is needed to maintain the first-line combat strength which we now possess.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. In 1948, the Navy stated that it would require annual contract authority at the then prices of $770,000,000 in order to maintain the strength which they believed necessary to defend our country.

Mr. HARDY. That still does not answer the question.

Mr. HINSHAW. It answers the question as to the 14,500 aircraft which the Navy hoped to maintain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I shall be delighted to. I have not yet disposed of the question asked by the gentleman from California, but perhaps I can dispose of both at the same time.

Mr. SIKES. I will wait until the gentleman has answered the other question.

Mr. HARDY. My point is simply that the Navy cannot, if I understood the gentleman's remarks correctly, even taking his $770,000,000 figure, maintain the full fighting strength which it considers necessary, or even which this bill provides.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is necessary, but without reserve aircraft.

Mr. HARDY. The point is simply that we are reducing our operational strength this year by 1,500 planes. I cannot see anything in the international picture that justifies our reducing our total operational planes. That is point No. 1. Point No. 2 is that if we needed a certain effective combat strength last year, we need it worse this year.

Mr. HINSHAW. We certainly do.

Mr. HARDY. If in order to maintain the present combat strength which the chairman the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] stated would require $383,000,000 in addition to what this bill carries, we try to give a token $100,000,000, we are still going to fall below the current combat strength by something over 400 planes per year; and if we continue this current program for the next 3 or 4 years, as the Chief of Naval Operations has indicated is his program, then, by that time we are going to be so far down the line in first-line planes that we will find it impossible to replace the last procurement in case of emergency.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has made a correct statement.

Mr. HARDY. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. If you are talking about first-line planes and the life of first-line planes and are going to need $383,000,000 a year, it is a question of whether we feel we can afford to spend the money or not. If we have a first-line naval air

force based on first-line planes, as long as those planes are modern they are first line, but as soon as they are superseded by new planes you are going to need every bit of money you are talking about. That does not mean that we are going to be short that number of planes that you are talking about in each succeeding year; it does mean that we are going to have to depend to an increasing degree upon planes which are not quite as new and modern and effective as we would like our men to have to operate. It is a question for the House to decide in its wisdom.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman's statement is exactly to the point.

I have here a letter dated May 3 which I received yesterday from the Chief of Naval Operations. I wish to read a part of it. He states:

I have at no time indicated that $100,000,000 is adequate to meet all the needs of the Navy for new aircraft. I have stated this figure was the minimum which would temporarily bring our first-line fleet combat units up to an acceptable level. I have further stated that for the next 4 years a minimum appropriation of about $800,000,000 annually would be required to maintain our fleet combat squadrons in an acceptable condition of readiness.

The admiral further states:

In 1954, we will have a large number of aircraft, delivered in 1945 and earlier, whose useful life will have expired. Commencing about 1954, a much larger annual appropriation would be required.

My point is simply that this is a question we have to decide. Apparently agreement has already been reached elsewhere so it will serve no useful purpose to seek to add the entire $383,000,000 needed. We ought to be aware of what we are doing, however. We are bringing our effective fighting force down every year. We are not going to have effective combat air strength in the Nation by 1954. By the admission of Admiral Sherman we are going to find ourselves with a naval air arm which is reduced to such an extent that if it is to be put back on an effective combat basis we shall have to increase very greatly our appropriation and even then we are going to have to wait 2 or 3 years to get the planes to fight with.

I think we are making a mistake. I think this is a shortsighted policy and that we are gambling with the Nation's defense. And make no mistake, we are not saving dollars. They will have to be spent tomorrow.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Admiral Cassady made this statement to the committee:

The 435 aircraft deficiency can be met by the continued operation of older aircraft but our requirements are computed on the basis of having only three-fourths of our combat units equipped with first-line aircraft.

In other words, he said their requirements are based upon a computation of three-fourths of the planes being first-line aircraft. I think that is a pretty good average.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Does he indicate how many it will be reduced to next year?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. He is talking about the present year.

Mr. HARDY. On the basis of this present program we are going down every year, yet we continue with this shortsighted policy.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I do not agree with the gentleman. The whole proposition is that this is a $13,000,000,000 budget for national defense. The amount for each department has been allocated to that department and that department in turn determined what they were going to do with the particular amount of money. The Navy determined the number of ships or number of planes they wanted and how they spend the money. If they prefer to build ships to planes, that is their responsibility.

Mr. HARDY. Now, as to the other side and what they are going to build with the money, the Navy did not say: "We need so much"; the Air Force did not say, "We need so much"; and the Army did not say, "We need so much." They have a total figure and they were told: "Now, here is your share. You do the best you can with it." What we are doing here does not indicate for a second the minimum force of any one of the three services.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is not what the Chiefs of Staff told us. Thirteen billion dollars is too much for a peacetime budget, it is not enough for a wartime budget, but it is all our economy can stand.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am gravely concerned about the situation in which we find ourselves. We receive so many conflicting reports on the conditions throughout the world and the state of our military preparedness. There are many things we would like to be able to speak about frankly and openly. If we cannot do it in the meetings of the Appropriations subcommittee, and print the testimony in the RECORD, we certainly cannot talk about them with propriety here on the floor of the House. As it is, sometimes Members and Government officials talk too much about the defense situation and the development of military devices. We stand aghast at some of the things we read in the newspaper that we assumed had been secret and top secret, yet we find them spread all over the pages of the paper, to such an extent that any potential enemy does not need to have a vast espionage service to learn what we are doing. All any potential enemy has to do is to have a staff to read the newspapers, sit in here and listen to the debates, read the hearings and reports. He will get a vast supply of information with ease. To me it is little short of tragic that we must operate in this way out in the open, when nearly every other nation cloaks such actions in deepest secret.

I have served on this Committee on Appropriations for 4 years. I served with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. Knowing them as well as I do, I have faith in their honesty, their integrity, and their desire to do what is right, having in mind the necessity of our Military Establishment and, again, having in mind the financial situation in which we find ourselves.

We are asked now upon faith—and I have faith in these men—not to appropriate $100,000,000 now, but to authorize $100,000,000 for the Navy Air Force. That is a lot of money, and some day, in the future, that huge sum must be paid. We have taken on by way of amendment some $2,500,000 additional, which may seem small compared to the whole sum. We have taken that on faith, but we are soon going to be asked to take on faith $350,000,000, which is over one-third of a billion dollars. I could do it myself. Rather than wake up in time of dire need of a single million short, I would rather be millions of dollars over on a defense budget. For if we don't have military strength when it is needed, it will be too late to get it. But, this question arises. You go home and you have advocated economy, and the folks know that you will not economize at the expense of the Nation's defense and its possible destruction. But, they will say, "Now, what information did you have upon which you based your judgment to vote for that increase of over one-third of a billion dollars?" Well, I can say that the members of the committee told us that that was necessary. They will say, "Well, what information did they have?" My reply would be: "They had hearings, but the points upon which we would like to have had specific information, as we look at the printed hearings, all say 'discussion off the record'."

So, Mr. Chairman, I would raise the question as to whether or not it might be possible or feasible, both, for the committee to go into executive session, and then in executive session have from the lips of these men who have all of these facts and figures those facts upon which this committee could act with reason and with logic so that we could say, "Even though we cannot tell you what the information was, we were told that these things which were absolutely necessary under these world conditions, and knowing the men who told us the source of the information, we relied upon those facts which we received, and therefore used our best judgment."

Mr. Chairman, I would submit a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not an executive session could be held and, if so, what procedure would be necessary to bring that to pass before we are asked to vote upon the $350,000,000 additional.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MANSFIELD). The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kansas that the Committee of the Whole would have no control over that. That would be a matter for the House itself to decide.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I understand that, of course, and raised the question for in-

formation of the Members. Since it is a matter for the House to determine, as a further parliamentary inquiry, what would be the method followed to take that action?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Kansas that a parliamentary inquiry of that sort should be addressed to the Speaker rather than the chairman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Very well. Of course, I realize that it will not be done. Such executive sessions of the House have not been held for over 100 years. Possibly it should not be done because it might be misinterpreted throughout the country. But at the same time I am suggesting that the members of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations discuss, possibly overnight, whether or not such action should be taken, so that we may be fully advised of the world situation and our military needs in view of those world conditions.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the discussion in the last 15 or 20 minutes has brought us face to face with the stern fact that we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. The fact has been disclosed by the gentleman from Michigan that we need greater national defense in the air arm and other places.

However, because of the large budget and the great national debt we possibly cannot have it. The discussion of General Eisenhower through the press and the exchanges between General Eisenhower and the President have pointed up to the same thought expressed here in the well of the House today. Both have agreed that our defense is inadequate because of lack of additional funds, because of our big public debt and the great cost of Government. It is the responsibility first of the Chief Executive, and secondly of the Congress, to preserve the financial solvency of this country. Our first line of defense is the financial solvency of our Government. The next duty of the Congress is to provide for the national defense of this country. A strong military is our second line of defense. Those are the two most important problems facing us in these days of world chaos.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The first requirement of a sound national defense is a sound economy. Once that is gone, there is no national defense possible.

Mr. VURSELL. That is right. Without a strong national defense, we cannot protect the people and the institutions of this country.

There is a way out for us, and there has been one all the while. If we are short on financial solvency or if we are short on national defense, the blame should be placed on the Chief Executive and the Members of this and past Congresses for allowing ourselves to get the country into that sort of condition. We can get out of it if we have the intestinal fortitude and the wisdom and the patriotism to do it.

The question I want to bring to you today is, How many of you are convinced that now is the time to pull for the shore and pull on the oars and strengthen our financial picture and strengthen our national defense, both imperative to all the people of this country? How many of you are ready to take such action now?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I say to the gentleman that I am ready to vote on that kind of proposition any time.

Mr. VURSELL. There are a lot of us that are ready, as the gentleman from Michigan has said.

I should like to call to your attention, that most all the economy directed from the Administration in this Government has been against the military and, secondly, some of the great liberals over in the other body have wanted to economize on flood control, because flood control and the military, I presume their thought is, do not have a concentration of votes.

May I point out further that the political, or patronage arm of the Government, the departments, have never been reduced or have been reduced very little. Generally month after month more Federal employees are added to the political departments of the Government.

This brings me to the point I have viewed with alarm for months and months, that the only economy moves made by the administration has been directed toward cutting the cost of the military defense of this country. It is an easy matter to do that, but it is a dangerous thing to play with. World conditions are too serious for us to permit our national defense to drop so low that we cannot meet an emergency if it should happen.

I do not impugn their motives, but I raise the question as to the wisdom of their policy. We appropriated some $700,000,000 in the last session of Congress to strengthen the air defense of this country, and it was impounded by the Chief Executive. I do not know whether or not the chairman of the subcommittee is right in stating that the President went beyond the veto power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. However, in my study of the Constitution, it seems to state clearly that it is the duty of the Chief Executive to faithfully administer the laws passed by the Congress. That would mean, in my judgment, not the impounding of the $700,000,000. Since that action the Joint Chiefs of Staff has asked us to increase the amount in this bill by over $300,000,000. Our Nation at the present time is so short of any semblance of a real hard striking air arm that it gives all the Members of this body deep concern.

I was alarmed when the gentleman from California showed the low state of the national defense of this country from the standpoint of air. The gentleman from Virginia has just raised the question, and a very important question.

But there is a way out. The gentleman from Texas, if I read the papers correctly, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, will offer one of the avenues out, and that is to cut out the cost for all services not absolutely necessary, excluding national defense out of this bill, and thereby save $750,000,000.

If you want to protect the freedom of the people, if you want to protect them from the standpoint of national defense, the thing to do is cut the cost of Government where it is possible.

In the latter days of this week in considering this great budget, let us reduce it by $1,500,000,000. Suppose it does bind here and there. Suppose it does cost the administration the loss of 100,000 or. 500,000 jobs that are beneficial on election day. Let them go, in the interest of the people of this country, and that is one of the ways out. For me, I shall support the Thomas amendment if it is offered to cut the cost of this bill $750,000,000. I think it is fine if it comes from the Democratic side of the House, because that side of the House has been entirely too silent, up to the present time in the weeks that we have been debating this bill, so far in offering to help us of the minority side in effecting any reductions in the bill now before us. Such action, if it happens, will be the first help we have had from your side of the House which has a majority of the votes. If we fail in that, and I hope we do not, then let us try to cut this budget, excluding the military, by $1,500,000,000, and if necessary add that to the airplanes and to the national defense of this country.

That, in my judgment, is the responsibility resting upon the Members of the Congress and the responsibility resting upon the Chief Executive who is now making a report to the people and for the third or fourth time is now out West dedicating Coulee Dam.

There is only one road we can take to protect our first line of defense, financial solvency, and build up an adequate military defense. That is to cut cost of the other departments to the bone. The future of our country and the freedom and liberty of our people may be at stake. I will take that road. The minority party will, I believe, also take it. Will you of the majority join us?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SHIPS AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, operation, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services, including subsistence and other expenses of civilian crews of vessels; installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks; charter

and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; research and development; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; $415,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 381, line 21, strike out the figure "415,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "415,282,000."

Mr. MAHON. This is another item concerning the rental housing general provision referred to in connection with the amendment on page 377, line 4. In addition, it adds $1,036,000 for the maintenance and operation of four additional destroyers to be continued in operation as proposed by the President in his supplemental 1951 estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head, $76,400,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 381, lines 23 and 24, strike out all of lines 23 and 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For an additional amount for 'Construction of ships,' to remain available until expended, $111,420,000, of which $76,400,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That the limitation imposed under this head on the total obligations to be incurred for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the fiscal year 1950 is hereby increased by $35,020,000, and obligations incurred for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the current fiscal year shall also be charged against said limitation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is embarrassing to present so many amendments to this bill.

I should like to explain again, if I may, the situation which makes it necessary for these amendments to be presented.

Near the conclusion of the hearings on the bill there was a meeting held at the Capitol, at which the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and Secretary of Defense Johnson were present; also members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The committee expressed concern about the antisubmarine warfare program and about the level of procurement of airplanes for the Navy and the Air Force, and asked that some study be made and some advice given to the committee as to any additional funds which might be required.

About this time General Eisenhower, before a committee in the other body, was raising some question as to the adequacy of our defense. As a result of this chain of circumstances, the Joint Chiefs of Staff held numerous meetings, and they made a recommendation which came to us in the form of a budget estimate for certain additional increases.

Fifty million dollars as an additional increase was requested for antisubmarine warfare, which is the highest priority objective of the Navy. All of us know that if war should come, and we trust it will not come, the sea lanes must be kept open or else we will be separated from any allies we might have in the event of hostilities. Our antisubmarine warfare is especially important, particularly in view of the submarine power of certain nations. Substantial progress has been made in antisubmarine warfare, and this additional $50,000,000 will be utilized for the important purpose of enabling us in the event of an emergency to meet more adequately the submarine menace.

So the amendment now pending provides an additional $35,000,000 of the $50,000,000 for that high-priority purpose. The total sum for any of these programs cannot be pinpointed in any particular paragraph. It has its impact on various paragraphs. Hence the necessity for the numerous amendments which must be offered.

Let me digress for a moment in order to make a few general observations. We are seeking to avoid spending ourselves into bankruptcy. We are placing our major emphasis on research and development and upon the capacity for quick industrial mobilization in the event of an emergency. It is necessary to have many ships and planes and weapons of all kinds. Yet we seek not to overstock on hardware, so to speak—on equipment which may quickly become obsolete in view of the rapid strides made in research and development. I undertook to present many of these matters to the House in a discussion of our national defense problems on April 4 of this year. At that time I sought to emphasize the necessity for a balanced and long-range program and close cooperation between Congress and the executive branch in national defense planning.

Members of the Appropriations Committee realize that all Members of Congress are aware of the threat to our security and that all Members want to use the greatest care and all necessary funds to seek to promote peace and American security. We have a tremendous responsibility to the Nation and to the world, and it is often difficult to know just how we should discharge it. We cannot afford to economize at the risk of encouraging world war No. 3. There is not doubt but that many additional billions of dollars could be utilized in the defense program. We have tried to balance military might and economic power in such a way as to promote national security. Generally speaking, we have followed the recommendations of General Bradley and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, and of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief. We can only hope that the decisions made will help achieve American security and world peace.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the production and procurement of Navy ordnance and ammunition (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); alteration, preservation, and handling of ordnance and ammunition; maintenance of ordnance (except installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance, and line maintenance of ordnance installed in aircraft); maintenance and operation of ordnance facilities; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in naval or private plants; lease of facilities; research and development; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; $175,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 382, line 14, strike out "$175,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$177,088,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, as the text of the bill will show, the paragraph just read has to do with ordnance and facilities. In this $50,000,000 antisubmarine warfare program, certain funds are required for ordnance and facilities, and the additional amount provided here is for that particular portion of the antisubmarine program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head, $30,000,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: Page 387, after line 15, strike out all of lines 16 and 17 and insert the following: "For an additional amount for 'Ordnance for New Construction,' to remain available until expended, $41,856,000, of which $30,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That the limitation imposed under this head on the total obligations to be incurred for armor, armament, and ammunition for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the fiscal year 1950 is hereby increased by $11,856,000 and obligations incurred for such purposes for construction, conversion, or replacement approved during the current fiscal year shall also be charged against said limitation."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, in explanation, this amendment is, of course a part of the total amount that was originally presented. It represents disbursements through the bill and brings those figures up to the recommendations of the President in his message transmitting supplemental estimates dated April 27, 1950, House Document No. 575.

This amendment increases the cash under this appropriation bill by $11,856,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to say that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has had long and varied experience on the Committee on Appropriations, that prior to the consolidation of the military and naval subcommittees he was the able chairman of the subcommittee handling all naval appropriations. His contribution to the cause of national security has been great indeed. As vice chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force he is doing an outstanding job for California and the Nation.

I think I should say further in fairness and for the information of some of the newer Members of the House that the position of chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations was also formerly held by another member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], one of the most ardent and able advocates of national defense ever to serve in the House, and that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] was formerly the chairman of the Army and the Air Force Subcommittee on Appropriations; and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], one of the ablest Members of this body, formerly served on the Armed Services Legislative Committee. While we make no pretense of being experts in the field, we do feel that the subcommittee has had much experience in these matters; and I may say that the amendments being offered by the gentleman from California have the complete endorsement of all members of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the chairman in behalf of myself and I am sure also my friend from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. Certainly we both consider it a distinct honor to serve under the gentleman from Texas as chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of naval hospitals, medical centers, clinics, schools, research facilities, the medical supply system, and other medical activities; procurement of medical and dental supplies, equipment and services; rent; instruction of medical personnel in naval hospitals, naval medical schools, and civilian schools; research and development; industrial mobilization; care of the dead; and departmental salaries; $34,000,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 383, line 14, strike out "$34,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$38,212,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, this, again, is an additional amendment for the disbursement of funds that were granted in detail and which are found in their respective positions in the bill. This amendment proposes to restore approximately $4,412,000, making the amount for these items the same as the Budget request.

The explanation is the same as in the case of the other amendment; it is a restoration of funds to the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of district public works offices, public works centers, advance base depots, construction battalion centers, defense housing projects, other civil engineering facilities, and shore activities not otherwise provided for; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment for the foregoing activities; purchase (for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; research and development; advance engineering planning; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; $52,502,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 384, lines 1 and 2, strike out the figure "$52,502,000" and in lieu thereof insert "$35,178,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, the explanation of this amendment is another of those under the rental housing provisions to which reference was made in connection with the amendment offered on page 377, line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of the Naval Observatory, the Hydrographic Office, Service-wide Communications, Naval Records Centers, Naval District Headquarters (except training and public works offices), River Commands, Sea Frontiers, and other service-wide operations and functions not otherwise provided for; procurement of supplies, services and equipment for activities financed hereunder; Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed $26,090,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 419c), to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; for examination of estimates for appropriations and of naval activities in the field for any branch of the naval service; and departmental salaries; $95,739,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 386, line 3, strike out "$95,739,000" and in lieu thereof insert: "$94,261,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, this is a reduction, and the explanation of the amendment is similar to that given for the rental housing provision to which reference was made in connection with the amendment offered on page 377, line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and contract modification of aircraft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and accessories therefor; electronic and communication equipment, detection and warning systems, and specialized equipment; expansion of public plants, and Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants for the foregoing purposes; industrial mobilization, including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and procurement planning; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents, transportation of things, and personal services in the field; to remain available until expended, $1,700,000,000, of which $1,525,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That there is hereby established a 1951 aircraft procurement program (including all purposes and objects provided for under this head) in an amount of $1,511,440,000, to be provided from (1) this appropriation, (2) the contract authority granted hereinafter, and (3) $726,151,000 of the balance of the contract authority granted under this head in the "National Military Establishment Appropriation Act, 1950," but this proviso shall not be construed to prevent the use in the fiscal year 1951 of other unused contract authority heretofore granted for aircraft procurement: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations granted under the head "Air Corps, Army," for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, shall remain available until June 30, 1951, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder prior to July 1, 1947, and July 1, 1948, respectively: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes in an amount not to exceed $610,289,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 387, line 16, strike out "$1,511,440,000" and in lieu thereof insert: "$1,711,440,000" and on page 388, line 6, strike out "$610,289,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "$810,289,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, on April 26 Secretary of Defense Johnson requested, among other amounts, a $200,000,000 additional contract authorization for the Air Force to be used for the procurement of planes. He made it clear that the request for the additional authority was not for the purpose of adding extra people or extra overhead but only for the additional procurement of planes. That is the purpose of these two amendments which have been offered and are required for the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that this amendment increases the original bill in the sum of $200,000,000 in contract authorizations for the Air Force?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. And that the need for this additional fund was developed during our committee hearings, but there was no budget estimate for the amount and in the original bill the $200,000,000 was not requested?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that after a study was made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff the position of the committee was sustained, a budget estimate was presented to the committee and to the Congress for the additional $200,000,000 and that all members of the committee concur in this additional fund which will help keep the 48-group program modernized if this level of procurement is continued, with some increase in future years?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman's statement is absolutely correct. Insofar as this particular amendment is concerned, it has the same background for justification as the amendments heretofore accepted by the committee.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. This brings the total for aircraft procurement to $1,711,000,000, but it will require a $2,000,000,000 annual appropriation to keep the 48 group modernized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course, this is one of the situations we are faced with. Looking at the hearings and the supplemental hearings we find that these were facts that were all gone into thoroughly by the subcommittee off the record with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and listening to their recommendations and to the needs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, the entire hearing was not off the record.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am talking about the main portion, and properly so, because it just makes my blood run cold to think that we lay all the facts on the table where everybody can see them, and that is one of the peculiar things about this representative Republic of ours. Probably it is one of its weaknesses or perhaps one of its strengths. But, I want the assurance of the gentleman from California that the recommendations are made not just upon speculation or upon conclusion but after having heard all of the intimate details presented to the gentleman in executive session and in the committee hearings, and that those things being so important to the national defense, they cannot be completely disclosed in all of their detail.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My answer to the gentleman is that his assumptions are quite correct. I would like to, however add that the gentleman has served with the committee in the past and that he is thoroughly conversant with the details gone into in order that the committee becomes familiar with the necessity for expenditure requested. And, I will say this to my colleague that, if anything, the committee has intensified its inquiry into this additional amount as compared with what it might have been in the past.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am glad to have that assurance, too, because as he will recall, recently we have had so many conflicting statements where somebody says that war may be just around the corner, and another says we are in better shape now than we have been in the last 4 or 5 years, and then the Secretary of Defense will say we need this money, and at the same time he is speaking one of his assistants says that in spite of the budget cuts, our position is better than ever before. So, there is in the minds of all of us that confusion, and I am glad to have it cleared up by the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair to point out to the House that with this amendment for an additional $200,000,000 for the Air Force, that on July 1, 1950, if the bill becomes law in its present form, the Departments of Defense, Navy, and United States Air Force, will have on hand in cash or in contract authority $5,600,000,000 for the purchase of aircraft, which is certainly a very large sum of money, but the sum is considered necessary for the defense of the country. Much of this money has, of course, been provided in appropriation bills in previous years. The planes have not been delivered and the funds have not been expended.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I think it is only fair to answer the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and tell him that this subcommittee on one occasion spent 3½ hours in a soundproof room in the Pentagon Building with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There were perhaps 75 or 80 people there, including members of the State Department. We had 3½ hours of consultation and I want to say that this committee certainly asked a lot of questions. We spent 2½ hours with the Air Force behind closed doors, soundproof walls, and what occurred there I cannot tell this House, and there were no leaks of any kind. But, it was after consultations of that kind that we came out with this bill, and this bill is based upon information given top secret which we obtained at those two meetings of about 6 hours duration.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my friend from Ohio, and I am well aware of his interest in the defense program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was very much interested in a question propounded by the gentleman from Kansas and the replies that have been made by the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Texas, and the gentleman from Michigan. There are a great many of us in this House, in fact, something like 370 Members, who are not on either the Committee on Armed Services or on the Committee on Appropriations. We have no opportunity to know anything about the actual needs, or the actual military situation, and we have been and are confused. We read where the top national-defense officials say one thing and the President, perhaps, says something else. So, we have to take on faith that which you tell us. So far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for this amendment because I have confidence in the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Michigan and others who have given us their word that this is necessary for the security of our country.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman well realizes that one could not determine with mathematical certainty whether or not war would come, and if war did come, when it would come. The defense budget is not adequate for the country if war should come overnight. It is a matter of taking certain calculated risks and trying to be as well prepared to strike an immediate and devastating blow in retaliation as may be possible. That is the theory upon which this bill is predicated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, we all realize this does not prepare us for an all-out war, but we do have to have someone in Congress upon whom we can place responsibility to tell us what is necessary to give us an adequate defense, so that at least we will be half way secure and able to retaliate in case of need, and the money will not be wasted.

I realize fully, as most Members of the House do, that it is impossible to spread all these details on the front pages of the newspapers or tell everyone on the floor of the House, because that would be giving the enemy all the information that might be helpful to them. So because of the faith and confidence we have in you gentlemen, I am sure this House is going to support your best judgment as to what should be done under the circumstances.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in case the Members of the House have not had an opportunity to peruse the committee report, the same being House Report No. 1797, second session, Eighty-first Congress, listen to what the committee has to say on page 311:

> On the question of increasing the Air Force program from 48 groups to 58 groups, there was much debate and consideration in the Congress over a period of months prior to the adoption of the 58-group program. In other words, the bill which was passed by the Congress and approved by the President embraced the 58-group program, but the impounding of funds by the President reduced the program from a 58-group program to a 48-group program. A major question of policy was determined by the Congress, and funds were provided to implement the policy, but the will of Congress was circumvented.
>
> It is perfectly justifiable and proper for all possible economies to be effected and savings

to be made, but there is no warrant or justification for the thwarting of a major policy of Congress by the impounding of funds.

I think that is a very important statement that we should have in the record of this debate. That is why I have read it into the RECORD.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The impounding that took place on the current appropriation bill involved the impounding of $500,000,000 and a little more. Does the gentleman know or does anyone here know whether or not the funds provided by these amendments that have been adopted here today and that may be adopted here today will be impounded?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. No one knows whether or not these funds will be impounded, but presumably from the fact of budget estimates sent up to us they may not be.

I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that instead of it being $500,000,000 which was impounded, there were $158,000,000 in cash and $578,000,000 approximately in contract authority which was impounded.

Mr. TABER. That is practically $750,000,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. $750,000,000 out of the additional $800,000,000 appropriated by this Congress were impounded.

I would like to say to the gentleman I discussed the subject of whether or not the Air Force and Navy had given up their programs, which they presented to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board and the Finletter Commission 2 years ago and whether they thought these programs were now unnecessary. I am directly informed that the situation is entirely to the contrary, that they continue to think these programs are necessary, but in view of what they call the necessity of keeping the budget down, they are not pressing it at this time. Of course they cannot press it under the direct orders of the higher echelon, shall we call them, of the Government of the United States. But that does not by any manner of means indicate that the military establishment departmental heads are not thoroughly in accord with the words which they gave to both commissions two and a half years ago. I feel sure, after reading this report of the committee, that they are in agreement and are merely bringing in this bill and these amounts in the realization that if they bring in higher amounts those additional funds will in turn be impounded again.

I ask the gentleman from Texas if he would care to express himself on that subject.

Mr. MAHON. May I point out to the gentleman from California that the committee had not withdrawn any of the statements which were made in the hearing and in the committee report. The committee did feel that the balance of these funds were completely and thoroughly unauthorized. We certainly want a closer working relationship in the matter of national defense between the Congress and the departmental heads of the Department of Defense and the President. I think with this compromise agreement which is being carried out by these amendments today we are going to have a better relationship which will all be to the good. I do not anticipate that the funds provided here today will be impounded.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, the gentleman would rather have a slice of the loaf rather than have the whole loaf put in the cupboard, to just mold there, is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor in strong support of this amendment to add $200,000,000 to aircraft procurement for the Air Forces. I support this, as I did the last amendment to add $100,000,000 for naval aircraft procurement.

This Nation must keep itself strong in the air as it is today our best defense against any sneak attack—and the best insurance against world war III breaking out.

We all want economy—I personally will vote for economy in our peacetime establishment—but I dare not risk the danger of leaving this country unprepared in the air by failure to order new and modern combat planes now. You cannot buy time—and our supremacy in the air will depend upon what this Congress does now to strengthen this first line of defense against attack.

I well remember when, just before the outbreak of World War II, how I felt certain then, that if Uncle Sam had had 5,000 first line fighting planes with combat pilots in readiness—our demand of Hitler that he not cross the Polish Corridor and thus start World War II, might have been effective. For the want of this first-class air force then—World War II broke out which cost us and other nations so many lives, and costs in dollars that ran over $400,000,000,000.

Strong defense expenditures now can mean greater savings later. In 1939 we were spending only one billion for our entire Army, Navy, and Air Force. If we had spent more to prepare, we would have had a chance of averting the war—and thus saved hundreds of billions that the war cost.

We know what is required to strengthen our Air Forces. The Finletter Commission, a nonpartisan commission of experts appointed by the President, and the Congressional Air Policy Commission both agreed that we need a 70-group air force to bring up our forces to proper strength.

Yet because of unwise handling in the other body—these funds have been attacked—despite the vote here last year of 305 to 1 in this House to start building up this 70-group air force and to have it ready by 1952. The other body, while it reduced Air Force funds by more than $500,000,000, added hundreds of millions to rivers and harbors projects and to other peacetime public works. This was false economy. It was dangerously unwise to spend such vast sums on peacetime development, desirable as it might sometime be, and to cut so dangerously the money needed to strengthen our Air Forces.

I compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the Military Subcommittee, for the great fight he made to provide proper funds for the expansion of our Air Forces. Even though this money was impounded for this year and not spent, his determination to write a clear record for the House position deserves much praise.

Now, because of his fight we still have these funds, both appropriations and contract authority still available to the extent of $800,000,000 for these additional and needed planes.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if these funds are still available or if they have expired?

Mr. MAHON. These funds were not utilized according to the mandate of the Congress in passing the bill. However, a request is made for a reauthorization of these funds which means that for all practical purposes of course the funds have not been used and will not be used unless you want to consider the seven hundred and fifty million or eight hundred million dollars a part of the Air Force appropriation for fiscal year 1951.

Mr. MONRONEY. But this $800,000,000 is still available for procurement of aircraft for the coming year if the situation is such that those in charge of our defense can be convinced that the House position was right on expanding our Air Force procurement program.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. Of course it is rather late in the year now for those funds to be wisely spent.

Mr. MONRONEY. But this money will continue to be available for the next fiscal year. The funds do not expire.

Mr. MAHON. No; they do not expire.

Mr. MONRONEY. So the action of the House in insisting last year on $800,000,000 in additional funds for more aircraft will continue to be in effect and the money will be available for expenditure by the Army and Navy Air Forces for the new fiscal year in the bill we now have under consideration.

Mr. MAHON. The funds could be considered as a portion of the funds appropriated and made available for fiscal 1951.

Mr. MONRONEY. And therefore the House has not retreated from its position for an adequate air defense.

Mr. MAHON. The House has not retreated from its position.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman stated that $5,600,000,000 in contract authority is still with the Air Force. I note language on page 388, lines 3 to 5, which provides that "the Secretary of the Air Forces is authorized to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes in an amount not to exceed $610,289,000." This language and limitation does not apply to the funds previously appropriated?

Mr. MAHON. No. That is new authority.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is new authority, and it does not impinge in any way on the $5,600,000,000 now ready for commitment if the defense forces so desire?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman. I want to make it crystal clear that I do not favor cutting the air forces, and particularly do not want to see us permit our planes to become obsolete and not replace them with modern 1950 and 1951 planes. World War II planes are of little use in today's combat, and we would not only leave our defenses impotent, but we would condemn our pilots to death if we tried to kid ourselves into thinking that we could use these obsolete craft in case of war.

You cannot get new planes designed, produced, and tested overnight, and to prepare for any emergency we must continue our procurement program now. I am advised that we have less than 2,000 modern, first-class, late model fighting planes on hand. This is too small a number to rely upon for our defense.

Despite our desires for economy we must not cut out the most vital part of our defenses and thus weaken our first line. Let the ax of economy fall on ordinary peacetime operations, postponable projects, where the loss of a year or two might not be the difference between military disaster and victory.

I trust that the gentleman from Texas, Chairman MAHON, will exercise the same diligence as he did last year in insisting in his conferences with Members of the Senate, that military funds, and particularly air force funds, be not drastically cut to the danger point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to tell the subcommittee that I believe it acted wisely in increasing the money for the procurement of planes for the Navy and Air Force. The members of the Armed Services Committee, as you all know, went over this information, as stated by the gentleman from Michigan behind closed doors. After evaluating the situation, I believe I can say that the Armed Services Committee is supporting this movement by the subcommittee unanimously.

I think we have to look at the picture today percentagewise, in the over-all cost of the Air Force, to see how expensive these airplane purchases are. More than 37 percent of the Air Force budget will be for procurement of airplanes. Not only do we have items for increasing and improving our Air Force in this appropriation bill, but also we have much research and development work being carried on in the atomic energy plants, and also in the NACA and other departments of the Government, which makes it very, very expensive.

The picture before us, as we know it, and as outlined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is amazing to those of us who sit and look at it, and imagine what can happen and how quickly it can happen. So, on that basis, assuming that other nations can do as well as we do, that information has been imparted to this committee as well as to us, we necessarily have to plan our air defense on that basis and in line with that thinking.

Again I want to congratulate the subcommittee in making this appropriation available. Also, the point that the gentleman from California raised as to the impounding of funds. I want to express my viewpoint on this. I felt like it was unwise when this action was taken last year. I certainly appreciate what the subcommittee has written into the report. I agree wholeheartedly with them. I hope that none of our funds will be impounded as they have been in the past. I believe that a committee of some 34 members on the Armed Forces Committee with military problems, members who have had long experience, and members of this Subcommittee on Appropriations are all experienced and have some definite opinions as to the necessary needs for this country's security. When we have passed on it, and I believe we are responsible under the Constitution for security. I certainly hope that the Defense Establishment will carry out the expressed intent of the Congress. With the sword of communism pointed at the heart of every free country on this globe we must not take chances with our security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In order that the record may be complete regarding the impounding of the funds, I want to read into the RECORD from the hearings held on April 26, 1950.

I asked General Wood, who is Assistant Comptroller of the Department of the Air Force, when he appeared before the committee, to supply certain information. For the benefit of the Members, I read that portion of the supplemental hearings:

Mr. ENGEL. General Wood, I would like to have you place in the record a statement showing the amount of money which was appropriated during the years 1948, 1949, and 1950 for the Air Force which was impounded by the executive department.

Also, I would like to have you show the breakdown for which that impounded money was appropriated.

I would also like to have a statement showing the amounts of such impounded money which were released, the dates that the funds were released if they were released; and then a statement showing the amount of money, if any, still impounded under the Executive order.

General WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENGEL. I think that should go in the record before we ever consider the $200,000,000. You can furnish that for the record.

General WOOD. We will furnish that for the record.

(The information is as follows:)

"1. None of the funds appropriated for Department of Air Force operations for fiscal years 1948 and 1949 were impounded.

"2. Following the enactment of the fiscal year 1950 appropriation bills, the President directed the Secretary of Defense to reserve the additional funds added by the Congress to the President's 48-group budget for the purpose of building up toward a 58-group air force. As a result, the following funds were placed in reserve:

"Appropriation:	
"Construction of aircraft and related procurement (contract authority)	$577,755,000
Special procurement	8,338,000
Maintenance and operations	130,928,000
Research and development	18,000,000
Contingencies	733,000
"Total	735,754,000

"As of this date the 'President's reserve' remains at $735,754,000.

"3. Two of the above appropriations, 'Construction of aircraft and related procurement' and 'Research and development' are continuing appropriations. Amounts in reserve have been applied in the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1951 (H. R. 7786) against total requirements under these appropriation titles in arriving at additional appropriations and contract authority proposed for enactment."

That gives the complete picture as to what was impounded and what it was impounded for.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft, and for maintenance, operation, repair, and other expenses necessary for Air Force facilities, including transportation of things; rents at the seat of government and elsewhere, and in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q payments of rents may be made in advance; field printing plants; hire of passenger motor vehicles; training and instruction of military and civilian personnel of the Air Force, including tuition and related expenses; pay, allowances and travel expenses of contract surgeons; utility services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Air Force regulations to be used for welfare and recreational purposes; rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, use or repair of private property, and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers; expenses of courts, boards, and commission; organizational clothing and equipage; civilian clothing and when necesary an overcoat, the cost of all not to exceed $30, for each person upon each release from a military prison, each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably, each enlisted man convicted by a civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a civil prison, and each enlisted man interned, or discharged without internment as an alien enemy; payment of exchange fees and exchange losses incurred by Air Force disbursing officers or their agents; losses in the accounts of Air Force disbursing officers as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 95a; 50 U. S. C. 1705–1707; act of July 26, 1947, Public Law 248); burial of the dead as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 916–916d; 5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of personnel of the Air Force of the United States who die while on active duty, travel allowances of attendants accompanying remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other in-

structional, entertainment, and welfare expenses for enlisted men; expenses for Inter-American cooperation as authorized for the Navy by the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421f), for Latin-American cooperation; payments of deficiency judgments and interests thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings heretofore instituted; and special services by contract or otherwise, $1,010,000,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing the Navy budget for maintenance and overhaul of aircraft I mentioned that when the time came to discuss Air Force overhaul and maintenance I would give a few figures. These figures come from justifications made by the Air Force and the Bureau of the Budget to this committee.

In the money to be expended for maintenance and overhaul in the Air Force there is a total of $144,971,000 worth to be carried on in Air Force depots and $18,563,000 among Air Force contractors. The depots will employ civilian personnel to the tune of 30,012; the approximate number to be employed by the contractors will be something less than 2,500.

The aircraft to be overhauled in the Air Force depots will total 2,342, and the aircraft to be overhauled by the contractors will total 293.

This illustrates what I mean when I say that the overhaul and maintenance work is being taken directly into the Government shops and not being done in private establishments. In that way we are going to lose the possibility of training for the reserve forces a great many men. They can be had among the regular employees of private contractors. In recommendation No. 7 of the Air Policy Board, and also in the recommendations of the Finletter Commission, we call attention to the fact that the reserve forces capable of doing overhaul and maintenance work on aircraft were falling to practically nil, and one of the ways that these reserve components could be built up was to require that a substantial portion of the overhaul and maintenance work be done in private plants, with the requirement that some proportion of the civilian personnel employed in the private plants be in the reserve forces. That is not being done, but gradually the business is being moved, as I said, entirely into Government overhaul plants.

The proposed budget would provide funds and personnel sufficient to do a planned number of overhaul jobs on 2,342 military planes, compared with the plan to perform overhauls on only 293 military planes through private contractors. The ratio is in favor of the Air Force depots by about 8 to 1. It seems to me that is pretty high. The money is about 12 to 1.

I think it would be well indeed for this committee to study that subject because there you have 30,012 civil service employees.

General Wolfe stated in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee, as is contained in the hearings:

"Contractual services for modernization as well as for normal depot type maintenance are limited to those cases where the facilities to perform the required services are not available in our depots or where such services can be more economically accomplished through contact."

Obviously, this policy statement by an official AF spokesman is a far cry from the recommendations of the Finletter Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board. If this AF policy is allowed to stand, and the private overhaul contractors thereby allowed to fall, obviously there could not be another successful Berlin air lift.

When we go back into the House I shall ask that the report of the Finletter Commission and the Air Policy Board be inserted in the RECORD. In the meantime I would like to call attention to the fact that the Finletter Commission is chairmanned by Mr. Tom Finletter, who is now Secretary of the Air Force, and I recommend respectfully to the gentleman through this medium that he read his own report and put it into effect now that he is Secretary. We have tried to get it put into effect before this but have been unsuccessful in doing so. While there is no possibility of amending this bill in that respect—it would be legislation on an appropriation bill—nevertheless there is one way in which the committee can effect certain economies in this budget and that is by having such work done by private contractors through the employment of privately employed mechanics.

I would like to call attention to one more fact and that is: Where they do let these contracts to private contractors for overhaul and maintenance these days, they are doing it, not on the basis of efficiency of the contractor, but on the basis of the level of wages paid by that contractor as well as certain other considerations, including overhead. In overhead are rent and taxes if the plant used is privately owned. By the device of leasing Government-owned plants to private operators at nominal rental, the contract overhaul business is being moved into Government-owned plants. From that point to Government operation of such plants is a short but fatal step to the private contractors—to private enterprise in the aircraft overhaul and maintenance field. If privately employed labor there needs a job it can then join the civil service at the bottom of the seniority list. It is not a pretty picture.

Mr. Chairman, under authority granted, I append recommendation No. 7 of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board and language from the report of the Finletter Commission, as follows:

[Excerpts from Congressional Aviation Policy Board Report, p. 12, recommendation No. 7, first paragraph]

In general, the present practice is for the armed services to overhaul aircraft in their own depots. This may serve peacetime needs of the services, but it falls far short of solving problems of providing maintenance facilities and personnel available for duty with combat units should hostilities require. Experience during the past war indicates clearly that private as well as military plants must be utilized for overhaul of military aircraft in continental United States in war. It is essential that some of these contract overhaul establishments be maintained in time of peace, ready for expansion in the event of national emergency.

[Excerpts from Finletter Commission Report (Survival in the Air Age), p. 68, third paragraph, contract overhaul]

A number of substantial civilian organizations are engaged in the overhaul of transport aircraft. This is a specialized type of business quite separate from the manufacture of airplanes. Testimony before us has indicated the economy and other advantages of having modifications and overhaul of military aircraft done by such civilian organizations under contract. This is particularly true when the same types of cargo or transport aircraft can be overhauled in the same shops for both the military services and the civil airlines. The services are not in agreement and stress the need for training their own overhaul personnel in their own shops. We recognize the validity of the argument but recommend that the services weigh carefully the savings possible through contract overhaul, and the possible long-term advantages of building up civilian staffs trained in such work for use in an emergency.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to disagree with my colleague from California whom I consider to be one of the outstanding aviation authorities in the House, but I cannot let his statement go unchallenged that these Government airplane maintenance depots are simply civil-service establishments and contribute nothing to our reserve forces.

In fact, over 85 percent of the more than 13,000 employees in the Midwest Air Depot in Oklahoma City are veterans of World War II and most of them came out of aviation services.

They are on call for world-wide service. Referring to the gentleman's statement about the Berlin airlift not being maintained, men from the Midwest Air Depot at Tinker Field, Oklahoma City, were moved to England to keep the planes in repair for the Berlin airlift.

These men put into force many of the thousands of mass-production methods of overhaul, maintenance, and rebuilding that they developed at Tinker Field.

This base, Tinker Field, is a model in efficiency and mechanical engineering. It is an example of mass production methods being applied to aircraft overhaul to improve the efficiency and skill of well-trained workmen, each of whom learn to excel at their particular task.

Their efficiency in handling B–29's and B–36's is so great that I doubt very seriously if these giant planes could be repaired anywhere, in any factory, at comparable costs, or be turned out in like new condition as they are at the Oklahoma City Air Depot.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Are these people in the Reserves or are they merely under civil service?

Mr. MONRONEY. A great many of them are in the Reserves. One of the big Reserve programs of the Air Force

is to send in reservists for a training period as a stand-by to certain jobs in aircraft repair in time of war. Thus every man on key jobs will have a stand-by reservists trained in the depot and when the keyman goes in the service you will continue your air depot there with experienced help. Such a program would be impossible in a private shop or factory because of the magnitude of the lines of work.

It is part of the Regular Army Air Force program with Reserve training being used throughout that immense plant to teach these men not only to make repairs on air frames and repairs on your ordinary aircraft motors, but also on our newest and largest jet motors. I do not know any shop or plant that has an installation that could overhaul so thoroughly and completely, take down to the last bolt and nut and rebuild to new condition a jet engine, which I understand has to be changed every so many hours.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I might say to the gentleman that there are a great many private plants that are perfectly capable of doing that; in fact, they have done it right along.

Mr. MONRONEY. On your new jet propulsion?

Mr. HINSHAW. On new jet propulsion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman put a list of those in the RECORD that are equipped and ready to do a complete overhaul job down to the last bolt. Tinker Field can test the terrific centrifugal force in spinning chambers of these highly complex engines.

Can these shops put these parts, each and every one disassembled from the engine, literally through X-ray, fluoroscope and other tests, to determine their soundness? When these motors are completed at Tinker Field they are more carefully assembled, inspected and tested than would be possible in the factory that built them in the first place.

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly all of the manufacturers of jet engines could do that as well as a number of engine overhaul companies such as Pacific Airmotive Co.

Mr. MONRONEY. Most of them, I believe the gentleman will find, are pretty busy with their present defense orders. I would not like to see us tear down a highly successful operation that I think has proven its worth in keeping not only our aircraft in the air, but providing for on-the-spot aircraft storage, so that we do not have to fly B–29's out to California to have them made ready for immediate service. We have them on our air base now. They go through the air depot, and they are on their way overseas immediately.

Mr. HINSHAW. There are several private manufacturers located on Long Island and in and about the city of New York and in the State of Maryland so that you do not even have to fly as far as Oklahoma to get this service.

Mr. MONRONEY. But we already have B–29's in "moth balls" on this field. It is good economy to be able to overhaul them on the same field where they are stored. I do not believe it is proper to tear down such a successful development that has been so successful in maintaining our aircraft through the war and through the postwar period. I would like to see some business given to the private contractors, but of necessity, we must have our major depots, with their parts storage, plane storage, skilled technicians in every line of the thousands that go into a modern bomber.

They are as essential to the maintenance of our fighting air forces as is a navy yard to the Navy. Our defense would suffer if we permitted any weakening of our present highly developed system.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 613. The appropriations contained in this chapter for the Air Force, Navy, and for the Army, which are available for the procurement or manufacture of supplies, materials, and equipment of special or technical design may be used for the development and procurement of gages, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, production studies, factory plans, and other production data, including specifications and detailed drawings, and for the purchase of copyrights and letters patent, applications therefor, and licenses thereunder pertaining to such supplies, equipment, and materials for which the appropriations are made.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: On page 401, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 614. Whenever any appropriation or contract authority contained in this chapter is used for the procurement from a contractor of any article or service to be manufactured or performed in a Government-owned plant or facility, and whenever in the course of such procurement any tool, die, jig or other production facility is furnished to such contractor by any agency of the Government, the contractor shall pay into the Treasury of the United States the full rental or use value of such plant or production facility so used by him, and such rental or use value shall be calculated in the same manner and to the same extent as though the contractors did in fact own, lease, or rent from another, acquire or manufacture such plant or production facility himself: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply in any case, and to the extent, that a contractor has contracted to establish a pilot production line in such a Government-owned plant, but it shall apply in such case when a production contract shall be entered into. Nothing contained in this section is intended to prevent the sale of any Government-owned plant or production facility to any contractor pursuant to any act authorizing the sale of Government property."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I have introduced it for the purpose of making it a matter of record. I do so for this reason:

More and more the procurement of the armed services is going into Government-owned plants all over the United States. It will be remembered that something approaching 1,600 such plants were built by the Government during the war. Some of them were in my area and some are in your areas. Some of them are elsewhere in the United States. But we started a program here shortly after the war for the disposition of these Government-owned plants. A number of them were disposed of. Then for some unknown reason, or for some reason unknown to me, at least, that disposition stopped and the rest of them have been continued in Government ownership.

The effect of the Government ownership of these plants is that they now lease them for a price or for a nominal sum. In some cases they are leased for a dollar a year plus maintenance. The Government in turn will furnish tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, and other equipment at no cost to the manufacturer.

The type of amendment I have offered has been made at the suggestion of organized labor groups who are employed in these plants, in the belief that if the transfer of business from privately owned plants to Government-owned plants continues, it will be perfectly possible for the Government to take over and operate these plants, thus nationalizing the aircraft industry. That would be a sad day for this country. The nationalization of military production means that you will have a second-best Military Establishment, because it requires real competition to develop the highest and best that can be done by human ingenuity.

I recognize that there is to be some saving made, which is only an apparent saving, by putting this production into Government-owned plants at practically no rent, because then the appropriations made under this bill will go a little further when it comes to the numbers of items that may be obtained. However, in the long run there are two categories of people who suffer. The first is the taxpayer of the United States, and the second is the local government. These plants are local-tax-exempt, and the local governments cannot receive any income from them for tax purposes.

I would hope that a bill could be introduced that would require a reimbursement to the local communities for the tax moneys they lose by virtue of having Government plants in their areas. I think the taxpayers of the United States should receive the full rental value of the property they own.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to compliment my colleague from California for bringing this point to the attention of the House today. He is indeed telling the truth when he says this present method of operation is a direct blow at private industry, because it subsidizes one type of private industry against another type by furnishing them jigs, dies, tools, and plant facilities at a dollar a year cost, and putting them in competition with private industries who have their whole capital investment to charge off when making bids on Government contracts.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is quite correct. It makes it possible to distribute the contracts on a bid basis which is unfair to privately owned plants and hence to truly private industry. More people than we few here are concerned with this. It is a matter of great concern to the labor organizations of the United States that the defense procurement shall remain in the competitive classification and in competitive private industry and not come under Government control and operation. These great organizations do not want to become civil-service employees. They do not feel that the benefits which would come to them as civil-service employees would outweigh the rules and regulations under which they would have to live and operate. They prefer to work and have their opportunities in private industry.

I hope, while this cannot be considered effectively here on the floor of the House under this bill, the great Committee on Armed Services will consider this subject carefully and weigh the facts as they may be learned. The subject of this amendment is one of the most vital subjects, other than our international position, which we face today. It is the subject of Government ownership and operation of industry versus private ownership and operation of industry. In that connection I call your attention to section 613 of this bill just read by the Clerk. That is a key section, key language in the law which is needed to implement the taking over by the Government of private industry engaged in manufacture for the Defense Establishment. The Committee on Armed Services might well look into the entire subject before we go much further down the line toward nationalization of defense industry.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has offered an amendment to which the gentleman from Texas raises a point of order. The gentleman from California concedes the point of order and the Chair sustains the points of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 629. The provisions of the act of February 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 3), shall be applicable to the appropriations of the Army and Air Force for military pay for the fiscal year 1950 and the current fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency of the department concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 411, after line 9, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 630. Not more than $15,000,000 of the amounts received during the current fiscal year by each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage material, shall be available during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, this provision has been carried in the Department of the Army appropriation for the past few years to enable the Army to salvage and return vital materials to the United States. It is the purpose of this amendment to apply the same provision to the three services in order that each may salvage and return to the United States such matériel as is or may become valuable to this country. Reports indicate that the operation by the Army has been quite successful.

I ask for a vote on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This chapter may be cited as the "Defense Appropriation Act, 1951."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on chapter X of the pending bill may have permission to revise and extend the remarks which they made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 411, following line 21, insert a new chapter, as follows——

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, this is undoubtedly a very important amendment, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the chapter of the bill under consideration today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 22—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 587)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 22 of 1950, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949. The plan improves the grouping of Government programs according to their major purposes by transferring the Federal National Mortgage Association from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This reorganization carries out the specific recommendation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government that "the Federal National Mortgage Association be placed under the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

At present, the Federal National Mortgage Association, a wholly owned Government corporation, is a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Its purpose is to provide a secondary market for home mortgages insured or guaranteed by other Government agencies through the purchase, service, and sale of such mortgages. In addition, it is authorized to make direct loans for housing in Alaska. As of the end of March 1950 its total holdings were approximately a billion dollars and its outstanding commitments to purchase were more than $1,400,000,000 in addition. Such a volume of activity has an obvious impact on the Government's entire housing program.

The Congress has long recognized that the function of such a secondary market is closely related to the entire housing program. The Federal National Mortgage Association originally was chartered by the head of the Federal Housing Administration as authorized by title III of the National Housing Act. In rechartering the Federal National Mortgage Association 2 years ago the Congress recognized the relationship between it and the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency by providing that the Federal Housing Commissioner alone would have authority to determine whether and when the Federal National Mortgage Association should be terminated. This act also required submission of semiannual reports to the Federal Housing Commissioner and for the transmittal by him of these reports to the Congress together with his recommendations thereon.

Nearly 3 years ago the Congress approved the establishment of the Housing and Home Finance Agency under an Administrator who could be held responsible by the President and the Congress

for the general coordination and supervision of Federal housing programs placed in the Housing Agency at that time. The Federal National Mortgage Association was not then made a part of the Housing Agency because the provisions of section 5 (e) of the Reorganization Act then in effect precluded submission of plans involving agencies whose organizational status had been changed by the Congress subsequent to January 1, 1945. The act of February 24, 1945, transferred the Federal Loan Agency which included the Federal National Mortgage Association from the Department of Commerce. Moreover, the holdings of the Federal National Mortgage Association amounted to only $7,500,000. This small volume of operation presented few immediate problems of coordination with other aspects of the entire housing program. However, the basic relationship of the Federal National Mortgage Association to the housing program was recognized by making the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or his designee, a member of the National Housing Council.

The present high volume of activity by the Federal National Mortgage Association has radically altered the situation which existed in 1947 and has made it essential that these market operations be geared more closely into the Government's housing program. The manner in which these market operations are administered has a direct effect on the kind of mortgages written and the availability and cost of mortgage credit. The secondary market must be administered therefore at all times in full consistency with other programs affecting housing credit.

The Government seeks to accomplish the objectives of its housing program through the use of several methods. The purchase and sale of home mortgages in the secondary market by the Federal National Mortgage Association is merely one of such methods. Others include the insurance of home mortgages and improvement loans, insurance of shares of savings and loan associations, and loans and grants to local public agencies for the purpose of financing low-rent housing projects and slum clearance. All of these methods are means whereby the objectives of the housing program are achieved and should be the responsibility of the agency charged with that program.

The transfer of the Federal National Mortgage Association will not prevent the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from making loans to business enterprises on the security of real estate, or from accepting mortgages as collateral ir connection with a business loan. This type of activity is consistent with normal business lending functions.

The transfer of the Federal National Mortgage Association to the Housing and Home Finance Agency will assure the necessary coordination of its operations with other housing programs, thus providing a sounder basis for future progress toward a better-housed America. It is not probable that the reorganization in this plan will immediately result in reduced expenses, but in view of the relationship to other programs of housing aids, a more consistent approach in carrying out such policies will be possible and should result in long-term economies.

After investigation I have found, and I hereby declare, that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 22 of 1950 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

In view of the direct relation of the Federal National Mortgage Association to other housing-finance programs, which was initially recognized by the Congress and only last year reiterated by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, I recommend that the Congress grant its approval to the transfer provided in this reorganization plan.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1950.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 23—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 588)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 23 of 1950, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949. The plan further promotes the grouping of Government programs according to their major purposes by transferring from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency the lending functions of the Government with respect to the production and distribution of prefabricated houses and components. This reorganization would be consistent with the objective set by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government which recommended that "all housing activities be placed in one agency under a single administrator."

Under its general powers pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, and pursuant to the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made a number of loans to finance the production, distribution, and marketing of prefabricated houses and components. In addition, under section 102 of the Housing Act of 1948, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is specifically authorized to make loans, not exceeding $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time, to finance the production of such housing. The greater portion of the loans so authorized have been made and are now outstanding.

The development of an efficient prefabricated housing industry is an essential part of the total housing program. It, therefore, requires integration with the major housing activities of the Federal Government.

Moreover, the functions to be transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are complementary to other activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the field of manufactured housing. The agency has under way considerable research on this type of housing construction. Under the National Housing Act, the Federal Housing Administration, a constituent agency, insures loans for the manufacture of such housing as well as mortgages on such houses when erected and sold. Thus, the successful operation of the program of loans for the manufacture of prefabricated houses depends, to a large extent, on the ready availability of mortgage insurance by the Federal Housing Administration as the primary means of assuring permanent financing for their sale.

The Federal Housing Administration also insures mortgages on rental housing developments to serve military installations under title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, the so-called Military Housing Act. The Congress recently has recognized the place of prefabricated houses in this program by amending the law to make it clear that the Department of Defense should use prefabricated housing which conforms to standards established by the Federal Housing Administration wherever it is feasible to do so. The development of a strong, expansible prefabricated housing industry also is essential for rapidly meeting any emergency housing needs of the country. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, in cooperation with the National Security Resources Board, should be in a position to encourage peacetime uses of prefabricated housing readily adaptable to potential emergency requirements of the future.

The transfer by this reorganization plan of the functions, loans, and unused authorizations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to prefabricated housing will place most of the Government functions concerning such housing in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This will make possible greater consistency between governmental assistance available for the production or manufacture of prefabricated houses with governmental assistance available for the distribution, erection, and marketing of such housing. It will also assure coordination and integration of the prefabricated housing functions with other programs within the Housing and Home Finance Agency and thus materially assist in carrying out the national housing policy.

This reorganization may not result in substantial immediate savings, although benefits should be achieved through improved operations which will result in economies over a period of time. An itemization of these economies in advance of actual experience is not practicable.

After investigation I have found, and I hereby declare, that each reorganization contained in Reorganization Plan No. 23 of 1950 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1950.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 24—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 589)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 24 of 1950, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949. The plan transfers the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of Commerce. The Corporation will continue to be administered by its board of directors and officers but subject to the supervision, coordination, and policy guidance of the Secretary of Commerce.

This reorganization plan is an important additional step in simplifying the organization of the executive branch of the Government and also in making more effective the various Government services to business. In my special message of May 5 to the Congress I stressed the necessity of assuring the most effective coordination of Government aids to small and independent businesses. For this reason, I recommended that major responsibility for these programs be placed in the Secretary of Commerce. The need for such unified leadership and coordinated direction is no less essential with respect to our general business programs.

Both the business loan program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the various services to business provided by the Department of Commerce have the same major purpose—the development of American business and industry. Government aid to business may involve loans, loan insurance, economic and trade information, managerial and technical assistance, or a combination of several of these different types of services. If these various services are to be of the greatest benefit to the business community, unified supervision is necessary. Vesting supervision of the Corporation in the Secretary of Commerce will promote consistent policies and coordinated administration for both the financial and nonfinancial services to business.

By grouping in one agency all the principal services to business, the plan follows a pattern of organization which has proved highly successful in the areas of agriculture and housing. Up to 1939 the Farm Credit Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Rural Electrification Administration—all of them major agricultural financial programs—were outside the Department of Agriculture. Today no major agricultural credit programs are outside the Department of Agriculture.

Similarly, most of the major housing programs, including those involving loans and insurance, have been grouped in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Further, I am transmitting today Reorganization Plans Nos. 22 and 23 of 1950, which carry this policy forward by transferring the Federal National Mortgage Association and loans for factory-built homes to the housing agency.

Only in the business area do we still maintain organizational cleavage between the Government's financial and nonfinancial activities. The reorganization under this plan will produce benefits comparable to those we have already obtained through unified administration of our agricultural and housing programs.

While the primary purpose of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to make loans to business enterprises, the Corporation, even after the transfer of its housing functions, will still retain certain functions not directly related to its basic mission. These include the manufacture of synthetic rubber, production of abacá, and operation of the Texas City tin smelter, which are temporary functions. Certain of these activities, particularly rubber, are substantially related to existing programs within the Department of Commerce. It is, therefore, appropriate that they also be transferred along with the Corporation to the Department pending decision as to their ultimate disposition.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government unanimously recommended that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be brought within the departmental structure of the executive branch. The Commission was not unanimous, however, in recommending the department to which the Corporation should be transferred. A majority of the Commissioners favored transfer to the Treasury Department; a minority preferred the Department of Commerce. I have given the Commission's recommendations careful study. In my judgment, the activities of the Corporation are designed primarily to aid business. This is also a basic mission of the Department of Commerce. On the other hand, the Treasury Department has no lending functions with respect to individuals or private corporations. The transfer of the Corporation to the Department of Commerce is consistent with the organization of lending activities for agriculture and housing.

The plan transfers the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as a corporate entity to the Department of Commerce. The Corporation's status within the Department of Commerce will be generally comparable to that of those 35 wholly owned Government corporations which are already within departments or agencies or subject to the supervision of department heads.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 24 of 1950 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The taking effect of the reorganizations included in Reorganization Plan No. 24 may not in itself result in substantial immediate savings. However, the important objective is maximum effectiveness in the administration of our programs to aid the Nation's business. Greater effectiveness in turn will produce indirect savings in terms of the quantity and quality of output in relation to expenditures. An itemization of these savings is not practicable.

The economic health and prosperity of this Nation are dependent upon the continuing growth of business and industry. It is of vital importance that the various Government services which can play a part in promoting such growth make their most effective contribution. I strongly urge acceptance of this plan as a means of accomplishing this objective.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1950.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 25—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 590)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 25 of 1950, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949. The plan transfers the function of the National Security Resources Board from the Board to the Chairman of the Board and makes the Board advisory to the Chairman. The plan also provides for a Vice Chairman, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The function assigned to the National Security Resources Board by the National Security Act of 1947 is "to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization." Proper performance of this function requires action by the Board and its staff in two broad areas:

(1) The conduct of advance mobilization planning which identifies the problems which will arise and the measures necessary to meet these problems if and when the Nation moves from a peacetime into a wartime situation.

(2) The formulation of current policies and programs which will help the Nation achieve an adequate state of readiness against the eventuality of a future war.

The role assigned the National Security Resources Board is clearly one of staff assistance to the President. The Congress recently recognized this fact in its approval of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1949 which, pursuant to the specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission, placed the National Security Resources Board in the Executive Office of the President.

The accompanying reorganization plan is designed to make the National Security Resources Board a more effective instrument. Successful performance of the Board's mission requires a wide range of detailed study and analysis to cover all the major aspects of national mobilization. A committee of department heads or departmental representatives encounters some natural difficulties in providing supervision and leadership in such an extensive and detailed activity.

The Chairman has the difficult task of exercising discretion as to which matters shall be submitted for Board approval. The departmental members of the Board cannot possibly supervise or approve the Board's extensive and detailed activities and yet, as Board members, must accept ultimate responsibility for all such activities. Likewise, the departmental members are encumbered by the difficulty of having to reach collective and speedy decisions on a great many matters for which they, as Board members, are responsible.

By vesting the functions of the Board in the Chairman, the difficulties of Board operation will be overcome. At the same time, the reorganization plan provides for the continued participation of the several departments and agencies in the task of mobilization planning. This is not only a matter of established policy but also a requirement of the National Security Act. The departments will continue to have representation on the Board. The Board, in an advisory relationship to the Chairman, will be a useful arrangement for obtaining the necessary participation of departments in mobilization planning and for coordination of their activity. It will enable the departments to keep abreast of the total range of security resources planning. Without reliance on the departments for the execution of much of the actual job of mobilization planning, coordination with the total range of governmental policies and objectives would be lost.

The Congress in passing the National Security Act amendments of 1949 recognized the difficulty which exists when functions of staff advice and assistance are placed in a board-type agency. The National Security Act amendments of 1949 in clarifying the role of the Chairman of the Munitions Board and the Research and Development Board strengthened and increased the effectiveness of these staff agencies of the Secretary of Defense by providing for the exclusive exercise of responsibilities by the Chairman. This plan achieves the same objective for the National Security Resources Board.

The accompanying reorganization plan provides for a Vice Chairman appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The tremendous responsibilities of the National Security Resources Board and the heavy workload on the Chairman fully warrant this. Providing the Chairman with a principal associate for the exercise of his responsibilities is consistent with the usual practice in other agencies of the executive branch.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 25 of 1950 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

I have found and hereby declare that it is necessary to include in the accompanying reorganization plan, by reason of reorganizations made thereby, provisions for the appointment and compensation of a Vice Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The rate of compensation fixed for this officer is that which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

The taking effect of the reorganizations included in Reorganization Plan No. 25 may not in itself result in substantial immediate savings. However, the important objective is maximum effectiveness in security resources planning.

The security of this Nation requires that these steps be taken to enable security resources planning to move forward more effectively. It is for that reason that Reorganization Plan No. 25 is today submitted to the Congress. It is for that reason, and that reason alone, that I strongly urge congressional acceptance of Reorganization Plan No. 25.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1950.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

IMPORTS FROM RUSSIA

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on several recent occasions I have called the attention of the House to the fact that within the past few months 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at approximately $3,000,000, and which was caught and packed by slave or forced labor, have been shipped into the United States from Soviet Russia.

There is good reason to believe that Russia still has on hand about 400,000 additional cases of this canned crab valued at $22,000,000. There is good reason to believe that Russia, unless prevented by actions of our Government, will ship this huge supply of crab meat into this country. If this happens, our prosperous Pacific and Atlantic seacoast crabbing industries will be destroyed, their cannery workers thrown into idleness, and thousands of crab fishermen, many of whom have invested their life savings in fishing boats, will be ruined financially.

Neither our cannery workers nor our crab fishermen can compete with the slave-labor conditions that prevail in Soviet Russia. We should not expect that they should.

These crab imports from Russia will not only hurt the American crabbing industry but also will injure the American shrimp, oyster, and lobster fishing and processing industries. Russian crab is produced by slave labor and so can be sold much cheaper than can any of our processed domestic shellfish. As a result, our American oysters, shrimp, and lobsters, while they probably will not be driven from the market, will be forced down in price because of the competition of Russian crab. These other American shellfish industries, as well as crabbing, will become far less profitable to both the employers and employees.

Last year 1949, according to a report of the Department of Commerce, the United States imported from Communist Russia $42,425,000 of canned crab and other products, while our exports to Russia totaled $6,646,000. In short, this balance of trade, favorable to the Russians, gave them a surplus of more than $35,000,000 of American dollars or dollar credits which they have employed to purchase from other European countries iron, steel, lead, zinc, rubber, and other materials that can be used to greatly strengthen their domestic economy and their war potential.

From France alone, Russia last year, according to our own Office of International Trade, purchased iron, cast iron, and steel valued at $19,782,840, copper valued at $11,028,820, lead valued at $1,583,160, tin valued at $941,000, and rubber and manufactures valued at $942,000. Much other potential war goods was bought by the Soviets from Belgium and Great Britain.

While this trade with our cold-war enemy, Russia, flourishes, our American State Department with double-handed diplomacy on one hand exhorts the American taxpayers to provide billions for the cold war in Europe while with the other hand holds wide open the doors of our country to permit the invasion of our markets by Russian goods. This invasion of our markets by the Soviets, whether with crab or other commodities, results in the weakening of our domestic economy by destroying domestic employment and undermining that prosperity at home which it is necessary to maintain if we are to finance continued aid to the democracies abroad.

This $42,000,000 of goods bought by the United States from Russia compared to only $6,000,000 of American goods exported to Russia does not, of course, tell the full story of the surplus of American dollars being accumulated by the Soviets by this trade. The figures I have quoted cover only the trade between Russia and the United States, and not any transactions between Soviet satellites and the United States. This trade with the satellites is heavy, as is indicated by the large shipments of hats and shoes that Czechoslovakia has sent into this country much to the injury of workers in the hat and shoe industry.

Furthermore, much Russian goods is being shipped by Russia to countries of western Europe and then transshipped by them into the United States. For example, of the 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab recently unloaded in Boston, 44,000 cases came from Britain, which had obtained them from Russia on a barter deal, in which British goods were exchanged for the Russian crab. Imports, such as this crab, are listed as imports from Britain and not from Russia, although the place of their origin was Russia.

The administrative agencies of the American Government, all of which now are in the control of the Democratic Party, have the power to stop these imports of Russian canned crab and other goods. I do hope that some of these agencies will have the courage and wisdom before it is too late to save our American crabbing industry from destruction by Russian slave-labor competition.

President Truman's Secretary of the Treasury, John Snyder, has the power to save by a mere scratch of the pen our

crabbing industry and other industries that are being hurt by too much importation of Russian goods. The laws of this country not only permit him to prohibit the importation of goods produced by slave or forced-labor but direct that he shall stop such imports. He should no longer procastinate in doing so.

Title 19 of the Customs Act of 1930 says, and I quote:

All goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation thereof is hereby prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision. The provisions of this section relating to goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured by forced labor or/and indentured labor, shall take effect on January 1, 1932; but in no case shall such provisions be applicable to goods, wares, articles, or merchandise so mined, produced, or manufactured which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in such quantities in the United States as to meet the consumptive demands for the United States.

"Forced labor", as herein used, shall mean all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty for its nonperformance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily. (June 17, 1930, ch. 497, title III, sec. 307, 46 Stat. 689.)

Six Republican Members of the House, on April 6, joined with me in calling Secretary Snyder's attention to this law and politely asked that he, as Secretary of the Treasury, enforce the law which directs him to ban the importation of goods which are produced in whole or part by forced labor. The signers of that letter, in addition to myself, were Mr. TOLLEFSON, of Washington; Mr. NORBLAD, of Oregon; Mr. NIXON and Mr. SCUDDER, of California; Mr. MILLER of Maryland; and Mr. NELSON, of Maine.

Twenty-five days after the letter was written to Secretary of the Treasury Snyder asking that he enforce a law he is directed to enforce, we received a reply, not from Secretary Snyder, but from the Department's Commissioner of Customs, Mr. Frank Dow, giving that old stall of bureaucracy that the matter would be investigated.

He said:

Presumably the Members of Congress who submitted the letter of April 6, 1950 are in possession of factual data which lead to their conclusion that section 307 should be invoked. If you, or they, will submit any such information not only will it be appreciated but it will be most helpful in connection with the investigation which is currently proceeding.

In short, the Commissioner of Customs of the Treasury does not yet know what every man on the street knows, namely, that Russian goods are produced by forced labor which in the act of 1930 is defined as meaning "involuntary labor" or labor that "is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty for its nonperformance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily."

By that statement Commissioner Dow and the Treasury Department admit not only that they do not know what the man on the street knows, namely, that Russian goods are produced wholly or in part by forced labor but that they also are unaware what high ranking authorities in the State Department have said on this subject.

If anyone in this country should know whether slave or forced labor is being employed in Russia, it is the State Department. Here is what William L. Thorp, United States Assistant Secretary of State, said as to Russia's employment of forced labor. In a speech at Lake Success on February 28, 1949 before the UN Economic and Social Council, Mr. Thorp, the Assistant Secretary of State, said:

At earlier session, abundant evidence of the existence of forced labor in the Soviet Union was brought to our attention by nongovernmental organizations and individual member governments. Evidence continues to accumulate. Unless we are prepared to accept the curious Soviet defense that this all has been misunderstood and that it is really nothing but an educational project, nothing has been put forward which disproves in the least the original charge that forced labor is an integral part of the Soviet system of subjugation of the individual and exploitation of labor. In fact, the mounting testimony by thousands of individuals all adds to the weight of the evidence.

If the Treasury Department, which is authorized and directed by law to ban imports into this country that are produced wholly or in part by forced labor want to really investigate whether Russia uses forced labor, I recommend to the reading of Secretary Snyder and Commissioner of Customs Dow the book Slave Labor in Russia which was published by the American Federation of Labor in 1949.

In a foreword to that book, President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, says:

The documents published in this volume speak for themselves. Here is the story of the persistent and resourceful campaign of the American Federation of Labor against forced labor—a drive which eventually resulted in a decision by the United Nations Economic and Social Council to conduct an international survey of this growing menace to human freedom.

Here is first-hand evidence of the slave-labor system of the Communist all-powerful state.

Here also is a report of the debate on forced labor that took place in the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

This debate is highly instructive. The speeches made by the representatives of the democratic countries and of the American Federation of Labor are outstanding as an interpretation of the struggle against slave labor and the degradation of human beings. Moreover, the debate clearly shows that though the representatives of Russia and the spokesmen of the satellite countries made lengthy and arrogant speeches, they did not answer the accusation that the Soviet system is based on human slavery—a charge which is substantiated by detailed and irrefutable evidence.

In the same book, on page 27, Mr. William Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, testifying before hearings of that Council, said:

Wherever Communist regimes have come into existence, they have brought in their wake a return to practices of slave labor similar to those abolished in the same countries about a century ago.

Also, Edward Corsi, New York commissioner of labor, was quoted in the New York Times on page 12 of its issue of February 27, 1947, as saying:

In April of last year, more than 2 years after the end of the Second World War, the Irkutsk Pravda, an official Soviet organ, could boast that 5,000,000 prisoners of war were being used in Siberia.

Norman Thomas, many times Socialist Party candidate for President of the United States, in the New Leader, page 6, October 1947, wrote:

The danger of forced labor in the Soviet Union is the greater because it is contagious. It is spreading to the satellite states, and Communists who defend and condone it in other parts of the world can be expected to practice it if they get power.

David J. Dallin, Russian historian, writing in the New Leader in section 2, page 6 of its issue of March 29, 1947, wrote:

Forced labor has become an essential element of the Soviet economy. This kind of cheap and obedient labor is a prerequisite for the fulfillment of the ambitious plans of industrialization, industrial expansion, and military preparedness. The Soviet slaves form the lowest class of Soviet society, the foundation on which rests the entire structure.

Victor Riesel, nationally known newspaper columnist whose column Inside Labor appears in 254 American newspapers, writing on the subject of Russian crab imports, recently said:

Within the past few months, exactly $3,000,000 worth of this fancily canned crab meat has come into the United States via Seattle and Boston—some of it direct from Russia's forced-labor fishing camps. This slave-packed food for America's tables arrived in 59,000 cases, 15,000 of which entered Seattle right from Siberia.

So that those who deal in this slave-speared crab meat shall know where it comes from—I put in the record the fact that there are 17 such slave fishing camps, stretching from Murmansk to the Sakhalin Islands.

When the American Federation of Labor published its book Slave Labor in Russia, it included in that book the complete text of the Corrective Codes of the R. S. F. S. R. as it had been obtained and compiled by the British Government. Matthew Woll, chairman of the international labor relations committee of the American Federation of Labor and a vice president of the A. F. of L. wrote a foreword in which among other things he says:

The working people of all nations owe a debt of deep gratitude to the Government of Great Britain for making public and available to the free world the text of the forced-labor laws prevailing in the Russian empire.

By presenting the full and official text of the Chronological Collection of Laws, Decrees of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and Ordinances of the Government of the R. S. F. S. R., regarding the system of forced labor in the Communist paradise, the British Government has provided further irrefutable proof of the monstrous slave economy to which all those in the Kremlin

orbit are today subjected. Thereby, the British Government has rendered the highest distinguished service to the cause of human freedom and decency.

Miss Toni Sender, of New York City, assistant to the A. F. of L. consultants to the UN Economic and Social Council, on February 15, 1949, in testimony to the Council said, in part:

The American Federation of Labor has received testimony from persons who have succeeded in escaping from the hell of slave-labor camps; testimony which contains accusations of such a nature that no one can read these statements without the deepest feelings of horror and pity. * * * The reliability of the statements mentioned is demonstrated in the fact that all these persons, although unknown to each other describe the cruel circumstances in similar terms. In great detail they describe the use of political opponents, of stateless persons, of prisoners of war for forced labor.

Was the Russian canned crab, 59,000 cases of which were shipped into the United States produced by forced labor? While no American can get behind the iron curtain and see the crab caught and put into the cans, I think strong and convincing circumstantial evidence can be presented proving that it was.

There is a Commission of Inquiry Into Forced Labor with offices at 112 Nineteenth Street, New York City. Dr. Harry D. Gidouse, chairman and president of Brooklyn College, is chairman of that commission. Among its members are such well-known public figures as Dr. Frank P. Graham, former president of the University of North Carolina and now United States Senator from that State; Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer, United Automobile Workers of America, CIO; and Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor. Altogether there are 24 distinguished leaders of American labor, business, and education on that commission.

This nonpartisan commission of distinguished citizens on February 24 of this year, in the statement on forced labor in Russia, listed 17 slave-labor fishing camps in Russia. These 17 slave-labor fishing camps were given by the commission as having been established at the following 17 locations: Ust-Usa, Prorvinsk, Murmansk, Novaya Zemlya, Vaigach Island, Kem, Astrakham, Sakhalin Island, Kolyma, Kamchatka Camps Cluster, Nagayevo-Kolyma Cluster, Sakhalin ITL, Kamchatskiye ITL, Chukotskiye ITL, Sevvostochnyye ITL, Ykut ITL, and Novaya Zemlag.

The strength and weight of this mass of circumstantial evidence, I am convinced, should lead the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, and his Commissioner of Customs, Mr. Dow, to the inescapable conclusion that a strong presumption exists that the crab meat and other products we imported last year from Russia to a total of $42,425,000 were produced wholly or in part by slave or forced labor. This conviction should be strengthened further by the fact that Russia has steadfastly refused to permit any examination or inspection of her forced labor camps by us, the Nation into which she is shipping her goods.

Russian canned crab and other merchandise about which a strong presumption exists that it was produced by slave or forced labor is coming into the United States. Prosperity and employment in many American domestic industries are thereby being undermined and weakened. Russia is employing the American cash or American credit she obtains from these transactions to strengthen her own economy and war potential. Russia refuses to permit the American Government to make any examinations to determine whether or not slave or forced labor is employed in the production of these Russian goods. The burden of proof, therefore, should be on the U. S. S. R. to prove that these goods are not the product of involuntary labor before any more of such goods are permitted to enter our country.

The problem is of sufficient magnitude to justify a complete investigation. Congress and the American people ought to know how much of these Russian forced-labor goods are being shipped, either directly or indirectly, by Russia into the United States. Congress ought to know how much surplus American cash and credit Russia is obtaining from these transactions. Most of all, Congress ought to know what Russia is doing with the surplus American funds this trade provides her, what she is doing with these surplus dollars in the way of purchasing from other nations goods that add to the Soviet economic strength and war potential.

Also, the Congress should know why our Treasury Department, has not and does not take any steps, although directed by law to do so, toward barring the continued importation of Russian crab and other goods produced by forced labor.

In my opinion, an appropriate committee of the House of Representatives, probably the Committee on Labor and Education, should undertake immediately a thorough and sweeping investigation of these Russian forced-labor imports which unless halted will continue to undermine and weaken our American domestic economy while at the same time strengthening a foreign power that harasses and embarrasses us at every opportunity.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. This statement to me is very interesting because, as the gentleman knows, my district adjoins the gentleman's on the south, and comprises about 400 miles of the coast line of California. We have a very flourishing crab industry along that coast. I have had word, however, that Californians are very much disturbed about this great influx of Russian crab meat. It is curtailing business and discouraging the fishermen.

Furthermore, I understand that just recently a large shipment of walnuts was brought in from Asia, I believe from China, which has had a very bad effect on the nut industry in California, a great part of which is located in my district. Has the gentleman taken recognition of the great importance of imports of foreign goods produced at living standards far below American standard?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I say to the gentleman from California that the amount of crab meat brought into the United States from Russia in the months of January, February, and March was in excess of the total shipments from Russia into this country in 1949.

As to walnuts, the amount of walnuts that were shipped into San Francisco from Russian-dominated China totaled 110,000 pounds. These nut imports from China broke the price on walnuts from 60 to 40 cents a pound and adversely affected the price on almost all varieties of nuts.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. May I say to the gentleman that he has made, I think, a very important and a very appealing statement. In talking about this one particular aspect of our tariff problems, which is the forced labor aspect, he is talking about perhaps the most dramatic and the most appealing of the whole flood of problems we have. But I do want to call to the gentleman's attention that, except for the question of forced labor, we are meeting with the same situation everywhere in competition with most all other countries.

Our subcommittee which has to do with fishing problems generally—and the gentleman's colleague from Washington, who is present on the floor, Mr. TOLLEFSON, can tell as much about this as I can—held extensive hearings on that subject last year, and we found that the New England fisheries, the great fisheries centered around Gloucester and Boston, Mass., and elsewhere, were facing that same type of competition from the perfectly free labor in Canada, but a labor which, of course, is paid very much less than our standards in America demand. If the situation continues, we are not going to be able to meet that Canadian competition. The same thing is going to happen with my glass industry in south Jersey as the result of Czechoslovakian competition. The same thing is happening in the shoe industry and the same thing has happened to the old-established Waltham Watch factory, again up in New England. That is the pattern we are following. Instead of correcting it and making it somewhat better, we are proposing a conference in London to reduce further tariffs on 2,500 different articles of American manufacture.

I think the gentleman has made a very interesting and important statement, and I compliment him on doing so.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am well aware that in 1949 we imported into this country 475,000,000 pounds of fish valued at $111,000,000. That quantity of fish, of course, had a tremendous impact on our economy and the American fishing industry.

I am also well aware of the splendid job which the committee, of which the gentleman from New Jersey is a member, did in investigating this problem. I am also aware of the fact that the State

Department is holding a conference in London in September for the purpose of further reducing the tariff on many fish products in order to encourage more of them to enter our country.

The point I am emphasizing here today, however, is that the Secretary of the Treasury who is directed by law to bar the importation into this country of any product produced wholly or in part by slave or forced labor has the responsibility and power to bar the importation of such goods. I maintain there is ample evidence in my statement today to show that Russian canned crab is produced by forced labor and that the Secretary of the Treasury should stop these crab importations immediately before the crabbing industry of this country is destroyed.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I compliment my colleague from the State of Washington for calling the attention of the Members of the House to this situation dealing with the importation of slave-labor-produced crab products. If the gentleman will permit me I should like to add to his remarks another situation having to do with the same general subject. I think the gentleman is somewhat familiar with it. I refer to the importation of Russian-produced furs into this country, produced by slave labor also. I think the gentleman perhaps is familiar with the situation in our State of Washington where, a few years ago, we had something like 200 fox fur farms. Today there are only three. There are some 400 mink farms producing furs and nobody knows how long they will last. In Alaska the fur trapping industry has dropped considerably, largely because of the importation of Russian furs.

If the gentleman will permit me further, I would like to add another comment in connection with that same subject. I appreciate that he is giving me some of his time, but I do think the RECORD should show at this point some of the problems which exist. Since the end of the war the imports of Russian furs have increased 800 percent. The interesting thing about that is that the Marshall plan countries which we are trying to help have not been permitted to increase their imports of furs to this country at all. Yet we take the position that we want to help the Marshall plan countries while we are not permitting them to increase their exports of furs to this country. We are, however, permitting the Russians and have permitted the Russians to increase their exports of furs to this country by 800 percent.

By reason of the fact that we have permitted this situation to come about, the Russian fur imports now comprise about 30 percent of our total fur imports and because they are produced by slave labor they can undersell any fur on the market. For that reason our raw fur market is controlled by these imports.

Mr. Speaker, I want again to compliment the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] for his contribution to the discussion.

I want to point out again as I have said earlier that we imported from Russia more than $42,000,000 of Russian goods while we sold to Russia only $6,000,000 worth of goods. That means Russia has a surplus of our dollars, or of our credit, to the extent of $35,000,000, which she is using in other nations to buy goods that strengthen her economy. I want to point out that I am referring solely to trade between the United States and Russia and not to trade between the United States, Russia, and her satellite countries.

If we considered trade with Russian satellites also, the volume of the favorable trade balance for the Russian controlled nations would be considerably in excess of $35,000,000.

I also want to point out that the 35,000,000 of surplus dollars does not include any shipments of Russian materials or merchandise that Russia or her satellites have made to the Western Powers who later shipped these Russian goods into the United States. Of the 59,000 cases of canned crab, which were landed in the United States recently, 44,000 cases came from Great Britain and not Russia. Russia shipped them to Great Britain, and Great Britain transshipped them to the United States. That gave Russia additional money with which the Russians bought iron, steel, rubber, lead and zinc, and other materials to strengthen their own domestic and war economy.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Coming back to the fur industry, I am sure it might be of interest to know about the imports of furs from Russia. Hearings were held 3 years ago, and testimony was given by the Commerce Department to the effect that a delegation was sent from the United States by Henry Wallace, when he was Secretary of Commerce, asking Russia to ship more furs into the United States. The peculiar thing is that, although most people who want to go to Russia cannot get there, it is always easy for the fur buyers to get visas and to be there during the fur market. I realize the logic of your statements, but I am sure you realize that the President of the United States has the power to do something about this if and when he wants to do so.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Secretary of the Treasury is directed by law to ban the importation of forced labor produced goods. He admits in a letter to me he is directed by law to do that. He now asks the seven Congressmen, who have asked him to invoke the law against Russian imports, if we can prove that Russian crab is produced by slave labor. I have submitted in my talk today a statement by the Assistant Secretary of State, who says that Russian goods are produced by forced labor. The State Department, if anybody, should know whether these goods are or are not produced by forced labor.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of course, the President, under the powers delegated to him, has already put embargoes or near-embargoes into effect during the years. We have an import embargo of 800,000 bushels on wheat coming into the United States, for instance.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The President certainly has not put it on imports of Russian crab, because in April of this year we imported as much crab from Russia as we imported from Russia in all the 12 months of last year.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is an embargo of 125,000 bales of short-staple cotton. That is all that can be imported. The long-staple cotton is considerably larger. But there is ample law, regardless of the slave-labor angle, to protect the American market if and when anyone wants to do it.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I think the gentleman is right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF] is recognized.

SEGREGATION IN SWIMMING POOLS IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, to my most profound regret, and to the chagrin and sorrow of every true American—every disciple of the true principles of democracy—I learned last week that the Committee on the District of Columbia had reported out a bill, the sole aim of which is to deprive a minority group of American citizens of the equal rights guaranteed them under the Constitution of the United States. This bill, H. R. 5968, is an endorsement of the vicious doctrines of discrimination and segregation and everything that is un-American and contrary to the principles upon which our Nation was established.

The sponsors of this legislation are attempting to disguise their real purpose by making it appear that their action merely would transfer the swimming pools in the National Capital parks from the control of the Interior Department to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They are fooling nobody. They know that while the pools remain under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior they will be operated in accordance with the national policy of equal access to all citizens. This is the policy that has been so eloquently enunciated by President Truman—the policy that guarantees that no American shall be deprived of his rights because of his race, creed, color, or national origin. They also know that if they could succeed in having the pools transferred to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the facilities would be turned over to the control of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, whose scandalous anti-American policies are making a shambles of the democratic way of life in our National Capital, destroying the confidence of a group numbering nearly one-third of its citizens in their

Government, and threatening to wreck the harmony of relationship between Negro and white neighbors. This is the board which, under the aggressive leadership of its chairman, has publicly disavowed its responsibilities to function for the benefit of all citizens; by its arbitrary action has drawn color lines in the operation of public services; has refused, by official action, to accept the pools for operation in accordance with the President's policy of nondiscrimination; and only a month ago had the audacity to withdraw its program of free swimming instruction at the pools despite the fact that it is charged by law with this responsibility and receives congressional appropriations for the purpose.

It is incredible that the members of the District of Columbia Committee would have drafted legislation that would have the effect of violating the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, which states unmistakably that no laws shall be enacted which shall abridge the privileges of immunities of citizens, had not these Members of the Congress been needled into this action by the false and inflammatory statements of the chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board—a man who, above all others on the Board, should be a devotee of the doctrines of tolerance and brotherhood, but who prefers to dedicate his efforts to the interest of selfishness and prejudice. Oh, I know that this fellow goes about glibly and piously declaring himself to be opposed to the infamous system of segregation which he and his fellow Board member, James E. Schwab, have foisted upon the Recreation Board and the people of the District of Columbia—promising that the Board will make every possible and realistic effort toward the removal of racial segregation in public recreation—but doing nothing and fooling few. One thing is certain: although both Wender and Schwab blandly state that leading Negro citizens support their stand, they have never, to my knowledge, produced a single supporter of their views from Negro leaders. On the contrary, they have been openly denounced by Negro citizens and the Negro press. I will read you an editorial published in the Washington Afro-American on April 12, 1950, which leaves no doubt of the editor's opinion of the Chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board. I quote:

HARRY WENDER SHOULD QUIT

All history—ancient, medieval, and modern—has been interspersed with revolting stories of the persecution of the Jewish people, which has taken many forms in many different lands and nations.

One of the prime factors which turned the modern world against Nazi Germany and ultimately to the destruction of the Third Reich was Hitler's abortive pogrom against minorities.

We cite all this just to lead up to a discussion of Harry Wender, Chairman of the District Board of Recreation.

Mr. Wender is a member of a minority group and is as familiar with the history of his own race as we are, in fact more so, yet we find Mr. Wender, of all people, the chief champion of Washington's diehard and poor-trash bloc opposing all of the moves which would extend the blessings of democracy to another minority.

Mr. Wender's latest move, which is as incendiary as anything that Hitler proposed, is the action of the Recreation Board in "washing its hands" of all responsibility in the abolition of segregation in public swimming pools.

In advancing the idea that the Board will not be responsible "in case anything happens," Mr. Wender and his cohorts are practically giving the green light to troublemakers to see to it that something does happen.

They are saying in effect, "Go to it, boys; stir up riots, we will not interfere."

But Mr. Wender is saying more than that. He is saying, in effect: "I do not believe that the Nation's Capital is ready for democracy. I have no faith in the stuff we are preaching. The people cannot be trusted to do the decent and right thing."

Mr. Wender's so-called policy of gradualism is bunk. By what process does he reason that the people in one section are any more ready for progress than the people in another section? Freedom is not parceled out piecemeal. It is a matter of general policy as enunciated by the Department of the Interior—or it is nothing at all.

And we would also like to ask by what process does Mr. Wender reason that he of all people should decide when colored citizens are ready for their civil rights. Just who decided when he and his group were ready for theirs?

Thousands of our boys paid with their lives and with life-long suffering to help lift the yoke of Hitlerism off the backs of his people in Germany.

Many more thousands of us are contributing our money and our moral support to help Israel carve a place among the nations where the persecuted people of Europe can find a haven and a right to racial integrity.

By his bootlicking antics, by his catering to the cause of white supremacy, by his selfish attempts to ingratiate himself in the good graces of the people whose contempt for him is matched only by their contempt for us, he makes himself not only a traitor to the cause of democracy, but a traitor to his own people as well.

Harry Wender should do one honest thing. He should say flatly, "I do not believe in freedom, equality and democracy and am therefore, incapable of administering it." Then he should get out.

If he is too cowardly to do this, we should find a way to kick him out before he destroys us all.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the recommendation of this forthright, plainspoken editor—Harry Wender should get out before democracy in the National Capital is completely destroyed.

Now I think that it is important that we review the recent history of public recreational activities in the city of Washington. For many years prior to the establishment of the District of Columbia Recreation Board the greater part of the program conducted by the former District of Columbia Playground Department was carried on on lands within the National Capital park system through the corporation and consent of the National Capital Parks. In an effort to foster unified recreation for the District of Columbia, the Department of the Interior on April 1, 1940, agreed to permit the then existing District of Columbia Community Center and Playground Department to assume operational functions, including the issuance of permits, supervision and leadership in connection with the program of supervised recreation in the National Capital Parks. The facilities involved included an archery green, 4 badminton courts, 18 baseball and 27 softball diamonds, 2 basketball courts, 7 croquet courts, the Palisades fieldhouse, 11 football gridirons, 4 hockey courts, 34 horseshoe courts, 4 marble rings, 79 picnic groves, 2 shuffleboard courts, 3 soccer fields, a speedball court, 50 tennis courts, and 5 volleyball courts.

Responsibility for the foregoing facilities previously had been a function of the National Capital Parks Recreation Division.

The District of Columbia Recreation Department succeeded the Community Center and Playground Department in 1942, continuing to operate the aforementioned facilities as agents for the National Capital Parks.

On August 29, 1949, a formal agreement between the Department of the Interior and the District of Columbia Recreation Board, as provided by the act of April 29, 1942, which created the board, gave the Recreation Department permission to conduct a recreational program in Anocostia Park, Archbold Parkway, Barnard Hill Park, Barry Farms Playground, Battery Kemble, Fort Bayard Park, Fort Bunker Hill Park, Fort Dupont Park, Garfield Park, Glover Parkway, the Mall, Montrose Park, the Washington Monument Grounds, Oxon Run Parkway, the President's Park, Rock Creek Park, Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, West Potomac Park, and Fort Stanton Park.

The recreational facilities within these areas include many which previously had been operated by the District of Columbia recreation authorities by permit.

The agreement of August 29, 1949, also provided that other National Capital Park areas might be made available to the Board from time to time and that the facilities operated by concessioners under contract with the Interior Department would be made a part of the agreement as soon as arrangements could be made with the concessioners. These included golf courses, tennis courts, boating, and bicycle concessions. The Department of the Interior regulation specifying that all of the park facilities should be operated upon a basis of nonsegregation was accepted by the Recreation Board and the agreement further provided that the Board would make every possible and realistic effort toward the removal of racial segregation in public recreation with respect to the facilities, public activities and programs which it now supervises on areas not under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

The swimming pools were not included under this agreement because of the unwillingness of the District of Columbia Recreation Board to operate the pools as nonsegregated public services.

Mr. Speaker, even though no single agency or group could claim exclusive credit for the steady advancement toward equal rights for all citizens in the National Capital, the contribution of the Department of the Interior has been clear and sustained. The objectives and example of the Interior Department may be briefly summarized in the principle so often stated by the President and the Supreme Court, namely, that the power of government in a democracy must ever be exercised to insure the equal enjoyment

by all citizens of publicly supported services and that the Government must refrain from using its powers to deny any racial, religious, or ethnic group free access to and enjoyment of such facilities.

Concrete action to implement this basic policy in the use of park facilities began in 1939, when the Secretary of the Interior ordered the discontinuance of compulsory racial segregation in the use of picnic groves. Permits have since been issued for all picnic areas without regard to the race of applicants. No racial frictions have arisen. On the contrary, the people of Washington have demonstrated that white and Negro groups can picnic harmoniously side by side.

Since 1940, by order of the Secretary of the Interior, the Washington Tourist Camp, long maintained as an exclusively "white" facility, has been operated on a basis of availability to all citizens without distinction of color. Here again, no incidents of racial friction have been reported since that time. Also in 1940 the Secretary ordered that the lighted tennis courts in West Potomac Park and the 17 courts on the Mall be opened to all applicants without distinction. They had been operated for white players only. Not a single incident of conflict based on race has occurred in 10 years.

In 1941, the Secretary ordered that the federally operated golf courses similarly be opened to all citizens. Both races have used the golf courses since that time freely and without friction.

The six swimming pools on park lands have also been open to all citizens for a decade. Until 1949, Negroes applied to swim only in two of the pools. In that year, colored swimmers used two others. At only one of these, in Anacostia Park, interracial friction developed which resulted in the closing of the pool.

Since 1941, the Department's contracts with concessioners in the national parks have required them to operate in accordance with the Interior policy which has now been in successful daily operation for 10 years. The Department has repeatedly urged the District of Columbia Recreation Board to abandon the rigid policy of compulsory segregation under which it has operated since its inception. In 1945, the Recreation Board incorporated in its bylaws a provision that racial segregation must be enforced in the use of all recreational facilities under its control. The Acting Secretary of the Interior then reaffirmed the policy of the Department, calling for the unrestricted use of areas under its jurisdiction, and stated that this policy must prevail in all areas under the control of the Department even if administered by the Recreation Board.

Since that time, the Secretary of the Interior has taken every action within his legal authority to require that the Recreation Board administer facilities on park lands in accordance with the national policy. Thus, in February 1949, the Secretary ordered the Recreation Board to cease discrimination in the granting of permits to play tennis on 18 courts located on park lands, and to grant them without distinctions of race.

The Department's efforts, however, were greatly hampered by a procedure of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission whereby it assigned park lands to the District Commissioners who then turned them over to the Recreation Board for operation under its policy of enforced segregation. A cover of legality was provided for this action by the Planning Commission's arbitrary designation of certain areas exclusively for white recreation and others exclusively for Negro recreation. Action instituted by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on March 15, 1949, led to the removal of such designations from the Commission's maps and plans.

Two months later, the Chairman of the District Recreation Board issued a public report acknowledging that the Board's policy of enforced segregation was out of tune with accepted practices in the community, and that the action of the Planning Commission had removed the last barrier to its modification. Thereupon, the Board for the first time authorized the evening use of public school buildings by interracial groups; adopted a bylaw under which it is pledged to apply as rapidly as possible a policy of granting to all citizens equal access to all its facilities, and permitted the Society of Friends to operate two playgrounds throughout the summer on a nonracial basis. Both the example and the voice of the Department of the Interior were instrumental in realizing all these advances.

These signs of progress were climaxed in August 1949 by the signing of a formal agreement under which the Recreation Board is to operate recreation programs on 19 park lands. Additional lands may be made available to the Board from time to time, and facilities operated by concessioners under contract with the Interior Department—golf courses, tennis courts, boating, and bicycle concessions—are to be made part of the agreement as soon as arrangements can be made with the concessioners. The crucial significance of this agreement lies in the provision that the Recreation Board shall operate all these facilities in accordance with the Department's policy, that is, "none of them shall be restricted to use by any people on the basis of their race, creed, color, or national origin."

In recent years the auditoriums in Federal buildings have not enforced segregation in their audiences. Year after year the Watergate concerts, ceremonies, and celebrations on the Washington Monument Grounds, at the Lincoln Memorial, and in other park areas have further demonstrated to Washingtonians the practicality of a policy of nondiscrimination in public entertainment. More recently a nondiscrimnating summer theater has been established at Meridian Hill Park. At none of these functions has the racial trouble anticipated by pessimists arisen to frustrate expression of the democratic creed.

The views of the Secretary are so well known in the Department that no specific order was necessary to insure equal access to the cafeterias in the New Interior Building when it opened in 1937. Interior led the way in the trend which soon developed to guarantee free use by all employees of the eating facilities in Government buildings. More recently, in the wake of this development, other Federal agencies have opened to all patrons the restaurants at the National Airport and National Zoological Park.

Over the years the Department's demonstration of the practicability of democracy in recreation and in admission to entertainment and eating places has exerted a steady influence on the practices of private proprietors in the District. In recent years several downtown movie theaters have opened their doors to all comers; Washington's new legitimate theater is operating successfully without enforced segregation; university auditoriums have been opened; a major sports arena has stopped segregating its patrons. Restrictions imposed by local bodies on interracial competition in amateur athletics have been removed. With one major exception, Washington's universities have opened their doors to students of different races. Most recently a large number of downtown restaurants have ended the practice of turning away Negro patrons.

While Interior has been only one among many contributing forces in this unmistakable trend, its example and its voice have played a vital part in creating the atmosphere in which progress can occur. On the other hand, the inability of the District of Columbia Recreation Board to exert the progressive leadership essential to the successful discharge of its responsibilities is obviously reflected in H. R. 5968. I sincerely pray that the District of Columbia Committee will see fit to withdraw this bill before it is presented to this House. Such an action would give evidence of real statesmanship and the true democratic sense of fair play. If it is brought to this floor, I am sure that the righteous indignation of the Members of this body will insure its overwhelming defeat, and the Negro citizens of the United States will be reassured that they can still look to their Government for justice and protection.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 6, 1950.*

HON. EARL CHUDOFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge you actively oppose H. R. 5968, bill transferring District of Columbia swimming pools from Interior Department to District Commissioners. Sole purpose is to designate use of recreational facilities on basis of race rather than need. Entire Nation will regard House passage as congressional endorsement of racial discrimination and segregation.

District of Columbia Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; District of Columbia Federation of Civic Associations; American Veterans Committee; Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith; American Federation of Teachers, Local 27; Interracial Workshop; Washington Chapter Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice; Fraternal Council of Churches; National Council of Negro Women; Interdenominational Ministers Alliance; CIO Industrial Union Council, District of Columbia; District of Columbia Branch, NAACP, Stephen Spottswood, President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LECOMPTE, for 4 weeks, on account of important business at home.

To Mr. DAVENPORT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the annual report of the Washington County, Ark., Production and Marketing Administration Committee, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $369.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two separate instances.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hutchinson.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 8, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1435. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the chief of engineers, United States Army, dated November 15, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Russian River, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 585); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1436. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Humboldt River and tributaries, in Nevada, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 586); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1437. A letter from the Chairman, the Textile Foundation, National Bureau of Standards, transmitting the Annual Report of the Textile Foundation, for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1949; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1438. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a letter concerning participation by Members of the House of Representatives in the Fourth Annual Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1439. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Julian Evelio Valdes-Rodriguez or Evelio Valdes Rodriguez, file No. [redacted] CR 23766, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1440. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1441. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the sixth annual report of operations under the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6560. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize provisions in national service life-insurance policies for increased monthly disability benefits; without amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7739. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8236. A bill to provide that on and after January 1, 1951, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash; without amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2128. An act to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain royalty-free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder; with amendment (Rept. No. 2026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEMKE: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6152. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of Indians, North Dakota, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2027). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEMKE: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7262. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of the Turtle Mountain Reservation, N. Dak., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7255. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in Hopkins County, Ky., to the estate of James D. Meadors; with amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 8428. A bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 38, Eighty-first Congress, concerning loans by the Secretary of Agriculture to bona fide fur farmers in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois:

H. R. 8429. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 8430. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 8431. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 8432. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 8433. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs:

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 8434. A bill to provide for a Delegate in the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia, for a Board of Education of the District of Columbia to be elected, and for reorganization of the executive departments of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8435. A bill to provide for the authorization for an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads, bridges, and other public facilities in the States of Minnesota and North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by floods in the spring of 1950, and for building necessary road dikes and levees and dike and levee protection; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8436. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 8437. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8438. A bill to provide for payment to certain retired members of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve of a lump sum equal to their retirement pay for the period during which they remained in an inactive status without pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. J. Res. 467. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives relative to the national defense program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. Res. 594. Resolution for the relief of Albert A. Wrede; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 595. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "The Making of a Congressman" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to providing for a report of sanatorium services provided by the State of South Carolina for veterans residing there; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 8439. A bill for the relief of Magda and Alice Katz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 8440. A bill for the relief of Noae Kawashima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8441. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Ebihara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8442. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Higashide; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8443. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harue Imai Kagemoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8444. A bill for the relief of Yoko Kiriya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8445. A bill for the relief of Teruko Kotani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8446. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko Hayashi Kubota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8447. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Setsu Takamori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8448. A bill for the relief of Mieko Tazawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8449. A bill for the relief of Nachiyo Watabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 8450. A bill for the relief of Raief Neahem, Iffef Neahem, and Ihsen Neahem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 8451. A bill for the relief of Yoshie Nozawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8452. A bill for the relief of Ronald Mow and Angeline Cecilia Mow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACY:

H. R. 8453. A bill for the relief of the Isbrandtsen Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 8454. A bill for the relief of Hendricus Baay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 8455. A bill for the relief of Robert F. Cullwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2113. By Mr. POLK of Ohio: Petition of the Council of the Village of Milford, Ohio, signed by A. G. Aiken, Mayor, and attested by Violet Snell, Clerk, petitioning the Congress of the United States to amend H. R. 6000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2114. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. Nancy M. Fischer, of St. Charles, and 71 citizens of Illinois, opposing armed conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2115. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Independence Chapter, No. 641, B'nai B'rith, Washington, D. C., stating its approval and support of Senate bill 1527; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2116. Also, petition of Joseph P. Anderson, executive secretary, American Association of Social Workers, New York, N. Y., endorsing the proposed plan for technical assistance to underdeveloped countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to whom the darkness and the light are both alike, in the midst of the night, O Lord, we whisper that soon the darkness will give way to dawn; in the tide's far ebb, we know that it will return; in the midst of winter we cry to our hearts, soon the green banners of the spring will blow throughout the land. For these certainties we give Thee thanks, O God, who faileth us never; yet for one other certainty we thank Thee even more, for surer than morning, surer than the returning tide, surer than the coming of spring, surer still are we that Thou art our friend forever, and that they who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.

In these days of crisis and decision, give us the vision that moves, the strength that endures, the grace of that Holy One who wore our flesh like a monarch's robe and walked our earthly life as a conqueror in triumph. We ask it in His ever blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 9, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RUSSELL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, considering Senate bill 1805, was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	Myers
Bridges	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Conor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Taft
Ecton	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lodge	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Lucas	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Gurney	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Malone	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE CRIME—APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to make appointment of the committee authorized under Senate Resolution 202, providing for what is commonly referred to as the Crime Investigation Committee. In view of certain implications or statements which have been carried in some newspapers, the Chair wishes to state that at no time has the President of the United States or the Vice President discussed either the resolution originally introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] or the substitute; nor has it ever been discussed in our presence. Neither of us has ever discussed, nor has anyone else ever discussed in our presence, the personnel or composition of the committee. The Chair therefore thinks it fair to make that statement in order that there may be no misunderstanding of the committee as appointed by the Chair under the resolution.

Inasmuch as the resolution authorizes the committee to select its own chairman, it does not make any difference which member is named first. The resolution authorized the appointment of a committee of five members, to be taken from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary. Of course, the Chair cannot commit himself with reference to any bill which may grow out of the investigation. However, in view of the fact that two bills which have already been introduced on the subject, under the Reorganization Act and the rules contained therein, had to be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and because other legislation dealing with the subject would have to tie into the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the jurisdiction of that committee, the Chair has felt it proper to appoint three members from that committee and two members from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Therefore, the Chair appoints from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. From the Committee on the Judiciary, the Chair appoints the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is entitled to the floor for 30 minutes after routine business has been disposed of.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITION

A petition was presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to study and review the problem of resurgent nazism and communism in Germany

"Whereas there are growing reports of the resurgence of nazism and communism in Germany: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to institute a thoroughgoing study and review of the resurgence of nazism and communism in Germany; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, April 26, 1950.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, May 3, 1950.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

"A true copy. Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

VETERANS' HOSPITAL IN QUEENS COUNTY, N. Y.—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF NEW YORK CITY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of New York, N. Y., favoring the reinstatement of the veterans' hospital program to provide a veterans' hospital in Queens County, N. Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolution 164

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reinstate the veterans' hospital program to provide a veterans' hospital in Queens County

"Whereas, in July 1947, Congress approved an appropriation for the construction of a 1,000-bed veterans' hospital in Queens County, and pursuant thereto, representatives of the Veterans' Administration in Washington, D. C., did inspect a number of sites presented to them by the officials of the Borough of Queens, and said representatives of the Veterans' Administration did select a 55-acre site in Bayside for such hospital to serve the 400,000 veterans in Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties, of which more than 50 percent reside in Queens County; and

"Whereas said project was later abandoned in December 1948, even though more than 400 veterans in Queens County alone required hospitalization and were deprived thereof for lack of available hospital beds; and

"Whereas at the conclusion of World War II, when 649 beds were available for veterans' care in St. Albans Naval Hospital, such bed availability has now been reduced to 100 beds for extreme emergency cases only, and no beds are available in the Kingsbridge veteran facility in the Bronx; and

"Whereas legislation is presently pending in our national legislative bodies for the construction of such Queens County veterans' hospital for which funds had previously been appropriated: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Council of the City of New York memorialize the Congress of the United States to reinstate the appropriation previously made, and that the Veterans' Administration be authorized and directed to proceed with that portion of its hospital construction program which will assure the erection of a veterans' hospital in Queens County; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. IRVING M. IVES and Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, United States Senators, and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New York, as well as to Hon. Carl R. Gray, Administrator."

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
Office of the City Clerk, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution passed by the Council of the City of New York on April 25, 1950, on file in this office.

MURRAY W. STAND,
City Clerk, Clerk of the Council.

SUPPORT OF FISH MANAGEMENT—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN DIVISION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from V. J. Muench, president of the Wisconsin division of the Izaak Walton League of America, enclosing a resolution adopted at the twenty-eighth annual conference of the League, at Des Moines, Iowa, March 23–25, 1950, relating to legislation providing support of fish management, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me, together with the letter and resolution, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter and resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, together with the letter and resolution will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The statement, letter, and resolution are as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WILEY

Mr. President, on May 3, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page 6212, I placed a resolution which had been adopted by the twenty-eighth annual conference of the Izaak Walton League of America which met at Des Moines, Iowa, between March 23 and March 25, 1950. That particular resolution related to the Great Lakes fisheries.

I have also been happy to receive a fine communication from the distinguished president of the Wisconsin division of the Izaak Walton League of America, Mr. B. J. Muench, of Green Bay. Mr. Muench conveyed a resolution which had also been adopted by the conference endorsing Congressman DINGELL'S revamped bill to provide funds for aid of the States in support of fish-management projects.

It was my pleasure to support Congressman DINGELL'S original bill for this purpose. Unfortunately, President Truman vetoed that bill, saying that the ear-marking of funds for support of fish-management would be a bad precedent. I personally feel that earmarking of funds for conservation purposes is a splendid precedent, and the Izaak Walton League and other conservation organizations of America feel exactly that way.

However, having been confronted with a Presidential veto, certain changes have now

been made in the Dingell bill (as stated in this resolution) so as to meet the Chief Executive's objections. So, it is my earnest hope that we will be able to secure the passage of this revised bill so that the great work done under the original Pitman-Robinson law, can be paralleled in support of the fish-management field.

Mr. President, I include the names of the very able citizens who serve as officers, directors, and chapter leaders of the Izaak Walton League in my State. It is my own conviction that if the Izaak Walton League of America had been heeded many years ago in its appeals for conservation, then America's wildlife, fish, forests, and other heritages would not be so terribly dissipated as they have been in the past decade.

President, V. J. Muench, 232 St. Mathews Street, Green Bay, Wis.

Vice presidents: Charles Broughton, Winnebago district, Sheboygan; Clarence Searles, Wisconsin River district, Wisconsin Rapids; C. F. Culler, Mississippi River district, Minneapolis, Minn.; R. J. Antes, Mendota district, Evansville; Wilton Erdman, Kettle Moraine district, Horicon.

Secretary-treasurer, Arthur Kaftan, Columbus Building, Green Bay, Wis.

DIRECTORS

Terms expiring 1950: Dr. A. M. Buechel, Fond du Lac; V. J. Muench, Green Bay, Joseph Soit, Two Rivers; William Cook, Stevens Point; Fred Steele, LaCrosse; Ray Zillmer, Milwaukee.

Terms expiring 1951: James Spindler, Manitowoc; Clarence Searles, Wisconsin Rapids; Pearl Pohl, Milwaukee; Lee La Fontaine, Fond du Lac; H. Klemme, Kiel; Robert Johnson, Milwaukee.

CHAPTER DIRECTORS

A. R. Jennings, Madison; Stewart Beaver, Manitowoc; H. Fale, Sheboygan; W. A. Otto, Watertown; C. P. Larson, Wausau; Dr. W. Enderby, Green Bay; Jerry Cutts, Stevens Point; R. F. Giddings, Beloit; Tom Kelley, Milwaukee; Ceylon Kohl, Ripon; Burton Lange, Horicon; Clyde Terrel, Oshkosh; Jerry Herchleb, Wisconsin Rapids; R. J. Antes, Evansville; E. J. Adkins, Fond du Lac; Al Rice, LaCrosse; Michael Kovac, Cudahy.

Past president, A. D. Sutherland, Fond du Lac.

WISCONSIN DIVISION,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
May 5, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: At the twenty-eighth annual conference held at Des Moines, Iowa, March 23–25, 1950, the Izaak Walton League passed a resolution favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the aid of States in sport-fish management along the general lines of the Pittman-Robertson law relating to upland game management. A copy of the resolution is enclosed herewith.

In view of the fact that population increases, along with the other factors associated therewith, are making such a tremendous drain on our outdoor heritage, we believe it is to the interest of the people that measures on the order of the Dingell bill be enacted to help save that heritage.

Therefore, in the public interest as well as in the interest of conservation, we respectfully urge your support of this legislation, and its prompt enactment.

Very truly yours,

V. J. MUENCH,
President, Wisconsin Division, IWLA.

Resolution 1

Dingell bill

Whereas the Izaak Walton League of America has long advocated the enactment of legislation by Congress to provide funds for aid of the States in sport-fish management along the general lines of the Pittman-Robertson law relating to upland game management; and

Whereas the Dingell bill which was passed by Congress but vetoed by the President has again been introduced with the elimination of the major objections raised in the presidential veto and said bill is now pending before Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Izaak Walton League does hereby endorse unqualifiedly the Dingell bill now pending before Congress and urges upon Congress the speedy enactment thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Izaak Walton League of America that the Dingell bill when enacted should be administered by the Fisheries Division of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service along the same general lines and in the same manner which have proved so effective over the past 10 years in the administration of the Pittman-Robertson law; and be it further

Resolved, That the State divisions of the league and the local chapters be urged to communicate directly with their representatives in Congress urging prompt action to bring about prompt passage of this bill.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 5103. A bill to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1542); and

S. Res. 261. Resolution favoring a rescission of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1543).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2875. A bill to extend for a period of 5 years the time for appropriating and expending funds to carry out the Federal Airport Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1551); and

S. 3173. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to undertake a project under the Federal Airport Act for the development and improvement of Chatham Field at Savannah, Ga., during the fiscal year 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1552).

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3560) to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services, and I submit a report (No. 1544) thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will be added as a cosponsor of the bill. The Chair hears no objection.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3565. A bill for the relief of Dragutin Sostarko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 3566. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 3567. A bill to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3568. A bill authorizing the Missouri River Basin agricultural program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3569. A bill for the relief of Harum Chowdhury, Suruj Mean, Abdul Motlib, Moklish Miah, Aftab Miah, and Jabid Ullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 3570. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BREWSTER, and himself):

S. 3571. A bill to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 178, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 251, Eighty-first Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES AT TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 251, Eighty-first Congress, providing for participation by the United States at the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Port-au-Prince, Haiti, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 178) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 251, Eighty-first Congress, introduced by Mr. MYERS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The statement presented by Mr. MYERS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

Mr. President, the Republic of Haiti is now commemorating with a bicentennial

exposition the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of its capital, Port-au-Prince. As the second oldest republic in this hemisphere, the Haitian Republic and its people over the years, and under the leadership of President Dumarsais Estime, have waged a steadfast and loyal battle in the cause of democracy and human rights. This exposition, which opened on December 8, 1949, is the first attempt by a Negro nation to present to the world an international exposition.

The participation of the United States, with exhibits built around the central theme of our social, cultural, industrial, and scientific achievements as a free people under a democratic form of government, has been an outstanding success. It has brought to the exposition the kind of spiritual and political leadership commensurate with the stature of United States leadership in inter-American affairs, and is a symbol of the cooperation and good will existing between our two countries.

I believe it is important that we should continue our participation in this worthwhile event and have, accordingly, introduced a resolution providing for an increased authorization for this purpose.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 1515, RELATING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SYSTEMS

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate concurrent resolution with respect to the printing of 10,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1515, of the Eighty-first Congress, second session, which is a report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, relating to the immigration and naturalization systems of the United States. I ask leave to submit it and that it may be referred to the appropriate committee.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 88), submitted by Mr. DONNELL, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1515 of the Eighty-first Congress, second session, which is a report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 137, Eightieth Congress, first session, as amended, on the immigration and naturalization systems of the United States. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 18 OF 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service present at a meeting of that committee, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution asking the Senate to act unfavorably on Reorganization Plan No. 18.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 17 OF 1950

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 271), which was refered to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 17 of 1950 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. TOBEY) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3547) to define bank-holding companies, control their future expansion, and to require the divestment of nonbanking assets, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Roy Blough, of Illinois, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert F. A. Studds, of Washington, D. C., to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

Kenneth R. Pinckney, for appointment as ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

Herman F. Rogall, and sundry other persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and three postmasters.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS AT CHEYENNE, WYO.

[Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. O'MAHONEY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President yesterday at Cheyenne, Wyo., which appears in the Appendix.]

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL—PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation by the President of the United States extending the protection of the copyright laws to citizens of the State of Israel, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ AT ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Albuquerque, N. Mex., Wednesday, May 3, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper release entitled "Happenings in Washington," issued by him on May 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HAND-OUT HIGHWAY TO DICTATORSHIP—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY H. W. PRENTIS, JR.

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "The Hand-Out Highway to Dictatorship," delivered by H. W. Prentis, Jr., before the National Council of Presbyterian Men, at Chicago, Ill., on February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPLY TO HAROLD E. STASSEN BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered on May 9, 1950, by Senator HUMPHREY in reply to Harold E. Stassen, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREWORD OF THE MAY ISSUE OF THE ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the foreword of the May issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, which appears in the Appendix.]

INEXPERIENCE BLAMED FOR UNITED STATES ROLE IN FAR EAST—ARTICLE BY HAROLD R. ISAACS

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Inexperience Blamed for United States Role in Far East," written by Harold R. Isaacs, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

GREAT CAMPAIGN OF TRUTH

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Great Campaign of Truth," reprinted by the International Latex Corp. in the New York Herald Tribune of April 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACHESON PERSUADED TO STAY—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Acheson Persuaded to Stay," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of May 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRUMAN AT LINCOLN—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman at Lincoln," published in the Washington Post, May 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHOULD PRESIDENT TAKE A HAND IN CONGRESSIONAL CONTESTS?—MINNESOTA POLL

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the result of the Minnesota poll on the question, "Should President Take a Hand in Congressional Contests?" published in the Minneapolis Tribune, May 7, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREAT POLITICIAN'S 1950 PERSONAL PARADE—EDITORIAL FROM RAPID CITY DAILY JOURNAL

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Great Politician's 1950 Personal Parade," published in the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Daily Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

MARAGON AFFAIR LEAVES BAD ODOR—EDITORIAL FROM THE MITCHELL REPUBLIC

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Maragon Affair Leaves Bad Odor," published in the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Republic, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETO OF THE KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL—ARTICLE BY THOMAS L. STOKES

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Agency Is the Target—Consumers Could Still Lose Victory Won in Veto of Kerr Natural-Gas Bill," written by Thomas L. Stokes and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SPECIAL CRIME INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE AND ITS OBJECTIVES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, a press release I have just made on the newly appointed Special Crime Investigating Committee and its objectives.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am today accepting appointment as one of the five members of the Special Senate Committee to Investigate Interstate Crime, authorized last week by the Senate of the United States. I believe sincerely that this special committee has a great opportunity to explore thoroughly and bring into the open the operations of gangsters, racketeers, and vice and crime syndicates who obviously operate in notorious defiance of law in our country. That is the principal reason I have consented to serve upon it, and I hope to devote considerable time and attention to its work.

As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have heard all of the testimony during the recent hearings on the Attorney General's bill which would prohibit the interstate transmission of certain gambling information. In the course of those hearings, the committee developed a great deal of important and constructive evidence relating specifically to that legislation and the bookie-betting situation. We will, of course, go forward with legislative consideration of that problem in the hope that we can work out a bill which will strike at the evil of illegal bookmaking and at the same time not do violence to our basic constitutional precepts of a free press and radio.

The hearings we have held have been important, not alone in connection with the antigambling bill, but also in paving the way for the broader forthcoming crime investigation. Evidence has been obtained which will, I am sure, prove invaluable to our new special Crime Investigating Committee which will have access to all of the records and information we have received and subpenaed.

While it may be premature to assert that open hearings of the nature we already have held have developed enough evidence from which to draw hard and fast conclusions, it has become clearly obvious that many engaged in the distribution of racing news and an overwhelming majority of those in the illegal bookmaking business either are or have been law violators or are associated with and do business with people who are known criminals. The effect of such gambling operations on other aspects of crime can, and I am sure will be, more carefully examined by thorough staff preparation and preliminary executive hearings. It is interesting to note, however, that the recent New York raids on the notorious Frank Erickson show clearly the value of the type of evidence which a Senate committee is able to develop.

At the proper time I shall request the special committee to call Frank Erickson before it because of certain contradictory and evasive testimony given before our Interstate Commerce Committee. I also expect that we will have Frank Costello back to go into discrepancies between his testimony before our committee and testimony he gave to a New York grand jury. If perjury is the only crime on which such characters can be nailed, let us start with that.

I am hopeful that the Special Crime Investigating Committee will prove to be of the same kind of assistance to other local law enforcement officials as our Interstate Commerce Committee already has been to the New York City district attorney in the Erickson case.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in the daily RECORD of May 5, on page 6563, I am recorded as not having voted on the amendment referred to on that page. Although there were 8 hours of voting on that day and my memory might lapse, I am quite positive that I voted affirmatively on that question. My vote would not change the result. I shall appreciate receiving consent to have the RECORD corrected, so as to show that I voted "yea."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Maine also would wish to have the Journal of the Senate corrected accordingly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is the third time this year that Senators have asked to have their votes changed or to have changes made in votes which occurred in the Senate. In other words, previously there have been two changes of votes, and now the Senator from Maine wishes to have the RECORD changed so as to show that he voted.

Of course, I assume that he did vote. However, I do not think the practice is a very good one. When votes are taken we have the clerk call the roll and recapitulate the vote in order that Senators may ascertain whether their votes are correctly recorded.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I may say that the clerk recorded me as voting, and he brought the matter to my attention.

I was present throughout the entire session; and I answered, as I thought, every roll call until 8 o'clock at night, when the Senate finally adjourned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not going to object, but I will say that the practice is not good.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the RECORD and the Journal will be corrected accordingly.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1950—RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE (WIS.) PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has reported, without recommendation, the resolution for disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5. I have previously commented on the floor of the Senate on the need for rejection of this plan, in view of the fact that it places in jeopardy the independent quasi-judicial Patent Office. In fact, I may say parenthetically, the Supreme Court has held that it is really a judicial function which the Patent Office performs. Naturally, it is with extreme reluctance that I have found it necessary to oppose this plan, because certainly there is general agreement among all of us on the need for greater Federal efficiency, economy, and streamlining.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I demand regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has announced that debate is not now in order on anything.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may simply read the remaining part of my brief introductory statement.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I object to anything except the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is, Is there objection to the insertion in the RECORD of the remaining part of the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]?

There being no objection, the remaining part of the statement of Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMAINING PART OF STATEMENT OF SENATOR WILEY

I have, however, pointed out that the American patent bar is deeply disturbed over the grave implications of Reorganization Plan No. 5 insofar as endangering the United States patent system is concerned. Throughout American business, there is increasing alarm, too, over the impact of this plan.

In this connection, Mr. President, I have in my hands a resolution adopted by the Milwaukee Patent Law Association opposing plan 5. I have previously pointed out on the Senate floor that this particular association is one of the pioneering patent groups in the Nation. Its officers and directors comprise a roster of the leading patent attorneys of the Badger State and, in turn, a roster of leading figures in the patent law section of the American Bar Association.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that I may insert in the RECORD a copy of the resolution of the Milwaukee Patent Law Association, to be followed by a list of the officers and directors. I am sure that that makes me regular, even if some folks are very much irregular in their extension of courtesies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with a list of the officers and directors, as follows:

Whereas the Milwaukee Patent Law Association vigorously supports the objectives of the Reorganization Act of 1949, providing for the reorganization of governmental agencies to promote better execution of the laws, economy, and efficiency by regrouping governmental agencies and eliminating overlapping and duplication of effort; but emphatically is of the opinion that no one of these objectives will be promoted by the transfer to the Secretary of Commerce of the functions of the Commissioner of Patents or other officers or employees of the United States Patent Office or the transfer

out of the Patent Office of any of its records, property, personnel, or unexpended balances or the transfer into the Patent Office of personnel other than as provided by law as proposed in Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950 transmitted by the President to the Congress May 13, 1950: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Milwaukee Patent Law Association vigorously opposes Reorganization Plan No. 5 insofar as it applies to the Patent Office and respectfully urges the Congress to disapprove that plan; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be authorized to transmit copies of this resolution to appropriate committees and Members of Congress and the President of the United States.

MILWAUKEE PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION

Officers: Harold S. Silver, president, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., zone 1; Merl E. Sceales, vice president, 735 North Water Street, zone 2; Joseph C. Schwalbach, secretary and treasurer, 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, zone 3.

Directors: Erwin B. Eiring, Frank H. Hubbard, Walter S. Pfeifer, Merl E. Sceales, Joseph C. Schwalbach, Harold S. Silver, and Arthur R. Woolfolk.

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD items which I shall enumerate in a moment. I am asking that these matters be inserted in the body of the RECORD because they concern the strike which began at 6 o'clock this morning on the part of the Brotherhood of Railroad Firemen and Enginemen, which is reported to have crippled four of the major railroads and to have spread quickly to a fifth, and which threatens to throw 500,000 industrial employees out of work.

Mr. President, the insertions which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD are:

First, a portion of the ticker tape of today which I now send to the Official Reporter and which I identify by the opening words, "Locomotive firemen and enginemen walked off the job today in a strike which crippled four major railroad systems, spread quickly to a fifth, and threatened to throw a half million industrial employees out of work."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Locomotive firemen and enginemen walked off the job today in a strike which crippled four major railroad systems, spread quickly to a fifth, and threatened to throw a half million industrial employees out of work.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Firemen and Enginemen pulled its men out of the locomotive cabs at 6 a. m. In each standard-time zone in the most serious rail strike since the Nation-wide, 48-hour tie-up in 1948.

The walk-out, called against four big rail networks serving commerce and industry from coast to coast, promptly disrupted operations of a fifth, the Chesapeake & Ohio.

The road announced that all its passenger trains, serving Washington, Chicago, Toledo, and Columbus, Ohio, and Grand Rapids, Mich., had been canceled. The C. & O. uses the tracks of other roads involved in the strike, and it said firemen, therefore, refused to man the trains.

Mr. DONNELL. Second, Mr. President, I ask to have printed a statement from the ticker tape of this morning from Chicago, the first sentence of which reads:

Locomotive firemen and enginemen went on strike today against four major railroad systems, crippling the Nation's transportation network and threatening to idle 500,000 other workers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO.—Locomotive firemen and enginemen went on strike today against four major railroad systems, crippling the Nation's transportation network and threatening to idle 500,000 other workers.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Firemen and Enginemen began the strike at 6 a. m. in each standard time zone.

As the strike passed the central time zone, 90 percent of the affected right-of-way was under complete strike, a union spokesman said.

He said 100,000 railroad men would be affected directly in the strike. If the stoppage continued, another 400,000 coal miners, steelworkers, and employees in other subsidiaries could be forced out of work.

As the strike dead line passed, National Mediation Board Chairman Francis O'Neill was still trying in Chicago to arrange a settlement.

Two minutes after the strike began on the east coast, Brotherhood President D. B. Robertson emerged from a Chicago hotel room where he was meeting with O'Neill and representatives of the Nation's railroads.

He said the strike started on schedule in the East. But he added:

"We're still working to try to prevent it from being a long strike. We're still hoping for a settlement."

The brotherhood called the strike to enforce its demand for an additional fireman on multiple-unit Diesel engines and to place at least one fireman on switch engines and electrically operated engines.

The strike forced the affected lines to halt or drastically reduce passenger and freight.

The struck lines were the Santa Fe railroad, the Southern railroad, the Pennsylvania west of Harrisburg, Pa., the New York Central west of Buffalo, N. Y., and four New York Central subsidiaries, the Ohio Central, Michigan Central, and Big Four lines.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the third insertion from the ticker tape of today is also from Chicago, the first sentence of which reads:

A strike of railroad firemen today crippled service on four railroad systems stretching from coast to coast.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO.—A strike of railroad firemen today crippled service on four railroad systems stretching from coast to coast.

As the strike became 100 percent effective at 8 a. m. central standard time, Federal mediators who talked with union leaders through the night still were hopeful of a quick settlement.

Pickets representing the 18,000 firemen on strike appeared at key points on the four systems—the Pennsylvania and New York Central, serving territory from Chicago eastward; the Southern Railway, a key line of Dixie, and the Santa Fe, operating from Chicago to the Pacific coast.

The firemen's brotherhood used a creeping technique in putting their strike into effect. It started at 6 a. m. in local standard time zones, the East feeling it first. An hour later firemen in the central time belt went out; an hour later those in the mountain zone.

At 6 a. m. Pacific time—or 9 a. m. in the eastern zone—the walk-out extended over its full course, the Nation's first major railroad strike since May 1946.

The tactic of singling out four principal carriers inconvenienced, but did not strand, the traveling public. Trains on runs at the time of the strike's zero hour continued on to their terminals.

Travelers between major terminal cities could make their trips on competing lines. Those relying on local service of the stricken lines had to switch to busses or other modes of transport.

Big freight customers transferred their shipping from the struck lines to alternate systems.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the next insertion is an editorial entitled "The Public Can Be Protected," from the Kansas City Star of April 25, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC CAN BE PROTECTED

The continuing threat of a strike to stop the operations of four railroads poses the fundamental issue of the public interest.

Senator FORREST C. DONNELL proposes to meet such situations with compulsory arbitration. His bill seems likely to attract more attention than would have been the case a few years ago. Regardless of whether Senator DONNELL has proposed the right method, the purpose of his bill is in line with widespread public thinking.

For 20 years the Railway Labor Act was held up as a model of labor legislation. Under it management and labor retained the rights of free bargaining. Procedure outlined by the law served to check hot-headed action. The railroads operated with few serious interruptions and presumably, everyone was happy.

There is nothing in the Railway Labor Act to meet the present threat that extends along railroad lines from coast to coast. The 2-week truce revives some hope in the immediate situation. But the current threat is only one step in a determined power drive by the brotherhoods. This part of the country suffered last year when the Missouri Pacific was chosen for the first test of power.

The ultimatum delivered by the firemen's union stands with no hint of backing up:

The railroads will yield to a program of feather bedding or the brotherhood will have its way by force.

The demand for a third man (with nothing to do) on Diesel locomotives is only one piece in a big pattern. This demand has already been turned down by the two independent fact-finding boards; one appointed by President Roosevelt and the other by President Truman.

A complete lack of a case makes no difference. The brotherhood simply says it must have its own way. The damage to thousands of businesses and millions of people along the lines rates no consideration. The last threat is no sudden flare-up. It represents a calculating, long-range program that has been developing for years. The public can only assume that the same power drive, the same ultimatums will continue in the future.

So what protection can the people of the United States expect? They have very little protection as matters stand today.

Generally neither business nor labor wants compulsory arbitration. It would mean another extension of power by the Federal Government. Wherever it applied the principle of free bargaining would be lost.

But it is also true that a great Nation cannot tolerate crippling strikes in its basic industries. A few thousand men cannot be maintained in the power to throw millions of other men out of work and cripple the whole national economy.

Free bargaining in basic industries can last only so long as it is accompanied by a sense of public responsibility. Where men of unusual power abuse their rights then some loss of rights becomes inevitable.

The spirit apparent in the firemen's union threat is the type of thing that might force far-reaching action by Congress.

In Missouri the question of the public's right in labor disputes led to the anti-utility-strike law. This law says that the public's right comes first where utilities are involved. It doesn't require compulsory arbitration. But the seizure power given the Governor has had a sobering effect. There have been no large utility strikes in Missouri since the enactment of the law. The law has been widely approved by the public. It has received considerable support from unions in the utility industries.

Outright compulsory arbitration isn't the only Federal power that could be raised on the side of the public. Whatever the method used, the American people look to their Government as their last line of defense. Reckless abuse of the right to strike must inevitably lead to powerful restraints in the basic industries.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the next insertion is an editorial entitled "Union Irresponsibility," from the New York Times of April 22, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION IRRESPONSIBILITY

The Railway Labor Act provides an elaborate mechanism for settling labor-management differences short of a strike. Should direct negotiation fail, it offers successively mediation, arbitration (if agreeable to both parties), and, finally, fact-finding by a Presidentially appointed board with authority to recommend a basis of settlement. Over the last decade, however, this machinery has failed to function in the manner in which it was designed to function. The reason is that the labor unions have in many cases flouted the recommendations of Presidential boards (and the "public opinion" which was supposed to "enforce" them), a procedure which has been at least negatively encouraged in Government circles.

We are now faced with a new and serious railroad walk-out, and again this threat has nothing to do with any shortcoming in the law. Like so many of its predecessors, it arises from the fact that the union concerned—the Brotherhood of Locomotive Enginemen and Firemen—has refused to abide by the decision of a Presidentially appointed fact-finding board and has elected to resort to the economic weapon of the strike to win its objective. The union's demand in this case is that the railroads be compelled to use two firemen, instead of one, on Diesel electric locomotives.

After months of negotiation, the President named a board on February 14, 1949, headed by George W. Taylor, former Chairman of the War Labor Board, to consider the demand. The board held hearings for a period of 2 months between June and August, and submitted its report to Mr. Truman last September 19. "Upon careful analysis of the data submitted," it said, "we have concluded that no valid reason has been shown as a support for the brotherhood proposal * * *." Despite this finding, David B. Robertson, president of the firemen's union, has announced he is calling a strike to begin next Wednesday at 6 a. m.

Of only slightly less importance than this decision of the firemen's leader to take his men off the job because of the rejection of an out-and-out feather-bedding demand is the strategy he plans to employ. In 1946 and 1948 Nation-wide railroad walk-outs were headed off by Government seizure on the ground that they threatened the economic safety and welfare of the Nation. In 1949 a strike on a single road, the Missouri Pacific, was permitted to continue for 45 days without Government action. The plans for the walk-out now proposed contemplate that it will hit all or parts of four of the Nation's biggest carriers—the Atchison, the Southern Railway, the Pennsylvania, and the New York Central. The union and its leaders presumably hope that they can achieve their objective by a piecemeal crippling of the Nation's transportation system.

It should hardly be necessary to define the administration's responsibility in this situation. It is to make clear beyond any doubt that it stands squarely behind its own fact-finding board and that the latter's recommendations are under no circumstances to be flouted with impunity.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the next insertion is an editorial entitled "An Irresponsible Strike," from the New York Herald Tribune of April 22, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IRRESPONSIBLE STRIKE

The Railway Labor Act, framed nearly 25 years ago as the result of joint negotiation between the railway unions and the carriers, has worked well until recent years. The growing determination in labor union leadership to brook no opposition to their demands finds new expression in the strike that has been voted by one of the principal operating brotherhoods against some seven western and midwest railroads and divisions of eastern lines. Defying the recommendations of the National (Railway) Mediation Board, rejecting arbitration, and rejecting the findings of a Presidentially appointed emergency fact-finding board the firemen are now free from the waiting period prescribed in the Railway Labor Act and are about to strike.

Objective examination of union demands by the two Presidential boards resulted in the conclusion that extra personnel on Diesel-powered trains was not warranted. But the union is now legally free to strike and is going so. In a national labor situation in which unions are achieving ever more power, it is disheartening in the extreme to observe this failure to act responsibly. A demand to load the railroads—or any industry—with unnecessary personnel will hasten economic disaster. The railroad industry is already overburdened with featherbedding rules which are extremely costly. It is meeting competition by truck and by air. Union pursuit of demands for extra men may well result in fewer rather than more jobs. Wise leadership would turn its attention to ways of increasing production. To all American industry the stepping-up of productivity is the major challenge today. Only by so doing can the real wages of workers be increased and the improved social benefits they want be supplied.

The strategy adopted by the union of striking only a part of the railway system seems calculated to avoid further Presidential action which a Nation-wide tie-up of the carriers would almost certainly invoke. Perhaps this seems smart to the union leaders. It may even work out as planned. But in the long run it may increase the demand for more stringent legislation than either the Taft-Hartley Act or the Railway Labor Act. This would be bad, it would be a defeat of the democratic principle. The very freedom to strike imposes responsibility. In the case of railroads this responsibility is far-reaching. But these grave considerations seemingly are ignored by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, finally, I ask to have inserted a copy of Senate bill 3463, upon which hearings have been held and will continue to be in progress before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3463) to amend the Railway Labor Act, as amended, so as to prevent interference with the movement of interstate commerce, and for other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, is amended by striking out paragraph (q) and substituting therefor the following:

"(q) Any party in interest aggrieved by an award or order, including a negative order, of a division of the Adjustment Board may, where no proceeding is pending under paragraph (p) of this section, bring an action against the Adjustment Board in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois to review such award or order. Any person in whose favor such award or order has been made or his collective bargaining representative shall be permitted to intervene in such action. The said court may enjoin, set aside, annul or suspend, in whole or in part, such award or order, if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court (1) that the findings of fact are clearly erroneous; or (2) that the findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence; or (3) that the award or order is not supported by the findings of fact; or (4) that the award or order was issued without due notice and reasonable opportunity having been afforded the aggrieved party for a full and fair hearing; or (5) that the award or order is beyond the jurisdiction of the division of the Adjustment Board; or (6) that the award or order infringes the Constitution or statutes of the United States; or (7) that the award or order is otherwise contrary to law.

"(r) The review of such award or order shall be upon the record made before the division of the Adjustment Board, except that the district court may in its discretion remand any case to the Adjustment Board or any division thereof for the taking of further evidence or for further proceedings in conformity with the judgment of the court. The orders, writs, and processes of the district court may, in such actions, run, be served, and be returnable anywhere in the United States. If in such an action an employee or employees should be a party therein, and shall prevail, he or they shall be allowed a reasonable attorney's fee, to be taxed and collected as part of the costs of the action.

"(s) Actions under paragraphs (p) and (q) of this section shall be begun within 1 year from the date of entry of such award or order, and not thereafter."

SEC. 2. Paragraphs (r), (s), (t), (u), (v), and (w), of section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, shall be relettered as paragraphs (t), (u), (v), (w), (x), and (y), respectively.

SEC. 3. The second sentence in the third paragraph of subsection First of section 5 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "If such efforts to bring about an amicable settlement through mediation shall be unsuccessful, the said Board shall at once request in writing the parties to submit their controversy to arbitration in accordance with the provisions of this act, and shall thereupon use all reasonable efforts to induce the parties so to do."

SEC. 4. Section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. First. If a dispute between a carrier and its employees, other than a dispute within the jurisdiction of the Adjustment Board, shall not have been adjusted, or arbitration agreed to within 15 days after the Mediation Board shall have requested the parties to submit such dispute to arbitration, the Mediation Board shall immediately so notify the President. On receipt of such notice, the President shall create a Presidential Board to investigate and decide such dispute, which Board shall be composed of a Chairman designated by the President and such number of other persons as the President believes desirable: *Provided*, That no member appointed shall be financially or otherwise interested in any organization of employees or any carrier. The compensation of the members of any such Presidential Board shall be fixed by the President. A Presidential Board shall be created separately in each instance. It shall promptly hold a public hearing of the parties with reference to the dispute and shall make and publish a report in writing with respect to the dispute which shall state the findings, conclusions, and decision of the Board on each of the issues involved.

"A Presidential Board shall have power to sit and act at any place within the United States. For the purpose of any hearing conducted by such Board, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C., secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of such Board.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of such Board, including the compensation and necessary traveling expenses and expenses actually incurred for subsistence of the members of such Board. All expenditures of the Board shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman.

"Second. If the Presidential Board shall find that such dispute involves the question as to which of two or more crafts or classes of employees may perform any particular type of work, or any question affecting the work or pending demands of crafts or classes of employees other than those who are parties to the dispute, the Board shall so notify the representatives of all such crafts or classes of employees, and such crafts or classes of employees shall thereupon become parties to such proceeding.

"Third. The report of the Presidential Board and the transcript of the proceedings before it, including the evidence, shall be filed with the President and with the National Mediation Board. Copy of such report shall, upon request, be furnished to each party to the proceeding who enters an appearance at the hearing.

"Fourth. In the event of disagreement between the parties as to the meaning of the findings, conclusions, or decisions, or as to the terms of the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may apply to the Presidential Board for a clarification of its report, whereupon the Board shall reconvene and shall, with or without a further hearing, promptly issue a further report setting forth its decision on each of the issues involved in such disagreement. In the event any member of a Presidential Board should be unable or unwilling to serve, the President shall appoint a successor.

"Fifth. A report filed as herein provided shall, unless set aside in judicial proceedings as hereinafter provided, be conclusive and binding on the parties and enforceable by appropriate proceedings in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or the United States district court for any district in which proceedings of the Presidential Board were held.

"Sixth. Within 30 days after the filing of the report a petition to impeach the report may be filed in any United States district court mentioned in the next preceding paragraph by any party to said proceeding on any one or more of the following grounds of invalidity:

"(a) That the report clearly does not conform to the requirement laid down by this act for such reports, or that the proceedings were not substantially in conformity with the act;

"(b) That the report does not conform to the issues in the controversy submitted to such Board; or

"(c) That a member of such Board rendering the report was guilty of fraud or corruption in connection therewith, or that a party to such proceedings practiced fraud or corruption which fraud or corruption affected the report.

"Seventh. No court shall entertain any such petition to impeach a report on the ground that such report is invalid for uncertainty; but any such report may be submitted to the reconvened Presidential Board for interpretation as provided by this act. A report contested as herein provided shall be construed liberally by the court, with a view to favoring its validity, and no report shall be set aside for trivial irregularity or clerical error, going only to form and not to substance.

"Eighth. If the court shall determine that the entire report is invalid on some ground or grounds designated in this section as a ground of invalidity, the court shall set aside the entire report; but if the court shall find that only a part of the report is invalid and if such invalid part is separable from the valid part the court may in its discretion set aside the entire report or set aside only the invalid part.

"Ninth. At the expiration of 20 days from the decision of the district court upon the petition filed as aforesaid, the judgment of the court shall be final unless during said 20 days either party shall appeal therefrom to the United States Court of Appeals. The determination of said court of appeals upon such appeal shall be final and enforceable by appropriate judgment of either the court of appeals or the district court."

SEC. 5. The Railway Labor Act is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"SEC. 10A. First. Any strike, including any concerted stoppage of work by employees or any concerted slowdown, sitdown, walkout, or other concerted interruption of operations by employees, or any lockout by a carrier, arising out of or in connection with any dispute falling within the purview of this act, shall be unlawful.

"Second. It shall be unlawful for any person, including a carrier or labor organization, (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, or conspire with, any other such person to interfere by any such unlawful strike or lockout with the operation of any carrier subject to this act; or (2) to participate in, or to aid any such strike interfering with the operation of any such carrier, or to give direction or guidance in the conduct thereof or to further the same by the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein; or (3) to aid in any such lockout interfering with the operation of any such carrier by giving direction or guidance to such lockout by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof.

"Third. Violation of any of the provisions of this section shall constitute a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, any offending person, carrier, or labor organization or offending officer, agent, employee, or member of such carrier or labor organization shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in paragraph 10 of section 2 of this act in the case of carriers or their officers or agents for violation of the provisions of that section. The provisions of said paragraph 10 with respect to the duty of any district attorney of the United States shall apply with equal force in the case of violation or threatened violation hereof upon application by the Mediation Board or any carrier or labor organization or its or their officers or duly authorized agents.

"Fourth. Any United States district court within the territorial jurisdiction of which any violation of this section shall have been committed or shall be threatened shall also have jurisdiction, at the instance of the Attorney General of the United States, or the attorney general of any State affected by such a violation or a threatened violation of this section, or of any interested carrier or aggrieved party, to grant the remedy of injunction, prohibitive or mandatory, which may be appropriate in the premises; and in any such action or proceeding the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of the act of October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 17, and title 29, sec. 52), and the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932 (U. S. C., title 29, secs. 101–115), shall not be deemed to apply."

SEC. 6. The Railway Labor Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "emergency board" wherever they appear, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Presidential Board."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, while I am on my feet——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to all these insertions, I ask, why should they be in the body of the RECORD? They have nothing to do with the business the Senate is transacting today, and why should they not go in the Appendix?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if I may answer the distinguished Senator, I think the matter of a railroad strike of the tremendous consequence of that which started this morning, together with the fact that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is considering at this very time a bill which is designed to prohibit strikes and lock-outs with respect to any dispute which is within the purview of the Railway Labor Act, is sufficient reason why the insertions should be in the body of the RECORD, where they will be read, rather than in the Appendix of the RECORD, where there would be at least a question as to whether any great proportion of those who received the RECORD would see them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, let me say that similar arguments can be made with regard to any bills. I am not expressing myself on the merits of the con-

troversy at all, but I think it is a wrong to the RECORD, to the public and to the Senate to fill up the body of the RECORD with a great deal of extraneous matter which could be placed in the Appendix, where it belongs. I am not going to object now, but I say to the Senator from Missouri that I shall object in the future to the filling up of the body of the RECORD with a great deal of material which ought to be in the Appendix.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE CRIME—LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF SENATE RESOLUTION 202

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Illinois for a moment. Yesterday the Senator from Illinois took some umbrage at a question regarding his resisting the so-called Kefauver crime-investigation resolution. Without undertaking to argue or pass on the merits of the question, I simply ask that the record which I hold in my hand, in regard to Senate Resolution 202, showing the date when it was submitted, the date when it was reported by the Judiciary Committee, the date when it was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, its pendency on the legislative calendar, the subsequent action by the Senate, and the appointment of the committee by the Vice President, be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point, so that people can draw their own conclusions.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 202

January 5, 1950: Submitted.

February 27: Reported with amendment (S. Rept. 1317). Referred to Rules Committee; executive sessions only.

March 23: Reported with amendment from Rules.

April 11: Democratic Policy Committee agrees to substitute resolution draft.

May 3: Senate adopted substitute with amendment.

May 10: Committee appointed by Vice President.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN ALFRED KOHLBERG AND DR. H. H. K'UNG AND DR. T. V. SOONG

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read three letters at this time, for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the first letter reads as follows:

MARCH 3, 1950.

Dr. H. H. K'UNG,
Dr. T. V. SOONG,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR FRIENDS: Having been on a mission to the west coast, from which I returned last week, I have just noticed an item on page 11 of Newsweek for February 6, reading as follows:

"The administration has an ace up its sleeve in case criticism of its Formosa and China policy becomes too hot. It is ready to disclose how Chinese Nationalists officials sold out their country by transferring personal funds and assets to the United States. The Treasury has the names and figures at its fingertips."

There have been many such articles in the press in the past. You have both told me that you would be pleased if the State Department or the Treasury gave out the figures, as statements such as the above are a gross exaggeration as far as you both are concerned.

While this item does not mention your names, in the public mind such charges as this constantly repeated are always attached to your names.

The investigation of the State Department by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is due to start next Wednesday. May I have your permission to advise members of that committee that you are both agreeable to having information referred to above made public? I ask this because in the past the responsible officials in the Treasury Department told me that they were under obligation to the individuals concerned not to make such information public. If you would both authorize publication of the information, this obligation on their part would cease.

With kindest personal regards and hoping that you may see the advantages that would accrue from complete revealment of the truth, I beg to remain,

Very sincerely yours,

ALFRED KOHLBERG.

The next letter reads as follows:

BANK OF CHINA,
NEW YORK AGENCY,
New York, N. Y., March 8, 1950.

Mr. ALFRED KOHLBERG,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KOHLBERG: I thank you for your letter of March 3 in which you inform me that there appeared an item in the February 6 issue of Newsweek reading as follows: "The administration has an ace up its sleeve in case criticism of its Formosa and China policy becomes too hot. It is ready to disclose how Chinese Nationalist officials sold out their country by transferring personal funds and assets to the United States. The Treasury has the names and figures at its fingertips."

You also inform me that the investigation of the State Department by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is due on Wednesday, the 8th of this month, and ask me whether I am agreeable to having information in the hands of the Treasury Department made public regarding the personal funds and assets I have in this country, should the matter of personal funds and assets of former Nationalist officials who have come to this country to live in the last few years be brought into discussion in the inquiry on the policy and actions of the Washington administration in respect to China. To your question, although I cannot speak for others, I give the answer that I shall be perfectly agreeable to making public by the State Department or Treasury Department the factual figures on the personal funds and assets I have in this country based on actual accounts, if this action is judged by them to be pertinent and relevant to the discussion.

One point I wish to make clear is that I resigned and retired from public office in China 5 years ago, and I was called to this country 2½ years ago to be with my wife, owing to her illness. Since then, owing to the Communist trouble, I have lost all my businesses and properties in China. What I was able to salvage was barely enough for the maintenance of myself and family for the time being. This will serve, I am sure, to clarify my personal position as an ordinary resident in this country.

I want to express my appreciation of your kindness and interest in an old friend to bring up the above matter for my attention at this time, thus giving me an opportunity to clarify my present position.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

H. H. K'UNG.

The next letter is dated May 8, 1950.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield as soon as I finish with this short letter. I shall then be glad to yield to the Senator. This was addressed to Mr. Kohlberg, and reads as follows:

NEW YORK, *May 8, 1950.*

MY DEAR MR. KOHLBERG: Thank you for your letter of May 5, calling my attention to Mr. Constantine Brown's column of May 3 in the New York Journal American.

When you originally wrote me on March 3, suggesting that I permit you to quote me as having no objection to official release of the record of my total holdings in the United States, I then replied that I did not choose to dignify the untruthful attacks by pro-Communists in the American press by any notice on my part.

However, when a man of Mr. Constantine Brown's reputation for integrity makes the same statements, I feel constrained to have you advise your friends in the United States Government that I have no objection to the publication by the United States Treasury or State Department of my total holdings in the United States.

Again thanking you for your interest, and with cordial regards,

Faithfully yours,

T. V. SOONG.

Mr. President, I think as a matter of historic interest the letters should be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I again ask the Senator if he will yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is this the same Kohlberg who has been mentioned frequently in the press lately as the head of the so-called China lobby?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Texas this is the same Mr. Kohlberg who has been charged in the Communist paper, the Daily Worker, as being a part of the so-called "China lobby"—in quotation marks, as they put it. It is the same Mr. Kohlberg who has been attacked by the Communist Party in the United States. It is the same Mr. Kohlberg who has been subjected to attack by the left-wing press of this country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to please answer the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have answered the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not invite an oration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California is attempting to answer the question of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. This is the same Mr. Kohlberg who has been bitterly attacking the administration, and whose name is before the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which is investigating the so-called charges against the State Department, is it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. He is the financial backer of those who are attacking the administration's policy, is he not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that Mr. Kohlberg, some years ago, was a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and took an active part in the effort to get rid of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, who was one of the witnesses who testified before the committee, and who, when asked whether he was a Communist, declined to answer on the ground it might incriminate him, and later was either removed or resigned from the position of secretary of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to have the Senator answer further, because he has not at all answered yet. I inquired whether this is the Mr. Kohlberg who was financing those who were attacking the administration's policy in China, and who has been prominently mentioned in connection with the matter before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator I do not know whether he has been financing the groups that have been attacking the policy. I would suggest, if the Senator wants to get some information, that the committee subpena Mr. Kohlberg to give testimony. He could furnish the best evidence in regard to that.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is assuming to speak on the floor of the Senate in regard to these letters and their contents. Now, when I ask for real information on the subject, he suggests the summoning of someone to appear before the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the contrary, I have been trying to point out that the smear attacks which have been leveled in the Communist press and by the Communist Party of this country, which supported a policy which led this Government to urge a coalition with the Communists in China, have subjected to attack all those who oppose that policy which contributed to the debacle in China.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not true. The Senator knows it is not true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that debate is not in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. I refuse to ask the Senator any further questions, because he does not answer. He does not respond to the question I ask him. Instead of answering the questions, he delivers an oration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order, under the order of the Senate that there be no debate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator a question, and he then proceeds with an oration about China, and what he did to save China, and what everyone else did against China. I do not care to hold a conversation with the Senator on the subject.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has just come to my attention through a press report that the President this morning had affixed his signature to the bill (S. 247), the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. I ask unanimous consent to speak not to exceed 2 minutes on this subject.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am going to have to object. I have been waiting for 4 days to get a few minutes on the floor of the Senate. I have unanimous consent to proceed following the disposition of routine matters this morning. I should like to accommodate the Senator, but evidently this is going to go on until 6 o'clock tonight. I object to anything except the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

THE PERIL OF IMPORTED OIL

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, in the historic Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on a melancholy day in May, 61 years ago, a horseman galloped down the Conemaugh Valley toward Johnstown, crying at the top of his voice: "The dam is breaking! For God's sake, run to the hills and save your lives." Many who heard the rider considered him crazy and consequently ignored his warning. A few minutes later, the Johnstown flood, one of the greatest calamities of the nineteenth century, shocked the Nation and saddened the world. It utterly destroyed $12,000,000 worth of property and hurled 2,200 human beings from the stirring land of the living into the silent land of the dead.

Please let me invite the attention of the Senate to a disastrous flood of another kind—a flood of imported oil. At this very hour, it is at high tide throughout the United States. It is as menacing to the prosperity of our coal, oil, and railroad industries as the ravaging waters of the Conemaugh Lake and River were to the lives of the people of Johnstown immediately before they were slaughtered on black Friday, the 31st day of May, 1889.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the able Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. I have listened with great interest to what the Senator said regarding the terrible catastrophe in Johnstown which occurred more than 60 years ago, and also to his reference to the damage to the oil and coal industries of the United States by reason of the importation of oil. Does the distinguished Senator know that within the past month there has been closed down a coal mine within 25 miles of Johnstown which was in existence when the Johnstown flood occurred, and that it has been closed down permanently? Its closing down will deprive 1,200 miners of employment. There is nothing for them to do. The mine will never be opened again because there is not a sufficient market for coal.

Mr. NEELY. I did not know that this particular mine had been closed. But it is a matter of common knowledge that the cutthroat competition of foreign oil is daily shutting down mines and forcing miners into idleness in every coal-producing State in the Union.

Mr. President, with commendable foresight. we have spent billions of dollars to secure this country against armed aggression. But we have deplorably failed to protect ourselves against the alarming aggression of oil, from the Middle East and Venezuela, which is deluging the country to the injury of the Nation, the damage of its industries and the irreparable loss of its people. It is displacing our coal at the rate of 40,000,000 tons a year. It is depriving American oil producers and coal operators of their markets and diminishing their profits. It is constantly closing mines in such coal-producing States as Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Alabama, Indiana, Illinois, and Tennessee. It is causing widespread unemployment, impoverishment, and distress in the coal, oil-refining, and railroad industries of the Nation. American businessmen, miners, railroaders, and refinery workers are being ruthlessly sacrificed on the altar of six giant, profit-seeking importing corporations.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator aware, also, that in the Gulf Coast area alone, 15 of 31 independent refineries have been closed down for weeks because there is no market for their fuel?

Mr. NEELY. I do not know how many have closed. But unless the present importations of oil are greatly reduced, all our domestic refineries will eventually succumb to the irresistible competition of foreign oil.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the junior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator intend to discuss other imports than imports of oil which are so dangerous to his community?

Mr. NEELY. Not today.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator recognizes, I am sure, that the same consequences are inevitable if we reduce protection to the point at which oil comes into this country at a much lower price than that at which it can be produced here, especially in West Virginia and in Ohio. The same is true with respect to the glass industry.

Mr. NEELY. I shall join the Senator in protecting the glass industry. It is my hope that he will join in my effort to save our coal, oil, and railroad enterprises from annihilation. I have long supported the reciprocal trade agreements legislation. But unless some restraint is promptly imposed upon the importation of foreign oil, I shall, in the future, do whatever appears to be necessary to obtain adequate protection against this greedy aggressor, regardless of my previous attitude or belief.

Mr. BRICKER. May I suggest to the Senator that I feel very happy about his recognition of the peril in which the industries to which he has referred find themselves today because cheap labor and cheap foreign imports are robbing our people of employment?

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from Ohio may rest assured that the Senator from West Virginia will never fail to vote with

him when the Senator from Ohio is right. It is my hope that he and I will both be right now and forever—particularly so far as the coal, oil, and glass industries are concerned.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not want to take up the Senator's time, but I think it would be very interesting to the Senate, at the beginning of the Senator's very able remarks, if he would state how much oil is now being imported, how many miners' jobs are at stake, and how many railroad men's jobs are at stake.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to respond to the Senator's acceptable suggestion.

Foreign oil flooded this country during the month of March 1950—the latest month for which importations have been officially announced—at the average rate of 885,000 barrels a day. The importations for the first quarter of this year were more than 85 percent greater than they were in the first quarter of the year 1948.

A train of railroad cars more than 6,000 miles long—more than twice the length of this country—would be required to transport the coal which, at the present rate, will be displaced in the United States by imported oil during the next 12 months. This displacement means that 35,000 miners will lose their employment. It means that thousands of railroad men will be idle. It means a direct loss to American labor and industry of three-fourths of a billion dollars a year. It means vast additional, indirect losses to the American people—the amount of which it is impossible to determine.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Does not the Senator know that the administration is apprised of this situation, and that Mr. Paul Hoffman has stated what is intended to be done about it, namely, to reeducate the coal miners in some other industry, to move them to some other part of the country, or possibly to give some relief to the coal industry itself by subsidizing it or nationalizing it? Does the Senator think that would solve the problem?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am not in favor of solving the problem in the manner indicated by the Senator from Indiana. If the executive branch of the Government does not promptly provide relief in the matter which we are discussing, Congress will be vigorously urged to enact whatever remedial law the case may require.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in hearty sympathy with the position of the Senator from West Virginia, and I see what his remedy is. However, I should like to ask the Senator if he feels that the executive department can apply it in light of the fact that only recently it has been advocated that 2,400 additional items be placed on the free-trade basis. Does not the Senator feel that the remedy, in reality, must be written into law? I ask that in all seriousness.

Mr. NEELY. If necessary, I am in favor, in this particular instance, of writing an adequate remedy into the law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the able Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I am wondering, in view of the Senator's remarks, if the prohibition of the importation of lower-cost foreign oil would give any assurance that our railroads would not attempt to continue to use American oil and thereby not give more employment to employees of the railroads. Would they not merely shift to American oil?

Mr. NEELY. In my opinion, they would not, to any great extent. The competition of domestic oil would necessarily be reasonable because of its higher cost of production. The competition of foreign residual oil is cutthroat and irresistible. The railroads can obtain the foreign competitive fuel oil at their own price. They could obtain no such bargains from domestic producers.

Mr. AIKEN. If the importation of foreign oil were to be prohibited, what would be its effect on transportation rates? Would not rates be raised? What would be the effect on power rates? I know that some power companies have converted from coal to oil, particularly in New England.

Mr. NEELY. Over a long period of time the rates would probably be lower instead of higher. If the foreign oil deluge continues until our domestic industry is destroyed, the importers will do what monopolists always do—increase their prices sufficiently to regain all they lost in exterminating their rivals, and thereafter make all such additional increases as their avarice might suggest.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not one of the reasons why the railroads have shown a slump in recent years due to the fact that they have increased their rates so that they have priced certain types of freight off the railroads and onto other means of transportation? I am wondering, if there were no increase in cost at all, whether the railroads would not continue to further price themselves out of the transportation market.

Mr. NEELY. Judging the future by the past, the railroads will persistently continue to increase their rates until all their passenger traffic and the greater part of their freight will have been lost to ships, airplanes, busses, automobiles, and trucks.

Mr. AIKEN. One of the worst things they can do is to set their rates so high that they price certain commodities off their rails. Once taken off the rails, those commodities hardly ever go back to that form of transportation.

Mr. NEELY. In that observation I unconditionally concur.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the eminent Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as the coal industry is concerned, it must be pretty prosperous. They got a raise in the price of coal as a result of the recent strike.

Mr. NEELY. At present, the coal industry is not prosperous. The competition of bargain counter foreign oil is not only wrecking the prosperity of the coal industry, but threatening its very life.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the Senator think that increasing coal prices far above what they were formerly had some influence on the lower consumption of coal?

Mr. NEELY. Increases in coal prices have closed no mines. All the many closings of which I have heard were caused by flooding foreign oil. Let me assure the Senator that it is my hope that my remarks will help not only West Virginia coal but also Texas oil. I am sorry that the Senator is critical of the coal industry which now has, and always has had, more than its share of trouble.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am asking the Senator a question. I am trying to find out something. I am a poor misinformed, ignorant fellow.

Mr. NEELY. I would not permit one of the Senator's enemies to say that about him.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am glad to see that the Senator from West Virginia will say something in behalf of Texas. Did not the Senator vote against the gas bill?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, against the gas bill and monopoly but not against Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. So, the Senator votes against Texas on everything except when he thinks he can help coal. When he thinks he can help coal, he is for Texas.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, of course, the Senator is mistaken. I have long and consistently voted for the protection and prosperity of Texas cattle, Texas cotton, and many other things in which that truly great State has been vitally interested.

Mr. CONNALLY. All American people do not live in West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. No, they do not, but many would be happier if they did. All Americans do not live in Texas but I shall never turn a deafened ear to a Texas call for help simply because a part of our population does not live within the border of the vast domain known as the Lone Star State.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not the Senator agree that the big danger is the residual oil, which is what is left after gasoline and other products have been taken from the oil, and which in the fuel market has the same place that slack coal has in the coal market? If we could dispose of the slack coal, we could run our mines. However, the big power plants are the consumers of slack, as well as the chemical industry. When they switch over to residual oil, slack has no market. Therefore it is impossible to mine the prepared sizes of coal. Is that not the fact?

Mr. NEELY. The distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia is as right as rain. The United States has no place to dump its slack coal. However, the whole United States is a dumping ground for slack residual oil from the Middle East and Latin America, and the

dumping threatens disaster to our coal and oil industries, and to all who are employed by them.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also a fact that by reason of the dumping of residual oils from abroad refineries in the Southwest have been shut down because they cannot store residual oil if they are unable to sell it at the price at which they have been selling it?

Mr. NEELY. That is undoubtedly and regrettably true.

Imported oil is now robbing miners and railroad men of their wages at the rate of $250,000,000 a year. It is reducing the gross income of the domestic oil industry at the rate of $500,000,000 a year. In the mining regions the butchers, the bakers, the grocers, and the proprietors of all other lines of business are suffering heavy losses indirectly caused by the insatiate culprit, foreign oil. As a result of this misehief-maker's depredations, State and Federal revenues are suffering serious impairment. Unless foreign oil importations are drastically reduced, it will soon be necessary to impose additional burdensome taxation to defray indispensable governmental operations.

Insidious propaganda has been industriously disseminated to the effect that as long as we are at peace, we should utilize foreign oil and conserve our own fuel resources for possible wartime emergencies. If we pursue this course, we should be likened unto the foolish man in the parable who built his house upon the sand. "And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it"—because it was built upon the sand. Not foreign sand, but domestic coal and oil, are the fuel rocks upon which our national security must be built.

For us to rely upon foreign oil in a wartime emergency would be like depending upon the blind to do our seeing, upon the deaf to do our hearing, and upon the dumb to do our speaking. American military experts know that there is no wartime security for this Nation in foreign oil. They know that the petroleum resources and productive facilities of the Middle East could, in the twinkling of an eye, be seized or destroyed by the only nation that could or would, within the foreseeable future, attack us or disturb world peace. These experts know from the experience of the Second World War that submarines could readily destroy all shipments of ocean-borne oil from Asia, South America, or elsewhere to the United States.

Our domestic oil industry should not, by unfair competition, be harried, hindered, or discouraged in its efforts to discover and develop additional American oil reserves. On the contrary, this industry should, in every proper way, be strengthened and encouraged today as a prudent precaution against the hazards of tomorrow.

About half, or a little more than half, the petroleum imports into this country consists of the residual oil to which the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia just referred. This residual oil is devastatingly competing with the products of our own oil refineries and our coal mines. Great quantities of crude oil are processed in foreign refineries—some of which were built, in whole or in part, with Marshall-plan money.

Europe offers a ready market for the gasoline and kerosene extracted from crude oil abroad. But there is practically no European market for the residual heavy fuel oil. Therefore, in direct contravention of the spirit of our reciprocal-trade program, this residual oil is dumped on our Atlantic seaboard and sold in cut-throat competition with our domestic fuels to the serious injury of both American capital and American labor.

Mr. President, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on the 9th of April this year carried an article entitled "Oil Import Policy Neglects United States Safety"—the accuracy, relevancy, and importance of which, in my opinion, could not be exaggerated. Let me read a few excerpts from this article which, after referring to a statement made by Assistant Secretary of State Thorp on oil imports before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, says:

> By leaving out logic and the facts of life in the oil industry and relying solely upon statistical tables of past performances, a superficially plausible case can be made out for the contention that oil imports have not caused appreciable curtailment of domestic drilling and exploratory activities. Through the end of last year the figures show no diminution in such operations. But that is due to the fact that commitments already had been made before the high tide of imports was reached, and these commitments had to be carried out. Producing companies had made their drilling appropriations, assembled acreages, and completed exploratory work, and were bound by contract and economics to proceed during that period with virtually full-scale operations.
>
> But that is not to say that continued shutting in of domestic production as it is supplanted by foreign oil will have no effect in discouraging new drilling and exploratory operations. Obviously and inescapably, it will. There is no incentive to developing new sources of oil when upward of a million barrels of present daily oil production already has been displaced by oil from overseas. And there can be no argument that the loss of half a billion dollars a year by the domestic industry if the import rate is sustained will not impair the financial ability of producing companies to drill new wells and uncover new petroleum reserves.
>
> Those reserves are the invaluable stockpile of a material indispensable to the Nation in case of emergency and essential to the military strength needed to deter attack upon us by an aggressor nation. Without adequate and constantly expanding reserves of oil within its own borders the Nation would stand in deadly peril. To realize this one has only to think back to the last war, when enemy submarines cut off all supplies of oil from abroad and ranged close enough to our coast line to pinch down shipments by tanker from Gulf points to the Northeastern States.
>
> If the absurd policy supported by Mr. Thorp had been in effect before World War I or World War II, we could have won neither of those wars. And if it remains long in effect, we not only will be inviting world war III but will be putting ourselves in a position where we certainly will lose it. One of Stalin's first moves, in launching an attack on the United States, would be to grab its sources of oil in the Middle East. With all due respect to Mr. Thorp, he is simply talking through his hat when he says that developing oil fields under the shadow of Russia's might is more in the national interest than developing our own.
>
> The taxpayer, particularly in Texas, is likely to feel he is being entirely overlooked when Mr. Thorp asserts that the climbing rate of oil imports has caused no hurt and threatens no hurt to anyone. The Federal Government is losing hundreds of millions of dollars a year in lost profits from oil not produced—a loss which cannot help but increase the burden of other taxpayers or add to the mountainous public debt. Texas, which has borne the brunt of production cutbacks necessitated by the inflow of foreign oil, now is losing petroleum tax revenues at the rate of more than $25,000,000 a year. More than Mr. Thorp's bland assurance will be required to convince the taxpayers and the numerous Texans who depend directly or indirectly upon oil for a living that a forced decline in the State's petroleum production threatens them with no damage.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia whether he agrees with Mr. Thorp when he testified that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the ECA—and the International Trade Organization were each necessary to the President's program and each dependent upon the other?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator will confine his questions to imported oil, the subject I am discussing. I do not concur in what the Texas newspaper from which I have read attributes to Assistant Secretary of State Thorp. The facts in my State conclusively refute what he is reported to have said. No, I do not agree with anything that is quoted in this article.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to state the question so that I would have a specific answer, because I have great regard for the Senator from West Virginia.

When Mr. Thorp testified last year, in the beginning of 1949, he mentioned three definite propositions as representing the State Department's foreign policy; namely, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the transfer of congressional responsibility to regulate foreign trade, to the Executive; that is, to regulate the national economy through the regulation of imports, the ECA making up the trade balance deficits while we are dividing our markets under the Trade Agreements Act so that theoretically there are no deficits; and the International Trade Organization, which would transfer to the 58 nations making up that organization the right to fix import fees for its member nations—and in addition fix quotas of production for such nations. Does the Senator agree with Mr. Thorp that such a policy is a wise policy for this country?

Mr. NEELY. I cannot answer as to the general policy indicated without much more consideration than I have given the matter. Today I am confining my remarks to the foreign oil that is flooding the country. If any other American industry is imperiled as the coal, oil, and railroad industries are now imperiled, I shall gladly lend my voice and vote to the lofty purpose of helping to protect it in every possible proper way.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia be granted at least another 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. My first question merely outlined the 3-part free trade program of the administration—including the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended—the ECA and the ITO. The junior Senator from Nevada visited virtually all the oil wells in the Middle East, and he concurs with the Senator from West Virginia that the 50,000,000,000 barrels of oil blocked out over there will be increased by another 25,000,000,000 within a few years, and that that oil can be laid down on our east coast from that area at a price which may conceivably close the coal mines and the oil wells of this country, which furnish fuel transported a considerable distance from their location for the generation of steam power and for the use in furnaces.

Mr. President, I heartily agree with the Senator from West Virginia in what he has just said. There are many other industries in the same boat, and there must be a change in the policy outlined by Mr. Thorp. I would ask the Senator, then, in view of the information now available to the Senate concerning the effects on industry, if he would favor a review of the whole question on the Senate floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I shall favor whatever the promotion of the general welfare may require. If any other article of commerce produced in the United States is in peril similar to that which now bedevils our coal, oil, and railroad industries, I shall work and vote for any proper measure that may be necessary to protect it from annihilating competition.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator. The junior Senator from Nevada has advocated a floor under wages and investments through the adoption of the flexible-import-fee principle as a substitute for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and that the International Trade Organization legislation — on the President's "must" list—must be stopped.

This is the jugular vein of the whole free-trade system advocated by the State Department and the President, and is effectively removing the floor under wages and investments.

We are in effect transporting the petroleum and coal-field jobs to foreign soil—to the Middle East and to Venezuela.

The power given the Executive, the State Department, under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to determine the industries that are to survive and the industries to be sacrificed on the altar of one economic world is in reckless and inexperienced hands.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the unusual importance of the question of oil, which I am endeavoring to discuss, admonishes me to resist the temptation to enter the broad and alluring fields of endless debate to which the Senator from Nevada has cordially invited me. On some appropriate future occasion, I shall gladly join the Senator in the excursion to which he has pointed the way. I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not want to take up too much of the Senator's time because what he is saying is of great value to the people of America; but I should like to ask two or three questions of the Senator, and if they take up too much of his time, he need not answer them.

Mr. NEELY. I shall be glad to hear the able Senator's questions.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that the importation of foreign oil has endangered a large number of the marginal oil and gas fields of the United States?

Mr. NEELY. That is absolutely true, and if the present rate of importation continues, all marginal American oil production will be abandoned.

Mr. MARTIN. The average production of an oil well in Pennsylvania now is about one-half barrel a day. Is it not true with respect to marginal fields in Pennsylvania, as well as in West Virginia and Ohio, that if they are closed down they can never economically be reopened, and all that great reserve will be totally lost?

Mr. NEELY. What the Senator has just said is gospel truth.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not also true that the importation of oil, particularly the cheaper grades of oil, those having an asphalt base, and that is what the foreign oils have, will take over the market for coal, and that many of the coal mines, when they are compelled to close down, will be permanently closed, like the one I referred to a moment ago in Johnstown, Pa.?

Mr. NEELY. That is sadly true.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I think it would be well if the Senator from West Virginia would repeat the number of jobs among the coal miners the importation of oil has already taken, and the jobs from railroad men the importation of oil has already taken. A number of Senators have come to the floor since the Senator made his statement on that point.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, as previously stated, imported oil is robbing miners of their employment at the rate of 35,000 a year; it is also robbing railroad men of their jobs at the rate of many thousands a year.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask the Senator from West Virginia the next question because he has first-hand knowledge of so many of the situations involved in the whole question. The Senator has first-hand knowledge of the oil and gas business and he has first-hand knowledge of the coal business, because West Virginia, next to Pennsylvania, is the oldest producer of coal in America.

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that it is most difficult for a coal miner, a man who has learned the work of a miner, after he is thrown out of employment in the mines, to secure employment in some other line of endeavor?

Mr. NEELY. It is difficult indeed, and if the miner is an elderly man it is practically impossible for him to obtain employment in another industry.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not also true that the men who work in the oil fields, the men who know that business, which is most intricate, often find it difficult to secure work in other lines of endeavor?

Mr. NEELY. That is just as true of the oil industry worker as it is of the coal miner.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not also true that the importation of oil, which is damaging the marginal fields, is also taking the jobs of many men in our other oil and gas fields?

Mr. NEELY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MARTIN. Then, it will reach to the refineries. I do not know whether it has happened in West Virginia, but during the past 6 months three refineries in Pennsylvania have closed down because of the heavy competition. It is most difficult for men who work in that industry, as I understand, to secure jobs in other lines of work. The type of manufacturing is different from anything else.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his pertinent and valuable observations.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the fact that New England, my section of the country, has largely converted to oil from coal because of the very high transportation costs, which amount to some ten or twelve dollars a ton at present, does not the Senator from West Virginia believe that the development of the Ohio and the St. Lawrence waterways, whereby coal can be put into that area for probably one-quarter of the present cost, would have a very healthy effect on the coal industry?

Mr. NEELY. If the canal to which the Senator refers were in operation, New England would certainly have no occasion to complain of freight rates on coal.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEELY. It is my hope that the able Senator's section of the country will continue to use West Virginia coal as freely as it has used it in bygone years.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure we will use it if we can obtain it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I will make the statement from the standpoint of national defense that the St. Lawrence Channel is closed down 5 months a year. What we need for real national defense in

America are products such as oil and coal right within our own borders. More nations have been defeated and destroyed because critical war items are outside their own borders than for any other reason. Is that not correct?

Mr. NEELY. As earlier indicated, it is my opinion that our own fuel resources are the rocks upon which the structure of our national security must be built.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the Senator in the early part of his speech say anything about whether or not the coal miners of the West were being forced out of employment?

Mr. NEELY. I asserted, and now repeat, that foreign oil is robbing miners of their employment throughout the coal producing areas of the Nation.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to call attention to the fact that I have received telegrams from western coal miners' unions stating that their miners are now working only two or three days a week, and they are complaining about the importation of cheap oils which are taking the place of coal in industry.

Mr. NEELY. Unfortunately, thousands of miners are wholly unemployed because of the disastrous competition of foreign oil.

Mr. WATKINS. May I also call to the Senator's attention the fact that lead and zinc miners of the State of Utah and of other Western States, are out of work entirely at the present time because of the flood of importations of zinc and lead from countries where they can be produced more cheaply than here?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator will excuse me from discussing those important metals at this time. If it should later appear that their peril is similar to that of coal and oil, I shall render every proper service in my power in behalf of appropriate relief.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What does the Senator propose as a remedy for this situation?

Mr. NEELY. I am urging and shall continue to urge that unless the executive department of the Government promptly and drastically reduces the importation of oil, the Congress enact whatever law may be necessary to provide adequate protection for the American coal and oil industries and the vast multitudes whom they employ.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. What the Senator is saying about the importation of oil is all very true. What he has said about the disastrous results in his own State is true. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that, although the independent oil operators of the midcontinent area went before the proper executive department of the Government months and months ago and asked them to do something about the importation of foreign oil, which comes into the United States at a relatively cheap price, the operators received very little if any consideration whatever from the the executive department in charge of those matters.

Mr. NEELY. Had I known that, I should have asked permission to become a member of the party and join in its plea for relief.

Mr. President, it is not the entire oil industry of the United States that has brought about this tragic state of affairs. Of the 35,000 separate units engaged in the oil business in this country, 6 and only 6 are responsible for the importation scourge from which the Nation now suffers.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that the wildcatting, as we call it, or the discovery of oil is usually done by the small operators?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not also true that the great volume of production of oil all over the United States is by the small producers?

Mr. NEELY. Of course, that is also true.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that the great volume of oil is produced by the small producers, not by the great corporations?

Mr. NEELY. There is no doubt about that. So far as I know, subject to only one exception, the wildcatters are uniformly small producers. The one exception is West Virginia's most distinguished and beloved native son, Colonel Mike Benedum, who now lives in the Senator's great industrial city of Pittsburgh.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, certainly he should be mentioned.

Mr. NEELY. He is the greatest of all oil wildcatters. He has found more oil in regions which others considered worthless territory than any other man who has ever lived. And fortunately for humanity the paramount task of Colonel Benedum's entire glorious career has been not to live for himself, but to live for others and bless his fellow men regardless of their race or rank or color or creed. But, in my opinion, even the philanthropic Colonel Benedum will not waste time or money hunting for more domestic oil as long as we continue to shut in a million barrels of our available production daily in order to utilize a similar amount of oil from foreign lands.

Mr. President, if the six importing corporations are permitted to continue to import foreign oil at the present rate, they will eventually make our coal industry a bankrupt, and our domestic oil industry a pauper. If that day comes, our inability to defend the Nation because of our lack of dependable fuel resources will become so notorious that the heartless, churchless, Godless country that infamously seeks to conquer the world, confiscate its property, enslave its people, and rule humanity with rods of iron, would promptly transmute its cold war abomination into hot war desolation. Then, when too late, we would learn, by bitter, bloody experience, the agonizing truth of Lord Byron's lines:

> A thousand years scarce serve to form a state:
> An hour may lay it in the dust! And when
> Can man its shattered splendors renovate,
> Recall its virtues back, and vanquish Time and Fate?

Mr. President, let the six importers of foreign oil be admonished to increase their patriotism and exile their greed. Let them promptly stop raiding American industries, wrecking American prosperity, endangering American security, and pauperizing American labor, or take notice that the Congress will enact whatever laws may be necessary to preserve the Nation's security and protect its capital, labor, and general welfare against the ruination of foreign oil.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask a question, but I wish to preface my question by stating that I desire to compliment the Senator from West Virginia for bringing to the attention of the Senate a question which I think will have to be answered not only with respect to oil—and I appreciate the Senator's speaking now primarily on the subject of coal in his State and the effect of oil importations upon coal—but also with respect to textiles, agricultural products, and other commodities which are coming into the United States practically tariff free.

The question I wish to ask is similar to the one I asked the distinguished Senator at the beginning of his remarks. It is my understanding that the remedial legislation the distinguished Senator is requesting would be in addition to suggestions made to the Executive to examine the schedules under which foreign oil is coming into the United States, with the idea of maintaining a proper schedule which would not discriminate indirectly against the oil producers or the coal producers in West Virginia.

We have had considerable experience of the administration of ECA. I am sure the Senator will remember that a year ago and 2 years ago I predicted exactly what would happen. The petroleum industry and the Special Committee on Small Business had gone thoroughly into the matter the Senator is discussing. I agree with what the Senator from West Virginia has said about wildcatting for oil, oil production, and other matters. My argument of a year ago and of 2 years ago was that unless some protection were written into the law, such importations virtually tariff free would become a policy of the administration, and then there would be an influx of foreign-produced oil, which now has increased from 600,000 barrels to 1,000,000 barrels.

I ask the Senator whether he feels that this matter can be handled by means of an examination made by the Executive? I ask that question because so many fields are involved. Or, on the other hand, does the Senator feel that the proper procedure would be in connection with the reciprocal trade agreements when they are renewed; or even

by means of a special enactment, in the nature of an amendment, not only to take care of this emergency situation, but also to take care of others similar to it which might arise and might come to our attention.

I ask that question in all seriousness.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will be answered in the spirit of manifest sincerity in which he has asked his question.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. NEELY. In my opinion, the executive department of the Government could and should immediately stop the dumping of foreign fuel oil on the Atlantic seaboard. I have no doubt that for such Executive action ample authority is conferred by existing law.

If Executive relief is not provided, my support will be unstintedly given to whatever legislative action may be necessary to save our coal and oil industries, and secure the employment of the hosts of deserving toiling men and women who are dependent upon these industries for all their prosperity, comfort, and happiness in life.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his answer. I do not care to belabor the Senator's remarks, because he has spoken at some length, but I do want to say to the Senator respectfully, that it is my humble opinion that if this situation is to be corrected it will have to be done in a legislative way. I do not say that to disparage the Executive, but from the debates that the junior Senator from Nebraska participated in a year ago or 2 years ago, when this subject was brought up time and time again, I think there is a feeling, because of the so-called dollar gap situation that this process will continue not only in the case of oil, but in the case of textiles, leather goods, and watches. I can think of dozens of other items which the junior Senator from Nebraska has learned about through ample evidence before the Small Business Committee, convincing him that the situation is critical. What is true of the coal industry, where 35,000 miners are going to be out of employment, is typical of what is happening in many lines of industry throughout the United States.

I suggest to the distinguished and able Senator that I shall be glad to join with him in attempting to get any executive relief that is possible, but I say to him now, it is my feeling that if what is desired is to be accomplished, it will have to be done through legislation, writing into the law what the administrators can and cannot do relative to the imports which rise above the safety margin and absolutely destroy not only business but export the jobs of millions of people, instead of keeping those jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the Senator for his generous offer and assure him of my deep appreciation of anything and everything that he may do to obtain the relief for which my appeal to the Senate has just been anxiously but hopefully made.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington may yield to the junior Senator from Nevada for 4 or 5 minutes, without prejudice to his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection to the request that the Senator from Washington may yield to the Senator from Nevada for purposes other than a question, for 4 or 5 minutes, without the Senator from Washington losing the floor?

Mr. CAIN. There is certainly no objection on my part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada has been very much interested indeed in the discussion and statement by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], regarding the importations of oil and petroleum, interfering with coal production in West Virginia. I assure the Senator from West Virginia that the junior Senator from Nevada agrees with him wholeheartedly, as I believe I have made clear on the Senate floor, not once but many times, during the past 3½ years.

A year or two ago, the junior Senator from Nevada, on the Wheeling, W. Va., 50,000 watt radio, made a statement to the effect that he had seen and had himself inspected most of the oil-producing areas in the Middle East, that there were approximately 50,000,000,000 barrels of oil blocked out in that area, that it was very cheap, low-cost production, that there would be probably a half more than that amount of oil blocked out within a very reasonable time, because a dry hole was almost unknown in the oil-producing areas. I further said that the oil from the Middle East could be laid down on the eastern seaboard of this country within a price range of somewhere from $1.70 to $1.90 a barrel, which conceivably could close down every oil well and every coal mine in the United States of America, not only in West Virginia but in Utah, Washington State, and other areas in the South and the West, which produce coal and petroleum and transport it a considerable distance from the place of production, for utilization in the production of steam power and as fuel in furnaces.

Now, Mr. President, there are three things in regard to this production which are important to this country: First, as has already been commented upon both by the Senator from West Virginia and by the Senator from Nebraska—and the junior Senator from Nevada has covered it numerous times—comes national safety. If the domestic production of petroleum should go down and as a result, we should be unable to increase our production within a reasonable time, in case of emergency we could lose a war before we could get back into production.

Mr. President, I want to say further that it not only includes coal and petroleum, but it goes all the way from coal and petroleum to clothespins, which are a product of the home State of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I recall that on one occasion she talked about clothespins at a hearing of the Finance Committee, and at that time said it was simply a case of Sweden's producing clothespins, paying 54 cents an hour or 56 cents an hour, while in Maine the workers were paid 98 cents an hour. Speaking to the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Maine said, "Mr. President, it is just as simple as that."

Mr. President, the petroleum question is just as simple as that. The mining industry is just as simple as that. The textile and other industries are just as simple as that. I could not find a better expression for it. Between clothespins and petroleum there are numerous other products, products of the mines, products of the farms. Ninety-eight percent of the farm products of this country would not need a subsidy, a farm bill, if we had a flexible import fee to make up the differential of cost of production almost entirely due to the difference in standards of living as between this country and the countries where our competition is located.

Mr. President, that includes, then, not only oil, coal, clothespins, and farm products; it includes textiles, precision instruments, watches, and livestock. If it were not for the hoof-and-mouth disease today, the scare keeping South American cattle out of this country, we would not be in the cattle industry, except for milk cows. The small tariff which we have on cattle does not protect us, and the same may be said as to lumber, wood products, pottery, lace. Lace manufacture may not seem to be very much of an industry to a westerner. We do not know much about it in the West, but representatives of the lace manufacturers were in my office this morning, representing industries employing 5,000 people in 12 factories. Those manufacturers are scared to death, not only of the reductions which have already been made by the administration in the tariffs and import fees, but they are fearful of the ones which are coming up in England in September, further reductions, Mr. President, if you please.

In 1934 the Congress of the United States transferred its constitutional responsibility to the Executive—the State Department—and placed in the hands of the executive department the power to regulate foreign trade and to regulate the national economy through the regulation of imports. We deliberately did that through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and, as extended in full force and effect, at this moment. We passed into the hands of an industrially inexperienced State Department the fate of every workingman and of every industry in the United States of America. That is what we did on the Senate floor in 1934, Mr. President.

We also passed into the hands of the State Department, through the same legislation, the right to select what industries in this country would survive and what industries would be sacrificed on the altar of one economic world, through an averaging of our living standards with

those of the entire world, in the interests of peace, if you please. How did we do that? The 1934 Trade Agreements Act passed into the hands of the State Department what had always been, by constitutional edict, the responsibility of Congress, the responsibility of regulating foreign commerce. It also placed in the hands of the State Department the right to lower tariffs or import fees 50 percent, after a perfunctory hearing. Then another 50 percent was added, making a total of 75 percent, amounting to practically total free trade—a 10-percent reduction amounts to free trade unless the wages and investments are written down to meet the competition.

Mr. Thorp stated that each of the three parts of this free-trade scheme was dependent upon the others.

The Trade Agreements Act, then the ECA, or the Marshall plan, which was a temporary stopgap, we are told, made up the trade-balance deficits of the 16 European ECA nations until we could divide the markets of the United States with the nations to the extent that there would theoretically be no trade-balance deficits.

What was the third part? It was the International Trade Organization, this great one-world organization. Hearings are being held on that subject, in the House at this moment. The plan was that 54 or 58 nations would join it. They would all join it. They can do nothing but win, and we can do nothing but lose. We are the nation which has the markets and from which they can get money for supplying those markets.

So we transferred to the executive department the right to regulate our foreign trade and our national economy, through the regulation of imports by the State Department—now through the International Trade Organization. We will transfer to the ITO the rights to regulate our foreign trade. This organization would have 57 foreign votes, and we would have 1 vote, the same as Siam. We assign to that Organization, with the approval of the ITO, the right to fix import fees and tariffs for its member nations. We further assign to them the right to fix quotas of production.

If they thought we were producing too much petroleum—and practically all the members of this great international organization would no doubt be graduates of Oxford or Harvard or at least be intellectuals and would understand how to do it—they would add all the consumption of the nations of the world together and apportion the production—and if they thought we were producing too much petroleum they would assign some of it to Argentina, the Middle East, or to other fields in South America or elsewhere. If they felt we were producing too many watches, clocks, or too much pottery, they could divide them up, just by edict.

Mr. President, we, the Congress, dodged our constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and placed it in the hands of the State Department or the executive department, which means the same thing. Now the administration proposes to transfer the regulation of our foreign trade into foreign hands.

The ITO is on the "must" list of the President of the United States. I ask Members of the Senate to refer to the first speech which the President made this spring. The first must was the International Trade Organization, and then point 4, to guarantee investments in those nations which have their nationalistic and socialistic plans for all investments, and the money to pay for it to be raised by increased taxes.

Mr. President, there is a new approach to this situation. One of the greatest fallacies ever sold to a trusting people is that there are always answers to all economic problems. Of course, there are not, or everyone would be rich; and, of course, the objective of every one of us is ultimate free trade throughout the world, but there are different means suggested for reaching that objective.

The administration's objective is to have free trade immediately through the three-part free-trade program. It is like jumping off the top of a building and alighting on a concrete sidwalk. As the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] said, we put our own people out on the streets—35,000 of them in the coal industry, he said. But the industry to which he was referring is not alone in unemployment on account of this stupid program.

Every industry in the United States, except the automobile industry, the heavy construction machinery, the heavy agricultural machinery are in the same boat.

How can we approach the problem? I shall suggest to the Senate what I think is the proper approach to the problem. In 1948 I introduced a flexible-import-fee bill. In 1949 I reintroduced it, and in September 1949 I stood on the Senate floor for several hours and argued that it should be substituted for the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

What would this flexible-import-fee principle accomplish? I hope Senators will study it. It would turn the long-experienced Tariff Commission into a foreign-trade authority because it more nearly represents its real work. It would give that Commission full latitude in fixing tariffs and import fees on a principle laid down by Congress on the basis of "fair and reasonable" competition. In other words, it would not stop imports, but it would have them come in on the basis of "fair and reasonable" competition. Foreign nations would have the same access to our markets as would our own producers, but would have no advantage. I submit, Mr. President, they cannot ask for more than that.

It has been done before in other fields. Let us take the Interstate Commerce Commission as an example. When, years ago, every railroad in the United States had a different rate for every shipper, Congress established the Interstate Commerce Commission and laid down the principle upon which it was to operate. What was that principle? It was to regulate freight rates so that there would be a "reasonable return" on investment.

I served for 8½ years of the Railroad Commission of Nevada. That commission held hearings many times in connection with the Interstate Commerce Commission. There were many factors—perhaps a hundred or more—entering into rate making. After we had considered such factors as reproduction cost, original cost, amortization, and so forth, what did we do? We decided on value, then the percentage which would be allowed, and the rate was fixed so that there would be a "reasonable return" on the investment. That was the principle laid down by the Congress and the State legislatures.

That is the way the Tariff Commission would fix import fees—on the principle of "fair and reasonable" competition laid down by the Congress. As the world raised its standard of living, then the flexible import fee would be lowered in accordance with such rise. Then when they are living on about the same standard of living as we are, free trade would be the almost automatic result.

Mr. President, it was with great pleasure that I listened this morning to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and it was with great pleasure that I listened, a few days ago, to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], when he went further into the question of the danger of "free trade" advocated by the administration. I should like very much to see the entire subject reviewed as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] have suggested.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. With the permission of the Senator from Washington, who has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I be permitted to ask the purpose which the Senator from South Carolina desires me to yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. In order that I may make a brief comment on what the Senator from Nevada has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from South Carolina for that purpose?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for what he has said with reference to the speech I made sometime ago regarding textiles. I shall be glad to make known news releases on the subject whenever there is an opportunity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am about through. No doubt, at the conclusion of my remarks, the distinguished Senator from Washington will yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thought the distinguished Senator had completed his remarks.

Mr. MALONE. No. I am about through.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Very well.

DEMAND FOR A NEW LOYALTY REVIEW BOARD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I believe that immediate action should be taken on S. 3213, for the creation of a real loyalty review board as an independent establishment of the Federal Government, the members of which would be approved by the Senate. I introduced this bill on March 8, 1950, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It lies in committee, and insofar as I know there has been no action taken. Passage of the bill would be in the interest of security of the Nation.

The present Loyalty Review Board is not effective. Its members, not passed on by the Senate, are scattered from Hawaii to New York. I am informed that the entire Board has never met together and that its functions are carried on by a clerical staff which, in routine manner, customarily approves the findings of the lower loyalty boards. The Board thus serves no effective purpose. Its appointment is little more than a hoax on the public. Proper safeguards are not being provided. Poor security risks are still in important Government posts.

Although the loyalty of by far the overwhelming majority of all Government employees is beyond question, the presence within the Government service of any disloyal and subversive person constitutes a threat to our security and democratic processes and breeds suspicion among loyal Government workers. Even though the present Board should find a Government employee disloyal, department heads may ignore the findings at will.

I have found to my amazement that some employees classed by department heads as "poor security risks" have been retained on the Government payroll with the weak explanation that they would be transferred to less sensitive jobs. In my opinion, it is senseless to try to measure loyalty by degrees, to say that this employee or that employee, while "not exactly disloyal," is "only a poor security risk" and must be kept on the Government payroll.

It is no wonder the people are losing confidence in their Government.

In this connection it is amusing to hear the administration defenders accuse us, who point out the wrongs in the executive departments, of weakening the position of the United States. They seem to overlook the fact that a tainted State Department or Commerce Department could hurt us far more if left to work unchallenged. Are we to assume that any administrative function of the Government is to be above criticism because to point out weak spots will hurt the function of that department? Just what is democracy coming to?

President Truman is reported to have made a broad statement in a recent speech intended to give the impression that there were no subversives in the Government service. One wonders if the President would not have made the same statement had traitor Alger Hiss, or some of the other subsequently exposed subversives, still been on the Governmental payroll. As a matter of fact, did not President Truman refer to the congressional investigation of Hiss as a "red herring" shortly before Hiss was proved to be a traitor?

Although the President's Loyalty Review Board includes some men of fine character, I regret to say that the Board itself is not above reproach. I am really informed, and there is documentary evidence to back it up, that one William Ludwig Ullman, in applying for a Government post in 1937, gave the name of Harry W. Blair, lawyer, Tower Building, Washington, D. C., as his personal reference. Later Ullman was accused of being a member of the espionage group which conveyed information from the files of the State Department here to agents of the Soviet Union, and when Ullman was subpenaed and asked questions pertaining to these charges he refused to answer on the ground of self-incrimination. Harry W. Blair, who is one of Ullman's sponsors, is a member of the President's Loyalty Review Board. I am not accusing Mr. Blair of anything, but, in all fairness, I think that if the cases of Ullman or his associates were before the present Board, Mr. Blair might be expected to be biased in their favor.

There is no denying that the President's Loyalty Review Board has cleared persons subsequently found to be poor security risks. To illustrate: A Mr. Jesse Eppstein, an admitted member of the professional unit of the Communist Party in Seattle, Wash., was cleared by the Loyalty Review Board of the Federal Public Housing Authority and the President's Loyalty Review Board approved that clearance. The man known in the Commerce Department as Michael J. Lee, whose real name is Ephraim Liberman, who was once refused American citizenship on the ground that he was not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, was cleared, and is still Chief of the Far Eastern Division of our Office of International Trade. I am told that William Remington, who admitted to cooperating with Elizabeth T. Bentley, a confessed Soviet spy, was cleared by the present Board and is now in the Department of Commerce, but transferred to a job where it is considered safe for him to work.

While thousands of loyal American citizens are out of work, we have the spectacle here in Washington of administration officials going far out of their way to find a place for one they admit is a poor security risk. Mr. C. V. Whitney, on the occasion of his resignation as Under Secretary of Commerce, said it is "eye wash" to think Government workers classed as poor security risks can simply be transferred to less sensitive jobs.

That reminds the junior Senator from Nevada of the recent appointment in England of Mr. Strachey as Secretary of State for War, head of national defense. The British say they will not give Strachey any secrets, not give the national defense head any secrets. That sounds very reasonable, I am sure.

The Loyalty Review Board as provided for in my bill, which bill is still in committee, untouched and on which no hearings have been held, would correct the present situation. The American people are interested in loyalty to America of their employees in Washington.

I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me.

THE PRESIDENT'S WESTERN TOUR

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington is justifiably and keenly homesick this afternoon. His thoughts are on the State of Washington, which is preparing for the coming visit on Thursday of this week of the first citizen of the land, the President of the United States. In the spring of the year few places are so pleasant and attractive as is the Evergreen State in the Pacific Northwest. All of our flowers and fruit and trees are in full bloom, and beauty abounds on every side. Our first citizen is fortunate to benefit from a trip, however hurried, to Washington State at this season of the year, and I wish that I might be there on Thursday to bid him welcome.

If the President of the United States were traveling to my State to engage in the 1950 elections, which are just beginning to get under way, I would necessarily want to be at home to oppose the President at every turn and from every crossroads. Fortunately, however, the President and his staff have made it clear that there is no intention to engage in things political. The President has already told several of his audiences that he is not politicking, but simply making a report to the people. What he is doing, he said at Burlington yesterday, "is what any head of an organization does once a year." He has not mentioned that he has neglected to make such a report during each of the years he has been our Chief Executive, but no one has called that neglect to his attention. I am willing, for the sake of the President's peace of mind, to agree that he wants to feel the pulse of the people by letting people talk with him everywhere, but how this can come about when the President does most of the talking from the rear end of some train I do not know.

Anyway, Mr. President, the President of the United States will visit Grand Coulee Dam on Thursday of this week. What he intends to talk about is not common knowledge. All anyone knows is that the first citizen will have a very large audience, because the people of Washington State are very hospitable, and generous, too, and the President can talk at them from any of a multitude of prepared speeches which may be placed in his hands. In a few moments I shall be so bold as to suggest a subject which would be of prime interest to many in his audience.

In recent weeks the press from our Nation's Capital has stated many reasons for the Washington State visit of the President of the United States. His own press secretary stated officially that the President was going to participate in dedication ceremonies at Grand Coulee Dam. The other day Peter Edson said that the nonpolitical reason or excuse for President Truman's trip West at this

time is to dedicate completion of installation of the last generating unit at Grand Coulee. The Associated Press in a recent dispatch said the trip to Washington State started out as something to do with water development. There have been other press conclusions on this fascinating subject of where the President of the United States is going and why. I ought to list six suppositions or purposes offered by six of our leading American newspapers and news services:

First. The nonpolitical purpose of visiting Grand Coulee Dam and making a nonpolitical speech.

Second. The nonpolitical purpose of dedicating as well as visiting Grand Coulee Dam and making a nonpolitical speech.

Third. The nonpolitical purpose of dedicating the entire Columbia Basin project and making a nonpolitical speech.

Fourth. The nonpolitical purpose of dedicating another new generator at Grand Coulee Dam and making a nonpolitical speech.

Fifth. The nonpolitical purpose of dedicating the shell for the future installing of generator No. 14 at Grand Coulee Dam and making a nonpolitical speech.

Sixth. The nonpolitical purpose of dedicating an irrigation ditch which will be provided with water by Grand Coulee Dam and to make a nonpolitical speech.

It is obvious to all of us that the President's nonpolitical visit is for the purpose of dedicating something at Grand Coulee Dam. There is no doubt about this, and the people of Washington State are very grateful that the President of the United States is to participate in some dedication ceremonies. Grand Coulee Dam has already been dedicated in part by many distinguished persons, including Mr. Truman, and it is good to have him travel so far to do some more dedicating, and to make, in his own words, a "nonpolitical" speech. Of course no one possessed of a sane mind who lives in or out of Washington State will believe this hocuspocus about a nonpolitical speech from America's first citizen, but, as I have stated, the citizens of Washington State are friendly and hospitable people, and they are more than happy to enjoy the President's little joke with him.

Actually, Mr. President, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior has invited many fine people throughout the country to come to Grand Coulee Dam on Thursday, May 11, when to, quote from the invitation, "The President of the United States will formally dedicate Grand Coulee Dam and Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake." In a mimeographed letter addressed to "Dear Sirs" all over the country, and signed by Mr. F. A. Banks, district manager of the Bureau of Reclamation, Coulee Dam, Wash., it is stated:

> On behalf of the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior; Mr. Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation; and Mr. Harold T. Nelson, regional director, I have the honor to extend to you the enclosed invitation to attend the dedication of the Grand Coulee Dam and Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake by the President of the United States on May 11, 1950.
>
> To assist us in making arrangements for the occasion, please return the enclosed card in the self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience.

This card merely provides that the person invited check-off a square to indicate whether he will attend, whether he will be accompanied by his wife, whether his wife will not accompany him, or that he just will not be able to go.

Through some oversight, Mr. President, for it could have been for no other reason, the junior Senator from Washington did not receive one of these intriguing invitations. I know that Mr. Banks and his superiors are very courteous people, and it would be their intention to send invitations to Republicas as well as Democrats. Though it is seldom mentioned, Grand Coulee Dam belongs to all of the people of Washington State, and to all of the citizens of the Nation, as well. Perhaps Mr. Banks and his associates knew that I would not be able to accept the invitation, and they decided to save paper and the 6-cent airmail stamp which was affixed to the envelopes. I think that everybody who can ought to attend the clambake on Thursday, but someone from Washington State ought to remain here—I think so, at any rate—to protect the interests of the State while so many are away. My own welcome to the President of the United States, which I give now, could not be more sincere or enthusiastic if I were among those who are to have such a good time at Grand Coulee on Thursday.

It is quite true, Mr. President, that Grand Coulee Dam has never been formally dedicated as a whole. The Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Interior, the Library of Congress, and the President's Executive Office, have all told me that this is a fact. No one, therefore, has any legitimate right to complain over the formal dedication which is in prospect.

Grand Coulee Dam, however, has had a long and meritorious career of partial dedications, which began on August 4, 1934, shortly after construction of the dam had been started. President Roosevelt made the first dedication speech, and I am told that it was a very good one.

Mr. Roosevelt gave the dam another dedicatory going over in 1937. Mr. Truman gave the dam a light dedication touch in June of 1948. It was then that he termed the Eightieth Congress "the second worst Congress in history."

Through the years there have been a number of lesser dedicatory services at Grand Coulee Dam. Probably most Senators know that the dam, when fully completed, will possess 18 generators, of which 13 have thus far been installed. Each of these installed generators have been dedicated by somebody. It is only a coincidence that all of the somebodies were Democrats and most of them when they were dedicating a generator either were running for some public office or advancing the cause of some other Democrat who was running for or from something.

It ought to be mentioned that Mr. Truman dedicated the last generator, No. 13, which came on the line. This dedication took place by remote control, for the President on May 20, 1949, just a year ago this month, merely pushed a button in his office and made appropriate dedicatory remarks while doing so. I remember that experience with great pleasure, for along with every other Member of the congressional delegations from the Pacific Northwest I had been invited and was present, down on Pennsylvania Avenue. On that occasion the President—and I could fully understand his feeling—was deeply distressed because of his inability to travel across the country to do the dedicating in person. He said that his disappointment could not be helped, because the world was in a bad fix, and conditions were quite bad at home. As the Chief Executive he felt that he must stand up to his responsibility and do his duty from his desk. I had not been aware that conditions had improved so vastly since this time last year. It ought to be good news to people everywhere that the President is now on his way across the country, because the problems of state, both domestic and foreign, are so much lighter this May than they were last May. Many Americans being people possessed of good common sense, will find it difficult to believe that this is so, but the President of the United States would have us believe it to be so. And the first citizen of the land, be he either a Democrat or a Republican, must be encouraged to make any statements he desires, however true or far-fetched people may really understand them to be.

Grand Coulee Dam put power on the line for the first time on May 22, 1941. There was the usual partial dedication for that noteworthy reason.

I do not know how much time it will take before the anticipated five additional generators are in position to produce power. All we know is that each additional generator will be dedicated in due time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I gather that the Senator feels that this dedication may be used for the purpose of generating something else besides power?

Mr. CAIN. I think I ought to leave it to the wisdom of the Senator from Maine, which he has in great abundance, and to every other American, to answer the question the Senator from Maine has just posed to the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Is not the pending business before the Senate the FEPC bill?

Mr. CAIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BRICKER. It is my understanding also that the President is making a report to the people on the adminis-

tration, and his responsibility, and I am wondering——

Mr. CAIN. I might take exception to what the understanding of the junior Senator from Ohio appears to be. My own view is that the President is endeavoring to tell the American people what the President conceives his duties and responsibilities to be, and in particular cases I for one take exception to his interpretation.

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to join with the Senator in his amendment of my suggestion. I wonder if the Senator knows whether the President, during this trip, is reporting to the South, which has been the backbone of the Democratic Party which he represents, on the business pending before the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. So far as I know, the President's trip began from Washington, D. C., several days ago, and started west, from which direction it is not possible to go south unless the 13-car special train is turned around, and, as I understand, there are not very many sidings which can accommodate the turnaround of a train of that size.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Washington whether the President took occasion in the month, I believe, he spent recently in the South, to report to the people of the South regarding the conditions which he observed there, and the necessity for the passage of the pending legislation.

Mr. CAIN. All I know as to the conduct of the President of the United States is what I read in the newspapers. What I read in the newspapers is something to this effect: That the President of the United States, with reference to the great American political campaign that was going on in Florida, took great pains and considerable caution to make certain that he, the President, said nothing about anybody at any time during the course of that campaign.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I understand the President's trip is by rail entirely, is it not?

Mr. CAIN. It began by rail. It will finish by rail. During its course it may on occasion be off the rails. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRICKER. I wonder if the Senator has any knowledge whether the President has expressed his opinion with regard to the pending railroad strike which might in some way interfere with his trip.

Mr. CAIN. To my knowledge the President has neglected—but he is a very busy man—to make any observations on that subject and on a good many other subjects of considerable interest to the American people as well.

Mr. BRICKER. Does not the Senator feel that that is a matter which might be of the most immediate importance to the people of the United States; that transportation might be tied up and that commerce might come to a standstill if the strike is really brought to pass?

Mr. CAIN. I think I would rather say that I can only hope, as an American, that wherever the President may be, the question of the possible curtailment or cessation of transportation will not only be brought to his attention, but that he will grapple with it firmly and openly insofar as taking the American public into his confidence is concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. We have been seeking as accurate information as possible regarding what is going on in order to find out the technique. I wonder, however, whether the Senator has any information as to whether or not the President took occasion on his maiden appearance in Illinois, from which the distinguished majority leader comes, to point out to the people of Illinois that the greatest difficulty he had had with the so-called Brannan plan, which he regards as the panacea for all our ills, was that it had been very vigorously and successfully fought thus far by the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois? Does the Senator know whether he took occasion to point that out in his report to the people?

Mr. CAIN. I can only guess. I imagine that he said something about that question. Probably it was a very embarrassing question to some of his friends whom he met with quietly, but not publicly. However, answering the question as to what the President of the United States said to the people of the State of Illinois in connection with the obvious and, in fact, the very sad contradiction as between the majority leader fighting as valiantly as he has been able to do against the Brannan plan and the President of the United States attempting to sell the Brannan plan all over the country, the President said absolutely not one single word about it in Illinois, so far as the junior Senator from Washington knows. He just ducked what is a great big question of material interest to the voters, Democrats and Republicans, of the State of Illinois.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. For fear that some injustice might be done by reason of the inadequacy of the newspaper reports, we have had our own observer there, and the observations indicate rather conclusively that not only did the President not discuss the Brannan plan and the unorthodox behavior of the Senator from Illinois, the distinguished majority leader, but he omitted even to mention the existence of the majority leader, which seemed a rather dramatic oversight, in view of the fact that, I believe, the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, is the nominee of his party for reelection in the State of Illinois, and 25,000 citizens of Illinois were present to hear the President. Would it not seem to the Senator from Washington as rather extraordinary that the President could not even make one genuflection in the direction of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, when he was appearing before so many citizens of the Senator's State, and when the Senator was fighting, as some have been unkind enough to indicate, for his political life in Illinois?

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington felt that the President's oversight was more sad than anything else. The junior Senator from Washington thinks highly of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois, though we, as Senators, representing different points of view, differ continuously and strenuously on occasions. But what made me sad about the President's neglect of his majority leader is, that here the majority leader sits, though not at the moment in person, fighting his level best in the Senate for a consummation of most of what is known as the President's program, while it is true that Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, will probably defeat the majority leader in the coming campaign in November, of which fact the President is aware, and the very least the President could have done for his majority leader was to stand up to and with him, win, lose, or draw.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not also a fact that the majority leader has rendered the very extraordinary service at the risk of his own political life of deferring for 15 months the consideration of the pending business in order to save embarrassment to certain sitting Senators, and to save embarrassment to the President, by not introducing so controversial a topic, and has, as a result, endured very severe criticism from the groups immediately concerned?

Mr. CAIN. To me it is a very true statement that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, on a number of occasions during the three and one-half short years I have been privileged to sit in this body sacrificed his own best and personal interests for the good of an administration, the head of which in his recent tour of Illinois did not deign to recognize the existence of a first-rate American.

Mr. President, permit me to repeat one sentence. I do not know how much time it will take before the anticipated five additional generators are in position to produce power at Grand Coulee Dam. All we know is that each additional generator will be dedicated in due time. The Northwest is anxiously awaiting the coming of generator No. 14 because we suffer in that area from a lack of power and every additional kilowatt will help.

In a recent Bureau of Reclamation publicity release it was stated that Grand Coulee Dam has now passed the three-quarter mark in construction of its maximum producing potential, with 13 of an eventual 18 generators already in operation, and with the placing of the outer shell for No. 14.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for order, so Democratic Senators may be able to listen to the speech being delivered by the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is almost certain that as the President formally dedicates Grand Coulee Dam tomorrow he will also dedicate the shell which has been conveniently erected in the last several weeks to house generator No. 14 when that unit has been built. This is a departure in our Grand Coulee Dam dedication activities. Heretofore a generator had to be completely installed and ready to go before it was dedicated. If the President dedicates a generator shell on Thursday, which is tomorrow, a new precedent will have been established and unlimited possibilities will result. Most of us in the State of Washington knew that we could look forward to five more generator dedications at Grand Coulee Dam, but now we might anticipate dedications for generator shells as well as for generators and this might lead to dedicating holes in the ground which obviously must be dug to accommodate generator shells.

Regardless of what may take place in the dedication future of Grand Coulee Dam no one will argue with our contention that Grand Coulee Dam is already the most dedicated dam in all of history. [Laughter.] Being a reasonable man I think that consideration ought to be given to changing the name of Grand Coulee Dam. It might more properly be called "Dedication Dam," and let it go at that. [Laughter.] Or, perhaps more attractively, the dam could be called—and I use this phrase because in the West we know something about brands—"Triple D Dam." This would fit the headlines better, and could be spelled out to say "Democrats Dedication Dam."

It is fun to have fun, Mr. President, and I have just had it; but I want to tell my colleagues a few important things about Grand Coulee Dam, which is one of the very great and outstanding achievements on the face of the earth. For the benefit of many Senators who have not had an opportunity of seeing Grand Coulee Dam or the Columbia Basin project—and I hope every such Senator will soon make such an opportunity for himself—it is sufficient to say that the magnitude and power of these projects is almost unbelievable. One example of many is that one of the man-made canals, a canal, mind you, which leads from Grand Coulee Dam to the dry and arid land to be irrigated will carry more water than the Colorado River does at flood stage. The man-made lake behind the dam—the Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake, which is going to get in on the dedication formula which has been established now for some years past—is longer than the distance from Richmond, in Virginia, to Baltimore, in Maryland. Several towns, abandoned when work was begun, are buried now beneath the waters of this lake.

There must be many Senators who know that the Grand Coulee project, the dam and irrigation works, were originally estimated to cost about $486,000,000. This is capital outlay. But year by year the total cost of the great project has increased. Actually, the latest cost figure on the project is not $486,000,000, but $743,500,000 in capital outlay, plus $12,000,000 occasioned by increasing the number of intended generators from 15 to 18, plus $119,300,000 for replacements, plus one hundred and fifty-eight million, six hundred thousand for other operating expenses during the repayment period, plus ninety-six million, six hundred thousand for interest, or a total as nearly as we can figure it accurately, of $1,118,000,000.

The cost of placing water on the 1,022,000 acres of land to be reclaimed is now estimated to be, in round figures, $550,000,000, or more than the original estimated cost of both the dam and irrigation works.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the able junior Senator from Washington think this project has been a good investment?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, as often as any other Senator I know on this floor—and I say this in a good mood which I trust I shall continue to maintain throughout this speech—continues to ask the obvious.

The answer to his question, which he knew before he asked it, is a conclusive "Yes."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted.

May I also ask the junior Senator from Washington whether this work was undertaken before 1933.

Mr. CAIN. My answer must be slightly vague, although I do not intend it to be so. The first time the then President of the United States came to take part in a dedication service at Grand Coulee was in the year 1934. That certainly implies that work had been undertaken probably in either 1932 or 1933.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The indication from that, Mr. President, is that very great works of importance to the people of the Northwest have been performed during the past 17 years. I wish to thank the junior Senator from Washington for this very clear explanation of the benefits which have come to the Northwest during this time.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have richly enjoyed the observation just made by my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Illinois. Having anticipated it, I shall deal with it in a paragraph which I shall shortly reach in the course of my remarks, and which I trust the junior Senator from Illinois will remain on the floor of the Senate to hear.

Mr. President, Grand Coulee Dam has cost a great deal of money, but it has thus far repaid its amortized obligations to the Federal Treasury out of power revenues, and will continue to do so in the future, even though it might become necessary to raise the power rate.

There is a distinction between the Grand Coulee Dam, which the President of the United States is to formally decidate on Thursday, and the Columbia Basin project, which some people think the President is going to dedicate on the same day. Grand Coulee Dam is part of a reclamation project called the Columbia Basin project. Grand Coulee Dam was constructed as a reclamation project, and that is its prime purpose, although most persons remember the dam because it is the largest single producer of electric power in the Nation.

There is likewise a difference between the Columbia Basin project, which includes Grand Coulee Dam, and what is referred to as the Columbia River Basin. Broadly speaking, the Columbia River Basin extends over Washington, Oregon, and Idaho and parts of four other States. These are the areas whose rivers throughout the Pacific Northwest drain into the mighty Columbia River, which is the Nation's second largest river and potentially the Nation's greatest producer of hydroelectric power. When this river has been fully developed and utilized, it will produce about 33,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectic power. As of this time, approximately 10 percent of that capacity has been translated into electric energy for the benefit of all the people of that vast area.

As everybody can see, Mr. President, Grand Coulee Dam is tremendous in every conceivable way. One reason it must be dedicated so often is that it is too large to be dedicated properly on any single occasion. Grand Coulee Dam was dreamed of and has been fought for and struggled over for many, many decades. It has taken many large appropriations by many Congresses to get the dam where it is today, three-quarters of the way to completion. The progress of the dam would not have been achieved had not Democrats and Republicans recognized its importance. There would have been no Grand Coulee Dam unless eastern and southern and northern Members of Congresses recognize the need for developing our western country for the betterment and benefit of America. Reclamation projects in the West, including Grand Coulee Dam—let me call only this single point to the thoughtful consideration and attention of my friend, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who, among everything else, is a considerate man—were born in large part from the wisdom of the legislation which was initiated by an American President whose last name was Roosevelt, but whose first name was Teddy. No single political party would think of taking credit for western reclamation or for Grand Coulee Dam because that would be downright silly, and no single political party wants to put itself in that ridiculous postion.

I am a little distressed, Mr. President, because of some of the criticism which already has been made about the prevailing 16-State trip of the President of the United States and his party, all of whom are accommodated by a 13-car special train. I do not think all of this criticism is exactly fair. Some of my colleagues have claimed that the trip would cost somebody, though presumably not the President of the United States, about $250,000. I have no way of knowing what the trip will cost, but it will cost a pretty American penny. My own feeling is that the citizens of Washington State will be very pleased to pay their proportionate share. They might just as well be pleased, because they are going to pay for the trip, anyway.

As everyone knows, the President of the United States has a travel allowance which amounts to $40,000 for 1950. In 1949 our first citizen's allowance was somewhat less, being $33,896. Considering that 1950 is an election year, I think it only reasonable that the President ought to be provided with a little more to help him put his best foot forward.

Will the President spend all of his 1950 travel allowance on his present trip? This cannot be so, because we have read of his traveling this year to and from the sunshine of Florida quite a lot. If the over-all travel expense of his present trip is going to cost roughly in the neighborhood of one quarter of a million dollars, some people will be puzzled as to where the differential is coming from. Perhaps I can be of some assistance through offering an explanation.

The other day I started to wonder as to what the actual travel expenses for the executive branch of our Federal Government might have been in 1949. I called the Bureau of the Budget and they gave me the answer. Mr. President, what do you think that figure was? Will you not hazard a guess, and please be exceedingly liberal in your guess? My own guess was that the figure ought to be about $10,000,000, but the Budget answer taught me how very little I really know about what goes on in the executive branch. For travel expenses only in the year of 1949 the executive branch spent $334,000,000. In the same year and for the same purpose, the legislative branch, including both Houses of Congress, had $1,000,000 appropriated to it, and the judicial branch was provided with $1,000,000. There are only three branches of our Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. For travel expenses the legislative and the judicial each received $1,000,000. In terms of comparison, if we were devising a formula, it would be $334,000,000 contrasted with $1,000,000 and $1,000,000. There is no contest in terms of dollars.

In these figures we have a pretty good answer as to how the President of the United States can travel in a special 13-car train around the country—and I am not criticizing him, Mr. President—when his own travel expense was only $33,000-plus in 1949.

I have played this guessing game with a number of my colleagues in the United States Senate, within the past few days, and not a single, solitary one of them, Democrat or Republican, has been able to guess within $200,000,000 of what the executive branch spent for travel in 1949, again showing how little we know what is taking place in our own country. Even in a day of inflated values and depreciated dollars it is hard to believe that those in the executive branch could do so much traveling. On the assumption that the President of the United States will address himself to some interest of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior we might take a sharper look at what these two Departments do in the way of flitting about the Nation in this enlightened twentieth century. In 1949 Mr. Brannan, of whom most of us have heard, and the employees of his Department spent only $11,000,000 for travel purposes. How much of this was charged against Mr. Brannan's traveling to sell the Brannan plan, which the Congress has thus far planned to set aside in favor of more important considerations, I am not qualified to say. I can say that Mr. Brannan has had enongh money to permit him to do as he likes. From hindsight, 1949 was a very conservative year, because for the year of 1950, a year, by the way, in which the American people will enjoy some political campaigns, it is estimated that Mr. Brannan will be permitted to spend $14,000,000. With conditions being better at home and abroad, as the President recognizes by traveling so far from the Nation's Capital, one would have thought that the cost of travel expense in 1950 would be less than the year before, but such is by no means the case.

The Interior Department only spent $7,000,000 for traveling in 1949, but they expect to jack this up in the present election year to $10,000,000. The Interior Department, it is known, has been plugging for a long time to establish a valley authority throughout the Pacific Northwest. Their agents run around the Pacific Northwest on this mission like locusts in a wheat field. They never charge any audiences before whom they appear for their services, because there is no need of any kind for them to do it. It is absolutely necessary for them to travel extensively and to charge these costs against their travel allowance, because in no other way could they use it up. It takes a great deal of travel to use up $10,000,000 in the course of 1 year. If they were very busy traveling in 1949, they will be even busier in 1950, because they will have $3,000,000 more to travel on. This may mean that their visits anywhere will be briefer but far more numerous, because it will be necessary for the Interior Department to keep them constantly on the go.

I ought to say just a word about the proposed Columbia Valley Authority, which is the Interior Department's present and prime mission in life. The President many months ago recommended the establishment of a valley authority for the Pacific Northwest, and he had every right to make this recommendation. He is our President. The question was submitted and has been before the appropriate committee of the Congress since the recommendation was submitted. The Congress, which represents the people and which is responsible, will make up its collective mind concerning the desirability of a Columbia Valley Authority. This is a responsibility which is charged to the Congress by the Constitution, but neither the President nor the Interior Department give more than lip service to the Constitution as it relates to the question of valley authorities. The President and the Interior Department have made up their minds concerning what the people need and what they are going to have. If the President does not talk about the authority question at Grand Coulee tomorrow we can be certain that agents of the Interior Department will be hawking the idea among the audience. Aside from being an illegal act—because I need not suggest to those who are better informed than myself that it is an illegal act for any executive agent to lobby for any legislation which is before the Congress of the United States, where it ought to be—the Interior Department ought to know that the people of the Pacific Northwest can make up their own minds as to what is good for them and the future of their great region. If the people want a valley authority they will see that their Congress gives it to them in due time.

If these same people, after study, thought, reflection, and hearings decide that they do not want a valley authority they will tell their Congress to completely deny a Presidential recommendation which is based on many reasons, one of which is to reelect and elect some New Dealers, Weird Dealers, and Queer Dealers.

I cannot get excited about the President of the United States spending a quarter of a million dollars for a nice, congenial trip around the country, when the agencies under his command spent $334,000,000 for the same purpose in 1949. I am so busy thinking about the latter that there is not time to think about the former. If I went to ponder further on the latter, I am reminded that the Budget Bureau told me that the executive branch travel allowance would jump $25,000,000 in 1950, an election year, from what it was in 1949, a year during which the President found it necessary to activate the thirteenth generator at Grand Coulee Dam by merely pushing a button in his office. Mr. President, when you go home tonight you might think about what you could do with $359,000,000, because that is the estimated 1950 travel allowance for the executive branch of our Government. I am inclined to believe that the additional $25,000,000 to be used in 1950 will crowd our means of public conveyance to the limit, and it might be necessary to give consideration again to establishing priorities for those who travel. In our American desire to be fair to the President and to the executive branch of the Government, and to provide them with only the best, we might become even foolhardy and short-sighted. The day may come when we shall provide so much money for travel allowances to administration agents that it will not be possible for the average civilian to secure accommodations on a train or plane or bus. This is a pretty dismal prospect, but perhaps I am a pessimist and should keep my mind on more pleasant things.

I can, however, get excited and enthusiastic about the Senate's coming opportunity to take action on an omnibus appropriation bill which will come before us in that form for the first time in history. For the first time, whether we take advantage of the opportunity or not, we shall be permitted, insofar as the Nation's budget is concerned, to understand conclusively what we are doing. If we find that the executive branch as a whole is being provided with appropriations through which it can go too far in any direction we can, if we will, cut out the water and the extravagance and the nonsense. This is not the time to discuss

the Nation's finances in detail but mention ought to be made of them in passing.

Anyway, the President of the United States in his trip has the subject of deficit spending well in hand. During one of his stops yesterday he defended and disposed, in a sentence or two, of spending more than the Government can take away from the taxpayers in any given year. He indicated that this procedure was here to stay and if the people accept his reasons as being valid I suppose that he is right. I think, however, that he said deficit financing was largely caused by our international commitments and the needs of security. While we all recognize that such burdens must be very heavy for a distressingly long time to come we might hope that promiscuous traveling on the domestic side could be curtailed a bit. All of us can hope, can we not, even if there is small reason to anticipate relief?

Mr. President, I did say that I would recommend a subject for the President to talk about at Grand Coulee Dam on Thursday and here it is. I think he ought to make one more effort to stir up interest in the Brannan plan even though his Democratically controlled Congress has said repeatedly that they want no part of it. The President talked about the Brannan plan somewhere yesterday and I hope he will do so again and again. My reason for urging this suggestion is that I have just about concluded that the agricultural plans we have are not working and that we ought to agree on some other plan. I have no use for the Brannan plan, but repeated Presidential urgings for its adoption might lead to something better.

I have no desire to be annoying, but if Secretary Brannan is trying to do a good job with the authority he possesses it has not come to my attention. I think that the travel allowance for the Agriculture Department is partly responsible for the Secretary's neglect of his responsibilities. He is probably so busy spending the travel allowance, and this goes for his staff as well, that they do not have time to settle down and reach decisions which are required.

In concert with the senior Senator from Washington and with other members of the delegations from Oregon and Washington, I have been trying literally for months to get a decision from Mr. Brannan with reference to a critical question in the Northwest, with no success whatsoever. My last attempt was through a letter dated April 14, 1950. I think comparable letters were likewise written by my senior colleague [Mr. MAGNUSON] and by one or both of the Senators from Oregon, and I am advised that so far neither of us has had an acknowledgment. I think other Senators who share concern over the problem have also written Mr. Brannan. None of us, that I know of, has even received an acknowledgment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG. I thought the Senator from North Dakota was the only Senator who had been trying to get a reply from Mr. Brannan. I now learn that other Senators are having similar difficulty.

Mr. CAIN. The Senators from Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, to my knowledge, share the distress and the annoyance which the Senator from North Dakota has experienced.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I have likewise sent letters to the Secretary and have received no acknowledgment at all.

Mr. CAIN. I am going to suggest an answer, insofar as the Pacific Northwest is concerned, and if the answer turns out to have some success—I have no pride of authorship, and have no copyright on it—I hope it will be taken up by delegations from other States of the Nation.

Mr. JENNER. If the distinguished Senator is able to get an answer from the Secretary of Agriculture, I should be glad if he would let me know.

Mr. CAIN. I had to write down for the answer, all other normal courses having long since proved to be fruitless and without avail.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG. I think that farm organizations, individual business concerns, and many others are having the same difficulty with the present Secretary of Agriculture. I think it is a rather unfortunate situation, when it takes a month or 2 months to receive an answer from the Secretary of Agriculture to a telegram on a very important question. The Secretary who held the position just prior to Mr. Brannan made a determined effort to make prompt reply. It finally reached the point where we would receive answers in not more than 2 weeks from the time the inquiry was sent to the Secretary.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from North Dakota has just made a logical contribution to this discussion, which concerns itself, in large part, with the responsibility of a Federal agency. It makes one justifiably sick, and it ought to make the American public indignant, to know that those who represent them in high executive positions are so busy trying to sell programs which have been, and I hope will continue to be, completely foreign to a large segment of the American public, that they do not have time to transact public business. If a Senator or any other American citizen can justify to me the reason that an $11,000,000 travel allowance for the Agriculture Department in 1949 should be increased to $14,000,000 in this election year of 1950, I should like to have him do so.

I am satisfied that other Senators think as I do, that executives ought to stay, for the most part, at the desks to which they have been assigned and from which they can carry on the public business by telephone, by telegram, and by writing letters, without so promiscuously having recourse to the unwarranted generosity provided for executive agencies by the Congress of the United States. That is the basic reason why I think Congress should be very grateful for having a coming opportunity to grapple with an omnibus budget in connection with which we can come to determinations concerning the equality or the balance which ought to be maintained not only between executive departments of the executive branch, but between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, because it is very obvious to some of us who at least try to study the problem that if we do not quit the direction in which we are permitting the executive branch to go, we are encouraging it to devour the legislative process which, if once destroyed, would probably cause the United States of America to disappear from the face of the earth forever.

It happens that Mr. Brannan has taken off for Grand Coulee Dam. There is apparently some convention of some sort scheduled for there on Thursday. My colleague will be there and a good many others from the Northwest's congressional delegations. The thought has occurred to me that all of these good people could get in a huddle with Mr. Brannan and seek an answer to a serious Northwest problem about which so many of us have written to Mr. Brannan in recent months.

This is why I have suggested that the President of the United States address himself to the Brannan plan. That would create a friendly atmosphere from which might come some helpful suggestions.

Whenever he is tracked down and caught, Mr. Brannan seems like quite a nice and personable fellow. I want to alert everyone in Washington State to enjoy this game of trying to rope Mr. Brannan, in order that somebody can get an answer to the question that so many people have offered for Mr. Brannan's consideration in recent weeks. I think my letter to Mr. Brannan ought to be read so that everybody will be aware of its content and anybody will then be qualified to talk business with Mr. Brannan if they catch him.

Mr. President, I wish to read this letter particularly because of the concern which has just been expressed by some of my colleagues. I wish to talk about a problem which is of serious concern to us in the Pacific Northwest and concerning which we have received neither acknowledgment, answer, nor satisfaction for a period of some months from a so-called responsible officer of the executive department of our Government.

The letter reads as follows:

APRIL 14, 1950.

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The seriousness of a situation threatening the existence of a basic industry in my State merits, I believe, your personal attention. This I respectfully request.

Involved is the production of wheat and its processing. Wheat is Washington State's most important dollar crop. Our flour milling industry has grown over a period of some seventy years into a business which normally provides employment to thousands and contributes substantially to the Pacific Northwest economy.

Today, wheat and flour produced in the State of Washington are deprived of normal

and historical outlets. Lower priced Canadian and Australian wheat and flour have taken over export markets because we cannot meet this competition.

Even more serious is the loss of historical markets in California, always our most important domestic outlet for these products. This latter situation results from inequities in the application of wheat loan rates under the Commodity Credit Corporation. Southern Idaho has usurped the California market because differentials make it possible for Southern Idaho wheat and flour to be dumped in California at a figure Washington, Oregon, and northern Idaho processors cannot meet under existing loan rates.

This entire situation, of course, has been discussed with various of your assistants. Months have passed, yet nothing has been done to meet what has become an emergency situation.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I may say that we have met a number of these assistants, and they have been invariably courteous, and, to my mind, quite competent. The only thing they lacked was authority. They were nothing more or less—and many Senators will agree with me—errand boys. They could take messages from Members of Congress to Mr. Brannan, and that was as far as they could go.

I continue reading the letter I sent to Mr. Brannan:

At a meeting recently held between representatives of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the members of the Washington and Oregon delegations in Congress, we were advised that a program to subsidize flour in export, to meet Canadian and Australian prices, was under consideration. The decision, we were told, rests with you and the Secretary of State. It is my belief, shared, I am sure, by all the Washington Senators and Congressmen, that an early and favorable decision by you and the State Department is essential and would be a proper step toward solution of this difficulty.

We believe, too, that the present inequities in the loan rate pattern should be corrected by bringing the southern Idaho figure into line with the Washington, Oregon, and northern Idaho rate. Such adjustments have been made before and a review of the loan pattern indicates that fractional changes in the loan rate structure nationally would achieve the required adjustment without increasing the cost of the subsidy program.

Our flour-milling industry has sought an answer to its problems in the aggressive American way. Everything possible has been done to build new markets for our products and to meet competition. However, as Government controls are in effect, the ultimate solution rests in the cooperation of the Government as represented by you and the department you head.

The simple fact is that present conditions exist because of a Government program and can be solved only by Government action.

Our agricultural program is intended to guarantee a fair return to all producers. In this instance, one geographical area finds itself at a dangerous disadvantage because application of the program is not equitable. The people of my State feel the Government has created this crisis. They therefore feel forced to insist that the Government take steps necessary to remedy it.

Please be assured of my earnest desire to cooperate with you and the department in achieving a solution to this problem and all others involving the interests and economy of my State and country. This letter includes all of my knowledge and understanding of the difficult problem which confronts my wheat and flour friends at home. If I am misinformed I know that you will so advise me. If there is any prospect of relief you will surely let me know. Above all, I want to know what can be expected and when. In anticipation then of hearing from you soon, I am with cordial regards

Most sincerely,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Now, Mr. President, can you see anything wrong with this letter? Had you written it would you not have expected an intelligent and prompt reply? Of course you would. In this letter I suggested that I thought the Pacific Northwest was entitled to some relief, but I requested only that I be advised of what action might be expected and when. Mr. Brannan may be a public servant, but those whom he serves do not include some Members of the United States Senate. Instead of being anxious to satisfy legitimate requests made by Members of the Congress and by responsible citizens throughout the Nation, Mr. Brannan appears to be anxious to scurry about the country praising the merits of the Brannan plan, which many thoughtful folk consider to be nothing short of an intended national racket.

All in all, Mr. President, Thursday ought to be a banner day at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington State. Again I wish to state that I wish I might be there in person. Aside from wanting to hear the President of the United States read a prepared and enticing speech on any subject I should like to be among those who will be chasing Mr. Brannan all over the landscape. I hope he is caught. If he is not caught on Thursday we might just as well close up the flour milling industry in Washington State and forget it. Even Mr. Brannan ought to be willing to agree that this would be a tragic and foolish thing to be required to do.

Mr. President, since I began my statement this morning it has come to the attention of some important and very friendly people that the junior Senator from Washington was not invited to visit Grand Coulee Dam on Thursday. Mr. F. A. Banks, the regional director, and a man whom I consider to be a friend and a very able engineer, has wired from Coulee Dam that he sincerely regrets that I have not received an invitation to attend the dedication ceremonies. He pointed out that invitations had been mailed on April 24 and he hopes that I might accept mine at this late date. He wants me to advise him if I can attend so that proper arrangements might be made for my seating on the platform with the President of the United States and my being introduced to the audience. This telegraphic invitation is keenly appreciated, and particularly because it came from Mr. Banks, but the junior Senator from Washington must restate his regret in not being able to accept such a promising invitation.

Because of my respect for the invitation, I telegraphed my response, as was perfectly proper, to Mr. Banks. It reads:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 10, 1950.*

Mr. F. A. BANKS,
District Manager, Bureau of Reclamation, Coulee Dam, Wash.

DEAR MR. BANKS: Many thanks for your telegraphic invitation of yesterday which I must deny because of demanding work in the Senate. It is so good to know that the President will benefit from another opportunity to see the miracle which is Grand Coulee Dam in operation. As a Senator and as a citizen of Washington State I bid him welcome. I know that he will be pleased and charmed by the hospitality which will be offered by all citizens. Every partial dedication of Grand Coulee Dam is a move in the direction of the most important dedication of them all. This will come about when the last of your 18 generators brings power on the line. Much as I would enjoy an interim dedication I shall actually only feel impelled to attend that coming dedication which recognizes that all of the work has been completed. This objective will require additional large amounts of money and support from every section of the country. In knowing that your partial dedication of tomorrow is in many hands I ought to remain here and strive for those things which will make the final dedication possible. May your day be happy and pleasing to everybody.

Most cordially,

HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, during the course of the late afternoon of yesterday, Representative HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington State, called to invite me to fly with him and with other members of the Washington and Oregon State delegations to Grand Coulee Dam, leaving here late today. He did not say where he had secured an aircraft, or who was going to pay for it, and I thought it would be very discourteous to raise the question. He merely said that it had just occurred to him that I might like to go along. Indeed, I would, but because there is work to be done, I ought to stay here, and, under the circumstances, I should not feel too unhappy. As Grand Coulee Dam has been dedicated many times in the past, it will be dedicated many times in the future, and when it comes to dedications it is just as satisfying to go to one as it is to attend another. I told Mr. JACKSON that there were plenty of people going along to dedicate Grand Coulee Dam this time, and that I would try to be among those who go west to dedicate Grand Coulee for the last time.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 11

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Michigan how long he expects to talk, and what the subject matter of his remarks will be?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am going to talk on Reorganization Plan No. 11.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection, Mr. President. As I understand, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is going to bring up Reorganization Plan No. 12, and I desired to say something about that before the motion to consider it is before the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I can conclude in 20 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the intention of the majority leader to speak after the Senator from Michigan concludes, and before the Senator from Ohio makes his motion? Is that the plan?

Mr. LUCAS. If I can get the floor I should like to say a few words before the motion to take up Reorganization Plan No. 12 is made, because under the rules, after the motion is made, it is not

debatable, and I should like to say a word or two before the motion is made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on March 13, 1950, President Truman sent to Congress his Reorganization Plan No. 11 providing for a reorganization of the Federal Communications Commission. He stated that many benefits and improved operations would result from the adoption of this plan. The substance of the plan is contained in section 1, which transfers from the Federal Communications Commission as a whole to the Chairman of the Commission "the Executive and administrative functions of the Commission, including: First, the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission; second, the distribution of business among such personnel and administrative units of the Commission; and third, the use and expenditure of funds."

The proposed transfer of such tremendous authority and power to the Chairman of the Commission is so broad it carries with it many implications. It gives the Chairman of the Commission virtually complete control over the Commission's purse strings, the selection of its staff, and the assignment of all its work. While the plan says that the Chairman's actions in these respects would be subject to general policies of the Commission, and his appointments of heads of major administrative units subject to the approval of the Commission, it is obvious that in nearly all cases, he will be able to carry out his ideas over any opposition which minority members of the Commission may offer. It is almost certain that his majority colleagues on the Commission will in most cases support everything that he does. The reorganization plan has the potential effect of making the FCC a one-man agency, and the probable effect of upsetting the bipartisan character under which regulatory agencies are intended to function.

Mr. President, the law requires that this agency be a bipartisan agency, and therefore it is very material, first, whether we will give to the Chairman, who is named by the President, the power of appointment of and supervision over personnel employed under the Commission; second, the distribution of business among such personnel and administrative units of the Commission; and, third, the use and the expenditures of funds.

Certainly it is true that in the United States, where it is so important that the people be informed of the issues of the day, where radio fills such a large and important niche in the daily lives of the people and where such great efforts have been made in the past with well-known success, to preserve the freedom of speech guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution—certainly here it is important to make certain that radio does not fall under the thumb of a dictator. If this should take place, many of the civil rights of the citizenry would conceivably be placed in jeopardy. The possibility of such a sad result is so alarming as to justify a complete examination of this reorganization plan and in fact a reexamination of the whole work of the FCC and its policies in regulating radio.

The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has completed its study of the reorganization plan, and by a closely divided vote has approved it. This approval is no doubt premised on the fact that plan No. 11 is in conformance with the general recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Without applying its recommendations specifically to particular regulatory agencies, the Commission in its first recommendation in the Report on Regulatory Agencies said:

> We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission.

The sharp division within the Expenditures Committee on this plan reveals the plan's weakness. While it is in general conformance with the Hoover report, it is no more than general. Moreover, it contains within it a concentration of authority, which is especially vital in an agency that is of necessity so reliant upon its technical staffs as is the FCC, which goes far beyond the purposes of efficiency upon which were based the Hoover recommendations for clearly defined lines of responsibility.

The Senate has already taken cognizance of the peculiar reliance upon its legal staff in the FCC. The Senate has unanimously approved S. 1973, which has the effect of stripping the Commission's legal staff of some of its tremendous unseen influence in the workings of the Commission by creating independent legal counsel to assist the individual Commissioners in the discharge of their duties. It is not without significance, as revealing a jealous determination to preserve the influence now exerted by the Commission's legal staff, that S. 1973 has been vigorously opposed in the House. It is an open secret that the Sadowski bill, a substitute for S. 1973 in the House, was written by the Commission's legal staff to preserve and protect its present prerogatives.

The FCC is widely known to be dominated by the "liberal" Democrats who serve on the Commission and who permeate its staff.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Michigan that Reorganization Plan No. 11, if it goes into effect, will nullify the action of the Senate in giving legal counsel to each individual member?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not go that far. I do not think it would nullify it, but it would certainly allow the Chairman to make the appointments, which would in effect nullify the action of the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. That is practically the same thing, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Each Commissioner would have a legal counsel assigned to him, appointed by the Chairman, a legal counsel who is responsible to the Chairman and removable by the Chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is the way the language of the plan reads.

The "big Government" philosophy which these people apply to the regulation of radio is threatening the radio industry and the people themselves to an extent which has become very, very dangerous to the Nation's welfare. These members of the Commission and, perhaps to even a greater extent, these members of the Commission staff, must be checked and their powers limited if freedom of speech is to prevail as an overriding principle in the political makeup of our country.

Mr. President, a previous member of the Commission went to England, and had some Englishmen come to this country to make an analysis of our radio system. That analysis was such that if the recommendations contained in it had been adopted, the radio broadcasting industry in America would have been placed under the same domination as the radio broadcasting industry in Britain, which is government-owned. I wish the commissions composing a part of the United States Government would begin thinking about America, and the way America may progress, rather than take their cues and their hints from other nations which are bent upon totalitarianism or socialization.

During the past 16 years, since its establishment by the Communications Act of 1934, the Federal Communications Commission has increasingly expanded its power of regulation in a manner which the framers of the Communications Act did not intend. It has succeeded in expanding these powers, perhaps to a much greater extent than many of us realize, and today stands in a position, if its power is not checked here and now, to throttle and ruin any radio station licensee it sees fit to discipline. The Commission is now attempting to expand these powers still further, and if this move is successful it is certain that the radio industry will be forced to give up even the fiction of free enterprise.

Why did a Federal Communications Commissioner bring to the United States from Great Britain men who were familiar with the British system to make a survey of our system and tell us how we ought to operate? I think we should keep that incident in mind when discussing this subject.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it not true at the present time that under the licensing system of the FCC, the Federal Communications Commission can deny a renewal of a license of any broadcasting company?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. And is there any appeal from that decision on the part of the licensee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand not. I think somehow the licensee can get into the courts, but it is a very difficult

proceeding, and it is very doubtful that the licensee has the right to challenge the actual finding of the Commission.

Mr. BRICKER. And the burden of proof is entirely upon the licensee, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Many companies have invested many hundreds of thousands of dollars and many millions of dollars in radio stations and in the staffs they have built up. Is it possible for the Federal Communications Commission under the present law completely to confiscate that investment and that property by the refusal of a renewal of the license?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Commission can wipe out all investments in a station; yes.

Mr. BRICKER. And from that there is no appeal?

Mr. FERGUSON. From that there is no appeal.

Mr. BRICKER. Except through the injunctive powers of the courts?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. President, it is even possible that the proposed expansion of the Commission's power can lead to complete Government ownership and operation of the radio industry. Let us examine the way in which this change has taken place and the way in which it can proceed.

The Communications Act of 1934 provides that radio licenses shall be granted where the "public interest, convenience, or necessity" will be served. This is the only criterion specified in the act which the Commission is given to follow in granting original applications for new stations. The vagueness of this term certainly requires that the Commission, in exercising the authority delegated to it by the Congress in this act, shall scrupulously avoid arbitrary decisions and, at all costs, refrain from violating the rights and privileges of individuals or companies holding station licenses by judging them on rumor or on unsupported allegations.

The primary function of the FCC is one of acting as a traffic policeman, an agent to ration facilities which have been said to be in short supply. While even this theory may be an impractical and indefensible legal fiction, it is certainly true that the Commission's technical functions of allocating frequencies is, under the statute creating it, its primary function. In dealing with stations already operating, the Commission is given the function of policing various prohibitions in the Communications Act. For example, a radio-station licensee may not transmit over the air waves any obscene, indecent, or profane language, nor may it broadcast information about lotteries. The framers of the Communications Act felt that the "public interest, convenience, and necessity" would not be served if such things were allowed.

Now it should be noted that the Communications Act provides that a person desiring a license to operate a radio station or a person desiring a license presently in force to be renewed, as licenses must be every 3 years, must set forth facts in his application to the Commission showing the "citizenship, character, and financial, technical, and other qualifications" of the applicant to operate the station. It is clear what is meant here by "citizenship" and by the "financial" and "technical" qualifications of the applicant to operate the station. But what is meant by the "character" of an applicant or a licensee? What sort of a "character" did the framers of this law have in mind to be required of an applicant or licensee? What sort of a "character" does the Commission believe should be required of an applicant or licensee? Upon the answers to these questions much may depend.

An examination of the legislative history of the Communications Act gives no substantial clue to the intent of the Congress in its use of the word "character" at the time of the enactment of the law.

But the actions of the Commission in the past and the interpretation given to this word by the courts in the past makes amply clear what the Commission has believed. And today, at a time when increasing regulation of private enterprise by the Federal Government is certainly the political fashion and certainly the primary motivation of the Fair Deal administration, the Commission seems bent upon expanding the meaning of this word "character" and thereby tremendously expanding its own power over the radio industry.

No one can disagree with some of the policy decisions of the Commission in dealing in the past with applicants for new licenses or for renewals of current licenses. Certainly one who gives false information in his application for a license cannot be said to have the character which should be required of a radio station owner. Certainly one cannot disagree with the Commission's policy of denying licenses to owners who repeatedly violate technical rules of the Commission, to owners who transfer control of their stations to others without the Commission's approval, in violation of the act, to owners who operate deficient equipment, or to owners who repeatedly broadcast false advertising or other objectionable matter.

However, Mr. President, in passing it should be noted that even in many of the cases described above—notably, in those dealing with false advertising, the use of deficient equipment, or violation of technical rules—the Commission has renewed the license when it was satisfied that the violation or other action to which it objected was unintentional and when it was satisfied that such action would not again occur.

It is also hard to disagree with the Commission's position, upheld by the Supreme Court, that in considering character it should scrutinize the applicant's qualities and deficiencies regarding traits of personality, integrity, temperament, consideration, sportsmanship, altruism, and so forth, which distinguish him as a human being from his fellowmen.

As I have said, that position has been upheld by the Supreme Court, but only in a case involving an application for the transfer of control of a radio station when serious doubt arose as to the integrity of the proposed transferee. The broad scope thus given to the authority to conduct a character investigation was applied only to a new applicant for whom no other test was available.

However, Mr. President, what is the Commission attempting to do today? In Los Angeles there have been a series of hearings on the requested renewal of the licenses of three radio stations, namely, Station KMPC, in Los Angeles; Station WJR, in Detroit; and Station WGAR, in Cleveland. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] brought these hearings to the attention of the Senate on March 30, on the floor of the Senate.

The principal stockholder of those stations is Mr. George A. Richards. Mr. Richards has operated those stations with public approval for a period ranging from 13 years, in the case of Station KMPC, to 23 years, in the case of Station WJR. These stations have a long history of fine programing and excellent public service, and they have the reputation of having met with the utmost, complete approval on the part of the citizens of the communities in which they are located. I personally can attest that that is true in the case of Station WJR.

Mr. President, if the radio industry and the people of the United States were to choose and had the right to choose, I am positive they would place these stations within the first 10 stations in the United States of America.

Throughout the years, as the license of each of those stations has come up for renewal from time to time—and as I have said, the stations have operated over a period of from 13 to 23 years respectively—the Commission has held hearings on the proposed renewals; and at the hearings, governors, mayors, representatives, charitable and religious organizations, representatives of veterans' organizations, and representatives of universities and colleges have all attested to the fine record of public service of these stations.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Inasmuch as one of the stations mentioned is in Ohio—namely, Station WGAR—I wish to join the Senator from Michigan and those whom he has quoted in praising the quality of the programs and the community service rendered by that station, which has operated for some 20 years in my State.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Michigan that the charges heard at the hearing have not reflected upon the program or the character of service rendered in the respective communities by that station and the other two, but, rather, have taken on the aspect of an attack upon the political thinking of the principal stockholder of those companies?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct in that statement. The charges made are not attacks on the operation of the stations or the programs or the programing of the stations, but they are attacks on the character of the principal stockholder of the stations and what he, individually, thinks.

I hope to cover that point a little later in the course of my remarks.

I thank the Senator for stating on the floor of the Senate what he thinks of Station WGAR, in Cleveland. It is a high-powered station, as is Station WJR. I think both of them are 50,000-watt stations. We in Detroit on occasion hear the Cleveland station. I have never heard anything but the best of radio over that station, as I have also said about Station WJR, in Detroit.

Mr. President, the character and the fitness of these stations and of Mr. Richards have, before now, never been questioned during all the period in which he has been the principal stockholder of these stations.

Nevertheless, now the Commission is threatening a refusal to renew the license of the stations in question, and is taking that position because of irresponsible allegations made against the character of Mr. Richards. Some of those allegations have been made by disgruntled ex-employees who were discharged because of inefficiency. Some of those allegations have been made by politicians. At this point, reference particularly should be made to a complaint written on the stationery of the Democratic State Committee of California. That complaint is the reason why I have said that some of the allegations have been made by politicians. That complaint was sent to the Commission by Mr. James Roosevelt, an active and an extremely vocal candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of the great State of California.

Mr. Richards was once a Democrat; but he disagreed with the breaking of the third-term tradition, and in 1940 he broke with the Democratic Party. Certainly, therefore, as the Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out, the presently threatened action on the part of the Commission, after its receipt of a strong complaint from a member of the Roosevelt family, who is so active in Democratic politics, should be regarded with considerable skepticism. The charges made against Mr. Richards and filed with the Commission relate to alleged opinions which Mr. Richards is said to have held concerning certain prominent persons, including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the wife of a former President of the United States; Howard Hughes; David Lilienthal, who was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; Henry Wallace, who was Vice President of the United States; and others.

It is further charged that Mr. Richards instructed members of his station staff of news casters to slant or distort the news reports relating to those individuals, so that nothing favorable about them would be reported but so that anything unfavorable about them would be reported over his stations.

He is further alleged to have ordered that all possible help be given to the Republican Party by those news casters in their writings and the delivery of news script.

Mr. President, it is something new when a charge is made that radio stations are attempting to give at least some help to the Republican Party and what it is attempting to do.

As I understand, there is absolutely no evidence, however, that the facilities of Mr. Richards' stations were being used to transmit over the airways any of Mr. Richards' private opinions.

Mr. President, I understand from reliable sources that during the course of these hearings, proof has been offered that Mr. Richards did on occasion issue instructions to his station employees to treat specific news items and general subjects in certain ways, which some persons might characterize as not being impartial. However, there is absolutely no credible proof in the record that any of those instructions to station employees ever were carried out and that biased or slanted newscasts were put on the air.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that, because it answers the question which has been asked by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]—namely, there is absolutely no credible proof that any of those instructions to station employees ever were carried out and that biased or slanted newcasts were put on the air.

It may be asked: Why, then, does it matter to the Commission what Mr. Richards may have said to his employees?

It may be asked: Is not Mr. Richards entitled to his private opinions, and is he not to be allowed to freely express those opinions?

Mr. President, I must confess that answers to these questions detrimental to Mr. Richards are not apparent to me on logical grounds. But it is certainly apparent that, with or without logic to base such action on, the Commission is attempting here to penalize Richards because of his privately expressed views, and because of his private opinions. The fact that those opinions did not happen to coincide with those of the Commission and its staff, especially with respect to matters relating to national politics, is certainly to be regarded as significant. And the fact that the Commission's own evidence begins with events in 1940, when Mr. Richards departed from the Democratic fold and became critical of President Roosevelt, is more than significant.

In other words, in this Richards case, the Commission is departing from past practice and is threatening to penalize the majority stockholder of these radio stations, which stations have an impeccable public service record, because of this stockholder's privately voiced opinions, contrary to those of the Commission, which never reached the air waves. This may be highly questionable for the Commission to do even in the case of initial applications for new station licenses where there has been no investment by the applicant, where no large labor force has been allowed, and where no loss to the community in radio service will result. But where the opposite is true I can conceive of no necessity for the same strict standards of character, the same type of evidence being required, the same criteria being applied with respect to stations and station licensees who have operated for years without criticism and without complaint. Is proven public service to count for nothing? Certainly where there is a station in existence, applying for a renewal of its license after long years of public service, the Commission should require credible evidence that biased or false statements actually were broadcast before the station could be deprived of its license, and the performance record of the station itself should be the test.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Michigan has detailed the character of the hearing against Mr. Richards, who happens to be a majority stockholder. If the Commission has power to look into the private thinking and expressions even of a majority stockholder, it has the same right as to a minority stockholder, has it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The evidence shows that even though he be a majority stockholder, there is nothing in the programs of the stations concerned to show that the advice or suggestions or thinking of the majority stockholder had anything to do with the character of the programs any more than if he had been a minority stockholder. Is that not true?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true. So it would not make any difference whether he was a minority stockholder or a majority stockholder; they could consider his thinking and determine whether, by his thinking, his character was so marred, in their opinion, according to their thinking, that he would not be entitled to a renewal of his license.

Mr. BRICKER. And in that way, even if a minority stockholder held opinions adverse to the Commission's judgment of what was wholesome, if they could do it in this case, they could positively do it in that case, confiscating the property, and all the rest; could they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. There could be a pure confiscation.

Mr. President, even in cases where objectionable material can be shown to have been actually broadcast, should it not be required that station licenses be revoked rather than that the Commission should merely fail to renew such licenses? In other words, in these cases they are not asking to revoke the licenses, for in that event, there would have to be a hearing. In a revocation proceeding, the licensee would be given complete notice of the charges against him; he would be given a bill of particulars, setting forth in detail the questionable practices of which he is suspected. He would be put on guard and given time to prepare a defense for his own protection.

But in a proceeding such as the one in the Richards' case, where the Commission has allowed the station licenses to lapse and has then set down for hearing the licensee's applications for renewal, resisting all efforts of counsel to obtain details with respect to the charges leveled against the licensee by complainants, there can be no question but that the Commission is proceeding unfairly. In the Richards' case, the record indicates clearly that counsel for Mr. Richards has attempted on many occasions

to obtain some idea of the suspicions which the Commission had as a result of the charges filed with it. These attempts were made through motions, through prehearing conferences, and through verbal efforts at the beginning of and throughout the hearings. These efforts were all to no avail. Commission counsel would state only in the vaguest and broadest terms what Mr. Richards was charged with. Only because some of the complaints filed with the Commission had been in part carried in trade papers did this licensee have even an inkling of the details of these complaints.

In other words, here is a case where the one who was really the defendant, whose property and that of the other stockholders was about to be confiscated, had to get the information as to the charges from trade papers. The Commission would not furnish the charges to him. Commission counsel certainly made no effort to help and in fact refused to help along this line.

Can it be doubted that this method of proceeding is unfair and not in accordance with our American traditions of jurisprudence? Is this proceeding in itself not substantial evidence that the FCC is attempting to enlarge and expand its powers of regulation, to the detriment of the public and without consideration being given to the deprivation of legal rights which such parties as Mr. Richards have suffered? It seems to me that if the Senate of the United States does not act now, and positively, to stave off this attempt by the FCC to expand its powers, the Federal Communications Commission will succeed again and again in the future.

Opposition to any reorganization plan, even when it is no more than in general conformity to Hoover Commission recommendations, is difficult for anyone who is pledged, as I am, to the Hoover plan for economy and efficiency in government.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand, there is no suggestion in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 11 that there would be any savings of money in any amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

I feel justified in recording opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 11, first, because it is no more than in general conformance with the Hoover plan; second, because I believe the great purpose of the Hoover plan is to be achieved by its enactment as a whole, rather than a nibbling at the edges without getting at entrenched inefficiency in Government; third, because this plan promises no appreciable savings, which is the main purpose of the Hoover plan, and in reality only employs the Hoover Commission as a device to demand greater and more arbitrary authority; fourth, because the exercise of such concentrated authority in the FCC, on the basis of the record, is to be mistrusted.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not think there is any implication or any suggestion at all that the powers over the appointment of the staff and the power over the allocation of money and the assignment of responsibility should be reposed in the Chairman. I do not think there is any positive recommendation to that effect, is there?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have found no such recommendation in the Hoover reports. The idea is to produce greater efficiency and bring about more economy.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator understand that the Hoover Commission report simply recommended that the chairman be given more administrative responsibility?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way it is worded. The President has now recommended giving him the power to hire, to discharge, to assign work, and to spend the money.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the distinguished Senator distinguish between executive powers, which would include the over-all management and control of the Commission, and administrative powers, which involve merely the assignment of cases and the assignment of responsibility?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The powers would be in the nature of those of a presiding judge having cases assigned to the calendar.

Mr. BRICKER. Even in the case of the reorganization and the supposed efficiency and economy which might result from it, there is nothing in the recommended Reorganization Plan No. 11 which really follows the Hoover Commission's recommendations, is there?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The plan surrenders to a single person authority over the selection and assignment of the personnel who by and large govern the operations of one of the most important regulatory agencies we have. It is the agency which by the nature of the field in which it operates is potentially the greatest thought-control medium in the Nation.

We have had enough of the planners, the charterers, and the lawyers in Government who tell us how and when to buy and sell, and would even tell us how to think.

It is not enough to warn against arbitrary power in the hands of the planners, charterers, and lawyers. If we cannot exercise control over them on the ground level of their functions, through their appointment, we can only protest against them after the fact. It can then be too late.

In other words, Mr. President, the department was conducted by lawyers, planners, and charterers. Tell any Senator what the lawyers, planners, and charterers think in the commissions and bureaus, and they will know how the commission or the bureau is going to be operated. The question is, Are we going to place in the Chairman, particularly in the case of a nonpartisan Commission, the power to control freedom of speech and of thought over the radio?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator on some of the statements he is making regarding the very disastrous effects of the abuse of power by agencies of Government. Since none of us will be able to speak on the FEPC matter this afternoon, I wondered if the Senator would permit me to amend his speech by striking out "FCC" and inserting in lieu thereof "FEPC," because the FEPC would have even more powers to deny the people control over their thoughts and opinions than would the Commission to which the Senator is referring.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe I shall be able to accommodate the Senator by striking out "FCC" and inserting "FEPC," because I do want my statement to apply to the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the Senator if he will be kind enough to consider the powers embraced in the FEPC bill when he has concluded his remarks about the FCC. He will find this new bureau it is proposed to create has much greater powers than the FCC. I thank the Senator for permitting this word of opposition to FEPC today.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know that I can accommodate the distinguished Senator in that respect.

I hope that notwithstanding the majority views of the Senate Expenditures Committee that the Senate will examine most carefully Reorganization Plan No. 11, and its implications. I hope on the basis of such an examination that the Senate will reject the plan, at least until we are possessed of adequate assurances that the authority vested by the plan cannot and will not be abused in any way.

To explore that subject further I suggest that there should be a complete and thorough investigation by the Senate of the policies and procedures of the Federal Communications Commission.

In support of that suggestion I submit a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion for the Department of Michigan, which I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENSORSHIP OF RADIO

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is currently conducting a hearing to determine whether a man's personal opinions render him unfit to operate radio stations in the United States; and

Whereas it appears that the Federal Communications Commission's power to censor radio by refusing periodical requests for renewal of a station's license to operate goes beyond the intent of Congress in establishing the FCC and outlining its duties; and

Whereas the present system of operation of the FCC enables powerful political interests to bring undue pressure and influence to bear for or against radio stations seeking license renewals: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee, Department of Michigan, the American Legion, in spring conference assembled in Detroit this 19th day of March 1950, That inquiry

into the personal beliefs of a radio station in the United States is a violation of the Constitution of the United States and is against the public policy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned by this body to so delineate the powers of the FCC as to remove the possibility of Government censorship of American radio in time of peace; and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Michigan, the American Legion, immediately supply each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives with a copy of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That each Member of Congress also be supplied with a copy of remarks on Federal censorship of radio which were made to the United States Senate by the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON, Senator from Michigan, on Monday, March 13, 1950; and be it further

Resolved, That each Member of Congress also be supplied with a copy of a pamphlet entitled "It May Happen Here," which is the opening statement of Attorney Hugh Fulton in the current FCC hearing on renewal of licenses of three major American radio stations.

(Adopted by executive committee, Department of Michigan, the American Legion, March 19, 1950.)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. I am seeking recognition to present a highly privileged resolution with reference to Reorganization Plan No. 12, and I submit that I have a right to submit that resolution at any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who yielded with the understanding that he would not lose his right to make a speech on the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I invite attention to the fact that regarding the cloture resolution, which is the same type of highly privileged motion, the Chair has ruled that the Senator making the motion may take a Senator off the floor after he has been recognized. It certainly seems to me that in seeking recognition, that priority should be given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian has advised the Chair that a Senator must obtain recognition. The Chair has recognized the Senator from New York.

REPORTS ON REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 3, 14, 15, 16, 19, AND 20

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so that I may submit reports on certain reorganization plans?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, in accordance with action taken by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in executive session on May 9, I am submitting herewith favorable reports on Reorganization Plans Nos. 3, 14, 15, 16, 19, and 20 submitted to the Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

These reports are submitted for the information of the Senate, in accordance with the usual policy of the committee when no opposition is expressed to reorganization plans submitted to Congress, although the Reorganization Act of 1949 does not require reports on plans on which there is no opposition.

Mr. President, I have prepared a synopsis of these plans, and in the interest of brevity, in the interest of saving time, and out of deference to the kindness of the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in yielding to me, I ask unanimous consent that the summary or synopsis be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the synopsis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950 provides for the reorganization of the Department of the Interior in accordance with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It conforms to specific recommendations Nos. 14, 16, 18, and 20 of the Commission's report on general management and to general recommendations contained in report No. 14 on the Department of the Interior.

This plan deals only with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission relating to vesting functions of the Department of the Interior in the Secretary, creates an Assistant Secretary, and an Administrative Assistant Secretary under the classified civil service, but does not cover other recommendations in the Hoover Commission Report No. 14 which recommended: (1) the creation of a board of impartial analysis, (2) the transfer to the Department of the Interior of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, general supervision of Federal building construction, the Bureau of Community Facilities from the General Services Administration, and the Texas City tin smelter from RFC, and (3) the transfer out of the Department of the Interior of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, and the commercial fisheries activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Reorganization Plan No. 14 has for its purpose the coordination of the administration of labor standards under the Department of Labor. The Hoover Commission recommended the actual enforcement of labor standards in Government contracts be vested in the Secretary of Labor, whereas Reorganization Plan No. 14 relates merely to the prescribing by the Secretary of Labor of appropriate standards, regulations, and procedures with respect to the administration and enforcement of labor standards in Government contracts and does not transfer the enforcement and administration of labor standards from the individual agencies and departments of the Government.

The committee in its report on this plan points out that the plan is construed to grant to the Secretary of Labor authority with respect to blue-collar workers only and does not apply to so-called white-collar employees.

Reorganization Plan No. 15 provides for the transfer of functions of the General Services Administration relating to public works in Alaska and in the Virgin Islands to the Department of the Interior. The Hoover Commission recommended that the Department of the Interior be "reorganized along more functional and major purpose lines" and included specific recommendations relating to the centralization of such functions.

Reorganization Plan No. 15 is designed to improve the long-range planning and welfare of the public-works programs in Alaska and the Virgin Islands and it is believed that the concentration of responsibility in the Department which is already charged with the execution of related programs in these possessions will tend to simplify relationships and lead to more efficient and economical administration of these related activities.

Reorganization Plan No. 16 provides for transfer to the Federal Security Agency of the functions of the General Services Administration relating to assistance to local school districts and grants and loans for water-pollution-control projects.

This plan is not specifically covered in the Hoover Commission reports, but it accords with the Commission's determination that Federal-State relations be concentrated wherever feasible within the Federal Security Agency and that major purpose functions be grouped together in a single agency.

The committee is of the opinion that the proposed consolidations covered by this plan vesting responsibility for the administration of the programs contained therein in the Federal Security Agency will tend to eliminate overlapping functions and bring about more efficiency and economy of operation than is now possible under the existing division of responsibility.

Reorganization Plan No. 19 transfers from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board and their functions.

This plan accords with recommendation No. 2 of the Hoover Commission Report No. 13 on the Department of Labor. The committee had no particular objections to the plan, although it holds the view that since other Federal functions relating primarily to compensation for injuries of civilians are now vested in the Federal Security Agency there was no valid reason why these functions should be transferred to the Department of Labor, except on the general premise advocated by the Hoover Commission that the Department of Labor should be built up into a comparable size in relation to other executive departments. It is the view of the committee, however, that since these agencies operate entirely within statutory limitations established by Congress it is immaterial where the general administrative supervision is vested and therefore no objection is made to the transfer to the Department of Labor.

Reorganization Plan No. 20 provides for the transfer from the Secretary of State to the Administrator of General Services a number of functions which have no connection with foreign affairs but bear a close relation to the archival and records functions of the General Services Administration.

There is no specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission which applies to the transfer of the functions covered by this plan, but it is in conformance with the general recommendation relative to "a more orderly grouping of the functions of government into major departments and agencies under the President."

The plan would retain under the authority of the Secretary of State the printing and publication functions with respect to international agreements, Presidential proclamations related thereto, and international postal conventions, but would transfer to the Administrator of General Services all other functions now vested in the Secretary of State relating to the preservation, publication, and certification with respect to acts of Congress, amendments to the Constitution, certificates of appointments, and votes of electors of the President and Vice President of the United States, including the official papers of the Territories from which the State of the Union were formed, and would coordinate such activities with those now being performed by the National Archives and Records Service.

The report of this committee which accompanies plan No. 20 contains a specific recommendation relative to additional legislative action which is indicated as desirable following the effective date of the plan to eliminate duplications in the printing of United States Statutes at Large and private laws, treaties, and other international agreements. This matter has been under consideration by

the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments suggests that that committee give further consideration to this matter in order that the indicated improvements to supplement the transfers effectuated under Reorganization Plan No. 20 may be put into effect.

The reports submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN were received and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Reorganization Plan No. 3, of 1950, providing for reorganizations in the Department of the Interior (Rept. No. 1545);

Reorganization Plan No. 14, of 1950, providing coordination of the administration of labor standards in the Department of Labor (Rept. No. 1546);

Reorganization Plan No. 15, of 1950, transferring the functions of the General Services Administration relating to public works in Alaska and in the Virgin Islands to the Department of the Interior (Rept. No. 1547);

Reorganization Plan No. 16, of 1950, transferring the functions of the General Services Administration relating to assistance to local school districts and water-pollution control to the Federal Security Agency (Rept. No. 1548);

Reorganization Plan No. 19, of 1950, transferring the Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor (Rept. No. 1549); and

Reorganization Plan No. 20, of 1950, transferring functions relating to acts of Congress, amendments to the Constitution, certificates of appointment, etc., from the State Department to the Administrator of General Services (Rept. No. 1550).

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the FEPC bill, the motion to take up which is now the pending question before the Senate, is so important that I believe nothing save of a highly urgent character should be permitted to interfere with its orderly and immediate consideration. However, I shall speak very briefly, since the principles and implications of the measure affirm a basic human and civil right, and are fully understood by every Member of Congress.

The real question here is somewhat different, perhaps, than that which is frequently involved in other legislation under consideration by this body. Prolonged discussion and debate frequently help to clarify many issues, not only in the Senate, but for people throughout the Nation. However, I doubt whether either the proponents or the opponents of FEPC would contend that the provisions or principles of the FEPC bill are not fully clear either to them or to their constituents. Yet I believe that every Senator should have an opportunity, of which I hope most Senators will avail themselves, of recording in the Senate their views on this momentous question.

I believe that FEPC legislation has been studied in two committees of every Congress since 1944. The President's splendid bipartisan committee threw additional light on the reasons for such legislation. It is my understanding that an FEPC bill has twice been before the Senate for consideration. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties are committed to legislative action on fair-employment practices.

I feel very deeply, and I believe with good reason, that it is not what we now say on FEPC, but what we do that will be closely watched not only in this country but in many other areas of the world. From now on it will be our performance, not our polemics, that will count on this issue. Our standing in the world and our influence in international relationships are as much at stake on the FEPC bill as on any measure which has or will be before us for consideration and action. The simple concept that no man has a right to deny his fellow man the opportunity to earn a living for reasons of race, color, creed, or national origin is so elementary in a free democratic society, that millions of people both here and abroad must wonder what has prevented us from enacting this legislation long ago.

I think it is fair to say that at this juncture in history, the United States is undeniably the most powerful democratic nation in the world. It is the use to which we put our power, not the fact that we possess it, that clearly concerns not only our enemies but even our democratic friends.

Every step we take to broaden the democratic front here at home and to provide greater freedom for our own people, deepens the faith of other peoples in our democratic practices and helps to strengthen their conviction that this Nation is determined to use its power for the sole purpose of preserving liberty and peace.

Similarly, each time that we refuse to meet the challenge to expand freedom here in the United States—a challenge which is implicit in this legislation—we betray our promises and even our principles as a great free nation. Inevitably we shake the faith of other peoples in those promises and principles, provoke new fears of our power, and create further suspicion about the uses to which that power will be put.

The men of good will of both major parties who have worked effectively and harmoniously together on serious problems affecting our foreign policy will, I know, recognize that S. 1728 is not and cannot be permitted to become a party issue. There is certainly enough individual credit for everyone who will join in support of the measure to expand the frontiers of democracy and strengthen individual liberty. And it will be to the everlasting credit and profit of the whole Nation if we act speedily and decisively on the issue of FEPC and enact S. 1728.

As a practical matter we have certainly had enough experience in this country to demonstrate that fair-employment-practice laws have created better fellowship and understanding in the communities where they are in effect. Where FEPC commissions exist it can be shown that economic and social conditions have vastly improved. The States have had ample time to act in setting up such commissions and the States where FEPC legislation is most needed have not acted. Economic and political discrimination is still the prevailing pattern in far too many areas of this country. We, as the representatives of all the people, should not and cannot tolerate any longer the shocking inequities which deprive men and women of the right to a livelihood simply because of their race, color, national origin, or religious beliefs. I believe that it is my duty under the Constitution and under the oath I took to uphold the Constitution to do everything within my power to see that those inequities are corrected. I have said and I repeat here that I do not believe they will be corrected unless we adopt an FEPC bill which carries sanctions for violations. Every good law, every effective law, must carry some penalties for violation. Otherwise, it is simply an expression of good intentions. While I do not question the integrity or sincerity of anyone in this Chamber who maintains that we do not need any FEPC law, and that we particularly do not need an FEPC law with legal sanctions, I disagree with them with all the force of my mind and heart.

Of course, I am for discouraging discrimination by the use of education, investigation, and by the exposure of this evil by every medium of publicity. But I am convinced that these processes are not enough. They must be supported and augmented by the weight of governmental authority.

The eradication of social injustice and the creation of equal opportunity is and must be the constant aim of progressive democratic government. It is an issue upon which the very safety and preservation of our way of life depend. There can be no real justice where there is discrimination against whole groups of our people, or where there exists inequality of opportunity.

The true test of our faith in the American system is revealed in our determination to defend and protect it against the unceasing attacks of reactionary forces. Discrimination in employment or, for that matter, in any other area of our national life—political, religious, or economic— aids and encourages the enemies of the American system.

I doubt if there is a Member of the Senate who has not expressed himself at one time or another on this issue of fair employment practices. I hope that we shall act and act quickly so that the ringing message will sound around the world that this Government and this Nation means what it says when it holds forth the promise of freedom and liberty for all mankind.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before making the motion which I wish to make with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 12, I gladly yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in order that he may make a statement, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that any remarks of mine on this subject be not charged against me on the FEPC bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Millikin
Anderson	Humphrey	Mundt
Benton	Ives	Myers
Bricker	Jenner	Neely
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kem	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Leahy	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Lucas	Thye
Ferguson	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gurney	McFarland	Wherry
Hayden	McKellar	Wiley
Hendrickson	Malone	Williams
Hill	Martin	Withers
Hoey	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. I may say, Mr. President, that before the quorum call I had yielded to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in order to give him an opportunity to make a statement, before I made my motion.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Ohio will, immediately following my short address, move that the Senate consider the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12, which motion is not debatable. I rise only to say for the RECORD that it is a little difficult for me to understand the perseverance on the part of my friend from Ohio in insisting on bringing up for consideration Reorganization Plan No. 12. I have talked to the Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and I have assured him that under no circumstances would I permit any of the reorganization plans to become effective without the Senate having had an opportunity to act upon Senate resolutions disapproving of plans. The Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, advised me that if the Senate considered resolutions adversely reporting plans by Tuesday of next week it would be acceptable to him.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives is ready to consider Reorganization Plan No. 12. I have been in conference with the majority leader of the House. The majority leader of the House advised me that perhaps tomorrow the House will consider Reorganization Plan No. 12 and try to make disposition of it then. In the event the House votes adversely on the plan, that is, disapproves it, that would dispose of the plan and there would be no need of action by the Senate. If the House should vote in the affirmative, of course, the Senate would have to vote on the Senate resolution.

Mr. President, what I am trying to do, and what I have had little success in doing, is to move along with the FEPC bill, the motion to take up which is the pending question before the Senate. We have had very few speeches this week upon that measure, and there is much to be said on both sides of the question.

As I said, it is a little difficult for me to understand why the distinguished Senator from Ohio persists in moving to consider the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 when he definitely knows it will be considered before the 23d of this month by the Senate, and when he realizes that the House is ready in the first instance to take action upon the plan tomorrow or the next day. I cannot understand it, Mr. President.

I have been criticized in the press for not acting to have the FEPC bill considered sooner than I did. I think the Senator from Ohio perhaps made some statements a few weeks ago that he was ready to go into the question of the FEPC and consider the measure. Now, before we get started on it, after only a few addresses have been made on the measure, we are confronted with the motion proposed to be made by the Senator from Ohio.

It seems to me to be a little strange that we should have to consider Reorganization Plan No. 12 now. That is especially true in view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senator from Arkansas, who, I dare say, is as much interested, and perhaps more so, in civil rights than is the Senator from Ohio, is willing to permit the debate on the FEPC bill to continue, and is willing to have plan No. 12 and other reorganization plans which have been disapproved by his committee taken up between now and May 23.

I repeat, Mr. President, I do not understand the attitude of the Senator from Ohio. I simply cannot understand it. Whether the Senator from Ohio is trying to eke out a victory here and proclaim it to the country, I do not know. He is not even a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Yet he has taken the lead here today. Of course, I know he has some of the southern Senators on the spot. Otherwise, he would not move to consider the plan under these conditions.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I will say to the able and distinguished majority leader that no Republican or no Democrat has me on the spot. I tried to discharge my duty in this matter by agreeing previously that I would support a motion to consider the Senate resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12. I did so primarily because of what I understood to be the implication of the able majority leader's remarks made earlier that when the FEPC legislation was considered, nothing else would be permitted to interfere with it until it was disposed of. At that time I reminded the able majority leader of the reorganization plans which had been submitted to the Senate, which had either to be approved or disapproved by the deadline of May 23. At that time I announced that I would undertake to have considered the resolutions of disapproval which were reported by my committee.

In view of the situation and the procedure which has been followed up to this time with reference to the measure now before the Senate, the FEPC bill, and in view of the assurance of the majority leader now that the Senate will be given an opportunity to consider the resolutions of disapproval of the reorganization plans reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and that they will be considered and acted upon before the deadline of midnight May 23, and so long as the proceedings with respect to the FEPC bill are conducted as they have been in the past few days, by the Senate staying in session only for reasonable hours, since there has been no effort to hold midnight sessions and to put undue strain upon those who oppose the bill—so long as that course is followed, I am perfectly willing to try to accommodate both the leadership on the side of the majority and those who are particularly interested in the resolutions of disapproval of the reorganization plans.

Mr. President, I have no special desire to see the resolution dealing with Reorganization Plan No. 12 brought up today. I am perfectly willing that it may be brought up on Monday or Tuesday of next week, or on any day within the deadline period. But I do say to the majority leader that, in view of the rule under which the resolutions must be processed to a final vote, with a deadline date, and in view of the special requirement that a resolution of disapproval must receive 49 votes to be adopted, 49 being a constitutional majority of the Senate, I think reasonable notice should be given of the time the resolutions will come up, so that all Senators interested may have an opportunity to be present and to vote.

So long as that procedure is followed and so long as we continue on the course which has been pursued during the last few days in regard to the motion to take up the FEPC bill, I am perfectly willing to agree at any time to have the resolutions relative to the reorganization plans come up at the convenience of the majority leader.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the Senate should, in line with ordinary procedure, adopt this resolution. If we put this matter off until next week, we shall become involved in an equally privileged matter, namely, a petition of cloture on the motion to take up the FEPC bill. Such a cloture petition will be only on the motion to take up the FEPC bill, not on the question of voting on the bill itself. In my opinion there is nothing to prevent the filing of such a cloture petition at any time the majority wishes to file it.

The statute provides that it shall be in order at any time to move to proceed to the consideration of reorganization plan resolutions, and that such motions

shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable.

Mr. President, we have here an extraordinary procedure, by which we have said that the President in effect may pass a law.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 is an attempt to repeal a law passed by the Congress only 3 years ago. It is substantive legislation. Yet a majority of this body by their votes cannot prevent the President from enacting that law; this body cannot prevent the President from enacting it unless we have 49 Members of the Senate in their seats and affirmatively voting on that question.

So an extraordinary privilege has been provided for in that connection; but, in turn, we have made this matter a highly privileged one.

It seems to be perfectly obvious that resolutions of disapproval of this kind, which have been on the calendar for 2 weeks, long before the motion even was made to have the Senate take up the FEPC bill, should have been allowed by the majority leader to be brought up for consideration upon the request of the Senators who sponsor the resolutions.

It seems to me obvious that the time to take up this particular resolution of disapproval is this week, for if we wait until next week to consider it, we shall then be confronted with eight different reorganization plans which have been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; and under the rule, each of those plans may be debated for 10 hours. Perhaps that time can be reduced by majority action, but whether that can be done I do not know.

However, if we postpone the consideration of all these reorganization plans until next week, then, regardless of what the majority leader says, I am sure that Senators who are opposed to the resolutions of disapproval may successfully filibuster to a point where we shall not be able to vote on these measures, even though they are highly privileged. It seems to me that that situation is particularly likely to occur if we wait to take up the resolutions at the same time we take up another highly privileged matter, namely, a petition of cloture on the motion to consider the FEPC bill, a petition which may come up next week. That petition is perhaps equally privileged.

Therefore, it seems obvious to me that the time to take up the resolution affecting Reorganization Plan No. 12, and vote on it, is this week.

We have given notice of this matter to Senators who are now campaigning and to Senators who are necessarily absent at home. We have notified them that this reorganization plan will be taken up tomorrow. We have given them that notice so that they can be here at that time. We did so only after the majority leader refused to give notice to such Senators, so that they could be here.

I repeatedly asked the majority leader to give such notice, but he consistently refused to do so. Finally, we had to say that on that date we would move to have the resolution considered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the floor when the Senator from Ohio is through.

Mr. TAFT. I am not through, but I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Ohio has said, I simply wish to state that the majority leader will guarantee that the Senate will act upon all these resolutions on or before May 23. There will be no question about that.

What I am trying to do is to permit the House of Representatives to act upon some of the reorganization plans first. In view of the claims which have been made in regard to the votes which will be had on some of the reorganization plans in the House of Representatives, perhaps we might not have to consider one or two of the resolutions in the Senate, if they can be considered in the House of Representatives first. In other words, I am trying to save some time for the Senate. Apparently other Senators do not wish to save time.

Many Senators wish to speak upon almost every other conceivable question, totally ignoring the question before the Senate. It seems to me only fair that under these circumstances the Senate should give the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote first upon this reorganization plan, and that we should continue to consider the motion to take up the FEPC bill, and should continue with that motion until Monday or Tuesday, at which time we can then take up this reorganization matter, and can dispose at that time not only of this particular reorganization plan, which has been reported adversely, but of any and all other reorganization plans, in order.

I guarantee that we will finish with all of them by the night of May 23.

So far as concerns the cloture petition on the motion to take up the FEPC bill, I did state that probably we would file it next week.

However, under the circumstances, if 10 hours will be taken upon each and every one of the reorganization plans or the resolutions of disapproval of the plans, obviously the Senator from Illinois is not going to rush in with a cloture petition. I try to be a fairly reasonable man. I believe I understand a thing or two about what is going on around the Senate.

All I am trying to do is to expedite action on the business of the Senate.

When Members of the House of Representatives have told me that the House will take up Reorganization Plan No. 12 and probably some of the other reorganization plans, it seems to me that when we are in the midst of debate on a motion to take up the FEPC bill, a measure the passage of which has been requested time after time by the Republican leaders, we should continue with that measure or the debate on the motion to take it up, and should not interrupt that procedure for the time being by proceeding to consider Reorganization Plan No. 12, especially when we know that we shall act on Reorganization Plan No. 12 and all other reorganization plans in due course, and before May 23.

Therefore, I appeal to my friends in the Senate to defeat the motion to take up Reorganization Plan No. 12, when that motion is made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only a few words to add.

The House of Representatives has the same problem that we here in the Senate face, namely, the problem of getting a constitutional majority to vote to disapprove a reorganization plan. However, the House of Representatives has a much more difficult job in getting a constitutional majority to vote to disapprove a reorganization plan, because I believe the last quorum calls in the House, during the consideration by the House of the appropriation bill, this week, disclosed the presence of not more than 350 Members of the House; and under the rule, the affirmative votes of 218 Members of the House are required to disapprove a reorganization plan. In short, it is doubtful whether the House will be able to defeat any of the reorganization plans.

Certainly, therefore, it seems to me that we in the Senate should consider these very important reorganization plans; it seems to me that they should be considered in the Senate, where there is a possibility of having all Members present, especially those who are interested in the matter.

We have given that notice to Senators now absent, who are planning to be here tomorrow, in some cases at great inconvenience to themselves, but who nevertheless have planned to be here for that purpose.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 248; and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The resolution will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 248), Calendar No. 1527, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I withdraw that request. But I have requested the yeas and nays on the motion to take up the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are necessarily absent on official business at the White House in connection with their duties as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is also absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] who is detained on official business is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who is detained at the White House reading the loyalty files as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—50

Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Jenner	Robertson
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kerr	Sparkman
Cordon	Knowland	Stennis
Donnell	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Ecton	McCarthy	Tobey
Ellender	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	McKellar	Wherry
George	Malone	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hill	Maybank	Young
Hoey	Millikin	

NAYS—22

Aiken	Ives	Neely
Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Benton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Douglas	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Lucas	Withers
Hendrickson	McFarland	
Humphrey	Myers	

NOT VOTING—24

Brewster	Gillette	Magnuson
Capehart	Graham	Morse
Darby	Green	Murray
Downey	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Hunt	Pepper
Flanders	Lodge	Taylor
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McMahon	Vandenberg

So Mr. TAFT's motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 248) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday in colloquy with the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] I think I made my position plain as to the time which should be allotted for debate on the FEPC. In the course of those remarks I stated I felt that in order to expedite the business of the Senate, privileged matters ought to take their place along with the debate on the FEPC bill and be disposed of as promptly as possible. At that time I stated I felt that ample time should be given to the presentation of the FEPC bill; I so believe, and so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned, that will be his position. I feel that when privileged matters come up, however, if unanmous consent can be obtained to limit debate in the interest of the pending measure or of any other measure, it ought to be done.

I stated then that I would be glad to work out with the acting majority leader or with the majority leader a unanimous-consent agreement to limit the time on the resolution, if the motion to take up this reorganization plan were agreed to. I have a unanimous-consent request prepared. I do not in any way want to take over the program of the majority leader. I should like to ask him whether he has a plan, and, if he has, I should like to hear it; if not, I should like to present this unanimous-consent request in order to limit debate on the plan as much as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no plan, and this is the first I have known about a unanimous-consent agreement having been drawn up for presentation by the minority leader. Not long ago, after I had been away from the Senate for 2 or 3 days, I presented a unanimous-consent request. I thought the Senator from Nebraska understood what had been more or less agreed upon between him and those who had been acting in my place. The Senator rather took offense because I proposed a unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator now comes along with one already written. The majority leader does not know anything about it at all. Senators on the other side of the aisle have scored a little victory, now, under peculiar circumstances, and immediately they want to present a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. President, under the rule, as I understand, 10 hours of debate are allowed. This is a very important question, and I think we had better debate it a while and then discuss a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer the unanimous-consent request, anyway.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to know how the time in this discussion will be charged into the 10 hours allowed by law for the discussion of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the time will be equally divided between the two sides. Prior to the beginning of the debate, the Chair thinks the time should probably be divided half and half.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent request.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That debate on said Senate Resolution 248 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950, shall be limited to 3 hours; that 1 hour of said time shall be devoted to the consideration of the said resolution on today; that on tomorrow, May 11, the Senate shall resume the consideration of said resolution at 12 o'clock noon, and vote on the question of agreeing to said resolution at the hour of 2 o'clock p. m.

Ordered further, That the time for debate on the part of the proponents of the resolution shall be controlled by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and on the part of the opponents by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, let me say, Mr. President, that I can understand the desire of the majority leader to expedite the debate on the FEPC matter, but this resolution is before us and those favoring or opposing it could debate it for 10 hours. The offer has been made to debate it for only 3 hours, and to vote at a specified time tomorrow.

Last week I gave notice that at the conclusion of the vote on Resolution 248, I would ask to bring up for consideration a resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I should like to amend the unanimous-consent request to provide that after the vote has been taken at 2 o'clock tomorrow on Resolution 248, the Senate

take up the resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1, and limit the debate to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side, and then vote on that resolution. In that way we shall have disposed of these two resolutions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Virginia will not attach that amendment to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If it is not attached to this request, I shall submit it separately.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept the amendment. It will expedite matters so that both resolutions will be out of the way by 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I object.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, whatever is included in the unanimous-consent request I would be constrained to object. But before I do so, I should like to say that I am very grateful to my friends on the other side of the aisle for working out this unanimous-consent request and providing for time. It is very kind of them to do that. I know how much they would like to have the debate concluded within a short time. But in view of what happened last year with respect to the Taft substitute, when the distinguished Senator from Ohio undertook to abolish the power of the general counsel and the general counsel himself, it seems to me this is an extremely important measure. Now that the matter is before the Senate, I am certainly going to object, because we shall take the full 10 hours to debate the measure if we can.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the RECORD will show that the unanimous-consent request offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska was modified to include the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will show that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me it is important to dispose of this resolution as promptly as may be possible, and certainly it is important to dispose of the FEPC matter as promptly as may be possible. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has already been made.

Mr. LUCAS. I have already objected.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then may I make a motion?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know; I am not the Parliamentarian.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it is important that we expedite proceedings in connection with both these resolutions, we should proceed and lose no time.

I know the majority leader has given his assurance to the opponents of the FEPC bill that he would not hold the Senate in session beyond a reasonable time in the discussion of the question. He certainly will not recede from that, and I would be the last one to urge him to do so. But there is no reason why we cannot remain until 8, 9, or 10 o'clock to discuss the important resolution which has been submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate remain in continuous session until 9 o'clock tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot agree with my friend from New York.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment.

I know how important the FEPC bill is to Senators on both sides of the aisle, to its proponents and its opponents. I also realize the importance of this particular resolution. In view of the fact that it has been bandied around a great deal in the past year, I do not propose now to hold the Senate until 9 or 10 o'clock tonight and find that we do not have a quorum about the time when we may want to vote. I do not suppose that we would be able to vote by that time, but there is always a possibility around 9 o'clock of doing almost anything to the majority leader. It has happened to me a number of times, and I do not propose that it shall happen again. I see no reason why we should remain here late tonight in connection with this matter, any more than we should remain late in connection with FEPC. There is no more reason for getting the debate in connection with FEPC over as rapidly as possible than there is in connection with the resolution which is now pending before the Senate. The Senator from Illinois, if he can obtain the floor around 6 o'clock, will move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorow.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the fact that a majority of the Senate has voted to lay aside the FEPC matter at the first opportunity today, does the Senator from Illinois really think there is any need for continuing debate on it? Is there not a good deal of shadow-boxing going on, and is there any likelihood that there will be any FEPC legislation at this session?

Mr. LUCAS. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, there is going to be FEPC legislation if by his vigor and his vote he can secure its passage. It goes back to what I said in the beginning, that it is a strange and unusual procedure that Senators who have been constantly crying from the housetops for action on FEPC, would now vote to set aside that measure, when the Senator from Illinois, as majority leader, has definitely guaranteed that this resolution would be taken up not later than Tuesday next. I do not know who is interested in FEPC, and I do not know about the shadow-boxing to which the Senator from Vermont has referred. Every Senator will have to be his own judge as to that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. May we have a ruling as to when the 10-hour debate begins?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has already begun.

Mr. TAFT. How is it charged?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It began at 4:45 p. m. and it is being charged to each side.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that the motion to take up Reorganization Plan No. 12 does not dispose of the FEPC matter? Is it not correct that it will automatically come before the Senate after the pending resolution is disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. That is an elementary question, Mr. President. I thought every Senator understood that. However, we thank the Senator from Nebraska for again expounding his knowledge on the floor and for getting us straightened out on a very difficult question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. While I shall not press the motion which the eminent Presiding Officer of the Senate declared to be out of order, because I see no chance of its being adopted, may I ask the Chair for an explanation as to why the motion which the junior Senator from New York made was out of order? That is my parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not a motion which is contemplated under rule XXII. The Senate is considering a privileged matter. The motion made by the junior Senator from New York is not a motion which is contemplated by rule XXII.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the resolution that is now before the Senate as a privileged matter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one short statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In view of the fact that no unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into, it is my present intention, when the Senate convenes tomorrow, to move for a limitation of debate on my motion, unless at that time some limitation has been provided. The proponents are quite willing to limit debate to an hour and a half for their side. I have not consulted the opponents. They may wish a longer time. However, whatever seems to be adequate would be agreeable. Accordingly tomorrow morning at 12 o'clock I shall make a motion to limit debate, so that this matter may be disposed of tomorrow at a reasonable hour and that plan No. 1 may also be disposed of, if the Senate wishes to take up the consideration of plan No. 1.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Who is in control of the time on each side of the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule does not provide for any control of the time. The proponents and the opponents have an equal amount of time, and 10 hours is the limit.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was merely trying to find out who is in control of the time for each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No one is in control of the time. It is a matter of recognition by the Chair.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Chair designate a Senator to be in control of the time on each side. I do not myself care to control the time and I do not wish to be held responsible for it. However, it would be perfectly agreeable to me if the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] be in control of the time for the proponents of the resolution. I believe that someone should be designated to control the time allotted to the opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] yield for the purpose of the Senator from Arkansas making a motion that Senators be designated to control the time of debate on each side?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the proponents be in charge of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the time of the opponents be in charge of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Assuming we debate for 10 hours, and assuming that the proponents of the measure do not use the 5 hours allotted to them, can the opponents of the measure use any of proponent's time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, we are limited to 5 hours on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Neither side may use more than 5 hours.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object to the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] desired to make a motion, and the Chair asked the Senator from Minnesota whether he would yield for the purpose of making a motion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said that it would be agreeable to me, provided I did not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With that understanding, does the Senator from Arkansas desire to make his motion?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Chair designate a Senator to be in charge of the time allotted to the opponents, and designate a Senator to be in charge of the time allotted to the proponents.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood that the motion referred only to the proponents of the resolution, not to the opponents.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In that event, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the author of the resolution, be in charge of the time of the proponents of the resolution, and that the able Senator from Minnesota be in charge of the time of the opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard

Mr. LUCAS. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has objected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is a little difficult to understand how the minority leader can do some of the things that he does.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I objected because I thought it was only right to recognize the majority leader as the one who should be in charge of the time on the other side. I had no other reason in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not wish my objection to be regarded in any way as criticism of the Senator from Minnesota. However, I did not think it was right to ignore the majority leader.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I certainly did not want to circumvent or ignore the majority leader. I was merely trying to bring the matter to a head so that we would know where we were and who was responsible for the time allotted to this debate. Therefore I moved that the Chair make the appointments. I have no desire to place anyone in charge.

Several Senators rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I feel that time is now being used by the opponents of this resolution, and I wish to carry on with the remarks which I have prepared on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, did the Senator observe that I requested permission to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very sorry that I feel I cannot yield to my good friend from Missouri, because I have already refused to yield to other Senators. I do not think it would be appropriate to do so. I may say, Mr. President, that it was the intention of the Senator from Minnesota to indicate that the time of the opponents of the measure was in the hands and control of the majority leader. We discussed the matter with the majority leader. He is the majority leader. On the floor of the Senate he represents the proponents of the reorganization plan. I speak with his concurrence and as one of those who supports his position.

The President's Reorganization Plan No. 12 should be permitted to operate. Resolution 248, sponsored by the senior Senator from Ohio, should be rejected. Our case is based on the facts, not on apprehensions, speculation, conjecture, or other assorted devices which have been used in an attempt to discredit Plan No. 12.

Mr. President, I have never been known to have a frail voice, but I submit that the combined opposition of the Senate is a little too much for me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Apparently some Senators have difficulty settling down after the parliamentary tactics which have just been indulged in. I am not so much interested in parliamentary tactics, Mr. President, as I am in the substance of the proposal which is now pending before the Senate. It is legislation that should be considered, not maneuvered.

I shall assume, and I believe, too, that what the Senate is interested in is a just and efficient administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. If we can demonstrate that plan No. 12 will provide such just and efficient administration, Senate Resolution 248 will be rejected.

My position on the Taft-Hartley law is well known and I am still sticking by it. But as long as it is the law of the land, pro- and anti-Taft-Hartley-ites have an obligation to have it administered wisely and efficiently. It is not now being wisely administered.

Let us take a look at plan 12 against the backdrop of past and present labor-relations legislation.

The first systematic piece of legislation to deal with labor-management relations in the United States was the National Labor Relations Act, passed in 1935. We know the act better as the Wagner Act.

The Wagner Act did two important things: It set up a representation procedure whereby workers could freely determine whom they wanted to represent them in collective bargaining. And it also specified a series of employer unfair labor practices which the Congress had found were interfering with labor's right of free association. In short, the Wagner Act dealt with representation and with employer unfair labor practices. That is a brief summary of the purposes and the objectives of the Wagner Act.

To administer these two broad categories of cases, the Wagner Act provided for a National Labor Relations Board headed by a three-man commission.

The Board set up what amounts to a three-stage procedure for the handling of unfair labor practices, charges, complaints, decisions. It worked something like this: A union filed a charge alleging certain unfair labor practices. If after investigation the regional director found merit to the charge he issued a complaint. If the charge presented novel or

unsettled issues he might in a few instances check with Board personnel in Washington as to whether he should issue the complaint or not. Or, as was true in the vast and overwhelming majority of charges which came to the field offices, the field examiner who investigated that charge was able to effect an acceptable settlement and the union withdrew its charge. The case would then end there.

If a complaint was issued, a hearing before a trial examiner was held. The trial examiner issued an intermediate report. Frequently, the intermediate report was acceptable to the parties involved. If not, the case went to the National Labor Relations Board, which issued a decision based on the record made before the trial examiner.

An employer was not legally obligated to abide by the Board's order until it had been reviewed by a circuit court of appeals. Only after the court had upheld the Board's order, in whole or in part, was there a legal obligation on an employer to comply. If after investigation it was found that the employer had not complied with a court order, he was then subject to contempt penalties. So much for unfair-labor-practice cases under the Wagner Act.

In representation cases, the process was somewhat simpler. Upon investigation that a question of representation existed, the regional director ordered an election in the appropriate unit. The results of the election were certified. But the results carried no sanction at all unless an employer refused to bargain on the basis of the election results. And then only if the union filed a labor-practice charge. At that point the charge was processed as I have indicated for unfair-labor-practice cases.

Conforming generally to the recommendations made by the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure in 1941, the National Labor Relations Board effected certain changes in internal procedure. These changes had the effect of establishing a marked separation between the personnel engaged in following through a complaint, and those like trial examiners and Board members engaged in rendering a decision after a hearing on the complaint.

I again call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Attorney General's committee on procedure in 1941 outlined what was considered to be good administrative policy for administrative organizations which had the function of not only holding hearings and arriving at facts, but also of conducting prosecutions and making decisions.

The Taft-Hartley law drastically amended the Wagner Act. To the employer unfair practices, it added union or employee unfair labor practices. It gave the Board, acting through the general counsel, the power to enjoin certain unfair labor practices on the part of the unions in the courts.

But for our purposes, the discussion of plan 12, the most important change which Taft-Hartley affected was a complete and total separation of authority between the issuance of complaint and the issuance of a decision. The issuance of a complaint in an unfair labor practice charge became the sole prerogative of the newly established office of general counsel. The National Labor Relations Act of 1947 put the supervision of field and all legal personnel—with a few exceptions—under the general counsel. The Board retained the power to appoint. But by a formal delegation of authority a few months after the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, the Board gave complete authority for the operation of the field offices and Washington administration to the general counsel.

It also gave him the authority to appoint all personnel short of the Board's own staff. This delegation carried with it the investigative functions preceding a representation case which the act retained in the Board.

Now, what does plan 12 do? In brief it transfers the general counsel's policy-making function to the Board as a whole. I wish to emphasize that plan No. 12 transfers the most important of the general counsel's policy-making functions to the National Labor Relations Board. It also transfers certain housekeeping day-to-day operating functions to the chairman but under general Board policy.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I wish to have printed in the RECORD a detailed analysis of plan No. 12, in order to conserve the time of the Senate. I hope that those who will vote upon the acceptance or rejection of this plan will carefully study the analysis of the plan, and see exactly what is contemplated by the reorganization move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Spelled out in greater detail here is what plan 12 does.

1. Plan 12 sets up for the Board an organizational pattern consistent with the pattern of other regulatory agencies. The NLRB is unique among regulatory commissions in being subjected to a sawing in half of the investigatory and decision-making functions. No other regulatory commission has imposed on it by statute an independent general counsel.

As the President said in his plan 12 message, "This action eliminates a basic defect in the present organization of the National Labor Relations Board and provides an organizational pattern consistent with that established for the other regulatory agencies" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3240).

2. In order to bring the NLRB into conformity with the organization structure of the other regulatory agencies, plan 12, as the President's accompanying message says, "restores unified authority and responsibility in the Board" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 13, p. 3242).

3. Plan 12 "restores unified authority in the Board" by dividing up the general counsel's and the Board's functions into two categories. One category of functions set forth in section 1 of plan 12 are the administrative and executive functions. In case there is any doubt as to what the administrative and executive functions are, the plan itself indicates the order of function involved by specifying (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the distribution of business among personnel and among administrative units, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds.

The administrative and executive functions on the order of those specifically enumerated above are transferred to the chairman. But with respect to these functions the chairman is not a free agent. In carrying out any of his functions under the provisions of this section, (b) (1) of the plan states, the chairman shall be governed by general policies of the Board and by such regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations as the Board may by law be authorized to make.

The chairman's authority with respect to these functions is limited in two other respects. Subsection (b) (2) makes the appointment by the chairman of the heads of the major administrative units under the Board subject to the approval of the Board. And personnel employed regularly and full time in the immediate offices of the members of the Board other than the chairman are not covered under the chairman's authority. Finally subsection (4) further limits the chairman's administrative and executive functions by reserving to the Board the revision of budget estimates and determining the distribution of appropriated funds according to major programs and purposes.

Section 2 of the plan authorizes the chairman to delegate his authority to any officer, employee, or administrative units under his jurisdiction.

4. The other category of functions previously exercised by the general counsel are what might be referred to as the high policy-making functions—the functions that have to do with issuing or refusing to issue complaints. Section 3 of the plan asserts "All functions of the general counsel of the Board not transferred by the provisions of section 1 of this reorganization plan are hereby transferred to the Board."

We have seen that the order of functions transferred to the chairman directly subject to control by the Board have to do with personnel, work allocation, and finances. In the context of the total area of responsibilities carried on by the general counsel, section 1 clearly excludes the complaint-issuing functions of the general counsel and section 3, in turn, clearly transfers the functions not included in section 1 to the Board.

The President, in submitting plan 12, said:

"In regard to the regulatory agencies, the plans distinguish between two groups of functions necessary to the conduct of these agencies. One group includes the substantive aspects of regulation, that is, the determination of policies, the formulation and issuance of rules, and the adjudication of cases. All these functions are left in the board or commission as a whole. The other group of functions comprises the day-to-day direction and internal administration of the complex staff organizations which the commissions require. These responsibilities are transferred to the chairmen of the agencies to be discharged in accordance with the policies which the commissions may establish. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 13, p. 3240).

Later in his message the President states: "The fact that, under these reorganization plans, the commissions retain all substantive responsibilities deserves special emphasis. The plans only eliminate multiheaded supervision of internal administrative functioning. The commissions retain policy control over administrative activities since they are subject to the general policies and regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations of the commissions" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 13, p. 3242).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in summary, the language of the plan leaves no room for doubt that the policy-making, complaint-issuing functions go to the Board and not to the chairman.

Let me recapitulate. The clear language of plan 12 and the accompanying Presidential message add up to this:

First. Plan 12 brings the National Labor Relations Board into conformity with the organizational pattern for the other regulatory commissions.

Second. Plan No. 12 does this by transferring the general counsel's investigative-complaint issuing functions to the Board, and transferring the business functions previously exercised by the general counsel and the Board, to the Chairman of the Board, in other words, placing in the Chairman of the Board the general housekeeping function, the internal administrative responsibilities, where they appropriately belong.

The present division of authority between the Board and the general counsel has made for an administrative monstrosity. Whether you are for Taft-Hartley or against Taft-Hartley has nothing to do with it.

Confusion of policy and enforcement, overlapping, and duplication of functions are bad in any piece of legislation. The glaring defects which arise out of a statutory separation can be documented by citing chapter and verse. And this is precisely what I am going to do. I am going to show that the existence of an independent general counsel side by side with an independent Board is bad administration, all within one agency.

One issue in controversy which has received considerable public airing has been the conflict between the Board and the general counsel over jurisdiction, a continuous argument between the general counsel and between members of the Board as to just where the respective spheres of activity and powers rest.

Mr. Denham, the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, made his position quite clear as early as 2 years ago in response to a question from Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, who was chairman of a House subcommittee in the Eighty-first Congress. Mr. HOFFMAN asked:

> There is no business, then, that you would not have jurisdiction over?

The general counsel replied:

> I can conceive very few businesses over which there is not at least technical jurisdiction.

In other words, as our minority report points out—and that minority report is available for study by Senators—the general counsel thinks the Taft-Hartley law gives him the power to go into every nook and cranny of the Nation's economy.

The Board thinks otherwise. They have said time and again, and they have said it explicitly to the general counsel since early in 1948, that the purposes of the Labor-Management Relations Act will not be served by penetrating into every grocery store and drug store.

The subcommittee which I just referred to, of which Mr. HOFFMAN was chairman, was highly critical of the general counsel's position. And certainly Mr. CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, cannot be considered unfriendly either to the Taft-Hartley Act or to the general counsel. The subcommittee stated:

> The subcommittee is of the opinion that this new interpretation proposed by the general counsel of the Board to be placed upon the term "affecting commerce" is not warranted either by the previous history of interpretation and administration of the Wagner Act, by the debates on the bill, or by the terms of the act itself; that such interpretation is not necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act (H. Rept. 2050, 80th Cong., 2d sess., 1948, p. 5).

I am not arguing that the general counsel is wrong and the Board is right. Nor am I arguing the other way—that the Board is wrong and the general counsel is right.

I am arguing that intelligent and intelligible administration of a statute is defeated if unions, management, and the public are continuously confronted with two diametrically opposed viewpoints emanating from the same agency.

If there ever was confusion confounded, and legalistic gobbledygook confounded, it happens to be in the National Labor Relations Board in its relationship with the general counsel's office. Today literally hundreds of businessmen and hundreds of unions are in complete bewilderment because of the difference of interpretation and different viewpoints emanating from two sections of the same agency, relative to the meaning of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. They have the interpretation of the general counsel, who says he is free from any supervision by the Board, and that his is the true interpretation of the National Labor Relations Act, and they have the Board's interpretation.

What about the field employees of the Board who have the job of advising unions and management as to whether they are covered or not? To whom shall they listen? The general counsel, who is their boss says one thing. The Board decisions, to which they have to look for policy guidance, say something else.

The policy conflict is the sort of conflict that can take place between reasonable people. If it is not over jurisdiction, it can be over secondary boycott or any one of the provisions of a statute.

What I am trying to say is that this conflict exists not because the statute is unclear on jurisdiction or on anything else. No one has ever succeeded in framing a statute which is so definite and precise that it needs no interpretation. No, what we are confronted with is not vagueness but separation which makes it possible for one agency, or at least nominally one agency, to stand for two different things at the same time.

For further support we can turn to no less an authority than the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio who almost a year ago said:

> The difficulty which arose with the independent general counsel was that he took a different view of the jurisdiction of the Board than did the Board itself. He would bring a case which he thought was covered by the act. After a year's litigation the Board would rule that it was not covered by the act. In the last analysis the Board determined the result, but in the meantime there was confusion. There was difference of opinion. There was difficulty in the separation of powers (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 7, p. 8586).

Nobody has really put it more succinctly. There was confusion. There was difficulty in the separation of powers. The senior Senator from Ohio was absolutely right. By the way, the solution proposed by the senior Senator from Ohio was the elimination of the independent office of general counsel.

The ugly consequences of separation of authority are also revealed in the problem of enforcing Board orders.

The Board is empowered to enforce its orders in the courts. That is, it is the Board's responsibility to petition the circuit court for a review of Board orders. As I have already said, the Board order has no meaning unless a circuit court orders a respondent to comply.

Now this kind of enforcement work can only be done by lawyers. But the statute specifically puts all lawyers except legal assistants to individual Board members under the supervision of the general counsel.

So here we have a situation where the Board is required to enforce its orders, and the law requires that the general counsel, who does not believe in the Board's orders, shall represent the Board before the circuit court in the enforcement of orders that he himself may oppose or be in complete and total opposition to.

In several cases in which the Board's order differed from the position which the general counsel took when he issued the complaint, the general counsel has refused to go into the circuit court and seek enforcement of the Board's order. The general counsel said he would be embarrassed if he took a position before a circuit court which differed from the position he took in issuing the complaint.

Let me present an example. Indeed in the Haleston Drug case, a very familiar case in the annals of labor-management relations law, the general counsel informed the Board that he might wish to go into court on his own so that he could state his point of view which was opposed to the Board's.

This is confusion again confounded. Here we have one agency, one law, and the general counsel is supposed to be the enforcement officer under that law. Then what happens? In a very important case before the National Labor Relations Board, in which a ruling has been made, the general counsel says he would like to go into court on his own, not for the Board. To do what? To fight the Board's ruling, a Board which is supposed to be working in conjunction with and in cooperation with the general counsel. Here again the interested public would have been regaled with the sight of the Government of the United States arguing for two opposing positions in one case. Literally it would be talking out of both sides of its mouth.

In another case the Board had to direct the general counsel to omit from a brief a statement of his position which he took as independent general counsel,

a statement which was opposed to the position which the Board was making before the court.

This is a sort of Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde business. On the one hand, he is supposed to be the agent of the Board, and on the other hand, he is supposed to be his own agent, representing his own interpretations, even though the law requires that the general counsel's office represent the National Labor Relations Board before the court.

The confusion caused by separation has spread to Board employees. It is almost an impossible situation.

In 1947 the National Labor Relations Board delegated its appointing authority over the field staff of the Board to the general counsel. That was done for purposes of convenience and to clarify the law so that there could be some coordination of activity. In 1949 it withdrew part of its delegation, to the extent that regional directors may still be named by the general counsel, but they have to be approved by the Board.

I know this must sound very confusing, Mr. President; and I say quite candidly that it is confusing. Those of us who have to spend a great deal of time in endeavoring to understand the relationship between the general counsel of the Board and the Board find it almost impossible to understand.

The general counsel challenges the right of the Board to withdraw its delegation, and says he has sole authority to appoint regional directors. Mark my words, Mr. President; back in 1947 the Board gave to the general counsel the right to make those particular appointments, and now the general counsel says that he alone has authority to appoint the regional directors, and he challenges the right of the Board to withdraw its delegation of that power to him.

The Administrative Division—in other words, the division which has control of the housekeeping activities of this administrative agency—and which works for the Board and for the general counsel, is, therefore, caught between the conflicting contentions of the Board and the general counsel.

In other words, Mr. President, we have a group of Federal employees who are supposed to be carrying out the responsibilities of recruiting certain persons for positions as regional directors. On the one hand, the Board says, "We have the responsibility of appointing the persons to be regional directors." On the other hand, the general counsel says, "Oh, no; you do not; you gave that responsibility to me back in 1947, and now that you have given it to me, you cannot withdraw it."

So, an entire agency of the Federal Government, which has been given a sizable appropriation, is confronted with that perplexing problem. Its employees do not know whether they should take orders from the general counsel or whether they should take orders from the National Labor Relations Board itself.

The Board members have stated in their uncontradicted testimony before our committee that they found they had to withdraw part of the delegation because Board employees were reflecting the general counsel's viewpoints on representation cases, although those representation cases are within the sole province of the Board.

There is substantial evidence that the rights of due processes had been impaired, too, as a result of the separation. This is quite ironic because the reasons given for the separation of the general counsel and the Board in the Taft-Hartley law were to strengthen due processes.

In a very real sense it can be said that the general counsel is indeed a judge, jury, and prosecutor. Mr. President, the judge, jury, and prosecutor role of the general counsel stems from his unlimited authority to refuse to issue complaints.

Here we have a situation in which one man without reason or explanation may refuse to bring cases before the Board's consideration. This is much too much power to remain in the hands of one man.

Here is the situation which a litigant before the Board is confronted with: A union or management representative files a charge with the regional director. The regional director requests advice from the general counsel's office. Many new cases, I am advised, arise. A special unit handles these requests for advice. Let us assume that the office of the general counsel says that the complaint should not issue. This information is transmitted to the litigant. He says to the regional director, "Is there any way in which I can get an appeal from this decision?" "Sure," says the regional director, "send one to the general counsel." Whereupon the appeal is filed, but it is handled by the same unit in the general counsel's office which originally advised the regional director not to issue a complaint.

That does not seem very much like due process of law or equal protection under the law. It seems to me that is a farce; I repeat that it is a farce on the right of appeal.

If Senators think this criticism is made only by persons who want to change the Taft-Hartley law, I want to call attention to the observation made on this point by the task force of the Hoover Commission. I want to remind Senators that the task force appointed by former President Hoover was composed of Owen D. Young, a distinguished American industrialist, and Prof. Robert R. Bowie, a noted professor of administrative law at Harvard University. This is what they said:

> In unfair-labor-practice cases regional directors issue complaints but only with the approval of the general counsel in some types of cases. The finality of refusal to issue complaint has led to demands for appeal; and it has been urged that an appeal to the same unit in the counsel's office whose advice was followed in the original refusal is illusory and that the appeal should be to an independent body. This problem highlights the nature of the authority the general counsel is exercising.

Mr. President, that task force of the Hoover Commission came to the same conclusion to which any other citizen would come, namely, that if the general counsel has refused to issue a complaint, an appeal from that decision of refusal should not go for determination to the one who made the refusal in the first place.

The general counsel himself has said and, by the way, this statement is quoted by the Hoover Commission Task Force:

> The incumbent, Mr. Robert Denham, has noted that his powers are "broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency."

The Hoover Commission Task Force points to the illusory character of the appeals procedure in the general counsel's office. The general counsel himself refers to his powers as broad and absolute.

I just cannot see how the opponents of plan No. 12 who say that they are interested in due process can support such broad and absolute powers in one man in an executive agency of the Government.

The incumbent general counsel himself conceded in the hearings on this very proposal, plan 12, that he probably had too much power and suggested that appeal be established to the district court. I shall have something more to say about the alternative but at this time I want to make the point that the incumbent himself, testifying before a committee, recognizes the scope and breadth of his powers. He said he had too much.

When we add up the ingredients of separation—policy confusion, duplication, and overlapping of functions—what we get is a drastic reorientation of the philosophy of government in labor relations.

As I understood the purposes of the Wagner Act and as I understood the good-faith protestations of the supporters of the Taft-Hartley law, the only role of government that made any sense in the field of labor relations was remedial, not punitive.

We realize that if we were constantly to pit unions against management as perpetual adversaries, that we would have a state of constant belligerence, or labor-management warfare.

The reorientation which the office of the general counsel has injected into the labor-management situation is one of punishment instead of settlement. Indeed, the general counsel in many of his observations through the last 2½ years has referred to himself, not as a general counsel, but as a prosecutor. I think he is right. He is a prosecutor. And he is a prosecutor because the statutory role which the Taft-Hartley law assigned him is that of a prosecutor. He is doing exactly what the law says. There is no reason to believe that any other incumbent would act differently. This is not a question of whether a man has the right personality. It is not a question of whether he sleeps well at night and wakes up with a smile on his face. It is a question of law that the general counsel's office, as an independent agency or an independent function, has within itself the ingredients of prosecution and of the prosecutor's office.

I submit, Mr. President, that the record will bear out the statement I am about to make. Mr. Styles, the newest

member of the Board—was a former regional director—confirmed unanimously by the Senate, he made this point very clearly, and Mr. Styles is worth listening to because he came to Board membership after a long period of service as a field representative of the Board. He told the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that "One of the great weaknesses of the general counsel concept has been the difficulty of administration at the regional level because people wanted to litigate; people said, 'this is a statute under which you prosecute, now get out there and prosecute'." Mr. Styles says that he noticed a tendency for the field personnel to drop their settlement efforts to a large degree. He brought out in his testimony that their efforts seemed to be in the direction of legal prosecution.

Chairman Herzog, speaking for a unanimous board before the committee—and I want to underline the word "unanimous"—gave us uncontroverted statistics that there was more litigation, relatively speaking, than less as a result of the separation of power. Here is what Chairman Herzog had to say:

> Under the present dispensation a great many more cases actually do go to complaint and hearing than did during the period when we had a single administration of the statute. During the last year of the Wagner Act about 7½ percent of the unfair labor practices cases went to hearing; over the entire 12 years it was 9½ percent * * *. It is the ones that go to hearing * * * that are the expensive ones. During the last 2½ years the figure of cases going to hearings—

That is, hearings in the field, before the Board—

> is 14.1 percent which is a great many more. Let me say this, in fairness, however; if consolidations are considered, the figure drops to 11.6 percent.

That is published in the minority views, Report 1516, on page 23, but this is the testimony of Mr. Herzog before the Senate committee.

Even when a comparison is made of the types of cases which were common to both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, that is, the cases of unfair-labor practices against employers, a much larger proportion of these cases has gone to hearings under the Taft-Hartley law than was true under the Wagner Act.

Thirteen and three-tenths percent of the Taft-Hartley section 8 (a) cases have gone to complaint and hearing. This is twice as many cases of the same type which went to complaint and hearing during the last year of the Wagner Act.

I think our minority views sized the situation up pretty well. The report setting forth the minority views was concurred in by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who has great insight into labor-management problems. He and I have not always agreed upon all matters of labor legislation, but I am sure that there is rather universal agreement at least between the two of us on the matter of the general counsel's office and of its separation of powers or functions. Here is what was said in that report of the minority views:

> These data—

That is, these percentage figures—

> show that the present dual structure is responsible for more adjudication than is required to get effective and fair administration of public policy.

It means, too, that there is a singular inability of the regional staffs and the general counsel to translate the decisions of the Board into action at the investigative and prosecution stages, in order to reduce the number of cases which have to run the full gamut of the Board processes. This is wasteful and it results in failure to get speedy adjudication of disputes.

This is not only the verdict of the minority views. It is also the verdict of a committee of some of the most distinguished legal minds of the country, appointed by the Attorney General, formerly Mr. Jackson, who at the present time is a member of the Supreme Court. In 1941, this significant Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure, said:

> Even where formal proceedings are fully available informal procedures constitute the vast bulk of administrative adjudication and are truly the life blood of the administrative processes. No study of administrative procedure can be adequate if it fails to recognize this fact and focus attention upon improvement at those stages.

This is from the report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedures in Government, page 35.

In short, what has been happening is that there has developed a clot, to use the Attorney General's committee's metaphor, in the lifeblood of the administrative processes.

The Attorney General's committee said this in 1941 and they applied it to all regulatory agencies. It is a tribute to their wisdom that what they said in 1941 as a general rule has been proved by what has happened in 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950, as a consequence of the separation of authority of the NLRB.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the wise decision and policy of the Attorney General's committee have worked out in practical application exactly as they said they would in the National Labor Relations Board's separation of authority. The committee said that if there were separation of authority the processes of fair and just administrative procedure would be stopped and that there would be confusion, duplication, and an overlapping of functions and responsibilities which would make for administrative chaos. I repeat, Mr. President, that is exactly what has happened, and no one can dispute the fact that the National Labor Relations Board's separation of functions of general counsel and Board is the only instance of the kind in the Government. It is a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, a violation of the Attorney General's committee policy, and a violation of any sensible, sound administrative practice.

I think that is best testified to by the fact that one of the authors of the bill, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], was one of the first to propose the abolition of the independent status of the general counsel's office. The fact that he does not want it abolished in this way does not remove the fact that it should be abolished. There is no argument between the senior Senator from Ohio and the junior Senator from Minnesota as to the need of abolishing such independent status. There seems to be some argument as to how it should be done and how far it should go.

With due respect to the motivations of my friends who have taken an opposite position on plan 12, I must say that if ever I saw an open-and-shut case of bad administration of a statute this is it. And it is not bad administration because the people are necessarily bad; it is bad administration because the principle of separation in a regulatory commission is bad.

In other words, it is simply a bad type of law in terms of administrative procedure. I am not talking about the content of the law. There are honest differences of opinion as to whether the Taft-Hartley law is a good or a bad law, in terms of our personal points of view. I am talking about the statute as it applies to administrative procedure, and I submit that the statute is indefensible.

Here is what makes it an open-and-shut case: First, a public conflict between the general counsel of the Board and the Board members over what constitutes the policy of the United States Government with respect to a single statute; second, unions and management plagued with doubt as to whether they are covered by a provision or are not covered by a provision, of a single statute; and third, the men and women of a single agency supervised by one branch but looking toward another branch for clarity. It simply cannot operate that way, Mr. President. This, to me, is government at its worst; it is indefensible government; it is government which goes into the depths of the worst confusion of administration. Persons who talk about good government and who believe in the Hoover Commission reports and in efficient government, surely could not defend this kind of an indefensible establishment.

The fourth point is that unions and management are going through needless litigation.

I am willing to admit that it is a sort of employment program for lawyers who may be called upon to ascertain what the general counsel means and what the Board means. But the purpose was not to provide an employment program for attorneys; it was to try to establish a body of rules and regulations by which labor-management relations might be properly conducted.

The fifth point is that there is one man with the power to deny access to an important remedial statute.

I repeat, the general counsel can deny the issuance of a complaint, and I repeat that the only appeal procedure, which is an indefensible procedure, is to appeal right back to the man who originally denied the issuance of the complaint.

If this is not an intolerable situation I do not know what is.

There is ample evidence that plan 12 will substantially improve the situation. It will improve the situation because it will substitute for the separation of authority, a single, unified line of responsibility and, as I shall show, it will insure a larger measure of justice than obtained under separation.

Plan 12 will eliminate confusion because there will be only one policy on jurisdiction. There will be only one point of view submitted to a circuit court. The Board's customers, in a manner of speaking, the unions, the employers, the individual workers who seek to use the Board's machinery will know what the Board's position is. They will not have to discover it by long-drawn-out litigation.

What is more, the personnel of the Board will not be suffering from split personalities. There will be only one voice which they have to listen to. They will be able to give authoritative advice to the union and management people who come to them. They will speak as representatives of one agency, not two agencies. In this respect the Board will be like every other regulatory agency.

That is, in substance, what plan 12 does. It puts some sense into administration. It makes it possible for an agency of government to speak with one voice, to give one decision, to have a uniformity of procedure, to have a uniformity of policy, and not to permit a sort of split personality on the part of the employees in trying to find out whether they should be loyal to the decision of the general counsel or loyal to the decision of the National Labor Relations Board.

Plan No. 12 will eliminate duplication and tend to improve efficiency.

The number of cases going to Board hearing will be minimized. There will be a greater number of settlements at the earlier stages. The relationships between the unions and their employers will not be aggravated so much by long-drawn-out litigation.

Jurisdictional disputes are inherent in the law, although it was designed to outlaw jurisdictional disputes. Under a law which was designed to outlaw jurisdictional disputes, there occur very serious jurisdictional disputes and right in the National Labor Relations Board.

Plan 12 would relieve the Board members of what appears to be the limitless possibility of controversy with the General Counsel. They will be able to spend more time thinking about their decisions and less time engaging in controversy with an independent general counsel.

Certainly there should be an improvement in morale on the part of Board personnel. We cannot have conflict going on without its having demoralizing effects on the people out on the firing line, in New York, San Francisco, Atlanta, Birmingham, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, or Denver.

The pattern of organization which plan No. 12 will usher in is a pattern that has been tried and proven as fair.

There are three sets of safeguards which the Board is mandated to apply to protect due process. These safeguards go beyond the safeguards for due process which the other regulatory commissions must abide by.

Obligatory on all regulatory commissions is the Administrative Procedure Act. The Administrative Procedure Act is no hasty piece of legislation. It was preceded by years of intensive investigation and study by a distinguished group of lawyers appointed by a respected Attorney General.

It was made into law in 1946 and the senior Senator of Nevada, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, said about the Administrative Procedure Act:

> It is a comprehensive charter of private liberty and a solemn undertaking of official fairness. It is intended as a guide to him who seeks fair play and equal rights under law as well as to those invested with executive authority. It upholds law and lightens the burden on those on whom the law may impinge. (APA Legislative History, 79th Cong., 1946, Foreword.)

The Administrative Procedure Act made mandatory internal separation between what has come to be known as the prosecuting function and the decision-making functions. It has ordered this separation at the same time that it has not shackled a regulatory commission with endless haggling and red tape.

The second set of safeguards, and these go beyond the safeguards imposed on any other regulatory commission, are in the Taft-Hartley law. Section 4 (a) says "no trial examiner's report shall be reviewed either before or after its preparation by any person other than a member of the Board or his legal assistant and no trial examiner shall advise or consult with the Board with respect to exceptions taken to his findings, rulings, or recommendations." These restrictions, as I have said, go beyond the restrictions imposed on any other agency. Plan 12 does not in any way affect these restrictions.

And then there are the provisions for court review which are as strong and probably stronger than that which the orders of any other regulatory agency are subjected to.

That is all in the body of the Taft-Hartley law. We say those regulations and restrictions are not affected by plan 12.

If the Federal Communications Commission should unjustly deny a license to a prospective broadcaster, the license is denied and the party presumably suffers until, and if, he can get a court order overruling the FCC decision.

In the case of an order or decision of the NLRB, however, the respondent, that is, the union or the management, is not legally compelled to do anything until the Board's order is upheld in a circuit court. The respondent may with impunity continue doing as he has done without any penalty whatsoever.

The findings of the Board on issues of fact must be supported by substantial evidence in the record. The court, however, is the sole judge of the law. I am not a lawyer but what this means to me is that, in effect, the court reviews both the facts and the law.

Going beyond any of the requirements of due process demanded by the Taft-Hartley law and the Administrative Procedure Act, the chairman of the Board has told our committee that the Board will introduce still additional safeguards to the sanctity of the due process as it operates in Board procedure. Our committee was told that the Board would appoint an administrator "whose job would be 'when asked by the regional office whether or not he should issue a complaint, to advise that regional office whether it is good policy to do so.'" Most of the cases would not come to this so-called administrator. Most of the cases would be settled in the field. But if the administrator thinks that a complaint should not be issued then the aggrieved party would have a right to appeal, not to the administrator who had made the original decision, as under the present situation, but to a committee of high staff officials of the Board appointed by the National Labor Relations Board.

In other words, the Chairman of the Board put himself on record as giving us adequate guaranties for the appeal procedures if plan No. 12 were to be adopted.

Should the Board members be required to intervene personally in this appeal stage, the facts in the case would be presented to the Board in a purely hypothetical form with little, if any, identifying data. The lawyers tell me that the Board would in these preliminary proceedings deny itself access to the specific facts in the case in greater degree than do the courts in a preliminary proceeding. It seems to me that if the danger of prejudgment has any merit at all, here is as complete protection as you can get with human beings, not angels.

Let me, then, sum up the positive aspects of our case for plan 12. First, the really important authority of the general counsel is transferred to the Board. The day-to-day operating and housekeeping functions are transferred to the Chairman of the Board under the supervision of the Board. Second, the situation which obtains now under the present sawed-in-half arrangement puts a premium on policy conflict, confusion, duplication, and overlapping of responsibility and function. Third, the present arrangement with an independent counsel has impaired due process, not aided it. Fourth, the enactment of plan 12 will bring a greater measure of efficiency and economy. Fifth, plan 12 plus the APA, plus the Taft-Hartley law safeguards, plus the changes in procedure which the Board will make on its own motion, will guarantee a maximum amount of fair treatment.

I do not think that I have used all of the ammunition in the arsenal of those favoring plan 12. I want to use some of the points favoring plan 12 to answer directly the contention of the majority report which urges that plan 12 be rejected.

Therefore, I submit for the record at this point a critical analysis of the majority report, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let me say at the outset that I think that the committee majority has done the best it could with the meager materials at its disposal. When you get right down to it, most of the points, in fact all of the points except one, are based on speculation, conjecture, and straw-man arguments.

Point one of the majority decisions says: "The plan repudiates a policy overwhelmingly expressed by Congress as recently as 1947."

The use of the word "repudiate" in this connection is a perfect illustration of semantic antics. If by "repudiate" the committee majority means "change," well, every reorganization plan changes a policy made by Congress previously. In that sense, therefore, every reorganization plan which Congress has approved repudiated something which it had done previously. If the plan did not repudiate a previous policy there would be no need for subsequent action by Congress. What I am getting at is, that the use of the word "repudiate" in this connection is intended to load the issue.

Moreover, the Senate of the United States is on record in 1949 in favor of eliminating the office of the general counsel. The Senate, whatever else may be said about its action, conclusively stated what its policy is. Plan 12 does precisely what the Senate said should be done in 1949. So Plan 12 certainly does not repudiate a policy of the Senate.

Further, the Senate never had an opportunity to debate the question of an independent general counsel as part of its own legislation. In fact the Senate's own version of the Taft-Hartley law specifically provided for the NLRB without an independent general counsel.

When the Senate did get an opportunity to vote on the House version of the Taft-Hartley law it had to vote on the conference report as a package. There was no opportunity whatsoever to make any amendments to the conference report. The Senate had to take it or leave it. Unfortunately it took it.

Assuming for the sake of the argument that plan 12 is changing a policy, isn't it necessary for a legislative body to evaluate, and change, if necessary, policies in the light of experience? We have now had close to 3 years' experience with separation of authority. Indeed, after less than 2 years' experience the man whose name the legislation bears, the senior Senator from Ohio, asserted that perhaps the most important of the amendments which he had suggested in 1949 was the elimination of the independent general counsel. I have already called attention to the characterizations by the senior Senator from Ohio that there was confusion, there was difficulty in the separation of powers.

I just cannot see how anybody can say that we ought not to change a policy after it has demonstrably been responsible for confusion, inefficiency, and impairment of fair treatment.

One of the most striking things about the record made before our committee is the unanimity with which even witnesses opposing plan 12 found important difficulties in the present position of the general counsel. I suppose the only exception to that would be Mr. Iserman who had a hand in framing the present law and who, in any event, saw no reason why the whole business of labor relations couldn't best be handled by abolishing the Board and throwing the whole business into the Federal district courts.

The senior Senator from Ohio thought so highly of the present independent status of the general counsel that he introduced a bill abolishing that office and setting up an independent administrator. Mr. Reilly, another adviser to the authors of the Taft-Hartley law, acknowledged that there are difficulties. He thought clarification would be the answer. Even Mr. Denham testified that he had more power than one man should have. He suggested that appeals from his decisions not to issue complaints should go to a Federal district court. But whatever their remedies, one thing was clear, the present arrangement was not satisfactory even from the point of view of the vast majority of opponents to plan 12.

The most authoritative body which studied the operations of the NLRB, namely the Hoover Commission Task Force, headed by Mr. Owen D. Young and Prof. Robert Bowie, could not find one favorable word to say about the present arrangement. I challenge anybody to find a phrase or a word in this document which can be interpreted as endorsing, favoring, or supporting the independent status of the general counsel of the NLRB.

Repudiation, indeed. If ever a policy deserved to be repudiated it is the policy by which we set up an independent general counsel as an adversary against the Board.

And I want to make this point: A proceeding under the Reorganization Act of 1949 requires action by Congress. If there is repudiation, it is Congress repudiating its own acts and there can be no question about the propriety of that.

In point 2 the committee majority says "the plan would destroy public confidence in the impartiality of the administration of laws regulating labor-management relations. This statement, it seems to me, is an example of the classic fallacy of begging the question. The statement assumes the very thing that has to be proved, namely, that there now exists public confidence in the impartiality of the administration of laws regulating labor-management relations.

Where is the evidence of public confidence? And I emphasize the word "public." To be sure, there are employers who are opposing plan 12 and who have said some things construed as endorsing the impartiality of administration. I must say candidly that the employers who are opposing plan 12 are not concerned with impartiality but believe that Mr. Denham is on their side, and that they ought to stand by him in his moment of need. I say to these employers that they are kidding themselves. By and large, it seems to me that neither management nor labor has been the beneficiary of the existing disorganization in the administration of our labor relations law. And in supporting such broad and absolute powers in one man, they are doing themselves damage—and considerable damage.

As a matter of fact, there are employers who have looked askance at the powers exercised by the general counsel. A delegation of employer witnesses in the hotel and restaurant industry viewed with considerable alarm the interpretations given by the general counsel. Read the hearings before one of the subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor of the Eightieth Congress, chaired by Mr. HOFFMAN, of Michigan.

Mr. Bruce Anderson, representing the American Hotel Association, testified in reference to the general counsel that "an administrative agency threatens to overturn the labor policies of an entire industry by a ruling which disregards the intent of Congress exempting local businesses from the act" (p. 10).

In testimony before the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations of the last Congress, Mr. John H. Dorsey, an attorney representing employers, said, "It appears that the procedural right of appeal from dismissal by the regional director to the general counsel * * * is illusory * * * this type of procedure merely gives lip service to the right of appeal. It is, to say the least, dilatory, and affords the appellant no hope of relief." (Pp. 1–17, Committee on Independent Regulatory Commissions, Staff report on the NLRB.) We have already referred to the fact that the subcommittee, chaired by Mr. HOFFMAN in the last Congress, found the general counsel's interpretation on the jurisdiction of the Board "not warranted either by the previous history of the interpretation and administration of the Wagner Act, by the debates on the bill, or by the terms of the act itself; that such interpretation is not necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act." (H. Rept. 2050, 80th Cong., 2d sess., 1948, p. 5.)

I don't suppose that labor feels that the administration of laws regulating labor-management relations in the United States has been exactly impartial. Labor, too, I understand, is part of the public.

Where, then, is this evidence of "public confidence" in the impartiality of the administration of laws regulating labor-management relations? There is no such public confidence. And there is no merit in the argument which pretends that there is.

Point 3 of the committee majority's position states "the plan would return the NLRB to the discredited role of grand jury, prosecutor and judge. Here again you find that same play on words which is intended to befuddle rather than to illuminate.

Let's deal with this grand jury, prosecutor, and judge business first. This language, as applied to regulatory commissions in general, and to the NLRB in particular, reveals, I regret to say, a sad and unfortunate ignorance about administrative law. As applied to the Board it makes no sense for reasons which I believe we cogently indicated in the minority report.

Take a look at the last 2 years of the Wagner Act in operation; 8,047 unfair-labor-practice charges were filed; 3 percent, or 242, were appealed to the Board.

In the same period, that is the last 2 years of the Wagner Act, 19,122 representation petitions were filed. In 2 percent, or 398, appeals were taken to the Board.

This means, then, that in only 3 percent of the unfair-labor-practice charges and 2 percent of the representation petitions was there any opportunity whatsoever for prejudgment.

The mistake, which is clear, the committee majority is committing is this—it thinks the five-member Board personally handles every unfair labor pactice charge which is filed with a regional office and personally handles every representation petition which a union or a management might file with the NLRB field office.

When you talk about a Board like the NLRB you mean one of two things. You mean the Board machinery with its many employees or you mean a three- or five-member Board.

If you are talking about the Board machinery they may be prosecutors but they can't be judges because only the five-member Board acts as the judge. If you mean the five-member Board you can't be talking about a prosecutor because the Board machinery, not the Board members as such, act as the prosecutor.

Now, to the extent that the Board does take a preliminary look at certain cases, before it actually examines the full record in connection with a decision, the Board is acting no differently than a court acts in granting a writ of certiorari. No responsible lawyer would say that the Supreme Court prejudges a case in a process of determining whether or not it is going to refuse that case. But the Board has told us that it is

prepared to go even beyond the precaution that a court takes not to prejudge a case. It has told our committee, and there is no reason why the Board should not be believed, that every attempt will be made to deal with a case in this predecision stage in hypothetical form so as to effectively disguise the identifying facts if the case should ever come to the decision stage.

So much for the misconception of the NLRB as grand jury, prosecutor, and judge.

Now the majority report's point 3 also talks about the discredited role. It is quite interesting to examine the evidence upon which it bases this characterization. The text of the report and indeed the text of the hearings indicate that the majority report relies upon the findings, primarily of the Smith Committee, which functioned in 1939 and issued its findings in 1940. Thus the major part of the indictment of the NLRB rests on material that is at least 10 years old.

Then, the majority also relies upon the instance of the Kaiser case in which the Board allegedly prejudged a case. No other specific case of prejudgment is cited, but what are the facts in the Kaiser case? The facts are that the Kaiser Co. was a prime contractor in our war effort; that the Board was subjected to legitimate pressure from a variety of war agencies who wanted to be assured that a Board action would not seriously impair one of our most important producers of war materials. Indeed, what the Board did was to assure itself that it had all of the relevant facts before proceeding. The considerations which the Board gave to the facts in the Kaiser case were not conducted in a smoke-filled room but were fully exposed to public view. We were in a war and every agency was adjusting its normal procedures to the exigencies of conducting a war. What is also significant is that the Kaiser Co. was being prosecuted and the Board in these extraordinary circumstances went, justifiably, to great lengths to see that it was not doing an injustice to a major war producer.

I think it is of more than passing significance that of all the thousands of cases which the Board has handled, an insider like Mr. Gerald Reilly, who volunteered this information on the Kaiser case, could not come forth with more instances of prejudgment.

He couldn't come forth with more instances because they did not exist.

The fact that the evidence with respect to the discredited role is 10 years old in one case, and 8 years old in another, conveniently makes it possible to bypass the application of the principles of the Administrative Procedure Act which were introduced subsequent to the instances cited.

The Administrative Procedure Act was passed in 1946. The report of the Attorney General's committee, upon which the act is based, was issued in 1941. And even before the recommendations of the Attorney General's committee and the force of law in 1941 to be exact, the NLRB undertook to revise its internal procedures so as to assure separation of the decision-making processes from the investigative- and complaint-issuing processes.

Point 4 of the committee majority's position is that the plan is defective in that it fails to specifically provide where the most important functions of the general counsel are to be lodged.

Frankly, I do not know how it could be made any clearer. The President's message with regard to the regulatory agencies Plan 7 to 13 distinguishes, as we have seen, between the substantive aspects of regulation which are left in the Board or Commission as a whole on the one hand and the day-to-day direction and internal administration which are transferred to the chairmen of the agencies on the other.

Plan 12, as I have demonstrated, deals with the day-to-day direction and internal administration functions of the general counsel and the Board in sections 1 and 2 and assigns them to the Chairman of the Board. Section 3 deals with the substantive aspects and assigns those to the Board as a whole. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget testified to this effect and the Attorney General's opinion is to this effect. The Board's statement clearly indicates who gets what powers.

I just can't see that after the President of the United States in his message and in his plan, after the Budget Director, after the Attorney General, and after the Board itself states clearly where the functions are, how it is possible to say that the plan fails to specifically provide where the most important functions of the general counsel are to be lodged. The most important functions of the general counsel are to be lodged in the Board—period.

And if we permit the plan to go into effect, the Congress will be on record as stating that its intent in approving Plan 12 was that the most important powers of the general counsel go to the Board and not to the Chairman. There is no doubt at all on that score and, if I may say so, this is an exceedingly frivolous objection.

Point 6 of the summary asserts "the plan would not accomplish the objectives of the Reorganization Act of 1949 relating to efficiency and economy." And with that point I also would like to treat point 12 which says, "the plan would not effectuate any substantial economy."

Here we have then a contention which says that plan 12 will not bring efficiency and economy in the administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act. It seems to me that the minority has clearly proved that there is confusion, that there is overlapping, that there is duplication. We have shown that cases are taken to hearing which in a sensible procedure should never have come to hearing. We have shown that Board personnel and Board members are engaged in wasteful motions of dealing with cases which could have been settled at a much earlier stage if there existed a unified structure. We have shown that an inordinate amount of time is being spent arguing with the general counsel. If eliminating such a situation does not bring efficiency and economy, I don't know what will.

Point 7 of the committee's summary asserts "the plan by concentrating the functions of grand jury, prosecutor, and judge in the Chairman and Board is contrary to sound principles of Government."

This point 7 is intimately related to point 3 which talks about "the discredited role of the NLRB as grand jury, prosecutor, and judge." The difficulty, I take it, is that in addition to returning the NLRB to a discredited role it is also contrary to sound principles of government.

Again I call attention to the play on the words "grand jury, prosecutor, and judge." As I think I have clearly demonstrated, the machinery of a regulatory commission bears not the slightest resemblance to a grand jury, prosecutor, and judge.

As to being contrary to sound principles of government, I'll stake the judgment of the Congress in enacting the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946 against the majority's position in this regard. The Administrative Procedure Act was enacted after many years of searching study by a distinguished committee of lawyers. It set up standards for the fair and equitable treatment of litigants in regulatory commissions.

The trouble with the committee's position on this is that it cannot understand that it is possible to have internation separation of functions and maintain a structure in which the same personnel in the agency do not act as grand jury, prosecutor and judge.

I offer the judgment of the Attorney General's committee on this issue. "We conclude not only that separation will not necessarily cure bias and prejudice, but that the requisite impartiality of action can be secured by the means set forth in this and the preceding sections of this report." (Administrative Procedure Act in Government Agencies, Report of the Attorney General's committee, footnote, p. 60.)

On the contrary, it is well established that separation of power and authority as we have now in the NLRB as between the Board and the counsel is contrary to sound principles of government in regulatory agencies. As far back as 1941, the Attorney General's committee with remarkable prescience anticipated the problems which would beset any regulatory agency which made a complete separation between the so-called prosecution and the decision-making stages.

Here are some of the misgivings which the Attorney General's committee expressed about separation in 1941:

1. The loss in consistency of action as a whole (p. 57).

2. To divorce entirely the investigating and enforcing arm from the deciding arm may well impart additional confusion (p. 59).

3. Separation would seriously militate against—the lifeblood of the administrative process—negotiations and informal settlements (p. 59).

4. Complete separation of functions would make enforcement more difficult (p. 60).

Opponents of plan 12 may well say that they considered these strictures against separation when they passed the Taft-Hartley law. Be that as it may, but there is no reason on this earth why we must insist on perpetuating our mistakes after experience has indicated we have made a mistake.

If anything is contrary to the sound principles of Government, I think it is pretty clear that what it is is the present separation of authority between the general counsel and the NLRB.

Point 8 of the summary says "the plan provides no satisfactory remedy for the alleged deficiencies in the present law, such as questions relating to jurisdiction, appointment of personnel, and appeals from refusal to issue unfair labor-practice complaints."

With respect to a remedy for the jurisdiction question, let me say that the remedy consists of having one Government position before the public and before the courts as to what the jurisdiction of the Board may be.

The position taken at any given time may not be entirely consistent with a position taken previously but at any one time the public and the courts will be confronted with only a single policy with respect to a given jurisdiction question. That is the remedy.

On the question of appointment of personnel. If you eliminate the office of general counsel the plan is clear that the major positions in the Board's machinery will be appointed by the chairman and subject to the approval of the Board. In the lower ranking positions section 2 of the plan permits the chairman to delegate his authority of appointment. There is no reason why the chairman or the Board members should be burdened with the appointing of every clerk and every stenographer in the agency, but there is every reason why the chairman with the consent and approval of the Board shall appoint such officers as regional directors and the heads of major administrative units. It seems to me an eminently satisfactory remedy; so satisfactory indeed that it is the common practice in all agencies of the Government.

Does plan 12 provide a satisfactory remedy on handling appeals from the refusal to issue

unfair labor practice complaints? I think it does. It is a satisfactory remedy for a variety of reasons. First, appeals will be handled by personnel who have had no connection with originally instructing the regional director not to issue a complaint. The personnel handling the appeal will have no vested interest in standing by an earlier decision. Secondly, in the minutely small number of cases appeals which will be handled by the Board as such, (a) the Board will receive it only as a hypothetical case and (b) an appeal considered by five men appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, it seems to me, is infinitely more desirable than an appeal rejected by the unlimited power of one man.

Point 9. "The plan, by giving the Board many additional duties would further delay its decision of cases."

All of the supporting testimony on this point was made by persons who either never had or who certainly do not now have intimate knowledge of Board operations. The testimony in support of this viewpoint is nothing but conjecture and speculation. There wasn't a concrete fact in all of the testimony. Ex-Board member Reilly couldn't give anything like a statistical answer to a question on the Board's current workload. (Senate hearing, p. 54.)

In contrast, Budget Director Lawton and Chairman Herzog, speaking for the full Board, supported factually their appraisal (1) that the Board was no worse off in its case load than any other regulatory commission; (2) that the Board members themselves were always current with their own work.

The distinguished chairman of our committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas, seemed to be impressed by the weight of this evidence for when Mr. Lawton concluded his testimony on this point he said, referring to the NLRB, "that is probably no different condition from what you would have in any regulatory body" (Senate hearings, p. 108).

As a matter of fact, the Board members will undoubtedly have a better opportunity to concentrate on the decision-making aspect of their work because they will be relieved of the day-to-day operating duties which are transferred to the Chairman and they will not be spending time in trying to persuade the general counsel to accept the Board's decisions as the last word. And if the Congress is generous enough to give the Board members additional legal assistants, we will have another source for cutting down the back-log.

Point 10. "The plan would subject the Board to pressures and influences in case handling at the initial stage."

In this, and in other points, there is either explicit or tacit assumption that the moral fiber of the general counsel is somehow superior to the moral fiber of the five board members. Isn't there some question about the general counsel being subjected to pressures and influences? Do we not need to look with alarm at the pressures and influences which the general counsel is subjected to in his unlimited power to refuse to issue complaints? Cannot the exercise of his power be diluted by outside pressures? Unless we assume that a general counsel is inherently constructed of such superior stock that he will not respond to such pressures or that he will remain immune to such pressures, this contention has no merit.

All of us have had experience applying pressures to Government agencies. I dare say that my experience is like that of every other Senate; that it is infinitely more difficult to get response to pressure from a board of 3 men, or 5 men, or 14 men, than it is from 1 man. If this allegation of pressure makes any sense at all I think that it has to be resolved in favor of the five-man board. As it happens, I don't think that the allegation makes any sense. We assume that every public official administers his responsibilities according to law. If he doesn't he should be removed.

Point 11. "The plan would bring about extensive litigation pending tests of its legality in courts."

Of all of the criticisms which have been made against plan 12, I must confess that I have the least patience and am less inclined to tolerate this one. It just occurs to me that every controversial piece of legislation which we have ever considered has always been faced with the threat of litigation. Of course, every aggrieved party exhausts every avenue of litigation that he can before he gives up. If we had listened to this sort of complaint about the Taft-Hartley law we would never have enacted it.

I want to say very seriously that the dignity and integrity of our body would be seriously impaired if we permitted such intimidation to alter our decisions one way or the other. If a bill is wise let's pass it. If it isn't, let's reject it. But let's reject it or pass it on its own merits, and not on the basis of whether there will be litigation or not.

We have already dealt with point 12 in connection with our consideration of point 6.

I would like to get into now what I consider to be some of the grievous errors in the text of the majority report. The majority's criticism of the NLRB under the Wagner Act on pages 4 and 5 rests, as I have indicated previously, on material which is 8 to 10 years old. The Kaiser situation which the majority uses as its only instance of prejudgment occurred in 1942 and there is even no basis for the charge of prejudgment in that case. The Smith committee report was issued in 1940 and rests on experiences in 1938 and 1939.

On page 4 the majority report asserts the action of the Supreme Court in passing on a writ of certiorari is in no way comparable to what the Board does when it takes a preliminary look at a case in the process of determining whether or not to issue a complaint.

A group of eminent lawyers, however, speaking in the Report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure does not agree with this observation in the majority report.

What is done in the issuance of a complaint by a regulatory commission says the Attorney General's committee "is wholly comparable to what a court does in the first stage of a show cause proceeding, or in the issuance of a writ of certiorari. No decision on the merits is made; the court or the agency merely concluded that the situation warrants further examination in formal proceedings. The ultimate judgment of the agency heads need be no more influenced by the preliminary authorization to proceed than is the ultimate judgment of a court by the issuance of a temporary restraining order pending a formal hearing for a permanent injunction." (Page 57.)

On page 5 the majority attempts to gloss over the necessity which the Board was confronted with when it delegated certain powers to the general counsel by saying that the "delegation carried out the intent of Congress as expressed in the legislative history of the Taft-Hartley Act." (Rept. No. 1516, p. 5.)

I see no basis in the legislative history for any such intent.

In the section of the House conference report which the majority report quotes, three functions are specified for which the general counsel has final authority; investigation of charges, issuance of complaints, and prosecution of such complaints before the Board. There is nothing in this section or any other section which says that the Board should delegate its authority over personnel to the general counsel.

But either the Board had to delegate authority to the general counsel or the general counsel had to delegate authority to the Board, else the situation would have been completely unmanageable. It would have resulted in two sets of personnel.

But even with the delegation the situation proved unmanageable and the Board had to withdraw part of its delegation to the general counsel. It found that its authority with respect to representation cases was being impaired and it withdrew a part of the delegation to the extent that now the Board wishes to have a veto power over the appointment of regional directors. The general counsel has publicly announced that he will not accept his slightly altered authority with respect to the regional directors.

The majority says on page 6 "that one man solely responsible with a spotlight of publicity directly on him knowing that he may be removed from office is not going to be arbitrary about refusing to issue complaints." Here again we see that double moral code operating, because there is an assumption that five men "with the spotlight of publicity directly on them" are going to be arbitrary about refusing to issue complaints. Is there anybody among us who would seriously contend that the spotlight of publicity is not on the NLRB? I would suspect that the NLRB is unprecedented in American history because now after 15 years following the enactment of a law there is still controversy and there is still the pitiless glare of publicity.

The majority report goes on to say, "furthermore, the general counsel has established his own advisory staff so that the decisions are made only after consultation with and upon the advice of competent experts." Let me tell you what an expert assigned by the Hoover Commission task force had to say about this consultation and advice within the general counsel's office. Prof. Walter Galenson of the Harvard economics department, designated by the task force, Owen D. Young, and Prof. Robert Bowie, said: "Policy deliberation on the general counsel's side is essentially different from that of the Board in that it represents discussion between a superior and his subordinates rather than among equals. A certain point of view is apt to be taken for granted at the outset and consideration centered not on the wisdom of an action, but on its legal validity and its political repercussions.

"An administrator is not likely to choose assistants whose basic philosophy differs from his own. Policy making by a single administrator may be more expeditious, for the administrator is free to dispense with superfluous deliberation, but, regardless of how organized, it is not to be confused with true group deliberation." (Staff report on the NLRB, p. 11–18.)

I paraphrase. Don't confuse the general counsel's consultation with his own staff, with true group deliberation.

The Owen D. Young, Robert Bowie task force made the same observations. "A single official can consult his staff but does not have to convince others to make his views or conclusions prevail. The member of the commission must expose his reasons and judgments to the critical scrutiny of his fellow members and must persuade them to his point of view. He must analyze and understand the views of his colleagues if only to refuse them." (Task Force Report, p. 2.)

On the same page we have still another instance of the double standard which the majority of the committee employs in appraising plan 12. They say, "We believe it preferable to have decisions made by a man appointed by the President with confirmation by the Senate than by an unidentified board appointee or committee who would be subservient to the Board." (P. 6, Rept. No. 1516.)

This statement is made in connection with the procedure which the Board tentatively contemplates in handling requests for advice and analyzing appeals.

In the last analysis the Board is responsible for the decisions of any appointee or committee just as the general counsel is responsible for the acts of his subordinates. The Board members are also, as it happens, appointed by the President and subject to the confirmation of the Senate. I think it is preferable to have decisions made by five men appointed by the President with confirmation of the Senate than by an unidentified general counsel appointee or committee which is subservient to the general counsel.

On page 7 of its report, the majority exaggerates the significance of a Board order. It says, "in complaint cases the Board's order often imposes heavy financial responsibilities on employers for back pay. Its negative orders (cease and desist) when enforced in the courts carry contempt of court sanctions when disobeyed."

In the first place a Board order does not impose heavy financial responsibilities upon employers. A board order can be violated with impunity until and if it is upheld in a circuit court. Moreover, in back pay computations, after the circuit court has upheld the Board's order, the Board subtracts monies earned by the aggrieved employee during the period he was discriminated against from the total back pay bill. Secondly, its negative orders are subject to review with respect to law and fact by the courts. It cannot be repeated too often that the authority of the courts to review Board orders stands as a bulwark against any possible capricious or unjust action by the Board. It is mistaken to give a subordinate position to court review of Board orders. As we have already said, the Board's orders probably have less force as orders than the orders of the other regulatory commissions.

I have already challenged in my earlier remarks the alleged public confidence which the present arrangement has and which the majority report repeats on page 7. For example, a scholarly study by Prof. Donald H. Wallett, Labor Relations and Federal Law, published by the University of Washington Press in 1949, asserts, "Administratively the double-headed character of the investigative hearing and enforcement machinery of the NLR Act should be eliminated with the general counsel losing his independent status and returning to a position under the NLRB." (P. 146.) This doesn't sound like a vote of confidence in the present arrangement.

An editorial note in the Iowa Law Review for May 1949 asserts: "Adopting the premise that expertise, prompt disposition, uniformity, and flexibility are essential to a desirable administrative procedure, the past months have shown that the Taft-Hartley Act has failed to provide the minimum essentials and that some revision is necessary to asure a petitioner under the act that he will obtain the full benefits of the administrative process to which he is entitled." (May, 1949, p. 672.)

There are, it seems, competent, objective, able students who have expressed sharp doubts that the present arrangement is as good as the opponents of plan 12 say it is.

In its discussion of the Administrative Procedure Act the majority persists in carrying on its semantic barrage. Referring to the Administrative Procedure Act, the report, on page 7, says "the Act does not deprive an agency of any dual function of prosecutor and judge." The analogy between a regulatory commission and a prosecutor-judge is misleading and inaccurate as we have said time and time again. If the analogy had any merit we now have a law on the statute books, the Administrative Procedure Act, which is designed to eliminate any danger to litigants if you have one person or agency acting really as prosecutor and judge. This is the law which the Congress passed, applicable to all regulatory commissions including the NLRB, to insure full protection and to provide, as the senior Senator from Nevada and the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said, "a comprehensive charter of private liberty and a solemn undertaking of official fairness."

The majority report says, on page 10, "it has not been demonstrated to the committee * * * that the plan will bring about any substantial saving of money." And then it goes on to criticize the President's statement that although the plan may not result in substantial immediate savings, the benefits in improved operations will result in a reduction in expenditures as compared with those that would otherwise be necessary.

As a matter of fact this is the statement that the President has made with respect to all of the plans in this category. Not only the President has said this but the Hoover Commission in its report on independent regulatory commissions has said it as well. "The savings that could be anticipated from the above recommendations cannot be reckoned in the normal manner * * * but the real savings are to be found elsewhere, delay and inefficiency in regulation involves large costs to the regulated industries themselves which must be passed on to the public by one method or another. Expedition will mean vast savings as well as better justice."

It seems to me that the elimination of the duplication and overlapping and confusion which we have already spelled out in great detail should result in substantial savings. I think what the majority is complaining about, is this: we refuse to look into the crystal ball and spell out in dollars and cents what the savings will be.

With respect to efficiency the majority asserts that the efficiency accomplished by the plan could be harmful. The majority goes on to say that it is inevitable that the philosophy of the Board or its Chairman would become the philosophy of all the employees.

Now, it is clear that the philosophy of the general counsel has become the philosophy of virtually all employees of the Board. They have no choice. He is their supervisor and they are subject to his will. Moreover, the general counsel has not provided any internal separation, where he might at least be assured that he would be getting independent judgments from within his own staff on issues that might be in conflict within his own staff.

The Taft-Hartley law, the Administrative Procedure Act, the Board's own intentions to initiate procedural changes indicate that there will be effective internal separation if plan 12 is permitted to operate.

The net effect at worst is that the general counsel now imposes his viewpoint with respect to cases which he refuses to issue complaints. And it is. I'm willing to stake the philosophy which is developed out of the discussion among five equal Board members, against the philosophy which is established by one man.

The majority report disparages the NLRB Chairman's judgment that the workload under plan 12 would be manageable—at least as manageable as the workload of the other regulatory agencies, in which there is no separation of authority.

And what this issue of workload gets down to is, Whom are you going to believe? Are you going to believe the judgment of the Board members and the Bureau of the Budget, both groups with intimate knowledge of Board management problems, or, are you going to believe the judgment of people who have only the most casual connection with the detailed day-to-day operations of the Board? I can't see that there is any choice. The weight of the evidence on workload is clearly in favor of those who have the knowledge and information, and they can be only the Board members and the Bureau of the Budget.

The majority report concerns itself again with the question of legality. It does not say that plan 12 is illegal under the Reorganization Act of 1949, but it says there is some doubt about it. I don't see that there is any doubt about it. The majority makes the point that plan 12 is in effect substantive law. I just can't see it. Plan 12 does not alter by one iota the unfair-labor practices of management, the unfair-labor practices of labor, the injunction proceeding, or any of the fundamentally substantive provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. The responsibilities of Government, of management, of labor, remain the same. The only thing changed is the officer who performs certain functions in connection with these procedures.

I don't think I can do any better than the Attorney General has in dealing with this question that plan 12 is a change in substantive law, and, therefore, illegal under the Reorganization Act. The very purpose of the Congress in passing the Reorganization Act was to authorize the President to transfer functions between agencies and within agencies when, after investigation, he finds that such a transfer will accomplish one or more of the purposes enumerated in section 2 (a).

The majority further amplifies its point that plan 12 is vague as to where the powers of the general counsel go. My point-by-point analysis of the President's message, of the plan itself, the statement of the Attorney General, the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the grudging acknowledgment of ex-Board Member Reilly, all add up to one thing—the investigative so-called prosecuting functions of the general counsel go to the Board; the housekeeping and day-to-day operations only go to the Chairman, and then only under the supervision of the Board.

Playing around with definitions of "executive" in Bouvier's Law Dictionary and Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary as the majority report does, it seems to me are not adequate enough to offset the judgments developed by the overwhelming weight of the testimony and of the record. Indeed, it seems to me a confession on the part of the majority that its position in this respect is weak, if in the face of the law which has been built up on the subject it seeks recourse to dictionaries.

As a matter of fact the majority report did not need to go any further than the Hoover Commission report on regulating commissions to find a definition of executive in the appropriate context of this discussion.

On page 3 of the Hoover report, you can find executive duties defined as "those that can be performed far better by a single administrative official."

The reference to the Lincourt case on page 13 of the report has nothing at all to do with the issue at hand. All that decision says is that any action of an executive branch of the Government from a certain viewpoint can be considered administrative. It simply categorizes the whole range of executive activity. The decision is not germane to our debate.

In its discussion of the point that plan 12 does not remedy deficiencies of the present act the majority contends that the answer lies in legislative clarification. But if there is going to be any legislative clarification it will have to clarfy every single provision of the Taft-Hartley law. The issue is not clarity; the issue is whether at any give time there will be either one or two interpretations of a given provision of the law. Under the present arrangement you have two interpretations. Plan 12 will insure that there will be only one interpretation. To be sure there is no guaranty that there necessarily

will be consistency in the interpretations over a period of time but there will be no question in anybody's mind what the Board stands for at any particular time.

While the difficulties of interpretation have developed in the area of jurisdiction they can just as well develop in respect to any other provision of the Taft-Hartley law. It is just impossible to frame a statute which will be so air-tight that it can be applied automatically to every case and every situation. If it isn't jurisdiction, it can be secondary boycott; if it isn't secondary boycotts it can be free speech; if it isn't free speech it can be any other of several hundred fine points in the statute. The existing separation of authority puts a premium on public conflict and disagreement. Plan 12 will eliminate this confusion and substitute one judgment where two now exist.

The vast differences which the majority points to on page 15 between the NLRB and other regulatory agencies simply do not exist. To support this we have the weight of the Hoover Commission, the Task Force Report, the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, all of which class the NLRB as an independent regulatory agency. Nowhere in any of these documents will you find any statement which distinguishes in any fundamental sense, the Board from other regulatory agencies. The majority offers no evidence of comparable weight to support its contention that the NLRB is not like any other regulatory agency.

Then the majority report goes on to say that Congress deliberately singled out the NLRB for special treatment in the Taft-Hartley Act and "nothing has transpired since the Taft-Hartley Act to change the Congress' judgment on that issue." Let's grant that the Taft-Hartley law singled out the NLRB for special treatment. But how, in the face of the overwhelming impact of the facts showing conflict between the Board and the general counsel, not only internally but public conflict from almost the very moment that the act was passed, how is it possible to say that nothing has transpired since the Taft-Hartley Act to change the Congress' judgment?

The task force report had not one word to say on the basis of its detailed investigation that can be construed as justifying the existence of the independent general counsel. Scholarly works have made devastating critcisms of the sawing in half of the NLRB A great deal has happened since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. And one thing that is crystal clear is that whatever justification exists for the establishment of the office of the independent general counsel originally, it has not worked out and we have had bad administration of a public law.

The most striking thing about the criticism that the majority has leveled against plan 12 is its lack of substance. Go through the majority report. Read the 12 summary points on pages 1 and 2. And what hits you in the face is the reliance on such vague and indefinite bogies as alleged public confidence, the revival of the shiboleth "grand jury, prosecutor, and judge," the threat of litigation, delay. There is hardly a major point made by the majority which rests on some collection of verifiable facts. Most of the argument is based on speculation, hearsay, and anticipation of horrible things to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the majority's summary says:

> The plan goes beyond the Hoover Commission's recommendations affecting the Government's regulatory agencies. The Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation concerning the NLRB.

First of all, let us clear up this connection between plan 12 and the Hoover Commission. No proponent, as far as I know, has said that that part of plan 12, which restores the powers of the general counsel to the NLRB is specifically mentioned in the Hoover Commission report. We want that to be clear. Secondly, it is clear that the way in which the Senators who are supporting the majority position are voting on other reorganization plans that whether or not the Hoover Commission recommended a particular plan is not the controlling fact in their vote. I want that to be noted. For example, the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover report, speaking through its research director, said there was no question that plan No. 1 dealing with the Treasury Department "fully accords with the Hoover Commission's recommendations." But the majority, and it is almost the same committee majority, opposing plan 12, is against plan 1.

Indeed, the chairman of our committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, has himself said that he cannot be bound by the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I think everyone has that right. In an addendum to the Hoover Commission report on Federal business enterprises, the chairman of our committee asserts that—

> In view of the dual position which I occupy as a member of the Commission and also as a Member of the Congress who has the duty of considering and acting upon the reports and recommendations, I feel constrained to reserve the right to further consider in my legislative capacity all recommendations made by the majority, and in such capacity to oppose those which in my judgment may be unsound or impractical, or which may be determined to be inadvisable. (P. 129.)

The Reorganization Act of 1949 makes no mention and indeed does not require that every reorganization plan be specifically called for in the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. So that whether or not the Hoover Commission has specifically recommended a plan is not a controlling fact with respect to the legality of the plan and with respect to the advisability of the plan.

But it can appropriately be said that plan 12 is in accord with the Hoover Commission recommendations. It certainly is not contrary to the Hoover Commission report as the majority states on page 9 of its report. That statement, by the way, is completely erroneous. I challenge anybody to find in the recommendations of the Hoover Commission a statement implicit or explicit which bars the reform that plan 12 seeks to make in the administration of the NLRB.

Mr. President, I contest the validity of the comment and statement in the majority report on page 9, where it says that plan No. 12 is contrary to the Hoover Commission report.

I have in my possession a copy of a letter which I received from Prof. James K. Pollock, chairman of the department of political science of the University of Michigan. The substance of the letter is contained in this paragraph:

> I cannot, of course, speak for the Commission but as a former commissioner I can see nothing wrong with the President's proposal. I have indicated in a letter to Senator MCCLELLAN, a copy of which I enclose, that I favor approval of all of the President's 21 proposals.

Professor Pollock was a distinguished member of the Hoover Commission. He is a reputable scholar and an outstanding political scientist who has recently been elected president of the American Political Science Administration.

Mr. President, I ask that this letter be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as a copy of the letter attached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Moreover, beyond enumerating the nine independent regulatory commissions to which its recommendations apply, there is no reference at all on the Hoover report to specific regulatory commissions, with respect to Hoover recommendation No. 1, to wit:

> We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission. (P. 5.)

To say, therefore, that the Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation concerning the NLRB ignores the crucial fact that the Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation with respect to any regulatory commission on the subject of recommendation No. 1. It is certainly as valid to say that the Hoover Commission did not exclude the NLRB from the scope of its recommendation.

Now, let us look for a moment at the context against which the Hoover Commission made its recommendations. Judging by the nine commissions which the Hoover Commission included in its categories of independent regulatory commissions, it is fair to say that with the exception of the NLRB all of these independent regulatory commissions are characterized by a unified structure.

In order to bring the NLRB in line with the organizational pattern consistent with the other regulatory commissions we first have to eliminate the separation of authority which means abolishing the office of general counsel.

When we have done that, we are in a position to apply the recommendation of the Hoover Commission, that is, to vest all administrative responsibility in the Chairman of the Commission. That is, in effect, what plan 12 does, "it restores a unified structure to the NLRB; (2) it gives the Chairman the responsibility for the day-to-day operating functions."

In view of the fact that the hour is late, I submit for the RECORD the balance of my analysis of plan 12 as it is affected by the Hoover Commission report. In my remarks there is reference to a letter from NLRB Chairman Herzog.

I ask that it be printed as an exhibit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that my prepared remarks which have not been delivered be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will have to be printed in the form of a

statement, but they will be printed, if there is no objection.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let us look at that section of the text of the report which deals with the Hoover Commission recommendations. The Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government states in his telegram that this subject (i. e., the separation of authority between the general counsel and the Board) "was never discussed by the Commission."

Circular Letter No. 2 of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover report asserts, on page 2, "the Commission informally considered, but made no specific recommendation on the major policy issue raised in plan 12 by the proposed abolition of the post of the independent general counsel of the NLRB."

The majority report asserts, "a search of the report of the Hoover Commission and the task force report on regulatory commissions, on which the Commission's report is based, proves clearly that the abolition of the independent office of general counsel as provided for by Reorganization Plan No. 12 was never contemplated by either."

Now, it is clear that the Hoover Commission did not recommend the abolition of the general counsel's office. But as to whether it was contemplated or not, I quote again the circular letter of the Citizens' Committee of the Hoover report: "The Commission informally considered * * * the major policy issue raised in plan No. 12."

The majority quotes another section of the Hoover report: "The Congress is engaged in revising labor policies which will affect some of these agencies. The Commission can make no recommendation as to their organization until these questions are settled." I want to call your attention to the concluding phrase "until these questions are settled." What the Hoover Commission is talking about is the 1949 debate on a revision of the Taft-Hartley law. That debate is over for the time being. These questions are settled for the time being. We are not now engaged in any debate on consideration of over-all revision of the Taft-Hartley law. There is no reason, therefore, why we cannot now make a judgment on the issue of separation of authority.

The majority report says, on page 9, "further evidence that plan 12 is contrary to the Hoover Commission's report is contained in a statement issued April 13, 1950, by the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover report. 'At the same time the plan raises issues which are not wholly organizational but are matters of national political and economic policy. * * * In this respect the plan goes beyond the terms of reference of the Citizens' Committee as stated in its charter and by-laws, in such a way as to render complete endorsement or disapproval of the plan equally impossible.' "

Now, let's examine that. The majority says that plan 12 is contrary to the Hoover Commission report and cites in evidence a statement issued by the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover report. I again challenge the majority or anybody else to find in this statement or in any other statement issued by the Citizens' Committee, or in any statement issued by the Hoover Commission itself, or in any statement issued by the ask force, that plan 12 is contrary to the Hoover Commission report.

There is no such statement and it cannot be found. Even in the section quoted by the majority of the Citizens' Committee says it cannot "render complete endorsement or disapproval." In short, the Citizens' Committee is neutral on the issue.

Secondly, you will notice that the Citizens' Committee is careful to say "the plan goes beyond the terms of reference of the Citizens' Committee." It goes beyond the terms of reference of the Citizens Committee, and there is no statement that says it goes beyond the terms of reference of the Hoover Commission itself. The Citizens' Committee also states its reasons and says the matter involved is national, political, and economic policy. This is, if the Citizens' Committee will forgive me, gobbledegook for saying that they don't want to get involved in an issue which is as controversial as this one is. Well, I agree. It is controversial. But I have never known the United States Senate to retreat from an issue because it is controversial. And, although the issue has been surrounded with heat it does not detract from the essential character of the problem with which we are confronted, namely, how to improve the efficiency and administration of the NLRB. In that connection, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, which appears as exhibit 2.

On page 10 the majority says the task force report is "somewhat critical of the type of separation created by the Taft-Hartley Act."

Let me read to you the "somewhat critical" observations of the task force report. The task force report says that the position of the general counsel has caused them "considerable concern." They quote Mr. Denham's statement that his powers are "broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency."

The task force says the general counsel's office "marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility."

Listen to some of the other things they say. The general counsel is in " a peculiarly exposed position"; "it is inevitably subject to heavy pressure from all sides and lacks the protection of either a multiheaded agency or an executive department in resisting such pressures." You see now, the task force says that contrary to the majority's position, the general counsel is more vulnerable to pressure than a board.

The task force says "the administrative position of the general counsel is also anomalous." They cite the internal administrative problems which the arrangement has created, pointing to the fact that the unit which anwsers requests for advice is the same unit which hears appeals if the litigant does not choose to abide by the advice.

The task force says "that our conclusion is that the present position of the general counsel is an unstable one."

When the task force report, headed by Owen D. Young and Professor Bowie, uses such characterizations as "division of responsibility," "exposed position," "subject to heavy pressure, "anomalous," "unstable," it is, according to the majority, only being "somewhat critical."

The majority quotes a section of the task force report in support of its statement that the task force did not recommend abolition of the general counsel. The task force recommended a council of labor created by Executive order to include the Secretary of Labor and the general counsel as well as other Federal officials concerned with labor problems.

Let us examine that statement. I think our minority report dealt with this very effectively. As the task force says in the part quoted by the majority on page 10, their recommendation "represented a compromise between the present independent status of the general counsel and his subordination to a department head."

As we said on page 30 of our report actually the very content of the proposal for a council of labor recognized that it dealt with a difficult issue and only indirectly and partially solved the immediate issue. The council of labor was proposed "to coordinate Federal labor policy." For a recommendation directly addressed to the separate general counsel issue one must look at the last of the four major conclusions of the task force which state "(4) the office of general counsel should not be left independent of both the Board and the executive department but should be integrated more closely into one or the other according to the functions to be performed."

With respect to placing the general counsel in the Department of Labor or the Department of Justice, the task force declared "each has serious draw-backs" (task force report p. 140). This leaves only the conclusion that the general counsel should be a subordinate official of the Board and that is exactly the effect of plan 12.

Let's tie up in a package the answer to this objection that plan 12 somehow violates the report of the Hoover Commission. (1) It is completely mistaken to say that plan 12 is contrary to the Hoover Commission report. There is no evidence whatsoever for this objection. (2) The task-force report is not "somewhat" critical. It is critical in a clearly devastating fashion. (3) True, the Hoover Commission report itself does not recommend abolition of the office of general counsel, but plan 1 is directly in line with the Hoover Commission's recommendations, and my distinguished colleagues are opposed to plan 1. So that clearly my learned opponents do not regard the Hoover Commission as the last word on reorganization. I have already referred to the fact that the able chairman of our committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas, specifically reserved the right not to be bound by the Hoover Commission recommendations, although he was a member of the Commission and may not have dissented in the Commission report itself.

I am not being critical of him for this. I would have probably done the same thing. My point here is not criticism; my point is that we are not limited to the confines of the dots and commas of the Hoover Commission report. It is an admirable document and has set the pattern for much worthwhile reorganization, but we are not limited, neither those for plan 12 nor those against plan 12, to the Hoover Commission recommendations in making our own recommendations.

Mr. President, I now conclude:

If plan 12 is going to be acted on by this Congress on the basis of light rather than heat, I say that we have no alternative but to turn down Senate Resolution No. 248 and thereby permit the reorganization of the NLRB in accordance with plan 12.

EXHIBIT 1

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Ann Arbor, May 3, 1950.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of April 27 has just been received, and I am replying immediately.

Since the Congressman from my district made an inquiry similar to yours, I believe it will serve your purpose if I enclose a copy of my letter to him. This was, of course, a letter between us, but I have no objection to your using the information contained in the letter.

As I point out in the letter, the Hoover Commission did not make a recommendation

on this particular point, but the President's plan is in consonance with the general principles of organization which we have proposed for universal application to all departments and agencies.

I cannot, of course, speak for the Commission, but as a former commissioner I can see nothing wrong with the President's proposal. I have indicated in a letter to Senator MCCLELLAN, a copy of which I enclose, that I favor approval of all of the President's 21 proposals.

You are kind to offer your congratulations on my being president of the American Political Science Association. We are honored to have you as a member of the association. It means a great deal to have an active political scientist in the greatest deliberative chamber in the world.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES K. POLLOCK.

APRIL 5, 1950.

HON. EARL C. MICHENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of March 29 requesting my views on Reorganization Plan No. 12 as submitted by the President. I have given the matter considerable thought and have also canvassed the views of several of my colleagues who are well informed in this field. I submit herewith my views on the matter.

Although the Hoover Commission did not deal specifically with the administrative structure of the NLRB, it supported the general structure of the independent regulatory boards and commissions and generally supported the able task-force report prepared by Robert E. Bowie and Owen D. Young.

The task force reported as follows on the independent status and broad and absolute final authority granted to the general counsel:

"The existence of such an office, independent both of the Federal departmental structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility.

"Such an official is in a peculiarly exposed position. In view of the wide powers of the office, it is inevitably subject to heavy pressure from all sides, and lacks the protection of either a multiheaded agency or an executive department in resisting such pressures." (Pp. 139–140.) (See also staff report on NLRB II, 25 ff., and IV, 13 ff., furnished in the typescript to the Congress.)

The proposal to place the general counsel within the administrative structure of the NLRB would terminate the anomalous situation in which both the independent general counsel and the Board have policy-making functions. Where policy-making is divided in carrying out the same administrative function, conflict and inefficient operation inevitably result, as is shown by developments since the Taft-Hartley Act has been in effect. Moreover, the Hoover Commission was unanimous in its belief that unity of command and responsibility was a requisite of efficient administrative organization.

Accordingly, I feel that the proposed reorganization of the NLRB, although not specifically recommended by our Commission, is by implication in line with other Commission proposals. I therefore urge you to support Reorganization Plan No. 12 and vote against House Resolution 516.

The opposition of the chamber of commerce as presented in the resolution you included in your letter, is based on the allegation that Reorganization Plan No. 12 would emasculate the Taft-Hartley Act and return us to the days of the Wagner Act. Such is not the case. Merely that portion of the act which set up an administrative structure which has given rise to conflict and divided responsibility would be altered.

The other argument of the chamber of commerce concerns the mingling of the functions of prosecutor and judge. The Hoover Commission did not object to this in any regulatory board. In my opinion, this difficulty has been adequately corrected by the Administrative Procedure Act which set up an independent corps of hearing examiners.

Moreover, as the task-force report points out, "only in part are his (the general counsel's) present duties genuinely prosecution; some parts are administrative and parts are a species of rule or policy making." (P. 141.)

These policy-forming duties of the general counsel are the ones over which conflicts with the Board have arisen.

Referring to Taft-Hartley, I think it is relevant to point out that the amendment redrafting the Taft-Hartley Act offered by Senator TAFT for himself, Senator SMITH of New Jersey, and Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, passed by the Senate in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress included this language:

"The Board shall appoint an executive secretary, and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties" (sec. 4).

In closing, I should like to add that, in my opinion, good administration requires the approval of the reorganization plan. The politics of the matter, on the other hand, should not override the rectification of administrative structure which is clearly in accord with the reasoning of the Hoover Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES K. POLLOCK.

APRIL 21, 1950.

The Honorable JOHN MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Expenditures, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Since I am unable to appear before your committee when it conducts hearings on the reorganization plans submitted by the President, I find it necessary to send my views to you in this letter. You may insert them in the RECORD if you so desire.

Careful study of the President's 21 plans for the reorganization of certain agencies of the executive branch, makes it clear that he has exercised his power not only in general conformity to the recommendations of the Commission on Organization, but also in full recognition of sound standards of administrative organization. Our Commission was convinced, and in numerous reports to the Congress recommended, that lines of authority and responsibility in the management of the executive branch should be clarified. This is a basic point in all of our reports. The President has now embodied certain of our primary recommendations in these reorganization plans now before you. I can see no sound reason why, in the public interest, you should not recommend their approval to the Senate.

Referring specifically to plans 7 to 15, they have as their main purpose the improvement of internal-management practices which the Hoover Commission found to be defective because of diffusion of administrative responsibility among commission members. A secondary purpose is to open up lines of communication between the President and each commission through the designation of a chairman. None of these plans would impair basic commission functions of rule-making or administrative adjudication, nor would the independence of commission action be threatened.

Similarly in connection with plans Nos. 1 to 6, clear lines of responsibility and authority from the President through the department heads down to the lowest level of operations is provided. Also necessary authority would be granted to enable department heads to make appropriate internal adjustments to accomplish clear authority. All of the other plans remedy some, although not all, of existing organizations defects in the agencies to which they relate.

I, therefore, strongly urge your approval of the President's plans.

At a time of great internal tension, the least the Congress can do is to assist in putting our administrative house in order. No national policy can be effectively and economically administered without the acceptance and adoption of the basic recommendations of our Commission. If there is a better way than we have proposed to achieve efficient administration, let the Congress provide this way, but in the absence of something better, there can be no justifiable excuse for not acting promptly to effectuate the recommendations of our Commission.

The plans now before you provide a real test of congressional sincerity in reorganizing the executive branch. A commission, created by your action, standing above party and above special interests has, after laborious and painstaking investigation provided you with the foundation for large-scale improvement. The country is now watching to see whether Congress is sincere in its expressed desire to improve administrative organization or whether it will yield to the interested pressures of individual groups. I am hoping that all doubts about reorganization matters will be resolved by you and your committee in favor of those whose recommendations you sought. The President has now successfully implemented some of our recommendations. It is up to you to give effect to the plans as presented.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES K. POLLOCK.

EXHIBIT 2

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
May 9, 1950.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In your letter of May 3, 1950, you request the Board's comments on a portion of the majority report on Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950, by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Your letter alludes to a reference by the majority to a letter this Board submitted to the committee in June 1949, in response to a request by the chairman of the Committee for the Board's comments "relative to the application of the various recommendations and textual discussion" of the Hoover Commission which appeared to affect this agency.

The majority report attempts to rely in part upon this Board's statement of June 1949 to support the proposition that the Hoover Commission report did not recommend transfer of the general counsel's functions and abolition of the Office of General Counsel. But we have at no time contended that the Hoover Commission did make such recommendation. Our testimony before the House and Senate Committees on Reorganization Plan No. 12 will bear that out. It has been our emphatic position, however, in testifying in favor of plan 12, that it is in conformity with the fundamental purposes of the Hoover Commission recommendations as to all regulatory commissions.

This position is in no wise inconsistent with our letter of June 1949 to the committee. That letter noted that the committee's "primary responsibility" is "to coordinate across-the-board recommendations designed to improve general management, personnel management, administrative services, and budgeting and accounting." It stated that

"the committee is particularly concerned about reductions in personnel and in operating costs resulting from reorganizations effected." It suggested that the committee would "like to be fully informed as to economies and efficiencies achieved through administrative actions and reorganizations effectuated to accord with the Commission's recommendations."

Accordingly, within the limited frame of reference suggested by the committee, our comments were intentionally confined to a report on the extent to which this Board, operating within the structure of the existing Taft-Hartley Act, had achieved conformity with the specific Hoover Commission recommendations, and the steps that had been initiated to accomplish further compliance. Our reply, as suggested by the committee, was devoted primarily to the commission's recommendations in respect of general management, personnel management, and performance budget.

As to the Hoover Commission's report on independent regulatory commissions, only the general recommendations applicable to all commissions appeared to affect this Board. It seemed to the Board that the most important of these was the proposal that "all administrative responsibility be vested in the chairman of the commission." In compliance with the limitations contained in the committee's request, we merely noted that the 1947 amendments to the National Labor Relations Act had divided administrative responsibilities between the five-member Board and its independent general counsel. We further indicated the character of the authority that had been delegated to the chairman under existing structure.

The May 1949 request of the committee did not invite the value judgments of this Board on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Such comments would, in any event, have seemed especially improper for us to venture at the time of the Board's reply, for the Senate was at that very time engaged in debating proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. Further, the Board had on February 2, 1949, a few months before receiving the committee's request, appeared through its Chairman before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and testified at length on S. 249, a bill then under consideration by the Labor Committee. Among other things, that bill specifically provided for the elimination of the independent office of general counsel and the creation of a structure, in its essential form, identical to that proposed by plan No. 12 of 1950. Our unqualified and unanimous opposition to the existing independent office of general counsel was thus already a matter of public record. (See February 2, 1949, testimony of Chairman Paul M. Herzog, hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, pt. I, pp. 116, 137, 173–177, 187–188.) It presumably did not need reiteration in our June reply to the committee's letter, even had we deemed it relevant or proper to include it there.

If called upon today, as we were in 1949 by the Senate Committee on Expenditures, to comment on the effect of the specific recommendations of the Hoover Commission on the present structure of the National Labor Relations Board, we would make the same reply as we did a year ago. Indeed we said just that in the following portion of our recent testimony before the Senate committee in support of plan No. 12:

"Efficient administration is not possible without a single and direct line of authority, whether in an executive department or in a regulatory commission. That is what the National Labor Relations Board does not have today, and would not have tomorrow if nothing more were done than to vest in the Chairman the few administrative functions which remain in the five Board members under present arrangements. Such a program would accomplish little at the National Labor Relations Board, however much it might add to the efficiency of the other six regulatory commissions which are not now saddled with the basic split in authority."

Very sincerely yours,

PAUL M. HERZOG, *Chairman.*

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 10 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Roy Blough, of Illinois, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and goodness, we pray that during this day our souls may be the sanctuary of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

We are seeking Thee in this moment of prayer because Thou hast first sought us. In our great need we have no one else to go to. Inspire us now with a more radiant faith in Thy wisdom and power to meet all our needs.

May our hearts be aglow with the enthusiasm and inspiration of high ideals and a vision of the splendor and glory of the kingdom of brotherhood and good will among men.

Grant that these ideals and this vision may be gloriously fulfilled and to Thy name we shall ascribe all the praise. Through Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ATTACHÉ

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture that the State Department has confirmed the appointment of one Wolf Ladejinsky for the position as agriculture attaché to the American mission in Tokyo.

In judging the sincerity and truthfulness of the State Department's vehement denials to charges of foreign influence in that Department, the American people ought to look at this appointment.

This man was born in Russia. He lived there a number of years, and in addition he was employed by the official Russian agency, the Amtorg Trading Corp., in this country.

Why cannot the State Department give the American people a break once? Why do not they go out to Nebraska or Kansas or Iowa or some other State and get a real agriculture expert from one of our agricultural colleges?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 157]

Bolling	Hare	Phillips, Calif.
Boykin	Hart	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Carlyle	Hébert	Redden
Carnahan	Jackson, Calif.	Reed, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Judd	Rhodes
Cavalcante	Kunkel	Rivers
Chatham	LeCompte	Smathers
Davenport	Linehan	Smith, Ohio
Davies, N. Y.	McConnell	Walsh
Dingell	McMillen, Ill.	Werdel
Douglas	Miles	White, Calif.
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Wolcott
Gilmer	Morgan	
Gross	Morrison	
Gwinn	Moulder	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.	
Nixon		

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Post, May 4, 1950.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address and, further, to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALSH (at the request of Mr. DENTON) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by James H. Allen.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include some remarks he made on Long Island last Sunday.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks

in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. WADSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the March 1950 issue of the magazine known as Freedom and Union.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one a newspaper article and in the other a statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by E. A. Mattison.

Mr. O'NEILL and Mr. JAVITS asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mr. VELDE asked and were given permission to extend their remarks, each in two instances.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include certain excerpts from extraneous publications and from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make today on the subject of taxes.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous excerpts.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous material.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to make an announcement. Before rising on yesterday the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to offer an amendment, on page 411, following line 21 of the bill.

The Clerk will now report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 411, following line 21, insert a new chapter, as follows:

"CHAPTER X–A. GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

"Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $500,000,000 [and the President is hereby authorized, with the aid and assistance of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to make such reductions totaling $500,000,000 in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this act, including funds for Government corporations:] *Provided*, That such reductions shall not be applied to appropriations and contract authorizations hereinbefore provided for expenditure for (1) construction and alteration of ships, new airplanes, new weapons and other equipment for the armed services, and (2) research and development conducted primarily for the benefit of the armed services: *Provided further*, That no appropriation, contract authorization, or other fund, hereinbefore provided, shall be reduced by more than 15 percent of the amount provided for such purpose in this act."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. Chairman, before we take final action on this omnibus appropriations bill, I ask the indulgence of the House to make a brief observation.

For several weeks we have been laboring with this huge appropriations bill. It is huge both in text matter and in the amount of money it appropriates. It is one of the, if not the most important measure to come before us. In this bill we are determining the country's fiscal policy for next year. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri, accurately expressed it in his opening speech when he said this is a tax-appropriation measure. What we spend by this bill must necessarily come from the taxpayers.

First of all, I wish to express sincere appreciation to those on our side of the aisle who have been here regularly on the floor, day after day, during the reading of the bill. And I think all of us appreciate the tremendous job that the entire membership of the Committee on Appropriations, from both sides of the aisle, has had in presenting this bill.

I particularly wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the committee, for his tireless efforts to reduce the proposed expenditures. He, and some others with him, have pointed out innumerable places where savings could be made. But unfortunately, in those efforts our Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle have given us practically no support.

In saying this I am not unmindful that certain individual Members—all too few from the controlling majority—have sought to assist us in these economy efforts. But I think the country should know why it is, after 4 weeks of work, we now have up to this moment a bill appropriating more money than the bill as reported by the committee.

It is true that $350,000,000 have been added for defense purposes. But one would think that with these extraordinary defense demands the House would make even greater effort to make savings elsewhere in the national budget.

Mr. Chairman, the country is deeply disturbed about what has taken place these last several weeks in connection with this bill. This morning I received a letter from a young man in my district in which he says: "Congress seems to me to be nothing but a bunch of people who talk about a balanced budget and when it comes to a vote the sky is the limit."

I think he expresses the sentiment of the majority of the American people. And I also think what he says applies with great force to our Democratic friends.

During the reading of this bill 45 amendments have been offered to increase items of expenditures, and 35 of them came from the Democratic side of the aisle. And with enthusiastic support from that side of the aisle, 18 of them were adopted.

And here is an astounding fact that the country should know. Thirty-six amendments have been offered to reduce various items, and only five of such reduction amendments came from the Democratic side. In other words, 31 of the 36 amendments making cuts came from the Republican side.

But the savings realized in this bill are small indeed when compared to the substantial savings that would be realized by the 26 amendments offered from the Republican side of the aisle, which were summarily rejected. They had practically no support from our Democratic friends.

As accurately as circumstances would permit, I have observed how the House

voted on the teller votes. After hearing all this fine talk about economy, I have been amazed at the lack of support received from our Democratic friends. It is understandable why the 26 reduction amendments from our side were rejected and only 5 adopted when you know that on the average, only five Democrats voted with us on teller votes for the respective reductions.

That is the record to date. We are now approaching the final vote. That will be the acid test. That is when each and every Member will be called upon to make good to his people his promises to cut Government spending. That is when the taxpayers will learn who is actually for, and who is actually against economy.

Those who vote for the astronomical sum carried in this bill will be voting to continue deficit spending and a continuation of the existing high taxes. Those who vote to reduce the amount for purposes other than our national defense will be voting to strengthen our first line of defense, which is our financial stability.

On these votes, as our names are individually called, the people we represent will at long last know exactly where each of us stand on the vital issue of economy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 411, after line 21, insert the following:

"In apportioning funds for the fiscal year 1951, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall place in reserve not less than 5 percent of the amounts available for administrative expenses and such reserves shall not be released for expenditure unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall certify that maintenance of essential Government service so requires."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Missouri on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, that it adds additional duties to be performed by an executive officer of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has offered a substitute amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has made a point of order against the amendment.

The Chair has examined the amendment very carefully and is of the opinion that the amendment is in order as a substitute for the Thomas amendment. The Chair might point out that the Thomas amendment contained some legislative features. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri is germane and does not, in the opinion of the Chair, add any additional legislation. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are nearing the close of the consideration of a long and detailed bill. Seldom has an appropriation bill been so well processed as to pass the House with so few amendments.

The bill as reported by the committee and as passed by the House up to this point, reduces the budget estimates approximately one and a half billion dollars in cash and contract authorizations.

Due to the presentation of the annual appropriations in one bill we have this year been able to defeat proposals to increase expenditure and efforts to add unwarranted appropriations which in former years we had to accept when presented as amendments to separate bills.

But even at that, Mr. Chairman, we still desire to effect any further reduction in expenditures which may be possible at the close of the reading of the bill. And with that thought in mind we now offer in addition to the economies already effected in the bill as a substitute to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] the motion which I send to the desk. It proposes a further 5-percent reduction in administrative expenses to be held in reserve unless the Director of the Budget finds it, or some portion of it, necessary to the maintenance of essential Government service.

The proposal submitted by the gentleman from Texas, of course, is untenable. It turns over to the President work which the Congress ought to do, it is an abdication by the legislative branch to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman tell the committee what that 5 percent would amount to in total in administrative expenses? Has the gentleman figured that up?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman realizes it would be difficult, if not impossible at this stage of the bill, to estimate accurately the amount involved. It has been variously estimated at a minimum of $250,000,000 and may be expected to run beyond that figure. But it is merely a matter of estimate at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is not the Bureau of the Budget an agency of the executive branch of our Government? Does not the amendment offered by the gentleman turn over to the executive branch the responsibilities for these cuts?

Mr. CANNON. The executive branch of the Government may impound, and does impound, appropriations at will. But by this amendment the Congress makes mandatory the sequestering of 5 percent whether the executive branch of the Government chooses to exercise its prerogative or not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My question is this: The proposed substitute states that there shall be placed in reserve not less than 5 percent. Would it be possible, or even probable, that 15 percent or 20 percent might be placed in reserve?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman understands that the President may impound any percentage, and he has done that in the very recent past. But, this amendment provides that he shall impound not less than 5 percent.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I ask further, has not that authority been exercised by the President rather than by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the past?

Mr. CANNON. It has been exercised by the President and it can be exercised by the President in the future, but we provide here that sequestration shall be mandatory and that funds so impounded shall not be released or expended unless the Director of the Budget finds it necessary to the maintenance of the essential services of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me address myself briefly to the contents and the purposes of my amendment. In the first place, it reduces the appropriations in this bill, which now total $29,500,000,000 by, approximately, $500,000,000. We all know that there are some untouchable items in this bill. Among the untouchable items are the fixed obligations, the debts of the Government, if you please, such as social security, amounting to about $2,000,000,000; veterans' hospitals, veterans' benefits, pensions, and so forth, amounting to approximately another $4,500,000,000; and various other items, and then on top of those untouchables we specifically say in this amendment that the armed services modernization of the Navy, new ships, guns, tanks, and weapons and research and development shall not be touched at all. When you add all of those you have out of that $29,500,000,000 about $16,000,000,000 that you can cut. So, this $500,000,000 in truth and in fact, after subtracting those nontouchable items, including national-defense weapons, will figure out a little less than 3 percent. Then, as a further safeguard, we provide that no item can be reduced as it now stands in this bill more than 15 percent. In this day and time when we are all talking economy, and we all want economy, let us be perfectly frank about it, the great Committee on Ways and Means is working day and night in response to the demand from big business and little business and every consumer in this country to reduce taxes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Who would determine what cuts were to be made, and from what items the cuts were to come?

Mr. THOMAS. We put that directly in the hands of the President of the United States, who prepared this whole budget of $42,000,000,000. He has a staff of over 300 people, and they are the ones who sent it to us. I do not think they know quite as much about it as we do, but, let us be frank about it, they certainly know something because they prepared it in the first place.

There is a tremendous demand from everybody in this country for a little economy. If hearsay is worth anything to us, our great Committee on Ways and Means is working day and night and is about to give industry and the consumers some relief, in the neighborhood, if the newspapers are correct, of from $700,000,000 to $1,000,000,000; and I am for it. We have to help that great committee a little bit, and this is an opportunity to cut this bill $500,000,000. It makes sense.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman have any opposition to increasing the $500,000,000 in his amendment to $1,000,000,000, so as to really do a fairly decent job?

Mr. THOMAS. I think $500,000,000 is a good start.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman admits it is only a 3-percent cut. Certainly we can do a little better than that, and make it 6 percent.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us do 3 percent, and show the people we are trying to do something.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I fail to see how the gentleman's amendment would exempt agriculture. Will the gentleman explain how the agricultural appropriation bill would be affected?

Mr. THOMAS. It is good old common horse sense. We have passed some laws around here and have obligated ourselves to do certain things. If my memory serves me correctly, those obligations are about $450,000,000. It is like social security; it is like veterans' benefits. Every time the President sends up a message he tells us that here are certain fixed obligations, and we cannot cut them. I do not want you to cut anything like that. Just cut those items that are not fixed obligations.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in order that we may try to see if we understand the true facts with respect to the bill that is now before us, did I correctly understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to state that the action of the committee and the action of the Committee of the Whole, as the bill now reaches its final form, have resulted in cutting this bill $1,500,000,000 under the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CANNON. The amount of the bill under the budget in cash is in round figures one and one-third billion dollars.

In addition sufficient contract authorization is canceled to bring the reduction $1,500,000,000 below the budget estimate.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman is in error in his estimates on this and the Members of the House should understand the situation.

Mr. CANNON. It is not a matter of opinion. It is only necessary to look at the tabulation to be found in the committee report, on page 6.

Mr. KEEFE. As I understand the situation, when the bill came to Congress from the Committee on Appropriations it suggested reductions below the budget estimate in round figures of $1,500,000,000. That is correct, is it not?

Now then, in the consideration of this bill by the House we have made additions of $485,000,000 in round figures.

I am not talking about the budget estimates; $350,000,000 of that is covered by the budget estimates for the armed services. But we have added $485,000,000. What we have actually reduced in round figures, and I have the exact figures to the penny, is $35,000,000. So that, as a matter of fact, the action of the House on this appropriation bill has added $450,000,000 to the total of the bill as it was reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations. So that the net saving below the Bureau of the Budget estimates as submitted to the House is not $1,500,000,000, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri, but is slightly in excess of a billion dollars.

I have the exact figures, but I am stating them in round numbers rather than to take the time to read them down to the last penny. It seems to me what we have done is to evade the clear and plain responsibility which was placed upon us when we were elected as Members of the House of Representatives. We are now seeking to transfer that responsibility to the President and in effect say to him, "Mr. President, we have combed this bill from top to bottom. We cannot find any place where we can cut it, and we are now directing you, Mr. President, to cut this bill, under the Thomas amendment, $500,000,000, or under the Cannon substitute we are asking you, Mr. President, to freeze this appropriation estimate as to administrative expenses at a level which will be 5 percent under the amounts carried in the bill." That, to me, would be a shocking display of incompetence on the part of the House of Representatives.

It would appear that you have not the courage to stand here in the House and face the issue. You want to let the people of America know that you are economy-minded and yet, when a single project comes before you for consideration, the House does not have the courage to effect a reduction. You now propose to evade a plain responsibility and transfer to the President our constitutional duty to control the Nation's purse. This I refuse to do.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a monstrous display of congressional incompetence, to say the least.

The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will reassert Congressional authority and responsibility and at long last let the people of America know that their representatives have the courage to stand up and be counted and not attempt to shirk a plain duty and hide behind the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement with the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I cannot see how any Member of the House conscious of the separation of powers in our Government and conscious of the division of our Government into three branches, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, could vote for the pending original amendment. Of course, the same remarks apply to the substitute amendment.

The gentleman from Texas says that there is about sixteen or seventeen billion that could be reduced. I doubt if there is going to be any reduction in the appropriation for national defense. The gentleman in his amendment exempts money for the alteration to ships and construction of new ships and research and development, but I doubt if there can be any cut in the activities of our national defense in the light of world conditions. We just put in $350,000,000, practically unanimously, because we recognized the world situation. We voted back $75,000,000 for hospital construction, which a majority of the Members felt was a good investment for human beings and human life, as contrasted with the reduction of dollars itself; and I agree with the majority. I voted with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in his motions to increase the appropriations, a negligible amount when we consider the total appropriations, for research work for heart disease and the other diseases that affect human beings, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] have so ably led the fight in this House to try to bring about appropriations for research work, with the hope that it will produce results helpful to the people of our country.

The practical operation of the pending amendment will affect perhaps not more than $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000. We eliminate national defense. That is, roughly speaking, $13,400,000,000. No one can reduce the interest on the national debt, which is, roughly speaking, $5,500,000,000. I doubt if anyone will affect the Veterans' Administration. That is over $6,000,000,000. That leaves only about three and one-half billion that the cut can apply to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the national debt interest charge of $6,000,000,000 is not in this $30,000,000,000. As far as the national defense items are

concerned, the money in this present 1951 bill to cover and liquidate past contract authorizations—that is a debt that we must pay—is practically $2,000,000,000. There is $1,400,000,000 in the present bill for the purchase of new airplanes. But in all it totals only about $5,000,000,000. So out of the $14,000,000,000 for national defense, you have seven to nine billion that can be cut. You must remember there are over 250,000 civilian employees in there. That is where the reduction can be made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand what the gentleman says but I say that in practical operation I doubt if there will be any reductions in connection with our national defense. It is one thing to talk about the language of an amendment, but we have to consider the practical operation of the amendment if it should be adopted.

Now, what about the Post Office? Every Member knows that the reduction already made of $25,000,000 has brought about certain rather drastic actions in the Post Office Department, and the pending amendment is only going to increase that difficulty. What about the other departments? I just present these as practical considerations to practical-minded men.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my distinguished friend from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the gentleman agree with me that this is a rather cowardly way of shirking our responsibility and putting it in the lap of the President? We have had the opportunity and the right to vote on reductions, and I think we should not give up an obligation which is ours and transfer it to the Executive. To pass these amendments would be to relinquish a part of our legislative responsibility and force it upon the Executive. Surely this cannot be the intent of the Members of this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to challenge the gentleman's opinion in the use of the word "cowardly," but I do not have to go that far to make out a strong case. I think it is wrong for us to abdicate our legislative responsibility. That was the main argument made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. He is absolutely on sound ground, and I am in complete agreement with him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Thomas amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER to the amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: In line 3 of the Thomas amendment strike out "$500,000,000" and insert "$600,000,000".

Strike out the rest of the paragraph and insert the following: "Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this bill, viz: (1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 percent below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 percent shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

"(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000 and not more than 5 percent less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 percent less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

"(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than $720,000,000: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 percent below the estimates submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 percent less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

"(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000 and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 percent below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

"(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000 and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000 and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(7) For other contractual services, not more than $1,301,000,000 and for all departments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,000,000 and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the veterans' hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000 and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(10) For lands and structures for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 percent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, recognizing that the only proper way to attempt to reduce the items in this bill, and the only opportunity we would have to do so would be by a motion of this kind at the end, I caused to be procured from the budget a table showing a complete breakdown of all expenditures of the Government for different purposes, by categories, so that I could figure this thing out and have some idea of how to proceed and be able to offer an amendment where the Congress of the United States did the job of cutting and did not delegate the authority to the President of the United States or the Bureau of the Budget. I had in mind a specific reduction in the estimates that were submitted. It is absolutely impossible to go through the bill item by item and gather them altogether at one time, but in this way I have been able to get a picture which I believe will take care of the needs of the departments—and at the same time save at least $600,000,000 to the Government.

I propose to do this by providing for civilian personnel a reduction in the estimates of the President of at least 10 percent all the way through. Some of those have been reduced to that figure now. Most of them have not been, except that in the Department of Defense I only propose reducing 2 percent and I have exempted nurses, doctors, and medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

On the travel item where there is a total of $365,000,000 in the President's budget estimate, I figure that they can take a cut of 5 percent in the military personnel travel and 20 percent in the amount provided for civilian personnel travel. I do not believe that figure is a bit more than it should be when you come to consider all of the departments of the Government.

For transportation of things for all departments and agencies I have limited them to $720,000,000 and have provided a cut of 10 percent below the budget estimates for all agencies except the Department of Defense and for that Department I figure they can take a 5-percent cut at least.

For communication services of $59,000,000 I recommend a cut of 10 percent below the estimates and 5 percent in the Department of Defense. The total there is $59,000,000 and the saving would be $5,000,000.

For rents and utilities I have exempted the Department of Defense and have recommended a cut of 10 percent.

For printing and reproduction I have recommended a straight cut across the board of 10 percent.

For other contractual services I have recommended a cut of 10 percent for everything except the Department of Defense.

For supplies and materials, I recommend a cut of 10 percent on everything except the Department of Defense and the veterans' hospitals.

For equipment I have exempted the Department of Defense and suggested a cut of 10 percent in the budget estimates on other departments.

For land and structures I have limited the cut to 5 percent and have exempted the Department of Defense.

This is the only way I can see at this time that we can save a very substantial sum of money and meet our own obligations under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support the gentleman's amendment. I have a question for information concerning the proposed cut for land and structures of 5 percent. Is that 5 percent to be applied on a project basis?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding, and that is what I intend. Of course, it applies to the budget estimates, and where an estimate has been reduced below the budget estimate, 5 percent would not apply.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, regardless of what agency it is, if it has a 10-, 15-, 20-, or 33⅓-percent cut, this would not be in addition to it.

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding, and that is my intention.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman state what the total amount of money is that would be cut under his amendment?

Mr. TABER. Six hundred million dollars.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman's amendment include a cut in all personnel?

Mr. TABER. Yes; a cut in all personnel.

Mr. VORYS. Of 10 percent?

Mr. TABER. Of 10 percent, with the exception of the Department of Defense, and there it is 2 percent.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Generally speaking, his amendment does not harm the Department of Defense in any way whatsoever, nor the Veterans' Administration, does it?

Mr. TABER. It does not. I do not think there is a single item in the Department of Defense that would be affected by this amendment but what they could take it. Two percent on their civilian personnel certainly would not hurt them, and cutting their communications down a little bit would not hurt either.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In other words, the gentleman's amendment places it directly in the hands of Congress to say what shall be done rather than leave it in the discretion of the President?

Mr. TABER. That is entirely correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it involves a reduction of $600,000,000 along the same general lines as the Thomas amendment, and in addition to that certain specific provisions which would result in additional savings; am I correct in that?

Mr. TABER. Not only that, but I specify directly the items that are to be reduced and cover the whole thing completely so there is nothing left for the Bureau of the Budget to do except perform its administrative functions under the law.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman have the figures as to the specific saving which would be effected over-all by the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. TABER. The only thing I can say is this: I have figured the thing out as closely as I could. I believe that there is no question but what these figures would run up to $600,000,000. They might go beyond that, but I would be practically certain that they would go to that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the gentleman translate his cuts in the civilian part of the Defense and in communications from a percentage into dollars? What would be the total amount of cuts?

Mr. TABER. On the civilian personnel in Defense?

Mr. KENNEDY. And on communications?

Mr. TABER. The cut in the Department of Defense, in the Department of the Army, would be something like $4,000,000. In the Navy it would be somewhere around $3,000,000, and in the Air Force it would be perhaps $2,000,000. There are not so many in the Air Force, because a lot of this buying of food is done by the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes. I wish to ask a question or two.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield, can he tell us the extent of the cut in the Veterans' Administration which the pending amendment would cause?

Mr. TABER. I could by going through the tables, but it would take some time.

Mr. ROONEY. Can the gentleman tell us in round figures?

Mr. TABER. In round figures, the cut would apply to the personnel other than those engaged in the hospitals, and the doctors, nurses, and orderlies. The cut would apply to any items of supplies and materials other than those that would be required for the hospitals.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman's amendment also contemplate cutting the Federal Bureau of Investigation as well as research programs in heart, cancer, and mental health?

Mr. TABER. I expect those items would be cut.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman's amendment, however, does not cut any of the statutory payments or allowances to veterans in any way?

Mr. TABER. Not in the slightest degree.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it should be said that the gentleman at least is not trying to do away with some of the responsibilities of this body. He is at least designating where these cuts should be made if the Congress should agree to his proposal.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. I hope this amendment may be adopted. It is the only way I can see to make a general cut at the end of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I think as we come to the conclusion of this appropriation bill there are a number of things we should keep in mind. We have a national debt of $257,000,000,000, and the Department of Commerce says the total value of our physical assets in this country is only $145,000,000,000. We lack today about four to six billion dollars annually, it is estimated, of meeting operating expenses. We can continue to run a deficit only so long as we can sell bonds. How long is that? No one knows.

Our Committee on Appropriations has been conscious of these facts and these figures. I do not yield to anyone on the committee in my efforts to try to dig in and see how we can help to hold down Government expenditures. We have tried our best to do that. But I do not want to say to the House that this is an exact business that we run. Five of us on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture sat for more than 2½ months. We heard witnesses. We went into all these sundry and various programs from A to Z. But you cannot say point blank that they should have this or that amount, you just have to use your best judgment. However, there are some things we know we have to realize today.

If you have this debt, and if you are not collecting enough money to meet your obligations, you have either to raise taxes or reduce salaries or reduce services or reduce personnel.

There is no way around it. You have four alternatives, and sooner or later, and I think sooner, you are going to be faced with it. In fact, we face it now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my opinion the gentleman from Mississippi is one of the most conscientious Members of the House working on the Committee on Appropriations. I want to back up what he has had to say and that is he need not go into the background whatsoever for any Member of the House,

as far as his earnest desire to do something toward balancing the budget is concerned.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend. We have worked together for many years in our efforts not only to provide adequately for agriculture but to try to do it as economically as the facts justify. The people of America expect economy. They expect us to show some effort toward achieving economy. The situation of our country demands economy. If I am right in that statement, however, I think we need to show judgment and discretion in our effort to bring about economy.

I am here before you today trying to point out to you the advantages of the approach in the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of our committee. Under the Thomas amendment you are turning over to the President the duty of cutting out so much money. Do you know whether he will cut it out of the Labor Department?

Do you know whether he will take it out of the Department of Agriculture? Do you know whether he will take it out of this, that, or the other department? You do not. Do you know how much he will take out of each one? You do not. If anyone wants to abdicate that authority to the President or to anyone else, that is their privilege.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] spells it out in detail.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will answer that, and I have a high regard for the gentleman from New York. It does spell it out in detail. It says where you have to cut it. When you pass that, then you have to take it. It does not make any difference what happens to a department or what happens to the armed services. If we pass that cut that is that; and we are helpless to do anything about it so far as that particular provision is concerned.

I want to point out to you just what the committee has done through its chairman. We are directing that 5 percent of the administrative funds shall be withheld—5 percent. You say, "Why that much?" That is the best judgment of the Democratic members of this committee. That has been the result after we made a determined effort to hold down the appropriation by making reductions of $1,300,000,000 below the budget. It comes as the result of our awareness of what is needed in this bill to balance our budget. It comes after we have done our very best to hold down expenditures. But the need for economy is such that we want to say once again that if the future shows that further savings can be made, then that shall be done and we are directing the withholding of 5 percent of the administrative costs over and above the $1,300,000,000 we have already reduced the bill. Then we say if perchance in the Veterans' Administration or in any other of the services of the Government this 5 percent withholding works such a hardship on the service so that it cannot be carried on, then on a proper showing we can do something about it to see that the Government operates. If you can tell me any sounder basis to try to handle the finances of this country than that, then I do not know what it might be.

First, there are 2½ months of detailed study and hearings. After that you must make your best effort to hold down these expenses. We cut out $1,300,000,000. We say in addition to that 5 percent of the administrative funds be withheld. But that could be too harsh with regard to some of the veterans in the veterans hospitals and with regard to some in other services and with regard to some other departments. You cannot go through a bill which covers so many pages and millions of services to the American people and be absolutely sure of what you are doing—and I do not claim to be sure, but I say that we should make this further saving over and above the $1,300,000,000 we have already eliminated—reserving the right to reconsider individual problems that might arise.

I think the Cannon substitute is the best approach to this problem, which is a serious problem in this Nation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Does not the gentleman believe that the Cannon substitute is not only the reasonable and sensible approach but that it is the logical approach, in view of the fact that right now the President has before the Congress 25 reorganization plans? If those reorganization plans are not disapproved, if they work out efficiently and savings are made, then that 5 percent can be applied to that. If they are not approved and these savings are not made, then the Bureau of the Budget has the discretion to release these funds in order not to cripple any of the essential business of the Government.

Mr. WHITTEN. My colleague has made a very sound argument, as he usually does. That is an additional reason as to why this is the sound approach.

But I want to say that, sitting on the Appropriations Committee, you are not in a position to say exactly. You have to back your judgment. If we can save more we want to do it. Under the Cannon amendment we will do it, but if perchance we go too far, we have not burned our house behind us or the bridge in front of us. We are where we can remedy the situation if we find it necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Taber amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the objection I have to both the Thomas amendment and the Cannon amendment is simply that we are surrendering the powers which we in the House should exercise. Moreover, the Cannon amendment means a reduction of not over $250,000,000, all through the bill, as far as we can estimate. I certainly will not settle for any paltry reduction in this huge bill of only $250,000,000. On the other hand, the Thomas amendment calls for about $500,000,000 reduction. Certainly we can do better than that. If we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the one to be offered later on by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] we will strike at the soft spots in this bill. We have all been on Pullman cars and noticed them well filled with Government people traveling. Here is your opportunity to say to each and every agency and department of the Government: "Hold down this travel item in your division to the extent specified by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]."

You can also say to them: "The transportation of goods shall be held down according to the limitations under this amendment."

You can also say to them: "When you Government folks get a notion that you want to make a long-distance call, think twice, because this particular agency must hold its communications expenditures down to a certain point."

I think that any man or woman in this House who votes against the Taber amendment certainly cannot conscientiously claim that he or she is much interested in economy in government.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I listened to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and, if I understood him correctly, he is in opposition to both the Thomas original amendment and the Cannon substitute therefor, because, as I understood him, he contends that they both involve the surrender of legislative responsibility and authority and power to the Executive.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Indiana is entirely correct. Just a few minutes ago we heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] make that approximate statement. Certainly I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts as to what he then had to say. I was much impressed by his argument against our surrendering our legislative responsibility to the executive branch.

Mr. HALLECK. I was impressed by that argument myself, I might say. But, likewise, is it not true that of these various proposals now before us, the Taber proposal is the only one that seeks to get at the soft spots, recognizing the initial, fundamental, and primary responsibility of the House of Representatives to deal directly and affirmatively with the matter of appropriations?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Indiana is very sound in his statement. Mr. HALLECK has always shown that he is willing to accept the

responsibility which belongs to every Congressman. It is our responsibility; and I will not admit to my people, to my farmers, that I am afraid to ask that they take a 5- or 10-percent cut along with the rest of the people, if necessary. We must cut all through this bill with the exceptions of our veterans and national defense if we ever hope to make any real saving.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my good friend from Nebraska who has consistently supported our recommendations for savings in this bill.

Mr. CURTIS. The Cannon amendment could end up with no reduction at all. Is not that so?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The Cannon proposal leaves the whole matter entirely to the whim of the Budget Bureau which, after all, is simply part of the President's office and absolutely under his control. There will be no saving of any consequence accomplished.

Mr. CURTIS. It seems to me that this is mere wishful thinking.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is mere window dressing, in my opinion. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that it amounts to practically nothing. The Taber and Jensen amendments would save perhaps $1,000,000,000 to the taxpayers.

Mr. CURTIS. There can be no painless reduction of expenditures.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct. We must cut even on things dear to us if we hope to do anything worth while.

Mr. CURTIS. The Taber amendment is a straightforward, honest method of cutting Government expenditures. I will support it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In conclusion, let me point out that the Taber amendment does no harm whatsoever to national defense or to the veterans.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri who has, like the gentlemen from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], tried to cut this huge appropriation measure down to a workable level.

Mr. SHORT. None of us wants to surrender our congressional authority.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is right. In my opinion, if we did so, we would do immeasurable harm to the prestige of this great body.

Mr. SHORT. The Taber amendment is not an abdication of legislative responsibility; rather, it keeps control over these expenditures in the hands of Congress where they should be.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Exactly; and that is why I cannot agree with my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], whom I complimented on the floor for his work in our Subcommittee on Appropriations. If there is cutting to be done, I think we are the ones to do it. Let us accept our responsibility and not throw this job into the President's lap. Let us adopt both the Taber and Jensen amendments.

ECONOMY NEEDED—NOT POLITICAL ARGUMENTS

People favor economy

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], proposes to reduce the general appropriation bill, which amounts to approximately $30,000,000,000, by $500,000,000. I believe that the amendment should be adopted. In my judgment and from my observation, the people of the United States want economy, not political arguments. It seems to me that we can obtain effective economy without seriously crippling some of the important functions of Government, such as national defense. I have no fear of what the people of this country will say if we make a move in that direction.

Four courses facing us

You and I need to examine the huge expenditures called for in this bill in the light of the responsibilities which we have as we seek to obtain peace and decency in this world. There are four courses we can follow.

First: Immediate war

First, as we try to find elbow room in this world for democracy and freedom, we can take the great gamble of declaring war on our potential enemies. But the people of this country have never been aggressors. They seek peace; they do not want war; and you and I do not want to declare war.

Second: Isolationism

Second, there is that ugly choice, the wholly unrealistic choice, the selfish choice of again becoming isolationists, withdrawing to our own shores and allowing freedom to perish in other lands. If we chose that course, our folly would some day return to haunt us, just as our isolation of the 1930's haunted us throughout the early days of World War II.

Third: Continued unrestricted spending

Third, we can continue as we have in the past by voting for all of the programs which we find desirable regardless of the cost. But many of these programs are luxuries which do not contribute to the strength of our national defense and which we can very easily do without. If we continue this course, it will lead us to disaster and chaos. There is but one choice.

Fourth: Prudent spending at home—Peace and decency throughout the world

That is our fourth choice—the choice, given us by the Thomas amendment, of providing for this nation a strong program of national defense which will enable us to speak out for peace and decency in this world, of providing assistance to those neighbors of ours who want democracy and who desire to join us in resisting the communistic dictator, and of doing without those luxuries which we can defer to a future date when we can afford them. As we pledge ourselves to that course, we shall also recognize that there are many things we would like to have. But we will have to postpone them to another day. It would be fine if we had unlimited resources to do all of these things, but we do not have unlimited resources. We must conserve our national resources as cautiously as possible in order that we do not fall victim of national bankruptcy.

Luxuries must be postponed

As I read the Thomas amendment, it follows the fourth course. It does not cripple our national defenses; it does not weaken our fight on communism. It merely postpones many luxuries—some of which are desirable, some of which I would like to see us have, but luxuries which we must do without if we are to achieve a strong, sound national fiscal policy.

Mr. Chairman, I believe very firmly that the people of the United States are willing to make every sacrifice necessary to achieve peace and decency in this world. For that reason, I shall vote for the Thomas amendment, which reduces this appropriation by $500,000,000. I believe its adoption will assist in securing the economy so necessary if this great nation is to endure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Taber amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for many, many years I have held this body, the House of Representatives, in great respect. As one of its Members I have been jealous with respect to the power that it should exercise as contemplated under the Constitution of the United States. From time to time I have regretted steps which have been taken in the direction of increasing the executive power beyond those limits originally contemplated in the Constitution.

Today we are faced with a situation which I think calls upon the House of Representatives, acting within its sphere, to make a decision and not leave it to any other power. In my judgment, the so-called Taber amendment gives us that opportunity, for it provides just how these reductions shall be made. When they are made, if they are made, they are the result of the judgment of the House of Representatives.

We face a difficult situation with respect to the fiscal condition of the Government. You know it as well as I do. You know in your hearts it is a serious situation and is becoming more so as days go by. We cannot go on with this deficit financing for much longer without endangering the whole economy of the country.

I would not for one moment propose that the services of the Government of the United States be reduced to such a point as to destroy the Government's effectiveness. The Taber amendment does not do that. What I would propose, and I do so in all earnestness, is that the time has come for the Government to display a little austerity.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cannon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in this House in my desire to obtain the greatest economy that we can possibly achieve. I realize that our present fiscal condition requires that we use extreme means. But let me say to you that the most effective way to accomplish economy is within the departments and it is for that reason that the subcommittee of which I have the privilege of being

chairman, has taken the action it has. I do not take credit for it. It was the work of the committee as a whole, and a large part of the credit should go to the former chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. What we did in our committee was to suggest that the Treasury Department make a thorough study to see how it could cut its expenditures.

As a result of that study the Secretary of the Treasury, who has cooperated with our subcommittee, reported to us this year that the Department has saved, by reason of improved management and machinery, 1,000,000 man-hours per annum. That is a real accomplishment toward economy.

Now, let us consider the Post Office Department. Our committee took the people of this Nation at their word, in their demand for economy, and reduced the appropriations for the Post Office Department. A subcommittee in the other body on yesterday voted 9 to 0 to rescind the order of the Postmaster General which would put into effect certain economies in an effort to reduce the expenditures of his Department.

The objection I have to the Taber amendment is that, when the cuts are made under that amendment, the same cuts will be applied to the Treasury and Post Office Departments, where a very strict economy program has already been adopted, as will be applied to the other departments of Government. In the Thomas amendment we refuse to discharge our duty to cut the appropriations and direct the President of the United States to do something that we do not have the courage to do ourselves. In the Cannon amendment we direct that 5 percent of the funds be held in reserve unless and until the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall certify that maintenance of essential Government services requires their expenditure. It seems to me that is a more sensible way to approach the problem.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The percentages that I used were directed at the President's budget estimate and not at the amount in the bill, and therefore a cut below what the committee has recommended would not be affected except as the committee has failed to make a 10-percent cut.

Mr. GARY. But it does apply to all departments alike.

Mr. TABER. It does.

Mr. GARY. The point I am making is that the savings that we have made in the Treasury Department are not all reflected in the cuts made by the committee this year, but some of them are reflected in the requests that appeared in the President's budget, because many of the changes to which I referred were made before the budget requests were submitted and the requests were smaller because of the changes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say or infer that the curtailment of delivery service of the Post Office Department was the only way that the Postmaster General could effect economies?

Mr. GARY. I specifically stated on the floor when I presented the report of our subcommittee that, in my judgment, it was not the only way, but it is only fair to say that the Postmaster General stated in his order that it was issued in response to a demand from our committee that he reduce expenditures and I, for one, do not intend to attempt to operate the Post Office Department. That is the duty of the Postmaster General.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 15 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the attitude of this House can probably best be described as a desire to keep each of the individual items in the appropriation bill at their present amount, or even to increase them, but to cut down the total amount appropriated in the bill. That certainly seems to me to be what has happened during the last 4 weeks. The House refused to cut any items, and, in fact, was often prone to increase them, but always Members expressed the hope and desire that after action was completed the total spending would be less.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with three definite proposals to effect reductions in the total of this bill. I certainly will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It is the most responsible type of action we can take at this point in the consideration of this legislation. I want to say, however, that should the Taber amendment be rejected I will support the Thomas amendment.

I share with some of my colleagues the sentiment that has been expressed that the Thomas amendment is really an irresponsible way to appropriate funds or effect savings. By it we abdicate to the President the power to do the appropriating for us. I will admit that. I think probably the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] himself would admit that it is not a very responsible way to appropriate funds. However, it is certainly less irresponsible than to pass the bill with the total of spending that is contained in it at the present time.

I am interested not so much in the procedure, Mr. Chairman, as I am in seeing to it that some savings are made.

At the present time the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member, is considering the matter of excise taxes and excise-tax reductions. You individual Members from all over the country know that the pressure is on you and you, in turn, are trying to put the pressure on the committee to reduce or eliminate many of these taxes. How, pray tell, can you vote, on the one hand, for expenditures which will create a deficit of anywhere between six and eight billion dollars and then, on the other hand, vote for reduction of any kind of tax? I think we must come to the realization that unsound spending means unsound taxes. I will be the first to admit that in the excise-tax field there are many inequities and injustices which must be corrected. But let us come to this realization right now: As long as you continue unreasonable spending, you are going to have to continue unreasonable taxes.

Let me make my position clear. I cannot support Government spending in the amount contained in this bill. I cannot support tax reductions as long as that spending continues. I am not going to vote to load our spending on my children.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how the proposal is made or by what method, I am going to vote to reduce the total amount of these appropriations. My record to date is clear. I have voted against all efforts to increase the individual items in the bill. I have voted for all responsible efforts to reduce the individual items in the bill, and I intend to continue that record.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Does the gentleman not feel that even without any directive as suggested by the Thomas amendment, the Executive as the head of the Government and of all the executive agencies has some responsibility to direct his appointees to reduce expenditures wherever possible?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He certainly has. I think that is one of the most unfortunate things that has faced this Congress in the last few years. We have control only over the total amount of money which will be given to the individual departments, but we have little or no control over how the departments spend the money once it is given to them. It is the responsibility of the President to see to it that the money is not wasted. I think all too often that responsibility which is the responsibility of the executive department has not been carried out.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think the gentleman will realize that neither the Congress nor the executive department can balance a budget without cooperation between the two. The gentleman has been aware during his service in the Congress of many instances pointed out by subcommittees on appropriations where real economies have been effected in departments and the service increased and the morale of the departments improved by

cutting out the driftwood and the shrubbery which they did not need. Savings do not mean crippling in every instance; often they are the medium for real progress. The danger is that, in the blindness of opposing any reduction, persons of responsibility in the executive department will issue untrue and misleading judgments as to the effect of any given reduction.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is true. I want to say one thing more before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, and that is that I think the Congress very often shirks or forgets its responsibility when it authorizes the expenditure of funds. I think too often the Congress places upon the members of the Committee on Appropriations an impossible job when it authorizes spending programs without giving consideration to the amount of money which is going to have to be appropriated to carry out the particular program involved.

I think it is time that we looked into our procedures for authorizing expenditures of funds and see if some corrections cannot be made in that field so that the House will be conscious when it authorizes a new program or a new activity of the cost that is involved. The real time to economize is when the legislation authorizing new and expanded program is before the Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the House adopted the 21-day rule it did away with the only brake that we had, and that was the Committee on Rules in stopping some of these authorizations.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That may be true but I would point out that each Member of the House also has an individual responsibility to put on the brakes. In fact, it is time we put on the emergency brakes.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, because of the cases of addiction to narcotics which have come to my attention in my district and the arrest by the Bureau of Narcotics of some 50 dope peddlers in Philadelphia within the last few days, I have made an investigation of the national narcotic situation. I find that since the end of the war smuggling and trafficking in heroin have increased sharply. There has been a serious upsurge in addiction, particularly among teen-agers and those in their early twenties. I find this to be true in my district and am advised that similar situations exist in other cities, particularly New York City, Chicago, St. Louis and East St. Louis, Los Angeles, Detroit, New Orleans, and, to a lesser degree, in many other cities and towns.

Unless drastic measures are taken, dope peddling and addiction will continue to spread rapidly. The Bureau of Narcotics, with a small force of 180 agents, has done an admirable job but with the increase in smuggled drugs, it cannot effectively control the situation unless its force of agents is materially increased. Before the war the Bureau of Narcotics had a field force of 240 agents. With this number of agents the dope traffic was kept under control. Wartime restrictions on international travel and shipping added to the hazards of drug smuggling and helped curtail the flow of illicit narcotics into this country. Consequently, the field force of the Bureau was gradually reduced to its present strength of 180 men. Even though this represents only 2 percent of the Federal law enforcement agents, the Bureau of Narcotics is responsible for the imprisonment of 10 percent of the inmates of Federal penal institutions.

Narcotic drug distributing syndicates are growing and, unless drastic measures are taken, will become firmly entrenched. The Bureau of Narcotics made 2,900 arrests in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year. This is more arrests than were made for the whole of each of the fiscal years 1941 through 1947. This certainly is indicative of the increasing dope traffic. However, the increased activity in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year depleted the Bureau's current appropriation to the extent that it has been compelled to cut back its enforcement activities sharply for the remainder of the fiscal year. Its funds for travel and purchase of narcotics are now so limited that it cannot make many investigations which should receive immediate attention.

For the fiscal year 1951 the Treasury Department requested for the Bureau of Narcotics the sum of $1,933,000. The Appropriations Committee reduced this to $1,750,000, a cut of $183,000. It is true that $1,750,000 represents an increase of $140,000 over the Bureau's appropriation of $1,610,000 for the fiscal year 1950. However, after this $140,000 is reduced by the salary increases under the Pay Act passed a few months ago, by the statutory increase in the per diem rate, and by necessary in-grade promotions, the net increase with which to combat the growing narcotic traffic is only about $25,000. This is negligible when it is considered that this small agency must combat the well organized criminal syndicates, which have millions of dollars at their command because of their unlawful activities. The amount requested would permit the employment of 12 new agents only and would allow the Bureau of Narcotics to operate at full speed during the next fiscal year. If the spread of addiction is to be curtailed, we must at least increase the Bureau's appropriation to the amount requested, $1,933,000.

Narcotic arrests reported by fiscal years

Year:	*Number*
1940	3,584
1941	2,819
1942	2,867
1943	2,571
1944	2,629
1945	2,047
1946	2,620
1947	2,855
1948	3,180
1949	4,803

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] is recognized.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, I am nonplused at hearing the three amendments this afternoon. Certainly the Appropriations Committee is on the spot. After we have deliberated for some 3 weeks—and I have heard most of the discussion on this tremendous bill—then to hear the members of the Appropriations Committee come in with amendments to cut, it seems to me that, if we should have cut this bill, it should have been cut at the beginning; and we should have known those cuts 3 weeks ago or 2 weeks ago, instead of at this late hour. I would not have been surprised if members of other committees had come in with these amendments, but I am surprised at the Appropriations Committee offering them. Of course, the members of the committee have a tremendous responsibility and they have assumed that responsibility. The rest of us, who are members of other committees, still believe what our committees report. The Appropriations Committee has conducted all the hearings and heard all the programs that have come before this Congress. The details have been explained. The Appropriations Committee has had the right to interrogate witnesses, and I understand they have worked hard and long and diligently. Who knows why the Appropriations Committee does not know? I am still naive. I believe people. I have believed what I have heard on the floor of this House for over 3 weeks. With the exception of one afternoon, I have been in attendance each day, and I have listened, because I realize this has been a tremendous bill. I came here feeling that I wanted to vote for cuts, because I was honestly economy-conscious—not suddenly, however. I just did not get that feeling lately. I have had it a long time, because I am one of those who does live within her means. I came here expecting to vote for cuts, but as I have heard the arguments and the programs explained and the expenditures that were required, each debate weighed heavily upon me, and, except in a few instances, I voted not to cut, because I realize that false economy can certainly be painful extravagance.

I realize, too, that government is not an exact science and it does not operate as such. We do not know what is going to face us or what the future has in store. I do believe if there is any group in this House that should know what finances are required to run this government, it is the Appropriations Committee.

Now, after we have deliberated on the bill for 3 weeks or more, the committee offers three amendments to cut the bill. If a department should have been cut, the Appropriations Committee ought to know where to cut, and it should not be for those of us who have been on other committees to come in here, after hearing the explanation for only a few minutes, and have this burden placed upon our shoulders. If the Appropriations Committee does not know what it is doing, then let us recommit the bill and let them agree, and let us have this economy consciousness and at least be honest

about it. Let us not have it as something sudden.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOSONE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Does not the gentlewoman realize that these cuts are being offered by members of the Appropriations Committee? I, too, have been sitting here, as the gentlewoman has, for 3 weeks listening to this debate. They have had no opportunity to look over the whole bill, because each of them were on subcommittees, which did not give them an opportunity to get a bird's-eye view of the entire bill.

Mrs. BOSONE. The funny part of it is that the cuts are coming from both sides of the aisle and from members of the Appropriations Committee. Where in the world does that leave the rest of us?

Mr. VORYS. That is the significance of it. They are coming from both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee reported to us a bill that reduced the budgetary estimates of the administration by one and one-third billion dollars. The members of the Committee on Appropriations and its staff are to be sincerely congratulated not only by the membership of this Congress but also by the entire Nation. I take the position in this discussion that where these members had 3 months' time with limited personnel and facilities to find a sum total of $1,300,000,000 by which they could reduce the administration's budget, there certainly must be many other places where cuts could be made. The Government agencies commenced preparing their requests in the summer of 1949; from that time until January 1950 hundreds of administrative employees working on the budget had a decided advantage over the Appropriations Committee and other Members of Congress. In view of that fact and in view of the efforts that have been made on the floor of the House to reduce certain items in the discussion that has taken place in the past 3 weeks, I candidly state to the House now that I expect to support the Thomas amendment, since most of those efforts failed, unless it is amended by another proposal. I expect to support any other proposal that is reasonably sound to effect an economical appropriation bill as it passes this House. I want to vote, and shall vote, for the best proposal to effect the greatest practical economy the pending parliamentary situation will permit.

All of us recognize, of course, that national defense from enemies without and within the borders of this Nation is of prime importance at all times and particularly under circumstances confronting us today. One of the major props upon which we must rest national defense is a sound domestic economy. In order to have a sound domestic economy we must make substantial progress toward a balanced budget.

I am not persuaded, Mr. Chairman, with the force of the statement made to the effect that should the Thomas amendment be adopted we would be delegating our authority to the Chief Executive; I would say that the House has failed to exercise its authority during the last 3 weeks and cut this appropriation bill at proper points as we have discussed it. Having failed to do that up to this point it is now our bounden duty, if we are economy-minded, and I certainly am, to exercise our authority today and tell the executive head of the Government that we instruct him to reduce expenditures in keeping with the terms of the Thomas amendment.

I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a question, if I may. As I understand his amendment, there is no reduction in the amount of the bill as it now stands for the essential national defense items by way of stockpiling and military equipment and personnel. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. There is not.

Mr. PICKETT. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York this further question: What reduction is there on such items as the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. TABER. There would be very little. It could apply only to those items where civilian personnel is involved.

Mr. PICKETT. There are other questions of similar nature regarding veterans and agriculture I would like to ask but my time has expired. I shall make inquiry concerning them of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] privately.

One concluding remark: Even before coming to Congress it has been my position we should operate the Federal Government under a balanced budget when possible. To do so we should eliminate the unnecessary in expenditures, reduce the desirable as low as possible, and scrutinize the essential most carefully before passing appropriations bills. I have done my best to follow that policy since my service in Congress began.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, we have now come to perhaps the most important amendment from a policy standpoint which has been offered during the several weeks this omnibus appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951 has been under consideration.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], is important because it will effectuate an expression of this House toward a measure of economy and a step toward getting our House in order on a sound business program. It provides an over-all reduction of approximately $600,000,000.

With this total appropriation of more than $29,000,000,000, this is a small percentage reduction. As has been stated, the committee reduced the budget request by approximately $1,500,000,000 and in the consideration of the various chapters providing funds for the agencies and departments of the Government for the next fiscal year, some $450,000,000 has been added. This means a net reduction of the committee action of approximately $1,000,000,000 and this amendment would be a further step toward economy of another $600,000,000.

I recognize the difficulty that exists in trying to bring about economy and efficiency in Government. I join others, however, who have expressed grave concern over the fiscal affairs of the Nation.

There is indication that the deficit this year will be from six to seven billion dollars. As I have said on many occasions, deficit spending is indefensible only in a crisis or national emergency.

A few days ago in consideration of the civil-functions chapter of this appropriation bill on flood control, I was somewhat critical of the approximately 25-percent reduction of the budget estimate without any comparable reduction on the other agencies and departments of the Government.

I said then, Mr. Chairman, if the same percentage reduction or anything like similar reductions were made, I would have no complaint with the action of the committee.

This amendment and the Thomas amendment would bring about this further reduction in these agencies of Government except the national defense establishments. This would not adversely affect our national-defense program, nor our national security, stockpile of strategic materials, and so forth. Neither would it affect as I understand its purpoes, the veterans, to whom we are obligated and committed to provide for their needs.

Furthermore, there is every reason to expect that the Ways and Means Committee will report a tax bill in the very near future. I went before the committee and urged the repeal and revision of war-excise taxes. I think it is nothing but right to remove this burden from the taxpayers of this country as it was never intended to remain after the war emergency had ended.

I therefore repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the war-excise taxes should be repealed and from the reports committee action thus far indicates there will be something like a $1,000,000,000 reduction in revenues from this source.

If this is true, the adoption of this amendment is even more important.

I do not consider this a partisan matter, though there are charges of spending and more spending. I consider this as an effort to bring our Federal budget in line with revenues.

I know it is easy to follow the course of providing more and more funds that will benefit more and more people. I am as interested in providing the actual needs and assuming a responsibility of public service that is needed and justifiable as anyone in this House, but I also know, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot continue to remain a strong, powerful, and leading nation of the world without continuing to be strong economically.

I know with world conditions so unsettled and the necessity of tremendous funds included in this bill for our national defense, that it is difficult to readjust funds available for this purpose.

I realize our commitments to foreign programs, appropriations which are yet to come, make it even more difficult to bring within our revenues these appropriations for our governmental service on the domestic front. I can understand how easy it is to make contentions that if we can spend money on foreign programs, we can invest more and more on these programs at home.

I feel any sound-thinking person, however, must understand that our commitments and appropriations on these foreign programs, economic assistance to needy countries, is for the preservation of peace in the world and to prevent another bloody war that could very well destroy our economy or freedom of enterprise, our American system, as well as taking the lives of untold numbers of our youth as we experienced in this recent and unfortunate destructive war. As I have said heretofore, if by the expenditures of funds during these few years we can prevent another war, saving the lives of our own men, the calculated risk would be thoroughly justified. It is a long-range program, of peace, one to prevent another tragic war and a program to prevent unholy aggression by tyrants that would enslave free people.

Our economy at home must be strong. We have many worthy programs underway, some of which will require years to accomplish. These must be approached on a sound financial basis, that will return dividends and make our economy stronger.

The only way we can bring about this accomplishment is to face a realization. The only way we can reach the objective is to determine our full responsibilities and commitments and pare on other programs to the extent of living within our revenues and insisting that these departments serve our public in a manner that will provide the actual needs but yet recognizing an economic stability, that a sound financial program in your Federal Government means as much toward the future as it does in any private undertaking.

It is the duty and responsibility of this Congress to take the steps that will bring us to the goal of living within our revenues and yet, start doing something about the enormous and tremendous debt that was brought on by the war.

We all say we are for economy and here, Mr. Chairman, is the opportunity of showing that we mean what we say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, like the gentlewoman from Utah, I still have a little confidence and faith in people. It may be that if I stay in Washington long enough I shall get so that I will not, but I hope not; and I still have it at the present time.

One of the great committees of this House, the Committee on Appropriations, began shortly after the first of January to consider this bill that we have now had under consideration here in this House for almost a month. They held hearings on this bill; the different departments of Government testified at those hearings; many others testified. They studied the bill for a period of practically 3 months. For almost a month we have had it on the floor of this House. It has been read by the Clerk line by line, paragraph by paragraph, figure by figure; we have had amendment after amendment offered on the floor of this House, and whether the amendment has been accepted or rejected it has always been by majority vote of the membership. Now, are we ready to say to our folks back home: The great Appropriations Committee of the House is unreliable? Shall we say they are incompetent?

Will we say: "They considered an appropriation bill for 3 months, then brought it to the floor of this House wrong"? Will we say: "This House considered and amended the bill for a month and it is still wrong"? Are we willing to admit that? As far as I am concerned I am not willing to admit it. I have been on the floor of this House every day that the bill has been under consideration. I voted for the cuts I thought were justified and voted against those I thought were not justified.

The great Committee on Appropriations took a billion and a half dollars off of appropriations and contract authorizations as allowed by the Bureau of the Budget. Then, because of a war scare, justified or unjustified as the case may be, we added about three hundred to three hundred and fifty million dollars to the bill for national defense, mostly for airplanes. I do not know whether that was justified or not, but I would rather vote for that military increase if it is not justified than to vote against it and find later that it is justified. So I voted for those military increases.

I still have confidence in people; I still think there are people in the United States who know more than I do, believe it or not. I am in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York. If this bill needs further cuts they should have been made by this House in regular order as we considered the measure. Shall we now say to our President: "We, of this House, did not have the courage to do our duty. We did not have guts enough to accept our responsibilities. Now, please, Mr. President, discharge our responsibilities for us"?

I still have the courage of my convictions. More than 50 years of observation has convinced me that 1 ounce of backbone is worth more than all the wishbone in the world.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to reduce the appropriations bill in the amount of approximately $800,000,000, $600,000,000 being direct reduction, and approximately $200,000,000 indirectly. It should be carefully observed that this reduction does not affect the appropriation for the defense of the country or for veterans benefits of all kinds or for stockpiling or for other items that are absolutely needed.

I call your attention to the fact that after deducting appropriations for defense and for the veterans' benefits, including hospitals and other necessities, that the deduction is less than 6 percent of the remaining portions of the appropriations bill.

This cut is a very mild one. I think the reduction should and could be as much as $1,000,000,000 without injury to any department of Government.

This bill has been under consideration for a period of 4 weeks. I am disappointed that amendments to reduce appropriations in various departments of our Government have met with so little support. I have voted for every reduction that I thought was fair and reasonable and have also offered amendments to reduce some of these items, even though they were defeated.

Mr. Chairman, every expense item in this bill should have been "cut to the bone." Of course, there are a good many projects and proposals included in the bill that contain certain benefits to particular regions or areas. All items in this bill should be considered on the question as to whether they are really needed, and not because certain individuals or groups want them.

Here we are today about to complete legislation that will charge the citizens of this country with a bill amounting to almost $30,000,000,000. This is almost $1,000 for every taxpaying family in this country. The responsibility of appropriating funds to carry on the activities of our Government is the responsibility of the Members of Congress. We should assume that responsibility with a view of appropriating only such funds as are absolutely required, and should be further considered in the light of the fact that our country is already in debt to the extent of $260,000,000,000, and that we will have a deficit at the end of this year of more than $6,000,000,000. That is good reason why this Congress and this country should "tighten its belt."

The responsibility for the expenditure of these funds is with the administration and the administrative agencies. This Congress ought to insist that those who are charged in handling such expenditures should see to it that every dollar appropriated under this bill is wisely and carefully expended. Every department of Government should be required to account in detail as to how and why and where these funds are expended.

Many times I have complained and criticized departments of Government with regard to the use of funds without serious consideration and realization that they are spending the money of the taxpayers of this country. On too many occasions those responsible for expenditures have been extravagant and careless, and in too many cases wasteful. From now on let us have full and complete accounting.

Furthermore, if any agency has unexpended funds on hand at the end of

the year, see that such funds are returned to the Treasury instead of insisting on spending them just because they have the funds on hand.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the various amendments as they are introduced in the Committee at that point in the RECORD where the various amendments are considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to explain briefly my support of various amendments to cut down the over-all appropriations provided for by this bill.

To begin with, I look with great disfavor upon the practice inaugurated by this bill of bringing to the House a so-called one-package appropriation bill. This bill appropriates almost $30,000,000,000. It embodies provisions for departmental and agency appropriations heretofore included in 11 or 12 separate appropriation bills.

In my opinion—I venture to express it despite the high regard I have for the ability, integrity, and patriotism of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and his fellow members—it is absolutely impossible, from a human, intellectual, and logical standpoint, efficiently and adequately for the House to study and consider the complex, multitudinous, and voluminous matters embraced in this bill in one single measure and at one virtually uninterrupted time. The human mind simply cannot adequately apprehend or absorb, let alone act intelligently, upon such a large number of intricate statistical matters involving the determination of vital social and economic policies without more mature deliberation and more detailed discussion. And if it were not for the serious legislative problem posed by the defeat of this measure I should almost be willing to recommit it and have its various provisions reported back to the House for action in separate categories, as has been formerly the practice. However, such a course seems to me impractical, and I am therefore compelled to vote along lines which I deem wise and salutary in order to curtail and reduce some of the huge sums appropriated by the bill.

I am not willing, in the light of present world conditions, to assume responsibility for cutting down further the appropriations for national defense. And I cannot subscribe to cutting the Veterans' Administration or funds for adequate postal service or funds necessary to insure essential and vital services and activities of the Government. But we must move toward a balanced budget and the end of deficit spending and the adjustment of the huge national debt. I think there are many ways available to Government agencies to slice the fat from current expenditures without harm or impairment to the essential functions of Government. The basic objectives of the Hoover report are undeniably in the interest of national economy, governmental efficiency, and departmental accountability. The Congress must answer the plea of the people for sound administration of Federal affairs and the lightening of tax burdens as soon as possible. A sound, healthy economy will be our best guaranty against national weakness in this critical period of history in which our free way of life is in peril.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending amendment is to reduce the over-all expenditures of the Government as provided for in the pending appropriation bill. I have and will continue to give my support to the pending amendment and any other that seeks to accomplish this purpose. It is imperative that there shall be reduction in the expense of conducting our Federal Government.

There is no more important question before the Congress today than that of bringing our fiscal affairs into balance. At the present time we are spending beyond our means. The result has been a deficit each year, with the exception of the 2 years when the Republicans had control of Congress in the Eightieth session. Prior to that time and since that time we have had a deficit each year. From present indications the deficit for this year will run upward of $6,000,000,000. In the coming fiscal year there is an indication that it may run as high as $8,000,000,000 if we spend at the rate fixed in the pending appropriation bill. We should not close our eyes to the harmful consequences that will result from the continuation of a policy of deficit spending. No individual can do this in his personal affairs, nor can any business do it, without reaping results that will be disastrous. Nor can our Government do it.

The situation becomes worse when we consider that, in addition to the present appropriation bill now before us, dealing only with our domestic affairs, there will shortly come before us bills appropriating huge sums of money to carry out our economic and military aid to foreign nations. The amount we are spending for such purposes is becoming alarming. And, from present reports it seems that now we must assume obligations for the expenditure of funds in the countries of southeastern Asia. All of this is adding up to tremendous sums of money. How long are we going to be able to carry these burdensome expenditures? Every deficit adds to our national debt. Increasing expenditures makes necessary additional taxes. We should be thinking and acting in terms of reduced expenditures and thereby make possible reduced taxation.

There are some who, by their remarks, seem to think that the budget cannot be balanced. I do not agree with that viewpoint. I believe we can balance the budget by reducing expenditures, thereby we can reduce taxes and pay off something on the national debt. I do not hesitate to say this can be done when there is a will to do it. The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress did reduce expenditures, did balance the budget, did pay off a substantial sum of our national debt, did reduce taxes, and left a surplus in the Treasury. What has been done can be done again. It must be done if we are to maintain the strength and security of our Nation. This is a matter of prime importance. We do not know what the future holds in store for us. We, therefore, must make every effort to maintain our financial structure in a sound condition. If we do not do so, but permit it to grow continually weaker, then we are endangering our future national security. This we must not do.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in support of the Taber amendment. It cuts approximately six hundred million from the appropriations.

We are faced in fiscal 1951 with an operating deficit of over $6,000,000,000. How long can we continue deficit financing on such a large scale with a national debt of over $258,000,000,000?

I hope the Taber amendment will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, this is a refreshing day for the American people, refreshing in that we are now engaged in a discussion as to whose amendment we shall adopt to save them money. It is refreshing—and not bewildering, as has been previously stated.

Let us be frank. The bewildering part of this entire procedure is the appropriations bill itself, and the method of its presentation. It utterly fails to provide the average Member of this body sufficient information by which to make an intelligent decision. I do not mean to infer that this is the fault of the distinguished Members who labor so diligently on the committee. They do the best job possible with poor machinery. It is the fault of our method of consideration. Therefore, I think, it is inappropriate and inaccurate to say that the method offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] for reduction of the appropriations bill is not an intelligent one.

Members of this House must of necessity appropriate in a general way. That I may be fully understood, let me ask how many of you know how much money has been appropriated for telephone calls for the Department of Labor or the Department of Commerce, or for the purchase of gasoline or railroad or airplane tickets? How many of you know how much has been appropriated for salaries in the various agencies and their millions of employees? How many of you know how much has been appropriated for construction, for administration, for travel, for entertainment? Frankly, I do not believe that 1 percent of the Members of this House can cast an intelligent vote other than a general one. No Member of this House could conceivably spend enough hours in a day to attack the problem in such detail.

To carry the point further, the applications for funds do not come out of Congress, but from the administrative branch, through the Bureau of the Budget, which, incidentally, is an arm of the executive branch and not of the Congress. Their report is such that it is most difficult to comprehend, as all of

the Members of this body know from experience. It is twice as thick as a Sears, Roebuck catalog, and not half so interesting. I have attempted, every year that I have been a Member of this House, to understand it, but it is put together in such a way, and probably of necessity, that I have great difficulty in doing so, and I am sure that the same is true of all of the Members of this body.

I have the greatest respect for the ability and intelligence of the members of the Appropriations Committee, and for the Members of the House of Representatives. I know how laboriously they work, and I know that they do not enjoy spending the money of the American people. The system that is available to them and to us, however, in the preparation and study of an appropriations bill, permits only a general appraisal.

There are some who are qualified to analyze and judge the needs of some of the departments. I venture there is none of us who is sufficiently familiar with the operation of all Government departments to be in position to correctly point out where money is being squandered and where it is being wisely spent.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems very appropriate, when we attempt to cut the appropriations, that we do so generally, as has been suggested in the amendment of my distinguished colleague, Mr. THOMAS, of Texas. That is the only way that makes sense. Let us say to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Government departments, "This is what our Government can afford to spend. Use it to the best possible advantage." They and they alone are in position to determine where curtailments can be made with the least loss of service to the people.

In my judgment, the gentleman from Texas is rendering a distinct service to the American people and to this body in offering such an amendment. We must strengthen our fiscal position, and this, in my judgment, is the only way in which it can and will be done. And, as you know, this amendment in no way curtails our national defense.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Instead of having a new method, we had better go back to the old method of reporting appropriations so that we can understand them. This is the worst I ever heard of.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This is a new method, and that is one reason we do not have these details.

Mr. LYLE. We have never had them in the 6 years I have been here. I have been constantly endeavoring to understand what we are doing with the people's money. Therefore, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], are both intelligent approaches.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I will say the only way we are ever going to get economy in Government is to have a Congress that is going to vote economy, or you are not going to get it. That does not apply to the gentleman now speaking, because I do not know his record, but I know that the only way we are going to have economy here is to vote economy.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, many of us from time to time are economy-minded, so we think, but when it comes down to the voting we soon find that we are not economy-minded, but economy-mouthed. I trust that we shall not be so today. It is estimated that this amendment will save $500,000,000. That is not a saving to the rich alone, but a saving to every American. It is a step that should strengthen our economy. It is a step that should strengthen America. It is a step that should inspire the executive departments to weed out the useless and unnecessary functions that most naturally and surely must be a part of each of them. If they do not have the money, they will not spend it unnecessarily. I shall support both the Thomas and the Taber amendments, for I believe them to be in the interest my country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, very definitely the need for some economy has been established by these weeks of debate and by events throughout the country. Yesterday we were told of information which could not be made public, which seemed to point to the conclusion that we are in danger of going to war. Obviously, if there was any justification for those statements being made, and any justification for increasing the amounts for the military, then, regardless of our previous attitude, our legislative sins, or our waste, the time has come when we simply must get into financial condition to sustain a war effort. Secondly, the people of this country are demanding excise tax cuts in order that business may be encouraged; and, thirdly, the American people are getting mighty worried about the value of their savings and insurance and bonds. So, it becomes incumbent upon this House and this Congress to reduce the total cost of Government.

Now then, in this particular situation where we have three possibilities before us, I can see no reason why we cannot support the Taber amendment, and in the event it fails, support the Thomas amendment. I have listened here today to some very eloquent arguments about the Congress surrendering its power to the executive. Let me say this to you that historically the importance of legislative control of the purse had to do with moneys appropriated. That power was designed to prevent the king or the administrator from extracting money from the people without the consent of the people's representatives. Now then, the Thomas amendment is built upon a situation where each specific item has been outlined, the specific amounts fixed, the total amount fixed, and then it simply carries the final statement that the executive must spend some percent less than we have previously agreed to. Now, that is not surrendering our power. It is a further order to the executive that the total amount must be reduced this much. Certainly, if it were a matter of surrendering legislative power it would have been possible for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to have gone back and suggested a cut of so much in each item. But, as a realistic thing, to get the cost down, and to provide further for some flexibility with a change of circumstances, he has proposed, and I believe wisely, that the executive be instructed to cut the budget; not given the privilege of cutting it, but instructed to cut it. Now, that is not a surrender of power. The only thing I see the matter with the Thomas amendment is that it is not sufficiently high in the amount ordered cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT.]

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, up to the hour of 1:40 on this day of grace the United States is still whirling down the road to ruin. This House will in a few minutes have an opportunity either to lend added impetus to that wild flight to disaster or to put on the brakes and turn the ship of state back upon a sound course, to sound fiscal policy, to a course that will save the value of the American dollar and the savings of the American people.

In my humble judgment, what we do this afternoon may well be a fateful decision, because if we accept this bill in its present form we will have pretty well committed ourselves to an indefinite continuance of unlimited, reckless, disastrous, inflationary deficit spending.

I am in favor of the Taber amendment because it is the obvious sound and constitutional way of meeting this problem.

It is the way the House should meet that major responsibility which is its responsibility first and foremost. If the Taber amendment should fail, I expect to support the Thomas amendment. It is not as effective and it is not the direct approach, but if the majority party is unwilling to support a sound and effective approach as offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], then I for one do not intend to allow partisan considerations to affect my judgment on a matter of the utmost importance to the Nation, to wit, a beginning of national economy in budgetary matters.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Utah had some very pertinent remarks to make about this bill and about the failure of the members of the Committee on Appropriations to understand what they are doing. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my fellow Members that the responsibility for that curious situation is largely that of the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations who forced upon the committee this monstrosity which we call the one-package bill. This entire bill came before the full committee with its $29,000,000,000 of authorizations and appropriations and

in about 2 hours it was whipped through the full committee. No Member had an opportunity to get a bird's-eye view or to find out what was in any part of the bill except that of his own little subcommittee. In my humble judgment what has happened up to this time has demonstrated the utter failure of the one-package approach.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting discussion today and as I sat here listening to the various comments pro and con and listening to those who are pleading for this approach to fix our fiscal policy for 1951, I wondered where all those Members were during the 3 months that the members of the Committee on Appropriations crept each morning at 10 o'clock down into the catacombs of the Capitol and stayed there until 6 o'clock in the evening sweating over this bill.

I wonder why these people who want to settle this fiscal matter in one fell swoop in this manner today did not come before our subcommittee and tell us then that the people of America are disturbed? Not a single Member of the House appeared before the subcommittee on which I served and asked us to reduce any item in any specific amount. I daresay that if the subcommittee chairmen here today were to take the well and comment on this phase of the matter, they, too, would say that no Member of the Congress came before their subcommittees and pled for the reduction of a single item. No, my friends—you know where they were then. The Members of the House of Representatives were appearing before the legislative committees, asking for authorizations for expenditures. That is where they were. They were asking for projects in their own States and their own districts and it is only about 60 days before the primaries that they wake up to the fact that the people are becoming economy-conscious in the country. They did not think about it at the time the Committee on Appropriations were working on this bill doing its best to bring a sensible bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman from Georgia please tell the Members of the House just what committee the Member from the Fourth District of Ohio appeared before during this session of the Congress, or during any other session of the Congress to ask for an appropriation either directly or indirectly for his district in Ohio?

Mr. PRESTON. May I say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Georgia has been so busy these days that he has not tried to keep up with the activities of the Member from the Fourth District of Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I would like to advise the gentleman from Georgia as well as other members of the committee that the Member from the Fourth Ohio District has not appeared before any committee or any subcommittee requesting authorizations or increased authorizations for his district in Ohio. And he does not intend to do so. I might further refer the gentleman from Georgia to that well-written editorial in the Saturday Evening Post which tells the story of how the Fourth District of Ohio solved their own problem of flood control in the great Ohio Valley.

Mr. PRESTON. I yielded for a question, not for an oration. I will ask the gentleman from the Fourth District of Ohio if he appeared before any committee asking for any economy.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I did not appear before your committee asking for economy. That was the duty of the members of your committee to effect economies.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman. If this Thomas amendment is adopted, I hope the first place the President applies the cut will be the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, and cuts the salaries and money that we spend so freely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this morning we heard the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] talk about being practical. We also heard the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi talk about using common sense. We heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], talk about economy, "but."

Mr. Chairman, the President is going around the country in a special train telling the farmers how bad off they are. It reminds me very much of the fellow crying the blues with a ham under each arm.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose the President finds out the engineer on this train is on strike and will not be able to get him back. Choo, choo, choo, woo, woo, woo. Train stop. The President ought to tell the people of this country that they will have to do one of three things. He will either have to spend less, tax more, or we go bust. Choo, choo, choo, woo, woo, woo. Cannot we get some economy in Government?

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

I want to say that at the present time we have between $4,000,000,000 to $4,750,000,000 tied up in surplus foods; right on down the line, wheat corn, cotton, down to soybeans. A couple of weeks ago we voted another $2,000,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy more surplus food products. Then the following week we had ECA, and we set up a billion dollars, which is a thousand million dollars, to buy more foodstuffs in the open market. Instead of taking this $1,000,000,000 that we appropriated to buy food in the open markets and set it up to purchase armaments, we are going to buy more foodstuffs when we cannot even now find places to store the food that we have already purchased.

This means that from the appropriations established, that they will be in a position to purchase $3,000,000,000 more of foodstuffs. Certainly that is not being practical. Certainly that is not common sense, when we have already tied up over $4,000,000,000 in foodstuffs and we are getting ready to buy up to $3,000,000,000 more. It is regrettable that the billion dollars set up in the ECA appropriation is not going into our national defense program for armaments, and that the four billion or more of stockpile foodstuffs that we now have, be used for distribution to those countries that need it, rather than spending another billion dollars in the open market to purchase foodstuffs. Here would have been a chance to save a billion dollars. We could have cut a billion dollars off of the ECA, because we already have the foodstuffs stockpiled that could be used to meet the demands to take care of any situation that might arise anywhere in the world. That would have been practical and common sense.

As my good friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] says, "Why, sure. We are for economy, but."

Let us not kid ourselves. Subsidy payments are great vote getters. We should be looking after the best interests of our country and economizing to build up our national defense to meet the needs and demands that may be made upon us if we suddenly find ourselves in an emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on these amendments, but I felt impelled to do so for a rather special reason at this time. We are discussing whether or not we shall vote an amendment which may cut $600,000,000, or one which will cut $500,000,000, or one which will cut somewhere between $60,000,000 and $250,000,000. But one thing that has been completely overlooked is that should we cut to the extent of any one of these amounts the deficit will still remain at six to seven billion dollars. Therefore, there must be something we are not dealing with when after 3 weeks of debate and months of consideration by the Committee on Appropriations we are still in that position, and I take these few minutes to call to the attention of the House two things that we should be thinking about at a time when the shoe is pinching, and it is pinching right now.

First, in our thinking we forget about what has been happening in the 3 weeks we have had this bill under consideration, how we have been passing legislation which establishes fundamental policy that costs the United States hundreds of millions of dollars. It is not just a question of what we might cut this afternoon, but it is a question such as the high fixed farm price parity is concerned which is holding up food prices as far as city consumers are concerned, costing vast sums of money and at the same time imperiling farmers because it is just stretching the rubber band much too far.

Second, we are not thinking enough about what America makes. It is not

alone what America spends; it is what America makes that is so important. I hazard the hope that when the time comes the House will pay as serious attention as it is paying here now, to the proposals for small business, the proposals to stabilize our own economy in respect of employment, the proposals to expand our program of giving technical aid abroad and thus enormously increasing world-trade markets; the proposals for facilitating world trade, proposals for taking care of displacement which may be caused by what is going to be essential for the United States, a new import outlook. I hope that at least in those days we will remember this time today and remember that it is just as important to decide on how to help what America makes as it is to decide on how to cut what America spends.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It is time we looked after American business in this country but suppose that at that same time we are looking after all the people of this world, how can we look after our own when we let them come in and take the American market from our manufacturers? How can we cure unemployment that way? It cannot be done.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I have talked that out before. It is only by expanding the markets of the world that America will be able to sell more of her own goods and increase her own employment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to join with my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in complimenting the gentleman from New York on his fine statement.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. REES. The gentleman has indicated that one of the factors of high cost of living is farm prices. Does the gentleman realize that in a 15-cent loaf of bread only 2 cents represents what the farmer in the Middle West gets for the wheat in that loaf of bread? Does the gentleman realize that the farmer gets only 22 cents a dozen for eggs for which the gentleman from New York pays 70 cents?

Mr. JAVITS. I have found no fault with the farmer, but only with policy which must be reviewed—including this very spread to which the gentleman refers. I believe in the stabilization of farm prices but it must have a relation to the realities the city dweller faces.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PEOPLE DEMAND ECONOMY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. This amendment would save the taxpayers of the Nation more than $600,000,000. I wish we could make a larger saving. We are confronted at this point in the bill with three amendments. The first by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], whose amendment would perhaps make a saving of about $500,000,000. This amendment, however, leaves the authority to the Chief Executive. The other amendment is that of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] which he indicates would make a saving of about $50,000,000. The Taber amendment, however, is the only one of the three that actually is mandatory and definitely makes a real and definite decrease. That is the amendment I hope the House will vote for.

I am proud of my membership on the committee which brought this huge appropriation bill to this House with a cut of $1,500,000,000 below the President's budget figure. I am also proud of my membership on the subcommittee which decreased the President's budget figures by nearly $100,000,000 in our bill.

Members of this House will recall that when we first presented this huge appropriation bill I took the floor and stated that although we made initial cuts in the committee that there is room for more reductions. The people in my district want economy if we can make same without serious injury to the necessary functions of Government. Here is our opportunity to do this. I am familiar with the items in the Taber amendment and I feel certain that this decrease will not apply to the necessary defense items nor to the veteran portions of the bill. There is still room to cut out a large amount of personnel, travel, administration and other items in Government without seriously injuring any of the necessary functions.

Mr. Chairman, we must make reductions in unnecessary expenditures and this is the place to do this. With a public debt of more than $260,000,000,000 and an annual interest charge on that public debt of $6,000,000,000 and an annual cost of $50,000,000 to administer the debt is one real reason why something must be done now. We know that we are faced with a deficit of about $7,000,000,000 a year. Financial ruin is staring us in the face. We know we must make expenditures for our national defense. We can cut very little or nothing in that item. So we must make the savings in other sections of the bill. Even with this saving of more than half a billion dollars in the Taber amendment we will not be able to balance the budget but we will make a start in that direction. We did a good job in this regard in the Eightieth Congress when we balanced the budget, paid on the public debt, showed a little surplus, and even cut taxes. Necessary Government functions were not injured. This is an example we must follow in this Eighty-first Congress.

THE FARM PROBLEM

Regarding another matter—that which was referred to by the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York—that is the question of the farmer. I wish to state that the farmers in my district are in favor of economy and want the budget balanced eventually. In reply to his intimation that the farmer is so well off, I may state that the facts do not bear out this belief. By such statements you would think that the farmers get everything the consumers pay for what they eat. This is far from the truth.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to say just a few words to correct somewhat the impression left by the gentleman from New York as to the cost of our farm price supports. I wonder if he realizes that the entire price-support program has not exceeded a total of $1,140,000,000 since 1939. This is based on the testimony of Mr. Brannan given to our subcommittee last January 12. I think the gentleman will agree upon those statistics and that $100,000,000 a year is a small cost when we consider the great good a prosperous agriculture does for our entire economy.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his statement in behalf of the farmers. Were the farmers to give away everything they produced the people in the East would still be paying at least 75 percent for many agriculture products.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. That is an argument in favor of price supports for the farmers which the gentleman helped so much in bringing about during his service in Congress.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska has also fought for years for this program. Will the gentleman further agree that were it not for the fact we have held farm prices to that level we call parity the industrial sections of our Nation would certainly suffer from a lot of unemployment?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is right. The people of the East ought to realize the farmer should get at least the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. He has always been one of the best friends the farmers have in Congress and the State of Nebraska has a right to be proud of him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman on his last statement. The farmer is entitled to cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. STEFAN. He has not been getting it for a long, long time. The farmer today is the man who suffers first from a decrease in food prices and always pays high prices for things he buys. Certainly the gentleman will agree with me that if the transportation and the distribution problems were solved we would solve a whole lot of our economic ills so far as the farmer is concerned. I have introduced a transportation bill with hopes that it will help solve this

problem. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CARL H. ANDERSEN] and other great friends of the American farmer favor this approach to solve our transportation and distribution problem. In the meantime we must keep fighting for full support on farm prices; otherwise the farmer will suffer and the laboring, business, and professional men will suffer with him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I can contribute too much in the short time available to me, but I would like to say a few words here regarding this bill. First, I want to refer to the statement made by the whip of the party on the left that only a few Democrats had voted for economy, that the Republicans were outvoted, and so forth. He complimented his Members for being on the floor. Where were they? The gentleman knows there were not too many of them here and that at any time they could have done right well if they had been.

I recall being on the floor practically every day before the Easter vacation and every day since. I recall the very noticeable absence of Members on the floor during all of this time while we were reading and during the discussion of the $29,000,000,000 appropriation bill which we have before us. Further than that, I want to say that several comments were made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] about the diligence of the Democratic whip in being able to round up a few more votes every time so that the Republicans could not make their votes for economy count. I think if their whip and their party had been as diligent about getting on the floor and staying on the floor practically any day they could have outvoted the Democrats on this proposition because the Democrats did not stay on the floor either. There were times when there were only 40 or 50 Members on the floor and sometimes less than that. I have been somewhat skeptical about this siuation and the earnestness and sincerity of people who are attempting to make a political issue out of economy. Perhaps they do not really want real economy as bad as they want it for an issue which they need badly.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. No. The gentleman wastes too much of the taxpayers' money every time he gets down here in the well of the House hollering about economy and does not practice it himself.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman does not believe in economy, he does not vote for economy, and he knows his statement is not the truth.

Mr. IRVING. I did not yield to the gentleman. He does not know what he is talking about. In fact his statements are utterly unfounded and perhaps accidentally false. If he will check the RECORD he will find that I have voted for economy. He will also find that I practice it in the conduct of my office and in many other ways that I shall be glad to tell him about. Of course, I think he knows very well how money is wasted in many ways.

I refuse to yield further. The gentleman wastes the time of the House every day singing the same song over and over again. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Appendix are filled with all kinds of useless, needless, and ineffective statements and so forth that cost the taxpayers money. He has cried wolf and whined so many times that it has gotten to be a joke.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I refuse to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a good idea if the Congress would practice a little economy itself. I think that maybe the various branches and departments of this Government would be a little more inclined to practice economy themselves if there was a fairly economical Congress here showing that they also believed in economy and would be willing to take the same medicine they prescribe so freely for others, thereby pointing a way and setting an example for them. I do not know but what they may get a little disgusted being preached at for economy all the time, and they may well say, "Well, here is a Congress wasting money right and left. They do not practice economy themselves, so why should we?" I have always been told if you want somebody to do something, set that kind of an example for them, and I think it probably would be a good idea for the Congressmen themselves to get down to business and practice economy in the running of their own affairs.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. No; I refuse to yield.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman referred to me. Will he yield?

Mr. IRVING. I referred in no manner that was critical. I hope that he can get all of his Members out here to vote for economy, because I surely think they could have outvoted the Democrats every time in favor of economy if they had really wanted to. I would like to see them actually do so.

Mr. ARENDS. With a 92 Democratic majority we cannot.

Mr. IRVING. There has never been a 92-percent majority on the floor in all the weeks we have been considering this bill, and it looked to me just like the Republicans were counting out their Members to have just a few less each time than the Democrats so that they could say that they could not vote these economy measures. Now the Democrats are for real economy, not false economy that in the end costs the taxpayers more. How about 1947–48? The Internal Revenue Bureau was cut so that the Government lost hundreds of millions of dollars. This certainly is not sound economy—save a few dollars and lose millions. That is why we need to make separate and individual cuts or reductions where they can be made without losing efficiency. Why did not we do so while we were working on this bill the last several weeks instead of trying to pass the buck to the President? We are dodging our responsibility and giving away duties if we do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of very caustic and severe criticism from the Republican side of this House of Representatives concerning this omnibus appropriation bill. The various appropriations contained in the budget and reflected in this bill have been called by some previous Republican speakers some very bad and unseemly things—some terrible names—and the impression has gone forth to the public generally that this bill is a sort of haphazard affair; that no one had any real concern about the money appropriated or the purposes of the appropriation except these self-crowned saviors of the Republic who are but a small segment of the Congress. Their concern, however, started to be manifested only when this bill began to be discussed before the Committee of the Whole. They never testified themselves before any appropriations subcommittee.

The word seems to have gone out from the Republican strategy committee to use to the full the present appropriations bill for its nefarious political purposes in an effort to persuade the people through the reactionary press of the Nation that the present appropriations could be cut so as to balance the budget. In some instances they have succeeded in so fooling the people. The only daily newspaper in Omaha has been such a paid tool for this unholy lobby and for days has run articles and editorials on its front page, and as a consequence I have received 59 letters from my district to the effect that the budget should be balanced and that President Truman ought to be stopped in his efforts to foist such a budget upon the people. Heretofore I never thought that it would be humanly possible for reactionary republicanism to so deceive the people. There seems to be a concentrated effort to give out false information to the people through the kept press of the Nation and vie with nazism, fascism, and Stalinism to repeat the lies so often that the people would put full credence in them. I shall take my remaining time to call the attention of this House and the readers of the CONGRESIONAL RECORD to certain undeniable truths concerning budget balancing and the way this budget, as contained in this omnibus appropriations bill, was made up.

First of all, this budget cannot be balanced at this time. It is humanly impossible. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and every other truthful Republican and Democratic Congressman will tell you that. There are $14,000,000,000 of fixed charges which cannot be cut. This leaves a balance of about $15,000,000,000 to run the Government and pay for all other items of expense. If it were not for the cold war, the budget could be balanced and something could be paid on the national debt. Other speakers have and will explain this in greater detail.

Now, is this budget in its present form as reflected by the omnibus appropriations bill made up by the President? The undeniable answer is "No." It is made up in the following fashion: Prior

to the beginning of each fiscal year—before July 1—each of the departments of Government requests each of its various subdivisions to make up estimates as to the amount of money necessary to run each of same. Experts in each subdivision furnish the heads of the departments with this carefully prepared, itemized data. Then the heads of the departments go carefully through these items and eliminate all unnecessary costs. Then the heads of each of the departments of Government transmit their corrected and trimmed budgets to the Bureau of the Budget, which is composed of many highly trained and capable experts, who examine carefully these financial demands of the heads of the departments of Government, and in turn eliminate all discovered duplications and unnecessary expenses, and finally makes up the budgetary demands and transmits them to the President, who in turn has his experts examine and check these items, and then sends them to the Congress. They are then sent to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, because all appropriations must originate, under the United States Constitution, in the House of Representatives. The Committee on Appropriations is composed of 45 able men, comprised of Democrats and Republicans.

The membership of the present Appropriations Committee is as follows:

Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress: CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, Chairman; JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina; GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; ALBERT THOMAS, Texas; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio; W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee; JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi; GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York; J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia; JOE B. BATES, Kentucky; JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma; E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia; PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., Georgia; OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana; LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, New York; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts; EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR., Indiana; JOHN TABER, New York; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Vermont; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; WALT HORAN, Washington; GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania; LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon; JOHN PHILLIPS, California; ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas; FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; EARL WILSON, Indiana.

This full Committee on Appropriations is divided into the following subcommittees:

District of Columbia—Subcommittee: JOE B. BATES, Kentucky, Chairman; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; FOSTER FURCOLO, Massachusetts; RALPH E. CHURCH, Illinois; LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon.

House of Representatives, Architect of the Capitol, Botanic Gardens, Library of Congress, Government Printing Office—Subcommittee: CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, New York, chairman; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio; GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico (temporarily assigned); GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas.

Department of State, Department of Justice, Department of Commerce, the Judiciary—Subcommittee: JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, chairman; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; PRINCE H. PRESTON, Georgia; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio.

Treasury Department, Post Office Department, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Subcommittee: J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia, chairman; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana; GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York.

Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, Railroad Retirement Board, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—Subcommittee: JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island, chairman; E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia; CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, New York; FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin; ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas.

Department of Agriculture—Subcommittee: JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi, chairman; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma; EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR., Indiana; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; WALT HORAN, Washington.

Department of the Interior—Subcommittee: MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio, chairman; W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas; HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania.

Executive office of the President, sundry independent offices and agencies, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Inland Waterways Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority—Subcommittee: ALBERT THOMAS, Texas, chairman; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee; GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; JOHN PHILLIPS, California.

Civil functions, Department of the Army—Subcommittee: JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina, chairman; CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri; LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; JOHN TABER, New York; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts.

Department of Defense—Subcommittee: GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas, chairman; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Vermont.

Since the adoption this year of the one-package appropriation bill called the Omnibus Appropriation bill, another final screening committee has been set up called the Central Subcommittee and it is as follows:

Central Subcommittee: LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan, chairman; W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee, E. H. HEDRICK, West Virginia; OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana; JOHN TABER, New York; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska. Alternates: HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Oklahoma; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; ALBERT J. ENGEL, Michigan; FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin.

All of the aforementioned 10 committees have held hearings for a long period of time and have done painstaking and diligent work and when they had gone over the budget proposals made by the President, and checked every matter thoroughly and made reductions where they deemed they should be made, their finished product was reviewed and rechecked by the central subcommittee, which also made reductions, and then the present bill was drafted reducing the estimates in the President's proposal by a very sizable sum.

Is there anyone who is wild and reckless enough to say that the making up of this budget was not a careful and painstaking effort?

Who is there who would be so ignoble and unjust as to find fault with the splendid service rendered by this Appropriations Committee to the rest of the Congress and to the Nation and its people? Why should I believe my reactionary home-town newspaper, and its 59 letter writers, and turn down the skilled and mature judgment of the subcommittees on appropriations and the central committee on appropriations and the full committee on appropriations? It just does not make sense to me and I shall stand back of these fine patriotic Democrats and Republicans who worked so hard and well to do a splendid job on this one-package budget, because they had all the facts at their disposal, and my other advisers had no facts at all—just a pack of lies.

When this bill is completed before the House it will then go to the Senate for rechecking, rescreening before its appropriation subcommittees and committee. It will be debated and voted upon in the Senate. If the Senate disagrees with the House, conferees of both bodies will be appointed, and all differences will be resolved and when both bodies agree it will go to the President, who can either sign the bill or veto it. If it is vetoed by the President it can be passed over his veto, if the proper majority is obtained.

No, my friends, this is not a haphazard, loosely thrown together, damnable, or outrageous budget bill at all, careless praters to the contrary notwithstanding. It is a splendidly considered bill and will end up, I am sure, as a splendid law which everyone of us, except the chronic or soreheads and bellyachers, can support.

I am sorry to take up so much time in detailing the foregoing matters but I believe it was worth the effort.

True our national debt is high because of past wars and their aftermath. The debt is now about $257,000,000,000. I ask the complainers which they would prefer, an unbombed Nation with a large debt, or a bombed Nation with an inconsequential debt? We had to pay a high price to win these wars but do you not think it was worth it? We should make every effort to economize, but not walk backward in trying to do it, but forward. We must carry on this cold war to try to avert world war III. We must be prepared and if my vote will do it we shall be prepared.

Our Nation is not bankrupt, nor any way near bankruptcy. Our physical assets are well worth over $684,000,000,000. Our national income is $225,000,000,000 plus. We are heavily in debt now, but when peace finally comes it will be as a drop in the bucket if we can still keep the enemies from our shores and splatter theirs with bombs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the more I listen to the discussion and the nearer we approach the

end of the time we have for the discussion of this amendment the more convinced I am that the discussion has gone deeper than whether we shall cut a certain amount of money from the bill before us. We have gone to a basic principle in the form of government under which the United States operates.

If you will read history as it refers to other nations that have gone through the same experience and also the papers and the records of the discussions of the men who set up our kind of government more than 170 years ago, you will realize why it is that the form of government we have has existed for some 170 years, while every other government in the world that was in existence at that time has changed its government in that period.

What happened in this new country was that we took the records and the experiences of the other nations of the world up to that time and, in the hands of men like Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton, and others, we took the weaknesses of those governments and the strengths and out of them created a government that had the simple principles embodied in our Constitution. For that reason we have existed as a free government when other nations of the world have lost their freedoms.

One of the essential features of our form of government has been the control of the purse, the control of the power of appropriation and of taxation, in the hands of the representatives of the people. The moment we give that up, even by the process of saying to the executive branch, "You take our work, which we have been unable to finish, and you work on it," the minute we do that we have surrendered one of the strengths in our Government.

As a practical matter, then, what would happen? Do you, Mr. Chairman, or do any of the people here, want to put into the hands of any one man of either party in the executive arm of the Government the right to determine where cuts shall be made in the budget, without consideration or representation or discussion among the representatives of the people who would be affected?

So I rise to remark that we have come today to another milestone in the history of the United States, that we shall stand up today and be counted on whether we are still for the republic, for free government, and for government in the hands of the people's representatives, or whether we shall move one step farther toward centralization of government, which inevitably in the history of the world has led to dictatorship.

Today, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], but I shall not vote for any amendment or any substitute which takes power and protection away from representative government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of day when Members of Congress like to stand up and be counted. Some have spoken apologetically about economy, professing their desire for the practice of economy and yet not appearing to realize that the House has already effected some very real and substantial reductions in the pending bill. Perhaps without exception, every Member has supported some substantial reductions in the pending measure. Let us not delude ourselves. Yesterday we passed the military portion of this bill. Even in the military portion of the measure, by reason of our desire for economy, we reduced the military requests of the President and of the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and the Air Force $190,000,000. We even reduced the funds for the Air Force, an establishment which is so popular with the country and the Congress and so essential to our defense, in an earnest effort to promote economy. We do not have to apologize and say that just today we have decided for the first time to become economy minded. Already in the mill we have made an earnest effort and some real progress in the direction of reduced spending. I have supported those efforts to effect economies and I join with others in the desire to achieve additional savings.

Our savings, as a result of the language and figures in this bill thus far, amount to $1,500,000,000. I do not apologize for the measure which has been presented to you.

When a war is on does anyone say that we should balance the budget and thereby perhaps lose the war? I think not. We bend every effort to the winning of the war, despite an unbalanced budget. Everyone knows that a certain type of war is in progress right now and that peace has not been achieved or declared. The cold war is a reality. The cold war brings about expenditures in some ways comparable to a shooting war. So we are now in the midst, if not in the critical stage, of the cold war. When one is asked why the Congress does not balance the budget, the answer is not hard to find. Thoughtful Americans are aware that we are spending at the rate of $20,000,000,000 a year in an effort to strengthen our national defense and win the cold war. We are bending every effort toward preventing world war No. 3. By reason of those efforts the budget is out of balance but peace is worth all we are doing to achieve it. If you take out the $13,000,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the ECA funds and the atomic energy and other funds amounting to a grand total of about $20,000,000,000 in the President's budget, if you eliminate the cold war, then you have a balanced budget and we can make a substantial payment on the public debt. That is the reason why we have not balanced the budget and that is why the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], does not himself advocate reductions adequate to balance the budget. The gentleman from New York merely says, in effect, in his amendment, "Let us reduce the budget by an additional $600,000,000 which would be added to the $1,500,000,000 reduction already made." That action would not, of course, balance the budget, as much as we all desire to see the budget balanced. Moreover, the so-called Taber amendment would give the executive branch a blank check, so to speak, to cut appropriations without specific congressional authorization. The amendment means that Congress would surrender its power and authority to the executive. For my part, I do not believe that Congress should surrender its power of representative government. Congress cannot properly shift its responsibility for economy in government to the executive. Congress should make the necessary reductions, specifying exactly where they are to apply. There is no other proper procedure.

Under the Taber amendment we would assign to the Executive the authority to make the reductions. The Congress would not make the reductions as required by the American system of democracy. In what department the reductions would be made, no man can tell. How severe the reductions would be, no one can tell. Mr. Chairman, Congress should accept its responsibility.

I dare say that not 10 percent of the Members have had an opportunity to read the amendment of the gentleman from New York. It is printed in the RECORD, but I doubt if anyone upon careful reading of the RECORD can understand or interpret it.

The amendment says, "For equipment not more than $3,577,000,000 may be expended." A reduction is proposed, and I would not oppose a needed reduction. But where will the reduction be made? No one can say, because the Congress is abdicating its authority to make appropriations. This I refuse to do. We should not surrender our prerogatives as legislators.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would yield, this hits every single item, separately, that the President sent up here.

Mr. MAHON. It takes equipment in all agencies of Government, amounting to $3,577,000,000. There is no way of telling what agency would be reduced and to what extent.

Mr. TABER. Not in the defense set-up.

Mr. MAHON. The defense set-up is exempted, but there is no possible way of knowing where the changes in the bill would take place in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Therefore, it is abdication of our responsibility to legislate, whether or not we admit it. We turn over to the Executive the power of legislation.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would read my amendment he would know that it would be on specific items.

Mr. MAHON. It would be made in what agency? No word is said as to where or how or when, except during the fiscal year 1951. That is the situation even though certain broad categories are mentioned in the amendment. The committee, and the House, in their desire to achieve economy, have already reduced the budget by $1,500,000,000, as has been previously explained. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in a desire to go even further, has offered an amendment which anybody can understand, and which does not abdicate congressional powers. I am supporting the Cannon amendment in an effort to further promote savings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. The Cannon amendment simply provides that the Bureau of the Budget, in apportioning the funds to the various departments, shall withhold 5 percent of the administrative funds from each department. That money could not be released unless it should be necessary for the essential purposes of the Government. This procedure should achieve a substantial reduction in civilian personnel.

The Members understand that when we appropriate money for a department, the actual money is not sent to the department. Every agency of the Government goes to the Bureau of the Budget and in effect says, "We have an appropriation of a certain amount for the fiscal year. Our schedule of expenditures for the first quarter, second quarter, third quarter, and fourth quarter is so much." That program is laid out, quarter by quarter, and the money is released for each quarter by the Bureau of the Budget to the agency. In other words, the funds are released and channeled through the Bureau of the Budget to the agency.

The committee amendment simply says that 5 percent of the administrative funds for the agencies shall be held by the budget, in order to effect further economies. The sum held in reserve could not be released unless such expenditures should be absolutely essential for carrying on the necessary operations of the Government. So that is where we stand.

Except for the cold war, we would easily balance the budget. We are doing our best to achieve savings and we do not have to apologize for a critical international situation which has thus far kept the budget out of balance. The amendment of the gentleman from New York is not the answer to the unbalanced budget. A more stable world situation is required. So long as our airplanes are being shot down and our way of life is threatened, it is not unwise to spend a few billion dollars in the cause of peace and national security.

All Members wish to take every safe step in the direction of economy. Legislation is a matter of compromise and the Cannon amendment seems to afford the best approach to our problem at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], the ranking member of the executive committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, did not the gentleman announce that he would oppose any such consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not advised what the gentleman may have announced yesterday. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe we all understand now what is going on. Shortly after we convened the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations started work on the budget for the next fiscal year. These subcommittees of our Appropriation Committee have heard thousands of witnesses. They heard the testimony, considered all matters before them, and made the cuts that the committee has made in this bill. When these subcommittees had finished their hearings the chairman of the full committee appointed an executive subcommittee whose duty it was to try to consolidate and assemble the recommendations of the several subcommittees and write one bill containing the entire budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1951.

The gentleman from Michigan was chairman of that committee; I was the next on the Democratic side. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was the ranking minority member. We invited the chairman and ranking minority member of each of our subcommittees to appear before the executive subcommittee for a general discussion of their committee work, and with but one exception these distinguished chairmen and ranking minority members indicated that all possible cuts had been made. The subexecutive committee then wrote the bill. Actually all we could do was to receive the several recommended reports and bills from the jurisdictional subcommittee. This is what we did. Each chapter of this bill was entirely prepared by the jurisdictional subcommittee. I think the actions of the various subcommittees were unanimous with very few exceptions. Only one exception was indicated to our subexecutive committee. The total savings made under total budget estimates amount to about one and a half billion dollars.

The flaw in the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is that he charges us with increases in the bill but does not give us credit for increased budget estimates. The bill has actually been reduced about a billion and a half dollars when you add to the original budget estimates the supplemental budget estimates; and I am sure he will agree with me on that.

We have read this bill line by line, word by word, figure by figure. There is not a man in this House who has not had an opportunity to reduce the bill or at least to offer an amendment on any word or figure in the entire bill. We have been considering this bill in excess of a month and the net result has been that many of the cuts made by the Appropriation Committee have been restored. That, of course, was your privilege. The fact is that the bill has not been reduced as it should have been, but you have canceled out several cuts that your Committee on Appropriations recommended. I have voted for cuts in subcommittees and in the full committee and on the floor of the House during the consideration of this bill.

I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] in the hope—I am not kidding myself and I do not want you to think I am—that it may mean that a strong suggestion by us will result in the Director of the Budget Bureau agreeing to cut out something; yet I am under the impression that since he has approved the items we already have in the bill to begin with he probably will not do anything.

If the Cannon amendment should not be adopted, then we may have to support the only amendment remaining in order to make substantial reductions in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion the other body may accomplish more than we have. At least I hope so.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment to the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Taber amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state the existing situation. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has offered an amendment. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], offered a substitute for the Thomas amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], offered an amendment to the Thomas amendment. The vote will first come on the Taber amendment to the Thomas amendment, then the vote will be on the Cannon substitute for the Thomas amendment, and then the vote on the Thomas amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 159, noes 141.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 183, noes 147.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 123, noes 181.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 141, noes 194.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. THOMAS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 213, noes 115.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1101. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year, in accordance with section 16 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicles (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), is hereby fixed at $1,400.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on May 5 the committee adopted the Case amendment. The Case amendment cut the administration fund of the Public Housing Administration $2,950,000. This means that the low-cost rental-housing program which we adopted earlier this year will be cut one-third in its administrative appropriation.

This is like taking the gasoline away from the automobile. You build the automobile and then you refuse to let the automobile have the gasoline necessary for its propulsion.

The President submitted a budget of $13,000,000 for the first full year's operation of this 6-year program. The House Appropriations Committee cut $1,300,000 of this, and then the Case amendment cut $2,950,000 more. This made a total cut of $4,250,000 on a $13,000,000 appropriation.

The result of that cut will be that general orders will have to be issued in the Public Housing Administration freezing all personnel employment. They will not be able to hire the people to administer the program which we passed in this House earlier this year.

It is interesting to note that during the presentation of this amendment by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the subcommittee chairman, spoke against the amendment. However, the Case amendment was carried notwithstanding the opposition of the chairman of the subcommittee. When the committee rises and we are in the House, I hope some member of the Committee on Appropriations will ask for a separate vote on this particular amendment. If not, I shall ask for a separate vote on it.

I emphasize the fact that the total cut of the Committee on Appropriations and the Case amendment is $4,250,000 on a $13,000,000 budget. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in his presentation, made several mistakes in his argument. He stated this would result in a 25-percent cut. As I have shown you it is a 33⅓-percent cut. He also stated it was twice as much as the Public Housing Administration uses during the current year. I point out that the supplemental appropriation during the current year was for an eight-and-a-half-month operation.

In other words, instead of a $4,250,000 cut, it amounts to a $6,600,000 cut on an annual basis in relation to the current budget. I shall ask for a separate vote on this amendment.

I hope those who are interested in the middle-income-housing groups and in making effective the middle-income-housing problem, so that people in the middle-income bracket will have houses to live in, and houses to rent, built by local authorities with private funds.

A vote for the Case amendment is a vote against the people in the middle- and low-income brackets who need housing. It will hamstring the PHA in its administrative services.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that this will also seriously affect the low-cost-housing program which was passed by the Congress only a short while ago.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct. The cut in this fund by one-third, as I said, is equivalent to taking the gasoline out of the automobile of low-cost housing.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I hope the gentleman is successful in obtaining a roll-call vote on this proposition.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall ask for a separate vote and hope the House will support the striking out of the Case amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that we should confine the discussion to the matters before us, but since there would be no opportunity to speak on this, and since the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent at the moment on important business, and since he had no reason to think we would return today to an amendment previously adopted, it is necessary for me to put upon the record certain facts which the House should know, particularly if on tomorrow or at any other time a motion would be made to ask for a roll-call vote upon that particular amendment.

It is necessary for the House to know that in the discussion before the subcommittee on independent offices which considered that matter it was generally felt—and while I speak only for myself, I say it was certainly a matter that appeared in the evidence before us—that this particular agency of Government could well stand a greater cut in its administrative expenses than had been given. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], my colleague and my good friend, said that it is like providing an automobile but not providing gasoline. His simile is not quite correct. It is a case in which an automobile needs 3 gallons of gasoline to get to a certain place, so he proposes to give it 10 gallons of gasoline for that particular distance.

Last year and in the preceding years, this agency of Government came before us and used the breaks, to speak in the vernacular. It used the little profit that it made on the difference between the amount it charged in interest and the amount that was charged it for money furnished from another agency. This year we gave it a different set-up in a legislative bill which passed the Congress, in which we gave it the right to come before the House and ask for a certain amount of money for administrative expenses. It was very noticeable that the amount immediately increased over the amount used in the preceding year, and the reduction desired by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is apparently less than the difference asked for. So I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will be sustained, with the very firm feeling that the administrative costs of this agency could be reduced without damaging its effectiveness. I do hope that, if a roll-call vote is asked for on tomorrow, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will be sustained.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 412, after line 8, insert the following new section 1102, and renumber the succeeding sections accordingly:

"SEC. 1102. No part of any appropriation contained in this act for education, research, and training shall be expended subsequent to the effective date of this act for tuition fees, grants, or other charges to any institution of higher learning, other than a religious or denominational institution, selecting its students exclusively or primarily from the members of such religion or denomination, on that basis, which excludes, limits, or otherwise discriminates against any person or persons seeking admission as students or faculty in such institution because of race, religion, creed, color, or national origin, or segregates such person or persons after admission."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for two reasons: First, because the bill contains something in the neighborhood of $3,000,000,000 for payment to institutions of higher education and payments to those who attend such institutions, the largest figure about $2,500,000,000 being the figure for veterans. I have patterned this amendment closely after the law which

we have in the State of New York prohibiting discrimination against those who seek admission into colleges and universities, which law has worked very effectively in New York, and I think it ought to be clear that this is no vain idea, no abstract belief. In New York we are actually making a law like this work, and it has been found useful to all of our people.

I do not think it should take much argument to convince the House that I am not talking about sectional views or the pressures which exist in different parts of the country—that is something which we know only too well and one would not be adult who proposed an amendment like this and did not understand what was incipient in the way the amendment would be voted on. But I am appealing to the great bulk of the Members of the Committee of the Whole and of the House who are not affected by such a particular local situation who have to look at these questions only as Americans and only as representatives of all the American people. I ask those gentlemen to ask their own consciences, regardless of how they feel on any piece of antidiscrimination legislation, whether there is any justification for paying out vast sums of money of the United States to any institution of higher learning which discriminates against those who seek admission either as teachers or as students on such grounds of color, race, or creed.

I think, too, that no discussion of this general subject at this time can be complete unless we understand, and understand clearly, just what is happening in the world with respect to what is called race relations in the United States. It is the biggest single piece of propaganda which we give the Communist propagandists anywhere. I feel in the most sincere good conscience that it behooves every American who is really militant in this cold war against the Communist forces we are fighting, to fight and to fight constantly on this particular issue. In the eyes of the world, it will demonstrate that we practice what we preach and that we just do not preach freedom and civil rights for other people.

Let me emphasize that the great bulk of the peoples of the world are yellow, black, or brown people, not white people. We cannot afford to deal with this problem on a purely national or on a local basis, but it must be projected on an international and on a world basis; and it becomes directly and materially a part of the foreign policy of the United States to seek to do what we can about this situation in our own country.

We should be most actively concerned in respect of discrimination and segregation on this front of education where the Government is spending huge sums of money with institutions which may discriminate and which may segregate. This issue is directly connected with the question of causing those institutions to drop those practices. I cannot possibly see how we can condone it, and yet be fighting for liberty with the full power and full conscience we ought to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PACE. If the gentleman's State Legislature in New York has given you what you want up there why do you not let other State legislatures give the people of their States what they want? Why do you want to impose the will of the Legislature of New York on the entire Nation?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentleman has put his finger on the main point. The Federal Government is paying $3,000,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury to institutions some of which may engage in these practices, and this is the only place in which that correction can be made. I am here at the place where I ought to be to endeavor to make the correction.

Mr. PACE. That would be all very well if the State of New York were putting up $3,000,000,000.

Mr. JAVITS. The State of New York puts up money for its own universities and its people put up a great share of the Federal revenues. The Federal Government here is putting up money for universities all over the country and any guilty of these practices should not get that money.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. We people in Pennsylvania want to see that the money goes to educational purposes regardless of race, creed, or color; and I am speaking for a city that pays a billion dollars a year in taxes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 412, line 8, after the period in line 8 insert a new section:

"SEC. 1101. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this bill shall be paid to any institution, firm, partnership, corporation, or person who denies equality in education or employment because of race, color, or creed."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is a meritorious one; however, it does not go far enough. A similar amendment was offered by me when we were dealing with that chapter in the bill that provided for aid and grants to States for educational and job-training purposes. This is the third time I have offered civil-rights amendments to this bill. The other occasion was when I offered an amendment to the District of Columbia chapter of the bill to prohibit discrimination and segregation in the District of Columbia. Both times the amendments were defeated.

Now we are considering the general provisions of this bill and therefore my amendment deals with the entire bill. Here we are appropriating $29,000,000,000. What does this amendment provide? It provides that in the expenditure of these funds not one penny shall be paid to any firm, corporation, institution, or individual who denies equality in employment and that not one penny shall be paid to any educational institution which denies equality in educational facilities because of race, color, or creed. We are applying here the principles of FEPC. That issue is undergoing another sham debate in the other body, and we might as well be frank about the situation that stares us in the face. Here we are about to adjourn soon. This Congress has about two more months to go, yet not a single piece of civil-rights legislation has been enacted.

It is my considered judgment that the fight in the other body, like the fight here on civil rights, is a phony fight, it is a fixed fight, the fight has been thrown before it started. So here we have an opportunity again to make a real fight and insure against the expenditure of $29,000,000,000 of Federal funds under conditions of segregation and discrimination and guarantee that they be spent under conditions of equality.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Under the gentleman's amendment just what executive or administrative agency or tribunal would make the decision that an individual or a corporation or a school or a college were in fact practicing discrimination so as to make applicable the amendment which the gentleman has offered?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The department which would have jurisdiction in the payment of the grant would have the power to make that determination. Further, this amendment deals with payments made directly by departments. The departments could not make payments to firms that deny equality in employment. The departments themselves would be prohibited by my amendment from practicing discrimination that the departments are practicing in many, many sections of the Government.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Then the gentleman's amendment gives the chance to Congress to vote on the matter that is involved in FEPC, where there is no compulsion but merely directs the money in proper channels so in no case will there be any discrimination by any agency against any child because of race, creed, or color?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. None of these funds will be paid to anybody who is guilty of discriminatory practices and nobody can benefit from the funds of the people of the United States who practices discrimination.

That is the amendment. It is very simple. It reduces itself down to a very simple proposition. You either believe in civil rights or you do not. Now, a lot of people profess to believe in it. This Congress certainly has no good record on that score despite the professions of the majority for civil rights. We have not passed any civil-rights legislation. As a matter of fact, this House has gone backward. A week ago Monday we passed a bill here which had the support of the House Democratic Party leadership—we might as well record it—which stripped

away from Negro employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing certain rights which they had obtained by Civil Service examination, and this House went so far as to make that bill retroactive so as to wipe out the benefits these Negro Government employees had earned by this examination. Yes, we have gone backward on the matter of civil rights.

Now the President, I understand, is going to make a speech at a civil-rights meeting. I just wonder what he is going to say about this Democratic Congress. Perhaps he is going to repeat his speeches of 1948; the blame is going to be placed by him on the so-called Dixie Democrats and Republicans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill H. R. 7786 to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I do oppose this bill. This bill is the budget. Budget represents policy; it implements policy. This bill implements the policy of a cold war which is not in the interests of the American people. The bill demonstrates conclusively the cold-war policy of sacrificing the people's needs for the benefit of those big trusts which profit from the cold war which unless terminated by the people will force the world into a war that nobody will win and which will destroy civilization itself. This bill represents the program of guns instead of butter; of Jim Crow instead of civil rights; of unemployment instead of jobs; of slums instead of housing; of a Taft-Hartley repression of labor instead of genuine collective bargaining; of tyranny and fear instead of freedom and our Bill of Rights. A study of this bill, as I have sat here every day during its consideration, reveals that veterans are subjected to a false economy, public housing has been deprived of adequate funds and the health program has been cut down to nothing. Even our postal service has been cut in almost half. On the other hand we have in this bill over $14,000,000,000 for the war program. Soon we will appropriate more billions for the Marshall plan and other similar cold-war devices. This bill sacrifices the veterans, the farmer, labor, the tenement dwellers, the old people, the orphans, the widows and the sick to the cold-war economy. When I think of the refusal of this House to make appropriations for heart disease and for cancer and think of the willingness with which we have increased the appropriations for the Wall Street war program I cannot in good conscience vote for this bill which says no to the needs of the American people for the profit of the big monopolies which are the only beneficiaries of this cold-war economy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I just wanted to be sure that we have the effect of these two amendments clear. My amendment applied to colleges and universities and the Federal moneys devoted to that purpose. The gentleman's amendment covered all the money in the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is right. The gentleman's amendment is a very limited civil-rights amendment. The gentleman is very limited in his approach to civil rights and my approach is sweeping. I want full civil rights. I admit the difference, and I think our records in this House will bear out that difference.

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the President may tell the country at the civil-rights meeting that the fault for the failure of this Congress to enact civil rights legislation rests with the so-called Dixie Democrats. Well, it is a matter of arithmetic. They are in the minority, and they oppose this legislation, and they are here when this legislation comes up; they have been here to vote against it, on every single occasion on which these amendments have been offered by me or by others. What the President must explain is where have his Democrats been on these occasions. I mean those Democrats who like Truman profess to be for the civil rights. I have always noticed the conspicuous absence of many of these so-called leading civil-rights spokesmen. They deliver wonderful speeches all over the country and over the radio and on the public platforms, but when it comes to a fight of this kind in the House, where are they? Where have they been? Certainly not here. Now, we have a good number of them here. Unfortunately we cannot get a record vote unless this amendment is adopted. But, I call upon them to square themselves with their consciences in this matter. I am calling upon those who campaigned on the civil-rights platform, on those who said that if elected they were going to vote and fight for civil rights, not dodge the civil-rights issue, not hide behind the procedure of anonymous voting that exists in the Committee of the Whole, but to stand up and be counted and vote and fight. I call upon them to live up to the obligations which they incurred when they were elected on the basis of the promises that they made to the people in their party platform. This issue of white supremacy has got to be fought out. How long do you think you are going to fool 140,000,000 American people by dodging and by using every single parliamentary device to avoid a position on this issue? How long do you think the President or anybody else can go around the country and say, "Well, it is the Dixie Democrats that stopped us"? The issue rests here with the northern Democrats, as well as Republicans. You constitute a majority here in this Congress. You have the votes. What are you going to do about it? Up to now you have killed every piece of civil-rights legislation. Up to now you have been going backward instead of forward on this issue. Up to now the fights on this issue have been fights that have been thrown, that have been fixed right from the very beginning.

Now, with my amendment, you have another chance to keep faith with the people. I know it is annoying to you when I offer these amendments. I know a lot of people are annoyed and disgusted that MARCANTONIO should be repeatedly offering these civil-rights amendments, but I am going to keep on offering them as long as I am here and until we win this fight, because I conscientiously believe, and it has been my guiding political philosophy, that no white man is free in America as long as the Negro is subjected to discrimination and Jim Crow and segregation. There can be no freedom and no democracy in any land where men and women are deprived of equality because of the color of their skins or their national origin or their place of birth or the church in which they worship.

I know that this principle is a challenge to white supremacy, but white supremacy has to be challenged and it has to be beaten, otherwise our democracy can never live. It is a mere mockery, it is a sham, it is a fraud.

Sure, you can wave the flag all you want and you can Red-bait all you want and you can raise the Red bogie all you want, but as long as men are deprived of equality and of these God-given rights by means of Jim Crow and white supremacy, so long we will not have any genuine, real freedom, real equality, real democracy in these United States. Now is the chance to strike a blow against white supremacy by adopting my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 119.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 48, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1109. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this or any other act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United

States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That, as applicable to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, nothing in this section shall be construed to require an affidavit from any person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property, and the payment of salary or wages may be made to such persons from applicable appropriations for services rendered in such emergency without execution of the affidavit contemplated by this section.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 417, after line 14, insert a new section 1110, and appropriately renumber succeeding sections. The new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 1110. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or practices the denial to any citizen of the United States of the right to apply for, hold or be promoted in any Government position or office on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it goes beyond the scope of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I point out that the provision which I have suggested as an amendment will result in retrenchment because it may result in withholding wages or salaries from employees of the United States. That is all that this refers to. It would affect the appropriations made under this act and therefore comes within the rules of propriety as an amendment to an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it goes beyond the scope of the pending bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, and is of the opinion that it does go beyond the scope of the pending bill. The Chair invites attention to the fact that it seeks to affect funds of corporations not necessarily appropriated for in this bill.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) Any appropriation available to an agency which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. Such information shall be submitted not later than 40 days before the beginning of any fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than 15 days after approval of the act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall apportion each such appropriation and shall notify the agency concerned of his action not later than 20 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available, or not more than 30 days after the approval of the act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. When used in this section the term "agency" means any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board, or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 422, line 5, after the period insert the following:

"The provisions of this section shall not apply to any corporation which obtains funds for making loans, other than paid-in capital funds, without legal liability on the part of the United States."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the only thing we are trying to do is to stop the debt-making activities of corporations. This has to do with the corporations that do not create any debt against the Government. This amendment is offered by request. We have no objection; I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I did not know anything about the amendment in advance; I did not know it was to be offered.

Mr. NORRELL. This has absolutely nothing to do with any Government corporation that creates debts against the United States Government.

Mr. TABER. What is the objective of the amendment?

Mr. NORRELL. We on this side were requested to offer the amendment if we did not intend to include such corporations. We indicated we did not include them and we have no objection to the amendment. I think the amendment is all right.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Will the gentleman explain what corporations are intended to be left out and what effect it has on limiting the funds under this bill then?

Mr. NORRELL. The corporations that we did not intend to include would be such as the intermediate credit bank and other similar corporations that do business, but have no power to obligate the Government in any way and cannot borrow money from the Treasury. We are not trying to include those corporations in this part of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. What is the effect of the amendment on the bill, because I do not understand exactly what it is?

Mr. TABER. It is a modification, as I understand it, of a provision in section 1111 of the bill, a limitation against it, which would permit Government created corporations to borrow money where the United States is not liable. That is what I understand it is aimed at. I have been advised that the two corporations that would be affected are the intermediate banks for cooperatives, and one other corporation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The intermediate credit bank issues debentures. In other words, they lend money to farmers, then they take the farmers' notes as security and issue debentures which on the face of them say that they are not obligations of the Federal Government. In our effort to control Federal corporations which operate on Federal capital and which issue obligations of the Federal Government, we wanted to show we did not want to include corporations which issue their own negotiable paper and which says that they are not obligations of the Government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have any objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN. On page 422, line 5, after the period, insert "Nothing in this subsection shall be so construed as to interfere with initiation, operation, and administration of agricultural price support programs."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the committee that the members of the subcommittee on this side of the aisle who have had occasion to go into this matter believe the original intent of the committee was not to give such authority to the Director as this amendment

would prohibit; so I am authorized to say to the Members on this side of the aisle that we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I have discussed this with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], members of the Subcommittee for Agricultural Appropriations. In the general provisions of this bill we are trying to prevent deficiencies, and in doing that the general provisions provide that the funds for the various operations of the Government shall be set up on a quarterly basis and have to be cleared with the Bureau of the Budget.

Now the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up as a corporation for the reason that we intended for them to have some freedom and latitude in handling their operations. This amendment leaves it where they have to make the same reports of their operations and all that, but it does mean that the Bureau of the Budget cannot interfere with the proper operation of the price-support program. In other words, they cannot delay the initiation or proper administration of the price-support programs. This leaves it where the Commodity Credit Corporation can follow the basic law and carry out the purposes set out in their charter and under the law authorizing its creation. There is some question whether the CCC would be included in the absence of this amendment, but this clarifies the provisions where there can be no question.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The same Corporation which is in charge of administering the price support program is likewise engaged in other activities, such as carrying out the International Wheat Agreement, acquiring supplies for the ECA, likewise acquiring beef in connection with the foot and mouth program in Mexico, and also in acquiring supplies for foreign cash customers. I think in all of those operations and transactions the Corporation acts as agent. It is not the purpose, as I understand, of this bill, to subject those transactions to budgetary scrutiny.

Mr. WHITTEN. Insofar as the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation are concerned, I think that the gentleman is eminently correct. In so far as the other agencies are concerned, I do not know.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Do I understand that the amendment is for the purpose of keeping out interference by the Bureau of the Budget with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation? If the Bureau of the Budget thinks something ought to be done for efficiency, this will block them.

Mr. WHITTEN. No; this does not enter into that. Under the general provisions the Corporation must make certain reports. In the absence of this amendment they would have to set up in advance, on a yearly basis or on a quarterly basis, their operations and you cannot do that with the Commodity Credit Corporation where you do not know in advance what your demand for outlays will be to support the price of crops.

Mr. FULTON. If the Bureau of the Budget feels that it is wise that there be these advance quarterly reports made by the Commodity Credit Corporation, why should we in the act by the amendment cut them out of that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. They make the same reports, but we say that the Bureau of the Budget cannot make such demands as will interfere with the proper discharge of the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Short of interfering with the proper discharge of such obligations, they have full rights, but if the Bureau of the Budget sets out to block the price support program which was authorized by law and which the Commodity Credit Corporation had an obligation and a duty to perform, this merely says in that case the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be permitted to go ahead.

Mr. FULTON. I do not see why, if the law says one thing, the Bureau of the Budget can block the Commodity Credit Corporation without this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is hard to understand, but we wish to be sure it does happen.

Mr. COOLEY. The Bureau of the Budget could not block them except for the provisions in the present bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, but it might be held by the Bureau of the Budget to give them that right, and we wanted to make it clear.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I do not understand the gentleman's amendment in this respect: The gentleman has made a statement with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation insofar as the antideficiency provisions of the act are concerned. Should not that same exception be made, for instance, with respect to the social welfare program about which the gentleman from Rhode Island spoke yesterday, inasmuch as we will not know beforehand, for instance, just what the charges against that will be, and the Bureau of the Budget might very well interfere with that?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not going to argue with the gentleman about that because I am not thoroughly familiar with it. I do feel that I am qualified to speak to the present question. As to the other, the gentleman may be clearly right. I just do not know.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman from Mississippi has already answered the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I thought perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania had not differentiated between the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office as to its subsequent check and its right to establish the procedures. That is not the right of the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) In the case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) of this section by an officer or employee of an agency, or of the District of Columbia, the head of the agency concerned or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall immediately report to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, this concludes section 1111. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a section-by-section analysis of the amendment we have made to the Antideficiency Act, showing the changes in this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENT OF ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 1111 OF H. R. 7786

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, subsection (a) would prohibit the making or authorizing of expenditures in excess of the amount available in any appropriation or fund, and also the creating or authorizing of an obligation against any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein. The second clause of this subsection would prohibit involving the Government in any contract or other obligation for the payment of money in advance of appropriations unless such contract or obligation were authorized by law. Certain items are authorized by law to be contracted for in excess of appropriations made therefor. See, for example, United States Code 41, page 11; United States Code 25, page 99; United States Code 31, page 667; United States Code 31, page 668. The language of this clause follows the present law, and would make no change in these authorizations.

Subsection (b) is substantially a reenactment of existing prohibitions against acceptance of voluntary services or employment of personal services in excess of those authorized by law.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) would provide that all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time (barring those which may be exempted by administrative action under later provisions of the amended section) be so apportioned as to prevent obligation thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period. This is designed to insure that appropriations which are available for a fiscal year, or for other time periods—usually related to fiscal years—will not be obligated at a rate which would exhaust the appropriation prior to the end of the period for which the appropriation was made, and thus result in a need

for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation, or an increase in the authorization for administrative expenses of a corporation, or in drastic curtailment of the activity for which the appropriation or authorization was made.

Paragraph (1) of this subsection would provide also that all appropriations or funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations—commonly referred to as contract authorizations—be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. The first part of this provision relates to the so-called no-year appropriations and to funds, such as funds used by corporations for purposes other than administrative expenses, which are available indefinitely and without relation to any particular fiscal year. The second part relates to contract authorizations which may or may not be required by law to be executed with reference to any particular fiscal year.

The appropriations and funds referred to—except certain types of corporate funds—are now under the apportionment system, but the authority for their inclusion in that system stems from Executive Order 8512, dated August 13, 1940, rather than from the present Antideficiency Act, which relates only to fiscal year appropriations. It is necessary that no-year appropriations and funds (including all funds of corporations, whether for administrative expenses or for other purposes) and contract authorizations be included in the apportionment system and be controlled to the extent necessary to insure efficiency and economy in carrying out the purpose for which such appropriations and authorizations are granted by the Congress. The last sentence of this paragraph would provide that as used thereafter in the amended section, the term "appropriation" means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) would authorize the officer making apportionments to establish reserves "to provide for contingencies, or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments" subsequent to the date on which the appropriation, fund, or contract authorization was made available. The further provisions of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) contemplate that the Congress will be requested to rescind any amount reserved in the apportionment process when it is found that such amount will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation, fund, or contract authorization concerned.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) would provide for apportionments by "months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof." The present Antideficiency Act provides for apportionments "by monthly or other allotments." The operations of many agencies do not fit into a system of calendar quarters but are best gaged by operating seasons or other time periods.

Paragraph (4) of subsection (c) would provide that apportionments be reviewed at least four times each year, and contemplates that upon such review such reapportionments will be made or such reserves established, modified, or released as may be necessary to further the effective use of the appropriation, fund, or contract authorization concerned in accordance with the purposes stated in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

Subsection (d) of the proposed amendment designates the officers who shall make apportionments and reapportionments. This subsection is divided into two paragraphs, of which the first relates to appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, and the District of Columbia. In this connection it may be noted that the present antideficiency law covers all appropriations—except certain types which are specifically exempted—without distinguishing between appropriations for the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the executive branch, except that contingent appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are specifically exempt from the apportionment provisions. Thus, the appropriations available to the legislative branch and those available to the judiciary, except the contingent appropriations mentioned, inadvertently have been made subject to apportionment by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in Executive Order 6166 of June 10, 1933. To correct this, paragraph (1) of this subsection makes separate provision for apportioning appropriations available to the legislative branch, the judiciary, or the District of Columbia, and designates the officer or officers having administrative control of each such appropriation to make the apportionment thereof. A time limit is provided within which the apportionment should be made.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) provides that appropriations for the agencies, required to be apportioned under the provisions of subsection (c), shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and that the agencies shall submit information necessary therefor in such form and manner as the Director may prescribe. Definite time limits for submitting such information and for making apportionments are provided, the net result of which is to require that apportionments in all cases be made not later than 20 days before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is available or not more than 30 days after the approval of the act by which such appropriation is made available, whichever is later. These provisions are aimed at preventing delays which have occurred in some cases in the past in the submission of proposed apportionments by the agencies, and in the making of apportionments by the Bureau of the Budget. They will cure a defect in the present law which does not recognize that appropriations may not be made prior to the beginning of the fiscal year.

Paragraph (2) also defines the term "agency," when used in the amended section, as meaning "any executive department, agency, commission, authority, administration, board or other independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States."

Subsection (e) of section 1 would provide that no apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, should be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which requires expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

Many new laws enacted subsequent to the submission to the Congress of estimates of appropriations result in increasing the rate of obligations in the fiscal year in progress. In some cases such laws are approved after the passage of the appropriation act, and in other cases shortly before the appropriation is made. Technically, in the latter type of case there may be an opportunity to seek additional appropriations to carry out the functions imposed by the new laws, but as a practical matter the legislative process seldom permits the passage of newly conceived appropriation legislation in the last few days, or even weeks, of a legislative session. It is for this reason that provision is made in clause (A), above, for apportionments on a basis indicating a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate in cases where new laws resulting in increased costs are enacted "subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates" for an appropriation, rather than subsequent to the enactment of an appropriation act. This procedure is in line with that now established under section 203 of the Budget and Accounting Act (31 U. S. C. 14) which provides that the President may from time to time transmit to Congress supplemental or deficiency estimates "necessary on account of laws enacted after the transmission of the budget."

It is not clear what is meant in that part of the present law which authorizes waiver or modification of an apportionment "upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment." The present law is equally vague in excepting from the apportionment system those appropriations made "for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor." Under

present law the executive branch heretofore has considered that appropriations for certain activities of the Government must be apportioned on a basis leading to a deficiency or supplemental estimate in some circumstances in order to insure that obligations of the Government will be met in accordance with the apparent intent of the basic legislation and the appropriations made pursuant thereto. Notable among these appropriations are those for grants to States for public assistance programs and for payment of benefits to veterans.

It is necessary that programs of this type be carried on without delay or curtailment, even in the event changed circumstances indicate that appropriations therefore are inadequate. Accordingly, the bill would authorize the apportionment of any particular appropriation on a basis which would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate when required in emergencies involving the immediate welfare of individuals who are dependent upon appropriations of this type, as well as in emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.

The provision of paragraph (2) of subsection (e) for an immediate report to the Congress whenever an appropriation is apportioned on a basis which would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation would give the Committees on Appropriations an opportunity to question immediately any apportionment which they believed to be not in accord with the will of the Congress.

Subsection (f) would permit exemptions from the apportionment system of certain appropriations and funds, such as appropriations for payment of claims and judgments, where apportionment would serve no useful purpose, and of appropriations for contingent expenses of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and of items determined by the President to be of a confidential nature. Funds of Goverment corporations would be included in the apportionment system, but receipts from industrial and power operations available under law could be exempted by the apportioning authority.

Subsection (g) would provide for administrative regulations to keep obligations within apportionments, and to fix responsibility for the creation of obligations in excess of apportionments. In the executive branch and the government of the District of Columbia, such regulations would be subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in order to insure a certain amount of uniformity therein, but without depriving any agency of the opportunity to develop such a system as might be required to fit its particular needs.

Subsection (h) would prohibit any officer or employee of the United States from authorizing or creating any obligation in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g). This is designed to insure that the officers and employees who actually obligate the appropriations will be responsible for keeping them within the apportionments.

Subsection (i) would provide specific penalties for violation of the amended section. Paragraph (1) of this subsection provides penalties for any officer or employee of the United States who violates subsections (a), (b) or (h). Such penalties comprise appropriate administrative discipline including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office; and, upon conviction of a knowing and willful violation, a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. This paragraph would improve the present law by specifying the acts which are to be considered subject to penalty, and by providing for more practicable penalties, which can be gaged with reference to the seriousness of the offense.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (i) would require immediate reports of all pertinent facts together with a statement of the action taken thereon, in each case of a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (h) by an officer or employee of an agency. Such reports would be made to the President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and to the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 425, after line 8, insert a new section 1112 and renumber the succeeding section, the new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 1112. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates or practices the denial to any citizen of the United States of the right to apply for, hold, or be promoted in any Government position or office on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to point out to the House that there is an Executive Order No. 9980 entitled "Regulations Governing Fair Employment Practices Within the Federal Establishment."

This Executive order has many provisions but does not seem to me to have provisions which have power. My amendment is designed to try to implement it.

The strongest term of this Executive order is that the head of each department "shall take the necessary corrective or disciplinary action in consultation with or on the basis of delegated authority from the head of the department." That is as far as it goes.

My amendment is designed to give the Executive order teeth as it relates to nondiscrimination in the Federal Establishment. It applies to those who have something to do with personnel in the Federal Establishment, the hiring of people. It seeks to penalize them in the effective way in which they can be penalized, by denying them compensation if they do not comply with the Executive order. That is the whole purpose of the amendment.

I feel it is only fair in a $29,000,000,000 appropriation bill, in view of the expressed policy of the President of the United States on this subject, to try to carry it through in some effective way by legislative enactment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I was appointed as a teller to count the votes in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

I want the House to know that I voted with the gentleman from New York on his amendment to prevent discrimination. The position I have taken here today objecting to amendments falls to my lot because of the position I hold in the Committee on Appropriations, responsible for carrying this legislation through the House, and not because of any principle involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1112. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any officer or employee during the calendar year 1950 and unused at the close of business on December 31, 1950.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 425, line 13, before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is self-explanatory. It prevents the accumulation of annual leave during the current fiscal year by prohibiting the use of 1951 appropriation funds to pay for leave which is earned during the calendar year 1950, but not used prior to the close of business on December 31, 1950. The amendment simply provides that this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will that include the employees of the Central Intelligence Agency who are employed outside the continental United States?

Mr. RABAUT. If they are outside of the United States, yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Why does the gentleman feel that this should be the law? What argument does he put up in favor of this amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in some parts of the world the place of the post of duty may be very unhealthy and from time to time under doctor's orders people have been advised to accumulate enough leave so that they may have the opportunity to restore or preserve their health by having the advantage of a longer period of leave. That is true in the Panama Canal section particularly and in many other places in the world.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the gentleman feel that the weather in Washington sometimes is most unhealthy?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, they can take a trip out of Washington any time they desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 425, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 1113. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the two paragraphs which constitute new section 1113 were originally in the bill when the chapter pertaining to the Departments of State and Commerce was considered in Committee of the Whole a week or so ago. Those two paragraphs contained in the bill at that time were stricken out of the bill on a point of order raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. The language of this pending amendment is in order as a result of the adoption of the rule on the pending bill.

The reason for the insertion of this language must be apparent to all of us. It is necessary in order to enable the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce to immediately discharge and get rid of any subversives or security risks who may be employed in either one of those two important departments of government, which are vitally connected with our national defense.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. My information, from discussing this amendment with Members on this side, is that we are very much in favor of the amendment and there is no objection on this side. I wish to ask the gentleman how he feels about applying this amendment to some other sections of the bill. The Atomic Energy Commission is protected, is it not?

Mr. ROONEY. They are protected as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am particularly concerned with these two vital departments, the Department of State and the Department of Commerce. I feel they should have this right so that the Secretaries of both Departments may immediately get rid of any subversives or security risks. That is not the situation today in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. STEFAN. I say there is no objection to the amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman accept an amendment to his amendment, putting in the Department of Defense? I had a bill, which has already been filed, that is similar to your amendment, but it also includes the Department of Defense as well as these two departments.

Mr. ROONEY. I am informed they already have authority to do exactly what the proposed language would do in the Departments of State and Commerce.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] that his amendment would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. That is a fact. Anything in addition to the language which is now proposed in the pending amendment would be subject to a point of order since it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

I ask for a favorable vote on the pending amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 425, after line 13, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 1113. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950:

"*Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 10 percent of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services;

"(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration;

"(f) to law-enforcement officers;

"(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions;

"(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies; or

"(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in order to have sufficient time to explain this amendment, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the gentleman yield to me to submit a consent request?

Mr. JENSEN. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 15 minutes, 10 minutes for the gentleman from Iowa and 5 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Members of the House that a great deal of hard work and many, many hours and days of study and research have been exerted in order to bring this amendment to as near perfection as is humanly possible in order that it be made fair, proper, and understandable, so as to do the thing I am quite sure the majority of the Members of the House wish done, and to meet the wishes of the American people which is to reduce the present number of Federal employees and hence their tax load. As of March 1 of this year, the latest figure, shows total civilian Federal personnel was 2,091,895 costing the taxpayers the enormous sum of almost $7,000,000,000 each year.

The average turnover in Federal employment is approximately 2 percent a month, which means that we have a turnover on an average annually of about 24 percent. That turnover is caused by deaths, resignations, and separations of all sorts. There are a great many folks working for the Government today who might be hard put to find gainful employment elsewhere if they were taken off the Federal payroll at a time when unemployment rolls are mounting as has been the case during 1949 and 1950. This method of reducing the number of employees was used in many States and cities during the depression and it was very satisfactory and effective. It is the painless way of reducing Federal employment over a period of years to the point which the American people can afford to pay.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I will yield later if time will permit. After I explain the amendment. My time is short, only 10 minutes. I wish I did have the time, for there is no man whose judgment I respect more than the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Chairman, I want to explain this amendment as best I can in the time I have so that all may understand we are not hurting the proper functioning of Government by this amendment. I shall explain the amendment section by section. I may say before I begin analyzing it that even though the amendment of the gentleman from New York was adopted by the House and should it become law, which I hope it does, each

department, commission, bureau, and agency of the Government numbering around 1,000 will have a certain amount of money made available to them on July 1 next to spend during the fiscal year 1951.

This amendment if adopted and made law would start operating after July 1, 1950, and would not in itself have the effect of taking anyone off the payroll. So it has in effect no connection with the amendment the gentleman from New York offered and which the committee has adopted today. Naturally, it would reduce the employees of the Government to the degree that it provides, as time goes on and vacancies occur.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the gentleman, will he tell the committee what his amendment does and whom it affects?

Mr. JENSEN. I will be glad to explain if the gentleman will permit me to do so.

The language, "No part of any appropriation contained in this act," limits the prohibition on expenditures to the funds made available by H. R. 7786, and would restrict the filling of vacancies by departments or agencies included in the said act only to the extent of the funds appropriated thereby, and would have no effect upon the expenditure of funds available to such departments or agencies from any other source.

The provision, "any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950" covers any person appointed to fill a vacancy in a civil position in any department or agency of the Federal Government, not included within the exceptions provided, when such vacancy came into being during the fiscal year covered by the said H. R. 7786. It would not restrict the filling of any vacancies which exist on July 1, 1950. Such provision would not apply to any person appointed by an agency or department not included within the appropriation provisions of the said act, and would not include members of the armed forces.

Exception (a) would permit the filling of 10 percent of all vacancies occurring during the fiscal year by reason of separations from the service for all causes, including deaths, resignations, retirement, and transfers to other agencies. Vacancies occurring through promotion or reassignment within the agency would not enter into the computation of the 10 percent.

Exception (b) would permit the filling of any vacancy wholly within the agency, thereby affording the head of an agency greater latitude in utilizing the personnel available to him than would be the case under an absolute prohibition on the filling of vacancies and, at the same time, necessarily would result in an overall reduction of personnel equal in number to at least 90 percent of the total number of employees separated during the year.

Exception (c) was included so that there could be no question but that the funds appropriated by the act would be available in any event to pay the compensation of persons whose appointments are required by law to be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Exceptions (d), (e) and (f) specifically exempt scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services; nurses and doctors and orderlies in the Public Health Service and in the Veterans' Administration; and all law-enforcement officers. These exceptions are necessary because of the technical qualifications required of such personnel and because it is vital to the public interest that the number of qualified employees in such positions be not further reduced.

Exception (g) would permit the unrestricted filling of vacancies in any temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions in any of the departments. That exception contemplates those positions not required to be filled at all times during the year, and those made necessary by emergency conditions, seasonal requirements, and so forth. If such positions were made subject to the provisions of the proposed amendment it might have the effect of seriously curtailing or abolishing necessary activities, such as forest-fire-fighting service, agricultural cooperative work, census enumerating, and so forth.

Exception (h) specifically would permit the filling of certain vacancies occurring in the Coast Guard. That exception is necessary because the Coast Guard is a quasi branch of the armed services, yet, being under the Treasury Department in times of peace, actually is a part of the civilian service of that Department.

Exception (i) exempts any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government and the municipal government of the District of Columbia from the prohibitions contained in the said section. This exception includes such agencies as the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, Architect of the Capitol, General Accounting Office, and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The proviso for impounding the appropriations or parts thereof unexpended because of the operation of this new section will prevent the use of such funds for any other purpose and the savings effected must be returned to the Treasury.

Estimated saving resulting from amendment

[Estimate based upon latest available total employment figures, separations, and average annual salary per employee as compiled by the Civil Service Commission]

Total separations (all causes) per year (estimated from figures released for December 1949)		324,000
Adjusted to exclude—		
1. Those who were on extended LWOP	18,000	
2. Those reappointed in all agencies by transfers	19,800	
		37,800
Total separations, all agencies		286,200
Estimated 2½ percent representing employees in agencies excepted from amendment		71,550
		214,650
10 percent authorized to be filled by appointments from outside the agency		21,465
Estimated net vacancies which will not be filled under provisions of the amendment		193,185
Average annual salary per employee		$3,550
Total average annual salary represented by unfilled vacancies		$685,806,750
Total saving resulting from amendment (estimated upon the basis that one-twelfth of the total vacancies will occur each month during the year)		$371,442,562

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would save approximately $371,000,000 in the fiscal year 1951. I have secured all my facts and figures from top officials of departments of Government who know quite accurately or as accurately as is humanly possible the amount which would be saved if my amendment becomes law.

I sincerely hope it will be adopted by this House today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in looking at this amendment, I want to admit that I do not understand it. I do not know anyone here who understands it, and I have been here quite a long number of years, and I have never seen this term before "cooperative position." Does anybody know what that is?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman can explain "cooperative position" to me, I will yield him a minute of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. I will be glad to explain it. The Soil Conservation Service and the PMA cooperate in working together on soil-conservation practices. In fact, the committee headed by the gentleman from Mississippi provided 5 percent in fiscal 1950 for the PMA to use to hire technicians for the Soil Conservation Service. There is a good example.

Mr. RABAUT. All right.

Mr. JENSEN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. RABAUT. No.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 93, noes 117.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. JENSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 141, noes 136.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This act may be cited as the "General Appropriation Act, 1951."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious from some of the things that have been happening here today that at long last the Members of the House of Representatives, being the representatives of the people back home, are understanding that there is a real demand and an insistent demand in the country for economy in governmental expenditure here in Washington.

We have made some progress today in that direction and I am happy for it, because I know that the people back home, in overwhelming majority, are going to applaud that action.

Today two amendments have been adopted that make real and substantial savings. I assume that they will come on for a vote as we go back into the House. The decisive majority by which the Thomas-Taber amendment was adopted clearly indicates that there will be no retreat from that amendment. However, because the time was so limited on the so-called Jensen amendment, I want to just say a word further about that.

If there is one thing that I have found from talking to my people in Indiana, if there is one thing that my mail demonstrates to me, it is the conviction on the part of the people that in too many places in Government we have too many employees. We have seen the numbers grow by the hundreds of thousands, so there has come this insistent demand that we cut down the number of employees. That is what the Jensen amendment seeks to do. As the gentleman from Iowa so well said, the amendment seeks to do it in a painless way, not to bring about a reckless separation of persons from the payroll, but simply up to 10 percent to see to it that places becoming vacant shall not be filled.

There are contained in his amendment, as he explained here so far as he was permitted by the time limit to go, exemptions and exceptions that have been carefully worked out to the end that no essential function or operation of Government will be interfered with if this amendment goes into operation. On the other hand, however, it does provide a real, practical, effective, decent way to cut down on the Federal payroll and to get off the Federal payroll employees whom we can do without; and what better place could we start to economize than in this direction? I say here to my friends who really want to bring about economy in Government without interfering with any essential function of Government, stand by the Jensen amendment. We will then see that it will work out effectively; it will not unduly prejudice anyone; it will not unduly prejudice the Federal service.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. It should be said again that this amendment does not affect the armed forces; it does not affect the Justice Department, or the FBI; it does not affect doctors and nurses and medical specialists or even orderlies in the veterans' hospitals; it does not affect the Coast Guard or the military or naval academies; in fact, this amendment has been worked out so carefully that it all makes sense and will not affect any agency of the Government or any person who is actually needed in the working of this Government.

Mr. HALLECK. Why, of course. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and when the roll is called on that amendment anyone who votes against it will put himself definitely on the side of those who are not willing to go even to the extent of 10 percent in cutting the Federal payroll in certain places. This amendment is designed to bring about a reduction in the number of people on the Federal payroll. If you want to take the responsibility for defeating that, O. K. by me. But, as far as I am concerned, I am going to respond to the demand that I know is in the country and act in a way that I know will not adversely affect the real interests of the government at all.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the few minutes that I have is not sufficient time to say what I want to say to the Members of this House in regard to this very important subject, the $29,000,000,000 omnibus appropriation bill. We are about to vote on the few remaining amendments and then on the final passage this afternoon of a bill of tremendous importance to all of us as well as every citizen and taxpayer of this great Nation. I would like to express my appreciation to various chairmen and members of the subcommittees as well as the full committee and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for their months of arduous work and tireless efforts to do a conscientious job in bringing to the House a bill that would be adequate for all needs of the Government and yet save money for the taxpayers. Perhaps they are not entirely satisfied and perhaps many of the other Members are not convinced that they have been able to do both satisfactorily. However, I think everyone will agree that with the great number of indeterminates and uncertainties involved in the past, present, and future of our far-flung foreign problems resulting from both hot and cold wars that have created grave responsibilities which no doubt have weighed heavily upon them in their considerations as will the many difficult and complex domestic situations arising in this postwar period.

So, this, together with the terrific burden of a vast and fast mounting public debt, it has no doubt been a very serious problem for them to proceed either in the direction of strict economy requiring retrenchments of such a nature that they would be unhealthy for our national defense or our domestic economy which requires as near full employment as possible with a corresponding high national income. Likewise it would have been unsound and unwise for this committee to proceed in an entirely opposite direction with no effort being made to consider all the possible avenues of reduction. It is presumed that they have tried to follow a course that would not take them too far in either direction: Making a saving and yet providing ample resources for any emergency; thereby avoiding the critical and almost fatal mistakes causing the condition of utter unpreparedness that we found ourselves in just before the beginning of the last war and even after we were attacked.

In conclusion I would like to say that I am certainly disappointed that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] did not include the legislative branch of the Government in his amendment instead of making it one of the exceptions to be exempted from any form of economy. It seems to me that it might have shown a little better faith on his part with those he is subjecting to reductions and little more sincerity on his part and those of his colleagues in this matter of economy that they have been talking so loudly about lately. I referred to this matter earlier in the debate today and so far it has been completely ignored, although not even the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], who has just spoken, will deny that many millions of dollars could be saved for the taxpayers if the many economies that they ask the other branches and departments of Government to effect were practiced by this branch itself, and I cannot see how it could possibly affect its efficiency to any noticeable degree. In fact it might increase it. I surely expected my Republican friends on the left would, after my calling to their attention this opportunity to effect really worth-while savings for the country, would jump on it immediately and include it in one of their amendments. No doubt it never has occurred to them, as it is often said that we often fail to see the things nearest to us because of straining to see those farther away. Then again it is better to preach than to practice. And so for this and other reasons that have been advanced here about these amendments I must say that they are not, in my opinion, the best way to effect economies nor reach the objectives that I seek, which are more efficiency, less waste, and real economy and not false economy. However, Mr. Chairman, until we can do better I shall vote for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized.

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to yield his time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].)

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it was very interesting to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, but the fact remains that the Taber amendment and the Jensen amendment are inconsistent with each other. The Taber amendment accomplishes one thing; the Jensen amendment is par-

tially and from a marked angle inconsistent with it. We are asked to pass a bill containing two amendments, one inconsistent with the other.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. In just a minute, if the gentleman will let me complete my observation.

Both amendments should be defeated. The Taber amendment is going to result in a greater cut to the Post Office Department, as an illustration; it is going to result in a cut to the Veterans' Administration; it is going to result in a cut over and above those already made by the Commitee on Appropriations to all other agencies of the Government.

It is one thing for the gentleman from Indiana to talk today; it is another thing to interpret this action tomorrow and to know what actually has happened. So we want the record to be clear. I hope there will be roll calls so that it will be known who brought about the further reduction which in turn will bring about the serious repercussions that are bound to occur as a result of both these amendments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There is nothing inconsistent in these two amendments. They dovetail into each other.

Mr. McCORMACK. Both amendments are clearly inconsistent with each other. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York cuts the appropriations. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] said his amendment will not result in certain employees being discharged. In that respect there is a very marked inconsistency. The fact remains that the Taber amendment will bring about further reductions in every agency of the Government over and above those already made by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, permit me to make an observation with regard to the reaction of the American public to the handiwork today of these gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. These same Republican gentlemen have voted billions upon billions of dollars for the Marshall plan and foreign aid and today they are denying the American public Government services to which they have been accustomed and entitled, such as those of the Veterans' Administration, the Post Office Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and research programs in heart, cancer, and mental health, just to mention a few. Yes; you cut the FBI this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains that if both of these amendments are retained they are inconsistent with each other. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], reduces the appropriation for every agency. My only purpose in rising at this time is so that the record will be clear to show just what has happened and where the responsibility lies.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts to call attention to the fact that the transcript of today's proceedings in typewritten form now on the table in front of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] shows conclusively, in answer to a question I put to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that the FBI is cut under the provisions of his amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say also it is going to be interesting to find out how many Republican Members offered amendments to increase the bill. That will be very interesting.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to ask the gentleman this question: In the list of people who are excluded from this particular amendment, it does not exclude vital help in veterans' hospitals, such as cooks. If the cooks quit, you cannot hire them again. How are you going to feed the people in the Veterans' Administration hospitals?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman take these two amendments and show the Members of the House just where the two amendments are inconsistent? I am sure the gentleman can do that. He has given us generalities but he has not given us any facts. Will the gentleman take them please and get down to cases?

Mr. McCORMACK. The amendment of the gentleman from New York among other things reduces the appropriation $600,000,000. That is what, among other things, it provides. That means that there has got to be a cut in every agency of Government over and above the reduction made by the committee. That includes the Post Office Department, that includes the Veterans' Administration, that includes all other agencies of the Government. I personally hope there is a roll call on that amendment.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in the complicated social, and economic structure of the present day, national and international, the number, size and complexities contained in the preparation of this appropriation bill almost staggers the imagination. We all appreciate, I am sure, that the committee members studied tirelessly, scrutinized diligently, and worked endlessly, with conscientious sense, over a long period of time to present this bill. On the whole they did, most of us will agree, a remarkable job and deserve our sympathetic commendation for their personal sacrifices, of time and effort, in a trying task. Nevertheless I deeply feel the American people are entitled to a practical demonstration of economy-mindedness in this body and I fully believe the over-all objective of the reduction which will result from the Thomas-Taber amendments should be adopted.

I am sure nobody here wants to interfere with Federal Government participation in the administration of social-security and unemployment compensation programs, or seriously cripple the efficiency of our postal service. I am certain you would not want to deny to our veterans, especially those disabled for life in our country's service, the aids and benefits to which they are legally, justly, and morally entitled. It would be a bold prophet indeed who would advocate the diminishment of our national defenses in these threatening, challenging hours. Unbiased authorities advise us the vast foreign commitments to which we are pledged must be sensibly maintained in peril of extinction of freedom here and throughout the democratic world. I do not stand to urge suppression of any of these vital activities. I would be the last to favor any move to paralyze essential Government functions and inflict needless injury and hardship upon individual citizens.

Yet I do want to see every energy exercised to answer, as much as humanly possible, the desperate cry of our taxpayers for some relief from their overpowering burdens. We are, as a Government, spending more money than is collected; we are in debt to the extent of a quarter of a trillion dollars; we are taxed every time we put out our hand. Under these circumstances I want to show our own people, our own citizens, by definite gesture, that we know the great personal sacrifices they have unselfishly been shouldering and that we want to ease their load as much as we can. The reduction proposed seems sensible to me; it will be an honest step toward trying to balance the budget. It may well be accomplished by careful administration and provide a morale lift to the taxpayer, which is why I favor it.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, within a very few minutes the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will rise and report this omnibus appropriation bill back to the House. The House of Representatives, Mr. Chairman, always appreciates a job well done, and when that job happens to be a difficult and a tedious and a tiring job, the measure of appreciation is all the greater.

I take the floor at the close of this debate to express a very sincere appreciation for the magnificent job done by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] in presiding over this bill in Committee.

I am sure that my sentiments in this respect are shared by every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to join, in behalf of the Republican Members of this House, in this commendation of our very able Chairman who has conducted himself with great dignity and fairness. We, on this side, appreciate him as we always have.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are all proud of JERE COOPER, not only as a Member of the House, but for the outstanding and the fine manner in which he always has presided over any bill that he has been designated as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House. I have served with my friend for many years. The people of his district and of his State can well be proud of their JERE COOPER.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, for more than a month this bill has been before the House. Day after day since about April 3 the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee has demonstrated every hour of every day those qualities of patience and fairness and justice that mark him as a great presiding officer.

In addition to his arduous duties of presiding during consideration of this bill, he has carried his part of the load during all of that time as the ranking majority member of the Committee on Ways and Means as it seeks to write a new tax bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appreciates the very kind references.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Canfield amendment, at page 109, line 1; the Gore amendment, at page 136, line 20; and the Boggs of Louisiana amendment, at page 305, line 14.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Taber amendment to chapter I, page 2, line 3.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Thomas amendment, page 411, after line 21.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is that the Thomas amendment as amended by the Taber amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Case of South Dakota amendment, page 290, line 2, which cuts the appropriation for the administration of the Public Housing Administration.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Jensen amendment at page 425, after line 13. This is the last amendment that was adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Will the Chair advise the House in what order the separate votes will be taken?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendments upon which a separate vote has been demanded will be considered by the House in the order in which they appear in the bill, that is, in the following order:

First, the Taber amendment, page 2, line 3, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES].

Second, the Canfield amendment, on page 109, line 1, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Third, the Gore amendment, page 136, line 20, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Fourth, the Case of South Dakota amendment, page 290, line 2, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Fifth, the Boggs of Louisiana amendment, page 305, line 14, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Sixth, the Thomas amendment, page 411, after line 21, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Seventh, the Jensen amendment, page 425, after line 13, on which a separate vote was demanded by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 3, strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$9,800,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 179, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANFIELD:

On page 109, line 1, strike out "$135,000,000" and insert "$136,000,000".

And on line 4, after "attrition", insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for expenses of reserve training, including pay and allowances of Regular and Reserve personnel on active duty engaged primarily in administration of Reserve training program, and including drill pay at a rate not to exceed those prescribed by or pursuant to law for the Naval Reserve."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANFIELD and Mr. GREEN) there were—ayes 143, noes 131.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and Mr. CANNON asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded, the Gore amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 136, line 20, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000".

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BIEMILLER) there were—ayes 152, noes 111.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 258, nays 131, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—258

Addonizio	Burke	D'Ewart
Albert	Burnside	Dollinger
Allen, La.	Burton	Dolliver
Andrews	Byrne, N. Y.	Donohue
Angell	Camp	Doyle
Aspinall	Canfield	Durham
Barden	Carroll	Eberharter
Baring	Case, N. J.	Elliott
Barrett, Pa.	Celler	Engel, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Chatham	Evins
Bates, Mass.	Chelf	Fallon
Battle	Chesney	Feighan
Beall	Christopher	Fenton
Beckworth	Chudoff	Fernandez
Bennett, Fla.	Clemente	Flood
Bennett, Mich.	Colmer	Fogarty
Bentsen	Combs	Forand
Biemiller	Cooley	Frazier
Blackney	Cooper	Fugate
Blatnik	Corbett	Fulton
Bolling	Crawford	Furcolo
Bonner	Crook	Gary
Bosone	Crosser	Golden
Breen	Cunningham	Gordon
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Ga.	Gore
Bryson	Davis, Tenn.	Gorski
Buchanan	Dawson	Granahan
Buckley, Ill.	DeGraffenried	Grant
Buckley, N. Y.	Delaney	Green
Burdick	Denton	Gregory

Gross	McCormack	Regan
Hagen	McDonough	Richards
Hall,	McGrath	Riehlman
Edwin Arthur	McGuire	Rodino
Hand	McKinnon	Rogers, Fla.
Harden	McSweeney	Rogers, Mass.
Hardy	Mack, Ill.	Rooney
Harris	Mack, Wash.	Roosevelt
Hart	Madden	Sadowski
Havenner	Magee	Saylor
Hays, Ohio	Marcantonio	Scott, Hardie
Hedrick	Marsalis	Scott,
Heffernan	Marshall	Hugh D., Jr.
Heller	Merrow	Secrest
Herlong	Miles	Shelley
Heselton	Mitchell	Sikes
Hill	Monroney	Simpson, Ill.
Hinshaw	Morris	Sims
Hobbs	Moulder	Spence
Holifield	Multer	Staggers
Holmes	Murdock	Steed
Howell	Murphy	Stigler
Huber	Murray, Tenn.	Stockman
Hull	Murray, Wis.	Sullivan
Irving	Nelson	Sutton
Jackson, Wash.	Nicholson	Tackett
Jacobs	Noland	Tauriello
Javits	Norton	Thomas
Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson
Jonas	O'Brien, Mich.	Thornberry
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Ill.	Tollefson
Jones, Mo.	O'Hara, Minn.	Trimble
Jones, N. C.	O'Konski	Underwood
Karst	O'Neill	Van Zandt
Karsten	O'Sullivan	Velde
Kearns	O'Toole	Vinson
Kee	Pace	Wagner
Keefe	Patman	Walter
Kelley, Pa.	Patten	Welch
Kelly, N. Y.	Patterson	Wheeler
Keogh	Perkins	Whitaker
Kerr	Peterson	White, Idaho
Kilday	Pfeifer,	Whitten
King	Joseph L.	Whittington
Kirwan	Philbin	Wickersham
Klein	Phillips, Tenn.	Wier
Kruse	Poage	Williams
Lane	Polk	Willis
Lanham	Potter	Wilson, Ind.
Larcade	Poulson	Wilson, Okla.
Lemke	Powell	Withrow
Lesinski	Preston	Wolverton
Lichtenwalter	Price	Woodhouse
Linehan	Priest	Woodruff
Lovre	Rabaut	Yates
Lynch	Rains	Young
McCarthy	Rankin	Zablocki

NAYS—131

Abbitt	Gavin	Miller, Nebr.
Abernethy	Gillette	Mills
Allen, Calif.	Goodwin	Morton
Allen, Ill.	Gossett	Norblad
Andersen,	Graham	Norrell
H. Carl	Granger	Passman
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn	Pfeiffer,
Andresen,	Hale	William L.
August H.	Hall,	Phillips, Calif.
Arends	Leonard W.	Pickett
Auchincloss	Halleck	Plumley
Barrett, Wyo.	Harrison	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs, Del.	Herter	Rees
Boggs, La.	Hoeven	Ribicoff
Bolton, Md.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rich
Bolton, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Sabath
Bramblett	Hope	Sadlak
Brehm	Horan	St. George
Brooks	James	Sanborn
Brown, Ohio	Jenison	Sasscer
Burleson	Jenkins	Scrivner
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Scudder
Cannon	Johnson	Shafer
Chiperfield	Kean	Short
Clevenger	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Kans.	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Cotton	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Coudert	Latham	Stanley
Cox	LeFevre	Stefan
Curtis	Lind	Taber
Dague	Lodge	Talle
Davis, Wis.	Lucas	Taylor
Dondero	Lyle	Teague
Doughton	McCulloch	Towe
Ellsworth	McGregor	Vorys
Elston	Macy	Vursell
Engle, Calif.	Mahon	Wadsworth
Fellows	Martin, Iowa	Weichel
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Widnall
Ford	Mason	Wigglesworth
Gamble	Meyer	Wilson, Tex.
Garmatz	Michener	Winstead
Gathings	Miller, Md.	Wood

NOT VOTING—41

Bailey	Hare	Nixon
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Ramsay
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Carnahan	Judd	Rhodes
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rivers
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Sheppard
Davenport	McConnell	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	McMillen, Ill.	Walsh
Dingell	Mansfield	Werdel
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	White, Calif.
Eaton	Morgan	Wolcott
Gilmer	Morrison	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Davenport with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Redden with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. BARDEN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 290, line 2, strike out "$11,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,750,000".

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BIEMILLER) there were—ayes 163, noes 124.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 163, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—222

Abbitt	Bishop	Cooley
Abernethy	Blackney	Cooper
Allen, Calif.	Boggs, Del.	Corbett
Allen, Ill.	Bolton, Md.	Cotton
Allen, La.	Bolton, Ohio	Coudert
Andersen,	Bonner	Cox
H. Carl	Bramblett	Crawford
Anderson, Calif.	Brehm	Cunningham
Andresen,	Brooks	Curtis
August H.	Brown, Ohio	Dague
Andrews	Bryson	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Burdick	Davis, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Burleson	Davis, Wis.
Barden	Burton	D'Ewart
Barrett, Wyo.	Byrnes, Wis.	Dolliver
Bates, Mass.	Camp	Dondero
Battle	Chatham	Doughton
Beall	Chiperfield	Durham
Beckworth	Clevenger	Ellsworth
Bennett, Fla.	Cole, Kans.	Elston
Bennett, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.	Engel, Mich.
Bentsen	Colmer	Fallon
Fellows	Keating	Riehlman
Fenton	Keefe	Rogers, Fla.
Fisher	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Ford	Kilday	Sadlak
Frazier	Larcade	St. George
Fugate	Latham	Sanborn
Fulton	LeFevre	Sasscer
Gamble	Lemke	Saylor
Gary	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hardie
Gathings	Lodge	Scott,
Gavin	Lovre	Hugh D., Jr.
Gillette	Lucas	Scrivner
Golden	Lyle	Scudder
Goodwin	McCulloch	Shafer
Gore	McDonough	Short
Gossett	McGregor	Simpson, Ill.
Graham	Mack, Wash.	Simpson, Pa.
Grant	Macy	Smith, Kans.
Gross	Marshall	Smith, Va.
Gwinn	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Hagen	Martin, Mass.	Stanley
Hale	Mason	Steed
Hall,	Merrow	Stefan
Edwin Arthur	Meyer	Stockman
Hall,	Michener	Sutton
Leonard W.	Miller, Md.	Taber
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Tackett
Harden	Mills	Talle
Hardy	Monroney	Taylor
Harris	Morton	Teague
Harrison	Murray, Tenn.	Thompson
Harvey	Murray, Wis.	Towe
Herlong	Nelson	Trimble
Herter	Nicholson	Van Zandt
Heselton	Norblad	Velde
Hill	Norrell	Vorys
Hinshaw	O'Hara, Minn.	Vursell
Hobbs	Passman	Wadsworth
Hoeven	Patten	Weichel
Hoffman, Ill.	Patterson	Wheeler
Hoffman, Mich.	Pfeiffer,	White, Idaho
Holmes	William L.	Whitten
Hope	Phillips, Calif.	Whittington
Horan	Phillips, Tenn.	Wickersham
James	Pickett	Widnall
Jenison	Poage	Wigglesworth
Jenkins	Potter	Williams
Jensen	Poulson	Willis
Johnson	Rankin	Wilson, Ind.
Jonas	Reed, Ill.	Wilson, Okla.
Jones, N. C.	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Kean	Rees	Winstead
Kearney	Regan	Wood
Kearns	Rich	Woodruff

NAYS—163

Addonizio	Forand	McKinnon
Albert	Furcolo	McSweeney
Angell	Garmatz	Mack, Ill.
Aspinall	Gordon	Madden
Baring	Gorski	Magee
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Mahon
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Marcantonio
Biemiller	Green	Marsalis
Blatnik	Gregory	Mitchell
Boggs, La.	Hand	Morris
Bolling	Hart	Moulder
Bosone	Havenner	Multer
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Murdock
Brown, Ga.	Hedrick	Murphy
Buchanan	Heffernan	Noland
Buckley, Ill.	Heller	Norton
Buckley, N. Y.	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Burke	Howell	O'Brien, Mich.
Burnside	Huber	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hull	O'Konski
Canfield	Irving	O'Neill
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	O'Sullivan
Carroll	Jacobs	O'Toole
Case, N. J.	Javits	Pace
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Patman
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Perkins
Chesney	Karst	Peterson
Christopher	Karsten	Pfeifer,
Chudoff	Kee	Joseph L.
Clemente	Kelley, Pa.	Philbin
Combs	Kelly, N. Y.	Polk
Crook	Kennedy	Powell
Crosser	Keogh	Preston
Dawson	Kerr	Price
DeGraffenried	King	Priest
Delaney	Kirwan	Rabaut
Denton	Klein	Rains
Dollinger	Kruse	Ribicoff
Donohue	Lane	Richards
Doyle	Lanham	Rodino
Eberharter	Lesinski	Rooney
Elliott	Lind	Roosevelt
Engle, Calif.	Linehan	Sabath
Evins	Lynch	Sadowski
Feighan	McCarthy	Secrest
Fernandez	McCormack	Shelley
Flood	McGrath	Sikes
Fogarty	McGuire	Sims

Spence	Tollefson	Withrow
Staggers	Underwood	Wolverton
Stigler	Vinson	Woodhouse
Sullivan	Wagner	Yates
Tauriello	Walter	Young
Thomas	Welch	Zablocki
Thornberry	Wier	

NOT VOTING—45

Bailey	Hays, Ark.	Nixon
Boykin	Hébert	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Quinn
Carlyle	Jennings	Ramsay
Carnahan	Judd	Redden
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rhodes
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Rivers
Davenport	McConnell	Sheppard
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smathers
Deane	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Mansfield	Walsh
Douglas	Miles	Werdel
Eaton	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Gilmer	Morgan	White, Calif.
Hare	Morrison	Wolcott

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Davenport with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Redden with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. ANDERSON of California changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS as amended by the Boggs substitute:

On page 305 line 18, strike out "$2,229,300" and insert "$3,175,000";

On page 306, line 3, strike out "$3,342,660" and insert "$5,886,000"; and

On page 306, line 3, strike out the remainder down to the end of the paragraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana) there were—ayes 105, noes 156.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 137, noes 145.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 411, following line 21, insert a new chapter, as follows:

"CHAPTER X-A—GENERAL REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

"Reductions in appropriations and contract authorizations contained in this act are hereby made in the sum of $600,000,000.

"Not more than the following sums may be obligated by any agency or department provided for in this bill, viz: (1) For civilian personnel, not more than an amount 10 percent below the amount proposed in the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951, except that in the Department of Defense where no more than the amount of the President's budget estimate minus 2 percent shall be obligated. This paragraph shall not apply to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration.

"(2) For travel, not more than a total for all departments and agencies of $319,000,000, and not more than 5 percent less than the estimates provided for military personnel travel and not more than 20 percent less than the amount provided for civilian personnel travel, than the estimates therefor contained in the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1951.

"(3) For transportation of things, for all departments and agencies, not more than $720,000,000, provided further that in no case shall the amount obligated exceed a figure 10 percent below the estimates submitted by the President in his budget message for 1951 for each item for all agencies except the Department of Defense, and for the Department of Defense not more than 5 percent less than the estimates of the President, transmitted in said budget message.

"(4) For communications services, not more than $59,000,000 and not more for any department other than the Department of Defense than the amount of the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent, and for the Department of Defense not more than a figure 5 percent below the President's budget estimates for 1951.

"(5) For rents and utilities, not more than $205,000,000 and for all establishments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for fiscal year 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(6) For printing and reproduction, not more than $52,000,000 and not more in any case than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(7) For other contractual services, not more than $1,301,000,000 and for all departments other than the Department of Defense not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(8) For supplies and materials, not more than $3,888,000,000 and for all departments of the Government except the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Hospitals not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(9) For equipment, not more than $3,577,000,000 and for all departments other than the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 10 percent.

"(10) For lands and structures, for all departments of the Government, except the Department of Defense, not more than the President's budget estimates for 1951 minus 5 percent."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 273, nays 113, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—273

Abbitt	Gary	Noland
Abernethy	Gathings	Norblad
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	O'Hara, Minn.
Allen, La.	Golden	O'Konski
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Pace
	Gossett	Patten
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Patterson
Andresen, August H.	Grant	Peterson
	Gross	Pfeiffer, William L.
Andrews	Gwinn	
Angell	Hagen	Philbin
Arends	Hale	Phillips, Calif.
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips, Tenn.
Barden		Pickett
Baring	Hall, Leonard W.	Plumley
Barrett, Wyo.		Poage
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Polk
Battle	Hand	Potter
Beall	Harden	Poulson
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Reed, Ill.
Bentsen	Harrison	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Harvey	Rees
Blackney	Hays, Ohio	Regan
Boggs, Del.	Herlong	Ribicoff
Boggs, La.	Herter	Rich
Bolton, Md.	Heselton	Richards
Bolton, Ohio	Hill	Riehlman
Bonner	Hinshaw	Rogers, Fla.
Bosone	Hobbs	Rogers, Mass.
Bramblett	Hoeven	Sadlak
Brehm	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Brooks	Hoffman, Mich.	Sanborn
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Sasscer
Bryson	Hope	Saylor
Buckley, Ill.	Horan	Scott, Hardie
Burdick	Howell	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Burleson	Hull	
Burnside	Irving	Scrivner
Burton	James	Scudder
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenison	Secrest
Camp	Jenkins	Shafer
Canfield	Jennings	Short
Case, N. J.	Jensen	Sikes
Chatham	Johnson	Simpson, Ill.
Chelf	Jonas	Simpson, Pa.
Chesney	Jones, Ala.	Sims
Chiperfield	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Kans.
Clevenger	Kean	Smith, Va.
Cole, Kans.	Kearney	Smith, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Kearns	Stanley
Colmer	Keating	Steed
Cooley	Keefe	Stefan
Cooper	Kennedy	Stockman
Corbett	Kerr	Sutton
Cotton	Kilburn	Taber
Coudert	Kilday	Tackett
Cox	Kruse	Talle
Crawford	Lanham	Taylor
Cunningham	Larcade	Teague
Curtis	Latham	Thomas
Dague	LeFevre	Thompson
Davis, Ga.	Lemke	Thornberry
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Tollefson
Davis, Wis.	Lodge	Towe
DeGraffenried	Lovre	Trimble
Denton	Lucas	Van Zandt
D'Ewart	Lyle	Velde
Dolliver	McCulloch	Vorys
Dondero	McDonough	Vursell
Donohue	McGregor	Wadsworth
Doughton	McKinnon	Wagner
Doyle	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Durham	Mack, Wash.	Weichel
Elliott	Macy	Wheeler
Ellsworth	Marshall	White, Idaho
Elston	Martin, Iowa	Whitten
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Mass.	Whittington
Engle, Calif.	Mason	Wickersham
Evins	Merrow	Widnall
Fallon	Meyer	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Michener	Williams
Fenton	Miller, Md.	Willis
Fernandez	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Mills	Wilson, Okla.
Ford	Monroney	Wilson, Tex.
Frazier	Morton	Winstead
Fugate	Moulder	Withrow
Fulton	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton
Furcolo	Murray, Wis.	Wood
Gamble	Nelson	Woodruff
Garmatz	Nicholson	Young

NAYS—113

Addonizio	Bates, Ky.	Bolling
Albert	Beckworth	Breen
Aspinall	Biemiller	Brown, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Blatnik	Buchanan

Buckley, N. Y.	Jacobs	O'Brien, Mich.
Burke	Javits	O'Hara, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Jones, Mo.	O'Neill
Cannon	Karst	O'Sullivan
Carroll	Karsten	O'Toole
Celler	Kee	Passman
Christopher	Kelley, Pa.	Patman
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Perkins
Clemente	Keogh	Pfeifer,
Combs	King	Joseph L.
Crook	Kirwan	Powell
Crosser	Klein	Preston
Dawson	Lane	Price
Delaney	Lesinski	Priest
Dollinger	Lind	Rabaut
Eberharter	Linehan	Rankin
Feighan	Lynch	Rodino
Flood	McCarthy	Rooney
Fogarty	McCormack	Roosevelt
Forand	McGrath	Sabath
Gordon	McGuire	Sadowski
Gore	McSweeney	Shelley
Gorski	Madden	Spence
Granahan	Magee	Staggers
Granger	Mahon	Stigler
Green	Marcantonio	Sullivan
Gregory	Marsalis	Tauriello
Hart	Mitchell	Underwood
Havenner	Morris	Vinson
Heffernan	Multer	Welch
Heller	Murdock	Wier
Holifield	Murphy	Woodhouse
Huber	Norton	Yates
Jackson, Wash.	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—44

Bailey	Hays, Ark.	Nixon
Boykin	Hébert	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Hedrick	Ramsay
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Carnahan	Judd	Rhodes
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rivers
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Sheppard
Davenport	McConnell	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	McMillen, Ill.	Walsh
Dingell	Mansfield	Werdel
Douglas	Miles	Whitaker
Eaton	Miller, Calif.	White, Calif.
Gilmer	Morgan	Wolcott
Hare	Morrison	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Davenport against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. LeCompte for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Walsh against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Rhodes against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. White of California against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Deane against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. BARING changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 425, after line 13, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 1113. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950:

"*Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 10 percent of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the armed services;

"(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration;

"(f) to law-enforcement officers;

"(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions;

"(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies; or

"(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 201, nays 185, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—201

Abbitt	Dague	Holmes
Abernethy	Davis, Ga.	Hope
Allen, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Horan
Allen, Ill.	D'Ewart	Irving
Andersen,	Dolliver	James
H. Carl	Dondero	Jenison
Anderson, Calif.	Doughton	Jenkins
Andresen,	Ellsworth	Jennings
August H.	Elston	Jensen
Angell	Engel, Mich.	Johnson
Arends	Fallon	Jonas
Auchincloss	Fellows	Kean
Barden	Fenton	Kearney
Barrett, Wyo.	Fernandez	Kearns
Bates, Mass.	Fisher	Keating
Beall	Ford	Keefe
Bennett, Fla.	Fulton	Kilburn
Bennett, Mich.	Gamble	Latham
Bishop	Gary	LeFevre
Blackney	Gathings	Lemke
Boggs, Del.	Gavin	Lichtenwalter
Bolton, Md.	Gillette	Lodge
Bolton, Ohio	Golden	Lovre
Bonner	Goodwin	Lucas
Bramblett	Gossett	McCulloch
Brehm	Graham	McDonough
Brown, Ga.	Gross	McGregor
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn	Mack, Wash.
Bryson	Hagen	Macy
Burdick	Hale	Martin, Iowa
Burleson	Hall,	Martin, Mass.
Burton	Edwin Arthur	Mason
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall,	Merrow
Camp	Leonard W.	Meyer
Canfield	Halleck	Michener
Chatham	Harden	Miller, Md.
Chiperfield	Harris	Miller, Nebr.
Clevenger	Harrison	Mills
Cole, Kans.	Harvey	Morton
Cole, N. Y.	Herlong	Murray, Wis.
Colmer	Herter	Nelson
Corbett	Heselton	Nicholson
Cotton	Hill	Norblad
Coudert	Hinshaw	Norrell
Cox	Hobbs	O'Hara, Minn.
Crawford	Hoeven	O'Konski
Cunningham	Hoffman, Ill.	Pace
Curtis	Hoffman, Mich.	Patten
Patterson	Sanborn	Taylor
Pfeiffer,	Saylor	Tollefson
William L.	Scott, Hardie	Towe
Phillips, Calif.	Scott,	Van Zandt
Phillips, Tenn.	Hugh D., Jr.	Velde
Pickett	Scrivner	Vorys
Plumley	Scudder	Vursell
Poage	Shafer	Wadsworth
Potter	Short	Weichel
Poulson	Simpson, Ill.	Wheeler
Reed, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.	White, Idaho
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.	Whittington
Rees	Smith, Va.	Widnall
Regan	Smith, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Ribicoff	Stanley	Williams
Rich	Stefan	Wilson, Ind.
Riehlman	Stockman	Wilson, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.	Sutton	Winstead
Rogers, Mass.	Taber	Wolverton
Sadlak	Tackett	Wood
St. George	Talle	Woodruff

NAYS—185

Addonizio	Granger	Murphy
Albert	Grant	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Green	Noland
Andrews	Gregory	Norton
Aspinall	Hand	O'Brien, Ill.
Baring	Hardy	O'Brien, Mich.
Barrett, Pa.	Hart	O'Hara, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Havenner	O'Neill
Battle	Hays, Ohio	O'Sullivan
Beckworth	Hedrick	O'Toole
Bentsen	Heffernan	Passman
Biemiller	Heller	Patman
Blatnik	Holifield	Perkins
Boggs, La.	Howell	Peterson
Bolling	Huber	Pfeifer,
Bosone	Hull	Joseph L.
Breen	Jackson, Wash.	Philbin
Brooks	Jacobs	Polk
Buchanan	Javits	Powell
Buckley, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Preston
Buckley, N. Y.	Jones, Mo.	Price
Burke	Jones, N. C.	Priest
Burnside	Karst	Rabaut
Byrne, N. Y.	Karsten	Rains
Cannon	Kee	Rankin
Carroll	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Case, N. J.	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Celler	Kennedy	Rooney
Chelf	Keogh	Roosevelt
Chesney	Kerr	Sabath
Christopher	Kilday	Sadowski
Chudoff	King	Sasscer
Clemente	Kirwan	Secrest
Combs	Klein	Shelley
Cooley	Kruse	Sikes
Cooper	Lane	Sims
Crook	Lanham	Spence
Crosser	Larcade	Staggers
Dawson	Lesinski	Steed
DeGraffenried	Lind	Stigler
Delaney	Linehan	Sullivan
Denton	Lyle	Tauriello
Dollinger	Lynch	Teague
Donohue	McCarthy	Thomas
Doyle	McCormack	Thompson
Durham	McGrath	Thornberry
Eberharter	McGuire	Trimble
Elliott	McKinnon	Underwood
Engle, Calif.	McSweeney	Vinson
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Wagner
Feighan	Madden	Walter
Flood	Magee	Welch
Fogarty	Mahon	Whitten
Forand	Marcantonio	Wickersham
Frazier	Marsalis	Wier
Fugate	Marshall	Willis
Furcolo	Mitchell	Wilson, Okla.
Garmatz	Monroney	Withrow
Gordon	Morris	Woodhouse
Gore	Moulder	Yates
Gorski	Multer	Young
Granahan	Murdock	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—44

Bailey	Hare	Nixon
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Ramsay
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Redden
Carnahan	Judd	Rhodes
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rivers
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Sheppard
Davenport	McConnell	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	McMillen, Ill.	Walsh
Deane	Mansfield	Werdel
Dingell	Miles	Whitaker
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	White, Calif.
Eaton	Morgan	Wolcott
Gilmer	Morrison	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Davenport against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. LeCompte for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Redden against.

Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Rhodes against.

Mr. McMillen of Illinois for, with Mr. Deane against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Walsh with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. White of California with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. BATTLE and Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. FISHER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 362, nays 21, answered "present" 2, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—362

Abbitt	Beall	Burdick
Abernethy	Beckworth	Burke
Addonizio	Bennett, Mich.	Burleson
Albert	Bentsen	Burnside
Allen, Calif.	Biemiller	Burton
Allen, Ill.	Bishop	Byrne, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Blackney	Camp
Andersen, H. Carl	Blatnik	Canfield
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs, Del.	Cannon
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, La.	Carroll
Andrews	Bolling	Case, N. J.
Angell	Bolton, Md.	Celler
Arends	Bolton, Ohio	Chatham
Aspinall	Bonner	Chelf
Auchincloss	Bosone	Chesney
Barden	Bramblett	Chiperfield
Baring	Breen	Christopher
Barrett, Pa.	Brooks	Chudoff
Barrett, Wyo.	Brown, Ga.	Clemente
Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ohio	Clevenger
Bates, Mass.	Bryson	Cole, Kans.
Battle	Buchanan	Colmer
	Bulkley, Ill.	Combs
	Buckley, N. Y.	Cooley
	Cooper	Jacobs
	Corbett	James
	Coudert	Javits
	Cox	Jenison
	Crook	Jenkins
	Crosser	Jennings
	Cunningham	Jensen
	Curtis	Johnson
	Dague	Jonas
	Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.
	Dawson	Jones, Mo.
	DeGraffenried	Jones, N. C.
	Delaney	Karst
	Denton	Karsten
	D'Ewart	Kearney
	Dollinger	Kearns
	Dolliver	Keating
	Dondero	Kee
	Donohue	Keefe
	Doughton	Kelley, Pa.
	Doyle	Kelly, N. Y.
	Durham	Kennedy
	Eberharter	Keogh
	Elliott	Kerr
	Ellsworth	Kilday
	Elston	King
	Engel, Mich.	Kirwan
	Engle, Calif.	Klein
	Evins	Kruse
	Fallon	Lane
	Feighan	Lanham
	Fellows	Larcade
	Fenton	Latham
	Fernandez	LeFevre
	Fisher	Lemke
	Flood	Lesinski
	Fogarty	Lichtenwalter
	Forand	Lind
	Ford	Linehan
	Frazier	Lodge
	Fugate	Lovre
	Fulton	Lucas
	Furcolo	Lyle
	Gamble	Lynch
	Garmatz	McCarthy
	Gary	McCormack
	Gathings	McCulloch
	Gavin	McDonough
	Gillette	McGrath
	Golden	McGregor
	Goodwin	McGuire
	Gordon	McKinnon
	Gore	McSweeney
	Gorski	Mack, Ill.
	Gossett	Mack, Wash.
	Graham	Madden
	Granahan	Magee
	Granger	Mahon
	Grant	Marsalis
	Green	Martin, Iowa
	Gregory	Martin, Mass.
	Gross	Merrow
	Gwinn	Meyer
	Hagen	Michener
	Hale	Miller, Md.
	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
		Mills
	Hall, Leonard W.	Mitchell
		Monroney
	Halleck	Morris
	Hand	Morton
	Harden	Moulder
	Hardy	Murdock
	Harris	Murphy
	Harrison	Murray, Tenn.
	Hart	Murray, Wis.
	Harvey	Nelson
	Havenner	Nicholson
	Hays, Ohio	Noland
	Hedrick	Norrell
	Heffernan	Norton
	Heller	O'Brien, Ill.
	Herlong	O'Brien, Mich.
	Herter	O'Hara, Ill.
	Heselton	O'Hara, Minn.
	Hill	O'Konski
	Hinshaw	O'Neill
	Hobbs	O'Sullivan
	Hoeven	Passman
	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
	Holifield	Patten
	Holmes	Patterson
	Hope	Perkins
	Horan	Peterson
	Howell	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
	Huber	
	Hull	Pfeiffer, William L.
	Irving	
	Jackson, Wash.	Philbin
		Phillips, Calif.
		Phillips, Tenn.
		Pickett
		Plumley
		Poage
		Polk
		Potter
		Poulson
		Preston
		Price
		Priest
		Rabaut
		Rains
		Rankin
		Reed, Ill.
		Rees
		Regan
		Ribicoff
		Richards
		Riehlman
		Rodino
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rooney
		Roosevelt
		Sabath
		Sadlak
		Sadowski
		St. George
		Sanborn
		Sasscer
		Saylor
		Scott, Hardie
		Scott, Hugh D., Jr
		Scrivner
		Scudder
		Secrest
		Shelley
		Short
		Sikes
		Simpson, Ill.
		Simpson, Pa.
		Sims
		Smith, Va.
		Smith, Wis.
		Spence
		Staggers
		Stanley
		Steed
		Stefan
		Stigler
		Stockman
		Sullivan
		Sutton
		Tackett
		Talle
		Tauriello
		Taylor
		Teague
		Thomas
		Thompson
		Thornberry
		Tollefson
		Towe
		Trimble
		Underwood
		Van Zandt
		Velde
		Vinson
		Vorys
		Vursell
		Wadsworth
		Wagner
		Walter
		Weichel
		Welch
		Wheeler
		White, Idaho
		Whitten
		Whittington
		Wickersham
		Widnall
		Wier
		Wigglesworth
		Williams
		Willis
		Wilson, Ind.
		Wilson, Okla.
		Wilson, Tex.
		Winstead
		Withrow
		Wolverton
		Wood
		Woodhouse
		Woodruff
		Yates
		Young
		Zablocki

NAYS—21

Bennett, Fla.	Cotton	Kean
Brehm	Crawford	Kilburn
Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Wis.	Macy
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman, Mich.	Marcantonio
Marshall	Pace	Shafer
Mason	Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.
Norblad	Rich	Taber

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

O'Toole Powell

NOT VOTING—45

Bailey	Hare	Multer
Boykin	Hays, Ark.	Nixon
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Quinn
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Ramsay
Carnahan	Judd	Redden
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Rhodes
Cavalcante	LeCompte	Rivers
Davenport	McConnell	Sheppard
Davies, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smathers
Davis, Tenn.	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	Mansfield	Walsh
Dingell	Miles	Werdel
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	Whitaker
Eaton	Morgan	White, Calif.
Gilmer	Morrison	Wolcott

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Davenport with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Redden with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. HOLIFIELD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF SECTION AND CHAPTER NUMBERS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may have the right to correct section numbers and chapter numbers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I take this time to ask the acting majority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] as to the program for tomorrow, and next week and as much of the week thereafter as he can possibly inform the House.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the distinguished minority leader that the only legislation scheduled for tomorrow is the bill S. 2599, a bill better known as the

Teague bill, which is some amendment to the Veterans' Training Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that all the different forces appear to be in agreement.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding. For some time there was some controversy over the bill, but it is my understanding that most of that controversy has been worked out by some amendments.

It is the intention to ask unanimous consent that we adjourn over until Monday.

As far as the program for next week is concerned, that will be announced tomorrow. I am not able at this time to give the program for next week.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 597, Rept. No. 2035), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6826) to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604) for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN LICENSES GRANTED TO THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 598, Rept. No. 2036), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2128) to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain royalty-free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 599, Rept. No. 2037), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, (S. 2440) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 600, Rept. No. 2038), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7764) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that notwithstanding the announcement as to the legislative program for the remainder of this week and next week it is my purpose the first time I can get recognition to call up all of the resolutions which have been reported out by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may state that he was under the impression that he had a talk with the gentleman from Michigan on the subject. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand what the talk was, but I am making that announcement so that there will be no mistake and so that I will not be shut off when I attempt to call up some resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know about the phrase "shut off."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, to have a ruling from the Chair to the effect that I cannot proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the Chair, or any other occupant, will certainly see that the rights of every Member are protected under the rules.

The Chair might observe, of course, that when agreements are made the Chair expects them to be carried out.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I say in answer to that, as far as I am concerned any agreement I have made will be carried out. But I am not making any more agreements. I have been unable to obtain compliance with the promises heretofore made to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair knows nothing about any agreements made with the gentleman that have not been complied with. The Chair had an agreement with the gentleman with reference to next Thursday. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not stating. As I understand, the Senate is now going to debate plan No. 12 until Friday. The agreement I made with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] will be kept.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The only desire of the Chair is to try and protect the House and the Members.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There will be no advantage, Mr. Speaker, taken by me of any of the House Members; but I do not intend, if I can help it—maybe I cannot—to be—perhaps the word is not strictly parliamentary—"jockeyed" out of any of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No occupant of the chair would do that, and the present occupant of the chair would not concede that the gentleman from Michigan would permit anybody to "jockey" him.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, some drastic changes affecting the Veterans' Administration hospital program were announced by President Truman on last Wednesday, May 3.

I am particularly interested in that portion of the President's announcement that he has directed that Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga., be transferred to the Veterans' Administration, to be utilized in lieu of a 500-bed general hospital previously ordered to be constructed at Atlanta, Ga. As a result of this order, plans for the construction of the new 500-bed veterans' hospital at Atlanta have been canceled.

As a further result of that order, instructions have been issued to close Lawson General Hospital in Atlanta; also, to reconvert Peachtree Hospital No. 48 at Atlanta, which is a 225-bed tubercular

hospital, to a general medical and surgical hospital; further, to transfer the 225 tubercular patients who are now patients in Peachtree Hospital No. 48 to Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga.; then to transfer 225 patients from Lawson General Hospital to the reconverted Peachtree Hospital No. 48; and to transfer 275 patients from Lawson Veterans' Hospital to Oliver General Hospital at Augusta.

This represents a sudden change in carefully worked out plans of long standing for hospitalization of veterans in that particular area. Veterans' Administration officials after carefully inspecting a number of available hospital building sites in and near Atlanta, Ga., selected a tract near Emory University, which on July 25, 1949, was purchased for the sum of $250,000, according to the Purchasing Division of the Veterans' Administration.

Plans for the proposed new hospital are well along toward completion.

The order to utilize Oliver General Hospital at Augusta contemplates that only 500 beds in that hospital will be used, although it is a 1,500 bed capacity hospital. Under the President's order, 500 beds at Oliver General Hospital will be used. One thousand beds will not be used.

From information recently obtained from the Veterans' Administration, out of a maximum capacity of 750 beds at Lawson Veterans' Hospital in Atlanta, there were 631 open beds, or available beds, with 119 not available, due to being under repair, located in contagious wards, or for other reasons.

At the present time available veterans' hospital beds in Atlanta are 856. These consist of 631 beds at Lawson Veterans' Hospital and 225 beds at Peachtree Tubercular Hospital No. 48.

When the President's order of May 3 goes into effect there will be only 225 beds available in Atlanta, these being at the reconverted Peachtree Hospital No. 48. There will be only 500 beds at the Oliver General Hospital in Augusta. This will make a total of 725 beds available in the combined facilities at Atlanta and Augusta. The maximum capacity of the two Atlanta veterans' hospitals now in use is 1,000 beds.

So, from the standpoint of the veterans, the President's order of May 3 means a reduction of 250 beds in hospital facilities for veterans in that area.

The President's statement of May 3 says:

> The utilization by the Veterans' Administration of these two hospitals will not affect the bed allowance of 131,000 authorized for the Veterans' Administration hospital program.

I believe the practical effect of the order will be to reduce the number of available beds under the over-all, Nation-wide bed allowance. Whether it reduces this over-all bed allowance or not, it does mean a reduction of available beds for the treatment of sick and injured veterans in the Atlanta and Augusta hospitals when the 500 beds are activated at Oliver General and the 750-bed Lawson Veterans' Hospital is closed in Atlanta.

It makes little difference that there may remain a Nation-wide bed allowance of 131,000 authorized beds. Some of the hospitals whose beds are counted in this bed allowance are not staffed by doctors and nurses, and are not available for use by sick or disabled veterans. I firmly believe that many of them never will be staffed by doctors and nurses, and consequently never will be available for use by sick and disabled veterans.

It is one thing to have a 1,000-bed hospital with a thousand beds in it, but it is another and an entirely different matter to be able to staff that hospital with doctors and nurses so that the 1,000 beds can be used by 1,000 sick and disabled veterans.

The place where a veterans' hospital is located has a great deal to do with the question of whether or not doctors and nurses can be procured to staff it. There are many factors which doctors and nurses consider in deciding whether they will go to a particular location or not. Whether we agree with their reasoning or not—whether we like their decision or not, it is foolish to ignore facts and to close our eyes to the realities of the situation. Doctors simply will not go to some locations.

There is a 1,000-bed hospital at Dublin, Ga., which was transferred to the Veterans' Administration at the end of hostilities. I have nothing but the kindest feelings for Dublin and for its citizens. However, this Dublin hospital is an illustration of the fact that a 1,000-bed capacity in a hospital does not, in any sense of the word, mean that 1,000 sick or disabled veterans can be treated in that hospital.

With reference to this 1,000-bed hospital at Dublin, Ga., Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, head of the Medical Division of the Veterans' Administration, is quoted by the press as saying on April 26, 1950, as follows:

> We authorized use of 500 of the beds. We've never been able to get enough staff to open more than 300. Dublin is a nice place, but we just can't find hospital technicians, nurses, and doctors willing to move there. I took the bull by the horns and ordered 15 of our doctors down there, and eight promptly resigned.

It is a calamity of the first water to close a 750-bed hospital, fully staffed, in Atlanta, and justify it by saying there is a 1,000-bed hospital in Dublin, Ga., with only 300 beds in use. The 700 unused beds there are a total loss, insofar as treatment of sick veterans is concerned. This is eloquently illustrated by the statement of Dr. Magnuson that 8 doctors out of 15 resigned when ordered to report to that hospital for duty.

With only the best of feeling toward Dublin and its good people, I believe that if it has become necessary to close a veterans hospital in the State of Georgia, it would be far better for the veterans to close the hospital at Dublin and keep Lawson Veterans Hospital open in Atlanta. There is no medical school at Dublin to staff that veterans' hospital. There is one of the finest medical schools in the United States in Atlanta, namely, Emory University Medical School. Doctors have resigned their positions with the Veterans' Administration when ordered to proceed to Dublin for duty. This has not happened with reference to Atlanta. I seriously doubt if it ever would happen with reference to Atlanta.

The veterans' hospital at Dublin, according to Dr. Magnuson, has 700 empty beds due to inability to staff it. Lawson veterans' hospital in Atlanta has not even one empty bed resulting from inability to staff it.

Lawson Hospital is one of the 50 or 60 dean's committee hospitals in the country—that is, it is staffed by Emory University Medical School. It has generally been regarded as one of the half dozen best hospitals in the entire VA organization. For example, it was one of the first two to be given interns for training.

The sudden decision to close this hospital creates additional problems from the standpoint of the medical school and the doctors serving on the staff.

Approximately 50 young physicians had accepted appointments to the resident staff of the hospital, effective July 1. Such appointments are always made 6 to 10 months in advance, and these young men, most of them recent graduates of Emory medical school, now have their plans for the next year completely upset. In addition, there is an attending staff of 50 to 75 physicians on a full-time or part-time basis. It is my opinion that those on a full-time basis would not be content to move to other VA installations where the close tie-up with the medical schools does not exist.

In my opinion the needs of the veterans require that both the veterans' hospitals in Augusta and Atlanta be kept open. They are both staffed fully. They are both operating. Unless closed, they will continue to operate with utmost efficiency and at full capacity. The University of Georgia Medical School is located in Augusta where it can fill the needs of Oliver General Hospital. Emory University Medical School located in Atlanta can fill the needs of Lawson Veterans Hospital and Peachtree Hospital, No. 48. To me, it is an unthinkable thing to close Lawson Veterans Hospital in Atlanta when Atlanta is conceded by everyone to be the largest and best medical center in the Southeast. Outstanding physicians and surgeons in Atlanta are available to that hospital as consultants and attending men. The Emory University School of Medicine and Surgery and their professors and consultants are available to the hospital.

In connection with the proposed changes, I think it is worth while to take note of the fact that the Veterans' Administration just recently spent, I am informed, over $150,000 to convert Peachtree Hospital No. 48 from a general medical and surgical hospital to a tubercular hospital. In its present status as a tubercular hospital, it is filled to its 225-bed capacity with tubercular patients. It is very close to Lawson Veterans Hospital, and Lawson Veterans Hospital is a tubercular chest surgical center. It is also a neurosurgical center, tumor center, orthopedic surgery center, plastic surgery center, certain specialized eye, ear, nose, and throat

surgery, and a center for diagnostic study of certain medical conditions which cannot be diagnosed at other hospitals. It is also a reference laboratory center. These above specialized services have rendered invaluable service in the treatment of veterans of the entire southeastern area. These services would not be available if the proposed closing of Lawson and splitting up of patients goes through, as ordered.

From the standpoint of economy, what is to be said about the $150,000 just recently spent to convert Peachtree Hospital No. 48 into a tubercular hospital? Will not that be wasted? What also is to be said regarding the additional amount which will now be required to reconvert that hospital from a tubercular hospital back again to a general medical and surgical hospital, which was its status before it was converted into a tubercular hospital? Is it economy to throw away these large sums of money?

What of the $250,000 spent when the site was purchased on July 25, 1949, for the proposed veterans hospital to be built near Emory University, as well as the time and money already put into the plans for that hospital which now are well along toward being completed?

Lawson Veterans Hospital is the only hospital in the southeast where the veteran can receive the proper treatment for cancer.

All these advantages will be dissipated if the order of May 3 goes into effect. New arrangements must be made, new facilities provided, settled routine will be upset, smooth running and efficient organization will be uprooted, all to the detriment of the sick and disabled veterans. The deaths and setbacks which may result from these things alone cannot be foretold.

With its larger capacity, Lawson Veterans Hospital is continuously under pressure to make room for sick and disabled veterans. The hospital has a waiting list now of over 500 veterans. Its daily admissions average around 30 patients per day, and on some days it admits as many as 58 to 60 patients. It is an impossibility for a 225-bed hospital, the capacity of Peachtree Hospital No. 48, under any circumstances to carry such a load.

Unfortunately, from time to time, and it is rather a regular occurrence, veterans crack up mentally, many of them becoming violent. Every few weeks I receive a telephone call from my district informing me of the crack-up of some veteran, who has been in jail for confinement because no bed can be found for him in a veteran's hospital. This situation exists because of the crowded condition of veterans hospitals in Georgia. In one recent instance it has been necessary to send such a veteran from Atlanta, Ga., to a veteran's hospital in the State of Texas, that being the nearest available vacancy for him. It is not a rare occurrence at all for veterans and their families to call upon me in emergencies of this nature. It is a rather regular thing.

This further reduction of hospital capacity is going to aggravate this unfortunate condition rather than help it.

In the State of Georgia the area which Lawson Veterans Hospital serves has a veteran population of 176,880. The Augusta area has a veteran population of 26,656. It is the policy of the Veterans' Administration to hospitalize veterans at the nearest hospital. This is a valid reason for maintaining at least those presently existing hospital facilities in Atlanta, which is easily accessible to the great majority of the veterans.

The large population of Atlanta lends itself to great numbers of volunteer workers in assisting with morale work at Lawson Veterans Hospital. An important factor in treating sickness is the morale of the patient. The location of Lawson Veterans Hospital in Atlanta makes it easier because of transportation facilities, hotel facilities, and the like, for the relatives of these veterans to visit them. This in itself is an important factor to be considered in the treatment of veterans.

If these hospital facilities are retained in Atlanta, the professional services and consultation will be furnished by the faculty of Emory University. There are 390 faculty members of the School of Medicine at Emory University. I have been told that this is more than three times the number of doctors in the whole of Richmond County, in which Augusta is located.

Emory University is privately endowed, with a total endowment of $34,394,571. I am informed that the total expenditure for the school of medicine per annum is approximately $3,000,000. The university has received $15,000,000 in additional endowment in the last 5 years, and very likely will receive more.

Atlanta is the laboratory center for the study of communicable diseases for the entire Nation at present, and all of the personnel of the communicable disease center is available to Emory University for teaching duties. All this adds to the desirability of Atlanta as the location of veterans' hospitals, and tends towards insuring the highest standards of professional care for veterans in such hospitals. It tends toward a high standard of teaching activity within the Veterans' Administration wholly approved by the qualifying agency.

Congress has given much consideration to the question of veterans' hospitals, and to the program of veterans' hospitalization which was worked out and approved. Lawson Veterans' Hospital in Atlanta and the proposed new hospital in Atlanta constituted a part of that program.

I believe that a reconsideration of the matter will bring to light the need for retaining Lawson Veterans' Hospital in Atlanta. I hope that the President may be induced to review the question when he returns to Washington on May 16.

In the event the order of May 3 ordering Lawson Hospital closed is not rescinded, it is my purpose to introduce legislation to provide that it shall be kept open, and that the number of hospital beds now actually available for sick and disabled veterans in that area shall be maintained, and not reduced. To that end I ask your sympathetic consideration of these facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a famous American once said that a house divided against itself cannot stand. That wise saying is applicable to the problem before us today. The architects of the Taft-Hartley law designed a divided house in the National Labor Relations Board, and it threatens to fall down. By submitting Reorganization Plan No. 12, along with other similar reorganization plans, the President proposes to do a repair and reconstruction job that will keep the house that Taft-Hartley built from falling to pieces.

The President's plan would restore unified authority and responsibility to the National Labor Relations Board. It merits the wholehearted support of everyone who believes in good government and orderly administration. The resolution opposing this reorganization plan should be defeated.

Let us look at the divided and shaky administrative structure that Taft-Hartley built.

Under the present law, there dwells on the one side the five-member Board, and on the other, the general counsel. The coauthor of the Taft-Hartley Act still in Congress has referred to the office of general counsel as "semi-independent." To carry out our metaphor of the Taft-Hartley house, we might say the office of general counsel is "semidetached."

This semidetachment is of a curious sort. There is no roof overhead to combine the two parts of the Tart-Hartley house into a coherent structure with a straight stairway of administration. Neither is there a firm wall that clearly separates the two parts of the house. The connecting passages were poorly laid out in the statutory blueprint.

Section 3 (d) of the Taft-Hartley Act—Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session—is the section that provides for the semidetached office of general counsel. This office is described in the law as general counsel of the Board. The general counsel is of the Board, and yet he is given some powers independent of the Board. He supervises the Board attorneys and field personnel, even though the law says they are to be appointed by the Board, and they perform duties for the Board, as well as for him; he is given sole and exclusive authority to investigate charges and bring complaints; yet in other respects he is subject to such duties as the Board may prescribe.

The administrative absurdity of this relationship should be readily apparent. The task force of the Hoover Commission which studied the regulatory agencies called the National Labor Relations Board a bifurcated agency and described the position of the general counsel as anomalous and unstable.

Senator TAFT has readily acknowledged that the law which bears his name is somewhat uncertain in the distribution of functions, and that the authority and position of the general counsel are vague

and ought to be revised—Senate committee hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950, pages 19, 23; and the general counsel himself, Robert Denham, has pointed out that when he took office and tried to determine what were his duties—

> A reading of the law revealed a great many bare spots, inconsistencies, and things which required a lot of coordination, and it was because of that that we sat down and worked out a sort of division of responsibility and authority. (Senate committee hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950, p. 196.)

Now, I submit that the worst possible kind of administrative arrangement is one which requires the parties charged with carrying out the law to sit down and trade functions with each other, to delegate back and forth, to make pacts or agreements, in an effort to determine what are their respective duties and responsibilities. Their desire to cooperate is laudable, but good administration cannot depend on such unstable and personalized arrangements.

Indeed, this attempt to make a working administrative arrangement, when the lines of authority and responsibility are so poorly drawn in the law, has not worked well at all. The Board and the general counsel are at loggerheads, not only with regard to basic policies necessary to enforce the law properly but with regard to the matter of control over their own personnel.

As noted above, the Board is authorized to appoint and the general counsel to supervise personnel. To avoid the cost and inefficiency of establishing a separate field staff to carry out the Board's responsibilities in representation proceedings, the Board in August 1948 delegated to the general counsel complete responsibility for the hire and discharge of all personnel in the regional offices. Naturally the 800 field employees began to look to the general counsel as their boss, even though an important part of their work related to the Board's own functions. Thereupon, in February 1950, the Board felt compelled to modify its delegation to the general counsel of authority over field personnel to the extent of insisting on approval of the appointment, transfer, demotion or discharge of any regional director or officer in charge of a regional office.

Without passing judgment on the merits of this matter, I wish to emphasize that it threatens a stalemate or even a breakdown of internal administration. The general counsel has publicly stated that he will not subscribe to the Board's revised delegation, despite the fact that the law confers upon the Board the initial responsibility to appoint all personnel and confers upon the Board representation functions which must be carried on by field personnel.

The Hoover Commission was created for the very purpose of marking out clear lines of authority and responsibility in order that public officials might be held fully accountable for their actions. In the case of the regulatory commission—and the National Labor Relations Board is specifically included by the Hoover Commission in this category—it was recommended that "all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission."

In response to this basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission, the President has submitted reorganization plans for seven regulatory commissions, including the National Labor Relations Board. He has not singled out the Board for special attention, although some have tried to make it appear that a sinister motive is behind this particular plan. Reorganization Plan No. 12 makes the relationship between the National Labor Relations Board and its Chairman identical with that provided in the reorganization plans for other regulatory agencies.

It is important to understand that the fulfillment of this basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission requires, in the case of the National Labor Relations Board, that the present division of duties and responsibility and the administrative confusion created by the semidetached position of the general counsel be eliminated. The architects of the Taft-Hartley Act made the general counsel an administrative officer as well as the prosecuting arm of the Board. At the same time, they invested the Board itself with administrative duties, in addition to making it the adjudicating part of the agency. Consequently, if the Chairman of the Board is to exercise the administrative functions which the Hoover Commission considers proper for the chairmen of all regulatory commissions, the office of general counsel must be integrated into the Board structure.

Senator IVES, who is well qualified to speak on matters of labor law and administration, has pointed up the issue in Reorganization Plan No. 12. In a recent statement he said:

> This plan is aimed to correct a very unfortunate condition occasioned by the very poor draftsmanship in the Taft-Hartley Act, which due to its ambiguity and inadequacy, has caused a great deal of confusion and conflict between the Labor Relations Board and the general counsel and—most unfortunate of all—in the minds of the parties coming before the Board or the general counsel. (Washington Post, April 16, 1950.)

Now I call to the attention of the Members the administrative organization of the present National Labor Relations Board. You will note that there are four major administrative units under the office of general counsel, which also perform certain functions for the Board. I will discuss their functions in some detail to demonstrate how this split in authority impairs the administration of the labor-management relations law.

I. LEGAL DIVISION

The division is called the Division of Law. It is headed by an associate general counsel who is directly responsible to the general counsel.

It performs the following functions on behalf of the general counsel: Initiates and prosecutes injunctions proceedings under section 10 (1) of the act; represents the general counsel in court proceedings brought against him or his staff.

It performs the following functions on behalf of the Board:

Represents the Board in miscellaneous court litigation involving the Board such as proceedings to restrain the Board from conducting elections, or from failing to conduct elections; to enforce subpenas issued by the Board; and to enjoin State Boards from acting in cases under the jurisdiction of the National Board. Represents the Board in the circuit courts of appeal and the Supreme Court by petitioning for enforcement of orders issued by the Board in unfair labor practices and by defending such orders when they are attacked by the parties against whom they are issued.

Note, however, that the Legal Division, even in the performance of functions on behalf of the Board, is supervised only by the general counsel and not by the Board. In certain cases the general counsel's supervision of functions performed on behalf of the Board by this division has made for conflict between the policies of the general counsel as prosecutor and those of the Board as the decision-making arm of the agency. Here are examples:

First. International Rice Milling Co.: The Board issued an order dismissing the complaint issued by the general counsel after the general counsel had obtained an injunction in the district court under section 10 (1) of the act. The charging party appealed to the circuit court of appeals from the Board's order dismissing the complaint and argued that the Board should not have dismissed the complaint. The general counsel advised the Board that his staff should not have to defend the Board's order because such defense of the Board's order in the circuit court would be in conflict with the position he had taken when he issued the complaint and obtained the injunction. The Board had to direct the general counsel specifically to use his staff to defend the Board's order. He agreed reluctantly and assigned to the oral argument before the court the attorney who had participated in obtaining the injunction in the first place and in the trial of the case before the Board.

Second. West Texas Utilities Co., Inc.: The Board rejected the company's defense to a refusal to bargain, and held that it was no excuse that the company in refusing to bargain had relied on a public statement of the general counsel as to what the law means. The employer appealed to the circuit court of appeals. The general counsel again asked the board that his staff be relieved of their duty to defend the Board's order in the court. And again the Board directed him to have his staff prepare the whole defense. The general counsel nevertheless inserted in a very prominent place in the brief prepared by his staff in defense of the Board's order a statement of the reasons which had prompted him to make the public statement on which the company had relied. If permitted to stand, this statement would have weakened the Board's defense of its order. The Board consequently directed the general counsel to delete that statement

from the brief, explaining to him that a brief in behalf of the Board should be devoted exclusively to a defense of the Board's order. The Board has heard indirectly that the general counsel still entertains some thought of presenting his own personal conflicting views to the court when this case comes up for argument.

Third. Postex Cotton Mills, Inc.: In this case the Board affirmed its reversal of the general counsel's position regarding an interpretation of that section of the law requiring the filing of non-Communist affidavits. The general counsel, while permitting the brief in defense of the Board's order to be written by his staff, refused to have any member of his staff present oral argument on the case in the circuit court of appeals. The case was argued by the Board's own solicitor.

Fourth. Haleston Drug Stores, Inc.: The Board dismissed the complaint issued by the general counsel in this case on the ground that it would not take jurisdiction over four drug stores in Portland, Oreg., because those activities are essentially local in character. The general counsel had issued the complaint despite the fact that the Board had dismissed an earlier representation proceeding for lack of jurisdiction. The employer has appealed to the circuit court of appeals from the Board's order dismissing the unfair labor practice case. The general counsel informed the Board that the basic conflict of position between him and the Board on the question of jurisdiction made it necessary for his staff not to prepare a defense of the Board's order, except to the extent that he would be willing to assign a brief writer to assist the Board's solicitor. The Board has agreed to this, and its solicitor is handling the entire proceeding in the circuit court, with the assistance of a brief writer assigned by the general counsel from his staff. The general counsel, in addition, has advised the Board of his intention to file a brief in the court in support of the employer's position and against enforcement of the Board's order.

Fifth. A–1 Photo Service: The Board dismissed an unfair labor practice proceeding involving a retail stationery and photo supply store at San Pedro, Calif., on the ground that its activities are essentially local in character. The employer has appealed to the circuit court of appeals from the Board's order dismissing the complaint issued by the general counsel. Here, too, the general counsel has refused to defend the Board's order. Its solicitor has taken over the entire proceeding before the court on the same basis as the Haleston case.

II. DIVISION OF OPERATIONS

This Division performs the following functions on behalf of the general counsel: Directs the administration and operation of all regional offices; receives and replies to all requests for advice from regional offices on issuance of complaints.

It performs the following functions on behalf of the Board: Receives and replies to all requests for advice from regional offices on the handling of representation cases.

Note, however, that this Division, even in the performance of functions on behalf of the Board, is supervised only by the general counsel and not by the Board.

The conflict between the Board and the general counsel on assertion of jurisdiction becomes a real one in the kind of advice this division gives to the regional offices. As in the Haleston Drug case, where the board dismissed a representation proceeding because of the local character of the business involved, the regional office nevertheless was directed to issue a complaint on behalf of the general counsel on substantially the same facts as to the business of the company. Similar conflicting advice goes out to the regional offices in other complaint cases, even after the Board has dismissed cases involving either similar industries or companies doing a similar amount of local business.

III. DIVISION OF POLICIES AND APPEALS

This Division performs the following functions on behalf of the general counsel: Prepares for the general counsel memoranda on questions of policy and law arising in connection with the issuance of complaints; and advises the general counsel on appeals from the refusal of the Regional Director to issue complaints.

It performs the following functions on behalf of the Board: Writes legal memoranda for the general counsel on questions of policy and law related to representation proceedings.

Note, however, that this division, even in the performance of functions on behalf of the Board, is supervised only by the general counsel and not by the Board.

Until about 6 months ago this staff gave advice on representation cases in conformance with the general counsel's views on jurisdiction and in conflict with those of the Board. This policy was not rescinded until about 6 months ago, although the Board had asked for its rescission for nearly a year prior thereto.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

This division, which handles personnel, budget, and other housekeeping functions for the entire agency, services both the Board and the general counsel. The director of administration in charge of this division and other employees within this division are appointed by the general counsel and directly responsible to him.

The recent revision, by the Board, of the statement of delegation providing that regional directors and officers in charge of subregional offices shall be appointed by the general counsel with the approval of the Board, has placed the administrative division right in the middle of the conflict engendered by the general counsel's refusal to submit to the revision. The Board has instructed the director of personnel, the chief clerk, and the chief of the administrative division that, in the future, a newly appointed regional director shall not go on the payroll as such unless the appointment is signed by both the Chairman of the Board and the general counsel. The general counsel has instructed these officials to disregard the Board's direction and to proceed as in the past. If they should follow the general counsel, rather than the Board, they would be disobeying the instructions of the Board.

In that event, the general counsel, who has sole authority to discharge or otherwise discipline these officials, could exercise that power if they obeyed the Board rather than him.

This is not a farfetched possibility. The general counsel has already indicated that he will not follow the revised statement of delegation in appointing an officer in charge of the regional office at Memphis, Tenn. He has instructed the administrative division to proceed as in the past, without regard to contrary directions to that division from the Chairman of the Board. The general counsel has, as yet, made no appointment to fill that vacancy, presumably because plan No. 12 is now pending. Should plan No. 12 not prevail, this interfamily conflict may well have to be settled by the Attorney General or the Comptroller General.

It will be readily seen that the present administrative organization of the National Labor Relations Board has been productive of internal strife and discord, of intrafamily feuds and quarrels. This is a poor administrative arrangement, which Reorganization Plan No. 12 is designed to correct.

Let it be clearly understood that this reorganization plan, which would result in the sound and sensible administrative organization indicated on the other chart, deals only with organization. It is not a plan to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act by indirection or otherwise, as some have so recklessly charged. To quote Senator IVES again:

> One might gather that this plan, if allowed to become effective, would destroy the Taft-Hartley Act and constitute a great victory for labor over management. These implications * * * are unjust and unfounded. * * * They reflect a state of mind and attitude which can never produce a sound and equitable labor relations statute in this country.
>
> What is at stake in this particular controversy over Plan No. 12 is not the reduction or the elimination or the abolition of functions. Neither is it a question of the separation of powers by statute. (Washington Post, April 16, 1950).

Senator IVES went on to say, as quoted earlier, that this plan is intended only to correct the faulty administrative set-up occasioned by poor draftsmanship in the Taft-Hartley Act.

I sincerely hope that the Members will accept this considered judgment of an authority on industrial relations. I trust this issue can be decided not in a narrow sense of partisanship but on the objective grounds of good administration. If we are seriously dedicated to the objective set forth by the Hoover Commission, we will accept on good faith the statement of former Budget Director Frank Pace—now the Secretary of the Army—before our committee, testifying on Reorganization Plan No. 12:

> What we are trying to do is to present to the Congress the kind of governmental reorganization that fundamentally was at the heart and basis of the whole program of the Hoover Commission in setting up the operation of agencies and commissions.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 would establish clear lines of authority and responsibility to reach down from the Board to the constituent operating units and the regional offices.

The Chairman of the Board, under this reorganization, will be responsible for the day-to-day administration, in keeping with the allocation of responsibility which the Hoover Commission proposed for the chairmen of all regulatory commissions.

It is well to have this point clearly in mind. It has been erroneously contended that the plan would center in the Chairman of the Board all the functions now performed by the general counsel. President Truman, in his message accompanying the 21 reorganization plans, has made very plain the distinction between the functions to be exercised by the Chairman and those to be exercised by the Board as a whole. His message states:

> In regard to the regulatory agencies, the plans distinguish between two groups of functions necessary to the conduct of these agencies. One group includes the substantive aspects of regulation—that is, the determination of policies, the formulation and issuance of rules, and the adjudication of cases. All these functions are left in the Board or Commission as a whole. The other group of functions comprises the day-to-day direction and internal administration of the complex staff organizations which the commissions require. These responsibilities are transferred to the chairman of the agencies, to be discharged in accordance with policies which the commissions may establish. The chairman is to be designated in each agency by the President from among the Commission members. (81st Cong., 2d sess., H. Doc. No. 503, p. 3.)

The text of Reorganization Plan No. 12 clearly contemplates this allocation of functions outlined in the President's message. Section 1 of the plan specifies the typical housekeeping functions assigned to the Chairman—the appointment and supervision of personnel, the distribution of business among personnel and administrative units, and the use and expenditure of funds. And, even in his exercise of these housekeeping functions, the Chairman is made subject to the general policies and determinations of the Board.

The Director of the Budget and the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board both have emphasized in recent testimony and in keeping with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, that the plan confers upon the Chairman as such only the housekeeping functions and not the whole range of functions now exercised by the general counsel. Furthermore, the Chairman has pointed out that under the accepted rule of statutory construction, the housekeeping functions assigned to him would necessarily be those of the kind specified in section 1 of the plan—Senate committee hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950, page 136.

The testimony is clear and to the point that the Chairman cannot become the czar that the general counsel has become under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Let me say, too, that Reorganization Plan No. 12 is not unclear or uncertain in the transfer of functions, as its opponents have charged. The plan is as clean cut and definite as the six analogous plans are, and as any plan can be, in effectuating the basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission that all administrative responsibility be vested in the chairmen of regulatory commissions. The ambiguities are not in the reorganization plan; they were created by the Taft-Hartley Act, and the very purpose and object of the plan are to eliminate these intolerable ambiguities. That is why the semidetached office of general counsel must necessarily be abolished in the process of reorganization.

The charge has been made—unwarranted, I may say—that the restoration of unified authority and responsibility to the Board and its Chairman will cause an obnoxious combination of prosecuting and judicial functions.

The opponents of Reorganization Plan No. 12 ignore the protection afforded by the Administrative Procedure Act. They overlook the administrative experience and practice which for the past 70 years or more has been recognized by Congress in placing within each regulatory agency quasi-judicial as well as other functions in the fulfillment of national objectives.

Recognizing that the broad powers necessarily conferred upon these regulatory agencies required the most scrupulous regard for fair treatment and equitable procedure to protect the rights of private parties involved or affected, the Congress in its wisdom passed the Administrative Procedure Act. The Board, as a regulatory agency, is subject to this act. Indeed, students of labor law and administration have pointed to the Board as a model of administrative performance in this regard.

Under the Administrative Procedure Act, as Senator TAFT himself pointed out in proposing an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act last year which would have abolished the Office of General Counsel, the judicial and prosecuting functions are largely separated, although not entirely so. Last year Mr. TAFT was willing, as he put it, "to go back to the Administrative Procedure Act and rely upon that for a fair treatment by the Board"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 30, 1949.

Senator TAFT's statement implied quite plainly a recognition of the fact that practically no agency which exercises regulatory functions can have the prosecuting and judicial functions entirely separated. Congress has decreed in each basic law one general policy; one agency must carry it out. To prosecute or to judge, in the narrow sense, are not the objectives of these laws, but rather incidents or techniques of putting them into effect.

If we take seriously and literally this idea that prosecutor and judge should be constituted in separate and independent agencies, there would be a multiplication and proliferation of Government agencies requiring the attention of 10 Hoover Commissions. The Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure—a committee of distinguished lawyers—recognized very well the impracticality of completely separating the prosecuting and adjudicating functions—see its final report, 1941, page 58.

Even more to the point, this kind of division of functions is usually urged by those who have no enthusiasm for the particular law or policy decreed by Congress. They advocate at the worst an impossible administrative arrangement; at the best a division of authority and diffusion of responsibility productive of confusion and uncertainty. Whether we draw the worst or the best conclusion about the administrative structure of the Taft-Hartley Act, it is bad; it defies every principle of good administration advocated by the Hoover Commission and most experts in public administration.

Certainly, by giving sole power to the general counsel to issue complaints, as the Taft-Hartley Act did, the problem of separation of prosecuting and adjudicating functions was not solved. Authority was shifted from a board to a single individual with sole discretion and unreviewable power in the field of complaints and ambiguous authority with respect to administrative affairs. The general counsel thereby became, if I may change a famous phrase, the autocrat at the bargaining table.

It has been argued by opponents of the reorganization plan that the National Labor Relations Board is different from other regulatory agencies in that it has no broad grant of power to make labor policy; that it simply performs as a judicial body in ascertaining whether the parties complained against have committed the acts alleged. This, I submit, is a narrow and distorted view of the Board's role. All regulatory agencies differ in their functions, of course. In some the adjudicative role is large—and the Board is among them; in others comparatively minor. But ever since 1887, when the Interstate Commerce Commission was created, practically every regulatory agency has had conferred upon it dual or even multiple functions directed toward the unifying aim, the integrated objective, of promoting or executing a public policy. The function of the Labor Board is not simply to ascertain whether private parties have committed certain acts. Let us not confuse the objective with one means of achieving it. The function of the Board is to carry out the policy, as the Taft-Hartley Act recites, "to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection."

Perhaps there is no weightier commentary on the exercise of this broad policy laid down in the law than the fact that the policy is effectuated in the main by informal activities that never come to the stage of judicial decision.

Mr. Gerard P. Reilly, reputed to be one of the chief architects of the Taft-

Hartley law, himself emphasized before our committee that this question of separation of functions in unfair labor practice cases has nothing to do with the merits of the substantive provisions of the Taft-Hartley law—House hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 12, of 1950, page 32. Mr. Reilly, a paid lobbyist and counsel for large industrial concerns and a spokesman for employer interests, happens to prefer the administrative arrangement in the Taft-Hartley Act to that in the President's reorganization plan, as no doubt anyone is inclined to be favorably disposed toward his own handiwork. But Mr. Reilly has believed for a long time, as he testified, that the Board should be a judicial agency, with the prosecuting and other functions reposing in the Labor Department or the Department of Justice. He is entitled to that view, which is hardly original with him. The point here is that by Reorganization Plan No. 12 we do not repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, however some of us might wish it. The plan proposes only to make administrative order out of administrative confusion. Why that laudable objective, sincerely and actively sought by the President for the whole executive branch, should be so vehemently resisted, I fail to understand.

It is significant that in the whole gamut of regulatory agencies, Mr. Reilly and other opponents of Reorganization Plan No. 12 could only point to the Tax Court—formerly the Board of Tax Appeals—to support their case for a separation of prosecuting and adjudicating functions. The sole function of this agency is to pass upon controversies between the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the taxpayers. The analogy to the functions of the National Labor Relations Board, I submit, is a poor one. It is the duty of the Labor Board to promote a labor-management relations policy by its decisions and by its other functions. The Tax Court, in contrast, does not promote a tax policy, but merely gives individuals who feel themselves aggrieved, an opportunity to present their cases for judgment. Also the Government is an interested party in such cases, as a potential direct beneficiary in a money sense. And even in the matter of the Tax Court, as the report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure noted, the separation of the tax collector from the tax judge has often resulted in confusion. The judicial function of reviewing decisions, whether of the Tax Court or of the National Labor Relations Board, is exercised by the courts of the land.

The five members of the Board, who are unequivocal and unanimous in support of the President's plan, are men of integrity; they are men of experience in administration. We must take cognizance of their considered judgment that the present administrative arrangement is unsatisfactory and prejudicial to the execution of a law of Congress.

The Chairman of the Board has testified that, whatever their views of the changes in labor-management law wrought by the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board members have attempted in good faith, to administer the act as amended. Thirty months of experience have convinced them that the law is administratively unsound. The chairman has given further assurance that procedures will be instituted that will go beyond even the present safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act in insuring a rigorous impartiality in the administration of the law if the reorganization plan is put into effect.

I urge the Members to accept this plan, to reject the resolution of disapproval, and thereby to allow the great work of reorganization initiated by this Congress to go forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE CASE FOR PLAN 12 ON NLRB

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, this plan would achieve administrative reforms that are necessary and proper. That is the basis on which I support it, and that is the real issue here—shall we adopt this plan and improve the functioning of the National Labor Relations Board? This plan was one of 21 submitted by the President. It is one of a group of six which are designed to improve the organization of the Federal Government's regulatory commissions. A great effort has been made by its critics to take it out of this context, and to use it as the basis of a rehash of national labor policy. Now I hold strong views about the Taft-Hartley Act, which I think is a dreadful law, and which I am prepared to debate at any appropriate time and place. But this is not that time and place, and I do not believe that my views on the Taft-Hartley law are relevant here. Nor are anyone else's. This is a reorganization plan, neither more nor less.

What is involved here is a test of the steadfastness of those who have pledged their support to President Truman and the Hoover Commission in the drive to make the executive agencies more efficient. Unfortunately, some of the opponents of the plan suffer from an emotional antilaborism which has fogged their judgment and clouded their minds. It is regrettable, but true, that some of the critics of this plan simply can't see straight about anything that deals with the word "labor."

In this instance, there are four separate blind spots in their thinking.

First, they fail to see the clear need for this reform in the present, tangled NLRB set-up.

Second, they fail to see the undoubted legal basis for this plan in the Reorganization Act of 1949, passed by Congress to facilitate reorganization.

Third, they fail to see how false it is to compare the NLRB to a court, where the separation of prosecution and judicial functions means something very different from what it means here.

And finally, they fail to see the damage which is being done to the whole reorganization program of the President and the Hoover Commission by excepting agency after agency.

This plan, like others proposed and adopted for other agencies, centers administrative responsibility for the NLRB's work in the chairman or his designees. It authorizes transfers and delegations of power within the agency. It transfers almost all of the functions of the general counsel, including prosecution and investigation, to the full Board, and abolishes his office. Now, what is the situation which this plan is designed to correct? It is the division of policy-making and administrative authority within the agency—certainly not a problem unknown to American political history.

Again and again the Board and the general counsel disagree as to who should be covered by the law.

What matters here is not who is right or wrong in each of these points, but the fact that an impossible confusion results in which litigants are never quite sure of where they stand before the NLRB—or rather whether they stand the same way before the general counsel and the NLRB. There is no argument about this uncertainty as a fact, but let me cite one glaring instance of the impossible administrative confusion that reigns at the Board. This one is, I believe, worth your detailed study, so that I am putting into the RECORD at the end of these remarks a portion of the general counsel's file in the case. The case began about a year ago with a proceeding to determine representation of the employees in retail drug stores operated by the Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., of Portland, Oreg. The Board refused to take jurisdiction in the very same case on the grounds that "the employer's business is essentially local in character." Nevertheless, as a staff memorandum of May 13 shows, the general counsel's regional man was subsequently instructed to issue a complaint requested by the employer. His words are:

> During the general counsel's recent visit to this office, the case was discussed with him and it is my understanding that, even though there was a dismissal—

By the Board in case covering the same parties—

> he is desirous of issuing a complaint. • • • We have a hearing date of August 16. Complaint will issue setting the case for a hearing for that date.

The general counsel in Washington then asked for a summary of facts and legal theory. But he also asked his field man, and I quote:

> In addition, ascertain, evaluate in detail and report the charging company's position with respect to its determination to vigorously pursue the matter beyond the Board's decision in the event that, after hearing, the complaint is dismissed by the Board on the same grounds as it dismissed the company's petition in the aforementioned case.

The attorney for the employer thereupon assured the regional office, which is under the supervision of the general counsel—in writing—that it would take an adverse decision by the Board into court.

The request for this assurance—before the complaint was cleared for issuance—was made by the Board's own lawyer, the

general counsel. As everyone knew he would, the trial examiner in the case followed the Board's precedent and threw the case out.

The Board ruled against the employer and dismissed the case because the four drug stores were an essentially local business. Then—November 4—the attorney for the employer wrote the general counsel a very instructive note. In it he explains why he lost before the Board and adds:

> Evidently the regional attorneys did not know anything about it either as I put in what they suggested.

Mr. Denham's staff thus helped this litigant with his case against the Board's own trial examiner. The employer's attorney naturally wanted to find out how much more help he could get from the general counsel in fighting the Board's ruling—ultimately in the Federal courts. He goes on:

> However, I am writing to you to find out how you wish to handle this matter from here on. Mr. Haleston is very desirous of going ahead and getting a ruling from the Court on the matter. I would be very much obliged if you would give me an outline of what you are going to do and what you want me to do. I am a little confused on this deal as to whether our petition for review to the circuit court of appeals should be by both of us on one petition or not.

Not the least bit fazed by his dual role, the general counsel replied on November 8 with further information and reassurances. He told the employer's attorney to go ahead. Moreover, he said:

> Upon filing of your petition, I would appreciate being advised so that this office can then take action relative to your petition for review, independent of your efforts.

Mr. Denham adds a note of caution by suggesting to the employer's attorney that as to matters "which cannot be disposed of by correspondence, please call upon the personnel in our Seattle regional office." I regret that I cannot enlighten the House as to the nature of the matters "which cannot be disposed of by correspondence." In any case, the employer's attorney was not satisfied with the legal counsel he got from Mr. Denham's field men, and picked up the correspondence again on November 22. He asked the general counsel's advice and help again, and on December 5 received an encouraging reply with an offer of still more help. On December 2, counsel for the employer sent Mr. Denham a copy of his petition for review.

Meanwhile, the attorneys for the union in the case—who had not had the benefit of these exchanges—tried to find out where they stood in the matter. They telegraphed the general counsel on November 23, a query:

> Has general counsel appealed Board decision to circuit court of appeals?

The reply from the general counsel's associate said:

> General counsel has no authority to appeal from the Board's decision. It is understood the company is taking steps to do so.

I leave it to you to decide whether this was a wholly adequate or accurate reply; whether it gives the union the whole picture of the general counsel's role. The general counsel obviously thought so, since he drafted or cleared it in a memo to his associate which I have included in the excerpts from the file.

At this point, after he had been nursing the case along for the drug stores for almost 8 months, the general counsel officially informed the Board that he would do nothing to defend the Board's order in the court. His memorandum of December 8 to all Board members deserves quotation in full:

> As you undoubtedly have been advised, the Haleston Drug Co. of Portland, Oreg., has filed a petition in the court of appeals for the ninth circuit, seeking a review of the Board's action in refusing to take jurisdiction over the above case.
>
> In view of the issues involved in that case it will be impossible for the general counsel or any of his associates or assistants to participate in the defense of the Board's order in this case. We will, however, be quite willing to assign an experienced and competent brief writer to prepare a brief in the matter under the supervision of the Board's solicitor or any other person on the Board's staff whom it may designate.
>
> In all probability, the general counsel will file a brief amicus in this case.—R. N. D.

The Board replied in a memorandum in which it agreed to waive its right to the general counsel's services in preparing a defense of its order in the Haleston case. It went on:

> We note with surprise that the general counsel is thinking seriously of filing a brief amicus in court, presumably in support of the company's position and in opposition to the Board's. We trust that the general counsel, following reflection upon the total inconsistency of such a course with proper governmental practice, will decide to follow it. We should much prefer not to find it necessary to express opposition to such action in court or elsewhere.

To which the general counsel rejoined—December 28:

> Concerning your memorandum of December 12, 1949, it is my thought to supply the court with my position in connection with the Board's attempt to invade the jurisdictional area of the general counsel.
>
> I regard the line of decisions of which the Haleston Drug Co. case is typical, as wholly unwarranted at law and such as to impose a duty on me, both as a statutory officer and as an officer of the court, to place it before the court on the basis of the statute and applicable decisions.
>
> Of course, if the members of the Board resent such presentation and desire to express opposition to it in the court—or elsewhere—

Whatever that may imply—

this is their privilege, I suppose.

I have included in the material on the Haleston case some of the memoranda among staff people at NLRB to indicate what this all meant in the lower echelons.

This summary of the Haleston case file is meant to highlight only one thing: the true meaning of having a two-headed agency. It proves that a fantastic situation exists, in which the general counsel, who is supposed to be the Board's advocate in court, encourages an employer to fight in the courts, a Board decision not yet handed down. The general counsel seems to hold the theory that almost every corner drug store, lunch-room grocery and bar should be subject to the Taft-Hartley law. He knew that the Board specifically disagreed with him in the Haleston case because it had already refused jurisdiction. Yet, all on his own, he issued a complaint on the employer's charge, after extracting a guarantee that the employer would fight the Board in the courts. And what's more, he offered and gave assistance to the employer in the preparation of his appeal to the court.

The public, labor and management are all innocent bystanders who suffer while the Board and the general counsel wage a little dispute of their own. Executives who should be working together, spend their time peppering one another with press releases. Employees who should be part of one direct chain of command find themselves scrapping on one side or the other. All of this in an agency supposed to smooth and reconcile the conflicts of others. It is no wonder that no one who brings a case to the Board can be sure of where he stands. That means endless wasteful litigation.

The depth and sharpness of the clash between the Board and the general counsel in this case seem to me to prove the utter hopelessness of trying to administer any regulatory statute with two so-called independent policy-makers. The trouble is that a prosecutor with unfettered powers does not know when to stop and will even incite litigation against a Government agency to vindicate his views as prosecutor.

The general counsel indicated in his testimony before the Senate committee on this plan that the whole jurisdictional question would be substantially settled by the Haleston case, and one other like it. But I am afraid he is overoptimistic. I think Mr. Styles, a member of the Board was a lot closer to the truth when he called it an inherent difference, and when he explained that the trouble came from the structure of the agency.

When you consider Reorganization Plan No. 12 reasonably, it does not matter whether you are for or against the Taft-Hartley law, for or against the Wagner Act, for or against any other particular measure. It does not matter whether, on any given legal point, you think the Board is right or the general counsel is right. What does matter is that under the present administrative set-up, no labor law can be well-administered. And it was to remedy just such situations that the Hoover Commission was called into being, and it is to remedy it in the NLRB that this plan is submitted.

The general counsel is, naturally, opposed to the abolition of his job. In his Senate committee testimony on this plan, he suggested alternative changes. But in 1949, Mr. Denham appeared before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which was then considering S. 249—Eighty-first Congress, first session, page 1667:

> Senator MORSE. Is it not true, Mr. Denham, if we were not in this situation of divided authority, if we did not have this division of authority and jurisdiction between the general counsel and the Board, that the type of conflict that these memoranda bring out between your office and the Board would, in fact, not exist, because the Board would render the decision?

Mr. DENHAM. You are very right about that, Senator.

It was to end that division of authority and jurisdiction that this plan was drafted. And that brings me to the question of this plan's legality and of whether it is in line with the reports of the Hoover Commission. It has been alleged that this plan represents an illegal effort to change the Taft-Hartley law. It is alleged that Congress never intended the Reorganization Act of 1949 to permit a change in the so-called separation of the powers of the general counsel and the Board. The record certainly does not bear this out.

The legality of plan 12 is established by the language of the Reorganization Act itself, by the legislative background against which it was enacted, and by a comparison with previous reorganization acts. Section 3 of the Reorganization Act of 1949—Public Law 109, Eighty-first Congress, first session—plainly authorizes, first, "the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions, thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency"; second, "the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency"; and third, "the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have any functions." And to eliminate any ambiguity, section 7 of the act spells out the meaning of the term "agency" in a crystal-clear fashion. Among the terms covered are "office, officer, in the executive branch of the Government." It is perfectly plain that the general counsel of the NLRB is such an officer. The Attorney General has judged this, as well as the other plans, to be legal, and I really do not think he had a close question to decide because the statutory language is so clear.

It is alleged by the opponents of this plan that Congress never intended that reorganization plans should overrule previous congressional enactments like the Taft-Hartley law. But the record shows that that is just what Congress did intend. Executive reorganization was proposed in previous laws. But for the very first time since 1939 the intent of Congress in the present law was clearly to put a reorganization law on the books that could apply to every last agency, function, and officer of the executive branch. In its letter to the Congress of January 13, 1949, the Hoover Commission unanimously recommended the enactment of a reorganization law without any exemptions. Among other things, it said:

> Once the limiting and exempting process is begun it will end the possibility of achieving really substantial results. It—
>
> The Commission—
>
> does believe that the safeguard against unwise reorganization plans lies both in a sound exercise of the President's discretion and in the reserved power in the Congress by concurrent resolutions to disapprove any proposed plan.

The same letter specifically argues against the inclusion of languages "intended to prevent the submission of any plan which imposes limitations upon the independent exercise of quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial functions."

The report of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—Senate Report 232, Eighty-first Congress—on the current Reorganization Act stressed the comparison of the 1949 act with previous ones. It pointed out that the new act contained no limitation on reorganizations affecting quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative functions, nor did it exempt any agency. The Senate committee also pointed out that the new statute would have no restrictions on reorganizations of agencies whose status had been defined by law after a given date. That had been done in the 1945 act. It had been done with frank intention of making it impossible to reorganize the RFC back into the Department of Commerce. Congress was fully aware of the restrictive devices which had been in previous reorganization acts; it could have left the Taft-Hartley Act out if it had wanted to exempt it. Actually, it wanted to exempt no agency.

I am content to conclude about the legality of Plan No. 12 by quoting from the testimony of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT before the Senate committee—hearings on Senate Resolution 248, pages 20–21:

> Senator SMITH. Senator TAFT, as I understand it, the general counsel's authority is set up by the Taft-Hartley law. I have some question as to whether the office of general counsel can be abolished in this way, through a reorganization plan, when the Reorganization Act itself says that the repeal of any act of Congress cannot be brought about through it.
>
> Senator TAFT. I don't know. I haven't even considered that.
>
> Senator SMITH. Isn't it a point to consider?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. May I read the statute at that point. Senator, I think this is what you have in mind. The Reorganization Act, section 5, provides: "No reorganization plan shall provide for and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—(and then under subsec. 4, it says) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress."
>
> Senator TAFT. Subsection 4 only forbids the creation of a function not already authorized by the law. In other words, you cannot authorize a new function, that is about all that subsection 4 says.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. This does not authorize a new function, does it?
>
> Senator TAFT. No; it just transfers a function.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. It transfers an existing function that is now provided by law from one officer to another.
>
> Senator TAFT. Frankly, I must say I haven't studied the full scope of the Reorganization Act, but offhand, I do not see any direct legal objection to it.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Of course, there are many other cases under this act where by transferring this or that you change something that was set up as a major policy by the Congress. I don't think there was any intention to allow that. My point earlier was that it is a change in substantive law, and therefore I do not think it is a proper use of the Reorganization Act, but I do not frankly, at the moment see any legal prohibition.

Thus we have the testimony of a leading critic of plan 12 on each of the first two points I raised. According to Mr. Denham's 1949 testimony, there is confusion at the Board which can be cleared up by an end to divided authority. According to Senator TAFT's recent testimony, this plan which is designed to straighten out the authority lines at NLRB is legal. Yet both of these men are adamant in their opposition to the plan. Their major line of argument rests on what I believe to be a totally false and misleading analogy. They allege that there should be a separation of prosecution and judicial functions in the NLRB, reminiscent of what one finds in a court of criminal law. This pitfall was foreseen in the Hoover Commission's letter to Congress from which I have already quoted. In urging the omission of language—which was in the 1945 Reorganization Act—about quasi-judicial functions, the Commission said that—

> The phrases are extremely vague and of uncertain meaning. Ingenious and plausible arguments can be made to apply them to a wide range of functions which should clearly be subject to reorganization procedure.

This is precisely the case with respect to the arguments concerning the so-called need for continued separation of powers between the general counsel and the NLRB. Such arguments start with the unsound premise that the Board needs to be like the judiciary and the general counsel like the prosecutor in criminal actions. That premise shows a failure to understand the reason for the establishment of administrative agencies by the Congress. Moreover, it ignores the great differences between the administrative and the judicial process.

The establishment of an administrative agency to handle labor relations was a conscious congressional policy choice in the full recognition of the inadequacy of the established court system for dealing with them. No law establishing a new agency would have been necessary if this were a matter to be handled by the judiciary. Congress could have proscribed certain practices, attached criminal penalties to violations, and provided for prosecution of alleged violators in the courts. This has certainly been done many times in Federal law.

But the establishment of an administrative agency in the labor relations field created an entirely different way of dealing with labor disputes. Fundamentally, it is not aimed at prosecution for criminal acts; instead it seeks to eliminate the sources of such disputes, and to bring about settlement before conflict disturbs the pattern of desirable industrial peace. The wisdom and success of such a choice is demonstrated by the fact that under both the Wagner Act and under the Taft-Hartley Act more than 93 percent of the charges of unfair labor practices have been adjusted informally before any formal complaint has been issued initiating formal proceedings. Once a dispute reaches the formal complaint stage, industrial peace has vanished and a situation develops which the act is intended to prevent. Even after a complaint has issued, many cases are adjusted until just a very small percentage of the cases require adjudication by the Board itself,

with an even smaller percentage going to the courts.

It must be emphasized that, unlike statutes which define criminal acts and attach penalties, the Labor-Management Relations Act merely gives the Board the exclusive power to issue orders for compliance. Even then the Board has no authority to enforce compliance with its orders. The Board must first look to the courts for enforcement of its orders. If, after the courts affirm a Board order, there is still noncompliance then and and only then does the Board itself even under the present statute undertake a role similar to that of a prosecutor. The Board then attempts to prove contempt of the court's decree—not its own—in order to have the court penalize for failure to comply.

An administrative agency differs from a court both in its purpose and its methods. Any attempt to make the two situations identical misses this basic difference, or tries to confuse the true situation.

The most common error in drawing mistaken analogies between the Board and other agencies involves the Tax Court. It seems to me that Chairman Herzog disposed of this well in his testimony before the Senate committee—page 141, Senate hearings:

> What Congress did when it set up the NLRB to administer the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act was to set up an agency to administer a policy of the Congress of the United States. The Tax Court, so far as I can make out, was not established to enforce a public policy in the public interest. It was simply established to determine the rights of private individuals who under the revenue laws think that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has given them a rather rough deal. * * * The court was set up so the people who did not like what was done by the Treasury Department, who thought that they were compelled to pay too much, or people whom the Treasury Department was going after a little bit harder, would have some tribunal before whom to come.
>
> Let me point this out: The so-called separation admittedly exists between the Treasury Department and the Tax Court. It was really quite necessary in terms of fairness because there the Government is not just an investigator and judge, if that is to be the terminology to be applied to the Board, but the Government in such cases is also the beneficiary or the potential beneficiary. If an excessive tax is collected from an individual, the Government is really the adverse party. I cannot see the analogy at all.

This should not be interpreted as meaning that the NLRB and other agencies do not observe the elements of due process. Attempts to make the two different ways of doing things appear identical either fail to understand this basic difference or try to confuse the true situation. Those are procedural requirements imposed by the basic statute, court interpretations, and the Administrative Procedure Act. Due process has never been construed by the courts to include any special organizational arrangement within an administrative agency. The Supreme Court, in upholding the constitutionality of the Wagner Act, did not find that special organizational requirements are an essential ingredient of due process—and this at a time when the Board's organization was unified as that proposed to be established under plan 12. Said the Court—*NLRB* v. *Jones & Laughlin* (301 U. S. 1, 47–48):

> The procedural provisions of the act are assailed. But these provisions, as we construe them, do not offend against the constitutional requirements governing the creation and action of administrative bodies. See *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Louisville and Nashville R. Co.* (227 U. S. 88, 91). The act establishes standards to which the Board must conform. There must be complaint, notice, and hearing. The Board must receive evidence and make findings. The findings as to the facts are to be conclusive, but only if supported by evidence. The order of the Board is subject to review by the designated court, and only when sustained by the court may the order be enforced. Upon that review all questions of the jurisdiction of the Board and all the regularity of its proceedings, all questions of constitutional right or statutory authority, are open to examination by the court. We construe the procedural provisions as affording adequate opportunity to secure judicial protection against arbitrary action in accordance with the well-settled rules applicable to administrative agencies set up by Congress to aid in the enforcement of valid legislation. It is not necessary to repeat these rules which have frequently been declared. None of them appears to have been transgressed in the instant case. Respondent was notified and heard. It had opportunity to meet the charge of unfair labor practices upon the merits, and by withdrawing from the hearing it declined to avail itself of that opportunity. The facts found by the Board support its order and the evidence supports the findings. Respondent has no just ground for complaint on this score.

Plan 12 would continue to provide the safeguards of due process and at the same time make possible more efficient administration in the field of labor-management relations. As a matter of fact, the Chairman of the Board has indicated that the Board has plans for securing a proper separation of function instead of the kind that now prevails. His views on that are set forth on pages 131–132 of the Senate committee's hearings. Those who oppose this plan out of honest concern for the protection of procedural rights of litigants who go before the NLRB should read that statement. It seems to me that it ought to reassure them completely.

Finally, I should like to say a word about the way this plan fits into the whole reorganization program. Right from the start, from the time when the Hoover Commission first made its report, every effort has been made by those who really advocate administrative reorganization to keep this effort nonpartisan and nonpolitical. But because of the very nature of these reforms, they must arouse opposition from people who feel that the present situations are to their advantage.

Now I believe that the Congress has the downright obligation to study every plan as carefully as possible. I think any Member who, after due deliberation, concludes that a particular plan is ill-advised has a moral obligation to oppose it. But there are now pending in the House and the Senate resolutions to disapprove 10 of the 21 plans recently submitted by the Congress. Needless to say, I reserve the right, as every Member does, to oppose any particular plan. But we must require overpowering proof of unwisdom before we disapprove of this or any other plan.

Above all we must resist those who want efficiency for everybody else, but not their pet little fat-cats. It is up to us in Congress to resist special-interest pressures against the plans to apply the principles laid down in the Hoover Commission reports. The whole purpose here is to scrape the barnacles off all the executive agencies. Naturally, over the years, various groups in and out of Government have acquired vested interests in particular bureaucratic practices. In this case, I think the vested interest of the opposition is in the present unfortunate set-up required by the opprobrious Taft-Hartley Act. That is why these intensely antilabor people have built up this senseless hue and cry against plan 12. If we yield to their pressures—and then if we yield to the pressures of those opposing the other plans on which resolutions have been offered—there will be precious little left of this phase of the President's program. In this regard, I was pleased to receive, about a month ago, a letter from the New York Board of Trade urging me to support all of the plans. They express their unqualified desire that these recommendations of the President become operative.

To summarize, I urge the adoption of this plan because—

First. It would remedy the administrative monstrosity created by the Taft-Hartley law;

Second. It is a completely legal exercise of the powers given the President and Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949;

Third. The plan will leave the way clear for a proper protection of the procedural rights of labor and management in line with good administrative practice;

Fourth. Its adoption will bring us one step closer to the end of the road laid out by the Hoover Commission.

DENHAM AND THE NLRB—PART OF THE CASE FOR PLAN 12

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following excerpts from the Haleston case file of the office of the general counsel of the NLRB. They bear witness to the shocking situation which the President's Reorganization Plan No. 12 will correct. I have discussed their meaning in full in my address on plan 12 which appears above:

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

APRIL 18, 1949.

To: George J. Bott, associate general counsel.

From: Thomas P. Graham, Jr., regional director, nineteenth region.

Subject: Waitresses and Cafeteria Women, Local 305 et al (Haleston Drug Stores), 86–CB–7.

A hearing date was requested April 14, 1949, on the above charge case.

This office has today received a decision on a representation case concerning the same employer, but a different union, in which the Board by a unanimous decision of all

members declined to assert jurisdiction. The commerce facts as stated in the Board's decisions are as follows: [1]

"The employer-petitioner, an Oregon corporation, operates four retail drug stores in Portland, Oreg., at each of which it sells conventional lines of drugs and cosmetics, operates a soda fountain, and prepares and sells medical prescriptions. During the period from January 1, 1948, to December 15, 1948, the employer made purchases for resale totaling $189,157.39 of which approximately 30.15 percent was shipped to the employer directly from points outside the State of Oregon. Approximately 60 to 75 percent of the purchases made within the State was of goods originating outside the State, having been purchased from warehouses engaged in interstate commerce including McKesson & Robbins, Upjohn Co., and Sharpe & Dohme. Sales during the same period totaled $308,011.21, all being made locally at the employer's drug stores."

The representation case hearing provided a full and complete record concerning the material aspects of the employer's business and it is not likely that any additional commerce facts could be obtained in a hearing on the charge.

In view of the Board's decision not to assert jurisdiction over this employer's business with respect to the representation case, we request advice as to whether or not this office should issue complaint and proceed to hearing in the charge case.

T. P. G., Jr.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

MAY 13, 1949.

To: George J. Bott, associate general counsel.
From: Thomas P. Graham, Jr., director, nineteenth region.
Subject: 36-CB-7: Waitresses' Local 305, Cooks' Local 207, Waiters' Local 189, Bartenders' Local 496, Local Joint Executive Board of H. & R. E. I. A. and B. I. L. of A., and Hotel Service Employees' Local 664.

The Board recently dismissed case 36-RM-26, which involved the same parties as does the above-entitled case. In the Board's dismissal it used the following language:

"Without deciding whether or not the employer's operation affects commerce within the meaning of the act, we do not believe that it would effectuate the policies of the act to assert jurisdiction, inasmuch as the employer's business is essentially local in character."

During the general counsel's recent visit to this office, the case was discussed with him, and it is my understanding that, even though there was a dismissal in 36-RM-26, he is desirous of issuing a complaint in 36-CB-7. We have a hearing date of August 16. Complaint will issue, setting the case for hearing for that date.

THOMAS P. GRAHAM, Jr.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

MAY 27, 1949.

To: Thomas P. Graham, Jr., regional director, Seattle, Wash.
From: George J. Bott, associate general counsel.
Subject: Haleston Drug Stores, case No. 36-CB-7.

In reply to your request for advice dated April 18, 1949, and your memorandum of May 13, 1949, please submit, for the general counsel's consideration, a summary of the results of investigation in the above case and the legal theory upon which it is proposed to issue complaint.

In addition, ascertain, evaluate in detail and report the charging company's position with respect to its determination to vigorously pursue the matter beyond the Board's decision in the event that, after hearing, the complaint is dismissed by the Board on the same grounds as it dismissed the company's petition in case No. 36-RM-26.

G. J. B.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 8, 1949.*

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
City.
(Attention Mr. Robert J. Wiener.)

DEAR SIR: My client, Haleston Drug Co., has advised me that in the event the Board refuses to take jurisdiction in the complaint case against the Culinary Workers' Union, that he will appeal the matter to the circuit court of appeals, ninth circuit, and prosecute said appeal to the best of his ability.

Yours very truly,

MASTERS & MASTERS,
By WILL H. MASTERS.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

To: George J. Bott, associate general counsel.
From: Thomas P. Graham, Jr., regional director, Nineteenth region.
Subject: Waitresses and Cafeteria Women's Local 305, et al. (Haleston Drug Stores, Inc.) Case No. 36-CB-7.

Pursuant to your request of May 27, there is attached hereto a summary of investigation which was prepared by the chief law officer. Therein he sets out the theory of the case. Attached to that report is a copy of a letter received from the attorney representing the charging party in this case.

T. P. G.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

JUNE 10, 1949.

To: George J. Bott, associate general counsel.
From: Thomas P. Graham, Jr., regional director, Nineteenth region.
Subject: Waitresses and Cafeteria Women's Local 305, et al. (Haleston Drug Stores, Inc.) 36-CB-7.

This responds to your request dated May 27, 1949.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

Charging party: C. D. Haleston for Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., operating the following drug stores in Portland, Oreg.: The Oregonian Drug Co., the Heathman Hotel Drug Co., the St. Francis Hotel Drug Co., the Commodore Hotel Drug Co.

Charged parties: [1] Cooks Local 207 (Cooks and Assistants Union); Waitresses Local 305 (Waitresses and Cafeteria Womens Union); Waiters Local 189 (Waiters Union and Vendors Auxiliary); Bartenders Local 496 (Bartenders, Card and Pool Room Workers); Hotel Service Local 664 (Hotel Service Employees); Local Joint Executive Board of Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance, and Bartenders International League of America.

FACTS

When the employer was about to open the Oregonian store in September 1948, agents for the cooks and waitresses respectively, asked Haleston to sign a closed shop hiring-hall contract.[2] The contract, in form between the employer and the joint board, would have obligated the employer to extend its provisions to employees over whose jobs jurisdiction was claimed by any of the five constituent locals of the so-called culinary unions allied in the joint board. However, when the contract was submitted, the wage schedules of only the cooks and waitresses were presented and discussed.

Haleston asked for time in which to consider the contract. The waitresses' agent urged an immediate decision in view of an intended meeting with the Central Labor Council on the following Monday.

A week or so later the agents of the cooks and of the waitresses returned, accompanied at this time by the agent of the drug clerks. They again asked Haleston to sign contracts with the joint board and with the drug clerks, and were refused by being told that no employees were yet hired. Thereupon, they caused pickets immediately to appear in front of the storeroom, bearing "unfair" signs over the names of the five culinary unions, and separately over the name of the drug clerks. The picketing has continued and at times has been implemented by the handbilling of patrons and of the public, advertising the employers as "unfair" and not worthy of patronage.

A few days after the picketing began, the employer was cited to appear before the central labor council, to show cause why it should not be listed by the council as unfair. The employer did not appear. The council thereupon declared the employer unfair, and published the name of the employer and the four drug stores on its unfair list in its labor paper circulated to its members, the holders of union house labels, and the public. This declaration by the central labor council was requested by the cooks, the waitresses, the local joint executive board, and by the drug clerks. The unfair listing has continued since it first appeared in October 1948.

In October, the employer filed two RM petitions, naming the drug clerks in one (36-RM-26), and the culinary unions in the other (36-RM-25). When the latter was dismissed because of the noncompliance of the culinary unions with the requirements of section 9 (f), (g) and (h), the employer filed the instant charge against four of them, later amending it to name all five and the Joint Board.

Subsequently, the Board dismissed the petition in 36-RM-26 on the finding that the employer's operations were of an essentially local character, and that the processing of this case would not effectuate the policies of the act.

Apparently, the employer has given no thought to filing a charge against the drug clerks for their activity in attempting to induce the employer to sign their contract.[3] Likewise, no charge has been made against the central labor council for continuing to list the employer as unfair, and thereby lending that sanction to the culinary union's continued efforts to secure a closed-shop contract.

---

[1] Haleston Drugstores, Inc., 36-RM-26.

[1] Not included in the amended charge is the Central Labor Council of Portland and vicinity, and the Drug Clerks Local 1092 (Retail Food and Drug Clerks branch of the Retail Clerks) whose part in the labor dispute is discussed below.

[2] The contract form contained the following clauses:

"2. During the life of this agreement, the employer will not employ in his establishment any person not in good standing in one of the unions.

"3. All new employees shall be secured by the employer through the union offices."

[3] At this time, unless this union continued its activity to a date short of 6 months, such charge would be barred by section 10 (b).

COMMERCE

As indicated above, the Board found in 36–RM–26 that the operations of the employer were insubstantial in relation to interstate commerce.

The employer's disposition to press the instant charge to a hearing on its merits, in the event that the Board adheres to its determination that the operations of the employer are outside the purview of the act, is stated in the attached letter from the employer's attorney to the officer in charge of the Portland office.

THEORY OF ACTION

Section 8 (c) does not relieve the unions of liability, where speech and action—otherwise lawful—is the means used to attain an illegal objective. In *Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (A. & P. T. Co.)* (81 N. L. R. B. No. 164), the Board said:

"As the legislative history of section 8 (c) makes it clear, the statements made by respondents' representatives during the bargaining negotiations were not the expression of 'views, arguments, or opinions'."

In *United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners (Wadsworth Building Co.)* (81 N. L. R. B. No. 127) the Board said "for the reasons discussed above which impel us to conclude that section 8 (c) does not protect the picketing, we find that the provision does not afford any immunity to the 'We don't patronize' list." Also see *Gibony v. Empire Storage & Ice Co. (U. S.)* (23 L. R. R. M. 2505).

The demand for a contract containing clauses which provide for a closed shop and for a hiring hall, was made in bargaining negotiations, and was implemented by the use of economic sanctions—pickets, handbills, and the listing of the employer as unfair. The unions' activities were comparable to the situation in Meat Cutters case cited above where the Board found "by the strike and the negotiations for the illegal closed shop agreement, the respondent violated section 8 (b) (2) of the act." Compare *National Martime Union (Texas Co.)* (78 N. L. R. B. 971); *United Mine Workers (Jones & Laughlin)* (83 N. L. R. B. No. 135).

T. P. G.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

AUGUST 15, 1949.

To: George J. Bott, associate general counsel.

From: Kenneth McClaskey, acting regional director.

Subject: Local 305; Cooks and Assistants, Local 207; Waiters, Waitresses, and Cafeteria Women Local 189; and Bartenders Card and Poolroom Workers Local 496. (Haleston Drug Stores), 36–CB–7.

Attached is a copy of Boyd's memo in this case.

You have already answered his inquiry when you informed us by telephone today that someone connected with the General Counsel's Office in Washington will file exceptions to the trial examiner's action in sustaining the motion to dismiss.

K. M.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

AUGUST 15, 1949.

To: Kenneth McClaskey, acting regional director.

From: Melton Boyd, attorney.

Subject: Waitresses and Cafeteria Women Local 305 et al. (Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., 36–CB–7.

We should ascertain whether this office or Washington will file exceptions to the trial examiner's dismissal of the complaint, if such exceptions are to be filed.

The employer, when informed of the trial examiner's ruling on August 12, indicated his purpose to file exceptions. He is being supported in this proceeding by an Oregon association of druggists, the correct name of which I do not have. It is indicated that they may employ counsel in Washington or to appear before the Board for oral argument on the exceptions, if such oral argument is permitted. It is indicated again that the employer will prosecute an appeal to the United States Court of Appeals, if the Board again rules that the employer's operations are of a local character to which the act should not be applied.

In interviewing the employer I discovered that he failed to put in evidence in the representation case, 36–RM–26, the full picture of his operations. Although the additional information increases the dollar volume, in relation to commerce, his operations are substantially the same percentagewise. The figures testified to in 36–RM–26 reflected operations from January 1, 1948, to December 15, 1948, and applied to the four stores that were in operation on December 15. These did not include the so-called No. 4 store, which operated from January 1 to September 1, 1948. The merchandise in the No. 4 store was transferred to and became the opening stock of the Oregonian store, which opened on September 29. The issue in this case relates to the union's efforts to secure a closed-shop contract at the Oregonian store prior to its opening.

In addition, the employer (a corporation) owned in its entirety a subsidiary corporation which, in turn, operated a sixth store known as the Terminal Drug Store. The dollar volume of its gross sales, and costs of merchandise sold, were not reflected in the figures testified to. A corrected statement of the total operations of the employer is indicated by the tabulation below:

Name of store	Gross sales	Cost of merchandise sold
Heathman	$142,642.99	$96,450.20
Commodore	69,696.05	41,903.59
St. Francis	82,710.01	55,203.24
No. 4 [1]	92,525.99	64,404.91
Oregonian [2]	20,047.26	13,591.68
Total	[3] 400,622.30	[4] 271,553.62
Terminal [4]	77,486.33	52,384.92
Total	478,108.63	323,938.54

[1] Ceased operations Sept. 1, 1948.
[2] Began operations Sept. 29, 1948.
[3] Exact figures.
[4] Ceased operations Dec. 1, 1948.

These additional factors could have been developed in evidence:

The annual dollar volume of retail drug sales in the United States is $3,800,000,000. Oregon does approximately 1.1 percent of this volume, or $40,000,000. The gross sales of the average store unit throughout the country is $76,000 per annum. Oregon is typical in this respect. Haleston Drug Stores averaged around $100,000 per annum, being metropolitan stores. Approximately 25 percent of Haleston's business was fountain business. These sales account for about 25 percent of his purchases, substantially all of which are of local products. Of the remaining 75 percent, 5 percent was drug items produced locally. Of the remaining 70 percent, most of which are trade-name products, that are manufactured in States other than Oregon, Haleston received through three channels—

1. About 30 percent by direct shipment on orders placed to out-of-State firms.

2. A relatively small additional quantity by direct shipment from out-of-State firms on orders placed with local jobbers (these are called drop shipments).

3. A substantial amount (figures not yet supplied) delivered from local warehouses of out-of-State firms having division offices in Oregon; in effect, direct deliveries from out-of-State concerns.

4. The remainder by delivery from local warehouses on orders placed with local jobbers, being products of out-of-State manufacturers shipped to jobbers for resale in Oregon.

Additional incidental factors are as follows:

Many name-brand products sold by Haleston and other druggists are sold to him under dealership agreements. Advertising used by store operators, in window and counter displays, are supplied by manufacturers and tie in with its national advertising and sales-promotion program. Numerous manufacturers pay a direct bonus, or pay it indirectly through the employer, to sales clerks on each item of their merchandise sold during sales-promotion programs. (Usually some such program is going on at all times.) Such retail stores are the principal sales outlets to ultimate consumers of a great volume of products produced admittedly in interstate commerce. These stores are licensed by the Federal Government for the sale of (1) narcotics and, separately, (2) medicinal alcohol.

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 18, 1949.*

Mr. ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DENHAM: I am enclosing herewith a copy of my exceptions to the trial examiner's holding in the Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., case together with motion to reconsider.

Mr. Melton Boyd, of Seattle, talked to me a number of times on the phone and requested that I put in exceptions and motion also.

I wish to further state that we will carry this along if the Board holds against us.

Yours very truly,

MASTERS & MASTERS,
By WILL H. MASTERS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *November 4, 1949.*

Mr. ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DENHAM: I received a copy of the Board's decision on the motion to review in the Haleston Drug Stores, Inc.

It would seem from the footnote in the opinion that the employer was not properly before the Board. That evidently came about by my not having the latest rules and regulations as the one I had had no section 203.27. Evidently the regional attorneys did not know anything about it either as I put in what they suggested.

However, I am writing to you to find out how you wish to handle this matter from here on. Mr. Haleston is very desirous of going ahead and getting a ruling from the court on the matter. I would be very much obliged if you would give me an outline of what you are going to do and what you want me to do. I am a little confused on this deal as to whether our petition for review to the circuit court of appeals should be by both of us on one petition or not.

I would be very glad to hear from you at your very earliest convenience.

Yours very truly,

MASTERS & MASTERS,
By WILL H. MASTERS.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1949.

Mr. WILL H. MASTERS,
Masters & Masters, Attorneys at Law,
Portland, Oreg.

Re Case No. 36–CB–7.

DEAR MR. MASTERS: This acknowledges your letter of November 4, 1949, relative to the above case. Upon the receipt of your letter,

I have discussed the matter with Patrick H. Walker, chief law officer of the nineteenth region, who, fortunately, is in the city at this time.

It has been my understanding that in the event of an adverse decision from the Board, you will, on behalf of your client, seek appeal in the circuit court. Your petition for review should be on your own behalf. Upon filing of your petition, I would appreciate being advised so that this office can then take action relative to your petition for review, independent of your efforts.

If there are further matters about which you would need to consult and which cannot be disposed of by correspondence, please call upon the personnel in our Seattle regional office.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel.

PORTLAND, OREG., *November 22, 1949.*

Mr. ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DENHAM: I have had considerable trouble here in determining how much time I have in which to file a petition for review in the Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., case. I could find nothing in the laws, and no one here seems to know. In accordance with your letter, I talked to your attorneys in Seattle, but they did not know, either.

Fortunately, I was going to San Francisco last week, and I contacted Mr. O'Brien, clerk of the United States Court of Appeals, who has always been the last word on the law down there. He informed me that there was no time specified, either in any of the laws or the rules of their court. Consequently, I am figuring the time for appeal would most certainly be a reasonable time, and am planning to have my petition for review filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth District before the appeal time is up, which I figure is the 1st of December 1949.

I have a couple of other questions also that are bothering me. I called your attorney in Seattle, Mr. Walker, this morning, but he was unable to give me any help. The law provides that after a petition for review has been filed the petitioner shall file with the court a transcript of the entire proceedings certified to by the Board.

I was wondering if you, being on the spot, could take care of seeing that the transcript of record was properly gotten out and seeing that I get it in time to have it filed with the court of appeals within the time specified by them. Mr. Walker was of the opinion that you would do this. However, he was unable to advise whether I was to file a deposit with them to cover any costs.

It seems to me that we would also have to have the record in the other case, Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., and International Retail Clerks, Food and Drug Clerks, Local 1092, AFL, No. 36-RM-26, included in the transcript of testimony, inasmuch as the Board refers to this case as giving the examiner the right to summarily dismiss the matter. I intend to file a petition for rehearing this week and will send a copy to you.

If you could let me know at your earliest convenience about these questions, I would be very much obliged.

Yours very truly,

MASTERS & MASTERS,
By WILL H. MASTERS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *November 23, 1949.*

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD:

Re Waitresses and Cafeteria, Local 305, et al., Haleston Drug Store, Inc., case 36-CB-7, has general counsel appealed Board decision to circuit court of appeals.

GREEN, LANDYE & RICHARDSON,
Attorneys for Unions.

PORTLAND, OREG., *November 28, 1949.*

GREEN, LANDYE & RICHARDSON,
Attorneys.

Re Haleston Drug Co., case No. 36-CB-7, general counsel has no authority to appeal from the Board's decision. It is understood the company is taking steps to do so.

GEORGE J. BOTT,
Associate General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board.

PORTLAND, OREG., *December 2, 1949.*

Mr. ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith is copy of my petition for review of the decision and order of the National Labor Relations Board in the Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., case.

I have also requested the National Labor Relations Board to furnish a transcript of the record to be filed in the court of appeals.

Yours very truly,

MASTERS & MASTERS,
By WILL H. MASTERS.

[Enclosure.]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT—HALESTON DRUG STORES, INC., PETITIONER, V. NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, RESPONDENT—PETITION FOR REVIEW OF THE DECISION AND ORDER THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Comes now, the Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., and pursuant to the provisions of section 10 (f) of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, petitions the Court to review and set aside the decision and order of the National Labor Relations Board made and entered on the 31st day of October 1949, wherein the National Labor Relations Board summarily dismissed the complaint against Waitresses and Cafeteria Women's Local No. 305, Waiters Local No. 189, Bartenders, Card and Poolroom Workers Local No. 496, Coks and Assistants Local No. 207, Hotel Service Employees Local No. 664, and local joint executive board of H. & R. E. I. A. and B. I. L. of A., commonly known as Culinary Workers Alliance, each affiliated with Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL, issued by the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board charging them with an unfair labor practice against petitioner.

Petitioner claims that it is engaged in an operation in commerce or effecting commerce within the meaning of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and, therefore, the National Labor Relations Board must take jurisdiction of the said complaint and does not have any authority to refuse to exercise such jurisdiction.

Dated at Portland, Oreg., this 28th day of November, 1949.

HALESTON DRUG STORES, INC.,
By C. D. HALESTON, *President.*
MASTERS & MASTERS,
By WILL H. MASTERS,
Attorneys for Petitioner.

STATE OF OREGON,
County of Multnomah, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the original petition for review herein.

_____,
of Attorneys for Petitioner.

PORTLAND, OREG., *December 5, 1949.*

Re Waitresses and Cafeteria Women's Local No. 305, et al., and Haleston Drug Stores, Inc. Case No. 36-CB-7.

DEAR MR. MASTERS: This is in reply to your letter of November 22, 1949.

As an aggrieved party's right to petition for review of a final order of the Board, under section 10 (f) of the act, is not limited to any specific time, you need not be concerned on that score. Review may be sought at any time after the issuance of the Board's order.

Within 40 days after the petition for review contemplated by the Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., in the ninth circuit is served upon us, the Board, in accordance with its usual procedure, will certify to the court a complete transcript of the record upon which its order was entered. At the same time a certified copy of the record of the representation proceedings (36-RM-26), of which the Board and trial examiner took official notice in the subject case (36-CB-7), will be mailed to the clerk of the court. All this, of course, will be done without cost to you.

From you letter, however, it appears that the company is considering filing a petition for rehearing with the Board. If you deem it advisable to take this step you may wish to defer filing the petition for review until after the Board has ruled upon the petition for rehearing, inasmuch as the filing of the record in court might have to be delayed until after the Board has acted upon the petition before it.

If I can be of any further service to you, please do not hesitate to contact me again.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

DECEMBER 8, 1949.

To: The Board.
From: Robert N. Denham, general counsel.
Subject: Haleston Drug Co. case.

As you undoubtedly have been advised, the Haleston Drug Co. of Portland, Oreg., has filed a petition in the court of appeals for the ninth circuit, seeking a review of the Board's action in refusing to take jurisdiction over the above case.

In view of the issues involved in that case, it will be impossible for the general counsel or any of his associates or assistants to participate in the defense of the Board's order in this case. We will, however, be quite willing to assign an experienced and competent brief writer to prepare a brief in the matter under the supervision of the Board's solicitor or any other person on the Board's staff whom it may designate.

In all probability, the general counsel will file a brief amicus in this case.

R. N. D.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

DECEMBER 12, 1949.

To: General Counsel.
From: The Board.
Subject: Haleston Drug Stores case.

Thank you for informing us that the company now seeks court review of the Board's decision in the Haleston case.

In view of the special circumstances present in this particular case, the Board members continue willing, to waive the provisions of section IA of the statement of delegation and not to require the general counsel or his principal deputies to represent the Board in court. We suggest that Miss Klaus and Mr. Findling confer soon to select the brief writer who is to work on this case under her supervision.

We note with surprise that the general counsel is thinking seriously of filing a brief amicus in court, presumably in support of the company's position and in opposition to the Board's. We trust that the general counsel, following reflection upon the total inconsistency of such a course with proper governmental practice, will decide not to follow it. We should much prefer not to find it necessary to express opposition to such action, in court or elsewhere.

P. M. H.
J. M. H.
J. J. R., Jr.
A. M.
J. C. G.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

DECEMBER 12, 1949.

To: A. Norman Somers, Esq., assistant general counsel.
From: David P. Findling, associate general counsel.
Subject: Haleston Drug Co., case No. 36–CB–7.

Mr. Denham has advised the Board that "it will be impossible for the general counsel or any of his associates or assistants to participate in the defense of the Board's order in this case. We will, however, be quite willing to assign an experienced and competent brief writer to prepare a brief in the matter under the supervision of the Board's Solicitor or any other person on the Board's staff whom it may designate." Mr. Denham has further informed the Board that "in all probability, the general counsel will file a brief amicus in this case."

In view of the foregoing, it will be necessary to await further instructions and clarification with respect to the names of attorneys who are to appear on behalf of the Board and the handling of correspondence and other communications with respect to this case. In the meantime, it is agreeable with Mr. Denham and Miss Klaus, on behalf of the Board, for Norton Come to be assigned to prepare the brief.

D. P. F.

PORTLAND, OREG., *December 14, 1949.*

Re Waitresses and Cafeteria Women's Local, No. 305, et al., and Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., case No. 36–CB–7.

Mr. ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DENHAM: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 5 concerning the above matter.

As you know, I have filed petition for review with the circuit court of appeals for this circuit and am now only waiting to hear about the transcript of the record. I also requested the Board to get this transcript out.

I thank you for your copy of the Labor Journal containing the article on this subject. I had already received one from Mr. Walker, of Seattle, but as he wanted it returned, I will send it back to him and keep yours.

Thanking you again, I am,

Yours very truly,

MASTERS & MASTERS,
By WILL H. MASTERS.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 27, 1949.

Re Waitresses and Cafeteria Women's Local, No. 305, et al., and Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., case No. 36–CB–7.

WILL H. MASTERS, Esq.,
Messrs. Masters & Masters,
Portland 4, Oreg.

DEAR MR. MASTERS: I have your letter of December 14, 1949.

Your letter of December 2 requesting the Board to certify a transcript of the record of the proceedings in this case to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has also been received. The record now being assembled in the office of the managing attorney will include the representation proceedings (36–RM–26), of which the Board and trial examiner took official notice in the subject case (36–CB–7).

Pursuant to court rule, this record, together with the Board's answer, will be filed by January 16, 1950, 40 days after service upon the Board of your client's petition for review.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

DECEMBER 28, 1949.

To: the Board.
From: Robert N. Denham, general counsel.
Subject: Haleston Drug Co.

Concerning your memorandum of December 12, 1949, it is my thought to supply the court with my position in connection with the Board's attempt to invade the exclusive jurisdictional area of the general counsel.

I regard the line of decisions of which the Haleston Drug Co. case is typical, as wholly unwarranted at law and such as to impose a duty on me, both as a statutory officer and as an officer of the court, to place it before the court on the basis of the statute and applicable decisions.

Of course, if the members of the Board resent such presentation and desire to express opposition to it in the court or elsewhere (whatever that may imply), this is their privilege, I suppose.

R. N. D.

JANUARY 3, 1950.

WILL H. MASTERS, Esq.,
Messrs. Masters & Masters,
Portland, Oreg.:

Re *Halestone Drug Stores, Inc.*, v. *N. L. R. B.*

As stated in my letter of December 27, certified record and Board's answer are due January 16, and arrangements are being made to have them filed in court by that date.

ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel,
National Labor Relations Board.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Date: January 10, 1950.

To: Robert N. Denham, Esq., general counsel.
From: David P. Findling, associate general counsel.
Subject: Haleston Drug Co., Case No. 36–CB–7.

Questions are constantly coming up in connection with details of processing the Haleston Drug case, which the staff are reluctant to answer for themselves because of uncertainty as to your wishes in that regard.

For example, Mrs. Filpowicz's office and Mr. Somers' office clear and handle the conventional correspondence with counsel and with the clerk of the court and with respect to printing the record and briefs. May the staff handle preparation of the record in the usual way, including stipulations with respect to designation of the record, etc.? Normally, this function would be handled by the attorney with the assistance of Mrs. Filipowicz and with clearance through Mr. Somers' office. Mr. Somers normally would sign all appropriate stipulations on behalf of the Board. Another question arises as to whether or not we may certify the record to the court in the usual way and enter the usual appearances. Normally, Mr. Somers would enter his appearance.

Questions also arise with respect to the pleadings. Normally, those are cleared through Mr. Somers' office and he would sign the documents. Is he permitted to do so in this case?

May I suggest that the easiest way of handling the case from our standpoint, and one which we do not believe will prejudice your own position, would be to have the case handled in the normal way up to the point of completion of the brief. We could then omit all names from the brief, if that should be your wish, except Miss Klaus and Norton Come. In that way you would not appear to be participating in the case against your own publicly stated position and at the same time we would avoid all of the trifling inconveniences and nuisances that attempting to process this case differently than any other at the early stages entails.

D. P. F.

Finding: Mechanically, we must supply the facilities, but all appearances—and I think stipulations and correspondence should be by Ida Klaus.

D.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

JANUARY 16, 1950.

To: A. Norman Somers, Esq., assistant general counsel.
From: David P. Findling, associate general counsel.
Subject: Haleston Drug Co., Case No. 36–CB–7.

This is an answer to your request for more detailed instructions with respect to handling Haleston Drug Co. case.

Mr. Denham advises that all appearances, stipulations, and correspondence should be handled over Miss Klaus' signature.

Please arrange for Mrs. Filipowicz to work out the mechanics in these regards with Miss Klaus.

D. P. F.

This case is under sole supervision of the solicitor. GC's office participates in no way—except to supply a brief writer who reports to Miss Klaus.

D.

FEBRUARY 10, 1950.

WILL H. MASTERS, Esq.,
Masters & Masters,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR WILL: I wonder if you have a couple of extra copies of your brief in the Haleston Trucking Co. case that you could mail me. I would very much like to have them to pass on to a couple of people who are very much interested in having them.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 13, 1950.*

Mr. ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 10, 1950, in regard to the brief in the Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., case,

I haven't as yet gotten the brief out as the clerk of the court of appeals hasn't sent me the printed record. I will send you some copies as soon as they are received.

Yours very truly,

MASTERS & MASTERS,
By WILL H. MASTERS.

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include at the end thereof copies of correspondence from the files of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter received from the Vatican by Mrs. Betty Jacobs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GOLDEN, for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, May 11, 12 and 13, on account of official business.

To Mr. JACKSON of California, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

To Mr. ANGELL, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. STOCKMAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHEPPARD, for 30 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1442. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of March 1950, pursuant to Public Law 8 Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1443. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize revision of the procedures employed in the administration of certain trust funds administered by the Veterans' Administration"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 6217. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7534. A bill to amend Veterans Regulations to establish for persons who served in the armed forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 3 years from the date of separation from active service; with amendment (Rept. No. 2030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8235. A bill to amend further the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2032. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6277. A bill to give discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps organized by the War Department under authority of the President of the United States for service during the war with Germany; with amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 597. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6826, a bill to extend the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604) for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2035). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 598. Resolution for consideration of S. 2128, an act to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain royalty-free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2036). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 599. Resolution for consideration of S. 2440, an act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No 2037). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 600. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7764, an act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2038). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3122. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 8456. A bill to provide for the appointment to regular classified positions in the postal field service of certain former war service indefinite regular carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8457. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of heliports on or near Government buildings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 8458. A bill authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to release the trustees of Columbia University, in the city of New York, and the Citizens' Veterans Homes Association of Rockland County, Inc., from obligations under their contracts for operation of veterans' temporary housing project NY-V-30212; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 8459. A bill to provide for a final settlement of individual shares in the tribal estate and assets of the Klamath Indians through voluntary withdrawal from membership in the Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 8460. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8461. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 8462. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 8463. A bill to authorize the sale of certain small tracts of Indian land lying to the south and east of the Tongue River in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8464. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8465. A bill relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 8466. A bill to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and the employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 8467. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 8468. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 8469. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Mount Airy, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 8470. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 8471. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed 5,000 additional copies of serial 14, part 4, of the hearings held before said committee entitled "Study of Monopoly Power," authorized by House Resolution 137, Eighty-first Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 596. Resolution expressing the opposition of the House of Representatives toward any form of world government which would curtail the liberties of citizens of the United States and the independence of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to studying and reviewing the problem of resurgent nazism and communism in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 8472. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Allegretta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:
H. R. 8473. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Tomita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. KING:
H. R. 8474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Safranek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H. R. 8475. A bill for the relief of Forrest Y. Stearns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. RABAUT:
H. R. 8476. A bill for the relief of Aniela Buczek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. STOCKMAN:
H. R. 8477. A bill for the relief of Marcel Rene de Romanett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:
H. R. 8478. A bill for the relief of Bernard Spielmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2117. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions memorializing Congress to study and review the problem of resurgent nazism and communism in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2118. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging study of the problem of resurgent nazism and communism in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2119. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to study and review the problem of resurgent nazism and communism in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2120. By the SPEAKER: Petition of R. A. MacDonald, clerk, Council of the City of Cincinnati, Ohio, endorsing House Joint Resolution 400, which designates an official Smoke Abatement Week in October 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2121. Also, petition of Mrs. Warren S. Currier, recording secretary, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., transmitting resolutions adopted by the Fifty-ninth Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, make us ready, we beseech Thee, on the threshold of each new day to go forth armed with Thy power, seeking on the high road of public office to right wrong, and to overcome evil.

Grant unto us all that, laying aside any partisan divisions, we may be given tallness of stature to see above the walls of our prideful opinions the good of the largest number. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us and in all things to serve Thee bravely, faithfully, joyfully; that at the end of the day's labor, kneeling for Thy blessing, Thou mayest find no blot upon our shields. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 10, 1950, was dispensed with.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in calling the roll be divided equally between the opponents and the proponents of the pending resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In order that we may have some order in the procedure, does not the Senator from Illinois think it would be desirable to agree that someone should allot the time on each side of the question?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I intend to do that as soon as we have a quorum present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Maybank
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Brewster	Hill	Myers
Bricker	Hoey	Neely
Bridges	Holland	O'Conor
Butler	Hunt	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Cain	Jenner	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Connally	Kefauver	Stennis
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Darby	Kerr	Taylor
Donnell	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Douglas	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Leahy	Thye
Eastland	Lehman	Tobey
Ecton	Lodge	Tydings
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Lucas	Wherry
Flanders	McCarthy	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McFarland	Withers
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Green	Malone	
Gurney	Martin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 248) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received a communication from the President of the United States which he asks the clerk to read. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Illinois that the time consumed in reading this communication, which consists of about three pages, be equally divided.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course I do not object to the suggestion of the Chair, but it rather seems to me that the time should be charged to the opponents of the resolution. However, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the communication from the President.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SIGNAL CENTER,
THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 11, 1950.

From: The President.
To: The Vice President.

TEXT OF TELEGRAM TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Understand that the Senate will shortly vote on Reorganization Plan No. 12, relating to the National Labor Relations Board.

Plan 12 will correct an administratively unworkable organizational set-up and will put the procedures of the Labor Board in line with those of all the other independent regulatory commissions. The procedures of the Labor Board are at present a glaring exception to the procedures of the other commissions.

The issues now involved in consideration of Plan 12 are not matters of personalities, neither do they go to the substance of the controversy over the Taft-Hartley Act, as opponents of Plan 12 have attempted to argue.

No group of men could efficiently operate the two-headed freak which the organization of the Labor Board now represents.

The history of this matter leads me to believe that most of the opponents of Plan 12 are more concerned with politics than with the merits of the proposal.

Last year the Senate passed a bill, commonly known as the Taft-Smith-Donnell substitute, which its sponsors said was designed to meet legitimate criticisms of the Taft-Hartley Act. Among the provisions which that bill contained, as passed by the Senate, was one to abolish the office of the independent general counsel of the Labor Board and transfer the functions of the office back to the Board itself. Thus, the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 would have been relied upon to maintain the necessary separation of judicial and prosecuting functions of the Board. That is exactly the object of Plan 12.

On June 29, 1949, Senator TAFT made the following statement on the floor of the Senate in support of the proposal which now appears in Plan 12:

"I believe that the amendments which we have suggested are important. Perhaps the most important one is the elimination of

the independent general counsel. The difficulty which arose with the independent general counsel was that he took a different view of the jurisdiction of the Board than did the Board itself. He would bring a case which he thought was covered by the act. After a year's litigation the Board would rule that it was not covered by the act. In the last analysis the Board determined the results, but in the meantime there was confusion. There was a difference of opinion. There was difficulty in the separation of powers.

"Under the Administrative Procedures Act, which was passed since the passage of the original National Labor Relations Act, the judicial and prosecuting functions are largely separated, although not entirely so. The procedure goes back to the Board. However, we felt that on the whole that separation accomplished the purposes we were trying to accomplish in not having the same people bring the prosecution, try the case, and then judge those whom they themselves had indicted. That was one of the strong protests made by the labor unions, and we felt that it was sufficiently justified to go back to the Administrative Procedure Act and rely upon that for a fair treatment by the Board."

Nothing has happened since June 1949, when Senator TAFT made that statement, to change the need for correcting the existing unsound administrative organization of the Labor Board. In fact, the contrary is the case. The need for change is greater now than it was then.

Plan 12 is in the best interests of sound Government organization and administration. I urge that the Senate give the plan its approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication will lie on the table.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time required for debate on the pending measure be controlled respectively by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me suggest to the Senator from Illinois and to all other Senators that any Senator who wishes to speak on this question should let us know as soon as possible how much time he wishes to have for that purpose. I understand that approximately 3½ hours now remain for the opponents of the resolution and nearly 5 hours for the proponents of the resolution.

The proponents of the resolution will not take more than an hour, so far as I have been able to ascertain. So I hope we may be able to reach a vote on this question not later than 4:30 or 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Ohio, let me say that I think we can accommodate him. I have canvassed the situation among Senators on this side of the aisle, and I doubt that we shall take more than an hour and a half or an hour and three-quarters in the debate.

I do not believe it is necessary to state definitely now the exact amount of time that will be required, for no doubt that can better be determined after observing the developments which occur. However, I think a little later in the afternoon we shall be able to determine the amount of time required.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A little later, when the majority leader ascertains more definitely the amount of time required, I should be glad to have him consider a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote at 4 o'clock on the pending question, in order that immediately thereafter we may consider and then vote on my resolution regarding Reorganization Plan No. 1, which we are perfectly willing to submit to the Senate for debate not to exceed 1 hour in duration, with the time to be equally divided, one-half the time to be controlled by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the other half by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from Virginia that I think we should take up that matter when we have finally disposed of the question now pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that all time now consumed on any subject is part of the 10 hours of debate, and is now under the control of the two Senators, respectively, who have been named as being in charge of the time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I hope the minute or two we take on this matter now will save time later, because it is obvious that we face the fact that 50 Senators voted yesterday to have the Senate take up this measure, and I assume that those 50 Senators will vote in favor of the resolution of disapproval. Therefore it seems to me that any further debate on the question will not result in changing any votes. Consequently it seems rather needless to hold Senators here very long for extended debate in the Senate on this question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not propose to hold any Senator longer than is necessary, but neither do I propose to enter into an agreement now which will have the result of cutting off debate on the part of some Senators who may not be on the floor of the Senate at this time.

I have canvassed Senators on this matter, and I know of five or six Senators who desire to speak on this question. There may be other Senators who will desire to speak on it.

I think that by 5 or 6 o'clock this afternoon we shall be able to determine more nearly the amount of time required.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I allow 20 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, if he wishes to use that much time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before the Senator from Ohio yields to the Senator from Arkansas, I wonder whether the Senator will yield to me sufficient time to permit me to request unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] may be granted unanimous consent to be absent.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] may be excused from attendance at the session of the Senate today and for such other sessions of the Senate as he may be unable to attend because of his illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY 35 SENATORS REGARDING FAR EASTERN POLICY—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make an insertion in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio has control of the time.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator from Ohio to yield time to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I am asking the Senator from Arkansas to yield to me.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, in order that he may make an insertion only.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on May 2, 35 Senators sent to the President of the United States, in a letter addressed to him, a statement of their observations on the development of the far-eastern policy. The letter is as follows:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of the Senate of the United States, respectfully urge that this Government, in the development of a far eastern policy, promptly make clear:

1. We have no present intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China; and

2. We shall actively oppose the move by representatives of the Soviet Union to unseat the representatives of the Republic of China and to extend membership to the representatives of the Communist regime of that country in the United Nations.

We firmly believe that a prompt clarification of our position in this matter is in the national interest.

Sincerely yours.

PAT MCCARRAN, GUY CORDON, KARL E. MUNDT, JOHN W. BRICKER, RALPH E. FLANDERS, CHAN GURNEY, W. E. JENNER, G. W. MALONE, JAMES B. EASTLAND, HARRY DARBY, HARRY F. BYRD, FORREST C. DONNELL, HUGH BUTLER, HENRY C. DWORSHAK, EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, HERBERT R. O'CONOR, CHARLES W. TOBEY, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, STYLES BRIDGES, OWEN BREWSTER, MILTON R. YOUNG, EDWARD THYE, EDWARD MARTIN, ROBERT A. TAFT, KENNETH S. WHERRY, ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, HARRY P. CAIN, ZALES ECTON, HOMER FERGUSON, JAMES P. KEM, ROBERT HENDRICKSON, JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, IRVING M. IVES, JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

On May 5 the President of the United States directed to the Senator from Nebraska a short communication which I should like to read.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield for debate.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall need only 30 seconds to complete this matter.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. The letter from the President reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 5, 1950.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KENNETH: I received the round-table suggestion which you and your colleagues got up and signed on May 2.

It is very thoughtful of you to give me an expression of your opinion on the Chinese situation—it will be carefully considered.

I hope you will place this communication in the records so all your colleagues, who signed the round robin, may understand that I appreciate their interest in foreign affairs.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for yielding me these few seconds, in order that I might make this insertion in the RECORD at this time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to propound unanimous consent, first, that I be permitted to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, consent is granted.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 17 AND 18

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before discusing the pending question, I should like to announce to the Senate that on yesterday two other resolutions of disaproval to pending reorganization plans were filed, namely, Senate Resolution 271, submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to disapprove Reorganization Plan 17 of 1950; and Senate Resolution 270, submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 18. On those resolutions the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold hearings next Tuesday, May 16.

I am asking that all Senators who are interested—all witnesses who may be interested, and the various departments interested are being notified of these hearings—be prepared to present their testimony to the committee as quickly as possible, because I hope and expect to conclude the hearings on both the resolutions in 1 day, by holding morning and afternoon sessions.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, during its consideration of reorganization plans, may be permitted to sit in the consideration of any plan at any time when the Senate is in session, for the purpose of holding such hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 248) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as the Senate is aware, of course, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on April 17, last, reported favorably Senate Resolution 248, which expresses disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950, relating to reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board.

The membership of the committee by a vote of 9 to 4 reported favorably the resolution of disapproval which was submitted by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The effect of the adoption by the Senate of Senate Resolution 248 will be to prevent Reorganization Plan No. 12 from becoming public law on next May 24. I have been informed the recent recess taken by the House from April 6 to April 18 extended by 11 additional days the 60-day period in which either House of the Congress may reject the plan, thus making the effective date May 24.

The action taken by the committee followed the holding of public hearings on April 4, 5, and 6. The testimony of 12 witnesses, who may be regarded as authorities upon the issues involved, was heard. Nine of the 12 witnesses strongly opposed the adoption of the plan, whereas three witnesses favored the plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as a part of my remarks, a list of the witnesses who appeared, both for and against the plan, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Witnesses who opposed the plan are:

1. Hon. Robert A. Taft, United States Senator from Ohio.
2. Robert N. Denham, general counsel, NLRB.
3. Theodore R. Iserman, attorney, New York City.
4. Bethel B. Kelley, Detroit Board of Commerce.
5. James D. Marshall, Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.
6. Lambert H. Miller, National Association of Manufacturers.
7. Gerard D. Reilly, attorney, Washington, D. C.
8. Hoyt P. Steele, executive vice president, Benjamin Electric Manufacturing Co., Des Plaines, Ill.
9. Alexander E. Wilson, Jr., law firm of Wilson, Branch & Smith, Atlanta, Ga.

Witnesses who favored the plan were:

1. Paul M. Herzog, chairman, NLRB.
2. Frederick J. Lawton, director, Bureau of the Budget.
3. Paul L. Styles, member, NLRB.

1. PLAN 12 WOULD NOT ACCOMPLISH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Reorganization Act of 1949, pursuant to which Plan No. 12 was submitted, had as its primary objectives the achievement of economy, efficiency, and improved management in the executive branch of the Government.

It is difficult to see how plan 12 furthers any of these purposes. It was not proved to the committee, through hearings, or otherwise, that the plan will bring about any substantial saving of money. The President, himself, in submitting the plan admitted it "may not in itself result in substantial immediate savings," but predicted "during the next years • • • a reduction in expenditures as compared with those that would otherwise be necessary." Subsequent statements by Mr. Herzog, the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, were equally vague as to economies which might be achieved.

It also requires considerable stretching of the imagination to conclude that greater administrative efficiency would result from adoption of the plan. It should be recalled that the Hoover Commission Task Force, which made an extensive analysis of the NLRB, reported that the chief bottleneck in case handling is the Board, rather than the general counsel or any of his operational divisions. I call attention to the fact that, notwithstanding the bottleneck, this plan would simply place a greater burden on the Board and therefore would possibly increase rather than diminish the existing bottleneck. When it is considered that the heavy burden of case handling at the initial stage will be added to the already overtaxed Board, or its chairman, as well as the supervision of an additional 800 employees of the general counsel's office, who likewise would be transferred under the plan, it is, indeed, difficult to reason that either administrative efficiency or internal management would be improved. To the contrary, it would appear that such extra burdens would produce exactly the opposite result.

No real evidence was presented that inefficiency presently exists in either the NLRB or the counsel's office. Rather the issue before the committee was that conflicts in interpretation of the basic statue, the Taft-Hartley Act, as to their respective functions is the cause of the controversy plan 12 seeks, and incorrectly seeks, to solve.

I may say that those controversies are soon to be settled by the courts. Two cases are now pending in the courts on appeal from the Board, or from the action of the general counsel, which will definitely determine the controversy with respect to the interpretation of the present law and the functions and duties of the general counsel under the law, as well as the duties and responsibilities or the jurisdiction of the Board under it. So I say, Mr. President, that what this plan would seek to correct—and as I have suggested, would seek incorectly to correct—is a problem and an issue which is now before the courts and which will soon be determined.

2. PLAN 12 CLEARLY REPUDIATES A POLICY OVERWHELMINGLY EXPRESSED BY CONGRESS AS RECENTLY AS 1947

The Taft-Hartley Act was enacted by the Congress in 1947 after lengthy debate, by overwhelming majorities in both Houses and over a Presidential veto.

Among the vital issues involved in the Taft-Hartley Act was the separation of the investigative and prosecuting functions of the NLRB from its judicial functions. As we all know, that was one of the strongest objections to the original Wagner Act and to the National Labor Relations Board created by that act. This plan simply means to revert to the

old procedure and to institute again a procedure which was condemned under that practice and under the old law.

Among the vital issues involved in the Taft-Hartley Act was a separation of the investigative and prosecuting functions of the NLRB from its judicial functions. The same issue is involved here, Mr. President. The House bill created an independent Administrator of the National Labor Relations Act, giving him all investigative and prosecuting functions. The Senate bill did not divorce the prosecuting functions from the judicial, but sought to improve the judicial functions of the Board in several ways. The conferees on House bill 3020 adopted a new section, section 3 (d) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which established the office of general counsel. This section set forth the counsel's functions in the following language:

SEC. 3. (d) There shall be a general counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He shall have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board, and shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law.

There was an attempt under this act wholly to divorce from the jurisdiction of the Board the prosecuting functions.

The intent of the Congress with respect to the independence of the general counsel from the NLRB was made unmistakably clear in the statement of the managers accompanying the conference report. This is what the conferees said was what they intended the law to do:

The general counsel is to have general supervision and direction of all attorneys employed by the Board (excluding the trial examiners and the legal assistants to the individual members of the Board), and of all the officers and employees in the Board's regional offices, and is to have the final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by, the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board. He is to have, in addition, such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law. By this provision responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual, who is ultimately responsible to the President and Congress.

This conference report was accepted by the House on June 4, 1947, by a vote of 320 to 79; by the Senate on June 6, 1947, by a vote of 54 to 17.

Thus, the conviction of Congress, in enacting the Taft-Hartley Act, that the investigative and prosecuting functions of the NLRB should be distinctly separated from its judicial functions, is clear.

Plan 12—beyond successful refutation—repudiates this policy. It transfers the powers of the general counsel to the National Labor Relations Board or its Chairman, thus destroying the separation of functions which the Congress established less than 3 years ago, and it abolishes the general counsel.

Nothing has occurred in my judgment since enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act which warrants this reversal of congressional policy on such a significant issue.

As I said a moment ago, the issue will soon be settled by the courts, and thereafter both the Board and the counsel will have the guide of the judiciary as to what their respective functions are and how to proceed under them.

The clear-cut separation of the investigative and prosecutory functions from the judicial functions of the National Labor Relations Board is just as important to the welfare of the country today as it was 3 years ago. It is just as important to have those functions separated, under the peculiar working and responsibility of this agency, as it is to have those functions separated in a court of law.

No fair-minded person can contend with reason that the Hoover Commission at any place in its reports recommended abolition of the office of general counsel of the NLRB. As a member of that Commission, I can assure Senators that it was not the intent or purpose of the Commission to recommend that the office be abolished or its functions transferred to the NLRB. I also will state that had that been its purpose, or had the majority of the Commission so recommended, there would have been a most vigorous dissenting report written, and I would have written it. I do not know who else would have joined with me, but such a dissenting report would have been filed.

Aside from my firm convictions as to the Commission's purpose in that matter, we have but to refer to the recent statement by former President Herbert Hoover addressed to the author of the current resolution of disapproval, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. With the permission of the Senator from Ohio I shall read the statement, which is part of the committee's records:

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I have your inquiry as to the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government as to the counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. So far as I recollect, this subject was never discussed by the Commission. There is no recommendation in the Commission's reports to Congress.

HERBERT HOOVER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TAFT. I yield five more minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. According to a memorandum which I have here, the Hoover Commission itself recommended that "all administrative responsibility be vested in the chairman of the commission."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; that is a general recommendation, of course. As a general principle, that would be true. But I was going to comment a little further as to the telegram from former President Hoover, and my recollection of what occurred——

Mr. LUCAS. Right along that line, as I understand, the Hoover Commission also said:

The existence of such an office (i. e., the general counsel), independent both of the Federal department structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; but insofar as the Hoover Commission making any recommendation about it is concerned, I say it did not. At the time it was presented in the hearings my recollection is that the Hoover Commission positively took no action. I also refer my colleague to other Senators, including the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who served on the Commission. Our recollection about the matter is the same, except that former President Hoover says he does not recall that it was ever discussed. I think I recall one occasion when the subject was broached. My recollection is that the Commission agreed that this was substantive law and, therefore, it involved a policy which Congress had fixed, and it was not the function or the jurisdiction of the Reorganization Commission, established to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, to try to interfere with the prerogatives of the Congress in fixing national policy.

That is the position which the Hoover Commission took, without a record vote. That is why there is nothing presented as a recommendation from the Hoover Commission on this subject. We felt that it was a law which the Congress had enacted as a policy, and, therefore, it was not within the prerogatives of the Hoover Commission to undertake to tell the Congress how to change its policy.

Most exhaustive search of the Hoover Commission's reports—both the Commission's final reports and the task force staff reports—fails to reveal any basis whatsoever for plan No. 12's major purpose, that of abolishing the NLRB general counsel. Basis exists for some other provisions of the plan, but not for abolition or transfer of the general counsel.

To the contrary, it recommended creation of a special council of labor under chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor, in which the general counsel and other Federal officials concerned with labor problems would be included.

For the reasons outlined above, and for other equally important reasons which I am certain will be forcibly presented in debate which will follow, I can reach no other conclusion than that Reorganization Plan 12 should be rejected.

Mr. President, as I conclude, I wish to invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to my thoughts about the question. The congressional-declared

purpose of the whole reorganization authorization is to bring more efficiency and greater economy into the Federal Government. It is my judgment, after study of many of the plans which are being submitted to us, that many of them tend more in the direction of centralizing power in the executive branch of the Government than they do in the direction of reorganizing the executive branch for the purpose of obtaining greater efficiency or economy. That is what this plan does. It centralizes power by placing all the investigative, prosecution, and judicial functions of a board which will have tremendous powers over the life of the economy of this Nation in one agency. The prosecuting functions and the judicial functions should be separated, in keeping with our American principles and traditions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 10 or 12 minutes to the senior Senator from New Jersey.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before I address myself to Senate Resolution 248, with the consent of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I wish to address myself for about a minute and a half to a matter which I think is of great importance to this body.

Yesterday the President affixed his signature to S. 247, the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. This is a matter of such importance that I desire to make a brief comment.

It is profoundly gratifying that the long effort to establish a National Science Foundation has thus been brought to a successful conclusion. This enactment is a historic milestone in the encouragement of basic scientific research, which is so vital to the welfare and safety of the American people.

Our experience during the recent war made clear the tremendous need for a larger number of researchers, and a much greater amount of first-class work, in fundamental science as distinguished from applied science. We found that while America stood unsurpassed in the application of scientific truth, and in the development of weapons and techniques, we, as a people, had never devoted a comparable effort to the search for fundamental scientific truth, from which all our techniques and machinery must be derived. The most dramatic example is atomic energy, a fantastic force for peace as well as for war, which we developed on the basis of discoveries made largely in other countries by such great scientists as Albert Einstein and Enrico Fermi. Dr. Einstein is now living in this country and is a resident of Princeton, where I live.

In my judgment this is the sort of problem which government can legitimately help to solve. The pursuit of fundamental science is not profitable from a short-range, dollars-and-cents point of view. Our universities have been doing a good deal of excellent work in these basic fields, but it is not enough because they are short of funds, and it is not well coordinated. Some Government agencies also have been doing good work, but this also is not well coordinated from the point of view of the security and welfare of the whole Nation.

The National Science Foundation Act is directly intended to meet this problem. Within a relatively small budget, it is authorized to grant scholarships and fellowships which will train young students in the basic sciences, and to let contracts for the carrying on of basic research projects by private groups such as universities, industrial concerns, and independent foundations. It is also directed to evaluate the work which is already being done both in Government and privately, and to coordinate its activities with these other projects so that the gaps will be effectively filled in. Its ruling body will consist of 24 private citizens, eminent in the sciences and in public affairs.

Except at the specific request of the Secretary of Defense, the Foundation will not engage in the development of weapons, and it is anticipated that only a very small part of its work will be of a secret nature. I wish to emphasize that in all matters where secrets may be involved the act sets up safeguards which were very carefully developed during the conference between the two Houses of Congress. I am satisfied that these safeguards will very effectively protect our national security without unduly curtailing freedom of scientific inquiry.

In a larger sense, the National Science Foundation will itself play a great part in promoting our American security, as well as our welfare. Without in any way limiting the free initiative of private citizens, it will make possible a steady advance in the search for those fundamental secrets of nature which are so important for the safety, health, and well-being of us all.

Mr. President, the Senators on both sides of the aisle with whom I had the honor to join in sponsoring S. 247 and its predecessors in the Eightieth Congress, S. 526 and S. 2385, are as follows: The Senator from Utah, Mr. Thomas; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Cordon; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Kilgore; the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Saltonstall; the Senator from Washington, Mr. Magnuson; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright; and the former Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Revercomb. These Senators, along with their opposite numbers in the House of Representatives, deserve the thanks of all of us for their contribution to the advancement of science in the United States.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 248) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to explain why I intend to support Senate Resolution 248 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950.

In the first place, this plan has been presented to the Congress under false colors as a purely administrative reform sanctioned by the report of the Hoover Commission. The fact is that the Hoover Commission made no recommendation to abolish the office of the general counsel. The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report has specifically and quite properly stated that plan 12 "raises issues which are not wholly organizational, but are matters of national, political, and economic policy. Any possible doubt as to whether the general recommendations of the Hoover Commission were intended to support the changes proposed by plan 12 must certainly be completely dispelled by Mr. Hoover's telegram of April 4, 1950, to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and by the testimony of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who served as a member of the Commission, as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out.

Mr. Hoover, in his telegram, says:

> So far as I recollect this subject was never discussed by the Commission. There is no recommendation in the Commission's report to Congress.

In the same connection, during the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] made the following positive assertion:

> I know that it was not the purpose of the Commission to recommend that this office—

That is, the office of the general counsel—

> be abolished.

I may add that I conferred in person with Mr. Hoover about this matter and he fully confirmed the foregoing statement. In light of these statements, I do not think there can be any further doubt on this point. We are being asked to change an existing legislative policy by the special procedures of the Reorganization Act of 1949. This, it seems to me, is entirely improper, aside from the merits of the question.

Mr. President, I am quite willing to concede that the present arrangement under the Taft-Hartley Act for the separation of functions between the general counsel and the National Labor Relations Board is not adequate and has not worked out successfully. In the dynamic and delicate field of labor-management relations we are constantly striving to find the legislative pattern which will be most conducive to industrial peace and justice. In 1947 we heard convincing testimony that under the Wagner Act the decisions of the Board were inevitably colored by the fact that the Board was responsible for directing the prosecution of the cases which, in the last analysis, it was called upon to decide. In other words, it was acting as both prosecutor and judge. We therefore worked out a separation of functions which we hoped would correct this deficiency and would bring the administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act in line with our traditional insistence that responsibility for prosecution and judgment should not reside in the same body. That is the whole issue here. Prosecution and judgment should not be vested in the same body.

It now appears that the arrangement we adopted has resulted in unfortunate conflicts between the general counsel

and the Board. There is disagreement, for instance, over the scope of the Board's jurisdiction. It has been pointed out also that the general counsel may exercise important policy-making power through his decision, from which there is no appeal, that an unfair labor practice complaint is not warranted in a specific case. I think we should correct these evils. Perhaps it would be desirable to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act to clarify the power of the Board to decide the scope of its jurisdiction, and to hear appeals from the general counsel's decision to refuse to issue an unfair labor practice complaint. In my judgment, however, in the process of correcting these defects it is both unnecessary and undesirable to throw out the window the separation of prosecuting and decision-making responsibilities that is so fundamental to the democratic process.

It also seems abundantly clear that the proper solution to these problems is not to revert back, as plan 12 proposes, to the previous set-up under the Wagner Act which the Labor-Management Act was designed to correct. We tried to correct the defects of that act. If we have not corrected them properly, let us try again to correct them.

I am convinced that as a legislative policy—and that is what we are discussing here—whatever solution is decided upon should be the result of careful consideration by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and by the Senate as a matter of legislative policy, rather than under the cover of a reorganization plan that is clearly disowned by the very body from which it is purported to originate.

I am advised that legislation has been introduced looking to the correction of the difficulties in the present act, and I understand it will be given consideration shortly by our committee. I am very much interested in it, and I hope to have a hand in developing the right kind of set-up for the difficulties which are being encountered. The way to correct them is not to revert to the procedure provided by the Wagner Act, under which trouble arose.

In summary, Mr. President, I shall support Senate Resolution 248 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12 because this plan is not in accord with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission; because this plan does away with the separation of functions that is essential to the just administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act; and because any defects in this act should be corrected only after careful consideration by the proper committee and by the Senate as a matter of legislative policy.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I must take such sharp issue with my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Inasmuch as my remarks are to be comparatively brief, I shall not yield until their conclusion, in the event any question may be raised by any Member of the Senate.

Whether by design or otherwise, Reorganization Plan No. 12 appears to have been the victim of a great deal of misinformation. Let me cite five conspicuous instances of the resultant misunderstanding regarding it.

In the first place, statements that plan No. 12 is an attempt to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act are utterly without foundation in fact. If adoption of this proposal were to repeal that act, then the adoption of most reorganization plans would repeal the laws to which they relate.

In the second place, while plan No. 12, as has been pointed out, is not one of the Hoover Commission recommendations, it nevertheless does not conflict with the principles and policies enunciated in those recommendations or with any of the recommendations themselves. As a matter of fact, both the staff report of the Hoover Commission's Task Force Committee on Independent Regulatory Commissions and that committee itself in criticizing the present functioning and operation of the National Labor Relations Board and the independent general counsel, have indicated the need for corrective action along lines which are not in conflict with plan No. 12. Indeed, plan No. 12 implements these suggestions by the task force committee and its staff and does conform in principle to the Hoover Commission's recommendations with respect to other regulatory agencies.

In the third place, plan No. 12 is not illegal. In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] himself stated that he did not question the legality of the plan. Furthermore, no witness appearing before the committee indicated his belief that it is illegal.

To be sure, the general counsel in his testimony expressed apprehension over the confusion which might arise if the plan were to be adopted and then subsequently thrown out by the courts. In this connection, however, I am constrained to observe that a similar situation existed when the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted and will almost surely occur again whenever there is substantial revision in our National Labor Relations law. If we are to refrain from amendment or change in the law in order to avoid litigation, then no revision worthy of the name will ever be undertaken.

In the fourth place, contrary to some allegations, under plan No. 12 all the National Labor Relations Board's power would not be concentrated in the Board's Chairman. This plan, in brief, and as has been stated in this debate, abolishes the office of the present independent general counsel and transfers his policy-making functions to the Board and his executive and administrative functions to the Chairman of the Board. That is what the plan states.

In the fifth place, during recent weeks a great deal has been written and said about the judge-jury-prosecutor functions in the Taft-Hartley Act, and one might be led to believe that these constitute all of its functions. Actually in this act there is comparatively little of the judge-jury-prosecutor relationship.

As many know, the act provides for a Labor Relations Board of five members and an independent general counsel. The function of the Board is to handle representation cases, sometimes involving elections, and to render final decisions in unfair-labor-practice cases which are appealed to it after the presentation of the facts by the general counsel. The function of the general counsel is to issue complaints in such unfair-labor-practice cases as he believes involve a violation of the law.

In the matter of representation cases, the Board's jurisdiction is final and its action in refusing to consider these cases in the first instance is also final. Insofar as unfair-labor-practice cases are concerned, the action of the general counsel in refusing to consider such cases in the first instance is final. There is no appeal from either of these agencies of Government in these particular circumstances.

The only instance where the judge-jury-prosecutor situation arises is in the matter of appeals to the Board from decisions in which complaints have been issued by the general counsel after the general counsel has agreed initially to prosecute the cases. This area of relationship between the two, although it has attracted considerable attention because of a number of controversies which have arisen, is comparatively limited.

The fact of the matter is that the general counsel himself, in his decision to prosecute, or to refuse to prosecute, unfair-labor-practice cases, as an individual is exercising much more completely and to a far greater extent the judge-jury-prosecutor function than is evidenced in the relationship between himself and the Board. And as for the Board, this body in turn in its own decisions regarding the consideration of representation cases is also exercising much more extensively the judge-jury-prosecutor function than is evidenced in its relationship with the general counsel. In fact, all this talk about the transcendent importance of the judge-jury-prosecutor functions as they pertain in the relationship between the Board and the general counsel is an enormous exaggeration.

These are among the reasons why in 1947 the labor relations bill originally passed by the Senate did not provide for this kind of separation of activity, but called instead for such segregation of functions as might be necessary to conform to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. This act requires the separation of functions in all administrative agencies to prevent a violation of the judge-jury-prosecutor principle.

Indeed, never has the Senate passed a labor relations bill of its own which provided for any such separation of powers as is required by the Taft-Hartley Act.

It may be recalled that the Taft bill, which was passed by the Senate last June, contained no such separation and its provisions dealing with this matter were very similar to those in the Senate bill of 1947. In truth, the procedures which would have been adopted by the Board under the terms of either the 1947 Senate bill or the 1949 Taft bill almost surely would be the same as those which would be adopted by the Board under the terms of Reorganization Plan No. 12.

What is at stake in this particular controversy over plan No. 12 is not the reduction or the elimination or the abolition of functions. Neither is it primarily a question of the separation of powers by statute. This plan is aimed to correct a very unfortunate condition occasioned by very poor draftsmanship in the Taft-Hartley Act, which was the product of conference action in 1947 and which, due to its ambiguity and inadequacy, has occasioned a great deal of confusion and conflict between the National Labor Relations Board and the general counsel and—most unfortunate of all—in the minds of the parties coming before the Board or the general counsel.

It happens that, in his selection of a general counsel, the President named a person who has appeared sometimes to be more friendly to management than to labor. But there is no assurance that another general counsel would not be friendly to labor and hostile to management. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that the personality of the present general counsel is among the least important of the factors in the consideration of plan No. 12.

Criticism has been directed against the present Labor Relations Board set-up because of its dual-headed nature. From the standpoint of efficient and effective administration, the justification for this criticism would appear to be obvious.

As I see it, however, the idea of dual-headed administration in this particular agency is most undesirable for reasons of far greater consequence than is the matter of administration itself. The whole concept of thus separating the prosecuting and adjudicating functions of the National Labor Relations Board—even to the limited extent to which the judge-jury-prosecutor relationship exists at the present time—is fundamentally hostile to the attainment of sound and satisfactory labor relations. By this process, labor and management are automatically set apart by law as naturally antagonistic forces in a set-up which legalizes their status of litigants in all labor-relations controversies. This separation of functions by inviting formal litigation acts to cripple the very force in labor relations which can contribute most to their improvement—the force of mediation.

This is one of my chief reasons for objecting to the present National Labor Relations establishment. It is one of my chief reasons for favoring Reorganization Plan No. 12. It is one of my chief reasons for objecting to the two-headed agency which would be created under the terms of S. 3339, which has been introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

If, as permanent policy, we are to accept the idea that there must be perpetual conflict between management and labor—which I deny—then neither the present set-up in the National Labor Relations Board nor the proposal offered by the Senator from Ohio is suitable. If in this country we have reverted to a condition where, insofar as the attainment of a happy relationship between labor and management is concerned, we must despair, then a system of labor courts with all the attendant prosecuting and other essential machinery and procedures should be established.

Right now, in the attitude of many opposed to plan No. 12, is evidenced at least a subconscious feeling that a basic antagonism and conflict between labor and management must be permanent. The very thought, as expressed by some, that the adoption of plan No. 12 would be a victory of labor over management is preposterous. I deplore this attitude. It augurs no good for the future of labor relations in our country.

For all of these reasons I favor Reorganization Plan No. 12 and oppose Senate Resolution 248.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the pending resolution to set aside Reorganization Plan No. 12. In my opinion plan No. 12 provides the best immediate method for putting an end to the unique administrative chaos in which the National Labor Relations Board is now operating.

The sponsors of the pending resolution would have the Senate believe that plan No. 12 is an exceptional plan, designed to set aside the expressed will of the Congress. Actually plan No. 12 is merely one of the seven proposed by the President to increase the administrative efficiency of the seven principal regulatory commissions of the Federal Government. The changes proposed for the National Labor Relations Board are admittedly more sweeping than those proposed for the other commissions, but that is only because the need is greater. A stronger remedy is required because the disease of administrative disorder is more serious in the National Labor Relations Board than in any of the other commissions and boards.

Four years' experience as lieutenant governor and 10 years as Governor of New York have taught me that efficient government management is possible only when the government structure is so arranged as to reduce to an absolute minimum the sources of internal friction and to establish clear lines of authority and responsibility within every administrative agency.

The hearings before the Committee on Expenditures are replete with evidence that the split in functions at the National Labor Relations Board has magnified many times the already great difficulties of administering the Taft-Hartley Act.

The question of sound administration has nothing to do with the substantive provisions of the present act. This same chaos would exist if the present administrative arrangement had been part of the original Wagner Act. Indeed the administrative monstrosity inherent in dividing the responsibility between the office of the general counsel and the Board, itself, is an evil separate and distinct from the question of the wisdom or lack of wisdom in all the other provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It has been asserted in some quarters that President Truman's action in proposing plan 12 is motivated, not by his interest in governmental efficiency, but by a desire to satisfy the criticism that labor organizations have directed at the present incumbent in the office of general counsel. Such an argument strikes me as very naive. It seems clear to me that the President has shown a deep sense of obligation to the responsibilities of his high office by proposing plan 12 at this particular time. If he had any motive other than the improvement in general administrative efficiency—if his motives were political—the President's easiest course would have been to leave the present structure exactly as it is, so as to permit existing resentment against the Taft-Hartley law to increase between now and November.

But President Truman has not permitted such considerations to affect his judgment. Instead, by proposing structural changes which will immediately increase efficiency in the administration of a statute which he has never favored, he has met his obligations as President, letting the political chips fall where they may.

Had the President failed to propose plan 12, he would indeed have been subject to criticism for leaving the National Labor Relations Board out of a reorganization program which he has proposed for every other important regulatory commission. He would then have disregarded the basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission that the structure of all commissions be changed so that "all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman."

This arrangement proposed by the Hoover Commission cannot be achieved at the National Labor Relations Board, as it can at the other commissions, by simply transferring to the Board Chairman those administrative and housekeeping functions now vested in the Board as a whole. Many of the existing functions of the independent general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board must also be transferred—the substantive functions to the Board as a whole, and the purely administrative ones to the Chairman—before there can be achieved a sound administrative structure.

Of course this involves a substantial reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board. But what is the purpose of the Reorganization Act, under which we are now considering plan 12, if it is not to reorganize?

It is true, of course, that the Hoover Commission did not specifically recommend the elimination of the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. But neither did the Hoover Commission make such specific recom-

mendations with respect to any regulatory commission or any Government department. The affirmative proposals of the Hoover Commission—and I am proud to be a member of the advisory board of that Commission—are largely general. The important fact remains, and it cannot be successfully denied by those who seek to complicate the issue, that the reorganization measures set forth in plan 12 will bring the National Labor Relations Board in line with the other Federal commissions. Thus plan 12 is entirely consistent with the basic purposes of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

The Hoover Commission task force headed by an outstanding citizen of my State, Mr. Owen D. Young, was extremely critical of the position of the independent general counsel. Following is what the task force says in its discussion of this subject:

> Another problem that has caused us considerable concern is the position of the general counsel. As indicated above, he is a prosecutor, an administrator, a policy maker. The incumbent, Mr. Robert Denham, has noted that his powers "are broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency." (Quoting from a speech of General Counsel Denham before the American Bar Association in 1947.)
>
> The existence of such an office, independent both of the Federal departmental structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility.
>
> Such an official is in a peculiarly exposed position. In view of the wide powers of the office, it is inevitably subject to heavy pressure from all sides, and lacks the protection of either a multiheaded agency or an executive department in resisting such pressures.

Later in its report, the task force states that—

> Our conclusion is that the present position of the general counsel is an unstable one.

Indeed, Mr. President, in June of last year, as has been repeatedly pointed out, the United States Senate, under the strong urging of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], approved a bill which would have abolished the independent office of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. The senior Senator from Ohio did not, at that time, regard this particular change in the Taft-Hartley Act as an incidental or improper one. In describing the changes he proposed at that time, he said:

> Perhaps the most important one is the elimination of the independent general counsel.

Mr. President, events in recent months, as recounted in detail by the five National Relations Board members in testimony before the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, and as summarized in the minority views of the committee, make it perfectly clear that the situation on the National Labor Relations Board has grown progressively worse. No one, including the general counsel himself, has offered any testimony to show that these difficulties have been eliminated.

Differences between the National Labor Relations Board and the general counsel concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction over small business, differences over the processing of cases in the courts, and over the supervision of Board personnel, have grown sharper during recent months. Surely this is not the time for the Senate to recede from a position which it took less than a year ago.

Although the President submitted plan 12 as one of a series of proposals to reorganize the executive branch of Government, the opponents of this plan have seen fit to debate this issue as if it were an isolated attack on the office of the general counsel of the NLRB. The junior Senator from New York is ready to argue the case on that basis, too. It is clear, Mr. President, that this is not a partisan issue. The stand of my colleague from New York [Mr. IVES] and of other Senators on both sides of the aisle bear witness to this fact.

On this issue, I ask the Members of the Senate why the elimination of the independent office of the general counsel, which was thought so suitable in 1949, should not be viewed with equal favor in 1950. Can it be because last year this change was recommended by the Senator from Ohio, whereas this year it is proposed by the President of the United States?

Mr. President, the real issue today is the attitude of Congress on the administrative process itself, a process which has been endorsed by the people of the United States ever since the Interstate Commerce Commission was established in 1887. One witness who opposed plan No. 12 before the Committee on Expenditures was frank enough to declare that this was the issue.

I agree with him that congressional endorsement of present administrative arrangements at the National Labor Relations Board would be an open invitation to chip away at the administrative process throughout the Federal Government. This witness, representing the National Association of Manufacturers, said with commendable candor, that—

> The present separation at the National Labor Relations Board could stand as a testimonial for its extension throughout Government agencies.

Does Congress wish to give such testimonial, Mr. President?

The junior Senator from New York certainly does not. He prefers to take his stand with Monsignor John P. Boland, whom he had the honor to appoint as the first chairman of the New York State Labor Relations Board in 1937. Commenting upon similar proposals for splitting the functions at the State board, Monsignor Boland said, in addressing the Holy Name Society in March 1942:

> When my colleagues and I were appointed to administer the Labor Relations Act, we were appointed to do just that: to administer the Labor Relations Act. By now it should be clearly understood that we were not appointed to prosecute or to judge employers or unions. There was a time when some persons misconceived our function. Ignoring realities, they imagined that the Board combined the functions of prosecutor and judge and declared that these functions should not be combined in a single agency.
>
> Actually, it is not possible for the Labor Relations Board to be both prosecutor and judge, for the simple reason that it is neither prosecutor nor judge. It is only one of many administrative agencies. It merely enforces a public right, because the State legislature has found that there is a paramount public interest in collective bargaining which cannot be either adequately protected by private lawsuit or wisely encouraged by criminal prosecution.

That is my attitude on this question, Mr. President. I think the present setup at the National Labor Relations Board is impossible administratively and dangerous in principle. It is a threat to orderly government. It represents total misinterpretation of the functions of the NLRB and of its general counsel. The function of the National Labor Relations Board, under even the Taft-Hartley Act, is theoretically to stabilize relations between labor and management. The effect of this arrangement is to provide, within the same act, two separate bodies with two separate and conflicting purposes. Let us reject the pending resolution and give our endorsement to plan 12.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, as all of us in this Chamber know, the report of the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government has almost universal popular support. Indeed, almost all Members of the Congress have pledged themselves to support it. Almost all of us have said that we would work for reorganization.

Former President Hoover has, I think, performed a great service by making government reorganization respectable—at least, respectable with the public, Mr. President.

The Hoover recommendations seem to me to be not only clear and unequivocal on the question of vesting administrative responsibility in the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, but, more important—indeed, far more important—these recommendations seem to me valid and sound.

The task force report says that the position of the general counsel has caused them "considerable concern." They quote Mr. Denham's statement that his powers are—quoting now from the task force report—"broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency."

Mr. President, the very persons who have organized to bring pressure upon us to defeat this proposed reorganization plan, claim they fear a grant of power far less than this to the Chairman and the Board.

When I was appointed to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I looked forward to the opportunity to vote for the various reorganization plans because I felt that their adoption would clear up some of the chaos and confusion. I thought

there was a determination in the Congress to eliminate at least some of the inefficiency of the executive branch of the Government.

I have now discovered, of course, that this broad support seems to be limited to the general principle only. It bogs down—as the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is so well demonstrating—when our pet projects are touched.

Of the 21 plans submitted by the President to Congress, at least 12 are being opposed by special-interest groups. Those of us who serve on the committee are seeing a veritable parade of pious witnesses adopting the line of—

We are all in favor of reorganization, yes. Go on out and reorganize everybody—everybody except me.

Of course the Congress knew when it passed the Legislative Reorganization Act that many groups would descend upon it to demand changes in the reorganization proposals, in line with their own selfish interests as they saw them. During its work, the Hoover Commission itself was subject to such pressures. It is to the great credit of ex-President Hoover that his firm leadership withstood these pressures. Today it is our turn, here in the Senate, to stand up and be counted. Yesterday ex-President Hoover expressed to us his deep alarm. Today we are voting on a reorganization plan which has been considered fully by ex-President Hoover's Commission. Pages 134 to 141 of the task-force report on regulatory agencies make this very clear. I shall, of course, support Reorganization Plan No. 12, as I shall support every one of the present 21 reorganization proposals.

I digress to salute the New York Board of Trade, Mr. President, and the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Connecticut and elsewhere, as outstanding examples of business groups which have understood the issues, which have withstood the internal pressures upon them from their own members and their own staffs, perhaps, and have recommended just such a course—the support of the 21 proposals.

Mr. President, I desire to give an example, which I think is very illuminating, of a great and powerful trade organization opposing one of the reorganization proposals. I refer to the National Association of Manufacturers. I shall not discuss its attitude on Reorganization Plan No. 12, which is well known. I shall however quote from testimony, in which I participated, on Reorganization Plan No. 5, dealing with the Department of Commerce.

The 15,000 members of the National Association of Manufacturers pay a very high percentage of the high cost of Government inefficiency. I am told that President Hoover once made a general estimate of this cost as being between $3,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000. It is the National Association of Manufacturers, it is its membership, which contributes a high percentage of the taxes which pay the bills. It is the heads of the 15,000 companies constituting that organization who should understand better perhaps than any other group in the country the principles involved in Government reorganization, and in the case I am about to cite, affecting the reorganization of the Department of Commerce, with its 46,000 employees and its budget of more than $600,000,000, they should have a special interest.

I shall read from the testimony and comment on it as I go along. I refer now to the testimony of George E. Folk, adviser to the committee on patents and research of the National Association of Manufacturers, who was an examiner in the Patent Office for 7 years, beginning in 1898, and who was general patent attorney for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. until retired 12 years ago. In his testimony Mr. Folk says:

During the last 12 years—

That is, "since I have retired from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co."—

more as a hobby than anything else, I have been patent adviser to the National Association of Manufacturers. * * * I am speaking today for that association, a voluntary organization of more than 15,000 manufacturers.* * * The National Association of Manufacturers urges adoption of Senate Resolution 259, which declares that the Senate does not favor the President's reorganization plan—

For the Department of Commerce.

When I had a chance to question Mr. Folk, near the end of his testimony, I asked him several questions. I shall read these questions and his replies, as taken from the printed testimony:

Mr. BENTON. These manufacturers who are among our biggest taxpayers * * * how may of them * * * had the other side of the case presented to them before agreement was reached on this statement which you submitted in the name of the National Association of Manufacturers?

Mr. FOLK. I can only say that I was authorized by the National Association to take the position I have taken.

Mr. BENTON. How many of the 15,000 members that you list on the first page of your statement have approved this statement?

Mr. FOLK. * * * of course, it was practically impossible, it would be impossible, to do that. I did submit these views to our committee on patents and research of the National Association of Manufacturers. A committee of more than 100 * * * constitute that committee.

Mr. BENTON. You think perhaps those 100 men have been exposed to the memorandum you presented today?

Mr. FOLK. They have not seen the memorandum, but it is the position NAM would take concerning the reorganization plan.

Not even the 100 men, Mr. President, had seen the memorandum.

Mr. BENTON. If they have not seen the memorandum, would you think it is a fair assumption to say that they have not been exposed to the kind of presentation or arguments presented by Secretary Sawyer, Mr. Fleming, and Mr. Lawton this morning which present the arguments demonstrated, according to those who have studied most thoughtfully, why this particular plan is in the interest of efficiency and economy and the best conduct of this Government?

Mr. FOLK. I did not see the arguments of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, myself, until today. So I dare say the members of the association did not have any more information than I had.

Mr. President, here there is presented a picture of a great, powerful, rich, and influential trade association at work, and seemingly, as I interpret this testimony, largely in the hands of this staff representative. To begin with, how many of the 15,000 members of the NAM are interested in patents? Surely only a segment. Surely the group is larger which is interested in efficiency in Government, and particularly in efficiency in the Department of Commerce. Suppose there are 1,000 of them interested in patents. Who are the 100 men they put on their patents and research committee? I telephoned this morning and secured the names of some of them. The chairman of the committee is Albert E. Noelte, treasurer of the Priscilla Braid Co. The vice chairman is Merwin F. Ashley, manager of the patent department, United Shoe Machinery Corp. Other members of the patents and research committee are Robert Gottschalk, assistant manager, development and patent department, Standard Oil Co.; Leslie R. Groves, vice president, Remington Rand, Inc.; Richard O. Loengard, president, United Chromium, Inc.; and Randolph T. Major, vice president and scientific director, Merck & Co., Inc.

The great corporations which are interested in patents and which belong to the NAM and pay their dues, put on the patent committee of the NAM their representatives who are charged with the duty of considering patents and who are interested in patents. But did these 100 men, these 100 subordinates, meet and consider Mr. Folk's memorandum? No, they did not meet or consider it. Who did approve it? Was it a subcommittee? Was it three or four men in New York, who operate in the name of the committee? Was it two or three members of the staff of the National Association of Manufacturers? Who is it that is responsible for this attitude on the part of the NAM? I know it is not the presidents and heads of the constituent 15,000 companies. I know that those men, hundreds of whom are within my own circle of personal acquaintances, would approve the principles advocated by former President Hoover and his Commission as recommended in these reorganization proposals.

I shall speak later on today, Mr. President, about Reorganization Plan No. 1. It looks as if the first two plans to come before the Senate will be bowled over like tenpins, and some of the great business and trade associations undoubtedly will carry an important part of the responsibility. I exclude, of course, the New York Board of Trade and certain other organizations which have courageously spoken in favor of these recommendations.

I, of course, thought this question of reorganization was not a party issue. It is not a party issue to the presidents of the 15,000 companies which I have mentioned.

The Republican Party, in its 1948 platform, pledged itself to support measures to provide for the more efficient assignment of functions within the Govern-

ment. The plan we are now considering is an important step in that direction. In opposing it, the Republican leadership is running counter to their own platform, as well as running counter to efficiency in the Government. I do not, of course, claim, Mr. President, that this is a unique procedure, but I think it should at least be pointed out to the country.

The Taft-Hartley Act introduced a new concept into the sphere of Government management by creating a double-headed monstrosity for the administration of a single statute. Such a concept is contrary to every principle of sound administration, whether in Government or in private industry.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. With reference to double-headed monstrosities, what is the difference between putting all the administrative and executive functions in one man and putting all the judicial functions in a board of five of which he is one member? Is there not as much a diffusion of responsibility there as there is between the board and the separate general counsel?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MYERS. I yield the Senator from Connecticut two additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. BENTON. One monstrosity in these marble palaces on the Potomac does not justify another monstrosity. I reject wholly and totally the implications of the question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I missed a portion of the Senator's speech. I wonder if, in summing up, he will point out exactly what the Hoover Commission has recommended dealing with this particular problem. The Senator has stated that the Hoover Commission recommended the type of reorganization which is contained in the plan.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. BENTON. The Hoover Commission's proposals have been unequivocal, as I have read and studied them. They place as their very first recommendation among their general over-all recommendations the following:

> We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission.

That is all we are talking about today. It is as simple as that, and it is as direct as that.

On page 139 of the task-force report on regulatory commissions it is contended:

> The existence of such an office—

The office which is under debate today, that of the general counsel—

> independent both of the Federal departmental structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility.

The very thing we have to have in order to assure efficient administration is fixed responsibility. That is what we do not have here now in the case of the National Labor Relations Board. The act which established the National Labor Relations Board failed to provide the responsibility of which we are now speaking, and we are seeking to secure effective administration through this reorganization proposal.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will have the courage, as well as the good judgment, to defeat the resolution which is now pending. I am confident that if the Chamber were full and the Members were exposed to these issues and had an opportunity to consider them and to consider the elements involved in the opposition to this reorganization plan, the Senate would reject the resolution. Its defeat will be a heartening development to friends of good government, not only at the national level, but, more important than that, at the State and community level as well. The adoption of the resolution, Mr. President, will encourage every privileged group with selfish interests to move in against the other plans which are yet to come before the Senate, and to bludgeon their own selfish views upon the United States Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, though I do not see the majority leader present at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the acting majority leader has informed the Chair that 20 minutes' time is yielded to the senior Senator from Utah, who is now recognized.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senate Resolution 248. As a preface to my remarks I desire to read two quotations. The first is taken from Chairman Herzog's report, and it answers one of the questions which has been asked:

> The plan is the President's plan. It was proposed so that the National Labor Relations Board would not continue to be the only regulatory commission whose administrative structure would be different from the one recommended, without exception, by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Second, the plan was proposed by the President because it will make for sound and efficient administration, not only of the present statute but of any regulatory statute, whether concerned with labor relations or with any other policy of Congress. We support it for the same reasons, and for these reasons alone.

Those are the words of Mr. Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, I now quote the words of the task force with regard to the general counsel:

> Another problem that has caused us considerable concern is the position of the general counsel. As indicated above, he is a prosecutor, an administrator, a policy maker. The incumbent, Mr. Denham, has noted that his powers "are broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Whom is the Senator quoting?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am quoting the task force report to the Hoover Commission. The quotation last made would be a quotation within a quotation. It is a quotation from Mr. Denham in speaking before the labor committee of the American Bar Association in 1947. The quotation begins with these words:

> "are broad and absolute, and his authority—

Referring to the general counsel—

> "final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency."
>
> The existence of such an office, independent both of the Federal departmental structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization, it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility.
>
> Such an official is in a peculiarly exposed position. In view of the wide powers of the office, it is inevitably subject to heavy pressure from all sides, and lacks the protection of either a multiheaded agency or an executive department in resisting such pressures.

Mr. President, I should like to say here that during all the hearings upon the amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, time and time again witnesses, including Mr. Denham himself, emphasized the point that the power reposed in him was really and truly so overpowering that at times he himself wondered about it. So, it is perfectly proper that the task force would wonder about giving him those great powers.

> Experience during the first year indicates a tendency to develop close working relations with the joint congressional committee established by the act. To the extent that this has involved advice and suggestions with respect to interpretation of the act and its application to specific situations, the practice seems doubtful and likely to blur the desirable separation between the legislature and administration.

I should like to add, Mr. President, that while I was not a member of the subcommittee, which was called the watchdog committee, during the first year, if one member of an administrative authority and a committee of Congress do not agree, there cannot help being a division of opinion which, if carried to an extreme, must work disastrously in the administration of law. I do not say that it was carried to an extreme, but I should like to point out that a device was set up by law which might make administration itself a very doubtful proposition, and might not only throw the general counsel against the

Board, but might actually throw a committee of Congress in favor of either the Board or the general counsel when a situation might arise, as one did arise.

But the administrative position of the general counsel is also anomalous. Thus the field offices under his supervision are engaged partly in representation work which is the direct responsibility of the Board, and partly in investigating, issuing, and prosecuting complaints, on which the general counsel has final authority. Under the act, the Board has the authority to appoint the regional directors and other employees. In part, as has been seen, the work of the general counsel is essentially prosecution of violations of specific offenses under the act. But insofar as his actions establish policy, they are of the kind frequently assigned to an independent commission.

The unusual position of the general counsel has given rise to several internal administrative problems. One is significant enough to be noted here: In unfair-labor practice cases, regional directors issue complaints, though only with the approval of the general counsel in some types of cases. The finality of refusal to issue a complaint has led to demands for an appeal; and it has been further urged that an appeal to the same unit in the counsel's office whose advice was followed in the original refusal is illusory, and that the appeal should be to an independent body. This problem highlights the nature of the authority the general counsel is exercising.

Our conclusion is that the present position of the general counsel is an unstable one. Various proposals have been made for integrating the position more securely into the Government structure. Some have suggested assigning him to the Department of Labor or of Justice, but each has serious draw-backs as the preceding discussion of his functions should indicate.

Mr. President, I imagine that the President of the United States, in making his recommendation, undoubtedly followed the philosophy as expressed by the task force.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has read all the task force report except the recommendations, which are absolutely contrary to the President's proposed plan No. 12. It seems to me that the Senator should read the last two paragraphs, which suggest that there should be some changes made, but absolutely different from those recommended by the President.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I understand that. However, I do not have the other paragraphs before me, so that I cannot read them. If the Senator from Ohio wishes to have them in my remarks, I am agreeable that he read them at this point.

Mr. TAFT. The last two paragraphs read:

Our staff recommends the creation, by Executive order, of a council of labor under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor, and including the general counsel and other Federal officials concerned with labor problems. The functions of the council would be to coordinate Federal labor policy and to advise the President of appropriate action. This represents a compromise between the present independent status of the general counsel and his subordination to a department head.

Others have strongly urged that the office should again be placed under the Board. To this the objection is made that the prosecuting functions should be separate from the hearing of complaints. But as has already been indicated, only in part are his present duties genuinely prosecution; some parts are administrative and parts a species of rule or policy making. It may be that the administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities.

So the one thing the report does not do is recommend the abolition of the general counsel.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that was covered to my satisfaction, at least, in my remarks in the last paragraph, which I quoted. I quote it again to show that there is no difference of opinion on that point:

Our conclusion is that the present position of the general counsel is an unstable one.

That is a criticism, Mr. President. It is the type of criticism which I show in my few remarks.

Various proposals have been made for integrating the position more securely into the Government structure.

Which is another criticism of the way in which the general counsel is operating.

Some have suggested assigning him to the Department of Labor—

To which an answer is indicated in the paragraph which the Senator from Ohio read—

or of Justice—

Which is also answered—

but each has serious draw-backs as the preceding discussions of his functions should indicate.

Mr. President, because the issues raised by Senate Resolution 248 threaten to be obscured, I feel compelled to take up the time of the Senate in order to define those issues in such a manner as to make them unmistakable. I undertake this duty, Mr. President, with considerable reluctance because it was my hope that the President's Reorganization Plan No. 12 would receive the support of the large majority of the Senate. This hope was based upon the action of the Senate in passing only last session that provision of S. 249, which eliminated the general counsel's office.

I find now that what we thought last session was a recognition of the lesson of experience was merely an offer of compromise. And so we are now faced with a withdrawal of that offer when the issue of the continuation of the general counsel's office is again presented to us.

At the time the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, both supporters and opponents recognized that the act created powers of extraordinary scope in the field of labor-management relations—for the act sought to prescribe rules which covered a wide and important area of industrial relations. Responsibiilty for the administration of a large portion of those powers was vested in the statutory office of the general counsel.

The issue which is here presented is whether these extraordinary powers shall continue to be vested in a single individual, or whether the exercise of those powers shall be subject to the collective wisdom of five Board members whose administration would be properly safeguarded by the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946. This is the issue—one-man rule versus the collective wisdom of a regulatory body of five.

Mr. President, I am as sure as I can be that when the Taft-Hartley bill was discussed on the Senate floor and was originally passed, no one, no matter how much he supported the bill, expected to see the general counsel assume the authority he has assumed, and carry on in the way in which he has carried on. It was not opposition to the Taft-Hartley law in and of itself, it was opposition to the way in which the general counsel administered his office, that undoubtedly caused even the supporters of the Taft-Hartley law to recommend the type of amendment which was recommended and caused the Senate of the United States to accept the recommendation, as it did accept it when it passed the amendatory measure last year.

I should think that there could be only one answer for the Members of the Senate—the elimination of the general counsel's office, and the return of the National Labor Relations Board to the family of regulatory agencies subject to the uniform scheme of organization prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act.

There have been many charges leveled against the present incumbent of the general counsel's office. I do not desire, at the present time, to pass judgment on these charges. But the Members of the Senate must recognize that the powers of the general counsel's office are such that if an incumbent has any predisposition toward unreasonableness or arbitrariness, that office lends itself to the unfettered expression of such tendency. This is the danger of vesting extraordinary powers in the hands of a single individual.

Mr. President, I should like here to quote again the very words of the general counsel himself, where he points out that his powers are broad and absolute. That is what Mr. Denham thinks of his own job, that the powers are absolute. Those are words which are not very often used in connection with an official of the Government of the United States. His authority, says Mr. Denham, is to an outstanding degree authority seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency.

Mr. President, it is that against which I am talking, it is that which the President of the United States is trying to correct. That affords the reason why I urge the Senate to vote against the pending resolution.

The issue, I repeat, Mr. President, is not the substantive rules governing labor-management relations, but whether a substantial responsibility for the administration of those rules is to be vested in one man or in the collective

judgment of five. Here is a test for those Members of the Senate who declared when they supported the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 that they recognized that it had defects and would, when given the opportunity, vote to remedy those defects. The Senate did vote to remedy the defect in regard to this condition.

The choice, I emphasize, Mr. President, is not between the separation of functions prescribed in the Taft-Hartley Act and no separation. The choice is between the discord breeding organization of the Taft-Hartley Act and the structure prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act. The latter act represents the considered and informed judgment of the Congress respecting the problem of mingling of functions in administrative agencies and ensures fair administrative procedure.

The Congress, when it enacted the Administrative Procedure Act, chose one particular method, out of several possible ones, for meeting the problem of separation. In general this method was to provide detailed and carefully thought out basic procedures for the conduct of hearings and formulation of decisions (sections 7 and 8); to provide for a complete internal separation in the administrative agencies of personnel who participate in the investigation or prosecution of particular cases from those who participate in or are consulted respecting the decisions of such or related cases.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. My time is about up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has approximately 1 minute more.

Mr. MYERS. I yield the Senator from Utah three additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have to attend to some duties at another place, as a member of a subcommittee, and, therefore, my time is very limited. My reason for asking the Senator to yield is that I desire to ask the able Senator from Ohio a question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. My recollection is that when we had before us the Taft-Hartley law amendments the Senator from Ohio offered an amendment dealing with the particular phase of the matter we are now discussing. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I expect to speak on that later. I agreed, in a series of amendments, to an amendment which returned the general counsel's power to the general power of the Board. The plan now being discussed turns his powers over to the Chairman of the Board, and makes the Chairman of the Board, in my opinion, an infinitely more powerful figure than the general counsel has ever been. At the time the amendments were considered, I, myself, did not agree with that change, but I finally consented, as a matter of compromise, in connection with the entire amending bill we then had before us.

I have introduced a bill to correct one or two of the particulars in which I think the present system is wrong. I think that bill should be considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at this session, and should be passed, in order to eliminate some of the proper criticisms which are made against the present system. In my opinion, what I agreed to was very different from what is proposed in the pending plan.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. If the Senator from Utah will bear with me for a moment more, I recall the situation, but I was not sure as to the form in which the amendment was offered.

May I ask the Senator whether he does not think that if the proposal he has suggested were so couched that the general counsel would be responsive to the whole Board, rather than independent, it would be a better proposal than the one we are about to vote on?

Mr. TAFT. It would be better than the one we are about to vote on, but I do not think it would be the best, because it would subordinate the general counsel to the Board, and I think he ought not to be subordinated. When he is under the entire Board, it is true that as a practical matter he is fairly independent. If he is under one man, he has to consult him on every question and every proposal. I think it is far better to have him completely separated. The bill I have introduced separates him completely. It undertakes to define clearly what he shall do and what the Board shall do, so as to eliminate the uncertainty of the present law, as well as the difficulty which has arisen, namely, a case being brought, and then a year later the Board saying they think the counsel made a mistake about the jurisdiction. That is taken care of in my new bill by providing that there may be an immediate appeal on the question of jurisdiction of the Board, so that that question may be settled at once, before the case goes any further.

I myself would be opposed to doing what with a great deal of reluctance, as I indicated on the floor of the Senate I agreed to do last year, because I do not think it is the best method of dealing with the situation. We did not have time last year to work the matter out properly. I have now done so, at least to my own satisfaction, and have introduced a bill which is before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I think the way to deal with this question is before that committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, my reason for asking the Senator the question is that I think, without looking at the RECORD, that I supported the Senator last year.

Mr. TAFT. That was only one of some 28 amendments to the law, to meet particular criticisms, and I tried to compromise the whole suggestion, and agreed to some things I did not care particularly to agree to. But I think that was better than the plan now proposed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought the Senator proposed to deprive the counsel of his completely independent status. I think there was a yea-and-nay vote, and I believe that on the vote I supported the Senator from Ohio on that proposal.

Mr. TAFT. There was no separate vote on that item. It was one of 28 amendments embodied in the substitute bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am glad the discussion has taken place. It has in a sense greatly clarified what I wished to bring before the Senate. It has brought into focus what I wished to present. A condition now exists which no one likes. The Senate has actually passed a measure which showed that the Senate did not like the condition which exists. Yet there has been no reformation. Now a suggestion of a change is made. If the resolution now before the Senate is adopted, Mr. Denham will have two declarations on the part of the Senate of the United States which, to his way of thinking, his notion, sustain him in his belief in his absolute power, his absolute authority.

Mr. President, in the light of what has taken place heretofore, in the light of the present discussion, in the light of the amendments of the Senator from Ohio, in the light of the remarks made by the Senator from Ohio today in response to the remarks of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I doubt very much whether any Senator present can stand here and say that a vote to sustain the pending resolution is not a vote to tell Mr. Denham that his method of administration, his ideas of his absolute authority, his ideas respecting his authoritarian powers, his ideas of his completely independent status so he can act as he pleases, are correct, and that he may continue to do as he has done, and not be checked.

Mr. President, I believe that never has the Senate had before it a more practical proposal on which to act than the one now pending. The Senator from Ohio tells the Senate that he has another amendment to the law to submit, a different amendment. The Senator from Ohio tells us that the plan submitted by the President will give the Chairman of the Board too much authority. Perhaps it will. The Chairman can never argue a case against himself and become a prosecutor against himself. The other members of the Board will see to it that he can never do so.

We are considering a situation which ought to be remedied, yet it seems that some Senators are now opposed to remedying the very bad situation.

Mr. President, I had previously said that the Congress, when it enacted the Administrative Procedure Act, chose one particular method, out of several possible

ones, for meeting the problem of separation. In general this method was to provide detailed and carefully thought out basic procedures for the conduct of hearings and formulation of decisions—sections 7 and 8; to provide for a complete internal separation in the administrative agencies of personnel who participate in the investigation or prosecution of particular cases from those who participate in or are consulted respecting the decisions of such or related cases—section 5 (c); to give hearing officers a more important role than that of merely sitting to conduct a hearing and receive evidence, by requiring that they make either the initial or recommended decision of the cases on which they sit; and to insure that the hearing officers' decisions reflect their genuinely independent views, by giving hearing officers security of tenure and salary during good behavior, protected by the Civil Service Commission, and independent of the recommendations or ratings of the particular agencies to which they might be attached—section 11.

Mr. President, if we vote to sustain the resolution and if the office of the general counsel remains as it is, we vote against ourselves again, and we vote against the philosophy of the Administrative Procedure Act.

I think the decision to be made is clear. It was indicated by the action of the Senate when it unanimously passed the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946. It was confirmed by the Senate when it approved S. 1126, the Taft bill, in 1947 which made no provision for a separate office of the general counsel. And it was reinforced by the action of the Senate when it voted only last year to eliminate the office of the general counsel.

Mr. President, I for one will heed the call of experience and vote in support of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 12 and in opposition to Senate Resolution 248.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, until today I have not voted against any reorganization plan which the President of the United States has submitted to the Congress pursuant to the so-called Hoover Commission reports.

As I understand, this plan is not in accord with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission, as the report of the Commission itself shows that that body at no time recommended that the separation of judicial and prosecuting functions, which I consider one of the major reforms of the Taft-Hartley Act, should ever be done away with so far as procedure before the National Labor Relations Board was concerned.

Although this statement has been challenged, all that any Senator who has any doubts on the subject need do, is to look at the text of the Hoover Commission report. Moreover, Mr. Hoover himself has removed any possible doubt on this score by his telegram in which he stated that at no time had the question of merging the prosecuting and judicial functions of the Labor Board ever been considered or acted upon by the Commission.

What we are voting on today, Mr. President, is really a substantive amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, an amendment which, to my mind, goes to the very core of the act. The Congress is being asked to do indirectly what it refused to do directly during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

My position on the Taft-Hartley Act is well known. I was a member of the Labor Committee which reported the bill, and was appointed by the minority as one of the conferees. In my judgment, a vote for Reorganization Plan 12 is a vote to repeal a substantial portion of the Taft-Hartley Act under the false guise of improving the efficiency of the Labor Board.

It is a strange paradox, Mr. President, to find that the Members of this body who were most vociferous last year in insisting upon the repeal of the act are now the ones who profess the greatest concern with what they claim to be a breakdown in the efficiency of its administration. They tell us that because the general counsel has independent authority to initiate all prosecutions under the act and that because the Board disagrees with him on some cases, the provisions and policies of the act could be more efficiently carried out if all power were concentrated again in the Board, as was provided for in the lopsided Wagner Act which Congress repealed two sessions ago.

What the proponents of Reorganization Plan 12 fail to say, however, is that the area in which the Board and the general counsel are in disagreement is with respect to cases in which the general counsel has taken a position in favor of vigorous enforcement of the act. But it is in those very few cases that the Board is refusing to carry out the mandate of Congress by giving full effect to the provisions of the new law to the extent that it modified the one-sided character of the Wagner Act.

Let me give the Senate one illustration:

One of the major provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act is the section which denies the facilities of the Labor Board to labor organizations or any organizations affiliated with them unless all the officers file affidavits disclaiming membership in or sympathy with the Communist Party.

The enactment of this section was intended by Congress to put a stop to the dangerouse infiltration of labor unions by Communist leaders. Its purpose was to put the Communists and fellow travelers of Communists on the spot with the overwhelmingly patriotic rank and file membership of the major labor unions in this country, for if they refused to sign the affidavits it would be clear to the members of unions that they were in effect Communists. Thus the membership could wield their power to drive them out of union office.

When the act went into effect, Mr. Denham, the general counsel of the Board, ruled that the requirement for signing Communist disclaimers applied not only to the officers of particular unions but to all officers of the AFL and CIO. Indeed, it is difficult to see how he could have made any other ruling, since there are scores of Labor Board decisions holding that the AFL and CIO are themselves labor organizations.

Shortly after that the AFL, meeting in convention, instructed all its officers to sign these affidavits. The Board, however, reversing Mr. Denham, held in the Northern Virginia Broadcasters case that this requirement applied only to constituent unions of the AFL and CIO and not to the top officers.

As a result, many CIO unions were permitted to file charges and petitions for election with the Labor Board even though the top officialdom of the CIO, until 3 or 4 months ago, were not in compliance with the act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. TAFT. I yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in one of these cases involving an employer in Texas, the Postex Co., this ruling was carried to the circuit court of appeals. Last week in New Orleans the court of appeals held that the Board had no jurisdiction to take the case and that the Board erred in overruling Mr. Denham. In other words, the court found that Mr. Denham, not the Board, was giving effect to the statute. The result of this decision, of course, is that the validity of hundreds of orders and certifications which were issued by the Board in the last 2 years has now in effect been invalidated, and the labor situation in these companies is chaotic, to say the least.

It is true that the Board itself favors return to the old system under the Wagner Act about which the Senate Labor Committee heard so many complaints for many years. Such an attitude is hostile to our whole judicial system. Indeed, the logic of the Board's position would recommend a future reorganization plan to eliminate any judicial review of their own orders, if that were possible, so as to achieve the highest degree of administrative efficiency.

The Congress separated the Board's prosecuting and judicial authority because it lacked confidence in the form of organization which combined them. Circumvention of the statute is now proposed under the guise of mere executive reorganization. The Board members' unseemly grasp for power and their avowed will to personal domination of our labor policy do not persuade that Congress was wrong. Reorganization Plan No. 12 should be rejected. Accordingly, I propose to vote for the pending resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

If he does not care to use time at this point, the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I shall make at this time may appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of the proceedings in connection with the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Under the foregoing order, Mr. FULBRIGHT's remarks appear in the RECORD following the proceedings on Senate Resolution 248, under the heading "Steps toward federation of the western European countries.")

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to myself.

Mr. President, I have no intention of making a detailed analysis at this time of Reorganization Plan No. 12 and the circumstances which render the adoption of this plan a necessity if we are to have efficient, just operation of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

However, I should like to make a few comments in regard to the disturbing manner in which the plan has been attacked. As the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] so well put it when he announced, a while back, his support of this plan:

> One might gather that this plan, if allowed to become effective, would destroy the Taft-Hartley Act and constitute a great victory for labor over management. These implications * * * are unjust and unfounded. * * * They reflect a state of mind and attitude which can never produce a sound and equitable labor relations statute in this country.

Mr. President, I have quoted those words from the speech delivered by the senior Senator from New York.

So, Mr. President, in view of all the confusion which prevails, I think it is highly important to make clear just what this plan does not do, because I think some statements have been made on the floor of the Senate today which might mislead Senators. If such statements are misleading, I know it is not intentional. Nevertheless, if accepted in toto, I think they would mislead Senators.

In the first place, Reorganization Plan No. 12 does not assign to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board all the powers now held by the general counsel.

I recall that the Senator from Ohio, in response to a question asked by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], stated that this plan differs from the provision contained in the amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act; and it is my recollection that just a few moments ago the Senator from Ohio said that this plan assigns to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board all the powers now held by the general counsel.

Mr. President, that simply is not so. The Chairman of the Board would take over only the executive and administrative functions of the Board, including, specifically, functions with respect to, first, appointment and supervision of personnel; second, distribution of business among personnel and among administrative units; and, third, the use and expenditures of funds. Even in carrying out these purely "housekeeping" duties the Chairman is to be "governed by the general policies of the Board and by such regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations as the Board may by law be authorized to make."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield, of course.

Mr. TAFT. What powers are there other than the administrative and executive powers except judicial and legislative powers?

Mr. MYERS. I am coming to that point now.

Mr. TAFT. Does not plan No. 12 propose to give to the Chairman of the Board complete power, including something which the general counsel does not have now, namely, the right to employ all personnel?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, Mr. Herzog in his testimony on Reorganization Plan No. 12 had something to say on that subject. He said—and I quote now from page 114 of the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, held on April 4, 5, and 6, 1950:

> It has become essential, at the outset, to correct one complete misconception of the plan which appears in recent statements by Senator TAFT, a misconception which he says has influenced his own change of position since 1949. He evidently believes that plan 13 vests many prosecutory and policy-making powers in the Chairman of the Board, and adds that he would not "object to the plan so much" if these powers were transferred to the Board as a whole. A reading of the plan itself should allay the Senator's fears, and any which his statement may have generated in others.
>
> The facts are as follows: The only additional functions the plan assigns to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, whether now vested in the general counsel or in the Board members, are the purely administrative and housekeeping ones assigned to the Chairmen of all seven Commissions covered by plans 6 to 13. The very wording of the plan itself makes it clear, that all investigatory and regulatory functions will be vested at this Board—precisely as they will continue to be vested at the other Commissions—not in one man, but in the five men who comprise the entire Board.
>
> Section 3 of plan 12 transfers "all functions of the general counsel" to the full Board, except for those purely "executive and administrative functions," which are transferred to the Chairman for purposes of convenience and efficiency.

I think a smoke screen has been thrown up, Mr. President, perhaps a sort of little iron curtain, which it is a bit difficult to pierce.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps the Senator has elaborated upon this query, but why is it that this one Commission is selected, as it is, under the resolution offered by the Senator from Ohio, while every other commission of the Government operates in exactly the way the President of the United States is trying to have the National Labor Relations Board operate under the reorganization plan? Can the Senator tell me the reason for that?

Mr. MYERS. Really I can see no logical reason for it, because that which is attempted and which has been accepted in respect to other commissions is practically the same as in plan No. 12. Whether pride of authorship has anything to do with it, frankly I am at a loss to say.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How far does the Senator from Pennsylvania think we would get, or any Senator would get, if he offered a resolution doing to the other seven Government commissions what is sought to be done to the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. MYERS. He certainly would not get very far.

Mr. LUCAS. We would be the laughing stock of the country if we were to attempt to do that.

Mr. MYERS. So I repeat that under section 3 of the reorganization plan all functions of the general counsel not transferred by provisions of section 1 are transferred to the Board. Functions thus going to the entire Board would include, I repeat, the investigatory or the complaint-bringing operations of the present general counsel's office. We would then no longer be operating under a labor relations setup which gives one man, as the senior Senator from New York mentioned earlier today, "broad and absolute powers" and "authority, final to an outstanding degree, seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency." The above description of the present duties of the general counsel is his own, Mr. President. That is, it is the opinion of the general counsel, as stated in an address before the American Bar Association.

There are other things the reorganization plan does not do. It does not revise or do away with or weaken any of the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, which were aimed at regulating union activity. There, again, there has been much propaganda, Mr. President, and much mail coming to the offices of Senators, because some employers have been misled and have been misinformed by certain organizations and groups as to the end effect of this reorganization plan. It would still be an unfair labor practice for a union to engage in a secondary boycott. It would still be necessary, if this reorganization plan were accepted, for unions to give 60 days' notice before going on certain strikes. It would still be necessary for union officials to sign non-Communist affidavits. It would still be unlawful for a labor union to make contributions to political campaigns.

There has been a great deal of discussion in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 12 regarding the dangers of having the same group act as judge and as prosecutor. I am convinced that the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act will prevent any injustice along those lines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MYERS. I yield myself five more minutes, Mr. President.

I think it cannot be emphasized too strongly that we cannot handle labor-management relations as we handle criminal prosecutions. We are not seeking convictions, I hope, Mr. President. We are aiming at a peaceful relationship between the forces of labor and the forces of business.

Let me read to the Senate a portion of the testimony of Paul Styles, newly appointed member of NLRB, given in support of this reorganization plan. Mr. Styles has had many years' experience in this field as a regional attorney, both under the Wagner Act and under the Taft-Hartley Act. He says:

I do not think a legalistic, prosecuting approach to labor relations is the approach intended by Congress. * * * One of the great weaknesses of the general counsel concept has been the difficulty of administration at a regional level, because people wanted to litigate; people said, "This is a statute under which you prosecute. Now get out there and prosecute."

The whole approach of the Board in the past, of all its regional offices, was, "Let's get the public," the employer back in those days, "to comply with the law. Let us talk him into complying with it. Let us settle these cases if we can."

I noticed in my own regional office that the minute the new act was passed, there was a tendency on the part of everyone, not confined only to attorneys who ordinarily like to go to court * * * but the field examiners themselves, the people who really do the work of the Board, to say, "Let us litigate." They dropped their settlement efforts to a large degree.

So, Mr. President, let me point out that this plan was in effect approved in both the majority report and in the views of the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last year. Notwithstanding the statement of the Senator from Ohio which was made a little earlier, every member, as I recall, with the exception of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who stated he was reserving his opinion on this point, voted for such a change in functions and such a change in administrative organization.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 has unfortunately become a much befogged issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Will the Senator, in view of the fact that he has mentioned the senior Senator from Missouri, permit the Chair to state that he thinks the senior Senator from Missouri reserved the right to present an amendment embodying the views to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. MYERS. I knew the Senator reserved the right, and I believe all the other members, both minority and majority members of the committee, approved of the plan.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 has unfortunately become a most befogged issue. But I feel certain that if the Members of the United States Senate really understand the issues that are involved here—the efficient and just administration of our Labor-Management Relations Act—we will approve the President's plan.

Then, too, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] read into the RECORD a telegram addressed to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] by former President Hoover, himself, Chairman of the Hoover Commission. In that telegram, former President Hoover said:

So far as I recollect, this subject was never discussed by the Commission.

Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand why the Commission never discussed this subject, which was such an important subject, and to which the task force devoted eight pages of its report. Former President Hoover may not have any recollection of it, but I feel certain the Hoover Commission considered the task-force recommendations. They may have been a little too hot for the Commission. There may have been some reason for their doing nothing about them. They certainly did not disapprove the task-force recommendations, although they did not approve them; they merely let them alone. But it seems to me strange that the Commission would never even consider the study which had been made by its own task force.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Pennsylvania that his time is up.

Mr. MYERS. I yield myself three more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair makes allowance for the few seconds during which the Chair interrupted the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it not more strange, when the Senator thinks of the extensive debate which took place in the Senate and in the House upon this question in the past, and the debate we are having now, that the Hoover Commission never even gave it consideration?

Mr. MYERS. It is strange, indeed, very strange, and I hope the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Commission report will watch these votes, and will see just what is being done to emasculate and destroy to some extent many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which the President himself has submitted to the Congress.

Mr. President, I should like to close by inserting at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post, dated April 19, 1950, entitled "NLRB's Split Personality." It is an excellent editorial, and it closes with this paragraph:

In our opinion, the proposed plan entails no changes in the present set-up that cannot be justified as a proper exercise of the authority given the President by Congress to reorganize the executive establishments. This reform is imperatively needed to eliminate the friction, uncertainty, and delays resulting from the present two-headed administration of the law.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NLRB'S SPLIT PERSONALITY

Last week the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report withheld endorsement of Reorganization Plan No. 12 abolishing the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and assigning his functions to the Board and its Chairman. Now the Senate Committee on Expenditures has rejected the plan. The citizens committee said that the plan to abolish the office of general counsel raises issues that are not wholly organizational, but are matters of national, political, and economic policy.

Others argue that the latter proposal entails changes in the Taft-Hartley Act which the administration has vainly tried to repeal. This objection seems far-fetched, although Mr. Denham's supporters have, no doubt, used it to good effect in their effort to discredit the plan. Even Senator TAFT admits that the present arrangement is defective. Last year he voted for an amendment to the act bearing his name that would have returned to the Board the powers exercised by the general counsel, although he is now opposing the reorganization plan. Furthermore, he concedes that there is no direct legal objection to the proposed shift of functions.

The existing extreme separation of functions has given rise to friction between the Board and the general counsel and has seriously interfered with effective enforcement of the law. In unfair labor practice cases, for example, the general counsel alone determines whether to issue a complaint, and in determining whether or not to do so he need not be guided by the Board's previous rulings. Chairman Herzog says that cases have been sent to the Board by the general counsel with the full knowledge that he would dismiss them later. The result is that both labor and management are confronted by a double standard, the work of the Board is needlessly increased, and litigation before the courts is encouraged. The Board also charges that employees in its regional offices under the supervision of the general counsel have been gradually losing their identity as agents of the Board even in handling representation cases.

The present set-up of the NLRB was a laudable attempt to separate the prosecuting from the judging functions of the agency. In practice, however, this division of functions has done infinitely more harm than good. Under the reorganization plan internal adjustments would prevent any official from acting as both prosecutor and judge. The chief difference would be that the Board would be in a position to exercise general supervisory powers over prosecuting activities, and prevent conflicts that impair its efficiency as a regulatory agency.

In our opinion, the proposed plan entails no changes in the present set-up that cannot be justified as a proper exercise of the authority given the President by Congress to reorganize the executive establishments. This reform is imperatively needed to eliminate the friction, uncertainty, and delays resulting from the present two-headed administration of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, the Chair would like to read from page 91 of the minority views, report 99, part 2, with reference to Senate bill 249:

My concurrence in the above minority views is subject to the fact that (a)—

That has no application to the present matter—

and (b) may conclude to present an amendment providing for appointment by the President, with confirmation by the Senate, of a general counsel, defining his duties and powers with possibly some limitation, not found in the Taft-Hartley law, as to said powers.

That is signed "FORREST C. DONNELL."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I merely mentioned the name of the Senator from Missouri because I had indicated that

both the majority and the minority had favored the amendment, but the senior Senator from Missouri did not give it his complete blessing and reserved the right to offer an amendment or to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appreciates the courtesy of the Senate in permitting the Chair to read the quotation which he read for the purposes of absolute accuracy.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I now yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, ever since the Hoover Commission made its report, I have been giving consideration to what we should do as to the recommendations made by that Commission. I have studied the plans and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I have studied the recommendations made by the Citizens' Committee. As a result I have decided to vote against the pending resolution and in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 12. I may say that my thought along this line was somewhat fortified when I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 29, 1949, something which has been referred to and quoted previously, but I want to read it again. It is a part of a speech by the very able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I read his language, as follows:

> I believe that the amendments which we have suggested are important. Perhaps the most important one is the elimination of the independent general counsel. The difficulty which arose with the independent general counsel was that he took a different view of the jurisdiction of the Board than did the Board itself. He would bring a case which he thought was covered by the act. After a year's litigation the Board would rule that it was not covered by the act. In the last analysis the Board determined the result, but in the meantime there was confusion. There was a difference of opinion. There was difficulty in the separation of powers.
>
> Under the Administrative Procedures Act, which was passed since the passage of the original National Labor Relations Act, the judicial and prosecuting functions are largely separated, although not entirely so. The procedure goes back to the Board. However, we felt that on the whole that separation accomplished the purposes we were trying to accomplish in not having the same people bring the prosecution, try the case, and then judge those who they themselves had indicted. That was one of the strong protests made by the labor unions, and we felt that it was sufficiently justified to go back to the Administrative Procedures Act and rely upon that for a fair treatment by the Board.

Mr. President, exactly what the senior Senator from Ohio was arguing for less than a year ago is what Reorganization Plan No. 12 seeks to provide. Under the influence of the soothing persuasiveness of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the Senate passed the Taft bill to take the place of the Taft-Hartley Act. One of the provisions of that bill, as I have pointed out in his remarks on the Senate floor, abolished the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board and restored to the Board a large part of the powers and responsibilities which it had before the Taft-Hartley Act was passed.

We have before us today a similar proposal, this time in the form of a reorganization plan submitted by the President under the Reorganization Act of 1949, under which executive and administrative functions of the National Labor Relations Board and of the general counsel relating to the appointment and supervision of personnel, the distribution of business among personnel and administrative units, and use and expenditure of funds would be transferred to the chairman of the Board. Under this plan, all other functions of the general counsel of the Board would be transferred to the Board, and the office of the general counsel would be abolished.

Mr. President, in talking about the office of general counsel and about the disagreements which arose between the general counsel and the National Labor Relations Board, I should like to point out that to my mind the greatest disagreement grew up over something as to which everyone ought to be greatly concerned, and particularly those of my colleagues who come from the South and who believe so strongly in States' rights.

The general counsel insisted upon bringing in the corner drugstore, the filling station, the little bakery, and the little laundry, whereas the Board ruled that those were matters of no great consequence; they were small businesses, local in their nature, and should be left to the States to handle. Time after time the Board refused to act upon or to approve the action which had been taken by the general counsel in relation to those small local businesses. In spite of that, the general counsel would insist on taking action, so that he was carrying on a constant harassment of small businesses all over the country, businesses which the Board continued to say it should not give attention to, that they should be left to the States to handle.

On April 15, 1949, the general counsel brought in a drugstore located, I believe, in Denver, Colo. The case was dismissed, but in spite of that, on October 31, 1949, the general counsel brought in exactly the same corner drugstore, and the Board again dismissed it.

There have been many such cases, Mr. President. In the short time allotted to me I cannot name all the cases, but I should like to mention just a few. I hope Senators will listen to the names of these cases, because even the names themselves indicate the littleness and the local nature of the businesses. Hom-Ond Food Stores. Matter of Sta-Kleen Bakery, Inc., Matter of Fehr Bakery, Co., Purity Creamery Co., Matter of Creamland Dairies. Mr. President, I could go on and on with similar cases. They are small, local businesses, which the general counsel has insisted on bringing in. As a result there has been created needless friction with the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, I ask that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, a memorandum relating to these particular matters and listing several of the cases, as well as giving quotations relating to each of them.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCUMENTATION OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND THE GENERAL COUNSEL, R. N. DENHAM

1. CASES OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN NLRB AND GENERAL COUNSEL

Disagreement between the NLRB and the general counsel had its major effects on the question of exercising jurisdiction over small businesses. The question arose in both representation (election) cases and unfair labor practice cases. The dispute was particularly marked in unfair labor practice cases because of the petition of the general counsel that among other reasons the Board had no authority under section 3 (d) of the Taft-Hartley Act to refuse to exercise jurisdiction over an unfair labor practice case once the general counsel had determined to issue the complaint. The general counsel's position was based on the language of section 3 (d) to the effect that "He shall have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance of complaints [in unfair labor practice cases] * * *."

The disagreement in this area arose over the exercise of jurisdiction over businesses "essentially local in character" (as the NLRB described them) such as drug stores, grocery stores, dairies, bars, and restaurants and other local businesses. The general counsel insisted that the Board should exercise jurisdiction where at least part of the products sold by these businesses, although sold entirely within the State, originated from out of State. The Board, on the other hand, early established a policy of not exercising its jurisdiction in such cases, on the ground it would not effectuate the policies of the act to do so, since the businesses were essentially local in nature.

(a) Representation cases: The Board first established the policy of refusing to exercise jurisdiction over so-called local businesses, in a line of decisions dismissing petitions in representation cases.

Hom-Ond Food Stores (May 13, 1948, 77 NLRB 647).

Matter of Sta-Kleen Bakery, Inc. (July 30, 1948, 78 NLRB 798).

Matter of Fehr Bakery Co. (Sept. 2, 1948, 79 NLRB 440).

Purity Creamery Co. (Sept. 28, 1948, 79 NLRB 1042).

Matter of Creamland Dairies (Nov. 8, 1948).

The Board found these businesses to be "esentially local in character" and therefore decided that it would not "effectuate the statute's policies to assert jurisdiction."

In spite of this established policy the general counsel on November 23, 1948, issued G. C. Field Letter No. 52 (revised) in which he instructed the regional offices to disregard these decisions and to proceed to process such local cases. The field letter stated:

"Where representaton cases involve different parties, but industries similar to those with respect to which the Board, notwithstanding the existence of statutory jurisdiction, may have denied the processes of the act because, 'it would not effectuate the policies of the act,' such cases will be processed at the regional level in regular manner." [See Hearings on S. 249, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 138–141 and 175.]

The Board, in an exchange of memoranda with the general counsel late in 1948 attempted to straighten out this disagreement. This exchange appears in the record of the hearings noted above. But the general counsel continued so to instruct regional office personnel with regard to representation cases until September 1949. (See statement of Paul M. Herzog, Chairman, NLRB, April 6, 1950, Hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 12,

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, 81st Cong., 2d sess., at p. 11.)

(b) Unfair-labor-practice cases: The conflict on the issues of jurisdiction still continues in unfair-labor-practice cases. (See statement of Paul Herzog noted above, at p. 11.)

The Board first asserted its power to refuse to exercise jurisdiction for policy reasons in an unfair-labor-practice case in—

A–1 Photo Service Co. (May 13, 1949, 83 N. L. R. B. No. 86, 24 L. R. R. M. 1106). The opinion in this case clearly points out the nature of the disagreement between the Board and the general counsel on this issue:

"The general counsel, on the other hand, contends that once he has issued a complaint in an unfair-labor-practice case, the Board members have no authority to decline to assert jurisdiction on policy grounds, if jurisdiction in fact exists. For the reasons given below, we find no merit in this contention.

"Under section 10 of the act, as amended, the Board is empowered to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice affecting commerce, but it is not directed to exercise its preventive powers in all such cases. From this, we believe it reasonable to infer, in the absence of any convincing evidence to the contrary, that Congress intended the Board to continue to have discretionary authority to decline to exercise these powers in appropriate cases, as it had under the Wagner Act. The Board can now exercise this discretionary authority only by dismissing a complaint. We have, therefore, dismissed complaints—as we have declined to proceed with representation cases—when, in our opinion, the assertion of jurisdiction would not effectuate the policies of the act (Matter of *Walter J. Mentzer* (23 L. R. R. M. 1570)).

"For the above reasons, we find, contrary to the general counsel's contention, that the Board has discretionary authority to dismiss complaints for policy reasons, even though commerce is affected."

The general counsel, however, has continued to assert his conflicting views and to instruct regional offices accordingly, even so far as to process unfair-labor-practice cases involving the very same employer over whose business operations the Board had earlier, in a representation proceeding, refused to exercise jurisdiction.

Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., et al. (Apr. 15, 1949), a representation case dismissed by the Board (82 N. L. R. B. 1264).

Haleston Drug Stores, Inc. (Oct. 31, 1949), an unfair-labor-practice case dismissed on same jurisdictional grounds over the opposition of the general counsel (25 L. R. R. M. 1040).

See also general counsel's G. C. Field Letter No. 52 (revised) of November 23, 1948:

"The fact that the Board has dismissed a representation case because, in its view, 'it would not effectuate the policies of the act' to process it even though legal jurisdiction exists, will not bar the acceptance and processing of a meritorious [unfair labor practice] charge involving the same parties or any of them." (Hearing on S. 249, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 81st Cong., 1st sess., p. 175.)

The general counsel is now refusing to represent the Board's point of view in the courts in two of these cases, the A–1 Photo Service case and Haleston Drug Stores, Inc., which are pending for review in the court of appeals at Denver. In the statement Mr. Denham said:

"The general counsel, however, cannot be expected to urge the courts to approve the Board's incursion into his own area of statutory responsibility or to accept the Board's delegation to him of this type of assignment."

(See public statement of General Counsel Denham, issued the first week in March 1950, announcing his refusal to submit to the Board's restriction of his authority in a revision of a 1947 memorandum delegating certain powers to the general counsel (25 L. R. B. 242, Mar. 6, 1950.)

The general counsel also informed the Board officially that he might wish to state his contrary views to the court in the Haleston case by a brief amicus in opposition to the Board. (See exchange of memoranda between the Board members and the general counsel, hearings, House Committee on Expenditures, March 23, 1950, p. 123).

2. GENERAL COUNSEL'S STATEMENT REFUSING TO SUBMIT TO NLRB'S RESTRICTION ON HIS AUTHORITY

The Board on February 28, 1950, issued a revision of a 1947 memorandum delegating certain powers to the general counsel (13 F. R. 654). In the revision the Board—

(a) Instructed the general counsel that he must obtain advance Board approval before he may appoint, transfer, discipline, or discharge any regional or subregional director.

(b) Directed the general counsel to act "in full accordance with the directions of the Board" when he is representing the Board in the lower courts. Previously the general counsel was merely required to act "upon direction" of the Board in these matters.

(c) Directed the general counsel when processing petitions for collective-bargaining elections, to do so in accordance "with the decisions and instructions of the Board."

Within a few days General Counsel Denham issued a public statement, took exception to these changes and announced his "refusal to submit" to these instructions. (See statement noted above.) In addition to refusing to defend in the courts the Board's position on jurisdiction (see discussion above on A–1 Photo case), the general counsel in his statement said that the Board's instructions on the employment of regional directors violated the "intent of Congress." He interpreted the conference report as indicating that it was the intent of Congress to place final authority over employment of a regional director in the general counsel.

3. VESTING OF "HOUSEKEEPING" FUNCTIONS IN NLRB CHAIRMAN

Reorganization Plan No. 12 provides for the transfer from the Board and the general counsel to the Chairman of "the executive and administrative functions of the Board and of the general counsel, including their functions with respect to (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the distribution of business among personnel and among administrative units, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds." All other functions of the general counsel are transferred to the full Board, and the appointment by the Chairman of the heads of major administrative units under the Board shall be subject to approval of the Board.

Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the Board, stated to the Senate Committee on Expenditures during the hearings on plan No. 12, that these functions transferred to the chairman are the purely administrative and housekeeping ones assigned to the chairman of the other six commissions covered by Reorganization Plans No. 6 through 11, and that all investigatory and regulatory functions are vested in the full Board.

This is in line with the Hoover Commission recommendation with regard to regulatory commissions in general that the chairman be made expressly responsible for administration. The task force report on regulatory commissions stated that this recommendation is designed to center the administration in one member, responsible to the Commission or Board, to relieve the other member of these duties, and "to assure effective supervision essential for expedious handling of cases and orderly dispatch of business." (See p. 32).

This is what Reorganization Plan No. 12 seeks to accomplish. It abolishes the present split in administration between the Board and the general counsel's office which does not make for efficient administration and which leads to a diffusion of responsibility. Efficient administration is not possible without a single and direct line of authority, whether in a regulatory commission or an executive department. The Taft-Hartley Act split the administration of the act between the Board and the general counsel. Shortly after passage of the act, the Board felt it necessary for reasons of economy and sound management to delegate to the general counsel complete responsibility for the hire and discharge of all personnel in the regional offices. This resulted in the loss by the regional employees of their identity as agents of the Board, as illustrated in the jurisdictional dispute discussed above, and in the disagreements on policy issues.

The administrative functions are placed in the chairman, rather than the full Board in order to prevent the absorption of all the commissioners in administrative details at the expense of the substantive work, the chairman should be specifically designated as the person responsible for administration within the Commission.

DUTIES

In practice his duties in this respect should include:

1. Supervision of the various bureaus and divisions from the administrative point of view, such as their workload, backlog, progress, and programs.

2. Direction of the administrative divisions of the Commission—those dealing with the budget, personnel, management analysis, and office and miscellaneous services.

3. Analysis of the administration and procedures of the Commission for proposing changes to improve administrative efficiency and to provide more systematic supervision.

RELATION TO COMMISSION

On routine supervision and appointments, the Chairman should merely report periodically to the Commission. But the Chairman's primary responsibility for administration should not supplant the ultimate authority of the entire Commission on matters which are of major significance to the agency. For example, the Commission should approve appointments of bureau or division chiefs, or major reorganizations of the staff. On such matters, the Chairman should have the responsibility for taking the initiative in spotting and analyzing the problems, developing data, and submitting proposals to the Commission. (See Task Force Report on Regulatory Commissions, pp. 46, 47.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes more to discuss the proposal in light of the Hoover Commission report. While I was at home last December, I attended a dinner given by the State chamber of commerce in Birmingham. They had had an all-day business session which was closed with a dinner that evening. My friend and distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was the speaker on that occasion. During the dinner it was announced they had one item of business to attend to. They had been in business session all day. That item of business, Mr. President, was a report of the resolutions committee. The

chairman of the resolutions committee rose up and said:

We boast of the fact that we are presenting one resolution, and this is it: "We wholeheartedly endorse and recommend that the Congress of the United States approve the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report."

That is the only resolution which was adopted during that day's business session of the State-wide Chamber of Commerce of the State of Alabama. I looked over that group and the thought that went through my mind was: How easy it is to recommend a general, overall program. I wondered how many of those people would communicate with me and protest against some particular plan submitted under the Hoover Commission report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if he knows that even Mr. Denham was against the division of authority when it was put into effect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know that he was against it when it was put into effect, but I do know that in a speech Mr. Denham said it had created an impossible situation. I do not remember his exact words, but, in substance, they were to that effect.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator if he recalls having read a letter which Mr. Denham wrote to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], dated February 21, 1947. The full text of the letter is printed in the report of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Senate bill 249, at page 1130. I should like to read the following excerpt from Mr. Denham's letter:

The provision for dividing the functions of the Board between the Department of Justice and the present Board savors of the wisdom of Solomon in dividing the child. It simply will not work. The administration of labor relations at the source involves much more than the trial and determination of adjudications. More than 90 percent of the matters which might develop into litigations are disposed of administratively in the regional offices. These dispositions must be coordinated to the same general policy that influences the final determination of the litigated cases. This proposed division would only create additional confusion with policy emanating from two independent and uncoordinated sources. If this is to be done, however, then the judicial side of the Board should be set up as a regular labor court with all the powers of the circuit courts of appeals and with the present position of trial examiner converted into that of judge with all the powers of a district judge. I would wholly approve of such a change, for it would concentrate the decisions in one body and do away with the diversity of opinions now coming from 10 circuit courts of appeal, which makes their decisions almost valueless as precedents until they have been passed upon and reconciled by the Supreme Court.

Does the Senator know that such a letter is in the record?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had not seen the letter, and I appreciate the Senator's calling it to my attention. I know that since then Mr. Denham has made speeches in which he has said the division presented an impossible problem.

Mr. President, if we are to do anything with reference to streamlining the Government and getting a more efficient operation of the Government, and making it possible to effectuate some of the savings which the Hoover Commission said we could make, we must begin to put into effect some reorganization plans. I do not intend by that statement to announce that I shall support every single plan, but I do say that I shall resolve any doubts in favor of these reorganization plans. That is exactly what I am doing with plan No. 12.

The citizens committee has pointed out that a great part of this plan as recommended does conform to the Hoover Commission's report. They say it does not entirely do so, but a great part of it does. Mr. President, I have studied it. I have studied the various recommendations. I have come to the conclusion that it does conform materially with the Hoover Commission's report. They say it ought to be approved. It is for those reasons, Mr. President, that I shall vote against the pending resolution.

Mr. President, there are other issues involved in Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950. One of the issues we have to decide is whether we are going to single out the National Labor Relations Board as a board requiring wholly special treatment. Alone among the regulatory boards and commissions, the National Labor Relations Board was singled out in 1947 for a statutory separation of prosecuting and judicial functions. Alone among the regulatory boards and commissions, the National Labor Relations Board was burdened with a heavy superstructure of dual personnel, dual policy making, and dual administration. Only the good sense of the National Labor Relations Board, which has striven to reduce the confusion resulting from this action to the minimum, has prevented wholesale disruption of the operations of the National Labor Relations Board since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947.

The National Labor Relations Board has pointed out to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which held hearings on the resolution of the senior Senator from Ohio to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 12, that—

The splitting of responsibility has caused friction within the agency, and confusion among management and labor unions, as to the coverage of the Labor Management Relations Act.

It has projected uncertainty and litigation.

It has been characterized by simultaneous policy determinations which were contrary to each other.

It has impeded enforcement of the public policy in the courts.

Continuation, or accentuation, of the split in authority will constitute a continuing threat to effective enforcement of the law, no matter what the law's substantive provisions may be.

These unanimous conclusions are based on five men's experience as administrators under an experiment of divided authority and separated functions.

The members of the National Labor Relations Board are by no means always unanimous in their decisions. The records of the Board are replete with instances of sharp differences of opinion over issues raised by the complex and intricate provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. On the problem of administration raised by the existence of the statutory office of general counsel, however, all five members of the Board, whatever their views of the scope and meaning of the act's provisions may be, are in agreement that the existence of this office hampers effective administration and results in confusion and uncertainty for all persons, employers and unions, who are affected by the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

There is one final point I would like to make, Mr. President. We should not be misled into thinking that the issue before us is whether we will have separation of prosecuting and judicial functions in the National Labor Relations Board, or no separation of prosecuting and judicial functions. While the Administrative Procedure Act exempted a number of our regulatory boards and commissions from the effect of its provisions, it did not exempt the National Labor Relations Board. Under the provisions of that act, the Congress has provided sound procedures to assure proper separation of prosecuting and judicial functions within an agency. The real issue, Mr. President, is not, I repeat, whether there should be separation of prosecuting and judicial functions in the operations of the National Labor Relations Board—and the Administrative Procedure Act assures us that there will be—but rather whether there will be in the structure of the National Labor Relations Board a statutory office of general counsel, with authority independent of that of the Board itself, which can frustrate and hamper the effectuation of our national labor relations policies and activities.

Because I am convinced, Mr. President, that the existence of the general counsel's office as a statutory agency, independent of that of the Board, does hamper sound effectuation of the policies written into our Federal labor relations law, I feel that Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950 is a sound plan and should receive the approval of the Senate. If we believe that the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are sound, we must agree with many provisions of this plan. If we feel that it is important to provide for constructive and harmonious carrying out of the policies of our principal national labor relations statute, we must support the abolition of the general counsel's office—the existence of which clearly makes the realization of this objective impossible.

It is my firm belief, Mr. President, that Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950 should be approved and that Senate

Resolution 248, the 1950 embodiment of the views of the senior Senator from Ohio on this matter, should be rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask whether any other Senator intends to speak in opposition to the resolution? I know that no one except myself intends to speak in favor of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that all Senators who are opposed to the resolution offered by the Senator from Ohio have spoken with the exception of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield myself 25 minutes. I may speak for a few minutes after the majority leader has spoken in opposition if I believe that something he said requires a reply.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to have a quorum call? I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Maybank
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Brewster	Hill	Myers
Bricker	Hoey	Neely
Bridges	Holland	O'Conor
Butler	Hunt	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Cain	Jenner	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Connally	Kefauver	Stennis
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Darby	Kerr	Taylor
Donnell	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Douglas	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Leahy	Thye
Eastland	Lehman	Tobey
Ecton	Lodge	Tydings
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Lucas	Wherry
Flanders	McCarthy	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McFarland	Withers
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Green	Malone	
Gurney	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Reorganization Plan No. 12 proposes to abolish the office of the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and to transfer—not to the Board, but to the Chairman of the Board—all the executive and administrative functions of the Board and of the general counsel. The general counsel, so far as I can see, never has had anything except executive and administrative functions. Obviously the plan would transfer all those to the Chairman of the Board. It would concentrate in the Chairman of the Board almost all the powers of the Board except judicial powers.

The Office of the general counsel—which is the prosecuting and administrative end of the National Labor Relations Board—today has about 1,200 employees. The Board as a judicial body has about 200 employees altogether. Under Reorganization Plan No. 12 all the 1,200 employees, and their appointment, which is now under the Board, according to the original law, would be transferred to the Chairman of the Board.

The suggestion has been made that the general counsel is an all-powerful dictator, with all sorts of power. However, Mr. President, Reorganization Plan No. 12, if put into effect, will give the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board twice the power the general counsel has ever had.

I wish to point out that the plan now submitted to Congress is not the original plan. The original plan was for a Board; and under the Board there was to be a general counsel with a line of prosecuting duties; and there was to be an office of examiners, and so forth, to handle the judicial duties. The duties in that connection were fairly well distributed.

However, under the plan now submitted, the prosecuting and judicial functions, by being vested in one man on the Board, would be concentrated, it seems to me, far more than even in the set-up in the National Labor Relations Board which was so widely criticized, which was changed by the Taft-Hartley law, and was twice attempted to be changed before that time by the House of Representatives.

There is some claim of justification for the transferral of these powers back to the Board; but I cannot see any justification for doing that. We are told that the performance of these duties is a policy-making function, but certainly the fact that it is a policy-making function does not mean that it is not an executive function. All the functions and powers of the President are executive functions and powers, and they include a number of policy-making functions and powers.

So it seems to me that probably this plan is far worse than the original plan which was changed by the Taft-Hartley law.

In the first place, Mr. President, the plan now submitted does not conform to the Hoover Commission's recommendations. I have in my hand Mr. Hoover's own telegram, addressed to me, as it appears on page 15 of the printed hearings. It reads as follows:

The Honorable ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I have your inquiry as to the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government as to the counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. So far as I recollect, this subject was never discussed by the Commission. There is no recommendation in the Commission's reports to Congress.

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] who was a member of the Hoover Commission, states that he thinks the question did once come up before the Commission, but that when it came up, it was at once agreed that it was not within the general functions of the Commission, that it was not merely an improvement of administration, but was a substantial change of the substance of a law which recently had been enacted by Congress, and that therefore the Commission should not make any recommendation regarding it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont, who was also a member of that Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would corroborate the statement of the Senator from Arkansas to the effect that this question did come up for consideration before the Hoover Commission at one time. It was decided that it was a matter for the Congress to determine. There is nothing in the Hoover Commission recommendations to the effect that the move now proposed by the President to be taken should be taken.

On the other hand, there is nothing in the recommendations to prohibit such a move, so far as I know.

However, the question did come up, and the Hoover Commission felt it was outside its own jurisdiction.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, it is suggested that the task force in some way recommended this proposal. That is not true in any sense, Mr. President.

A reading of the task-force report shows that while the task force criticized the present setup—and I am quite free in admitting that it is subject to criticism, for reasons which I shall mention—yet the task force did not recommend at any point the abolition of the general counsel or his subordination to the Board or to the Chairman of the Board.

In fact, what the task force said, after criticizing the present setup, was:

> Our staff recommends the creation, by Executive order, of a council of labor under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor, and including the general counsel and other Federal officials concerned with labor problems.

Their recommendations therefore contained the recommendation that the general counsel should continue as an officer sitting in on the determination of major policy matters.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In that recommendation they did not say that the general counsel should remain independent, as he is at the present time, and as the pending resolution seeks to continue him; did they?

Mr. TAFT. They did not recommend plan No. 12, nor did they recommend at any point the abolition of the general counsel, as plan No. 12 would do.

In fact, by recommending that he be a member of the proposed new labor council, they deliberately took exactly the opposite position from that taken in plan No. 12, which recommends the abolition of the general counsel.

Mr. LUCAS. But is it not a fact that the task-force report says that is a complete departure from administrative practices and that the office of the general counsel should not be left in charge both of the Board and of the executive functions or agencies of the Board?

Mr. TAFT. The task-force report states:

> Others have strongly urged that the office should again be placed under the Board. To this the objection is made that the prosecuting functions should be separate from the hearings of complaints. But as has already been indicated, only in part are his present duties genuinely prosecution; some parts are administrative and parts are a species of rule or policy making. It may be that administrative and policy-making functions could be subordinated more clearly to the Board's control while still maintaining an adequate separation of the truly prosecuting activities.

In other words, the task force itself, so far as it takes any definite position, recommends the continuation of the general counsel and recommends that his prosecuting functions at least be independent of the Board.

So there is nothing in either the Hoover Commission's report or the report of the task force to support the proposal set forth in plan No. 12 that all the general counsel's powers be transferred to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and that the office of the general counsel be abolished.

Mr. President, there is another reason why it seems to me the action proposed by plan No. 12 should not be taken by this particular method under the Reorganization Act. The Reorganization Act was intended to reorganize the executive departments. It was not intended as a means of changing major policies established by the Congress.

When Congress determined a definite policy—as Congress did in 1947—certainly Congress was not granting to the President, by means of this rather curious semilegislative, semiexecutive procedure, the right to reverse major policy decisions made by the Congress in recent years. Certainly that is not the purpose of the Reorganization Act.

The attempt to repeal a major policy established by the Congress is not properly within the scope of a reorganization plan.

If the President finds that by this means he can repeal laws which Congress has enacted, we shall find all kinds of reorganization plans being submitted to us, because it would be far easier for the President to proceed by this method under which his proposals can only be vetoed by the affirmative votes of 49 Members of the Senate or 218 Members of the House of Representatives, rather than to ask Congress to pass laws in the usual way.

So I say this is an improper use of the reorganization plans, and we should not approve any such procedure.

Mr. President, to my mind the plan itself is completely unsound. We have had a long history of confusion as between the prosecuting and the judicial functions. It seems to me very clear that where there is anything in the nature of a serious question of prosecution, those functions should be separated. The same man, the same board, should not be the prosecutor and then the examiner and then the jury, in effect, and then the judge who will determine questions of fact and questions of law.

The man who finally decides, the man who passes on the question of whether a person should or should not be prosecuted and the question of whether a person has violated a law, whether he has engaged in an unfair labor practice, naturally looks into the question and halfway makes up his own mind. As a rule, he would not recommend the prosecution unless he thought the prosecution was justified. Certainly it is wrong, then, that the case should come before him as a judge, because when it does come before him as a judge, his mind is already made up, and he is disposed to vote to support his original administrative decision.

On that principle, it was felt for years that the National Labor Relations Board was a peculiar example of unfair and unjudicial procedure.

I sat in the hearings in the Senate Office Building in 1939 and heard William Green and William Padway denounce the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board before 1939 as the most outrageous perversion of justice this country had ever seen, because the Board decided first what it wanted to do, and then brought the prosecution, and then assumed the judicial function. Since usually there were questions of fact, it was very difficult indeed to get a court ever to reverse their decision.

Mr. Green said the Board set out deliberately to put a CIO union in every plant in the United States, and in every case where there had been a question between the CIO and the AFL, he said the decision was always in favor of the CIO. Mr. Roovevelt let the terms of the members of the Board expire, and he appointed members who were more satisfactory to the AFL. In time the complaint of the AFL was cured. But the procedure was the same, and in most cases, the new Board was just as unfair to the employer on the other side, as had been the original Board. So that when the question again arose, we decided the functions ought to be separated, and we tried to do so.

I do not think the present separation between the general counsel and the Board is entirely satisfactory. There are two difficulties. The law is not very clear as to exactly how their functions are divided. In one respect, a serious complaint was made that the general counsel would bring a case and decide that it was properly within the jurisdiction of the Board, and then a year later the Board would decide it was not within its jurisdiction. The general counsel was disposed to press the idea of interstate commerce further than I would press it, and, on the other hand, the Board took the position, which would seem to me equally wrong, that only large cases should be considered and not small cases. In any event, a difference developed, and the general counsel might bring a case, and a year later the Board might throw it out. In my opinion, that situation can be dealt with.

I have introduced a bill which is now pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to deal with those two faults. The bill makes it perfectly clear who appoints the personnel, who has the function of deciding whether to bring a prosecution or not, and, on the other hand, deciding that if the prosecution is brought and the Chairman thinks there is no jurisdiction, it will be possible to obtain immediate ruling from the Board, so that if the Board decides it is not a proper case, the case can be dismissed at once without going through the long procedure of an actual trial. I think that bill should be considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and worked out on the basis of the evidence, to accord with the basic theory of the Taft-Hartley law, that there should be a separation of prosecuting and judicial functions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Ohio contend that the investigatory and regulatory functions are vested in the Chairman of the Board, or in the Board itself?

Mr. TAFT. I would think that the investigatory functions, from the point of view of determining whether a case should be brought and prosecuted are vested in the Chairman. It seems to me very clear that that is an executive or administrative function—probably an executive function. I have no question that it is vested in the Chairman. The Chairman testifies he thinks it is not. I think he is simply wrong. He would like to have the plan adopted of course. He is in a somewhat prejudiced position, and naturally he is interested. I think it is perfectly clear what is an administrative and what is an executive function. So far as regulatory functions are concerned the general counsel has no regulatory rights. So far as I know, he cannot issue a regulation, today. I do not know what the Senator means by a regulatory function.

Mr. LUCAS. I am referring primarily to the investigatory power, which is the principal thing the Senators are talking about, because, involved in that, is the prosecution. The Senator from Ohio contends one thing with respect to where that power is lodged, yet the Chairman of the Board, who has to administer the act, definitely says in the hearings before the committee that it is absolutely lodged in the Board itself, not in the Chairman.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read the words:

> There are hereby transferred from the National Labor Relations Board, * * * and from the general counsel of the Board, to the Chairman of the Board, * * * the executive and administrative functions of the Board and of the general counsel, including their functions with respect to (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the distribution of business among personnel and among administrative units, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds.

The Chairman of the Board appoints every one of the 1,200 people engaged in prosecution, expressly. It seems to me, certainly, if he does not have the right

to decide how they shall act, he can at least tell them how they should act, because he has the appointment and supervision of those men. Under the original plan, they were appointed by the Board; at least one man did not have the appointing power. If we return this to the Chairman of the Board, it seems to me that whoever administers the prosecuting function is going to consult the chairman about every major question of policy. He is bound to. He is not going to do something to get himself in wrong with the man who appointed him and the man who can remove him from office. In the old days, toward the end, the Board did not interfere much with prosecuting, because, after all, it is pretty hard for 5 men to pass on cases of that kind. But when it is transferred to the Chairman of the Board, the Chairman of the Board it seems clear to me is going to be the one who actually, in practice, decides whether a case shall be brought, and who then sits as head of the board which finally decides the case. So the plan it seems to me is very much worse than the original law.

The President and others have criticized me because, last year, in a long substitute bill which made some 20 changes in the Taft-Hartley law, I agreed to return these powers to the Board itself. I have tried to point out that I think it is very much worse to return them to the Chairman of the Board than to the Board. I said on the floor of the Senate at that time that I did that with great doubt. I was endeavoring to get general agreement among all those who were in favor of a substitute bill, instead of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and I agreed somewhat further than I thought was desirable. I know also that the House would go into the question, and that they would study very carefully the problem of how, in particular, we should meet defects which had been shown in the present law. And so I have introduced a bill which is now pending, as I say, before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and which attempts to meet those particular difficulties. I am rather amused that the President refers to the fact that the Senate passed the bill amending the Taft-Hartley Act, because as soon as it got over to the House he sat on it, and all of his instructions were to sit on it. The labor people sat on it, and they killed the bill entirely. If they are willing to take the whole bill, with all the other things in it, I think I might be willing even to make the compromise I made last year. But this plan goes even a good deal further than that compromise. This plan, it seems to me, sets up a real labor dictator, a man in whose single, individual decision is to be vested finally the determination of the labor policy between employer and employee in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the very able senior Senator from Ohio whether it is not true that, while the Hoover Commission made no particular recommendation concerning the distribution of powers inside the National Labor Relations Board, in the case of other regulatory bodies, such as the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and so forth, they did advocate a general distribution of powers almost identical with the changes recommended for the National Labor Relations Board by plan No. 12, namely, to transfer the appointive and administrative work from the Commission as a whole to the Chairman; and second, to put the counsel under the Chairman. As a matter of fact, I think that condition already exists in virtually all the regulatory commissions, and we do not propose to disturb it. I should like to ask the very able Senator whether my statement is not correct.

Mr. TAFT. The only recommendation is that all administrative responsibility be vested in the chairman of the commission. I think, as I read the report of the task force, that what they meant was a kind of housekeeping function. But plan No. 12 goes further. It provides that all executive functions and the administrative functions shall be transferred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the difference between executive and administrative duties?

Mr. TAFT. I think "executive" is a broader term. It covers everything the President does. He is the Executive of the United States. All his powers are executive powers. It is a broader term than "administrative." The latter word relates to the carrying out of details proposed by others.

Mr. President, I doubt the wisdom of the whole plan. I think I shall vote for most of the other plans, but I do question the wisdom of this one, unless it is confined to housekeeping powers, namely, to the business of keeping accounts and operating the routine daily business of the Board. I would agree to that; but when the plans go further and try to make the Chairman of the Board the boss of the whole show, taking orders from the President who appoints him, and then directing or trying to direct the action of the Board as an executive policy, I think they go too far, if that is what they do, and I am afraid that is what they do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad the able and distinguished Senator from Ohio has made that statement, because I think it is the position to which he is logically going to be driven. The proposals with reference to the National Labor Relations Board, in Reorganization Plan No. 12, do not differ, so far as I can see, from the plans dealing with the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the new Maritime Commission, and so forth. So, if the Senator from Ohio rejects this principle in the case of the National Labor Relations Board, he will be driven, as a logical and consistent man, to oppose all the Hoover reorganization plans for independent commissions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I want to say this as to the general question of separating judicial and prosecuting functions: It is far more necessary to separate them in the case of the Labor Board than it is in the case of any other board. The truth is that the Government commissions are all very different; their functions are different; their actions are different; they deal with different questions. In the labor field the Board deals with a very touchy subject in which there is intense feeling, in which there is always a controversy on one side or the other. It is peculiarly necessary that the Government be a judicial arbiter between labor and management. The Labor Board should be so set up that no one can doubt its acting in a judicial sense, that it is not deliberately favoring labor, as a matter of policy, as was the case under the Wagner Act, and that it does not favor management. So, the reasons for keeping the functions separate in the case of the National Labor Relations Board are far greater than in the case of any of the other regulatory commissions of which I know. Its function is not so much the trial of cases; it does not depend so much on a lot of facts disputed vigorously on both sides; it depends rather on an administrative study of the entire problem. In this case I would say it is necessary to keep the functions separate.

The whole purpose of the Taft-Hartley law is to put the Government in a position in which it is fair as between labor and management, in which it tries to hold the scales even, so that the parties, when they meet, can feel that they can deal on a fair and equal basis across the bargaining table.

Mr. President, that brings me to my last point, and that is that it seems to me, looking at the present position, that it is to a large extent part of a political policy. It seems to me perfectly clear that the President is determined, if he can, first, of course, to repeal the Taft-Hartley law; if that is not done, then to take such action as to nullify many of its provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TAFT. I yield myself 10 more minutes, Mr. President.

What struck me very clearly is that the President seems to have entirely missed the point of having an impartial Board. In connection with the recent appointment to the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Gordon Gray, who had been appointed by the President 3 years ago, came up for reappointment, his term having expired. It was said that he was favorable to management. He sometimes, I think, perhaps more than did other members of the Board, voted on the side of management or voted more against labor. I could not find that his differences were anything more than anyone might have who deals with rather complicated problems arising under the law. As his term approached its end the press reported a determined labor opposition to his reappointment. He was not reappointed. The position remained unfilled for several months while the President sought an appointee who would be acceptable both to the CIO and to the A. F. of L. The White House

announced that the vacancy would not be filled until after consultation with labor organizations. Significantly, there was no mention of consulting with management organizations.

The President apparently feels that it is a Board which is supposed to crusade on the side of labor. I cannot help thinking that this particular plan is a part of that general program. Mr. Denham is more friendly to management, apparently, than are the Board's decisions. I do not find any prejudice shown in what he has done. I do not always agree with him. I think some of his opinions about jurisdiction are incorrect, but I cannot see that he has favored labor or management in any of the decisions he has made. But he is regarded by labor as being not favorable enough to labor, or as being antilabor.

I cannot help thinking, Mr. President, that the main purpose of the plan is to follow out the general program of the administration to make the National Labor Relations Board a labor agency and to destroy the basic principle of the Taft-Hartley law, which is to have an impartial board deciding cases on the basis of justice and holding even the scales between the contesting parties.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, in regard to the appointment of Mr. Styles to the Labor Board as the successor of Mr. Gray, whether it is a fact that Mr. Styles was unanimously approved by the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. TAFT. I have no criticism to make of Mr. Styles. I only know that before he was appointed he had to be approved by the American Federation of Labor and the CIO. I know he was himself a union member. Personally, I have no objection. He may turn out to be the most impartial member the Board ever had. I only suggest that the policy of the administration in refusing to reappoint Mr. Gray and seeking labor endorsement for another appointee shows a determination to nullify the spirit and the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The junior Senator from New York understood the Senator from Ohio to say, a few minutes ago, that if there were a transfer of functions to the Board rather than to the Chairman of the Board, he would not have any serious objection.

Section 1 of the act recites:

> There are hereby transferred * * * to the Chairman of the Board * * * the executive and administrative functions of the Board and of the general counsel, including their functions with respect to (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the distribution of business among personnel and among administrative units, (3) the use and expenditure of funds.

Those are the usual duties which are assigned to the chairman of a board of this character, and certainly they are functions recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. TAFT. I have already dealt with that whole question. I would rather not deal with it over again.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, I know that.

Section 3 pertains to the matter I brought out in the beginning of my remarks. I read:

> Transfer of functions to Board: All functions of the general counsel of the Board not transferred by the provisions of section 1 of this reorganization plan are hereby transferred to the Board.

Mr. TAFT. I cannot think of any functions exercised by the general counsel today which are not executive or administrative functions. So I should say that they are all transferred to the Chairman of the Board under the exact provisions of the plan.

Mr. LEHMAN. Virtually every function of a board, save those of a judicial character, is executive in nature. I know of very few exceptions, if any.

Mr. TAFT. They are either executive or judicial. However, the Board is primarily a judicial body, and most of its functions are judicial. I might add one other thing, Mr. President, from the report of the task force, which has not been referred to. The report says:

> The chief bottleneck is the Board, rather than the general counsel or any of his operational divisions.

So that it seems perfectly foolish to transfer an additional workload on the Board, which is already the bottleneck in the whole set-up.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. With respect to the workload, the Senator from New York would like to inquire of the able Senator from Ohio if he did not note, in the event that he has read the testimony taken at the hearings, the testimony with respect to the duties, functions, and activities of the Board? The Chairman of the Board indicated at that time that the so-called housekeeping functions which have been referred to were the ones which had always taken up a great share of the time of the Board, and that under an arrangement whereby such functions would be left to the Chairman such a condition would not obtain. Furthermore, far from causing an increase in the amount of work of the Board, such an arrangement would actually reduce the amount of work of the Board as a whole.

Mr. TAFT. Obviously it would reduce the amount of work of the other members of the Board, but it would probably triple or quadruple the work of the Chairman of the Board. He would have the job of appointing 1,200 personnel throughout the entire United States. He would have the job of supervising and bossing them. I do not see how anyone would be able to perform all the duties which would be put on the Chairman of the Board by this reorganization plan. More than half the duties would be executed by him, and the remainder by the whole Board.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Did not the Senator note also that the Chairman of the Board at the same time pointed out that he would be perfectly willing to undertake the additional functions; that although the performance of the extra functions might take some extra time, he would be perfectly agreeable to assuming those extra functions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have never seen any man who, when a legislative body decided to confer upon him arbitrary or dictatorial powers, was not willing to assume them. Of course, he is willing to undertake them. Oh, he thinks he is going to execute them mildly and justly, and act as a benevolent dictator would act under the circumstances. However, I have never yet known of a man who has refused such powers on the ground that it would make him too powerful. I have no doubt whatever that the Chairman is in favor of plan No. 12.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to remind the able Senator from Ohio that, regardless of his own implication as to the purpose the Chairman may have had in making the statement, the fact remains that the Chairman did not imply that purpose in his remarks when he commented upon the proposal. His statement referred exclusively to the actual activities which would be assigned to him and to his ability to perform the functions required of him in handling those activities.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks. In addition to the general method by which the President has handled the appointments to the Board, I wish to point out that the Department of Justice also, it seems to me, has in effect sabotaged the act in many respects. The Department of Justice has almost nullified the provision regarding the welfare fund. Its decisions have extended the checkoff provisions to initiation fees and assessments, which I believe was never intended when the act was passed. It has had referred to it 23 cases of persons signing non-Communist affidavits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TAFT. I assign myself five more minutes.

The Department considered 23 Communist cases and has not brought a single prosecution. A representative of the Department made the statement to the press recently that the reason why action was not taken was that the affidavit said, "I am not a Communist on this date." Therefore, the Department could not prosecute the man, because they could not prove he was a Communist on that date. That is what all Federal employees prove. I would not be in favor of requiring an affidavit which said "I

have never been a member of the Communist Party," because a man may change in good faith. Probably it would be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court recently upheld the constitutionality of the anti-Communist oath. In the past few months every Communist has signed an anti-Communist oath, and the Department has failed to enforce the law, as I think it failed to enforce the law in the coal case.

Mr. President, plan No. 12 is a part of a general plan to nullify the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. It is an attempt to nullify it indirectly by a method which I feel was never intended. I feel confident that if this matter is left to Congress we can work out such a statute which would fix in detail the powers of the general counsel and the Board and which will meet the basic principle of the law. The desire of Congress, I am certain, is to have the National Labor Relations Board operate as a judicial body holding evenly the scales of justice between those with whose activities it is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I assign myself such time as I shall need.

Mr. President, it is not only interesting but it is amazing that the able Senator from Ohio should close his very able argument on the note that Reorganization Plan No. 12 is nothing more or less than a plan to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. It is amazing in view of what happened on the floor of the Senate last May. As everyone knows, the Taft substitute, which prevailed on the floor of the Senate by a vote of 46 to 40, as I remember, provided for the abolition of the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. The reorganization plan submitted by the President of the United States contains a similar provision. It is difficult for me to understand what all this shouting is about in view of the previous firm and strong position which the distinguished Senator from Ohio took only a year ago.

Mr. President, in order to shift from the position which the Senator from Ohio took a year ago, he now construes and interprets Reorganization Plan No. 12 as entirely opposed to the purposes of the bill which was submitted as the Taft substitute in 1949. We have the testimony of the man who is sworn to administer the law, namely, the Chairman of the Board. He cannot do other than administer the act as it is written. The distinguished Senator from Ohio disagrees with what the Chairman of the Board said. Surely what the Chairman of the Board testified to before the committee as to his interpretation of Reorganization Plan No. 12 with respect to his duties, powers, and prerogatives ought to be final.

This is what he said:

> It has become essential at the outset to correct one complete misconception of the plan which appears in recent statements by Senator TAFT, a misconception which he says has influenced his own change of position since 1949.

Of course, the Senator from Ohio had to change since 1949. He had to find some way to get out from under the position he took in May 1949, when 47 or 48 other Senators supported him, in connection with this very important piece of legislation.

I quote further from what the Chairman said:

> He evidently believes that plan 12 vests many prosecutory and policy-making powers in the Chairman of the Board, and adds that he would not "object to the plan so much" if these powers were transferred to the Board as a whole. A reading of the plan itself should allay the Senator's fears, and any which his statement may have generated in others.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator remembers that this is a part of the substitute bill offered in place of a bill to repeal the entire Taft-Hartley law, does he not?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I remember that very well, but that does not change one iota the principle which the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Illinois both have fought for, the abolition of the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. The Senator from Ohio gave his arguments then as to why we should abolish the office of general counsel. They were cogent arguments; they were plausible arguments; and they do not square with the arguments made by the able Senator from Ohio on the same proposal today.

The Chairman of the Board, Mr. Herzog, proceeded further:

> The only additional functions the plan assigns to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, whether now vested in the general counsel or in the Board members, are the purely administrative and housekeeping ones assigned to the Chairmen of all seven commissions covered by plans 6 to 13.

Mr. President, I ask in all good faith, why do we here in the Senate make an exception of this particular agency? We are giving the others, seven in number, different treatment than we are giving to the National Labor Relations Board. A sound and plausible argument cannot be made for that type and kind of discrimination.

The Senator from Ohio talks about the delicacy of this matter, he speaks of the emotionalism being engendered in labor-management relations. One of the reasons why we have had so much emotionalism, so much trouble in labor disputes, is because of the arbitrary power which has been lodged in the general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board; and he has said so himself.

I quote further from the Chairman of the Board:

> The very wording of the plan itself makes it clear that all investigatory and regulatory functions will be vested in the Board—

Mark the word, "investigatory." That is the important part; that is where the prosecution lies, in the investigatory part. The prosecuting power does not lie in the Chairman, according to the Chairman himself. I quote:

> The very wording of the plan itself makes it clear that all investigatory and regulatory functions will be vested at this Board—precisely as they will continue to be vested at the other Commissions—not in one man, but in the five men who comprise the entire Board.

I ask how a Senator can discriminate and give the other seven commissions certain powers and duties, and yet deny the National Labor Relations Board the same kind of treatment.

Mr. Herzog said further:

> Section 3 of plan 12 transfers all functions of the general counsel to the full Board, except for those purely executive and administrative functions which are transferred to the Chairman for purposes of convenience and efficiency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What is a purely executive function? Is not practically every function exercised by every President of the United States and every other officer an executive function?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Ohio has been talking about investigatory power; he has been talking about regulatory power. His contention is that under the reorganization plan all those powers have been lodged in the Chairman of the Board. That is what I deny. I challenge that statement, and I am contending now that the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Herzog, who will administer the Board if Reorganization Plan No. 12 is agreed to, is correct in his interpretation; and after he has gone on record before a committee on the statements I have been reading to the Senate, he would not dare interpret it otherwise than he has in his statements which I have been reading.

Mr. President, to all intents and purposes, there is no difference between the plan submitted last year by the Senator from Ohio in what was called the Taft substitute for the Taft-Hartley law, and Reorganization Plan No. 12.

The Taft substitute, passed by the Senate in 1949, contained all of the language of sections 3 and 4 of the Taft-Hartley Act, except that section 3 (d), providing for the independent office of general counsel, was completely omitted.

On the single issue of the abolition of the office of general counsel, the Taft substitute bill and Reorganization Plan No. 12 are identical, except that under the Taft bill all administrative or other functions of the general counsel would have gone to the Board as a whole, while under Reorganization Plan No. 12 the purely administrative and housekeeping functions of the general counsel are transferred to the Chairman of the Board, in accordance with the Hoover recommendation. Even in the exercise of these functions the Chairman is to be governed by the general policies of the Board. Since the Taft substitute bill retained the language from the Taft-Hartley Act which made procedural changes, and since the reorganization plan will not affect this language in any particular, the Senator from Ohio in 1949 was supporting exactly what is being accomplished by this reorganization plan.

The Senator from Ohio has been arguing that this plan is not the same as what he proposed last year. He claims that this plan will merely transfer the

power from the general counsel to the Chairman of the Board, that this is a political use of the Hoover Commission recommendations, and that it makes a substantive change in the law. He further says that this is an improper use of the functions of the reorganization plan.

When the Senate or the House of Representatives passes upon this plan, it will either become a law or will not become a law. In other words, if we are changing substantive law, the Senate is changing it. The argument made here seems to me to be fallacious and unsound.

Although the Chairman of the Board will exercise the administrative and housekeeping functions for the entire Board, he is still subject to the general policies of the Board, and there is not an independent office such as the office of general counsel which now exists. The bifurcation, with its split authority, will be done away with, just as in the Taft substitute.

It is clear from the reorganization plan that all the investigation and prosecution functions will be vested in the Board as a whole, and not in the Chairman. That is the real distinction, so far as the Senator from Ohio is concerned.

The Senator from Ohio is adopting a strained construction of the reorganization plan. This is not the interpretation made by the Chairman of the NLRB, who will actually put the plan into operation, as I have stated.

On May 4, 1949, the Senator from Ohio inserted in the body of the RECORD a list of the proposed changes from the Taft-Hartley law made by his bill. The fifth point was the following:

> The independent general counsel provision is eliminated so that the Board will be governed hereafter by the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, except that we have retained certain of the procedural reforms made in the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, that is exactly what is done by Reorganization Plan No. 12.

In the debate on this measure on June 29, 1949, the Senator from Ohio outlined the confusion which had arisen because of the separate office of general counsel, and extolled the virtues of the Administrative Procedure Act which would be applicable under his bill, as well as under Reorganization Plan No. 12. He said:

> I believe that the amendments which we have suggested are important. Perhaps the most important one is the elimination of the independent general counsel. The difficulty which arose with the independent general counsel was that he took a different view of the jurisdiction of the Board than did the Board itself.

He did so upon not one but upon hundreds of complaints which came before that group. Mr. President, talk about chaos and confusion. Talk about questions being of a delicate nature. Talk about questions that cause emotionalism and bitterness to arise. How could they help but arise under the operations of such a monstrosity as this, a general counsel who has arbitrary and dictatorial powers, and who is in constant conflict with the members of the Board? Is there any wonder the National Labor Relations Board has not done its work as well as it should have done?

I continue to quote the Senator from Ohio:

> He would bring a case which he thought was covered by the act. After a year's litigation the Board would rule that it was not covered by the act.

Can one imagine anything more silly than that? Here is a counsel who has the power under the present law to bring in a case, and he rules it is covered by the act. Then the Board says it is not covered by the act. Yet, Mr. President, there is presumed to be harmony and cooperation in the Board.

I continue to read from the Senator from Ohio:

> In the last analysis the Board determined the result, but in the meantime there was confusion. There was a difference of opinion. There was difficulty in the separation of powers. Under the Administrative Procedure Act, which was passed since the passage of the original National Labor Relations Act, the judicial and prosecuting functions are largely separated, although not entirely so.

This is the Senator from Ohio talking to the Senate 1 year ago. It is not the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator talking. It is the Senator from Ohio talking to the Senate 1 year ago, the same Senator who now says that he wants to leave the situation just as it is, after the Senate passed the substitute measure last year abolishing the general counsel's powers.

The Senator from Ohio continued:

> The procedure goes back to the Board. However, we felt that on the whole that separation accomplished the purposes we were trying to accomplish in not having the same people bring the prosecution, try the case, and then judge those who they themselves had indicted. That was one of the strong protests made by the labor unions, and we felt that it was sufficiently justified to go back to the Administrative Procedure Act and rely upon that for a fair treatment by the Board (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1949, p. 8586).

On June 30, 1949, the Senator from Ohio made the following statement with respect to this issue:

> The amendments which we have suggested are important ones. The most vigorous protest was directed against the operation of the independent general counsel. While there was some doubt on my part, we agreed that provisions should be eliminated and that we should return to the administrative procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. It is a great improvement over the original procedure, although it does not completely separate the prosecuting and judicial functions (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 30, 1949, p. 8712).

Mr. President, let us note the difference between the position of the Senator a year ago and his position now. What has changed the opinion of the Senator from Ohio with respect to this very important matter?

When the Senator from Ohio says "It is a great improvement over the original procedure," he is referring to the minor procedural changes made by the Taft-Hartley Act, which he says are an improvement over the original act.

This plan would reorganize the NLRB so that it would conform to the general pattern of good organization recommended by the Hoover Commission for regulatory commissions. The Hoover Commission itself recommended that "all administrative responsibility be vested in the chairman of the commission." That is the purpose of Reorganization Plan No. 12.

The task force of the Hoover Commission responsible for studying the regulatory commissions commented on the anomalous organization of the NLRB. The task-force report said:

> The existence of such an office (i. e., the general counsel), independent both of the Federal department structure and of the Board, marks a departure from previous administrative practice. If permitted to set a pattern for future Government organization it may lead to a diffusion of responsibility.

In its conclusions the task force recommended that a review of the NLRB should consider four factors. The fourth of these was:

> The office of general counsel should not be left independent of both the Board and the executive departments but should be integrated more closely into one or the other according to the functions to be performed.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 eliminates a confusing, inefficient, and probably dangerous method of organization.

The incumbent general counsel, Denham, has said that his powers—listen to his statement—"are broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded a single officer in a peacetime agency"—Senate hearings, page 6.

We hear much said about the granting of powers to the executive branch of the Government. We hear constant discussion and debate with respect to the granting of dictatorial and arbitrary power. Listen to what Mr. Denham himself says about the power he has. He said before the Senate committee, and it appears in the Senate hearings on page 6, that his powers "are broad and absolute and his authority final to an outstanding degree seldom accorded to a single officer in a peacetime agency."

Mr. President, to me it appears extremely dangerous that such a grant should be made. I care not who is granted such power; it is dangerous. It is dangerous to the country that such power should be put into the hands of any one man, whether he be Mr. Denham or whether he be Mr. Herzog, or someone else. Mr. Denham admitted boldly before the committee that he has more authority—more power—than any single officer has ever been granted at any time past.

This dual administration of one law has resulted in many conflicts:

First. The general counsel has interpreted the Taft-Hartley Act so that his jurisdiction is practically unlimited. The NLRB itself has refused to act where the amount of interstate business is insubstantial. These two conflicting interpretations of the jurisdiction granted

by the Taft-Hartley Act cause confusion and waste.

Second. The Board's orders must be enforced in the courts, but no provision is made for a legal staff with which to perform this function. Think of that, Mr. President. All the lawyers of the NLRB are under the supervision of the general counsel. Experience shows that in some instances the general counsel has refused to permit his legal staff to enforce the orders in the courts.

Does confusion, does chaos exist in the Board? Yet, when we have an opportunity, under the Reorganization Plan No. 12, to end the confusion, some wish the situation to continue as it is. Some Senators are going to vote to continue the abominable situation which exists today.

Third. The general counsel has unlimited discretion to refuse to issue a complaint. Yet it is this choice of cases in which to proceed that in a large measure determines administrative practice.

Reorganization Plan No. 12 preserves all the safeguards essential to due process and provides for a workable separation of the functions of investigation and prosecution on the one hand and decision on the other within the framework of the single agency organization.

Under the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, regulatory commissions are to separate the prosecution and decision functions. This means that organizationally and administratively the Commission is organized as a single unit, but within that organization certain individuals will handle the investigation and prosecution, while others will make decisions on cases presented. That is the way it should be.

Mr. President, this is the general pattern of the organization of the other regulatory Commissions, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and others. Reorganization Plan No. 12 will conform the NLRB to this pattern. The Administrative Procedure Act has proved workable in separating the prosecution of cases from the decision of cases without introducing the confusing and wasteful practice of establishing separate offices for general counsels.

Mr. President, in conclusion I say that if the Senate of the United States really desires to do something in the way of encouraging good labor-management relations, now is the time to act so such relations may be encouraged, by adopting the Reorganization Plan No. 12 submitted by the President of the United States. If the plan is not adopted, the situation will remain as it is, with all the conflicts that exist, with all the confusion that exists, and which has existed ever since the Taft-Hartley Act has been the law of the land. How any United States Senator can put the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and other commissions in one category, giving them the power they ought to have, and the diffusion of power they ought to have, and yet hamstring the National Labor Relations Board, is more than I can understand.

It seems to me that, definitely, it is a penalty on labor's head, and would impede what labor is trying to do, by refusing to permit this kind of an organization to go into effect, an organization by means of which we shall have some order, instead of the chaos and the confusion which have existed since the beginning of this act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that if I yield the remainder of my time, the Senator will yield the remainder of his?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the remainder of the time allotted to this side.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Martin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Maybank
Benton	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Hoey	Myers
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cordon	Kem	Stennis
Darby	Kerr	Taft
Donnell	Kilgore	Taylor
Douglas	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Leahy	Thye
Ecton	Lehman	Tobey
Ellender	Lodge	Tydings
Ferguson	Long	Watkins
Flanders	Lucas	Wherry
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wiley
George	McClellan	Williams
Gillette	McFarland	Withers
Green	McKellar	Young
Gurney	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 248.

Perhaps the Chair will be permitted to make this statement, in the interest of clarity:

The resolution is in negative form:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 13, 1950.

Therefore, those who do not favor Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950 will vote "yea." Those who do favor Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950 will vote "nay."

The Parliamentarian informs the Chair of the fact that at least 49 votes are required in order to adopt this resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] who is also absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—53

Brewster	Fulbright	Millikin
Bricker	George	Mundt
Bridges	Gillette	O'Conor
Butler	Gurney	Robertson
Byrd	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Cain	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Jenner	Stennis
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Taft
Darby	Kem	Thye
Donnell	Kerr	Tydings
Dworshak	Knowland	Watkins
Eastland	McCarthy	Wherry
Ecton	McClellan	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Young
Flanders	Maybank	

NAYS—30

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	McFarland
Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	McKellar
Benton	Kefauver	Myers
Chavez	Kilgore	Neely
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Green	Leahy	Taylor
Hayden	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Hunt	Long	Tobey
Ives	Lucas	Withers

NOT VOTING—13

Downey	McMahon	Pepper
Frear	Magnuson	Russell
Graham	Morse	Vandenberg
Humphrey	Murray	
McCarran	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote there are 53 yeas, 30 nays. A majority of the authorized membership of the Senate having voted in the affirmative, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is a motion to reconsider in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. Under the act and the rule, it is not in order.

STEPS TOWARD FEDERATION OF THE WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

(By unanimous consent, the following remarks by Mr. FULBRIGHT, delivered during the course of the proceedings on Senate Resolution 248, were ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD:)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was pleased, indeed, to read in the morning newspapers about the proposal of the French Government to combine the French and German coal and steel industries. I regard this as an extremely important proposal. If it is carried through successfully, it will be a large and an important step along the road toward federation of the western European countries.

For more than 3 years I have done everything I could to persuade our Government to promote the unification of Europe. Except for the recent activities of Mr. Paul Hoffman, of the ECA, our Government has taken the attitude that we should not interfere in this matter, not even to the extent of suggesting it.

Now that the French Government has taken the lead, I think our Government ought to give the proposal wholehearted and enthusiastic support. Secretary Acheson is now in Europe, and I urge him to take the proposal seriously and to pledge our support and cooperation in every possible way.

There are, of course, many difficulties involved in the scheme. It will undoubtedly meet with much opposition from local interests. It is already suggested in the press that Great Britain is not enthusiastic about it.

Mr. President, with regard to practically all other suggestions concerning European unification, the present Labor Government of Great Britain has been reluctant to lend its support. I sincerely hope that in this instance that government will consider most seriously the possible consequences of rebuffing this courageous and far-sighted leadership on the part of the French Government.

Many of us, including myself, have been losing our enthusiasm for the Marshall plan because of the apparent impossibility of making any progress toward European federation. If none is made, I believe the British must assume much of the responsibility, and I believe the consequences will be very serious indeed.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the French Government for having the imagination and the courage to make this proposal. We have heard a great deal recently to the effect that the French Government is politically weak, being torn by the Communists. However, this proposal would indicate that the French Government has a considerably greater amount of strength than I had thought or that the press had indicated it had, because the Communists have traditionally, for many years, opposed any step toward the unification of Europe.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be as informative as possible, I now ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the text of the proposal of the French, as it appears in the New York Times of May 11.

There being no objection, the text of the plan was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE FRENCH COAL-STEEL POOL PLAN

The peace of the world can only be preserved if creative efforts are made which are commensurate, in their scope, with the dangers which threaten peace.

The contribution which an organized and active Europe can make to civilization is indispensable for the maintenance of peaceful relations. France, by championing during more than 20 years the idea of a united Europe, has always regarded it as an essential objective to serve the purposes of peace. Because Europe was not united, we have had war.

A united Europe will not be achieved all at once, nor in a single framework: it will be formed by concrete measures which first of all create a solidarity in fact. The uniting of the European nations requires that the age-old opposition between France and Germany be culminated; the action to be taken must first of all concern France and Germany.

ASKS ACTION ON GERMANY FIRST

To that end, the French Government proposes that immediate action be concentrated on one limited, but decisive point:

The French Government proposes that the entire French-German production of coal and steel be placed under a joint high authority, within an organization open to the participation of other European nations.

The pooling of coal and steel production will immediately assure the establishment of common bases for economic development, which is the first state for a European federation, and will change the destiny of these regions which have long been devoted to the production of arms to which they themselves were the first to fall constantly victim.

The community of production which will in this manner be created will clearly show that any war between France and Germany becomes not only unthinkable, but in actual fact impossible. The establishment of this powerful production unit, open to all countries that wish to participate in it, will give a real foundation to their economic development, by furnishing on equal terms to all countries thus united the fundamental elements of industrial production.

This production will be offered to the entire world, without distinction or exclusion, as a contribution to the raising of living standards and to the progress of world peace. Europe, with its resources thus increased, will be able to pursue one of its essential tasks—the development of the African Continent.

This will quickly and easily bring about the fusion of interests which is indispensable to the establishment of an economic community and introduce a leaven of broader and deeper community of interest between countries which have long been divided by bloody conflict.

By pooling basic production and by creating a new high authority whose decisions will be binding on France, Germany, and the other countries who may subsequently join, this proposal will create the first concrete foundation for a European federation which is so indispensable for the preservation of peace.

In order to pursue the objectives so defined, the French Government is prepared to initiate negotiations on the following bases:

The functions entrusted to the joint high authority will be, as quickly as possible, to modernize production and improve its quality; to supply coal and steel on equal terms to the French and German markets as well as to those of the member countries; to develop joint exports to other countries; to improve and equalize conditions of life and work in these industries.

In order to reach these objectives in the light of the disparate conditions of production prevailing in the member countries, certain transitional measures must be taken involving the application of a production and investment plan, the institution of a mechanism for equalizing prices, and the creation of a reconversion fund to facilitate the rationalization of production. The flow of coal and steel between member countries will be immediately exempted from all customs duties and may not be subject to freight differentials. In this way conditions will be progressively created which will automatically insure the most effective rationalization of production on the basis of the highest level of productivity.

CALLED UNLIKE A CARTEL

Unlike an international cartel whose purpose is to divide up and exploit national markets through restrictive practices, and the maintenance of high profits, the projected organization will insure the fusion of markets and the expansion of production.

The principles and the essential undertakings defined above will be the subject of a treaty between the states to be submitted to parliaments for ratification. The negotiations required to work out the details of implementation will be conducted with the assistance of jointly designated arbiter. The latter's duty will be to see that the agreements conform with the principles and, in the event of final disagreement, to determine the solution to be adopted.

The joint high authority charged with the operation of the entire system will be composed of independent personalities chosen on a basis of equality by the governments; a president will be chosen by the governments by common agreement; his decisions will be enforceable in France, Germany, and the other member countries. Appropriate measures will assure the necessary channels of appeal against the decisions of the high authority. A representative of the United Nations near the authority will be charged with making a public report to UN twice a year on the functioning of the new organization, particularly with respect to protecting its peaceful aims.

The setting up of the high authority in no way prejudices the question of ownership of the enterprises. In the exercise of its mission, the joint high authority will take into account the powers conferred on the international Ruhr authority and the obligations of every kind imposed on Germany as long as they are in existence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article pertaining to this proposition, by Mr. Walter Lippmann, appearing in this morning's newspapers. As everyone knows, Mr. Lippmann has for many years almost alone among the columnists supported vigorously the movement and the idea of European federation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A MOST IMPORTANT EVENT

The French proposal to Germany, announced Tuesday evening by Mr. Schuman, has taken the world by surprise. But it is a very pleasant surprise. The French Government has proposed to the German nation much more than concessions on this and that. The French have proposed that they take the first but also by all odds the most important step toward a final liquidation of the Franco-German conflict in Europe.

The essence of the proposal is that the big industries of western Europe, fundamentally coal and steel, which are in Germany, in France, in the Saar, in Luxemburg, and Belgium, shall all be brought under the same—a common—system of industrial law and regulation. The operating conditions, the trading rights and arrangements, the labor standards are to be made approximately equal despite the fact that the industrial region is under four—or if one counts the Saar, five—different political governments.

The French Government has thus made a fundamental change in its attitude toward Germany. In place of dismemberment and prolonged inequality M. Bidault and M. Schuman are offering Germany full equality and a full Franco-German partnership in European affairs. This is the boldest, the wisest, the most far-reaching, and constructive act of statesmanship since the end of the war. Chancellor Adenauer was quick to see the immense significance of the French proposal. If that proposal can be consummated, then in the Franco-German partnership there will come into existence the nucleus of a European power—of that "third force" which is so indispensable to the stabilization of Europe and to peace in the world.

No project of this magnitude can be carried through without a struggle against vested interests of many kinds—in every country immediately concerned and in other countries as well. There ought to be no hesitation, it seems to me, on the part of the American Government in giving the proposal its full and active support in Bonn, in Brussels, in London, and elsewhere. For this is a bus which we simply cannot afford to miss.

The terms of the partnership will have to be worked out by the French and the Germans. Our first role in the business is to do what we can to see to it that there is no interference from the outside. Then it is our right as an occupying power and our interest in the broadest sense to encourage the Germans and the French to believe that the risks will be less and the prizes will be greater if they are bold and magnanimous. For France and for Germany, after the terrible war and in the face of a war that would be so much more terrible, there is no safety now except in audacity.

The French proposal is bold and it is magnanimous. Only 5 years have passed since the end of the cruelist and most degrading of all the Franco-German wars. It is a bold and magnanimous act on the part of the French Government, which is among the victors, to propose to its hereditary enemy, which is defeated, that they enter into a full and equal, and indeed an intimate, partnership in European affairs.

In taking the decision to make the proposal the French Government must have realized that this meant the revival of the political and economic influence of Germany in Europe. In any such equal industrial regime as the French are offering, the Germans are bound by their technological and administrative gifts and discipline to play a leading part.

Moreover, the French cannot have had the illusion—which is entertained by many in Washington and in London—that this resurgent and powerful Germany can be enmeshed or integrated into being a useful, reliable secondary ally of Britain and of the United States. In a Franco-German partnership the Germans will acquire such independent power that they can have a foreign policy of their own.

What will that policy be? Some among us hope and believe that the Germans, having achieved full equality with the West, will therefore turn their backs on the East. I believe this to be a miscalculation. The Germans, living as they do in the middle and not on the western fringe of Europe, will have—as they have always had throughout their history—an eastern as well as a western policy. My own belief is that a Franco-German understanding would on the part of the Germans be followed by something like—at the least—a Bismarckian policy of reinsurance with the East. But within the framework of the Bidault-Schuman policy it would be possible, indeed necessary, for France to participate as an equal and fully informed partner in any German negotiations with the East.

One of the prime facts of European life, which is not always fully appreciated in London and in Washington, is that Germany must have relations to the east. She can wage war to the east. She can make deals with the East. But what is impossible for Germany is to have no relations with the East.

We can get along without relations with eastern Europe and with Russia. Britain can get along. But not Germany. And any conception of European and German policy which assumes the contrary is sure to lead to disappointment and to failure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent, in further elucidation of the same point, to have inserted at this point in the RECORD the leading editorial of this morning's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER BOLD NEW PLAN

When the Big Three foreign ministers meet in London today to buttress the bulwarks of the Atlantic world against the menace of Russo-Communist imperialism, they will have before them what is by all odds the boldest and most dramatic European proposal toward that end advanced thus far. This proposal, if carried out, would rival in ultimate significance both the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Pact itself. It is the French proposal for pooling the basic coal and steel industries of Europe and putting them under a common international high authority. The plan would begin with the coal and steel industries of France and Germany, but it would be open to other European countries willing to join. Under this plan the participating nations would undertake to subordinate their own sovereignty in respect to these industries to the high authority, in order to establish a common market for their products, break down customs and other trade barriers and embark upon a common development program as a first but concrete step toward both the European economic integration urged by the United States and the European federation demanded by growing numbers of the Europeans themselves as their last hope of salvation.

The political and economic implications of this plan are so momentous—and the practical difficulties of giving effect to it are so enormous—that further study and further elucidation of its many ramifications will be necessary before final judgment can be passed on all of its phases. But one point is clear. This move represents a far-reaching French initiative toward a sweeping economic partnership between France and Germany designed to end the age-old rivalry between these two countries and to rivet the new Germany firmly to the western community of nations. As such, it has already been hailed as a generous gesture by German Chancellor Adenauer, who has made numerous similar proposals in the past, and who on the strength of this plan is now proceeding immediately to effect Germany's entrance into the Council of Europe, which was likewise a French idea. Both French Foreign Minister Schuman and Mr. Adenauer agree that the implementation of this project, even between France and Germany alone, would make future war between them materially impossible. And if that is so—if French fears of a reviving Germany can be permanently allayed—then a Franco-German partnership is capable of opening up new vistas leading not only toward a stronger and better Europe but also toward a firmer peace.

It is from this point of view that Secretary Acheson has welcomed the far-reaching intent of the plan, pending final analysis of details, with sympathy and approval. As he told a London audience, for better or for worse the people of Western Germany are "part of our company," and the reestablishment of Germany in the family of western civilization must be a cooperative enterprise in which the risks and responsibilities must be shared by all, including the Germans themselves.

As in all matters of European political or economic integration, the British reaction has been more hesitant, partly because Britain believes in a step-by-step approach to difficult problems rather than in grandiose concepts, partly because the French plan does not fit the Socialist program of the Labor government (on which point it is supported by all European Socialists, including the German) and partly because Britain looks askance at possible competition from a continental bloc. But the French, who still oppose closer political association with Germany unless Britain joins as a counterweight, obviously have now decided to break the log-jam of British hestitation by moving for a continental economic unification from which Britain can absent herself only at considerable risk. For whether Britain joins or not, it is more than likely that if the Franco-German partnership becomes a reality other continental countries will find it to their advantage to join. Moreover, if such a partnership is effected in coal and steel it is inevitable that it will soon be extended to other industries, until full economic integration has been achieved.

One danger facing the plan is that it may be diverted into a new kind of cartel arrangement, for which its "price-equating" provisions could provide a basis. But this danger is small because the plan would be operated not by private industry but by a public international authority reporting to the United Nations. If that danger can be avoided, the new plan is bound not only to command American moral and financial support but also to exert a powerful attraction on nations now being exploited by the Soviets behind the iron curtain.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of March

1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STRENGTHENING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, conclusions to a report prepared by the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security on "Strengthening Unemployment Insurance" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Finance:

" 'Senate Resolution 5

" 'Memorializing Congress concerning the importation of rubber and other products

" '*Resolved by the Senate,* That the Congress of the United States be urged to take whatever action is necessary and suitable to regulate the importation of rubber goods and other manufactured products into this country, such action to be undertaken to protect this country's manufacturers from loss of contracts and the resulting loss of employment opportunities for the working people of the Nation.'

"STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
"Senate, May 2, 1950.

"STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
"Office of the Secretary, ss:

"I, Winifred McDonald, secretary of the State of Connecticut and keeper of the seal thereof, and of the original record of acts and resolutions of the general assembly of said State, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of Senate Resolution No. 5, memorializing Congress concerning the importation of rubber and other products, with the original record of the same now remaining in this office and have found the said copy to be correct and complete transcript thereof

"And I further certify that the said original record is a public record of the said State of Connecticut, now remaining in this office.

"In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State, at Hartford, this tenth day of May, 1950.

"WINIFRED MCDONALD,
"Secretary."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the problem of resurgent nazism and communism in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE] on May 10, 1950, p. 6766, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Federation of Woman's Clubs of Cumberland County, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Fifty-ninth Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., relating to American education and other matters pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2496. A bill to authorize contributions to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 7635. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to provide graduation leave upon appointment as commissioned officers in the regular components of the armed forces of graduates of the United States Military, Naval, or Coast Guard Academies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554); and

H. R. 7708. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 3573. A bill to relieve persons in the military service from refunding to the United States the amount of life-insurance premiums, and interest thereon, guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 3574. A bill authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to release the trustees of Columbia University, in the city of New York, and the Citizens' Veterans Homes Association of Rockland County, Inc., from obligations under their contracts for operation of veterans' temporary housing project, NY–V–30212; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 3575. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 3576. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Jessie Pleases Herself; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to correct the service records of Navy veterans of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL POWERS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 272), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, created by Senate Resolution 58, agreed to February 20, 1950, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words.

SEC. 2. A majority of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949 for comparable duties. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the heads of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies.

SEC. 4. Until an appropriation shall be made for payment of expenses of the committee, such expenses, in an amount not to exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECHES AT BURLINGTON, OTTUMWA, CRESTON, AND PACIFIC JUNCTION, IOWA

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speeches delivered by the President at Burlington, Ottumwa, Creston, and Pacific Junction, Iowa, on May 8, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMENTS BY SENATOR WHERRY ON STATEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on May 9, 1950, commenting on the statements made by President Truman during his present western tour, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN BEFORE PRESBYTERIAN CHAPLAINS DINNER

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MARTIN before the Presbyterian chaplains dinner of the Military Chaplains Association of the United States, held at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, on Tuesday, May 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FARMERS' INTEREST IN THE KERR GAS BILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KERR

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him concerning the farmers' interest in the Kerr gas bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MRS. OVETA CULP HOBBY AT ANNUAL JOURNALISM BANQUET, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby at the annual journalism banquet at the University of Missouri, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPLICATIONS OF THE HISS CASE—ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Hiss Case Said To Have Aroused Irate Demand for Full Spy Story," written by Mark Sullivan and published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S WESTERN TOUR—EDITORIAL FROM THE CONCORD DAILY MONITOR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Nonpolitical' Tour," published in the Concord (N. H.) Daily Monitor of May 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "United Jewish Appeal," published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of May 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTRICAL CARTELS IN POSTWAR EUROPE—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sweden Uncovers Electrical Cartel," from the New York Times of Wednesday, May 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 21—STATEMENT BY ROSCOE H. HUPPER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Roscoe H. Hupper in support of Senate Resolution 265 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 21, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCIDENTS—BRUCE BARTON'S COLUMN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the column of Bruce Barton entitled "Accidents," published in a recent issue of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of telegrams received by him from industries and businesses in Ohio, indicating the serious unemployment situation by reason of the present railroad strike, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ARTICLE BY DON ROSS

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Rail Service Cut in 27 States by Firemen's Strike on Four Roads," by Don Ross, published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ARTICLE BY GEORGE ECKEL

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Railroad Traffic Is Disrupted as Firemen Strike on Four Lines," by George Eckel, published in the New York Times of Thursday, May 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a letter protesting against the curtailment of postal service, written by Dr. Richard Lewisohn, of New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR McCARTHY'S CHARGES

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Subversion in the Senate," published in the Saturday Review of Literature, which appears in the Appendix.]

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM—RESOLUTION OF KIWANIS CLUB OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, some of the most pleasant memories I can recall are those associated with my fellow members of the Kiwanis Clubs of America. In 1933 it was my pleasure to serve as Governor of the Wisconsin-Upper Michigan District of Kiwanis International.

It is therefore always with particular interest that I note the great activities of this distinguished service organization which is so well represented in my own State and throughout the Nation.

I have in my hand a resolution conveyed to me by G. B. Athey, vice president of the Kiwanis Club of Milwaukee. In this club, Don M. Pierson is president, Curtis H. Lankford is secretary, Clarence H. Lichtfeldt is treasurer, Miss Ruth M. Jensen is executive secretary, and Byron H. Spear is immediate past president.

The resolution pertains to the revamping of the Nation's obsolete old-age and survivors insurance system. I believe it would be of interest to my colleagues, and so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

KIWANIS CLUB OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 9, 1950.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is my privilege and duty to present the following to you in the name of the Milwaukee Kiwanis Club:

Resolved, That in the highly important field of social security, the Kiwanis Club of Milwaukee favors the following:

1. That all occupations not now covered, including self-employment and farm labor, should be brought under old-age and survivor insurance.

2. That the Federal approach to the problem of the care for the aged should fundamentally be on an insured basis rather than on a needs basis, limiting any action on a needs basis to State and local action.

3. That if universal extension of coverage is adopted then benefits should be increased in accordance with the formula recommended by the advisory counsel of the Senate Finance Committee, but with the retention of the $3,000 wage base for determining average wage.

4. That the program be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis by continuing the present method of equal contributions by employers and employees.

5. That the proper approach to the problem of the total and permanently disabled lies in the rehabilitation and assistance programs of voluntary organizations and public-assistance agencies at the State and local levels without any Federal aid unless at the end of 7 years it is shown that care in this field is not being provided.

It is our hope that you will recognize the importance of the above resolution and will give it your sympathetic support when voting on bill H. R. 6000.

Respectfully.

KIWANIS CLUB OF MILWAUKEE,
G. B. ATHEY, *Vice President.*

REDUCTION IN LEATHER TARIFFS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement, and two messages which I have received from Wisconsin supervisory and rank-and-file employees, on the question of opposition to proposed reductions in leather tariffs. I ask unanimous consent to have these two messages, along with my statement, printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON PROTECTION OF AMERICAN BUSINESS AND AMERICAN JOBS

On Tuesday, May 2, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 6126, a message which I had received from a boot and shoe workers union local in south Milwaukee. This letter pointed out the critical problem faced by these workers who find their jobs threatened by a flood of cheap foreign shoes pouring into the United States at one-half or so the cost to produce them in our own country. I stated at that time, and I repeat now, that (a) America is blessed with the highest standard of living in the world; (b) American workers are paid the highest wages in the world, in contrast (c) to low foreign standards of living and cheap wages paid to foreign workers.

WE DON'T WANT BREAD LINES BACK

Since the ultimate cost of any product is in considerable part composed of the labor cost, naturally cheap labor cost abroad means a cheap price tag on the over-all product. Inevitably that means that many American goods can be easily undersold and completely driven from the market. Mr. President, I do not want to see our beloved country return to the days of bread lines, soup kitchens, apples being sold on street corners, and gates with signs spread over them reading "Factory closed—do not apply to personnel office."

The desire to afford reasonable protection to American jobs and American business is not inconsistent with a desire to promote world trade to the greatest extent possible. We know that trade cannot be a one-way street. We know that foreign nations must sell to the United States in order to buy from us.

UNCLE SAM MUST NOT BE UNCLE SAP

At the same time, we know that it is our country which has invariably made the greatest number of trade concessions in the world, and that in spite of our concessions, in spite of the slashing of our tariff barriers, many foreign countries have invariably responded by reneging on their commitments and putting up all sorts of barriers against American products.

In other words, in our conferences, we have been playing the game of "give and take." We give everything (all sorts of trade concessions) and take nothing. The foreign countries often give nothing and take everything. I do not want to be unkind to these foreign nations. I know the critical postwar problems that they face. I have supported reasonable efforts to help put them back on their own feet.

WE CANNOT HELP WORLD BY DESTROYING AMERICA

But I have pointed out, and will continue to point out, that one of the greatest hopes for foreign trade is in developing items which are not directly competitive with American products, and I have pointed out, too, that we cannot build world prosperity on the basis of destroying American prosperity. A strong, solvent America is still the best guaranty of a strong, solvent world.

I don't want to see tanneries or other factories closed in Fond du Lac or Milwaukee or Wausau or Appleton, Wis., because American goods have been driven from the field by avalanches of coolie-made foreign products.

LETTERS FROM CIO AND SUPERVISORS

As an indication of grass-roots sentiments on this issue, I have in my hands two letters which I have received within the last 2 hours. One comes from a CIO local in Fond du Lac, Wis., and the other from a group of management employees in the same town. Both express a similar message—a very reasonable message—an appeal for protection of American leather workers from reckless slashes in our tariffs.

This is a matter which I have taken up time and again with the United States Tariff Commission and with the White House, and it is an item which I will continue to take up until we are satisfied that American bargainers at tariff-negotiation conferences are mindful of the tremendous impact of their reckless actions on United States jobs and United States business.

The letters which I have received are as follows:

INTERNATIONAL FUR AND
LEATHER WORKERS UNION
OF THE UNITED STATES AND
CANADA, CIO, LOCAL NO.
360, LEATHER DIVISION,
Fond du Lac, Wis., May 9, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has been brought to our attention that serious consideration is being given to lowering the tariff on leather and leather byproducts being shipped into the United States from abroad. We consider this as being both dangerous and unfair to both American labor and management.

Much attention is being directed to the present unemployment condition in this country. Certainly lowering or eliminating the tariff now in effect would be disastrous to the leather industry and would tend to create a much more serious unemployment situation.

The Government cannot expect labor and management of the tanning industry to compete with cheap foreign labor and material. If we expect to maintain the high standard of living prevailing in America, we must protect ourselves by insisting that the tariff on leather and other byproducts be kept at a fair level.

The 390 members of Local No. 360, International Fur and Leather Workers Union, urgently request that you as our representative exert every bit of influence and power at your command to prevent further reduction in leather tariffs. We are in a position to send you a formal petition with the signatures of the 390 members of Local No. 360, should you so desire.

This local feels that our jobs and our security depend on immediate action on this matter. We will anticipate your prompt consideration of this problem and will sincerely appreciate any information from you pertaining to your progress.

Yours very truly,
DONALD STOFFREGAN,
Recording Secretary.

KEY MEN'S CLUB,
FRED RUEPING LEATHER CO.,
Fond du Lac, Wis., May 8, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Key Men's Club of the Fred Rueping Leather Co. is an organization of all supervisory employees of this company. At a recent meeting the 88 members unanimously delegated their chairman to write a letter to their legislative representatives, protesting any further reduction in the tariff on leather or leather products.

Any weakening of the low tariff protection now in effect would be disastrous to the leather industry of this country. It is impossible for our industry to compete with foreign companies who receive financial subsidies from their governments, are protected against competition by import restrictions, and whose employees receive wages as much as 90 percent lower than ours. The present United States duties on foreign leathers are the lowest of any leather producing country in the world and they must not be reduced to any lower level.

If it would be of assistance, we will gladly send the signatures of the Key Men, all of whom believe that any action on leather tariff should result in increased, rather than decreased, protection for the United States leather industry.

We urgently request that you take all possible steps to prevent further reduction in leather tariffs and would appreciate any information from you regarding action taken.

Yours very truly,
CARL W. TONJES, *Chairman.*

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate the remainder of this week, to and including Tuesday, May 16, 1950.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday and Tuesday of next week.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF EUROPEAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE, AND SUNDRY OFFICERS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the junior Senator from Virginia yield to his colleague?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield 2 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in executive session, and as acting chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I report from that committee the nomination of Mr. Archibald Stevens Alexander, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Army; Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel, United States Army, to be Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee; and numerous other routine Army, Navy, and Air Force nominations, including a large number of midshipmen and cadets, with the recommendation that they be confirmed and the President notified. If they are not approved today they will have to be printed on the Executive Calendar and will take up about 40 pages. There are 4,633 names. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that all these nominations be confirmed and that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 246, dealing with the Office of Comptroller of the Currency, debate to be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, the time to be equally divided, and the time for the proponents to be controlled by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and for the opponents by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, I hope the Senator will make a motion instead of asking unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 246 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 246) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that debate on this resolution be limited to not exceeding 1 hour—I hope it will be less—and that the time be equally divided——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the time is equally divided under the law, without request.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask that the time for the proponents be controlled by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and for the opponents by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a short statement?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Before yielding myself 10 minutes, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to state that the Committee on Banking and Currency had before it for consideration the resolution offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and voted unanimously against the transfer proposed in Reorganization Plan No. 1.

As chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is chairman, and made quite a lengthy statement. The record speaks for itself. Speaking for both Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I hope that the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, like a number of others submitted to the Congress by the President on March 13, involves a single issue which has brought about opposition to it.

The only real objection to the plan voiced at the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was that the plan, by transferring the functions of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Secretary of the Treasury, would tend to disrupt the existing confidence in our national banking system.

There was no objection to any of the provisions of the plan which would conform to the general recommendations of the Hoover Commission relative to reorganizations within the Department of the Treasury, and to provide the Secretary with an administrative assistant under the classified civil service. Nor was there any opposition expressed to vesting all functions of the Department, excepting the Comptroller of the Currency, in the Secretary.

Therefore, the whole issue involved in Reorganization Plan No. 1 is that it proposes to go counter to an accepted principle established by Congress 86 years ago, in that the exercise of the quasi-judicial functions now administered by the Comptroller of the Currency on an independent statutory basis, be vested in the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator believe there could possibly be any economy if the plan were adopted?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No, none at all, because the Secretary does not want the power; he wants the situation left as it is. The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency is paid for by the banks and not by the Government.

Witnesses contended that this would destroy the independence of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and make that Office subservient to the President.

During the hearings it was fully developed by various witnesses that the Comptroller's office has a unique status within the Department of the Treasury in that it is supported not by Federal funds, but by contributions from member banks, and no part of its expenditures are paid from public funds.

A further point was made that the inclusion of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency within the plan is not in accord with the objectives of the Hoover Commission in its recommendations toward effecting economy and efficiency in the Government, and the elimination of duplicating functions. The Secretary of the Treasury stated specifically in a letter to the committee that he would make no change whatever in the present operations of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency should the plan become effective, although such authority is granted to him thereunder.

I invite Senators to read the letter. It will be found on page 9 of the report.

The Secretary stated that he could not be responsible for what some of his successors might do.

A further point at issue in connection with the consideration of this reorganization plan is the fact that it does not accord with the intent of section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, which sets forth the specific purposes of that act and the conditions under which reorganization plans were to be submitted to the Congress by the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 2 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 containing its objectives and purposes be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, section 2 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the Senator from Arkansas agree with me that so far as there being any economy involved is concerned, there would be no economy to the country through the acceptance of this particular reorganization plan?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There would be no economy to the country, to the Government, or to anyone else that I know of, because the Secretary says he will not exercise the power if it be granted to him. He said that some other Secretary might exercise it, but he will not exercise it.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the Senator will further agree with me that in this time of deficit-spending it would be tremendously dangerous to do anything which would tend to undermine the confidence of the country generally in our banking system or tend to develop additional dissatisfaction on the part of the bankers themselves?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will read the letter to which I have referred he will find that thought expressed, possibly not in words, but implied all the way through in the spirit of the letter.

No witness appearing before the committee made any statement to the effect that the inclusion of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency within the provisions of this plan would accomplish any one of these six objectives. It can, therefore, well be assumed that the plan is not in accord with the purposes of the Reorganization Act as set forth in that act.

I can assure the Senate that the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are most anxious to further in every way possible reorganization plans, or legislation, which would carry out recommendations of the Hoover Commission designed to conform to the specific recommendations contained in its reports to effect economy and efficiency in Government. While this plan does conform thereto in many respects, it was the firm conviction of the committee that it went far beyond the intent of the Commission by its inclusion of quasi-judicial functions carried on presently under the Comptroller of the Currency in accordance with the intent of the Congress.

The Hoover Commission itself recognized the fact that there were such activities within the Federal structure which would not lend themselves to simple reorganization proposals and would go beyond the premise on which its studies were made. In its concluding report, the Commission stated:

As a matter of principle, the Commission has not been concerned with matters of substantive policy.

The Commission continued, saying that—

In practice, however, it has often been extremely difficult to separate policy from administration, although a conscientious effort has been made to do so.

This is a legislative policy. It is the policy of the Nation, and it has continued satisfactorily for nearly a century. That is the same problem with which the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was confronted in the consideration of this plan, and the majority of the committee reached the conclusion that the matter should be beyond the scope of a reorganization plan. Any policy changes in the authority of the Comptroller of the Currency which are desirable should be made only after proper consideration by policy committees of the Congress and approved through direct legislative action after all the facts have been presented and considered in connection therewith.

Should this plan become effective and the resolution of disapproval rejected, the majority of the Committee feels that it might well have a serious repercussion on our banking system and inject political influences into their operation which was not intended by Congress in its establishment of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

There is the fear that we are meddling or tampering with something for some purpose, but not for efficiency or economy, not to serve the present able Administrator, but to serve some other purpose. Who knows what the purpose is? The evidence does not reveal it, but it is to serve some purpose undisclosed to us, when we are asked to make a change in a legislative policy which has functioned well and efficiently for nearly a century.

The effect would be that the Comptroller would no longer have sufficient initiative, authority, and independence of action to continue to exercise the functions vested in him by the Congress. This fact has been freely acknowledged by the Secretary of the Treasury in his communication to the committee, and I feel that the Senate can do well to follow the advice of the Secretary of the Treasury, who has had the courage of his convictions to so express himself in spite of the fact that it was necessary to oppose the reorganization plan submitted by the President.

In reporting favorably the resolution of disapproval on Reorganization Plan No. 1, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments made it clear in its report to the Senate that the entire basis of its opposition to the plan was due to the fact that it included these quasi-judicial functions not in accord with the premise on which the Hoover Commission made its recommendations. I think I speak for a majority of the members of that committee when I say that, had this plan contained a provision therein which would have exempted the quasi-judicial functions of the Comptroller of the Currency, the plan would have been approved. There is no other objection to the plan, but there is objection to an attempt which, without cause, without rhyme, without reason, and without disclosure, would invade the province of an independent agency and place it in a subservient position under a department head.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I assign myself one more minute.

In closing, I should like to emphasize that in acting adversely on this plan the committee wishes to make it clear that it does so because it does not conform to the tenor of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, although it technically complies therewith in some respects. I personally feel that if a new plan is submitted to reorganize the Department of the Treasury along the lines now contained in Reorganization Plan No. 1, and as specifically recommended by the Hoover Commission, with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency exempted from its application to insure the continued independence of the Comptroller, the plan would be approved. Since no such exemption is included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, I shall vote in favor of Senate Resolution 246 to disapprove the plan.

Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not know that there is very much I can add to what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas as to why the plan should be rejected and why the Senate should vote in favor of the resolution. The Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, voted unanimously against the plan and in favor of the resolution. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments likewise voted unanimously to disapprove the plan. I believe I am correct when I say that no one appeared in behalf of the plan before the Committee on Banking and Currency. There were only two witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles banking legislation which comes before the Senate, voted unanimously against the plan. The plan will not save taxpayers one penny. In fact, the Comptroller's office is paid for wholly by the national banks.

I can see nothing to be gained by making the change. I can see much that would be lost. It is somewhat difficult for me to understand why the President requested that the Comptroller of the Currency be put under the Treasury Department of the United States, because the Secretary of the Treasury, in a letter to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, said that if the plan became law he would not exercise his rights under it because he was perfectly satisfied with the way the Comptroller of the Currency was operating. I fail to find in my research and in talking with many people, including many bankers, any good, legitimate excuse for the plan.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may feel to be necessary for the informal remarks which I wish to make. Because I have spoken twice this week on the floor with prepared papers, first on the FEPC bill and, earlier today, on Reorganization Plan No. 12, I am not in a position to furnish the detailed, thorough, and careful analysis which I should like to present at this time. I feel that my role is an unhappy one, for three reasons. First, as the distinguished Senator from Indiana has pointed out, I seem to be alone on this issue. However, although I seem to be alone, I am certain that the distinguished Senator from Indiana is mistaken when he says that no one appeared to testify in favor of the plan. The most important group in the country today dealing with this subject is the Citizens Committee on the Report of the Hoover Commission, headed by my friend, Dr. Robert Johnson, president of Temple University, of Philadelphia. Mr. Robert L. McCormick, research director of the Citizens Committee, in his testimony before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, said that plan No. 1, dealing with the Treasury Department, including its recommendation with regard to the Comptroller of the Currency, fully accords with the Hoover Commission recommendations. There can be no question about that. He said further that the rejection of the plan would set a very unhappy and unfortunate precedent for the consideration of other plans still to come.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe that the Hoover Commission's report recommended that the RFC, the FDIC, and the Export-Import Bank be transferred to the Department of the Treasury, but not a word was said about taking adminstrative functions from the Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. BENTON. If the Senator will permit me, I hope to touch on that subject later in my remarks, when I show that the Comptroller of the Currency, in line with the evidence of the past 16 years, has been under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury. I am sure the Senator from Virgina will recall the statement in the Hoover Commission report of March 1949 dealing with the Treasury Department:

> In our first report we urged that good departmental administration required that the Secretary have authority from the Congress to organize and control his organization, and that independent authority should not be granted directly to subordinates.

That applies to the Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The main objection raised by Mr. McCormick was that if the resolution were adopted, it would be easier for some other plan to be rejected.

Mr. BENTON. I am sorry, but I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I recall the testimony of Mr. McCormick, he said that if Congress adopted the resolution, it would be easier for Congress to disapprove some of the other plans which his committee thought were more important than this plan.

Mr. BENTON. Yes; he brought that cut, and he also brought out the point of the precedent that would be established.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps I did not say what I had intended to say. I meant to say that there was no opposition other than from those who appeared in behalf of the Hoover Commission. I had in mind bankers and governmental agencies, who did not appear. In other words, there was no banker or anyone in the banking industry in the United States who had any cause to complain about the Comptroller of the Currency. They were all very happy with the way his office has been operated and they felt it should continue as it has operated for many years.

Mr. BENTON. That is unhappily true, as reported by the Senator from Indiana, and I hope to deal with that subject in a few moments. No bankers

appeared to favor the Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. President, I started to say that my role is an unhappy one, because I seem to be alone here. But since the banking fraternity is concerned—and I am sure the distinguished Presiding Officer will understand my statement—my role is unhappy because one of my companies owes the banks $6,000,000, and I do not like to be here discussing the banking business.

The third and real reason for my unhappiness is the exhibition which was made by the American Bankers Association, a great and powerful trade association representing the American business community. I should like to read what Mr. F. Raymond Peterson, the president of that association, who officially presented the position of the association, said to the committee. I assume that his statement was probably written for him by his staff, some member of the trade association representing the bankers. It is my opinion that whoever wrote this statement should be discharged forthwith and thrown out of the trade association, because it is an unhappy fact that American businessmen today, to too great an extent, are abdicating their responsibility, and often their thinking, about big key problems, to trade-association executives, whom they would not hire in their own companies. They are allowing these trade associations to make statements on their behalf which they would never permit the treasurer of their company or the vice president of their company to make even on behalf of their own individual business.

I call the attention of the Senate to this testimony of Mr. Peterson. He stated:

> The plan would have two, and only two, significant results.

He testified that—apart from giving to the Secretary of the Treasury a new administrative assistant, the only bureau affected by Reorganization Plan No. 1 is the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. President, of course there are 9 bureaus affected, 9 large bureaus, including some vastly larger and more important ones than the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. The personnel in the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency is only 1.3 percent of the total personnel affected by this reorganization plan. Yet, Mr. Peterson testified as he did, and in doing so showed the hand of the bankers. They are not interested in the efficiency of the Treasury Department. All they have heard about is this one little tiny matter which affects the Comptroller in his relations with the Secretary of the Treasury, but which, relatively speaking, does not compare with the problem as a whole.

Mr. President, I spoke earlier this afternoon about the National Association of Manufacturers' testimony as it affected plan No. 5, and the Department of Commerce. I believe I can speak with some experience on the problems of business trade organizations in relation to the Government, as well as with some feeling.

I first met the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is sitting next to me at the moment, when I was appointed by Mr. Jesse Jones, certainly a good friend of business, as vice chairman of the board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development, which was organized during the war to assist the business community because the existing trade associations were not so organized and so geared as to do the kind of tremendous job which had to be done.

I have observed these trade associations, have belonged to some of them, and know their weaknesses. I should like to examine for a moment what some of the facts are as I have known them and as I guess them to be, applied to the recent action by the American Bankers' Association.

Of course, one manifest fact is that the banks are indeed very powerful politically, or they would not be having a political influence on some of the Members of this body. That is a most unhappy fact, in my opinion, and in view of their record and in view of their ignorance, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the banks opposed the establishment of the Federal Reserve Board. They all opposed the establishment of that Board. I call attention to the fact, further, that they opposed the establishment of the SEC. They fought, with the best men they could hire, to prevent Congress establishing the SEC in the public interest.

I call attention to the fact that the banks virtually unanimously opposed the establishment of the FDIC. I received the full story not long ago of the way in which the banks opposed the passage of the Federal Banking Act of 1935. A very highly placed official who worked all through that operation told me the story. That was the most important legislative act of that year, and the banks were virtually unanimously against it, as they are now unanimously opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1. How do they stand on the Federal Banking Act of 1935 today? They are virtually unanimously for it.

What would be the condition in this country if we had not created the Federal Reserve Board, passed the Federal Banking Act of 1935, established the SEC, and set up the FDIC, but had knuckled down to the bankers, the way it is proposed that we knuckle down to them today in regard to this great reorganization proposal?

Mr. President, I might tell the case story which has come to me about the Federal Banking Act of 1935. The Business Advisory Council labored against the passage of that act. I know a high percentage of the men who were on that council at that time, and who are on it today. The report of the Business Advisory Council was written by an economist who worked for the man who is chairman of a subcommittee of the council. Whether the chairman of the subcommittee read the report of his economist condemning the Federal Banking Act of 1935, I do not know. He is a very prominent banker, and I shall not at least bring out his name on the floor of the Senate. But it is agreed by those who studied the matter later that the subcomittee did not read the report, and, similarly, the Business Advisory Council adopted the report and did not read it.

Mr. President, this report went to the Secretary of Commerce, who in turn transmitted it to the President of the United States. Here was a report allegedly speaking for the Business Advisory Council, which was unread, and which had been written by a staff man away down the line, working for the chairman of a subcommittee.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to what the Hoover Commission recommendations might have meant if they had been followed through all the way.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. In line with the subject just spoken of by the Senator from Connecticut, I do not know whether he remembers that after the passage of the law and the creation of the Federal Housing Authority, the banks refused to deal with the Federal Housing Authority until a lot of missionary work was done with them. They did not want the guaranteed loans, because the interest was higher than on the normally processed bank loans, and it was only when the big life-insurance companies and fire-insurance companies started financing the FHA loans that the banks willingly fell into line, and now they are all seeking those loans.

Mr. BENTON. The banks never want any change, they never propose any change, and they never stand for any change. All men in the business community who have operated with banks know that to be an established fact in the temperament of the banking fraternity. I am glad to be reminded of that. I am even hopeful that I may make a convert before I conclude, and I thank the Senator from West Virginia for bearing with me, and I trust that he will stay with me.

The Hoover Commission in its report on the Treasury Department went far beyond what the President has done in these recommendations. The point is not that the recommendations outdid the Hoover Commission report. On the contrary, many things recommended by the Hoover Commission have been held back, and were not included in the plan which came up to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The extracts from the minority views of Commissioners Aiken, Pollack, and Rowe bring that out very clearly, and they make very clear that the Commission's viewpoint went far beyond the scope of the issue with respect to the Comptroller of the Currency, which is in dispute today in connection with plan No. 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a page which further elaborates on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWEEP OF HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION MUCH BROADER THAN COMPTROLLER QUESTION

Hoover Commission Report No. 11 on the Treasury Department makes recommendations going far beyond those proposed in Reorganization Plan No. 1. Thus, the majority of the Hoover Commission states that "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Export-Import Bank, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are independent agencies reporting directly to the President. The President cannot give the time necessary for their supervision. Practically they are accountable to nobody."

Hence the Commission recommends that their supervision "be vested in the Secretary of the Treasury."

The following extracts from the minority views of Commissioners Aiken, Pollack, and Rowe will serve to make doubly clear that the Commission's viewpoint went far beyond the scope of the issues with relation to the Comptroller of the Currency under dispute today in connection with plan No. 1.

"We do not quarrel with the Commission's proposal to place the Export-Import Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation within the departmental structure of the executive branch. But we are not so sure that the Treasury is the right Department for the first two agencies. * * *

"The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If this agency is to be put in the Treasury, one of the main reasons is because its bank examining functions should be more closely integrated with those under the Comptroller of the Currency. The same reasoning is valid as to the bank-examining functions of the Federal Reserve System which require integration just as much and just as little as those of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation." (P. 31 of Hoover Commission Report 11 on Treasury Department.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate some of the statements and data which I prepared for my minority views. The Senator from Indiana is mistaken if he thinks the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was unanimous on this subject. There was a minority of three who voted to uphold the reorganization proposals of the Treasury.

Mr. President, I want to remind the Senate of a fact which very few know, namely, that the Comptroller of the Currency is not independent. His so-called independence is a myth, as the comments in the minority views to which I shall refer bring out. What we have now is a state of confusion, for the responsibility is not clearly defined so all can see it. Only those who are in the know, are aware of what the true situation is. But the Secretary of the Treasury already appoints the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency. He now prescribes regulations governing the Office of the Comptroller, the conduct of its officers and clerks, and the distribution and performance of its business. The legal work relating to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency is under the general counsel of the Treasury Department. The appointment of the personnel of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, together with the fixing of compensation, transfer, promotion, demotion, suspension, or dismissal, is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury. The Comptroller cannot even appoint bank examiners without securing approval from the Secretary of the Treasury.

It is difficult for me to reconcile the foregoing with the apparent feeling of some of those who testify that the Comptroller of the Currency is an independent officer and that the reorganization plan would destroy his independence. As the foregoing shows, the Comptroller of the Currency is by no means independent. The statute even provides that the Comptroller "shall perform his duties under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

That is the law now. When Senators vote down this key and important reorganization proposal I hope they will keep in mind that the present law puts the Comptroller "under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

This statutory mandate to the Comptroller has not been a mere formality. Before I prepared the minority views I talked with men who have been in Washington, for many years working on these problems and who are very high placed in key Government roles. I did not plunge into the subject blindly or willfully. One highly placed official told me that from his 16 years of observation he believes the Comptroller could not have functioned with less independence than would have been the case if the reorganization plan had been in effect.

For example, he said that the first Deputy Comptroller of the Currency for a long period was the personal representative of the Secretary of the Treasury; that a Secretary of the Treasury dictated the participation of the Comptroller of the Currency in an agreement among the three Federal supervisory agencies on examination policy; that the policies of the Comptroller with respect to the approval of branches for one of the largest banking organizations in the country have been determined from time to time by the various Secretaries of the Treasury, and that the Comptroller of the Currency has not been in position to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to legislation except after consultation and in accordance with the views of the Secretary of the Treasury. Thus the situation with respect to the Comptroller would not be different under this plan from what it has been in the past, except that there would be brought about greater efficiency in the administrative operation.

Mr. President, I deny the theory of the Senator from Indiana that economy is not involved in an organization merely because it receives revenue and supports itself. Let us consider any monopoly situation, such as that of a local telephone company, a power company, or a gas company. Does it follow merely because such a company makes a profit or supports itself that there is no room for efficiency and no chance for economy? Not in the least. It is actually in monopolies with assured profits that the greatest opportunity for efficiency is most often afforded.

Mr. President, my authority makes the point—and to me it goes to the heart of the question—that this reorganization plan will have the merit of bringing out into the open the lodgment of responsibility in the Secretary of the Treasury for the determination of policies, where as heretofore there has been obscurity as to whether the responsibility was exercised by the Comptroller. Of course, I feel that in connection with all the plans we are going to discuss it is far better to make the authority explicit in every case than it is to have it covered up.

I agree that the present confusion created by bankers concerning the status of the Comptroller of the Currency might delay action on the part of the President, if he wished to dismiss the Comptroller. Some persons do not understand that the President has the authority to dismiss the Comptroller. Surely that would seem to lodge the final responsibility with respect to the Comptroller in the President, and if he wished to discharge this subordinate person confusion might make replacement somewhat more difficult. But it was fully conceded in the testimony of all the bankers who appeared, that there is no enlargement whatsoever of the power of the President over the Comptroller of the Currency by anything suggested or planned by the reorganization here proposed.

Mr. President, I am told that the pressure of the bankers has successfully operated on Congress with respect to this particular issue, and of course what I am saying is, I fear, too late and too little. Therefore, perhaps, the point of my remarks relates not so much to Reorganization Plan No. 1, which may be over the dam, or which to use another illustration, may be likened to the sacrificial lamb which marches up to the slaughter. My remarks therefore are keyed to the various other plans as they come from the committee. We have had two plans before the Senate today and they have gone down like ten pins. Other plans are coming before the Senate, and we are faced by selfish, narrow groups who are determined to defeat many of the plans. Shortly we are going to hear from the patent attorneys.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator stated that we have had two plans under consideration today, and they have both gone down like tenpins. I was under the impression that we voted only on one plan. Am I correct?

Mr. BENTON. Of course, the Senator is correct. My rhetoric seems to have carried me away. I have been consulting with those who try to advise me, and they have told me of future events respecting which I should like to hope they are mistaken, and that the implications of the question of the Senator from Missouri are those to which I should be listening.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I was not in any sense criticizing the Senator, but I was somewhat concerned. I had been in the Senate nearly all day, but I wondered whether some other piece of business had been transacted along this line of which I knew nothing.

Mr. BENTON. No.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator from Connecticut now is speaking somewhat with the spirit of prophecy rather than making a recital of history.

Mr. BENTON. Fortunately that is correct, and I am honored that the Senator from Missouri is here to listen to me.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Would it not be correct to withdraw the expression that the plans have been bowled over like tenpins, and instead say that they are about to be bowled over like tenpins?

Mr. BENTON. Surely many individuals with much money in their pockets are standing around with great big balls in their hands ready to roll them against these plans. There is no doubt about that. My remarks are not being addressed to the bankers, because the plan under consideration is over the dam. My talk is not being addressed to the press, because I have found there is no sex appeal, no glamour in governmental reorganization. My remarks surely are not being addressed to some Senator or even to ex-President Hoover. But I hope they may have some effect subsequently so far as the American business community is concerned, because we have a case study here for the young student of political science, or a case study for the League of Women Voters, who are in favor of this plan, or a case study for the junior chambers of commerce, who are in favor of this plan. If they want to understand their Government better and if they want to understand better how their Government operates, I want them to take this as a case study in respect to our failure to deliver.

Mr. President, this national campaign of pressure has been instituted by the banks to alarm the bankers throughout the country, the small bankers who write letters saying, "I have received a letter from the American Bankers' Association and a letter from my State Bankers' Association and a letter from the National Bank Division of the American Bankers' Association and a letter from the Kansas Bank Association." We find all that set forth in one letter, showing how much pressure was put upon a small banker—in the case I have in mind—a banker at Paola, Kans.

Mr. President, in my opinion that national pressure campaign accounts for the 8-to-3 vote in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That campaign obscures the true facts.

On the other hand, the bankers have never been exposed to the other side of this problem. They have heard nothing about the importance of reorganizing the Treasury Department or reorganizing the Federal Government in many other respects, nor are they aware of the significance of what they are doing in following the dictates of this pressure campaign, to the cost of which I presume many of them may be contributing from the other pocket, in support of the Citizens' Committee, in support of the Hoover Commission's proposals.

I think it is imperative for the country, particularly for the business groups, to understand better a problem of this kind, if they want to be more effective and more constructive in their work with the Federal Government and, notably, with the Members of Congress.

The opposition on the part of the banks stems, I think, therefore, from a lack of study and thought about the overall problem, and of course it stems partially from deep and very real mistrust of our democratic processes of government.

The banks are the trustees of the people's money. The welfare of the banks is essential to all of us. The responsibilities of bankers train them to take a dim view of the future and I may add, Mr. President, of mankind in general. A good banker must train himself to try to foresee the unfavorable, dark contingencies of the future, the dark problems which may lie ahead.

However, I certainly think it is not the business of the Congress to key its policies primarily to the fears in regard to future blackouts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has remaining only 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, that will be sufficient. I thank the Chair for reminding me.

I think such blackout fears as those to which I have referred, Mr. President, if applied to the other bureaus and agencies of the Government and their operation, would enormously intensify the present great confusion, waste, and inefficiency. I made that point in the remarks I made earlier today in regard to Reorganization Plan No. 12. They would make the Government even more unmanageable than it is today, and far more inefficient and far more confused and far more confusing. They must be resisted.

Therefore, Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I hope the Senate, if it finds itself committed on this particular plan and problem, will look ahead to the other 19 proposals which are coming through from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and perhaps will hesitate longer and think harder before commitments are made to the individual pressure groups that are moving in upon us.

I hope the American business community will begin to try to get into the trade organizations which represent them, men who think more as statesmen, the kind of men who will give to the business community the foresight and judgment it needs if it is to overcome the tendency referred to in a statement by Karl Marx which the business community might well ponder:

> The businessman will commit suicide for a short-term profit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 13 minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time, or as much thereof as he may desire, to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, all I wish to do, in response to the argument of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, is to say that when he charges that we are rolling over or rejecting all these plans to have better administration, it should be remembered that Mr. Hoover himself was not in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 12, which the Senate has disapproved today—and I voted to disapprove it—and it should also be remembered that Mr. Hoover is not in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 1, upon which we are about to vote. It should further be remembered that Reorganization Plan No. 1 is not approved by the Cabinet officer to whom this power would be granted. He wrote to the committee saying that he did not approve it and did not want the power, and that if it were given to him, he would not exercise it.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the sentiment against this plan, which comes to us in an entirely different form from that which the Hoover Commission recommended, is so overwhelming in the country and so overwhelming on the floor of the Senate, I shall not delay the vote by discussing the matter further; but I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a brief statement in support of the resolution of disapproval.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. President, I have received hundreds of letters in recent months from constituents and other citizens urging me to support the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and I have told these correspondents that I would support those recommendations which would promote economy and efficiency in our Government.

In advocating today adoption of my resolution to disapprove the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, I want to emphasize that I am not speaking as an opponent of the Hoover Commission's proposals nor am I departing from the position I have regularly taken favoring Federal economies.

Although this plan is based on an interpretation of the Hoover Commission's general recommendations concerning management in the executive branch, the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover report itself admits that it differs widely from the more specific recommendations which the Commission made for reorganization of the Treasury Department.

In essence this plan merely would destroy the present independent status of the Comptroller of the Currency and would give the Secretary of the Treasury an administrative assistant secretary. I have no objection to giving the Secretary another assistant if he needs one, but adding additional employees certainly is not a direct way of economizing in our spending. I am strongly opposed to the part of the proposal relating to the Comptroller. What we do there cannot promote governmental economy because the costs of the Comptroller's Office are paid by direct assessments against the national

banks which it examines. No efficiency is involved unless it be claimed that a program of deficit financing can be promoted more efficiently if the President, through his Secretary of the Treasury can indirectly control the credit policies of the national banks. That is not the kind of efficiency in which I believe.

I said at the outset of these remarks that I had received hundreds of letters endorsing the Hoover Commission recommendations. In contrast, all of the letters except one which I have received concerning Reorganization Plan No. 1 have been opposed to it. And the one banker who favored it admitted frankly that he was influenced in his position by an unpleasant personal experience with the Comptroller's Office.

On the other hand, I found that our national banks were against the proposed change; that the Comptroller did not favor it and that the Secretary of the Treasury, who would be given additional power, did not want it.

In a letter submitted for the record of the hearings on the pending resolution, Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder made the statement that he was in accord with the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 "except to the extent that it would transfer the functions of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Secretary of the Treasury."

In this letter Mr. Snyder said: "If Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950 became effective, I would use my full powers thereunder to preserve the continuity of this bureau in all possible respects in order to maintain a situation which, in my opinion, is most beneficial both to the national banking system and to the general economy. However, it must be borne in mind that my policy in this respect would not necessarily be maintained by future secretaries of the Treasury."

In other words, if this plan is accepted now, the Secretary of the Treasury promises to let things go on practically as they are so that the effect would be a nullity, but the latter part of his statement suggests that he shares the fear many of us have that some future secretary might use his power over the Comptroller to whip National Banks into line in support of the Executive's fiscal policies.

Secretary Snyder himself went so far as to say: "It is my firm conviction that a vigorous national banking system is essential to the economy of this country. It not only acts as a pacemaker, as I intimated above, for the State banking systems, but also serves to provide competition for those systems, and hence increases their strength as it increases its own. It is also my belief that the national banking system would not long remain intact, strong, and vigorous without leadership by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which has no other function than its supervision and administration. The preservation of that system is more important than creating a new channel of authority where no need therefor appears."

Mr. Snyder's letter then referred to the summarization of the principles of administration contained in the Hoover report and continued: "It is difficult to see how the operations of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency could be performed with greater effectiveness or responsibility. As for economizing, that Bureau is one of the few administrative agencies of Government that uses no tax funds; it is supported entirely by assessments upon the banks it supervises."

The letter concluded with a renewed expression of Mr. Snyder's doubt as to the advisability of the proposed transfer.

I would also remind you that at the hearings on the pending resolution, the distinguished Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the senior Senator from South Carolina, appeared at the direction of his committee to oppose the plan. He pointed out that this committee, on which I also have the honor to serve, was concerned because of the proposal to abolish, in effect, the agency which has supervised national banks ever since the national banking system was established.

Others who appeared at the hearings in opposition to the reorganization plan and favoring the pending resolution included representatives of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, the American Bankers Association, several State bankers associations and the Reserve City Bankers Association.

The only testimony favorable to the plan was that given by representatives of the Budget Bureau and a spokesman for the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report who admitted that part of his concern over what happened to this plan was not so much because of its content as because it was the first of the reorganization plans and he feared the precedent that would be set by its rejection.

Confirming my own experience, the staff director of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which handled the pending resolution, reported in a statement incorporated in the hearings that it had received 376 communications from 37 States dealing with plan No. 1 and that all but one of those was in opposition to the plan.

Mr. President, I shall not take up the time of the Senate with further discussion of this plan, because I feel the objections to it are too obvious and the arguments for it too weak to require extended treatment. I ask, however, that there may be inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks the short statement I submitted at the committee hearing outlining 10 reasons why this reorganization plan should not be approved.

The statement follows:

REASONS FOR OPPOSING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1950

1. For 86 years the Office of the Comptroller has enjoyed, and still does, a semi-independent status.

Other branches, bureaus, or divisions of the Treasury Department do not possess this standing. The plan, therefore, primarily would affect the Comptroller.

The Comptroller is appointed by the President with the consent and advice of the Senate. He administers the functions of the office under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. He is accountable to Congress through annual reports and through reports on salaries of all bank examiners. He makes recommendations to Congress concerning legislation affecting national banks. He enjoys a position of prestige on the same plane as the heads of other supervisory authorities, such as the FDIC and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The plan would result in the Secretary of the Treasury absorbing all functions of the office and severing the Comptroller's present direct relationship with Congress.

2. The Comptroller's office does not constitute, in any way, a burden upon our Federal budget.

One of the principal objectives of the Reorganization Act of 1949 is to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government. With this sound principle we are all in accord.

At this time, the Comptroller's Office is entirely self-sustaining, dependent in no way upon appropriations made by Congress or funds supplied by the Treasury Department. The expenses of the office are defrayed exclusively by the assessments on national banks for examinations made by it. Therefore, no reduction of Government expenditures would result from the proposed reorganization plan.

3. Under the plan the Secretary of the Treasury could effect transfers of the funds of the Comptroller's Office as well as records, property, and personnel.

The sum paid to the Comptroller by national banks therefore would be subject to this provision. The Secretary of the Treasury would have control of these funds and any unused portion thereof could be appropriated and used by him to carry out other functions of the Department.

4. It would be a step toward the breaking down of our existing dual banking relationship.

This plan might be only the forerunner of still an additional reorganization plan which would transfer either to the Board of Governors or the FDIC the examining, statistical, and other functions of the Comptroller, excepting perhaps the chartering of national banks.

5. It would place the Comptroller in an inferior position with relation to the heads of other supervisory bodies, such as the FDIC and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

6. The Secretary of the Treasury could reassign duties which might seriously interfere with the efficient operation of the Comptroller's functions.

The Secretary of the Treasury, under the plan, would have complete direction and control over the duties now performed by the Comptroller's Office. The Secretary could authorize any other officer, agency, or employee of the Department to handle any of the functions now performed by the Comptroller's Office. This could lead to serious difficulties in the enforcement of the National Bank Act, as the proper administration of national banking laws requires quick decisions by experienced supervisory authorities, whose decisions are final.

The national banks, at this time, have confidence and are satisfied with the splendid past performance of the Comptroller's Office, and certainly do not desire any change which might in any way jeopardize the same.

7. The plan possibly would involve the replacement of the Comptroller by the Secretary of the Treasury on the Board of Directors of the FDIC, unless the Secretary delegates that function specifically to the Comptroller or to some other official.

8. An Administrative Secretary would be appointed who would perform such duties as prescribed by the Secretary, particularly in supervising and directing the policies and the programs of the Department.

This would inject outside interference in the determination and administration of policies and regulations now carried out by the Comptroller and his assistants.

9. The Office of the Comptroller enjoys the confidence of the national banks of the country.

There are approximately 5,000 national banks in this country, representing over 56 percent of all the commercial banking resources of the United States. These banks look to the Comptroller of the Currency as their sponsor in Washington, a Federal official free to speak and act on their behalf and without censor or influence from a superior. While the banks of the country have the highest respect and confidence in our present Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable John W. Snyder, there is apprehension that some future holder of this office might use his powers and authority in a way not conducive to sound banking or for the general public welfare. It is a matter of law, rather than a matter of personalities. Over the long years of its existence, the Office of the Comptroller has built up a splendid record. It is our belief that nothing should

be done which would in any way disturb the present satisfactory operations of national banks and the public confidence in them.

10. The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency should be kept out of politics.

Congress provided that the term of office of the Comptroller should be for 5 years and, therefore, it would not be concurrent with the tenure of office of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Formerly, his appointment was made by the President on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be confirmed by the Senate. In the Banking Act of 1935, this was changed to provide for the appointment of the Comptroller solely by the President, without the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, but with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Apparently, these provisions were made for the purpose of protecting the national banks with a leadership independent of undue influence from other governmental authority. The Comptroller is responsible for momentous decisions which would insure sound operations for the national banking system. These decisions should be unbiased and final.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield back to the Senator from Arkansas the remainder of the time which he has allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Malone
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Martin
Benton	Hill	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Butler	Ives	Neely
Byrd	Jenner	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Connally	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Darby	Kerr	Sparkman
Donnell	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworshak	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Lehman	Thye
Ferguson	Lodge	Tobey
Fulbright	Long	Watkins
George	Lucas	Wherry
Gillette	McCarthy	Wiley
Green	McClellan	Williams
Gurney	McFarland	Withers
Hayden	McKellar	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those in favor of the resolution will vote "yea." Those opposed to the resolution will vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Chair to mean that if a Senator opposes the reorganization plan, and favors the resolution disapproving it, he should vote "yea"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay".

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—65

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hoey	Millikin
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Butler	Ives	O'Conor
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kerr	Stennis
Darby	Knowland	Taft
Donnell	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ecton	Lucas	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Wherry
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Withers
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hendrickson	Martin	

NAYS—13

Aiken	Hill	Neely
Benton	Kefauver	Sparkman
Ellender	Kilgore	Williams
Green	Leahy	
Hayden	Lodge	

NOT VOTING—18

Chavez	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Douglas	McCarran	Pepper
Downey	McMahon	Russell
Flanders	Magnuson	Taylor
Frear	Morse	Tydings
Graham	Murray	Vandenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote there are 65 yeas, 13 nays. A majority of the authorized membership of the Senate having voted in the affirmative, the resolution is agreed to.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD—not in the Appendix—at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of today, May 11, 1950, entitled "Inexcusable Strike," in which the present railroad strike is discussed, the concluding two sentences of which read as follows:

Indeed, we think Congress ought to take another look at the Railway Labor Act, which is predicated on reasonable acceptance of the facts. Compulsory arbitration of rail disputes would have many undesirable ramifications, but it might be inescapable as a means of protecting the public interest—especially against a strike such as this one which seems to have resulted primarily from a union attempt to save face.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INEXCUSABLE STRIKE

It would be hard to conceive of a strike with less merit, from the public standpoint, than that which has tied up four major railroads. The strike has been called by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen to enforce demands for a second fireman on multiple-unit Diesel locomotives. That demand has twice been turned down by Presidential fact-finding boards on the very reasonable ground that there is little or no work for a second fireman to do. The crippling effects of the strike cannot yet be fully judged, but certainly they will be great. The New York Central, Pennsylvania, Santa Fe, and Southern are all trunkline railroads linking major cities; in many instances they afford the only direct route. A subsidiary effect of the walkout may be seen in the Chesapeake & Ohio order canceling passenger trains out of Washington because they must use Southern tracks.

From the standpoint of the firemen, the issue is twofold: prestige and job security. There is an intense rivalry between the firemen and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, who also have asked for a second crewman on Diesels but have not pressed their claim. Jobwise, most of the rail unions fear the inroads of Dieselization—for Diesels can haul heavier trains faster over longer distances, and there is a threat of potential displacement of some crewmen.

The fear of fewer jobs is behind much union featherbedding, but the means used to combat that fear are reminiscent of the Luddites, who broke the machines that displaced them. A major factor in declining rail traffic is the high cost of transportation. Diesels give promise of reducing costs and attracting new traffic—but economies can easily be nullified by feather bedding. Yet increased traffic is the only real guarantor of job security. Is it not time for rail unions and managements to get together and affirm their faith in an expanding economy, meanwhile making some provision for retraining and relocating temporarily displaced workers?

By striking only four lines, the union undoubtedly hopes to avoid the cry that a na-

tional emergency exists. But these lines are vital arteries to many parts of the country, and some sort of seizure may soon be necessary. Indeed, we think Congress ought to take another look at the Railway Labor Act, which is predicated on reasonable acceptance of the facts. Compulsory arbitration of rail disputes would have many undesirable ramifications, but it might be inescapable as a means of protecting the public interest—especially against a strike such as this one which seems to have resulted primarily from a union attempt to save face.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there likewise may appear in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, May 11, 1950, on the same general matter, the railroad strike, the editorial being entitled "No Room for Compromise."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO ROOM FOR COMPROMISE

Ever since the First World War the Nation's railroads have been fighting with their backs to the wall against the rising tide of competition from newer types of transportation—the passenger car, the motor truck, the airplane, and the pipelines. This has placed a high premium on the achievement of increased operating efficiency. In recent years the carriers have found that one of the most effective instruments for this purpose was the introduction of Diesel-electric locomotives. Indeed, in the case of a good many roads, the shift to Diesels has just about meant the difference between earning a slight profit and operating in the red.

Since the movement toward Dieselization became general, however, two railroad brotherhoods—the firemen and the engineers—whose jurisdictional rivalry is only slightly less intense than that of a blood feud, have vied with each other to hijack the railroads, as it were, and appropriate for themselves the economic benefits represented by this costly investment program. When Diesel power was first introduced on the Burlington system in 1934 the locomotives were successfully and safely operated with one man in the cab, an engineer. Shortly thereafter, however, the Burlington was compelled under threat of a strike to add a fireman to its crew. And now for nearly a decade the two unions have been trying to push still further this packing of the engine crews, the one demanding a second engineer, the other insisting on an additional fireman.

In 1943 a Presidential fact-finding board found that there was no justification whatsoever for adding either more engineers or more firemen. In other words, the demands were rejected as being purely featherbedding, or make-work proposals. Although nothing had changed in the meanwhile to alter the situation, the firemen renewed their demand in 1947. After negotiation and mediation had failed President Truman named another fact-finding board. Like its predecessor, this board, in a ruling handed down last September, declared that the union suggestion was "devoid of merit." Although a Presidential fact-finding board is the court of last resort under the Railway Labor Act, the firemen's union appealed over the board's head to the White House, accompanying the appeal with threats of a strike in defiance of the Labor Act and the judicial opinion of the President's own appointive board. Yesterday the firemen put those threats into action. Their chieftain, David B. Robertson, pulled 18,000 members of the brotherhood off four of the Nation's key railroad systems in a strike which can only be described as a calculated outrage against the railroads, the Government, and the American public.

Although the number of railway firemen affected in this walkout is comparatively small, it is regarded as only a question of time before the strike produces a national emergency, crippling production in all parts of the Nation. This is a walkout which was coldly embarked upon, not in an effort to remedy some injustice, real or otherwise, but to impose by economic terrorism a demand which had been twice adjudicated by the highest railway-labor tribunal in the Nation, and twice found to be completely without justification. It is a strike to test whether the interest of the community is, or is not, paramount to that of any labor group which happens to find itself in a position to exploit the public to further its ends, however demonstrably unworthy and objectionable these may be. And it should not be necessary to say that in such a test there can be no room for compromise.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there likewise may appear in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "An Indefensible Strike," published in the New York Herald Tribune of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INDEFENSIBLE STRIKE

The strike on five great railway lines comes at the end of a 2-week special truce and after exhaustion ofall the processes of delay and mediation provided by the Railway Labor Act. It is not surprising, considering the position of the railway union, that negotiations have thus far been futile. For the union is concerned, not with hours, not with wages or working conditions, but with a simple measure of featherbedding. Twice impartial fact-finding boards have denied the need for a second fireman on Diesel locomotives; but the union continues unremittingly to demand this unnecessary and wasteful addition to the crew. What neither safety nor convenience requires, and what sound operating procedure emphatically rejects, the union insists upon, even at the cost of disrupting a large part of the economy of the Nation.

The conversion to Diesel locomotives has been one of the most hopeful signs in American railroading. The pressing need of improving service and lowering fares and freight rates, to meet competition from other forms of transportation, has found the promise of a real answer in the development of the Diesel engine. Private capital has supplied the necessary investment; the Government has encouraged the conversion. It would be an economic tragedy if the gains thus envisaged were to be cast away by union short-sightedness. Technological unemployment is resisted by labor with an ardor for which the public may frequently have sympathy; but where this resistance takes the form of featherbedding as crude as in the present instance, and where the gains of technological progress are so direct for industry—and in the comparatively short run for labor, also—mere obstruction can seem a fatal policy. It is especially so in an area of labor where responsible unionism has long been the tradition, and where a wide-spread stoppage places such burdens on the public.

The present strike is indefensible. If the union has got itself into a position where negotiation is no longer fruitful, and where only retreat is possible, then for its own sake it will have to retreat.

ADDRESSES BY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT CASPER AND LARAMIE, WYO.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, two addresses delivered in my State by the President of the United States, one at Casper, Wyo., on May 9, and the other at Laramie, Wyo., on May 10.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT CASPER, WYO.

It's good to be back in Wyoming again.

Seeing this western country and talking to the people out here always reaffirms my faith in the vigor of this Nation and the glowing promise of its future.

This is my first visit to the West since 1948.

As you know, we have settled a number of issues since then. And we've settled them in the old-fashioned, American, democratic way. One of those issues is of particular importance here in the West. It concerns the policy this Nation is going to follow in developing its great wealth of natural resources.

In this country, there have always been two philosophies about the use of natural resources. One philosophy is that our resources should be exploited by a privileged few for their own benefit. This first philosophy holds that if we preserve or develop natural resources for the benefit of all the people, that is socialism, or some other form of ism.

The second philosophy holds that our natural resources are the cornerstone of a strong, free democracy. As such, they must be used to advance the well-being and the prosperity of all the people. This philosophy holds that it is necessary for democratic government to make sure that our land and water, our forests and our minerals, are used wisely, and not exploited for the benefit of a few.

You know which of these philosophies I believe in. It is the same one that the great majority of the American people believe in.

I am happy to be able to say that since I was out here in 1948, we have been making progress in strengthening the policy of using our resources for the benefit of all the people. This Congress has been moving forward—not backward.

I am particularly happy to say this to you here in Casper.

Wyoming is a State with tremendous natural resources. Here in Wyoming, the great plains of the West, with their abundant agricultural possibilities, rise to meet the high plateaus and mountains, rich in minerals and water power.

Not so long ago, this part of the country was considered "way out west." That phrase meant something more than physical distance. It expressed the attitude of too many people in important places in the East, toward the real needs of this great region.

This country, way out west, was a source of low-priced raw materials for the East. It was an area where eastern money could be invested for quick, spectacular profits. The real needs of this western country were not understood or appreciated. Because it was "way out west," too many people, both in and out of Government, just didn't care about the future of this part of the country.

You know where that spendthrift, careless philosophy led us. Much of the best range land was badly damaged, some almost beyond recovery. Precious topsoils were washed down the rivers. The cream was skimmed off the mineral deposits. The primary emphasis was on quick exploitation of resources. The whole idea was to make money quickly and then move on.

I am sure that you businessmen, farmers, and ranchers remember the tragic results of this philosophy. You are still fighting to recover from the loss and waste of that era. But now the American people are with you. They have renounced the narrow, selfish view of natural resources.

For 17 years, with one brief set-back, you have had a Government that recognizes its

responsibility for helping to preserve and develop natural resources. This is a Government that works with you, not against you.

The contrast between the enlightened, democratic approach to the use of our natural resources, and the selfish, antidemocratic approach, is plain here in Wyoming. About 50 miles north of Casper lies Teapot Dome. About 50 miles southwest is the new Kortes Dam.

The name Teapot Dome stands as an everlasting symbol of the greed and privilege that underlay one philosophy about the West. It is not only a reminder that there were selfish or misguided individuals seeking special privileges. There are always such individuals. It is also a reminder of what can happen in your own front yard when you have the wrong kind of government in Washington.

Kortes Dam is a product of a different philosophy about resources, and a different kind of government. High up in a mountain canyon on the North Platte River, this dam is a new source of wealth and strength for the people of the West. This is an example of the right way to use natural resources for the benefit of all the people.

When the Kortes power plant goes into operation this year its three turbines will add 36,000 kilowatts of electricity to our national store of energy. It will be tied into a network of transmission lines and teamed up with the plant at Seminoe Dam 2 miles upstream and with other plants downstream. This development will bring light and power to thousands of homes, farms, and industries in Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska.

Furthermore, Kortes Dam is a part of the reclamation work of the Federal Government. The dam is built as part of a project which will bring more water tc irrigated lands. The income from the power produced at Kortes will help repay the investment in irrigation work.

The completion of Kortes Dam is thus a step toward developing natural resources for the welfare of the people. But this dam has another significance. It is based upon a recognition of the fact that water and land and forests must be treated together. We can make proper use of our resources only if we base our plans on that fact.

Like many of you here today, I was born and raised in the Missouri Valley. Like you, I have seen at first hand the terrible effects of looking at resources separately. When too much sod on the plains was broken to plant crops, when the range land was overgrazed, the result was not only a loss of grassland and soil cover. The result was floods, and dust storms, and a heritage of waste that has had to be slowly and painfully overcome.

Today we know that soil and forest conservation, flood control and the development of power, navigation, and irrigation, must all be tackled and solved together. We have learned that a great river valley cannot be developed in piece-meal fashion. It is not possible to separate the land from the water. It is foolish to prepare for floods downstream but to pay no attention to soil cover and small creeks upstream.

It has taken years for us to organize our efforts in line with this concept of the interrelationship of all resources. We have met great opposition from selfish or short-sighted people—although I am glad to say that many have gradually been converted to the right viewpoint as the soundness of what we are trying to do has been demonstrated. We still have far to go. But the progress we have made in the last 17 years is tremendous.

Here in the Missouri Valley, which covers one-sixth of the counrty, work is going forward to develop the land, water, and forests. We have embarked on these enterprises in the best democratic tradition. Our success has been possible because of private initiative, coupled with cooperative work by Federal, State, and local governments.

You can see the results all about you. The city of Casper lies in the midst of an area containing about half a million acres of irrigated land. Private enterprise and local, State, and Federal Governments are all playing a part in making irrigation farming more secure and more productive. Not the least part of the success of irrigation farming is due to the national investment in irrigation and power facilities by the Federal Government.

That investment is good for the farmer, and it means a more stable economy for the people in town. For the Nation as a whole the investment in sound reclamation work is part of our broad effort to create a growing economy.

Here in the western part of the Missouri Valley we have also been working to conserve and improve range lands. For the long-run success of livestock ranchers, a well-grassed and well-watered range is essential.

Before 1934 almost nothing had been done to create that kind of range. Since then much has been done on both private and public lands. We have found better grasses to provide improved cover and more profitable grazing. We have learned to build small ponds and reservoirs, as a defense against drought.

Right here in Natrona County, within the past 10 years, 2,000 stock-water ponds have been built. With more watering places, cattle and sheep can spread out over the range instead of overgrazing some parts and letting good grass go to waste on other parts.

This range-improvement work means a more productive and secure livestock industry. It is important also in another way. Poor management of range lands contributes to floods and allows silt to go down the rivers to fill up the power and irrigation reservoirs. Good management of range lands prevents erosion, helps to hold back floods, and protects our investments in reservoirs.

We should be proud of the work we have been doing—on the range lands, in irrigation, in power development, and all the other parts of our resource work. Green fields, blue reservoirs, clear streams, and shining new transmission lines tell of the advances we have made.

In the development and use of our resources, however, some of the most challenging tasks still lie ahead.

We need to put more of our land under good conservation practices. We need to build more ponds and reservoirs on the ranges, and dikes to spread water more evenly over the land. Millions of acres need reseeding. We are far from a balanced range program. Through the agricultural conservation program, we are making a national investment on private range lands which is considerably larger per acre than the amount the Government is spending on public range lands. Incidentally, the amount we are spending on the public range lands is less than 1 percent per acre per year.

Another field in which greater effort is needed is the control of insect pests. Here in Wyoming, there is a serious plague of grasshoppers. The Federal Government should bear its full share of the cost of overcoming this plague through the excellent Federal-State cooperative program that has been worked out.

In the forests, we need to build more roads, so that we can reach the timber and use it.

Along the rivers, we need more sound irrigation projects. In addition, we need other works to control and use the waters of the rivers—from the small creeks and tributaries in the mountains all the way down to the mouths of the main streams.

Minerals must be conserved, too, in the sense that we must take out of the ground all that can economically be extracted, and must increase our exploration for new sources.

Furthermore, we need to go ahead rapidly to conserve our limited water supplies. Out here in the West, water has always been relatively scarce. And as more and more water is put to beneficial use, it is becoming more and more necessary to conserve every drop. Even in the East, it is becoming obvious that more needs to be done to assure an adequate supply of good water.

This water problem is not only serious for farmers and for cities and towns. In many parts of the country it is also a serious problem for industries. For example, down south of here in Colorado there are huge reserves of oil shale. In the years to come, we may well need to obtain oil from that shale. It will take a lot of water to do so, however, and there is a real question whether there is enough water for that purpose.

This whole problem of limited water supplies and growing water uses, is the reason I appointed a Water Resources Policy Commission earlier this year. I asked some of the best experts I could find to serve on that Commission, including several from the Western States. They are making a thorough study of the facts, and should give us some sound recommendations for our future progress.

As we move forward in our use of resources, we must improve the organization of the Federal Government so that its part of the development job can be done better and with more effective participation by State and local governments.

There are still reactionary forces that oppose every forward-looking proposal to develop the resources and increase the prosperity of the West. The philosophy that produced Teapot Dome is not dead.

But these reactionary forces are fighting a losing battle. We have been overcoming their opposition for 17 years. And we are going to go right on beating them.

Those who are opposing us now are the same ones who said the soil-conservation program would regiment the American farmer. A few years back they asserted that it was socialism for the Government to lend money to farmers to build rural electric lines. They claimed it was a boondoggle to plan shelter belts of trees on the plains.

Now they're for those things. They admit that these programs have been good for the country. All they want to do now is to prevent any further progress.

But their past record is clear and plain. And their new arguments are no better than their old ones.

The American people will continue to go right ahead, taking the practical, sensible steps that are needed to build a better future. We are a strong, free people. We know that to continue free and strong, we must wisely develop and use the resources with which nature has endowed us.

The money we spend for effective conservation work is a sound investment in better living for ourselves and our children. We will not be dismayed by those who say the cost of such investments is too great. The cost of not making them would be far greater. We cannot afford to slacken our efforts, for this is work which is vital to our future.

Today, more than ever before, we can see how important it is that we take these steps to develop our resources. We are engaged in a world-wide struggle to bring lasting peace to the world. In that struggle, we are being opposed by a cynical imperialism which asserts that freedom and democracy are soft and incapable of strong action.

We can prove how false, how hollow, are the claims of communism. But we can prove that only by deeds. We must demonstrate that our free country, along with other

free countries, can achieve strength, prosperity, and growing welfare for our people.

To do so, we must continue to move forward in our use of natural resources. We must not permit any backsliding toward the old philosophy of private greed and the public be damned. We must continue to look upon our resources as a public trust, to be preserved and increased as the physical basis for a growing future.

In the tremendous conflict that exists in the world today, our fundamental strength is our belief in the worth of the individual, under God. Our whole democratic tradition rests on our faith that freemen, working together in cooperation, can achieve justice and well-being for themselves and for one another.

In that faith, we shall move forward on the path of freedom and peace.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT LARAMIE, WYO.

It is always a pleasure to visit Laramie, a landmark of the old West. It is a particular pleasure to speak here at the University of Wyoming, a symbol of the new West.

The West exerts a strong influence on the imagination of Americans. The stirring drama of the opening of the West is a part of our national folklore.

It is a tradition that the West is a country of great distances and of isolated communities, of many days of travel between cities. That tradition has left a deep impression on all Americans.

It had much to do, I think, with the notion that many of us once held that the United States was a vast distance away from foreign neighbors—that our Nation was an isolated community separated by days of travel from other communities on the globe.

You know how the West has shrunk. Distances seem to have been wiped out by a network of rails and highways, and now by the huge airliners that cross the entire Nation in less time than it used to take to cross a single county.

The world's distances have likewise shrunk. To put Laramie in its right perspective, you should erect signposts in the center of town that read like this: One pointing east that says, "London, 30 hours"; one pointing west that says, "Shanghai, 44 hours"; one pointing south, "Santiago, 35 hours"; and one pointing north, "Moscow, 45 hours."

These are the normal flight times of commercial airliners.

There are military planes that fly even faster.

It took two World Wars to bring home to us the fact that world distances have disappeared. We are next-door neighbors now to people in other countries who once were scarcely more than names to us. We have become citizens of a larger community—the whole world.

It is the great problem—and the great challenge of our age—that strangers have become fellow citizens at a time when the world is so deeply divided. We have been forced into a common citizenship with peoples who do not understand our conceptions of democratic life. We must recognize—whether we like it or not—that we are neighbors with a government which denies all the values of the American tradition, indeed of all ethical and moral traditions, and which seeks to spread its doctrine over the entire earth. We have become neighbors of a new and terrible tyranny.

Tyranny is not new in the world. As long as democracy has existed, tyranny has also existed. But never before has it been so difficult for tyranny and democracy to find a basis for peaceful coexistence.

There are two reasons for this. The first reason I have already mentioned—the elimination of distances. Where once we could ignore a far-off tyranny there no longer are any far-off places. Today everybody on the globe is our neighbor.

The second reason is that the new tyranny of Soviet communism is giving no evidence that it is willing to let the free world exist peacefully. Communism has clearly shown its purpose to penetrate free countries, to divide free peoples and confuse them, to subvert their institutions, and to weaken their resistance. This is a method of attack far more subtle than the ancient and direct method of military attack. It requires more understanding, more alertness, and more determination on the part of those who want to preserve their freedom.

How do we meet this overriding problem—the most important one of our time?

I will tell you two things we cannot do.

First, we cannot compromise our own social and ethical beliefs. We know, as our ancestors knew, that tyranny is evil. We know that this newest form of tyranny is a compound of evils. Communism denies all that we have come to know as democracy. It denies freedom and liberty and human dignity. It denies God. We cannot meet the challenge by any form of compromise with such beliefs.

Second, we cannot isolate ourselves. The leadership of the free world, the hopes of millions of people who have not our strength and our resources depend on us. But even if we could forget our friends we know that there is no salvation even for ourselves in any passive policy of withdrawal. If we permitted communism to engulf the rest of the world and to roll up to our borders there would be no peace and no security for us.

We cannot compromise our principles.

We cannot withdraw from the world.

What can we do?

We can do this: We can, together with other nations of the free world, clearly demonstrate the superiority of the ideals of freedom over the iron hand of tyranny. We can make clear that democracy and freedom bring to each individual, each day, more of what he wants than any other system of government.

The free world must demonstrate moral superiority. It must demonstrate material superiority.

The free world has the resources to make that demonstration. It has the tremendous advantage that always adheres to the cause of justice, liberty, and respect for human dignity. With leadership, with unity, with steadfastness, that demonstration of moral and material superiority can be made.

As the strength and the effectiveness of the system of freedom are made clear over the globe—as the peoples who now stand in doubt turn to democracy—the danger of Communist domination will dwindle and finally disappear. The struggle for peace, security, and stability in world affairs can be won.

This is a long-time project. I know that the American people are impatient. But in this instance we must be more than patient. The conflict that exists in world affairs will be with us for a long, long time. There is no quick way, no easy way, to end it.

In all our relations with other nations we are following a consistent and forthright policy to strengthen the cause of freedom and bring about stability and peace in world affairs.

We are working, first of all, for unity among the nations. The foremost expression of our will for unity is our work within the United Nations. The United Nations was created on our soil. Its headquarters are in this country. We have worked unceasingly to make the United Nations and its affiliated organizations strong and effective agencies of peace and international cooperation.

We have done our best to settle—through the United Nations—some of the difficulties in the world today. You know the record. You know of the vetoes. You know that failures in the United Nations cannot be laid to any lack of good faith on our part or any lack of trying.

In spite of all difficulties, the United Nations has done—and is continuing to do—work of tremendous value in helping the nations of the world to get along with one another and solve their common problems. This work must continue—and it will continue.

As long as I am President we shall support the United Nations with every means at our command.

Within the larger framework of the United Nations, we have joined the countries of western Europe in a great combined effort to assure their economic recovery and political stability.

The decisive vote of 60 to 8 by which the Senate a few days ago approved the Foreign Assistance Act of 1950 is a forceful expression of the determination of the American people to carry forward our constructive foreign policy. This action by the Senate, following a large favorable vote by the House of Representatives, assures our partners in western Europe that we will successfully complete the great recovery program that was launched 2 years ago.

To promote international peace and security in vital areas, we joined first with the other Republics of North and South America in the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro and then with Canada and 10 European nations in the North Atlantic Treaty. Through the mutual defense assistance program, we have joined with a number of other free nations to strengthen our common military defense against aggression.

In the former enemy countries of Germany and Japan, we have been working to restore them to the society of free nations as rapidly as they can build firm and reliable democratic institutions.

Our efforts in Germany have been delayed by the attempts of the Soviet Union to turn Germany into another Communist satellite. Nevertheless, Western Germany has made great progress along the road toward democracy. We believe that the Germans will continue to build upon these elements in their tradition which are good. We want Germany to become more closely integrated with the free nations of Europe.

In Japan, we have also seen encouraging progress. The Japanese people, who have not had the same long familiarity with democratic ideals, are nonetheless learning the ways of democracy. They are rebuilding their economy along more democratic lines. In one field after another, the Japanese are reestablishing their contacts with the rest of the world in preparation for a resumption of full membership in the international community.

Elsewhere in Asia, we are encouraging the aspirations of the millions of people who are striving to establish new democratic governments. In this part of the world, we have witnessed since the end of the war a tremendous event in history—the birth of a great group of new nations—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, South Korea, and the Philippines. These new nations are now consolidating their independence and working out their problems of internal security and stability.

We welcome these new countries into the family of nations. We can, and shall, continue to give them support, material as well as moral, in their struggle to maintain their freedom.

The credit of $100,000,000 to the United States of Indonesia is one type of material aid. Another type is the technical assistance we shall make available to underdeveloped countries under the program that has become known as point 4. This was approved by the Senate last week after earlier authorization by the House. Point 4 provides an example of broad-scale collective action on the part of many countries to bring the benefit of better living conditions to millions of individuals now suffering from ill health,

illiteracy, and poverty. The point 4 program is one of the greatest contributions we can make to the cause of freedom.

While our support of the new nations of Asia has been of real benefit to them, we have recently been unable to be of any assistance at all to the people of one vast area—China. Since the Chinese Nationalist Government disintegrated and the Chinese Communists seized control on the mainland, the plight of hundreds of millions of Chinese has been tragic. Their new taskmasters have been heartlessly indifferent to the worst famine which has occurred in China in 100 years.

We have been working for some time on steps which our country might take to feed at least some of these stricken people. The attitude of the present authorities in China has forced the withdrawal of American official representatives from that country. However, there are still a number of American religious, educational, and charitable organizations which have representatives in China who might be able to help out. We are now trying to find a way for the Government to get food into the hands of these private agencies for distribution in China.

We do not know whether American private organizations will be permitted by the Chinese Communist authorities to provide this assistance. The Communists so far have tried to deny the existence of a famine. They have rebuffed the efforts of others to discover the facts. They have even sent to the Soviet Union food which is desperately needed by the Chinese people. Nevertheless we shall keep on trying to find ways to get some food to the Chinese people.

In Asia, and in the rest of the world, we are trying to do far more than to bring relief to people who are in want. We are working by every means at our command to build the kind of world economy in which nations can be self-sustaining over the long run by their own efforts. This is of great importance, because there can never be political stability and peace unless there is a reasonable degree of economic stability and prosperity.

Our world economic policies are aimed at breaking down the barriers to world trade. We believe that a high level of trade can raise standards of living in our own country and every other country. This is the purpose of our reciprocal trade agreements program, and it is the purpose of the proposed International Trade Organization.

Our economic policies are also aimed at increasing the international flow of investment capital. The industrial growth of underdeveloped areas will mean more production, better markets, and a stronger world economy.

All our international policies, taken together, form a program designed to strengthen and unite the free world in its resistance to the spread of communism. They are aimed at banding the free countries together in a great demonstration that the free way of life is more rewarding to the individual than any form of tyranny, old or new.

I say again that we have a long task ahead. It may be many years before we can be sure that communism is no longer a threat, that our goals of stability and peace have been attained.

But those goals are clearly within our reach. The non-Communist nations together have two-thirds of the world's people and three-fourths of the world's productive power.

And we have much more than mere quantity or mere strength. We have the greatest attraction of all—human freedom. Our system of life satisfies the most fundamental desire of man—the opportunity to be his own master.

We can have faith that with these qualities and the help of the Almighty we will attain a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

THE PRESIDENT'S WESTERN TOUR

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am much interested in the remarks of the President of the United States, and the leader of his party, as he makes his way through several of our Rocky Mountain States.

There is the usual pattern of party strut, the sweaty flogging of nonexistent villains, or of devils long since dehorned. There is the claim of scintillant party virtues and the reiterated notion that everything good in the world commenced 17 years ago.

Then there are the magic remedies dealing with the symptoms of deep-seated ills caused by the doctor's own bad medicine. One is reminded of the physician who achieved a reputation for curing fits, and who thereafter always induced fits in his patients so that he could cure them.

The President's cure is always the same: more of the taxpayers' money and more Federal control. In Nebraska it was the Brannan plan. In Wyoming, reclamation is to stooge for a super Missour Valley Authority to revolve in its own orbit, independent of the people, the States, and the Federal Government.

At Casper, Wyo., the President, referring to developments in reclamation, said:

> We still have far to go, but the progress we have made in the last 17 years is tremendous.

Why the last 17 years, Mr. President? The progress has been tremendous since the pioneers first went into the western country. More than 85 percent of the Nation's total irrigated area has been developed by private money and private enterprise and without partisanship.

Indeed, the partisan reference to the last 17 years, in relation to the development of reclamation, is especially inappropriate and unfortunate in view of the fact that Members of Congress from the West, and all westerners, having the slightest claim to foresight, have recognized that for obvious reasons, partisanship in this matter must be put aside; there must be unified approaches and programs if we are to have the constructive assistance of the Federal Government in the development of our resources where the problems are too great for individual or local governmental solutions.

During the time that I have been a Member of this body—I have served on the old Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, and as a member of its successor, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—I have never known of an instance where a project was authorized or not authorized to serve a partisan political purpose.

We get a better view of the blundering injustice and harmful provocations resulting from partisan attempts to monopolize credit for the advancement of our reclamation programs, when we remember that the National Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, the basis of all such developments, was sponsored by the then Senator H. C. Hansbrough, Republican, of North Dakota, and the then Congressman F. G. Newlands, Democrat, of Nevada, and approved by Republican President Theodore Roosevelt.

We get a better view of this presidential foreshortening of history into a partisan span of 17 years when we note that Mr. Truman muffed the opportunity which could have been grasped with just a little bigness of spirit, to pay appropriate tribute at Cheyenne to the late Republican Senator Joseph M. Carey, author of the Carey Act approved August 18, 1894, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to grant desert lands to the States for the development of irrigation and reclamation. That Republican-sponsored act was approved by Democratic President Grover Cleveland.

The home of Senator Joseph Carey was at Cheyenne, and grandchildren are living there at the present time. The people of the West are proud of the inspired and effective trail-blazing pioneer efforts of Republican Senator Joseph M. Carey, of Cheyenne, Wyo., in furtherance of reclamation.

But what does that matter during a partisan political trip made at the taxpayers' expense? Heaven on earth did not start until 17 years ago, and nothing else is worth mentioning.

But even during that proclaimed 17 years of utopia, from which I suppose we are to infer the fantastic falsity of unfailing yearly Treasury surpluses and freedom from national debt, freedom from war, freedom from fear of war, freedom from domestic treacheries, freedom from unemployment, freedom from high taxes, and freedom from catastrophic failure of foreign policies, western Republicans in Congress nevertheless continued to cooperate with members of the President's party to advance the interests of reclamation.

Thus the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress made the largest appropriations for reclamation up to that time amounting to $240,000,000. The succeeding Republican Eightieth Congress upped this more than 50 percent to $389,000,000.

Another example of the right way as contrasted with partisan, sneak punch approaches: The Flood Control Act of 1944 was amended to require certain preferential dedications for the most advantageous use of water in the arid and semiarid States. The amendment provided for much-needed integration of effort between Government agencies, such as Reclamation and the Army engineers; it required consultation with the affected States and all interested parties, official and private, with opportunity for protest to Congress before authorizations for projects would be made.

The authors and sponsors of this amendment were the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], Democrat, and your speaker, the junior Senator from Colorado, Republican.

The President was singing off key at Cheyenne, and one can only hope that his strident vocalisms will not upset the harmonies of approach necessary for moving forward with our reclamation programs.

In his singleminded preoccupation with getting in his partisan plug for the unalloyed blessing to the people of the last 17 years of his kind of Federal Government, the President neglected a great opportunity to pay deserved tribute to the free American men and women who made their danger-ridden trek to that part of our country, whose unsubsidized bivouacs and pioneer cabins were the citadels of their dauntless hope, courage, and independence, who settled the lands, utilized the waters of the streams, built up their herds, who opened the mines and oil fields, who developed a superior civilization long prior to 17 years ago, and who developed a spirit for freedom which will outlast and will mitigate, if it does not cure, the afflictions of the past 17 years.

Those pioneers died too soon. How did they ever get along without the thought control of official propaganda from Washington, without the aid of the planners of the Federal Government, without technical assistance and supervision, socialized medicine and Brannan plans, without the joy of paying one-third of their incomes to government, the joy of price controls, of making out endless forms, and submission to countless other governmental nuisances?

Mr. Truman at Cheyenne said:

* * * spirit of the frontier is exactly what I want to talk about today.

He also said:

And today's frontiers call for the same pioneering vision, the same resourcefulness, the same courage that were displayed by the men and women who challenged our geographical frontiers a century ago.

Today's frontiers do indeed call for the vision, resourcefulness, and the courage of the western pioneers. But unhappily there is not the slightest play for those qualities in Mr. Truman's completely antithetical plans for an omnipotent, ever expanding, ever present, all pervading Federal Government.

There must be a lot of restlessness in the graves of the pioneers out there.

I hope that I am not too harsh when I say that "the spirit of the frontier" is the last thing in this world that Mr. Truman is competent to talk about. Our West, which is a living symbol of that spirit, is the last place where he should be talking about it.

Mr. Truman made a number of references to "boom and bust." I doubt whether our western people are ignorant of the "bust" possibilities from a "boom" that rests on the obsolescence of war, on foreign giveaways, on a 50-cent dollar, and on borrowed money.

At Cheyenne, the President said:

A steady growth in the standards of living of the American people is a goal within our ability to attain.

Then comes this strange statement:

There are still some—

The President always has a devil; it may be some old, potbellied Republican reactionary, or some fellow under the bed in Wall Street, but there is always a devil. Watch these words:

There are still some who look upon the goal of an ever-expanding economy as a pipe dream.

That was a strange devil for the President to kick around. The only people that I know of who rejected the goal of an ever-expanding economy were those economic disease carriers responsible for the planning mania of the President's party in the thirties who preached that we had reached a static economy and that, therefore, we must plan and control everything to see that everyone got a fair share of the bleak and dreary future which they predicted for this country.

Although the defeatist theories basic to their planning manias exploded in their faces, their plans continue to be your plans, Mr. President.

Everyone with any sense knows and has always known that we must have an ever-expanding economy—if for no other reason than to carry the steadily mounting deducts from our payrolls. The question is, How are we going to get it? And anyone with any sense also knows that this must result from increasing productivity, from more and more goods for the buyer's dollar. Everyone with any sense knows that we cannot have an ever-expanding healthy economy on ever-expanding debt and deficits.

Out in the country which you are now visiting, Mr. President, our people want their economy to rest on a sound, pay-as-you-go basis. They are not misled by the consumptive flush of a prosperity which depends upon I O U's to be paid by their children and their children's children.

That part of our country has great need for the help of a friendly government. It may ask for the temporary loan of a cane, but it does not want the planner's opium pipe.

And by the way, Mr. President, the boom and bust of the twenties were not repaired, as you intimated, by the panaceas of the thirties. They merely continued unemployment and increased our debt. The people out in the West know about the war, about World War II, about war obsolescence and its replacement; they know about the temporary stimulants of foreign aid. They know about the showy and unreal money values represented by 50-cent dollars, and they know that the same processes which lowered the dollar to 50 cents will, if not stopped, lower it to nothing.

At Cheyenne the President displayed solicitude for small business. This, of course, was commendable.

But, Mr. President, once more you are working with symptoms of bad government. Reduce the taxes of the small-business man, reduce the taxes of his suppliers and customers, and his needs for credit will become manageable. And, Mr. President, our banks are jammed with privately owned money which would flow in abundance into good ventures. But there are no good ventures for either private or public money if taxes do not leave sufficient opportunity for profit commensurate with the risks.

Unless we can cut loose from the madness which controls our fiscal policies, the small-business man will be out of business regardless of credit, venture capital, or technical assistance. His last contribution to our economy will be to put in a line of wheelbarrows so that his customers can bring in enough money to buy a can of beans.

Mr. President, there were many small businesses in the territory which you are traversing which fell by the wayside as a direct result of misguided Presidential policies. A large number of our citizens in the West once engaged in fur farming, including many war veterans. They have been ruined and are out of business because of your tariff policies. They were finished off by free importation of furs from Russia. Uncle Joe may be a prisoner of the Russian Politburo, but our fur farmers are the prisoners of official stupidity.

There are a lot of small mines which operated in the Rocky Mountain region, Mr. President. They, too, are out of business because of Presidential tariff policies. They cannot compete with the avalanche of low-cost copper, lead, and zinc which is pouring into this country as a result of those policies. On your trip, you speak, Mr. President, of maintaining our standards of living. How are you going to do that when you open our markets to the low-cost products of foreign mines? Our idle miners and their families and the service businesses depending on them, would like to have the answer.

Ah, Mr. President, the destruction of our small mines is not an accidental, thoughtless result. The injury does not result from a ricochet shot. A representative of your executive department appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where he was asked this question by the junior Senator from Colorado:

Is your theory, Doctor, based upon building up a mining industry, and only that part of our mining industry which could, when built up, compete with imports?

The gentleman replied—"That is correct." (Page 54, hearings on S. 240, S. 2105, S. 2230, and S. 2320, held in July and August of 1949.) That, Mr. President, was a sentence of death to all of our small-mining businesses and to all but a few of our largest ones.

Out in the oil States of the West, Mr. President, the impact of excessive oil importations is bound to reduce production, reduce prices, reduce exploratory operations, and reduce employment of oil workers. Those effects hurt the little as well as the big operator. They hurt all the small businesses and payrolls that are dependent upon the success of those oil ventures such as those you referred to at Cheyenne, the "drug stores, filling stations, and retail stores." The speech on the subject made yesterday by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is worthy of the most serious consideration by your tariff tinkerers.

How long will it take us to learn that we must maintain healthy, prosperous, expanding domestic production of the strategic raw materials necessary for war as well as peace purposes? Visit the Atlantic coast, and 5 years after the war there can be found shore lines stained with oil from tankers torpedoed while trying to bring their desperately needed cargoes into our ports. There can be

seen the derelicts of ships destroyed by the enemy while trying to reach safe harbor with badly needed strategic minerals.

We thought we had learned the lesson in World War I. We thought we had learned the lesson in World War II. But already addle-pated planners tell us to keep everything in the ground and argue the patent nonsense that production of strategic materials, like an electric-light switch, can be turned on and off to suit our needs.

Mr. President, in your talk at Cheyenne you stated:

> The task of economic expansion requires using all the resources of this great Nation. Of the nearly 4,000,000 business concerns in our country, more than 90 percent are usually classified as small. These small concerns provide jobs for over 20,000,000 people—roughly, half of private, nonfarm employment. If we are to have an expanding economy, small business must provide its share of the additional jobs needed. In doing so it will not only create new payrolls for workers; it will also enlarge markets generally for other businessmen and farmers.

We cannot ride it both ways, Mr. President. Businesses destroyed by adverse tariff policies and confiscatory taxation do not add to our payrolls. The little businesses of this country do not have elaborate labor-saving assembly lines. A large part of their costs goes for the handwork of employees receiving high wages necessary for sustaining our superior standards of living. Those little businesses support the one-factory towns which characterize and buttress our economy. And yet at this moment, Mr. President, your agents are in Europe urging the countries over there to aim their competition in this country at the very small businesses for which you profess solicitude.

Ah, but do not worry about that, Mr. President. Mr. Hoffman has figured it all out. He would put the displaced workers on unemployment relief or retrain them or induce them to migrate to other work centers.

And who will employ these displaced workers? Obviously, not the other stricken small businesses. They will go to work for the big companies, if there are jobs, and that, Mr. President, is the way your agents would fight and eliminate monopoly and encourage little business.

Have a good trip, Mr. President. You will find the people in the West very hospitable but not as stupid as you think.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, press dispatches today give reports of the speeches and comments made by the President at Boise, Idaho, yesterday and at Grand Coulee Dam, Wash., today. I am impressed by a report which I find in the Washington Evening Star of today in which reference is made to a comment by the President to the effect that it is time to get some action on his proposal to create a Columbia Valley Authority. It is interesting to note that the President is forthright in referring to this proposal as an authority. His administration, and the leaders therein who have been advocating the establishment of an authority for the past 2 years have been calling the authority an "administration." I presume that is for the purpose of avoiding the harsh connotation which is found in the word "authority." The same dispatch in the Evening Star tells us that the President believes "the Columbia Valley Authority is a necessary next step in the sensible democratic development of the resources of the Northwest."

Mr. President, I contend that under the existing program, the Congress, the Federal agencies and the people in the area affected are now proceeding in an orderly, democratic way to develop the great resources in the Northwestern area.

During the past 17 years an ever-growing group of self-seeking politicians has been trying to guide the American people, their Government, and their representatives, down a primrose path known as "planned economy." This road leads to the so-called welfare or socialist state—a national poorhouse to which our deluded British friends are now making a mass migration.

Some thousands of Socialist planners have found their way into practically all departments and agencies of our Federal Government, and have used the opportunities afforded by these positions of vantage as a means to fasten shackles of Government control and regulation on our lives, liberties, occupations, associations, and properties. Their common plan and purpose is destruction of all forms of freedom and free enterprise by which the wealth, development, and present level of living in this country have been made possible.

For the Socialists, the ruin of our Republic is expected to open the door to unlimited personal power. For the Communists and their sympathizers, such a result will produce world-wide Soviet supremacy; while for the average American citizen, the destruction of our representative Government will eventually and inevitably lead to poverty and slavery.

The aims and ambitions of the Socialist planners were well stated by Rexford G. Tugwell, in 1935, when he said:

> When industry is government, and government is industry, the * * * conflict in our modern institutions will be abated * * *. This is why the prospect of planned economy is so congenial * * * planning * * * will become a function of Federal Government * * * or planning will supersede Government. Business will be required to disappear * * * perhaps our Constitution and statutes will be revised.

Socialism and communism thrive on national disasters, so the disciples of planned economy in our land found their great opportunity in the dark days of 1933 when the depression was at its worst. At that time, Congress passed an act which was, in part, a product of New Deal planners. This statute created the Tennessee Valley Authority which has subsequently come to be called the TVA.

TVA is a milestone in American history, for it is the forerunner of a regulatory regionalism which may follow a future liquidation of all State governments in our present Union. TVA contains the means and methods by which such transformations could be made in the American way of life; and its political power is now felt by every State, county, and city government in a half dozen States.

This organization falls into the familiar formula and operational pattern of Russian plans of the last 30 years. But the people of Idaho have had no opportunity to vote upon the question of abolishing their State government; and I am not in the United States Senate to liquidate their liberties, properties, hopes, and happiness by voting to create a future Federal despotism in the Pacific Northwest.

PLAN NINE AUTHORITIES

Since 1933, our Socialist planners have expanded their thinking from a single regional operation, such as TVA, to nine regions which are to blanket this whole country. The first of these additional ventures into sectional socialism and regional regulation is the proposed Columbia Valley Administration for the development of an area of about 280,000 square miles in the States of Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Montana, and portions of Utah, Wyoming, and Nevada. These lands lie in the watershed of the Columbia River, and include nearly 40,000 square miles in Canada.

Senate bill 1645 relating to the proposed Columbia Valley Administration, or CVA, is now pending in Congress. The operations and experience of TVA have obviously led to an identity of plans and purposes for the future CVA; but these two projects nevertheless involve basic differences which defy accurate comparison.

The valley of the Tennessee River had long been a poverty-stricken land of limited resources, and this area had been regularly ravaged by destructive floods. The climate, resources, occupations, culture, and standards of living differ greatly from corresponding conditions in the Pacific Northwest. An iron-handed rule of a Federal feudalism of three appointed autocrats has undoubtedly produced beneficial results in the TVA area. But those same results could have been gained without the destruction of American freedoms, if Congress had made available to the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies just about half of the funds so far expended by TVA.

As the President takes the stump for a possible Columbia Valley Administration, I want to make clear my firm belief that the supreme values involved are the human values. Furthermore, the maxim that "human nature cannot be left out of human affairs" applies with full force and effect to the new project. Hence, a good starting point for this discussion is the men who will make and manage the CVA, and the organization they will use for the purpose.

WOULD EXERCISE POWER

Section 12 (a) of Senate bill 1645 provides that CVA "shall be a wholly owned Government corporation." The private corporation thus created to carry on public business will be backed by the political power and wealth of our Federal Government; but not being a department, bureau, or other direct agency of Government, the CVA will be less likely to suffer

interference from or any successful investigation by Congress. This independence will give a fine flexibility through which the management of the future CVA could set up a regulatory regionalism and would limit the liberties of everyone in its area. The self-sufficiency and future freedom from control that will be enjoyed by the new organization proposed by Senate bill 1645 are emphasized again and again in that bill. For example, sections 12 (d) and (e) provide that the United States Treasury shall set up a CVA administration fund, to which Congress may, from time to time, add the amounts it appropriates for CVA. The new Administration may, likewise, pay into the fund; and moneys from other sources may also be deposited therein.

The sums thus paid into the United States Treasury will not become part of the general funds of the United States, as they should, by law. Moreover, the disbursements from the CVA administration fund will not be controlled by lawful or normal processes, such as authorizations of Congress, for CVA will be granted individual power to determine what disbursements shall be made and for what purposes.

CONGRESS MIGHT LOSE AUTHORITY

There is serious doubt whether Congress can surrender its complete control over future funds in the United States Treasury—as is thus attempted to be done in Senate bill 1645. There is an even greater doubt as to the constitutionality of an abdication by which Congress would attempt to part with its present powers over future Federal appropriations and future Federal taxation. These attempted grants of authority to CVA are contained in Senate bill 1645, and they clearly invade a number of powers that have been delegated only to Congress by the terms of the United States Constitution.

Perhaps the most startling grant of power to CVA is contained in section 16 (a) of Senate bill 1645. According to this section, the proposed administration—

> may exercise any of its powers under this act, including the power of condemnation, with respect to Indian lands, or property, irrespective of the manner in which title to such lands or property is held.

Mr. President, many Indian lands are the subject of solemn treaty obligations, entered into by our Federal Government with various Indian tribes. The language quoted above from section 16 (a) of Senate bill 1645, confers on CVA a power to nullify or abrogate these treaties, to the full extent of taking treaty lands from the Indians by means of condemnation suits which would be brought at the instance of the three directors of CVA—a private corporation. Here, indeed, is a legal and administrative innovation, whereby three officials of a private corporation, who are not even employed by our Government, are to have a power of treaty revocation, which even the State Department does not possess.

In order to endow the proposed Columbia Valley Administration with extraordinary powers over the funds, taxes, appropriations, and treaties of the American people, our political planners are apparently bent on stripping Congress of its constitutional powers, without even the formality of amending the Constitution.

Senate bill 1645 provides that the proposed CVA will be administered by a board of three directors who will possess almost unlimited powers of decision and action in matters involving the control and use of water, the condemnation and flooding of farms for dam sites and reservoirs, the production, distribution, and sale of electric power, and other activities in which CVA may choose to engage. In other words, these three directors will possess the power of life and death over every person and every enterprise in at least the three States of Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. Could Stalin ask for more than this, if he ruled our Pacific Northwest?

PEOPLE HAVE NO VOICE

The three CVA directors will not be chosen according to votes cast by the people who live in the area these men will rule. Although the people of the proposed regulatory region will pay 80 to 85 percent of the costs of CVA, they will have nothing to say about the management or direction of the organization. The directors will be selected and appointed by the President, and, in the last analysis, they will answer practically to him alone.

It is within the realm of possibility that David E. Lilienthal and J. A. (Cap) Krug, the former power manager of TVA, may be appointed by the President to become directors of CVA, if Senate bill 1645 is enacted into law.

These gentlemen will long be remembered in the Tennessee Valley, for they were there in positions of great power and responsibility when TVA was guilty of calculated cruelties and oppressions in its treatment of some 75,000 farmers. This story of almost 14,000 American families, whose lands—to the extent of more than a half-million acres—were taken from them, is a saga of suffering inflicted on supposedly free, but nevertheless, defenseless American people. Their little farms were condemned and bought by arbitrary actions which allowed appraisals at values acceptable to TVA. Those values became the prices quoted by TVA on a "take it or leave it" basis. The excuse has been offered that TVA acted "within the letter of the law". This is, indeed, true, for the socialist planners inserted cut-throat provisions in the TVA Act—and some of those same provisions are in Senate bill 1645.

To farmers who favor a Columbia Valley Administration, I ask this question: "Where do you expect to go, if CVA condemns your lands and pays you the pittance it may think you should receive?"

WATER RIGHTS JEOPARDIZED?

IF CVA comes into corporate existence, thousands of farmers in the Pacific Northwest will be faced with the above question, and they will have to answer it. The very same question may trouble the owners of businesses, factories, and power companies that would probably be wrecked by future operations of CVA.

Senate bill 1645 confers sweeping powers of condemnation on the proposed administration, and there appears to be little hope of survival for any business, industry, utility, farm, or mine which happens to obstruct the path of the CVA empire builders.

The terrible mistakes made by such planners as Henry A. Wallace and the British Socialists have proved that it is utterly impossible for one man or any little group of men to plan intelligently for an entire nation or for any considerable part of it. The combined abilities of all the Members of Congress are not even sufficient to do a satisfactory job.

Therefore, to invest three politicians of good, bad, or indifferent qualifications with administrative powers such as those provided for in Senate bill 1645, is to invite disaster; and local governments probably will not be able to avert or even ameliorate the consequences.

The question of local participation in CVA affairs appears in amusing and misleading language of section 5 of Senate bill 1645. This section provides for participation by "State and local governments—to the fullest practicable extent in the formulation and execution of programs." But the extent of this proposed activity is later limited to "consultation and interchange of views," following which CVA will be at liberty to do just as it pleases.

Local participation in the policies, decisions, and actions of proposed organizations is an argument that has been worn threadbare by excessive use. It is just a bit of bait which has never failed to lure the luckless local leaders to their administrative annihilation.

Denial of full, fair, and honest participation to local governments inescapably reveals the alien and antagonistic plans and purposes of the future CVA, as well as the fundamental loyalties which its directors will have. The Pacific Northwest will be saddled with a three-man autocracy whose directors will look and answer only to the President in Washington. Even a right of appeal as to some possible grievances will be denied the people; and as to other grievances, the people will be destitute of any effective protection against the administrative tyranny of CVA.

Section 6 of Senate bill 1645 contains a grant of general powers which include promotion of navigation, control of floods, conservation and reclamation of lands, forests, minerals, fish, and wildlife, and the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy. In order to carry out these well-nigh unlimited controls of life and living, CVA will have power to buy, sell, condemn, and otherwise deal in and with all kinds of property.

The new administration can engage in manufacturing, banking, and other businesses which may, and probably will, compete with, and even destroy private enterprises.

POWER DOMINATES IRRIGATION

Senate bill 1645 shows that the production, distribution, and sale of electric energy will be by far the most important activity of CVA. To the farmers of the entire Pacific Northwest I give this grave warning: Do not forget that CVA will give its immensely profitable production

of power a high priority over your farms and their irrigation. This statement may be denied by Socialist defenders of CVA, but my warning contains a truth fully proved by the record of the TVA, the model that CVA will follow.

If CVA brings its "blessings of socialized planning" to the Pacific Northwest, the farmers, and those in allied activities, will be vitally interested in questions of irrigation, water rights, and reclamation.

Eminent legal authorities who have studied the proposed CVA act have announced that the bill will permit CVA to condemn and take water rights. In the semiarid States of the Pacific Northwest this power is practically one of life and death, but it is obviously one which CVA will use liberally in order to fashion fabulous, tax-free revenues from its Federal power monopoly.

Among the dangerous and arbitrary powers granted to CVA by section 6 of Senate bill 1645, it is provided in subsection (c) that CVA is authorized, and shall have power—

1. To acquire real and personal property, including any interest therein, by purchase, lease, condemnation, exchange, transfer, donation, or otherwise, * * * *Provided, however,* That the Administration (CVA) shall have no power to condemn any water right except as it may be appurtenant to land acquired incident to the construction of dams, reservoirs, or other projects or facilities.

ESCAPE CLAUSE POINTS THE WAY

In the above quotation the word "except" opens the door to those following conditions under which CVA will be able to evade the provision which declares that it "shall have no power to condemn any water right." The escape clause which permits water rights to be condemned, gives CVA a generous choice of pretexts under which to seize them. CVA will condemn water rights by condemning the lands to which such rights belong. The stated causes for these actions will be proposed construction of "dams, reservoirs, and other projects or facilities." And only in this way can CVA hope to build up its power production potential and its revenues.

To those who dwell in a dream of fancied security based upon State laws dealing with water rights and irrigation, it will later become painfully apparent that little vitality will be left in any State water law in the CVA area.

Section 19 of Senate bill 1645 provides:

This act shall be liberally construed to carry out the purposes of the Congress to provide * * * for the national defense, improve navigation, control destructive floods, and promote interstate commerce and the general welfare.

In this section, the so-called commerce clause of the United States Constitution has again been invoked as a means to invade and usurp certain other rights that were reserved by the States when our Constitution was adopted. This process of usurpation began with the NRA and the Blue Eagle; and it has since been carried on in one Federal statute after another for the past 17 years.

There is not a word in section 19 which will provide for a liberal or even a fair interpretation in favor of the water laws or water rights of any State. This condition impairs or destroys the supposed protection afforded by section 10 to State laws.

Section 10 offers little protection to State water laws, for it is limited in its application to irrigation projects that CVA may undertake. A part of this section reads as follows:

(a) No provision for work of irrigation in or under this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water for domestic irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

There is nothing in the words just quoted which will prevent CVA from beginning a "work" of generating electric power, or controlling floods, or improving navigation, even if such a project seriously interferes with State laws, relating to appropriation, use, and control of water.

In order to consolidate its future power and position in the control of water and other resources, the CVA is given authority, by section 3 (c) of Senate bill 1645, to effect removal of law suits from State to Federal courts. The section reads as follows:

Any proceeding brought against the administration in a court of any State may be removed by the Administration to the District Court of the United States for the district in which such proceeding is pending.

By the above expedient, State laws and the decisions of State courts may be more easily and effectively attacked or perhaps, entirely avoided.

It is a lesson of logic and human experience that a prospective litigant who seeks to select his own forum is looking for a soft spot in the law, or in its interpretation.

EXEMPTED FROM CIVIL SERVICE

If CVA is approved by Congress it may develop a payroll running into thousands of employees. Senate bill 1645 provides an almost complete control by CVA over terms and conditions of employment. The new Administration is exempted from civil-service laws and regulations, except the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. Section 15 of Senate bill 1645 recites:

Subject to the provisions of this act, the Administration (CVA) is authorized to deal collectively with its employees through representatives of their own choosing, and is authorized to enter into written and oral contracts with such employees' representatives.

In practical operation the quoted words do not compel or order CVA to make future employment contracts with labor unions, and CVA is not even required to deal collectively with its employees. Having taken great pains to avoid any specific obligation to deal collectively, it may be safely assumed that CVA will follow the example of TVA, by dealing with its men on an individual basis as to terms and conditions of employment.

There may be a yearly meeting of CVA officials and a few labor representatives, and a general discussion of wages and working conditions may occur. But fundamental rights of labor to bargain collectively and to strike will probably be seriously compromised or practically nonexistent in CVA operations.

LABOR POLICY INDEFINITE

There is little or nothing in Senate bill 1645 to indicate that CVA will possess a genuinely cooperative attitude toward organized labor. Quite the opposite result should follow, for the pattern of TVA treatment has been faithfully followed. Organized labor can, however, be sure of one thing, it will be required to contribute its fair share to the building of the Socialist empire of power in the Pacific Northwest.

No one can accurately estimate how many millions of dollars of property and other taxes will be lost each year by the governments of States in which CVA will operate.

Section 13 of Senate bill 1645 covers the subject of taxation in some detail. The CVA will, apparently, fix the amount of taxes it will pay—a decision which each and every taxpayer in the country would like to be able to make.

Section 13 (f) sums up the future of CVA taxes in the following words:

The payments authorized under this section are in lieu of taxation and the Administration (CVA), its property, franchises, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision thereof. The determination by the Administration of the necessity of making any payments under this section and of the amounts thereof shall be final.

The CVA will pay what it is willing to pay, and from its decision on this question there will be no appeal. Annual losses of tax revenues running into millions of dollars will have to be made up out of the pockets of the public.

There is a single section of Senate bill 1645 which by itself alone fixes my adverse opinion of the whole measure. The section is 10 (d) and these are its provisions:

CONTROL SIZE OF FARM UNITS

The Administration (CVA) shall establish the maximum size of farm units within each project for the reclamation of lands in accordance with its findings as to the area sufficient in size to constitute an economic family farm or adequately to supplement family grazing or dry farming operations on adjacent lands, but no farm unit shall contain more than 160 or less than 10 acres of irrigable land, except that any nominal quarter section comprising more than 160 acres of irrigable land may be included in one farm unit.

I am unalterably opposed to the adoption of the Russian colony or Communist farm-community system in our land; yet we have it offered right here in language I have just quoted from Senate bill 1645. Ours is still a land of freedom and free enterprise, and the ownership of land should not depend upon the whims of a triumvirate of politicians and their swarms of self-seeking servitors. In my opinion section 10 (d) of Senate bill 1645 is un-American, and is unfit for serious consideration by the Congress. This provision is a frank foretaste of the regulatory regionalism that our Socialist planners would nationalize here in America.

In our Pacific Northwest the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have done the kind of magnificent work that only the greatest construction agencies in the world could do. Vast projects of reclamation, flood control, navigation control, and power production have come into being, and the coordinated plan for future development of the Northwest has been prepared.

COOPERATION EXISTS NOW

The tremendous achievements so far made have been produced in a spirit of good will and cooperation between Federal and State agencies. The people who are to pay the bills had a voice in the selection of projects and in fixing the sums to be spent, for their local representatives have actively participated.

CONGRESS EXERCISES CONTROLS UNDER A DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

The Pacific Northwest has so far accomplished much, but it can do a great deal more in the future if the American ways of freedom and cooperation are followed. The Northwest has gained greater results with less money than TVA, and we have nothing to gain by trading the experience and ability of Army and Reclamation engineers for the combined cupidity and inexperience of three men who may be appointed to direct the CVA.

It is significant that while the President presumes to tell the people of the Northwest that they should have a valley authority, he has not made any real effort to create a Missouri Valley authority for his own State. The record will show that the people in the Missouri Valley are making splendid progress under a coordinated valley plan, and that they are not even interested in any proposal to set up a valley authority.

ALREADY DECENTRALIZED

Statistics show that the Columbia Basin States have made more rapid progress than the national rate of industrial and economic development. The pioneers who settled in the Northwest have demonstrated their resourcefulness, and their ability to maintain a stabilized economy without arbitrary controls from the National Capital. Proponents of CVA state that this plan would decentralize controls from Washington. However, I desire to point out that the Bureau of Reclamation regional office is located at Boise, Idaho. The district office of the Army Engineer Corps is located at Walla Walla, Wash. The Bonneville Power Administration headquarters are located at Portland, Oreg. Thus it is apparent that the Federal agencies directly involved in the administration and direction of resource development in the Columbia Basin are already decentralized, and that it would be essentially a backward step to discard these agencies in favor of a new three-man board, accountable only to the President and far removed from the influence of the people whose destiny is vitally affected by development of this river basin.

I am confident that the people of Idaho will accept the challenge of the President to make the Columbia Valley Administration an issue in the November elections.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the nominations appearing on the Executive Calendar in the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the postal service be confirmed, and the President immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—JOHN W. KERN

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. On May 9, at page 6698 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I made a motion for a reconsideration of the vote by which was confirmed, on April 25, 1950, the nomination of John W. Kern to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States. Also on May 9, 1950, I made a motion requesting the President to return to the Senate the notification to him of the confirmation of the nomination of John W. Kern to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States. The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the notification to the President of the confirmation of the nomination to which I have referred has not yet been received by the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I submitted another inquiry to the Presiding Officer on May 9, 1950. I was referring to the two motions, and in regard to the second motion, I said—I had better read it so that it will be consecutive:

I wish to be sure that I correctly understand the parliamentary situation. May I inquire if it is this:

First, the motion to request the President to return to the Senate the notification to him of the confirmation of the nomination of John W. Kern, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, has been carried?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion has been agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Second, that there has been made and is now pending before the Senate for future action a motion for a reconsideration of the vote by which was confirmed on April 25, 1950, the nomination of John W. Kern to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider has been entered as in executive session and will be considered in executive session.

Mr. President, on the Executive Calendar of today the motion to reconsider does not appear, and, consequently, has not been acted upon today and has not been considered by the Senate today.

The parliamentary inquiry which I address to the Chair is whether the motion for a reconsideration of the vote by which was confirmed the nomination which I have mentioned will be placed before the Senate on the Executive Calendar without action on my part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The usual thing is to put the notice there, but it has been entered in the Executive Journal.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Chair this question? Will the motion to reconsider be mentioned or placed, by reference or in full, in the printed Executive Calendar as it shall be distributed to the Members of the Senate on a subsequent date?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be done by the executive clerk.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it appropriate that I make request at this time that it shall be done? If so, I make that request, so that we may have it upon the Executive Calendar in due time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I had intended to speak upon a matter which I regard as of some importance and which was previously mentioned on May 8 on the floor of the Senate by myself.

It is now approximately 1 minute to 7, and it would be quite agreeable to me, if it is agreeable to the Senate, that I do not speak this evening, provided that I may have unanimous consent that I have the floor at the beginning of the session tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, although ordinarily I believe it to be poor practice to grant unanimous consent for a Senator to have the floor on a following day, under the circumstances, because of the lateness of the hour and because he had previously requested the floor, I think the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri is entirely justified, and I shall not make any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 12, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 11 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

EUROPEAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel, United States Army, to be Executive Director of the European Coordinating Committee, pursuant to the authority of section 406 (e) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 and Private Law 412, Eighty-first Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Archibald Stevens Alexander, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAIN

Herman F. Rogall
Charles J. Wood
Cullen W. Edwards
Kurt F. Czybora
William P. Williams

TO BE CHIEF MACHINIST

Hoyt J. Caple
Herman Pedersen
George D. King

TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERK

Mack J. Snowden

TO BE CHIEF PHARMACIST

Floyd J. Coulter

TO BE CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Robert W. Young

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Robert F. A. Studds to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Kenneth R. Pinckney to be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective May 9, 1950.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SUBSECTION 515 (C) OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be brigadier generals

Col. John Max Lentz, [redacted].
Col. Riley Finley Ennis, [redacted].
Col. Emerson Leroy Cummings, [redacted].

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Clark Horace Bailey, [redacted], and other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 1, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Clark Horace Bailey which appears on page 6072, and ending with the name of Ruby Zillah Winslow which appears on page 6075.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1949 (Public Law 96, 81st Cong.):

To be colonel

Frederick A. Ward, [redacted]

To be lieutenant colonels

Bienvenido M. Alba, [redacted].
Santiago G. Guevara, [redacted].

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 625, Eighteth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenant

William P. Goodman, JAGC, [redacted].

To be second lieutenants

Dorothy M. Brown, WAC, [redacted].
Lola M. Irelan, WAC, [redacted].
Elsie J. Metcalf, WAC, [redacted].
Lois C. Putman, WAC, [redacted].
Mary L. Truslow, WAC, [redacted].

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Robert H. Banks.
Eugene C. Barbero, [redacted].
Leland E. Beyersdorff, [redacted].
Robert J. Bouchard, [redacted].
Murray N. Bullard, [redacted].
Terry T. Feild, [redacted].
Harold P. Fields, [redacted].
Charles V. Follett, Jr., [redacted].
Herbert O. Graeser, [redacted].
John A. Hughes, Jr., [redacted].
John J. Knight, [redacted].
Charles W. Luke, [redacted].
Robert B. McIntosh, Jr., [redacted].
James M. Minter.
Lee B. Moore, [redacted].
Lloyd H. Newcomer, Jr., [redacted].
Jehiel Novick, [redacted].
Willard T. Pflueger, [redacted].
Tom H. Reynolds.
Carl F. Roark, [redacted].
Henry S. Rubenstein, [redacted].
Lawrence L. Savage, Jr., [redacted].
Donald E. Smith, [redacted].
Gerald C. Stinson, [redacted].
Ransom D. Stone, [redacted].

The following-named distinguished military graduate for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress), subject to physical qualification:

O'Neill Barrett, Jr.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Thomas E. Duffy, [redacted].
Wayne B. Fagg.
John L. Fletcher.
Gerald G. Hennis.
Richard G. Hicks, [redacted].
James H. Hosey.
Charles T. Hutzler, [redacted].
William J. Lockhart.
Richard S. Miller, [redacted].
Alvin A. Poag, Jr., [redacted].
William T. Purdy, [redacted].
Hillard J. Trubitt.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

David D. Adams.
Garner V. Allen.
John E. Anderson.
Samuel J. Armeni, [redacted].
Ned R. Ash, [redacted].
Robert W. Ashbee.
Allan C. Ashcraft.
Doyle R. Avant, Jr.
Benjamin F. Bateman, [redacted].
John R. Berger.
Willy F. Bohlmann, Jr.
Charles S. Brantley, [redacted].
Haynes Brinkley, Jr.
George S. Brown.
William R. Brown, [redacted].
Howard D. Burtchett, [redacted].
Charles C. Bush III.
Elwood L. Carlson.
Richard A. Clarke.
James P. Coffin.
Robert E. Crosser.
William F. Donnelly.
John J. Douglas.
Theodore H. Emmerich, Jr., [redacted].
Robert A. Flake.
Herbert L. Frandsen.
Columbus B. Fulton.
Oved Gonzales.
Francois D. Gravois, Jr., [redacted].
James C. Griffith.
Melvin G. Gross.
Frank M. Gunby, Jr.
Julian C. Hammond.
Frank W. Harrison.
Robert M. Huckins.
Eugene M. Huff.
Roger W. Jepsen.
David E. Kettlewell, [redacted].
Constantine W. Koines.
David J. Kreager, Jr.
Laurance D. Krentzlin.
Elvin R. Kromer, Jr.
Osborne Lawes, [redacted].
George S. Lokken.
Orville W. Love.
John M. Mays, [redacted].
Norman W. McNabb.
Richard S. Medding.
James C. Morris.
Paul Morris.
William C. Myre.
William E. Nichols.
Billy L. Odneal.
Macyl K. Orman.
Max F. Pachl, Jr.
Patrick E. Parkes.
William G. Phelan.
John M. Pickarts.
James M. Pierce.
Roy E. Platt, Jr.
Joseph H. Powell.
Jip M. Pruden II, [redacted].
Anthony L. Pullano.
Ernest A. Rajala, [redacted].
John R. Randolph.
Neil A. Reilly.
Robert B. Rigler.
Robert A. Roseberry.
Roy W. Roth.
Joseph T. Ryan.
Erle O. Sandlin, Jr., [redacted].
Walter J. Sinclair.
Stanley W. Smith, [redacted].
Clayton O. Spann.
Wayne M. Stevens.
Reginald N. Timberlake.
Gramount D. Twitty.
Joseph Veltri.
Walter D. Weiti.
Edward J. Yost.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment as second lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Donald E. Haskins.
John E. Scanlon, [redacted]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be captains

George T. Britton, MC, [redacted].
Don E. Gibbin, DC.
Frank J. Glassy, MC, [redacted].
David S. Hamburg, DC.
Barrie M. Kato, MC, [redacted].
James E. Lewis, MC, [redacted].
Wendell V. Lyon, MC, [redacted].
Ernest R. Seitz, MC, [redacted].
Richard R. Taylor, MC, [redacted].

To be first lieutenants

Clay F. Barritt, MC.
John H. Belser, DC, [redacted].
Richard O. Bullis, Jr., MC.
Frederick R. Carriker, MC, [redacted].
Andrew Christopher, DC, [redacted].
John H. Dodson, JAGC, [redacted].
Robert J. Gosling, MC, [redacted].
James E. Hemann, Ch C, [redacted].
George A. Krikos, DC, [redacted].
Wendell A. Meikle, DC, [redacted].
Earl E. Schoeppner, DC, [redacted].
Andrew F. Serio, DC, [redacted].
Charles M. Smith, DC, [redacted].
Raymond W. Tomczak, DC, [redacted].
Allan O. Wilson, DC, [redacted].

To be second lieutenants

Geraldine V. Coxwell, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth J. Fitzgerald, WMSC, [redacted].
Goldia N. Harkness, ANC, [redacted].
Bertha J. Hoehn, ANC, [redacted].
Barbara L. Kennon, WMSC, [redacted].
Martha M. McDevitt, ANC, [redacted].
Petronila Mejias-Garcia, ANC, [redacted].
Helen E. Moode, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth A. Muth, ANC, [redacted].
Shirley M. Neill, ANC, [redacted].
Rosemary D. O'Regan, WMSC, [redacted].
Marie A. Souza, ANC, [redacted].
Mildred A. Wilcox, ANC, [redacted].
June E. Williams, WMSC, [redacted].
James B. Woodrum, MSC, [redacted].

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Thomas P. Burke, [redacted].
William R. Veal.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1950, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Office Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduate, and subject to physical qualification:

Donald J. Opitz.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Dexter W. Adams, [redacted].
James J. Albertson, [redacted].
Don C. Ambrose, [redacted].
Richard C. Ames, [redacted].
Allen R. Anderson, [redacted].
Kenneth S. Anderson, Jr., [redacted].
Lewis J. Ashley, [redacted].
Jack S. Bailey, [redacted].
Doric W. Ball, [redacted].
Andrew M. Barr, [redacted].
George B. Barrett, [redacted].
Marshall B. Bass, [redacted].
John P. Berres, [redacted].
William R. Bierwirth, [redacted].
Leslie M. Blake, [redacted].
Maurice H. Boutelle, [redacted].
Donn T. Boyd, [redacted].
Robert K. Bradford, [redacted].
Patrick J. Breen, [redacted].
Haldon D. Brown, [redacted].
Jackson M. Bryant, [redacted].
Frank R. Burget, [redacted].
Dalton O. Carpenter, Jr., [redacted].
Kevin F. Carrigan, [redacted].
Michael J. Cerrone, Jr., [redacted].
Egbert B. Clark III, [redacted].
Richard W. Clark, [redacted].
Stanley P. Converse, [redacted].
Robert F. Coveny, [redacted].
William H. Crane, [redacted].
Thomas H. Crowder, Jr., [redacted].
John D. Cunningham, [redacted].
Wallace H. Currey, [redacted].
Vernon C. Devan, [redacted].
Jack L. Dinkel, [redacted].
Otis J. Doty, [redacted].
James R. Duncan, [redacted].
Richard J. Eaton, [redacted].
William W. Etchemendy, [redacted].
David E. Etzold, [redacted].
Harry E. Evans, [redacted].
Ronald J. Fairfield, Jr., [redacted].
Rudolph A. Fallon, [redacted].
Donald P. Fink, [redacted].
Alvin E. Fort, [redacted].
Robert Francis, [redacted].
Robert M. Galloway, [redacted].
Orlando Garcia, [redacted].
Joseph M. Gay, Jr., [redacted].
Henry H. Gerecke, [redacted].
Freddie W. Gramling, [redacted].
Benjamin L. Gunter, Jr., [redacted].
George M. Hamscher, [redacted].
Joseph S. Harrelson, Jr., [redacted].
Harry B. Harris, [redacted].
John L. Hart, [redacted].
Carl W. Hartman, [redacted].
Elzie Hickerson, [redacted].
John H. Hoffman, [redacted].
John J. Hoffman, Jr., [redacted].
Robert P. Hotaling, [redacted].
Harmon Howard, [redacted].
James M. Hull, [redacted].
I. J. Irvin, Jr., [redacted].
Arthur Jackson, [redacted].
John E. Jessup, Jr., [redacted].
Clayton E. Johnson, [redacted].
Jasper R. Johnson, [redacted].
Paul E. Jones, [redacted].
Delbert A. Jurden, [redacted].
Andrew J. Kapec, [redacted].
Kenneth F. Kast, Jr., [redacted].
Daniel K. Kealalio, [redacted].
Bernard S. Kern, [redacted].
Howard W. Killam, [redacted].
William W. Kirchman, [redacted].
Eric Kobbe, [redacted].
Kenneth W. Koch, [redacted].
Kendall W. Korems, [redacted].
Constantine D. Kryzanowsky, [redacted].
George V. Labadie, Jr., [redacted].
Wilfred G. Lalonde, [redacted].
Joe B. Lamb, [redacted].
James E. Lawson, [redacted].
William F. Lawson, Jr., [redacted].
Robert H. Lehman, [redacted].
Bernard J. Leu, Jr., [redacted].
John W. Liddle, [redacted].
Leon H. Lockhart, [redacted].
John Lycas, [redacted].
Milton E. McCaig, [redacted].
Leo C. McCarthy, [redacted].
Paul D. MacGarvey, [redacted].
Robert T. Mailheau, [redacted].
Merritt P. Martin, [redacted].
Robert J. Martin, [redacted].
Billy M. M'Carver, [redacted].
Sam Meadow, [redacted].
Jack M. Meiss, [redacted].
Jack R. Metzdorf, [redacted].
Warren H. Metzner, [redacted].
Douglas A. Mollison, [redacted].
Keith L. Monroe, [redacted].
Fred S. Moore, [redacted].
William J. Morrisroe, [redacted].
Paul A. Morton, [redacted].
Albert R. Moses, [redacted].
James J. Murnane, [redacted].
Francis J. Murphy, [redacted].
Irvin E. Nachman, [redacted].
Marvin L. Nance, [redacted].
Orrin D. Neff, [redacted].
Louis J. North, [redacted].
Richard C. O'Connor, [redacted].
Wade H. Padgett, Jr., [redacted].
David W. Passell, [redacted].
Arthur G. Pendleton, [redacted].
Jack G. Penick, [redacted].
Edgar L. Petty, Jr., [redacted].
Milton B. Phillips, [redacted].
John J. Policastro, [redacted].
Gilbert Procter, Jr., [redacted].
Nicholas G. Psaki, [redacted].
George W. Pulliam, Jr., [redacted].
George P. Ramsey, Jr., [redacted].
James C. Ramsey, [redacted].
Albert Redman, Jr., [redacted].
Daniel J. Renneisen, [redacted].
Oliver L. Robbins, [redacted].
Robert S. Robbins, [redacted].
John F. Rogan, [redacted].
Warren J. Rosengren, [redacted].
John P. Ruppert, [redacted].
Gerald F. Ruschmeyer, [redacted].
Donald P. Rush, [redacted].
David C. Russell, [redacted].
Robert C. Russell, [redacted].
Hans G. Ruthe, [redacted].
Bernard B. Sapp, [redacted].
Edward W. Sargeant, [redacted].
Louis T. Schaner, [redacted].
Wittmer I. Schleh, [redacted].
Edgar B. Sharpe, [redacted].
Charles J. Shoemaker, Jr., [redacted].
Paul L. Skogsberg, [redacted].
Dillon Snell, [redacted].
George Snipan, [redacted].
Jack W. Stallings, Jr., [redacted].
James K. Stringer, [redacted].
Leslie J. Swope, [redacted].
Loren H. Sylvester, [redacted].
Douglas B. Tucker, [redacted].
Joseph P. Ulatoski, [redacted].
William D. Van Buskirk, [redacted].
Miles C. Vaughan, Jr., [redacted].
Homer L. Walker, [redacted].
Richard H. Ward, [redacted].
William B. Ware, [redacted].
Milton D. Weeks, [redacted].
Seymour T. Weisser, [redacted].
Thomas R. Westermann, [redacted].
David D. Whiteside, [redacted].
Charles H. Whitledge, [redacted].
Kingston M. Winget, [redacted].
Sanford H. Winston, [redacted].
Dean R. Woodward, [redacted].
Robert D. Worthen, [redacted].
John D. Yarbrough, [redacted].

The nominations of Peter Anthony Abbruzzese and other cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenants, effective June 2, 1950, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 2, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption Nominations, beginning with the name of Peter Anthony Abbruzzese, which appears on page 6163, and ending with the name of Paul Ray Zavitz, which appears on page 6165.

IN THE AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Lyman E. Ihle, [redacted], et al., for appointment in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 14, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Lyman E. Ihle, which appears on page 5231, and ending with the name of John W. Yingling, which appears on page 5232.

The nominations of Robert Milton Abelman and other persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 5, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert Milton Abelman, which appears on page 6501, and ending with the name of Harold George Vielhauer, which appears on page 6502.

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of John Richard Anderson and other officers for promotion in the

United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John Richard Anderson, which appears on page 5713, and ending with the name of Florence T. Roche, which appears on page 5714.

The nominations of Maurice Dale Fulkerson and other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 14, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Maurice Dale Fulkerson, which appears on page 5230, and ending with the name of Anne Martha Murphy, which appears on page 5231.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for appointment to the grade of rear admiral as indicated:

Temporary appointment in the line

Kenmore M. McManes
Frank T. Ward, Jr.

Permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps

Algert D. Alexis

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent or temporary appointment to the grades and corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary appointment to the grade of captain:

Medical Corps

Robert B. Brown
Bishop L. Malpass
Charles M. Parker

Supply Corps

Robert M. Bowstrom	Jesse S. McAfee
John F. Castree	Stanley Mumford
Paul W. Clarke	Joseph F. Tenney
Marshall H. Cox	Ignatius N. Tripi
John W. Crumpacker	

Chaplain Corps

George A. Rosso.

Dental Corps

Hubert F. Delmore	Robert W. Wheelock
Alvin H. Grunewald	Wilbur N. VanZile
George D. Odiorne	

Civil Engineer Corps

George K. Brodie
Ralph N. Ernest
William A. Zobel

For temporary appointment to the grade of commander:

Medical Corps

James A. Addison	Leo S. Madlem, Jr.
James H. Boyers	Charles S. Mullin, Jr.
Robert H. Bradshaw	Clyde W. Norman
James A. Brimson	John A. O'Donoghue
William C. Cantrell	James W. Packard, Jr.
John F. Chace	Arthur G. Rink
Joseph R. Connelly	William A. Robie
William A. Dinsmore, Jr.	Ralph D. Ross
James B. Hague	James A. Turner
William G. Lawson	Haskell Wertheimer
Jack C. McCurdy	Karl R. Whitney
	William A. Wulfman

Supply Corps

Herbert C. Borne	George S. Lofink
Forrest P. Brown	William L. Thorpe, Jr.
Charles J. Hawkins	James E. Tinling
Donald J. W. Hos	Chester W. Utterback
William C. Humphrey	Roy O. Yockey
Raymond E. Johnson	

Chaplain Corps

Charles D. Beatty	Raymond F. McManus
Joseph C. Canty	Henry J. Rotrige
Robert W. Coe, Jr.	David A. Sharp, Jr.
Charles J. Covert	Edward A. Slattery
Otto D. Herrmann	Marion O. Stephenson
James W. Kelly	James A. Whitman

Dental Corps

Clayton L. Bohn	George T. Moore, Jr.
John H. Cathcart	Paul A. Moore
Joseph M. Clements	Kenneth L. Morgan
Silas D. Cunningham	Walter H. Peat
Frank D. Dobyns	Louis J. Rhen
William T. Faulconer	Duane R. Shiffert
Walter F. Hanley	Albert L. Vogel, Jr.
Von Rue McAtee	John E. Wiseman
George E. Madden	Frank S. Wozniak, Jr.
Gordon L. Miller	Robert B. Young

Civil Engineer Corps

William J. Byrnes
Thomas J. Doyle
Chester J. Kurzawa

Medical Service Corps

Chester S. Fay	Clarence J. Owen
Fay O. Huntsinger	Max E. Zimmerman
Daniel J. O'Brien	

Nurse Corps

Margaret C. Jensen
Gladys Smith
Anna L. Welsko

For permanent appointment to the grade of commander:

Medical Corps

Frances L. Willoughby

Medical Service Corps

Margaret M. Diehm
Mary T. Sproul

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve on active duty to the grades and corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the Naval Reserve:

Supply Corps

Joseph F. Deegan
Casper T. Fredrickson
William E. Max

For temporary appointment to the grade of commander in the Naval Reserve:

Medical Corps

Arthur V. Miller, Jr.
Lewis D. Williams

Supply Corps

Robert S. Davison
John A. Johnson, Jr.
Francis T. Mullin

Dental Corps

Ronald C. Dove
Nighbert W. Sutphin

Chaplain Corps

William L. McBlain

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Lee C. Anderson	Raymond E. Demming, Jr.
William P. Annin	Joseph J. Dupnik
Frank J. Bardecki	Alwyn L. Eisenhauer
Max G. Baumgardner	Raymond H. Foster
Kenneth L. Beckman	Francis T. Gamble
Robert H. Belter	James W. Godshalk
Ralph F. Bennie	Howard A. Goldman
William B. Bircher	Joseph C. Grote
Morton McK. Boyd II	Berkeley W. Hall
Robert F. Brennan	James E. Halle
Robert S. Brown	James R. Harrison
Gerald C. Canaan	Allen D. Hauge
James N. Carr	James A. Helle
Porter E. Clemens	Howard F. Hofmeister
Edwin M. Crow	Eugene T. Howard
Richard E. Davis	
Earle F. Hubacker	James A. Parkes
Harold J. Hubinger	John W. Petrick
Gerald Huelsbeck	Jack Q. Quinn
George H. Irelan	John J. Radican
John A. Jacobs	John M. Reynolds, Jr.
Owen A. Kidd	Kenneth C. Reynolds
Georg C. Klieser	Samuel I. Rogers, Jr.
Harold H. Knight	Richard N. Romkema
Griffith H. Knoop, Jr.	Robert A. Rulis
Harold R. Larson	Arthur F. Schneider
Raymond W. Littel	Joseph E. Sherin
Theodore A. Loyer	Bryan McC. Smith, Jr.
LeRoy H. Ludi	Jack E. Speiser
Charles R. MacDowell	Norman E. St. Louis
Allan E. McNally	Robert F. Stratton
Ross A. Mathews, Jr.	George E. Taylor
Marvin J. Miller	Leonard J. Treichler
Donald W. Mitchell	Clyde H. Tuomela
Joseph Molnar	Martin J. Twite, Jr.
George L. Nicholls	Robert J. Vollmer
Frank I. Nulton	Francis G. Wachowiak
Raymond H. Oakes	Robert H. Wagner
Bernard T. O'Laughlin	Philip E. Webb
Richard J. Owens	William A. Wilkinson
Gerald "J" Parent	James R. Williams

James W. Greenwood, Jr. (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps), to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950.

Richard L. Baker (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Francis B. Quinlan	John B. Sherman
Alois E. Schmitt, Jr.	Max L. Washington

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy as previously nominated:

Robert G. Adams	Louis Huszar, Jr.
Lawson I. Ainsworth	John P. Jaso, Jr.
Eldon D. Aldred	Seward R. Keim
Richard L. Allen	Addison H. Kermath
Leonard L. Attwell Jr.	Kenneth E. Klotz
	Walter S. Kmak
Emory D. Ayers	Wilbur S. Leinberry
Edward McC. Baty	Robert H. Lindquist
Gerald L. Bearer	Douglas R. Lynch
Robert L. Berg	James H. McFadden
Robert T. Billington	Richard O. McNerney
William H. Boden, Jr.	Lonnie A. Marshall
Stephen R. Caliento	Robert W. Muery
Carroll A. Carr	Robert C. Ockerlund
Edgar S. Carr, Jr.	John R. Patterson, Jr.
Billy R. Catherwood	Stanley D. Penny
Victor Chacho	Richard E. Powell
Stanley L. Clewett	Harland A. Riker, Jr.
James W. Deardorff	Stanley H. Saulson
Paul G. Eppes	Lynn E. Schrier
Norton H. Falls	John A. Sheffield, Jr.
Richard W. Ferris	Charles B. Simison
John W. Ferry	Porter J. Smith, Jr.
Harold L. Goyette	Donald E. Stocking
Alfred G. Granieri	Tom D. C. Thomas
Elmer D. Hamann	Brooks F. Warner
Carl C. Hanke, Jr.	William B. Whalley
Kenneth E. Heidelberg	James A. Whelan
William B. Henderson	Frank J. Young
Richard W. Huston	Richard M. Young

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed:

Renato T. DiStefano, Jr.	Harvey M. Soldan
	Gene F. Straube
Byron A. Nilsson	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the

Supply Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated:

Lewis D. Cassell	Walter P. Harris, Jr.
Stanley Cohen	John I. Harrison
James J. Connell	Theodore J. Newton, Jr.
Theodore J. Fussell	
Lewis E. Gary	Thomas C. Simons
Jack E. Gove	

George R. Wentz (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated.

Carl Birdwell, Jr. (Naval Reserve aviator) to be an ensign in the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Leon L. Cepparo	Rocco H. Mautone
Lloyd B. Chaisson	William A. Ruel
Robert W. Elliott, Jr.	George E. Sanquist
Theodore C. Enger	Louis F. Snyder, Jr.
David J. Knoedler	Edward F. Sobieski
Howard S. Kramer, Jr.	Carl H. Wilkens, Jr.
Robert F. LeGendre	

Violetta J. Kellagher to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Commanders

Julius M. Amberson
Russell H. Blood
Joseph M. Coppoletta

Midshipman James P. Rasmussen, Jr. (Naval Academy) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950:

Emil R. Borgers	Albert R. Knotts, Jr.
Wenzell B. Bryant	Alexander M. McDougal
John P. Donovan	
William F. Gerold	Richard M. Regan
Ralph H. Henty, Jr.	Charles L. Sweeney, Jr.
Rothschild H. Holden	John H. Thorp

Richard G. Williams (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1950:

James A. Derdick	John P. Plunkett
Johan S. Gestson	Henry F. Schlueter
Kenneth C. Johnson	Roderick M. Stewart
Theodore H. Kruse	Taylor J. Tucker
Robert D. Morse	Anthony H. Winchell
Richard E. Packard	

Norman F. Lattin (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated:

Philip B. Ezell	Albert E. Shaw, Jr.
Richard D. Flynn	Paul J. Uhlig
Helge R. Hukari	

The following-named (civilian college graduates to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Homer S. Arnold	Malcolm D. Dinges, Jr.
Edward W. Bird	Owen W. Doyle
Louis F. Brignac, Jr.	Frank L. Golbranson
Robert J. Cales	John H. Griffin
Charles M. Callis	David H. Hosp
Halvard J. Davidson	James R. Householder
Thomas F. Dillon	William F. Hughes
Roger G. Ireland	Earl Peterson
Melvin A. Kutschbach	David L. Spence
John W. McAllister	Richard C. Stevens
James L. May	Francis J. Sweeney
William R. Moore	Winston F. Whipple
Benjamin P. Owens	McClure Wilson

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert W. Elliott, Jr.
William A. Ruel
Chester H. Tiberii

Henry B. Wilson (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

Joan Rhodarmer to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commander

Lewis D. Williams

Lieutenant

Sidney H. Cohen

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Loy T. Brown
Francis L. Giknis
Charles H. Howarth

The following-named officer (woman) to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commander

Norman C. Furtos

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Marjorie C. Chilcott

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade and corps indicated:

Commander, Medical Corps

Harry L. Day

The nominations of Donald S. Albright, Jr., et al., to be ensigns or lieutenants (junior grade), in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 12, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Donald S. Albright, Jr., which appears on page 5093, and ending with the name of Doris N. Snell, which appears on page 5096.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

John C. McQueen, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Donald C. Tierney, Bellflower.
Ida Belle Lawlor, Clarksburg.
Melvin D. Kronquest, Clearlake Park.
Hurkless A. Bullard, Coachella.
Verne H. Watson, Corona Del Mar.
James V. Vescere, Crows Landing.
Robert B. Reynolds, Fort Jones.
Thelma M. Luckenbill, Guasti.
Francis R. Faucher, Lemongrove.
Lola H. Heaton, McArthur.
Charles S. Maloney, Jr., Marina.
Emmett Williams, Montebello.
Otto Frederick, Norden.
Albert L. Schoepf, Orange Cove.
James H. Ashley, Pebble Beach.
William P. Martin, Rialto.
Frances P. Autenrieth, Rutherford.
Kenneth R. Hammaker, Sacramento.
John J. Mollinet, Soquel.
Ethel E. Hain, Stinson Beach.
Ralph M. Wright, Sunol.
Harry R. Ellison, Tujunga.

COLORADO

William E. Bales, Fort Morgan.
Sol Cahen, Spivak.

IDAHO

Marian T. Gillette, Kimberly.
Frank L. Jolley, Meridian.
Bertha A. Roberts, Winchester.

KENTUCKY

Ernest M. Martin, Beaver Dam.
Ollie J. Brandenburg, Booneville.
Pearl M. Caddell, Burgin.
William B. Reynolds, Kings Mountain.
Martine Calhoun, Livermore.
Billy G. Combs, Lothair.

MARYLAND

Ruth B. Parent, Betterton.
Gertrude L. Hopkins, Cordova.

MINNESOTA

Walter H. Hedin, Bock.
Edward J. Kavanaugh, Carlton.
William J. Murray, East Grand Forks.
Ray C. Hansen, Lutsen.
Harold L. Fisher, Royalton.

MISSOURI

Clifford E. McColl, Appleton City.
Robert A. Moberly, Excelsior Springs.
Scott Moore, Galena.
Wayne E. Boring, Hopkins.
Jane C. Martin, Pomona.
Ross Alexander, Jr., Spickard.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Walter J. T. Richard, Manchester.

NEW JERSEY

Florence E. Morton, Lake Como.
Charles W. Brahn, Spring Lake.

NEW YORK

Walter L. Smith, Blue Mountain Lake.
Harold T. McCormick, Brownville.
Francis J. Burns, Clinton.
Arline P. Herrington, Collins.
Edward L. Van Tassell, Croton-on-Hudson.
George H. Geer, Downsville.
Ruth E. Wright, Lagrangeville.
Charles D. Lovell, Poland.
Charles A. Reilly, Salem.
Madeline M. McCabe, Starlake.
Orville C. Kalin, Ten Mile River.
Ethel S. Navins, Tivoli.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harry S. Johnson, Grenora.
Alfred L. Schrade, Kensal.

OHIO

John M. Bishop, Arlington.
Harold Montgomery, Jr., Austinburg.
Robert L. Canter, Bethel.
Donna M. Emery, Bloomingburg.
Marvel I. White, Blue Ash.
Ernest C. Tracey, Huntsville.
George L. Burkett, Malinta.
Mary Ellen Swerlein, McCutchenville.
Herbert B. Hague, Senecaville.
Herbert A. Lannert, Springfield.

OKLAHOMA

Newton M. Foster, Catoosa.
Lloyd E. Null, Chickasha.
Norman W. Kingsley, Nash.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gilber B. Bainbridge, Ambler.
Franklin G. Spohn, Breinigsville.
Albert M. Smith, Jr., Bushkill.
George R. Hixon, Dawson.
Roy E. Raub, Edinburg.
Clarence Donald Dotterer, Emlenton.
Louis J. Pagano, Galeton.
George V. Beitler, Glenshaw.
Esther L. Rosencrance, Greeley.
Grover C. Bower, Grove City.

John G. O'Connor, Kane.
Charles P. Kennedy, Malvern.
Frank Maida, Port Kennedy.
Elmer A. Carvell, Rothsville.
Wayne K. Wildonger, Souderton.
Anna Smith, Starjunction.
Carl A. Shollenberger, Tyrone.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William L. Antley, Ellcree.

TEXAS

Texas R. Flaniken, Freeport.

WASHINGTON

William T. Harmon, Bong.
Eula Hedin, Kennydale.
Ralph Nelson, Raymond.

WEST VIRGINIA

Merriman S. Smith, Bluefield.

WISCONSIN

Leo E. Offord, Deerfield.
Frederick C. Thacker, New Glarus.
Carleton J. Rubin, Portage.
Edward J. Ikert, Rockland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may this be a day when we shall be blessed with a clear and commanding vision of the glorious enterprise of building Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace upon this earth.

Fill us with a passion to heal our heartbroken and fear-ridden world of the malady of hatred and war. Show us how we may lead all mankind into a nobler and more humane social order.

May we not be discouraged and allow our faith to become eclipsed by doubt and despair. Grant that with increasing tenacity of purpose we may lay hold of the glad assurance that the spirit of the Prince of Peace shall prevail everywhere.

In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MAY 9, 1950.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR., as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the First Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Virginia, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ROBESON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the House sponsor of the Employment Act of 1946 and as a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I have watched with great interest the work of the Council of Economic Advisers during the 3½ years of its existence.

It is therefore exceedingly gratifying to learn that President Truman has designated Mr. Leon H. Keyserling as Chairman of the Council. Mr. Keyserling's work at the Council of Economic Advisers since its inception has contributed to a new and better understanding of the need for an expanding economy and for a more wholesome relationship between business and government.

No Member of Congress who has been associated with Mr. Keyserling during his many years in the Government can fail to recognize his unusual competence and his comprehensive grasp of all subjects with which he has been concerned.

But what should make Members of Congress particularly happy about Mr. Keyserling's designation as Chairman of the President's Economic Council is his unfailing attitude of helpfulness toward the members of committees of Congress. It has been my observation and that of my colleagues that, when called upon for information, testimony, or technical assistance by any Member of Congress regardless of party or ideology, Leon Keyserling has always responded in a helpful and cooperative manner. It is only by such an attitude on the part of the Council of Economic Advisers that the Employment Act of 1946 can be successful. This is the only way that our form of government can work.

I am also glad to learn of the appointment of Dr. Roy Blough as the third member of the Council. Mr. Blough is a distinguished economist from the University of Chicago who has gained a great deal of practical experience during his service with the Bureau of Tax Research of the Treasury Department. Mr. Blough's appointment gives assurance that the Council now constitutes a rounded group of economists and offers the prospect of ever-increasing service to the Nation.

HOUSE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE QUESTIONABLE TRADE PRACTICES

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the Members of the House that the last perjury case arising out of testimony before the House Committee of the Eightieth Congress to Investigate Questionable Trade Practices has been disposed of satisfactorily.

As you know, that Committee, of which I was chairman, investigated, among other things, the gray market in steel which flourished during 1948. In this connection we looked into the activities of the Wayne Sheet Steel Co. of Detroit, Mich. Because of the nature of the testimony under oath of William Voisine, owner of the company, and Edward Sauve, his manager, we referred the matter to the Department of Justice for appropriate action. As a result, Voisine was convicted of perjury on April 3, 1950, after a trial in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and received a sentence of 8 months to 2 years in a Federal penitentiary. On May 4, 1950, Edward Sauve entered a plea of guilty in the same Court to a charge of perjury before a congressional committee and received a sentence of 4 months to 2 years. As far as I can determine, this is the first time any defendant so indicted has elected to plead guilty to such a charge.

I cannot help but feel that these and other recent convictions which have been obtained by the United States Attorney's office will materially assist congressional committees in their investigations. There will be far less likelihood that any witness will attempt to mislead a committee or attempt to interfere with or delay it in the exercise of its proper functions if it is abundantly clear from the vigorous prosecutions in the past that perjurious testimony or contumacious conduct will not be tolerated.

I, therefore, respectfully and earnestly suggest that the chairmen of all investigating committees, who have not already done so, arrange for the United States Attorney, Mr. George Morris Fay, to advise them, which I am sure he will be only too glad to do, of the legal technicalities laid down by the courts, which must be observed by a congressional committee if a case of perjury or contempt is to be successfully prosecuted.

The proper handling of all cases of this nature can be insured by a little advance preparation and, in my opinion, this manner of protecting the dignity of congressional investigating committees and increasing the effectiveness of their work is well worth the small effort required.

May I also bespeak the courtesy of our eminent majority leader, the Speaker pro tempore of today, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, in sending me earlier this week with a little note the Georgetown Law Journal which, in a review of legislative committees on page 350, said:

> The Macy committee of the Eightieth Congress is a happy example of the orderliness and effectiveness of this procedure.

I do not take this as a personal compliment but as a compliment to my distinguished colleagues on the Committee and in the House who accorded us at all times unanimous support.

FLOODS IN NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the disastrous floods that have been occurring in southeast Nebraska. A number of lives have been lost and there has been great loss of property. The following telegram sets forth some of the known losses at this time:

LINCOLN, NEBR.

Re southeast Nebraska flood, May 8, 1950.

HON. CARL T. CURTIS,

House of Representatives:

Seventeen known dead to date in following counties: Eight in Lancaster, five in Otoe, three in Nemaha, one in Cass. At least five still missing in Otoe and Nemaha Counties. Lancaster County deaths all result of cars washing from Highway No. 77 south of Lincoln. American Bus Lines bus swept from Highway No. 2 into Little Nemaha River near Syracuse, Otoe County. Three occupants of bus saved, two bodies recovered, three still missing. Remaining fatalities result of cars washed from highways.

Result of flooding of Salt Creek in Lincoln estimated $200,000 damage to industries, plus most extensive residence damage since 1908. As yet unestimated. Total Lancaster County bridge and road damage estimate $150,000. Railroad tracks washed out, extensive soil erosion, fence, farm buildings, and livestock loss in Lancaster, Saline, Gage, Johnson, Otoe, and Nemaha Counties. Residence and business damage reported to date in Syracuse, $105,000; Unadilla, $50,000; Dunbar, 12 houses and railroad station; Crete, $25,000; property damage Gage County estimated over half million dollars, result of Blue River flooding. Two hundred thousand dollars' damage in Auburn, mostly due to tornado. Water supplies in De Witt, Nebr., and Weeping Water contaminated, and mass inoculation against typhoid started. National Guard, Red Cross, State, and local authorities all assisting.

C. M. PIERSON.

These floods occurred on the Blue River, on Salt Creek, the Nemaha Rivers and other creeks and streams.

On several occasions I have appeared before the Flood Control Committee in connection with the local flood-control works at Beatrice, Nebr. The committees of the House and Senate were unable to take action because the report on the Kansas River, in which the Beatrice and Hubbell, Nebr., local projects are carried, had not reached the Congress prior to their action on the recent flood-control bill. An Army engineers' report is in the process of being assembled but has not reached Washington concerning the Salt Creek flood problem. This is in response to a resolution I introduced some years ago. I likewise introduced a resolution for flood surveys on the Nemaha Rivers but that report has not yet been officially transmitted to Congress so that action could be taken.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that these various reports can be expedited, that flood-protection recommendations may be worked out which are in accord with the views of the local people and that the necessary authorization act can be considered. These steps are necessary before any funds can be provided for flood protection.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PASSMAN, for 9 days (May 12 to May 20, inclusive) on account of official business in Louisiana.

CHANGING HORSES IN MIDSTREAM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it would hardly be fair to accuse the Secretary of State of getting us into a third world war, but it might be fair enough to say that he did not keep us out of one, if we do get into one.

So I call the attention of the House to that old, old statement that you "should not change horses in the middle of the stream." Instead of waiting until we get into this war, we just ought to change horses now and get rid of Mr. Acheson before we get into a war so that we will not have that argument put up to us later on when the war is on.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PRICE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INTEGRATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY IN GERMANY AND FRANCE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I second what has been said and written about the importance of the stand taken toward the integration of the heavy industries of Germany and France. I am confident the free world will welcome the rebirth of leadership being shown by the great French nation. There can be no lasting peace until western Europe learns to work together. At long last, France is helping to show the way for western Europe to work together. This proposal, if earnestly and sincerely followed through, may become one of the important steps of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RAMSEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN-MADE SHOES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed about the growing imports of shoes coming into this country from behind the iron curtain and competing with our own American produced shoes.

It is true that the well-being of many communities in my section of the country depends upon the shoe and leather industry, which employs thousands of workers at high wages.

Today, in Boston stores and in stores throughout Massachusetts and the Nation, women's shoes made in Czechoslovakia are being offered to the public.

These shoes are shipped into the United States from behind the iron curtain and are sold to importers at prices which are less than the American manufacturer must pay for leather and other materials and not allowing for the high wages paid American workers.

There is no question but that every pair of these Czechoslovakian shoes purchased in this country, feeds good American dollars into Communist-dominated areas, encourages and builds up totalitarian labor methods and undermines American prosperity and the free labor of our own shoe industry.

It is estimated by the trade that at the present rate of imports, over a million pairs of Czechoslovakian shoes will come into this country in 1950. These will be dumped here by an economy organized on totalitarian principles at below the American costs of production.

In fact, some state that they can be sold in American markets at half the price of American-made shoes.

I think that Members of the House will agree that this is a very serious and alarming situation. I have strongly protested it many times with appropriate officials of this Government. It is unconscionable in my mind that it should be permitted to continue when it can be shown clearly that these imports, these Soviet-dumped goods, constitute a direct attack upon American labor, American business and American prosperity.

I am again urging that these imports be stopped at once in the national interest and hope that Government officials will move to this end at an early date.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am very interested to hear the gentleman speak as he has, because we are having the same trouble in our own district in the glove industry in Fulton County.

Mr. PHILBIN. I think it applies to many industries, and I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is not the thing which the gentleman complains about right in line with the administration, the very thing that is being done by the Economic Administration every day, flooding this country with foreign products and foreign metals? Is that not in line with the policy of the administration?

Mr. PHILBIN. The distinguished gentleman has put his finger on a very serious and grave condition, and I hope it may soon be remedied.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad the gentleman has called this to the attention of the House, because the same situation exists in the pottery and glass industry in my own State.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachuset's [Mr. PHILBIN] has expired.

PENNSYLVANIA'S FINANCES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], frequently berates the Democratic administration for deficit spending, socialism, and confusion within the Democratic Party.

I want to call to the attention of my friend from Pennsylvania that all is not serene in his home State.

In fact, Governor Duff issued a statement last week in which he said that the boasted $200,000,000 surplus of his predecessor, Governor Martin, was actually a $23,000,000 deficit.

I also note with interest that Governor Duff's administration has supported a $500,000,000 bonus for veterans, but they have not levied taxes to take care of this obligation which was incurred over 6 months ago.

It therefore appears that the Republican Party administration in the State of Pennsylvania is also resorting to deficit financing.

Now as to confusion and dissension in the Democratic Party, I am sure that my friend obtains little comfort from the situation of his own party in Pennsylvania.

In the April 3 issue of Newsweek, there is a very interesting article on the internecine Republican Party fight between Governor Duff and what the Governor denounces as the "old guard reactionaries in the Grundy machine."

The article states that—

> Last week Jim Duff was having the brawl of his life. It was a brass-knuckle battle with Pennsylvania's powerful Grundy machine, fought under boom-town-barroom rules. Everything went, including rabbit punching, eye gouging, and kneeing in the clinches. Duff swore that he would smash the machine into a heap of twisted junk. It was that, he said, or else the machine would destroy the Republican Party in Pennsylvania and nationally.

So I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whom I admire for his unfailing service to his constituents and his frequent good-humored chastisements of the Democratic Party, "Save some of your energy and advice for the benefit of the strife-ridden and deficit-spending Republican Party in Pennsylvania."

PENNSYLVANIA POLITICS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California very graciously notified me in advance that he was going to say something about Pennsylvania politics. I want to say to him and to all Members from other States that if they will leave Pennsylvania alone we will wash our own linen. We do not have to rely on the Crump machine in Tennessee, the Kelly-Nash machine in Chicago, the Hague machine in New Jersey, the Curley machine in Massachusetts, or the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, and ask for any help from any of them. We will do the job ourselves. To our own satisfaction and to the honor of the Republican Party and for the good of our country.

We have a contest up there in Pennsylvania and when we get through we will support the Republican Party, whoever is nominated, because we believe in the primary system. The fellow who is nominated honestly by the majority of our party we will support because we want good honest politics and good government. We believe in the two-party system. When the two-party system in this country fails, then we will not have any Government at all. We are builders. We are for a good government; we will have it if Republicans have charge.

Mr. Speaker, watch the train that is going out there to the West. Whenever the President of the United States can take a TAYLOR, knowing what a tailor will do in manufacturing his suit, when the time comes that he finds this suit does not fit him, he will determine then it has been wrong in the cut. The Democrats fight one year and condemn each other, then ride on the same train together in Idaho. Birds of a feather should travel together. Toot-toot, the train is off again. Whistle stop. Woo, woo, woo. The President says all will get a salary of $4,000 a year in sixty. He does not say that if that happens by his inflation their eggs will not be 60 cents a dozen, but $1.20 a dozen; bread 20 cents a loaf to 50 cents a loaf; milk 20 cents a quart to 45 cents a quart; a pair of shoes made in America, $50 a pair, but an imported pair of shoes, $15; and our shoemakers out of a job. Let Pennsylvania alone you other States. We will elect good Republicans this fall. We are sound Americans.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] although I was not surprised. The Republicans in Pennsylvania have supported the Republican ticket, but I am just wondering what the Republicans will do this fall when they hear played back over the radio the things that the Republicans have been saying about Republicans.

HAROLD E. STASSEN

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I hate to join in this attack which may embarrass the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. The gentleman cannot embarrass me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to know that.

Mr. RANKIN. He is a gentleman whom no compliment can flatter and no criticism can embarrass.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last week the people of the United States heard an extraordinary speech. It was extraordinary in its bitterness, it was extraordinary in its irresponsibility and also in its attempt to confuse the people of the United States. It was all the more extraordinary in that this bitter, disrespectful, misleading, and irrespon-

sible speech was made by a man who is now president of the University of Pennsylvania and one who himself has sought the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. If that statement is being made about a speech of the President of the United States, I must object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is made in reference to a speech made by the president of the great University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, it is a cause of great embarrassment to me as a citizen of the State of Minnesota to admit that the author of this address was at one time the Governor of the State of Minnesota. It is a cause of embarrassment to me as a former member of the academic profession to see the president of a great university show such lack of responsibilty in a public address.

There is slight consolation in the fact that Minnesota no longer claims Mr. Stassen as a citizen. He is Pennsylvania's responsibilty by adoption. And to judge from a recent statement by Governor Duff, Pennsylvania seems to have discovered faults in its adopted son. Referring to another recent statement by Mr. Stassen, Governor Duff is quoted by the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph as declaring.

It is beyond belief to me that the president of a university would make such a completely false and misleading statement to the people of this great State.

Governor Duff went on to say:

Mr. Stassen either knew what he said was false, and is, therefore, subject to the highest possible condemnation; or he failed to get the facts, and as president of one of the great universities of Pennsylvania, he had a distinct obligation not to be a traitor to the facts.

SHOE IMPORTATION

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] in the statement he has made about shoes. As the Representative of 20,000 Endicott-Johnson shoe workers I wish to object loudly to a proposal recently made and introduced as a bill in this House which will eliminate the American selling price as a basis for computing the duty on imported rubber footwear. Such a proposal, if it is made law, will throw many Endicott-Johnson workers out of their jobs and will permit Japanese shoes to be brought into this country for about 70 cents a pair. It will enable shoes made behind the iron curtain to come into direct competition with American shoes being made up in my district. The American selling-price method of computing the duty on shoes is the only possible way that rubber-soled canvas oxfords and rubber-soled footwear can be adequately produced by American manufacturers. I think those in the State Department and the Treasury Department who are making these proposals and bringing them in here in the form of legislation had better think about the welfare of the American shoe industry before they do anything else.

If H. R. 8304, the bill I am referring to, is passed, the bars will be let down to such an extent that shoes made by slave labor from iron-curtain vassal states and also those produced in the sweatshops of Japan will flood the markets of America in direct competition with the products of American shoeworkers who enjoy the highest wage standard in the world.

This action can only result in the crippling of the rubber-footwear industry, with the accompanying loss of thousands of jobs in these plants. This action will force Americans, whose life work consists of the skilled and time-honored profession of building shoes, to accept unemployment insurance and eventually to seek unfamiliar lines of endeavor.

Such action can only lead to disastrous results to our domestic rubber-footwear industry.

OMNIBUS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who does not believe in intelligent economy. The Cannon amendment yesterday which I supported, would have helped in that direction. But I think that yesterday was a very black day for the Government services that the American people expect, and for the Government employees themselves. We were guilty, I think, in this House, of meat-ax economy. We ask for nothing but trouble when we apply indiscriminate across-the-board cuts. I refer specifically to the Taber amendment and to the Jensen amendment.

I want to illustrate briefly with just one type of service that will be greatly hit as the result of our action if it is allowed to stand by the other body. All of us have been haranguing for the last several years about the need for modernization of equipment in the Post Office Department. We deplore the ancient trucks that are still in use, and the antiquated equipment of other sorts. We all want better service for the American people. As the result of yesterday's action we have slashed by 10 percent the funds available for modernization of the Post Office Department.

Secondly, many of us have been receiving loud protests from the people in our constituencies about the curtailment of mail service that has been put into effect by the Postmaster General. If the Jensen amendment is permitted to stand you are now faced with this situation, that if 10 carriers retire in your district during the next year, only 1 new carrier may be appointed; only 1 vacancy may be filled. How are you going to carry the mail under such circumstances? Better search your souls, you gentlemen who voted for these amendments.

THE RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, we read that the President's train, by reason of special privilege, is to be exempted from the operation of the railway strike in that the Brotherhoods have given instructions that there is to be no strike or interference with the President's train. Of course, we are glad to hear such courtesies extended to the Chief of our Government, but at the same time, by the acceptance of a favor from one side of a controversy as against the other side, does not the President disqualify himself either as an impartial mediator in his own person, or by reason of having accepted a favor, can anyone thereafter trust the President's good faith in a genuine effort to solve this strike by which the millions of Americans are inconvenienced, he himself having accepted convenience in preference to justice and impartiality?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED, AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, I simply take this opportunity to ask the distinguished acting majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to respond to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader.

The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday, and following that will be the consideration of the bill H. R. 5990, relating to the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, followed by the consideration of the bill H. R. 7058, which provides for some technical amendments to the laws with reference to the United States Naval and Military Academies. Following the disposition of that bill we will consider H. R. 5074, a bill relating to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

On Wednesday the regular Memorial Services of the House of Representatives will be held.

On Thursday and Friday we hope to consider some reorganization resolutions. Following the disposition of any reorganization resolutions that may be considered on either of those days, we will take up for consideration H. R. 7941, the Federal Aid Road Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has happened heretofore in the House with reference to unanimous-consent requests and also the announcement of the various legislative programs, I wish to give notice for myself and such other Members of the House as may desire to avail themselves of the privilege that I reserve the right to call up any privileged resolutions or motions which may be in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

TRAINING OF VETERANS UNDER SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 447 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944). That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2596) which relates to the education and training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which was passed by the other body.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate.

So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman kindly explain the provisions of the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. This bill writes into permanent law what is now a regulation and what has been put in the appropriation bill for the last 3 years. It continues the ban against avocational and recreational training and the ban against a school taking veteran students, unless it has been in operation for a year. It puts into law a number of standards that the President recommended to the Congress on February 13, 1950, concerning the GI bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the passage of this bill mean that it will cost more to operate and handle the program?

Mr. LYLE. Yes, it will cost a little more.

Mr. TEAGUE. This bill will cost an additional $2,300,000, according to the Veterans' Administration. That money is to be used for the State approving agencies to check the schools to see that they are complying with the law. The Veterans' Administration and the President recommended that. My State approval agency tells me our inspection service and on-the-job training and farm training has gone down because no additional money was included, but the Veterans' Administration says it will cost $2,300,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. In other words, all the bill does is reduce to a statute the practice that has been carried on under their regulations.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to be clear in my own mind concerning which particular bill is under discussion. Is it Senate bill 2596?

Mr. LYLE. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that while this committee has held no hearings on this particular bill, the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations was to the effect that if this bill passed, it would cost $2,500,000,000 a year, is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. The Veterans' Administration did testify that, but I wrote them and asked them to explain how it would cost that much. They said the preamble of the bill destroyed the expiration date of the GI bill. I wrote back to the Veterans' Administration and asked them to write an amendment which would correct that. That amendment will be offered.

I do not agree with the Veterans' Administration. I sent the bill to the legislative reference service and asked them for a report. They said there was nothing in the bill which changed the expiration date, but to be sure that there is no doubt about it the amendment prepared by the Veterans' Administration will be put in the bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it the intention to offer the House bill, H. R. 8465, as a substitute?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; I intend to offer that as a substitute for the Senate bill 2596.

Mr. KEARNEY. If that is so, what would be the difference in the cost of the bill as it passed the Senate and the cost of the proposed amendment?

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] heard the same testimony that I heard concerning S. 2596, in executive session in our committee. At that time the Veterans' Administration did not mention the expiration date of the GI bill. It would not change anything as pertains to the expiration date of the GI bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. But as I get the picture it changes the figures in the Senate bill from $2,500,000,000 to $2,500,000. If that is so I am going to ask the question now, How can we reconcile any differences in any conference committee between the sum of $2,000,000,000 and $2,000,000?

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman from New York knows that when the Senate passed this bill there was no thought of any such cost as that. The Veterans' Administration came up with that figure before the Appropriations Committee, after they had testified before our committee. There was no Senator that ever mentioned changing the expiration date of the GI bill. There is no Senator who will object to this amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY. You understand I am not criticizing my good friend from Texas, because there is not a harder worker on the Veterans' Affairs Committee than the geneleman from Texas, but I do say that as far as this particular legislation is concerned, as it stands now I am opposed to it, for the simple reason that we have never had any hearings on this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask my colleague from Texas this question. About 3 days ago, Mr. Lawton, the present Director of the Bureau of the Budget, sent to the Committee on Appropriations covering the independent agencies a letter stating that S. 2596 will cost an additional $1,000,000,000 a year. If my memory serves me correctly, we appropriated for education and training for the fiscal year 1950, $2,900,000,000. He says this bill S. 2596 will cost an additional $1,000,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman is prepared to break down at this time the difference in cost of S. 2596 and H. R. 8465? I believe the gentleman intends to substitute H. R. 8465; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, sir. Does the gentleman have a copy of H. R. 8465 before him?

Mr. THOMAS. Can the gentleman break down the difference in cost and give that more or less in round figures?

Mr. TEAGUE. I have not seen the letter from Mr. Lawton, but I did read the testimony before your subcommittee where they said it would cost an additional $2,500,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. That was the Director of the Veterans' Administration, General Gray.

Mr. TEAGUE. I, in turn, wrote to them and asked them to explain where that could possibly happen. They said it was because of the preamble. There is one section in H. R. 8465, section 4, that contains the cost of $2,300,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman again state how he feels assured that in the event his substitute bill is passed how we can be assured that in conference they will not split the difference, or do something like that, and run it into billions of dollar on this legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will say to the gentleman that there was no intent by the people who passed this bill in the Senate to change the expiration date of the GI bill. As far as I am concerned, I am sure I can state for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that we would not agree to any such thing as that in conference.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am glad to have that assurance.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I bring up again my original thought about a compromise. How can you or any member of the conference committee adjust the differences between $2,000,000,000 and $2,000,000?

Mr. TEAGUE. If the gentleman from New York introduced a bill by which he intended to do something, and the agency involved came back and said that because of language that he had in the bill, an amount that he had never dreamed of, would be required, and he wrote the agency and asked for an amendment, would he worry about the amount then?

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I am particularly worried about the amount in these two bills, I will say very frankly to the gentleman from Texas. I have here a statement which I referred to previously of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] stated:

> General Gray's figure was about $2,500,000,000 additional cost per annum. That would make a total expenditure of over $5,000,000,000 a year if S. 2596 goes through.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I want to know if this changed expiration date is the thing that changed the $2,000,000 to $2,000,000,000.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is it exactly; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MASON. Then if that change in the expiration date is corrected it will be approximately $2,000,000.

Mr. TEAGUE. Correct.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me obvious to everyone in this room after hearing the discussion here that the committee themselves do not agree on what the cost of this measure is going to be. Some say $2,000,000; some say $2,000,000,000; some say $5,000,000,000.

I personally am sorry that this bill is here before the Congress under these conditions, a bill on which they have had no hearings. I have attempted to obtain some information as to the provisions, cost, and so forth, but have been unable to do so. If this committee wants to come in where they themselves do not understand what is contained in the bill and ask Congress to pass something like that, I just think it is bad procedure.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. There have been no specific hearings on this bill, but before the Senate committee, before our Committee on Appropriations, before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, there have been hearings on this same provision.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. As a matter of fact, is it not true that we adopted the hearings of the other body with reference to a bill we had on the floor here a short time ago which caused quite a bit of confusion? That was the 16,000-bed hospital bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true. We do not know who appeared before the Senate committee, we do not know who appeared in opposition to the bill or in favor of it; no one knows that.

Mr. TEAGUE. Most of the hearings in the Senate were in executive session of the Committee on Education and Labor and they heard representatives of the Veterans' Administration. There were a number of conferences and my colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] can verify this or tell whether it is true or not, that there were conferences between the Appropriations subcommittee and the Veterans' Administration trying to work out the language of this bill; and there were about 2 weeks of hearings over in the Senate before the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill was reported out of the Senate committee unanimously and passed by the Senate unanimously.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Was the Director of the Budget brought down to testify as to the cost of the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. I do not recall whether there was a letter from the Director of the Budget or not; there was one from the Director of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think I can give him a little helpful information.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. General Gray does not like this bill. General Gray, the Veterans' Administrator, is opposed to this bill. He is opposed to any legislation that will tie his hands or that will restrict him in the issuance of regulations from time to time in the administration of this program, so General Gray is opposed to the bill. But the veterans of the country want some standard set up in the operation of the schools; the school authorities themselves want some standards set up whereby they can operate under some educational standards; the veterans' organizations see the need for it; educators of the country see the need for it. But General Gray does not want any law written in this Congress which will tie his hands in the running of the program. There is the opposition.

This is not a money bill; this is a belated setting up of standards and prescribing of regulations. The language of the bill incorporates 90 percent of the law already on the books in the Eightieth Congress. They did not include money in the appropriation bill for avocational and recreational training. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress the same legislation was rewritten. Regulations have been issued which are included in this bill. So what I am trying to say to the gentleman is, this is not a money bill. This is a bill for setting up standards and regulations which are already law and which are in effect.

Mr. JOHNSON. How did the Rules Committee happen to give a rule on a bill on which no hearings were held? Why did the Rules Committee permit the bill to come out?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. They came to the committee and said it was unanimously reported with the exception of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I do not believe he took an active part. We were told that the committee was unanimously for it with the exception of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. JOHNSON. It developed before the Rules Committee there had been no hearings?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes, and I was opposed to it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I concur in everything the gentleman from Tennessee has said with reference to this matter with one exception. I went down to see General Gray in reference to this particular legislation, not the bill which the gentleman from Texas is going to substitute but the bill, S. 2596, which I was under the impression until about a minute or two ago was the bill that would be before us today.

General Gray said to me: "I am the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and I will administer any bill that you send down here. That is my job."

He did not say he was for or against this bill. I think General Gray is a sound administrator, I think he means what he says. This is the House of Representatives and if we send a bill down there General Gray has said he will administer it. As a matter of fact, he will administer it whether he likes it or not, for that matter. I do think in fairness to the general I ought to say that he is not

for or against the bill as he explained to me in person.

Mr. EVINS. May I say that when General Gray came before our committee in October of last year he asked the committee and the Congress not to take any action until he had an opportunity to report to the Congress. He subsequently reported with a volume of some 200 pages, listing about 200 schools out of the literally thousands throughout the country in which he has found some practices which are objectionable.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Here is what most of us on the Rules Committee understood about the bill. It was to perfect title II of the Service Readjustment Act. There were a lot of these fly-by-night schools that started up for recreational purposes, teaching veterans how to dance and so forth. In the Rules Committee we thought this bill was to perfect title II at a cost of about $2,000,000. Now we learn it comes to $2,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000. I will ask the gentleman from Texas this question: Will this cost two billion or two million? That is the question I think will decide the issue.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will stake my life on the fact it will cost $2,000,000 and not $2,000,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I think that answers the question as far as I am individually concerned, if the gentleman says he is willing to stake his reputation on the fact it will cost $2,000,000. I do not want to see any more of these fly-by-night schools all over the country and if it is going to cost two, three, or five billion dollars then naturally I think we should oppose the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. This bill was turned over to the Legislative Reference Service and they were requested to make a study. May I read the last paragraph of Mr. Griffith's letter?

As we have indicated at the outset, difficulty has been experienced in evaluating the objections raised by the Administrator and the Solicitor, but the main decision to be faced in the consideration of S. 2596, as we see it, is whether Congress shall legislate and establish policy with regard to entitlement of veterans to educational benefits or leave this matter to the Administrator. Some of the objections raised appear to relate to provisions now found in the regulations or instructions which are substantially the same as those contained in the bill. The natural conclusion is that these objections are to establishment of these limitations by legislation, thus precluding further administrative change.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] whether, in his opinion, this bill will cost $2,000,000,000?

Mr. EVINS. No; it will not. I think that by the adoption of these standards and having some uniformity in the operation of the schools it will bring about some economy in its operation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Let me ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] what his opinion is in regard to the cost of this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that I opposed reporting out Senate bill 2596. The gentleman said a while ago, as I understood him, that I was the only member of the committee that opposed reporting it out. The vote was 8 to 5. Only 13 members voted on this bill, S. 2596. Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has a substitute that he proposes to offer. I have not gone over it as carefully as I should. I have not had the time nor the opportunity, but so far as Senate bill 2596 is concerned, as it passed the Senate, I certainly would not support that measure under any consideration.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What is the opinion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] as to the cost?

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I cannot give any information nor can anybody else. We have not had any hearings on it, so how can we give any figures?

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. Eddie Menasco at the Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOLLING, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include newspaper clippings.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include additional matter including essays by a young man and a young woman, winners of awards given by the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Philadelphia.

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in eight instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at the conclusion of the legislative program and special order for the day.

Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article that appeared in America, by Hon. WALTER A. LYNCH.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from Newsweek Magazine.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Altoona Tribune.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the text of President Truman's speech delivered at Pendleton, Oreg., on yesterday, on economic affairs.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances; to include in one a speech delivered by President Truman in Galesburg, Ill., day before yesterday, and in one to include editorials appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY OF THE AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 182) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That H. Con. Res. 163, adopted on July 26, 1946, providing for the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Eightieth Congress, be, and is hereby, rescinded, and that in lieu thereof there shall be compiled and printed, with illustrations, as a House document, in such style and form as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Eightieth Congress (1774–1948); and that 6,500 additional copies shall be printed, of which 4,400 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 1,600 copies for the use of the Senate, and 500 copies for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO THE NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolu-

tion (H. Con. Res. 176) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee during the Eighty-first Congress, first session, relative to the national health plan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "UNIFICATION AND STRATEGY"

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 551) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the report entitled "Unification and Strategy" made by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives be printed as a House document.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentlewoman kindly explain what this document is?

Mrs. NORTON. It authorizes the printing of the report entitled "Unification and Strategy" as a House document. The estimated cost is $229.08.

Mr. MARTIN of Masachusetts. What is the document?

Mrs. NORTON. The name of it is "Unification and Strategy."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But what committee got it out?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This is a committee print from the House Committee on Armed Services. The resolution was introduced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. He has asked the Committee on House Administration to report this resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there any popular demand for it?

Mr. ALBERT. Apparently there is.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say that the publication relates to the investigation conducted by the House Committee on Armed Services on the B–36 and related matters.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this document a criticism of Secretary of the Navy Matthews?

Mrs. NORTON. I am sure that it is not.

Mr. ALBERT. I do not think so, either.

Mr. STEFAN. I would oppose a criticism like that unless I saw the document.

Mrs. NORTON. As far as I know, no criticism is involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "CONGRESS AND THE MONOPOLY PROBLEM—FIFTY YEARS OF ANTITRUST DEVELOPMENT, 1900–1950"

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 557) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Congress and the Monopoly Problem—Fifty Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1950," prepared for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "THE MAKING OF A CONGRESSMAN"

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 595) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "The Making of a Congressman" be printed as a House document.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentlewoman explain who is the author of this, and how it can be done?

Mrs. NORTON. They are the remarks of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] which appeared in the RECORD recently, as the gentleman well knows. The gentleman could not possibly object to this resolution, I may say.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HAZEL PRATER

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 555) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Hazel Prater, daughter of Eva M. Young, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Eva M. Young.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ROSE MARGARET TORRANCE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 591) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Rose Margaret Torrance, widow of Thomas Torrance, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Thomas Torrance.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT A. WREDE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 594) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Albert A. Wrede, father of Edward C. Wrede, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Edward C. Wrede.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF GEORGE T. GIRAGI

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 506) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the estate of George T. Giragi, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said George T. Giragi.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out lines 4 and 5 down to the word "not."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution providing for the payment of $350 funeral expenses to the estate

of George T. Giragi, late an employee of the House of Representatives."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 534) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective April 1, 1950, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation at the basic rate per anum to certain employees of the House, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

To the superintendent, House Press Gallery, the sum of $480; first assistant superintendent, House Press Gallery, the sum of $500; second assistant superintendent, House Press Gallery, the sum of $500; third assistant superintendent, House Press Gallery, the sum of $400; messenger, House Press Gallery, the sum of $440; superintendent, House Periodical Press Gallery, the sum of $500; superintendent, House Radio Press Gallery, the sum of $500; first assistant superintendent, House Radio Press Gallery, the sum of $300; and messenger, House Radio Press Gallery, the sum of $450, whose title hereafter shall be changed to read second assistant superintendent, House Radio Press Gallery.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 524) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, in addition to $50,000 authorized by House Resolution 88, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 9, 1949; $50,000, authorized by House Resolution 127, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to April 1, 1949; and $50,000, authorized by House Resolution 252, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 1, 1949, including employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 495) and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the consideration of the resolution on the ground that a quorum was not present when it was reported out of committee.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, we did have a quorum present, but some Member may have slipped out of committee during the consideration of the resolution. I assumed that a quorum was present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May not the consideration of this resolution at this time be blocked by a point of order that a quorum is not present in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Of course, the point of order that a quorum is not present may be made at any time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is too late to raise the point of order that a quorum was not present in the committee after it has reached the floor of the House. If no point of order is made in the committee, the presumption is that a quorum was present. To take any other attitude would virtually paralyze legislation. If no point of order was made at the time, the presumption then is that a quorum was present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state in response to the parliamentary inquiry that the point of order is properly addressed at this point because the resolution has just been reported to the House. The question as to whether or not the point of order will be sustained is an entirely different question.

The Chair would like to ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey if at the time the resolution was reported out there was a quorum present in the committee.

Mrs. NORTON. To the best of my knowledge, there was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] whether or not he was present at the time the resolution was reported out.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio was not present at the time. He came in late and was informed there had not been a quorum present at any time. Another resolution was blocked a little later on account of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a further point of order. This is a very serious proposition that really affects the orderly procedure of the House. I make the point of order that it is too late to raise a point of order that there was no quorum present in the committee unless that point of order was made in the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the point of order can be made in the House when the report is made. A point of order that a quorum was not present when the resolution was reported out can be made when the resolution is reported to the House. For that reason the Chair rules that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is within his rights at this particular time in making the point of order that he has.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman insists on his point of order, I will withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

Mrs. NORTON. May I at this time thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. RANKIN. The lady is quite welcome. I was glad to yield all the time she needed.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STANLEY. What is the status of the resolution now that has just been withdrawn?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey has withdrawn the resolution. The matter is not before the House. Therefore, there is no question for the Chair to pass upon.

Mr. STANLEY. Could the resolution be properly presented to the House again without going back to the committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Of course, it could be taken up by unanimous consent. In the event of its being presented again, a point of order could be raised; but the Chair would not express any opinion now on the point of order that might be raised at that time.

Mr. STANLEY. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is this a privileged matter?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If it is reported out of committee with a quorum present, it is a privileged matter.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House and the rules of every committee, legislation is passed every day without a quorum being present, and unless that question is raised they cannot go into the courts and contest the legislation. The same thing applies to the committee. A ruling to the contrary would simply demoralize legislative procedure as far as the committees of this House are concerned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to paragraph (d) of section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which reads as follows:

No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. That means the paralyzing of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi was recognized for a motion.

TRAINING OF VETERANS UNDER SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration

of a bill that was reported under the same conditions, S. 2596, relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2596) relating to education and training of veterans, with Mr. WELCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if it is possible for me to get over to the Members of this House what is in this bill, 99 percent of them will be 100 percent for it.

This is not a liberalizing bill; it is a restrictive bill. It is not a bill to add money to the GI bill; it is a bill to make the GI bill more restrictive and to save money.

Six years ago today, on May 11, 1944, this House began general debate on S. 1767, the so-called GI bill. There was much debate as to whether it was a States' rights bill; there was considerable debate between the members of the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation as to what each committee had accomplished. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] told of his early school teaching days in a one-room school and stated that the first day of school he had five students and five dogs, and that the school was a howling success. It was very interesting to read the debate on the GI bill.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been a country which tried to do as much for their returning veterans as this Congress did in May of 1944. The House of Representatives foresaw all the danger in the bill—the so-called fly-by-night schools, veterans who abused their privileges, and also administrative abuses by the Veterans' Administration.

Soon after this law became operational and as predicted in the debate on the GI bill, many new schools came into existence, and, obviously, many, such as dancing schools, personality development schools, calisthenics, and similar subjects, were obviously of a fly-by-night nature. As the number of schools continued to increase and the amount of money paid for tuition, fees, and subsistence continued to increase, the Veterans' Administration issued change No. 9, the first tightening of the GI bill. This regulation required, among other things, that all schools operating for a profit, a majority of whose students were veterans, and which were established after June 22, 1944, or which, though established prior to that date, had not been in continuous operation since that date, or which had increased their tuition charge by 25 percent since that date, enter into a contract with the Veterans' Administration—such contract to establish the rate which such school should receive for tuition, fees, books, and other necessary supplies. Moreover, the contract rate so established was to be renegotiated at the end of each contract period.

As time went on a series of three amendments were enacted, each amendment further tightening the GI bill and attempting to prevent known abuses of the GI bill. The first one was Public Law 679, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, establishing standards for on-the-job training for veterans and authorizing the reimbursement of State agencies for services rendered in assuring compliance with these standards. The next amendment was Public Law 377, which established standards for institutional on-the-job training. The third amendment was Public Law 862, of the Eightieth Congress. This amendment prohibited the expenditure of Federal funds for tuition, fees, or subsistence allowance in connection with any avocational or recreational course. Public Law 266, of the Eighty-first Congress, continued the same ban in modified form and in addition required schools operating for profit to have had at least 1 year of successful operation before being permitted to participate in this program. As a result of language in Public Law 266, the Veterans' Administration 1 week later issued a most arbitrary regulation, No. 1–A. This is the regulation which caused the senior Senator from Ohio to tell Mr. H. V. Stirling, of the Veterans' Administration, that he had no faith in him. This regulation, among a number of other things, declared that all schools established after June 22, 1944, were avocational and recreational. Soon after this regulation was issued, Mr. Speaker, and after a number of conferences between Members of the House and the Senate with the Veterans' Administration, 1–A was replaced with 1–B, and the Veterans' Administration was requested to make a complete report on educational training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended.

As a result of 1–A and a result of the conferences between Members of Congress and the Veterans' Administration, S. 2596 was introduced and passed in the Senate for three reasons: First, to safeguard the rights conferred upon the veterans by basic law; second, to regularize the policy and practice to be pursued by the Veterans' Administration in its relationship with educational institutions participating in the program; and, third, to clarify and strengthen the authority of the Veterans' Administrator to cope with certain abuses under the act.

Mr. Chairman, since that time the Veterans' Administration has made its report on the GI bill and the President transmitted this report to Congress with a special message dated February 13, 1950. In this message the President made eight specific recommendations which he said were necessary to assure that our expenditures for this program yield a proper return both to the veterans and to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation includes seven of the eight recommendations and a portion of the eighth recommendation. The President recommended that the present expiration date of the GI bill be preserved. This bill complies with this recommendation. The President recommended that the 1 year ban against new schools as established by Public Law 266 last year be continued. This bill continues a 1-year ban against new schools. This provision will virtually prohibit the establishment of any new profit schools.

The President has recommended that the prohibition against the use of funds for avocational and recreational training enacted by the Congress by Public Law 862, Eightieth Congress, be continued. The avocational restriction which would expire with the 1949 Appropriation Act would be made permanent law by this bill. The President has recommended that the present restrictions which are now regulation against indiscriminate course changing be continued. This bill allows a veteran to take courses in the same general field in accordance with present regulations. The present law has no restriction against change of course by the veteran.

The President has recommended that the Veterans' Administration be given additional authority to require schools to properly report when a veteran interrupts his training or accrues excessive absences. This bill provides additional authority to the Veterans' Administration to require prompt and accurate reports. The President has made a recommendation that minimum standards be established for the States in approving schools. The State approval agencies have previously recommended that such standards be established. The President has also recommended that the States be given financial assistance to enforce these standards as is now provided for the enforcement of standards for on-the-job training.

After the President's message of February 13, 1950, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] introduced a bill containing minimum standards. Within the past 10 days the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] together with myself and representatives of the schools, State approval agencies and institutions of higher learning have worked out a set of standards to which we generally agree.

Mr. Chairman, from questions that I have been asked, it appears that Members of Congress want to know about the cost of S. 2596, whether it liberalizes the GI bill and whether it provides restrictions and controls for the so-called fly-by-night schools. This bill does not liberalize the GI bill of rights and does establish a number of restrictions on the so-called fly-by-night schools.

Mr. H. V. Stirling testified before the Appropriation Subcommittee of the House that this bill would involve increased costs.

I wrote the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs asking for an explanation of this alleged increase in cost and I was advised by the Administrator that their estimate of increased cost was based on

the assumption that the preamble of this bill did away with the July 25, 1951, expiration date. I replied to the Administrator that it was not the intent of anyone supporting this bill to extend the GI bill and asked that the Veterans' Administration submit to me a proposed amendment which would correct the preamble and remove the doubt as to cost. I also sent this bill to the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress for study and they reported as follows:

> With regard to the termination date we find no item in the bill which affects a change.

Regardless of that, Mr. Chairman, the amendment prepared by the Veterans' Administration which I will introduce, will remove all doubt as to increased cost and will preserve the expiration date as now provided by the GI bill.

The Veterans' Administration claims that section 3 of the bill would cost approximately $20,000,000. This section would broaden the base of reimbursement of nonprofit institutions of higher learning to include the entire cost of training the veteran. This provision would place all institutions on an equal basis regardless of whether they are State institutions or private schools. Because of cost, an amendment will be offered to strike this section from the bill.

The other item of cost is section VI of the bill. This section provided reimbursement to States for services in determining the qualifications of proprietary institutions. The Veterans' Administration estimates the cost of this section to be $2,330,000. This section complies with one of the recommendations of the President in his message to Congress dated February 13, 1950, and will provide funds for the States to intensify supervision of schools for the purpose of further reducing abuses.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] has worked very hard on this bill and I regret that it was necessary that he go back to Georgia. He is in complete agreement on this bill, and I know of no one opposing it.

Mr. Chairman, after conferring with the House Parliamentarian I introduced yesterday H. R. 8465 which is a new bill including all proposed amendments which I have mentioned and when we begin reading S. 2596 I shall offer H. R. 8465 as an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, section 1 of this bill continues the provision that a school must be in operation 1 year before they are allowed to participate in the veteran program. It also provides that a veteran may not change courses except in the same general field. In other words, it prohibits veterans from taking a barbering course, a tailoring course, and a cooking course. This section also continues the ban on avocational or recreational training which was a part of Public Law 862, an appropriation bill.

Section 2 of this bill writes into permanent law the provision of Public Law 266 on customary tuition charges. It also writes into permanent law the Veterans' Educational Appeals Board provided for in Public Law 266 except that under this bill the Veterans' Appeal Board would be appointed by the President of the United States and not by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This section also provides that the Administration shall continue to make further payments to a school at such amount as the Administrator considers to be fair and reasonable during negotiations for a contract and during the pendency of any appeal which the school may make.

Mr. Chairman, there will be a motion to strike section 3 from the bill because of cost.

Section 4 of the bill provides that a school shall be considered nonprofit if it is exempt from taxation under paragraph 6, section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code whether it was certified as such by the Bureau of Internal Revenue before or subsequent to June 22, 1944.

Mr. Chairman, section 5 was one of the recommendations of the President and which provides some inspection service for State-approval agencies in ascertaining the qualifications of schools under the GI bill.

Section 6 of the bill is a proposed set of standards which were recommended by the President and which were worked out and agreed to by myself, the gentleman from Georgia, representatives of the private schools, and representative of the State-approval agencies.

There is one paragraph of this section to which there was some objection by the schools and is paragraph 3, page 12.

Section 7 of the bill was a recommendation of the President concerning hours per week of schools. Section 8 was a recommendation of the President. Sections 9, 10, and 11 are administrative sections.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. It is my understanding that the gentleman intends to offer at the appropriate time as a substitution for this bill, the bill H. R. 8465; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. I expect to offer it as an amendment to the bill S. 2596. After conferring with the Parliamentarian of the House yesterday he suggested that it be handled in this way, and that is the reason it has been done in that manner.

Mr. EVINS. Is H. R. 8465 substantially the same as S. 2596? And if there are any differences, what are the differences?

Mr. TEAGUE. If the gentleman will permit, I will get to that.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The report says that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is reporting the bill S. 2596. Is that the fact, that it was S. 2596 that was considered and reported by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct. Last year the Senate passed S. 2596. At the same time they asked for a complete report from the Veterans' Administration, and that report has been made. The President has recommended that those eight recommendations be put into effect, and that we put in some standards. This bill, H. R. 8465, which will be offered as an amendment, includes those recommendations and those standards.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman says "which will be offered." Is H. R. 8465 a committee amendment that has been voted on?

Mr. TEAGUE. No, it is not. Because of the number of those amendments, and after conferring with the House Parliamentarian, I introduced that bill yesterday.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have in mind an automotive training school that was in existence 8 months. It was a legitimate school, but due to the 1-year ruling it was not allowed any more tuition from the Government for its enrollees. The school, nevertheless, maintained its courses and now it has passed the 1-year mark. Is it possible for that school to be approved?

Mr. TEAGUE. If the school has existed for 1 year and its standards are such that the State approval agency recommends it, then they would be permitted to accept veteran students.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Even though they had been disqualified under the previous regulations.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct, because it must have existed for 1 year.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. On page 2 of S. 2596, in subparagraph (b) the last sentence, there is this language:

> Upon the certification of any State approval agency that a new institution is essential to meet the requirements of veterans in such State, the Administrator in his discretion may approve such an institution notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph.

On page 5 of the committee report there is practically a reiteration of that particular sentence. I am wondering if, in the amendment that the gentleman intends to offer, there is a similar provision.

Mr. EVINS. That is exactly the question I wanted to propound to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE. When our Subcommittee on Appropriations last year put that wording in the appropriation bill, it made it retroactive, and the number of schools that had been in existence for 9, 10, and 11 months, were suddenly cut out. That wording was put in the Senate bill to take care of those schools, but no similar wording is contained in H. R. 8465, which will be offered as an amendment.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman object to the inclusion of such a sentence in the amendment that he intends to offer?

Mr. TEAGUE. I know of two or three Members that intend to offer that amendment. If that amendment is to

take care of those schools who were done an injustice last year, in order to take care of those schools, I would have no objection. If it is a case of permitting indiscriminate new schools, I would be against it.

Mr. FORD. I think that particular sentence protects against the establishment of schools of fly-by-night character indiscriminately. In other words, the Administrator still has discretionary authority. He could use that discretion to approve legitimate schools that were caught in the box, so to speak, in the last few months following the enactment of the law that contained section 266.

Mr. TEAGUE. Certainly, a number of those schools were done an injustice.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows that I am supporting his bill and I have been working with him on it. I was under the impression that the language the gentleman mentioned would be included in the substitute, H. R. 8465. I have been unable to find that language, and therefore I have an amendment that I will offer to reinstate it. I think, in fairness to the schools that have been in operation for some months and doing a good job, that they should not be discontinued.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa. I just read the gentleman's debate, and I read all his statements on the GI bill when it was considered 6 years ago.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If I understand the gentleman's bill, the real purpose of this educational provision is that if the school has been in existence for 1 year and has met the requirements of the State authority, whether it be the superintendent of public instruction or whoever it is in the State that authorizes the schools, then it is qualified to train the veteran, and it will not be subject to being disqualified by any arbitrary ruling of the Veterans' Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. Any school where the Veterans' Administration finds that the students are not receiving proper training, the Veterans' Administration cannot disapprove the school but can stop the tuition and subsistence of the veterans who go to the school. In that way the head of the Veterans' Administration can control any school if there is an obvious fraud or something of that sort going on.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman's bill will still permit that?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is right.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the RECORD should show that the gentleman from Texas has led in this fight and has done a perfectly remarkable job, and has earned almost as many decorations in this peacetime war as he earned during the war.

Mr. TEAGUE. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the gentleman whether the key to what he is trying to accomplish is not contained in the one sentence of the report of the committee on page 4 which states:

> Moreover, the numerous amendments, clarifications, and interpretations subsequently issued by the VA added to the general confusion.

Is the gentleman trying to resolve all of that dispute?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to advise the Members that passage of this bill, according to the substitute the gentleman from Texas will offer, is a most important question on which I have heard from a very large number of veterans from my district favoring it. The substitute only seeks to secure for veterans the full rights which the Congress intended they should have in terms of education and training. It is an effort to see that regulations do not depreciate these rights. This bill will give veterans reasonable and legitimate freedom of action in choice of courses and schools, in respect of their entitlement—and that was as the Congress intended it should be. The effort of the Congress to close some loopholes has been misinterpreted. In this bill we are seeing to it that such misinterpretation, which has been a serious handicap to veterans, is ended. I hope the House will approve this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood the gentleman to say in answer to an inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] that under the bill he is now supporting the Veterans' Administration would have the authority to protect the fund against those schools which do not give proper education. Is that the way it is?

Mr. TEAGUE. If somebody is operating a school and it is obvious to the Veterans' Administration that the school is not giving satisfactory teaching to the boys, they have no authority to do anything to the school but they can discontinue the subsistence payments to the boys going to the school, which would in turn stop the school.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman used the word "obvious," if it is "obvious" to the head of the Veterans' Administration. Does the gentleman mean by that that he must have something more than just ordinary information?

Mr. TEAGUE. No, I do not. I mean that if there is fraud or the school is not giving the kind of instruction it should the Veterans' Administration can stop the subsistence payments to the students going to that school.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but who determines whether there is fraud or whether the instruction is not proper? That is the point that is bothering me.

Mr. TEAGUE. It is a cooperative thing between the State authority and the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration can override the State approval by stopping the subsistence of the students going to the school.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Am I correct in my assumption that the head of the VA can cut off the tuition if, in his judgment, the school is not giving proper instruction?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is the wording of Mr. H. V. Stirling, director of this part of the GI bill. He says they can do that.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will recall my interest in the GI flight training program and the amendment I had in the appropriation bill to aid GI flight training, to keep the flight training intact. Then the VA went after it, with the result that many of the trainees were precluded from participating in flight training. What will the gentleman's new bill do to the GI flight training? Is the gentleman acquainted with my amendment?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; I certainly am.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman assisted me in the adoption of that amendment, and agreed with me that flight training should not be considered entertainment.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman is correct. The same wording we put in the appropriation bill is in this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Is my amendment in there yet?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; it is; the same wording.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should be very glad to yield 5 minutes of the time on this side to the gentleman, that he may explain the bill point by point. He has been interrupted and has not explained the entire bill. I wish he would explain the part of the bill that concerns the regulation which is to be issued by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the bill offered by the gentleman from Texas as a substitute for S. 2596 will receive favorable consideration. I am disappointed that the members of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Members of the House did not have a longer opportunity to study its provisions and weigh its value to the veterans. I believe it to be good legislation and I will vote for it when offered.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the gentlewoman very much for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. We have a report here which says "analysis of the bill by sections." Now, we are to throw that away and hear what the gentleman has to say, is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. The first section, paragraph A, continues the 1-year ban

against schools. In other words, it requires the school to be in operation for 1 year before it can accept GI students.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. HAND. To what date does the 1-year limitation apply? Will it be 1 year from August 24, 1949?

Mr. TEAGUE. If you start in school today, the school you go to would have to have been in operation for a year.

Mr. HAND. Would it have to be in operation a year before August 24, 1949, which is the date set in the previous bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. No; it would have to be in operation for a year from the date that you go into the school.

Mr. HAND. But there is a date set.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; that was the date of the appropriation bill, August 24.

Mr. HAND. And it is still that same date?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is right.

Mr. HAND. So the school would have to have been in existence under your proposed bill or under your amendment for a full year prior to August 24, 1949?

Mr. TEAGUE. No.

Mr. HAND. It would not? Then, will the gentleman tell me what his bill does?

Mr. TEAGUE. If you were to start in a school today, the school would have to have been in operation for 1 year. If you started school a month from now it would have to have been in operation a year prior to the day that you start going to school.

Mr. HAND. That is prior to the day you go in?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is right.

Mr. HAND. That is what the gentleman's bill provides?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is right. That is what the appropriation bill provided also.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. WHITAKER. In the original bill, S. 2596, it was provided that a school which has been approved by the Federal agency or by the State agency would be allowed this money from the Government. But now that is being cut out, is that not correct? In other words, I have the only colored trade school in my State. It has been approved by the Federal agency and by the State agency. The people who are putting in this trade school have spent $25,000 on the building. They have spent part of their money on contracts for the educators to run it. Then when the act was passed, this 1-year rule just cut the ground out from under them, so there they are now with a dead approval, and yet they have spent all this money.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct. And may I recall to the gentleman that last year when the House of Representatives was holding its sessions in the committee room of the Committee on Ways and Means it was very difficult to hear, and I personally did not know that that was to be passed until it had gone through and neither did other members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that I know of. It is true that many schools were discriminated against in that way.

Mr. WHITAKER. My understanding is that the appropriation for that particular school was included in the estimate.

Mr. TEAGUE. There is to be an amendment offered which will correct that.

Mr. Chairman, to continue with the explanation of the bill:

Paragraph B: If the Administrator finds that the progress of a person is unsatisfactory, he may disapprove a change of course of instruction and may discontinue any course of education in which he finds that the progress is unsatisfactory.

Paragraph C permits a student to change a course in the same general field, but he cannot go from barbering to tailoring to baking.

A number of Members have asked, "What about a boy who starts studying medicine and flunks out and wants to take another course?" Unfortunately he will just be out of luck, so far as this bill is concerned. But in trying to limit the boys who have gone from baking to tailoring and barbering, and so forth, and taking these different courses, it was felt that this provision was necessary.

Paragraph D is the same provision that was in 266 last year on avocational or recreational courses, which contain dancing courses, photography courses, glider courses, bartending, personality development, and entertainment courses, and so forth.

Section 2 is the same wording as 266 last year, with the exception of two things: This bill provides that for the purposes of this bill it includes contracts under Public Law 16 and Public Law 346. If a school has had two contracts, the last contract shall be the one that is in effect. The Veterans' Administration ruled that there was a difference in Public Law 16 and Public Law 346, and therefore many schools could never get two contracts, but these are very largely the same, and this law says they are the same. I understand from talking to members of the Committee on Appropriations that that was their intent in placing that provision in the appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. To the last word on line 10, page 3, "glider." Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. TEAGUE. If a man is in flight training, if it is obvious that in his business he can go on, he can go to glider training. But he must get two affidavits saying that that is something that will help him in his business.

The Committee on Appropriations last year said that if the administration finds that any institution has no customary cost of tuition, he shall forthwith fix and pay or cause to be paid a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition fees and other charges for the course offered by such institution. Under that language, when the contract period is set, the Veterans' Administration will refuse to pay this institution for 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes. The gentleman knows the bill probably better than anyone else, and I think it will be helpful to the House to have his explanation.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the gentlewoman. In Nashville, Tenn., there is a school where the Veterans' Administration owes that school for 11 months because they have not come to an agreement on a contract. From talking to members of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration should continue to pay what was a fair and reasonable fee until the contract was negotiated. Therefore, we have put in this bill one provision:

Provided further, That the Veterans' Administration shall continue to make further payments to a school at such amount as the Administrator considers to be fair and reasonable during negotiations for a contract, and during the pendency of any appeal which the school may make.

From many Members of Congress I take it they have received the same complaints. That language was worked up by the Legislative Reference Service and I feel it will take care of these contracts.

Section 3 of the bill is a section which was inadvertently left in the bill and would cost some money. That is not going to be offered as part of the amendment.

Section 4—up until last year the Veterans' Administration ruled that any school would be regarded as a nonprofit school if it was exempt from taxation under paragraph 6, section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code. Last year they ruled that any school created after June 22, 1944, would not be so considered. This bill reaffirms the fact that the Veterans' Administration will regard a school as nonprofit if section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code says they are a nonprofit institution.

Section 4 is one item in this bill that will cost some money. The President, in his recommendation to Congress, recommended that we adopt some standards for this training. He said if Congress could enact minimum standards of the type suggested, it is recommended that, as in the case of on-the-job training courses, Federal grants to States be authorized for necessary expenses to assure sound and effective adminstration of the law. The Veterans' Administration has testified that this provision would cost $2,300,000. The people in my State say that on-the-job training has gone down to such an extent that if the Veterans' Administration will give them permission to use the same people for inspection that they will not need any additional money.

Section 6 is a set of standards.

In the President's message he recommended a set of standards. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], who has done a lot of work on this bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]—and I might add that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] is

unable to be present today because he had to go back to Georgia—but the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER], a representative of the National Federation of Private Schools, a representative of the National Association of Private Schools, a representative of State approval agencies, Mr. Raisley, of Boston, Mass., who is on the President's Advisory Committee, got together and worked out this set of standards. None of them agreed 100 percent, but they are very similar to the standards that are in the on-the-job training and institutional on-the-farm training programs.

The two things in the standards about which there was any argument was one which states this:

No new course, or additions to the capacity of existing course, in any school operated for profit, shall be approved if the State approving agency shall determine that the occupation for which the course is intended to provide training is crowded in the State and locality where the training is to be given and that existing training facilities are not adequate.

In other words, if a school down in Texas wanted to establish a radio department, or if it was desired to establish a radio school at that place, and there were more than 500 students in the school, if the locality was crowded as far as radio operators were concerned, they would have authority to turn down that school. There was some disagreement on that.

The other part where there was disagreement was on clock hours. The President recommended that the Congress enact legislation to prescribe attendance requirements.

(b) For the purpose of this part, a trade or technical course, offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level, involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 30 hours per week of attendance is required with not more than 30 minutes of rest period per day allowed. A course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 25 hours per week net of instruction is required.

That was the biggest problem among this group. For example, in Louisiana, the schools are all on a 25-hour basis. The VA set up 25 hours to begin with. This group finally came up with this idea that those schools in which the majority of the training is theoretical, where they sit in the classroom entirely, 25 hours is sufficient; that in schools where much of the training is shop work or outside work that there should be a minimum of 30 hours.

We wired the State approval agencies in every State in the Union and asked them about this provision, and the majority of the agencies came back with the report that there would be no objection to a 30-hour minimum. There will probably be an amendment to strike out that section, but I am not sure yet.

The President stated in his report that the schools had been lax in reporting absentees, that they had been lax in reporting the veterans who quit their schools or left school, and he recommended some legislation corrective of that situation. There is a provision in this bill to require schools to report absentees and to permit the VA to place that amount of money against what the VA owes the school if they do not report it.

These are the general provisions of the bill as far as Congress is concerned. There is one provision in this bill that will cost money.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his fine explanation of the bill. The gentleman will remember that he and I have talked a number of times about certain new schools, the managers or owners of which have felt that perhaps their schools might be unduly handicapped as a result of certain rules and regulations. In my opinion these new schools in which the owners in some instances have invested sizable sums of money should not be discriminated against. Many of these owners in good faith established these schools to help our veterans. What is the situation, in the gentleman's opinion, as to the effect of this legislation upon certain new schools which came into existence recently?

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman has talked to me a number of times about new schools. There is no doubt there have been abuses by the schools. The State approval agencies and the Veterans' Administration both agree that there are sufficient schools and agree that there should be this 1-year requirement, that a school should exist for a year and prove itself before it accepts GI students. The only way a new school can start is by existing for a year and proving itself before it takes veteran students.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman spoke of the school at Nashville, Tenn., which has been in disagreement with the Veterans' Administration for 8 or 9 months. Would this bill be retroactive in allowing that school the amount that the Veterans' Administration deemed to be proper?

Mr. TEAGUE. No; the bill would not be retroactive, but there is an amendment to be offered which says that any school that has signed a contract because of that may appeal to the Appeals Board.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Would any school that had been in existence less than a year and which was disqualified but which has now been in existence a year be allowed repayment for the tuition during the period in which they were disqualified?

Mr. TEAGUE. Not under this bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman made the statement they would not be permitted for a year to accept GI students. He means they could take the students but they would not be reimbursed by the Government?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. How much will the section add that the gentleman says does add money to the cost?

Mr. TEAGUE. The VA testified it would be $2,300,000. The State-approval agencies testified it would not cost that much. All they need is permission to use the personnel they now have.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. On page 11, line 4, there is the following section:

The curriculum and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in the public schools or other private schools with recognized and accepted standards.

There was a spirited debate in the other body on this provision as to whether or not the standards, where you talk about the accepted standards, are those accepted by the State universities.

Mr. TEAGUE. Accepted by the State-approval agencies.

Mr. CARROLL. The point was raised that there was discrimination against night schools and the debate hinged around the Chicago area. I would like to have it in the record that the State sets the standards and not the various educational groups.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This bill comes about as a result of an order of the VA about last September?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; just when school started.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There was some exception taken to that and they then modified that order?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This bill is an effort to put into statue form that he would have discretion about these things?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. With the adoption of this bill would it extend the authority of his discretion under regulations with reference to GI students any more than if this bill were not passed?

Mr. TEAGUE. It definitely restricts the Administrator.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, the question of the cost of this bill must be given consideration insofar as the cost of any regulation that the Administrator might put into effect from here on is concerned?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In the gentleman's opinion, will the adoption of this bill increase the cost of the balance of the GI students' program any more than if it were not adopted, and, if so, to what extent?

Mr. TEAGUE. Truthfully and very seriously I think it will lessen the cost instead of increasing the cost.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This presumed figure of $2,000,000,000 was the figure

that the balance of the GI program might cost if the bill were not passed?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Does the gentleman's amendment carry the language found in this bill reading:

> Upon the certification of any State approval agency that a new institution is essential to meet the requirements of veterans in such State, the Administrator in his discretion may approve such an institution notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph?

Mr. TEAGUE. It does not. That was discussed a few moments ago.

Mr. SUTTON. That has been left out?

Mr. TEAGUE. It has been left out.

Mr. SUTTON. Would the gentleman object to that language being put in?

Mr. TEAGUE. An amendment will be offered. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] who did a lot of work on this bill objected to the language and it was taken out of the bill. I am presenting the two sides and will let the House vote on it.

Mr. SUTTON. I understand the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is going to offer the amendment. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to add my praise to the praise of the others for the gentleman and his fine work on this bill. It seems to me this is a very splendid piece of legislation. I note on page 3 you have listed avocational and recreational courses, but you have failed to list aviation courses. I wonder if by your failure to list it you mean they are permitted under this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. If the gentleman will turn over to the next page he will find that it is the same wording that was in the appropriations bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. In my State we recognized the evils that were cropping up immediately following the war and the State legislature of my State passed a regulatory law. First we licensed all of these schools and then we set up the regulations under which they would operate. My question there is this: By the passage of this law, will that annul some of the regulations in a State law?

Mr. TEAGUE. No. It is up to the State approval agency to approve them. Many States have those standards, but this affects those standards in no way.

Mr. WIER. I think the gentleman ought to explain this. There is quite a controversy between the Veterans' Administration and the schools involved; I think that it ought to be clarified why the schools are so concerned about the passage of this bill against the wishes of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TEAGUE. If you were running a school and it came to the point of negotiating your contract, and one man down in the Veterans' Administration had authority to tell you that he would not agree, and hold up your pay for 6, 7, 8, or 9 months until you were bankrupt, and if some legislation was proposed that would force the Veterans' Administration to continue to pay you and give them a chance to appeal to an appeals board, I believe the gentleman would be for the legislation, too. That is the point where your schools come in and why they want this legislation.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I might say in that connection that the course or practice on the part of this section of the Veterans' Administration is an attempt to do indirectly something that they will not do directly, and when they have these contracts under negotiation, that is the weapon they use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to explain my own personal reasons why I am against this bill. As far as the gentleman from Texas is concerned, there is no Member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for whom I hold a higher regard along with my colleagues who worked with him on portions of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] and the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. EVINS]. But, I go back, my colleagues, to the 16,000 hospital bed bill, that we passed in this House some few days ago. I adopted a stand, and I intend to stick by it, that I am going to be opposed to any bill, particularly bills that come out of my own committee, when no hearings have been held on those bills. I realize of course, that H. R. 8465 will be offered as a substitute for the original S. 2596. But, along with several Members of the committee, I am in a state of confusion. The bill, S. 2596, as it passed the other body, according to the testimony, will cost approximately $2,500,000 a year. You will not find those figures in the debate on the bill in the other body, but you will find those figures in the testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is a member.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. There was an executive session of our committee on S. 2596. The Veterans' Administration came before our committee to state their objections to the bill. Did they mention any enormous cost at that time?

Mr. KEARNEY. I have no recollection of the figures given, if any, by any of the officials of the Veterans' Administration. I am taking this from the record of the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, where it states:

> General Gray's figure was about $2,500,000,000 additional cost per annum, which would make a total expenditure of over $5,000,000,000 per year under S. 2596.

Mr. TEAGUE. I read the hearings last night on the GI bill and I read the statement of the gentleman from New York. There is no Member who knows more about veterans legislation or knows the Veterans' Administration better than the gentleman from New York. Does he believe that this bill would cost any sum like that? Does he believe anyone connected with it would have any intent to go along with any such cost? The gentleman from New York knows that his beliefs are almost exactly the same as mine. We have talked about this a thousand times.

Mr. KEARNEY. As long as I have been a member of that committee, which has been some 8 years, I have never found two witnesses who could agree on any particular cost. But what I am getting at is this: Let us assume for argument's sake that the cost of the Senate bill is $2,000,000,000, in round figures. As I understand, the gentleman from Texas has stated that the cost of his proposed bill will be in the neighborhood of $2,300,000. What I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas now is, Can he imagine any group of conferees getting together on differences between the sum of $2,000,000,000 and the sum of $2,000,000? It is for that reason that I am opposed to the bill and the further fact no hearings have been held before our committee. We never saw the bill until this afternoon.

Mr. TEAGUE. If I even dreamed any such amount was in this bill, I would not say one word for the bill. I would be against it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe the Senate had absolutely no idea that the cost of their bill would be $2,000,000,000. I think this is some idea the Veterans' Administration had when they claimed, I think before the Committee on Appropriations, that the expiration date would be extended, and that would bring the cost way up. Apparently there is nothing in the bill that would allow that to be extended.

Mr. KEARNEY. Only this morning there were several Veterans' Administration officials up in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs trying to determine the difference between the Senate bill and the proposed substitute. It took them over 2 hours to iron out their own differences as to what the two bills consisted of, but there was no cost given to approximate the total cost in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman ever known the Veterans' Administration to give one cost and stick to it? I have been on that committee since 1925, and I have never known them to do it.

Mr. KEARNEY. I do not think that we should lay the blame for this situation on the Veterans' Administration. This bill now is the responsibility of the House of Representatives. In the first instance, it was the responsibility of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

We held no hearings on the bill. Outside of the gentleman from Texas, and one or two others, there is no member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that I know of that knew even the contents of the bill until they came onto the floor of the House this morning. To my mind, that is not a proper way to legislate.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman will recall that I am a member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations which has this budget in charge. He is expressing the predicament in which we now find ourselves, whether or not the figure of $2,000,000,000 or $2,500,000,000 is right. It is a figure for a year. It is not, as the gentlewoman said, an additional figure for all time. That runs to $50,000,000,000 or more. But feeling as the gentleman does and as the gentlewoman does, that there might be some discrepancy, the subcommittee—and I know my chairman will permit me to say this instead of his saying it for himself—asked the Bureau of the Budget for, and just now we have had, a new and more accurate estimate, which still says that it could run to $2,000,000,000 a year, giving a figure as a minimum of $1,000,000,000 a year. Whether or not that is true, the feeling of the gentleman from New York, and it is mine, too, is that this is nothing we can guess at on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEARNEY. I do not believe this is a matter the House should guess at. I think we should have approximately all the testimony on any particular bill and the figures, if any are available, presented, so that the House will know what it is doing.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I address this question to the gentleman from California: In mentioning these figures which the gentleman from California has given us, was he referring to the bill S. 2596?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes; that is correct. I should have made that clear. I think both the gentleman from New York and I are referring to the Senate bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. But we have no information. I have been trying in a short time to read the substitute but am still unable to determine what it does as compared to the Senate bill.

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman. I notice the bill we are considering now is to be offered as an amendment to Senate bill 2596. H. R. 4665 was introduced by Mr. TEAGUE on May 10, 1950. It says "Referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs." May 10 was yesterday. I presume the bill was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for consideration and hearings. Now, do I understand there have been no hearings on the bill, which was introduced on May 10, 1950, and that it is a new bill which no one knows the contents of and the House here is considering a bill and proposing to offer it as an amendment to the Senate bill?

Mr. KEARNEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would it not be in order to have this bill recommitted so that at least some hearings could be held on it. Surely more light should be shed on this subject before we can act intelligently on it.

Mr. KEARNEY. When the time comes, the gentleman from New York will offer the proper motion.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. We have a report dated October 14, 1949, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reporting S. 2596 as having been voted out by that committee. Were there hearings on that bill?

Mr. KEARNEY. There were some in executive session, but there were no public hearings.

Mr. VORYS. Is that the bill, the cost of which is estimated at $2,000,000,000 a year?

Mr. KEARNEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Is the Committee on Veterans' Affairs sponsoring the only bill which is before the House at the present time? Are the membership generally here sponsoring the only bill on which we have a report and which is before this body? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. KEARNEY. The individual members of the committee would have to answer for themselves. I am not sponsoring the bill nor am I going to vote for it for the reason I have heretofore given.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. May I point out to the gentleman from Ohio that the bill, S. 2596, was reported out, as I pointed out a while ago, by a vote of 8 to 5. I was one of the five who opposed the bill, and I will oppose it now unless there are clarifying amendments adopted.

While I am on my feet, may I say to the gentleman from New York, that there has been a good deal of racketeering by these private schools, and I mean racketeering. I have here before me a letter from the Veterans' Administration in Jackson. One school there, the Southern Trades School, of Greenville, has already collected and banked $627,612.04 in excess of wholesale cost of equipment. The Magnolia Trade School collected and banked $17,707.72 in excess of cost of equipment.

One school at Biloxi, $1,513; and it goes on down. What was happening in Mississippi was happening in these private schools all over the country. For that reason I opposed the Senate bill and I shall decide what I am going to do about supporting this substitute when we have concluded considering the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. KEARNEY. May I again point out to the membership, Mr. Chairman, that what I have expressed here today is not with any intention of criticizing the motives of the gentleman from Texas. He is honest and sincere and a hard-working member of our committee. I am simply opposed to the method by which the bill was brought to the floor. The contents of the bill is not under discussion by myself at this time.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGEE. Does not the gentleman from New York feel that it is a rather unique situation when we hear the argument of the gentleman from Texas that this will tighten the restrictions of the Veterans' Administration's regulations, instead of liberalizing them and that yet every trade school in the United States is supporting the Senate bill, and I suppose, supporting this proposed legislation?

Does the gentleman feel that the trade schools would be supporting this if they thought they would get less than they are getting now?

Mr. KEARNEY. Well, I do not know. I think the trade schools, or any other schools, should know what is in the bill. They do not know it now. We do not, or we did not before we came on the floor of this House. I am not qualified to answer for any of the trade schools. I cannot even answer for myself as far as the contents of this bill is concerned. I did not see the bill until this afternoon, and certainly feel that full and public hearings should be held on any bill costing millions of dollars.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I am sure the distinguished gentleman heard our colleague from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and I join in his laudatory remarks of the gentleman from Texas. But the gentleman heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] tell us that he would stake not only his reputation but his life on the fact that this bill would not cost more than $2,300,000. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] will weigh his love and affection for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] against the lack of two or three pages of hearings, which is not unusual in this House—the Senate sends us a bill with hearings that they have held. That happens in the other body and in this body frequently. The fact that these hearings were in executive session is not unusual. All the hearings before the great Committee on Appropriations are held in executive session. But does not the gentleman think the word of the gentleman from Texas is enough?

Mr. KEARNEY. I am certainly willing to wager my affection for the gentleman from Texas provided it does not cost money.

Mr. FLOOD. More than $2,300,000.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. If it were left up to the gentleman from Texas, and I had the power to do so, there would have been all the hearings on earth, but I

did not have the authority to hold hearings. That is the reason there were not any hearings. I have a resolution before the Committee on Rules asking for a complete investigation by a joint committee appointed by the Speaker, of the whole GI bill as far as education is concerned. It is very interesting to know that your private schools are for that resolution, and the Veterans' Administration is against it. I said awhile ago why the trade schools are for it, because today the Veterans' Administration is holding up contracts for 6 or 7 or 8 months, and those people are going bankrupt. That is not an honest way to do business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] has expired.

All the time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has been consumed.

The gentleman from Mississippi has 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of the committee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I may be able to make some contribution in the consideration to this legislation, for I know the Members of the House are interested in getting information.

As far as General KEARNEY's complaint is concerned, regarding the need for additional hearings, there are a number of members on the committee who desired and wished for more hearings, but it was not possible under the circumstances to have additional hearings.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the chairman of my committee.

Mr. RANKIN. The committee had all the hearings it wanted. We had the Senate hearings, and the representative of the Veterans' Administration came before us in executive session and gave us the information we asked for.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is correct in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, the consideration of this bill has been made necessary by reason of the numerous regulations which have been issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs affecting the veterans' educational training program authorized under the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights. It has also been made necessary by reason of the much confusion that has developed in this program and because of a number of abuses that have grown up and developed in the course of the administration of the veterans' school training program.

I want to say at the outset that I am supporting the substitute bill offered by my colleague and fellow member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. The substitute measure which he has introduced, House bill 8465, is a clean bill and embraces a number of worth-while provisions designed to improve the operation of the veterans' educational and training program and to set up some standards for its operation in the interest of the veteran and the continuation of worth-while and beneficial training under the educational and training provisions of the GI bill of rights.

As we all know, when the Congress enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, provision was made that veterans whose education or training had been interrupted during the war would have an entitlement to resume and continue training which was lost or interrupted during their wartime service. As indicated, in the course of the administration of this provision, there have naturally sprung up many types of schools throughout the country offering veterans training and some of them have been found to be teaching various types of courses which were not in line with the spirit and intent of the original bill—and which courses of training were not designed to lead to an occupational objective—or a course of training of such a nature that would help the veteran receive employment.

I want to emphasize here that I hold no brief for so-called fly-by-night schools—but on the other hand I do not feel that meritorious and beneficial and worthwhile veteran training should be impeded or curtailed. Because of the fact that there have been a few exceptions to the general rule the good should not be discarded. In this connection, I should like to quote from a statement made by the President in a recent report on the operation of the veterans' trade school program wherein the President, as have others, recognized the value and benefit and worthwhileness and contribution which the veterans' training program has made to the ex-servicemen of the Nation. In calling attention to the great good accomplished by the program the President said:

> The contribution which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act has made to the postwar development of the Nation's most important resource—its young men and women—is very great. It is now approximately 4 years after general demobilization. During these 4 years an overwhelming proportion of all veterans have completed their readjustment or moved far in that direction. For the great majority of those who have made use of education and training provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act the law has been of real and lasting service.

I prefer to emphasize the positive, rather than the negative aspects of the program. Yet, as the gentleman from Texas has said, one of the reasons why this bill has been made necessary and is before the Committee today is due to the fact that there have been some abuses and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs issued during September of last year a most far-reaching regulation which adversely affected the entire veterans' training program. This regulation—now infamous—was known as regulation 1–A. The effective date of the regulation was September 12, 1949, and announcement of the regulation was not made until September 15—3 days after it went into effect. Following the issuance of this regulation, a wave of protest resulted—brought about by veterans, veterans' organizations, educators, and the operators of veterans' trade and training schools. By reason of the protests the effective date of the regulation was postponed until November 1, 1949. The regulation would have, in effect, accomplished the following results:

First. All certificates of entitlement for a veteran to take a course of education or training would have been canceled.

Second. The regulation required the making of new applications for certificate of entitlement even though the veteran was already pursuing approved courses of training.

Third. The regulation would have required the making of application for supplemental certificates when the veteran desired to transfer to another course of training—and the failure to file such supplemental application would have resulted in a loss of credit to the veteran or curtailment of aid in tuition payments and authorized subsistence allowances.

Fourth. The regulation required the filing of affidavits and other supporting documents showing complete justification to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration before a course of training could be approved.

This regulation with these provisions was most arbitrary and far reaching and went beyond the scope of authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. As indicated, following the issuance of this regulation and the protests which resulted, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in a closed session, called General Gray before the committee and made known to him the intent of the committee and of the Congress in the passage of the GI bill and amendments thereto. At this meeting, General Gray admitted that the regulation had gone too far and he promised the committee that he would rescind the regulation and that no more similar regulations would be issued until he had had an opportunity to report to the Congress. He did rescind regulation 1–A and later promulgated regulation 1–B as a substitute. Regulation 1-B has been in effect for the past several months and the number of complaints arising under this regulation has been few and limited. However, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has felt, and necessarily so, that permanent legislation should be enacted to set up standards by which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be guided in the conduct and the administration of the veterans' training program and this bill is designed to accomplish that purpose.

S. 2596—the bill for which the present measure is substituted—passed the Senate during the previous session of the Congress and contains largely three general provisions or sections.

Section 1 generally prohibits the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from the issuance of further regulations or instructions which are designed to deny to any eligible veteran his right to select a course of training which he desires during the period of his entitlement, with a general proviso excepting various types of courses which are enumerated and set out in the act which are declared

to be avocational and recreational in character and which types of training do not lead to a job objective. In other words, under title 1, the Administrator is prohibited from issuing a regulation which would prohibit a veteran from taking a course of training to which he is entitled provided that course is a legitimate and beneficial one and such a course as would ultimately serve to lead to a job or occupational objective. Under the provision, veterans are prohibited from taking a course of training of avocational or recreational character, such as dancing, courses in horseback riding, photography, bartending, sports, and other types of a recreational character.

Section 2 of the bill sets up a method of determining tuition fees or costs to be paid to schools authorizing approved types of veteran training. In the course of this program, it is developed that many schools have a customary cost of tuition, whereas others have no set standard of customary charges, and this section of the bill is designed to make uniform and to set up standards for the various schools operating under the program. This section provides for a Veterans' Education Appeals Board to hear and determine disputes and complaints arising as a result of tuition charges and tuition payments under the program. This section of the bill is already in the law. It is a provision which has been written into the independent offices appropriation bill as a rider on the Veterans' Administration appropriation and unless this legislation is enacted it will be necessary, from year to year, to continually repeat the reenactment of this feature of the bill. I say to you that the proper way to proceed is to enact legislation as an amendment to the GI bill as permanent legislation rather than continually, from year to year, repeating the enactment of the same legislation as a rider on the appropriation bill.

Section 3 of the bill sets up new standards for the improved operation of the trade-school program. In a recent report issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the education and training program, General Gray, together with the former Director of the Budget, Mr. Frank Pace, and the President, have recommended to the Congress a set of eight recommendations to improve the program and to set up better standards for its operation—in the interest of cracking down on so-called fly-by-night schools—putting business practices in the operation of the program, as well as providing Government economy.

A number of these recommendations have been carefully studied by many of the members of the committee, as well as veterans themselves and proprietors of legitimate veteran trade schools. These proposed standards have been enumerated to you and are set forth in the third major portion of the bill—section 6 of the substitute measure.

Thus, we have here a bill with three principal sections. In summary they are: First, to prohibit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from further arbitrary action which would deny the veteran taking meritorious and beneficial courses of training except certain specific avocational and recreational courses enumerated in the bill; second, the section providing for the establishment of a Veterans' Education Appeals Board to settle complaints regarding tuition charges and tuition payments; and, third, the section containing other standards for operation of the veterans' schools as recommended by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the President, and approved by the proprietors of a number of legitimate veteran trade schools themselves.

THIS IS NOT A MONEY BILL

Contrary to the statements of many persons and numerous reports in the press, this is not a money bill. This bill is designed to set up regulations and will, in effect, bring about desirable economies in the operation of the trade-school program, while insuring to the veteran that he shall continue to be entitled to take his full legitimate and beneficial course of training. We have heard many wild statements as to what this bill would cost. Instead of the bill costing huge sums, as its opponents say, the failure to enact this bill or a similar measure will mean that greater costs will be incurred. We should enact this measure as an amendment to the GI bill rather than annually and continually adopting riders on the Veterans' Administration appropriation bill. The correct and desirable way to legislate is to amend the basic law and not annually to write riders on the appropriation bill. The latter method is improper and usurps the functions of the legislative committee. The Appropriations Committee should not usurp, or be permitted to usurp, the functions of the regular legislative committee—the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this instance. As indicated, this bill does not deal with the expenditure of money, but only with regulations and procedure in the conduct of veterans' training schools.

As I have heretofore indicated, I hold no brief for so-called fly-by-night schools—the abuses which have been practiced should not be condoned—but on the other hand the Veterans' Administrator should not be permitted unrestricted license to continue to issue regulations which are arbitrary and unwarranted and not in conformance with the intent of the Congress—regulations designed to deny to veterans their rightful entitlement to pursue legitimate and beneficial types of training.

I want to say that since the issuance of the famous or infamous regulation 1–A in September of last year that I have talked with a great many veterans and officials of veterans' training schools and none have voiced any objection to the adoption of reasonable and proper standards for the operation of the veterans' training school program. The majority of the provisions and standards here prescribed are already in existing law or embraced within the provisions of regulation 1–B, now in operation. This measure would enact this regulation and existing legislative appropriation rider into permanent law as an amendment to the GI bill.

As indicated, the veterans and legitimate veterans' trade schools do not object to these minimum standards—and the veterans and the proprietors of the schools themselves are advocating the enactment of this legislation—they want this legislation to insure that there will be no further issuance of unwarranted regulations going beyond the scope of these specifications.

To repeat, under the terms of this bill beneficial and meritorious types of training will be continued and I believe that the Congress should set standards to guide the Veterans' Administrator, clearly defining his authority in the administration of the Veterans' education and training program.

The moneys which have been invested by the Government in training our veterans shall be returned many fold as the effects of time and application bear fruit in this generation and those to come. This program has been one of the few self-liquidating investments the Government has been able to make for its citizens. The education of our veterans is unquestionably an investment the benefits and ramifications of which will be realized in the future, not only in terms of money but in terms of higher standards of living, security, and greater strength in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include copies of two letters in connection with my remarks in support of the pending legislation:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1950.

Subject: Members of Congress are fully justified in voting for Senate bill 2596.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: Congress intended all veterans to have the opportunity to recover for themselves and their families the position which they sacrificed in entering the armed services. The intent of Congress was clear. It was also clear that Congress did not intend to have that purpose varied by administrative decree.

Many thousands of veterans are vitally interested in obtaining jobs and employment opportunities which will assure them a good living. Most of these veterans are not interested in so-called higher learning and have, therefore, chosen vocational schools in which to learn a trade or vocation and thereby obtain the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment as provided in the GI bill.

The Veterans' Administration has been prejudiced against private vocational schools since the beginning of this educational program and, because of the possible abuses by 3 percent of the training institutions so engaged, has attempted to malign the entire program and cut down the benefits which the veterans were promised and are entitled to receive.

On various occasions we have constantly sought to improve the relationship between the Veterans' Administration and the training institutions, but to no avail. The treatment accorded American citizens by representatives of the Veterans' Administration has been shocking and disgraceful. The contemptible methods used in many areas by Veterans' Administration representatives are, indeed, reprehensible.

On August 24, 1949, Congress enacted Public Law 266 following which the Veterans' Administration, with complete disregard for the

intent of that legislation, put into effect so-called Instruction I-A. As a result of that arrogance and the bitter acrimony which developed before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, S. 2596 was passed by the Senate and the Veterans' Administration was forced to withdraw Instruction I-A. In its place, they issued Instruction I-B, which is administered as though Instruction I-A had never been withdrawn.

S. 2596 attempts to clarify and define the relationship which should exist between the veterans, the training institutions, and the Veterans' Administration. It affords an effective right of appeal from arbitrary decisions with regard to customary tuition rates and, in justified instances, gives the training institution recourse to review by the courts.

It would also place reasonable limitations upon the Administrator's power to issue arbitrary and unreasonable regulations or administrative decrees. The attitude of Veterans' Administration officials has been that no one can stop them; and their contention has been upheld by recent court decisions, which have made the Veterans' Administration a haven of arrogance.

Unless Congress asserts itself and reaffirms its intention to train veterans as congress first wanted them trained, the Veterans' Administration will totally cripple the national program of vocational training.

This association is aware that there may be certain shortcomings in the field of vocational education and we attribute this to the sudden expansion necessary to meet the demands of the veterans' training program. The recent Veterans' Administration report to the Senate cites approximately 250 instances of alleged abuses on the part of various schools. We contend that these instances are the exception and not the rule. We further contend that the instances cited by the Veterans' Administration are substantially all the cases they could assemble and are cumulative over the 4-year period in which the veterans' training program has been in operation. In their entirety, they comprise less than 3 percent of all the private trade schools engaged in the veterans' training program.

We believe that the relations which now prevail between the Veterans' Administration and the private schools are in need of improvement. We believe that the provisions of S. 2596 will meet the needs of that situation and should eliminate a great many of the difficulties. We sincerely recommend favorable action when that legislation comes up for a vote.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. PARKER,
Washington Counsel.

AERONAUTICAL TRAINING SOCIETY,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1950.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: One of the provisions of H. R. 7422, the Wheeler bill, which has caused considerable concern to veterans attending trade schools including aviation schools is that beginning on line 14, page 13, which states:

"For the purposes of this part a course provided by a school for training in a skilled or semiskilled occupation which is customarily learned through apprenticeships or other training on the job shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 36 hours per week of attendance is required."

The concern is based upon the fact that the veteran attending a trade school to be regarded as taking a full-time course would be required to be in attendance at such a school up to three times as many hours as he would were he attending an accredited institution of higher learning. In substance H. R. 7422 suggests that if a GI is going to study to be an economist, business administrator, advertising man, or any other subject in an academic institution that 12 hours of class work is enough, if that is what the institution in question establishes as a minimum. If, however, a man is going to be a radio technician, a television expert, a watchmaker, an airline pilot or mechanic and is studying in a proprietary school, he should be required to put at least 36 hours a week in class. Up to now VA has considered 25 hours full time instruction in both private trade schools and public vocational schools including aviation schools.

The following table gives comparisons of the minimum hours of classroom attendance required by VA of veterans attending various types of courses in tax supported or private (proprietary) institutions:

Type of school	Present VA minimum requirement in hours for full course	Increase proposed by H. R. 7422
		Hours
For an accredited 4-year or junior college operating on unit of credit plan (under theory of 2 hours of outside work for each hour academic instruction)	12	None
For an accredited 4-year or junior college which has trade school offering course credits of which are transferable to State university	12	None
For an accredited 4-year or junior college which has trade or vocational school offering courses, credits of which are not transferable to State university or other accredited schools	25	None
For vocational and technical high schools or trade and industrial schools	25	None
For proprietary schools offering courses "for training in skilled or semiskilled occupation which is customarily learned through apprenticeships or training on the job"	25	36
For other types of private and proprietary vocational schools operating on clock-hour basis	25	None

While the above covers the principal classifications of schools presently doing training under the GI bill, A. L. Combes, Director of Education and Training Service of VA, informs me that in some cases based on individual investigation of the facts, unaccredited departments or schools of accredited academic institutions are permitted to operate under the semester credit hour basis, i. e., whatever the institutions require but in no case less than 12 hours of instruction a week. Information provided by the United States Office of Education indicates that both accredited academic institutions and vocational schools customarily offer more hours of instruction than the VA minimums. Most colleges and junior colleges require 15 or 16 hours of classroom attendance weekly in academic courses.

Students in most academic institutions are supposed to do 2 hours of outside study for every hour of attendance and those in technical schools are supposed to do 1 to 2 hours of outside work for every classroom hour. Outside work for trade schools varies widely because such a course as cobbling may require little or no outside study, while preparing for building electrical or textile trades demands considerable.

It should be remembered that there is no way VA can be sure that students devote 2 hours of outside study or any other for every hour in class in an academic institution or any other kind unless the institution sets up a cumbersome, expensive, and in most cases impossible system of supervised study. Policing extent of outside study is impossible in most institutions. In light of the facts, there appears to be no sound reason why VA should require a GI, who aspires to be a mechanic or technician, to be in class 36 hours a week while a boy who is headed for a Ph. D. or one of the professions need only put in 12.

For this reason, it appears that because of this and other burdensome and needless requirements, H. R. 7422 should be rejected.

Thanks for your fine leadership on matters dealing with the veteran and his rights.

Cordially yours,

WAYNE WIESHAAR,
Secretary.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Texas on the comprehensive report to the House concerning this bill, and wish to thank the chairman of the committee for the time he has given me.

To me this bill just puts into law some of the regulations of the Veterans' Administration that have been in effect for a long time. Most of the schools are for this bill for the reason that the Veterans' Administration has been arbitrarily interpreting some of the regulations to the detriment of the schools, holding up contracts sometimes 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7 months. Just 2 or 3 days ago I received notice from a school in my district that they had their contract confirmed and had received their back pay which had been held up for about 6 months. They had about decided to quit giving training to veterans unless something was done about the situation. This is one condition I know about personally.

There is a lot of dissension, too, in my State about flight training and something will have to be done to correct this situation. Veterans have a hard time getting in a flight-training school at all. One of the approval agencies has approved one student for commercial pilot training last August. That is the information given to me. Several have applied but no one seems to be able to get in.

I think it is time we put into law some of these regulations. We are all elected by our people to come here and make laws for the best interests of our State and Nation. I want to accept that responsibility and not turn it over to some agency downtown to arbitrarily assume this power, hold up contracts, and retard training for veterans.

With reference to the arguments made by the gentleman from New York as to the cost of the bill, I understand from the gentleman from Texas that he recently asked the Veterans' Administration the cost of the bill and they said $2,500,000. Am I correct about that?

Mr. TEAGUE. The VA stated that the reason this bill would cost any money was because it does away with the expiration date. I asked them to write an amendment which would correct that and that will be offered.

Mr. STAGGERS. I think that clarifies that issue. All this absurd talk about $2,000,000,000 has nothing to do with this matter. He said that is the latest information they have given to him. The reason the Veterans' Admin-

istration is against this is because it wants this power to arbitrarily do as it pleases. I have been trying to get things done for veterans in my district and in my State and every time I call on one of these bureaus down here they give me some run-around or whitewash on the question. I am getting tired of them telling Congress what to do. I do think the Members should think about this situation somewhat. This bill is for the veterans and it is going to help them. Of course, it is not going to hamper General Gray and his Administration; on the other hand, it should prove quite helpful.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I gather from the gentleman's remarks, which are in line with my own experience, that he has finally discovered it does not make much difference what laws the Congress passes, the administrators determine them as they want to?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am only a freshman Member of Congress, but I have run into those circumstances several times. I think it is high time that the Congress assume its responsibility.

We were elected by the people to take care of veterans as well as to make laws for the Nation. I want to see something done about this because I am getting complaints all the time from veterans in my district that they are not being properly taken care of. This bill should go through so that they will know exactly where they stand and so that they can say to the Veterans' Administration that they have certain rights and privileges granted to them by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired for general debate. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 9 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: *"Provided,* That the Administrator is not authorized to promulgate any regulation or instruction which denies or is designed to deny to any eligible person, or limit any eligible person in his right to select such course or courses as he may desire, during the full period of his entitlement or any remaining part thereof, in any approved educational or training institution or institutions, whether such courses are full time, part time, or correspondence courses: *Provided further*—

"A. That the Administrator shall disapprove a course in any institution which has been in operation for a period of less than 1 year immediately prior to the date of enrollment in such course unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949, but this shall not require or permit the disapproval of any course in (a) any public school or other tax-supported school, or (b) any branch within the same county or within a radius of 25 miles of a parent institution which parent institution has been in operation for a period of more than 1 year, or any course given by an institution which has been in operation for a period of more than 1 year which does not completely depart from the whole character of the instruction previously given by such institution. Upon the certification of any State approval agency that a new institution is essential to meet the requirements of veterans in such State, the Administrator in his discretion may approve such an institution notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph;

"B. That in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 (a) of this part, the Administrator may, for reasons satisfactory to him, disapprove a change of course of instruction and may discontinue any course of education or training if he finds that according to the regularly prescribed standards of the institution the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory;

"C. That the Administrator may require consultation by the veteran in case he has discontinued any course of education or training before completing the same, or in any case in which the veteran after completing a course of education or training decides to take another course in an entirely different general field, but after such consultation the Administrator shall have no right to refuse approval to a different course or an additional course in the same or any other field, except as limited by paragraph D below;

"D. That the Administrator shall refuse approval to any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, which is avocational or recreational in character. The following courses shall be presumed to be avocational or recreational in character: Dancing courses; photography courses; glider courses; bartending courses; personality-development courses; entertainment courses; music courses—instrumental and vocal; public-speaking courses; and courses in sports and athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling and sports officiating (except applied music, physical education, or public-speaking courses which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a course leading to an educational objective); but no such course shall be considered to be avocational or recreational in character if the veteran submits complete justification that such course will contribute to bona fide use in the veteran's present or contemplated business or occupation; and the Administrator may find any other course to be avocational or recreational in character, but no such other course shall be considered avocational or recreational in character when a certificate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two competent disinterested persons has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, education, or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation shall not, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be considered avocational or recreational when a certificate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two competent disinterested persons, has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 14, strike out "or any other" and insert: "general."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2596 and insert "That paragraph 9 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: *'Provided,* That, except as provided in the amendment, no regulation or other purported construction of title II, as amended, shall be deemed consistent therewith which denies or is designed to deny any eligible person, or limit any eligible person in his right to select such course or courses as he may desire, during the full period of his entitlement or any remaining part thereof, in any approved educational or training institution or institutions, whether such courses are full time, part time, or correspondence courses: *Provided further*—

" 'A. That the Administrator shall disapprove a course in any institution which has been in operation for a period of less than 1 year immediately prior to the date of enrollment in such course unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949, but this shall not require or permit the disapproval of any course in any public school or other tax-supported school;

" 'B. That in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 (a) of this part, the Administrator may, for reasons satisfactory to him, disapprove a change of course of instruction and may discontinue any course of education or training if he finds that according to the regularly prescribed standards of the institution the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory;

" 'C. That if any eligible veteran, who has completed or discontinued (for any reason other than unsatisfactory conduct or progress) a course of education or training, applies for an additional course in the same or other field of education or training, the Administrator may deny initiation of such course only if he finds (1) that it is precluded by the first proviso, paragraph 1 of said title II, as amended, or (2) that it is not in the same general field as his original educational or occupational objective, or (3) that it is precluded by limitation of paragraph "D" below;

" 'D. That the Administrator shall refuse approval to any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, which is avocational or recreational in character. The following courses shall be presumed to be avocational or recreational in character: Dancing courses, photography courses; glider courses; bartending courses; personality-development courses; entertainment courses: music courses—instrumental and vocal; public-speaking courses; and courses in sports and athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, and sports officiating (except applied music, physical education, or public-speaking courses which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a course leading to an educational objective); but no such course shall be considered to be avocational or recreational in character if the veteran submits complete justification that such course will contribute to bona fide use in the veteran's present or contemplated business or occupation; and the Administrator may find any other course to be avocational or recreational in character, but no such other course shall be considered avocational or recreational in character when a certificate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two competent disinterested persons has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation shall not, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be considered avocational or recreation when a certificate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two

competent disinterested persons, has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood.'

"SEC. 2. Paragraph 11 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (d) as follows:

"'(d) As used in this part, the term "customary cost of tuition" or "customary charges" or "customary tuition charges" shall mean that charge which an educational or training institution requires a nonveteran enrollee similarly circumstanced to pay as and for tuition for a course, except that the institution (other than a nonprofit institution of higher learning) is not regarded as having a "customary cost of tuition" for the course or courses in question in the following circumstances:

"'(A) Where the majority of the enrollment of the educational and training institution in the course in question consists of veterans in training under Public Laws 16 and 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended; and

"'(B) One of the following conditions prevails:

"'1. The institution has been established subsequent to June 22, 1944.

"'2. The institution, although established prior to June 22, 1944, has not been in continuous operation since that date.

"'3. The institution, although established prior to June 22, 1944, has subsequently increased its total tuition charges for the course to all students more than 25 percent.

"'4. The course (or a course of substantially the same length and character) was not provided for nonveteran students by the institution prior to June 22, 1944.

"'For any course of education or training for which the educational or training institution involved has no customary cost of tuition, a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges for such course shall be determined by the administrator. In any case in which one or more contracts providing a rate or rates of tuition have been executed for two successive years, the rate established by the most recent contract shall be considered to be the customary cost of tuition notwithstanding the definition of "customary cost of tuition" as hereinbefore set forth. For the purpose of the preceding sentence "contract" shall include contracts under Public Law 16 (78th Cong., Mar. 24, 1943), Public Law 346 (78th Cong., June 22, 1944), and any other agreement in writing on the basis of which tuition payments have been made from the Treasury of the United States. If the Administrator finds that any institution has no customary cost of tuition he shall forthwith fix and pay or cause to be paid a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, and other charges for the courses offered by such institution. Any educational or training institution which is dissatisfied with a determination of a rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges under the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, or with any other action of the Administrator under the amendments made by the Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1949, shall be entitled, upon application therefor, to a review of such determination or action (including the determination with respect to whether there is a customary cost of tuition) by a board to be known as the "Veterans' Education Appeals Board" consisting of three members, appointed by the President. Members of the Board shall receive, out of appropriations available for administrative expenses of the Veterans' Administration, compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the Board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall provide for the Board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions. Such Board shall be subject, in respect to hearings, appeals, and all other actions and qualifications, to the provisions of sections 5 to 11, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act, approved June 11, 1946, as amended. The decision of such Board with respect to all matters shall constitute the final administrative determination. In no event shall the Board fix a rate of payment in excess of the maximum amount allowable under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended.

"'Any institution having a "customary cost of tuition" established under this part may revise and improve an existing course (or establish a new related course) of substantially the same length and character subject to the same customary cost of tuition: *Provided*, That nothing in the foregoing amendments shall be construed to affect adversely any legal rights which have accrued prior to the date of enactment of the Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1949, or to affect payments to educational or training institutions under contracts in effect on such date: *Provided further*, That the Veterans' Administration shall continue to make further payments to a school at such amount as the Administrator considers to be "fair and reasonable" during negotiations for a contract, and, during the pendency of any appeal which the school may make.'

"SEC. 4. Paragraph 5 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*And provided further*, That for the purpose of applying the governing statutes and applicable regulations of the Veterans' Administration respecting the payment of tuition and other charges, in the case of nonprofit institutions, any institution shall be regarded as a nonprofit institution if it is exempt from taxation under paragraph (6), section 101, of the Internal Revenue Code, whether it was certified as such by the Bureau of Internal Revenue before or subsequent to June 22, 1944.'

"SEC. 5. The third sentence of section 3 of Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, is hereby amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: '(4) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of proprietary institutions for furnishing education and training under the provisions of part VIII of such regulation and in the supervision of such institutions.'

"SEC. 6. That paragraph 11 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph.

"'(e) 1. Any school operated for profit in order to secure or retain approval to train veterans which, during any period, has fewer than 25 students, or one-fourth of the students enrolled (whichever is larger), paying their own tuition, in addition to meeting all requirements of existing law, will be required to submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course or courses of training. The written application covering each course must include the following:

"'a. Title of the course and specific description of the objective for which given.

"'b. Length of course.

"'c. A detailed curriculum showing subjects taught, type of work or skills to be learned, and approximate length of time to be spent on each.

"'d. A showing of educational and experience qualifications of the instructors.

"'e. A description of space, facilities, and equipment used for the course.

"'f. A statement of the maximum number of students proposed to be trained in the course at one time.

"'g. A statement of the educational prerequisite for such a course.

"'2. The appropriate approving agency of the State or the Administrator may approve the application of such school when the school is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"'a. The curriculum and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in the public schools or other private schools with recognized and accepted standards.

"'b. There is in the school adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training. When approval is given, it shall state the maximum number authorized to be trained in each course.

"'c. Educational and experience qualifications of the instructor are adequate as determined by the State approval agency.

"'d. The salaries of teacher and administrative personnel are comparable to the prevailing salary rates of teachers and administrative personnel in similar schools located in the same area.

"'e. Adequate records are kept to show attendance, progress, and conduct, with periodic report to be provided to the Veterans' Administration; there are clearly stated and enforced standards of attendance, progress, and conduct.

"'f. Appropriate credit is given for previous training or experience, with training period shortened proportionately. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to a veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the course objective.

"'g. A copy of curriculum as approved is provided to the veteran and the Veterans' Administration by the school.

"'h. Upon completion of the training, the veteran is given a certificate by the school indicating the approved course, title, and length, and that the training was completed satisfactorily.

"'3. No new course, or additions to the capacity of existing course, in any school operated for profit, shall be approved if the State approving agency shall determine that the occupation for which the course is intended to provide training is crowded in the State and locality where the training is to be given and that existing training facilities are adequate.

"'4. The Veterans' Administration is not authorized to award benefits under this part if it is found by the appropriate State approving agency that the course offered by a school operated for profit fails to meet the applicable requirements of this subparagraph (e).'

"SEC. 7. Paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to insert '(a)' immediately after '6,' and adding the following new subparagraph:

"'(b) For the purpose of this part, a trade or technical course, offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level, involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 30 hours per week of attendance is required with not more than 30 minutes of rest period per day allowed. A course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or class-room instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 25 hours per week net of instruction is required.'

"SEC. 8. Paragraph 5 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after '5', and adding a new subparagraph (b) as follows:

"'(b) In any case where it is found that an overpayment to a veteran of subsistence

allowance (which overpayment has not been recovered or waived) is proved in a hearing before the Committee on Waivers of the appropriate Veterans' Administration regional office to be the result of willful or negligent failure of the school to report, as required by applicable regulation or contract, to the Veterans' Administration unauthorized or excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran, the amount of such overpayment shall, at the discretion of the Administrator, constitute a liability of the school for such failure to report, and may be recovered by an off-set from amounts otherwise due the school or in other appropriate action, provided that any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is received from the veteran. This amendment shall be construed as applying only to matters arising after the effective date of this amendment, and shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal action under any other statute.'

"SEC. 9. This act shall be effective the date of approval except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That section 7 shall be effective the first day of the third calendar month following the date of approval of this act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 5 shall be applied at the earliest practicable time in accordance with regulations issued by the Administrator.

"SEC. 10. The matter beginning with the first proviso in the item 'Readjustment benefits' under the caption 'Veterans' Administration' in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, approved August 24, 1949, is hereby repealed, effective August 24, 1949.

"SEC. 11. This act may be cited as the 'Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1949.'"

Mr. TEAGUE (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point thereof.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment ought to be read very carefully because even the average member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has never seen it. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized in support of the amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to yield to Members who have questions to ask.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to have the gentleman answer this question. If I understand it, there was some racketeering in certain trade schools. The Veterans' Administration some time ago issued a ruling to curb this racketeering and to protect the veterans as well as the Government from this racketeering in those trade schools; and in the issuance of this rule it went so far that it interfered with the legitimate rights of legitimate trade schools and thereby injured the veterans in the school that had signed up to conduct that legitimate trade school. The substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will simply correct that, but will still protect the veteran from the racketeering trade school and protect the Government from the racketeering trade school, and will secure administration for the legitimate school. Is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE. The Veterans' Administration admitted that they went too far in regulation 1 (a). They issued 1 (b), and practically everything that is in 1 (b) is in this bill. This bill does not in any way liberalize the GI bill. The same curbs that the Committee on Appropriations has put on fly-by-night schools are in this bill, making them permanent law instead of legislation on an appropriation bill, or instead of a regulation by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I understand the gentleman's bill, then, it is for the benefit of the veteran, for the benefit of the Veterans' Administration, for the protection of the Government, and the protection of the veteran.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And also to protect the good, legitimate trade schools that have been put on the approved list by the proper authorities in the various States?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. One further question. I understand that an amendment will be offered to the substitute amendment which has already been offered, and when that amendment is adopted it will guarantee that the additional cost to the Government will not exceed $2,300,000.

Mr. TEAGUE. I certainly will support that amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The only change in the printed bill is the elimination of section 3, beginning on page 8, and changing "1950" on page 14, and renumbering of the printed bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I have several questions in which I would like to suggest there are other changes, but I will do it on my own time and not take up the gentleman's time.

However, I would like to ask this one question. Is it not a fact that on page 6, beginning with line 19, and on down, are we not for the first time creating an appeals board outside of the agency, for something which occurs in the agency. Therefore, is that not a matter of policy which perhaps should have more consideration than we have given this afternoon. I do not want to take the gentleman's time for I should take my own time to discuss that.

Mr. TEAGUE. The appropriation bill No. 266 provides a Veterans' Appeals Board appointed by the Administrator. This bill makes the same Board except that it is appointed by the President of the United States, with the belief that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should not be judge and prosecutor at the same time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman's substitute bill fix a definite date for the termination of this program?

Mr. TEAGUE. I may say that it does not change the existing law which states that a man must be in training on July 1, 1951, and out by 1956, the very bill you people wrote 6 years ago. This bill does not change this in any way, form, or fashion.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Do we understand that you yourself are going to offer an amendment to substitute the provisions of this bill to provide that the cost shall not exceed $2,000,000, or substantially that amount?

Mr. TEAGUE. I would be very happy to offer the amendment. I do not have it prepared, but I would offer it and support it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the committee ought to understand this point definitely. I had understood that the gentleman was fostering such an amendment and would offer it.

Mr. TEAGUE. I have not drawn it, but I would be willing to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Some of us are much concerned about what this will cost. Here is a situation where some members of the committee say this bill will cost $2,000,000,000 plus; other members of the committee, including the gentleman from Texas, say the bill will cost $2,000,000 plus; our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas, who now occupies the floor, as I understood would stake his reputation and his life on the fact that the cost would not exceed $2,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is a valuable Member here, and we all like him. We who have been here longer would not stake our life on a proposition like that. If this bill as written can be administered for $2,000,000 it is the cheapest piece of legislation ever to come from the Veterans' Committee. I do not want the gentleman from Texas to find himself asking for execution.

I do want to condemn the committee for bringing in a bill under these circumstances. I want to go along. I like these regulations. You have practically put into writing, with improvements, what they have been doing down there. It is a good thing. But in these days of economy, personally, I doubt the wisdom of turning over to the Bureau unlimited authority without having more information about cost.

Mr. TEAGUE. I may say to the former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that if he will help me write this amendment that will limit the cost to $2,000,000 I will introduce it and support it.

Mr. MICHENER. I have written some of them, but the gentleman is very capable, and I am sure he can do a better job than can the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As was explained in the beginning, this Senate bill was reported out of the committee by a vote of 8 to 5

Mr. TEAGUE. We are not talking about the Senate bill now, but about the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood that the bill the gentleman from Texas is offering as an amendment is entirely different.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the gentleman from Texas is at heart a poet. I think we recognize poetic license when we see it with reference to any rigid figure in this or any other bill. I just talked on the telephone to a Mr. Stirling, Dr. Stirling, at the Veterans' Administration. He is the high muckety-muck down at VA with reference to this kind of legislation. Further, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] raised this question of $2,000,000,000 versus $2,000,000. Even as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I could recognize that discrepancy.

Dr. Stirling has assured me, and I told him I was going on down to assure the gentleman, that the Veterans' Administration, including Dr. Stirling, no longer is concerned with the figure of $2,000,000,000 with reference to this act. They recognize that that is no longer in issue. Their minds are at ease. I have permission to assure you there is only the question of the $2,000,000,000 with reference to a terminal date. The Veterans' Administration is satisfied. I cannot take his name in vain, but in a conversation in the last few minutes with the gentleman from New York, I believe he understands the situation as well, that the $2,000,000,000 is no longer before this committee with reference to this piece of legislation. There is only the figure of $2,300,000 which I think we will permit a judicial amount of elasticity with insofar as the long career of the gentleman from Texas in this House is concerned.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question? Did Mr. Stirling also say that the Veterans' Administration would feel that the substitution of the paragraph in H. R. 7380 for the paragraph on page 13 would be a preferable paragraph technically and would also save $200,000,000?

Mr. TEAGUE. Which paragraph on page 13?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Beginning with line 3, subparagraph (b). Apparently it is a paragraph which I have not been able to look up in H. R. 7830. He may understand what that is.

Mr. FLOOD. My answer to the first question is "no," Dr. Stirling did not so state. Although I mentioned that point to him, I indicated that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] had explained in his original statement on the bill that problem which concerns the gentleman from California and he satisfied me because I was likewise concerned about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words and I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. The point brought out by the gentleman from California is a very important one. The President in his message on February 13 recommended that all VA schools giving trade or technical courses be on a 36-hour basis. There is no doubt that would save a lot of money because it would drive practically all of your schools out of business. For example, in Louisiana all schools are based on 25 hours. In a conference between a representative of the Private Trade School Association and the Private Trade School Federation they said they did not like this language either. They say this language goes too far but it is a compromise with which they said they could live without destroying the schools. Does that answer the question?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes, I understand the intent of the section.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Was that the section, the section now numbered 6, which the gentleman from Texas said was the only one that in his judgment would cost any money? That is the section which in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas is the only one which he thinks will increase the expense?

Mr. TEAGUE. No, that would not increase the expenses.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additonal minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. On page 9, line 15 through 22, there is the section that the VA said will cost $2,300,000.

Mr. KEATING. That in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas is the only section which will result in additional cost by the enactment of this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman from Texas will permit me to make a preliminary statement, then I have other questions. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it wil be clear to the House the difficulties in which this bill is placing a good many of us. I am a veterans; my father was a veteran of the War Between the States; and five members of my immediate family are veterans of World War II. Obviously my record has been one of support and friendship for all of the needs of the veterans and the benefits which we extend to them and which will not react eventually against the veteran.

Before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, it was testified, regarding the probable cost of the original bill—and I think we should all understand, as the gentleman from Texas has said, that no one here thinks that the present bill, which will be referred to as the Teague bill, H. R. 8465, will cost anything like $2,000,000,000 or more. There was testimony that it would cost some money, and we would like to know how much, and also we would like to know some of the details of the expansion of the right to take courses. Only about 19 percent of the veterans are finishing the courses they take. The subcommittee on which I serve does not think that that is good for the veteran, just as we think that anything we can do to permit the veteran to get an education is what we should do. I supported the liberalization of the GI bill from the beginning. I felt that veterans should be permitted to take flight courses, because I wish everybody in the United States would become air-minded as some foreign countries have made their people air-minded. Yet, there was definite evidence that as soon as the 52–20 Club, as it was familiarly known, ceased, there was an immediate increase in the number of students who entered the vocational training courses.

The gentleman from Texas and I both are working toward the same objective, and that is to give education to the veterans where it will do some good. It has been testified that the cost involved in the right of the veterans to courses they may or may not take could go as high as thirty or forty or fifty or sixty billion dollars. That is a total figure. I am convinced we should, in some way, make it clear that we want the veterans to take courses, but that we do not want to liberalize the GI bill in the sense that a vocational course is to be used as a substitute for unemployment compensation.

Now, taking H. R. 8465, the paragraph at the beginning of page 2. Like all of you, I am trying to read it very hastily and come to some conclusion as to what it means, beginning with paragraph C. It seems to me to prevent the closing date for vocational courses and it seems to me that we have that now. Why is it necessary in this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this is writing it into permanent law, and today that is part of your appropriation amendment. This says that a man may change courses in the same general field. That was to keep men from, as the gentleman says, using vocational training for unemployment insurance, or taking first a barbering course, then a tailoring course, and then a cooking course.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If they want to do that now, they can. The only restriction we have placed upon them is that they must go to a vocational ad-

viser under the VA and explain they want it changed, but that they cannot change from barbering to meat cutting or flight training because they do not like the course. The record shows that one out of five of the veterans finish a course that they have started since the GI bill went into effect, and that is not good for the veteran's morale nor his character.

Now turn to page 6, please, and tell me why, beginning with line 9 and going down to line 15, it does not freeze in a necessity of having these contracts at the higher cost, even though they have been renegotiated by the Veterans' Administration satisfactorily to the school and the Veterans' Administration; why that would not require us to continue to pay out at the higher previous rate.

Mr. TEAGUE. The Subcommittee on Appropriations set up a Veterans' Appeals Board. If you were running a school and you had two contracts with the Veterans' Administration, the last contract that you had would be considered the customary cost. If the Veterans' Administration came along and said it should be reduced, you either have to take the reduction or take it to the Appeals Board, and the Appeals Board would decide what your contract should be.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. As I understand it, even though they were satisfied with the cost, they would have to return to the preceding higher cost.

Mr. TEAGUE. It would be the customary cost at that time. If the Veterans' Administration disagrees, it goes to the Veterans' Appeal Board.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Turn to page 11, line 18, where reference is made to similar schools. In my opinion the word should be public, because we are apparently paying an average of about twice the average public school teacher's salary. Would it not be better for the veteran if that word were "public" instead of "similar"? I am asking that not because I have any strong feeling but just to find out if it would not be better for the veteran.

Mr. TEAGUE. I cannot agree with the gentleman that you should base the salaries of private school teachers on those of public school teachers. For example, it costs much more to go to a private school than it does to go to a public school. That would certainly be unfair to the private schools, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Let me ask one more question. This has been a very hurried résumé of the bill by me.

On page 14, line 22, the date August 24, 1949, is stricken out, and with the passage of this act other wording will be substituted. I would read that to wipe out the restrictions placed in the appropriation bill; is that right?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is the gentleman sure that he has included in the bill the same desires of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. TEAGUE. I have read side by side the words of the Appropriations Committee and these words. It is in this bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. My own feeling regarding the bill is that the intent of the bill is excellent, but it is very difficult for us to understand it on such short notice.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. My position is pretty much the same as that of the gentleman from California and the Appropriations Committee as well, but I have resolved this thing since this matter started at 12 o'clock pretty clearly, and I am very much in favor of it now. I refer the gentleman to page 12, paragraph 3, as an additional argument now existing in the bill having to do with this question of new courses. I think that language is very strong. I do not know who wrote it or how it got there, but that satisfies one problem that concerns me:

> No new course, or additions to the capacity of existing course, in any school operated for profit, shall be approved if the State approving agency shall determine that the occupation for which the course is intended to provide training is crowded in the State and locality where the training is to be given and that existing training facilities are adequate.

I think that is a salutary provision.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. Certainly there is no Member of the House whom we would be more willing to follow in any matter of this kind than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. EVINS to the amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: On page 2, line 11, after the semicolon, add the following language: "*Provided*, That upon the certification of any State approval agency that a new or existing institution is essential to meet the requirements of veterans in such State, the Administrator in his discretion may approve such an institution, notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph."

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, this language is included in S. 2596, and gives the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs the discretion to approve a new school where it is certified by the State as needed and necessary. This language will take care of existing schools presently in operation that have already been approved and are accredited and are living up to high standards.

It was my understanding that language was to be included in the substitute bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Under the terms of the gentleman's amendment which is to be inserted following the word "school" in line 11, page 2 of the substitute, a school which had been certified would be entitled to be considered notwithstanding the fact that the certification had not been for a year prior to August 24, 1949?

Mr. EVINS. That is correct. That is if the school comes up to accredited standards.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. FORD. This particular amendment hits at the problem which all of us have been trying to solve where we found certain discriminations against schools for one reason or another, which could not qualify under the legislation which was approved a year or so ago. It does not say that any fly-by-night school can be approved. The Administrator can still disapprove such applications. It simply says that in a meritorious case the State agency can certify the school as being meritorious and it then leaves the final discretion in the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman's amendment also will take the monopoly away from those who are already in the field.

Mr. EVINS. That is correct, and it keeps from freezing this in the hands of existing schools in the event there is a meritorious school which comes up to the standards.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Or the standards as they existed on August 24, 1949.

Mr. EVINS. That is right. I think it ought to be made clear in the RECORD. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is also interested in this amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. I might say that I had proposed to introduce this amendment, but was glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is of course a member of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who, I understand, will offer no objection to this amendment although he did not originally write this language in his substitute bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] who is not present, I must state that the gentleman from Georgia would not agree to this amendment and it was taken out as a compromise. It was put in originally to take care of those schools that had been done an injustice last year when that provision was made retroactive. In other words, if the school had operated 9 months, and spent a great deal of money, when we passed 266, it was suddenly cut out. I certainly am not in favor of establishing new schools or opening the door, but I do think if we can take care of those schools that have been done an injustice, that should be done.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Does this still leave the decision up to the Veterans' Administrator, or is it mandatory?

Mr. EVINS. No, it leaves the discretionary power with the Administrator.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I address this question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]; is it not a fact that this would in effect add to the cost and add schools which otherwise would not get on the list? Is it not a fact it would add to the cost of the bill?

Mr. EVINS. It takes care of existing schools and those that may be certified by the State agencies as necessary. It does not freeze things and create a monopoly for existing schools or close the door. It does not, I might say to the gentleman, have anything to do with the termination date of the act which is drawing near.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] satisfied?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from California has said is true, it would cost more for any new schools that are put into operation.

Mr. EVINS. That is a possibility.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is an obvious fact.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. How can it cost more if a veteran attends an existing school or one that may be established in the future? What difference does it make to the Government if the veterans attend a school which has been in existence for 12 months or 10 months?

Mr. TEAGUE. It might cost more.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, the gentleman says it might, but it cannot cost more.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHELLEY to the Teague amendment: On page 9, line 20, insert before the quotation marks a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That for the purpose of applying the governing statutes and applicable regulations of the Veterans' Administration respecting the payment of tuition and other charges, any professional or graduate school which has been continuously affiliated with an educational institution since June 22, 1944, may elect to be subject to the nonresident tuition rates established for such educational institution, with respect to payments made for tuition during any school year beginning on or after August 1, 1949, even though the administrative function of such school is separate and distinct from that of the institution with which it is affiliated."

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to clear up a situation that exists at the University of California School of Law, Hastings Law School, which I have been informed exists in several other universities in regard to their professional or graduate schools, such as engineering, medicine, or law. Hastings Law School of the University was originally started as a private venture some years back. The early part of the century it was taken over by the University of California as an affiliated school. It is now formally a part of the university and is recognized as such by the State legislature. Its funds are appropriated in the general appropriation bill. The California Supreme Court has rendered decisions declaring it to be an integral part of the State university, but it has continued to keep a separate governing board, practically all of whom are attorneys, because it is a law school. Due to that separate function, the Veterans' Administration ruled that they were in a different position and could not be treated on the same basis as the university proper. First, the Veterans' Administration said, "You are not really affiliated. You are a separate school." Now they have said, "We do not say that, but since you are not on the campus exactly"—Hastings conducts classes in the city of San Francisco—"we have to declare you as not being under the definition." And they have changed the allotment to the school.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad the gentleman brought this up. I personally have not been able to understand the ruling of the Veterans' Administration in this respect. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I join in the sentiment expressed by my colleague from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I think this is a very meritorious amendment and will clear up the situation.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. I am very glad the gentleman has brought up this amendment, because there has been some difficulty in this very extraordinarily fine school in San Francisco, connected with the university. I compliment you on bringing it up.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is it not a fact that the amendment just adopted will take care of the situation the gentleman speaks of? In other words, what they call a new school—a school that had not been in existence for a year. That is the reason they refused to recognize it?

Mr. SHELLEY. No. I am sorry. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] will not take care of it. This is not a new school. It is a question of definition, whether or not they are a part of the University of California which they do recognize. It will take this amendment to correct the situation to which I referred, as it applies to graduate or professional schools. The Hastings School of Law was recognized and the students were given an allotment for four and a half years, but on September 1 last year they were suddenly put in a different category by the Veterans' Administration on what we think is an extremely flimsy basis, if there is any basis at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is one concerning which I have personal knowledge. It applies primarily to a college in the northern part of the State, but it would affect schools in other States. I am in support of the amendment.

However, I take this time to ask something of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]—I have just been called from the floor by a telephone call. It was from Mr. Stirling, of the VA. I had not previously called him. He authorized me to make this statement: You understand he is not expressing opposition to the bill, but evidently he had been sent an inquiry from the Committee on Appropriations as to how much the bill would probably cost. He authorizes me to say that the section beginning on page 6, line 9, and extending to the first word on line 15, has been estimated by their accountant to cost $15,000,000 for the year 1951.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does not the gentleman from California feel that all these telephone calls and conversations should be made to the Veterans' Affairs Committee where the representatives of the Veterans' Administration can testify definitely?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am in complete agreement. I felt that since we have had these various figures—and I am just as much confused, if not more so, than anybody on the floor—I wanted to give the gentleman from Texas a chance to know this, in connection with his statement that it could not cost more than $2,000,000. He should explore the discrepancy between these various figures.

Mr. TEAGUE. My information came from members of the Appropriations Committee. I should like to read from the appropriation bill:

In any case in which one or more contracts provide a rate or rates of tuition have been executed for two successive years the rate established by the most recent contract shall be considered to be the customary cost of tuition. * * * If the Administrator finds that any institution has no customary cost of tuition he shall forthwith fix and pay or cause to be paid a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, and other charges for the courses offered by such institution.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. This is the item which I questioned earlier.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes. I was told by some of the members of the Committee on Appropriations that they meant that if they had had two contracts, Public Law 16 which covers the disabled men, and Public Law 341 which covers all

others, if they had had two of those contracts that the last contract would be the one that was in effect.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I have nothing further to say. I ask for a favorable vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak generally on the subject of the obligation of the people of the United States toward their representatives to take care of certain principles which they set up in the GI bill of rights. There has been quite a bit of talk here as to the cost of this; it has ranged from two and one-half billions, which is absurd, down to $2,300,000.

In the first place, the whole educational and vocational training program, as I understand, is costing at the present time about $2,500,000,000, and there are about 2,180,000 GI's enrolled in these courses. To say that it would cost another $2,500,000,000 is absurd; it would mean doubling the number of GI's going to school. So that kind of argument can be ignored.

As to whether this will cost $2,000,000, $3,000,000, or $15,000,000, I wonder if we are not losing sight of the main point? The main point is that the Congress of the United States said that the veterans would have a right for certain educational and vocational training. Whether it costs $15,000,000 more per year until the eligible number are taken care of, or $3,000,000, is beside the point. I realize that we are in an economy wave, but we are not in an economy wave that is so strong that we can ignore the expressed obligation of the Congress to give to these boys the kind of training that they need.

I know of many cases in my own district, and I know every other Member knows of boys who have had vocational training or educational training and have thereby been able to earn much greater annual salaries than if they had not had such training. What does that mean? That means that when they start earning $4,000, $5,000, $6,000, or $7,000 a year in place of the $50 or $60 a week as an untrained laborer, that they proportionately pay more into the Treasury of the United States as income tax. I think we should not lose track of the fact that this is actually an investment in these boys, an investment which will come back manyfold to the people of the United States. I also want to mention the benefits that it will give to the individual involved and to their families in the way of a higher standard of living, because of implementing the wishes of the Congress, we are giving these boys a chance to train themselves to get on a higher earning level. We are making a real investment in our citizens and we are discharging an obligation to those boys who were willing to invest the most valuable thing they had, their life, if necessary to preserve the country that we all love.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean on all of the amendments?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin have an amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; I do not, but I have about 2 minutes of comment I would like to make.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the motion until the gentleman from Wisconsin gets those 2 minutes out of his system.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill, because I find myself, I believe, in the position of a vast majority of the members of our committee. We hardly know enough about this bill to be able to enlighten the Members on the floor about it. It is a fact that we have not had proper hearings on it, so it does catch all of us, sincere as we are in our attempt to do something that will remedy abuses that have occurred and do justice to the veterans in their honest desire to obtain the educational benefits under the GI bill of rights. So we are caught between two fires.

In the first place, we realize it is the responsibility of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to write this kind of legislation. In the past too often we have seen the regulations affecting this educational program handled either by decree or by regulation of the Veterans' Administrator, which is not the proper way to handle it, or we have seen it handled through riders on appropriation bills, riders that have been made necessary because of the fact that our legislative committee has not provided by legislation the regulations that are needed for guidance under this program. So I think we all agree that this bill represents the proper approach to the problem we have before us, but, as I say, the approach is hardly enough. The fact remains that our committee has not followed through on this proper approach. This is not a committee bill.

I want to pay my high compliments to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] who have spent long hours, and tedious and studious hours, in attempting to do a job that ought to be done by the committee as a whole. I believe this is better than anything we have had by regulation in the past, but because it is not a committee bill I am going to be compelled to vote for the motion to recommit, and I shall do that with great reluctance because I fear if the motion does carry and the bill does go back to our committee, the committee will not bring out the kind of legislation we ought to have. Because I cannot as a member of that committee in good conscience recommend to the Members of this House that they support a bill which has not had hearings before our committee, as I say, I shall reluctantly and with great deference to the work which my very esteemed colleague from Texas has done on this matter, vote for the motion to recommit that will be offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened attentively to the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. As I understand, this is an attempt to put into substantive legislation the very regulations that are now effective under regulations of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TEACUE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. KEEFE. If that is true, then why the urgency for the passage of this bill, and why not hold hearings on this proposal and let us get the facts as to the cost, because if the statement which the gentleman agrees with is correct, no harm or injury is going to occur to the veteran, because he proposes to incorporate into substantive law the actual situation that now prevails under regulations. I am inclined to agree with my colleague from Wisconsin that this is a hasty way to bring legislation here without hearings, without an opportunity on the part of the Members to give this matter the study that it ought to receive. I shall support the proposal to return this measure to the committee with the hope that the committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi will hold hearings on this bill so that the Members will know what is in it and not have the equivocation that is apparent here this morning as to the cost, and other things. I think that is a proper legislative way to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this morning I called the Veterans' Administration about 9 o'clock and asked them to give me a breakdown of the cost of this substitute bill. I was advised that they had not had an opportunity to do that and had not made a study. So, a few minutes ago I was called and they said they had made the study, and I understand one of the sections has been stricken, but the point is that the entire cost, as a minimum estimate, will be $77,300,000.

Mr. TEAGUE. What section?

Mr. THOMAS. They said two sections. They said that two sections would cost $75,000,000, and the contribution to the State would be $2,300,000.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish the gentleman would not try to usurp the functions

of the Committee on Appropriations of the Veterans' Administration. I have in my hands the figures which the clerk of the gentleman's committee provided me this morning. We had a lot of controversy about the cost.

Mr. THOMAS. This is a conversation I had with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. EVINS. This controversy I had was with the clerk of the gentleman's own committee. He gave the figures for 1949, 1950, and 1951, and I have the figures here.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I had this conversation less than 10 minutes ago. The total cost—I am quoting them; it is their figure and not mine, because I do not know what is in the bill, and if I had known I would not have called them, of course—was $77,300,000.

My point is this. I do not yield to any man on this floor in my desire to help the veteran, but as sure as I am talking to you gentlemen, if we keep on adding benefits and benefits, where are we headed for? Certainly, there is no demand from the veterans themselves, for this bill; let us not fool ourselves about that. There is a handful of proprietary schools that are not happy and satisfied. Not all of them are unhappy, of course, because most of them have made sufficient money out of other bills and they are not unhappy. And, if we keep on yielding to that sort of pressure we are going to drive these veterans into an economic situation that I am so afraid of, and my goodness alive, what a horrible thing it will be for the veterans. Nobody wants to do that. I am trying to talk just a little common horse sense. Now, you all want to help the veteran just as I do, but we must do it within reason. Let us recommit this bill and let the distinguished gentleman from Texas and his subcommittee study this thing carefully. There is no finer man on this floor or anywhere else than my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. He has a great and distinguished war record; a man that has gone through the shadows of death himself in battle and has impairment of health that he will carry to his grave. But I suggest that he take this bill back to his committee and give it the consideration and the study he is capable of giving it. If he gives it the necessary time and has the proper assistance, it is my judgment he will come back with a good, sufficient, and sound answer. When he comes back and reports it to this House, I will accept his judgment under those circumstances.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I want to echo the thoughts of the gentleman from Texas in reference to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. I say this because in the first instance, the cost of this bill was two-million-dollars-something, after the first telephone conversation it came to $15,000,000, and now it is $77,000,000. If we keep legislating by telephone it may run to $100,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. There is some honest difference of opinion there.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure the other Members appreciate, as I do, the fact that the gentleman is insisting on clarifying this matter in order that we may all know just where we are.

Our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] a few minutes ago said he intended to offer an amendment that would give assurance that this legislation would not cost more than $2,300,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us not do it by piecemeal. Let us do it in the right way, and go back and give him a chance to work it out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944), pursuant to House Resolution 447, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 163]

Abbitt	Combs	Green
Angell	Cooley	Hall,
Bailey	Coudert	Leonard W.
Barrett, Pa.	Davenport	Hare
Biemiller	Davies, N. Y.	Harrison
Bolton, Ohio	Davis, Tenn.	Hays, Ark.
Bonner	Dawson	Hébert
Boykin	Deane	Hill
Breen	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Buchanan	Dingell	Jackson, Wash.
Buckley, N. Y.	Dollinger	James
Bulwinkle	Douglas	Jones, N. C.
Burton	Durham	Judd
Byrne, N. Y.	Ellsworth	Kee
Cannon	Engel, Mich.	Kennedy
Carlyle	Gilmer	Kilburn
Case, S. Dak.	Golden	Klein
Cavalcante	Gordon	Kunkel
Christopher	Gore	LeCompte
Chudoff	Granahan	Lodge
Clemente	Granger	Lyle
McCarthy	Murphy	Shafer
McConnell	O'Neill	Sheppard
McKinnon	Patten	Sims
McMillan, S. C.	Pfeifer,	Smathers
McMillen, Ill.	Joseph L.	Smith, Ohio
McSweeney	Pfeiffer,	Stockman
Mack, Wash.	William L.	Towe
Macy	Potter	Vorys
Mansfield	Powell	Walsh
Martin, Iowa	Quinn	Werdel
Miles	Redden	Wheeler
Miller, Calif.	Rhodes	White, Calif.
Mitchell	Roosevelt	White, Idaho
Monroney	Sabath	Wolcott
Morgan	Scott, Hardie	Wolverton
Morrison	Scott,	Wood
Multer	Hugh D., Jr.	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TRAINING OF VETERANS UNDER SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KEARNEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEARNEY moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for further study and for full and complete public hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEARNEY) there were—ayes 102, noes 145.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The bill as passed is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That paragraph 9 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Provided, That except as provided in this amendment, no regulation or other purported construction of title II, as amended, shall be deemed consistent therewith which denies or is designed to deny any eligible person, or limit any eligible person

in his right to select such course or courses as he may desire, during the full period of his entitlement or any remaining part thereof, in any approved educational or training institution or institutions, whether such courses are full time, part time, or correspondence courses: *Provided further*—

"'A. That the Administrator shall disapprove a course in any institution which has been in operation for a period of less than 1 year immediately prior to the date of enrollment in such course unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949, but this shall not require or permit the disapproval of any course in any public school or other tax-supported school: *Provided,* That upon the certification of any State approval agency, that a new or existing institution is essential to meet the requirements of veterans in such State, the Administrator in his discretion may approve such an institution notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph;

"'B. That in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 8 (a) of this part, the Administrator may, for reasons satisfactory to him, disapprove a change of course of instruction and may discontinue any course of education or training if he finds that according to the regularly prescribed standards of the institution the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory;

"'C. That if any eligible veteran, who has completed or discontinued (for any reason other than unsatisfactory conduct or progress) a course of education or training, applies for an additional course in the same or other field of education or training, the Administrator may deny initiation of such course only if he finds (1) that it is precluded by the first proviso, paragraph 1 of said title II, as amended, or (2) that it is not in the same general field as his original educational or occupational objective, or (3) that it is precluded by limitation of paragraph D below;

"'D. That the Administrator shall refuse approval to any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, which is avocational or recreational in character. The following courses shall be presumed to be avocational or recreational in character: Dancing courses; photography courses; glider courses; bartending courses; personality-development courses; entertainment courses: Music courses—instrumental and vocal; public-speaking courses; and courses in sports and athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, and sports officiating (except applied music, physical education, or public-speaking courses which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a course leading to an educational objective); but no such course shall be considered to be avocational or recreational in character if the veteran submits complete justification that such course will contribute to bona fide use in the veteran's present or contemplated business or occupation; and the Administrator may find any other course to be avocational or recreational in character, but no such other course shall be considered avocational or recreational in character when a certificate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two competent disinterested persons has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation shall not, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be considered avocational or recreational when a certificate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two competent disinterested persons, has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood.'

"SEC. 2. Paragraph 11 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (d) as follows:

"'(d) As used in this part, the term "customary cost of tuition" or "customary charges" or "customary tuition charges" shall mean that charge which an educational or training institution requires a nonveteran enrollee similarly circumstanced to pay as and for tuition for a course, except that the institution (other than a nonprofit institution of higher learning) is not regarded as having a "customary cost of tuition" for the course or courses in question in the following circumstances:

"'(A) Where the majority of the enrollment of the educational and training institution in the course in question consists of veterans in training under Public Laws 16 and 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended; and

"'(B) One of the following conditions prevails:

"'1. The institution has been established subsequent to June 22, 1944.

"'2. The institution, although established prior to June 22, 1944, has not been in continuous operation since that date.

"'3. The institution, although established prior to June 22, 1944, has subsequently increased its total tuition charges for the course to all students more than 25 percent.

"'4. The course (or a course of substantially the same length and character) was not provided for nonveteran students by the institution prior to June 22, 1944.

"'For any course of education or training for which the educational or training institution involved has no customary cost of tuition, a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges for such course shall be determined by the Administrator. In any case in which one or more contracts providing a rate or rates of tuition have been executed for two successive years, the rate established by the most recent contract shall be considered to be the customary cost of tuition notwithstanding the definition of "customary cost of tuition" as hereinbefore set forth. For the purpose of the preceding sentence "contract" shall include contracts under Public Law 16 (78th Cong., March 24, 1943), Public Law 346 (78th Cong., June 22, 1944), and any other agreement in writing on the basis of which tuition payments have been made from the Treasury of the United States. If the Administrator finds that any institution has no customary cost of tuition he shall forthwith fix and pay or cause to be paid a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, and other charges for the courses offered by such institution. Any educational or training institution which is dissatisfied with a determination of a rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges under the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, or with any other action of the Administrator under the amendments made by the Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1949, shall be entitled, upon application therefor, to a review of such determination or action (including the determination with respect to whether there is a customary cost of tuition) by a board to be known as the "Veterans' Education Appeals Board" consisting of three members, appointed by the President. Members of the Board shall receive, out of appropriations available for administrative expenses of the Veterans' Administration, compensation at the rate of $50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the Board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall provide for the Board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions. Such Board shall be subject, in respect to hearings, appeals, and all other actions and qualifications, to the provisions of sections 5 to 11, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act, approved June 11, 1946, as amended. The decision of such Board with respect to all matters shall constitute the final administrative determination. In no event shall the Board fix a rate of payment in excess of the maximum amount allowable under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended.

"'Any institution having a "customary cost of tuition" established under this part may revise and improve an existing course (or establish a new related course) of substantially the same length and character subject to the same customary cost of tuition: *Provided,* That nothing in the foregoing amendments shall be construed to affect adversely any legal rights which have accrued prior to the date of enactment of the Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1949, or to affect payments to educational or training institutions under contracts in effect on such date: *Provided further,* That the Veterans' Administration shall continue to make further payments to a school at such amount as the Administrator considers to be "fair and reasonable" during negotiations for a contract, and, during the pendency of any appeal which the school may make.'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph 5 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*And provided further,* That for the purpose of applying the governing statutes and applicable regulations of the Veterans' Administration respecting the payment of tuition and other charges, in the case of nonprofit institutions, any institution shall be regarded as a nonprofit institution if it is exempt from taxation under paragraph (6), section 101, of the Internal Revenue Code, whether it was certified as such by the Bureau of Internal Revenue before or subsequent to June 22, 1944: *And provided further,* That for the purpose of applying the governing statutes and applicable regulations of the Veterans' Administration respecting the payment of tuition and other charges, any professional or graduate school which has been continuously affiliated with an educational institution since June 22, 1944, may elect to be subject to the nonresident tuition rates established for such educational institution, with respect to payments made for tuition during any school year beginning on or after August 1, 1949, even though the administrative function of such school is separate and distinct from that of the institution with which it is affiliated.'

"SEC. 4. The third sentence of section 3 of Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, is hereby amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following : '(4) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of proprietary institutions for furnishing education and training under the provisions of part VIII of such regulation and in the supervision of such institutions.'

"SEC. 5. That paragraph 11 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"'(e) 1. Any school operated for profit in order to secure or retain approval to train veterans which, during any period, has fewer than 25 students, or one-fourth of the students enrolled (whichever is larger), paying

their own tuition, in addition to meeting all requirements of existing law, will be required to submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course or courses of training. The written application covering each course must include the following:

" 'a. Title of the course and specific description of the objective for which given.

" 'b. Length of course.

" 'c. A detailed curriculum showing subjects taught, type of work or skills to be learned, and approximate length of time to be spent on each.

" 'd. A showing of educational and experience qualifications of the instructors.

" 'e. A description of space, facilities, and equipment used for the course.

" 'f. A statement of the maximum number of students proposed to be trained in the course at one time.

" 'g. A statement of the educational prerequisite for such a course.

" '2. The appropriate approving agency of the State or the Administrator may approve the application of such school when the school is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

" 'a. The curriculum and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in the public schools or other private schools with recognized and accepted standards.

" 'b. There is in the school adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training. When approval is given, it shall state the maximum number authorized to be trained in each course.

" 'c. Educational and experience qualifications of the instructor are adequate as determined by the State approval agency.

" 'd. The salaries of teacher and administrative personnel are comparable to the prevailing salary rates of teachers and administrative personnel in similar schools located in the same area.

" 'e. Adequate records are kept to show attendance, progress, and conduct, with periodic report to be provided to the Veterans' Administration; there are clearly stated and enforced standards of attendance, progress, and conduct.

" 'f. Appropriate credit is given for previous training or experience, with training period shortened proportionately. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to a veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the course objective.

" 'g. A copy of curriculum as approved is provided to the veteran and the Veterans' Administration by the school.

" 'h. Upon completion of the training, the veteran is given a certificate by the school indicating the approved course, title, and length, and that the training was completed satisfactorily.

" '3. No new course, or additions to the capacity of existing course, in any school operated for profit, shall be approved if the State approving agency shall determine that the occupation for which the course is intended to provide training is crowded in the State and locality where the training is to be given and that existing training facilities are adequate.

" '4. The Veterans' Administration is not authorized to award benefits under this part if it is found by the appropriate State approving agency that the course offered by a school operated for profit fails to meet the applicable requirements of this subparagraph (e).'

"SEC. 6. Paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to insert '(a)' immediately after '6,' and adding the following new subparagraph:

" '(b) For the purpose of this part, a trade or technical course, offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level, involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 30 hours per week of attendance is required with not more than 30 minutes of rest period per day allowed. A course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 25 hours per week net of instruction is required.'

"SEC. 7. Paragraph 5 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after '5,' and adding a new subparagraph (b) as follows:

" '(b) In any case where it is found that an overpayment to a veteran of subsistence allowance (which overpayment has not been recovered or waived) is proved in a hearing before the Committee on Waivers of the appropriate Veterans' Administration regional office to be the result of willful or negligent failure of the school to report, as required by applicable regulation or contract, to the Veterans' Administration unauthorized or excessive absences from a course, or discontinuances or interruption of a course by the veteran, the amount of such overpayment shall, at the discretion of the Administrator, constitute a liability of the school for such failure to report, and may be recovered by an offset from amounts otherwise due the school or in other appropriate action, provided that any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is received from the veteran. This amendment shall be construed as applying only to matters arising after the effective date of this amendment, and shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal action under any other statute.'

"SEC. 8. This act shall be effective the date of approval, except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That section 5 shall be effective the first day of the third calendar month following the date of approval of this act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 4 shall be applied at the earliest practicable time in accordance with regulations issued by the Administrator.

"SEC. 9. The matter beginning with the first proviso in the item 'Readjustment benefits' under the caption 'Veterans' Administration' in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, approved August 24, 1949, is hereby repealed, effective August 24, 1949.

"SEC. 10. This act may be cited as the 'Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1950.' "

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to make an announcement of importance to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, for the last several years there has been a congressional baseball game played between Democrats and Republicans. The benefits go to the summer encampment of underprivileged children of the District of Columbia.

I have the honor again to be designated by my colleagues on the Democratic side to undertake to manage this bunch of rugged individualists. I wish to announce to the House of Representatives today that arrangements have been made with the management of Griffith Stadium, with the sponsors, the Washington Evening Star, and others in the District of Columbia interested in this worth while undertaking that on a week from next Friday, that is, on the 19th of May, at 8:30 o'clock p. m., this annual game will be played.

We know that to make it another successful event it will be necessary to have the cooperation of the Members of the Congress and those downtown willing to participate.

The Secretary of Defense has very graciously and courteously consented to allow the bands from the various branches of the service to participate on that occasion. I am sure you will find participation in this worthy cause will be very gratifying and will make you feel glad of your efforts. Last year the receipts from this game afforded an opportunity to several hundred underprivileged childen of the District of Columbia to attend a summer camp who otherwise might have been on the streets, perhaps in the slums here in the District of Columbia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to my colleague and rival manager, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP], who will manage the Republican team again, and let him make such statement as he wishes for the benefit of our friends on the other side.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the Members to the fact that they have been listening to OREN HARRIS and not Bucky Harris. Last year the Republicans might have been a little bit overconfident, but this year we are getting down to real business. We have a few new faces on the team and we know we are going to give the Democrats plenty of trouble. We were also informed last night, and as you might know from the press, that we may have some assistance from the Senate side. With that additional assistance, which I acknowledge we need, you are going to see a good ball game for a good cause. We are hoping for an ideal night, so that you can come out and enjoy yourselves. Last year we netted about $6,500 from the game, which was spent, as our colleague Mr. HARRIS has told you, to send the underprivileged children of the District to a summer camp. This year in this special effort that the Star and their friends are going to make along with the Members of Congress we hope that we can raise that to $10,000 to help the underprivileged children of the District without regard to race, creed, or color.

So it is up to you and your families to go out and enjoy yourselves. I hope you will enjoy our efforts. We hope we have not waited too long. I know we are going to give you the best we have.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of my distinguished rival manager. It has been reported around here that they have been going out early in the morning and trying to make us think that they are going out at 9 o'clock to practice. The fact is that the pages of the House did challenge them to a game a few days ago. They came back here and reported that they defeated the pages 7 to 3. The truth is, I am reliably informed, that the pages defeated the Republicans 17 to 2.

You realize that on our side of the House we have a bunch of fellows who

call themselves rugged individualists, and as manager I have already run into a lot of trouble. For instance, I have one Member who said to me, "You better play fair with me this time because very frankly where I come from I can go over to the Republican side as well as the Democratic side."

That gives me no little concern. I found out that our star pitcher, a man who, of course, has been doing a fairly good job for us the last couple of years, lives down in Georgia and may not be here. I got to checking into it and it looks like the National Defense Establishment has colluded with the Republicans and called our pitcher back to Georgia. It seems he is going to have to be detained for Army Day. I do not know why they have Army Day the next day after this ball game.

Then, another development has caused the manager a great deal of concern. I notice in the Star this afternoon that we have a hold-out. I may get TOM PICKETT out there. He is the best performer we have. I am not sure that he has rendered the greatest benefit to the team other than being a performer, but if my Democratic friends would allow me to take them into my confidence, I would ask them to help get this star performer, TOM PICKETT, out there for his usual performance.

Mr. BISHOP. May I call attention to the fact that the first question the manager on the Republican side would ask this hold-out is, "What kind of a ballplayer are you?"

I might call attention to the fact that this snooper had a lot of help. This is a true story. One of the sons of a gentleman from the opposite side of the House, who happens to be on the right side of the aisle, had his son out there watching every ball that was being thrown.

When we get to the pages' side of this, the biggest boy that came to me said, "You all know that we are not just playing Democrats in this, don't you?" I said I presumed that all the pages were going to participate, and they came out. The pages participated on both sides. We did not have enough to fill the uniforms. May I tell you seriously we are urging the Republicans to turn out so that we will have enough to fill all the uniforms on the night of the nineteenth, but with the help of the pages assigned to us we made a few innings out there and the actual score was 6 to 4, by calling the game so that we could get back to our offices and do some work. Of course I do not know how many were on bases at the time, but there were not over three.

Mr. HARRIS. We are glad to have that clarification.

There is another development that my team mates had better take notice of. One of the ladies in this House may participate in this game. She has notified us by letter and I talked to her about it. So I can say to these so-called hold-outs that we are going to have a great deal of rivalry on this team and a lot of competition. However, seriously speaking, the game is to be played for a very worthy cause, and we would appreciate a good attendance.

Mrs. BOSONE. To clear this up, I am not that woman.

Mr. HARRIS. I would say to my distinguished colleague we would be very happy for her to join with us.

Mr. BISHOP. The ladies on our side have been invited; but they said they loved baseball, but they did not think they would be there in uniform that evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has expired.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 5, President Truman requested the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee to direct his attention to the establishment of statehood for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. I am inserting President's Truman's letter in today's RECORD.

The momentum of recent events makes it certain that before long both Alaska and Hawaii will possess an equal voice in directing the affairs of this great Nation. Just how imminent is a 50-State Nation depends on the swiftness of Senate action. And there is every indication that such action may come sooner than anyone expects.

One of the corollary problems attendant to the establishment of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is the significant change which will take place in the American flag when these new States are added. These are momentous times for Old Glory too. In the past, our flag has been changed without rhyme or reason, or, to be more exact, without congressional direction, whenever a new State has come into the Union. For this reason, I have introduced a resolution to establish a committee of this great body to hold hearings and make recommendations regarding the appearance of our new flag, or, should I say, our New Glory. I am certain that the passage of this resolution will insure us of a New Glory worthy of our hallowed institutions.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 5, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am highly gratified by the thorough and objective consideration which your committee is giving to H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, bills which would enable the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to take their rightful place as members of the Union. As you know, I have long supported the objectives of these important bills which carry out the pledges made to the people of the two Territories. I sincerely hope that the Congress, during its present session, will enact legislation granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. The need is more urgent today than ever before. By such action, we will not only promote the welfare and development of the two Territories, but also greatly strengthen the security of our Nation as a whole.

It should not be forgotten that most of our present States achieved statehood at a relatively early period of their development. The stimulus of being admitted as full partners in the Union and the challenge of managing their own affairs were among the most significant factors contributing to their growth and progress. Very few of our existing States, at the time of their admission to the Union, possessed potential resources, both human and natural, superior to those of Alaska and Hawaii. I am confident that Alaska and Hawaii, like our present States, will grow with statehood and because of statehood.

There is no necessity for me to repeat at this time the arguments for statehood. The many qualified witnesses who have appeared before your committee have, I am sure, presented convincing evidence both as to the need for and the tangible benefits to be derived from statehood. There is, however, one objection made by opponents of H. R. 331 and H. R. 49 which I believe requires further discussion because it goes beyond the question of statehood and raises a fundamental constitutional issue. I am referring to the objection that Alaska and Hawaii as States would be entitled to representation in the Senate of the United States disproportionate to their population.

This argument is not only entirely without merit, but also directly attacks a basic tenet of the constitutional system under which this Nation has grown and prospered. Without the provision for equal representation in the Senate of all States, both great and small, regardless of population, there probably would have been no United States. This was one of the great compromises which the Federalist says was a result "not of theory, but of a spirit of amity, and that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable." There is no justification for denying statehood to Alaska and Hawaii on the basis of an issue which was resolved by the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

America justly takes pride in its record of fulfilling to the letter its obligations to foreign nations. We should be no less scrupulous in carrying out the promises made to our own citizens in Alaska and Hawaii. The case for statehood rests on both legal and moral grounds.

These are troubled times. I know of few better ways in which we can demonstrate to the world our deep faith in democracy and the principle of self-government than by admitting Alaska and Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth and fiftieth States.

Sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE TABER AND JENSEN AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in perusing the morning paper, the Washington Post, I noticed an article which purported to give an estimate of the Civil Service Commission in which they said that in the fiscal year 1951 there would be 310,000 vacancies in the Federal personnel. This is around 15 percent, I believe, of the total civilian personnel.

The Taber amendment, of course, and the Jensen amendment also, will have

a direct bearing on the filling of these vacancies.

The Jensen amendment exempts doctors and nurses in the Veterans' Administration and the Public Health Service, but it is very interesting to note that it does not exempt St. Elizabeths Hospital; the doctors and nurses there are not exempted. This is the largest mental hospital in the world. It has a patient load of over 8,000. If we have a possible loss through resignation or otherwise of 15 percent in the doctor and nurse personnel at St. Elizabeths you can see the problem we are going to have confronting us. It is just another indication of passing a broad and sweeping amendment without knowing its effect. I predict that many other problems will arise. I think the adoption of the Jensen amendment is something which will be long regretted by this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Would the gentleman comment on the impact that yesterday's action of the House of Representatives, if it were to be sustained, would have with regard to the layoff of from 200,000 to a quarter of a million Government employees, the effect it would have on the economy of our country?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Undoubtedly it will add to the rapidly growing unemployment situation. But I am concerned even more with the Jensen amendment which will permit only one in ten of these vacancies to be replaced.

I certainly hope that the conferees on the Appropriations Committee in their conference with the Senate will revise this amendment to the point where it will at least be practical and workable.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman will recall that there were only 21 votes against the bill as it finally passed the House yesterday.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not remember the size of the vote; the gentleman may be right. But it would not be the first time that the House of Representatives made a mistake. I can even remember some instances where the Supreme Court has overruled some of the decisions that have been made by this House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that the number of votes against the bill yesterday on final passage is no true indication of anything, for the reason that the real vote was on the Thomas-Taber amendment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the gentleman is speaking the truth in that regard.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, an ever-increasing burden is being imposed upon the taxpayers of the Nation.

Not only do the annual appropriation bills constantly grow larger—the present one calls for something more than $29,000,000,000—but, with this year's increase of more than $5,000,000,000 in the Federal debt, the total debt now being around $260,000,000,000, there is an annual interest charge on that debt of some $5,000,000,000. That interest charge continues to increase.

To date, while Congress talks economy, it takes no steps to give you economy.

But the ever-increasing tax burden, which now forces you to work 1 day out of 4 for Uncle Sam, is not our greatest concern.

Just a few days ago, President Truman, on his across-the-country speaking trip, told us the international situation was not as threatening today as it was in 1946; said he expected to reduce the defense budget next year.

It is my hope that the President knew what he was talking about, that the situation justified his hope.

But not so long ago, Defense Secretary Johnson, Gen. Omar Bradley, and George Kennen, spokesman for the State Department—three men who have all possible available information about military and political conditions—expressed grave concern over our defense problems.

All three stated they hoped that war would not come to us this year, but they admitted they have no way of accurately forecasting the plans of Russia. They did insist that they would be remiss in their duty if they failed to call for improvement of our present military preparedness situation.

Recently, Defense Secretary Johnson was striving to cut defense expenditures, but now all three are calling for an immediate greater national defense program.

In addition to dollars, Secretary Johnson is calling for a continuation of the law to draft into the Armed Services the youth of our land.

Now, folks, listen, and especially you wives and mothers. It is one thing to take from the wage earners, the people of this country, $1 out of every 4 they earn. That is a grievous burden. We may be able to survive that, if we stay out of war.

But, if we must pay that exorbitant tax, can this country survive a course which will again, and for the third time within 40 years, force the youth of this land to fight on foreign soil under other than the command of their own officers?

There is either something radically wrong with our system of government, or with those who administer it, when American young men are called repeatedly to fight and die everywhere in the world.

At the moment, it is the policy of our State Department, while thousands of our young men are maintaining order in Japan and Germany, to conscript other young men and send them to Indochina, there to fight in a prelude to a third world war.

While demanding less spending and more efficient service in our Federal Government here at home, we should give the gravest consideration to the question of whether this country shall again, for the third time, send its boys and girls across the seas, to fight a third civilization-destroying world war.

It may be ruinous to send our dollars and strip our country of its natural resources to aid other nations.

It will be national suicide, to sacrifice our own flesh and blood on foreign soil, in a futile effort to make other nations live together in peace when they will do little or nothing to help toward that end.

It is silly and foolish, if we must have a war to get out of the mess in which we have become involved, to leave that "getting out" to those incompetents who have not been able to keep us out of the situation in which we are now bogged down.

Instead of waiting until we get into the middle of the stream, let us change horses before we wet our feet.

PLAN NO. 12 WOULD MAKE FOR INCREASED EFFICIENCY

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, some opponents of plan 12 have contended that the plan would increase delay in case handling, because certain duties would be restored to the Board.

I believe that the contrary result will follow. Who can deny that the spectacle of agency heads wrangling among themselves has a most demoralizing effect on staff work? The differences between the Board members and the general counsel which have arisen have not been kept secret or confidential. They have been fully aired before Congress and in the public press. Anyone familiar with Government knows the result of such public division. Factions develop within the staff. Gossip and malice are fostered. Employees are diverted from attention to their duties. Interest in the immediate internal conflict takes precedence over the performance of public service.

These are the inevitable consequences of a notorious inability of agency heads to agree. In this case both the general counsel and the members of the Board insist that no personal antagonism is involved. This is true, but it is no guaranty that subordinates on the staff can maintain the same objectivity. There must necessarily be a tremendous loss in agency output.

The general counsel and the Board are proceeding at cross purposes. They must devote much time to praiseworthy, but futile, efforts to compose their differences. These differences cannot be composed; they flow inevitably from the confusing and conflicting provisions of

the law regarding the respective powers and duties of the officers concerned.

A third cause of loss in output under the present system is the necessity of processing cases which must ultimately be dismissed. These are the cases processed by the general counsel on his theory, which are later dismissed by the Board on the application of its theory.

Impartial minds must agree that the elimination of these present obstacles to output will more than offset the added responsibilities upon the Board members resulting from the restoration of their policy-making duties.

PLAN NO. 12 IS IN ACCORD WITH THE HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much during debate and have read in the papers in the recent past the oft-repeated assertion that the provisions of plan No. 12 were not recommended by the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for the NLRB.

Now I think this is one issue that should be met immediately and settled once and for all.

I have carefully reviewed the testimony of witnesses before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and I did not find that any administration spokesman asserted that recommendations upon which the provisions of plan No. 12 are based, were proposed by the Hoover Commission exclusively for the NLRB. I have carefully reviewed the statements made by those spokesmen to the Senate and again I did not find any contention that the recommendations upon which the plan is founded were proposed for exclusive application to the NLRB. Quite the contrary my investigation discloses that it was the consistent position of the advocates of plan No. 12 that it conforms in essential detail with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in respect of all regulatory commissions, of which the Board is one.

It appears to me that this issue has been raised only for the purpose of confusion. Accordingly, it should be placed in proper prospective for a clear understanding both of the plan and its intrinsic merits.

It is true that the Hoover Commission did not make any specific recommendation limited in its application to the NLRB. However, the Commission did make the same type of survey of the NLRB as it conducted of each of the other eight quasi-judicial, quasi-administrative agencies. Now why did the Commission refrain from announcing conclusions and submitting recommendations as to this Board alone while at the same time issuing conclusions and recommendations at least as to some of the other commissions.

The answer to that lies in the statement of the Commission itself. In its report on the Department of Labor in which it comments on that Department, but also upon the status of the National Labor Relations Board, the Commission states:

> The Congress is engaged in revising labor policies which affect some of these agencies. The Commission can make no recommendations as to their organization until these questions are settled.

That report of the Commission issued in March 1949. What Member of the House will not remember that at that time there were pending before the Congress a large number of controversial bills relating to the National Labor Relations Board. The Commission wisely refrained from reaching any specific conclusion that might have been susceptible of the interpretation by some as an unwarranted effort to influence legislative matters under congressional consideration.

But that is not the entire story. The answer to the lie is again the Commission's reports.

In another report dealing with the so-called Independent Regulatory Commission and also submitted to the Congress in March 1949, the Hoover Commission submitted general recommendations respecting the internal organization of all such regulatory agencies and specific proposals as to some. The Commission stated that in this report it had "confined itself to a discussion of the organizational problems of these regulatory agencies," and the report does not deal with their more basic or the quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions.

This report on page 1, footnote No. 1, lists the agencies which were the subjects of the Commission's study. The National Labor Relations Board is there listed by the Commission as one of the nine regulatory commissions in respect of which its general recommendations were made.

Further, on page 3 of the same report the conclusive proof that the NLRB is covered by these recommendations is found. In commenting upon one of its recommendations the Commission specifically refers to the National Labor Relations Board as one of the Commissions to which its recommendations apply, and without qualification. What could be more explicit?

Now remember that this report relates to all—and I emphasize all—regulatory commissions and is limited to Hoover Commission recommendations that are confined to a discussion of the internal organizational problems of such agencies.

If these recommendations are appropriate and desirable for regulatory commissions as such, is there any sound reason why they should not be applied to the National Labor Relations Board?

Or, putting it another way, if these recommendations will result in improved and more efficient operation of eight of the nine commissions surveyed by the Commission, is it logical to exclude the NLRB from their application merely because the Commission did not make other and further recommendations as to the Board?

Quite patently it is not. The Hoover Commission in this report made no specific recommendation in respect of the Federal Trade Commission nor the Federal Reserve Board, but like the NLRB included these agencies among those that would benefit because of increased efficiency by adoption of the recommendations. Merely because no specific recommendation was made in this report in respect of the FTC and the FRB should these two agencies be denied the opportunity to benefit by the recommendations? Quite obviously not.

A rejection of plan No. 12 can be justified only if it fails to accomplish the intent and purpose of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, or that it is patently not in conformance with such recommendations.

Accordingly, let us look for a moment at what plan 12 proposes to accomplish.

The plan itself is brief. Its sole objectives are improved organization and management. It in no wise modifies or alters substantive policies of the act the Board administers.

Brushing aside for the moment details of the plan and looking to its central purpose we find that the plan would transfer to the Chairman of the Board from wherever now residing, all executive and administrative functions. These functions have been characterized as the housekeeping functions of the agencies—the day-to-day operating problems, and not the basic authority of the Board. They include the appointment and supervision of personnel, distribution of the Board's business among personnel and administrative units, and the use and expenditure of funds. Appropriate safeguards are incorporated to assure compliance by the Chairman with general policies of the Board and conformance to decisions and determinations the Board is authorized by law to make. Also the Board itself and not the Chairman must approve appointments to head major administrative units. And the Board, of course, will retain authority to revise budget estimates.

Does such a plan conform to the Hoover Commission recommendations?

Looking to the reports of the Commission, we find that great emphasis was given to the establishment of clear lines of authority and responsibility. In line with this major objective, it recommended that the everyday operating problems of all regulatory commissions be assigned to the chairman of such agencies.

Recommendation No. 1 of the Hoover Commission in its report on regulatory commissions states:

> We recommend that all administrative responsibility be vested in the Chairman of the Commission.

These are the words of the Hoover Commission. That is what plan No. 12 proposes to accomplish. The Hoover Commission, as I have pointed out, intended that it apply equally to the NLRB as to the other eight commissions surveyed.

Plan No. 12 provides an organization for the NLRB identical with that provided for these other regulatory commissions. It achieves this uniform pattern by literal and absolute reliance upon the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Those who argue that the Hoover Commission made no specific recommendation respecting the NLRB overlook the fact that the Commission commonly made general recommendations without going into all specific effects upon each particular agency. Those who insist that

this is not so are not trying to achieve adoption of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, but rather seek to prevent application of these recommendations for good organization to the NLRB.

A vote against this plan will be a rejection of one of the important recommendations submitted by the Hoover Commission and at the same time a bar to the more efficient administration of one of our most important public policies.

SEPARATION OF FUNCTIONS UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY ACT HAS NOT WORKED

Mr. Speaker, the question before this House is whether to install a sound and constructive organization at the Labor Board with a clear and direct line of responsibility, or whether to continue to put up with the administrative monstrosity that that agency has become.

Long before the Taft-Hartley Act, experts in and out of Government recognized that the administrative-agency approach to Federal regulation requires a flexible approach and a clear line of authority. As early as 1941, the Attorney General of the United States received a lengthy and thorough report on administrative procedure. That report weighed the advantages and disadvantages of a complete separation of functions, such as is now in effect at the Labor Board. The considered judgment of that report was that "complete separation of functions would make enforcement more difficult and would not be of compensating benefit to private interests. On the contrary, both those private interests which the statutes are designed to protect and those which are regulated would be likely to suffer, and finally we conclude not only that separation will not necessarily cure bias and prejudice but that the requisite impartiality of action can be secured by the means set forth in this and the preceding sections of this report"—report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, 1941, pages 55–60.

The reasons of the committee for rejecting complete separation included the fear that consistency would be lost, confusion would result, enforcement would be rendered more difficult, and informal settlements would be discouraged.

In conformance with the recommendations of the Attorney General's Committee, the Congress, in 1946, enacted the Administrative Procedure Act. That statute is applicable to the National Labor Relations Board and to all other administrative agencies. Section 5 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act provides that—

> No officer, employee, or agent engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for any agency in any case shall, in that or a factually related case, participate or advise in the decision, recommended decision, or agency review pursuant to section 8 except as witness or counsel in public proceedings.

This requirement, and all the other major requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act were already in effect at the Labor Board at the time that that statute was enacted. It is generally conceded that Labor Board procedure was taken as the model for some of its provisions. The act provided for the foregoing type of internal separation of functions as the most efficient and at the same time the fairest procedure.

In February of 1947, the present general counsel of the Board, at the request of Senator DONNELL, commented on the provisions of Senator Ball's labor bill, S. 360. That bill contained a provision for the separation of the Board's functions and for the transfer of its investigative and prosecuting functions to the Department of Justice. Mr. Denham, at that time, fully recognized the dangers of the proposal. He wrote:

> It simply will not work. The administration of labor relations at the source involves much more than the trial and determination of adjudications. More than 90 percent of the matters which might develop into litigations are disposed of administratively in the regional offices. These dispositions must be coordinated to the same general policy that influences the final determination of the litigated cases. This proposed division would only create additional confusion with policy emanating from two independent and uncoordinated sources. (Hearings before Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 249, 81st Cong., 1st sess, p. 1130.)

It is no discredit to Mr. Denham that he later accepted appointment to his present post. He is a fighter and I respect him for it. In September 1947, shortly after his appointment by the President, Mr. Denham again very candidly appraised the set-up. He said:

> There are bare spots in the picture and there are spots where a protracted division of opini n between the Board and the general counsel could lead to fantastic results. Particularly is this true in matters pertaining to the jurisdictional features of the law. The Board, on appeals, in representation cases, may find jurisdiction and entertain a petition. On the same facts the general counsel may refuse to issue a complaint for what he conceives to be lack of jurisdiction. In neither decision will a direct appeal lie. It is an absurd situation but it can happen in the present state of the law. (Senate hearings, p. 207.)

Unfortunately, Mr. Denham was a good prophet. The separation of functions simply has not worked. The confusion he foresaw has developed. The absurd situation which he described has yielded the fantastic results which he feared.

A number of head-on clashes have occurred. The Board and the general counsel are at loggerheads over jurisdiction. They are unable to agree that he should express only the Board's position in the courts. The Board has ordered him to consult them on the appointment of top field personnel. He has publicly refused—NLRB release, No. 284, March 2, 1950.

I do not say that in these disputes between the five-man Board and the general counsel, that the Board is always right or that Mr. Denham is always wrong. I do say that it is high time we put an end to the frustrating duality of authority which characterizes the administration of the labor law, so that the law will have a chance to operate.

It is ridiculous to continue under a system that has been so thoroughly discredited. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "no" on the resolution to disapprove plan 12.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 12 TRANSFERS HOUSEKEEPING FUNCTIONS TO CHAIRMAN AND SUBSTANTIVE POLICY-MAKING FUNCTIONS TO WHOLE MEMBERSHIP OF NLRB

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of loose talk and conjecture about what plan 12 actually does.

Just exactly what is the purport of plan 12? The plan, if adopted, will do two, and only two, things. First, it will transfer the housekeeping functions of the Labor Board to its Chairman. Second, it will restore the policy-making functions of the Labor Board to the Board members, where it belongs.

I have heard no criticism of the proposal to centralize housekeeping responsibilities. These involve supervision of personnel, assignment of duties, and disbursement of funds. It is the considered judgment of the Hoover Commission, after exhaustive study, that these duties can best be performed by one man, leaving the remaining Commissioners free for adjudication and policy making. This proposal has been uniformly recommended by the Hoover Commission for the seven regulatory commissions of the executive branch, of which the Labor Board is only one. Its sole purpose is to improve the efficiency of the service, and it will surely meet approval.

It is when attention is directed to the equally sound proposal to restore policy functions to the five-man Board that a strange and terrible heat is generated. Cries of "foul" are heard; it is said that this is a back-door attempt to legislate by way of reorganization. What are the facts? First, no new function is created by plan 12 and no existing function is taken away. All that is done is that the broad policy functions now exercised by the general counsel as an independent agency are restored to the five-man Board. This is wholly within the province of the Reorganization Act and is not a novel procedure under reorganization acts of the past. The testimony before the Committee on Executive Expenditures—page 90—contains 12 instances in which entire offices were eliminated by consolidation pursuant to reorganization plans. It is only natural that when all the functions of an agency are transferred to another the first agency will have no further reason for being and must be abolished.

The objection is made that the plan will have the effect of amending an act of Congress. Of course it will. The entire Reorganization Act was necessary only in order to enable reorganization of functions which were originally allocated by statute. If the matter were not provided by statute, the reorganization could be made without congressional approval, and no plan would now be before us.

The further objection is made that this proposal is somehow substantive. This is wholly untrue. Not a single unfair labor practice, not a single representation rule, not a single provision covering emergency strikes, injunctions, private suits, union security, or any other substantive requirement or rule of the Taft-Hartley Act is affected. All that is involved is that the present two-headedness of the

agency is eliminated, so that the agency may lay down uniform policy and so that the staff and the public can be saved from confusion, conflict, inefficiency, and expense.

One final comment. It has been strenuously asserted in some quarters that this plan's vice lies in assigning the general counsel's functions to the Chairman of the Board; that all that is done is to substitute one-man control by the Chairman for one-man control by the general counsel. A reading of the plan itself completely refutes this contention. The Attorney General of the United States has made clear that only the housekeeping functions of the agency will be in the Chairman. In a letter to the Director of the Budget—April 13, 1950—he states:

> It is clear that the plan transfers from the general counsel and the Board to the Chairman housekeeping functions and related functions of a supervisory nature. It is equally clear that it is the purpose of the plan as described in the afore-mentioned message of the President to establish between the Board and the Chairman the "identical relationship" as that "provided for the other regulatory agencies," which means that substantive decisions are the responsibility of the Board as a whole and not of the Chairman individually.

There is nothing sinister about this plan as some would have us believe: It is not an attempt to change substantive legislation; it is a proposal to improve efficiency: it does not add or abolish any function of government; it does transfer certain functions in the interest of uniformity among the regulatory agencies. It does not transfer the policy functions of the general counsel to the Chairman of the Board; it does transfer them to the five-man Board.

If the House will restrict itself to a consideration of the merits of what the plan will accomplish, there can be little doubt but that the resolution rejecting the plan will be defeated, as it should.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNDEMOCRATIC ACTIONS IN LABOR UNIONS

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to a most vivid example of undemocratic action in a labor union. This example is built around the case of Mr. Lloyd Sidener, of Canton, Ill., who this week came to Washington of his own free will and accord and at his own expense to assist the Federal Government in legislating against the undemocratic processes which are depriving him, and many others like him, of his and their very livelihood.

As it is rather doubtful at this point as to whether or not Mr. Sidener will be given the opportunity to testify before the House Labor Subcommittee set up to investigate undemocratic actions in labor unions, I want the facts to be of public record to show what is going on in some unions today and that we, as representatives of the people, are obligated to right this wrong, and correct this injustice with remedial legislation, if necessary.

As I said before, I should like to review the case of Mr. Lloyd Sidener, a coal miner from Canton, Ill. Mr. Sidener is a typical American, who, through ambition and enterprise, became a trusted worker in the mines, trusted by his employer, the United Electric Co. of Illinois, trusted by his fellow workers in the mines who knew him well—so well, in fact, that they elected him president of the United Mine Workers of America, Local No. 7455, which position he held until February 24, 1950. On that day, Lloyd Sidener attempted to obey a court order issued by Federal Judge Richmond B. Keech. Believing in the sanctity of our Federal court orders and in our democratic processes, he led 130 men of his union back to the coal pits, only to be met by a picket line and a road block. These pickets had their orders from a great and powerful figure in Washington; prearranged orders, if you please, which every miner in the country understood, characterized by the phrase, "the whistle blew once."

Mr. Sidener did not believe that orders issued by any American citizen should supersede the orders of a duly constituted American court. He stuck by the order of the court; he disobeyed the order of John L. Lewis. Today, Lloyd Sidener finds himself in this position.

First. He is unemployed, although he is a skilled coal-shovel operator and nearly all coal miners are digging coal today.

Second. He has been removed as president of local No. 7455 at Canton, Ill.

Third. The United Mine Workers of America have assessed a fine of $50,000 against him, which, of course, being an ordinary American citizen, he is unable to pay.

Now, I ask you, just what kind of a government would tolerate such an injustice? We might expect to find such a situation in Hitler's Germany or in modern times in Stalin's Russia. But surely not in America! Yet, that is the situation as it stands today, whether we like it or not. Lloyd Sidener is not the only coal miner in America who believes in our constitutional Government and the edicts of its duly constituted courts. Millions of other loyal American labor-union members believe in the same things Lloyd Sidener believes in.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Upon what information does the gentlemen base his statement, whether upon the statement of Mr. Sidener alone, or of other witnesses? Where did you get your information?

Mr. VELDE. If the gentleman will allow the Jacobs subcommittee which has been formed by a vote of the full labor committee to issue subpenas and to investigate the Sidener's case, I am sure he will have the answer to those questions.

Mr. PERKINS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman brought Mr. Sidener up here from his district and the statement he is now making to the House is based altogether on the statement that was taken by the investigator for the Education and Labor Committee from Mr. Sidener and from no other source?

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman is mistaken in at least two instances. I did not bring him to Washington. He came of his own free will and accord. He is not from my district in Illinois. Some of the information which I have obtained has come from Mr. Sidener and has come from him personally. I have not even talked to the investigator for the committee regarding this.

Mr. PERKINS. I am sure the gentleman is correct and that he did not bring the witness here. I was misinformed. But I am asking the gentleman at this time whether or not he is basing these statements on any other person's statement other than Mr. Sidener and if he has other information, would he please tell the House from what source he is getting these statements? I think the Members of this House would like to know that and whether or not Mr. Sidener has repudiated his own statements on one occasion back in Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I will say to the gentleman that Mr. Sidener has never repudiated any of his statements as far as I know. I think the gentleman knows that a great deal of this story has appeared in the press already. I think the gentleman also knows that the FBI has been investigating this case and has recently had a number of agents in Canton, Ill., investigating the case.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman knows that if a wrong has been committed or if a right of Mr. Sidener has been infringed upon, that this will be corrected in his case before the National Labor Relations Board, he has a proper remedy before the National Labor Relations Board, and, besides, the gentleman concedes that the FBI is making an investigation in this particular district. In addition to that, we have a case pending here in the Supreme Court concerning Judge Keech's injunction. In view of all these various actions, I would like to ask the gentleman if his only reason for coming here before the membership of this House and making these statements is not solely for politcal purposes?

Mr. VELDE. I think the gentleman will agree that it is not popular politically, and I would not be speaking here today just for that reason. I certainly have no feeling that the investigation of undemocratic activities in labor unions would be popular politically. I think it is a duty that someone has to do, and I think it is a duty that this Congress should perform.

Now I should like to review briefly the events as I understood them in my talk with Mr. Sidener leading up to his being literally denied the right to return to

work, removed as president of the local union, and fined $50,000 by the union.

Prior to the time that Mr. Sidener's local union officially received a telegram ordering the miners back to work, Mr. Sidener received a telephone communication from the United Mine Workers board member of his district, Mr. B. J. Beasley, who advised him that John L. Lewis had just said that the "whistle blew one for Monday."

The meaning of the phrase, "the whistle blew one," can be traced to the traditions in the coal fields where it is customary to blow one whistle when no coal is to be loaded the following day and three whistles when the mine is to load coal the following day.

So actually, according to Mr. Sidener, the telegram ordering the men back to work was in effect canceled before it arrived by the phone call made to Mr. Sidener by Mr. Beasley.

Mr. Sidener has stated that many members in the local union signed a petition requesting a special meeting to find out why they could not go back to work and that approximately 130 of the 207 total membership made an attempt to go back to work.

There were several reasons why these men wanted to go back to work.

First, the men wanted to obey the order of the Federal court of the United States directing the miners to return to work.

Secondly, the economic conditions forced upon the miners through their inability to earn a livelihood caused many to lose their homes, their cars, and many mortgaged their possessions. Many people were in very bad circumstances as can be attested to by the formation of so-called breadlines in the Canton area. It was necessary for many to seek other jobs on the surrounding farms, with the T. P. & W. Railroad section gangs, and in some cases these men had to seek employment in nonunion mines in the vicinity.

After the settlement of the coal strike, Mr. Sidener was charged by the union with attempting to start a rival union. He was never officially or legitimately notified as to the charges filed against him, nor was he notified officially of the actions of the local union.

He was notified, however, through friends and through the press that his local union assessed a fine of $50,000 against him and gave him the opportunity to pay the fine at the rate of $25 a day. Of course, this is ridiculous, for Mr. Sidener could not make that much working 7 days a week with time and a half and double time for all his overtime. He would actually have to pay the union more than what he would receive in wages for the privilege of working.

This is the story of only one man who has suffered from undemocratic action on the part of a labor union. It is, indeed, unfortunate that this kind of thing is allowed to happen in these United States under our Constitution.

During the past year and a half I have served on the Education and Labor Committee I have noted with alarm the increased tendency toward dictatorial control of local union activities by the international officers and directors. This case I have just presented is only one of thousands of similar cases throughout the country. The rank and file of labor union members have realized this fact. They do not like it. They want to belong to a union where they have some voice in activities. They want to vote on and talk over their problems and make their own decisions. But what happens when the little labor man starts to voice his opinion. He is told to shut up—that his welfare is being handled by the big boys higher up. And if he persists in exerting his constitutional rights of free speech, he is ousted from his union, loses his job, is suspended or otherwise beaten down—just like Mr. Sidener was handled when he and his members tried to exert their right to work and their right to local autonomy.

It takes courage to fight for your rights; it takes courage to oppose dictators especially when these dictators have power over your earning power and your very life. But someone must fight this battle if we are to return to the unions the autonomy they once enjoyed. I am glad that there are courageous men such as Lloyd Sidener on our side in fighting this battle.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statements, excerpts and extraneous matter.)

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago President Truman sent to Congress a very fine message on small business. A bill has not as yet been introduced in either House to carry out the President's message. A bill in each House will probably be introduced Tuesday or Wednesday of the coming week that will carry out the provisions of this message.

POINT 1

Point 1 of the President's message relates to insurance of bank loans, a law to provide for insurance on self-sustaining basis of bank loans up to $25,000, but probably mostly $5,000, repayable in 5 years. This will be similar to Federal insurance on loans for home improvements. The bank passes on the loan application, subject only to Federally prescribed standards. No one else will pass on the application except the bank itself. No prior approval by Government will be required. An insurance premium to cover probable expenses and losses will be charged; no Federal expenditure except in the initial appropriation to establish the insurance fund, and ultimately repayable. This is point 1.

POINT 2

Point 2 is national investment companies. They are to be chartered by the Government but privately owned. They are to provide equity capital and long-term loans, also help administer the loan program for small independent enterprises, procure funds from individual investors and financial institutions, also participate jointly with local banks, and should receive tax incentives. In early years the Federal Reserve banks should be authorized to invest in these companies. That is point 2. No Government money at all will be used in the national investment companies in point 2 of President Truman's program.

POINT 3

Point 3, Mr. Truman recommends that the collateral requirements of the RFC on small-business loans be relaxed if actual or potential earnings warrant relaxation. It authorizes increased participation with private banks on small-business loans. One strong point in this is to authorize at least 15-year loans instead of 10-year loans. During the Eightieth Congress, the preceding Congress, the time limit was reduced to 10 years. Mr. Truman asked that that be made at least 15 years. However, there will be no RFC financing if money is attainable from new investment companies, that is point 2, or from the banks, in point 1. In other words, the policy of RFC as in the past is to be pursued in the future, that the RFC will not grant any loan if it is possible for the applicant to obtain loans from private investors. That has been the rule all the time, and it is a good rule.

The RFC has helped a lot of banks substantially. For instance, an applicant would go to the local bank to get a loan. The local bank would not even talk to the applicant but would say, "No, we aren't in a position to grant you a loan, and don't want to go into it."

The applicant goes into one of the 32 different offices in the United States and files application. Maybe the manager of this office in getting his application and going into the facts discovers, "Why, this is a good, bankable loan. Why don't you get it from your local bank?" The applicant says, "Well, I went to the local bank but I was turned down." Then the RFC will get in touch with the local banker and explain to him that it is a good, bankable loan. In many instances the local bank will take the entire loan or, if not the entire loan, will participate to a large extent with the RFC. To that extent the RFC has been a good business-getter for the local banks. It has been very helpful in that respect.

The RFC under this plan of President Truman's will be under the Secretary of Commerce. It will be under the Commerce Department. That is for the obvious reason that the President of the United States cannot deal with too many independent agencies. All these problems and the major questions should come up to him through a Cabinet officer. That will be done through the Secretary of Commerce for the RFC. That does not mean that the RFC will be in a position to be dictated to by the Secretary of Commerce or by President Truman. It will remain the same independent agency that it has always been. Neither the President nor the Secretary of Commerce will have anything to do with the RFC's individual loans, and will only participate, if they participate at all, in arriving at major policies of the RFC.

For instance, RFC money, which is Government money, should not be used for any propaganda of any kind. A major policy should be and doubtless will be, as in the past, that no loans will be made to a magazine company or to a newspaper company or to a radio concern, because they are in a position where they could probably influence public thinking.

Therefore, public money should not be used for that purpose. So the RFC will remain the same independent agency it has always been, but by Executive order the President will transfer it to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman advise the House as to why it should be in the Department of Commerce and not in the Treasury Department?

Mr. PATMAN. The Treasury Department is not in the business of making loans at all and is not connected with the business affairs of the country like the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce is charged with the duty of advising with both small and large business—not just small business, but large business as well. In Mr. Truman's message you will note he said we need large business—big business—just the same as small business. The Department of Commerce is the logical place I think to place this agency, much preferable to placing it with the Secretary of the Treasury. Suppose Mr. Truman were to change it to the Secretary of the Treasury. Think how vulnerable he would be. They would say, "Here is the President putting them both together and just funneling money right out of the Treasury of the United States and turning it over to the RFC to make loans to everybody in the country."

He would be very, very vulnerable, much more vulnerable.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The only thought I had in connection with this is that the Treasury Department is the Department which administers or has control of the loans that these banks make. They are the ones that examine the bank.

Mr. PATMAN. No, I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Who does, then?

Mr. PATMAN. The controller of the currency, and also the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, but not the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Well, then, if we may start all over again, the people who have had control of the credit in the national banks, naturally could work in close harmony with this new setup if they guaranteed the loans, because then it would all be in one department, is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. They will work closely with them because they will examine the banks and naturally the bank examiners will have something to do with the type of loans they make.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is not that the fundamental reason why this proposed legislation has merit because we have had the bank examiner saying that they should get rid of such-and-such a loan because they have been carrying it long enough, yet with the Government insurance they will not be in a position to do that.

Mr. PATMAN. They will have an over-all policy, I imagine, that will make sure the loans are safe and bankable loans, otherwise they will not be accepted. If accepted, of course, they can be taken out of the portfolio.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman knows during the depression that was one of the troubles. We had one Government agency going around to a bank and saying, "You have a bad loan there. You have had it too long. You should liquidate it."

I can give you cases where it was only a matter of four or five hundred dollars.

Mr. PATMAN. I know of cases myself.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. And then they turn right around and another Government agency says under their formula they would help on a loan up to twelve or fourteen hundred dollars.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is under a different policy. You see, the commercial banks have to be more liquid than these other institutions.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I realize that.

Mr. PATMAN. And the other institutions that the gentleman mentioned can safely carry them because they are set up to carry them for a long time. But the commercial banks are not set up that way.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If this proposed legislation had been in effect during the depression we would not need to have that working to cross purposes and all the overhead because those loans could have been guaranteed.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman will find when he sees the bill which will be introduced that it will be just as good as if it were under the Treasury.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The only interest I had, may I say to my distinguished colleague, was to try to avoid this working at cross purposes, if this plan is to be put into effect.

Mr. PATMAN. I know that the gentleman is very sincere. He has demonstrated that during the years that he has served in the Congress. His suggestion is very much appreciated. I hope it is considered. If it is better to go in the Treasury, it is all right with me. But Mr. Truman has decided otherwise.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to put my judgment up against the Treasury or the Commerce Department. If it is going to be set up I want it to be set up so that there is some protection to the bank itself.

Mr. PATMAN. I assure the gentleman the bank will be protected.

POINT 4

Now, point 4 is technical advisory services by the Department of Commerce. There is another reason why it goes in the Department of Commerce. This bill will strengthen the technical and managerial office provided by the Secretary of Commerce.

Also, to undertake research on technical problems of interest to small business. Also, development work on new products and new processes. In other words, people who have new ideas have an opportunity to try them out.

These proposals will apply to business fields. The Secretary of Commerce will, in a large way, do for the small business of the country the same thing that the Secretary of Agriculture is doing for the small and large farmers of the country.

POINT 5

Point 5 gives general responsibility for all these new programs, with one exception, to the Secretary of Commerce. Supervision over the RFC will be in the Secretary of Commerce. The reorganization plan will be forthcoming very soon. The exception is national investment companies, to be supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve. However, the Secretary of Commerce is to assist in promotion of investment companies, and to advise the Federal Reserve Board concerning investment companies. The present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to make industrial loans is to be terminated, and the $139,000,000 which was turned over to the Federal Reserve Board in 1934 is to be restored to the Treasury.

SHOULD RFC BE LIQUIDATED?

I think this is a long step in the right direction. I know that recently Hon. Jesse Jones, former Chairman of the RFC, made a statement that the RFC should be folded up; it should be terminated; it should be liquidated; it should go out of business. In the event Congress did not see fit to liquidate it entirely, that certainly the 32 local offices should be liquidated.

I find myself in complete disagreement with Mr. Jones. At one time I remember, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Jones was before our committee and was asking for an extension of the RFC and its powers. The gentleman from Connecticut, a member of the committee, asked Mr. Jones, "How many loans did you make the past year?" Mr. Jones said, "Not a dollar." This Member from Connecticut said, "Don't you think it is a good time to liquidate the RFC? There is no demand for it. You did not have any loans last year."

Mr. Jones' reply was a good one, as his replies invariably were. He said, "If we did not have any loans we need this shotgun in the corner. We don't know when we may need the RFC. We should always have it available to prevent what has happened in the past."

I think his reply was an excellent one. The 32 offices that he was talking about are the local offices, like at New Orleans; Dallas, Tex.; Boston, Mass.; San Francisco, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; Minneapolis; Chicago—32 all over the country. That makes it easy for the small-business man to go to a nearby office to make his application. Of course, if you abolish those offices you would abolish the principal agency that makes it easier for the small

man to be accommodated. The little man cannot always come to Washington and pay a 5 percenter or 50 percenter to look after his work, although that has never gotten into the RFC, I am happy to say, but they have to have somebody to help them. We must continue to keep those 32 offices so as to accommodate the small-business men all over the country and make it easier for them to get financial assistance when they are entitled to get it and when they have the collateral that justifies it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We really have a demonstration of the same principle in connection with the Cooley Act, have we not?

Mr. PATMAN. What do you mean by the Cooley Act?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Under the Cooley Act, loans on family-type farms are guaranteed to the bank.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, yes. I thought that was the Pace Act.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No. That is under the Cooley bill.

When I was home Eastertime I visited one of those farms in which the local bank has an interest; and I might say that the banks in my State have over 10 percent of those guaranteed loans under the Cooley Act.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Our people out there stay at home and work together; they do not spend their time fighting you fellows down here in Washington.

The loan is carefully supervised to start with. They do not start the young fellow out on a worthless piece of land. We will say he starts out on 80 acres of good farm land. It will carry a $6,000 loan. There is a precedent for what the President proposes at this time as far as small business is concerned.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that, and I look with great favor on that act. I thought the gentleman from Georgia, STEVE PACE, got that bill through. The authorship of the bill does not make any difference to me, but I just knew it as the Pace bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is handled under the Cooley Act.

Mr. PATMAN. The local banks can keep these loans 7 or 8 years and then get their money back with interest.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. So they had a guaranty there. In my section of the country these local banks do not want to carry those loans, but they pool them; they get 10, 15, or 20, and any insurance company will take them off their hands because it is just tailor-made for the insurance companies. The insurance companies do not want to have to deal with each individual applicant; they want several of them grouped together. The banks do that servicing and sell them to the insurance companies, and that makes it a very fine loan and helpful to the farmer.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have no crystal ball to look into the future, but there is considerable sentiment that these chattel mortgages that go along in many cases with these farm guaranteed loans will ultimately end up as guaranteed loans so that the individual farmer does not have to contract all over the United States when he wants to do any business, but he goes to his local bank and follows the same procedure that you propose for the small-business man which, if it is handled carefully, is surely a step in the right direction.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; and these farm loans that the gentleman has just referred to, I think the reason they have not been more in favor is because farmers have not been able to buy farms on reasonable terms, or they cannot buy the good land that they used to. Something has got to happen, I do not know what, to encourage these people with large land holdings to sell off their land at good prices but in smaller tracts. If that is done, this law that the gentleman refers to will be more effective; but because they cannot buy the little farms now, it is not as effective as we would like for it to be.

I believe that the bill that will be introduced next week by Members in the House and the Senate will carry out the President's program. I believe it will be a long step in the right direction. It is true that the small-business man needs more than just credit; he needs some security and protection as President Truman often points out; he needs protection against economic power that is used to destroy small businesses. I do not oppose big business because it is large, necessarily we will have a lot of big businesses. They are not entitled to criticism just because they are large, but they are entitled to criticism if they are big enough to use their power in a way to destroy small business and they do use their power for that purpose; and if they do that they should be broken up. In fact, I can name you, for instance, the case against the A. & P., which is the most misrepresented case in the newspapers by the paid advertisers I have ever heard of. There is a case where a large concern by reason of its size sold at a loss in 29 percent of its stores. You know what would happen if that were long continued, it would just put the little man out of business; he could not meet that kind of competition. When they are big enough to use their power for that purpose, and do use it for that purpose, something should be done about it.

TESTIMONY BEFORE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

I am inserting herewith my testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House:

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, ON MAY 10, 1950, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF MONOPOLY POWER (COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY), IN RESPECT TO H. R. 7905, CONCERNING TREBLE-DAMAGE ACTIONS UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS

It was with very great pleasure that I accepted the invitation of your distinguished chairman to appear before you and to present my comments on H. R. 7905, which consolidates various proposals in aid of treble-damage and related actions brought under the antitrust laws and was introduced by one of your own distinguished members, Hon. WINFIELD K. DENTON.

The Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have the honor to be chairman, unanimously supports the general purposes and objectives of this bill, as well as the bulk of its actual provisions. The strengthening of civil damage remedies under the antitrust laws is undoubtedly a change in the right direction. Big firms in particular, which may now violate the antitrust laws with relative impunity—even with the proposed increase of antitrust fines to $50,000—might suffer a change of heart if treble-damage and related remedies had real teeth in them. Moreover, if violations of the antitrust laws should, as many leaders of the business community contend, be regarded as economic offenses, rather than criminal violations, any change in the law, particularly as to damage actions, directed at the violator's pocketbook or balance sheet, is apt to be salutary.

SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE'S FOUR BILLS

It has been the considered opinion of all the members of the Select Committee on Small Business that, however important and extensive your committee's general investigation on antimonopoly might be, there were certain bills of a more piecemeal nature, sponsored by our committee, which deserved immediate consideration by the Judiciary Committee.

The following is a quotation from pages 72 and 73 of the progress report, first session, of the present Select Committee on Small Business:

"No matter how important, however, it is the committee's feeling that investigation and debate on the over-all question of bigness in business and monopoly generally should not serve to postpone action on bills immediately needed to strengthen the existing antitrust laws. An over-all and drastic change in the antitrust laws may never take place. There is respectable opinion, even in antitrust circles, that the basic antitrust laws are fundamentally sufficient and that the deficiency is in the enforcement of these laws and in the funds and manpower for their enforcement. Moreover, even a so-called basic change in the antitrust laws may not only take a long time to enact but itself is apt to be piecemeal, rather than comprehensive and pervasive. Perhaps antitrust legislation and enforcement must of necessity be approached on a pragmatic and piecemeal basis.

"In any event, in the opinion of this committee, there are certain bills which should be acted on by the Judiciary Committee as promptly as possible. Among the bills which, in this committee's opinion, should receive prompt consideration are:

"H. R. 5139, increasing antitrust fines;

"H. R. 4402, removing guilty corporate officials;

"H. R. 5117, authorizing United States to commence treble-damage actions; and

"H. R. 4985, Federal statute of limitations."

It has been a source of real gratification on the part of the members of the Select Committee on Small Business that your committee has seen fit to give its formal consideration to the subject matter of three of the four bills just enumerated, if not formally to the three bills as such.

1. $50,000 FINES (H. R. 5139)

As to H. R. 5139, increasing antitrust fines to $50,000, the Judiciary Committee has reported out H. R. 7827, which does the same thing as our bill and in almost the same terms. Additional provisions, originally contemplated by your committee, were dropped, after I had the honor of presenting my reasons for not including such additional provisions.

2. BARRING CORPORATE OFFICIALS (H. R. 4402)

H. R. 4402, the second bill mentioned in the quotation just read from our progress report, is my bill proposing that corporate

officials convicted of violating the antitrust laws should be barred from serving as such for specified periods. This is the one bill of the four mentioned in the report which, so far as we know, has not received advanced consideration from your committee. We still hope that it will.

If the officer of a big corporation knows that he may be barred from being an officer for a definite period he may hesitate a long time before permitting himself to violate the antitrust laws. And if violations of the antitrust laws constitute an economic offense rather than a criminal offense in the layman's sense, as has been contended, then there should be little objection by guilty corporate officers to a suspension from office, in lieu of a jail term, which the courts do not impose in any event.

This bill received unanimous and bipartisan support from the members of the Select Committee on Small Business. Moreover, the principles embodied in the provisions of the bill were expressly endorsed by the Select Committee on Small Business for the Eightieth Congress, which recommended the following mandatory penalty:

"Persons found guilty of any of the foregoing offenses shall be enjoined from serving as an officer or director of any corporation engaged in commerce in the United States for a minimum period of years. For second offenses penalties should be more severe, and consideration should be given to permanent injunction."

The proposed penalty is analogous to the suspension of a member's rights to a stock exchange seat, by reason of unethical or unlawful conduct, a penalty developed by the business community itself. It is also analogous to suspension or disbarment of an attorney, or suspension of a license to practice medicine. It is, moreover, a penalty with real teeth in it—more so, even, than the $50,000-fine bill which you reported favorably.

3. UNITED STATES AS PLAINTIFF (H. R. 5117)

H. R. 5117, the third on the list in our progress report, is our bill authorizing the United States to commence treble-damage actions, introduced by Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH. Heretofore, by reason of court decisions, the United States has not been deemed a proper party to commence an action for damages by reasons of violation of the antitrust laws. The present bill, now under consideration by your committee, changes this by providing that the United States may be a party commencing such an action. However, your bill limits the United States to actual damages, instead of treble damages, as with a private plaintiff. While we still feel that the United States should be entitled to treble damages, we favor H. R. 7905, allowing the United States to sue at all, as far as the bill goes.

4. FEDERAL STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS (H. R. 4985)

H. R. 4985, the fourth in our progress report list, as quoted previously is our bill, introduced by Hon. JOE L. EVINS, setting up a Federal statute of limitations for treble-damage actions and making the statute run from the time of discovery of conspiracy. Such a Federal statute of limitations, in place of the various State statutes and running from the time of discovery of conspiracy, is set up by H. R. 7905, now under consideration. However, it does not have the retroactive feature contained in the bill endorsed by our committee.

BILLS 3 AND 4 (H. R. 5117 AND H. R. 4985)

It is the last two of the four bills enumerated in our progress report, as previously quoted, which directly bear on H. R. 7905, the bill now under consideration. These two bills are H. R. 5117, authorizing the United States to sue, and H. R. 4985, creating a Federal statute of limitations. Reference to these two bills makes it possible to give quotations from the unanimous report of the Select Committee on Small Business on these bills which will make available to your committee what is in effect comment of our committee directly applicable to provisions of H. R. 7905, the bill now under consideration.

SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE COMMENT ON SUITS BY UNITED STATES (H. R. 5117)

The first quotation will be from page 77 of our progress report, on H. R. 5117, authorizing the United States to sue in damage actions, although it authorizes treble damages for the United States, which H. R. 7905 rejects. Our report states, in part, as follows:

"There seems to be no good reason whatever why Government procurement agencies, if victimized by price-fixing combinations or other antitrust violations, should not have the right to sue for damages.

"Able lawyers have thought that the Government has this right as a person under the present law, but the Supreme Court of the United States decided otherwise, by a vote of 5 to 3, in *United States* v. *Cooper Corporation* (312 U. S. 600 (1941)). Subsequent decisions seem to have weakened, and at any rate have not strengthened, this decision.

"Nevertheless, it seems more salutary for Congress to act on the matter. Although the bill would permit the Government to collect treble damages, it should be borne in mind that the courts have been very strict in treble-damage actions in requiring that a direct and rather immediate connection be shown between damages sustained and the violation of the antitrust laws.

"The treble-damage civil-action approach is another method of treating antitrust violations as economic offenses. It does not seek to brand offenders as criminals or to send them to jail. It simply provides an economic penalty of sufficient measure to deter wrongdoers. A treble-damage action by the United States is much like a civil action by the Government for a penalty, the amount of which may exceed actual damages.

"This bill gives the armed services and the General Services Administration, including the Federal Supply Service, an adequate retaliatory weapon against competitive prices matched sometimes to six decimal points, whether for cement, steel, or any other product, resulting from anti-trust-law violations by illegal use of the basing-point system or otherwise."

SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE COMMENT ON FEDERAL STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS (H. R. 4985)

There will now follow a quotation from pages 77 and 78 of the progress report of the Select Committee on Small Business in regard to H. R. 4985, the bill sponsored by us proposing a Federal statute of limitations. You will note in this quotation our reference to the retroactive feature, which is not contained in H. R. 7905, and the reason we include the retroactive feature. I quote:

"The primary purpose of this bill, introduced by Mr. EVINS, of the committee, is to insure that there shall be a uniform statute of limitations applicable to all Federal courts so that the statute of limitations in treble-damage actions for antitrust violations shall not commence to run until the plaintiff learns about the conspiracy, provided the plaintiff uses due diligence. The bill also provides for a uniform period of 6 years irrespective of geographical location.

"Because there is no Federal statute of limitations on treble-damage actions at the present time, the law of the particular State applies, which means that not only is there no uniformity throughout the various Federal courts, but also that a plaintiff may lose his day in court because the defendants have succeeded in concealing their conspiracy from outsiders. An example of this is offered by the Burnham Chemical Co., which brought the matter to this committee, eventually leading to the introduction of the bill. It is because of the plight of this company, against which the present applicable statute has already run, that the bill also includes section 2 making it retroactive to a certain extent. The companion bill in the Senate is S. 1910.

"The Burnham Chemical Co. was an independent producer of borax in 1928, having produced 1,427 tons of borax from its Searles Lake Federal lease during that year. It had scarcely started production in June of that year when the price of borax was cut in half, and by the end of 1928 the price was one-third of its normal figure. It naturally lost money on every ton produced and had to close down. It has been trying to get back into business ever since.

"* * * during World War II the Government seized one of the companies, German-owned, in the borax industry, and then discovered for the first time, in the files of this company, a secret written agreement in violation of the antitrust laws. Armed with this evidence, the Government, in 1944, commenced its suit against the so-called borax cartel. The Burnham Co. thereupon brought a treble-damage action, in 1945; however, it has been held, in rather extensive litigation, that the action is barred by the statute of limitations."

MAIN PROVISIONS OF H. R. 7905

Turning directly to H. R. 7905, the bill now under consideration, we find that its provisions can be summarized as follows:

1. Statute of limitations: Under H. R. 7905, section 4 (c) of the Clayton Act, as amended, would provide for a uniform 6-year statute of limitations, and the statute would commence to run from the time of discovery of conspiracy, with reasonable diligence. In addition, under the bill section 5 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended, would provide that the running of the statute of limitations would be suspended not only as now provided for in the act, but also during the pendency of a civil-damage action by the United States, which is authorized by the bill. This latter provision was not among those recommended by the Select Committee on Small Business, which did not consider the point.

2. United States may sue for damages: Under the bill, section 4 (b) of the Clayton Act, as amended, would permit the United States to sue in a civil-damage action if it is injured in its business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws. As we have seen, however, the United States would be limited to actual damages, whereas our bill permitted the United States to have treble damages, like other suitors.

3. Conclusive evidence: Under the bill, section 5 (a) of the Clayton Act, as amended, would provide that final judgments or decrees in antitrust proceedings commenced by the United States, except in new damage actions, will be conclusive evidence against a defendant in a treble-damage action or a United States damage action. This is in contrast to the present law, the wording of which is presumptive evidence. Our Select Committee on Small Business did not make any recommendation on, nor did it consider, this point; but I fully support the proposal as made in Mr. DENTON'S bill.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON H. R. 7905

Reviewing the three major changes made by H. R. 7905, as just outlined, the following may be said:

1. Statute of limitations: I, together with the other members of the Select Committee on Small Business, am in hearty accord with the bill's proposed amendment to the Clayton Act providing for a uniform statute of limitations of 6 years, for treble-damage or United States damage actions, commencing to run from the time of discovery of conspiracy. This accords with H. R. 4985, approved unanimously by our committee.

It is perhaps regrettable that the bill does not include the particular retroactive feature

included in our bill, but, all things considered, I am not disposed to press the point.

It might be noted, also, that I am in accord with the addition to the present tolling provision proposed by the bill, whereby the statute of limitations will be tolled during the pendency of a United States damage action, as well as other actions by the United States, as provided for under the present law.

2. United States may bring damage actions: All of the members of the Select Committee on Small Business, including myself, are, as reported in our progress report, in strong accord with the bill's proposed amendment to the Clayton Act authorizing the United States, as well as private persons, to commence a civil-damage action for damages sustained by it as the result of antitrust violations. This accords with H. R. 5117, unanimously approved by our committee.

However, it does seem regrettable that the present bill limits the United States to actual damages, instead of permitting treble damages, as does our bill. The main justification for penalty damages is the same, whether a private person is injured or the United States is injured. A violator causing damages to the United States on a large scale should not be treated more leniently than a violator causing damages to a private person on a smaller scale. Experience shows that the courts have been very strict in assessing damages in treble-damage actions, in any event. I am therefore taking the liberty of recommending that the bill under consideration be amended so as to allow treble damages to the United States.

3. Conclusive evidence provisions: I am in hearty accord with the amendment proposed by the bill whereby a final judgment in a proceeding brought by the United States, except a damage action, will be conclusive evidence in a treble or United States damage suit, instead of presumptive evidence. I cannot speak for the Select Committee on Small Business on this point since the proposal has not been brought before it, although my feeling is that our committee would support this proposal.

COST OR COSTS

In examining the bill under consideration, I note that proposed section 4 (a) of the Clayton Act—which your analysis of March 29 states is "virtually a reenactment" of section 4, the present provision—does contain what might be construed by the courts to be a vital change. The proposed subsection provides for treble damages, plus the "costs" of the suit and attorney's fee, instead of treble damages plus the "cost" of the suit and attorney's fee, as now provided for in section 4 of the Clayton Act.

That the word "cost" is the one used in the present provision of the Clayton Act can be verified by referring to the Statutes at Large and 38 Statutes 731 in particular. The word "costs" is used, it is true, in the comparable provision of section 7 of the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209, 210), which, however, has in effect been superseded by section 4.

As applying to the expense of a legal suit, including attorney's fees, you will no doubt agree that "cost" is the better and more accurate word. There are many cases distinguishing between "cost" and "costs" of a legal suit. The term "costs" tends to be limited to actual legal costs, which are quite small under our American legal system. "Cost" of suit, however, is generally construed to include the actual expense of the suit, including attorney's fees.

Inasmuch as the present operating provision, section 4 of the Clayton Act, actually uses the word "cost," and inasmuch as this is also the preferable word, it is my respectful recommendation that the present bill be amended so as to change the word "costs" on page 2, line 3, to "cost."

It may also be noted that I am, of course, in agreement with the bill's repeal of section 7 of the Sherman Act which has already been in effect superseded by section 4 of the Clayton Act, as already stated. This recommendation, as are my other recommendations, is subject to any possible technical objection arising out of the discarding or changing of tested statutory wording which might be raised by the Department of Justice.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Section 3 of the bill under consideration provides that the term "antitrust laws" has the meaning assigned to it by the first section of the Clayton Act. In and of itself this is a salutary provision and in the interest of uniformity.

However, it happens that section 3, the criminal section of the Robinson-Patman Act, was not, under the terms of that act, made an amendment to the Clayton Act. Moreover, section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act has never been added to the list of laws designated as "antitrust laws" in section 1 of the Clayton Act .

It is true that criminal proceedings pursuant to said section 3, for violation of the sections of the Robinson-Patman Act which do not amend the Clayton Act, have been rare. However, the law is on the books and, I am reliably informed, at least two prosecutions under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act were commenced fairly recently.

It is my recommendation, therefore, that section 3 of the present bill, relating to the definition of "antitrust laws," be amended so as to amend section 1 of the Clayton Act by including section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act (49 Stat. 1526, 8) in the definition of "antitrust laws," as used in the Clayton Act.

If you agree with my recommendation, then section 3, the criminal provision of the Robinson-Patman Act, will have a direct application to treble-damage actions and will be connected with all other Clayton Act matters where the act refers to antitrust laws. There is no reason why section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act should not have this application.

Of course, this proposal to define section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as covered by the term "antitrust laws" could be accomplished by a separate bill to amend the Clayton Act. However, in the interest of expedition it might well be done in the present bill.

SUMMARY

By way of summary, it may be stated that H. R. 7905 is recommended for approval by your committee, with some qualifications, the major of which are the following:

I. Add the words, "including the United States," after "any person," page 1, line 8. This will result in giving the United States treble damages, not merely actual damages. Also strike out new proposed section 4 (b), page 2, lines 5 to 11, as being accordingly unnecessary. Also strike out "(including an action brought by or on behalf of the United States)" on page 2, lines 12 and 13 and lines 19 and 20, as also being no longer necessary—i. e., if "including the United States" is added as here recommended.

II. Strike out "costs" on page 2, line 3, and substitute "cost."

III. Rephrase section 3 on page 4 so that the definition of "antitrust laws" will include section 3, the criminal section of the Robinson-Patman Act.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and that following his remarks made under special order, he may include a brief by the Honorable Paul A. Dever, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on the same subject.)

NATURAL GAS FOR ALL OF US EXCEPT NEW ENGLAND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, that is the story, at the moment, as the coal and railroad interests pull wires to hold back this economic first-aid from New England, which is the only remaining industrial area in the Nation that does not enjoy the benefits of this cheap fuel.

They are not satisfied with the fact that both householders and industrial users in the six northeastern States are now penalized by the highest electric-power rates in the Nation. They want us to labor under the additional burden of also paying the highest rates for fuel.

A Federal Power Commission hearing is now under way in Boston on the application of the Northeastern Gas Transmission Co. for a certificate of convenience and necessity that will permit it to bring this sorely needed fuel to the relief of New England's homes and factories.

The monopolists do not want this, or any other trunkline company, to upset the status quo controls with which they are bleeding the economic strength and enterprise of our region.

Natural gas, which is one-third as cheap as manufactured gas, is asking for permission to push its pipelines into New England, but the spokesmen for other fuels are trying to block this progressive move under a smoke screen of confusion.

We can begin to enjoy the blessings of cheap and plentiful natural gas by next winter if the Federal Power Commission is not fooled by the obstructive tactics of those who fear fair competition.

I hold no brief for any one company, but I do plead for the right of New England housewives and manufacturers to have access to this low cost, abundant, and convenient fuel before living costs and industrial costs overwhelm them.

I repeat, producers and consumers alike are being squeezed by prohibitive electric power costs on one side and by fuel costs which are also the highest in the United States. We must have relief.

The effective utilization of our water-power resources through a public program of development is inevitable, but it will take time. In the meantime we can get ample supplies of natural gas this year to ease the handicaps under which we are operating if the FPC gives the green light to the new fuel.

Our Federal Union will be "Balkanized" if the Government of the United States persists in a policy of developing every other region except New England. This first area of the Nation to become industrialized is now last when it comes to sharing the benefits of public power and natural gas. And the injustice of the situation is that the Northeastern States have been overtaxed to bring backward areas up to a level with New England and then to surpass it. We are being taxed to price ourselves out of the market.

If there is to be reciprocal trade here at home, among the 48 States, the Fed-

eral Government and its agencies must deal fairly with New England.

That we are actually suffering from discrimination is revealed by these two brutal facts:

First. Due largely to public power developments elsewhere, the cost of purchased electric energy in manufacturing industries in Massachusetts is higher than any other State in the Union, closely followed by Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire in that order. Only Maine, which does not export the hydroelectric energy from its plentiful water-power resources, enjoys a low cost-per-kilowatt-hour that enables it to compete on a fair basis with every other State outside New England.

Second. As the one remaining region still unserviced by natural gas, our fuel costs are also the highest in the Nation. Compared with the West South Central States, they are 215 percent higher.

Fuel and electric supercosts force industries to migrate from New England and discourage the expansion of existing ones or the creation of new enterprises. And they raise the living costs of consumers to the point where left-over income suffers by comparison with more highly favored regions.

The use of gas is vital to such major New England industries as textiles, plastics, printing and publishing, paper and allied products, machinery and metalworking, food processing, radio tubes, television, radar equipment, electrical equipment and appliances, and the manufacture of electrical machinery. The high cost of manufactured gas and electric power put our industries at a competitive disadvantage which narrows the margin of profit. This in turn leads to increasing unemployment which is the penalty we are forced to pay because, for some strange reason, our problems do not capture the fancy of the academic planners in Washington.

But I should like to serve notice on them that we in New England are not going to take a back seat on this issue. We do not come hat in hand, to plead for help in saving our present industries. We need these, of course, but we have set our sights on an expanding economy for our region, and we are determined to share in those new sources of fuel and power that will make it possible.

It is imperative that we have access to adequate supplies of natural gas without further delay.

We in New England are fed up with promises that are not followed through with effective action.

If the Federal Power Commission should fail to approve of a life-giving pipeline to our economy, we shall have but one recourse left, and that is for the entire New England congressional delegation to band together in a tight, cohesive unit that will vote as such on all issues with but one thought in mind, and that is to fight for the welfare of our region before every other consideration, national or international.

The talking stage is over.

We need and want natural gas as a starter, not in some vague, post-election period, but this year.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein an economic brief by the Honorable Paul A. Dever, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, regarding natural gas for Massachusetts and New England.

OUR NEED FOR NATURAL GAS IN MASSACHUSETTS AND NEW YORK

(Economic brief filed by Gov. Paul A. Dever, of Massachusetts, before Federal Power Commission)

I. THE UNNECESSARY BURDEN CARRIED BY THE CONSUMING PUBLIC OF MASSACHUSETTS

In my inaugural address to the General Court of Massachusetts on January 6, 1949, I emphasized the fact that "we have witnessed an ever-growing and increasingly crushing burden on the wage earner due to the rising cost of the necessaries of life. The prices of food, fuel, and clothing have continued to rise above limits already intolerable. Gas, electricity, telephone, and transportation exact more and more dollars from the already overburdened weekly pay check. In the case of these latter, numerous petitions for additional increases in rates are presently pending, and each day brings more demands for still further increases." A year later, in my annual message to the general court, I called attention to the several respects in which the economic position of the wage earner has deteriorated during the course of the year. This deterioration is especially marked with respect to fuels and public-utility services. Within the last 12 months the prices of some consumer goods remained constant while others actually decreased. But fuel prices and utility rates continued their seemingly irresistible advance. When it is recalled that these increases are added to the highest fuel and electric costs of any area in the United States, it then becomes apparent that immediate and decisive action must be taken to correct a situation which long since has passed the bounds of the tolerable.

Both in my inaugural address and annual report I recommended the enactment of legislation to establish a revitalized Commission on the Necessaries of Life. I proposed that the new Commission should begin an immediate investigation of the possibilities of bringing into this Commonwealth by means of a pipeline a sufficient amount of natural gas to effect reductions in the price of gas. With the passage of time, the need for natural gas becomes, if possible, more urgent. The unhappy consequences for Massachusetts' consumers and industries resulting from the present exorbitant cost of fuel necessitate my personal intervention before this Commission to petition that authority be granted at once for the transmission of natural gas to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The direct savings of millions of dollars to be realized by the consuming public through first checking and then reversing the present trend of gas rates are obvious. Nor is this the only gain to be derived by our consumers from the introduction of natural gas. The freedom of the individual consumer to choose for himself is as basic a condition for the existence of a democratic economic society as is the freedom of the individual voter to choose among rival political candidates a condition for the survival of political democracy. Political democracy is destroyed when the voter finds, as he does in so many dictatorial countries, that there is but one name on the ballot. In exactly the same sense economic democracy loses its meaning when the consumer finds that the number of alternative goods and services from which he may choose is arbitrarily restricted by the monopolistic actions of government or business. For all practical purposes the consumers of our State have no real freedom of choice with respect to fuels for home heating purposes. Gas rates are so high that only the wealthy can use gas for this purpose. This situation reminds me of the days when the right to vote was restricted to men of property. We in Massachusetts have observed how frequently consumers in other States, when allowed the choice, express a preference for gas over other fuels. We believe that the cleanliness and convenience of gas will exercise a similar appeal to our consuming public. In any case, it is the individual's prerogative in a democratic society to decide this issue for himself. The welfare of our consumers is not advanced when either business or government makes the decision for the individual. The withholding of natural gas from the consumers of Massachusetts is an arbitrary, monopolistic restraint upon economic freedom. It cannot be defended on any grounds that are compatible with the conditions required for a healthy economic society.

II. HOW THE INCREASED AVAILABILITY OF GAS WOULD AID MASSACHUSETTS INDUSTRY

It is sometimes asserted that only the consumer would benefit from the transmission of natural gas to Massachusetts. The charge comes, of course, from those interests which wish to continue to deprive our consumers of the right to use gas. But even if the assertion were correct, it would nevertheless provide adequate support for our petition. In the final analysis the sole purpose of economic activity is the creation of more benefits—a higher living standard—for the consuming public. However, the needs of the consumer are integrated with the needs of Massachusetts industry. Our citizens cannot enjoy the living standards to which they aspire if industry in our State continues to be deprived of the opportunities that would arise from a more adequate and less costly supply of gas. Our manufacturers have expressed their views on this subject in clear and unmistakable fashion. We refer to the responses given to a questionnaire sent out to 633 New England manufacturers by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. The purpose of the survey was to determine what factors in New England constitute an important advantage or disadvantage to our manufacturers in their competition with producers located elsewhere. Of the strictly economic factors, three were considered by the manufacturers to be the greatest net disadvantages of a New England location. These disadvantages were the costs of fuels, transportation, and electric power. These were the greatest handicaps to our producers in their attempts to survive in competition with manufacturers located in other areas. The rapid spread of natural-gas pipelines to all other major areas of the Nation constantly increases the competitive disadvantages suffered by Massachusetts producers.

The need of Massachusetts industry for an increased supply of gas at lower cost is evident not only from the direct testimony of our manufacturers but is demonstrated as well by our industrial history for the last 30 years. During this period the industrial structure of the Commonwealth has been subjected to constant change. Certain aspects of this revolution in the pattern of our industrial life create profound problems. Two of our principal industries—textiles and leather—have steadily reduced the amount of employment they offer to our workers. The decline of these major industries continues into the present. Within the last 12 months 10,000 jobs were lost in the city of Fall River alone. This was not merely a temporary loss of employment occasioned by a momentary decrease in business activity. The transfer of textile operations to other areas means that these jobs are lost forever. New Bedford and other cities heavily dependent upon textiles or leather have suffered comparable losses. In 1949 a contraction in new textile

and shoe orders produced large-scale unemployment throughout Massachusetts and New England. The number of applications for compensation and relief exceeded those in any other area of the country. This is a vicious circle. Should unemployment develop, then Government expenditures and taxes would rise as a result. Higher taxes do not encourage the establishment of new plants or the expansion of existing ones. These are some of the features of a problem with which we in Massachusetts have lived for a long time.

Fortunately the transformation of our economy has a brighter side. Over the years the employment lost through the contraction of some of our basic industries has been offset by the expansion of other industries. Only by the continuation of this process can we hope to absorb in new employments the workers who must find other employment due to the long-run readjustment of our industrial structure. For this reason we must improve the locational advantages of Massachusetts in every possible way. Among the specific improvements which can be made immediately is an increase in the supply and a reduction in the cost of gas.

I want to illustrate in very specific terms the role gas plays in the industrial development of Massachusetts. Our metal working and machinery industries have their origins in the colonial period. Throughout the decades they have grown steadily until today they are a major employer of workers in our State. In a hundred different ways these industries use gas as a tool in manufacturing operations.

In the 1880's the manufacture of electrical machinery and equipment was initiated in the Thomson-Houston plant in Lynn. It was from this plant, under the guidance of Massachusetts businessmen, that the General Electric Co. developed. One cannot state fully all the benefits derived by our citizens from the growth of the electrical manufacturing industry. Today thousands of our workers are dependent upon it for employment and thousands more benefit from it in a less direct fashion. Gas plays a very important part in the production operations of this industry. Had it not been for the high cost and limited availability of gas our share of the industry would be even greater than it is. Various branches of the industry located in other sections due to superior fuel advantages there.

Printing and publishing is a major Massachusetts industry. Through the years it has enjoyed a slow but steady growth. Its high-speed rotary presses employ gas for drying purposes. Our paper industry, one of the oldest and most substantial industries in the State, is now exploring the possibilities of gas for drying purposes. This application of gas has been proved successful in other areas. To this list of major Massachusetts industries can be added many others that are engaged in the preparation of food, the manufacture of instruments, the production of plastics, and so on virtually without limit.

In a very real sense the industries singled out for special reference may be said to have saved the Massachusetts economy from catastrophe. These are the industries whose development has filled the gap left by the gradual decline of the textile and leather industries. They have provided employment for thousands of workers who otherwise would be unemployed or forced to migrate to other areas. We in Massachusetts are most grateful that the gap was filled. It is a fundamental objective of our policy to provide our industries with every possible advantage so that they may continue to grow and prosper in Massachusetts. We cannot conceive how ever-rising gas rates are consistent with this objective. We have every confidence that the leather and textile industries will be stabilized in their Massachusetts location. Our shoe industry, although it employs fewer workers than in years past, produces more shoes with a greater market value than in any previous period. Today, it is a more productive industry and as a result is much better prepared to survive the competitive struggle. Through the years the woolen industry has demonstrated that it is well adapted to its present location. Nylon, orlon, and other new materials give every promise of stimulating output and unemployment in mills formerly devoted to cotton textiles. The expansion of our rayon production in recent years suggests the potentialities of the newer materials. For many years gas has been an indispensable tool in the singeing of cloth. Revolutionary and highly productive innovations in the drying of cloth are currently being introduced in the textile industry. We are resolved, since gas can be used in these new operations, that the producers in our State shall not suffer due to the unattractive terms upon which gas is presently available.

Up to this point I have referred only to well-established industries which have been with us for many years. With the end of the war, a whole new era began in Massachusetts. Let us look at some of the industries which are now emerging as important elements in the State's economy. We have firms pioneering in the construction of instruments for control engineering. One firm launched the production of an entirely new line of products which includes polaroid glass, a radically different kind of camera and a new type of film. A Boston concern was the first to find industrial applications for atomic materials and now manufactures instruments and chemicals in the field of radioactivity. Other companies are pioneering in the development and manufacture of electrostatic generators, precision research apparatus for nuclear physics, spectrochemical instruments for the chemical analysis of metals and gases, improved types of flexible tubing, high precision mechanical, hydraulic, and electrical devices, radar equipment for industrial and domestic use and many other novel products of which the public is not yet aware. In some of the new industries gas is preferred to other fuels because of its convenience and control features. In other instances, gas is an indispensable agent in the production process. It must be used regardless of cost.

The significance for Massachusetts of these postwar industries is beyond expression. Not for a moment can we tolerate the thought that they might move elsewhere due to the unfavorable fuel situation in our State. Immediate and favorable action upon an application for the transmission of natural gas is the best guaranty that we can have that these industries will not transfer their activities to other areas.

Through these brief illustrations I have attempted to convey an idea of the extent to which gas is needed in Massachusetts industry. By this limited means we cannot adequately measure the full extent of our need for larger and less expensive fuel supplies. The full measure of our need becomes apparent only when viewed in terms of the long-run transformation of our industrial structure. This transformation has brought with it the basic problem of developing new industries to replace declining ones. Failure in this venture means that a substantial proportion of our citizens might have to migrate to other areas or go unemployed. Here we have the basic and compelling need to improve the locational advantages of our State. Here, also, we have the most fundamental expression of the need to improve the fuel situation in Massachusetts.

In no other area of the Nation has there yet occurred the far-reaching industrial transformation we have experienced in Massachusetts for the last 30 years. Consequently our problems are not always understood by persons from other areas. I have, therefore, devoted the following sections of this petition to a more detailed analysis of the nature of our basic economic problems and to an explanation of their causes.

The economy of Massachusetts is integrated with the economies of our neighbor New England States. A list of the 10 major New England manufacturing industries coincides exactly with the 10 major industries of Massachusetts. Industries cross State lines, as do the operations of individual companies. Our centers of population are frequently dispersed over State borders and are dependent upon common industries. The Providence-Fall River-New Bedford metropolitan area, for example, contributes to the welfare of both Rhode Island and Massachusetts. For all these reasons, we have made repeated references in the following sections to the other New England States.

III. THE BASIC MASSACHUSETTS PROBLEM

We have indicated how for the last 30 years the Massachusetts economy has been undergoing a process of profound structural change. During this period major Massachusetts industries have fallen from their former preeminent positions. In these industries there has been a substantial decrease in the number of operating companies and a resultant loss of employment opportunities for our citizens. However, over the same period of years, many new industries developed and these provided new opportunities to replace those lost through the decline of the old industries. In terms of employment the forces of growth and expansion have on balance more than offset those of contraction and decline. As a result more persons are employed in all Massachusetts industry today than were employed 30 years ago. Despite this currently happy outcome the outlines of the basic Massachusetts problem are clearly evident. If for any prolonged period of time, the forces of contraction should prove more powerful than those of growth, then Massachusetts must be prepared to face the inevitable consequences. Should this possibility prove to be a reality, we would have either a large volume of unemployment or a large scale migration of our citizens to other areas. Neither of these alternatives is acceptable to us. It is for these reasons that we in Massachusetts welcome any new development which promises to expand the range of industrial opportunity available to Yankee enterprise. To the extent that any new development promotes the forces of expansion on the one hand or reverses those of contraction on the other it will contribute to the solution of the basic, Massachusetts problem.

Employment trends in Massachusetts and New England

An idea of the magnitude of the problem created by the secular contraction of selected manufacturing industries can be obtained from a study of the employment situation in the textile, leather and lumber industries. In 1919 these three industries afforded employment to approximately 685,000 persons in New England. By 1949 less than 375,000 individuals found employment in the combined industries. During this period employment opportunities in textiles, leather and lumber were extinguished at an average rate of 10,000 a year. Between 1919 and 1939 employment in all New England manufacturing industries decreased from 1,509,000 to 1,121,000, a net loss of jobs at an average rate for the period in excess of 19,000 a year. A part of this total loss can be traced to the lower level of business activity in 1939 which characterized the Nation as a whole as well as the New England States. Nevertheless, as the employment figures for 1949 indicate, at least half of the loss in manufactur-

ing employment in our area is due to the long run decline of activity in textiles, leather, lumber and other industries. By 1947, due in part to the stimulus of war and postwar conversion, total manufacturing employment in New England had risen considerably above the 1939 level, although it still fell short of the volume achieved in 1919. Employment in all manufacturing industries has again declined from the high 1947 level. In January, 1950, approximately 150,000 fewer jobs were available in manufacturing than had been provided in 1947.

Among the New England States, Massachusetts is the largest employer of manufacturing labor. Between 1919 and the present employment trends in Massachusetts conformed to the general New England pattern. However, the severity of the decline in the volume of manufacturing employment between 1919 and 1939 was markedly greater in our State than in the rest of New England. Whereas employment in this period decreased by 19 percent in the other New England States, it fell by 31 percent in Massachusetts. The net effect of these decreases was to reduce the Massachusetts share of the total New England manufacturing population. Fifty-three out of every 100 New England manufacturing employees—as opposed to employees in all industries—were engaged by Massachusetts concerns in 1919, while 49 out of every 100 were so employed in 1939. In this period the greater part of the burden of adjusting to the dislocation of the textile and leather industries fell upon Massachusetts. Contraction in the Massachusetts branches of these industries was the primary cause of the greater severity of the fall in our manufacturing employment. Between 1939 and 1947 employment recovered by approximately the same percentage amount (32 percent) in our State as in the other New England States. Since the latter date manufacturing employment has fallen off by somewhat less than 10 percent both in Massachusetts and New England.

There is a second aspect to our problem of maintaining full employment in New England. Each year, as a result of population growth, new additions are made to the New England working population. Between 1920 and 1946 employment in all New England nonagricultural industries—manufacturing and nonmanufacturing alike—rose at an average rate of approximately 32,000 annually. This figure does not measure the total yearly increase of new workers, for in stated years all those seeking work were not successful in finding it. The figure may be taken as a minimum estimate of the annual increase in our working population on the assumption that no substantial change occurs in the rate at which our population grows.

The basic Massachusetts problem would be complicated enough if it consisted of nothing more than creating a sufficient number of jobs to absorb each year's supply of new workers. But, as we have seen, we have the additional task of providing for the reemployment of those workers who have lost their jobs because of fundamental changes in the industrial structure of our economy.

The persistent challenge to the ingenuity of the residents of Massachusetts is how to create adequate employment opportunities for the thousands of workers who annually seek employment. Our community is fully aware of the extent and seriousness of the challenge. For many years individuals, business associations, community groups and Government organizations have sought to create conditions more favorable to the development of new concerns and industries in this region. On balance these efforts have been successful. Massachusetts has much to offer new enterprises. In response to these advantages, companies from other areas have moved here or established branch plants. Within Massachusetts many new industries have been created. While we are fully cognizant of the attractiveness of our State as an industrial location, we are aware also of the fact that all attempts to foster the industrial development of our area confront and, in some cases, are limited by certain immutable physical factors. Among these are two of particular importance. Massachusetts is not richly endowed with many of the raw materials required in important sectors of modern industry. Geographically our State is not advantageously placed with respect to the sources where some of these raw materials must be acquired. The existence and importance of these factors make it imperative that everything possible be done to improve Massachusetts' position with respect to those other factors over which a degree of control can be exercised. Every effort must be directed toward minimizing the relative disadvantages suffered by Massachusetts as compared with other areas. A concerted attempt must be made to broaden the range of industrial opportunity open to the Massachusetts producer.

The significance of natural gas to the Massachusetts economy

It is with respect to these imperative necessities of the Massachusetts economy that the proposed introduction of natural gas derives its fundamental significance. Natural gas, as such, will not give this region an advantage over other areas. At best its introduction is merely a step in the direction of correcting existing disadvantages. Other sections of the country have enjoyed the benefits of natural gas for many years. More recently these advantages have been conferred upon all other areas of the Nation with the sole exception of New England. In particular, the introduction of natural gas into the Middle Atlantic States, where many of our most active and direct competitors are located, constitutes a real threat to the stability of employment in Massachusetts industry.

The importance of natural gas as a means of increasing the range of industrial opportunity in Massachusetts cannot be fully determined at this time. Evidence has been presented to illustrate the utility of gas in various regional manufactures. I have no doubt that a considerable volume of additional testimony could be offered to demonstrate how known gas technology could be applied in our industries once an adequate supply of gas is made available. But such testimony would not bring out the full potentialities this fuel holds for our economy. I have no sympathy for the contention sometimes made that gas in Massachusetts has only a very limited industrial use. At one time or another exactly the same argument was made with respect to coal and oil. I feel reasonably certain that 90 years ago Colonel Drake, upon initiating the commercial production of oil in America, never visualized more than a very small part of the tremendous industrial developments that were to result from his discovery. I doubt that the imaginative horizon of any of his contemporaries was any broader. Today the industrial applications of atomic energy are largely unknown. Yet there are few persons who would argue that the development of atomic energy in all its aspects should be abandoned.

In estimating the industrial possibilities inherent in natural gas, allowances must be made for all the new uses which may be found for it within the unique New England industrial structure. It is highly unlikely that other areas with their different industrial structures have developed and exploited all the possible uses of gas. While from nature our area has inherited locational and resource disadvantages, through science our States have acquired important advantages. The university and industrial laboratories of Massachusetts make this the research capital of the world. They create new techniques and products on a scale which is not surpassed in any other State of the Union. Of all the benefits promised by the increased availability of gas in Massachusetts, none is of greater significance than the prospect it holds of expanding the range of industrial opportunity open to Yankee enterprise.

IV. THE CHARACTERISTIC MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES OF MASSACHUSETTS

A more detailed understanding of why the introduction of natural gas is so important to the stability of the Massachusetts economy can be obtained from an analysis of the structure of our economy. A comparison between the United States and Massachusetts shows that in Massachusetts the percentage of all employees engaged in manufacturing industries is very much higher than for the Nation as a whole. The large percentage of the work force occupied in manufacturing is the most characteristic feature of our economic structure. Table 1 presents the percentage distribution among 10 principal industry groups of employed persons in the United States and Massachusetts for the year 1940. Comparable data are also given for the other New England States. From the statistics of table 1 it can be seen that 23 out of every 100 employed persons in the United States are engaged in manufacturing activities while 19 out of every 100 employees are occupied in agriculture, forestry, and fishing. In contrast, 37 out of every 100 Massachusetts employees derive their salaries or wages from manufacturing occupations whereas only 3 out of every 100 are similarly dependent upon agriculture, forestry, and fishing. The exceptional degree of our dependence upon manufacturing explains why we must do everything within our power to maintain the competitive strength of these industries.

Table 2 ranks the major manufacturing industries of Massachusetts according to their relative importance in the economy of the State. The measure of importance is the one used previously; namely, the percentage of all employed persons in the State that is engaged in the given industry. For comparative purposes there is placed to the left of each industry group the percentage for the United States as a whole.

An examination of the information contained in table 2 suggests that a broad distinction may be drawn between the industrial structures of southern and northern New England. In the southern New England States, the machinery, metallurgical, and transportation equipment industries form an important part of the industrial structure. In the northern New England States a group of substantial manufacturing industries is based upon forestry products. Thus the paper, logging, furniture, and lumber industries absorb 10.4 percent of Maine's employed population, while in New Hampshire and Vermont 9.1 and 6.4 percent, respectively, of the employed populations are so occupied.

The industrial structure of Massachusetts shares the characteristics of its neighbor States. Throughout all the New England States one ubiquitous industrial pattern is encountered. Either the textile or the leather industry is the first or second most important industry in every State with the sole exception of Connecticut where textiles rank fourth in importance.

We noted previously the major decline in the volume of manufacturing employment which occurred in Massachusetts during the period 1919–1939. In that period employment contracted by 32 percent or at an average rate of 1.6 percent annually. Over the 20-year period employment opportunities were lost at a rate of more than 12,000 a year. The greater part of this loss can be

traced to the decline of our textile and leather industries. Yet, even following the drastic liquidation of textile and leather concerns, these industries remain as the principal sources of wages and salaries for Massachusetts employees. Our past experiences have demonstrated to us the disastrous possibilities inherent in the delicate balance between the forces of economic expansion and contraction in Massachusetts. We were reminded of these unpleasant possibilities in 1949 when large scale unemployment developed in the textile and leather industries. Our changing industrial structure creates the need for offsets to the threatening flood of unemployment whose source is to be found in the declining industries of our State. Any new supply of materials or fuels which can be made available to New England in greater quantity or at a lower cost must be welcomed for the prospect it holds of widening the range of industrial opportunity.

V. COMMON CHARACTERISTICS OF MAJOR MASSACHUSETTS AND NEW ENGLAND MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Not every type of industry can locate in Massachusetts or New England and hope to survive. As a general rule, industries which consume large quantities of raw materials—as opposed to semi-manufactured materials—will not find that this is an advantageous location. The reasons for this have been mentioned before. Our area is not richly endowed with the raw materials of modern industry. Industries in other areas are better situated with respect to supplies of raw materials and, consequently, enjoy a relative advantage in transportation costs. The data of table 3 provide a basis for ascertaining the common characteristics of the major manufacturing industries. The industry groups listed therein are those used in the census of manufacturers. In the first column information is provided on the ratio of the cost of materials to the value of product for each industry in the United States. For all industries material costs amount to 56.6 percent of the value of products. Each industry is ranked in the first column according to the ratio its material costs bear to the value of its products. Thus in the industry designated products of petroleum and coal material costs constitute 77.1 percent of the value of the product while in the printing and publishing industry such costs amount to only 31.5 percent of the value of the product. From this column we can determine the relative importance of material costs to the several industries of the United States. By comparison we can discover the extent to which Massachusetts and New England industries are heavy, light or average consumers of materials.

Nine major New England industries are indicated by the letter "X" in the second column of table 3. In January 1950, these nine industries accounted for 76 percent of all Massachusetts manufacturing employment and for 71 percent of such employment in New England. The proportion of the Massachusetts working population employed in each of these industries exceeds the national average. (See table 2.) With the exception of the food industry, the same condition holds for New England as a whole. The data presented provide the basis for a number of conclusions concerning the characteristics of the major Massachusetts and New England industries.

The major Massachusetts and New England industries as indicated in the second column of table 3 divide into two groups. Those in the first group have the common characteristic that the ratio of material costs to value of product is above the average ratio (56.6 percent) for all industry groups in the United States. With the exception of the leather industry they share a second characteristic. The food, apparel and paper industries derive their principal materials from local New England sources. Locally supplied pulp wood is available to the paper industry. The food industry processes the raw milk, fruits, vegetables, poultry and fish produced by New England agriculture and fisheries, and the apparel industry completes the fabrication of semimanufactured goods derived from the textile industry. One other factor plays an important role in the location of the food industry. The production of bakery products is necessarily oriented with respect to the final market for those products. Only the leather and leather products industry appears as an apparent exception to these locational principles. Actually, it is not an exception for the industry has been in a period of decline for over 30 years.

The second group of major Massachusetts and New England industries have very low material-value ratios. They are also the expanding industries of the area. While materials imported from other regions are used in these industries, the materials constitute a relatively small part of the value of the products produced. The material-value ratio in the textile industry approaches more nearly the ratios prevailing in the first group. The raw materials are derived almost exclusively from other regions. All available data support the conclusion that a condition for an industry's survival and expansion in Massachusetts and in the other New England States is a comparatively low material-value ratio, unless local raw materials can be relied upon or unless the product is necessarily oriented toward the ultimate consumer. Changes in raw material sources and technology can alter the effect of these general conclusions. New technical processes may reduce the transportation disadvantage of our location with respect to raw material sources. The development of new raw material sources—particularly when water transportation is involved—may place Massachusetts midway between raw material and consumer markets. Given these developments which are already beyond the stage of anticipation, the increased availability of lower cost fuel becomes even more crucial as a determining factor in our economic growth.

In the third column, the ratio of wages and salaries to value of product is presented for each of the several industries. For the country as a whole, wages and salaries represent 20.5 percent of the value of manufactured products. In seven of our nine major industries the ratio exceeds 20.5 percent. In other words, New England specializes in those industries where labor costs are a comparatively large part of the value of products and where material costs are a relatively small part of the value of products.

VI. THE HIGH COST OF FUEL IN MASSACHUSETTS AND NEW ENGLAND

Fuel costs are higher in New England than in any other area of the United States. Comparative cost data for the several regions of the United States are presented in table 4. For the Nation as a whole the average cost of a million B. t. u. of fuel was 15.8 cents in 1939. In Massachusetts the cost was 26 percent above the national average or 19.9 cents per million B. t. u. Fuel costs here exceeded those in the West South Central States by over 200 percent. What is of more significance for the welfare of our economy is the difference between our fuel costs and those of our closest competitors. The manufacturing industries of the Middle Atlantic States provide direct competition for all nine of the major Massachusetts industries indicated in table 3. In this competition we are handicapped by fuel costs that are 24 percent above those of the Middle Atlantic area.

The relationship between the quantity of fuel consumed in industry and its price is demonstrated by the data given in table 4. In the West South Central States, where fuel could be obtained at a cost of 6.6 cents per million B. t. u., 1,946,000,000 B. t. u. were used per wage earner. In New England, where fuel costs were 215 percent higher, only 299,000,000 B. t.u. were used per wage earner. Consumption per wage earner in the West South Central States exceeded that in New England by 550 percent. On the same basis, consumption in the Nation as a whole exceeded that in New England by 128 percent. The statistical data support a familiar proposition in economics, namely, that the quantity of any commodity demanded decreases with an increase in its price.

VII. THE HIGH COST OF ELECTRIC ENERGY IN MASSACHUSETTS AND NEW ENGLAND

Massachusetts and New England suffer even greater disadvantages in the cost of electric energy than in the cost of fuels. Table 5 presents the relevant data for the several principal areas of the United States. The cost of electric energy in Massachusetts exceeded the national average by 47 percent. Our costs were 53 percent above those of our principal competitors in the Middle Atlantic States and 260 percent higher than those of the State with the lowest costs.

The relationship between the kilowatt-hour cost of electric energy and the kilowatt-hour consumption per wage earner is of the same form as that established for fuels. Consumption per wage earner in the United States exceeded consumption in Massachusetts by 80 percent. On the same basis, consumption in the Middle Atlantic States was 80 percent higher than in Massachusetts. Outside of New England, only two States in the Union, Florida and New Mexico, consumed less electric energy per wage earner than Massachusetts.

Developments in the fields of fuels and electric energy since 1939 have increased the cost disadvantages suffered by Massachusetts. Two developments are of particular importance. Public power projects in several areas have increased the spread between electric energy costs in those areas and in Massachusetts. Lower fuel costs in other regions have resulted from the introduction of natural gas. Massachusetts has not enjoyed the benefits resulting from either of these developments. To the contrary, our manufacturers have confronted steadily rising fuel and electric energy costs. The practical effect of these extremely unfavorable fuel and electric energy costs is to preclude any possibility of establishing industries in Massachusetts which are even moderately heavy consumers of fuel and energy. This is a highly effective way by which to limit the freedom of our industry to develop.

VIII. THE TRANSMISSION OF NATURAL GAS TO MASSACHUSETTS WOULD PROMOTE THE GROWTH OF INDUSTRY

Our intent in presenting the foregoing material is to show how an increased supply of less costly gas can contribute to the solution of the basic problem we confront. The question of whether or not natural gas should be transmitted to Massachusetts cannot be determined by a mere list of the concerns which currently use gas in their operations. We believe the test of current use is both inadequate and misleading. Applied, for example, to the field of atomic materials and energy it would establish, since the present uses of atomic materials and energy in industry are exceedingly limited, the absurd conclusion that efforts to increase the availability

of these factors should be abandoned. Application of the same criterion to Massachusetts industry in 1900 would have resulted in equally misleading conclusions. Since that time our economy has been transformed by the development of new industries which make an extensive use of gas in their operations. (See table 6.) In the present case erroneous conclusions are certain to result from applying the current use test. We submit that the need for transmitting natural gas to Massachusetts is entirely conclusive when viewed against the background of our changing industrial structure. Rather than looking solely at the number of concerns currently using gas we must look at the direction in which our economy is tending to grow. We must consider the manner in which an increased supply of this fuel at lower cost would complement other factors which promote the expansion of our industry.

From the material presented in the preceding sections a number of conclusions can be formed concerning the characteristics of both the expanding and contracting industries in Massachusetts and New England. As a general rule, successful business ventures in Massachusetts are ones in which labor costs constitute an important part of the value of the product produced. Our expanding industries make an increasing use of highly skilled, technical labor. These features are particularly notable in the cases of those industries, such as machinery and electrical equipment, which developed during the period of maximum decline in the textile and leather industries. They are even more characteristic of the new, postwar industries, whose typical manufacturing operations are often only one stage removed from laboratory work.

A second factor determining the success or failure of business ventures in Massachusetts is the ratio of materials cost to the value of the product. For one group of successful industries the material-value factor is not important. This group derives its raw materials from local sources. Thus the paper, food, and apparel industries are based upon the use of locally available material supplies. Many of our newest industries gain an advantage from access to virtually unlimited sources of scientific and technical advice. Aside from these cases, the expanding industries of Massachusetts are characterized by the low ratio of material costs to value of product and by the relatively small consumption of fuel and electric energy per wage earner. In other words, successful business operation requires an above-average economy in the use of all those materials and services which are supplied from other areas upon relatively disadvantageous terms. Such economy minimizes the disadvantages of a Massachusetts location, such as, the local unavailability of many materials, the great distance from some raw-material sources and the fantastically high costs of fuels and electric energy.

Among these factors are some over which no control can be exercised. Fuel costs, however, can be controlled. We consider the transmission of natural gas to Massachusetts the most immediate and promising method by which the expansion of our industries can be promoted at this time.

IX. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO MASSACHUSETTS

To this point we have been primarily concerned with the promise natural gas holds for stimulating the development of Massachusetts manufacturing industry. There are two other respects in which the introduction of natural gas would contribute to the promotion of our interests.

The living standards of Massachusetts workers are closely related to this problem. Money wage rates today are determined in part by the cost of living. We in Massachusetts take pride in the relatively high wages earned by our workers. But it must be noted that relative wage rates between two areas do not always measure the actual regional differences in living standards. A worker's living standard is not raised when his wage rate is increased merely as a means of compensating for higher living costs. By virtue of this action, the worker derives no benefit. Indirectly, however, he may be seriously injured by it. When increases in wage rates are only a consequence of higher living costs in a given area, they result ultimately in pricing the labor of that area out of the national market. Employment under these conditions is certain to contract. We in Massachusetts have every reason to be seriously concerned over this problem. Our grounds for concern are obvious. This is especially so in the case of consumer fuel costs. Due to severe winters, fuel costs are a very important part of family budgets in our State. The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor publishes a consumer's price index derived from data collected in 35 large cities of the United States. Three New England cities are included in the index. By November 15, 1949, the index of fuel costs for the United States as a whole stood at 139.1. Fuel costs in all three New England cities exceeded the national average by a very consideral amount. The index of fuel costs rose to 153.3 in Manchester, N. H., to 154.4 in Boston, Mass., and to 151.1 in Portland, Maine. Ranked according to the magnitude of these costs Manchester, Boston and Portland were second, third and fifth among the 35 cities included in the survey. If domestic consumers in our State were to use an amount of electric power adequate for the maintenance of reasonable living standards, they would be required to pay the highest electric rates in the United States. This is a type of distinction which New England can ill afford. Since November 1949, fuel costs have again increased. Sooner or later these increases will be reflected in higher wage rates, but the higher wage rates will not confer any benefit upon our workers. Their only consequence will be to make Massachusetts labor relatively more expensive than labor in other areas and to substitute production by workers in other regions for the production which might have been undertaken here.

There is one final problem to which we wish to call attention. When Massachusetts producers sell cloth to other areas, they receive payments. When the same producers purchase raw cotton from other regions, they make payments. Whether our payments to other areas for all purposes exceed or fall short of payments made to us is a matter of great importance. For a number of years Massachusetts' payments to other regions have exceeded the payments made to us. In short, we have an unfavorable balance of payments with the rest of the United States. Today this is referred to as a dollar shortage, and we are as concerned with our dollar shortage as the Europeans are with theirs. A decrease in the price of raw cotton would mean that our textile manufacturers could obtain the same quantity of cotton by making a smaller total payment for that purpose. To this extent our unfavorable balance would be reduced. Exactly the same situation exists with regard to fuels. With very minor exceptions all fuel consumed in Massachusetts is imported from other regions. A reduction in fuel prices would reduce the payments we would need to make to those regions and thus aid in bringing about a more favorable balance.

Massachusetts cannot maintain an unfavorable balance of payments without limit. It cannot, in other words, continue to buy more than it sells. The continued drainage of funds from our area would reduce the ability of Massachusetts industry to pay higher wage rates at the very time when higher rates must be paid in order to compensate for rising living costs. The proposal to bring natural gas to Massachusetts is the most specific and valuable suggestion yet made for the correction of this situation.

TABLE 1.—*Percentage distribution among industry groups of employed persons in the United States and Massachusetts, 1940*

	United States	New England States					
		Massachusetts	Rhode Island	Connecticut	Maine	New Hampshire	Vermont
All industries (percent of United States total)	100.0	3.4	0.6	1.5	0.6	0.4	0.3
Industrial groups (percent of each area or State total):							
1. Agriculture, forestry and fishing	18.8	2.7	2.1	4.0	14.2	9.1	24.7
2. Extractive	2.0	.1	.1	.1	.2	.2	1.2
3. Construction	4.6	4.5	4.9	4.9	4.3	5.1	4.5
4. Manufacturing	23.4	36.8	45.8	43.5	32.8	39.5	22.0
5. Transportation, communication, etc.	6.9	6.5	4.8	4.9	6.2	5.1	6.3
6. Trade	21.9	24.8	21.2	21.2	18.8	18.1	17.1
7. Personal services	8.9	8.4	7.3	8.1	9.4	9.2	9.9
8. Professional services	8.2	10.2	7.9	8.6	8.0	8.5	8.3
9. Government	3.9	4.3	4.5	3.2	4.1	3.3	4.2
10. Industry group not specified	1.5	1.8	1.2	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.0

Source: Census of Population, 1940.

TABLE 2.—*The characteristic manufacturing industries of Massachusetts and New England—A comparison between the percentage distribution among manufacturing groups of employed persons in the United States and each New England State, 1940*

SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND STATES

United States	Massachusetts		United States	Connecticut		United States	Rhode Island	
2.6	Textile-mill products	8.3	2.8	Iron and steel and their products	7.4	2.6	Textile-mill products	21.6
.8	Leather and leather products	4.6	2.4	Machinery	7.3	1.8	Miscellaneous	7.2
2.4	Machinery	4.6	.6	Nonferrous metals and products	6.2	2.8	Iron and steel and their products	4.8
1.8	Miscellaneous	3.3	2.6	Textile-mill products	5.9	2.4	Machinery	4.7
1.7	Apparel	2.1	1.8	Miscellaneous	5.7	.6	Nonferrous metals and products	1.4
1.4	Printing, publishing and allied industries	1.9	1.7	Apparel	2.7	1.7	Apparel	1.1
.7	Paper and allied products	1.9	.7	Transportation equipment	2.1			
.7	Transportation equipment except auto	1.2	1.0	Chemicals	1.0			
.6	Nonferrous metals and products	.9	.7	Paper and allied products	.8			

TABLE 2.—*The characteristic manufacturing industries of Massachusetts and New England—A comparison between the percentage distribution among manufacturing groups of employed persons in the United States and each New England State, 1940*—Continued

NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND STATES

United States	Maine		United States	New Hampshire		United States	Vermont	
2.6	Textile-mill products	8.4	0.8	Leather and leather products	12.5	2.6	Textile-mill products	3.3
.8	Leather and leather products	6.3	2.6	Textile-mill products	9.0	2.4	Machinery	3.1
.7	Paper and allied products	5.0	.7	Paper and allied products	3.7	.8	Stone, glass and clay products	2.8
.3	Logging	2.2	.8	Furniture, etc	2.2	1.0	Sawmills and planing mills	2.3
.7	Transportation equipment except auto	1.7	.3	Logging	1.6	.8	Furniture, etc	1.9
.8	Furniture, store fixtures, miscellaneous wooden goods	1.7	1.0	Sawmills and planing mills	1.6	.7	Paper and allied products	1.1
1.0	Sawmills and planing mills	1.5	.7	Transportation equipment except auto	1.4	.3	Logging	1.1

Adapted from Census of Population, 1940.

TABLE 3.—*Major Massachusetts manufacturing industries, cost of materials, wages and salaries, and value of products*

Industry group	Percent cost of materials[1] is of value of product, 1939[2]	Major Massachusetts industries, 1950[3]	Percent wages and salaries are of value of product, 1939[2]
All industry groups	56.6		20.5
Products of petroleum and coal	77.1		7.5
Tobacco manufacturers	73.5		6.0
Nonferrous metals and their products	68.0		15.0
Automobiles and automobile equipment	67.3		18.9
Food and kindred products	66.5	X	11.1
Apparel and other finished products made from fabrics	58.5	X	24.9
Leather and leather products	58.0	X C	25.2
Paper and allied products	56.9	X	19.6
Iron and steel and their products	55.2		24.4
Rubber products	55.0		22.8
Textile-mill products and other fiber manufactures	53.7	X C	27.0
Furniture and finished lumber products	50.6		27.4
Chemicals and allied products	49.7		14.0
Transportation equipment except automobiles	46.6		34.3
Lumber and timber basic products	44.9		32.3
Electrical machinery	42.1	X E	27.6
Miscellaneous	40.3	X	30.1
Nonelectric machinery	39.5	X E	30.9
Stone, clay, and glass products	36.7		28.4
Printing and publishing	31.5	X E	32.0

[1] Includes cost of materials, supplies, fuels, purchased electric energy and contract work.
[2] Based upon *Census of Manufactures*, 1939.
[3] U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 4.—*Consumption and cost of fuels in manufacturing industries, 1939*

	Consumption of fuels	Cost per million B. t. u.'s	Consumption per wage earner
	Billions B. t. u.	*Cents*	*Millions B. t. u.*
United States	5,367,386	15.8	681
GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS			
1. West South Central	510,948	6.6	1,946
2. East South Central	309,013	12.1	864
3. Mountain	123,612	14.9	1,785
4. Middle Atlantic	1,563,601	16.1	696
5. South Atlantic	452,176	16.3	458
6. West North Central	218,370	16.8	571
7. East North Central	1,715,751	17.7	781
8. Pacific	186,368	18.4	413
9. New England	285,518	20.8	299
Rhode Island	32,725	16.7	308
Massachusetts	139,856	19.9	304
Connecticut	66,404	20.9	284
Maine	28,312	24.8	374
New Hampshire	13,700	27.6	246
Vermont	4,493	33.0	206

Source: Census of Manufactures.

TABLE 5.—*Consumption and cost of purchased electric energy in manufacturing industries, 1939*

	Quantity purchased	Cost per kilowatt-hour	Consumption per wage earner
	Kilowatt-hours	*Cents*	*Kilowatt-hours*
United States	45,040,075	1.03	5,711
GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS			
1. East South Central	3,787,107	.68	10,584
2. Mountain	1,065,388	.76	15,387
3. Pacific	3,263,467	.90	7,236
4. South Atlantic	5,694,100	.96	5,772
5. Middle Atlantic	12,949,780	.99	5,756
6. West South Central	1,960,990	1.02	7,468
7. East North Central	10,882,529	1.17	4,957
8. West North Central	2,051,200	1.25	5,367
9. New England	3,385,514	1.35	3,550
Maine	572,342	.74	7,565
New Hampshire	175,082	1.27	3,139
Vermont	104,785	1.40	4,816
Rhode Island	378,448	1.42	3,561
Connecticut	687,276	1.49	2,943
Massachusetts	1,467,581	1.51	3,186

Source: Census of Manufactures.

TABLE 6. *Selected Massachusetts industries currently using gas*

Electrical machinery and equipment: Incandescent lamp making, flange making, stem making, insertion of filament supports, sealing-in, exhaust, basing, sintering for coiled filaments, miscellaneous use.

Fluorescent lamp making: Flange making, stem making, sealing-in, exhaust, basing, lehring (annealing and coating baking).

Tubes: Radio, television and radar equipment.

Electrical equipment and appliances: Flame hardening, plating, baking, baking and finishing, soldering, drying.

Food processing: Roasting, baking, cooking, smoking.

Machinery and metalworking: Annealing, carburizing, coating, cleaning equipment, cyaniding, drying, hardening and tempering, hydrizing, nitriding.

Paper and allied products: Drying.

Plastics: Softening, compression molding, injection molding.

Printing and publishing: Drying, melting.

Textiles and other mill products: Singeing yarns and fabrics, drying.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF REA LIGHT AND POWER PROGRAM

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the Government program that brought light and power and an improved way of life to rural America observes its fifteenth anniversary this month. At this time I would like to pay tribute to its accomplishments and to pledge my support to any measure that will insure its continued progress.

On a day long to be remembered by the farmers of this Nation, May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was created by Executive order of the late President Roosevelt. At that time only 1 out of every 10 farms in the Nation had electricity, and there was little chance that the others would ever get it unless the farm people themselves were given the opportunity to do something about it. The REA program provided them that opportunity on a pay-as-you-go basis. Today, better than 85 percent of our farms are electrified.

In 1935, when this great program started, only about three out of every hundred farms in North Carolina had electric service. Now, 15 years later, 8 out of 10 are connected to the highlines.

The first REA loan in my State was made to the Tidewater Power Co., of Wilmington, back in 1935. Since then, 1 other commercial company, 2 municipalities, and 34 cooperatives have borrowed a total of $61,244,552 and the lines that this money financed now reach into all but 4 counties of North Carolina. In my Eighth Congressional District, rural people in all 12 counties are receiving service from REA cooperatives.

More than 129,000 farm families and other rural establishments in North Carolina have been brought electricity by REA-financed lines. Most of them would not have it now except for the REA loans. Almost 7,000 more families—perhaps 28,000 people—will have service as soon as construction already approved is completed.

And the REA co-ops have pledged themselves to keep on expanding their facilities until practically all of the 45,000 farms still unserved in North Carolina have access to power.

There are six of these co-ops serving the rural people in my district. They are the Pee Dee Electric Membership Corp., of Wadesboro; the Davidson Electric Membership Corp., of Lexington; the Davie Electric Membership Corp., of Mocksville; the Union Electric Membership Corp., of Monroe; the Lumbee River Electric Corp., of Red Springs; and the Central Electric Membership Corp., of Sanford.

These cooperatives are doing a fine job and their members have great pride in their accomplishments. Altogether these co-ops are operating more than 8,000 miles of line and are serving nearly 30,000 of my constituents.

At least 500 more families in my district will receive electricity when these co-ops complete construction already approved by REA.

The money that these farm people in my district borrowed from REA to build their facilities is being paid back to the Government at a remarkable rate. The six co-ops have received loans totaling $12,655,000 and already they have made

principal and interest payments totaling $1,290,458, including $162,901 on principal before it was due.

The REA program, as it has been put to work by the farmers of my district and the Nation, provides an excellent example of free enterprise at work. It is indicative of what a Government alert to the needs of its people and its responsibility to serve them can and should do.

Until the REA program was created, more than 287,000 farm families in North Carolina were denied the tools of modern living and farming. They had little hope of ever having electricity and the conveniences it brings; the conveniences which city people take for granted; the things which we are so proud to lump together and call the American standard of living.

Electricity has brought a new and more abundant way of life to the farms of America. Without electric power to lend a helping hand, farming means back-breaking toil from morning until dark. It means endless chores for the housewife, doing the family laundry with an old-fashioned washboard, carrying hundreds of pails of water a month.

That sort of existence was driving thousands of young folk off the farm to seek employment where they could enjoy the comforts of city living. It is vital to the Nation that those young men and women be encouraged to stay on the farm; to grow the food and fiber needs of this country. Electricity coming to the farm has been the greatest single factor in offering them that encouragement.

This, too, has been a big factor in the migration of thousands of young war veterans to the rural areas of America where they have settled with their families in farm homes which offer all the comforts to be found in city dwellings. The wives now are able to enjoy electric refrigerators, electric ranges, washing machines, and other labor-saving appliances.

But even of greater importance is the part electricity has played in helping the farmer to prosper; it has increased his efficiency many times over what it was when all farm chores had to be done by hand. Now, with the flick of a switch, he can put electricity to work for him on more than 400 different chores. It saves him time, money, and effort, and increases his income.

In its role as a banker for the program, which has been hailed by many as one of the most outstanding examples of democracy in action, the REA has invested more than $2,100,000,000 in the electrification of rural America. This money has been used to help start nearly 1,000 new privately owned, privately operated, tax-paying businesses, run by the farmers of this country, and dedicated to bringing electricity to every person in rural areas who wants it.

This goal is being reached at a record rate. During 1949, REA-financed cooperatives connected one consumer to their lines every 15 seconds of every working day. Right now they are operating more than 1,000,000 miles of lines and serving nearly 3,250,000 consumers who otherwise might never have had electricity.

I would like to emphasize that the money borrowed to build these facilities is being paid back to the Government with interest. There is no grant or subsidy whatsoever connected with these loans. Every penny lent by REA must and will be paid back by the borrowers.

Yet there are some who will tell you that this whole program is not American; that through these loans the Government is designing to get into the electricity business.

There is nothing further from the truth. Every pole, every foot of wire, every meter, and every transformer that goes into an REA-financed electric system is owned—lock, stock, and barrel—by the borrower. REA does not own, operate, or control a single piece of electric equipment.

Free, private enterprise is actually flourishing under the REA program.

For example, REA co-ops, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, paid commercial power companies $30,924,331 for wholesale power to serve their farmer-consumers. More than $237,000 of this was paid by the co-ops in my district. More than 57 percent of all the power used by REA co-ops was purchased from these commercial companies. This compares with 51 percent in 1946, 55 percent in 1947, and 56 percent in 1948.

REA co-ops are just about the best customers the private utilities have. The commercial power companies are selling more energy than ever before in history, and REA is one of the principal reasons.

The problem that faces REA today is serious. With 85 percent of the Nation's farms electrified, the REA program is being bogged down by a power shortage. The almost fantastic increase in farm use of electricity in recent years has just about exhausted the capacity of existing suppliers to meet the power needs of the cooperatives.

In fact, a recent survey shows that 22 percent of the co-ops do not now have enough power to meet their present needs. Another 26 percent report they do not have enough power in sight to meet their anticipated growth. Unless additional power sources are opened up, continued progress of rural electrification is threatened.

REA can be forced against the wall unless power can be made available. Two REA's have already been forced to sell.

I am pleased to know that the six REA cooperatives in my Eighth Congressional District are moving forward with renewed interest. It behooves every member to work closely with his local REA board of directors and managers. These men and women are performing a great service and must have the full cooperation of all users.

The farmers of my congressional district, of my State and of the Nation, on this fifteenth anniversary of the REA program, should be congratulated on the fine job they have done in providing themselves with electricity. Let us help them protect the gains they have made and likewise help them do a still better job.

ABANDONED AIRFIELDS SHOULD BE GUARDED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been forcibly directed to a situation in this country with respect to the manner in which airfields and airports formerly used by our armed forces have been abandoned since the close of hostilities.

There are several hundred in the United States, some of them in Kansas. Nearly all of these airfields are either not policed, or if so, only partially guarded.

I have a letter from Mr. J. E. Schaefer, vice president, Boeing Airplane Co., Wichita, Kans., who has called my attention to this matter, and from which I quote in part:

> As you know, there are several large airfields which have been abandoned in Kansas. This same situation is true in almost every State of the Union. Little or no policing is provided on many of these airfields. * * * These abandoned airports should then either be policed, immobilized, or destroyed. * * * Congress, it seems to me, should request an immediate study of this situation and require whatever defensive action is necessary to preclude any possibility of abandoned airports being used by a potential enemy or its accessories.

Mr. Schaefer has spent a lifetime in the airplane business. He has recently made a careful study of this subject matter to which I have called your attention. He believes we should not sit idly by and permit these hazards to continue, when with comparatively small expense and little effort, they could be amply protected.

I suggest that members of the Committee on Armed Forces give this important problem the attention to which it is entitled.

Mr. Schaefer states Gen. George Kenny, commanding general of the Air Force University, Maxwell Air Field, in a recent visit to Wichita, joined Mr. Schaefer in his opinion.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, on account of official business.

To Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BRAMBLETT, for an indefinite period, on account of important business.

To Mr. ALLEN of California, for 3 weeks, beginning May 13, 1950, on account of official business.

To Mr. SCUDDER, for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address the Members of the House again today on the subject of economy. Yesterday in the Committee of the Whole, while we were debating the $29,000,000,000 omnibus appropriation bill, I spoke twice rather caustically and pertinently about this vitally important subject. The remarks I am about to make cannot in any way be construed in the nature of criticism of the present administration, because it has generally been felt that the ECA or Marshall-plan program has been one that has received nonpartisan support. I supported the program because of its definite worth to all of us as a nation and because it has been so tremendously effective in combatting totalitarianism in the balance of the world where free people still survive. Further, it has for some time been under the direction of a very fine Republican, Mr. Hoffman.

However, it is my purpose to call your attention to this newspaper item date lined Paris, May 10. It is very short, only about 9 or 10 lines, but it is very illustrative of the lack of economy that I am so strenuously opposed to. Waste and inefficiency along with such stupid and ineffective use of the taxpayers' money are things that the American people are objecting to and are so resentful of. Why do not we eliminate such idiotic and careless handling of our financial affairs by those who are so callous and indifferent to the general welfare of our own country.

May I read this little clipping from one of the Washington newspapers:

ECA FUNDS REBUILDING FRENCH GAMING CASINO

PARIS, May 10.—Marshall-plan funds are being used to the extent of four and a half million francs to rebuild the gambling casino at Le Havre. The ECA office here says "this may seem frivolous expenditure, but it is important to help increase the town's revenues."

To me it seems rather inconsistent that the Congress is authorizing the spending of $150,000 for a committee of the Senate to make a nation-wide investigation of gaming or gambling with its resultant crime and corruption, and $20,000 for a House committee to make a similar investigation confined to the District of Columbia. I know it must strike you the same way. The brashness and absurdity of the whole affair would throw a person for a loop or make one throw rocks at their grandmother so to speak. Many a town or city in this country may need to increase its revenues, but we will not agree that this is the proper way for them to do so. Is this the old way of "taking" our touring citizens? We should pay for these contraptions and supply the suckers as well? No indeed, let these schemers go to work producing goods that will benefit their citizens and supply a permanent and legitimate source of revenue, thereby also eliminating the causes of hardships and moral degeneration. More honest work and less dishonest scheming will help solve their problems.

I am sure that most of the Members here will agree that this does make sense. If they do not, then I will say that it is too bad because I am sure the majority of the good people of this country will not condone such reckless and ill-advised spending of their money. And, that is only from the dollar-and-cent viewpoint. There are many who will have some moral compunctions about such activities. Many civic-minded people in our towns and cities, counties, States, and Federal Government, are trying desperately, or should be if they are not, to control, or better yet, to eliminate this grave menace to our own society and Government. These are the aspirations of those who desire to protect fine mothers with their families of good children who are many times utterly helpless to avoid the disgraceful hardships which are inflicted upon them by such nefarious and evil activities. To say they are unlawful is but a mild statement and only a temporizing rebuke. No one can deny that to a great extent the payoffs are in the form of broken homes, separations, divorces, and child abandonment. No one can deny that innocent children are ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad because of commercialized gambling. Nor can anyone say that they are not further harmed by the lack of proper medical care, insufficient schooling, inadequate home training, as well as badly neglected religious instruction. I think I need not go further in my efforts to show how these families are ravaged and the lives of future citizens are jeopardized and imperiled under such circumstances, and I think it well applies to those of other countries. Shall we support them with our tax money? No.

It is not a habit of mine to lecture, nor to moralize, and I have not intended to do so. It has only been a desperate effort on my part to point out as vividly and dramatically as possible for me to, to the pathos of such a situation where we are actually sending our money to another country while we are denying, because of the dire need for economy here, relief for many of our children from the very things that I have spoken of.

Mr. Speaker, it is, to my way of thinking, an atrocious as well as ludicrous proposition to say the least. Now you may say I am making a mountain out of a mole hill. What is four and one-half million francs, you say—maybe not too much, but I would not care if it were only 50 francs under these circumstances. Then again, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first instance of such unwise and unjustified expenditures of ECA money that has come to my attention. No, indeed; some have been reported that would make this sum look like a 5-cent bag of peanuts. Now let me caution you Members as well as the people of this country that we cannot expect perfection in the handling of such a colossal program with all of its many harassing ramifications. It is certainly impossible to expect this huge organization to lay everything on the line to the degree of a gnat's heel. However, let us get down to brass tacks and cut out the monkey business. We must do it if we want the future wholehearted support and cooperation of Mr. Public.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SHELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include articles and speeches.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a tribute to Johann Sebastian Bach prepared by Mr. Herschel C. Gregory, a resident of Lebanon, Ind.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include newspaper articles.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 15, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1441. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system, and authorizing the United States to pay for water and water services secured from the District of Columbia water system," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 182. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress

up to and including the Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2039). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 176. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the national health plan for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 2040). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 551. Resolution authorizing the printing of the report entitled "Unification and Strategy" as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 2041). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 557. Resolution authorizing the printing of the committee print entitled 'Congress and the Monopoly Problem—50 Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1950," as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 2042). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 595. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "The Making of a Congressman" as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 2043). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 555. Resolution for the relief of Hazel B. Prater; without amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 591. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Rose Margaret Torrance; without amendment (Rept. No. 2045). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 594. Resolution for the relief of Albert A. Wrede; without amendment (Rept. No. 2046). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 506. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and $350 funeral expenses to the estate of George T. Giragi, late an employee of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 2047). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 534. Resolution providing for additional compensation for certain employees of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 2048). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 524. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7722. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation, as a part of the National Capital park system, of the Old Stone House in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 8287. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate No. 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell; without amendment (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4370. A bill for the relief of May Hosken; without amendment (Rept. No. 2052). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8290. A bill for the relief of Jeffrey Bracken Spruill and Susan Spruill; without amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 8479. A bill to provide waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8480. A bill to establish the counties of Kings and Richmond and the counties of Nassau, Queens, and Suffolk in the State of New York as a separate and complete internal revenue collection district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 8481. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the third district area, Elkhart and St. Joseph Counties, Ind., including tributaries of the St. Joseph River, for flood control, drainage, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. R. 8482. A bill to amend section 5 of title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 8483. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8484. A bill to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 8485. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 8486. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 8487. A bill to authorize the use of penalty envelopes by the National Guard of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 8488. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 8489. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, so as to prohibit the use by Federal savings and loan associations of certain terms commonly used by banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8490. A bill to provide for the retirement of any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico, and the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and any judge of a Circuit Court of the Territory of Hawaii after 10 years of service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 8491. A bill relating to the chartering of war-built vessels and other defense reserve vessels by the United States Maritime Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 8492. A bill to repeal paragraph 1752 (relating to patna rice) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8493. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to remove from the free list patna rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned soups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8494. A bill to impose a duty of 2½ cents per pound on patna rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned soups and for other purposes, rice meal, and broken rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 8495. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8496. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 8497. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and orders, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. J. Res. 468. Joint resolution designating June 26 of each year as National Baseball Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 601. Resolution to bring about rescission of the order curtailing postal service of the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 8498. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Istvan Eisasser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 8499. A bill for the relief of Zora Krizan, also known as Zorardo Krizanova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 8500. A bill for the relief of Hatsuko Torikai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8501. A bill for the relief of Michiko Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2122. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress to revive the Civilian Conservation Corps for unemployed youths between the ages of 17 and 23; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2123. By Mr. HART: Resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Union City, N. J., condemning the order

of the Postmaster General dated April 18, drastically reducing mail service to the public, etc.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2124. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of 27 members of John T. Alderson Auxiliary, No. 17, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Washington and Alaska, of Yakima, Wash., urging approval of House bill 6217; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2125. By Mr. RICH: Resolution of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Renovo, Clinton County, Pa., urging that the order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal service be rescinded; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the abiding peace of the universe, our lot has been cast in this strange and difficult time; so many things distract us; often our lives become feverish and hectic and irritable. Help us so to confront the problems that baffle us that from them may come victory in our own souls and spiritual gain for the world.

Teach us the secret of dwelling in a world full of hate and yet not becoming hateful persons. Giving our best ability to the people's good, may we rise above all bitterness by an unshakable faith in the shining splendor of humanity. So may we be the obedient servants of the Father of all, who shall not fail nor be discouraged till He hath set judgment in the earth and in the isles which wait for His law. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 10, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 247. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes;

S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton;

S. 1069. An act to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect; and

S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944), with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the national health plan for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Eightieth Congress.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and next week.

On request of Mr. LONG, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FREAR was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next 10 days or 2 weeks, on official committee business.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MCFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Darby	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Taylor
Ecton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Frear	Lodge	Tobey
Fulbright	Long	Tydings
George	Lucas	Watkins
Gillette	McCarthy	Wherry
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior and junior Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Arizona means that his request is made without prejudice to my right to the floor.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes; without prejudicing the right of the Senator from Missouri to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Oshkosh, Wis., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2163, to make farm loan bonds issued under authority of the Federal Farm Loan Act obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The memorial of Mrs. W. J. Munday, of Atlanta, Ga., remonstrating against the extension of rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Citizens-Taxpayers Association, of Westerly, R. I., signed by A. Fred Roberts, secretary, relating to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Severo S. Guinto, of Batasan, Macabebe, Pampanga, Philippines, relating to his claim for a pension for service in the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Hartman Pauly, of Sacramento, Calif., praying for compensation of certain war damages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FLOOD DAMAGE—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, GRAND FORKS COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the

Board of County Commissioners of Grand Forks County, N. Dak., relating to flood damage in the Red River Valley.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas flash floods and recurring subsequent floods have sustained enormous damage to roads, bridges, and culverts, inundated several hundred thousand acres of fertile farm lands in the Red River Valley; and

Whereas these disastrous circumstances are also reflected in grievous human suffering and untold loss of livestock, grain, and erosion of fertile top soil, which at this time it is physically impossible to determine; and

Whereas the loss to Grand Forks County alone to its roads and bridges will in all probabilities exceed the sum of $1,500,000; and

Whereas the counties and other political subdivisions are financially unable to rehabilitate themselves in the vast reconstruction program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Grand Forks County, N. Dak., That financial assistance be requested to be made available by the Federal Government and that every effort be made by the Members of Congress to facilitate the passage of bills to make such appropriations available immediately.

Dated at Grand Forks, N. Dak., this 9th day of May 1950.

E. O. BRY,
Chairman of Board of County Commissioners, Grand Forks County, N. Dak.

Attest:

C. E. OVERLAND,
County Auditor.

TRANSFER OF WATSON LABORATORIES FROM RED BANK, N. J., TO ROME, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have introduced into the RECORD resolutions and statements by various groups in the State of New York, urging transfer of the Watson Laboratories from Red Bank, N. J., to Rome, N. Y. I know that the Senate has already authorized this transfer, but action is still pending in the House. I therefore ask unanimous consent that a detailed communication on the subject of the transfer, sent to me by James M. Kennedy, president of the chamber of commerce at Rome, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Rome, N. Y., May 1, 1950.

DEAR SENATOR: This communication concerns pending congressional action of utmost importance to the best interests of national defense and economy.

The Department of the Air Force proposes to transfer its electronics research and development installation, known as Watson Laboratories, from Eatontown, N. J., to Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.

Authorization of this transfer has been approved by the Senate in the military public-works bill.

A special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee investigated the Air Force plan and rendered a majority report fully supporting the Air Force proposal. Despite this, New Jersey interests were able to eliminate the authorization in the House committee. The vote was 12 to 11.

The issue is of national importance. No group of private citizens can be permitted to jeopardize national defense, or the safety of our Nation, nor can private citizens be allowed to substitute their thinking to the point where the military are not permitted to make strategic moves after a 2-year study indicating such necessity.

It is expected an amendment will be offered on the floor of the House to restore the authorization to the bill.

Your support of this amendment is respectfully requested to correct the present situation and on the unbiased facts contained in the majority report. Copy of majority report is attached hereto.

NECESSITY

After a detailed study of over 2 years' duration, the Air Force concluded that its program to move Watson Laboratories from Eatontown, N. J., to Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y., is in the best interests of national economy and defense.

Private citizens and employees of Watson Laboratories oppose this program.

We must rely upon the Air Force experts for the proper evaluation of this program. We cannot change the national-defense program on the grounds that laymen know more than our military. Nor can we change our national-defense program on the basis that private citizens do not find it convenient to move from Eatontown, N. J., to Rome, N. Y.

SUITABILITY

Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y., has a replacement cost estimated at $66,000,000. It comprises an area of 5 square miles, with permanent buildings in excellent condition and surrounded by concrete highways and sidewalks.

It has a first-class airport with concrete runways and aprons. It is complete with administrative buildings, signal tower, and hangars, all of which can be used in connection with the type of work done at Watson Laboratories.

The Air Force contends that electronic testing at the McGuire Air Force Base interferes with fighter activities based there.

Furthermore, the experimental planes which range from the B–29 size down are now based at Griffiss Air Force Base, and when testing is necessary, it requires the planes to fly to McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey, a distance of over 200 miles. This is not only expensive, but a loss of personnel working time, which would be unnecessary if the move to Rome is made, as facilities are now available at Rome for this work.

Work confidential and secret—Griffiss Air Force Base readily adaptable and ideally suited. Has one entrance and no windows and easily susceptible for protection and guarding. This is not true of Watson Laboratories.

ECONOMY

Air Force contends that to retain Watson Laboratories at its present site entails an expenditure of $17,000,000 for permanent structures. Without permanent structures extensive repairs are necessary to temporary structures.

Why spend $17,000,000 when the Air Force plans call for the use of the $66,000,000 structure, thoroughly complete, at Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.?

HOUSING

At the suggestion of the Air Force, approximately 400 housing units have been constructed by private capital in the Rome, N. Y., area.

Testimony disclosed that there will be adequate housing at Rome, N. Y.

The subcommittee heard no complaints from the opponents of the move concerning inadequate housing of personnel at Rome, N. Y.

CONCLUSION

Representatives of Air Force are in a better position to know their own needs for research and development than employees of Watson Laboratories and/or private citizens who are concerned only with that installation.

On the basis of such information, which the subcommittee (House Armed Services Committee) has had available, it feels that further intervention in these plans of the Air Force is not now justified.

Cordially yours,

JAMES M. KENNEDY,
President.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have seen in the RECORD in recent days a number of insertions of editorials and letters concerning rent control. I, too, have received a large number of communications on the subject of rent control. The majority of the letters I have received—and they have come from all over the country—have been in favor of the continuation of rent control. While individual letters do not necessarily constitute proof of either the validity or weakness of rent control, I certainly think that letters may bring out typical reactions which Members of the Senate may well weigh and consider.

I ask unanimous consent to insert five of these letters in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that they be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTCLAIR, N. J., *May 7, 1950.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I commend you on your stand for the continuance of the present Federal rent control.

This legislation is absolutely necessary to prevent certain class of landlords from bleeding the white-collar and middle-class tenants, of which I am one of the former class.

My landlord is a New York lawyer. In 1947 when rent control permitted leases of 18 months' duration, at the possible 15-percent increase as permitted under the law, I voluntarily accepted the increase. Upon the renewal of the original lease of 1947, the landlord attempted to increase the rent another 15 percent. I signed the lease as a test case as to the legality of this second 15-percent increase. The regional office rejected the renewal leases on all apartments as filed by the landlord, which I fully expected they would do.

Necessary repairs for the general upkeep of the building, housing 16 tenants, is something out of the question. I have been a tenant for 8 years; when we moved in the window frames and sills were in need of paint, which has not been forthcoming. Putty in most of the windows are half gone to such extent of the glass going out in a strong wind. Pays no attention to the complaint.

Decontrolled apartment rents, since 1948 have been increased considerably. On hearsay I understand the landlord is just waiting for rent control to be lifted, so he may increase the rents. If he receives this privilege I fear the consequence. This above statement I understand was made to a tenant of about 3 months' standing.

How many of the 16 tenants accepted the 15-percent increase I do not know but I do know it was not all, therefore cannot see why those accepting the increase should be

penalized for those who refused. This to me, seems unfair. This is where the original bill fell short in saying "voluntary."

Senator ELLENDER may represent a State that does not need rent control; that is why he takes the stand he does. The wage rate in the South and North are two different conditions. Labor has it all over the white-collar office man and most of their standard of living is entirely different.

Yours very truly,

J. A. VAN HORN.

HAGERSTOWN, MD., *May 7, 1950.*

Senator HERBERT LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please allow me to congratulate you on your stand in regard to rent control. I am more than thankful that there is someone in our Congress who gives some thought to the many widows and others in the low-income group.

My landlord informed me that if and when the rent control goes off that my rent would be just $5 less than double what I am now paying. This in spite of the fact that I have taken care of all major repairs, such as papering, electric light fixtures, worn-out window blinds, and enlarging the garage, etc.

Sincerely yours,

MINNIE RICHARDS WOLFINGER.

STAMFORD, CONN., *May 6, 1950.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I listened with interest to you on the radio Sunday on the matter of rent control. It seemed to me that two very important considerations were left entirely unmentioned in this discussion.

The first is that the Government has the responsibility to keep rents within reasonable limits, because the Government itself by war necessity was responsible for the shortage of rental units. Practically all such building was stopped during the five war years by Government orders and because of this stoppage the demand for rents is greater than the supply. Hence there is no competition from vacancies to hold rentals in line.

The second point is that no one group has profited more generously from the inflation than the owners of residential properties. The house which cost $8,000 in 1940 sells for close to $20,000 today, a two-and-a-half-fold increase in its value. The actual increase to the owner is much more than this for usually there was a $5,000 mortgage against that $8,000 house, with only a $3,000 equity. At $20,000 there is a $15,000 equity, or a fivefold increase in the owner's cash investment. In general the same situation holds also on big properties such as apartment blocks. If a man owned a hundred shares of A. T. & T. at 150 and it went to 300, he would not get much sympathy if he was crying because the dividend had not also doubled. Add the fact that 50 percent of the profit from the sale of real estate property held over 6 months is completely exempt from income tax and the plight of the poor landlord does not seem so bad. He has had an average of 10 percent a year capital value increase, an amount about equal to his gross annual income from his rentals. What more does he want?

When the rent-control legislation is brought up in Congress, it would seem that these two points should be brought up. But don't mention my name, for I am a tenant.

Respectfully yours,

PHILIP W. PORRITT.

MAY 9, 1950.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Heard you talk Sunday on rent control and was glad to hear you say you are in favor to continue it for another year.

Senator ELLENDER put me in mind of the fellow who said "Let them eat cake."

I make $40 a week and pay forty a month rent, and I know if rent controls go off he will raise me sky high, and I, like many others, will be out on the street.

Also if Senator ELLENDER has many people paying rents any place from $30 to $60 and are put out on the street, he might not go back to Washington, and I would not feel sorry for him. Also 10 or 15 years ago you could go out for a walk and see "for rent" signs, but not any more. Also today all they are building is for those who can pay $50 and $60 a room, which is no interest to the middle class.

As of today our State rent-control bill is in the courts and will leave us out on a limb if the courts say it is unconstitutional. That is one of the reasons we need Federal control.

Yours,

ANA VAN BLARCOM.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
May 7, 1950.

SENATOR LEHMAN: I heard your discussion with Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, on the radio a moment ago about rent control. If rent control goes off here I'm afraid a sort of civil war shall have to be started. We cannot stand another penny more of an increase. Thirty-five percent of our income goes for rent now, and I know, I am sure, that our landlord shall raise the rent. My husband is trying to finish here at the university and I am out of a job—he is not on GI any longer. What a sordid picture to draw for you.

I had not planned this letter; forgive its hastiness. I am trying to point out to you one example of a student family in Minneapolis. I can with fact write that there is no rent control in this city that is worthwhile.

I am pessimistic; let rent control go off. Who has it helped in this city but a sparse few? The few that have lived in an apartment for 5 years or more are helped (good for them), but not the mass of the people. People were scattered all over the country during the war; they weren't hanging on to an apartment so that 5 years hence they wouldn't have to pay double to live. We were told there was a war to win.

Again, let it go. When it really strikes home people will finally fight back. Only you know, but probably won't admit it, that the children who fought in New York for an increase in teacher's salaries were called Communist inspired; when we fight back we shall be considered thus.

I write once more just let it get bad enough, people someday wake up.

I hope that your secretary shall please be kind enough to have you read this letter that I have taken the time and effort to write and send.

DELLA BAUER BASKIN.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2395. A bill to provide for payment of amounts due to mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1556).

FURTHER STUDY OF HEALTH PROBLEMS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably an original resolution, which was unanimously approved by the committee, directing further study by that committee of health problems.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 273) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized and directed through the Subcommittee on Health of the said committee to—

(a) continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto which have been referred to the said subcommittee, which study shall be primarily concerned with ascertaining the status, methods of operation, types, potentialities, and problems of health insurance plans in the United States, the activities of State and local governments in the field of health services, and of related matters in terms of their bearing on the objectives sought by those legislative proposals;

(b) consult, in the course of such study, with Federal agencies administering health and related programs, with such other legislative committees of the Senate as are concerned with related matters, and with such other agencies, organizations, or persons as the subcommittee may desire to consult;

(c) report to the Senate not later than February 1, 1951, the results of the study, together with such proposed legislation, if any, and such other recommendations as the subcommittee may deem desirable.

SEC. 2. (a) The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through the said Subcommittee on Health, is authorized to sit and act at such times and in such places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such consultants, clerical, and other assistance; to procure such printing and binding; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures, within the limits below set forth, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The expenses incurred under this resolution, which shall not exceed $42,500 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 3577. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to extend its provisions to coffee; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3578. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Gus Other Medicine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3579. A bill for the relief of Midshipman Willis Howard Dukelow, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3580. A bill authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system, and authorizing the United States to pay for water and water services secured from the water system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3581. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stanislawa Karczewska Kilarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. 3582. A bill to authorize revision of the procedures employed in the administration of certain trust funds administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 3583. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Terramagra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3584. A bill to amend the act of June 9, 1906 (34 Stat. 227) entitled "An act granting land to the city of Albuquerque for public purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3585. A bill for the relief of Dodge County, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3586. A bill for the relief of Charles de Than; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate Joint Resolution 180, to suspend until December 31, 1950, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the study and investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF FIELD OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which, if enacted, will have the effect of exempting from the statute which restricts Government lawyers and others from activities in matters in which the Government has an interest, members of the staff of the special Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, and I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Utah will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 180) to suspend until December 31, 1950, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the study and investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

Although I have not had occasion to request the Congress to exempt anyone employed on committee staffs of which I have been chairman up to this time, I am informed that it is not a rare practice in any sense in order to attract good attorneys and other professional men and women for short-time assignments in the legislative branch, to make such an exemption.

This matter was presented by the Counsel of the Labor-Management Relations Subcommittee in connection with some prospective appointments. On a proper motion made by a Senator, it was ordered by the subcommittee that the resolution be introduced and referred.

I may say that there is an understanding in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that a vote to place a matter on the calendar or otherwise to further its passage carries, as a matter of Committee policy, a reservation that a given Senator may later, if he desires to do so, oppose the self-same measure. So far as I now know, there is no prospective objection to the proposal, and on the contrary, the Subcommittee by its action is in the position of expressing a desire for its passage.

I ask for the appropriate reference of my resolution.

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSE OF INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN INDUSTRIES

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 274) was read by the Chief Clerk, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the cause or causes of increasing unemployment in the coal, oil, silver, zinc, lead, and railroad industries. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem proper, to the Senate on or before the twenty-fifth day of June 1950.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO EXEMPTIONS FROM TAX ON ADMISSIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 3905, to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to exemptions from tax on admissions, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a short explanation of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. At present, Mr. President, home missionary societies, religious and church groups, educational associations, high school glee clubs, and American Legion benefit programs, have to pay a tax on admissions. That was not so formerly. My amendment, if agreed to, would give the local district collector of internal revenue the opportunity and authority to waive such taxes in cases where it could be shown that there was no profit to accrue to anyone. If the amendment shall be agreed to when it is called up, it will have that effect.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 182) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Eightieth Congress, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Benjamin J. Chester, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

NATIONAL DEFENSE WEEK—PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of this brief statement the text of a proclamation by the Governor of the State of New York proclaiming the period May 13 through May 20, 1950, as National Defense Week in New York State.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

There can be no man, woman, or child in our great country who does not pray constantly and fervently that we do not become involved in another war. Nevertheless, our aspirations to peace must not blind us to the facts of our times. We cannot afford to overlook the painful fact that we are engaged in a cold war with a powerful and ruthless enemy and we need to remain alert to the constant danger of the most destructive hostilities that ever will have afflicted mankind.

Our vital necessity to be strong and remain strong is too obvious to require argument. Many reports in our newspapers and magazines are discouraging, in fact alarming. We must never again make the mistake of underestimating the potential enemy. Our prayers for peace should be combined with prayers that we may never again enter another war as unprepared as we were in 1917 and, still more disastrously, again in 1941.

Preparedness demands the vigilance not merely of elected and appointed officials, but of the people at large—of every loyal American citizen. For this reason it is desirable that we set aside a period for calling particular attention to our national defense.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the period of May 13 through May 20, 1950, as national-defense week in New York State.

I also proclaim May 20, 1950, as Armed Forces Day, and I invite the mayors of cities and chief executive officers of other municipalities throughout the State to issue proclamations calling for celebration of that day in such manner as to honor the Armed Forces of the United States and of our own State in particular.

As commander in chief of the National Guard of New York State I direct the chief of staff to the Governor to mark the day with appropriate ceremonies, and to cooperate with Federal authorities and civic bodies in suitable observances.

I urge my fellow citizens to give public understanding and support to the Armed Forces, both Regular and Reserve, in order to assist them to attain and maintain the strength necessary to discharge their grave responsibilities.

I call upon my fellow citizens to display the flag of the United States at their homes on Armed Forces Day and to participate in exercises expressive of our recognition of the skill, gallantry, and uncompromising devotion to duty characteristics of the Armed Forces of the United States and of the State in the carrying out of their missions.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 9th day of May in the year of our Lord 1950.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

SPEECHES BY THE PRESIDENT AT WENDOVER AND RAWLINGS, WYO.

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by the President at Wendover, Wyo., on May 9, 1950, and the speech delivered by the President later the same day at Rawlings, Wyo., which appear in the Appendix.]

HAWAII'S CLAIM TO STATEHOOD—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him on May 6, 1950, before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with reference to Hawaii's claim to statehood, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEWEY, OF NEW YORK

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Governor Dewey, of New York, at the mass demonstration and pageant sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America in celebration of the second anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel, Madison Square Garden, New York City, May 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

PETROLEUM IMPORTS—STATEMENT BY INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on petroleum imports presented at the midyear meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, held in Los Angeles, Calif., on May 7 to 9, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTATION OF CZECH-MADE SHOES—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Czech Shoe Probe," published in the Boston Traveler on May 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNREASONABLE RESTRAINTS BY LABOR MONOPOLIES—EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What's to Keep John L. From Doing It Again?" published in Collier's for May 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COFFEE SITUATION—LATIN-AMERICAN LETTER

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD Hanson's Latin-American letter, dated May 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ARTICLES FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article headed "Rail strike jobless increase—Two trains shot at, fireman hit," and another article headed "Many cities feel first effects of railroad tie-up," both published in the New York Times of May 12, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ARTICLE FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lay-offs Near 158,000 Mark in Rail Strike," published in the Baltimore Sun of May 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ITEM FROM THE NEWS TICKER

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of the item from the news ticker dealing with the railroad strike, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECENTRALIZING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Decentralizing the Federal Government," written by him and published in the spring issue of the magazine Air Affairs, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP WEEK; UNDERSTANDING CHECKS AND BALANCES—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Good Citizen Quiz," published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 11, 1950, and a supplementary statement prepared by him on the subject Understanding America, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE BRANNAN PLAN—ARTICLE BY ALLAN B. KLINE

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cheaper Food—Promise or Political Lure?" by Allan B. Kline, from Collier's for May 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF THE MARSHALL PLAN TO SALVATION OF EUROPE—LETTER FROM CHARLES E. SCOTT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Charles E. Scott, president of the North Dakota State Teachers College, located at Dickinson, N. Dak. Mr. Scott has been in Germany, and the letter gives his views of conditions there, particularly in relation to the contribution of the Marshall plan.

I might add that I have a telegram from Mr. Scott authorizing me to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Dickinson, N. Dak., April 13, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Ever since my return from Germany last June, where I served as consultant to the education branch under military government for 2½ months, I have thought about writing you to give you the benefit of my observations and impressions. I do not claim to be an authority on American affairs overseas. Take these suggestions for what they are worth.

One cannot help but be impressed over there with the tremendous flow of American dollars. The spread of American activities throughout the country is quite evident.

I found the German people apparently reasonably well clothed and reasonably well fed. I was surprised when I arrived, April 15, to see the display of goods in the German store windows and the stores were well stocked. I was told this situation was of only 3 months' duration and that 3 months prior to my arrival the stores had nothing to sell. The Germans were very frank to give the Marshall plan credit for improving economic conditions. There is still a great deal of poverty and hardship, due to the fact that prices were high and income very low. Prices were about the same as ours, a little higher, and incomes about one-third of ours for comparable work.

I believe that the Marshall plan served a very useful purpose as a "stopgap aid." I believe by means of it we saved western Europe from communism. I do not believe much of it is necessary for that purpose at this time. I think we must help western Europe on the road to economic recovery. Either we help Germany restore her economy, which may even mean a measure of rearmament and certainly the restoration of some of her heavy industries, or we can continue feeding them. Personally, I think we should say to all western Europe, "No more dollars until you have your house in order." I would even go so far as to insist on a united western Europe, by whatever name it may be called.

While I am in the mood, I would like to give you my points of view on several other matters.

Among all the people I associate with the feeling is very strong that Congress should check Federal expenditures. One need not be an economist to know that to continue the present spending plan must lead to bankruptcy. Nearly everyone I visit with feels that expediting further implementation of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission is of prime importance.

While I should like to see aid for education and feel that it is much more deserving than some other types of Federal spending, I am willing to sacrifice that provided economy will be effected along other lines of Federal spending.

I hope that Congress will not ease up on the law governing the admission of displaced persons. I know that there is tremendous pressure on Congress from some special interests to do so. I hope Congress will not yield to those pressure groups who would open the floodgates. This does not mean at all that I am opposed to admission of a rea-

sonable number of such persons, provided they are carefully screened.

I didn't mean to write at such length when I began. I hope these observations will be of some value to you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. SCOTT, *President.*

PROPOSED INTEGRATION OF WISCONSIN RETIREMENT FUND WITH FEDERAL SOCIAL-SECURITY SYSTEM — STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY, AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding an amendment I propose to offer to integrate the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal social-security system. I also ask to have printed several communications regarding this subject, together with an article by Frederick N. McMillan, executive director of the Wisconsin Retirement Fund.

There being no objection, the statement, communications, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY—ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO INTEGRATE WISCONSIN RETIREMENT FUND WITH FEDERAL SOCIAL-SECURITY SYSTEM

On March 3, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A2547, a copy of an excellent statement made by the executive director of the Wisconsin Retirement Fund, Mr. Frederick McMillan, urging the integration of the 25,000 active individuals and 4,000 inactive employees covered under that fund with the Federal social-securty system which will be broadened under the legislation now before the Senate Finance Committee.

At that time, hearings on H. R. 6000 had just been concluded in committee. I had respectfully urged the committee to adopt the amendment suggested by Mr. McMillan—an amendment which incidentally, would not harm any individual, any teacher, any policeman, any fireman, covered under municipal, county, or State retirement systems in Wisconsin or elsewhere in the Nation. The pioneering Wisconsin Retirement Fund is entirely unique, Wisconsin being the only State which has made provision for integration of its fund with a broadened Federal coverage.

FINANCE COMMITTEE UNFORTUNATELY REJECTED OUR AMENDMENT

Unfortunately, the Senate Finance Committee rejected Mr. McMillan's amendment and decided that no individual now covered under State or local retirement systems should be included under the broadened Federal coverage, although individuals not now covered could be inclued provided the State entered into an agreement with the Federal Government.

SENATOR M'CARTHY AND I WILL OFFER AMENDMENT

Based on the committee's rejection of the McMillan amendment, it is my intention to offer, when the social-security bill comes up, an amendment cosponsored by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and myself. We feel that this amendment will provide elementary justice for the employees covered under the Wisconsin retirement fund.

From the inception of the Wisconsin system there has been written into the law provision for integration. The actual result of the amendment which the junior Senator from Wisconsin and I will propose would be that the contributions of employees and governmental units to the Wisconsin retirement fund would be reduced by the amount of their respective contributions to social security. However, the employees themselves would then receive the full benefit of social security and they would retain without change all of the accumulated credits which they have developed under the Wisconsin retirement fund. Moreover, they would continue to build up additional credits under our State's retirement fund.

By diligent search of all of the implications of this proposal, we have not been able to locate a single individual who would be harmed in the slightest by this proposal, but on the contrary, we know that there would be tremendous aid to the folks who would be covered.

WHY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST PUBLIC EMPLOYEES?

It seems very unfair that private industry should have its individuals receive both private pensions and supplementary Federal coverage while other groups are denied that right. Why should public employees be left out of the picture and discriminated against? I particularly want to point out that if an individual leaves public employment and enters private employment under the present situation, he would completely lose all of his credits which he had accumulated in public employment.

Let me also point out that if the State of Wisconsin and the various municipalities under our State's retirement fund are absolutely barred from including public employees under the social security system, each of these governmental units will have great difficulty in trying to recruit and retain qualified employees. Would not an individual think twice before going to work for a Wisconsin county or municipality when this individual knows that his dependents and survivors would be denied the full protection which would be provided by Federal social security? Inevitably this fact will serve to deemphasize employment in the counties and municipalities, but Mr. President, I for one maintain that it is up to the Congress to strengthen State, county, and local governments rather than to see them further weakened.

Let me reiterate, I respect the convictions of those groups which definitely do not want to be covered under the Federal system. I refer to the teachers, the policemen, the firemen who are content with their individual retirement funds. But I do not feel and I am sure they do not feel that their desire to stay out of Federal coverage should interfere with the rights of individuals who want to come in under Federal coverage.

BROAD COVERAGE OF WISCONSIN FUND

Let me point out that the Wisconsin retirement fund now includes all eligible employees of some 76 Wisconsin cities, 15 villages, 37 counties, and 33 other local governments in my State.

I have in my hand a message just received from Mr. A. J. Thelen, executive secretary of the Wisconsin County Boards Association endorsing the amendment which the junior Senator from Wisconsin and I will offer. I ask that this letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point along with several other messages, and an article by Mr. McMillin published in the Wisconsin State Journal of April 26, 1950.

It is my earnest hope, moreover, that Members of the Senate will give their consideration to the Wisconsin retirement fund amendment which we will offer, which will not harm any of their or our constituents, but which will definitely help some 30,000 Wisconsin people and their families. The amendment will be so worded, I assure my colleagues, so that only the unique Wisconsin retirement fund will be covered.

WISCONSIN COUNTY BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Madison, Wis., May 9, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The counties of Wisconsin have for the past 6 years petitioned Members of our Federal Congress to amend the present social-security law so as to integrate the present State and municipal retirement system with the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act so that county employees under the Wisconsin retirement system may also be brought under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system.

We are happy to know that you are going to support such an amendment from the floor to H. R. 6000 stating that the exclusion of existing retirement systems shall not be applicable to any retirement system where integration with social security already is provided for by law as it is in Wisconsin.

I know that you are familiar with the reasons why integration of the State and Federal systems is desirable and, therefore, I will not burden you with any more of the details.

This letter is written to you to assure you that the Wisconsin County Boards Association in its last three annual conventions has unanimously recommended the adoption of an amendment similar to that which is now being proposed.

With best of wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

WISCONSIN COUNTY BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
By A. J. THELAN.

MIDDLETON, WIS., *May 10, 1950.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge you to do everything you can to make possible the integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with social security.

VILLAGE OF MIDDLETON,
AND VILLAGE EMPLOYEES,
A. C. DAHLK, *Clerk.*

MADISON, WIS., *May 10, 1950.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

Urge you introduce and support amendment H. R. 6000 suggested by F. N. MacMillin permitting Wisconsin to integrate retirement system social security.

WISCONSIN STATE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION,
ROY E. KUBIETA,
Executive Secretary.

CUDAHY, WIS., *May 11, 1950.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

On behalf of the city of Cudahy employees who are now under the Wisconsin retirement fund I urge you to do everything to make possible the integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with social security by submitting an amendment to H. R. 6000 as is now provided for by law under the Wisconsin system. It would be discriminatory to deny public employees the opportunity to have both social security and a supplementary retirement plan as is now common for those in business and industry.

VINCENT TOTKA,
Mayor, City of Cudahy.

(By Frederick N. McMillin, executive director, Wisconsin retirement fund)

The decision as to whether the Wisconsin Retirement Fund will be made fully effective for the 25,000 active employees and 4,000 inactive public employees included thereunder will be made by Congress in the near future.

This retirement system was established by the legislature in 1943 and in addition to

State employees now includes all eligible employees of 76 cities, 15 villages, 37 counties, and 33 other local governments in Wisconsin.

The plan was devised with the assumption that eventually the covered employees would also be included under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system (Social Security). Then the State system would automatically be transformed into a supplementary retirement system as is becoming increasing prevalent in private business and industry.

Public employees have been excluded from Social Security because Congress is barred by the Federal Constitution from requiring the State or any municipality to pay what the private employer pays to Social Security. It must be done on a voluntary basis, and that is provided for in H. R. 6000 which the House of Representatives passed last October and which is now pending before the Senate Committee on Finance.

This bill would make effective section 66.903 (2) (b) of the Wisconsin statutes which would integrate the State system with Social Security.

Under this the payments by individuals and by the governmental unit to the Federal system would be deducted from the payments made under the State system, with the result that the total cost would remain about the same.

Each person would then receive all the benefits possible under Social Security and he would likewise accumulate substantial benefits under the State system. The State benefits would be reduced because of the lower payments.

Here are some reasons why such integration is desirable:

One. It would be discriminatory to deny public employees the opportunity to have both Social Security and a supplementary retirement plan, a combination now common for those in business and industry.

Two. Since payments by workers and employees to Social Security are meeting only a fraction of the ultimate full cost, the difference must eventually be paid by taxpayers. To provide comparable benefits under the Wisconsin plan would require substantial increases in payments by individuals and by the governmental units. It is unreasonable to expect those under the Wisconsin retirement fund to help pay the cost of social security without participating in the benefits. Neither should Wisconsin taxpayers be required to help finance social security and also increase their payments to the State system to provide the same benefits.

Three. Each person under the State system would naturally benefits to the extent that his total annuity from both systems would be increased in the aggregate. For example, a person at $250 per month under the State system from 45 to 65 could retire on about $66 per month, but under both systems it would range from $130 to $161.

Four. A wife with minor children receives from the State fund only a refund of her husband's contributions if he dies while working, or a small death benefit. Under H. R. 6000 she might receive as much as $150 per month.

Five. Of 1,279 now receiving annuities under the State system, only 116 selected the option where the annuity continues for the widow or other survivor (but at the expense of a substantial reduction in the annuity). Social Security makes substantial provision for a surviving widow.

Six. The average life annuity now paid by the State system is $48 per month. The system is based on half pay at 65 after 35 years of service. Actually, the average length of governmental service of those now retired was only 21 years.

Seven. While 49 persons are now receiving an annuity under the State system because of total and permanent disability, this averages only $39 per month. The pending bill would provide substantially higher benefits.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, the newspapers of the small towns dotting the United States reflect the solid, sound thinking of people who are concerned about what is happening to our financial and economic structure.

Mr. Frank C. Sands is editor of the Independence Daily Reporter, president of the chamber of commerce and a wounded veteran, decorated for bravery, of World War I. This capable and distinguished editor has expressed the feelings of his community in an excellent editorial, Tell 'Em To Quit, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELL 'EM TO QUIT

Independence, Kans., knows a great deal about Washington, D. C.; but how much does Washington, D. C., know about Independence, Kans.? Not enough.

Washington, meaning the Federal Government, doubtless knows more about Independence than it did before our fellow townsman, HERBERT A. (HUB) MEYER, first went to the National Capital to represent the third district, but it should know more about what the people in this and similar towns are thinking.

Washington knows the thoughts of the generals like New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and about the colonels and majors, too. But sergeants are the backbone of an army and Washington does not hear the voices of the sergeant towns very clearly.

What are the sergeants like? Many will boast in chamber of commerce terms, as does Independence, of their payrolls, commercial establishments and good living. Most have some special features, as Independence does in its exceptionally fine park, its buffalo ranch, its site of the first night baseball game ever played in regularly scheduled professional league competition. They, like Independence, will talk of their fine schools, churches and homes.

Independence thinks it is above average and few small cities like it are so lacking in local pride that they do not believe they also are above average. Whether they are or not, their people are in general good Americans who have more time to think than city dwellers. They do not have to spend so much time in just getting from one place to another; they waste no thought on policy games, betting on the races, night clubs, or any of the many other distractions that bulk large in the minds of city dwellers.

The small town man talks more politics. He thinks more and worries more about what is going on in Washington and what Washington is doing to the country.

What is he thinking about now?

As the editor prepares to leave soon for a visit to Washington, there is one remark most often spontaneously made to him:

"Tell 'em to quit wasting so much of our money."

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

UNITED STATES TAX COURT—JOHN W. KERN

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any further routine matters? If not, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] is recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I rise for two purposes: First, to mention to the Senate an effect of a procedure which the Senate frequently follows with respect to confirmations of nominations, which the President makes, from time to time, of officers of the United States;

Second, to ask, though without endeavoring at the moment to suggest the answer to the question, What should the Senate do in view of said effect of the procedure which has just been mentioned?

The procedure to which reference is made is that of the Vice President, or other Presiding Officer for the time being, making announcement promptly after confirmation of a nomination has occurred that "Without objection, the President will be notified", after which announcement there is the silence which constitutes absence of objection. In mentioning an effect of that procedure, I make no criticism of the Vice President, any Presiding Officer for the time being, or the Senate itself.

The action taken, as aforesaid, promptly after confirmation of a nomination has occurred, directing that the President shall be notified, may seem, in the absence of further information as to the effect of such action, to constitute only an appropriate courtesy to the President. By such notification, however, much more than the rendition of a courtesy is accomplished.

There is in a statute of at least one State a definition of certain brief terms employed in certain deeds of conveyance, which definition causes those brief terms to include a much more comprehensive meaning than would appear from the terms themselves. Thus, by the terms of a statute of the State of Missouri, the term "grant, bargain and sell" in all conveyances in which any estate of inheritance in fee simple is limited, shall, unless restrained by expressed terms contained in such conveyances, be construed to be three certain expressed covenants, which are set forth in the statute.

In the case of the procedure constituted by the statement to the Senate, "Without objection, the President will be notified", followed by the absence of objection, there is likewise an accomplishment of much more than might at first glance be realized to be the effect of such language and absence of objection.

Upon investigation, one will realize or discover that not alone a courtesy to the President is achieved by that procedure, but that further and far-reaching results may also be produced by that procedure. The notification to the President, of course, constitutes the transmission of official information that certain action has been taken by the Senate. The ordering of immediate notification is, however, tantamount to conferring on him a further and highly important authority, namely, the authority to complete the appointment of the person whose nomination has been confirmed.

Indeed, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *United*

States v. *Smith* (286 U. S. 6, loc. cit. 35), said:

> The natural meaning of an order of notification to the President is that the Senate consents that the appointment be forthwith completed and that the appointee take office.

Mr. President, what is the effect of such notification of the President, his completion of the appointment of the nominee, the taking of the oath of office by the nominee, and his entry on the discharge of his duties, upon an attempt subsequently made by the Senate to reconsider its act of confirmation of his nomination?

In the consideration of that question, I confine myself solely to the specific circumstances that—

(a) The President, following the receipt of notification of the advice and consent by the Senate to a nomination, shall have signed and, through the Department of State, delivered to the nominee a commission purporting to appoint him to the office to which he had previously been nominated by the nomination which the Senate had advised and to which it had consented;

(b) The nominee shall have taken the oath of office and shall have undertaken forthwith to discharge the duties of the office to which he shall have been nominated;

(c) Subsequent to the signature and delivery, as aforesaid, to the nominee of such commission, his taking the oath of office and his undertaking, as aforesaid, to discharge the duties of such office, the Senate shall have adopted a motion to reconsider said nomination and also a motion to request the President to return the resolution of confirmation which had passed into his possession; and

(d) The President shall have been notified in due course by the receipt by him of the resolution of the Senate that he be requested to return to the Senate the resolution advising and consenting to the appointment of such nominee to be such officer.

I am not discussing a case in which, notification of the President having theretofore occurred, subsequently but prior to the adoption of a motion to reconsider the nomination or prior to the adoption of a motion to request the President to return the resolution of confirmation there (a) shall not have occurred the signature of a commission, or (b) shall not have occurred the delivery as aforesaid of the commission, or (c) shall not have occurred the taking by the nominee of the oath of office, or (d) shall not have occurred an entry by the nominee on the discharge of the duties of the office, to which he shall have been nominated.

In the specific circumstances to which I am, as previously stated, in the consideration of the question confining myself, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case which I have previously mentioned—United States against Smith—said, loco citato 30:

> The sole question presented is one of law. Did the Senate have the power, on the next day of executive session, to reconsider its vote advising and consenting to the appointment of George Otis Smith, although meanwhile, pursuant to its order, the resolution of consent had been communicated to the President, and thereupon, the commission had issued, Smith had taken the oath of office and had entered upon the discharge of his duties?

The Supreme Court of the United States in that case affirmed the judgment of the lower court denying a petition for a writ of quo warranto filed, in the name of the United States, pursuant to request by the Senate of the district attorney of the District of Columbia to institute proceedings in quo warranto to test the right of the man, who had been so nominated, to hold office.

The Court thus held that, in the circumstances which I have recited, and to which I am confining myself, the Senate did not have power, on the next day of executive session, to reconsider its vote advising and consenting to the appointment of the nominee. The attention of the Senate is, however, today again called to the facts that, in the Smith case, between the vote advising and consenting to the appointment and the adoption by the Senate of the motion to reconsider and of the motion to request the President to return the resolution of confirmation, the resolution of consent had been communicated to the President, the commission had been issued, having been signed by the President and, through the Department of State, having been delivered to the nominee, and said nominee had taken the oath of office and had entered upon the discharge of the duties of the office to which he had been nominated.

One effect, therefore, of the notification of the President, promptly after confirmation of a nomination, that such confirmation has occurred is to render the Senate powerless to reconsider under its rule XXXVIII its vote advising and consenting to such nomination if, prior to the attempt to reconsider such vote, the resolution of consent shall have been communicated to the President, he shall have signed, and through the Department of State delivered, a commission to the nominee purporting to appoint him the officer to fill the office to which he had been nominated, and the nominee shall have taken the oath of office and undertaken forthwith to discharge the duties of said office.

If such notification had not been ordered by the Senate there would under said rule XXXVIII, have existed in every Senator voting in the majority on the confirmation of the nomination the right to move for a reconsideration on the same day on which the vote was taken, or on either of the next 2 days of actual executive session of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point there be set forth in my remarks a copy of clauses 3 and 4 of said rule XXXVIII. In order that there may be no confusion by the use of the word "clauses", I state that by "clause 3" I mean that portion of rule XXXVIII which begins with the words "When a nomination is confirmed or rejected," and that by "clause 4" I mean that portion of rule XXXVIII which begins with the words "Nominations confirmed or rejected by the Senate".

There being no objection, clauses 3 and 4 of Senate rule XXXVIII were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> 3. When a nomination is confirmed or rejected, any Senator voting in the majority may move for a reconsideration on the same day on which the vote was taken, or on either of the next 2 days of actual executive session of the Senate; but if a notification of the confirmation or rejection of a nomination shall have been sent to the President before the expiration of the time within which a motion to reconsider may be made, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the President to return such notification to the Senate. Any motion to reconsider the vote on a nomination may be laid on the table without prejudice to the nomination, and shall be a final disposition of such motion.
>
> 4. Nominations confirmed or rejected by the Senate shall not be returned by the Secretary to the President until the expiration of the time limited for making a motion to reconsider the same, or while a motion to reconsider is pending unless otherwise ordered by the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. The making and execution of such order of notification thus cuts short the power of reconsideration under the circumstances which existed in the case, previously mentioned, of United States against Smith.

That the power thus cut short by the making and execution of such order of notification is valuable cannot be doubted. In the argument for the Senate in said case of United States against Smith, it was pointed out, loco citato 11, that the Senate by its rules "formulated the practice of reconsideration in order the better to reach a sound judgment in the confirmation of nominations submitted by it". In the sentence in which appears the quoted language the argument for the Senate in said Smith case thereafter employs the words "this valuable power". In the United States against Smith case Mr. John W. Davis, with whom Mr. Alexander J. Groesbeck was on the brief, represented the United States Senate.

Not only is the power thus cut short by the making and execution of such order of notification of the President valuable, but in addition the Supreme Court itself stated in the Smith case that notification before the expiration of the period for reconsideration is—to quote loco citato 35—"an exceptional procedure". The Court further pointed out in that case that notification before the expiration of the period for reconsideration—to quote loco citato 35—"may be adopted only by unanimous consent of the Senate".

I have in these remarks mentioned an effect of the procedure which, though as pointed out by the Supreme Court is "an exceptional procedure", is followed with great frequency in the Senate, and have indicated that said procedure cuts short a power which is valuable and was so described in behalf of the Senate in argument before the Supreme Court of

the United States, and is an exceptional procedure which may be adopted only by unanimous consent of the Senate. I shall not discuss at this time whether there are other effects of said procedure.

The second purpose for which I today rose was, as stated, to ask, though without endeavoring at the moment to suggest the answer to, the question what should the Senate do in view of said effect, which I have mentioned, of this exceptional procedure. On the one hand, that procedure makes for speed. On the other hand that procedure cuts short, under the circumstances to which I have confined myself and perhaps under other circumstances, a practice which the Senate formulated by its rules, again to quote from the argument for the Senate in the Supreme Court in the Smith case, "in order the better to reach a sound judgment in the confirmation of nominations submitted to it".

I respectfully submit to the Senate for its consideration the question which I have presented to it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. JENNER] and I have discussed the subject of Judge Kern's nomination and its confirmation by the Senate. Judge Kern comes from the State of Indiana. I desire to give the Members of the Senate a few of the highlights in the life of Judge Kern, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a sketch of his biography. I shall also touch the high spots of the Owens litigation; Mr. Owens being the gentleman who brought charges against Judge Kern. I shall then ask that detailed information concerning the litigation be placed in the RECORD.

Judge John W. Kern was born in Indianapolis in 1900. His father was the Democratic nominee for Vice President in 1908. His father served as United States Senator from 1911 to 1917, during President Wilson's administration, or at least during a portion of that administration, and he was the majority leader of the Senate.

Judge Kern was mayor of the city of Indianapolis. He was elected as one of our superior court justices, and he served as United States Commissioner under both Judge Anderson and Judge Baltzell from 1923 until 1930.

Judge Kern is a graduate of Harvard Law School and enjoys a most splendid reputation in the State of Indiana. So far as my colleague and I personally know and have been able to ascertain from those who have been in a position to know Judge Kern, during his entire lifetime his record as to integrity and honesty, and as to his conduct as a judge and as the mayor of Indianapolis has been excellent. We know nothing particularly of the merits of Mr. Owens' charges. I have read the affidavit which he executed, and the many letters and telegrams which he has sent to Members of the Senate.

I am not endeavoring at the moment in any way to reflect upon Mr. Owens' sincerity, but I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the litigation to which Mr. Owens objects and which he maintains was not properly conducted by Judge Kern, started in 1926 and had to do with Mr. Owens' income-tax return for 1920. The litigation has been going on from 1926 through 1950. Three Federal courts have decided against Mr. Owens, in addition to the decision of Judge Kern. The Supreme Court has twice denied review of the case. In other words, three Federal courts have found against him. Judge Kern, for the Tax Court, found against him, and the Supreme Court has twice refused to review the case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks——

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not also a fact that the amount of the tax of Mr. Owens in 1920, which was held to be $36,000, was reduced to approximately $28,000?

Mr. CAPEHART. The amount of the tax in 1920 which the Internal Revenue Bureau claimed was due by Mr. Owens was $36,000, but Judge Kern, after reviewing the case, reduced the amount to $28,000.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not also a fact that no part of his tax, which has been owing since 1920, has yet been paid?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is correct. Not one single penny of either the $36,000 originally charged against Mr. Owens or of the $28,000 to which it was reduced by Judge Kern has been paid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks, to be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point, a biographical sketch of Judge John W. Kern, and also a brief statement regarding the litigation in the cases of Owens against Commissioner, and United States against Owens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF BIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF JOHN W. KERN PREPARED BY SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART

Judge John W. Kern was born in Indianapolis, Ind., in 1900. He is the son of John W. Kern, who was Democratic nominee for Vice President in 1908, who represented Indiana in the Senate of the United States from 1911 to 1917, and who was majority leader of the Senate during the first administration of Woodrow Wilson. Judge Kern was educated in the public schools of Indianapolis until he was forced to withdraw by reason of serious illness. He graduated from Washington and Lee University in 1920, and from the Harvard Law School in 1923. In the same year Judge Kern was appointed United States commissioner by Judge A. B. Anderson, then Federal judge for the district of Indiana, and served as United States commissioner under Judge Anderson and his successor, Robert C. Baltzell, from 1923 until 1930. In that year Judge Kern was elected judge of the Superior Court of Marion County, which is also the Court of Claims for the State of Indiana. Judge Kern served for many years as secretary of the Indianapolis Bar Association, and was for 10 years professor of law at the Indiana Law School. After an interruption of 2 years and 9 months, during which he served as mayor of Indianapolis, Judge Kern resumed his judicial career when he was appointed in 1937 as a member of the United States Board of Tax Appeals, which is now the Tax Court of the United States. He was confirmed by the Senate in September 1937 to fill an unexpired vacancy on that tribunal. He was reappointed in 1938 and was again confirmed by the Senate. During his 13 years of service on the Tax Court Judge Kern's record on appeals was one of the best on that court. In 1949, although still a comparatively junior member of the court, he was chosen by his colleagues to act as presiding judge, in which capacity he now serves.

Judge Kern is married and has one son, John W. Kern, 3d, who is a student at law school. He is a member of the Indianapolis Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the American Bar Association, and was recently elected a member of the American Law Institute. At the present time he is lecturer on Federal tax law at the law school of the University of Virginia.

Prior to his recent reappointment to the Tax Court Judge Kern was overwhelmingly endorsed for such reappointment by the tax section of the American Bar Association, and was also recommended for reappointment by the State and City Bar Associations of New York, as well as by many other leaders in the profession.

Throughout his 25 years of judicial service as United States commissioner, judge of the superior court, member of the United States Board of Tax Appeals, and judge of the Tax Court of the United States, there has never been any criticism of his conduct as a judge or any imputation directed against his personal honor or judicial integrity.

IN RE LITIGATION OF OWENS V. COMMISSIONER AND UNITED STATES V. OWENS

On December 13, 1922, O. O. Owens filed an amended Federal income-tax return for 1920 claiming for the first time a deduction of $75,000 from his 1920 gross income. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed this deduction and determined a deficiency in the income tax of Owens for the year 1920 in the sum of $36,000. On April 24, 1926, Owens instituted proceedings in the Board of Tax Appeals to litigate his tax liability for 1920. After various proceedings, which would take several pages to recite in detail, the case was finally set for trial on the Tulsa, Okla., calendar of cases on April 10, 1939. On April 13, after some hearings on the merits, the case was continued for further hearings to Washington. Such further hearings were held on November 9 and 10, 1939. After the case had been fully briefed by both parties, the case was decided in 1940 and the decision reduced the amount of Owens' deficiency in tax from $36,000 to $28,000. After various motions to review had been overruled by Chairman Arundell and Acting Chairman Smith, Owens appealed to the circuit court of appeals, and in 1942 the circuit court affirmed Judge Kern's decision. In the same year the Supreme Court denied a petition for certiorari filed by Owens. In 1947, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue not having been able to collect from Owens the tax determined to be due, filed an action for judgment in the District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma to prevent the bar of the statute of limitations. In this action Owens again vigorously presented his contentions, but after a complete trial, the court decided against him. Thereupon Owens again appealed to the circuit court and again the circuit court affirmed the action of the lower court. Owens again filed a petition for certiorari with the Supreme Court, and on February 13, 1950, the Supreme Court again

denied certiorari. To date the Commissioner has not collected any of the taxes in dispute from Owens for the year 1920—30 years ago.

During the course of the litigation, lasting from 1926 to 1950, three Federal courts have decided against Owens, in addition to the decision of Judge Kern, and the Supreme Court has denied review twice.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of my colleague [Mr. CAPEHART] in regard to the Kern matter. Judge Kern has had a distinguished career in Indiana, as did his father, and also in his assignment as Federal judge. The matter has been stated in some detail by my colleague, and to save the time of the Senate we decided to have the documents placed in the RECORD. We wanted the Senate to have full information on the subject. Judge Kern enjoys a good reputation in Indiana, and that reputation should not be treated lightly by this body.

IMPLICATIONS OF INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNISTS—CHARACTER OF WITNESSES

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Anderson	Hill	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Darby	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Taylor
Ecton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Leahy	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Frear	Lodge	Tobey
Fulbright	Long	Tydings
George	Lucas	Watkins
Gillette	McCarthy	Wherry
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have the same feeling that was entertained by a great colleague who served in the Senate several years ago, Senator Reynolds, of North Carolina. When he would rise to speak, and realized that Senators were busy in committee meetings, or perhaps in conferences, he would say, "Well, anyway, I will speak to the American people." This afternoon it is my purpose to address myself officially to the Senate of the United States, but mainly to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I rise to deal with a matter which I know is probably regarded as impolitic to discuss; unpleasant realities are never popular. If what I am about to say is bitter and sharp it is because we have allowed ourselves to drift into a situation which can only be corrected by plain speaking and soul searching, and not by mincing words or sparing feelings.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives for 4 years, and have been a Member of the Senate for 15. I have had the honor to serve the people of New Mexico and the people of the United States in several positions of high trust. With my colleagues I have sponsored much legislation to improve the general welfare of our country. It has been my privilege to introduce many measures which are today on the statute books, designed to advance economic well-being for our citizens, promote the national defense, and strengthen the educational, social, and governmental institutions of this country. However, a man is ultimately measured by what he does in relation to his times, and the fact that we do our assigned duty adequately may not be enough; sometimes we must step out and sound the alarm.

I should like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice—and I devoutly hope not a voice in the wilderness—at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual. I would consider all of the legislation which I have supported meaningless if I were to sit idly by, silent, during a period which may go down in history as an era when we permitted the curtailment of our liberties, a period when we quietly shackled the growth of men's minds.

It matters little if the Congress appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to check the erosion of the soil if we permit the erosion of our civil liberties, free institutions, and the untrammeled pursuit of truth.

Mr. President, I am referring to the current attempt to establish tests and criteria for the patriotism of United States citizens, the attempt to evaluate Americans by the political beliefs they hold. And I am deeply concerned lest the consequences of these attempts lead to the control of our acts and of our thoughts, and ultimately to the destruction of our entire democratic way of life.

We have embarked upon a course which breeds hysteria and confusion—a course so dangerous that few dare to oppose the drift lest they be the next marked for destruction. Particularly disturbing is the impetus which this trend is receiving from certain ill-considered statements and actions emanating from this very body. I must say that as a result the dignity of the Senate has already been seriously impaired.

Mr. President, for the first time in my 19 years in Congress, I make the deliberate point of referring to my religion. I speak as a Roman Catholic.

Nowadays a man who claims he is a Catholic is accorded special attention and authority when discussing communism. This arises from the fact that the Catholic Church is correctly, unalterably opposed to communism which it regards not only as immoral but also as a heresy. Because of the unique irreconcilability of catholicism to the Communist doctrine a special obligation is imposed on anyone speaking on this subject while enjoying the status afforded by the church. I am certain that all devout Catholics have recognized this responsibility, and scrupulously avoided taking advantage of their position. For this reason it is particularly dangerous for an individual to use his Catholic standing and the obvious public standing which this gives him in order to engage in specious and divisive attacks against his fellow citizens and against the concepts of freedom and the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I am not one to pose as a more religious man than my neighbor, a more devout Christian, or a more dutiful follower of the church, nor do I proclaim myself as the special protector and defender of the church. The church can do that very well itself. However, when I feel that the church which I revere is being used by an individual as a shield and a cloak to protect the purveyor of un-American, un-Christian, dubious testimony, I am compelled to identify what is going on and protest not only as a Catholic but as an American.

Recently congressional committees and the general public have been provided with information regarding the Communist conspiracy, in America, and particularly inside the United States Government, by the man Louis Budenz. He has been speaking not merely as a private citizen. Budenz has been speaking with special emphasis as a Catholic, investing his appearances and utterances with an added sanctity by virtue of the fact that he recently went through the forms of conversion to catholicism.

My ancestors brought the cross to this hemisphere. Louis Budenz has been using this cross as a club.

I stand in judgment of no man. It has always been my contention that in a democracy each man has the right to live his own life privately, and without the intrusion of self-appointed or official probers, provided he lives within the law and has a decent respect for the equal rights of his neighbor.

However, when an individual deliberately sets himself up as a tribunal, as a public censor of the political and patriotic conduct of his fellows, then it becomes our duty to examine that individual's qualifications for the role. We are entitled to know something of the career of Louis Francis Budenz, who has now been elevated to the unique position of America's No. 1 professional witness in all matters concerning loyalty, patriotism, and political reliability—a man who has been accepted in certain circles as the final authority, the arbiter of truth in the shadowy world of ideologies, conspiracies, and subversive intrigue.

Budenz was born in Indianapolis. He married Gizzella Budenz in 1916 and was divorced by her for desertion in 1938.

By his own admission, Budenz entered into relations with one Margaret Rogers while still married to Gizzella Budenz.

This before he became a Communist. He had three children by Margaret Rogers in 1934, 1937, and 1943 and then married her in 1945. Once in a while he exhibited some sense of decency.

Under the laws of the State of New York Budenz was guilty of bigamy, as he was involved in a common-law marriage with Margaret Rogers while still legally wed to another woman.

Finally, to afford him some relief from the hum-drum domesticity of two wives at the same time, he appears to have registered under various aliases in hotels in Pennsylvania, New York, and Connecticut, concentrating his attentions on a certain Louise Gahen. Louise Gahen was Budenz' adopted daughter—a relationship which, though not directly biological, is supposed to, in our society, involve certain proprieties and decencies on the part of the parent.

Budenz likes to attribute his sordid past to the corrupting influence of the Communist Party, but this is hardly correct inasmuch as his depravity reached its depth before he joined the Communists in 1935, at the tender age of 44.

Prior to becoming a Communist, Budenz had lived a life that was actively hostile to established society. He was arrested 21 times. He earned his living as a professional agitator, stirring up and inciting others, and participating in violent assaults against the communities where he was tolerated.

Budenz confesses to being a full-fledged member of a subversive conspiracy against the United States during the years of his admitted membership in the Communist Party. He admits engaging in conspiracies to commit murder and espionage. Typically, these admissions are made after the statutes of limitations have expired. Smart boy. Budenz is thus protected from any prosecution which he might otherwise face. That feature of American law he loves.

While a member of the Communist Party, Budenz was evidently planning his next move. He left the party in 1945 and advertised his conversion to Catholicism. He became holier than thou. Budenz' resignation from the high councils of the Communist conspiracy obviously caused a sensation. He has enjoyed and profited from that sensation in the past 5 years—writing books and magazine articles, lecturing, holding press conferences, and testifying whenever he has the opportunity, reveling in every minute of his new-found prosperity and sudden respectability. Mr. President, I believe in clemency for sinners and in forgiving their sins; but with repentance should go humility, not hypocrisy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Mexico is of the opinion that this man Budenz is one who could be persuaded to lie under oath?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe he would do anything. Anyone who has been a Communist would do anything. Budenz claims he was brought by subpena before the subcommittee presided over by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], but I have looked at the record of the hearings of that subcommittee, and I defy anyone to show that Budenz was a reluctant witness. He was glad to appear there. He was eagerly and hopefully anticipating that call.

A bare word from him or a single honest admission that he did not know Mr. Lattimore would have resulted in Budenz being excused from appearing before the committee. But, instead, he developed the pose of a man holding the key to masses of valuable secret information. I will wager that he has a lot of it, too.

On April 11, 1950, on a speaking engagement at Midland, Mich., the press questioned Budenz regarding a subpena to come to Washington. According to the United Press, Budenz said that the subpena came as a surprise. According to the Associated Press, he had been expecting it. In answer to the direct question of whether he knew Dr. Lattimore, he declined to state whether he knew Lattimore or not.

The "reluctant" witness was fearful lest he reveal the fact that he possessed no evidence and thus forfeit the opportunity of playing the Washington circuit—kleig lights, television, movie cameras, and all the trappings. He could not afford to relinquish the opportunity of making Congress the sounding board for his malicious propaganda.

It strikes me as most remarkable that Budenz, who, when before the microphone, suddenly alleges that he remembers significant tie-ups between Lattimore and the Communists, never once mentioned Lattimore's name in the hours and hours spent with the FBI or in his innumerable appearances before investigating committees or in the two books he has written. Lattimore's name apparently struck an inviting note when Budenz saw it loom large in headlines, and when he realized that public hearings were taking place without him. Perhaps Budenz is one of those witnesses who require the inspiration of an audience to tell his story.

I, for one, fear lest Mr. Budenz forget some of the Communists whom he claims to know about. He might remember them by election time—the customary season for planting Reds in the Democratic Party. It is difficult to conceive how any persons running for local, State, or National office could incur the displeasure of Budenz without having him embellish their names with a crimson brush. We are tired of Budenz' surprising flashes of memory.

Therefore, I think Budenz should be invited to tell at once all the Communist names he knows, so that we are not kept in suspense until election time.

If Budenz or anyone else knows the names of undercover Communists, let him give the names to the Department of Justice and then hold his peace. I believe in a government of laws, not of men. I also think the Congress should cooperate and should turn over such evidence to the proper authorities for proper prosecution, if law violations have occurred. Members of the Senate and House should stop competing with the executive branch of the Government in purging alleged subversives.

Mr. President, what right do we have to punish anyone? The Senate does not have such a right. Suppose crimes are committed, and suppose that in one of the Senate committees the members of the committee learn of that fact. Can the committee itself do anything about it? No, Mr. President; it cannot. However, we do have the responsibility of turning over such information to the administrative branch of the Government, so that those who have committed crimes will be punished according to law. Such matters should be handled by the courts of the country in line with their duty. Certainly we have fine courts, in spite of occasional criticisms to the contrary.

If constitutional procedures are ignored and if the Congress continues to take up each individual charge and countercharge, examining the records in regard to the personal beliefs and affiliations of persons who are the subjects of such charges, and delving into their private lives and connections, then the Congress had better remain in session continuously from now on, for I contend that we are a nation of dissenters. Your ancestors and my ancestors, Mr. President, left Europe because they were dissenters. Our Nation was created by dissenters; it was created on dissension. Our ancestors were not satisfied. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are based upon the fact that our ancestors were not satisfied with things as they were. As a nation, we still are that way, and I hope we shall continue to be. I contend that inasmuch as we are a nation of dissenters, a nation founded by dissenters, we shall have a big job ahead of us if we listen to all ex-Communists and ex-Nazis who would like to use the Congress of the United States as a forum in which to proclaim and denounce every citizen who has ever held an opinion.

Mr. President, is my friend, the Senator from Indiana, subject to criticism because he is a Republican? I personally do not agree with him; but under our system he has a right to be a Republican.

Is my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, subject to criticism for being a Democrat? I think it is grand that he is. [Laughter.] But that is still his business, and remains so, under our law.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Has it ever been proved to the satisfaction of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that Mr. Budenz is not still a Communist?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would not have to claim the immunity of the Senate in replying to that question. I think he is still a Communist, I care not how many times he may pat himself on the back and praise himself for saying that he is no longer a Communist.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not wish to divert the Senator from New Mexico from the presentation of his remarks, to which I am listening with a great deal of interest; but I wonder whether he would

mind my telling a little story which might be apropos of some of the remarks which were made in the Senate yesterday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not at all; I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. There was a young man about 20 years of age who had some severe worry, and finally he lost his mind, and was locked up in an insane asylum. He remained in the insane asylum for 6 months, during which time he received treatment. At the end of the 6 months he was discharged from the insane asylum, and the superintendent gave him a certificate reading:

> The bearer, John Smith, was insane, and was confined to this asylum, but was released on the 16th day of June, and declared to be sane.

The superintendent signed his name to that certificate. John Smith, who had been insane, then went about his normal way of life. One day he got into an argument with another fellow, a man by the name of Bill Jones. Bill Jones said to John Smith, "Smith, you are crazy." Whereupon Smith pulled out the certificate saying that he had been released from the insane asylum and declared sane, and he said, "There is the proof that I am sane. Where is your proof that you are sane?" [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, we have Budenz' word that he is not a Communist.

This man Budenz, so swiftly elevated to the level of the infallible authority on communism and Communists, can pass no test of credibility. In the recent immigration proceedings—Ex parte Santo—where he was a witness under oath, he refused to answer 25 questions relating to points of fact, on the grounds that the answers might incriminate him.

Of course, every crook in the world refuses to answer questions on the ground that to do so might incriminate him. As I recall, another investigating committee, headed by my good friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], was given such an answer 3 or 4 days ago by Frank Costello and a man by the name of Erickson, who were afraid that if they answered the committee's questions, they would incriminate themselves; so they would not answer.

Yet, when Budenz appears before a Senate committee, where the counsel for the accused has no opportunity to cross-examine, Budenz is a loquacious witness.

As a private citizen and as a public witness, this man has impeached and exposed himself as a devious, conspiratorial, warped personality who uses words and information as instruments of propaganda, and not for their intrinsic truth. Budenz is constitutionally unable to give a straight answer, justifying his foul means by the perverted ends he seeks. I do not think he knows truth from falsehood any more.

If we think so little of Communists, why do we believe a confessed Communist?

I do not know what motivates the Budenz type. But I do know—and I hope that many others will recognize this fact with me—that Budenz has always, and is today, attacking the institutions of our society; first as a Communist, and then as an alleged anti-Communist, he is against the Government of the United States. I call attention to the fact that Budenz, who spent years in subversive conspiracy spreading confusion and chaos in the United States, is still seeking to smear the United States Government, its officials, and its policies by claiming that our very highest and most trusted and patriotic citizens were really corrupted by subversives—subversives such as Budenz.

The Washington Post editorialized about Mr. Budenz:

> If Mr. Budenz' reasoning were taken seriously it would be easy to conclude from it that he himself remains a Communist agent in disguise, covering up his party membership by attacks on the party, while carrying out its orders by denouncing wholly innocent non-Communists.

And I might add, doing this under the pretext of the virtue of the Catholic Church.

What is the sinister purpose of Budenz today in wildly claiming that the State Department and individuals whose records are above reproach are really tools of the Reds? I submit, Mr. President, that this man Budenz was, is, and can be counted upon to be an enemy of our free society, a congenital conspirator, a man driven to attack free institutions and free people. By his own bawdy personal excesses, his leadership in anti-American conspiracies, and now his lust for sensational publicity in the role of irresponsible informer, he shows he has consistently been the fanatic enemy of the normal and accepted forms of our free society. Mr. Budenz does not yet comprehend that it is possible for men to have their own opinions, disagree, oppose injustice, and criticize various phases of our community life, and still not be part of a violent conspiracy to overthrow our way of life.

I feel sorry for any man who has become so imbued with the totalitarian way of doing things that he has become a political cripple for life. But the fact that I feel sorry for Louis Budenz does not mean that I must enthrone him as the superior expert on the very diseases of which he is the leading victim.

Budenz, or his type, is not new in history. His kind has happened before, and the consequences were always disastrous and the same. Whenever the Budenzes have occurred down through the ages, innocent people have lost their lives and sometimes governments have fallen.

It is only recently that I had the occasion to reread Tacitus, and I was astonished by the fact that this great Roman historian, writing in the first century A. D., chronicles events which read like yesterday's newspaper. He writes of Rome under the reign of Tiberius, some 20 years after the death of Christ. Speaking of the exalted position which was bestowed on informers he comments:

> It was on this occasion that those practices were first devised which for so many years ate like a canker into our public life.

Tacitus writes of an attempt by the Roman Senate to reform the practice of giving informers and prosecutors rich rewards out of the property of their victims:

> It was proposed that if a person accused of treason should commit suicide before the trial was over, the prosecutors should forfeit their rewards. This motion was on the point of being carried (in the senate), when Tiberius, with unusual openness, pronounced in favor of the informers; protesting with much asperity, that such a rule would nullify all law and be a serious danger to the states.

What American does not believe in law more than in men? We respect our public officials, as we should, but what makes them public officials is the law, the Constitution. That is the only thing that counts. Whenever we forget about the law and undertake to put men above the law, we are in for a sad awakening—such a rule would nullify all laws and be a serious danger to the States. "Better upset laws," said he, "than remove their guardians."

Mr. President, how would you like to have prevail in our country the doctrine—better upset all law than remove people from office, no matter how much we may trust them?

> Thus was it that baits were dangled before informers—a tribe of miscreants called into being for the public ruin, whom neither pains nor penalties have ever been able to repress.

And further Tacitus writes:

> Of all the evil features of that time, none was more calamitous than this, that the first men in the senate would practice the vilest delation: some openly, some in secret; not distinguishing between kinsfolk and strangers, between friends and unknown persons, between things of yesterday and things obscured by time. Words uttered in the street, or across the dinner table—

Let us follow that and see how close it is to what is now going on.

> Words uttered in the street or across the dining table, on any subject whatever, were noted for accusation, every man hurrying to be the first to mark down his victim: some few acting in self-defense, the greater number as if infected by some contagious malady.

Now, in modern history—and I am pretty sure that the majority of the Senators are fairly well acquainted with the history of England—we have Titus Oates, who lived some years before our War of Independence and played the Louis Budenz of his day. This seventeenth century English informer may give us some clue to Budenz' devious actions. Oates was an Anglican cleric with a turbulent beginning similar to that of Budenz. He was expelled from the Royal Navy for perversion. He then joined first one Jesuit academy, then another, and was expelled from both.

In 1678 Oates took it upon himself to denounce a vast Jesuit conspiracy, spreading tales of plots by the Catholic Church to assassinate the king and upset the established church and Government of England. In all the arrangements he had been, he said, a trusted emissary—such as Budenz. Over a hundred conspirators were mentioned by name. Oates was examined by the privy council. By piecing together things true and false, or true facts falsely interpreted, and by inventing treasonable letters and accounts of military preparations, he was able to stir a wave of fear which overran the country.

As a result of the turmoil, many imprisonments and more than one death occurred. Parliament investigating one of the murders, called upon Oates to testify. When a new witness was needed to support Oates' story, a man named William Bedloe finally came forward. At first he remembered little; by degrees he remembered everything that was wanted. The slaughter and slander of Jesuits and Catholic laymen lasted without check until 1679 when the force of Oates' fabricated testimony finally diminished.

A major factor in making a Titus Oates possible in that day was the existence of the Test Act which Parliament had passed demanding an oath from all persons holding civil, military, or municipal office.

Witness the ideas which are prevailing in some of the schools in this day.

The oath was to swear supremacy and allegiance only to the Anglican Church and its sacraments and to denounce other versions and beliefs of holy communion. Thus, the Test Act effectively barred Catholics and non-Anglican Protestants from holding any office or position of public trust.

Titus Oates, who thrived in such an atmosphere, after finally serving a prison term for perjury—do not be surprised if something happens one of these days; some Senate committee will get him one of these days—retired to a life of intrigue and petty thievery and died in 1705. However, his tactics seem to be enjoying a popular revival in the cunning hands of Mr. Budenz.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator state what particular testimony of Mr. Budenz he thinks was false or perjured?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think everything he has said is false.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am wondering whether the Senator is familiar with the fact that the Department of Justice, which is represented by the Attorney General, who is a Cabinet officer, has in various criminal trials vouched for Mr. Budenz' veracity when it has used him as a Government witness to convict certain persons. What does the Senator say about that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that many innocent persons are convicted by perjured testimony possibly given by someone like Mr. Budenz. Anyone who says he will not answer a question because he is afraid to be incriminated cannot have my faith or confidence.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator wish to state when he believes the Government became conscious of the fact that the witness Budenz was a perjurer and was not worthy of belief? The Senator says he thinks that all his testimony was false.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Michigan wants to believe in an ex-Communist, that is all right with me.

I am not apologizing for anything I said, nor am I questioning the motives of the Senator from Michigan. I give him the same right to have an opinion of Mr. Budenz as I have. If he wants to believe and have faith and confidence in an ex-Communist, that is all right. His motives will not be questioned.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator will point out the particular testimony on the part of Mr. Budenz, which he believes is false, and if he has any facts which he might relate to the Senate to show that that particular testimony was false.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that most of his testimony had ulterior motives. He had an idea, and he did not care whether it was true or otherwise. All he wanted was a sounding board; and that is what I am tired of.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator would be of the opinion, then, that the 11 Communists who were convicted in New York should be freed because they have been convicted upon perjured testimony on the part of Budenz; is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not going to let the Senator from Michigan attribute to me——

Mr. FERGUSON. I am asking the Senator a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will tell him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a moment. I happen to be a member of a church which does not believe in Communists. I do not believe that the testimony of Mr. Budenz was the only thing which convicted those 11 Communists. I, for one, am glad they were convicted. I think they were guilty. I am not defending them or any ex-Communists who might want to use a committee of the Senate as a sounding board to exploit themselves.

I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator from New Mexico, without getting into the argument, that seven FBI undercover men in the Communist movement were the principal prosecuting witnesses in the case referred to. Budenz simply testified about techniques. The witnesses who were FBI undercover men furnished the real evidence which convicted the 11 Communists.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. About the only thing Budenz contributed was to admit that he had been a Communist.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator would not sanction the Government using as a witness a man whom he would not believe under oath; would he?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course I would not sanction it. But the Government is carried on by individuals; it is carried on by representatives, and once in a while they also make mistakes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could the Senator relate to the Senate the particular testimony or particular evidence with respect to which he believes Budenz testified falsely, and could he then relate the facts to prove or to give to the Senate the benefit of proof that the testimony was false?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not want to bore the Senator nor any of my other colleagues, notwithstanding the interest in protecting an ex-Communist.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. As the Senator from New Mexico is a lawyer, he is no doubt aware of the legal significance of the words "vouch for." Those words have been used by the Senator from Michigan in reference to the Attorney General. In legal parlance the words "vouch for," when a State uses a witness, mean that the State is prohibited from impeaching that witness unless he shows hostility.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The Senator from Michigan, who is a very fine lawyer, knows that.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator not noticed that there has been a perfect rash of reformed Communists informing on persons, and that their testimony seems to be given the greatest credence?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what I am complaining about. More attention is paid to the testimony of Communists and ex-Communists than to the testimony of anyone else. It would seem that if a man who has never been a Communist testifies, he is impeached.

Mr. KILGORE. Apparently, in the eyes of some persons, his testimony is not as worthy of belief as is that of a man who was formerly a traitor or a Communist.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from New Mexico believe that all Communists are liars or that they lie?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is a fair question. I do.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator believe that all Communists were liars and would lie in 1933?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think they lie at any time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Was the Senator a Member of the United States Senate in 1933, when this Nation recognized Russia?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was a Member of the House of Representatives in 1933. I was in Congress when Russia was recognized.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator believes that all Communists are liars and will lie, and he believes that they did so in 1933, does he not feel that the United States made a mistake in recognizing communistic Russia?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I refuse to answer that question. I am talking about Communists in the United States, and especially about one who seems to have received a great deal of attention of late. I want to show the type of person he is.

We make a grave error in assuming that alleged ex-Communists are our best source of information on communism. It has become the fashion to lionize and extol the ex-Communist in America today. Ex-Communists are treated as heroes of the Republic. They are rushed to forums from which to denounce good citizens who always opposed communism but refused to make merchandise of their patriotism. Those of

us who were striving for a more enlightened, freer, happier world while the Budenzes, Bentleys, and Utleys were busy destroying it, are evidently unworthy today. We, who were never part of the conspiracy, must step aside and let the alumni of the conspiracy tell how America must be cleansed and protected. And Louis Budenz, cum laude graduate of conspiracy, is exalted to our highest authority. Even the great prosecutor from the State of Michigan, as a prosecutor of criminals, would defend the innocent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Budenz testified before a committee on which the Senator from New Mexico served. That is why the Senator from Michigan asked the Senator from New Mexico to point out the particular evidence given by Mr. Budenz which is false. I should like to hear that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not the evidence he gave. It is the lack of evidence. It is the evidence he withheld.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That would be just as perjured as testimony which was false, because he would be sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. He would be required to give all the testimony.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Michigan wants to believe a man such as Mr. Budenz because he was sworn to tell the truth, that is perfectly satisfactory to me. If he wants to believe such a man it is all right with me. I would not believe him and I would not care how many Bibles he swore on.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Just a moment, please. We are all in constant peril lest one of these people suddenly points an accusing finger at us. We cannot show our resignation from the Communist Party, never having been members. The Senator from Louisiana cannot show it. Can the Senator from Louisiana show his resignation from the Communist Party? I know he can not. Budenz can. With their perverted logic, such men are likely to point to the Senator from Louisiana and accuse him of being a Communist because he is unable to show that he is not a Communist.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LONG. With reference to the colloquy between the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Michigan, is not the position of the Senator from New Mexico not a matter of pointing to something Mr. Budenz said which the Senator can prove was false, but rather, knowing what the Senator knows about Mr. Budenz, he would not rely on anything Mr. Budenz has said, whether he was under oath or not under oath.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. There is no good reason to trust him.

Mr. LONG. The only statement of Mr. Budenz which the Senator from New Mexico believes, is his admission that he was a Communist, because that is all that is known to be a fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. President, I am particularly mindful of the testimony of the ex-Communist Freda Utley who points to the fact that Dr. Lattimore failed to follow the Moscow line as proof that he is a Communist. Here is a proved Communist, who admits that she was a Communist, trying to prove before a Senate committee that Dr. Lattimore, of the State Department, is a Communist because he did not follow the Moscow line. Obviously he was covering up, she contends, in order to avoid detection. This Alice-in-Wonderland logic is openly spread before a Senate committee and the American people as evidence—evidence mind you—that a citizen was engaged in a treasonable conspiracy to undermine his country's foreign policy.

I am intrigued by the fact that during her testimony, Mrs. Utley referred to the outbreak of hostilities after the Nazi-Soviet pact in 1941 as the time when Russia attacked Germany. The last time I heard that Russia attacked Germany was from Goebbels on the Berlin radio. At least Mrs. Utley reveals that she had thrown up her Communist doctrine only to swallow the Nazi line. To such witnesses do we give the forum of the Congress of the United States.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to outline the consequences of what we are doing by pursuing the current irresponsible and crude tactics in dealing with this problem.

If Senators think that I cannot give credit to those on the other side for being good citizens, they do not know the Senator from New Mexico. Our country has become great under our system. In many instances and for many years the administration of laws was under men who professed the party affiliation of Senators on the other side of the aisle. We made great strides even then. I want to keep it that way. That is why I do not believe Budenz' testimony.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did the Senator say "even then"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did the Senator say that even under Republican administrations we made great strides?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course we did.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; we did. I revere Lincoln. I revere McKinley. Yes; we did. I go even further than the Senator. I am proud to say a kind word for Harding. As a clerk of this body I saw him in the chair which is now occupied by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. He was a great American. He was a great President. I do not want our system of government broken on the testimony of Communists, who want to undermine it. Even if the American people are foolish enough to elect a Republican President, I still think this is a great country.

These are the consequences, Mr. President:

First, we are providing a platform from which every unreliable and discredited individual can proclaim to the world that the United States is rotting with subversives. The real Communists can use this to prove that their fifth columns are conquering us. We proclaim the lie that our country cannot even formulate a foreign policy because agents honeycomb the State Department, and we project the new lie that Communists not only took China but that they have taken our Department of State.

Second, we have followed a course which has caught nobody—and I emphasize that nobody has been proven guilty of anything—but we have permitted the smearing of loyal citizens and seriously impaired the morale of efficient and patriotic Government officials.

That is why I object to the Bentleys and the Budenzes. I do not talk of the administration from the standpoint of politics. I talk of the administration as the representative of the Government. I would say that if Mr. Dewey had been elected President and if the same thing had been going on, I would still believe in this country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield in a minute. The cunning attack has been calculated to harm the administration and choke any effort at a creative foreign policy, particularly in the case of China, which has been the focal point of the conspiracy to spread mistrust and confusion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did I understand the Senator to indicate that there never was anyone in the State Department who had any connection with the Communists?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think there were many.

Mr. FERGUSON. What about Hiss and Wadleigh?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly. I think they are just as bad as Budenz.

Mr. FERGUSON. How does the Senator feel the Justice Department could get evidence about these closely knit Communist cells if it were not for the fact that people who at one time were Communists but who have actually changed their spots come out as Christians and tell the truth?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I for one think that the Department of Justice has done a wonderful job in getting Communists from under. I think they have done a grand piece of work for the American people.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator feel that sometimes it is possible to prove a crime only by the testimony of an associate of the criminal who knows of the criminal's activities?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator acknowledges that that is the way to prove it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; certainly.

Third, we have permitted the impairing of individual rights and reputations. I am not defending Dr. Lattimore personally, and I am not defending any individual merely because I happen to know him. However, I believe in law, and I believe in American institutions. I believe in the punishment of crime. However, I want it to be punished in

the American way, by a jury of the accused person's peers, and not in the way in which it is being done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator would then agree with the Senator from Michigan——

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator from Michigan so many times that I wish he would agree with me once, that Budenz is not worthy of either respect or trust.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator feels that people should be punished for the crimes they commit; does he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Rather than to be convicted merely of perjury they commit before senatorial or congressional committees?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No one knows better how our law works than does the Senator from Michigan. He has been an honored judge. He has been trusted by the people in Michigan. I know that he has enforced the law, and possibly sentenced people whom he found he should sentence. But he did so under the American system of law. That is the only way he would have it for only in accordance with the principles of law would he sentence men and send them to the penitentiary. He would not depend on the findings of a committee of the Legislature of Michigan to send men to the penitentiary, I am sure. He is too good an American and too fine a lawyer for that. He knows how the law works.

Citizens of distinction, such as the outstanding liberal jurist, Judge Dorothy Kenyon, and, I say in all sincerity, the learned and valuable Chinese expert, Dr. Owen Lattimore, have been accused. If we were the jury, of what would we convict them on the testimony of Budenz or of whoever has testified against them? Do not Senators believe they are entitled to at least that great characteristic of Americanism—fair play? Do we believe in Anglo-Saxon law, or do we want to follow some other system? I still believe in the jury system.

I repeat, Mr. President, citizens of distinction, the outstanding liberal jurist Judge Dorothy Kenyon, the learned and valuable Chinese expert, Dr. Owen Lattimore, and faithful State Department officials like Brunauer and Hanson, have been attacked and their reputations subjected to calumny, yet not one charge has been proved against them. Professionally such individuals have suffered, as their families have suffered, their wives probably in tears and their children ashamed to go to school, because of the testimony submitted by a confessed Communist. But what can be done to make restitution to a man for his shattered reputation?

Fourth, even if we make restitution to the individual victims of these wild and irresponsible charges, think of the fear that has been implanted in the minds of teachers, researchers, scientists, Government workers, and in the minds of all citizens, since everyone is aware of the public flogging awaiting individuals accused of the reckless crime of thinking.

Think of it, people being accused merely because they dare think. I respect Senators on the other side of the aisle. I believe they think wrongly, but they think, and I would rather have them think wrongly than not to think at all. Many of the persons who have been mentioned have been accused merely of thinking.

I contend that once men are tried for the heresy of thinking a democracy is robbed of its intellectual yeast.

The cement of our society is voluntary agreement. If we accept only "safe" people the cement falls apart and we become a slave people. I do not know whether this type of suppression works in a totalitarian society. It may very well be that a dictatorship survives by curbing thought and intelligence, but I am certain that the United States cannot gain strength from a population of "safe" people—people approved by a Louis Budenz; people who have never thought or dreamed or spoken anything that is not prescribed and dictated by higher authority. I contend that if our officials and our citizens become political nonentities and yes-men, the American way of life perishes.

Americanism certainly includes, among its many attributes, the right to be wrong.

Fifth, we are establishing a situation in America where there can be only two opinions—the Communist and the anti-Communist. We are playing right into the hands of Moscow, for we are polarizing all opinion in the United States between the Communists and the non-Communists, telling Moscow that all people who disagree or dissent with our personal political opinions are Communists. I for one would not like to hand over to Moscow everyone in the United States who happens to disagree with me. We have differences of opinion in this body. Every vote we take here shows differences of opinion, and I would not like to see that system changed.

Mr. President, I object to our elevating the Communists to the tremendous prestige of being the single opposition in American life—a success far beyond the wildest dreams of the small and puny professional Communist movement.

Sixth, I, for one, would like to know what the real Communists are up to. Clearly we are not going to discover the espionage agents of a foreign power by indulging in staged public inquiries. We should be concerned over the possibility of actual spies and saboteurs, whose apprehension can only be achieved by diligent and expert counterintelligence.

Counterintelligence has to do with the procedure of getting information. But besides that we ought to do some real thinking, both on this side of the aisle and on the other side.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator may not be drawing the inference which I thought I obtained from his conclusions, but is it the Senator's position that he is opposed to the investigation by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I am not opposing any investigation. If there is anyone who has the highest respect for the duties of the Senate, including the duty of making inquiries, it is the senior Senator from New Mexico. What I oppose is taking it for granted that the type of testimony being taken by such committees will have more value in bringing about the result we all desire than would the testimony of honest citizens who cannot swear that they have not been Communists.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I take it that the Senator is really making this address today to the American people and to the Senate as a warning to the committee that when they make up their opinion and their judgment they should not believe Budenz, Bentley, and Utley; and does he include Field and Browder?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have heretofore told the Senator and the Senate that I am a great worshiper of laws and not of men. What I am trying to tell the American people and the Senate is that we created a great country, that our ancestors had a concept of liberty and freedom which has never been equaled anywhere else. I want to see that system maintained. I want Americans to be free to think. I want Americans to be convicted only on proper evidence. I want Americans to be convicted only by juries of their peers. I want whatever inquiries are conducted to be made by the Senate or the House of Representatives in order to enforce that system of government.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, as I understand, the Senator is merely telling the committee and the people to be careful, and not believe the Budenzes, the Utleys, and the others of like character?

Mr. CHAVEZ. What I am telling the American people, if the Senator will try to bear with me, is that we have a free country, that there are ways of punishing crime, that crime should be punished, but that we should carry on as Americans, and not as dictators; that we should apply the principles of a free government, and refuse to listen to gossip, innuendoes, and insinuations, and regard them as being evidence on which a free American could be convicted. I would rather have several guilty persons go unwhipped of justice than to have an innocent person punished on the basis of such testimony.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the Senator, what he has said in his speech with reference to Budenz is that he simply would not believe Budenz under oath with respect to any proposition he might espouse before the committee or anywhere else. That is about all the Senator said, is it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is all I said, so far as Budenz is concerned. But I want to emphasize, and I cannot emphasize it too strongly, that law and order should prevail. Americans guilty of crime should be punished by due process of

law, yes. But they should not be subject to the whims and the caprices of anyone.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say for the RECORD that, as I recall, from reading the newspapers, Budenz said he did not know Lattimore.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. But what he did say was that he attended a meeting back in 1946 with Field and Browder, two other Communists, and that they related to him that they thought Lattimore was a Communist, and it was on the basis of that hearsay testimony that he made his statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. When the Senator from Michigan was a judge, would he for one moment have accepted that sort of evidence as being valid in his court?

Mr. LUCAS. It was on the basis of that hearsay testimony of Budenz that Lattimore was pilloried throughout the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the RECORD should further show that when Browder and Field were brought before the committee they both testified that no such conversation took place. Now I do not know who in that Communist group was lying, but somebody certainly was.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me make one point, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I repeat: I, for one, would like to know what the real Communists are up to. Clearly we are not going to discover the espionage agents of a foreign power by indulging in staged public inquiries. We should be concerned over the possibility of actual spies and saboteurs, whose apprehension can only be achieved by diligent and expert counterintelligence. To secure this type of protection we must have a skilled body of experts well versed in the nature of the enemy, with a continuing experience in dealing with this sensitive and highly secret problem. Public hysteria and thought control are poor substitutes for an adequate security system. I believe in a security system.

The subcommittee headed by the Senator from Maryland has obviously been trying to do a thorough and impartial job. It certainly was not their intention to provide a sounding board for self-proclaimed ex-subversives to wreak vengeance on society. It does appear that the committee has been propelled into murky waters where, instead of being able to deliberate upon evidence, it must defend itself from the various attempts to abuse and pervert it.

For this reason I would like to second the observations of the able junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who proposed on May 8 that the Tydings subcommittee proceed henceforth in nonpublic sessions.

The Senator from Vermont noted that the public sessions were hurting the morale of able and conscientious public servants and causing astonishment and uncertainty abroad. I should like to endorse the purposes of the Flanders resolution—I said the purposes of the Flanders resolution—and I trust the Senator from Maryland will proceed with closed hearings, or by some other method at his discretion to accomplish the purposes for which his committee was established.

When the committee has had an opportunity to sift the truth from the rumors and calumny it will be possible to issue a report of findings and conclusions to the proper Government departments, the Congress, and the American people. I am sure my good friend from Michigan is such an excellent judge and lawyer that that is the only way he would want it done. From the actual evidence the truth will be known.

The American people are entitled to know the facts. But the American people do not want, I am certain, the United States Senate to be turned into a platform for every half-baked gossip, every suspicious or vengeful individual, every mountebank and scandalmonger who revels in the glory of prattling publicly.

Mr. President, when we consider all these things, when we think seriously about them, the past arises before us like a dream. Gossip and intrigue destroyed Greece, and Crete before it. Intrigue and totalitarian ideas destroyed Rome. Intrigue has destroyed every great empire that has arisen. I do not like such things. We have a wonderful country. We should be proud of our ancestors. We should be proud of what they did when they devised the Declaration of Independence, and wrote the Constitution, and the first 10 amendments to the Constitution which protect the rights of every citizen. All I ask is that we proceed under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Magic of Ex-Communists," which appeared in the Washington Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAGIC OF EX-COMMUNISTS

Another reformed Communist—a class of people, incidentally, which seems to have discovered a short cut to fame and public adulation, has made the headlines. The method follows the current pattern. Having won prestige because of having been a member of the Communist Party, the witness rises suddenly from obscurity by testifying in a manner that carries some taint against one of the great men of our times—in this case, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. Dr. Oppenheimer needs no defense, here or anywhere else. The fact remains that now he, too, has been drawn into that growing company of men and women whose reputations are smeared by those whose claim to credibility rests on admitting previous membership in a society of liars.

One of the aims of the Communist Party is to create distrust and confusion among our people. Suppose we join, for a moment, the high command of the Communist Party and witness how this could be done. A scheme that experience seems to indicate is workable might be unfolded in this manner:

Comrade X, in the name of Stalin, rise and receive your orders. You are a known Communist. Tomorrow morning you must renounce communism. You must do this publicly. You must write an article exposing our alleged secrets and damning Stalin. You must say you have been won over to American democracy, that you wish to save it, that you wish to warn against the dangers of communism.

It will not be long before you are summoned to Washington. Be modest, but be firm. Face the klieg lights standing up, the cameras, the audience which jams the chamber. Swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God. If possible, on your way to the hearing, hold a brief press conference and hint at, but do not divulge, the things you are going to say. Give the impression that you will name names and dates, but only to the committee.

When you get on the stand, remember this list of people, highly placed in the American Government. Let the names come out, as if they were being drawn from you against your will. Praise them faintly as having been known to you as faithful workers for the party, or as one who mingled with Communists. The reception that you receive will awe you, but keep your head. Remember that the applause is not for you, personally, but for the great tradition that we, the members of the party, have been able to establish—the tradition that we Communists, once we publicly renounce communism, become the fountainhead of truth, symbols of infallibility, modern Pied Pipers whose magic attracts all the little children along with all the rats.

Thus the agent receives his instructions and embarks upon his mission. And nobody yet has been able to explain the mysterious processes of the human mind which elevate him above his fellows, give authority to his testimony, allow him to scar and blacken for life the reputations of people who, far from claiming they once were Communists, are ready to swear they are not and never have been Communists.

How do we know the reformed Communists actually have reformed? How do we know they really are transformed, by the curious alchemy of the times, from liars to truthful men and women? How do we know that they are not the participants in some subtle plot to panic us into mob tactics? How do we know, as a matter of fact, that they are ex-Communists?

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—NEWSPAPER ARTICLES AND COMMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER obtained the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for insertions in the RECORD?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be set forth at this point in my remarks, in the body of the RECORD, a telegraphic message dated May 10, 1950, from M. D. Griffith, executive vice president, New York Board of Trade, Inc., 291 Broadway, N. Y., to myself, the same relating to the pending railroad strike, and in which the sender of the telegram petitions and strongly urges the immediate passage of Senate bill 3463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegram is as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y.

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully petition and strongly urge immediate passage of S. 3463 by Senator DONNELL, the purpose of which is to amend the Railway Labor Act to prevent interference with the movement of interstate commerce. American business dependent upon railroad services, which are the arteries of

commerce, are seriously threatened. Urge immediate consideration.

M. D. GRIFFITH,
Executive Vice President, New York Board of Trade, Inc.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Firemen's Strike," appearing in the Washington Evening Star of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Is there objection to the printing in the body of the RECORD of the editorial to which the Senator from Missouri refers? The Chair asks that question for the reason that there was objection to a similar request yesterday.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator why it should go in the body of the RECORD?

Mr. DONNELL. Because of two things. It refers to the firemen's strike, which is now in progress, and in the second place, because of the great importance of this strike to the American people and American industry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, every day the Senator from Missouri has been talking about the strike and its importance to the country. Every day he has been placing matters in the body of the RECORD relating to the strike. I am not going to object, but I still think it is poor practice, as stated by the Senator who objected yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

FIREMEN'S STRIKE

The strike by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen should dispel the pleasant myth that labor unions, given an equitable procedure for adjusting differences with their employers, will conduct themselves in a reasonable manner.

This strike, affecting two rail systems and parts of two others, has been called after exhausting procedures of the Railway Labor Act. Two presidential boards, after careful investigation, recommended against the union demand for an additional fireman in multiple-unit Diesel engines. The boards found that there would be little or no work for the extra men to do—in a word, that the union was making a feather-bedding demand.

What it all comes down to is this: The rail unions over the years have won very substantial benefits under the processes of the Railway Labor Act. When a recommendation is made in favor of a union, the railroad has no choice except to grant it. But when the shoe is on the other foot—when a fact-finding board recommends against a union—the employees are free to strike in enforcement of their demand, and they frequently do.

Suppose for a moment that the fact-finding boards had found that the additional firemen were needed and that the railroads, to compel the unions to give up their demand, had stopped operating. Everybody from Mr. Truman on down the line would be denouncing them, and rightly so, as selfish, high-handed malefactors. But with the union cast in the malefactor role, the silence of these usually articulate gentlemen is deafening.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIME

Mr. KEFAUVER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator begins his speech, will he yield for a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say that I supported the resolution submitted by the Senator from Tennessee, relative to the investigation of crime, which resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not recall how elastic or how broad the provisions of the resolution are. Does the Senator feel that the committee would have the right to investigate crime in France?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have not planned to talk at this time about the crime investigation. However, in my opinion, the language of the resolution which has been adopted by the Senate is very plain. I cannot imagine a situation in which the resolution would enable us to investigate crime in France.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As chairman of the special committee, and as a Senator in whom all of us have faith and confidence, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether he thinks there is any difference between supporting gambling in France and supporting gambling in the United States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator from Nebraska is driving at. I was not aware that we were supporting gambling in France.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield for about 2 minutes, I should like to bring to his attention the matter I have in mind, and then I should like to ask him to answer questions about it, if he will.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be glad to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Nebraska after I have finished the remarks which I wish to make at this time; but at this point I should like to proceed with my speech.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield to me for the purpose I have mentioned, it will not take 2 minutes to cover this matter.

I am not attempting in any way to impugn the motives of the Senator; but a matter which has arisen interests me, and I should like very much to call it to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee. I should like very much to do so now, and it will not take me more than 2 minutes to present it.

I can read the observation to the Senator from Tennessee now, and he can answer it either now or after he has finished his speech, if he will be so kind.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I would rather have that matter brought up separately, and not at the beginning of my speech, because I do not know what subject the Senator from Nebraska has in mind, and I would rather not have a discussion of it precede the delivery of the speech which I have planned to make to the Senate at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, if it relates to some other matter. I do not wish to get into a discussion at this point.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to state what my unanimous-consent request is.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has already yielded to me, to enable me to state my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I have asked the Senator from Tennessee whether he will permit me to make an observation for 2 or perhaps 3 minutes, before he begins his speech.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am certain that the Senator from Nebraska will be here in the Senate Chamber after I conclude my speech. So I would rather proceed with my speech now, and let him discuss whatever he has in mind after I have concluded my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee declines to yield.

THE ATLANTIC UNION RESOLUTION. (S. CON. RES. 57)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, our Secretary of State is meeting this week in London with the Foreign Secretaries of Britain and France, and beginning with the first of next week there will be a meeting of the Council for the Atlantic Pact countries, at which meeting the three Secretaries will also be present. Certainly in view of recent events in the field of international relations they should meet, and it is to be fervently hoped they can agree on some new and practical approach to the problem of meeting our common peril. It is to be hoped that this conference will produce something more than we are led by past experience to expect from diplomatic conferences. Our diplomats have had dozens of conferences and hundreds of talks and the only results we see are reflected in our present precarious situation.

There is a difference of opinion among lawyers about the provision in our Constitution which calls for the "advice and consent" of the Senate in the conduct of our foreign affairs and the formation of our policy in that field. There are those who maintain that only the consent of the Senate is required after the policy has been formed and agreements have been negotiated. There are others who contend that the word "advice" was intended to mean precisely that and that this advice should be sought in formulating our policies.

In view of the continued deterioration of the international situation in the past few years, I submit, Mr. President, in complete candor and sincerity, that we would do well now in accordance with the latter school of thought.

Since I, myself, hold to this view, I take it as the prerogative of the Senate and of Senators to offer advice to our State Department and to our Secretary of State. With this premise in mind and with an eye on our present international situation, I should like, Mr. President, to offer some advice to Mr. Acheson relating to his meeting with

the Foreign Secretaries of Britain and France, and to his meeting with the larger group beginning next week.

Ample and recent precedent for advice from Senators and the Senate is afforded by the statesmanship of the eminent senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in proposing the resolution adopted by the Senate on June 11, 1948, which bears his name, and which led to the creation of the Atlantic Pact. On other occasions the advice of such eminent legislators as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has been heeded, as was also the advice of the Senator from Arkansas at the time when he was a Member of the House of Representatives.

The Vandenberg resolution, as Senators know, represented a bold departure from our previous policies. Mr. President, I submit that the situation today demands another demonstration of boldness; another bold step, farther and more comprehensive, in that direction. The Secretary of State listened to that advice, and the Vandenberg resolution become State Department policy. The Senate also knows of the wholesome effect of the Connally and Fulbright resolution.

The advice several of us would offer today is that we explore the possibility of a real and full partnership with our democratic allies of the Atlantic area. We would advise the Secretary of State, in his conversations in London, to open the subject of this exploration with Mr. Bevin and M. Schuman. By so doing he can turn their thoughts to a more adequate solution of our present problems and pave the way for early and successful action in accordance with the advice of the Senate proposed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 57.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too much the urgency for the Senate to give that advice during the present session.

Today the Kremlin has the offensive in the cold war. The probing fingers of communism encircle the entire globe, searching for soft spots. They are now consolidating their gains in China, while they stir the fires of unrest in Indochina. Recent rumblings indicate that even in the newly established order of the United States of Indonesia, disorder may soon again hold sway. Berlin is a powder keg with a fuze that may burn to its end before the month is out. From the Baltic to the Dardanelles to Korea, the pressure is unrelenting.

As Soviet policy has unfolded we can see what Stalin meant in 1945 by the words, "Not war, not peace." He meant a confused and confusing state midway between the two, which has since come to be called the cold war. Stalin's cold war has enjoyed success after success. This is realized the more fully when the successes are viewed against the aims. Stalin wants to create confusion, to promote distrust, to prevent recovery, and to continue chaos and disunity among the forces of freedom. A moment's reflection on the present world situation demonstrates how great has been Stalin's success toward achieving these aims.

Mr. President, these events show that the piecemeal policies we have been pursuing in the cold war have proved inadequate. The bits and pieces of intergovernmental cooperation between the Atlantic democracies, Marshall plan aid, and point 4 promises, have proved inadequate. Diplomacy itself, although implemented by the most far-reaching international cooperation our country ever attempted, has proved inadequate. Something more is needed, a more comprehensive over-all means than diplomacy, a means which can bring a comprehensive, over-all solution to the critical problems we face. I submit, Mr. President, that even Mr. Acheson's total diplomacy will not prove sufficient for the task, for what is needed is beyond the reach of diplomacy in any form.

The greatest possible blow that could be dealt the forces of Kremlin communism would be the achievement of real unity, of real union among the forces of freedom.

Premier Georges Bidault of France has recently proposed going beyond what has yet been attempted and creating an Atlantic high council to tackle the economic and political problems of the Atlantic democracies. His suggestion was reported to have been coldly received in both Washington and London. But, Mr. President, even this proposal, valuable as it may be in pointing up the desirability of more integrated action by our governments, could not provide the over-all action our problems require. A high council of the Atlantic would be a diplomatic body, directly dependent upon the cooperation of governments. Certainly it would be better than what we are doing at the present time. It would be a diplomatic instrument. It would preserve the traditionally European method of diplomacy, when this method may be said to account in large measure for our present lack of success. All the diplomats say we must have closer unity among the free; but, they say it must be limited to a closer unity among the diplomats of the nations represented.

Mr. President, the great Will Rogers long ago said, "We never lost a war or won a conference." I believe the American people subscribe in large measure to this view. Diplomacy, as I said a moment ago, is traditionally a European method, whereas we in America are traditionally more skilled than they in the workings of democracy. So I say it is high time we moved over to a method more suited to our own traditions and skills.

The innumerable conferences of diplomats have failed, and failed miserably, as we can see from the headlines that scream at us daily. Will we never learn? It is so easy to profit from experience, if we only would. Why can we not profit from our own glorious experience?

The methods of diplomacy had failed to solve the problems of 13 little colonies along our Atlantic seaboard. They were bankrupt and torn from within while being harassed and threatened from without. Their leaders had the vision and the genius to abandon the methods of diplomacy which had failed them. They used their genius and vision to devise a new method, a method so sound that, in the century and a half since, it has not failed in a single instance where it was applied. This method of federal union has brought to us, and to the others who have applied it, a greater prosperity, a higher living standard, a larger measure of security, and more individual freedom than any other method ever devised.

We can reverse the trend and win the cold war. But I submit that it cannot be won by the tools so far brought to the task.

The method of diplomacy depends on voluntary cooperation of governments. This is far too fragile a reed on which to lean in the present tense situation.

If we are to reverse the trend and win the cold war it will require a reversal of thinking on the part of our officials who refuse to recognize the genius of this method, which is peculiarly American—the method of democratic federal union.

This method is not only American, but I am convinced the American people want it applied now. Last July, on behalf of myself and 19 other Senators, I offered the Atlantic union resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 57—in the Senate. Since that time I have received not hundreds but thousands of letters not merely supporting this resolution but urging its adoption as a matter of first importance. The American people have confidence in this democratic method of solving our problems.

The Atlantic Union Committee was organized as a Nation-wide movement to support the adoption of this resolution. It has grown in less than 1 year at such a rate that it now has organized chapters or community leaders in every State of the Union. Its membership continues to grow at an accelerating pace. As I have traveled about the country I have found an ever-increasing interest in the exploratory convention the Atlantic-union resolution would bring.

Extensive hearings have been held on this resolution by a foreign relations subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah. The resolving clause provides:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

A number of eminent Americans have testified on this resolution, including former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, former Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, and Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner in atomic science. I believe that most Senators who have either heard or studied this testimony will agree that the establishment of an Atlantic union would contribute greatly and even decisively to the security and prospects of peace of the American people, to their future prosperity, and to a progressive expansion of freedom and democracy

But apparently a like proportion of Senators do not appear to recognize the urgency of action on this resolution. There appears to be a tendency to think that there is plenty of time to take such action later if events eventually force us to conclude that we should do so.

Time has proved in recent years to be the Nemesis of democracies. If the British and French had commenced their prewar rearmament earlier, Hitler might not have struck. If the United States had adopted two decades ago the foreign policies which it follows now, Hitler would not have struck. The democracies have paid a fearful price in blood, in treasure, and in loss of security for doing too little and doing it too late. They have usually done too little because they started too late. Let us not again, in a day of atomic armament, make the same fatal mistake.

To appreciate the urgency of action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, we must get down to cases. We must examine the steps toward establishment of an Atlantic union in terms of time. We should remember, as we do so, that we cannot later buy back any time which we now waste.

Let us suppose that adoption of the Atlantic-union resolution is postponed until the next session of Congress and effected only in 1951. After the resolution is agreed to, considerable time will be required before the exploratory convention called for in this resolution can actually meet. Many details will have to be arranged through diplomatic channels, delegates will have to be selected and appointed, and the governments and the delegates involved will presumably wish to give serious thought to the problems and implications of union which the convention must consider.

For these reasons it appears to me probable that the postponement of adoption of this resolution until the next Congress would delay the convention until well into 1952. That year, of course, is a presidential election year. Leaders of our political parties who necessarily should be appointed as delegates to the convention will then be concerned with election campaigns, and the issues before the convention would likely become involved in partisan politics. To postpone the convention until after the election would mean that it could not begin its exploration of this broader, safer road to peace and prosperity until 1953.

Let us now suppose that the convention is successful in its exploration of the possibilities of Atlantic union and is able to produce a concrete plan or a draft constitution. Is it realistic to believe that, under the complex conditions of our modern industrial civilization, it could achieve such a result within a year? I should doubt it. And then, after that, how much time would be required for the acceptance of an Atlantic union constitution, which in our country, would require a constitutional amendment?

No one can answer these questions definitely, but it seems likely that postponement of action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 at this session would postpone the actual establishment of an Atlantic union in peacetime until 1955, 1956, or even later. It is possible, of course, that we might be forced by events into a streamlined procedure. A greater crisis, a depression, the conquest of additional nations by communism, might rush the convention and the Atlantic democracies into precipitate action, as the British were precipitated into offering union to the French in 1940. But that is not a sound way to proceed in establishing common governmental institutions.

To build such an edifice wisely, we must mold events, not be driven by them.

Mr. President, to establish an Atlantic union carefully and wisely will require time, even if we should pass the Atlantic-union resolution tomorrow. But it will not be necessary to await the erection of the completed edifice in order to enjoy some vitally important benefits from this constructive effort. On the contrary, we may confidentally expect that the mere meeting of the exploratory convention itself will transform the world situation.

The convening of the convention will automatically wrest the initiative from Soviet Russia in the cold war and force the Communist leaders onto the defensive. How better, how more effectively, can the Atlantic democracies reach the minds of men, enlist their support, and awake hope in their hearts than to meet to explore creation of a federal union, based on freedom and designed to include other free peoples? Imagine the repercussions, throughout the West, in India, in southeast Asia, and even among the crushed millions inside the iron curtain caused by the realization that here, at last, the forces of freedom intend to stand united against the forces of slavery. The whole world would watch breathlessly while the convention met to consider union as a way to peace, security, and economic well being.

Consider, also, how the meeting of the convention would affect the leaders and the policies of Communist Russia. The Russian leaders will know that with the democracies engaged in exploring union, they will certainly stick together if any of them are attacked. This consequence alone will deter aggression and promote international security.

The Russian leaders will be forced to recognize, moreover, that the more aggressive are their words and acts, the more they will accelerate the democracies toward union. For them to decrease the likelihood that the convention will succeed, they must turn toward new peace offensives, soothing words, and less aggressive acts.

We can thus both reduce the danger of the cold war and gain the initiative in the cold war by merely calling the convention. Can we afford to delay calling the convention until well into 1952 or 1953?

The year 1952 looms ahead already as a crucial year in the destinies of mankind. It is for us a presidential election year, a period in which our country is most vulnerable to cold war offensives, a period in which hostile propaganda methods can be employed most effectively to confuse our foreign policy and create friction and recriminations between Americans and western Europeans.

The year 1952 is also the year in which Marshall-plan aid will come to an end. At that time western Europe will still suffer from a dollar shortage which threatens to curtail European imports of American products and, consequently, our own exports to Europe. The mere prospect of this situation is already exerting an adverse influence on European recovery. The full repercussions of the actuality, the new problems which will arise and the action which will be necessary to solve them cannot now be foreseen accurately.

Furthermore, by 1952 we must expect that Soviet Russia will have enough atomic bombs and enough long-range bombers to place the cities of both the United States and western Europe under an ever-present threat. How this development will affect the peoples of the Atlantic community cannot now be foreseen accurately. Conceivably, it could undermine the defense machinery set up under the North Atlantic Pact and force us to seek Atlantic union under threats and pressures which would preclude the painstaking consideration this vast project requires.

Can we afford to await until well into the critical year 1952 or even 1953 to convoke the exploratory convention the Atlantic union resolution proposes? Mr. President, I believe that to do so would show not caution but recklessness. I believe it would be an unnecessary gamble with the lives and destiny of the American people. If there is even the remotest possibility that this exploratory convention can provide us with a means of attaining enduring peace and prosperity it is our duty to convoke it as early as is practicable, and well before 1952, while there is still time for careful and painstaking progress.

To wait until 1952 or 1953 would mean wasting two or three more years before even exploring this broad road to safety. Consider what has happened in the last 3 years. During that time the Marshall plan was conceived and half its life is now gone. During that time the Kremlin initiated the cold war and developed it into the overriding factor in the world situation.

To lower our sights, consider only what has happened within the last year. It has seen the conquest of China by communism. It has seen Britain forced to devalue the pound. It has brought the sinister discovery that Russia has begun to make atomic bombs. It has projected the horrifying shadow of the immeasurably more destructive hydrogen bomb. On the encouraging side, it has witnessed the coming into force of the North Atlantic Alliance and the introduction into both Houses of Congress of the Atlantic-union resolution.

Mr. President, the world situation, our own situation, and our outlook and attitudes have been radically transformed by the events of just 1 year. Have we any reason to believe that events of comparable magnitude will not occur within the next 12 months?

The peaceful peoples of the Atlantic democracies are even now wondering

what Russia will do during this spring and summer. No one can say what will occur in Germany during the next year, or what will happen in southeastern Asia. Russia is encroaching on Sinkiang. The Communist clique which has conquered China is now threatening Tibet and Formosa. Meanwhile, British Malaya, a vital source of tin and rubber for us and of dollar earnings for Britain, is torn by Communist guerrilla attacks. Meanwhile, the French Army on which principal reliance is based for the land defense of western Europe, is heavily engaged in Indochina.

When all these critical dangers confront us now, threatening again to transform the whole world situation within another year, how can we be content to rely, for not 1 year but 2 or 3, upon the diplomatic methods which have failed to prevent an ever-deepening crisis? Can we even afford to bear for 3 years more the crushing burdens these methods have placed upon our country, burdens which have unbalanced our budget in a time of prosperity and full production?

Furthermore, Mr. President, reports from Europe in recent days have indicated the impossibility, under present circumstances, for our European allies to finance their continued recovery and at the same time pay for their rearmament which the Joint Chiefs say is necessary.

What is the answer to this new problem?

It does not take a prophet to see that continued restriction of our efforts in the Atlantic area to diplomatic methods will necessarily involve a direct choice between security on the one hand and economic viability on the other, not only for our European allies but also for the United States.

Surely, in such a situation, if there is even a possibility that there is a way out through Atlantic Union, or any limited federation, a way to peace, to atomic security, to lower taxes, greater freedom and higher standards of living, we should explore it. It is our duty as Senators to explore it and to do so at the earliest possible moment.

I strongly advise Secretary Acheson to suggest the exploration of this way out in his meeting with the Foreign Ministers of the Atlantic democracies, and the meeting to follow after Monday.

What is the earliest moment at which this exploration for a solution by democratic rather than diplomatic methods can be begun?

We can use time, instead of wasting time, by passing Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 during the present session. The issue is relatively simple. The commitment is trivial in comparison with the stake. We need merely agree that union should be explored by the methods which wrought that miracle of history, our own United States.

If we do this, and thereby provide the American people with an opportunity to attain peace, prosperity, and a greater happiness than is attainable by diplomatic methods, what will be the time schedule?

Allowing the same period as I did before for initial studies of the problems and implications of union, for agreement on the details of the convention, for invitations to our Atlantic allies, and for the appointment of delegates the convention will be able to meet in 1951 instead of in 1952.

That means that well within a year we can enjoy the benefits which the mere convocation of the convention will bring. The democratic peoples will move to the political and psychological offensive in the cold war. Free people everywhere will be electrified by a new hope in the future, and the possibility of a practical implementation of the ideal of freedom will capture the minds of men in every non-Communist country in the world. The Communist leaders will be forced onto the defensive. They will also be forced to observe restraint in their international dealings, to show the smiling face Stalin sometimes employs rather than the wooden scowl of Molotov in desperate efforts to reduce the pressures impelling the delegates at the convention to seek safety through union.

All these results can be gained in 1951 by passage of this resolution before this Congress adjourns. More than that, when the election year 1952, the critical year 1952, opens, the convention will have been at work many months in the calm deliberation made possible by a lessening crisis. It will have progressed far in the exploration of Atlantic union. On many principles and on many problems a large measure of agreement will undoubtedly have been reached. The issues on which delegates will divide will by that time have been made familiar to the Atlantic peoples. They will have had a substantial degree of education in the principles, the possibilities, and in the advantages of federal union unattainable by any other means. In our own country, the convention and its issues and implications will have had full public attention without having been obscured and confused by the partisan debates which always attend our national elections.

Looking further ahead in 1952, the convention, its progress, its success or lack of success, will give each of our great political parties time to determine its attitude toward whatever plans are crystalizing at the convention. It is as if providence had afforded us a unique opportunity. By passing the resolution this session, we can assure that the convention will meet early enough to at least complete its spadework by the first half of 1952, and thus allow the American people, through the great debates which will occur during that year, a full opportunity to decide their attitude toward this great project.

Mr. President, I have been considering prospective developments during 1951 and 1952. What about the world situation during the summer of 1950, 3 or 4 months from now? I believe that passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 at this session will influence the world situation and the cold war.

Adoption of the resolution will have political and psychological effects which I believe will be far more extensive than most of us now realize. It will tell the world that the Congress of the United States, not content with merely preaching integration to others, is prepared to explore it with them.

To a lesser degree than the meeting of the convention, but still to an extent which will shake the world, the passage of this resolution will provide the democracies with a tremendously dynamic idea which will greatly influence the course of the cold war. It will give us the initiative and force the Kremlin into a defensive position. We all remember well how the mere announcement of the Marshall plan raised morale among the democracies, brought among them a resurgence of hope, and caused dismay and confusion behind the iron curtain. How much greater will be the effect of a resolution by Congress calling for exploration of an Atlantic union of the free?

It is my conviction that the Senate and the House of Representatives by adopting Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 at this session, can strike a blow for freedom which will turn the tide of history. Favorable consequences, such as I have indicated, will follow at once and will develop and expand after the convention meets. We the free peoples will see light ahead as we set out upon this over-all, common endeavor to safeguard our heritage from the past and to win the future.

Mr. President, we see only a very dark uncertainty ahead now, and that is a basic reason for the wide discontent which has been expressed in this chamber on the subject of our foreign policy. The piecemeal policy of containing communism has not contained it. While it has succeeded in large measure in western Europe, it has failed to prevent the Communist tide from sweeping over the 400,000,000 of China.

The Secretary of State has warned us that to succeed by diplomatic method in the cold war we should have a total diplomacy and will need steadfastness and steady nerves. His portrayal of the task before us indicates that if the existing struggle for the future of the world can be won by these methods, victory is a long way off. Yet our budget is already unbalanced, and it is not evident how we can continue indefinitely to bear the burdens which this struggle will require. Meanwhile, during the last year, we have been losing, not winning, as the frontiers of freedom in Asia have been forced back thousands of miles.

We are, however, making an unprecedented effort to succeed, as far as the rigid limitations of international cooperation between governments will permit. The Marshall plan continues. We are engaged in implementing the North Atlantic Pact, and General Bradley has pointed out that we must expect to relinquish additional elements of sovereignty in this task.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 will not interrupt or impede the Marshall plan, the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact or other

important moves in foreign policy. Instead, it can be counted upon to contribute powerfully to successful cooperation between the governments of the Atlantic area, since peoples who are engaged in a common exploration of a larger concept will be more ready to join in lesser steps, whether political, economic, or military. At the same time, as I have indicated, it will have far-reaching, favorable repercussions among all free peoples, bringing them to look to our country with new hope and cooperate more effectively with our Government.

What, however, if the convention should fail to produce a concrete plan for union? Would such an outcome create divisions in the Atlantic community and constitute a victory for Stalin and another defeat in the cold war? I do not subscribe to any such pessimistic view.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if Washington had allowed parallel fears to sway him, we should not have our American Union now. To win the cold war and to gain peace and security, we must take some risks. This risk of failure, I am convinced, is a very small risk. It is a calculated risk we can well afford to take, far less dangerous than the risk inherent in continuing our present policies and continuing to restrict the cooperation of the Atlantic democracies to a government-to-government basis.

I cannot believe, moreover, that a failure of the convention to agree upon a concrete plan for union would imply a failure to produce constructive results. I cannot conceive of a convention comprising some of the best minds in North America and Europe studying common problems and exploring common solutions for a year or more and adjourning without constructive proposals for further Atlantic integration.

This latter outcome is the minimum result we need anticipate, a result which, however short of a plan for union, further strengthens and unifies the central care of the free world.

But I am also convinced that the adoption of the Atlantic union resolution at this session will lead to more than that minimum result; that the convention will hammer away at the problems of union and their practical solution until the majority of its delegates can agree upon concrete proposals for a union. Our United States provides a tested pattern of what is required. But the Senate and the House of Representatives must act at this session to bring the convention into being in time to give it the best prospects of success.

Mr. President, I believe that the Secretary of State can smooth the way in London now for early and successful exploration by the Atlantic democracies to secure these inestimable benefits. He can smooth the way by considering with his British and French colleagues the possibilities and advantages of union as a means of solving successfully the problems which now threaten the future of our three great democracies.

But a more direct responsibility bringing about this wise and provident action now rests upon the Senate. The resolution calling for exploration of Atlantic union was introduced into the Senate and has been considered here more exhaustively than it has in the House. It is the Senate's prerogative, moreover, to give advice to the President and the Secretary of State in relation to foreign policy. Initial action for exploration of a union of peoples should properly be taken by the Congress, the elected representatives of the American people, and in this instance it should be taken first by the Senate. Without advice on our part concerning so comprehensive a move in domestic and foreign policy, the administration may be reluctant to act.

We cannot evade our responsibility in relation to this resolution. How are we going to fulfill it?

That issue confronts us now, overriding in its implications for the future of our country other issues which occupy the forefront of our thoughts. Shall we act during the present session to bring about this exploration of an essentially American way to security, economic advance, and growing freedom? Or shall we delay, postpone action, and condemn the American people to reliance for their safety upon essentially European methods of diplomacy which have been proved inadequate, realizing that to do so may condemn Americans and Europeans alike to a third world war?

While it is the responsibility of the Senate to advise, it is the duty of the Secretary of State to lead. I can conceive of no situation which presents a greater urgency for leadership, nor can I conceive a situation presenting a greater challenge to his leadership.

History will record the manner in which this administration meets that challenge.

Mr. Acheson's meetings in London this week and in the weeks to follow provide a near-perfect setting for his discharge of his obligations to humanity. America and the free world will watch with anxious eyes the manner in which he meets this challenge.

Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 10, there appeared in the Washington Post a column under the title "Losing Europe?" by Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber. It is the first of a series of two articles. Servan-Schreiber is a special correspondent of a Paris newspaper, and is now in this country, I understand, under a Smith-Mundt fellowship. I have made some inquiry about him, and find that apparently he is a young man with a great deal of knowledge of the subject about which he writes. I wish that the ideas he has expressed in this first article could be known to Americans everywhere.

I desire to read about two or three paragraphs of what he says in his column. I read:

> If by 1955 Europe is lost to Stalinism in the cold war—as China was in 1950—those who will hunt for the first origins of this new defeat should be able to find them in the events of the 2 weeks preceding this London Conference.

He is speaking, of course, of the Conference of Foreign Ministers. The article continues:

> The way Europe will fall, if ever, will probably be different from China's fall. But the spark plug of both defeats will probably have been the same, via this principle: "To save a country from Stalinism it is enough to distribute dollars and arms."

This is false, because the cold war is primarily a political war. However, in the last 2 weeks, a behind-the-scenes dialog, based on that false principle, has taken place between Washington and Europe, a dialog which has just ended in an Atlantic defeat in the political war. A defeat of immeasurable consequences if not exposed publicly before the ministers meet in London. This episode is, roughly speaking, l'affaire Bidault.

Three weeks ago French Prime Minister Bidault offered a proposal to the Atlantic nations to create together a permanent Atlantic Council responsible for planning a common policy. He was thus proposing to tighten the bonds between Europe and America, to coordinate their plans on the economic and political levels as well as on the military.

The reaction in France and the other European countries has been heated and divided. On one side, all who put their hope in the unification of the Atlantic world in front of the Soviet world, reacted with enthusiasm. The European ministers who were meeting in The Hague on the same day, immediately approved the French proposal.

On the other side, the Communists and all rightists and leftists who want a neutral Europe between Washington and Moscow were violently opposed and called Bidault an American stooge. A first result was thus achieved, the friends and foes of a true Atlantic community were counted clearly. And this proposal, moreover, in giving constructive hope, attracted to the Atlantic camp many who had hesitated. Then everybody turned toward America to watch for her answer.

The American administration was officially silent and unofficially very cool. Discouragement descended upon the partisans of the Atlantic community and their adversaries took immediate advantage of it. The neutralists started a new campaign more violent than ever in Germany, France, and Italy. They declared this was proof that America would oppose any attempt at true political partnership, that she wanted to lead the cold war alone in exchange for the dollars she distributes. In France, for instance, a well-known professor explained on the front page of Le Monde that from then on neutrality was the best policy. And General de Gaulle declared more forcefully than ever before that Europe should keep away from both America and Russia.

Mr. President, I hope the conclusion this young journalist states is incorrect. I dislike to think that, with the decision clearly made between the people of western Europe as to whether they are going to work for better cooperation between the North Atlantic democracies or whether they are going to stand neutral between Kremlin communism and American democracy, the Secretary of State discouraged those who believe in unity and cooperation. But I must say very frankly that the reports which have been coming from London as to the attitude of the Secretary of State do not look very encouraging. Let us hope that if he has let down the people who believe in wholesome unity, and in working together in the interest of peace and stability between the peoples of the North Atlantic, he will reconsider. Even if he does not reconsider, the Senate has a duty and a responsibility in the matter.

I believe the Senate and the Congress are away ahead of the State Department. I believe the people are ahead of us.

So whatever may be the failings or shortcomings of the Secretary of State, if he has disappointed the supporters of the Bidault plan I would say he is using very poor judgment, a judgment which could lead us only to catastrophe. In any event, we have our responsibility, and I hope we will perform it.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article to which I refer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOSING EUROPE?

(By Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber)

I. PREFACE TO LONDON

(Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber is a special correspondent of Le Monde of Paris, now on a Smith-Mundt fellowship in this country. Twenty-six years old, he served as a pilot in the Free French Air Force and then enjoyed a meteoric rise to fame as a journalist. His articles rebutting the European idea of "neutralization" brought discussions with Prime Minister Bidault and Foreign Minister Schuman.)

If by 1955 Europe is lost to Stalinism in the cold war—as China was in 1950—those who will hunt for the first origins of this new defeat should be able to find them in the events of the 2 weeks preceding this London conference. The way Europe will fall, if ever, will probably be different from China's fall. But the sparkplug of both defeats will probably have been the same, via this principle: "To save a country from Stalinism it is enough to distribute dollars and arms."

This is false, because the cold war is primarily a political war. However, in the last 2 weeks a behind-the-scenes dialog, based on that false principle, has taken place between Washington and Europe—a dialog which has just ended in an Atlantic defeat in the political war; a defeat of immeasurable consequences if not exposed publicly before the Ministers meet in London. This episode is, roughly speaking, "l'affaire Bidault."

Three weeks ago French Prime Minister Bidault offered a proposal to the Atlantic nations—to create together a permanent "Atlantic Council" responsible for planning a common policy. He was thus proposing to tighten the bonds between Europe and America, to coordinate their plans on the economic and political levels as well as on the military.

The reaction in France and the other European countries has been heated and divided. On one side, all who put their hope in the unification of the Atlantic world in front of the Soviet world reacted with enthusiasm. The European Ministers who were meeting in The Hague on the same day immediately approved the French proposal.

On the other side, the Communists and all rightists and leftists who want a "neutral" Europe between Washington and Moscow were violently opposed and called Bidault an "American stooge." A first result was thus achieved—the friends and foes of a true Atlantic community were counted clearly. And this proposal, moreover, in giving constructive hope, attracted to the Atlantic camp many who had hesitated. Then everybody turned toward America to watch for her answer.

The American administration was officially silent and unofficially very cool. Discouragement descended upon the partisans of the Atlantic Community and their adversaries took immediate advantage of it. The neutralists started a new campaign more violent than ever in Germany, France, and Italy. They declared this was proof that America would oppose any attempt at true political partnership, that she wanted to lead the cold war alone in exchange for the dollars she distributes. In France, for instance, a well-known professor explained on the front page of Le Monde that from then on neutrality was the best policy. And General de Gaulle declared more forcefully than ever before that Europe should keep away from both America and Russia.

The political consequences of the cool American attitude have been so far-reaching that French Foreign Minister Schuman made what can be considered a first retreat in an official speech. He declared that this "Atlantic Council" should not be truly Atlantic but should become a sort of little United Nations and include the neutral countries. That already takes away the main point of the proposal. But even this appeared too risky, in view of the continuing lack of backing from Washington.

And finally the French Government unofficially announced that because of the cool attitude of the United States, the French proposal would not even be put on the agenda of the London meeting. The "neutralists," formerly shaken, now rejoice that the whole thing seems to have turned in their favor.

Argument could go on at length about the responsibilities. Maybe France has not made a sufficient effort to make her proposal clear to the American public. Maybe England aided in confusing the issue to stall for time in order to state her position later. This discussion is futile. What counts now is that the London meeting, starting Thursday, can still repair the harm done and give basis again for the hope of political unity in the West. So it is necessary to make clear why, in European eyes, the necessity for political partnership is urgent.

What is the essence of the cold war in Europe? In other words, what is the political aim of the Communist propaganda and action? It is generally believed, outside Europe, that the aim of the Communists in Europe is to rally the greatest number of partisans favorable to the Soviet Union. It is not so. They found out 2 years ago that that would not lead them very far.

Their new tactics are shrewder and more efficient: The aim is to reduce by any possible means the number of partisans favorable to America. The aim, in other words, is not to try and make people love Russia but to make them hate America. For if and when they succeed in making Europe neutral militarily, politically, and economically, it will then fall by itself, like a ripe fruit, in the Soviet camp.

These are shrewd tactics because they can use both the fellow-travelers of the left and the nationalists of the right. And, this "anti-Atlantic" political force represents between 40 and 50 percent of the public opinion in any European country—France, Germany, or Italy. The danger is serious and the struggle is on.

But in view of the confusion and inefficiency of the present official cooperation between the Atlantic nations, the neutralists propaganda is really child's play. On the one hand, the Atlantic community appears primarily to be a machine for military preparation, resulting in grave psychological consequences in Europe. On the other hand, the six or seven ministers' committees (three Atlantic, Brussels, Marshall plan, Strasbourg, Big Three * * *) are incapable of planning a common policy, for each sees only one aspect of the problems, and they meet only 5 or 6 days a year.

As a result the only real policy-planning appears to be done in Washington and then discussed bilaterally between Washington and each European capital; under this process the Europeans have the disagreeable feeling of being "semisatellized." On top of it all reigns a great confusion and the decisions taken by each are separate, nationalistic, and uncoordinated.

These three aspects—emphasis on military preparation, impression of semisatellization, and confusion of policies—are a remarkable help to the Communist propaganda and the political appeal of a neutralist policy. If this state of affairs continues, the "pro-Atlantic" political group, representing today a little more than half of the public opinion in Europe, will become smaller and smaller. And if the day comes when it will become a minority, America will either have to give orders to the European countries—both impractical and contrary to her principles or accept a neutral Europe—a definite reversal of the balance of forces in the cold war.

It is to avoid this possible and lethal dilemma, while there is still time, that France has proposed the creation of an Atlantic policy planning commission. Its aim is not to be an executive body but an organism to make the issues clear, study the problems under their different aspects, and to propose common solutions. This can hardly be considered a revolutionary step. But the future of the world political war may depend on whether such a step will be taken during the London meeting. The Atlantic community is now at the cross road.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIME—ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS FOR GAMBLING ACTIVITIES AT LE HAVRE, FRANCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee agreed to yield to me after he had concluded his remarks, did he not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If I said I would yield to the Senator from Nebraska, and I am in a position to do so, I shall be glad to yield. What I thought was going to happen was that the Senator would get the floor and read his statement in his own right, but if I may be permitted, as he had the understanding, I should like to carry it out, if I may do so.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question. I ask him whether he feels that from a moral standpoint, or any other, there is any difference between gambling in a foreign country and gambling within the confines of the United States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Organized crime in interstate commerce is bad wherever it is to be found.

Mr. WHERRY. How about the moral standpoint? The Senator is against crime, is he not, whether it is in a foreign country or here at home?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. There was inserted in the RECORD yesterday a press release, coming from France, reading as follows:

ECA FUNDS REBUILDING FRENCH GAMING CASINO

PARIS, May 10.—Marshall plan funds are being used to the extent of four and a half million francs to rebuild the gambling casino at Le Havre. The ECA office here says "this may seem frivolous expenditure, but it is important to help increase the town's revenues."

How does the distinguished Senator from Tennessee harmonize the appropriations from the taxpayers' money we have made for ECA to rebuild a casino in Le Havre, France, to permit gambling in order that the revenues of that town might be increased, with the appropriation of $150,000 to investigate that identical kind of crime here in the United States? How can those two things be reconciled?

Mr. KEFAUVER. My answer to that is very simple. Of course, the Senator and I are now talking about different things. The statement just made by the Senator from Nebraska respecting the building of the casino in Le Havre, France, is the first intimation I have had of such a project. But if it is being done, of course, it is the duty of the President, of Congress, or of some Government agency or official to see that any such expenditures are immediately discontinued. I wish to say, however, that the fund is, of course, in the hands of a very capable and, I am sure we all agree, a very honorable man, Mr. Hoffman. Anyone can make mistakes. But necessarily the fund must be administered by someone. I am sure that if the matter is called to Mr. Hoffman's attention, he will see to it that money from his fund is not used for such a purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has answered my question.

I wish to ask him a second question. Does the Senator intend to notify Mr. Hoffman or any of the so-called administrators of ECA to appear before the committee, in order to interrogate them as to whether the report is true? I am serious in putting that question. I supported the Senator's resolution, and I am sure the Senator is acting in the utmost of good faith with respect to carrying out its purposes. I acted in good faith in supporting the resolution. I believe in its purposes. I believe it is important, however, to find out not only what is happening at home, but what we are doing abroad with the taxpayers' money.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who is chairman of the special committee, if he intends to interrogate Mr. Hoffman or whoever is responsible for permitting the expenditure of four and one-half million francs to rebuild a casino at Le Havre, France, to permit gambling, so the town can increase its revenue?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate the support of the Senator from Nebraska of the resolution to investigate organized crime in interstate commerce. I appreciate the fact that he feels the committee will act in good faith. We expect to do the very best we can, to bring about the greatest amount of good we can under the provisions of the resolution. I cannot, with respect to any specific matter, outline the program of the committee, because that is to be decided by the commitee as a whole. It is not for the chairman, before the committee has even agreed on the program or worked it out, to state what the program is or shall be. If we were to investigate where all the funds of ECA go, we would miss our objective and not be doing the chief thing which we were authorized and directed by the Congress to do, which is to investigate to ascertain whether there is organized crime in interstate commerce in the United States, and what effect that has on governing bodies in the United States, if we find that there is such organized crime.

It seems to me the matter referred to by the Senator from Nebraska is more properly under the jurisdiction of the ECA watchdog committee, or of some other committee of Congress—and there are several—which are supposed to supervise the work of the ECA. I really do not see how the matter referred to can be considered as being in interstate commerce in the United States of America. If we were to undertake to investigate it, I believe we would be going pretty far out of our field.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right to speak for several minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an observation, which will require but 3 or 4 minutes. The Senator from Tennessee desires to leave the floor; but before he does so, I should like to make an observation. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for at least 5 minutes. Is that agreeable to the Senator from South Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have no objection, if I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the request with the understanding that the Senator from South Carolina will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe the special committee has authority to bring before it for questioning those who are using the funds of the taxpayers to further the interest of organized crime, whether it be within the United States or in France. I believe that if 4,500,000 francs have been appropriated out of the funds of the ECA to build the casino for the purpose of organized gambling in the town of Le Havre, in the interest of obtaining revenue, the order under which the money was provided should be rescinded immediately. I do not believe the use of the money of the American taxpayers for such a purpose meets with the approval of the taxpayers of the United States.

The allotment of ECA funds for the purpose referred to justifies the position taken by the junior Senator from Nebraska on the floor of the Senate, when, with respect to the ECA authorization, he said there should be a check made of the moneys spent by ECA. A check should be made down to the last dime to see that the moneys are spent for the purposes provided under the act. Certainly money should not be spent for the purpose of increasing and aiding and abetting organized gambling in France.

This matter was brought to the attention of the House of Representatives yesterday by Mr. IRVING, Representative from the Fourth District of Missouri. He happens to be a Democrat. I wish to compliment Representative IRVING for bringing the matter to the attention of the Members of the Congress. My first thought when I read his statement was that it justified the position I took with respect to the ECA authorization. But, after reflecting upon the matter and knowing that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the special committee to investigate crime, will act fearlessly, and that he is backed by able Senators, members of his committee, I wanted to bring to his attention my feeling that regardless of whether we are spending the taxpayers' money in the United States or in France, it is our job to see to it that the taxpayers' money is spent for lawful purposes, for purposes which will benefit our citizens.

Mr. President, I have written today to the ECA to find out whether what Representative IRVING said is true. Representative IRVING said that the ECA stated that while the use of money for such purpose might be considered to be a frivolous expenditure of 4,500,000 francs, it is done for the purpose of increasing the revenue of Le Havre. The Senate has provided $150,000 for the purpose of investigating gambling, and so forth. The expenditure of the money in France would make it appear as though we were tolerating gambling and the like abroad, while we were trying to investigate it and to eliminate it within the confines of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the special committee, will not attempt to confine the work of the committee under the terms of the resolution to such narrow limits that he may not feel he can bring the matter to which I have referred to the attention of the Administrator of the act. The amount involved, in dollars, is approximately $12,850. That is a considerable amount of the money of the taxpayers of the United States to spend for the purpose of aiding and abetting gambling in France. The Senate has authorized the spending of $150,000 by the special committee to investigate crime in the United States. Other committees are engaged in making investigations along the same lines.

I respectfully bring the matter to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I say to him that I will give him all the aid I can. I say once again that I feel we should have an accounting for the money that is spent by the Administrator of the ECA fund. The appropriation for ECA, $3,000,000,000, is a very large sum. Where does it go? Does it go to stop the extension of communism, or to such purposes as have been so forcefully brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States by Representative IRVING,

a Democrat from the Fourth District of the State of Missouri?

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield, in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska in regard to the matter he was discussing?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, provided there is unanimous consent that I may do so without losing my right to the floor or without having a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask this question: Does the Senator from Nebraska have any knowledge as to whether or not the equipment for the casino in France will be manufactured in the United States, and whether that will interfere with industry in the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is a very pertinent question. I will say that regardless of whether the equipment will be manufactured in the United States, the result will be that dollars will be translated into the equipment. So there will be no difference in that respect. I am glad that the Senator asked the question.

However, what impresses me is that apparently the present administration holds out to the people that it is going to put down crime in this country, but at the same time it proposes that we subsidize it in France. That is the entire burden of my argument.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Nevada should be on the floor during this discussion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Nebraska has answered my question.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I have not.

NURSERIES AND NURSERY SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, under the same conditions.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3258) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1951. I wish to announce that if there is any debate on the measure, I shall withdraw the request. I feel that the measure will be unanimously approved immediately.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished Senator if the bill was reported unanimously by the committee which considered it?

Mr. HUNT. It was.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask whether there was a full attendance of the committee when the bill was voted upon?

Mr. HUNT. I could not say that the full committee was present, but there was nearly a fully attendance of the membership.

Mr. WHERRY. Has any minority report or adverse report been made on the bill?

Mr. HUNT. None whatsoever.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill applies to the nursing schools in the District of Columbia?

Mr. HUNT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I correctly understand that if the bill continuing the present nursery school system is not enacted promptly, some of the day nurseries will have to be closed?

Mr. HUNT. Yes. The existing statute is about to expire, and it is necessary to continue the schools.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I should like to call attention to the fact that when the pending motion on the FEPC bill was made, I stated that I would object to the consideration of any other matters except privileged matters during the time when that motion remained before the Senate. However, I understand that two measures are now to be brought up—first, Senate bill 3258, regarding which apparently there will be no debate at all, and then House Joint Resolution 466. I wish to inquire whether the Senator from Wyoming is ready to ask to have the Senate take that up, too.

Mr. HUNT. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. WHERRY. At any rate, I shall not object to the consideration of either measure, provided there is no debate. If there is debate, I shall ask for the regular order.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I renew my request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3258.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3258) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1951, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "out", to strike out " "and until June 30, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "and until June 30, 1951" " and insert " "on and after July 1, 1946, and until June 30, 1950, and no longer".", on page 3, line 2, after the word "Columbia", to strike out the colon and *"And provided further,* That any balance remaining in such trust fund account after June 30, 1951, shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts of the District of Columbia."; after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, not exceeding $100,000 to carry out the purposes of this act.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for each fiscal year thereafter, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

And on page 3, line 19, after the word "effect" to strike out "July 1, 1950", and insert "upon enactment."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "on and after July 1, 1946, and until June 30, 1950, and no longer."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Board is authorized to make and enforce rules and regulations governing admission to and use and enjoyment of said nurseries and nursery schools, including the fixing of fees to be charged parents for care and maintenance therein of their children; which fees shall, as near as practicable, equal the expenditures of the District of Columbia for personal services, labor, food, and supplies in the operation and maintenance of such nurseries and nursery schools or to enter into contracts with any private or public agency or agencies for such care and maintenance: *Provided,* That the Board may, in cases where parents are unable to pay for such care, waive all or part of such fees. All fees collected under the provisions of this act shall be paid to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia and deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of an account to be known as 'Miscellaneous trust-fund deposits, District of Columbia—Day Care Nurseries' said fund to be available, in addition to appropriations made pursuant to section 4 of this act, for expenditure for the purposes of this act: *Provided,* That such fund shall be audited and disbursed in the same manner as other trust funds are audited and disbursed by the District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for each fiscal year thereafter, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

SEC. 4. Section 2 of this act shall take effect upon enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may we have a very brief explanation of this measure?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for 1 minute in order that I may make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Provided that unanimous consent is given for that purpose and also that I may yield for that purpose without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this bill provides for a continuation of the presently existing day nurseries for working mothers in the city of Washington.

The bill was approved unanimously by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

We feel that if this measure is not enacted almost immediately, there will be a lapse of time between the termination of the present law and the enactment of a new law, and in that time the situation will become chaotic.

Therefore we feel that this measure should be passed immediately. Otherwise the mothers who will be adversely affected by a failure to enact this law promptly will have to begin to receive aid under the measure providing aid for dependent mothers, and in that case the ensuing cost probably will be greater than the cost of continuing the day nurseries.

I think that is sufficient explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let me give a further word of explanation in regard to this matter.

This bill does not propose new legislation for this activity; it is already in existence. This bill will simply permit the continuation of what has been done heretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not that the difficulty? Does not this proposal come up every year? Should not the system be made permanent so as to avoid that difficulty? Otherwise will not we be faced each year with a request for a renewal?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will permit an additional word of explanation, let me say that I think the Senator handling the bill will explain that the adoption of the amendment on page 3 will result in making the system permanent.

Is not that true?

Mr. HUNT. Yes; I understand that the bill as thus amended will make the arrangement permanent, and not simply for the present year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3258) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia."

REPORT OF THE IOWA REPUBLICAN FARM POLICY COUNCIL

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina or the Senator from Wyoming yield, to permit me to place in the RECORD a matter which I discussed with the Senator from Wyoming a few moments ago? I make this request because I am due at another place to examine some very important records, and I am a little late now.

Mr. HUNT. I shall be glad to do so, if that is satisfactory to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank both Senators.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, in yielding I do so with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I include that provision in my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, some month ago the Republican veterans' organization of Iowa sponsored a forum and a series of meetings of leading farmers from all over the State of Iowa to study the farm situation and to attempt to develop some long-range and comprehensive recommendations on the part of practical farmers in connection with the farm program and proposals relating to it.

Last week the results of that series of important conferences of leading Republican farmers of the State of Iowa were made public in a short, comprehensive report dealing with the problems to be faced and some of the means which have been arrived at for obtaining the desired results. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE IOWA REPUBLICAN FARM-POLICY COUNCIL, 1950

Council members: Robert Fischer, Edgar C. Corry, Jr., co-chairmen; Harold McKinley, George Paul, LeRoy Getting, Leo Hoegh, Elmer Bass, Alfred Beardmore, Lawrence Beckett, Carroll L. Brown, Al Christiansen, Burton Dull, Scott Ellis, Wayne Ferris, Fulmer Hansen, Kenneth Fulk, Harry Hahn, Charles Lesan, Bill Lodwick, Julius Lynch, Marvin McClain, Dwight Meyer, Wilbur Molison, Roscoe Packer, Ned Perrin, Herbert Pike, Raymond Pim, Howard Roach, Robert Sar, Henry Siefkas, George M. Strayer, Rolland Trively, Howard Waters, W. O. Weaver, William H. Yungclass, R. C. Blake, Earl Elijah, Frank Hoxie.

INTRODUCTION

Iowa farmers are deeply concerned about the direction our national farm programs are taking. With the postwar introduction of controls on corn and wheat acreage, they see the long shadow of socialism fall across the road ahead. But the road back, where there were no price supports or income guaranties, is haunted with the specter of the 10-cent corn and sheriff sales of 1932. (Socialism in agriculture means across-the-board control over the production and marketing of most important agricultural products.)

This apparent choice between regulation or depression is based on the fact that we have outgrown the two fundamental principles adopted as emergency farm-support legislation in the thirties. Briefly, those principles are that:

1. For the short run, the only way to provide farmers with income or prices at fair (parity) levels is by using the monetary power of the state to remove a portion of the supply from the market (or to move it through the market).

2. For the long run, the only way to adjust supply and demand of farm products to support-price levels is by restricting production by means of controls. If pursued, it leads to socialized agriculture.

The fact that these two principles have been accepted, almost without question, for the past 15 years or more does not necessarily mean that they are right. It is conceivable that agricultural prices can be kept at fair levels without draining the National Treasury or employing the vast police powers of the Federal Government.

Accordingly, the Iowa Republican Farm Policy Council set upon the task of exploring the problems of agriculture and devising a new farm program which would meet the requirements of the farmers and of the Nation as a whole without jeopardizing the solvency of our Government or the freedom of our way of life.

The Iowa Republican Farm Policy Council, in an effort to further the welfare and prosperity of American agriculture, protect its most cherished freedoms, and increase its great contribution to the livelihood of the peoples of the world, present these findings and recommendations to the people of Iowa and their representatives.

PART I. MAJOR ASPECTS OF THE FARM PROBLEM

SECTION 1. Acute and chronic agricultural depressions: Those familiar with the history of the United States know that the "farm problem" is nothing new. It has been the source of argument, agitation and suffering for many years, and has fathered numerous political reforms. The major problem has always been agriculture's susceptibility to two kinds of depressions: (1) Prolonged periods of depression when farm income hovers far below reasonable standards for many years. (2) Periodic shorter depressions when farm income almost disappears and farmers "go broke" by the thousands.

SEC. 2. Our divided economy: These agricultural depressions occur, of course, when farm production exceeds the total world demand for American farm products at reasonable prices. In recent times, this condition has been created, in part, by the fact that agriculture is the only major industry which continues to operate in a free market. In one way or another, most other industries have managed to peg their prices to a general price range, and many basic industries set prices at exact points. They limit production to the amount that can be sold at those levels. Labor, too, with wage contracts and fixed wage schedules, has moved more and more to the fixed price side of the economy.

The farmer, of course, produces at full capacity most of the time. When prices are considerably above normal, he increases production a little by spending more money on his crops. When prices are considerably below normal, he also increases production by doing more work in an effort to keep his net income up or even to minimize his losses.

Under this situation, farm prices fluctuate far out of proportion to other prices. In a normal-business cycle, they seem to take all the rise and the fall which should be distributed over the entire economy. Hence, within 20 years we have seen corn prices go from 10 cents to $2.60 a bushel, and then start back again.

SEC. 3. Inelastic demand: The wide fluctuation of farm prices is further aggravated by the fact that a small surplus of any one commodity will decrease the price a great deal. Likewise a 5-percent surplus of general farm products will send all farm prices to depression levels.

The other way around, a brisk foreign demand which takes an additional 2 to 5 percent of our total production causes prices to soar. Hence it is the last 10 percent or so of supply which determines the price the farmer gets for his whole crop. Historically, other things being equal, the farmer gets more money for a short crop than he does for a bumper crop.

SEC. 4. Dependence on exports: For many years agriculture depended on export shipments to absorb surpluses and to make the markets. The farm depression after World War I was precipitated by the greatly reduced export sales as European agriculture recovered and Europe tried for a while to save money and pay off war debts. Since World War II farm prosperity has been greatly stimulated, if not largely supported, by heavy foreign demand for our products. Again, as European agriculture recovers and the dollar

gap seals off exports, American farmers are confronted with the devastating effects of losing their good customers abroad.

SEC. 5. No real surpluses: The idea of agricultural food surpluses, of course, is a pure fiction of the market place. Strictly speaking, there are no surpluses of food, even in the United States. If all the people in the country had a good minimum diet there would be no food to spare. World War II proved the point by taking all we could produce, and using up our supplies in storage at the same time. Meanwhile, our overseas troops consumed more foreign-produced foods than we shipped to other peoples, so the American people as a whole were really a food-importing nation.

SEC. 6. The food-price gap: One source of trouble is that food prices at the grocery store do not entirely reflect the rise and fall of farm prices. More and more of the consumer's dollar goes to pay for additional services, transprtation costs, marketing costs, and hidden taxes. These items, like the price of steel, are relatively fixed, so the farmer winds up with less than 50 percent of the national grocery bill, and the price of beef or pork at the stockyards had to drop more than 60 percent for the consumer to get a 30 percent break in prices over the block. Furthermore, as prices go down, the percent of the retail price that goes into distribution costs gets bigger and bigger, while the percent that goes to the farmer gets smaller. Theoretically, at least, if the farmer gave away the products on his farm, the housewife who bought them would still have a very considerable grocery bill.

SEC. 7. Interdependence of agriculture and industry: It is apparent that domestic demand for farm products depends primarily on prosperity and full employment in industry. Most farmers know that agriculture cannot prosper if the rest of the economy lags.

On the other hand, most farmers also know what many city people are apparently forgetting: That we cannot have a prosperous national economy without a reasonably prosperous agriculture.

From the standpoint of real income, the farmers' prosperity also depends on full production by industry. As an illustration, if industry only produces at half of its capacity during times of prosperity, its products would have to be sold at high prices to provide living wages and full returns to its workers and owners. The farmer, operating at full production, would have to pay more bushels of corn for one tractor under those conditions than he would if industry, too, were operating at full capacity. Hence, any economy of scarcity by industry and labor always mitigates against the farmer.

SEC. 8. Farm credit: The problem of credit has confronted farmers for a long time. During periods of high prices and prosperity, credit is usually ample and oftentimes too readily available. Then in slack periods, when many good farmers really need credit to carry them through, they find that the sources have dried up.

SEC. 9. Farm slums: There are several million farms and farmers in America that are impervious to agricultural prosperity. They are the little, submarginal, subsistence farms where poor families eke out a miserable existence, producing most of their own food and shelter; offering nothing to and taking nothing from the channels of trade. This group, quite obviously, presents special problems requiring special treatment.

SEC. 10. Agriculture in politics: The whole business of agricultural programs has been taken into politics lock, stock, and barrel. The result has been to create great uncertainty from year to year as to what kind of supports the farmers would have, what kind of production should be encouraged, etc., etc. Sometimes the instabilities of politics seem worse than the instabilities of a free market.

PART II. OBJECTIVES OF A SOUND FARM POLICY

Confronted with these several conditions, the council finds that the American farmer wants certain things to be achieved.

SECTION 1. Permanent, bipartisan farm programs: In the first place, farmers want Federal agricultural programs to be established on a permanent basis and taken out of politics. During the depression, the last war, and the immediate postwar period, it was reasonable for farm programs to be treated as emergency measures. But now, as we emerge into a real, peacetime economy, agricultural programs can no longer be considered as emergency, year-to-year propositions. Moreover, both the farming industry and the national economy suffer greatly by having farm programs used as political footballs. Hence, the farmers want a permanent, long-range farm program based on bipartisan farm policy and a bipartisan agricultural administration that will enable them to make their own plans for the future with confidence.

SEC. 2. Stabilized agricultural and national economies: Almost every living farmer has gone through one or more prolonged periods of chronic agricultural depression when it was impossible for the most diligent farm operators to maintain a high standard of living or to get ahead. They have also been through one or more acute depressions when every farmer, good or bad, wondered whether he could hold onto his investment and his home as he watched many of his good neighbors go under. He fears a return to such conditions more than anything in the world, and those fears are accentuated as he completes his annual tax returns, watches his costs go up from year to year, and realizes that his cash income will have to stay up all the time if he is to survive.

He has also learned that most other businessmen whose investments are as large as his, who take as many risks as he does, and who do as much work as he, make more money most of the time than he makes.

And so he wants to see the American farm economy stabilized at a prosperous level where he can receive a just and fair proportionate recompense for his efforts and production. He is well aware that this requires stabilizing the entire national economy at a prosperous level of full employment and full production.

SEC. 3. Distribution and utilization of farm products: The farmer has always been impatient with the whole idea of farm surpluses. He knows perfectly well that the food and fiber he produces are needed on the dinner tables and on the backs of millions of Americans, and hundreds of millions of suffering human beings in other countries. He knows, too, that those persons can easily produce enough goods of the kind he wants to exchange with him for his crops at a fair price.

Thus the average farmer feels that its all poppycock to talk about overproduction in agriculture. The trouble is somewhere in the distribution system—in the channels of trade, both within the United States and between the countries of the world.

He wants to see the distribution system overhauled and repaired so it can handle his abundant crops at a fair price level, just as he has to overhaul his machinery to handle those crops in the field. He wants domestic and international distribution of farm products that will put our entire agricultural production where it can be used constructively to the betterment of human health and welfare, the reestablishment of world trade, and the advancement of international relations.

SEC. 4. Conservation of soil and water resources: In recent years, most farmers have become aware that nature's precious balance which makes rich agricultural production possible can be upset by mismangement in any number of ways. They also know that other civilizations have been destroyed because they had plundered their soil, and that the future of our own civilization may soon be in jeopardy for the same reason. The great majority of farmers, therefore, want comprehensive preservation and improvement of both our soil and water resources throughout the country.

SEC. 5. Preservation of liberties: Farmers are traditionally independent. They prize and will fight for, their rights to make their own decisions about their own lives and their own farms. They hate controls with a vengeance, and chafe under the few production controls that have recently gone into effect. They are dismayed at the picture of the British farmer, hedged about with all kinds of controls and compelled to perform, or else. In the extension of controls over agriculture, farmers generally see a real threat to all of our prized democratic freedoms.

Farmers are, therefore, especially concerned that the problems of agriculture and the national economy be worked out at their source at the economic level. More than anything else, farmers want their own individual liberties, as free and independent agents in a free society, to be maintained.

SEC. 6. A balanced national budget: Most farmers are familiar with debt in their own affairs, and are aware that the Federal Government is an agent of the American people. Accordingly, they view the Federal budget in somewhat the same light as their own finances, and they are concerned by the Government's inability to live within its income during a period of great prosperity. They wonder (1) how long it can go on; (2) what the deficit would be if we got into a real recession; (3) what an ever-increasing public debt portends in terms of increased public ownership and control of industry. Naturally, they are anxious to see the Federal budget balanced.

PART III. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Administration of Federal agricultural programs

SECTION 1. Bipartisan agricultural board: To take farm programs out of politics, the council recommends that a bipartisan board be created whose members would be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. The many policy-making powers over agriculture that are now delegated by Congress to the executive branch of the Government (such as the power to determine price support levels, etc.) should be vested in this board, which would operate outside the political pressures that surround the Cabinet offices and officers. The board should also be given general direction over the administration of farm programs, whether or not such programs were set up within one of the executive departments.

SEC. 2. State and local administration: The council recommends that the administration of farm programs at the State and local level should be through farmer-elected nonpartisan committees and State directors. As absolute maximum of administrative authority over the program should be retained at the local level to be exercised by the locally elected committees.

B. Domestic distribution of farm products

SECTION 1. General prosperity: To provide a sound market basis for the distribution of farm products, the council recognizes the primary necessity of maintaining a high level of general prosperity by such means as may be necessary to encourage continued full employment and full production.

SEC. 2. Capacity production by industry: To make it possible for a fair exchange basis to be maintained between farm products and the products of industry, the council points out the necessity for industry to produce at

full capacity at all times without indulgence in monopolistic or abitrary high-pricing practices.

SEC. 3. Improving the markets: The council finds that certain abuses and inefficiencies in marketing of farm products—especially perishable commodities and minor crops—impair their proper distribution. Some markets are too sensitive to small, temporary surpluses. Others are susceptible to being controlled, and driven down, by combinations of traders or processors who have conspired for that purpose. And so forth. To meet those conditions, and to improve markets generally, the council recommends:

1. The instigation of a sound system of cooperative marketing in those fields where abuses exist.

2. An extensive research program in the distribution of processed foods aimed at reducing the margin between the farm prices and retail prices of those commodities.

3. Reexamination of the laws governing the taxation of cooperatives to see if means can be devised to deny false cooperatives the protection that is rightly and properly afforded to genuine cooperatives. (False cooperatives are privately owned concerns which are organized as co-ops to avoid taxes but which do not, in fact, distribute their profits on the true co-op basis.)

SEC. 4. Developing latent demand: The council finds that a large percent of the American population which could really afford ample food actually live on substandard diets because of lack of knowledge as to the importance of good food, lack of interest, or a preference to spend their incomes for other things. This great reservoir of latent demand would, if it were transformed into effective demand, consume most of our farm surpluses and possibly enough more to make it necessary to expand our total farm production. To accomplish this purpose, the council recommends:

1. A greatly intensified program of consumer education as to the importance and values of a well-balanced, nutritional diet. This program should be especially directed to urban areas which have not been reached by the nutrition-education program of the Extension Service.

2. An extension program of advertising basic farm commodities and the requirements and virtues of a good nutritional diet. It seems feasible that the average housewife should be as well versed on the advantages and components of a good diet as she is on the various trade-named washing compounds.

3. Research in marketing to bring about better merchandising and display of farm products. Cheese is an example where attractive packaging and display have produced results. Meat could be given similar treatment.

4. Research in marketing with reference to the promotion and dissemination of market information and costs to consumers. An example is the program of a Minneapolis radio station beamed to housewives telling them what foods are currently selling at bargain prices, and giving general market information.

5. Research and marketing programs to improve the quality and palatability of farm products all the way from the farmer's gate to the consumer's table. There is a great deal of room for better varieties, better grading, market premiums for quality, better and faster handling of perishables, etc.

SEC. 5. Federal nutrition programs: The council finds that some groups who should have ample diets are simply unable to afford them. The number of people in those categories is not significantly reduced when farm prices are allowed to fall to low levels. In fact, historically, such groups are most numerous when prices are very low.

In addition, there are certain groups, such as school children, who deserve special nutritional consideration. Accordingly, the council recommends the following Federal-aid programs to encourage balanced nutrition:

1. Continuation and expansion of the school-lunch program to use foods designated as surplus.

2. Supplement substandard diets among low-income groups with surplus foods by means of a food-stamp program.

3. Purchase of farm surplus foods by the Federal Government for distribution to State institutions and persons on relief.

SEC. 6. Industrial usage for farm products: Experience in the last 20 years with certain crops indicate that there are considerable possibilities for ultilizing farm crops in industry. The council therefore recommends that research for new and better uses for farm products through chemurgy be encouraged. Research should also be directed toward the production of new crops that could be processed for industrial use. This could result in the shift in production from some of the so-called surplus crops to the new crops. This research is deemed to be of sufficient importance to be financed by direct Federal appropriation.

SEC. 7. Distribution of federally controlled surpluses: The council finds that the disposal of farm surpluses in the hands of the Federal Government is frequently awkward, unduly expensive, and injurious to normal trade. It therefore recommends that all such surpluses being disposed by the Government be channeled through the already established normal trade outlets.

C. Foreign distribution and world trade

SECTION 1. The world food shortage: The council finds that the world as a whole is critically short of food and fiber because world population has outrun agricultural production in the past 50 years. Prewar statistics indicate the following:

Commodity	Annual average world production (millions)		Average per capita production	
	1911–15	1932–36	1911–15	1932–36
Wheat.....bushels..	3,925	4,192	2.27	1.82
Cotton.....bales..	25.2	25.7	[1]7.3	[1]5.5
Corn.....bushels..	4,199	3,974	2.43	1.74
Oats.....do....	4,460	4,297	2.58	1.86

[1] Pounds.

During the war, American increases in food production were offset by corresponding decreases in the war-torn areas. Since 1946, European production has partially recovered, American production stayed high, and European colonial production increased sharply under tremendous pressure. But world population still keeps ahead, and production per capita is lower in 1950 than it was in 1932–36.

As a result, high-dietary areas in the world are characterized as tiny islands in a sea of hunger.

The obvious economic implication is that there is plenty of actual human demand for American farm surpluses (which would raise dietary standards in India 2½ percent for a short time, or increase food consumption in deficient areas of Europe and Japan by 2 cents per person per day).

The political implications, less obvious, were expressed by Sir John Boyd Orr with the statement that, "Communism is simply hunger becoming articulate." The basic problem of western Europe is food. Political problems cannot be rationally solved on empty stomachs. Communism can always outpromise us, but final political trends will be determined by deliveries, not promises.

The Council finds that the food-consumption picture is vastly different in different parts of the world. It falls roughly into three groups:

Areas	Developed (United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, parts of Europe)	Intermediate (Spain, southeast Europe, Russia, white south Africa, coastal South America)	Undeveloped (Africa, south Asia, Latin America, northern and inland South America)
Proportion of world population	⅙	⅙	⅔
Calories per day	3,040	2,760	2,150.
Ounces of fat per day	4	2.3	1.3.
Ounces of animal protein per day	1.6	0.9	0.3.

SEC. 2. American agricultural exports: The council finds that American farm exports have decreased sharply in the past 30 years. This decline was caused by (a) increased domestic demand, (b) some commodities being priced out of foreign markets (e. g. cotton in the 30's), (c) upset international military and trade conditions, (d) United States graduating from a debtor to a creditor Nation—and the ultimate dollar shortage, (e) American farm products being outsold by other American exporting industries. This latter factor has been partially brought about by American-controlled cartels plus wartime destruction of foreign industries which leaves the United States the only real source for many essential industrial products.

Year	American farm exports as a percent of—	
	Total farm income	Total United States exports
1919–23	21	53
1939–43	7	13
1946	11	[1]
1947	9	22
1948	8	[1]

[1] Not available.

Best estimates are that about 8 percent of our total farm production is net exportable surplus under conditions of full agricultural production and reasonably high national income.

SEC. 3. The dollar shortage: The council further finds that the great bottleneck in foreign trade which prohibits our surpluses from reaching hungry mouths abroad comes from two basic sources:

(a) The efficiency gap, or the disparity between the results of human efforts in different parts of the world, is the chief problem. Hundreds of millions of people do not produce enough of anything to exchange for our commodities at reasonable prices.

(b) Trade barriers, which take over where the efficiency gap leaves off—preventing trade with those people who do produce merchandise that we can profitably take.

The total dollar shortage (excess of exports over imports, including gold and other dollars) since 1914 has amounted to $101,000,000,0000. In 1948 we exported $13,305,000,000, imported $7,517,000,000, leaving a dollar shortage of $5,788,000,000.

ECA makes up part of the difference. It exports $2,000,000,000 in foodstuffs annually. When ECA expires, Europe will be hard pressed, since she is earning only one-third of the dollars needed for her agricultural import requirements.

Those European requirements will continue after complete agricultural recovery has been accomplished. In fact, 16 major European countries will need more bread and coarse grains, fats and oils, meats and dairy products, and cotton in 1952 and 1953 than in 1948 and 1949. Despite intensified production programs in the colonies, much of those requirements must come from America, because political and economic developments within the colonies undermine their dependability as sources for foodstuffs.

SEC. 4. The pattern of farm exports: Because of the conditions outlined in the previous section, the council finds that the great bulk of our farm exports go to the relatively developed countries that are advanced enough to have some gold, earn some dollars, maintain some credit, merit some appropriations, and send in some merchandise over our trade barriers.

The council finds that we have the following limited alternatives with regard to our exportable farm surpluses:

(a) Eliminate them by restricting farm production.

(b) Give them to the other countries, the gifts being financed by the Government or the farmer.

(c) Sell them cheap. Send them our total exportable surpluses, take what gold and dollars they have in return, and call the account square. This can be done by allowing farm prices to drop to what level they will, or by a two-price system.

(d) Increase our imports to pay for the farm exports, taking—in addition to the available gold and dollars—such other merchandise as they wish to send and we wish to accept. Two kinds of imports are available:

1. From the underdeveloped countries: Raw materials currently being produced crudely and inefficiently.

2. From the developed countries: Manufactured and handicraft items currently being prohibited by our trade barriers.

SEC. 5. Direct trades: The council recommends that we accept the last of the abovementioned alternatives, and that we implement it at once by direct trades of farm products for foreign raw materials and merchandise.

Where feasible, American firms can be employed to extract, process, and transport the raw materials which might (a) substitute for and thereby conserve our own supplies, (b) increase our total consumption of them, and (c) increase our critical stockpiles.

Additional imports of manufactured items, etc., could reasonably be limited by quotas so that the markets of particular items would not be flooded. Informed estimates indicate that imports of any one item need not exceed 3 to 5 percent of similar domestic production to handle all of our exportable farm surpluses.

The council finds that the increase in total national income by exporting agricultural surpluses would more than absorb the imported merchandise, and would actually stimulate rather than decrease total demand for corresponding American-produced merchandise.

SEC. 6. Revising customs regulations: The council finds that our great accumulation of overlapping customs duties and regulations is, in itself, an effective barrier to import trade. Ultimately those laws and regulations will have to be completely revamped. In terms of better world trade and trade relations—the sooner the better.

SEC. 7. Capital export program: The council further recommends that a broad-scale program of private-capital export to underdeveloped countries should be undertaken as the long-run solution to our world-trade problems. Such a program would be aimed at overcoming the efficiency gap mentioned in section 3, thereby expanding the total world economy, and stimulating profitable multilateral trade in which the United States would be an active participant. Such increased trade would, in effect, create new markets for our exports and new wealth which we could profitably import.

Because of the uncontrollable hazards of political instability, monetary uncertainties, etc., unassisted private capital has been reluctant to move into these new fields. To tap the large amounts of such capital which would be available for this purpose if the undue hazards were removed, the council recommends a capital export insurance program operated somewhat after the pattern of the Federal Deposit Insurance program and operated, like FDIC, by an independent, federally instigated, and federally financed corporation. The council believes that premiums paid to such a corporation for insuring foreign investors against certain kinds of risks would prove profitable to the investors and would soon make the corporation itself fully independent and self-supporting, as FDIC is now.

To reduce the risks involved, and to make the capital export program have its maximum salutary effect on the world economy, it would be necessary to:

1. Negotiate treaties with the countries where investments were made to protect against subsequent confiscation, etc.

2. Complete plans of cooperation with local authorities in areas where investments would be made.

3. Conduct extensive research to determine the areas and industries where investments could best be made.

4. Make arrangements, in each instance, to use as much native capital and native talent as possible.

5. Proceed, in each instance, with a fully balanced program of nutrition, sanitation, medicine, education, transportation, etc.

The council envisages that such a program, conducted on a large enough scale, would expand the world economy greatly, with a resultant great increase in the national income of the United States, and a corresponding increase in American agricultural production and income as the farming industry expanded with new technology, to meet increased domestic and foreign demand for our farm products.

D. Soil conservation

SECTION 1. Significance and definition: In terms of our national future and welfare, a comprehensive program of soil conservation is one of the most important aspects of any permanent national program for agriculture.

Such soil conservation, in its larger sense, means adequate management and control of both our soil and water resources. It means maximum agricultural production consistent with minimum depletion of the producing unit. Permanency of agriculture is always the overriding consideration.

By this definition genuine soil conservation cannot be subverted to other purposes (such as price-support programs) or used as a carry-all for other objectives. Rather, it must be pursued for its own ends by the best possible means consistent with sound administration and democratic principles.

SEC. 2. Administration of soil-conservation programs—(a) Nonpartisan, decentralized administration: The council finds that local, "grass roots" administration is essential in efficient administration of soil-conservation programs. No amount of scientific knowledge and expert guidance from afar can suffice for the intimate, detailed, day-by-day familiarity of local people with the local problems of soil and water control.

For such grass-roots administration to be effective it must be executed by nonpartisan farmer-elected committees at the State and local level, with the assistance of bipartisan administration from the national level as outlined in part III—A above.

(b) Soil-conservation unit and base: The council finds that the best soil conservation requires individual treatment for each individual farm on the basis of its particular problems and capabilities.

So-called "historical bases" or past cropping practices cannot be used as the primary basis for a proper conservation effort. Their value, if any, is merely to serve as a guide to better conservation management.

(c) Cooperation between agencies: The full-scale job of soil conservation, including all the public education required, is too broad to be confined to one agency. It is feasible for one organization, such as Extension Service, to carry out a large part of the education functions while another action of "line" agency provides the technical assistance, administration, and capital goods required. It is possible for such agencies to work together effectively without duplicating efforts or working at cross-purposes.

(d) State and Federal assistance: While locally administered and essentially self-directed, it is necessary for the local soil-conservation unit to avail itself of substantial assistance from the State and Federal Governments. This assistance comes in several forms, such as direct monetary support, technical assistance, use of machinery and capital goods, research, technical and educational materials, etc. The importance of maintaining the difficult balance between utilizing State and Federal help, maintaining maximum local control, and correlating the progress of the respective local areas cannot be overemphasized.

(e) The administrative unit: The council recommends that the soil-conservation district, as known and established under the programs of the United States Soil Conseration Service, is the best administrative unit, and combines into the best administrative organization for carrying out the objectives of soil conservation as stated above in the manner and with the limitations provided in this section. From the standpoint of immediate application, it has the additional advantage of having been legalized in every State in the Union, and almost completely organized in many of them.

SEC. 3. Soil-conservation programs.—(a) Education: The council finds that there is still much to be done in the education of landowners and farmers in the practices of good soil and water conservation. Moreover, such education is the best way to get long-run compliance of such year-to-year practices as contour farming, proper rotation, legume and grass seeding, etc., which usually bring their own more-or-less immediate monetary returns. Hence the council recommends that a much larger proportion of the funds appropriated for agriculture be allocated to the education of land owners and operators toward modern soil-conservation practices and benefits.

(b) Experimental work and research: Those who have worked closely with soil conservation have found that there is still much to learn about soil and water management which can achieve maximum production with minimum depletion of our resources. Strides already taken in devolping new pasture crops, improving soil-bacteria counts, improving water-control structures, etc., point the way to a vast area for constructive research. The council therefore recommends that more funds be devoted to experimental work and research in the whole field of soil and water conservation and control.

(c) Practice payments: Permanent improvements, such as drainage ditches, terraces, dams, spillways, grass waterways, etc., which require considerable cash outlay without substantial immediate returns should be supported by practice payments to help the farmer finance the original investments.

In the interest of good administration, such payments should be carefully controlled

by the local district committees as follows:

1. Before payment eligibility is established the fact that the practices performed are properly in keeping with a long-time program, and the fact that they have been properly and completely executed, should be certified by a person adequately trained to be competent in the judgment of such matters.

2. Generally tested and approved practices, once established on a farm, should no longer be subsidized by any public agency.

(d) Technical assistance: To place and carry out an extensive program of permanent conservation improvements requires a great deal of technical assistance to the soil-conservation districts and the individual farmers. The council therefore recommends that a larger proportion of Federal expenditures for agriculture be spent for such assistance.

(e) Livestock programs: The council recognizes that a good soil-conservation program on most farms entails the use of more acres for grasses and legumes and the production of more roughage-consuming livestock. Such production is also implied by the emphasis on improved nutrition for the American people brought about through better distribution of farm products as recommended in part III, B above. The council recommends that every feasible means be employed to encourage increased farm livestock programs of this kind.

(f) Long-term leases: The council finds that transient tenancy, wherein each succeeding tenant "mines" the land for 1 or 2 years for all he can get before moving on, is responsible for many of the worst abuses of our soil and water resources. It therefore recommends that measures be instituted to encourage long-term leases as a basic principle of good tenant farming.

(g) Reforestation: There are some marginal agricultural areas in the country which are ill adapted to profitable farming and almost impossible to conserve under any attempts at farming. Hence, it is recommended that surveys be conducted to define those areas precisely, and that necessary measures be undertaken to have those areas properly reforested.

(h) Watershed conservation: Recent experience has shown that, in many areas, soil-conservation practices can best be approached on a watershed basis (such as that being followed in the Little Sioux Basin). The council recommends that this method be employed wherever possible.

SEC. 4. Participation by the States: The council recommends that the States should accept considerable additional responsibility in both the financing and administration of soil-conservation programs.

E. Agricultural support programs

SECTION 1. Making 100 percent parity normal: The council finds that proper distribution of farm products and proper soil and water conservation as set forth above will correct most of our economic farm problems at their fundamental sources (the breakdown of trade channels and the "mining" of soil resources), so that agricultural prices and income will normally be held at full parity levels or above by the natural means of a strong demand for farm products.

SEC. 2. Emergency supports: These programs for distribution and utilization of farm products on prosperous markets should be backed up by emergency agricultural support legislation to go into effect during any possible periods of distress. Such legislation should provide a full-scale, integrated system of flexible supports aimed at stabilization of both farm markets and the farmer's income with minimum expense to the Government and minimum controls over the farmer. Under the administration of the bipartisan board outlined above, it should provide for applying to each farm commodity the devices best suited to accomplishing those purposes, including: commodity purchases on the open market; purchase agreements; commodity loans, compensatory payments on nonbasic, perishable commodities; greatly increased compensation for soil-conservation improvements; development of other sources of income for many marginal, part-time farmers; etc.

The council notes that allowing major farm prices to fall to low levels during such distress periods while maintaining farm income with large direct subsidies would not fulfill the requirements of stabilizing farm markets.

SEC. 3. Soil conservation required: The council recommends that farmers should be required to adhere to good soil-conservation practices, as determined and adopted at the township and county levels, in order to be eligible for participation in these emergency price-support programs.

F. Credit, monetary, and fiscal policies

SECTION 1. Our national deficit: The council finds that farmers are alarmed over the continuing Federal deficit in times of high national income. It therefore recommends that the Federal Government should stop spending more money each year than it collects.

SEC. 2. Farm credit: The council finds that farm credit is customarily least available when the farmer needs it most. Correspondingly, during this present period of prosperity, sufficient farm credit is available. The council recommends that the farmer should have Government-sponsored credit at reasonable rates during those times when such credit is not available elsewhere.

SEC. 3. Monetary stabilization: Along with his other problems, the farmer suffers from a fluctuating monetary purchasing power which creates economic insecurity. Contraction of money and bank credit during periods of depression and undue expansion during periods of prosperity should be prevented.

The council recommends that a bipartisan joint congressional monetary study commission be established for the purpose of recommending means of bringing greater stability to the purchasing power of money.

PART IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The council believes that all the objectives set forth in part II of this report are attainable under a combination of sound policies and good administration. That is to say, we can have a permanent, bipartisan agricultural policy and administration; we can have a stabilized and prosperous farm economy; we can achieve full distribution and constructive utilization of our complete agricultural production; we can conserve our soil and water resources, maintain our liberties and our free society, and even balance the national budget.

The council takes this position in conscious opposition to those who say that we either have to let prices fall or submit to sweeping controls over agriculture; that we have to let farm income go down if we are to balance the national budget, etc. And we take special issue with those who maintain that agricultural policy must and should be fought out in the political arena.

To support its position, the council recommends: (1) A sweeping program of domestic distribution and utilization of farm products; (2) increased exchange of farm products for raw materials and merchandise abroad; (3) vast expansion of the world economy after the pattern used to build our own national economy; (4) comprehensive conservation of our soil and water resources; (5) certain monetary and fiscal reforms; and (6) a genuine bipartisan approach to farm policies.

To be sure, no one of the measures recommended by the council, taken alone, would fulfill the objectives set forth. In combination, however, they represent an over-all program and a systematic approach that the council believes would work.

Beyond all of the specific recommendations, the chief conclusion that the council wishes to offer to the people of the State of Iowa is that fact that we can attain our objectives if we go after them constructively and with determination. We can, if we wish, have both prosperity and freedom in American agriculture for ourselves and our posterity.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from South Carolina.

TRADE TRANSACTIONS WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from South Carolina yield to me long enough to permit me to make a brief statement, provided that I may obtain unanimous consent that if he yields to me for that purpose he will not impair his right to the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not wish to yield for a long speech.

Mr. JENNER. It will be very short.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. How long will the Senator's speech take?

Mr. JENNER. It will take 4 or 5 minutes, I should say.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator's speech does not take any longer than that, I shall yield in accordance with his request, provided it is understood that by doing so I shall not jeopardize my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, yesterday, at the very hour when Senate and House conferees were earmarking $8,000,000 of unexpended China-Formosa recovery funds to aid flood and famine victims in Communist China, our own Department of Agriculture was approving a deal whereby 60,000 tons of Manchurian soybeans—valued at almost exactly $8,000,000—were being snatched from the mouths of these same starving Chinese for export to Japan.

Mr. Ralph Trigg, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, yesterday announced officially that the deal had been consummated. About 45,000 bales of cotton held by CCC will be traded through a New York export firm to the Red government of China for 60,000 tons of Manchurian soybeans. These soybeans in turn will be moved to Japan for distribution by the Department of the Army.

Either the Chinese are starving or they are not. Personally, I believe they are. And if they are, how can our own Government, with one hand, offer $8,000,000 worth of food to these famine victims, and, with the other hand, take an equivalent amount of nutritious soybeans from these same people?

Was this cruel joke what Mr. Truman had in mind earlier this week in his speech at Laramie, Wyo., when he proposed that we offer aid to the people of China?

It is not stated in the official Department of Agriculture release just what price we are paying for the Manchurian soybeans. However, the 45,000 bales of cotton to be traded will represent an investment of about $175 per bale, deliv-

ered at Dairen. This would be a total of about $7,875,000, and, on that basis, the soybeans would cost approximately $3.28 per bushel. Currently, soybeans are available in the domestic market at about $3.05 per bushel, and the Department of Agriculture informed the public in an official report only the other day that there are plenty of soybeans on hand in the United States. Soybean stocks as of April 1 were reported to be the largest in history.

An April 27, I called the attention of the Senate to this impending deal, and urged that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State disavow it immediately.

At that time I asked, and I ask again today: "Who conceived this newest method of 'stopping communism' by doing business with the Reds, themselves?"

At that time I also pointed out that Indiana ranked second among the States in production of soybeans and, together with Illinois, produced roughly half of the soybeans grown commercially in the United States. I could not understand then, and I do not understand now, why we should buy from Communist China farm commodities which are available in our own domestic market, especially when a purchase such as has just been approved means further starvation for the Chinese people.

Today's newspapers report it is questionable that the Red government will permit the United States to send food and relief workers into China. In that case, the starving people will not receive the $8,000,000 worth of supplies which we propose to make available.

There is no question about the $8,000,000 worth of soybeans, however. They will definitely be moved from a land of mass starvation to comparatively well-fed Japan—and with official blessing of both the Chinese Communist Government and the other party to the deal, the Government of these United States of America.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at long last we have an opportunity to speak on Senate bill 1728, which as I notice from its title, is a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Before entering upon a discussion of the bill, I should like to call the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that the reporting of the bill by the committee was not in regular order. First, from page 1 of the report, I notice the following:

> The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, report thereon without amendment, and without recommendation for consideration by the Senate.
>
> The committee took this action after rejecting by a vote of 5 to 5 a motion to conduct hearings on the bill, rejecting an amendment in the nature of a substitute by a vote of 7 to 3, and rejecting a motion to report the bill favorably by a vote of 6 to 6. The vote to report the bill (S. 1728) without recommendation was 11 to 1. Views expressed by various members of the committee follow.

Six of the committee's 13 members joined in the report. At page 27 of the report is found a statement of the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], from which I quote the following:

> The committee has reported a bill without recommendation, without hearings, and with almost no consideration in executive session. Nor did the committee give any consideration to the bill which I introduced, S. 2994. I have no recourse, therefore, except to urge its consideration on the floor of the Senate.

The Senator is speaking of his bill, not Senate bill 1728. I continue:

> I feel that the compulsory provisions of the bill reported by the committee without recommendation will hinder progress toward solving the problem rather than achieve it. Few realize how extensive these compulsory provisions are. They are modeled on the unfair-labor-practice provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and give to anyone who is refused employment or dismissed from a job the right to bring an action against the employer, alleging some motive of discrimination because the applicant or employee is white, black, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Czech, Pole, or German. Such motives are always possible to allege, and the question is left for decision to a board which is bound by no rules of evidence, and practically not subject to court review.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator did not intend to overlook the fact that the sanctions of this proposed law would also apply to every case of individual promotion within every industry in the United States employing over 50 persons, as well as to employment and discharge cases.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Madam President, I am glad the Senator from Georgia brought that to my attention, but I am now reading from the statement of views by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], contained in the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall touch on the other matter when I have a chance later to explain my view. I am at this time merely showing how far the Senator from Ohio went.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had just come on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I realize that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I feel sure the Senator from South Carolina had not overlooked the fact to which I referred, even though the Senator from Ohio had, because the bill would probably apply in more cases of promotion than it would in cases of employment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct.

I read further from the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in reporting Senate bill 1728, as follows:

> No scientific study of the problem has yet been made, and that should be the first task of the boards I propose.
>
> It is true that there may be a few recalcitrant employers, but if local committees are set up and sound plans developed I believe they will be a few indeed.

That is, they violate the law.

> If there are a few, perhaps they can be bypassed and employment provided by other means. If the voluntary method fails to continue progress, the Commission is given power to recommend compulsory legislation. I should not oppose it as a last resort. Even then, I doubt if the unfair labor practice approach is the proper method of dealing with the situation. For instance, when a comprehensive plan of employment has been made, and efforts at voluntary compliance have failed, the Board might be given the right to apply to a court for general approval of the plan, and a court order against an employer whose course of conduct interferes substantially with the success of the plan. Or perhaps complaints could be issued against an employer to require him to discontinue a discriminatory course of conduct which has been proved to exist.
>
> The bill which I have introduced and which I shall offer as a substitute proposes a constructive approach to one of the most difficult problems we face. I hope it may meet with general approval.

That is what the Senator from Ohio had to say. Let us now listen to what another member of the committee had to say, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. He had this to say:

> Had I been present during the committee consideration of S. 1728, whose purpose is the same, I would have supported the motion to report the bill favorably to the whole Senate for its consideration.
>
> I wish to add, however, that my full approval of the purpose of S. 1728 does not extend to its methods, specifically its provisions for the use of legal sanctions. As I stated in my separate views on S. 984, Eightieth Congress (S. Rept. 951), "We cannot legislate happy and productive human relationships." At this period in our history any attempt to enforce fair employment practices nationally would unquestionably encounter determined resistance on a large scale.

Mr. President, that is a New Jersey Senator speaking—

> I fear that the resulting conflicts might retard our objectives, not advance them. In my judgment Congress, which cannot ignore the injustice and waste of discrimination, can at present contribute most effectively to its steady elimination by furthering peaceful methods of education, conciliation, and example, and by developing positive incentives rather than negative prohibitions.

Mr. President, the statements which I have read were made by Senators who come from north of the Mason and Dixon's line.

I think we should looke at the bill for a few moments to see just what it provides.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the distinguished Senator find anywhere in the report, in the views of members of the committee, or anywhere in any documents, any approval whatsoever of the manner in

which the bill was handled, the manner in which it was forced through without any committee hearings or study, the manner in which the subcommittee had the bill referred to it, on which no hearings were held, and the manner in which it was reported favorably without anyone being heard on it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator has brought that to my attention. I notice that the bill was introduced on April 28, 1949, by a Senator who is at this time the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. McGrath. No hearings were held on it. On October 17, 1949, it was reported without recommendation by the committee and without any hearings whatsoever.

Mr. LONG. I assume the Senator knows, does he not, that only by a tie vote was the motion to hold hearings defeated, and that half of the Senators on the committee felt that there should be hearings?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand the Senator's statement is correct. A great many Members felt there should have been hearings, and they still feel that way.

Mr. LONG. So we have before us a case of people being denied the right to be heard on proposed legislation which would most vitally affect them. Many persons will be forced out of business if this type of bill should be passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that this bill was introduced on April 28, last year. I do not know why no hearings were held on it. It was reported on the 17th of October. Then another thing happened. I hold in my hand the report, which is similar to reports which usually accompany reported bills. It was signed on May 5, 1950, by the majority, and the minority made a report on May 5 of this year, on the Saturday before the Monday on which it was taken up.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator would not expect to have an up-to-date, learned, and thoroughly-studied committee report for the advice of the Senate issued by Senators who had not held any hearings at all on the bill, would he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We certainly do not have any learned report here. The committee held no hearings. It is the report of the views which they hold.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know who were the members of the subcommittee to which the bill was assigned?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am sorry the Senator from South Carolina cannot answer that question.

Mr. LONG. I was under the impression that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] were on that subcommittee. Being comparatively new Senators, it would seem that they would want to study the question from a national standpoint, even though they might know the views on the matter in their own States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Knowing the ability of those Senators in matters of this kind, it is very peculiar that they did not hold hearings to try to find out the latest feeling of the people in regard to the subject.

Mr. President, as I stated in the beginning, the bill is entitled "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin." I should like to invite attention to some of the misnomers in the bill. It is called a fair-employment-practice bill. It is given that title. That is not the title that I would give it if I were asked to give it a title. I would not say on the floor of the Senate exactly what I would call this bill; but it is anything other than a fair-employment-practice bill, as I shall point out as I read it, section by section. It starts out with these words:

> The Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation—

We have to be told that we have the greatest nation on the face of the earth—

> with respect to protection of the rights of individuals, the rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the United States to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin are being denied—

They reached that conclusion without having a hearing. They reached it without giving both sides an opportunity to be heard. We are asked to pass upon this measure without having heard a single witness.

I read further from the bill:

> and that such infringements upon the American principle of freedom and equality of opportunity are destructive of the basic doctrine of the integrity and dignity of the individual upon which this Nation was founded——

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make a brief statement with respect to the program of next week. I should like to do so without having the Senator from South Carolina lose his right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the majority leader for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. We are now debating a motion to take up the FEPC bill. Of course, we have not had very much debate upon the measure, because some of our friends on both sides of the aisle have talked about extraneous matters. Moreover, two reorganization resolutions occupied more than a day. However, it is the hope of the Senator from Illinois that when the Senate reconvenes on Monday we shall be able to stay with the issue presented by the pending motion. It seems to me that on a motion to take up a measure of this kind, 2 weeks, regardless of what else the Senate may consider, is sufficient time for debate. Therefore I hope that our southern friends will agree to take up the bill, so that we may be able to debate the merits of it, rather than debate merely a motion to consider the bill. I hope they will agree when the time comes. After all, we are actually debating the merits of the bill now, not the motion to consider it. Therefore, if the proper spirit of cooperation is shown by our friends from the South, there is no reason why we cannot consider the bill and debate its merits and demerits for a number of days, if necessary. I do not wish to be understood as attempting to limit legitimate debate on the bill. We really have before us a technical question, that of a motion to take up the bill, but we are actually debating the merits of the bill. I do not object to that; but it seems to me that perhaps by the middle of next week, regardless of what else may happen, we ought to agree to take up the bill and debate it. If we cannot agree to do that—which I do not suppose we can—I shall file a petition for cloture some time during the middle of next week and see whether or not we can get 64 votes to take up the bill.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield, with the permission of the Senator from South Carolina, who has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to yield for a question to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Illinois, with the understanding that the Senator from South Carolina does not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree that there have been only three speeches against the bill? So far as I know, only three Senators have spoken against it. Perhaps there was one more, but I do not recall at this time. However, every one of the Senators who spoke against the bill urged very strongly that an irregular procedure had been adopted in forcing a controversial measure to the floor of the Senate without first holding committee hearings on it. I am sure the Senator from Illinois realizes that every Senator has urged that reason, among others, why this bill should not be considered.

Mr. LUCAS. I am fully aware of what the Senator from Louisiana has said. What I am trying to say is that on a motion to consider the bill, which is more or less a technical question, it seems to me that we should not take too long a time to debate it. We should take only a short time to debate the technical question involved. However, I have not insisted that we do that, because I want the merits and demerits of the bill debated, even on a motion to take it up. However, if we should be fortunate enough to get cloture on the motion to consider the bill, debate would continue on the merits and demerits of the bill after the motion was adopted. Debate could go on for some time after that, before we would attempt to file another cloture petition. Certainly it is not the intention of the Senator from Illinois to deprive any Senator of the opportunity of legitimate debate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator if in recent years a similar motion has been made to consider a bill on which no committee hearings had been held and on which no recommendations had been made by a committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care to enter into a discussion of that question with my good friend from South Carolina. What I am trying to do is to outline in advance a line of procedure which I hope we shall be able to follow. I know we have considered extraneous matters during the week. I pleaded with my good friend from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] not to bring up the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 12, because I wished to give the House an opportunity to pass on it first, and also to give the Senate an opportunity to move along on the FEPC bill. I guaranteed to him that in due course and in sufficient time before May 23, if the House did not act on the reorganization proposals, or if they acted affirmatively the Senate would take them up. My plea fell on deaf ears. Two full days were occupied in debate on the two reorganization resolutions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield so that I may address an inquiry to the distinguished majority leader, without causing the Senator to lose his right to the floor, and with all the protections that he desires in that respect? Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address an inquiry to the majority leader without in any way interfering with the right of the Senator from South Carolina to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. With that understanding, Madam President, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able majority leader whether he could give us an indication as to the approximate time of the contemplated filing of the cloture petition? As the Senator knows, under the rule it would take 64 affirmative votes, or the constitutional two-thirds of the Senate, to adopt such a procedure. Inasmuch as this is a relatively new procedure, and heretofore no petition for cloture could be presented on a motion to consider a bill, we are desirous of having as many Senators present as can be present. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader could give us an approximate indication, without holding him down to the exact date.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the distinguished Senator from California, I may say that I wholly agree with his statement. Senators should have at least a week's notice. That is the primary reason why the Senator from Illinois rose at this time to announce the more or less tentative program for next week. I would say that if we cannot get our southern friends to agree to take up the bill, a petition for cloture probably will be filed on Wednesday of next week. By filing the petition on Wednesday we would be able to get a vote on the motion by Friday. I do not see how we can continue on this matter any longer than that. Surely if the motion to take up the bill is agreed to, we are not depriving any Senator, whether he is for or against it, an opportunity to talk on the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, as the Senator points out, this is merely the first hurdle. After the bill is taken up, it will still be subject to debate.

Mr. LUCAS. If we are fortunate to get favorable action of the cloture petition, the bill will be subject to debate, and I assure my friends on both sides of the question that I would not under those circumstances rush the Senate into an early vote being taken on it by introducing another cloture petition under the new rule. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I shall not undertake to advise the Senator from Illinois on the procedure that should be followed. That is a responsibility which devolves on him as the majority leader. However, I challenge his statement that the motion is merely a technical matter. The motion to take up the bill is not a technical matter. In ordinary cases, where legislation has been considered by a committee, Senators have had an opportunity to present amendments for consideration by the committee and representatives of departments have appeared before a committee and have undertaken to outline the methods of procedure which would be followed under the terms of a new bill. In such circumstances a motion to take up is more or less a technical matter, and the chief issue involved in such a motion is the relative merits of other bills which might be considered.

We insist in this case that the issue of parliamentary procedure of the Senate which is involved in the motion to take up and consider the bill is as important as the bill itself; and no man would deny that the bill is far-reaching in its consequences.

We are debating this motion in good faith, standing four square upon all the precedents of the Senate, contending that the Senate of the United States should not proceed to the consideration of major legislation which has just been introduced, in the first instance. That is exactly the position of this bill in the Senate today; it stands in the same status as a piece of legislation which has just been introduced, a bill on which there have been no hearings, to which no committee amendments are attached, and which has had no committee recommendation. There have been no hearings on the bill which the Senator from Illinois has moved to have considered, it has no committee recommendation, and no Senator has been afforded an opportunity to present an amendment. There is no difference whatever between this piece of legislation and one which has just been introduced.

We contend, and contend in all good faith and earnestness, that the motion which is presented would set a precedent which would be utterly destructive of the parliamentary practices which have been followed here since the first Senate convened. It bypasses a committee, and when it bypasses a committee, it takes away the right of citizens to be heard, and of Senators to present amendments which shall receive committee consideration. It is in effect a motion that the Senate resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of legislation, without any authority to hear a witness.

While I do not quarrel with the distinguished Senator from Illinois on any procedure he may adopt, I cannot let pass unchallenged the statement that this is a mere technical matter, in this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for one more observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to reply to the observation the Senator from Illinois has made. I should like to say, first, that I agree with the Senator from Illinois in his declaration that those who are really and truly opposed to the bill have had very little opportunity to discuss it or discuss the motion now before the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Madam President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield that I may extend a welcome?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not want to be taken off the floor.

Mr. THYE. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If I may yield without losing the floor.

Mr. THYE. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is speaking from the Republican side and to welcome him to our side of the aisle.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, when the institutions of the Senate are involved, there should be no division into parties. Every Member of this body, without regard to his party affiliations, should feel gravely concerned over any assault upon the Senate as an institution. I therefore have come to this side of the aisle, in the hope that some of my colleagues who sit here might be awakened to the dangers which are involved in the pending motion to proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a short observation? If so, I shall not bother the Senator further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for an observation, if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, I wish to make a short reply to the able Senator from Georgia. I want the RECORD to show that I totally disagree with

him with respect to his position that a motion to take up a bill is not a technical matter. On the merits of the question which the Senator discussed, as to whether or not there has been any testimony, and regarding the questions asked me by the Senator from South Carolina, I shall have something to say next week when I make my speech upon the bill.

I should not like to have the Senator from Georgia get too far on the other side of the aisle, because he has unusually persuasive powers, and I want all Republicans whom I can get to stay with me on this question, because there have been times when we lost out on very important measures.

Mr. THYE. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield with the same understanding.

Mr. THYE. As acting minority leader, I assure the majority leader, the very able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], that he will find a very substantial majority of the Members on this side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, with him in his endeavors concerning the particular piece of legislation we are discussing. I was merely calling to the attention of the folk in the galleries the fact that we had a distinguished visitor, the junior Senator from Georgia, Senator RUSSELL, on our side of the aisle, speaking from our side of the aisle. It was for that reason that I wanted to extend a little welcome to the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for one statement?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Even though the mad stampede to put over this political measure is joined by both the majority leadership and a majority of the Republicans, those of us who are striving to uphold the dignity of the Senate and the regularity of our parliamentary process will carry on, even though we may have the leadership on both sides arrayed against us. We shall not falter in the fight.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Madam President, I was interrupted right in the middle of the first paragraph, and while I do not like to go back and read the whole paragraph again, it looks as though I shall have to do so, so that those listening may understand what I am talking about. Therefore I read the first provision of the bill again:

> The Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation with respect to protection of the rights of individuals, the rights of some persons within the jurisdiction of the United States to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin are being denied, and that such infringements upon the American principle of freedom and equality of opportunity are destructive of the basic doctrine of the integrity and dignity of the individual upon which this Nation was founded and which distinguishes it from the totalitarian nations, force large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foment industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprive the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, and thereby adversely affect the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States.

I should like to comment on that a little. It is claimed there is probably more discrimination in the South than in the North. There is very little industrial strife in the South, so little that a great many industries are moving to the South. In recent years my State has received more new industries than practically any other State in the Union. I am glad to see that tendency. Yet it is said there is industrial strife.

Then it is said in the bill that denying employment opportunities, and so forth, deprives "the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production."

If there ever was a country which could produce, and did produce during the war and since the war, it has been the United States under the system which we have followed and under which we are operating our Government at the present time. Can anyone deny that?

Madam President, I think we are getting along well, and that conditions which now prevail are not affecting the interstate or foreign commerce of the United States. I think that is a mistake in the bill.

I read further from the bill:

> The Congress recognizes that it is essential to the general welfare that this gap between principle and practice be closed; and that adequate protection of such rights of individuals must be provided to preserve our American heritage and prevent serious damage to our moral, social, economic, and political life, and to our international relations.

Yes, I think the bill goes into a great many things and deals with a great many things not appropriate to be dealt with by it. The employment of one person instead of another will not improve the standard of living; certainly it will not do so for the person who is displaced by the other.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. On the basis of the declarations of the bill is it not fair to inquire how our Nation managed to get by for so long a period of time as it did, how we as a Nation came to be the greatest Nation in the world, how we became able to carry many of the burdens of other nations, how we came to be so productive that peoples everywhere look to the United States for assistance?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe it is fair to make such an inquiry. We might ask why those who say the United States is such an awful place in which to live do not leave the United States and go to some other country.

The bill further provides:

> The Congress, therefore, declares that the rights to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin is a right of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and that it is the national policy to protect the right of the individual to be free from such discrimination.

I believe we ought to educate our people. I believe we should try to teach them the principles of the Bible, and even preach to them. But when we undertake to legislate what they can do and what they cannot do we get into trouble.

Let us for a moment consider two persons who seek employment. They go to the employment office in a cotton mill in South Carolina. One is a white person; the other is a colored person. Let us say the color line is drawn, and that the white person is employed, and the colored person is not employed. Under such circumstances, what would happen, under the terms of the bill, if it were enacted? Do not Senators believe that the colored man would immediately say, "I have been discriminated against"? I believe he would make that charge, even though he might not have been qualified to do the particular job for which he made application.

For the information of the Senate I will say that in the industries in South Carolina approximately 175,000 persons are employed. About 90 percent of them are employed in the textile industry of my great State. For the further information of the Senate I will say that of the total active spindles in the United States, 28.3 percent are located in South Carolina.

For the further information of the Senate I will say that only a few colored persons work in the textile mills of South Carolina. There is a reason for that Years ago when the textile industry was established in my State the mills were built in the Piedmont section, because it was close to power. The Piedmont section is at the foothills of the mountains. All that is necessary to do in order to obtain power is to build a small dam. The eastern section of my State is flat. It is called the low country. Negroes will be found in the lower part of the State. Why? Because they like to farm. They located there and remained there.

Much of the white population lives in the Piedmont section where the mills are located. For that reason the workers employed in the mills are white. I do not know at the present time of a single colored person in South Carolina who can do what I can do in a cotton mill. That is a broad statement. I do not know of my own knowledge a single colored man who can weave in a cotton mill. The colored people have not been trained in that line of work. The same is true in the carding rooms, in the operation of the speeders, of the intermediates, and of other machines. But if a colored person should walk up to a mill operator and ask to be employed, and the operator did not give him a trial and even teach him how to do the work, the operator would probably have a case on his hands.

That illustrates how far-reaching the terms of the bill are.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Under the terms of the bill, would it not actually be possible for an employee to file a charge and take the employer before a board for trial, or even make him travel to some remote place to be tried on a charge of discrimination, simply because the employee thought he should have been promoted when someone else was promoted?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is certainly true that the terms of the bill cover promotion, demotion, employment, hiring, and firing.

Mr. LONG. Further than that, does not the bill permit the employee who prefers the charges, after he has had his case tried at great expense to the employer, to have all his legal fees and legal expenses paid by the Government?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will say for the information of the Senate that that is true. The bill gives the person making complaint the right to subpena all the witnesses he wants, and the Federal Government will pay the cost and expenses out of Government funds. But the man who is being prosecuted cannot avail himself of similar rights.

Mr. LONG. He has to defend himself at his own expense, does he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LONG. And if the defendant wins, the person who prefers the charges does not even have to pay the court costs, in spite of the fact that he has lost his suit, does he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is also true.

Mr. LONG. In addition to that, even though the plaintiff filed a frivolous lawsuit, which might have cost the employer a thousand dollars to defend, and although the plaintiff lost his case, the employer could not fire him, after all the expense he had been put to by reason of the action of the plaintiff?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true that the employer could not fire the employee even though he may have brought a frivolous charge against him which cost the defendant thousands of dollars.

Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that if the employer were to promote one employee in his plant, the same employee who had previously brought a frivolous charge against him could start the whole thing all over again by alleging discrimination because he was not also promoted?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, he could start an action all over again if he was not also promoted. Perhaps only one job representing a promotion was open. Hundreds of persons may be employed, but one individual who was not also promoted might say he was discriminated against, and bring charges.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, all the employees in the whole plant who were not promoted could file complaint, in the event only one person was promoted?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under the terms of the bill there can be no question about that.

Had the bill been considered in committee I am certain that we would now find black lines running all across the bill, striking out every word in the bill, and we would find it rewritten and more to the point.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator believe it would have been fair for the committee, before reporting the bill to have considered the points the Senator has now raised?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the committee should have considered them. But they were not considered. A bill cannot be written on the floor of the Senate, and so far as I am concerned, such a bill as this will not be written on the floor of the Senate if God gives me strength to talk if the time comes when the bill will be considered. I am now presenting simply a few of the high lights. I am not at this time engaging in what some might call a filibuster. I feel it to be my duty as a Senator, however, to point out a few of the glaring defects in the bill.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. As I understand, the Senator from South Carolina is pointing out the defects merely to show why the bill should not be considered at this time, and why the proper thing to do with it is to recommit it in order that it may be given the careful study it certainly should have?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Absolutely; I agree with everything the Senator from Louisiana says.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only.

Mr. MAYBANK. My colleague is making a most able address, and I am very appreciative of what he is presenting to the Senate.

He has said that no hearings have been held on the bill. Of course, none have been held on it. The only report we have was written 3 years ago by a committee of Senators, some of whom are not now on the committee.

Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent, if I may have the permission of my colleague, to have printed at the conclusion of his remarks—in order not to interfere with the sequence of his speech—an article entitled "Senator BENTON'S Argument for the FEPC," by Arthur Krock, appearing in yesterday's New York Times. The article was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD earlier today by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The article referred to appears in the RECORD at the conclusion of the speech of Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, inasmuch as the Senator from South Carolina has said that no hearings have been held on this measure, I should like to say that, of course, hearings were held in 1947 on a previous bill; but in his article Mr. Krock reminds us that—

> The origin of the modern drive for this legislation in the United States is also certain to play a part in the Senate debate. According to available records, a detailed demand for the FEPC and other antidiscrimination laws in behalf of Negroes first appeared in the Communist Party platform of 1928 and was published on page 6 of the Daily Worker of May 26 in that year.

Madam President, I trust that the Senators from New York and other Senators who would favor such proposed legislation will take the trouble to read Mr. Krock's article, which shows that FEPC legislation is what the Communists and the Daily Worker have been recommending to the United States since 1928.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Madam President, I read further from Senate bill 1728:

> (c) The Congress further declares that the succeeding provisions of this act are necessary for the following purposes:
>
> (i) To remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations.

Does anyone know any way in which commerce has not been allowed to flow freely because of anything referred to in this bill or anything which this bill seeks to change? I do not.

I read further from the bill:

> (ii) To insure the more complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States.

Those who sponsor the bill forget that employers also have some rights. I feel that an employer has some rights in regard to the matter of employing persons. If I were an employer, I would certainly want to employ the man who would best further my business. If it is not good business for an employer to want to do that, I do not know why not.

However, if there is to be a Federal board or commission which will tell all employers what persons they may hire, what persons they may fire, what persons they may promote, and what persons they may demote, we are going to get into a totalitarian government, sure enough.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me at this point for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does not the very able and distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina find it entirely contradictory that the very bill which purports to assure people of their American rights, denies them their most fundamental of American rights—the right of trial by jury, the right against self-incrimination, the right to be left alone, the right to choose one's own company, the right to pick one's own employees, the right to pick one's own associates?

Does not the Senator find it odd that this bill, which speaks of protecting American rights, would itself deprive Americans of their rights; and is it not also odd that those who are interested in having the bill enacted are attempting to force it through the Senate by means of some of the most irregular methods ever used, to my knowledge, in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator's question, let me say that from reading the bill I find that it actually will do exactly the opposite of what it says it will do. In other words, instead of giving rights, it will take away the rights of American citizens.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina is chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That committee handles all matters of proposed legislation concerning the postal service and the civil service, including the promotion of postal and civil service employees. Does the Senator from South Carolina receive from the colored people of the United States any complaints that they are being discriminated against?

In that connection let me state that I receive no such complaints in my office. So far as I know, those in the Post Office Department are satisfied that they are getting a square deal. Similarly, those who work in the navy yard in my State—and more than one-third of the employees in that navy yard are colored people—are satisfied.

So I wonder whether it is necessary for the Congress to enact a bill to set up a commission to exercise such special authority over the Post Office Department and over all other Federal agencies?

I repeat, Mr. President, that I wish to ask whether the Senator has received many complaints.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply, let me say that I have received very few complaints at all about discrimination. So far as my committee is concerned, I have received very few such complaints from either whites, colored people, or persons of any other nationality or creed.

It should be noted that the activities of approximately 2,000,000 Government employees are regulated by legislation handled by the committee, and to the committee are referred proposed laws dealing with classification, promotion, and other matters affecting those Government employees. Of course, when such laws are enacted, the Civil Service Commission administers them.

There have been very few complaints. When complaints are made and are investigated, in most instances we find that they come from persons who may be classified as chronic complainers. Of course, I am sorry to have to say that there are a few such persons in this country. On the other hand, some of the complaints have some small basis of justification. However, we have had no complaints relating to discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's committee has received no complaints to speak of about discrimination because of race, color, or creed?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. None at all; we have not had one.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to ask this question of the junior Senator from South Carolina, the Chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, at a time when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], likewise a member of that committee, is also on the floor of the Senate. Is it not a fact that most Government employees, regardless of their race, color, or creed, have a very good opinion of, and hold in high esteem, the Civil Service Commission, which is under the immediate legislative jurisdiction, so far as the appointment of the members of the Commission, and so forth and so on, are concerned, of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, headed by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina? Am I correct in believing that Government employees speak very highly of the Civil Service Commission?

Let me say that they speak highly of it to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Generally speaking, the Government employees are pleased with the action taken by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. President, let me continue to read from Senate bill 1728:

(iii) To promote universal respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race or religion, in accordance with the undertaking of the United States under the United Nations Charter—

So we see that those who have written the bill have attempted to broaden its scope in such a way as to make it apply now to all the world—

and to further the national policy in that regard by securing to all persons under the jurisdiction of the United States effective recognition of certain of the rights and freedoms proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. President, the part of the bill I have just read is more or less a declaration and statement of the need for enactment of the bill, of the great work it will do, and of why it will do it.

Then the bill proceeds to state definitions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Does the junior Senator from South Carolina notice how much of the preamble of the bill is directed at the treaties of the United States and at the United Nations? I notice that that is a large portion of the preamble. Does the Senator from South Carolina notice that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do. At this rate, the next thing we know, those who have sponsored this bill will want us to tell the other nations of the world how to run their affairs and what they should do.

Mr. LONG. Has it ever occurred to the Senator from South Carolina that in the early portion of the bill all the emphasis on the international situation might indicate that the author of the bill might have known that such a measure was entirely unconstitutional, and might have hoped to support the alleged constitutionality of such an obnoxious piece of proposed legislation on the basis of the international obligations and the treaty power of the United States Government?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. In that connection, I should like to state that I have never heard of a single Communist who was not in favor of FEPC. I want Senators to consider that point very seriously. Have Senators ever heard of a Communist who was not in favor of the FEPC?

I read further from Senate bill 1728:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals—

So the bill would get everyone, going or coming—

partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof.

It takes in everyone, it will be noticed. Is there anything left out?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As I understand, the definition of person includes trustees in bankruptcy. Does it not occur to the Senator from South Carolina that there might have been an oversight in not including all the poor devils who, if this bill were enacted, would go into bankruptcy?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are not forgotten at all; they are merely covered up, here.

(b) The term "employer" means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ 50 or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer—

I hope everyone who is employed is working and acting in the interest of his employer—

directly or indirectly; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, not organized for private profit, other than a labor organization.

Mr. President, I call particular attention to the last clause, "other than a labor organization."

(c) The term "labor organization" means any organization, having 50 or more members

employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, wages, hours, terms, or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

(d) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession; or between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof.

(e) The term "Territory" means Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(f) The term "possession" means all possessions of the United States, and includes the trust territories which the United States holds as administering authority under the United Nations trusteeship system, and the Canal Zone, but excludes other places held by the United States by lease under international arrangements or by military occupation.

(g) The term "Commission" means the Fair Employment Practice Commission, created by section 6 hereof.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 4. This act shall not apply to any employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions.

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin; and

(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

Let me show how far-reaching that is. We noted earlier in the bill a reference to conditions, terms, or privileges of employment. In a great many plants men work on three shifts. One shift, called the day shift, runs from 7 or 8 o'clock in the morning until 3 or 4 in the afternoon. The second shift usually runs from around 4 o'clock until 12 o'clock at night. The third shift, beginning around midnight and continuing until about 8 o'clock in the morning, is known as the graveyard shift. Under the terms of the bill, if a person applied for employment at a plant where there were three shifts, if he were not allowed to choose the shift, he could claim discrimination, even though he were given employment on, let us say, the second or third shift, when he preferred employment on the first. The employer would then have to go through the courts. He would probably not be tried in his own State. Under the bill, he could be taken anywhere for trial. The Commission might find that the man who knew the most about the case was in Washington. If a material witness lived in Washington, the employer would have to come to Washington to prove his defense.

I read further:

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization—

I am calling the attention of labor organizations to this provision. I say to the labor unions, read and study this paragraph. I have been one southerner who has always encouraged organization within my State. But let labor consider and see whether this paragraph will help organization in the South. I will let labor be the judge.

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive such individual of employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. President, labor is trying to organize in the South at the present time. The textile industry is the biggest labor field in the South. Is it believed that one can go into the South and organize labor under that section? Remember that more than 50 percent of the textile workers are in North Carolina and South Carolina, 23 and a fraction percent in North Carolina and 28 percent in South Carolina. I read further from the bill:

(c) It shall be an lawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

If any person is discharged by an employer after he has testified or after he has participated in any charge, although he may have been discharged because he came late to work not 1 day, but for many days, or because he did not operate his job properly, the employer must be tried before the Commission, where the prosecutor is a part of the Commission, where the jury is a part of the Commission, where the court is the Commission. It can be imagined what a fair trial he would obtain. If the necessary witnesses to prove the case were not present, the case would be continued. I have had some experience in connection with Commission trials under the Federal Government. One of the commissioners may go out and get the evidence, give it to an employee, and hear the case. He is the jury, under this bill. Imagine having an employee sitting as a judge in the case. He would lean over backward to give his employer what he wanted.

I believe, Mr. President, if the bill is enacted into law it will do a great deal of damage to our American way of life. I do not blame Communists for being in favor of the bill. If I were a Communist I would be in favor of it also.

I read further from the bill:

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall be composed of 5 members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman of the Commission, and one member to serve as vice chairman. The chairman shall be responsible on behalf of the Commission for the administrative operations of the Commission. The vice chairman shall act as chairman in the absence or disability of the chairman or in the event of a vacancy in that office.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) The Commission shall make an annual report to the President for transmission to the Congress summarizing its activities during the preceding fiscal year, including the number and types of cases it has handled and the decisions it has rendered; and shall report to the President from time to time on the causes of and means of eliminating discrimination and make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $17,500 a year, except that the Chairman shall receive a salary of $20,000 a year.

The Chairman is to receive $7,500 more than a Senator receives.

(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I take it from that provision that it is intended that if complaints and agitation do not stir up a sufficient number of cases to be heard by the Commission, the Commission is supposed to make business, to foment trouble, and get things going, if complaints do not come to the Commission at the rate expected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator is entirely correct. The Commission must make annual reports to the President, and it would like to make glowing reports. Representatives of the Commission will go to South Carolina, to the west coast of the United States, to California, Oregon, Washington, and they will not omit New York and Chicago. They will naturally want to show that they are very busy during their terms of office. Naturally, they will want to show how important they are when the time for reappointment arrives.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Certainly in the case of a Federal agency which does not have much business we could cut down their appropriations and reduce their personnel. However, under the authority

given to the Commission in this bill, the Commission could build up a great personnel, because if people do not file complaints before it they could investigate everyone, if they wished.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is entirely correct. In a little while I shall read from the bill a provision which gives the Commission the right to employ specialists, experts, lawyers, or anyone else they think they need at any time.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Further than that, they would be able to subpena people and even require people to bring all their records with them, regardless of how voluminous they were, from any one place in the United States to any other place in the United States? Is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is entirely correct.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, the Commission could have a two-bit agent from Bangor, Maine, for example, at a small vacation resort, and that agent could subpena a number of men to come all the way from Los Angeles, Calif., and bring their records with them and testify in that agent's investigation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is entirely correct. I read further:

Any such agent, other than a member of the Commission, designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the judicial circuit—

That is the only limitation put on it. The limitation is that the man who is conducting the hearing must be in the district, but it does not say that a man must be tried in the district in which he lives.

I read further:

as defined in title 28, United States Code, section 41, within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

(g) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions; and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

If they can do that, they can set up the classifications and the salaries to be paid the employees.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from South Carolina does not expect the Commission to hire GS–1's? Undoubtedly they would hire GS–10's and GS–15's. They would hire $10,000- and $15,000-a-year men. Is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If they were turned loose, certainly they would do that.

Mr. LONG. They could hire anyone they wanted to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. LONG. And pay them as much as they wanted to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes. They would fix the salaries. Congress would not have anything to do with fixing the salaries.

I read further:

(2) to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States.

Those are the expenses that the Government would pay for. Anyone with a grievance could give the names of a group of witnesses. The Commission would pay for the depositions—"depositions," Mr. President—not testimony in court—"to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken."

They would pay the witnesses for their depositions, instead of having them come into court to testify. I did not know that such a practice was followed even in our courts.

I read further:

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder.

The bill gives the Commission the right to employ attorneys and doctors. Perhaps the doctors would be engaged on some medical phase of a case. I never had to employ one doctor in my life for the purpose of testifying for me. I never had to employ an expert for myself. I have employed many experts to testify for clients, but never have I had to employ an expert to testify for myself. I have had to pay as much as $200 a day for expert testimony.

I read further from the bill:

(5) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate.

This refers to instances when employees do not cooperate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, inasmuch as there are very few Senators on the floor, and it is somewhat late in the afternoon, if he would agree to continue his speech when the Senate meets again on Monday. I believe the Senate will recess in a few minutes. The Senator may desire to continue his speech on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from South Carolina would agree to such a suggestion provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana propound that as a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] be permitted to suspend at this time, without prejudicing his right to the floor, and continue his address when the Senate meets on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(During the speech of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained consent to have the following article printed in the RECORD at this point:)

[From the New York Times of May 11, 1950]

IN THE NATION—SENATOR BENTON'S ARGUMENT FOR THE FEPC

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 10.—Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, speaking yesterday in favor of the administration's bill to provide Federal penalties for industrial employers and labor unions in all the 48 States who are found guilty by a Fair Employment Practice Commission of racial or religious discrimination, said several times that "the big issue is * * * justice for our own citizens in our own land." But for the many who doubt that a compulsory Federal statute is the right or the constitutional way to effect that justice, Mr. BENTON stressed two other arguments of the type politicians call "practical."

1. He said "our failure to live up to our democratic preachments on civil rights for all Americans regardless of race, religion, color, or national origin, contributes most to the poisonous, tremendous, and terrible effectiveness of Soviet propaganda against this Nation in the world." Hence, he said, passage of this bill would not only be a master stroke in foreign policy but one acutely necessary.

2. Mr. BENTON'S second practical argument was that "more than 98 percent of all enterprises in the United States employ fewer than 50 persons," and "there are not as many employers in the South as I would wish * * * who employ more than 50 persons." Hence, the law would operate in a small area of the industrial economy: "Without the development of the modern corporation it may be questioned whether this legislation would be needed."

GRIST FOR BOTH MILLS

In making these statements Mr. BENTON exposed two features of the administration bill which opponents have found especially vulnerable. They do not see disproof of their belief that the measure is unconstitutional, and bad domestic public policy as well, in the statement that these should be waived in the interest of our foreign policy, as Mr. BENTON and others evaluate it. And Senator CONNALLY remarked that a bill of such high idealistic professions that exempts "98 percent of all enterprises in the United States" is either a sham or is intended as the outrider for another bill which will affect all employers. Senator BENTON'S percentages, and the history of all sumptuary legislation with a modest beginning (such as the local option laws that became Nation-wide prohibition), certainly support Mr. CONNALLY'S observation.

Mr. BENTON also said:

"The Soviet radio tells the Russian people [and others] that our Constitution was written by representatives of exploiting classes and does not truly guarantee civil rights; that our Congress * * * one of their favorite targets * * * permits the minority to prevail 'because of the poll tax and the filibuster.'"

This led Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, to observe:

"I hope the Senator from Connecticut does not advocate that we should repeal the Constitution because the Communists have been putting out a good deal of false propaganda about it."

Of course, Mr. BENTON did not advocate this. But to those who object to the FEPC bill on constitutional and public-policy grounds this is a logical extension of his argument that the bill should be judged largely on his contention that its approval

would destroy a most effective segment of Soviet propaganda.

A CHOICE OF METHODS

As is nearly always the case when people differ fundamentally on an issue, and differ on principle, the reasons given by Mr. BENTON for passing the compulsory FEPC bill seemed to the opposition to fortify its objections. This was true not only of the arguments and answers cited above but of his description how vigorously the State Department is meeting the propaganda he would legislate against and how firmly the Supreme Court has upheld civil rights.

He said the Voice of America broadcasts, which he proposes greatly to expand, have made "most effective use of material on favorable racial developments in the United States. Our broadcasting," he said, "has reported the truth about our progress in this field, about the President's civil-rights program, about the historical background of our race relations, about the opposition of our most prominent Negro leaders to the Communist system, and also about the great civil-rights decisions of our Supreme Court."

To Mr. BENTON this supports his argument that the FEPC bill should be passed to put a clincher on these activities. But to those who disapprove of the bill on law and principle it is proof that this particular Soviet propaganda is being dealt with effectively—the Senator said so—and in the right way, and will be more effective when his expansionist program is adopted.

The origin of the modern drive for this legislation in the United States is also certain to play a part in the Senate debate. According to available records, a detailed demand for the FEPC and other antidiscrimination laws in behalf of Negroes first appeared in the Communist Party platform of 1928 and was published on page 6 of the Daily Worker of May 26 in that year. But, since then, the CIO, and citizens' groups with no possible link to communism, have adopted most of this program, broadened it to cover other minorities, and given it its present political strength.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. LONG. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 15, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Eugene John Pajakowski, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana, vice Al W. Hosinski, term expired.

IN THE NAVY AND NAVAL RESERVE

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temtorary or permanent appointment to the grades and corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For permanent appointment in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Alice E. Applegate
Harriet E. Ashworth
Noma R. Brice
Virginia Cameron
Leonora A. Cofer
Patricia G. Conwell
Dorothy I. Council
Katherine C. Doe
Frances L. Hill
Anne King
Abigail P. Leik
Nancy B. Long
Esther M. K. Lound
Loretta E. Mersy
Katherine E. Shilling
LaForrest W. Smith
Marion F. Wagner

LIEUTENANTS, SUPPLY CORPS

Faynola V. Armstrong
Shirley J. Kaye
Grace J. Page

LIEUTENANT, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

John M. Daniels

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Gladys H. Brewer
Sara B. Butterfield
Glenna L. Cahill
Virginia J. Eager
Georgie I. Simpson
Mary W. Winter

CHIEF BOATSWAIN

William H. Johnson

For temporary appointment in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Aubyn L. Adkins
Jackson H. Adams
Robert S. Adams
Robert N. Adrian
Edward M. Albrecht
Virgil F. Aldrich
William B. Allen
James C. Aller
Robert G. Amme
Steven N. Anastasion
Clyde B. Anderson
William R. Anderson
Raymond L. Angelo
Danta Armogida
Norbert E. Aubrey, Jr.
Frank W. Ault
Jesse R. Austin, Jr.
Daniel G. Bailey
Jewett A. Baldridge
Sidney N. Baney
William R. Banks
Laughlin Barker
Alcus E. Barrett
John M. Barrett
Thomas E. Barrett
Herbert L. Baslee, Jr.
Clifford E. Baxter
Robert H. Beaver
Jack L. Becker
John H. Behl
Milton D. Bennett
William R. Bennett
Carl R. Berquist
James R. Berry
Raymond A. Bertrand
Clarence R. Beyer
Louis E. Biechlin
William P. Blackmore
William P. Blackwell
Walter C. Blattmann
Marion L. Bohgren
George T. Boland
Irvin H. Bordihn
Thomas A. Boulton
Francis X. V. Brady
John E. Braun
Richard E. Brega
Henry Bress
John D. Brewster
Paul W. Bridwell
Chester A. Briggs
Clifford L. Brown
George M. Brown
John L. Brown
Melvin W. Brown
Earl E. Buckwalter
William A. Budding, Jr.
John M. Bunch
Arthur W. Bunting, Jr.
Fred M. Burdette
Albert C. Burley
Henry R. Busby
Clyde J. Bushong
William S. Busik
Francis A. Butler
John F. Buttler
Donald F. Byers
William F. Cafferata
Warren D. Calhoun
James F. Calvert
James M. Campbell
Joseph M. Campbell
Lawrence D. Caney
Carl A. Carlson, Jr.
William P. Carmichael
Arthur M. Carter, Jr.
Clifton B. Cates, Jr.
Theodore K. Cencebaugh
Alfred A. Cherbak
Harry L. Clark, Jr.
Howard E. Clark
Samuel E. Clark
Jarvis R. Clifton
William W. Cobb
William K. Coker
Gerard F. Colleran
Charles L. Collier
Cecil B. Collins, Jr.
Phillip E. Collins
Bartholomew J. Connolly 3d
Robert E. M. Conwell
Henry J. H. Cooke
Charles T. Cooper 3d
William T. Coulson
Albert W. Cox
Dale W. Cox, Jr.
Eugene D. Cravens
Edward J. Cummings, Jr.
Moody O. Curry
Elmer L. Custance
Franklin E. Dailey, Jr.
John J. S. Daniel
Edwin G. Dankworth, Jr.
Howard E. Danner, Jr.
Edward H. Daughtrey
William T. Davern
George S. Davis, Jr.
Robert A. Davis
William E. Dean
Daniel D. Decker, Jr.
Dallas K. DeJarnatt
Roderick C. Dennehy
Donald M. Detrick
Austin L. Detweiler
Russell C. Dickinson
Mason H. Dill
Clement F. Dingey
Paul W. Dodson
James C. Donaldson, Jr.
Homer M. Doran, Jr.
Thomas L. Dowdy
Curtis L. Downey
Wilbur T. Doyel
Joseph B. Drachnik
Robert W. Duborg
John A. Dudley
Hugh M. Durham
Robert A. Dusch
Howard W. Dye
Joseph O. Eddy, Jr.
Arthur T. M. Edwards
William S. Edwards
Marsh K. Eckhardt
Gail J. Eilerbe
James W. Ellis, Jr.
Mack D. Ellis
Orben E. Ellis
John J. Emanski, Jr.
Arthur T. Emerson, Jr.
Clifford W. Engler
Virgil L. Epperly
Philip F. Erkenbrack
John S. Ervin
Melvin R. Etheridge
Samuel L. Evans
William J. Everett
Gordon C. Facer
Frederick R. Fearnow
Michael Fedzyshyn
Harrison R. Fehr 3d
Loren E. Feikins
Leonard E. Field
Miles R. Finley, Jr.
Harold B. Fish
Loren P. Fitzgerald
Conrad J. Flessner
John P. Flynn
William M. Forester
Robert J. Fossum
Elmer L. Fox
Daniel H. Freeman
Clarence T. Froscher
John E. Frum
Henry H. Frye
Charles R. Fuller
Joseph D. Fuller
Rex A. Gage
Roy H. Gallemore
Amedeo H. Galvani
John H. Gano
Martin D. Gastrock
Chester W. Gates, Jr.
James C. Gibson
Ronald E. Gill
Robert H. Gillock
Carll T. Gleason
Ralph F. Goetter
William A. Golden, Jr.
Kenneth C. Golding
Harry E. Goldsmith
Andrew Golian, Jr.
Rene E. Gonzalez
William M. Goode
Joseph E. Gould
Robert B. Greenwood
Richard D. Greer, Jr.
Robert A. Gregg
John Greksouk, Jr.
John B. Griggs 3d
James A. Griswold
George Grkovic
Warren A. Grossetta, Jr.
Stephen V. Hadley
Homer H. Haisten, Jr.
"J" "C" Hale
Alvin W. Hall, Jr.
Marlin L. Hall
Perry Hall
Orion A. Hammett
Edward J. Hannon, Jr.
Robert L. Hansen
Ralph M. Hanson
William H. Hardcastle, Jr.
Julius W. Harman
William M. Harnish
Robert B. Harris
Robert E. Hawthorne
John C. Haynie, Jr.
Charles F. Helme, Jr.
Glen A. Herndon
Leslie R. Heselton, Jr.
Lawrence Heyworth, Jr.
Fred C. Hill
Ulmont C. Hill
William O. Hill
Edwin N. Hitchcock, Jr.
Harry Hlywa
Philip E. Hobson
James L. Holloway 3d
Frank W. Hollowell, Jr.
David C. Holmes
Carl O. Holmquist
Robert L. Holt
Donald A. Homrighausen
Willard D. Hoot
Charles L. Hovey
Harvard C. Huber
Jack G. Hudson
Roy E. Huettel
William S. Humphrey, Jr.
Daniel Hunt, Jr.
Thomas C. Hurst, 3d
Stanley K. Hutchin
Charles J. Hutchison
Milton T. Ingram
Eric Ischinger, Jr.
Lawrence S. Jackman
Erwin S. Jackson
Douglas H. Jennings
Earl B. Johnson
Alva J. Jones
Charlie R. Jones
Daniel E. Johns
Donald R. Jones
Jack B. Jones
Robert L. Jungklas
Daniel M. Karcher
Robert D. Karl
Hal A. Kauffman
Harry B. Keller
George A. Kelley, Jr.
John W. Kelsey, Jr.
Edward F. Kenney
Edward E. Kerr
Stuart D. Keys
Samuel B. Killingsworth
Andrew Kirinich
William B. Kirkland, Jr.
Donald G. Kirsch
Lloyd M. Kivell
John J. Knight
John F. Koons
Albert C. Koplewski
Robert M. Kunhardt
Archie C. Kuntze
Lawrence A. Kurtz
Paul L. Lacy, Jr.
Stephen F. Lahmann
Harold F. Lang
Richard W. Langworthy
Allen N. Lasater
Donald L. Lassell
Robert G. Laurie
Lefteris Lavrakas
Richard R. Law
Dunbar Lawson
Richard D. Lazenby
Guy C. Leavitt
James W. LeCompte
Jesse E. Lee
Patrick Leehey
Milton W. Leewe
Frederick H. Lemly, Jr.
Bernard C. Lennon
Neil H. Lindhjem
Kenith V. Lindstrom
John H. Lobdell
John W. Logan
Robert C. Logan
Benjamin F. Lohr
Joseph A. Lovington
William S. Luberda
Ira T. Lynn
John W. MacNeil
Richard O. Madson
Clarke R. Mahaffey
David B. Maher
William T. Maners
James H. Manning
William J. Manby, Jr.
James N. Martin
Neal Martin, Jr.
Robert Marvel
Theodore F. Marx
Leonard M. Matson
Isthmael W. Matthews
Allan E. May
Nicolas J. Mayer
Glenn A. Medick
Lewis W. Metzger 3d
Edgar R. Meyer

Francis A. Meyer
George R. Meyer
Louis L. Milano
Anthony J. Miller
Donald A. Miller
Robert O. Mink
Fred L. Minneman
Forrest R. Mitchell
Lloyd R. Mitchell
Joseph B. Mongogna
Howard S. Moore
Michael U. Moore
Ernest L. Morgon
Jack T. Moritz
Bernard W. Moulton
Gregg Mueller
Ernest B. Murphey
Robert J. Murphy
Harvey L. Myers
James L. McAnn
Audley H. McCain
Thomas R. McCants
Brian McCauley
Thomas R. McClellan
William G. McClellan
Robert M. McConnell, Jr.
Walter D. McCord, Jr.
William M. McCulley, Jr.
Patrick H. McGann
Malcolm W. McGaughey
Millard G. McKinney
Ellis H. McKissick
Philip S. McManus
Alton R. McMullen
William R. McQuilkin
John A. McTighe
Jesse A. Naylor
Frank M. Nelson
George I. Nelson
Ne's J. Nelson
Daniel M. Newbern
Arthur W. Newlon
John L. Nichols
John W. Newland, Jr.
John J. Nolan
Kenneth R. Norton
James M. O'Brien
John J. O'Brien
Joseph P. O'Donnell
Myron L. Ogden
James D. Oliver, Jr.
Frank P. Omohundro
Henry F. O'Reilly
Leon J. Otto.
Irad B. Oxley
Elmer W. Ozenberger, Jr.
Paul E. Padget
William M. Pardee
Joseph A. Pariseau
William C. Patterson
Raymond E. Peet
Charles A. Pendleton, Jr.
Victor S. Pedersen
Robert M. Peterson
Lester A. Petrowsky
Julius J. Perecko, Jr.
Richardson Phelps, Jr.
Charles Philip
Richard W. Phipps
Clyde Pitts
Henry O. Powell
Lester A. Powers, Jr.
James R. Preis
John D. Price
Benjamin T. Pugh
Charles D. Pulver
Frederick R. Putnam
Richard M. Quattlebaum
James C. Quillin, Jr.
Paul J. Raab
Charles C. Ragsdale
William T. Rapp
Albert L. Rasmussen
Leon H. Rathbun, Jr.
Julian E. Rawls
Robert F. Regan
Frank J. Reh
William R. Riblett
Eugene J. Rice
Harold E. Richter
George E. Riddle
Herbert H. Ries
George W. Ringenberg
Nelson E. Roberts
Edgar A. Robie
Samuel J. Robinson, Jr.
Charles D. Robison, Jr.
Chester R. Rocher
Angus W. Rose
Robert H. Rossell
Milton M. Routzahn
Robert R. Ruff
Charles K. Ruiz
Fred C. Rupprecht
John W. Ryan, Jr.
Robert J. Sammons
Goodwin W. P. Sandvig
Merrill H. Sappington
Lee R. Scherer, Jr.
Walter M. Schubauer
Linus H. Schuh
David A. Scott
Edward W. Scott
Laurence F. Seaman
John W. Sedwick
Leslie H. Sell
Robert J. Selmer
Donald W. Sencenbaugh
Joseph A. Sestak
Thomas L. Shenton
Tazewell T. Shepard, Jr.
John T. Shepherd
Samuel W. Sherfey
David A. Shonerd
Samuel W. W. Shor
James W. Short
John W. Shultz, Jr.
Arthur P. Sibold, Jr.
Robert J. Siegelman
Pierre M. Sinclair
Harry C. Sipe, Jr.
Winfield S. Slocum 3d
Austin B. Smith
Fenton F. Smith, Jr.
Fred E. Smith
Leonard G. Smith, Jr.
William H. Smith
Robert G. Smith
Andrew K. Simmons
Gordon A. Snyder
Harold D. Sollenberger
John W. Sotak
Howard J. Spencer
Cecil E. Spitzer
Roger E. Spreen
Robert T. Stagner, Jr.
David L. Staley, Jr.
David S. Stanley
Jay A. Stapley
Robert E. Stark
Charles E. Stastny
Robert W. Stecher
Oliver F. Steenman
David S. Sterrett
Jack L. Stowe
Harold Strawhorn
Louis M. Strayer
Reuben E. Strelow
Mitchell P. Strohl
Hope Strong, Jr.
Arthur D. Struble, Jr.
Robert M. Stuart
Emmett C. Suggs
John R. Sullivan, Jr.
Joseph B. Sullivan
Kenneth M. Sullivan
Ted N. Swain
John M. Sweeney
Caydar E. Swenson
Maurice P. Talbot
Philip B. Taliaferro
Charles A. Taylor, Jr.
William E. Taylor
John P. Tazewell
Howard C. Teaford
Orion A. Templeton
Bernard A. Thielges
Bert A. Thompson
Lloyd J. Thompson
Lowell E. Thompson
Ralph M. Thompson
Raymond C. Tolerton, Jr.
Sumner E. Thompson, Jr.
Fred H. Thorne
Edgar W. Toney
William P. Toohey
James T. Traylor, Jr.
Robert M. Tuft
Francis M. Tully
Arcia O. Turner
Alvin H. Tutt
Louis K. Tuttle, Jr.
Bernard S. Umbarger
Albert B. Underwood, Jr.
William W. Vallandigham
Harper E. VanNess, Jr.
Roswell Van Over
Joseph W. Vercher
Vito L. Vitucci
Joseph E. Volonte
James B. Verdin
Americo J. Vescovi
Dennis A. Wagner
Albert C. Waldman, Jr.
Lewis W. Walker, Jr.
Maurice E. Wall
Kenneth C. Wallace
Martin H. Wallace
Charles H. Walker
John J. Wannamaker
James R. Ward
Ebert S. Watson
Richard Watson
Samuel E. Watson
James A. Weatherbie
Edgar H. Weber
John M. Weeks
William Wells
Irving E. Wetmore
Claude A. Wharton, Jr.
George H. Whisler, Jr.
Richard S. White 3d
John E. Whitely
Daniel W. Wildfong
Andy W. Williams
Byron L. Williams
Franklyn M. Williams
Loris D. Williams
Thomas S. Williamson, Jr.
Richard W. Willis
James C. Wilson
Walter K. Wilson
Jesse V. Wood
Malcolm L. Wood
Reuben F. Woodall
Robert C. Woodside
Halford Woodson
Horace J. Woodward
Lynn F. Woodward
Nelson C. Woodward
David P. Wynkoop
Maury F. Yerger, Jr.
Joseph S. Zeigler
Richard G. Zimermann
Robert J. Zoeller
Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Frank A. Baldwin
Howard W. Burnett, Jr.
John J. Caporaso
Charles W. Chappell
Royce L. Daniels
Algernon H. Kerr, Jr.
Kenneth R. Klofkorn
Joseph A. Kriz
Ralph G. Leedy
Wellington H. Lewis
William C. Norcott
William T. Peach III
Guy H. Putman, Jr.
Carlos L. Tolleson
Walter W. Tolson
Elliott M. Weart
Merle E. Weedlun
Ernest C. White

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

John F. Callahan
John W. Collins
Wendell G. Davis
Frank C. Hansche, Jr.
Bryan S. Pickett
Alexander P. Zachella

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Gervais T. Moss

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Alberta S. Burk
Anna Danyo
Ruth A. Erickson
Margaret L. Halcy
Estelle E. Kalnoske
Gertrude H. Nelson
Rosemary Shavia
Myrtle M. Teisseire

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS

John P. Ahearn
Markham J. Anderson
Willard P. Arentzen
Charles E. Bancroft
Preston H. Bandy
Phillips L. Bates
Frederick B. Becker
Paul B. Bender
William F. Bennett, Jr.
Jack C. Berger
Billy R. Blackburn
Charles E. Boonstra
Murdock S. Bowman
Gurdon L. Bradt
Jay S. Broadbent
John B. Bryan
Robert G. Busboom
David M. Butler
John L. Butler
John C. W. Campbell
David B. Carmichael, Jr.
Herman E. Carr, Jr.
William E. Carter
William S. Carter, Jr.
Nathaniel M. Cohen, Jr.
James M. Cole
Thomas J. Coleman
Dayton A. A. Cooper
Robert R. Cooper, Jr.
Earl E. Correll
John C. Country
Donald R. Cruse
Henry R. Delancy
Lawrence A. Denney
Delbert R. Dickson
Milan Diklich, Jr.
Robert M. Dimmette
David C. Dixon
David G. Doane
Kevin A. Doyle
Richard S. Farr
John S. Featherston
James B. Flanagan, Jr.
Richard Foulk
Nathaniel E. Fowler
Leo J. Frank, Jr.
George R. Frempter
Frank D. Fuller
Robert E. Fultz
Aubrey D. Gantt
Robert R. Garison
Harold W. Garvin
Albin Gedarovich
Orville M. Graves, Jr.
Martin O. Greaney, Jr.
James W. Greer
Donald W. Grimes
James R. Hamilton
Paul K. Hamilton, Jr.
Frank P. Hammon
John W. Hanni
Walter F. Hansen
Richard H. Hardin
Kenneth L. Hardy
Tom C. Hardy
James H. Harris
Edward G. Haskell, Jr.
Mack M. Hill, Jr.
Robert R. Hirst
Richard F. Hoffman
Alden V. Holmes
James H. Holmes
Roy W. Holmes
Raleigh M. Hood
Edward A. Horr
Charles C. Houghton, Jr.
William Ingram, Jr.
Paul A. Jarand
Alvin C. Jensen
Morton Johan
Harold G. Johnson
Maurice N. Johnson
John M. Jones
Robert J. Kleinhenz
Martin Koeck III
Donald R. Koerner
William G. Krech
Stuart D. Kustermann
Stephen V. Landreth
Livius L. Lankford
William E. Larsen
Charles L. Lear
Thomas B. Lebherz
Richard H. Lee
Walter G. Leonard, Jr.
Thomas H. Lewis
Robert H. Lister, Jr.
Lyle D. Litton
Donald E. Lloyd
Richard G. Lonsdorf
Richard E. Luehrs
Robert W. Lykins
Gordon B. Magill
John T. Mallams
Charles E. Mangin
"C" "L" Manning, Jr.
Albert E. Marland, Jr.
Francies Marshall
Gerald A. Martin
William E. Mayer
Charles A. Mead, Jr.
Harold T. Meryman
Robert P. Moore
James F. Morrell
Marshall G. Morris, Jr.
Samuel L. Moschella
Houston F. Mount
Charles C. Muehe
Donald R. Mundie
Robert J. McCarthy
Harry S. McGaughey
Claude R. Nichols, Jr.
Donald J. Nollet
Robert W. O'Brien
Donald O'Hanian
William F. Park
Edward E. Parker
William T. Patton
Harold M. Peacock
Paul H. Pennypacker
James C. Peterson
Leonard V. Phillips
Keith D. Powelson
James M. Poynter
Thomas N. Quilter
Joseph E. F. Rankin
John W. Reece
Walter D. Reese
Albert L. Rhoades
Matthew P. Romeo
Delmar W. Ruthig
George F. Sager
Myron E. Samuelson
Peter W. Schneider
Harry F. Schwenger, Jr.
Leslie W. Sederstrom
Edwin P. Shanks
William C. Sharp, Jr.
Bernard D. Sherer
Daniel M. Shook
Edward M. Smith, Jr.
Carl C. Stanford
Marshal K. Steele, Jr.
Eugene C. Stone, Jr.
Marshall P. Stonestreet
William M. Strunk
Louis Sussman
Thomas H. Taber, Jr.
George J. Taylor III
George V. Teter, Jr.
Clayton L. Thomas
William R. Thomas
James I. Thorn
Edwin M. Tomlin
Anton A. Tratar
Lockland V. Tylor, Jr.
William A. Viele, Jr.
Roger K. Wallace
Ernest F. Wallner, Jr.
Herbert L. Walter
Stephen H. Ware, Jr.
Alan D. Watson
Lorrain E. Watters, Jr.
Gilbert A. Webb
Robert N. Webster
John P. Welborn, Jr.
Clay N. Wells
John F. Wetegrove
James E. Whiteside
Frederick G. F. Wiegand
Stewart A. Wilber
Richard K. Williams
Robert G. W. Williams, Jr.
Arthur J. Wilets
Theodore H. Wilson, Jr.
Harold E. Wood, Jr.
Edwin P. Woodward
William K. Woodard
Wayne L. Wright, Jr.
Norman F. Wyatt
John H. Young
George G. Zorn, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

John L. Adams
Douglas G. Aitken
Dan P. Appleby
James H. Ard
Herbert H. Aull
Donald W. Bahl
Russell H. Baisden
Conrad A. Barger
Alton W. Barton
Raymond H. Bates
Edward E. Beasley
Adrian D. Bell
George E. Bell
Keith Bennett
William S. Berkshire, Jr.
Andrew F. Bevill
Sherman W. Blandin, Jr.
Roland H. Bouchard
Richard K. M. Bridges, Jr.
Peniston E. Browne
Zack F. Brown, Jr.

William L. Bryson
Stanley A. Buzzelle
John J. Casey
Thomas A. Cassin
Franklyn L. Clark
Eldon O. Coffey
Murry Cohn
William W. Collier
Foster F. Comstock
James J. Conlin, Jr.
Raymond K. Connell
Francis S. Cooksey
Hugh L. Culbreath, Jr.
Clarence A. Creel
Philip Crosby
Oscar M. Dale
Charles Daniel, Jr.
Clemens J. Denne
Julius C. Dinkel
Lewis Dobbs
Glen L. Dunlap
Paul Elam
William W. Fink, Jr.
George L. Fitchett
William O. Foulkes
Roy W. Fox
Charles A. Gardner, Jr.
Elmon A. Geneste, Jr.
Leo P. Girard
Loyd Goolsby
Charles F. Grad
Anthony Grego
William N. Haddock
Harry J. Halley
Robert W. Hanwell
John G. Harper
Milton W. Harvey
Noble T. Hawkins
Paul W. Hebert
Carl L. Henn, Jr.
James W. Herb
James I. Hightower, Jr.
Jack W. Hillman
Robert C. Hobbs
George P. Hoffman
John W. Holmes
Carl M. Johnson
Kimey Johnson
William H. Johnson
Russell A. Jones
John E. Juracka
John C. Kelleher
Richard J. Kessler
Clyde D. Killion
Don H. Kleinhammer
Louie B. Knudsen, Jr.
Charles E. Kridle
Edward L. Kurek
David G. Lamborne
Carl E. Lamzik
James E. Laney
John W. Lipscomb, Jr
Kenneth W. Longnecker
Mathew Mackey, Jr.
Howard L. Madden
Charles M. Mason
Laurens B. Mathews
Lester G. Maxwell
Archie B. Meihls, Jr.
Herbert F. Mills, Jr.
Albert W. Moloney
Jack J. Moore
Francis W. Moseley
Wesley J. McClaren
Eyrie L. McCord
Robert J. McCormick
Edward M. McDonough
John E. McGraw
Gerry N. McLeod
Hugh A. McManus
Richard L. McNutt
Howard D. McPike
Richard E. Newton, Jr.
William A. Novak
Raymond S. O'Connell
James V. O'Connor
Paul D. O'Keefe
John J. O'Malley
John F. Paolantonio
Gerald J. Patton
Herman L. Philbrick
Robert K. Ponder
Robert C. Porter
William M. Poulson
Edmund J. Prosch
Lawrence O. Purkaple
Alvin H. Rampey
Elbert S. Rawls, Jr.
Frank R. Rephlo
Howard L. Rezner
Vernon G. Rivers
William J. Robinson
Edward S. Ruete
James M. Sappenfield
Robert A. Schauffler
Willard N. Schneider
Robert J. Schwarz
Clinton Searles
Paul C. Shumaker
William E. Sigman
Samuel R. Simpson, Jr.
Jack J. Skapin
Bert E. Smith
James A. Smith
Frank L. Spillman, Jr.
William W. Statia
William E. Stephens
Joseph H. Steveley
Hubert W. Stevens
Thomas E. Stevenson
Carl J. Stringer, Jr.
Donald D. Stumm
Toxie A. Thomas
Monte F. Tidmore
George H. Treece, Jr.
Earl A. Unger
Carl W. Utterback
Harris L. Vowels
David E. Ward
William A. Wheless
Charles E. Whiteside
William R. Whitney
Joe J. Wilcox
Wilbur A. G. Wilson
John J. Wohlschlaeger
Clarence S. Wood
Kenneth L. Woodfin
Paul W. Woodhead
James M. Wright
William D. Wright
Armand E. Wulffaert
William H. Yarborough

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Peter H. Brewerton
Harold H. Cummings
John M. Danielsen
Andrew J. Grygiel
Robert M. Harrison
Deane W. Kennedy
Robert F. Lang
Ernest W. Metzger
Glynn A. Oglesby
Samuel Sobel
Eugene S. Swanson
Edwin R. Weidler

LIEUTENANT, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Henry C. Besmen
Benjamin T. Dibble
Edward T. Diberto
Charles W. Graff
Ralph B. Grahl, Jr.
Robert B. Jarvis
Howard T. Johnson
Custer F. Krickenberger, Jr.
Foster M. Lalor, Jr.
John J. Manning, Jr.
Albert R. Marschall
Karl O. Munninger
Russell J. Rowson
George R. Shepard
Oliver R. Sholders
Henry E. Stephens
William B. Stephenson
Allen S. Waters
Ervin E. White
John P. Williams
Joe R. Wilson
Sidney J. Wynne, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS

Luke J. Braxmeier
Warren C. Caldwell, Jr.
Stewart T. Elder
Bert E. Eldred
Loren F. Enke
William N. Grammer
Lewis L. Gunther
Theodore R. Hunley
Charles E. Kailer
Harvey W. Lyon
James A. Mitchell
Neale H. Morrow
Ray B. Mueller
Wayne A. Nelson
Dwight W. Newman
Thomas J. Pape
Henry J. Ruff
Henry H. Scofield
John R. Sheppard
Carl B. Thimes
Enrique Valentin, Jr.
Walter F. Woodward
Robert P. B. Yingling

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Hugo B. Bergstrom
Booth Chilcutt
Neb B. Curtis
John W. Fechter
Francis H. Flynn
Thomas G. Fowler
Matthew F. Gallagher
Donald R. Gooden
Philip M. Griffith
Ernest N. Grover
Elie A. Guilbault
Richard W. Jenkins
Arthur E. Johnson
William E. Kelly
Charles B. Meek
Albert E. Mibeck
Guy H. Morgan
Solomon C. Pflug
Guy A. Richard
Richard C. Richardson
George W. Spotts
Walter L. Schamel
James E. Thompson
Sidney Weinstein
William F. C. Whalen
Sylvester H. N. Zumbrun

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Evelyn L. Aaberg
Sarah E. Adams
Barbara K. Allen
Grace L. Barrett
Elizabeth H. Barrington
Rita E. Belanger
Wilma R. Berg
Barbara E. Bernstein
Bertha Bernstein
Margaret B. Binkley
Julia M. Blair
Gaetana Blandino
Alice M. Bonora
Mary C. Burda
Clella P. Cain
Helen E. Casby
Ninetta M. Chapman
Mary G. Chisler
Jeanette F. Clabough
Ruth M. Crofton
Dorothy A. Dalesio
Marion M. Dooley
Anne Dubik
Virginia C. Duerr
Kathryn C. Duprea
Dorothy M. Edwards
Ruth S. Edmunds
Ruth E. Fabian
Elizabeth Feeney
Agnes Findlay
Cecilia C. Flannery
Frances J. Floriano
Hilda L. Freseman
Alice F. Gibbons
Edith Hall
Jean F. Halpin
Virginia S. Hamilton
Margaret J. Janney
Marguerite F. T. Johnson
Mary E. Kelly
Barbara A. Leonard
Eva M. Mahr
Helen L. Mongan
Elizabeth M. Murray
Elizabeth A. Nimits
Helen T. O'Brien
Eleanor R. O'Donnell
Sunshine M. Payne
Roberta E. Perron
Pauline M. Peters
Eunice E. Richardson
Irene I. Schanz
Lillian A. Shipman
Elizabeth L. Spangler
Laura M. Stevens
Wanda T. Szymborski
Mavis M. Thomas
Charlotte L. Venettozzi
Margaret W. Warren
Carrie J. Webb
Ethel M. Weik
Elsie L. Werner
Jean E. Wilson
Norma R. Wood

For temporary appointment in the Naval Reserve:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Boyd Nethercott

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS

Benjamin J. Gaieski
Walter W. Ledyard
William S. Markham
Gordon C. McNeilly
Bruce M. Sutton

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Charles C. McCall
Richard A. Wier
Wesley J. Wiggin

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Newell V. Brink
Thomas V. Edwards

LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS

William N. Grammer
Ray B. Mueller

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Jean E. Ackerman
Eleanor M. Antoine
Nancy M. Black
Louise Budrey
Jeanne E. Clarke
Alice J. Cochrane
Calla V. Goodwin
Frances L. Harris
Bette L. Klinger
Catherine M. McCleary
Eleanor R. O'Donnell
Lorene J. Peake
Irene V. Prue
Helen F. Rickard
Besse R. Rummel
Myrtle L. Woodall

For permanent appointment in the Naval Reserve:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), LINE

Penrose L. Albright
Edward H. Barnes
Stig G. Gavelin
John A. Hucksteadt
Elmer G. Huldtquist
Daniel R. Kinnaly
Alvin Masterson, Jr.
Edward J. Motzenbecker
Francis X. Sheehan
Alfred Stanford
Carl H. Swadell
Ronald A. Wallace
Gerald L. Wilda
Steve Zelisko

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), NURSE CORPS

Edith M. Goodell
Gladys I. Marsden
Julia M. Miller

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent or temporary appointment to the grades and corps indicated, and to correct typographical errors as previously nominated and confirmed.

For temporary appointment in the Navy:

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Henry S. Colony
Elmer R. King
Wilbur S. Lummis, Jr.
Arthur V. Miller, Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Richard A. Markham

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Chester M. Lessenden
Romulus L. May

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Ellsworth E. Richards

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Leif R. Larson

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Theron K. Eaton

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Cameron N. Stephenson

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Karl N. Keever

For permanent appointment in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Fonville Kelley

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Houston W. McGlothlin

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), LINE

William A. Buttlar
Robert F. Schniedwind

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Joseph H. Benton

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, Thou dost gladden our eyes and thrill our beings with the glory

of Thy handiwork. Thou hast written Thy law in our hearts. In Thy fellowship alone we find peace for our spirits and power for our tasks. On every side Thou hast multiplied Thy benedictions. For the beauty of nature, in which Thou hast housed us like royal children in a palace, we thank Thee.

Save us from walking in a rich world yet being poor because our eyes are holden and our hearts calloused and insensitive.

In days of crisis and alarm, which are also days of opportunity and privilege, raise up the spirit of this people into unselfish citizenship. Make us hate with a deep and persistent hatred the things that should be hated and regard with holy indignation any act or attitude that betrays the public trust. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 12, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On May 11, 1950:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

On May 13, 1950:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLIKIN were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 1 week beginning today.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAMS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FREAR was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the next 10 days, because of official business for the Subcommittee on Reconstruction Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCCARRAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Mundt
Benton	Holland	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Conor
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Darby	Kilgore	Stennis
Donnell	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Langer	Taylor
Eastland	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Lodge	Thye
Ferguson	Long	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	Young
Hill	Maybank	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matter for the RECORD, without debate, and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATING TO NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 176, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said committee during the Eighty-first Congress, first session, relative to the national health plan

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITION

Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) presented resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO WORK FOR THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Whereas the people of Ireland after long years of trial and tribulation have finally established their own free Government, and Ireland is now a sovereign, independent democratic state; and

Whereas the dream and the goal of all Irishmen has ever been a free and united Ireland; and

Whereas at the present time but six counties, politically a part of the United Kingdom, are set off from the rest of Ireland, and through political machinations and propaganda are denied the opportunity of uniting with their fellow countrymen: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to reaffirm its tenets of the democratic principle of the rights of any people to determine its own form of government, to work for the abolition of the present partition of Ireland, and to promote the establishment of a united Ireland with all Irishmen under one government and one flag; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted May 3, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, May 9, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

IMPORTATION OF RUBBER AND OTHER PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Connecticut, relating to the importation of rubber and other products.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See text of resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice

President on May 11, 1950, p. 6889, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

DISPOSITION OF LABOR DISPUTES—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at a meeting held April 14–16, 1950, by the board of directors of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, at French Lick, Ind., relating to the disposition of transportation labor questions.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON AMENDMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Labor legislation in the field of transportation should be developed and strengthened so that it can fairly and consistently dispose of labor-management problems without resort to strikes. Certain States have already pioneered in this field to the point of outlawing strikes with respect to all public utilities including transportation. It would seem not only consistent but highly essential that Federal legislation be developed to adequately protect both labor and management as well as the public interest in the disposition of transportation labor questions. The Railway Labor Act could be amended to form the basis for this kind of legislation and the decisions or proper boards of labor adjustment could be appealable to, and made enforceable in, the regular courts.

The board of directors of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce recommends that the Railway Labor Act be amended and strengthened to provide legal methods of fully disposing of labor controversies that will be fair and equitable to labor, management, investors, and to the general public and without interference with transportation service.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received this morning a letter from V. H. Hurless, comptroller of the city of Milwaukee, enclosing a copy of an important resolution adopted by the common council of that great metropolis on May 8, 1950.

The resolution presented five recommendations for incorporation in the new Federal-aid highway legislation now pending before the House of Representatives.

We of Wisconsin are very proud of our road system but we are aware of the fact that there is still tremendous room for highway improvement and that such improvement involves traffic expenses.

I believe that the resolution will be of interest to my colleagues and so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Federal motor vehicle taxes paid by highway users exceed $1,000,000,000 annually; and

Whereas more than 50 percent of all vehicle-miles are traveled on urban streets; and

Whereas the average city main street carries six times as much traffic as the average main rural road; and

Whereas cities' street systems must be adequate to handle heavy traffic flows if the total United States highway system is to function properly; and

Whereas the average per mile cost of urban road construction is more than eight times that of the average rural road; and

Whereas Milwaukee and many other cities are finding that there is no substitute for express highways but that such highways are expensive to build and to maintain; and

Whereas cities are unable to build and to maintain sorely needed highway improvements without substantial contributions from the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is requested to incorporate the following five recommendations in their Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950:

1. At least $125,000,000 should be annually made available for projects in urban areas.

2. Urban area funds which are not used by certain States because those States are unable to provide the required matching money should be annually redistributed to those States which can match it.

3. A discretionary fund of not less than $25,000,000 should be provided annually for distribution to the States on the basis of critical needs.

4. Fifty percent of costs of acquiring rights-of-way should be payable from Federal-aid highway funds.

5. Urban areas which incur debt to expedite the federally aided highway system within their cities should be able to use Federal-aid funds for the repayment of such indebtedness; and be it further

Resolved, That the Comptroller be and hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to those Senators and Representatives who represent the city of Milwaukee and to the members of the Senate Committee on Public Works.

THE 12½-PERCENT MILLING PROVISION—TELEGRAM FROM R. H. McCLAIN

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from R. H. McClain, district vice president of the American Federation of Grain Millers International Union of Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. McClain points out in his telegram to me the disastrous effect that will follow the deletion of the 12½-percent milling provision in H. R. 7797.

Only last year by reason of a compromise there was retained the 12½-percent milling provision. In my opinion, no one can contend that the retention of this percentage, which is relatively low, could or would work a hardship in any manner whatever. The American taxpayers have furnished the funds most generously for the rehabilitation and for aid and assistance of needy European countries in the European recovery program. The products of our milling industry certainly are needed in the ECA program, and I am sure that the producers as well as the processors of wheat throughout the United States will consider the deletion of this 12½ percent as a direct blow aimed at the sections of this country which are vitally interested in the production and the processing of wheat of all kinds.

As a Senator from one of the great wheat-producing sections, in conjunction with others who feel as I do, I protest this proposed deletion. It is of such vital importance that I think it should be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress, the industry, and the people at large.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 15, 1950.*

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appeal to you to contact meeting on Joint House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committee and request that you retain the 12½-percent milling provision in H. R. 7797. We received word this morning that joint committee had decided to delete this provision but as yet their action has not been reported out of committee and there is a possibility that they would change their present position. If this provision is deleted, it means that several thousand people in flour milling industry will be thrown out of work and put on relief rolls. Also, many mills will be forced to shut down. Last year, foreign export of flour decreased 69 percent. We need the by products to be used for commercial feed purposes in this country. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

R. H. McCLAIN,
District Vice President, American Federation of Grain Millers International Union.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 2386. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals, experiment station at Reno, Nev.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1558).

H. R. 7984. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557).

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY PERSONNEL AND INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 275), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Eighty-first Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $3,000 (in addition to amounts heretofore made available for such purposes), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3587. A bill to provide for certain per capita payments to members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3588. A bill for the relief of Luigi Dini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3589. A bill to waive in certain cases the priority of payment of debts owing to the United States in the administration of a deceased debtor's estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 3590. A bill for the relief of Toshiki Ishigo and his children, Kiyoko and Chiyiko Ishigo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3591. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Rebekah Degree, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IVES (by request):

S. 3592. A bill to increase the opportunities of blind persons for employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 3593. A bill for the relief of Nicolas de Rochefort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE PATH TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DWORSHAK

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the Mother's Day ceremonies sponsored by the American War Mothers, at Arlington National Cemetery, on May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT WE MUST DO TO STAY FREE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUNDT

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, What We Must Do To Stay Free, delivered by him at the annual membership meeting of the Executive-Foreman's Club of Elizabeth, N. J., with the questions and answers which ensued, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON FIRST FLIGHT'S DAY OF ROCK COUNTY AIRPORT

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the dedication ceremony of the Rock County Airport at Beloit, Wis., on May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a meeting of the Greater New York Hospital Association, in New York City, on May 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY BERNARD M. BARUCH AT THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND CIVIC ADMINISTRATION, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch at the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the School of Business and Civic Administration, College of the City of New York, on May 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SYMINGTON ENERGIZES RESOURCES BOARD—ARTICLE FROM THE SUNDAY STAR

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Symington Energizes Resources Board," published in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDIAN BUREAU BUDGET PROPOSALS—LETTER FROM PURL WILLIS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated May 8, 1950, addressed to him by Purl Willis, counselor, Mission Indian Federation, San Diego, Calif., dealing with the budget proposals of the Indian Bureau for the Indians of California, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. TRUMAN BUILDS A (FIGURATIVE) DAM—ARTICLE BY EDWARD H. COLLINS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Truman Builds a (Figurative) Dam," written by Edward H. Collins, and published in the New York Times of May 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMPLOYMENT OF NEGROES IN BOSTON STORES—ARTICLE BY LAURA HADDOCK

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Better Jobs for Negroes Widening in Boston Stores," written by Laura Haddock, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GLORY OF AMERICAN HISTORY—EDITORIAL BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Glory of American History," written by Harry H. Schlacht, and published in the New York Journal-American of May 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILROAD STRIKE—ARTICLE BY W. H. LAWRENCE

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the railroad strike, by W. H. Lawrence, from the New York Times of May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILWAY STRIKE—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. DONNELL, by separate requests, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD 16 newspaper editorials, articles, and letters regarding the current railway strike, which appear in the Appendix.]

INDEPENDENCE OF FARMERS—ARTICLE BY PAUL C. JOHNSON

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "It's High Time the Farmer Threw Away Crutches," written by Paul C. Johnson and published in the Washington Post of May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAMPAIGN OF TRUTH—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Campaign of Truth," published in the Washington Post of May 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL—NEWSPAPER AND CONGRESSIONAL COMMENTS

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from newspaper reports and comments and quotations from Members of Congress concerning the Kerr natural-gas bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON IN 1800—ARTICLE BY ALEXANDER R. GEORGE

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning Washington in 1800, written by Alexander R. George and published in the Washington Post of May 8, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROBLEM OF OLD-AGE SECURITY

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD some excerpts from the testimony of Prof. Sumner H. Slichter before the Senate Finance Committee in support of an expanded old-age insurance program, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNDER-COVER DEMOCRACY—EDITORIAL FROM THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser of Friday, May 12, entitled "Under-Cover Democracy," which points out clearly how completely the Democratic Party in Hawaii is controlled by the ILWU group, an organization that is generally considered as Communist controlled.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER-COVER DEMOCRACY

Stripped of camouflage and false fronts, the question that Hawaii's Democrats are faced with today is whether their party shall be the personal possession of an undercover group, meeting secretly at a private home in the dead of night, or a public political organization subject to the will of its members.

The issue was raised in 1946 when Harry Bridges' agents packed the Democratic precinct clubs and took over the party machinery.

It was brought into focus when these leaders, who gained power through a coup, refused to aid in an investigation of communism conducted here by a Democrat-majority committee of Congress.

It came to a crisis when straight-line Democrats refused to sit in convention with these recalcitrant witnesses and set up a separate organization which recognized the authority of National Committeeman Charles E. Kauhane and National Committeewoman Victoria K. Holt, whom the left-wingers attempted to "fire" although they had no authority to do so.

It reached a climax when the left-wingers met secretly at night to set up a front organization listing new names but behind which remained the same old influences that have led Hawaii's Democrats into strange paths during the past 4 years.

The attempt to unseat Hawaii's members of the Democratic National Committee is not the gravest aspect of the situation the left-wingers have created but it presents probably the most graphic illustration of the arrogance of the captors who have seized the party machinery. Mr. Kauhane and Mrs. Holt already are members of the national committee for terms that have not expired. That committee is the judge of its own membership. No cliques outside the committee can remove its members. That is an

authority which the committee alone possesses.

To attempt to usurp this authority was a disservice to democracy in Hawaii that puts the Territory and its statehood aspirations in a bad light before a Democratic national administration. To follow it with an underground operation to dominate Hawaii's Democrats was an affront to the party's rank and file that is certain to be a source of deep resentment which is particularly harmful in an election year.

The Democratic Party in Hawaii is suffering bitterly from self-inflicted wounds. Still these need not be fatal if the rank and file Democrats throughout the Territory take their party's affairs into their own hands, remold them into the time-honored form that has earned the public's respect and demand unity of purpose among their leaders.

Hawaii's Democrats, leaders and followers, would do well to sit humbly at the foot of veteran Manuel Pacheco's hospital bed and listen to his wise counsel. "Politics, like everything else, needs sensible leadership, not selfish leadership," Sage Pacheco advises.

EFFECTS OF THE RAILROAD STRIKE—NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of many telegrams I have been receiving in connection with the strike of locomotive firemen. This telegram from E. C. Moriarty points out the present existing conditions as the strike affects the Santa Fe Railroad system from Los Angeles, Calif., to the city of Wichita, Kans. It is of such importance that I think it should be brought to the attention of the Senate of the United States and the country at large.

It shows the necessity of some practical type of legislation to protect the public interest and the thousands of communities of our country, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of people who are presently affected, and the millions who will be affected in the future if this strike continues.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA, KANS., *May 14, 1950.*

Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I just arrived from California on the Santa Fe Chief, one of the two trains running out of the seven California trains they regularly operate. The trip gave me a close-up view of the creeping paralysis being imposed on the country by a handful of railroad employees. At Los Angeles the effect was not so noticeable on account of the size of the city, but at the busy division point of Barstow the effect was becoming evident, and at Albuquerque the next morning started to become a disaster, as over a thousand employees in no way on strike will be laid off on the 15th. At La Junta, over 300 will be laid off, and at Newton several hundred, with smaller layoffs at intermediate points. Albuquerque is a city of about 90,000 and is entirely without railroad-freight service, and as you know, one of the all-important defense works is in that immediate vicinity. This strike would be ridiculous if it was not so serious, and probably the next thing you will hear of will be that the chair-car porters will go on strike for at least two men to a car, establish a picket line and tie up the country's rail transportation. The railroad brotherhoods were the first pressure group to bluff the Government into passing special-class legislation for their special benefit when the Adamson Act was passed in 1917. At that time the late E. P. Ripley said that the action of Congress in letting anyone bluff them into special legislation in the face of a national emergency would plague this country as long as we existed, and I guess he was right. This can no longer be a one-way street and if the brotherhoods insist on accepting only Government benefits without thought of their responsibility to the public, some action will have to be taken by Congress to insure such protection as the right to strike has now gone beyond all reason. Anyone who says a national emergency is not being created, must be crazy. One of the things that alarms me most is the apathy with which the general public and affected communities accept such high-handed abuse. I fear we are losing our fighting spirit.

E. C. MORIARTY.

EFFECT OF THE RAILROAD STRIKE ON CALIFORNIA CROPS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD two telegrams I have received from growers' organizations in California pointing out the serious and adverse effect the railroad strike is now having on the crops that are coming into the harvest at the present time in California, and what the ultimate effects will be if the strike is continued.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *May 14, 1950.*

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We as growers and shipper of 3,000 cars fresh fruits and vegetables yearly and now in peak of production being shipped interstate, strongly urge you use every means within your office to bring the present unjustified railroad strike to termination immediately, otherwise we and the entire vegetable and fruit industry face severe losses and possible crop disaster account of inadequate service and increasingly shortage of refrigerator cars for loading on nonstriking railroads.

DARRIGO BROS. CO. OF CALIFORNIA.

BRAWLEY, CALIF., *May 13, 1950.*

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The harvesting of the highly perishable Imperial Valley cantaloupes, watermelons, tomatoes now under way. It cannot be delayed. A total railroad strike would deprive great many people who follow vegetable harvest of an important part of their yearly wage. Also a year's work, money, and effort has gone into these perishable crops. We respectfully request and know you will do all possible to facilitate settlement railroad strike.

JACK BROS. & MCBURNEY, INC.

POOLING OF HEAVY INDUSTRIES OF FRANCE AND GERMANY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I issued to the press on May 12.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The announcement by the French Government of its decision to pool the heavy industries of France and Germany looks like the best news to come out of Europe since the ending of World War II insofar as the prevention of world war III is concerned.

It is obviously a great thing from a political and a military standpoint and, if it does not mean a new European cartel, it should be a splendid step forward in the economic sense. Taken in conjunction with the North Atlantic Pact it should give new life to the idea of building a group of nations in western Europe which are strong not only economically, but militarily as well.

It gives new hope and new confidence—and happily, hope and confidence can snowball just as effectively as can suspicion and fear.

Basing my opinion entirely on the news reports and without having yet had time to read the document, it appears clear to me that this is a proposal which the United States should support enthusiastically, and I am glad the Secretary of State has done so.

The French statesmen are entitled to congratulations for their courage and creative political spirit.

WAIVING OF PAYMENT OF DUTY ON CERTAIN IMPORTATIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1555, House Joint Resolution 466, which the House has passed without dissent, and which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Finance. It permits the importation without the payment of tariff charges of certain articles from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the first United States International Trade Fair, in Chicago. If the articles are kept in this country for more than 3 months, they become subject to duty. If they are sold, they become subject to duty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 466) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is the kind of measure which the junior Senator from Nebraska had suggested the Senate ought to consider even though the motion to consider the FEPC bill is pending before the Senate. I made the statement on the floor that I thought only privileged matters should come up during debate on FEPC proposal. However, the joint resolution should be considered immediately, in order that exhibitors may be assured that there will be no tariff charged on their exhibits, unless they decide to sell them or keep them in the country more than 90 days. The provisions of the joint resolution have been narrowed considerably from the bill in which the junior Senator from Illinois was interested some time ago. I understand the bill has been reported unanimously, and the junior Senator from Nebraska is glad to join the Senator from Georgia in having the joint resolution considered at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Its application has been narrowed to this one exhibition at

Chicago, which is to open early in August.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FILING OF CLOTURE PETITION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the announcement made on Friday last by the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS], I ask unanimous consent to address an inquiry to the acting majority leader as to whether or not it is now the intention of the majority to file a cloture petition on the pending motion to consider the FEPC bill on Wednesday of this week. The majority leader announced that if some arrangement could not be made to bring up the bill for debate, it was his probable intention to file a cloture petition on Wednesday.

My reason for the request is that if such action is to be taken, I should like to know it and be able to announce the program to all Senators on this side of the aisle, and see that they are present Friday to vote on the cloture petition.

Mr. MYERS. It is my understanding that the majority leader announced definitely that he would not file the petition before Wednesday, but that it would probably be filed Wednesday, to be voted on Friday. I think the Senator is safe in announcing to the Senators on his side of the aisle that no cloture petition will be filed before Wednesday.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the intention that the petition shall be filed on Wednesday?

Mr. MYERS. My understanding is that it is the intention to file the petition on Wednesday.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS—TELEGRAM TO HERBERT HOOVER BY SENATOR TOBEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous consent agreement of Friday last the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, if I may do so without prejudice to my right to the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I desire to read a telegram which I am today dispatching to the Honorable Herbert Hoover, as follows:

HERBERT HOOVER:

On February 15, 1949, I voluntarily took a national radio hookup to support Hoover Commission reports. This speech, entitled "Curbing the Octopus" attracted favorable national response, particularly in State of New Hampshire, where I distributed thousands of copies in effort to marshal public support for your outstanding work, and a personal letter of appreciation from you. I might add, parenthetically, that a special session of the New Hampshire State Legislature is currently and successfully making a sweeping reorganization of that State's government acting under the recommendations of Gov. Sherman Adams and a fine bipartisan commission. This action has overwhelming public support in my State and my personal endorsement as an individual voter there. This, I believe, is an indication of what can be accomplished when an alerted and informed public opinion speaks out. In my opinion the efficient reorganization of the Federal Government, in line with your recommendations, faces an acute crisis. Group after group has sponsored resolutions of disapproval for specific reorganization plans submitted by the President under Reorganization Act of 1949. According to the Washington Star of May 14, the members of the powerful transportation lobby have forgotten individual competitive infighting long enough to combine to defeat plans of reorganization Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Maritime Commission, and others. This and other groups insist these and other reorganization plans "not in line with Hoover Commission recommendations," "establish dictators of Commission chairman;" "delegate powers of Congress to the Executive." Not to be confused with these lobbies, individual industrialists of my State, men of highest integrity and perspicacity have written me to vote against several reorganization plans.

There are many busy members of United States Senate such as myself who are not members of Executive Expenditures Committee and hence not in position to determine fine points of these arguments. It is imperative in the interest of efficient government and increased economy, that you speak out specifically and unequivocably on the reorganization plans coming to vote in Senate this week. Are the arguments raised by these special groups and individuals valid or are they a further case of "reorganize everybody else but me." Troubled and busy Senators such as myself who can and will vote independently and resolutely in the public interest and not at the beck and call of special groups need your unqualified answer. Time and the opportunity to implement the reports of your Commission are slipping away and the climate to reorganize is daily growing more unfavorable under the incessant hammering of these special groups, both within and without the Government.

I appeal to you to speak out in clarion tones to cap your distinguished public career which, in its humanitarian aspects and length of public service, is without parallel in this country. I am prepared to go down the line for well-thought-out and specific views expressed by you at this time.

CHARLES W. TOBEY.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE PROPOSED FREEDOM FAIR

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, when things go wrong and when failures occur, it is a human weakness to try to place the blame on the other fellow. It is rare indeed when a person has the courage to be fair enough and big enough to take the blame himself.

The failure of the proposed Freedom Fair has been laid at the doorstep of Congress by some people. One noncongressional member of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission has been quoted by the press as saying:

It's unfortunate the Eightieth Congress (which passed the Sesqui Act) didn't give us the tools to work with.

It is gratifying that another noncongressional member of the Commission has taken issue with that statement, which seeks to place the blame on Congress, and in challenging that statement has countered with the statement that—

It seems to me that both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses gave everything they were asked to give, and the lack of legislative authority to proceed with the Freedom Fair must be charged to the Commission itself.

Mr. Joseph C. McGarraghy, chairman of the executive committee of the Commission, displayed admirable fairness and rare courage to resist the human weakness of blaming the other fellow. He backed up his statement in a letter of May 11, 1950, to Mr. Carter Barron. As an ex officio member of the Commission, I agree with Mr. McGarraghy, and I commend his fairness.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter to Mr. Barron, a copy of which was sent to me without comment, be inserted in the RECORD to keep the record straight on the ill-fated Freedom Fair.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1950.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Enclosed is copy of my letter of today to Mr. Barron which is self-explanatory.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. MCGARRAGHY.

MAY 11, 1950.

Mr. CARTER T. BARRON,
Executive Vice Chairman, National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, Loew's Capitol Theater, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CARTER: Today's issue of the Washington Post contains the following quotation attributed to you:

"It's unfortunate the Eightieth Congress (which passed the Sesqui Act) didn't give us the tools to work with."

This quotation, which is along the general line of other comments which have appeared in the press from time to time, makes it important, it seems to me, that the record be kept straight regarding the legislative history.

In the latter part of 1948 a meeting of citizens was held in the United States Chamber of Commerce Building, pursuant to call of the Washington Building Congress at which it was voted to create a committee to sponsor legislation for appropriate commemoration of the sesquicentennial.

As a result of that meeting a Citizen's Sesqui-Centennial Committee was organized of which you, Mr. Fleming, and I were members. There was a total membership of 15.

The committee met on December 27, 1948, and elected officers. The committee then considered draft of a bill as submitted by General Grant. It was decided to refer the matter to a subcommittee of three to put the bill in final form. The subcommittee consisted of Messrs. Frederic P. Lee, Christopher B. Garnett, and Charles H. Tompkins. The first two named are well-known lawyers.

This subcommittee prepared a revised draft of the bill and thereafter the Citizens' Committee submitted it to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the request that the Commissioners sponsor the legislation.

The proposed bill was considered at a meeting of the Board of Commissioners on January 21, 1947, and on January 30, 1947, the Commissioners wrote the committee that

they "endorse the plan outlined in the proposed bill." They then proposed certain minor changes in the draft but still not changing any of the essential features.

My files indicate that on February 4, 1947, as chairman of the citizens' committee, I advised each member of the action of the Commissioners (my file contains carbon copy of my letter of that date addressed to you.) Thereafter we arranged to have the bill introduced in the Eightieth Congress and it was enacted by that Congress in the terms recommended by the committee.

I am certain that at no time during the discussion of the proposed legislation was there any mentioned of a Freedom Fair and it does seem to me that we subject ourselves to proper criticism when we criticize the Eightieth Congress for failure to give us the tools to work with when the fact is that the Congress enacted precisely the legislation requested.

As you know, the legislation creating the Sesquicentennial Commission as passed by the Eightieth Congress was not intended to and did not do more than set up the Commission which would report to the Congress and seek further enabling legislation. If there was any failure of the Congress to give us the tools to work with, it seems to me that we should look to the further enabling legislation which was enacted by the Eighty-first Congress. However, here again I do not see how the Congress can be blamed, for the fact is that the further enabling legislation which was passed by the Eighty-first Congress was in accordance with the request of the Commission which had then come into being and, if the Commission failed to include in its proposed legislation adequate tools to put on a Freedom Fair, we certainly cannot blame the Congress for failure to provide the tools.

Of course, the further fact is that the idea of a Freedom Fair was not discussed by the Commission until the meeting of the Commission held at the White House on April 15, 1949, when the plans were unveiled for the first time. Since the further enabling legislation had been drafted prior to that meeting and actually was embodied in joint resolutions introduced by Senator McGrath and Mrs. NORTON on March 22, 1949, I do not think we can criticize the Eighty-first Congress for failure in that resolution to provide the tools to execute a program subsequently brought forward.

I think the record should be kept straight that the original legislation creating the Sesquicentennial Commission was passed in the form requested by the Citizens' Committee at which time there had been no expressions about a Freedom Fair.

It seems to me that both the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congress gave everything they were asked to give and the lack of legislative authority to proceed with the Freedom Fair must be charged to the Commission itself.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the other members of the executive committee.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. MCGARRAGHY.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

FRIENDS AND OPPONENTS OF CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield, provided it does not have the effect of taking me off the floor or of interfering in any way with my position.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] may yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan at this time, with that understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in connection with the debate on the FEPC, I merely desire to make a few remarks this morning. I think it will be found interesting if I show what is currently going on in connection with that measure. Mr. Truman, on his "nonpolitical" whistle-stop tour of the West of course advised the people that he and his party were all for the civil-rights program. He insisted that they are a unit upon that particular program. Difficulty is apparently being experienced in maintaining that unity. A sort of round-table discussion took place in Chicago yesterday on the subject, and in the Baltimore Sun, Mr. Thomas O'Neill gives an account of it. What he has to say I think clearly demonstrates there is great difficulty keeping the wraps around this united program, and I think it clearly shows what is going to happen in the Senate regarding FEPC.

I have been in the Senate but a short time, this being my second term. During my first term, I had occasion to serve on a steering committee which sought to have considered the anti-poll-tax bill and certain other so-called civil-rights bills. The distinguished Senator from New York at that time, Mr. Mead, was on that committee. We could never get to first base in our effort to have the Senate consider those bills, and I think the real facts of the situation are coming to light now.

The two distinguished Senators from Alabama have stated their positions on the civil-rights program, describing the unity which exists on the subject within the Democratic Party. I think the public should realize exactly what is happening. From the Baltimore Sun, let me read the following:

Most of those in attendance at the civil-rights panel departed early and missed the high spot. That was the unscheduled appearance of a southern member of the Democratic National Committee to take issue vigorously with the long list of scheduled speakers who had all solemnly declared the need for immediate enactment of the fair-employment-practices bill now up in the Senate.

DANIELS REFUSES TO SWERVE

The unexpected voice was that of Jonathan Daniels, of Raleigh, N. C., who was formerly a White House aide to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and is a recognized leader of liberal political forces in the South.

Repeated attempts were made by the authorities in charge of the program to dissuade Daniels. Among those who took him aside for earnest solicitations in the name of party harmony—

I repeat, "in the name of party harmony" trying to deceive the American people. Who were those persons?

Among those who took him aside for earnest solicitations in the name of party harmony were Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and Mrs. India Edwards, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Daniels would not be turned aside by soft discourse.

Other means of discourging him were tried. The panel chairman, Senator GREEN, Democrat, Rhode Island, called 18 speakers, some of them unusually voluble, while Daniels squirmed and sent repeated messages to the presiding officer.

VOTED FOR TRUMAN

At the end, beyond the hour when the committee had agreed to relinquish the meeting room in the the Sherman Hotel, Senator GREEN announced:

"I had hoped to have time for a question period. Most of the questions you would have asked, I believe, have already been answered in the statements made.

"One gentleman, however, asked me some time ago to call on him. I feel I must let him have a few minutes."

Mr. President, after taking all this time and thinking they had unity on this question wrapped up, what do they do in the great thriving city of Chicago? They try by every possible means to deceive the public as to the unity of the Democrats on this great issue now before the Senate.

I want to quote from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. In a recent speech in Alabama the Senator from Alabama said:

Some seem to think that the Republicans are our friends in defeating civil-rights proposals. Such is simply not the case.

We hear on the floor, we read in the newspapers that there is a bloc of northern Republicans and southern Democrats out to defeat FEPC legislation and other civil-rights bills, such as antilynching bills and anti-poll-tax bills. There is nothing further from the truth. Let me read the authority for my statement that there is nothing further from the truth than the statement that here is such a bloc of northern Republicans and southern Democrats. It comes from a member of the bloc of southern Democratic Senators who might well like to see a coalition with anyone on this question. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is still speaking, and I quote:

I have before me an AP news item of April 12, the headline of which tells the story. I quote: "Republicans Demand Act on FEPC."

In recent months a civil-rights amendment has been offered to three different measures, all important to the South. In each instance the amendment was offered by a Republican Senator, and in each instance the Republicans voted strongly for the amendment, and the Democrats, northern and southern alike, voted against it.

Mr. President, ever since I have been in the Senate, civil-rights bills have been defeated as the result of combinations of northern Democrats and southern Democrats, and not northern Republicans and southern Democrats.

Let me now read a statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]:

If our group of southern Senators is to continue to defeat these civil-rights bills, we must keep the power and influence we hold as members of the Democratic Party.

I repeat: "of the Democratic Party."

We know the Republican history of the civil-rights bills. When the people of the Second Alabama District first sent me to Congress some 25 years ago, the House of Representatives was engaged in a fight over the antilynching bill. It was a Republican bill, just as the antilynching bill on the calendar of the Senate today is a Republican bill, introduced by the Republican Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The Republican Party brought the civil-rights bills into being, and today the Republican leader in the House and the Republican leader in the Senate proclaim the Republican Party's solemn commitment to these bills.

Mr. President, this language and what happened in Chicago, should spike forever the statement that there is a conspiracy between northern Republicans and southern Democrats. The real conspiracy, Mr. President, is between northern Democrats and southern Democrats. Behind the scenes they are doing, and for years past have done, everything they can to defeat civil-rights legislation.

Mr. President, I ask that excerpts from the addresses by the Senators from Alabama be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The extracts from the addresses by Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN are as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The following excerpts are from speeches made over State-wide radio hookups on April 12–17 by Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN J. SPARKMAN of Alabama:

I. SENATOR LISTER HILL, MONTGOMERY, ALA., APRIL 12, 1950

"I am a States' Rights Democrat. I have fought the battle of States' rights. I have kept the faith. I tell you it is the power and influence of your Senators and Congressmen that has made possible the defeat of FEPC and the other so-called civil-rights bills. They hold this power and influence as members of the Democratic Party.

"The anti-poll-tax bill is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee. Senator JOHN C. STENNIS of Mississippi is chairman of this subcommittee because of his membership in the Democratic Party. If he were a member of a Dixiecrat splinter party he could not be chairman of this committee or any other committee. He could have little influence in the fight against the civil-rights bills.

"The general civil-rights bill is bottled up today in a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator JIM EASTLAND of Mississippi is chairman of this subcommittee because of his membership in the Democratic Party. If he were not a Democrat he could not be chairman of this committee or any other committee.

"As a Democrat, I hold a place on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I led the fight in the committee against the FEPC bill, and the committee dropped the bill like a foundling on the Senate's doorstep—without a word in its favor.

"We know the Republican history of the civil-rights bills. When the people of the Second Alabama District first sent me to Congress some 25 years ago, the House of Representatives was engaged in a fight over the antilynching bill. It was a Republican bill, just as the antilynching bill on the calendar of the Senate today is a Republican bill, introduced by the Republican Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

"The Republican Party brought the civil-rights bills into being and today the Republican leader in the House and the Republican leader in the Senate proclaim the Republican Party's solemn commitment to these bills.

"If our group of southern Senators is to continue to defeat these civil-rights bills, we must keep the power and influence we hold as members of the Democratic Party.

* * * * *

"We cannot put off this decision. We live in the Democratic Party every day in the year. We meet our problems day by day—as Democrats. We won the fight for our cotton and peanut farmers—as Democrats. We hold the line against the civil-rights bills—as Democrats."

II. SENATOR JOHN J. SPARKMAN, MOBILE, ALA., APRIL 17, 1950

"There are some things about the Democratic Party that I do not like; some parts of the platform that I will not accept; some of the legislative program that I will not support. We do not have to sacrifice any of our convictions. I am against the civil-rights proposals—always have been and always will be. One of the first votes I cast upon going to Congress 14 years ago was against one of these bills. Almost every year since then I have voted against such proposals.

"To listen to some of those who would lead us into a splinter party, one would think that the civil-rights proposals were first made in 1948. They have been coming up with consistent regularity since shortly after the Civil War. During the time I have been in Congress I have voted against them more than a dozen times. In the 1890's, Alabama's great Democratic Senator John T. Morgan led a successful filibuster against such legislation proposed by Republicans to punish the South.

"The platforms of both great parties for many, many years have carried similar proposals for so-called civil-rights legislation. Every platform upon which Franklin D. Roosevelt ran contained such proposals—and Alabama gladly supported Roosevelt without question.

"By the way, we southern Democrats had the chance to have the same language on civil rights, almost word for word, in the 1948 platform as was in the Roosevelt platform in 1944. I can say that the decision was Alabama's to make. I was in the hotel meeting of the Alabama delegation that hot Sunday afternoon when the proposal was made. But unfortunately, half of our delegates had gone to that convention determined to walk out and they were determined that nothing should happen to keep them from walking out. So they refused to accept the 1944 version and thereby brought about the fight in the convention that resulted in the more objectionable language in the platform. They took the position that they would not play unless they could write every single rule. That is the attitude that the Dixicrats are taking today. You and I know that games are not played that way.

"Even though the Democratic platform, as well as the Republican, carried a pledge for civil-rights legislation, no such law has been enacted. And I predict that if you do not take away from us who represent you in Congress the power that is ours as long as we can operate as Democrats—on the inside—there will not be any such legislation.

"After all civil-rights legislation is not defeated by Dixiecrat maneuvers in Alabama nor by threats of the formation of a splinter party. In the past it has always been defeated on the floor of the Senate. There and there alone must we look for its defeat in the future.

"We southern Democratic Senators—21 of us—are banded together and pledged to use every parliamentary device possible to defeat civil-rights legislation. And listen to this: Every single one of those 21 southern Democratic Senators believes that we should stay in the Democratic Party. We know what our most important weapon is. It is the ability to work as Democrats.

"Some seem to think that the Republicans are our friends in defeating civil-rights proposals. Such is simply not the case. I have before me an AP news item of April 12, the headline of which tells the story. I quote: 'Republicans demand act on FEPC.'

"In recent months a civil-rights amendment has been offered to three different measures, all important to the South. In each instance the amendment was offered by a Republican Senator and in each instance the Republicans voted strongly for the amendment and the Democrats—northern and southern alike—voted against.

"On a Republican proposal to tie civil rights to Federal aid for education, not a single Democrat voted for it. On the Republican proposal to tie civil rights to housing, the Republicans voted almost solidly for it while only three Democrats voted that way. A similar Republican attempt to tie civil rights to oleo tax repeal bill was strongly supported by Republicans, but opposed unanimously by Democrats.

"Let us never for one moment be fooled into thinking that we can depend on Republicans help to defeat these measures.

"I repeat: We must depend upon our group of 21 southern Senators operating as Democrats inside the Democratic Party.

"Alabama has much to lose in getting out of the Democratic Party."

Mr. WHERRY. What is the date of the Hill release?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is April 12, 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the date of the Sparkman release?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is April 17, 1950.

Mr. WHERRY. They were both released prior to the Democratic primaries.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I think it was very significant that we were unable to get the pending bill on FEPC to the floor before the Florida and Alabama primaries. It did not come up for weeks. The same difficulty has so far stymied my antilynching bill, which has been on the Senate Calendar and ready for vote since last June, almost a full year It is always being put off.

Now we see this spectacle in Chicago yesterday. What were they trying to do? They were trying to show the Democrats that there was unity among all Democrats to pass the bill. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee did not want Mr. Jonathan Daniels to upset the apple cart by revealing to the people the real truth as to what goes on within the Democratic Party.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the argument could not go a step further in order to show that, so far from there being a Democrat-Republican bloc, the Republicans generally have not voted for anything that would help the South.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the South has done pretty well in connection with appropriations, if that means anything in reply to the question. I say there is no conspiracy between northern Republicans and southern Democrats in connection with civil-rights legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not a fact that the majority of the Republicans voted for a bill providing for Federal aid to education, under which two-thirds of the money was to go to the Southeastern States?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I do not think the Republican votes, on the average, have been against the South, where the national interest is to be served.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the meeting in Chicago yesterday was televised.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And there was a very flickery result. Does the Senator from Michigan know whether the unusual flickering of the television set yesterday was due to the fact that the Cabinet members were trying to occupy several positions at the same time, or were they just jittery?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it was the natural result of a Cabinet member jumping from one side of an issue to the other, inevitably causing a flickering result in the television broadcast. Or it may have been merely the uncertain character of that supposed Cabinet meeting that was being televised.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I just heard from Chicago that the unfortunate result of the Cabinet meeting yesterday, when only a third of the seats were filled, was because the good people of Chicago preferred a good baseball game to a phony Cabinet meeting, the sense of which they detected.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not blame them for attending a real baseball game instead of a phony meeting in which an effort was made to make the people think it was a genuine Cabinet meeting. I am really disappointed that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has not asked that the sessions of the United States Senate be taken to Chicago and televised. I think it would be well to show the public, through the debate, what is really going on.

It will be noted that an unusual technique was used at the meeting in Chicago. Everyone had gone home except a few newspapermen, and that is why we see the headline in the Baltimore Sun which announced, "Chicago gives cold shoulder to the Democrats."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos of the remark made by the Senator from Louisiana, which I would not want to be permitted to stand unchallenged, does the Senator, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, recall in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Eightieth Congress, or the Eighty-first Congress, when certain matters came before the committee, that there was any partisanship shown or any discrimination shown against the South or any other part of the country in dealing with projects which came before the committee? As a matter of fact, does not the record show that the South has been equitably treated, along with other sections of the Nation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that they have been very equitably treated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In order to have the record straight, I think it should show that the aid of distinguished Republicans in voting for Federal aid to education amounted to nothing, because the bill has not been enacted, and probably will not be enacted.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether or not the distinguished Senator is aware that the Representative from North Carolina who has charge of that bill in the House is a member of the majority party. Is the Senator claiming that Republicans have not voted to report the bill?

Mr. LONG. Nevertheless, it is true that the Republican support of the aid to education is sound and fury, signifying nothing, because the South has not and probably will not receive any aid from the Federal-aid-to-education bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. We put that bill through the 80th Congress and through the 81st Congress, and it has been held up and defeated on a religious dispute between two Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, Mr. LESINSKI, of Michigan, and Mr. BARDEN, of North Carolina. They introduced a religious question into it which did not belong in the consideraton of the bill. Certainly if anyone is to blame for that failure, it is the Democratic members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. In view of what my personal friend, the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has said—and I consider him my very good personal friend, because I like the young man very much, and I have served with him on committee—I wish to remind him, while he is speaking of what has been done for the South and what has not been done for the South, that prior to the legislation which was enacted in 1949 only six agricultural commodities were under mandatory support, and of those commodities four were what might be considered crops of the deep South, namely, tobacco, rice, peanuts, and cotton. If the Senator should ever have a feeling that his area of the country has been neglected, I should like to have him think very seriously about those four crops, which have mandatory support.

I should like him to consider, also, that such great agricultural activities, as dairying, livestock, and poultry never had mandatory support until last year, when we succeeded in getting mandatory support of from 75 percent to 90 percent only on dairy products. So I ask the Senator not to become sectional. Let us not talk about what we do for one part of the United States and what we do not do for another part of the United States. I would rather think in terms of the whole United States. I would rather think in terms of our country than in terms of groups, classes, or sections. However, if the Senator wishes to refer to what the South has not had done for it, or what the South has had done for it, I believe we can show that some Senators from the South have represented their States so splendidly that people of the North might well criticize us Senators from that section because we have not done so well for them as the Senators from the South have been able to do in behalf of the people of their States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I fully agree with my friends on the Republican side that appropriations should be made on a bipartisan basis and that all sections of the country should share in them. However, it seems to me that there is no use of the Republican side trying to blow both hot and cold at the same time. The Senator from Michigan said that Republicans have never helped us on civil-rights legislation. We might go a step further and say that, so far as I know, there has been no great effort on the part of the Republicans to help the South on anything. If they wish to claim that they have worked with us, I would be interested in hearing about it. I should like to know in what way the Republicans have helped the South.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Louisiana obviously believes they have not, but that is beside the point. I should like only to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether he agrees with the senior Senator and junior Senator from Alabama on what they had to say, to the effect that the defeat of civil-rights legislation had to be brought about within the Democratic Party. Their statements, and the leadership's record of keeping the FEPC bill from the floor until after the primary in Florida and then attempting to have it considered clearly reveal the sham in the Democratic Party on this issue.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator is asking me whether I agree with the distinguished Senators from Alabama——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina rose.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I ask my question of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question only. I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator asks me whether I agree with the speeches made by the Senators from Alabama, I merely wish to say that I agree with a great portion of the logic expressed in those speeches. I might add that they not

only say the Republican Party had not helped the South on civil-rights legislation, but went on to show that the Republican Party had not helped the South on anything. I agree with them on that, too.

Mr. FERGUSON. Although they do not dispute my basic contention, to accommodate the Senator from Louisiana I shall put the entire speeches in the RECORD, so that Senators may read them, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The speeches by Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether my 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not intend to become involved in any sectional argument. I try to avoid sectional arguments as much as possible. I have no apology to make for having voted with or against Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle on any occasion. I try to vote my convictions on issues as I see them. However, in view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] I should not like the RECORD to be closed without pointing out that the four crops to which the Senator referred as being southern crops are the only four crops which are under penalties of acreage allotments and marketing quotas. So that at least our farmers bear that burden, which is not borne by the producers of other commodities.

In view of the motion which is now pending before the Senate, I derive much amusement from the present discussion. One thing has always puzzled me, and I should like to have the able Senator from Michigan answer a question for me.

When southern Senators vote with Republicans on any issue, as we have done on occasion, it is referred to as a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats with the inference such a combination is most sinful. I also read something else which was said yesterday by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] in a speech at Chicago. He beat the drums and summoned to his colors all Republicans and urged them to vote in favor of cloture on the FEPC bill. It has always puzzled me considerably why it is called a coalition when a few southern Democrats assert their independent judgment and vote with Republicans, but when Republicans combine with northern Democrats, as the Senator from Illinois invited them to do, it is referred to as a great and holy bipartisan movement. [Laughter.] If the Senator from Michigan can make a distinction for me, I should like to have him do so, because it has always been a matter of great bewilderment to me. It is an unholy coalition when we vote with Republicans. On the other hand, the Democratic leadership never shows any hesitancy in summoning Republicans to join Democrats in a great bipartisan movement.

MR. FERGUSON. I think I can clear up the question for the able Senator. I, too, have been amused and even amazed by the comments about "holy" and "unholy" alliances. But I haven't been bewildered, and the public should not. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have seen northern Democrats use that "unholy alliance" expression to hoodwink northern voters. It is just what I am talking about today. It is why I am making this nonpolitical speech today. I think it is time that we answered some of these nonpolitical speeches, which are now being made in various places. The only thing I miss is the whistle. If I had a whistle I might get up more steam. Mr. President, the term "coalition between the North and the South" is used to deceive northern voters, no more, no less. That is what was attempted in Chicago yesterday, at some pains but not with complete success. Mr. Daniels, the national committee member, just would not be kept silent. He wanted to tell what has been going on.

Just remember this: back in the days when the Senate had only 16 Republican Members and when the House of Representatives had only 80 Republican Members, this same civil-rights program was possible of ready enactment. It was was used then, as it is now, by the northern Democrats to get votes in the North, with no intention on their part of passing any such legislation. That is the whole point of the incidents in Chicago yesterday, and the shadow-boxing by the Democratic Party through the years on this issue of civil rights.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to call attention to one sentence in the remarks made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which reads as follows:

> We must depend on our group of 21 southern Senators operating—
>
> I underline that—
>
> as Democrats inside the Democratic Party.

I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan whether, when the chips are down and a vote is taken, the Republican votes in favor of the measure are not likely to be considerably in excess of the Democratic votes? Is it not true that perhaps 80 or 90 percent of the Republican votes will be in favor of the proposed legislation, and that certainly if 50 percent of the Democrats' votes are in favor of it the Democrats will be doing well? Is there any doubt, when the roll is called up yonder, as to what will be found? [Laughter.]

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we will find what the Senator has indicated on any roll call, today, tomorrow, or hereafter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to say that while I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator's nonpolitical speech——

Mr. FERGUSON. Whistle-stop speech.

Mr. RUSSELL. He still leaves me thinking it is a distinction without a difference in the even constant reference to a coalition when some southern Democrats vote with the Republicans, or vice versa, but perfectly proper when the administration desires Republican votes to appeal to the Republicans to join them in a bipartisan crusade.

Mr. FERGUSON. I conclude that it is "bunk." That is just what the administration is giving to the people of the United States—"the bunk."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from South Carolina is willing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The question the Senator from Georgia raised makes one believe that the able majority leader of the Senate has been enunciating a new "guilt by association" doctrine, namely, that so long as the southern Democrats vote regularly with the Democratic Party it is a very fine thing; but if any of them happen to vote with the Republicans, there is guilt by association. [Laughter.] I am not quite sure as to which the guilty party is, according to the lights of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. The majority leader also appeals to the Republicans to come over and join him, thereby making him guilty by association [laughter], on the motion to take up the FEPC bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for the 10 minutes he yielded me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, beginning where I left off last Friday, and continuing my nonpolitical speech discussing FEPC, I am going to take a few minutes to make some observations about what took place on the floor of the Senate a few minutes ago.

I noticed that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made reference to the Republican Party trying to claim credit for the possibility of the passing of the FEPC bill. I desire to take credit for attempting to kill the bill, and call to the attention of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from California just what has taken place in regard to similar measures in their States. I note the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is now present on the Senate floor. In California a similar bill was submitted to the voters; and the people of California voted upon that issue. Those voting in favor of it were 675,697, and 1,682,646 voted against it. The vote in California was almost 3 to 1 when the people voted upon that issue. I thought I would call attention to what happened in that particular State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the figures from the State of California on the FEPC referendum?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The people of California voted 675,697 for the bill. Voting against it were 1,682,646. It was defeated by more than a million majority in California.

Mr. LONG. That was about a 2 to 1 vote against it, was it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was better than that; it was about 2½ to 1.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the Legislature of Illinois the house passed a similar bill, and it went to the

senate, and the senate voted it down. I believe the Republicans have a majority in the senate in Illinois. They voted 25 to 23 in Illinois in the State of the majority leader.

In North Dakota a similar bill passed the house but died in the senate. All these figures apply to what happened last year.

In Ohio a similar bill died in conference after a close vote in the house, 70 to 61.

Mr. President, I am repeating these figures to indicate that there is not merely an effort of the southern people to defeat this bill, but the people throughout the Nation are against it when they properly understand it.

I do not believe any party should claim any credit in relation to it. I know that in my own State I do not want to claim any credit for it, and I do not intend to do so. I am giving warning here and now that, so far as the South is concerned, there will be another crisis, just as much of a crisis as was Pearl Harbor when the Second World War was started, if an attempt is made to put such a bill into effect.

Mr. President, a similar bill was killed in Pennsylvania in April 1949. The vote in the senate of the legislature was 35 to 15.

Let no one attempt to say that only southerners are against the bill.

Something was said a few minutes ago to the effect that this bill should have been brought before the Senate prior to the primary election in Florida. I wonder why that statement was made. Was it because those favoring it did not want the people to express themselves on it immediately before the vote? That is the only thing I could gather from the statement.

Proceeding to a discussion of the bill, Mr. President, nearly every day some Senator rises on the Senate floor and complains to high heaven that some "little bureaucrat," as he calls him, has added a few dozen more obnoxious controls and restrictions over the social and economic lives of the people. Yet almost every one of such restrictions and controls has stemmed from direct congressional authorization or from laws drawn so generally as to give Federal agencies carte blanche to do almost anything they desire in order to achieve policy ends. When Washington says to an American citizen that in his private business he may or may not hire an applicant for employment, he naturally and instinctively rebels. Accordingly, a solemn obligation is imposed on every person whose voice may contribute to, or result in the enactment of the proposed legislation to pause a little and weigh the consequences of such a law. Law after law has been enacted in which broad powers have been given and abused, and Members of Congress, to escape the condemnations, protestations, and vituperations of their constituents have blamed the agencies of the executive branch because they did precisely what Congress in terms authorized them to do. The bar of history knows no such excuses. Statutes should be passed under the theory of not only what will be done, but also what may be done under them. Therefore, it behooves us not to create the opportunities for the growth of little cells of totalitarianism, which in the aggregate amount to state socialism, plus a Federal police state. The blame would rest properly upon Congress if Congress created the opportunity for such result for what ensued.

It is apparent that the proponents of the legislation are not interested in the welfare, well-being, and success of the minority races in the Southern States, but that they are directing the legislation at the South for political purposes. They are simply using the Negro in the South as a political football.

I venture to assert that the vote of a Negro in New York, Illinois, or Michigan is worth 100 times as much as a white vote in South Carolina. Why do I make that statement? Because both political parties are fighting for the Negro vote in certain districts in New York, in certain districts in Illinois, in certain districts in Michigan. It is not so in South Carolina. The reason why it is not so in South Carolina is that in the November election the State is certain to go Democratic. It is hardly necessary to go to the polls to vote, because everyone knows what the result will be. But in States where the results are very close between the Democrats and the Republicans, there is a pulling and a hauling with all the strength each side can exert to get the Negro vote on its side. That results in stirring up the Negro question very greatly. There is no question about that, Mr. President. Every sensible man knows it to be so. It is for that reason I have supported and voted for a law which would provide for a change in election of President and Vice President. The effect of such a law would be a pro rata division of representation in the electoral vote; if one party received 51 percent of the total vote it would have a 51 percent electoral representation; if the other party received 49 percent of the vote it would have a 49 percent of the electoral vote. The result would be that the two parties would not be fighting so hard to secure a majority in order to obtain the total number of electoral votes of the State. To a certain extent it would result in lessening the fight for the votes of the minority group.

I stated on the floor of the Senate on February 1, 1950:

> We, in the South, highly resent the fact that both parties will spend a hundred times as much money to get the Negro vote in Harlem and that the vote of a Negro there is worth a hundred times as much on the national political scene as the vote of a white man or a Negro from South Carolina.
>
> We do not believe it is fair or honest or democratic to place such a high premium on such a few votes because they happen to be from a section in Chicago, Detroit, or New York.
>
> Political parties and political bosses can never resist the temptation of making undue appeals to minority groups whose votes mean the balance of power and the election of Presidents.

The best friend the Negro race has ever had has been the white southerner. That reminds me of a colored man who had been in the North and while there became unemployed and needed someone to help him. He immediately thought of the South and started to walk back to the South. Finally he ran into a man who treated him like southerners treat the Negro, and the colored man immediately realized that he was drawing near to his destination, to the South. He said to that southerner, "Thank God, I am getting back closer to the South."

I charge that the great majority of the people of the United States are not supporting this proposed legislation and that the meager popular support it receives comes mainly from pressure groups, radical organizations, Communist-front groups, and representatives of minority racial organizations. At that point let me say that Senators will find that all of them are advocating the proposed legislation. I repeat the question I asked on last Friday: Has any Senator found a Communist who was not for the FEPC bill? I have not.

Mr. President, I have opposed and will continue to oppose the FEPC program, which is fostered upon the basis of misunderstanding, or lack of understanding, or not put forward in good faith. Any student of human relations, sociology, or psychology knows that one cannot legislate tolerance and understanding, that one cannot force brotherly love, and that one cannot legislate decency and morals. The Congress cannot force or intimidate human beings, even by threat of prosecution and penalty of imprisonment under law, into having affection or admiration, or even respect for those persons with whom they have no desire to associate. As I have stated before, the problem is not one to be solved by legislative enactment, executive fiat or decree. It is purely and simply a problem of education in understanding and tolerance.

The people of the South have made tremendous progress in the improvement of the race and color situation. I know that during my short time in politics, which has been since 1923, great progress in this regard has been made in South Carolina. This has been done through patient, kind, and helpful treatment of the Negroes within our midst. Stories of violence in the South today, pathetically regrettable though they are, have been grossly exaggerated and distorted beyond their real significance. A few horrible, isolated or infrequent instances of brutality are played up and flashed before the Nation in sensational headlines by the hate mongers who would commercialize on human misery in order to promote their own selfish and often sinister interests. I am certain that the tactics and techniques discernible in a great amount of this scare propaganda have been designed in the past, as they are being dictated today, by the insidious and vicious fascistic and communistic forces at work in the world.

Oh, how Russia today will picture to her people what is taking place here in the United States Senate, telling her people how depressed is a portion of the population of our Nation and how much better off the Russians are. That is the kind of false propaganda the Russian Government spreads.

God knows that America is the place where a man can rise from the ground floor, so to speak, and can reach any office, no matter how high. So I can say that ours is the greatest nation on the face of globe.

Madam President (Mrs. SMITH OF Maine in the chair), I know whereof I speak. When I realize my humble beginnings, and then when the people of my State by their popular vote have twice made me their Governor, and then have sent me to the Senate of the United States, I appreciate my country, and I will never say anything which might hinder the progress of this great Nation, which has progressed so rapidly not only in wealth, but, as I see it, intellectually, and at the same time has given to the masses of the people more than any other nation on the globe has given to its people. When I say that, I realize what wages are paid to people in Russia, and I further realize what wages are paid to people in France, and I realize what wages are paid to people even in England. I also realize that under the American system of government, every person in our country is given the right to say whom he will employ, who will operate the looms in his mill, who will be employed in his stores, and to employ only those who best fit into the picture in his establishment and are fitted to keep his business on a paying basis, rather than to cause it go into the red, with the probable result that many persons would be thrown out of employment. Those things should be considered when Senators are discussing this bill, which proposes to change our American way of life.

The United States Senate is recognized as the greatest forum, the most resounding sounding board in all the world, where full, complete, and lengthy discussion and debate can be held without fear and the threat of intimidation. However, Madam President, when it is allowed to become a siren of reeking hatred to stir up race against race, it is a blasphemy before God and man.

So far as concerns trying to do good for a certain race, I am in favor of uplifting that race, but that must be done by education. Madam President, I urge the path of education and tolerance and cooperative understanding, not the way of force and fear. I urge this body to review with honest minds, with clean, clear judgment, and without passion, the progress that has been made, and not to mine the road ahead with dynamite that is certain to explode with great destruction when these opposite viewpoints collide.

No people on the face of the earth have ever had greater rights and greater liberties than our people here in America. These rights and liberties are reserved to our people by the Constitution. The framers of our magnificent and highly practicable Constitution—men of almost divine wisdom and of remarkable vision—sought to establish for the first time a truly democratic legislative process. In drawing up the Constitution, the founding fathers did not forget the long struggle for freedom, or the power from which they had rescued individual liberty. As we know, that power was the state, represented, successively, by kings and parliaments. To cope with that, they erected a political structure of limited, delegated powers. Among the powers denied to the Federal Government was the power to encroach upon the God-given inalienable liberties of the individual. The very essence of liberty is that the individual be let alone. The basic philosophy of our Constitution is that individual freedom can be maintained only if government is fenced away from it as much as possible. That is why the tenth amendment declares that—

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

In other words, the way to secure these rights is not to interfere with their exercise.

The very objective of the type legislation now proposed is detestable, for it seeks to prohibit and to prevent, by governmental action, any freedom to choose one's associates or coworkers in business, if that choice is based upon considerations of race, religion, color, or national origin. Yet the freedom to choose one's associates because of personal liking and confidence or individual judgment is one of the most essential freedoms of a free citizen, and for decades has been guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The freedom to choose one's associates is essential to a free exercise of the right to earn a livelihood and is likewise essential to a genuine liberty of contract, and to the free pursuit of happiness. Under our great Bill of Rights, any industry is entitled to employ whom it sees fit—employees who can best serve, who are equipped to serve, who can advance according to individual initiative, personality, integrity, and ability. This is our American way of life, the American custom and practice. The intimate relation of employer and employee should never be dictated, regardless of race. We do not want to be dictated to in the matter of social, religious, economic, or any other views. The welfare of our Nation will be at stake if such an absurd legislation is enacted. We who are charged with the operation of this great Government of the United States should resort to sound reason and discretion, and not be blinded by the communistic attempts of a group of radicals.

Therefore, Madam President, FEPC legislation is in direct conflict with these fundamental American purposes. If this proposed legislation is enacted, we might as well kiss individual liberty in America good-by. Liberty will be destroyed.

FEPC legislation will destroy the right of the individual to choose with whom he will associate; it will destroy the right of an employer to employ whom he will to work for him, it will destroy the right of a worker to work where he will. This forcing of an employer to employ an applicant regardless of the applicant's religion or racial origin destroys both freedom of religion and freedom of contract.

The practice of segregation which exists and has existed in the Southern States for a long period of time is widely approved by whites and Negroes alike as aiding in satisfactory relations between the two races. This practice, which is a part of the social structure, allows employers to use whites for some jobs and Negroes for others. Whites choose to work in some jobs, and the same is true of Negroes. It is impossible to change overnight a system which has been built up over a period of 200 years. This practice was being followed before our Government ever began.

The FEPC proposal is communistic. It means regimentation. Let anyone deny it who will. The FEPC bill is unconstitutional, which will be seen further on, by reference to court decisions.

Communism is based upon the theory of class struggle. The interests of the "working class" are supposed to be different from the interests of everyone else. It is contended that there is irrepressible enmity between the "working class" and everyone else; "the workers" are "the exploited"; the others "the exploiters." The communistic theory demands that "the workers" must engage in "class conflict." They must be convinced that they are being "exploited," and the natural disappointment which almost everyone feels at not having achieved as much as he dreamed, must be fanned into a flame of resentment against "the exploiters." In the United States, they are told they are being robbed of their rights.

Communism has no interest in human rights. It is dedicated to the ruthless suppression of individual rights, as well as to the destruction of any political or social system which respects them. To weaken the unity of a free people, to destroy faith in the integrity of free institutions, Communists have found that agitation for so-called civil rights can pay high dividends. It is perfectly adapted to stirring up conflict, setting race against race, employee against employer, one religious group against another. So Communists and fellow travelers, with pretended pious concern for civil rights, undermine the only free society on earth in which civil rights are really respected. How can FEPC do anything but stir up conflict, when an employer knows that every time he employs someone, he is going to be dragged before a commission, probably, and told, "You ought to employ this fellow," the reason assigned being that the applicant is perhaps an Episcopalian, or perhaps a Baptist. Because Baptists are so numerous in the South, it may be said that Baptists get more than their share, and so other religious groups may complain to high heaven of discrimination. The same thing is true as between Protestants and Catholics, Jews and gentiles. Madam President, do not tell me that such a bill as this would not stir up strife and discontent among all religious elements in America. If religion goes, if our churches go, then our Nation will not be worth a continental penny.

In this effort to subvert us to slavery, the Communists do two things:

First, they plant the seed of class conflict in American life. They blind those they dupe to the great truth that in a free society there is no real conflict of "class interest." It is to the interest of employer and employee alike that business shall prosper. A depression that cuts down production and profit automatically cuts down payrolls and the money in the pay envelope. All alike share in prosperity; all suffer in adversity.

Second, they encourage Government to intrude into the forbidden area of individual liberty, and they condition the people first to accept and then to demand such intrusion. They urge Government interference with individual liberty upon the pretended ground that Government is entering the forbidden area in order to protect it, just as Hitler in 1938, and Stalin in 1948, graciously consented to protect Czechoslovakia. So it was reported.

It is for these purposes, not for love of freedom, that Communists stir up agitation for civil rights. The whole movement, from the beginning, has been Communist-inspired and Communist-powered, although it has managed to enlist many good people and a good many politicians with vote-seeking instincts into giving it aid.

FEPC is a blow at Christianity. A responsibility has been placed on mankind to keep his race pure. We all agree that there is a Being more omnipotent than any other, Who made His people as He would have them be; and FEPC is a total disregard of human nature. There is no reason why any one group, by congressional action, should enforce their views on racial relations over the entire Nation. A true Christian holds that being a Christian makes a man better and more trustworthy. A Christian employer has a right to include a man's religious belief in any total estimate of his character. It may have something to do with his character. He has an unalienable right, which no law can take away, to entrust matters of confidence to a person of the Christian religion.

A man may be employed in a Christian organization and know a certain group of men there. He would rather trust them than to trust someone he did not know. Under the bill, he would probably have to employ the man he did not know. If he is a Jew, he has an unalienable right to trust a Jew. I notice that in a great many instances the Jews do trust each other, and I do not blame them one iota for it.

This proposed legislation attempts to do what is psychologically and mortally impossible. When the Government assumes to look into the mind of an employer and declare what went on in his mind as he looked over an applicant it assumes the omniscience of the Deity. What goes on in a person's mind is known only to God and himself, and this proposed legislation takes any man out of the rule of law and puts him at the mercy of any bureau or court.

One of the basic human rights God has given man is the right to make his own estimates of others, to like them or dislike them, to trust them or to distrust them, to associate with them or to avoid them, for any reason or for no reason. The moment that right is taken away, freedom becomes a mockery. The civil rights agitation is designed to destroy that element of freedom.

This type of legislation destroys the free market for goods and services upon which our economic system and our political liberty both depend. In a free market for services, both employer and employee are free to bargain, and need not agree unless mutually satisfied. This system is our American way of doing business. FEPC would change all of this. It would bring the Government in as a third party—a party who can say, "You must employ this man, or you must employ this woman." This would result in the destruction of a free market. Again, this would suit the Communists.

This problem is a local one. The Federal Government should keep out of it, and should not meddle in the affairs of the States. I wonder how California would feel about it? That State voted almost three to one against FEPC legislation. Jefferson believed in an association of States rather than a strong central government. Why is it necessary to secure a concentration of all governmental powers in Washington? The social reformers want it here so their pet schemes can be put into effect and their own positions made more secure. We have had so many groups grabbing for power here in Washington that democracy itself is being impaired. Where is democracy? It is not here in Washington; it is back in the crossroads, in the towns, the counties, and the States. It is in the communities, towns, and cities where people live and die, where children are born, where public meetings are held, where people attend church. Kill this exercise of democracy by this and other so-called civil-rights measures and we will see democracy die. It will be replaced by a concentration of power in Washington and by an eventual dictatorship. To attempt force is to threaten national unity and to invite disruption. To attempt it now, with communism over-hanging the world, is to play straight into the hands of Moscow.

I have been telling Members of the Senate what the bill would do. I want to read from the bill where I left off on last Friday:

(g) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

It does not say where they are going to place anyone. They would certainly place their friends at the top, if they are given such carte blanche authority as is indicated in the first sentence which I have just read.

I read further from the bill:

(2) to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies.

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States.

The Commission can have a deposition taken and can pay the witness for signing his name and swearing to it. It was brought out on Friday, with reference to the first part of the bill, that the Commission is given the right to hold hearings. The bill does not provide where the hearings shall be held. It does not provide that a man in South Carolina shall be heard in South Carolina, or that the Commission shall hear a witness in North Carolina, or even in Virginia. The commission is established in Washington. The Commission will pay the witnesses. Imagine the fair trial that would result. The man who is hearing the evidence may be the one who brought the case before the Commission. The prosecution, the jury, and the court are all one.

Reading further from the bill:

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder.

They will be furnished with technical assistance. Technical knowledge. Free legal advice. All other expenses.

I read further:

(5) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate—

Cooperate with whom? Cooperate, as someone has said, with someone who had discriminated against someone else. Imagine being an employer who wished not to take sides. He had better take sides, and he had better take the right side. If he did not, this is what would happen. Listen to this, Senators:

(5) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action.

They violate the law unless they step in and cooperate with the side they ought to be on.

I read further:

(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

(7) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this act, and the Commission may authorize them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens residents of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2), for persons serving

without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

I hope Senators will notice that all the way through the bill there is no limitation on what they can do. There is no field into which they cannot go. They would be turned loose upon the people of the United States.

I read further:

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise.

They will have a Federal police set-up. I read further:

Provided, That the Commission is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession, or local government, to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases even though such cases may involve charges of unlawful employment practices within the scope of this act—

Can anyone imagine their turning jurisdiction over to anyone they thought would not push a case?

The bill reads further—

unless the provision of the statute or ordinance applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.

(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved—

Note that, Senators. Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed, it is heard on behalf of any person claiming to have been aggrieved.

The paragraph continues—

or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the Act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate—

Shall investigate. It does not say "may." They will stand behind the "shall" if Congress puts it in there.

It continues—

such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

Note the word "persuasion." I do not know what type of persuasion they would use.

I read further:

Nothing said or done during and as a part of such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding.

I have had some experience in court. It cannot be used against him, but when he is on the stand he can be asked the question, and a foundation can be laid for charging him with perjury if he does not tell the truth the second time.

I read:

Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within 1 year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful employment practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this act, or in advance thereof if circumstances so warrant, it shall cause a copy of such written charge to be served upon such person who has allegedly committed any unlawful employment practice, hereinafter called the respondent, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than 10 days after the service of such charge.

At a place herein fixed. Where is that place?

The bill provides further:

(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such written charge and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

I wonder where he would have to travel in order to attend that hearing.

There is nothing here to indicate. It will be found that under all our statutes when a man is accused he is allowed to be tried in his home community, in his home county. There is nothing about that written here. There is not anything in the bill which will require such a trial, even in the home State of the accused.

(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

(g) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof, except as a witness.

If someone has made an investigation, and is over the others in authority, he can come forward and testify. There is an attempt to make it appear that the Commission is not the jury and the judge and everything else, but all these people belong to the same Commission, all are working together—probably they sleep together at night.

(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision.

I know the Commission is going to have its headquarters in Washington, and the record probably will be sent to Washington.

The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice.

Reasonable time is given the accused to get to the hearing. I wonder who will pass upon what is a reasonable time.

In its discretion the committee on notice may take further testimony.

If they find the testimony is a little weak after the testimony is all taken, they can take further testimony.

(j) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice, and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees—

If a year has elapsed, and one employee has been out, the employer will have to pay him for a year and get another—

with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the act: *Provided, however*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the written charge has engaged in or is engaging in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

Mr. LONG. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From page 13.

Mr. LONG. The Senator just read the section where it is stated that the Commission may take additional testimony if it so desires.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LONG. There is no requirement that the Commission shall take additional testimony, is there?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is no word in the bill which gives the accused the right, on his own motion, to have anything opened up, and to go further. It is left entirely with the Commission.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, then, as I understand the Senator's argument, under the bill, if the Commission sees the record and decides that there is not enough in it to land a poor employer in jail, or to make him hire someone he does not desire, it can open the case up and take additional testimony if it so desired?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My interpretation is that the Commission can do that, and that they can prolong the case and have it hanging over the employer's head, not 1 day, not 1 month, not 1 year, but for 10 years, if they desire to do so.

Mr. LONG. Does not the bill further provide that an employer against whom a complaint is filed cannot, when such a case goes to court, urge any argument he has not made in the hearings or before the Commission?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is my interpretation of the bill, from a legal standpoint.

Mr. LONG. The Commission has the power to open the record, take additional testimony, and build the record up as far as it desires, until it is ready to make its findings; and once its findings are made, the man against whom the complaint is filed will have no right to make any argu-

ment he might desire to add to the record, would he?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, and the Commission can prolong the case as long as they desire, and cost the Government as much as they desire. They can string it out as long as they want to. Remember that the Federal Government is paying the costs of all the witnesses, for all testimony, and everything, so far as their side is concerned, but not for the other side.

Mr. LONG. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I read further from the bill:

(k) Until a transcript of the resord in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

If they see that they made a mistake, they can go back and modify the finding. If they think they are going to be reversed, they can modify it.

(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Here is the joke; because a finding once made is equivalent to law. I have had a great deal of experience in the field of law so far as hearings before boards and commissions are concerned, and my colleagues know, as well as I do, speaking from a legal standpoint, that if there is any evidence to sustain the finding of the Commission, as in the case of a finding by a jury, the finding of the Commission cannot be set aside. But listen to this:

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States Court of Appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court or other United States court of the territory or place within the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

It will be noticed that a transcript of the entire record is required. In some cases of appeal the transcript of the entire record would cost an exorbitant sum of money. I have had some experiences in that field. When I had a case in which I knew it would not be necessary for me to appeal, but in which the other side would be obliged to appeal, I would put plenty of testimony in the record, because I knew the other side would have to pay for it if it appealed, and that the cost would be considerable. When the cost of appeal is great that in itself tends to discourage an appeal being taken. The Commission would have knowledge of that fact. They would place so much testimony in the record that it would be burdensome for the other side to appeal. The other side would be inclined to forfeit its rights rather than pay the considerable sum involved as cost of appeal.

(b) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

I know of no court that does not have a right to do that. The bill, however, provides such power, in event the case ever gets to court. But as I see the situation, only a few cases would wind up in court. Those of us who have been engaged as lawyers in court know what would happen. We might as well use our imaginations with respect to what would take place under the provisions of the bill.

(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

(d) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

In practically all cases tried before the Commission the Court will have that right.

(e) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed—

That is, after they get into court—

and it shall file such modified or new findings and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

It will be noticed that the Commission is given the power to do that after the case is brought into court. It had always been my thought that courts existed to give both sides an equal opportunity. But under this provision the Commission can modify its findings after the case has been brought to court. A right is thus given to the Commission which is not given to the other side.

(f) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(g) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person transacts business, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside.

I move over to page 20.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

SEC. 10. (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, in any amount exceeding $10,000. Such regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

NOTICES TO BE POSTED

SEC. 11. (a) Every employer and labor organization shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of the act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the act.

(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 for each separate offense.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

I thought something would have to be done for the veterans.

SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, Territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

Thank the Lord, the veterans are cared for.

I read further from the bill:

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 14. Whoever shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a

member, agent, or employee of the Commission while engaged in the performance of duties under this act, or because of such performance, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both.

If this bill is enacted into law, and if the agents or employees of the Commission begin to investigate, every employer in the country had better be good to them and do what they want done; every employer had better not interfere with them or resist them or oppose them or impede them or intimidate them.

Let me ask this question: What would a Senator do if he were an employer and if agents or employees or representatives of the Commission came into his establishment and accused him of violating the law by discriminating against someone? Would a Senator in such a case oppose them, if he thought he had not been guilty of discriminating against anyone?

I ask Senators to think about that. Would they oppose such agents or employees under such circumstances? If a Senator should "resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission," he could be fined $500 or could be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

Madam President, this proposal, if enacted into law and if really enforced and put into effect, would be calamitous.

Of course, I do not want any law to be put on the statute books unless it is going to be enforced. We should not have on the statute books laws which are not enforced. We should not pass a law if we do not propose to have it enforced and if we are not in sympathy with it.

However, if this proposal is enacted into law and put into effect, I predict—and I ask all Senators to note my prediction—that in less than 10 years from that time we will have a depression worse than the so-called Hoover depression, the depression which followed the Hoover administration.

We cannot regulate employment, in every line of business in respect to every promotion and every demotion, and otherwise tell the employer what to do, unless we propose to wreck our way of doing business in the United States. When that is done, this country will be set back, not 1 day, but 50 years.

Madam President, I am pleading with my fellow Senators to consider the importance of this matter, and I am pleading with all my colleagues not to vote for the enactment of such legislation.

First of all, the Senate should not take up this legislative proposal; we should not take the first step toward its enactment. We are now discussing the question of whether the Senate should proceed to consider the bill. I am grateful for the Senate rule which requires that in order to invoke cloture on debate, 64 Senators must be present and vote in favor of cloture, in favor of limiting debate—in other words, that 64 Senators must so vote before this proposal can be taken up.

Madam President, I do not want any Senator to become ill; but it might be good for the United States if some Senators happened to be absent because of illness on the day when the question now before the Senate is voted on, for if a Senator who proposed to vote in favor of having the Senate take up this bill were absent at the time when that vote was taken, he certainly could not be recorded as voting in favor of having the Senate consider the measure. Of course, I do not want any Senator to be sick; I never would want that to happen. However, I hope that when the vote is taken there will not be a sufficient number of Senators voting in favor of having the Senate consider the bill.

Madam President, I hold in my hand a small pamphlet issued by Dr. James W. Fifield, a Congregational minister, of Los Angeles, California . I was almost thrilled when I read it, for it sets forth my views on this matter—so much so, that I decided that I would read it into the RECORD today. The title is "Faith and Freedom," and this pamphlet is described as the Monthly Journal of Spiritual Mobilization. The issue I hold in my hand is volume 1, No. 6, for May 1950. It reads as follows:

FEDERALIZED RACE PREJUDICE—WILL THE FEPC BE ABLE TO SOLVE THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM?

Judeo-Christian conscience has always been strong for statute sin; people must be made good by law.

The fact that every attempt in this direction has failed in the purpose, that the law has always induced lawbreaking rather than virtue—as witness our prohibition experiment—cannot down the heritage. Presently, the advocates of legislated goodness are pressing hard for a thunderbolt against race prejudice. President Truman, in particular, wants a Federal Employment Practices Commission to put sense into men's minds, decency into their hearts.

It is to the credit of the composite American intelligence that this proposal is meeting a very chill reception. If the Commission is actually established it will certainly lack the powers at first adumbrated. But an analysis of what Mr. Truman wants, in this connection, is not less timely because he is unlikely to get it.

Free choice?

The proposed law, intended to give redress to those who lose jobs simply because of their minority position, begins by limiting the employer in the choice of his associates; he must not hire only those whom he is pleased to hire.

Why? It is not yet a tenet of American politics that a man cannot be selective in the choice of his social contacts. He may still choose his tennis, bridge, or marriage partner. What principle is invoked in legally limiting his business associates?

The principle is implicit: That society has a stake in capital. The owner cannot claim absolute ownership, because it is reasoned that capital is a social product, and the state may therefore intervene in its management. The alleged right of the state, in designating the associates of the capital-owner, rests on the socialistic notion of the collective character of capital. The FEPC proposal, then, is merely another denial of the right of private property, and another evidence of how far Marxist notions have permeated our thinking.

COMPETENCE BECAUSE OF FREEDOM

Putting theory aside, as a practical matter the free exercise of judgment in the selection of its operatives is essential to the best use of capital, and therefore in the best interest of society as a whole. When a capital-owner employs a helper he is entrusting capital to the care of the latter. The lowliest member of the crew has power to do harm to these instruments of production. Incompetence or dishonesty may cause losses.

Does society benefit from inefficiency? Does it make allowances for incompetence? On the contrary, it coldly rejects the marginal producer by refusing him its custom. Since society is thus arbitrary in its market selectivity, it has no right to interfere in the management of production. Enterprise can serve only when it is free.

Congeniality is as important in a business organization as is competence. A complement of workers of similar background or habits will be more productive than one characterized by divergencies. A publisher of Catholic books would find a staff of Protestants or atheists difficult for his purpose. A kosher slaughterhouse would be in trouble if its crew were unacquainted with or unsympathetic to the ritual. The trustees of a Quaker college would like it to have more than a proportionate number of Quaker students. Selectivity in may cases is a matter of necessity.

These problems of managment are bypassed in the urgency to eradicate discrimination on the ground of race or religion. That is the sin. It is wrong against society, if not against God, to deny employment to Jews as Jews, to Catholics as Catholics. Why?

WILL FEPC CREATE MORE JOBS?

Prejudice is an irrationality, perhaps a form of insanity. But, if all irrationality were banished by law, who would insure that the custodians were rational? He who hates his fellow man harbors a canker in his heart, but if that cankerous condition pleases him that is his affair. Society has no power to make him over, no mandate to try it.

The charge is made, however, that in venting his spleen against a given group the employer deprives its members of the right to earn a living. That is silly. If he employs a Jew instead of a Baptist, the latter is hurt; if the selection is reversed, the Jew is hurt. Where one job is at stake, one or the other of two applicants must fail to obtain it. The right to earn a living is impaired by the lack of jobs, not by prejudice, and the FEPC is not concerned with making more jobs. It is merely a venture in compulsory ethics.

This bill, if enacted, will create prejudice where this is none, intensify prejudice where it already exists. Since it would be possible, under this plan, for a discharged employee to haul an employer before the FEPC on the charge of discrimination, the employer who does not now concern himself with such matters would in self-protection be forced to consider the race or religion of the applicant.

Should the commission "qualify" the discharged employee, the employer would not only have to associate with the unwanted person but would also have to suffer a back-pay fine. All the more reason for the personnel office to be careful.

SINGLED-OUT PREJUDICE

In order to avoid the wrath of the FEPC, every firm would have to establish a token quota of those generally considered discriminatees, and these would always carry the stigma of a necessary evil. They would be so singled out by fellow workers, with consequent unpleasantness.

Prejudice would also be accentuated by the provision in the proposal regarding advancement. Rivals on the staff would not hesitate to point out that the one receiving preference is of the unwanted group, and that he was pushed ahead of them merely as a sop to the law, not because he had earned advancement.

CONTRABAND INFORMATION

As with every law that presumes to interfere with individual habits or preferences, this one would give rise to methods

of evasion; the necessity for evasion would intensify the hatred of those whom the plan proposes to help. Employment agencies would become detective services, providing the contraband information. Since one who resigns cannot claim discrimination, there would be resort to nasty ways of forcing resignations. Employers who did not make inquiries as to race and religion when hiring, would certainly have to know about these particulars when firing.

Some of the possible, nay probable, political consequences of the proposed law ought to be considered.

WHICH PREFERENCE WILL HAVE PRIORITY?

An existing law condones, even demands, discrimination. Under practices following from the Wagner Labor Relations Act, an employer is compelled to give preference to a labor union member.

Suppose an employer discriminates in favor of a Jew who is a member of the union, against a Catholic who cannot gain admission. Suppose the latter brings the case before the FEPC, claiming religious discrimination. Will the agency have power to compel the union to extend membership to the Catholic? How would you handle a complaint from white men (or women) who might seek jobs as pullman porters, now monopolized by Negroes?

DOES FEPC PROVIDE AN ANSWER?

The scarcity of jobs in the 1930's was the underlying cause of race riots in Detroit; white workers resented the influx of Negroes. Here the discrimination was practiced by workers, not by employers. How would the FEPC handle this always latent problem? Or, again, if a southern employer were compelled by local prejudice to discharge a Negro employee, how would the FEPC propose to enforce its edict?

UNEMPLOYMENT THE REAL PROBLEM

Such stinging bees are nestled in a plan that attempts to deal with the social and moral consequences of an economic problem it cannot solve. If the problem of unemployment could be solved, the problem of prejudice would be academic. Philosophers, not politicians, might concern themselves with it. The deepest prejudices of the most narrow-minded employer will give way to his need for help when help is scarce.

But during a depression, the problem of selection would be made difficult by the antidiscrimination law, and employers might for fear of reprisals, turn to the FEPC for assistance.

They could ask the agency to qualify employees in advance. It is not outside the range of possibility that power would thus be thrust on the bureaucrats. The FEPC could find itself in the position of a national employment agency.

Nor should we overlook the campaign potential of this bureau. The administration would most certainly advertise its antidiscrimination record to win minority group votes, while the opposition would appeal to the unemployed who could with some reason blame their plight on discrimination. Our political campaigns would thus be further impregnated with the stench and bitterness of racial and religious antagonisms.

NO LIMITS

Furthermore, while the proposed law does not consider discrimination on the grounds of sex, age, or fraternal connections, what would prevent pressure groups from demanding that the scope of the FEPC be extended? If an institution employs Masons only, could not the Elks make an issue of it? The "over 40" workers and the unemployed female linotype operators might well see their redress in an amendment and expansion of FEPC.

And, since power is the lifeblood of bureaucracy, the FEPC would most assuredly look with favor on the efforts of pressure groups to broaden its sphere of interest.

Thus, inherent in this piece of legislation is a mess of trouble. This is the case simply because it would again attempt the impossible task of making men good by legislative fiat. The only thing to be done with the irrationality of prejudice is to ignore it. Efforts at legal suppression can only inflame this prejudice and give us more Government intervention to boot.

Mr. President, I am glad to read from this booklet. I agree with the statement almost in toto, for it points out to us that we are in danger of passing legislation which would injure us not only from a moral standpoint, but commercially and economically throughout the Nation.

It is well understood among lawyers and laymen that in the field of legislation which attempts to regulate private conduct the powers of Congress are much more limited than are those of the State legislatures.

The bill deals with alleged discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Some of the words appear superfluous, since every race has a distinctive color. Actually, the bill deals with races, religions, and nationalities. It specifically deals with aliens and American citizens, even American citizens under this legislative proposal may not be preferred to aliens. It makes no difference how good an American a man may be, he cannot receive any preference over a Communist in America. That is true in the business world, according to the bill.

How can Congress absolve or exculpate itself from blame for proposing such an unfair procedure? How can the Congress solve the problem and get itself out of the situation in which it finds itself? I am sure this bill will not work out well in regard to alleged discriminations in America.

Heretofore the discussion of races and religions has been fraught with difficulty and the intrepid soul who analyzes those phases of our life is immediately set upon as being intolerant or bigoted. Now that the matter is before the Senate, plain, full, free, and accurate discussion and analyzation of these phases of our life are required. There must be no hesitancy and no taboos.

Mr. President, that is why it is necessary for me to speak on this subject at length. A measure such as the FEPC bill, with its elaborate findings and declarations of policy, necessarily requires an extended speech in order to determine whether there is any real basis for the findings and declarations of policy as written into the first part of the bill. We find the facts and declarations of policy are not conclusive as to the need or propriety of constitutional validity of a law. Any statement which is of a debatable character and accuracy may be challenged.

The statement that discrimination forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living is highly debatable, since it is difficult to understand how the forced employment of one person in place of another can improve the standard of living of the displaced person. Likewise the statement that discrimination deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production is essentially an attack upon the theory of a free, competitive economy. So long as competition is the rule of industry, necessarily the most successful enterprises must be those that utilize the services of the most capable persons who can be organized to work cooperatively to advance common interests. To insist that the Government shall undertake to determine how and what employees shall be selected, and thus to restrict competition and the competitive judgment of the managers of private enterprise, is to undermine the very foundations of private enterprise and a competitive system. This is simply an oratorical justification of legislation based on assumptions which cannot be regarded as findings of fact.

If a person were going to employ a man to manage a big business, would he not choose a man who is capable of choosing other persons to work under him, to carry on the business, or would he rather trust to some commission in Washington to tell him whom to hire, whom to fire, whom to promote, or whom to demote? Which would be for the best interests of the particular business? Suppose there were discrimination against a person because he were a Jew, or a Catholic, or a Protestant, or even because he was a white person. Should not an employer be able to select those he thinks best fitted to work for him without restriction? Do not Senators think that is best for business in the United States? If we pass this bill, we are saying to businessmen throughout the United States, "You had better not hire the one you think is best for your business, because the Commission may consider you to be discriminating against someone else who may belong to a minority group." It would keep business in fear all the time. I know what I should want to do if I had a big business and were confronted with such a situation. I would feel like turning my business over to them and saying, "You had better do the hiring and firing for me. You tell me whether it is right for me to promote this one or that one. If I do not promote the right person, I will be hauled before the Commission and tried. I will be fined. I will have to pay the fellow whom I did not employ, and to the fellow whom I did not promote I will have to pay the difference in wages between what he receives and what the fellow whom I promoted receives."

That is exactly what this bill would do. It is not a question of the colored man about whom we hear so much. As I see it, it is Washington trying to get more power. When some Senators rise and say, "We are against bureaucrats," I say that this is the time to show their colors and vote against forming another bureaucracy in Washington which would have its hands on every business of any size in America.

So long as competition is the rule of industry, necessarily, the most successful enterprises must be those that utilize the services of the most capable persons organized to work cooperatively to advance common interests.

I have repeated that statement because it is so true.

To insist that the Government shall undertake to determine how and what employees shall be selected, and thus to

restrict competition and the competitive judgment of the managers of private enterprise, is to undermine the very foundations of private enterprise and a competitive system.

The declaration that the right to employment without discrimination is a right of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States is a declaration quite beyond the power of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States has held time and time again that any power to create a civil right, unless specifically delegated to the United States by the Constitution, has been reserved to the separate States.

It is argued, of course, that the power of the Federal Government over interstate and foreign commerce provides a constitutional basis for the proposed law. However, in the first place, the bill only purports to apply to persons engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ 50 or more individuals, whereas the findings and declaration of policy undertakes to create a civil right for all the people of the United States.

The proposed law goes to the other extreme and is an attempt to reconstruct society by subjecting all private enterprise to regulation by the state for the purpose of substituting the moral judgment of a political majority for the independent judgment of an employer as to those persons with whom he wishes to associate himself in the activities of a private business enterprise. This would mean complete domination of private business by the state, and, as has been pointed out, the gradual but sure destruction of private enterprise.

This country grew great because under the Constitution as it was written, and interpreted as it was written, there were no minorities as such. The recent tendency to create minorities in order to stir up class consciousness and to induce segmental attitudes among the people should be abhorred. This has been the curse of Europe, and it is plain that the designing few are bent on creating here a veritable Balkans, with all the plagues which have afflicted Europe for centuries. This bill will be a step in Balkanization of the United States by stirring up race and class consciousness which otherwise would lie dormant and dissipate itself in the progress of futurity. The bill engenders group isolation with a tendency to infuse and instill group consciousness of a combative nature with a consequent disharmony in our national life. Its group or clan isolationist effects really constitute its actual purpose. Some of its backers are more interested in trying to weaken the United States than in aiding their fictitiously concocted minorities.

What is a minority? How can it truly be said that we have minorities in this country? It is neither fair nor accurate to pick up one class or group and weigh it against all the rest of the people composed of different, disparate, and diverse elements themselves minorities, if you please, and say that such a group is a minority. Rather should it be asked, Is there any one homogeneous group which can dominate all the rest of the people? The answer is at once, "No." This bill actually deals with manufactured and self-styled minorities. It sets them up in the law. It is said there are approximately 20,000,000 Catholics in the country, but they are composed of Italians, French, Germans, Polish, and many other national groups. Certainly they are not going to oppress one another or discriminate against themselves. Moreover, they are the largest single religious group because the Protestants again are subdivided into numerous religious denominations.

The Jews, considered either as a race or creed, themselves coming from different countries, most assuredly are not discriminating against one another in their own ranks for that reason. Furthermore, as a class, they are so large in numbers—including refugees and resident aliens amounting probably to six or seven millions and economically occupy so powerful a position in the Government, courts, and entire industrial life that they cannot possibly be said to be a minority.

The colored are, for practical purposes, all composed of citizens of the United States and actually native-born, thus enjoying this great advantage. They represent as large a homogeneous group, if the word can be so used in this manner, as exists here. Their status, political and economic, has improved marvelously since the War Between the States. If in the next 50 to 75 years they make the same educational, economic, and social progress, their accomplishments will be one of the most outstanding achievements of modern times. As they continue to grow in mind and spirit, improve in their health conditions, and rise to a sense of increased responsibility, they will, like any and all other citizens who have accomplished these things, feel a sense of satisfaction and enjoyment in that which they have done. Persistent agitation, designed to cause all colored people to have such a group consciousness as to carry continuously a chip on their shoulders, making themselves color-conscious, simply creates, maintains, and stimulates an inferiority complex which prevents, hinders, and impedes their own progress. Moreover, it might accomplish the most dangerous thing of all, namely, to make the white people color-conscious, and thus stir up and actually institute a feeling not even existing among vast numbers of white persons today.

It is seen, therefore, that the United States, which is sometimes called a country and not a Nation because of the large groups of different nationalities and descents, has no one dominant element in it sufficient to force its will—even if so inclined—on the whole people, and this is true from a religious, racial, and nationality standpoint. Just as soon as any one religion or race attempted to be dominant, all the others would gang up and forestall any such action. This is just human nature. So the minority idea is false in fact and theory, and its attempted propagation is inimical to the national interest, and subversive of unity. It is the most insidious form of internal-conflict provocation.

The FEPC bill is wholly one-sided. The entitlement of the bill is to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, but when the body of the measure is examined, it is seen that only one phase of discrimination is treated, namely, discrimination against; discrimination in favor of is entirely ignored.

This bill is, therefore, antidemocratic. It is just as evil to give a person a job because of his race, his color, his religion, or national origin, as it is to deny him a job on account of it. The presence in industry, government, or any place where persons are hired, of large number of persons of the same race, color, religion, or national origin, should be considered evidence of discrimination in favor of, just as absence of any particular group might be thought to create a presumption of discrimination against. If this kind of legislation is to become national policy, it ought to be fair and equal. It ought to work both ways. It ought not to be one-sided. It ought not to be discriminatory. It should not foster unfair practice. It should be to prohibit discrimination in favor of as well as against.

One of the particularly obnoxious features of many foreign countries is the police state. In such a state the individual is constantly under surveillance in almost all of the ramifications of his existence. He is beset on every hand with innumerable snoopers of one kind or another. For the sake of economy and efficiency in such foreign states, their surveillance is to a large degree centralized. Without realizing it, this country is fast coming to what might be called a composite police state. The same thing is fast being accomplished through the medium of a number of Federal agencies, everyone possessing sizable police and investigative powers. So far, these investigative, police, visitational, and inquisitional powers have been largely confined to property and property rights. Now they are to be extended, under FEPC, to persons and their habits, customs, and morals. The subpena powers and investigative authority conferred on the Commission in the present legislative proposal should not become the pattern which Congress is to follow in successive acts, because the aggregate will surely bring on the police state, which has been the bane of civilized existence in many states abroad.

The net result of all this, is that, brushing aside the window dressing of the bill, it must stand or fall on the commerce clause. The framers of the proposed legislation may not derive any constitutional strength for it from the negative provisions of the fifth amendment, although they may run afoul of it.

Mr. President, if the bill should become law, it would, in my humble opinion, cause a great deal of misunderstanding, it would cause many businesses to close, it would throw a great many persons out of employment. That condition would come about because business

in America cannot successfully be operated if it is all the time under surveillance and told what it shall do. So I urge upon the Senate that the bill not be passed, and that the motion to consider it be rejected.

Mr. President, the bill would place more obnoxious controls and restrictions, social and economic, upon the lives of the people than any legislation of which I have knowledge, heretofore attempted to be passed. If enacted, the law would apply not to the South alone. It would affect all sections of our great country. The manufacturing plants of the North, East, and West would alike be affected. Passage of the bill would sound the death knell of all free enterprise in America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees; and

S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1151. An act to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers;

H. R. 2783. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.; and

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the Secretory of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau (Alaska) Camp.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1354. An act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California;

H. R. 2387. An act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections; and

H. R. 5097. An act for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7302) to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSE OF INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN INDUSTRIES

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably and without amendment, Senate Resolution 274, which I submitted in behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and myself on the 12th day of May.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and placed on the calendar.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which was unanimously approved by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the cause or causes of increasing unemployment in the coal, oil, silver, zinc, lead, and railroad industries. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem proper, to the Senate on or before the 25th day of June 1950.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand from the Senator from West Virginia that the resolution was favorably reported from the committee, with substantially a full membership present.

Mr. NEELY. A quorum was present. The committee's approval was unanimous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did all the minority members of the committee who were present approve the resolution?

Mr. NEELY. They did. The minority members present were the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question: Does the resolution require any funds from the Senate?

Mr. NEELY. It requires no expenditure whatever.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the committee now has the power to make such an investigation, and I further understand that it is the purpose of the Senator from West Virginia to obtain the endorsement of the Senate for an investigation which the committee really can make anyway.

Mr. NEELY. The committee could make the investigation without Senate action, but, in my opinion, Senate approval would promote the success of the undertaking.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall not object.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire a little about the resolution. Which committee of the Senate would the resolution authorize to make the inquiry?

Mr. NEELY. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MYERS. Under the resolution, that committee is to make the investigation; is that correct?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection.

I believe this matter should be studied, considered, and thoroughly investigated. I know that in the Senator's State of West Virginia and in my own State there has been considerable controversy over this very problem. I think it is something which should be given thorough consideration, because I understand that many of the mines which have been closed, have been forced to cease operating, because of the importation of foreign oil.

Mr. NEELY. That is true. Not only mines but also domestic refineries are being closed by the cut-throat competition of foreign oil.

Mr. MYERS. So I really believe the resolution should receive the immediate consideration of the Senate, and I heartly endorse the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say that I further understand that the resolution applies not only to coal, but also to zinc and lead.

Mr. NEELY. It includes unemployment in the coal, oil, zinc, lead, silver, and railroad industries.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think I am correct in stating, am I not, that this afternoon, at a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, at which seven members of the committee were present, the resolution was reported favorably by unanimous vote?

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether any appropriation is involved or authorized by the resolution?

Mr. NEELY. None whatever.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 274) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the

cause or causes of increasing unemployment in the coal, oil, silver, zinc, lead, and railroad industries. The committee shall report its finding, together with such recommendations as it may deem proper, to the Senate on or before the twenty-fifth day of June 1950.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement regarding the resolution.

I wish to commend the Senator from West Virginia for the resolution, which he has just submitted, carrying out further the very striking and, I think, statesmanlike speech which the Senator from West Virginia made in the Senate a few days regarding the peril to our economy as a result of foreign importations. I know that in the hands of the Senator from West Virginia, who I assume will be named as chairman of the subcommittee to deal with this matter, we shall have before the date fixed in the resolution—namely, June 25, 1950, or some time within the next 5 or 6 weeks—a report on this matter which in my judgment may well be a waymark in pointing out the peril of the course we have been pursuing.

I think especial commendation is called for because of the fact that the resolution comes from the other side of the Chamber, with the unanimous consent of all the Senators who were present following the quorum call—indicating that they were not prepared to follow without questioning the doctrines which have been enunciated throughout the country in the past week by the distinguished President of the United States on his nonpolitical tour, demanding not only that we should endorse all the previous reductions of our tariffs, but that we should go further not only with the reductions in tariffs now contemplated at Torquay, England, at the conference now planned, but also that we should adopt the International Trade Organization, which would freeze for years to come the present condition of our country. As the Senator from West Virginia has well pointed out, we are already suffering disastrous results and there are possibilities of further damage which it is impossible to calculate.

So I consider that the resolution of the Senator from West Virginia is not only to be commended, but that the report which may be filed on the basis of the resolution and the limited materials available, may well point out the way by which to save the country from the course which the President is trying, in his advocacy of it, to persuade the Nation to adopt in the interest, so he alleges, of peace.

After all, Mr. President, we reduced tariffs in 1913, and 5 years later we had a world war. We reduced tariffs again in 1932, and 8 years later we had a world war. Certainly the path of tariff reductions is not the path which has kept the United States out of war.

I do not blame the Democrats, but I certainly think the Republicans could not have done any worse.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on this occasion, I shall refrain from discussing either the age-old tariff question, or the doctrines of the beloved President of the United States. But I assure the distinguished Senator from Maine that the investigation which will be made in accordance with the resolution will shed light on the devastation caused by flooding foreign oil, which is daily and hourly injuring our coal, oil, and railroad industries.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am heartily in favor of the resolution, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia well knows. I have already complimented him upon the forceful address he delivered in the Senate last week, relative to the purposes of the resolution and its basis.

No doubt the resolution is sufficiently broad to cover more than the oil and coal industries and unemployment in those particular industries, for I understood that it would also include an investigation into such commodities as glassware and lead and zinc.

Mr. NEELY. It includes only the lead, zinc, silver, coal, oil, and railroad industries.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for broadening the scope of the resolution so as to have it include at least those commodities and industries.

I am quite sure that if the distinguished Senator will carry this matter to a successful conclusion—as I know he will—he will be able to make many other observations about the importation of commodities other than oil.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator should not doubt either the thoroughness or fairness of the investigation or report since the eminent Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the eminent Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will be members of the subcommittee by which the investigation and report will be made. Notwithstanding my chairmanship of the subcommittee, its work will be well done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the information. I am happy indeed to see a committee of this kind undertake the investigation, which I think is badly needed. The Senate should have light upon the impact of the flood of such importations not only upon the domestic economy but upon the dislocations of industry, and certainly the unemployment situation which is bound to result if the movement continues on the present scale.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I may say and I think the Senator will agree—that the limitation in the resolution does not indicate any conclusions as to whether the difficulties may be more widespread. We on this side of the Chamber were very happy to cooperate with the somewhat limited scope of the resolution, not only because that was what the Senator from West Virginia was addressing himself to, in view of his concern for his own constituents, which is most commendable, but because, as time goes on, it may appear that a broader scope will be desirable, either through his committee or other committees.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me repeat the assurance which I gave some of my friends on the Republican side during my recent discussion of this question. If it should appear that any other industry is suffering as the coal, oil and railroad industries are suffering, I shall help to provide proper relief.

THE CROSSROADS IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there has been much discussion recently on the question of how to get the Reds out of the Federal Government. Today I want to discuss an equally important question—how to get the Federal Government out of the "red."

In 1951 the United States Government is planning to spend approximately $42,000,000,000. Placed end to end, these billions of dollars, in 1 dollar bills, would circle the globe 162 times. This is a tremendous amount of money. When we talk about billions of dollars, it is beyond the comprehension of the average person. Let us consider 42,000,000,000 in terms of 1 dollar bills. In 1 dollar bills, the amount of money proposed to be spent by the Government as I have said, would go around the world at its widest point 162 times. This amount is from $6,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000 more than the estimated $35,000,000,000 to $36,000,000,000 the Government hopes to collect in taxes and other revenues during the same period.

In other words, for the twentieth year in a row, with the exception of 2 years, 1947 and 1948, during which the Republicans controlled the Congress of the United States, when the Republicans balanced the budget and reduced the debt substantially—except for those 2 years, for the past 20 years the annual Federal expenditures have exceeded the annual Federal income. The most amazing part of this dismal story is that recently this deficit has been incurred despite unprecedentedly high Federal receipts caused by our greatly increased national income.

This annual Federal deficit—and what we should do about it—is what I want to discuss. During the war it was necessarily tolerated because of the national emergency. Today that alibi no longer holds true. There is no more reason for spending beyond our income today than there was in the thirties—and it is many times as dangerous. If we spend so much beyond our income in a normal peacetime year, what will happen if we have an economic or foreign crisis? Each year we are led to understand that in this particular year, "because of the emergency," we cannot have a balanced budget. The inference is that next year—always next year—things will look brighter, and then we shall begin to balance the budget and reduce the debt. The inference is that next year we are going to do something about it. It reminds me a good deal of the New Year's resolution of Mark Twain. On one occasion he made the following New Year's resolution: "This year I am going to live within my income—even if I have to borrow money to do it." That is the principle on which the Federal Government

has been operating. President Roosevelt started it back in 1932 when he said:

> Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

I do not think I need comment on that statement. We all know the record of Roosevelt's New Deal policies.

Two years ago I stood in this same spot and warned the Congress that we were approaching a crossroads in Government spending. I said that we must either put our financial house in order or suffer heavier and heavier onslaughts on the bulwark of our democratic way of life.

Today I repeat that warning. But this time let me add that each day that passes, each dollar we add to the Federal debt, each time we allow for an expansion of the welfare state, we are forcing ourselves into a harder decision. And if we go beyond the crossroads, there may come a time when the decision will no longer be ours to make. Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes recently stated much the same idea when he said to the Southern Governors:

> We see many of the states of western Europe and Great Britain which have embraced socialism, unable to stand on their own feet; the very existence of their governments is dependent upon the taxpayers of the United States. It would seem prudent for us to hold fast to our system fof government and to put our financial house in order. Instead of that, we are threatened with the concentration in Washington of the powers of local governments, including police powers and the imposition of creeping but ever-advancing socialistic programs.

Mr. President, we stand at the crossroads, and there are three paths we can take: First, we can take the road to the right. We can adopt the proposed spending program for 1951 and raise the taxes necessary to meet its requirements. Second, we have the road to the left. We can adopt the proposed spending program for 1951, leave taxes where they are and let the deficit be added to the already staggering $255,600,000,000 debt.

Third, we can take the center course. We can reduce the expenditures proposed in the budget to equal expected revenues.

Let us examine each of these briefly. First, the road to the right; the proposition to increase taxes to meet our deficit.

Undoubtedly this could be done. It would, however, increase the Federal tax burden one and one-half billion dollars above the wartime peak. That wartime peak tax load, it will be remembered, was intended to eliminate as much spending as possible. We did not want the consumer to compete for goods in short supply and thus encourage the black market.

More important, if local and State taxes are included, the average tax burden today is even higher than it was in 1945 when we were fighting a war and trying to pay for it at the same time. If substantial new taxes were added to the present load, it would cut our purchasing power and thereby glut our markets.

There is also the matter of incentives. Incentives apply not only to corporations and people with large incomes to invest, but also to Mr. Average Man trying to make financial provision for his future and the future of his children.

The President has indicated that he is counting heavily on an expanding economy to take care of the national debt. If the incentive to produce is destroyed by oppressive taxes, there will be no expansion.

Most of us, when we think of taxes, have in mind the March 15 payments or month-end payroll deductions. Yet only about 42 percent of the Federal tax revenue comes from personal-income taxes. Most of the remaining 58 percent of Federal revenue comes from excise and corporation taxes. These are very frequently hidden taxes—taxes hidden in prices. On cigarettes the Federal tax is 7½ cents a pack; on distilled spirits, about 50 percent; on theater admissions, 20 percent; on refrigerators, radios, electric, gas, and oil appliances from 5 to 25 percent; on baby oil, luggage, jewelry, and soap, 20 percent; on telephones, telegraph, and travel, 15 to 25 percent. For example, there are 151 different taxes on a loaf of bread.

The administration has implied that the present deficit is the result of the tax cut made by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Let us examine this idea. In the first place, the President himself had recommended a previous tax cut.

Furthermore, many noted economists have indicated that the reduction in wartime taxes made by the Eightieth Congress provided the additional stimulus needed to carry the Nation successfully over the postwar slump when supply caught up with purchasing power. As Prof. Sumner Slichter, noted Harvard economist, has pointed out:

> The cut in the personal-income taxes, effective in the middle of 1948, helped increase incomes after taxes at the time when consumer buying was leveling off.

Thus, had it not been for that much-maligned tax cut, the mild economic adjustments we have been undergoing in the past 18 months might have been far more severe—might, in fact, have been as disastrous as administration leaders had prophesied would happen at the end of the war, but which never occurred.

Mr. President, we have on the north a neighbor, Canada. Canada has had an experience in tax reduction, and it is a very noteworthy illustration of what could happen here. Since the war, the Canadian Government has made 5 successive tax cuts in 5 years. Each of these reductions was substantial, the total being approximately 55 percent of the tax collections in the last war year. Yet, tax receipts have varied very little. Why? Because, when the taxes were reduced, the economy of Canada expanded.

A tax increase now would, in my opinion, dry up our purchasing power, halt our economic expansion, and ultimately throw millions of people on relief rolls in the most serious economic depression we have ever faced.

No; increased taxes to make up our present deficit cannot and must not be the answer.

A long step toward solution of our tax problem must some day be taken. This step will involve reorganization of our entire tax system. It is ridiculous for a Nation which supports a free economy likewise to support a tax system calculated to destroy the free economy. We must provide incentives. We must eliminate double taxation. We must seek venture capital and return it to the money markets. These ends can be accomplished only through reorganization of our entire tax structure for the purpose of providing proper incentives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In order to make the comparison complete, has the Senator any knowledge of the amount of the Canadian debt at the start and at the finish of the war, and how much it has been reduced percentage-wise, as compared with our own debt?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have the figures in my office, but I did not bring them to the Chamber today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not that a proper part of the Senator's discussion?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, it is. Later on I shall put the figures into the RECORD.

(In the daily RECORD of Wednesday, May 17, Mr. BRIDGES made the following statement, which, on his request and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be transposed and printed at this point in the permanent RECORD:)

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a table showing the Canadian national debt during the past 5 years. This information was requested of me on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on Monday last. I have been furnished the following figures by the officials at the Canadian Embassy:

Canadian debt

1945–46	$16,807,000,000
1946–47	16,524,000,000
1947–48	15,957,000,000
1948–49	15,585,000,000
1949–50	15,191,000,000

Mr. BRIDGES. Alternative No. 2, the road to the left, is deficit financing—leaving taxes where they are, spending more than we collect, increasing the Federal debt.

This I regard as even more undesirable than increased taxation. Yet this is the program to which the administration has been committed since 1933. Dr. Edwin J. Nourse, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has even pointed out that deficits, he is afraid, are becoming a way of life.

Let us remember that except for the Republican years of a balanced budget, a man 40 years old has never seen his Government make ends meet since he was old enough to vote.

Nor, when an individual spends more than he makes, he may get for a year or two, but ultimately and inevitably the end is bankruptcy. The same is true of governments.

If deficit financing can be thought of as a disease, then inflation of currency is the telltale pockmark of that disease. The two go together. During 35 years of deficit financing in France, the value of the French franc fell from 32 cents to

about one-third of a cent. In this country, the last 10 years of deficit financing have reduced the value of the American dollar to less than 60 cents.

The worst part of this is that inflation strikes hardest at those who can least afford it; it shrinks savings, life insurance, pensions, and anything else tucked away for a rainy day. As a great Democrat, Bernard Baruch put it: "Anything which saps the value of savings—and inflation is the worst single threat—is the enemy of the aged and those who expect to grow old."

And he added, "and that is everybody in America."

Deficit financing, in the name of socialized security, might well combine with inflation to reduce a 60-cent dollar to a 10-cent or 5-cent dollar. Aside from the effect this would have on individual savings, it would deal a near-fatal blow to the economic strength of the Nation as a whole.

A Hoover Commission task force pointed out that the economic strength of the United States has given us victory in two World Wars. That strength is lost if deficit spending and inflation destroy confidence in our Government and our financial structure, both internally and externally. Thus, our national security itself is endangered by a continued policy of deficit spending.

Finally, there is a moral issue in deficit financing. Are we morally justified in passing onto our children and our children's children a gigantic ever-increasing national debt that must be paid for in generations to come, in the sweat of their brows? Even today the man who works 5 days a week, works Monday and part of Tuesday each week for his Government in order to pay taxes. One need not work 100 percent of the time, Monday through Friday, to arrive at a totalitarian welfare state. Such a course is as undemocratic as it is immoral. No. Deficit financing is not the answer.

There is a third alternative, the middle way. And that is to reduce Federal spending to what we as a nation can afford.

Because it must be done by us, here and now, it is the hardest course of all.

Several Senators have indicated that as much as $6,000,000,000 can be cut from the present budget without injury to a single essential program. Such a cut would bring about an approximate balance of the budget for the coming fiscal year. I give my wholehearted support to this program. I shall do all in my power as ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to see that it is carried out.

As stated previously, during the Eightieth Congress, controlled by Republicans, we balanced the budget. We even reduced the debt substantially. I had the honor to be chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations at that time, and I can state authoritatively that just as much spending pressure was exerted then as is being generated now. Yet a glance at the record will show that a balanced budget and debt reduction were accomplished during those years. This must be done now, too.

Here in brief form, are ways in which this can be accomplished:

First. Reduce the ordinary peacetime expenditures of the Government. These items, which are not related to past or future wars, have risen from $6,700,000,000 in 1948 to an estimated $12,300,000,000 in 1951, an increase of $5,600,000,000 in 2 years.

Second. Cut out the new programs until we can afford them. The President in his 1951 budget asks for more than $950,000,000 to finance 34 entirely new spending programs. How can we afford these?

Third. Reduce our ridiculous subsidy hand-outs which are costing us hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Let us protect the farmers. There is no necessity for ruining the national economy to do so. It is time for the planners to remember that Jefferson once said "Were we directed from Washington where to sow and where to reap, we should soon want bread."

Fourth. Reduce our grant-in-aid hand-outs. This program costs the taxpayers over one and one-half billion dollars annually. Several States have had the courage to renounce this device by which Federal controls are extended and have called the extension of Federal aid to States wasteful, unnecessary, and destructive of the American system of government. They have called upon Congress to stop or reduce such offered aid and suggested that the National Government limit itself to matters of purely national concern. Most States are in an excellent financial condition. Let us give back to the States their rights and prerogatives.

Fifth. Reduce Federal personnel. In 1932 there were somewhat more than 500,000 Federal employees. By 1939 this number had nearly doubled. Today it is almost four times as high, or nearly 2,000,000.

I commend the House of Representatives for the adoption of the so-called Jensen amendment. It was offered by the distinguished Representative from Iowa, Mr. BEN JENSEN, and it was adopted by the House of Representatives by an almost unanimous Republican vote, and with some 50 Democrats voting in favor of it. A study of the Jensen amendment discloses as intelligent an approach to the problem of reducing Federal employment rolls as we have seen offered in Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In order to reduce Government personnel, it is essential to have the cooperation and leadership of the executive branch, is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, it is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Congress alone cannot do it as intelligently as it should be done. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The Jensen amendment puts a limitation on rehiring when vacancies occur. It is perhaps the most painless and scientific approach to the problem which has been proposed so far. I do not know whether it is the whole answer, but certainly it is the best approach I have seen. It is a commonsense approach to a problem which has been a bugaboo for years.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Jensen amendment would require that the first 10 percent of vacancies in each department be not filled; is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. It would give an incentive to those who are still employed in a department to do a better job, so that they may succeed to a little better position, would it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it would. I believe it would combine a method of reduction in Federal personnel with an incentive for the remaining employees to do their best work.

Mr. BRICKER. Those who remained would realize that no political appointee would be brought in to succeed the person who had left the department?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The Government would get a double advantage. It would provide incentive and bring about a reduction in personnel.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. We have been aimlessly trying to find a way to reduce the number of Federal employees without, at the same time, being subjected to pressure from certain groups. It seems to me that the so-called Jensen amendment is an excellent approach to the problem.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Consideration should be given to one question, however, which was brought up in the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations. For example, it is possible that 50 percent of the electricians employed in the Boston Navy Yard might either resign or leave their employment. If only 1 electrician in 10 could be rehired, it might well hold up the whole line of work in the navy yard. So that while the principle of the Jensen amendment is sound, it must be adjusted to fit local conditions in order to be practical.

Mr. BRIDGES. It can be so adjusted. I am sure that what the Senator has cited is an extreme case. I do not think of many situations where all or 50 percent of the electricians or any other class of employees on a project would resign.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator have information as to the percentage of resignations or vacancies which occur over a period of a year in Federal employment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not have the figures before me. However, I am informed that there is a turn-over of about 2 percent a month. Therefore, it seems to me that a 10-percent cut could be accomplished in a fiscal year without any great harm being done to anyone. Whenever there is talk about economy, people are inclined to say, "Well, you are for economy, but you are talking in general terms." Mr. President, specifically, I am pointing out methods—and I have enumerated them 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10—of how we can reduce Govern-

ment expenditures, if there is a will in Congress to do so. The burden cannot fall alone on the shoulders of the minority party. The minority, after all, is in the minority. There must be support not only from the minority party, but from the majority as well. If we have the will to do it, it can be done.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. It might be said, too, that no one would be laid off if no replacements were made. I say this because there has been some concern expressed on the part of the younger veterans. They have expressed apprehension that because they have obtained jobs in the Government since the end of the war they have no seniority. Therefore if anyone is to be laid off, the younger veterans would be the first to be laid off. Of course, if a veteran has a disability rating, he is retained, and someone in the younger working class or group is the first to lose his job. Therefore considerable concern is expressed by that type of worker that a curtailment in the number of employees would immediately put the younger persons out of their job.

However, if we were to provide that no replacement was to be made when an employee retired because of age, or when a vacancy occurred by reason of death, this new class of worker who recently came on the payroll would not be affected. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. What he suggests would overcome the usual objection when reductions in personnel are planned. When a reduction of 5 or 10 percent in Government personnel is ordered, the employees with the least seniority, consisting usually of veterans and younger men, are the first to be discharged. Under the so-called Jensen amendment when a vacancy occurred by reason of resignation or death, the vacancy would not be filled immediately, either from a civil-service list or through political appointment because it would be possible to fill only 1 in every 10 vacancies that occurred up to 10 percent of the total. In other words, there wou'd be provided a painless method, as I see it, of reducing the Federal payroll by approximately 200,000 employees. As I said, I should like to commend the able Member of the House of Representatives for his sound approach to the problem.

Sixth. Generally eliminate contract authorization except in special instances. This is a legislative device by which the costs do not show during the year the power to obligate the money is given. We only hoodwink ourselves when we use this I O U device instead of making appropriations.

I have seen, as all other Members of the United States Senate have seen many times, Senators rise when a bill is pending, and say, "This bill carries no appriation; it is merely an authorization." So they allay the fears of the frugal by saying it carries no appropriation. Immediately after the bill is passed they come before the Committee on Appropriations and say, "Well, now, the Congress has authorized this amount. If Congress did not intend that the money should be spent, it never would have authorized it. You gentlemen are under a moral obligation to make the appropriation." They turn it around and it works both ways.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it not a fact that in the case of some of the contract authorizations, it has been represented that it would be several years in the future before there would be any necessity for the projects to come into full fruition, or to be developed or finally to be accomplished? Is not that true?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In this period, when we are running a big deficit, is it not practical for the Congress to recheck and rechannel some of the authorizations, or lay them on the shelf, until the Federal budget can be brought into some type of balance?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think that is one of the most constructive things that could be done. The distinguished President pro tempore will agree with me, because he has been bothered with the same problem, that if we are ever to get an answer to the problem we are facing, there could not be a more constructive act for the Congress than to authorize a study of projects which have been authorized, with the object, if it is possible to do so, of recalling or repealing some of the authorizations. Or we could at least postpone some of them until a future date when we could afford them. In that way we would relieve the necessity for the appropriation of a great deal of money.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does not the Senator agree that the most potent argument for a contract authorization is not that it will not be paid off for 4 or 5 years, as has been suggested by the Senator, but that it will not cost us anything until after the next election?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is true only too often.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator agree that the argument urged in the last week on the floor of the Senate for the adoption of point 4 in the ECA bill was exactly along that line?

Twenty-five million dollars is authorized as a lick and a promise, and many projects are started, so that when the next bill comes before the Congress, no doubt it will take several hundred million dollars to complete that which has been begun with an open-end authorization.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with that absolutely. That is the theory, and the problem we face.

Mr. BRICKER. We have had the same argument with respect to authorizations and appropriations bills. I am thinking particularly of the housing bill, which, the Senator remembers, was considered a short time ago, and which before it is finally consummated will cost approximately $15,000,000,000, or $20,000,000,000. The cost cannot be calculated because of the variable material costs which must be considered within the period of the duration of the law. In the beginning the cost will be small, the next year it will be more, and it will run into hundreds of millions of dollars before it is finished.

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely; the housing legislation is a fine example.

Mr. BRICKER. It is impossible to stop a program of that kind after it gets started because of the pressure of the minority groups which benefit.

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely. And talking about pressure, let me say one more thing to the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I think it was in 1947 when a certain item was before the Committee on Appropriations. The committee had not acted on it. The House had cut the item from $36,000,000 to $33,500,000, or approximately that amount. It was about 8 percent. The department involved proceeded to dismiss a much larger percentage of its field workers than was necessary. In the 3 days from Friday until the following Monday I received more than 5,000 communications addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

A very interesting thing happened, which I should like to cite as an example of what we are up against in a representative government. I could not send telegrams back to this large number of people, or send them individual letters. But I did send a mimeographed letter, and more than 300—I have forgotten the odd number—of the 5,680, took the time and trouble to sit down and write me that they had never sent me any such telegram. That is what the Congress faces from pressure groups. There is not only honest pressure, but there is dishonest pressure. I believe what I have cited is typical of what is going on all the time.

Mr. BRICKER. I think we have an example in the Senate this week of pressure in connection with the postal cut. The letters are coming in by the thousands every day. I think it is the best organized campaign we have experienced in years.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is absolutely correct. Here are other ways to cut spending:

Seventh. Fry the fat out of the pork-barrel bills. Our programs for river and habor development, flood control, rural electrification, power development, and reclamation are vastly extended beyond either our present needs or present ability to finance them. In many sections we are reclaiming more land to irrigate larger areas, to produce more crops, to create bigger surpluses, to pay larger subsidies, to increase the national debt. And then we burn the surpluses, and pay the owners of the reclaimed land to curtail production to increase the debt some more.

Eighth. Eliminate bureaucratic Government with its red tape and its duplications and wasteful management. To cite a few examples—and this is amazing:

Duplicating: The Army and Air Force have 140 printing and duplicating plants, the Navy 86, Commerce 26, Interior 15, to mention a few.

I repeat, the Army and Air Force have 140 printing and duplicating establishments; the Navy has 86; the Commerce Department has 26; the Interior Department has 15. People believe we have a Government Printing Office in Washington, but very few have any idea that the Department of Commerce alone has 26 different printing plants scattered over the country.

For instance, to show how they are located, some 61 are in Washington, 23 in San Francisco, 25 in Philadelphia, 16 in Chicago, 16 in New York, and so on.

Overlapping of functions: The committee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] found that 37 agencies carried on activities in public health, 22 in housing, 27 in labor relations, 64 in business relations, 37 in foreign aid, 24 in map making, 21 in transportation, 16 in education, and so forth.

Mr. President, that shows the number of departments there are running off in different directions, heading for the same goal.

Red tape: Now I wish to talk just a moment about red tape. It takes as many as 35 separate steps to process a routine letter received by the State Department. In another agency there are over 100 steps taken in processing an application for employment. And this does not include a single interview or examination.

Purchase orders: Half of the 3,000,000 purchase orders by Federal civilian agencies are for purchase of $10 or less. Yet it costs the Government more than $10 to perform the paper work alone on each of these purchase orders.

Vacant beds: On June 30, 1948, there were 100,000 vacant beds in Federal hospitals. Nevertheless, the lower House passed a bill on April 24, 1950, authorizing construction for 16,000 additional beds.

Insurance: The VA needs four times as many employees to handle its insurance workload as do private companies doing comparable work.

Supplies: A Hoover Commission task force report reveals that a $1 item costs an agency from $1.41 to $1.84 because of Federal handling and storage costs.

Hundreds of such items of waste, duplication and bogging down in the mire of red tape are available to the investigator. They go on unchecked for the most part. There are more of them every day.

A United Press item of March 13 revealed that one Government agency has a 93-year supply of light bulbs, a 247-year supply of loose-leaf binders, and enough filler paper for the binders to last 168 years. Those are the facts. What happens in the average department in Government? It approaches the end of the year. It is so anxious to get its next year's appropriation that if it has a few thousands dollars left over, instead of being proud to return the amount to the United States Treasury, it starts buying filler paper or something of that kind, until it gets, a 1-year supply ahead, or as much as 168 years' supply ahead. That is another reason the Government is running into the red today.

MOTOR VEHICLES

It is estimated the Government operates approximately 2,000,000 motor vehicles; yet no one agency has any idea of where they are or who runs them. There is not one agency or one person in the Federal Government who has any idea about where they all are. That is a problem in connection with which an over-all supervision would bring about very desirable results.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. As I remember the employment figures, that is about one automobile for every Government employee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. That is a pretty high average.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is a pretty high average. Of course, my employment total does not include military personnel. The 2,000,000 motor vehicles would include military vehicles.

ACCOUNTING PRACTICES

The Government of the United States is often referred to as the largest business in the world, but no business could possibly survive if it used the bookkeeping procedures employed by the Federal Government. The collectors of internal revenue impose most precise requirements on how a taxpayer should keep his books, but, as T. Coleman Andrews, who is chairman of the American Institute of Accountants' Committee on Governmental Accounting, has said:

> It—the Government—has not itself had an accounting system worthy of the name. There is no central accounting department and no officer solely responsible for seeing that regular understandable reports are submitted to the people, Congress, or the President on how the taxpayers' money is being used. Only a few years ago the Treasury announced a surplus when actually a deficit existed which was several times the reported surplus. If the average business firm kept no more appropriate and informative books than the Government, it would soon be bankrupt for lack of financial data which management needs to do its job successfully.

HOUSING

There are a total of 45 different agencies or offices concerned with housing, of which the Senator from Ohio, who has made a study of that problem, is probably aware.

Often these agencies are unknown to one another. It would appear that they could be consolidated into one or two central housing agencies; thereby making bureau chiefs out of agency heads at great savings in salary and the trappings that go with high office in Washington.

TYPEWRITERS

The Government owns more than three typewriters for every person on the Federal payroll who knows how to type. Did Senators know that for every clerk, every stenographer, every secretary, every person in the employ of the United States Government who can operate a typewriter, the Government of the United States has three typewriters? The Government owns three typewriters for every employee who knows how to type.

Ninth. I place last on the list of methods to balance the budget that concerning our defense expenditure outlay, in which I shall include our foreign commitments. Together these total roughly half of our Federal budget. Because they relate to the national security they are considered untouchable. This unfounded assumption has already cost us billions of dollars. Certainly anyone who has ever been a member of the armed services can attest to the fact that waste is ever present—in time, materials, and manpower.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wonder if the Senator is aware of a press release which was issued a few days ago, which set forth that there are something over 4,000 more telephones in the Pentagon Building today than there were there in the height of wartime?

Mr. BRIDGES. No, I am not. But I am not surprised at that figure.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Pentagon switchboard is the largest switchboard in the world, or so it is reported.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator for that statement. What the Senator has pointed out is typical. The statement respecting the telephones is news to me. However, I would have been willing to guess that the number of telephones in the Pentagon was no less than at the height of the war, but I could not dream there were 4,000 more now than then. It certainly shows the trend of the Government today.

The Secretary of Defense is to be commended for some of the economies he has accomplished in his establishment. Nothing I say here is intended in any way to belittle his achievements.

But much more can be done and must be done. When we voted for unification of the armed forces, we believed, as was stated on the floor of the Senate, we would have one system instead of the two then in being—the Army and the Navy. Instead, we now have four systems—the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We have four agencies there where we had two before. We now have more personnel offices, more budget offices, more accounts offices, more supply channels than we had before unification was brought about. Where we had two types of uniform we now have three. The Air Force now even plans to paint its vehicles stratoblue instead of the present olive drab. That is unification.

I voted for unification. I helped with the unification bill. I hoped we would obtain unification, and that it would bring about increased efficiency and eliminate a great deal of waste and inefficiency. There has been some increase in efficiency, but I think much more has to be done in the way of elimination of inefficiency. In some instances agencies, rather than having eliminated waste and inefficiency, have done the reverse.

Throughout the United States the Army still maintains a tremendous num-

ber of forts, camps, and installations. They have utterly no relation to our national defense needs. Only installations which are integrated in our overall plans for the defense of America can, in my opinion, be justified.

For instance, in some sections of the country Indian forts were built for use in the days when we were fighting the Indians. There is no reason on earth for maintaining those forts today. Soldiers cannot be trained in them now. Soldiers must now be trained in large training camps.

We have forts in existence on the Canadian border. We have some, even in New England, the existence of which cannot be justified for any military or other reasons. If we want to economize there are many ways by which we can do so in the defense establishment without doing any damage to the national security.

Primarily our objective in defense preparations must be to balance out expenditures against our vital needs in the light of our economic ability to support such vast costs. We must remember that we can spend ourselves into becoming an economically weak war machine.

With this in mind I intend shortly to introduce proposed legislation calling for a revaluation of our air defense needs and war potential. It is high time we took stock of ourselves again in the manner suggested by the Joint Congressional Aviation Board and the Finletter Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New Hampshire has suggested that we must spend our means for our vital needs. Is it not essential that we consider the national security first? If we consider the national security first, then the advancement of our way of life by the development of our resources and improvements for the benefit of all of us as individuals will come with the peace and security which is acquired. But at the present time does not the great problem arise from the fact that we are trying to carry two buckets of water, one in either hand, one representing security and the other representing improvements in our way of life at home, and that the two buckets together are too heavy to carry? Is not that the cause of our basic problem?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is what brings about our basic problem, yes. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The wanton spending of the Democratic administrations is playing into the hands of the Communists. In a speech in 1924, Nikolai Lenin, patron saint of Soviet Russia, discussed the Communist timetable for the conquest of American democracy. This was many years ago. He made a prophecy that America would exhaust its people and its resources by wanton spending in the guise of national defense. He advised his comrades to keep an unremitting pressure on the United States. He predicted that such pressure would compel our Nation to spend itself into destruction. Stalin recalls Lenin's prediction. He must watch our financial antics with grim satisfaction.

Mr. President, we must remain strong; but we must also remember Lenin's prophecy. To over-extend our economic ability to wage war might exact as fearful a toll as lack of preparedness itself. We over-extend ourselves when we continue year after year to spend more than we can pay for.

The budget can be balanced this year, if we have the will to do it. It will require courage to do so, for it is not easy to vote against popular local handouts.

Yet public opinion, I believe, is becoming increasingly antagonistic to unwarranted Federal spending. In a recent poll—I do not place too much dependence upon polls, since a year and a half ago—67 percent of those queried believed the Government was spending too much, 18 percent said the total was about right, 4 percent said not enough was being spent, and 11 percent were undecided. Significantly, substantially over half of those in the middle-income and lower-income groups believed too much was being spent.

Yet constantly we are today being beseiged by pressure groups demanding their share of the handout booty. Despite this, there are millions of Americans who are not seeking Government help; that do not want false financial assistance at someone else's expense.

But the Federal financial crisis will not be licked until the American people refuse handouts, in the knowledge that there is no such thing as something for nothing, in the realization that the taxpayer must foot the bill for every Government gift, in the understanding that the Federal Government does not produce, it only uses up what the people produce.

People are beginning to understand the problem. We need more men, though, like the man in Casper, Wyo., who wrote the Secretary of Defense recently:

> We saw our air base taken off the active list. When you took a stand for economy * * * we felt you were taking a stand for the things this country believes in and holds important.

Or the city officials of Winnetka, Ill., who rejected an allotment of $316,000 for a new post office, when they were notified by the distinguished majority leader of the Senate. They said:

> The country needs many things more urgently than Winnetka needs a post office, among them a spirit of economy in Washington.

The citizens of my State—the State of New Hampshire—will contribute more than $123,000,000 toward the 1951 budget. That is a small part of the total, but consider this: The State government of New Hampshire is operating an austerity program, on an annual budget of approximately $50,000,000. The legislature, presently in session, is attempting to devise ways and means of raising funds to provide our school teachers with pensions and our State employees with salary adjustments.

People in New Hampshire have no complaint about contributing their share to our national budget for financing past wars and the possibility of future wars. These are proper functions of the Federal Government, but the people of New Hampshire are demanding that the Federal Government stop usurping the right of States to handle their own affairs.

They know that the hand-out policy of the Federal Government will react to the detriment of New Hampshire people and the entire population.

They know that the Federal tax dollar can never return in full to the people.

They know that administrative costs, waste, duplication, and the frills of Federal Government bite ever increasing chunks out of the tax pie.

They know the increasing interest on the Federal debt, increasing Federal control on State affairs, and an increasing dependence on Federal hand-outs will sap our national strength.

They want us to do something about it.

With this kind of support, Mr. President, the Congress can solve our present financial crisis. We can balance the budget by reducing Federal aids, subsidies, and loans, by eliminating excess personnel and unnecessary services, and by cutting ruthlessly the pork-barrel legislation.

Simultaneously we can cut down our paradoxical program which, for example, finds one agency telling farmers how to grow bigger crops, which is a good thing, but is inconsistent with the work of another agency in limiting production through acreage control and other regimentations; which finds the Government controlling private credit, but expanding the public debt; which finds the Government subsidizing airlines and road transport to a point where competition threatens to bring about bankruptcy or new subsidies for railroads.

The Congress can balance the budget this year, but it must be supported wholeheartedly by public opinion; and, to be effective, it must be nonpartisan.

Before this is possible, the American taxpayer's reawakened understanding of the value of a dollar must be part of the Federal financial picture.

Reduced spending, accompanied by limitations on the functions of Government, is the hard way; but it is the only path to real national security. The very existence of our Nation may well depend on what every American thinks and does in this situation—a situation which George Washington had in mind when he said in his Farewell Address:

> Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of debt.

Never has Washington's advice had greater significance. Never has there been greater need for a united front against this enemy from within—financial chaos.

Mr. President, I shall never forget a statement which was made by a distinguished Member of the Senate in the

spending days of the thirties, when I was in the Senate. He was a very able Democratic Senator from Mississippi, the late Pat Harrison. Pat Harrison said, and I often recall it:

> This country can no more spend its way to prosperity than a drunken man can drink himself sober.

Mr. President, if the statement of principle enunciated at that time by Pat Harrison could be taken to heart by the Members of this Congress, it could be a very useful motto today.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his clear and thoughtful analysis of the economic problems facing the country at the present time, especially in connection with the budget which we anticipate passing upon soon.

However, I find it rather difficult to acquaint the American people with the facts which will cause them to have an appreciation of the meaning of deficit financing and the danger attending it. The people have been rather anesthetized by indirect taxes; for today, so far as direct taxes are concerned, the people feel only a slight part of the total tax burden which presents the total cost of the Federal Government.

Does the Senator from New Hampshire agree with me that the experience with Government bonds of small denominations which were purchased in a spirit of patriotism during the war some 10 years ago, and now are being cashed, brings home rather clearly the danger of deficit financing? During the war our people paid, for instance, $75 for a Government bond which was to be redeemed at $100 in 10 years. However, at the present time every dollar of the maturity value of such a bond is worth only 60 cents in terms of the value of a dollar 10 years ago. In other words, today that bond is worth only a little more than half of what its maturity value was worth at that time; the owner of the bond finds his present return diminished to that extent, in addition to the taxes which have to be paid upon the bonds.

Furthermore, in the case of life-insurance policies which were purchased some 10 years ago, the experience of today is that they are presently worth only approximately one-half of what they were worth at that time.

So, Mr. President, if the American people could be awakened by having to pay a larger part of the total tax burden by direct taxes, rather than by indirect taxes, and if they could again have brought home to them how much less they can buy today with a dollar than they could when they invested their dollars in insurance policies or in Government bonds, I believe there would be an awakening on the part of the public generally and a tax consciousness which would undergird the Senate and the House of Representatives in their efforts to balance the budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct.

A few days ago there was brought to my attention an instance which points up the situation very well: A man who had been a hard worker and thrifty, died very suddenly. He left a widow and four children. All his life he had put his savings into life insurance. That life insurance was written in such a way that, on the basis of the value of the dollar at the time when he made his plans, his family could have been cared for adequately. Today, with the shrinkage in the buying value of the dollar, and the deficit fiscal situation, we find that the wife, who is a partial cripple, and her family are hopelessly in debt. Two of the children probably will have to be either placed in a home or adopted. Yet that man, a good American citizen, had faith in his Government when he made provision for his family. He thought he was caring for them adequately. We have seen the Federal fiscal situation so change the picture that it makes his family almost a relief case today.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the direct result of deficit financing, which is weakening the value of the dollar.

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator further agree that the use of social-security money, as it has been used in deficit financing during the past few years, has further weakened our whole economic system and has not really given security to those who have a false feeling of security because of what Government promises them in the future, and has it not likewise deprived the hard-working American citizen of the opportunity of building his own security for himself and those dependent upon him against the day of need?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do. I agree, absolutely. I believe in social security. But the person who depends on social security and says, "Well, it does not make any difference to me whether the Government goes on a spending spree or not," is going to be fooled. He has got to remember that the only possibility in the world that he will be taken care of in his old age, through the social security program is the ability of the United States Government to tax someone else to pay him.

Mr. BRICKER. In other words, social security is absolutely dependent, if it is to be real social security, upon political security and political liberty, is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Absolutely; political security and political liberty are the fundamental essentials.

SOVIET PLANS FURTHER AGGRESSION FROM ITS CHINA BASE—ARTICLE FROM LABOR'S MONTHLY SURVEY

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, from Labor's Monthly Survey, a publication of the American Federation of Labor, the issue of April-May 1950, volume 2, No. 4–5 which was released on May 8, the paragraph dealing with our far-eastern policy, which begins on page 5 and continues to the top of page 7. I think Members of the Senate and of the press who have not read it will find it very enlightening.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET PLANS FURTHER AGGRESSION FROM ITS CHINA BASE

Soviet control in China follows the pattern familiar in Europe. Stalin's puppet Mao carries out his orders, and in return Stalin supplies him with the armed force necessary to keep him in power and to carry forward the Soviet conquests. Soviet planes and equipment are being furnished, Soviet generals direct Red China's armies. From its China base, the Soviet reaches for Indochina, plans a drive into Tibet, infiltrates Thailand, has already conquered the island of Hainan, looks toward a drive on Formosa, the last island stronghold of the legitimate Government of China. By fomenting civil war in Indochina and attacking the Viet Nam government which is a member of the French Union, Stalin accomplishes a double purpose: He forces the French to drain their military strength away from Europe, and also prepares a further Communist advance into southeast Asia, toward Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, with the goal of outflanking India. And India is the key to this vital southeastern area, rich in so many essential raw materials. This is an area of great danger to the United States of America, at the western door to our own country.

It is significant that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions is sending a delegation to India and the Far East preliminary to setting up a branch office there. Such an office will be a vital rallying point for free-trade unionists who seek to defeat Communist efforts to capture the Indian and other trade-union movements.

In China, the ruthless Communist conquest has brought the people to poverty and starvation. It is estimated that about 10,000,000 Chinese will die of starvation this year, and the Soviet has refused to permit the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization to send food to them. Many of the free-trade unionists who sought to better the conditions of Chinese workers have been murdered in cold blood. Liu Sung-shan, veteran trade-union leader revered by all, had been three times Chinese workers' delegate to the International Labor Organization. He thought he could carry on his trade-union activities under the Communist government as he would under any other, and continued to help the Chinese workers. He was beheaded by the Communist authorities.

On the island of Formosa are the headquarters of the anti-Communist underground movements active on the mainland. Formosa is the key to maintenance of legitimate governments in the Philippines, Japan, and the far eastern islands. Anti-Communists everywhere can help by aid to these resistance organizations. Here is the last chance for the United States to take a stand against the spread of Communist aggression across the Pacific to our own shores.

DEATH WARRANT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS?

The United Nations was set up 5 years ago to suppress acts of aggression and bring about settlement of international disputes "by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law." All members, including USSR, pledged

themselves to respect "the territorial integrity and political independence of any state" and to refrain from the use of force. Stalin now seeks to remove from the United Nations the legitimate government of China, a charter member, and replace it with the usurping Communist regime, imposed on the people of China by military conquest in violation of the United Nations charter. He hopes by so doing to secure for himself two of the five veto powers on the Security Council.

As the chairman of the Federation's Free Trade Union Committee points out, for the United Nations to agree to any such maneuver "would be tantamount to signing its own death warrant." If, instead of striving to protect weaker states and insisting on law and justice, the United Nations becomes a means of endorsing aggression and recognizing states set up by military conquest, it will follow the League of Nations to the scrap heap.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the motion to take up S. 1728, the FEPC bill. I hope that ultimately cloture may prevail and we will have a chance to discuss the bill on its merits and to vote on it. I am in favor of its passage.

On February 8, 1946, I offered two amendments to Senate bill 101 which was then under discussion and which was the FEPC bill of the Seventy-ninth Congress. These amendments had to do with the enforcement provisions of the bill. They were not very dissimilar from those which we are now discussing as a part of the present bill. At that time I stated that when I was the Governor of Massachusetts in 1943 I was very much disturbed by a report in a New York newspaper regarding race riots in Boston. That experience gave me an inkling of how easily misunderstandings can arise. Boston is truly a metropolitan city, made up as it is of citizens of many different racial and religious beliefs, but we have never had great dissension because of those differing beliefs. At that time in 1943 I appointed a commission of five distinguished citizens of different religious and racial beliefs and asked them to verify the truth of the charges. They investigated carefully and reported. The charges did have a slight basis in fact but were greatly exaggerated. What basis in fact they did have could be ascribed to the ordinary exuberance of 16- and 17-year-old boys in a crowded neighborhood. But, the commission that I appointed did so much good work in determining the truth in this instance and was so universally accepted by our citizens that I requested them to continue their work. That commission is still functioning, having functioned under one Republican and two Democratic governors since I left office. The recommendations that this commission makes from time to time emphasize education and understanding as the greatest means of eliminating racial and religious jealousies.

Mr. President, in that connection, I found a note in the Boston Daily Globe of Friday, May 12, which came to my desk today, in which it is pointed out that the United Community Services of Boston, which is our community-fund effort in Boston, had just presented 10 awards to Negroes for aid in the community. That was done because of their meritorious contributions to community relations. That is the spirit we want to foster and encourage if we can.

Today the world is still torn by the effects of World War II. While in some lands the shooting still goes on, for us the shooting war is over—I hope forever. But, at an increasing tempo we are in a cold war of ideologies. If we are not going to allow that war to become hot, we must remain strong; we must strive with every means at our command to show to the other nations of the world the principles and ideals for which we stand. This can be done best through education. The object which we seek in this legislation can best be accomplished by education. I feel confident that it can be accomplished; but in seeking to make it more of a reality we want to be sure that our Nation endeavors continuously to do its utmost to end any discrimination that may arise within our borders. We must study again those words contained in the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

I have always felt very keenly that if we consider the proper interpretation of these words "all men are created equal" and if men have among their "unalienable rights," "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" then we must agree that any discrimination because of religion, or race, or color, or national origin is not compatible.

In our State of Massachusetts I know we are making progress toward better understanding among our citizens. I have always been proud of how the various groups that comprise Massachusetts work together. I am proud of this fact because about 60 percent of our citizens were either born in another country or are the sons and daughters of citizens born in other countries. So, we have in Massachusetts truly representative citizens of the United States in the full sense of that word. Our Massachusetts Constitution has this to say:

> The end of the institution, maintenance, and administration of government is to secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights, and the blessings of life.

Today the Constitution of Massachusetts is the oldest written constitution in the world in practical operation. I am confident that the good citizens who formed it did not have in mind any discrimination against anyone. It seems to me perfectly clear when they mention "their natural rights and blessings of life" that they meant all men and women have a right to be treated alike without discrimination and that it is the duty of government to see that they have this opportunity. The Constitution of Massachusetts goes on to say "and whenever these great objects are not obtained people have a right to alter the government and to take measures necessary for their safety, prosperity and happiness."

The older I become and the longer I remain in public life, I cannot stress too strongly that laws can never replace mutual understanding and confidence. This can only be done by education and by a willingness among individuals to cooperate with each other, to live peacefully with each other, and to understand the hopes and aspirations of their friends and neighbors. This is the fundamental thought that must underlie any legislation of the character of FEPC. Experience has shown, as I shall point out later, that some compulsory feature of FEPC legislation is highly desirable but the mere fact that out of the many cases which have been heard none has yet been taken to court shows that conciliation has been extremely successful. Conciliation in its best sense means mutual understanding and a will to cooperate.

Ten States have now passed FEPC legislation. In eight of those States the laws are very similiar to the bill that we now have under discussion. In two of those States—Indiana and Wisconsin—there are no compulsory features. The experience of four of those States, i. e., New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington, is necessarily limited because their laws were passed only last year. However, there has been sufficient practical experience in the States of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut to give some very good indication of how their laws are working. In each of these States commissions have been established. In each of these States these commissions have the duty of attempting to end the alleged discrimination by conference and conciliation. So far no cases in any State, as far as I have learned, have been brought before the courts or had the compulsory feature in the law operate. In every instance satisfactory results, in the opinion of the commisson, have been accomplished through the conciliatory and conference sections of the act.

Each of these commissions emphasize in their reports, and in the correspondence that I have had with them, the fact that the existence of the compulsory feature has permitted the commission to accomplish the results without its actual use. This fact is emphasized by the statement from the administrative assistant in Wisconsin, where there is no compulsory feature. I quote one paragraph from Miss Virginia Huebner's letter to me of January 27, 1950:

> The need for guaranteeing equality of job opportunity for all persons who qualify having been clearly demonstrated, it is my personal belief that defining the so-called compulsory provision as a last measure when all other informal methods of persuasion and

conciliation fail to achieve the desired results, really dignifies the fair employment procedure and stimulates interest, action, and respect. Such provision, however, has not been written into our present Wisconsin act.

This year, in order to find out how the commissions were working in the States where they have been set up, I wrote to the governors in those States. I should now like to read to the Senate some of the answers which I received.

Chapter 118 of the Laws of 1935 in New York, the law that bears the name of our distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], was the first in operation. Under date of January 7, 1950, Governor Dewey wrote me in part as follows:

In New York the law has now been operating for 4½ years. The commission consisted of fine, enthusiastic people. But they were also restrained and intelligent people. As a result, every case that ever went to the board, at least until recently, was conciliated privately without ever a hearing by the full board. That means, of course, that no orders were ever issued, there were no violations of orders, and no legal sanctions have ever been invoked. There has been universal acceptance of the law and barriers in employment have been broken down almost universally by voluntary action following conference.

Senators will note the last sentence, which I shall repeat:

There has been universal acceptance of the law and barriers in employment have been broken down almost universally by voluntary action following conference.

Governor Bowles, of Connecticut, emphasizes in his letter the importance of the work of the commission in Connecticut and states he believes it should be accomplished by a separate commission and not by any existing agency. He also believes that the work should be done quietly and persistently but not with any emphasis on publicity. The report of the commission in Connecticut states in part:

CIVIL RIGHTS IN CONNECTICUT

Connecticut has a fair employment practices act passed in May 1947, administered by the State inter-racial commission. It provides for complaint, investigation and where the commission believes a discriminatory practice has been committed, they attempt to correct it by conciliation, conference or persuasion. Failing this, they are empowered to hold an administrative hearing, issue cease and desist orders, and if necessary call on the courts to enforce these orders.

To date some 140 complaints have been filed under this act and in about 60 percent of these the commission has felt that discriminatory practices had been committed. It was able to adjust these complaints without resort to the hearing procedure except in one complaint which has been scheduled for a hearing. If this hearing is held, it will be the first one in any of the 8 States now having FEPC laws. Features of the Connecticut law are that it covers all employers of five or more. Unlike other States, it does not exempt charitable, educational, religious, and nonprofit enterprises. It also states that discrimination includes separation and segregation. Unlike the other State laws it does not provide criminal penalties or stipulate that pre-employment inquiries or questions in employment interviews regarding applicants' race, religion or color are discriminatory.

The State civil service law (merit system) also has a section forbidding discrimination against civil service employees or applicants on account of their racial or religious affiliations.

From New Jersey, Governor Driscoll writes as follows:

The 1945 legislature passed an act to prevent and eliminate practices of discrimination in employment (P. L. 1945, c. 169). The law took effect July 1, 1945. In the almost 5 years that have elapsed, the division against discrimination processed a total of 893 individual complaints. Two hundred of these involved inquiries into alleged discriminatory situations other than employment, and these were handled by the division as part of its broader program of studying the problems of discrimination in all fields of human relationships and of fostering, through community effort or otherwise, good will, cooperation and concilation among all elements of the population of the State.

The division did not once, during this entire period, find it necessary to hold a public hearing or resort to the courts to enforce the provisions of the law. About 50 percent of the complaints filed with the division charging discrimination in employment were found to be justified; discrimination actually did exist. In every instance the division through interpretation, conciliation and mediation, effected adjustments which not only satisfied the complainant, but resulted in a change of the employment policy that had caused the initial complaint.

Some have argued that if cases can successfully be settled on the conference level, then the compulsory feature in the law is unnecessary. The answer to this, of course, is relatively simple. Where all parties to the conference know that enforcement provisions are available, they tend to be much more receptive to settlement agreements. Contrast the experience of organizations which have sought the same ends through a program of education, the only method available to them. I have been informed by representatives of the Urban League, for example, that in the 40 years of that organization's existence it has made relatively little progress, using education tools only, in interpreting to employers and union leadership the real meaning of employment discrimination.

We in New Jersey feel that a fair employment practices law must, if it is to be effective, have compulsory features. At the same time, the law must be sufficiently elastic to permit wide discretionary powers in the administrator before legal sanctions are applied.

The debates in Congress will doubtless include the familiar argument that civil rights laws can never eliminate prejudice. In New Jersey we recognize the realities of the situation. We agree that laws cannot of themselves eliminate prejudice. All we are attempting to do is to restrain people who would translate their prejudices into active discrimination and thus interfere with the basic rights of other individuals. We look upon our civil rights laws as a means of reducing the discrimination, just as other laws have been found necessary to control other types of offenses against the social order.

Opponents of FEPC distort the facts in so many ways that it would be impossible for me to give as much information as I should like in this letter. I am therefore taking the liberty of enclosing material prepared by our division against discrimination in the State department of education, in the hope that it may prove helpful to you.

The commission's report from New Jersey substantiates these statements of the Governor. I have the report here if anyone wishes to look at it.

From my own home State of Massachusetts, Mrs. Mildred H. Mahoney, the very capable chairman of our commission, writes in part as follows:

We feel we have been very fortunate indeed in that we have settled 562 cases dealing with employers of over 300,000 employees without recourse to the compulsory features of our act. The wording of the act itself has been of great assistance to us. It states: "After the filing of any complaint, the chairman of the commission shall designate one of the commissioners to make, with the assistance of the commission's staff, prompt investigation in connection therewith; and if such commissioner shall determine after such investigation that probable cause exists for crediting the allegations of the complaint, he shall immediately endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practice complained of by conference, conciliation, and persuasion."

This means that the initial handling of the case is done on a conference basis and in a very informal manner. We feel that this approach has had real educational value and that often respondents have been persuaded that discrimination is decidedly undesirable and un-American. This approach is the antithesis of swinging a big stick.

We have also not sought publicity after cases have been settled. A fairly clear account of the operation of the commission's is presented in our annual report of last year and of this year. Since they are both brief, I am enclosing them and also a copy of the law itself.

On Wednesday of last week, I received a telegram from Governor McKay, of Oregon, stating the experience in that State since the law became effective on July 16, 1949. I quote:

Believe Oregon FEPC law working very satisfactorily. Fifteen complaints alleging discrimination filed since law became effective July 16, 1949. Fourteen of these were based on race and one on religious and national origin. Eleven complaints filed against employers and four against labor organizations. In one case it was found there had been no discrimination. One complaint dismissed because of lack of jurisdiction and three were adjusted by conference and conciliation. Ten complaints are pending. Much approval has been expressed for Oregon's legislation.

From Rhode Island on May 12 I received a reply which reads, on pages 10 and 11 of that State's initial report of its fair employment practices commission:

We feel that this law is a profound educational instrument and that the actual working of the law makes it possible for persons of differing racial, religious, and ancestral backgrounds to come to know one another more closely. We have viewed that strained feelings about minority groups have a natural tendency to disappear in the face of mutual understanding among individuals.

In the first 6 months of operation, the commission has processed seven cases of complaints of alleged discriminatory practices in the field of employment. Additional cases were reported to the agency; but not recorded, as conference on the problems disclosed there was no sound evidence of alleged discrimination. It is to be noted, however, that in all such cases, the complainants were fully satisfied in their own minds that they were prejudging the case and acting upon emotion rather than reason. Of all cases received and recorded, all were satisfactorily settled through conference and conciliation and no formal hearings were required. No cases are recorded as settled without the expressed satisfaction of the complainant with

the results. Of the cases against employers, two persons were hired by the employers, one has been assured the next job opportunity, and the others were found to be less qualified than the persons actually hired.

From the State of Washington, Governor Langlie telegraphs as follows:

Our FEPC law passed in 1949. Progress has been satisfactory. No cases have gone to hearing. All settled by conciliatory methods.

Governor Langlie also arranged to have sent to me the final semiannual report of the Washington State Board Against Discrimination in Employment. This report lists a total of 36 formal complaints filed since the board's establishment. Twenty-eight of these complaints have been closed with eight still pending. Of those closed, 24 revealed no discrimination practiced, 1 was closed by conference and conciliation, 3 were closed as having no ground for proper complaint.

Mr. President, I realize that this problem differs in the various sections of the country.

While I feel I cannot reiterate too often that I believe education is the best and most adequate solution to the problem of discrimination, I feel confident that the debates on this subject in the Senate during the 5½ years I have been privileged to be a Member have brought the whole problem more closely to the attention of the people of the country than at any previous time in our history. I feel confident that our citizens want to help to gradually reduce any symptoms of discrimination and to eliminate them just as far as possible. I believe that a Federal law properly, carefully, and sensibly administered by men and women carefully selected, who are willing to listen to all sides of the question will accomplish much in this direction.

For this reason, since I have been in the Senate I have joined in sponsoring FEPC legislation. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, when I first came to the Senate in 1945 I was very much interested in S. 101, the FEPC bill of the Seventy-ninth Congress. When it came up a year later, I submitted two amendments which I thought would make it more workable. In the Eightieth Congress, I was one of the sponsors of S. 984, the FEPC bill of the Eightieth Congress, which was introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] on March 27, 1947. While this bill was favorably reported, I regret to say it did not come up for discussion. Again in the present, the Eighty-first Congress, the Senator from New York introduced S. 174, an FEPC bill almost identical with the one now under discussion. Again I was very glad to be one of the sponsors.

I shall not enter upon a long discussion at this time of the effect of racial discrimination and our relations with other countries of the world because now we are debating our problem here at home. It is a problem for us in the United States. The solution must also be ours. I realize entirely that the problem in the North and the problem in the South are not the same in every respect by any means. I feel, however, that the problem becomes one for all of us to consider from whatever section of the country we come when we in Congress are asked to consider it. Every question brought before the Congress which involves the rights of any single individual to be free of racial or religious discrimination becomes the problem of every other citizen in the United States.

Mr. President, if we are to advance as the greatest nation the world has ever known, if we are to continue our Government as we know it today, if we are to continue to be a great land of opportunity, we must move forward as one nation without discrimination against any one of our citizens because of race, creed, or color.

Mr. President, I desire to discuss now very briefly the pending motion. It may involve, and I believe it will involve, the first test of an amendment to the rule on cloture, rule 22, which was adopted at the last session of the Senate. I take this opportunity to discuss this briefly because it has always been of interest to me. During my first year in the Senate when I tried to understand the rules I saw that the cloture provisions were not clearly enough worded to prevent endless discussion of the motion to take up if a determined minority resisted. In 1946 I submitted a resolution to amend the rules in an effort to plug the loopholes that permitted this. I submitted it again in 1947. That year the Rules Committee reported a resolution to amend the rules, but no action was taken upon it in the Eightieth Congress. Last year I again joined with others in submitting an identical resolution. This was reported and brought up for discussion. In the debate which followed the Vice President ruled that cloture could be obtained on a motion to take up under the rules then prevailing, when there was no unfinished business pending. I felt he was right, but the Senate overruled him.

As a result of this decision and a long discussion, a petition was circulated for a compromise. That compromise was for a constitutional two-thirds vote on cloture on any business before the Senate, including a motion to take up. This resulted in the Senate voting to amend rule 22 to make it as it presently stands. I did not sign the compromise, as I believed cloture should be obtainable by two-thirds of those present and voting. I cosponsored with the then Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Baldwin, an amendment to effectuate this objective. When this amendment was defeated I voted for the compromise because I felt it was a distinct step forward. It was a step forward in that it clearly made it possible to have a cloture petition on a motion to take up. If this amendment had not been adopted then we would be in the same position today in which we were in 1946 when we debated an amendment to the Chaplain's prayer and an amendment to the Journal for a period of 3 weeks, and then dropped the measure from further discussion because there was no way to end debate on the amendment to the Journal. This was the situation in which the Senate found itself in the discussion of 1949, after the Vice President's ruling was overturned by a majority of the Senate.

I believe in full and free debate. I do not believe in premature closing of debate. I believe that the rights of the minority should at all times be protected, but I feel that after reasonable discussion there should be some means, if at least two-thirds of the Senate believe the debate should be brought to a close, of bringing the debate to a close and voting the question involved either up or down.

This right to bring debate to a close should not be given to a majority, for it might, by so doing, override to easily the rights of the minority. It might in emotional crises do more harm than good. But we permit two-thirds of Congress to propose amendments to the Constitution, two-thirds of the Senate to ratify treaties and to amend the Senate rules, and two-thirds seems a logical percentage to determine that debate should be brought to a close.

The compromise under which we are now operating requires a constitutional two-thirds. It is an even more severe provision than is required for amending the Constitution. Therefore, no critic can say that the rights of the minority are being trampled upon. I only hope that this amendment to the rule will prove to be a practical step forward in making it possible to expedite the business of the Senate, and in due course to bring the issue to a vote.

I mention this in this discussion because there has been criticism that the change in the rules accomplished last year was not a step forward, but a step backward. I cannot agree with that criticism. If it were a step backward, a petition for cloture would not now be in order, and debate on the "motion to take up" could go on for such an indefinite period that other important Senate business could be blocked, and the bill presently under discussion never be brought up for debate on its merits.

Mr. President, I hope that cloture may prevail, and that S. 1728 may be taken up and favorably acted upon, because I for one would like the opportunity of voting yea upon it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Chester M. Foresman, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

A. Garnett Thompson, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia, vice Leslie E. Given, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified. That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James E. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Henry L. Pitts, Jr., of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

John A. Lehrs, of Maryland.
Franklin H. Murrell, of California.
J. A. Tuck Sherman, of Pennsylvania.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

To be ensign

Alfred C. Holmes, effective May 25, 1950.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Benjamin J. Chester

To be assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Preston Holden

To be nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Virginia Arnold

To be senior assistant dietitian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Susanne L. Cihunka

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

John B. Vander
Albert L. Chapman
Henry I. Kohn
Edward K. Reid
John D. Porterfield

To be senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Joseph E. Unsworth

To be senior scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Charles G. Dobrovolny
Malcolm J. Williams
Willard T. Haskins
Clarence M. Tarzwell

To be nurse directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

Lucile Petry
Pearl McIver

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Mildred E. Barnett
Ruth E. Anderson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose blessings and mercies are far beyond our worthiness and our comprehension, we bow before Thee in adoration, in humility, and in supplication.

Give us words with which to praise Thee; give us contrite hearts for our sins against Thee; give us aspiration and strength to serve Thee faithfully.

Take our hands in Thine and lead our faltering steps in the ways of righteousness and peace; take our minds and inspire them with a more spiritual interpretation of life and a finer conception of the brotherhood of man.

Bless us daily with a vivid sense of Thy nearness as we face difficult problems. May the fears and doubts which so often assail our souls be forever dispelled and supplanted by faith and courage.

In the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 10, 1950:

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson; and

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor.

On May 11, 1950:

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Avner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the national health plan for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3258. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 50–22.

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MAY 15, 1950.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable BEN H. GUILL as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of the State of Texas, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Eugene Worley, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. GUILL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

MINIMUM WAGE AND HOUR LEGISLATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, last year the House of Representatives passed a

very important bill in the field of minimum wage and maximum hour legislation. It will be recalled that the bill which we passed was the Lucas substitute for the Lesinski bill. The Lesinski bill transferred enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the Secretary of Labor out of the hands of the Wage and Hour Administrator. The bill carried more power, as I advised the House at that time, to the Secretary of Labor than any peacetime legislation which had ever been offered in the Congress.

Efforts have been made three times to carry the power of the Wage and Hour Administrator to the Secretary of Labor, giving him the power to regulate American business. Now the House is faced with that same problem again. The President's Reorganization Plan No. 6 provides that the Secretary of Labor shall issue regulations and so forth, and, in fact, administer this act. That organization plan will be up for consideration on the floor of this House on Thursday. I earnestly request each Member of this House to be present at that time in order that we may give full consideration to the measure which I have introduced—House Resolution 522—and understand exactly what will happen if it is not passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered and to revise and extend and make certain additions to those remarks.

AUTHORIZING THE GOVERNOR OF ALASKA TO FIX CERTAIN FEES AND CHARGES WITH RESPECT TO ELECTIONS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2387, an act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "Governor of Alaska" and insert "Alaska Territorial Legislature."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Governor" and insert "legislature."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "Governor" and insert "legislature."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "Governor" and insert "legislature."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF ALPENA, MICH.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2783, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich., with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "without consideration therefor" and insert "for the consideration of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value therefor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

TRANSFERRING A BUILDING IN JUNEAU, ALASKA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3494, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau—Alaska—Camp, together with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "without charge" and insert "in consideration of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

INDIAN LIVESTOCK LOANS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5097, an act for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Lines 3 and 4, strike out "at prevailing market prices" and insert "by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

Line 8, after "ratified", insert ": *Provided*, That hereafter the value of such livestock for the purposes of any such cash settlement shall be based on prevailing market prices in the area and shall be ascertained by a committee composed of three members, one of whom shall be selected by the superintendent of the particular agency, one of whom shall be selected by the chairman of the tribal council, and one of whom shall be selected by the other two members."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

PAYMENT FROM FUNDS TO THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 1354, an act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "alive on June 30, 1948" and insert "living on the date of the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "before June 30, 1948" and insert "prior to the date of the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "before June 30, 1948" and insert "prior to the date of the approval of this act."

Page 4, lines 8 and 9, strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act."

Page 4, line 25, strike out "section" and insert "act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Tuesday, May 16, following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday, May 16, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

REPUBLICAN POLICIES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues and of the country the similarity of the mask behind which the high command of the Republican Party is now hiding to that which it wore in the late twenties when it plunged this country into the greatest depression and the darkest period of hopeless despair we have ever known. I was of the generation engulfed by the catastrophic depression, the generation wrecked by the high command of the Republican Party, and I remember only too vividly how the depression started. It started in the same

kind of talk of economy that we are hearing now—a false, selfish, one-sided economy, it is true, but that was the ugly side of the face that the high command of the Republican Party hid behind the mask. It talked glibly of economy and efficiency, and it practised economy by reducing wages to increase profits and it practiced efficiency by sending in the efficiency-wrecking crews to find more ways of increasing the human work load. Then, inevitably, came unemployment and the crash.

I am for economy, but it must be an honest economy. I will have nothing to do with the false economy of the high command of the Republican Party which is based upon the daring and, I would say, the sacrilegious assumption, that God intended that even here in our American democracy a few men and women should enjoy all the cream and the rest of American manhood, womanhood, and childhood should be left fighting for a taste of the skimmed milk.

If fine gentlemen of publicized respectability, who show not their faces but who pull the strings, want the respect of the decent and honest men and women of America for their sincerity, they will start by trying a little economy where it will hurt their own pocketbooks. That, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, is too much to hope for, the power of long habit being what it is. I suppose when one has grown accustomed to believing that God intended him to have all the cream it is far preferable to take the chance on another depression rather than consent to a little of the cream dribbling into the other fellow's cup.

THE UNDISTURBING GOP SHADOW

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, now that Gabrielson has again blown his horn and a native son of the Hoosier Commonwealth has answered the clarion call to join Victor Johnson, executive secretary of the Republican senatorial campaign, to trail a great shadow over President Truman's train, we of the Democratic Party have not grown disturbed in the least. In fact, the opposition party has been trailing us since 1932 and it has a long trail ahead to convince the people of this Nation that it has something better to offer.

Recalling the great destructive shadow that the leaders of the Republican Party cast over our entire Nation in 1929, one would think the indelible lesson impressed upon their minds would stimulate them to refrain from the unscrupulous tactics of even attempting to shadow any type of an object.

However, realizing the fact that some people of the opposition had the audacity to paraphrase two of our most beautiful pieces of literature, the twenty-third psalm and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, in their desperation to discredit the Democratic Party, we must frankly admit some minds have grown barren of original ideas, and we can expect a bit of unthoughtful shadow casting as the trailers follow the Democratic leaders in quest of some constructive and durable platform planks to use that will appeal to the American people.

ORIGIN OF MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday millions of people all over the Nation, as well as in other countries of the world, celebrated Mother's Day, and rightfully so. I think every day in the year should be Mother's Day, but I do agree that it is nice to have one day set aside on which we can really celebrate mother who has been termed "God's angel on earth."

I was astonished, though, in listening over the radio to several programs, that they apparently did not know where Mother's Day originated. One gentleman said it originated in Philadelphia at some church on such and such a street.

I wish to inform the House and the Nation that Mother's Day originated in Andrews Church at Grafton, W. Va., in 1907 where at the request of Miss Anna M. Jarvis, the first Mother's Day address was given by Mr. Norman F. Kendall, superintendent of the Sunday school, advocating the establishment of a day honoring all mothers everywhere. In 1908, on the anniversary of her mother's death, Miss Jarvis launched Mother's Day, now observed in every nation.

We feel that this honor should not be taken from us.

THE GLOVE INDUSTRY OF FULTON COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of last week, a delegation from Fulton County, N. Y., including the Honorable Robert B. Ramsey, mayor of the city of Gloversville, N. Y.; Mr. Walter Mahoney, representing the tanners association of the county; Mr. Gordon Blake; Mr. Nat Keene; Mr. Clarence M. Hallenbeck, vice president, Consolidated Cutters and Shavers Union; Mr. Leonard J. Hannig, president; and Bertha L. Beach, vice president and business manager; and Mr. James Casey, of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers; had a conference with Mr. Carl D. Corse, Chief of the Commercial Policy Staff, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State. They explained to him the serious situation that the glove industry of Fulton County, N. Y., is in as a result of lowered tariffs and the uncertainty of a further reduction.

I was amazed and shocked by the attitude of this gentleman when he told the delegation they were "not interested in the 7,000 out of 9,000 American working men and women out of work," but they were "interested in the over-all picture."

We have a sick industry in Fulton County and unless something is done immediately it will be a dead industry and then it will be too late to revive the corpse.

How does the gentleman of the State Department reconcile his thoughts with the thoughts expressed by the President of the United States in his address at Fargo, N. Dak., when he said, according to the press, and I quote:

> A gradual rise in imports over the next several years may, it is true, cause minor dislocations in our domestic economy, the same kind of dislocations that occur all the time in a dynamic economy, in which new products and new industries are constantly coming into the market. It will not cause more than that, because our system of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements is set up so as to give full consideration to the claims of every domestic industry that fears possible injury from increased imports.

Whom are we to believe, the Department of State or the President of the United States?

Along with many colleagues from other parts of the Nation, I feel that the time has come when joint action is necessary and that a united front be presented to the men having charge of the reciprocal trade agreements in order that we may know definitely what our Government is going to do for the various industries affected by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Reciprocity, in my humble opinion, is a two-way street, but the actions of those in charge and the administration firmly convince me that it is a one-way street and as a result thousands and thousands of American workers are out of jobs. The time for action is now.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CLOSING OF CERTAIN VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, warmest congratulations to the gentleman from West Virginia whose congressional district first observed Mother's Day. We all have the greatest love and affection for our mothers and for the memories of our mothers. We all remember our mothers' teachings and examples for consideration, kindness, and helpfulness to others. We remember the great love and patience they

showed us, their many fine examples of courage and fortitude. Our mothers want us to be fine men and women. Our mothers hope we may be successful in life but above all else they teach and exemplify the importance and enduring value of high moral character.

Mr. Speaker, many of the veterans' hospitals and hospitals for the servicemen in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are being closed. One of these that I think is especially close to the hearts of the mothers of America is the hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., if I can judge from the letters that come from there. This is a hospital where paraplegics are hospitalized. We passed a bill allowing them special houses. They have built their houses around that hospital in order that they could live at home, yet be near enough to that particular hospital in order to get treatment.

This is also true with reference to TB cases at that hospital. These cases will be transferred from a dry climate to a damp climate where the hospital is located. I remind the Members that it will be more expensive to operate this other hospital than to keep the boys at Van Nuys.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order, and I do it in order to stop the pressurizing. My point of order is that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 164]

Addonizio	Burton	Coudert
Allen, Calif.	Canfield	Crosser
Andresen, August H.	Cannon	Cunningham
Angell	Carlyle	Dague
Bailey	Carnahan	Davenport
Barden	Carroll	Davies, N. Y.
Barrett, Pa.	Case, N. J.	Davis, Tenn.
Biemiller	Case, S. Dak.	Dawson
Bolling	Cavalcante	Deane
Boykin	Celler	DeGraffenried
Bramblett	Chatham	Delaney
Breen	Chesney	Dingell
Bryson	Chiperfield	Dollinger
Buchanan	Christopher	Dolliver
Buckley, Ill.	Chudoff	Donohue
Buckley, N. Y.	Clemente	Douglas
Bulwinkle	Cole, Kans.	Doyle
Burnside	Cooley	Eaton
	Corbett	Eberharter
Ellsworth	Kirwan	Powell
Engel, Mich.	Klein	Quinn
Fenton	Kunkel	Rabaut
Fernandez	Lane	Redden
Fisher	Lanham	Rhodes
Flood	Latham	Ribicoff
Frazier	LeCompte	Rich
Fulton	Lesinski	Riehlman
Gamble	Lichtenwalter	Rivers
Gary	Linehan	Robeson, Jr.
Gavin	Lyle	Rodino
Gillette	McConnell	Rooney
Gilmer	McCulloch	Roosevelt
Gordon	McDonough	Sabath
Gorski	McGrath	Sadlak
Graham	McKinnon	Saylor
Granahan	McMillan, S. C.	Scott, Hardie
Green	McMillen, Ill.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gwinn	McSweeney	Shafer
Hale	Magee	Shelley
Hall, Leonard W.	Marcantonio	Sheppard
Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Simpson, Pa.
Hand	Meyer	Smathers
Hare	Miles	Smith, Ohio
Hart	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Harvey	Miller, Md.	Stanley
Havenner	Mitchell	Stockman
Hays, Ohio	Monroney	Sutton
Heffernan	Morgan	Taber
Heller	Morrison	Tauriello
Herlong	Morton	Taylor
Herter	Multer	Towe
Hoeven	Murphy	Wadsworth
Hoffman, Ill.	Nixon	Walsh
Holifield	Noland	Walter
Howell	Norton	Weichel
Jackson, Calif.	O'Brien, Ill.	Welch
Jackson, Wash.	O'Hara, Minn.	Wheeler
James	O'Neill	Whitaker
Javits	O'Toole	White, Calif
Jenison	Passman	Wickersham
Jones, N. C.	Patten	Widnall
Judd	Patterson	Wigglesworth
Kearns	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Wolverton
Kelley, Pa.	Pfeiffer, William L.	Wood
Kelly, N. Y.	Philbin	Woodhouse
Keogh	Phillips, Tenn.	Yates
Kerr	Plumley	Young
Kilburn	Poulson	Zablocki
King		

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and twenty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

A NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a farm bill known as a national agricultural policy to be carried out on a self-sustaining basis, and to promote conservation and development of the national soil resources.

This bill is the result of 32 grass-root conferences, with approximately 3,500 actual farmers and consumers participating which I conducted last year, and reflects the majority views of the farmers, consumers, and taxpayers alike.

It is self-financing and not dependent upon the Federal Treasury for its existence. It gets away from the fallacious Santa Claus philosophy. It provides for fair prices at the marketplace instead of doles and hand-outs.

It is operated and controlled from the grass-roots level, not from Washington bureaus.

It assures the farmer the maximum of freedom of activity, and is not infested with controls and penalties.

It operates within the framework of our free enterprise system, and is not socialistic in scope. It is discretionary with the farmer, and not mandatory.

It relieves the taxpayers of billions of dollars in taxes annually, thus relieving them of an undue hardship.

It provides for orderly disposal of farm surplus, so that the produce from God's ground is used to feed God's people, thus eliminating waste.

It will assist materially in balancing the budget, thus ending deficit spending.

It encourages better farming, rather than stifling the initiative of the individual farmer.

It protects the family sized farmer.

It stabilizes the farm income, thus preventing a decline in farm prices which would affect our entire economy.

Mr. Speaker, for a complete analysis of the farm problem and the bill which I have introduced today, I call your attention to the Appendix of the RECORD.

I do not say that the bill I have introduced is the only answer to the complex farm problem, but I do want to emphasize that it points the way and provides the pattern for a sound long-range farm program which is worthy of serious consideration. It is in that spirit I have introduced my bill.

ECA FUNDS REBUILDING FRENCH GAMBLING CASINO

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, listen—

NEWS RELEASE, PARIS, May 10.—Marshall plan funds are being used to the extent of 4,500,000 francs to rebuild the gambling casino at LaHavre, France. The ECA office here says, "This may seem a frivolous expenditure, but is important to help increase the town's revenue."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the taxpayers of this country will consider this not only frivolous but ridiculous. It is a reckless spending of the taxpayers money. The other body has appropriated $150,000 to investigate gambling in this country and the ECA proposes to spend 4,500,000 francs to promote gambling in France. They are looking for a big tourist trade. These suckers will be given the proper trimming.

It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that we stop spending the taxpayer's money to promote gambling in France.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice also they are going to use ECA funds to put in television throughout Italy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

PRESIDENT THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, some years ago the second President of the United States made a statement that may be of interest to the Members of the House at this time.

At that time he said:

JEFFERSON'S INTEGRITY

I confess that I am not reconciled to the idea of a chief magistrate parading himself through the several States, as an object of public gaze, and in quest of an applause which, to be valuable, should be purely voluntary. I had rather acquire silent good will by a faithful discharge of my duties than owe expressions of it to my putting myself in the way of receiving them.

As I have never yet seen the time when the public business would have permitted me to be so long in a situation in which I could not carry it on, so I have no reason to expect that such a time will come while I remain in office.

Mr. Speaker, those are the words of Thomas Jefferson.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ESTABLISHING GRADES OF CERTAIN RETIRED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1151) to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause over to and including line 3 on page 2 and insert "That the act entitled 'An act placing certain noncommissioned officers of the first grade', approved March 3, 1927, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 2. Noncommissioned officers of the following groups whose names were placed on the retired list of the Regular Army prior to July 1, 1922, are placed in the sixth enlisted pay grade established by section 201 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.)—

"'(1) all sergeants (first class), other than those sergeants (first class) referred to in section 1, who were retired as such,

"'(2) all sergeants (first class), other than those sergeants (first class) referred to in section 1, who were changed to staff sergeants pursuant to the act of June 4, 1920, and who continued as such staff sergeants, or who became technical sergeants prior to their retirement, and who were retired in the third pay grade established by subsection 4 (b) of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 761).'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from Mr. S. W. Jackson, of the highway department of the State of Pennsylvania, also a table contained in his annual report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

MAY 11, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: I wish to hereby tender my resignation as a member of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission.

With very best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. BARRETT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

SUSIE LEE SPENCER—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 593)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without my approval H. R. 1026, a bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer.

The enrolled bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $7,500 to the estate of Mrs. Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Mrs. Spencer sustained in an accident in the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, on December 11, 1943.

It appears from the committee reports and from Government records that Mrs. Spencer was employed by the Navy Department as a civilian truck driver at the Norfolk Navy Yard and was fatally injured on the night in question when her truck was struck by a train of cars which was being backed through the yard by a Navy yard locomotive. The investigating officer found that the railroad crossing had not been properly flagged in accordance with the Navy Department's general safety rules and that the conductor, a civilian employee of the Department, did not have his train under proper control when approaching the crossing, and the officer expressed the opinion that the responsibility for the accident rested on the conductor who was charged with the proper handling of the train.

At the time of her death Mrs. Spencer was 28 years of age. She had been married only 8 months and left no dependent children or other relatives. Her husband made application under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for compensation on account of his wife's death. The claim had to be denied because there was no showing that, as required by the Compensation Act, the husband had been wholly dependent upon his wife for support at the time of her death. However, as permitted by the Compensation Act, a burial allowance of $200 was awarded and paid to the funeral directors.

I can appreciate the motives of fairness and justice which prompted the Congress in seeking to make amends for the negligence of a Government employee by private bill insofar as money can do so. Unfortunately, I feel duty-bound to subordinate considerations of sympathy and individual equity to what I believe to be overriding considerations of sound public policy and equality before the law. The underlying issue presented by this case is identical to that involved in H. R. 1481, Eighty-first Congress, a bill for the relief of Julius Zaffareni, which, on May 3, 1950, I returned to the Congress without my approval. In view of this identity of issues, it would appear that the reasons upon which my disapproval of H. R. 1481 was based apply with equal force to the instant case.

Moreover, when consideration was recently being given to certain proposed amendments to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, which are now contained in Public Law 357, Eighty-first Congress, the question in what circumstances the surviving husband of a Federal employee killed in the performance of duty should be compensated was again before the Congress. In those amendments, the provision which limited the right of a surviving husband to compensation under the act to cases in which the husband was "wholly dependent for support upon the deceased employee at the time of her death" was not only reaffirmed but was clarified by providing that he should be entitled to compensation only if he was so dependent upon her "by reason of his physical or mental disability * * *." Such a recently established general policy should not be weakened by singling out a particular individual for special treatment which is manifestly not accorded to others similarly situated.

For the foregoing reasons, I am compelled to withhold my approval from this measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 1950.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

By unanimous consent, the bill and message were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BRYSON (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE) was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the National Tennessean.

Mr. MILES (at the request of Mr. FERNANDEZ) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a speech made by the President of the United States at Umatilla, Oreg.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson entitled "Security First, Economy Second."

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of the annual convention resolutions of the Kiwanis International.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances, in two to include editorials and in two to include resolutions.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject, How Safe Is America?

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in four instances and include newspaper reports.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the speeches made in the State of Idaho by the President of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include in the first the speech of the President on May 11, in the second the speech of the President on May 12, and in the third the speech of the President on May 14.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Card Clothing Machine Operators Union of Fall River, Mass.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $430.50.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PROVIDING CERTAIN BENEFITS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4295) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR SETTLEMENT IN ALASKA BY WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4424) to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4499) to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5920) to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the last time this bill was called up I asked unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I recognize the worthy objectives of the bill and have discussed it with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. After further study of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the departments of Government that may take any bonds or make any payments within the purview of this law will be very, very careful to see that the rights and interests of the beneficiaries are protected at all times.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I know that last time the bill was called up the gentleman from Massachusetts had some questions concerning the protection which would be given to those who might be declared to be incompetent. Has the gentleman gone into this matter to find out if there are adequate safeguards in that regard?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the department or departments that make payments within the purview of this act and designate the appointment of what might might be termed an informal guardian follow the matter closely and provide for yearly reports and see that only proper expenditures are made by the guardian or conservator or whatever such person may be called, and also keep a constant check on the matter, I believe that satisfactory controls will exist for the proper safeguarding of the rights of the incompetent.

Also, we must remember that on any payment in excess of $1,000 a bond may be exacted, which is a further safeguard.

Of course, the departments should realize any person appointed by them is a trustee holding a serious position of trust. When we delegate that power to any agency or agencies, they in turn have the serious responsibility which constitutes a grave trust, and I believe we are justified in presuming that they will perform their duty accordingly if this bill becomes law. If not, then Congress can very quickly meet any abuses that may occur in the future.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of the author of the bill. I note that it refers to those who are mentally incompetent. There is also another bill, 499, dealing with the psychosis of veterans. I remind the author of the bill that about 800,000 people occupy hospitals for the insane in the United States, and about half the hospital beds in the United States are occupied by the mentally incompetent. Psychiatrists tell us that about 35 percent of those individuals are there, not because they are necessarily insane, but because they are trying to escape some of the difficulties of life. They use it as an escape mechanism to enter into another era of life in which they can be perfectly happy without all of the difficulties that come to people who are up against the hard realities of life. Now, who decides whether these people are mentally incompetent? Might there not be some of these people who find the realities of life so hard that they get into a mentally incompetent frame of

mind, where there might be some abuses connected with this legislation?

Mr. KILDAY. I am not familiar with the large group to which the gentleman refers. That appears to be a pretty hard way out of the hard realities of life. However, this applies to military personnel. That is, those who are paid under the military pay law and would not come under the group to which you refer. When these people become mentally incompetent they have a very small amount of money coming to them. Ordinarily it is a month or a few months' pay while they are being judged by a board, so that the amount rarely is over a thousand dollars. The bill calls for a board of doctors of medicine, one of whom shall be a psychiatrist.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think they are properly protected, but I am disturbed about the large number filling our hospitals for the insane, and the fact that probably 35 percent of those beds are filled with people who do go there to escape some of the tough realities of life.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to call attention to the fact that the bill was completely rewritten by the committee. It is not the bill which was before the House previously. It did not have the safeguards that this bill contains and it did not have the protection of a bond. We rewrote the bill completely.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might also say that I recognize the worthy objective sought. Of course, if a person goes into court and is bonded for a small amount, the legal expenses and the court expenses are very large in proportion to the amount paid. So I recognize the very worth-while objective, and, upon consideration, I am satisfied that we might well let this bill pass. If the agencies watch it closely in the interest of the unfortunate beneficiary over whom somebody has been appointed to take care of the money paid to them, then everything will be all right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the term "member of the uniformed services" as used in this act means any person on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, including transferred members of the Fleet Reserve and of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and members of the Reserve components of the respective services entitled to Federal pay either on the active or any retired list of said services.

SEC. 2. Any active duty pay and allowances, or any amounts due for accumulated or accrued leave, or any retired or retainer pay, otherwise payable to any member of the uniformed services who, in the opinion of competent medical authority, is mentally incapable of managing his own affairs, is authorized to be paid, for the use and benefit of such incompetent member, to such person or persons who may be designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Federal Security Administrator, or such other officer or officers as the respective Secretaries or Administrator may designate for such purposes, without the necessity for appointment in judicial proceedings of a committee, guardian, or other legal representative, and any payments to the person or persons so appointed as provided herein shall constitute a complete discharge of the obligation of the United States as to the amounts so paid: *Provided*, That no person serving in a legal, medical, or fiduciary capacity, or in any other capacity, shall demand or accept any fee, commission, or charge for any services rendered under the authority of, or in connection with, the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply where a legal committee, guardian, or other representative has been appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction, except as to any payments made hereunder prior to the receipt in the paying agency of the department or agency concerned of notice of such appointment.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Department concerned and the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out effectively the provisions of this act, and all determinations, except as to the amounts due, made by the respective Secretaries or by the Federal Security Administrator, or by their duly designated subordinates pursuant to this act, shall be final and conclusive and not subject to review by any court or Government official.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the term 'member of the uniformed services' as used in this act means any person on the active or retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, including transferred members of the Fleet Reserve and of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and members of the Reserve components of the respective services entitled to Federal pay either on the active or any retired list of said services.

"SEC. 2. Any active-duty pay and allowances, or any amounts due for accumulated or accrued leave, or any retired or retainer pay, otherwise payable to any member of the uniformed services who, in the opinion of competent medical authority, is mentally incapable of managing his own affairs, is authorized to be paid, for the use and benefit of such incompetent member, to such person or persons who may be designated by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Federal Security Administrator, or such other officer or officers as the respective Secretaries or Administrator may designate for such purposes, without the necessity for appointment in judicial proceedings of a committee, guardian, or other legal representatives, and any payments to the person or persons so appointed as provided herein shall constitute a complete discharge of the obligation of the United States as to the amounts so paid: *Provided*, That no person serving in a legal, medical, or fiduciary capacity, or in any other capacity, shall demand or accept any fee, commission, or charge for any services rendered under the authority of, or in connection with, the provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply where a legal committee, guardian, or other representative has been appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction, except as to any payments made hereunder prior to the receipt in the paying agency of the department or agency concerned of notice of such appointment: *And provided further*, That competent medical authority shall consist of a board of not less than three qualified doctors of medicine, one of whom shall be specially qualified in the treatment of mental disorders, appointed by the Secretary of the Department concerned or the Federal Security Administrator from available medical officers.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Department concerned and the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out effectively the provisions of this act, including a requirement that such person or persons designated to receive payments as provided in section 2 above shall furnish satisfactory assurances that amounts received have been and will be applied to the use and benefits of the incompetent and, in cases wherein the payments may be reasonably expected to exceed $1,000, that a suitable bond shall be provided by such person or persons which may be paid for out of sums due the incompetent.

"SEC. 4. The determination of the person or persons authorized to receive payments as provided in section 2 above, made by the respective Secretaries or by the Federal Security Administrator, or by their duly designated subordinates pursuant to this act, shall be final and conclusive and not subject to review by any court or Government official."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF ANNUAL LEAVE TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2350) to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 938), is amended by the addition of section 2, reading as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) If an officer or employee who under section 1 of this act would have been entitled to receive a lump-sum payment as compensation for annual leave is deceased, the payment shall be made to his estate.

"(b) The compensation provided for in section 1 of this Act shall be for all accumulated or current accrued annual leave which would have been due the officer or employee under the leave regulations in effect on the date of the expiration of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 72) had he remained in the service immediately following the expiration of the Bituminous Coal Act until the expiration of such annual leave and which has not been granted him or for which he has not otherwise received credit or compensation.

"(c) Notwithstanding the period provided in section 1 of this Act for the filing of notices of election to receive lump-sum payments as compensation for annual leave, such payments may be made if a notice of election has been or is filed by an officer or employee, or the duly authorized representative of the estate of an officer or employee who is deceased, before the expiration of 180 days after the enactment of this section 2.

"(d) Any payments heretofore made which are in conformity with the provisions of this act, as amended, are ratified.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,052.26 for the purpose of making payments under this Act, as amended."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3396) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the State of Kentucky, by quitclaim deed, title to that land, comprising approximately one hundred acres, acquired by the United States in the case entitled "United States of America versus Certain Lands Situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky., The West Point Brick Co., et al.", Civil No. 362, in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky at Louisville.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF OBSCENE MATTERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2811) to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can somebody explain the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think I might be able to explain the bill satisfactorily to the gentleman. It appears that at the present time, although the code does prohibit the importation or transportation of any obscene or lewd printed matter, books and so forth, it does not apply at the present time to phonograph records. This is to put phonograph records within the scope of the code in that regard, to put them in the same category as pictures and printed matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1462. Importation or Transportation of Obscene Matters.

"Whoever brings into the United States, or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or knowingly deposits with any express company or other common carrier, for carriage in interstate or foreign commerce—

"(a) any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, motion picture film, paper, letter, writing, print, or other matter of indecent character; or

"(b) any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy phonograph recording, electrical transcription, or other article or thing capable of producing sound; or

"(c) any drug, medicine, article, or thing designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception, or producing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral use; or any written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where, how, or of whom, or by what means any of such mentioned articles, matters, or things, may be obtained or made; or

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company or other common carrier any matter or thing the depositing of which for carriage is herein made unlawful—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 71 of such title, immediately preceding section 1461, is amended by striking out the item "1462. Importation or transportation of obscene literature.", as set out in such analysis, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "1462. Importation or transportation of obscene matters."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out the word "things," and insert the word "things".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLITION OF HOLY CROSS NATIONAL MONUMENT, COLORADO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7339) to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Holy Cross National Monument, containing 1,392 acres, established by proclamation of May 11, 1929 (46 Stat. 2993), is hereby abolished, and the Federal lands and property therein shall hereafter be administered as a part of the national forest within which such properties are situated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANAGEMENT OF FOREST LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest land owners, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to cooperate with State foresters or equivalent officials of the several States, Territories, and possessions for the purpose of encouraging the States, Territories, and possessions to provide technical services to private forest landowners and operators, and processors of primary forest products with respect to the management of foreign lands and the harvesting, marketing, and processing of forest products, and, where necessary to avoid uneconomic duplication of certain technical and training services, to make such services available to private agencies and persons. All such technical services shall be provided in each State, Territory, or possession in accordance with a plan agreed upon in advance between the Secretary and the State forester or equivalent official of the State, Territory, or possession.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act, the sum of $2,500,000. Apportionment among the participating States, administrative expenses in connection with cooperative action with such States, and the amount to be expended by the Secretary to make technical services available to private persons and agencies, shall be determined by the Secretary after consultation with a national advisory board of not less than five State foresters or equivalent officials selected by a majority of the State foresters or equivalent officials of all States, Territories, or possessions participating in the program. The amount paid by the Federal Government to any State, Territory, or possession for cooperative action in the State, Territory, or possession shall not exceed during any fiscal year the amount expended by the cooperating State, Territory, or possession for the same purpose during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such expenditures on the certificate of the appropriate official of the State, Territory, or possession having charge of the cooperative work for the State, Territory, or possession that the expenditures as herein provided have been made: *Provided*, That it is the intent of Congress that the Secretary may continue to cooperate with persons and private agencies in furnishing technical forestry services under existing authority.

SEC. 3. The act of May 18, 1937 (50 Stat. 188), known as the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, is hereby repealed effective June 30, 1950.

SEC. 4. This act shall be known as the Cooperative Forest Management Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED MONTHLY DISABILITY BENEFITS UNDER NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6560) to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize provisions in national service life-insurance policies for increased monthly disability benefits.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

UNIFORM BENEFITS FOR VETERANS ATTENDING MILITARY, NAVAL, AND COAST GUARD ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7739) to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of July 13, 1943 (Public Law 144, 78th Cong.; 38 U. S. C. 730), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. For the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy during the period from August 13, 1898, to July 5, 1902, shall be considered active military or naval service in the Spanish-American War; such service during the period from April 6, 1917, to November 12, 1918, shall be considered active military or naval service in World War I; and such service during the period December 7, 1941, to December 31, 1946, shall be considered active military or naval service in World War II."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "August 13" and insert in lieu thereof "April 21".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF DIVIDENDS ON NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE IN PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8236) to provide that on and after January 1, 1951, dividends on national service life insurance shall be applied in payment of premiums unless the insured has requested payment of dividends in cash.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the list of eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, would there be objection to taking up the next bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair allowed that to be done on one occasion and got into great trouble with the objectors; they had not studied it.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I will not ask that it be taken up.

AMENDING CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7058) to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to objection, will the gentleman from North Carolina explain the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 7058 is to amend certain laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy. This bill was originally presented to the committee as H. R. 5532; however, the committee found that the Army and the Navy purported to be accomplishing the same thing but in different sections of the bill. We were convinced that if it were desirable to authorize equal provisions in certain respects for the two Academies, it should be accomplished in a single unified section wherein the language would be equally applicable to both of the services. These amendments, together with other changes deemed desirable by the committee, resulted in the clean bill H. R. 7058.

Section 1 of the bill, with the exception of subsection (c), is a codification of the existing law relating to the source of appointments to the Military Academy at West Point. Inasmuch as it was necessary to amend the law with reference to the nomination of candidates from among enlisted members of the Army and the Air Force and the Reserve components, it was considered advisable to codify the other sections of law which have come into being as the result of successive legislative acts over a long period of years. Inasmuch as the Navy required no amendment to its existing law on this subject, no comparable section is included for the Navy.

Subsection (c) provides a new method for the selection of 180 cadets from enlisted members of the Army and the Air Force and their Reserve components. Under existing law, the Army has an allotment of 90 for the enlisted men of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force. The National Guard has an allotment of 90 for its enlisted members, including the enlisted members of the Air National Guard. However, enlisted members of the Active Reserve, other than the National Guard, are not permitted to compete for appointments to West Point. There are at present approximately 110,000 enlisted members in the Active Reserve, and it was considered appropriate to extend them the same incentive as is already enjoyed by the other enlisted persons hereinbefore mentioned. As a result, the committee has included a new subsection (c) which places the entire quota of 180 on a completely competitive basis. During any 4-year period, the Army, the Air Force, the National Guard, and the Enlisted Reserve will each be authorized to nominate three candidates for each available vacancy from among their enlisted members who have served in an active-duty or active-training status in such component for not less than 1 year, who will compete for admission at the annual competitive entrance examination. Therefore, during any given 4-year period, each of these sources will nominate not to exceed 540 enlisted men for the competition, from which group will be selected the 180 best qualified without regard to the service or component from which the candidates are appointed. The committee considers this to be more meritorious than existing provisions of law.

Section 2 revises the existing maximum and minimum ages for admission to the two Academies. Under existing law, enacted as a wartime measure, candidates for admission may be as much as 24 years of age. As a result, we are having 27- and 28-year-old ensigns and second lieutenants entering the service. This is not considered to be a desirable situation in peacetime. The original provisions of section 2 on page 4, line 22, provided a maximum age limit of 21 as of January 1 of the calendar year of which the candidate enters the Academy. General Collins, Army Chief of Staff, protested this age limitation on the basis that it was an undue restriction on many enlisted men in the Army who had less opportunity to be nominated to the Academy because of the restriction of the numbers which may be nominated from enlisted men of the Regular Army. He proposed that the maximum age be 22 on July 1 of the calendar year in which admitted. The committee agreed to this position and amended the bill. As a result, the minimum age for admission will be 17 years of age and the maximum will be 22 years of age as of July 1 of the year on which admitted.

Both the Navy and the Air Force strongly recommended the minimum age of 17. It is particularly important to the Air Force since those Academy graduates who are allotted to the Air Force must receive a period of flight training before being capable of performing their military duty. Therefore, it is desirable to obtain graduates at the youngest possible age.

The first proviso of section 2 is a codification so far as the Army is concerned and a substitution of a statutory provision for an administrative practice so far as the Navy is concerned. The Navy has followed this procedure for more than 50 years. The second proviso is merely a codification.

Section 3 is a codification of existing law which sets forth the undertakings in which cadets and midshipmen shall engage upon completion of their academic education at the Academies.

Section 4, with one exception, is a codification of existing Army law and is a new provision to the Navy. It has previously been required of the Army that when a new class of cadets contains less than the number authorized, the Secretary of the Army was permitted to enumerate sufficient additional candidates to fill the class. It was further provided that the two-thirds of those so appointed must be from among qualified alternate candidates nominated by the Vice President, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, Delegates and Resident Commissioners, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Governor of the Panama Canal, and one-third from among qualified candidates holding competitive appointments from sources authorized by law other than those holding such alternate appointments. The substitute amendments to existing law are found on page 7, line 3, in the words "at least two-thirds" and in lines 8 and 9 and in the words "not more than one-third." Under existing law, if the Army found that it was unable to fill its one-third quota, it applied these same restrictions to the two-thirds quota of qualified alternates of Congressmen and the other designated nominating agencies. The new language would remove this restriction so that if the Army is unable to attain its one-third quota, the deficiency may be supplied by appointing more than the two-thirds quota authorized for qualified alternates of the Vice President, Congressmen, and other designated agencies. The purpose of the amendment is to insure that the prescribed quotas of the respective academies will be maintained at full strength, the only limitation being the physical facilities of the respective Academies and the demands of the Armed Services.

The provisions of the original law, with reference to the two-thirds and one-third quotas, above described, were enacted as section 2 of the act of June 3, 1942, and were prompted for two reasons:

First. At the time of entrance of a new class each year, on July 1, there were usually more than 100 unfilled va-

cancies. Since the cost of operating the Military Academy, except for the modest pay of each cadet, is practically the same whether the corps is at full strength or under strength, it was apparent that it would be to the interest of the Government to make the maximum possible use of the plant and facilities at West Point.

Second. It was known that each year there were many congressional alternates with excellent qualifications who, though fully qualified mentally and physically, were denied entrance because their principals entered and there were no vacancies for the alternates. The same was true for many excellent competitive candidates for whom there were no vacancies. This provision, since its enactment, has been most gratifying and has resulted in the appointment of a number of congressional alternates who have proved to be outstanding cadets. I will not burden you with a complete list of the outstanding cadets who have been obtained from this source. I would call your attention to the committee report on pages 4 and 5 where eight of these young men, and a complete record of their outstanding accomplishments, are listed.

The foregoing facts clearly demonstrate the advisability of the original provisions of the 1942 act and the amendments contained in this bill. It should be thoroughly understood that neither these provisions nor other provisions of this bill will deprive any Congressman of a single nomination to either of the Academies. On the contrary, the only possible effect of section 4 will be to increase the number of congressional nominations.

The sole purpose of section 5 is to include the Air Force and Coast Guard personnel as sources from which the President may annually appoint 75 midshipmen.

Section 6, subsection (a), repeals existing law governing leave of absence of the Superintendent of the Military Academy without deduction from pay or allowances in the same manner as provided for other officers of the Academy. These provisions have been superseded by the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946. Therefore, this is a repealer section in the interest of codification.

Subsection (b) is a repealer section made necessary by section 2 of the bill.

Subsections (c) and (d) are repealer sections, made necessary by the codification in sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the amendments to section 5.

No attempt is being made in this bill to codify all the existing law relating to the Academies. In all frankness, there are many variations in the law governing administration of the two Academies, however, the Services' Academy Board in the office of the Secretary of Defense is now giving full consideration to all of these discrepancies and it is anticipated that their recommendations will be embodied in appropriate legislation which will subsequently be submitted to the Congress.

The Department of Defense, with the concurrence of the respective military departments and the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, recommends the enactment of the proposed legislation. The bill is reported to the House with the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Armed Services. The bill is not complicated, and its provisions are entirely meritorious. I hope that you will give it your speedy approval.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. About all the bill does is to increase the number of men who can be taken from the enlisted ranks, and it also allows the members of the Reserve component to compete.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. In order to build up our officer personnel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the corps of cadets of the United States Military Academy shall be authorized and consist of the following:

(a) Eight cadets from each State at large (four to be nominated by each Senator in Congress therefrom); four from each congressional district to be nominated by the Representative in Congress therefrom; four from each Territory to be nominated by the Delegate in Congress therefrom; four from Puerto Rico to be nominated by the Resident Commissioner thereof; six from the District of Columbia to be nominated by the Commissioners thereof, all of which cadets shall be actual residents of the State, or of the congressional or territorial district, or of the District of Columbia, or of the island of Puerto Rico, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed; and two cadets to be nominated by the Governor of the Panama Canal from among the sons of civilians residing in the Canal Zone and sons of civilian personnel of the United States Government and the Panama Railroad Company residing in the Republic of Panama.

(b) One hundred and seventy-two cadets from the United States at large, as follows: 40 to be nominated from among honor graduates of the honor military schools and the honor naval schools designated by the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy, respectively, such nominations to be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe; 40 from among the sons of members of the land or naval forces (including male and female members of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of all components thereof) of the United States, who were killed in action or have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated, in active service during World War I or World War II as each is defined by laws providing service-connected compensation or pension benefits for veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents: *Provided,* That the determination of the Veterans' Administration as to the service connection of the cause of death shall be binding upon the Secretary of the Army: *And provided further,* That such appointees are otherwise qualified and shall be selected in order of merit as established by competitive examination; 3 upon nomination of the Vice President; and 89 to be appointed upon the personal selection of the President.

(c) One hundred and eighty cadets from among enlisted members of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States. Each component (Regular and Reserve) of these services may nominate three candidates for each available vacancy from among their enlisted members, who have served in an active-duty or active-training status in such component not less than 1 year, to compete for admission at the annual competitive entrance examination. Such nominations shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe. The vacancies will be filled from among such qualified competitors making the highest proficient averages in the order of merit established at the competitive entrance examination, without regard to the service or component thereof from which the candidates are appointed.

(d) The number of cadets hereinbefore authorized to be nominated or selected constitutes in each instance the total number of cadets authorized in the corps of cadets at any one time from the respective source or nomination or selection except as hereinafter provided in this act.

(e) In addition to the number of cadets hereinbefore authorized, which totals 2,496 there is also authorized such number of cadets (who are otherwise qualified for admission) as may be appointed from the United States at large from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded a Medal of Honor in the name of Congress for acts performed while in any of the Armed Forces of the United States.

All cadets, from whatever source of admission, shall be appointed by the President.

SEC. 2. Effective January 1, 1951, all candidates for admission to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy must be not less than 17 years of age on July 1 and not more than 21 years of age on January 1 of the calendar year in which they enter the Academy: *Provided,* That whenever any member of the graduating class shall fail to complete the course with his class by reason of sickness, or deficiency in his studies, or other cause, such failure shall not operate to delay the admission of his successor: *Provided further,* That candidates allowed for States, for congressional districts, for the District of Columbia, and for Territories for appointment to the respective Academies must be actual residents of the States, districts, or Territories, respectively, from which they are nominated.

SEC. 3. Hereafter, each cadet appointed to the United States Military Academy and each midshipman appointed to the United States Naval Academy shall, if a citizen or national of the United States, sign articles, with the consent of his parents or guardian if he be a minor, and if any he have, by which he shall engage—

(1) to complete the course of instruction at said Academy; and

(2) if tendered an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Regular Army or Regular Air Force upon graduation from the United States Military Academy, or in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps or Regular Air Force upon graduation from the United States Naval Academy, to accept such appointment and to serve under such appointment for not less than three consecutive years immediately following the date of graduation; and

(3) in the event of the acceptance of his resignation from a commissioned status in the Regular component of such armed service prior to the sixth anniversary of his graduation, or in the event of an appointment in such Regular service not being tendered, to accept a commission which may be tendered him in the Reserve component of such Regular service and not to resign from such Reserve component prior to such sixth anniversary.

SEC. 4. When upon determination that upon the admission of a new class to the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy, the total number of cadets or midshipmen will be less than the number authorized, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy

may within their discretion and within the capacity of the respective academies, nominate additional cadets or midshipmen, respectively, to be admitted in such class in such number to meet the needs of the armed services, but not to exceed the authorized strength of the corps of cadets or the brigade of midshipmen, from qualified candidates holding alternate appointments and other qualified candidates holding competitive appointments from the remaining sources of admission authorized by law recommended and found to be qualified by the Academic Board of the respective academies, at least two-thirds of those so appointed to be from among qualified alternate candidates nominated by the Vice President, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, Delegates and Resident Commissioners, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Governor of the Panama Canal, and not more than one-third of those so appointed to be from among qualified candidates holding competitive appointments from sources authorized by law other than those holding such alternate appointments: *Provided,* That any appointments made pursuant to this section shall be in addition to and not in lieu of appointments otherwise authorized by law.

SEC. 5. Subsection (a) of section 16 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1061), as amended (34 U. S. C. 1039), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President may appoint annually 75 midshipmen to the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard personnel."

SEC. 6. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(a) That part of the act of August 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 263, 264) reading as follows: "Hereafter the Secretary of War may grant the superintendent of the academy leave of absence without deduction from pay or allowances for the same period that the superintendent may grant leave of absence to other officers of the academy under the provisions of section 1330 of the Revised Statutes."

(b) Effective January 1, 1951, section 1318 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1 of the act of December 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 606), and section 1517 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 2 of the act of December 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 606).

(c) So much of—

(1) the second paragraph of the act of June 8, 1926 (ch. 492. 44 Stat. 704);

(2) the act of December 1, 1942 (ch. 650, 56 Stat. 1024);

(3) the act of November 24, 1945 (ch. 492, 59 Stat. 586); and

(4) the act of November 24, 1945 (ch. 493, 59 Stat. 586),

as pertain to cadets at the United States Military Academy, and the Secretary of War.

(d) Section 1321, Revised Statutes; section 2 of the act of May 4, 1916 (39 Stat. 62); chapter XXII of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 894); the act of June 7, 1935 (ch. 201, 49 Stat. 332); the act of July 26, 1937 (ch. 523, 50 Stat. 534); the act of June 3, 1942 (ch. 322, 56 Stat. 306); section 15 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1061), and all other laws or parts of laws inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and the provisions of this act shall be in effect in lieu thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, line 22, strike "on July 1" and substitute "twenty-two" for "twenty-one".

On page 4, line 23, substitute "July" for "January".

On page 5, line 15, after "engage", substitute a "comma" for the "dash" and add "unless sooner discharged by competent authority—".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the resolution (H. Res. 497) was laid on the table.

THE BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 567 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5990) to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and at this time I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], who will explain to the House the provisions of the bill H. R. 5990.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 567 brings before the House the bill H. R. 5990 which is a measure I introduced some time back for the purpose of transferring jurisdiction from the Public Roads Administration to the National Park Service of certain rights-of-way and park land between the District of Columbia line and the Fort Meade Reservation.

At the close of the NRA President Roosevelt transferred from the then defunct NRA approximately $2,000,000 to the Public Roads Administration for the purpose of developing a parkway system which would run primarily through vast Government reservations to connect with a similar road to be constructed from Baltimore to Fort Meade. An agreement was made at that time between the Federal Government and Maryland with reference to the location of the road. Had it not been for that agreement Maryland would naturally have programed the road at a width in keeping with the construction of Maryland roads rather than the 400 feet provided and at a location where it would have primarily served the public rather than the various Government reservations through which this will go.

As now located the parkway will extend along five Federal reservations, a distance of 8.5 miles of it being on Government land. Those reservations are Fort Meade with 13,000 or more acres, the District of Columbia Training School with 1,400 acres, the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge of 2,700 acres, the massive Beltsville Agricultural Experiment Station and Research Center of 12,000 acres, and the Greenbelt project of 3,000 acres, making a total of 33,260 Government-owned acres or about 52 square miles of Government land that this project goes through.

On the faith of this agreement the State of Maryland has practically completed its portion of the road which is approximately halfway from the city line down to Fort Meade.

Mr. SHORT. Does the gentleman mean from the city of Baltimore?

Mr. SASSCER. From the city of Baltimore down to Fort Meade where the parkway system under this agreement is to pick it up and bring it on through those Government reservations, approximately half of it being through Government-owned land.

Rights-of-way have been obtained with this money that was allotted at the beginning, there has been some grading, all the engineering has been completed and it is located on a line which would not, of course, have been selected by the State.

No. 1 Highway, as all of you know, is a death trap. In 1949 38 people were killed and 739 injured, many of them seriously. We feel that this is a commitment, that it is primarily a Government project and in the faith of the commitment we urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. How much is this going to cost?

Mr. SASSCER. This bill limits the expenditure to $13,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it going to result in an appropriation of $13,000,000?

Mr. SASSCER. I understand $3,000,000 has been approved by the budget. It is to be included in the parkway system.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to know what this is going to cost.

Mr. COX. Thirteen million dollars.

Mr. STEFAN. They will have to come in for an appropriation for that, will they not?

Mr. COX. I think so.

Mr. SASSCER. Part of the road will cost approximately $15,000,000, and that is in the last stages of completion. Approximately $2,000,000 of Federal money has been spent in the initial stages of this. The bill limits the expenditures to $13,000,000. However, the immediate expenditure, which is a corollary but not in this bill, is $3,000,000, which has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and will, we hope, be included in the parkway authorization.

Mr. STEFAN. Why could not that be taken out of the Federal State-aid road program instead of coming in here with special legislation?

Mr. BEALL. If the gentleman will yield, Maryland has already taken her share of the Federal contribution and put it on the eastern end of the road.

Mr. STEFAN. Then this is special legislation.

Mr. BEALL. No.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any objection on this side with regard to the passage of the rule. I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to follow the line of questioning started by the gentleman from Nebraska. As I understand, this is a move to get away from the regular Federal aid to highways system. Is that correct?

Mr. FALLON. To give the gentleman a brief history of this highway, the move to build this highway was initiated by the Federal Government back in 1942.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Can the gentleman answer my question directly? I have only a short time. I know the history of the act.

Mr. FALLON. The highway was designed by the Federal Government to serve Federal properties up to and including Fort Meade. The State of Maryland was asked if it would not cooperate and extend the highway from Fort Meade into Baltimore. This the State of Maryland agreed to do. This highway would serve 52 square miles of Government property, which is 10 square miles less than the whole city of Washington. The State of Maryland has already completed about 7 miles of highway and intends to complete the remaining 6 miles into Fort Meade by the end of 1952. The Government has acquired all the rights-of-way from Fort Meade into the city of Washington, on which it has spent approximately $2,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Now answer this question. Exactly how much money is coming out of the Treasury of the United States as the result of this authorization, if it is agreed to?

Mr. FALLON. Thirteen million dollars.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is not this plan called the $35,000,000 parkway?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Where do we get this money? How much is entailed here?

Mr. FALLON. Maryland is putting up $14,000,000—some to build its end of the highway.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Why could you not come in here when we bring the regular Federal-State-aid highway bill into the House and take care of this project then? We are going to have that bill here in a few days.

Mr. FALLON. Under the new general highway bill Maryland can build a road from the point where they have now stopped into the District of Columbia, but not using the same route, not serving the Government property but serving the Maryland constituency, for the same amount of money as the Government is going to put into this highway, under the new general roads bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Does not the gentleman believe that this is maybe special legislation?

Mr. FALLON. No; this is not special legislation at all.

Mr. STEFAN. It is special legislation in that it does not come in under the regular Federal-aid highway program.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The proposed parkway is in a different category than the ordinary Federal highway, because it serves much Federal Government property.

Mr. FALLON. Fifty-two square miles of Government property.

Mr. SHORT. Maryland is putting up her share.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. This is some difference and some variation of the usual procedure as established in the 1940 and 1944 Highway Acts. This bill and also the highway has been considered by our Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, and we felt this was a separate program and should be considered by itself. The total cost will be $13,000,000, but it represents a different principle of allocation than carried in the Highway Act which will be considered by this body Friday of this week.

Mr. STEFAN. Do you not believe in view of the fact that $13,000,000 is involved, it ought to be held over?

Mr. McGREGOR. I feel that it should be considered today so we will then be ready to hear the Highway Act on Friday.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Do you not think in view of the importance of this procedure, apparent new precedent, taking this program away from Mr. MacDonald's Public Road department and putting it into the Department of the Interior, this ought to be passed over? It calls for an eventual appropriation of $13,000,000. This is very important legislation.

Mr. FALLON. I do not believe the matter should be passed over now, because if the State of Maryland was to build this highway from the point where they have now stopped, into the District of Columbia under the regular Federal aid to roads program, they would not use this route, and they would not be serving 52 square miles of Government property. Instead, the road would serve more of State property and the $2,000,000 that the Government has already put up would be wasted, because the State of Maryland is not going to build a road through Government property.

Mr. STEFAN. I am afraid we are hurrying this unnecessarily. I know a safe highway is needed but I just wonder if we are setting a new precedent.

Mr. FALLON. May I point out to the gentlemen that this project is 9 years old.

Mr. STEFAN. I know of the hard work the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] has done on this legislation in order to eventually get this road in Maryland completed but I feel the matter should have full and lengthy debate in view of the money involved and the apparent precedent the legislation sets.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the huge outlay of funds involved in this bill, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 165]

Addonizio	Gillette	Morrison
Allen, Calif.	Gilmer	Morton
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Multer
Andresen, August H.	Gorski	Murphy
Andrews	Graham	Nixon
Angell	Granahan	Norton
Arends	Grant	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Green	O'Hara, Minn.
Barrett, Pa	Gwinn	O'Neill
Biemiller	Hale	O'Toole
Bolling	Hall, Leonard W.	Pace
Boykin	Halleck	Passman
Bramblett	Hand	Patterson
Breen	Hare	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bryson	Hart	Pfeiffer, William L.
Buchanan	Harvey	Philbin
Buckley, Ill.	Hays, Ohio	Phillips, Tenn.
Buckley, N. Y.	Heffernan	Plumley
Bulwinkle	Heller	Poulson
Burdick	Herlong	Powell
Burnside	Herter	Quinn
Burton	Hoeven	Rabaut
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Ramsay
Cannon	Holifield	Redden
Carlyle	Howell	Rhodes
Carnahan	Jackson, Calif.	Ribicoff
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	Rich
Case, N. J.	James	Riehlman
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Rivers
Cavalcante	Jenison	Robeson
Celler	Jennings	Rodino
Chatham	Jones, N. C.	Roosevelt
Chesney	Judd	Sabath
Chiperfield	Kearns	Sadlak
Christopher	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott, Hardie
Clemente	Keogh	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Shafer
Corbett	Kirwan	Shelley
Coudert	Klein	Sheppard
Cunningham	Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.
Dague	Lane	Smith, Ohio
Davenport	Lanham	Stanley
Davies, N. Y.	Latham	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Sutton
Dawson	Lesinski	Taber
Deane	Lichtenwalter	Taylor
DeGraffenreid	Linehan	Towe
Delaney	Lovre	Wadsworth
Dingell	Lyle	Walsh
Dollinger	McConnell	Walter
Dolliver	McCulloch	Weichel
Donohue	McDonough	Welch
Doughton	McGrath	Wheeler
Douglas	McKinnon	Whitaker
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	White, Calif.
Eaton	McMillen, Ill.	White, Idaho
Eberharter	McSweeney	Wickersham
Ellsworth	Magee	Widnall
Engel, Mich.	Marcantonio	Wigglesworth
Engle, Calif.	Martin, Iowa	Wolverton
Feighan	Meyer	Wood
Fenton	Miles	Woodhouse
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Frazier	Miller, Md.	Young
Fulton	Miller, Nebr.	Zablocki
Gamble	Mitchell	
Gary	Monroney	
Gavin	Morgan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 228 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I trust my remarks will not be construed in any way as a criticism directly or indirectly of any Member who has made a point of order that a quorum is not present. But in justice to the Members who are necessarily absent today, as majority leader I feel it is my duty to make clear for the RECORD that some Members are away today because of the primary which will take place tomorrow in the State of Pennsylvania. It is a time-honored custom, regardless of the party in power, to take into consideration the primary contests in the several States in making up the legislative program. The leadership of the House, whether it has been Democratic or Republican, has always scheduled a light program on the day of any primary, as well as the day before and, if possible, the day after, so that Members might have the opportunity to attend to their primary contests, if any, and to vote themselves. Of course, every Member wants to set an example for the people of his district by being home and voting.

As majority leader of the House, I take the responsibility involved in so scheduling the legislative program of the House. I do not hesitate to do so because it has been done for years during the time that I have been majority leader, and also when my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], was majority leader during the Eightieth Congress, as I feel properly so.

For today we had the Consent Calendar scheduled and the bill and rule which is now being considered. Tomorrow we will have the Private Calendar and one bill. These matters would have to be taken up some time and so we are not wasting time today by taking up this legislation. If they are not taken up today and tomorrow, they will have to be taken up later in the week. These bills scheduled for today and tomorrow are more or less noncontroversial, the controversial legislation being scheduled for the latter part of the week.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I heartily concur in what the majority leader has just said. any other modus operandi would be intolerable. It would not be possible to carry on the business of the House. Recently a certain columnist arraigned Members on both sides for alleged absenteeism. Ordinarily, a Member of the House is working in his office when the bells ring and he finds out a quorum call is taking place. Ninety percent of the Member's time is spent in his office or making calls on the various departments of Government or at committee meetings, That is the way a Member of Congress serves the people of his district. I express my appreciation to the majority leader for what he has just said.

Mr. McCORMACK. I felt it was my duty and obligation on this occasion to make that clear to the membership. I am in no way criticising, directly or indirectly, any Member who makes a point of order that a quorum is not present. But, I feel it is my duty to protect the Members who are away, so that the RECORD would reflect the true picture, so the people of the country may be advised through the press what the situation actually is. Those Members who are away today should not be criticized because of their absence in order to attend to matters concerning themselves and their constituencies.

Furthermore, the legislation which we are now considering is more or less noncontroversial. It would, of course, have to be programmed at some time and it should be understood by all that we are by no means wasting time by taking this legislation up now, but on the other hand, we are extending the proper sort of consideration to our colleagues who may have a primary fight on their hands, the sort of consideration that all of us would like to receive if we had a primary fight.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any time on the rule, but I feel I might be able to clear up a few misunderstandings in regard to this bill.

I would like to start from the beginning. The move to build this highway was initiated by the Federal Government in 1942. Two million dollars was appropriated to the Public Roads Administration to build the highway. The purpose of building the highway was a national defense measure. It was initiated by President Roosevelt to serve mainly Fort Meade. At the time this move was initiated the officials of the State of Maryland were called in and asked if they would cooperate with the Federal Government, that when the highway is completed to Fort Meade they would continue the highway on to Baltimore. The officials of Maryland agreed to do this. They agreed to build it under Federal specifications, that is, with a 400-foot right-of-way acquired by the State of Maryland, from Fort Meade into Baltimore, to conform with the rights-of-way acquired by the Federal Government from Washington to Fort Meade. They also specified that there should be dual 24-foot lanes divided not less than 100 feet, according to the topography of the land. The construction of this road is considerably more than the average State expends on a normal dual State highway, due to the width of the highway and the width of the rights-of-way. It is not normal that a State condemn property 400 feet wide for any particular highway.

The Federal Government proceeded to secure rights-of-way from the District line up to a point below Jessup's Road, opposite Fort Meade. The private property that was acquired, and also the Federal Government agencies in agreement, turned this road over to the Public Works Administration. Something less than $2,000,000 was spent in acquiring and grading 6 miles of this highway, starting at the District line 3 miles, and starting from Fort Meade toward Washington 3 miles. Of course, the war came on and the work was suspended, due to material reasons. But after the war was over, the State of Maryland, living up to to the agreement it made with the Federal Government, has already constructed the highway, according to Government specifications, down to a point below what is known as Friendship Airport. The State of Maryland has acquired rights-of-way in and across Jessup's Road, where they will build a large underpass so that this will be a safe nonaccess highway.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. Is it not a fact that Maryland has just about completed her part of it now? It has completed about 8 miles and has about 5 miles to complete?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct. It has completed 8 miles and has about 5 miles to complete. The State roads commission tell us now in the committee that they would have it completed in 1952.

Mr. BEALL. And is it not further a fact that this road as built will not be of any use to anybody until it is built all the way in?

Mr. FALLON. It would not be of any use to the Federal Government as far as serving this property is concerned. This road serves 52 square miles of Federal property. That is only 10 square miles less than the whole city of Washington. When this highway is built through this Government property it will enhance the value of this property to the extent that it might pay the Government to build this road for nothing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Aside from the explanation that the gentleman is making, the question has been asked as to why this proposal was not embraced in the general Federal-aid highway bill which is to be considered later in the week. Is it not true that this proposal for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway were embraced in one bill introduced in 1949?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And that at the request of the Committee on Public Works, those two proposals were divorced on the ground that there should be separate treatment of each proposal, and thereupon Suitland was taken over under an act passed by the Congress in 1949, and this bill was reported in a separate bill which was introduced in August 1949, following the passage of the Suitland highway bill.

Mr. FALLON. That is true.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And is it not also true that one reason why this bill was reported separately was because the President recommended in his budget an appropriation? The committee

thought there should be an authorization before the President's recommendation was adopted by the Congress, although strictly not necessary, but to limit the appropriations. Thereupon, this bill was submitted presently, submitted unanimously by the committee because of the fact that its construction had already begun and because of the further fact that it was unlike all other authorizations for parkway construction where work had not been begun. We are faced with a separate proposition which should be considered, and I believe that a consideration of this bill on its merits will show that there is no conflict between this bill and the regular Federal Aid Authorization Act.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. It should be pointed out that the highway passes through five different Federal reservations and properties in about half of the distance between here and Fort Meade.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman from Michigan is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What concerns me is whether or not this is going to prove to be a precedent for the enlargement of all these other highways running out of Washington, whether they be in Maryland or Virginia. Will it be the future policy of the Government to construct four-lane highways on Route 29 to the northeast, or Route 240 to the west?

Mr. FALLON. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota should have been asked and that it is a matter that gave a number of us some concern. The gentleman from Maryland says he does not think it will set a precedent, but the fact remains that the Federal Government has constructed and paid for the construction of about one-third of the road from here to Fort Belvoir; the fact remains that the Federal Government has paid for the construction and building of the highways that go into Virginia and around the Pentagon; the fact remains that the Federal Government paid for the construction of the Mount Vernon Boulevard; the fact remains that the Federal Government pays for the construction of all parkways within the national parks and the District of Columbia; all parkways in the District are constructed by the Federal Government.

Mr. DONDERO. The question asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] was exactly the question I raised in the committee. We discussed other projects and features, but were advised that no precedent was set.

Mr. FALLON. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that if he will remember, at that time I said that this is quite a different category because the Federal Government is coming in and asking the State to do a thing; it is not a case of the State coming to the Federal Government and asking the Federal Government for something.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is there involved in this plan any arrangement to bypass Baltimore, or will we still have to spend an hour trying to get through Baltimore?

Mr. FALLON. That too came out in the committee, and I will explain that to the gentleman. Baltimore City has an appropriation now under a law passed last year to spend $20,000,000 on the first leg of a highway bypassing Baltimore. In addition to that, an announcement was made by the Governor 2 weeks ago that when the Chesapeake bridge is completed, which will be 2 years from now, it is their intention to take this highway across and under the Patapsco River into the Philadelphia road as in the Federal plan, and is planning to bypass Baltimore City. In addition to that, we have one leg of the bypass completed.

Mr. VORYS. What the gentleman has to say about Baltimore and Maryland is most persuasive with me in asking the Federal Government to participate.

Mr. FALLON. And I may also say that a new highway is being built now from Annapolis into Washington, a new dual highway, in which the Federal Government will not be asked to contribute one single cent.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to compliment my friend the gentleman from Maryland on the able presentation he is making; I intend to support him on the pending rule.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In passing this type of legislation is a precedent set for other States and cities to ask for like aid?

Mr. FALLON. No precedent is set.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman cite similar instances in which these provisions prevail?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] just went into great detail on the different parkways in and around Washington which the Federal Government has constructed literally at its own cost. However, the Federal Government is not paying the entire bill because in this case with a cost of $30,000,000, the State of Maryland is paying $15,000,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. All these highways, though, were constructed by the military.

Mr. FALLON. Under the Highway Act, Maryland can get a 50 percent Federal contribution on such a highway, and that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, being the first Member today to raise the point of order that a quorum was not present, I want to say that I was first provoked to do that by a slight misunderstanding as to a ruling of the Chair. However, in view of the fact that legislation of such importance, involving a large sum of money, smelling decidedly like pork, is being called up, I do not think it should be considered in a campaign year without a quorum being present to decide on the merits of such legislation. I think we should have a quorum on the floor before legislation involving so many millions of dollars is considered. In all fairness to the taxpayers who are going to dole out the millions for this highway to Pimlico and Laurel, to the race tracks, and to reelect perhaps or assist in reelecting people to high office in the State of Maryland, in view of the fact that the taxpayers are already financing a junket for High Tax H., who is now traveling across the country, I think it is highly improper that this legislation be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I can go along with the statement that business must be scheduled for consideration and that we all desire that everyone who has a primary should have full opportunity of attending and advising with his people. But when there is important legislation or legislation calling for the expenditure of $15,000,000, and when the gentleman who scheduled this legislation knows that many Members of the House will be away, not only for attendance at their primary campaign and to conduct their primary campaigns, but, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] said, when 145 of them are attending a political meeting in Chicago, at which President Truman is making a nonpolitical speech then important legislation calling for the expenditure of this amount of money should be postponed so that the membership of the House may be present and vote. I am sure the gentlemen in Chicago who are enjoying this Democratic celebration would like to be here and assist in seeing that the money is appropriated for proper purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] referred to this road being built to the race tracks for gambling purposes. They are spending 4,500,000 francs to build a gambling casino over there in France with ECA funds.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I heard the gentleman speak about that this morning. I assume it does not meet with his approval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I take it that the gentleman from Kansas is the one to whom the majority leader referred a moment ago as raising the point of order that a quorum was not present. I raised that point of order and properly so because in the Second District of Kansas $15,000,000 is important business. When we have a piece of legislation authorizing the expenditure of that sum of money I felt, and I still feel, that a quorum should be present for the consideration of the rule bringing up a measure authorizing the spending of that much money. In the weeks just passed we members of the Appropriations Committee were toiling here day in and day out trying to save money for the taxpayers. Now we see a piece of legislation brought in here which would authorize more money after an hour's deliberation than we were able to save in a week's time. I was absolutely right when I made the point of order that a quorum was not present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 166]

Addonizio	Davis, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Dawson	Holifield
Anderson, Calif.	Deane	Howell
Andresen, August H.	DeGraffenried	Huber
Angell	Delaney	Jackson, Calif.
Barden	Dingell	Jackson, Wash.
Barrett, Pa.	Dollinger	James
Battle	Dolliver	Javits
Bemiller	Donohue	Jenison
Bolling	Douglas	Jennings
Bolton, Ohio	Doyle	Jones, N. C.
Boykin	Eaton	Judd
Bramblett	Eberharter	Kearns
Breen	Ellsworth	Kelley, Pa.
Bryson	Engel, Mich.	Kelly, N. Y.
Buchanan	Feighan	Keogh
Buckley, Ill.	Fenton	Kerr
Buckley, N. Y.	Fernandez	Kilburn
Bulwinkle	Flood	Kirwan
Burke	Frazier	Klein
Burnside	Fulton	Kunkel
Burton	Gamble	Lane
Byrne, N. Y.	Gary	Lanham
Canfield	Gavin, Pa.	Latham
Carlyle	Gillette	LeCompte
Carnahan	Gilmer	Lesinski
Carroll	Gordon	Lichtenwalter
Case, N. J.	Gorski	Lind
Case, S. Dak.	Graham	Linehan
Cavalcante	Granahan	Lovre
Celler	Green	Lyle
Chatham	Gwinn	McCarthy
Chesney	Hale	McConnell
Chiperfield	Hall, Leonard W.	McCulloch
Christopher	Halleck	McDonough
Chudoff	Hand	McGrath
Clemente	Hare	McKinnon
Cole, Kans.	Hart	McMillan, S. C.
Corbett	Harvey	McMillen, Ill.
Coudert	Hays, Ohio	McSweeney
Crosser	Hébert	Magee
Cunningham	Heffernan	Marcantonio
Dague	Heller	Martin, Iowa
Davenport	Herlong	Meyer
Davies, N. Y.	Herter	Miles
Davis, Tenn.	Hoeven	Miller, Calif.
		Miller, Md.
Mitchell	Quinn	Stockman
Monroney	Rabaut	Sutton
Morgan	Ramsay	Taber
Morrison	Redden	Taylor
Morton	Rhodes	Towe
Multer	Ribicoff	Wadsworth
Murphy	Rich	Walsh
Nixon	Richlman	Walter
Norton	Rivers	Weichel
O'Brien, Ill.	Robeson	Welch
O'Hara, Minn.	Rodino	Wheeler
O'Neill	Roosevelt	Whitaker
O'Toole	Sabath	White, Calif.
Passman	Sadlak	White, Idaho
Patterson	Saylor	Wickersham
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Scott, Hardie	Widnall
Pfeiffer, William L.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wigglesworth
Philbin	Shafer	Wolverton
Phillips, Tenn.	Shelley	Wood
Plumley	Sheppard	Woodhouse
Potter	Simpson, Pa.	Yates
Poulson	Smith, Ohio	Young
Powell	Stanley	Zablocki
	Steed	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and twenty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 194, nays 32, not voting 206, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—194

Abbitt	Doughton	Jonas
Abernethy	Durham	Jones, Ala.
Albert	Elliott	Jones, Mo.
Allen, Ill.	Elston	Karst
Allen, La.	Evins	Karsten
Anderson, Calif.	Fallon	Kee
Andrews	Fellows	Kennedy
Arends	Fernandez	Kerr
Aspinall	Fogarty	Kilday
Auchincloss	Forand	King
Bailey	Ford	Kruse
Baring	Fugate	Larcade
Bates, Ky.	Furcolo	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Garmatz	Lemke
Beall	Gathings	Lodge
Beckworth	Golden	Lucas
Bennett, Fla.	Goodwin	Lynch
Bennett, Mich.	Gore	McCarthy
Bishop	Gossett	McCormack
Blackney	Granger	McGregor
Blatnik	Grant	McGuire
Boggs, Del.	Gregory	McSweeney
Boggs, La.	Guill	Mack, Ill.
Bolton, Md.	Hagen	Mack, Wash.
Bonner	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Madden
Bosone	Harden	Mahon
Brehm	Hardy	Mansfield
Brooks	Harris	Marsalis
Brown, Ga.	Harrison	Martin, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Harvey	Mason
Burdick	Havenner	Merrow
Burke	Hays, Ark.	Mills
Burleson	Hedrick	Morris
Camp	Heselton	Moulder
Cannon	Hill	Murdock
Cheif	Hinshaw	Murray, Tenn.
Colmer	Hobbs	Nelson
Combs	Holmes	Nicholson
Cooley	Hope	Noland
Cooper	Horan	Norrell
Cox	Huber	O'Brien, Mich.
Crawford	Irving	O'Hara, Ill.
Crosser	Jacobs	O'Sullivan
Davis, Ga.	Jenkins	Patman
Denton	Jensen	Patten
D'Ewart	Johnson	Perkins
Dondero		Peterson
Pickett	Secrest	Tollefson
Poage	Short	Trimble
Polk	Sikes	Underwood
Preston	Simpson, Ill.	Van Zandt
Price	Sims	Velde
Priest	Smith, Va.	Vinson
Rains	Spence	Vorys
Rankin	Staggers	Vursell
Reed, Ill.	Steed	Wagner
Richards	Stigler	Werdel
Rogers, Fla.	Sullivan	Whittington
Rogers, Mass.	Tackett	Wier
Rooney	Talle	Williams
Sadowski	Tauriello	Willis
St. George	Teague	Wilson, Okla.
Sanborn	Thomas	Wilson, Tex.
Sasscer	Thompson	Wolcott
Scudder	Thornberry	Woodruff

NAYS—32

Andersen, H. Carl	Hull	Phillips, Calif.
Barrett, Wyo.	Kean	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearney	Rees
Clevenger	Keating	Scrivner
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Smith, Kans.
Cotton	Macy	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Marshall	Stefan
Davis, Wis.	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Gross	Murray, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Hoffman, Mich.	Norblad	Winstead
	O'Konski	Withrow

NOT VOTING—206

Addonizio	Gilmer	Murphy
Allen, Calif.	Gordon	Nixon
Andresen, August H.	Gorski	Norton
Angell	Graham	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Granahan	O'Hara, Minn.
Barrett, Pa.	Green	O'Neill
Battle	Gwinn	O'Toole
Bentsen	Hale	Pace
Biemiller	Hall, Leonard W.	Passman
Bolling	Halleck	Patterson
Bolton, Ohio	Hand	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Boykin	Hare	Pfeiffer, William L.
Bramblett	Hart	Philbin
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Phillips, Tenn.
Bryson	Hébert	Plumley
Buchanan	Heffernan	Potter
Buckley, Ill.	Heller	Poulson
Buckley, N. Y.	Herlong	Powell
Bulwinkle	Herter	Quinn
Burnside	Hoeven	Rabaut
Burton	Hoffman, Ill.	Ramsay
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Redden
Canfield	Howell	Regan
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Rhodes
Carnahan	Jackson, Wash.	Ribicoff
Carroll	James	Rich
Case, N. J.	Javits	Richlman
Case, S. Dak.	Jenison	Rivers
Cavalcante	Jennings	Robeson, Jr.
Celler	Jones, N. C.	Rodino
Chatham	Judd	Roosevelt
Chesney	Kearns	Sabath
Chiperfield	Kelley, Pa.	Sadlak
Christopher	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Chudoff	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
Clemente	Kilburn	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, Kans.	Kirwan	Shafer
Corbett	Klein	Shelley
Coudert	Kunkel	Sheppard
Crook	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Lanham	Smathers
Dague	Latham	Smith, Ohio
Davenport	LeCompte	Stanley
Davies, N. Y.	Lesinski	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	Lichtenwalter	Sutton
Dawson	Lind	Taber
Deane	Linehan	Taylor
DeGraffenried	Lovre	Towe
Delaney	Lyle	Wadsworth
Dingell	McConnell	Walsh
Dollinger	McCulloch	Walter
Dolliver	McDonough	Weichel
Donohue	McGrath	Welch
Douglas	McKinnon	Wheeler
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	Whitaker
Eaton	McMillen, Ill.	White, Calif.
Eberharter	Magee	White, Idaho
Ellsworth	Marcantonio	Wickersham
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Iowa	Widnall
Engle, Calif.	Meyer	Wigglesworth
Feighan	Michener	Wolverton
Fenton	Miles	Wood
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Woodhouse
Flood	Miller, Md.	Yates
Frazier	Mitchell	Young
Fulton	Monroney	Zablocki
Gamble	Morgan	
Gary	Morrison	
Gavin	Morton	
Gillette	Multer	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wolverton.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Breen with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Case of New Jersey.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Graham.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Green with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Hefferna. with Mr. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. James.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. White of California with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Battle with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Stanley with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Yates with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Lovre.
Mr. de Graffenried with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Meyer.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Young with Mr. Michener.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Chesney with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Buckley of Illinois with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Linehan with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. REED of New York changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

THE BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5990) to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland as an extension of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILSON of Indiana) there were—ayes 119, noes 14.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 29, not voting 211, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

YEAS—192

Abbitt	Fellows	McCarthy
Abernethy	Fernandez	McCormack
Albert	Fogarty	McGregor
Allen, Ill.	Forand	McGuire
Allen, La.	Ford	McSweeney
Anderson, Calif.	Fugate	Mack, Ill.
Andrews	Furcolo	Mack, Wash.
Aspinall	Garmatz	Madden
Auchincloss	Gathings	Mahon
Bailey	Golden	Mansfield
Baring	Goodwin	Marsalis
Barrett, Wyo.	Gore	Marshall
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Martin, Mass.
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Mason
Battle	Grant	Merrow
Beall	Gregory	Michener
Beckworth	Guill	Mills
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen	Morris
Bennett, Mich.	Hall,	Moulder
Bentsen	Edwin Arthur	Murdock
Bishop	Harden	Murray, Tenn.
Blackney	Hardy	Nelson
Blatnik	Harrison	Nicholson
Boggs, Del.	Havenner	Noland
Bolton, Md.	Hays, Ark.	Norrell
Bonner	Hedrick	O'Brien, Mich.
Bosone	Heselton	O'Hara, Ill.
Brehm	Hill	O'Sullivan
Brooks	Hinshaw	Patman
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Patten
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Perkins
Burdick	Hope	Peterson
Burleson	Horan	Pickett
Camp	Huber	Poage
Cannon	Irving	Polk
Chelf	Jacobs	Preston
Christopher	Jenkins	Price
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Priest
Colmer	Johnson	Rains
Combs	Jonas	Rankin
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
Cooper	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Cox	Karst	Rogers, Mass.
Crawford	Karsten	Rooney
Crook	Kennedy	Sadowski
Davis, Ga.	Kerr	St. George
Denton	Kilday	Sanborn
D'Ewart	King	Sasscer
Dondero	Kruse	Scudder
Doughton	Larcade	Secrest
Durham	LeFevre	Short
Elliott	Lemke	Sikes
Elston	Lodge	Simpson, Ill.
Evins	Lucas	Sims
Fallon	Lynch	Smith, Va.
Spence	Tollefson	Whittington
Staggers	Trimble	Wier
Steed	Underwood	Willis
Sullivan	Van Zandt	Wilson, Okla.
Tackett	Vinson	Wilson, Tex.
Talle	Vorys	Winstead
Tauriello	Vursell	Wolcott
Teague	Wagner	Woodruff
Thompson	White, Idaho	
Thornberry	Whitten	

NAYS—29

Andersen, H. Carl	Kean	Rees
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearney	Scrivner
Clevenger	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Cotton	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Macy	Stefan
Davis, Wis.	Miller, Nebr.	Velde
Gross	Murray, Wis.	Werdel
Hoffman, Mich.	Norblad	Williams
Hull	O'Konski	Wilson, Ind.
	Reed, N. Y.	Withrow

NOT VOTING—211

Addonizio	Gordon	Murphy
Allen, Calif.	Gorski	Nixon
Andresen, August H.	Graham	Norton
Angell	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Arends	Green	O'Hara, Minn.
Barden	Gwinn	O'Neill
Barrett, Pa.	Hale	O'Toole
Biemiller	Hall, Leonard W.	Pace
Boggs, La.	Halleck	Passman
Bolling	Hand	Patterson
Bolton, Ohio	Hare	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Boykin	Harris	Pfeiffer, William L.
Bramblett	Hart	Philbin
Breen	Harvey	Phillips, Calif.
Bryson	Hays, Ohio	Phillips, Tenn.
Buchanan	Hébert	Plumley
Buckley, Ill.	Heffernan	Potter
Buckley, N. Y.	Heller	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Herlong	Powell
Burke	Herter	Quinn
Burnside	Hoeven	Rabaut
Burton	Hoffman, Ill.	Ramsay
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Redden
Canfield	Howell	Regan
Carlyle	Jackson, Calif.	Rhodes
Carnahan	Jackson, Wash.	Ribicoff
Carroll	James	Rich
Case, N. J.	Javits	Richards
Case, S. Dak.	Jenison	Riehlman
Cavalcante	Jennings	Rivers
Celler	Jones, N. C.	Robeson
Chatham	Judd	Rodino
Chesney	Kearns	Roosevelt
Chiperfield	Kee	Sabath
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Sadlak
Clemente	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Cole, Kans.	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
Corbett	Kilburn	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Coudert	Kirwan	Shafer
Crosser	Klein	Shelley
Cunningham	Kunkel	Sheppard
Dague	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Davenport	Lanham	Smathers
Davies, N. Y.	Latham	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	LeCompte	Stanley
Dawson	Lesinski	Stigler
Deane	Lichtenwalter	Stockman
DeGraffenried	Lind	Sutton
Delaney	Linehan	Taber
Dingell	Lovre	Taylor
Dollinger	Lyle	Thomas
Dolliver	McConnell	Towe
Donohue	McCulloch	Wadsworth
Douglas	McDonough	Walsh
Doyle	McGrath	Walter
Eaton	McKinnon	Weichel
Eberharter	McMillan, S. C.	Welch
Ellsworth	McMillen, Ill.	Wheeler
Engel, Mich.	Magee	Whitaker
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	White, Calif.
Feighan	Martin, Iowa	Wickersham
Fenton	Meyer	Widnall
Fisher	Miles	Wigglesworth
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Wolverton
Frazier	Miller, Md.	Wood
Fulton	Mitchell	Woodhouse
Gamble	Monroney	Yates
Gary	Morgan	Young
Gavin	Morrison	Zablocki
Gillette	Morton	
Gilmer	Multer	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Case of New Jersey.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Burnside with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Howell with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Lind with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. James.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Gwinn.
Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Chesney with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Buckley of Illinois with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Burke with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Graham.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Linehan with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Young with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Walsh with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Rhodes with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Meyer.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Phillips of California.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Taber.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Breen with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Stanley with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Patterson.
Mr. Green with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Hale.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Lovre.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from "present" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5990, with Mr. HUBER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, known as the Baltimore-Washington Parkway bill, is an authorization bill. It was carefully considered by the Committee on Public Works for two sessions of the Congress, and has been unanimously reported to the House.

I judge from the remarks thus far made that some Members of the House feel that this project should be authorized in the general Federal Aid Act of 1950. In that they are mistaken. When the House considers it, that bill will provide for authorizations for parkways that have already been authorized, and limit the amounts of the authorizations.

For instance, the authorizations for roads in Indian lands were made by a separate act, dated May 26, 1928. The authorizations made for roads in the national parks and for national monuments were made by a separate act April 9, 1924. The authorization for the Blue Ridge Parkway was made by a separate act of August 14, 1947.

In the Eighty-first Congress, first session, a bill was introduced to provide for the Federal Government's taking over and completing the Suitland Parkway and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. The House Committee on Public Works reported favorably on the Suitland Parkway because it had been completed. They amended the bill so as to eliminate the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. The Suitland Parkway bill was passed by the Congress.

I say that the first ground of opposition today, that this bill should have been considered as a part of the Federal aid highway authorization bill, later this week falls to the ground because previous parkway authorizations, and I have named at least one of them, have been considered by special acts, as is being done in the pending bill.

It may surprise those who have thus far manifested opposition on the so-called ground of economy when I say that the pending authorization bill will promote economy and in all probability reduce authorizations rather than increase them for the completion of this project. I make that statement for this reason: This parkway was authorized by a directive of the President of the United States on September 9, 1942, and the President allocated $2,000,000 for its construction from unobligated National Industrial Recovery Act funds to the Public Roads Administration. Under the rules of the House this is a public work that is under construction and, if appropriations were made without any further authorization a point of order could not be made against those appropriations.

This bill under consideration limits the amount of appropriations that can be made to $13,000,000. Without this authorization bill there would be no limit on the appropriations.

There are other restrictions and limitations in the pending bill that would promote economy and that would prevent other appropriations that might be made. I refer among other things to the matter of rights-of-way. The bill provides for rights-of-way through Greenbelt and other Government reservations to be turned over to the Department of Interior without costs.

This bill was not loosely reported by the Committee on Public Works. The committee went into every phase of it. I make the statement that this bill is in line with the policy under the Federal aid highway authorization bill already reported to the House and to be considered as scheduled later this week.

Moreover the leadership, and they need no defense at my hands, has kept faith with the House. Last Thursday the acting majority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], in response to a question by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], stated this bill would be up for consideration today.

As to the merits of the bill, permit me to say one of the most congested highways in the United States is between Washington and Baltimore. The most traveled highway in the world is between Philadelphia and New York City, and the road from Philadelphia to Washington is but a continuation. You may perhaps insist, and I will agree with you, that the most important road in the world is the one that goes by your front door. Last year, 1949, seven to eight hundred people were injured on the Baltimore-Washington Boulevard. There is just one highway between Washington and Baltimore. Two of the greatest railroad systems in the United States, the Baltimore & Ohio and the Pennsylvania, are required to carry the traffic from Washington to Baltimore and then on to New York. The existing Washington-Baltimore Boulevard is so congested that it cannot be widened or enlarged. This bill, which has had the consideration of the Committee on Public Works in the Eightieth Congress, under the chairmanship of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and has been reported and which is now before you, would in the opinion of the committee promote economy because the rights-of-way have already been acquired and paid for to the amount of about $440,000, and because the bill provides for rights-of-way without costs through Government reservations.

Under the terms of this bill the other rights-of-way, as a result of the amendments to the bill, are to be contributed to the Federal Government, either by the State of Maryland or from existing Federal reservations. We have put every safeguard around the bill. There are two main railroads, as I have said, between Washington and Baltimore. There is only one highway which it is most expensive to enlarge or widen. Those who have studied the problem of highways in this country know that there is one thing which is absolutely apparent, and that

is the need for more four-lane highways. We need more four-lane highways between congested centers of population. I have been a student of this question for a good many years. This is in reality a national-defense road. This road was started in 1942, and if this is not a national-defense road from here to Fort Meade and the other Federal reservations, it would be difficult to point one out. It was essential when it was started, during the war, and now is greatly needed.

Under the Federal aid to highways bill, which we are recommending to you, we are saying when the Federal Government collects $1,500,000,000 in taxes from the auto users of this country and we are only authorizing $500,000,000 annually, there should be an increase in the Federal contribution to these main defense and interregional thoroughfares.

For 18.8 miles from Washington to Fort Meade the rights-of-way have already been acquired. Keep in mind that the rights-of-way for defense highways in many cases cost a great deal more than the construction of the highway itself. The rights-of-way do not have to be paid for. The grading has already been done 4 miles from the District line toward Fort Meade, with 3 miles from Fort Meade toward Washington. The parkway is to be supplemented by a four-lane highway by the State of Maryland which is under construction now from Baltimore to Fort Meade at a cost of $14,000,000. Maryland is using Federal funds to match State funds. The Federal Government puts up $7,000,000 of that and the State of Maryland $7,000,000. I say this bill would promote economy under the rules of the House because under the rules of the House there would be no limitation on the amount that could be appropriated. We have put a limitation of $13,000,000 here, while we know that they might spend more than that without that limitation; $13,000,000 plus $14,000,000 expended by Maryland makes a total of $27,000,000.

Under the Federal Aid to Highways bill for defense or interregional highways it is contemplated the Federal Government would pay three-fourths, or 75 percent, whether the road goes through Jackson, or Vicksburg, as it does in Mississippi or the road east and west through those two cities goes, or whether it is on the interregional or defense system in any other State. So in the circumstances it does strike me that this separate bill reported some thirty days before we reported the Federal-aid-to-highways bill merits your favorable consideration, especially since the President of the United States has requested an appropriation of $3,000,000 for the next fiscal year. It was unanimously reported by our committee. I personally feel the bill should be considered before we bring in the Highway Act of 1950 so as to put a limitation on it before there was an appropriation for the current year to provide for additional necessary highway needs between Washington and Baltimore. The bill was carefully considered and unanimously reported and I respectfully submit the bill should be unanimously passed by the House because it is absolutely in line with the appropriations which we authorized and the legislation that has been proposed and heretofore supported so far as the construction of highways in our national defense of interregional system is concerned.

Mr. HINSHAW. One of the basic principles of major highway construction in these times is that the major highway shall bypass heavily congested areas, or that the through travel will be able to bypass those areas.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I anticipate the gentleman's question. I have said that the only highway between Washington and Baltimore, 1,100 miles from where I live and the district I represent, cannot be widened. It is a four-lane highway. It is proposed to go about 3 or 4 miles from that road, but not in a territory that is so populous, and put this main thoroughfare through at a total cost of $13,000,000. If you undertake to widen the present thoroughfare to make it an eight-lane highway, I hesitate to hazard a guess as to what the cost might be, but it would be many times the cost of the present bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will this highway join onto route 40 bypassing Baltimore?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Nobody is any more anxious than I am to bypass Baltimore, or every other city where there is a bottleneck. You have heard the statement of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] with respect to the cost of undertaking to bypass Baltimore, and they are undertaking to do that work. They have issued bonds, as I understand it, for that purpose. Personally, I would like to see them bypass Baltimore. Moreover, the matter of bypassing large cities is not a matter altogether of not going through those cities. In cities like Cleveland, and other large cities, it is often a matter of acquiring at less cost so-called slum areas. But, bypass or not, whether you go around or go through, this type of highway or parkway construction is essential if you do any bypassing, within or without the cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to take further time to yield to any member of the committee who desires to ask questions.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. What percentage of the land will be Government-owned land in the District of Columbia, and what percentage will be in private or State land?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fair question, and I will again state that all of the privately owned land in the stretch of about 3 miles from the District line has already been acquired under money that President Roosevelt set aside in 1942. That in the District of Columbia, and from about 3 miles from where the construction now starts on Defense Road, this bill provides that Greenbelt and other reservations shall transfer the title of the land so that there is no expense for rights-of-way whatsoever. All rights-of-way of private lands have been acquired. All other rights-of-way are through Government-owned lands and the transfer of these lands is provided for in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. You are going to build approximately 19 miles of highway?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. Seven miles of the grading has already been done. The cost will be approximately $15,000,000. The cost will be a total of $15,000,000, or $13,000,000 as authorized.

Mr. GROSS. How much is that per mile?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That will average about $680,000 a mile against about $450,000 a mile for the Pennsylvania Turnpike, although costs of construction have increased at least 200 percent since the Pennsylvania Turnpike was constructed. Just a few days ago we had testimony that in congested centers in the State of New Jersey it is costing, in some areas, as much as $5,000,000 per mile to construct a throughway and some parts of a parkway are costing more than $1,000,000 per mile. The cost of the proposed parkway to the Federal Government will be less than the cost to the Federal Government if the present four-lane highway were to be increased to an eight-lane highway. The proposed bill is the most practical provision for increased highway facilities with Federal aid from Washington to Baltimore.

Mr. GROSS. But will the distinguished gentleman not agree with me that you are not building this through a congested area on the Government end of it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree that while the Baltimore-Washington Parkway is not being built through as congested an area as along the existing Baltimore Boulevard, it nevertheless will serve a great many people with proper accesses who are on Government reservations. Sixty-five hundred employees do not live on the reservation at Fort Meade. Beltsville has 2,500 employees but only about 40 families live on the grounds. Greenbelt has a population of 7,000 who would use the Parkway. The Greenbelt and the Beltsville reservation center are to transfer rights-of-way. The proposed parkway does pass through a rugged country. The grading will be expensive. The accesses will be expensive. There will be one crossing over the Pennsylvania Railroad. There will be some 13 other installations that are expensive. The committee believes that the estimated cost of $13,000,000 is fair and reasonable. It is far less than the total cost now being paid for the 90-mile extension that is being made to the Pennsylvania Turnpike. That extension is costing, as I am advised, about a million dollars a mile. Moreover, some 15 years ago, without the right-of-way, as I recall, the 160 miles of the Pennsylvania Turnpike cost $70,000,000 or about

$450,000 a mile. The proposed parkway will be in keeping with the other parkways in the District of Columbia. It will be comparable to the Suitland Parkway. It will provide for reaching military and other Government installations with protection to the public. It will certainly more than double the present capacity of the Baltimore Boulevard.

The cost of highway construction has increased in 15 years. Many miles in parkways being constructed today in other jurisdictions cost over $1,000,000 a mile.

The proposed parkway will not only be used by Washington and by Baltimore and by the Government reservations, but it will be used by the people of the United States who travel between Washington and Baltimore where additional highway facilities are probably more greatly needed than in any other part of the United States.

Finally, on account of Fort Meade, Beltsville, and other Federal reservations, there will not be precedent for the construction of parkways where there are no military establishments or Government reservations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody in this House who knows anything about my record over the last 18 years will accuse me of being a spender. I have been far the other way. The record will show that I voted against all foreign spending except where it provided clothes and food for women and children abroad, immediately after the end of World War II.

We are considering a bill here today for a good road. Good roads in our modern day are as essential as the automobiles which travel them. Perhaps this bill may not present exactly the same road program as passes through your district. We are presented with a condition different from the ordinary road program. A condition which satisfied my opposition to this bill at first. I am not only in favor of it, but our committee unanimously reported this bill to the House. We have 18.8 miles of roadway, a large portion of which traverses through land owned by the Federal Government; five Federal reservations would be served by this road. Part of the road is already constructed or graded. The State of Maryland is now constructing its portion. At the end of the Federal portion of this highway is a military installation, Fort Meade. Some people object to this bill because the Federal Government will pay more than 50 percent of the cost, as we do throughout the Nation where we have the State-Federal highway program. We have precedent for this project in the Fort Belvoir and Mount Vernon highways, maintained by the Federal Government.

The Baltimore Pike, or U. S. No. 1, which now exists undoubtedly is one of the most congested highways in the United States. As the Chairman already has pointed out, 32,000 vehicles used that road every day last year. Thirty-eight people were killed. There were 748 accidents reported, and the Maryland State police say there are at least twice that number of accidents not reported. The total damage to property alone was $3,500,000. More than 700 people were injured, 513 seriously. I give these figures to show the congested and dangerous condition on one of the main roads leading out of the District of Columbia where the heart of the Federal Government is situated—the highway between Washington and the city of Baltimore.

What are you going to do? What is your solution if you oppose this bill, which your committee brings to the House today? Certainly, as the chairman has pointed out, to try to widen the present road between here and Baltimore and make it an eight-lane highway, would cost far more to acquire the right-of-way, than the total amount necessary to build this new highway. The right-of-way for this new highway is already acquired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. You are spending no money for the acquisition of the right-of-way; is that so?

Mr. DONDERO. We are spending no money for the acquisition of the right-of-way; that is already acquired.

Mr. GROSS. And yet you are spending approximately $15,000,000 for the building of 19 miles of road. Where else in the country is there any such cost in the construction of a road?

Mr. DONDERO. You have a right-of-way 400 feet wide; it is to be a double-lane highway, that is a four-lane highway with a small parkway in the center. Highway construction in congested areas costs a great deal more.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know what the comparison in cost would be between this proposed highway and the Pennsylvania Turnpike?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know; I have never inquired into the cost of the turnpike, but I know the turnpike is paying for itself and is far ahead of schedule.

Mr. GROSS. It is a toll road.

Will the Federal Government police this new road?

Mr. DONDERO. I expect it will, at least a portion of it.

Mr. GROSS. And maintain it? Who is going to control the concessions? Will there be any oil stations and other concessions?

Mr. DONDERO. The Federal Government controls the property on both sides, so I expect it will control whatever is placed on Federal property.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] will yield, permit me to say that as I recall the Pennsylvania Turnpike, without the costs of rights-of-way, was about $450,000 per mile. An addition of 90 miles is being made today and it is costing about $1,000,000 a mile. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway is through rugged country. The grade is expensive. A number of bridges are to be constructed. More than 13 separate crossings have got to be constructed. Again, the cost of construction since the Pennsylvania Turnpike was built has increased from 126 to 200 percent. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway like the Pennsylvania Turnpike will provide for proper location for concessions and accesses to protect the public. Moreover, is it not true that the Federal Government made a grant of 45 percent to the construction of the Pennsylvania Turnpike?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct; it was an out-and-out grant to the State of Pennsylvania of $45,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Permit me to say that under the Defense Highway Act, during the war, the Government paid 75 percent of the costs of Federal-aid roads to defense plants and installations. Let me also say that in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, which is scheduled for hearing this week, the Federal Government will pay 75 percent of the costs of Federal-aid highways that are on the interregional system, primarily in national defense.

Let me also say that in the pending bill the Federal Government will pay about 75 percent of the total costs of the parkway and the road from Fort Meade to Baltimore.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa who has just interrogated me that I raised the question in the committee about establishing a precedent believing that we were doing something here that we were not doing in other parts of the United States; but in both that Mount Vernon highway and Fort Belvoir highway military installations are involved. Military installations are involved in this road. At Fort Meade we have 10,000 military and civilian residents and 6,500 employees who do not live on the reservation but who enter and leave daily. Therefore the installation alone involves some 16,000 people. In case of war or an emergency this highway would certainly be considered a part of our national defense to expedite easy and quick passage between Washington, Fort Meade, and Baltimore.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have listened attentively, and there are some questions that are unanswered, in my opinion. The first one is, Why was this special authorization necessary in view of the fact that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] stated, as I understood him, that this project had been started under some Executive order under which the President had transferred some funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Where did the $2,000,000 come from that the President transferred?

Mr. DONDERO. It came from an unexpended fund. I cannot advise the gentleman exactly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It was from some unobligated National Industrial Recovery Act funds that the President was authorized to allocate to highway and parkway construction.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That gives the source. As I understood the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] he inferred, if he did not make the out-and-out statement, that even without this legislation under that Executive order this road could be built.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I did not say exactly that. It could be built but there would not be the limitations as to costs and rights-of-way contained in the pending bill. I said under that directive the road had been begun and under the rules of the House Federal works projects once started are not subject to a point of order against making an appropriation to complete them. That was my statement.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is substantially the same thing. You can go ahead without this special authorization.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, but there would be no limitations such as we have in this bill. They might go out and acquire additional rights-of-way, they might not limit the cost to $13,000,000; they could spend more than the $13,000,000. In the bill, therefore, there is a limitation on the cost. It costs $1,000,000 to build some miles of road in national parks. The costs of building concrete roads has vastly increased and the increase, as I recall, from 1941 to 1949 in building the average highway is 126 percent. Roads that used to cost $30,000 a mile are today costing, as I am advised in many cases, $100,000 a mile. The cost of highway construction, like all other construction, is vastly more than it was when the Pennsylvania Turnpike was authorized, or than it was 15 years ago.

The State of Maryland is one of the most economy-minded States in the country and it is building 12 miles and spending $14,000,000. I respectfully submit that if the Federal Government only spends $13,000,000 and puts in a parkway 800 feet or more wide, it will be doing a more economical job than is done by the State of Maryland, from Fort Meade to Baltimore.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman from Mississippi does not assume they will go out and get more highway. We have been told that all of the highway has been acquired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It has been so far as this bill is concerned, but without this bill there would be no limitation on their getting other rights-of-way if it developed they needed them. A parkway in New Jersey is being constructed today and in many cases the cost is in excess of $1,000,000 a mile.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I assume they are going to be economical, that there would be no further right-of-way acquired when they already have it. Now, another question and going one step further. I still think from what the gentleman from Mississippi said that under his statement this road has been started under Executive order; as he said, it is not a new project, and it could carry on. There is a limitation but that would be for the Appropriations Committee. One of the gentlemen from Maryland mentioned the fact, as I understood him, and I have tried to hear everything, that it really did not make much difference because by this act and under this program we are authorizing 50 percent of the construction and under the general program they would be in the same position, is that right?

Mr. DONDERO. The Federal Government would pay the cost from Washington to Fort Meade, and Maryland would pay one-half from Fort Meade to Baltimore.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Under the general road-building legislation there would be a 50 percent contribution from the Federal Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; from Fort Meade to Baltimore. I could not conceive the State of Maryland wanting to build a roadway over Government property. Government property extends nearly half of the way between Washington and Fort Meade.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The Federal Government has not raised any objection to that.

Mr. DONDERO. No; I cannot imagine the State of Maryland building a road with State funds over Federal property.

Mr. SCRIVNER. You come in here with special legislation when we have general legislation. As I understand it, you are coming in here on Thursday or Friday with a road bill that will cover the entire United States. Why should one stretch of road from Baltimore to Washington have separate action as compared with any other road in the United States?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what some may contend, this legislation is highly irregular. It is brought in, I would say, in a very convenient way and time. Here we have 221 Members on the floor of the House, according to the last record vote, only three more than half. We are considering a bill which provides for the building of a fairway or parkway or high-speed thoroughfare for the convenience of those wishing to get out of Washington to Pimlico and Laurel in a hurry and to get back. In another body we are studying legislation to outlaw gambling.

This bill states "To provide for the development, administration, and maintenance"—maintenance, if you please—"of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland."

My good friend from Michigan makes comparison between this project and the Federal highway leading to Mount Vernon. Since when do you compare the city of Baltimore with Mount Vernon? Since when did the city of Baltimore become a national shrine or a memorial of some type? There is no correlation between them whatsoever. We all know that Mount Vernon is the estate of the Father of his country. The highway leads there and ends there.

This bill is for a Federal highway through Government property to Baltimore and it is brought up at this time when there is barely a quorum present.

The leadership of the House on both the Republican and Democratic sides should go slow in committing Members without their knowledge or consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made allegations, yet he is not even decent enough to yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I was sent here by my district, a good, conservative district in the State of Indiana, to speak for them and for no one else. No one except my constituents are dictating to me or speaking for me. I expect to represent them as I see fit to do so.

Yes; this highway will be maintained by civil-service employees, broken-down politicians. You people who get up and speak for economy but vote for every issue to pledge the Federal Government to a greater outlay of money seem to be a little inconsistent. Yes; and you speak about the number of people on the Federal payroll, but what are you doing today, with a bare 221 Members present? You are committing the Federal Government to an increase in civil-service employees. You are adding to the bureaucracy which you have been condemning. Yes; you are looking in one direction and you are traveling in another. You are saying one thing and you are meaning another. What are the folks back home going to think about that? I think it would be highly complimentary to this House to wait on this bill and vote when there are more Members present.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTINGTON and Mr. DONDERO.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 11, noes 73.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUBER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5990, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands may meet tomorrow during general debate for further hearings on the CCC bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, George Washington, truly "the Father of our Country," in his Farewell Address, to which we dedicate a day and listen as it is read every year by a Member of the House of Representatives designated by the Speaker, laid bare his great heart when he wrote his yearning for unity.

With every passing year the address to the people of the United States becomes freighted with more meaning, and its wisdom is more apparent in the light of history. Every hearer must be acutely impressed by those passages wherein is expressed his parental solicitude: "That your Union and brotherly affection may be perpetual"; and by the primary injunction:

> The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity in every shape, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes, and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

The Blue and Gray Association, Inc., was formed for the sole purpose of building good will between the North and South. It is an institution functioning every day dedicated to the single aim of unifying our Nation.

Kipling sang truly:

> But there is neither east nor west, border, nor breed, nor birth,
> When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth!

That is the theme song of The Cradle of the Confederacy. Montgomery, Ala., has become these last 12 years the home of the conviction that nothing cements lasting friendships so well as good, clean sports played in an atmosphere of genuine hospitality.

Away down yonder in the land of cotton there has been born and grown a fervent belief that while we may, as Vice President Marshall said, need a good 5-cent cigar, the most important need from a secular standpoint is unification.

What is planned is a national shrine—a field of honor where men of good will are invited to meet from the four points of the compass as well as everywhere in between, forgetting their differences and enjoying together recreation in every known sport.

Beginning 12 years ago the only bowl football game in the Nation scheduled for the last Saturday in each year has been played annually in Cramton Bowl in Montgomery, Ala., following a week of holiday fun and athletic events—track, basketball, tennis, skeet shooting, and similar attractions, in the comfort of golden sunshine, in the great out-of-doors.

Over 200 Members of the Congress are members of the Blue and Gray Association, Inc., many of whom have enjoyed these events during the Christmastide.

The welcome on the door mat of Montgomery is written larger every year. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of Pennsylvania are coming down this year in a motorcade, with their championship fife and drum corps. Let us all go. Leaving right after Christmas, and spend the last week of the year holidaying to get ready for the Eighty-second Congress.

You and yours will love it!

SUPREME COURT DECISION IN UNITED STATES V. CLASSIC

Mr. Speaker, in his column in the Washington Post of Saturday, May 13, 1950, the distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, seems to have missed the point decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Classic et al.* (313 U. S. 299).

In that case the opinion was based on article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The pertinent part of the opinion reads as follows:

> Obviously included within the right to choose, secured by the Constitution, is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections.

The soundness of this holding must be conceded by all. No one should defend stealing. I am sure that neither States' righters, however ardent, nor the Attorney General of the United States do, for 1 minute. Nor do they question the law of the land.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE SMITH-BENDER CASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to congratulate the Marine Corps, the Navy Department, and the State Department for their successful efforts in bringing about the release of Chief Electrician's Mate William Smith, of Columbia Falls, Mont.; and Marine Sgt. Elmer Bender, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

As the House knows, those two members of the Armed Forces have been held captive by the Chinese Communists for something like 19 months. While there has been a great deal of criticism relative to this matter, I wish to assure the House, as one who was vitally interested in the release of those people, that the State Department, in my opinion, has done everything it possibly could to bring about the release of these two enlisted men.

I want to extend in the RECORD the correspondence which I have had with the State Department and the Navy Department relative to the holding of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender by the Chinese Communists, so that the House will have an understanding of the great and untiring efforts which have been put forth, and the difficulties which have been encountered and successfully overcome.

I want at this time to extend my best wishes to the family of Sergeant Bender, and also to the family of Chief Electrician's Mate Smith.

Reference was made some time ago in a radio broadcast to a similar occurrence in north Africa during the tenure of President Theodore Roosevelt. At that time an American of Greek descent, by the name of Perdicaris was taken captive by a Moroccan bandit by the name of Raisuli. President Theodore Roosevelt used strong measures at that time to effect the release of this American of Greek descent. He issued his famous ultimatum: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." As a historical matter of fact, the telegram containing these words was sent by Secretary of State John Hay. Because of that ultimatum, Perdicaris was released and returned to his country and to his family.

Times have changed, though, since the early years of the present century, and had we adopted that same policy in the case of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender it might well have brought about the death of those two individuals and pos-

sibly plunged this country into war. In the interest of just what did actually occur, I am inserting in the RECORD this correspondence which I have had with the State Department and the Navy Department, and also a résumé of the development in the Smith-Bender case, which will indicate just what has been done to effectuate the release of those two individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include with those remarks various bits of correspondence, as well as a résumé of the development in the Smith-Bender case.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 29, 1949.

Hon. FRANCIS MATTHEWS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Navy Department.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received a letter from Mrs. Charles M. Smith, route 1B, Columbia Falls, Mont., which reads as follows:

"This letter is in reference to my son, William Charles Smith, construction electrician chief, United States Navy, who failed to return from a routine flight over territory controlled by the Chinese Communists in the Tsingtao area on October 19, 1949.

"That was 9 months ago. Since that time we have received word that he and his companion Master Sgt. Elmer C. Bender were held by the Chinese Communists somewhere in China. There seemed so little we could do to help him. We have written to different people asking their help. All seemed very willing, but did not know of any way to help. Yesterday, while in Kalispell, I talked with the men at the radio station KGEZ, and Don Treloar told me you were the only one he knew who could help. That he knew if I wrote to you giving you the whole story you would take hold of it and do more than anyone else can.

"Enclosed you will find a clipping from a recent issue of the Press-Telegram, of Long Beach, Calif. Also two copies of letters that were being sent by their friends from Long Beach to Senators and others who might help in some way. Something must be done very soon. I have spent several months with my son's family recently. I went down last November to be with her when her baby was born December 18. Since that time she has been in poor health with a serious operation pending. Doctors wish to wait, if possible, until her husband can come, although they say the longer they wait the less chance she has to survive. Little Mike, now 2 years old, has been very, very ill the last 2 weeks and frets for "Daddy." He was very much a daddy's boy when his dad left a year ago. There is little Pat, who doesn't know anything about a daddy. Also last October they started to buy a home in Long Beach through GI and FHA. My son had signed the first contract papers. He was taken prisoner before the contract was completed. She did not have power of attorney. She had paid $1,500 down payment. In May the real estate firm gave her notice to move out. Well, the Navy and other forces showed the firm where they were in the wrong. But still nothing can be done—for a while. So she just stays on. A very distressful situation—if only my son could be returned to the States. And just why hasn't this been done? Can you find out? Of course, I can go to the VFW, American Legion, Navy Mothers, Blue Star Mothers, and all of those, asking each one to write into Washington, but I'll wait awhile and see what you can find out for us. I will gladly give any further information you might like to have."

I would appreciate your giving this matter your personal attention and letting me know what can be done to have this boy returned to the States.

Thanking you for your assistance, and with best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

AUGUST 10, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This will amplify the acknowledgment of August 2, 1949, referring to your special interest in the case of Chief Construction Electrician William Charles Smith, United States Navy, who is presently in a missing status.

I wish to advise you that Mr. Smith was placed in an officially missing status on October 19, 1948, the date when the plane in which he was a passenger failed to return from a routine flight in the area of Tsingtao, China. On November 4, 1948, a report from the Commander of the Naval Forces in that area was received in the Bureau of Naval Personnel stating that indirect information had been received that the plane had landed in Communist-held territory and that the occupants were alive and well. In a report dated January 17, 1949, this information was corroborated with the additional indirect information that Mr. Smith and Master Sergeant Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, were in Chinese Communist hands, unharmed and in good health. A report received in the Bureau of Naval Personnel on March 22, 1949, again stated that both men were believed to be alive and well.

Subsequently, information was received from an apparently bona fide agent of the command that is holding Mr. Smith that he and Master Sergeant Bender were moved from Hsia Tien, China to Nan Tsun, China, about February 15, 1949. Negotiations were conducted with that agent and a requested written document was prepared and delivered. An answer was received stating that a representative of the Navy would be aided in contacting the highest administrative officials in order to carry on further negotiations for the return of Mr. Smith and his companion. Not having heard to the contrary, the Department of the Navy assumed these latter negotiations were in progress. However, the situation in China, as you are aware, is very turbulent and as a result diplomatic negotiations are constantly being interrupted and hence long drawn out.

When the Department of the Navy felt that too long a period had elapsed without any action being taken by the Communists for the release of the two men, I requested the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, to obtain their release. Mr. Acheson informed me that he had forwarded a dispatch to the American Consul General at Peiping, China, with instructions to approach the Communist authorities in that city in an effort to arrange for the release of Mr. Smith and Master Sergeant Bender. Mr. Acheson further stated that upon receipt of any information relative to the two men the Department of the Navy would be advised immediately. To date no further information has been received regarding Mr. Smith and Master Sergeant Bender.

I wish to assure you that your interest in behalf of Mrs. Smith is appreciated and that upon receipt of further information concerning her son she will be notified promptly.

Sincerely yours,

DAN A. KIMBALL,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

AUGUST 10, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I wish to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of July 29, 1949, addressed to Secretary Acheson enclosing correspondence from Mrs. Charles M. Smith concerning her son, William C. Smith, United States Navy, who is now being held by the Chinese Communists.

Please be assured that since receiving information from the Department of the Navy in April concerning Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender, our diplomatic and consular officials have been doing everything in their power to secure information concerning the welfare of the two men and to secure their return. The American Embassy at Nanking and the American consular officers at Peiping and Tsingtao have made repeated attempts to approach Communist authorities on the subject. Unfortunately, these initial efforts evoked no response. The Department informed relatives of each step in the search for Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender.

On July 9, 1949, the American consul at Tsingtao informed the Department that a responsible member of the Foreign Affairs section of the local Communist regime told the consul that he had personally seen Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender late in May and that they were safe and well. This information was immediately conveyed to their relatives. On July 22 the Department telegraphed its representatives in the field that, in addition to formal approaches to authorities, they should make every effort through informal contacts to secure information as to the welfare of the two men and action looking toward their return.

On July 27 the Department informed Mrs. Smith that it had just received a message from the American consul at Tsingtao stating that he had had personal assurances from a member of the local government that both men were in Tsingtao and were safe and well.

Concerning the date of the release of Mr. Smith, it should be noted that the channels of communication between American official representatives and the local Chinese Communist authorities in the cities mentioned above are extremely tenuous. The Chinese Communist authorities do not recognize the official status of our consular officials and state that in the absence of diplomatic relations foreign consular officials are regarded as private citizens. Written communications addressed by American officials, to the Communist authorities are not acknowledged and it has been impossible to establish direct personal contact with responsible Chinese Communist authorities for the purpose of arranging for the release of Mr. Smith. While an Aliens Affairs Bureau has been established in each of the larger cities, these offices are often unwilling or unable to take effective action in matters concerning foreign nationals.

As Mrs. Smith was assured on July 27, our consul at Tsingtao will continue to follow this case closely and our officers at Nanking and Peiping will make every effort through formal approaches and informal contact to obtain the release of the two men.

Any further information which is received by the Department concerning this case will be conveyed to Mr. Smith's wife and to his mother. The enclosures to your letter are, as requested, returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MIKE: Reference is made to previous communications from you concerning efforts

to obtain from the Chinese Communists additional information with regard to William C. Smith and to secure his release.

For your information there is enclosed a statement sketching the history of the case which the Department released to the press on August 31, 1949. As noted in the press release the matter is again being brought to the attention of the highest Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping. Information concerning any results which may come from this representation will be conveyed at the earliest possible moment to the family of Mr. Smith.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary.

[Enclosure: Press release.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *August 31, 1949.*

(For the press)

On October 19, 1948, two American servicemen, William C. Smith, chief construction electrician, United States Navy, of Long Beach, Calif., and Elmer C. Bender, master sergeant, United States Marine Corps, of Cincinnati, Ohio, failed to return from a routine training flight over territory in the Tsingtao area of Shantung Province, China. The two men were members of the United States naval headquarters which was established at Tsingtao at the request of the Government of the Republic of China.

Since receiving reports that the flyers were in territory controlled by the Chinese Communists, the Department of the Navy, through the United States naval headquarters at Tsingtao, and the Department of State, through its representatives at Nanking, Peiping, and Tsingtao, have made repeated attempts to obtain from the Chinese Communists information concerning the men and to secure their release. These initial approaches have been unsuccessful although Smith and Bender have been reported to be safe and well. The matter is again being brought to the attention of the highest Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping.

The Departments of State and Navy remain in contact with the relatives of the two servicemen and will convey to them any additional information which is received.

OCTOBER 18, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MIKE: With reference to previous communications on the subject of Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender, the American servicemen who failed to return from a training flight over the Tsingtao area of China last October, I wish to inform you that the consul at Tsingtao on October 10, 1949, addressed an informal memorandum to the local Communist authorities stressing the humanitarian aspects of the two cases.

Unfortunately, as was true with regard to previous efforts to obtain the release of the men, this approach was without satisfactory response from the local authorities, who were instructed to inform the consul that they no longer know the whereabouts of Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender.

Please be assured that our consular officers in Chinese Communist-controlled areas are continuing their efforts in this case and that all possible avenues are being explored in an effort to obtain additional information concerning Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender and to effect their release.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary.

OCTOBER 27, 1949.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I have your letter of October 15, 1949, enclosing a communication from Mrs. Charles M. Smith on the subject of a reported conversation between her son, William G. Smith, and a crewman of the Panamanian vessel *Eastern Trader* during its recent call at the port of Tsingtao, China.

The Department is endeavoring to obtain additional information concerning the crewman's story from Hong Kong and the future ports of call of the *Eastern Trader*. The Department of the Navy also is making an effort to obtain information from the ship's crew. Let me assure you that any pertinent information which may be obtained from these efforts will be urged in approaching the Communist authorities with regard to the release of Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender.

As mentioned in a letter from Mr. Gross of October 18, the local authorities at Tsingtao have been instructed to state that they no longer know the whereabouts of the two men. The statement of the authorities, of course, does not of itself indicate that the status or welfare of the men has changed; it is considered as emphasizing the refusal of the Communists to discuss matters with representatives of the United States whose official standing they do not recognize.

With reference to the Secretary's letter of October 26 concerning American citizens who are being held in Communist-controlled areas of China, information concerning four additional individuals who have been refused exit permits by the Communist authorities has just been confirmed. As stated in Department's press release No. 825 of the evening of October 26 the following official personnel in China have so far been unable to obtain permits to leave China:

Gen. Robert B. Soule, United States military attaché, Nanking.

Commander Morgan Slayton, assistant United States naval attaché, Shanghai.

Dr. G. G. Schram, United States Public Health officer, Shanghai.

Chief Yeoman Alvin E. Shrout of the naval attaché's office, Shanghai.

Please be assured that the Department's representatives in China are continuing to do all that is in their power to assist Americans who have expressed their desire to leave China.

The enclosure to your letter is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

BEN H. BROWN, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations
(For the Secretary of State).

[Enclosure: Letter from Mrs. Smith.]

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *October 12, 1949.*

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Last week, I came down from Kalispell, to stay a month or so with the family of our son, William C. Smith.

You have likely read the press items over the last week end concerning Bill and Bender. They are being contacted in some prison in Tsingtao by a crewman of the *Eastern Trader*. We were much interested also to learn that their plane had crashed, as that is the first information we have had as to what had happened to them.

We sent a cablegram to the ship's officers asking for information. Today we received a cable from the captain and crew members of the *Eastern Trader* that they regret very much that they are unable to help.

Now that, Bill, and Bender, have been able to get word out that they are still alive, they will expect immediate release and I know every American will help to bring them home safely. Please tell them there in Washington that they have got to help us.

Sincerely,

MRS. CHARLES M. SMITH.

NOVEMBER 22, 1949.

MRS. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of November 20 which I have just received and read with much interest.

I was very glad to hear from you, and I am happy to take this occasion to report to you. It just happens on yesterday I had a personal conference with the officials of the State Department relative to your husband and Bender. They assured me personally that they were doing everything they possibly could, and they also said they would see to it that they will do everthing in their power to bring about their release at the earliest possible moment. I want to assure you that I am still very much interested in your husband and Bender who may still be together, and that I think it should take precedence over the case of Consul General Ward and his colleagues because, as you indicated, your husband has been held for a considerably longer length of time than Ward and the others. You may be assured of my continued interest and desire to be of assistance to you. You may rest assured also that I will continue to do all I can to keep the State Department busy on this case.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

NOVEMBER 28, 1949.

MRS. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

MY DEAR MRS. SMITH: I have just received your letter of November 21 and I hasten to answer because I believe that you have been misinformed.

You will remember the effort which we took by the use of planes flying over Shantung, and by the use of leaflet drops requesting information and the return of your husband and his companion, and by the use of agents throughout Shantung. Although we received several rumors which we invariably followed up, we never received any positive information as to the location of our service mates.

Since the Navy left Tsingtao two or three additional rumors have been received. Throughout this time the State Department has utilized its personnel in China, its agencies, and all available means looking toward the location of your husband and to his return. These negotiations have involved the headquarters of the Communist regime, as well as local authorities. In no case has a satisfactory or conclusive answer been received.

I personally have followed up these attempts to gain some information in the matter and I can assure you that the State Department has not, in my opinion, overlooked any opportunity for favorable action.

I also assure you that the State Department has issued several press releases concerning these activities, but the press in the United States has either not published them or has not given them wide distribution. Therefore the fact that the Angus Ward case has received more public notice is not because of any lack of effort or because of lesser interest on the part of the State Department officials. It may seem to be less but it is really due to the fact that the press has not published the reports in the matter.

I am sure that you will realize that no report has been received which is conclusive as to the whereabouts of your husband.

The other day I was informed that one of the agencies in Tsingtao had reported to our consul that your husband had been seen in that vicinity. This report gave me great cheer and further hope that your husband was safe. At the same time, the State Department began working on the development of this report to check on its truthfulness and accuracy, which would lead to further hopeful negotiations.

Please do not be discouraged to the degree that you might think your husband has been forgotten or overlooked because things like that just do not happen in our service and all possible effort for his recovery will

be carried on by the Navy, Marine Corps, and the State Department. First to ascertain his whereabouts, and, second to obtain his recovery. I shall present your letter to highest State Department officials with the request that they keep you better informed at all times of the situation so as to ease your worries, as much as these unfortunate circumstances permit. Possibly it will be reassuring to you to know of our continued and wholehearted efforts in behalf of you and your husband.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR C. BADGER,
Vice Admiral, United States Navy.

DECEMBER 6, 1949.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: By reference from Admiral Badger, with whom I have had the opportunity to discuss the subject of the detention of your husband by the Chinese Communists, I have received copies of your letter of November 21 and his reply thereto.

I wish to express my wholehearted sympathy for the suffering your husband's absence has caused you and the other members of his family. Please be assured that, as Admiral Badger has stated in his letter, the Navy Department and the Department of State have pursued every realistic means which might conceivably result in the release of your husband and Sergeant Bender.

I deeply regret that you have apparently received the impression that efforts on behalf of your husband have been less energetic than those made in connection with other Americans who have met with the refusal of Chinese Communists to observe the accepted principles of international behavior. The truth of the matter is that our officials have made more efforts in more localities of China to obtain a satisfactory response from the Communists with regard to your husband than in any other case.

I hope you will accept my assurances that the United States Government is most energetically continuing its efforts to obtain your husband's release.

We shall keep you informed of all developments.

Sincerely yours,

W. WALTON BUTTERWORTH,
Assistant Secretary.

DECEMBER 20, 1949.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 18, which has just reached me.

President Truman is not in town as you know but I am once again taking your case up with the State Department and I want to assure you so far as I have been able to find out, the State Department is doing everything it possibly can to bring about the release of your husband and Bender. Yesterday I met with an official of the State Department and made the suggestion to him if at all possible some contact should be made by our Embassy in Moscow where Mao Tse-tung, the head of the Chinese Communist Government, is at the present visiting.

Must close now but please rest assured of my continued interest and desire to be of all possible assistance. With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

(Copy to Mrs. Charles Smith, Route 1B, Columbia Falls, Mont.)

JANUARY 3, 1950.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 30 which I just received.

I immediately called the officials about your allotment and they are wiring the Cleveland office instructing them to give special attention to your case. From what I could find out here, the only thing that would be holding it up is the backlog of work as some 164,000 cases were being changed under the new law. I will however let you know when I receive a report from the Cleveland office which I hope will be within the next day or so. You may be assured that I will see that everything is done so that you can receive your money.

Must close now but with best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

DECEMBER 30, 1949.

DEAR MIKE MANSFIELD: I received this card from Cleveland that my family allowance has been stopped. I know you wrote me that it had been restored but seems as if they didn't get the information.

So would you please see what happened. I need this allotment by the 5th of January as I have bills coming due then.

I appreciate everything you have done for me and thank you very much.

Yours truly,

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

P. S.—The allotment is made out in my name, Ruby R. Smith.

DECEMBER 8, 1949.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 6, which has just reached my desk.

I am immediately contacting the Navy Department about your family allowance and you may be assured that I will do everything that I can to be of all possible assistance to you.

Must close now but will write you as soon as I have anything further to report.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

P. S.—I contacted the Navy Department and your $100 family allowance will be restored and will be retroactive to date of termination, September 1949.

M. M.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *December 6, 1949.*

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I am writing you concerning my family allowance of $100 per month being stopped. I cannot live on $150 per month. I must continue to have this family allowance. I have budgeted my living to the $250 per month I was receiving, and I just made ends meet. I cannot pay my bills and feed, clothe two children with the high cost of living any cheaper than $250 per month, as I was receiving.

I will appreciate it if you have a talk with the Navy and explain to them that I need the $100 family allowance.

Enclosed is copy of letter from Navy. Mr. MANSFIELD, I thank you very much for the help you have given us.

Yours truly,

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH.

SPECIAL PAYMENTS DIVISION,
NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Cleveland, Ohio, November 28, 1949.

Mrs. RUBY R. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: Reference is made to the case of your husband, William Charles Smith, chief construction electrician's mate, United States Navy, who has been missing since October 19, 1948.

As your husband's pay has been increased under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, entitlement to family allowance benefits terminated as of September 1949. Your husband's pay account has been adjusted for the October and November 1949 payments.

If the discontinuance of the family allowance payments results in undue hardship and your present dependent allotment of $150 is inadequate, it is suggested that you request the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Dependent's Welfare Branch, Casualty Section, Washington, D. C., to authorize an increase.

Very truly yours,

D. R. STEWART, LTJG SC USN
(By direction Chief of Field Branch).

JANUARY 25, 1950.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: Your letter of January 21 and enclosed clipping from the Long Beach Tribune have just reached me. I am immediately contacting the State Department about the questions raised by you and also am contacting the Navy Department to see what can be done in the way of legal assistance on your home.

I have been in constant contact with the State Department and they have informed me that they are taking action on my suggestion that the officers of the United States Embassy at Moscow try to contact Mao Tse-tung and others of the Chinese delegation while they are there to see what can be done to effectuate the release of your husband and Sergeant Bender. The Department has sent the Embassy at Moscow a cable requesting that it utilize any available occasion to bring the case to the attention of Chinese Communist diplomatic officials at Moscow and Mao's entourage. At the same time, they have asked our officers at our four posts in Communist-occupied China to continue to do everything they can to bring about the release. I am informed by the State Department that on December 27 they notified you by telegram that the American consul at Tsingtao had learned from local Chinese Communist authorities that your husband was safe and well and was being detained at a military base in the Tsingtao area. With regard to your statement that the Government paid for Angus Ward and staff but is unwilling to pay the ransom the Communists want for your husband's freedom, they informed me that they have already informed you that there is no indication that your husband and Sergeant Bender are being held for ransom. The State Department informed me that they did not pay any ransom for Mr. Ward's release. I am enclosing with this letter some of the previous clippings which you sent me and I will write you when I have anything further to report.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

JANUARY 26, 1950.

Mrs. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: I have talked with the legal assistant to the Secretary of the Navy relative to your securing power of attorney and after looking into the matter thoroughly, I was informed that you cannot be granted power of attorney by the Government.

They did state that you should have your attorney file a stay of execution with the court under section 522 of title 50 of the United States Code (p. 5697) which is the Sailors and Soldiers Relief Act. Under this law, no further action can be taken on the suit until your husband returns. I believe Mr. Truman is familiar with this and may already have taken such action. I also was informed that the legal officer for the Navy has been in touch with you and if you have any other legal questions, he would be glad to help you further.

The only way the Government could help you so far as this particular matter is concerned, is if some communication could be gotten through to your husband and for him

to make up a power of attorney for you. The chances for this are slim in view of the fact that no direct contact has been successful yet.

Must close now but I want you to know that if there is anything further I can do, please let me know. With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

JANUARY 26, 1950.

LEGAL OFFICER,
United States Naval Station,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. William C. Smith, 141 West Fifty-first Street, Long Beach, Calif., wife of William Charles Smith who is being held by the Chinese Communists, concerning a suit filed against her on the matter of a purchase of a home.

Mrs. Smith does not have power of attorney for her husband. I understand from Secretary Matthews' office that your office has assisted Mrs. Smith in some respects and I would appreciate your again contacting her to see what assistance you might be to her in the matter of this suit which has been filed. I would appreciate your writing to me after you have discussed this matter with her.

Thanking you for any assistance you may give and with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER,
UNITED STATES NAVAL BASE LOS ANGELES,
Long Beach, Calif., January 30, 1950.

Re Mrs. William C. Smith.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This will acknowledge receipt of your air-mail letter of January 26, 1950, in regard to Mrs. William C. Smith, wife of William Charles Smith, CEC, United States Navy, presently held by the Chinese Communists, concerning suit filed against her in connection with the purchase of a home.

Please be advised that the legal officer has been in personal contact with Mrs. Smith, as well as her attorney, Rolland Truman, 609 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif., who is handling her case. This office has rendered and is presently rendering Mrs. Smith such legal assistance as is permissible in such matters and the legal officer is maintaining close liaison both with Mrs. Smith and her attorney with respect to the matters confronting her. Upon receipt of your letter in this morning's mail, the legal officer immediately telephoned Mrs. Smith and inquired as to what possible further assistance he might be to her and assured her that he was keeping in close touch with her attorney and he likewise with the legal officer.

You may rest assured that this office will render Mrs. Smith every assistance possible. Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

BRADNER W. LEE, Jr.,
Commander, United States Naval Reserve, Legal Officer.

FEBRUARY 9, 1950.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Your letter of January 26, 1950, to Mr. Butterworth regarding measures which might be taken to forestall the possible eviction of Mrs. William C. Smith from her home in Long Beach, Calif., arrived just after Mr. Butterworth's departure for the Far East, and I am therefore replying in his stead.

The Department has discussed this case with the Navy Department and has written Mrs. Smith on the subject, suggesting that Mrs. Smith again communicate with the Navy Legal Assistance Officer at San Diego, Calif. I am informed by the Navy Department that he was instructed last fall to help Mrs. Smith with regard to her housing difficulties, that he discussed the matter with Mrs. Smith at that time, and that due in part to his efforts eviction proceedings were at least temporarily suspended.

With regard to your suggestion that the Government endeavor to secure a power of attorney from Chief Smith, the Navy Department is asking Mr. Truman to furnish the Government a power of attorney form suitable both for his purposes and for telegraphic transmission. The Department of State will then telegraph the text of such power of attorney to the British Foreign Office for transmission to the British Consul at Tsingtao with the request that the consul endeavor to obtain Chief Smith's signature on a prepared form. As you are undoubtedly aware, the United States Consulate General at Tsingtao has been closed and the American consular officials have left the city.

The enclosures to your letter are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP D. SPROUSE,
Director for Chinese Affairs.

FEBRUARY 23, 1950.

MRS. WILLIAM C. SMITH,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 20 and enclosure.

I talked with the Director of Naval Intelligence and he informed me that they would have to work through the State Department on the release of your husband. As you know, the State Department has made a number of requests for his release, but has not received a reply to any. It would appear doubtful that the Communists would recognize the Navy Department instead of the State Department when they have not acknowledged the State Department heretofore. The State Department is the representative of the Navy Department, and I have been informed that the Communists have been told these were Navy men. I am also informed that Captain Jones went to see General Wong at the request of our American consul, and the Department is now looking into the statements made by Wong to Jones. I expect to have a report from the State Department within the next day or so, which I will forward to you.

Must close now, but please be assured of my continued interest and desire to see that everything is done. With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *February 20, 1950.*

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Please ask the Secretary of Navy to do all in his power to effect the immediate release of my husband, William Charles Smith, and Elmer Bender, pursuant to recent information furnished the Long Beach Naval Intelligence.

Yours truly,

MRS. WILLIAM C. SMITH.

P. S.—This is the information Captain Jones gave me I turned over to to naval intelligence, also Captain Jones turned the same information to naval intelligence:

February 15, 1950, Capt. David Jones of the freighter *Flying Arrow* arrived in Long Beach and came to see me with confidential information.

Captain Jones told me that General Wong, Chief of Foreign Military Affairs of the Chinese People's Government at Tsingtao, China, sent for him to come to his headquarters for conference.

They talked for about half hour and General Wong said you want to know about Smith and Bender don't you? Captain Jones told him he did and wished to obtain their release and take them aboard his ship the *Flying Arrow* and bring them back home to their families.

Mr. Wong told Captain Jones that Smith and Bender could be released in a matter of days if the Navy admitted the men were Navy men, and answered the question as to why the men were flying over Communist territory with a camera?

He said the Navy had not asked for their release but prior to their departure from Tsingtao, sent a hurriedly written letter asking that the men be turned over to them.

That they (the Navy) didn't even tell the Communists where to deliver the men.

Wong said, that the State Department had never asked for them by a proper official request as required by them. Wong said, to hell with the State Department, let the Navy claim these men, answer the question and the men would be turned over to the Navy. He said Smith and Bender were like hot potatoes in China, due to the publicity and that they wanted to get rid of them, by turning them over to the Navy. The questions the Chinese want answered before their release of Smith and Bender:

1. Let the Navy claim these men—say they are United States Navy.
2. Are they really United States Navy enlisted men?
3. Why were they flying plane over Communist territory?
4. Why did they have camera in plane?

Answer of these questions by Navy authorities will bring the release of these men.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 24, 1950.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Your letter to Mr. Butterworth dated February 14, 1950, enclosing a letter to you from Mrs. Charles M. Smith, has been referred to me for reply in view of Mr. Butterworth's absence from the Department. I believe the following information will be useful to you in replying to Mrs. Smith.

With reference to Mrs. Smith's suggestion that the Department may never have made a proper request to the Chinese Communist authorities for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, United States Government representatives at Peiping have requested their release in writing five times, in formal communications addressed to the general headquarters of the Peoples Liberation Army, the Communist Alien Affairs Office, and Chou En-lai personally. In addition, numerous written and oral representations have been made by diplomatic and consular officials at Nanking, Tsingtao, Shanghai, and Tientsin. Mrs. Smith has been informed of these approaches. In each instance it was requested that the men be released for repatriation to the United States and, in the interim, allowed to correspond with their families in the United States. As in other cases, the Communist authorities ignored our communications. The Communist official at Tsingtao who reportedly informed Captain Jones of the *Flying Arrow* that the United States had not made a proper request for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender was either unaware of our previous representations or was willfully distorting the facts (it is, of course, also possible that in his opinion the United States previous requests were not proper because due to nonrecognition our representatives had no official standing in China).

With regard to the statement that the United States paid extortion money to the Chinese Communists for the release of consular personnel at Mukden, the Government paid only the cost of transporting the consular party, their personal effects, and a considerable amount of consular equipment from Mukden to Tientsin, where the group embarked for the United States. The ques-

tion of payment of travel costs for Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender will, of course, not arise until the Communists agree to their release. The Department has already discussed with Mrs. Smith the possibility that the men are being held for ransom, and has advised her that the United States Government has received no indication that such is the case. As you are aware, Captain Jones, without authorization from the Government, offered the Communist authorities at Tsingtao the sum of $25,000 to pay expenses for their release and was informed in reply that the men were not being held for ransom.

I suggest you inform Mrs. Smith that it is the view of the Department of State that it is highly unlikely that a blockade of Chinese Communist ports such as she suggests would be successful in effecting the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender. Such action would be more likely to prolong their detention and perhaps inspire reprisals threatening their personal safety.

In accordance with your request I am returning Mrs. Smith's letter.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP D. SPROUSE,
Director for Chinese Affairs.

MAY 3, 1950.

Mrs. CHARLES M. SMITH,
Columbia Falls, Mont.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: I am enclosing letter and report I have received from the Assistant Secretary of State. I will write you as soon as I have a further report.

Must close now but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours.

MAY 2, 1950.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MIKE: Thank you for your letter dated April 22, 1950, enclosing for the Department's consideration letters you have received from Mrs. Charles M. Smith and Mr. Ted C. Yeager regarding Mr. Yeager's offer to proceed to Communist China to negotiate for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender. The Department is now considering the desirability of Mr. Yeager's proposed trip from the standpoint of the personal risk involved as well as the effect which his representations might have upon British negotiations on behalf of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, now in progress at Peiping. The Department will advise you of its reaction, returning the enclosures to your letter, in the very near future.

In response to your request for information on the case, I am enclosing two copies of a report prepared in the Department on April 27, including a full and up-to-date account of the Government's efforts to secure the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender and the latest information received in the Department regarding their welfare and whereabouts.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK,
Assistant Secretary.

[Enclosure: Two copies of memorandum dated April 27, 1950.]

RÉSUMÉ OF DEVELOPMENTS IN SMITH-BENDER CASE

APRIL 27, 1950.

On October 19, 1948, Construction Electrician Chief William C. Smith, United States Navy, and Master Sergeant Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, failed to return from a regularly scheduled local familiarization flight in the area of Tsingtao, China. The men were members of the United States Naval Headquarters which was established at the request of the Government of China. They were reported to be flying a light observation-type aircraft, probably an L–5. Presumably Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender ran out of fuel or encountered engine trouble and were forced to land in Communist-occupied territory. Pilots at the Naval Headquarters had standing instructions to avoid flying over Communist territory. However, the lines of battle were extremely fluid, and Communist advances on the perimeter of Tsingtao gradually reduced the Nationalist-held area available for flight operations, making these instructions very difficult to observe. To the Navy Department's knowledge, the aircraft carried no cameras or special equipment whatsoever, since the flight was merely for training purposes.

Between October 1948 and April 1949 the Headquarters of the Commander, Naval Forces, West Pacific, made numerous efforts to locate the two men. Naval and Marine forces in Tsingtao conducted for several days an intensive air search of the land and sea area within a radius of a hundred miles of the city. In addition leaflets were dropped from aircraft on the village of Hsia-Tien, where the two men were reportedly being held at that time, in an attempt to get in touch with responsible Communist authorities. On February 23, 1949, the commanding officer, Third Marines, in Tsingtao, sent a letter to the chief Communist political officer for East Shantung requesting the release of the two men. No satisfactory reply was received. During this period the Red Cross, through its representatives in Tsingtao and in the United States, kept the dependents informed of developments, transmitting unconfirmed reports received from Chinese sources to the effect that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender were being detained by the Communists but were safe and well.

In a letter of April 13, 1949, the Acting Secretary of the Navy requested the Department of State to endeavor to secure through diplomatic channels information concerning the welfare and whereabouts of the men, and to attempt to negotiate for their release. Immediately upon receipt of this request, the Department of State instructed the Consul General at Peiping to take the case up with Communist authorities there. The following is a chronological outline of the Consul General's written approaches to the Peiping authorities:

April 25, 1949: A request for their release was submitted to the Communist Alien Affairs Office, which stated orally that it had no jurisdiction in the case.

April 26, 1949: The case was submitted to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army.

June 7, 1949: A second communication was sent to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army.

August 3, 1949: A third communication was sent to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, stating that reports from Tsingtao indicated that the men were well and under detention in the vicinity of Tsingtao and again requesting their release.

August 30, 1949: A letter was sent to Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, requesting that he take action in the case.

November 25, 1949: A letter was written to Chu En-lai, in charge of foreign affairs for the Chinese Communist regime, stressing the humanitarian aspects of the case and requesting action by the Communist authorities.

After the Communist forces took over Nanking and Tsingtao the Department instructed United States representatives in those cities to make similar approaches to the local authorities. On July 22, 1949, the Department instructed its posts in Peiping, Nanking, and Tsingtao to supplement their official approaches with informal inquiries. Similar instructions were later sent to United States consular posts at Tientsin and Hong Kong.

The Communists have refused to respond to any of these formal or informal approaches. Written communications have been ignored. They have given no explanation of the reason for the detention of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, and no indication as to when they will be released. The channels of communication between American official representatives in China and the Communist authorities were always extremely tenuous since in the absence of diplomatic relations the Communists refused to recognize the official status of our consular personnel, regarding them merely as private citizens. On November 30, the Secretary of State pointed out that the Chinese Communist authorities were apparently unaware that the international practice of civilized countries for many years has recognized that consuls should be afforded full opportunity for the proper conduct of their duties in the protection of their nationals. He emphasized that American public and official opinion which has been deeply concerned about these violations of accepted international procedures was now thoroughly indignant over the inhumane treatment which continues to be accorded these two American citizens and the hardship and suffering being experienced by their families.

On January 18 the Department of State arranged for the transmission of a message to Captain David Jones, Master of the *Flying Arrow*, requesting that he interview Communist authorities at Tsingtao in an effort to obtain the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender for repatriation aboard his ship. The American and British consular officials at Tsingtao were informed of this request and asked to provide Captain Jones all possible assistance.

Captain Jones discussed the case with Mr. Wong, a Tsingtao Communist official described as the director of the military foreign affairs control board, on January 21. He was advised by Mr. Wong that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender were being detained 80 miles northeast of Tsingtao; that they were well cared for and in good health and spirits; and that their only requirement was English language reading material. Mr. Wong refused to arrange for the release of the men for repatriation aboard the *Flying Arrow*. He also refused to allow Captain Jones to visit them to obtain from them letters to their families in the United States. Captain Jones offered to pay $25,000 as "expenses" for their release, but was informed by Mr. Wong that the men were not being held for ransom. (The United States Government did not authorize Captain Jones to offer money for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender; in this connection, the Communist authorities have never given the Government any indication that ransom was in fact involved.) Mr. Wong insisted that their release must be effected through official channels and indicated that the United States Navy should make an official request, since previous Navy approaches had not been considered satisfactory by the Chinese Communist authorities.

Mr. Wong's remarks regarding the United States representations to date on behalf of behalf of Smith and Bender were not strictly in accord with the facts and the Government was not inclined to rely upon his suggestions. Nevertheless, in order to exploit fully every possibility for effecting the release of the men, the United States Naval Attaché in China addressed several notes to the highest Communist authorities at Peiping, once again identifying Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender as United States Naval personnel, describing briefly the nature of their flight and the circumstances which forced them to land in Communist-occupied territory and suggesting arrangements for their repatriation to the United States. No reply was received to any of these communications.

In order to obtain similar details from time to time in the future regarding the welfare and whereabouts of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, the Department instructed the Consulate General at Hong Kong in the

future to request the masters of American merchant vessels calling at Tsingtao to make an approach to the local Communist authorities similar to that made by Captain Jones, if at all possible. Recently an official of a United States shipping line, traveling on board an American vessel which called at Tsingtao, was unsuccessful in his attempts to obtain an interview with the local authorities.

On January 31, 1950, Gen. George C. Marshall, president of the American Red Cross, sent a telegram to Gen. Chu Teh, commander of the Chinese Communist Peoples Liberation Army at Peiping, requesting that he give his personal attention to the matter of the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, and in the meantime enable them to communicate with their families. General Marshall's request was made on humanitarian grounds "in the true spirit of the world-wide Red Cross movement." No response to this request was received.

The American Red Cross has informed the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva of the details surrounding the detention of the men and has advised the Department that delegates of the International Red Cross Committee in Tsingtao and Shanghai are now endeavoring to assist in efforts to effect the release of the men.

On February 5, in order to investigate fully the avenue of approach suggested to Captain Jones, of the *Flying Arrow*, by Mr. Wong, Communist official at Tsingtao, the Secretary of the Navy sent a telegram to General Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, requesting the speedy release and return of the men. This communication, like all other previous approaches, elicited no response.

The most recent information received from Communist authorities in the Tsingtao area indicates that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender are in good health and are confined near the city of Laiyang, approximately 80 miles northeast of Tsingtao. The British consul at Tsingtao has recently made several approaches to local Communist officials, but has been unable to obtain any information other than the usual reports that the men are safe and well and under detention in the Tsingtao area. Tsingtao Communist officials have consistently maintained that representations for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender must be conducted on an official level at Peiping. Now that the British are in the process of establishing diplomatic relations with the Chinese Communist regime, the Department has asked the British Foreign Office to approach the Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping regarding the release of the men. The Communist regime's refusal to respond to this country's numerous approaches to date is apparently based on the pretext of nonrecognition. It is hoped, therefore, that the British representations which are now in progress may be more successful.

MAY 4, 1950.

MRS. CHARLES M. SMITH,
Columbia Falls, Mont.

MY DEAR MRS. SMITH: Thank you for your letter dated April 19, regarding Mr. Ted Yeager's offer to go to China as a Government representative to negotiate for the release of your son and Sergeant Bender.

You are aware from previous correspondence that Government representatives at consular posts throughout China—men who have had considerable experience in dealing with the Chinese—have endeavored through verbal and written approaches to the Peiping authorities to arrange the release of the men. These approaches have been ignored altogether by the Chinese Communists on the pretext that, in the absence of diplomatic relations, United States Government representatives have no status in China. Under such circumstances negotiations through British channels on a diplomatic level seem to offer greater hope for success. While these negotiations are in progress it would appear inadvisable to authorize independent action by a United States Government representative. Not only would such action offer little hope of success in view of the past experience of United States Government representatives, but it might well affect adversely the outcome of the British negotiations.

Should Mr. Yeager desire, however, to go to China in a personal capacity, the Department would of course give his passport application careful consideration. Few passports have been issued to date for travel in Communist China, due chiefly to the dangers involved in such travel. Foreigners traveling in Communist China are subjected to considerable risk at the present time, due to unsettled conditions, disrupted communications, and, in certain places, the scarcity of food and other necessities of life. American citizens have found the attitude of the Chinese Communist authorities completely unpredictable. It is, of course, possible that the Communists might adopt an uncooperative or even openly hostile attitude toward Mr. Yeager's mission, and refuse to grant him a permit to leave the country. Several Americans in China are in such a predicament at the present time. As you know, the treatment accorded United States diplomatic and consular officials by the Chinese Communist regime has made it most difficult for them to provide even the most routine protective services on behalf of American citizens in the area. United States diplomatic and consular posts in Communist China have now been closed, and what slight protection and assistance they were able to provide to American travelers will no longer be available. It is generally the Department's practice to decline to issue passports for travel in areas of the world where no United States consular protection can be afforded.

If, however, Mr. Yeager is interested in making the proposed trip in spite of the adverse circumstances described above, it is suggested that he address a letter to the Department of State, requesting the necessary passport application forms, whereupon his application will be given full consideration.

Sincerely yours,

TROY L. PERKINS,
Officer in Charge, Political Affairs,
Office of Chinese Affairs
(For the Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 8, 1950.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MIKE: With further reference to your letter dated April 22, 1950, regarding Mr. Ted C. Yeager's offer to proceed to China to seek the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, I am enclosing a copy of a letter dated May 4, 1950, to Mrs. Charles M. Smith which explains in detail the Department's views on the subject.

The Department has expressed to Mrs. Smith the opinion that it would be inadvisable for the Government to authorize Mr. Yeager to negotiate officially with the Chinese Communists, and has pointed out in detail the risks to which Mr. Yeager would be subjected in undertaking such a venture in Communist China. We have, however, agreed to examine Mr. Yeager's passport application in the light of existing circumstances and conditions in Communist China, should he desire to make the trip in a purely private capacity and request a passport for that purpose.

I am returning the enclosures to your letter, in accordance with your request.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK,
Assistant Secretary.

MAY 11, 1950.

MRS. CHARLES SMITH,
Columbia Falls, Mont.:

State Department and Marines have confirmed reports Bill Smith and Bender on British ship *Hunan*. British official saw boys and they look good. Arrangements will be made to fly boys home from Hong Kong. *Hunan* due in Hong Kong May 15 or 16.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress.

COLUMBIA FALLS, MONT., *May 13, 1950.*

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I have been trying for 2 or 3 days to write you a letter to properly thank you for all the fine things you have done for us. But I just cannot find the right words and phrases to even begin to tell you what your kindness and thoughtfulness has meant to us in these last trying months.

You have ever been our bringer of good tidings. I have before me your telegram of the 11. Your wonderful letter of May 9. Today brought another special delivery from your Secretary, Mr. Sullivan, with more and more good news of our son and Sergeant Bender.

When I listened to you speak yesterday morning from Missoula I wished I could have been there so I could have thanked you in person, and hoped that you might find time to come up to the Flathead, but heard later that you continued on to Butte. If you ever get up in this part of Flathead we would like you to know you will always be welcome at the Smith home.

Very sincerely,

MRS. CHARLES M. SMITH.

RÉSUMÉ OF DEVELOPMENTS IN SMITH-BENDER CASE

On October 19, 1948, Construction Electrician Chief William C. Smith, United States Navy, and Master Sgt. Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, failed to return from a regularly scheduled local familiarization flight in the area of Tsingtao, China. The men were members of the United States Naval Headquarters which was established at the request of the Government of China. They were reported to be flying a light observation-type aircraft, probably an L–5. Presumably Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender ran out of fuel or encountered engine trouble and were forced to land in Communist-occupied territory. Pilots at the naval headquarters had standing instructions to avoid flying over Communist territory. However, the lines of battle were extremely fluid, and Communist advances on the perimeter of Tsingtao gradually reduced the Nationalist-held area available for flight operations, making these instructions very difficult to observe. To the Navy Department's knowledge, the aircraft carried no cameras or special equipment whatsoever, since the flight was merely for training purposes.

Between October 1948 and April 1949 the Headquarters of the Commander, Naval Forces, West Pacific, made numerous efforts to locate the two men. Naval and Marine forces in Tsingtao conducted for several days an intensive air search of the land and sea area within a radius of a hundred miles of the city. In addition, leaflets were dropped from aircraft on the village of Hsia-Tien, where the two men were reportedly being held at that time, in an attempt to get in touch with responsible Communist authorities. On February 23, 1949, the commanding officer, Third Marines, in Tsingtao, sent a letter to the chief Communist political officer for East Shantung requesting the release of the two men. No satisfactory reply was received. During this period the Red Cross, through its representatives in Tsingtao and in the United States, kept the dependents informed of developments, trans-

mitting unconfirmed reports received from Chinese sources to the effect that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender were being detained by the Communists but were safe and well.

In a letter of April 13, 1949, the Acting Secretary of the Navy requested the Department of State to endeavor to secure through diplomatic channels information concerning the welfare and whereabouts of the men, and to attempt to negotiate for their release. Immediately upon receipt of this request, the Department of State instructed the consul general at Peiping to take the case up with Communist authorities there. The following is a chronological outline of the consul general's written approaches to the Peiping authorities:

April 25, 1949: A request for their release was submitted to the Communist Alien Affairs Office, which stated orally that it had no jurisdiction in the case.

April 26, 1949: The case was submitted to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army.

June 7, 1949: A second communication was sent to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army.

August 3, 1949: A third communication was sent to the general headquarters of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, stating that reports from Tsingtao indicated that the men were well and under detention in the vicinity of Tsingtao and again requesting their release.

August 30, 1949: A letter was sent to Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist Peoples Liberation Army, requesting that he take action in the case. There was no reply.

November 25, 1949: A letter was written to Chou En-lai, in charge of foreign affairs for the Chinese Communist regime, stressing the humanitarian aspects of the case and requesting action by the Communist authorities. This letter was returned in a different envelope.

After the Communist forces took over Nanking and Tsingtao the Department instructed United States representatives in those cities to make similar approaches to the local authorities. On July 22, 1949, the Department instructed its posts in Peiping, Nanking, and Tsingtao to supplement their official approaches with informal inquiries. Similar instructions were later sent to United States consular posts at Tientsin and Hong Kong.

The Communists have refused to respond to any of these formal or informal approaches. Written communications have been ignored. They have given no explanation of the reason for the detention of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, and no indication as to when they will be released. The channels of communication between American official representatives in China and the Communist authorities were always extremely tenuous since in the absence of diplomatic relations the Communists refused to recognize the official status of our consular personnel, regarding them merely as private citizens. On November 30, the Secretary of State pointed out that the Chinese Communist authorities were apparently unaware that the international practice of civilized countries for many years has recognized that consuls should be afforded full opportunity for the proper conduct of their duties in the protection of their nationals. He emphasized that American public and official opinion which has been deeply concerned about these violations of accepted international procedures was now thoroughly indignant over the inhumane treatment which continues to be accorded these two American citizens and the hardship and suffering being experienced by their families.

On January 18 the Department of State arranged for the transmission of a message to Captain David Jones, master of the *Flying Arrow*, requesting that he interview Communist authorities at Tsingtao in an effort to obtain the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender for repatriation aboard his ship. The American and British consular officials at Tsingtao were informed of this request and asked to provide Captain Jones all possible assistance.

Captain Jones discussed the case with Mr. Wong, a Tsingtao Communist official, described as "the Director of the Military Foreign Affairs Control Board," on January 21. He was advised by Mr. Wong that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender were being detained 80 miles northeast of Tsingtao; that they were well cared for and in good health and spirits; and that their only requirement was English-language reading material. Mr. Wong refused to arrange for the release of the men for repatriation aboard the *Flying Arrow*. He also refused to allow Captain Jones to visit them to obtain from them letters to their families in the United States. Captain Jones offered to pay $25,000 as expenses for their release, but was informed by Mr. Wong that the men were not being held for ransom. (The United States Government did not authorize Captain Jones to offer money for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender; in this connection, the Communist authorities have never given the Government any indication that ransom was in fact involved.) Mr. Wong insisted that their release must be effected through official channels and indicated that the United States Navy should make an official request, since previous Navy approach had not been considered satisfactory by the Chinese Communist authorities.

Mr. Wong's remarks regarding the United States representations to date on behalf of Smith and Bender were not strictly in accord with the facts and the Government was not inclined to rely upon his suggestions. Nevertheless, in order to expoit fully every possibility for effecting the release of the men, the United States naval attaché in China addressed several notes to the highest Communist authorities at Peiping, once again identifying Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender as United States naval personnel, describing briefly the nature of their flight and the circumstances which forced them to land in Communist-occupied territory and suggesting arrangements for their repatriation to the United States. No reply was received to any of these communications.

In order to obtain similar details from time to time in the future regarding the welfare and whereabouts of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender, the Department instructed the consulate general at Hong Kong in the future to request the masters of American merchant vessels calling at Tsingtao to make an approach to the local Communist authorities similar to that made by Captain Jones, if at all possible. Recently an official of a United States shipping line, traveling on board an American vessel which called at Tsingtao, was unsuccessful in his attempts to obtain an interview with the local authorities.

On January 31, 1950, Gen. George C. Marshall, president of the American Red Cross, sent a telegram to Gen. Chu Teh, commander of the Chinese Communist peoples liberation army at Peping, requesting that he give his personal attention to the matter of the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender and in the meantime enable them to communicate with their families. General Marshall's request was made on humanitarian grounds in the true spirit of the worldwide Red Cross movement. No response to this request was received.

The American Red Cross has informed the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva of the details surrounding the detention of the men and has advised the Department that delegates of the International Red Cross Committee in Tsingtao and Shanghai are now endeavoring to assist in efforts to effect the release of the men.

On February 5, in order to investigate fully the avenue of approach suggested to Captain Jones of the *Flying Arrow* by Mr. Wong, Communist official at Tsingtao, the Secretary of the Navy sent a telegram to Gen. Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Communist peoples liberation army, requesting the speedy release and return of the men. This communication, like all other previous approaches, elicited no response.

The most recent information received from Communist authorities in the Tsingtao area indicates that Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender are in good health and are confined near the city of Laiyang, approximately 80 miles northeast of Tsingtao. The British consul at Tsingtao has recently made several approaches to local Communist officials, but has been unable to obtain any information other than the usual reports that the men are safe and well and under detention in the Tsingtao area. Tsingtao Communist officials have consistently maintained that representations for the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender must be conducted on an official level at Peiping. Now that the British are in the process of establishing diplomatic relations with the Chinese Communist regime, the Department has asked the British Foreign Office to approach the Chinese Communist authorities at Peiping regarding the release of the men. The Communist regime's refusal to respond to this country's numerous approaches to date is apparently based on the pretext of nonrecognition. It is hoped, therefore, that the British representations which are now in progress may be more successful.

LETTER FROM THE AMERICAN CONSUL GENERAL AT PEIPING TO CHOU EN-LAI, DATED NOVEMBER 25, 1949

Under instructions of my Government, I invite your attention to the case of two United States Navy personnel, Tech. Sgt. Elmer C. Bender and Chief Electrician's Mate William C. Smith, who failed to return to their base after a regularly scheduled routine flight in the Tsingtao area on October 19, 1948, the small training land plane that they were using presumably having come down in Communist-controlled territory. Reports received at the time indicated that the two men had landed safely and were held in the first instance near Nantsun in the Tsingtao vicinity.

This matter was submitted to the Peiping Alien Affairs Office on April 25, but that office stated orally that the matter was outside their jurisdiction and that they were therefore not in a position to discuss the matter. The case was thereupon submitted to the general headquarters of the People's Liberation Army in a letter of April 26, 1949, with the request that arrangements be made for the return of those Navy personnel to their base. On June 7, being in nonreceipt of a reply to that letter, I sent a second communication to the general headquarters. That letter likewise remained without a reply. On August 3 I informed the general headquarters in a new letter that a representative of the Tsingtao alien affairs office on July 23 had told a member in the American consulate general at that place that Messrs. Bender and Smith were then in Tsingtao and were well. I again requested that the general headquarters take such action as might be requisite to cause the early release by the Tsingtao military authorities of the two American Navy personnel. In nonreceipt likewise of a reply to that latest communication, on August 30 I addressed a letter directly to Gen. Chu Teh as commander in chief of the People's Liberation Army, bringing the matter to his attention and requesting that he cause there to be taken appropriate action for the release of the two

Americans. A copy of that letter is enclosed for your information.

The consulate general at Tsingtao on October 10 delivered an informal memorandum regarding the matter to the alien affairs office at that point, inviting their attention particularly to the humanitarian aspects of the case. A representative of the Alien Affairs Office on October 12 orally informed the consulate general that, while the humanitarian aspects of the case were appreciated, he had been instructed to state that the local authorities no longer knew the whereabouts of the two men. Respecting the above-mentioned humanitarian aspects of the case, I invite your attention to the fact that the two Americans have now been held for over 1 year without any explanation as to the reason for their detention, and that during that time it has been impossible for them to communicate with their families, with considerable suffering and unhappiness as a result. The wife of Chief Electrician's Mate Smith on December 18, 1948, gave birth to a son, regarding who Mr. Smith has received no word and, moreover, must have an operation which the doctors have advised postponing until his return. I now bring this matter to your attention with the request that the matter be handled in accordance with established principles of the international committee, and that you cause an early investigation of the matter to be made, to the end that the two men shall be released.

It is requested that in the interim—a time which it is hoped will be short—the men be permitted to communicate with their families with respect to their personal welfare, this request being made particularly because of the humanitarian aspects involved.

MESSAGE FROM SECRETARY OF NAVY MATTHEWS TO GENERAL CHU TEH (DELIVERED BY CONSULATE GENERAL, PEIPING, APRIL 7, 1950)

As the general may be aware, two young American servicemen, Chief Construction Electrician's Mate William C. Smith, United States Navy, and Technical Sergeant Elmer C. Bender, United States Marine Corps, have been missing since October 19, 1948, when they failed to return from a routine training flight in the Tsingtao area. Since that time, over 17 months ago, they have been held incommunicado and repeated efforts to obtain their release have failed. The extreme mental anguish suffered by their families and friends has been reflected in their continuing appeals to me for assistance in restoring their loved ones to them.

The general will undoubtedly agree that the protracted detention of these two enlisted men cannot possibly serve any military or political purpose. From the humanitarian viewpoint, the prolonged separation of these men from their families and friends seems an unnecessary cruelty—incomprehensible to their families and to the public all over the world.

Recent information indicates that Smith and Bender are at a camp located near Tsingtao. Since United States and other foreign merchant vessels frequently visit this port, it is urged that these men be released without delay and delivered to the master of any foreign ship calling there. If this is not practicable, it is requested that the two men be delivered to the senior United States consular representative in Peiping.

It is earnestly hoped that the general will personally consider this case and use his authority to permit Bender and Smith to rejoin their families in the very near future. Signed Francis P. Matthews, Secretary of the Navy of the United States of America.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS REGARDING SMITH-BENDER CASE

MARCH 10, 1950.

Gen. George C. Marshall, president of the American Red Cross, has sent a telegram to General Chu Teh, commander of the Chinese Communist Peoples Liberation Army at Peiping, regarding the detention of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender by the Chinese Communists. No reply has been received.

The following is the text of General Marshall's telegram:

"I should like to direct your personal attention to the plight of two members of the United States Navy, Elmer C. Bender and William C. Smith, and of their immediate families.

"It has been brought to my attention that on October 19, 1948, these men failed to return from a routine training flight in the Tsingtao area. Also, I have learned that the United States Government, through its representatives at Nanking, Peiping, and Tsingtao, has made repeated attempts since that time to make it possible for the men to communicate with their families and to bring about their release. In addition, communications on the subject have been sent to the Aliens Affairs Office and to the general headquarters of the People's Liberation Army. To date all these attempts have brought no satisfactory result.

"Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Bender are married. Mr. Smith has a son born over a year ago whom he has never seen. The families have not heard from them since their disappearance 14 months ago. Quite naturally they are experiencing considerable hardship and suffering. Having been unsuccessful in obtaining direct communication with and effecting the release of their husbands, the wives of these two men have appealed to the American Red Cross for help. Their request is quite in order because under its charter, the American National Red Cross is charged with the responsibility of acting as a means of communication between the individuals in the armed forces of the United States and their families. When circumstances prevent ready communication and as a result the welfare of the man and his family is jeopardized, it is the duty of the Red Cross to take whatever steps it deems necessary to try to reinstate communication and, if humanly possible, to bring about a change in these circumstances.

"Therefore, in the true spirit of the worldwide Red Cross movement and on humanitarian grounds, I urge that you give your personal attention to the matter of the release of these men. In the meantime, I urge that you make it possible for them to communicate with their anxious families."

The American Red Cross reports that delegates of the International Red Cross Committee at Tsingtao and Shanghai have been advised of the detention of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender and are working to effect the release of the men.

A Chinese Communist official at Tsingtao, in discussing the detention of the men with Captain Jones, of the *Flying Arrow*, reportedly suggested that their release might be effected through further Navy representations. Some of the remarks made by this official regarding the United States representations to date do not correspond with the facts, and the Government is not inclined to rely upon his suggestions. Nevertheless, in order to exploit fully every possibility of effecting their release, the United States naval attaché in China has addressed a note to the highest Communist authorities at Peiping, once again identifying Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender as United States naval personnel, describing briefly the nature of the flight and the circumstances which forced them to land in Communist-occupied territory, and suggesting arrangements for their repatriation to the United States.

RELEASE OF SMITH AND BENDER

MAY 9, 1950.

The following is the full text of the Chinese Communist radio broadcast, datelined Peiping, May 8, regarding the release of Chief Smith and Sergeant Bender:

"Gen. Hsu Shih-yu, commander of the Shantung military district of the People's Liberation Army of the People's Republic of China, made the following statement on the release of the two United States airmen who have been held prisoners here for some time:

"A plane of the United States Navy which invaded the air of our country landed near Tayenchia, village in Lungshan district of Haiyang County in Kiaotung Peninsula, at about 12:30 a. m., October 19, 1948. The plane and two airmen, E. C. Bender and W. C. Smith, were taken prisoners.

"The headquarters of the Shantung military district, People's Liberation Army, immediately examined the captured plane and its crew. It was discovered that the plane was an L-5 craft, with markings O Y O 2767, a type which could be used for reconnoitering purposes, carrying charts and various military maps of the No. 44 field survey team of the United States espionage organization (external service department, NCNA). At the same time, it was also discovered that E. C. Bender and W. C. Smith were on active service in the United States armed forces. A decision was therefore made to detain the plane and to hold the crew in custody as prisoners of war. However, E. C. Bender and W. C. Smith firmly refused to reveal the motive and mission of this unlawful flight.

"It was not until lately that Bender and Smith, influenced by our magnanimous policy toward prisoners, began to confess and stated that the objective of the flight was to reconnoiter the railways because there was a report at that time to the effect that there were activities along the railways of liberated areas.

"At the same time, the flight was to discover what constructional projects were under way in Laiyang because they had had a report saying that the People's Liberation Army was maintaining great numbers of troops there. Bender also admitted that 'Major Lantz told me where I must (* * * (word uncopiable—Editor) and that Smith's job was to reconnoiter constructional projects along the route taken by us.'

"Their confession said further that the route to be taken by the plane was: Take off from Changkow Airfield near Tsingtao, reconnoiter along railways, then head for Laiyang to reconnoiter military constructional works, and then turn back to Tsingtao. But on their way the plane landed in Haiyang County.

"The above facts and confession prove that the aim of this United States imperialist airplane flight was to invade our territorial air and with the purpose of carrying out planned military reconnaissance to help the anticolonial war of the Kuomintang brigands.

"On the basis of the above facts, the Shantung military headquarters has decided to confiscate the airplane which intruded into Chinese territorial air for conducting military reconnaissance. Since Bender and Smith have confessed their repentance, they are being released and deported in line with the magnanimous policy of the Chinese People's Liberation Army toward prisoners.

"Facts have revealed that the American imperialists have repeatedly committed criminal actions in helping the Kuomintang gang by dispatch of their military personnel in airplanes to intrude into Chinese territorial air and spy on military movements of the People's Liberation Army.

"On April 5, 1948, an American plane with four American military personnel was captured by the People's Liberation Army at Hung Shih Ya, of Chiaohsien, about 80 kilometers northwest of Tsingtao. Subsequently, on June 29 of last year, Oscar C. Badger, then commander of the United States Western Pacific Fleet, admitted their mistakes in a personal letter and guaranteed that no similar occurrence would happen

again. The captured American personnel were then released.

"Such criminal actions of the American imperialists in encroaching on the sovereign rights of China and aiding the Kuomintang gang to conduct war against the Chinese people have long been detested by people throughout China. Any subversive activity of the American imperialists encroaching on the sacred sovereign rights of China will be dealt with ruthlessly by the Chinese people."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MAIL DELIVERIES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a telegram which reads as follows:

We have received practically no mail since railroad strike began; plenty of trucks making regular trips Chicago to our section available. Where is planning for southwestern Michigan done? Kindly advise by wire. Best regards.

G. K. FERGUSON,
Watervliet Paper Co.

Talking with Mr. George E. Miller, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, in charge of surface postal transport, he advised that the routing of mail is in charge of their general superintendents and district superintendents in the field.

For the southwestern Michigan area, routing is under the general superintendent at Cleveland; probably also district superintendents at Chicago, Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Toledo.

He said Michigan Central is only making one round trip a day between Detroit and Chicago; that they are sending Detroit mail over the Pere Marquette and other mail for good portion of Michigan on the Grand Trunk to Battle Creek, and then trucking it from Battle Creek; also trucking into Detroit from Cleveland, and from Toledo, as no train service there.

Could send mail over B. & O., but part of its tracks run over Michigan Central and B. & O. employees respecting picket line.

From the editor of the Sturgis Journal under date of May 12, there comes a letter which reads as follows:

THE STURGIS JOURNAL,
Sturgis, Mich., May 12, 1950.

Mr. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARE: I assume that you are aware of what this railroad strike is doing to the towns in your district as well as the State of Michigan.

There hasn't been any passenger or freight service in or out of Sturgis now for three days and the news today does not look too hopeful.

What the answer is I do not know but how our Government can tolerate such a situation is beyond my understanding. The railroad firemen are striking despite the fact that their claims were denied by two presidential fact finding boards.

If the Journal does not get a carload of paper now on the way from Canada by June 1 we will have to suspend operations. We do not have storage space for more than a carload at a time in our plant.

I realize that Congress is probably helpless to do anything about it and Truman is 2,000 miles away dedicating dams.

This failure of rail service is also showing up the inefficiency of the postal service.

Of the 14 villages and towns where the Journal maintains carrier delivery service the post office cannot get our papers there in time for delivery on the rural routes the following morning. We are obliged to transport the papers in our own cars.

Most newspapers including the Journal would have no objection to increased postal rates if we could be assured of adequate service. For a daily newspaper time is of the essence and as things stand now the postal service is almost useless.

I hope Congress will not allow itself to be bluffed by the postmaster general's recent curtailment of service. They may be curtailing the service but I haven't noticed any curtailment in the amount of help the post office is using.

Constructive suggestions. Fire every postmaster in the country and turn the service over to a private corporation like the A. T. & T. to operate. We'll have better service, rates will be lowered, and the corporation will operate at a profit.

Cordially yours,

MARK P. HAINES.

THE GREED OF A FEW SHOULD NOT CAUSE ALL TO SUFFER

Mr. Speaker, it is the imperative duty of the Congress without delay to curb the arbitrary action of a union which by a strike impairs public health, safety or welfare, or injuriously affects the economic life of a community.

Conceding that employees have the right to bargain collectively and to strike, that right, like every other right, is subject to the limitation that, in exercising it, the public welfare shall not be threatened or impaired.

Labor unions have grown powerful because the Congress conferred upon them and their members special benefits and powers.

To attain benefits to which they were not entitled, some unions have exercised arbitrary power to the detriment of the rest of us.

The latest illustration of the exercise of that arbitrary power is the strike of the railroad firemen, who now demand the employment of an unnecessary third man, another fireman, on Diesel engines, even though the railroads have no need for that man's services, and, two fact-finding boards of the President have so declared.

Not only would the employment of the second unnecessary fireman add to the cost of transportation, to which all must contribute, but it would establish a precedent for the employment of other unneeded workers.

The effect of this strike is widespread. Yesterday's mail brought many protests from California; the morning brought me letters and wires from Michigan, and the morning press indicates the widespread tie-up, not only of express, of perishable freight, but of the mail.

The remedy for this present situation and for strikes which injuriously and unfairly affect the rights of the individuals of communities throughout the country is simple and apparent.

Only because unions have been granted special privileges by exemptions granted them under the antitrust laws, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and because of the special privileges given them by the Taft-Hartley Act, and by other legislation designed to benefit labor, are they now able to ignore the rights of the public, enforce their will, their demands, upon all.

I would not attempt by law to force any man contrary to his wishes to work at any job. I would not attempt to restrain any man from quitting a job for any reason or for no reason at all. I would not attempt to deny a man or an organization the right to strike.

But when an individual or an organization misuses the special benefits and privileges granted by laws enacted for the benefit of the worker or for a labor organization, I would withdraw those special rights, those special privileges, so granted.

If a son, for whom I had purchased and to whom I had given a high-powered, speedy automobile insisted upon driving that car recklessly down the highway, endangering the safety of others who might be using it, I would take that car from him. So, too, I would, by law, take from the worker, from the union, the privileges and special benefits given to them, when they, arbitrarily, and to the injury of others, misuse those special powers.

Today a bill was introduced by me which offers that simple and clear remedy. It inflicts no penalty upon the union which calls a strike, upon the employee who engages in a strike or who walks the picket line.

It does, however, when he misuses the power which the Congress has given him, take from him those special benefits and privileges heretofore granted.

What could be more simple? What could be more effective? What could be more fair?

Will the Congress act now? Or are we fearful of incurring the political wrath of the unions?

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MISS DOROTHY SHAVER

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, last week the French Ambassador presented the Cross of the Chevalier of the Legion of Honor to America's most outstanding career woman, Miss Dorothy Shaver, president of New York's Lord & Taylor. She was commended for her service to "French art and French fashion in the United States." During the war Miss Shaver served as a director of American Relief for France.

It is my pleasure to be a friend of the Shaver family. I have personally known and been closely associated with the Shavers for years; they have lived for generations in the district I have the honor to represent. Her father, Hon. James D. Shaver, a prominent lawyer and outstanding judge, has distinguished himself as one of the State's best known and most respected jurists. He has been a great inspiration to me; he lives now with his son, Ben, who is known throughout the State of Arkansas for his legal ability and performance at the bar. Her other brother, Jim, is a very successful abstracter and real-estate man. In her pursuits, Miss Shaver has been encouraged and supported by her sister, Elsie.

Dorothy Shaver's success is due to a personality of opposites. Her father's

family of lawyers gave her a tough masculine mind; her mother's family of artists a highly feminine creative touch. In her 27 years at Lord & Taylor's she has used both to advantage. She is accomplished, patient, tolerant, and well informed.

The path Dorothy Shaver has traveled and the fame she has acclaimed are worthy of emulation and are expressive of the opportunities that exist in our United States. Miss Shaver was born in the little town of Center Point, Ark.; was educated in the public schools of Mena, Ark., and the University of Arkansas. She then studied art with her sister, Elsie, at the University of Chicago. Then the two sisters went to New York. Dorothy suggested to Elsie that she design a doll for commercial sale. "It could make us a fortune," she thought. Elsie designed and created five little dolls, which they called the Five Little Shavers. The New Yorkers were impressed; women carried the dolls under their arms as mascots. The sisters had opened a shop, Elsie designing and Dorothy managing. Lord & Taylor beckoned for Dorothy, and there, 27 years ago, Dorothy began her phenomenal rise to success. Yes; it is an admirable story of success and one exemplary of our American way of life.

The people of the Wonder State of Arkansas—the land of opportunity—point with pride to the unusual accomplishments and outstanding achievements of this great woman—the first female to head a $30,000,000 corporation.

Her ideas and innovations in advertising and merchandising have been widely effective. She is credited with being largely responsible for securing recognition for American designing talent. She has discovered and developed more than 75 native designers in the field of fashion and decoration.

In 1924 Dorothy Shaver joined Lord & Taylor's staff to reorganize the comparison shopping bureau. A year later she suggested the establishment of a bureau of fashion advisers and then proceeded to organize the first bureau of stylists in an American department store now an essential part of this business.

In recognition of her ability, Miss Shaver was made a member of the board of directors of the company in 1927. By 1931 she was a vice president of the company, with an expanding influence in retail sphere. From 1937 until her promotion in 1945 the executive was first vice president, charged with handling the advertising, fashion promotion, public relations and display programs of the store.

During World War II she applied her knowledge of merchandising to the war effort in her service as general consultant to the Office of Quartermaster General.

In late 1945, by her election to the presidency of Lord & Taylor, the career woman again established a precedent—the first woman to head a department store this size, she succeeded Walter Hoving at a significant time in the history of the New York store. The corporation has a broad postwar expansion plan—the erection of a new building on Fifth Avenue between Fifty-second and Fifty-third Street, and additional suburban branches. In May 1946 Miss Shaver was elected a director of the Associated Dry Goods Corp., the parent organization with which Lord & Taylor is affiliated.

Miss Shaver has crossed the Atlantic often, establishing merchandising markets in Europe. She has been described as a woman sizzling with ideas, not only about design, but about politics and the world in general.

WOMEN RUN THE RASCALS OUT OF GARY

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, this being Monday and the day following Mother's Day, I feel that what I am going to say here today is truly a genuine tribute to mothers on the day dedicated to them, although I cannot feel that they should be subjected to the embarrassment and humiliation of having to take the actions that are described in the article that I am including with my address. I still feel that this address is a tribute to them, and I want to say that I feel that under the circumstances, as described therein, it is necessary for them to take this sort of action if they are to rid their towns and cities of such intolerable conditions.

What a disgrace. It certainly is an indictment of those men who have been elected or come to public office and are entrusted with the enforcement of good laws. By their actions they destroy the value of fine principles and wise laws which have been put on the statute books over the period of years by the duly elected representatives of the majority of the people—those who wanted protection from this sort of thing and who sincerely desired to safeguard their homes and families. Men without integrity have no place in public office and will all too often sell their honor and public trust for the proverbial thirty pieces of silver.

This tribute may be somewhat different from the usual ones on this beautiful day when mostly we speak with flowery words of tender love, appreciation, and adoration. I like those speeches and enjoy hearing those wonderful words with the sincerely beautiful sentiments they convey. And it is with deep regret that I admit that they are all too quickly forgotten by those men and women who so ruthlessly succeed in bringing pain to the hearts of many of those same mothers who only a day or two before had been the recipients of flowers, candy, greeting cards, and many other tokens of love and admiration.

These mothers whose husbands and sons have fought in World Wars I and II need only the blooming of the poppies in Flanders Field, and tiny crosses on Okinawa to remind them that they are mothers. Mothers whose kin fought so valiantly to abolish greed and avarice, the two causes of vice and corruption, that they might have a more decent world for them to live in. And, now they themselves must take up banners instead of guns and form picket lines in the streets and alleys where they are abused and insulted. The noble instinct of motherhood ever within their breast will cause them to make these sacrifices to preserve for themselves, their children and their children's children, that finest heritage, the quality of decency in living and in government.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Members of the House last Thursday upon the subject of economy in Government, I called their attention to the fact that ECA money was being used in France to rehabilitate a gambling casino. This I am definitely opposed to for the many reasons I gave in those remarks. Necessarily, I made direct reference to this situation as it affects our own citizens in the various communities in which they live. Because of the great amount of money the Congress is spending in investigating this subject on a Nationwide basis and with the questionable results of this investigation and the effectiveness of any possible resultant legislation that may be enacted, I take the privilege of suggesting what seems to me a more direct and effectual method of combating this problem.

I believe the article taken from the May issue of the American magazine will demonstrate clearly what I mean. The people of any community must take a greater interest in its civic affairs. They have more power in their hands than any lawmakers. The forces for right and decency are more potent than mere laws. The power of an aroused public opinion, aided by exposés by the various news services can do an effective job. Where there is a will there is a way.

It is hardly possible to legislate morals. May I remind you of the complete failure of the prohibition law. Education and a strengthening of our national morality are the answers, in my opinion. Our churches have long been a potent force in such situations, along with our many civic and service clubs and organizations. They must further stimulate their members to the never-ending task that seems to be everlastingly confronting them.

The church in America has long had the tradition of being nonpolitical, and rightly so, but does any honest citizen, or worshiper, feel that because his church is nonpolitical it therefore should not point out the road to civic virtue. Does any one feel that all ministers should hold their peace in the face of political tyranny or corruption? No, indeed. The many large and highly respected fraternal organizations whose very foundations are based upon the highest of ideals and the noblest precepts will be willing partners in such a cause. And, last but not least the women of America, as you will see when you read the following article, are and always have been, in my opinion, the strongest force of all for decency. They will do any job they set their minds and hearts to do.

It is indeed encouraging to me that more and more of our citizens are taking an increasing interest in the affairs of their Government. It is hoped that all people will realize that they have responsibilities as well as privileges, and they

must take a more active part if they are to help shape the policies their representatives adopt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to clutter up the RECORD with inconsequential material and I am sure that the Members will agree that there is a serious and grave situation existing, such as I have outlined, from coast to coast. And, with desperate appeals coming to the Federal Government from cities like Los Angeles for Federal help, we must take immediate stock of our resources to solve the problems. Then let us go further than just finding the prevention. Let us discover the causes of crime and corruption and work for the elimination of them.

And, lastly let us not forget the importance of the ballot box in electing men and women of honor and integrity to public office.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my own remarks upon this subject and before the inclusion of the magazine article I referred to I would like to take a brief second to make an observation about my speech Thursday to the House.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] made a rather lusty speech here this afternoon in regard to this matter of spending ECA money for the gambling casino in Le Havre, France. I am glad to know that the gentleman took notice of the remarks I made on Thursday where I called it to the attention of the House. It also pleases me that Members of the other body, the Senate, likewise took notice of my address and said so in their remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article from the American magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WOMEN RUN THE RASCALS OUT OF GARY

(By Edwin T. Connell)

After a first-hand look into the civic housecleaning that has taken place in Gary, Ind., during the past year, I am convinced that if you want your town cleaned up, just turn the job over to the women.

Hold your fire, men. Don't shoot—yet. I used to think politics was a man's world, too. But now—well, see for yourself.

A little over a year ago, Gary, a key industrial city of some 140,000, had the dubious distinction of being one of the worst communities in the Nation. National surveys showed it to be the country's second crime center and one of the top three in vice. The American Social Hygiene Association reported about 100 percent gain in organized vice activities in 4 years. Today, Gary has dropped down the odious list to a point where it is a fairly decent place in which to live.

In the first 8 weeks of 1949, there were eight brutal murders in Gary. In the next 10 months, there were only two.

As last year began brothels and bookie joints boomed. They didn't even bother to turn down the blinds. Today, the blinds are up and dust gathers on the gaming tables and fancy furnishings of the fleshpots.

Fifteen months ago, women either did not dare go out alone at night in Gary or, when they did, many carried guns and knives for protection. Now, once again, they are able to attend their church and club meetings unarmed and without fear for their lives and property.

What happened?

In a year 10,000 stout-hearted and determined women literally forced decency upon their city. They had tired of men's excuses that a gigantic vice syndicate had the politicians and police by the throat and nothing could be done. They defied a multi-million-dollar syndicate. Two thousand women stormed city hall in a body. They picketed brothels and joints. They ignored threats. They poked indignant fingers into every phase of city government. And they got results. They got results that any crime- and vice-ridden city can get if the citizens have the spirit and resolve of the petticoat vigilantes of Gary.

What actually called these women to arms was the brutal slaying of a revered member of their own sex. On the night of March 3, 1949, Miss Mary Cheever, a beloved 45-year-old language teacher, was shot and killed in an alley near her home, when she apparently resisted a purse snatcher. Miss Cheever had been returning from a PTA meeting, where she had lectured on her travels in South America. She had just parked her car and was about to enter her apartment building, when the murderer grabbed her. He escaped, and has never been caught.

The tragic news spread like a forest fire over the city, gathering heat as it went. Lights burned late that night. Telephone wires hummed. Miss Cheever had taught many of Gary's young matrons. She was now teaching some of their children. She had been active in civic and church affairs. She typified the best in Gary, or any city. But now she was dead, brutally and wantonly murdered by a desperate thug in the shadow of her own home. It could have happened to any woman.

Among the many phone conversations that night was one between two women, who were not only struck with grief, but fired to action. One of them said, "This is too much. None of us is safe. Let's do something." The other replied, "All right; let's."

With those few words one of the most amazing crusades in American history was launched. The identity of the woman who made the original suggestion has never been revealed. Her colleagues, contrary to the traditions of their sex, have kept it a closely guarded secret, fearing reprisals if the identity of the modern Joan of Arc becomes known.

These two women agreed to call some friends. Their friends called other friends, and on a Sunday afternoon, 3 days after Miss Cheever's death, 21 women met in the YMCA consultation room. Their purpose was to draw up a resolution to the city council demanding that an outside investigator be brought in to clean up the city, and also an immediate increase in the number of police. These women were housewives, teachers, businesswomen. Many nationalities were represented. There were Negroes and whites; Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; Republicans and Democrats. Most of them didn't know one another. In fact, they had only two things in common—each was a leader in some woman's group, and they were all blazing mad.

In a 7-hour session—they worked right through dinner—they drew up a resolution, and decided to call a mass meeting of Gary's women for the next night to present it. They didn't even wait for some time to build up interest, or to give people a chance to arrange personal affairs. On Monday, an announcement appeared in the Gary Post-Tribune, the town's only daily newspaper, calling the meeting.

That night, although it was a cold, raw March evening, over 2,000 angry women packed Seaman Hall and unanimously approved the resolution. The tone of the meeting was set by Mrs. Russell T. Griffith, young wife of a chemical engineer and assistant director of the Gary Symphony Orchestra, who said, "If the city officials won't protect us, we woman can—and will." Someone pointed out that the city council was meeting in city hall at that very moment. "Let's present this resolution to the council in person," said another. The "ayes" shook the rafters.

And so, bundling into their furs and their cloth coats, the entire body of 2,000 women marched with dignity and determination down Broadway—Gary's main street—and literally stormed city hall. There were no shouts, screams, or demonstrations of any kind. Of course, only a few got inside, but the others waited silently on the winding stairs of the city hall rotunda and swelled out onto the street.

Inside the packed city council chamber, Mrs. Benjamin Saks, a former English teacher, read the resolution in a small but firm voice demanding that Arthur M. Thurston, superintendent of the Indiana State Police, be called in to investigate Gary, and that more police be added. Mayor Eugene Swartz happened to be present at the meeting and, since this was really his responsibility, the president of the council asked him for comment.

"I have always tried to give this community exactly what it wanted," said the mayor. "If this town wants gambling cleaned up, it can have it. We'll clean it from top to bottom, from one end to the other. And I shall not ask for more police to do the job, not right now, anyway. If that's what you people want, that's what you're going to get."

That's what the women wanted, but not all. The mayor said the city could not afford more police at that time, and the women came back with figures showing that other cities of the same size as Gary had more police protection on a lower budget than their city. They were not impressed, either, by promises of a shut-down of gambling. They'd had them before, especially around election time, when opposing candidates and the newspapers would scream about vice. The word would simply go out over the underworld to lay low for a while. Once the election was safely passed, the vice joints were wide open again.

The women kept pounding the mayor with questions and demands, and finally, when it was nearly midnight, the women allowed the meeting to adjourn after they had given Mayor Swartz 2 weeks to do something, and he had promised action.

Well, the next day you couldn't place a bet, play a slot machine, or find an operating brothel in Gary. But as yet no one was really taking the women seriously. This was just a new variation of one of the periodic reforms that blossom up overnight and die as quickly. The syndicate had been through it a dozen times.

To give you some idea of what the women were up against, perhaps I had better fill you in with a brief background picture of Gary. It is a young city, founded in 1906 by United States Steel, and is the home of the Nation's largest steel works. It is built on a sand dune on the shores of Lake Michigan. An almost unbroken rim of steel mills stretches along the water front. Fire and smoke belch from blast furnaces around the clock.

It is a lusty town, with more men than women. They work hard and they play hard. There are no real old families in Gary and, consequently, it is only now, when a second generation has grown up, that a civic pride is developing. Gary is also plagued by migratory workers. These men are on the loose. They make good money and spend it. Gambling houses, bars, and brothels make it easy spending. Gary is 27 percent Negro and has a large foreign population. One section of town called the central district has about the most shocking living conditions you'll find anywhere.

Vice in Gary had been organized into a smooth-running machine. Gary and nearby Chicago newspapers repeatedly charged that the town was run by the syndicate; that some of the politicians and police were paid off regularly. There were repeated reports, too, revealing how politicians had prospered in office and police officials were able to live far beyond their salaries. Vice was a $5,000,000-a-year business. It was not going to retire from business without a struggle.

Consequently, no one was surprised, least of all the women, who were learning about their town fast, when at the end of 2 weeks nothing had happened other than the closing of the joints. Completely ignored had been the demand for an outside investigator to study Gary's vice and crime problem and put into effect permanent reforms; also, no steps had been taken to increase the number of police. Once again, the women called a mass meeting, and, as before, packed Seaman Hall with 2,000. They sent a committee to the mayor to get a report. Then, restless over waiting, they decided to march again. Another 2,000 paraded in the rain down to city hall. They learned that the mayor was out of town.

"This is a stall," concluded the women. "All right," they said; "we'll go to the Governor."

Their leaders called Indianapolis and made an appointment with Gov. Henry F. Schricker for later that week. Into the State Capitol, in the vanguard of the descending women, poured bushels of letters and telegrams from the chamber of commerce, civic and church groups, business and professional men who carried weight and, more important, votes, all stating they were behind the women 100 percent.

When 18 delegates of the women's army arrived in Indianapolis, Governor Schricker agreed to give them 15 minutes. The women told me that at first the Governor was merely polite to the nice ladies who had come all the way to the Capitol to see him. He was glad of their interest in government. But when they let it be known they were not just sightseeing and began bombarding him with questions and demands that he send State Police Superintendent Thurston to Gary to clean up the city, he grew angry.

Mrs. Griffith told me that at one point Governor Schricker said the demonstration by the women was a Republican trick to embarrass his Democratic administration. Mrs. Saks, who had read the original resolution at the city council, wiggled a finger at the Governor, and said, "I'm probably a better Democrat than you are, Governor." Finally, the Governor agreed to do something and said he would send Thurston, if invited by Mayor Swartz. The original 15-minute handshaking session had lasted 4 hours.

The 18 women rushed back to Gary to report and wait. Thurston did come to Gary, but, according to the women, he made only a visiting-fireman's tour of the town and left.

The women decided they must dig in for a long fight. They made their organization a permanent one, and had it incorporated under the name of the Women's Citizens Committee. They decided, one night, they must have some money. The next day they had charter membership cards printed. They gave the cards out to women in bunches, not even bothering to count how many were given to each. They went from door to door for contributions, and 2 weeks later had over $16,000.

Membership in the WCC grew to 10,000. The greatest interest came from the poor sections, where these people were heartened by the fact that for the first time someone was paying attention to them. The women formed a Crime Commission comprised of 65 members of the leading men's citizen groups and the 21 original members of the women's group, who became the advisory committee. It was to study the police.

A committee of women called upon Mayor Swartz and told him flatly they would keep up their demonstrations until the city was cleaned up permanently. Although ostensibly the places of vice were closed, there was evidence of lots of cheating and, if you were known, you could get just about anything you wanted. The syndicate was gradually inching its way back into business as usual, as it had so often in the past.

However, the continued persistence of the women had made it evident to the administration that it had more than a flash-in-the-pan nuisance on its hands, and the first concrete step was taken. The mayor did some reshuffling in the police department, created a new vice squad and placed Capt. Peter Billick at the head.

Billick had a long and honorable record. He worked closely with the FBI during the war. Police in Gary are civil service, and Billick had no fear of losing his job. Given the green light by the mayor as a result of the women's pressure, Billick and his squad swung into action. They raided brothels, gambling houses, bookie joints, and unsavory taverns; made arrests by the score.

The women did their part by opening a post office box No. 569 and invited citizens to give them tips of where the law was being violated. Information poured in, and Billick acted on it.

But the syndicate was not yet licked. It was annoyed because all this was costing money, but was far from beaten. All the syndicate did was fall back on the courts. As fast as cases came up in court, they would, almost invariably, be dismissed. When one of the gambling or prostitute cases came up in city court, a special judge would be requested by the attorney for the defense, and the request would be granted. This is permissible under Indiana law. The special judge was merely a local Gary lawyer.

According to Captain Billick, it was a common occurrence that on a certain day this lawyer would sit in judgment on a case involving a madam of one of the brothels and would dismiss the case. The very next day, this same lawyer would be defense attorney for another madam, and the lawyer for the defense on the previous day would be the special judge. He, too, would dismiss the case for his colleague.

Billick told me that every imaginable dodge was used. Warrants were declared faulty or there were no warrants. Evidence was insufficient. If an outright dismissal was too bald, the case would be continued and Billick would lose his witnesses. The syndicate fought a delaying action. The whole purpose was to discourage the police and the women. But Billick kept at it. He said he got at least the satisfaction that he was costing the vice boys money, at least $100 for each arrest. Over a period of 7 months, Billick arrested about 1,000 persons, which adds up to $100,000.

Well, the weeks of spring came and went, and soon it was summer. The weather became stifling. Many of the WCC leaders were away on trips. Others, with their children home all day from school, had little time for meetings. The WCC seemed to be dying of the heat. Billick himself took a vacation. While he was away, the underworld boys set the grapevine buzzing with the news that the "lid is off." Back in business went the gamblers and the madams.

It was at this point that the women struck their most dramatic and telling blow of all. The advisory committee held a special and very secret session. Mrs. Griffith was chairman of the committee at the time.

At this special meeting, the advisory committee decided something had to be done, or the WCC would fold. They called a meeting of the steering committee for the next night to disclose their plan. This group is made up of some 300 women, who are the heads of Gary's clubs and organizations. It is through this committee that the 10,000 women are held together. A notice to the steering committee was published in the paper. No information as to the purpose of the meeting was given except that it was important. Mrs. Griffith said she did not know whether anyone would respond, and a small hall at the YMCA was used. Over 100 women responded and there were not enough seats. Then Mrs. Griffith disclosed the new strategy.

"I told those women," Mrs. Griffith now recalls, "that it was obvious that arrests were not bringing results. Places were still operating. The politicians said there was no vice in Gary. Our tips had proved that not to be true. Then I said it was the wish of the advisory committee that the women of Gary go out and stand in front of the known places of vice and gambling, wearing identifying arm bands which we had had made, and observe and report any illicit activity.

"Much to our amazement, practically all the women agreed to the plan. In no time, we had over 160 volunteers. What we called at the start, observing, was immediately dubbed picketing. It makes no difference what it was called; it worked."

For the next 2 days Gary was treated to what was probably one of the most unusual sights in American history. Working in 2-hour shifts from 10 a. m. until 8 p. m. these resolute 160 women picketed. They picketed only in the daytime for safety's sake, but since Gary is a three-shift working town and men are free at odd hours, day is the same as night as far as gambling and vice are concerned. There were 2 to 10 women picketing at each place, depending upon the size. They watched front and back doors. They wore their WCC arm bands and carried pencils and pads. They went right down into the worst section of Gary, the central district.

They stood in the broiling sun and observed. They took down the license number of every car that stopped. They jotted down the names of the men they knew as they entered a place, or the names of men given to them by woman residents of the section, who were in sympathy with the demonstration. Needless to say, this hurt business. In addition to the brothels, they picketed cigar stores, poolrooms, barbershops, and cafes where it was known you could make a bet. Even a man bent on an innocent game of pool or a haircut would not dare go past the picket line of women.

Baby-sitters did a land-office business as the fighting women left their homes and children to picket. Dishes piled up in sinks, and houses remained undusted. The women withstood jeers and threats from the gamblers and catcalls from the madams and prostitutes, who shouted and cursed at them from behind shutters, and even spit upon them.

The demonstration was not without its amusing side. One of the better-type bookie joints provided chairs for the women on the sidewalk, another offered soft drinks and even invited the women in for lunch. "We've got air-conditioning," the operator gave as his lure. One enterprising operator said he'd give the women a "sure thing" at Arlington, if they'd leave him alone. The women resisted all temptations.

However, one bookie became so incensed that he pulled up the awning in front of his joint and forced the women to stand in the broiling sun. They stood.

Well, 2 days of this and the vice boys were ready to cry "Uncle!" They headed for cover again. Taking the cue from the women, Billick, having returned from his vacation, abandoned the policy of concentrating on evidence and arrests and began a systematic program of harassment. He had policemen stationed in the bookie joints. The prosti-

tutes began leaving town in droves, and some were picked up for soliciting as far away as Indianapolis. "Gary's too hot," was their lament.

Billick began systematic raids in three shifts. He would hit one place several times a day and night; other places night after night. The gamblers tried to alert one another, but Billick varied his raids. They didn't know where he'd strike next.

The leaders of the WCC received dire threats. Mrs. Griffith was told several times over the phone that she would be killed. She laughed them off. "We're too strong," she said. "They wouldn't dare." One woman was told that if she picketed she was stepping "on a bunch of eggs and was asking for the undertaker." She picketed. The husband of one of the women, an attorney, told me that a politician cautioned him to quiet his wife down or there would be trouble. The lawyer replied, "I've been trying to quiet her for 15 years. If you think you can do it, you have my blessing."

Secretly, the men are very proud of their pioneering mates. It stands to reason that most of the women would not be able to continue unless the men gave their tacit approval. The women have gone in where the men had long feared to tread. The husbands also had wanted reform, but had always hesitated. They had their businesses to think about. They knew that men had been beaten and even murdered because they had gotten in the way of the vice lords. The men considered the dangers; the women ignored them.

For the 6 months that Billick kept up his harassment, Gary was closed tight as a drum as far as organized vice was concerned. Mayor Swartz brought in the investigator the women were demanding. He was Donald K. Kooken, of Chicago, and he made several recommendations for improving the police set-up. The women, meanwhile, branched out into many phases of government—housing, legislation, taxation, traffic, courts, education.

When the lid first came down on vice in Gary, the vice boys tried to move their places just outside the city limits. But the petticoat army was right behind them. One day the women spotted trucks carrying gambling equipment to a large house in the county. They also knew that Governor Schricker was attending a luncheon in a nearby town. The women got into cars, tracked down the Governor, and informed him that State highways were being used to transport gambling equipment and he had better put a stop to it. The place never opened.

Along about the first of this year, with the women immersed in long-range reforms, the vice boys made another bid for return. Billick was removed from his assignment and put in charge of records. This looked as though he were being shelved. Five new captains were appointed and the work was divided. There was to be no vice squad and each officer was responsible for any vice or gambling on his beat. This was in accordance with the recommendations of investigator Kooken, and since the women had asked for such an investigation, they said nothing. But they watched.

The vice boys, however, took the changes to mean the light was again green for them. It was going to be a happy new year. Well, it was the shortest happy new year on record. Five days after 1950 made its bow and Gary commenced coming to life again as a pleasure town, the women sighted their guns. They went on the radio; they made statements in the papers; they warned the mayor and the chief of police: "We'll march again; we'll picket again." That was enough. The lid went back down, and there it remains as this is being written.

According to Gary police officials, gambling has been cut down at least 60 percent during the past year. There is still some gambling in private clubs, and policy wheels operate on the sly, but I was informed that revenue from policy had dropped from $6,000 or $7,000 per week to between $300 and $400 a week.

Everybody I talked to, both men and women, agreed that organized vice and gambling were licked in Gary. In addition to the fact that murders had dropped from one a week for 2 months to two murders in 10 months, police records show a great reduction in purse-snatching, housebreaking, and other crimes. This, despite the fact that Gary had a 7-week strike late last year in the steel plant and such a condition has, in the past, resulted in an increase in crime. The women of Gary no longer fear to walk the streets after dark.

Most astounding of all, not only to the politicians but to the husbands of the crusading women, is not so much what they have done, as the fact that they keep doing it. They have more enthusiasm now than when they started.

The women know that they have not completely licked the problem. You can still make a sly bet in Gary. I saw some bets being taken while I was there. Taxicabs do a thriving business in finding girls for men who are so minded. Some of the taverns have an unusually large number of female customers at the bar, and a male customer will not be snubbed if he opens a conversation. Nor will he be disappointed if he suggests a date. The women are the first to tell you all this and say they hope to largely eliminate it in time. They know you can't legislate morals. Their major pride is in the fact that they have reduced vice to a catch-as-catch-can status and have slain the dragon syndicate.

They've been called Carrie Nations and petticoat crusaders and they renounce any connection. They regard themselves, instead, as normal American citizens, who want a decent city in which to live. Like their pioneer forebears, they'll fight for it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MILITARY PROVISION IN H. R. 7797

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that I have been here all day, and only because of urgent and important business in my office did I miss the first quorum call, No. 164.

Mr. Speaker, a matter that I feel is important as far as unemployment and employment are concerned is the matter of the deletion of the 12½ percent milling provision in the bill H. R. 7797. I have a letter here from the American Federation of Grain Millers which I would like to insert in the RECORD along with my remarks.

The first paragraph of this letter reads:

> We would appreciate your support in obtaining an amendment to House bill H. R. 7797. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has deleted the provision in this bill which provides that 12½ percent of all wheat grants under the ECA be in the form of flour. It is important to us that this provision be incorporated in the new bill.

I will read the first few lines of my wire to him:

> Regarding milling provision in H. R. 7797. We had been informed by members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that it had been retained and we had nothing to worry about. However, I have just now discovered that contrary to our previous assurance it has been deleted in House and Senate joint conference.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is really important that we take another look at this ECA program. The people here have to work, they have to have employment if they are going to furnish the money for such program. After all, 12½ percent is only one-eighth, which means only one bag of flour out of eight that goes to Europe would be milled in this country.

The millers themselves, the owners, want this provision, the employees need it. They are down to 4 days a week, and they will be down to three before long. They cannot live on that kind of take-home pay.

There is also involved the question of exports. Between 1920 and 1930 the mills in this country were exporting from 27 to 30 percent of all the flour to foreign countries. A question has been raised by testimony in the committee that Britain, for instance, does not want the kind of flour we mill. They say it is too fine, or something of that kind. May I say that if they could use it from 1920 to 1930 they can use it now and I should think they would be glad to get it and let us have a little employment for our people over here. They claim that is the reason they buy wheat from Canada, but it looks rather peculiar to me that we who send our money to foreign countries and have them turn around and buy everything they need from other countries besides us. It seems to me that out of gratitude or from some other feeling they would not always require that we give up everything. If we are going to send everything to Europe in that fashion, why do we not send our steel over there and let them manufacture their own tractors, automobiles, and so forth? We have unemployment in this country and it is a situation we should be considering.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, if we send our steel over there and let them manufacture automobiles and fabricate all the rest of those things, there will be more people out of work. The gentleman said something about their buying things from us. They cannot buy anything unless we give them the money and does not the gentleman realize what a wonderful profit there is in those transactions?

Mr. IRVING. I am not promoting the idea of our sending steel over there; they have steel already over there, but if we follow that basic policy, let us follow it all the way through.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I cannot yield further.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have a very short simple question.

Mr. IRVING. The gentleman's questions are always simple, like who killed cock robin, or something of that nature.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It would be interesting to find out who did kill him.

Mr. IRVING. Or what did the Governor of South Carolina say to the Governor of North Carolina.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He said, "Let's have a drink."

Mr. IRVING. It is questions like that which are only injected to confuse the speaker and for dilatory tactics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thought the gentleman would quit.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri does not quit. He does not care to waste his time or the time of the House or the taxpayers' money in any such nonsense. Nor does he think the people of this Nation approve of the delaying and dilatory tactics that were used here today by those on the left side of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. ENGLE of California, for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. MAGEE, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. FELLOWS), for an indefinite period, on account of death in family.

To Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. WELCH, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3258. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1445. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a request to repeal section 9 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (Public Law 110, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1446. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain persons to accept and wear decorations bestowed upon them by certain foreign countries"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1447. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the acts of the first special session of the Seventeenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, August 29 to September 11, 1949, pursuant to section 23 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, approved March 2, 1917; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1448. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1449. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 8, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Big South Fork River and tributaries, Tennessee, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TACKETT: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1739. An act to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, and House Resolution 107, Eighty-first Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6209. A bill to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6319. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 8199. A bill to amend certain provisions of the act of May 25, 1948 (Public Law 554, 80th Cong.) relating to the Flathead Indian irrigation project; with amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1959. An act to commemorate Jim White and his contribution to the early history of Carlsbad Caverns, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. S. 2117. An act to provide for the designation of the reservoir to be formed by the Davis Dam on the Colorado River as Lake Mohave; without amendment (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. Senate Concurrent Resolution 64. Concurrent resolution requesting burial in Arlington National Cemetery of the last surviving member of the Grand Army of the Republic upon his death; with amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 8502. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives and to reorganize the executive departments of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 8503. A bill to provide a reimbursement for uniforms and equipment for officers of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8504. A bill to authorize payment of death gratuity on account of death in active or training service of personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, including the Reserve components of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 8505. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 8506. A bill to provide for the construction of the Markhams Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 8507. A bill to protect the public health and economic welfare of the States and the subdivisions thereof and of the people thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8508. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 8509. A bill to provide for a national agricultural policy to be carried out on a self-sustaining basis, and to promote conservation and development of the Nation's soil resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 8510. A bill to authorize revision of the procedures employed in the administration of certain trust funds administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 8511. A bill to amend and supplement section 3 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8512. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to extend financial assistance to private enterprise to promote the development, production, and utilization of taconite and other minerals advantageous to the national defense and the strengthening of the national economy, to promote free enterprise in the mineral-mining industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 8513. A bill to facilitate the conservation of wildlife and the preservation of natural features by providing a Nature Conservancy of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 8514. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 8515. A bill to amend the act of July 18, 1940, to provide an additional 1-year period in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army may make claims for benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8516. A bill authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system, and authorizing the United States to pay for water and water services secured from the water system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. J. Res. 469. Joint resolution to appropriate funds to combat serious infestations of bark and pine beetles; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. J. Res. 470. Joint resolution directing the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Air Coordinating Committee of the Department of Commerce to carefully investigate the so-called Rome Convention limiting payment arising out of ground accidents caused by overseas air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 471. Joint resolution to provide for the distribution by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities among certain flood victims; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 602. Resolution requesting the President to suspend his order closing the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital, at Van Nuys, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 603. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, concerning the importation of rubber and other products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting the abolition of the present partition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 8517. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 8518. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 8519. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archer C. Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 8520. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toshi Ishibashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8521. A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to Frank David Blackhoop and Thomas Blackhoop; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 8522. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Abraham Rough Surface and Samuel Rough Surface; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8523. A bill for the relief of Marianna Gantschnigg and Merle Richard Gantschnigg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 8524. A bill for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 8525. A bill for the relief of Lonnie Odell Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8526. A bill for the relief of A. D. Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2126. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Women's Club of Little Falls, N. J., opposing compulsory health insurance and favoring the voluntary approach and the preservation of free enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2127. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolution adopted by the West Central Minnesota Association of Life Underwriters and attested by Richard E. Melby, secretary, Fergus Falls, Minn., in opposition to the enactment of any legislation for the establishment of any system of compulsory health insurance and socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2128. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Fulton County, N. Y., unequivocably opposing proposed action of the State Department in encouraging imports of leather gloves from Europe by reducing present tariff rates thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2129. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by the Racine Taxpayers, Inc., Racine, Wis., that the Congress speedily enact into law Senate bills 2212 and 2213 and House bill 5775, relating to the obsolete methods of handling postal finance and the political appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2130. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Roger Bliss, city clerk, Oshkosh, Wis., requesting and urging passage of Senate bill 2166; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2131. Also, petition of Fred Schwarzkopf, city clerk, Bridgeport, Conn., requesting that the Common Council of the City of Bridgeport, Conn., be placed on record as favoring the completion of the investigation now going on in the State Department concerning subversive activities, and also requesting that support be given to the Mundt-Nixon bill; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2132. Also, petition of Miss Agnes C. Tuttle and others, Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Bronx, N. Y., requesting that action be taken against the antitrust suit against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2133. Also, petition of Edwin C. M. Dickey, Washington, D. C., relative to case 197-MCS, from the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2134. Also, petition of Miles D. Kennedy, director, the American Legion National Legislative Commission, Washington, D. C., relative to House bill 6277, and requesting that they be placed on record as being opposed to any legislation granting to former members of the merchant marine any veterans' benefits or any benefits akin to those normally granted veterans for their rehabilitation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, may the hush of Thy presence move us in this hallowed moment to adoration; and may all other voices be stilled that Thine may be heard. We wait for Thy benediction that we may face whatever the day brings in the certainty of Thy guidance, in the glory of Thy service and in the solemn realization that we are indeed our brother's keeper.

Speak to us now, through the silence, and, ere duty lead us back to a noisy, crowded way, vouchsafe to our waiting hearts assurance of forgiveness, of cleansing, of empowering, that as servants of Thine and of the people we may the more worthily serve this great day, when the hearts of men are stirring with the throb of deep desire for more abundant life. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 15, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2811) to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills,

in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5920. An act to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service;

H. R. 7058. An act to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7155. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7339. An act to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7739. An act to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees;

S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.;

H. R. 1151. An act to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers;

H. R. 1354. An act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California;

H. R. 2387. An act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections;

H. R. 2783. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau (Alaska) Camp;

H. R. 5097. An act for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

NOMINATION OF HAROLD K. HILL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I announce that a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been called for Thursday this week, at 10 o'clock, in room 324, Senate Office Building. At that meeting it is proposed to consider the nomination of Harold K. Hill, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Mr. Hill has been invited to be present.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Butler	Ives	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Darby	Kilgore	Stennis
Donnell	Knowland	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Taylor
Dworshak	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	Lucas	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Wherry
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Gurney	McKellar	Withers
Hayden	McMahon	Young
Hendrickson	Malone	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee has been very commendably active in working out problems with Federal implications affecting Milwaukee and other major American municipalities. I have received from V. H. Hurless, city comptroller of Milwaukee, two such resolutions on critical problems facing Milwaukee and other metropolitan centers. One of the resolutions pertains to the tremendous amount of Federal property located in these big cities—property which does not pay local taxes and which thus puts a strain on municipal budgets by taking out of the field of taxable revenue considerable space.

The other resolution pertains to a matter to which I have been particularly close, and that is the question of formation of a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. It was my pleasure to be one of the original cosponsors of this legislation, because I feel that it is only by setting up a little Hoover Commission, so to speak, which would work out the interrelationships between Federal, State, and local governments, which would consider the question of overlapping taxes, which would consider the problem of centralization of power in Washington, D. C.—only by setting up such a commission can we effectively cut through the present maze and confusion.

I believe that both of the resolutions will be of interest to my colleagues, so I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred as follows:

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas there is within the city of Milwaukee $15,733,200 worth of property which is owned by the United States Government; and

"Whereas no general property taxes or payments in lieu of taxes are paid on $13,970,700 worth of this Federal property; and

"Whereas enactment of the Horan bill (H. R. 7478), which is being considered by the Eightieth Congress, would result in the United States Government making payments in lieu of taxes on approximately $8,000,000 worth of this property that is located in the city of Milwaukee; and

"Whereas the Horan bill further provides for the establishment of a commission to determine the amounts to be paid in lieu of taxes; and

"Whereas the city of Milwaukee badly needs additional revenues to finance municipal services, many of which are provided to Federally owned properties: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is urged to enact legislation to provide for payments in lieu of taxes on Federally owned properties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the comptroller be and hereby is authorized and directed to urge those Representatives and Senators who represent the city of Milwaukee and Representative ANDREW L. SOMERS, chairman of the House Public Lands Committee, to act on the Horan bill (H. R. 7478) and to expedite the Budget Bureau's investigations of payment in lieu of tax problems."

To the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Whereas many intergovernmental problems on revenue sources, functions, immunities, ownerships, regulatory powers, etc., exist and have existed for decades; and

"Whereas no governmental agency is currently empowered to make comprehensive studies and to resolve the many questions arising between the Federal, State, and local governments; and

"Whereas bill S. 3147, which is being considered by the Eightieth Congress, would create a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (consisting of seven members appointed by the President), which would make recommendations to the Congress based on (1) a study of the relations and allocation of functions and powers between the Federal, State, and local governments; (2) a study of the fiscal relations between Federal, State, and local governments with special emphasis on tax immunities, revenue sources, and grants-in-aid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is requested to create a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by enacting bill S. 3147; and be it further

"Resolved, That the comptroller be and hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1862. A bill to provide refunds of certain deposits made for the purpose of obtaining credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1559); and

S. 2640. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 7341. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Anacostia River in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1565).

By Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. Res. 253. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1950; favorably, together with minority views (Rept. No. 1567);

S. Res. 259. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950; without recommendation, together with individual views of Mr. BENTON (Rept. No. 1561); and

S. Res. 263. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950; favorably, together with minority views (Rept. No. 1566).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. Res. 254. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1950; adversely (Rept. No. 1562);

S. Res. 255. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 9 of 1950; adversely (Rept. No. 1563); and

S. Res. 256. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 11 of 1950; adversely (Rept. No. 1564).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 16, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees; and

S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3594. A bill for the relief of Tulana Farms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3595. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of San Luis Obispo Creek in California for the purpose of determining action necessary to control floods in the drainage area of such creek; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 3596. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Michael Hanak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 3597. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and orders, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3598. A bill for the relief of William Zumsteg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 3599, to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3600. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Sonobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3601. A bill for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 3602. A bill for the relief of Antonio Artolozaga Euscola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARBY:

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Kansas and the State of Missouri establishing a boundary between said States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCORPORATION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF PURPLE HEART

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of numerous representatives of those men and women who have been awarded the Military Order of the Purple Heart by the Government of the United States for distinguished and meritorious service and for wounds received in combat against an enemy of the United States, while serving in the armed forces of the United States, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

The bill (S. 3599) to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 5920. An act to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 7058. An act to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7155. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 7339. An act to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7739. An act to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edwin F. Stanton, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Thailand, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States on the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947;

Harold W. Dodds, of New Jersey, and Edwin B. Fred, of Wisconsin, to be members of the Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange;

Howland H. Sargeant, of Rhode Island; George D. Stoddard, of Illinois; Miss Bernice Baxter, of California; Isidor I. Rabi, of New York; and George F. Zook, of Virginia, to be representatives of the United States to the fifth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization;

Stanley Woodward, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada, vice Laurence A. Steinhardt, deceased;

John G. Erhardt, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Austria, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa;

James E. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service;

Thomas H. Lockett, of Kentucky, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service;

Norman Armour, Jr., of New Jersey, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for

promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service; and

Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

THE PRESIDENT'S WESTERN TOUR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPEHART

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him from Chicago on May 13, 1950, dealing with the President's western tour, which appears in the Appendix.]

SELLING AMERICAN FARMERS DOWN THE RIVER—ARTICLE BY SENATOR JENNER

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Selling American Farmers Down the River," written by Senator JENNER, of Indiana, and published in the May 1950 issue of the National Republic of Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

HOME OF CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with the dedication of the International Home and headquarters of the Credit Union National Association, published in the Bulletin of the Madison and Wisconsin Foundation on May 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL-SERVICE SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS—ARTICLE FROM THE POSTAL RECORD

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "S. 878 Should Be Enacted Into Law," published in the Postal Record of May 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY JOHN J. O'CONNOR, CONCERNING REORGANIZATION PLAN 21 RELATING TO UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement of John J. O'Connor, representing Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on May 9, 1950, concerning Reorganization Plan No. 21 relating to the United States Maritime Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFL UNION INDUSTRIES SHOW—ARTICLE BY SYLVIA PORTER

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Big Fair Here Is Tribute to United States System," written by Sylvia Porter and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRANSFER OF WATSON LABORATORIES—ARTICLE FROM THE ROME DAILY SENTINEL

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Foster Urges Lab Transfer in Nationwide Broadcast," published in the Rome Daily Sentinel on April 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE CRIME—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Kansas City Stares at the Kefauver Committee," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal on May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF STRIKES ON THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wave of Crippling Strikes Hurting Democratic Party," by David Lawrence, published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on May 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILWAY STRIKE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Railway Strike," from the New York Times of May 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BACKGROUND ON FEPC—LETTER FROM WALTER WHITE

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Walter White entitled "Background on FEPC," published in the New York Times May 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIG GAS COMPANIES REAL SCUTTLERS OF KERR BILL—EDITORIAL FROM CERVI'S ROCKY MOUNTAIN JOURNAL

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Gas Companies Real Scuttlers of Kerr Bill," published in the April 27 issue of Cervi's Rocky Mountain Journal of Denver, Colo., on April 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE "ECONOMY BRANDS" MAKE THEIR CASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND NEWS-LEADER

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Economy Brands' Make Their Case," published in the Richmond News-Leader of May 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALIFORNIA LAND LAW HELD INVALIDATED BY UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on April 28, 1950, as appears at pages 5993 and following of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I introduced into the RECORD, and made certain remarks with respect to, the decision of the District Court of Appeals of the State of California, Second Appellate District, Division 2, in a case holding that the Charter of the United Nations invalidated the California Alien Land Act.

In the New York Times of May 14, 1950, is an article with respect to an appendix by Prof. Manley O. Hudson to a petition for rehearing filed by Attorney General Howser in that case.

In view of the fact that both the decision in the case and my comments with relation to that decision are set forth in the body of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that said article be set forth in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES' LAWS HELD ABOVE UN TENETS—EXPERT CHALLENGES CALIFORNIA COURT RULING ON OWNERSHIP OF LAND BY JAPANESE ALIENS

LOS ANGELES, May 13.—A fresh delineation of the United Nations' legal influence on internal affairs of the United States came forth this week in a California lawsuit widely watched by both the legal profession and students of international affairs.

The view was authoritatively set forth that, as admirable as the United Nations Charter and related instruments might be, their tenets might not be binding on Americans until they had been specifically embodied in local law.

On April 24 the California Court of Appeals ruled that the United Nations Charter was, as a treaty duly ratified by the United States Senate in 1945, the supreme law of the land, superseding State laws that conflicted with its provisions.

ANALYSIS BY HARVARD EXPERT

This was interpreted by the court in the case of Fujii against California as invalidating California's long-standing law which precludes land ownership by Japanese aliens, since the law contradicted United Nations Charter stipulations against racial discrimination.

A petition challenging this view and asking a rehearing, filed this week by the State Attorney General Fred N. Howser, defendant in the action, was based primarily on an analysis obtained from Dr. Manley O. Hudson, Bemis professor of international law at the Harvard Law School and chairman of the International Law Commission of the United Nations.

Dr. Hudson's study, entitled "Charter Provisions on Human Rights in American Law," was included as an appendix to the petition in advance of its publication in the legal press.

Dr. Hudson's central point was that while treaties were, under the Constitution, "the supreme law of the land," the only features of treaties that were automatically incorporated into American law were "self-executing" provisions that did not call for legislative implementation.

DECISION BY MARSHALL CITED

The California court's ruling, he said, "was based on a misconception of the human-rights provisions of the Charter." The several sections of the Charter dealing with human rights and nondiscrimination, he added, were variously statements of purpose and definitions of powers and responsibilities of different United Nations segments, none of which imposed any specific obligation on individual member nation beyond cooperation.

He quoted Chief Justice John Marshall, in the Foster against Neilson decision of 1829, as follows:

"A treaty * * * is to be regarded in courts of justice as equivalent to an act of the legislature whenever it operates of itself without the aid of any legislative provision, but when * * * either of the parties engages to perform a particular act, the treaty addresses itself to the political, not the judicial department; and the legislature must execute the contract before it can become a rule for the court."

Noting that some Charter provisions regarding the United Nations' legal status, privileges, and immunities might be considered to have been incorporated in the laws of New York City and therefore now be self-executing, Dr. Hudson continued:

"Clearly, however, the Charter's provisions on human rights have not been incorporated into the law of the United States because they are not self-executing."

The human rights and fundamental freedoms mentioned in the Charter, he added, were not defined therein. He quoted the late Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., as chief of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Charter Conference:

"Because the United Nations is an organization of sovereign states, the General Assembly does not have legislative power. It can recommend, but it cannot impose its recommendations upon the member states."

RIGHTS STATEMENT NOT BINDING

The United Nations' declaration on human rights, also cited by the California court, Dr. Hudson noted, had been specifically excluded at the time of its adoption from the category of a treaty or international agreement and "is in no sense binding on the Government of the United States, and its provisions have not been incorporated in our national law."

"The Human Rights Commission of the United Nations is now engaged in drafting a second instrument—a covenant on human rights," Dr. Hudson commented. "If this covenant is signed and ratified by the United States, and if it is brought into force by a sufficient number of nations, it will be on a wholly different basis from that of the declaration.

"It is designed to be a treaty between various nations. As such, depending on a text which has not yet been finalized, its self-executing provisions might be incorporated into American law; the United States is currently insisting that its provisions should not be self-executing."

The California court, Dr. Hudson suggested, might have been influenced in its opinion by the case of Oyama against California, in which Justices Hugo L. Black and William O. Douglas of the United States Supreme Court "went out of their way to declare: 'There are additional reasons now why that law stands as an obstacle to the free accomplishment of our policy in the international field. One of these reasons is that we have recently pledged ourselves to cooperate with the United Nations to "promote * * * universal respect for an observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." How can this Nation be faithful to this international pledge if State laws which bar land ownership and occupancy by aliens on account of race are permitted to be enforced?'

"Clearly," Dr. Hudson said in conclusion, "a court is not the appropriate agency to determine for the Government of the United States the particular way in which it should 'cooperate with the United Nations.'"

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE—LETTER FROM EDWARD KEATING

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter concerning the devastation which will result from the Postmaster General's recent order to increase unemployment and decrease postal service. The writer of the letter is Hon. Edward Keating, a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, and now the editor of Labor, the most widely circulated and one of the most important of the world's labor papers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1950.

Senator M. M. NEELY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEELY: I have a good deal of sympathy for Postmaster General Donaldson. Our newspaper Labor has never protested against an increase in postal rates.

We have felt the Postmaster General's original recommendation provided for rates which were too high. However, we believed Congress would make a proper adjustment and that we should not add to the Postmaster General's woes.

We still maintain that attitude, but I confess Mr. Donaldson's order restricting service has been a shock to us.

As you may know, Labor has the largest paid circulation of any labor newspaper in this country, and probably in the world. All our papers are delivered through the mails. We have complied with every suggestion from the Post Office Department calculated to make it easier for the Department to handle our papers. Some of these changes have cost us a good deal of money, but we don't complain about that.

Consider just this one example of the Postmaster General's order: We are informed that copies of Labor will not be handled by the Washington post office between 6 p. m. and 8 a. m. Just why Labor should be barred during those hours is not clear. However, the result will be disastrous for us.

We have a very large circulation on the Pacific coast. Papers for that area are mailed the first thing Wednesday evening and they go out on the Wednesday night train.

Under the Postmaster General's recent order, these papers, destined for the Pacific coast, would probably not go out until Thursday night—a delay of 24 hours. Such a change might mean a 48-hour delay in getting Labor to our readers in some parts of the Pacific coast area, because the papers might arrive at some points on Saturday night and be held over until Monday morning.

In other words, the Postmaster General's order knocks a carefully-arranged schedule into a cocked hat and we can't figure out how Uncle Sam will gain by it.

I hope it will be possible to persuade the Postmaster General to continue the present service until such time as Congress may decide the issue of rates and, of course, the all-important question of appropriations for the Post Office Department.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely,

EDWARD KEATING,
Manager.

SHIPMENT OF ARMS TO ISRAEL AND OTHER COUNTRIES OF THE NEAR EAST

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I consider it imperative that the State Department review immediately the entire question of arms shipments to Israel and other parts of the Near East. Information before us shows there is a definite threat to peace in that area, and we will be recreant to our duty to the infant nation of Israel if we do not face up to this situation in a realistic manner.

In a formal statement to me on this matter early in March, the State Department declared that the United States is not enforcing an embargo on the shipment of arms or munitions from this country to Israel. At the same time, the Department declared its readiness to receive applications from all governments in the Near East, including Israel, for the exportation of military equipment "which is considered necessary for the maintenance of internal order and to provide for legitimate defense requirements." This likewise was declared to be Britain's policy.

Despite such assurances, the fact remains, apparently, that the Arab nations surrounding Israel are continuing to receive arms and munitions from Great Britain in quantities which would seem to go far beyond internal security needs. This is particularly upsetting to Israel because, with a peace treaty still unsigned, the present armistice agreements provide only an armed truce which could readily deteriorate into open warfare at the slightest provocation.

With America's world policy dedicated primarily at the moment to the attainment of world peace, the situation in the Near East is one which demands the immediate attention of our State Department. Certainly in a world divided between democratic and Communist nations the citizens of Israel can be counted definitely as adherents to western ideologies of government. Their millions of dead at the hands of dictator-ruled forces and the unparalleled sufferings of members of their race in both Germany and Russia place them inevitably on the side of democracy and against dictatorship. It is important that the United States help them to retain their national integrity.

While we as a nation bend all our efforts to the winning of peace between western and eastern Europe, it does not seem reasonable or wise that we close our eyes to a situation that not only is a threat to peace in the Near East but which could easily be the explosion that would throw the whole world into a new war.

I am, therefore, presenting anew to Secretary of State Acheson an urgent request that the matter of arms export to all the countries of the Near East be made the matter of diplomatic discussion with Great Britain, the source of Arab arms, and, further, that the United Nations be invited to give attention to this important matter. Israel is our friend, its people are deserving of our wholehearted support, and we must not fail them in the time of greatest need.

KANSAS

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, the oldest newspaper in the State of Kansas is the Leavenworth (Kans.) Times, edited and published by Mr. Daniel R. Anthony III. The training and experience of the staff of this great newspaper reflects a great deal upon Mr. Anthony's proved ability to report and edit the news of the Nation.

I consider it an honor to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, an excellent editorial entitled "Kansas" by Mr. R. E. Emberton, news editor, of this prominent and outstanding newspaper.

The fundamental basis of American life rests in our small communities where people live close enough to the soil and sun to know what makes America tick. Mr. Emberton is a native Kansan, active in civic affairs in his community, and has ably expressed the feeling of pride Kansans have in their State.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial inserted in the body of the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS

Kansas is blessed with a wealth of natural resources. Economic figures and statistics prove this year after year.

Kansas was a vital factor in the settlement and development of the great Middle West. History and events make this a positive statement.

Kansas was the hub around which the wheel of fortune revolved leading to the great

struggle between the States that decided once and for all that the United States was indeed a united nation.

Kansans are proud of Kansas—and for good reason.

In economic, political, and social improvement, the State has always been one that has pointed and led the way. It has never been content to be a follower.

When others think of Kansas they think of sunshine, waving fields of golden wheat and corn. They think of the bountiful prairies that help feed the world.

But the world is now knowing Kansas more and more for other natural resources that affect the economy of the Nation.

Kansas is rich in mineral deposits. It produces oil, gas, coal, salt, and many other things vital to the national existence.

Even large-scale industrialism is finding its way to Kansas because the State is the very heart of the Nation, both from geographic location and diversity of resources.

Yes, Kansas has everything a State could wish to make it great. But its most important asset is its people.

Not just for the many who have achieved world-wide recognition and fame, and it has certainly produced its share of those in science, business, the professions, and statesmanship, but because of the people who make up its communities, its neighborhoods, and its entire population.

Ask a real Kansan why he wants to live in Kansas and his answer will be:

"Because I like the friendly people who live in Kansas."

There can be no better reason to live any place in the world.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, after observing some of the things which happened in the Senate early yesterday afternoon, one might conclude that the Republican Party and the Democratic Party are seeking, each, to claim the credit for the FEPC bill; that is to say, there seems to be a rivalry for the credit, on the part of each of the major political parties. One must have a very inadequate understanding of the history of this country if he is concerned by this rivalry for credit for the bill which now is sought to be presented to the Senate.

In the unfortunate period when the flames of war lighted the skies in America for more than 4 years, our people witnessed, of course, the adoption of the thirteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, followed by the fourteenth amendment, followed by the fifteenth amendment. Many bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate by the then majority party, seeking to establish civil rights for a minority race in the United States, who theretofore had been denied certain civil rights. However, Mr. President, there was never anything comparable to the particular bill which is now on motion sought to be made the unfinished business before the Senate. Not in all the wildest dreams of Charles Sumner or Thaddeus Stevens or Senator Trumbull or in the fertile mind of any of the able men of that time was there any concept of a Fair Employment Practice Commission theory, which is advanced in this bill. They did seek to give to the freed men the right of suffrage and other civil rights, but they did not go to the extreme philosophy which is the basis of this proposed legislation

When the Republicans back in those days—which happily are closed, and should remain closed—were seeking to grant certain civil rights to those who had but recently been freed, generally Senators on this side of the aisle voted against them.

The situation now presented is that both parties are struggling to impress minority groups that they are going to be given certain civil rights, and both are seeking to take the credit.

Among all those who represented the Republican Party back in that unfortunate era in our country's history, there was no one who thought of this particular scheme or, at least, having thought of it, even suggested bringing it forward. Generally speaking, those who called themselves Democrats insisted upon the rights of the States, and fought against the undue concentration of power in the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, I say there is no need for an unseemly contest between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to obtain credit for this particular piece of proposed legislation. If any credit is due, it is due to another party, a party which fortunately has not yet succeeded in obtaining any large following, numerically, in the United States. If there is any pride of parentage here involved, it certainly could not go to the Republican Party, and it certainly could not go to the old Democratic Party or to a sound Democratic Party. It can only go to a new party which fortunately is not now very popular in the United States.

Let me say that back many years now past, two suggestions were made on the economic front and on the industrial front. Those two suggestions did not originate, be it said to their credit, in the minds of our Republican friends and did not originate in the minds of Democrats. Both suggestions came from the Communist Party. The first one was that there should be an absolute limitation upon the income of every taxpayer in America. They wanted, of course, in the beginning, to provide a very liberal income, and they finally persuaded the then President of the United States, as a war measure, to recommend a limitation of $25,000 upon the income of any American taxpayer. As I say, that was quite liberal, and, if all Americans could have an income of $25,000 after taxes, no one would protest. But in talking, as a member of the Finance Committee, to the proponents of that measure, I soon discovered that what they really wanted was an outright limitation upon income in America of not to exceed $15,000 a year, with an eagerness to reduce it to $10,000, or even below that.

Anyone with the slightest experience should know that once a limitation is put upon what a man or a woman in this country can earn, by the sheer force of political pressure that amount will be constantly reduced. Why? For what purpose? It will be reduced to the point where there can be no reserves which will build enterprises, which will give jobs to the people. Our Communist friends will then say—indeed, as they intended to say—"Only the state can furnish capital. Only the state can provide jobs. Only the state can keep the wheels of industry turning." That was one of their proposals. I am not talking about a far-distant date; I am talking about the platform of the Communist Party as late as 1928, in the United States.

The Republican Party is not the daddy of FEPC. It may now think it profitable to claim parentage of this thing. The Democratic Party, as we knew it in America—the Democratic Party, indeed, as it always was until present times—cannot claim any parentage for this thing. Every line of the basic philosophy upon which we have stood as a party and made our flight has been opposed to it. Do not rob the Communists of their just credit. I hope there will be no unseemly contest here between Republicans and those on this side of the aisle who call themselves Democrats, and who belong to the Democratic Party, over the authorship of this particular bill. Let us concede it to the Communists.

What was the other proposal the Communist Party advanced on the economic and industrial front? It was that the Government should interfere with the management of industry and private enterprise to the point where industry and private enterprise could not function; when, again, our Communist friends would say, "Government must take over; there is no capital; there are no reserves; there can therefore be no such thing as private enterprise." If government can substitute its will for the will of the manager, the will of the owner, the will of the man who made the enterprise, the man who saved for it, and who is now trying to operate it, then of course the Government will take it over. So I say again, let no unseemly contest be engaged in here between Republicans and Democrats for the parentage of this un-American concept. Let the Commies have it. Let them keep it.

Through the years it has been said that the Finance Committee was a very conservative body. Mr. President, let me say to the Senate and to the American people that if the Senate Finance Committee through the years had not been a very courageous body, a very courageous group of Senators, our economy long since would have passed under the control of the State, through these two particular programs, borrowed from the Communist platform of 1928. Read where they proposed to put an absolute limitation upon the earnings of the American taxpayer, the earnings of the American citizen, and ask yourself, Mr. President, whether if that program had succeeded there could have been an accumulation of wealth by individuals in this country, whether in their individual capacities or as stockholders in corporate and company enterprises, with which to carry on American business. We are talking now about a shortage of equity capital. We are talking now about creating some sort of new lending

agencies and banking institutions to help small business. Even the President is talking about it. No doubt the Congress will pass legislation of that type.

Mr. President, if a limitation were placed upon what a man can earn, with the constant temptation of the demagog to reduce that amount to the vanishing point, there would be no equity capital and there would be no possibility of equity capital. We are not really going to help small business merely by providing easy credit for it. I know that credit is often necessary. Frequently it enables an enterprise to get started and to keep going. But we are not going to help small business until we make it possible for small business, out of its earnings, to retain enough to pay its debts and to go ahead. Suppose credit were made easy for small business, through the RFC or through any other arrangements that might be made. What would be accomplished? Would it enable small business, under the heavy burden of taxation now resting upon it, to pay off the debt?

But that is aside from the point, Mr. President. If the second proposal of the Communists, that we must substitute political judgment and control for the judgment and control of the owners of business, had prevailed, then, of course, the free-enterprise system would have passed out of existence. We cannot have free enterprise unless the owners, the responsible managers of legitimate businesses themselves, are given the power to direct those businesses, subject always to the control of government if power be abused, if crimes and frauds be committed, and subject always to just regulation by government in order to prevent such frauds and crimes against society.

So, again, Mr. President, I hope there will not be any unseemly contest between the Republicans and the Democrats over the authorship of this bill. Some persons are nervous lest the bill may be passed by the votes of those on the other side of the aisle, and the successful advocates of the measure will go into the next election claiming credit for it. The Republicans were never the daddy of this proposed legislation. Those who call themselves Democrats, whether they be New Dealers, Fair Dealers, or what not, were never the daddy of this thing. It came out of communism. It is a basic communistic concept.

There are many good men who support it, and there are many good women who support it because of the humanitarian appeal which it has. They say, "Why should we not make it a crime to discriminate against anyone on account of his race or his color or his religion or his national origin?" That is a very strong appeal, of course, addressed to the sympathetic heart of any American. But we must examine it. We must see what it means. So I looked at the bill and found among the three primary purposes to be promoted, and, consequently, the three foundations which support this proposed legislation, the final and principal one, which is as follows:

(iii) To promote universal respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race or religion, in accordance with the undertaking of the United States, under the United Nations Charter, and to further the national policy in that regard by securing to all persons under the jurisdiction of the United States effective recognition of certain of the rights and freedoms proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in the universal declaration of human rights.

Mr. President, I would not myself sponsor any bill in the Senate if I had to make my appeal for its legality and validity based upon the provisions of the United Nations Charter, especially if I had to invoke the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in support of it. We have never ratified the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Once we do ratify it, if it is ever done, under the inferences of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States we shall have changed, actually changed, if that Court should permit it to be changed, the character of the Government of the United States.

So, Mr. President, the Republicans did not "daddy" the thing, and the Democrats did not "daddy" it nor "mammy" it. The Communists are entitled to the credit.

Mr. President, I supported the United Nations Charter, but I had in mind that we were trying to preserve peace in the world, to preserve the security of the world. I did not have in mind that we were robbing the States of their reserved powers. I did not have in mind that we were establishing an instrumentality under which we could destroy this Nation under the Constitution and substitute some sort of treaty which the Communists participated in formulating and presenting to the world.

If the Communists did not think up this scheme, they would be the simplest group of persons on earth, because their whole program is to throw into confusion and break down the processes of free enterprise and capitalism in order to put the burden on the Government so that it will take over as the political manager of business, commerce, industry, and what-have-you, in this country.

Mr. President, I am speaking rather plainly, but I am speaking very earnestly.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is present, and I wish, therefore, to read his individual views on this bill. I must say that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio presented a bill himself, but not a bill primarily based upon a drastic criminal statute. It was a bill seeking voluntary assistance and a voluntary approach to the elimination, so far as possible, of prejudice in the employment of workers. Here is what the distinguished Senator from Ohio had to say about the bill which we have been discussing:

The committee has reported a bill without recommendation, without hearings, and with almost no consideration in executive session.

Undoubtedly that is true. It has been repeated by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and no one has controverted it. The statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio is warrant of the truth of the statement. I read further:

Nor did the committee give any consideration to the bill which I introduced, S. 2994.

I believe that is the correct number; at least, it is the number here stated. I read further:

I have no recourse, therefore, except to urge its consideration on the floor of the Senate.

That is the position of the Senator from Ohio. It is an understandable position, and I am offering no criticism whatever of the statement made by the distinguished Senator.

This bill establishes a Federal commission of five—

I think that has reference to the Senator's bill. I read further:

I feel that the compulsory provisions of the bill reported by the committee without recommendation will hinder progress toward solving the problem rather than achieve it.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio was never more correct in any statement he ever made to his fellow citizens.

Few realize how extensive these compulsory provisions are.

Referring to the bill which is now sought to be made the unfinished business of the Senate.

They are modeled on the unfair-labor-practice provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and give to anyone who is refused employment or dismissed from a job the right to bring an action against the employer, alleging some motive of discrimination because the applicant or employee is white, black, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Czech, Pole, or German. Such motives are always possible to allege, and the question is left for decision to a board which is bound by no rules of evidence, and practically not subject to court review.

That statement is absolutely true—"bound by no rules of evidence."

Yet there is a coalition in this body to bring the bill up and make it the unfinished business, presumably for the purpose of passing it. The Senator from Ohio is quite right when he continues: "and practically not subject to court review."

Let me pause to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio omitted a statement which I think is quite significant; namely, that under the procedure established by the bill trial by jury is abolished.

An American citizen who happens to own a business and who is charged with having discriminated against someone on account of his or her race, religion, creed, or national origin, is deprived of the right of trial by jury. Do Republicans want to bring up such a bill as that?—"and practically not subject to court review."

That is absolutely correct. Through the past eventful years we have provided by law authority for regulations and for trial under those regulations. If there is any evidence to sustain a finding of a bureau, a commission, the courts leave it alone. It is true that the courts have made those decisions, but we passed the laws.

Reading further from the statement on this bill by the distinguished Senator from Ohio:

> Abuses which come about under similar provisions of the National Labor Relations Act led to demands for its amendment by labor organizations themselves. As I see it, the compulsory act, if duplicated in every State as its proponents plan, will finally force every employer to choose his employees approximately in proportion to the division of races and religions in his district, because that will be his best defense to harassing suits.

That would be the employer's only final defense. He would have to ascertain the population of all minority races, religions, sects, and creeds in his community, and select his employees in the proportion in which those races are represented in his community or district. The Senator from Ohio is again correct. His logic is above possible criticism. Let me repeat it:

> Abuses which come about under similar provisions of the National Labor Relations Act led to demands for its amendment by labor organizations themselves. As I see it, the compulsory act, if duplicated in every State as its proponents plan, will finally force every employer to choose his employees approximately in proportion to the division of races and religions in his district, because that will be his best defense to harassing suits.

Let me read further:

> Race and religion will enter into every decision. Catholic institutions, for instance, will have to employ Protestants. The Methodist Book Concern will have to employ Catholics. White waiters and porters could insist upon most of the work in the pullman sleepers and dining cars. In the long run this Board would tell every employer how he must make up his labor force. The bill even includes national origin and ancestry, so that in a city like Cleveland, Ohio, employers could be sued by representatives of every nationality group particularly if they do not have members of that nationality employed in the particular office or plant.

That is the bill which Republicans and Democrats wish to take up and make the unfinished business of the Senate, at a time when national unity is essential at home and abroad, and at a time when America should be thinking along constructive lines.

I read a little further from the statement of the Senator from Ohio:

> In my opinion any such compulsory measure will create more bad racial and religious feeling than any other method which can be pursued. I think it will do the colored race much more harm than good. Progress against discrimination must be made gradually and must be made by voluntary cooperation and education with encouragement from a Federal board, like that I propose, and State governments and boards, and not by inviting thousands of lawsuits which will get beyond the control even of the Fair Employment Practices Commission itself.

The Senator from Ohio is entirely correct, except I dare add that we would make much faster and greater progress along right lines if the Federal Government kept its hands off. I am not so sure that we would not make greater progress if State governments kept their hands off and let the American people work out the problem as they have always worked out their troublesome problems.

I read further from the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio:

> A voluntary commission can develop different kinds of plans to increase good colored employment in different cities after studying the local conditions and the character of local industries. The method of solving the problem of Negro full employment in Cleveland may be entirely different from that which should be pursued in New York City or in Atlanta, Ga.

That statement is true, of course.

The Senator adds:

> No scientific study of the problem has yet been made, and that should be the first task of the boards I propose.

I shall not read further from the distinguished Senator's statement on the bill. I think I have read sufficient to convince any fair-minded man that this is not the kind of bill which ought to be taken up and made the unfinished business of the Senate, with the resulting confusion and disorder, and with the resulting delay of legislative programs which should be considered before this session comes to an end.

Mr. President, I have one other word to say. I do not care to enter upon a discussion of the merits of the proposal, but I wish to say that here is a bill reported out without hearings. Long hearings in the past will not suffice. Conditions may have changed; indeed, conditions are constantly changing. The bill was reported, not by a majority vote with recommendation, but it was reported to the Senate without any recommendations from the committee itself. It comes before us as a new proposal thrown on the desk here, a bill which we are now asked to make the unfinished business of the Senate.

Everyone knows the highly explosive character of this proposal. It is certainly not a wise course that is proposed, whoever is responsible for it, but I again express the hope that there will be no particular credit to the Democratic Party or to the Republican Party if the bill shall be forced through at this session of the Senate. I again say that while I do not love them at all, I do not want to see the Communists robbed of any of their just dues, or any of the programs to which they have stood committed, and will always be committed, so long as they are against capitalism, so long as they seek to tear down private enterprise, so long as they seek to substitute the judgment of politicians for the judgment of men and women who have earned and saved until they have built an enterprise and provided jobs for their fellow citizens.

Mr. President, antidiscrimination bills seem most dangerous to the very purpose which they are designed to serve. They bring into a complicated question of human and social relationships, not religion, not education, or freedom, but compulsion. They endeavor to establish a rule for such relationships by congressional fiat.

Predictions are dangerous, but experience of the past has indicated again and again that an attempt to change customs and attitudes and prejudices by statute, particularly a drastic criminal statute, creates greater evils and produces more violent emotions and reactions and prejudices than those they seek to cure.

Therefore, the bill we are discussing raises a fundamental issue of government, not in the legalistic and narrow sense, but in the historical, the broad, the true sense. It is directly opposed to the theory of government which found its great expression in the Bill of Rights and in the fourteenth amendment. There the prohibition was on the State against interference with religion, with life, with liberty, with the pursuit of happiness which is based upon the possibility of the ownership and control of property. Now the proposal is that the compulsion should be by the State on its citizens.

Once adopt this philosophy, and we accept the philosophy of totalitarian government. If it is a proper function of the State to compel its citizens to follow certain principles as to race, creed, color, or national origin, in deciding whom they shall employ or whom they shall admit to union membership, the State can at some future date compel its citizens to adopt other and quite different and quite contrary principles. If the State can compel nondiscrimination, it can compel discrimination.

It is not necessary to point to the example of Nazi Germany to see what can happen once the State is recognized as the arbiter of human and social and religious relationships. The founders of our Government had seen what could happen if the State assumed this role. They knew what happened in the field of religion as a result of attempts to compel adherence to what the State considered desirable principles. They resolved that our Government should not assume such powers, no matter how desirable the object might seem. We have now come full swing around. Any fair-minded person hopes that discriminations of all kinds will become less, but the lesson of the past is that human attitudes and human emotions and human prejudices cannot be changed by compulsion. If the compulsion is that of the State, through drastic criminal laws, we embark on a dangerous sea. With the best of intentions, we adopt, not a charter of liberty, but a charter of totalitarianism.

Electing a man to high public office cannot endow him with either character or wisdom. At most, it can give him power, power to do good or to do evil to his people. The Constitution does not list human virtues, such as compassion, charity, due respect for one's fellow man, as qualifications to be prescribed by Government. These virtues are in fact personal and voluntary. They are the results of religion, of long education, of culture. Government can punish crime by force, but it cannot create in the heart or the mind of any man or any woman the right attitude toward his or her fellow beings. At best, through force it can create only fear and breed suspicion, and ultimately disloyalty. Certainly, at this time we need unity, full understanding,

full cooperation, at home, and with free peoples everywhere.

Government with us is grounded on individual freedom, personal responsibility, and equality before the law, for all citizens, employers as well as employees.

I have heard it asserted in this debate that the proponents of this measure were seeking equal opportunity for all American citizens. I deny that. I condemn it as a misleading misstatement. They are not seeking equal opportunity for all citizens; they are seeking special opportunities for the group of citizens that has more votes than the other group.

A man must be foolish if he does not know that there are more people who have less than the relatively few people who have more. Certainly it is not sought to secure equal opportunity for the employer. Whether those who father the bill intend it or not, a natural result of the legislation, if it should be passed and finally sustained and enforced, would be to procure special privileges for the larger voting element of two groups, the employers and the employees.

Opposition to the consideration of the FEPC bill does not grow out of hostility to any race or to any religion. It is, however, inspired by opposition to creeds such as communism, which seek to divide our people, to destroy our business and industry, so that in the resulting confusion we will become impotent at home and abroad. One certain effect of the proposal will be to create confusion and to destroy the effectiveness of our economy.

At the State level the proposal may be enforcible, and there are honorable Senators who will say that such a law is working very well in certain States. The law may operate well at the State level, but do we not know that the one basic principle in preserving human freedom is local control, local self-government administered by local authority, responsible to a local constituency? Certainly such legislation may be tried out locally, and no one would say no to it.

But when attempt is made to elevate it to the national level, and to extend it by the vast power of the Commission all over the United States, if the attempt should succeed, then there would be set up an instrumentality of tyranny and of oppression, and in the hands of those who are most devoted to alien doctrines—I do not say all those who now advocate the bill fall in this category—but by those who are most devoted to such doctrines and the basic thought underlying them, it would be an instrumentality which would so cripple, so hogtie our free-enterprise system as to make inevitable intervention by Government and the taking over of key industries and natural resources.

Mr. President, at this point I think I shall conclude what I have to say today, because I do not care to go very far into the discussion of the merits of the proposal. I come back again to the simple statement: Why force this measure before the Senate at this time? Can it possibly be productive of any good? It is a bill which never had the affirmative vote of even a majority of the committee, a bill reported to the Senate without hearings, as the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has declared in his written statement. It is a bill which received practically no consideration even in executive sessions. Why force that bill before the Senate? Why make that bill the unfinished business, Mr. President, to the sacrifice of other legislative programs which ought to be considered?

Mr. President, before I take my seat, if the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] desires me to do so, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. I leave the decision to him, however.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he makes that suggestion?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield for a question. I must leave the Senate Chamber shortly. However, I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall present the question, and possibly some of the Senator's colleagues may answer it. The Senator suggests that some of us who are supporting the legislation may be thinking in political terms. As one Member of the Senate I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that the whole subject gives me great distress and great difficulty. I have high regard for the Senator from Georgia, and I appreciate the sincerity with which he has presented his case. I am very much impressed with it. I always have been, but I want to ask the Senator a simple question. If there are some of us who do sincerely believe in equality of opportunity in education and equality of economic opportunity in this country, what is the way to achieve it? I am troubled by that thought. During my recent trip in the Far East I became very much impressed by the yearning of peoples of all races for freedom from superimposed authority, from classification as second-rate citizens. I found that they were seeking some way to get away from the superimposed shackles of what have heretofore been imperialism and colonialism. I think it is one of the great issues in the world today; I am yearning to receive an answer to that question.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with the Senator, but human likes and dislikes, and prejudices, if you please, are not among the great tryannies of the world. It may be conceded that they are common traits among mankind. There is no need to get away from them at all but we should get away from all those things which are in conflict with virtue and the right attitude toward one's fellowman. That can be accomplished through religion, education, by long culture of the individual and of the race. Those are the only means by which we can get away from such things. Let me make clear, however, that I do not believe in absolutism. That is the point at which I part company with my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Jersey. I say with all respect to him that I part company with him at that point. I do not believe that government has any power to enter this field, and undertake to control likes and dislikes, and enforce a choice as between one employee and another who might wish to become employed. I do not believe the Government can enter that field. There are some things which have not been committed to the kind of government we have in America. Indeed the whole Bill of Rights is an attempt to assert the immemorial rights of freemen which are over and above all government, local or general. Therefore I do not believe in absolutism. I myself do not undertake to point out how government can make a man be good or Christian or tolerant, because government cannot do so. If government undertakes to do so it becomes a tyranny.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator entirely in the thought that people cannot be made good by legislation. But let us assume for the purpose of argument that discrimination existed in respect to educational opportunities, that there was not equality of educational opportunities, would we not be justified in passing legislation which would insure equality of opportunity for all our people, without regard to race, creed, or color?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been opposed to the legal sanctions in the bill, but I think the Commission should study the situation and endeavor, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] provides in his amendment, to bring about ways and means by which equality of education and of economic opportunity can be insured. I think we are moving in the right direction.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with the Senator that it is the duty of government to provide equality of economic opportunity and educational opportunity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Those are the only things I am arguing for.

Mr. GEORGE. I certainly agree as to that. There can be no question about it. In all our States we must provide equality of opportunity for education. We do not necessarily mean by that, that we favor the mingling of the races in the schools or the colleges.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. GEORGE. However, we do provide, and we are under the compulsion of law to provide, equality of opportunity in matters educational as well as economic.

Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that I know it is easy enough to say that a certain discrimination exists against certain minorities; but I have never seen a good, industrious, energetic member of a minority race in my State who did not have employment, and profitable employment.

The proposed legislation now being discussed is not the way to overcome whatever evil there is in our system, because, as I have said before, I do not believe in absolutism. The whole theory of our Government is against absolutism, because we recognize that there are limits beyond which the Government cannot go, should not go, and should not attempt to go, and that means local government as well as the Federal Government, because there are powers which

are reserved to the people themselves—indeed, those powers which through the ages they have insisted are superior to the rights and powers of any government over them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I agree with the Senator from Georgia with respect to his views on absolutism. I am not advocating absolutism.

I now ask the Senator this question: Assuming that this proposed legislation is passed over, as the Senator from Georgia advocates, would he be willing to join with us in seeing by what ways we can assure equality of opportunity in education and in other areas to all our people?

Mr. GEORGE. I would be quite willing to join with all my colleagues, including the Senator from New Jersey, who is a man of integrity and high capacity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Not only would I be willing to join with them, but I would be willing to do all I can, as I have tried all my life, to bring about equality of opportunity for all our people. In that I thoroughly and basically believe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his splendid exposition, which is very enlightening.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Jersey leaves the floor, let me say that, speaking only as one Senator from a Southern State, I am grateful for the expressions of moderation and tolerance and of human kindness which have come—and not unexpectedly so—from the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. Let me say to him—and I do not wish to detain him on the floor of the Senate—that I think that out of the sort of approach which he has voiced will ultimately come the solution, so far as laws can bring solutions, of the problems concerning which we speak in this debate.

Before the Senator from New Jersey leaves the floor, let me suggest to him that those of us from some of the Southern States, who in connection with this matter feel so keenly that an approach by law is unsound and that this particular approach under this particular proposed law is unwise and un-American, have not come without some suggestion which leads toward the solution of these problems. I remind the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, for instance, that on the question of the elimination of a poll tax, there are 10 southern Senators who more than a year ago introduced a joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment on that subject. That joint resolution still languishes in a Senate committee; but if the constitutional amendment thus proposed had been promptly submitted at that time, it would, at least in the judgment of the Senator from Florida, have been well on its way toward adoption by this time, if it had not already been adopted.

Let me also say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that repeated assurances have been given on this floor, by southern Senators in the field of anti-lynch legislation, regarding a moderate law which will stand the constitutional test, but will not try to follow the ideology which we think is wholly un-American—that of levying collective damages against an American community which may be so unhappy as to have sustained within its limits a lynching, which all of us deeply deplore, and want to avoid and eliminate by every legal and moral means within our power.

Let me say that on the very question of employment practices, repeated assurances have been given on this floor of willingness to have the subject studied, and repeated assurances have been given on this floor of a stronger effort toward achieving equality of education than any which has been enjoyed heretofore in either the North or the South.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey will recall that the Southern States on their own initiative, through their own means and resources, have launched an interregional program of education which already is bearing heavy fruit, particularly in the way of increased opportunity for higher education in medicine, dentistry, and veterinary science for the members of the Negro race in our section of the country who aspire to the practice of those professions.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey also will recall that not only have we not been able to get moderate measures reported from the committees, but that every time a moderate measure is mentioned, the minority groups, through leadership which we think is not sound, assert their unwillingness to approach the subject through a moderate or tolerant method. In the very matter of regional education, the Senator from New Jersey will recall that, without his vote, by a majority of one the Senate refused to give its approval, after the House had overwhelmingly approved an interstate compact for regional higher education in the South.

So I simply wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey, for whom I have the deepest affection, and who I know voiced the sincere convictions in his own heart in his remarks of a few minutes ago to the senior Senator from Georgia, that we appreciate his consideration and the evidence of the milk of human kindness which typifies his remarks on this subject, as well as on other subjects; and we on this side of the aisle hope he will persist in seeking an approach which is moderate and which does not seek to solve, through mere laws, problems which cannot be so solved.

So, Mr. President, I express my very deep appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Florida that during all the time I have been in the Senate, I have been hoping against hope that the group from the South who have always opposed the proposals made in an effort to try to bring about equality of opportunity in education, and especially economic opportunity, would offer some program which we could study and on which we could try to cooperate with them. However, I have never seen a program offered which seemed to me to make the position of the individual in this broad land one of safety, protected from the possibilities of abuse. That is what troubles me.

So, although I see the problem being studied, I say that it seems to me the study is not adequate until and unless something is offered which will insure equality of opportunity, both educational and economic, to all our people, despite any differences among them. I think it is most important that we move ahead with a program to solve this problem in the light of world conditions, in which this very issue is involved everywhere.

As I said to the Senator from Georgia, I very recently returned from the Far East, where the yearning is to get away from secondary citizenship. I am making a plea for a program to get away from secondary citizenship everywhere, and especially in our free country. That is my position.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I do not have to remind him that there is presented here in America a very great opportunity to the minority races of the earth and religious creeds which are represented among our citizenship as compared with that which is denied to them elsewhere. I am sure he will feel that we have made great progress, and that we all want to continue to make even greater progress. For instance, contrast the treatment which has been accorded and is still being accorded to the Jews in other countries with the many efforts to obtain opportunities for their advancement and the gaining by them of high position in our Nation and under our system of government. The contrast is all in favor of the American doctrine. When he looks at what has recently happened in India between those of one religious faith and those of another, and will realize that in the course of their troubles there, literally millions of innocent people have lost their lives because of the intolerance, mostly religious intolerance, which prevails there, he must surely see the difference between that situation and what obtains in the United States. When he thinks a moment about what has happened recently, not on one occasion but on several occasions, in South Africa, where men who are black have been fighting with men who are brown, and hundreds of them have lost their lives because of the intolerant hatred which somehow persists in the human mind in so many places of the earth, he will realize that there is a contrast instead of a comparison between the friendly and understanding and human attitude in this Nation between people of different races, and that which prevails there.

When he looks for a moment at what happened in Eritrea or Somaliland but a few weeks ago, where, again, hundreds of people lost their lives, or when he looks at the division between Jew and Arab in

Palestine and in the surrounding regions, I am sure he will have to feel, as the junior Senator from Florida feels very strongly, that under the protection of a government which is trying to be fair to the people of all creeds, the people of this Nation have attained to a greater degree of equality, prosperity, and welfare, working together, than has been attained by any other group of people of varying races and nationalities and religions and colors anywhere else on top side the green earth.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to say with respect to everything the Senator has said, that I agree with him, and I commend the Senator for the approach he makes to the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield further to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am simply saying, in reply to what the Senator from Florida has just said, which was in reply to my previous question, that I agree with what he has just said, that what we have offered in this country has been beyond anything offered in any other country of the world. We are moving toward a better world. I shall not call it the millennium, because we shall never attain that, but we are moving toward a place where I hope we will set an example against the possibility of secondary citizenship anywhere. That is what I am asking for.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LEHMAN. I hope the distinguished and able Senator from Florida realizes that until quite recently, when legislation was passed in the State of New York outlawing discrimination, it was substantially impossible for any man or woman of my faith or for any Negro or member of some of the national minorities to obtain employment in a great many of the banks or public utilities or large industries of the State of New York.

If the Senator will yield for another question, I wonder whether he knows that until President Franklin Roosevelt became governor and I became lieutenant governor, it was substantially impossible for any Negro in the State of New York to get a position even within the civil service. It was only because of our insistence and the legislation which was passed on our recommendation that that situation happily has been corrected.

I point this out not in criticism of the great State which the Senator so ably represents, or of the South; I say it because I feel that without suitable legislation, even in New York, we would not have been able to render justice to minority groups.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator, who, by his very presence on the floor of the Senate, dignifies and does honor to the membership of the Senate, and we are happy to have him here. Incidentally, the first Senator from the State of Florida happened likewise to be a member of the Senator's faith and race, and we are proud of his memory and of his service—the very presence of the Senator from New York shows the tremendous opportunity which is allowed to people of his faith in this Nation. If it be true that in the State of New York State legislation was required in order to assure equality of opportunity, I, for one, could not object to it or find any fault with anyone, either the distinguished Senator or any other citizen, for supporting such legislation there.

Mr. President, and Senators, I wish to address myself briefly—as briefly as I may—to the pending motion to take up Senate bill 1728, the FEPC bill.

First, a brief outline of FEPC, as to what it is. FEPC came into existence in 1941, not as a law, but as an Executive order of President Roosevelt under his war powers, to permit of the more effective furtherance of the war. No legislation was enacted by Congress then, nor has any been since enacted. The purpose of the order was to end discrimination in employment in the Government agencies, and in war plants. The order related, therefore, solely to Government workers and those producing war goods under Government contracts. It made no pretense of including private business or industry. Efforts to create a permanent FEPC covering private industry by Federal legislation failed, both during the war and thereafter, and FEPC died with the war. Latest efforts to enact national FEPC were in the Eightieth Congress, under the Ives bill, S. 984, and in the Eighty-first Congress, under the McGrath bill, S. 1728, the one to which this motion is addressed, and the Lesinski bill, H. R. 4453, the last two being identical administration measures. Of course, the House declined to pass H. R. 4453 in February of this year, but did pass a drastically amended bill from which the enforcement provisions were stricken.

We are now debating a motion to take up and consider, not the watered-down measure which passed the House last February, but the original administration bill as introduced in the Senate, S. 1728.

Before discussing any of the issues presented by the bill, I wish to again call attention to the unusual fact that this bill was placed on the calendar without hearing and remained on the calendar without benefit of a committee report or recommendation from October 17, 1949, until Friday, May 5, 1950—the day the motion now being debated was made—when a report was filed, though the same was not printed and available until sometime Monday, May 8, the very day this debate commenced.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know of any time in this Congress when a controversial piece of legislation, of which this is an example, has been brought before the Senate without committee hearings, especially when there were Senators and other persons who desired to be heard in connection with that type of legislation?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not know of any such incident, either in this Congress or in any other Congress, and no such situation has been presented. In further answer, I should like to say to my friend, it seems to me that there was a peculiar necessity for a hearing in this particular case and on this bill, not only because of the vital importance of the contents of the bill, but because, since the hearing on the last bill, in the Eightieth Congress, was concluded, there have been so many efforts made in so many States of the Union to adopt State FEPC laws, which were bitterly contested by members of the legislature, by business, by labor unions, and by ordinary citizens, and in more than a dozen States, as will appear later from my remarks, those measures were defeated. Certainly the problem was being developed through such defeat, and the attitude of the citizens was being shown through such repeated defeats.

It would seem to the junior Senator from Florida that it would be the part of necessity as well as the part of decency, to allow fellow Members of the Senate to be heard, and to allow the many groups of citizens, who were so concerned about similar measures pending in State legislatures, to make clear their reasons for fearing the adoption of such legislation and for taking the position, which they did strongly take, that the legislation was un-American, unwise, and communistic, and posed grave threats to the Nation and its institutions. To have shut off those particular persons representing many States, many industries, many labor unions, without giving them the slightest oportunity to be heard, appears to the Senator from Florida to have been a veritable travesty as well as a tragedy.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator, and I completely agree with him on that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I may say, in the first instance, that no one sponsoring this bill, so far as I have been able to discover, thinks that by itself it answers the legislative part of the problem. In other words, no one thinks that the question of interstate commerce, which is the only slender peg on which the advocates of the measure can hang any semblance of Federal jurisdiction, covers the whole problem, but, to the contrary, every advocate whose testimony I have been able to find makes it clear that such legislation, if it were passed, would be simply supplemental to State legislation and even local legislation in various areas of the Nation.

Without laboring the question, Mr. President, I should like to quote the testimony of one of the leading advocates of the bill, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], whose tesimony on the subject appears at page

100 of the House hearings on House bill 4453:

> This is not to say that national legislation is to replace local and State laws. On the contrary, it is my understanding that H. R. 4453, which you are discussing, specifically provides that the Federal Commission for Fair Employment Practices may cede jurisdiction to the appropriate local body where the local or State laws are sufficient to carry out standards of equality in employment opportunities.
>
> In other words, Mr. Chairman, I say that any Federal law that we adopt should have within it a provision which states that where a State law that meets certain national standards has been passed or where a local law that meets these national standards has been passed, the jurisdiction should go right down to the State and the local government, because it will be more humanly administered, the people will know the other people, and they will do a better job of administration.

Mr. President, before concluding the quotation from the testimony of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, I may say I thoroughly agree that the law would be more humanly administered by the State or local government. It is quite apparent that the Senator from Minnesota visualized the situation in which the States and communities which saw fit to pass legislation of their own, of as high standards as those in any Federal law, or even higher, would be allowed to run their own business. But, Mr. President, there is implicit in the statement, as there is in the bill, the fact that in those great portions of the Nation where States have refused to pass such laws, where cities have not even dreamed of passing city ordinances on the subject, not more human administration, as mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota, but some other type of administration, certainly less human—and I shall not use any words of my own to characterize it—would seek to enforce upon the sovereign will of the people of the great majority of the States of the Union, who have so far been unwilling to believe that FEPC is at all a proper subject for legislation to enforce upon them administration by Federal agencies, with the long arm of the Federal law.

Those of us who are familiar with the report of the President's Civil Rights Committee and with the many bills which have been introduced know that the proponents do not want to have enforcement through the local district attorney or the local FBI officers in the various States. The proponents of the bill want, instead, to have a central force, in the nature of a gestapo, established, not only to look into things which may cause trouble, but, ahead of time, as is made clear in the report of the President's Civil Rights Committee, to keep in touch with every community and every person from whom any trouble could be anticipated, so that it could be prevented in advance. If anyone can describe those activities any more fittingly than they are described in the report of the President's Civil Rights Committee, I should like him to do so.

I continue the quotation from the statement of the Senator from Minnesota:

> Federal legislation, then, should set the basic national pattern, and local laws may be enacted, or ought to be enacted, to apply the pattern to groups which cannot be appropriately covered by national legislation. Furthermore, State and local government can and should legislate to raise the standards for their areas above the minimum established by the National Government as far as the social development in those areas permits.

Mr. President, I have quoted from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, not at all because I agree with his philosophy, but because he makes it very clear, speaking as one of the leading advocates of the measure, that by no means does he intend by this bill to occupy the whole field of legislation, but, to the contrary, he hopes for the passage of much stricter State and local laws, and he lays the predicate in this bill. There are certain provisions in the bill itself by which the Federal agency could pass on and delegate all its powers to State and local agencies for enforcement in their particular geographic areas.

So, Mr. President, I think, when we realize that it must be very clear that this is not a southern problem, but a national problem—it is not a Federal problem but it is a State problem as well—and that even the advocates of the measure recognize the fact that it is a State and local problem, we can understand that they expect to have supplementary State and local legislation along with any national legislation which may be passed.

Mr. President, before leaving the point that this is not a southern problem, but a national problem, and also a State problem in every State, I should like to remind the Senate that the Democratic platform gives some evidence of the fact that various States had different positions, as represented by their delegates to the Democratic Convention at Philadelphia, in 1948, and that the attitudes and convictions of those various delegates, speaking for their States, showed up very clearly on that occasion in the adoption of the platform plank on this subject. Every Senator knows that the proposal which came from the platform committee was not adopted. Instead, a minority report on the subject was adopted.

Before going into the subject further it should be made clear at this time that there was great difference of opinion as to the wisdom and propriety of the adoption of the minority report, and that it was adopted by a very close vote. The minority report, which is the so-called civil-rights plank in the Democratic Party platform of 1948, was adopted by the close vote of 651½ to 582½. I repeat those figures, 651½ to 582½. It is interesting to note that the entire vote of many of the Eastern States was cast in favor of the resolution, including, for instance, the entire vote of the State of New York, 98 votes; the entire vote of Massachusetts, 36 votes; the entire vote of Connecticut, 20 votes, and the entire vote of New Jersey, 36 votes. Senators know that those four States have adopted State FEPC laws. It is quite apparent that because of their enthusiasm for their State laws the delegates from those States in the Democratic Convention felt they could properly cast their entire vote for the adoption of the Federal FEPC plank, which is of such far-reaching force and effect.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that if the State of New Jersey alone, with its 36 votes, had changed its vote from one side to the other, namely, if it had voted against the plank, the Democratic civil-rights plank would not have been adopted. If the State of Massachusetts alone had changed its vote from one side to the other, the plank would not have been adopted. Similarly, of course, if the State of New York had changed its vote, the plank would not have been adopted, but would have been soundly beaten.

It is quite evident that the States which have State FEPC laws dominated the picture at the convention, and that through their votes alone—and there were 180 votes from those four States—the measure was thrust down the throats of a very large and very vocal minority, which cast 582½ votes against the adoption of the plank.

Mr. President, without trying to cover the field more fully, I should like to say that quite a number of the great Midwestern States and some other Atlantic States took the same position. For instance, the State of Illinois, with 60 votes, in spite of the fact that it had repeatedly turned down the adoption of a State FEPC law, cast its 60 votes in favor of the plank. The State of Michigan, with 42 votes, in spite of the fact that it had consistently turned down State FEPC legislation, cast its entire vote in favor of the plank. Likewise, the State of Pennsylvania, with 74 votes, voted its block of 74 votes in favor of the adoption of the plank. It should be noted that Pennsylvania has for three successive legislative terms turned down proposed FEPC legislation in such a way that no one can have any question as to whether the good people of that State want that kind of legislation.

It is interesting to note that some of these States did not even count on the Democratic side when it came to the election in November. I cannot recall any electoral votes coming for the Democratic ticket in the fall of 1948, from the State of New York. I cannot recall that any electoral votes came from the State of Connecticut, from New Jersey, and others of these great States.

Mr. President, it is perfectly apparent that the plank which was adopted at the Democratic Convention in Philadelphia was adopted as a result of a battle between State delegations, and that the FEPC States prevailed. It is also quite apparent that for some undisclosed reason delegations from many States which had declined over and over again to adopt State FEPC legislation nevertheless cast their votes in favor of the adoption of the FEPC plank in the platform.

Mr. President, I think it is enlightening to note that of the Senators who have already spoken in favor of bringing up the FEPC bill for debate and making it the unfinished business four are from FEPC States. Five addresses have been made by the proponents of

the bill. The first speech was made by the distinguished Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee [Mr. THOMAS]. The other four were made by Senators from States which have adopted State FEPC laws. They are the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Those are the Senators who have spoken in support of the measure.

Of those of us who do not desire to see this legislation come up for consideration, much less have it adopted, I will be the fifth speaker, I believe. I note with some surprise that among that group there is not a single Senator who comes from the large number of States which have rejected State FEPC legislation. The five Senators who have spoken against the measure are the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the junior Senator from Florida. Mr. President, I think it is worth while to consider what has happened in States outside of the South and to ask with wonderment why Senators who speak for the large number of States which have consistently and continuously refused to adopt State FEPC legislation have not made the convictions of their own States heard in this body up to this time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Certainly it would seem to me, and I wonder if the distinguished and very able junior Senator from Florida would not agree with me, that unless there is really some compelling reason for it, legislation should not be forced onto the people of States who have expressed their own will against such legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I fully and thoroughly agree with the Senator from Louisiana. I wonder at the temerity of Senators from the comparatively few FEPC States who have dominated the debate in favor of this particular legislation. They argue that because eight States have seen fit to adopt FEPC laws such legislation must be good for the Nation as a whole. They ignore the fact that 19 sovereign States have voted it down conclusively, and that many other States including, of course, Southern States, have refused to give the matter sufficient consideration even to bring it before their legislatures.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem to the distinguished and able Senator from Florida that in the case of Senators from States where such legislation was rejected, especially where it was rejected by their people at referenda, the people going to the polls to reject this type of legislation, there would be more compulsion on such Senators to oppose this type of obnoxious legislation than there would be upon those of us who come from States in which the people have never expressed themselves on it?

Mr. HOLLAND. It might seem so, I will say to the able Senator from Louisiana. At the same time, I think every Senator must decide the question for himself. I am simply listening with avid heart and with a hope which still continues that before the debate is over we shall hear vocal expression in opposition to the consideration of this measure at this time from some of the Senators from the 19 States who have rejected State FEPC legislation and have expressed themselves as against its wisdom and against its philosophy.

Mr. President, I should first like to mention briefly the eight States which have adopted State FEPC legislation. They are good States. I have no quarrel with them. I have no quarrel with the men who represent them so ably in the Congress of the United States. I think those men, whether in the Senate or in the House, have a full right to speak for the convictions of their people and for the actions of their people as taken through the governments in their respective States in the enactment of State FEPC legislation.

The States which have adopted FEPC legislation are the good States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington, a total of eight States in all, with a total population of 27,736,309, according to the 1940 census, the last completed Federal census. I may say, before going further, that I have tried to bring these figures forward to the latest estimates of the Census Bureau, although no figures for 1950 are yet available, and I find that in no substantial way is the proportion changed between the groups of States which I shall mention in my remarks.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the eight States which have adopted FEPC legislation are shown in red on the map which is on the floor of the Senate. Of the eight States shown, five are more or less contiguous to New York, and the others are New Mexico, where, of course, the Spanish and Mexican people are a large part of the population, and the two good States in the far Northwest, Washington and Oregon. Those are the only States which have adopted State FEPC legislation of a compulsory nature.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, as I have stated, those States have a total population of 27,736,309 people, of the roughly 131,000,000 people in the Nation at the time of the taking of the 1940 census.

At this time I should like to submit as a part of my remarks a list of the eight States I have just mentioned which have adopted compulsory FEPC laws, and which are the only States which have adopted such laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States adopting compulsory FEPC

	1940 population		
	White	Negro	Other races
1. Connecticut	1,675,407	32,992	843
2. Massachusetts	4,257,596	55,391	3,734
3. New Jersey	3,931,087	226,973	2,105
4. New Mexico	492,312	4,672	34,834
5. New York	12,879,546	571,221	28,375
6. Oregon	1,075,731	2,565	11,388
7. Rhode Island	701,805	11,024	517
8. Washington	1,698,147	7,424	30,620
Total	26,711,631	912,262	112,416
Grand total, 27,736,309.			

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators will note that there are two States shown upon the map which, though they are colored in blue, have yet an entering wedge of red shown on them, the good States of Indiana and Wisconsin. I may say briefly that this is the history of FEPC legislation in those two good States. There was an attempt in both of them, in the beginning, to have compulsory FEPC laws adopted. Instead, the best the legislatures would do for the proponents of that type of legislation was to adopt voluntary FEPC laws, without any compulsory features, and I may say, with very limited appropriations and personnel to make a study of the employment situations confronting the people in the two States of Indiana and Wisconsin.

Mr. President, the reason why those States are shown in blue, except for the red wedges which appear in them, is that since the time indicated additional efforts have been made to force upon those States and their people compulsory State FEPC laws, and those efforts have been defeated in both the State of Indiana and in the State of Wisconsin.

The voluntary laws existing in those States have proved to be of such limited effect, practically of no effect at all, that the majority of the Senate committee in its report on this very bill, which was filed at the time of the beginning of the debate now taking place upon this floor, saw fit to include these words referring to the voluntary FEPC laws in Wisconsin and Indiana:

> While the voluntary laws in Wisconsin and Indiana are already almost forgotten (the Indiana commission has not even filed a report in over 2 years).

Then the committee in its report goes on to other matters. I repeat that reference to the voluntary laws in those two States, showing of what nugatory effect they have been, at least up to this time, because the Senate will recall that this report was filed on May 5, 1950, and in printed form it became available to the Members of the Senate only late in the day the debate actually began, a week ago Monday. I quote again the words from the committee report:

> While the voluntary laws in Wisconsin and Indiana are already almost forgotten (the Indiana commission has not even filed a report in over 2 years).

Mr. President, for the purpose of showing the Senate and the public what has been done by way of rejecting compulsory FEPC legislation, we have had very carefully compiled by the Library of Congress, and shown in the form of the map to which I have already referred, indicated in blue, the States throughout the Nation which have rejected FEPC State laws of a compulsory nature. There are 19 of those States. As the Senate will see, they are located from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific. They include every one of the six greatest States of the Union in population which come immediately after the State of New York, which, of course, itself is the leader in population in the Nation. In other words, of the six greatest States in population other than New York, namely, the States of Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, California, and Texas, none has adopted compulsory State FEPC legislation. To the contrary, five of them—being all six of the States I have mentioned except the State of Texas—have had the program repeatedly up in their State legislatures, and have declined to adopt State FEPC legislation, instead frowning upon any such un-American set-up. In describing it as un-American, I use not my own words, but words repeated many times in the course of the State debates and in the course of the records made in the consideration of these proposed FEPC laws.

Mr. President, I ask that there may be incorporated in the RECORD a list of the 19 States which have rejected FEPC legislation, and that the list may appear as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States that have rejected FEPC

	1940 population		
	White	Negro	Other races
1. Arizona	542,920	1,235	6,155
2. California	6,596,763	124,306	186,318
3. Colorado	1,106,502	12,176	4,618
4. Delaware	230,528	35,876	101
5. Illinois	7,504,202	387,446	5,593
6. Indiana	3,305,323	121,916	557
7. Iowa	2,520,691	16,694	883
8. Kansas	1,734,496	65,138	1,394
9. Kentucky	2,631,425	214,031	171
10. Michigan	5,039,643	208,345	8,118
11. Minnesota	2,768,982	9,928	13,390
12. Montana	540,468	1,120	17,868
13. Nebraska	1,297,624	14,171	4,039
14. North Dakota	631,464	201	10,270
15. Ohio	6,566,531	339,461	1,620
16. Pennsylvania	9,426,989	470,172	3,019
17. Utah	542,920	1,235	6,155
18. West Virginia	1,784,102	117,754	118
19. Wisconsin	3,112,752	12,158	12,677
Total	57,884,325	2,153,363	283,064
Grand total, 60,320,752.			

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I simply read for the information of Senators now present which States these are. They are the States shown in blue on the map, the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that of those 19 States, 17 are completely away from the South, so far away from it that they are not even referred to as border States, whereas two of the States are generally referred to as border States, namely, the States of West Virginia and Kentucky.

The total population of these 19 States which have rejected State FEPC laws is 60,320,752, or considerably more than 2 to 1 greater than the population of the eight States which have adopted compulsory FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, that concludes the two groups which have themselves considered FEPC legislation; one which has adopted the legislation, a group of 8 States, the other a group which has declined to adopt it, a group of 19 States. The disparity in population has already been indicated in my remarks. The States which have rejected FEPC have far more than a 2-to-1 population as compared with those which have accepted it.

In order that the picture may be fully clear I want the Members of the Senate to glance again at the map and to note the fact that in 21 States shown in white upon the map no legislator has even so highly regarded FEPC legislation as to suggest the adoption of it by the introduction of a bill in the State legislature or by the introduction of a proposed constitutional amendment.

Looking at the map Senators will note that the States which have not even considered such legislation may be placed in four different groups. Three of those States are New England States, and fine old New England States, steeped in the traditions of real Americanism. The States are Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, where no member of their legislatures has thought sufficiently highly of FEPC legislation to introduce it into their legislatures.

The second group which I mention is composed of four Western States, the States of South Dakota, Wyoming, Idaho, and Nevada. The same situation obtains there. No legislator in that group of four States has seen fit to introduce any proposed FEPC legislation in any of their legislatures.

The third group comprises three border States, the States of Maryland, Missouri, and Oklahoma. No legislator has introduced FEPC legislation in the legislatures of those States.

By far the largest group is, of course, composed of the 11 States of the Old South, and I do not think I have to advise the Members of the Senate—I do not believe it would be any startling news to them—that no legislator in the 11 legislatures which represent the 11 sovereign States in the Old South, has thought sufficiently highly of the FEPC proposal as a measure of State enactment as to have introduced any such legislation into any of those legislatures.

Mr. President, to conclude my statement with reference to the comparison of population, I simply wish to remind the Senate that the 21 States which I have just mentioned have a combined population of 43,612,214. In 1940 the total population of the 19 States which have rejected FEPC, and the 21 which have not considered FEPC, or 40 States in all, was 103,932,966, as against the 27,736,309 population in the 8 States which have adopted FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, and Senators, I think it will be very clear that only between one-fourth and one-fifth of the population of the whole country reside in the 8 States that have adopted State FEPC legislation.

On the question of what the various States have done in this field, I shall not weary the Senate by producing the record for each State. We have had a study made by the Library of Congress, which shows exactly what has been done in each of these States. It is a record of the introduction of nearly 200 bills and the rejection of those bills by the legislatures of the various States, in such a way as to make it very clear that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the Nation, even without regarding the 21 States which have not considered such legislation, is against this un-American approach to the problem of fair employment practices.

Mr. President, in going back to the question of what has happened in the various States, reference was made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia to the fact that there has been one State in which this matter was entrusted to the people themselves, to pass upon it in a referendum. The legislature refused to act in the great State of California in 1945 and 1946, as I recall—and I have the record and will read it exactly in a moment. Some friends of FEPC legislation saw fit to initiate for the ballot that was to be voted on in the fall of 1946, a proposed constitutional establishment of State FEPC in the State of California. It was a very bitterly fought contest. It was a contest in which apparently the merits and the demerits of the proposed program were made clear to the people of California from one end of the State to the other. I doff my hat to California as being a State which is certainly not a reactionary or standpat State, but which has been in the forefront of progressivism and of true liberalism for these many years, and I hope and believe will always remain in that position.

I may say for the great State of California that there is no State in the Nation which is less provincial than that State, because its people come from literally all over the United States. We of Florida like to think of California and Florida as being in a class somewhat by themselves. If the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], whom I see present, is not in accord with that statement, I would simply regret it. I believe it to be true that the citizenship of the two States is quite comparable in that it comes literally from all over the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement, if he does not lose his rights to the floor by doing so?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say that I have been listening to the very interesting talk the Senator has been making. On behalf of the State of California I wish to express my appreciation for the very high regard in which he holds the

State of California. I agree that both the States of Florida and California represent the Nation as a whole, since we have been fortunate in having come to our respective States people from every State of the Union, who have made very fine citizens.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I am glad to find that the Senator from California and the Senator from Florida are in such full accord in esteeming the high quality of their citizens.

Mr. President, the result of this great election in California, where people from all parts of the country have come to seek living conditions which they could find better than back home, was that 1,682,646 votes were cast against the proposal and 675,697 votes were cast for the proposal. The outcome was approximately a 2½-to-1 vote against a State FEPC for California.

Further, Mr. President, to show that the issue was not determined either solely in the great cities of that great State or solely in the countryside, I want to say that the most impressive thing about the result in that election was that in every county of that great State the voters participating—and they did participate, as can be seen, to a total number of more than two and one-quarter million—cast a substantial majority against the adoption of such FEPC legislation for the State of California.

Mr. President, I shall come back to California a little later. I took up that State first, not simply because the Senator from California was on the floor, though that would have been a sufficient reason, but because unhappily that is the only State in which the sovereign voters have really had a chance, except by indirection, to pass upon this question. In various other States the voters have not been slow to remove from office persons who misrepresented them by trying to foist upon them State FEPC laws.

However, let us go back for a moment to a consideration of some of the other key States which are shown by the report of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to have rejected State FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, if any Senator desires to have me do so, I can discuss any other States in this connection, yet the four States which I shall mention now, in order that the RECORD may show how exhaustive has been the battle in the States where FEPC proposed legislation has been rejected, not once, but over and over again, will be the great, pivotal States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California, because I believe the RECORD should show the tremendous debates which have been held there at the State level and the rejection which has been accomplished at the hands of the representatives of the people of those four great States, not once, but over and over again, during the years since 1943.

In the case of the State of Pennsylvania, the report of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress shows that it has no positive information on this subject for the year 1945, but it is certain, from the remarks on legislation in later years, that some bills on FEPC were introduced in that year in the Pennsylvania Legislature. The Legislative Reference Service has not been able to include any specific showing on them.

In 1947 two bills were introduced in the Pennsylvania Senate. Both those bills died in committee. Five bills were introduced in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. One of them, house bill 644, was subjected to a motion to discharge the committee, so that the bill could be brought to the floor. The motion to discharge the committee was defeated by a vote of 142 to 39.

In 1949, the next session of the Pennsylvania Legislature, four senate bills and four house bills were introduced. None was reported from committee.

A resolution to discharge the senate committee from the further consideration of senate bill 137 was defeated on April 21, 1949, by a vote of 35 to 15.

A resolution to discharge the house committee from the further consideration of house bill 975 was defeated on April 5, 1949, by a vote of 109 to 89.

A resolution to discharge the house committee from the further consideration of house bill 32 was defeated on April 21, 1949, by a vote of 103 to 79.

So, Mr. President and Senators, it must be clearly apparent that in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the last three sessions of its legislature, FEPC legislation has been proposed each time, and at least in the second and third session, those in 1947 and 1949, such proposed legislation was rejected by very large votes of both houses of the legislature.

I think it might be enlightening at this time to read the plaintive testimony of a certain witness who, coming here before the house committee in the course of its hearings on house bill 4453, found great fault with the State of Pennsylvania because it had exercised its sovereign pleasure in declining to adopt FEPC legislation, and so testified before the house committee in May 1949. I quote now only two sentences from the testimony of Mr. Will Maslow, counsel for the American Jewish Congress, who testified at some length. In the course of his testimony he said:

> Perhaps there may be some question in your mind as to the necessity for Federal action, in view of the fact that by now we have eight effective State FEPC laws.

Mr. President, that testimony was given in May 1949. This is May 1950. There still are eight FEPC States, but there is no indication that any other States will be added soon to that galaxy.

The witness further said:

> One of the answers to that problem, Mr. Chairman, is that in many States, like Pennsylvania, for example, an FEPC bill has been killed for the third time.

Then the witness proceeded with his testimony.

In other words, it was his philosophy and his position that inasmuch as Pennsylvania had decided in its own good judgment, for the third time in three successive sessions of its legislative body, that it wanted nothing of FEPC legislation, then the thing to do was to come to Washington, and so far as concerns the good citizens and officials of the State of Pennsylvania who had demonstrated their judgment and wisdom so effectively by the treatment they had given to proposed FEPC legislation, make them take, on the Federal level, a law which they did not want and which they have rejected.

Mr. President, how completely juvenile, how completely puerile, how completely hopeless and undemocratic is an approach which says that, "Since we cannot sell the people of a great sovereign Commonwealth on the wisdom or the justice of such legislation, we will run down yonder to Washington and pass a Federal law and then come back and ram it down the throats of the people of that great Commonwealth."

That simply cannot be done in this sort of field; and the sooner we learn from experience that that kind of experimentation in legislation is wrong, and particularly so at a time when unity in our Nation is so imperatively necessary, the better it will be for us and for the rest of the world which looks to us for unity and for leadership.

Mr. President, that is the situation in Pennsylvania. There are many other quotations which I could have given, but I think I have by now presented a reasonably clear picture of what has happened in this field in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I turn next to the sovereign State of Ohio. The figures which I shall present are the result of the work and research of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Its study shows that the Legislature of Ohio has rejected 10 separate proposals on FEPC legislation during the 1945, 1947, and 1949 sessions of the Ohio Legislature.

The first was in the 1945 session. Senate bill 292, which was designed to set up a commission to make studies and recommendations in the field of discrimination in employment, was rejected.

In the 1947 legislature, five separate bills were introduced. Four of them—senate bills 10 and 90 and house bills 58 and 111—were designed to create an Ohio FEPC. All of them either failed to receive a first reading or were killed in committee.

The fifth bill, senate bill 354, was a study proposal. It was referred to the rules committee, and died in committee after a motion to withdraw it had failed of adoption. That was in 1947.

In 1949 three bills to create an Ohio FEPC law were introduced—senate bill 250 and house bills 32 and 106. The first two died in committee. The last, house bill 106, passed the house by a vote of 70 to 61 and went to the senate. It was amended in the senate committee by striking out all of the enforcement provisions; and in that shape—that is, as a voluntary bill—it passed the senate by a vote of 30 to 1.

Eventually, however, after the bill went to conference and after the conferees on the part of the house insisted on including some enforcement features, the senate by a vote of 17 to 13 rejected the report of the conference committee, thus killing the bill.

In the same 1949 session of the legislature, a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11)

was proposed to amend the Ohio Constitution so as to permit of State FEPC legislation. That resolution was referred to the senate committee on commerce and labor, and died there.

In the summary which I have there is much more detail upon each of these measures, but I think what I have given is sufficient to show what happened to 10 specific proposals in the Legislature of the State of Ohio during the 1945, 1947, and 1949 sessions of its legislature.

I come next to Illinois. In that great State 18 different FEPC proposals were rejected during the regular biennial sessions of its legislature in 1943, 1945, 1947, and 1949. I read now from the letter of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

> The first such legislation came before both the house and senate (of Illinois) in 1943 in the nature of a house bill (H. B. 494). This 1943 bill to establish the Illinois State Board of Fair Employment Practices was amended in the house committee to which it has been referred and was reported favorably as amended. It passed the house June 17, 1943, by a vote of 86 to 19. From there it went to the senate where it died in the committee on industrial affairs. An attempt to discharge the committee from further consideration of this bill failed by a vote of 18 to 7 and the senate ordered on June 28, 1943, that the bill be left in committee, thus killing it.

In 1945 in the Illinois Legislature four bills were introduced in the senate and one bill in the house, each bill designed to create a State FEPC, and, in addition, two separate appropriation bills were also introduced to finance State FEPC activities.

> No bill creating an FEPC or appropriating money therefor became law. Each of the senate bills was tabled. In the house, however, house bill No. 353 was withdrawn from committee on a discharge motion. By a vote of 77 to 16 the committee was discharged.

The bill then came on, with amendments, and was defeated by a vote of 41 to 28, on June 26, 1945. So ended the 1945 session of the Illinois Legislature.

In 1947, FEPC bills met the same fate as they had in 1943 and 1945. Three FEPC bills were tabled in the Illinois Senate. In addition, the senate refused to consider a resolution placing the senate on record as being in favor of an FEPC, and also tabled a bill authorizing cities and villages to enact local FEPC bills.

Furthermore, in 1947, in the house, two FEPC bills were tabled, one bill being reported with committee recommendations that it do not pass.

> The house also failed to act on a resolution, house resolution No. 19, "pledging the support of the house in the enactment of a law which will guarantee equality of opportunity to all in the obtaining of employment in this State.

Mr. President, could it be clearer that the members of the Illinois Legislature felt that here was a field which had a large appeal, but which nevertheless they felt to be not a field in which legislation could be properly or successfully employed? The legislature did, in 1947, create a good will interracial commission limited to an investigation of means of affording opportunity and profitable employment to all persons and the promotion of tolerance and good will. This commission made quite a study, and in its report in 1948, stated that it felt an FEPC was needed in the State, on the State level; and I quote from its report:

> Impartial review of the various approaches to opportunities for employment herein reported in a direct factual manner, brings out clearly the fundamental fact that discrimination in opportunities for employment on racial, creedal, and ethnic grounds has become a responsibility for the State government.

To carry out that recommendation—

> In 1949 two FEPC bills were introduced (S. B. No. 145 and H. B. No. 163). The senate bill died in committee. The house bill passed the house 81 to 43, but was voted down in the senate, 25 to 23, on June 14, 1949. The bill was thus 3 votes short of the 26 votes required for passage in the Illinois Senate.

So, Mr. President, there is another great State, which for 4 successive sessions of its legislature, has rejected legislation—18 separate proposals, in all—to create a State FEPC agency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the very able and distinguished Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the very able junior Senator from Florida whether he is not perhaps laboring under a misapprehension concerning the nature of the motion which is now before the United States Senate. I rather inferred from the discussion of the distinguished Senator from Florida that he is opposed to a Federal FEPC law. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And he is directing his argument against the enactment of a Federal FEPC law?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am directing my argument against the enactment of a Federal FEPC law, and, had the Senator been more timely in his arrival, he would have found out the connection, at least in the judgment of the Senator from Florida, between Federal and State legislation. The Senator from Florida quoted specifically from the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], though he could have quoted from many other sources to the same effect, that no advocate of this Federal FEPC legislation views it as sufficient, standing by itself, to deal with this situation, but instead regards it as being supplementary in nature to State legislation, and, as stated by the Senator from Minnesota, to local legislation. Moreover, the bill proposes by its very terms to allow the Federal board to turn over and delegate to the State or to the local agency, in the event one is established by satisfactory law, the enforcement of this legislation in its own jurisdiction. So the Senator from Florida has simply been reviewing the complete lack of success—the complete failure—that has been noted in all the States shown in blue upon the map which is directly back of the Senator, 19 in all, when efforts have been made, and repeated efforts, embracing about 200 proposed State laws, to enact FEPC legislation as a State matter. The Senator from Florida was merely reading from the report of the Library of Congress on what has happened in Illinois.

In order to make the picture more complete, however, the Senator from Florida thinks it would probably be proper at this time to say that the State of Illinois has a living example of what FEPC legislation means, in that the city of Chicago has a city ordinance on this subject, and in that, therefore, the people of Illinois have a chance to see first hand from what happens in that city, whether anything good or anything sufficiently acceptable comes out of it, as a result of which they would want to have it in their State law.

Apparently the people of Illinois, through their representatives, both in the upper house and in the lower house of the Illinois legislature, have been deciding in the sessions of 1943, 1945, 1947, and 1949, some of which time was before the setting up of the Chicago experiment, some of which was after it, that there was nothing in the Chicago experiment which made them desire to adopt it as a State measure. At least, they had declined to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a third question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to respond.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator was addressing himself to the question whether we should have a Federal FEPC law, but I am sure the Senator will pardon me if I say that that is not the question which is now before the United States Senate. The question which is actually before the United States Senate is whether the Senate will proceed to consider an FEPC law. It seemed to me that the very able Senator from Florida was not addressing himself to that issue. Now, I should like to ask my good friend——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to respond to that part of the admonition of my good friend, the junior Senator from Illinois, by saying that it became entirely necessary to discuss some of the facts in connection with this long-drawn-out but generally unsuccessful effort in States other than the States of the South to adopt FEPC legislation, because unfortunately the Senate committee, entrusted with the duty of holding hearings on this particular measure—and the junior Senator from Illinois is one of the outstanding members of that committee—saw fit to have no hearings whatever, turned down requests by brother Senators to appear for the purpose of a hearing, and afforded no opportunity for a hearing to the legislators of the good State of Illinois and 18 other States, which had declined to adopt FEPC legislation, since the last hearing was held in the Eightieth Congress. The committee declined to allow to appear before it legislators, members of industries who were affected, members of labor unions who felt that they were exceedingly adversely affected by the pro-

posals of such a bill, and members of the general public.

So the Senator from Florida, speaking only for himself, felt it might be appropriate, or at least that he had the right to decide it was appropriate, for him to discuss briefly on the floor of the Senate the complete collapse in the State of Illinois of the oft-repeated effort of the good citizens of that State who, no doubt, were animated by the highest motives and objectives, though mistakenly, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, in endeavoring to enact State FEPC legislation during the past 7 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very grateful to the Senator for the very careful study he has made of the varying degrees of progress of this legislation in various State legislatures. But would it be permissible to ask him if he objects to the Senate even considering the motion? Why should we not have an opportunity to consider the motion and then to debate the bill? In my judgment, the Senator from Florida, with the fairness which has always characterized him in this body, should at least vote to consider the bill because I am sure the Senator wants the Senate to debate the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the kindness and the candor of the Senator from Illinois, but the Senator from Illinois, with other members of the committee, has created a condition in which action is sought without the benefit of any hearing whatsoever; nor was any report forthcoming from any members of the committee until May 5, the same day on which the motion was made to take up the bill. On that day a report was filed, whereas the bill had been on the calendar since October 17, 1949. That being the case, the Senator from Florida feels that he certainly does not have the wisdom to provide by his feeble efforts and his brief remarks a substitute for a careful taking of testimony and a careful making of recommendations based upon testimony, and he feels that the Senator from Chicago——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I represent the State of Illinois, as well as the city of Chicago. I am very proud to claim Chicago as my home, but I do not represent that city exclusively.

Mr. HOLLAND. That, perhaps, is correct, but I remember that the Senator from Chicago during the consideration of rent-control last year made it very clear that he felt he had a peculiar trust upon his mind, heart, and soul, because the people of the State, outside Chicago, had treated his people unkindly, so he thought. Therefore, he prevailed successfully upon the Senator from Florida, and a majority of the Senate was willing to decide that he was a stalwart fighter for the people of Chicago, and that, although other persons in the State of Illinois had turned his good city down, we would come to his aid and comfort, which we did, and I believe the Senator was very grateful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I so expressed myself at the time, and I want again to say that our good friends from the South, in the matter of rent control on apartments in large cities, were exceedingly courteous and friendly and received my undying gratitude. But it so happens that we are now considering a motion to take up an FEPC bill. We are presumably not discussing the bill but are merely considering a motion to consider the bill. I inferred, from what my very able friend from Florida has said, that if the Senate Committee on Education and Labor had held hearings, he would vote to consider the motion——

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator has gone a little further than the Senator from Florida intended to go.

The Senator from Florida has made his attitude clear that he feels the Senate would be exceedingly unwise and unfaithful to its trust and derelict in its obligations to the Nation as a whole, and particularly to the people of 19 States, including the State of Illinois, which turned down FEPC, if it permitted such proposed legislation to come up without the benefit of any hearings, without the benefit of any recommendations, without the benefit of anything whatever except the views and philosophies of various members of the committee. I have not been able to agree with all of them, but they were ably expressed. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois and other members of the committee for remembering enough about the measure to be able, some 8 months after it was reported, to file a report for the edification of the Members of the Senate who, at last, were to be given a chance to say why they felt, as the junior Senator from Florida feels, that it is an imposition to ask the Senate to take up a bill on which the committee failed to hold hearings, failed to produce a printed record, failed to show anything which happened during the years since the last record was made, and what happened in the State of Illinois which the Senator so ably represents. The Senator from Florida feels it would be a hopeless mistake to permit the complete defeat of the rules of parliamentary procedure by allowing such an important proposal to come up without the committee having in any sense discharged its duty or fulfilled its trust, which is the case in connection with this matter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask one simple question. In view of the fact that the committee held no hearings, made no study of the proposed legislation, but simply refused, by a tie vote, to hold any hearings or make any study, and reported the measure without hearings, why should Senators consider the views of the Members of the committee as being any more informed than are those of any other Senator?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has a splendid question, and I am glad he asked it. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accord great wisdom and dignity to the members of the committee, and I subscribe to the belief that it is the duty of the membership of a committee to take patient, diligent, and wise action, based in the traditions of this body, going back to the founding of the Nation, which action is necessary, if we are to have sound legislation; but the Senator from Florida would say to the Senator from Louisiana that he has not been impressed with the feeling and has been unable to come to the conclusion that the distinguished Senator from Illinois and some of his colleagues and conferees have wanted to have presented on the floor of the Senate, or wanted to make available to the Members of the Senate, to the press, and to the Nation, the very disappointing experience which advocates of FEPC legislation have had in recent years when they have taken the question closer to the State legislatures which are very close to the people and when they have been refused so consistently, as happened in the State of the good Senator from Illinois in 1943, 1945, 1947, and 1949. I think the Senate would be interested in knowing about it.

Mr. LONG. Much as we admire the very learned and able junior Senator from Illinois, we must also have some respect for the legislature of his State.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I feel that the Senator from Florida, who appears rarely on the floor, and never to the extent of taking 3 days of the time of the Senate, as did the Senator from Illinois during his able and learned discussion on the late bill referred to as the Kerr bill, might have a couple hours of the Senate's time in which to discuss at least his views on why he feels the committee has done the Senate wrong. He sticks by those views, and he does not believe the Senator from Illinois or any other able member of the committee can justify the action, or the lack of action, resulting in the complete abuse of parliamentary processes and procedure which characterized the committee's mishandling of this particularly important bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida is perhaps aware of the fact that in 1947 a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of this body held prolonged hearings on FEPC, which are contained in a light-blue colored document near the desk of the Senator from Florida, consisting of 810 pages, in which the arguments on both sides were exhaustively advanced, and that, furthermore, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the House Committee on Education and Labor held prolonged hearings on the subject, which ran to 577 pages. I take it, therefore, that the subject has been thoroughly discussed in committee meetings. We know perfectly well, as reasonable and practical men, that probably the opinions of the Senators from south of the Mason and Dixon's line would not have been altered by additional hearings. No new facts would have been brought out. Why is it not enough to take the two sets of hearings and say that there has been sufficient prior discussion to justify the Senate in at least considering the bill?

That is all we are seeking at this moment. All we are seeking is the right to

have the Senate consider the bill. I know that my friend from Florida is a fair-minded man.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for that conclusion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, I find it difficult to believe that a fair-minded man would oppose the consideration of the subject. I can understand that opinions may differ once the issue reaches the floor of the Senate. However, I have been reading the RECORD for some time now, and in all the speeches which have been made by Senators who are apparently opposed to FEPC, 99 percent of the emphasis has been on FEPC legislation. I submit that is not the issue before us. The issue before us is whether we should proceed to the consideration of the FEPC bill. I think on that point fair-minded men will agree that the Senate should be permitted to consider the measure and to come to a vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his question. In reply I would say simply that the Senator from Chicago has been——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Pardon me. I am still the Senator from Illinois, although I am happy also to represent the city of Chicago.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us say the Senator from Chicago, Ill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the State of Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has been a little too early in making his concession to the fair-mindedness of the junior Senator from Florida, because the junior Senator from Florida believes there is no way for the Senator from Illinois to evade the conclusion which Members of the Senate and millions of American people have drawn, to the effect that the Senator from Illinois, in keeping and in company with other good Senators who comprise the majority of the committee of which he is a member, simply failed to observe the clear mandates and requirements of parliamentary procedure. Instead, he proposes to take the record made in 1947 and in 1948.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have here the record of the hearings conducted in 1945, in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have two pounds of hearings before us.

Mr. HOLLAND. That takes us even further back into history. That was before the cessation of the Second World War. The Senator from Illinois forgets the point made by the Senator from Florida, which I think should not be forgotten. The point I make is that there has been developed an experience of 2 years under State FEPC laws. There have been 2 years of experience in States which have adopted FEPC laws. There has been experience developed also in a great many more States where efforts were made to pass FEPC laws, most of which attempts were abysmally unsuccessful. The Senator from Florida wonders why it was the people of Illinois declined to yield to the seductive efforts of the Senator from Chicago, Ill., and his friends in presenting something that had been good in Chicago but was not regarded as good in the rest of the State. It was regarded so far from good that they knocked it down. The Senator from Florida would like to have known authoritatively why that was the case. He would like to have had the benefit of evidence given by leaders on both sides of the question. He would like to have given leaders on both sides of the question an opportunity to be heard by the committee and to express their convictions. They doubtless had reached conclusions. However, the able Senator from Chicago, Ill., was not willing to have those convictions expressed to a committee of the Senate. I cannot ascribe any reason for his decision. Apparently he did not want people from his own legislature, and people from the legislatures of 18 other States who had declined to adopt FEPC legislation, to give their thinking to the Senate of the United States through the medium of committee hearings. Instead, the Senator prefers to depend on hearings held in 1947, in 1945, and, I believe he said, the hearings——

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the 1949 hearings before the House committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I know that the Senator is too diligent to have anyone think he is trying to get by with a consideration of the House committee's hearings. I am sure he would not want people to think that he is willing to have someone else do his work. He is a very diligent Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois testified before the House committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator from Illinois would not want to be regarded as being willing to accept the conclusion or judgment of a committee of our sister legislative body based on the testimony of any given witness which required exploration and explanation when the witness was on the stand.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Florida if the argument as made by the able Senator from Illinois were carried to its logical conclusion it would not be just as reasonable to say, because we held hearings on a tax bill to fight World War I, we should not hold hearings on another revolutionary tax bill to finance the carrying on of World War II? This bill is entirely different from a bill on which hearings were held in 1947. As a result of those hearings and the subsequent debate on the Senate floor, a number of improvements were made in the bill.

I regret to hear the distinguished Senator from Illinois make the argument that because hearings were held by a committee of the House the Senate should not conduct any hearings. It is the very essence of our Government to have balances between the House and Senate. The committees of both Houses are supposed to pass upon legislation, because in that way one can correct the errors of the other. In that way one House can explore angles which had not come to the attention of the other body. If we were to adopt the philosophy that because the House has held hearings the Senate should not conduct hearings, we would be relegating the Senate to an inferior position in our legislative system. We are resisting the motion to take up this bill because it comes to us without any hearings, because the committee could not get together even to formulate a set of recommendations. Indeed, no report was filed on the bill until very recently. Regardless of the pressures which are involved, it would be a sad day if we were to be whipped into abandoning the system of hearings by a committee, the servant of the Senate, which is supposed to discharge that function. If we are to be denied the right as Senators to present amendments to a committee and go before it to present our view why a certain amendment should be adopted, and if we are to be stampeded into taking up this bill, I should like to know what answer we would make to another pressure group which might come to us with another bill and say, "You rushed through the FEPC bill, which was a political bill, without hearings and without receiving any recommendations from a committee, and therefore you should do the same for us, because we have 5 percent more voters than the supporters of the FEPC bill had." It would be disastrous to our parliamentary system. It would jeopardize the rights of the American people. It would deny the right of petition. It would take from an American citizen the right to come before a committee of the Senate to present his case.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He is eminently correct.

I invite the attention of our colleague from Illinois to the fact that even the House did not seem to be too favorably impressed with the recommendation of the House committee, because the House tore the bill to shreds and substituted its own bill, and sent over to the Senate a voluntary measure. The Senator from Illinois and his confreres are not trying to bring up the voluntary measure which was the final expression of wisdom on the part of our coordinate body. Instead, they are trying to go back to where the House committee was, even though that committee has been repudiated by the membership of the House which the committee served.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Earlier in the colloquy with the distinguished junior Senator from Florida he asked a question which at the moment was rhetorical but about which I thought he wanted some information. He said that he would like to have the junior Senator from Illinois explain why it was that the Illinois Legislature at its last session did not pass an FEPC law. May I inquire whether he still wants an answer to that question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I decline to yield except for a question. The

Senator from Illinois will have his own time to discuss this measure, and I shall be happy to listen to him at that time, and shall be happy to listen to a question now, if he has one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was I correct in inferring that the Senator from Florida said that the lower house of the Illinois Legislature passed an FEPC law in 1949 by a vote of 81 to 43?

Mr. HOLLAND. I read from the report of the Library of Congress, and shall repeat, if the Senator will permit me to go back to it. What year was that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Nineteen forty-nine.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have the records here for 1943, 1945, 1947, and 1949. This is a quotation from the report of the Library of Congress, and I shall read the entire paragraph relating to 1949:

> In 1949 two FEPC bills were introduced (S. B. 145 and H. B. 163). The senate bill died in committee. The house bill passed the house 81 to 43——

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was my point, that there was a vote in its favor of 81 to 43, or almost 2 to 1, in the house.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senater would mind suspending until I try to comply with his reasonable request. I shall continue the quotation—

> but was voted down in the senate, 25 to 23, on June 14, 1949. The bill was thus 3 votes short of the 26 votes required for passage in the Illinois Senate.

I think I have read verbatim from the report of the Library of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the members of the House of Representatives of Illinois are elected every 2 years, and therefore those who voted in 1949 had just been elected in 1948, whereas the members of the senate are elected for a 4-year term, and only half of those who voted in 1949 had been elected in 1948 and the other half had been elected in 1946? Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator was not aware of it but is not surprised to learn of it. That is precisely the structure of the senate in his own State, the State of Florida, and in many other States with which he is familiar.

The Senator may continue by saying that he is not surprised that in the 1948 election that type of thought and philosophy may have prevailed, because the Senator from Illinois has made it so abundantly clear, during his all-too-brief stay here, that that is his philosophy, and I understood he was one of the leaders of the ticket, that he ran a magnificent race, made a tremendous impression upon his people, and he carried along to success numerous others who were candidates of his party at that time. Therefore, it is not surprising to learn that the House of Representatives of Illinois might have voted in the way indicated. But the senate—the more conservative body, the body which has its feet on the ground generally a little more sturdily, because of the very fact that it does not have to respond every 2 years to the electorate, and therefore has a little sounder perspective of things that are suggested—the senate apparently did not join in that philosophy. Let us hope that they will continue to exercise the good judgment, along the same line, which they demonstrated so ably in 1949.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the fact that the overwhelming proportion of the State senators who had been elected to the Illinois Legislature in 1948 voted for a State FEPC law and that the overwhelming proportion of the senators who had been elected in 1946, 2 years before, voted against an FEPC law, and that, therefore, it can be said the FEPC law was defeated in the senate by the dead hand of the 1946 election? Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is not aware of that fact. That is one of the facts which he would have liked to see the people of Illinois have a chance to bring out in the committee room, as they might have done, if their desire to be heard had not been thwarted by the apparent resistance of the Senator from Illinois to conducting any hearings. If that could have been shown to be the case in Illinois and in the other 18 of the 19 States affected, I am sure it would have made a profound impression on the members of the committee. They might have found material there which would have justified them in making a different sort of report, or at least making mention of that fact to the Senate. The Senate is forced to accept such gleanings, in its effort to get facts, as may come from the Senator from Illinois or others in minor expressions which come out in the debate.

It would appear to me that the determined attack on the motion to take up the bill is being justified by the fact that the Senator from Illinois has presented some facts which have not heretofore been made known to the Senate. I wish the same situation might obtain in regard to the other States, but unfortunately other Senators are not here to take that position, and unfortunately the Senator from Illinois by his own decision has aided in thwarting the opportunity of other Members of the Senate, who are not members of the committee, from having the benefit of the expression and experience of people in the 19 States which have rejected FEPC laws.

On that one ground alone the Senator from Florida thinks that the Senator from Illinois erred very greatly. He is not chastising the Senator from Illinois, he has no right to do that, but he feels he does have the right to advance his views in support of his feeling that it is untimely to take up this bill and it would be unwise to take it up, because the Senator from Illinois and his compatriots on the committee have, by their determined opposition to the granting of any right of hearing, defeated the purpose for which their committee and other committees exist, and have deprived other Members of the Senate of the opportunity to have the expressions that would develop from such a hearing.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator if he has noted section 9 (e) of the bill we are being asked to take up. That section appears to be unprecedented. I ask him if he does not agree that this is a section unheard of in American jurisprudence? Here is a section which denies individuals the right to refuse to testify on the ground that what they might say might incriminate them. Here is a section which, so far as I know, without any study or analysis we are asked to pass upon, compelling people to testify and to say they committed crimes, to give evidence under oath, and even though that testimony cannot be used against them, it can be used against their relatives and neighbors. Does not the Senator feel that if the committee had studied this language, certainly Senators who voted to report the bill favorably would think we should not compel individuals to forego their rights to refuse to testify on the ground that they might incriminate themselves?

Mr. HOLLAND. Answering the Senator's first suggestion, Senators did not vote to report the bill favorably, but they reported it without recommendation. Senators on the floor do not even have the benefit of the individual judgment of Senators, except as it is expressed in individual opinions or the majority opinion at the time the report was printed, at the time the debate started.

In regard to the second matter, there have been a few isolated instances in recent years in which such philosophy has been written into legislation. The Senator from Florida is not ready to accede at all to the position that such legislation is sound or is American. He has never knowingly voted for any such legislation. He agrees entirely with the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana that that kind of legislation is hopelessly un-American, and has no place on the American statute books, and he will oppose it with all his vigor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a good deal of sympathy with the contention of the Senator from Florida that, other things being equal, it would have been highly desirable for the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to have had hearings on the bill. But is it not a fact that the advocates of FEPC have been somewhat discouraged by the procedure which a great many of our friends from the South have adopted once bills of this character have reached the floor of the Senate?

The Senator will doubtless recall the experience of 1946. Neither he nor I were at that time Members of this body, but I happened to be in the hospital at the time and therefore had leisure to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each morning. I remember, as the Senator from Florida doubtless remembers, that after the Senate Committee on Education and Labor held rather thorough hearings in March 1945—which I hold in my hand, and which total 189 printed pages—the bill was reported to the Senate. A motion was made to bring it up for consideration, and at that time a great many of our southern friends prevented it from

being considered upon the ground, as I believe they declared, that the prayer of the Chaplain the preceding morning had not made a proper reference to the Deity. For some time the entire proceeding was stymied by speeches, which seemed to me extraordinary at the time, in which it was set forth that the Chaplain had not given proper recognition to the Deity in the prayer of the given morning.

Now I should like to ask my good friend from Florida this question: Will the good friends from south of the Mason and Dixon's line agree that in the future they will allow important measures to be at least considered, provided hearings are held on such bills? While I have no authority to speak for my senior colleague, the majority leader, if such a pledge could be given it might be possible either now or in the future to have hearings held, and then if it could be agreed that the holding of the hearings and the presentation of the report would insure the support of the able Senator from Florida and his colleagues, who feel as he does about this matter, I think a great many of our difficulties would be removed, and we could at least proceed to discuss these issues on the floor of the Senate as well as in the committee.

The experience of 1946 really inflicted a shock upon the nervous systems of those of us who were advocates of FEPC, because we felt that no matter how carefully the testimony was taken we would not be permitted to consider it because certain methods which were used to prevent its coming up then were frivolous. I read that prayer of the Chaplain, and it seemed to me a perfectly proper prayer. I do not know whether he was a Unitarian, a Theosophist, a member of an Ethical Culture society, a Baptist, a Methodist, or an Episcopalian, but to me it seemed to be a perfectly proper prayer. But immediately some Senator rose and objected to the approval of the Journal because the prayer itself had not made proper reference to God.

With all due deference to our friends from the South, that seemed to us a very frivolous ground for objection. We inferred that it was not the real ground for objection; that the real ground was not the prayer of the Chaplain, but the determination of our friends from the South to prevent this matter from even being considered.

Mr. President, we live in a democracy. The South already has ample protection in its representation in the Senate. The rules of the Senate give them ample protection when matters are up for a final decision and a vote. Why should this additional obstacle be thrown in the way of free discussion, namely opposition to the consideration of a measure? And the motion to consider, I should like to submit to my good friend from Florida, is the only matter which at this moment is before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may reply to my good friend the Senator from Illinois before yielding to the Senator from Georgia, I will say that in the first place I thought the Senator from Illinois was pleading with the Senator from Florida a few minutes ago not to be governed by the dead hand of the past, or something of that sort. I believe that was the substance of his remark; that he did not want to be governed by something that happened in 1946. If I have correctly understood—and I may have misunderstood—this represents the present suggestion of the Senator from Illinois: He wants to go back to a period prior to the time when he was in the Senate, and on the basis of report, rumor and information that had come to him prior to the time the Senator from Florida was a Member of the Senate, to bring something out and discuss it as if it were mandatorily binding upon the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Illinois. I think it is not at all binding.

I may say further before yielding to the Senator from Georgia, who has sought recognition for a question, that while I have some sympathy with the Senator from Illinois in his feeling that at least the prayer should not have been questioned seriously, I hope that no profound objection was made to the contents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think a profound objection was made to it, but certainly a prolonged objection was made to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Illinois will permit me to conclude. I wish to say I am a little surprised that the Senator now proposes to substitute himself for the Chaplain by himself trying to put the Senator from Florida in the position of having to take a pledge which will be binding in the future life of the two Senators in this body, which I hope will be a long and pleasant one. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned he is going to judge each issue on its own merits. He is going to retain to himself the power and prerogative of making his own decisions as to whether or not he thinks legislation has been adequately prepared, or whether, if it has been adequately prepared, the issue is so vital, so tremendous in its importance, that everything that is done to consider it and bring it to passage should be objected to and fought by the Senator from Florida and any other Senator who shares his convictions.

So the Senator from Florida, though always pleased to hear the comments and the suggestions of the Senator from Illinois, cannot agree with him on either of his counts; first, that either of us is bound by the dead hand of the past, or, second, that either of us should attempt to prejudge the issues which may arise in the future. The Senator from Florida, at least for himself, will not attempt to prejudge them, but will for himself decide those issues as they arise and as he thinks their importance requires him to decide them.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would not undertake on any ordinary occasion to dispute a question of fact with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, whose mind is a veritable storehouse of knowledge. It so happens that I was present in the Senate in 1946, and I can say that the Senator from Illinois has his facts all in error when he charges that there was any objection to the prayer of the Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me for a moment, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for a comment by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, not a question, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will have no objection if the Senator from Georgia will speak a little louder so we on this side of the aisle can hear him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am merely correcting the RECORD. The Senator from Illinois had stated that there was objection made to the prayer of the Chaplain in 1946 because he did not mention in it the name of the Deity. I wish to say the Senator from Illinois is entirely in error in this statement. The prayer was delivered by the revered present Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, one of the great divines of this era, and naturally did not omit mention of the Deity. The objection lodged was against the unanimous-consent request to dispense with the reading of the Journal. Objection was made because a motion had been made to take up the bill on a day on which that motion was not subject, under the rules, to debate. The motion was made in violation of what we considered as an understanding that no motion would be made to proceed to the consideration of any bill until after the President's message had been received. We therefore availed ourselves of the technicality of requiring that the Journal of the Senate be read. Upon the reading of the Journal it appeared that it did not contain the prayer of the Chaplain. Therefore the late lamented Senator John H. Overton, I believe it was, moved to amend the Journal of the Senate in order that the Chaplain's prayer, which did contain reference to the Deity, might appear in the Journal. I do not know that he gave this reason for it at the time, but some of us felt, at least in our hearts, that if there ever was a time when the Chaplain's prayer should be stressed and should appear in the Journal of the Senate it was then, in 1946, in the face of the irregular proceeding to bring up the FEPC.

And, Mr. President, if there ever since has been so great a need for prayer for the Senate of the United States and for the country it is now, when it is sought to bring up the FEPC bill without any hearings and without any recommendations. I can see stronger and additional and sounder reason for the Chaplain praying for the Senate and the country now than in 1946, because in 1946 the committee at least had held some hearings on the bill and had made recommendations, whereas in 1950 there have been no hearings on the bill and no recommendations by the committee. We are now confronted with a naked bill which has had no more consideration than if it had been introduced on the

day the motion was made to proceed to its consideration.

No objection was made to the Chaplain's prayer. On the contrary, we were insisting that it be set forth in the Journal.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his observation.

Mr. President, I had intended to conclude before this time; but, as the Presiding Officer will note, there have been a good many interruptions, for which I have been glad to yield, of course.

The next case I wish to mention in connection with State legislation and State experience in the FEPC field or in the effort to have the States adopt State FEPC legislation is that of California.

I have already mentioned the referendum to the people of California, which was decided by such an overwhelming adverse vote by the people of California themselves in 1946, the vote being better than two and one-half to one, with approximately 2,250,000 votes cast, and with every county of the State showing a substantial majority, so I am informed, against the approval of the FEPC proposal.

However, the things I shall take up at this time are those having to do with attempts to have such legislation enacted in the great State of California. This comment will be based upon a rather lengthy monograph or letter written by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The entire monograph is available to any Senator who wishes to see it.

California's Legislature rejected the first FEPC bill introduced in that body on June 16, 1945. That was the date of rejection. The bill itself was introduced in the California Assembly on January 3, 1945. When the matter came up for vote, under the provisions of the California Constitution 60 favorable votes in the Assembly were required for the bill to be considered, but not that many votes could be mustered. Only 46 votes could be obtained in favor of its consideration, so the bill failed even to come up for consideration.

Following that occurrence in June 1945—and I quote now from the monograph of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

> The press of California reported that considerable pressure was being brought to bear on Governor Warren by minority groups to press for a California FEPC. In his proclamation convening an extraordinary session of the legislature on January 7, 1946, Governor Warren stated 53 purposes to be accomplished at this extra session. Purpose No. 14 was:
>
> "To consider and act upon legislation to provide for the prevention and elimination of practices of discrimination in employment—

And so forth. I shall not read the full text.

I read further from the letter from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

> As a result, an FEPC bill was introduced in the assembly the next day, January 8, 1946. That bill was reported from committee without recommendation and no action was ever taken on it. * * *
>
> Subsequently petitions began circulating to place on the November 1946 ballot an initiated measure—

Which I have mentioned previously in my remarks; and it was rejected so overwhelmingly by the voters of California in the election of November 1946.

I now read further from the letter of the Legislative Reference Service:

> The measure was defeated November 5, 1946, by over a million votes, totals being—for the measure, 675,697; against the measure, 1,682,646.
>
> It was in 1947, however, that the movement to sponsor an FEPC in California was given the final and fatal blow.

Mr. President, I am still quoting from the letter of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I continue to quote from it:

> One bill (S. B. No. 16) had been introduced in the senate and one bill (A. B. 2211) had been introduced in the assembly.
>
> Neither bill got further than being reported, for on March 24, 1947, a Joint Fact-Finding Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities in California reported that the proposed FEPC was Communist-inspired.

I wish to have the Senate note that point clearly, namely, that a joint fact-finding committee of the California Legislature, appointed to investigate this and other similar matters having to do with un-American activities, reported, during the pendency of those two bills, which were introduced in 1947, that—and I quote again from the letter of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

> A Joint Fact-Finding Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities in California reported that the proposed FEPC was Communist-inspired. Committee investigators reported that after an exhaustive study they found that more than one-half of the 63 sponsors identified with FEPC in California "had been prominent in movements sponsored by the Communists and left-wingers in California." The committee in its summary of findings stated—

Mr. President, there are two pages of the findings of the committee. Rather than weary the Senate by reading them, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the quotations from the committee report, as they appear in the letter from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The committee in its summary of findings stated:
>
> "The Communist Party infiltrates every conceivable mass organization in the country—'in trade unions, in farm organizations, in ladies' clubs, in Harlem, in the deep South, among the intellectuals.' It inspires the creation of mass organizations, to which non-Communists are attracted because of publicized purported 'liberal' objectives. This Communist work is everywhere efficiently centralized, correlated, directed and organized." (Assembly Journal, 1947, Report at p. 1629, and pp. 46 and 17 ff.)
>
> The committee, terming its findings "Behind the FEPC," reported:
>
> "BEHIND THE FEPC
>
> "Early in 1945 it became apparent to the Communist Party leaders in California that a political organization capable of drawing ethnical groups into its sphere of influence was necessary to supplement the work of its other fronts. The Communist inspired Fair Employment Practices Act (FEPC) was to be launched as a rallying point for racial minorities and the Communist Party hoped to mobilize these groups at the polls in the 1946 elections and thus carry their own candidates with an overwhelming vote for the initiative measure.
>
> "Committee investigators made an exhaustive study of the tracts, pamphlets, dodgers, handbills, and miscellaneous literature issued by the Southern California Committee for the Promotion of the Fair Employment Practices Act (FEPC), generally referred to in the 1946 elections as proposition No. 11. The committee learned that of the 63 sponsors and officers of the committee for proposition No. 11 more than one-half had been prominent in movements sponsored by the Communists and left-wingers in California.
>
> "Augustus F. Hawkins, assemblyman from the sixty-second assembly district in Los Angeles County, was listed as the executive director of the committee.
>
> "Hawkins has consistently followed the Communist Party line. In 1943 he endorsed a drive for funds for the west coast organ of the Communist Party, the People's Daily World. In 1942 he publicly urged the release of Earl Browder, then national secretary of the Communist Party in the United States. (Browder, at that time, was serving a 4-year sentence in a Federal penitentiary.) Hawkins is one of a handful of assemblymen in the California Legislature who has consistently voted against this committee investigating un-American activities in the State. In 1943 he succeeded Oscar Fuss, former functionary in the Communist-dominated Workers' Alliance as legislative director for the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Since this appointment Hawkins has been active in the CIO Political Action Committee. His name has been linked with American Youth for Democracy, formerly the Young Communist League, the People's Educational Center, the California Labor School, and other organizations notoriously known as Communist fronts.
>
> "Dolph Winebrenner was listed as the publicity director of the Southern California Committee for Proposition No. 11. Rena M. Vale (see the committee's 1943 report), a former member of the Communist Party and a witness before this committee, declared under oath that Winebrenner was a member of the professional section of the political commission of the Communist Party in the spring of 1938 and that she served with him on that commission.
>
> "As might be expected, the notorious Marxist, John Howard Lawson, is prominently listed as one of the sponsors of the FEPC proposition. The committee has had occasion to list the Communist activities of Lawson many times and the reader is referred to the committee's 1943 and 1945 reports, as well as the index of this report, for details. While John Howard Lawson is presently eking out a miserable proletarian existence as a screen writer at a fabulous salary in Hollywood, it must be remembered that he was formerly an associate editor of the official organ of the Communist Party of the United States, the New York Daily Worker.
>
> "Among other sponsors of the proposition, taken at random, are such well known party-liners as Fay Allen, Charlotta Bass, Rev. Clayton Russell, Reuben Borough, Carey McWilliams, Leo Gallagher, Samuel Ornitz, and Albert Maltz. Fay Allen, Charlotta Bass, and the Reverend Russell enthusiastically

sponsored and endorsed a call for a fund-drive for the official voice of the Communist Party on the west coast, the People's Daily World, July 9, 1943. Submission to Moscow is chronic with these individuals.

"Carey McWilliams is particularly distinguished by both the congressional and California legislative committees as an individual belonging to an outstanding number of satellites in Stalin's solar system. The reader is referred to the committee's 1943 and 1945 reports for further details on Carey McWilliams. (Also see index this report.)

"Leo Gallagher's Communist record in California is known to nearly every person who has had occasion to interest himself in public affairs. As in the case of Carey McWilliams and John Howard Lawson, the activities of Leo Gallagher are set forth in great detail in the pages of the reports heretofore submitted to the California Legislature. Gallagher is presently a member of the law firm of Katz, Gallagher and Margolis. Both Ben Margolis and Charles Katz, of the said law firm, have been active for many years in Communist Party activities in this State.

"Albert Maltz, Communist dialectic writer, has been used for a number of years for Communist Party 'window-dressing.' He recently caused a furore in Communist Party journalistic circles by daring to state that a novel might be written outside of the Stalinist intellectual straightjacket. Although the incident might have been concocted for ideological agitation for the benefit of backsliding Marxist hack-writers, the 'Maltz sin' was good for many issues in the Communist Party press. Such Kremlin stalwarts as John Howard Lawson and Samuel Sillen vigorously beat Maltz to his knees and after considerable fan-fare at the Embassy Auditorium in Los Angeles, Maltz recanted and now declares with Lawson and Sillen that 'art is a weapon.'

"Those who have read the committee's previous reports will have little difficulty in determining the character and purpose of the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act. The Communist Party had inspired it and the Communist Party was determined to find arguments, whether they existed or not, in support of the proposition. The Communist steering committee had to find terrorizing incidents in order to mobilize racial minorities into a frenzied stampede at the polls in November of 1946. If the needed incidents in question were not in existence, the Communist Party was prepared to manufacture them.

"It should be unnecessary to add that the proposition was deliberately designed to create racial frictions and agitations, rather than to remedy such discriminations between ethnical groups as actually existed" (ibid., pp. 46–48).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me read the concluding paragraphs of the letter from the Legislative Reference Service:

In 1949 the California Senate refused to adopt a resolution (S. Res. No. 49) which would have created a senate committee to study discriminatory practices in employment, and to study operation of the New York FEPC.

I wish that all Senators would note that point. In other words, so thoroughly had the public of California become convinced that FEPC was—as it is—Communist-inspired, that even a simple little resolution which would have created a California Senate committee to study discriminatory practices in employment and to study the operation of the New York FEPC Act was turned down and rejected by the California Senate.

The concluding paragraph of the letter from the Legislative Reference Service in reference to the action of the California Assembly in 1949 reads as follows:

The assembly killed an FEPC bill by refusing to force its withdrawal from committee, 35–31.

That completes the letter regarding the legislative occurrences in California in the case of this important matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, so that I may make a brief statement about an important matter relative to the pending question, but without causing the Senator from Florida to lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the majority leader for that purpose without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF FILING OF CLOTURE PETITION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Friday last, before the Senate took a recess until yesterday, I advised all of the Members of the Senate that probably on tomorrow a cloture petition would be presented under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to bring to a close the debate upon the motion which is pending before the Senate. On two or three different occasions—and the RECORD will show that I am correct in the statement I am about to make—I have advised the Members of the Senate who were vitally interested in this measure that they should be present in the Senate of the United States ready to vote upon a petition for cloture, to bring the debate to a close upon the motion to take up the bill, either Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday. I think I made that statement early in the debate, and I made another statement last Friday.

I merely make this statement now to advise Members of the Senate that this is an important petition which we are about to present. As everyone knows, under rule XXII, it is necessary for those seeking to bring the debate to a close to obtain 64 votes at the proper time. So every Senator—and I think I can say this regardless of whether he is a Democrat or a Republican—who believes that the debate on the motion should be brought to a close, is from now on acting on his own responsibility as to whether he is here on Friday next; because, tomorrow the petition for cloture will be presented, and, under the rules of the Senate, we will automatically vote on it at 1 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. President, I make this statement in the utmost good faith. I am now again advising Senators, especially Senators on this side of the aisle, who are interested in going along with the position of the majority leader, that those who do not vote on Friday next must take their own responsibility for failure to be present; and I undertake to say that there is no committee assignment, there is no speech to be made on the hustings anywhere that will excuse Senators from attendance at that time. In other words, unless an individual Senator is confined to a hospital or to his home because of illness, he ought to be here on Friday next, of all times.

I have heard the suggestions made that if we wait until Tuesday next, or if we present the petition today, more Senators will be present on Thursday of this week than there will be on Friday, and, if we present the petition on Friday, more Senators will be present on Tuesday than there will be on Friday. It is the same old story, Mr. President, which I have heard ever since I have been in the Senate. Frequently we have tried to accommodate Senators on both sides of the aisle who cannot be here at a certain time, and postponed a vote until another date; but I undertake to say the RECORD will show that the Senator from Illinois has repeatedly advised Senators that we would vote upon a cloture petition some time this week. So plenty of notice has been given, and there is absolutely no excuse in my opinion for a Senator, either upon this side of the aisle, or upon the other side, who is vitally interested in this FEPC measure, not being present on Friday.

I have before me a petition, at the present time, signed by 20 Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that petition be presented at this time, the vote on cloture will be had on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand. I am not going to present it now.

Mr. RUSSELL. A moment ago the Senator spoke of presenting it.

Mr. LUCAS. If I did, I did not so intend. But I am going to present it tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Illinois to say that he purposed to present the petition tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the Chair understand that the discussion now taking place, and any that may ensue on this point, will all be subject to the unanimous-consent agreement that I shall not be held to have lost my place on the floor?

Mr. LUCAS. We will guarantee that the Senator from Florida will not lose his right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is with that understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. What I started to say a moment ago, when I was interrupted by my able friend from Georgia, was this: We now have on this petition for cloture, which is being circulated today, the names of 20 Members of the United States Senate, 10 from the Democratic side, 10 from the Republican side. We have circulated the petition only during the last hour. What I intend to do is to place this petition on the desk, in front of the Parliamentarian, merely advising Senators on both sides of the aisle that they will have this afternoon to place their names on the petition, in the event they desire to do so. I am not going to circulate the petition any further. I hope those in charge of the respective sides of the aisle will advise

Democrats and Republicans that the petition for cloture will lie on the table this afternoon for any Senator who may want to sign it, and, sometime probably tomorrow, following the quorum call and a further explanation for the benefit of other Senators who may desire to sign it at that time, we shall then present it.

Mr. President, that practically concludes what I desired to say. I yield the floor, unless some Senator wishes to ask a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for an observation, provided he does not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator wishes to make an observation, I ask that the same unanimous-consent agreement be made as was made previously in order to allow the majority leader to make his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's rights will all be protected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, those of us who have been vitally interested in the new rule have cooperated with the majority leader in circulating the petition. I am glad he made the observation he did, that in the neighborhood of, I think, 20 Senators signed the petition almost immediately, and that, without any further circulation, the petition will lie upon the table until tomorrow, at whatever hour the distinguished majority leader determines to present it, and that the vote on the petition of course will be, as the majority leader has already stated, automatically at one o'clock on Friday afternoon.

I should like to say this is the first time there has ever been a vote on a cloture petition to take up a motion in the United States Senate, and it really affords an opportunity for those who believe that this motion has been debated for a sufficient length of time, to vote to terminate, without filibuster, further debate on a motion to take up.

As the distinguished majority leader has pointed out, it is vital that each and every Senator be in his seat. An absentee is in reality a negative vote, and as the majority leader has said, each Member who is absent will assume personal responsibility as to whether the motion prevails.

So I join with the majority leader in admonishing those on this side of the aisle, and, indeed, all Senators, that, because of the importance of this vote they should take notice and be present, especially since, as I have said, this is the first time there has ever been an opportunity to terminate debate upon a motion to consider a bill. I hope the membership will be present on Friday afternoon.

While I must confess to the majority leader that because one or two Senators on this side have business of their own involving primaries which will occur on Friday, it would have been to our advantage to have had the vote on Tuesday, yet I realize that no particular date which might be chosen would be satisfactory to 96 Senators.

With that statement, I shall be glad to have the vote on the cloture motion taken on Friday, and I ask full cooperation on the part of Senators on this side of the aisle, as well as on the other side, in carrying out the will of the Senate in this very important matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield so that I may make one further brief statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. With the same understanding, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, supplementing the statement I made a few moments ago, I desire to advise my friends of the press with reference to the agreement I made with them a short while ago that I would read the names from the floor in order that they might have them, that I have changed my mind, in view of the agreement which has been made permitting other Members of the Senate to sign the petition this afternoon. I suppose, when we finally finish the session this afternoon members of the press will be able to get the names.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, are we to understand that the Secretary is acting in the capacity of custodian for the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nebraska, rather than in his capacity as an official of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. A point of order, then, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What constitutes the presentation of a cloture petition if it is not presented when sent to the desk and placed in the hands of officers of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The petition has not been presented during the time the present occupant of the Chair has been presiding.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the point of order is rather nebulous, in the opinion of the Senator from Illinois. All I am trying to do is to accommodate Senators who desire to sign the petition. I did not ask the Parliamentarian or the clerk to take charge of the petition. I think it is proper to place it on one of the little tables in front, where all Senators can see it. I did not want any Senator to influence any other Senator to sign the petition. I want Senators to sign it voluntarily.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think they are likely to do it. Some of them do not belong to a group which could be influenced to sign the petition. I thought it was proper to make it clear that officials of the Senate had this petition as custodian for Senators rather than for the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not want any of the officials to assume responsibility. Obviously, it was never so intended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 469. An act for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener;

S. 1145. An act for the relief of Persephone Poulios;

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth;

S. 2258. An act for the relief of Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis;

S. 2308. An act for the relief of William Alfred Bevan;

S. 2427. An act for the relief of Masae Marumoto;

S. 2431. An act for the relief of Sumiko Kato;

S. 2443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgette Ponsard;

S. 2479. An act for the relief of A. D. Strenger and his wife Claire Strenger;

S. 2568. An act for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon; and

S. 3122. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4433. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass.; and

H. R. 4732. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union School district, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and to furnish said school district water free of charge.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6171) to authorize commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to administer certain oaths, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had concluded my brief relation of the efforts to enact FEPC laws in the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California. I again invite attention to the map on which the States shown in red, eight in number, have compulsory FEPC laws. The States shown in blue, 19 in number, have defeated or rejected proposed State FEPC laws. The States shown in white, 21 in number, have never considered any FEPC legislation. I again invite attention to the fact that the population of the eight States which adopted FEPC laws is between one-fourth and one-fifth of the population of the entire Nation, taking all population figures from the 1940 census. I have stated to the Senate that the latest estimate of population, last year, shows no substantial proportional change in the situation.

Mr. President, I know perfectly well that there are certain cities which have FEPC ordinances, which lie outside the

States which have that kind of measures. I have asked the Library of Congress to prepare a list of such cities, and I ask at this time to have it incorporated in the RECORD, indicating opposite the name of each city the date on which it adopted an FEPC ordinance. I call the names hurriedly, in passing. They are the cities of Chicago; Milwaukee; Cincinnati; Minneapolis; Philadelphia; Phoenix, Ariz.; Richmond, Calif.; and Cleveland, Ohio.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIES THAT HAVE FEPC IN SOME FORM

(Information obtained from Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service)

1. Chicago: August 21, 1945 (applies to city employees and public contracts).
2. Milwaukee: May 13, 1946.
3. Cincinnati: June 5, 1946.
4. Minneapolis: January 31, 1947 (general FEPC).
5. Philadelphia: March 16, 1948.
6. Phoenix: April 27, 1948.
7. Richmond, Calif.: May 16, 1949.
8. Cleveland: March 12, 1950.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think it is interesting to observe, and I ask all Senators to make particular note of the fact, that although some of the cities adopted FEPC ordinances or measures as long ago as 1945 and 1946, the cities which have adopted such an ordinance lie outside the States which have enacted FEPC legislation. I think that is of considerable importance, because it indicates rather clearly, first, that this kind of legislation seems to be most desired by urban dwellers in great centers in which there are large minority groups, particularly industrial centers, and, in the second place, it indicates rather clearly that the great mass of people who live in small cities, towns, and villages, and upon farms, have not been attracted by what they have seen in the way of FEPC legislation and enforcement in the several cities which I have mentioned. I think that is of importance, because it indicates rather conclusively that when we consider the people as a whole, apart from persons in great cities, they do not want FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, I invite particular attention—and I note with interest that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is on the floor—to the fact that a great city of his State, Minneapolis, adopted on January 31, 1947, more than 3 years ago, an FEPC ordinance of a compulsory nature, that the ordinance has been in effect and, as I have heard, has been enforced, since that time, but that his State legislature, since that time, has declined and refused to adopt proposals to enact State-wide legislation for the State of Minnesota. To the contrary, Mr. President, in 1949, at the end of a stormy session in which the Republican governor and the leadership of both parties had been trying to have State FEPC legislation adopted for the State of Minnesota, such proposed legislation was knocked down by a hostile vote in the senate of 34 to 29. It seems to me that if the good people of Minnesota, having had a chance to observe the situation in the city of Minneapolis, the largest city of the State, could have been persuaded that it was something worth while, sound, good, and wholesome, they would certainly have taken the opportunity to vote for it. As I say, the leadership of both parties were endeavoring to put it across, but the State senate knocked it down by a vote of 34 to 29, and the lower house of the Minnesota Legislature declined to report it from the committee.

Mr. President, I had the opportunity to make some observations in the course of a debate some weeks ago with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] who, I regret, is not on the floor at this time. In the course of the debate he was given the opportunity to comment upon the situation not only in Minnesota, but in the other States of the Nation, 19 of which have declined to pass FEPC laws. I want to read into the RECORD the words of the junior Senator from Minnesota in giving his explanation as to why State adoption was not obtained. Those words appear in a pamphlet printed by the American Forum of the Air. It was in a debate in that forum that the remarks were made. They appear in the following words:

I am glad my friend in Florida brought up the legislatures, because legislatures in this country are the most unrepresentative bodies in America.

Then, a little later, I remarked:

I am sorry, Mr. Moderator, that my distinguished friend does not believe in the type of democratic action that prevails in the State house of Minnesota.

To which the junior Senator from Minnesota replied in these words:

I surely don't.

Then, a little later, in the same record, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota had these further observations to make about legislatures—and I am particularly regretful, Mr. President, that any such comments should have been made with reference to the representative quality or character of State legislatures, for they are close to the people and generally respond very quickly and faithfully to the reaction of their people. It seems to me that State legislatures are highly representative, and that they are the custodians of a great part of the responsibility of our system of democratic government.

I read the later quotation.

Mr. THYE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like first to read this further quotation. After I have read it I shall be very glad to let the distinguished Senator defend his colleague.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say that I shall not attempt to defend my colleague. However, I should like to defend my legislative colleagues of Minnesota.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator, and I assure him that the Senator from Florida was glad to go to bat for the integrity, democracy, and high qualifications of the good citizens who, I am perfectly sure, comprise the majority of the members of both houses of the legislature of the great and good State of Minnesota, which has sent to the Senate the great and good man who formerly served as Governor of the State, the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield now, or does he wish first to complete his statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, I should like to complete reading the second quotation. Following that I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

I quote from the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]:

One more thing about the legislatures. I want to repeat that there is no one area of government in the United States that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures.

Mr. President, the Senator's first comment indicted his legislature. I shall yield in a moment, if I may, in order that the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Minnesota may, as I am sure he will, successfully defend the character and integrity of the representatives of his State in the State Legislature of Minnesota. However, in the second statement the junior Senator from Minnesota assumes greater jurisdiction. He made his remarks applicable in general to the legislative bodies of several States of the Union.

Mr. President, having been for a good many years a member of a State legislature myself, perhaps I am a little tender when it comes to criticisms which I think are improperly made of people who, generally at their own expense, and never with enough money paid to them to defray their expenses, go to their State capital in an effort to serve their fellows, their State, and the Nation. It seems to me it was peculiarly unfortunate for the advocates of FEPC to resort to this kind of defense when it is called to their attention, as it must be, that 19 States of the Union—all the States which the Senate can see depicted in blue on the chart—when proposals for the establishment of a State FEPC organization were presented to their State legislation for action either favorably or unfavorably, rejected the proposals and refused to regard them as a proper type of legislation to be adopted for the governance of the people of those great States.

I shall reread the last quotation:

One more thing about the legislatures. I want to repeat that there is no one area of government in the United States that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures.

In closing, and just prior to yielding to my good friend the senior Senator from Minnesota, I may say to the contrary that I think the fact that legislatures in 19 States—in some States four succeeding legislatures, in most States three succeeding legislatures—rejected such proposals and refused to be driven by minority pressure into the enactment of FEPC legislation for their States should not bring that kind of reward from anyone. I think that kind of statement should be publicized widely as the sort of defense which advocates of FEPC make when they are confronted with adverse rulings and decisions by the fine

and democratic people, whether they be Democrats or Republicans, who serve in the legislatures of the States of the Union.

If I may now do so without prejudicing my rights, I should like to yield to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I thank the very able Senator from Florida for yielding. As I said before, I shall not attempt to defend my colleague. However, having had the privilege of serving as Lieutenant Governor of Minnesota and thereby being privileged to serve as the presiding officer of the State legislature, and having been privileged to serve as Governor, I became very well acquainted with all the legislative members of both branches of the Legislature of Minnesota. I would say that that legislative body is as good a legislative body as will be found in any State. We elect the members of both houses without party designation. Therefore, we cannot point our finger and say, "This is the action of the Democratic Party," or, "This is the action of the Republican Party." Minnesota is a highly agricultural State. Minneapolis is its largest city, followed by St. Paul and Duluth. Many members of the legislature come from areas of the State as representatives of predominantly agricultural communities. We have never had serious trouble on the question of fair employment practices, because we are, as I said, a highly agricultural or rural State. I presume I could say without much contradiction that members of the legislature coming from a community where they have never heard any complaint of unfair employment practices would not have a strong conviction to protect a citizen against employment discrimination. Those of us who have had the privilege of serving in public capacities in the State know of instances where there has been employment discrimination.

It is for that reason that I personally, even though I come from a rural section of Minnesota, support the FEPC bill. In fact, I have signed the cloture petition. I definitely feel that if there is employment discrimination it should be corrected, because if I were an individual who had been discriminated against I would feel exceedingly unhappy, and I would try to apply to others the consideration I would have others apply to me.

Because I was privileged to serve as Governor of Minnesota—and I know that during that same time the able Senator from Florida was serving as Governor of his State, because we met in several Governors' conferences—I would say to my distinguished friend that even though Minnesota is a strictly agricultural State, I personally feel that the underprivileged should be protected. I feel that if a person is subjected to discrimination of any kind those of us who are privileged to serve in public office should try to protect him. I have supported FEPC legislation. I defend the members of the legislative body of my State because it is composed of honorable men. They have excellent and good intentions. I know that if they voted against such legislation they did it with a strong conviction that it was not necessary. I wish they had voted for it. However, I do not criticize a man for that, because I believe he voted the dictates of his heart, rather than the dictates and influences pressing on him.

I say again that I defend the members of the legislature of my State. The Senator from Florida and I may differ on a legislative question, but we do not condemn one another. We are oftentimes misjudged and condemned because we have voted in a certain manner in the Senate. When we have done so people have thought that we either acted contrary to our beliefs or we had been influenced unduly by certain political pressure. At the same time, never have I condemned a man because of his vote, since I know he voted according to his conviction, and possibly a year or 2 years later something may occur which would change his mind, and he might vote contrary to the very vote he cast 2 years before, in another legislative term or session.

Therefore, I say to the very distinguished and able Senator from Florida that I find myself entertaining a different conviction from that entertained by him on this legislative question. But I do not condemn him because of his conviction. I merely say that I recognize that his conviction is an honest one, and my honest conviction is that I should vote for such a measure as that we are discussing if I have the privilege of doing so in the Senate in the next few days or in the next few weeks. I hope we may vote on it. I hope the debate may not run so long that we will not reach a vote. I hope the cloture petition will result in limiting debate, and that we can actually reach a vote on the measure itself, because fair employment practices, if carried out in the manner in which the bill provides, are worthwhile, in my humble opinion.

It must be terrible to be an individual who is being discriminated against. The Senator and I have not suffered that type of experience, but I assert that if I were in a minority, and found definitely that I was being discriminated against, and that I could not in any sense protect myself, I would be very unhappy. We know that any man under those circumstances would be unhappy, and, as such, he would not be as good a citizen as one who felt his country gave him the same opportunity others enjoyed. So again I say I hope we can reach a vote on the measure. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. As always, he is magnificent in his tolerance and in his understanding, and I have perfect confidence that he will do what he thinks is right.

Sometimes the background from which we come forces us to different conclusions. I note from the census figures for 1940 covering the Senator's own great State of Minnesota that, as against a white population in that year of 2,768,000, a little over two and three-quarter million whites, there resided in his great State in that year 9,928 Negro citizens, and 13,390 citizens of other races. I would not know who they were, but I suppose they would be largely Indians.

Mr. THYE. They would be Indians, because we have quite a sizable Indian population.

Mr. HOLLAND. The figures show a total of approximately 23,000 people in the Senator's State other than whites, out of over 2,750,000 population, whereas in the same year, 1940, in my own State—another good State—the figures were these: White, 1,381,000; Negro, 514,000; other races, 1,230, the latter, I assume, being largely the Seminole Indians in Florida. So that, as the Senator will see, there are very great differences between the backgrounds, from the population standpoint, in his State and my State. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent, if the Senator will yield for that purpose, that I may make a correction of the RECORD regarding the incident which occurred in connection with the 1946 discussion on FEPC with the understanding that the Senator will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to make the unanimous-consent request, and I hope it will be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Earlier in the debate this afternoon I stated that we of the North have been somewhat discouraged in this matter because of what happened in the Senate in 1946, when the FEPC bill came up after hearings had been held by the Senate committee.

I said that we were discouraged because there had been an evident intention then to delay the consideration of FEPC through technical parliamentary points which were made. That is true.

However, I was in error as to the precise parliamentary point which was made, and I should like to correct the RECORD on that point now. I said that a southern Senator objected to the prayer of the Chaplain of the Senate on the ground that it did not make a proper reference to Deity. That, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] pointed out, was an error. What happened was that on the 17th day of January the Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, offered a prayer, which was printed, as usual, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but which, as usual, was not printed in the Journal of the Senate. The difference between the Journal and the RECORD is known to every Senator. The Journal merely records the acts of the Senate, while the RECORD reports the debates and full procedures.

The prayer of the Chaplain on the 17th of January was included in the RECORD for that day, as always, but it was not included in the Journal, since prayers never had been included in the Journal.

On the following day, the then Senator from Louisiana, Senator Overton, rose and refused to join in the approval

of the Journal for the preceding day on the ground that the prayer had not been included, and made a motion that the prayer be so included. The motion was debated for some days, and I believe that if there had been a desire on the part of our friends from the South that it be brought to a test, it probably could have been rather quickly brought to a vote.

Some days later the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] moved to lay the motion of the Senator from Louisiana on the table, and that motion was agreed to. But almost immediately thereafter the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] moved that all those Senators who had not answered to the quorum call on the 17th of January should have their names listed in the Journal. Again, I may say, it had not previously been the practice to list the names of the absent Senators in the Journal, and the practice was instead to list only the names of those who did answer to the quorum call. The motion of the Senator from North Carolina was debated for some days.

In other words, while the Senator from Illinois was technically inaccurate in the reference he made about the precise grounds of objection, I think he was completely accurate regarding the spirit of what went on. It was about that spirit that I wanted to comment, namely, that while I would have preferred that we actually hold hearings on the FEPC bill in the committee, we were discouraged from doing so because of what happened on the floor of the Senate in 1946, when one technical point after another was raised to prevent the bill from even being considered.

We are dealing here with grave matters, and I know that there is always a temptation to resort to technical parliamentary defenses in order to prevent action which one fears will be hostile to the interests of the section or group which we hold closely at heart.

If that program is carried through, however, we really come back to Calhoun's theory of concurrent majorities, namely, that no action shall be taken by a majority of the Senate or the House unless it is also a majority of each and every section or group which has representatives on the floor of the Senate or House. Calhoun's theory has been repeatedly discussed, but I do not think it has ever become part of the constitutional procedure of the country.

Without wishing to read a lecture to anyone, I think if we would all be more willing to agree to a decision of the majority, it would be better for the country as a whole. I should like to point out to my good friend that already, by the system of equality of representation of the States, the small States have been given great protection in this body and the South has also been given a great deal of protection. We do not wish to be unfair to any section, but we do believe that matters as important as this should at least be allowed to be considered.

I want to thank my good friend from Florida for the courtesy he has shown in permitting me to make this statement in correction of the RECORD. I think the RECORD will show that the substance of what I said was correct, even though the precise ground on which the late Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Overton, made his objection, was not correctly stated.

I want to thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois. I am glad to have him so meticulously straighten out this matter affecting prayer. I suspect it would not hurt either the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Florida, or any other Senators in this body if we gave more attention to that subject. I am glad the Senator from Illinois was so careful to see that whatever he had said about that important subject was correctly shown in the RECORD.

I may say before the Senator leaves, however, that there is one thing he has said that I think he would not have said if he had given really accurate thought to the situation in which the Senate finds itself. He has stated, as I understand, that the reason why he is inclined to reject the idea of any considerable discussion of a motion to take up was that something happened in 1946 having to do with the prayer, and under the rules which prevailed then and not now.

I call to the distinguished Senator's attention the fact that he is again doing what some little while ago he warned the Senator from Florida not to do. He is permitting the dead hand of the past, even under a past rule which does not now exist at all, to becloud his vision and to cause him to become set in his views against something which is going on here now which is not at all governed by the rule then prevailing, and is not at all comparable to what was done then. Instead, the Senate is proceeding under another rule which does allow cloture on a motion to take up, a rule which by the way is a decided improvement over the old one, and which was adopted by the vote of the very Senators against whom the Senator inveighs from time to time as being from below the Mason and Dixon's line, but over the disapproving vote, as the Senator from Florida recalls, of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Who, the Senator from Florida correctly recalls, was not among those who voted for the substitution of the new, sounder, and saner rule for the old rule of which the Senator now complains. I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator when he reads the RECORD of what he said, will not want to express the opinion that the Senator from Illinois inveighs against those from below the Mason and Dixon's line. If the Senator from Illinois has ever done that he certainly is most apologetic. I do not believe that the RECORD will ever show that he has. He has characterized many of those who live in the South as coming from below the Mason and Dixon's line, but he has never inveighed against them. On the contrary he has tried to treat them in a gentlemanly fashion, both by word and act.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida may now say something very clearly. The Senator from Florida does not recall that any other Senator who has been in this body has referred to the Senators from the South as the Senators from below the Mason and Dixon's line except the Senator from Illinois. He has referred to us in that way a great many times within the hearing of the Senator from Florida, which is quite an appropriate designation, but not customarily made by other Senators. The Senator from Florida thinks that Senators from the South have just about the same attitude respecting great questions of national policy, respecting questions of the safety, the security of the Nation, and the soundness of legislation, as have Senators from any other section of the Nation. We are not accustomed to thinking of Senators as coming from either our part of the Nation or from Chicago, Ill., or from some other part of the Nation, no matter how remote or how different in philosophy the people there may be from the people who have sent the southern Senators to this body. We think of ourselves all as Members of the United States Senate commissioned to do the same job. Without desiring at all to say anything that would be unpleasant or even hinting at such a thing, the Senator from Florida wishes again to say that in no case except by the remarks of the junior Senator from Illinois, does the Senator from Florida remember any Senator having adverted, and particularly at numerous times, to his colleagues from the South as Senators from below the Mason and Dixon's line. So I hope that the Senator may retrace his steps on that and decide that that is not a necessary feature of his service in the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President and Senators, there is one more point I should like to make at this stage before I go to the latter portion of my remarks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it would be better for me to proceed for a moment, and later I shall be glad to yield.

Referring to the maps which appear in the back of the Chamber, I again remind Senators of the fact that on the map to which I point the States shown in red are the only States which have a compulsory FEPC. They are 8 in number. The States shown in blue, 19 in number, are the States which have rejected FEPC legislation for themselves. The total population of those 19 States is considerably more than 2 to 1 as compared to the States which have adopted FEPC legislation.

The States shown in white, 21 in number, are States which have not given any consideration to FEPC legislation, for the reason, presumably, that they regard it as unworthy of serious consideration.

Mr. President, I call attention to the other map for a moment, because I want Senators to realize what it is that is being suggested by way of voting upon 40

States, and upon the people of 40 States, 19 of whom have rejected the philosophy of FEPC, and voting upon the Nation as a whole, a concept of governmental interference in employment practices which has been regarded as acceptable and satisfactory in only 8 States of the Nation, whereas the other 40 have not so regarded it. I want that to be contrasted with the effort, with the approach, which we made toward prohibition a good many years ago in good faith, and with the desire to attain an objective, and after the people of most of the States of the Union had decided that for their own governments, for their own States, they wanted prohibition. Thirty-three States—and the map to which I point shows the 33 States in red—had voted State prohibition, either constitutionally so or by statute, most of them by constitutional provision, before the adoption of the Federal constitutional amendment for national prohibition.

I simply wanted in passing to give this contrast to the Senate and to the public between the approach then made and the approach now attempted to be made, which is so completely unwise, as contrasted with the other, I want the people of the Nation to understand that, aside entirely from what the South may want or may think about this matter, the people of the Nation as a whole, outside the South, have expressed themselves by a tremendous majority as not wanting this type of legislation.

Mr. President, lest the contrast with prohibition go too far, I desire to make it very clear that the Senator from Florida is not claiming that prohibition was a success even though it was adopted on a national scale after 33 States had individually provided for it. To the contrary, we all know the melancholy history of that effort. It was not a success. If the Senate will note, many of the same States which have now projected themselves into the State FEPC field were States which would not accept prohibition for themselves, and were therefore among the relatively few States, 15 in number, which were brought along under attempted compulsion by Federal law when the Federal Government embarked on national prohibition. I do not have to remind the Senate that the attempt to drive the people of great States into that field, personal as it was, sumptuary as that legislation was, was a tragic failure, and that it broke down not only the national structure but it broke down the satisfactorily functioning structure in most of the States which had adopted for themselves prohibition prior to that time.

I want the Senate to stop, look, and listen, and to realize what a terrible and tragic comparison there is between this untimely effort and that much more well-timed effort, unsuccessful as it was, in the case of the adoption of national prohibition.

I now yield for a question to my friend the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Florida was discussing with the very able and learned Senator from Illinois the question of committee hearings, and the Senator from Illinois made the point that it was because of fear that this legislation might require extended debate in the Senate that no committee hearings were held.

I simply wanted to ask the Senator if it is not true that usually proper committee hearings reduce the time necessary to dispose of proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate, and that many times it is because of the failure of a committee properly to explore proposed legislation that there occurs in the Senate lengthy debate, which might have been avoided had the committee done its duty and attempted to work out the differences and to reconcile the conflicting points of view?

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment, and certainly it is a correct one.

Mr. President, I see that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has now come to the floor. I wish to restate what I put in the RECORD—unfortunately, in his absence—a few minutes ago, at the time when I read from the record of his joint debate with the junior Senator from Florida on the subject of FEPC, over the American Forum of the Air, some months ago.

I may say to the Senator from Minnesota, in order that he may understand clearly what I have done, that in discussing the subject of the rejection of FEPC legislative proposals on the State level by numerous State legislatures within the Nation—19 in all—I commented on the position taken by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota in the course of that debate, and I quoted from his remarks the following words:

> Now let's go into the legislatures for a while. I am glad my friend in Florida brought up the legislatures, because the legislatures in this country are the most unrepresentative bodies in America.

I made no pretense of reading the entire record, although of course the Senator from Minnesota may put all of it into this RECORD if he wishes to do so.

A little later, in response to my comment—

> I am sorry, Mr. Moderator, that my distinguished friend doesn't believe in the type of democratic government that prevails in the statehouse in Minnesota.

The Senator from Minnesota replied:

> I surely don't.

A little later, in the course of the debate, I quoted these remarks by my distinguished friend:

> One more thing about the legislatures. * * * I want to repeat that there is no one area of Government in the United States that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures.

Mr. President, I quote these statements again at this time, now that the junior Senator from Minnesota has arrived on the floor of the Senate, simply because I want to make it very clear that I regretted that he was not here when I made the statement earlier today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I simply want the Senator to know that it is my intention properly to reply to the comments he has made, and at the same time to present some factual material pertaining to the observations the Senator from Florida has made.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I simply wanted to make it clear in the RECORD that I was completely willing to discuss the matter objectively and dispassionately, just as the discussion occurred with the Senator on the previous occasion.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the Senators from States which have rejected FEPC proposed legislation up to this time have not seen fit to take the floor of the Senate in behalf of the action of the majority of their State legislatures, which repeatedly—for two, three, or four sessions, and most of them for three sessions—have rejected FEPC proposals. I say that because I think such Senators could speak much more accurately regarding the attitude of their people and of the members of their State legislatures than could anyone else.

However, I may say that we have endeavored to get the gist of the argument which runs through the various newspaper reports, through the various reports of committees, and through other documents which tend to show the arguments which were most persuasive in bringing on the results which developed in the various State legislatures.

I present, without any intention whatsoever of holding them out as being an exclusive listing of the reasons why the people of the several States have so clearly and conclusively in 19 cases rejected the setting up of a State FEPC, first, the question of constitutionality. As to that question, I am not able to give the arguments which were advanced. I realize perfectly well that they are different from the arguments which would be made here, where the principal arguments would be made on the ninth and tenth amendments to the United States Constitution. However, apparently that was one of the strong grounds of argument and differences of opinion, because the record shows that numerous States in their legislative proceedings did consider the submission of constitutional amendments to be voted upon and considered by the people of their States—indicating very clearly that they felt a strong question of constitutionality was involved.

In every case which has been brought to my attention—and I have tried to get the background of the argument in each case—and in every case in which the argument was submitted to the legislature for its consideration, the legislature declined to submit such a constitutional amendment to the people for their approval or disapproval.

The second thing which seems to have disturbed them greatly is the point that

the important property right which belongs to every employer and every manager of property to be free in the selection of his own employees, was adversely affected in a way which the legislatures apparently thought was completely incompatible with American free enterprise and the American way of doing things.

In passing, I call the attention of the Senate briefly to the point that this matter not only relates to the qualifications, so far as training, experience, and ability to do a particular job with head or hand are concerned, on the part of a particular applicant, but it also goes much deeper than that, because it runs to the question of whether or not the applicant is, in the judgment of a property owner who operates his business, best suited to work cooperatively under the owner or the management with other employees who already are there. I call attention to the fact that one of the greatest tests of sound executive ability is not solely the question of getting well-qualified personnel, but also the question of getting personnel who can work well with each other and can constitute a good team who can get things done.

I also call the attention of the Senate—and apparently this was one of the subject matters frequently debated in the legislatures of the several States—to the fact that the freedom of selection of employees is hopelessly diminished by the proposed intervention in the form of either State law or a Federal law, if one were passed by the Congress, and that that interference constitutes the deprivation of an important property right which pertains to the property and its enjoyment and the making of it to pay dividends to give back what it should give back in the way of earnings to the owner.

The third thing which I notice was debated was the freedom of the selection of associates, particularly as applicable to unions. Unions have always felt that they had a definite concern in the matter of choosing and having some right to pass upon the qualifications and character and personality of the persons who would serve with them as their associates with full fraternal membership in the body in which all of them were members. That seems to have been one of the questions which was debated. I think all Senators will agree that certainly it is a pertinent question. Before I leave that subject, let me point out to the Senate that not only is the right of the employer involved here, but also this matter involves a very deep and dangerous question running to the matter of the continued and successful functioning of labor unions, because the preferential rights which undoubtedly will accrue to minority employees will also indubitably accrue to minority groups and their members who are members of labor unions, against the ordinary John Doe, the average citizens who also are members, and to the great majority of the membership of the several unions.

The next point I make is the preferential deal that is given to minorities and also the diminished rights of the majority of average American employees. I do not think there is any majority group in this Nation which wishes to withhold from any minority group or any member of it any right to succeed, any opportunity to do well. But he certainly does not want such a right or such an opportunity to be carved out of his own rights, and to leave him with less protection, less security, and less rights; and that is exactly what is intended, and what will be accomplished under this particular measure, if it be adopted. That argument was made in the various States. Evidently it was highly persuasive. Nineteen States knocked it down.

Fifth, the unsound governmental policy of catering to minorities. Mr. President, I do not have to expound that principle to Senators who have grown gray in politics, who know so well that it is the established vogue in politics in this day and time to pander to minority groups and that minority groups in large measure dictate what is in many of our political platforms. That is an unsound condition.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment. It is unsound, it is undemocratic, and it leaves the country in a position of not putting first things first, and putting first issues out where they will command the greatest importance, but, instead, in the position of trafficking in this or that political deal, which will leave that particular party in the best position to command the vote and support of a minority group or groups in a key State, which may be so nearly in the balance as between the strength of the two great political parties that the minority groups, by going one way or the other, will determine the outcome of the election. I now yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. What would constitute a minority group in one section of the United States might almost be a majority in another section. I have always felt it was my good fortune that, in 1917, I was privileged to serve with men from the deep South while in the air service. I came into Jefferson Barracks, Mo., early one morning, getting off the train from the North. A group of boys came in from Mississippi, Arkansas, and Georgia. We were in a way thrown together. A company was formed. I was about the only northern man in the company with that group of southern boys. I served for practically a year with them. I learned more about the deep South in that year's time than I had ever learned from history books. I may say to the Senator, I believe that when he speaks of minority groups in the northern section of the United States, they would be the majority in the southern part of the United States—I think the Senator will agree with me about—and what we think of in the North as a minority group, would be in the deep South a majority. For that reason, I can fully appreciate what the Senator is confronted with, and I can appreciate what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is sitting here, is confronted with. But, nevertheless, I recognize the great problem fair-employment practices may encounter, and that certain groups which might be a majority in the Senator's section of the country might be a minority in my section of the country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I recognize what the Senator is confronted with. That is one reason why the Senator advances the argument he does. But I come back to the first statement I made regarding the man who is discriminated against, who cannot obtain employment, or who is denied this, that, or the other privilege, because of race or color, or because he comes from the wrong side of the railroad tracks, or the wrong side of the village. That man or that person is unhappy, and I am in favor of helping him through the enactment of legislation which will put him on a par with myself and with the Senator in respect to his rights and opportunities.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or, rather, that I may make a statement at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for the purpose of asking the Senator from Florida a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Speaking for the State of Mississippi, there is certainly no discrimination in employment in that State because of race, color, or national origin. In all the hearings which are talked about, there will not be found a scintilla of proof that there is discrimination in Mississippi or in any other State of the deep South. I deny most emphatically any statement that there is discrimination in my State based on race or color.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will permit me to make a reply to the able Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield for a few minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, for the purpose stated, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not want the able Senator from Mississippi to labor under the mistaken thought that I was in any sense attempting to convey the idea that there was discrimination, insofar as employment is concerned, against any individual or group in the State of Mississippi. I do not believe I made that statement, but, if I did, or if I left the impression that I was trying to convey such an idea, I do not want the matter to be left in that way. What I was answering was the argument of the very able Senator from Florida, and what I said was that what constituted a minority in one section of the United States might well constitute a majority in another section. I was not referring to discrimination in Mississippi against one group or class of people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I correctly understood the Senator from Minnesota, and, without recognizing any situation at all, or any State in which that is the case—and that would certainly be possible—the position of the

Senator from Florida would be exactly the same in any such case. The question is whether the long hand of the Federal law should be extended to the point of regimentation of private business, seeking to assume control in such matters as the hiring and firing of an employee for reasons which seemed sufficient to the owner or manager of the business. I think that too few of the advocates of this legislation have given any consideration at all to this fact, which is an undoubted fact, that the quality which real executive ability displays is not necessarily the ability to find a person well qualified to serve, because generally the field is large. Executive ability shows itself best in the selection of people who can work together, who can work together and turn out a very much greater job together than they could if there were friction or misunderstanding between them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I can think of no greater disservice that could be done to a prospective employee than to allow him to be employed as a member of a personnel group in employment where the employer knew in advance that he could not possibly get along, that he could not possibly be happy, that he would not be fairly treated, or knew what would be even more to the point, that the employer himself did not trust that applicant, did not trust that employee, or did not believe that he personally could get along with him.

Mr. President, this matter of choosing employees goes so much further than the mere matter of looking for qualifications, as they do in civil service.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Before yielding to my friend I must add this additional thought. It seems to me that what the misguided friends and advocates of FEPC are doing is trying to set up a sort of grandiose civil-service operation, to operate in all the businesses of the Nation and to have the sole question, whenever an applicant comes forward, this: Can he do this job? Is his training and experience such that he can do it under all possible circumstances, without reference to what those circumstances or what those surroundings would be?

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota has been a successful governor of his great State, and I know perfectly well that his success and the fine record he left there, the splendid reputation which he bears there, is not confined simply to his finding men who could do the job, but the finding of men who, as his key men, his little cabinet, his appointees, men who made his record for him in large part, because, speaking from experience, I know that no governor by himself can do very much of the hard work that has to be done; he chose men who could work with each other and who were sold on his philosophy, sold on the way he wanted to get things done, and who were not simply trained or experienced so that they should have been able to turn out a good job in that particular post.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator agree that the great underlying controversy here is whether we shall deprive the American people of a right inherent in citizenship, a right which is inherent in free men, which is the right of freedom of association? Without that right there can be no such thing as human freedom in the United States. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct. The Senator will recall that one of those who so ably debated the question on the floor, quoted two or three times from the words of Justice Brandeis with reference to freedom to be let alone, freedom to do business as one sees fit, which is a freedom of incalculable value and benefit. Without it we would be no longer Americans. The advocates of this un-American measure seek to take away that right to be let alone in the handling of their own business, the selection of their employees and associates. They seek to deprive the American people of a heritage which goes back before the foundation of this Nation, and it attaches itself to our form of law and of society. They want to make us over. I say, with all respect, to my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has convictions, that I think he is wrong, just as he doubtless thinks the Senator from Florida is wrong.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that if the Congress of the United States has the power, under the Constitution, to pass a law infringing upon the right of freedom of association or freedom of employment, a great hoax has been perpetrated on the people of the country? We have been deceived. It is not a free country, if such a power is in the American Congress. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree implicitly. I do not believe there is any such power. If there is such power, our founding fathers certainly never mentioned it or dreamt of it, and never sought to engraft that sort of thing upon their employment practices or their living practices. They went forth as free men. They looked out on that great area, which has since become the great State of Minnesota, for individuals who were strong and sturdy and who would go with them to help make the land fruitful. They were looking for people with whom they could work.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. The very fact that the Senator and I are here is because some of our ancestors did not like the yoke under which they lived in their respective communities and countries, and they were willing to face the hardships of crossing the ocean, in all its vastness, to come to America and blaze trails across the wilderness to establish homes and communities for the privilege of being free men and free women and for the privilege of doing things in accordance with their own convictions.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. That is why the Senator and I are here, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly right. When opportunities were offered, they were not parceled out among so many Catholics and so many Protestants, among so many white persons and so many colored persons, among so many English and so many Scotch persons. They were given to persons who were willing to stand by each other loyally. They settled together as friends and associates. They chose each the other, and they did not even think about such things as those which would be placed in dominant position by the passage of this particular bill. The Senator has made out our case completely. We do not want to be dividing the sheep and the goats. I know the Senator from Minnesota does not try to parcel out the opportunities in connection with his broad farm lands in Minnesota, among particular groups. He is looking for men and women who can get the job done.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. The Senator has very ably stated the situation. We do not examine applicants for employment to see whether they have some individual characteristic. We choose an individual because we think he can serve us best in the capacity in which he is employed. When we were blazing trails across the wilderness in this great land there was no question of employment discrimination, because every hand was needed to do the job which lay before the early settlers. But today we are finding conditions a wee bit different in some of our densely populated areas. When the man is seeking the job there can be discrimination. During the war years the job was seeking the man, and, therefore there was no discrimination, and the question was not nearly so acute as it was prior to World War II and as we can anticipate it at some future time.

It does not make me happy to argue this particlar question with my friend from Florida, but inasmuch as I was drawn into it by the reference to the State legislature of Minnesota, I found myself compelled to try to defend my convictions. I am not attempting to be argumentative with the Senator from Florida. I was defending myself because the State of Minnesota, which I in part represent, was brought into the debate.

I am very strong in my conviction that fair employment is a question which should be not only debated, but actually voted on, because, while it is not a tremendously important question in Minnesota, I recognize that in some of the metropolitan areas in other States it is a very important question. In future years we may find it more acute than we have known it to be in the past.

If I may impose a little more on the time of the able Senator from Florida, I should like to comment to this extent, that during the war years, when it was an easy matter for a disturbance to

break out in an industrial plant, or a war factory in metropolitan centers, I was sitting in the governors' conference at Columbus, Ohio, with the Senator from Florida and with the Governor of Michigan, and other governors, when information came to the Governor of Michigan that a riot was taking place in one of the industrial centers of his State. He had to leave the governors' conference so that he could be on hand at the point where the riot was taking place.

After the conference I returned to my State and assembled a group of men and women, and said, "I do not want any such mob action to disrupt the normal functions of industries in my State." I wanted their advice as to how we might organize to meet such a contingency. Out of that conference came the Interracial Commission, in which all classes of people and all religious beliefs were cemented in one organization. Very little disturbance occurred. We had a splendid record of labor achievement in Minnesota and in racial attitudes and feelings of persons towards one another. I was always grateful to those who helped me in bringing about the organization of the Governors' Interracial Commission.

So I say to the Senator from Florida that while I know it is a problem to the Senator and to other Senators in Southern States, I feel that it is a question which we should be able to answer. If we cannot find the answer in the bill which is before us, let us amend it into such a form that there can be no race discrimination, so that a man who was born with a certain color of skin shall not be denied that which another man is permitted to have. That is my conviction.

I am one who was born of immigrants, and whose way was not easy. I could not speak the language of the land when I first entered public school. I could not speak the language that was spoken at school. Consequently I suffered much in the way of being ribbed, kidded, and mimicked, until I mastered the language. Perhaps I am somewhat sensitive about the man who cannot meet the circumstances and the environment in which he finds himself. He may not be able immediately to fit himself into the working conditions that exist in a plant. However, if we give him an opportunity he will fit himself into the plant and into the working conditions. While he may not be qualified today, if we help him, give him the opportunity, he will become qualified. It is for that reason that I have such strong convictions about FEPC legislation. Unless a man is given the opportunity to demonstrate his willingness, desire, and intelligence to learn he will never get there. He will be on a different level for all time to come, and so will his children. It is for that reason that I enter into debate even with one whom I so highly respect and like as I do the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. May I say that the Senator may be correct in his view that there was no discrimination in his good State in the early days. I suspect that the forefathers of the 13,000 Indians who are still in his State might have debated the subject with him. I remember as well as he the matter of the calling of the distinguished former Governor of Michigan from the governors' conference to handle the riot in Detroit. We who gathered at the Governors' conference knew that the riot had not happened because the white people or the colored people in Detroit wanted it to happen. We knew it did not happen because there was no law in Detroit. It happened in the face of the law. These things always happen in the face of the law. They cannot be solved by purely legal technique. The good Senator from Minesota knows that perfectly well.

We people in the South, as other people in the Nation, have been striving with all the strength we command to solve peaceably and with good will and understanding the problems which exist in our part of the country. We have gone a long, long way in solving them. As long as the Senator has mentioned the matter of violence, I should like to invite his attention to the fact that the sum total of violence which has occurred, all of which we deplore, in this field in the Southeastern States in recent years, does not begin to equal, in terms of individuals whose lives were taken or people who were hurt and sent to the hospital, to what has happened in areas of the country farther north. The Senator mentioned the riot in Detroit. My recollection is that 34 lives were lost and something over 500 people taken to the hospital. That same year in the Harlem riot five lives were lost and some 500 people were taken to the hospital. In more recent times, as the Senator will recall, we have had the so-called Peekskill riot in New York. That riot did not happen because there was no law. Sometimes these things break out in the very face of the law. There is a good deal of the human in all of us. A law goes as far as it can in keeping down or preventing grotesque manifestations of human hatred, but those manifestations are not entirely eliminated by any law. So it was with the recent riot in Harlem on the night after the convicted Communists were released on bail. Quite a number of policemen of the city of New York, who were simply trying to maintain order, had to be taken to the hospital. In addition, a great amount of property was destroyed, and many people were hurt. In those parts of the country where many fewer Negroes—to speak of one particular minority—are present than are found in other parts of the country, and where people look with as much aversion as we in the South look on such things, there has been vastly more trouble and vastly more deaths, more injuries, and there has been vastly more trouble of the type that I have just been mentioning a while ago than occurred throughout the southland.

Mr. President, before leaving this point, let me remind the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that down in our part of the country, where some 45,000,000 people reside—from Kansas City to Miami, and from Baltimore to the Rio Grande—of those 45,000,000 about 34,000,000 are of the same color as the Senator and myself, and about 11,000,000 are human beings, our brethren, who happen to be of a different color. We are having a better performance in the field of violence than is being had anywhere else in the country. I say it would be a fatal blunder, even though it may be a well-intended movement, to try to put the dominant hand of the Federal Government into this matter of employment practices and the kindred matters which go along with it and are part of this problem, which I had intended to mention a little later. We are making tremendous progress, and we are making it rapidly. We want to make it without intervention and without interruption and without having the hand of the Federal law come in. It is a hand which does not understand our problem. We would not attempt to tell the distinguished Senator from Minnesota how to handle the 13,000 Indians in his State. We do not know anything about those problems. Nor would we undertake to tell the good people of New Mexico how to handle their Mexicans, or the Californians how to handle their orientals. Neither would we undertake to tell the people of New York State how to handle their manifold minorities, which when added up, almost constitute a majority. We are content to let them handle their own problems. We know that they will handle them soundly and in accordance with the best American traditions and customs. We do not believe it to be sound government or sound planning to have someone sitting here in the cloistered Senate of the United States, who knows nothing at all about the juxtaposition of 11,000,000 people of one color with 34,000,000 people of another color in every town, hamlet, and community in the Southland, to try to assert his judgment, as in the case of the Senator from Minnesota, for example, based upon his limited personal experience. I do not believe the Senator from Minnesota would wish to impose his judgment in a a field which we know to be one of the most difficult fields offered in human relations and which must be solved by human minds.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, without taking the Senator from Florida from the floor I want to announce that tomorrow, immediately after we get through with the routine business which plagues every session of the Senate, I expect to make a motion to bring up for consideration Senate Resolution 253, which deals with Reorganization Plan No. 7. I understand that motion is not debatable. So I give notice that I shall make such a motion tomorrow.

Time for consideration of reorganization plans is running out very rapidly. As I understand we must conclude action with respect to the various plans by May

23. I understand furthermore that the Senate has entered into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Friday the 18th with respect to cloture. There may be other votes had on the 18th. So the last day on which we may be able to consider reorganization plans will be Monday, May 22. Four resolutions dealing with reorganization plans have been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my hope that the Senate can dispose of Senate Resolution 253 which relates to Reorganization Plan No. 7, and Senate Resolution 256 which relates to Reorganization Plan No. 11. I do not believe the debate will take much time tomorrow. I do not expect to speak for more than an hour. I do not believe more than an hour and a half will be required for the affirmative side of the question. I presume those speaking on the negative side will require about the same amount of time. So perhaps we can act on several of the resolutions tomorrow.

The two other Senate resolutions which were reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will probably not require so much time as the first two to which I referred. I think we ought to be able to dispose of all those resolutions tomorrow. I hope we can do so, because on Monday similar resolutions will be brought before the Senate for consideration, and as I stated, it is my understanding that the deadline is the 23d of May. Such resolutions have a high status of preference. I simply wanted to call the Senate's attention to the fact that it was my intention to move to bring up two resolutions for consideration tomorrow.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while the distinguished majority and minority leaders are present I should like to announce that it is the present intention of the four sponsors of Senate Resolution 263 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4, relating to the Department of Agriculture, to move to consider that resolution, if we can secure the floor, immediately after the cloture vote has been had on Friday, regardless of the outcome of that vote.

I may say that I had hoped to have a chance to discuss the matter with the distinguished majority leader in particular. When I took the floor this afternoon the Senator from Illinois had not returned to the Chamber; at least that was my information. I simply wanted to advise him and the distinguished minority leader likewise, that it is the intention of the sponsors of the resolution, who include the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and myself, to move to take up Senate Resolution 263 on Friday. The Senators I have named are the joint sponsors of that particular resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I understand the Senator to say that he intended to move to bring up the resolution for consideration after the vote was taken on Friday?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is our intention. I may say that it is not our intention to try to hold the Senate in session for a 10-hour debate. Quite the contrary. We simply feel that Friday, after the vote on the cloture motion, is an acceptable time to move the consideration of the Senate resolution. We believe it to be a timely occasion for consideration of such a motion. I hope the distinguished majority leader will feel that that is in line with a policy which he can approve. I regret that I have not had an opportunity to discuss the matter with him previously.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may state my position as one of the cosponsors of the resolution pertaining to Reorganization Plan No. 4?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. It was my hope that the resolution could be considered in the forepart of next week, either Monday or on Tuesday, I will say to the able Senator from Florida, for the reason that I had intended to ask leave of the Senate to be absent on Friday afternoon beginning possibly at 3 or 4 o'clock; I am scheduled to attend a meeting that evening. It was my hope that we might consider Reorganization Plan No. 4 on Monday or Tuesday of next week, rather on Friday of this week. If it is considered on Friday, it would be most embarrassing to me. I would either have to cancel my engagement or forego taking part in discussion of the resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not care to make the decision alone, as I am only one of four sponsors of the resolution. I have discussed the matter with two other sponsors of the measure. I had not seen the Senator from Minnesota. I thought the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] had conferred with him. It was the expectation to move that the resolution be taken up on Friday evening, and then to have consideration of it go over and that it be the pending business, if the motion were to prevail, when the Senate resumed its session on Monday. That was the expectation.

Mr. THYE. If the resolution can be taken up when the Senate convene on Monday it will be more convenient for me. However, I do not want my desires or wishes to influence the Senate. If the resolution were to be considered on Friday it would be embarrassing for me if the debate lasted a long time on the resolution dealing with Reorganization Plan No. 4 and the vote came late Friday evening.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe there can be any debate at all on the motion to consider the resolution. That motion is to be made as soon as the vote on the cloture petition is disposed of. It is my hope that it will be acceptable to the majority leader that whatever is the result of the vote on the cloture petition, the resolution may go over and be the pending business on Monday when the Senate convenes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It may be necessary for the Senate to hold some night sessions in order to make proper determination of all the Senate resolutions which have been reported disapproving reorganization plans. I do not know how many such resolutions have been reported, but the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has just stated that he expects to move to take up for consideration two resolutions tomorrow, and that two others have been reported from his committee.

Mr. President, if all the resolutions which may come before the Senate disapproving the various reorganization plans presented by the President of the United States are agreed to, we will wind up, as we always do with respect to reorganization, with no reorganization at all. It is my hope that with respect to most of the plans we may follow the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Apparently there is going to be controversy with respect to seven or eight of the plans. I shall do all I can to see to it that reorganization is accomplished in line with what the Hoover Commission has recommended and in line with the plans sent to the Congress by the President. The resolutions may require some debate, and we may have to hold some night sessions. If there is going to be any debate, and apparently there is, on the resolution referred to by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which he expects to move that the Senate proceed to consider on Friday, I should like to have that debate proceeded with, to see if we cannot complete action on the resolution Friday evening, because, as was said a moment ago by the Senator, the time is getting rather late for the final disposition of all these matters.

So I should hope perhaps to get that resolution out of the way Friday afternoon when we conclude action on the cloture petition. Practically all Members of the Senate will be here at that time; probably there will never be a time when more Members of the Senate will be present than on Friday, at 1 o'clock. Certainly it would not be too strenuous for Senators to hold a night session at that time, because we have not held a single night session since the question of the FEPC bill has been before us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose, provided I may obtain unanimous consent to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader whether he means that if the Senate does proceed to consider the FEPC bill, it will be set aside on Friday in order that the reorganization plan resolutions of disapproval may be considered at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no. The Senate will vote on the cloture petition at 1 o'clock on Friday, and of course the length of the proceedings at that time will depend on the number of votes which are had.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. If 64 Senators do not vote in favor of invoking cloture, we probably will continue the debate. However, of course a motion will be in order to lay aside the pending motion, as has already been done in the case of the two resolutions of disapproval of other reorganization plans. I assume that Senators who favor the disapproval of the other reorganization plans which have been mentioned have the votes to have the Senate set aside the FEPC at any time they wish to have that done. I will not agree to any unanimous-consent request to have that done; if such resolutions of disapproval of reorganization plans are taken up at that time, such action will have to be taken by means of the adoption of a motion to lay aside the FEPC.

However, I will not agree to permit the consideration of FEPC to stand in the way of obtaining action between now and midnight of the 23d of May upon the resolutions of disapproval of the reorganization plans which have been mentioned, even if we have to hold night sessions in order to do so, as I said a moment ago.

Mr. WHERRY. The point about which I asked—I think my question has been answered—was that no Senator is assuming now that the debate on FEPC will terminate if the cloture petition is rejected; and I assume that unless that does occur, the present intention is to press on with FEPC, even though the resolutions of disapproval of the reorganization plans might be taken up temporarily and the FEPC might be laid aside for that purpose, if the attempt to invoke cloture on the FEPC motion is successful.

Mr. LUCAS. Even though we might fail in the effort to invoke cloture on the motion to have the Senate consider the FEPC bill, that will not mean that we shall cease the debate on it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me say that I hope we will continue the debate. I hope we will continue the debate and will defeat any filibuster, if the debate develops into a filibuster. Let us stay here and decide once and for all whether we can or cannot obtain the required two-thirds vote in favor of taking up the FEPC bill on a cloture petition. Let us try this issue.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is very brave of the Senator from Michigan. I appreciate the position he takes, and I heartily agree that we certainly should do all we can to obtain 64 votes in favor of having the Senate consider the FEPC bill. I take it that, if the Senator from Michigan had his way, that would mean that if we could not obtain 64 affirmative votes, under the present rule, we would remain here until we did obtain them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I will stay with him.

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment, please.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit a further observation by me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a further observation by the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, all of us know that, under the rule, amendments can be submitted to the FEPC bill, once it is taken up. All of us know that each Senator has a right to speak twice on every amendment. Therefore, if we can not obtain sufficient votes to invoke cloture, we could be here all summer long, and even up to Christmas.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the way to get action.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I know that is the way to get action; and I found out how those on the other side of the aisle in the Eightieth Congress got it in the same way, when they stayed in session such a long time but did not get anything so far as FEPC is concerned. Now they are telling me to have the Senate stay here all fall.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are just offering the aid of Senators on this side of the aisle.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

I regret to have to decline to yield further, but for the last 3 hours I have been trying to finish my speech. There have been a great many questions by other Senators. I hope the Senate can indulge me for perhaps 20 minutes more, in order that I may conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, I had reached the point of the unsound governmental policy of catering to minorities, which was one of the matters which gave great concern to the legislatures of the 19 States which knocked down proposals for State FEPC's; and I think the same consideration applies to any proposed Federal legislation on the subject. I shall not dwell longer upon that point.

The next point which I found was of grave concern was the matter of creating a new, expensive, far-reaching and multi-peopled bureaucracy to rove from one end of a State to the other in an effort to do some key-hole exploring of all the businesses of the State, to determine whether or not there was something which needed attention in each business in the State.

I think we cannot too greatly emphasize that particular point. I believe that the members of the legislatures of the 19 States which have knocked down FEPC proposals are greatly concerned about that particular one, and I believe that the Members of the Senate of the United States are greatly concerned about it. I suspect that there is not a Member of the Senate who did not in his campaign urge the necessity for cutting down and getting rid of governmental bureaus and commissions, and not creating new ones. Yet here it is proposed to create a large bureaucracy with far-reaching implications and with long rolls of personnel, extending to all parts of the United States.

Of course, the same point was made in the State legislature debates. It is true that the bureaucracy for this purpose in the States would be smaller in size; but from the standpoint of the size of the individual State and its ability to carry the expense of such personnel, it would be no whit smaller than the bureaucracy and the personnel to be created under the proposed Federal legislation for FEPC.

The next point which was considered in the State legislatures was the question of the apparent willingness of the people who were sponsors of this sort of proposed legislation to let it be enforced by the pressure of the minority groups, not by law. In the case of the eight States which have FEPC laws, we have not been able to find a single case which has gone to the courts. The advocates of this legislative proposal plead like angels trumpet-tongued for the enactment of this proposed legislation on that ground.

It seems to those of us who oppose the enactment of legislation of this type that there are two things which must be remembered in connection with that sort of situation: First, that that kind of situation will not exist in a State where there is real opposition to FEPC; that FEPC has been created, conceivably, only, in the States where the minority problem is a great and a pressing one and where the minority groups are themselves large and important. Of course, the point does not apply in the case of those particular States.

However, in the case of other States which have voted against FEPC legislative proposals, certainly there would be court trials and court appeals; and we would hope there would be, because only in that way, if such legislative proposals were enacted, could we knock down this un-American proposal which threatens the lives and liberties of all the people of the United States.

Mr. President, one of the things which gave greatest concern to the people of the States, I may say, was the very clear statement that the purchasing power of a community, the power of criticism by the people of a community, the power of minorities in turning the community groups and the civic efforts against anyone who did not seek to comply with such a State law, was being used, and was being used heavily. Mr. President, that is not the way to enforce a law, and it is no way for lawmakers to attempt to proceed. They should not attempt to subject their people to that sort of pressure, because when a law hits deep down into the traditions of this country and proposes to fly in the face of vital traditions and to strike down important inherited rights, we hope there will be many Americans and many American businesses who will make it a matter of first importance to apply the tests of the courts, and of all the courts which can be reached, to the weighing of such legislation, which we believe to be unconsti-

tutional, un-American, unwise, and not at all framed in accordance with the ideology of our fathers.

Mr. President, that brings me down to the next point, which I found of such importance in the California debate and in the decisions made there in the California Legislature following the report of the California legislative committee on un-American activities. The Senate will remember that that report showed at length that more than half of the 63 persons who were active in sponsoring the initiated measure for FEPC in California were known to be Communists. The Senate will remember that the reports of the Library of Congress upon this subject showed conclusively that after that time and since that time there has really been no serious consideration given to any FEPC proposal in California, because, at last, they understood out there that this scheme had its rise in communism, and in Communist philosophy, and that the actors, the agitators in California were themselves Communists in great degree—more than half, as I say, of the 63 men and women who comprised the very active committee which sponsored that initiated measure.

Mr. President, there has recently been a revival of the interest of scholars in this subject, in the fact that the original impetus in this field came from a Communist platform and came from Communist philosophy. Senators will recall that the able columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, in an article printed in the New York Times, May 11, dealt with the speech made by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] some days ago on this motion. I shall not read that column of Mr. Krock's at length at this time, but I ask that it be included in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, at this place.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 11, 1950]

IN THE NATION—SENATOR BENTON'S ARGUMENT FOR THE FEPC

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 10—Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, speaking yesterday in favor of the administration's bill to provide Federal penalties for industrial employers and labor unions in all the 48 States who are found guilty by a Fair Employment Practice Commission of racial or religious discrimination, said several times that "the big issue is * * * justice for our own citizens in our own land." But for the many who doubt that a compulsory Federal statute is the right or the constitutional way to effect that justice, Mr. BENTON stressed two other arguments of the type politicians call "practical."

1. He said "our failure to live up to our democratic preachments on civil rights for all Americans regardless of race, religion, color, or national origin, contributes most of the poisonous, tremendous, and terrible effectiveness of Soviet propaganda against this Nation in the world." Hence, he said, passage of this bill would not only be a master stroke in foreign policy but one acutely necessary.

2. Mr. BENTON'S second practical argument was that "more than 98 percent of all enterprises in the United States employ fewer than 50 persons," and "there are not as many employers in the South as I would wish * * * who employ more than 50 persons." Hence, the law would operate in a small area of the industrial economy: "Without the development of the modern corporation it may be questioned whether this legislation would be needed."

GRIST FOR BOTH MILLS

In making these statements Mr. BENTON exposed two features of the administration bill which opponents have found especially vulnerable. They do not see disproof of their belief that the measure is unconstitutional, and bad domestic public policy as well, in the statement that these should be waived in the interest of our foreign policy, as Mr. BENTON and others evaluate it. And Senator CONNALLY remarked that a bill of such high idealistic professions that exempts "98 percent of all enterprises in the United States" is either a sham or is intended as the outrider for another bill which will affect all employers. Senator BENTON'S percentages, and the history of all sumptuary legislation with a modest beginning (such as the local-option laws that became Nation-wide prohibition), certainly support Mr. CONNALLY'S observation.

Mr. BENTON also said:

"The Soviet radio tells the Russian people [and others] that our Constitution was written by representatives of exploiting classes and does not truly guarantee civil rights; that our Congress * * * one of their favorite targets * * * permits the minority to prevail 'because of the poll tax and the filibuster.'"

This led Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, to observe:

"I hope the Senator from Connecticut does not advocate that we should repeal the Constitution because the Communists have been putting out a good deal of false propaganda about it."

Of course, Mr. BENTON did not advocate this. But to those who object to the FEPC bill on constitutional and public-policy grounds this is a logical extension of his argument that the bill should be judged largely on his contention that its approval would destroy a most effective segment of Soviet propaganda.

A CHOICE OF METHODS

As is nearly always the case when people differ fundamentally on an issue, and differ on principle, the reasons given by Mr. BENTON for passing the compulsory FEPC bill seemed to the opposition to fortify its objections. This was true not only of the arguments and answers cited above but of his description how vigorously the State Department is meeting the propaganda he would legislate against and how firmly the Supreme Court has upheld civil rights.

He said the Voice of America broadcasts, which he proposes greatly to expand, have made "most effective use of material on favorable racial developments in the United States. Our broadcasting," he said, "has reported the truth about our progress in this field, about the President's civil-rights program, about the historical background of our race relations, about the opposition of our most prominent Negro leaders to the Communist system, and also about the great civil-rights decisions of our Supreme Court."

To Mr. BENTON this supports his argument that the FEPC bill should be passed to put a clincher on these activities. But to those who disapprove of the bill on law and principle it is proof that this particular Soviet propaganda is being dealt with effectively—the Senator said so—and in the right way, and will be more effective when his expansionist program is adopted.

The origin of the modern drive for this legislation in the United States is also certain to play a part in the Senate debate. According to available records, a detailed demand for the FEPC and other antidiscrimination laws in behalf of Negroes first appeared in the Communist Party platform of 1928 and was published on page 6 of the Daily Worker of May 26 in that year. But, since then, the CIO, and citizens' groups with no possible link to communism, have adopted most of this program, broadened it to cover other minorities, and given it its present political strength.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call particular attention to the last paragraph of Mr. Krock's column, which reads as follows:

The origin of the modern drive for this legislation in the United States is also certain to play a part in the Senate debate. According to available records, a detailed demand for the FEPC and other antidiscrimination laws in behalf of Negroes first appeared in the Communist Party platform of 1928 and was published on page 6 of the Daily Worker of May 26 in that year. But, since then the CIO and citizens' groups with no possible link to communism have adopted most of this program, broadened it to cover other minorities, and given it its present political strength.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at the moment. I shall be glad to yield when I complete this point.

In spite of the fact that the CIO has come in and adopted this, in spite of the well-known fact that the CIO has tried to purge itself of Communists, nothing can change the completely irrefutable fact that this particular venture has its roots in and springs directly from a plank of the Communist national platform of 1928.

We requested the Library of Congress, if possible, to get up for us the Communist platform of that year, and we find that it was published in pamphlet form, which we have here. We found also that the page of the Daily Worker which was referred to by Mr. Krock was available, so that we asked for the making of a photostatic copy of that particular page, so that there might be placed in the RECORD this long catalog of declarations of policy, platform declarations on the part of the Communist Party in 1928 as a basis for its campaign, which was aimed directly at winning the Negro vote.

I am going to ask at this time that that portion of the article dealing with the Negro question be included in the RECORD at this time as a part of my remarks. That would begin with the words "Oppression of the Negroes," in column 5 of page 6 of the Daily Worker of Saturday, May 26, 1928, and would extend over into column 6, down to the heading "The foreign-born workers."

There being no objection, the portion of the article referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPRESSION OF THE NEGROES

American white imperialism oppresses in the most terrific way the 10,000,000 Negroes who constitute not less than one-tenth of the total population. White capitalist prejudice considers the Negroes as a lower race, as the born servants of the lofty white masters. The racial caste sytem is a fundamental feature of the social, industrial and political organization of this country. The Communist Party declares that it considers

itself not only the party of the working class but also the champion of the Negroes as an oppressed race and especially the organizer of the Negro working-class elements. The Communist Party is the party of the liberation of the Negro race from all white oppression.

There is a "new Negro" in process of development. The social composition of the Negro race is changing. Formerly the Negro was the cotton farmer in the South and domestic help in the North. The industrialization of the South, the concentration of a new Negro working class population in the big cities of the East and North, and the entrance of the Negroes into the basic industries on a mass scale have changed the whole social composition of the Negro race. The appearance of a genuine Negro industrial proletariat creates an organizing force for the whole Negro race; furnishes a new working class leadership to all Negro race movements, and strengthens immensely the fighting possibilities for the emancipation of the race.

The Negro tenant and share farmers of the South are still, despite all the pompous phrases about freeing the slaves, in the status of virtual slavery. They have not the slightest prospect of ever acquiring possession of the land on which they work. By means of an usurious credit system they are chained to the plantation owners as securely as chattel slaves. Peonage and contract labor are the fate of the Negro cotton farmer. The landowners, who are at the same time the merchants and the government of the South, rule over the Negroes with a merciless dictatorship.

There is the most dishonest and disgraceful "gentlemen's agreement" between the two capitalist parties against the political rights of the Negroes. The famous fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution amount but to a scrap of paper. They were never carried out for a moment. The Supreme Court has upheld all State laws which disfranchised the Negroes. Sheer force prevents the Negro from exercising his so-called political rights. The Federal Government has never made any attempt to reduce the representation of those Southern States which violate the Constitution, as section 2 of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution provides. The Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, has sunk so low that it has provided for measures to segregate the Negro delegates to its 1928 Kansas City nominating convention. Lynch law is the hold over the Negroes. The terror of the Ku Klux Klan is the constitution for the Negroes. They are burned alive, whipped to death, hunted to death with dogs in the name of white civilization.

There is a general segregation policy against the Negro race. Separate residential sections; Jim Crow cars; separate schools for Negro children; exclusion from white hotels, restaurants, theaters, and railway waiting rooms; exclusion of Negroes from juries which try Negroes. Negro teachers cannot teach in white schools. The white masters try to reduce the Negroes to illiteracy. According to the 1920 white census, there were 4 percent illiterates among the whites and 22.9 percent among the Negroes. The Southern States spend hardly any money for the education of Negro children, but provide lavishly for the education of the children of the white.

In the cotton States the Negro farmers live in shacks together with their animals. In the cities the Negroes do the unskilled, the most disagreeable, most hazardous work and are crowded into the worst sections of the city. The death rate of the Negroes is much higher than that of the whites. In 1925 it was 11.1 per thousand for the whites and 18.2 for the Negroes.

The southern plantation owners and their government have tried to keep the Negro farmers and agricultural workers in the southern cotton fields by force. But even their brutal terror has not been able to check the mighty migration from these cotton plantations to the industrial centers of the Northern and Eastern States. This migration is an unarmed, Spartacan uprising against slavery and oppression by a capitalist and feudal oligarchy.

The Negro fled from the South, but what has he found in the North? He has found in the company towns and industrial cities of the North and East a wage slavery no better than the contract labor in the South. He has found crowded, unsanitary slums. He has exchanged the old segregation for a new segregation. He is doing the most dangerous, worst-paid work in the steel, coal, and packing industries. He has found the racial prejudices of a narrow, white labor aristocracy, which refuses to recognize the unskilled Negro worker as its equal. He has found the treachery of the bureaucracy of the A. F. of L. which refuses to organize the Negroes into trade unions. The lynchings of the South are replaced by the race riots of the East. The employing class tries to arouse the racial hatred and prejudice of the white workers against the Negro workers with the sinister aim to split and divide the ranks of the working class.

The Communist Party considers it as its historic duty to unite all workers regardless of their color against the common enemy, against the master class. The Negro race must understand that capitalism means racial oppression and communism means social and racial equality.

DEMANDS

1. Abolition of the whole system of race discrimination. Full racial equality.

2. Abolition of all laws which result in segregation of Negroes. Abolition of all Jim Crow laws. The law shall forbid all discrimination against Negroes in selling or renting houses.

3. Abolition of all laws which disenfranchise the Negroes on the ground of color.

4. Abolition of laws forbidding inter-marriage of persons of different races.

5. Abolition of all laws and public administration measures which prohibit, or in practice prevent, Negro children or youth from attending general public schools or universities.

6. Full and equal admittance of Negroes to all railway station waiting rooms, restaurants, hotels, and theaters.

7. The War and Navy Departments of the United States Government should abolish all Jim Crow distinctions in the Army and Navy.

8. Immediate removal of all restrictions in all trade unions against the membership of Negro workers.

9. Equal opportunity for employment, wages, hours, and working conditions for Negro and white workers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to read the ninth demand in that platform—that platform which covers almost every conceivable demand that the ultra left people have been making in this field—and which is said by Mr. Krock and which is reported by investigators to be the fountainhead and source, the suggestive source from which FEPC planks have since come, and from which FEPC programs have been evolved and suggested to States, and now finally have come on the agenda of the National Congress. That plank, No. 9, under the heading "Demands" reads simply as follows:

Equal opportunity for employment, wages, hours, and working conditions for Negro and white workers.

Mr. President, Mr. Krock says the investigators and research men say it seems to be definitely established that that is the source from which FEPC legislation has grown.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to complete this part of my talk, then I will yield. That does not mean necessarily that the particular program would have to be bad, simply because the Communists suggested it, but it means that it comes from their philosophy, that they claim paternity, as they have repeatedly, in the Daily Worker, that that paternity is recognized by such writers as Mr. Arthur Krock, that paternity was recognized by the California Committee on Un-American Activities of the California Legislature, and that, following that declaration, Communists generally have been active in the promotion of FEPC, just as was shown in the case of the California activity, that over 30 of the active members of 63 on the committee there which was sponsoring FEPC as a constitutional measure were themselves Communists and in the communistic effort.

That does not at all mean that everyone who has sponsored FEPC or who is now sponsoring FEPC has the remotest idea of supporting anything which is communistic. It does not mean at all that the Senator from Florida is charging that everyone who is supporting FEPC is communistic; quite the contrary.

Let me make this very clear. This whole program that is related in that part of the Communist platform which has already been placed in the RECORD, radicalism of the worst sort, has the earmarks of destructive effort, which will make itself felt in every part of the Nation and upon every part of our United States Government, both at the Federal level and at the State and local levels, and we might as well know, when we are seriously considering bringing up such legislation as this, this is the source from which it comes. Not only does it come from that source, but it has had active lip service and active foot service from that source ever since it sprung full-formed from Communist brains back in 1928.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should merely like to invite the Senator's attention to a statement—and I shall pose it in the form of a question—since the Senator is referring to the source of the idea of FEPC. On page 5 of the report of the bill, S. 1728, at the middle of the page, there is a statement by the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, bishop of Grand Rapids, a noted Catholic clergyman, who, in a letter in 1947 to the chairman of the committee that was holding hearings on FEPC, said:

I earnestly hope that this bill will become law.

I offer no lengthy comment on the underlying principle of the bill; that is, that all American citizens are equal, and that all are entitled to have their right to equal opportunity protected by law. To me both as an American citizen and as a Catholic bishop

this principle needs no supporting argument. Equality is among our most treasured American possessions, as it is a central doctrine of Christian faith, which proclaims that all men are equal before God, made equal before Him through His Divine Son, Jesus Christ.

May I refer also to the Senator with a request for his comment the remark of the Catholic bishop, the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, who said:

I conclude by stating that in Paul's letter to the Corinthians he said:

"Ye are neither Jews nor Gentiles, neither bond nor free: Ye are all one in Jesus Christ our Lord."

I ask the Senator what does he really think is the source of FEPC, in the face of the testimony of Bishop Haas, Bishop Sheil, and the beloved and late lamented Monsignor Ryan, who said:

The Christian precept of brotherly love is not satisfied by mere well-wishing, nor benevolent emotion nor sentimental yearning. It requires action.

I wish the Senator from Florida would give me his observations. Is FEPC equality of treatment, a fundamental part of the Christian doctrine, or is it a Communist-inspired doctrine? I think an answer should be forthcoming.

Mr. HOLLAND. The answer will be forthcoming, and at once. There is no doubt in the world that this proposal for the creation of a governmental agency to engraft upon our Government the principle that men have to be hired or fired, depending upon religion and religious beliefs, race and racial beliefs, or color, comes from Communist inspiration. There is not the slightest question of it. The Senator from Minnesota will find no ground for any other conclusion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not yield at this time. I prefer to continue in my own way.

There is an equality before the law, and then there is an equality, spiritually and morally, of which the Senator is talking. Certainly no one questions the equality of all men as brethren, and, according to our concept, as sons of God. I should be the last to deny that. But to say, in the next breath, that that means every employer has to give his concern to the question of whether his employees are gentiles or Jews, Roman Catholics, or Protestants, white or colored, to apportion his representation amongst his employees on that basis, and that there shall be compulsion to see that he does so—there is no such thing as that in Holy Writ or in Christine doctrine, and anyone who would pretend that such is the case would be on unsound ground. I remind the distinguished Senator that a much wiser brain than mine, and much more devoted lips spoke with authority that has never been seriously questioned—

Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.

I must remind the Senator that he is dealing with values which have nothing to do with governmental practice. When he comes to the field of thought control, of dictation to an individual, to tell him that he cannot choose the person he thinks is the best qualified to perform the service for which he will pay, we get into an ideology far, far from the American democratic principle.

Mr. President, I find no support whatever for any other ascribable source for the suggestion that FEPC be created as a governmental agency to itself and to force and engraft upon men's minds, both employers and employees, this thing which is called antidiscrimination in the field of employment. That comes from communism; it has been suggested by Communists. Persons who have gone into the subject much more deeply than has the Senator from Minnesota or as has the Senator from Florida have come up with that conclusion. I do not think it is worthy of further debate, because it is a fact that it was suggested by communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield at this time.

The mere fact that communism suggests it, does not blast it, but it is part of a general disruptive scheme which is designed to tear down good will and sound relations among our people, on racial lines, and every other conceivable line. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota cannot possibly read promulgations in the entire plan of the Communist platform of 1928, which has been adhered to so closely since that time, without coming to the conclusion, to which able men and women who have made a life-long study of it have come, that communism is seeking to destroy us. It is seeking to tear us down.

As stated in the report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, it made a deliberate effort to tear down and to rend apart a fine State government. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that since the issuance of that report California has not even given serious consideration to any further suggestion of FEPC legislation. The Senator was not present when we discussed that this afternoon, which I regret, and I shall repeat only this much of it, that it was stated by the Senator from Florida that there was not any broader electorate than that of California, where there is no poll-tax requirement, and there were 2,250,000 persons voting. They were persons who had come from every section of the Nation, who had always been dominantly progressive, not reactionary. They knocked it down before they had the report of the Un-American Affairs Committee of the California Legislature, by a vote of 2½ to 1, with 2,250,000 persons voting.

Maybe the Senator has an answer for that. I remember his answer in connection with the knocking-down of FEPC legislation by legislatures, as a State matter. His answer was that legislatures were not properly representative of American thinking, with which I disagree entirely. But I have not yet heard any answer from the distinguished Senator, which I hope he will give us in his own good time, and on his own time, as to why the people of California, in the expression of their sovereign will and in one of the most widely participated in elections they have ever had, gave such a blasting repulse to the suggestion that they turn over their State government to an ideology as foreign, as destructive, and as disruptive as they found the Communist-inspired FEPC scheme to be.

Mr. President, I had intended——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to conclude, I shall be happy to yield for further questions at the conclusion of my remarks.

I had intended to go into a completely different field, the South, because, up to this time, except for some questions or colloquies, I have confined myself to what happened outside the South. It is true that whereas 8 States have approved FEPC, 19 States have rejected and knocked it down. Those States have a population more than twice as great as have the States which adopted it. It is true that 21 States have not regarded it as of sufficient value even to consider it in their legislatures. It is true that between one-fourth and one-fifth of the people of this Nation live under FEPC laws, a very large proportion have rejected it, and the rest have regarded it as so unsound that they do not want it. They have done more than reject it; they have refused to regard it as something they would like to have engrafted upon their form of government.

Mr. President, to refer to the South, I was going to dwell at some length upon the record in the South and our deep conviction that the adoption of any such unsound program will cause great trouble in an area of the Nation in which there has not been as much violence as there has been outside the South, where there is much greater educational opportunity, in the main, for our Negroes than is to be found in other places, where, as was shown in the debate last year on the question of the southern regional educational program, people in other States are having to send their young Negroes to two Negro schools for dental and medical training. One of the schools is Howard University, in Washington, D. C., and the other is Meharry, in Nashville, Tenn.

In the case of the University of Pennsylvania, it at one time, when I was speaking in Philadelphia in 1948, had one Negro enrolled in all four classes of their great medical school. At the same time about 25 colored citizens of Pennsylvania were enrolled and were taking medical training at Howard University or at Meharry. It is an inescapable fact that our system has brought and is bringing better results. Even though the door of opportunity may be open in that part of the Nation where segregation does not exist, it is practically closed by the fact that the competition is too severe.

I have in my file a letter from the dean of one of the great California medical schools, stating that they would like to have Negro youths there. They wanted them to apply and take the examinations. However, competition had been too severe and they had not been able to make the grade. He even suggested that Meharry or Howard be kind enough to send over two or three of their best young people. They said they would welcome them. The fact was that they

were not helping to solve the problems of the Negro people, simply because the organization of their educational system was not such as to give them any opportunity. They are getting an opportunity in the South. It is irrefutable that they are getting it. The Senators who are present know that is true. They are getting the opportunity in the field of education in the South. Negro professional people in education have an opportunity which is withheld or denied in other parts of the Nation. Mr. President, there is no use for us to smile about that and say, "Well, that is a small situation, and that does not count much." I say that the solution of this problem must largely come from within the minority. It must come from the leadership and the devoted service of people from within those minority groups. We want to help them. We have helped them, and we shall continue to do all we can in greater and greater measure. After all, their rights will be determined by the kind of leadership they have and how that leadership exerts itself in training their youth. I call attention again to the fact that in the South 7 Negroes out of every 1,000 in our area are professional teachers, as compared with—and these are Library of Congress figures—only 1 out of every 1,000 Negroes in all the rest of the Nation, taken together as a group.

Mr. President, that is not the whole difference. In the South we have a large number of colored college presidents, deans, and principals of schools. It is a situation which cannot exist as such in other parts of the country. At the time the study was made there was not a single Negro college president outside the South. In the South we are giving that opportunity, and we are glad to see it avidly contended for and avidly used. It is the expression of devoted lives of people of that color, who think they see a chance to raise their own people to a higher standard of living and culture. They are people who have devoted their lives to that end. Negroes have no such opportunity in the nonsegregated schools in the North, East, and West.

I have already spoken of violence. We are making a better record in the South than elsewhere, in many, many fields. We are doing a much better job than is being done in other parts of the Nation. We want to continue doing that job. We are doing it to the best of our opportunity, advantage, training, and devotion. I have in mind something else which people in other parts of the Nation do not understand. That is good will. It is the good will which exists between the colored citizens of the South and the white people of the South. It is a real factor. It exists on a very great scale. It is responsible for the major part of the program of advancement which now exists. Senators may not recall, but the junior Senator from Florida recently put into the RECORD the Record of Achievement—and that is what it is—of the Southern Regional Commission on Higher Education, which has gone so far already without the help of an approving resolution in the Senate and without the chance of building up new capital structures which could be built only with heavy appropriations, which of course would not be given so long as there exists the question of legality. So far as the establishment of facilities and the distribution of those facilities are concerned, we are doing a fine job, and I am proud of it. It is not only the South which is proud of the job we are doing. Educators and other public officials all over the United States recognize that fact as outstanding. If the record is examined, it will be found that Negro boys and girls are getting a large part of the help. While their population is only a third of ours, the number of colored youth who are being helped is exactly equal to the number of white youth. In other words, in going to medical schools from a State such as mine which has no medical college, in going to dental schools from a State such as mine which has no dental schools, or in going to a veterinary school from a State such as mine which has no schools in that field, we are finding opportunity and giving opportunity to youths of both colors which they could not get otherwise. We are proud of the job we are doing. We are doing it in the name of humanity, essential Christianity, and religion, of which my friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was speaking a while ago. We believe in equality of opportunity. We do not believe equality of opportunity is expressed by a law which says to an employer, "You must do so and so, simply because it violates a rule of distribution of your employees among certain religious and racial groups."

Mr. President, the reason I cannot go into the southern field fully this afternoon is obvious. It is too late to do so. Before I leave this point, however, I want to make it clear that at some subsequent date in the debate I hope to come back to this field. The reason I wish to do so is because it is made crystal clear in this debate, by the report, by the report of the President's Civil Rights Commission, and by the messages of the President himself, that we are not talking about an isolated problem. We are not talking about FEPC standing by itself. We are talking about a general problem which goes much further than any person who has any grasp of its background wants to go.

I should like to quote from a speech made on the floor of the Senate by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] on Tuesday, May 9, as follows:

> The point in my program, Mr. President, is that we should now pass this bill—

He is speaking of the FEPC bill—

> and let us then enact every phase of the President's civil-rights program. Let us erase every stain of racial discrimination and segregation from our statute books. Let us accelerate the progress already made in barring discrimination and segregation from our educational system—

What a tragedy it would be to the Negro people if that course were followed through—

> our housing—

What a tragedy it would be to the Negro people if that course were followed. Most public-housing units in the South have to do with housing for Negro people. If these short-sighted people on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House had been successful in their insistent proposals from time to time that no educational money should go from Federal sources to an educational institution which operated on a segregation basis, or for housing except on a basis of joint use of housing by both colored and white people, the colored people in our country would have been the ones who would have sustained grievous if not irreparable loss. That would have happened if the short-sighted policy had been adopted.

> Let us accelerate the progress already made in barring discrimination and segregation from our educational system, our housing, our civilian government, and our military forces.

I do not indulge the hope that any Senator will remember an incident which I related last year when we were debating a somewhat similar issue on the floor of the Senate. I related a true incident which had occurred in my home town when a group of Negroes came to see me. They made it clear that under no circumstances did they want legislation passed which is contained in the civil-rights program, in the President's proposal, and in the agitation in this whole field, which would require that men in uniform be given access to all places of public accommodation and amusement, such as hotels, restaurants, dance halls, pool rooms, bowling alleys, and other places of that nature. I had thought of it from the point of view that perhaps Negroes in the military forces, because of some circumstance, might try to trespass upon customs and law of communities in which they were serving. On the contrary, what these Negroes feared was that white youths to whom they properly referred, I think, as white trash, might come over into their quarter of the town and, perhaps, infused with a little too much alcohol, might force their way into Negro dance halls, restaurants, hotels, and other places, where young colored people were being entertained, with the result that there might be racial friction and perhaps serious trouble.

Then they came to the point, as they said to me, "Judge, don't you know that if that sort of thing happens the people who will suffer the most will be the colored people whose homes are here, and who ask nothing better than to be left alone, in our living and our progress, getting better conditions for ourselves and our children and grandchildren?" An old grandfather was the one who uttered that to me, and it made a profound impression. Yet here is a good Senator, led by good motives, of course, offering to do away with all discrimination and segregation affecting the members of the armed forces; and that is a definite part of the recommendation of the Civil Rights Committee and of the President himself.

Mr. President, the trouble is there is too much lack of information about the real implications of this program, and the real problem we are talking about and trying to solve, not by legislation, because it is not soluble by legislation,

but instead by working things out gently and kindly, with understanding and sympathy, and with reciprocal courtesy, each race and each religion having that attitude toward the others.

Mr. President, I know something about these problems. Every man who has been Governor of a Southern State knows about them, and I see sitting in the seat of the minority leader the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who served as Governor of his State, and I am sure this same problem is still present in his State.

It is by observing tolerance and mutual good will that a solution of these problems will finally come. We are reaching that point rapidly. We are proceeding at a tremendous pace, and will reach a solution of the problem if we are just allowed to bring it to its natural conclusion through the methods which we are following effectively, and with great success.

Mr. President, I am sorry I have not had time to go adequately into the question of what the threat of this legislation means to the South. The South does have a great stake in the problem. It would be idle to deny it, and I would not deny it. So far as I am concerned, I am activated not only by the existence of the problem in the South but by the existence of the problem generally throughout the Nation. Certainly the problem affects the South more than any other part of the Nation. People who are fair, like the New Jersey Negro editor who came South a while back and studied conditions, or like the committee of students from Massachusetts who came down and studied the situation, or like similar investigators, find peace and quietude and mutual understanding and prosperity existing, and marvel at it, and go back and say they did not think such conditions existed, because they were used to hearing of bitterness as prevailing everywhere in the South.

Mr. President, I hope to speak at some length on this subject at a later stage in the debate, but I did not want to ignore it at this time. I felt impelled to refer to it because the Senator from Connecticut has gone into the subject matter, because of the fact that the Civil Rights Commission goes into it so exhaustively, the fact that the President referred to it so fully, the fact that the platforms of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party went into it. In the case of the Democratic platform, the plank was adopted by only a small vote, and, as I pointed out earlier in the day, the change of the vote of New Jersey, of Massachusetts, of New York, of Illinois, of Michigan, or of any one of several other States, would have changed the result.

Mr. President, the fact that those things exist means that we know this is not an isolated program standing by itself, but is part of a general program aimed at breaking down segregation, aimed at breaking down social admixture—I like that term better than "social equality." I recall that when the Senator from Minnesota testified before a House committee he stated he believed in social equality. I respect his views, but I do not think he had the understanding of the problem that would come from living with it for many years.

We know that these other things are in this picture. We know, in the case of the minority groups that are driving all the time for the enactment of the program, that they are not thinking of FEPC in terms of an isolated act, but of all the acts that have been suggested. They are thinking of social admixture.

Throughout the South we were terribly disturbed in the last year when it appeared so clearly that the two principal Negro leaders of NAACP had that in their minds, because both of them, after their Negro wives were divorced, married white women. It is not for me to comment as to whether that is sound leadership or unsound, safe or unsafe, false or good, but the point I make is that the people of the South know that the preservation of racial purity on both sides, the white stock on the one and the colored stock on the other, is fully involved in this argument. Both our white and our Negro people violently oppose mixed marriage. We know from the very attitude and performance of leaders in this field that that is one of the things they are thinking about.

We do not have to be told that something is wrong when we see the Negro leaders in some parts of the Nation—and I glory in the fact that there are only a few—go off after communism. We do not have to be told things are going badly when men appear and testify against their sons making themselves available for the military service of the Nation. We know that does not speak the sentiments of the Negro people, because the Negro people are a patriotic people, and they have proved repeatedly their patriotism, and that they are willing to die for their country. But we know, when those things are manifested day after day, when we see them and know them and hear about them, that they are really a part of the program. All that is in the sorry picture—miscegenation, social equality, a turn to communism by some Negro individuals who had most to be grateful for, because as American citizens, they were given the chance to attain to greatness. I am thinking of the case of the singer Robeson, of the real greatness of the stature he had attained as an artist and the pleasure of all our people at his performance in his chosen field of music, in which he had such great talent. But he strayed away to communism.

Knowing that these things are in the picture, we must be most deeply concerned, particularly when we see good friends of ours from other parts of the Nation who do not have the problem present in their own sections not troubled about it; particularly when we see a situation coming up in which, after 19 States have knocked down FEPC efforts, not a Senator from any of those States rises to explain the position of his people, to explain why his people took the action they did take, based on their deep convictions.

It begins to be apparent that the force and the pressure of the minority groups have prevailed in places where they should not have prevailed, and I deeply deplore of that thing happening in free America, where we think that all people of all classes and creeds have stood together and should continue to do so.

I have spoken already of the moderate program by which we are willing to approach this series of problems. We are willing to go more than half way in the effort to find a sane solution.

I ask Senators never to get the idea that we who view this matter as a vital problem, as a vital threat to the dearest things we have, in our families, in our States, in our communities, in our schools, in our churches, all through the South, are going to yield on this question, which we think so terribly destructive of a way of life under which happiness prevails, and under which kindness is being done by each group to the other, and I know great progress is being made by following the American pattern laid down a long time ago by our wise forefathers, a pattern which we are certainly willing to continue to follow and to preserve for those who will come after us.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

FLOOD CONDITIONS IN MANITOBA

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the distinguished Senator from Florida permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOLLAND. By unanimous consent, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to take any time from the distinguished Senator from Florida. However, I should like very much to have unanimous consent to make a statement, and I ask that my remarks may appear at the conclusion of the distinguished Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the serious flood conditions in Manitoba, Canada. We have had serious flood conditions in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and in my own State of Nebraska. The Red River at Winnipeg has reached a height of 30.1 feet. It is 12.1 feet above the level of the river bank.

The principal urgency at this moment is the holding of the dikes, which are being manned by 50,000 civilian volunteers and 5,000 soldiers. The flooded area at Winnipeg comprises 8 square miles, with refugees numbering between 82,000 to 100,000 persons, most of whom have been evacuated from Winnipeg.

In addition the river has flooded 10 towns south of Winnipeg, inundating 3,000 homes in the 600 square mile farm area. This valley is rich grain and cattle-raising land. Ten thousand persons have been forced out of the farm area in addition to the refugees out of Winnipeg. The river has a 30-mile current at this moment and this force, plus winds, is beating against the dikes. The crucial point in the minds of Canadian officials is whether or not the dikes can hold. Evidence of weakening is shown

across the river from Winnipeg, at St. Boniface, which stands a chance of being under 12 feet of water momentarily. Canadian officials say it is impossible to estimate damage or the extent of the evacuation.

The Canadian Government is organizing an airlift capable of taking out 9,000 persons a day from the area. Evacuees are presently being taken to the nearest centers in neighboring provinces. Those who can are staying with friends and relatives. The Canadian Army and the Canadian Red Cross are faced with the job of housing and feeding the rest.

Mr. President, I have been reliably informed that the American Red Cross has sent observers into the particular area affected, and they have been told to stand by. They have offered all the relief possible, which, of course, will take care of the need for food. But momentarily there is danger of disease breaking out and hunger coming upon the people. This is one of the most devastating disasters in the history of Canada.

Mr. President, we have extended aid to many countries, and it seems to me that a neighbor and friend like Canada should at least have our moral and our spiritual assistance at this particular time. I have drafted a concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. If it shall result in any debate, I shall withdraw it. It merely provides that the President shall make available the appropriate agencies of the United States to assure Canada immediately that we stand ready to render aid in case of need.

I had particularly in mind the airlift, and the effort to help to get the evacuees out of the stricken area. It seems to me this would be not only a gesture of good will, but it would lend Canada moral and spiritual support which a neighboring country should extend at such a time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest that it would be possible to help evacuate those who must leave Winnipeg by the use of the United States Air Force. I am sure we have plenty of planes, even in that vicinity, which could aid in taking the people to proper shelters, and if they need food, our Government agencies will be able to supply it, and our medical services may lend aid to the people who need it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his observations. My thought was that if any of the agencies knew that it was the sense of the Congress, that such aid should be granted according to law, so that no law was violated, and under the direction of the President, it might be the sensible, the charitable, and the neighborly thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator asked for unanimous consent? Time is of the essence. The flood is now raging.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senate does not mind, I should like to have the resolution read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It is a concurrent resolution, so that if it could be adopted by the Senate tonight, it could go to the House immediately.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I visited the stricken area of the Northwest, and saw the devastating flood in the making. It was then in the area of Crookston and East Grand Forks and other towns north toward the Canadian border. We knew it was going to strike into Canada, because of the enormous amount of water that was in the area where I visited. I fully appreciate the situation which confronts the people of Winnipeg and the Canadian Government.

I should like also to call attention to the terrific losses suffered by communities in northwest Minnesota and northeast North Dakota as a result of the flood. At this time we do not know of all the loss and damage suffered by those communities because of the flood, but I think this legislative body should take speedy action on appropriation measures to assist in financing the losses the communities have sustained.

I commend the Senator from Nebraska for offering the concurrent resolution. It is a neighborly action, and I hope the concurrent resolution may be acted on speedily.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I join with those who have spoken in relation to the subject raised by the Senator from Nebraska. In this world of many conflicting affairs, when catastrophe strikes, as it does, either in any of our States or anywhere on earth, the heart of America responds.

I commend the distinguished minority leader for sensing the situation brought on by the flood, which gives an opportunity to express our sincere sympathy, but more than that, our sincere intent to afford such help as is possible, spiritual and moral and financial, as the Senator says, to our neighbors to the north. After all, the Canadians are our kinfolk. There is probably no other nation nearer to us than the great people of Canada, who have done so well. I am very happy to join in the sentiments expressed by the minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 89) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President should direct the appropriate agencies of the United States to make available immediately the fullest aid consistent with law to the appropriate agencies of the Dominion of Canada in order that the facilities and resources of the United States may assist the Dominion of Canada in giving aid and relief to those suffering as a result of the recent disastrous floods in the Province of Manitoba, and especially in the city of Winnipeg. The physical, financial, and moral support of the United States should be extended to the Canadian people in their hour of need not alone as an act of mercy, but as a natural and fitting expression of the historic friendship and kinship of the peoples of the United States and of Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the concurrent resolution. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether the Canadian Government has been asking for assistance.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I have not taken it up with the Canadian Government. My theory was that one spot particularly affected was Winnipeg. The morning newspapers indicate that 100,000 people have been evacuated. The reports show that 9,000 people are being taken out of that city every day by airplane. I did verify with the Canadian Embassy most of the observations I made relative to the situation.

I am not sure there is much that can be done, so I drafted the concurrent resolution to indicate that it was the sense of the Congress that the President should look into the matter and advise the Government facilities which are available, and extend such aid, if any, as could be extended to the Province of Manitoba, and especially, the city of Winnipeg. My thought was that this was a time to show our moral and financial support to a neighboring country like Canada. Whether or not they would use the aid which might be available would be a matter for later consideration. I do know that the American Red Cross has sent observers to Canada, and they have offered their assistance to relieve human suffering. The Canadian Red Cross has given assurance that they would call upon the American Red Cross if they needed their aid.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is somewhat unusual for the Congress of the United States to direct the President to start aiding another country financially when there has been no request for such aid. If the time comes when we can do anything to assist those who are suffering from the flood, we should give what help we can. But I do not believe this is the proper time to proceed. I do not believe we should proceed unless there is a direct demand or cry for help from the people in the afflicted area of Canada. The Canadian Government is in pretty good shape. I have heard speeches made on the floor of the Senate condemning our own Government for its fiscal policy, and comparing our fiscal situation unfavorably with that of Canada. Until I know a little more about the situation I shall object to immediate consideration of a concurrent resolution of this kind. I regret that it was taken up in my absence, without an attempt being made to bring it up after a quorum had been called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the concurrent resolution will lie over under the rule.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728)

to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier in the day I said to the Senator from Florida that in view of the fact that he had brought into his discussion and his debate a series of arguments in reference to my participation in the radio discussion on the American Forum of the Air, I desired to make an appropriate reply. While I realize the lateness of the hour, Mr. President, I also realize the seriousness of the decision we are about to make on the pending question.

I must confess that it is rather difficult for me to listen to what I consider to be a complete distortion of the purpose of the legislation. When I say "complete distortion," that can be documented, as it shall be, once the measure is on the floor as a measure for debate and for discussion, where we can vote on the measure, and not vote upon a parliamentary question of whether we should consider the measure.

The Senator from Florida has referred to FEPC legislation saying to employers "You must hire a certain number of people of Jewish faith, a certain number of Protestant faith, a certain number of Catholic faith, a certain number of the Negro race or the Chinese race, or some other race." That is a complete distortion of what the legislation stands for, because the legislation says just one thing, that in the matter of employment there shall be no discrimination because of a man's race, his color, his national origin, or his religion. In other words, what the Senator has said is completely the opposite of the purpose of the bill. It is about time the record was appropriately set straight, because this is legislation to provide that persons shall have the right of freedom of association on the basis of their skill, their talent, their ability, and not be denied the freedom of association because of such false standards as may be established by the prejudices of mankind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the Senator has seen the only decision we have been able to find coming out of any of the FEPC commissions. It is not a court decision, but a decision of the commission of the State of Connecticut, a 1950 decision, in the case of Oscar S. Draper against Clark Dairy, Inc. Has the Senator from Minnesota seen it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I have not.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish the Senator would yield long enough for me to read the headlines into the RECORD. Then the Senator may have the whole file if he wishes for use in later debate by him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Florida that we are not discussing Connecticut legislation. We are discussing Senate bill 1728. The Senator from Minnesota has read the bill not once, but many, many times, and is familiar with every paragraph, every sentence, every word, every semicolon, and every comma in it. I submit that there is not one word in the legislation which substantiates the arguments made today as to the purposes of the bill.

I yield to the Senator from Florida to make the insertion he requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. I read as follows:

Connecticut (1950).

Oscar S. Draper v. *Clark Dairy, Inc.*

Finding of fact, opinion, and cease and desist order of hearing tribunal of hearing examiners appointed by chairman of Connecticut Interracial Commission. Complaint No. FEP 120, March 8, 1950.

Connecticut Fair Employment Practice Act—unfair employment practice—discrimination in employment because of race—employer ordered to hire Negro.

Mr. President, the whole decision is too long to read, but I wanted to put that much in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I will be very happy to have the file of the case so I may study it. I may say that if the decision is as it was stated, it is to be commended, because the purpose of the legislation is to do away with the false standards of discrimination and to permit persons to be employed on the basis of their skill, their ability, and their talent, which is thoroughly within the American tradition. And I shall say at a later time in my debate, not tonight, but at a later time, and with full documentation, that the purposes of the bill are within the tradition of all the spiritual and philosophical tenets of the American way of life.

Mr. President, I have listened to one other argument on which I wish to make a brief comment. The argument is that somehow or other we are catering to minorities. The time has come for plain speech. The only group that seems to be catering to a minority today is the United States Senate. We are catering to a minority of persons who are unwilling even to permit a measure to come up to be voted upon. It appears to me that the minority is here in the Senate, not out in the country. I want that to be clearly understood as being my position.

I have heard arguments made today that it would be wonderful if we could remain in session and debate the legislation on through. The majority leader was helped in a colloquy by members of the minority side of the aisle who said how wonderful it would be, how they would love to join with the majority leader to stay and fight the issue through to the bitter end. Would that we had had that same kind of concern and consideration when we voted upon the change of the rules, which require 64 votes for the Senate to stop unlimited debate on even a motion to bring up a bill, much less to vote on passage of the bill. The American people do not understand this nonsense. They think we are debating FEPC. Here we are debating whether or not we are going to talk about FEPC, and we have been talking about it for 10 days. Is it any wonder that sometimes people lose faith in democratic procedures?

May I make particular reference to the comment which was made pertaining to the hearings, because I want this to go into the RECORD. I have watched the crocodile tears as they have been shed, and have heard the pious statements about the fact that there were no hearings held on the FEPC bill. The question is asked, How can we consider a measure of such momentous importance as FEPC without hearings?

How did Senators who ask such questions happen to vote on the bill to provide Federal aid to education this year, which was passed by a vote of 58 to 15, without any hearings in the Eighty-first Congress having been held on the subject of Federal aid to education? The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had held no hearings on Federal aid to education. I have in my hand the record vote of every Senator on that subject. Those who protested the loudest about the fact that we have had no hearings in the Eighty-first Congress respecting FEPC, and therefore we must not consider the bill as such, would be violating parliamentary traditions, voted the loudest and made the greatest noise in connection with Federal aid to education. Yes, they voted for a bill on which not 1 day of hearing was held in the Eighty-first Congress.

How many of the Senators on this floor voted for the school health services bill? That is a measure which is going to inject the Federal Government into every schoolroom in America.

I have heard much comment over what terrible things will result from enactment of the FEPC legislation. Yet not a Senator rose to his feet and said that we ought to have hearings on the school health services bill.

How about the hearings in the Eighty-first Congress on the National Science Foundation bill? Were there any hearings? No. When were the hearings held? In the Eightieth Congress. Were they accepted in the Eighty-first Congress? They were.

We have had hearings on the FEPC bill in the Seventy-seventh, the Seventy-ninth, the Eightieth, and the Eighty-first Congresses. But we have had many speeches in the Senate in which Senators have told what a terrible thing we will be doing if we take up the FEPC bill. If we did so, we would shake the foundations of the Republic. No hearings have been held. That is nothing more or less than a parliamentary move.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. The question is merely for information. Is the Senator correct in his statement that there were hearings held in the Eighty-first Congress on the FEPC bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DONNELL. None were held in the Senate committee, though.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, but the House of Representatives is a coordinate body in the legislative branch of the Government, and any Senator who wanted to be heard could have been heard. The same witnesses testify before the House committee who testified before the Senate committee. I only wish to say that the committees went a little bit further in the Eighty-first Congress in respect to the FEPC legislation than they did in respect to the National Science Foundation or the school health services bill.

The Senator from Minnesota wishes to say that he does not see why some Senators are so alarmed all at once by reason of lack of hearings respecting the FEPC legislation. We have this kind of distortion, this kind of legislative trickery going on here respecting this important piece of legislation. That is done in an effort to do what? To prevent the Senate even having a chance to vote on one of the most controversial issues of our day. I submit that that shows lack of faith. It represents an unwillingness to test the courage of the respective Members of the United States Senate to see how they are going to vote. Are we going to settle the issue on the basis of a trick parliamentary maneuver—on a motion to consider the bill?

Mr. President, the Senate has considered the ECA bill and the Senate has considered one bill after another pertaining to the defense of this country. The Senate considered the bill for Federal aid to education and bills pertaining to Federal aid to hospitals and medical schools. The Senate has considered bills on almost every conceivable legislative proposal, without debating for one minute the question of whether to have the Senate proceed to consider those bills. In regard to such bills, the majority leader simply announced the bill, and most Members of the Senate left the floor and went back to their offices.

However, now when we come to the FEPC bill, we find that we have to have a delaying argument in regard to whether to have the Senate proceed to consider the bill. No Senator has given any reason against having the Senate consider the bill, except that some Senators do not like the bill. The only argument against having the Senate consider the bill is that some Senators do not like it.

I happen to be enough of a believer in the democratic process to say that if Senators do not like a bill, they should give their arguments and should register their votes, but should do so on the question of the bill itself, and should not resort to some sort of legislative trickery or some other legislative procedure, call it what we will, to prevent the measure from being acted upon.

Mr. President, let me speak now for a moment in regard to the kind of doctrine of association which has been advanced by some Senators. This sort of attack is an insult to our intelligence. The attack which was made today by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the attack recently made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is an attack upon the integrity of the religious faiths in this country and the political institutions in this country.

Let me quote from an Associated Press dispatch regarding the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in the Senate:

WASHINGTON.—Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, Georgia, today launched a sizzling attack on the Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC) bill which administration forces are seeking to bring before the Senate for action.

RUSSELL, quarterback of the southern Democratic forces opposing the bill, charged an FEPC law would bring about nationalization of industry, and "follows the Russian idea" in that it would create "thought police" in the United States.

The bill would set up a commission to enforce nondiscrimination in employment.

"We will not defeat Russia in either the cold war or a shooting war by copying any part of the Russian system," RUSSELL told the Senate.

"I, of course, do not charge that all persons supporting this bill are Socialists or Communists. Many good Americans have been deceived. I do, however, unhesitatingly assert that every Socialist and every Communist in the United States, every person who believes in government ownership and operation of our industries, is ardently supporting this measure and all of its sanctions."

Mr. President, today the Senator from Florida has stated to the Senate that this proposed legislation is Communist-inspired, that the source of this legislation is the Communist Party.

However, to the contrary, I say that the source of this legislation is the Declaration of Independence, which says—

That all men are created equal.

And that—

Governments are instituted among men * * * to secure these rights * * * (of) life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. President, during the debate on this measure, when we get away from the present parliamentary maneuvering, I shall quote again, and at great length, from the report and from the hearings of the Senate committee in the Eightieth Congress and from the House committee hearings in the Eighty-first Congress and I shall recite the testimony of persons of importance who apparently have been influenced by the desirability of the enactment of FEPC legislation.

I mention first some of the great spiritual leaders who have testified in behalf of this legislation. I say it is sheer distortion and adulteration of the facts and the evidence to try to label this kind of legislation as Communist-inspired.

I happen to have known the late Msgr. John A. Ryan, one of the great Christian leaders of this Nation and of this century. He testified before the Senate committee in 1944—a great Catholic spiritual leader—in behalf of this legislation. He based his advocacy of this legislative proposal, not upon some political doctrine, but upon the moral doctrine of the Christian faith.

I also call the attention of those who are trying to muddy the waters and those who are trying to indulge in smear tactics, to the testimony, in advocacy of this bill, of the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, Bishop of Grand Rapids; to the testimony of another distinguished Catholic bishop, the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago; to the testimony of Rabbi William F. Rosenblum, president of the Synagogue Council of America; to the testimony of the Reverend Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; to the testimony of representatives of practically every religious faith in the Nation.

Mr. President, for any Member of the Senate to try by word or by the inflection of his voice to indicate that this legislation is Communist-inspired is, in my opinion, blasphemy, and should be so labeled. Believe me, Mr. President, there are other arguments than arguments based on rumor or smear or distortion, to be made in connection with this legislative proposal. There are other arguments which can be made against FEPC, but FEPC is not to be attacked on the ground of alleging that it is Communist-inspired or Communist-supported.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota deny the expression of this philosophy which first appeared, so far as politics are concerned, in the Communist National Party platform in May of 1928?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not interested in Communist Party platforms. I have never read one, and I do not want to read one. I have read the testimony of the great religious leaders of this country, who, I am sure, have more knowledge of communism than most Senators have, or at least as much; and I believe that their testimony is not based upon any political party platform, but is based upon the moral discipline of their religious faith.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota deny the finding and the declaration made by the Bipartisan California Committee on Un-American Activities, a committee of the California Legislature, of the very conclusive fact that Communists did inspire and were behind and were the agitators and the prime supporters of FEPC, as proposed in the initiative in California in 1946, which was plastered down or turned down so definitely by the vote of the people of California?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the activities of the California Un-American Activities Committee, except that many persons in California do not think too well of it.

I am not familiar with that referendum vote; I do not have that information. I shall be more than happy to reply as to that when we come to the debate on FEPC.

However, I know what I believe to be the truth. I believe that the truth is that in politics in America, when someone wishes to kill a proposal, he merely has to find that the Communists have supported it. Of course, in that connection all we have to do is stand still and watch and listen, and we shall find that such arguments about such Communist support will make the full circle.

Mr. President, I have my own faith, and it is grounded in the Judeo-Christian democracy. If the Communists happen to subscribe to it once in awhile, I will not leave it. After all, the Communists can be right once in awhile, I suppose.

Mr. President, the facts in this matter are crystal-clear. The facts are that the most responsible, the most enlightened, the most devoted citizens of the United States have appeared before the committees of Congress to testify in behalf of this legislation.

I resent the fact that every time a decent bill comes before the Senate, a bill which has good purposes and good objectives, some Senator must drag in the Communists. On that basis, I suppose we will get rid of the American flag because it has red in it. Mr. President, it is simply ridiculous.

Let us debate this bill on its merits, not on the basis that somehow or another, somewhere, way back when, someone who was digging around in Communist literature—which I would say is not very good literature to be digging around in—found that the Communist Party was in favor of some kind of FEPC.

I prefer to receive my inspiration from men like Monsignor Ryan, rather than Earl Browder; I prefer to receive my inspiration from men like Bishop Haas, rather than Joe Stalin.

I prefer to read the literature of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, rather than the Daily Worker; and I shall read that literature, rather than snoop around in the moth-eaten files of the Daily Worker.

Mr. President, let us nail down several points which need to be nailed down. First of all, whenever the minority of the Senate wants something, it does not talk about parliamentary tricks, about hearings, or anything else of that sort. Measures which are approved by the minority are shouted through so quickly that we scarcely realize what has happened.

However, when there is a measure which some Senator does not want, then Senators can resort to mere rules and regulations and can dig back into 45 manuals to find out ways of preventing the consideration of that measure.

Let me say that the statements I made on the American Forum of the Air were considered statements, and the words I used at that time were considered words. I submit that in America today a job which needs to be done is the reapportionment of the State legislatures in order to get adequate and proportionate representation in the respective State legislatures.

The Senator from Florida does not need to take my word about that. The American Political Science Association, made up of the most eminent men in political science in this country, says that reapportionment is needed in many States—that legislatures, without regular reapportionment, are unrepresentative. In the State of Minnesota we have not had reapportionment since 1910. I am looking at my friend, the Senator from California. California has not had reapportionment for a long time, either. They have not had it in many States. In 1910, the population of the State of Minnesota was much less than it is today, yet the same number of representatives serve in the State legislature from the respective counties today as served in 1910. The Senator from Minnesota was not talking about the character or the qualities of the individual legislators. They are splendid, fine citizens. They do the best they can. They represent their point of view, and they represent a point of view honestly. The need for reapportionment is exemplified by the county in which the city of Minneapolis is located. In 1910 this county had about 350,000 people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That county now has almost a million people, with the same number of representatives in the legislature. I submit that is not proper representation. It is not fair representation. The Governor of our State says it is not fair, the Democratic Party says it is not right, the Republican Party says it is not right, the League of Women Voters, the chamber of commerce, the A. F. of L., the CIO—not a single responsible political group or economic group in the State underwrites the lack of proper apportionment of the legislature.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that in doing so he shall not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator may be entirely familiar with the situation in Minnesota, and I take it he is. The Senator is mistaken, however, when the says the Legislature of California has not been reapportioned since 1910.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not say that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Perhaps I misunderstood.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator said that the problem of reapportionment exists in California, as it does in other States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the matter of apportionment of the Legislature of the State of California is an entirely proper one under the constitution of the State. The assembly, which represents the districts, is divided according to population as shown by the Federal census. The State senate is under the so-called Federal plan, which has been challenged on several occasions, and in each case the people of California by an overwhelming direct vote of the people have sustained the Federal plan of apportionment. So, while the Senator may speak for Minnesota, I wish he would be more accurate in speaking for California.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to receive the information regarding California. I am glad the Senator is so happy with the situation there. I know that his constituents will be very happy to know it, too. The situation, according to the Senator from California, is one that is perfectly satisfactory to the great majority of the people of California. I accept that. I was only quoting what has been a review of the respective State legislatures in the United States by impartial, non-political, disinterested persons, who are in the field of government as a science—the American Political Science Association.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It may well be that there are some distinguished, eminent gentlemen living in various sections of the country who may disagree with the Federal plan of apportionment as it exists in the State of California. My only point is that the provisions under which we apportion the legislature are provided in the constitution of the State. Under the constitution of California, the people have a chance to vote directly through constitutional amendments or through the initiative or the referendum, and to pass judgment on it. In each case, when an attempt has been made to change the apportionment, the people by an overwhelming vote have sustained the provisions of our State constitution. It seems to me to be a bit strange for the eminent Senator from Minnesota, who apparently believes in the working of the democratic process, that when the people of a sovereign State have spoken, not once but on several occasions, and have sustained them, to cite as a reason for change the fact that a few academic people may disagree with the procedures which the people of California have adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota does not think that at all. He said he was more than happy to receive the information from the Senator from California. I may say it will be of great interest to the Members of the United States Senate. As the people from California wish to be apportioned, that is their wish, and it shall be done. As the State constitution prescribes, so be it. That is exactly the way it ought to be. I merely say that one of the problems of the American Government over the Nation has been the lack of apportionment and reapportionment.

Let me get back now to Minnesota.

I only want to point out, Mr. President, what has been said about Minnesota, that the junior Senator from Minnesota, in making his statement that the legislature did not represent the will of the people, again repeats that statement. Let me now document it. First of all——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator does not yield at this time.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD following my remarks a poll, a State-wide poll of September 7, 1949, which poll I have often referred to on the floor of the Senate, a poll that is made by the Minneapolis Morning Tribune. Its authenticity has been well-established throughout the years. It has the variables of percentage weakness that any poll may have. However, great effort has been made to make this an accurate one, which shows that 76 percent of the people in Minnesota believe the Congress should pass a law to guarantee everyone in the United States an equal chance to get a job according to his abilities, regardless of race, religion, or

nationality. That was a poll which was taken just about a year ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Another poll was taken pertaining to the kind of legislation which is pending before the United States Senate, talking about a specific law, not just the general principle, but a specific bill with teeth in it—enforcement powers. That poll showed that 54 percent of the people of Minnesota are in favor of a Federal law which would say to employers that they cannot discriminate against applicants because of their race, religion, or nationality.

The second poll which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD is dated February 12, 1950. That is within the last 2 or 3 months. It demonstrates a rising tide of favorable public opinion in my State toward fair employment practices. And, since I have been told that I should confine myself to my State, I shall confine myself to that particular area of the country. In this poll, 79 percent of the people agree with the statement, "It is up to the Federal Government to see to it that all people—whites, Negroes, and other races; Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—have the same chances of getting jobs from any employer, assuming they are qualified to do the work."

I ask unanimous consent that this poll be printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement submitted by the Minnesota Council for the Fair Employment Act. This statement gives evidence that responsible business leaders in our community are in favor of FEPC legislation. It also indicates that this legislation is supported by both political parties in our State, the major labor organizations, the Minnesota Department of the American Legion, and numerous other civic groups. I ask that the names of the officers of the Minnesota Council for Fair Employment Practice also be printed. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also want to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Minnesota State Executive Board of the League of Women Voters has just voted to recommend to the members that the league support fair employment practices legislation as an action program in the next session of the Minnesota Legislature.

My colleague on the floor made reference to the legislature. I agree with his reference to the legislature, insofar as the quality of its membership is concerned. It has a membership of high character, of good morals, and fine background. The issue to which the Senator from Minnesota is extending his remarks is simply this, that the Senator from Florida made comment upon the fact that the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, as reported and as mentioned by the junior Senator from Minnesota, was not representative of the will of the people on the issue of FEPC. Mr. President, never was a truer statement ever made. The Governor of our State, who was elected in a Democratic year, was a Republican, and his major issue was the issue of human rights. The junior Senator from Minnesota, who served 2 terms as mayor of his city, a city of over 500,000 people, had as one of his major issues the issue of a fair employment practices law. I shall not burden the RECORD with the majority votes which were piled up, but they were sufficient and substantial. What is more important is that the responsible business leadership and spiritual leadership of our State, the responsible educational leadership of Minnesota, the responsible veterans' leadership of our State, all have gone before the legislature urging favorable action. The Minnesota State Senate passed it. The house of representatives acted somewhat like the Senate of the United States—it delayed it, and, in the process of delaying it, it was tabled in the committee.

So I would say, in view of the appropriate comments of the Senator from California, no one knows more about a State than do those who represent it; and since I have heard of reapportionment and the legislature in California, and I accept it—let me ask my colleagues of the United States Senate to accept as a matter of fact and truth, with a good deal of substantiating evidence, the assertion by the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I should like to note the position of Minnesota business and civic leaders, men like Bradshaw Mintener, vice president and general counsel of Pillsbury Mills, who favors FEPC legislation; men in industry, prominent contractors, men in the retail establishments, such as York Langton, the trade extension manager of the Coast to Coast Stores. Mr. Stuart W. Leck, on the basis of his business experience, endorses and supports FEPC legislation.

For example, Mr. President, one Julius H. Barnes, president of the Barnes Shipbuilding Co., who served as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce for three terms, appeared personally before the House Labor Committee and said:

> I am glad to confirm to you that by study, observation, and conviction I feel that the proposed FEPC legislation * * * is entitled to public approval and public confidence.

As I have mentioned, great educational leaders of our State support it. Dr. Lawrence Gould, president of Carleton College, presented the following written testimony:

> We have no right to expect approval of our way of life by other nations unless we take a forthright position toward matters of this sort. I want to add my recommendation concerning the desirability of such a bill. It is only in line with what we have always protested to be our democratic American ideas. I do not see how anyone who prides himself upon our American heritage can do less than give his wholehearted support to this bill.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be incorporated in the body of the RECORD, and I ask that particular emphasis be placed in the reading of the statement upon the caliber and character of the individuals who have testified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I make this further observation, Mr. President. It was not only the city vote to which I had reference, but, as a matter of fact, in the farm country 61 percent of the farm people were in support of FEPC legislation, 50 percent in the cities, and 56 percent in the towns of middle size.

Mr. President, at a later date it is my intention——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the Senator now does not wish to have this statement which I read into the RECORD, stand with reference to his own State, the statement being as follows:

> I want to repeat, that there is no one area of government in the United Ctates that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, not at all. That is absolutely true. I would not want to make a move of political expediency here to please someone. The RECORD is perfectly clear. The views of some persons are not as important as what is the truth. The truth is that what I have said is true, and it will remain so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I listened with interest to the comments which the Senator made with reference to the attitude of church people. I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD a letter dated January 1, 1950, from G. M. Lane, chairman of the American Council of Christian Churches of California, which deals with this subject; and I wish to make it very clear that the group of churches of which he is the head does not support FEPC legislation, but regards it as ungodly. The letter ends with the following paragraph:

> We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination against employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection—

Says this churchman—

> it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not object. I merely say it is the opinion of one church leader. Everyone has a right to his opinion. If we are going to add up the opinions of individuals, this bill should have been passed last week. So far as the responsible organizations who are in support of it are concerned, we would not have needed any debate. There are differences of opinion. This business of bringing in by the doctrine of association, by innuendo, the subject of communism and socialism every time the Senate is considering a question, is a little beneath the dignity of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 1, 1950.

The Honorable SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Doubtless there will be FEPC legislation brought before the Congress this session.

We have consistently opposed this type of legislation and we still do.

FEPC legislation would rob the employer of the right to choose whom he would to work for him. This right was upheld by Jesus Christ when He approvingly quoted the employer as saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matthew 20:15). An employer does have the God-given right to choose whom he will to work for him. There is a kind of discrimination that is not wrong.

We realize that there is a kind of discrimination that is wrong. We hold no brief for the one who hates another or for one who discriminates solely because of the color of skin. However, we are convinced that this discrimination is not as prevalent as some of our liberal friends would have us believe. We attended a meeting sponsored by an organization that was pushing FEPC and at which representatives of other allied groups were present. A call was made for any authentic cases of discrimination that could be brought before the California legislative body that was considering their bill. Among all the organizations represented (all of which were left-wing groups) only two individuals were found in the ranks of these groups in all of the Los Angeles area who would go before a legislative hearing and testify that they had been discriminated against. Surely this does not indicate a very serious situation.

FEPC, if adopted, would act as an effective extension of the police state. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business is to add one more control to the already burdensome load which is being borne by the private-enterprise system. This private-enterprise system, which in our modern world is so distinctively American, is the only economic system which is stamped with the approval of the word of God. And that private-enterprise system is the economic system which has made our Nation great.

We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination against employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

Sincerely,

G. M. LANE,
Chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. For a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without encumbering the record I should like to say one thing briefly, and then I shall be through. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has letters from pastors of every known evangelical denomination, and from Catholic societies, stating that no one has authority in any of those groups to speak for their denominations, but they personally are strongly opposed to FEPC and believe that the great majority of their churchmen in those various groups oppose it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the comments of the Senator from Florida, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD page 5, page 6, and down to the heading at the bottom of page 7, of the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Senate bill 1728.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As was to be expected, distinguished leaders of the clergy and laity in all of our major faiths have led in the condemnation of job discrimination as an outrage to the central spirit of our religious beliefs. Such discrimination has been unremittingly denounced as immoral, unjust, and an affront to the innate dignity of man.

One of the outstanding witnesses before the House committee was the Reverend Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Dr. Cavert appeared at the direction of the executive committee of the council which comprises a federation of 27 national denominations with 28,000,000 members. In his testimony urging this legislation, Dr. Cavert pointed out that in addition to the federal council, explicit support for antidiscrimination in employment legislation has come from conventions of the general conference of the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, the Northern Baptist Convention, the general council of the Congregational Christian Churches, and the general synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Negro Protestant churches on record for FEPC include the four leading denominations—the National Baptist Convention, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and the Colored Methodist Church. Dr. Cavert indicated only two exceptions to this statement of the views of American Protestantism, namely, the Southern Baptists and the Presbyterian Church in the United States (Southern).

Great leaders of the Roman Catholic Church added their voices in behalf of a Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. As long ago as 1944, the late Msgr. John A. Ryan told a subcommittee of this committee that he favored this legislation because "The Christian precept of brotherly love is not satisfied by mere well-wishing, nor benevolent emotion, nor sentimental yearning. It requires action." In 1947, the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, bishop of Grand Rapids, said in a letter to the chairman of this committee:

"I earnestly hope that this bill will become law.

"I offer no lengthy comment on the underlying principle of the bill; that is, that all American citizens are equal, and that all are entitled to have their right to equal opportunity protected by law. To me both as an American citizen and as a Catholic bishop this principle needs no supporting argument. Equality is among our most treasured American possessions, as it is a central doctrine of Christian faith, which proclaims that all men are equal before God, made equal before Him through His Divine Son, Jesus Christ."

Yet another distinguished Catholic bishop, the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, said:

"A fair employment practices law would give legal recognition to that God-given dignity which every human being possesses. Economic discrimination is immoral; it is clearly sinful. How long are we expected to sit by while children of God find their paths blocked at every point by the forces of bigotry and discrimination?"

Leaders of American Judiasm have joined with the Christian clergy in pointing to the spiritual and moral need and foundation for this bill. Rabbi William F. Rosenblum, president of the Synagogue Council of America, told a subcommittee of this committee:

"It is natural that religious groups should come strongly to the support of any measure which puts into practice the fundamental principle that we have 'one Father and that one God made us all.' * * *. However, it is not merely from a theological point of view that we feel strong effort must be made against discrimination, but from the more practical aspect of preserving the rights of our citizens and especially of furthering the aims of our form of government."

Other members of the rabbinate, both Orthodox and Reformed, seconded Rabbi Rosenblum.

Vigorous support for these expressions by their clergymen has come from the laity in all three faiths. Organizations representing millions of God-fearing Protestants, Catholic, and Jewish men and women have sent their lay leaders to affirm that they share the views of their spiritual leaders.

Moreover, testimony based upon practical considerations of benefit has mounted. Sociologists have testified that poverty born of discrimination breeds disease, squalor, and crime. Economists have pointed out that States with the lowest per capita income are those in which discrimination is most severe.

This is clear evidence that when large numbers of persons are prevented from working on jobs for which they are qualified by education, training, and skill, the purchasing power and standard of living of the total community sinks accordingly.

Almost all labor unions have joined in the demand for an end to discrimination in employment on the ground that it depresses wages and creates divisions inimical to the trade-union movement.

Illustrative of this point is the resolution of the American Federation of Labor adopted unanimously in November 1948 and inserted in the hearings of the House in 1949 (H. R. 4453) on page 300 as follows:

"Whereas a Federal FEPC law is essential for the elimination of discrimination in employment relations based upon race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, and since the right to work is tied up with the right to live, which is God-given: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Sixty-seventh convention of the American Federation of Labor assembled in Cincinnati, Ohio, November 1948, reaffirm its position of supporting the movement for Federal fair-employment-practice legislation and call upon the Eighty-first Congress to enact legislation for an effective Fair Employment Practices Commission."

The vigorous attitude of the CIO in forming a committee to abolish discrimination and following through both by application of antidiscrimination principles and support of the President's policy is further attested in its Resolution No. 8, the concluding part of which will be found on page 334 of the House hearings in words as follows:

"Resolved, That the tenth constitutional convention of the CIO hereby pledges itself to continue the struggle to achieve the full,

equal enjoyment of all the rights guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

"We demand:

"1. The passage of Federal and local fair-employment practice acts.

"2. The abolition of segregation in the armed forces.

"3. The enactment of a Federal antilynching bill.

"4. The passage of Federal and State legislation outlawing poll taxes and other restrictions on the right to vote.

"5. The passage of measures to ban segregation in interstate travel.

"6. The enactment of safeguards against racial discrimination in Federal appropriations for State aid.

"7. The enactment of civil-rights laws in all States which now do not have such laws eliminating segregation.

"8. The abolition of the Thomas-Rankin committee.

"9. The enactment of laws protecting aliens long resident in the United States and regularizing their status.

"10. The establishment of guaranties to protect the freedom of thought and the freedom of political views of Government workers and the revocation of Executive Order 9835."

Businessmen, too, particularly in the more recent hearings, appeared to testify or submitted statements expressing their opinion that discrimination is a "fool's economy," that it is uneconomical, cutting down the size of markets, increasing costs of production, and raising the burden of taxation.

For example, Mr. Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has been widely quoted in favor of Federal fair employment practice legislation and in a letter dated February 1, 1949, Mr. Julius H. Barnes, also a former chamber of commerce president, wrote as follows:

"The FEPC ideal appears to me to be one of even-handed justice and equal opportunity, assured by the authority of government itself. The instinctive American respect for equal treatment and for fair play would be strengthened and stimulated by such an attitude on the part of Government itself."

In this connection, the testimony of Elwood S. McKenney, commissioner, Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission, to be found on page 249 of the House hearings, is significant. Mr. McKenney stated in part as follows:

"I would like to examine our experience in the 3 years of this law in Massachusetts. Prior to the enactment of the statute in Massachusetts the representatives of industry said that the passage of FEPC legislation would create such a burden upon employers that the most damaging effect it would have would be to drive business out of the State. Well, the 1948 report of the Boston Chamber of Commerce speaks for itself. That report said that during 1948, the third year that the fair-employment practice law was in effect, 36 new business organizations had been established in metropolitan Boston, and further than that, 58 existing firms had begun new construction at a cost of $300,000,000 * * *.

"It is also significant that after 2½ years of FEPC in Massachusetts, the Associated Industries in Massachusetts and the Boston Chamber of Commerce both issued statements that although they were not in favor of the law as a matter of principle, they were satisfied legislation of that type could be administered without causing a burden upon industry. That doesn't mean that the Commission has been remiss in its duties, it simply means it has won the confidence of business."

And finally, there is the testimony of our diplomats that discrimination has an adverse effect on our relations with other nations; that it constitutes a formidable obstacle to the development of mutual understanding and trust, and that we will have better international relations when this obstacle is removed.

In all the volumes of testimony, in all the array of witnesses who appeared at the committee hearings, including those who appeared in opposition to the proposed legislation, there was not one who disputed the ideal of equality of opportunity, not one who rose to defend the principle of discrimination, not one who challenged the fact that discrimination in employment is an unmitigated evil.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since I understand that I may be denied the right to the floor at a later time, because I have spoken today, I had intended to make some remarks in a very brief statement which I had prepared, not pertaining to the Minnesota Legislature, but to the whole picture. I realize that it is late, and I had not intended to proceed at this time. I gather that there may be some difficulty in making the statement at a later time, so I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the morning hour, I be permitted to make my statement. If I am not interrupted, I do not think it will take more than 15 minutes. The statement is seven pages long, in triple space. However, I do not ask for that limitation of time. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate tomorrow, right after the routine business has been transacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of September 7, 1949]

MINNESOTA POLL—54 PERCENT IN STATE FAVOR FEDERAL FEPC LEGISLATION

Minnesotans are in favor of the broad principle of equality in job opportunities for people of all races, religious, and nationalities, a State-wide survey by the Minnesota poll indicates. But they are less strongly in favor of specific legislation that would restrain employers from rejecting job applicants on account of race, religion, or nationality.

Proposals for fair-employment practices legislation that would bar discrimination in employment have been made to Congress by President Truman on a number of occasions. Little headway has been made by supporters in Congress thus far. A bill in the State legislature to equalize employment opportunities failed at the last session.

Minnesota poll interviewers asked a representative cross-section of the State's voting-age men and women two questions about their views on that kind of legislation, but one question was couched in very general terms, and the second was specific in referring to a prohibition against discrimination by employers in the kinds of people they hired. The first question was:

"Do you believe that Congress should pass a law that would guarantee everyone in the United States an equal chance to get a job according to his abilities, regardless of his race, religion, or nationality?"

The replies:

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes, should	76	74	82	76
No, should not	19	21	15	15
Qualified	1	1	1	2
No opinion	4	4	2	7
Total	100	100	100	100

Some people contended "we don't need any such law; it's already in the Constitution." Several giving qualified answers said there should be a guaranty "for people who are citizens." Eighty-four percent of the women, 83 percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, 83 percent of the people with grade-school educations, and 83 percent of the voters who supported Truman last November, are agreed that such a law should be passed.

The second question was:

"How about a Federal law that would say to employers: 'You cannot turn down job seekers because of their race, religion, or nationality'; would you be in favor of, or against, that kind of law?"

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
In favor	54	50	56	61
Against	34	36	37	27
Qualified	4	5	4	3
No opinion	8	9	3	9
Total	100	100	100	100

It is likely that the first question influenced some persons to say they are "in favor" to the second question. Several earlier Minnesota poll studies on State attitudes toward FEPC legislation showed less than half of the adults supporting such measures.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 12, 1950]

MINNESOTA POLL—SHOULD UNITED STATES "SEE TO IT" THAT YOU GET HOUSING AND JOB EQUALITY?

Minnesotans are in general agreement that the Federal Government should "see to it that a family can get decent housing when it needs it" and that it should assure equal job opportunities to all people, regardless of race or religion, the Minnesota poll finds. A majority of them feel, however, that it is not up to the Government "to see to it that a person can get a job when he needs it."

There is disagreement over the idea that the Federal Government should "see to it that a family can get medical care when it needs it." Fifty-one percent think the Government should bear that responsibility; 44 percent think it should not.

In one form or another, all four of those issues—housing, fair employment practices, medical care and full employment, are before Congress this year. In his message to Congress last month, President Truman urged enactment of FEPC legislation, national health insurance, an adequate housing program for middle-income families (Congress last year passed a low-rent housing and slum-clearance measure), and "basic protection against the economic hazards of * * * unemployment."

The Minnesota poll survey of State attitudes concerning Federal responsibilities in those four fields was made on a broad, generalized basis, without reference to any specific legislative proposal.

Interviewers told a representative cross-section of Minnesota men and women, living in cities and towns, and on farms:

"I'm going to read you a series of statements, and I'd like to know whether you agree or disagree with each of them."

The statements, and the replies:

1. "It's up to the Federal Government to see to it that a person can get a job when he needs it." Do you agree or disagree?

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	36	31	39
Disagree	57	63	52
No opinion	7	6	9
Total	100	100	100

2. "It's up to the Federal Government to see to it that a family can get decent housing when it needs it." Do you agree or disagree?

	Al.	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	58	55	62
Disagree	34	39	29
No opinion	8	6	9
Total	100	100	100

3. "It's up to the Federal Government to see to it that a family can get medical care when it needs it." Agree or disagree?

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	51	51	51
Disagree	44	43	44
Qualified	1	1	1
No opinion	4	5	4
Total	100	100	100

4. "It's up to the Federal Government to see to it that all peoples—whites, Negroes, and other races; Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—have the same chances at getting jobs from any employer, assuming they are qualified to do the work." Do you agree or disagree?

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	79	78	80
Disagree	17	18	17
No opinion	4	4	3
Total	100	100	100

People in the lower economic group and those with grade-school education are inclined to agree with all four statements regarding Federal responsibility.

Those in the upper economic group and those with college education disagree with the first three statements, but—like all other segments of the cross-section—agree with the statement that the Government should see to it that all people have equal opportunities to get jobs, if they are qualified for the work.

The survey also shows:

On seeing to it that a person can get a job when he needs it—

Democratic-Farmer-Laborites are evenly divided between agreeing and disagreeing that that should be a Federal responsibility, but two out of every three Republicans and independent voters disagree.

People who voted for Dewey in 1948 express greater disagreement (72 percent) than do people who supported Truman (52 percent disagree).

A St. Paul man who agrees that the Government should see to it that people in need of jobs get jobs says, "A man deserves a job." A Minneapolis woman comments, "Everyone should be able to get work." An Ada woman thinks that "jobs are scarce and it's going to get worse."

But a St. Louis Park man feels that "that's not the function of the Federal Government"; a Rushton farmer says, "I've always had to get my own job—why not everybody else?" and an Ortonville man thinks that "if a man hasn't got enough incentive to get a job himself, he isn't much good."

On providing decent housing—

Sixty-three percent of the city people say the Federal Government should see to it that "a family can get decent housing when it needs it." Little more than half (51 percent) of the farm people share that opinion.

"If you have a Government by the people and for the people, they should be interested in people's welfare," a Champlin man contends. "They should spend money for housing instead of sending it to Europe," is the opinion of a Sacred Heart farmer.

On the other hand, a Minneapolis man says that "that's too close to the welfare state"; a St. Charles farmer wants people to "take care of themselves," and a Goodhue woman feels that "the Government shouldn't be our grandfather at all."

On seeing to it "that a family can get medical care when it needs it"—

People in the lower economic group are strongly in favor of having the Government provide that assurance, as those in the upper economic group are opposed to that idea:

	Upper	Middle	Lower
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	34	48	63
Disagree	64	47	30
Qualified	1	1	1
No opinion	1	4	6
Total	100	100	100

The few persons offering qualified answers say the Government should see to it that needy families get medical care when they need it, or that the Government should see that medical care is available in all places, but not free care.

In the 30–49 age groups, there are as many men and women who disagree as agree that the Government should assume the responsibility, but among people 21–29 years of age and among those 50 and older, more than half agree with the statement.

On seeing to it that all people, regardless of race or religion, have the same chances at getting jobs—

More than three out of every four city, town, and farm residents agree that that is a Federal responsibility.

Eighty-six percent of the labor union members questioned support that position. So do 88 percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, 76 percent of the independent voters and 69 percent of the Republicans.

A Rochester man declares the Government "shouldn't tell private employment whom they can and can't hire," and a Minneapolis man says, "I want the opportunity of picking help as I see fit."

Typical of the majority's comments is this from a Minneapolis man: "The only basis should be qualifications and ability."

EXHIBIT 3

THE POSITION OF MINNESOTA BUSINESS AND CIVIC LEADERS ON THE PROPOSED FEPC BILL

You have been told that the employers of Minnesota are opposed to a State FEPC bill. That is not true. The 100 letters from employers presented to the legislature by Otto Christenson were secured by intensive solicitation of the 1,100 members of his organization. In securing these letters and in preparing his pamphlet against the proposed bill, Christenson has spoken with complete disregard for, and in absolute contradiction to, the record of actual experience with the operation of fair employment practice commissions in the cities of Minneapolis and Philadelphia and the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey. Similar commissions recently began operation in the States of Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, and Rhode Island. Their experience so far has been equally favorable.

It was evident that the employers who wrote those letters and who appeared to testify against the bill had had absolutely no experience with fair employment practice commissions and were completely misinformed as to the actual record of their operations. If these employers were correctly informed as to the facts, we are confident that they would support the present bill.

Practical Minnesota businessmen who once had honest doubts about the value of a fair employment practice law have become enthusiastic supporters of such legislation after examining the record of the Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Commission. Many of these informed employers joined in urging the enactment of State legislation last spring.

Bradshaw Mintener, vice president and general counsel of Pillsbury Mills, addressed a letter to other employers over the State in which he said:

"After considerable thought and reflection, I have come to the conclusion that as a Nation we cannot afford the luxury of having people in it who practices discrimination. * * * I cannot see how we can ever realize our full measure of national economic well-being until every man and every woman is not only permitted, but encouraged, to work at whatever he can best do, regardless of his color, his religion, or his social standing. * * * I am confident that after you have given this matter the thought and consideration that it requires, we will be able to count you an ally in the task that faces us in making fair-employment practices a reality in the State of Minnesota."

Stuart W. Leck, president of the Leck Construction Co., wrote: "As a Minnesota employer, I endorse the fair-employment-practices bill. Action, not lip service, is needed if equality of opportunity is no longer to be denied some of our citizens solely because of their color or religion. * * * I have carefully read and considered your bill. I have confidence that it will be sanely administered, thereby helping to correct present abuses and buttressing our republican form of government."

Both of these men had urged the city council to delay action on the ordinance at the time it was enacted because they had serious doubts that such legislation was either necessary or desirable. W. H. Feldmann, president of Electric Machinery Manufacturing Co., had shared their misgivings. In explaining how the legislation had gained his support, he said, "I should like to express indorsement of the bill to create a State commission against discrimination in employment. While I have long been wholeheartedly for these objectives, I have had some misgivings in the past as to possible abuses in administration of such a law. However, the administration of the city of Minneapolis ordinance has worked exceedingly well because of the restraint and good judgment applied by the commission. Under the provisions of your bill, it seems likely that equally intelligent administration will result. Certainly such legislation will more rapidly advance the elimination of the

handicapping of employment opportunities due to prejudice. And the attainment of that objective warrants some risk."

One of the most significant statements in support of the proposed fair employment practice bill comes from Julius H. Barnes, president of the Barnes Shipbuilding Co., who has business interests in both Minnesota and New York. He served as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce for three terms and as chairman of the board for 3 years more. He appeared personally before the House Labor Committee and also submitted a written statement, which said in part: "I am glad to confirm to you that by study, observation, and conviction I feel that the proposed FEPC legislation * * * (is) entitled to public approval and public confidence.

"I put special weight on the philosophy that in a democracy the individual is the important factor, and fairness and equality of treatment the only atmosphere in which individual character can develop.

"The FEPC ideal appears to me to be one of even-handed justice and equal opportunity, assured by the authority of the Government. The instinctive American respect for fair play would be strengthened and stimulated by such an attitude on the part of Government itself."

The first chairman of the Minneapolis Commission was George M. Jensen, regional zone manager of the Nash-Kelvinator Corp. He reported that: "A number of employers have expressed to me the conclusion that * * * the ill effects expected from the legislation have failed to develop * * *. It is my opinion that employers, employees, and citizens of our community at large, have benefited from the salutary effects of the ordinance * * *. Judging by our local experience * * * such legislation * * * at the State level * * * would prove of definite value to the citizenry of the State as a whole."

The trade extension manager of Coast-to-Coast Stores, York Langton, testified before the House Labor Committee both on the basis of his business experience and in his capacity as president of the Minnesota United Nations Association. He said: "The Minnesota United Nations Association strongly supports the Minnesota Fair Employment Practice Act * * *. This bill, if enacted into law, would give every person an opportunity to obtain employment without discrimination because of race, color, or religion.

"As a Nation profoundly interested in peace, we must recognize that this important issue of doing away with discrimination is the foundation stone on which the temple of peace must rest."

The public relations director of General Mills, Abbott Washburn, serves as a member of the Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Commission. He appeared in person before the House Labor Committee. On the basis of his intimate knowledge he concluded that the Commission's work "has resulted in extensive correction of discriminatory practices and has opened the gates of employment opportunity to many workers who previously found them closed. It has likewise protected many employers against unfair charges of discrimination."

Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc., recently wrote: "From my observation of the operation of the FEPC in Minneapolis, I believe it has helped * * * to corect some of these inequities. * * * Its instigators and present members are all men of good will whose integrity and loyalty are beyond question. * * * The equalization of employment opportunities is strictly in the American tradition, and anything that promotes that equalization deserves, within reason, our support. I believe the greatest value of the FEPC ordinance has been educational. It has caused management to review employment policies and to endeavor to get rid of old prejudices."

In his written testimony in support of the proposed bill, Edward F. Waite, retired judge of the Hennepin County District Court, said, "As I look back through a long experience, I observe that the time has always come to say 'must' to those who have rejected enlightenment and persuasion; and I believe that in the field we are considering, that time has arrived. Our moral and religious convictions, our self-respect among the nations as professed lovers of freedom and champions of human rights, our economic interests to develop and utilize our potential manpower, prudent precaution against long-smoldering fires of justified resentment—all say 'now.'"

Dr. Lawrence Gould, president of Carleton College, presented the following written testimony: "We have no right to expect approval of our way of life by other nations unless we take a forthright position toward matters of this sort. I want to add my recommendation concerning the desirability of such a bill. It is only in line with what we have always protested to be our democratic American ideas. I do not see how anyone who prides himself upon our American heritage can do less than give his wholehearted support to this bill."

The active support of the Minnesota Department of the American Legion was indicated by Nate V. Keller, who testified in his capacity as chairman of the Legion's employment committee. He said: "The American Legion is very much interested in the FEPC; in fact, at every one of our past three State conventions our convention committee passed a resolution endorsing it. It would be very happy to contact by letter all the members of our State legislature advising them of the stand of the American Legion on this very important project."

The Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party has given its unanimous support to the State fair employment practice bill. The written testimony submitted by Orville L. Freeman, State chairman, included the following statements:

"At our State convention held at Brainerd on June 15, 1948, the convention of some 1,500 delegates, representing all counties in our State, unanimously adopted a clear and unequivocal position calling for the immediate establishment of a State fair employment practice commission with enforcement powers."

Bernhard W. LeVander, State chairman of the Republican Party of Minnesota, testified that: "The platform of the Republican Party adopted at the State convention of September 1948 * * * provides as follows: 'We recognize the need for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission to eliminate discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin, in private industry as well as in Government work, including the National Guard, at the same time realizing that only education can permanently eliminate the deep-seated emotional prejudices which are the cause of discrimination.'

"The platform was passed unanimously by 1,200 delegates representing all of Minnesota's 87 counties and representing the Republican Party of our State."

In addition to those from whom we have quoted, the following citizens of Minnesota provided oral or written testimony in support of the proposed bill: Harvey Hoshour: Morgan, Chase, Headley, & Hoshour, St. Paul; faculty member, University of Minnesota Law School; member, St. Paul Council of Human Relations; Rev. Clifford Ansgar Nelson: pastor, Gloria Dei Lutheran Church, St. Paul; board member, Minnesota Federation of Churches; member, St. Paul Council of Human Relations; William Seabron: industrial secretary, Minneapolis Urban League; Whitney Young: industrial secretary, St. Paul Urban League; Robert Olson: president, Minnesota State Federation of Labor, AFL; Walter Finn: representing Ramsey County Industrial Union Council and State CIO; Lora Lou Mead: chairman, Civil Rights Committee, Carlton College Student Association, Northfield, Minn.; Lawrence E. Kelley: retired chairman, Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce; member, city of Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Commission; Amos S. Deinard: Leonard, Street & Deinard, Minneapolis; chairman, city of Minneapolis, Fair Employment Practice Commission; Wilfred C. Leland, Jr.: executive director, city of Minneapolis, Fair Employment Practice Commission; Curtis Chivers: Minneapolis branch NAACP; Isamu Shijo: United Citizens League of Minnesota; Jonas G. Schwartz: Minneapolis attorney; Hubert Schon: United Labor Committee for Human Rights; Phyllis McAllister: faculty member, College of St. Catherine; Frank Marzitelli: Cooks & Bakers Union, AFL; Edward V. Donahue: United Steelworkers of America; Martin Hughes: attorney and civic leader, Hibbing, Minn.; Mrs. Mabeth Hurd Paige: Minneapolis civic leader and former State legislator; John G. Simmons: chairman, Minneapolis chapter, Americans for Democratic Action; 1949 chairman, Minnesota Council for Fair Employment Practice.

MINNESOTA COUNCIL FOR FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE—EXECUTIVE BOARD

Officers—Chairman: Robert C. McClure, Minneapolis attorney and associate professor of law; first vice chairman: Rev. Floyd Massey, Jr., pastor, Pilgrim Baptist Church, St. Paul; second vice chairman: Julie Villaume, State chairwoman, Minnesota Young Republican League; treasurer: Jonas G. Schwartz, Minneapolis attorney; secretary: Mrs. Arnold Karlins, Minneapolis Council of Jewish Women.

Members of the board: Edward V. Donahue, State Industrial Union Council, CIO; Frank Marzitelli, Minnesota Federation of Labor, AFL; Bradshaw Mintener, vice president and general counsel, Pillsbury Mills; general chairman, Minneapolis Community Self-Survey of Human Relations.

THE AMERASIA CASE

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on May 9, 1950, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 6687, the second of the series of articles appearing in the Washington Daily News dealing with the Amerasia case. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a continuation of the articles which appeared in the issues of that newspaper of May 10, May 11, May 12, May 15, and May 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 10, 1950]

AMERASIA CASE COSTLY TO FBI—SEVERAL HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS

(By Frederick Woltman)

The Amerasia case cost the FBI several hundred thousand dollars.

It occupied 50 to to 75 agents for nearly three wartime months. Many were crack men, brought from other parts of the country to the two concentration points, New York City and Washington.

All were experienced and some of them were lawyers.

From the start, it was the Bureau's current top-drawer investigation, because it involved Government officials and stolen Government documents.

For the State and Navy Departments to call in the FBI was proof alone of its seriousness. Government agencies prefer to wash their own dirty linen.

Agents assigned to the Amerasia case were told at the beginning it was strictly hush-hush. They were even warned against discussing any of its aspects with their associates.

ROUND-THE-CLOCK SURVEILLANCES

Round-the-clock surveillances were put on Philip J. Jaffe, Amerasia's editor, people he contacted, and the magazine's staff. Two-way radio surveillance cars were used.

At first, according to former FBI agents who worked on the case, the Bureau suspected there might be a link between Amerasia and the vast Soviet spy net operating in America with local Communists to steal atom-bomb secrets.

That top-scale atomic counterespionage job had been called off to avoid offending Russia during the formative stages of the United Nations. Arrests were held up and known Russian spies permitted to escape.

FBI investigators found there was no connection. Mr. Jaffe was interested in promoting Soviet aspirations in the Far East, not in passing data over to Russian agents.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT LAWYERS CONSIDERED CASE SOUND

But there were the secret Government records systematically rifled from State Department files—1,500 to 1,700 of them later confiscated in Amerasia's headquarters.

The FBI turned its evidence over to the Justice Department. The Department's legal talent decided it had a sound criminal case. The Department directed J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Chief, to sign the complaints and arrest the Amerasia six. It knew full well what repercusions would follow charges against two State Department officials and a naval intelligence lieutenant.

The FBI complied. Had it any doubts about the Government's case, the FBI would never have gone through with the arrests.

Spearheaded by the Communist Party and its newspaper, the Daily Worker, a crusade was started against the FBI and Joseph C. Grew, who was Acting Secretary of State when the arrests were made in June 1945.

They were accused of trying to intimidate critics of the Grew bloc in the State Department. That group favored the Chinese Nationalists as against the Chinese Reds. The defendants in the Amerasia case became heroes to the leftist press; Messrs. Grew and Hoover, the culprits.

One pro-Communist radio commentator, J. Raymond Walsh, even charged that the Amerasia arrests were part of a larger plot. They were deliberately timed, he asserted, to do the most damage to America's negotiations with Russia over the veto power in the new United Nations.

This fantastic charge was not pressed.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT BEGAN TO SOFT-PEDAL

The Justice Department began to soft-pedal news of the Amerasia affair. Less and less appeared. Evidence was quietly presented in July to one grand jury here. Then it was presented all over again in August to a new grand jury and three of Mr. Jaffe's co-defendants were permitted to testify in their own behalf. They were not indicted.

A curious thing happened about this time. I called the Justice Department for background on these developments.

"I never thought they had anything on these three," volunteered Ben B. Dulaney, Acting Director of Public Information for the Attorney General. "Anyway you papers went overboard on this story and overplayed it."

Mr. Dulaney was reminded the news stories were based on a release from the Justice Department itself, which quoted both the Department and J. Edgar Hoover. He denied there had been any such release.

"Of course," he remarked, "Hoover may have had other evidence but we don't know anything about it. No statement he made was ever cleared by our Department."

Then Mr. Dulaney said he had wasted enough time and hung up.

I checked with the FBI. Within an hour, Mr. Dulaney phoned back. He'd just learned from the FBI that there had been such a release, he said. He explained he must have been out of town when it was issued.

FBI NEVER NOTIFIED OFFICIALLY OF DECISION

On September 29, 1945, a Saturday morning, Mr. Jaffe was permitted to plead guilty and pay a $2,500 fine. Nothing was said in the court about his Communist background or that of Amerasia. No evidence was ever presented publicly about it. Jaffe later told friends that attorneys' fees cost him around $17,500.

It was from unofficial sources in New York that the FBI first learned of the Government's decision to settle the Amerasia case without a public trial, ex-FBI agents have since told the Scripps-Howard newspapers. There had been no notification from the Justice Department.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 11, 1950]

TWENTY-SIX DOCUMENTS IN AMERASIA CASE LISTED—SEIZED BY OSS AGENTS

(By Frederick Woltman)

A list of 26 Government documents recovered by agents of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in their wartime raid on Amerasia magazine came into possesison of the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers today.

The list was presented last week to an executive session of the TYDINGS Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee investigating charges of communism in the State Department. It has never been made public by the Government.

The very titles refute claims that the Amerasia documents, stolen from the State Department, mostly contained inconsequential gossip.

These claims have been advanced by spokesmen for the Justice Department to explain its failure to press the prosecution of Philip J. Jaffe and his associates on Amerasia.

Many of the reports are marked "restricted," "confidential," or "secret," and deal with political and economic conditions in the Far East.

In the hands of Mr. Jaffe, a Communist, they gave him inside knowledge of Government wartime and postwar policies not available to any but top Government officials. Mr. Jaffe used this data in his magazine which was dedicated to promoting Communist aims in Asia.

The contents of the 26 documents were not learned. But their titles follow:

A Policy Toward Japan. Secret.

Report to Secretary of State No. 2796 Regarding T. V. Soong and H. H. Kung. Secret.

Plan to Permit Overseas Japanese to Organize for Political Warfare Against Japan, March 8, 1945. Secret.

Economic Policy Toward Japan, January 6, 1945. Secret.

Report to Secretary of State No. 2761 Regarding Relations Between Chiang Kai-shek and Madam Chiang Kai-shek. Secret.

India, April 1944. Restricted.

Report No. 2730 Regarding a Speech Delivered by Dr. Huang Yin-pei on May 29, 1944. Restricted.

Chinese Views Regarding the Postwar Treatment of Japan, February 22, 1945. Secret.

Transportation Conditions in China. Confidential.

The Hot Springs Institute of Pacific Relations Conference, January 25, 1945. Confidential.

An OSS Report Regarding References to Activities of Indonesia, Japan, and Occupied Areas. Confidential.

Preliminary Survey of the Economy of French Indochina. State Department.

Preliminary Survey of Industry and Mining in China. State Department.

Preliminary Survey of the Economy of Thailand.

Preliminary Economic Survey of Korea.

OSS Report Re Gen. Fang Chien-chueh. Stamped by State Department.

Report No. 1486 to Secretary of State from American Ambassador at Chungking.

Report of OSS Regarding the PPC as Viewed by a Chinese Liberal.

Importance of Reconstruction of Agriculture—China.

Military Intelligence Summary—Europe.

State Department Policy.

Personal Intelligence—Far East.

Personal Intelligence—Near and Middle East.

China's First Public Opinion Poll With Source as the OSS, Research and Analysis Branch, Report No. 78.

Report to Secretary of State No. 2914.

Official Japanese Broadcasts, North American Affairs.

HUNDREDS OF OTHERS

The February 22, 1945, secret report on the postwar treatment of Japan was dated just 17 days before it was found in Mr. Jaffe's office by the OSS raiders.

Frank Brooks Bielaski, OSS chief investigator who led the raid, found hundreds of similar documents, some of a military character. Fearful his superiors in Washington might doubt the magnitude of his find, he seized the 26 as a sampling.

It was OSS's discovery of these documents that led to the subsequent FBI investigation and raid on Amerasia which uncovered 1,500 reports.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 12, 1950]

FELLOW TRAVELS OF ANDREW ROTH—AMERASIA MYSTERY DEFENDANT

(By Frederick Woltman)

Andrew Roth was one of the mystery defendants in the Amerasia case. But it didn't handicap him then—or since.

If anything, his association with Philip K. Jaffe, key figure in the stolen-documents arrests, and with Mr. Jaffe's Communist-line journal on the Far East, enhanced his usefulness.

The former Navy lieutenant, whose indictment in 1945 was dismissed on motion of the Government, spent a good part of last year traveling in the Far East.

His job, as correspondent for the leftist New York magazine, the Nation, was to expert on Communist progress and conquest in Asia.

Mr. Roth's itinerary took him to India, China, Siam, and Korea.

This territory must have been familiar to him. For it was in the office of his mentor, ex-boss, and confidant, Jaffe, Communist editor of Amerasia, that the FBI found hundreds of the secret wartime reports on the Far East. The reports had been taken from State Department files.

BARRED FROM INDOCHINA AS RED SYMPATHIZER

Roth's far eastern travels, however, were not all smooth sailing.

Late last summer Roth was barred from French Indochina.

Although given a visa by the French consul at Seoul, Korea, he was prevented from landing at Saigon on orders of the French high commissioner.

The French Government considered him a Communist sympathizer trying to get into Red-controlled Indochina, the French Embassy here has informed the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Before that, the Netherlands Government had refused him a visa for Indonesia.

Curious aspects of Mr. Roth's role in the Amerasia affair remain one of the chief unsolved mysteries of the case.

He had worked for Jaffe as a researcher on Amerasia, which was plugging for Soviet interests in Asia. Then he joined the Navy, which sent him to Harvard to study Japanese. Commissioned a lieutenant, he was recommended for Naval Intelligenc .

His papers were referred to the counter-intelligence section of the Third Naval District at New York. The intelligence report stated he had connections with pro-Communist groups interested in China and recommended against an assignment to Naval Intelligence.

GOT INTELLIGENCE POST DESPITE ADVERSE REPORT

Nevertheless, Roth got the assignment. One of his jobs was to serve as Navy Intelligence liaison with the State Department. And, at the time of his arrest on June 6, 1945, he was under orders to join the Joint Intelligence Center, Pacific Ocean Area, which was Admiral Nimitz's intelligence arm.

Almost a year later, after the Amerasia case washed out, a House subcommittee reviewed it. Capt. G. W. Whitfield, head of naval intelligence, testified that a Navy report showed he was suspected to be a fellow-traveler.

"Despite this he was commissioned because we were at peace with Russia," Captain Whitfield declared. "The fact a man was a Communist was not a bar to a commission."

With naval intelligence, Captain Whitfield admitted, Roth had access to secret documents. He denied that the lieutenant could obtain top secret papers.

During the 3-months FBI surveillance of Jaffe, the Communist editor saw the Navy lieutenant on numerous occasions. They met on the street, at the Statler Hotel here, in restaurants, and at Roth's home.

JOINED CRUSADE AGAINST STATE DEPARTMENT

Immediately after the Amerasia arrests, the Communist Party whipped up a crusade against the State Department. The arrests, the party charged, were instigated to silence critics of the Chinese Nationalists.

Roth jumped in, too. That same month he wrote a series of articles for a leftist New York newspaper. In it, said an introduction, "Mr. Roth * * * tells why present policies of the controlling group in the State Department toward China and Japan are sowing seeds for a third world war."

Eventually, Jaffe, Roth, and Emanuel Sigurd Larsen, a State Department China expert, were indicted for conspiracy to steal documents from official files.

Jaffe, who had a $30,000 to $40,000 annual income, pleaded guilty and paid a $2,500 fine. Larsen paid a $500 fine without contesting the charge.

Almost at once, Larsen charged that Roth had introduced him to Jaffe and Jaffe had misled him. He said he knew the Navy lieutenant as an adherent of pro-Soviet policies. He insisted the Amerasia case was whitewashed.

The Government then had the Roth indictment dismissed.

GO-BETWEEN FOR JAFFE IN WASHINGTON

In its October 1946 report to Congress on the Amerasia case, the House subcommittee which had reviewed the Amerasia case said of Roth:

"At the time of the arrest of Andrew Roth in Washington, D. C., no secret or confidential documents or copies thereof were found in his possession. The records made available to this committee indicate, however, that Roth, who had been under surveillance, was the contact man or go-between for Jaffe in Washington. He was observed at various times transmitting envelopes to Jaffe or others connected with these transactions."

[From the Washington Daily News of May 15, 1950]

TRUMAN ORDERED AMERASIA ARREST

(By Frederick Woltman)

President Truman intervened personally in the Amerasia case and ordered the arrests of the Amerasia six after the Justice Department had directed the FBI to hold them up, the Scripps-Howard Newspapers learned today.

The President reversed the Justice Department in a direct call to the FBI.

In so doing he went over the head of his own Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, now a Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

The President acted, it was learned, after Assistant Secretary of State Julius C. Holmes informed him that the Justice Department had instructed the FBI to hold the case of the stolen State Department documents in abeyance.

President Truman at once ordered the FBI to press the case as speedily and vigorously as possible.

The President also directed the FBI to notify him personally if any further instructions for a delay were received and to tell him who issued the instructions and what they were.

The events which caused President Truman's intervention in the Amerasia case follow:

On May 29, 1945, after an intensive investigation, the FBI laid its evidence before the Justice Department. The outcome of the conference was a decision to arrest Philip J. Jaffe and five associates on charges of conspiring to steal Government documents.

Two days later, on May 31, the Justice Department instructed the FBI that the Amerasia case would have to be held in abeyance until the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference on the organization of the United Nations. The FBI was to take no further action until notified.

The reason given was that arrests at that time might antagonize the Soviet delegates and cause friction in the San Francisco Conference. The Conference itself adjourned on June 26.

On June 2, Mr. Holmes heard of the delay and went to the President. The call from the White House to the FBI followed.

The arrests, consequently, were made on June 6.

Earlier, the Government had ordered the FBI to make no arrests in another investigation, which turned up a Soviet spy ring operating here to get possession of atom bomb secrets. This was done with the San Francisco Conference in mind.

In the Amerasia inquiry, however, the FBI found no link between Soviet agents and the Amerasia six. The Bureau did, however, turn up a systematic rifling of secret wartime documents from Government files.

Mr. Holmes, now United States Minister in London, had been assigned to handle the case for the State Department by Secretary Edward C. Stettinius.

LARSEN FINED

The FBI inquiry conected two State Department officials with Jaffe. One was Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen, a China specialist in the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, who eventually paid a $500 fine. The second was John S. Service, a veteran foreign-service officer who subsequently was cleared by the grand jury.

Since the inquiry showed that State Department records were being carried away in huge quantities, Mr. Holmes favored a quick prosecution to break up the practice.

He so advised Joseph C. Grew, then Acting Secretary of State, whose consent was necessary for the arrests.

Mr. Grew asked to be reassured on two points:

1. Was the FBI convinced its evidence was air tight?

2. Did the FBI believe prosecution would be successful?

Mr. Holmes brought back an affirmative answer. And Mr. Grew gave his consent.

The presidential order, reversing the Justice Department, followed.

The arrests themselves could scarcely have caused embarrassment to the American delegates at the UN conference. For the Government withheld all information in the Amerasia case.

Nor was the Communist angle mentioned in court when Jaffe pleaded guilty, nearly 3 months after the San Francisco Conference ended.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 16, 1950]

HOW FBI LINKED SIX IN AMERASIA CASE

In one of its most intensive surveillance jobs, the FBI linked Philip J. Jaffe with his five associates in the Amerasia case.

All his movements were watched in an attempt to learn how large quantities of Government records were falling into the possession of the Communist magazine editor.

Philip J. Jaffe, editor of Amerasia, key figure in case, pleaded guilty and paid $2,500 fine.

Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen, State Department China expert, paid $500 fine without contesting charge.

Lt. Andrew Roth, Naval Intelligence liaison officer with State Department, indictment dismissed on motion of Government.

Mark Gayn, free-lance writer, arrested, but grand jury failed to indict.

John S. Service, veteran State Department Foreign Service officer, at time adviser to American Embassy in Chungking; arrested but grand jury failed to indict; welcomed back into Department by Secretary James F. Byrnes.

Kate Louise Mitchell, co-editor of Amerasia; arrested; grand jury failed to indict.

In 11 weeks' work the puzzle was put together. Six arrests followed, involving charges of conspiracy to steal official documents.

In the wind-up Jaffe got off with a $2,500 fine. One codefendent, Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen, paid a $500 fine. Charges against the rest were dropped.

MEETING AT STATLER WAS FIRST REAL BREAK

Here, told step by step for the first time, is an abbreviated story of what the FBI discovered about the operations of the key figure and his codefendants in the mysterious Amerasia case:

March 21, 1945: The first real break. Jaffe left New York for Washington, registered at Statler Hotel. Met Larsen in lobby. Soon joined by Lt. and Mrs. Andrew Roth. Larsen and Jaffe carried brief cases; Lieutenant Roth, a manila envelope. Luncheon in the Colony Room.

Lieutenant Roth drove Larsen to his office in State Department's Walker Johnson Building. Then, in parking area, Roth and Jaffe examined papers over the steering wheel of auto. Then they drove to Roth's apartment, 1614 North Coomb Street, Arlington, Va.

Late in afternoon Roth drove Jaffe to Statler. Jaffe met Larsen again. They went for walk. Jaffe returned to hotel where he was joined by Roth and Mark Gayn. They

dined at a nearby Chinese restaurant. Lieutenant Roth drove Jaffe to the Union Station.

At this point the FBI began to investigate Gayn.

April 10: Larsen and Lieutenant Roth lunched together.

April 11: Mrs. Roth went to New York, stayed with parents in Mohawk Hotel, Brooklyn.

April 12: Mrs. Roth visited Jaffe in Amerasia office. Later dined at Jaffe's apartment, 49 East Ninth Street. Jaffe drove her to train.

April 15: Lieutenant Roth left Navy Building office around 9 a. m. Met Larsen on corner Eighteenth and D Streets NW., and handed him large envelope. Larsen returned to Walker Johnson Building.

ANOTHER MEETING HERE; MORE MANILA ENVELOPES

April 18. Jaffe arrived Washington, Statler Hotel. While registering met by Lieutenant Roth and Larsen, both carrying manila envelopes.

Lunched Embassy Room, returned to Jaffe's room. Remained an hour.

Later Gayn dined with Jaffe. Then Jaffe visited Larsen's apartment until midnight.

April 19: Lieutenant Roth lunched with Jaffe at Statler, then returned to Navy Department. Late in afternoon Larsen, carrying filled manila envelope, met Jaffe, carrying brief case, in lobby. They examined papers from each container. Whether any were exchanged was not determined.

Around 6 p. m. Jaffe left Statler with John S. Service who carried zipper bag. Jaffe carried nothing. Drove to Lieutenant Roth's home to attend party. Around 11 p. m. they left, Jaffe carrying manila envelope.

April 21: Carrying brief case, Gayn entered Amerasia office in New York, Left half hour later and boarded bus.

HAD DOCUMENT LATER RECOGNIZED AS SECRET

On bus Gayn seen extracting two typed documents from case. One bore word "Chungking" at top; dated July 11, 1944.

FBI agent noted heading, "To honorable, Secretary of State, Washington, D. C." The message started: "I wish to refer to No. 1183."

During Jaffe's arrest June 6, FBI agents confiscated hundreds of Government records. One was recognized as a copy of above document. It was an Embassy dispatch from Chungking, marked "Secret, not for distribution," and reported on dissension in Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's household.

April 24: Mr. Service went to New York, stayed in Gayn's apartment. Same night they entertained guests, including Jaffe and Kate Louise Mitchell.

April 25: Mr. Service visited Jaffe at Amerasia.

May 7: Jaffe arrived in Washington, met Larsen and Lieutenant Roth, each bearing manila envelope, in Statler. Larsen, Lieutenant Roth left without envelopes.

JAFFE WENT WITH SERVICE TO STATE DEPARTMENT

May 8: Jaffe had breakfast with Mr. Service went with him to State Department, and stayed nearly an hour.

After noon Lieutenant Roth visited Jaffe at Statler, carrying manila envelope; remained 2 hours.

Later Larsen met Jaffe in lobby, soon departed.

Jaffe joined by Mr. Service and Lieutenant Roth. Mr. Service left quickly. Lieutenant Roth and Jaffe dined.

Jaffe returned to New York.

May 28: Jaffe visited Washington, met Lieutenant Roth and Larsen in the Statler. Lieutenant Roth had letterhead-size parcel; Larsen manila envelope. Had lunch.

May 29: Lieutenant Roth, carrying briefcase, visited Jaffe at Statler. Larsen visited Jaffe. That evening, Lieutenant Roth, Jaffe, and Service left Statler to spend evening at Arlington, Va., apartment.

May 30: Larsen visited Jaffe at Statler. In evening, Jaffe visited Larsen home. Lieutenant Roth was present.

The Larsens and Jaffe had dinner at Chinese Lantern Cafe.

Jaffe returned to New York. Went to Gayn's apartment, remaining from 1 to 3:30 a. m.

FBI SEIZED 1,700 GOVERNMENT RECORDS

June 6: Amerasia arrests. In Jaffe's office at Amerasia, FBI agents found 1,700 Government records, some marked "confidential," "secret," and "top secret."

They originated from Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, the State Department, the Office of War Information, and Office of Strategic Services.

SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the people of the Nation are relieved at the announcement of the settlement of the railway strike which strike-bound four railroads, namely, the Pennsylvania Railroad west of Harrisburg, the New York Central Railroad west of Buffalo, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, and the Southern Railway, and before its conclusion it had been supplemented by instructions to firemen of a fifth railroad, namely, the Union Pacific Railway, not to conduct trains over a 100-mile stretch of Santa Fe tracks used by the Union Pacific Railway in California.

A dispatch of yesterday by George Eckel, from Chicago, which appeared in this morning's New York Times, called attention to the fact that the New York Central, which had previously laid off 40,000 employees, yesterday furloughed 10,000 additional employees, many of them—and I call special attention to this fact—in the eastern area of the system which is the area of the New York Central system which had not been struck. The dispatch calls attention to the fact, further, that with this new lay-off of 10,000 additional employees the total unemployment because of the strike appeared to have passed the 200,000 mark.

Mr. President, I do not think that the article shows with absolute certainty whether the writer was referring solely to unemployment with the railroads themselves. The fact is, of course, that in addition to the many thousands who were out of work on the railroads an increasing number of persons either had lost their work or would soon lose their work in the industries which were dependent upon the maintenance of transportation.

In a dispatch of May 13, Mr. Eckel had pointed out:

> Unemployment resulting from the walkout hovered around the 200,000 mark, with—

I call special attention again to this important fact—

> with nonstriking railroad employees accounting for perhaps three-quarters of the total.

Mr. President, according to the information which Mr. Eckel thus gave us, with unemployment resulting from the walk-out hovering around 200,000, perhaps 150,000 of those were nonstriking railroad employees who had lost their work, not because they were striking, but because others who had controversies with the railroad were striking. I think this is of importance, for a man who has a wife and children to support and is ready and able and anxious to work may well look with apprehension upon an industrial situation or a legal situation which permits a comparatively small group among the employees of an industry to make it impossible for the one with the family, to whom I have referred, to work or secure wages or income. With possibly 50,000 men out of work who were striking employees—I am not sure whether it was that many who were striking—Mr. Eckel's statement that the nonstriking railroad employees accounted for perhaps 150,000 is an appalling and important fact.

Mr. Eckel in a dispatch of yesterday which appeared in the New York Times of today, pointed out that in Pennsylvania the strike had had its strongest economic effect in the closing of major and minor mines, idling at least 7,500 miners, and that the Fretz-Moon Tube Co., a steel fabricating plant, yesterday furloughed 250 employees for lack of steel shipments.

In an article by Robert A. Bedolis, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of May 13, the writer said:

> It was estimated that more than 175,000 workers have been made jobless, including miners in western Pennsylvania and Indiana, where lack of coal cars has closed scores of mines.

Mr. President, I shall not this evening and at this late hour go into detail as to the widespread effect upon industry everywhere along the lines of these various railroads, spreading, as it would have done had it continued, in farther and farther and wider and wider circles. I may have something to say along those lines at a subsequent date. Suffice to say, Mr. Bedolis, as I have indicated, points out that it was estimated that more than 175,000 workers by May 13, which is 3 days before today, had been jobless, including miners in western Pennsylvania and Indiana, to whom he referred.

In a dispatch dated May 12, from Detroit, appearing in the New York Times of May 13, it was stated that the General Motors Corp. announced drastic cutbacks in overtime work, and furloughs for 500 employees in its Fisher Body Plant in Flint; also, that the company had on May 11—and May 11 was only 1 day after the strike had started—laid off 400 employees at its body plant in Grand Rapids.

In a dispatch dated May 12, from Schenectady, appearing in the New York Times of May 13, it was stated that General Electric Co. announced on May 12—which was 2 days after the strike had begun—that the company's plants very shortly will be paralyzed—not merely interfered with, Mr. President, but paralyzed—unless the railroad firemen's strike is settled.

A dispatch of May 12 from Pittsburgh, appearing in the same issue of the New York Times, reads:

> Lack of empty railroad cars raised the total of major coal mine shut-downs to 23 today

in the strike of railroad firemen. The number of small pits that have closed is not known. In all, miners, now idled by the railroad walkout rose to at least 7,500. The daily production loss is estimated at almost 49,000 tons of soft coal.

This was on May 12, only 2 days after the strike had begun.

Mr. President, there sits at this moment in the chair a distinguished friend and colleague of mine, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, the Senator quoted a telegram from E. C. Moriarty, stating, among other things, that a trip on which it appears the latter had just arrived in Wichita, Kans., from California on the Santa Fe Chief, one of the two trains then running of the seven California trains which the Santa Fe regularly operates, gave Mr. Moriarty, to quote his vivid language, "a close-up view of the creeping paralysis being imposed on the country by a handful of railroad employees."

Mr. President, if someone should say Mr. Moriarty is gifted with the power of graphic diction and possible exaggeration by terming it "creeping paralysis," I say that an absolute defense to any such charge against him can be shown by the statement from the General Electric Co., to which I have referred, announcing, on the second day after the strike began, that the company's plants very shortly would be paralyzed unless the railroad firemen's strike was settled. The analogy of paralysis is accurate and correct. Every Member of the Senate realizes, and every man of thoughtfulness in the United States will realize and does doubtless realize, that that is the effect of a great industrial strike tying up great portions of the railroad systems of the country.

Mr. President, dispatches introduced into the RECORD on May 15 by my distinguished friend who but a few moments ago requested permission to introduce certain items into the RECORD, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], indicated the severe losses, and, to quote the author of one of the dispatches presented by the Senator from California, "possible crop disaster," which were threatened by the strike which happily came to an end this morning.

A dispatch appearing in this morning's New York Times pointed out that shortage of supplies because of the railroad strike yesterday caused a reduction of 18 percent in the production of automobiles and trucks at the General Motor Corp.'s Chevrolet and Fisher Body factories at North Tarrytown, N. Y.

These are but illustrations of the effect which the strike was having on our Nation, a strike brought about by a handful of employees of four railroads.

Mr. John G. Forrest, financial editor of the New York Times, in an article appearing therein on May 14, 1950, day before yesterday, said:

> The strike against four of the major railroads, on the question of an additional fireman for Diesel locomotives, caused an immediate curtailment of train schedules. It also affected activities in many industries far removed from railroading.

Then, Mr. President, listen, as the Presiding Officer is so intently listening at this moment, to this language with which Mr. Forrest concludes this paragraph:

> The full impact will be felt more by the automobile, steel, and coal industries than by other groups, but—

And I call the attention of the Senate to this significant language of Mr. Forrest—

> eventually every segment of the Nation will suffer if the strike continues for any length of time.

Mr. President, the people of the United States have indeed good reason to be pleased because the strike has been settled, in view of the inevitable injury to widespread sections of the Nation which would have resulted from a protracted strike.

The settlement, however, does not mean that all labor problems in the railway industry are disposed of. I shall not undertake tonight to recite all these problems. Indeed, I do not know them all, though I have information with respect to some of them which I think would be of interest to the Senate. I do, however, read this significant news article from the Washington Post of March 21, 1950:

> Truman Halts Plan To Strike on 12 Railroads.

I pause to say that the strike to which reference is had in this headline is not the strike which has just been settled. This is one which would be not only upon four railroads, or, including a segment of the Union Pacific, five, this strike, the plan for which the President had halted, was a strike to occur on 12 railroads, if eventualities should bring about the strike.

Let me read the dispatch:

> KEY WEST, FLA., March 20.—President Truman signed an Executive order here today heading off a strike scheduled for tomorrow on 12 western railroads.

Mr. President, I digress to suggest that in all probability there were not 10 Members of the United States Senate who knew at that time that there was a strike scheduled for March 21 on 12 western railroads. It may be that all others but myself knew of it, and if so, I shall withdraw the implication that so many did not, but I have no recollection of ever hearing, until I read this article in the issue of the Washington Post of March 21, that the President had headed off a strike scheduled for that very day, March 21, by signing an Executive order on the day before, thus heading off a strike on 12 western railroads.

Let me read just a little further from the Washington Post article of March 21:

> The President's order set up an emergency board to inquire into a dispute between the carriers and the Switchmen's Union of North America.
>
> The order automatically postpones the strike for 60 days. Personnel of the board is to be named later.

I pause again to pay tribute to the President for the wisdom of his action in signing the Executive order. I also call attention to the fact that the union which was involved or was to be involved in the strike on these 12 western railroads was not the firemen's union, not the union which has been carrying on the strike which was terminated this morning, but another union, the Switchmen's Union of North America.

Let me read further from the article in the Washington Post of March 21 with reference to the 12 railroads and the prospective strike which was scheduled for March 21. The writer continues:

> The railroads are the Chicago Great Western; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; Davenport, Rock Island & North Western; Denver & Rio Grande; Minneapolis & St. Louis; Great Northern; Northern Pacific Terminal Co. of Oregon; Salt Lake City Union Depot & Railroad Co.; St. Paul Union Depot Co.; Sioux City Terminal Railway Co.; Western Pacific Railroad Co.; and Railway Transfer Co.—city of Minneapolis.
>
> About 4,000 members of the switchmen's union had been poised for a strike Tuesday.

Tuesday was March 21, the day of the issue of the newspaper from which I am quoting. Then the writer concludes:

> The union is asking a 40-hour week without reduction in gross pay for the present 48-hour week.

Mr. President, I am not in any sense, even remotely or impliedly, indicating any views with respect to the merits of the strike that was in prospect. The point I make at this moment is that although the firemen's strike was settled this morning, there was contemplated another strike which was postponed on March 20 for 60 days. If I do not misread the calendar, 60 days from March 20 is approximately May 20, and today is May 16.

Mr. President, let me read a few words from a statement made on May 11, 5 days ago, to a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was then considering, and is continuing to consider, and I have no doubt will hold subsequent hearings—I trust so—in the near future on a bill now pending before the Senate, namely Senate bill 3463. The statement to which I refer was made by Mr. Daniel P. Loomis. Senators may ask, "Who is Mr. Loomis?" His statement—by the way, he was unable to be present because of the fact that he had important duties in representing railroads in connection with the strike which had been called and was effective on the day before the statement was presented to the subcommittee—was read by Mr. Prince. Mr. Prince, reading from his statement, gave us this information with respect to Mr. Loomis:

> My name is Daniel P. Loomis, and I am chairman of the Association of Western Railways, but I appear here today on behalf of all railroad members of the Association of American Railroads, which comprises practically all of the class I railroads of the United States, and somewhat in excess of 95 percent of the entire railroad industry.

So, Mr. President, the witness, I take it, is obviously qualified by his profession and his connection and his experience to tell us validly and correctly that of which he testified.

I should like to read from the transcript of the testimony thus presented in the statement of Mr. Loomis, which was

read by Mr. Prince as follows—and I quote from page 217 of the multigraphed transcript:

The conductors and trainmen—

They are not the firemen; they are the conductors and trainmen—

have demanded a 40-hour week with wage increases for yardmen and various rules changes for all employees which would also involve wage increases. When negotiations and mediation failed, the organizations threatened to strike, but the President appointed an emergency board which is now investigating the matter.

That board will make its report to the President sometime in June.

I pause, Mr. President, to point out that not only is there in the offing this strike, which would involve 12 railroads, to which the President sent the emergency order on March 20, and we will know apparently sometime around May 20 what will happen with respect to it, but in addition to that, the conductors and trainmen have made the demands to which I have just referred. and the board which the President has appointed will make its report to him sometime in June, and thereafter, Mr. President, with the lapse of an additional 30 days, as I understand the Railway Labor Act, there will be no prohibition, nothing in the world to prevent a strike on behalf of the conductors and trainmen if the parties shall not have come into agreement.

I read further from the testimony of Mr. Loomis, appearing at page 219 of the transcript:

The Switchmen's Union of North America has made similar proposals for a 40-hour week and wage increases for the yardmen it represents and threatened a strike.

I think this is the same controversy to which the Washington Post article of March 21 referred. Let us see what Mr. Loomis tells us about it:

The President named the same Board which was hearing the case of the conductors and trainmen, since the issues were so similar and the employees involved are in the same classes, except that they work on different railroads. The switchmen's union declined to enter into any arrangements to have its request heard before that Board and refused to agree to any extension of time. The Board reported this situation to the President on April 19 and recommended that if the switchmen's union would not agree to any other arrangement the recommendations which the Board will make in the case of the conductors and trainmen should likewise apply to the employees represented by the switchmen's union. Under the Railway Labor Act as it now stands, the 30-day cooling-off period will expire on May 19.

I pause, Mr. President, to say that my computation of approximately May 20 should be altered to state that the end of the period will, as Mr. Loomis points out, take place on May 19 instead of 20.

Continuing, says Mr. Loomis:

The railroads involved include such properties as the Chicago Great Western; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; Davenport, Rock Island & North Western; Denver & Rio Grande Western; Great Northern; Minneapolis & St. Louis; Railway Transfer Co. of the City of Minneapolis; Northern Pacific Terminal Co. of Oregon; St. Paul Union Depot Co.; Sioux City Terminal; and Western Pacific.

The Pullman conductors on the Pullman Co. and on the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific have also threatened a strike, but that case is still in mediation.

So, Mr. President, we have a possible strike of the switchmen. We have a possible strike of the conductors and trainmen. Now we have a possible strike of the Pullman conductors, according to Mr. Loomis.

Then I proceed with the following from Mr. Loomis' statement at page 220:

The Railroad Yardmasters of America likewise has a request for a 40-hour week and wage increase and has threatened a strike, but the President has issued an order appointing an emergency board and named the same board which is investigating the conductors' and trainmen's case since those organizations also represent yardmasters. The board has, however, been unable to reach any agreement with the parties on the question of conducting hearings concurrently with the conductors' and trainmen's case, and the report in the case of the yardmasters is due to be filed with the President on May 11.

So, Mr. President, here we are: One strike is settled today, and there is a possibility of a strike by the conductors, a possibility of a strike by the switchmen's union on 12 railroads, a possibility of a strike by the Pullman conductors, a possibility of a strike by the Railroad Yardmasters of America.

I say, therefore, that, notwithstanding the relief which our Nation properly experienced this morning by the announcement which as one individual I heard on my radio as I drove down from my home to the Senate, there are still possibilities in the future which are clouds in the sky, and they may be most ominous and portentous clouds.

Obviously, with the few possible strikes I have indicated, we have the full realization of the fact that, as the days go on, and as the weeks go on, and as the months go on, and as the years go on, controversy after controversy may very easily arise between the employees of railroads and the carriers which will have within them the same threat of strikes which in the case of 1946 and 1948, and then again on May 10, 1950, brought about such conditions as we are all familiar with.

Mr. President, now is the time, not some time long deferred in the hope that all things will improve so thoroughly that there will be no reason for it—now, this time, now is the accepted time for Congress to amend the Railway Labor Act in such manner that any strike or lock-out arising out of or in connection with any dispute falling within the purview of the Railway Labor Act shall be unlawful.

In the Appendix of the RECORD of yesterday there was a very interesting article set forth by Mr. Louis Stark, of the New York Times, the heading of which is sufficient to make the point to which I refer. The heading—I do not know whether Mr. Stark wrote the heading or whether someone else wrote the heading—is this: "Railway Act no longer model for labor laws—Recurring failures to end disputes bring demands for revision."

I say that the facts, as they solemnly confront us at this very moment, indicate that now is the time for Congress to amend the Railway Labor Act in such manner that any strike or lockout arising out of or in connection with any dispute falling within the purview of the Railway Labor Act shall be unlawful.

A moment ago I referred to the article by Mr. Stark. The opening sentence of that article, which is dated May 13, and appears in the New York Times of May 14, occupying a very prominent position in the Sunday issue of the New York Times, and spreading over considerable space—and the article is there set forth in full, reads as follow, as I have indicated by having the article inserted in the Appendix of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The strike of railroad firemen and enginemen this week focused attention on the weaknesses of the Railway Labor Act and coincided with congressional hearings designed to amend this law so as to make it strikeproof.

It is better, far better, that Congress act, if possible, while a strike is not in progress and while coolness and calmness may more easily prevail.

In this connection, I respectfully call to the attention of the Senate the bill I mentioned a few moments ago, which I introduced on April 21, 1950, namely, Senate bill 3463. That bill amends the Railway Labor Act, as amended, as follows:

First, to provide court review of award or order made by the Adjustment Board—which Board has jurisdiction over disputes between an employee or group of employees and a carrier or carriers growing out of grievances or out of the interpretation or application of agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions.

Second, to provide that if the efforts of the Mediation Board under section 5 of the Railway Labor Act to bring about an amicable settlement through mediation shall be unsuccessful, said Board shall at once request in writing the parties to submit their controversy to arbitration and shall thereupon use all reasonable efforts to induce the parties so to do.

Third, to provide that if a dispute between a carrier and its employees, other than a dispute within the jurisdiction of the Adjustment Board, shall not have been adjusted, or arbitration agreed to within 15 days after the Mediation Board shall have requested the parties to submit such dispute to arbitration, the Mediation Board shall immediately so notify the President; that on receipt of such notice the President shall create a Presidential Board to investigate and decide such dispute; that the report of the Presidential Board and the transcript of the proceedings before it, including the evidence, shall be filed with the President and with the Mediation Board and that a report so filed shall, unless set aside in judicial proceedings as in the amendment provided, be conclusive and binding on the parties and enforcible by appropriate proceedings in court.

The bill, in a new section to be known as section 10A, further provides that—

Any strike, including any concerted stoppage of work by employees or any concerted

slow-down, sit-down, walk-out, or other concerted interruption of operations by employees, or any lock-out by a carrier, arising out of or in connection with any dispute falling within the purview of this act, shall be unlawful.

The bill makes it "unlawful for any person, including a carrier or labor organization, (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, or conspire with, any other such person to interfere by any such unlawful strike or lock-out with the operation of any carrier subject to this act; or (2) to participate in, or to aid any such strike interfering with the operation of any such carrier, or to give direction or guidance in the conduct thereof or to further the same by the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein; or (3) to aid in any such lock-out interfering with the operation of any such carrier by giving direction or guidance to such lock-out or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof."

Mr. President, the bill causes violation of any of the provisions of section 10A to constitute a misdemeanor punishable by the penalties prescribed in paragraph 10 of section 2 of the Railway Labor Act in the case of carriers or their officers or agents for violation of the provisions of that section.

The bill also provides that any United States district court within the territorial jurisdiction of which any violation of section 10A shall have been committed or shall be threatened shall have jurisdiction at the instance of the Attorney General of the United States or the attorney general of any State affected by such violation or a threatened violation of section 10A, or of any interested carrier or aggrieved party, to grant the remedy of injunction, prohibitive or mandatory, which may be appropriate in the premises.

The bill provides details covering the foregoing contents of this statement, including the various judicial proceedings which have been mentioned by me here this evening.

Mr. President, I think it is very interesting to observe the newspaper comments. I hasten to say that I shall not trespass much longer upon the time of the Senate this evening, but I desire to call to the attention of the Senate a significant utterance in the New York Times of today, in what I conclude is its leading editorial or certainly its first editorial, which is entitled "The Railway Strike."

That editorial takes up perhaps three-quarters of a column or certainly a half a column, perhaps I should say, on the editorial page of the New York Times for today.

The concluding paragraph of that editorial reads as follows:

> The present strike may be said to represent the logical culmination of a labor trend that has been in progress on the railroads now for about a decade. More and more the unions have moved in the direction of abiding by the decisions of fact-finding boards only when those decisions were favorable. But if the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1946—

It should be "1947," Mr. President—

> proved anything, it was that sooner or later labor legislation catches up with trends of this kind. If the railroad unions will not accept decisions which are not legally binding—

I call the attention of the Senate to the following statement which is strong and clear and unequivocal—

> then nothing could be more certain than that ultimately they will have to reconcile themselves to a labor-management policy under which decisions will be binding.

That is the gist of Senate bill 3463, the bill which now is pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, ready for its consideration and for its recommendation to this body.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to the few Senators who have so bravely remained this late in the evening to hear these remarks. I offer no apology, however, for trespassing upon the time of any Member of the Senate tonight, because of the fact that in my judgment the subject matter to which I have addressed myself is of such outstanding importance to the welfare of the Nation as to make it imperative that the attention of the Senate shall be directed to the facts to which I have adverted and to the importance of immediate and appropriate action with respect to legislation needed to prevent repetitions of strikes such as that through which we have just gone.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I urge that the Senate do not, because the present strike has been settled, merely heave a sigh of relief and forget the problem until the next recurring difficulty shall arise. Let us proceed without delay to consider and act upon a plan to prevent future labor stoppages in railway operations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Garnett Thompson to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester M. Foresman to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it the intention of the Senator to move that the President be notified of these confirmations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I shall ask that the President be notified of the action of the Senate confirming the nominations.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator not merely in futuro intend to do so, but does he now ask that the President be notified?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I so ask.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to notification of the President, I desire to address myself briefly to the subject matter which was considered by me on the 12th of May 1950 on the floor of the Senate. In the first place, the action of notifying the President, if it should be carried out, would constitute a consent that the appointments which have just been confirmed be completed forthwith and that the appointees respectively take office. I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *United States* v. *Smith* ((286 U. S. 6), loc. cit. 35), said:

> The natural meaning of an order of notification to the President is that the Senate consents that the appointment be forthwith completed and that the appointee take office.

From the announcement by the Chair that, without objection, the President will be notified, or from the action taken upon suggestion or motion such as that made by the distinguished acting majority leader that the President be notified, it is easily possible to arrive at the inference that this is merely in appropriate courtesy to the President. But, Mr. President, by such notification, in fact, not merely is a courtesy extended, but far more than the rendition of a courtesy is accomplished. I pointed out, on May 12, and I quote from column two of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6967.

> One effect, therefore, of the notification of the President, promptly after confirmation of a nomination, that such confirmation has occurred is to render the Senate powerless to reconsider under its rule XXXVIII its vote advising and consenting to such nomination if, prior to the attempt to reconsider such vote, the resolution of consent shall have been communicated to the President, he shall have signed, and through the Department of State delivered, a commission to the nominee purporting to appoint him the officer to fill the office to which he had been nominated, and the nominee shall have taken the oath of office and undertaken forthwith to discharge the duties of said office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I understand, then, that the Senator is to object to the notification of the President?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I intend to, in a very short time. But I do not yield further at this time.

The fact that the power of reconsideration is a valuable power was recognized in a most notable piece of litiga-

tion, namely, *United States* v. *Smith* (286 U. S. 6), to which I have referred, which was recognized, and in fact was projected and stated, as I shall indicate in a moment, by the distinguished counsel who represented the United States Senate in that litigation.

Mr. President, the making and execution of such order of notification of the President cuts short the power of reconsideration under the circumstances which I recited a moment ago, and which are the circumstances, in substance, which existed in the case of United States against Smith. I quote further from the remarks which I made on May 12, at page 6967 of the RECORD, as follows:

That the power thus cut short by the making and execution of such order of notification is valuable cannot be doubted. In the argument for the Senate in said case of United States against Smith, it was pointed out, loco citato 11, that the Senate by its rules "formulated the practice of reconsideration in order the better to reach a sound judgment in the confirmation of nominations submitted by it".

I pause to say that that is the statement of counsel for the Senate in the litigation to which I have referred, and this is the precise language of the counsel, used in the argument before the United States Supreme Court. I continue reading from page 6967 of the RECORD of May 12, 1950:

In the sentence in which appears the quoted language the argument for the Senate in said Smith case thereafter employs the words "this valuable power".

I continue to read:

In the United States against Smith case, Mr. John W. Davis, with whom Mr. Alexander J. Groesbeck was on the brief, represented the United States Senate.

I continue to quote from my remarks of May 12:

Not only is the power thus cut short by the making and execution of such order of notification of the President valuable, but in addition the Supreme Court itself stated in the Smith case that notification before the expiration of the period for reconsideration is—to quote loco citato 35—"an exceptional procedure". The Court further pointed out in that case that notification before the expiration of the period for reconsideration—to quote loco citato 35—"may be adopted only by unanimous consent of the Senate".

Mr. President, it is true that although the court referred very appropriately to the fact that the procedure of directing, promptly upon the confirmation, notification of the President is "an exceptional procedure," nevertheless we are all familiar with the fact that the procedure has at least in recent years been followed with great frequency in the Senate; yet, as I have indicated, such procedure not only cuts short a power which is valuable and was so described in behalf of the Senate in argument before the Supreme Court, but is in addition, as the Court itself indicated and said, "an exceptional procedure" which "may be adopted only by unanimous consent of the Senate."

I think the proper time for notification of the President is after the period for reconsideration shall have terminated. And, Mr. President, in order that in the course of my remarks there may appear just what that period is, I ask unanimous consent that there be set forth at this point in my remarks clauses 3 and 4 of rule XXXVIII of the Senate, which relate to the matters under discussion.

There being no objection, clauses 3 and 4 of Senate rule XXXVIII were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

3. When a nomination is confirmed or rejected, any Senator voting in the majority may move for a reconsideration on the same day on which the vote was taken, or on either of the next 2 days of actual executive session of the Senate; but if a notification of the confirmation or rejection of a nomination shall have been sent to the President before the expiration of the time within which a motion to reconsider may be made, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the President to return such a notification to the Senate. Any motion to reconsider the vote on a nomination may be laid on the table without prejudice to the nomination, and shall be a final disposition of such motion.

4. Nominations confirmed or rejected by the Senate shall not be returned by the Secretary to the President until the expiration of the time limited for making a motion to reconsider the same, or while a motion to reconsider is pending unless otherwise ordered by the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as I have indicated, I do not think we should abdicate this valuable power, a power declared by our own counsel—eminent counsel—to be valuable, nor should we make of an exceptional procedure a frequent and nonexceptional procedure.

So, Mr. President, bearing in mind the importance of the right that the Senate shall have the period prescribed in rule XXXVIII for reconsideration, during which any facts which may come to the attention of the Senate shall not be lost upon the desert air, but be availed of by the Senate, and bearing in mind the other objections to which I have referred this afternoon, I respectfully object to the request made by the acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in view of the objection, there is nothing more to do than to let the matter stand as it is.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

A. Garnett Thompson to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Chester M. Foresman, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in all simplicity and sincerity, we are thanking Thee for the gift of life and the blessings of this new day.

Grant that we may meet our tasks and responsibilities courageously and cheerfully, never proving ourselves recreant before any duty or cowardly before any difficulty.

Help us to feel that with the confident assurance of Thy counsel and companionship no task is too arduous, no responsibility too exacting, no trial too great, no sorrow too deep, and no burden too heavy.

When this day comes to a close and the evening shadows fall, may there be within us no vain regrets, no feelings of remorse, and no disturbing memories, but may we have a conscience that is peaceful and a heart that is happy.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 7302) entitled "An act to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. BUTLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARSALIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

BARTER DEALS WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership to a rather serious situation. The following is from the May 13 Washington Farm Reporter:

BARTER

CCC has arranged to barter cotton for soybeans produced in Communist China. The contract, made through a New York export-import firm, calls for exchange of approximately 45,000 bales of cotton for 60,000 tons of Manchurian yellow soybeans.

The beans will be delivered to the Army for use in Japan while the cotton will be

shipped directly to China. USDA reports the Army has stopped buying United States soybeans because the price is too high.

Other barter deals with Communist China are hinted in the official announcement. Officials said the arrangement leaves the way open for exchange of other price-supported commodities for soybeans or other products.

Mr. Fred Bailey, editor of the Farm Reporter, is a reliable source of agricultural information and is so regarded nationally. I have also checked with the CCC and am assured of the facts.

The points I wish to make are:

First. That President Truman told the American people in Washington State last week about the horrors of the famine and the starvation in China. While he was making this speech, in which he indicated help for the Chinese, his administration's agency was helping to starve additional Chinese. Soybeans are a human food product in China.

Second. The second point is that while we may not recognize China officially, it is evident this administration is willing and has recognized China commercially.

I ask in all seriousness, does this procedure make sense to you from a human standpoint?

I realize the power and force of cotton. However, it is morally wrong to follow this path. From all reports the Russians will and have exacted sufficient food from China without our country adding to a most distressing situation.

We have arrived at a serious point when we are a party to adding misery to a people in order to dispose of a few bales of cotton.

THE LATE HONORABLE EVERETT SANDERS

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I requested unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order that I may pay tribute to a former Member of this body, the Honorable Everett Sanders, of Terre Haute, Ind.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Indiana today mourns the passing of one of its most illustrious sons, the Honorable Everett Sanders, of Terre Haute, whose sudden passing on the afternoon of May 12 came as a shock to all who knew and loved him.

It seems fitting and proper that the House of Representatives today should pay tribute to Everett Sanders, for he was, for many years, actively associated with this body, both as a Member and, later, as secretary to a President of the United States, the Honorable Calvin Coolidge.

Everett Sanders was born, one of a large family, in humble circumstances. He rose to become a four-term Member of Congress, and a confidant of the most influential men in this great Nation during the administrations of Presidents Coolidge and Herbert Hoover.

As a young man, he taught school before attending the normal school of Terre Haute, Ind. He received a law degree at Indiana University in 1907 and 9 years later, in 1916, was elected to Congress from the old Indiana Fifth District, parts of which today are in the district I have the honor to represent.

For four terms, Everett Sanders served his constituency and served it well. He served on the Interstate Commerce Committee and conducted hearings on the return of the railroads to private management after World War I.

At the conclusion of his fourth term in 1924, he declined to seek reelection and, instead, became chairman of the Speakers' Bureau for the Republican National Committee.

At the conclusion of the successful 1924 Presidential campaign, Mr. Sanders was invited to serve as secretary to President Coolidge, a position which won him the further respect of the membership of the Congress.

He was elected chairman of the Republican National Committee and held that position until the conclusion of the 1932 Presidential campaign.

Retiring from active participation in the political arena, Mr. Sanders devoted the remainder of an illustrious career to the practice of law here in the District of Columbia.

His earthly career ended when he passed away at his desk last Friday at the age of 68. Burial services are being conducted this afternoon in Terre Haute.

We extend our deepest and sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Sanders and the family.

In the words of the Hoosier poet, James Whitcomb Riley, "He is not dead, he is just away," and his sterling characteristics, his many acts of kindness, his great influence and devotion to his family, State and Nation will long be remembered.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying respect to the memory of the finest man I ever have had the privilege of knowing. On last Friday afternoon we were shocked at learning of the passing of Everett Sanders, a former Member of the House of Representatives, and a sincere, honest, upright, and courageous citizen. To many of us, he is particularly remembered for his kindly and gentle nature, and for his spirit of helpfulness. As for myself, I think I found in him about all the attributes that are to be found in any one individual.

These words of mine are not stereotyped expressions which one might utter of any casual acquaintance. They are sincere and coming from the heart, because I knew Everett Sanders and was a beneficiary of his many kindnesses.

Always, to me, he was kindly and helpful. I well recall when I first came to Congress in 1935, and knew very few people in Washington. I was not a little concerned about the responsibilities that confronted me, and many of you can well appreciate the appearance of a friend at such a time. Such a friend I found in Everett Sanders, who was one of the first persons who came to my office to offer his help.

Throughout the years since that time our friendship continued. Everett Sanders was most helpful in many ways. Often have I been a guest in his home, with him and his good wife. We Hoosiers always liked to go to see them, because they were just the sort of folks that we like to think of as true, real Hoosiers.

Certainly the State of Indiana has lost a great citizen, and the Nation has lost a great citizen. We all join in mourning his passing.

Mrs. HARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the lady yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, with the probable exception of the Speaker and my distinguished friend from Georgia, Mr. Cox, I am the only Member on the floor on our side of the House at this moment who served with Everett Sanders.

When I came to the Sixty-seventh Congress Mr. Sanders was one of the parliamentary leaders on the Republican side. The friendships that grow up between members of different parties in this body have been referred to as the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

I learned to admire the ability, the courage, the energy, and the real Americanism, if you please, of Everett Sanders while he was a Member of this body at a time when we had some of the hardest battles that I have ever gone through. I also knew him when he was secretary to President Coolidge, and I have known him ever since. He was one of the finest men I have ever met.

His death is a great loss to this country, as well as to his home State of Indiana.

When I think of Everett Sanders I can see such men as James R. Mann, Frank Mondell, Nicholas Longworth, Claude Kitchen, Ben Humphreys, Henry Rainey, and the troops of others who have now passed to the Great Beyond, in the words of Thomas Moore—

> I feel like one
> Who treads alone
> Some banquet hall deserted,
> Whose lights are fled,
> Whose garlands dead,
> And all but he departed.

Mrs. HARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I join with the members of the Indiana delegation in this tribute to an old personal friend, a distinguished public servant and a great American. It was my privilege to know Everett Sanders shortly before I came to Congress. He was identified with those of us interested in the renomination of President Coolidge.

Ever since I have known Everett Sanders through all these intervening years as a man of outstanding ability, a man of courage, a man whose devotion to his country was never exceeded by any individual, Everett Sanders could well be

the theme of a Horatio Alger story. Born of humble parents, born under circumstances in which he had to make unaided his own battle to get ahead in the world, he succeeded and slowly climbed the ladder of success until he became the confidant of a great President of the United States, Mr. Coolidge. During all this period of struggle he never lost the common touch; he was kind; he was humble. He never failed to appreciate those who had helped him and had been associated with him in his long climb from a humble Hoosier boy to his high position in the councils of the great.

So, as one who enjoyed his personal friendship, I know the great loss that has come, not only to Indiana but to his legion of friends and to the country. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mrs. HARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I join with thousands of Hoosier friends and friends from all over the Nation, as well as friends throughout the world, in mourning the passing of a great Hoosier, Everett Sanders.

Everett Sanders was typical of all that is America. Only in America today can people rise from the humble circumstances and environment in which Everett Sanders grew up. He was born in a log cabin in Clay County. He worked his way through college and rose to the position of Representative in the Congress of the United States and secretary to the great President Calvin Coolidge.

Everett Sanders, on arriving in Washington to serve his first term, cast his first vote in this House of Representatives for a declaration of war against Germany. Everett Sanders also was the man to whom President Calvin Coolidge scribbled the little note, "I do not choose to run," in answer to the press inquiry, "Will you run for the presidency in 1928?"

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Everett Sanders served his country well; and, both in the Congress of the United States and as secretary to former President Coolidge he contributed much not only to the reconstruction period of the country following World War I, but also to the great industrial expansion period that was coincident. His death marks the passing of a great American. All of us in the House, I am sure, extend our sympathy to his widow and surviving brother.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Indiana yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, would like to pay my tribute to Everett Sanders, a great Hoosier. Indiana has sent many fine men and women to Congress. Everett Sanders was one of the finest. I knew him well and saw him frequently, especially when he was secretary to President Coolidge. I saw him on many matters of the district and my State, and matters concerning disabled veterans when I was the President's personal representative in care of disabled veterans. Everett Sanders was a great man, a great American. So many have spoken of his kindliness; I remember when I called the White House about things that he felt the President might not want to consider, although often the President did. I remember his helpfulness and his regret if things could not be accomplished but he helped accomplish many things. President Calvin Coolidge said he was a perfect Presidential secretary. Many others shared that view. What more can be said of anyone than to be loyal to one's chief, to be loyal to the President of the United States, to be loyal to one's country? America is much richer because of his noble life and example. I send my deepest sympathy to his gracious widow.

Mrs. HARDEN. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of Everett Sanders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Everett Sanders was a real man—one of splendid ability. In the writings of President Coolidge he stated that in the appointment of Mr. Sanders he had chosen a man of great ability. In that statement he was correct for Sanders was a man of great ability and a great citizen. We need many men of his type today.

CAMPAIGN ADVICE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday our former colleague and my distinguished personal friend, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, advised his fellow Democrats to fight in the coming campaign with their backs to the wall, with guns smoking hot, and colors nailed to the mast.

Without premeditation the famous Gridiron Club that evening, Saturday night, in a skit entitled "Happy Harry's Carnival," had the Kansas City Kid, to the tune of Everything's Up to Date in Kansas City, from the musicale Oklahoma, sing:

We got it figgered out in Kansas City,
From Pendergast we learned a thing or two,
O' diff'runt ways there is fer votin' double,
As pistol-packin' Democrats can do.
We settle all the arguments with our forty-fives,
Never have to worry nor to chafe;
'Taint no trick at all to control the City Hall,
If you know the combination to the safe.

Everything's up to date in Kansas City,
We've gone about as fur as we can go;
They never seem to dope it out, even the FBI,
How Democrats are takin' in all the dough.
Everything's going swell in Kansas City,
Republicans will never have a show;
We got a nifty system there whenever the people vote,
A special way of countin', but it ain't the way you wrote;
We're careful to apologize before we cut your throat,
We've gone about as fur as we can go.

Seemingly the top-flight newspapermen of Washington, who make up the Gridiron Club, are just as aware as most Republicans that the 19 unsolved gangland murders in Kansas City during the past 5 years, and the stealing of the ballots of a corrupt election from the courthouse vault, were both most instrumental in permitting the Pendergast machine, one of the cornerstones upon which the present Democratic administration is based, to remain in power.

We hope, however, Senator ANDERSON was not suggesting that in the 1950 campaign the whole Nation be subjected to the smoking pistol ballot-stealing technique which has maintained the corrupt Pendergast machine and the Democratic Party in control of Kansas City for so many years.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S REPORT TO THE NATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of riding with the President through the State of Montana last week. The President in his official capacity was making a report to the people of the Nation. In other words he was going home because home for him is all 48 States.

He traveled through the East and the Midwest, he traveled through the Teapot Dome country, he traveled up into Washington, and across Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and ended up in Illinois where, if my memory serves me correctly, the last Republican Governor had a good many newspapermen on the State payroll. I think it was a good thing for the President to go to that part of the country and report to the people.

His receptions were tremendous and the people loved the Chief Executive who came to see them—and to be seen. It is my hope that the President will, at least once a year, travel throughout our country and make a first-hand report to his constituents—the people of the United States.

THE PENNSYLVANIA PRIMARY

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening I was driving through my district to go to Columbiana, Ohio, one of the cities in my district. Imagine my amazement when from the loud speaker of the radio of my car came the voice

of ex-Governor James, of Pennsylvania. He was telling about the corruption and the thievery that has been going on in the State of Pennsylvania, and he named some names.

Among other things, he said that Judge Fine, who is one of the candidates in today's primary up there, had been a judge in one of the most corrupt counties in Pennsylvania, a county that had been alive with gangsters and racketeers for so long that if nominated charges would be brought against him which would prevent his election or his taking office if elected. He also had some very uncomplimentary things to say about the present Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor Duff, and what a tragic mistake it would be to elect a man of his unsavory reputation to the United States Senate.

I am very much interested in seeing just exactly what the Republicans in Pennsylvania will do today, how they will explain this away when they have nominated Governor Duff or Judge Fine.

POLITICS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] as usual injected a little politics when he quoted from the Gridiron Club dinner. I am at this time looking at a news report on the same dinner which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times, and I find there the following:

GOP RAIN MAKER TURNS OUT A FROST

In the rain-making machine skit Republican leaders were gathered on a New Mexico desert. Finding that a machine could make rain by shooting dry ice into the clouds, they wondered if Republican votes could be gained by firing dry speeches into the air.

I had no idea of the ability of the Republicans to produce such a strange machine. I quote from one of the songs in this act:

Our party's faced a barren waste
without a taste of water;
Cool water.
With might and main, we'll try for rain,
so we can gain the voter;
Cool, cool voter.

At the close of the number the remarkable Rube Goldberg machine rained snow, instead of votes.

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I listened last evening with quite a lot of interest and some enthusiasm to the speech of President Truman in Chicago, in which he referred to the Eightieth Congress as an old-fashioned, backward-looking Congress.

I have to admit that we were guilty of being a little bit old-fashioned and a little bit backward-looking, because that Eightieth Congress for the first time in 18 years balanced the budget, reduced taxes, and paid some on the national debt.

If to be forward-looking and progressive is to fight a bloody war at the expense of three or four hundred billion dollars and several hundred thousand lives, and to lose the peace after that war is fought, then I plead guilty to having been a Member of that backward-looking, old-fashioned Eightieth Congress. I hope I may never be a Member of any Congress which repeats the acts of the Democratic Congresses of the 16 years preceding that Eightieth Congress.

THE CAPONE MOB

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] told us about the President's nonpolitical trip and the various places he visited. He said the President ended up in Chicago.

That was at the Democratic rally. It might be well if he ended there and did not bother us any more down here.

Chicago is a fitting place. Maybe some of you remember that Capone mob of Chicago that extorted something over a million dollars from the members of unions, working people, and then were convicted and sent to prison. Finally one of the President's friends, Mr. Dillon, came up from St. Louis and attended hearings at Chicago.

He visited the White House—social visits, he said. Dillon managed the President's campaign when he was a candidate for Senator. This is all according to Dillon's own testimony. It is all sworn testimony in the record.

Then Tom Clark was seen, and Tom Clark had a boyhood friend named Hughes. Hughes is the fellow who in New York was handed by an unknown 14 $1,000 bills.

The ultimate result of the activities of Tom Clark in dismissing the indictment that was pending against the Capone mobsters and of Mr. Dillon and Mr. Hughes was to free those mobsters.

I hope the President had a pleasant visit with those three, at least, who are still out of the penitentiary.

PENNSYLVANIA PRIMARIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have before me the New York Times of May 8, 1950, not May 8, 1900, as most Republican leaders think today. I quote:

A small group of old fogies, sourpuss fakers—

Strong language—

out of touch with the people—

Significant language—

but with a lot of money—

Note that, now, with a lot of money—

are doing everything in their power to force on the party their own hand-picked candidates.

That is not a Democrat making that statement, it is a Republican, Governor Duff, of Pennsylvania, in commenting about Mr. Grundy. That is the best evidence possible, a Republican governor using that language and referring to his own party in Pennsylvania.

The whole country is laughing in glee at the discomfort of our Republican friends in Congress, not the Republicans in the home, because they are far ahead of the Republicans in Congress, except a few who have progressive ideas; the whole country is laughing in glee at the discomfort the President has given the Republican Party in this Congress by his trip to meet the people. If there is one thing the American people like, it is a President who is close to them. They liked Theodore Roosevelt when he went around the country. Even then the Republican leaders and the Republican press tried to knock him down when he went around for a square deal for the people and fighting the trusts. They termed him then as wielding a big stick.

Theodore Roosevelt is remembered because he was close to the people. The Republican leadership in Congress does not like to see a President keeping close to the people. Of course, President Truman, by being and remaining close to the people has caused the Republican leadership a great deal of mental distress.

TWO ROCK UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4732) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union school district, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and to furnish said school district water, free of charge, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 7, strike out "not to exceed" and insert "equivalent to."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union school district, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETROCESSION OVER CERTAIN LAND IN SHIRLEY, MASS.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4433) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "of 1947."

Page 2, line 3, after "1600", insert "of 1947."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF ARMED FORCES TO ADMINISTER CERTAIN OATHS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6171) to authorize commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to administer certain oaths, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after "component" down to and including "States," in line 6 and insert "(including the reserve component) of any of the armed forces of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an oration.

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement from the National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution expressing concern over the policy of our country in the Middle East.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include newspaper articles and also the speeches of the President of the United States in the State of Montana.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter in each.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

GLADYS J. SENYOHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Gladys J. Senyohl.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 187) favoring the granting of the status of permanent resident to certain aliens.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ALEXANDER STEWART

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1991) for the relief of Alexander Stewart.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

CATHRYN A. GLESENER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 469) for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cathryn A. Glesener, of Underwood, Wash., the sum of $36,441, with interest at 4½ percent from January 1, 1938, to the date of enactment of this act, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for (1) the destruction of a log wharf and boom on the north side of, and extending into, the Columbia River, near Underwood, Wash., by the United States engineers in 1937 in connection with the construction of the Bonneville Dam; (2) losses incurred by reason of the depreciation in value of shore property, improvements and facilities as a result of the destruction of such log wharf and boom; and (3) loss of earnings as a result of the destruction of such log wharf and boom and the loss of business from 1935 to 1937, inclusive, while the Bonneville Dam was under construction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN P. HAYES, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2229) for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster; Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster; William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders; and John S. Bantham, station examiner, at Albany, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $362.54; that Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $219.18; that William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders at the Albany, N. Y., post office, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $186.31; that John S. Bantham, station examiner at the Albany, N. Y., post office, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $165.86. Such sums represent a shortage at the Albany post office due to the embezzlement of postal funds by a former clerk in the money-order section of that post office who has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for such embezzlement. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of John P. Hayes in the sum of $362.54, the account of Peter J. Grant in the sum of $219.18, the account of William W. Crist in the sum of $186.31, and the account of John S. Bantham in the sum of $165.86. The surety on the bond of said postal employees is released from any liability on account of such shortage $933.89.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1 line 5, strike out $362.54" and insert "$933.89."

Page 1, line 5, after the figures strike out "; that Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $219.18; that William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders at the Albany, N. Y.,

post office, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $186.31; that John S. Bantham, station examiner at the Albany, N. Y., post office is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $165.86", and insert a period.

Page 2, line 10, strike out all after the sign "$", and insert "933.89."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL J. D. MARSHALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2535) for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall," approved December 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 718), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Samuel J. D. Marshall, a sum equal to any money paid by him or withheld from him as a partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States arising by reason of such alleged shortage."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel J. D. Marshall, of Sewell, N. J., a sum equal to 1 year's pay, at the rate he was receiving when discharged from the Army on December 15, 1922, as computed by the Comptroller General of the United States, to which sum he was entitled under the act of June 30, 1922 (42 Stat. 716), as amended by the act of September 14, 1922 (42 Stat. 840): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY C. GOAKES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3007) for the relief of Harry C. Goakes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry C. Goakes, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $3,194.61. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harry C. Goakes against the United States arising out of the loss of personal property owned by him when the vessel *Rio de la Plata* sank off the coast of Mexico in August 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM A. CROSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3535) for the relief of William A. Cross.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $894.75 to William A. Cross, of Needham, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement of expenses incurred for private medical and hospital treatment while on authorized absence from duty as an enlisted man of the Army during the period from April 4, 1942, to April 25, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT AMERICAN INDEMNITY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4140) for the relief of the Great American Indemnity Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Great American Indemnity Co., New York, N. Y., the sum of $651.34. Such sum represents reimbursement for a like amount paid by such company to cover claims for compensation for personal injuries incurred by three employees of the Clarke-Halawa Rock Co., Honolulu, T. H., resulting from a collision in Honolulu, on September 1, 1944, between a truck, owned by the Clarke-Halawa Rock Co. and in which such employees were riding, and a jeep driven by a member of the United States Marine Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLARENCE F. MOORE, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4364) for the relief of Mrs. Clarence F. Moore; John Robert Lusk III; J. R. Lusk, Sr.; Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk; Mrs. Willie Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Clarence F. Moore, the former wife of J. R. Lusk, Jr., deceased; and the sum of $5,000 to the minor, John Robert Lusk III, son of J. R. Lusk, Jr., deceased; and the sum of $5,000 to J. R. Lusk, Sr., and Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk, the father and mother of J. R. Lusk, Jr., deceased, in full settlement of all claims they have against the United States for the death of J. R. Lusk, Jr., and to pay the sum of $15,000 to Mrs. Willie Pruitt, the former wife of Ernest W. Tillinghast, and the sum of $5,000 to Billie John Bickle, daughter of Ernest W. Tillinghast, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Ernest W. Tillinghast, and for personal injuries and hospital and medical expenses of Mrs. Willie Pruitt sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle near Blanco, Blanco County, Tex., on January 10, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500 to Mrs. Ruth B. Moore (formerly Mrs. John R. Lusk, Jr.), of Dallas, Tex., and the sum of $5,000 to the legal guardian of John Robert Lusk III, of Dallas, Tex., the minor son of John R. Lusk, Jr., deceased, on account of the death of the said John R. Lusk, Jr.; the sum of $135 to John R. Lusk, Sr., of Ballinger, Tex., for the expenses incurred by him in connection with the burial of the said John R. Lusk, Jr.; the sum of $6,500 to Mrs. Minnie P. Pruitt (formerly Mrs. Ernest W. Tillinghast), of Colorado City, Tex., on account of the death of Ernest W. Tillinghast and expenses incurred by her as the result of his injury and death, and for the property damage and personal injuries sustained by her, including the medical and hospital expenses incurred by her as the result of her injury; and the sum of $5,000 to Mrs. Billie John Bickle, of Hamilton, Tex., on account of the death of her father, Ernest W. Tillinghast, in full settlement of all claims of said parties against the United States arising out of an accident involving a United States Army truck, which occurred near Blanco, Blanco County, Tex., on January 10, 1941: *Provided*,."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth B. Moore; John Robert Lusk III; John R. Lusk, Sr.; Mrs. Minnie P. Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD F. ELMERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard F. Elmers, Pleasant Plains, N. Y., the sum of $12,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on July 8, 1947, when he was assaulted and robbed by unknown assailants while employed as a civilian employee of the Army Exchange Service, to wit, a junior auditor, serving with the Army in Germany: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH H. WHITNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4960) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney, of Winchester, Mass., the sum of $3,589.74. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney against the United States arising out of the death, on February 3, 1947, of her husband, Lt. Charles A. Whitney, Jr., United States Naval Reserve, serial No. xxxxxxx, for 6 months death gratuity, for compensation for medical expenses incurred, and for the difference between active-duty pay and retired pay from the date of his separation from the service to the date of his death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,589.74" and insert "$2,559.20."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. M. TINDAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5252) for the relief of W. M. Tindal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,343.53 to W. M. Tindal, of Neeses, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, near Tillman, S. C., on October 29, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACME FINANCE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5799) for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Acme Finance Co., Colorado, the sum of $864.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such Acme Finance Co. against the United States arising out of the loss of such Acme Finance Co.'s equity in a 1941 model Mercury automobile (motor No. 99A-385413) when such automobile was confiscated in connection with its use in transporting altered currency: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Company," insert "Denver."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL E. ROCKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6416) for the relief of Paul E. Rocke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul E. Rocke, Warren, Ohio, the sum of $373. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul E. Rocke against the United States for property damage sustained on May 3, 1946, when an Army reconnaissance car, driven by a soldier who was using such car without authority, ran into the automobile of the said Paul E. Rocke which was properly parked on Market Street, Warren, Ohio: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN F. ROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6644) for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwin F. Rounds, of Sundance, Wyo., the sum of $330.18. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edwin F. Rounds against the United States arising out of his selling supplies on credit to Roland Williams, an Army contractor, at the request of Army officers, in February 1949. Although Army officers assured the said Edwin F. Rounds that he would be paid for the supplies out of money due the contractor from the United States, and arranged an assignment for that purpose, the assignment was later declared invalid and the contractor was paid in full, but the said Edwin F. Rounds was not paid the purchase price of the supplies: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

D. C. HALL MOTOR TRANSPORTATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7991) for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to D. C. Hall Motor Transportation, Fort Worth, Tex., the sum of $7,551.17. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said D. C. Hall Motor Transportation against the United States arising out of the collision near Leland, Miss., on December 11, 1945, of a United States Army truck (which was being operated in a negligent manner by an Army enlisted man who was using the vehicle without authority) with a truck and trailer belonging to the said D. C. Hall Motor Transportation and being operated with due care: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on

account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,551.17" and insert "$7,107.17."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM B. BUOL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2225) for the relief of William B. Buol.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States, the first proviso to section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 50, War, Appendix, sec. 303 (a)), shall not be held to apply to William B. Buol, of Winona, Minn.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of William B. Buol, as of May 23, 1940, the date on which he legally entered the United States; and the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Swiss quota of the first year that the Swiss quota is hereafter available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA GEERTRIUDE MULDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2766) for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Maria Geertriude Mulders, of Crescent City, Calif., who was admitted into the United States on a visitor's visa, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of June 10, 1947.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of the Netherlands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUK ONN WON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3805) for the relief of Yuk Onn Won.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause an immigration visa to be issued to Yuk Onn Won, the adopted son of Kui Fat Won and Margaret Choy Keau Ching Won, husband and wife, American citizens and residents of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, if he is found by the United States consul to whom application for visa is made to be admissible under all the provisions of the immigration laws other than the Quota Act of May 26, 1924. Upon his admission to the United States, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, pertaining to unmarried children under 21 years of age of a citizen of the United States, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Yuk Onn Won; and the said Yuk Onn Won shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Kui Fat Won and Margaret Choy Keau Ching Won, United States citizens and residents of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA GRAZIA RICCIO DiPIETRO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5221) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro, a naturalized citizen of the United States who lost citizenship of the United States by voting in an Italian election in 1946 may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year from the enactment of this act, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act.

(b) From and after naturalization under this act, Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFIO BATELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5947) for the relief of Alfio Batelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Alfio Batelli as of September 5, 1947, the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHENG SICK YUEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6066) for the relief of Cheng Sick Yuen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Cheng Sick Yuen shall be considered to be the natural-born son of American veteran of World War II, Larry Cheng, and his wife, Mrs. Larry Cheng.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the quota limitations now provided by law, a quota immigration visa may be issued to Cheng Sick Yuen, minor adopted child of Keung Jack Cheng (Larry Cheng), a naturalized citizen of the United States, provided the said Cheng Sick Yuen is otherwise admissible to the United States under the immigration laws.

"SEC. 2. Upon the issuance of such visa, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese racial quota for the first year such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAIJIRO YOSHIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7315) for the relief of Daijiro Yoshida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Daijiro Yoshida, minor son of Suzuko Yoshida, an American citizen, and that the said Daijiro Yoshida may be permitted to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE MARGARETA RIES ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7564) for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provisions of the immigration laws or other laws relating to entry into the United States, the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to admit into the United States for permanent residence Maria Margareta Ries, who is the financée of Kenneth H. Headrick, a citizen of the United States, and their minor child, Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries. The Secretary of State shall thereupon direct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the German quota for the first year said quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Maria Margareta Ries may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Maria Margareta Ries is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Kenneth H. Headrick, a United States citizen, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the imigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Maria Margareta Ries, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Maria Margareta Ries, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Maria Margareta Ries as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, pertaining to unmarried children under 21 years of age of a citizen of the United States shall be held to be applicable to Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries, minor child of Kenneth H. Headrick, a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

[redacted], Abrahamson, Karen Elizabeth (nee Thompson).
[redacted], Anaya, Maria De La Luz, or Concepcion Rodriguez.
[redacted], Andreanchich, Giachino, or Jim Andren.
[redacted], Asapansa-Johnson, Josephus Milton, or Comma, Asapansa-Johnson.
[redacted], Bageris, Helen George or Bagheris (nee Alexopoulou).
[redacted], Barron-Juraez, Angel, or Angel Barron.
[redacted], Bournais, Eleftherios, or Elifterios or Louis Terry or Louis George Bournias.
[redacted], Camacho, Cresencio Pesina.
[redacted], Campo, Sebastian, or Sebastian Campa.
[redacted], Casella, Maria Angela, maiden name Fasciani, former marriage D'Amore or Maria Angela Trato.
[redacted], Chiu, Chen Sung, or Chui Chen Sung or Sung Chui Chen.
[redacted], Chen, Hsui-Hua (nee Wu).
[redacted], Chow, Che Keung.
[redacted], Ciccone, Maria (nee De Martino or Maria Pastafina or Maria Villano or Roza Puma or Parente or Jennie Esposito or Jenni Capuana).
[redacted], Cosman, George William or Kosman, George William or Gregory or Casman, George William.
[redacted], Da Silva, Francisco Honorato.
[redacted], De Cortez, Felicitas Moreno, or Felicitas Moreno-Escobedo.
[redacted], De Guzman, Maria Encarnacion Gutierrez, or Encarnacion Gutierrez De Guzman or Encarnacion Arroyo.
[redacted], Delegeorge, George Thomas, or George Athamasios Delegeorge or Georgios Deligeorgis.
[redacted], De Trejo, Concepcion Gonzalez Vda.
[redacted], Diaz, Jose Maria.
[redacted], D'Onofrio, Loretta (nee Penna).
[redacted], Dulak, Josefa.
[redacted], Economou, Venizelos.
[redacted], Erbe, Emilie Franziska, or Emmy Erbe.
[redacted], Evangelos, Despina.
[redacted], Fadl, Mostafa Ahmad Aboud, or Ahmed Mostapa Fadl or Ahmed Mustapha Fadl or Ahmed Musthapah Fadl or Ahmed Mistafa Fadl.
[redacted], Felif, Alphus Jeremiah Strickland, or Alpheus Jeremiah Felix.
[redacted], Fiebiger, Babette Hacker (nee Babette Hacker).
[redacted], Flores, Silvestre, or Angel Silvestre Flores or Crescencio Reza or Soltero Delfin or Crescencio Reva or Jose Marquez.
[redacted], Foster, Henry, or Harry Foster.
[redacted], Garcia, Francisca Mendez, or Francisca Mendez.
[redacted], Glatzel, Ferdinand Salvatore.
[redacted], Ging, Neng Shwen, or Neng Swen Ging (alias Nelson Ging).
[redacted], Glikis, Traintafilos, or Ross Glikis.
[redacted], Gurrobat, Thomas Gianan.
[redacted], Hurowitz, Sam (alias Owsej Urowecz or Owziej Urowicz).
[redacted], Hutchinson, George Earl Wilfred, or George Wilfred Hutchinson.
[redacted], Jahren, Signe Marie, or Signe Jahren Valentino.
[redacted], Jurjan, Sybill, or Sibilie Z'hie (nee Stankevitz).
[redacted], Karaviotis, Ioannis, or John Karas.
[redacted], Lawyer, Eric Sorabji, or Erachsaw Sorabji Lawyer.
[redacted], Leahey, Suzanne, or Suzzane Krausz or Suzanne De Body or Suzanne De Strasser or Suzanne Bernstein.
[redacted], Lehr, Fridolf Alarik, or Fridolf Lihr.
[redacted], Limberator, Laklis Panagiotis, or Hercules Limberatos or Iraklis Libby.
[redacted], Lorenzo, Manuel Alvarez, or Manuel Alvarez.
[redacted], Maneiro, Manuel Arcos.
[redacted], Marcoida, Juan Hoyos.
[redacted], Mata, Luis, or Louis Mata.
[redacted], Metaxas, Kleanthis Dionysios.
[redacted], Muntean, Cornelia Filip.
[redacted], Muntean, Stella or Steluta.
[redacted], Mykulak, Peter.
[redacted], Nakamura, Chieko or Chiye.
[redacted], Nielsen, Dagmar Charlotte (nee Sander formerly Henriksen).
[redacted], Pappargyris, George Nicholas, or Georgios Nicholas Pappargyris.
[redacted], Pearson, Dudley Augustas, or Dudley Pearson.
[redacted], Pedersen, Jens Peder Albinus, or Jens Pedersen.
[redacted], Perhaus, Carlo Mario.
[redacted], Petrincich, Francesco.
[redacted], Pohl, Heinrich August.
[redacted], Pontarolo, Ellen Laura (nee Gillanders or Ellen Laura McMurry or Ellen Laura Vonkeister).
[redacted], Railton, Susan Ann, or Sarah Virginia Railton.
[redacted], Railton, Timothy John Reid.
[redacted], Rasso, Carmen Mary Ramirez, or Carmen M. Ramirez.
[redacted], Rasso, Alfredo N., or J. Alfredo Rasso.
[redacted], Root, Jeanne Rose (nee Jeanne Rose Albinelli).
[redacted], Rosi, Cleofe, or Mario Rose.
[redacted], Rouse, Herbert Newton.
[redacted], Samuels, Frances Louise, or Frances Louisa Samuels (alias Franca Luisa Sparano or Franca Sparano).
[redacted], Samuray, Salih Behcet.
[redacted], Saucedo, Alfonso Campusano, or Alfonso Saucedo.
[redacted], Schmitt, Fraser Jasper.
[redacted], Seoane, Eugenio, or Eugenio Calvo Seoane.
[redacted], Serenil, Clara Briseno, or Clara Briseno-Ogaz or Clara Briseno or Clara Ogaz.
[redacted], Shanda, Elsie Zamora, or Elsie Zamora Salas (maiden name).
[redacted], Simony, Marie Anne (nee Brady).
[redacted], Sodeikat, Otto August Wilhelm or Sodiekat.
[redacted], Staine, Antonio.
[redacted], Szulc, Judel, or Judel Schultz.
[redacted], Tavarez, Librada, or Librada Tavarez-Loya or Librada Loya.
[redacted], Toong, David.
[redacted], Tosini, Cesare Alessandro, or Chester Tosini.
[redacted], Troutlein, William.
[redacted], Uddin, Rahan.
[redacted], Wang, Philip, or Philip Wong or Philip Sheng Ping Wang or Sheng Ping Wang.
[redacted], Wlodarski, Waclaw Ignacy, or Waclaw Ignacy Wodarski or Wodarsky.
[redacted], Zen, Osman Ben, or Osman Zen.
[redacted], Ziemba, Eustachio, or Eustachius, or Stanislaus or Stanislaw or Stanley Ziemba.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, in order to get some information from the committee on this bill, Calendar No. 829, a concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens. We have a similar concurrent resolution, Calendar No. 841. How many suspensions are covered?

Mr. D'EWART. There are 97 cases covered by Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, each case recommended for approval. A check has been made to determine whether or not the alien could meet the requirements of the law, whether he was of good moral character and possessed of strong equities which would warrant suspension of deportation.

Mr. STEFAN. How many are covered by the other resolution?

Mr. D'EWART. The other resolution, Calendar No. 841, covers 165 cases.

Mr. STEFAN. That makes 250 cases of aliens in these two bills.

The reason I call this matter to the attention of the House is to ask the members of the committee whether or not this has been cleared through Mr. Watson Miller, Director of Immigration. Has the Commissioner approved those two resolutions?

While the gentleman is looking that up, I wish to call to the attention of the membership that when we brought up the bill making appropriations for the Bureau of Immigration, Mr. Miller called our attention to the fact that he has presently 3,500 aliens who have been convicted of some crime; a hundred of them were Communists, subversives, well supplied with money, who are out on parole and running over the country at will; and he has no legislation by which he can keep them under surveillance.

He indicates he wants such legislation because he is unable to secure landing certificates for them on account of the fact that about 100 or more of them come from countries behind the iron curtain. I wonder whether or not these approximately 250 aliens under discussion are among this category of aliens whose deportation this bill would suspend.

Mr. D'EWART. I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. In view of the fact there are so many of them and the committee cannot give us assurance that this has been approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and the Department, does not the gentleman think this ought to be laid over? I do not want to do anything that would create a hardship on any of these aliens but we should have information and know what we are doing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent to pass it over.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

The was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 78.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATION OF GEORGETOWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7966) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806 (2 Stat. 356), is amended by striking out "3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "25,000."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of such act is amended by striking out "held on the first Tuesday of April, in every year hereafter" and inserting in lieu thereof "held at such time as may be prescribed by the bylaws."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSEPHONE POULIOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1145) for the relief of Persephone Poulios.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Persephone Poulios. From and after the date of enactment of this act the said Persephone Poulios shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Persephone Poulios, who was temporarily admitted into the United States on December 17, 1945, shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States.

SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Greece.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALICE WILLMARTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2071) for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provision of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Alice Willmarth, a native and citizen of Japan, and who is the wife of Benjamin Willmarth, a citizen of the United States. If otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, said Mrs. Alice Willmarth shall be granted the status of a nonquota immigrant.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. APOSTOLOS A. KARTSONIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2258) for the relief of Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis, of Ann Arbor, Mich., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Greece.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM ALFRED BEVAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2308) for the relief of William Alfred Bevan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, William Alfred Bevan, minor adopted son of Frederick W. Bevan, a citizen of the United States, and his wife, Margarita Llacer Bevan, shall be deemed to be the alien natural-born child of said Frederick W. Bevan and his wife, Margarita Llacer Bevan.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASAE MARUMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2427) for the relief of Masae Marumoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Masae Marumoto, the Japanese fiancée of Capt. Harry Ost, of Fredonia, N. Dak., and that the said Masae Marumoto may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Masae Marumoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Capt. Harry Ost, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masae Marumoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masae Marumoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Masae Marumoto as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUMIKO KATO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2431) for the relief of Sumiko Kato.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Sumiko Kato, the Japanese fiancée of Thomas D. Jacobs, Jr., a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Sumiko Kato may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sumiko Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Thomas D. Jacobs, Jr., and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Sumiko Kato, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Sumiko Kato, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence and said Sumiko Kato as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required fees and head taxes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed,

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GEORGETTE PONSARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2443) for the relief of Mrs. Georgette Ponsard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration and naturalization laws which exclude from admission into the United States persons of the Japanese race, shall not be held to apply to Mrs. Georgette Ponsard, the wife of Paul Ponsard, who is residing in Mexico City, Mexico.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. D. STRENGER AND CLAIRE STRENGER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2479) for the relief of A. D. Strenger and his wife, Claire Strenger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the provisions of section 307 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940 shall not be held to apply to A. D. Strenger and his wife, Claire Strenger.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARMEN E. LYON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2568) for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Carmen E. Lyon, wife of Capt. Charles A. Lyon, an American citizen, and that the said Carmen E. Lyon may be permitted to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO ARTOLOZAGA EUSCOLA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6482) for the relief of Antonio Artolozaga Euscola.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings against Antonio Artolozaga Euscola, of Salt Lake City, Utah, who entered the United States at the port of Philadelphia, Pa., on November 26, 1944, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "entry" and insert "residence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN KENTUCKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7255) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in Hopkins County, Ky., to the estate of James D. Meadors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the estate of James D. Meadors, late of Dawson Springs, Ky., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property in Hopkins County, Ky. Such real property was conveyed to the United States by the late James D. Meadors and his wife, the late Ella C. Meadors, for use by the United States for the construction and maintenance of a highway, but such real property is no longer being used for highway purposes. Such real property is more particularly described as follows:

A strip of land 100 feet in width, being 50 feet on each side of the centerline of the roadway which centerline begins at a point on the line between the lands of Cynthia C. Campbell and Matilda Dunning and of James D. Meadors, south 69 degrees east 940 feet from the corner of said lands of Cynthia C. Campbell and Matilda Dunning and of Mrs. Lou Coleman Cook, said point being on a 5-degree curve to the left and at station 25 plus 12.8 on said highway location, and running with said curve 231⅗ feet to the point of tangent at station 27 plus 44.4; thence with said tangent south 24 degrees east 1,086⅗ feet to a point on the bank of Tradewater River at station 38 plus 31.0.

Said strip of land is a part of the land conveyed to James D. Meadors by Lou C. Cook and husband by deed dated December 7, 1911, and recorded in deed book 87, page 601, in the office of the clerk of Hopkins County Court.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 21, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The conveyance shall contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOODYEAR AIRCRAFT CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3122) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., at such locations and under such terms and conditions as he may consider appropriate, a perpetual easement for sewage purposes in, over, and across a parcel of land constituting a portion of the naval air facility, Litchfield Park, Ariz., being located in Maricopa County, Ariz., acquired by the United States by deed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting by and through War Assets Administration, dated December 31, 1948, recorded in the land records of Maricopa County, Ariz., in docket No. 323 on pages 456 to 461, inclusive, which deed is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCY P. CROWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8287) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate No. 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue to Lucy P. Crowell duplicate of William Gerard's special certificate numbered 2, subdivision numbered 13, originally issued for forty acres of public land pursuant to the act of Congress approved February 10, 1855, upon satisfactory proof of ownership and loss of same and the execution of a bond with good and sufficient securities, in double the market value of the certificate so to be issued, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, conditioned to indemnify the United States against the presentation by an innocent holder of the alleged lost certificate. Such duplicate shall have all the legal force and effect of the original.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAY HOSKEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4370) for the relief of May Hosken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of May Hosken who entered the United States on November 25, 1948, at Rouses Point, N. Y.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for India of the first year that such quota number is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEFFREY BRACKEN SPRUILL AND SUSAN SPRUILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8290) for the relief of Jeffrey Bracken Spruill and Susan Spruill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jeffrey Bracken Spruill and Susan Spruill shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor children of Captain and Mrs. W. R. Spruill, citizens of the United States, and shall be deemed to be nonquota immigrants within the purview of

sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER STEWART

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 806, the bill (H. R. 1991) for the relief of Alexander Stewart, and I withdraw my objection to the present consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien Alexander Stewart, Houston, Tex., and is directed not to issue hereafter any such warrants or orders in the case of such alien. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Alexander Stewart shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, after "residence" insert "as of July 3, 1947."

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for France of the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 572 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5074) to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MR. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, as a reading of the resolution discloses, it makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5074, which is a national defense measure. In view of world conditions, I cannot imagine that there would be any opposition whatever offered to the resolution or even to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the immediate adoption of the rule. Undoubtedly the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will explain the provisions of the bill when we get into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5074) to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5074, with Mr. MURDOCK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 18 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was created by a Naval Appropriation Act on March 3, 1915. It is an independent agency of the Government which has grown in size and importance from the date of its creation until it now consists of a committee of 17 members, controls physical facilities of $140,000,000 and employs more than 7,000 persons. Its central office is located here in Washington, D. C., and its principal facilities are the Ames Laboratory in California, the Lewis Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, and the Langley Laboratories at Langley Field, Va.

Since the date of its creation in 1915, the NACA has presented its financial requirements for successive fiscal years to the Appropriations Committee without prior authorization from any legislative committee of the Congress. On two occasions in the past, NACA appropriations bills have been subjected to point-of-order objections on the ground that they embodied legislation rather than appropriations. On one of those occasions, the objection was resolved in conference between the Senate and the House. On the other occasion, the House Parliamentarian ruled that the item in question was justified by existing statutory language.

During the hearings conducted by the House Appropriations Committee on the NACA budget for fiscal 1950, this question was again raised and the Appropriations Committee expressed the conviction that an appropriate legislative committee should entertain appropriate authorization legislation for the NACA. This resulted in H. R. 5074, the bill now under consideration, and I want to point out that this is the first general authorization bill for the NACA which has ever been presented to the Congress.

In addition to the general authorization this bill provides specific authorization for new construction, which items I shall presently detail.

Subsection (a) is a general authorization which permits NACA to equip and maintain and operate offices, laboratories, and research stations under its direction. The practical effect of this section is that it is a restatement of the original Appropriation Act of 1915, which created the NACA. This language merely carries out the desire to enact statutory provisions covering these authorizations. This will not be a recurring item in subsequent authorizing legislation for NACA.

Subsection (b) provides for new construction. In the NACA budget for fiscal 1951, an authorization of $16,500,000 is requested for new construction. Of this amount, $15,000,000 is in contract authority and the remaining $1,500,000 is cash. It is considered that this amount of cash is all that can be judiciously expended during fiscal 1951 to implement the authorizations under this section. The specific authorizations under this section are:

First. Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, facility for landing loads research. This is a new facility to simulate under identical conditions of speed, size, weight, and landing surface the loads encountered by aircraft landing gear from the moment of impact to the end of the landing run. Accurate measurements of these loads is essential to the design of safer, more dependable, and lighter landing gear. This will involve an estimated cost of $4,143,000, for which no cash has been requested, but contract authority in an equal amount and in lieu of cash has been requested of the Appropriations Committee.

Second. The second item at Langley involves an expansion of the utility systems which will be required for the utilization and protection of facilities to be completed during the fiscal year 1950. The project includes a new boiler for the heating plant, a water-storage plant, a frequency conversion unit. and the extension of power lines, at an estimated cost of $632,000 for which cash in the amount of $323,000 and contract authority in the amount of $309,000 will be requested.

Third. The next installation involves Wallops Island Station. The expanding research program at this station, which is an island off the coast of Virginia, requires more efficient transportation of personnel, supplies, equipment, research models, and construction apparatus to and from the island. The minimum facility which can meet these requirements is a small ferry and suitable docking facilities, at an estimated cost of $250,000; $50,000 cash and $200,000 contract authority will be requested.

Fourth. The next construction program is at Ames Aeronautical Laboratory in California. It is proposed to modernize the existing 16-foot high-

speed wind tunnel by increasing its maximum operating Mach number from 0.95 to 1.25. The alterations required are similar to those being completed on the Langley 16-foot tunnel. The need for and difficulty of conducting research at speeds near that of sound are so great that this type of improvement must be extended to this tunnel.

The estimated cost of this project will be $11,282,000, for which $502,000 in cash and $10,780,000 in contract authority will be requested.

Fifth. In addition, the present make-up air system of the 12-foot pressure wind tunnel is being utilized for operation of four other wind tunnel facilities, two of which have recently been completed. Experience has shown that delays because of conflicting needs are unduly hampering urgent research work. Additional compressor equipment is required to eliminate these delays and to provide stand-by equipment in the event of break-downs in the existing equipment.

The estimated cost of this project is $375,000, for which a full appropriation will be requested.

Sixth. The final project is located at the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio. Because of the great quantities of air required by jet engines, the altitude tunnel—originally designed for research on reciprocating engines, which do not require as great quantities of air as jet engines—is at present handicapped during research operations involving large jet engines at simulated and high altitudes by insufficient exhauster capacity. The additional exhauster capacity proposed for installation will eliminate this deficiency and greatly increase the usefulness of the altitude tunnel and two groups of high-speed air jets which operate from the same exhauster equipment.

The estimated cost of this project is $818,000, for which $250,000 cash and $568,000 contract authority will be requested.

As previously stated, these projects total $16,500,000, for which an appropriation of $1,500,000 will be requested for fiscal 1951.

Section 2 authorizes the Department of Defense or any other governmental agency, or the components thereof, to transfer supplies, equipment, aircraft, and aircraft parts to NACA without reimbursement. The section, as amended, merely authorizes the transfer of the enumerated types of matériel when it shall prove to the best interest of the Government, as determined between NACA and other governmental agencies.

Section 3 permits NACA to compensate aliens in their employ, notwithstanding statutory prohibition against such practice. There are at present only two such aliens, both of whom have given outstanding service and have been fully cleared by NACA. This same authority has been included in previous appropriation language and approved by the Congress.

Section 4 provides for the renaming of the laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio. More than 1 year ago the NACA renamed this facility the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory. This section merely provides statutory approval of that action.

The committee added three new sections, 5, 6, and 7. Section 5 is general, authorizing legislation to implement section 1 (b), but not to exceed $16,500,000.

Section 6 authorizes appropriations to be made available until expended when specifically provided in the Appropriations Act. This will permit the NACA to develop a program on a sound basis and not to have it disrupted at a critical period.

Section 7 authorizes the prosecution of all projects under direct appropriation or contract authority, as the Appropriations Committee may direct.

The last three sections which the subcommittee has added are a restatement of identical provisions which are included in all construction bills which are presented to the committee.

The bill is endorsed by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Bureau of the Budget and is reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Armed Services.

I would like to point out that the consideration of this bill at this time presents a rather unusual situation. The bill was reported to the House on February 22, 1950. It had been scheduled for House consideration on several different occasions, but, due to the press of other business, it has been impossible to consider the bill before today.

A complete justification for every item contained in this bill has previously been given to the House Committee on Appropriations, and an appropriation covering each of these items is included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for fiscal 1951, which legislation the House approved last Wednesday, May 10. So the net effect of this action today is to provide statutory authorization for the appropriations which you have already authorized and to remove future NACA appropriations, except for new construction, from point-of-order objections. There is no controversy involved here, and I trust that the proposed legislation will be expeditiously approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There may be no importance attached to it, but I wonder why the change in the name of the laboratory at Cleveland.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman from Ohio probably can explain that. Mr. Lewis was one of the outstanding scientists of the world. He was one of the outstanding men and one of the men who really developed much of this program in the beginning.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Was not Mr. Lewis Chairman of the Board at one time?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I think it is being named in his honor for the work he did.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes. He was one of the first Chairmen of the Board.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Most of this money is provided for research in that field, is it not?

Mr. DURHAM. Practically all of this is the real heart of the whole Air Corps development of this country. It includes the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand the money has already been appropriated, and this simply legalizes it?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does any part of this authorization inure to the benefit of the commercial air lines?

Mr. DURHAM. It does not.

Mr. ROONEY. In other words, it is strictly a military proposition?

Mr. DURHAM. It is strictly a military proposition. In fact, we get more from the civilian people than we give them, in my opinion.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not correct that the lessons which are learned from the research activities of NACA are available for the benefit of commercial aviation as well as military aviation?

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly, it is; but I thought he asked if any direct appropriation went to civilian airlines under the authorization of this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. That was not my question at all. I understand that this money is appropriated to the NACA. My question concerned the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]: Are the commercial airlines going to benefit as the result of this $16,500,000 authorization?

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly; there is one provision in here, that of safety landing facilities in which they are very much interested—facilities we are building and expanding at Langley Field.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the commercial airlines are financially benefiting far too much from the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated for aviation by the Congress. They receive far too many benefits they should pay for themselves.

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly, the gentleman will agree with me that it is the responsibility of us here in Congress to try to provide safety regulations for civilians as well as the military—by research basic and fundamental and applied.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish to revert to the question asked by the gentleman from New York to which the gentleman from North Carolina replied that civilian airlines would benefit; the gentleman means they would benefit from the research. Is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it, or is it not, a fact that NACA does not undertake any specific research project at the request of civilian airlines?

Mr. DURHAM. Not that I know of.

Mr. JOHNSON. They just do general research and civilian airlines can

benefit from the facts derived, as well as the military?

Mr. DURHAM. If it had not been for the research done by the civilian airplane manufacturers before the war where would we have been when the war broke out? Where would we have been if we had not had the DC–3's, for instance? And other types of planes developed by private industry it is to our mutual advantage to exchange information.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not believe that we should appropriate money for any special research jobs for those who are in the business for profit.

Mr. DURHAM. We are not doing special jobs for them.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not also true, in answer to the observation made by the gentleman from New York, that business and industry in this country make their contribution to the Government whenever there is an emergency? Why should not civilians benefit by this program as well as the Government?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The reason I made the inquiries of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina was to insure expenditure of the bulk of the requested authorization for military purposes rather than for the development of jet planes for the commercial airlines. If the gentleman assures me that this is 100 percent an authorization for the development of military planes for our Armed Forces, then I will resolve the question in favor of his bill and vote with the able gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I may say to the gentleman that I believe I can assure him of that. Some of these projects at the present time in my opinion should not be discussed on the floor of the House, but if he wants to be assured on that I can assure him of it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill. At the outset, I wish to call the attention of the membership to the importance of the interrogation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], because he is chairman of the committee which makes appropriations for the Department of Commerce, wherein is located the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Civil Aviation Board. We also at one time had the National Advisory Council for Aeronautics in our committee. I wish to assure the membership of the committee that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] knows his aviation, and he knows the appropriations that are made for all civilian aviation and all of the reesarch and is very familiar with the appropriations for NACA.

I call your attention to the fact that the bill we passed in this House just recently making appropriations for independent offices included the appropriations for this agency, the NACA. It included $40,890,000 for salaries and expenses; it included $15,500,000 for construction, and $10,000,000 for contract authorization. The agency wanted $46,000,000 for salaries and expenses, $16,500,000 for construction, and $15,000,000 for contract authorization. Here is a new authorization bill requesting an appropriation of $16,000,000 plus for construction.

I am proud of the work that has been done by the NACA. Its research has resulted in much advancement in aviation. We need that agency and need it very badly if we are going to keep pace with the rapid development and improvement in lighter-than-air craft. May I ask a question of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], who has so ably explained this bill: How does it come that this authorization has been referred to the Armed Services Committee when usually such legislation is handled by the Independent Offices Subcommittee?

Mr. DURHAM. It was referred to that committee by the Speaker.

Mr. STEFAN. I am favorable to the Armed Services Committee handling defense research.

Mr. BROOKS. Legislation of this character has always come to that committee. I handled a bill of similar character some time back.

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad it was referred to the Committee on the Armed Services. I think it should be given full consideration by that committee which is so familiar with the rapid development in Navy and Army aircraft.

May I ask this further question: To which committee will the appropriation matter be referred? I take it it will be the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices?

Mr. DURHAM. I suppose it will be referred to the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. STEFAN. This $16,000,000 is in addition to the $40,890,000 and the $15,000,000?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; this is in addition to that.

Mr. STEFAN. This is in part an emergency?

Mr. DURHAM. I believe the committee is convinced it is an emergency. I think the Appropriations Committee has already taken care of this. We have gotten into the development of speed beyond sound. I may say to the gentleman that up until last year we had never built a supersonic wind tunnel in this country, and I may say also that as early as 1936 Germany had built supersonic wind tunnels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether or not this duplicates any of the research being done by the CAA at its Indianapolis experimental station?

Mr. DURHAM. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I want to clear up what is apparently a misunderstanding in reference to the sixteen and one-half million dollars authorized by this bill. I understand the appropriation bill passed by the House last week for the fiscal year 1951 includes the sixteen and one-half million dollars authorized by this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I have been endeavoring to find out. This is not in addition?

Mr. COLE of New York. No.

Mr. STEFAN. In what item is it included in the appropriation bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. It is in the $15,000,000 for construction and one and one-half million dollars of contract authorization.

Mr. STEFAN. It is already in the bill passed by the House. This is simply an authorization for $16,000,000 which is already in the appropriation bill passed by the House?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. The details have been pretty well covered or answered by the previous speakers.

As a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman, which has charge of the appropriation for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, we have been concerned for several years with the increasing budget and with the fact that a request for an increased authorization had not been before the legislative committee.

This year we suggested that the Committee on Armed Services review the matter, and were advised that it would not be possible for that committee to review the matter before the 1951 budget hearings in the subcommittee, as a result of which the money was put into the budget bill which passed last week. This is the authorization bill now to justify the appropriations the House has already approved. It is very definitely in order.

The work being done by the NACA is of a high quality. Such benefits as might be obtained by the private lines are only those which, under similar situations in other research, would be obtained by the development of new designs in automobiles or new planes or new ships or in the development of atomic energy, of which 20 percent could be used for war and 80 percent for war or peace.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. May I say to the gentleman from California that we reported this bill back in February and the delay in its consideration is simply due to the fact that it has not been placed on the program.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct. We understood that. With the bill coming up and with the chairman's letter to us on the subject, the committee went ahead and appropriated the money.

I support this bill and hope it will pass.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wonder if in the deliberations of the gentleman's committee you came to know something about whether there is a conflict between what the Air Force is doing in research and what these people are doing.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There is no conflict.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. What actually occurred is that we got the cart before the horse. The Committee on Appropriations was really in advance of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. This money has already been appropriated, $1,500,000 cash and $15,000,000 for contract authorization. This bill is simply to give statutory authority to the NACA.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. With the approval of the committee on which the gentleman serves so ably, we felt that the money should be in this year's appropriation bill and put it there.

Mr. SHORT. The members of the Committee on Armed Services are very grateful to the gentleman and other members of his committee for being so considerate and generous.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to state for the information of the Committee that this bill was carefully considered by the full membership of the House Committee on Armed Services and received the complete approval of that committee. The explanation given by the gentleman from North Carolina covers the general subject matter of the bill, but I should like to emphasize that this bill will require no additional funds from the Treasury other than what has already been appropriated or is in the process of appropriation, and that it puts into statutory form the legislative authorization for the continuance of the operation of the NACA, which has not been the case in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within the limits of appropriations now or hereafter available to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics said Committee is hereby authorized—

(a) to equip, maintain, and operate offices, laboratories, and research stations under its direction;

(b) when specified in appropriation acts, to acquire additional land for, undertake additional construction at, and purchase and install additional equipment for, existing laboratories and research stations under its direction; and

(c) to purchase and maintain cafeteria equipment.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Military Establishment or any component thereof is authorized to transfer supplies, equipment, aircraft, and aircraft parts to the Committee without reimbursement: *Provided*, That such transfers shall be reported by the Committee to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with regulations prescribed by him: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed as authorizing the transfer of administrative supplies or equipment: *And provided further*, That this section shall not be construed as prohibiting the loan of items of any sort to the Committee.

SEC. 3. Statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to aliens shall not apply to any persons whose employment by the Committee is determined to be necessary.

SEC. 4. Section 1, paragraph (b), subparagraph (3), of the act entitled "An act to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1948, is hereby amended by striking out the words "Flight Propulsion Research Laboratory" and by substituting in lieu thereof the words "Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "within the limits of appropriations now or hereafter available to."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "when specified in appropriation acts."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "National Military Establishment" and insert "Department of Defense or any other governmental agency."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "by the committee" and after "determined", insert "by the committee."

Page 3, at the end of the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary for the purposes of section 1 (b) of this act, but not to exceed $16,500,000.

"SEC. 6. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction, including administrative overhead, planning and surveys, and shall be available until expended when specifically provided in the appropriation act.

"SEC. 7. Any projects authorized herein may be prosecuted under direct appropriations or authority to enter into contracts in lieu of such appropriation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURDOCK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5074) to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 572, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWSON GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he thought that the Kansas City gang learned anything from the Ohio gang.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest against the closing of the Lawson General Hospital in Atlanta, Ga. That hospital was originally an Army institution, but has been used most profitably and efficiently as a veterans' hospital. I concur in the President's order stopping the building of a new hospital in Atlanta because, in my opinion, no new hospitals should be built at this time; at least not until all available facilities have been used. I voted for the Rankin bill authorizing the building of new VA hospitals, but only after it had been amended so as to require the use of all present available facilities before the building of new ones.

The case for Lawson Hospital is so cogently stated by Mr. Calvin Cox in the Atlanta Constitution for May 15 that I am including that statement as a part of my remarks. I think the order taking over the Veterans' Administration hospital at Augusta is justified, there is no criticism of that, but by all means Lawson General Hospital in Atlanta should be kept open for the benefit of the veterans in north Georgia and northeast Alabama. To close Lawson would be a tragedy for these veterans.

Mr. Cox's article is as follows:

THE CASE FOR LAWSON HOSPITAL

(By Calvin Cox)

If service to the veteran is the yardstick, it would appear the closing of Lawson Veteran's Administration Hospital in Atlanta is, in the language of the GI, "strictly a bad deal." It is to be assumed that veteran hospitals are established to provide medical facilities for veterans, and, furthermore, it would seem logical to establish hospitals where great numbers of veterans are.

State records reveal there are 176,880 veterans in the area now served by Lawson. Under present plans, the 631-bed hospital would be closed by next January 1, and Oliver General Hospital, a former Army institution, established as Georgia's leading veterans' facility. In the Atlanta area, Hospital 48 would be converted from the tuberculosis facility it now is to a 225-bed general hospital.

There is in Augusta now a veterans' hospital of 1,342 beds. This is a psychiatric institution, though it does have approximately

200 beds for general patients. Activation of Oliver General Hospital as a VA facility would give the Augusta area 500 general hospital beds. Seventy miles from Augusta is another VA hospital at Columbia, S. C. It is a permanent facility, with 750 beds.

Counting the psychiatric facilities at Augusta, and with the addition of the 500-bed Oliver General, plus 750 beds in Columbia, we find approximately 2,500 beds available in an area containing only 26,656 Georgia veterans.

After the changes in hospitals are made, the 176,880-veteran area now served by Lawson would have only 225 beds available, at Hospital 48. If that old wartime word "logistics" means anything in peacetime, it would seem there's something radically amiss in this shift of facilities from an area of great need to an area of lesser need.

Under the rules governing operation of VA hospitals, the ailing veteran must go to the closest facility. To 176,880 Georgians, plus a large number in eastern Alabama, that means Lawson.

Lawson now is the leading veteran hospital in the Southeast. It is the leading veteran hospital in the Southeast because it is in the leading medical center of the Southeast, Atlanta. Lawson, because of its location, is able to attract more than enough doctors to fill its requirements. Lawson, because of the large number of patients and because of the consultation services of leading private specialists in Atlanta, and because of the connection with Emory, is certified as a training center by medical specialty boards.

Lawson Hospital is a chest-surgery center, a neurosurgery center, a tumor center, an orthopedic-surgery center, a plastic-surgery center, a specialized eye-ear-nose and throat center, a center for diagnostic study of unusual cases, and a research laboratory center. Because Lawson is the leading VA center for these practices in the Southeast, it is able to attract resident physicians who are training to become specialists in these fields. The hospital now has 55 such resident physicians, 55 consulting specialists, 15 full-time staff members, and 8 interns.

It is pointed out by Lawson officials that this resident-training program attracts large numbers of doctors to Atlanta and to Georgia, and that the vast majority of them stay in the State after becoming highly trained specialists. It is doubted if the reduced beds of 48 Hospital would qualify the facility for the training program now in operation at Lawson.

Lawson is a research center in the Southeast. The large number of cases there provides an admirable scope for research. At Lawson, one of the Nation's outstanding tuberculosis research authorities is on the trail of a simple blood test for tuberculosis. Other doctors are using the new drug cortisone in studies seeking to raise new barriers to the inroads of disease.

It is doubted these research facilities could be carried on in the reduced Hospital 48, with its 225 beds.

Yet it may be argued that these facilities of training and research could be transferred to the new Oliver General Hospital. But one must realize that Atlanta's reputation and standing as a medical center would not follow the VA to Augusta. That city has admirable facilities for doctor cooperation with a VA hospital in the presence of Georgia Medical College, but Augusta isn't the medical center Atlanta is.

The veterans are in the area covered by Lawson and the doctors are available in Lawson itself. What more logical combination is there than a large reservoir of need and the know-how to administer to it?

It would seem that putting the ax to Lawson, with its preeminent position in the field of VA medicine—a standing gained in 4 years of hard work and staff integration—is equivalent to knocking the hub out of a wheel and expecting it to roll on as though nothing had happened.

Long ago the VA said it would build new hospitals only in areas where outstanding medical personnel and facilities could be utilized in conjunction with the hospital. The Presidential order closing Lawson is an exact reversal of this logical policy. The proposed new 500-bed hospital for Atlanta, the structure planned to succeed Lawson, has been canceled, even though $250,000 had been spent for the site.

Look at Dublin. There is a wonderful hospital plant, but it is only partially operated because doctors do not wish to go there. That is why there are empty beds in VA hospitals, because the hospitals are in the wrong places. Some of the best surgery ever performed was done in tents during World War II. You have got to have the doctors, not marble palaces, and Atlanta has got them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGUIRE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR PRESENT-DAY FARM PROBLEM, ITS CAUSES AND ITS PROPOSED SOLUTION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, agriculture has become mechanized. During the years 1909–14, the base period for our original farm parity-price program, horses and mules powered practically all farm operations as well as most forms of city transportation. At that time about 80,000,000 acres were required to grow feed for the horses and mules being worked; therefore 80,000,000 acres were not available to produce food for human consumption.

But times have changed. Improved machinery, improved methods, improved seed, improved livestock breeds, and improved soil management have doubled the output of our farm acres. Today our farmers produce more food than our people can consume. They can no longer sell all the products they can produce, and so cannot continue to operate their acres at full capacity.

The American farmer today no longer needs the "horsepower" once used, but he certainly needs more than ever the "horse sense" he has always possessed. The very success of the American farmer today, the very abundance of our farm production, threatens now to destroy American agriculture.

For years our Department of Agriculture has relied upon price supports, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas to solve the farm problem of overproduction. These things have not worked too well. Recently the Department has given thought to better marketing facilities, world markets, and laboratory research work to find industrial uses for farm crops—and these recent efforts are all good and worth while. However, we have forgotten—passed up entirely—the old McNary-Haugen two-price program for the disposal of farm surpluses. Instead of shackling and regimenting our farmers, as the Brannan plan would do, why not try the as-yet-untried McNary-Haugen plan?

I endorsed the McNary-Haugen plan when it was first presented in Congress. I have always considered it the soundest farm plan advanced by anyone, and I still advocate it as a permanent solution to our farm surplus problem.

Briefly the McNary-Haugen plan proposed a two-price system for farm products, a fair and equitable price on the American market, and a world price for all surpluses exported. The losses suffered by exporting surpluses at world prices would be made up by a percentage assessment upon the farmer for each pound or bushel he sold at the American market price. Wheat, corn, cotton, and oats were the crops to be covered. This plan would not cost the American taxpayer 1 cent. There was and still is more horse sense wrapped up in the old McNary-Haugen plan than in any of the New Deal farm plans. It should be given a trial.

PRICE-SUPPORTS POLICY BOOMERANGS

Mr. Speaker, Henry Wallace when Secretary of Agriculture started a policy of price supports for agricultural commodities that has proven a boomerang. Surpluses of all kinds of perishable farm commodities are piling up under the Wallace price-support program, proving the program extremely costly, very embarrassing, and absolutely unworkable.

For example, under the egg-support program the country's egg production for January 1950 over January 1949 increased 12 percent, which means one-half billion more eggs produced in January 1950 over January 1949. At this rate the Government will have to buy up eight to ten billion surplus eggs this year as compared to the 2,500,000,000 egg surplus bought up by the Government last year.

The potato story is a similar one. The Government paid out $225,000,000 to buy up and destroy the 130,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes for 1948. Acreage limitations were imposed on growers for the 1949 crop. The growers then planted their potato rows closer together, fertilized heavily, and produced 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes in 1949 for the Government to buy up and destroy. In the meantime, the market price for potatoes was so high that potato consumption per person fell from 123 pounds to 108 pounds, a drop of 12 percent.

The egg and potato surpluses are insignificant, however, compared to the Government-owned surpluses of wheat, corn, cotton, flaxseed, linseed oil, and so forth. Storage facilities for these surpluses were expanded last year and will have to be expanded again this year. The Commodity Credit Corporation is asking Congress for an additional $2,000,000,000 to finance these purchases. Nothing can save the Wallace price-support program but disastrous crop failures. Therefore alterations in our agricultural aid program should be made, and made soon.

The National Grange suggests the two-price system for agricultural products as a permanent solution—a fair price on the American market, and a world price for surpluses shipped abroad. In reality this is the old McNary-Haugen farm plan.

THE ORIGIN OF THE BRANNAN PLAN

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress have learned from an authoritative source that the much-publicized Brannan farm plan is the brain child of Henry Wallace, Rexford Tugwell, and Alger Hiss. Prepared when Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture—when both Tugwell and Hiss worked for Wallace—it was buried for several years in the musty

archives of the Department of Agriculture and then resurrected by Mr. Brannan when he became Secretary. He dusted it off and is now trying to sell it to the American farmers. If the plan is the brain child of the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss trio, as reported, then our American farmers should beware.

Mr. Brannan has had months to work out the details of the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss plan, but according to observers at Des Moines, he was unable or unwilling to reveal a single definite item of cost. He had no answer to charges that milk subsidies alone would cost the taxpayers nearly $2,500,000,000 a year. He refused to hazard a guess on the cost of guaranteeing an "income standard" on corn and wheat surpluses. He asks the farmers to buy a pig in a poke that he labels "prosperity" without any mention of cost to the taxpayer, or of the socialistic regimentation involved in the plan.

Our farmers do not want their prosperity dependent on the whims of political planners in Washington. Farmers still resent the killing of little pigs, ordered by the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss trio 15 years ago, and they resent the Government controls Mr. Brannan now proposes. When we start writing programs of this sort in Washington and begin poking them down the people's throats, we can no longer call our Government a Republic.

SECRETARY BRANNAN'S DOUBLE-BARRELED FARM PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, Henry Wallace is out of both Government and party, but his program goes marching on. Wallace paid farmers for pigs and crops they did not raise while millions of people in the cities were short of food. Now Secretary Brannan proposes a guaranteed income for the farmer and lower prices for the consumer. Brannan's plan is a political plan, not an economic plan. He wants to please two great groups of voters—the farmers and the city workers—at the expense of the general taxpayer.

What will his new plan cost? We know that food subsidies in Great Britain cost $1,500,000,000 per year. Our population is three times as large as Great Britain's and we have a much higher standard of living. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that food subsidies for the consumer here would cost at least $6,500,000,000 per year, without considering Government payments to the farmer to insure his guaranteed income. Since the four major crops—corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco—are not to come under the new program, but continue under parity supports at a cost of over $1,000,000,000 a year, the total cost of Secretary Brannan's political farm program could easily run between seven and eight billion dollars per year.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to analyze the Brannan program one finds it difficult to decide whether it is a farm program or a consumer program. Secretary Brannan proposes that farm prices should be allowed to sink to whatever level the law of supply and demand will bring about. This will please the 145,000,000 consumers by providing cheap food, but it will saddle upon the same 145,000,000 consumers added taxes—seven to eight billion dollars—to make up the difference between the cheap food prices and prices that guarantee a fair return to the farmer—plus a heavy payroll burden for the thousands of extra Government employees that will be needed to implement the program.

The 6,000,000 farmers of the Nation, on the other hand, are expected to be delighted with definite assurance that they will receive a check from Uncle Sam to guarantee them a fair return for their labor. Not so pleasing, however, to these same 6,000,000 farmers will be the endless bureaucratic dictation, controls, edicts, and restrictions that will be insisted upon as a necessary part of the Brannan plan. In advancing this program to subsidize and socialize American agriculture, Secretary Brannan did not consult any of the leaders of our farm organizations.

I ask: "Shall we adopt an untried socialistic program which even if it did work would destroy the traditional independence of our farm people? Will the American farmer benefit by regimentation and Government control, which is what the program involves?"

THY LEFT HAND VERSUS THY RIGHT HAND

Mr. Speaker, the Good Book says, "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." The Department of Agriculture takes this biblical statement literally because it does not let the State Department know what it is doing, or vice versa. For example:

Last year the Department of Agriculture bought up 93,355,837 pounds of butter to take it off the market to keep up the high price. But, at the same time, the State Department made a Reciprocal Trade Agreement with Denmark, cutting the duty on butter in half and permitting the importation of 60,000,000 pounds of butter each year. Here we have the right hand—State Department—increasing the supply of butter on the American market, while the left hand—Department of Agriculture—was doing its best to decrease the supply of butter by taking 93,355,937 pounds off the market.

It would be much easier for both the American taxpayer and the American housewife if these two hands of the Government got together and worked together.

OUR ABSURD POTATO PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are receiving letters protesting against the administration's program which destroys potatoes and permits imports of Canadian potatoes. The potato program is nothing in the world but socialism in action. It is the result of Government interference with the free market and the attempts of a few men to substitute their own plans for the workings of a free market.

Everybody loses by such a course. Henry Wallace started these various plans to cut down acreage, kill little pigs, and plow under corn and cotton. It was economically absurd then and it is absurd now. As time goes on the whole thing becomes more and more absurd—and more expensive.

The taxpayer loses because he is taxed heavily to pay support prices whether he is a city man or a farmer. He also loses because he has to pay higher prices for the products he consumes. By running the price of food up, the Government is unjust both to the farmer and to the consumer. Because laborers have to pay more for their food, they strike for higher wages. These higher wages are reflected in the costs of manufactured articles which the farmer must buy. Hence everyone loses—and will continue to lose so long as a Government subsidy-conditioned electorate continues to elect Fair Deal candidates.

In the meantime Secretary Brannan is making speeches all over the country in favor of a plan that would completely socialize agriculture. The tragic thing about it is that the Brannan plan is not a farm plan at all. It is a political plan, advocated by a small group of planners who are in present favor in Washington and who desire to make over and take over America.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present a fair picture of our present-day farm problem. I have tried to point out some of the causes and also to make suggestions for a cure. However, I am satisfied that until we get rid of the starry-eyed theorists that occupy policy-making positions in the Department of Agriculture today; until we get rid of the believers in socialism and communism that occupy important positions in our Federal Government, we will continue to travel down the road to a controlled agriculture, with Washington bureaucrats telling our American farmers when to sow and when to reap, what to plant and how much to plant, when to sell and for what price to sell. When we have controlled agriculture, this will not be America as our forefathers knew it or planned it.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. I noticed an article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times telling about the Chinese in A. D. 1100 trying a plan similar to what is now known as the Brannan plan. Of course, that started them down the road to agricultural despair and failure.

Mr. MASON. If the gentleman will read my complete speech, he will know that I am supporting and advocating the two-price system for our farm products, known originally as the McNary-Haugen plan.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets on Thursday next it meet at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGUIRE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR IS AWAKENING

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the position taken by the President last week in some of his speeches was in direct opposition to that of a part of organized labor in this country.

Apparently the President had not read the newspapers lately. They show that the workers in the electrical utility industry refuse to submit to the inroads of bureaucracy and socialism at the cost of their personal liberty. Both the CIO and the A. F. of L. have served notice in the respective unions operating in the electrical utility industry that the nationalization of that industry has gone too far.

The President stated last week that free enterprise must be destroyed in the electrical power industry in its relation to water resources.

He meant, of course, that the electrical workers, the men who read the meters, climb the poles, and run the generators would then be robbed of their right to strike, their right to work under conditions dictated by themselves, their right to bargain collectively, their right to negotiate freely.

He declared by inference that in future the workers of this class will become the mere puppets of Government ownership.

Already the bureaucrats and Socialists are beating the drums for nationalization of steel and the socialization of medicine. Coal, railroads, and ships are marked for the same fate. The difference between Socialist Britain and Socialist America is only a matter of degree.

This week, for the 'steenth time, the Grand Coulee Dam was rededicated. Harry Truman took his turn at it this time. It is probably the most dedicated dam in the world. Every time a suitable occasion arises to make a doctrinaire speech for the socialistic system of government, somebody rises up and dedicates that dam all over again.

Union labor, particularly the Utility Workers of America, CIO, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., will be especially interested in the President's declaration of war on private enterprise in connection with the electrical power industry. Nationalized power is, of course, step No. 1 on the road to socialism—from which there is no road back to freedom.

Union labor has come to realize that, as workers for the Government, their right to negotiate will be destroyed. Destroyed, too, will be the sacred right of all workingmen, the right to quit their jobs in protest against conditions which they refuse to tolerate.

A Government worker in industrial production—this does not apply to the career services in the normal functions of Government—necessarily becomes a mere cog in the wheel of Government. Union labor knows and fears this, and it knows President Truman should know of their fears.

I speak with some emotion and feeling when I say to rob a man of the incentive of working out his own salvation, of his freedom to negotiate in an atmosphere of liberty, puts him in a strait-jacket, destroying American principles.

My career in this House has been largely devoted to sound development of our Nation's water resources. I find that union labor and my own thinking on this subject are in complete harmony. I should like to summarize my beliefs and my stand in opposition to Truman Marxism. I quote a recent statement which is the voice of union labor and entirely reflects my own beliefs:

1. Where power is generated in conjunction with worth-while water projects, the transmission, distribution, and sale of such energy should, under proper regulation, be allocated to the private utility companies.

Where investor-owned companies fail to provide for the distribution and sale of electrical energy then, and then only, should the Government undertake such duties.

2. Approximately one-fifth of the power generated in America today is distributed and sold by Government agencies. We believe that further encroachment of Government into the utility industry should be discouraged except in cases of national emergency.

3. It is our firm belief that the best interests of all of the people of this Nation can best be served and secured through collective bargaining in investor-owned public-utility corporations.

4. We shall continue to advocate that the water resources of the Nation be developed. However, we shall object to any move that will result in these worthy projects being used as a means of destroying taxpaying utility companies who, under proper regulation, are furnishing adequate service.

5. We further recommend as a matter of policy that the national officers, the local officers, and members use every means available to prevent further nationalization of the utility industry; and

We further recommend as a matter of policy that we insist on fair and proper regulation of the utility industry and that every effort be made to compel utility managements to fulfill their obligations to the consumers and to their employees.

I wish it were my own high privilege to lay claim to the authorship of the language I have just quoted. Certainly I am wholly in accord with the entire statement. It happens, however, to be the statement of policy unanimously adopted on April 30 of this year by the annual convention of the Utility Workers of America (CIO). It is union labor's complete answer to Harry Truman's Marxist death sentence to free enterprise in the electric power industry.

I am happy to state that certain local unions in this industry who are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor have indicated an equally aggressive attitude toward the defense of private enterprise. Union labor has become more and more aware of its stake in the fight against creeping socialism.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. I want in my humble way to state that I am sincerely in accord with every word that the gentleman has uttered; I think that he does visualize the possibility that if something is not done to curtail the moves that are now under way and tendencies that are being followed by the Government not only to socialize the electrical industry but every major enterprise of this country that we will soon find ourselves in the predicament of Great Britain. Incidentally, the first article in the Appendix of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on the theory that electric power is a public responsibility because it is a necessity. I cannot follow that doctrine. I believe that food is a necessity, that clothing is a necessity, that wearing apparel, and the conveniences of life that are essential to this day and time, are all as much necessities as electricity. If we are going to act on the pattern of determining the public responsibility according to the necessities of life, then we, of course, would socialize the entire economy of this country.

As late as the 8th day of this month, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down an opinion wherein they declared that even the war production plants were operated in private enterprise; that to hold otherwise would be contrary to the very philosophy of government which made this the greatest country on the face of the globe. Even the Supreme Court of the United States, which some allege has been packed, can still see the need for continuing private enterprise if we are to exist as the great democracy we have become.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas that private investment and private enterprise are the things that have made this country what it is, not public ownership.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman made the statement in the course of his remarks that the only difference between socialism in the United States and socialism in Britain was simply a matter of degree. The gentleman also made some reference to Marxism. I wonder if he would feel that the difference between Trumanism and Marxism is also just a matter of degree?

Mr. DONDERO. The similarity is in government ownership and in government control of everything.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JACOBS. I wish to point out in connection with the statements that have just been made and the contention that Trumanism and Marxism are the same except in degree——

Mr. DONDERO. No; I said that socialism in Great Britain and socialism in America was only a matter of degree.

Mr. JACOBS. I think that it was predicated upon public ownership. I would like to know what the gentleman thinks about this—and this is the record—at the close of the war this Government owned some $27,000,000,000 worth of war plants that we had built up as a part of the war effort and which constituted approximately 25 percent of the plant potential in this country. We immediately set about—and that was this administration that my friends on the other side are charging with socialism—we immediately set about selling and transferring those plants to private enterprise.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman from Indiana has missed the point entirely. We were not discussing war plants; we were simply discussing the attitude taken by organized labor in the utility field. I speak of the electric-utility field—their attitude in deference of private enterprise instead of Government ownership and control.

Mr. JACOBS. I am only addressing my remarks to the last statement made in regard to the public ownership of property. It is well for the RECORD to show that the present administration disposed of these plants as rapidly as they could be sold to private enterprise, which is the antithesis of any attempt to go toward socialism.

Mr. DONDERO. As far as the war was concerned, whatever the Government had to build during the war was of no further use to it when the war was over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. I would like to take a minute to point out that there is still a relevancy to the statement made by the gentleman now in the well of the House and that is that in England they only desire at the present time complete ownership of six or eight of the basic industries. In England they socialize the industries by controlling the operation of those that are left in private ownership. So that the very fact that this Government, after having built plants during the war, decides to put them into private ownership, but still desires to control their operation, their profits, their prices, and all of their labor costs and functions, is still along the same line, different only in the matter of degree, of that going on in England.

Mr. DONDERO. In my opinion, the Socialist Government in England could not continue if it did not receive support from the United States, which they have been receiving since the end of the war.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. In reference to the statement about the Truman Marxism philosophy, the gentleman now addressing the House is located pretty close to the city of Detroit?

Mr. DONDERO. Very close to it.

Mr. PRICE. Who operates the transportation system in the city of Detroit?

Mr. DONDERO. The city of Detroit does and the transportation system is operating in the red like the Federal Government.

Mr. PRICE. Who was the main proponent of that idea many, many years ago? Was it not Senator Couzens, the great Republican Senator from the State of Michigan, and was he not a great factor in taking over the transportation system?

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman wish me to commit myself to a policy of public ownership in a local matter?

Mr. PRICE. I think when you get into this question, you can go pretty deeply into it and you will find just as many on the left-hand side of the aisle as on the right-hand side of the aisle of the same opinion.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not believe in Government control and ownership when private enterprise can do the job just as well.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1950, the House Committee on Education and Labor, by a vote of 13 to 12, agreed to consider the Burke public-school teachers' salary bill, H. R. 5939, on or after April 17.

I am convinced that the committee acted in good faith, that it meant what it said, and that it will move to action in the near future.

A considerable part of the committee has been busy, it should be noted, as members of the Lucas subcommittee charged to study and report on Federal aid to assist the States in the development of our public school facilities. Another group has been hard at work for several weeks as members of the Bailey subcommittee which has been studying Federal responsibility in relation to school districts overcrowded by reason of Federal activities.

The Federal Government carries a definite responsibility in both these areas. That responsibility should be discharged. The House should move to favorable action as soon as the legislation being prepared by these subcommittees can be favorably reported by the full Committee on Education and Labor.

The Bailey subcommittee has now completed its work. The first, H. R. 7940, is ready to report by the full committee to the House. This bill authorizes Federal aid to assist some 600 war-impacted school districts in meeting the current costs of operating their public elementary and public secondary schools. The second bill, H. R. 8113, providing Federal aid to assist these districts in erecting school facilities made necessary by increased numbers of school children resulting from Federal activities, is before the full committee.

Let me make myself clear in this connection that what I am saying is not in any slightest degree intended to minimize the importance of legislation directed at the alleviation of critical educational needs in these 600 school districts. In their present form, or in any reasonably amended form in which H. R. 7940 and H. R. 8113 may later appear on the floor of the House of Representatives, I intend to actively support them. I congratulate my distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, for the splendid job he has done on these bills.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Critical School Areas," which appeared in the Washington Post, May 3, 1950.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial is as follows:

CRITICAL SCHOOL AREAS

Of all the pending proposals for Federal aid to bolster up the Nation's sagging public-school system, perhaps the most urgent is that aimed at the relief of districts where Federal expansion has created a critical shortage of school facilities. There are more than 500 school districts affected in this way, and they have about a million and a half school children whose education is being impaired as a result. The problem grew out of the acquisition of large property holdings by the Federal Government and an influx of Federal workers. This meant simultaneously an increase in the school-age population and a decrease in the taxable sources of revenue.

The case for Federal aid in these acutely congested areas was stated succinctly by Agnes E. Meyer at a meeting here recently attended by delegates from 19 States. "We are trying to convince Congress," she said, "that the Federal Government must help to solve certain problems created by activities of the Federal Government." In a real sense, the families who migrated to these areas at the Government's behest are our own displaced persons. They constitute a national problem neglect of which will result in national injury. The problem cannot be solved at the local level. It needs to be solved promptly by the Nation in the national interest no less than in the interest of the individuals and the localities involved.

The Post editorial writer states that "perhaps" the most urgent proposal for Federal aid to education now pending in the Congress is represented by the Bailey bills. There is some doubt in the mind of the editorial writer on that point. But certainly all of us will agree that the needs in the war-impacted school districts are critical and should be met.

The Bailey bills are excellent as far as they go. The great difficulty is that they do not go far enough. They limit Federal aid to several hundred school districts or approximately one-half of 1 percent of the school districts in the Nation, when the benefits of Federal aid should be extended to many thousands of school districts. They provide help in districts enrolling from one to one and one-half million children where help is needed for some 10,000,000 children who are either attending no school at all today or else are enrolled in substandard schools.

There can be no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, to continue long to bypass the comprehensive assignment of shoring up our public-school systems, which are in desperate straits today, in order to concentrate exclusively upon mere fractions of that assignment.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY IS INCLUSIVE

It is easily demonstrated, in my judgment, that the Federal Government has a responsibility to aid the States in financing public education in the war-impacted school districts.

It is also demonstrable that the Federal Government has a responsibility to aid the States in providing educational opportunities for children wherever they are neglected.

The worth of a child as an asset to our country cannot be evaluated according

to whether he is denied adequate schooling because of Federal activities, or because the State and community lack the financial strength to provide good schools, or because he lives in a community where overcrowding has resulted from vast population migrations resulting from the war effort.

A neglected child is no less neglected, and no less costly to our country because of that neglect, no matter what the factors responsible for that neglect may be.

At a time when the ways of free men are challenged for existence by ideologies that seek in every way to destroy democracy the demands for national security require that each citizen must function at the peak of his power.

He must know the history of our country and of its political and economic institutions. He must be productive. He must be cooperative. He must possess a controlling conviction in the ways of free men. He must be willing to serve our country in whatever role may be available for him in a time of national crisis. The man cannot qualify in these respects unless in his youth his mind and heart were disciplined through proper education to these ends. This training for youth in time of peace is as basic as in the discipline of military life in time of war.

The demands of national security are urgent. It is appropriate to build our defenses across mid-Europe and to bolster our strength in the far reaches of the Pacific. The billions of dollars being spent for this purpose abroad are of great importance. Our policies directed at security and peace are not, however, in balance when with so many billions expended to bulwark our defenses abroad we neglect to strengthen them through the expenditure of a relatively small sum of money to guaranty to our own children a fair chance to get a basic education in the American way of life here at home.

These are some of the reflections which prompt me to hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will at an early date give effect to its March 15 decision to consider the Burke public-school teachers' salary bill, H. R. 5939. I have personally favored the committee bill all the way through, but I believe the Burke salary bill for public-school teachers will serve the purpose. This is sound legislation, directed at the accomplishment of an important objective.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith a memorializing resolution passed by the General Court of Massachusetts.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News entitled "High Time To Stop Wishful Thinking and To View the Facts Realistically," an editorial in which tribute is properly paid to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. STIGLER), from May 16 to May 20, 1950, on account of official business.

To Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 10 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1151. An act to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers;

H. R. 1354. An act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California;

H. R. 2387. An act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections;

H. R. 2783. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau (Alaska) Camp;

H. R. 5097. An act for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees; and

S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1450. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the second quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program authorized under Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 13, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1451. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 594); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 8527. A bill to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 8528. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 8529. A bill to provide retroactive promotions for certain postal transportation clerks engaged in military service or service on war transfer during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 8530. A bill to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 8531. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 604. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 8532. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 8533. A bill for the relief of Emiko Nishimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2135. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to work for the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2136. By Mr. POLK: Petition of the Central Labor Council of Portsmouth, Ohio, signed by E. H. Dinsmore, secretary, petitioning Congress to prevent the carrying out of the Postmaster General's order of April 18, 1950; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2137. By Mr. RICH: Resolution of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Jersey Shore, Pa., going on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2138. Also, resolution of Loyal Order of Moose, No. 81, Renovo, Pa., urging that the order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal service be rescinded; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.